



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 4 of 8 < 1 2 3 **4** 5 6 7 8 > ▾

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

09-01-2006

#61

katierussell

Member

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



Loaded language filled posts deserves little but loaded language back in return. So thats what radvermin got! And as for monotheism. Most definitions of monotheism I see here are really trinitarian monotheism which wrongly restricts the meaning and application of the terms el, elohim and theos. Biblical monotheism allows for others not God to be called such. There is nothing of the "a god" translation that conflicts with biblical monotheism whether trinitarians choose to accept it or not. And as for "insulting" language. Read radvermins as he wrote as he did and got back what he wrote to me. And see where faithful says what I do and what "lies" I follow. Insulting? Abusive? Yes, of course it is if you think mine was! Loaded language? Of course it is. But where were you when they were doing that? No where for they are not JW's are they! You yourself then show your true biased colors.



09-01-2006

#62

AmazingGrace

CARM Super Member



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



i'm sorry, the second one was fine. What you just typed is huge. I'm thinking you may have clicked on the HTML code or something. Check the bottom left corner of the screen under posting rules. It is the very last line.

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

#63

[truffy](#)

Inactive



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

Quote:

Originally Posted by [katie russell](#)
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?

Katie, this one I'm typing right now is the default, so you don't need that bigger monstrous and mean-looking font to try to prove a circular discussion about the fonts. I asked you before if you can wait for my book ordered about [John 1:1](#) and to be studied. So you didn't reply to my question. Are you in such a big hurry with me, for I know pressure is mounting on you for me to make a quick answer? Let's wait Katie and please be kind and patient. Patience is a virtue for me, patience is a virtuoso for you when it comes to your artistic talents with your fonts. 😊

Tim 😊😊😊



09-01-2006

#64

[tkkclark](#)

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006
Posts: 275
18 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by [katie russell](#)
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?

Katie, this one's fine. It shows up bigger than everyone else's, but at least I can read it. If you want the same size as everybody else's, just don't use the size HTML tags at the front of your posts, delete them right out and you'll automatically revert to the Board default. If it makes any difference, though, if you want to keep on using the size HTML tag, the board default is a size=2, the second line of your "Life is what happens when..." stuff.

But truly, sincerely, THANK YOU!!!! for upping the size. I can read your posts much better now.



09-01-2006

#65

[katie russell](#)

Member

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

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

I was showing how your quotation was misleading or at least how one might be misled by it. I was right then to show that Harris did *not* think that theos and ho theos were "interchangable" in [John 1:1](#)! Your quotation of him was on

John's general usage. Not on his analysis of [John 1:1](#)! You really ought not to rely on "secondhand" quotes. This should teach you why.

John did not *write* in terms of "person". Thats you reading post-biblical thoughts into what John wrote. He wrote in terms of theos not in terms of "person." A translation then should make the same differentiation John does should they not? Yes, that the Word was a "**different**" *theos* than the one in [John 1:1b](#)!

And no one has simply argued that an anarthrous theos automatically means that it is then indefinite! I have not, the NWTTC have not! They have argued that in *this sentence structure* a noun is indefinite not definite which the translation "and the Word was God" translate it to be. To translate it as "and the Word was God" is to understand the anarthrous theos as definite, ho theos. That is wrong and some scholars have expressed that it is.

You write though: "Theos in 1:1c is used in a different sense than in 1:1b."

Then tell me if theos of [John 1:1c](#) and the ho theos of 1:1b have different senses if those different senses are brought out in the translation "the Word was with God and and the Word was God"? It does not does it!



09-01-2006

#66

[katierussell](#)

Member

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



Just to be awkward I am going to opt for font size 3. That should not be too large me thinks.



09-01-2006

#67

[truffy](#)

Inactive



Join Date: Jul 2006



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*

Posts: 1,593
27 Reputation Points

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.

Elohim is called a God numerous times in both our Bibles. If you say the words specifically uses capital or small case, that does not apply in the original Greek manuscripts. Our reasoning would say if you put two persons who can be called a God or God, and they both have Mighty God essences, then both should be treated the same whether a God or a god. So, if Jehovah is a God or a god as the Greek would say without capital G, how can you destine one as a creature and one is not?

As for the 'was God' issue, if you look at the beginning of the sentence, it starts with "In the beginning..." This is why John was portraying Him as was God, for the beginning was in the past. In [Acts 2:32-33](#) Paul wrote... 32 God has raised this Jesus to life, and we are all witnesses of the fact. 33 Exalted to the right hand of God, he has received from the Father the promised Holy Spirit and has poured out what you now see and hear. So you are claiming Jesus lost His power as God....and then He got it back again....exalted in what way I would ask? And why would you think He lost His power in the first place? Your theology is much more confusing than ours, and you JWs somehow thought our Trinity was too hard to understand?

Tim 😊😊😊



09-01-2006

#68

[tkkclark](#)

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006
Posts: 275
18 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by [katierussell](#) Loaded langauge filled posts deserves little but loaded language back in return. So thats what radvermin got!

Loaded language is wrong -- regardless of who is using it. If radvermin was using loaded language, that was wrong. Just as it was wrong for you to reply with it.

Quote:

And as for monotheism. Most definitions of monotheism I see here are really trinitarian monotheism which wrongly restricts the meaning and application of the terms el, elohim and theos.

If you want to discuss the trinity, there's another forum for that.

As for monotheism...It's the belief in one God. All other gods are false or figurative. Please note that I didn't mention the Trinity even once.

Quote:

Biblical monotheism allows for others not God to be called such.

Certainly. They are called gods falsely or figuratively.

Quote:

There is nothing of the "a god" translation that conflicts with biblical monotheism whether trinitarians choose to accept it or not.

See my comments in regards to using "biblical" as a preface to "monotheism." Saying your monotheism is biblical doesn't add credibility to your argument. It really doesn't.

Quote:

And as for "insulting" language. Read radvermins as he wrote as he did and got back what he wrote to me. And see where faithful says what I do and what "lies" I follow. Insulting? Abusive? Yes, of course it is if you think mine was! Loaded language? Of course it is. But where were you when they were doing that? No where for they are not JW's are they! You yourself then show your true biased colors.

So...2 wrongs = 1 right?

Katie, I am not CARM's appointed Loaded Language Gestapo. It is not my job to go around this forum pointing out every instance of loaded language.

Do I criticize it in non-JWs?

No, not really. If I have, I can't remember doing it, at any rate.

For one, I don't respond to other posters near as much as I reply to your posts, certainly not enough to notice a pattern of habitual use.

And for another, I'm not going to chastise/criticize people who share my position in whatever we're discussing. That's YOUR job, as the opposing party. If that makes me biased, so be it. *shrug*

If you notice loaded language in somebody you're talking to, by all means, say so. I don't have a corner on the market, for goodness sake.



09-01-2006

#69

AmazingGrace

CARM Super Member



Join Date: Jun 2006
Location: Columbus, OH



And if he wasn't God, why would [Acts 3:15](#) say this:

[Acts 3:15](#) (Amplified Bible)

15But you killed the very Source (the Author) of life, Whom God raised from the dead. To this we are witnesses.

Not to mention that in the following verse, he is shown to be God & man:

Gender: ♀
Posts: 2,682
56 Reputation Points

[Acts 2:36](#) (Amplified Bible)

36Therefore let the whole house of Israel recognize beyond all doubt and acknowledge assuredly that God has made Him **both Lord and Christ** (the Messiah)--this Jesus Whom you crucified.

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

#70

AmazingGrace

CARM Super Member



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

Is he or isn't he????

Quote:

Originally Posted by **AmazingGrace**
And if he wasn't God, why would [Acts 3:15](#) say this:

[Acts 3:15](#) (Amplified Bible)

15But you killed the very Source (the Author) of life, Whom God raised from the dead. To this we are witnesses.

Not to mention that in the following verse, he is shown to be God & man:

[Acts 2:36](#) (Amplified Bible)

*36Therefore let the whole house of Israel recognize beyond all doubt and acknowledge assuredly that God has made Him **both Lord and Christ** (the Messiah)--this Jesus Whom you crucified.*

Websters defines AUTHOR in relation to Deity this way:

Deity

God, Lord, Jehovah, Jahweh, Allah; The Almighty, The Supreme Being, The First Cause, the Prime Mover; Ens Entium; **Author** of all things, Creator of all things; **Author** of our being; Cosmoplast; El; The Infinite, The Eternal; The All-powerful The All-wise, The All-merciful, The All-holy.

And on top of these things above, I want you to see how AUTHOR is defined by Websters:

One of the general definition's by Websters:

2. An **author** is someone who originates or causes or initiates something.

And we see Jesus as Author here [Hebrews 2:10](#) - Author of our salvation; and in [Hebrews 12:2](#) - Author & perfecter of our faith.

You can haggle your grammar any way you want - you will never make Jesus 'a god' - HE WONT LET YOU!!! Thank you Jesus that you expose the doctrine of demons at every turn!!

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](#)

Last edited by AmazingGrace : 09-01-2006 at 08:06 AM.



09-01-2006

#71

[tkkclark](#)

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006

Posts: 275

18 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by [katierussell](#)

I was showing how your quotation was misleading or at least how one might be misled by it. I was right then to show that Harris did not think that theos and ho theos were "interchangable" in [John 1:1](#)! Your quotation of him was on John's general usage. Not on his analysis of [John 1:1](#)!

You are absolutely right. Mondo and I got into a scrap over the very same thing in regards to Robertson and the imperfect *en* in 1:1a. He posted Robertson discussing general usage, so to speak (in that imperfects do not always point to continued action) while I posted about Robertson talking specifically about 1:1a specifically **as** pointing to continued action (existence).

Quote:

You really ought not to rely on "secondhand" quotes. This should teach you why.

Point taken. The secondary source didn't have much in the way of context and without the primary source to check against, may have misrepresented what Harris said. You're right (don't fall off your chair), I withdraw the quote.

Quote:

John did not *write* in terms of "person". Thats you reading post-biblical thoughts into what John wrote. He wrote in terms of theos not in terms of "person."

Vincent's Word Studies on 1:1c:

Quote:

The word God, **used attributively**, maintains the personal distinction between God and the Word, but makes the unity of essence and nature to follow the distinction of person, and ascribes to the Word all the attributes of the divine essence. (Emphasis mine.)

Was *theos* in 1:1b used attributively? 1:1c points to *theos* attributively (to use Vincent's word), like an adjective: what God is, the Word is.

I really need to c/p over your reply to Robert a pg or two ago and adjust the font up so I can read your response. I'm afraid that was one of the posts I skipped because of the small type.

Basically, John **did** speak of *theos* in terms of person. By omitting the article in 1:1c, John states very clearly that the Word in 1:1c is not interchangeably identical with the *theos* in 1:1b, but the Word in 1:1c shares the same nature of the *theos* in 1:1b.

Quote:

A translation then should make the same differentiation John does should they not?

The problem we have is -- what sort of differentiation does the text demand? I do not see that the text demands two separate *theos*. One *theos* in 1:1b is **accusative** (being the object of the preposition *pros*, both noted by RWP and VWS). The other is **attributive** (like an adjective): what *theos* is, the Word is. The different uses of *theos* here simply does not demand two separate people.

Quote:

Yes, that the Word was a "**different**" *theos* than the one in [John 1:1b](#)!

I agree. The Word **is** another *theos* than the *theos* of 1:1b. 1:1c specifically states that Jesus is not interchangeable with the *theos* of 1:1b **by** omitting the article. If the article was there, it'd mean the Word was interchangeable with the *theos* in 1:1b. I certainly don't believe that!

Quote:

And no one has simply argued that an anarthrous *theos* automatically means that it is then indefinite! I have not, the NWTTC have not!

My mistake. I thought you were. Thus my (now withdrawn) quote from Harris.

Quote:

They have argued that in *this sentence structure* a noun is indefinite not definite which the translation "and the Word was God" translate it to be. To translate it as "and the Word was God" is to understand the anarthrous *theos* as definite, ho *theos*. That is wrong and some scholars have expressed that it is.

Man, I **really** do not like grammar.

"...the Word was God" does not demand that the anarthrous *theos* is definite. But if it bothers you that much, go by the NEB of 1:1c: *what God was, the Word was*. Personally, I don't like the NEB much, but in this instance, I think it captures the thought of 1:1c in the modern vernacular. Or you could go with the Word was Deity or the Word was Divine. Personally, I think the Word was Deity is awkward given how we speak these days and the Word was Divine doesn't quite cut it for me, either, because unless you understand Divine properly (as in entirely Divine, like the Father is entirely Divine, per the attributive *theos*), that can be misleading in the common vernacular as well.

Quote:

You write though: "Theos in 1:1c is used in a different sense than in 1:1b."

Then tell me if *theos* of [John 1:1c](#) and the ho *theos* of 1:1b have different senses if those different senses are brought out in the translation "the Word was with God and and the Word was God"?

Yes. It does. That's my position. I prefer as literal a translation that I can get (without reading an interlinear) and the Word was God best reflects the word-for-word translation. The NEB example above is okay, mind, as it offers the thought of it, but I prefer formal equivalents, the NASB primarily.

Quote:

It does not does it!

I'm presuming this is a rhetorical question.



09-01-2006

#72

[katierussell](#)

Member

Join Date: May 2006

Posts: 1,481

16 Reputation Points



Sorry, but Vincent is just reading his theology into John here.

You write:

Quote:

Basically, John did speak of theos in terms of person. By omitting the article in 1:1c, John states very clearly that the Word in 1:1c is not interchangeably identical with the theos in 1:1b, but the Word in 1:1c shares the same nature of the theos in 1:1b.

John did not write that the Word "shared the same nature of ho theos." He wrote simply that the Word was theos. But just before that he wrote the Word was with ho theos. So, he was writing in terms of theos. While the Word was with ho theos he was himself theos. No, not the ho theos he was with but another theos. There is nothing in the Greek of [John 1:1](#) that says anything about the Word's 'sharing the same nature of the theos he was with.' One has to accurately translate the Greek of John before one does what you are doing. You are still reading into John's Greek something you already believe. It may or may not be true. But you can't get "shared the same nature of the theos" from theos en ho logos! What we can *only* get is that the Word had the nature of theos.

Quote:

"...the Word was God" does not demand that the anarthrous theos is definite.

Yes it does, because "God" in English is a definite noun. "God" in English is a who and when one says that someone "was God" you are identifying them as that definite being. Hence, the translation "and the Word was God" is undoubtedly a definite rendering. But the anarthrous theos in this construct is describing what the Word was. The translation "and the Word was God" then is incorrect.

Quote:

But if it bothers you that much, go by the NEB of 1:1c: what God was, the Word was. Personally, I don't like the NEB much, but in this instance, I think it captures the thought of 1:1c in the modern vernacular.

This is of course, not a literal translation. John does not say "what God was the Word was" for this would mean that he wrote something else than what he did! He did not write that what ho theos was the Word was! He simply wrote the Word was theos. This is not the theos he was with and it indicates that he had the nature of theos or was of the class of theos. One must be careful not to read something into John here as he does not say which the NEB's translation says he does. The NEB changes the anarthrous predicate theos into a definite subject and the copula "was" has no stated object! What "bothers" me of course is that even those who can see that the literal translation "the Word was God" is incorrect can not bring themselves to admit

that the best *literal* translation would be "the Word was god." But of course we do not write like this in English. One need an article before "god" in this sentence. As theos in the Greek is not definite then one has to use the English indefinite article. Having the translation "a god" does not deny that theos is being used to describe the nature of the Word either. One can do that in English with a noun phrase. For example, as one could do it with "Katie is stupid" where "stupid" is a predicate adjective one could write "Katie is a stupid girl." It says the same thing. Undoubtedly then "the Word was a god" is the best literal translation there is. It does not put thoughts into John's Greek that are not there. It does not supply words that are not there. It keeps the predicate theos as a predicate noun and it does not consider theos as definite which would result in a translation that identifies the Word rather than what the Greek does and describes the Word as a 'what'. It does raise questions about 'how can there be another god other than the one true god and not be false'. But that is another thing altogether. One should not reject the best literal translation on questions of that ilk not least of course that John was quite in accord with using a term that others not God could be called and having no conflict with monotheism. But, based on grammar alone, the "Word was a god" is undoubtedly the best one can get. Lets get the best translation first before one discusses what it means or does not mean!

Quote:

Or you could go with the Word was Deity or the Word was Divine. Personally, I think the Word was Deity is awkward given how we speak these days and the Word was Divine doesn't quite cut it for me, either, because unless you understand Divine properly (as in entirely Divine, like the Father is entirely Divine, per the attributive theos), that can be misleading in the common vernacular as well.

But "**Deity**" and "**Divine**" are definite translations the same as "God" is. The anarthrous theos can not be considered definite. "**d**eity" and "**d**ivine" would be better and so it would be "the Word was deity." But how is that different from "and the Word was a god" for "deity" means "a god." And of course its not very good English for one would usually need an article before it. It would be like writing "Katie was girl." And of course if John wanted to mean the "Word was **divine**" he had theios. But he did not use it. Theos here is undoubtedly substantival, either "God" or "god." But it cannot be "God" for that would mean theos would have to be considered definite. But it is not. This leaves us with "god."



09-01-2006

#73

[katierussell](#)

Member

Join Date: May 2006

Posts: 1,481

16 Reputation Points



Oh, as you quote Vincent on [John 1:1c](#) perhaps you can quote him what he said just before that which you quoted of him for truffy's instruction? For does he not say the subject of [John 1;1c](#) is the "Word" and the predicate theos? Indeed he does. So, if you would kindly point out this to truffy he will have had three independent witnesses that he made a mistake in thinking what he did and there is no need for him to wait for that book he ordered(though for the life of me I hope he has not wasted his hard earned cash for if he can not see that the theos in [John 1:1c](#) is anarthrous and

predicate and that the theos in [Luke 12:24](#) is definite and subject then what hope is there for him! 😊

Last edited by [katierussell](#) : 09-01-2006 at 09:45 AM.



09-01-2006

#74

[kelton graham](#)

Member

Join Date: Jan 2006
Posts: 331
19 Reputation Points



Seems like there is a real thirst for Greek here.

Well if anyone is interested one can check the B-Greek archives for the latest discussion of [Jn 1:1](#). I along with some other trinitarians discussed this with Carl Conrad (although he really did not express his personal view) and Rolf Furuli in a civil manner, both sides expressed their views and if you understand Greek I think it is a good discussion to check out.

We went over count nouns, imperfects EIMI's, qualitative QEOS, and towards the end some others started discussing the Coptic versions. (I was not too interested in that one.)

<http://lists.ibiblio.org/pipermail/b...ly/thread.html>

By the way I am KGRAHAM0938 in the archives and if anyone wants to discuss my views they can email me or discuss this here.



09-01-2006

#75

[newWitness](#)

Member

Join Date: Aug 2006
Posts: 695
15 Reputation Points



Thank you for making me aware of my supposed violation. I will be more careful with my observations. If anyone has taken how I worded my observations of Christendom as an insult, I appologize. I still would like for you to open your minds up to the logic our thoughts on this thread debate.



09-01-2006

#76

[moderator13](#)

Moderator

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



Not "supposed" - Real.

Yes, do be more careful.



09-01-2006

#77

[tkkclark](#)

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006
Posts: 275
18 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by [katierussell](#)

Oh, as you quote Vincent on [John 1:1c](#) perhaps you can quote him what he said just before that which you quoted of him for truffy's instruction? For does he not say the subject of [John 1;1c](#) is the "Word" and the predicate theos? Indeed he does. So, if you would kindly point out this to

truffy he will have had three independent witnesses that he made a mistake in thinking what he did and there is no need for him to wait for that book he ordered(though for the life of me I hope he has not wasted his hard earned cash for if he can not see that the theos in [John 1:1c](#) is anarthrous and predicate and that the theos in [Luke 12:24](#) is definite and subject then what hope is there for him! 😊

Eh?

Sorry, I really haven't been following that portion of the program. (Did I mention that I loathe grammar? LOL)

Truffy, the subject of 1:1c is *ho Logos*, the Word. The predicate is *theos*, God. Literally, the Greek reads *kai theos en ho logos* or 'And God was the Word.' But we shouldn't read it that way (in English). Words are moved forward in a sentence to emphasize them in Koine Greek, as *theos* has been moved forward here in 1:1c.

Per Katie's request, Vincent says on 1:1c in part, "...But θεός, God, is the predicate and not the subject of the proposition. The subject must be the Word..."

[Robertson's Word Pictures](#) also says of 1:1c, "...The subject is made plain by the article (*ho logos*) [my insertion: the Word] and the predicate without it (*theos*) [my insertion: God]."

Neighborhood kids just invaded, I'll print your reply to my post, KR, and maybe get to it tomorrow...If we're not floating down the river by then, that is. We needed rain, but not Ernesto-level rain. 😊



09-01-2006

#78

newWitness

Member

Join Date: Aug 2006
Posts: 695
15 Reputation Points



Thank you for your comments and concern. I hope that since we Witness's have to have a thick skin so can some in Christendom. Thanks a lot, I will try to be more careful. Just one question? Just so I don't step out of bounds again, I just want to know is it just as insulting to call what we believe as brain-washed and demonic?



09-01-2006

#79

newWitness

Member

Join Date: Aug 2006
Posts: 695
15 Reputation Points



The point that you are missing is, Jesus is not God the Almighty whether in 1/3 part or the whole. My last thought on this line of reasoning will be the *theos* in [John 1:1c](#) doesn't not lead to Jesus being the Almighty. Please understand what we mean by the definition of *theos* in this particular verse. It means mighty one. He is not God. Katie, help me out on this one.



09-01-2006

#80

moderator13

Moderator

Join Date: Jan 2006



The distinction is as follows: What you wrote had to do with personally insulting another poster's intelligence. Personal insults and attacks are usually taken as a

Location: Pennsylvania
Posts: 672
19 Reputation Points

violation of Board Rules.

The only exception to this is when things such as (for example) the "L" word (liar) is used and it can be very clearly proven that the person HAS indeed lied. This word is to be used VERY infrequently (VERY) - and it HAS to be clearly shown.

Comments regarding beliefs being "demonic" and the like should probably be avoided - they don't promote much in the way of discussion/debate. I suggest that it is generally understood that Christians do believe that the doctrines of the Watchtower are demonic.....and the JW's think that the beliefs of Christians are too. This is a sort of "given" that need not be actually stated).



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

Quick Reply

Message:

B
I
U
A

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 07:54 AM.
As of July 6, 2006, Total Page Views: 22,355,296, Page Views Today: 22,355,296

-- 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