



08-28-2006

#301

### mondo

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006  
Posts: 816  
13 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **tkkclark** ▾  
*You present ONE authority, while I've presented several...And you think I'm desperate?*

Because the one authority removes all weight from your insistence. The other authorities do not even comment on this fact, but they disregard it in favor of their theology.

Quote:

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

Obviously, which is why you are having so much trouble dealing with the fact that I did not misrepresent Vine. You can't follow his grammar.

Quote:

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.

Because I gave you enough context to see the point, that "we need not insist that hn (jo. 1:1) is strictly durative. I'm not going to type out that entire section. Sorry, just not going to happen. You have a significant amount of material that leads up to those key words. By all means, remove the two sections prior to the ellipses, the point still remains, that it is not necessarily the case.

Quote:

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.

It was not even remotely dishonest. Why? Because my argument was that grammarians admit that it can be translated as "a god," Vine is clearly seen as stating that "a god" is a literal translation. He believes the "literal translation" is "entirely misleading," and he is free to do that, but that does not change the fact that 1) it is what it literally says and 2) Vine acknowledges that.

Quote:

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.

You're missing the point. All of your commentaries that you posted are making an interpretation of the text. They are free to do that. My point and my only point is that such is not the only valid interpretation of the text and so it doesn't "prove" anything, contrary to what you might like it to do .

Quote:

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.

If it wasn't plausible, why would he even bring up that one specific text? Yes, in his WP he does say what you claim, but that, again, is not the only valid interpretation. He admits that such an interpretation cannot be insisted upon, for he says "we need not insist that hn is strictly durative." [John 1:10](#) goes to prove that too, for nobody would argue that Jesus was eternally in the world.

Quote:

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**.

You missed the point there. Vine doesn't mention that it is poetry, but it is! That is the point! The text has a very specific poetic rhythm that can be clearly defined when read in Greek. Thus, my point is that Vine is wrong in his argument because the basis for his argument is word order and the word order uses is necessary not to be emphatic, but because of the poetry.

Quote:

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.

That doesn't change the fact that he still counts it as literal.

Quote:

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.

There is no emphasis on word order, it has a word order because of the poetry. Nevertheless, you are still stuck between a rock and a hard place because with the word order and with his argument he still says that it is literally a god.

Quote:

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.

That isn't what he says at all! At no time does he even come close to saying what you argue for.

Quote:

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.

If that is what he meant, why didn't he say that?!?!? He didn't say that! He said "a god" was literal.

Quote:

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!

And still, none of this changes the simple fact that he says the literal translation is a god.

Quote:

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**.

The context does not change what he said. Stop trying to twist and turn your way out of it. Literal is literal. And what according to Vine is literal? "a god."

Quote:

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.

The quote in context still says exactly what I claimed for it. Your huffing and puffing about it doesn't change that fact. If I was using the quote to claim that Vine endorsed the translation, you'd be correct in saying that I took it out of context, but I did not do it. All I did was show that Vine acknowledged it as a literal translation. I didn't even remove the fact that he says it is misleading. I don't have a problem if he views it that way, for he still says that a god is what the text literally says. That was my point, nothing more. Now grow up and act like an adult.



08-28-2006

#302

**mondo**

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006  
Posts: 816  
13 Reputation Points

Quote:

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

Jesus didn't apply it to himself, that is the point. It was God speaking. The speaker is not explicitly identified in the text, but we can see from 1) the fact that it is a quote about the Father and 2) going back to 21 we see who the Alpha and Omega is and 3) Jesus doesn't start speaking until verse 16.



08-28-2006

#303


**truffy**

Inactive



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

Quote:

Originally Posted by **mondo**  
  
*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.*

But again, you didn't answer my questions...obviously a question dodger. 😊

Tim 😊😊😊



08-28-2006

#304

**mondo**

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006  
Posts: 816  
13 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **truffy**  
*But again, you didn't answer my questions...obviously a question dodger.*  
☹️

What question didn't I answer?



08-28-2006

#305

**truffy**  
Inactive



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

Quote:

Originally Posted by **mondo**  
*What question didn't I answer?*

You're right, they weren't questions, but they were obviously answers to the WatchTower puzzle...

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

#306

**mondo**  
501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006  
Posts: 816  
13 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **truffy**  
*You're right, they weren't questions, but they were obviously answers to the WatchTower puzzle...*

*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 don't need to "change" anything, but I need accuracy in translation. The problem is that it is others who have "changed" the translation to try and make a connection that simply does not exist!



08-28-2006

#307

**AmazingGrace**  
CARM Super Member

I think v. 16 shows that the angel prior to v.16 spoke on behalf of Jesus. But if we go to v.20 we see what we need to know even more clearly.



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



20He who testifies to these things says, "Yes, I am coming soon."  
Amen. Come, Lord Jesus.

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

#308

[katierussell](#)

Member

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



I will come back to you on the A&O of [Rev 22:13](#) AG. I usually can reply off the top of my head but sometimes its worth my while to pick another time where I can concentrate on a particular passage and explain it as I see it.



08-28-2006

#309

[mondo](#)

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006  
Posts: 816  
13 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by [AmazingGrace](#)   
*I think v. 16 shows that the angel prior to v.16 spoke on behalf of Jesus. But if we go to v.20 we see what we need to know even more clearly.*  
  
*20He who testifies to these things says, "Yes, I am coming soon."  
Amen. Come, Lord Jesus.*

Yes, Jesus is coming soon, but the point is that the Father is said to be coming too! That is exactly what he see in [Isaiah 40:10](#).

Jesus' statement about the angel are not merely related to the past few verses, but the entire book of Revelation, as seen in 1:1, yet we know that others speak throughout the book of Revelation, including the Father in chapter 21. I think it is a stretch to say that 12-13 are the angel speaking for Jesus, especially when we consider that only the Father is identified as the A&W in Revelation.



08-28-2006

#310

[truffy](#)

Inactive



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



Quote:

Originally Posted by [katierussell](#)   
*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!*

Mondo didn't say that, he said one is a predicate nominative and one is not. For that one statement he was wrong, because both words predicate and nominative

has to do with verbs in a sentence, your two words 'predicate' and '**anarthrous**' (which is not even in my huge Webster Dictionary) is a totally different statement. Did you even see what Mondo said? If you claim [John 1:1](#) does not have the Greek definite article, then prove it, because both verses contain the Greek definite article, both verbs are preceded by theos, both sentences are identical in structure and so on... Where is your proof that these two sentences are nowhere alike?

Tim 😊😊😊



08-28-2006

#311

[truffy](#)

Inactive



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



Quote:

Originally Posted by [mondo](#) >  
*I don't need to "change" anything, but I need accuracy in translation. The problem is that it is others who have "changed" the translation to try and make a connection that simply does not exist!*

Then you must be referring to the Sahidic Coptic translation. If you prefer their language over the Septuagint Greek original, then that is just fine by me, and just fine by the master of deception.

Tim 😊😊😊



08-28-2006

#312

[mondo](#)

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006  
Posts: 816  
13 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by [truffy](#) >  
*Then you must be referring to the Sahidic Coptic translation. If you prefer their language over the Septuagint Greek original, then that is just fine by me, and just fine by the master of deception.*

No, I'm reading the Greek.



08-28-2006

#313

[Ongyo no Kiheiji](#)

Senior Member

Join Date: Jan 2006  
Posts: 2,280  
18 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by [Ongyo no Kiheiji](#) >  
*To add to what Katierussel has stated, here is what the Dead Sea Scrolls give as to an insight of the early Jewish belief about Angels.  
"Praise him, divine spirits, praising for ever and ever the firmament of the highest heavens, all...and its wall, all its structure, its shape. The spirits of the holy of holies, the living 'gods', the spirits of eternal holiness above all the holy ones...The divine spirits surround the dwelling of the King of truth and righteousness; all its walls" (Vermes 226 [4Q403 I i, 30-46]).  
"The figures of the 'gods' shall praise him, the most holy spirits...of glory; the floor of the marvelous innermost chambers, the spirits of the eternal gods, all...figures of the innermost chambers of the King, the spiritual works of the marvelous firmament are purified with salt, spirits of*

knowledge, truth and righteousness in holy of holies, forms of the living 'gods,' forms of the illuminating spirits. All their works of art are marvelously linked, many-coloured spirits, artistic figures of the 'gods,' engraved all around their glorious bricks of splendour and majesty. All their works of art are living 'gods,' and their artistic figures are holy angels. From beneath the marvelous inner most chambers comes a sound of quiet silence: the 'gods' bless..."(Vermes 228 [4Q405 19ABCD]). The author here describes the Most Holy chamber of the Temple. In this chamber was where the Ark of the Covenant was kept. This is where Jehovah dwelled symbolically. Everything in the Most Holy was made of the finest gold. The Bible tells us that the Temple was ornamented with pictures of angels ([1 Kings 6:27-32](#)). Therefore, this description of the "gods" ministering to the Almighty fits perfectly with the Bible. The curtain that separated the Holy from the Most Holy even has pictures of angels ("gods") woven into it ([2 Chron. 3:14](#)).

"The 'gods' praise him when they take up their station, and all the spirits of the clear firmament rejoice in his glory...when the gods of knowledge enter by the doors of glory, and when the holy angels depart the realm, the entrance doors and the gates of exit proclaim the glory of the King...the fear of the King of 'gods' is awe-inspiring to all the 'gods,' and they undertake all his commissions by virtue of his true order" (Vermes 229 [4Q405 23i]).

The War Rule says that "the host of warring 'gods' gird themselves for the Day of Revenge" (1QMXV, Vermes 121). We also find in the fragment titled by Vermes as The Song of Michael and the Just (4Q491 fr. II, Ma) an incomplete sentence that says that there is "a throne of strength in the congregation of 'gods' so that not a single king of old shall sit on it, neither shall their noble men...(Vermes 126). The one called Michael is also held as saying "I am reckoned with the 'gods' and my dwelling place is in the congregation of holiness" and "for I am reckoned with the 'gods,' and my glory is with the sons of the King" (Vermes 126).

As D.S. Russell writes: "There is ample evidence to show that [the OT] conception of monotheism was held in conjunction with a belief in a spiritual world peopled with supernatural and superhuman beings who, in some ways, shared the nature, though not the being, of God" ( \_The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic\_ P. 235). Compare this with the proskuneo of the angel who visits Joshua ([Joshua 5:14](#); cf. [Genesis 18:2](#); [Numbers 22:16](#)). If one wishes to, he or she can conclude that certain Israelites worshipped another 'god' (or other 'gods') as well, since the Bible calls angels 'gods' .

Sorry, that was [Numbers 22:31](#).



08-28-2006

#314

[katierussell](#)

Member

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



I have already pointed out to you truffy something about [Matthew 19:6](#).....it has the Greek definite article before it! Theos in [John 1](#);1c has not. Also theos in [Matthew 19:6](#) is the subject not the predicate. Theos in [John 1:1c](#) is the predicate not the subject! So, in regards to [Matthew 19:6](#) you have your "answer"? How do you "answer" *this*?

08-28-2006

#315

[katierussell](#)



Member

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

Mondo was referring to theos in both places. This is because you said: "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 fee here this **God** in [Luke 12:24](#) is any different than **God** in [John 1:1](#)?"

Also you should have said not [John 1;1](#) but [John 1:1c](#)

In [John 1;1c](#) theos is the predicate nominative in the other it is not. Theos in the Luke scripture is not the predicate truffy! It is the subject of the sentence. In the clause of [John 1:1c](#) we do not have the Greek article before theos. It is also in the predicate. In that clause "logos" is the subject. Hence they are definitely not of the same sentence structure. You are totally confused truffy!

This is what you have to do: Find a singular anarthrous predicate noun that precedes the verb. You have not come up with one yet! There are plenty about though! 😊



08-28-2006

#316

[truffy](#)

Inactive



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

Quote:

Originally Posted by [mondo](#)   
*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.*

You're right, Sahidic Coptic language was translated from original Greek. But our Bibles were translated from original Greek also. So you think our Bible was corrupted somewhere along the way from there to here in time? Experts don't think so, our Bibles were as accurate as can be, and they were not passed over in time, but directly translated from the original Greek. Theos in [John 1:1](#) is a definite article, not indefinite. Compare it with other verses containing theos with verbs, the structures are the same, the same layout and so on.

Tim 😊😊😊



08-28-2006

#317

[truffy](#)

Inactive



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

katie and Mondo, Gee I'm learning a lot from you guys. Thanks for the help in the Greek and sentence structures, I really appreciate it. Now please don't get frustrated because I don't agree with your views of [John 1:1](#), I see the words, I know what the Greek words do mean, and I know what nominative predicate means. My analysis of that sentence is open minded, yours is not, so please don't get offended because of my analysis. Thank you.

Tim 😊😊😊



08-28-2006

#318

[mondo](#)

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006

Posts: 816

13 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by [truffy](#)

*You're right, Sahidic Coptic language was translated from original Greek. But our Bibles were translated from original Greek also. So you think our Bible was corrupted somewhere along the way from there to here in time? Experts don't think so, our Bibles were as accurate as can be, and they were not passed over in time, but directly translated from the original Greek. Theos in [John 1:1](#) is a definite article, not indefinite. Compare it with other verses containing theos with verbs, the structures are the same, the same layout and so on.*

The problem is that most Bible are translated by people with a theological agenda. And if you are a Trinitarian, you would not believe that [John 1:1c](#) is definite, for a definite reading is Modalism, not Trinitarianism. It makes Jesus the Father. That is why Trinitarians also say it is not definite.



08-28-2006

#319

[mondo](#)

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006

Posts: 816

13 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by [truffy](#)

*katie and Mondo, Gee I'm learning a lot from you guys. Thanks for the help in the Greek and sentence structures, I really appreciate it. Now please don't get frustrated because I don't agree with your views of [John 1:1](#), I see the words, I know what the Greek words do mean, and I know what nominative predicate means. My analysis of that sentence is open minded, yours is not, so please don't get offended because of my analysis. Thank you.*

Why are you open minded and us not? We have looked at the issues and reached a conclusion while understanding the Greek, you made your conclusion without even understanding it!



08-28-2006

#320

[mondo](#)

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006

Posts: 816

13 Reputation Points

Btw, I'm waiting for you to join the message board at [www.scripturaltruths.com](http://www.scripturaltruths.com) so we can discuss the Trinity.




 Page 16 of 26   « First < 6 12 13 14 15 **16** 17 18 19 20 > 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: 22,354,812, Page Views Today: 22,354,812

-- 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