# **Examination of Two House Doctrine**

Two-House Doctrine from a Karaite Jew's understanding

Karaite Judaism is the "<u>sola scriptura</u>" sub-set among the people who use the Tanakh. Karaites wholeheartedly *believe* what the Tanakh says about the uniting of the houses of Judah and Ephraim, but just as wholeheartedly *reject* the beliefs and practices that have grown up around the assumptions that Christians and Orthodox Jews have added to the WORDS that YHWH gave us through His prophets.

When **YHWH** told Moses to come up to Mount Sinai to receive the Torah in <u>Exodus</u> <u>24:12</u> [JPS], He said "Come up to me into the mountain, and wait there, and I will give you the stone tablets with the teachings and commandments which I have <u>inscribed</u> to instruct them." It says that the commands are <u>written</u>, and no mention is made of an Oral Law being given for instruction.

The **Torah** states in <u>Deuteronomy 4:2</u>, "You shall **not add** <u>anything</u> to what I command you, **or take** <u>anything</u> **away from it**, but keep the commandments of **YHWH**, your Elohim, which I enjoin upon you."

Joshua 8:34–35 [JPS] states:

- **34.** After that, he [Joshua] read <u>all</u> the words of the **Teaching** [Torah], the Blessing and the Curse, just as it is <u>written</u> in the Book of the **Teaching**.
- **35.** There was <u>not a word of all that Moses had commanded that Joshua failed</u> to <u>read</u> in the presence of the entire assembly of Israel, including the women and the children and the strangers who accompanied them.

**First of all**, because **Joshua 8:35** says that Joshua was able to <u>read</u> from the Torah **every word** that Moses had <u>commanded</u> (not just the commandments that had been <u>written</u>). Because Joshua could not have **read** an **Oral** Law out of the **written** Torah, this is saying that Moses <u>had not</u> been given an **Oral** Law,.

<u>Secondly</u>, there could **not** have been **additional commandments** outside of the **written** Torah, because <u>ALL</u> of the commandments that existed could be **read** from the Torah scroll.

And <u>Thirdly</u>, <u>Joshua 1:8</u> [JPS] states: "Let not this Book of the Teaching cease from your lips, but recite it day and night, so that you may observe faithfully <u>all</u> that is <u>written</u> in it. Only then will you prosper in your under takings, and only then will you be successful."

This means that <u>each word</u> is important. Just like "*no job is done until the paperwork is done*," and "*if it isn't written down, it didn't happen*," Karaite Jews generally reject anything that cannot be found <u>written</u> in the Tanakh.

## A little about Bernie Besherse, Chief Justice, Beyt Din Hillel:

- 1- I am a reader, a researcher, and a writer on many topics. I am also a religious court judge. I have been studying the laws of YHWH and rules made by man for many years. I have been a plaintiff in man's courts in the USA all the way from small claims courts to U.S. District Court. I had eight months of experience as a juror in what was, up to that time, the longest and most expensive criminal trial in Alaska history. During that experience, I had a long-term, ring-side seat, watching modern legal theatre, and learned a lot about what constitutes evidence, and how to evaluate evidence. Also, I learned more about how to present and support evidence.
- 2- My method of arriving at a conclusion is to <u>examine</u> the evidence, <u>cross-examine</u> [Proverbs 18:17] the evidence, and have any conclusion <u>supported</u> <u>by</u> the evidence.
  - a. Legal Maxim Expresio unius est exclusio alterus. ~ The expression of one thing is the exclusion of all others. [Black's Law Dictionary, 5<sup>th</sup> Edition, page 521, without case cites]
  - b. A maxim of statutory interpretation meaning that the expression of one thing is the exclusion of another. Mention of one thing implies exclusion of another. When certain persons or things are specified in a law, contract, or will, an intention to exclude all others from its operation may be inferred. Under this maxim, if statute specifies one exception to a general rule or assumes to specify the effects of a certain provision, other exceptions or effects are <u>excluded</u>.
  - c. When the Torah or Prophets make a clear statement, then that is the meaning that was intended. When someone tries to expand the meaning, as do the Christians who are seeking "types and shadows," they are adding to the words that were written. Expanding the Torah with "types and shadows" requires speculation and conjecture, and substitutes that speculation and conjecture in the place of the plain wording of the Torah and Prophets. This is a serious violation of Torah.
    - i. When the Tanakh makes a clear statement, then <u>that</u> is what must be accepted as truth. We can examine the context and we can look at other definitions for the words that were used, but we cannot change the wording or inject another meaning for something that was specifically stated in the Tanakh, or use *imaginary* meanings for support for a pre-existing belief.

- ii. It is common for people, especially Christians, to take a convenient phrase that can be twisted into something that might support their belief in Jesus, and make the claim that the passage in the Tanakh has two applications, - a *present* (when written) application as well as a *future* application, that might possibly support their belief in Jesus. If they allow themselves to invent dual applications, why stop there? Why not triple applications, or scores of applications? It is the Karaite position that the Tanakh says what it means, and means what it says, and any invention of additional meanings is a violation of <u>Deuteronomy 4:2</u>.
- d. Sometimes, there are words that can have alternative translations that can make the passage more easily understood. The bible was given to us in Hebrew, and it was given to us for our instruction in righteousness, so we must be able to understand it before we could be held accountable for what it says. We should exercise extreme caution when doing this, because WE might also violate <u>Deuteronomy 4:2</u> and fall into condemnation.
  - i. In Hebrew: other applications is an adding onto or taking away from the meaning.
  - ii. When a Hebrew prophet makes a prophesy, he often uses phrases like "Thus sayeth YHWH our Elohim," or "the word of YHWH came to me that, \_\_\_"
  - iii. Ask yourself, "Where can you find an example of a <u>Hebrew</u> prophet citing an <u>event</u> in a previous book, and turning it into a <u>prophesy</u>?" When the Hebrew prophets do not or cannot turn an <u>event</u> into a prophesy, what makes us think that Christians should have the liberty to create dual (or multiple) applications like Matthew citing an <u>event</u> like Rachel weeping for her children, and turning it into a prophesy?
  - iv. When there is no written support (only imaginary support) for the spurious belief, this is like adding to the Torah, which is a very serious crime.
- e. When, after reading a passage in several translations, I am having a difficult time understanding the meaning, I go to Strong's Concordance and try to find an alternative word that might help in understanding. As an example of difficulty in understanding, and a method of resolving the issue, at least to my own understanding, I'll give you the Shma, -<u>Deuteronomy 6:4</u>.

In Hebrew, with transliteration and English translation below it:

: שמע ישׂראל יהוה אלהינו יהוה אחר echad YHWH eluhenu YHWH Israel Shma ← one YHWH Almighty YHWH Israel Hear ←

In the King James Version:

6:4 Hear, O Israel: The LORD our God is one LORD:

In the KJV with Strong's definitions:

**<u>6:4</u>** Hear,<sup>H8085</sup> O Israel:<sup>H3478</sup> The LORD<sup>H3068</sup> our God<sup>H430</sup> is one<sup>H259</sup> LORD:<sup>H3068</sup>

In the <u>JPS 1917</u>:

<u>6:4</u> HEAR, O ISRAEL: THE LORD OUR GOD, <u>THE LORD IS ONE</u>.

In the <u>JPS 1999</u>:

<u>6:4</u> Hear, O Israel, The LORD is our God, <u>the LORD alone</u>.

Interesting, isn't it?

You can immediately see by comparing the <u>Hebrew</u> and the <u>KJV</u> that the final word, <u>LORD</u>, is *present* in the KJV but is *absent* in the Hebrew. The final word in the Hebrew is 7778, - echad. The final word in KJV is LORD. This is an <u>addition</u> to the Torah, which is prohibited. It also imposes upon the reader the preconceived ideas of the translators.

I dislike raising an issue or pointing out a problem unless I can also suggest a peaceful solution. Sometimes it causes more confusion than it does assist in understanding, so let's try to make sense out of the Shma, OK?

The **ORDER** by YHWH to "<u>**HEAR**</u>," does not mean just to <u>*be aware of a sound*</u>.

Shma means to listen *CLOSELY*, with implication of <u>attention</u>, <u>obedience</u>, etc.

The **ORDER** is directed toward Israel, which is obviously am\_Israel, because eretz\_Israel *cannot* hear, and medinot\_Israel *will not* hear.

Who is am\_Israel supposed to listen to?

YHWH, their Almighty ONE.

Why or how are they to listen?

In the KJV, they are supposed to be listening because He is <u>one LORD</u>.

In the <u>JPS 1917</u>, because <u>He is one</u>.

But do either of these options make sense? Not really.

The final word is "echad," which is a number (singular) that is often translated as first, alone, or only.

In the <u>JPS 1999</u>, where is says we are to pay attention to YHWH our Elohim, and to Him <u>alone</u> (possibly, to Him *ONLY*), then the sentence makes the most sense.

A shorter version of the sentence, in modern English, might be:

"Listen to and obey YHWH your Elohim, - YHWH only."

Does this make sense? Or does this violate <u>Deuteronomy 4:2</u>? What do you think?

- f. We can read the bible all we want to, but unless we understand the WORDS *as they were written*, we will not grow in wisdom. If we leave out words, or add words, or twist the words, then we may even be bringing condemnation upon ourselves.
  - i. Excerpts out of the legal definition of "presumption" can be very instructive. The below definition is taken out of Black's Law Dictionary, 5<sup>th</sup> Edition. On page 1067, we find:
    - 1. A presumption is a rule of law, statutory or judicial, by which finding of a <u>basic fact</u> gives rise to existence of <u>presumed</u> fact, until presumption is rebutted.
    - 2. The better rule is that once <u>evidence tending to rebut</u> the presumption is introduced, <u>the presumption</u> loses all its force.
  - ii. Likewise, it can be very instructive to read about the difference between presuming and assuming. Again out of Black's Law Dictionary, 5<sup>th</sup> Edition, page 112, we find:
    - 1. Assumed facts. Facts concerning which no <u>evidence</u> has been introduced at trial and hence no rulings of law or jury instructions are required. In argument, a hypothetical set of facts used to illustrate a point of law.
    - 2. There is a legal objection used at trial where an attorney will say, "OBJECTION! Assumes facts not in evidence." This requires that the party that is putting forth the <u>assumed</u> facts provide a <u>foundation</u> for the allegation by finding admissible evidence for support for the assumption.
  - iii. Assuming facts not in evidence When you cannot find an idea written in the Torah, or in the Prophets, then you cannot use an assumption for supporting a hypothesis. Substituting "types and shadows" or "smoke and mirrors" in place of actual evidence is basically dishonest.

- g. Another failure in logic is that they <u>ignore all evidence</u> that goes against their pre-conceived conclusions and beliefs This is the most common failing among Christian apologists who try to claim that the Tanakh supports their religion.
  - i. When there is absolutely no verse in the Tanakh saying that anyone except YHWH is our savior, they *just ignore it*.
  - ii. When there is absolutely no verse in the Tanakh that tells us that we are ever, under any conditions, allowed to drink blood, they *just ignore it*.
  - iii. When there is absolutely no verse in the Tanakh that tells us that we are ever, under any conditions, allowed to eat human flesh, they *just ignore it*.
  - iv. When there is no verse in the Tanakh that tells us that one man can die for another man's sin, they *just ignore it*.
  - v. When there is no verse in the Tanakh that tells us that the Messiah will be called the son of YHWH, they *just ignore it*.
  - vi. When there is no verse in the Tanakh that tells us that the Messiah will save us from our sins, they *just ignore it*.
- h. Failing to verify all of the facts before arriving at a conclusion One first and best examples of this is failure that can be found in the New Testament is the allegation that Matthew makes regarding the slaughter of the children in Bethlehem Judah, saying that it was prophesied in the Tanakh. [Matthew 2:17 - 18] The "Bethlehem Ephratah" [Jeremiah 31:15] in the Tanakh reference about <u>Rachel</u> was in the land of Zebulun, about <u>70 miles</u> away from <u>Bethlehem Judah</u>.

There are many other, gross errors, in the New Testament, but this little detail is lost on people who do not seek out and research all of the facts. It certainly provides more evidence that the New Testament was not written by people who lived in Israel, and the work-product of the Council of Nicea is NOT an extension of the religion of the Tanakh.

**3-** How do we straighten out the mess????

When YHWH *tells us* to do something, it will not get done until *WE DO IT*. When YHWH says that HE will do something and we try to do it for Him, then we are telling YHWH that we do not think/believe that He is able to deliver on His promises.

- a. Example #1 <u>I Samuel 8:18</u>
  - i. In verse 3, the judges were taking bribes to deliver per verted judgement.
  - ii. In verses 4 5, the Elders wanted to throw out their King along with a few corrupt judges.
- iii. In verse 6, Samuel asks YHWH what to do.
- iv. In verse 7, YHWH says "they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected Me, that I should not be king over them."
- v. In verse 18, we are told that we will cry out for relief from the king that we chose to rule over us, and YHWH would not hear us in that day. This means that WE must make the first move to disavow the earthly king before we can expect YHWH to provide relief.
- b. Example #2 <u>Ezekiel 37:19 & 23</u>
  - i. **OUR** portion is to give up the idols, detestable things, and transgressions.
  - ii. **HIS** job is to re-unite the two houses.
  - iii. We need to concentrate on OUR job, and trust Him to do His job.
- **C.** <u>Zephaniah 3:9</u> For <u>then</u> will I turn to the peoples a <u>pure language</u>, that they may all call upon the name of the LORD, to serve Him with one consent.
- i. YHWH says that <u>HE</u> will do it.
- ii. There is a lot of speculation on exactly what this "pure language" will be, but that is not up to us. If WE try to implement it, we will be placing ourselves (or our favorite guru) "before" YHWH.
- iii. UNTIL the pure language is restored, it is my understanding that we should try as much as we can to learn about ancient Hebrew, but even if we perfected ancient Hebrew (Paleo-Hebrew), we would still not be qualified to restore the pure language.

- iv. UNTIL the pure language is restored, there will be differences in understanding, but it is not something that should cause lack of fellowship among Torah-keepers.
- v. For instance:
  - 1. Nehemia Gordon has his theories on the pronunciation of YHWH, as do I. His theory comes from some vowel marking on some text that he was reading and translating on September 11, 2001. His texts may or may not have been from Before the Common Era (BCE). His theory is that the Name is pronounced Yehovah'.
  - 2. My theory is based on the writings of Flavius Josefus, from the first century CE. Josefus says in his "Antiquities of the Jews," that the name of the Hebrew God is made up of the <u>vowels</u>, יהוה.
  - 3. Josefus was saying that each of the sounds was a <u>vowel</u> <u>SOUND</u>. The letters in YHWH do double-duty, as both consonants and vowels. As a vowel, the yud, ', has the sound of a long E, the heh, ', has the sound of a short A, and the waw, ', has the sound of the letter U, as in "soon." Combined, YHWH makes the sound of eeeeeaaaaa-uuuuu waaaaa
  - 4. Who is correct? Nehemia Gordon, or Bernie Besherse? We cannot <u>both</u> be correct, so the other alternatives are:
    - a. Nehemia is correct and Bernie is wrong, or
    - b. Bernie is correct, and Nehemia is wrong, or
    - c. Both Nehemia and Bernie are wrong, and we are both happily waiting for YHWH to show us the pure language, and in the mean-time, I respect his right to depend upon his research, and he respects my right to depend upon my research.

5. Nehemia has pointed out the verses in <u>Psalms 44:20-21 (21-22</u> in KJV) where it says:

Psa 44:20 (44:21) If we had forgotten the name of our God, or spread forth our hands to a strange god;

**Psa 44:21** (44:22) Would not God search this out? For He knoweth the secrets of the heart.

Nehemia explains that this means that even though we call out to the Eternal ONE using a name that we learned through ignorance, that YHWH sees our heart, and does not hold our ignorance against us.

- 4- What is the Two-House Doctrine, and where does it come from???
  - a. <u>Ezekiel 37:15 28</u> ~ This should be read in several versions, KJV first, then some version with expanded definitions, and finally, JPS 1999.
- 15. The word of the LORD came again unto me, saying,
- 16. Moreover, thou son of man, take thee one stick, and write upon it, For Judah, and for the children of Israel his companions: then take another stick, and write upon it, For Joseph, the stick of Ephraim, and *for* all the house of Israel his companions:
- 17. And join them one to another into one stick; and they shall become one in thine hand.
- 18. And when the children of thy people shall speak unto thee, saying, Wilt thou not shew us what thou *meanest* by these?
- 19.Say unto them, <u>Thus saith the Lord GOD</u>; Behold, <u>I</u> will take the stick of Joseph, which *is* in the hand of Ephraim, and the tribes of Israel his fellows, and will put them with him, *even* with the stick of Judah, and [I will] make them one stick, and they shall be one in <u>mine</u> hand.
- 20. And the sticks whereon thou writest shall be in thine hand before their eyes.
- 21. And say unto them, Thus saith the Lord GOD; Behold, <u>I will</u> take the children of Israel from among the heathen, whither they be gone, and will gather them on every side, and bring them into their own land:
- 22. And **I will make them one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel**; and **one king** shall be king to them all: and they shall be no more two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all:
- 23.Neither shall they <u>defile themselves</u> any more with their <u>idols</u>, nor with their <u>detestable things</u>, nor with any of their <u>transgressions</u>: but <u>I will save</u> them out of all their dwellingplaces, wherein they have sinned, and <u>will cleanse them</u>: so shall they be my people, and I will be their God.
- 24. And David my servant *shall be* king over them; and they all shall have one shepherd: they shall also walk in my judgments, and observe my statutes, and do them.

- 25. And **they shall dwell in the land** that I have given unto Jacob my servant, wherein your fathers have dwelt; and they shall dwell therein, *even* they, and their children, and their children's children **for ever**: and my servant **David** *shall be* **their prince for ever**.
- 26. Moreover I will make a covenant of peace with them; it shall be an everlasting covenant with them: and I will place them, and multiply them, and will set my sanctuary in the midst of them for evermore.
- 27. My tabernacle also shall be with them: yea, I will be their God, and they shall be my people.
- 28.And the heathen shall know that I the LORD do sanctify Israel, when my sanctuary shall be in the midst of them for evermore.
  - b. Is <u>Ezekiel 37:15-28 *future* tense</u>, or *present* tense?
    - i. It was Future tense when it was written, and *still* future, because none of the events that were prophesied have *ever* come to pass.
    - ii. The importance of this fact becomes obvious to us when we begin thinking about where we ARE versus where we WANT TO BE, and what is keeping us HERE.
  - c. At this point in time, <u>everyone</u> is waiting for the Messiah, and we are also waiting for the two houses to be rejoined.
  - d. As surely as the two houses have not yet been rejoined, as described in verse 19, above, the houses are still defiled with idols, detestable things, and mired in their transgressions.
  - e. What do various 2-house doctrine adherents believe?
    - i. There is a quite impressive list of them found in Wikipedia and other internet sources.
    - ii. In essence, it appears that most 2-house adherents are Christians, who are partly aware of some Hebrew words, and want to feel good about being Christian, without having to change their ancient, pagan belief that *they can sin and <u>have someone else</u> pay for it*.
    - iii. Most 2-House groups seem to want to be part of the Ezekiel 37:19 verse, without yet being able to recognize that they must also have to rid themselves of the pagan beliefs and practices that they learned through the New Testament. Before they can completely unite as one Israel, they must be willing to subject themselves to Ezekiel

<u>37:23</u>, and get rid of their idolatry, detestable things, and transgressions.

- iv. The major item that appears to be preventing the fulfillment of <u>Ezekiel 37:19</u> is the unwillingness of am\_Israel to be subjected unto <u>Ezekiel 37:23</u>.
- f. Jeremiah 32:37 44
- 37- Behold, I will gather them out of all the countries, whither I have driven them in Mine anger, and in My fury, and in great wrath; and I will bring them back unto this place, and I will cause them to dwell safely;
- 38- and they shall be My people, and I will be their God;
- 39- and I will give them **one heart** and **one way**, that they may fear Me for ever; for the good of them, and of their children after them;
- 40- and I will make an everlasting covenant with them, that I will not turn away from them, to do them good; and I will put My fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from Me.
- 41- Yea, I will rejoice over them to do them good, and I will plant them in this land in truth with My whole heart and with My whole soul.
- 42- For thus saith the LORD: Like as **I have brought all this great evil upon this people**, so will I bring upon them all the good that I have promised them.
- 43- And fields shall be bought in this land, whereof ye say: It is desolate, without man or beast; it is given into the hand of the Chaldeans.
- 44- Men shall buy fields for money, and subscribe the deeds, and seal them, and call witnesses, in the land of Benjamin, and in the places about Jerusalem, and in the cities of Judah, and in the cities of the hill-country, and in the cities of the Lowland, and in the cities of the South; for I will **cause their** captivity [*literally*: their former state of prosperity] to return, saith the LORD.'

Verse 44 is a *very good* example of why it is so necessary to learn how to use a good dictionary!!!

It is our *former prosperity* that will be restored, not our *captivity*!!!

We will be restored to our condition <u>**BEFORE</u>** the captivity.</u>

## 5- What is keeping the Ephraim people separated from Judah?

# a. On the Internet, on a <u>Hebrew Roots</u> web site, these particular Messianics begin their discussion of the Two-House theology with this:

By **Michael Bugg** ~ While not all in the Two-House Movement make the error of denying the universality of the Good News of the Messiah, the core assumption of most who enter such fellowships—that they personally are descended from the northern tribes of Israel—remains an error in both history and theology. However, the Bible does provide an alternative for those whose hearts the Spirit has filled with the desire and calling to draw ever nearer to the Jewish people.

- b. Michael Bugg is saying that he believes that it is an error to deny the "universality" of the "Good New" (gospel) of the "Messiah." This is, in context with the rest of their web site, an obvious admission that he believes the fables that were concocted at the First Council of Nicea, where pagan priests were assembled by a pagan Emperor, and the result was <u>another</u> pagan religion made up of previous pagan religions and then dressed up in a beanie, tallit, and tzitzit.
- c. Presumption vs. Assumption
  - i. Michael Bugg assumes that his New Testament is a valid extension of the Tanakh, in spite of the overwhelming evidence that the New Testament is merely the ancient pagan practices of Mithraism and Zoroastrianism that is dressed in the trappings of the Tanakh.
  - ii. Michael Bugg, and the entire Messianic Movement, accepts the Jesus character as being the Hebrew Messiah. This theory is "made up out of thin air," so to speak, because there is absolutely nothing in the <u>37 messianic prophesies</u> in the Tanakh that can be cited as a basis for presuming that there is any validity to the New Testament.
- d. Are there any WORDS in <u>Ezekiel 37:15 28</u> that direct am\_Israel on what to do between now and the re-uniting of the houses?
  - i. Not specifically, but are there any words *in the Tanakh* that give us direction?
  - ii. YES!!! We are to keep Torah!
  - iii. Because YHWH gave us the foreknowledge, in writing, then we are to be aware of the future re-uniting, and we are being given an opportunity, in advance, to get rid of the idols and detestable things. We can cease our many transgressions. We can make it easier on ourselves, or not. Our choice.

- iv. As surely as there is no RIGHT WAY to do the WRONG THING, there is no WRONG TIME to change our behavior (repent) and start doing the RIGHT thing.
- e. In order to be re-united with Israel, Ephraim must get rid of the idols, detestable things, and cease their transgressions.
- f. Some other things that Ezekiel says, are
  - i. One man cannot die for the sins of another Ezekiel 18:19; also 2 Chronicles 25:4; (therefore, Jesus could not die for my sins)
  - ii. The son cannot die for the sins of the father Ezekiel 18:17 (we do not die for Adam's sin).
  - iii. When we get our lives in line with Torah, we save our own souls alive, and will not die Ezekiel 18:27 28 (we do not need Jesus)
  - iv. Bottom line? The soul that sinneth, <u>IT</u> shall die. <u>Ezekiel 18:4</u>; <u>Ezekiel 18:20</u>;
- g. The above verses are <u>EXPLICIT</u>. Can anyone find, anywhere in the Tanakh, ANY words that are <u>as explicit</u> saying that the (or a) <u>Messiah</u> can or will die for our sins? That Jesus can die for our sins? That we can die for someone else's sins? Or do you have to resort to *types and shadows*, *smoke and mirrors*, or some other kind of addition onto the WORDS given by YHWH to the prophets?
- h. Do the Two-House Christians think that the same YHWH that drove them OUT of Israel in <u>Jeremiah 32:37</u> is going to now accept them back into Israel and let them bring with them their idols, detestable things, and transgressions?
- i. If they cannot or will not see that their Christianity is what YHWH was talking about, then <u>EXACTLY WHAT</u> do they think it is that DOES constitute the idols, detestable things, and transgressions?

To listen to the "rough draft" of this examination, you can go to the following link for roughly an hour of discussion between Bernie Besherse, C.J., and the owner of the web site.

http://www.podcasts.com/2730-years...and-counting-34f045285/episode/BERNIE-BESHERSE-PANAMA-f7b8

### Please send any comments about this article to:

BeytDinHillel@GMail.com

Similar articles and papers that were written, formatted, or edited by Bernie Besherse:

1	How many in YahHead.pdf	24	Counting of the Omer.xlsx Spreadsheet)
2	Has THE Messiah Come.pdf	25	Counting of the Omer - scripture cites.pdf
3	Problems with the NT.pdf	26	Message to Friends about Omer.pdf
4	The Jesus Forgery.pdf	27	False Prophet Test.pdf
5	NT Disagrees With Itself.pdf	28	Who are the Rabbis?
6	Mithra: The Pagan Christ.pdf	29	Roman Tribute Coin
7	383 false Messianic Prophecies.pdf	30	Romans 13 & 1 Peter 2:13-14
8	Gentiles take hold of a Jewish Cloak	31	The accuracy of our written Torah.pdf
9	72 Jerusalem Jews translate Torah.pdf	32	Origins of the Jesus Mythos
10	Can Jesus be a ransom for our souls.pdf	33	Why I Gave Up Jesus
11	For it is Written, - or IS it?.pdf	34	Forgiveness of sin in the Tanakh
12	Yes, it IS written (Re-Direct).pdf	35	Does Christianity have Hebrew Roots?
13	Forgiveness of Sin without blood.pdf	36	No Not One
14	Ten Commandments & Los Lunas Stone.pdf	37	The Roman Road
15	Jesus, the Perfect Passover Lamb?	38	Examination of Two House Doctrine
16	Why Jesus Didn't Qualify as the Messiah.pdf	39	Karaites Believe
17	Why Jews Don't Believe in Jesus.pdf	40	Rise Of The Karaite Sect-Cahn 1937
18	Torah is Forever.pdf	41	Alternate Date For Passover
19	Virgin Birth <u>IS</u> possible.pdf		
20	Karaite discussion of Sukkoth in exile.pdf		
21	How do we celebrate Sukkoth		
22	Talmudic Logic – (a story, probably fiction)		
23	NT Contradictions.pdf	42	List Of Articles On Religious Topics

#### יהוה

The name of our Creator is made up of four, Hebrew <u>vowels</u>, Y H W H יהוה. Vowels are <u>sounds</u>, not just marks on paper. (source: Flavius Josephus - Antiquities of the Jews)

The letter **¬** (h) when used as a vowel, usually has the "ah," "ha," or the "huh" sound. The **¬** is the *definite* article, or *THE*, *SPECIFIC*, *to the EXCLUSION of ALL others*.

This is exemplified in showing the difference between the word "eretz," meaning land, and the words "ha\_Eretz," meaning *THE Land of Israel*, to the <u>exclusion</u> of all others.

In Hebrew, the letters (y) and (v)(w) are used interchangeably, and when located in the first, second, or third position in a word, indicate the tense of the word, either past, future, or continuing.

Being placed in the first and third positions, the ' and ' indicate that the name is **both past and** future, or, - *Eternal*.

The **T** associated with **both** the **'** and the **'** means that the name is specifically, to the exclusion of all others, both *past* and *future*, or **THE Eternal**.

Furthermore, being *singular*, and *being found <u>twice</u>*, the **T** would also allow the addition of the word, **ONE**, as a descriptor.

The Name, **YHWH**, could then be logically rendered as **The Eternal ONE**, because **He** has eternal existence, **to the exclusion of all others**.

It is pronounced in one, long breath, like the wind, with the accent on the middle syllable. .

eeeeeaaaaaa UUUUUUU' waaaah