

# Proving the Deity of Christ...

## ...To Jehovah's Witnesses

By Ben Webb

April 1999

---

### **Introduction**

It is my belief that any doctrine is better understood when we are able to refute the arguments that may be used against it. Since the Jehovah's Witnesses (JWs for short) are probably the most prevalent people who call themselves "Christian" but reject the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ, this study is written from the position of a civil debate with members of their organization. We are not necessarily encouraging such a debate; we only wish to use this format in order to better explain the concepts contained herein. But if some reader does wish to engage in a "civil debate" with Jehovah's Witnesses, the information contained in this study should prove to be helpful.

The Jehovah's Witnesses base a large part of their doctrine upon the unscriptural belief that the Lord Jesus Christ is only a created being (or, a "creature"). They teach that God first created Jesus, and then Jesus created everything else in the universe. Not only is this teaching to be condemned; it should also be refuted by knowledgeable Christians whenever possible. Far too many Christians, though, either don't have any idea the JWs teach this, or don't care. As a result, this false doctrine continues to be propagated.

The main purpose of this study, then, is to prove that Jesus is indeed God, and that the Holy Spirit is God. We will accomplish this by explaining how to answer the various arguments used by the JWs against the Deity of Christ.

For the most part, JWs are nothing more than sincere people who have been deceived into believing they are the only ones who have hope of eternal life. It is highly unlikely that they will realize they have been deceived when we first talk to them; but if we pray for guidance, the Lord may lead us to "plant a seed of truth" that someone else is to water later. Or, there is also a possibility that someone may have already planted a seed, and that the Lord may actually be choosing us as the ones who are to water the seed!

Typically, the first time the J Ws come by, they will not have much time to discuss the Bible. Instead, they usually hit a neighborhood in groups, and focus upon distributing their magazines to as many people as possible. So the more we know about our subject initially, the more success we will have reasoning with them. If they begin making excuses to leave, it is recommended that they be asked to come back at a specific date and time. Be certain, though, that they may bring others who are better trained on their next visit, especially if they had difficulty defending their beliefs in the initial visit. Above all else, we should always allow the scriptures to be our final authority, instead of relying upon some creed or tradition.

The main purpose of the following study, then, is to prove that our Lord Jesus Christ was truly God manifested in the flesh. If some reader does decide to discuss scripture with the next J Ws that show up at the door, many of the arguments they will use are refuted in the following study. Most of these arguments have actually been used by the J Ws that have come to this writer's own door, and some of their typical reactions are related from personal observation. Although we are all individuals, and there is no way we can predict the reaction of each individual J W, they are still predictable to a large extent as a group, having been trained by their parent organization to use specific arguments in defense of certain doctrines they hold. These same arguments can also be found in their publications, being standard arguments The Watchtower has used for years.

The scriptures contained in the following study, then, should benefit every reader, whether one wishes to talk to the J Ws, or whether one simply wishes to learn more about the Trinity. Let the reader be aware, though, that a J W is taught not to accept any literature that is perceived to be anti-Jehovah's Witness in content, so they will refuse to read this study if it is handed to them. For this reason, it is advisable for the reader to learn these passages, and also to mark them in the Bible if he or she decides to "witness to the J Ws". For those who simply wish to learn more concerning the Deity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and who do not wish to talk to any J Ws, the following study should help them to understand why we believe Jesus is God, and why we believe the Holy Spirit is God. This writer's only wish is for all Christians to better understand these concepts. Even when we are doctrinally correct, we still gain a better understanding of our own doctrine when we can successfully refute arguments that may be used against it.

---

## **Chapter 1: Jesus, as God, Raised Himself From the Dead**

It is clear from the scriptures that our Lord Jesus Christ is fully God, manifest in the flesh. Of this there can be no doubt, as long as we hold the Bible as our final authority. For example,

Jesus - in response to the Jews' request for a sign - prophesied that He would raise His body from the dead, in John 2:19-22 -

"Jesus answered and said unto them, Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up. Then said the Jews, Forty and six years was this temple in building, and wilt thou rear it up in three days? But he spake of the temple of his body. When therefore he was risen from the dead, his disciples remembered that he had said this unto them; and they believed the scripture, and the word which Jesus had said."

Peter, however, stated that it was God Himself Who raised Jesus from the dead, in Acts 2:32 -

"This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses."

There are numerous other passages which also state that God raised Jesus from the dead (Acts 10:40; Acts 13:30; Eph. 1:20; etc.). Since Jesus prophesied that He would raise the temple of His body from the dead in John 2:19, yet God raised Him from the dead, then either Jesus spoke falsely, or He must be God.

Plus, Jesus also stated that He had the "power" to take back His life after His crucifixion in John 10:17-18 -

"Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father."

Jesus, then, clearly had the power to take back His Own life after His crucifixion, because He said He did; and He even prophesied that He would raise the temple of His body from the dead. Yet since Peter states that God raised Jesus from the dead, then either Jesus was a deceiver, or Jesus was Himself deceived, or Jesus must be God.

The above passages are a powerful testimony to the Deity of our Lord Jesus Christ. When presented in the above order, they are useful for explaining the concept of our Lord's Deity to the Jehovah's Witnesses, who have been deceived into believing that Jesus is not God. This writer, for example, once participated in a good-natured debate with a particularly friendly J W who came by the house, but made little progress. Finally the above passages were presented to him, at which point he closed his Bible and sat silent, staring straight ahead for what seemed like a full minute. Being faced with scriptural proof that Jesus is indeed God, he finally stated that, although he could not refute the above argument, neither was he "allowed" to accept the implication that Jesus is God. This is because Jehovah's Witnesses, who are also referred to as "J Ws" for short, are taught that their own organization (the Watchtower Bible and Tract Society) is God's prophetic organization on the earth. They must therefore believe that this

organization's teachings come from God Himself. Since God's prophets are never wrong in their utterances (see Deut. 18:22), then if a J W was to question the teachings of their own "prophet", this would be the equivalent of questioning God Himself. In addition, they are also taught that the Bible is God's Word (upon this we can agree with them), and they claim to believe that the scriptures themselves should be the final authority (again, we both agree upon this point). Yet when faced with a contradiction between what the Bible says and what their own organization teaches, they will be forced to make the difficult choice of either believing their own organization (as this particular J W did), or of believing the Bible instead of their organization.

---

## **Chapter 2: Scriptural Basis for His Deity: Our Understanding is Not a Requirement**

The word "Trinity" is simply a term that originated in order to convey the idea that in the Bible, Jesus is God, the Holy Spirit is God, and the Father is God; yet there is only ONE God. While the word "Trinity" does not appear anywhere in the scriptures, the concept that there is one God in three Persons is found throughout. The doctrine of the Trinity is therefore a doctrine solidly based upon the Divinely Inspired scriptures themselves. Any doctrines or teachings that are not based upon scripture should indeed be rejected, since it was God Himself Who actually inspired the scriptures, as Paul states in 2 Tim. 3:16 -

"All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness:"

The various authors of the books in the Bible were therefore writing by Divine Inspiration when they wrote the books we now have contained in the scriptures. The Holy Spirit of God Himself caused these men of God to write down His Words from the start, as Peter writes in 2 Peter 1:20-21 -

"Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

Clearly, these men were Divinely inspired by God's Holy Spirit to write down His words. From Genesis through Revelation, the words in our Bible were written by Divine Inspiration. We should therefore test all doctrines with the light of the scriptures, which - as the words of God Himself - are the final authority.

As stated before, the doctrine of the Trinity is based in part upon the fact that there is only ONE God; yet in the Bible, Jesus is equal to God, the Holy Spirit is called God, and the Father is

God. While we may not understand this with our human intellect, we should not reject the concept of the Trinity simply due to our lack of understanding. In fact, one of the most common arguments the JWs use against the Trinity is that "we cannot understand the Trinity; therefore, it must not exist". Understanding, though, has never been a requirement of faith. For instance, the writer of Hebrews writes concerning faith and understanding in Heb. 11:3 -

"Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear."

It is therefore only by faith that we know God spoke the creation into existence in Genesis chapter 1. We cannot possibly understand this with our intellect; instead, we understand "by faith" that He did so. Nor can we understand just how Jesus fed the multitude with five loaves of bread and 2 fish (Mark 6:34-44), or how He walked on water (Mark 6:47-51), or how He performed any of His miracles. The inspired Bible writers simply record the fact that these events took place, and we know by faith that they actually happened. In the same manner, it is only by faith in the accuracy of scripture that we believe the Trinity exists. Our own understanding is not essential to the doctrine.

---

### **Chapter 3: Jesus was not "Created" by God**

In one of the tactics used by the JWs, they may "build up a straw dummy", so to speak, and then proceed to tear it down with a scripturally legitimate argument. In other words, they may describe some inaccurate idea concerning the Trinity that has been taught in the past (this inaccurate idea is their "straw dummy"). Then, the JWs will claim that we who believe in the Trinity still teach the same error (this is the "building up of the straw dummy"). By proving to the listener that the proposed idea is incorrect (thereby "tearing down the straw dummy"), they can actually weave a convincing argument that all Trinitarians believe the same way; yet in reality, few Trinitarians may actually believe in their supposed "straw dummy". This is a deceitful tactic, to be sure, but one which they will not hesitate to use. For instance, some Christians in the past have held the misconception that Jesus was only part man and part God. Because the scriptures prove this idea to be flawed, though, the JWs might try to convince some listener that "everyone" who believes in the Trinity still believes that Jesus is part man and part God. By doing so, the unwary or uneducated listener may actually be deceived into believing that we Trinitarians still teach this, especially if he (or she) does not realize that the scriptures really do portray our Lord Jesus as God manifest in the flesh.

Our main points throughout this study will therefore be directed towards proving one principal fact: God Himself, the Creator of the universe, actually chose to "empty Himself", and literally came to earth as a Man (the Lord Jesus Christ), thereby taking upon Himself the weaknesses of

humans. The Lord Jesus Christ, then, was literally God, manifested in the flesh (see 1Tim.1:16, King James Bible). This is the essence of the view concerning the Deity of Christ, and this view is based upon the scriptures alone. In fact, Paul also explains that Jesus chose to take upon Himself "the form of a servant" when He came to earth as a man, in Phil. 2:7-8 -

"But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross."

We must first realize that it was not God Who made Jesus "of no reputation". Instead, Jesus made Himself of no reputation when He was "made in the likeness of men". Other versions of the Bible may translate verse 7 above using different words, but the thought is the same in each Bible version (the J Ws' own Bible translation states that Jesus "emptied himself", while the N.I.V. states that Jesus "made himself nothing"). Using the J Ws' own words here, it was actually Jesus Who chose to "empty" Himself when He came to earth as a man. This comes as no surprise, for we know that Jesus had weaknesses associated with man. Jesus became hungry when He was tempted of the devil for 40 days (Luke 4:2), and His human body required sleep (see Luke 8:23). Having human limitations, Jesus therefore "became obedient unto death" (verse 8, above). To this end, all men die, and prophecy stated that as Messiah, Jesus certainly had to die (see Isaiah 53). The scriptures, though, also stated that He had to rise from the dead, as well (see Psalms 16:10; compare Acts 2:25-32). Yet the man Jesus would only be able to resurrect Himself (as He prophesied in John 2:19-22) if He actually was God manifested in the flesh (1Tim.1:16 in the King James Bible).

---

#### **Chapter 4: The Dual Nature of Our Lord Jesus Christ**

In order to answer most of the arguments the J Ws will use against the Deity of our Lord Jesus, we must first understand the fact that He had a dual nature. Jesus was truly God manifest in the flesh (1Tim.1:16, King James Bible); yet at the same time He was also fully man. He was not part God and part man; nor was He sometimes God and sometimes a man. Such teachings are incorrect, and the J Ws will be quick to take advantage of them. For example, if Jesus had not been fully God manifest in the flesh, he would not have been able to raise Himself from the dead, as we have seen already.

As we shall also see, Jesus was in fact equal with God (see John 5:18-19), while at the same time He was also fully man. Once again, we may not understand with our intellect how Jesus could be equal with God and at the same time be fully man, but understanding has never been a requirement of faith. Instead, this is what the scriptures themselves teach, and we need only to believe the scriptures. The J Ws, however, have been trained to only believe half of these

scriptures. They will believe every passage that portrays Jesus in His humanity. But since they believe that He was "created" before anything else was created, they will refuse to believe any passage that portrays Jesus as God. This writer's goal, then, is to equip Christians with enough evidence to convince them otherwise.

Although He was indeed a Man, our Lord Jesus Christ was a Perfect Man, because He is the only Man Who ever lived a sinless life. Concerning men who have a human father, for example, the scriptures state that "all" have sinned (Ro. 3:23; Ro. 5:12). In addition, the scriptures also state in Ecclesiastes 7:20 -

"For there is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not."

Likewise, Ezekiel 18:4 states, "the soul that sinneth, it shall die". Jesus, though, had no sin, being conceived of the Holy Ghost (Mt. 1:20), with God as His Father. The writer of Hebrews also states that Jesus was "without sin" (Heb. 4:15). Jesus therefore became sin for us, as Paul states in 2 Corinthians 5:21 -

"For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him."

Being without sin Himself, though, Jesus could not be held by the grave, as Peter stated in Acts 2:24 -

"Whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death: because it was not possible that he should be holden of it."

Therefore, being a Sinless Man, our Lord Jesus had to be resurrected from the dead, and could not be held in the grave. Furthermore, we also know that Jesus was equal with God for another reason: He had prophesied that He would resurrect Himself from the dead (as we saw in John 2:19-22 and John 10:17-18); however, God is the Only One Who gives life, according to passages such as Deut. 32:39 -

"See now that I, even I, am he, and there is no god with me: I kill, and I make alive; I wound, and I heal: neither is there any that can deliver out of my hand."

Since Jesus was conceived of the Holy Ghost (Mt. 1:20), He was the Son of God, and is therefore equal with God (as we shall see next). In addition, scripture also states that God cannot die (Habakkuk 1:12). Being equal with God, Jesus could not remain dead; instead, He had to resurrect Himself.

Because Jesus had a human mother (a created being), He was also human. Jesus became "flesh and blood" for the express purpose of destroying the devil, as the writer of the book of Hebrews states in Heb. 2:14 -

"Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil;"

In order to destroy the devil, Jesus had to be born as flesh and blood (as in Phil. 2:7-8, where He chose to "make Himself of no reputation"). When we realize that Jesus purposefully chose to limit Himself while upon this earth, we can begin to understand the fact that He was indeed the Man Jesus. Yet at the same time, Jesus was also the Son of God, and equal with the Father, because He resurrected Himself from the dead.

---

## **Chapter 5: Jesus is Equal with God**

As the Son of God, Jesus was indeed equal with God, and could therefore perform only the deeds that God would perform. Jesus truly did only the things He saw the Father do, as John states in John 5:18 - 19 -

"Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the Sabbath, but said also that God was his Father, making himself equal with God. Then answered Jesus and said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do: for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise."

In verse 18 above, it is important to note that Jesus' equality with God is a fact stated by John himself, who wrote this gospel. Jesus' equality with God was not just an accusation thrown out at Him by the unbelieving Jews. By Divine inspiration, it is John who states that Jesus made Himself "equal with God" when He claimed God as His Father. The JWs, though, because they teach that Jesus was a created being, do not believe that Jesus was actually equal with God. Instead, they believe that the Jews were only accusing Jesus of setting Himself equal to God in this passage. Because of their unbelief, the JWs claim that Jesus was only breaking some Jewish tradition here, although they cannot find any such tradition. If this had been simply an accusation by the Jews, the JWs would be correct in renouncing such an accusation as being irrelevant. John, though, does not state that the Jews only accused Jesus of making Himself equal with God.

In order to drive this point home, the above passage also states that Jesus broke the Sabbath, as well. The Jews did not simply accuse Jesus of breaking it, because the event was fully



documented by John earlier in the chapter when Jesus healed a man on the Sabbath (the J Ws do not deny this fact). Since Jesus was "Lord even of the Sabbath day" (Matt. 12:8), He was clearly able to "break" the Sabbath if He chose to do so. When discussing the above passage with the Jehovah's Witnesses, it is helpful to point out this fact. Jesus was not simply accused of breaking the Sabbath; nor was He accused of making Himself equal with God. Instead, it is obvious from John's statement in verse 18 that, just as Jesus literally broke the Sabbath, so also did He literally make Himself "equal with God" by claiming that God was His Father.

In addition, Jesus states in verse 19 that as the Son of God, He can only do the things the Father would do, "for what things soever He doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise". However, the J Ws will also try to twist John 5:19 to mean that Jesus could not act of His own free will, so Jesus could not be equal to God. While this may sound ridiculous to the reader (every man has free will), the J Ws actually believe this. Jesus, though, was not a "puppet on a string", so to speak. Instead, although Jesus had free will, He came to do the will of the Father, as He also explains more thoroughly in John 5:30, John 8:28, John 12:49, John 14:10, etc.

Since scripture always verifies scripture, we should always depend upon other scriptures to verify our beliefs. However, if the J Ws begin to feel cornered, the reader should be forewarned that they may try to suddenly change the subject. Witnessing to the J Ws, then, is similar to playing a game of chess. If we can anticipate their next move, we can be prepared with a response. When discussing John 5:18-19 with the Jehovah's Witnesses, ask them to prove their claim from the Bible. If the Jews were only accusing Jesus of claiming equality with God in the passage, the J Ws should be able to prove this from the passage. Since they cannot prove this, though, they may change the subject by claiming that since Jesus stated that the Father was "greater" than he, then God was "superior to" Jesus, according to John 14:28 -

"Ye have heard how I said unto you, I go away, and come again unto you. If ye loved me, ye would rejoice, because I said, I go unto the Father: for my Father is greater than I."

In order to support their argument here, they have to claim that since God was "greater" than Jesus, then Jesus "must have been" inferior to God. Their argument, though, is not a valid one, because "greater" does not mean "better". Instead, because Jesus "emptied" Himself, according to Phil. 2:7-8 (see section 3), He came to earth as a man, complete with human weaknesses. Being born of a woman (a created being), Jesus ultimately had to die. It is in this sense that the Father was greater. Therefore, the Father was greater because of His position, just as a man's boss at work is also "greater" in position (but not "better").

When this is pointed out to the J Ws, though, they may try to make another connection between the man and Jesus: they may claim that just as a man's boss is greater because he has worked at the job longer, this shows that God is superior to Jesus because God had to be

around longer in order to create Jesus. However, this is a desperate move on the part of the JWs, because very few companies promote men based upon seniority alone. Instead, most companies promote workers to positions of authority based upon qualifications.

---

## **Chapter 6: Jesus is One with the Father**

Another example of the Deity of Jesus can be seen in the Jews' attempt to stone Him for blasphemy after He stated that He and the Father are one, therefore making Himself equal with God, in John 10:30-33 -

"I and my Father are one. Then the Jews took up stones again to stone him. Jesus answered them, Many good works have I shewed you from my Father; for which of those works do ye stone me? The Jews answered him, saying, For a good work we stone thee not; but for blasphemy; and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God."

In contrast to our previous discussion concerning John 5:18-19, the charge of blasphemy in the above passage is only an accusation of the Jews, but the charge is based upon a real fact we have already looked at. If Jesus is actually the Son of God, then He is truly equal to God. When discussing the above passage with the JWs, they will probably point out the fact that the Jews charged Jesus with blasphemy here. In this case, they should immediately be referred to John 5:18-19, in which John by Divine Inspiration writes that Jesus - as the Son of God - is indeed equal to God (see our discussion there). Again, since we cannot understand how Jesus and God could be "one", the Jehovah's Witnesses will claim that Jesus did not "really" mean what He said in the above passage. Instead, they claim that Jesus "actually" meant that He and God are "one in purpose", just as a husband and wife are two different individuals who are also "one in purpose". While it is true that Jesus and God were indeed one in purpose, there would be nothing blasphemous in His above statement if He had meant only this. Jesus would only be accused of blasphemy if, in stating that He and the Father were one, He had actually implied equality with God.

As we saw in John 5:18-19, since Jesus was accused of blasphemy, He truly meant that He and God were equal there. Since Jesus and God were also "one in purpose", though, the JWs will focus upon this fact. We do not disagree with fact that Jesus and God were one in purpose; however, they may focus upon this fact alone in an attempt to steer the conversation away from the topic of blasphemy. In order to do so, they will quote passages in which Jesus prays for His apostles to be "one in purpose" such as John 17:21-23 - "... they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us...", "that they may be one, even as we are one...", etc. In this passage, Jesus was indeed praying that His apostles would remain "one in purpose". Another passage they use is 1 Cor. 3:8 - "Now he that planteth and he that

watereth are one...", again meaning that they are "one in purpose". We cannot deny the meaning of these passages. They will, however, use this argument of "one in purpose" as a "smokescreen", in order to hide their inability to explain Christ's equality with God in John 10:30-33. They will then speculate that Jesus violated some tradition of the Jews by claiming to be "one in purpose" with God, but they can find no proof of any such tradition. As stated before, John 5:18-19 totally disproves this. Failing in their argument that Jesus violated some Jewish tradition here, the J Ws will then argue that Jesus actually tried to deny that He was God. Again, though, they fail in their reasoning, which is based upon the next three verses in John 10: 34-36 -

"Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods? If he called them gods, unto whom the word of God came, and the scripture cannot be broken; Say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God?"

In verse 36, Jesus' claim to be the Son of God is the reason the Jews accused Him of blasphemy. Again, their charge of blasphemy was not the result of Jesus claiming to be "one in purpose" with God. Instead, it is clear from verse 36 that Jesus was accused of blasphemy "because" He claimed to be the Son of God. Of course, the J Ws will try to get around this. In the passage to which Jesus is referring (Psalms 82:6), the scriptures make reference to the Judges in the early history of Israel as being "gods". The word "god" can therefore carry the meaning of "a powerful godlike one" in the scriptures. In fact, the word "god" is also used of Satan as well (2 Cor. 4:4). The J Ws argue here that, since these early Judges in Israel were called "gods" in the scriptures, and since Satan is also called "a god", Jesus was accused of blasphemy in the above passage because He "really meant" that He was "the son of a powerful godlike one". Once again, however, the passage is clear. According to verse 36, Jesus was accused of blasphemy because He claimed to be the Son of God. As the Son of God, then, according to John 5:18-19, our Lord Jesus Christ is in fact equal to God. Therefore, beside the above passage of John 10: 34-36, those who wish to be ready the next time the J Ws show up should write John 5:18-19 as a reference in their Bible.

---

## **Chapter 7: Jesus - God's Only "Begotten" Son**

One of the most subtle ways in which the J Ws twist the scriptures involves their faulty usage of certain words. They base their teaching that the Lord Jesus Christ is a "creature" (that is, a "created being") partly upon their own faulty use of the word "begotten". In order to make it appear that God created Jesus, they redefine the word "begotten" and use it as if it means "created". As an example, they will refer to passages such as John 3:16 (which in most Bibles

states, "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son..."), and claim that the verse "really means" that God gave His "only-created" son. According to the standard dictionary, the word "beget" means "to father, or to cause to exist". Applying the dictionary's definition of the word to John 3:16, they claim that when Jesus was begotten, God "caused Jesus to exist", which means (to them) that God "created" Jesus. The scriptures, though, are so much smarter than the J Ws are, because the dictionary's definition is not our final authority when we use scriptural terms. Instead, the scriptural usage of a word is always our final authority. While it is a fact that Jesus was indeed "begotten" of God, Jesus was actually begotten when God raised Him from the dead, as Paul states in Acts 13:33 -

"God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again; as it is also written in the second psalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee."

In the above passage, Paul verifies that, in fulfillment of "the second Psalm", Jesus was begotten of God when God "raised up Jesus again". Here, Paul is quoting from (among other prophecies) a prophecy concerning the Lord's resurrection from the dead, which is found in Psalms 2:7 -

"I will declare the decree: the LORD hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee."

According to Acts 13:33, the above passage was therefore fulfilled on the day Jesus raised from the dead, at which time He was begotten of God. Although the words "beget" or "begotten" have other meanings as well, they are never used to mean "create". Instead, when the above scriptures refer to Jesus as "begotten" of God, they are referring to His resurrection from the dead.

As we have seen, Jesus was the Son of God when He was alive. Yet He was declared to be the Son of God "with power" when He was resurrected (or begotten) from the dead, as Paul writes in Ro. 1:3-4 -

"Concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh; And declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead:"

Again, let there be no doubt here. Jesus was "declared to be the Son of God" ("begotten") when He was raised from the dead. This fact alone will blow a hole in the J Ws' misuse of the word, because they always claim that the scriptures alone are their final authority. If we stick to the scriptural use of the word, in which the Bible states that Jesus was begotten when He was raised from the dead, the J Ws will be forced to either believe the scriptures themselves, or to fall back upon a less effective argument. In any discussion concerning God's "only begotten

Son", then, the J Ws should be immediately referred to the above passages (especially Paul's statement in Acts 13:33), in order to establish the true scriptural meaning of the word, "begotten".

In order to avoid the fact that Jesus was begotten of God when He was raised from the dead, the J Ws may therefore use the dictionary as their final authority instead of the scriptures. God Himself, though, has even written the scriptures so as to outwit the J Ws in their own argument here, too. Using the dictionary's own definition of the word "begat" (and therefore using the definition preferred by the J Ws), Abraham "begat" (or "fathered") two sons, Ishmael and Isaac. The writer of the book of Hebrews, though, writing by Divine inspiration of God, refers to Isaac alone as Abraham's "only begotten son", in Heb. 11:17-19 -

"By faith Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac: and he that had received the promises offered up his only begotten son, Of whom it was said, That in Isaac shall thy seed be called: Accounting that God was able to raise him up, even from the dead; from whence also he received him in a figure."

Although the dictionary defines "only begotten" as "only fathered", the scriptures alone are to be our final authority here. Since Abraham actually fathered two sons, yet the writer of Hebrews states that Isaac was Abraham's "only begotten" son, the J Ws cannot even base their argument here upon the dictionary. Instead, the scriptural usage of the word is to be used as the true definition. God Himself inspired the writer of the book of Hebrews to state that Isaac was Abraham's only begotten son, although he actually "begat" (or "fathered") two sons. As a result, since the dictionary's definition of "only fathered" does not apply to Isaac as the only begotten son of Abraham, neither can it be applied to Jesus as the only begotten Son of God.

Any discussion of God's only begotten Son will therefore create an opportunity to show the J Ws this error in their doctrine. If the above facts are stated in the form of a question, they will be forced to choose between what the Bible teaches (which is supposed to be their "final authority") and what their organization teaches:

"Jesus is referred to as God's 'only begotten Son' in John 3:16. Because the dictionary defines 'only begotten' as 'the only one having been given life', you claim that Jesus is the only one to Whom God 'gave life'. Abraham, though, 'gave life' to two sons. Yet the writer of the book of Hebrews refers to Isaac alone as Abraham's only begotten son in Hebrews 11:17. The dictionary's definition of 'only begotten' cannot be trusted here, since Abraham also 'gave life' to Ishmael. Why, then, should the Dictionary's definition of 'only begotten' be trusted for John 3:16, in which Jesus is called God's 'only begotten' Son?"

When all else fails, the J Ws may even run to the Greek language, from which the New Testament was translated. Even here, though, they will fail in their argument. The Greek word

"monogenes" (which literally means "only begotten", or "only born") is the only Greek word that is translated as "only begotten" in the King James Bible. If the JWs begin trying to "explain" the true usage and meaning in the Greek language of the word "only begotten", simply point out the fact that the writer of the book of Hebrews, in Heb. 11:17-19, also uses "monogenes" ("only begotten") in referring to Isaac as Abraham's "only begotten son". Then, pose the same question to them, referring to the Greek word (monogenes) for "only begotten":

"Jesus is referred to as God's 'only begotten Son' in John 3:16, with the scriptures using the Greek word 'monogenes' for 'only begotten'. Because the dictionary defines 'only begotten' as 'the only one having been given life', you claim that Jesus is the only one to Whom God 'gave life'. Abraham, though, 'gave life' to two sons. Yet the writer of the book of Hebrews refers to Isaac alone as Abraham's only begotten son in Hebrews 11:17, again using the same word 'monogenes' for 'only begotten'. The dictionary's definition of 'only begotten' cannot be trusted here, since Abraham also 'gave life' to Ishmael. Why, then, should the dictionary's definition of 'only begotten' be trusted for John 3:16, in which Jesus is called God's 'only begotten' Son?" The reader should not be surprised if the JWs have no answer to this question.

Also supporting the fact that Jesus was begotten when God raised Him from the dead, God's only begotten (resurrected) Son is currently "in the bosom of the Father", according to John 1:18 -

"No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him."

Just as the beggar Lazarus was carried into Abraham's bosom after he died (see Luke 16:22-23), so also would Jesus be "in the bosom of the Father" after He died (and was resurrected). In the above passage, since the only begotten Son is "in the bosom of the Father", it is apparent that Jesus was begotten when He was resurrected from the dead and placed in the bosom of the Father.

---

## **Chapter 8: Begotten: Another Possibility to Consider**

Incidentally, Paul's use of the word "begotten" in reference to our Lord's resurrection in Acts 13:33 could also disprove a tradition long held by many fundamental Bible believers, unless this tradition is soundly based upon the scriptures (the JWs, though, react strongly here). Since Jesus was "begotten" of God when He was raised from the dead, there is the distinct possibility He may never have spoken the words of John 3:16 -

"For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life."

There are two schools of thought concerning John 3:16, and each "school" presents a convincing argument that can be used in refuting the J Ws' arguments. First, the passage states that God "gave" His only begotten Son, and the word "gave" is in the past tense. This means that if Jesus did actually speak these words to Nicodemus, He was already "begotten" when He spoke them. However, since Jesus was begotten when God raised Him from the dead (as Paul states in Acts 13:33), this indicates the words of Jesus may actually end in verse 15. In fact, the words of Jesus may even end in verse 12, because the Greek text of the King James Bible places the Son of man "in heaven" in verse 13, at the time John 3:16 would have been spoken. If this is the case, John 3:16 is part of the narrative by John, written after Jesus was "begotten from the dead". John himself, then, is explaining the condemnation of those who fail to believe "in the name of the only begotten Son of God" (the resurrected Son) in verses 18-19.

Second, it is possible that John 3:16 may be the actual words of Jesus (most people believe this, since their Bibles place these words in red letters). These could be the words of Jesus, not because they are in red letters, but because Jesus was "conceived" (or, "begotten") in Mary by the Holy Ghost, according to Matt. 1:20 -

"But while he thought on these things, behold, the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost."

If Jesus is referring to Himself as God's "only begotten Son" in John 3:16, He would have to be referring to the fact that He was "begotten" by God when He was conceived by the Holy Ghost (the J Ws, though, will reject this belief). However, since Jesus was already begotten in John 3:16, and since many of the Greek manuscripts place Him "in heaven" at the time the passage was written, this evidence points to the possibility that these words just might be part of a narrative written by John (the J Ws will also reject this possibility).

In any case, while some people may also believe Jesus spoke the words of John 3:16 based upon tradition, we must not base our beliefs upon traditions alone. Otherwise, the J Ws (who also believe that Jesus spoke the words of John 3:16, but for a different reason) will use our dependence upon tradition to their own advantage. If these were the words of Jesus, they argue, then Jesus was already begotten when He spoke these words (most people believe this). The J Ws will then present their belief that in John 3:16, Jesus was referring to a past time when He was "created" by God. If we base our beliefs upon tradition alone (or red letters in the Bible), there is no way we can disprove this argument. If, however, we base our belief upon the scriptures, then we can be ready with a scriptural response to their argument: If John 3:16 does

contain the actual words of Jesus, then by referring to Himself as God's "only begotten Son", Jesus would be referring to His conception by the Holy Ghost in Matt. 1:20 as the time when He was "begotten", or "fathered".

Finally, John also writes concerning Jesus as God's only begotten Son in 1 John 4:9 -

"In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him."

There are also two viewpoints that are possible concerning the above passage. When God "sent" Jesus into the world at His birth, He was already destined by prophecy to be resurrected from the dead. In this sense, John may be referring to the fact that even before Jesus was born, prophecy stated that He would be resurrected (or "begotten") from the dead, as Paul explains in Acts 13:33. As another possibility, John may also be referring to the fact that Jesus was "conceived" in Mary by the Holy Ghost (as in Matt. 1:20), and it could be in this sense that He was God's "only begotten Son" in this particular passage. This writer will allow for either possibility here, so readers of this study are left to draw their own conclusion from the scriptures alone.

---

## **Chapter 9: Jesus, God's "Firstborn" (Favored Son): Firstborn from the Dead**

The word "firstborn", in many instances in the Bible, simply means "preeminent", or "superior", or "favorite", as we shall see. Yet if the J Ws are unsuccessful in their attempt to portray God "creating" Jesus as His only begotten Son, they may switch the discussion to passages in which the Bible refers to Jesus as the "firstborn" of God. Once again, in an effort to justify their teaching that God first-created Jesus in the beginning, the J Ws' parent organization (The Watchtower Bible and Tract Society) has changed the meaning of the word "firstborn", teaching instead that the word means "first-created". By doing so, they can then claim that when the Bible speaks of Jesus as being God's "firstborn", it is referring to His creation by Jehovah God "in the beginning", instead of His preeminence.

One of the passages the J Ws will revise in this manner can be found in the book of Psalms. In a prophecy concerning our Lord's resurrection (which was still future at the time the Psalms were written), the Psalmist has prophesied that God "will make him" (Jesus) His firstborn in Psalms 89:27 -

"Also I will make him my firstborn, higher than the kings of the earth."

The J Ws correctly believe that the above passage is a reference to Jesus. However, by redefining the word "make" in the passage, and using it as if it means "create", they compound



their erroneous belief that God "created" Jesus in the past, when He "made" Jesus His firstborn. Building upon this misconception, they have concluded that God "made" (or "created") Jesus His firstborn ("first-created") in the beginning, and that Jesus created everything else in the universe. There are, however, at least four reasons why Psalms 89:27 cannot be referring to God's "creation" of Jesus before the universe was created:

#1. First of all, the figurative use of the term "firstborn" is plainly used of someone who has favor, or who is the "favorite", and does not indicate creation in any way. In the book of Genesis, for example, Joseph had two sons, Manasseh and Ephraim, from whom came two of the twelve tribes of Israel. Joseph's son Manasseh was the oldest (or literal firstborn), and Ephraim was the younger, according to Gen. 41:51-52 -

"And Joseph called the name of the firstborn Manasseh: For God, said he, hath made me forget all my toil, and all my father's house. And the name of the second called he Ephraim: For God hath caused me to be fruitful in the land of my affliction."

Later, though, God Himself called Ephraim (the younger son) His firstborn, in Jer. 31:9 -

"They shall come with weeping, and with supplications will I lead them: I will cause them to walk by the rivers of waters in a straight way, wherein they shall not stumble: for I am a father to Israel, and Ephraim is my firstborn."

In this passage, God applies the term "firstborn" to the younger son, thereby indicating the son who "has favor" (instead of the elder son). Therefore, when God calls the younger Ephraim His firstborn here, He is using the word in a figurative sense, since Manasseh was actually the older of the two. In this same manner, the word "firstborn" is also applied to Jesus in Psalms 89:27, and indicates God's Son Who "has favor". Of course, even the JWs agree that Jesus is indeed the "Most Favored" ("firstborn") Person Who will ever live.

#2. According to Psalms 89:27, at the time Jesus is "made" God's firstborn, He is also made "higher than the kings of the earth". If we can identify the exact point in time when Jesus was exalted, we will also be able to know when Jesus was "made" God's firstborn. The answer here is obvious, because Paul writes that Jesus was exalted when God raised Him from the dead, and set Him above every name in Eph. 1:20-21 -

"Which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, Far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come:"

In fulfillment of Psalms 89:27, then, God clearly set Jesus above every name (including "the kings of the earth") when He raised Jesus from the dead, and set Jesus at His Own right hand.

Since this was the point in time when Jesus was exalted, this was also the point in time when He was "made" God's firstborn. In fact, Paul literally states that Jesus is the firstborn "from the dead" in Col. 1:17-18 -

"And he is before all things, and by him all things consist. And he is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things he might have the preeminence."

Since verse 18 states that Jesus has the "preeminence" (superiority) in all things, God has indeed made Jesus His "Favored Son" ("firstborn"). In addition, Paul also writes that Jesus was exalted for His obedience unto death (Philippians 2:8-10). As a result, since the Psalmist wrote that Jesus was to be "made" God's firstborn, higher than the kings of the earth, and Paul states that Jesus was exalted above every name at His resurrection from the dead (incidentally, this would include the "name" of Jehovah, as well), we have the answer to the arguments the JWs are so fond of using. Jesus was not "created" when He was made God's firstborn; instead, He was "made" God's firstborn, "higher than the kings of the earth", upon His resurrection from the dead. In fact, there are numerous passages which state that Jesus was exalted when He was resurrected, and these passages are not hard to find (see, for example, Mt. 28:18, Ro. 8:34, Eph. 4:10, Phil. 2:9, 1 Peter 3:22, etc.).

#3. The third point to emphasize concerning Psalms 89:27 is that the passage was written in the future tense, because it states that God "will" make Jesus His firstborn. This clearly indicates that Jesus was not yet God's firstborn when the Psalmist wrote the passage. Since Psalms 89:27 had not yet been fulfilled when it was written, the passage looked forward to a future time when God would make Jesus His firstborn. It was not looking back to an earlier time when God had already made Jesus His firstborn. As a result, Psalms 89:27 must be referring to our Lord's then-future resurrection, at which time He was to become God's firstborn.

#4. Finally, when God states in Psalms 89:27 that He will "...make him my firstborn, higher than the kings of the earth", the context must be taken back to verse 20, in which the Psalmist states, "I have found David my servant...". Since David was the youngest of at least eight sons of Jesse (see 1 Samuel 16:10-11), and was not even the firstborn of Jesse, we know that Psalms 89:27 cannot be referring to David's previous reign as king over Israel. Instead, the passage is also a prophecy of God's still-future Kingdom, in which His "servant David" will be a "prince" indeed, as prophesied in Ezekiel 34:23-24 -

"And I will set up one shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David; he shall feed them, and he shall be their shepherd. And I the LORD will be their God, and my servant David a prince among them; I the LORD have spoken it."

In the Old Testament, David is often used to represent Jesus in prophecy. Since verse 23 above states that there will be one shepherd over them, this passage represents the Lord Jesus Himself as "the good Shepherd" (see John 10:11). There can be no doubt that Jesus will actually reign in the future as the "chief Shepherd", because Peter states in 1 Peter 5:4, "And when the chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away." In fact, when God's Kingdom is established, the children of Israel will again seek David their king, as prophesied in Hosea 3:4-5 -

"For the children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and without an image, and without an ephod, and without teraphim: Afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek the LORD their God, and David their king; and shall fear the LORD and his goodness in the latter days."

Concerning King David, then, Psalms 89:27 stands to be fulfilled in the future Kingdom of God, and cannot refer to God's past "creation" of Jesus. As a prophecy of Jesus, though, the prophecy has already been fulfilled, since He was made God's "firstborn", or God's Favored Son, upon His resurrection from the dead.

As a result, when the J Ws redefine the word "firstborn" to mean "first-created", the above passages present overwhelming evidence with which to refute their definition. The word "firstborn" clearly indicates someone who is "favored", and the J Ws will agree that Jesus is indeed the Most Favored Person Who will ever be raised from the dead. Since Paul states in Col. 1:18 that Jesus is the "firstborn from the dead", it stands to reason that He was "made" God's firstborn (favorite) upon His resurrection.

---

## **Chapter 10: Jesus is "the Beginning," Jehovah God is also "the Beginning"**

Yet another reason the J Ws believe our Lord Jesus was a created being is due to their faulty understanding of the word "beginning". In the scriptures, Jesus is referred to in several places as "the beginning"; however, the J Ws mistakenly redefine the word "beginning" to mean "creation", but only when the word "beginning" is used in reference to Jesus. As an example, Jesus is referred to as "the beginning of the creation of God" in Rev. 3:14 -

"And unto the angel of the church of the Laodiceans write; These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God;"

In the above passage, when Jesus refers to Himself as "the beginning of the creation of God", the J Ws believe He "really means" that He was "created in the beginning" by God. In order to justify such a belief here, they will also apply their re-definition of the word "beginning" to

other passages in which Jesus is referred to as "the beginning". For example, the apostle Paul also refers to Jesus as "the beginning" in Col. 1:18 -

"And he is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things he might have the preeminence."

By redefining the word "beginning", and using the word as if it means "created", the J Ws' parent organization (the Watchtower Bible and Tract Society) has therefore deceived them into believing that Jesus, AS the beginning, was "created in the beginning" by Jehovah God. They completely ignore the fact, though, that Jehovah God also refers to Himself as "the beginning" in Rev. 21:5-7 -

"And he that sat upon the throne said, Behold, I make all things new. And he said unto me, Write: for these words are true and faithful. And he said unto me, It is done. I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end. I will give unto him that is athirst of the fountain of the water of life freely. He that overcometh shall inherit all things; and I will be his God, and he shall be my son."

The J Ws will agree that Jehovah God is indeed speaking in the above passage, since He clearly identifies Himself as God in verse 7. However, He also calls Himself "the beginning" in verse 6. If the word "beginning" implies creation when it refers to Jesus in Rev. 3:14, then Jehovah God must have been created too, according to this passage. In addition, Jehovah God again calls Himself "the beginning" in Rev. 22:13 -

"I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last."

In the above passages, the J Ws will reluctantly agree that Jehovah God is indeed the One referring to Himself as "the beginning". However, if the word "beginning" always means "created", as they claim, then by their own definition, even Jehovah God Himself "had a beginning". Jehovah God therefore "must have been created", if we use their "definition" of the word. Once this fact is pointed out to them, then, their only option will be to revise their definition, and claim (again, without any proof) that the word "beginning" only implies creation when it is used in reference to Jesus. Consequently, the above two passages in the book of Revelation are excellent for refuting the J Ws' claim that Jesus had a beginning.

Once the definition of the word "beginning" has been clarified, it is time to explain to the J Ws why Jesus is referred to as "the beginning of the creation of God" in Rev. 3:14. In our previous passage of Col. 1:18, when Paul referred to Jesus as "the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning", it is important to note that he was referring to Jesus as both "the head" and as "the beginning". As the beginning, Jesus is therefore equated with the head of "the body, the church". The word "beginning", then, cannot imply "creation" when it is used in reference to

Jesus in Col. 1:18, either. Instead, the fact that Jesus is "the beginning" indicates His position as "the head" over the church. In the same sense, then, the fact that Jesus is the beginning "of the creation of God" (Rev. 3:14) also indicates His position over creation, not His status as a created being. As a result, while the word "beginning" can be used to imply creation, it is not always used in that sense in the scriptures, and it is never used in that sense when referring to Jesus. As we have seen in Rev. 21:5-7 and Rev. 22:13, Jehovah God also refers to Himself as "the beginning", and even the J Ws themselves must admit that there is no way He was created. If the word "beginning" always implies creation when it refers to Jesus, then it should also imply creation when it refers to Jehovah God, as well.

The J Ws, however, may decide to sidestep this issue, and change the subject to the "original meaning" of the word "beginning" in the Greek of the New Testament. While they may sound impressive when they take this approach, they only misuse the Greek in the same way they misuse English. As a result, there is no need for us to learn Greek in order to refute them here; we only need to be aware of the way they mishandle it. In all of the passages we have looked at so far in this section, the Greek word used for "beginning" is "ar-che" (pronounced "ar-KHAY"), which can mean either "beginning", "magistrate", or "principality". In Rev. 3:14, for example, in which Jesus refers to Himself as "the beginning of the creation of God", the J Ws insist that the Greek word "ar-che", which is translated as "beginning" must imply creation. As we have seen, though, this word is also used by Jehovah God when He refers to Himself as "the beginning" in Rev. 22:13. Once again, the same question still applies: If the word "ar-che" implies creation when it is used in reference to Jesus, then why does it not imply creation when it is used in reference to Jehovah God? Therefore, since the J Ws do not believe the word implies creation when it refers to Jehovah God, they cannot even give a substantial reason from the Greek language as to why the word should only imply creation when it is used in reference to Jesus.

---

## **Chapter 11: Yet Another "Beginning": Wisdom Personified, a Key Passage Misread**

The J Ws also believe that God created Jesus "in the beginning" because they misread a passage in the book of Proverbs, which is a key to their theology. A writer may sometimes portray an idea as a real person, using a method of writing known as "personification". For example, wisdom is depicted as a person in Proverbs 8:22-25 -

"The LORD possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was. When there were no depths, I was brought forth; when there were no fountains abounding with water. Before the mountains were settled, before the hills was I brought forth:"

In the above passage, wisdom is personified as a real person, whom Jehovah God possessed "in the beginning". The above passage also states that God "brought forth" (or "created") wisdom "before the mountains were settled" (verse 25). The J Ws, then, will claim that Paul is referring to the above passage when he refers to Jesus as the wisdom of God in 1 Cor. 1:24 -

"But unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God."

Therefore, since God brought forth (or created) wisdom before the mountains were settled, the J Ws tie the two passages together to "mean" that He "created Jesus (wisdom) in the beginning, before the mountains were settled". This argument, though, is really nothing more than speculation on their part, and is easy to disprove, from at least two different angles:

First, Jesus was a Man, and not a woman. Yet wisdom is referred to as "she" in Prov. 8:2-3 ("She standeth in the top of high places...; She crieth at the gates..."). This is because even in the previous chapter, wisdom is actually personified as a sister, in Proverbs 7:4 -

"Say unto wisdom, Thou art my sister; and call understanding thy kinswoman:"

So if Prov.8:22-25 "really" means that Jehovah God initially "created" the Lord Jesus Christ as "wisdom", as the J Ws believe, then we could actually call the Lord Jesus Christ our "sister", as well, since Prov. 7:4 instructs the reader to do so.

Second, we can also disprove the J Ws' argument concerning Prov.8:22-25 by showing them that personification alone does not make anything a real person. For instance, sin is also personified as having desire, in Genesis 4:6-7 -

"And the LORD said unto Cain, Why art thou wroth? and why is thy countenance fallen? If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door. And unto thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt rule over him."

However, the fact that sin is personified in the above passage certainly does not make sin a real person. Likewise, neither is wisdom a real person just because she is personified in Prov.8:22-25. Again, if the personification of wisdom was proof that Jesus was created by Jehovah God, then Gen. 4:7 would also be proof that sin is a real person with desire, as well.

Some J Ws, though, may attempt to "get around" this by claiming that the English of Genesis chapter 7 is "archaic", and therefore inaccurate. By casting doubt upon the grammar that is used in the book of Genesis, the J Ws may then claim that Gen.4:7 is "really" referring to Abel's desire to serve and please Cain, instead of sin's desire to rule over Cain (while this tactic is not actually taught in Watchtower literature, it is one that has been attempted by individual J Ws

with whom we have come in contact). By using this approach, they can then divert the issue from the personification of wisdom in the book of Proverbs.

In order to refute this argument, it is only necessary to obtain a copy of their own Bible (the New World Translation), from a used book store, and then quote Jehovah's words to Cain, from their own Bible, in Gen.4:6-7:

"At this Jehovah said to Cain: "Why are you hot with anger and why has your countenance fallen? If you turn to doing good, will there not be an exaltation? But if you do not turn to doing good, there is sin crouching at the entrance, and for you is its craving; and will you, for your part, get the mastery over it?"

Obviously, then, Gen.4:6-7 does not refer to Abel's desire to rule over Cain, and even their own Bible agrees here. As a result, we do not need to "run to the Hebrew" in order to show the J Ws that the book of Proverbs does not personify wisdom as the Lord Jesus Christ. Instead, we only need a couple of cross references, plus a copy of their own Bible, in order to do so. By marking a cross-reference in our own Bible, from Prov.8:22-25 to Prov.7:4, we are equipped to show them that once again, the Watchtower has lied to them concerning the personification of wisdom, since she is referred to as a "sister".

Once the above facts are understood, it is important that we also understand one other fact when discussing this subject with the J Ws: the real reason they believe Proverbs 8 refers to God's "creation" of Jesus (personified as wisdom) is because Jehovah God "possessed" wisdom "in the beginning" (Prov.8:22); and "set up" wisdom "from the beginning" (Prov.8:23); yet Paul also refers to our Lord Jesus Christ as "the beginning, the firstborn from the dead" (Col.1:18). In other words, because the J Ws have a pre-judged concept that our Lord Jesus Christ was "created in the beginning" by Jehovah God (although the scriptures never say this), they will connect these totally unrelated passages together, in an attempt to force them to agree with Watchtower theology. Yet by doing so, they are basing their reasoning upon pure speculation (as well as upon their own prejudices), instead of actually believing the scriptures themselves.

Finally, if the J Ws attempt to connect Prov.8:22-25 with Col.1:18, we should also press home our earlier question, which we discussed in Section 10 of this study: "Why can't the word 'beginning' imply creation when it refers to Jehovah God, if it implies creation when it refers to Jesus?"

---

## **Chapter 12: Jesus: Firstborn of Every Creature; Firstborn from the Dead**

Another passage perverted by the J Ws, in their ongoing attempt to portray Jesus as a created being, is found in the book of Colossians. We have looked at the way in which they redefine the word "beginning" as if it means "created" in Col. 1:18 (see section 10). When read in its proper context, though, in any Bible version (except for the J Ws' own Bible), this passage will actually disprove the J Ws' contention that God created Jesus. In an attempt to disguise this fact, their parent organization (the Watchtower Bible and Tract Society) has actually come out with its own Bible version, the New World Translation. In this "version", they have actually altered the way this passage reads, in order to force it to agree with the propaganda the J Ws are being taught to believe (and which they are therefore spreading). In order to do so, they have added the word "other" to the passage in four different places, with absolutely no evidence whatsoever that the word should be added. There are no Greek manuscripts in which the word "other" is even implied, yet their parent organization, which oversaw the "translation", has added the word anyway. Because this organization is supposed to be Jehovah God's "prophetic organization" upon this earth, the J Ws have been misled into believing that the passage should actually read the way it does in their Bible. This should not be held against the individual J W who may knock upon the door, though, since he (or she) has been trained to believe every word that comes from their parent organization. We will therefore look at the J Ws' own version, straight from their New World Translation, of Col. 1:15-18 -

"He is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of all creation; 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 and by means of him all [other] things were made to exist, and he is the head of the body, the congregation. He is the beginning, the first-born from the dead, that he might become the one who is first in all things."

For comparison, we will look at the King James Version of Col.1:15-18 -

"Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature: For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him: And he is before all things, and by him all things consist. And he is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things he might have the preeminence."

Because their Bible states that Jesus created "all [other] things" in the above passage, this clearly illustrates their belief that Jesus was also a "thing" that was created by Jehovah God first; and then Jesus Himself created everything else. Talk to any J W, and this is the essence of their belief - and now they have their own "Bible" with which to "prove" it. Moreover, in an



attempt to justify such a flagrant abuse of God's words, their parent organization - which oversaw this "translation" - claims that the word "other" was simply "added in order to make the passage more understandable". This "explanation" is therefore passed on by the J Ws to everyone they talk to at the doorstep. The J Ws will therefore reject even a polite suggestion that their parent organization simply added some words to their own Bible in order to make it agree with their doctrine.

As stated earlier, this perversion of their Bible should not be held against the individual J W who may happen to appear at the doorstep. In this case, he (or she) really is the victim of a scam, which is being propagated by The Watchtower and Bible Tract Society itself. Since the J Ws may be offended by any suggestion that their own organization added the word "other" in order to alter the passage, we may stand a better chance of convincing them if we avoid attacking their Bible itself. Instead, we should be familiar with the arguments they have been trained to use in defense of their "interpretation" of the above passage. If we can keep the focus upon their doctrine, instead of attacking their Bible, there is a better chance that they may see the perversion for themselves. It is therefore helpful to understand that, in their attempt to "make" Jesus a created being, their parent organization has actually altered the meaning of this passage from at least four different angles:

1: Since the J Ws redefine the word "firstborn" to mean "first-created" (see section 9 of this study), they apply their flawed definition to Paul's statement that Jesus is "the firstborn of every creature" in Col. 1:15 -

Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature:

The J Ws' Bible alters the above verse to read that to Jesus is the first-born of "all creation", which conveniently obscures their actual belief that Jesus was the "first-created of every creature". As we have seen, though, the word "firstborn" does not imply creation, as they teach; instead, it indicates the "favored son". As God's firstborn, then, Jesus is literally God's Favored Son. In addition, Paul uses the word "creature" in the above passage because Jesus actually did have a human mother, which simply means that He also was a man. Jesus is therefore the "firstborn" ("favorite Son") because He is God's Perfect Son, and Jesus is also the firstborn "of every creature" because His mother was human.

In order to defend their perversion of the phrase "firstborn of every creature", their parent organization has also mistranslated verse 16 to read that Jesus created "all [other] things". They are so intent on making Jesus a created being that the word "other" has been added to the passage twice, without any evidence from the Greek manuscripts that it even belongs there at all. Although the proof of this is beyond the scope of this study, any parallel English/Greek text,

when it is used in conjunction with a Greek concordance, will show that the word "other" does not belong anywhere in the entire passage of Col. 1:15-18.

This writer has found that the best way to explain Col. 1:15-16 to the JWs is to first explain that the word "firstborn" implies "favorite", not "created" (see section 9). Hopefully, their organization has not yet trained them to reject this approach. Since this fact is based upon scripture, they will probably listen to reason here (however, since this is a new concept for them, they may resist it at first). If they can then be persuaded to admit that the scriptures do indeed use the word "firstborn" to indicate "favorite" (as in Psalms 89:27), much of their argument will immediately evaporate, since they will no longer be able to claim that "firstborn" always means "first-created". At this point, it is time to point out that Jesus "became" God's "firstborn" when He was raised from the dead. In response to this, though, the JWs may get angry and leave. Such actions on the part of the JWs, though, should not be met with anger; instead, the reader should realize that their anger could be due to the fact that they are under conviction by the Holy Ghost.

2: The JWs also pervert Paul's statement that Jesus is "before" all things in Col. 1:17 -

"And he is before all things, and by him all things consist."

Again, the JWs' Bible adds the word "other" here, stating that Jesus "...is before all [other] things and by means of him all [other] things were made to exist". Since their parent organization has added the word "other" to this verse in two places, the JWs must therefore believe that Jesus "was created before all [other] things". The verse, however, does not state that Jesus "was" before anything. No, the passage is written in the present tense (even in their own Bible), and states that Jesus "is" before all things. Paul is therefore indicating our Lord's preeminence (His supremacy) when he states that Jesus is before "all things". Again, there are numerous passages which also prove that God exalted Jesus upon His resurrection (Eph. 1:20-21, Phil. 2:9, etc.), and any Greek Interlinear Bible will show that the word "other" does not belong in the verse.

3: They also misrepresent Jesus as "the beginning" in Col. 1:18 -

"And he is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things he might have the preeminence."

Since the JWs' own Bible also states here that Jesus is the "head of the congregation", it is ironic that they attempt to misrepresent the above verse anyway. In their eagerness to make Jesus a created being, they again interpret the phrase "the beginning" to mean that Jesus was "first-created in the beginning". However, if the word "beginning" did imply that Jesus was created, then Jehovah God would also have been created, since He likewise refers to Himself as

"the beginning" in Rev. 22:13 (see section 10). Since Jesus and God are both referred to as "the beginning", there would actually be two beginnings if Jesus was not God. Jesus, then, as "the beginning, the firstborn from the dead", must in fact be God Himself, "the beginning and the end".

When Paul describes Jesus as "the head of the body, the church" in the above verse, he is actually indicating our Lord's exalted position as the head of the church. The JWs may even admit that Jesus is "the head" (after all, their own Bible states that Jesus is the "head of the congregation"), but they actually seem reluctant to acknowledge this. Since their parent organization claims that the verse portrays Jesus as a created being, they almost seem willing to conceal the fact that Jesus is the "head of the body, the church". When the JWs are shown Col. 1:18 from any Bible but their own, if they can be convinced to at least consider the possibility that the word "firstborn" only describes Jesus as the "head of the congregation", progress can still be made in the discussion. If their only reaction is to insist that the passage "really means" that Jesus was "first-created", though, they give every indication that they have actually been "programmed" to respond in a predictable way to a specific stimulus. This is indeed a sad testimony of the extent to which they have been influenced to believe their parent organization over the Bible itself.

4: Finally, they again distort Paul's statement that Jesus is the firstborn "from the dead" in Col. 1:18 -

"And he is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things he might have the preeminence."

The JWs' own Bible also states that Jesus is the "first-born from the dead" in the above verse, yet they again twist the word "firstborn" to imply that He was "first-created" from the dead. However, even if Jesus had been "created" by being raised from the dead (and we do reject even such a possibility), this still would not mean that He was created before "all [other] things", as the JWs claim. Instead, it would only mean that when Christ rose from the dead in order to be "created", He would have been created at the time He was raised from the dead. The word "firstborn", then, does not mean "created before all [other] things"; nor does it even imply creation. Instead, the word "firstborn" means "superior", or "favorite", as explained in section 9 of this study.

In summary, then, even using their own definitions, the JWs still have no proof that Jesus was "first-created in the beginning before all [other] things", which is their actual interpretation of Col. 1:15-18. Instead, as we have seen, Paul's use of the word "firstborn" refers to our Lord's exalted position as God's "favorite", and indicates supremacy. In addition, the fact that Jesus is before all things again indicates His preeminence, or superiority, over all things. And finally,

Paul's statement that Jesus is the firstborn "from the dead" not only indicates His position as the "head of the body, the church"; it also confirms the fact that Jesus actually became God's firstborn when He rose from the dead (see Acts 13:33), thus fulfilling the prophecy of Psalms 2:7.

---

### **Chapter 13: The Holy Spirit is God**

We will now look at the Holy Spirit, or the Holy Ghost, Who the J Ws claim is nothing more than "God's active force". Although it is true that the Holy Spirit is indeed God's "active force", He cannot be limited to this one function. Instead, God's Holy Spirit is indeed a Person, because He displays all the characteristics of a Person. The scriptures, in fact, actually portray the Holy Spirit as God. For example, in the book of Acts, Ananias and Sapphira sold a parcel of land. Afterwards, they lied to the Holy Ghost about the amount they had sold it for, and held back part of the profits from the apostles. Peter, though, stated that by lying to the Holy Ghost, they were actually lying to God in Acts 5:3-4 -

"But Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost, and to keep back part of the price of the land? Whiles it remained, was it not thine own? and after it was sold, was it not in thine own power? why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart? thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God."

According to verse 3, Ananias lied to the Holy Ghost; yet according to verse 4, Peter states that Ananias lied to God. There are only two possibilities here: either Peter spoke falsely when he accused Ananias of lying to God, or lying to the Holy Ghost is indeed the equivalent of lying to God Himself. Since Peter and the apostles had been "filled with the Holy Ghost" only ten verses earlier, though (see Acts 4:31), it would be difficult to believe that he spoke falsely in the above passage. If Peter did not falsely accuse Ananias of lying, then, we have only one other option: the Holy Ghost can be no less than God Himself.

The J Ws, though, may claim here that the Holy Ghost only "represented" God, and that Ananias actually lied to God when he lied to God's "representative". The scriptures, however, do not state anywhere that the Holy Spirit is simply a "representative" of God; nor does Peter accuse Ananias of lying to God's "representative". Instead, Peter states that by lying to the Holy Ghost, Ananias lied to God. This would only be possible if the Holy Ghost was actually God Himself. By contrast, if the Holy Spirit was simply God's "active force", Ananias would have only lied to an "active force".

There are other scriptural reasons why we believe Holy Ghost is so much more than God's "active force", as the J Ws believe. For example, concerning the Spirit of the living God, Paul

writes in 2 Corinthians chapter 3 that the Lord is "that Spirit". As a matter of fact, even the J Ws' Bible declares here that "Jehovah is that Spirit". Paul begins the thought by reminding the Corinthians that they are actually a living epistle that is read by all men, stating that "the Spirit of the living God" writes in "fleshy tables of the heart"(2 Cor. 3:3). Later in this same chapter, Paul states that although unbelieving Israel has a veil upon their heart, the Spirit of the Lord is able to take away this veil from their heart in 2 Cor. 3:15-17 -

"But even unto this day, when Moses is read, the veil is upon their heart. Nevertheless when it shall turn to the Lord, the veil shall be taken away. Now the Lord is that Spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty."

When Paul states in verse 17 above that "the Lord is that Spirit", he is referring back to "the Spirit of the living God" in verse 3 (the Spirit Who writes in fleshy tables of the heart). By comparison, even the J Ws' own Bible (the New World Translation) admits here that Jehovah IS "the Spirit" in 2 Cor. 3:17 -

"Now Jehovah is the Spirit; and where the spirit of Jehovah is, there is freedom."

In fact, if the Spirit of the Lord was merely "God's active force", as the J Ws believe, Paul's above statement would be ambiguous indeed, since it would imply that "Jehovah is only God's active force". Instead, since even the J Ws' own Bible proclaims that Jehovah IS "the Spirit", this indicates that "the Spirit of the living God" is actually Jehovah God Himself.

For another example of the Deity of the Holy Spirit, when Jesus was speaking to the woman at the well, He also made the statement that God is "a Spirit" in John 4:24 -

"God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth."

Like the previous passage, the J Ws' Bible also states here that "God is a Spirit". Once again, if the Spirit was only God's "active force", Jesus' above statement would also imply that God is an "active force". As we have seen, though, the Spirit is more than just God's "active force". In fact, since Jesus states that God is a Spirit, and Paul also wrote that God is "that Spirit", then the Spirit of God can be no less than God Himself.

One reason the J Ws do not accept the fact that the Holy Spirit is God (or the idea of the Trinity) is due to the fact that they are trying to understand a Spiritual concept from the standpoint of human reasoning, which cannot be done. Spiritual things cannot be understood by the natural man, as Paul states in 1Cor. 2:14 -

"But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned."

Instead, as we saw in the beginning of this study, there are some things that must be accepted on the basis of faith in the infallibility of the scriptures. The scriptures portray Jesus as God, and they also portray the Holy Spirit as God; yet they state that there is only one God. We simply cannot comprehend this with the human mind. If the J Ws begin arguing that the Holy Spirit cannot be God (or the Trinity cannot exist) because we cannot understand it, they must first be convinced that understanding has never been a requirement of a man's faith. In order to persuade the J Ws of the futility of trying to understand the Deity of the Holy Spirit (or the Deity of Jesus), maybe the best response is to show them Paul's above words in 1 Cor. 2:14.

In addition, a copy of the J Ws' own Bible (the New World Translation) may also come in handy for reference. One can be picked up in the Religious section of used bookstores, usually for a couple of dollars or less, and the purchase price in a used bookstore does not go to their organization. If they try to claim that there is no scriptural proof that the Holy Ghost is God, they may think twice when they are shown that even their own Bible admits that Jehovah is the Spirit in 2 Cor. 3:17 and John 4:24. If they are then asked to explain their interpretation that "God is an active force", they could actually begin to realize they have been misled here.

---

## **Chapter 14: Final Thoughts**

The Watchtower claims that only Jehovah's Witnesses will have eternal life, and that we who do not agree with them (especially we who believe in the Trinity) will simply cease to exist (J Ws do not believe in a literal hell; however, an examination of this topic demands another study in itself). The J Ws have been so misinformed by The Watchtower concerning our actual concept of the Trinity, though, that they actually believe we worship the Trinity. This is simply not true. We worship God alone, through our Lord Jesus Christ. Jesus is our one and only mediator, as Paul states in 1 Tim. 2:5 -

"For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus;"

Incidentally, please notice Paul's statement here that Jesus is a man, not "the archangel Michael". Because the J Ws refuse to accept our concept of the Trinity, though, they may attempt to use truly ridiculous arguments against the Trinity. For instance, they may mockingly substitute the word "Trinity" for "God" in passages such as John 1:1, thus making the passage read: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with the Trinity, and the Word was the Trinity". They intentionally try to confuse the issue, because they are again trying to understand Spiritual concepts with the human mind. Instead, the natural man cannot understand Spiritual things (as Paul states in 1 Cor. 2:14).

The J Ws are also notorious for quoting their own literature (which is published by The Watchtower) as "authoritative writings" or "reliable publications". This is dishonest, to say the least. In support of their Bible's translation of certain passages, they are also well-known for quoting obscure translations that most Churchgoing Christians have never even heard of. The J Ws use these tactics to make the average Christian think there is much support for The Watchtower among "certain authorities" and "widely recognized translations", when in fact their only support is from The Watchtower itself.

The J Ws may also try to compare our belief in the Trinity to the fact that certain non-Christians (such as the Hindus) worship gods in a trinity. Again, however, this is just a "smokescreen", and is easily refuted. The J Ws profess to worship "one God, Jehovah", but the Muslims also worship one god ("Allah") in the religion of Islam. Since both the Muslims and the J Ws share a common belief that there is only one god, the J Ws have no room to compare Trinitarians with religions that worship a trinity of gods. Again, we do not worship the Trinity. If it is wrong for us to believe in the Trinity because the Hindus worship a trinity, then it is also wrong for the J Ws to worship only Jehovah, since the Muslims also worship only one god. Yes, we both agree that the Hindus are wrong in worshipping their trinity. However, we do not disagree with the Hindus simply because they worship a trinity of gods; instead, we disagree with the Hindu religion (just as we disagree with the J Ws) because there is one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus (1 Tim. 2:5).

Finally, this writer has a hypothesis concerning the Lord's purpose for his life here on this earth. Imagine, for a moment, that the Lord gave each of us only one purpose in this life, and that purpose is to lead one particular individual to Christ. Imagine, too, that we do not even need to go out and search the world over for that one person, because the Lord has determined that He will send that individual to us. Yet the next time some J W shows up at the doorstep, his first instinct is to run the J W off because he is too busy, or because he is not interested in the J Ws' perverted theology. Imagine, though, that the J W who showed up at the doorstep was in fact that one individual the Lord had chosen to send to him, and he only needed to "water" a seed that had already planted by someone else (see 1 Cor. 3:6-8).

Benjamin R. Webb, Jr.

April, 1999