



08-28-2006

#321

**tkkclark**  
Member

Join Date: Apr 2006  
Posts: 275  
18 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **mondo**   
*Because the one authority removes all wieght from your insistance.*

Only in your deluded mind, mondo. Only in your deluded mind.

Robertson notes **a possibility** when it comes to imperfect tenses of a verb not **always** pointing to continued action of each verb and if I remember correctly, notes earlier in your quotation of him that we shouldn't understand the imperfect tense as continued action, for instance, when the verb is a speech/commanding verb.

The imperfect tense **alone**, all by itself, does not determine if it denotes continued action. We must look to the **context** to determine if continued action is intended. Looking at context to determine word meaning is **not** theological bias. If so, every time a word had more than one meaning, you could scream theological bias rather than allowing the context point to meaning.

Oh.

Wait.

You do that.

LOL.

Robertson points to John's delibrate use of *egeneto* and the imperfect *eimi* in pointing to *eimi* as imperfect denoting eternity. Care to answer that?

Quote:

The other authorities do not even comment on this fact, but they disregard itin favor of their theology.

Yet another **unsupported** blanket accusation of bias.

Quote:

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.

I said I loathe grammar. I did not say I didn't understand grammar. And when it comes to Vine's, which **is not** a grammar text but a basic Bible dictionary, I'm perfectly capable of reading and understanding what I read.

Quote:

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.

Possibility is not proof, mondo.

Quote:

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.

He points to it as a literal **mistranslation**, which is readily apparent in the context of his entry. If you want to know how **not** to translate it, Vine's gives you the quote as his example. Yet, you claim his example of how **not** to translate 1:1c somehow mysteriously proves that's how you **should** translate it.

Quote:

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 .

Yet again, unsupported blanket accusations of bias -- that **never** addresses the points addressed in these commentaries and authorities.

And again, possibility that the imperfect tense **may** not point to continued action does not **prove** continued action is not appropriate in [John 1:1a](#).

Want to address any of the points any of the authorities I quoted address? Ever? Such as the immediate context of *en arche*, In the beginning..? Such as John's deliberate word choices in regards to *en* and *egeneto*? John's allusion to creation? Are you going to address any of these issues that support the imperfect tense or just dance around a blanket bias accusation all the live long day?

Quote:

If it wasn't plausible, why would he even bring up that one specific text?

Possibility is not proof.

Quote:

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.

Robertson does:

Quote:

Imperfect tense of continuous existence in the universe before the Incarnation as in [John 1:1](#) and [John 1:2](#).

I guess it's a matter of how you define world.

Quote:

You missed the point there. Vine doesn't mention that it is poetry, but it is! That is the point!

No, the point is what Vine meant and intended. The point is not what **you** believe. The point is what **Vine** believed and what **he** wrote in his entry.

Quote:

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.

You're certainly entitled to believe Vine was wrong, but that does not invalidate what the man believed and he believed different than what you say. **He** believed word order placed emphasis on *theos*. He, furthermore, believed that the lack of the article also placed on emphasis on *theos*. He also believed the lack of the article served to point to it as predicate.

Tell me: did Vine believe in this whole poetry business?

So why are you dragging that out when we're discussing what Vine believed, what he intended to say and whether his meaning lines up with yours?

You're quoting him as though what he intended supports your position, yammering about poetry, when Vine doesn't say a blasted thing about poetry.

You can disagree all you like, but that does not change what **Vine** meant.

Quote:

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

Yes -- a literally misleading translation.

Quote:

There is no emphasis on word order, it has a word order because of the poetry.

Your opinion, not Vine's.

Quote:

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.

I'm not stuck anywhere, compadre.

You're also going on and on about Vine's belief in emphasis being placed because of word order and studiously ignoring his belief that emphasis was also placed due to the lack of the article.

Quote:

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

Vine says:

Quote:

...when the absence of the article serves to lay stress upon, or give precision to, the character or nature of what is expressed in the noun. A notable example of this is in [John 1:1](#), "and the Word was God"; here a double stress is on *theos*, by the absence of the article and by the emphatic position. To translate it literally "a god was the Word" is entirely misleading.

He notes 2 conditions which he believes lays stress on *theos* then provides an example of how the clause **shouldn't** be translated, given the existence of those two conditions.

Quote:

If that is what he meant, why didn't he say that?!?!?

Are you physically incapable of reading in context or is this just a special case???

Quote:

He didn't say that! He said "a god" was literal.

Look at the c/p quotation in context again. Please. He said your literal interpretation was "entirely misleading" given the conditions he mentioned in the preceding sentence.

Quote:

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

And none of your repetitive assertions to the contrary changes **the context**. Vine himself says the translation is **wrong**. He provides it as an example of how **not** to translate it.

Quote:

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."

Context does not change what he said, but it does reveal the meaning of what he said and his meaning **does not reflect what you insistently demand**.

How have I twisted and turned what Vine said? Did Vine say translating that way is valid or that translating that way would be "entirely misleading"?

Stop yanking a quote of context and twisting it to suit **your** purposes.

Quote:

The quote in context still says exactly what I claimed for it.

Too bad Vine didn't mean what you insist.

You are aware that repeating a position doesn't make it any more true, right?

Quote:

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.

No, he acknowledged it as a literal **mistranslation**.

Quote:

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.

You lose the argument so you resort to attacking me personally?

And this reflects well on **your** integrity...How?

Attack the argument, not the person to whom you are arguing with.

Honestly, I must say you are a very poor loser.



08-28-2006

#322


truffy

Inactive



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

Quote:

Originally Posted by **katierussell**   
*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 feel 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! 😊

This comes to your opinion of whether it is a predicate nominative or it isn't. My opinion is the opposite, both verses do clearly indicate a definite article, which is God or theos. Both verses put theos ahead of the verbs, so [John 1:1c](#) is clearly meant to be just like [Luke 12:24](#) in the sense that both theos are the subjects of both sentences. You don't want to see it that way because of your beliefs. I have a belief too, but I also don't see any difference between [John 1:1c](#) and [Luke 12:24](#) in their sentence structures, you do. Thank you for teaching your theories Katie, but please don't be offended if I don't agree with what you said, its only a discussion. 🙏

Tim 😊😊😊



08-28-2006

#323

[katierussell](#)

Member

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



You may well have learnt what a predicate nominative is/means but so far you have been unable to identify one in all the examples you have cited which you felt are the same sentence structure of [John 1:1c](#). You have consistently confused the subject with the sentence's predicate!



08-28-2006

#324

[secondbirth](#)

CARM Super Member



Join Date: Jul 2006  
Location: NEW JERSEY  
Posts: 1,757  
41 Reputation Points



once again mondo, lets see what the jw greek interlinears says: 1969 edition, i have been is properly rendered in the perfect tense. 1985 edition says:its properly translated by the perfect indicative.HERES MY QUESTION? wouldnt true scholars know the correct tense? which is wrong ,which is right. also in the nwt 1950, they claim now its in the perfect tense, new light huh! WELL ALL THREE ARE WRONG MONDO. THE CORRECT TENSE IS THE PRESENT TENSE. AND THE CORRECT TRANSLATION IS "I AM" NOT I HAVE BEEN. SO WHY THE FLIP FLOPS HERE



08-28-2006

#325

[katierussell](#)

Member

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



Truffy, the Greek definite article is not before theos of [John 1:1c](#). Here is the Greek: kai theos en ho logos. Literally "and god was the word." The subject here is the Word for this is shown from the very first part of this verse when we read "In the beginning was the Word." The predicate nominative is theos. It has no Greek article before it. Hence we know that the Word, the subject, is being described, in the predicate, as theos. Can you see this? Do you accept this? If not why not?

Now, in [Luke 12:24](#) we have :kai **ho** theos trephei autous. Here theos **does** have the Greek definite article. Here the subject of the sentence is theos and the predicate tells us what the subject does. In this case it is trephei autous, "is feeding them." IF you disagree tell us why you do.

From this though you should now be able to see that the theos in [John 1:1c](#) is an anarthrous predicate noun (and preceding the verb en) but in [Luke 12:24](#) theos is the subject (and preceding the verb trephei). Now, see that they are certainly then **not of the same sentence structure** as far as theos is concerned and of course in [John 1;1c](#) the predicate is first while in [Luke 12:24](#) the subject.

This has nothing whatsoever to do with "beliefs" truffy. Nor is the above any "theory"! Just simple grammar! Perhaps a non-witness should come into it now and tell you this then perhaps you will accept what you should? It seems that you are simply arguing against what I and Mondo are telling you because we are JW's! Now, that is as close-minded as one can get and is against your claim you are "open minded"!

I will no longer discuss the sentence structure of [John 1:1c](#) with you but advise you to do some basic study.



08-28-2006

#326

[katierussell](#)

Member

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



This one for instance:

Quote:

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."

This is one of the scholars who "misunderstood" Colwell's Rule (which the above quote comes from an article by Metzger on the NWT and 'used' Colwell to criticize the NWT's [John 1:1c](#) translation) according to [Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament](#).

So, your "more qualified men" are not always to be trusted are they Toejamken!



08-28-2006

#327

[mondo](#)

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006  
Posts: 816  
13 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by [secondbirth](#)

*once again mondo, lets see what the jw greek interlinears says: 1969 edition, i have been is properly rendered in the perfect tense. 1985 edition says: its properly translated by the perfect indicative. HERES MY QUESTION? wouldnt true scholars know the correct tense? which is wrong ,which is right. also in the nwt 1950, they claim now its in the perfect tense, new light huh! WELL ALL THREE ARE WRONG MONDO. THE CORRECT TENSE IS THE PRESENT TENSE. AND THE CORRECT TRANSLATION IS "I AM" NOT I HAVE BEEN. SO WHY THE FLIP FLOPS HERE*

They are all right, actually. Perfect is the TENSE, indicative is the MOOD. Understand the difference? The tense referenced to is the ENGLISH tense, not the Greek, and so they were 100% accurate.





08-28-2006

#328

## mondo

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006

Posts: 816

13 Reputation Points



I'm not going to bother discussing Vine further with you, I've already made my case and you can't overcome it, pure and simple. You've gotten to the point where you are grossly misrepresenting Vine, implying that he said things that he did not say at all. Any honest reader of your comments can see right through them when compared to what Vine says, but I will go ahead and address what you said with respects to Robertson.

Quote:

Originally Posted by [tkkclark](#)

*Robertson notes **a possibility** when it comes to imperfect tenses of a verb not **always** pointing to continued action of each verb and if I remember correctly, notes earlier in your quotation of him that we shouldn't understand the imperfect tense as continued action, for instance, when the verb is a speech/commanding verb.*

*The imperfect tense **alone**, all by itself, does not determine if it denotes continued action. We must look to the **context** to determine if continued action is intended. Looking at context to determine word meaning is **not** theological bias. If so, every time a word had more than one meaning, you could scream theological bias rather than allowing the context point to meaning.*

Robertson specifically cites [John 1:1](#) as an example where the imperfect might be aoristic. The context does nothing to substantiate that it is eternally durative. You must come to the text with that conclusion a priori in order to demand that reading of the text, pure and simple. Thus, as I said to begin with, HN in [John 1:1](#) does not prove that Jesus is eternal. It is your argument and so the burden of proof is on you. You are free to believe that this text expresses that, but it in no way proves that even remotely.

Quote:

Robertson points to John's deliberate use of egeneto and the imperfect eimi in pointing to eimi as imperfect denoting eternity. Care to answer that?

Sure, gladly. [John 1:10](#) does that. He was not eternally in the world, but he came to be in the world and yet it uses HN, but in the same text it says that the world came to be through him. There is not a mystical contrast here, it is just a different emphasis.



08-28-2006

#329

## secondbirth

CARM Super Member



Lol, With A Piece Of Chicken Wing Stuck To My Teeth.



Join Date: Jul 2006  
Location: NEW JERSEY  
Posts: 1,757  
41 Reputation Points



08-28-2006

#330

### AmazingGrace

CARM Super Member



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



Quote:

Yes, Jesus is coming soon, but the point is that the Father is said to be coming too!

In [Rev 1:7-8](#) it is clear who is coming on the clouds, we see it is the one who was pierced.

Quote:

are the angel speaking for Jesus, especially when we consider that only the Father is identified as the A&W in Revelation.

The A & W? Now God is rootbeer? Just kidding, did you mean A & O or am I missing something?

Jesus is shown to be the Alpha & Omega because in v.12 he says 'behold I'm coming quickly' and it ends in v.20 with 20He who (BK)testifies to these things says, "Yes, (BL)I am coming quickly " Amen (BM)Come, Lord Jesus. Again, what have I missed?

You agree that Christ is also the First & Last (which means A & O), but besides that, we see in [Isaiah 44:6](#) where Jehovah says that of himself.

So I must just somehow not understand what Jesus is saying. Because it appears to me that Jesus & Jehovah make the same claims for who they are.

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

#331

### AmazingGrace

CARM Super Member



That may be true, but it can be said about the NWT as well. Who translated the NWT?



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



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

#332

[mondo](#)

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006  
 Posts: 816  
 13 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by [AmazingGrace](#)

*In [Rev 1:7-8](#) it is clear who is coming on the clouds, we see it is the one who was pierced.*

[Revelation 1:8](#) doesn't say that the speaker is the one in 1:7, it identifies the speaker as "he who is, who was and who is coming," which we see from verses 4 and 5 is not Jesus.

Quote:

The A & W? Now God is rootbeer? Just kidding, did you mean A & O or am I missing something?

Jesus is shown to be the Alpha & Omega because in v.12 he says 'behold I'm coming quickly' and it ends in v.20 with 20He who (BK)testifies to these things says, "Yes, (BL)I am coming quickly " Amen (BM)Come, Lord Jesus.

Again, what have I missed?

You agree that Christ is also the First & Last (which means A & O), but besides that, we see in [Isaiah 44:6](#) where Jehovah says that of himself.

So I must just somehow not understand what Jesus is saying. Because it appears to me that Jesus & Jehovah make the same claims for who they are.

[/quote]

Simply because Jesus says he is coming quickly does not mean that he is the speaker in verse 12. I have made an argument and you have entirely avoided it.

As for Jesus, yes he is the first and the last, but as the one who because dead and alive. He is the firstborn from the dead, the first to be raised to eternal life, thus he is the first, and he is the last for he now has eternal life, he is not immortal.



08-28-2006

#333

[AmazingGrace](#)

CARM Super Member

Quote:



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

Quote:

Revelation 1:8 doesn't say that the speaker is the one in 1:7, it identifies the speaker as "he who is, who was and who is coming," which we see from verses 4 and 5 is not Jesus.

So do you think v.4&5 show the Father as coming? I said who is coming (not speaking) - it shows quite clearly that the one who was pierced is coming. Lets put it all out here for those on the sidelines to judge:

[Rev 4-8](#)

4(J)John to (K)the seven churches that are in (L)Asia: (M)Grace to you and peace, from (N)Him who is and who was and who is to come, and from (O)the seven Spirits who are before His throne,

5and from Jesus Christ, (P)the faithful witness, the (Q)firstborn of the dead, and the (R)ruler of the kings of the earth To Him who (S)loves us and released us from our sins by His blood--

6and He has made us to be a (T)kingdom, (U)priests to (V)His God and Father-- (W)to Him be the glory and the dominion forever and ever. Amen.

7(X)BEHOLD, HE IS COMING WITH THE CLOUDS, and (Y)every eye will see Him, even those who pierced Him; and all the tribes of the earth will (Z)mourn over Him. So it is to be. Amen. 8"I am (AA)the Alpha and the Omega," says the (AB) Lord God, "(AC)who is and who was and who is to come, the Almighty."

Quote:

I have made an argument and you have entirely avoided it.

I'm sorry, if you think I avoided your argument, look again. I'll repaste it for you.

AG's previous post:

Quote:

Jesus is shown to be the Alpha & Omega because in v.12 he says 'behold I'm coming quickly' and it ends in v.20 with 20He who (BK)testifies to these things says, "Yes, (BL)I am coming quickly " Amen (BM)Come, Lord Jesus.

I'm sorry if there was some sort of miscommunication, I thought I made it quite clear who was speaking as evidenced by who said he was coming quickly and it ending with showing that Jesus was the one coming.

Quote:

As for Jesus, yes he is the first and the last, but as the one who because dead and alive. He is the firstborn from the dead, the first to be raised to eternal life, thus he is the first, and he is the last for he now has eternal life, he is not immortal.

I agree he is the firstborn from the dead. And is also the first & last as Jehovah is. That verse doesn't say firstborn from the dead, but other verses do. So I would say there is a clear distinction in that he is both.

I'm assuming the problems with what you wrote above is due to typos and that you mean he is immortal.

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

#334

[katierussell](#)

Member

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



The 1985 version just uses more modern terminology not that each are talking of two different English tenses. And while the Greek is indeed in the present this does not mean it should be translated with an English present. If you have the interlinear look at [John 15:27](#) and the plural of eimi which in the Greek is the present tense, "you are" but every English translation(bar the KJV)renders into an English perfect "you have been." No "flips flops" just a bit of sloppy thinking on your part!



08-28-2006

#335

[truffy](#)

Inactive



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



Quote:

Originally Posted by [AmazingGrace](#)   
*That may be true, but it can be said about the NWT as well. Who translated the NWT?*

I can answer that one, I learned it a long long time ago. You see, they had a panel of 5 translators (so they were called), and the leader of that panel was Franz. It turned out he did all the translating and the other 4 so-called translators were only there to assist him with all the side work. Franz, so we learned, had no degree or schooling of the Hebrew translating, but only had a limited schooling of the Greek translating, which he did not finish or graduate from. Instead he quit the courses and went ahead to translate the whole Bible (OT and NT) which he was not fully qualified to do. The other 4 so-called translators turned out they only had high school diplomas and had no translating courses. That was the makeup of their NWT Bible when first published in 1950. I borrowed a book on that subject from a friend of mine, and I was really awed at how a Bible can be so terribly corrupted by desperate men.

Tim



08-28-2006

#336

[truffy](#)

Inactive



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



Quote:

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

This is what you typed before...

Quote:

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.

Actually if you look at the Trinity board at CARM there are only a few people at a time over there, mostly Unitarians. If you are afraid of being bombarded its not going to happen unless viewers from this board know we are going there and they want to follow. I don't have an account at the site you want me to go to, and this site is sufficient enough for all kinds of discussions. So why don't you go to that Trinity Board with me and discuss the Trinity Theology? 🙄

Tim 😊😊😊



08-28-2006

#337

## AmazingGrace

CARM Super Member



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



Really? Hard to believe that such a translation would deserve so rigorous a defense.

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

#338

## truffy

Inactive



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



Quote:

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

I don't follow you, you said all that needs to be said to explain your argument of predicate nominative sentences, verbs after theos, the subject of theos, whether definite or indefinite. I learned a lot from you two, but I just don't agree with your conclusions as you pointed out for that sentence and the other sentence in [Luke 12:24](#). So my conclusion is as follows...

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

1-theos is the subject in that sentence

2-this sentence has a verb just like [Luke 12:24](#)

3-this theos is therefore a definite article, not an indefinite article

4-the Word was God

That is my conclusion, so just live with it. 🙄

Tim 😊😊😊



08-28-2006

#339

## Toejamken

Junior Member

Join Date: Jul 2006



Quote:

Originally Posted by [katierussell](#)

Location: NW Florida  
 Posts: 89  
 16 Reputation Points

*This one for instance:*

*This is one of the scholars who "misunderstood" Colwell's Rule (which the above quote comes from an article by Metzger on the NWT and 'used' Colwell to criticize the NWT's [John 1:1c](#) translation) according to [Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament](#).*

*So, your "more qualified men" are not always to be trusted are they Toejamken!*

Why the exclamation in your last sentence when you were asking a question? Perhaps you think you've really shown me something? Am I to conclude that Metzger is untrustworthy from the little tidbit you just shared? Can you with any authority tell me he has no respect among his peers? Perhaps you could share with me the books you've written about ancient greek, and how they garner respect among those knowledgeable of the same? I'm not impressed. You're unwilling to share what your qualifications are, so I can only conclude you have none.

I understand there is something mysterious about Jesus being God incarnate, which means it cannot be fully known. Jesus is uncreated and equal with the Father, and I am among those willing to accept this plain truth of Scripture. Jesus and the Father are both called God, yet there is only One, and both are worthy of worship. All choices have consequences, and mine has not been unrewarded ([Romans 5:5](#) ; [1 John 3:23-24](#)) .

"For not even the Father judges anyone, but He has given all judgment to the Son, so that all will honor the Son even as they honor the Father. He who does not honor the Son does not honor the Father who sent Him. Truly, truly, I say to you, he who hears My word, and believes Him who sent Me, has eternal life, and does not come into judgment, but has passed out of death into life." ([John 5:22-24](#))

Jesus never once refused the worship of His followers, and I have chosen to honor the Son equally with the Father according to Jesus own words. By the grace of God I have experienced Jesus as the way, the truth, and the life. The Holy Spirit is my guarantee that I do not come into judgement, but have the light of life in Jesus Christ.



08-28-2006

#340

truffy

Inactive



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

Quote:

Originally Posted by **AmazingGrace**   
*Really? Hard to believe that such a translation would deserve so rigorous a defense.*

I wish I still have that book I borrowed, there was a lot more said about Franz and Rutherford and their knowledge for their Greek and Hebrew. It turned out they had very little knowledge, because when they went to testify in court, in separate events of course, the lawyer asked them to translate a sentence, they said they couldn't do it. I'll have to borrow that book again, someday, a lot of really interesting things were said about the two men.

Tim 😊😊😊





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

### Quick Reply

Message:

X | **B** | *I* | U | A ▾ | | |

ABC | ↑ | ↓ | A

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

Options

Quote message in reply?

Post Quick Reply

Go Advanced

#### Posting Rules

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

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

All times are GMT -4. The time now is 07:43 AM.

As of July 6, 2006, Total Page Views: 22,354,929, Page Views Today: 22,354,929

-- 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