



CARM.ORG - Christian Discussion Forums > RELIGIONS > Jehovah's Witnesses  
**How can Jesus be worshiped if only a "god"?**

**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 11 of 26    << First    <    7    8    9    10    **11**    12    13    14    15    21    >    Last >> ▾

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

08-27-2006

#201

**mondo**

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006  
Posts: 816  
13 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **truffy** ▾  
*You people are always playing games. My question was **do the last letters destine the word as God or 'a god'**? Forget the nominative and accusative, is it God or 'a god'? That was my question here. Once again you deliberately avoided my question and answered it with something else which has nothing to do with my question. I didn't ask whether it is nominative or accusative, does the last letter destine the word as God or 'a god? Get it?*

I have answered your question, but you don't know enough about Greek to recognize that I have!

First, I explained to you what the last letter here means. Then I said this:

Quote:

This in itself tells us nothing of whether it should be definite or indefinite.

Do you not get that? The last letter does not tell us if it is definite or indefinite!



08-27-2006

#202

**katierussell**

Member

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

No, I did not say I "learnt Greek fast"! I said I grasped the issues involved in the translation of [John 1:1c](#) which is quite simple Greek. But what has that got to do with you you ask? Its you who keep trying to deny that the anarthrous theos can be indefinite. Based on grammar it can be. If you wish for a JW to tell you why [John 1:1c](#) can be rendered as "and the Word was a god" then you will not be able to get away from the fact that theos here is a singular anarthrous predicate nominative preceding the verb. All these grammatical terms are used in our own language so if you know your English grammar then you should have no difficulty in understanding them! And it does not come from "WatchTower literature and was deliberately designed to confuse people with average intelligence" but simply an exact description of the sentence structure of [John 1:1c](#) that any work on Greek grammar discussing [John 1:1c](#)(such as Wallace) will inform you of! Live with it Tim, don't try to "confuse people of average intelligence" with that remark!

You want the same sentence structure of that which we have at [John 1;1c](#) and which English translations have translated the anarthrous noun as an indefinite? Try these:  
[John 4:19](#); 8:48; 9:24; 12:6 for starters.  
 Now, you ask "about proskuneo, is it positive or negative for Jesus?" It is "positive" whatever you mean by that!



08-27-2006

#203

**truffy**  
Inactive



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



Quote:

Originally Posted by **mondo**

*I have answered your question, but you don't know enough about Greek to recognize that I have!*

*First, I explained to you what the last letter here means. Then I said this:*

*Do you not get that? The last letter does not tell us if it is definite or indefinite!*

Then Your answer is no, the last letter does not destine the theos word as God or 'a god'? If you answered it more directly then your own answer would definitely be well understood. This is exactly what I was saying all along, but all you said to me is I don't know Greek and I shouldn't be posting about it here. Two things you must know...1-I was right from the start the last letter does not destine the theos word as God or 'a god', which you criticized me negatively for without cause, and, 2-This board is not about my Greek at all, it is about your beliefs which you can't defend without criticizing others about things that have nothing to do with this board. So why did you criticize my Greek when I was right about those last letters in theos? It says everything about the way you side-track my questions and talk about my Greek among other things that don't relate to my questions. 😏

Tim 😊😊😊



08-27-2006

#204

**mondo**  
501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006  
 Posts: 816  
 13 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by **truffy**

*Then Your answer is no, the last letter does not destine the theos word as God or 'a god'? If you answered it more directly then your own answer would definitely be well understood. This is exactly what I was saying all along, but all you said to me is I don't know Greek and I shouldn't be posting about it here. Two things you must know...1-I was right from the start the last letter does not destine the theos word as God or 'a god', which you criticized me negatively for without cause, and, 2-This board is not about my Greek at all, it is about your beliefs which you can't defend without criticizing others about things that have nothing to do with this board. So why did you criticize my Greek when I was right about those last letters in theos? It says everything about the way you side-track my questions and talk about my Greek among other things that don't relate*

to my questions. 😊

This was never part of our argument and we were not critical of you over this issue, but other things.



08-27-2006

#205

truffy

Inactive



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

Quote:

Originally Posted by [katie russell](#)

*No, I did not say I "learnt Greek fast"! I said I grasped the issues involved in the translation of [John 1:1c](#) which is quite simple Greek. But what has that got to do with you you ask? Its you who keep trying to deny that the anarthrous theos can be indefinite. Based on grammar it can be. If you wish for a JW to tell you why [John 1:1c](#) can be rendered as "and the Word was a god" then you will not be able to get away from the fact that theos here is a singular anarthrous predicate nominative preceding the verb. All these grammatical terms are used in our own language so if you know your English grammar then you should have no difficulty in understanding them! And it does not come from "WatchTower literature and was deliberately designed to confuse people with average intelligence" but simply an exact description of the sentence structure of [John 1:1c](#) that any work on Greek grammar discussing [John 1;1c](#)(such as Wallace) will inform you of! Live with it Tim, don't try to "confuse people of average intelligence" with that remark!*

*You want the same sentence structure of that which we have at [John 1;1c](#) and which English translations have translated the anarthrous noun as an indefinite?*

*Try these:*  
[John 4:19](#); [8:48](#); [9:24](#); [12:6](#) for starters.

*Now, you ask "about proskuneo, is it positive or negative for Jesus?" It is "positive" whatever you mean by that!*

Well, Katie, its so nice talking to you since yesterday. May I ask you therefore what do the words 'anarthous predicate nominative' mean to you? I certainly never used those words in my grammar and I'm sure over 90% of this board don't know what you mean.

Quote:

Try these:  
[John 4:19](#); [8:48](#); [9:24](#); [12:6](#) for starters.

Why not try these:

In [John 3:34](#) God speaks, so that is theos preceding a verb. In [John 8:42](#) "If God father of you was, ye would have loved me; for I of God came forth and have come". [John 11:22](#) God will give. [John 13:31](#) God was glorified. [John 13:32](#) God was glorified and God will glorify. Is this done right Katie? I try not to make any mistakes. In [John 1:18](#) you will see theos "God the one being in the bosom of the Father...". Is this one preceding a verb or would you say it is not?

So what is your answer here Katie? Let's play a game called **Name That Verse** and see if you will win this one. 🤔

If Jesus received a positive proskuneo from His followers, wouldn't you want to be more positive with Him? I certainly would want to, anyway.

Tim 😊😊😊



08-27-2006

#206

**truffy**

Inactive



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

Quote:

Originally Posted by **mondo**

*The problem is that you won't even understand the full answer if we give it! If we don't give the full answer, you will try and manipulate the partial answer.*

*I'll answer you on [John 1:18](#) though. Neither use of QEOS is a predicate nominative as in [John 1:1c](#). However, when Jesus is called QEOS he is done so with the adjective MONOGENHS. I take this adjective, as it most naturally reads, to be modifying the noun. Thus it defines the type of QEOS that Jesus is, making him a different type of QEOS than the Father.*

Amazing, so you are theorizing if theos is with an adjective just like theos is with a verb in [John 1:1](#) it destines as 'a god'? Look up [Mathew 19:6](#); [Mark 10:9](#); [Luke 12:24](#); [Luke 12:28](#); [John 3:34](#) and tell me if God in those verses should have been destined as 'a god' because all these theos do precede verbs.

Tim 😊😊😊



08-27-2006

#207

**mondo**

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006  
Posts: 816  
13 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **truffy**

*Amazing, so you are theorizing if theos is with an adjective just like theos is with a verb in [John 1:1](#) it destines as 'a god'? Look up [Mathew 19:6](#); [Mark 10:9](#); [Luke 12:24](#); [Luke 12:28](#); [John 3:34](#) and tell me if God in those verses should have been destined as 'a god' because all these theos do precede verbs.*

I didn't say that at all. Simply because QEOS precedes a verb tells us nothing in and of itself.



08-27-2006

#208

**tkkclark**

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006  
Posts: 275  
18 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **mondo**

*First of all, the vast majority of NT Greek scholars are Trinitarian.*

That, in and of itself, ought to tell you something about the trinity, but I digress.

Quote:

They have no choice but to reject that translation.

So your answer is to slam around a blanket "they're all biased" accusation?

Ah, I see conspiracy theories are alive and well in modern America.

**All** NT scholars know the "God" translation of [John 1:1c](#) is wrong, but they insistently and vehemently deny the "a god" translation offered by the NWT committee is even possible -- because to do so might damage the doctrine of the Trinity.

Riiiiiiiiiiiiight.

That powdered sugar on donuts will effect your verility, too.

Quote:

"a god" is easily justified by looking to the numerous predicate nominatives in the NT that are translated indefinitely.

And again, NT scholars uniformly disagree with you. Even the ones the NWT quotes to try to bolster their position disagrees.

Quote:

Second, your argument on the imperfect is entirely invalid. Nothing in EIMI demands eternal existence. This is a fallacious argument.

So you say. Three times, in three sentences. And yet not once in those sentences do you offer a single sliver of support for your much-proclaimed argument that mine is "fallacious."

Saying it ain't so doesn't prove it ain't so.

To support my position, first up, James White:

Quote:

Throughout the prologue of the Gospel of John, the author balances between two verbs. When speaking of the *Logos* as He existed in eternity past, John uses the Greek word *en* (a form of *eimi*). The tense of hte word expresses *continuous action in the past*. Compare this with the verb he chooses to use when speaking of everything else -- found, for example, in verse 3: "All things *came into being* through Him," *egeneto*. This verb contains the very element missing from the other: a point of origin. The term, when used in contexts of creation and origin, speaks of a time when something came into existence. The first verb, *en*, does not. John is *very* careful to use only the first verb of the *Logos* throughout the first thirteen verses, and the second verb, *egeneto*, he uses for everything else (including John the Baptist in verse 6). Finally, in verse 14, he breaks this pattern, for a very specific reason, as we shall see...[when the Word, Jesus, became flesh]

Above, we noted that John gave us some very important information about the time frame he has in mind when he says "in the beginning." That information is found in the tense of the verb *en*. You see, as far back as you wish to push "the beginning," the Word is already in existence...If we push it back further...A thousand years, the Word is there. A billion years, the Word is there. What is John's point? The Word is eternal." ([The Forgotten Trinity](#), p. 51)

How about A. T. Robertson?

Quote:

Three times in this sentence John uses this imperfect of eimi to be which conveys no idea of origin for God or for the Logos, simply continuous existence. Quite a different verb (egeneto, became) appears in [John 1:14](#) for the beginning of the Incarnation of the Logos. See the distinction sharply drawn in [John 8:58](#) "before Abraham came (genesthai) I am" (eimi, timeless existence). (RWP on [Jn 1:1](#))

Marvin Vincent:

Quote:

With evident allusion to the first word of Genesis. But John elevates the phrase from its reference to a point of time, the beginning of creation, to the time of absolute pre-existence before any creation, which is not mentioned until [John 1:3](#). This beginning had no beginning (compare [John 1:3](#); [John 17:5](#); [1John 1:1](#); [Ephesians 1:4](#); [Proverbs 8:23](#); [Psalms 90:2](#)). This heightening of the conception, however, appears not so much in ἀρχή, beginning, which simply leaves room for it, as in the use of εἶναι, was, denoting absolute existence (compare εἰμι, I am, [John 8:58](#)) instead of ἐγένετο, came into being, or began to be, which is used in [John 1:3](#), [John 1:14](#), of the coming into being of creation and of the Word becoming flesh. Note also the contrast between ἀρχή, in the beginning, and the expression ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, from the beginning, which is common in John's writings ([John 8:44](#); [1John 2:7](#), [1John 2:24](#); [1John 3:8](#)) and which leaves no room for the idea of eternal pre-existence...This notion of "beginning" is still further heightened by the subsequent statement of the relation of the Logos to the eternal God. The ἀρχή must refer to the creation - the primal beginning of things; but if, in this beginning, the Logos already was, then he belonged to the order of eternity...And when it is said the Logos was in this beginning, His eternal existence is already expressed, and His eternal position in the Godhead already indicated thereby" (Lange). (VWS on [Jn 1:1](#))

Albert Barnes:

Quote:

This expression is used also in [Genesis 1:1](#). John evidently has allusion here to that place, and he means to apply to "the Word" an expression which is there applied "to God." In both places it clearly means before creation, before the world was made, when as yet there was nothing. The meaning is: that the "Word" had an existence before the world was created. This is not spoken of the man Jesus, but of that which "became" a man, or was incarnate, [John 1:14](#). The Hebrews, by expressions like this, commonly denoted eternity. Thus. the eternity of God is described [Psalms 90:2](#); "Before the mountains were brought forth, etc.;" and eternity is commonly expressed by the phrase, before the foundation of the world." Whatever is meant by the term "Word," it is clear that it had an existence before "creation." It is not, then, a "creature" or created being, and must be, therefore, uncreated and eternal. There is only one Being that is uncreated, and Jesus must be therefore divine. (Barnes on [Jn 1:1](#))

Want more?



truffy

Inactive



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



Quote:

Coptic is not a "region," it is a language. You are the game player here. It is not just any Coptic either, for there are specific dialects of Coptic. This is the Sahidic Coptic.

I didn't say Coptic is a region...I said the manuscripts you are referring to came from Northern Egypt, the Sahidic Coptic manuscripts were written and came from there, the same region as Judas Iscariot's Gospel manuscript was written and found.

Quote:

QEOS is easily shown to be translated "a god" and the construction of [John 1:1c](#) is easily shown to be indefinite. [Acts 28](#) does both of these. That PROSKUNEW can be rendered obeisance can be seen by looking in any Greek lexicon.

You avoided my question...did you learn this Greek negative for Jesus when in the Baptist Seminary, or was it when you were first influenced by WatchTower literature?

Tim 😊😊😊



08-27-2006

#210

truffy

Inactive



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



Quote:

Originally Posted by **mondo**   
*I didn't say that at all. Simply because QEOS preceeds a verb tells us nothing in and of itself.*

But you didn't answer my question...Look up [Mathew 19:6](#); [Mark 10:9](#); [Luke 12:24](#); [Luke 12:28](#); [John 3:34](#) and tell me if God in those verses should have been destined as 'a god'? So what is your answer?

Tim 😊😊😊



08-27-2006

#211

JaySee

Member

Join Date: Jun 2006  
Posts: 861  
24 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by **katierussell**   
*No, I did not say I "learnt Greek fast"! I said I grasped the issues involved in the translation of [John 1:1c](#) which is quite simple Greek. But what has that got to do with you you ask? Its you who keep trying to deny that the anarthrous theos can be indefinite. Based on grammar it can be. If you wish for a JW to tell you why [John 1:1c](#) can be rendered as "and the Word was a god" then you will not be able to get away from the fact that theos here is a singular anarthrous predicate nomitative preceding the verb. All these grammatical terms are used in our own language so if you know your English grammar then you should have no difficulty in understanding them! And it does not come from "WatchTower literature and was*

*deliberately designed to confuse people with average intelligence" but simply an exact description of the sentence structure of [John 1:1c](#) that any work on Greek grammar discussing [John 1;1c](#)(such as Wallace) will inform you of! Live with it Tim, don't try to "confuse people of average intelligence" with that remark!*

*You want the same sentence structure of that which we have at [John 1;1c](#) and which English translations have translated the anarthrous noun as an indefinite?*

*Try these:*

*[John 4:19](#); [8:48](#); [9:24](#); [12:6](#) for starters.*

*Now, you ask "about proskuneo, is it positive or negative for Jesus?" It is "positive" whatever you mean by that!*

Did John make a mistake by creating another god besides God? John knew there is no god besides God as God said so many time, but according to the JW's on what John was saying here, the JW's are making a strong point for second god. Great job, JW's! I applaud you. I must say you are very smart in creating gods after gods after gods. gods of money, gods of this, gods of that and you say they are really gods. Umm...um...you are good. I admit defeat.

But I still believe there is only one God, there are no false gods either. Simply, no other gods besides God! So, if Jesus is a god, he must either be true or false, not a less powerful or lower god. To make Yeshua a god is to create a god besides God and God said it's a NO NO.

So, JW's, do you believe in many Gods/gods or just One? Stop saying there are lesser gods out there! But your posting all this time prove that JW's BELIEVE IN MANY GODS! or jws believe in many gods. or jws believe in a small god and A BIG GOD. In other words, two, or 2, or more than 1/one Gods or gods.

Whatever.... 😊 🍌



08-27-2006

#212

[mondo](#)


501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006

Posts: 816

13 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by [truffy](#)   
*But you didn't answer my question...Look up [Mathew 19:6](#); [Mark 10:9](#); [Luke 12:24](#); [Luke 12:28](#); [John 3:34](#) and tell me if God in those verses should have been destined as 'a god'? So what is your answer?*

I looked at them and no they would not be translated as "a god," for they are articular (they have the definite article) and the structure of the sentence gives no grammatical view of it being indefinite.



08-27-2006

#213

[katierussell](#)

Member

Join Date: May 2006

Posts: 1,481

16 Reputation Points

Before me I have [Teach Yourself English Grammar](#) by B.A.Phythian as used by my 13 yr old daughter. In it one finds the grammatical terms "verb," "singular," "anarthrous," "predicate" and "nominative" mentioned and explained. Now, why is it my 13 yr old daughter could tell me what those terms meant and you do not?

After quoting me where I gave you some examples of singular anarthrous

predicates that precede the verb what do you do? You say absolutley nothing about them!

Instead you cite us, again, [John 3:34](#); 8:42; 11:22; 13:31, 32; amd 1:18. But none of them are singular anarthrous predicate nominatives preceding a verb! So when you ask me: "Is this done right Katie? I try not to make any mistakes" you have once again repeated the same old mistakes! You then lose any "game" you have played!

And when you ask: "If Jesus received a positive proskuneo from His followers, wouldn't you want to be more positive with Him?" you assume I give less "positive" proskuneo than his followers! 😊



08-27-2006

#214

[mondo](#)

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006  
Posts: 816  
13 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by [JaySee](#)

*Did John make a mistake by creating another god besides God? John knew there is no god besides God as God said so many time, but according to the JW's on what John was saying here, the JW's are making a strong point for second god. Great job, JW's! I applaud you. I must say you are very smart in creating gods after gods after gods. gods of money, gods of this, gods of that and you say they are really gods. Umm...um...you are good. I admit defeat.*

*But I still believe there is only one God, there are no false gods either. Simply, no other gods besides God! So, if Jesus is a god, he must either be true or false, not a less powerful or lower god. To make Yeshua a god is to create a god besides God and God said it's a NO NO.*

*So, JW's, do you believe in many Gods/gods or just One? Stop saying there are lesser gods out there! But your posting all this time prove that JW's BELIEVE IN MANY GODS! or jws believe in many gods. or jws believe in a small god and A BIG GOD. In other words, two, or 2, or more than 1/one Gods or gods. Whatever.... 😊🌍*

Your theology is backwards. Paul expressly said "there are many gods and many lords," and the angels are expressly called "gods" along with the judges of Israel. John didn't create another god, John simply recognized Jesus for what he was/is. The problem is that your 21st century western mind has limited the meaning of the word "god" to a single meaning, which wasn't the case in the 1st century.



08-27-2006

#215

[truffy](#)

Inactive



Join Date: Jul 2006  
Posts: 1,593



I just found out that the Sahidic Coptic were engaged in widespread heresy and were against the Church of the time. They actually believed the God of the Old Testament was inferior to the God of the New Testament...two different Gods, now that is really interesting. Is this the group you Witnesses are so dearly following and how long have you been following their ideas and manuscripts? How much have you grasped from their doctrines?

27 Reputation Points

Tim 😊😊😊



08-27-2006

#216

[katierussell](#)

Member

Join Date: May 2006

Posts: 1,481

16 Reputation Points



John did not "create" another god! John knew that the term theos can be used/applied to others not the one true god, God. He rightly applied it for the "Word" who was "with" the "God" of the OT. John then still accepted there was one "God" and he was not saying that the Word was a "false god" either anymore than the angels of God are and God's word applies the term elohim, gods, to them. So you have simply not grasped what the term can signify and how it can be used.

Yes, JW's believe in "one God." Whenever that expression occurs it never ever refers to a triune being, a triune God and never ever refers to the Son, Jesus Christ but only the Father. Yes, JW's believe in "many gods" for the bible tells us the angels of God are "gods" and that the Word is "a god." But you I think believe in a pagan inspired anti-scriptural triune God where each person is "God" but there are not three Gods.....whatever! 😊



08-27-2006

#217

[mondo](#)

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006

Posts: 816

13 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by [truffy](#)

*I didn't say Coptic is a region...I said the manuscripts you are referring to came from Northern Egypt, the Sahidic Coptic manuscripts were written and came from there, the same region as Judas Iscariot's Gospel manuscript was written and found.*

And so you want to discredit it on those grounds? You smell of complete and total desperation.

Quote:

You avoided my question...did you learn this Greek negative for Jesus when in the Baptist Seminary, or was it when you were first influenced by WatchTower literature?

Greek is neither positive or negative for anybody. It is a language that communicates, just like English. Now, what is said by a language can be positive or negative, but I am not saying anything negative for Jesus, I'm simply not stating things falsely as most people here do.



08-27-2006

#218

[mondo](#)

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006

Posts: 816

13 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by [truffy](#)

*I just found out that the Sahidic Coptic were engaged in widespread heresy and were against the Church of the time. They actually believed the God of the Old Testament was inferior to the God of the New Testament...two different Gods, now that is really interesting. Is this the group you Witnesses are so dearly following and how long have you been*

*following their ideas and manuscripts? How much have you grasped from their doctrines?*

LOL. "The Sahidic Coptic"? Who is that? Again, it is a language!! It is a translation! They knew Greek better than you or I, because it was a living language in their day!



08-27-2006

#219

[tkkclark](#)

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006

Posts: 275

18 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by [katierussell](#)  
*Before me I have Teach Yourself English Grammar by B.A.Phythian as used by my 13 yr old daughter. In it one finds the grammatical terms "verb," "singular," "anarthrous," "predicate" and "nominative" mentioned and explained. Now, why is it my 13 yr old daughter could tell me what those terms meant and you do not?*

Not to step into your argument here with truffy (the contents of the argument at any rate), but my daughter's IQ is in the low 130s. She's 14 and in all the honors classes (including English) starting high school tomorrow. She's supposed to receive an award at the next school board meeting for her writing. Granted, creative writing isn't grammar, but she's not exactly ignorant when it comes to all things English. You don't even want to know what her projected ACT/SAT English score ranges were based on the last standardized test.

I just asked her if she could tell me what all the terms outlined above meant. Verb, she knew. Singular, she knew. Predicate, she knew. Anarthrous and nominative were a mystery.

Of course, we're talking about **public** school here. LOL

My IQ is in the high 130s. I'm 36 and a college graduate. Before studying with JWs last year, I didn't know what anarthrous was, either. And **I** started in college as a liberal arts English Major.

I don't think it's fair to criticize someone for not knowing what certain terms are (whether that's true or not) by claiming that a 13yo knows it. Maybe your 13yo does, but the average kid doesn't. Even the above-average kid (my daughter) doesn't and case in point, this above-average adult didn't know it until the topic came up with visiting JWs, either.



08-27-2006

#220

[truffy](#)

Inactive

Jesus  
LOVES  
you

Join Date: Jul 2006

Posts: 1,593

27 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by [mondo](#)  
*LOL. "The Sahidic Coptic"? Who is that? Again, it is a language!! It is a translation! They knew Greek better than you or I, because it was a living language in their day!*

Sorry, my mistake, I didn't read this site clearly enough. What they really meant was the Coptic translators were fighting widespread heresy driven by Gnostic

Marcionism. No offense intended, I think I will take a break from my computer. I think I am getting computer sick. 🤖

Tim 😊😊😊



[Post Reply](#)

Page 11 of 26 << First < 7 8 9 10 **11** 12 13 14 15 21 > Last >>

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

### Quick Reply

Message:

**B** *I* U **A** ▾
 



 ABC ↑ ↓ A/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 07:36 AM.

As of July 6, 2006, Total Page Views: 22,354,658, Page Views Today: 22,354,658

-- 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](#)