

THE WATCHTOWER HERESY VERSUS THE BIBLE

by

Ted Dencher

Copyright © 1961

CHAPTER TWO

THE DEITY OF JESUS CHRIST

THE WATCHTOWER desires that Jesus Christ be a creature (Few realize that the Watchtower teaches that Michael the archangel became Messiah, who had to obtain the new birth as does any sinner!) The Deity of Jesus Christ, however, is taught throughout the entire Bible. A volume could be written on this subject alone! Let us begin our investigation with the promise of the Messiah to come, as found in the Old Testament.

In the book of Genesis we find an equality between the divine Persons of the Godhead. Genesis 1:26, 27: **‘And God said, Let us make man in OUR image, after OUR likeness . . . So God created man in HIS own image, in the image of God . . . created HE them.’** This is similar to the language found at Genesis 11:7, 8 concerning the time of the Tower of Babel: **“Go to, let us go down, and there confound their language, that they may not understand one another’s speech. So THE LORD scattered them abroad . . .”**

At Isaiah 9:6 a prophecy is found referring to Messiah as **“the mighty God.”** Quoting *The Holy Scriptures According to the Masoretic Text*, this verse is number five in chapter nine: **“And his name is called Wonderful in counsel is God the Mighty, the everlasting Father, the Ruler of peace.”**

Jehovah’s Witnesses will be quick to point out that he is called mighty, not ALMIGHTY. SO we will be quick to point out in return that so is Jehovah! Where? At Isaiah 10:21 and Jeremiah 32:18! In all three verses you find the SAME HEBREW EXPRESSION, namely, EL GIBBOR. SO here Messiah has the same title as Jehovah God.

Coming to Isaiah 40:3 we read a prophecy concerning the coming Messiah: **“The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the LORD, make straight in the desert a highway for our God.”** We find this fulfilled at John 1:23: **“He [John] said, I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Make straight the way of the Lord, as said the prophet Esaias.”** If the New Testament English were true to the Hebrew text to which it refers, it would read **“the way of Jehovah,”** for this is the prophecy referred to which was being fulfilled. Of course it refers to Jesus Christ! So here the prophecy concerning **“Jehovah . . . our God”** was fulfilled by Jesus!

The way was to be prepared for JEHOVAH (Isaiah 40:3); it was fulfilled by the one whom announced as “**the lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world**” (John 1:29).

Now, for the moment at least, we must pause. Otherwise, the big hand of the Watchtower will stop us. Let us face their accusations against what has been said above, and answer them. Their pretenses at accurate Bible translation will be revealed, and *The New World Translation* (the Watchtower translation of the Bible) will be exposed.

The context of Proverbs 8:22 is taken by some (including Jehovah’s Witnesses) as referring to the Son of God. Regarding the Son of God, the book *Let God Be True* says on page 32: “He was the first son that Jehovah God brought forth. He is not the author of the creation; but after God had created him as his firstborn Son, then God used him . . .” And so as the Watchtower translators made Proverbs 8:22 read: “Jehovah himself PRODUCED me as the beginning of his way.” The Hebrew word QANAH translated here as produced has 18 different meanings, NONE OF WHICH is produced!

However, we find another Hebrew word, namely, QARAB, that does mean “produced.” *The Watchtower* attaches the meaning of QARAB to the word QANAH, for the average Witness with his full trust in the Society would never think of questioning it! He is told that THIS is the correct translation and all others are wrong, or at the most, less accurate. He is to remain silent and not question anything the Society prints. If he gets too inquisitive, he will be closely watched and quite possibly warned that he had better mind his own business if he wishes to remain in the organization! No wonder! Look what we unearth when we investigate the Society’s translation!

Let us consult *Matthew Henry’s Commentary*. He believes also that the Wisdom mentioned herein is the Son of God, so this is a suitable work to quote from. From Volume III, page 835:

The Word was eternal, and had a being before the world, before the beginning of time; and therefore it must follow that it was from eternity.

The Lord possessed him in the beginning of his way, of his eternal counsels, for those were before his works. This way indeed had no beginning, for God’s purposes in himself are eternal like himself, but God speaks to us in our own language . . . The Son of God was, in the eternal counsels of God, designed and advanced to be the wisdom and power of the Father, light and life, and all in all, both in the creation and in the redemption of the world. That he was brought forth as to his being, and set up as to the divine counsels concerning his office, before the world was made, is here set forth in a great variety of expressions, much the same with those by which the eternity of God himself is expressed in Psalm 90:2, **Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, thou art God.**

We come to the text that gives the Witnesses the most trouble, and about which they have gone to great lengths to explain away. They have erroneously translated it in their Bible, and we are to expose the tricks they use in order to accomplish this. Most of the information is so technical that even the Witnesses cannot understand the explanation the Watchtower translators give in the appendix to the *New World Translation*, which is found on page 773.

This is admittedly a matter for theologians, into which field the Witnesses have trespassed. But, since they will refer any disputant to the material in the *New World Translation* appendix (even though they can't understand it themselves), we must meet it and answer it. This we will do.

The magazine *Consolation* of November 8, 1944, in discussing *The Emphatic Diaglott*, says on page 27: "For example, the student may open the *Diaglott* at John 1:1 and read: 'In the beginning was the Logos, and the Logos was with God, and the Logos was God.' This seems to support the view of Trinitarians. The minister knows that that impossible three-in-one doctrine is false; so he shift's his eye from the right-hand column to the left-hand column and reads the interlinear translation: 'In a beginning was the Word, and the Word was with the God, and a god was the Word.' This clears up the difficulty." Furthermore, Jehovah's Witnesses, in their desperation to avoid seeing what is so plain here, will point out a "difference" in the Greek text itself, even though they cannot read it! The Greek text in the *Diaglott* reads at this point: EN ARCHE EN HO LOGOS KAI HO LOGOS EN PROS TON THEON KAI THEOS EN HO LOGOS. Show this to a Jehovah's Witness the next time one of them starts on Greek and ask him to translate the above for you! He will beat a hasty retreat!

However, with the interlinear, he is able to detect that both THEON and THEOS are translated "God." He thinks that due to the difference in spelling two Gods are mentioned! This is laughable! It certainly will be a big let-down for him to find out that this is only due to the placing of the word in the sentence. We say, "I am going to the store—meet me there"; not "Me am going to the store—meet I there." So it is with the Greek sentence structure; it has its form also. In the above case both "I" and "me" refer to the same person. You cannot say there are two persons mentioned because of the two different forms of the same word used!

According to the Watchtower Bible, John 1:1 reads: "Originally (or, at a beginning) the Word was, and the Word was with God, and the Word was a god." In the appendix referred to previously, they quote (on page 768) *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* by A. T. Robertson. Regarding the expression THEOS EN HO LOGOS we read their quotation from the Grammar: "The absence of the article here is on purpose and essential to the true idea." The "true idea" they take, naturally, to mean their perverted idea of Christ as "a god." Then on page 767 they again quote Robertson, this time giving an incomplete quotation as follows: "NOUNS IN THE PREDICATE. These may have the article also." No wonder they stop here! Look what follows: "AS ALREADY EXPLAINED, THE ARTICLE IS NOT ESSENTIAL TO SPEECH."

The Watchtower seems to think that if this verse were to read "the Word was the God" in Greek, they would then be free to assume that Christ is God. Let us consult Robertson's Grammar (on pages 767-768) regarding this problem: "It is true also that HO THEOS EN HO LOGOS (the God was the Word) would have been Sabellianism." Sabellianism is the doctrine taught by an African bishop of the 3rd century A.D., named Sabellius, that God exists as one Person, and that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are but different manifestations of God.

This, however, would be against the Watchtower's own theory, as they hold that Jehovah and Jesus are separate persons! Not only that, but it would teach an unscriptural doctrine besides!

The Greek text at John 1:1 does NOT read a god regardless of anything and everything the Watchtower says to the contrary. For the benefit of those who do not read the Greek language, we will quote *A New Short Grammar of the Greek Testament* by A. T. Robertson and W. Hershey Davis. On page 274 under “No Indefinite Article in Greek” we read: “The Sanskrit and the Latin had no article of any kind (definite or indefinite) AS THE GREEK HAS NO INDEFINITE ARTICLE. Not even has the modern Greek taken up the indefinite article like that developed in the Romance and Teutonic languages.”

On page 279 we read: “As a rule the article with one and not with the other means that the articular noun is the subject. Thus HO THEOS AGAPE ESTIN can only mean ‘**God is love,**’ not ‘love is God.’ So in John 1:1 THEOS EN LOGOS the meaning has to be ‘the Logos was God,’ not ‘God was the Logos.’”

On page 781 of Robertson’s *Grammar* we read this interesting note: “The devil is represented as admitting that Jesus is a Son of God, not the Son of God” (Matthew 4:3, 6). This is the way Jehovah’s Witnesses recognize Jesus Christ. Now we go on and quote from pages 795 and 796:

“The word ‘*theos*’ like a proper name, is freely used WITH and WITHOUT THE ARTICLE.” “It would have been very easy IF THE ABSENCE OF THE ARTICLE IN GREEK ALWAYS MEANT THAT THE NOUN WAS INDEFINITE, BUT WE HAVE SEEN THAT THIS IS NOT THE CASE” (Emphasis mine). On page 790 under “The Absence of the Article” we read: “The translation of the expression INTO ENGLISH OR GERMAN is NOT DETERMINED by the MERE ABSENCE OF THE GREEK ARTICLE” (Emphasis mine).

Now we shall begin an examination of individual texts, spurred on by what we have found as a result of John 1:1. Consider Colossians 2:9. Here we find another example of Watchtower trickery. Their version of this text reads: “Because it is in him that all the fullness of the divine quality dwells for the body.” Here is the text they have so translated: HOTI EN AUTO KATOIKEO PAN TO PLEROMA TES THEOTES SOMATIKOS. Some manuscripts have the word THEOTETOS in place of THEOTES. Regarding THEOTES, *Thayer’s Greek Lexicon* says: “The state of being God, Godhead.” Regarding THEOTETOS *The International Critical Commentary* says: “Of the Godhead.” Of the word SOMATIKOS: “Bodilywise, corporeally.”

The text, Colossians 2:9, is similar to Colossians 1:19 where the RSV translation reads: “For in him all the fullness of God was pleased to dwell.” Following are some translations of Colossians 2:9:

- “For it is in him that all the fulness of God’s nature lives embodied” (*American Translation*).
- “Yet it is in him that God gives a full and complete expression of himself” (*Phillips*).
- “For it is in Christ that all the fulness of God’s nature dwells embodied” (*Weymouth*).
- “Because in him dwells all the fullness of the Deity bodily” (*Emphatic Diaglott*).
- “For it is in him that all the fulness of the Deity dwells bodily” (*Moffatt 1901*).
- “It is in Christ that the entire fulness of deity has settled bodily” (*Moffatt 1935*).
- “For in Him the whole fullness of Deity (the Godhead) continues to dwell in bodily form—giving complete expression of the divine nature” (*Amplified New Testament*).

The Watchtower translation is ridiculous. It is as far from the true meaning of the Greek text as you can possibly get. Little wonder no attempt is made to explain THIS text in the *New World Translation* appendix!

Let us now consider the passage at John 8:58. Because it indicates the deity of Jesus Christ, the Watchtower alters the text. They render this passage: “Before Abraham came into existence, I have been.” The expression “I have been” is taken from the Greek words EGO EIMI. At John 8:24, 28 they render this expression “I am he.” In other verses they translate this “I am” (see Revelation 1:8, 17; 22:13). A footnote on John 8:58 tells us their rendering “I have been” is “properly rendered in the perfect indefinite tense.” That would be fine if it were not for this one fact: THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS A “PERFECT INDEFINITE TENSE” IN THE GREEK LANGUAGE!

The reason for their dodging the issue here, is obvious. There is only one “**I am**.” At John 8:24 Jesus says: “**Except ye believe that I AM (EGO EIMI) ye shall die in your sins.**” Then at verse 28: “**When ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know that I AM (EGO EIMI).**” This, of course, is JEHOVAH at Exodus 3:14, where, according to the Septuagint (Greek translation of the Old Testament) Jehovah calls Himself EGO EIMI (I am).

The following versions render John 8:58 as “I am”: *Moffatt, Weymouth, Berkeley, Williams, Confraternity, Amplified New Testament, The New English Bible.* The Watchtower translators are guilty of deliberate, inconsistent translation in order to escape a fact they do not wish to acknowledge.

Now we will consider Hebrews 1:6. Regarding Jesus Christ, it reads: “**And let all the angels of God worship him.**” In the *Questions From Readers* column of *The Watchtower* magazine of January 1, 1954, page 30, an article appears in answer to the question “Should we worship Jesus?” They take nearly two pages of small print to answer “No!”

Here they bring the Greek word PROSKUNEO into the picture. This is a word the New Testament uses for worship. In their discussion of this subject the article reads: “The knee is bent in the name of Jesus as Lord and in worship to the Father as God. . . .” Here a clear distinction is made between “Lord” and “God.” Now look at this:

“Every Greek reader must confess that in the LXX (Septuagint) the Greek words *kyrios* (Lord) and *theos* (God) have been used to crowd out the name of the Supreme Deity” (Page 19, *New World Translation* of the Christian Greek Scriptures). Here the words mean the same thing!

Speaking of early copyists and their disregard for the Divine Name, the foreword reads: “In place of it they substituted the words *kyrios* (usually translated ‘the Lord’) and *theos*, meaning ‘God.’” (*New World Translation of the Christian Greek Scriptures*, page 18).

So *The Watchtower* magazine makes a clear distinction between “Lord” and “God” while the *New World Bible* claims they stand equally for the Supreme Deity! Obviously, *The Watchtower* is trying to support a claim without evidence.

Readers of *The Watchtower* magazine apparently were not satisfied with this evasive treatment the Society was giving this subject. So, in the May 15th issue another article appeared in the same column. This time the question reverts to the answer the Society gave the first time, and asks: “Does this not contradict the statement at Hebrews 1:6?” Hebrews 1:6 reads: “And again, when he brings the firstborn into the world, he says, ‘Let all God’s angels worship him.’”

To this, the congenial, benevolent Watchtower replied: “Are you an angel of God in heaven? If you are, then Hebrews 1:6 applies to you. If you are not one of God’s angels in heaven, then Hebrews 1:6 is not directed to you. . . .” Well, now! That really solves the problem completely, doesn’t it? Makes it sound as if part of the Bible was written for angels and part of it for us!

Thus, we see *The Watchtower* way of avoiding the real issue. They admit the word PROSKUNEO means “worship” when it applies to Jehovah, but when it applies to Christ the meaning suddenly changes—when people (not angels) are called upon to “worship!”

Angels are allowed to worship God alone—see Revelation 19:10; 22:9. Yet they were called upon (Michael included, for no exceptions are made!) AT JESUS’ BIRTH AS A CHILD to worship Him! Lest any think the expression “**when he bringeth in the firstbegotten into the world**” applies to some age past when He was “created,” please notice that this call to worship applies when Jesus is brought into the EARTH ITSELF! Even the Watchtower translation renders the word OIKOUMENE as “INHABITED EARTH” in all fifteen times that it occurs in the New Testament! Yes, all the angels of heaven were called upon to worship (in the full sense of the word) this little Child, born into the world through Mary! At the moment of His birth He was worshiped as God!

The reasons for the Watchtower Society’s decisions in these matters can more easily be understood when the reader realizes just WHO and WHAT they think Jesus was. They are not allowed to recognize him as Saviour, because their organization set-up is based upon a “work for salvation” theory. If a Saviour came, then the Watchtower treadmill would stop!

The need for authoritarian control would vanish, giving way to the Holy Spirit. As it is, they have “organizational spirit” in lieu of the Holy Spirit. The “unity” they have stems from the rigid, strict control exercised by the New York headquarters over the Witnesses. The heavenly movement of the Holy Spirit is unknown to them, for they rejected Him long ago.

Jesus told Nicodemus that he must be born again (John 3:7). Nicodemus was a sinner just as you and I. That is why he had to be born again.

The Watchtower magazine of October 1, 1958, page 605, captions a paragraph “JESUS, THE FIRST TO BE BORN AGAIN.” Then the paragraph remarks: “Jesus had to be born again from the spirit.” Thus, they attribute to Jesus Christ the sin nature that is common to us all! But we know the Son of God, the sinless One, need not be born again. Further, the Witnesses believe that Jesus was NOT born the Messiah! *Let God Be True* book says, page 39: “By being thus anointed with the spirit Jesus BECAME the Messiah . . .” (Emphasis mine).

The paragraph that follows says: “Jehovah God ACCEPTED him for sacrifice as mankind’s Redeemer” (Emphasis mine). In other words, it was not unalterably determined what Christ should do, but merely that events so transpired that he became born again, and so was accepted as Messiah by Jehovah! If He had failed, then who would have become Messiah? I read nothing in the Scriptures about a substitute!

In sharp contrast to this, the Bible says: “There is born to you this day in the city of David a Saviour who is (Greek, ESTIN) CHRIST (Greek for MESSIAH) the Lord” (Luke 2:11). If He was BORN the Messiah (as the above text states), what did He yet need to become? Moreover, the Witnesses think that Jesus was BEGOTTEN TWICE! They believe that HE LOST HIS SONSHIP!

Again quoting *Let God Be True*, page 39: “By acknowledging him as his beloved Son; God BEGOT JESUS to be his spiritual Son ONCE MORE” (Emphasis mine). Since, according to the Bible, sons of God do not have to become born again (seeing that the new birth is for the purpose of restoring sonship), we conclude therefrom, in the light of the above-quoted statement, that according to Witnesses, IT WAS NOT THE SON OF GOD WHO BECAME MESSIAH, BUT ONLY AN EX-SON OF GOD!

The Codex Bezae and a few later manuscripts contain the clause “thou art my beloved Son, this day have I begotten thee” (Luke 3:22). This is used by persons attempting to prove that Jesus was not the Son of God in the proper sense before His baptism. The above passage has no support in older Greek manuscripts and is found only in late copies of Luke, where it is a clear gloss from Psalm 2:7.

According to the Watchtower then, it was a good man (no more than that) who became Messiah and the Son of God at the same time. This means that IT WAS NOT GOD’S SON who was thus accepted, but a good man who was taken for this position! Since they believe that Jesus could have failed (for he was just another Adam, and Adam failed!), it would be interesting to find out what they think would have happened if Jesus had decided to default. Such, then, is the teaching of this pseudo-Christian group, parading as a recognized denomination! This is one of the most atrocious heresies ever invented by unsaved men.

Let us pursue the matter further, for the Watchtower is not yet finished with degrading Jesus.

Quoting from the book *Your Will Be Done On Earth*, page 317, we read this about Michael the archangel: “Michael in heaven was associated with the angel that brought the vision to Daniel.” They say this in order to bolster up their teaching that Jesus was Michael! On page 316 we read: “When he died AS THE MAN JESUS CHRIST and was resurrected and went back to heaven, what was his proper name? . . . He resumed his heavenly name MICHAEL” (Emphasis mine).

The book *New Heavens and a New Earth*, page 30 says: “Michael the archangel is no other than the only-begotten Son of God, now Jesus Christ.” This text seems not to bother the Watchtower: “UNTO WHICH OF THE ANGELS SAID HE AT ANY TIME, **Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee?**” (Hebrews 1:5). Once again we see the Watchtower heresy fall before the gleaming two-edged sword, the Bible (Hebrews 4:12).

So we have it: The unscriptural picture of a created angel, born later as a man who had to become born again as does any common sinner, who, at the age of thirty, became Messiah; then, after His death and resurrection, went back to become Michael the archangel again! And they call this the Christian gospel!

But let us turn from this heresy of the Watchtower to the Bible. See what it says in contrast to what we have been reading out of the Watchtower publications. A refreshing change indeed!

Consider again John 1:1. It compares with Deuteronomy 32:39: “**See now that I, even I, am he, and there is no god with me.**” However, the reading from Bagster’s Septuagint is even more significant. It reads: “Behold, behold that I am (EGO EIMI), and there is no god (THEOS) beside me.” If Jesus were a god of any kind (as the Watchtower translation says), then something is decidedly wrong with the text. But if He were God Himself as John 1:1 concludes that He was, then the two texts harmonize.

Again we are reminded of the same expression EGO EIMI as used in John 8:24, 28, 58. That is why that even though John 1:1 states “**the Word was WITH God,**” it rightly concludes by saying “**the Word WAS God.**” Thus we have an agreement between the texts, and not a contradiction, which we would have if the Watchtower translation were accurate.

At Isaiah 44:8 Jehovah asks: “**Is there a God beside me?**” He answers “**I know not any.**” This does not disturb the Witness, however, for he feels there is a God besides Jehovah, regardless of what the Scriptures say.

The Witness will make his usual feeble attempt to avoid what we are asking him to see. He will point out the difference between a small letter “g” and the capital “G,” especially as he sees them used in the above texts.

For his benefit we point out that in both HEBREW AND GREEK (early manuscripts) there are ONLY capital letters used!

The die-hard Jehovah’s Witness has only one alternative left: He will refuse to believe the Scriptures!

Referring to Hebrews, chapter 1, from which reference has already been made, verses five and six, we follow to verse eight, where Jehovah says of the Son: “**Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever.**” The New World Bible reads: “God is your throne forever.” The Greek text, in reference to the Son, reads HO THEOS (THE GOD). Here we have THEOS with the definite article, speaking of the Son! Naturally the Watchtower Society never pointed THIS out to the Witnesses!

Now Titus 2:13. We find the Greek expression TOU MEGALOU THEOU KAI SOTEROS HEMON CHRISTOU IESOU. The Watchtower translation reads: “Of the great God and of our Saviour Christ Jesus.” Reading literally as it appears word for word in Greek, we have: “OF THE GREAT GOD AND SAVIOUR OF US, CHRIST JESUS.”

In the New World translation appendix, page 781, an attempt is made to explain their translation of this text. The reader may refer to it and draw his own conclusions. The *Revised Standard Version* reads: "Awaiting our blessed hope, the appearing of the glory of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ." The *American Standard Version* renders it: "Looking for the blessed hope and appearing of the glory of our great God and Saviour Christ Jesus." The *Amplified New Testament*: "The glorious appearing of our great God and Saviour Christ Jesus, the Messiah, the Anointed One."

Next, we come to a text the Watchtower Society have found practically impossible to hide, though they tried. It is John 20:28 where Thomas says of Christ: HO KURIOS MOU KAI HO THEOS MOU. Which is when translated word for word into English: "THE LORD OF ME AND THE GOD OF ME." Here again we find HO THEOS (THE GOD) used in reference to the Son! Not merely God, but the God! Needless to say, the Watchtower has no comment to make upon this text!

Now either Jesus is or is NOT what the Scriptures say He is. What do you say?

The Watchtower speaks plainly, and the Bible speaks plainly. If the Watchtower is right, the Bible texts are wrong. If the Bible texts are right, then The Watchtower Society is wrong. Which do you choose? If you are a Jehovah's Witness, may God grant you wisdom to understand the truth as revealed in His Word concerning His only begotten Son, our Saviour, Jesus Christ.

In Isaiah 44:6 and 48:12 Jehovah declares Himself to be "**the first and the last.**" The Witness will accept this statement but not the following ones: "**I am the FIRST AND THE LAST: I am he that liveth; and was dead**" (Revelation 1:17, 18). "**These things saith the FIRST AND THE LAST, which was dead**" (Revelation 2:8). At Revelation 22:13, 16, 20 we read: "**I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last . . . I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches. I am the root and the offspring of David, and the bright, the morning star. He which testifieth these things saith, Surely: I come quickly. Amen: Even so, come, Lord Jesus.**"

"I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was and which is to come, the Almighty" (Revelation 1:8).

In order to avoid what can plainly be seen here, the Jehovah's Witness will say there are two "firsts" and two "lasts" and two "beginnings" and two "endings." Two "A's" to begin the alphabet and two "Z's" to end it! Thus they pit the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures against each other, creating a disagreement between the Testaments. **THUS THEY SPLIT THE BIBLE INTO TWO OPPOSING FACTIONS!**

Coming right down to the point, I John 5:20 says of Christ: "**This is the true God**" (Greek, OUTOS ESTIN HO ALETHINOS THEOS). Even the *New World* translators could not change that! In chapter one of Titus GOD is the Saviour in verse three; then, in verse four, JESUS is the Saviour. This compares with Isaiah 43:11 where Jehovah says: "**Beside me there is no Saviour.**"

Zechariah 12:10 is a text that disputants of the Trinity doctrine would like to conceal. It quotes the words of Jehovah, where He actually says: **“They shall look upon ME whom they have pierced.”** Here the Hebrew word ALAI is used, and means **“me.”**

Admittedly, as the *American Standard* footnote points out, a few manuscripts read “him” here. However, the rendering **“me”** is found in all the ancient Hebrew manuscripts, and not only in the best of the later ones, but also in the largest number of them. The rendering **“me”** is sustained by the Septuagint, Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotian, the Syriac, the Targums, the Vulgate and the Arabic translations. It is supported by the Talmud and the exposition by Rabbi Rashi.

The following English translations recognize the proper translation as **“me”**: *Douay, Harkavy, Darby, Lamsa, Berkeley Version, Rotherham, Knox, Julia Smith, Leeser, Young, Moulton’s Modern Reader’s Bible, George R. Noyes, Dr. A. Benisch’s Jewish School and Family Bible, Aaron Pick’s Literal Translation, The Holy Scriptures According to the Masoretic Text.*

It is the fact that Jehovah was pierced by the soldier’s spear that Paul refers to when he states that if the rulers had known His true identity **“they would not have crucified the Lord of glory”** (I Corinthians 2:8). The footnote “s” on this passage in the *Revised Standard Version*, which states that Theodotian reads “him” has been recognized as being in error, and is being dropped from all future printings.

Now let us face the trouble that Jesus was having with the Jews over his deity. Read John 5:18: **“Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the sabbath, but said also that God was his Father, making himself equal with God.”**

This is the conclusion reached by John, not that of the Jews, therefore, it is true and accurate. Note the following translations of this text and how the same thought is expressed.

- “This remark made the Jews all the more determined to kill him, because not only did he break the Sabbath, but referred to God as his own Father, so putting himself on equal terms with God” (*Phillips*).
- “On account of this the Jews were all the more eager to kill him, because he not only broke the Sabbath, but actually called God his Father, thus putting himself on an equality with God” (*American Translation*).
- “The Jews therefore were all the more eager to put Him to death, because He not only broke the Sabbath, but also spoke of God as being in a special sense His Father, thus putting Himself on a level with God” (*Weymouth*).
- “For this reason then the Jews sought all the more to kill Him, because He was not merely breaking the Sabbath but also calling God His own ‘Father,’ making Himself equal to God” (*Moffat 1901*).
- “This made the Jews more determined than ever to kill Him, because He not only broke (weakened, violated) the Sabbath, but He actually spoke of God as being (in a special sense) His own Father, making Himself equal (putting Himself on a level) with God” (*The Amplified New Testament*).

Dear reader, do you see the inescapable fact to which this Scripture points? If this very same Jesus were upon earth today, Jehovah's Witnesses (as Unitarians and other cultists) would be His most bitter enemies! For they, like those Jews of old, will NOT accept Him as God!

In defense of His deity Jesus said: **"The Son can do nothing of himself, but WHAT HE SEETH THE FATHER do: for what things soever HE doeth, THESE ALSO DOETH THE SON LIKEWISE"** (John 5:19). Thus Jesus could equal the Father in anything He did!

Take careful note, please: Jesus did NOT say He would do what he HEARD OF the Father doing, but what He SAW Him do—AND HE SPOKE THUS WHILE HE WAS IN THE FLESH UPON EARTH thus proving His omnipresence as God. That is why we are told that He did not have to seek after equality (Philippians 2:5, 6), because HE ALREADY POSSESSED equality!

But was Jesus not created? Jehovah's Witnesses think He was. They quote Revelation 3:14 which reads: **"These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God."** Also Colossians 1:15, which states that Jesus is **"the firstborn of every creature."**

Regarding the texts in Colossians and Revelation we quote *Let God Be True*, page 32, paragraph 3:

This One was not Jehovah God, but was "existing in God's form." How so? He was a spirit person, just as 'God is a Spirit'; he was a mighty one, although not almighty as Jehovah God is; also he was before all others of God's CREATURES, for he was the FIRST SON that Jehovah God brought forth. Hence he is called "the only begotten Son of God," for God had no partner in bringing forth his first-begotten Son. He was the first of Jehovah God's creations. He speaks so of himself, at Revelation 3:14: "These are the things the Amen says, the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation by God." (NW) Also at Colossians 1:15 he is spoken of as "the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation." Thus he is ranked with God's creation, being first among them and also most beloved and most favored among them (Emphasis mine).

Matthew Henry's Commentary says regarding this subject:

He is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead, the principle, the first-born from the dead; the principle of our resurrection as well as the first-born himself. All our hopes and joys take their rise from him who is the author of our salvation.

Not that he was the first who ever rose from the dead, but the first and only one who rose by his own power, and was declared to be the Son of God, and Lord of all things. And he is the head of the resurrection, and has given us an example and evidence of our resurrection from the dead.

The Trinity by Edward E. Bickersteth, beginning on page 105, reads:

If you regard the word first-born in its general acceptance among Eastern nations, it imports lordship, excellence, dignity; and as such the clause might well have been translated here, "The chief of all creation."

But if you press for a more exact significance, it absolutely resists the interpretation that Christ is himself a creation of God, for then it would have been PROTOKTISIS, first created, as Chrysostom observes, not PROTOKOS, firstborn.

The (-TOKOS) guards against this, and the PROTO- So far from assuming him to be the first creature, declares his pre-existent priority to all creation, according to the well-known usage of the superlative for the comparative, and the clause might well have been rendered by that in our version of the Athanasian creed: "Begotten before the worlds." Thus the phrase by itself is an unambiguous testimony to his Deity; and the succeeding clauses, ascribing to him the creation of all, prove him increate; for, if a creature, he made himself, which is absurd.

Now we come to Revelation 3:14 and Bickersteth comments as follows:

The beginning of the creation of God, HE ARCHE—Revelation 3:14. Compare with this, "I am, saith the Lord, the beginning and the end" HE ARCHE KAI TO TELOS—Revelation 21:6; 22:13. The above . . . sufficiently prove that, as used in chapter 3:14, it regards the pre-existent eternity, the "from everlasting" of the Lord, and as such declares him to be the beginning or origin, or originator, or precisely as we say, the First Cause of the creation of God.

Both Williams' and Goodspeed's translations of Revelation read: "The Beginner of God's creation." *The New English Bible* reads: "The prime source of all God's creation." We must also take note of Isaiah 43:10, where Jehovah says: "**Before me there was NO GOD FORMED** [created, *Lamsa*], **neither shall there be after me.**"

Following are some uses of "begotten," which the Witnesses think mean "created."

- First Corinthians 4:15 reads: "**For though ye have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet have ye not many fathers: for in Christ Jesus I have BEGOTTEN you through the gospel.**" Did Paul create them?
- Philemon 10 reads: "**I beseech thee for my son Onesimus, whom I have BEGOTTEN in my bonds.**" Did Paul create Onesimus?
- I Peter 1:3 reads: "**Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy hath BEGOTTEN us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.**"

Every child of God is begotten, but it has nothing to do with his original "creation," for his birth by nature must precede his new birth by the Spirit. I John 5:1 tells us: "**Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born [BEGOTTEN] of God: and whosoever loveth him that begat loveth him also that is BEGOTTEN of him.**"

Jesus referred to His Deity when speaking of His coming resurrection: "**Jesus answered and said unto them, Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up . . . When therefore he was risen from the dead, his disciples remembered that he said this**" (John 2:19).

Jehovah's Witnesses, as automatons of the Watchtower movement, can only see in the Scriptures what the Watchtower Society wants them to see. For example, at Matthew 11:27 they can readily see the words: "**Neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son.**" They think that this disproves the doctrine of the deity of Jesus.

The preceding words escape their notice: “**No man knoweth the Son, but the Father.**” It is even as He said: “**The Father is in me, and I in him**” (John 10:38).

Concerning the resurrection of Christ, the book, *Your Will Be Done On Earth*, says on page 143: “He arose as a spirit person with a spirit body.” However, *The Watchtower* is at a loss when it comes to explaining what happened to Jesus’ physical body. The average Witness will say that Jehovah disposed of the body in some manner not revealed in the Bible. Well then, anything they say in that regard is merely speculation, only adding imagination contrary to the revealed report.

When Lazarus was raised from the dead, he came forth from the tomb bound in his burial garments (as bodies in those days were mummified at burial). In Jesus’ tomb, the burial garments had been removed from the body and laid neatly aside. If the Witnesses are right, why were the garments not disposed of with the body? Who was in that tomb alive, to so separate the body of Christ from its burial garments? Remember that His body had been mummified— wrapped securely and completely. Whose hands placed those wrappings where they were found, minus the body? What physical person, alive in that tomb, performed those tasks?

Following is an example of how the Watchtower translators have deliberately ADDED TO THE WORD OF GOD in order to change entirely the meaning of a passage. At I Timothy 2:6 we read of Christ “**who gave himself a ransom for all.**” *The Watchtower* Bible reads “Who gave himself a CORRESPONDING ransom for all.” THIS WORD CORRESPONDING IS NOT IN THE GREEK TEXT AT ALL! IT WAS DELIBERATELY ADDED TO CHANGE THE MEANING OF THE SCRIPTURE!

However, even if we grant them their addition to the Word of God, we ask: What did Jesus’ ransom correspond to? It corresponded not only to Adam, but to the entire outgrowth of Adam’s sin which was atoned for. One again the Watchtower translators have failed in their attempts to conceal the truth of God’s Word.

Why did these translators ever do such a thing? Well, they want the Witnesses to think that Jesus was only another Adam before the Fall, that is, a perfect man. Therefore, they took this opportunity to make it appear as if Jesus gave a ransom only of what Adam failed to give. This allows for a continuation of our own sins, not covered by Jesus’ shed blood. Hence, there is only a removal of Adam’s sin, not of ours!

Through such reasoning the Watchtower Society keeps the Witnesses on that ever-turning treadmill, which is just a non-Catholic pre-death purgatory!

Following is a worthwhile quotation from William Smith’s *Dictionary of the Bible*, page 3089:

We find that when our Lord put to the Pharisees this question, “**What think ye of Christ, whose Son is he?**” their answer was not, “He is the Son of God,” but “**He is the Son of David;**” and they could not answer the second question which he next propounded to them, “**How then doth David, speaking in the Spirit, call him Lord?**” The reason was, because the Pharisees did not expect the Messiah to be the Son of God; and when He, who is the Messiah, claimed to be God, they rejected his claim to be the Christ.

The reason, therefore, of his condemnation by the Jewish Sanhedrin, and of his delivery to Pilate for crucifixion, was not that He claimed to be the Messiah or Christ, but because He asserted Himself to be much more than that: in a word, because He claimed to be the Son of God, and to be God.

This same source reads further along:

It was the claim which He put forth to be the Christ and Son of God, that led to our Lord's condemnation by the unanimous verdict of the Sanhedrin: "**They all condemned Him to be guilty of death**" (Mark 14:64; Matthew 26:63-66); and the sense in which He claimed to be the Son of God is clear from the narrative of John 5:18. "**The Jews sought the more to kill him because He not only had broken the Sabbath, but said also that God was his Father (PATERA IDION ELEGE TON THEON), making Himself 'equal unto God.'**"

And when He claimed Divine preexistence, saying, "**Before Abraham was (GENESTHAI), I am, then took they up stones to cast at him**" (John 8:58, 59); and when He asserted His own unity with God, "**I and the Father are one**"—one substance (HEN) , not one person (HEIS) — "**then the Jews took up stones again to stone Him**" (John 10:30, 31); and this is evident from the words, "**For a good word we stone thee not, but for blasphemy; and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God**" (John 10:33).

Accordingly we find that, after the Ascension, the Apostles labored to bring the Jews to acknowledge that Jesus was not only the Christ, but was also a Divine Person, even the Lord Jehovah. Thus, for example, St. Peter, after the outpouring of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost by Christ, says, "**Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye crucified, both LORD (KURIOS, JEHOVAH) and Christ**" (Acts 2:36). This conclusion supplies a convincing proof of Christ's God-head. *If* He is not the Son of God, equal with God, then there is no other alternative but that He was guilty of blasphemy; for He claimed "**God was His own Father, making Himself equal with God,**" and by doing so He proposed Himself as an object of Divine worship.

And in that case He would have rightly been put to death; and the Jews in rejecting and killing Him would have been acting in obedience to the law of God, which commanded them to put to death any prophet, however distinguished he might be by the working of miracles, if he were guilty of blasphemy (Deuteronomy 13:1-11); and the crucifixion of Jesus would have been an act of pious zeal on their part for the honor of God, and would have commended them to his favor and protection, whereas we know that it was that act which filled the cup of their national guilt, and has made them outcasts from God to this day . . .

Those persons who now deny Christ to be the Son of God, coequal with the Father, are followers of the Jews, who, on a plea for the Divine Unity, rejected and crucified Jesus, who claimed to be God. Accordingly we find that the Ebionites, Cerinthians, Nazarenes, Photinians, and others who denied Christ's Divinity, arose from the ranks of Judaism. The Jews sinned against the comparatively dim light of the Old Testament: they who have fallen into their error reject the evidence of both Testaments. . . .

The doctrine of Christ, the Son of God as well as Son of Man, reaches from the highest pole of Divine glory to the lowest pole of human suffering. No human mind could ever have devised such a scheme as that: and when it was presented to the minds of the Jews, the favored people of God, they could not reach to either of these two poles;

They could not mount to the height of the Divine exaltation in Christ the Son of God, nor descend to the depth of human suffering in Christ the Son of Man . . . But in the Gospel, Jesus Christ, Son of God and Son of Man, reaches from, one pole to the other, and filleth all in all (Ephesians 1:23). The Gospel of Christ ran counter to the Jewish zeal for Monotheism, and incurred the charge of Polytheism, by preaching Christ to be the Son of God, coequal with the

Father; and also contravened and challenged all the complex and dominant systems of Gentile polytheism, by proclaiming the Divine Unity. It boldly confronted the World, and it has conquered the World; because **'the excellency of the power of the Gospel is not of man, but of God'** (II Corinthians 4:7).

On this same subject we now quote *Basic Writings of St. Augustine*, Vol. I, chapter 1, page 699:

Wherefore, although we hold most firmly, concerning our Lord Jesus Christ, what may be called the Canonical rule, as it is both disseminated through the Scriptures, and has been demonstrated by learned . . . handlers of the same Scriptures, namely, that the Son of God is both understood to be equal to the Father according to the form of God in which He is, and less than the Father according to the form of a servant which He took; in which form He was found to be not only less than the Father, but also less than the Holy Spirit; and not only so, but also less even than Himself—not that Himself who was, but that Himself who is; because, by taking the form of a servant, He did not lose the form of God. . . .

Volume II, chapter 7, page 678 says:

They say, for instance, that the Son is less than the Father, because it is written that the Lord Himself said, **"My Father is greater than I."** But the truth shows that after the same sense the Son is less also than Himself; for how was He not made less also than Himself, who **'emptied Himself, and took upon Him the form of a servant?'** For He did not so take the form of a servant as that He should lose the form of God, in which He was equal to the Father.

If, then, the form of a servant was so taken that the form of God was not lost, since both in the form of a servant and in the form of God He Himself is the same only-begotten Son of God the Father, in the form of God equal to the Father, and in the form of a servant the Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; is there any who cannot perceive that He Himself in the form of God is also greater than Himself, but yet likewise in the form of a servant less than Himself?

And not, therefore, without cause the Scripture says both the one and the other, both that the Son is equal to the Father, and that the Father is greater than the Son. For there is no confusion when the former is understood as on account of the form of God, and the latter as on account of the form of a servant.

Volume II, chapter 8, page 680 on the subject "Delivering Up the Kingdom to God" reads:

Neither may we think that Christ shall so give up the kingdom to God, even the Father, as that He shall take it away from Himself. For some vain talkers have thought even this. For, when it is said, **"He shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father,"** He Himself is not excluded, because He is One God together with the Father. But that word **"until"** deceives those who are careless readers of the Scriptures, but eager for controversies.

For that text continues, **"For He must reign, until He hath put all enemies under His feet;"** (I Corinthians 15:24, 25) as though, when He had so put them, He would no more reign. Neither do they perceive that this is said in the same way as that other text, **"His heart is established: He shall not be afraid, until He see His desire upon His enemies"** (Psalm 112:8). For He will not then be afraid when He has seen it. What then means, **"When He shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father,"** as though God the Father has not the kingdom now? . . . The words, **"When He shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father,"** are as much as to say, When He shall have brought believers to the contemplation of God, even the Father.

For He says, **“All things are delivered unto me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father: neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him”** (Matthew 11:27). The Father will then be revealed by the Son, **“when He shall have put down all rule, and all authority, and all power;”** that is, in such wise that there shall be no more need of any economy of similitudes, by means of angelic rulers, and authorities, and powers.

Chapter 10, page 684 reads:

In that contemplation, therefore, God will be all in all; because nothing else but Himself will be required, but it will be sufficient to be enlightened by and to enjoy Him alone . . . For we shall then contemplate God the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, when the Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father, so as no longer to make intercession for us, as our Mediator and Priest, Son of God and Son of Man.

A significant fact is that Christ is referred to as being **“after the order of Melchizedek”** (Hebrews 6:20). Melchizedek was **“without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life, but made like unto the Son of God”** (Hebrews 7:3). If Jesus had a beginning, then he could NOT be compared to Melchizedek.

Jesus, the sacrificial Lamb without blemish, was also the high priest who officiated at the sacrificial ceremony of His own slaughter. To understand the significance of this, we must go back to the time when the original sacrifices were made upon the altar.

There we find:

- (1) The animal to be slaughtered;
- (2) The high priest who performed the ceremony;
- (3) The tabernacle containing the Holy of holies, into which the high priest entered to present the blood before the presence of Jehovah God.

An account of this is given in the ninth chapter of Hebrews:

“Then verily the first covenant had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary. For there was a tabernacle made; the first, wherein was the candlestick, and the table, and the shewbread; which is called the sanctuary.

“And after the second veil, the tabernacle which is called the Holiest of all; Which had the golden censer, and the ark of the covenant overlaid round about with gold, wherein was the golden pot that had manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the tables of the covenant; And over it the cherubims of glory shadowing the mercyseat; of which we cannot now speak particularly. Now when these things were thus ordained, the priests went always into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the service of God. But into the second went the high priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people: The Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing . . .

“But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us . . . For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us.”

Jesus, having made of no further value or use the original sacrifices through his own sacrifice, completely replaced the former ceremony. He had to be the sacrificial lamb, **“a lamb without blemish and without spot”** (I Peter 1:19). Also, we see from the above-quoted verses in Hebrews that he was also the high priest.

At Hebrews 7:26, 27 we read: **“For such an high priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens; who needed not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people’s; for this he did once and for all, when he offered up HIMSELF.”**

Jesus was not only the lamb; He was also high priest. It was He who presented the sacrifice of the perfect lamb to Jehovah. If *The Watchtower* theory were correct, there would have been no high priest to present the blood before Jehovah in Heaven.

Concluding our study of the deity of Jesus Christ, we quote *Let God Be True*, page 17: “When a religious organization forbids its members to read the Bible and requires its members to accept what its clergymen teach without comparing their teachings with the Holy Scriptures, such religious organization belies its claim that it is apostolic.”

With those words *The Watchtower* condemns its own system. The *Let God Be True* book is misnamed, for it does everything but that! While Jehovah’s Witnesses may read the Bible, **THEY MAY NOT INTERPRET ANY PART OF IT**, but are required to accept **THE WATCHTOWER EXPLANATION AS THE FINAL AUTHORITY FOR INTERPRETATION!** And in finality, they must accept the Watchtower translation.

But we are not yet through exposing *The Watchtower* heresy. As we continue we will consider the subject of the Triune Godhead, to give full and complete proof for the Trinity.

~ end of chapter 2 ~

<http://www.baptistbiblebelievers.com/>
