



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 14 of 26    « First < 4 10 11 12 13 **14** 15 16 17 18 24 > Last » ▾

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

08-27-2006

#261

**tkkclark**  
Member

Join Date: Apr 2006  
Posts: 275  
18 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **mondo**   
*Robertson killed you there too. Seems all your arguments just fall apart when critically examined!*

Okay, let's look at Robertson.

Your original quote:

Quote:

"They are sometimes called 'aoristic' imperfects... The same root was used for both forms, as only one form exists and it is hard to tell which tense the form is... We see this difficulty in hn, efhn, elegon, etc., particularly in verbs of saying, commanding, etc.... Hence we need not insist that hn (jo. 1:1) is strictly durative always (imperfect). It may be sometimes actually aorist also. So as to efn (Mt. 4:7); elegen (mk. 4:21, 24, 26, 30, etc.), etc." [Robertson, A. T. A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research (Grammar). (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934.), 882-3.]

Now, your second quote in which you purportedly expanded your ellipses to include what was omitted from the original quotation above:

Quote:

"Modern Greek conceives of uphga, ephga and efera as aorists (Thumb, Handb., p 143). Thumb (Thi. L.-Z. xxviiiim 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."

Your quotes don't match. The first very briefly sandwiches a mention of [John 1:1](#)

between two ellipses. God knows what was before and after the mention, filling those ellipses because I do not, nor do you provide this context, which I asked for.

The second doesn't even mention [John 1:1](#) at all.

Yet, all my arguments fall apart under your critical examination? You can't even match up your quotes and that's "critical examination?"

\*snort\*

And once again, mondo, even if the above Robertson quote(s) have not been yanked from context or selectively quoted to suit your own purposes rather than the intended meaning of the author, the fact that one authority has published conflicting opinions about 1:1a does not mean my argument has "fallen apart." IF the Robertson quote(s) are credible (and actually applicable), which I have yet to agree, that's ONE authority who (may) agree with your position. No field of study has uniform agreement and unless we take the various scholars/authorities as infallible, it's fallacious to expect (nay, demand) that authorities agree. ONE example isn't even **significant** conflict when it comes to an appeal to authority.

You haven't disproven anything. And considering you spent the past hr or two blathering on about 1:1c rather than 1:1a, your "critical examination" leaves much to be desired.

Also in regards to your "fine" quotation from Vine's, which you repeatedly insist is credible in supporting your position, let me break it down for you.

Vine says *theos* has a "double stress," one because it lacks the article and one because it was moved forward to the emphatic position. Then, he says the quote you're so proud of, "a god was the word" to show how it would be **misleading** to translate it as such, given the double emphasis, i.e. "god" must appear after *the Word was*, not before (one stress) and "a god" would be inappropriate because, so Vine says in the entry, stress was placed on *theos* by omission of the article (second stress). So not only is one stress (word order) misleading, the second stress (lack of article) is also misleading. Given the context in Vine's entry, his focus was illustrating that the lack of a definite article places emphasis. Then, he gives an example to illustrate the error in failing to recognize emphasis by lack of the article.

Yet, you quote it. Proudly.

If you take issue with that, please see the entire quote I posted. Vine provides the 1:1c translation "and the Word was God" one scant sentence before your precious quote -- and does **not** say that translation is "misleading" whatsoever.

The fact that you are so determined to insist that phrasing Vine himself uses as an exemplar of what is **not** correct as though it must be true boggles the mind. The immediate context provides the proper translation of 1:1c, *the Word was God*, discusses omission of the article in placing emphasis and provides an example to illustrate improper handling of this omission-for-emphasis: your quote.

Go fish.



### JaySee

Member

Join Date: Jun 2006  
Posts: 861  
24 Reputation Points



God Himself declared there is NO gods but GOD HIMSELF. How clear does God have to be before we finally understand that there are no gods but God?!

Simply, the JW's believe in two gods/GODS. You cannot accept Jesus as a god and yet still claim that there is one true God. If God is the one and only true God, is Jesus a false god, then? All other gods are man's idealism. Paul plainly said man's gods are nothing but idols, which aren't really gods, but man-made idealism. So, that means there aren't really any gods but God. The satan is called god of this world, but never in God's mind that Satan is a small god. He is rather, a rebellion angel, not god. And no angels are gods. Show me scriptures with the proper contextual meaning and we'll go from there.



08-28-2006

#263

### Toejamken

Junior Member

Join Date: Jul 2006  
Location: NW Florida  
Posts: 89  
16 Reputation Points



Mondo,  
I've tried to share the truth with you. Unless you repent you will die in your sins.

Ken



08-28-2006

#264

### Toejamken

Junior Member

Join Date: Jul 2006  
Location: NW Florida  
Posts: 89  
16 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by [katie russell](#)  
*No, you simply misunderstand Is.43:10-11. There Jehovah is saying there are no gods that are independant from him. In truth the gods of the surrounding nations are a unreality. But the "Word" being "a god" in [John 1:1](#) is not a god that is independant from Jehovah nor is his godship an unreality. Hence, one can not use Is.43:10 against a translation that is both grammatically and contextually the best translation.*

Katie,  
I understand [Isaiah 43:10-11](#). You're simply in denial, but your denial will have negative consequences at the final judgement unless you repent.

Ken



08-28-2006

#265

### Toejamken

Junior Member

Join Date: Jul 2006  
Location: NW Florida  
Posts: 89  
16 Reputation Points



Katie,

You are obviously in denial of what the Word of God actually says. The consequences of which are eternal.

I post the comments below in hope that you will listen to those more qualified than yourself to translate the Word of God.

DR. J.R. MANTEY (who is quoted on pages 1158-1159, of the Society's Kingdom Interlinear Translation): "A shocking

mistranslation". "Obsolete and incorrect". "It is neither scholarly nor reasonable to translate [John 1:1](#) "The Word was a god."

DR. BRUCE M. METZGER of Princeton University (Professor New Testament Language and Literature): "A frightful mistranslation...", "erroneous...", "pernicious..." "reprehensible...". "If the Jehovah's Witnesses take this translation seriously, they are polytheists."

DR. SAMUEL J. MIKOLASKI of Zurich, Switzerland: "This anarthrous (used without the article) construction does not mean what the indefinite article 'a' means in English. It is monstrous to translate the phrase 'the Word was a god.'"

DR. PAUL L. KAUFFMAN of Portland, Oregon: "The Jehovah's Witnesses [translators] evidence an abysmal ignorance of the basic tenets of Greek grammar in their mistranslation of [John 1:1](#)."

DR. CHARLES L. FEINBERG of La Mirada, California: "I can assure you that the rendering which the Jehovah's Witnesses give [John 1:1](#) is not held by any reputable Greek scholar."

DR. JAMES L. BOYER of Winona Lake, Indiana: "I have never heard of, or read of any Greek scholar who would agree to the interpretation of this [[John 1:1](#)] verse insisted upon by the Jehovah's Witnesses... I have never encountered one of them [Society member] who had any knowledge of the Greek language."

DR. WILLIAN BARCLAY of the University of Glasgow, Scotland: "The deliberate distortion of truth by this sect is seen in their New Testament translations. [John 1:1](#) is translated: 'the Word was a god.' a translation which is grammatically impossible. It is abundantly clear that a sect which can translate the New Testament like that is intellectually dishonest."

DR. F.F. BRUCE of the University of Manchester, England: "Much is made by Arian amateur grammarians of the omission of the definite article with 'God' in the phrase 'and the Word was God.' Such an omission is common with nouns in a predicative construction... 'a god' would be totally indefensible."

(The late Dr. Barclay and Dr. Bruce are generally regarded as Great Britain's leading Greek scholars. Each have New Testament translations in print.)

DR. ERNEST C. COLWELL of the University of Chicago: "A definite predicate nominative has the article when it follows the verb; it does not have the article when it precedes the verb... this statement cannot be regarded as strange in the prologue of the gospel which reaches its climax in the confession of Thomas: 'My Lord and my God.'--[John 20:28](#)."

DR. J. JOHNSON of California State University, Long Beach: "No justification whatsoever for translating THEOS EN HO LOGOS as 'the Word was a god.' There is no syntactical parallel to [Acts 23:6](#) where there is a statement in indirect discourse; [John 1:1](#) is direct... I am neither a Christian nor a Trinitarian."

DR. EUGENE A. NIDA, head of Translation Department, American

Bible Society: "With regard to [John 1:1](#), there is of course a complication simply because the New World Translation was apparently done by persons who did not take seriously the syntax of the Greek." (Responsible for the Good News Bible -- the committee worked under him.)

DR. B.F. WESTCOTT (whose Greek New Testament text -- not the English part -- is used in the Kingdom Interlinear Translation): "The predicate (God) stands emphatically first, as in [John 4:24](#). It is necessarily without the article... No idea of inferiority of nature is suggested by [this] form of expression, which simply affirms the true deity of the Word... in the third clause 'the Word' is declared to be 'God', and so included in the unity of the Godhead."

DR. J.J. GRIESBACH (whose Greek New Testament text -- not the English part -- is used in the Society's publication The Emphatic Diaglott): "So numerous and clear are the arguments and testimonies of Scriptures in favor of the true Deity of Christ, that I can hardly imagine how, upon the admission of the Divine authority of Scripture, and with regard to fair rules of interpretation, this doctrine can by any man be called in doubt. Especially the passage, [John 1:1-3](#), is so clear and so superior to all exception, that by no daring efforts of either commentators or critics can it be snatched out of the hands of the defenders of the truth."

Source: Grieshaber, Erich, and Jean Grieshaber. "Mistranslations," *Redi-Answers on Jehovah's Witness Doctrine*. Blue Letter Bible. 1 Jul 2002. 28 Aug 2006.  
< <http://blueletterbible.org/study/cults/rajwd/rajwd24.html> >



08-28-2006

#266

[katierussell](#)

Member

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



I am not "comparing" the godship of the Word with that of others but have simply shown that the word can indeed be applied to others not God and that biblical monotheism allows for this. Although some of what you say I disagree with(eg: the Word is "uncreated") I certainly agree that the Word's being a god was of a godship greater than any other such as the angels who are also called such for it was "through" the Word that God created all things(in [John 1:1](#) the physical universe). he is also called the "only begotten god" and the one closest to God the Father(1:18).



08-28-2006

#267

[katierussell](#)

Member

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



No, In Is 43:10 we consider what he says there in accord with it own context. However, whenever we do come across the expression" only God" or "one God" it never ever refers to anyone but God the Father, Jehovah. I believe that the "a god" is contextually correct for it say that one theos is with another and to translate the second theos as "God" confounds these two whom were with each other. Solely on this the translation "a god" is contextually the better and without reading post-biblical thoughts and idea into John here which trinitarians are apt to do. This is the reason why they reject the "a god" translation as well as not really understanding what is true biblical monotheism and think wrongly that the "a god" translation is polytheistic. It is not. Ad the Word is not said to have existed forever, without a beginning as one can not get

that from verse 1a, and nor does 1:2 says that the Word is the creator but that it was another, God, who created "all things" but "through" this Word. There is then nothing contextually inconsistent with the "a god" translation but it is in fact not only gramatically the better and contextually too when one does not read trinitarianism into it.



08-28-2006

#268

[katierussell](#)

Member

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



Well, I think that I have allowed each, that is [Isaiah 43:10-11](#) and [John 1:1, 2](#), to be understood properly in their respective contexts and that I have a proper understanding of biblical monotheism. I could say then that because you have not both, apparently, it's you who are in "denial." But I won't.



08-28-2006

#269

[katierussell](#)

Member

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



You are assuming things Tim! I and my husband were Catholics but when we both reached adult hood we both started to read the scriptures without any preconcieved ideas which led us to reject certain doctrines of our Church. Including the trinity doctrine. This was before we met up with any witnesses. So, do not assume things about another poster Tim! You asked the wrong questions!



08-28-2006

#270

[mondo](#)

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006  
Posts: 816  
13 Reputation Points



What on earth is that smell? Hmm.. Oh yes, desperation.

Quote:

Originally Posted by [tkkclark](#)   
*Okay, let's look at Robertson.*

*Your original quote:*

*Now, your second quote in which you purportedly expanded your ellipses to include what was omitted from the original quotation above:*

*Your quotes don't match. The first very briefly sandwiches a mention of [John 1:1](#) between two ellipses. God knows what was before and after the mention, filling those ellipses because I do not, nor do you provide this context, which I asked for.*

The two quotes match up perfectly. Maybe you should buy his grammar. Watch and see how it matches up

"They are sometimes called 'aoristic' imperfects... The same root was used for both forms, as only one form exists and it is hard to tell which tense the form is... We see this difficulty in hn, efn, elegon, etc., particularly in verbs of saying, commanding, etc. Modern Greek conceives of uphga, ephga and efera as

aoorists (Thumb, Handb., p 143). Thumb (Thi. L.-Z. xxviiiim 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 Tattius.

Hence we need not insist that hn (jo. 1:1) is strictly durative always (imperfect). It may be sometimes actually aorist also. So as to efn (Mt. 4:7); elegen (mk. 4:21, 24, 26, 30, etc.), etc." [Robertson, A. T. A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research (Grammar). (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934.), 882-3.]

The context is all about this subject, nothing else. It is under the heading "Doubtful Imperfects" which he then says "are sometimes called 'aoristic' imperfects. That is the topic of this entire section, which he lists [John 1:1c](#) as a possible member of.

Quote:

The second doesn't even mention [John 1:1](#) at all.

It is all one section! He doesn't have to list the text in every sentence of the section!

Quote:

Yet, all my arguments fall apart under your critical examination? You can't even match up your quotes and that's "critical examination?"

\*snort\*

Yes it does. And you are so desperate to avoid the facts that you imply my dishonesty, when I have yet to do anything remotely dishonest. It has proven to be only your way of lightening the weight of evidence.

[qupte]

And once again, mondo, even if the above Robertson quote(s) have not been yanked from context or selectively quoted to suit your own purposes rather than the intended meaning of the author, the fact that one authority has published conflicting opinions about 1:1a does not mean my argument has "fallen apart." IF the Robertson quote(s) are credible (and actually applicable), which I have yet to agree, that's ONE authority who (may) agree with your position. No field of study has uniform agreement and unless we take the various scholars/authorities as infallible, it's fallacious to expect (nay, demand) that authorities agree. ONE example isn't even **significant** conflict when it comes to an appeal to authority.

[/quote]

Oh but it is, because all of your scholars that you quoted are attempting to defend their doctrine in context. They have mixed theology and grammar. In this case, Robertson is honest enough to admit that it is not necessarily the case.

Quote:

You haven't disproven anything. And considering you spent the past hr or two blathering on about 1:1c rather than 1:1a, your "critical examination"

leaves much to be desired.

Also in regards to your "fine" quotation from Vine's, which you repeatedly insist is credible in supporting your position, let me break it down for you.

Vine says *theos* has a "double stress," one because it lacks the article and one because it was moved forward to the emphatic position. Then, he says the quote you're so proud of, "a god was the word" to show how it would be **misleading** to translate it as such, given the double emphasis, i.e. "god" must appear after *the Word was*, not before (one stress) and "a god" would be inappropriate because, so Vine says in the entry, stress was placed on *theos* by omission of the article (second stress). So not only is one stress (word order) misleading, the second stress (lack of article) is also misleading. Given the context in Vine's entry, his focus was illustrating that the lack of a definite article places emphasis. Then, he gives an example to illustrate the error in failing to recognize emphasis by lack of the article.

Vine's argument can be knocked down by recognizing one simple point. The word order has nothing to do with stress, it has to do with poetry. [John 1](#) has a very carefully used poetic rhythm that is destroyed if the word order is changed. John couldn't use a different word order for his poetry.

Now what is "a god" though, according to Vine? It is literally how it should be translated he says! Vine actually does not specify why he views it as misleading. He does not say it is because of the "double stress," he does not say "Thus, to translate it literally.." For whatever reason he does view it as "misleading," he still confesses it to be the "literal" reading and you just \*do not\* want to accept this. You don't have a choice at this point, because it is \*what he said.\*

Quote:

If you take issue with that, please see the entire quote I posted. Vine provides the 1:1c translation "and the Word was God" one scant sentence before your precious quote -- and does **not** say that translation is "misleading" whatsoever.

Of course he does, because that is the KJV's rendering! He does not say that the rendering is "literal" though, he says "a god" is literal.

Quote:

The fact that you are so determined to insist that phrasing Vine himself uses as an exemplar of what is **not** correct as though it must be true boggles the mind. The immediate context provides the proper translation of 1:1c, *the Word was God*, discusses omission of the article in placing emphasis and provides an example to illustrate improper handling of this omission-for-emphasis: your quote.

Go fish.

Sure, he does not believe it to be correct, but he does believe it to be "literal" and that is my whole point!

Fish caught, cleaned and cooked.



[truffy](#)

Inactive



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



Quote:

Originally Posted by [mondo](#)  
*The question is not valid, because it is based upon a false premise, which is that the Greek I use is negative for Jesus. It is not, but what I show when explaining that Greek is negative for your theology.*

So I guess you do like to follow other Greek forms of scripture, the Sahidic Coptic, not the Septuagint? My, oh my, such desperation on your side. That alone says everything about your negative feelings for Jesus. So I ask again...did you learn this Greek negative for Jesus when in the Baptist Seminary, or was it when you were first influenced by WatchTower literature? I'm waiting.....?

Tim 😊😊😊



08-28-2006

#272

[mondo](#)

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006  
Posts: 816  
13 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by [truffy](#)  
*So I guess you do like to follow other Greek forms of scripture, the Sahidic Coptic, not the Septuagint? My, oh my, such desperation on your side. That alone says everything about your negative feelings for Jesus. So I ask again...did you learn this Greek negative for Jesus when in the Baptist Seminary, or was it when you were first influenced by WatchTower literature? I'm waiting.....?*

You really have absolutely no idea what you're talking about do you? The Septuagint is the same form of Greek as the New Testament. The Sahidic Coptic is Sahidic Coptic, not Greek at all! Thus, as I said, faulty question.



08-28-2006

#273

[katierussell](#)

Member

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



Yes, seen them all before, read them but decided not to buy the T-shirt. You have been misled. Some of those scholars you quoted based their criticism's on Colwell's Rule. But you just quoted Harner whose article was against this rule! Talk about contradictory posts! Yours are! Its obvious you have no knowledge about the grammatical issues involed here with the translation of [John 1:1c](#). I addressed your last post and what do you do? Simply quote scholars which you copied and pasted off some web site and so it is patently clear you have little idea what I said, what they are saying and even that they are wrong! But you won't accept that because they are "scholars." Try thinking for yourself please.



08-28-2006

#274

[truffy](#)

Inactive



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



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

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...

Quote:

The two texts do not compare grammatically.

Mondo, you didn't answer this question...can you tell me why the two texts do not compare grammatically? The sentences are quite similar, theos precedes the verbs, etc....

[John 1:1](#) (and God was the Word)  
[Luke 12:24](#) (and God feeds them)

And so.....? your answer is.....?

Tim 😊😊😊



08-28-2006

#275

### AmazingGrace

CARM Super Member



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



And he is also called God. How do you reconcile that with your beliefs? If Jehovah is Alpha & Omega, how can Jesus claim that for himself?

Thanks, this conversation has been quite interesting. Have a great day.

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](#)



08-28-2006

#276

### truffy

Inactive



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



Quote:

Originally Posted by [katierussell](#)   
*You are assuming things Tim! I and my husband were Catholics but when we both reached adult hood we both started to read the scriptures without any preconcieved ideas which led us to reject certain doctrines of our Church. Including the trinity doctrine. This was before we met up with any witnesses. So, do not assume things about another poster Tim! You asked the wrong questions!*

Sorry, I try not to assume or speculate, but that is the normal path a former Catholic would take when answering the door knocks. We are all still waiting for your definitions of "anarthrous predicate nomitative", do you have a calculating guess as to what those three words really mean, in simple grammar of course?

Tim 😊😊😊



08-28-2006

#277

## katierussell

Member

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



Jesus was certainly not called "God" in any trinitarian sense. Thats for sure.

Others other than God can have theos applied to them and not be the one true God nor anything like a 'false god.' But the weight of the scriptural evidence is great that the "one God" the "only God" the "true God" is the Father and the Father only for none of these expression refer to any other but to the Father only. In fact atv times the bible writers explicitly refer to the Father as such in distinction from his Son. Only the Father is called "**God the Father**" and the title "Almighty" only ever applied to him. If Jesus was truly God as much as the Father was why his he not so called(yes, I know some texts are in dispute) "one God," "only God" "our God" and "true God." Yet the Father is called such where there are no ambiguities from either grammar or context? The noun theos is never ever used to refer to a triune God and yet it is thought of by those who think Jesus is "God" that he is a person of this triune God! Understand where I'm coming from?

Thanks and I will, hope you likewise.

Oh, nearly forgot. I do not think that Jesus is the Alpha & Omega.



08-28-2006

#278

## mondo

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006  
 Posts: 816  
 13 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by **truffy** >

*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...*

*Mondo, you didn't answer this question...can you tell me why the two texts do not compare grammatically? The sentences are quite similar, theos precedes the verbs, etc....*

*[John 1:1](#) (and God was the Word)*

*[Luke 12:24](#) (and God feeds them)*

*And so.....? your answer is.....?*

One is a predicate nominative, one is not.




08-28-2006

#279


[mondo](#)

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006  
 Posts: 816  
 13 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by [AmazingGrace](#)   
*And he is also called God. How do you reconcile that with your beliefs? If Jehovah is Alpha & Omega, how can Jesus claim that for himself?*

*Thanks, this conversation has been quite interesting. Have a great day.*

The answer is that he isn't called the Alpha and Omega. They are both called the First and the Last, and that is easily explained when the texts are kept in context.




08-28-2006

#280

[AmazingGrace](#)

CARM Super Member



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



Quote:

I believe that the "a god" is contextually correct for it say that one theos is with another and to translate the second theos as "God" confounds these two whom were with each other.

I don't see how this can be contextually correct. I believe it is a misunderstanding of the trinity that has been taught by the WT that confounds you on the subject.

From the scholars I've read, they say that John wrote it in this manner for the specific purpose of showing that Jesus is God. But I think you are already aware of that. How do you feel about the WT misquoting scholars to show support for their translation?

Quote:

This is the reason why they reject the "a god" translation as well as not really understanding what is true biblical monotheism and think wrongly that the "a god" translation is polytheistic

Do you think nonJW's misunderstand monotheism? We believe in one God.

'a god' is certainly polytheistic as it is a belief in more than one god, no matter how much worship you say he gets or whether it's the same as what the Father receives, it is yet another god. Websters defines it as:

**1.** Worshipping or believing in more than one god.

So yes, the JW belief is poly. where does God say that we will worship him along with a littler god? Where does Jehovah tell us to praise or worship anyone other than himself? why does faith in Jesus glorify the Father? It goes against the context not just of John, but the bible as a whole.

I have to assert again, that the 'a god' is not contextual at all since Jesus is indeed called God in the scriptures and because it does, indeed, make the belief polytheistic. And you have shown that you do believe in more than one god.

Quote:

And the Word is not said to have existed forever, without a beginning as one can not get that from verse 1a, and nor does 1:2 says that the Word is the creator but that it was another, God, who created "all things" but

"through" this Word.

Can you show that Jesus isn't eternal? My opinion is that God refers to himself as the beginning and the end, first & last - If he is the beginning & Christ was with him in the beginning, why would one doubt that Christ is eternally existing.

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



Post Reply

Page 14 of 26 << First < 4 10 11 12 13 **14** 15 16 17 18 24 > 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**

All times are GMT -4. The time now is 07:39 AM.  
As of July 6, 2006, Total Page Views: 22,354,792, Page Views Today: 22,354,792

-- 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