



09-07-2006

#101

katierussell
Member

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

Quote:

[Acts 28:4](#) When the natives saw the creature hanging from his hand, they began saying to one another, "Undoubtedly this man is a murderer, and though he has been saved from the sea, justice has not allowed him to live." (NASB)

Yeah...So, what's your point?

1. I never said that precopulative (preceding the verb) anarthrous PNs must be Q, without exception never-ever. If you'll check the statistics I cited in my previous post, Q wasn't 100%. It was 56%, I think. It's in the majority, sure. I think the two others with the highest % was I (17%) and Q-I (your position, also 17%). Also, if I recall correctly, D was 10 or 11%. Q is in most likely sense, but it is not the only sense.

And how do you know these "statistics" are correct? Isn't this all rather subjective this semantic tagging? Indeed it is. If the sentence structure of [John 1:1c](#) is purely 'Q' then what of [Acts 28:4](#) where the exact sentence structure is the same? Yet we both know how it has been translated and rightly so. Phonus as indefinite.

Quote:

2. In English, we usually use the indefinite article to reflect qualitiveness, but not always. Sometimes, Q is reflected as an adjective in English. Sometimes without the article altogether (as in [Mark 2:28](#) "So the Son of Man is Lord even of the Sabbath." NASB, which we certainly wouldn't translate as a Lord of the Sabbath. The NWT doesn't insert the "a" either, btw.)

So, if one can translate into English as indefinite a noun in the Greek which is a 'Q' then what is stopping it being translated as such in [John 1:1c](#)? As "a god." And if one were to translate the anarthrous theos in [John 1:1c](#) with an English adjective, which one would you choose? "divine"? You cannot have "Divine" or "Deity" for by those having capital they are proper names, hence, definite. (Of course, proper names can be treated as common nouns when

they do not have unique references, though they retain capitals in writing and they can then be in the plural and take determiners that are confined to count nouns, e.g in the sentence. "This always happens on a Saturday night." But theos in [John 1:1c](#) does of course have unique reference, the Word.) You could not have "God" for that is a definite noun. And why is kurios of [Mark 2:28](#) 'Q'? Note that the REB translates "...is lord even of the Sabbath." Goodspeed has "is master even of the Sabbath." The NRSV as "...is lord even over the Sabbath." I take these as renderings as qualitative ones that shows that the Son of man has authority over the Sabbath. To translate " is Lord even over the Sabbath" is a definite translation! I would translate kurios as indefinite here. "the son of man is a lord even of the Sabbath." This means as does the qualitative rendering that the son of man even had authority over the sabbath. So I would tag this either as 'QI' or 'IQ' but there is no real difference in meaning. If we then treat [John 1:1](#)'s theos similiarly we could translate "and the Word was god." Not "the Word was God" which is a definite translation for it is no different to a translation of ho theos here. But what does "the Word was god" mean. That the Word had the qualities of "god." Having these qualities would make the Word "a god." And so one could translate.

Quote:

Is [Acts 28:4](#) Q? No idea. Don't know, don't care, and it doesn't really matter if it's Q or not in regards to my argument. Citing exceptions when I've already said there are exceptions doesn't damage my argument at all. So no, I'm not going to waste my time haggling over whether or not this is Q or Q-I. Sorry.

Why is this an "exception? Are there any more "exceptions?

And could you please list all singular predicate anarthrous nominative preceding the verb? I would like to see how many have been translated indefinitely.

Last edited by [katierussell](#) : 09-07-2006 at 01:28 AM.



09-07-2006

#102

[katierussell](#)

Member

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

Quote:

Quote:
 They simply quoted Harner for he was one scholar who argued against the translation of "the Word was a God" for this is a definite rendering.

Okay.

Quote:

When I wrote:

Quote:

Yes it does, because "God" in English is a definite noun.

You reply:

Quote:

Check your Websters. God is not always a proper noun.

No, Webster's under "God" shows it to be definite. Having a capital letter G this shows it is definite and in fact all scholars recognize it is a definite noun and when in "the Word was God" is a definite noun phrase. God is a definite English substantive!

You don't have teenagers, do you?

How many times have you heard kids or (regrettably) even Christian adults say OMG and variations thereof? I've heard this on the lips of atheists, pagans and Christians (tragically) alike. If you look at examples of this in contemporary fiction, God is in many cases capitalized in OMG (and variations thereof) and only rarely (if ever) does the speaker intend a definite, refer to any specific being.

Not saying it's right. But it is an example of an indefinite capital G in an English setting. Which says nothing capitalization in poetry, used to emphasize and/or draw attention to words (John's prologue is poetry)...

Of course, I'm not saying the predominant use of the capitalized God is any of those things. Just saying your assertion that the capitalized G is always definite is fallacious because there are exceptions.

God in "Oh my God" **is a definite use** of God because of the **possessive pronoun!** This *definitizes* the noun. (See for example [John 8:54](#)'s anarthrous theos with its attached possessive pronoun hence rightly translated as "**God**.") So, you have not shown that "God" is not a definite noun and OMG is not an exception at all!. God is definite. That's why it is spelt "**God**." I asked you to check up Websters for you asked me to "Check your Websters. God is not always a proper noun." Well, I checked and it is! God is a "proper name" especially in Christian religion and all proper names are definite. And remember, Harner argued **against** this translation because it **was** a definite translation! So, if you want to tag the anarthrous theos of 1:1c as purely 'Q' then you must reject as Harner did the translation "and the Word was God." If John had written *ho theos en ho logos* which mean the predicate theos here is definite one would translate, taking logos as the subject as the context shows "the Word was God." We do not need to translate the Greek article any more than it is in 1:1b. This also shows that to translate as "the Word was God" from John's Greek is to

understand theos to be definite. So, what translation do you think would convey the qualities of the noun theos? You said that often one can translate with an indefinite noun phrase or with an adjective? So, how then would you with both? Can you do so for us?

Last edited by [katierussell](#) : 09-07-2006 at 01:08 AM.



09-07-2006

#103

[mondo](#)

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006

Posts: 816

13 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by [steider2003](#)

I have a question isn't bowing or kneeling a sign of worship?

[Acts 10:25-26](#) Cornelious fell down when Peter entered the room and Peter corrected him. [Revelation 19:10](#) John fell down before an angel and the angel corrected him. Also [Revelation 22:8](#) John fell down before an angel and the angel corrected him again.

Remember the words of the devil in the temptation in [Matthew 4:9](#) ? "And he said to Him, 'All these things will I give You, if You fall down and worship me.'" No possibility of mistaking that. Then Jesus said to him, "Begone, Satan! For it is written, 'You shall worship the Lord your God, and serve Him only.'"

Why didn't Jesus ever corrected anyone falling down or bowing before him?

here are some examples:

The leper came to Him and bowed down to Him, saying, "Lord, if You are willing, You can make me clean." In [Matthew 9:18](#), "While He was saying these things to them, behold, there came a synagogue official and he bowed down before Him, saying, 'My daughter has just died; but come and lay Your hand on her, and she will live.'" In [Matthew 15:25](#), we see a Canaanite woman whose daughter was demon-possessed bowing down before Him and saying, "Lord, help me!" In [Matthew 20:20](#) the mother of the sons of Zebedee came to Him on behalf of her sons, bowing down and making a request of Him.

No it isn't. There is bowing and kneeling throughout the OT to various ones and it isn't worship.



09-07-2006

#104

[katierussell](#)

Member

Join Date: May 2006

Posts: 1,481

16 Reputation Points

Quote:

Quote:
When I wrote:

Quote:

God" in English is a who and when one says that someone "was God" you are identifying them as that definite being. Hence, the translation "and the Word was God" is undoubtedly a definite rendering. But the anarthrous theos in this construct is describing what the Word was. The translation "and the Word was God" then is incorrect.

You reply:

Quote:

And the Word was God allows for the qualitative theos. And the Word was a god does not.

No, God is not a qualitative noun at all! Could you give me a qualitative noun in English that has a capital letter and does not identify? But that is what God does. It identifies a particular being. It is a 'who' not a 'what. However, the translation "the Word was god" does not indentify, as John does not himself at 1:1c, but describes what the Word was, as John does with his Greek at [John 1:1c](#). "god" is not a 'who' but a 'what'. This is what is predicated of the Word, his being no ho theos, "God", but theos, "god."

You can disagree all you like that theos in 1:1c is not a qualitative count noun, but I do not agree. As such, we are arguing at cross-purposes in regards to the English translation and what it could and should reflect. You see theos as Q-I and therefore, any translation that allows for class membership or is any way ambiguous in that respect is okey-dokey with you. I believe theos is qualitative. Not just qualitative, in fact, but emphatically so, given its emphatic position at the beginning of the clause. As such, I believe any translation that allows for class membership directly or through any ambiguity is wholly inappropriate. The "a god" translation reflects that ambiguity. So again, I believe "And the Word was God" is the best literal translation. Is it a perfect translation? No. I've never claimed it was. Which is why I suggested substituting Deity or Divine instead (though I don't like them as well) and the NEB's paraphrase. Why do I capitalize Deity and Divine? Because there is no grammatical reason for demanding the noun theos has different meanings in [John 1:1](#)! (In lieu of your citing/quoting an authority who states nouns change their characteristics when fronted by the definite article, at any rate.) A lowercase D (in both cases) would be ambiguous in that it might be interpreted as reflecting less than the characteristics of the theos in 1:1b.

I had asked you: "No, God is not a qualitative noun at all! **Could you give me a qualitative noun in English that has a capital letter and does not identify?** But that is what God does. It identifies a particular being. It is a 'who' not a 'what. However, the translation "the Word was god" does not indentify, as John does not himself at 1:1c, but describes what the Word was, as John does with his Greek at [John 1:1c](#). "god" is not a 'who' but a 'what'. This is what is predicated of the Word, his being no ho theos, "God", but theos, "god." "

You have not done so. You have simply made an assertion that

"God" in the translation "the Word was God" is a qualitative noun! You say that "theos" is qualitative! But can you say "God" is? I have told you why you can not. I have previously quoted Beduhn concerning what Harner thinks are nouns that express the qualities of the subject of which the noun is predicated of. Sometimes the emphasis is on nature or characteristics and at times the emphasis is on identity or membership and that each can not be distinguished in any meaningful way. This is true, for many nouns that are in the exact same sentence structure as we have in [John 1:1c](#) are translated indefinitely and at times it just can not be avoided. You say that you could "substitute "Deity" and "Divine" but once again you offer definite nouns. If you wish for a predicate adjective then you could have "divine." "The Word was divine." You could also have "deity" "the Word was deity." But the second is no different from and the Word was a god" for deity means being a god!

And yet you say why do you capitalize "Deity" and "Divine" its because "there is no grammatical reason for demanding the noun theos has different meanings in [John 1:1](#)!" Well, that is some admittance! The theos of 1:1b has a definite sense, it being theos preceded by the definite article. But if you think the theos is also the same then where has your qualitative meaning gone!!! Lexically theos means the same in each case, "god." But in 1:1b it identifies, it is definite and hence the article is not translated but ho theos is translated as "God." There is no grammatical reason why theos should be so understood: it is in the predicate, it is anarthrous and it describes what the Word was, not who the Word was. You say that to have "deity" would be ambiguous in that it might be interpreted as reflecting less than the characteristics of the theos in 1:1b." But this is where you are saying that the Word's being theos means he has all the qualities of **ho** theos! But that is not what John said, not what he wrote. He did not say that the Word was ho theos, but theos. He has all the qualities of theos. Now, we have only two literal words for theos in English. We have either "God" or "god." (And where may I ask has any modern English translation not use either of these for theos?) Now the first, as have been shown, is the proper translation for ho theos in 1:1b, 2. And "god" would be the best literal translation for theos for the reasons given for theos in 1:1c. So, we are left with "the Word was god." But this is not good English. We need the indefinite article to make it so. "the Word was a god." Does this convey the Greek noun's qualities which are predicated to the Word? Yes. For if the Word was "a god" then he would have to have all the qualities needed for him to be so. Its just that in English we can convey those qualities in an indefinite noun phrase. In fact you have admitted elsewhere this can be the case. That is, a Greek noun that emphasizes qualitiveness can be translated by the English indefinite noun phrase.

Quote:

Quote:

As we can both agree that the NEB is not a literal translation we can set that aside.

Set it aside all you like. That doesn't change the fact that I still believe that it provides the thought of 1:1c.

But if that "thought" is that the Word is given all the qualities of hotheos that thought ought to be rejected for that is not what John wrote.

Quote:

Quote:

But of course it does make God the subject where in John's Greek in 1:1 it is not but the predicate.

It's a PARAPHRASE, Katie. You do understand what a paraphrase is, right? When you take something and put it into your own words? As a PARAPHRASE, in rewording this text, the NEB translators can make the subject anything they want as long as it adheres to the thought of what they believe is being said in the original Greek.

Discussing the merits or not of the NEB's translation is a side issue. Yes, it is a paraphrase, but I would like us to find what is the best literal translation. The Greek of [John 1:1, 2](#) is very simple. Its not unique(the context is of course where we have two whom are theos but not the same theos)and one can **easily translate it literally**. I did not bring up the NEB's rendering. You did. We are discussing whether the theos of [John 1:1c](#) is purely qualitative or indefinite or even a combination of the two. I say that it is indefinite, because it is an anarthrous PNV, but because the noun is placed first qualitiveness is in **addition** to its indefiniteness. If one considers it to be purely qualitative then how are you going to translate it? One thing for sure, you can not use a substantive beginning with a capital "G" as it would be definite. This rules out "and the Word was **G**od." So, please translate [John 1:1c](#) with an English substantive(as theos is), with one that is always used by modern English bible translations for the word theos and one that is not definite. There is only one choice!

Quote:

Again, I prefer formal equivalents, but paraphrased Bibles don't offend me, as they seem to offend you. If you don't like them, fine. Don't consult them. But I can and will whenever I think the paraphrase brings out the thought of a passage or verse, as I have done so here.

You presume and assume to much. I did not say that paraphrases, or dynamic equalivalent translations "offends" me! I only commented on one particular English translation and that was of [John 1:1c](#) which was paraphrastic and was one that did not accurately convey what John meant. In my opinion, here that is, not necessarily elsewhere, the translators realized that the a literal translation, "the Word was God" was **not** the best so they opted for a less than literal approach to it. In fact I know this is the case for the NEB for C.H.Dodd(who was the main translator and the Director behind the NEB translation of course) writing in Technical Papers for The Bible Translator stated:

Quote:

"The Word was God" does not convey the meaning required.-
Vol.28, No.1, January 1977, page 104.

So, if then you believe that the NEB's translation **is** capturing the "thought" John meant us to capture you will also have to accept that the translation does not capture the "thought" that the translation "the Word was God" does!

Last edited by *katierussell* : 09-07-2006 at 06:34 AM.



09-07-2006

#105

truffy

Inactive



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

Quote:

Originally Posted by **steider2003**
I have a question isn't bowing or kneeling a sign of worship?

[Acts 10:25-26](#) Cornelious fell down when Peter entered the room and Peter corrected him. [Revelation 19:10](#) John fell down before an angel and the angel corrected him. Also [Revelation 22:8](#) John fell down before an angel and the angel corrected him again.

Remember the words of the devil in the temptation in [Matthew 4:9](#) ? "And he said to Him, 'All these things will I give You, if You fall down and worship me.'" No possibility of mistaking that. Then Jesus said to him, "Begone, Satan! For it is written, 'You shall worship the Lord your God, and serve Him only.'"

Why didn't Jesus ever corrected anyone falling down or bowing before him?

here are some examples:

The leper came to Him and bowed down to Him, saying, "Lord, if You are willing, You can make me clean." In [Matthew 9:18](#), "While He was saying these things to them, behold, there came a synagogue official and he bowed down before Him, saying, 'My daughter has just died; but come and lay Your hand on her, and she will live.'" In [Matthew 15:25](#), we see a Canaanite woman whose daughter was demon-possessed bowing down before Him and saying, "Lord, help me!" In [Matthew 20:20](#) the mother of

the sons of Zebedee came to Him on behalf of her sons, bowing down and making a request of Him.

It seems to me like the JW's want to portray everyone in the New Testament who did obeisance to Jesus as Japanese people in Japan. No offence to the Japanese, as this is only an example, but this is exactly what the JW's want everyone to believe. The number of times they bowed to this same person, the number of times they claimed it obeisance is a striking parallel in culture to the Japanese people in their country. So who is going to believe this nonsense? If I did obeisance to Jesus when He comes back then I must be in a totally different country. 🙄

Tim 😊😊😊



09-07-2006

#106

Ongyo no Kiheiji

Senior Member

Join Date: Jan 2006
Posts: 2,280
18 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **truffy**

It seems to me like the JW's want to portray everyone in the New Testament who did obeisance to Jesus as Japanese people in Japan. No offence to the Japanese, as this is only an example, but this is exactly what the JW's want everyone to believe. The number of times they bowed to this same person, the number of times they claimed it obeisance is a striking parallel in culture to the Japanese people in their country. So who is going to believe this nonsense? If I did obeisance to Jesus when He comes back then I must be in a totally different country. 🙄

Well, proskuneo usually refers to prostration (and why it is usually translated as bowing low, prostrated, etc). However, your statement is incorrect.



09-07-2006

#107

kelton graham

Member

Join Date: Jan 2006
Posts: 331
19 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ongyo no Kiheiji**

Well, proskuneo usually refers to prostration (and why it is usually translated as bowing low, prostrated, etc). However, your statement is incorrect.

Response: BDAG says that KUNEW means 'to kiss' and was frequently used to designate the custom of prostrating oneself before persons and kissing their feet or the hem of their garment, the ground, etc; the Persians did this in the presence of their deified king, and the Greeks before a divinity or something holy.



09-07-2006

#108

katierussell

Member

Join Date: May 2006

[

Quote:

[

Posts: 1,481

16 Reputation Points

Originally Posted by katie russell

If one had the qualities of theos would not that make that one a theos? For how could one have the qualities of theos but not be of the class theos?

You presume class membership. You also presume the class has more than one member. Neither of these are stated in the text of 1:1c.

I could just as well say you presume that the theos in 1:1c denotes purely qualities! However, I do not presume anything! If I had the qualities of "woman" would I also not be "a woman"? Yes, of course. And how could I be "a woman" and not have the qualities of a woman? You see, there is really nothing to distinguish one being a member of a class and having the qualities or characteristics of that class! And I do not presume anything either about there being more than one in the class of theos! The bible itself and the culture of the time John wrote in could use the term theos for others not the one true God.

Quote:

So you see in English one can denote what quality the noun has by using an indefinite noun phrase.

I never said that an indefinite English phrase couldn't translate a qualitative. Qualitatives can sometimes be translated as an indefinite phrase in English, sometimes as an adjective and as I said in regards to the NWT of [John 3:6](#), sometimes as definite. With the English translation of 1:1c, you demand that qualitatives can only be translated with an indefinite English phrase, but even the NWT translates qualitatives as definites at times, circa [John 3:6](#).

I have not so demanded! I have said the best literal translation would be "and the Word was a god." But you seem to think that "the Word was God" that "God" is conveying the qualities of theos. It does not. It identifies the Word as ho theos, that the Word had the qualities of the god, God. John did not write that at all! And the NWT has **not** translated the anarthrous pneuma of [John 3:6](#) as definite!! It would have if it has "Spirit" but it did not, it has "spirit." In fact Harner says pneuma in [John 3:6](#) is **not definite**. And if one does the same with the anarthrous theos of 1:1c we would have "god."! But while "spirit" does not have to have the English indefinite article before it as here this count noun is being used in a non-count noun sense as the English word "fire" can be." But this does not mean that every count noun can be so used. So it is **context** that is the guide as to whether *pneuma* is a count noun or not. Here in 3:6 it is being used as a mass noun. But one would not want to understand theos in 1:1c as a mass noun would one! Of course not as then one could not translate it as "God" for "God" is not a mass noun, it is countable, you can pluralize it (but not of course when it is being used for a singular subject).

Quote:

Quote:

Harner rules out the indefinite understanding because of how he thinks the qualitiveness of theos makes the Word have the same nature of God, making the Word God. JW's do not have to go along with Harner's trying to fit what he feels is the meaning of the Word's having the quality of theos with his theological view but they do agree that the syntax points to a certain quality about the Word.

Emphasis above mine. I'd like to see evidence that Harner's "theological view" dictated what he believed theos meant. Accusation without proof is just irresponsible slander and the accusation only serves as an excuse to NOT address the issues presented by the target of the slander.

Have *you* read Harner's article for yourself? I have. What does one other who has have say about Harner and his theological view? This was Jason Beduhn. I would quote him but cannot find where he said what I have! But he did! If one reads Harner you will see this for yourself so drop the slander charge until you do! And I did **not** say that his theological view "dictated" what theos meant at John1;1c. Now, that is slander, or libel, and this can be shown from reading me where I stated no such thing!

And of course Harner rejects, as I wrote, the translation of "the Word was God" because this is a definite, not a qualitative translation! You skipped right over this and hence made no comment on it whatsoever but tried instead to say I slandered" Harner! Was this your trying to distract our readers from the fact that here we have a scholar who out rightly says that what you think is the best literal translation that conveys the qualitative sense of the anarthrous theos does not such thng??

Quote:

Quote:

However, it is true that an English indefinite noun phrase can bring out the qualities of the noun...

In some instances, yes. Not in all instances, however, which is what I think you're demanding here.

Quote:

...for if the Word had the qualities of theos in what way does the English "the Word was a god" deny he had the qualites of theos, god?

But it also reflects one of a class and Q does not demand class membership.

So, in what "instances" would an indefinite noun phrase not convey the qualitiveness of a substantive then?

And can you list for us all the anarthrous singular count noun that

precede the verb that you have been led to think are purely 'Q' in the NT? Then we can see how they have been translated.

If 'Q' does not demand class membership then please show any sentence that in English which predicates a quality about someone with a substantive and that excludes that one from the class the substantive refers?

Last edited by *katierussell* : 09-07-2006 at 08:42 AM.



09-07-2006

#109

[tkkclark](#)

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006


Posts: 275

18 Reputation Points



Responding to your posts in no particular order...

Quote:

Originally Posted by [katierussell](#) 
And how do you know these "statistics" are correct? Isn't this all rather subjective this semantic tagging? Indeed it is. If the sentence structure of [John 1:1c](#) is purely 'Q' then what of [Acts 28:4](#) where the exact sentence structure is the same? Yet we both know how it has been translated and rightly so. Phoneus as indefinite.

If you disagree with the statistics, Katie, you're more than welcome to **prove them wrong**.

And as I've said, I'm **not** going to argue [Acts 28:4](#) with you. I **never** said, nor has **anyone else** that I'm aware of, that **all** precopulative anarthrous PNs **must** be Q.

Quote:

So, if one can translate into English as indefinite a noun in the Greek which is a 'Q' then what is stopping it being translated as such in [John 1:1c](#)?

I believe I've answered this before. Why, yes. Yes, I have:

Quote:

I believe theos is qualitative. **Not just qualitative, in fact, but emphatically so, given its emphatic position at the beginning of the clause. As such, I believe any translation that allows for class membership directly or through any ambiguity is wholly inappropriate.** The "a god" translation reflects that ambiguity. So again, I believe "And the Word was God" is the best literal translation. (Emphasis mine.)

Soldiering on...

Quote:

And if one were to translate the anarthrous theos in [John 1:1c](#) with an English adjective, which one would you choose? "divine"? You cannot have "Divine" or "Deity" for by those having capital they are proper names, hence, definite.

Why, I do believe I've answered THIS one before, too:

Quote:

I suggested substituting Deity or Divine instead (though I don't like them as well) and the NEB's paraphrase. Why do I capitalize Deity and Divine? Because there is no grammatical reason for demanding the noun theos has different meanings in [John 1:1](#)! (**In lieu of your citing/quoting an authority who states nouns change their characteristics when fronted by the definite article**, at any rate.) A lowercase D (in both cases) would be ambiguous in that it might be interpreted as reflecting less than the characteristics of the theos in 1:1b. (Emphasis mine.)

Do you even read my posts?

Quote:

And why is kurios of [Mark 2:28](#) 'Q'? Note that the REB translates "...is /ord even of the Sabbath." Goodspeed has "is *master* even of the Sabbath." The NRSV as "...is *lord* even over the Sabbath." I take these as renderings as qualitative ones that shows that the Son of man has authority over the Sabbath. To translate " is *Lord* even over the Sabbath" is a definite translation! I would translate kurios as indefinite here. "the son of man is *a lord* even of the Sabbath." This means as does the qualitative rendering that the son of man even had authority over the sabbath. So I would tag this either as 'QI' or 'IQ' but there is no real difference in meaning.

You're kidding me, right?

You think there are a **class of beings** who can legitimately be Lord of the Sabbath???

Quote:

Mark, Matthew ([Matthew 12:8](#)), and Luke ([Luke 6:5](#)) all give this as a climax in the five reasons given by Christ on the occasion for the conduct of the disciples, but Mark has the little word "even" (kai) not in the others, showing that Jesus knew that he was making a great claim as the Son of Man, the Representative Man, the Messiah looked at from his human interest, to lordship (kurios) even of the sabbath. He was not the slave of the sabbath, but the master of it. "Even of the sabbath, so invaluable in your eyes. Lord, not to abolish, but to interpret and keep in its own place, and give it a new name" (Bruce). (RWP)

Clarke, I think, addresses what you may (or may not) be implying with your demanded indefinite sense to [Mk 2:28](#):

Quote:

Some have understood this as applying to men in general, and not to Christ. The Son of man, any man is Lord of the Sabbath; i.e. it was made for him, for his ease, comfort, and use, and to these purposes he is to apply it. But this is a very harsh, and at the same time a very lax, mode of interpretation; for it seems to say that a man may make what use he pleases of the Sabbath; and, were this true, the moral obligation of the Sabbath would soon be annihilated.

God ordained the Sabbath not only to be a type of that rest which remains for the people of God, but to be also a mean of promoting the welfare of men in general.

The ordinances of religion should be regulated according to their end, which is the honor of God, and the salvation of men. It is the property of the true religion to contain nothing in it but what is beneficial to man. Hereby God plainly shows that it is neither out of indigence or interest that he requires men to worship and obey him; but only out of goodness, and to make them happy. God prohibited work on the Sabbath day, lest servants should be oppressed by their masters, that the laboring beasts might have necessary rest, and that men might have a proper opportunity to attend upon his ordinances, and get their souls saved. To the Sabbath, under God, we owe much of what is requisite and necessary as well for the body as the soul.

And actually, I do think there's a difference between I-Q and Q-I. To me, I-Q means the indefinite sense of the noun is predominant whereas in Q-I the qualitative sense of the noun is predominant. Although to be fair, this is only my opinion. Hartley's is the most extensive study of the semantic categories I've seen and I don't think he differentiated between I-Q and Q-I in his study, but rather lumped them together (for simplicity's sake no doubt).

Quote:

Why is this an "exception? Are there any more "exceptions?

My previous answer:

Quote:

I never said that precopulative (preceding the verb) anarthrous PNs must be Q, without exception never-ever. If you'll check the statistics I cited in my previous post, Q wasn't 100%. It was 56%, I think. It's in the majority, sure. I think the two others with the highest % was I (17%) and Q-I (your position, also 17%). Also, if I recall correctly, D was 10 or 11%. Q is in most likely sense, but it is not the only sense.

Again, do you read my posts at all? Or are you just skimming through them? I ask only because you appear to be revisiting arguments and issues I've already responded to.

Quote:

And could you please list all singular predicate anarthrous nominative preceding the verb? I would like to see how many have been translated indefinitely.

Are you seriously suggesting that **I** should do your homework for you??? ROTFL! Katie, if you want to do a study on the subject, by all means, do so, but it's not **my** job to do **your** legwork for you. To even suggest it...Well, it's ridiculous. I'm **not** your research assistant. ROTFL!!!



09-07-2006

#110

AmazingGrace

CARM Super Member



Quote:

has never really been answered. The Hebrew text of [Psalm 8:5](#) uses the word 'elohim' to describe the angels--a word that is translated most frequently as 'God' or 'god/s'. Therefore, the Bible does call the angels 'gods' (elohim). Now, scripture shows the angels received proskuneo from

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

the Israelites ([Genesis 18:2](#), [Numbers 22:31](#), [Joshua 5:14](#)) which was not rejected. And since the Bible calls the angels 'gods' (elohim) at [Psalm 8:5](#) (just as Jesus is called theos, which is the equivalent of elohim) and they received proskuneo from a number of God's people (with no rebuking from the angels, no dire consequences, etc.), how is it that the Israelites are not polytheistic? **Could it be that God allowed those whom He has called gods (that are not independent of his authority) to rightly receive proskuneo as well (by virtue of the authority granted to them by God Himself) without his people being view as polytheistic?**

No, you can't.

Quote:

The fact that Jesus is Shiloh answers why he rightly receives proskuneo in these instances. But all of the proskuneo that he receives (now, after his resurrection) does nothing but bring glory to God the Father, not to himself.

I am so glad that you realize this. It is what we've been saying!! What is your problem with worshipping Christ when the bible says it brings glory to the FATHER?!! Thank you Jesus that it is being understood!! Now ask yourself how Jesus receiving worship CAN glorify the FATHER. Once you put those things together, you'll leave the WT.

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](#)



09-07-2006

#111

Ongyo no Kiheiji

Senior Member

Join Date: Jan 2006
 Posts: 2,280
 18 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by [kelton graham](#)
Response: BDAG says that KUNEW means 'to kiss' and was frequently used to designate the custom of prostrating oneself before persons and kissing their feet or the hem of their garment, the ground, etc; the Persians did this in the presence of their deified king, and the Greeks before a divinity or something holy.

Are we talking about how the Greeks or the Persians viewed proskuneo, or the Israelites?



09-07-2006

#112

katierussell

Member

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

Quote:

And as I've said, I'm not going to argue [Acts 28:4](#) with you. I never said, nor has anyone else that I'm aware of, that all precopulative anarthrous PNs must be Q.

So, how does one determine which one is and which one is not?

And yes, I do read your posts. So when I ask which adjective would you choose to translate what you think is a purely qualitative noun, theos of [John 1:1c](#) I take it then either "Divine" or "Deity" would be your choice. But of course they are not adjectives. So, try again.

Quote:

Quote:

And why is kurios of [Mark 2:28](#) 'Q'? Note that the REB translates "...is lord even of the Sabbath." Goodspeed has "is master even of the Sabbath." The NRSV as "...is lord even over the Sabbath." I take these as renderings as qualitative ones that shows that the Son of man has authority over the Sabbath. To translate " is Lord even over the Sabbath" is a definite translation! I would translate kurios as indefinite here. "the son of man is a lord even of the Sabbath." This means as does the qualitative rendering that the son of man even had authority over the sabbath. So I would tag this either as 'QI' or 'IQ' but there is no real difference in meaning.

You're kidding me, right?

You think there are a class of beings who can legitimately be Lord of the Sabbath???

Do you not also think that the Father is also a lord even over the sabbath he created? Sure he is. Likewise the son of man is. You by your quotations have not refuted my reasons above why kurios is indefinite. And of course I have shown you that plenty of translations do not translate it as definite but denote with their "lord" what *kind of lord* the son of man is. That he is even a lord over the Sabbath. This categorizes the son of man's lordship.

Quote:

Quote:

And could you please list all singular predicate anarthrous nominative preceding the verb? I would like to see how many have been translated indefinitely.

Are you seriously suggesting that I should do your homework for you???

ROTFL! Katie, if you want to do a study on the subject, by all means, do so, but it's not my job to do your legwork for you. To even suggest it...Well, it's ridiculous. I'm not your research assistant. ROTFL!!!

Are you saying that Hartley's statistics are not based on all the anarthrous PNV's there are? Then what good are his statistics? And what about if he allowed subjectivness to unconsciously over ride a proper analysis of any one? Both these puts a serious quetion mark about your Hartley's "statistics"! It looks like you wish Hartley to do your "homework" for you though! But the fact is Beduhn is right

when he says to Hommell, and he has done a study of PNV's that: "This is a very sound statement of a position that, while not in full agreement with mine, is defensible. I am willing to walk down this road with you, and assume a "qualitative" semantic force as something logically separable, and in English grammatically distinct, from an indefinite. The next question would be, what is meant by "qualitative"? What I find in what you have written in our discussion, and in some of the studies you cite, **is a leap from the general, linguistic meaning of "qualitative" to a very specific philosophical concept of "in every sense the same as x."** This same leap is made by **Wallace and Hartley**. But this very elaborate and restrictive definition of "qualitative" cannot be derived from the language alone, but is read into the language as a desired interpretation. It is a leap that cannot be substantiated, as you can see if you try to apply it to every case where a "qualitative" semantic force appears." and, more to the point here with us:

Quote:

The semantic distinction between quality and category is not made in Greek GRAMMAR. In other words, Greek writers do not write differently for qualitative meaning than they do for categorical meaning. For them, category and quality are the same. We can argue over the exact nuance of a phrase, over its semantic stress, certainly. But the language does not carry in itself anything that allows us to settle the argument definitively. On the other hand, it carries enough information to permit us to define the semantic RANGE of a phrase, what is possible and what is impossible, what conveys what the language carries and what steps beyond that. Your argument above would support, at most, a translation of "the Word was god," using "god" as a common noun denoting a category of being, just as "man" in your example. Of course, to translate that way results in exactly the same meaning, the same semantic force, as "the Word was a god." For John, as for Greek writers generally, membership in a category carries with it (at least some, if not always all) the qualities of that category

and....

Quote:

there is no "qualitative noun" in Greek GRAMMAR. "Quality" is a matter of interpreted semantic stress in a usage of a noun in one of its forms, in the case of [John 1:1c](#), an indefinite form. The author may well intend stress one way or another, but we only know the author's "intention" based upon signs in his use of grammar and syntax. What's not there can only be guessed at. Harner may well be right that a certain pattern of placement of anarthrous nouns is such a sign of stress on quality. That would yield a translation of "the Word was a divine being" or, a bit looser, "the Word was divine." Is there something conveyed in such translations that is not conveyed by "the Word was a god" or "the Word was god"?

and....

Quote:

The claim that there is a distinct "qualitative noun" in Greek is only a hypothesis, and cannot be proven because there is nothing in the grammar that conclusively shows such a distinct noun function.

This is where one comes back to Hartley which as you can see Beduhn would and has rejected his "statistics".

Can I ask you? What semantic tag does Hartley offer for *hamartolos* of [Luke 7:39](#) and could you quote him where he argues for it to be purely qualatative?



09-07-2006

#113

kelton graham

Member

Join Date: Jan 2006
Posts: 331
19 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ongyo no Kiheiji**

Are we talking about how the Greeks or the Persians viewed proskuneo, or the Israelites?

Response: I don't think it makes much difference. The only difference would be the object of worship but the word means the same.



09-07-2006

#114

Ongyo no Kiheiji

Senior Member

Join Date: Jan 2006
Posts: 2,280
18 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **AmazingGrace**

No, you can't.

No you can't what?

Quote:

Originally Posted by **AmazingGrace**

I am so glad that you realize this. It is what we've been saying!! What is your problem with worshipping Christ when the bible says it brings glory to the FAther?!! Thank you Jesus that it is being understood!! Now ask yourself how Jesus receiving worship CAN glorify the FAther. Once you put those things together, you'll leave the WT.

All JWs render to Jesus proskuneo. Anything else?



09-07-2006

#115

Ongyo no Kiheiji

Senior Member

Join Date: Jan 2006
Posts: 2,280
18 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **kelton graham**

Response: I don't think it makes much difference. The only difference would be the object of worship but the word means the same.

If that is the case, proskuneo given to angels, men, etc. would also make them objects of worship, correct?



09-07-2006

#116

AmazingGrace

CARM Super Member



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

Quote:

No you can't what?

Worship other 'gods' even the ones that Jehovah has placed in authority. That would be contradicting what the bible says. He will give his glory to no one.

Quote:

All JWs render to Jesus proskuneo. Anything else?

It is written:

[John 5:23](#)

23that all may honor the Son just as they honor the Father. He who does not honor the Son does not honor the Father, who sent him.

I wasn't trying to be short with you earlier, I had to run, sorry.

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](#)



09-07-2006

#117

AmazingGrace

CARM Super Member



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

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ongyo no Kiheiji** [▶](#)
If that is the case, proskuneo given to angels, men, etc. would also make them objects of worship, correct?

In some cases, yes. But that doesn't mean that God permitted or ordained it as the type of worship for deity. My thought is that the writer's felt confident that those seeking after God could discern in what sense the word was used.

I was looking in Vine's at the word Proskuneo and I found this note of interest:

The Note to [John 9:38](#) in the American Standard Version in this connection is most unsound; it implies that Christ was a creature. J. N. Darby renders the verb "do homage" [see the Revised Preface to the Second Edition (1871) of his New Translation].

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](#)



09-07-2006

#118

[upnylou](#)

Junior Member

Join Date: Mar 2006

Posts: 175

16 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **olivetree**
The fact remains that if Jesus is another god, he cannot be worshiped, period.

now wait a minute! according to the watchtower society's own publications (and many of them) .. "our Lord Jesus while on earth was really worshiped, and properly so"

arent you with jehovah's witnesses???

Quote:

Originally Posted by **olivetree**
The apostles understood what they were doing. They were worshipping Yaweh incarnate in the person of Jesus.

so according to you (but NOT the watchtower society) .. the wise men werent really worshipping Him ..

[Mat 2:11](#) And they came into the house .. and they fell down and worshipped HIM; and opening their treasures they offered unto HIM gifts, gold and frankincense and myrrh.

and the leper was lying too ..

[Mat 8:2](#) And behold, there came to him a leper and worshipped him, saying, Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean.

the ruler was lying also ..

[Mat 9:18](#) "While he spake these things unto them, behold, there came a ruler, and worshipped him"

AND the apostles were not worshipping Him ..

[Mat 14:33](#) And they that were in the boat worshipped him, saying, Of a truth thou art the Son of God.

AND the caananite woman was lying ..

[Mat 15:25](#) But she came and worshipped him, saying, Lord, help me.

AND the mary magdalene and mary werent worshipping Him ..

[Mat 28:9](#) And behold, Jesus met them, saying, All hail. And they came and took hold of his feet, and worshipped him.

and 11 of His disciples had not worshipped Him ..

[Mat 28:17](#) And when they saw him, they worshipped him ..

and the man with an unclean spirit worshipped Him ..

Mar 5:6 And when he saw Jesus from afar, he ran and worshipped him

and yet AGAIN His disciples worshipped Him ..

Mar 15:19 And they smote his head with a reed, and spat upon him, and bowing their knees worshipped him.

WOW .. and all these people - according to you - were wrong. and people wonder why it is that Christians think of jehovah's witnesses as all part of a cult!?

"we believe our Lord Jesus while on earth was really worshiped, and properly so .. and to receive homage from both angels and men." [Watchtower, 7/15/1898]



09-07-2006

#119

AmazingGrace

CARM Super Member



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



I don't believe Olive Tree is a JW

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

09-07-2006

#120

tkkclark

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006
Posts: 275
18 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by [katierussell](#)

Yes, "flesh" here in [John 1:14](#) is a **mass** noun, a **non-countable** noun. But it has a qualitative meaning. Nouns are either count or non-count in classification (and they correlate in distinction with that of concrete and abstract nouns to some extent), but there is no such thing as a qualitative noun.

I have neither the time nor the desire to type out "singular count noun with a qualitative semantic nuance" every time I refer to one, esp when Q or qualitative noun will suffice to express my intended meaning. If you have the time and/or desire to type out the whole smack, more power to you. I don't.

And this is, IMNSHO, nit-picking at petty details that reflects poorly on **you**.

Quote:

We can even get countability from non-count nouns with a partitive expression "*bits of* information."

No, I'm afraid not. The "partitive expression" you refer to (Hartley calls them ammassives, sp?) become plural, **not** the noun. We say **bits of** information, not **bit of informations**. Ammassives (your partitives), in fact, are indicators of and confirmation that we are dealing with a mass noun. Mass noun never become count nouns. The ammassives/partitives take on and reflect the plural, not the noun.

Quote:

But let us look at "flesh" of [John 1:14](#). Here it means the Word became flesh in that the Word took on all the qualities of what is "flesh." This refers of course to becoming *human*...

You're making an extra-grammatical leap. Grammar doesn't require us to

interpret what a word metaphorically represents. To demand that we do so is completely unnecessary, fallacious and **inserts our subjective, personal interpretation into the grammar**. As such, in fact, **interpretation** determines the grammar. Hardly reflects a clear and consistent methodology. I'd argue that it reflects **no** methodology at all. Your **personal interpretation** is your methodology, **not grammar**.

Grammar is interested in "flesh" -- NOT what you or I or anybody else thinks "flesh" metaphorically represents.

As such, "flesh" is certainly a mass noun (and since we're being so particular about saying is just so), a mass noun with a qualitative semantic nuance having **no** notion of countability in context. The qualitative *sarx* ("flesh") of 1:14 connects back to *theos* in 1:1c, just one among several other indicators that *theos* in 1:1c should be taken as Q (and Q only) as well.



Post Reply

Page 6 of 8 << First < 2 3 4 5 **6** 7 8 >

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

Quick Reply

Message:

X | **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 07:56 AM.

As of July 6, 2006, Total Page Views: 22,355,379, Page Views Today: 22,355,379

-- Default Style

[Contact Us](#) - [Christian Discussion Forums](#) - [Archive](#) - [To](#)

Get Weather for any City, State, Zipcode, or Country:

Fast Forecast