

Jehovah's Witnesses and the New World Translation **sermonaudio.com**  
*Jehovah's Witnesses*  
By Dr. James White

**Preached on:** Wednesday, January 1, 1986

**Alpha and Omega Ministries**  
P.O. Box 37106  
Phoenix, AZ 85069

**Website:** [aomin.org](http://aomin.org)  
**Online Sermons:** [www.sermonaudio.com/aominorg](http://www.sermonaudio.com/aominorg)

This evening we're looking at the Jehovah's Witnesses New World Translation (NWT). The translators, interestingly enough, you'll search in vain through your New World Translation looking for the names of the translators. The reason is, according to the Society anyways, that they do not want to give any glory to any particular man. I'm not sure if that's really the complete reason.

In 1980, Raymond Franz, who was on the governing body of Jehovah's Witnesses, was dis-fellowshipped and in a book he wrote entitled "Crisis of Conscience," he reveals the names of the people who served on the translation committee of the New World Translation and of the people who served on the committee, only one man had any training in biblical languages whatsoever, about a year and a half of Greek, it's unclear whether that was classical or koine, the feeling was classical Greek wasn't even the Greek of the New Testament, as I understand, but this was the only official training that any of these people had received. So though most Jehovah's Witnesses really feel that this translation here is extremely scholarly, it's the most accurate, so and so forth, the the fact of the matter is they have no credentials to back up the claims that they're making at that point.

Now the New World Translation is known for the fact that most of them will have numerous appendices in the back and these appendices will address various translational questions and I would say mistranslations in the NWT, and many of them will quote true scholars of the Greek language, A. T. Robertson; Dana and Mantey; other true scholars of the Greek language in the appendix. What is interesting is the fact that the writing department of the Watchtower Bible and Tract Society has access to a library which is one of the largest in the world as far as religious literature goes, they have access to just about everything that there is, and what is unfortunate is that they search high and low for any kind of quotation from this mountain of literature that would support their position while passing over vast amounts of quotations that completely and totally disagree with their presentation and their position, and it must be a hard thing for a person to work in the writing department and have to ignore the vast majority of the references they look up because they don't support a particular position taken by the Society, but this we see over and over again when you examine the New World Translation.

The Greek text utilized by the Watchtower Society is Westcott-Hort's text of 1881. There are more modern texts which might have been better if they had followed, but I have no particular problem with the Westcott-Hort at all. I realize that in the forward of the 1984 edition of the NWT, we read that the translators attempted to be as accurate to render things as accurately as possible, and what I'd like to examine from that is whether they did a very good job of rendering things as accurately as possible, and as we're looking through these, I'd like you to keep in mind what is it that is being spoken of in each of these passages that we examine. Is there a common thread doctrinally and theological realm between these what we will call mistranslations or very tortured translations or something like that. See if there is some type of a reason possibly behind these translations. I think after we do just a few of them, you'll see that there is indeed a common thread between all of them.

One last thing before we actually get into examining some mistranslations. You might wonder, "Why in the world would you take the time to examine this? You're going to be talking about some complicated issues, you'll be getting into some things that most Christians would never deal with, why do this?" The main reason is Christianity is based upon the teachings of the Bible, the Bible is our guidebook, the Bible provides us with the information that we have concerning who Jesus is and what his work was, and so if you can change the Bible, if you can in some way alter its message, you can alter the very fabric of the faith that is based upon it, and so it is an important thing to accurately translate the text of Scripture. Paul did not read or write English, in fact, English didn't even exist at the time that Paul lived. We are reading translations of the Hebrew Old Testament and the Greek New Testament and so we must needs be able to examine the credentials and the accuracy of those people who would translate the Scriptures for us unless we're going to take the time to learn the Greek language ourselves, or Hebrew or something like that, so that we don't have to rely on someone else's translation and, of course, that takes many hours of study and work. Most people don't have the opportunity of doing that and so they must rely on translations, and so what we're going to do is we're going to examine just how accurately the Watchtower Bible and Tract Society has translated the things from the Scriptures.

So if you'll take your Kingdom Interlinear Translation and look with me first at Matthew 25:46. Matthew 25:46. Now most people, at least for a while, will probably still have the purple editions of Kingdom Interlinear Translation so I'm not giving you page numbers in the purple one. The page numbers are different. The page number in the new '85 Kingdom Interlinear is page 137. It is not that in the old purple edition, it is page 153 in the old purple edition. So as you can see, there's a few pages different there. So when I give you a page, that'll be in the new blue 1985 Kingdom Interlinear.

The New World Translation, which you'll find along the right-hand side of the page, says in Matthew 25:46, "And these will depart into everlasting cutting off but the righteous ones into everlasting life." The word that is questionable here is the Greek term kolasin which you see in your interlinear portion translated "cutting off," or in the interlinear portion it says "lopping off." Now it is true that at one point in history kolasin meant cutting off or lopping off. Unfortunately, that was hundreds of years before the period in

which the New Testament was written. At the time the New Testament was written, the koine period, it meant punishment. Punishment. Almost every translation I've ever read contains that meaning of punishment, not cutting off.

You say, "Well, why might you mention this?" Well, the fact of the matter is that the Watchtower Bible and Tract Society does not believe in eternal punishment and if you'll look at the text here, you'll see that you have eternal life and you have eternal punishment and they're parallel to each other, however long life is, so is punishment, and I have a feeling that to cloud this issue, to be perfectly honest with you, this mistranslation has been introduced into the text, cutting off instead of punishment.

Now undoubtedly the most famous translation, if we can use that term in the New World Translation, is John 1:1. John 1:1. Here on the board I have written from the Greek text John 1:1 which says, "En arche en ho Logos kai ho Logos en pros ton Theon kai Theos en ho Logos. In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God and the Word was God." Now as you can see in the New World Translation, the NWT translates it, "In the beginning the Word was and the Word was with God and the Word was a god." Now the Society has expended great time, money and effort to substantiate this translation. They have quoted out of context numerous scholars including Dana and Mantey from "A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament" to attempt to substantiate that. Let's look at the actual text and see what is being said.

"En arche en ho Logos, In the beginning was the Word." This word "en" is the imperfect form of "eimi." "Eimi" is a simple existence verb. It means "I am." It simply states that the Word was in existence in the beginning. It is timeless. It does not point to any point of origin or beginning whatsoever. Whenever that beginning was, the Word was already in existence. In fact, all the way through the first 14 verses of John, the writer of John is very very careful to differentiate between two verbs, this verb right here "en" and another verb "ginomai," or as it's found in this passage in the aorist form "egeneto." You say, "What does that have to do with the price of butter in Russia?" Egeneto refers to a point of origin, a source, a beginning. When he talks about "all things," when he talks about John, he says these things became, they started. Well, when he talks about the Word, ho Logos, he says "en." He does not use a verb that points to a point of origin or beginning. Now the only time this changes is in verse 14 when it says "The Word became flesh." Here he uses egeneto. Well, of course he does because there was a point in time at which the Word became flesh, the Word was not eternally flesh, the Word became flesh at a point in time and so this use of the verbs is very important in John's thinking.

So what he says here in the first clause of John 1:1 is that the Word is eternal. The Word has always been. However far you want to push "en arche" back, you can take it back to the beginning of creation if you wish, the Word's already in existence. You could push it as far back into eternity as you want, the Word still is. This is his first part of this verse. The second phrase says "kai ho Logos en pros ton Theon, and the Word was with God." Now this is interesting. A person reading the first phrase would get the idea, well, the Logos is eternal. Now to a monotheistic Jew such as John, the only thing that was completely and totally eternal that was not a creation of God in any way, shape or form,

was God himself, and so we have this idea of the Word here being eternal and then the very next phrase he says, "and the Word was with God," and we see here two persons: we have the Word, and of course, we know that in John 1:14 this Word is identified as Jesus Christ, the Word was eternally with God. Now if you stopped right there, you'd get the idea that the Word may be eternal but the Word is to be completely and totally distinguished from God and there is, indeed, a distinguishing here between Logos and Theon but he didn't stop there, he added the next phrase, "kai Theos en ho Logos, and the Word was God." So there is here in the second word, second phrase, clause, we have a word "pros." Pros means face-to-face; it indicates communication; it indicates fellowship. The Word was eternally face-to-face in fellowship with God. And then the third clause says "kai Theos en ho Logos, the Word was God."

Now the Society's contentions have revolved around the fact that this word "Theos" does not have what is called an article. An article in Greek would appear such as right here, ho. Logos has the article in each phrase, right here, right here and right here. Theon has the article right here, ton, "ton Theon," but here Theos does not have an article which in English would be "the," and so they say this makes it indefinite and hence should be translated "a god." Now this is not the case. Instead of what you have here, this phrase is called a copulative phrase, and I know I'm taking you back to the good old days of grammar in English class but it's very important. The subject of the sentence is "the Word." You could not translate it "God is the Word." You could not translate it that way because when you have a sentence like this, that little mark right there, the article, points out what the subject of the sentence is. So it is "the Word was," then we have "Theos." Now if Theos had an article, if Theos had an article, then you could translate it either "God was the Word" or "the Word was God," either one. It would be interchangeable and what it would say was all of God was the Word and all of the Word is God, they are identical things. Now if John had said that, what he would be saying is the Word is all of God. God and the Word are the same person. That is an ancient heresy known as Sabellianism or Modalism, teaching that there is no Trinity, there is no three persons but the Father is the Son, the Son is the Father, and the Father is the Holy Spirit, and the Holy Spirit is the Father, so on and so forth. That is not the case.

So here what could John have done? If he had put the article in, he would've basically been teaching heresy which he did not do. Why, then, did he write it in this way? Basically when, this is called a predicate nominative, when the predicate nominative precedes the verb and does not have the article, it takes on a characterizing effect. Kenneth Wuest in his expanded translation brings this out when he says, "The Word was as to his nature absolute deity." John's point is that though you can differentiate between the Word and God, the Word's nature is the same nature as God's. In fact, one translation translates it, "What God was, the Word was." So Paul is not, Paul, John is not attempting to say that Jesus is the Father, that Jesus is Theon. He is saying is Logos, Jesus' nature is the same as the Father's. They both share the one essence, the one being that is God.

A translation of "a god" is false and misleading. It does not do justice to the context of the language in any way, shape or form. It also teaches polytheism for this would teach that you have a big god, Jehovah, and a little god, Jesus. Now Jesus said there is only one

true God and hence if big god, Jehovah, is the one true god, then that makes Jesus a false god. Obviously that is not the case from John's viewpoint. If a student, for example, in one of my Greek classes that I teach at church were to translate this phrase and put "and the Word was a god," I would have to mark it wrong because it is just simply against the rules of Greek grammar.

So we have here an example of a mistranslation at this point. The extent to which the Society has gone in an attempt to defend this is beyond the realm of our research this evening, though it is fascinating to see how many times true scholars have been quoted out of context, falsehoods have been produced, we've even gone so far as to find out that the Society utilized translation by a spirit medium by the name of Johannes Greber who also translated this "the Word was a god," but he got his translation from the spirit world which should say something about the seriousness of what we're dealing with here.

So John 1:1 is a major mistranslation. You're saying, "But how am I gonna explain that to a Witness friend or relative of mine? I can't spew back all that copulative sentence material." Well, let's look at a few things here. In the Kingdom Interlinear Translation, 282 times the word "Theos" appears without an article and if that rule the Society has seemingly made up about John 1:1 holds true, then 282 times we should find them translating it "a god," however you will find out that only 16 times they translate it that way. In other words, they break their own rule 94% of the time. They are inconsistent to their own rule 94% of the time. For example in verse 6 of John 1 we have Theou and some might go, "Well, see that's a different word." But it's not. Theou is just simply the genitive ablative form of Theos and the Society, itself, has admitted that. Theou has no article and yet look how they translate it in verse 6, "There rose a man that was sent forth as a representative of God," with a capital "G." If they were consistent, they would have to translate it "a god." But they did not.

There are numerous other examples. In 2 Corinthians 5:19 you have Theos appearing without an article. It is translated in the NWT as capital "G," God. This happens over and over and over again. Also, do not be taken in by a very common Witness ploy of taking you to Acts 28:6 where Paul is bitten by a serpent and they say, you see, look right here they said that "they thought him to be a god." The problem is the construction in Acts 28:6 is not in any way parallel to what we have in John 1:1, and without going into a lot of detail, there is a passage in your Kingdom Interlinear Translation there that is exactly parallel to John 1:1 which you can show a Witness and demonstrate how the NWT correctly translates the other passage while mistranslating John 1:1.

Let's take a look at that. It's Mark 2:28. Mark 2:28. Mark 2:28 is a parallel construction to what we have right here. In other words, we have a noun preceding the verb without an article. According to the Society, it should be translated indefinitely. Let's look at Mark 2:28. "Hence the Son of Man is Lord even of the Sabbath." Now if you'll look at your Greek, you'll see "hoste kyrios." Notice kyrios. Kyrios is a nominative. It is before the verb estin, and if the Society's contentions are right and if they stuck to their own rule, you would have to translate this, "Hence the Son of Man is a lord even of the Sabbath," but they do not because that would be patently absurd obviously, and yet why do it in

John 1:1? I'd have to say it's because of the theological bias against the deity of Christ obviously, and I think that has been substantiated over the past 36 years in the fact that numerous scholars have written articles showing the fact that John 1:1 has been mistranslated in the NWT and yet they try to stick to the translation. Only a person who has a point to prove is going to do that when faced with true scholarship against their position.

So John 1:1 is a mistranslation and it can be demonstrated as such from the text. Let's look at another one that has caused a lot of raised eyebrows in the scholarly community and it is John 8:58. John 8, verse 58. Now this evening I handed out to you, and those people who are listening by tape do not have the benefit of this, but I will describe to you it is a photocopied sheet giving the footnote from the New World Translation from 1951, 1969, 1984, at John 8:58. You will notice that it has changed numerous times.

In 1951, the New World Translation had as a footnote: "I have been, ego eimi," after the aorist infinitive clause "prin Abraam genesthai" and hence properly rendered in the perfect indefinite tense. It is not the same as "ho on," meaning "the being" or the "I am," Exodus 3:14, and LXX means the Septuagint. Now it was immediately pointed out by Christian scholars world around that there was no such thing as a perfect indefinite tense in Greek. The Witnesses were just about as quickly to respond that they didn't mean in Greek, even though that's obviously how it seems to have been written, they meant in English and there is a perfect indefinite tense in English, however, it was dropped very quickly because, of course, they could provide no evidence for what they were saying.

So you'll notice that in the 1969 edition the Kingdom Interlinear Translation all the way up to, oh, just last year, this second note was put in which says: "I have been, ego eimi," after the aorist infinitive clause "prin Abraam genesthai" and hence properly rendered in the perfect tense. It is not the same as "ho on," meaning "the being" or the "I am," in Exodus 3:14, and the Septuagint.

Now this has been changed. In the 1985, I know I put '84 down there, the 1985 Kingdom Interlinear Translation, notice something has disappeared. It now says: "I have been, ego eimi," the action expressed by this verb, began in the past, is still in progress and is properly translated by the perfect indicative. Well, they're getting closer but the problem is they're missing the entire point of the passage. Many times context is a guiding light to translation.

Let's look at what was going on in John 8. Jesus is talking to the Jews and he's told them in John 8:24, "Unless you believe that, ego eimi, I am, you shall die in your sins." He wasn't pulling any punches here and he comes to 8:58 and says, "before Abraham came into existence or came into being, I am." Notice what happens in verse 59, "Therefore they picked up stones to hurl them at him but Jesus hid and went out of the temple." Now the Jews took great offense at Jesus' use of ego eimi. There are some real reasons for this. Ego eimi is used both in Deuteronomy and Isaiah as a euphemism, another terminology for Yahweh God. This is used, for example, in Isaiah 43:10 where Jehovah's Witnesses even get their name in the Septuagint translation. And the Jews understood what Jesus

was saying, the Jews comprehended that he was claiming to be their God and they accused him of blasphemy and picked up stones to hurl at him. I mean, they only had two reasons to stone him, it was either blasphemy or adultery, and obviously he's saying "before Abraham was, I am," was not adultery. They considered it to be blasphemy.

So the Society has missed this point and I personally believe to hide the obvious claim by Jesus at this point. They have mistranslated a simple present indicative active, ego eimi, as "I have been" instead of "I am." Now it is true that obviously it means that in the past he was. That's true. I mean, here is a comparison between Abraham and notice the verb there, genesthai, it's ginomai again. The exact same comparison that John was making way back in John 1 is continuing here in John 8. Abraham came into existence at one point. Jesus, present indicative, continuous action, has always been. Ego eimi. The same comparison is made in the Septuagint translation in Psalm 90:2 where, "before the mountains are brought forth, wherever thou hast formed the earth and the world even from everlasting to everlasting, thou art God." The mountains came into existence, God has always been. It's the same comparison in the Greek of Psalm 90:2 in the Septuagint as we have here in John 8:58. The Jews knew all of this.

So the best translation, of course, is "I am. I have been" is contained in the meaning. Certainly in the past, yes, but the translation is "I am" and I have to figure that the reason we've stuck with "I have been" in the Society for the past 36 years is mainly to hide a point.

On the bottom of the page here I have from a beginning grammar of the Greek New Testament by William Hersey Davis, section 458, John 8:58 comes up as an example and he says, "prin, before" is frequently used with the infinitive. For example, "prin Abraam genesthai, ego eimi, before Abraham came into being, I am." Now William Hersey Davis studied under the greatest American Greek scholar who has ever lived, Dr. A. T. Robertson, and William Hersey Davis was a colleague of his, and so you can't get much greater authority than William Hersey Davis or A. T. Robertson at this point.

So John 8:58 has figured rather largely in this discussion. Acts 10:36, we'll pick up the pace a little bit here. Acts 10:36. Acts 10:36 says that, "He sent out the word to the sons of Israel to declare to them the good news of peace through Jesus Christ. This one is the Lord of all others." The Society has a penchant for adding to word "other" into the Scriptures. The word "other" is nowhere in the Greek text, as you can see. Only a theological bias causes it to be added where it is at this point. We will see numerous other examples of this.

2 Corinthians 13. 2 Corinthians, the very last verse of the letter, says, "The undeserved kindness of the Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God and the sharing in the Holy Spirit be with all of you." You might say, "So what?" Well, when you read it in the Greek, you'll notice that what we have here is a Trinitarian passage. We have reference to the Lord Jesus Christ, the Father God, and to the Holy Spirit, and yet even though the construction is identical, "of the Lord Jesus Christ, of God," and it should be, "of the Holy Spirit," the Society has broken up this Triune passage and translated a simple

genitive as a locative and said, "in the Holy Spirit." Now any first year Greek student would recognize that this is a genitive form and yet they're translating it as a locative with really no reason at all, especially due to the fact that it's obviously parallel with "of the Lord Jesus Christ" and "of God" above. And I think, again, the reason revolves around theological differences. The Society doesn't believe in the Trinity. The thing that worries me is you need to come to the Scriptures and derive your theology from the Scriptures rather than taking your theology and impressing them upon the Scriptures themselves and changing the Scriptures to fit your theology, and yet we see this happening over and over again.

Look at Philippians 1. Philippians came in for a lot of this, for some reason. I'm not sure why but Philippians contains a high number of questionable translations. Philippians 1:23 is an example. Paul says, "I am under pressure from these two things but what I do desire is the releasing and the being with Christ, for this to be sure is far better." Now the word is "analysai" which is an infinitive and simply means Paul is saying, "I wish to be released. I wish to be released." Now if you'll look at the appendix that the Society provides concerning this, what they try to say is that Paul was talking about something way down the road someplace when, in fact, what Paul's talking about here is, "I want to go home to be with the Lord. I want to be in the Lord's presence." But why would the Society have any problem with that? Well, if you know what the Society teaches concerning that, they do not teach a conscious existence in the afterlife. You are literally recreated by God at the time of the resurrection. And so instead of Paul saying, "I want to be released and to be with the Lord," we have a different translation which would make that a little bit harder to see.

Philippians 2:9. Philippians 2:9 gives us another example of the word "other" being inserted into the text. "For this very reason also God exalted him to a superior position and kindly gave him the name that is above every other name." Now the 1985 edition of the Kingdom Interlinear Translation has the word "other" in brackets. It did not in the 1969 edition. The 1969 edition, the purple people-eater as we called it, that word "other" is not in brackets. They have now decided to bracket it mainly due to the fact that what Philippians 2:9 says is that his name is above every name. Now you can understand why they put the word "other" in there from the Witnesses' viewpoint. Every name but the name of Jehovah, of course. What they don't realize is Jesus is Jehovah. Jesus identified as Jehovah over and over and over and over again in Scriptures, but this is not seen in the NWT.

Philippians 3:11. Philippians 3, verse 11, gives us another example where a doctrine of the Society is smuggled into a translation. Philippians 3:11 says, "To see if I may by any means attain to the earlier resurrection from the dead." The Greek term is "exanastasin." Exanastasin does not mean earlier resurrection, it just simply means a resurrection out of. It is the Greek term "anastasis," resurrection, and "ex," out of. It has nothing to do with earlier whatsoever. Why is this translated this way? Well, as you understand Witness doctrine, you can see why it is translated in this way and, again, it is a doctrinal consideration.



More tampering with the text can be seen and it is one of the most obvious, obvious passages is Colossians 1. Colossians 1:16-17 in the NWT reads, "Because by means of him all other things were created in the heavens and upon the earth, the things visible and the things invisible, no matter whether they are thrones or lordships or governments or authorities; all other things have been created through him and for him. Also he is before all other things, by means of him all other things are made to exist." Now notice the word "other" is in brackets. It originally was not. If you will look at the 1950 or the 1951 NWT, the word "other" was just put right into the text, no brackets whatsoever. Such an outcry was raised concerning this that obviously very quickly the Society inserted the brackets but they didn't take the word out. Now why has this word been put in there? Well, obviously if Jesus Christ created all things, *ta panta* is the Greek term and it means "all things," if he created all things, then he's the Creator not a creation. If I create all things then I'm not a creation, but if I'm a creation, then I have to say I created all other things and exclude myself from that category. The Society has realized this and to take away the clear indication of the fact that Jesus Christ created all things, he is before all things and by his very power all things hold together, the word "other" has been inserted.

Other groups have taken different tracks. For example, The Way International, Victor Paul Wierwille's group, who also deny the deity of Christ, take a much less scholarly approach, I should say, not that this is scholarly but a much less likely approach by saying verses 16 and 17 are an excursus that are in reference to the Father, not to the Son. It's sort of like in parentheses or something along those lines. Every group has to do something with the fact that Jesus Christ according to Colossians 1:16-17 is the Creator, not a creation. It's a very very important distinction.

The next passage to look at is Colossians 2:9. Colossians 2:9, an extremely important verse in presenting the deity of Christ to anyone, obviously, but Colossians 2:9 says in the New World Translation, "Because it is in him that all the fullness of the divine quality dwells bodily." Now the Greek phrase is "*hoti en auto katoikei pan to pleroma tes Theotetos somatikos*, because in him all the fullness of deity dwells in bodily form. The word "Theotetos" means "deity."

Now notice in the '85 Kingdom Interlinear Translation there has been a change. In the 1969 purple people-eater, it read "godhead, godship, godship." Now it's been changed to "divinity" which is in actuality a weaker form. It is a step in the wrong direction. Now you will find, however, "divinity" in various lexicons of the meaning but to the Witness, divinity means not deity. They have a complete difference between divinity and deity. Theotetos means that which makes God God, the very essence of being God. It's a very strong term. In fact, it's the only time it's used in the New Testament at all and it's in reference to Jesus Christ. Divinity to a Witness is something much less. You will never find in any lexicon the meaning "divine quality" for Theotetos. That is a mistranslation to hide the fact that Colossians 2:9 teaches very clearly that Jesus Christ is in the state of being God, deity. That's from Thayer's Greek Lexicon. B. B. Warfield would find it as that which makes God God.

It's a very strong, very clear term that unfortunately if I were to read this as my regular translation, and how many Witnesses do you know that do that? I mean, this is the only translation they read on a regular basis. I wouldn't see it. I could read over that verse 100 times and not see the clear teaching that Jesus Christ was deity, that he was God, and the fact is also most Witnesses are very ignorant of the background to these passages. You see, Paul was writing against an error called Gnosticism and Gnosticism taught that God was all good and that matter was all evil. Spirit was good, matter was evil, so that you have a god up here that could never have created matter and from god were a number of emanations called Eons, all those emanations together were the pleroma, and each Eon, each emanation was a little bit farther away from god's and a little bit lower until you got down to the bottom and you had what was called a demiurge, a real, yuck, vile being which the Gnostics identified as Jehovah of the Old Testament who created all things. One of these emanations along the way was Jesus and the Gnostics worshiped angels as these emanations and Paul mentions this here in Colossians, and so when you realize that he's writing against that, you can see how important Colossians 2:9 really is, "For in him all the fullness of deity dwells in bodily form." They thought bodily was evil, terrible, corrupt, and yet Paul's point is all the fullness of deity, that which makes God God, exists in Jesus in bodily form.

Now up until this change that they've now made here, there was one other word in the New Testament which they translated in the interlinear portion as "godship" and that was over at Romans 1:20, theiotes, and it's a different word uses, ?? in there, it's a completely different word, comes from a completely different word, and yet they had the same translation in the interlinear. Theotetos does mean divine quality. That's what it refers to. It refers to the divine attributes. It's much less of a specific term and it's different than what is here at Colossians 2:9, Theotetos.

Let's move on from here to 1 Timothy 2:6. 1 Timothy 2:6. Here is another example of basically smuggling a doctrine into a translation. 1 Timothy 2:6, NWT reads, "Who gave himself a corresponding ransom for all. This is what is to be witnessed to at its own particular times." Corresponding ransom comes from the Greek term antilytron. Antilytron. Anitilytron simply means a ransom, not a corresponding ransom, but when you realize the Witnesses' doctrine of the corresponding ransom, that Adam, the perfect man, lost so Jesus, the perfect man, gave his perfect life and that obviously shows that Jesus could never be God because he couldn't be more or less than Adam, and so on and so forth, you see why the translation of antilytron as corresponding ransom.

Hebrews 9:27 in the NWT says, "And as it is reserved for men to die once for all time, but after this a judgment." Once for all time, the phrase "for all time" does not appear in the Greek, and of course, when you realize the Witnesses' doctrine that when you die, you cease to exist, you can understand how that would be rational and consistent from their viewpoint, but again it is simply smuggling a doctrine into the Scriptures.

Hebrews 12:9 and 23. Hebrews 12:9 has in the NWT toward the end of the verse, "shall we not much more subject ourselves to the Father of our spiritual life and live." Notice that in the Greek it is pneumaton. Pneumaton. It is the genitive plural "spirits" and it is

translated "spirits" in the interlinear portion of the Kingdom Interlinear Translation. Somehow we get from spirits to our spiritual life. A similar translation is done in verse 23 of the same chapter where we know that it says, "in general assembly in the congregation of the firstborn who have been enrolled in the heavens and God the judge of all and the spiritual lives of righteous ones who have been made perfect." What Hebrews 12 is talking about is spirits of righteous men. Well, the Society doesn't believe in that spiritual being, that spiritual essence to man existing on past death, and so we change from spirits to spiritual lives.

1 Peter 1:11 is interesting to me. 1 Peter 1:11 says in the NWT, "They kept on investigating what particular season or what sort of season the spirit in them was indicating concerning Christ, what it was bearing witness beforehand about the sufferings for Christ and about the glories to follow these." Now this passage is in reference to the prophets, the prophets of the Old Testament, and there was a spirit in there witnessing about Christ. Now if you'll look at any other translation, if you'll look at your New American Standard or something like that, or if you'll just simply look at the interlinear Greek portion, you'll see "Pneuma Christou, Spirit of Christ." It was the Spirit of Christ that was testifying in the prophets of old. Now when you look at the Old Testament, you see the Old Testament clearly says it was the Spirit of Yahweh, the Spirit of Jehovah that spoke through the prophets. Now at 1 Peter 1:11, it's saying it was the Spirit of Christ that was doing this, well, you can see why we need to do something with this translation because this would be another one of the many places where Jesus is identified as being Jehovah. And so here we have a very simple construction, Pneuma Christou, simple translation, Spirit of Christ, and yet we translate it, again I believe, in reference to theological rather than grammatical reasons.

Revelation 3:14 is another example. The book of the Revelation, chapter 3, verse 14 says, "And to the angel of the congregation Laodicea write: These are the things that the Amen says, the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation by God." Now Witnesses are very quick to point this out and say, "See, this says that Jesus is the beginning of the creation by God. He was God's first creation." Now the word translated "beginning" is the same word we had up here in John 1:1, "arche." That same word is used in description of God, God who is the beginning and the end. So if using the word "arche" of Jesus makes him a creation, I guess Jehovah is too. Obviously that's not what it says. The phrase under consideration is "tou Theou, of God." He is the beginning or the arche of the creation of God, not by God. By God is simply an interpretation by the Society. What Revelation 3:14 is in reference to is that Jesus Christ is the arche, the origin, the source, the beginning, the ruler of the creation of God. He is not the first created thing because we've already seen in Colossians 1:16-17 that he created all things. Here again is a translation that is based upon the theological preferences of the Society and it is a mistranslation.

Now the next few passages we're gonna look at all tie together. They're all examples of a particular kind of Greek construction. You're going, "Oh no, another Greek construction." I think we can go through it to where you can understand exactly what it is we're looking at. What we're looking at in the next few passages is what's called Granville Sharp's rule.

Granville Sharp's rule. And what Granville Sharp's rule says is this: when two singular nouns describing a person are found in the same case and are connected by the word "and," which in Greek is "ka," with the first noun having the article "the" and the second lacking it, both nouns refer to the same person. What that means is when you have two nouns, they're singular and they're describing a person and they're connected by the little word "and," the first one has the article, the second one doesn't, the rule says both of them are describing the same person.

Let's look at some examples of this so we can get this firmly into our mind. Let's look, for example, at 2 Peter 3:18. 2 Peter 3:18 is correctly translated by New World Translation. It says, "No, but go on growing in the undeserved kindness and knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. To him be the glory both now and to the day of eternity." Now what I want to look at is "our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ." In the Greek that is "tou Kyriou hemon kai Soterou Iesou Christou." This is a Granville Sharp construction, that is, you have two nouns, the first is Kyriou and the second is Soterou, Lord and Savior. They are connected by the word "kai, and." The first, Kyriou, has an article, "tou." Soterou does not. This is a classic Granville Sharp construction correctly translated by the NWT as "our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ," both Lord and Savior refer to the one person, Jesus Christ. Correctly translated.

Let's look at another example, 2 Peter 1:11. Same book. In fact, you will find there are five, count them, five Granville Sharp instructions in the short little book of 2 Peter. He uses it very frequently. 2 Peter 1:11 says, "In fact, thus there will be richly supplied to you the entrance into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ." Lord and Savior, Lord has the article, Savior does not, connected by "kai," and describing one person. It is not our Lord and our Savior Jesus Christ as if our Lord was one person and Savior Jesus Christ was somebody else. That's not what it means. Again, correctly translated by the NWT.

Now you have 2 Peter 1:11 on the little sheet that I gave you, on the sheet you have there, you have " tou Kyriou hemon kai Soterou Iesou Christou, of the Lord of us and of the Savior Jesus Christ." Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. Now let's go to 2 Peter 1:1. Notice this is only one page away from 2 Peter 1:11. 2 Peter 1:1, "Simon Peter, a slave and apostle of Jesus Christ, to those who have obtained the faith, held in equal privilege with ours by the righteousness of our God and the Savior Jesus Christ." Notice the word "the" is in brackets. Now let's look at the Greek. In fact, on your sheet of paper you have seen I have made a comparison to the two. There is only one word difference between 2 Peter 1:1 and 2 Peter 1:11. In 2 Peter 1:1, the word "Theou, God" appears, in 2 Peter 1:11, it is "Kyriou, Lord." They are identical in form. These two passages are identical to each other. Now if you could translate 2 Peter 1:11 as "our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ," then consistency demands that you translate 2 Peter 1:1, "our God and Savior Jesus Christ," and understand that both God and Savior apply to the one person, Jesus Christ. If you do not translate it that way, which the NWT obviously does not, what you're saying is that Peter used the same construction five times in his letter, four times he meant it one way, and this is the only exception to the rule.

Now a couple of years back, I undertook Project Eyestrain which was a project for a Greek class I was taking at that time in which I examined all the writings of Peter and Paul and found every single Granville Sharp construction in those writings. Now I realize Paul wrote 13 of the books of the New Testament and so that was a lot of searching, and what I did is I examined every "kai" in all those books. It's this little three letter word, kai. There are a lot of "kais" in all of Paul's and Peter's writing, I can guarantee you that. And so I've seen every example of Granville Sharp's rule that Paul or Peter ever utilized and I found something very unusual in that study. Most rules seemingly were meant to be broken and there are almost always exceptions to a rule in Greek. I found no exceptions to Granville Sharp's rule. Paul did not do it. Peter did not do it. You can't find an exception to it. That means something to me, it means it was definitely something they understood.

Let's look at another passage. Titus 2:13. Titus 2, verse 13. Here again we have another classic Granville Sharp construction. Titus 2:13 in the NWT reads, "While we waited for the happy hope and glorious manifestation of the great God and of the," in brackets, "Savior of us, Christ Jesus." Again, notice God kai Soteris, Theou kai Soteris. Theou has the article, Soteris does not, the article is on the preceding page. It is a classic Granville Sharp construction. Here Jesus is described as our great God and Savior by the Apostle Paul. Notice also it is the appearing of our great God and Savior. The epiphaneian, the epiphany is used only of Jesus Christ in the New Testament. If you'll look up that word epiphaneian and look at every time it appears, it's only used of Jesus. It's never used of anyone else. And so to be consistent, this must be in reference to Jesus also.

It's also interesting to note that in the very next verse, you have some references to the Old Testament that were in reference to none other than Jehovah here applied to Jesus Christ. Consistency and many different lines of information point to the fact that if you're gonna understand this passage, you must realize that Paul believed that Jesus was our great God and Savior. There is no other way to understand it.

Now the next group of verses that we'll go through a little faster are what I call strain, biased, contorted or tortured translations which means that it's not necessarily correct to say that they are a complete and total mistranslation. You can translate it that way if you're very poor at translation and ignore the context and how the words are used in their normal usage, so on and so forth.

For example, Matthew 24:3 is one of the many examples of the Greek term parousia. Parousia. The NWT consistently translates parousia as "presence." You'll notice most of your Bibles it is translated as "coming." Here the disciples ask Jesus, "What will be the sign of your coming." Now the Society translates it "presence" because they believe that Jesus has already come in 1914, which of course, is based upon the fallacy that Jerusalem fell in 607, which it didn't, it fell in 586, but that's just another one of the many factual errors that most Witnesses don't know about.

The definition of "parousia," I'm taking this from Moulton & Milligan's Vocabulary of the Greek Testament which is based upon the papyri. It's based upon how people used

these words at that time. It says, quote, "The visit of a king, emperor or other person in authority, the official character of the visit being further emphasized by the taxes or payments that were exacted to make preparations for it." So it was used of the entire process of the coming as well as the actual visit of a king. Now here again I see a theological bias on the part of the Society to hide the coming and emphasize the present. You can't take either/or, it's both together. What they're talking about is what would be the sign of your coming? When you come, what will be the signs of that? Not an invisible presence someplace that no one knows about, and of course, the context would support that idea.

Luke 23:43 gives you a real example of how just a little bit of tampering can do a great deal. Luke 23:43 in the NWT reads and listen closely, "And he said to him, Truly I tell you today, you will be with me in paradise. Truly I tell you today, you will be with me in paradise." Now there's a little footnote that says: today the Westcott-Hort text has a comma in the Greek text before the word for "today," but commas were not used in Greek uncial manuscripts, hence in keeping with the context, we omit. What they don't point out is they don't omit the comma, they move the comma, they move it so that it appears before or excuse me, it appears after the word "today" rather than after the word "you." We are used to hearing, "Truly I say to you, today you will be with me in paradise." But that completely contradicts the Witnesses understanding of the passage.

Now I must ask you: how many times did Jesus say, "Truly I say to you today"? Well, I'll answer the question for you: he never did. I mean, obviously he wasn't saying, "Truly I say to yesterday." I mean, that's pretty obvious. Here is a man who is dying upon a cross probably from suffocation, wasting his breath saying a word that means absolutely nothing, "Truly I say to you today." Well, obviously it's today. No, he said, "Truly I say to you, today you will be with me in paradise." That was the great hope that he offered that thief on the cross. Obviously here we just have a little textual changing around to hide something that's rather obvious.

Romans 9:5 is another example of this. In the ninth chapter of Romans, verse 5, the NWT reads, "To whom the forefathers belong and from whom the Christ sprang according to the flesh: God who is over all be blessed forever, amen." Now the NWT is joined here by the Revised Standard Version which I do not suggest or support in any way, but at any rate, by making a break after the word "all." The NIV, I believe, has the best rendering where it talks about, "he who is God over all, blessed forever." The natural sense of the passage here ascribes the word "God" to Jesus Christ who is God over all, blessed forever. Here again the NWT obviously chooses the inferior translation.

The next passage I want to look at is undoubtedly one of the most tortured translations I've ever seen. Philippians 2:6. Philippians chapter 2, verse 6 in the NWT reads, "Who although he was existing in God's form, gave no consideration to a seizure, namely that he should be equal to God." Now that's pretty sad, to be perfectly honest with you. Philippians 2:6 reads, "Who although he was existing," and notice we have a participle there, hyparchon, "eternally existing in the very morphe Theou, the form of God, did not give consideration," they say, "gave no consideration." The New American Standard

says, "Who although he existed in the form of God, did not regard equality with God a thing to be grasped." The point of the passage is gone into in detail in our tape on the deity of Christ and I'm not going to go into that right now. The fact of the matter is this translation in the NWT is so tortured and so twisted that they actually reference this in a denial of the deity of Christ when the verse when properly understood and properly translated teaches the deity of Christ in a very clear and in an easily understood manner but, you know, if you can change things around, you're gonna be able to do a good job on that one. Philippians 2.

In for example Colossians 2:6, 7 and 10, you'll find how free and loose the Society plays with things. In Colossians 2:6, 7 and 10, you have the phrase "en auto, in him" translated three different ways and that all within four verses. Obviously if a writer is going to repeat a phrase three different times in four verses, he's trying to get a point across, but a person reading the English translation in the NWT would never see it. "In him" is extremely important to Paul. A Christian is in him, but in the Society a Christian really isn't in him or at least one of the great crowd is not truly in him in the biblical way.

Look at Hebrews 1. This one is really interesting to me. Hebrews 1 is in reference to the superiority of Jesus Christ over the angels and Hebrews 1:6 says, "But when he again brings his firstborn to the inhabited earth, he says, And let all God's angels do obeisance to him." Now aside from the fact that making "firstborn" possessive, "his firstborn" is questionable. The main point is "let all God's angels do obeisance to him," now if you have the '69, the purple Kingdom Interlinear Translation, it will say "worship him," because in 1971 is when the Society went through the Scriptures, found the Greek term "proskyneo," and when it applies to God the Father they allowed it to be translated in its proper sense, worship, but when it's applied to Jesus Christ, now it's do obeisance to. I wonder why? Basically because the Society doesn't believe you can worship Jesus Christ because worship is only for God and yet we find here that all of the angels of God are to worship Jesus Christ. Now, of course, the Society believes Jesus Christ is Michael the archangel, he's one of the angels and how he's supposed to worship himself or even do obeisance to himself, I'm not sure. But this has been a change even since the NWT was originally translated.

Verse 8 also provides us with a tortured translation, "But with reference to the Son, God is your throne forever and ever and the scepter of your king was the scepter of uprightness." King James, New American Standard, NIV, say in reference to the Son he says, "God," identifies the Son as being God, "thy throne, O God, is forever and ever," instead of "God is thy throne," a much clearer translation in the modern translations.

Now the last section of verses I want to look at very quickly is textual emendations or missions or inconsistencies. For example, one that I frequently point out to Jehovah's Witnesses is John 14:14. John 14:14 is a very interesting passage as long as you can use the Kingdom Interlinear Translation to look at it. John 14:14 in the Kingdom Interlinear Translation reads, "If you ask anything in my name, I will do it." Now the King James reads the exact same way, however, the difficulty here is in reference to a textual variant, and if you will look at the Greek text of the Kingdom Interlinear Translation, you will see

that it says, "If ever anything you should ask me in the name of me, this I shall do." Now the textual variant at that point to all modern versions do have that first "me" there. It is very strongly supported, the King James is based upon the TR, the Textus Receptus, which deletes that, however, it is really strongly understood that word "me" is there. It's interesting the Society puts no footnote on it. It is not in brackets. But they have completely deleted the word "me." Jesus said, "If you will ask me anything in my name, I will do it." This is an example of prayer to Christ. Now we have many other examples of prayer to Christ in the New Testament, Acts 7:59 and 1 Corinthians 1:2, and so on and so forth, but here even though the Greek text they use, Westcott-Hort, has the word "me," they don't translate it. It's gone. It's been deleted and I have to wonder why. Well, I think I know why.

Romans 10:12-13, this is another interesting example. Romans 10:12-13. Now this brings up the point that the New World Translation in the New Testament inserts the word "Jehovah." They remove either Theos or Kyrios, and that's not really all bad. When a quotation is taken from the Old Testament where the word Yahweh or Jehovah appeared, I have no problem with indicating that in the New Testament. I would like to point out that there is not one Greek manuscript in the New Testament anywhere in the world that contains, of the New Testament that contains the name Jehovah. The Society believes it was taken out. There is absolutely positively no evidence of that whatsoever, in fact, all the evidence completely and totally contradicts that position. That is completely and totally false and you could challenge anyone, you could walk right into Bethel headquarters today and challenge anyone to provide you one shred of evidence to the contrary and they would be unable to do so.

At any rate, Romans 10:12-13 says, "For there is no distinction between Jew and Greek for there is the same Lord over all who is rich to all those calling upon him, for everyone who calls on the name of Jehovah will be saved." Now that is true, that the one who calls upon the name of Jehovah will be saved but the problem is it said everyone who calls upon the name of the Lord shall be saved, Jehovah has been inserted into it, and the context of the passage makes it very clear that Romans 10:13 is in reference to the name of the Lord and the Lord in this context is Jesus Christ. Calling upon the name of Jesus is how one is saved, is that not what Acts 4:12 says? "There is no other name given under heaven by which men can be saved than the name of Jesus." This is true and if you will look up the word "onoma, name," and follow it through the New Testament, you'll find the name in the New Testament is not Jehovah, it is Jesus. And so here we have putting in the word Jehovah but taking out Kyrios and confusing people away from the fact that it is in the name of Jesus that we have salvation. It's the name of Jesus.

1 Peter 3:15 is interesting. 1 Peter 3:15 says in the NWT, "But sanctify Christ as Lord in your hearts, always ready to make a defense before everyone who demands of you a reason for the hope in you but doing so together with a mild temper and deep respect." Now they do have a footnote on this at least giving the textual things here, but here we have the word Kyrios, sanctify Christ as Lord. Now why don't they be consistent and here insert the Tetragrammaton? Why HWH? Sanctify Christ as Jehovah in your hearts. Why do they not do this? I think I know why it is they don't put Jehovah in here though they



should, because this is a quotation from the Old Testament, Isaiah 8:13, to set apart Jehovah, to sanctify Jehovah. Here Peter is quoting this in reference to Jesus Christ, another one of the many references to the fact that Jesus is Jehovah and yet the NWT hides it by just putting in Lord instead of Jehovah.

This happens again in Philippians 2:10-11 which we've already looked at Philippians 2:9 but in Philippians 2:10-11, we have here a quotation from Isaiah 45:23 which is in reference to Jehovah and yet in Philippians 2:10 we read, "So that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow of those in heaven and those on earth and those under the earth, and every tongue should openly confess that Jesus Christ is," and in the Greek text Kyrios is even capitalized in the Kingdom Interlinear Translation, but they don't put in Jehovah. They leave it "Lord." Now if they were consistent, they would have to put in the Tetragrammaton and they would say that Jesus Christ is Jehovah to the glory of God the Father. That's the confession, that Jesus Christ is Lord, that Jesus Christ is Jehovah. That's true. This is Paul's point but it's hidden in the NWT. It's not there for the average Witness to see that a person is to know that Jesus Christ is Jehovah.

The same thing happens back in 1 Peter 2:3, "Provide you a taste that the Lord is kind." Again, it should be that Jehovah is kind. This is taken from Psalm 34:8 but the context clearly shows we're talking about Jesus. The NWT cannot allow Jesus to be identified as Jehovah, which he is over and over again, and so we don't put Jehovah in for Kyrios. It's inconsistencies, inconsistencies and their usage of the Tetragrammaton.

One of the most obvious ones that I use a lot to talk to Jehovah's Witnesses is Hebrews 1, back to Hebrews 1 again, verse 10. Look at Hebrews 1:10. Now Hebrews 1:10 through verse 12 is obviously in reference to Jesus Christ. Notice that the NWT starts off and, "You at the beginning, O Lord, laid the foundations of the earth itself." They do not put the Tetragrammaton in here. If you will look, you will see that Hebrews 1:10-12 is a direct quotation of the 102<sup>nd</sup> Psalm, verses 25 through 27, which are in reference to Jehovah. A direct quotation. What is almost even worse is the fact that in the 1984 reference edition with all these references in the middle, here is a direct quotation of the Old Testament and they do not reference it in the center column so you can go back and find out that the psalmist was writing about Jehovah, the writer of Hebrews is talking about Jesus, they're talking about the same person but it's not referenced for you. I wonder why? I think I know why. That is just complete straight-out dishonesty.

Let's look at Romans 10:9. Romans 10:9. I've already mentioned that here we have a reference to Jesus being Lord. Romans 10:9, "For if publicly declare that word in your mouth that Jesus is Lord and exercise faith in your heart that God raised him from the dead, you will be saved." Notice there is a footnote on "Lord," and it mentions, it says, "Lord, Kyrios," and it mentions a number of the J documents. I'm not going to go into depth about the J documents, they're basically Hebrew translations of the New Testament. Notice it says, "Not Jehovah." They're trying to point out that the confession was not that Jesus was Jehovah. Well, that's interesting, they reference all these J documents and they're trying to make their point and try to keep you from believing Jesus is Jehovah. I wonder why over in 1 Corinthians 12:3 we don't have a footnote too. Let's

look at 1 Corinthians 12:3. 1 Corinthians 12:3 says, "Therefore I would have you know that nobody when speaking by God's Spirit says Jesus is accursed and nobody can say Jesus is Lord except by Holy Spirit." Notice there is no footnote on the word "Lord" there, is there? There should be. One of their very own J documents, J14, Reichardt's 1846 edition of the New Testament in Hebrew, at this very point reads, "Jesus is Jehovah." YHWH, the Tetragrammaton. Why don't they let you know that one of their J documents here says Jesus is Jehovah? I think I know. I think I know why. Because they simply don't want you to know how often Jesus is identified as being Jehovah.

Now at the beginning of this brief run-through, and I certainly have not gone into depth on almost anything and there's so much more that could be looked at, at the beginning of this I asked you to see if you could identify some common theological threads that run all the way through these mistranslations. Did you notice some things? I did. I noticed that the vast majority of the passages that are mistranslated have to do with the deity of Christ. Many others had reference to life after death. Others had reference to the Trinity or to eternal punishment. Doesn't it say something to you that the mistranslations are almost all with reference to the doctrines at which point the Society leaves historic Christianity and, in fact, faults and attacks you as a Christian? You see, it would be one thing to say the men who translated the NWT were not scholars, and they weren't, they were not, they were not scholarly and the NWT is not a scholarly translation in any way, shape of form. It has been written in such a way to try to make it look like it is but it is not and so it would be one thing to say, "Well, they didn't know any better," and so the mistranslations were not purposeful, they were just simply, well, you know, I have people in my first year Greek class that I'm teaching who will mistranslate things simply they don't have a lot of practice or a lot of training. Fine, I understand that. You can just chock that up to ignorance. But if that were the case, we would find mistranslations all through the text and they would not be within certain bounds, they would be in reference to almost anything, and yet the major mistranslations we find are in reference to particular subjects which means there is a plan behind it, there is purpose behind it. You cannot simply say, "Well, they just didn't know better." They do know better. I, myself, have taken the time to send registered letters to, for example, Albert Shroeder of the governing body who had a part in translating this very book, I sent him my study on Granville Sharp's rule and refuted material in the NWT where they try to support their mistranslation of Titus 2:13 and 2 Peter 1:1. I know he's gotten that. Ignorance cannot be used as an excuse at this point.

I think it's very important we're talking about the text of Scripture that we realize that this is purposeful tampering and I have a feeling God takes it very seriously because not only is it purposeful tampering but the Society itself is so structured that it teaches its people that they cannot examine, for example, the information that you can pick up off the table this evening, there is our tract entitled, "As Accurately As Possible," the title of this tape, documenting many of the mistranslations we've looked at this evening, they could not examine that. March 15, 1986 Watchtower shows a picture of a Jehovah's Witness throwing apostate material away. So don't even look at it. You're not to have an open mind in the Society, though the November 22, 1984 Awake Magazine said you were to have an open mind. That was mainly meant for people outside the Watchtower. Examine

our teachings, be open and examine the Watchtower's teachings but once you get inside the Watchtower, oh no, you're never to examine anything outside the Watchtower. You cannot question this in any way, shape or form. What if an individual Witness were to examine the NWT, what would they find? They'd find out it's not scholarly, it's mistranslated, so you're told not to.

So here is a Witness, most Witnesses are extremely and totally sincere, they really believe this is true but they don't have the facilities, they don't have even the ability to examine opposite viewpoints that would demonstrate to them that the NWT is not a translation of the Bible, it is a perversion of the Bible. And so not only is the Society guilty of mistranslating God's word, they're also guilty of placing their own people in such a position that they can't find it out, hence we are faced with a very dangerous attack upon the very basis of Christianity and it is used to help substantiate false doctrine as taught by the Watchtower Bible and Tract Society and most Witnesses will never have the opportunity of knowing what God's word really says, of knowing that Colossians 1:16-17 says Jesus Christ is the Creator, not a creation, and in Colossians 2:9, "In him all the fullness of deity dwells in bodily form," that Philippians 2:5-6 does not teach that he was not God, teaches that he was, and that Jesus in John 1:1 has the very being of God, he's not a god. Most do not know and will not have the opportunity to. That makes the New World Translation in my mind one of the most devious attacks ever taken upon the Christian faith.