



CARM.ORG - Christian Discussion Forums > RELIGIONS > Jehovah's Witnesses
How can Jesus be worshiped if only a "god"?

Welcome, tkkclark.
You last visited: 1 Hour Ago at 06:19 AM
[Instant Messages](#): Unread 0, Total 0.

User CP FAQ [Donate](#) Members List Calendar New Posts Search ▾ Quick Links ▾ Log Out



Page 25 of 26 << First < 15 21 22 23 24 **25** 26 >

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

08-30-2006

#481

katierussell

Member

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



What did The Linguistic Key, a scholarly publication tell you Truffy?

What did it say was the predicate of [John 1:1c](#)?

Theos or logos?

Tell us all Truffy?

And as regards [Luke 12:24](#). Ever heard of a compund sentence Truffy? Does the subject have to be the same in each clause? How does one tell? Please answer.

And you did not answer my question about the Greek definite article and where it is not and where it is in [John 1:1c](#) and [Luke 12:24](#) and how this indicates that [John 1:1c](#) and [Luke 12:24](#) are certainly not parallel sentence structures. Will you not now please answer my question?



08-30-2006

#482

truffy

Inactive



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



Quote:

In [Luke 12:24](#) it is God whom then Jesus makes a statement about.

But Jesus was also making a statement about ravens...24"Consider the ravens: They do not sow or reap, they have no storeroom or barn; yet God feeds them. And how much more valuable you are than birds!" Can you honestly say the subject in this sentence is not about ravens?

Quote:

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?

Look at the whole sentence...1 "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." Can you honestly say God (theos) is not the subject in this sentence?

So how about Jesus, do you care when you put Him down to a lower class of god, down to a level playing field with Satan who is a god of this world?

Tim 😊😊😊



08-30-2006

#483

truffy

Inactive



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

Quote:

Originally Posted by **katierussell**

What did The Linguistic Key, a scholarly publication tell you Truffy?

What did it say was the predicate of [John 1:1c](#)?

Theos or logos?

Tell us all Truffy?

And as regards [Luke 12:24](#). Ever heard of a compound sentence Truffy? Does the subject have to be the same in each clause? How does one tell? Please answer.

And you did not answer my question about the Greek definite article and where it is not and where it is in [John 1:1c](#) and [Luke 12:24](#) and how this indicates that [John 1:1c](#) and [Luke 12:24](#) are certainly not parallel sentence structures. Will you not now please answer my question?

I don't follow you, Katie, you're always searching for the untruth in this matter. Why don't you look up...<http://www.bible.ca/trinity/trinity-texts-john1-1.htm> and you see what [John 1:1](#) really means, then get back to me. Also, compare it with [John 20:28](#) "My Lord and My God!" and don't make a mistake like Mondo, who said the pronoun mou was used so this sentence was insignificant to him. Try and make a polite reply Katie, I know you're in a lot of pressure, but remember, its only a discussion. 🙏

Tim 😊😊😊

Last edited by truffy : 08-30-2006 at 07:45 AM.



08-30-2006

#484

katierussell

Member

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

Yes, but in the clause kai ho theos trephei autous " yet God feeds them" he makes a statement about what God would do. Yes, God is the subject, the predicate is trephei autous, "feeds them," the verb is "feeds" and the object is autous, "them", for this is the word which is affected by the action of the verb towards which it is directed. Got it? (Remember, in compound sentences the subject does not have to remain the same.)

Now to [John 1:1](#). Yes, the "Word" is the subject of this compound sentence and is the subject of [John 1:1c](#). Remember, the subject of a sentence(or clause) is a word(or group of words) which denotes the person about which a statement is made. In the sentence "The Word was God," or "the "Word was a god" the "Word" is the subject, "was" is the verb and "was God/a god" is the predicate and "God/a god" is the object which towards which the verb is directed. Now, can you understand this? Hence your paralleling of [John 1:1c](#) with [Luke 12:14](#) is a huge mistake.

Of course, one can see that in [John 1;1c](#) theos is anarthrous while theos in [Luke 12:24](#) is articular. Hence even that should have told you they are not the same sentence structure!

And I have quoted you The Linguistic Key have I not?

Yes.

Then tell us what word in [John 1:1c](#) it said was the predicate Truffy?

(And as for you "do you care when you put Him down to a lower class of god, down to a level playing field with Satan who is a god of this world?" not only is this not what we are discussing at the moment, one way to translate [John 1;1c](#) but that translating it as "a god" does no such thing as you faslely allege!)



08-30-2006

#485

truffy

Inactive



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

Quote:

Originally Posted by **katierussell**

Yes, but in the clause kai ho theos trephei autous " yet God feeds them" he makes a statement about what God would do. Yes, God is the subject, the predicate is trephei autous, "feeds them," the verb is "feeds" and the object is autous, "them", for this is the word which is affected by the action of the verb towards which it is directed. Got it? (Remember, in compound sentences the subject does not have to remain the same.)

Now to [John 1:1](#). Yes, the "Word" is the subject of this compound sentence and is the subject of [John 1:1c](#). Remember, the subject of a sentence(or clause) is a word(or group of words) which denotes the person about which a statement is made. In the sentence "The Word was God," or "the "Word was a god" the "Word" is the subject, "was" is the verb and "was God/a god" is the predicate and "God/a god" is the object which towards which the verb is directed. Now, can you understand this?

Hence your paralleling of [John 1:1c](#) with [Luke 12:14](#) is a huge mistake.

Of course, one can see that in [John 1;1c](#) theos is anarthrous while theos in [Luke 12:24](#) is articular. Hence even that should have told you they are not the same sentence structure!

And I have quoted you [The Linguistic Key](#) have I not?

Yes.

Then tell us what word in [John 1:1c](#) it said was the predicate Truffy?

(And as for you "do you care when you put Him down to a lower class of god, down to a level playing field with Satan who is a god of this world?" not only is this not what we are discussing at the moment, one way to translate [John 1;1c](#) but that translating it as "a god" does no such thing as you faslely allege!)

Your calculations are all wrong, just look up...<http://www.bible.ca/trinity/trinity-texts-john1-1.htm> and put a hood over your theology issues about Jesus, Katie. If you think you can confuse me on this issue, then you are wasting my time along with everyone elses time. Your Greek is made up of theology, ours is made with factual findings and a lot of common sense. If you think we are not discussing God or a god...

Quote:

not only is this not what we are discussing at the moment, one way to translate [John 1;1c](#) but that translating it as "a god" does no such thing as you faslely allege!

then you are wasting your own time.

Tim 😊😊😊



08-30-2006

#486

katierussell

Member

Truffy, I quoted you [The Linguistic Key](#). A scholarly publication. It told you what is the predicate noun of [John 1:1](#).

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

What did it tell you?

Please answer now.

Also I have asked you time and time again:

Does theos in [John 1;1c](#) have the article before it? Yes or no? Does theos in [Luke 12:24](#) have the article before it? Yes or no?

If your answer is different, as it has to be, then this will show you that you are making one hell of a huge mistake in paralleling [John 1:1c](#) and [Luke 12:24](#). Why do you not admit this?



08-30-2006

#487

[katierussell](#)

Member

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



Does that link say what is the **subject** of [John 1:1c](#) truffy?

Please answer yes or no?

If yes tell us what does it say is the **subject** of [John 1:1c](#) truffy.

Did I quote from [The Linguistic Key](#) Truffy?

Yes.

What did it say as to theos?

Did it say it was the **subject** or the **predicate** truffy?

Please answer now.



08-30-2006

#488

[truffy](#)

Inactive



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



Quote:

Originally Posted by [katierussell](#)
Truffy, I quoted you [The Linguistic Key](#). A scholarly publication.

It told you what is the predicate noun of [John 1:1](#).

What did it tell you?

Please answer now.

Also I have asked you time and time again:

Does theos in [John 1;1c](#) have the article before it? Yes or no? Does theos in [Luke 12:24](#) have the article before it? Yes or no?

If your answer is different, as it has to be, then this will show you that you are making one hell of a huge mistake in paralleling [John 1:1c](#) and [Luke 12:24](#). Why do you not admit this?

I can admit Jesus will be spanking a lot of people when He comes back. Your mind was made up, Katie, why don't you admit it. You can't make a positive reading in Greek for Jesus without getting into the WatchTower game of misinterpretations. Again I ask you to see..<http://www.bible.ca/trinity/trinity-texts-john1-1.htm>. and get back to me. I'm off for work and lunch and work and supper...see ya later Katie.

Tim



08-30-2006

#489

[katierussell](#)

Member

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



Truffy,

Why is it you **can not bring yourself** to say what [The Linguistic Key](#), that scholarly publication I quoted you, said which is the predicate noun of [John 1:1c](#)? (It is not a "Watchtower" publication! 😊)

And why is it that **you refuse to admit** that theos of [John 1:1c](#) does not have the article while in your scripture of [Luke 12:24](#) theos does and this shows that your [Luke 12:24](#) is no parallel to that of [John 1:1c](#)?

Are **you too proud to admit your mistake**? It is a big one but all the more reason to admit it surely?



08-30-2006

#490

[katierussell](#)

Member

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



Simple. Context! Many times theos has not the article but translators will translate it as "God." In [John 1:1](#) we are told that the "Word" was "with God." With ho theos, "the god", hence "God." So, he is not this "God." John's readers would have understood that this ho theos, "God," was the God of the O.T., Jehovah. The "Word" was with this God not that he was this "God." Next John wrote kai theos en ho logos. But you say: "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."

But this is where you contradict yourself(as did Robert Frazier in this same thread). You rightly say that the anarthrous theos "is telling us something about" the Word. But then you say "that the Word was God." But that would be identifying who the Word was not something about the Word! "God" in English is definite. The translation "the Word was God" is a definite translation. It makes the Word ho theos, the god, God. But that is not what John wrote. To think he omitted the article before theos in [John 1:1c](#) but it has to be understood as definite would make the Word the God he was with which is called modalism! So this translation is ruled out despite its popularity! But you were right. John was telling us something about the Word. He was theos, god. Now in Greek thats how they wrote, "The Word was god." But in English we don't. We use the definite or indefinite articles, "the," and "a." Here, we can not say "the Word was the god" which is the same really as "the Word was God" for the above reasons I have given you. So we are left with one translation: "the Word was a god."

However, **you still have not admitted to everyone your erroneous paralleling** of your quoted examples from John's gospel with that of [John 1:1c](#). **That they were and are erroneous I have explained in that none of them were anarthrous predicate nominatives that precede the verb as we have at [John 1:1c](#). Will you now acknowledge your mistake?**



08-30-2006

#491

[newWitness](#)

Member

Join Date: Aug 2006
Posts: 695
15 Reputation Points



I think the real problem is that people in Christendom, can't understand that there is more than one definition(meaning) of Theos based on how its used in a sentence. English as well as greek have a grammar. In [2Corinthians 4:4](#) theos is used to describe Satan. You have to let go of the idea that theos is only denoted to God. Theos just another word in the greek vocabulary, what is important is there is a heavenly father and his son Jesus Christ who are separte people and not co-eternal or co-equal. I get that from reading the bible and not a publication.



08-30-2006

#492

[katierussell](#)

Member

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



Also, from [John 1:1](#) that the Word is a separte theos from the one he is with. But 'Christendom' can't 'get this for to them it flies in the face of there being only one theos. They simply do not and can not accept that the word theos at the time John wrote and before could be applied to others not ho theos, not "God" without any conflict with monotheism and off they go quoting this and that scriptures(usually from Isaiah) completely unaware, if we are to be charitable to them, that they are not understanding the context of them, in a vain attempt to discredit what is undoubtedly the best translation both grammatically and contextually of what is very simple Greek and at the same times reading every post-biblical trinitarian idea

and thought into John's words, misunderstanding the context of [John 1:1-3](#), as well as inventing new and novel classifications of a count noun! Its a diabolical travesty that they do all this! 😞



08-30-2006

#493

truffy

Inactive



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



Quote:

Originally Posted by **katierussell** [▶](#)
*Does that link say what is the **subject** of [John 1:1c](#) truffy?*

Please answer yes or no?

*If yes tell us what does it says is the **subject** of [John 1:1c](#) truffy.*

Did I quote from [The Linguistic Key](#) Truffy?

Yes.

What did it say as to theos?

*Did it say it was the **subject** or the **predicate** truffy?*

Please answer now.

Why don't you go to my link, all my answers are there. 😏

Tim 😊😊😊



08-30-2006

#494

secondbirth

CARM Super Member



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



Plain And Simple..... [Revelation 5:14](#)



08-30-2006

#495

truffy

Inactive



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



Quote:

Originally Posted by **katierussell** [▶](#)
Truffy,

*Why is it you **can not bring yourself** to say what [The Linguistic Key](#), that scholarly publication I quoted you, said which is the predicate noun of [John 1:1c](#)? (It is not a "Watchtower" publication! 😊)*

*And why is it that **you refuse to admit** that theos of [John 1:1c](#) does not have the article while in your scripture of [Luke 12:24](#) theos does and this shows that your [Luke 12:24](#) is no parallel to that of [John 1:1c](#)?*

Are you too proud to admit your mistake? It is a big one but all the more reason to admit it surely?

I don't have an ego problem, so far you never took my request and visit that link I gave you, all of my answers are right there. 😊

Tim 😊😊😊



08-30-2006

#496

katierussell

Member

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



Once more **you refuse to acknowledge** what [The Linguistic Key](#) informed you of, that theos is the predicate noun in [John 1:1c](#).

Your link was anti-JW so is hardly going to be objective is it? And at any rate, are you saying it, **like you**, makes the error of thinking theos in John1:1c is the subject?

Now, let me quote you another scholarly work.

This is from [A Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament](#).

it says: "**theos**: predicate with article."

Can you see that? Can you read that?

What does it tell you truffy?

Now, will you acknowledge your mistake in thinking the subject of [John 1:1c](#) is theos?



08-30-2006

#497

katierussell

Member

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



You can not **hide** behind a "link" truffy!

It does **not** say in that link that theos is the subject in "kai theos en ho logos."

Nor does it mention anything about [Luke 12:24](#)!

Now, these are my two simple requests:

Why is it **you can not bring yourself to say** what The Linguistic Key, that scholarly publication I quoted you, said which is the predicate noun of [John 1:1c](#)? (It is not a "Watchtower" publication!)

And why is it that **you refuse to admit** that theos of [John 1:1c](#) does not have the article while in your scripture of [Luke 12:24](#) theos does and this shows that your [Luke 12:24](#) is no parallel to that of [John 1:1c](#)?

If you do not have an "ego problem" then I expect you to now **own up to your mistakes**. But will you? Everyone is watching with baited breath what you will do? **Hide behind a link that does not do what you say it does? Or be humble enough, christian enough to admit you have been wrong all the time?**



08-30-2006

#498

newWitness

Member

Join Date: Aug 2006
Posts: 695
15 Reputation Points



Truffy,
<http://www.bible.ca/trinity/trinity-texts-john1-1.htm> has nothing to offer to counter our position on this! If you look at this link, the first thing you notice is this mis-application:

Quote:

"The irrefutable argument stated:

[This verse is so simple it is impossible to get it wrong. An illustrated paraphrase of the text would be:](#)

-
- "In the beginning was EVE, and EVE was with MAN, and EVE was MAN. SHE was in the beginning with MAN."

Even adopting the Jehovah's Witnesses paraphrase, the New World Translation's, (NWT hereafter) unscholarly insertion of "a god" of the text makes no difference:

-
- "In the beginning was EVE, and EVE was with MAN, and EVE was a MAN.

"

I need to go no further on that website to see that the person owning the page has no idea what the greek says. The above would be correct if [John 1a,b](#) didn't have the definite article, but it does in John's Gospel.

So, if you were to place the definite article in the above sentence it totally changes what the person is saying.

In the beginning was EVE, and EVE was with (the) MAN, and EVE was MAN. SHE was in the beginning with (the)MAN. This is what the persons sentence should have said.

This person obviously has no interest in being scholarly, he/she is only trying to stumble people who already know the truth. You can tell their lack of interest because they don't even include words that are in the greek to try and make their analogy.

I see no reason for going on at that link, if they are going to be ignorant from the start.

Please come to the truth about God the Father and his son Jesus.



08-30-2006

#499

[truffy](#)

Inactive



Join Date: Jul 2006

Posts: 1,593

27 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by [katierussell](#)

You can not *hide* behind a "link" truffy!

It does *not* say in that link that theos is the subject in "kai theos en ho logos."

Nor does it mention anything about [Luke 12:24](#)!

Now, these are my two simple requests:

Why is it *you can not bring yourself to say* what The Linguistic Key, that scholarly publication I quoted you, said which is the predicate noun of [John 1:1c](#)? (It is not a "Watchtower" publication!)

And why is it that *you refuse to admit* that theos of [John 1:1c](#) does not have the article while in your scripture of [Luke 12:24](#) theos does and this shows that your [Luke 12:24](#) is no parallel to that of [John 1:1c](#)?

If you do not have an "ego problem" then I expect you to now *own up to your mistakes*. But will you? Everyone is watching with baited breath what you will do? *Hide behind a link that does not do what you say it does? Or be humble enough, christian enough to admit you have been wrong all the time?*

Katie, your link isn't even working. I don't know why, could it be this site will not allow this site because it is non Christian? I don't really know what it is, but to show you my ears are open for Christ's business, I ordered a book called The

Linguistic and Exegetical Key to the Greek New Testament. Are you satisfied? I also wondered why you avoided the "My Lord and My God" issue at [John 20:28](#)? Can you atleast answer that question and get it over with.

Tim 😊😊😊



08-30-2006

#500

katierussell

Member

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



There is no link in my post. Just my own words and arguments and supported by a scholarly publication. Good that you have ordered the book for yourself...but you will only discover that what it said is what I quoted from it which showed you are dead wrong in thinking theos of John1:1c was the subject! It is not.

And before we go to [John 20:28](#) lets clear this thing you have with [Luke 12:24](#). I will have to ask again then:

ONE: Why is it you can not bring yourself to say what The Linguistic Key, that scholarly publication I quoted you, said which is the predicate noun of [John 1:1c](#)? (It is not a "Watchtower" publication!)

TWO: And why is it that you refuse to admit that theos of [John 1:1c](#) does not have the article while in your scripture of [Luke 12:24](#) theos does and this shows that your [Luke 12:24](#) is no parallel to that of [John 1:1c](#)?



Page 25 of 26 << First < 15 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?

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**

-- 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