



08-29-2006 #461

truffy
Inactive



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

Hi Pat, can I answer your question about Elohim? That is the plural form of God. The divine name in the OT was removed and they used Adonai and Elohim. If you look at the history of why the Masorettes had to replace the YHWH divine name with the two mentioned, you will see why. Let's look at the YHWH for a moment...the Masorettes could not figure out the vowels to go in between the consonants, along with the accents. Then look at all the other words they translated in the Hebrew scripture, those consonants were added with vowels and accents. So, if you see they couldn't work out the most important name in the OT, and somehow fixed all the other words, so what does that honestly mean? Can you figure out why they couldn't work out that one word in the whole OT? I can, they were too scared to write and/or utter such a Holy Divine Name which was sooooo sacred. Now for the NT that is a totally different story. Remember Jesus' prayer "Our Father who art in Heaven, Hallowed be thy Name..." the word hallowed means holy...holy be thy name. Why did Jesus leave that Holy Name out? If He is called YHWH Our Righteousness, do you honestly think He would leave out His Holy Name? Of course not, so even He knew that Holy Name should never be used in our prayers. That is why we never use that Holy Name in our prayers, but you use the Jehovah name which is a Latin form of YHWH, which is the same abuse when you use it in your prayers. Also, the Jehovah name was added in the NWT Bible in the NT many times, which is not supported by the original Greek manuscripts. And, the change in the NWT was made with the lack of fear, and our Bible in the OT was changed for the fear of that Holy Divine Name. So, do you think it is wrong to have fear of God's Holy Name in our OT? And do you somehow think it is OK to have no fear of that Holy Name which was added in the NT in the NWT? Just think about that, Pat, and get back to me.

Tim 😊😊😊

08-30-2006 #462

pestmanpat1
Member

Join Date: Aug 2006
Posts: 1,119
15 Reputation Points

1. honor A person's high standing among others:
dignity, good name, good report, prestige, reputation, repute, respect, status.
See [respect](#).

500 billion years and still burning"think about that"



08-30-2006

#463

faithful281

CARM Super Member



Join Date: Mar 2006
Location: Washington
Gender:
Posts: 726
 44 Reputation Points



[quote=pestmanpat1;476307]this subject can be debated.not all scholars see it the same way however combined with the ovewhelling scriptual evidence of jesus own testimony regarding his father it is clear that jesus is not his father.as when he prayed to his father in heaven while he was on earth.he wasnt praying to himself was he.he said to his father not my will but your will.2 people .if trinity is what jehovah wants us to believe why such mystery.

those against the jws accuse us of putting jesus up as a seperate god.

in john 1:1 there are many other translations that correctly translate the sense of the word god here.such as the word was divine.

[No, you are quite right Jesus is not the Father. Christians believe that Jesus is God BY NATURE. We do NOT believe Jesus is he person of the Father! He can NOT be the Father, since he prayed to the Father in [Jn. 17](#)! He certainly wasn't praying to Himself. The Bible teaches that Jesus is God by NATURE, as is the Father and the Holy Spirit. There is only one true God by NATURE. See [Gal. 4:8](#). The Trinity is NOT defined as three Gods in one, but instead three Persons in one God. God is the NATURE of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit./QUOTE]



08-30-2006

#464

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?"

You replied:

"Wrong, the subject here is not the Word, **the subject is theos**."

If you can not or refuse to be corrected by a JW on this, what is, very simple Greek my I quote the following:

The New Linguistic and Exegetical Key to the Greek New Testament says for theos of [John 1:1c](#):

"theos. The word occurs without the article. *It is the predicate...."*

Now, is it not about time you simply acknowledge you are making one mistake after the other here? So Tim. Is it not time for you to admit you are "wring" and have been along?

(Of course, if you were a JW and made this same mistake no doubt one non-JW poster would have immediately jumped in and accused you of 'obviously not knowing Greek.' They would be right to do so. But of course they have not....because you are not a JW!)

Last edited by katierussell : 08-30-2006 at 04:29 AM.



08-30-2006

#465

AmazingGrace

CARM Super Member



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



It says honor the Son as you honor the Father. Period.

God bless you.

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](#)



08-30-2006

#466

steider2003

Member

Join Date: Jun 2006
 Posts: 699
 22 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by [katierussell](#)

*"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?"*

You replied:

*"Wrong, the subject here is not the Word, **the subject is theos**."*

If you can not or refuse to be corrected by a JW on this, what is, very simple Greek my I quote the following:

The New Linguistic and Exegetical Key to the Greek New Testament says for theos of [John 1:1c](#):

***"theos**. The word occurs without the article. It is the **predicate**...."*

Now, is it not about time you simply acknowledge you are making one mistake after the other here? So Tim. Is it not time for you to admit you are "wring" and have been along?

(Of course, if you were a JW and made this same mistake no doubt one non-JW poster would have immediately jumped in and accused you of 'obviously not knowing Greek.' They would be right to do so. But of course they have not....because you are not a JW!)

In [John 1](#) alone they violate their principle at least five times. Checking their interlinear (pp. 417-419) we see the following:

- [John 1:6](#) para theou—no definite article
- [John 1:12](#) tekna theou—no definite article
- [John 1:13](#) ek theou—no definite article

- [John 1:18](#) Theon—no definite article
- [John 1:23](#) odon Kuriou—no definite article

And they are all translated as God.

Who must admit they are wrong? 😊

Last edited by steider2003 : 08-30-2006 at 04:57 AM.



08-30-2006

#467

[katierussell](#)

Member

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



None of these are where theos is nominative! Look at the spelling for goodness sake!
 And none of them are the same as [John 1:1c](#) where there theos is an anarthrous predicate nominative!

So, Truffy has been joined by another who is just plain wrong! 😊



08-30-2006

#468

[steider2003](#)

Member

Join Date: Jun 2006
 Posts: 699
 22 Reputation Points



the last letter in Thoes doesn't make a difference if it doesn't have an artical in front of it just as [John 1:1](#) . Wow, and you really know greek?

- [John 1:6](#) para theou—no definite article
- [John 1:12](#) tekna theou—no definite article
- [John 1:13](#) ek theou—no definite article
- [John 1:18](#) Theon—no definite article
- [John 1:23](#) odon Kuriou—no definite article



08-30-2006

#469

[katierussell](#)

Member

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



Yes, other cases do not need the definite article to be definite! The nominative usally do to be definite. Obviously, you don't know that. Your mistake No.1.
 Also, as I told you, none of those you cite are anarthrous predicate nominatives. Your mistake No.2.
 Also, there was no 'rule' for all such nouns in the predicate to be considered indefinite. Its just they usually would be. Your mistake No.3.
 Context play a part too. Your mistake(because you seems not to have considered it) No.4.
 So, here we have you making mistake after mistake like Truffy.

Last edited by katierussell : 08-30-2006 at 05:35 AM.



08-30-2006

#470



newWitness

Member

Join Date: Aug 2006
 Posts: 695
 15 Reputation Points

Being a new Witness to the board here, I must say, I have read enough of the post's here to see that your post has been thoroughly answered. If YOU read all the Witness's previous post's on this thread topic, this question will be easily answered.

If you don't intend to do that, then here is a quick answer.

All of your scriptural references are to the a form of the greek word THEOS. Now go learn some greek to see how the word form of the greek word has changed to meet the grammatical necessity of the the sentence. You should ask yourself why isn't there a definite article in the sentence, the answer in these particular reference is you don't need it because of how the word is being used. IE, look at the word ending and see how those changes define the general word THEOS.

PLEASE read the threads here in this topic and other's it will help you discover that we do know what the bible really teaches.

PS if you don't understand what I am saying in this post, please PM me and I will explain the GREEK and why your response are without merit.

newWitness



08-30-2006

#471

steider2003

Member

Join Date: Jun 2006
 Posts: 699
 22 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by **katierussell**

Yes, other cases do not need the definite article to be definite! The nominative usually do to be definite. Obviously, you don't know that. Your mistake No.1.

Also, as I told you, none of those you cite are anarthrous predicate nominatives. Your mistake No.2.

Also, there was no 'rule' for all such nouns in the predicate to be considered indefinite. Its just they usually would be. Your mistake No.3.

Context play a part too. Your mistake(because you seems not to have considered it) No.4.

So, here we have you making mistake after mistake like Truffy.

[John 1:1](#) "The Word was with [the] God" (the article is used)
 When the article is used with "God", then divine personality is in view. The article points out which Person of the Godhead Christ was with from eternity past.
 "And the Word was God" (no article is used)
 When the article is not used, divine essence is signified (all that God is). The Word (Christ) is here described as being GOD (with the emphasis upon all that God is and all that God is like). If the article had been used here, then the phrase would be theologically incorrect: "The Word was the God."

An article in greek is just a finger point to what you are talking about.



08-30-2006

#472

katierussell

Member



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

Now you are not writing about what you did at first!

You have yet to admit that the case of the noun usually determines whether it is definite or not. Nouns in the dative and the genitive normally do not require the definite article to be definite. Accusative and nominatives do. Got that?
Now, back to your quoted examples. None of them were nominative.
Also, none of those you quoted were where theos was the anarthrous predicate nominative before the verb.

Now, will you admit your error or not in this with your false and misleading comparison of [John 1:1c](#) and those you quoted? Everyone is watching you!



08-30-2006

#473

[Jonathan Roy](#)

Member

Join Date: Feb 2006
Location: Newcastle Upon Tyne, England, UK
Posts: 1,019
28 Reputation Points



Whatever the truth of the matter, Jesus died for you... in the JW scheme of things, Jehovah didn't. In fact, Jehovah does not do much of anything according to what I have read in 'What the Bible really Teaches'. I left with the conclusion that he is a lazy sod. The bible says that there is no greater love than that a man lay down his life for another. So Jesus loves me more. He will do the judging, he will be the king... kindly explain why the big god should have any right to demand more worship than the wee god? I am going for the wee god... but then, I believe he is the big one anyway!!



08-30-2006

#474

[steider2003](#)

Member

Join Date: Jun 2006
Posts: 699
22 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by [katierussell](#)
Now you are not writing about what you did at first!

*You have yet to admit that the case of the noun usually determines whether it is definite or not. Nouns in the dative and the genitive normally do not require the definite article to be definite. Accusative and nominatives do. Got that?
Now, back to your quoted examples. None of them were nominative.
Also, none of those you quoted were where theos was the anarthrous predicate nominative before the verb.*

Now, will you admit your error or not in this with your false and misleading comparison of [John 1:1c](#) and those you quoted? Everyone is watching you!

So how do you know which God they are talking about if it doesn't have an article in front? The same as you know which God they are talking about in the second part of [John 1:1](#) when the first part has a article.

The fact that "word" is articular while "God" is anarthrous makes it clear that John is telling us something about the word, namely, that the word was God.



08-30-2006

#475

[truffy](#)



Inactive



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

Quote:

Originally Posted by [katierussell](#)
*"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?"*

You replied:

*"Wrong, the subject here is not the Word, **the subject is theos**."*

If you can not or refuse to be corrected by a JW on this, what is, very simple Greek my I quote the following:

The New Linguistic and Exegetical Key to the Greek New Testament says for theos of [John 1:1c](#):

"theos**. The word occurs without the article. It is the **predicate...."

Now, is it not about time you simply acknowledge you are making one mistake after the other here? So Tim. Is it not time for you to admit you are "wring" and have been along?

(Of course, if you were a JW and made this same mistake no doubt one non-JW poster would have immediately jumped in and accused you of 'obviously not knowing Greek.' They would be right to do so. But of course they have not....because you are not a JW!)

Why are you avoiding my grounds for common sense about those two verses which I compared...

Now if you take [John 1:1c](#) and declare that subject is the Word, then you will have to also do that to [Luke 12:24](#) and declare the subject is not theos but only ravens. You can't have it one way for this verse and then put it another way for that verse, both verses will have to be treated the same.

If you like it this way for this verse, and then that way for that verse, that is why I said it is wishful thinking. You can't play around with verses written by God in a way to make Jesus a target of Satan who is a god of this world. I would never do that, it is simply so very wrong and that is my grounds for common sense about Jesus' deity and those two verses.

Tim 😊😊😊



08-30-2006

#476

[truffy](#)

Inactive



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

Quote:

Originally Posted by [newWitness](#)
Being a new Witness to the board here, I must say, I have read enough of the post's here to see that your post has been thoroughly answered. If YOU read all the Witness's previous post's on this thread topic, this question will be easily answered.

If you don't intend to do that, then here is a quick answer.

All of your scriptural references are to the a form of the greek word THEOS. Now go learn some greek to see how the word form of the greek word has changed to meet the grammatical necessity of the the sentence. You should ask yourself why isn't there a definite article in the sentence, the answer in these particular reference is you don't need it because of how the word is being used. IE, look at the word ending and see how those changes define the general word THEOS.

PLEASE read the threads here in this topic and other's it will help you discover that we do know what the bible really teaches.

PS if you don't understand what I am saying in this post, please PM me and I will explain the GREEK and why your response are without merit.

newWitness

Then try comparing [John 1:1c](#) with [Luke 12:24](#) and make a conclusion about the subjects of those two sentences. In [Luke 12:24](#) the subject is theos and in [John 1:1c](#) it is the Word, so that's what Katie said. If the Word is the subject in [John 1:1c](#) then you tell me why the ravens are not the subject in [Luke 12:24](#)? Is there any common sense on your part and can you make a reasonable comparison?

Tim 😊😊😊



08-30-2006

#477

[katierussell](#)

Member

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



Common sense is it now? And all along I thought you were giving us all examples of the same Greek sentence structures of what we have at [John 1:1c](#)!

Look at it a different way Truffy.

Lets look at the English translation.

[John 1:1c](#) is usually translated "the Word was God." Now, you know, hopefully, that the English sentence is subject-verb-predicate. Yes? Agree with this so far? Now, the subject comes first, followed by the verb followed by the predicate. Got it? Now, look at the sentence "the Word was God." Could you tell us all who is the subject of that sentence? The Word or God? Its the Word isn't it Truffy??? So, in the Greek the subject of the sentence kai theos en **ho logos**("the Word") it's **the logos** that is the subject of the sentence is it not Truffy?

Now, in Greek word order in a sentence is often predicate verb subject but not always. One can find the subject by simply looking to see which word denotes the person about which a statement is being made. In [John 1:1c](#) it is, as I have shown "the Word." This is the person about which John then makes a statement about. In [Luke 12:24](#) it is God whom then Jesus makes a statement about. In [John 1:1c](#) the predicate is a word which expresses that statement. In [John 1:1c](#) it is "en theos." Hence, theos is the predicate of [John 1:1c](#).

Another thing of course is that in [Luke 12:24](#) theos has the article before it so it is a definite nominative as nominatives require the article to be definite. While in [John 1:1c](#) theos is without the article and so is indefinite in this sentence structure(anarthrous predicate nominative.) and so quite rightly translated indefinitely "a god."

I also quoted you the [Linguistic Key](#) to inform you what word is the predicate in [John 1:1c](#). What did it tell you truffy?



08-30-2006

#478

[truffy](#)

Inactive



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

Quote:

Originally Posted by [Jonathan Roy](#)
Whatever the truth of the matter, Jesus died for you... in the JW scheme of things, Jehovah didn't. In fact, Jehovah does not do much of anything according to what I have read in 'What the Bible really Teaches'. I left with the conclusion that he is a lazy sod. The bible says that there is no greater love than that a man lay down his life for another. So Jesus loves me more. He will do the judging, he will be the king... kindly explain why the big god should have any right to demand more worship than the wee god? I am going for the wee god... but then, I believe he is the big one anyway!!

It is correct the Jehovah's Witnesses have put Jesus down, but don't despair, He will come back to spank them. If you look at what [Revelation 21:22](#) states what John said about the Temple. He said "I saw no Temple in it, for the Lord God the Almighty and the Lamb are its Temple." We all know the Lord God the Almighty is the Father, and the Lamb is the Son, no doubt. So, can the Witnesses explain how the Father and the Son be only One Temple in this Bible passage, not two temples? If They are only one Temple, then this means They are One, not two separate deities, like God and 'a god' in the Witnesses' beliefs. Also, the word Temple defines as 'a structure of worship', so the Father and the Son ARE ONE structure of worship. Hence, if they are one structure of worship, then they are to be worshipped together as ONE in this passage. So I don't believe Jesus will receive more or less worship than the Father, they will be equally worshipped. They should be equally worshipped right now, but I guess we will have to wait for Jesus' return.

Tim 😊😊😊



08-30-2006

#479

[katierussell](#)

Member

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

Truffy. Just tell us one thing? In [John 1:1c](#) is the definite article before theos? Yes or no? Its no is it not? Then tell us if the definite article is before theos of [Luke 12:24](#)? Yes or no? Its yes isn't it? If it is no to the first question and yes to the second, which it is, than theos of [Luke 12:14](#) is **not** an **anarthrous**(without the article) predicate nominative is it? No? Its no isn't it Truffy? Then we do not have a parallel with [John 1:1c](#) and [Luke 12:24](#) do we? Truffy?

One can get technical also Truffy. Actually kai theos en ho logos is really a clause part of a longer sentence. Likewise is kai ho theos trephei autous. Both are in what are called compound sentences. The subject does not have to be the same in each clause truffy. The Word is the subject all through [John 1:1](#) including of course 1:1c but the subject of the clause of kai ho theos trephei autous is ho theos "God" not autous(tous kopakas) "the ravens").

Last edited by [katierussell](#) : 08-30-2006 at 07:14 AM.



08-30-2006

#480

truffy

Inactive


Jesus
LOVES
you

Join Date: Jul 2006

Posts: 1,593

27 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by [katierussell](#) 
*Truffy. Just tell us one thing? In [John 1:1c](#) is the definite article before theos? Yes or no? Its no is it not?
 Then tell us if the definite article is before theos of [Luke 12:24](#)? Yes or no? Its yes isn't it? If it is no to the first question and yes to the second, which it is, than theos of [Luke 12:14](#) is **not** an **anarthrous**(without the article) predicate nominative is it? No? Its no isn't it Truffy? Then we do not have a parallel with [John 1:1c](#) and [Luke 12:24](#) do we? Truffy?*

Katie, its nice for me to get the old name truffy back. I was talking about the subject of those two sentences. Can you honestly say theos in [Luke 12:24](#) is the subject and the Word is the subject in [John 1:1](#)? Why can't you see what you're doing to Jesus? When I look at the two subjects you laid out for those two verses, the closed minded theology you put into those two sentences are right there. How can you say the Word is the subject not theos in [John 1:1](#) and the theos is the subject not ravens in [Luke 12:24](#)? And where does that put Jesus when you put Him on the same level playing field with Satan who is a god of this World? Please don't be offended with my replies I only emphasize common sense about the two subjects in those two sentences which is only a discussion.








Tim   






 Page 24 of 26 [« First](#) [< 14](#) [20](#) [21](#) [22](#) [23](#) **24** [25](#) [26](#) [>](#)
[« 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?


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 07:47 AM.
As of July 6, 2006, Total Page Views: 22,355,062, Page Views Today: 22,355,062

-- 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](#)