



08-23-2006

#21

[pestmanpat1](#)

Member

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

Greek NT - Byz./Maj.) you can see here that [John 1:1](#) shows in the original greek that the two "gods" are different. one is acusative "The God" and one is descriptive, Like god or divine as another translation puts it. the king james does not relay this difference.

εν αρχη ην ο λογος και ο λογος ην προς τον θεον και θεος ην ο λογος

Γρεεκ NT – Ω–Η) [θηνη 1:1](#) εν αρχη ην ο λογος και ο λογος ην προς τον θεον και θεος ην ο λογος

500 billion years and still burning "think about that"



08-23-2006

#22

[olivetree](#)

Junior Member



Join Date: Jan 2006
Posts: 225
26 Reputation Points

According to my Strongs concordance, the definitive is not always needed to translate theos God and is translated the same way in other passages.

He also pointed out that it is not used here because "word" is the subject and theos in this case had to follow the case of the noun. In other words the definitive is missing in the second theos due to grammar rules.

It still does not change the fact that translating theos little g god in this passage causes Jesus to be another god separate from Yaweh, which causes Him to be an idol. And that it is strictly forbidden in the Bible to honor, pay homage to, bow to, worship, etc. any god but Yaweh. Even if it is ok to pay homage to or bow to men, it is not ok to do the same to another god.

Also, the apostles, in particular Peter, make it clear in the book of acts that it is not ok to do this to men. Peter immediately rebukes Cornelius for bowing to Him. So if the apostles do not find it acceptable to bow to men, then it would not be acceptable for them to bow to Jesus if He were a mere man.

Also in the Revelation of John, John is rebuked for bowing to an angel. So if Jesus is an incarnation of Michael, it is unacceptable to worship or bow to him. But the apostles did bow to Jesus.

It is not acceptable for believers to bow to other gods or to men or to angels. Therefore, it is unacceptable for the apostles to bow to Jesus unless He is the incarnation of Yaweh.

Peace and Joy, Bill

John 17:20,21 "that they all may **be one**, as You, Father, in Me, and I in You; that they also may **be one** in Us, **that the world may believe that you sent Me.** 🙏 😊



08-23-2006

#23

dumotel

Member

Join Date: May 2006
Posts: 481
18 Reputation Points



Hey Pat :>

The omission of a definite article doesn't necessarily validate automatic insertion of an indefinite article, instance in mention being 'a god' in the NWT. The definite article can be implied in Greek, and in the case of [John 1:1](#) it's extremely likely to be the case. Why? Well, firstly, the definite article "ton" (accusative form) was used immediately before the second and only other reference to 'theos' in this verse which has the omission of the definite article. There is clear implication of the definite article from the first reference. How so? It's all in the Bible!

Since only one 'alithinos theos' (true God) is proclaimed in the Bible, John's grammar would naturally serve to reflect this. I have difficulty entertaining the idea that John would be implying more than one god in such a statement. Since omission of the definite article does not automatically justify insertion of the indefinite, and since God Himself teaches no acknowledgement of any other God but himself, the NWT, in this instance, has poor rendering, or has made an adjustment of the text to suit its doctrine (because it allows for more than one god, albeit a lesser one.)

The NWT translation makes it sound like "in the beginning was the word and the word was with god, and the word was a god **too**. It forcefully implies the concept of polytheism – the existence of a false god, but a god just the same, since there can only be one true god...! the NWT itself has Jehovah saying there's no other (true) god than Himself. This means all other gods are false, whether they are believed to be or even worshipped as mighty or almighty. Nowhere does Jehovah say or imply that there is another true god, nowhere does he say or imply you can accept another as a true mighty god, so long as you remember He's the Almighty One. Any other god is a false god, period.

John certainly knew what he was saying, and the message is loud and clear. It had nothing to do with more than one god.

Perhaps I'm narrowed minded, perhaps subconsciously I just want to see it the way I do, what can I say? I just can't see it any other way knowing that John knew full well there is only one true God, that he would introduce us to 'another' god.

Du

- Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world. **1 John 4:1**



08-23-2006

#24

dumotel

Member

Join Date: May 2006
 Posts: 481
 18 Reputation Points



Hi Olivetree! (nice name :>)

Sorry, I had left writing my post to finish dinner and upon completing it, didn't see that a post with similar assertions as mine has already been made.

Du

- Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world. **1 John 4:1**



08-23-2006

#25

Johan Henze

Member

Join Date: Jan 2006
 Posts: 957
 31 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by **olivetree**

Just out of curiosity.

What does "500 billion years and still burning "thank about that"" mean?

Peace and Joy, Bill

Pat,s

Way of thanking God for revealing us the nature of hell!!

Johan Henze



08-23-2006

#26

tkkclark

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006
 Posts: 275
 18 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by **olivetree**

But to answer your question form my limited knowledge about JWS. I would say that they would see these "cultic devotional patterns" to be of the lesser type, not the same as devotion to God.

I know they believe that it's a lesser obeisance. I just don't understand why they believe it's lesser obeisance. Not talking in terms of WTS theology, mind. I know why their **theology** demands a lesser obeisance. I just don't understand how they can consider the **cultic practices themselves** as lesser obeisance.

08-23-2006 #27

pestmanpat1
Member

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

i think you have read it wrong it dosent say thank.

500 billion years and still burning"think about that"

Quote

08-23-2006 #28

pestmanpat1
Member

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


hi second birth.i got it strait from the net .anyone is free to look for themselves.by all means read the whole article.
since the time i started posting on this forum i have not used a single watchtower.i have quoted from other translations than the nwt.
and i have quoted from other interliniers.and though i have asked many what there faith is i have not attacked there church as you are attacking mine.you assume that we cant think for ourselves,you asume to much.

500 billion years and still burning"think about that"

Quote

08-23-2006 #29

AmazingGrace
CARM Super Member



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

And Pat, one thing to keep in mind in the WT translation of this passage:

They say that it could be translated as "God", but they don't **have** to translate it that way. Then, over the course of the rest of the chapter, where the definite article is missing they use a capital "G".

Now, if their reasoning wasn't faulty, how come their translating isn't consistent?

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**

Quote

08-23-2006 #30

wannabe
Junior Member

Join Date: Aug 2006
Posts: 63
10 Reputation Points

Great response Grace, If I may be allowed to answer it without being accused of deviating from the thread topic, the answer I believe is quite simple. The definite article is not necessary in the rest of the chapter because of the form of the word theos. If you are to look at the word usage by John in the rest of the chapter you will see its used with the GENITIVE declension. That means the word is being used as a position.

Since John already stated who the God was in [John 1:1a,b](#) with the ACCUSATIVE declension of theos, the reader can extrapolate that Gods position is higher than that of the Word. Thus, according to Goodspeeds Translation the word was devine or WT "a god" meaning a mighty person. The term theos has been applied to humans in the OT LXX and the NT, now we now these people were not

the Almighty.

If you take a look at the openings of all of Pauls writings for example,

[Romans 1:7](#)Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ. Two distinct individuals.

[Romans 1:8](#) First, I thank GOD through Jesus Christ.... 1:9 For GOD, whom I...

[1Corinthians 1:3, 1:9](#)

[1Corinthians 11:3](#)

and the grand-daddy of them all [Ephesians 1:17](#). Please allow me to type this all out here.

I pray that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory may give you a spirit of wisdom and revelation as you come to know him. The "him" here in the end of the sentence means "God the father."

and finally in [Revelation 1:6](#) "and made us to be a kingdom, priests serving his God and Father, to him be glory and dominion forever and ever. Amen

From the following cites, you can see that That Jesus is in a lesser position that the Almighty both heaven and earthly both before his coming to earth and returning to heaven. In the last two examples you see Jesus has a father, who is God the Almighty. Just as Jesus, I am not my not father anymore than he is.

So from the above it is clear that [John 1:1](#) is translated just fine, even as the Goodspeed Translation is just fine also. And even the mainstream translation of [John 1:1](#) is fine as long as you know how to define theos in [John 1:1c](#).

Nice to still have the ability to chat with you, unless I this post that I have made is way off topic and get accused again of deviation.
wannabe



08-23-2006

#31

secondbirth

CARM Super Member



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



HEY PESS\TMAN. YEAH I HAVE MY OWN ENCYCLOPEDIA BRITANNICA, AND PEOPLE PLEASE RESEARCH THIS, BECAUSE PESTMAN HAS NOT READ THE FULL ARICLE OF THIS ISSUE. CHECK THIS OUT.....Neither the word Trinity nor the explicit doctrine appears in the New Testament. .. THE TRUTH OF THE MATTER AND THE QUOTATIONS PUT INTO THEIR PROPER CONTEX.. AHA! ANOTHER PERIOD WHERE THERE THERES ACTUALLY A COMMA IN THE ORIGINAL. THIS ARICAL HERE GOES ON AT SOME LENGHT TO SUPPORT THE TRINITY, AND ACTUALLY CONCLUDES WITH THESE WORDS..... THUS, THE NEW TESTAMENT ESTABLISHED THE BASIS FOR DOCTRINE OF THE TRINTY... YOU SEE PESTMAN CHECK THIS OUT ONLINE, BUT DIDNT READ EVERYTHING BECAUSE YOU HAVE TO BE PAY TO READ ALL OF IT. YES WE KNOW THAT THE WORD TRINTY IS NOT IN THE BIBLE, BUT THAT DOESNT MEAN ITS NOT REVEALED IN IT, LIKE THE WORD BIBLE IS NOT IN THE BIBLE, BUT YET WE KNOW ITS A BIBLE... PEATMAN, YOU ARE NOT BEIN HONEST , READ THE FULL ARTICLE



08-23-2006

#32

secondbirth

CARM Super Member



Olivetree, Forgive Me, I Know You Are Not Jw, I Was Just Pointing Out What



Pestman Quoted You In The Encyclopedia, And It Was Faulty, So I Read It Myself And Tried To Point It Out To You So You Wont Be Discieved By It.. Hey Man Jesus Is Good Rite...

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



08-23-2006

#33

steider2003

Member

Join Date: Jun 2006
Posts: 699
22 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by [secondbirth](#)
HEY PESS\TMAN. YEAH I HAVE MY OWN ENCYCLOPEDIA BRITANNICA, AND PEOPLE PLEASE RESEARCH THIS, BECAUSE PESTMAN HAS NOT READ THE FULL ARICLE OF THIS ISSUE. CHECK THIS OUT.....Neither the word Trinity nor the explicit doctrine appears in the New Testament. ... THE TRUTH OF THE MATTER AND THE QUOTATIONS PUT INTO THEIR PROPER CONTEX.. AHA! ANOTHER PERIOD WHERE THERE THERES ACTUALLY A COMMA IN THE ORIGINAL. THIS ARICAL HERE GOES ON AT SOME LENGHT TO SUPPORT THE TRINITY, AND ACTUALLY CONCLUDES WITH THESE WORDS..... THUS, THE NEW TESTAMENT ESTABLISHED THE BASIS FOR DOCTRINE OF THE TRINTY... YOU SEE PESTMAN CHECK THIS OUT ONLINE, BUT DIDNT READ EVERYTHING BECAUSE YOU HAVE TO BE PAY TO READ ALL OF IT. YES WE KNOW THAT THE WORD TRINTY IS NOT IN THE BIBLE, BUT THAT DOESNT MEAN ITS NOT REVEALED IN IT, LIKE THE WORD BIBLE IS NOT IN THE BIBLE, BUT YET WE KNOW ITS A BIBLE... PEATMAN, YOU ARE NOT BEIN HONEST , READ THE FULL ARTICLE

JW should note that the word THEOCRATIC KINGDOM is not in the bible. Also, the word bible is not in the bible so I guess the bible doesn't exist.



08-23-2006

#34

Bro Maurice

Senior Member



Join Date: Jan 2006
Posts: 3,280
69 Reputation Points

An excellent book that would be very helpful to you is: "Reasoning From The Scriptures With The Jehovah's Witnesses" by Ron Rhodes, ISBN 1-56507-106-9 currently available at most Christian Book Stores.
I found it to be excellent and fascinating reading----it is definately the ultimate reference guide. Let me know what you think.



08-23-2006

#35

AmazingGrace

CARM Super Member

Quote:

Since John already stated who the God was in [John 1:1a,b](#) with the



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

ACCUSATIVE declension of theos, the reader can extrapolate that Gods position is higher than that of the Word. Thus, according to Goodspeeds Translation the word was devine or WT "a god" meaning a mighty person. The term theos has been applied to humans in the OT LXX and the NT, now we now these people were not the Almighty.

I think it boils down to this. If you call Jesus 'a god' - you have shown Jesus to be a liar and you've shown the Father to be a liar. (BTW - If Jehovah is uni-personal, how come He isn't referred to as Jehovah everywhere? Why Lord, Father, etc? If it is all about glorifying His name, it doesn't make a lot of sense to call Him anything but Jehovah, right? The bible goes to a lot of trouble to show that Jesus and the Father are distinct, but then unites them by commonly referring to both of them as Lord.)

So if God says:

10 "You are my witnesses," declares the LORD,
"and my servant whom I have chosen,
so that you may know and believe me
and understand that I am he.
Before me no god was formed,
nor will there be one after me.
11 I, even I, am the LORD,
and apart from me there is no savior.

How do you reconcile that with 'a god'? There is no "other" god, no 'a god' - there is only God. All the other "gods" in the bible were not true "gods" and you & I know that. John went to an awful lot of trouble just to say Jesus was only a man, no one different from say, a king or something. No, John set Jesus apart. Nothing was created apart from Jesus and everything is held together by Jesus, the Word.

Jesus is prayed to and worshipped. But everywhere that someone has attempted to worship a person or being that they thought was God (like an angel for instance), they were stopped. Yet Jesus didn't stop anyone from worshipping him. [and please don't go saying that kings were worshipped as 'gods', because you and I both know it isn't the same thing at all].

Jesus is a part of God. He was in the Father's bosom. He proceeds forth from him. He is begotten of God, therefore he is the same substance as God.

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](#)



08-23-2006

#36

[pestmanpat1](#)

Member

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



i took the relevent quotes and posted them.they are not mine but britannicas.**nor the explicit doctrine** about sums it up.
if jesus was his father. and he wanted us to know he was, why the developing mystery?

500 billion years and still burning"think about that"



08-23-2006

#37

Robert V Frazier

Senior Member

Join Date: Jan 2006
Location: Coral Springs,
Florida, USA
Gender: ♂
Posts: 3,173
89 Reputation Points



Who told you that time goes by in Hell? You keep arguing as though you know all sorts of details about Hell, while simultaneously declaring there's no such place and you don't believe in it. The more I think about what you ask me to think about when it comes to Hell, the more I think you don't what you think about it!

Robert V Frazier

The Watchtower is not the instrument of any man or any set of men, nor is it published according to the whims of men. No man's opinion is expressed in The Watchtower. (The Watchtower, 1931 November 1 p.327) If you believe that, you'll believe ANYTHING!



08-23-2006

#38

pestmanpat1

Member

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



its all about context eg:read 1 corinthians 8;5,6

ASV: yet to us there is one God,theFather, of whom are all things, and we unto him; and one Lord,JesusChrist, through whom are all things, and we through him.

so its saying there is only one lord. yet if we read gen;19;1,2

<LX <CM <ML CH

ASV: And the two angels came to Sodom at even; and Lot sat in the gate of Sodom; and Lot saw them, and rose up to meet them; and he bowed himself with his face to the earth;

notice he was not rebuked for bowing down and calling them lord.

ASV:and he said,Behold now,my lords,turn aside,I prayyou,into your servant's house,and tarry all night,and wash your feet,and ye shall rise up early,and go on your way.And they said,Nay;but we will abide in the street all night.

sarah called abraham lord. abigail called david lord.

does this contradict 1 corinthians "only one lord" **no !**

saying "a god" as in john 1:1 does not contradict jesus statments to worship his father.

remember "god -elohim means mighty one.its all about context.

500 billion years and still burning"think about that"



08-23-2006

#39



AmazingGrace

CARM Super Member



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

Quote:

Originally Posted by [pestmanpat1](#)
its all about context eg:read 1 corinthians 8;5,6

*[ASV: yet to us there is **one God,theFather**, of whom are all things, and we unto him; and **one Lord,JesusChrist**, through whom are all things, and we through him.](#)*

so its saying there is only one lord. yet if we read gen;19;1,2

[<LX <CM <ML CH](#)

[ASV: And the two angels came to Sodom at even; and Lot sat in the gate of Sodom: and Lot saw them, and rose up to meet them; and he bowed himself with his face to the earth;](#)

notice he was not rebuked for bowing down and calling them lord.

*[ASV:and he said,Behold now,**my lords**,turn aside,I prayyou,into your servant's house,and tarry all night,and wash your feet,and ye shall rise up early,and go on your way.And they said,Nay;but we will abide in the street all night.](#)*

sarah called abraham lord. abigail called david lord.

*does this contradict 1 corinthians "only one lord" **no** !*

saying "a god" as in john 1:1 does not contradict jesus statments to worship his father.

remember "god -elohim means mighty one.its all about context.

Hey Pat - I don't understand where you're going with the Genesis chapter. We already know there were others called lords. And I don't see where Lot was worshipping them in that scripture, do you?

None of what you've put up there has contradicted what I said. I get the feeling that either a) you didn't really read what I wrote or b) you didn't understand? when did I say that we shouldn't worship the Father?

And you and I both know that Sarah calling Abraham lord is not the same thing. So what are you debating with your comment here on elohim? I don't follow.

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](#)



08-23-2006

#40

Robert V Frazier

Senior Member

Join Date: Jan 2006
 Location: Coral Springs, Florida, USA
 Gender: ♂
 Posts: 3,173
 89 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by [corvus](#)
Because in ancient times the Jews would call a judge "el" or "theos" without even vaguely implying that that one was a deity in either of the senses Trinitarians think. You have to admit, Jesus is a judge, the mightiest in all of existance.

I agree that Jesus is the mightiest Judge in all of existence, and that Judge is God, of course! Good point.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **corvus** 

It is applied to God as is the Hebrew shachah. So the translation of the word is purely arbitrary - if you already believe Jesus is God then you will assume that it means "worship" and is therefore proof that he is God. If you are not burdened by such human doctrine you will not make any such assumption.

You should read Kittel's entry on *proskyneo*. In the New Testament, it is always used of worship, either true worship as of God the Father and of Christ, or false worship, of Satan, the antichrist, demons. Angels firmly reject it, which frankly they would not if they shared your views of the word!

An interesting fact I found at the end of the entry: *proskyneo* is used over and over in the Gospels and Acts, and then again many times in Revelation. But in all other books of the New Testament, it appears exactly twice, both in quotes from the Old Testament. Reinforcing the concept that this word is used for the physical, bodily response to someone or something one can see and which one regards (rightly or wrongly) as Divine with a capital "D".

Quote:

Originally Posted by **corvus** 

The word PROSKUNEO simply means "toward <like> a dog",

Good old Corvus! Never learn or use a definition where a half-baked etymology will do! No, it simply means to bow down low enough to the ground to kiss it, as an act of worship. It's basic etymology would be "kiss toward", and it may come from the idea of kissing the hand the way a dog licks a human's hand. Nothing about that in Kittel's, so I think it's pretty conjectural. Incidentally, the first occurrences of it are in Homer, where both Odysseus and Agamemnon kiss the ground in worship to the Earth for granting them safe landfall after a sea voyage.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **corvus** 

it was a word applied to humans and even the Trinitarian Roman and Eastern churches performed it to people like the Pope and the Byzantine emperor without the assumption that it means "worship as G/a god". The word SHACHAH simply means "to depress" and like PROSKUNEO was applied by the Jews as much to men as to God without taking the position that the recipient was God or a false god.

Usage long after the Bible does not tell us anything about usage inside the pages of the Bible, and you ought to know that! The persistent idea of worship as God (true worship) or worship as a god or goddess (false worship) is no assumption, though of course, you have to convince yourself it is.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **corvus** 

The use of these words both in the Greek and Hebrew OT and in the NT for humans is proof positive that they do not mean what Trinitarianism

says they do.

Nope. Precisely the opposite of the truth. The usage from the beginning, up to and including the last chapter of Revelation give consistent proof positive that *proskyneo* does mean exactly what Christianity (which you call Trinitarianism) says it does. And not what you say it does.

Robert V Frazier

The Watchtower* is not the instrument of any man or any set of men, nor is it published according to the whims of men. No man's opinion is expressed in *The Watchtower*. (*The Watchtower*, 1931 November 1 p.327) **If you believe that, you'll believe ANYTHING!*



Post Reply

Page 2 of 26 < 1 **2** 3 4 5 6 12 > 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 07:29 AM.

As of July 6, 2006, Total Page Views: 22,354,402, Page Views Today: 22,354,402

-- 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