



08-28-2006

#281

truffy
Inactive



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

Quote:

Originally Posted by **mondo** ▾
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.

Then tell me how you will explain to God the Father and God the Son why Jehovah's Son has to be put down to the level playing field with Satan who is a god of this world? If you truly do believe in God the Father, you wouldn't be following the WatchTower's rhetorics but instead follow Jesus in the Bible who is the God the Son. If you follow Jesus then why put Him down to that dangerously lower level of deity at the mercy of the Devil, which only serves the love of the master of deception, who is Satan himself?

Tim 😊😊😊



08-28-2006

#282

mondo
501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006
Posts: 816
13 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **truffy** ▾
Then tell me how you will explain to God the Father and God the Son why Jehovah's Son has to be put down to the level playing field with Satan who is a god of this world? If you truly do believe in God the Father, you wouldn't be following the WatchTower's rhetorics but instead follow Jesus in the Bible who is the God the Son. If you follow Jesus then why put Him down to that dangerously lower level of deity at the mercy of the Devil,

which only serves the love of the master of deception, who is Satan himself?

None of that follows anything. You are merely trying to emotionalize the discussion to make things seem all bad for Jesus, when in fact your representation of the matter is entirely false. I've addressed your point and demonstrated how the entire basis of Trinitarian theology is in error.



08-28-2006

#283

AmazingGrace

CARM Super Member



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



How do you explain that he was called God then? That again is merely opinion Katie. And I respect that it is your belief, but that isn't what the scripture says. What you are asking here doesn't diminish the argument of Christ's deity. You can say theos doesn't refer to God in the way I understand him (triune), I simply don't agree. I've been waiting for some evidence to make me see that Jesus isn't who he claimed to be, but I've yet to see any. I have to believe that Jesus is who he claims to be.

So where Jesus says he is the Alpha & Omega in Revelation 12"Behold, (AG)I am coming quickly, and My (AH)reward is with Me, (AI)to render to every man according to what he has done. 13"I am the (AJ)Alpha and the Omega, (AK)the first and the last, (AL)the beginning and the end."

Who is coming? Is it Jehovah who is coming or is it Jesus? Plus, v.16 shows it is Jesus talking. Katie, I honestly don't understand why there is a staunch refusal to accept what scripture says. Don't you only want to please God, no matter what the cost? Why do you not agree that Jesus is referring to himself as the A & O?

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

#284

AmazingGrace

CARM Super Member



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



[Rev 22](#) shows Jesus calling himself the A & O. And isn't the meaning of A & O first & last? Please show me how I've taken this verse out of context.

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

#285

mondo

501-1000 Posts



Join Date: Mar 2006
Posts: 816
13 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **AmazingGrace** 
Rev 22 shows Jesus calling himself the A & O. And isn't the meaning of A & O first & last? Please show me how I've taken this verse out of context.

Jesus is not identified as the speaker of the one who identifies himself as the Alpha and Omega in [Revelation 22](#). Jesus doesn't start speaking until verse 16. [Rev 22:12](#) is a quote from [Isaiah 40:10](#), which references both the Father (Jehovah) and the Son (the arm of Jehovah - c.f. [Isa. 53:1](#)) The Father is coming ([Rev. 22:12-13](#)) with the Son ruling for him. Jesus is not the speaker prior to verse 16, just as John was not the speaker only a few verses earlier prior to when he said "I, John," and prior to [Rev. 1:9](#) when he says the same.



08-28-2006


#286

truffy
Inactive



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

Quote:

Originally Posted by **mondo** 
The NT writers also take texts about David, Solomon and Isaiah and apply them to Christ. A sampling of this can be seen them in [Hebrews 1-2](#). This never makes them one and the same or one person of a polypersonal being.

Your "I am" stuff was refuted a long time ago, as was the [John 12 - Isaiah 6](#) stuff. The arguments are entirely weak. The best place that I know to point you to online for both is gonna be <http://www.scripturaltruths.com/jesus/iam/> and <http://www.scripturaltruths.com/jesus/agloryseen/>

btw, in the future, if you are going to quote copywrited material, you should at least give proper credit to where you got it from and not post it as your own words.

Mondo, where did you get this accusation from, where is your proof this was copywrited material? Is it because his reply was lengthier than yours? You must have an ego problem, for some of us use 2 or 3 hours to reply to you and somehow all their typing only drives you up the wall. If you will notice he took 35 minutes between your previous post and his last post, so why all the flying accusations without proof? I suppose if Jesus said "before Abraham I shall prove to be" will convince you we are right, but it just doesn't work that way, because you people already made up your minds, and always look the other way. Then you would change the "I Shall Prove To Be" in Exodus back to "I Am" just because Jesus would have said "I shall prove to be", and that is your deceptive game. So many places in the Bible you people have changed and it was only to serve the WatchTower, not God.

Tim   



08-28-2006

#287

mondo
501-1000 Posts



Join Date: Mar 2006

Quote:

[Empty quote box]

Posts: 816
13 Reputation Points

Originally Posted by **truffy**

Mondo, where did you get this accusation from, where is your proof this was copywrited material? Is it because his reply was lengthier than yours? You must have an ego problem, for some of us use 2 or 3 hours to reply to you and somehow all their typing only drives you up the wall. If you will notice he took 35 minutes between your previous post and his last post, so why all the flying accusations without proof? I suppose if Jesus said "before Abraham I shall prove to be" will convince you we are right, but it just doesn't work that way, because you people already made up your minds, and always look the other way. Then you would change the "I Shall Prove To Be" in Exodus back to "I Am" just because Jesus would have said "I shall prove to be", and that is your deceptive game. So many places in the Bible you people have changed and it was only to serve the WatchTower, not God.

I copy and pasted a sentence out of the material into Google and did a search and found that it was cut word for word from a Church of God website.

Read the article I linked. It soundly deals with the issue.



08-28-2006

#288

truffy

Inactive



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

Quote:

Originally Posted by **mondo**

None of that follows anything. You are merely trying to emotionalize the discussion to make things seem all bad for Jesus, when in fact your representation of the matter is entirely false. I've addressed your point and demonstrated how the entire basis of Trinitarian theology is in error.

Oh good, does that mean you would want to go to the Theology room and discuss this on the Trinity Board? I made so many discussions over there and I don't mind you and me getting in there making a discussion on the Trinity. I don't think the Trinity is allowed to be discussed here in the JW board. So what do you say, do you want us to go there?

Tim 😊😊😊



08-28-2006

#289

mondo

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006
Posts: 816
13 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **truffy**

Oh good, does that mean you would want to go to the Theology room and discuss this on the Trinity Board? I made so many discussions over there and I don't mind you and me getting in there making a discussion on the Trinity. I don't think the Trinity is allowed to be discussed here in the JW board. So what do you say, do you want us to go there?

Actually, so we can not have a million people bomb the thread besides us, why don't you go to the site I linked and join the board there. I will do the same and we can discuss it there.





08-28-2006

#290

AmazingGrace

CARM Super Member



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



But what does Jesus say in v. 16?

16"(AS)I, Jesus, have sent (AT)My angel to testify to you these things (AU)for the churches I am (AV)the root and the (AW)descendant of David, the bright (AX)morning star."

He just said that he sent the angel to testify. Was it not the angel speaking before?

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 : 08-28-2006 at 09:22 AM.



08-28-2006

#291

katierussell

Member

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



Yes, in 3 places all in John the word theos is applied to him. But in each case the context(and grammar)shows him not to be God in the absolute underived sense that the "one God" the "true God" the "only God" is. Because the word can be and had been used for others not "God"(in the OT and writings since then and before John wrote his gospel) John could and felt he could when using it toward the Son. It was quite appropriate for him to do so. But when one examines his writings one thing stands out. The Father was "God" in a way the Son was not. Only the Father is shown to be the "only" the "true" the "one" God and in fact "our God." This is also in Paul's writngs too.

I am not trying to "diminish" Christ's deity but keeping it in it's proper place. I believe trinitarianism does not do that.

Yes, I accept who Jesus is and who he claimed to be. Not God but God's Son. What I also said is that no bible writer ever uses the word theos to refer to a triune being. But that is exactly what trinitarians mean when they say "God." Can you see a problem here? They use a biblcal word, "God" but not in a way the Bible does!

As to who is the A&O of [Revelation 21:13](#) I will not go into that at the moment. Perhaps another time. Suffice for me to say now that the speaker there does not have to be Jesus. The angel changes to and from whose words he speaks in this chapter as one can readily see.



08-28-2006

#292

tkkclark

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006
Posts: 275
18 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by [mondo](#)
What on earth is that smell? Hmm.. Oh yes, desperation.

You present ONE authority, while I've presented several...And you think **I'm** desperate?

snort

Quote:

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

Nope, not going to buy the grammar. Sorry. I **loathe** grammar.

To give credit where credit is due, though, you **did** say that your second quote was the contents of the ellipses. I thought you were typing the quotation, in full. My mistake. **Some** of us are honest enough to admit when they've made a mistake.

I will note, however, that I asked you to fill in what you omitted in your ellipses in your original quote. You filled in **one** ellipses. There were **three**. And you did not note in your second quotation which ellipses your quotation filled. Had I seen 3 quotations, reflecting the 3 portions of omitted material, rather than one quotation which expanded upon only one of the three (without mentioning which of the 3 ellipses the quotation belonged), the fact that you were not quoting in full (as I mistakenly assumed) would've been immediately obvious.

Quote:

"They are sometimes called 'aoristic' imperfects..."

See? Ellipses #1.

Quote:

The same root was used for both forms, as only one form exists and it is hard to tell which tense the form is...

Ellipses #2.

Quote:

We see this difficulty in *hn*, *efhn*, *elegon*, etc., particularly in verbs of saying, commanding, etc. 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 treated as aorist, but Moulton (*Prol.* p. 129) demurs, though he admits the possibility 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 difference between *elegen* and *eipen* is well-nigh gone, if it ever existed. The same thing is true of the usage of Achilles Tatius. 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.]

And finally ellipses #3, the part you fill in. The others you did not. Nor did you note which ellipses your second quotation expanded upon. Rather confusing. And if you want to insist that it should've been readily apparent which ellipses you were filling in...You didn't say which omitted material you were providing and I asked for all 3. Sorry, my spirit guides must've had the day off. (This is sarcasm,

btw. I do not believe in so-called spirit guides unless we're talking about demons, in which case, I certainly don't consult them.)

Quote:

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.

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

And Robertson also stated quite the contrary in my original quotation of him in RWP.

Quote:

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.

Mondo, I'm not implying anything. I am **stating explicitly** that your quotation of Vine's was dishonest. Your quotation of Vine was yanked out of context and does **not** in any way reflect what Vine intended or meant. Dance around it all you like, but that **is** dishonest.

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.

So your ONE authority (who, if your quotation is credible, conflicts with what he himself wrote in RWP) invalidates the many, many authorities I cited (and many more I **could** and **have offered** to quote) because you're levelling a blanket accusation of bias without so much as a shred of proof and/or supporting evidence for your charge of uniform bias.

Dream on.

And just because Robertson admits that it's **possible** for the imperfect tense to not require continued action of the verb, that does not mean he believes it is plausible in [John 1:1a](#). See my quotation of RWP wherein he states the imperfect *eimi* therein denotes "...no idea of origin for God or for the Logos, simply continuous existence." Possibility is not probability. Possibility is not proof that it should be understood that way. Robertson explicitly stated in RWP that the imperfect *eimi* points to the eternity of the Word. The imperfect tense may not, in every case, need to point to continued action of the verb, but in this instance, [John 1:1a](#), Robertson very clearly stated that the imperfect **did** mean continued action and explains why in the context of RWP when he remarks on John's deliberate word choices, between his choice of *egeneto* for created things (John the Baptist, the world) as opposed to the imperfect *eimi* for the Word.

Quote:

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.

Does Vine mention poetry? I see no mention of poetry in Vine's entry. Certainly, that may be **your** interpretation, but that certainly is not **Vine's**. And we **are** considering Vine's argument as to whether or not what he intended and meant lines up with what you insist. Vine's does not mention poetry. Ergo, you are importing your own argument rather than discussing what **Vine actually said and intended**.

Quote:

Now what is "a god" though, according to Vine?

A misleading translation because **he** believed a double stress had been placed on *theos* by virtue of word order and the lack of the article. AND he continues in the next sentence following your quotation about how predicates can be determined by the lack of article as well.

Quote:

It is literally how it should be translated he says!

Yes. He says this is how it should be literally translated if you disregard emphasis by word order, emphasis by lack of article, then goes on to discuss identifying the predicate by that same lack of article.

Basically, he says that's how it should be literally translated if you're translating without considering matters he is addressing in that section of the entry.

Quote:

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.*

Dude, look at the quote. Vine says [John 1:1](#) is a "notable instance" of double stress, one due to word order and another to lack of article. Then he quotes your lovely quote, saying it is misleading. Why else, within the context of that very paragraph would **Vine** (not **you**, **Vine**) say that your beloved quote is misleading? He's making the point of emphasis by lack of article, providing an "notable instance" of a wrong translation for what he previously stated: stress can be reflected in the lack of article.

You say "for whatever reason" but the context of Vine's entry makes that reason crystal clear. His reasons are no elaborate mystery because he provides his reasons **in the very context of your quote**. Look at the sentence immediately preceding your quote. There's your reason. He even says [John 1:1](#) is a "notable instance" of that reason. Vine is specifically addressing emphasis via lack of article. Then, your quote which he says is misleading. You'd like to paint this as a matter of 'oh, we don't know what Vine meant,' but we very much know what Vine meant because we know what subject matter he was addressing in the sentence that immediately precedes the "misleading" translation!

Yet, you deny it.

Unbelievable.

PATHETIC.

Quote:

Of course he does, because that is the KJV's rendering!

Does he say the KJV is misleading? Hm?

Quote:

He does not say that the rendering is "literal" though, he says "a god" is literal.

Literally misleading, you betcha. And you quote it as though his example of what not to do is the Gospel. You should be ashamed of yourself.

Quote:

Quote:
Yes. He says it's literally wrong to interpret it as such. It's an example of what **not** to do, provided by Vine himself!

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

mondo, you're obsessed with "literal" to the point of excluding Vine's immediate context which readily, plainly and concisely explains why your quote is **literally wrong**.

Quote:

Fish caught, cleaned and cooked.

Yours has been, I agree. Very obviously so. You got busted yanking a quote of context to make it appear the author intended something he most certainly did not mean. Yep, your fish is pretty well fried.



08-28-2006

#293

mondo

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006
Posts: 816
13 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by **AmazingGrace**
But what does Jesus say in v. 16?

16"(AS)I, Jesus, have sent (AT)My angel to testify to you these things (AU)for the churches I am (AV)the root and the (AW)descendant of David, the bright (AX)morning star."

He just said that he sent the angel to testify. Was it not the angel speaking before?

I explained to you already that it is a quote from Isa. about the Father, didn't I?



08-28-2006

#294

truffy



Inactive



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



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

Quote:

One is a predicate nominative, one is not.

That is totally wrong, both sentences are predicate nominatives. Both come with verbs and theos precedes the verbs. Your reasoning is being blinded by negative doctrines. You are only theorizing this without proof, only WatchTower rhetorics.

Tim 😊😊😊



08-28-2006

#295

AmazingGrace

CARM Super Member



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



I disagree. And those are not the only places in scripture that he is called God. You keep saying that the **The Father was "God" in a way the Son was not** - we keep agreeing on this but you keep saying it as though it is any refutation of what I believe.

No, I don't see a problem with understanding God to be triune.

In [Rev 21:16](#) Jesus says that the angel testified for him.

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

#296

truffy

Inactive



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



Quote:

Originally Posted by **mondo**
Actually, so we can not have a million people bomb the thread besides us, why don't you go to the site I linked and join the board there. I will do the same and we can discuss it there.

Let's go there then.

Tim 😊😊😊



08-28-2006

#297

AmazingGrace

CARM Super Member



Join Date: Jun 2006
 Location: Columbus, OH



Then why would Jesus apply it to himself which he makes clear in v.16 that the angel testified for him.

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](#)

Gender: ♀
 Posts: 2,682
 56 Reputation Points



08-28-2006

#298

[katierussell](#)

Member

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



No truffy, theos is the subject of the sentence and it is also articular(has the Greek definite article). Theos in [John 1:1c](#) is predicate and anarthrous(does not have the Greek definite article)

Stop accusing Mondo of being "blinded" by this or that! Its not only disrespectful but totally wrong!



08-28-2006

#299

[AmazingGrace](#)

CARM Super Member



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



what site?

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

#300

[truffy](#)

Inactive



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



Quote:

Originally Posted by [AmazingGrace](#) [»](#)
what site?

Gee I thought he knew what I was talking about. I asked him to go meet me at the Trinity Board. Hehehe, and he wasn't even there. LOL. That's the reason why I came over here 3 days ago, the Trinity board is too boring and very few people go there.

Tim 😊😊😊



[Post Reply](#)

Page 15 of 26 [« First](#) [<](#) [5](#) [11](#) [12](#) [13](#) [14](#) **15** [16](#) [17](#) [18](#) [19](#) [25](#) [>](#) [Last](#) [»](#)

[« Previous Thread](#) | [Next Thread »](#)

Quick Reply



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: 22,354,805, Page Views Today: 22,354,805

-- 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