

IOUO – THE ONLY NAME OF GOD

(Supplement of the book: IOUO – The Name of God)

by Kurt Manfred Niedenführ

© 2002, Kurt M. Niedenführ
- All rights reserved -

Contents

Foreword	3
Chapter 1 – Some Theories Questioned	4
Chapter 2 – The first theory about IOUO, Yahuh and Yahoh	6
Chapter 3 – The second theory – Ἰαὼ and Yahoh	12
Chapter 4 – The third theory – Yahoh and Yehoh derived from NT-names	15
Chapter 5 – The fourth theory – The Halleluiah	18
Chapter 6 – The fifth theory – The Yahuh and Yehoh of the Massorets	21
Chapter 7 – The sixth theory – The Stress of the Name	23
Chapter 8 – The seventh theory – IOYO and ΙΩΥΩ	25
Chapter 9 – Concluding remarks	27

Foreword

This book entitled “IOUO – The Only Name of God” can only be understood in connection with the preceding book entitled “IOUO – The Name of God”. It is a supplement and also a correction of that book. Both books form an entity and serve as a scientific treatise on the subject “God’s Name”. Thus they merely serve scientific purposes, not religious ones.

Since I am a born again Christian for about 30 years it is not possible, however, to write about this central religious subject in a totally non-religious way. Science doesn’t necessarily need to be atheistic or darwinistic. Therefore I turn to linguists, Semitologists, Hebraists, Graecists and Bible-scientists, no matter of which religious background they are from. The views of these scientists on my statements can further the discussion on God’s Name regardless of any denominational bonds. This subject is important for all Bible-readers and Bible-researchers.

Those researchers of the Bible should be most delighted that a conclusive proof (due to the influence of the holy spirit) for the pronunciation “IOUO” now is at hand and they should be interested very much in a confirmation by science experts.

My thoughts can be found on the Internet at www.iouo.de and at www.iouo-god.net, and are not available as bound books. According to Exodus 9:16 God wants his name be declared all over the earth, therefore the Internet is an ideal means to guarantee worldwide access and I allow free download of my book for everybody, free copying or translation of my books provided no commercial purposes are involved.

I thank again my sons Matthias and Daniel.

Please excuse the unsatisfactory English.

Haundorf, Germany, April 2002

Kurt Manfred Niedenführ

Chapter 1 – Some Theories Questioned

The book “IOUO – The Name of God” contains some theories, which I want to supplement with some thoughts of correction after careful consideration.

A first theory was: God revealed his name first in the form “IOUO” to Adam, but to Moses at the thornbush God revealed his name in the form “Yahuh”. Finally Jesus made known God’s name in the form “Yahoh”.¹

A second theory was: The Greek form Ἰαῶ, which was handed down by Diodorus Siculus and which was also found in fragments of the Septuagint of the Dead Sea Scrolls points to the form “Yahoh” of that time.²

A third theory was: Names of the NT, which contain parts of the Tetragrammaton point to a former “Yahoh” and a former “Yehoh”, two inspired forms of God’s name.³

A fourth theory was: The Halleluiah from Revelation 19 proves an inspired “Yah” or “Jah” as an abbreviation of God’s name.⁴

A fifth theory was: The vowel points of the Massorets are an additional proof for the inspired forms “Yahuh” and “Yehoh”.⁵

A sixth theory was: The stress upon the name “IOUO” is not clearly defined.⁶

¹ Cf. Kurt M. Niedenführ, *IOUO – The Name of God*, Chapters 6, 7 and 8.

² Ibid. Chapter 6.

³ Ibid. Chapter 5.

⁴ Ibid. Chapter 5 and Appendix A - 22.

⁵ Ibid. Chapter 5.

⁶ Ibid. Chapters 8 and 10.

A seventh theory was: The name IOUO can be transliterated into Greek with two forms namely ἸΟΥΟ and ἸΩΥΩ, which both are reflected in encodings of pictures in the Greek text of the NT.⁷

These seven theories have to be considered once again and need a correction according to my opinion.

The following seven chapters are to shed light on these seven theories and a final chapter shall round off my two IOUO-books with some passing remarks.

⁷ Cf. Kurt M. Niefenführ, *IOUO – The Name of God*, Chapter 17.

Chapter 2 – The first theory about IOUO, Yahuh and Yahoh

Can God really reveal his name differently at different times? Did God really introduce himself to Adam as IOUO, to Moses as Yahuh and to the disciples of Jesus as Yahoh? God is the father of the celestial lights, with whom there is not a variation of the turning of the shadow (James 1:17); God remains true to himself. God is a god not of disorder, but of peace (1 Corinthians 14:33). God's eyes look straight ahead (Proverbs 4:25) and his ways are not crooked (Isaiah 59:8, Psalms 125:5, Proverbs 2:15). He is righteous and upright (Deuteronomy 32:4). Can God cause a confusion about the most holy thing that is, namely his name? Do there really exist proves that God revealed his name with different pronunciations?

True, God's name was really pronounced differently at different times by humans. But is God responsible for that?

It is interesting that I could only find clear and distinct encoded pictures in the NT (John 1) when writing the base-text with 'IOYO (and a declined 'IOYOY) instead of ὁ θεός. This is an indication that the original Greek text contained 'IOYO and not only a Hebrew Tetragrammaton or a יהוה as found in the Dead Sea Scrolls on Septuagint fragments. Obviously the writers of the NT did know IOUO and did write it in the form 'IOYO. Jesus said in John 17:26: “[...] I have made your name known to them [...]” Therefore the early disciples of Jesus knew the Name in the form IOUO and used it in the NT. Jesus didn't make known a “Yahoh” but a “IOUO”.

In the same way we can conclude that Moses at the thornbush received a “AOUO ASHR AOUO”, a “AOUO” and a “IOUO”. He didn't receive a “Yahuh”. God never changed his name.

Why did God say to Moses: “And I used to appear to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob as God Shaddai, but as respects my name IOUO I did not make myself known to

them.” (Exodus 6:3)⁸ Of course Abraham knew the name IOUO (cf. Genesis 18:27). God didn’t reveal to Moses a name different from IOUO but made himself known to Moses as a God who really fits to the literal meaning of the name “IOUO”: “He is”, “He causes to become”.

“He is existent” for his people and “causes” a miraculous salvation for Israel “to become”. The whole supernatural dimension of this salvation (10 plagues, Red Sea walked through, thundering Horeb, 40 years of Manna falling from heaven, 40 years columns of cloud and fire above the tabernacle and many other miracles) produced a totally different depth of the meaning of God’s name IOUO. The forefathers never experienced such a shining brilliance of God’s existence of His being with them. The special sense of God’s name became concrete.

But God didn’t reveal a new pronunciation of his name to Moses. God cannot deny himself, he cannot deny his own name either, which alone is unreachably high (Psalms 148:13). Therefore it is clear that this name at all times was the same, it is the same and will be the same. Zechariah 14:9 says: “And IOUO must become king over all the earth. In that day IOUO will prove to be one, and his name one.”

God isn’t responsible, that his name during a long period of time was not pronounced as one. God never wanted this situation to arise and he will cause the whole humankind to find back to an only and sole pronunciation of this name, namely the pronunciation IOUO, as soon as the whole earth is reunited under one heavenly rule of his own kingdom (Matthew 6:10). God never was interested in a confusion about his name and its pronunciation. This confusion is the first thing He will remove when his kingdom will be ruling unrestrictedly over all the earth, if not starting this project even already before that.

⁸ Cf. Kurt M. Niedenführ, *IOUO – The Name of God*, Chapter 7.

This Name of God in Hebrew is the Tetragrammaton יהוה, which originally corresponded to the 4 long vowels I [i:], O [o:], U [u:] and O [o:]. Accordingly, the only correct transliteration is IOUO [i: o: u: o:], a word, which contains special holiness by exclusively consisting of four vowels, i.e. four strong and voiced sounds.⁹ It is interesting and also in complete accordance with this pronunciation, that already Flavius Josephus (30-100 C.E.) in his book “The Wars of the Jews” (Book V, Chapter V) in the description of the robe of the High Priest in his treatise on the temple wrote about God’s name as follows:¹⁰

“[...] another golden crown, in which was engraven the sacred name [of God]: it consists of four vowels.” (Flavius Josephus. *The Works of Flavius Josephus*. Translated by William Whiston, Auburn and Buffalo: John E. Beardsley, 1895)

Heinrich Paret also translates: “Dieß sind die vier Vokale.“ [These are the four vowels.] (Heinrich Paret, *Des Flavius Josephus Werke*, 1855, p. 553)

The Greek original term that was rendered here as “vowels” reads as follows: φωνήεντα (Flavius Josephus, *De bello Judaico libri vii*, ed. B. Niese). According to the dictionary *Langenscheidt Altgriechisch – Deutsch Wörterbuch* the Greek term for vowel is: το φωνήεν, -εντος. The φωνήεντα of Flavius Josephus is derived from φωνήεις, which stresses the idea of voiced or vocal (Cf. the German translation of vowel: “Selbstlaut” means “self-sound”).

Obviously Flavius Josephus – being of priestly background himself – knew that the Name of God exclusively consisted of four vowels, but which he believed not to be allowed to pronounce (Cf. *Jüdische Altertümer*, book II, chapter 12 § 4). But at least he left us the unequivocal proof - out of the immediate time after Jesus Christ - that the Name of God at that time was pronounced with four vowels, which the first Christians immediately wrote down in the NT.

⁹ According to *Webster’s Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary* a vowel is „a speech sound produced without occluding, diverting, or obstructing the flow of air from the lungs (opposed to *consonant*)”
Latin: vocalis = with “vox” = with voice, sounding = Vokal (German) = vowel.

¹⁰ A link to my book posted by Franklin E. Rhoads on the Internet led me to Flavius Josephus. Hereby I want to convey my gratitude to this gentleman.

But as in those days in the Septuagint all mentions of the Name were changed into Kyrios, likewise also from the New Testament all mentions of the divine name were erased soon, maybe at first only replaced with the Hebrew Tetragrammaton, but then quickly with κυριος and ὁ θεος etc.

That ך, ה and ו originally were used as vowels is also confirmed by the paragraph “VOWEL-LETTERS” of the book *A Practical Grammar for Classical Hebrew* by Jacob Weingreen, Oxford 1959, pp. 6, 7. There it reads as follows:

The original Hebrew alphabet consisted of consonants only; vowels were not represented in writing. Even to-day, the Hebrew Scrolls of the Law which are read in the Synagogues are unpointed, i.e. without vowel-signs. However, long before the introduction of the vowel-signs it was felt that the main vowel-sounds should be indicated in writing, and so the three letters ךהו were used to represent the long vowels, thus:

ה represents â, so that מה reads mâ. [¹¹, *author*]

ך represents î and ê, so that מך reads mî or mê.

ו represents û and ô, so that מו reads mû and mô.

Because these three letters – ךהו – represent both vowels and letters they are known as VOWEL-LETTERS.

Obviously it is the exact other way round! First, they were vowels, then they additionally also became consonants, today they are only mere consonants!

Also the Arabic language has to be considered, which has the same roots as Hebrew but survived the centuries as a living language. How is it in this case? Does its alphabet only contain consonants? If that originally was the case in the Hebrew as well as the Arabic language, then there is a high possibility that the Arabic language would have been the first to remain as a consonant-only script. But let us consider what the book *Aussprache und Schrift des Arabischen* [Arabic Pronunciation and Script] (from Hartmut Kästner and Albert Waldmann, Langenscheidt 1992) remarks on page 7:

¹¹ Why â and not ô? Cf. Kurt M. Niedenführ, *IOUO – The Name of God*, Chapter 7, note 22 and Appendix A – 7.

The Arabic Script is an alphabet script, represented by 28 letters. These mark the consonants and the long vowels. The short vowels are not represented in the script [...]

It is the same with the Adamic alphabet described in my preceding book *IOUO – The Name of God*: Consonants and long vowels as alphabet, short vowels are not written, but only inserted orally by the reader, if needed.

The Arabic alphabet knows the long A [a:]. It corresponds to the Aleph א in Hebrew and is an unequivocal A.

The Arabic language knows the long I [i:] as a single letter. It corresponds to the Hebrew י (=Yodh).

The Arabic language knows the long U [u:] as a single letter. It corresponds to the Hebrew ו (=Waw).

Up to this point the parallels to the Adamic alphabet can't be ignored.

But the E and O and the connections to H are not that clear. That would be another interesting field of research.

The pronunciation of the Name of God is holy (four vowels) and pure as well. Therefore it is likely that the ו is not being pronounced as an open sound but as a closed one, because the five basic vowels are A [a:] (= א), E [e:] (= ע), I [I:] (= י), O [o:] (= ו) and U [u:] (= ו). A closed O [o:] is purer than an open O [ɔ:], which is a more of a mixture of O and A.

It is probable that God stressed the pureness (Zephaniah 3:9) and the holiness of his name by using four basic vowels. This is further stressed by the Omicron in the NT-transcription IOYO! Some thoughts to this matter will follow in Chapter 8.

And now I want to add a remark to the issue that God didn't reveal to Moses his name as "Yahuh":

In my book *IOUO – The Name of God* I pointed out many patterns, which are in connection with the name IOUO and the pronunciation IOUO.¹² However, if God would have revealed the Name as Yahuh, why can't patterns with Yahuh be found as easily then? At least I couldn't detect any. It is also said that God has put his name upon the place, where temple and tabernacle stood. But temple and tabernacle only point to IOUO not to Yahuh.

Ezekiel 39:7 shows that God doesn't want his name to be desecrated furthermore. Can therefore he himself already have "desecrated" it with confusing revelations of the Name?

As according to Psalms 72:17 his Name shall last forever, which exact name God meant with that? Shouldn't he have better said: "his names shall last forever"?

The H of Yahuh has actually been handed down only since the punctuation (vowelization) of the Massorets. Therefore it seems that the change from O (= ו) to H (= ה) took place much later than the time of the thornbush and before, obviously much later than assumed in my preceding book.

At the time of Moses and Jesus only IOUO was divinely revealed. The voice out of heaven: "I both glorified it and will glorify it again" (John 12:28), therefore only refers to one pronunciation, not to several competing pronunciations, because this would have more likely harmed a glorification.

¹² Cf. Kurt M. Niedenführ, *IOUO – The Name of God*, Chapters 2 and 12.

Chapter 3 – The second theory - Ἰαὼ and Yahoh

We have seen that there is evidence about the Name of God that in the 1st century it was written only with vowels. It is interesting that also the Ἰαὼ, which Diodorus Siculus mentioned about the same time, is also written only with vowels.

My former theory was that Ἰαὼ was a transliterated Yahoh, only that the middle H and the final H couldn't be written, because it didn't exist in Greek.

But the reference to Flavius Josephus made me assume that the Ἰαὼ was nothing else than the transliteration of IOUO (= ἸΟΥΟ), of which the “OU” in the middle was transliterated with “α”, because a U didn't exist as a full letter in Greek (the Y only in Koiné is a U-substitute following vowels meaning O), and the “OU” could be a sound similar to α when spoken quickly.

The Ἰαὼ is known through fragments of the Septuagint from the Dead Sea. Therefore the Ἰαὼ could be an invention of the translators of the original Septuagint, who were confronted with the difficulty of rendering the many thousands of mentions of the Name of God of the Hebrew original with a Greek proper name, which was as equivalent as possible.

Today it is the same problem after all: How should you write IOUO in the different languages, if you want to achieve a precise pronunciation like the Hebrew IOUO and also want to use the characters that can be found in the language?

When writing IOUO in German, this still is easy.

When writing it in English, I have to add the international phonetic transcription in order to teach an English speaking person the exact pronunciation, in order to avoid a pronunciation as [aiouo].

In French it is even more difficult. A French speaking person probably would pronounce IOUO as [iuo]. Should you write “Iauouo”? In Russian we write □ and in Turkish OÜO , in Spanish ÍOUO and in Italian Iouo, but in Arabic ايو

The Chinese language would have a certain range of characters, but a name usually is written with two characters at most. It would be possible to write it in Mandarin Chinese: □□. This would on the one side have the same meaning as AOUO (= I am), namely “there is – me”. And on the other side it would be pronounced similar to IOUO: iou – wo (Pinyin: **yôuwô**). However it doesn’t sound that way in other Chinese dialects.

It is not possible to render the IOUO into every language with a hundred percent exact transliteration. God can expect, of course, that you learn IOUO as a foreign word or define it from scratch in any language. Other names are often handled in this way. For instance, nobody in Germany has pronounced the name “Reagan” in exact German but left it English. But then the danger is that the same happens as with the first century when Greeks pronounced PiPi when reading the Hebrew Tetragrammaton.

It was probably the same difficulty for the translators of the Septuagint. This could be the origin of Ἰαὼ, in which at least the principle was preserved to write the Name of God only with vowels because of its holiness. It was a mere makeshift intending the smallest desecration possible of the most holy Name IOUO.

Let us summarize:

The Ἰαὼ is no evidence that the Name of God was pronounced Yahoh in Jesus’ times. It is rather a hint that the Name originally was pronounced IOUO and that it was also pronounced IOUO and consisted only of vowels in the time of the Septuagint and Diodorus Siculus, and therefore in the time of Jesus and his disciples, too.

The Ἰαῶ gives us evidence that God on the contrary didn't reveal his name pronounced differently in different eras.

Ἰαῶ is a direct and immediate hint to IOUO.

The transliteration of the Hebrew name Jehu (יהוא) indicates that also in the times of the Septuagint a transliteration from OU (הו) to OY was known, because in the Septuagint Jehu is called Ἰου. And the transliteration Ἰουδαίους (= Jews) from the Hebrew יהודה (= Judah) indicates OU → OY.

But other names were transcribed with OU → A.

For instance: Elijah אליהו → Ελιας was transcribed with a graecizing ending.

Therefore it was totally consistent with the habit of name translation in the Septuagint to transcribe IOUO as Ἰαῶ. Also many difficulties of name transliterations occurred in many cases of names in the Septuagint. Ἰσαακ, e.g., is a very far-fetched transliteration of the Adamic IZChQu (Hebrew יצחק).

It is interesting, that obviously also the Hebrew ה was often transcribed with α = A in the Septuagint. For instance, הבל = Αβελ (Abel), הגר = Αγαρ (Hagar) etc.

It was therefore logical to render also a יהו with Ἰα and IOUO (= יהוה) with Ἰαῶ.

Chapter 4 – The third theory – Yahoh and Yehoh derived from NT-names

We have already seen that Yahoh can't be derived from Ἰαῶ. But I have also held the theory that Yahoh as well as Yehoh can be derived from NT-names containing parts of the Tetragrammaton and therefore can even be considered as an inspired form of the Name of God, because the NT is the inspired word of God. That is not the case with the Septuagint. What can be said to this matter?

In the NT the following parts of the Tetragrammaton can be found: ια(ς), ιου, ιω and ιη. The ιου is only a Greek genitive of ια and therefore doesn't indicate the pronunciation IOUO.

However, the Ια obviously is a transcribed IOU (or at least IO) as already pointed out with Elijah.

The Ιη can only be found in Ἰησους and is derived from to the Hebrew **יְשׁוּעַ**. It is simply the **י** combined with the short vowel Shwa inserted between **י** and **שׁ**. The Ιη therefore doesn't indicate Yehoh as an inspired Name of God. But it can only be traced back to the transcription of the Hebrew **יְשׁוּעַ** (= Jeshuah). Obviously there it was taken into account that some Jews said I^eShUE instead of IShUE as a result of language slur in the course of many centuries. The Septuagint in 1 Chronicles 24:11 uses Ἰησου for Jeshuah. This appears to be the origin of the name Ἰησους in the NT.

Therefore neither Yehuh nor Yehoh can be proven by the NT.

The Ἰω from Ἰωαννης is no proof for the pronunciation IOUO (or IOU or IU from IOUO), because Ἰωαννης corresponds to the Hebrew **יְהוָה** and is only a proof for the fact, that the Septuagint transcribed the **י** into Ἰω, a hint that already at that time the Waw was pronounced O instead of U.

However, the **י** is an abbreviation of the whole name IOUO, with only the first and third letters appearing. It is therefore a shorter and contracted IOU. The **י**ω therefore indirectly indicates IOU. Or this can at least be assumed.

But the **Ω** is actually a transcription of U (= **י**). The **י**ω in no case is a proof or an inspired hint to a god-given Yahoh or Yehoh, as we assumed in the first place.

יוהנן in 1 Chronicles 3:15 of the Septuagint is a **Ἰωαναν** (= Johanan),
similarly **י**ואחז in 2 Chronicles 34:8 is a **Ἰωαχαζ** (= Joahaz),
also **י**ואל in 1 Chronicles 27:20 is a **Ἰωηλ** (= Joel).

The transcription of Joah in 2 Chronicles 34:8 is interesting:

Hebrew: **י**ואח → Septuagint: **Ἰωαχ**.

Here appears an indirect hint to IOU again.

If you compare Joah with Joahaz you can see the parallels in Hebrew:

יואח + **י**ואחז

This is also the case with the two transliterations:

Ἰωαχ + **Ἰωαχαζ**

The **י**ω is therefore very near to the IOU and the translators of the Septuagint obviously brought that to the fore.

You can see as a summary that the NT-names containing parts of the Tetragrammaton aren't inspired hints to the pronunciations Yahoh or Yehoh of the Name of God or a possible divine revelation of the Name of God in a form deviating from IOUO.

They merely indicate the habit of translating Hebrew names into Greek according to the Septuagint at that time.

The NT with its names doesn't provide us with evidence for a form of the Name of God deviating from IOUO.

The Ἰω of Ἰωάννης is of course also a result of the fact that the Greek language contains no U as a full letter. In Koiné Y was used as a U-substitute after vowels. Later also the diphthong “OU” was used as a clear U. The Septuagint uses ω for U, which leads us to the assumption that at that time already Waw was (alternately) pronounced as O instead of U. Or that ω was only a makeshift solution for the transcription of U (=ᾠ) and ᾠ at that time was pronounced exclusively as U like original Adamic.

As a consequence, no sound shift from ᾠ to ᾠ in the era before Jesus can be proven with the Septuagint.

In this context the Vulgate is also interesting, because e.g. in 1 Chronicles 15:21 it shows that **עוזיאל** is transcribed with Ozaziu (= Azaziah; Greek: Οζιας) and that in 1 Chronicles 25:4 **בוקיאל** is transcribed with Bocciau (= Bukkiah; Greek: Βουκίας). Here the U appears again despite the fact that it was practically hard to transcribe it into Greek.

The “iau” of Bocciau is a construction similar to the Ἰαῶ. In Latin the translators either thought of the Ἰαῶ. Or they wanted to translate the Hebrew IOU in an exact way but already rendered the ᾠ (=O) as “A” following the Greek *ιας*. Maybe, however, because the Hebrew long vowel ᾠ was known as an “A”-sound at that time.

Chapter 5 – The fourth theory – The Halleluiah

In my previous book I held the opinion that the four times Halleluiah of Revelation Chapter 19 (Verses 1, 3, 4 and 6) have to be considered as an inspired proof for “Jah” as an abbreviation of the Name of God and also as a proof for the inspiration of the “Yahoh”, which suggests a “Yahuh”.

But as we have seen in the previous Chapter, the influence of the Septuagint on the New Testament and its original text has been immense. When we see a Halleluiah in Revelation 19 our first question should be:

Does this Halleluiah derive from the Septuagint transcription of the Hebrew הללויה, a term often used in Psalms and meaning “Praise IO”?

Exactly that is the case!

The Septuagint transcribes the Hebrew Halleluiah into “Ἀλληλουια.”¹³ and exactly this word appears in the NT. Some write Ἀλληλουιά (e.g. Nestlé-Aland) and Ἄλληλουιά (e.g. Westcott and Hort). However, the Greek text of The Trinitarian Bible Society, London writes Ἀλληλουϊά. Dr. J.J. Griesbach writes in his text: Ἀλληλουόϊα. It is therefore written once with spiritus asper and once with spiritus lenis.

The NT therefore does in no way prove an H at the beginning. Thus we can conclude that the final H is not proven, either.

Obviously the translators of the Septuagint in principle translated the Hebrew ה into an A.

In Adamic it was OLLUIQ (Hebrew הללויה)! They changed both O’s into an A.

¹³ Cf. *Septuaginta* ed. Alfred Rahlfs. Württembergische Verlagsanstalt, Stuttgart, 1935.

That means, that the “יָא” from Halleluiah is in no way an inspired proof for a “Jah”. The “יָא” is only the Septuagint equivalent for the IO, which was simply adopted in the NT, because the Septuagint was extremely common and was noticed by the Christians more than the Hebrew original. Neither does the A of “יָא” indicate a different divine revelation other than IOUO, nor does the “יָא” prove or indicate an H at the end of “Jah”, which the Greek script would have had to omit, because Greek contains no final H.

If actually Halleluiahh with H twice was right, why did the Vulgate in Revelation 19:1, 3, 4 and 6 use “Alleluiaa”, although it easily could have used an H in Latin?

It is really possible that to this time the הָ was not already used as an H or very rarely used as an H. It was used mainly as a long vowel A.

It was not until the Massorets that the Jah was stressed in the form הָיָ. But that was many centuries later.

The Quamets, however, indicated an O-sound here as well, because Quamets is an [ɔ:]-sound. It is a sound between a dark A and an open O, more sounding to O. The הָיָ of the Massorets therefore clearly indicates an IOUO, based on the assumption that the הָ in the course of time changed from O into H, but the O-sound couldn't be entirely abandoned.

Many of the words the Massorets punctuated did contain an O standing next to the הָ in the form of הָּ or as Quamets or as □.

Therefore in the course of centuries the original meaning of הָ, namely O, didn't vanish completely. It is possible that even the pronunciation IOUO was known to the Massorets, but their superstition forbade them to punctuate this. How good at least that the O of IO was able to prevail in the form of a Quamets.

But of course one question remains unanswered:

Do some variant readings of Halleluiah exist in the original text manuscripts of the NT, which would not write “ἰα” but “ἰο” instead, and only the long lasting influence of the Septuagint changed the “ἰο” into “ἰα”?

Of course, this is only mere speculation, but it would be consistent with the idea of the whole Scripture being inspired (2 Timothy 3:16).

But on the other side, it is not inconsistent with the idea of inspiration that in the Greek original text of the NT simply the Greek of the Septuagint was adopted, even though touching the Name of God.

The “ἰα” of the Halleluiah of the Revelation therefore is in no way proof against the pronunciation “IOUO”. On the contrary, it rather supports this pronunciation.

The A of “ἰα” is only a result of the difficulty of transcribing the Name of God from Hebrew into Greek already mentioned several times. This led to Ἰαῶ in the Septuagint and also to this “ἰα”, which in the case of many names also led to “ἰαζ”.

Chapter 6 – The fifth theory – The Yahuh and Yehoh of the Massorets

The Massorets have punctuated Yahu and Yeho instead of יהו (= IOU) in names that contain parts of the Tetragrammaton. Therefore I thought that Yahuh has its roots at the times of Moses. I also thought that this was a proof for Yehoh having been used at any time or any place.

But as demonstrated in the previous chapters the Massoretic text with its punctuation was developed many centuries after the time, when the Jewish priesthood still existed. And therefore we must doubt that this long handing-down of the Hebrew pronunciation leads to any backward conclusions about pre-Christian times.

The Yahu is only proof for the U in IOU. And the Yah of Yahu is more likely proof or a hint to “IO” in IOUO than to a former Jah or Yahuh, as already demonstrated in the previous chapter.

The Yeho as in Jehoshua and Jehonadab more likely points to the connection with the thoughts about Ἰησοῦς already pointed out in chapter 4. It is likely to have its roots in the sound shift from ו to ׀, i.e. from U to O in the case of Waw. Or it maybe has its roots in the tradition of the Greek transcription of וׁ into Ἰω.

In no way the prefix Yeho and the suffix Yahu somehow prove that God would have revealed his name with Yahuh in any time, or even that the “Yeho” would indicate that the “Jehovah” was actually inspired.

It could only be that the Massorets with their cursed superstition, which already led to the punctuation יהוה, again let themselves be influenced in their punctuation of the prefix IOU and therefore punctuated יהו. But this does in no way indicate an inspiration. The idea of “Jehovah” being an inspired pronunciation of the Name of God is really ridiculous.

Although the intention of the Massorets' punctuation system was to preserve the Hebrew Bible, it only cemented Hebrew of the Middle Age, which was not the Hebrew of the days of Jesus, Moses or Adam. The only thing left were hints that lead to a picture of the Adamic original language.

The Septuagint, of course, helped to cement a certain understanding of the Hebrew language, too. This echoed in the NT. And also the Vulgate had its share in cementing.

But one thing is clear:

In spite of all this confusion God didn't leave himself without witness (Acts 14:17). Otherwise his name would have been erased. The Name really is unreachably high (Psalms 148:13) and also the Yahu or Yeho of the Massorets were not able to remove it from that place.

Chapter 7 – The sixth theory – The Stress of the Name

I held the opinion that the stress in Adamic was not determined exactly, but that the stress was as free as the insertion of short vowels. This could have led to a broad variety of dialects, which still could have been easy to understand. This would have fitted to Gods habits, because in the creation he determined a variation of races and species to descend from a basic species or genus.

Even now I can't prove that the Name of God has one precisely determined stress, of course. But I think that there are lots of reasons to believe that the stress should be on the first letter (= I). Why?

The Hebrew language in general stresses the last syllable. But this wasn't necessarily so in all times.

The connection between the AOUI and the human cry for help and cry of pain as in German: "Aua" (English: "Outch"), which is documented in one way or the other in all languages – an original cry or basic cry (German: "Urschrei"), so to say – suggests anyway that the stress is at the beginning. German: "Aua" (English: "Outch") is being stressed at the beginning.

But also another circumstance forces me to think that way:

The "I" of IOUI without any doubt is the most holy and most important letter of that word. "I" means "he", therefore a person, namely the person of God! OUI is only a verb, an activity, which this person is carrying on. Therefore this most important letter "I" should be stressed.

When stressing the "I" you get a much easier pronunciation of the vowel-word. When saying [ˈi:ou:] or [ˈi:ou], we are not in a possible danger of easily saying [jou:], this way pronouncing the most important vowel of the Name as a consonant.

Therefore it follows that there is a very natural reason, that I hold the opinion that the Name of God should be pronounced [ˈi:ouo]. A consonantal pronunciation definitively should be avoided in any case, because it would be a pronunciation, which ignores the holiness of the vowels.

Even the fact that the Greek Ἰαὼ of the Septuagint has the stressed upon the Omega cannot convince me that the original Adamic pronunciation wasn't [ˈi:o:u:o:] or [ˈi:ouo].

Chapter 8 – The seventh theory – IOYO and IΩYΩ

Now I return to the basic concept, which can already be felt in chapter 2:

God is a God of order. Could he have inspired two pronunciations of his name?
We said: No!

Then we also have to give up the theory that the encoded pictures in NT (John) point to two forms of the Name in Greek: 'IOYO and 'IΩYΩ! There can only be one correct inspired and transcribed form of the Name in Greek.

It is the 'IOYO then, not the 'IΩYΩ, of course, because the 'IOYO as code appears far more often than the 'IΩYΩ as code. You can't even prove that 'IΩYΩ is a correct code. The combination "OY" practically appears constantly in a Greek text, with the "ΩY" nearly not appearing in practice. As an inevitable consequence, only an 'IOYO has the chance of leading to pictures as code.

IOUO is one IOUO, his name is one single and unique name. There is only one spirit, one body etc. The whole Bible contradicts the idea of God having created, revealed and approved two forms of his name.

The encoded pictures in the NT of my book *IOUO – The Name of God* should therefore be read without the codes IΩYΩ or IOYΩ or IΩYO. They still remain fully conclusive pictures. The Ω never was determining a picture in any way, but was always irrelevant.

Additionally, the Name of God should be provided with pure basic vowels, underlining the idea of the pureness of the holy things of God. Therefore an Ω – an open O [ɔ:] then – is not pure enough for the Name of God, because it is a mixture of A and O, an O sounding to an A. Pure vowels are A (= [a:]), E (= [e:]), I (= [i:]), O (= [o:]) and U (= [u:]). These are the five basic vowels.

All five vowels can be found in the Name of God and its conjugational forms as well as in the Adamic name Jesus:

A → AOUO
E → IshUE or IOUShE
I → IOUO
O → IOUO, AOUO, TOUO
U → IOUO, AOUO, TOUO

Also when transliterating the name IOUO into other modern languages it should be taken care that the vowel-nature as well as the pureness of the vowels are being expressed, if anyhow possible!

Chapter 9 – Concluding remarks

The name IOUO is really the only, the one and sole Name of God. Only conjugations and abbreviations of this one name, as well as double mention in connection with AshR (= which; Hebrew אֲשֶׁר), is wanted by God.

The name IOUO, this Name of God is also the most holy word in the Bible. But the Bible contains other forms of address of God, too. Next to God (singular or plural), Lord, Lord Zebaoth and Shepherd, the most outstanding address is “Father”, and its pet name form “Abba” (= Daddy).

The truth is that the address “Father” is even much more intimate than the Name of God as address. Father and Αββα convey a certain level of intimacy with God, which doesn't let God appear on a throne anymore, but as a companion holding your hand and escorting and guiding you in a protective way.

IOUO (Exodus 9:16) often is a term that expresses the might of God, also his capacity as judge and his royal might.

But the father is very close to us and we are familiar with him. Jesus often said in prayer: Αββα, Father (= Daddy, Father). Therefore the word Father together with the word Αββα can be compared with the columns of cloud and fire, which hovered above the three cubes of the tabernacle. In the same way “Father” and “Αββα” hover above the three forms of the Name of God: IOUO, TOUO and AOUO, overshadowing them.

Romans 8:14-17 mentions the children of God who proclaim “Αββα, Father.” Therefore their hearts are intimately bonded with their Father.

And the Lord's Prayer also mentions the word “Father” first, before mentioning the Name of God.

The whole Bible, too, starts in Adamic with BRASHITBRAIOUOALOIM. It is interesting that before the Name of God a “BRA” is mentioned twice. It is possible that a BABA might be hidden deliberately in this BRA-BRA. And therefore the whole Bible actually indirectly starts with the BABA-idea. This is an encoded Αββα (= Daddy) and AB (= Father → BABA), because still today a BABA is the word for Father and Daddy in many languages (Arabian, Chinese, Franconian = German dialect, Persian, Turkish etc.; and as PAPA: Latin, Ancient Greek, Modern Greek, German, English, French, Russian, Japanese, Spanish, Icelandic etc.).

Maybe IOUO wants to tell us this way that the whole purpose of the Bible mainly is to search one’s Father and Daddy and to find him (Matthew 7:7; Acts 17:27; Matthew 18:3; Matthew 19:14; Proverbs 2:1-5). The love to one’s own parents leads directly to the love to the heavenly father (Proverbs 1:7-9; Ephesians 6:1-3; Exodus 20:12; Deuteronomy 5:16).

The Name of God is mentioned in the Bible as a protective factor and as a mediator to salvation on this way to God (Proverbs 18:10; Roman 10:13; Acts 2:21; Joel 2:32; Zephaniah 2:2,3; Psalms 145:18). Philippians 2:2,11 shows that the one thing that someone has to keep attention to is the Father. That is the same thing that Jesus meant when saying to Martha that only one thing is really necessary (Lukas 10:42). 1 Timothy 1:5 shows that love, above all the love to God, is the real aim. Jesus said that the love to God is the first and greatest commandment (Matthew 22:36-38 and Mark 12:28-30). Somebody who doesn’t find the Father is doing violence to his soul (Proverbs 8:35,36).

But love to God doesn’t mean love to Jesus, of course. Jesus is the son of God, therefore compared to IOUO he is only an insignificant infant (German: Dreikäsehoch). He said himself that the Father is much greater than him (John 14:28). We speak to God through Jesus (Hebrews 7:25; Colossians 3:17; 2 Corinthians 5:18).

Already Origenes (before 250 C.E.) wrote that “compared to God, Jesus is only a small light.” Not Jesus is the one worthy of highest praise but his father and the

father of us all: IOUO. Therefore his name is also unreachably high and worthy alone to be blessed to highest degree (Psalms 148:13).

And I want to close my two books with these more religious thoughts and the praise of Nehemiah 9:5:

Rise, bless IOUO your God from
time indefinite to time indefinite.
And let them bless your glorious
name, which is exalted above all
blessing and praise.

Short autobiography of the author:

born in May 1952 in Munich

protestant early childhood

Father: Constructional engineer

Mother: Technical employee, then housewife

From 1964 onward connected with Jehovah's Witnesses

In January 1967 leaving protestant church

1971: Abitur (= higher school graduation) in modern languages

August 6, 1971: Christian baptism by Jehovah's Witnesses

1971/72 and 1977/81: University study of civil engineering at TU Munich

May 19, 1972: Marriage to Kornelia Müller

August 16, 1972: born again as anointed Christian

1972/77: Constructional Draftsman

Since 1981: Retirement due to a disability

June 26, 2002: Excommunicated (= disfellowshipped) from the Jehovah's Witnesses
for expressing my own Christian standpoint

Children: 2 girls, 2 twin boys and 1 foster daughter

Nationality: German