



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 8 of 26 « First < 4 5 6 7 **8** 9 10 11 12 18 > Last » ▾

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

08-26-2006

#141

JaySee

Member

Join Date: Jun 2006
Posts: 861
24 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **mondo** ▾
I get what you are saying perfectly, and it is flat out wrong. Jesus used everyday Greek grammar here and the sentence because unintelligible nonsense if we apply what you are saying. However, when we read what he said and just accept it as a regular Greek sentence, which it is, it makes perfect sense.

No, you only do that because you are not willing to accept the true nature of Christ, on who He claimed He is! He claimed to be the Great I AM. If you don't get that, than you don't get anything.

Just tell me, what were the Jews saying in [John 10:33](#) if the GREAT I AM or the claim to be God isn't what they are referring to?



08-26-2006

#142

Athanasian Creed

Member



Join Date: Jul 2006
Location: Toronto
Gender: ♂
Posts: 671
30 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **katierussell** ▾
Tim, I did not say that theos is preceded by a verb but that "it[theos] precedes the verb."

*[John 1:1](#) reads in Greek: En arche en ho logos kai ho logos en pros ton theon kai theos **en** ho logos.*

I have made bold which is the verb that precedes the anarthrous predicate singular theos.

Now, as to my question to you:

Could you tell us all from the scriptures you cite whether in each case they are like [John 1:1c](#) as to grammar, sentence structure and context?

Jehovah's Witnesses deny the deity of Christ, and claim that [John 1:1](#)

merely calls him "a god," but not full deity. They rest their case on three facts of Greek grammar:

1. There is no such word as "a" or "an" in Greek, so we sometimes have to add "a" to translate into English, ([Acts 28:6](#)).
2. The Greek word used here (theos) has two meanings: usually the supreme God revealed in Scripture, but sometimes lesser beings like the gods of Greek mythology.
3. The Greek word "the" is often attached to the word "God" or theos, but it does not appear in [John 1:1](#). Hiding behind the Witness rendering of the verse is an unspoken equation: God + "the" (ho theos) = Jehovah, the Almighty God, God - "the" (theos) = a created being with divine qualities. Witnesses claim that the apostle John deliberately omitted a "the" in the final phrase to show the difference between God and the Word. As the New World Translation (p. 775) explains:

"John's inspired writings and those of his fellow disciples show what the true idea is, namely, the Word or Logos is not God or the God, but is the Son of God, and hence is a god. That is why, at [John 1:1,2](#), the apostle refers to God as the God and to the Word or Logos as a god, to show the difference between the Two.

Is this the proper translation?

No. The equation underlying the Witness rendering breaks down within a few verses. [John 1:18](#) contains theos twice, without "the" either time. According to Watchtower assumptions, we would expect to translate both as "god" or "a god." Instead, the New World Translation says "God" the first time and "god" the second time. The context overrules their rule.

Why did John choose not to put "the" on the word God?

1. To show which word was the subject of the sentence. In English, we can recognize the subject of a sentence by looking at word order. In Greek, we must look at the word endings. [John 1:1](#) is trickier than most verses, because both "God" (theos) and "Word" (logos) have the same ending. The usual way to mark off the subject clearly was to add "the" to the subject and leave it off the direct object. That is precisely what John did here.
2. To conform to standard Greek grammar. E.C. Colwell demonstrated in an article in the Journal of Biblical Literature in 1933 that it was normal practice to omit "the" in this type of sentence. John was simply using good grammar, and making it clear that he intended to say, "The Word was God" rather than "God was the Word," a statement with some theological drawbacks. John constructed his sentence in the one way that would preserve proper grammar and sound doctrine, declaring that "the Word was God."

Author: Dr. John Bechtle

JESUS IS JEHOVAH, THE ALMIGHTY!!!

Ray 😊

"We shall not adjust our Bible to the age; but before we have done with it, by

God's grace, we shall adjust the age to the Bible."
- Charles Spurgeon



08-26-2006

#143

mondo

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006
Posts: 816
13 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **JaySee**

No, you only do that because you are not willing to accept the true nature of Christ, on who He claimed He is! He claimed to be the Great I AM. If you don't get that, than you don't get anything.

Ad hominem eh? I'm willing to accept what Jesus said, but he simply didn't say what you are claiming. His words were PRIN ABRAAM GENESQAI EGW EIMI. Pretty simple sentence actually.

Quote:

Just tell me, what were the Jews saying in [John 10:33](#) if the GREAT I AM or the claim to be God isn't what they are refering to?

The words "I am" aren't even in that context! And as for what they said he was claiming to be, it was qeos, which he defended being identified as, noting that the judges of Israel are also called such in [Psa. 82:6](#). Nothing to do with the Almighty.



08-26-2006

#144

mondo

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006
Posts: 816
13 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Athanasian_Creed**

Jehovah's Witnesses deny the deity of Christ, and claim that [John 1:1](#) merely calls him "a god," but not full deity. They rest their case on three facts of Greek grammar:

1. There is no such word as "a" or "an" in Greek, so we sometimes have to add "a" to translate into English, ([Acts 28:6](#)).
2. The Greek word used here (theos) has two meanings: usually the supreme God revealed in Scripture, but sometimes lesser beings like the gods of Greek mythology.
3. The Greek word "the" is often attached to the word "God" or theos, but it does not appear in [John 1:1](#). Hiding behind the Witness rendering of the verse is an unspoken equation: God + "the" (ho theos) = Jehovah, the Almighty God, God - "the" (theos) = a created being with divine qualities. Witnesses claim that the apostle John deliberately omitted a "the" in the final phrase to show the difference between God and the Word. As the New World Translation (p. 775) explains:

"John's inspired writings and those of his fellow disciples show what the true idea is, namely, the Word or Logos is not God or the God, but is the Son of God, and hence is a god. That is why, at [John 1:1,2](#), the apostle refers

to God as the God and to the Word or Logos as a god, to show the difference between the Two.

Is this the proper translation?

No. The equation underlying the Witness rendering breaks down within a few verses. [John 1:18](#) contains theos twice, without "the" either time. According to Watchtower assumptions, we would expect to translate both as "god" or "a god." Instead, the New World Translation says "God" the first time and "god" the second time. The context overrules their rule.

Why did John choose not to put "the" on the word God?

1. To show which word was the subject of the sentence. In English, we can recognize the subject of a sentence by looking at word order. In Greek, we must look at the word endings. [John 1:1](#) is trickier than most verses, because both "God" (theos) and "Word" (logos) have the same ending. The usual way to mark off the subject clearly was to add "the" to the subject and leave it off the direct object. That is precisely what John did here.
2. To conform to standard Greek grammar. E.C. Colwell demonstrated in an article in the Journal of Biblical Literature in 1933 that it was normal practice to omit "the" in this type of sentence. John was simply using good grammar, and making it clear that he intended to say, "The Word was God" rather than "God was the Word," a statement with some theological drawbacks. John constructed his sentence in the one way that would preserve proper grammar and sound doctrine, declaring that "the Word was God."

Author: Dr. John Bechtle

JESUS IS JEHOVAH, THE ALMIGHTY!!!

Ray 😊

This guy clearly doesn't have even the slightest idea what he is talking about. I feel really bad for people like that who try and make arguments without having idea what they are actually saying. I see that a lot here though it seems. It is amazing that he mentions [Acts 28:6](#), when only 2 verses prior in verse 4 we see the exact same construction as in [John 1:1c](#) and it is translated with an "a".



08-26-2006

#145

[Athanasian Creed](#)

Member



Quote:

Originally Posted by [katierussell](#)
ahhh..but when you read the "Bible" you don't mean, probably, the original languages, but a **translation** of the Bible.

Join Date: Jul 2006
 Location: Toronto
 Gender: ♂
 Posts: 671
 30 Reputation Points

Let's get a glimpse of how much Greek (and Hebrew) the 'translators' of the NWT PERversion had, shall we:

Translators of the New World Translation:

The following list of translators of the *New World Translation* is a compilation from a variety of sources:

Frederick W. Franz: Main translator. Took liberal arts sequence at University of Cincinnati; 21 semester hours of classical Greek, some Latin. Partially completed a two-hour survey course in Biblical Greek in junior year; course titled "The New Testament--A course in grammar and translation." Left in spring of 1914 before completing junior year. Self-taught in Spanish, biblical Hebrew and Aramaic. Entered Brooklyn headquarters facility of Watchtower Society in 1920. Probable ghost writer for J. F. Rutherford (2nd president of WTS) from late 1920s through 1942. Vice president of WTS from 1942 to 1977, president from 1977 until death in 1992 at age 99.

Franz writes in his autobiography: "What a blessing it was to study Bible Greek under Professor Arthur Kensella! Under Dr. Joseph Harry, an author of some Greek works, I also studied the classical Greek. I knew that if I wanted to become a Presbyterian clergyman, I had to have a command of Bible Greek. So I furiously applied myself and got passing grades" (*The Watchtower*, May 1, 1987, p. 24). Franz gives the impression that the bulk of his Greek studies were "Bible Greek" under "Professor Kensella" and that classical Greek was secondary under "Dr. Joseph Harry." The opposite is true. As mentioned above, Franz only took one 2-hour credit class of "Bible Greek" but 21 hours of classical Greek. According to the course catalog of 1911, Arthur Kensella was not a professor of Greek, as Franz wrote, but an "instructor in Greek." Kensella did not have a Ph.D. and he therefore taught entry-level courses.

Nathan H. Knorr: No training in biblical languages. Entered Brooklyn headquarters in 1923; 3rd president of WTS from 1942 to 1977. Died 1977 at age 72.

Milton G. Henschel: No training in biblical languages. Private secretary and traveling companion to N. H. Knorr from late 1940s until early 1970s. 4th president of WTS from 1992 to 2000. Still

living, age mid-80s.

Albert D. Schroeder: No training in biblical languages. Took 3 years of mechanical engineering, unspecified language courses in college, dropped out in 1932 and soon entered Brooklyn headquarters. Registrar of "Gilead School" from 1942 to 1959. Still living, age 90.

Karl Klein: No training in biblical languages. Entered Brooklyn headquarters in 1925; member of Writing Dept. since 1950. Died 2001 at age 96.

George D. Gangas: No training in biblical languages. Greek-speaking Turkish national, entered Brooklyn headquarters in 1928 as a Greek translator from English to modern Greek publications. Died 1994 at age 98.

As far as the translators -- F.W. Franz was presented in a court case against the Watchtower Society as an official translator. **Under cross-examination, he was forced to admit that he was unable to read Hebrew.** Klann, who wrote the book Jehovah of the Watchtower, names five of the translators and makes this statement about them, "**None of the committee members reads New Testament Greek, or, for that matter, Hebrew or Aramaic.**" Mantey (the author of the Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament) was offended when he was misquoted by the Watchtower Society. **So he did some research and discovered that none of the translators could read Greek or Hebrew.** He made this statement on the radio program, The Bible Answer Man. The Watchtower Society refuses to give out the names of the "translators," and one would wonder why anyone would take seriously a translation when you know nothing about the translators!

The NWT Committee has always been extremely secretive, and so information about who was on it has only trickled out of the Brooklyn headquarters as various staff members have left and revealed what they knew. Scant information has been published, other information has leaked by word of mouth.

Someone on the private list asked some questions and I answered as follows:

"How much paraphrasing did the translator(s) of the NWT intend to employ?"

I'll let the "Introduction" to the 1984 NWT Reference Bible answer (p. 7):

"Paraphrases of the Scriptures are not offered. Rather, an effort has been made to give as literal a translation as possible where the modern-English idiom allows and where a literal rendition does not, by any awkwardness, hide the thought. In that way the desire of those who are scrupulous for getting an almost word-for-word statement of the original is met. It is realized that even such a seemingly insignificant matter as the use or omission of a comma or of a definite or an indefinite article may at times alter the correct sense of the original passage.

What a JOKE! 😊

JESUS IS JEHOVAH, THE ALMIGHTY!!!

Ray 😊

"We shall not adjust our Bible to the age; but before we have done with it, by God's grace, we shall adjust the age to the Bible."
- Charles Spurgeon



08-26-2006

#146

Athanasian Creed

Member



Join Date: Jul 2006
Location: Toronto
Gender: ♂
Posts: 671
30 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Laurie**
Jesus may not be your creator Katie, but He is mine [Hebrews 1:8-11] [John 1:3], and I'm so thankful the Lord of me, and the God of me, who created me, loved me enough to purchase me with His Own blood.[Acts 20:28] 😊😊😊

Actually Laurie, if you read my post (#131) you will see how the deceivers, the 'translators' of the NWT PERversion made Christ out to be the Creator of all (other) things in heaven and on earth (even though the word 'other' is nowhere to be found in the original but put there brazenly to denigrate Christ's supreme Deity)

However, when the word (*other*) is unwarrantedly interjected four times in [Colossians 1](#), it alters the thought to imply that Christ is the author of all created things, **with the exception of one, Himself, who the Watchtower Society says was created.** A footnote in the *New World Translation* reads: "All other: as at [Luke 13:2,4](#) and elsewhere."

All this to say that JW's do, in fact, believe Christ is man's Creator. Problem is, He supposedly has a Creator Himself which we know (or should know) God's true word does NOT teach!! 😊

JESUS IS JEHOVAH, THE ALMIGHTY!!!

Ray 😊

"We shall not adjust our Bible to the age; but before we have done with it, by God's grace, we shall adjust the age to the Bible."
- Charles Spurgeon

Last edited by Athanasian_Creed : 08-26-2006 at 11:17 PM.



08-26-2006

#147

faithful281

CARM Super Member



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



mondo:

IN the New Testament, there are many scriptures where the writers apply to Jesus passages that were written in reference to Yahweh in the Old Testament. the practice of the new Testament writers is so common that its significance may escape us. By using Yahweh scriptures for Jesus, these writers are implying that Jesus was Yahweh, or God, made flesh. Of course, we shouldn't be surprised that the writers make this comparison, because Jesus himself explained that Old Testament passages applied to him ([Luke 24:25-27, 44-47](#); [John 5:39-40, 45-46](#)).

In John's Gospel, Jesus tells his disciples: "I am telling you now before it happens, so that when it does happen you will believe that I am He" (13:9). The phrase "I am He" is translated from Greek ego eimi. The phrase occurs 24 times in John's Gospel. At least seven of these are said to be "absolute" in that they are not followed by a predicate, such as in [John 6:35](#), "I am the bread of life." In the seven absolute cases, no predicate follows, and the "I AM" phrase comes at the end of the clause. This indicates that Jesus is using this phrase as a name to identify who he is. The seven places are [John 8:24, 28, 58](#); 13:19; 18:5, 6 and 8.

If we go back to [Isaiah 41:4, 43:10](#) and 46:4, we can see the background for Jesus' reference to himself in John's Gospel as ego eimi ("I AM"). In [Isaiah 41:4](#), God or Yahweh says: "I, the Lord...I am he." In [Isaiah 43:10](#) he says "I am he," and later says, "You are my witnesses," declares the Lord, 'that I am God'" (verse 12). In 46:4, God (Yahweh) again refers to himself as "I am he."

The Hebrew phrase "I am he" is translated in the Greek version of the Holy Scriptures, the Septuagint (which the apostles used), by the phrase ego eimi in [Isaiah 41:4](#); 43:10; and 46:4. It seems clear that Jesus' made the "I am he." statements as references to himself because they directly connected to God's (Yahweh's) statements about himself in Isaiah. John said, in effect, that Jesus was saying he was God in the flesh ([John 1:14](#), which introduces the Gospel and speaks of the Word's divinity and incarnation, prepares us for this fact).

John's ego eimi ("I AM") identification of Jesus can also be carried back to [Exodus 3](#), in which God identifies himself as the "I AM." Here we read "God [Hebrew, Elohim] said to Moses, 'I AM WHO I AM. this is what you are to say to the Israelites: "I AM has sent me to you'" (verse 14).

We've seen that the Gospel of John makes a clear connection between Jesus and Yahweh, the name of God in the Old Testament. But we should also notice that John does not equate Jesus with the Father (and neither do the other Gospels). Jesus, for example, prays to the Father ([John 17:1-15](#)). John understands that

the Son is distinct from the Father - and he also sees that both are distinct from the Holy Spirit ([John 14:15, 17, 25](#); 15:26). Since that is so, John's identification of Jesus as God, or Yahweh (if we think of his Hebrew, Old Testament name), is a Trinitarian explanation of God's being.

Let's go over this again, because it is important. John repeats Jesus' identification of himself as the "I AM" of the Old Testament. Since there is but one God, and John would have understood that, then we are left with the proposition that there must be two persons sharing the one nature that is God. (We have seen that Jesus, the Son, is distinct from the Father.) With the Holy Spirit, also discussed by John in chapters 14-17, we have the basis of the Trinity

To put aside all doubt about John's identification of Jesus with Yahweh, we may quote [John 12:37-41](#), which says:

Even after Jesus had done all these miraculous signs in their presence, they still would not believe in him. This was to fulfill the word of Isaiah the prophet: "Lord, who has believed our message and to whom has the arm of the Lord been revealed?" For this reason they could not believe, because as Isaiah says elsewhere: "He has blinded their eyes and deadened their hearts, so they can neither see with their eyes, nor understand with their hearts, nor turn - and I would heal them." Isaiah said this because he saw Jesus' glory and spoke about him.

The quotes above that John used come from [Isaiah 53:1](#) and 6:10. The prophet originally spoke his words in regards to Yahweh. John says that what Isaiah actually saw was "Jesus' glory" and that he "spoke of him." For John the apostle, then, Jesus was Yahweh in the flesh; before his human birth he was known as Yahweh.



08-26-2006

#148

Watch-a-Tower

Inactive



Join Date: Apr 2006
 Location: A Witness and Follower of Jesus Christ and a Soldier of the Cross.
 Gender: ♂
 Posts: 1,940
 47 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by [mondo](#)

Actually he isn't your creator, he is the one through him the creator worked. The grammar of [John 1:3](#) is very clear. Dana and Mantey explain it in their grammar: "Here God the Father is thought of as the original cause of creation, and the λογος as the intermediate agent."

Origen, of the early church, states on the same text: "Thus, if all things were made, as in this passage [[John 1:3](#)] also, through the λογος, then they were not made by the λογος, but by [one] stronger and greater than He."

Further, the purchase "with his own blood" is a textual variant. The most accepted reading in Greek actually reads, when literally translated, "the blood of his own," with idios (own) referring to one that is possessed by him, with whom he is in a close relationship, who would be his son.

And for [Hebrews 1:8-11](#), verse 9 explains verse 8 and verse 2 explains verses 10-11.

-Mondo

Welcome back Mondo!

Hope you stick around for a while.

I mean that sincerely, and I want to also sincerely express that you do not understand the scriptures, and this is because you do not hear the Word of God in the context, as it was inspired by the Holy Spirit to be written. Your erroneous understanding has been Satanically indoctrinated to you by the self-proven false prophet known as the WTBTS. Why is it that you continue to spout their teachings, though you have been made aware of their decades of false prophecies and false teachings that contradict the Bible? What about the hypocrisy of the WTBTS joining (for what ever reason you believe; NGO or whatever) the U.N.; of which they teach in 'Revelation, it's Great Climax Is At Hand!' as being Satan's Visible Organization a.k.a. the Wild Beast of Revelation with the mark 666. Please tell me, since you believe that the WTBTS is 'Jehovah's Organization,' since when does Jehovah need anything from Satan? Is there any sharing of the Light with darkness? (See [2 Corinthians 6:14-18](#) & [John 8:44-45](#) in your NWT) After all, the WTBTS made the claim that this teaching came from Jesus.

Looking forward to your reply,
Watch-a-Tower



08-27-2006

#149

mondo

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006

Posts: 816

13 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **faithful281**

mondo:

IN the New Testament, there are many scriptures where the writers apply to Jesus passages that were written in reference to Yahweh in the Old Testament. the practice of the new Testament writers is so common that its significance may escape us. By using Yahweh scriptures for Jesus, these writers are implying that Jesus was Yahweh, or God, made flesh. Of course, we shouldn't be surprised that the writers make this comparison, because Jesus himself explained that Old Testament passages applied to him ([Luke 24:25-27, 44-47](#); [John 5:39-40, 45-46](#)).

In John's Gospel, Jesus tells his disciples: "I am telling you now before it happens, so that when it does happen you will believe that I am He" (13:9). The phrase "I am He" is translated from Greek ego eimi. The phrase occurs 24 times in John's Gospel. At least seven of these are said to be "absolute" in that they are not followed by a predicate, such as in [John 6:35](#), "I am the bread of life." In the seven absolute cases, no predicate follows, and the "I AM" phrase comes at the end of the clause. This indicates that Jesus is using this phrase as a name to identify who he is. The seven places are [John 8:24, 28, 58](#); 13:19; 18:5, 6 and 8.

If we go back to [Isaiah 41:4, 43:10](#) and [46:4](#), we can see the background for Jesus' reference to himself in John's Gospel as ego eimi ("I AM"). In [Isaiah 41:4](#), God or Yahweh says: "I, the Lord...I am he." In [Isaiah 43:10](#) he says "I am he," and later says, "You are my witnesses," declares the Lord, "that I am God" (verse 12). In [46:4](#), God (Yahweh) again refers to himself as "I am he."

The Hebrew phrase "I am he" is translated in the Greek version of the Holy Scriptures, the Septuagint (which the apostles used), by the phrase

ego eimi in [Isaiah 41:4](#); 43:10; and 46:4. It seems clear that Jesus' made the "I am he." statements as references to himself because they directly connected to God's (Yahweh's) statements about himself in Isaiah. John said, in effect, that Jesus was saying he was God in the flesh ([John 1:14](#), which introduces the Gospel and speaks of the Word's divinity and incarnation, prepares us for this fact).

John's ego eimi ("I AM") identification of Jesus can also be carried back to [Exodus 3](#), in which God identifies himself as the "I AM." Here we read "God [Hebrew, Elohim] said to Moses, 'I AM WHO I AM. this is what you are to say to the Israelites: "I AM has sent me to you"' (verse 14).

We've seen that the Gospel of John makes a clear connection between Jesus and Yahweh, the name of God in the Old Testament. But we should also notice that John does not equate Jesus with the Father (and neither do the other Gospels). Jesus, for example, prays to the Father ([John 17:1-15](#)). John understands that the Son is distinct from the Father - and he also sees that both are distinct from the Holy Spirit ([John 14:15, 17, 25](#); 15:26). Since that is so, John's identification of Jesus as God, or Yahweh (if we think of his Hebrew, Old Testament name), is a Trinitarian explanation of God's being.

Let's go over this again, because it is important. John repeats Jesus' identification of himself as the "I AM" of the Old Testament. Since there is but one God, and John would have understood that, then we are left with the proposition that there must be two persons sharing the one nature that is God. (We have seen that Jesus, the Son, is distinct from the Father.) With the Holy Spirit, also discussed by John in chapters 14-17, we have the basis of the Trinity.

To put aside all doubt about John's identification of Jesus with Yahweh, we may quote [John 12:37-41](#), which says:

Even after Jesus had done all these miraculous signs in their presence, they still would not believe in him. This was to fulfill the word of Isaiah the prophet: "Lord, who has believed our message and to whom has the arm of the Lord been revealed?" For this reason they could not believe, because as Isaiah says elsewhere: "He has blinded their eyes and deadened their hearts, so they can neither see with their eyes, nor understand with their hearts, nor turn - and I would heal them." Isaiah said this because he saw Jesus' glory and spoke about him.

The quotes above that John used come from [Isaiah 53:1](#) and 6:10. The prophet originally spoke his words in regards to Yahweh. John says that what Isaiah actually saw was "Jesus' glory" and that he "spoke of him." For John the apostle, then, Jesus was Yahweh in the flesh; before his human birth he was known as Yahweh.

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

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

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

words.

Last edited by mondo : 08-27-2006 at 12:45 AM.



08-27-2006

#150

Beka

Junior Member



Join Date: Jan 2006
Posts: 30
10 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **katierussell**

*ahhh..but when you read the "Bile" you don't mean, probably, the original languages, but a translation of the Bible. If [John 1:1](#) is translated very differently, and it can be, how are you going to choose which is correct? And when you ask: "Do all of the JW's that say this stuff truly understand what they are saying or is it just a memorized response?" the answer for some would be yes, they do and no they don't. But why did you frame your question by limiting it to the "JW's"? Why did you not also ask do the **non**JW's understand this "stuff" and is it the case the **non**JW's just give a "memorized response"? Why did you not ask these also???????*

First off, I never said bile, I said Bible, bile is a whole nother thing. Second I read several different translations so I feel sure I have a good idea of what it should be. Out of all the translations I've read, the NWT is the only one I've seen that says 'a god'. If I want to see what something was in the original languages I pull up e-sword and compare there.

Third, I'm sure some JW's research this stuff to better argue their side, as I know some mainstream Christians do. But honestly when talk of the third participle verb subjugated from the particle preadative subverb and such comes up my brain hurts, and I made good grades in english in school.

My point was, most mainstream believers, weather they are JW, Mormon, Baptist, Lutheran or whatever don't go so deep that they research the ancient greek and hebrew. They simply pray, open their Bible, read, and listen for the discernment from God as to what they are reading means. I don't think God made the Bible so complex you had to have a PhD in ancient languages to understand his word.



08-27-2006

#151

Allan 747

Inactive

Join Date: Jan 2006
Location: Alberta, Canada
Gender:
Posts: 1,005
57 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **katierussell**

I think the first pneuma should be translated as "spirit," not as "Spirit" as its not being used as a proper noun here.

>Oh really I didn't know that the original Greek scriptures had capitals.

It is a count noun and not qualitative so should be translated as "a spirit." The second pneuma has a different sense than the first. It is being used as a mass noun. (So you will not be able to pluralize it) It is describing what quality one's worship should be. Jesus says he is the "truth." But how is he? Because he was sent by the Father, God, he came not in his own name but that of the Father's([John 5:43](#)) and what he did was not his but the will of another's, God's.

> so He lied when He said He was the truth?

What he spoke was not his but anothers, God's and what he taught was not his but another's, God's.

> No He didn't, He spoke and said that He is the way, the truth and the life

See [John 4:34](#); 5:30, 36,37,43 ; 6:38; 7:15,29; 8:28; 9:4 etc

>One verse at a time please

[John 14:6](#) Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me.



08-27-2006

#152

Allan 747

Inactive

Join Date: Jan 2006
Location: Alberta, Canada
Gender:
Posts: 1,005
 57 Reputation Points



[John 1:10](#) He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not.

[John 1:11](#) He came unto his own, and his own received him not.

[John 1:12](#) But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, [even] to them that believe on his name:

From these verses Jesus created the world and has the authority to grant salvation to those who believe in His name.

He also has the authority and power to pass judgement over the saved and unsaved.

If you want to be in His kingdom you had better put your trust in Him and become born again as He instructed.



08-27-2006

#153

Athanasian Creed

Member



Join Date: Jul 2006
Location: Toronto
Gender:
Posts: 671
 30 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Beka**

...My point was, most mainstream believers, weather they are JW, Mormon, Baptist, Lutheran or whatever don't go so deep that they research the ancient greek and hebrew...

Sorry to nitpick, but it is necessary.

Baptists and Lutherans are mainstream Christian believers. JW's and Mormons are not...they are part of cults and not believers.

Mainstream churches/denominations adhere to the prevailing doctrines that make Christians 'Christian.' They hold to orthodox beliefs. Cults and false religions do not do so, they are heretical and generally do not fellowship with the 'mainstream' due to their heretical beliefs. 😊

Ray 😊

"We shall not adjust our Bible to the age; but before we have done with it, by God's grace, we shall adjust the age to the Bible."
- Charles Spurgeon



08-27-2006

#154

mondo

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006

Posts: 816

13 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Allan 747** ➤

[John 1:10](#) He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not.

[John 1:11](#) He came unto his own, and his own received him not.

[John 1:12](#) But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, [even] to them that believe on his name:

From these verses Jesus created the world and has the authority to grant salvation to those who believe in His name.

He also has the authority and power to pass judgement over the saved and unsaved.

If you want to be in His kingdom you had better put your trust in Him and become born again as He instructed.

The world was created through him, just as we see in [John 1:3](#). He was not the source of it, but the one through whom the source worked.



08-27-2006

#155

Allan 747

Inactive

Join Date: Jan 2006

Location: Alberta, Canada

Gender: ♂

Posts: 1,005

57 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **mondo** ➤

The world was created through him, just as we see in [John 1:3](#). He was not the source of it, but the one through whom the source worked.

Well [John 1:10](#) says the world was **created by Him**. He was the source of it.



08-27-2006

#156

Allan 747

Inactive

Join Date: Jan 2006

Location: Alberta, Canada

Gender: ♂

Posts: 1,005

57 Reputation Points

[John 1:3](#) **All things were made by him;** and without him was not any thing made that was made.

Is Jesus a thing? Thats what WT would have you believe.



08-27-2006

#157

mondo

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006

Posts: 816

13 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Allan 747**

Well [John 1:10](#) says the world was **created by Him**. He was the source of it.

Wrong. Says THROUGH him. Grammar is the same as [John 1:3](#), where Christ is not see as the source, but the intermediate agent.



08-27-2006

#158

Allan 747

Inactive

Join Date: Jan 2006

Location: Alberta, Canada

Gender:

Posts: 1,005

57 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by **mondo**

Wrong. Says THROUGH him. Grammar is the same as [John 1:3](#), where Christ is not see as the source, but the intermediate agent.

Prove what you say.



08-27-2006

#159

Allan 747

Inactive

Join Date: Jan 2006

Location: Alberta, Canada

Gender:

Posts: 1,005

57 Reputation Points

His Divine and human nature.

John the Baptist came to bear witness concerning Jesus. Nothing more fully shows the darkness of men's minds, than that when the Light had appeared, there needed a witness to call attention to it. Christ was the true Light; that great Light which deserves to be called so. By his Spirit and grace he enlightens all that are enlightened to salvation; and those that are not enlightened by him, perish in darkness. Christ was in the world when he took our nature upon him, and dwelt among us.

The Son of the Highest was here in this lower world. He was in the world, but not of it. He came to save a lost world, because it was a world of his own making. Yet the world knew him not. When he comes as a Judge, the world shall know him. Many say that they are Christ's own, yet do not receive him, because they will not part with their sins, nor have him to reign over them. All the children of God are born again. This new birth is through the word of God as the means,

1Pe 1:23, and by the Spirit of God as the Author. By his Divine presence Christ always was in the world. But now that the fulness of time was come, he was, after another manner, God manifested in the flesh. But observe the beams of his Divine glory, which darted through this veil of flesh. Men discover their weaknesses to those most familiar with them, but it was not so with Christ; those most intimate with him saw most of his glory. Although he was in

the form of a servant, as to outward circumstances, yet, in respect of graces, his form was like the Son of God His Divine glory appeared in the holiness of his doctrine, and in his miracles. He was full of grace, fully acceptable to his Father, therefore qualified to plead for us; and full of truth, fully aware of the things he was to reveal. ([Jn 1:15-18](#))

Previous commentary:
The Divinity of Christ.

Next commentary:
John the Baptist's testimony to Christ.

About this commentary:
Matthew Henry's Concise Commentary on the Bible is available in the Public Domain.



08-27-2006

#160

mondo

501-1000 Posts


Join Date: Mar 2006

Posts: 816

13 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Allan 747** 
Prove what you say.

Easily. A.T. Robertson's Word Pictures for [John 1:10](#) states:

"'Through him.' Same statement here of "the world" (ho kosmos) as that made in [John 1:3](#) of panta."

Same as [John 1:3](#)? What does he say about the preposition there?

" By means of him as the intermediate agent in the work of creation. The Logos is John's explanation of the creation of the universe. The author of Hebrews ([Heb 1:2](#)) names God's Son as the one 'through whom he made the ages.' Paul pointedly asserts that 'the all things were created in him' (Christ) and 'the all things stand created through him and unto him' ([Col 1:16](#)). Hence it is not a peculiar doctrine that John here enunciates. In 1Co 8:6, Paul distinguishes between the Father as the primary source (ex hou) of the all things and the Son as the intermediate agent as here (di' hou)."

Do I need to also open up BDAG and provide that? Or how about Winer's grammar? I could even go back to Origen. They all substantiate my case.



 Post Reply








Page 8 of 26 << First < 4 5 6 7 **8** 9 10 11 12 18 > Last >>

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

Quick Reply



Message:


B
I
U
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 07:28 AM.

As of July 6, 2006, Total Page Views: 22,354,373, Page Views Today: 22,354,373

-- 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