

## Chapter 3: *YHWH in the New Testament*

### Paragraph 13 & יהוה in the New Testament

Paragraph 13 states:

All who want God's favor must learn to call upon his name in faith. The Bible promises: "Everyone who calls on the name of Jehovah will be saved." (Romans 10:13)...<sup>1</sup>

This is the first instance in the KNOWLEDGE book displaying a unique feature of the NWT – the use of God's name in the New Testament. The WTBS and NWT translators assert that יהוה was in the original New Testament writings and was later removed. The forward of the WTBS Kingdom Interlinear Translation of the Greek Scriptures (hereafter referred to as KIT) states:

The evidence is that the original text of the Christian Greek Scriptures have been tampered with, the same as the text of the LXX has been...Sometime during the second or third centuries C.E., the Tetragrammaton (YHWH, or JHVH) was eliminated from the Greek text by copyists who did not understand or appreciate the divine name or who developed an aversion to it, possibly under the influence of anti-Semitism. Instead of YHWH (or, JHVH) they substituted the words *Ky'ri-os*, "Lord," and *The-os'*, "God."<sup>2</sup>

As such, the NWT translation committee "restores" the divine name, Jehovah, to the New Testament 237 times.<sup>3</sup> The KIT forward continues:

Hence, the modern translator is warranted in using the divine name as an equivalent of those two Greek words, that is, at places where the writers of the Christian Greek Scriptures quote verses, passages, and expressions from the Hebrew Scriptures or from the LXX where the divine name occurs.

...How may modern translators determine when to render the Greek words *Ky'ri-os* and *The-os'* as the divine name? By determining where the inspired Christian writers have quoted from the Hebrew Scriptures. Then they must refer back to the Hebrew text to locate whether the divine name appears there. In this way they can determine the identity to be given to *Ky'ri-os* and *The-os'*, and make appropriate use of the personal name.<sup>4</sup>

Furthermore, the NWT translation committee asserts that יהוה occurred in the original writings of New Testament in passages that **do not** quote Old Testament passages. KIT states:

They have restored the divine name not only when coming upon quotations from the Hebrew Scriptures but also in other places where the texts called for such restoration.

---

[1] Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society of New York, Inc. *The DIVINE NAME That Will Endure Forever*, 1984. Pp.26-27.

[2] Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society of New York, Inc. The Kingdom Interlinear Translation of the Greek Scriptures, 1985. P. 10, 11.

[3] Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society of New York, Inc. "Appendix 1C." The New World Translation of the Holy Scriptures with References. 1984. Pp. 1565-1566 for complete list.

[4] Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society of New York, Inc. The Kingdom Interlinear Translation of the Greek Scriptures, 1985. P. 11, 12.

...We have looked for some agreement with us by the Hebrew versions we consulted to confirm our rendering. Thus, out of 237 times that we have restored Jehovah's name in the body of our translation, there is only one instance wherein we have no support or agreement from any of the Hebrew versions. But in this one instance, namely at 1 Corinthians 7:17, the context and related texts strongly support restoring the divine name.<sup>5</sup>

I **highly** recommend the following books for extensive study on the divine name and the New Testament: THE TETRAGRAMMATON and the CHRISTIAN GREEK SCRIPTURES, THE NEW WORLD TRANSLATION AND HEBREW VERSIONS Book 1, Jehovah in the New Testament, Book 2, and THE DIVINE NAME in the NEW WORLD TRANSLATION available for free download at <http://www.tetragrammaton.org> . (Accessed January 2007.) I also highly recommend Doug Mason's book, Witnessing the Name, available on-line at: [http://www.freeminds.org/doctrine/thename.htm#\\_Toc472342618](http://www.freeminds.org/doctrine/thename.htm#_Toc472342618) (Accessed January 2007.) I cannot express how greatly I encourage readers of this site to download/print a copy of these books, to read and study them thoroughly for an exhaustive understanding of this issue.

In a nutshell and very much contrary to the WTBS assertion in my first blocked quotation of the KIT, there is **no** "evidence" whatsoever that יהוה was **ever** used in the writings of the New Testament or that the New Testament writings were tampered with.

True, more recent discoveries of the LXX (the Septuagint, the Greek translation of the Old Testament) have included fragments that use יהוה and Appendix 1C of the NWT with References lists 10 of these fragments.<sup>6</sup> However, the reader should note that these are ancient fragments of the **Old Testament, not the New Testament**. Many copies and fragments of the Masoretic (Hebrew) text prove that the divine name was used in the Old Testament. The presence of יהוה in the Old Testament is solidly attested to, but no one argues that God's name wasn't in the Old Testament. It was. The problem is we are not concerned with the Old Testament here, but the New.

The Old Testament canon was closed centuries before Jesus' birth and New Testament times. The Old and New Testaments are related, of course, but quite distinct one from the other, especially in regards to manuscripts, canonization and standardization. The Old Testament was translated into Greek for Jews who no longer spoke or understood Hebrew, but no single version existed in New Testament times. **There was no one, single LXX**. There were many. Standardization of the LXX did not happen until long after Jesus' resurrection, in response to the destruction of the Temple in 70 A.D. and the Christian adoption of the LXX in study, praise and worship. Before that time, a great many versions of the LXX were available and in use.

Finding a few copies/fragments of the LXX that contain יהוה does not demand nor require that Jesus, the Apostles or the early church used those particular versions of the LXX. In fact, of the fragments found that contain יהוה, those listed by the WTBS, are widely accepted as coming from Jewish, **not** early Christian sources. All these fragments prove is that **some** Jews had copies of the LXX that contained God's name. It proves nothing in regards to LXX copies early Christians used.

Doug Mason, in his book Witnessing the Name, stated:

The WTS wishes to give the impression that the LXX used by the Christian Church regularly contained the Tetragram. However, the LXX copies come from Jewish sources, apart from two

---

[5] Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society of New York, Inc. The Kingdom Interlinear Translation of the Greek Scriptures, 1985. P. 11, 12.

[6] Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society of New York, Inc. "Appendix 1C." The New World Translation of the Holy Scriptures with References. 1984. Pp. 1562-1564.

LXX copies that come from a source of doubtful origin, possibly Jewish, or of a Jewish form of Christianity.

Extant versions of the Septuagint coming to us from Jewish sources contain the Tetragrammaton in ancient script whereas only two Septuagint copies that contain the Tetragrammaton may have possibly been of a Christian source.[4] But these "Christian" sources were of:

"a Jewish form of Christianity (that) persisted in Oxyrhynchus, and a possible explanation of these two eccentric texts would be that they were the work of Jewish-Christian scribes." (MANUSCRIPT, SOCIETY AND BELIEF IN EARLY CHRISTIAN EGYPT, C.H. Roberts, page 34.)<sup>7</sup>

In regards to one of the manuscripts whose origins is in doubt, LXXP. Oxy. VII.1007 (#6 on the NWT with References Appendix 1C list) I refer the reader to:  
<http://www.anchist.mq.edu.au/doccentre/PCE276.pdf> (Accessed January 2007), which states:

The treatment of kuvrio" suggests the text was copied by a Jewish scribe, and such has been argued by e.g. Kahle (*The Cairo Geniza*, 247), followed by Treu, 'Die Bedeutung', 142. The use of a blank space to mark the division between chapters 2 and 3 (r.i.25) can also be paralleled in other Jewish texts (e.g. 8 HevXIigr; cf. Roberts, *MSB*, 18 with n.3). However, both the codex format and the use of the *nomen sacrum* for qeov" suggest a Christian context (Roberts, *MSB*, 33-34; 77). In scribal terms, both a Jewish scribe being influenced by Christian treatment of the sacred name and a Christian scribe preserving the Hebrew abbreviation (and contracting qeov" according to his own principles) are possible. It can be argued that the translation (LXX and not one of the other Greek translations of the Hebrew Bible), the codex format, and the use of *nomina sacra* makes a Christian context more likely. However, if one moves from scribal practice to actual use, it is more difficult to see how the text could have been employed for liturgical or private reading in a context in which the meaning of the Hebrew characters was not known (as would be most probable in Christian settings). If a Christian context is to be seen, it might be postulated that the text bears witness to a syncretic form of Jewish Christianity (Roberts, *MSB*, 34, cf. 57). Alternately, one might suppose that the text formed part of the collection of an educated Christian such as Origen, in whose opinion (*PG* 12.1104B) the most authoritative LXX manuscripts were those preserving the divine name in 'the most ancient' Hebrew characters.<sup>8</sup>

Mr. Mason further stated, quoting Kahle, "We now know that the Greek Bible (or the LXX, the OT) text, as far as it was translated by JEWS FOR JEWS did not translate the Divine name KYRIOS, but the Tetragrammaton written with Hebrew or Greek letters was retained. ... It was the Christians who replaced the Tetragrammaton by KYRIOS, when the divine name written in Hebrew letters was not understood any more".<sup>9</sup>

---

[7] Mason, Doug. "4. The Society's Reasons." *Witnessing the Name*. 2000. Available on-line at: <http://www.freeminds.org/doctrine/thename.htm> . (Accessed January 2007.)

[8] Footnote of cited source:

P.E. **Kahle**, *The Cairo Geniza* (Oxford 1959 2 ) 247; A. **Pietersma**, 'Kyrios or Tetragram: A renewed quest for the original LXX', in, A. Pietersma and C. Cox (eds), *De Septuaginta. Studies in Honour of John William Wevers on his sixty-fifth birthday* (Mississauga, Ont. 1984) 85-101; C.H. **Roberts**, 'The Christian book and the Greek papyri', *JThS* n.s. 50 (1949) 157; K. **Treu**, 'Die Bedeutung des Griechischen für die Juden im römischen Reich', *Kairos* N.F., 15 (1973) 123-44.

[9] Mason, Doug. "4. The Society's Reasons." *Witnessing the Name*. 2000. Available on-line at: <http://www.freeminds.org/doctrine/thename.htm> . (Accessed January 2007.) Citing: THE CAIRO GENIZA, Paul Kahle, P. 222.

And again, speaking of Aquila, who is attributed to two of the manuscripts cited by the WTBS in the NWT with References Appendix, Mr. Mason said:

When he employed the Tetragram in his Greek translation of the (Hebrew) Scriptures, Aquila used the very ancient Hebrew script that had, even by his time, long ceased being used. In doing so, Aquila appears to be reaching back into the roots of Judaism, **in opposition** to the contemporary terminology being used by his **opponents** which, on the evidence of the NT manuscripts available, consisted of translation into Greek of the Hebrew surrogates ("Lord"; "God") and the use of Nomina Sacra.<sup>10</sup> (Emphasis mine.)

Appealing to Old Testament manuscripts that contain God's name, especially when those manuscripts weren't used by Christians (or whose origins are suspect) doesn't prove anything. Since these manuscripts weren't used by early Christians, but rather by Jews, it only proves that Jews had copies of the LXX that contained God's name. We, however, are concerned with copies used by early Christians, not Jews.

I encourage readers to review a debate in regards to correlating the LXX usage of God's name with a supposed New Testament usage of God's name at <http://www.theologyweb.com/campus/archive/index.php/t-27561.html> (Accessed January 2007.) The WTBS asserts that since יהוה was changed to Kurios in the LXX (at least in certain manuscripts), the New Testament could have been similarly altered. The debate contrasts the LXX context of these changes against the New Testament environment.

In summary:

Prior to the twentieth century our oldest copies of the Old Testament texts dated from a millennium or more after the close of the OT era. Overnight, that gap shrank hundreds of years. With a millennium-long gap, it would have been highly speculative to have guessed what we would find in older Greek translations of a Hebrew original. (The fact that a translation is the subject is significant, since translations exhibit a greater degree of verbal variance from one another than copies in the same language do from one another)...

The situation with the New Testament is not the same. We are not talking about translations of the original language texts into other languages, and we are not talking about a millennium long gap. We have manuscripts of the NT in the original language dating from as little as 25 years from the close of the NT era. We have manuscripts of virtually the entire NT dating from a century after the NT was finished. We also have a paper trail of writers quoting from those NT writings throughout the intervening century; these writers confirm the evidence of the NT manuscripts that no change in the text was made.<sup>11</sup>

In the above debate, Rob Bowman states, "...even though the manuscript evidence does not provide absolute, mathematically certain proof that your [WTBS] position is impossible, the best explanation of the evidence we have is that your [WTBS] position is incorrect."<sup>12</sup>

---

[10] Mason, Doug. "4. The Society's Reasons." *Witnessing the Name*. 2000. Available on-line at: <http://www.freeminds.org/doctrine/thename.htm> . (Accessed January 2007.)

[11] "Is 'Lord' a Mistranslation of YHWH?" debate at Theology Web Campus. Post written by Rob Bowman, dated June 3<sup>rd</sup> 2004, 02:36 AM, available on-line at: <http://www.theologyweb.com/campus/archive/index.php/t-27561.html> . (Accessed January 2007.) I also encourage the reader to review the post made by Rob Bowman on July 8<sup>th</sup> 2004, 04:58 PM in which the difficulties inherent in the transmission of copies of original language texts (i.e. the New Testament) and copies of **translations** of those original language texts (the LXX) are discussed in greater detail.

[12] Is 'Lord' a Mistranslation of YHWH?" debate at Theology Web Campus. Post written by Rob Bowman, dated June 5<sup>th</sup> 2004, 04:09 AM, available on-line at: <http://www.theologyweb.com/campus/archive/index.php/t-27561.html> . (Accessed January 2007.)

I very much agree.

**In any event, there are no New Testament manuscripts that contain יהוה.**

We possess papyrus fragments and manuscripts of the New Testament that date to the second century, not to mention over 5000 other ancient New Testament manuscripts and fragments.<sup>13</sup> One fragment, P52 in the John Rylands Collection, has been dated to 125 A.D. – approximately 25 years after the New Testament canon was complete. **None** of these ancient manuscripts and fragments include יהוה. **NONE.** I can't stress this enough: there is **NO ANCIENT MANUSCRIPT EVIDENCE SUPPORTING THE WTBS POSITION OF THE DIVINE NAME IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.**

Not only is there **no manuscript evidence** supporting the inclusion of the divine name in the New Testament, there is absolutely **no evidence** or even a mention about the WTBS' assertion of a corruption of the Biblical texts in which יהוה was replaced with "Lord," in ANY non-canonical writings. The Ante-Nicene Fathers (ANFs) wrote prior to the Nicean Council of 325 A.D. We can obtain a general understanding of the beliefs of the early church from these, the earliest church writings.

None of the ANFs mention the removal of the divine name from the New Testament and this is at a time when the early church was persecuted to the point of death. They died to preserve and protect the Bible we have today. The heretic, Marcion, for instance, corrupted the text by throwing out the entire Old Testament and using only the Pauline epistles and editing his own particular revision of the Gospel of Luke. The ANFs wrote about Marcion and his corruption of the New Testament. But we find NO such discussion or mention of the removal of the divine name. Such a corruption of the text would certainly have been at the very least mentioned by one of the ANFs and discussed in the early church. Yet, there is absolutely no evidence of any such controversy.

Furthermore, the ANFs quote the New Testament writings extensively in their own writings throughout the period in which the WTBS claims the removal of the divine name from the New Testament occurred. Of course, these works are not canon, but we are not concerned with what the writers said in this instance, but rather we focus instead on the Scripture in use and quoted at the time. Over half of the 237 Jehovah insertions "restored" by the NWT can be found in the Scripture quoted by the ANFs in their writings and 171 of these ANF quotations – written at the time the WTBS insists Jehovah was removed from the New Testament writings – directly contradict and disprove the NWT.<sup>14</sup> None contain God's name. **None.**

The quotations above also indicate that the NWT translators used Old Testament quotations in order to confirm where to insert Jehovah in the New Testament. Quite alarmingly, however, the NWT translators were not consistent in applying God's name from Old Testament quotations in the New Testament. There are instances of a few Old Testament quotations that the NWT translators opted against inserting "Jehovah."

---

[13] View some of these fragments at the following links:

P46 (Hebrews, 2<sup>nd</sup> cent.): <http://www.bible-researcher.com/papy46.html> (Accessed January 2007.)

P52 (John, 125 AD): <http://rylibweb.man.ac.uk/data1/dg/text/fragment.htm> (Accessed January 2007.)

P66 (John, 2<sup>nd</sup> cent.): <http://www.bible-researcher.com/papyrus66.html> (Accessed January 2007.)

P103 (Matthew, 2<sup>nd</sup> cent.): <http://www.csad.ox.ac.uk/POxy/papyri/vol64/pages/4403.htm>  
(Accessed January 2007.)

[14] I compared the list of Jehovah insertions provided in the 1984 New World Translation with References Appendix 1D (pp. 1565, 1566) with ANF New Testament quotations, available on-line at: <http://www.earlychristianwritings.com/e-catena/>. (Accessed January 2007.)

Hebrews 1:8 is a quotation of Ps. 45:6:

### **Psalms 45:6**

***Thy throne, O God**, is for ever and ever: the sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre. (KJV)*

***Your throne, O God**, is forever and ever; A scepter of uprightness is the scepter of Your kingdom. (NASB)*

***Your throne, O God**, will last for ever and ever; a scepter of justice will be the scepter of your kingdom. (NIV)*

***God is your throne** to time indefinite, even forever; The scepter of your kingship is a scepter of uprightness. (NWT)*

Compare with Hebrews 1:8:

### **Hebrews 1:8**

*But unto the Son he saith, **Thy throne, O God**, is forever and ever: a scepter of righteousness is the scepter of thy kingdom. (KJV)*

*But of the Son He says, "**YOUR THRONE, O GOD, IS FOREVER AND EVER, AND THE RIGHTEOUS SCEPTER IS THE SCEPTER OF HIS KINGDOM.** (NASB)*

*But about the Son he says, "**Your throne, O God**, will last for ever and ever, and righteousness will be the scepter of your kingdom. (NIV)*

*But with reference to the Son: "**God is your throne** forever and ever, and [the] scepter of your kingdom is the scepter of uprightness. (NWT)*

You will note above that the variant translation offered by the NWT above, emphasized in bold, "God is your throne" rather than the other translations that indicate 'Thy/Your throne, O God.' Of the 55 Bibles I reviewed for Psalms 45:6<sup>15</sup>, 48 addressed God directly as reflected by 'Thy/Your throne, O God' and minor variations thereof.<sup>16</sup> 87.3% of the Bibles consulted address God directly in this verse. 7 Bibles do not address God directly, 6 of which indicate that the throne is given of God.<sup>17</sup> None of these translations agree with the NWT's translation "God is your throne."

---

[15] Please see the Foreword, Bibles Consulted section for more information.

[16] King James Version (Authorized); The Amplified Bible; The Holy Bible, New International Version®; American Standard Version; New American Standard Bible; *Holy Bible*, New Living Translation; The New King James Version; The New Revised Standard Version; The Douay-Rheims Bible; The KJV Strong's Version; the NAS Strong's Version; The J.B. Rotherham Emphasized Bible; GOD'S WORD; The Darby Translation; Webster's Bible Translation; Young's Literal Translation (1898); *Holy Bible*, English Standard Version; Updated Bible Version 1.9; J.P. Green's Literal Translation; 21<sup>st</sup> Century King James Version®; Modern King James Version; Third Millennium Bible; Revised Webster Version; English Jubilee 2000 Bible; American King James Version; A Conservative Version; The Apostles' Bible; Today's New International Version; Living Bible; NET Bible, New American Bible; Modern Language Bible, and the Geneva Bible (1587).

The minor variations that address God directly are: The Restored Name King James Version; The Bishop's Bible (1568); The Wycliffe Bible (1395); The Bible in Basic English; World English Bible, Hebrew Names Version of the World English Bible; Holman Christian Standard Bible®; Complete Jewish Bible; New Century Version; Holy Bible: Easy-to-Read Version; The Revised Standard Version; Miles Coverdale Bible (1535); New Life Bible; and the King James Version (1611).

[17]

***The kingdom that God has given you** will last forever and ever. You rule over your people with justice; (Good News Translation - Second Edition)*

When we look to the New Testament quotation of this Old Testament verse in Hebrews 1:8 and the translations/versions thereof, we find that 69 of 72 translations<sup>18</sup> also address God directly. Only the Daniel Mace New Testament (1729), Twentieth Century New Testament and the New World Translation indicate God is thy/your throne, reflecting a 4.17% agreement with the NWT in the pool of Bibles consulted. The vast majority of Bibles reflect the 'thy/your throne, O God' translation.

Of Hebrews 1:8, the NET Bible footnote states:

Or possibly, "Your throne is God forever and ever." **This translation is quite doubtful,** however, since (1) in the context the Son is being contrasted to the angels and is presented as far better than they. The imagery of God being the Son's throne would seem to be of God being his authority. If so, in what sense could this *not* be said of the angels? In what sense is the Son thus contrasted with the angels? (2) The μέν...δέ (men...de) construction that connects v. 7 with v. 8 clearly lays out this contrast: "On the one hand, he says of the angels...on the other hand, he says of the Son." **Thus, although it is grammatically possible that θεός (qeos) in v. 8 should be taken as a predicate nominative, the context and the correlative conjunctions are decidedly against it. Hebrews 1:8 is thus a strong affirmation of the deity of Christ.**<sup>19</sup> (Emphasis mine.)

Adam Clarke wrote quite extensively of Hebrews 1:8:

This verse is very properly considered a proof, and indeed a strong one, of the Divinity of Christ; but some late versions of the New Testament have endeavored to avoid the evidence of this proof by translating the words thus: God is thy throne for ever and ever;... ὁ Θεός being the nominative case, is supposed to be a sufficient justification of this version. In answer to this it may be stated that the nominative case is often used for the vocative, particularly by the Attics; and the whole scope of the place requires it should be so used here; and, with due deference to all of a contrary opinion, the original Hebrew cannot be consistently translated any other way...**I may add that none of the ancient versions has understood it in the way contended for by those who deny the Godhead of Christ, either in the Psalm from which it is taken, or in this place where it is quoted.** Aquila translates אלהים Elohim, by Θεε, O God, in the vocative case; and the Arabic adds the sign of the vocative ya, reading the place thus: korseey yallaho ila abadilabada, the same as in our version. And even allowing that ὁ Θεός here is to be used as the nominative case, it will not make the sense contended for, without adding εστι to it, a reading which is not countenanced by any version, nor by any MS. yet discovered... in the same way, all reading it in the nominative case, with the force of the vocative; for none of them has inserted the word εστι, is, because not

---

**"Your throne is God's throne, ever and always; The scepter of your royal rule measures right living.** (THE MESSAGE: The Bible in Contemporary Language)

(Ps. 45:7) **Thy throne given of God is for ever and ever; a sceptre of equity is the sceptre of thy kingdom.** (JPS Old Testament (1917))

**Your throne is the very throne of God. Your kingdom will last for ever and ever. You will rule by treating everyone fairly.** (New International Reader's Version)

**The kingdom that God has given you will last forever and ever. You rule over your people with justice;** (Today's English Version)

**Your throne is like God's throne, eternal, your royal scepter a scepter of righteousness.** (New English Bible)

[18] Please see the Foreword, Bibles Consulted section for more information.

[19] [www.bible.org](http://www.bible.org). "Footnote on Hebrews 1:8." The NET Bible. (Accessed January 2007)

authorized by the original: a word which the opposers of the Divinity of our Lord are obliged to beg, in order to support their interpretation.<sup>20</sup> (Emphasis mine.)

None of the ancient manuscripts agree with the NWT translation.

Albert Barnes agreed with Clarke:

The "form" here - ὁ Θεός ho Theos - is in the vocative case and not the nominative...This then is a direct address to the Messiah, calling him God;...**Unitarians proposed to translate this, "God is thy throne;" but how can God be "a throne" of a creature? What is the meaning of such an expression? Where is there one parallel? And what must be the nature of that cause which renders such an argument necessary?**<sup>21</sup> (Emphasis mine)

Wayne Grudem, in his Systematic Theology, also stated:

The suggested translation of Heb. 1:8 in the RSV margin, "God is your throne forever and ever," while **possible grammatically, is completely inconsistent with the thinking of both Old and New Testaments: the mighty God who created everything and rules supreme over the universe would never be merely a "throne" for someone else. The thought itself is dishonoring to God, and it should certainly not be considered as a possibly appropriate translation.**<sup>22</sup> (Emphasis mine.)

I have to agree with the ridiculousness of demanding that God is any creature's throne.

Also, we must look to the Hebraic poetic parallelism in Psalms 45. Defining Hebraic parallels:

A common literary feature of Hebrew poetry in the Old Testament is called **parallelism**, in which the words of two or more lines of text are directly related in some way. This feature can be found in any poetic passage, and sometimes even in narrative, although it is more common in the Psalms and Proverbs.

Recognizing parallelism as a poetic feature can sometimes aid in understanding or interpreting a passage. For example, the use of parallelism usually means that the message of the text is in the larger passage and its overall point or impact rather than individual words or single lines. Also, specific words that may be ambiguous or used in unusual ways can be clarified or more narrowly defined by seeing them in the context of a parallel structure.<sup>23</sup>

Psalms 45 reflects the parallel structure. In Brenton's LXX:

Ps. 45:3 (44:3) Gird thy sword upon thy thigh, **O Mighty One**, in my comeliness...

Ps 45:5 (44:5) Thy weapons are sharpened, **Mighty One**, (the nations shall fall under thee)...

Ps 45:6 (44:6) Thy Throne, **O God**, is forever and ever...

From another website, quoting two books (unbelievably) that I do not, in fact, own ☺:

---

[20] Clarke, Adam. "Commentary on Hebrews 1:8." The Adam Clarke Commentary. 1832.

[21] Barnes, Albert. "Commentary on Hebrews 1:8." Barnes' Notes on the Bible, 1798-1870.

[22] Grudem, Wayne. Systematic Theology. 1994. P. 228.

[23] Bratcher, Dennis. "Parallelism in Hebrew Writing." Available on-line at: <http://www.cresourcei.org/parallel.html> (Accessed January 2007.)

The LXX translation of Psalm 45, from which the author is quoting, the king is addressed by the vocative *dunate*, *dunate* ("O Mighty One"; vv. 4, 6; cf. Reymond, *Systematic Theology*, 274). Similarly, Harris observes:

in the LXX version it is even more probable that *o( qeoj* is a vocative for the king is addressed a "mighty warrior" (*dunate*) not only verse 4 but also in verse 6. . . . This dual address heightens the antecedent probability, given the word order, that in the next verse *o( qeoj* should be rendered "O God." One may therefore affirm with a high degree of confidence that in the LXX text from which the author of Hebrews was quoting *o qeoj* represents a vocative *θης* [*Elohim*]" (Harris, *Jesus as God*, 215).<sup>24</sup>

"O God" in Psalms 45:6 is a poetic parallel to "Mighty One" and "O Mighty One" (the vocative *dunate* noted in the quotes above), arguing quite convincingly for a similarly vocative *ho theos* and against the "God is your throne" nominative translation.

The WTBTS, to my knowledge, has never provided an answer or response to this.

Significantly, Justin Martyr, an Ante-Nicene father, quoted Psalms 45:6/Hebrews 1:8 three times in *Dialogue with Trypho*, one of which I quote here:

...it must be admitted absolutely that some other one is called Lord by the Holy Spirit besides Him who is considered Maker of all things;... `Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever... If, therefore, you assert that the Holy Spirit calls some other one God and Lord,...<sup>25</sup>

Justin obviously didn't interpret Psalms 45:6 as the NWT's 'God is thy throne,' but rather that He considered this verse a direct address to *ho theos*, Yahweh God.

The only commentary I found that could possibly support the NWT translation, "God is thy throne," is Robertson's Word Pictures of the New Testament:

It is not certain whether *ho theos* is here the vocative (address with the nominative form as in Joh 20:28 with the Messiah termed *theos* as is possible, Joh 1:18) or *ho theos* is nominative (subject or predicate) with *estin* (is) understood: "God is thy throne" or "Thy throne is God." Either makes good sense.<sup>26</sup>

However, the reader should note that Robertson indicated that the translation "makes good sense" from the perspective of grammatical possibility. The commentaries noted previously stated that the NWT translation was grammatically possible. No one denies that the translation is grammatically possible. Possibility, however, is not proof that it **should be** translated as such, nor does it reflect probability or likelihood of said translation.

Hebrews 1:8 is a quotation of Psalms 45:6, which is a direct address to God as *ho theos* applied to Jesus in the New Testament. If the NWT translation committee follows its own rules in translating *ho theos*, this verse would read (paraphrasing from the NWT), *But with reference to the Son: "Thy Throne, O Jehovah, is forever and ever...*

Hebrews 1:8 stands firmly as a statement of the Deity of Jesus Christ.

---

[24] "Hebrews 1:8." Available on-line at: [http://christiandefense.org/Hebrews1\\_8.htm](http://christiandefense.org/Hebrews1_8.htm) . (Accessed January 2007.)

[25] "Chapter LVI.-God Who Appeared to Moses is Distinguished from God the Father." *Dialogue with Trypho*. [http://www.ccel.org/fathers2/ANF-01/anf01-48.htm#P4043\\_787325](http://www.ccel.org/fathers2/ANF-01/anf01-48.htm#P4043_787325) . (Accessed January 2007.) The other two quotations of Justin are also in *Dialogue*, see "Chapter XXXVIII.-It is an Annoyance to the Jew that Christ is Said to Be Adored. **Justin** Confirms It, However, from Ps. XLV" and "Chapter LXIII.-It is Proved that This God Was Incarnate."

[26] Robertson, A.T. "Commentary on Hebrews 1:8." Robertson's Word Pictures of the New Testament.

Continuing...

### **Hebrews 1:8, 10-12**

[8] *But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever: a scepter of righteousness is the scepter of thy kingdom. [10] And, Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands: [11] They shall perish; but thou remainest; and they all shall wax old as doth a garment; [12] And as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail.* (KJV)

[8] ***But of the Son He says, "YOUR THRONE, O GOD, IS FOREVER AND EVER, AND THE RIGHTEOUS SCEPTER IS THE SCEPTER OF HIS KINGDOM. [10] And, "YOU, LORD, IN THE BEGINNING LAID THE FOUNDATION OF THE EARTH, AND THE HEAVENS ARE THE WORKS OF YOUR HANDS; [11] THEY WILL PERISH, BUT YOU REMAIN; AND THEY ALL WILL BECOME OLD LIKE A GARMENT, [12] AND LIKE A MANTLE YOU WILL ROLL THEM UP; LIKE A GARMENT THEY WILL ALSO BE CHANGED. BUT YOU ARE THE SAME, AND YOUR YEARS WILL NOT COME TO AN END."*** (NASB)

[8] ***But about the Son he says, "Your throne, O God, will last for ever and ever, and righteousness will be the scepter of your kingdom. [10] He also says, "In the beginning, O Lord, you laid the foundations of the earth, and the heavens are the work of your hands. [11] They will perish, but you remain; they will all wear out like a garment. [12] You will roll them up like a robe; like a garment they will be changed. But you remain the same, and your years will never end."*** (NIV)

[8] ***But with reference to the Son: "God is your throne forever and ever, and [the] scepter of your kingdom is the scepter of uprightness. [10] And: "You at [the] beginning, O Lord, laid the foundations of the earth itself, and the heavens are [the] works of your hands. [11] They themselves will perish, but you yourself are to remain continually; and just like an outer garment they will all grow old, [12] and you will wrap them up just as a cloak, as an outer garment; and they will be changed, but you are the same, and your years will never run out."*** (NWT)

This passage is addressed to the Son, Jesus Christ. Hebrews 1:10-12 is a quotation of Psalms 102:25-27:

### **Psalms 102:24-27**

[24] *I said, O my God, take me not away in the midst of my days: thy years are throughout all generations. [25] Of old hast thou laid the foundation of the earth: and the heavens are the work of thy hands. [26] They shall perish, but thou shalt endure: yea, all of them shall wax old like a garment; as a vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed: [27] But thou art the same, and thy years shall have no end.* (KJV)

[24] *I say, "O my God, do not take me away in the midst of my days, Your years are throughout all generations. [25] "Of old You founded the earth, And the heavens are the work of Your hands. [26] "Even they will perish, but You endure; And all of them will wear out like a garment; Like clothing You will change them and they will be changed. [27] "But You are the same, And Your years will not come to an end.* (NASB)

[24] *So I said: "Do not take me away, O my God, in the midst of my days; your years go on through all generations. [25] In the beginning you laid the foundations of the earth, and the heavens are the work of your hands. [26] They will perish, but you remain; they will all wear out like a garment. Like clothing you will change them and they will be discarded. [27] But you remain the same, and your years will never end.* (NIV)

[24] *I proceeded to say: "O my God, Do not take me off at the half of my days; Your years are throughout all generations. [25] Long ago you laid the foundations of the earth itself, And the heavens are the work of your hands. [26] They themselves will perish, but you yourself will keep standing; And just like a garment they will all of them wear out. Just like clothing you will replace them, and they will finish their turn. [27] But you are the same, and your own years will not be completed.* (NWT)

This passage is addressed to God the Father.

Albert Barnes stated:

... it is clear that the writer here designed to adduce this as applicable to the Messiah... In the Psalm, there can be no doubt that Yahweh is intended... No one, on reading the Psalm, ever would doubt that it referred to God, and if the apostle meant to apply it to the Lord Jesus it proves most conclusively that he is divine.<sup>27</sup>

John Gill wrote that Psalm 102:25,

...is a proof of the deity of Christ, to whom these words belong: this is said to be done "of old", or "at" or "in the beginning", as Jarchi and the Targum; and so in Heb 1:10, where they are applied to the Messiah, the Son of God; and this, as it proves the eternity of Christ, who must be in the beginning, and before all things... and so fully express the eternal existence of Christ...<sup>28</sup>

David Guzik, furthermore, showed how this Old Testament quotation proves the deity of Christ, stating:

- c. The Son is not only called God, but *Lord* (Yahweh) as well (Hebrews 1:10), and the Son is described with attributes that God alone has.
  - i. Jesus Christ, the Second Person of the Trinity, is the Creator (You, LORD, in the beginning laid the foundation of the earth).
  - ii. Jesus Christ, the Second Person of the Trinity is self-existent (They will perish, but You will remain).
  - iii. Jesus Christ, the Second Person of the Trinity is sovereign (Like a cloak You will fold them up, and they will be changed).
  - iv. Jesus Christ, the Second Person of the Trinity is immutable, unchanging (You are the same), and eternal (Your years will not fail).<sup>29</sup>

Please note that Psalms 102:25-27 says that Yahweh, God the Father created the heavens and the earth, that the heavens are the works of Jehovah's hands, denoting an intimate and personal involvement in the work of creation while Hebrews 1:10-12 ascribes the same to Jesus, i.e. both God the Father and Jesus were personally and intimately involved in the creation.

---

[27] Barnes, Albert. "Commentary on Hebrews 1:10." Barnes' Notes on the Bible, 1798-1870.

[28] Gill, John. "Commentary on Psalms 102:25." John Gill's Exposition of the Entire Bible, 1690-1771.

[29] Guzik, David. "Commentary on Hebrews 1". David Guzik's Commentaries on the Bible. 1997-2003.

I refer the reader to:

**Isaiah 44:24**

*Thus saith the LORD, thy redeemer, and he that formed thee from the womb, I am the LORD that maketh all things; that stretcheth forth the heavens **alone**; that spreadeth abroad the earth **by myself**; (KJV)*

*Thus says the LORD, your Redeemer, and the one who formed you from the womb, "I, the LORD, am the maker of all things, Stretching out the heavens **by Myself** And spreading out the earth **all alone**, (NASB)*

*"This is what the LORD says-- your Redeemer, who formed you in the womb: I am the LORD, who has made all things, who **alone** stretched out the heavens who spread out the earth **by myself**, (NIV)*

*This is what Jehovah has said, your Repurchaser and the Former of you from the belly: "I, Jehovah, am doing everything, stretching out the heavens **by myself**, laying out the earth. **Who was with me?** (NWT)*

And again:

**Job 9: 2, 8**

[2] *I know it is so of a truth: but how should man be just with God? [8] Which **alone** spreadeth out the heavens, and treadeth upon the waves of the sea. (KJV)*

[2] *"In truth I know that this is so; But how can a man be in the right before God? [8] Who **alone** stretches out the heavens And tramples down the waves of the sea; (NASB)*

[2] *"Indeed, I know that this is true. But how can a mortal be righteous before God? [8] He **alone** stretches out the heavens and treads on the waves of the sea. (NIV)*

[2] *"For a fact I do know that it is so. But how can mortal man be in the right in a case with God? [8] Stretching out the heavens **by himself** And treading upon the high waves of the sea; (NWT)*

Isaiah 44:24 and Job 9:8 both clearly state that Yahweh "alone" created." Yet, Hebrews 1:10-12 and other New Testament passages state that Jesus created. Among them, speaking of Jesus:

**John 1:3**

**All things were made by him;** and without him was not any thing made that was made. (KJV)

**All things came into being through Him,** and apart from Him nothing came into being that has come into being. (NASB)

**Through him all things were made;** without him nothing was made that has been made. (NIV)

**All things came into existence through him,** and apart from him not even one thing came into existence. (NWT)

For the Trinitarian, there is no dilemma. The Father is God. Jesus is God. Therefore, both could (and did) create the heavens and the earth. For the WTBTs, however, there is a very large problem in that God the Father could not create "alone" (NASB, Isaiah 44:24) when Jesus is said to create as well.

Reasoning from the Scriptures briefly addresses this dilemma:

Why does Hebrews 1:10-12 quote Psalm 102:25-27 and apply it to the Son, when the psalm says that it is addressed to God? Because the Son is the one *through whom* God performed the creative works there described by the psalmist. (See Colossians 1:15, 15; Proverbs 8:22, 27-30.) It should be observed in Hebrews 1:5b that a quotation is made from 2 Sam 7:14 and applied to the Son of God. Although that had its first application to Solomon, the later application of it to Jesus Christ does not mean that Solomon and Jesus are the same. Jesus is "greater" than Solomon and carries out a work foreshadowed by Solomon – Luke 11:31.<sup>30</sup>

The WTBS seeks to strike an equivalent comparison between Psalms 102:25-27/Hebrews 1:10-12 with 2 Samuel 7:14/Hebrews 1:5.

### **Hebrews 1:5**

*For unto which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee? And again, I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son? (KJV)*

*For to which of the angels did He ever say, "YOU ARE MY SON, TODAY I HAVE BEGOTTEN YOU"? And again, "I WILL BE A FATHER TO HIM AND HE SHALL BE A SON TO ME"? (NASB)*

*For to which of the angels did God ever say, "You are my Son; today I have become your Father"? Or again, "I will be his Father, and he will be my Son"? (NIV)*

*For example, to which one of the angels did he ever say: "You are my son; I, today, I have become your father"? And again: "I myself shall become his father, and he himself will become my son"? (NWT)*

And reading 2 Samuel 7:14 in context:

### **2 Samuel 7:11-14**

*[11] And as since the time that I commanded judges to be over my people Israel, and have caused thee to rest from all thine enemies. Also the LORD telleth thee that he will make thee an house. [12] And when thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom. [13] He shall build an house for my name, and I will stablish the throne of his kingdom for ever. [14] I will be his father, and he shall be my son. If he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men: (KJV)*

*[11] even from the day that I commanded judges to be over My people Israel; and I will give you rest from all your enemies. The LORD also declares to you that the LORD will make a house for you. [12] "When your days are complete and you lie down with your fathers, I will raise up your descendant after you, who will come forth from you, and I will establish his kingdom. [13] "He shall build a house for My name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever. [14] "I will be a father to him and he will be a son to Me; when he commits iniquity, I will correct him with the rod of men and the strokes of the sons of men, (NASB)*

*[11] and have done ever since the time I appointed leaders over my people Israel. I will also give you rest from all your enemies. "The LORD declares to you that the LORD himself will establish a house for you: [12] When your days are over and you rest with your fathers, I will raise up your offspring to succeed you, who will come from your own body, and I will establish his kingdom. [13] He is the one who will build a house for my Name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever. [14] I will be his father, and he will be my son. When he does wrong, I will punish him with the rod of men, with floggings inflicted by men. (NIV)*

---

[30] Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society of New York, Inc. "Entry for 'Trinity.'" Reasoning from the Scriptures, 1985. P. 414.

[11] *even from the day that I put judges in command over my people Israel; and I will give you rest from all your enemies. ""And Jehovah has told you that a house is what Jehovah will make for you. [12] When your days come to the full, and you must lie down with your forefathers, then I shall certainly raise up your seed after you, which will come out of your inward parts; and I shall indeed firmly establish his kingdom. [13] He is the one that will build a house for my name, and I shall certainly establish the throne of his kingdom firmly to time indefinite. [14] I myself shall become his father, and he himself will become my son. When he does wrong, I will also reprove him with the rod of men and with the strokes of the sons of Adam.* (NWT)

Arthur Pink stated:

...Its first reference was to Solomon, who, in many respects, was a remarkable **type** of the Lord Jesus. But its chief application was to Christ Himself. That **Solomon did not exhaust its fulfillment** is clear enough from the language of verse 13 itself, for, as Dr. Brown has pointed out, **"It refers to a son to be raised up after David had gone to be with his fathers, whereas Solomon was not only born but crowned before David's death; and the person to be raised up, whosoever he is, was to be settled 'in God's house and kingdom,' and his throne was to be established forevermore," – words certainly not applicable, in their full extent, to Solomon.**"<sup>31</sup> (Emphasis mine.)

Albert Barnes also wrote rather extensively about the typology of Solomon, stating:

This passage is evidently quoted from 2Sa 7:14. A sentiment similar to this is found in Psa 89:20-27. As these words were originally spoken, they referred to Solomon. They occur in a promise to David that he should not fail to have an heir to sit on his throne or that his throne should be perpetual. The promise was particularly designed to comfort him in view of the fact that God would not suffer him to build the temple because his hands had been defiled with blood. To console him in reference to that, God promises him far greater honor than that would be. He promises that the house should be built by one of his own family, and that his family and kingdom should be established forever.

...If the Messiah was to be a descendant of David, then it was natural to apply these promises in regard to his posterity in an eminent and special sense to the Messiah. They were part of the promises which included him, and which terminated in him. The promise, therefore, which here is made is, that God would be to him, in a special sense, a Father; and he should be a Son. It does not, as I suppose, pertain originally exclusively to the Messiah, but included him as a descendant of David.

...while these words originally might have been applicable to Solomon, or to any of the other descendants of David who succeeded him on the throne, yet they at last terminated, and were designed to terminate in the Messiah...

The promise, doubtless, had a special reference to the Messiah. Nay, we may safely assert, that the chief reference was to him, for in the case of the typical persons and things what they adumbrate is principally to be regarded. So here, **though the original application of the passage be to Solomon, the type of Christ, yet it finds its great and ultimate application in the person of the glorious antitype...This the apostles understood as well, that they were never stumbled by it, and what is remarkable, and of the last importance on the subject, "never for a moment drawn from the ultimate and chief design of a promise or prophecy" by its primary reference to the type. They saw Christ in it, and made the application solely to him, passing over entirely the literal sense, and seizing at once the ultimate and superior import.**...Now certainly the apostles are the best judges in matters of this kind. Their authority, in regards to the sense of passages quoted by them from the Old Testament, is just as great as in the case of the

---

[31] Pink, Arthur. Chapter 4: Christ Superior to Angels, *An Exposition of Hebrews*. Available on-line at: [http://www.pbministries.org/books/pink/Hebrews/hebrews\\_004.htm](http://www.pbministries.org/books/pink/Hebrews/hebrews_004.htm) (Accessed January 2007).

original matter of the New Testament. **That Christ was indeed principally intended is further evident from the fact, that "when the kingdom had passed from the house of David," succeeding prophets repeat the promise in 2 Sam. 7: as yet to be fulfilled. See Jer 33:14, Jer 33:26.**<sup>32</sup> (Emphasis mine)

Solomon was very obviously a type, or foreshadowing, of the Messiah, which the WTBS indicated in the Reasoning from the Scriptures quotation above. The WTBS seeks, however, to draw a parallel between the Old Testament quotation of God's work of creation with the Old Testament quotation of God's promise to David of an eternal throne (verse 12). To reflect equivalency in the comparison, since Solomon is a type of Jesus, does the WTBS assert that Jehovah God is a type, a foreshadowing, of Jesus as well? Of course not! An equivalent comparison between Almighty God and a type of Jesus is fallacious and just plain silly.

Furthermore, as stated in the quotations above, the promises made to David spoken by God were clearly **not fulfilled** in Solomon. Solomon died. His throne did not stand forever. Since God always keeps his promises, we would of course look to a complete fulfillment in David's descendants or the "seed of David" noted in 2 Samuel 7:12. Jesus, as the antitype, was repeatedly called the seed of David (John 7:42, Romans 1:3, 2 Timothy 2:8) and completely fulfilled these promises. In effect, the equivalency the WTBS demands between Hebrews 1:5 and Hebrews 1:10-12 simply does not exist because Scripture very obviously demonstrates that **Solomon failed to fulfill the promise God made to David**, whereas **Jehovah God certainly did not fail to create**. In failing to fulfill God's promise to David, we **must** look beyond Solomon to Jesus. God, however, did not fail to create. We don't need to look beyond Yahweh for complete fulfillment as we must Solomon, but Jesus is attributed with the work of creation regardless. As such, quotations that refer to Solomon and quotations that refer to Jehovah God hardly reflect any degree of equivalency for comparison purposes.

We must also note, as stated by Albert Barnes, that the Apostles certainly had no problem "passing over" the lesser literal fulfillment in Solomon of 2 Samuel 7:11-14 and applying this promise **exclusively** to Christ Jesus.

The WTBS' demanded comparison equivalency further breaks down once we consider the context of both Old Testament quotations. Hebrews 1:5 indicates that God will become a father to Solomon and establish his kingdom forever. Hebrews 1:10-12 indicates that Jesus created the heavens. Creation, needless to say, is limited to Almighty God alone. Creation is attributed **only** to God (Isaiah 44:24, Job 9:8 above) and is necessarily limiting. The alleged equivalent parallel to Solomon is **not** limiting at all. Solomon was not the **only** king of Israel. There were many kings of Israel. We, in effect, are supposed to force a parallel between a limited, divine quality (creation) and an unlimited, generic quality (kingship). Regardless of WTBS assertions, this certainly does not reflect an equivalent comparison.

I refer the reader to an excellent article, "Hebrews and Jesus as Creator" which addresses this matter in much greater detail, available on-line at: <http://www.abrahamic-faith.com/shamoun/Refuting%20Stafford%20Jesus%20as%20creator.html> (Accessed January 2007) as well as the follow-up debates based on the article also available on-line at: <http://www.abrahamic-faith.com/shamoun/Refuting%20Heinz%20Job%209%20Part%201.html> and <http://www.abrahamic-faith.com/shamoun/Refuting%20Heinz%20Job%209%20Part%202.html> (both accessed January 2007). The author, Sam Shamoun, quotes James White's book, The Forgotten Trinity, stating:

"...The connection between the Lord Jesus and Solomon has to do with a shared characteristic: kingship. But kingship is not a *unique* attribute of Solomon. There have been many kings. So while citing a passage about Solomon of Jesus doesn't make Jesus Solomon, citing a passage about a *unique characteristic* (creatorship, immutability, eternity) of *Yahweh* does make Jesus *Yahweh*, for no one else shares that characteristic. Being a king didn't make Solomon who he was, but being eternal and unchangeable *does* define who *Yahweh* is." (White, *The Forgotten Trinity* [Bethany House Publishers: Minneapolis, MN, 1998], p. 135)

---

[32] Barnes, Albert. "Commentary on Hebrews 1:5." Barnes' Notes on the Bible, 1798-1870.

Furthermore, as to the first part of the [Reasoning from the Scriptures](#) quote above, [Insight on the Scriptures](#) (Vol. 1) elaborates, saying:

...since Jehovah is the one primarily responsible for all this creative work, it is ascribed to him.<sup>33</sup>

I refer the reader, again, to Isaiah 44:24 and Job 9:8 above. Do the verses say Jehovah God created **primarily** alone? Do they say Yahweh did the work of creation **mostly** by himself? Do the verses say the heavens are the works of his hands **for the most part**, but God actually had someone else (Jesus) do the job? Do Isaiah and Job say Jehovah is primarily responsible or – *the work of **my** hands* – **directly** involved in creating?

The Scriptures very clearly and explicitly state that God alone created and was directly involved in the work of creation. The WTBT's assertion to the contrary simply denies and rejects the plain teaching of Scripture.

Jesus is attributed with God's role of Creator in Hebrews 1:10-12 and since God alone created the heavens and the earth, this is a powerful testimony that Jesus is God.

Again, we find another passage in which the NWT translation committee failed to replace יהוה with "Jehovah" in an Old Testament quotation in the New Testament in 1 Peter 2:3, which quotes Psalms 34:8:

#### **Psalms 34:8**

***O taste and see that the LORD is good: blessed is the man that trusteth in him.*** (KJV)

***O taste and see that the LORD is good; How blessed is the man who takes refuge in Him!*** (NASB)

***Taste and see that the LORD is good; blessed is the man who takes refuge in him.*** (NIV)

***Taste and see that Jehovah is good, O YOU people; Happy is the able-bodied man that take refuge in him.*** (NWT)

Compare with:

#### **1 Peter 2:3**

***If so be ye have **tasted that the Lord is gracious.***** (KJV)

***if you have **tasted the kindness of the Lord.***** (NASB)

***now that you have **tasted that the Lord is good.***** (NIV)

***provided you have **tasted that the Lord is kind.***** (NWT)

Psalms 34:8 explicitly speaks of God and is applied to Jesus in 1 Peter 2:3. John Gill wrote, "by the Lord is meant, the Lord Jesus Christ..." and Matthew Henry agreed: "The next verse assures us that the Lord here spoken of is the Lord Jesus Christ." In Psalms 34:8, the NWT says taste and see that Jehovah is good. Yet, when the New Testament refers to this same Psalm 34, the NWT retains "Lord" instead of "restoring" Jehovah in spite of the fact that no less than 5 Hebrew Version (J Documents, see below) support the insertion of Jehovah.

---

[33] Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society of New York, Inc. "Entry for "CREATION." [Insight on the Scriptures, Volume 1](#), 1988. P. 527

The footnote to 1 Peter 2:3 in the 1984 New World Translation with References, quotes F.J.A. Hort, who states (in part), "...St. Peter is not here making a formal quotation, but merely borrowing O.T. language and applying it in his own manner. His use, though different from that of the Psalm, is not at variance with it..."<sup>34</sup> However, I refer the reader again to the KIT foreword, which states:

Hence, the modern translator is warranted in using the divine name as an equivalent of those two Greek words, that is, at places where the writers of the Christian Greek Scriptures quote verses, passages, **and expressions from the Hebrew Scriptures or from the LXX where the divine name occurs.** (Emphasis mine.)<sup>35</sup>

The NWT translates *Kurios* as Jehovah in instances which are not direct quotations, but in instances in which Old Testament verses are paraphrased, adapted for New Testament use, or when Old Testament "expressions" are used. Yet, here the NWT does not "restore" God's name. Inexplicably so.

And again, 1 Peter 3:14, 15 quotes Isaiah 8:12, 13:

### **Isaiah 8:12, 13**

[12] *Say ye not, A confederacy, to all them to whom this people shall say, A confederacy; neither fear ye their fear, nor be afraid.* [13] **Sanctify the LORD of hosts himself; and let him be your fear, and let him be your dread.** (KJV)

[12] *"You are not to say, '{It is} a conspiracy!' In regard to all that this people call a conspiracy, And you are not to fear what they fear or be in dread of {it.}* [13] **"It is the LORD of hosts whom you should regard as holy. And He shall be your fear, And He shall be your dread.** (NASB)

[12] *"Do not call conspiracy everything that these people call conspiracy; do not fear what they fear, and do not dread it.* [13] **The LORD Almighty is the one you are to regard as holy, he is the one you are to fear, he is the one you are to dread,** (NIV)

[12] *"YOU men must not say, 'A conspiracy!' respecting all that of which this people keep saying, 'A conspiracy!' and the object of their fear YOU men must not fear, nor must YOU tremble at it.* [13] **Jehovah of armies—he is the One whom YOU should treat as holy, and he should be the object of YOUR fear, and he should be the One causing YOU to tremble."** (NWT)

I emphasized whom we are directed to sanctify in bold above. In Isaiah 8, we are told to sanctify יהוה or Jehovah.

### **1 Peter 3:14, 15**

[14] *But and if ye suffer for righteousness' sake, happy are ye: and be not afraid of their terror, neither be troubled;* [15] **But sanctify the Lord God in your hearts: and be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you with meekness and fear:** (KJV)

[14] *But even if you should suffer for the sake of righteousness, you are blessed. AND DO NOT FEAR THEIR INTIMIDATION, AND DO NOT BE TROUBLED,* [15] **but sanctify Christ as Lord in your hearts, always being ready to make a defense to everyone who asks you to give an account for the hope that is in you, yet with gentleness and reverence;** (NASB)

---

[34] Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society of New York, Inc. The New World Translation of the Holy Scriptures with References. 1984. Pp. 9, 10.

[35] Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society of New York, Inc. The Kingdom Interlinear Translation of the Greek Scriptures, 1985. P. 11.

[14] *But even if you should suffer for what is right, you are blessed. "Do not fear what they fear; do not be frightened."* [15] **But in your hearts set apart Christ as Lord.** *Always be prepared to give an answer to everyone who asks you to give the reason for the hope that you have. But do this with gentleness and respect, (NIV)*

[14] *But even if YOU should suffer for the sake of righteousness, YOU are happy. However, the object of their fear do not YOU fear, neither become agitated.* [15] **But sanctify the Christ as Lord in YOUR hearts,** *always ready to make a defense before everyone that demands of YOU a reason for the hope in YOU, but doing so together with a mild temper and deep respect. (NWT)*

Again, I emphasized to whom we are directed to sanctify in bold above. In 1 Peter – a quotation of Isaiah 8:12, 13 – we are directed to sanctify Jesus Christ as Lord of our hearts, as יהוה of our hearts if we follow the NWT parameters for applying "Jehovah" in Old Testament quotations in the New Testament writings. Yet, the NWT fails to insert Jehovah here.

Barring these occurrences (and others I may have missed) where Old Testament uses of יהוה were quoted in the New Testament and/or applied to Jesus and the NWT translation committee failed to insert Jehovah, what of the 125 occurrences of Jehovah in the NWT that are not quotations from the Old Testament?<sup>36</sup> What rationale serves to inserting "Jehovah" in those **125 non-quoted** instances?

As indicated by the KIT quotations above, the NWT translation committee consulted Hebrew versions (hereafter referred to as J Documents) to confirm where to insert "Jehovah" in the New Testament text, particularly in the 125 instances in which "Jehovah" was inserted that is not an Old Testament quotation. The reader should note that the NWT translators did not use these J Documents to **ascertain** or **identify** instances in which Jehovah was to be used in the New Testament apart from Old Testament quotations, but to **confirm** the renderings of those instances **already selected** by NWT translators.

On what basis did the NWT translators select and choose which instances of Lord (that are not Old Testament quotations) should be reviewed for a possible restoration of Jehovah?

According to Insight on the Scriptures (Vol. 2):

Supposing a Christian scholar were engaged in translating the Greek Testament into Hebrew, he would have to consider each time the word κυριος occurred, whether there was anything in the context to indicate its true Hebrew representative...The Hebrew Scriptures would be a guide in many passages thus, wherever the expression 'the angel of the Lord' occurs, we know the word Lord represents Jehovah; a similar conclusion as to the expression 'the word of the Lord' would be arrived at, if the precedent set by the O.T. were followed...(*Synonyms of the Old Testament*, 1897, p. 43) It is on such a basis that translations of the Greek Scriptures (mentioned earlier) containing the name Jehovah have proceeded.

Outstanding, however, in this regard is the *New World Translation*...

So, occurrences of Jehovah in the New Testament not contained within an Old Testament quotation, are said to be restored by virtue of *Kurios* ("Lord") being part of Hebrew expressions found in the Old Testament, such as angel of the LORD or word of the LORD.

I checked the 125 **non-quotation** occurrences of Jehovah for such Hebrew expressions. I allowed and included the following expressions (in order of appearance in the New Testament, NWT terminology,

---

[36] To review the 125 instances in which Jehovah is not supported by an Old Testament quotation, see "Appendix B: Comparison of 237 'Jehovah' References," THE TETRAGRAMMATON and the CHRISTIAN GREEK SCRIPTURES, 1996.

allowing for minor variations): angel of Jehovah (occurs 11 times<sup>37</sup> in the NWT New Testament), sanctuary of Jehovah (once<sup>38</sup>), Jehovah our/their God or Jehovah God (12 times<sup>39</sup>), hand of Jehovah (3 times<sup>40</sup>), law of Jehovah (twice<sup>41</sup>), in the name of Jehovah (4 times<sup>42</sup>), in the eyes of Jehovah (twice<sup>43</sup>), in the sight of Jehovah (once<sup>44</sup>), spirit of the Jehovah/Jehovah's spirit (twice<sup>45</sup>), word of Jehovah (13 times<sup>46</sup>), fear of Jehovah (twice<sup>47</sup>), the underserved kindness of Jehovah (once<sup>48</sup>), will of Jehovah or if Jehovah wills (2 times<sup>49</sup>), glory of Jehovah (once<sup>50</sup>), day of Jehovah (4 times<sup>51</sup>) and Jehovah of armies (once<sup>52</sup>).

Please note that demanding angel of the LORD/Jehovah and other Old Testament "expressions" reflect the same individual or individuals in the New Testament texts has no Scriptural support. Nowhere, for instance, does the New Testament say the NT angel of the Lord is the OT angel of the LORD, as such. One must first assume these NT occurrences of Lord refer to OT occurrences of God's name and force your presumptions on the NT text – and you know what they say about assume. ☺

Regardless, even allowing a great deal of latitude in regards to what phrases do or do not reflect a Hebrew expression, I found **over 70+ instances in which the Old Testament was not quoted and Kurios ("Lord") was not contained in an Old Testament Hebrew expression.** Why was Jehovah "restored" to these occurrences? This is not explained. The NWT translators simply, inexplicably selected these instances in which Lord does not appear in an Old Testament quotation or appear in a Hebrew expression and searched for Hebrew New Testaments (and in one instance, a concordance) that uses God's name (or a substitution, see below) – without a solitary explanation as to why such "restoration" was demanded.

---

[37] Mt. 1:20, 1:24, 2:13, 2:19, 28:2; Mk 1:11; Lk 2:9 (1<sup>st</sup> occurrence); Acts 5:19, 8:26, 12:7, 12:23.

[38] Luke 1:9.

[39] "Jehovah their God" Luke 1:16; "Jehovah our God" Acts 2:39; "Jehovah the God" Luke 1:68; "Jehovah God" Luke 1:32; Revelation 1:8, 4:8, 11:17, 15:3, 16:7, 18:8, 21:22, 22:5.

[40] "Jehovah's hand" Acts 13:11; "hand of Jehovah" Luke 1:66; Acts 11:21.

[41] Luke 2:24, 2:39.

[42] "name of Jehovah" 2 Timothy 2:19 (2nd occurrence); "in Jehovah's name" Luke 19:38; "in the name of Jehovah" James 5:10, 5:14.

[43] "from the person of Jehovah" Acts 3:19; "in the eyes of Jehovah" James 4:10.

[44] 2 Corinthians 8:21.

[45] "spirit of Jehovah" Acts 5:9, "Jehovah's spirit" 8:39.

[46] "Jehovah's word" 1 Thessalonians 4:15; "word of Jehovah" Acts 8:25, 12:24, 13:44, 13:48, 13:49, 15:35, 15:36, 16:32, 19:20; 1 Thessalonians 1:8; 2 Thessalonians 3:1.

[47] Acts 9:31; Colossians 3:22.

[48] Acts 15:40.

[49] "if Jehovah wills," 1 Corinthians 4:19; "will of Jehovah," Ephesians 5:17.

[50] 2 Corinthians 3:18 (1st occurrence).

[51] "Jehovah's day" 2 Peter 3:10, 1 Thessalonians 5:2; "day of Jehovah" 2 Thessalonians 2:2; 2 Peter 3:12.

[52] James 5:4.

## Hebrew Versions and J Whats?

What, for that matter, are Hebrew versions, the J Documents? They are Hebrew translations of the ancient Greek texts. As mentioned previously, we have manuscripts and fragments dating back to 100 – 200 A.D.

Translators used these ancient Greek texts that **do not contain יהוה** to translate the New Testament into Hebrew for Hebrew-reading audiences, the earliest copy of which is dated to 1385 A.D. – over **1000** years after the ancient Greek source documents that, again, **do not contain** the tetragrammaton, from which the translation was made. **These J documents inserted יהוה without manuscript support 1000 years after the ancient Greek source documents from which they made their translation were made.**

The WTBTS and the NWT translation committee, in effect, placed greater importance and significance on copies made 1000 years after the **source** of the translations. They place greater significance on the copies from the Greek source documents even though these much later copies made additions that **are not in or supported by the ancient Greek source documents**. Rather than consult the ancient Greek texts, the WTBTS and NWT translation committee relied and continue to rely on 1000 year later translations of the ancient Greek texts that added to the text without a shred of supporting evidence for these additions.

## Problems with the NWT J Documents

1. Five of the J Documents are Bibles dated **to or after 1900**.<sup>53</sup> They are as follows:

Document	Date
J19	1957
J20	1963
J22	1979
J23	1975
J25	1900

The notion that I am to trust a document dated within my lifetime, as several of the above are, more so than ancient documents and fragments that date to the second and third centuries is patently ridiculous. If you aren't intellectually offended by such shenanigans, you should be. I own shoes older than J22.

2. Several of the J Documents don't use יהוה. J1 uses the letter H as a substitution for יהוה and in only one place uses HaShem (The Name). J1 does not contain יהוה at all. Nor does J2, which also uses "The Name" as a substitution for יהוה. J3 does not contain יהוה, either, but rather a triple yod shaped in the form of a triangle. In short, **neither J1, J2 nor J3, cited in support of the insertion of יהוה in the New Testament, actually contain יהוה**.<sup>54</sup>

3. J20 isn't a Bible. It is a concordance. Doug Mason states:

On page 30 of the Foreword, the Translation Committee explains that the Concordance provides "the Hebrew text" being referred to or quoted by the NT Greek text. As the Concordance is simply listing Hebrew OT texts being quoted by the NT, it **gives no evidence**

---

[53] Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society of New York, Inc. The New World Translation of the Holy Scriptures with References. 1984. P. 1458.

[54] Please see <http://www.tetragrammaton.org> , click on Readers' Contributions for more information.

**that the Tetragram appeared in the Greek NT text. The Concordance does not place the Tetragram (or variants) in the NT Greek text, but is listing Hebrew OT texts.**<sup>55</sup>  
(Emphasis mine.)

So J20 simply quotes the Old Testament passages that contains God's name, but does not use God's name in the New Testament at all.

4. J21 is The Emphatic Diaglott, a **Christadelphian** Greek to English interlinear. I use J21 on this site, only because J21 is known to be used as a resource by the WTBS. I **do not** use it in any other area of my personal Bible study and limit it only to WTBS research. Perhaps the WTBS trusts this resource. I, however, do not.

5. Quoting THE NEW WORLD TRANSLATION AND HEBREW VERSIONS, Book 1:

Some of the Hebrew versions produced in English speaking countries were printed as two-language translations. That is, they had both Hebrew and English parallel texts. They were not produced as *interlinear* translations with one word-for-word text over the other. Rather, they gave an unbroken Hebrew text on one page and an English text on the facing page. Both J17 and J18 are produced in this format.

...we can use this Hebrew-English arrangement as a commentary for the intended meaning of יהוה in the Hebrew translation. It would interest the reader to glance through either J17 or J18 and notice the parallel passages where the Tetragrammaton is used in the Hebrew text. Almost without exception, the English text reads *Lord*.<sup>56</sup>

6. There are various textual families and associations in the J Documents. J2, which was written to **oppose** Christianity, was revised and released as J3, which was revised and released (in part) as J4. As such, J2-4 do not represent three unique document witnesses, but rather **one** document that has been revised and re-released. Likewise, J7 was revised and released as J8, which was revised and released as J10. Again, instead of three unique document witnesses, we have **one** document that has been revised and released. Finally, J11, J13, J14, J15 and J16 were **all** published by translators of the London Jewish Society. Instead of five unique document witnesses, they are related by virtue of the same translators.<sup>57</sup>

7. J Document support for individual insertions of Jehovah in the New Testament in many instances is quite sparing. As noted by the NWT foreword, there is **no** support for inserting Jehovah in 1 Corinthians 7:17. The WTBS also notes three instances<sup>58</sup> in which only one single J Document supports the NWT insertion of Jehovah:

Acts 18:21	J17
Colossians 3:13	J23 (1975)
James 2:23 (2nd occurrence)	J17

Please note that the insertion of Jehovah in Colossians 3:13 is supported by only **one** J Document and that J Document dates to **1975**. Were you born after 1975? Then you're older than the WTBS' best and only support for the insertion of Jehovah in Colossians 3:13.

---

[55] Mason, Doug. "5. J1 - J21 Examined" Witnessing the Name. 2000. Available on-line at: <http://www.freeminds.org/doctrine/thename.htm> . (Accessed January 2007.)

[56] THE NEW WORLD TRANSLATION AND HEBREW VERSIONS, Book 1. "Chapter 4 The Hebrew Versions' Translation Preference." Pp. 21, 22.

[57] Mason, Doug. "5. J1 - J21 Examined" Witnessing the Name. 2000. Available on-line at: <http://www.freeminds.org/doctrine/thename.htm> . (Accessed January 2007.)

[58] None are Old Testament quotations according to "Appendix B: Comparison of 237 'Jehovah' References," THE TETRAGRAMMATON and the CHRISTIAN GREEK SCRIPTURES, 1996. None are Hebrew expressions, either.

The NWT also notes eight instances in which there are only **two** supports for the insertion of Jehovah:

Acts 13:44	J17, J22 (1979)
Romans 14:4	J18, J20 (1963)
Galatians 3:16	J7, J8
Ephesians 5:17	J7, J8
Ephesians 6:7	J7, J8
Colossians 1:10	J7, J8
Colossians 3:22	J18, J22 (1979)
James 3:9	J18, J23 (1975)

Please note half of the secondary supports used in the above-noted verses are dated to the 1960s and 1970s. The same pattern of **one** older J Document coupled with **contemporary** supports repeats in the fourteen instances in which the NWT supports the insertion of Jehovah with only three J Documents: Acts 2:47, 4:29, 8:22, 10:33, 12:17, 13:12, 15:40, 16:15; 1 Corinthians 10:9, 11:32; 2 Corinthians 8:21; 2 Thessalonians 2:2, 2:13; and 2 Peter 3:12.

In effect, of the 237 instances in which the NWT inserts Jehovah in the New Testament, 26 instances possess alarmingly weak J Document support.

8. The NWT cites these J Documents to support the instances in which the WTBS restores Jehovah to the New Testament, but comparing these J Documents against the entire body of 237 insertions of Jehovah in the NWT New Testament, we find a **significant** degree of J Document disagreement with the NWT:

- J1 (Matthew only) does not support the NWT by a factor of 11%
- J2 (Matthew only) does not support the NWT by a factor of 16.7%<sup>59[59]</sup>
- J3 (Matthew & Hebrews only) does not support the NWT by a factor of 10%
- J4 (Matthew only) does not support the NWT by a factor of 5.5%
- J5 (Gospels only) does not support the NWT by a factor of 60.3%**
- J6 (Gospels only) does not support the NWT by a factor of 62%**
- J7 does not support the NWT by a factor of 18.6%
- J8 does not support the NWT by a factor of 13.1%
- J9 (Gospels & Hebrews only) does not support the NWT by a factor of 11.8%
- J10 does not support the NWT by a factor of 13.6%
- J11 does not support the NWT by a factor of 56.5%**
- J12 does not support the NWT by a factor of 57.8%**
- J13 does not support the NWT by a factor of 22.8%
- J14 does not support the NWT by a factor of 36.7%
- J15 (Luke, Acts, Romans & Hebrews only) doesn't support the NWT by a factor of 27%
- J16 does not support the NWT by a factor of 24.5%
- J17 does not support the NWT by a factor of 23.6%
- J18 does not support the NWT by a factor of 20.2%
- J19 (John only) agrees with the NWT in every instance**
- J20 does not support the NWT by a factor of 81.4%**
- J21 does not support the NWT by a factor of 92.4%**
- J22 does not support the NWT by a factor of 21.1%
- J23 does not support the NWT by a factor of 23.2%
- J24 does not support the NWT by a factor of 42.6%
- J25 does not support the NWT by a factor of 26%
- J26 (Matthew 1:1 – 3:6 only) does not support the NWT by a factor of 67%**
- J27 does not support the NWT by a factor of 99.2%.**

---

[59] The WTBS' *Insight on the Scriptures* (Vol. 2, 1988) states in "Entry for 'Jehovah'" on p. 10, speaking of J2, "Wherever Matthew quoted from the Hebrew Scriptures, this translation used the Tetragrammaton in each case of its occurrence." That may be the case, but please note this J Document **still** disagrees with the NWT by a factor of 16.7%.

[59] Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society of New York, Inc. *The Kingdom Interlinear Translation of the Greek Scriptures*, 1985. P. 1016.

So even the J Documents the NWT uses to support the insertion of Jehovah in the New Testament disagree with the NWT, many to quite a significant degree. Only **one** J Document agrees with the NWT in its insertion of Jehovah in every instance (emphasized in bold above) and that, only in the book of John. In fact, of the J Documents cited by the NWT, **eight** don't agree with the NWT's insertion of Jehovah over half of the time (also emphasized in bold above).

9. The NWT translation committee also refers to these J documents selectively. Many support insertion of the divine name in verses in which the NWT does not. Please see "Hiding the Divine Name" at <http://www.catholic-forum.com/members/popestleo/hiding.html> (Accessed January 2007) for further details, including links to image scans of several J Document passages that include יהוה in 1 Corinthians 12:3, Hebrews 1:10, 1 Peter 2:3, and 1 Peter 3:15.

Collating from several resources regarding these J Documents and use of יהוה in verses in which the NWT failed to "restore" God's name in the New Testament:

J7, J8, J10

Luke 2:11 "...born to you today, a Savior, who is Christ, יהוה"

J14

1 Corinthians 12:3 "...no one can say Jesus is Lord (יהוה) except by..."

J7, J8

Hebrews 1:10 "Thou, Lord (יהוה), in the beginning..."

J7, J8, J13, J14, J20

1 Peter 2:3 "...kindness of the Lord (יהוה)..."

J7, J8, J11-14, J16, J17, J20, J24

1 Peter 3:15 "...but sanctify Christ as Lord (יהוה) in your hearts..."

The KIT footnoting apparatus yields a very small glimpse of J Document support of God's name occurring in a verse not included in the NWT alleged restorations. That verse is 1 Peter 3:15 (noted last in the list above). The KIT footnote indicates that "Jehovah God" is supported by J7, J8, J11-14, J16, J17, and J24.<sup>60</sup> The NWT uses "Lord" in this passage, in spite of support from nine J Documents for inserting God's name, Jehovah, instead. 31.6% of the NWT's 237 Jehovah insertions have the support of 8 J Documents or less – less support than that noted for the insertion of Jehovah in the KIT footnote for 1 Peter 3:15. (To view a scan of this footnote, please see Appendix E: KIT & 1 Peter 3:15.) The NWT inserted Jehovah in 75 instances, many with **far** less support, but fails to do so here. Inexplicably.

If these so-called J Documents can and should be used to support the insertion of Jehovah in the New Testament for the NWT's 237 occurrences, as the WTBS asserts, these same J Documents can also be cited to justify the insertion of Jehovah in other verses which **affirm** the Deity of Jesus Christ as Almighty God and used to refute the WTBS rejection and denial of Jesus as God.

If the NWT use J Documents to justify insertion of God's name in the New Testament, the evidence indicates that the NWT does so selectively. Comparing J Document insertions against occurrences of God's name in the same J Documents in which the NWT fails to similarly "restore" God's name, we can see that the NWT "restored" God's name to the New Testament only in those instances in which the insertion supports WTBS theology, while ignoring occurrences in which J Document support refutes WTBS theology.

---

[60] Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society of New York, Inc. *The DIVINE NAME That Will Endure Forever*, 1984. Pp.26-27.

In any event, I strongly caution the reader:

**Do not trust the NWT translation of the New Testament in any instance in which "Jehovah" appears. The insertion of "Jehovah" into the New Testament writings lacks any and all foundation in ancient manuscripts. There is NO non-canonical mention of a removal of the Divine name in ANY ancient writings...There is absolutely NO BASIS for inserting "Jehovah" in the New Testament!!!**