Thank you for writing to me, I very much appreciate it. I find it interesting the way you sent me a letter to my personal home with my personal address and having a return address with no last name and a P.O. Box address. I see that you are playing it safe. It seems like a good idea in today’s crazy world. In any event, I have seen some material from JW.org and the Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society and I definitely have some questions.

In Revelation 1:8; 21:6; and 22:13, we see that ***someone*** says that He is the *Alpha and the Omega*. What does this mean though? *Alpha* and *Omega* are the first and the last letters in the Greek alphabet, right? Isn’t that cool? God is the first and the last! But in Revelation 1:17, we find something else interesting. John says, “And when I saw him, I fell as dead at his feet. And he laid his right hand upon me and said: “Do not be fearful. **I am** the First and the Last…” But then if we keep reading in the New World Translation in verse 18, we find this: “…and the living one; and I became dead, but look! I am living forever and ever, and I have the keys of death and hades.” My question here is did Jehovah God die? Or are all of these really talking about Jesus? It seems clear that all of these verses are talking about the same being.

In verse Revelation 1:8, it says the word “*Jehovah*,” but this is the *New Testament*, not the Old Testament. Why was the word *Jehovah* (YHWH) added to this verse by the Watchtower Bible and Tract Society when this *Hebrew* word does not appear in the *Greek* New Testament? How does this fit with the Revelation also saying in chapter 22:18 that “I am bearing witness to everyone that hears the words of the prophecy of this scroll: **If anyone makes an** **addition to these things**, God will add to him the plagues that are written in this scroll…” (NWT)? So how can the Watchtower Bible and Tract Society add to this prophecy and change the message in chapter one, verse eight, which seeks to give glory to Jesus? Or do I have it wrong somehow?

Another question I have is in the book according to John. It concerns chapter one verses one through three, but mostly verse three. I just cannot get past this… It says,

“In the beginning the Word was, and the Word was with God, and the Word was a god. 2 This one was in the beginning with God. 3 All things came into existence through him, and apart from him not even one thing came into existence.”

If “*all things came into existence through him*” wouldn’t that mean that he is also uncreated? Wouldn’t the ***Word*** (who seems to be Jesus according to JW.org, and verse 14 in the same chapter), be the one to create “all” things? If this is the case, then he is not created, but he is the one who did all of the creating. If he were uncreated, wouldn’t this mean that he is God? Is this wrong? In John 1:3, the quote “Apart from him, not even one thing came into existence” also seems to expel the idea that it only refers to things on earth, but refers to things that exist versus things that do not exist. So if we were to say that it is only referring to things on earth, it just doesn’t seem correct because “not even one thing came into existence.”

I have seen in Colossians 1:15 where it says that “He is the image of the invisible God, the *firstborn* of all creation.” But, The Bible says that King David is also God’s *firstborn* in Psalm 89:27. So either this word means something other than being *born first*, or that the Bible contradicts itself because it calls David the firstborn as well. Can you help me with this? How are we to understand John 1:3 if the ***Word*** created “all things” and that it seems as though he was never born, but “became” flesh as John 1:14 describes? This is very confusing, don’t you think? Doesn’t it sound like the one who created “all things” put on human flesh and “resided among us” according to the New World Translation?

It seems also that the book according to John should be self-explanatory and not need other books to interpret what it means in this regard. Do you think John wrote his book with the intention of having other books explain what he meant? That doesn’t seem to make sense, but even more, it sounds like it would be absurd to suggest that John wrote his book with the intention that other books interpret what he means. As you can see, the most important of my questions comes from John 1:3.

In any event, I hope you find this as interesting as I do, but hopefully less confusing. Thanks again!