

Origin of the Name Jesus

Presented by your servant, Dan Baxley

Origin of the Name JESUS

Email: dan@servantsofyahshua.com

www.servantsofyahshua.com or www.yahshuaservant.com

This is excellent research taken from Wikipedia and I would suggest you go there for the complete coverage of this subject concerning the name Jesus and Yeshua. What follows is a small portion of that study with my comments added, not to contradict the study, or the research, but adding to it some reasoning and logic when it comes to accepting false Messiah's and other names not of our Savior.

Original name for Jesus --

Source: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Yeshua> (name)

“The English name Jesus derives from the Late Latin name Iesus, which transliterates the Koine Greek name 'Inoous Iesoûs.

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

Servant's Comment: You will notice the English Name Jesus is not derived from the Hebrew, not the ancient Hebrew (Paleo) and not from Modern Hebrew, and not from Aramaic language. When our Savior was given His Name it was not a Greek name, and not a Latin name. Our Savior came to His own (Mat 15:24), the house of Israel, it was not He but His Apostles, mainly Paul, that preached the Gospel to the Gentiles. Our Savior did not even go to the Samaritans (Mat 15:25-28) as He objected to granting a request but later conceded. From this encounter we can see it would be highly unreasonable to suggest our Savior possessed a Samaritan name, or a Gentile name. He came as a Jew which the Gospels accounts make plain. There is also examples of what He would be name in prophetic types found in the Hebrew Scriptures. The Book of Joshua (old English transliteration of His Name) tell as story of the coming of our Savior to lead His

people into the promised land, into the Kingdom of God. Joshua of the OT a type of Messiah and his name was changed from Hosea to YaHshua (Joshua) pointing to the true deliver to come. Again we find in the Book of Zechariah a man called YaHshua (Joshua), a priest being crowned as a King. Read Chapter 3 and you will see this forerunner of our Savior is called the Branch which identifies our Savior. These two examples are no mistake and we see His Name declaring His purpose and this Name, given Him at birth and it was neither Greek nor Latin.

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

Servants Comments: Here we see the origin of the corrupted name, Yeshua, replacing the original name YeHoshua. This name is being pronounced as Yes - shoo - ah but when we find this very name in the Hebrew Dictionary (H3442) we find the pronunciation is presented as YaH-shoo-ua, or YaH-shoo-ah. This, I believe is were the "transliterated" Name, YaHshua, comes from and as a transliteration is a pretty good pronunciation. Some do prefer YaHoshua which is also closer to the real Name than Yeshua, as it is pronounced today, and most definitely better than the false Latin Name Iesus, or the English Jesus. If this business of "Transliteration" and "translation" is confusing please go to this link for a detailed explanation -- [Transliteration](#).

Contrary to what some seem to think, a "transliteration" does not have to appear as the original, but is to appear in the letters of the other language creating a similar sound to that of the original. Once this understood the arguments against certain English forms can be ignored. One thing that cannot be ignored and comes to light is that the names used by Christianity today and by the Jews are not "transliterations", or are not even the name they claim to be.

YeHoshua and YeHushua are variations of the same name, as is YaHushua, or YaHshua. The "a" vowel replacing the "e" vowel as a better choice today as the "e" of old used to be in the "long" form which has the sound of the "a" as in the word, Yawn, while the "e" of today is sounded out as in the word "Yes" which is not correct even though many scholars and others claim otherwise, insisting on saying Yes - shoo - ah instead of YaH-shoo-ah. What makes this so important is in the Yeshua form and in the Greek and Latin, the "H" is dropped from the Holy Name of the God of Israel as well as from the birth Name of our Savior.

“The earlier form *Yehoshua* did not disappear, however, and remained in use as well. In the post-exilic books, Joshua the son of Nun is called both Yeshua bin-Nun (Nehemiah 8:17) and Yehoshua (I Chronicles 7:27). The short form *Yeshua* was used for [Jesus ben Sirach](#) in Hebrew fragments of the [Wisdom of Sirach](#).

(Some concern remains over whether these fragments faithfully represent the original Hebrew text or are instead a later translation back into Hebrew.^[22]) The earlier form *Yehoshua* saw revived usage from the [Hasmonean](#) period onwards, although the name *Yeshua* is still found in letters from the time of the [Bar Kokhba Revolt](#) (132-135 AD).

In the context of the documentary entitled [The Lost Tomb of Jesus](#), archeologist [Amos Kloner](#) stated that the name Yeshua was then a popular form of the name Yehoshua and was "one of the common names in the time of the [Second Temple](#)."^[23] In discussing whether it was remarkable to find a tomb with the name of Jesus (the particular ossuary in question bears the inscription "Yehuda bar Yeshua"), he pointed out that the name had been found 71 times in burial caves from that time period.^[24]

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

Servant comment: This article points out how the "original" name had never disappeared but was replaced by a "short" form. The problem with this "short" form is that it sounds nothing like the Original so it fails as a "transliteration". At one time it must have satisfied those refusing to use the "full" Name of their God by the dropping of the "H" (the transliterated letter for the original Hebrew). This was supposed to be pronounced as YeH-shoo-ah, as though the "H" remain but we know today this form is now pronounced as Yes-shoo-ah.

Seeing both forms, Yeshua, and YeHoshua used in Scripture should tell us the original, YeHoshua, is not lost and there is really no reason to be using the corrupted form, Yeshua, as the pronunciation has changed and is no longer a proper transliteration. It finds its support in the fact it appears similar to the bogus name Jesus. The Christians like this, and the Jews like it too but for different reasons. The Jews, and I include the Messianic Jews in this, say Yeshua is a short form and is found in the Scriptures -- forget the priests and the Scribes messed with it in translation of the Hebrew to the English -- transliterating names incorrectly, on purpose. The Christians are happy to acknowledge the corrupted name, Yeshua, because it looks so similar to the name they preach and teach in -- forget the false name Jesus is really from the Greek and Latin.

Something to Think About

YeHoshua, YaHoshua, YeHushua, YaHushua, YaHshua, Yeshua, Iesous, Iesvs, Iesus, Jesus -- Now Think, which are the transliterations of the Transliteration? The beginning of the *replacement* name, Yeshua, we begin to

see the change taking place and finally the complete replacement of His Name that is nowhere near the original. Is this God changing the Name of His Son, our Savior, or man? Maybe there is something even deeper going on here - why is this so important and who, as an enemy of our Savior and of those He is calling would seem to benefit the most by keep, or changing the Name of our Savior?

It is my hope this short *article* will assist you in coming to see clearly through the fog of biased opinion when it comes to uncovering our Savior's Name, the Name He was given at birth, a Name by which we must all be saved (Acts 4:12; 2:21, Zech 13:9, Ps 79:6, Rom 10:13-14) When you read those verses remember the names have been changed in your bible, it is up to you to restore what has been changed.

(Act 4:12) Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other Name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved.

(Act 2:21) And it shall come to pass, *that* whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved.

(John 17:11) And now I am no more in the world, but these are in the world, and I come to thee. Holy Father, keep through thine Own Name those whom you have given me that they may be one, as we *are*.

(Zech 13:9) And I will bring the third part through the fire, and will refine them as silver is refined, and will try them as gold is tried: **they shall call on My Name, and I will hear them: I will say, It is my people: and they shall say, YaHWeH is my God.**

(Rom 10:13) ***For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.***

Think of it like this, if there were no other names and these names we see in the KJV and other translations are correct without any alternates then that would be the end of it, but this is not true, there are alternate choices and the topper is the "alternates" are *the originals*. Why accept a form that never existed until around 400 years ago when we have the ability to return His original birth Name? If we have the original, or a much closer transliteration, in today's language and corrected lettering, then why not use the proven original transliterations as opposed to the corrupted or the replacement names? Even the KJV, remember, presents His Name in the Old English transliteration as JOSHUA (The Book of JOSHUA) a much closer alternative over the bogus name, JESUS. The name JOSHUA is an near equivalent while, JESUS is not even close.

Another Coincidence -- or -- Too Many Coincidences?

Type the Latin name IESUS, in your word processor and then do a spell check and see what you come up with. I think you will find, ISIS as the alternate for this name, unless, of course, this bogus name has been added to your spell checker earlier, which it has in mine as I tired of it continuing to pop up for correcting so I reluctantly added it to my definitions. In a virgin spell check, however, it will come up as a misspelling and suggest correcting it to "ISIS" and this is how many in Europe pronounce the name JESUS. We know ISIS as a famous goddess of Egypt. Did you know the number for this Egyptian goddess is 666, something to do with snakes and her name making hissing sound. This is all speculation and conjecture and offensive to some, I am sure, but still, all of these little coincidences -- JESUS sounding like Hey Zeus in Latin and Spanish languages, and when you take the vowels out of the name IESUS you have ISS which is pronounced ISIS and now we see some spell checkers advise changing the Latin Iesus to Isis. How does all of this compare with the original transliterations? It doesn't as the English transliterations of the Original connect to and compare favorably with the original and actually point back to the God of all Creation, YH WH (YaHweh) - YaH-shua - He said He came in the Father's Name.

(John 5:43) I am come in my Father's Name, and you receive me not: if another shall come in his own name, him you will receive.

Failure of the Scholars and Bible Teachers -- an Example:

Without going into great detail and quoting misapplications of information by Biblical professional and others thinking they are using top of the line sources, I will give one simple, easy example of what is commonly found in Biblical studies and research.

"Vine's Complete Expository Dictionary of the Old and New Testament Word", by W. E. Vine, Merrill F. Unger, and William White, Jr. -- a research work of monumental effort and like the Strong's Concordance and Hebrew/Greek Dictionary is found in most serious bible student's library. We should, however, be aware that we are told as we approach the "end-days" (so called) "knowledge shall be increased". With this in mind we should then be ready and willing to correct faulty knowledge from the past. Some, however, take things from the past and

try to use what was once thought to be correct and continue to push a biblical, flat world doctrine, especially when it comes to His Name.

The following is a quote from this outstanding work from Vine's concerning our Savior's Name, or really, the false name:

Under, JESUS, page 333, "iesous ('Inoovs, 2424) is a transliteration of the Heb. "Joshua," meaning "Jehovah is salvations," i.e., "is Savior" a common name among the jews Ex. 17:9, Luke 3:29 (RV) Col 4:11. It was given to the Son of God in Incarnation as His personal name, in obedience to the command of an angel to Joseph, the husband of His Mother, Mary, shortly before He was born, Matt 1:21."

Things to consider from this "older" information:

First: Iesous is not a transliteration of Joshua, how can it be, it sounds nothing like it. Remember the purpose of a "transliteration" is to reproduce a word or name from one language to another. When a name is properly "transliterated" it may look different but will sound the same, or nearly the same. To repeat -- the transliterated name will have a like sound, a very similar, or exact pronunciation as that of the original language from which is being *transliterated*. Either the scholars of this work have forgotten what a "transliteration" is or they are truly blinded or they are doing this on purpose in an attempt to support the false name "Jesus".

Second: The lagging scholarship is seen in the use of the name, JeHovah, which even the Jehovah's Witnesses admit, in their extensive work, "Aid to Bible Understanding", page 884-85, that the name Jeshovah is a Latinized form and the YaHWeH is the more correct. This only demonstrates this is now the accepted knowledge, that YaHWeH is the transliteration of the Tetragrammaton YHWH -- in other words, that is the way it is pronounce, as we now know. Correcting Vine's, "Jehovah, is salvation" to "YaHWeH is salvation", which is not really correct either as it should be, for His Name, "YaH is Salvation", or "YaH is Savior" and this is seen in the corrected transliteration of our Savior's Name, YaHshua. Some will say, YaHoshua, or YaHushua, in keeping with the Hebrew found in the Hebrew text. I do not see a problem with this as the original Name, YaH, remains intact, even in the older understanding, Jeovah, we see this Holy Name preserved, JeH, remembering the "J" of old and still in some parts of the world was and is pronounced as we would pronounce the "Y" in English.

Third: It is admitted a Name was given Him, presented to Joseph, and to Mary too, and it was a name found commonly among the Jews (Jews like others, liked to name children after heroes). At that time the name JESUS, a Greek/Latin name was not in existence. Get it? The false name JESUS, as it is pronounced today did not exist until around 400 years ago. So, what was the name given to our Savior, over 2 thousand years ago? We see it in the KJV transliterated in the OT as "Joshua", being mispronounced because of the change in the "j" which used to be sounded out similar to the "Y" as in the word "Yawn". This Old English transliteration is nothing like the adopted name Jesus, or Iesus, or the Greek, Iesous. When the angel presented the Holy Name of our Savior, a Name found among men (not in heaven) and a name by which we must all be saved the bogus name, Jesus, never existed but the name YaHshua did. What Vine's is saying is that "Jesus" is a transliteration of "YaHshua" and this cannot be and is proven from the fact they sound nothing alike making it a failed transliteration or it is simply a different name.

I hope this article helps and encourages those called by the one and only YaHshua. Thank you for your time, your servant, Dan

Contact: servant@dslextreme.com

www.yahshuaservant.com

