



08-27-2006

#241

[tkkclark](#)

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006
Posts: 275
18 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by [mondo](#) ▾
Here is another for you:

"According, from the point of view of grammar alone, [theos en ho logos] could be rendered "the Word was a god."-Murray Harris, Jesus As God, 1992, pp.60.

Do you know I've been waiting **three months** for this book? Ordered it toward the end of May and nada, still not here.

Mind quoting surrounding context?

Given the way you quoted Vine's above...

Frankly, that was low. Way, way low. I cannot believe you did that. I mean, **everybody** has Vine's. If you're going to fudge a quote, use a reference not everybody is going to have like Murray's (though I'm certainly giving it my best effort, LOL), a book I can't pop downstairs, grab it from the shelf and check the context.

Sheesh.



08-27-2006

#242

[kelton graham](#)

Member

Join Date: Jan 2006
Posts: 331
19 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by [tkkclark](#) ▾
*Do you know I've been waiting **three months** for this book? Ordered it toward the end of May and nada, still not here.*

Mind quoting surrounding context?

Given the way you quoted Vine's above...

*Frankly, that was low. Way, way low. I cannot believe you did that. I mean, **everybody** has Vine's. If you're going to fudge a quote, use a*

reference not everybody is going to have like Murray's (though I'm certainly giving it my best effort, LOL), a book I can't pop downstairs, grab it from the shelf and check the context.

Sheesh.

Response: I had the book (had to return it) and yes he does say that based on grammar alone that QEOS can be taken indefinitely. He just holds the same view I have that the rendering would be impossible based upon monotheism. But grammatically alone, the indefinite rendering would be fine. It's a good book, you should call and check on it and see if you can see what happened to it, I may try to get me another one.



08-27-2006

#243

AmazingGrace

CARM Super Member



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

Quote:

Originally Posted by [katierussell](#)

Yes, Jehovah says no other gods but in a context where he is referring to the gods of the nations surrounding Israel which gods were independant from Jehovah. This does not mean that Jehovah has not created creatures that he himself recognizes as "gods" and that are dependant on him. He has, the angels. The angels are not false gods they are true gods for they have superhuman natures and reflect the nature of the One true God. In the very same place, Is 43:10, 11, Jehovah says there are no saviors but he. But this does not mean that Jehovah has not himself raised up saviors for Israel and can be called as such. He did and they are called saviors. But there are no saviors independant from Jehovah for Israel. So, from this one can see that Is 43:10 can not be used against a grammatically and contextually valid translation of the Greek of [John 1:1c](#). Yes, when one does that one is ripping Is. 43:10-11 out of it's context.

Yes, the Word's being "a god" mean that his godship is true for his being "a god" is because he has been made such by God and his godship is dependant on God but still limited and qualified. The bible's monotheism allows for others other than the one true God to be gods for these ones, such as the angels, are gods because they share the nature of God and reflect his power. Polytheism is not only the recognition of more than one god but the worship of more than one god. The Word being "a god" does not mean he is worshipped as God, nor even as "a god." So the translation of [John 1;1c](#) as "and the Word was a god" is not polytheistic but in accord with the Bible's monotheism which allows others not God to be gods but not independant from God and hence not to be worshipped as one should only God.

I hope this explains why Is 43:10-11 should not be used, or really, misused, against a grammatically and contextually valid translation of [John 1:1c](#) and why the charge of polytheism against the "a god" translation only comes from a misunderstanding of true biblical monotheism.

First, you keep saying that [John 1:1](#) is contextually correct - I don't think you, nor any other JW has proven that.

Yes, the bible does refer to angels and even some kings as 'gods' or even 'sons of god' because their authority came from him. But how do these compare with Christ in any way shape or form? Christ is uncreated and has been with God from the beginning. Where do we read that about any other? Where does any

other stretch out the heavens and earth? which of these is called "Son"?

So yes, you can say these things, but then it is the JW side that is taking out of context for clearly the debate isn't over men or angels or satan being called gods, it's over them actually BEING gods; which they are not. Christ is completely different and you can't compare him to these. As a matter of fact, it should be one of the contrasts that should make a JW take a step back. If those afore mentioned are called gods, then clearly Christ is so far above them that he couldnt' be just 'a god'. Does that make sense?

[Romans 9:5](#) (New International Version)

5Theirs are the patriarchs, and from them is traced the human ancestry of Christ, who is God over all, forever praised![\[a\]](#) Amen.

[Titus 2:13-14](#)

13while we wait for the blessed hope—the glorious appearing of our great God and Savior, Jesus Christ, 14who gave himself for us to redeem us from all wickedness and to purify for himself a people that are his very own, eager to do what is good.

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



08-27-2006

#244

[truffy](#)

Inactive



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



I strongly disagree with your view. [Luke 12:24](#) says..."and God feeds them...". Compare that with [John 1:1](#) "and God was the word", two theos preceding two verbs, each have a parallel structure with words. What makes you feel here this God in [Luke 12:24](#) is any different than God in [John 1:1](#)? Is it because you just simply won't believe there are two persons in one God? The structures are the same, so what's the difference? Your predetermined mind on your negative doctrines?

Tim 😊😊😊



08-27-2006

#245

[mondo](#)

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006
Posts: 816
13 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by [tkkclark](#) ▶
Yeah....So...?

*Quoting the Greek word order, as though reading from an interlinear, is **not** the same as reading in proper English. Let's read the context of your quote:*

The context does not at all change the thrust of my argument. "a god" is how we literally translate it. You are attempting to dilute the force of this point, and I simply won't let you do that.. nice try though.

Quote:

Thank you. Now, would you mind removing the triple dots and quoting it at me again? Pardon, but you, so I believe, selectively quoted Vine above, citing only that which supports your theology -- out of its intended context. I mean, seriously. What you quoted had nothing to do with whether it should be "a god" or "God," but was an analysis of word order in that clause, in that *theos* comes first because it's in the emphatic position. It's not a comment on "a god" vs "God" at all.

Yet, you quoted Vine as though what Vine said in regard to emphasis and word order somehow supported your position.

I quoted Vine fine, you don't like it though, so you attempted to take weight away from it. You failed I might add. Vine is very clear on how it literally reads. Here is what you find in the ... Which isn't gonna help you at all, I just took it out because it was not significant.

"Modern Greek conceives of uphga, ephga and efera as aorists (Thumb, Handb., p 143). Thumb (Thi. L.-Z. xxviii 423) thinks that in the N.T. eferon had begun to be treaded as aorist, but Moulton (Prol. p. 129) demurs, though he admits the possiblity of punctiliar action in prosfere to owron in Mt. 5:24 (ib., p. 247) See also fere kai ide fere kai Bale in [Jo. 20:27](#). But one must not think that the Greek did not know how to distinguish between the aorist and the imperfect. They "did not care to use their finest tools on ever occasion," but the line between aorist and imperf. was usually very sharply drawn. The distinction is as old as the Sanskrit. In modern Greek it still survives, though the different between elegen and eipen is well-nigh gone, if it ever existed. The same thing is true of the usage of Achilles Tatius."

So there is your ... That was really a waste of both our times (my typing it and you reading it)



08-27-2006

#246

mondo

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006

Posts: 816

13 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by **tkkclark**
*Do you know I've been waiting **three months** for this book? Ordered it toward the end of May and nada, still not here.*

Mind quoting surrounding context?

Given the way you quoted Vine's above...

*Frankly, that was low. Way, way low. I cannot believe you did that. I mean, **everybody** has Vine's. If you're going to fudge a quote, use a reference not everybody is going to have like Murray's (though I'm certainly giving it my best effort, LOL), a book I can't pop downstairs, grab it from the shelf and check the context.*

Sheesh.

Stop being a crybaby. I quoted Vine just fine! Vine said literally it is "a god." Get over it. Kelton confirmed Harris too. I don't have it in front of me to type the rest out.



08-27-2006

#247

mondo

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006
Posts: 816
13 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **truffy**
I strongly disagree with your view. [Luke 12:24](#) says... "and God feeds them...". Compare that with [John 1:1](#) "and God was the word", two theos preceding two verbs, each have a parallel structure with words. What makes you feel here this God in [Luke 12:24](#) is any different than God in [John 1:1](#)? Is it because you just simply won't believe there are two persons in one God? The structures are the same, so what's the difference? Your predetermined mind on your negative doctrines?

The two texts do not compare grammatically.



08-27-2006

#248

tkkclark

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006
Posts: 275
18 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **kelton graham**
Response: I had the book (had to return it) and yes he does say that based on grammar alone that QEOS can be taken indefinitely. He just holds the same view I have that the rendering would be impossible based upon monotheism. But grammatically alone, the indefinite rendering would be fine. It's a good book, you should call and check on it and see if you can see what happened to it, I may try to get me another one.

I've gotten 3 delayed shipdates on the thing and expecting my cancellation notice any day now.

Anybody who knows where I can get my hands on a copy of this bk, please PM me!!! I'm desperate!!!



08-27-2006

#249

tkkclark

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006
Posts: 275
18 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **mondo**
Stop being a crybaby.

Oh, get over yourself. I wasn't being a crybaby. I was stunned that you could do something so stupid. I assure you I won't make the same mistake in future.

Quote:

I quoted Vine just fine!

Yeah. You quoted him verbatim. Too bad you ripped it out of context to make it appear he said something he never, in a million years, meant.

Quote:

Vine said literally it is "a god."

Yeah. He was quoting the literal word order while speaking of how *theos* is emphasized by that word order. The literal Greek word order has no bearing on the English translation of that word order.

Quote:

Get over it.

I'm not the one who made a fool out of myself, buddy.

Quote:

Kelton confirmed Harris too. I don't have it in front of me to type the rest out.

Yippee for you. As if I'd trust a quotation from **you** after this. *snort*

As for Harris...Without reading the context, I can't rightly understand what he interprets indefinite to mean.

But even if he does say "a god" is okey-dokey, that's one (maybe) NT scholar.

Against multitudes.



08-27-2006

#250

[mondo](#)

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006
Posts: 816
13 Reputation Points



You see, Vine really is killing you, for if he were merely providing an interlinear translation, he would have said "god was the word." He didn't, he said "a god." This is what the text literally says. Very, very clear. The context does not change the fact that he used "a" and he said that this was what is said "literally." Nice try again, but failure again too.



08-27-2006

#251

[truffy](#)

Inactive



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



Quote:

Truffy,

It is for the same reason that Paul can teach that Jesus Christ is our "one Lord," and yet when the apostle John spoke to one of the 24 elders, he had no problem addressing him with the words "my Lord."

You people have a problem of always avoiding my questions. So you are always side-tracking my questions and answering it with an unrelated answer. We do have One God and One Lord, which is the Triune Godhead. My question is...If JW's believe there is only one God then how can there be another god besides God? If you claim Jesus as a savior and call him a god, you are making Him into another god, and making Jesus into a god is putting Him into a level playing field with Satan who is a god of this world. If this is what your Jehovah wants, then your Jehovah is definitely not My God, because I know My God would never want to put Jesus who is also My God down to a lower deity, and I know Satan would love to see this happen. So where is your common sense in this matter? Can't you see the logic of what Satan wants versus what God wants? So can you please answer the questions I put forward and stop wasting our time and unnecessary posts added to this thread?

Tim 😊😊😊



08-27-2006

#252

mondo

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006
Posts: 816
13 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **truffy**

You people have a problem of always avoiding my questions. So you are always side-tracking my questions and answering it with an unrelated answer. We do have One God and One Lord, which is the Triune Godhead. My question is...If JW's believe there is only one God then how can there be another god besides God? If you claim Jesus as a savior and call him a god, you are making Him into another god, and making Jesus into a god is putting Him into a level playing field with Satan who is a god of this world. If this is what your Jehovah wants, then your Jehovah is definitely not My God, because I know My God would never want to put Jesus who is also My God down to a lower deity, and I know Satan would love to see this happen. So where is your common sense in this matter? Can't you see the logic of what Satan wants versus what God wants? So can you please answer the questions I put forward and stop wasting our time and unnecessary posts added to this thread?

Truffy,

What I've shown is you're in a theological corner. By that I've answered you, because now you are forced to recognize how we do it.



08-27-2006

#253

truffy

Inactive



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



Originally Posted by truffy

I strongly disagree with your view. [Luke 12:24](#) says..."and God feeds them...". Compare that with [John 1:1](#) "and God was the word", two theos preceding two verbs, each have a parallel structure with words. What makes you feel here this God in [Luke 12:24](#) is any different than God in [John 1:1](#)? Is it because you just simply won't believe there are two persons in one God? The structures are the same, so what's the difference? Your predetermined mind on your negative doctrines?

you said...
The two texts do not compare grammatically.

And.....? Can you say why?

Tim 😊😊😊



08-27-2006

#254

tkkclark

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006



Quote:

Originally Posted by **mondo**

Posts: 275
18 Reputation Points

You see, Vine really is killing you, for if he were merely providing an interlinear translation, he would have said "god was the word." He didn't, he said "a god." This is what the text literally says. Very, very clear. The context does not change the fact that he used "a" and he said that this was what is said "literally." Nice try again, but failure again too.

The depths to which you will crawl astound me.

Pop quiz: What does Vine's discussion on word order as regards emphasis in Greek have to do with "a god" vs. "God" as a proper English translation?

Answer: **Nothing.**

You are desperately grasping at straws, any- and everything that might possible support your position, regardless of the context.

PATHETIC.



08-27-2006

#255

truffy

Inactive



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

Quote:

Originally Posted by **mondo**
Truffy,

What I've shown is you're in a theological corner. By that I've answered you, because now you are forced to recognize how we do it.

Why thank you Mondo. And you said "because now I am forced to recognize how you do it." Yes, I know how, the twisted factor comes in my mind. Maybe even a little brain-washing and Bible rewriting helped, but it doesn't help God or Jesus, only the master of deception himself.

Tim 😊😊😊



08-27-2006

#256

truffy

Inactive



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

Quote:

Originally Posted by **katierussell**
I have, of course, read the Bible from "start to finish" and I do not see that Jesus is "God"(but I thought you think that three person are "God"??) but only the Father is, God the Father being the expression Paul uses often....never "God the Son." 😊 Have a nice rest Tim.

Did I hear you at one time say you were a former Catholic? And did you believe Jesus was God back then? And what information was it that lead you to believe what you believe now, the WatchTower knocking on your door and handing out leaflets program? Can't you see some of their information is not based on the Bible, but based on speculations, negative doctrines and false prophecies?

Tim 😊😊😊





08-27-2006

#257

mondo

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006
Posts: 816
13 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **tkkclark**

The depths to which you will crawl astound me.

Pop quiz: What does Vine's discussion on word order as regards emphasis in Greek have to do with "a god" vs. "God" as a proper English translation?

*Answer: **Nothing.***

You are desperately grasping at straws, any- and everything that might possible support your position, regardless of the context.

PATHETIC.

What does Vine say is the literal translation of [John 1:1c](#)? "a god" What does that have to do with it? EVERYTHING!

You can't win this one buddy, so you might as well give it up.



08-27-2006

#258

mondo

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006
Posts: 816
13 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **truffy**

Why thank you Mondo. And you said "because now I am forced to recognize how you do it." Yes, I know how, the twisted factor comes in my mind. Maybe even a little brain-washing and Bible rewriting helped, but it doesn't help God or Jesus, only the master of deception himself.

Why don't you deal with the issue instead of running from it. The Bible speaks of the Father as the one God and yet called Jesus a god. If there is one God, how can there be another one called a god?

That is the issue you raise, correct, for that is the basis of Trinitarian theology, and thus your argument. Well I note that Jesus is called the one Lord, and yet John had no problem identifying one of the 24 elders as his Lord, so if your argument has weight, that elder is also a person of God.

Thus, your argument has no weight and you misunderstand the meaning of somebody being the "one" something. It means they are it in the absolute, complete sense. Doesn't restrict others from being it in other or lesser senses.



08-27-2006

#259

tkkclark


Member

Join Date: Apr 2006

Quote:

Originally Posted by **mondo**

Posts: 275

 18 Reputation Points

What does Vine say is the literal translation of [John 1:1c](#)? "a god" What does that have to do with it? EVERYTHING!

You can't win this one buddy, so you might as well give it up.

Yeah, you keep telling yourself that, compadre.

Which says nothing of the fact...

Didn't all this start because I'd asked you for supports for your position that *en* in [John 1:1a](#) **didn't** denote continual existence?

What does something Vine says about the Greek word order (in regards to emphasis) of 1:1c have to do with the imperfect tense of *eimi* in 1:1a???

Nothing.

Are we avoiding the issue perhaps?

Let's not.

Want to tell everybody what Murray said about 1:1a and the imperfect tense of *eimi*? I mean, you're so quick to pull out Murray to support your position in 1:1c, why not have a look at what Murray has to say about 1:1a. You know. The issue we were discussing when I asked for your supports?

I've got a quote from Murray, secondhand from another source that clearly indicates that Murray (gasp) supports my position of 1:1a pointing to the Word's pre-existence.

Quibble over 1:1c all you like.

Dodge it all you like.

1:1a clearly points to the Word as eternal.



08-27-2006


#260

mondo

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006

Posts: 816

 13 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **tkkclark** 

Yeah, you keep telling yourself that, compadre.

Which says nothing of the fact...

*Didn't all this start because I'd asked you for supports for your position that *en* in [John 1:1a](#) **didn't** denote continual existence?*

*What does something Vine says about the Greek word order (in regards to emphasis) of 1:1c have to do with the imperfect tense of *eimi* in 1:1a???*

Nothing.

Are we avoiding the issue perhaps?

Let's not.

Want to tell everybody what Murray said about 1:1a and the imperfect tense of eimi? I mean, you're so quick to pull out Murray to support your position in 1:1c, why not have a look at what Murray has to say about 1:1a. You know. The issue we were discussing when I asked for your supports?

I've got a quote from Murray, secondhand from another source that clearly indicates that Murray (gasp) supports my position of 1:1a pointing to the Word's pre-existence.

Quibble over 1:1c all you like.

Dodge it all you like.

1:1a clearly points to the Word as eternal.

Robertson killed you there too. Seems all your arguments just fall apart when critically examined!



Post Reply

Page 13 of 26 << First < 3 9 10 11 12 **13** 14 15 16 17 23 > Last >>

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

Quick Reply

Message:

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

Options

Quote message in reply?

Post Quick Reply

Go Advanced

Posting Rules

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

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

-- 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