

the spirit of Christ in all that we do. We know that God wants us to worship him "in spirit and truth. " (John 4:23) We need the courage and love necessary to follow that quest no matter where it leads. In doing so we need to keep matters in balance. Worshipping God in spirit and truth, does not mean that we must have an the answers to every religious question. Part of the truth lies in knowing that we only have "partial knowledge" and therefore only "see in hazy outline" spiritual concepts. (1 Cor. 13:9, 12) There is no reason for us to be upset about this because our partial or

imperfect knowledge is sufficient for salvation. We will make mistakes and even stumble from time to time but that need not make us anxious. God and Christ understand our circumstances and our limitations better than we do. Their Spirit can and will be at work in us. The action of God's Spirit on us does not leave us inactive but helps us marshal our God-given abilities to respond to that Spirit. All of this can be done calmly and in the spirit of love using whatever gifts and opportunities we have to strengthen and encourage individual members of the body of Christ. □

The Name "Jehovah"

(Number 26. Originally published June 28, 1986)

This issue of *The Christian Respondent* is in response to a 32-page brochure published by the Watchtower Bible and Tract Society titled: "The Divine Name That Will Endure Forever," printed in 1984. This booklet presents a summary of Watchtower theology surrounding the name Jehovah and the importance they attach to its use in Christian worship. In addition to their own views on the matter there are a number of quotations from scholarly sources together with photographic reproductions that help the reader gain an appreciation of both the etymology of the word and its usage historically. Most readers know that the name Jehovah's Witnesses, was adopted as the unincorporated name of the body of believers associated with the New York-based Watchtower Society in the year 1931. Since that time, by word of mouth and printed page, the name Jehovah has been given great prominence by the Witnesses both in their congregational meetings as well as their public ministry. In taking this appellation to themselves the claim is made that this is the name that "the Lord God has named."

"In 1931 their representatives from many countries assembled in convention at Columbus, Ohio, and resolved that they desire to be known and called by the name which the mouth of the Lord God has named, to wit, Jehovah's witnesses: 'Ye are my witnesses, saith Jehovah.' (Isaiah 43: 10; 44:8, ASV) After that all local congregations or companies of these Christians throughout the earth declared themselves as recognizing *this God-given name.*" -*Let God Be True*, Revised Edition, 1952, pages 221,222 (Italics added)

From the above quotation it can be appreciated that more is claimed regarding the name than merely asserting that it is an appropriate one for Christians. It is clearly presented as God-given, which conveys the

thought that Almighty God determined that his people were to be called by this name. The scriptures quoted from in support of this claim, namely, Isaiah 43: 10 & 44:8 were addressed to the nation of Israel who were his witnesses to the fact that he had proven himself to be God in connection with them. Other gods could not point to any nation or people whose experience proved their godship. As in a giant court of law Jehovah God could produce witnesses to verify the fact that he was God. It was in this respect that they were his witnesses. But they were never named Jehovah's witnesses and are not called by that name in the Bible.

They were variously called "the seed of Abraham, " "sons of Jacob," "Israelites" and "children of Israel. " (Ps.105:6; Josh.13: 13; 2 Chr.13: 12) We never find the expression Jehovah's witnesses used in this manner in the Old Testament. More importantly, however, is the fact that early disciples of Jesus Christ were not called Jehovah's witnesses but rather Christians: "So he (Barnabas) went off to Tarsus to make a thorough search for Saul and, after he found him, he brought him to Antioch. It thus came about that for a whole year they gathered together with them in the congregation and taught quite a crowd, and it was first in Antioch that the disciples were by divine providence called Christians." -Acts 11:25,26, *NW* (see also Acts 26:28 and 1 Peter 4: 16)

There is some differences of opinion among commentators as to whether the name Christian was taken by the disciples or given to them by outsiders. The way the *New World Translation* translates the Greek verb *chrematizo* to read "by divine providence called," clearly suggests that it was by divine decree. Apart from this there is no indication of either divine approbation or disapproval. The same verb form is found only once more in the New Testament and that is

at Romans 7:3. *W E. Vine's Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words* regarding this word says: "occasionally means to be caned or named, Acts 11 :26 (of the name 'Christians') and Rom.7:3, the only places where it has this meaning. Its primary significance, to have dealings with, led to this. They 'were (publicly) called' Christians, because this was their chief business. "

In the Watchtower's book *Aid to Bible Understanding*, a case is made for rendering the Greek verb as they do at Acts 11 :26. In explaining further why this divinely provided name was appropriate they offer the following: "The Scriptures speak of Jesus Christ as the bridegroom, the Head and Husband of his anointed followers. (2 Cor.11:2; Eph.5:23) Appropriately, then, as a wife is happy to take her husband's name, so this 'bride' class of Christ was pleased to receive a name identifying them as belonging to him. In this way observers of these first century Christians readily recognized them not only by their activity but also by their name as altogether different from the practitioners of Judaism; here was a growing association where there was neither Jew nor Greek but all were one under their Head and Leader Jesus Christ." (Ga1.3:26-28; Co1.3: 11) *Aid to Bible Understanding*, page 316.

If one takes the position the Watchtower Society does in regard to the meaning of the Greek verb used at Acts 11 :26 and further establishes the propriety of that name' to identify Jesus' disciples as they do in the above quotation it begs the question why they would take it upon themselves to change the name after 19 hundred years? The Christ is still the Head of the congregation, his bride, and still belongs to him. In his parting command to his disciples before ascending heavenward he commissioned them to act as *his* witnesses "to the ends of the earth. " (Acts 1 :8) It must be borne in mind that everything Christians do and say is under the direct authority of Jesus Christ. (Matt.28: 18) It has pleased the Father to put everyone under the direct control and authority of his son. (John 3: 35) This includes the Christian congregation. (J OM 17:2) In view of this biblical truth it seems strange, indeed, that a group would select a name for themselves that totally ignores their "only owner," Jesus Christ! (Jude 4)

Especially since 1931 has the Watchtower Society made the use of the name Jehovah of paramount importance in Christian worship. The booklet under consideration (*The Divine Name That Will Endure*

Forever), summarizes their arguments in this connection. They draw attention, for example, to the "Lord's Prayer," wherein Jesus instructed his followers to pray: "Our Father in heaven, hallowed be your name." (Matt.6:9) and about which they say: "It was not merely by chance that Jesus taught his followers to put God's name first in their prayers. That name was clearly of crucial importance to him, since *he mentioned it repeatedly in his own prayers*. on one occasion when he was praying publicly to God, he was heard to say: 'Father, glorify your name!,' And God himself answered: 'I have glorified it, and I will glorify it again.' The evening before Jesus died, he was praying to God in the hearing of his disciples, and once again they heard him highlight the importance of God's name. He said: '*I have ffl4de your name known* to the men you took from the world to give me. ' Later, he repeated: 'I have made your name known to them and will continue to make it known.' - *The Divine Name That Will Endure Forever*, page 3 (Italics added)

There is something misleading about the way the Watchtower Society presents matters in the foregoing statements. They are laying the groundwork for establishing the name of God as Jehovah and that Jesus emphasized this name in his prayers and when instructing of his disciples. When they say he mentioned it repeatedly in his own prayers, they seem to be suggesting that he used the name Jehovah repeatedly in his prayers and thus set an example for his disciples in this regard. The fact is that the name Jehovah is not contained in any of the recorded prayers of Jesus! The form of address used by Jesus in prayer to God and the one that he taught his disciples to use was Father—a more intimate term than the name Jehovah. This is not to suggest that Jesus and his disciples did not use some form of the divine name. The personal name of God represented by four Hebrew consonants YHWH is found thousands of times in the Old Testament.

Unfortunately, translators have, for the most part, followed a Jewish tradition of substituting the generic terms LORD and GOD for this personal name in the O.T. which most agree is best rendered as Yahweh in English. There seems to be no good reason to think that the Lord would scruple against use of the name. He certainly would have no problem with knowing how to pronounce the name despite the fact that Jewish tradition deemed it inappropriate to utter the name. It is common knowledge that in the New Testament there are hundreds of quotations from the Old Testament. Many of these O.T. quotations contain the divine name

represented by the Hebrew consonants YHWH called the tetragrammaton. For example, when Jesus presented himself at the synagogue in Nazareth he asked for the scroll of the prophet Isaiah and read from its 61st chapter: (see Luke 4: 16-21) "The spirit of the lord Yahweh has been given to me, for Yahweh has anointed me. He has sent me to bring good news to the poor, to bind up hearts that are broken; to proclaim liberty to captives, freedom to those in prison; to proclaim a year of favor from Yahweh, a day of vengeance for our God." -Isaiah 61: 1, 2, *Jerusalem Bible*.

The Catholic translation above renders the tetragrammaton as Yahweh instead of Jehovah .. What would have prevented Jesus from using an accurate form of that name when reading aloud from Isaiah? Would he be afraid of taking the name in vain and for this reason not used it? Would he refrain from its use because his hearers scrupled against its use? Is it likely that the Son of God would be governed by such religious prejudice? It seems more likely that Jesus both knew and used the name when it was appropriate to do so.

When coming upon a personal name in the original language of the Bible a faithful translator would be obliged to render that name by a suitable equivalent in the language into which he is translating. This would include the name God has given himself. By retaining some form of that name in Christian worship it is possible to distinguish the Father from the Son in their respective roles. For this reason I believe that the *New World Translation* is correct in using a form of the divine name at Matthew 22:43-46 where Jesus quotes from the 110th Psalm containing the name. Other English translators fail to do this and thus contribute certain ambiguity to the reading. By comparing how the *Revised Standard Version* renders these verses with the *New World Translation* we can better appreciate the helpfulness of using some form of the divine name in its appropriate place.

"Now while the Pharisees were gathered together, Jesus asked them a question, saying 'What do you think of the Christ? Whose son is he?' They said to him, 'The son of David.' He said to them, 'How is it then that David, inspired by the Spirit, calls him lord, saying, 'The Lord said to my Lord, sit at my right hand, till I put thy enemies under thy feet'? If David thus calls him lord, how is he his son?' And no one was able to answer him a word, nor from that day did anyone dare to ask him any more questions." -Matthew 22:41-46,

Revised Standard Version.

"Now while the Pharisees were gathered together Jesus asked them: 'What do you think about the Christ? Whose son is he?'" They said to him: 'David's.' He said to them: 'How, then, is it that David by inspiration calls him 'Lord,' saying, 'Jehovah said to my lord: 'Sit at my right hand until I put your enemies beneath your feet '? 'If, therefore, David calls him 'lord,' how is he his son?' And nobody was able to say a word in reply to him, nor did anyone dare from that day on to question him any further." -Matthew 22:41-46, *New World Translation* Altogether this messianic psalm contains the divine name four times and clearly shows the distinction between Jehovah and David's Lord. At Acts 2:29,31-36 we find the apostle Peter quoting this same psalm and applying it to the resurrection of Jesus Christ. By retaining a form of the divine name in this quotation it does away with any ambiguity as to the identity of the persons involved in this prophecy. otherwise one is faced with two generic "Lords" with no way of assigning personality to them.

The objection to any form of the divine name on the basis that there is but one God and therefore does not need a personal name does not validate its removal from the Bible. While it is true that there really is only one God it is also true that there is but one Lord-Jesus Christ. Yet that does not cause translators to ignore the personal name of that one Lord. (I Cor.8:5,6; Eph.4:5) Christians are not ashamed to use the name Jesus even though it may not sound in their native tongue the way it sounded in Hebrew, Aramaic or Greek. The sound of any name will vary from language to language. The important thing is that the user of the name and the hearer of the name understand the personality represented by the name being used. Whether one uses the form Jehovah or Yahweh or some other form is not the important thing (although the evidence strongly argues for Yahweh as being the most accurate transliteration).

Why some avoid using any form of the name is not understandable to me. After all God is the one who gave himself a personal name as well as giving his fleshly Son a name. (Exodus 6:2; Matthew 1:21) Why should we feel uncomfortable using a suitable rendering of those names?

In explaining its use of the form Yahweh in its translation the *Jerusalem Bible* says the following in its forward: "The translator of the Bible into a vernacular may surely consider himself free to remove the purely

linguistic archaisms of that vernacular, but here his freedom ends. He may not, for example, substitute his own modern images for the old ones: the theologian and the preacher may be encouraged to do this, but not the translator. Nor must he impose his own style on the originals: this would be to suppress the individuality of the several writers who responded, each in his own way, to the movement of the Spirit. Still less must it be supposed that there should be throughout a kind of heretic language, a uniform 'biblical English,' dictated by a tradition however venerable." About the use of Yahweh in this translation they add: "It is in the Psalms especially that the use of the divine name Yahweh (accented on the second syllable) may seem unacceptable-though indeed the still stranger form of Yah is in constant use in the acclamation Hallelu-Y ah (Praise Yah!) It is not without hesitation that this accurate form has been used, and no doubt those who may care to use this translation of the Psalms can substitute the traditional 'the Lord.' On the other hand, this would be to lose much of the flavor and meaning of the originals. For example, to say 'The Lord is God' is surely a tautology, as to say 'Yahweh is God' is not."

It is evident, therefore, that Jehovah's Witnesses are not the only ones who show respect for the divine name. As the brochure demonstrates it has been faithfully preserved within the realm of Christendom. In fact the form of the name favored by them, namely Jehovah, can be traced back to the work of a Roman Catholic monk in the 13th century. Concerning this they offer the following on page 17 of this brochure:

"In time, God's name came back into use. In 1278 it appeared in Latin in the work *Pugio fidei* (Dagger of Faith), by Raymundus Martini, a Spanish monk. Raymundus Martini used the spelling Yohoua." (a footnote adds: "Printings of this work dated some centuries later, however, have the divine name spelled Jehova. ") - *The Divine Name That Will Endure Forever*, page 17.

The Watchtower Society holds to the form Jehovah rather than Yahweh because they argue that people are more accustomed to it. Interestingly, in their forward of the *New World Translation of the Christian Greek Scriptures* (New Testament) 1950 edition, they say the following: "While inclining to view the pronunciation 'Yah-weh' as *the more correct way*, we have retained the form 'Jehovah' because of people's familiarity with it since the 14th century. Moreover, it preserves, equally with other forms, the four letters of

the tetragrammaton JHVH." -page 25 (Italics added) It should be noted here that the form Yahweh preserves the four letters as YHWH considered by many as a more accurate representation of the Hebrew tetragrammaton than JHVH in the Latinized form. The booklet makes the following comments regarding Yahweh: "Where, though, did pronunciations like Yahweh come from? These are the forms that have been suggested by modern scholars trying to deduce the original pronunciation of God's name. Some-though not all-feel that the Israelites before the time of Jesus probably pronounced God's name Yahweh. But no one can be sure. Perhaps they pronounced it that way, perhaps not." -pages 8,9. "Is it, then wrong to use a form like Yahweh? Not at all. It is just that the form Jehovah is likely to meet with a quicker response from the reader because it is the form that has been 'naturalized' into most languages. The important thing is that we use the name and declare it to others." - page 11.

While the Society has acknowledged that the form Yahweh is probably "the more correct way" to pronounce the name they hold to the traditional form Jehovah. So while they say that it is not wrong to use the form Yahweh they do not use it apart from the way it is alluded to in this brochure. If one of their number began to regularly use another form of the divine name it would be viewed as disruptive of 'unity' despite the fact that other Witnesses would know immediately who was being identified by the other form-such as Yahweh. In this way they demonstrate that they are securely locked into their own tradition despite their saying that "the important thing is that we use the name and declare it to others. " It would seem more correct to say that the important thing is the *knowing of the personality behind the name and making that personality known*. And for the record, if Yahweh is the more correct form why not use it?

Using one form or another of the divine name does not validate as truth what is said in that name. The Watchtower Society has uttered many false predictions in the name of Jehovah God. Prolific use of that name did not make those predictions correct. It is the same today. They may boast about their regular use of the form Jehovah but that in no ways proves them right. Even they acknowledge that merely using the name is not enough:

"But does 'knowing God's name' involve merely an intellectual knowledge that God's name in Hebrew is YHWH, or in English, Jehovah? No, it means more than

that. When Moses was in Mount Sinai, 'Jehovah proceeded to come down in the cloud and station himself with (Moses) there and declare the name of Jehovah.' What did this declaring of the name of Jehovah entail? A description of his qualities: 'Jehovah, Jehovah, a God merciful and gracious, slow to anger and abundant in loving-kindness and truth.' . . . Hence, *knowing God's name means learning what that name represents and worshipping the God who possesses it.*" -page 28 (Italics added)

The Watchtower Society stresses the point that in order to be saved one must "call on the name of Jehovah." (Romans 10: 13, MV) They also call attention to the fact that God proposed to take out of the nations "a people for his name." (Acts 15: 14) Both of these scriptures are discussed on page 16 of the brochure. Keep in mind that the context in which these scriptures are brought to the reader's attention is focusing on the *literal name Jehovah*. The impression obviously intended is that use of the literal name of God has merit in itself and seeing that only Jehovah's Witnesses regularly use this appellation then they must be God's people.

However, do these scriptures address themselves to God's personal name, per se, or is something else intended? To shed light on this matter we must consider the significance of "calling on the name of Jehovah." (One Bible Dictionary addressing itself to the relationship between a name and the bearer of the name says the following: "THE NAME AND THE PERSON: So far we have studied what was involved in the giving of a name, and what bearing it had on the relationship between giver and receiver. We now ask concerning the relationship between the name and the person who bore it. The biblical teaching can be stated in three propositions: *the name is the person; the name is the person revealed; and the name is the person actively present.*" -*The New Bible Dictionary*, Page 862 (Italics added) "Why does Isaiah speak of the 'name of Yahweh' coming, rather than simply of 'Yahweh coming?' (Isa.30:27) The answer is that *the 'name' means the person as revealed*: The 'name of Yahweh' means Yahweh in all that fullness of divine power, holiness, wrath, and grace which He has revealed as his character. The 'name' is a place of refuge because the God who bears the name has so revealed himself. " ~*Ibid*. Page 863 (Italics added)

This explanation helps us to understand why things are said in a certain way in the Bible. Instead of saying "everyone who calls on the name of Jehovah will be

saved," why didn't the apostle Paul simply say: "everyone calling on Jehovah will be saved?" The answer lies in knowing that the person himself is referred to in the expression 'name' rather than the name itself. In other words we could paraphrase Paul's words: "everyone calling on the *person* of Jehovah will be saved." Similarly, when Jesus taught his disciples to pray: "Our Father in heaven, hallowed be your name," he was not urging them to articulate the *grammatical* name of God but rather to "hallow" or "sanctify" God himself. It was the person of God that was to be sanctified. The same would be true regarding God's taking out of the nations" a people for his name." It simply means that he was taking out of the nations a people for himself!

At various times in history God has made his 'name' (his person) known. Each revelation of his personality, his character, his purpose and his majesty added to the understanding of his name-his person. As a God of revelation and a fulfiller of promises he demonstrates that he, alone, is the Most High God. The full revelation of God's person, however, had to await the coming of his Son Jesus Christ. It was in Christ that the 'name' (person) of God was more fully revealed. When Jesus said: "I have made your name manifest to the men you gave me," he meant that he had revealed the person of the Father to them in his life and ministry. (John 17:6) He added dimensions to their comprehension of God heretofore not understood or revealed. He personified God. When the disciple Philip asked the Lord: "'Show us the Father.' Jesus replied: 'Have I been with you men so long a time, and yet, Philip, you have not come to know me? He that has seen me has seen the Father.'" (John 14:9,MV) Obviously, the Father was represented perfectly in the Son. So when we call upon the person of Christ we are also calling upon the person of God because the Son is God's means of salvation.

That this is the case is clearly shown by the way both the apostles Peter and Paul used Joel's prophecy: "'For Moses writes that the man that has done the righteousness of the Law will live by it. But the righteousness resulting from faith speaks in this manner: 'Do not say in your heart, 'Who will ascend into heaven/' that is, to bring Christ down; or, 'Who will descend into the abyss?' that is, to bring Christ up from the dead.' But what does it say? 'The word is near you, in your own mouth and in your own heart;' that is, the 'word' of faith, which we are preaching. For if you publicly declare that 'word in your own mouth.' that Jesus is Lord, and exercise faith in your heart that God

raised him up from the dead, you will be saved. For with the heart one exercises faith for righteousness, but with the mouth one makes public declaration for salvation. For the scripture says: 'None that rests his faith on him will be disappointed.' For there is no distinction between Jew and Greek, for there is the same Lord over all, who is rich to all calling upon him. For 'everyone who calls on the name of Jehovah will be saved.' -Romans 10:5-13, *NW*.

"But Peter stood up with the eleven and raised his voice and made this utterance to them: 'Men of Judea and all you inhabitants of Jerusalem, let this be known to you and give ear to my sayings. These people are, in fact, not drunk, as you suppose, for it is the third hour of the day. On the contrary, this is what is said through the prophet Joel, 'And in the last days,' God says, 'I shall pour out some of my spirit upon every sort of flesh, and your sons and your daughters will prophesy and your young men will dream dreams; and even upon my men slaves I will pour out some of my spirit in those days, and they will prophesy ... And everyone who calls on the name of Jehovah will be saved.'" -Acts 2: 14-18,21, *NW*.

The latter part of Paul's witness from Romans contains his quotation of Joel 2:32 whereas Peter quoted the prophecy more completely using verses 28 through 32. The Watchtower Society argues that since Joel's prophecy contained the divine name originally both apostles would have been obliged to use some form of that name and not substitute Lord or God. Let us assume that they are correct in this assumption. Would that really change their message in any way? Each apostle, in his contextual use of Joel's prophecy, makes God's way of salvation very clear. If either or both of them did use some form of the divine name would that suggest, in itself, that in addition to believing that "Jesus is Lord" and that "God raised him up" that one must also verbalize the divine name in order to be saved? That is what the Watchtower Society seems to be suggesting by making the name, per se, so important. In so doing they make the use of the name Jehovah a fetish. They clearly teach that using the name, in itself, has merit.

On page 31 of this brochure, under the title.

"Blessings From Knowing God's Name," they say:

"Jehovah protects those who love his name. The psalmist said: 'Because on me he has set his affection, I shall also provide him with escape. I shall protect him

because he has come to *know my name*. ... (Psalm 91: 14) Italics in original. That they are focusing on the *name* itself and not the *person* of God is evidenced by the fact that they have a drawing on this page (31) that depicts a man looking reverently heavenward at an emblazoned rendering of the four Hebrew letters making up the written name of God. No representation of the person of God is shown-only the name.

Scriptures, such as the one quoted above, are used to teach that from knowing the name, using the name and thinking on the name special benefits will follow. This fetish-like attitude towards the name, itself, apart from the person of God behind the name is clearly evident. It is no secret that the Watchtower Society has a certain disdain for those who, in their opinion, over-emphasize the personal name of God's Son Jesus Christ in their worship. They like to point out that just using the Lord's name doesn't mean that he recognizes them as his disciples. A favorite text in this regard is found in Matthew: "Not everyone saying to me, 'lord, lord,' will enter into the kingdom of the heavens, but the one doing the will of my Father who is in the heavens will. Many will say to me in that day, 'Lord, lord, did we not prophesy in your name, and expel demons in your name, and perform many powerful works in your name?' And yet then I will confess to them: I never knew you! Get away from me, you workers of lawlessness.'" -Matthew 7: 21-23 *NW*.

These hard-hitting remarks by the Lord are applied in Watchtower literature against all professed Christians outside their own ranks. The Watchtower Society likes to point out that the Lord makes it clear that just doing powerful works in his name does not mean he recognizes them as his disciples. Powerful works done in the Lord's name only has merit when those "works" are in harmony with the Father's will. The final judgment as to who does and who does not fall into this category rests with Jesus Christ-not those who claim to speak for him.

But if it is so that "powerful works" performed in the name of the Son of God does not exempt one from adverse judgment would it be any less true of those who do "powerful works" in the Father's name? The key issue is the doing of the Father's will. Attaching the personal names of the Father or the Son to what is said and done religiously avails nothing unless the will of the Father is being met. This sobering truth applies to everyone-not just to religions outside of the Watchtower system.

The Watchtower Society boasts that it not only uses the name Jehovah in the thousands of Old Testament appearances of the divine name but also 237 times in the New Testament. The justification for the latter being that quotations from the O.T. containing the divine name originally are to be found in the N. T. and when this is the case it is appropriate to render the name in one's translation. Concerning this practice the Translation Committee of *The New World Translation of the Christian Greek Scriptures* had this to say:

"How is a modern translator to know or determine when to render the Greek words *KUQ* *we*; and *8E0e*; into the divine name in his version? By determining where the inspired Christian writers have quoted from the Hebrew Scriptures. Then he must refer back to the original to locate whether the divine name appears there. This way he can determine the identity to give to *kurios* and *theos* and he can then clothe them with personality. Realizing that this is the time and place for it, we have followed this course in rendering our version of the Christian Greek Scriptures." -Forward, *New World Translation*, 1950 edition, (Emphasis added).

The fact is, however, that the *NW Translation* does not limit the use of the name Jehovah to the above policy. There are many occurrences of the name Jehovah in this translation that do not originate in O. T. quotations. Three examples are here given from Acts to illustrate this: "And they went on casting stones at Stephen as he made appeal and said: 'Lord Jesus, receive my spirit.' Then, bending his knees, he cried out with a strong voice: '*Jehovah* (Greek Text shows *kurios* here), do not charge this sin against them.' And after saying this he fell asleep [in death]." -Acts 7:59,60 *NW*. "Although they kept requesting him (Paul) to remain for a longer time, he would not consent but said good-bye and told them: 'I Will direct my course back to you again, if *Jehovah* (Greek Text shows *theos* here) is willing.'" -Acts 18:20,21 *NW*. "Now a certain Jew named Apollos, a native of Alexandria, an eloquent man, arrived in Ephesus and he was well versed in the Scriptures. This man had been orally instructed in the way of *Jehovah* (Greek Text shows *! <:urios* here) and, as he was aglow with the spirit, he went to speaking and teaching with some correctness the things about Jesus." -Acts 18:24,25 *NW*. Many other examples could be shown but these illustrate the point.

In these verses the *NW Translation* Committee substituted "'Jehovah," for *kurios* and *theos* instead of

rendering them as Lord and God. The support for inserting the name in these additional places comes from a number of N. T. translations in the Hebrew language dating from the 14th century. They also call attention to a number of missionary translations into native languages that contain some form of the divine name. Whether such versions or translations provide a scholarly basis for inclusion of the name beyond those taken from the O.T. where it is known with some degree of certainty that the tetragrammaton originally appeared is not for me to determine. However, it would seem much less certain. How, apart from the Greek text, would you know that *theos* at Acts 18:21 originally had the divine name there when the Greek Manuscripts: Sinaitic, Alexandrian & Vatican of the 4th and 5th century A.D., all used the word *theos* here? It is not an O.T. quotation so as to be able to refer back to the original to see if the name was used there. Of what weight-for translation purposes-is a translation (version) of the N. T. into Hebrew produced in 1877 A.D. in Leipzig, Germany by Franz Delitzsch? What was the textual basis that justified Delitzsch's inclusion of the name Jehovah at Acts 18:21?

If it is wrong to substitute the divine name with the generic words Lord or God where the original contained that name would it not be equally wrong for the translator to substitute the divine name for Lord or God when these Greek terms were used in the original? In doing this very thing the *NW* translators have done the very thing that they criticize others of doing, namely, altering the translation to suit their theology.

As stated earlier there is, I believe, a need for retaining and using the divine name in one form or another. The translator, above all others, would be obligated to do this. Surely the divine name of the Father has its place in Christian worship just as the Son's personal name has its place. But, in my opinion, the Watchtower Society has blown the matter all out of proportion as respects the name. And in doing so I think they distort matters in such a way that it tends to rob Jesus of his preeminence as head of his body, the Christian congregation.

The over-emphasis on the name Jehovah has also cultivated a mystical quality in the minds of Jehovah's Witnesses. The constant repetitions of the name in their meetings and conversations tends to lose sight of God as Father. What father would want his children to use his given name in a family setting? Even in speaking to strangers about one's father it would seem that a loving intimacy with one's father would naturally

result in choosing a more intimate expression in naming his father. This kind of intimacy was introduced and exemplified by Jesus Christ .□