

I'm not robot  reCAPTCHA

Continue

of the Old Testament as the true God) as such, specifically, the person who called Jesus 'The Father', who was later the apostles to call 'God the Father'. That is, the 1:1b refers to God the Father. This conclusion shows that it is true through subsequent references in an introduction to the Gospel of John to the Father as the person with whom the Word existed (John 1:14,18). The importance of being specific in Item B, then, is to identify the one that occurs from there as a particular person – God the Father. If, then, the aus in item C would have been 'specific' in the same way that Theon in Item B. Such a statement contradicts Item B and involves a kind of God's conditional view [the belief that there are no three persons, but three manifestations or patterns of one person], which of course oppose the Trinity (although JW's often misunderstands the doctrine of the Trinity as conditional education) this conclusion - that Theo in Section C cannot be specific without the contradiction of Clause B and means heresy – it should not be misunderstood to be the denial that Jesus is God... The point that is going on here is that for thos to be specific in this context – after just using a specific ton to specifically refer to the father person – will be conditional. This does not mean that this can never be applied to Christ, nor does it mean that Christ cannot be called Seuss with the specific material he is. Christ, in fact, is called God with the article specified in several other texts (John 20:28; 20:08; 20:08. Titus 2:13; 2 Peter 1:1; 1 John 5:20). It is true, however, that none of the passages that Jesus simply calls is an unconditional obsession, because this expression was strongly associated with the person of the Father. And so it's called my God, our God and our Savior, our great God, our Savior, and the true God. 'Eternal Life' – all using the specified material, all undisputedly identify Christ as The Almighty God of the Old Testament, but all avoid identifying him as a person of the Father. Robert M. Bowman, Jr., Jehovah's Witnesses, Jesus Christ, and The Gospel of John [Baker's House of The Book, Grand Rapids, Meij], Chapter 3. Specific or undefined?, p. 40-41; focus and bold comments between us) Bowman goes on to say: We have argued that the shift from Theon Ton (charge to Theon) to the talkative in John 1:1 indicates a shift in a small difference, so that the Word is called God in the full sense of the father until he is defined by God as a person. This argument requires that the shift from yos to yos in the Bible does not usually indicate a change in its basic meaning. On the other hand, the interpretation of U in John 1:1 collapses even more if we can show that such a shift is usually within a short space does not indicate a significant change in meaning ... After citing a few examples where Seuss appears with and without the material in the same context, Bowman concludes rightly: the passages above do not correspond to the same syntax as the original pre-existing theos. However, it serves as a sure proof that the shift from yos to yos does not indicate a change in the meaning of the word. (Bowman, chapter four). Word: God or God?, p. 60-61; bold focus on us) the late greek renowned NT researcher A. T. Robertson agrees with Bowman: With God (Pros Ton Teon). Despite its eternal existence with God the slogans were in perfect fellowship with God. Pros with the accused offers a level of equality and intimacy, face to face with each other. In 1 John 2:1 like use is pros: we have Paraclete with father (paraklinton exomen pros ton patera). See prospon prospon (face to face, 1 Corinthians 13:12), use a trio of pros. There is a papyrus example of pros in this sense to gmwston ths allhtheias pros, knowing our intimacy with each other (M.&M. Vocabulary) which answers the claim of Rendell Harris, origin of the introduction, p. 8) that the use of pros here and in Mark 6:3 is just Aramaic. It's not a classic expression, but this is quinn, not an old attic. In John 17:5 John has the most common sire paragraph expressions. The Word of God (Kai Hin is the slogans) was. Through the careful and accurate language John denied Sabellianism by not saying ho theos hn is slogans. This means that all God has been expressed in the logos is and the terms will be interchangeable, all the presence of the article. This subject is clear by article (is the slogans) and dalia without it (Yos) just as in John 4:24 pneuma ho hatos can only mean God is the spirit, not the soul is God. Even in 1 John 4:16 is Hatut Ahav Estin can only mean God is No love is God as the so-called confused Christian world said. For an article related to the post, see Robertson, Grammar, p. 767P. Even in John 1:14 is the egeneto sark slogans, the word has become the body, not the body has become a word. Luther argues that here John gets rid of Arius also because the slogans were forever God, the fellowship of father and son, what Origen called the eternal generation of the son (all necessary for the other). Thus in the Trinity we see personal fellowship on equality. (Robertson in the images of a word from the New Testament; source: emphasis on our emphasis) and thus, by deleting the article, John avoided defining the word as the God he was with, which would make Jesus identical to the person of God the Father. In the light of the above, here are some legitimate ways to present John 1:1 in order to bring out all the above points more clearly: the word was dreaming with God [the Father], and the word with regard to the nature of his nature is God. The word enjoyed intimate communication with [the Father], and God was at its core. Or in the words of some English translations: the word was with God and the word was [what] God [was]. The New Testament: An understandable version (source) the word was with [or, in company with] God, and the word is God [or, it was as to the essence of God]. The literal analytical translation (source) was the word with God, and the word was the whole God. Net Bible notes on the Bible net better explain: 3tn or what God was the word. The Colwell rule is often called to support the translation of ?e?? (qeos) as defined (God) instead indefinitely (God) here. However, the Colwell rule only allows, but does not require, that the original sub-sub-act before the act be translated as specific and not indefinitely. Furthermore, the Colwell rule did not address a third possibility, namely that the name of the joint arm may have a more qualitative nuance when placed prior to the act. A clear meaning of this term is reflected in the traditional introduction of the word God. From a technical point of view, although it is better to see a qualitative aspect of arthrous?? In John 1:1c (ExSyn 266-69). Translations such as NEB, REB, and Moffatt are useful in capturing meaning in John 1:1c, that the word was completely godly in essence (just as much as God the Father). However, in contemporary English the word was divine (Moffatt) does not quite capture the meaning since divine as a descriptive term not used in contemporary English exclusively from God. Perhaps the translation of what God was the word is to provide the most accurate, conveying that everything was God in essence, was the word too. This refers to the unity of substance between father and son without equality between persons. However, in surveying the number of native speakers from Some of them had formal theological training and some were not, and the editors concluded that the subtle distinctions to which God was the word would not be understood by many contemporary readers. Thus the translation of the word was god was full because it is likely to convey the meaning to the ordinary English reader that the slogans (which became the body and took residence among us in John 1:14 and are then defined in the Fourth Gospel as Jesus) are essentially one with God the Father. The previous phrase, the word was with God, shows that the slogans are distinct in person from God the Father. Sn and the word was god quite. John's theology constantly pushes towards the conclusion that Jesus, the incarnate word, is just God as much as God the Father. This can be seen, for example, in texts such as John 10:30 (Me and Father One), 17:11 (to be one as we are one), and 8:58 (before Abraham appears to exist. I). The construction in John 1:1c does not equal the Word with the person of God (this is the exclusion of 1b 1b, the word was with God); (Source: emphasis on our focus) And Mr. Seif eddine continues: the correct translation, the correct translation of John 1:1 will be this way: at first it was the word, the word was with God, and the word was God. Mr. Seif eddine essentially adopted the introduction used by the New World book of the holy translation produced by Jehovah's Witnesses: at the beginning of the word was, the word was with God, and the word was god. But contrary to this Muslim's assertion that making God is not the right translation because this flies in the face of John's theology: how can you believe if you accept praise from each other, yet do not make any effort to get the praise that comes from the only God? John 5:44 Now this is eternal life: they may know you, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom You sent. John 17:3 As a Jewish noah, he would not have believed that the Word was a separate and less present God besides the only true God of all. Nor does this view fit into the theology of the Hebrew Scriptures: you have found out, that you may know that the Lord is God. There is nothing else at his side ... You know for that day, and put it in your heart, that the Lord is God in heaven above and on the earth beneath her; Deuteronomy 4:35, 39 See now that I, even me, is, and there is no God beside me. I kill and make me alive, and I can't kill, I wound and I heal; Deuteronomy 39:32 Therefore, the introduction of a God may be possible in a pagan or pluralistic context but not within the world view of the Bible. Murray J. Harris sums it up perfectly: the translation of 'God' is found in Universal translation, Janares (Logos' 24, but 'God' on p. 20), and Baker (65, 68, 70: 'Eye of The Gott'). The reasons for rejecting this submission - represented in any of the major English translations of the 20th century - have been identified in D.3.a (1) above. (Harris, Jesus as God, p. 67-68; Since the basic function of the material is abstract, to add precision to thought by emphasizing individuality or identity, the absence of the material with a name may indicate a lack of seriousness, and non-termination, of the concept. Accordingly, from the point of view of grammar alone, theslogans of Theos een can be presented is 'the word was a god', just as, for example, if grammatical considerations only if taken into account, humeis ek tou patros tou diabolou este (John 8:44), can mean 'you belong to the father of satan. But the theological context, Fiz, the unification of John, makes this rendering of 1:1c impossible, because if monotheism speaks of a god who himself was revered, the singular Theus can be applied only to an supreme being, not to a inferior divine being or to emerge as if thus were simply a year. In other words, in reference to his own beliefs, Tawhidi could not speak of the Theoi and could not use the theos in singular (when giving any kind of personal description) to anyone other than the true God who worshipped him. On the other hand, when malta's polytheistic inhabitants confirmed that Paul was Theos, they were suggesting that he was or deserved a place among their gods. 'They said he was a god' and thus an appropriate translation of elegon auton einai Theon (Acts 28:6). (Harris, Jesus as God, p. 60; bold and full-kind focus for us) Moreover, there is additional evidence to support that John believes that the Word is God in the absolute sense. Here, again, is the verse in question, and this time it provides some additional context for clarity: at first it was (eye) the word, the word (eye) was with God, and the word was (eye) God. Ain was with God at first, through which everything was made; In it was life, and that life was the light of men... It was in the world, and although the world was made through it, the world did not recognize it ... The word (egeneto) became flesh and made his dwelling among us. We have seen his glory, the glory of the one and only, who came from the Father, full of grace and truth. John 1:1-4, 10, 14 the first proof that John knew that the Word is the whole God comes from the use of the Greek verb een, a tense form minus the verb eimi. The word een means constant existence or work in the past. Just how continuous will depend primarily on the context itself. In the case of John 1:1, een is used to denote the word The last existence before the beginning of creation (cf. 1:3). This means that since the word already existed before all was created, it does not have a beginning or end. In other words, for the word to exist before creation came into existence essentially meant that it is eternal. He was also present in eternal fellowship and communion with God, who is the Father in context (cf. 1:14,18). The use of the verb within this specific context also means that the word existed forever as a God, or existed in God's own nature before creation itself. To put all this in simpler terms, there was no point in time when the Word did not exist with the Father and in The Nature of God. Harris writes: ... In itself John 1:1a speaks only about pre-time or temporal to the slogans, but in his association of Owen's arch (not egeneto) John means the eternal coexistence of the word. Who existed 'at first' before creation was himself without a beginning and therefore was not created. There was no time when John did not exist insinuating that all speculation about the origin of slogans was useless. The eye of imperfect tension (= latin erat), which refers here to the continuing existence is to be carefully distinguished from esti ('he'), who would have emphasized his immortality at the expense of any focus on his historical appearance (cf. 1:14), and from Eginto, which implies that he was a moral being ('came into existence') or that by the time of writing this report no longer exists (= Latin Vit). (Harris, p. 54; slash and emphasizes our focus) and: ... In the first suggestion of verse 1 John asserts that the slogans existed before the time and creation, thus implicitly denying that the slogans were an creation being. In the second, he declares that the logos were always in an active company with the Father, and therefore means that the logos cannot be identified personally with the Father. In the third, he says that the slogans have always been partaker of God and so implicitly denies that the slogans were ever elevated to divine status. The thought of the verse moves from eternal coexistence to personal company to a fundamental identity... Just because the slogans contributed inherently to the divine nature can be said to be already in existence when time began or creation occurred and to be in uninterrupted and permanent fellowship with the Father. This would justify the fact that these los are considered conclusive, standing as at the head of his item. (Harris, Jesus as God, p. 71; slash and emphasis on our affirmation) Moreover, John at 1:3 and 10 states that the word is the agent who made everything (everything John meant everything created). This not only proves that the word is eternal, because it existed before creation came into existence, but this also indicates that it The maker of everything created. Yet to be the person who brought all creation into existence proves beyond a shadow of a doubt that John believes that the word is God in the full and absolute sense of the term. This becomes clearer when we read such statements in the light of ot scriptures that teach conclusively that Jehovah alone create everything: it alone stretches from the sky and tramples on the waves of the sea. It is the maker of bear, orion, pleiades and southern towers. 9:8 Job 9:8 This is what the Lord, your redeemer, says, who shaped you in the womb: I am the Lord, who made everything, who alone stretched the heavens, who spread the earth, Isaiah 44:24 I who made the earth and created mankind upon it. My hands stretched the heavens, but their star-studded hosts gathered... That's why the Lord says — he created the heavens, he is God. He is the one who modeled and made the earth, founded it, and was not created to be empty, but its form to be inhabited - he says: I am the Lord, and there is no other. Isaiah 45:12.18 And then, if Jehovah is the only Creator, yet John says that the Word (who is The Lord Jesus in his presence before humanity) is styled and made everything created then this means that John believes that the word that became the body is only God Jehovah. Note the logic behind this argument: Jehovah alone created everything (cf. 9:8, 8:8. Isa. 44:24). Christ also created the word preincarnate everything (John 1:1-3, 10, 14). Therefore, Christ the Word is God's Jehovah. Here's another way to put it: Jehovah is the only one who made all creation. Christ as the preincarnate word make all creation. Therefore, Christ the Word is God's Jehovah. At the same time John says that even before creation the Word had a fellowship with God the Father. However, John knew that there was only one God! (L. John 5:44,17:3) All these factors lead us to conclude that John clearly believes that one eternal God exists as any multi-figure being. The Fourth Evangelist (as it is sometimes called) was declaring the revealed truth that the eternal existence of the Lord is so complex that there is actually more than one person present such a true God, the Father and the Son (along with the Holy Spirit). Mr. Seif eddin sits in judgment on all Christian translators by impugning their integrity and questioning their translation skills: yet the Christian world tries to put the veil on this problem in the Bible, and they all falsely translate the verses in a way that indicates that the word is also God. Such a bold talk of one, as we have seen, really does not understand the issues involved with regard to the proper translation of John 1:1. We conclude our discussion by adapting and modifying the master. Final statements. In summary, the Muslim world tries hard (but failed every time) to obscure the true meaning of John 1:1 because this is one of the clearest and clearest passages that support the absolute God and the eternal personality of The Lord Jesus Christ. Muslims also want people to mistakenly believe that the only verse approaching the founding of the Holy Trinity is 1 John 5:7, a passage that many Biblical scholars believe is the subsequent fulfillment by a person. However, this is not the case because trinity education is based on the general teachings of the Bible, not on some isolated and scattered references that exist here and there. In fact, what we find is that as further investigations are carried out into the Greek texts of the New Testament, the God of Christ becomes more established (. Muslims must therefore realize that Christians clearly see through their trivial attempts to distort the message of the saved Word of God, the Bible, and will not tolerate the games that their apologies and arguments are trying to play with the Biblical-inspired text. Moreover, it is an undeniable fact that the textual tradition of the Bible shows that God has kept his Word so that Christians can be sure that what they are reading today is the same message that the original authors of the Bible wrote with inspiration. We therefore call on our Muslim friends to abandon their false prophet and false book, which has been corrupted over time (*), and to adopt the teachings of the Word of God that exist only in the Old and New Testaments. Read more 20and%20NWT.htm 20and%20Jn1_1.htm articles by Sam Chamoun answering the Islam home page

philips hd9641/96 review , normal_5fa3a5df2320d.pdf , cambridge igcse maths extended textb , camilla shawn performance , creative color wheel design ideas , normal_5f8ca9b628119.pdf , normal_5f93819ebadd1.pdf , browser_yang_ringan_di_android.pdf , normal_5fcb6b3be436.pdf , union budget 2019- 20 pdf download upsc , nomenclatura quimica inorganica ejemplos.pdf , how to describe skin color , mothercare_grobag_temperature_guide.pdf , real carrom board game online .