



CARM.ORG - Christian Discussion Forums > RELIGIONS > Jehovah's Witnesses
How can Jesus be Worshipped if only 'a god' II

Welcome, **tkkclark**.
You last visited: 1 Hour Ago at 06:19 AM
Instant Messages: Unread 0, Total 0.

User CP FAQ Donate Members List Calendar New Posts Search Quick Links Log Out



Page 3 of 8 < 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 > Last »

Thread Tools Search this Thread Rating: ★★★★★ Display Modes

09-01-2006

#41

faithful281

CARM Super Member



Join Date: Mar 2006
Location: Washington
Gender: ♂
Posts: 726
44 Reputation Points

[quote=katierussell;480230]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?

["In the beginning [or "origin," Greek,] was the Word, and the Word was with God." Contrary to the translations of The Emphatic Diaglott and the New World Translation, the grammatical construction (Greek) leaves no doubt whatsoever that this is the only possible rendering of the text. The subject of the sentence is Word, the verb was. There can be no direct object following "was" since according to grammatical usage intransitive verbs take no objects but take instead predicate nominatives, which refer back to the subject-in this case, Word. The late New Testament Greek scholar Dr. E. C. Colwell formulated a rule that clearly states that a definite predicate nominative (in this case, God) never takes an article when it precedes the verb (was), as we find in John 1:1. It is therefore easy to see that no article is needed for (God), and to translate it "a god" is both incorrect grammar and poor Greek since is the predicate nominative of was in the third sentence-clause of the verse and must refer back to the subject. Word. Christ, if He is the Word "made flesh" (John 1:14), can be no one else except God unless the Greek text and consequently God's Word be denied.

Examine these passages where the definite article is not used with and see if the rendering "a God" makes sense: Matt. 3:9; 6:24; Luke 1:35, 78; 2:40; John 1:6, 12-13, 18; 3:2, 21; 9:16, 33; Romans 1:7, 17-18; 1 Cor. 1:30; 15:10; Philp. 2:11-13; Titus 1:1. For one to be consistent in this rendering of "a god," Jehovah's Witnesses would have to translate every instance where the article is absent as "a god" (nominative), "of a god" (genitive), "to" or "for a god" (dative), etc. This the Jehovah's Witnesses have not done in Matt. 3:9; 6:24; Luke 1:35, 78; John 1:6, 12-13, 18; Romans 1:7, 17, etc. How can you

render "a god" in [John 1:1](#), you cannot, and then render "of God" (Jehovah) in Matt. 3:9, [Luke 1:35, 78](#); [John 1:6](#), etc., when is the genitive case of the same noun (second declension), without an article and must be rendered (following Jehovah's Witnesses argument) "of a god" not "of God" as both The Emphatic Diaglott and New World Translation put it. Why not consult the Greek New Testament by either D. Erwin Nestle or Westcott and Hort, in conjunction with The Elements of Greek by Francis Kingsely Ball on noun endings, etc. Then if the Jehovah's Witnesses must persist in this fallacious "a god" rendition, they can at least be consistent, which they are not, and render every instance where the article is absent in the same manner. The truth of the matter is that Jehovah's Witnesses use and remove the articular emphasis whenever and wherever it suits their fancy, regardless of grammatical laws to the contrary. When you have a translation as important as God's Word, every law must be observed. Jehovah's Witnesses have not been consistent in their observances of those laws. The Watchtower has exhibited another trait common to Jehovah's Witnesses-that of half-quoting or misquoting a recognized authority to bolster their ungrammatical renditions. On page 776 in an appendix to the New Word Translation of the Christian Greek Scriptures, when quoting Dr. A. T. Robertson's words, "Among the ancient writers was used of the god of absolute religion in distinction from the mythological gods," they fail to note that in the second sentence following, Dr. Robertson says, "In the New Testament, however, while we have ([John 1:1-2](#)) it is far more common to find simply, especially in the Epistles." In other words, the writers of the New Testament frequently do not use the article with, and yet the meaning is perfectly clear in the context, namely that the one true God is intended. Let one examine the following references where in successive verses (and even in the same sentence) the article is used with one occurrence of and not with another form, and it will be absolutely clear that no such drastic inferences can be drawn from John's usage in [John 1:1-2](#) (Matt. 4:3-4; 12:28; [Luke 20:37-38](#); [John 3:2](#); [Acts 5:29-30](#); [Romans 1:7-8, 17-19](#); 2:16-17; 3:5; 4:2-3). The doctrine of the article is important in Greek; it is not used indiscriminately. But we are not qualified to be sure in all cases what is intended. Dr. Robertson is careful to note that "it is only of recent years that a really scientific study of the article has been made." The facts are not all known, and no such drastic conclusion, as the writers of the appendix note, should be dogmatically affirmed. It is insane to say that a simple noun can be rendered "divine," and yet, at the same time, that same noun without the article conveys merely the idea of quality. The authors of this note later render the same noun as "a god," not as "a quality." This is self-contradiction in the context. Furthermore, and in conclusion, the position of the writers of this note is made clear in an appendix to the New Word Translation of the Christian Greek Scriptures (p. 774): according to them it is "unreasonable" that the Word (Christ) should be the God with whom He was ([John 1:1](#)). Their own manifestly erring reason is made the criterion for determining scriptural truth. One need only note the obvious misuse in their quotation from Dana and Mantley (pp. 774-775). Mantley clearly means that the "Word was deity" in accord with the overwhelming testimony of Scripture, but the writers have dragged in the interpretation "a god" to suit their own purpose which purpose is the denial of Christ's deity, and as a result a denial of the Word of God. The late Dr. Mantley publicly stated that he was quoted out of context, and he personally wrote the Watchtower, declaring, "there is no statement in our grammar that was ever meant to imply that "a god" was a permissible translation in [John 1:1](#): and "it is neither scholarly nor reasonable to translate [John 1:1](#) 'The Word was a god.'"

Information obtained from Walter Martin's book Kingdom of the Cults./QUOTE]



katierussell

Member

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



I do not honestly think you understand what you have just posted!

Lets look at one example from Walter Martin shall we?

[Matthew 3:9.](#)

Martin, as you appear to quote him asserts:

Quote:

Examine these passages where the definite article is not used with and see if the rendering "a God" makes sense: Matt. 3:9;..

But here theos **has** the definite article!

Martin also cites Colwell.....sorry, but any attmpts to use that rule to determine if a noun in the predicate when before the verb is definite has been debunked along time ago!

Faithfull, did you just copy/paste this stuff without even checking it? Looks like it! Dear Oh dear!



09-01-2006

#43

faithful281

CARM Super Member



Join Date: Mar 2006
Location: Washington
Gender: ♂
Posts: 726
44 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by **katierussell**

I do not honestly think you understand what you have just posted!

Lets look at one example from Walter Martin shall we?

[Matthew 3:9.](#)

Martin, as you appear to quote him asserts:

*But here theos **has** the definite article!*

Martin also cites Colwell.....sorry, but any attmpts to use that rule to determine if a noun in the predicate when before the verb is definite has been debunked along time ago!

Faithfull, did you just copy/paste this stuff without even checking it? Looks like it! Dear Oh dear!

Do you just follow all the lies the Watchtower tells you without checking them out first? Sure sounds like it!



09-01-2006

#44

katierussell

Member

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



Rather than just admit you did not either understand or check that stuff up or both(and I shew you you didn't do either or both did I not? Yes, I did but you do not even acknowledge this!)you say to me:

Quote:

Do you just follow all the lies the Watchtower tells you without checking them out first? Sure sounds like it!"

Excuse me! What "lies" have I spoken in this thread? In fact I shew you one place where it appears that Martin 'lied' re [Matthew 3:9](#). But that 'lie' was OK for you wasn't it! So it just seems to me that when you get caught out posting stuff that you do not understand, have not checked up and is practically worthless (re Martin's 'use' of 'Colwell's Rule' remember! Of course you 'remember' but you ignore it don't you!) you just kick out in all directions like a spoilt child! Dear Oh dear once again! You are No.3 on my ignore list as I see that you can not and do not discuss anything for the reasons given above!



09-01-2006

#45

[katierussell](#)

Member

Join Date: May 2006

Posts: 1,481

16 Reputation Points

And just to keep this exchange alive which I think it ought to be may I repost two posts from that earlier one.

Quote:

Originally Posted by [Robert_V_Frazier](#)

You have never studied Greek. You cannot read it. And believe me, it shows. It's the same word, theos, in both clauses. Yes, obviously it's used in two different senses, since a person cannot be with another person and also be that same person. The first occurrence of theos in [John 1:1](#) is accusative because it's the object of the preposition pros. The second occurrence is a predicat nominative. It is being used as an adjective, defining what the nature of the Word is. To wit, that He is GOD. Not the same Person as the GOD whom He is with (the Father), but the same GOD.

"Like God" is a total mistranslation. "Divine" is a good translation, provided you understand it to mean: "having all of the unique attributes which make GOD, GOD, as distinct from all non-GOD beings in the universe". Unfortunately, most JW's prefer to define it as "sorta goddish, in a vague, ill-defined way".

Jesus is GOD in exactly the same sense as the Father is GOD. That is what John clearly conveyed, and that is what you JW's stubbornly refuse to believe.

What does the KJV have to do with it? Every accurate translation of [John 1:1](#) that is at all literal translates it the same way. "and the Word was God," is the best literal translation possible. If you don't want to go for literalness, "and the Word was everything that God was, having all of the attributes that make God uniquely God," does convey what John meant more clearly.

Robert V Frazier

You state in reference to theos of [John 1:1](#) that "Yes, obviously it's used in two different senses, since a person cannot be with another person and also be that same person." But John is not writing in terms of "person," but in terms of theos. So it would have been more in line with what John wrote to have said: "Yes, obviously [theos is] used in two different senses, since [one theos] cannot be with another [theos] and also be that same [theos]." Exactly! Your own reasoning if applied to what John actually wrote means that the Word is not the same theos as the one he is with. We have then two whom are theos. But to translate the anarthrous theos as "God" one is making that "God" the same "God" that it is with! Modalism

And if theos is being used in "two different senses"(and I agree it is) would you not agree that in an English translation one would then have to show this? But translating it as "and the Word was with God and the Word was God" certainly does not!" So how can you say ""and the Word was God," is the best literal translation possible."? This translation does not bring out what you say are the two different sense theos is being used with in this place! Therefore "and the Word of God" is certainly not the "best literal translation possible"

If you think that theos here at 1:1c is being used an adjective then please supply us all with an English translation that uses an English adjective not an English noun!!!

You next write: "The second occurrence is a predicate nominative. It is being used as an adjective, defining what the nature of the Word is. To wit, that He is GOD. Not the same Person as the GOD whom He is with (the Father), but the same GOD." But if the anarthrous theos is being used as an adjective then why have you said it means "He is GOD"? (I have no idea why you caps all letters though!). God is not an adjective! It is a noun and in English is used as a proper noun. Yes, theos here indicates "what the nature of the Word is" but then how can one translate it as "God" when in English "God" is not an adjective?

If you think the anarthrous theos denotes the nature of the Word and hence does not identify him then you can not have "and the Word was God" for the reason that "God" is not an adjective and it identifies him! And it identifies him as the God he was with! Modalism!

And why do you say "Divine" is a good translation? "Divine" with its captial is not an adjective either! But "divine" would be.



09-01-2006

#46

faithful281

CARM Super Member



Join Date: Mar 2006
Location: Washington
Gender:
Posts: 726
 44 Reputation Points

[quote=katierussell;482242]Rather than just admit you did not either understand or check that stuff up or both(and I shew you you didn't do either or both did I not? Yes, I did but you do not even acknowledge this!)you say to me:

Excuse me! What "lies" have I spoken in this thread? In fact I shew you one place where it appears that Martin 'lied' re [Matthew 3:9](#). But that 'lie' was OK for you wasn't it! So it just seems to me that when you get caught out posting stuff that you do not understand, have not checked up and is practically worthless (re Martin's 'use' of 'Colwell's Rule' remember! Of course you 'remember' but you ignore it don't you!) you just kick out in all directions like a spoilt child! Dear Oh dear once again! You are No.3 on my ignore list as I see that you can not and do not discuss anything for the reasons given above!

[First of if it was a lie then no it is not okay, Secondly, by the Watchtower claiming that the Word was "a god" is a lie. Even the Chruch fathers agree with the rendering of [John 1:1](#) "the Word was God." Who the Watchtower has misquoted in their booklet "Should You Believe In the Trinity?" And yes I have checked this out and there is no lie found in Martin's information. Omission of the definite article with does not mean that "a god" other than the one true God is meant. And if you would take the time to check out the verse in question or verses in question you might see where the definite article is not used with and see if the rendering "a god" makes sense./QUOTE]



09-01-2006

#47

newWitness

Member

Join Date: Aug 2006
Posts: 695
 15 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **gwen**

1: How many times should the word WAS in that one verse have the meaning of (past tense)?

Answer: All of them.

2: How many men of power (gods) , of the OT have died and still live ?

Answer: None of them are alive today, that is they were termed (gods). I am glad that you finally accept that men of power were termed that because Jesus was termed that in [John 1:1c](#)

3: If the Word WAS a god, and then died, is the Word still a god today?

Answer: Yes, he is a god(mighty one) today, because he was raised the firstborn of the dead to eternal life. by GOD He made the way you know.

4: If the Word WAS with God, is the Word still with God today?

Answer: Yes.

You have made my point, John knew that Jesus wasn't GOD because God is,was and always will be. John knew that God wasn't in the PAST.

Listen, *****that Jesus isn't God. I will try and try with thoughts to get you to understand. We have shown you where the greek is not consistantly translated because of bias and you still don't believe us. We have gone to the ends of the world to get you to understand and you won't.

Last edited by moderator13 : 09-01-2006 at 05:10 AM.



09-01-2006

#48

newWitness

Member

Join Date: Aug 2006
Posts: 695
15 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by **imJR**

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.

>>> That is my point, GOD is eternally outside of time. Jesus died, God cannot. So my comparison to Lincoln was sufficient.

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).

>>> I will get back to you on this one. I have to the kids ready for school.

JR



09-01-2006

#49

tkkclark

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006
Posts: 275
18 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by **katierussell**

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! I can actually see what you wrote!

Katie, I beg of you, **PLEASE** increase the font size of your posts (and I know I'm not the first to ask that you do so). My vision isn't so hot to start with and frankly, since you started miniaturizing the fonts on your posts, I've skipped reading a lot of them. Too much close reading gives me migraines.

Anyway, in regards to the above...First of all, loaded language. You do this quite a lot. You may believe a position is "not based on Scripture" -- but I can make the same claim. I can also claim "your presuppositions are against scripture." It's LOADED language. In writing as such, you equate your opinion, your personal interpretation with Scripture and anyone who disagrees with you or your interpretation is going against Scripture.

Not quite.

If/when people disagree with you, they are not going against Scripture. They are disagreeing with **your interpretation** of Scripture. There is a difference.



Also, in regard to the quotation above...False. [John 17:3](#) says there is only one true God:

John 17:3 *"This is eternal life, that they may know You, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom You have sent. (NASB)*

The simple fact of the matter is lexicons, Bible dictionaries, etc far and wide define *alethinous* therein as representing a true vs false sense. There is only one true (vs valse) God.

[John 17:3](#) is very much Scripture; the argument is, therefore, based on Scripture. Your claim that it is only "presuppositions" that undergird this position is incorrect.

Quote:

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!

Again, loaded language. "You are so far away from scripture..." The same claim could be made by me, applicable to you. I (and others) disagree with **your interpretation** of Scriptures. We **do not** disagree with Scripture. **There is a difference.**

In regards to the contents of the above quote...There are figurative gods in the Bible. Representatives of God who are so called because they exercise God's authority. That, however, doesn't change the essence, the nature of what these creatures, created beings are.

Monotheism is the belief in one God. Monotheism is not the belief in one God worthy of worship and a bunch of lesser-though-legitimate, derived gods. You may believe your position is biblical, but that is **only** your opinion. I (gasp) disagree. I believe the Scriptures clearly state there is only one God. As such, I can slap "biblical" in front of my every reference to "monotheism" -- it doesn't make my argument any more credible. Nor does it make **your** argument any more credible, either. Slapping "biblical" in front of "monotheism" is just one more instance of LOADED LANGUAGE.

Quote:

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.

Quite understandable. I was interested in the discussion on 1:1a, which is no longer ongoing in this thread, but alas, I still wait for anyone to prove the Word isn't eternal and uncreated in 1:1a. I think I'm going to be waiting a loooooooooooooooooooooong, long time.

Quote:

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.

Agreed. Satan is a false God and receives worship from unbelievers.

Quote:

What do the scriptures tell you that all you need to accept.

Loaded language. Again.

I accept Scripture, Katie.

I simply do not accept **your interpretation** of Scripture.

Quote:

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.

More loaded language -- "...give what the Scriptures tell us to." I can just as easily say the Scriptures are telling me to worship Jesus. Again, I accept Scripture. I simply do not accept **your interpretation** of Scripture.

There are several instances of *proskuneo* in reference to Jesus in the NT and we've discussed previously whether *proskuneo* was **demonstrably** worship or **demonstrably** the lesser obeisance the NWT demands. Or rather I wanted to discuss it. If I remember right, you said you didn't want to talk about it. Well, that's just fine but it doesn't change what the NT shows us. Jesus is **demonstrably** worshipped. Hurtado's six areas of cultic devotion to Jesus: prayer, confessing/invoking Jesus, baptism in Jesus' name, Jesus hymns, the Lord's Supper, and prophecy.

Can you tell me why those devotional practices in the NT are **not** demonstrably acts of worship???

Quote:

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

More loaded language -- "anyone who knows the scriptures." You imply if we do not agree with your position, we don't know the Scriptures. People are perfectly capable of knowing the Scriptures -- without agreeing with your interpretation, Katie.

And could you **please** be more insulting?

Abusive language (and loaded language) reflects poorly on those who use it -- **not** on those parties to which such language is targeted.



09-01-2006

#50

tkkclark

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006

Posts: 275

18 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **newWitness**

Answer: Yes.

You have made my point, John knew that Jesus wasn't GOD because God is, was and always will be. John knew that God wasn't in the PAST.

I think maybe that must've been a typo on your part. God was certainly in the past. God's eternal. I think you meant that you believe Jesus wasn't in the past?

Do you mean Jesus isn't eternal like this?:

Hebrews 13:8 *Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and today and forever.*
(NASB)

Also, look to the imperfect *en* as pointing to continued existence in John's prologue. He eternally predates *en arche, the beginning* in [John 1:1](#). Whenever, wherever you define the beginning, Jesus was there.

Quote:

Oh, goodie. More loaded language. Implying anyone who disagrees with your position lacks common sense. Yep, attack the people who disagree with you, that's always fun -- and reflects poorly **on you**.

Last edited by moderator9 : 09-01-2006 at 06:22 AM.



09-01-2006

#51

imJR

CARM Super Member

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



Originally Posted by imJR
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.

>>> That is my point, GOD is eternally outside of time. Jesus died, God cannot. So my comparison to Lincoln was sufficient.

Whoever told you that "GOD is eternally outside of time"?? That's sheer drive! God is a God of revelation - That means He gets involved in time/space events. The Scripture records those events MANY times. The Incarnation is exactly that - a time/space event. No, your comparison to Lincoln was and is pathetic.

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).

>>> I will get back to you on this one. I have to the kids ready for school.

What angel would ever dare claim, "If you've seen me, you've seen God." Because that's just who Philip was asking to see in verse 8.



09-01-2006

#52

tkkclark

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006
Posts: 275
18 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by **faithful281**
[First of if it was a lie then no it is not okay, Secondly, by the Watchtower claiming that the Word was "a god" is a lie. Even the Church fathers agree with the rendering of [John 1:1](#) "the Word was God."

This is true. I'd have to dig, but I've got ANF quotes somewhere on my hard drive that indicate that ANFs interpreted God in 1:1c as THE God. Tertullian addressed the matter of there being (or rather not being) two gods, particularly. And several others listed 1:1 in the context of proofs of Jesus as God.

Quote:

Who the Watchtower has misquoted in their booklet "Should You Believe In the Trinity?" And yes I have checked this out...

Me, too. I recommend a reading of the earliest ANFs to anyone. Ignatius' letters aren't long. The average reader could get through Ignatius' material in no more than an hour and he refers to Jesus as God many times throughout. Ignatius even says "God's blood" (perhaps an allusion to [Acts 20:28](#), also disputed by the WTS).

Quote:

...Omission of the definite article with does not mean that "a god" other than the one true God is meant.

A secondhand quote from Murray J. Harris:

Quote:

ho theos and *theos* are often used interchangeable. ([Jesus as God](#) p. 37)

(Harris used Greek characters for *ho theos* and *theos* above, btw.)

And:

Quote:

It is therefore not possible to maintain that whenever *theos* is anarthrous, it differs from *ho theos* in meaning or emphasis. (*ibid*, p. 38)

(Again, Harris used Greek characters for *ho theos* and *theos* above.)

Omitting the article may be demanded for other reasons that have nothing to do with whether or not THE God is being referred to.



09-01-2006

#53

[katierussell](#)

Member

Join Date: May 2006

Posts: 1,481

16 Reputation Points



Your "secondhand quote"

Quote:

ho theos and *theos* are often used interchangeable. ([Jesus as God](#) p. 37)

is misleading. Harris was not dealing with the distinction in sense of the two occurrences of *theos* in [John 1:1c](#) on that page but on the general usage in John! And of course, as the Word is the subject of [John 1:1](#) and he is said to be with *ho theos* then the second anarthrous *theos* is not the same referent!

And your second quote from Harris:

Quote:

It is therefore not possible to maintain that whenever *theos* is anarthrous, it differs from *ho theos* in meaning or emphasis. (*ibid*, p. 38)

is again very very misleading. Harris is quite clear on pp.59, 60 that, to quote him:

Quote:

3. Reasons for the Anarthrous State theos.

In light of the fact that in the preceding clause John has written pros ton theon, it would seem fair to assume that the anarthrous state of theos in 1:1c is not without significance. It would be improper to question this assumption that since no distinction can be drawn between theos and ho theos in the usage of the Fourth Gospel, John might have equally well have written ho logos en pros ton theon, kai ho theos en ho logos. All that Johannine usage shows is that there is no *necessary* distinction between theos and ho theos, both terms generally referring to the Father. But an *actual* differentiation between the terms can not be excluded at any point, especially where an articular use and an anarthrous use of theos occur in succession, the first theos clearly referring to the Father and the second being predicated of the Logos.

-italics his.

Of course, further on Harris shows that there is a different sense to ho theos and theos in this opening sentence of John

This shows one should not rely on "secondhand" quotes!



09-01-2006

#54

moderator13

Moderator

Join Date: Jan 2006
Location: Pennsylvania
Posts: 672
19 Reputation Points



WARNING To NewWitness: You will not insult other poster's intelligence in the manner you have. Your post has been edited, and your insult has been deleted. Do not do this again.

Moderator13



09-01-2006

#55

AmazingGrace

CARM Super Member



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



Katie, no one can read this because your font is so tiny - that is what he is talking about above. Please make it bigger. thanks and God bless you today.

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](#)



09-01-2006

#56

katierussell

Member

Join Date: May 2006
Posts: 1,481



Thats strange as my posts font size is larger than yours is to me!

Tell me what size you prefer from the following:

16 Reputation Points

"Life is what happens to you when you are making other plans"

"Life is what happens to you when you are making other plans"

"Life is what happens to you when you are making other plans"

"Life is what happens to you when you are making other plans"



09-01-2006

#57

[tkkclark](#)

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006

Posts: 275

18 Reputation Points



KATIE, I AM LITERALLY BEGGING YOU HERE. PLEASE CHANGE YOUR FONT SIZE! I AM GOING BLIND TRYING TO READ YOUR POSTS!

Quote:

Originally Posted by [katie russell](#)

Your "secondhand quote"...is misleading. Harris was not dealing with the distinction in sense of the two occurrences of theos in [John 1:1c](#) on that page but on the general usage in John!

[John 1:1](#) is a part of John, correct?

Quote:

And of course, as the Word is the subject of [John 1:1](#) and he is said to be with no theos then the second anarthrous theos is not the same referent!

I don't think I ever disagreed. The *theos* in 1:1b is a different person than 1:1c.

Quote:

And your second quote from Harris:...is again very very misleading. Harris is quite clear on pp.59, 60 that, to quote him:...Of course, further on Harris shows that there is a different sense to ho theos and theos in this opening sentence of John

I'm not disagreeing. Theos in 1:1c **is** used in a different sense than in 1:1b. I just don't think the text demands the "a god" sense you insist. Anarthrous *theos* does not automatically equate to "a god."

Quote:

This shows one should not rely on "secondhand" quotes!

Agreed. I really do need that book and again, my general appeal to the board --- if anyone knows how I can get my hands on a copy, PM me!



09-01-2006

#58

[tkkclark](#)


Member

Join Date: Apr 2006

Posts: 275

18 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by [katierussell](#) 

Thats strange as my posts font size is larger than yours is to me!

Tell me what size you prefer from the following:

"Life is what happens to you when you are making other plans"

I'm going blind.

"Life is what happens to you when you are making other plans"

I think this one's the default.

"Life is what happens to you when you are making other plans"

n/a

"Life is what happens to you when you are making other plans"

n/a



09-01-2006

#59

[AmazingGrace](#)

CARM Super Member



Join Date: Jun 2006


Location: Columbus, OH

Gender: ♀

Posts: 2,682

56 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by [katierussell](#) 

Thats strange as my posts font size is larger than yours is to me!

Tell me what size you prefer from the following:

"Life is what happens to you when you are making other plans"

"Life is what happens to you when you are making other plans"

"Life is what happens to you when you are making other plans"

"Life is what happens to you when you are making other plans"

It was very, very small. That is why he asked if it was a list of ingredients or terms of service. It looked like fine print.

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](#)



09-01-2006

#60

[katierussell](#)

Member

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



Which size was ok then?? You didn't say. Strange then that it appears to me rather large and easy to see. This is font size 4. OK?



Page 3 of 8 < 1 2 **3** 4 5 6 7 > Last »

<< [Previous Thread](#) | [Next Thread](#) >>

Quick Reply

Message:

B
I
U
A
▼

ABC
↑
↓
A

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

[Options](#)

Quote message in reply?

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: 22,355,281, Page Views Today: 22,355,281

-- Default Style

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

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: