



08-31-2006

#21

[sharpjohn63](#)

CARM Supporter



Join Date: Mar 2006  
Location: Cairo, Ga USA  
Posts: 1,783  
72 Reputation Points

**seeking God finding peace.....**

"But seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added to you." [Matthew 6:33](#)

It is theology that brings God to us, but it is faith that brings us to God.

"Lord help us to have more faith than theology in our never-ending struggle to live after the example of Jesus Amen"

Peace

John

Christ is the perfect expression of God in human form

Jesus is my ROCK



08-31-2006

#22

[tdickensheets](#)

Member

Join Date: Jan 2006  
Location: Seattle, WA  
Posts: 1,793  
42 Reputation Points



Then you have two Gods.

Why did the Father called Jesus God?  
[Heb 1:8](#)

God angels worship him. Him Who? Jesus.  
[Heb 1:6](#)



08-31-2006

#23

[radvermin](#)



Junior Member

**Observations of JW inferiority.**

Quote:

Originally Posted by [newWitness](#)

BAPT-IST

Join Date: Feb 2006  
Gender:   
Posts: 178  
 15 Reputation Points

*?Like I said the greek word for worship can be interpreted several ways. Many bibles do interpret it in many ways in different verses, how do you explain that? Proving that Christ is not God, that leads me to believe that the greek word for worship is not translated correctly for Jesus. If Jesus is the God of the Old Testament he would have demanded to be worshipped.*

Few observations

When dealing with JW's I've noticed that it's like reading the DaVinci code. The answer may be obvious at first but you must delve deeper to see the "true light" The example here is seen in the JW's useage of grammer. I do not agree that just because theos has an atricle in front of it then those theos' are not the same. It's just splitting hairs. It also shows me how little respect JW's have for the word God: that it can be thrown around and applied to different scenarios. God is God and there is no other. So when [John 1](#) says that the Word was with God, and the Word was God, understand the lack of respect to use God in any other way than to refer to God. When you take Jesus Christ out of the Godhead you lose respect for God.

2nd observation, I already stated this and referred to Carm.org under JW's and worshipping God, but JW's pick and chose how worship could be used. They apply worship just as easily to God as they do Satan yet refuse to apply it to Jesus Christ. When you take Jesus Christ out of the Godhead you lose reverence for God.

3rd. Your last statement really hit home about something I had theorized for a while, that only Christians know the true love of God. As Phillip Yancey said, that if God didn't come down incarnate as Jesus Christ then the crucifixion is the ultimate form of child abuse. God didn't come down as a powerhouse, demanding to be worshipped, but as a lover. He had tried to gain our love through rules in the OT, by showing himself, by miracles, by punishing sin when people did wrong, but they didn't get us any closer to loving God. So he humbled himself, let himself be rejected, and died for us. That is the God I serve, worship and love. You do not know a humble God, but I do. I also have a true love relationship with God.

[John 15:13](#), "Greater love has no one than this, that one lay down his life for his friends." If God did not come down incarnate in Jesus Christ, then Jesus Christ loves me more than the Father, and I will worship the one who truly loves me. I'm glad that I believe in the Trinity so I can accept that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit truly love me.

Radvermin

"I do not nullify the grace of God, for if righteousness comes through the Law, then Christ died needlessly." Galatians 2:21





08-31-2006

#24

**AmazingGrace**

CARM Super Member



Join Date: Jun 2006  
Location: Columbus, OH  
Gender:   
Posts: 2,682  
 56 Reputation Points



**It is written:**

**[John 5:22-24 \(Amplified Bible\)](#)**

22Even the Father judges no one, for He has given all judgment (the last judgment and the whole business of judging) entirely into the hands of the Son,  
23**So that all men may give honor (reverence, homage) to the Son just as they give honor to the Father. [In fact] whoever does not honor the Son does not honor the Father, Who has sent Him.**

Until the end of our testing we cannot take for granted our being saved; **and therefore when someone asks, "Brother, are you saved?" we do not give a categorically affirmative reply, but qualify our answer, "Thus far, yes!"**w52 7/1 p391 [See 1Jo 4 truth](#)



08-31-2006

#25

### katierussell

Member

Join Date: May 2006  
Posts: 1,481  
16 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by [newWitness](#)  
*Katie, I am not, truffy, I am newWitness. I am on your side. Truffy is dodging my question. I am not implying that you are dodging mine.*

And I'm glad we are on the same side. 😊

I was replying to one of truffy's posts. I do not know what "display mode" you look at posts at but in mine my post is clearly a reply to one of truffys. In future though I will quote the post I am replying to so as not to confuse. And I wholly agree with you about truffy's link. There is so much misleading reasoning on there is astonishing!



08-31-2006

#26

### AmazingGrace

CARM Super Member



Join Date: Jun 2006  
Location: Columbus, OH  
Gender: ♀  
Posts: 2,682  
56 Reputation Points



I found it on a business card too! And it is so very true. Thank you Lord Jesus that I know you and have a personal relationship with you. Let your kingdom come!

Until the end of our testing we cannot take for granted our being saved; **and therefore when someone asks, "Brother, are you saved?" we do not give a categorically affirmative reply, but qualify our answer, "Thus far, yes!"**w52 7/1 p391 [See 1Jo 4 truth](#)



08-31-2006

#27

### katierussell

Member

Join Date: May 2006  
Posts: 1,481  
16 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by [radvermin](#)  
*Few observations  
When dealing with JW's I've noticed that it's like reading the DaVinci code. The answer may be obvious at first but you must delve deeper to see the "true light". The example here is seen in the JW's useage of grammer. I do not agree that just because theos has an atricle in front of it then those theos' are not the same. It's just splitting hairs. It also shows me how little respect JW's have for the word God: that it can be thrown around and applied to different scenarios. God is God and there is no other. So when [John 1](#) says that the Word was with God, and the Word was God, understand the lack of respect to use God in any other way than to refer to God. When you take Jesus Christ out of the Godhead you lose respect for God.*

Your first "observation" is extremely misleading and inaccurate. To say that it is "splitting hairs" to determine whether a noun is definite or indefinite is tantamount to saying grammar is useless!! Of course it matters whether theos and any other noun of course has the Greek definite article or not! Its like you saying that it matters not when you did and when you didn't in your "observation" you used the English articles or not! You did and of course it matters! And no one, including JW's have ever said or argued that "just because theos has an atricle in front of it then those theos' are not the same"! Yet in fact even trinitarian scholars will tell you that in [John 1:1c](#) the absense of the Greek article before theos is important and that it gives a sense to the second theos different from the first. Are these trinitarians "splitting hairs"? Of course they are not! Are you now going to level the same charge against them that they have "no respect" for God's Word??

You end by saying: "So when [John 1](#) says that the Word was with God, and the Word was God, understand the lack of respect to use God in any other way than to refer to God. When you take Jesus Christ out of the Godhead you lose respect for God." But thats what we are discussing! Does John say the "Word was God"? Sorry, but you are not arguing with much sense and you are dismissing the fact that [John 1:1](#) is very important theologically and it is not the JW's alone who sometimes read like the "Da Vinci code" when it comes to explaing a particular understanding of John's Greek here.

*Last edited by katie russell : 08-31-2006 at 12:09 PM.*



08-31-2006

#28

[truffy](#)

Inactive



Join Date: Jul 2006  
Posts: 1,593  
27 Reputation Points



NewWitness, I hope that last explanation of the paraphrase clears the air. Also, if you would notice, if you are so worked up at making Jesus a god, then look at these two verses in your NWT bible and see what it says about Jehovah being a god...

[Luke 20:38](#) and [1 Corinthians 14:33](#)

Then you will realize that even the Almighty One can sometimes be called a god. So if you say Jesus is a god and rendering Him a creature, does that also fall on to Jehovah's Almighty deity too? Just think about that for a moment and get back to me.

Tim 😊😊😊



08-31-2006

#29

[katie russell](#)

Member

Join Date: May 2006  
Posts: 1,481  
16 Reputation Points



I am still waiting...patiently, truffy, for you to acknoweldge your two mistakes.



08-31-2006

#30

[AmazingGrace](#)

CARM Super Member



Join Date: Jun 2006  
Location: Columbus, OH  
Gender: ♀  
Posts: 2,682  
56 Reputation Points



Katie, please change your font. I haven't been able to read any of your posts with these old eyes of mine. Thanks and God bless you! 😊

Until the end of our testing we cannot take for granted our being saved; **and therefore when someone asks, "Brother, are you saved?" we do not give a categorically affirmative reply, but qualify our answer, "Thus far, yes!"**w52 7/1 p391 [See 1Jo 4 truth](#)



08-31-2006

#31

**truffy**  
Inactive



Join Date: Jul 2006  
Posts: 1,593  
27 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **katierussell**

*But it will not change that which I quoted from it that tells you the subject of John1:1c is not theos as you erroneously think! I also quoted you A Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament. Will you be ordering that too? There are plenty of other works that will tell you what is the subject and what is the predicate in the Greek of John 1:1c truffy! Have you not got Vine's? It tells you "the Word" is the subject of the sentence, exemplifies the rule that the subject is to be determined by it having the article when the predicate is anarthrous." Now, you do not have to wait at all to admit your error in thinking that theos is the subject of John 1:1c do you truffy?*

*But you do not even have to get the book you say you ordered, or look at Vine's. Why? Because I even showed you from the common translation of the Greek by English Bibles, to wit: "the Word was God" that this shows that theos is not the subject? Do you not even know English truffy? So, there is no need to "wait" truffy!*

*Also, you have yet to acknowledge that theos in Luke 12:24 has the article but theos in John1:1c does not and so your 'example' is not parallel.(And of course theos in the Luke 12:24 is the subject not the predicate noun!) Why do we have to "wait" for your acknowledgement of this and so your admitting that the clause in Luke 12:24 has nothing whatsoever to do with how one can translate the clause of John 1:1c? I have asked you time and time to acknowledge this and so acknowledge your gross error. Are you "scared" to "learn" you have made this gross error and admit it on this board truffy?*

Is this a list of ingredients, a client agreement or is it terms of service...I better get my magnifying glass. I'll respond to you Katie once I find it in one of my drawers. 🍷

Tim 😊😊😊



08-31-2006

#32

**tdickensheets**  
Member

Join Date: Jan 2006  
Location: Seattle, WA  
Posts: 1,793  
42 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **newWitness**

*?Like I said the greek word for worship can be interpreted several ways. Many bibles do interpret it in many ways in different verses, how do you explain that? Proving that Christ is not God, that leads me to believe that the greek word for worship is not translated correctly for Jesus. If Jesus is the God of the Old Testament he would have demanded to be worshipped.*

Q: Is Jesus a true God or false god?



08-31-2006

#33

**sharpjohn63**  
CARM Supporter



Join Date: Mar 2006  
Location: Cairo, Ga USA

**very good points.....**

I agree with you. I am perplexed at the JW insistance on greek word translations. The Bible is the Word of God, the sword of the Spirit and I must have faith and trust that the people who translated the english versions of the Bible from the KJV to now, did so as accurately and honestly as possible. I suppose this might be the biggest problem for JW's it does not seem that they have any faith to step out and believe what they read, how they read it. Of course their "Bible" the NWT of the Holy Scriptures is not much help and from what I have discovered and read here on this forum, the Bible does not carry top priority, it is the other

Posts: 1,783  
72 Reputation Points

books and publications the WT puts out. I guess if they "encourage" their members to read other material, they are not in any danger of actually learning something that the WT does not want them to know.

Welcome to the mission field

Peace

John

Christ is the perfect expression of God in human form

# Jesus is my ROCK



08-31-2006

#34

**AmazingGrace**

CARM Super Member



Join Date: Jun 2006  
Location: Columbus, OH  
Gender: ♀  
Posts: 2,682  
56 Reputation Points



That was cute! 😊

Until the end of our testing we cannot take for granted our being saved; **and therefore when someone asks, "Brother, are you saved?" we do not give a categorically affirmative reply, but qualify our answer, "Thus far, yes!"**w52 7/1 p391 [See 1Jo 4 truth](#)



08-31-2006

#35

**radvermin**

Junior Member

BAPT-  
IST

Join Date: Feb 2006  
Gender: ♂  
Posts: 178  
15 Reputation Points



I was in error in the past and I thank you for shedding the light about JW's haven't argued "that they aren't the same with regard to the definite article."

HOWEVER! I was more stating the fact that this passage, which calls Jesus, God (with or without a definite article), means that he is equal to God the Father. You may disagree but understand that I take the word (name) "God" very seriously; understand that "god" either means sinful and against God, or the true God. BUT GUESS WHAT KATIE, MY ARGUMENTS DIDN'T END THERE!

The issue that is on this line of thought is "does Jesus deserve to be worshipped", not the value of grammar. Because while you harped on the the grammer issue you must have forgotten about the other issues, so I'll bring them back to you again since they have more to do with this thread than grammer. You apply worship easily to Satan and not to Jesus Christ, and worship a child abusing god who sent his son who showed more love than this god of yours did.

If you want me to become a JW, then you are asking me to follow a sinful god that I apparently surpass.

You do not know a loving God who would do anything to persue his love, the human race.

You obey a harsh god which makes me understand more fully why you believe in works for salvation and why newWitness said "If Jesus is the God of the Old Testament he would have demanded to be worshipped." JW's are closer to Isalm than Christianity in terms of freedom from the Law and loving God.

Radvermin

"I do not nullify the grace of God, for if righteousness comes through the Law, then Christ died needlessly." Galatians 2:21



08-31-2006

#36

### newWitness

Member

Join Date: Aug 2006  
Posts: 695  
15 Reputation Points



I am not getting worked up over anything. I must say its Christendom that is getting worked up with our translation of "a god." Do you really understand what we are trying to convey? "a god" isn't meant as God in the sense that you are applying it. Its meant as a person of power(mighty one) just like elohim is used in the OT to address men of power there.

Lets look at this from a basic grammar point of view. If God was, is and always will be, you get an idea of him being in the past, present and future. In [John 1:1c](#), John writes and the Word was theos. Well if Jesus was God then he would still be God yet today, but by John saying the Word was(past tense) theos, then that means he isn't that anymore.

For example, Abraham Lincoln was a president, but he isn't the president anymore. So if Jesus was God, he should still be that today, again John said he was(past tense) Theos. This leads me to thing that theos in the sense wasn't meant to mean the almighty god.

If John wanted his readers to think Jesus is GOD then he might have said..."and the WORD is THEOS.

Just a thought.



08-31-2006

#37

### imJR

CARM Super Member

Join Date: Jan 2006  
Posts: 4,474  
99 Reputation Points



Nonsense. [John 1:1](#) is a historical statement. Didn't "In the beginning" give you a clue?

And, the attempt at comparison between Lincoln and Christ is quite pathetic. A president is only president for a length of time. God doesn't have a term limit.

And, as far as John wanting his readers to think Jesus is GOD, John does that. [John 14:9](#) would be one example (which, by the way, annihilates the JW idea of Jesus = Michael, because no angel would ever dare make the claim that's made there).

JR



08-31-2006

#38

### gwen

CARM Super Member





Join Date: Jan 2006  
Location: RI  
Posts: 535  
33 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **newWitness**  
*I am not getting worked up over anything. I must say its Christendom that is getting worked up with our translation of "a god." Do you really understand what we are tryiing to convey? "a god" isn't meant as God in the sense that you are applying it. Its meant as a person of power(mighty one) just like elohim is used in the OT to address men of power there.*

*Lets look at this from a basic grammar point of view. If God was, is and always will be, you get an idea of him being in the past, present and future. In [John 1:1c](#), John writes and the Word was theos. Well if Jesus was God then he would still be God yet today, but by John saying the Word was(past tense) theos, then that means he isn't that anymore. For example, Abraham Lincoln was a president, but he isn't the president anymore. So if Jesus was God, he should still be that today, again John said he was(past tense) Theos. This leads me to thing that theos in the sense wasn't meant to mean the almight god.*

*If John wanted his readers to think Jesus is GOD then he might have said..."and the WORD is THEOS.*

*Just a thought.*

And it is quite a thought I must say! I've been sitting here thinking about what you said and I asked myself questions.

- 1: How many times should the word WAS in that one verse have the meaning of (past tense)?
- 2: How many men of power (gods) , of the OT have died and still live ?
- 3: If the Word WAS a god, and then died, is the Word still a god today?
- 4: If the Word WAS with God, is the Word still with God today?

**"And now, as the critical year of 1975 enters, it may well be asked: Has the Most High God of prophecy made a name for himself? The answer is self-evident, Yes! By whom?... by Jehovah's Christian witnesses!"**7/15/1974  
Watchtower

Last edited by gwen : 08-31-2006 at 10:29 PM.



09-01-2006

#39

**katierussell**

Member

Join Date: May 2006  
Posts: 1,481  
16 Reputation Points



So, you may be "cute" as one poster thinks (but I disagree for the reasons I will now give), but you still are refusing to acknowledge your gross naive errors both in Greek and even English grammar! This shows that I should have no interest in what you think or post in this thread or any other and hence you are now on my ignore list. I have no wish to discuss with someone who refuses to learn what everyone else knows. That would be a waste of anyone's time. Best wishes.



09-01-2006

#40

**katierussell**



Member

Join Date: May 2006  
Posts: 1,481  
16 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by [radvermin](#)

*I was in error in the past and I thank you for shedding the light about JW's haven't argued "that they aren't the same with regard to the definate article."*

*HOWEVER! I was more stating the fact that this passage, which calls Jesus, God (with or without a definate article), means that he is equal to God the Father. You may disagree but understand that I take the word (name) "God" very seriously; understand that "god" either means sinful and against God, or the true God. BUT GUESS WHAT KATIE, MY ARGUMENTS DIDN'T END THERE!*

Your "argument" that "god" "either means sinful and against God, or the true God" is not based on scripture but on your presuppositions that are against scripture. There is nothing in the words that we translate as "god" that means what you say it means. One can, in biblical monotheism be a god without being sinful, without being against God, without being false and without being the true God! You are so far away from the scriptures I am amazed!

Quote:

The issue that is on this line of thought is "does Jesus deserve to be worshipped", not the value of grammar. Because while you harpped on the the grammer issue you must have forgotten about the other issues, so I'll bring them back to you again since they have more to do with this thread than grammer.

Wrong, I fogot nothing but choose to post as I saw fit which was a new thread of the old one in which I was only interested in one part of it.

Quote:

You apply worship easily to Satan and not to Jesus Christ, and worship a child abusing god who sent his son who showed more love than this god of yours did.

Wrong again, but worse. That "worship" of Satan is easliy applied by JW's is plain silly. That would be worship of one that is not God and while the Witnesses do no such thing the scriptures clearly shows the "world" doing so. What do the scriptures tell you that all you need to accept. And just because the JW's do not "worship" Jesus as God, which the scriptures never ever so state one should, does not mean we do not give to him what the scriptures tell us to. You are just arguing against the Witnesses position from your trinitarian one as you do not back up anything you say with scriptures. Did Jehovah want Abraham to "abuse" his son Isaac? That is what you have implied with your "[you] worship a child abusing god who sent his son [to die]" ! You also imply that the Father who sent his Son to die is also a "child abuser"! Is this what you believe??? And when you say "his son who showed more love than this god of yours did" you must think the Son showed more love than the Father did for the Father, God the Father, sent his Son, he did not come himelf to die! Is that what you want to believe? I will leave that to you!

The rest of your post is so way out it deserves nothing but revulsion from anyone who knows the scriptures. Enough said!



Post Reply

<< Previous Thread | Next Thread >>

Quick Reply

Message:

Please click one of the Quick Reply icons in the posts above to activate Quick Reply.

Options

Quote message in reply?

Post Quick Reply

Go Advanced

#### Posting Rules

You **may** post new threads  
 You **may** post replies  
 You **may not** post attachments  
 You **may** edit your posts

[vB code](#) is **On**  
[Smilies](#) are **On**  
[\[IMG\]](#) code is **On**  
 HTML code is **Off**

All times are GMT -4. The time now is 07:53 AM.

As of July 6, 2006, Total Page Views: 22,355,280, Page Views Today: 22,355,280

-- Default Style 

[Contact Us](#) - [Christian Discussion Forums](#) - [Archive](#) - [To](#)

Powered by vBulletin® Version 3.6.7  
 Copyright ©2000 - 2007, Jelsoft Enterprises Ltd.  
 copyright CARM 2006,2007

Get Weather for any City, State, Zipcode, or Country:

Fast Forecast