



09-07-2006 #121

Ongyo no Kiheiji

Senior Member

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

Quote:

Originally Posted by **AmazingGrace** ▾
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.

Since both Christ and the angels are elohim, to render proskuneo to either does not automatically cause one to be polytheistic, since the angels received proskuneo in the scriptures I quoted (just like Jesus did), and it was not considered wrong.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **AmazingGrace** ▾
*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.*

All JWs do this as well.



09-07-2006 #122

Ongyo no Kiheiji

Senior Member

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

Quote:

Originally Posted by **AmazingGrace** ▾
*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].

Proskuneo was (rightly) rendered to God, angels, and men by servants of God throughout the Bible without any consequences or correction because it was not wrong to do so.



09-07-2006

#123

mondo

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006

Posts: 816

13 Reputation Points

Quote:

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.

Actually you're dead wrong here. BDAG catagorizes SARX in [John 1:14](#) as meaning "3. one who is or becomes a physical being, living being with flesh." Funny thing is, they convert it into a count noun. Notice the "a"? 🤔



09-07-2006

#124

tkkclark

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006

Posts: 275

18 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by [katierussell](#)

*God in "Oh my God" is a definite use of God because of the **possessive pronoun!** This definitizes the noun.*

I'll also remind you that I specifically referred to OMG and "variations thereof" -- TWICE. Not all of these variations include possessive pronouns.

Aethists don't even believe there **is** a God. Are you telling me, on the lips of an atheist, that atheist is referring to a specific being when s/he says OMG? How about Oh God? G.D.? Is that referring to a specific (definite) being, too?

Quote:

So, you have not shown that "God" is not a definite noun and OMG is not an exception at all!

Oh, I think I have shown there are exceptions.

Quote:

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."

Katie, I **quoted** the translation Harner offered for 1:1c. In fact, I'll do so again, with a little more context:

Quote:

Perhaps the clause could be translated 'the Word had the same nature as God.' This would be one way of representing John's thought, which is, as I understand it, that *ho logos*, no less than *ho theos*, had the nature of *theos*."

Do I agree with the above? Yes. As I also agree with the NEB and substituting Deity and Divine. Do I agree that any of these are the **best literal translation**, though? No. I do not. You seem to think (or at least argue) that I must only recognize one translation as credible. I do not. Harner's translation is fine, as is the NEB's, ad nauseum. I simply don't consider them the **best literal translation**.

You demand I must "reject as Harner did" *And the Word was God* simply because Harner rejects this rendering, but what does Harner offer in its place? Was it one comparable to **yours**? Or one more comparable to the *Q theos* with **no sense of indefiniteness** as I've been arguing all along? Harner offers, "the Word had the same nature as God." Don't tell **me** I must "reject as Harner did" until and unless you're willing to accept "as Harner did," **his** translation as perfectly acceptable as well.

Is "the Word had the same nature as God" acceptable to me? Yes. Is it the best literal translation? No. But I do consider it a credible translation. Do you?

Quote:

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?

I do not for the life of me understand why it is you repeat the questions above umpteen million times when I've **consistently and repeatedly** answered, **uniformly**, the same **umpteen million times** that **I believe *And the Word was God* is the best literal translation!** The fact that you don't like my answer isn't going to change my answer. And the constant repetition is highly annoying. I've sent my 5yo into time-out for less.



09-07-2006

#125

tkkclark

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006

Posts: 275

18 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **katierussell** *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."*

Are you asserting that all definite nouns must be translated with capitalization now?

My car (definite noun) is in the driveway.

According to you, though...

My Car is in the driveway.

snicker, snicker

Quote:

In fact Harner says *pneuma* in [John 3:6](#) is **not definite**.

I didn't say *pneuma* is definite. I said it was Q. I also said the NWT translates it as a definite -- because it lacks the definite article you insistently demand is required of your purported Q-I *theos* in 1:1c!

Quote:

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.

Ah and here's the crux of the matter.

According to you, a count noun isn't determined by its properties (whether it can be plural or take the indefinite article), but rather by what **you** determine it should be. Instead of a clear, consistent and objective method for determining the category to which a noun belongs, we have only your **subjective interpretation** as a "guide."

Your methodology leaves far, far too much to **your** interpretation. It lacks consistency, reliability, and any manner of objectivity.

But if you want your personal interpretations to steer your grammar...Well, that's your business.

But **your subjective methodology** certainly isn't **mine**.

Quote:

Here in 3:6 it is being used as a mass noun.

snort

Well -- and I can't believe I'm asking this --- is *pneuma* Q as a **mass noun** then? I mean, you **are** denying there's a pure Q entirely, right?

And no, I am **not** ceding the point. [The 2nd](#) occurrence of *pneuma* is a singular count noun with a Q nuance, in direct parallel to the 2nd occurrence of the mass noun *sarx* ("flesh"), which has the Q-d nuance. Your supposed methodology for determining the category of this noun leaves much to be desired, to say the very least.

Quote:

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 John 1:1c. Now, that is slander, or libel, and this can be shown from reading me where I stated no such thing!

1. You do understand what citing a source and/or reference means, right? As in quoting the aforementioned source/reference? And barring that, providing pages numbers or some sort of specific information that allows others to locate the reference independently? Perhaps I should have been more clear when I spoke in regards to unsubstantiated opinions. Vague claims that somebody agrees with you isn't providing a proper support. Scholastic transparency means anyone can go directly to the source cited and read the source. Now, I suppose if I actually owned Beduhn's book and began reading it, I'd eventually come across whatever it is you're babbling about above, but I have zero desire to A) buy the book right now and B) spend a day or two reading it in grand hopes of finding what you assert.

2. You said, "JWs 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...**"

I said I'd like to see **evidence** of this. If Beduhn has **evidence** that Harner tried to fit the meaning of *theos* with his theology, sure, cite him. Better yet, given that I don't own the book, quote him. If Harner actually **did** let theological bias slip into his work, I'd certainly be interested in seeing evidence that proved it.

Quote:

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!

Ev-i-dence. Accusation without **evidence** is smearing someone, slandering them and/or their work. Perhaps "dictated" was too strong a word, I'll allow, but the fact is you **were** demeaning Harner's work with a hollow claim of theological bias. Hollow meaning -- lack of **evidence** to support your accusation.

From Websters:

Quote:

1 : the utterance of false charges or misrepresentations which defame and damage another's reputation
 2 : a false and defamatory oral statement about a person -- compare LIBEL
 (<http://www.m-w.com/cgi-bin/dictionar...ary&va=slander>)

If you cannot prove what you said in regards to "...Harner's trying to fit what he feels is the meaning of the Word's having the quality of theos with his theological view...", then I would say that your behavior surely does fall into the parameters of misrepresenting Harner so as to defame/damage his reputation.

Actually, legally, since this is in print, I think the more accurate word is libel, but I digress.

Quote:

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??

No, this is my way of me trying to make you **put your money where your mouth is!**

If Harner's work has been swayed by his theology -- **PROVE IT.**

Until you have that evidence, frankly, I don't want to hear any more sly accusations about Harner or anybody else whose intergrity you may feel the urge to malign, demean or in any other way defame.



09-07-2006

#126

kelton graham

Member

Join Date: Jan 2006
Posts: 331
19 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ongyo no Kiheiji** *If that is the case, proskuneeo given to angels, men, etc. would also make them objects of worship, correct?*

Response: Whenever a king that was deified was given PROSKUNEW he was surely the object of worship. You'll find the same thing with regards to idols such as in [Acts 7:43](#), BDAG list Dg 2:5 TA UF HUMWN PROSKUNOUMENA.

Other times it is just "do reverence to, welcome respectfully or just prostrating oneself before."

Not sure of any cases of angels other than what John tried.



09-07-2006

#127

tkkclark

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006
Posts: 275
18 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by **katierussell** *So, how does one determine which one is and which one is not?

And yes, I do read your posts.*

You must not be paying attention then. We've only been arguing about whether or not Q demands class membership for how many days now?

Quote:

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.

Sorry, but no, I do not **need** to try again as you so coyly suggest. I don't **need** to provide an adjective because I have clearly, consistently and **repeatedly** stated that I believe *And the Word was God* is the **best literal translation**.

I said qualitatives (in general) could be translated with an adjective -- sometimes. For instance, if the noun is sinner and Q is the nuance, the translator could go with sinful. How's that for an example of an adjectival Q?

I did not, however, state that an adjective would be appropriate for 1:1c. If I am mistaken and I **did explicitly** say that the best literal translation of 1:1c would be an adjective, please point out my error so I may correct it. If not...Go fish.

Quote:

Do you not also think that the Father is also a lord even over the sabbath he created?

Why, yes. Yes, I do.

Quote:

Sure he is.

Well, I'm glad we agree on **something**.

Quote:

Likewise the son of man is. You by your quotations have not refuted my reasons above why kurios is indefinite.

And there goes my happy thought. ROTFL!

Oh, I could get into the whole the Father and the Son are both God thing, but really, why bother? You'll just throw a hissy fit and I've been on here forever already. Maybe I'll address this tomorrow...Maybe not. My dh is about to kill me for being here too long and if your interpretation of context "guides" your categorization of nouns, really, what's the point? You can interpret the context to fit whatever notion you want it to fit. Flesh doesn't mean flesh, after all. Yeah, that's the word, but John really meant (conveniently) **a** human being so ta da, flesh magically becomes.....a.....count noun!

Give me a break.

Quote:

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.

None of the translations you cited included the indefinite article. None of them said "a lord". Isn't that your position? That the indefinite article is demanded in 1:1c because *theos* is indefinite?

The translations you cited had no indefinite article, "a," but said 'is lord of the...'
Again -- Are you now asserting that definites require capitalization to be definite?
And if so, dare I ask why?

Continuing...

I say:

Quote:

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!!! (Emphasis mine.)

To which you reply:

Quote:

Are you saying that **Hartley's** statistics are not based on all the anarthrous PNV's there are?

Do you, for some bizarre reason, believe **I** am **Donald Hartley**???

ROTFL!!!!

Really, if you want to segway into more sly accusations, you need to work on your transition a little more, improve a little on your method of delivery.

According to Hartley:

Quote:

"...when I worked on the thesis in 1995-1996, I scrutinized every instance of the verbs EIMI, GINOMAI, and and UPARCW. I looked at somewhere in the range of 3000 occurrences of these verbs (3,213 to be exact). Roughly a quarter of the total fell into the category of study... ("Another Rejoinder to Stafford's Surrejoinder to Don Hartley: Q-Class Count Nouns, [John 1:1c](#), and Other Related Matters" at http://www.jude3.net/hartley_fourth_response.htm)

To review Hartley's methodology, see link above and/or his article at http://www.bible.org/page.asp?page_id=1812 .

Hartley's study focused on 3 specific verbs, one of which is used in 1:1. He looked at over 3000 of these verbs and narrowed the study down to 1/4 of them -- roughly 750.

How many has Mr. Beduhn looked at? What was his statistical pool? 750? Over 750? What was his methodology?

And you think Hartley's statistical pool wasn't large enough?

LOL

Again, I invite you -- as well as Beduhn for that matter -- to **prove Hartley's study wrong**.

Quote:

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"!

Oh, goodie. More sly innuendo to smear the integrity of another respected scholar. Why I am not surprised?

Quote:

It looks like you wish Hartley to do your "homework" for you though!

Appealing to authority -- and frankly, Hartley's a great deal more knowledgable than I am when it comes to this subject, given the great amount of work he's done -- isn't a sin. Am I going to repeat Hartley's work? Uh...NO. Not in a million years. I hate grammar. (I'm personally amazed I wasted the past few days arguing about it. Most of the time, I'd rather volunteer for a root canal than ever whisper the words "singular count noun.") Why should I repeat his work?

As I've said, again and again and again, if **you** want to repeat Hartley's work and

prove him wrong, by all means, **DO SO**.

Quote:

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

And again, I'd very much like to see Beduhn's statistics -- his critical analysis of the matter. What and how many examples did he include in his study? What was his methodology? Where has he published his results? Do his peers recognize his work?

Until Beduhn has done a comparable study, I would say it is Hartley -- not Beduhn -- who has a more thorough knowledge of the matter.

Quote:

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 qualitative?[/size]

If you've got a point -- make it, Katie. I'm **not** your research assistant and I'm certainly **not** your personal secretary, either.



09-07-2006


#128

Ongyo no Kiheiji

Senior Member


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

Quote:

Originally Posted by **kelton graham** 
Response: Whenever a king that was deified was given PROSKUNEW he was surely the object of worship. You'll find the same thing with regards to idols such as in Acts 7:43, BDAG list Dg 2:5 TA UF hUMWN PROSKUNOUMENA.

I agree. However, since we are discussing the use of proskuneo from a Jewish/biblical standpoint (in regards to whom the Jews gave proskuneo to), and also that Jewish kings received proskuneo without them being deified (in the Jews' eyes), such an argument is invalid.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **kelton graham** 
*Other times it is just "do reverence to, welcome respectfully or just prostrating oneself before."

Not sure of any cases of angels other than what John tried.*

[Numbers 22:31](#) is one.



09-08-2006

#129

katierussell

Member

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

Quote:

Quote:
Originally Posted by katierussell

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

And yes, I do read your posts.

You must not be paying attention then. We've only been arguing about whether or not Q demands class membership for how many days now?

You have never addressed this question and when I ask it now you still do not. So, I will ask again: How does one determine if any particular anarthrous PNV is "qualitative" or indefinite. For instance, phoneus is not 'qualitative' at [Acts 28:4](#) is it? Well, every translation you could consult translates in by an indefinite noun. So, by what means does one determine phoneus is indefinite and theos of [John 1;1c](#) is 'Q'?

Quote:

Quote:

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.

Sorry, but no, I do not need to try again as you so coyly suggest. I don't need to provide an adjective because I have clearly, consistently and repeatedly stated that I believe And the Word was God is the best literal translation.

I said qualitatives (in general) could be translated with an adjective -- sometimes. For instance, if the noun is sinner and Q is the nuance, the translator could go with sinful. How's that for an example of an adjectival Q?

I did not, however, state that an adjective would be appropriate for 1:1c. If I am mistaken and I did explicitly say that the best literal translation of 1:1c would be an adjective, please point out my error so I may correct it. If not...Go fish.

And where should we find this place in the NT where the Greek noun meaning "sinner" should be translated "sinful" please? You do not cite a place for us to evaluate it!!! Please now do so.

So, you think "God" is a qualitative translation? I thought that you thought that theos of [John 1:1c](#) was 'qualitative'? But as you know "God" is a proper name and does not convey qualities but it identifies, it is a definite noun. You then want to have theos qualitative but retain what in the past has often been said to be a definite translation(which it is) and argued that it should be so translated for the anarthrous theos was indeed definite! If this is so then one would translate "the Word was God." But not now if one considers theos here to have no definiteness only conveying qualities of the noun! Can you please explain this to us all?

And I did not say above that you said that it would be "best" translated with an adjective! But I asked if you would choose which adjective would you? I said to you that neither "Deity" nor "Divine"(both of which you brought up as possible ways to translate) are adjectives. But "divine" is and "deity" would be a noun. So, I will ask again: What adjective would you choose? As you have said one could translate with an adjective.

Quote:

.....You can interpret the context to fit whatever notion you want it to fit.

As Hartley has done you mean?

Quote:

Flesh doesn't mean flesh, after all. Yeah, that's the word, but John really meant (conveniently) a human being so ta da, flesh magically becomes.....a.....count noun!

Give me a break.

I shew you what "flesh" meant at [John 1:14](#). Your remarks here of course do not refute what I wrote. However, I did not say "flesh" did not mean "flesh" of course, but here it does not mean the composition of the human body but the Word becoming human, a human being. Indeed, this is how [u]Today's English Bible[/i] so understands it for it translates as :

"The Word became **a human being**....".

And The Translator's New Testament:

"The Word became **a human being**..."

In its "Glossary" it says under "Flesh":

"This word is not to be equated with the body...In the Gospels and Acts it is normally the equivalent of '**human being**'..."

And as for your "Flesh" became "magically" a count noun? Could I not retort that "sinner," a count noun, has become, for you, "magically" an adjective "sinful"? 😊😊

Of course, I never said that "flesh" becomes a count noun! But that here it could be *translated* by an indefinite noun. And of course it has as you can see above with the translations I quoted. 😊
As Barrret says "the Word came on the human scene, as flesh, **man**." Yes, as "flesh" can denote humans "flesh" here means that the Word who once existed with God and was divine(mighty being) became **a (weak) human being**.

May I ask was [John 1:14](#) one of Hartley's qualitative nouns?

Quote:

Quote:

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.

None of the translations you cited included the indefinite article. None of them said "a lord". Isn't that your position? That the indefinite article is demanded in 1:1c because theos is indefinite?

Not at all. It is not definite and there is nothing wrong with "lord" without the indefinite article. But if one wishes to parallel this with the theos of [John 1:1c](#) we would have of course have "god" not "God".

Quote:

The translations you cited had no indefinite article, "a," but said 'is lord of the...' Again -- Are you now asserting that definites require capitalization to be definite? And if so, dare I ask why?

Yes, you can ask why. Definiteness requires either the definite article before it or one has to capitalize it. There is no warrant for either in the Greek. Those who have translated it with a lower case have not then translated it as definite. They are Q translation (or even QI) and with a lower case letter. Just as one would if one thought theos of [John 1:1c](#) should be so, i.e., "god" not "God."

Skipping over the rest of your comments on Hartley (whose pool would not rule out subjectivity and which Beduhn is aware of his thesis and have rejected it) I asked and you replied:

Quote:

Quote:

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 qualitative?

If you've got a point -- make it, Katie. I'm not your research assistant and I'm certainly not your personal secretary, either.

Well, you just asked me to prove "Hartley's study wrong" did you not? And it is you that is leaning so much on Hartley's thesis.

OK then, please provide what I asked and I will attempt to with this one example. Over to you 😊



Member

Join Date: May 2006

Posts: 1,481

16 Reputation Points

Quote:

Quote:

Originally Posted by katierussell

God in "Oh my God" is a definite use of God because of the possessive pronoun! This definitizes the noun.

I'll also remind you that I specifically referred to OMG and "variations thereof" -- TWICE. Not all of these variations include possessive pronouns.

Aethists don't even believe there is a God. Are you telling me, on the lips of an atheist, that atheist is referring to a specific being when s/he says OMG? How about Oh God? G.D.? Is that referring to a specific (definite) being, too?

Belief does not come into it! We are dealing whether one *uses* the noun definitely or not and when one writes "God" then whatever way one uses it it is a definite noun! Whether an atheist believes "God" exists is another matter entirely! I have shown you why "Oh my God" is definite. You ought to accept this. "Oh God" does not help you with either as you are still using it definitely. It means "oh, the god." "Oh my God" means "oh the god of me." Both are definite.

Quote:

Quote:

So, you have not shown that "God" is not a definite noun and OMG is not an exception at all!

Oh, I think I have shown there are exceptions.

As you can see, your eager search for "exceptions" were **not** examples of "exceptions"! "God" is a proper name and hence is definite. You will not get around this. Of course you must if you wish to cling to your preferred "best literal" translation and also understanding the anarthrous theos as purely qualitative, not definite! Its not looking good for you is it? 😊

And you did not mention anything about "Webster's" this time. Why? Was it not you who asked me to look at one? Yes, you did. And did I not tell you I did? Yes, I did. And did I not tell you it shows that "God" is a definite noun? Yes I did. So, what was it about Webster's you wished for me to see?

Quote:

Quote:

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."

Katie, I quoted the translation Harner offered for 1:1c. In fact, I'll do so again, with a little more context:

Quote:

Perhaps the clause could be translated 'the Word had the same nature as God.' This would be one way of representing John's thought, which is, as I understand it, that ho logos, no less than ho theos, had the nature of theos."

This is not very clever at all! Harner is against a definite translation of [John 1:1c](#), against the translation "the Word was God." Your quotation shows him that he thought theos as qualitative and this shows that the logos was no less theos than ho theos was theos. But this does not mean he thinks that "the Word of God" shows this. He does not. He rejects it. If then you agree with Harner you ought to reject it also! It really does look like you have not read the full article for yourself? Is this the case? Then are you once again quoting "second hand"? Remember what you said about quoting "second hand" from Harris book????

Quote:

Do I agree with the above? Yes. As I also agree with the NEB and substituting Deity and Divine. Do I agree that any of these are the best literal translation, though? No. I do not. You seem to think (or at least argue) that I must only recognize one translation as credible. I do not. Harner's translation is fine, as is the NEB's, ad nauseum. I simply don't consider them the best literal translation.

I know you do not consider them the best literal translations. How could I when they are not even literal translations? You can agree with the NEB but has I have shown you in another post doing so would once again mean you ought then to disagree/reject "the Word was God" for those behind the NEB did and offered their paraphrased translation as one **against** the "Word was God" as they felt the latter did **not** convey what John wrote but heir translation **did**.

And neither "Divine" and "Diety" are purely qualitative translations of theos but which you say theos of [John 1:1c](#) is!

Quote:

You demand I must "reject as Harner did" And the Word was God simply because Harner rejects this rendering, but what does Harner offer in its place? Was it one comparable to yours? Or one more comparable to the Q theos with no sense of indefiniteness as I've been arguing all along? Harner offers, "the Word had the same nature as God." Don't tell me I must "reject as Harner did" until and unless you're willing to accept "as Harner did," his translation as perfectly acceptable as well.

Why should I accept what Harner offers when I do not agree that

[John 1:1c](#)'s theos is purely qualitative? You are the one who thinks it is (leaning on Hartley)! So, if Harner thinks it is purely qualitative and rejects the definite translation "the Word was God" you either have to also reject this translation or disagree with Harner somewhat? Which is it?

Quote:

Is "the Word had the same nature as God" acceptable to me? Yes. Is it the best literal translation? No. But I do consider it a credible translation. Do you?

Yes, it acceptable. But one can read into it more or less into it as one sees fit! This is why I would certainly not outright reject it but it is also certainly not the best literal translation. There are only two strictly literal translations. "the Word was God" or "the Word was god." The first is not 'qualitative' at all. The second is but not good English but one can bring out the qualities of the noun god by using an indefinite noun phrase....."and the Word was a god." 😊 (As for "the Word had the same nature as God." Lets give a parallel analogous sentence." "Don had the same nature as Fred." Both are of the class "man" and both have the nature of "man." Do you think this means that Fred and Don are equal in *all* respects? Why, could not Don be 18 years old, 4ft 10ins, with two withered weak arms, an IQ which is subnormal, poor eyesight and almost deaf? And Fred 101 years old, 6ft 3ins, extremely strong arms and with an IQ of 150, 20-20 vision and could hear a pin drop at 20 feet? Yes, because they are both "men" they share the same nature. And of course the angels as spirits have the same nature as God but they certainly are not God nor his equal by having God's nature!)

Quote:

Quote:

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?

I do not for the life of me understand why it is you repeat the questions above umpteen million times when I've consistently and repeatedly answered, uniformly, the same umpteen million times that I believe And the Word was God is the best literal translation! The fact that you don't like my answer isn't going to change my answer. And the constant repetition is highly annoying. I've sent my 5yo into time-out for less.

I know that "the Word was God" is what you think, despite it being not 'qualitative' at all, the "best literal translation." But you said that a qualitative noun in the predicate can be translated with a predicate adjective and that also an indefinite noun phrase can accomplish what that same predicate adjective can. So, I will ask again: If theos in [John 1:1c](#) is purely 'qualitative' what **adjective** would you use (and remember, one can not have "Divine" but one

could have "divine") and then what indefinite noun phrase would you think would do the same as *this* adjective?



09-08-2006

#131

[katierussell](#)

Member

Join Date: May 2006

Posts: 1,481

16 Reputation Points

Quote:

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.

I did not say a non-count noun became a count noun! I said we can achieve *countability* with non-count nouns through partitive expressions. Read me more carefully! This is basic English grammar.

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.

If then the Word's taking on "flesh" does not mean what I said it mean then what does it mean? You have not said!
It can hardly be that "flesh" here denotes what the Word was made of only? As Vincent rightly remarks:
"The phrase became flesh, means more that that He assumed a human body. He assumed human nature entire.."
And it can hardly mean that the Word became sinful(Galatians 5:19). Is it not amenable to reason then that the semantic signal of "flesh" here is that of becoming "human."([Romans 3:20](#)) Yes, that the Word became a human being, denoting he became a weak human creature contrasting what he was before when with God as we are told in [John 1:1](#).
Why is this an "extra-grammatical leap"? **It is not of course!** We

are talking here of **semantics** *not* grammar or lexemes!!!!!!
 This is quite acceptable and every translation does it at times to bring out what the author meant. For instance, The Translator's New Testament translates "the Word became **a human**." This means of course we have here a translation team that certainly disagrees with your assertion that "flesh" here is "a mass noun with a qualitative semantic nuance having **no notion of countability in context**." It is certainly being used here metonymically of **man**.

Lexical Aids to the New Testament" compiled by Spiros Zodhiates says about sarx at [John 1:14](#):

Quote:

In [John 1:14](#) when it speaks of the Word becoming flesh, it means He became man(or took on human nature.)

Now, if this becoming "flesh" means "becoming man or took on human nature" this certainly gives an indefinite nuance to sarx here and then one could legitimately translate "a human" as the above translation has done. This indefinite noun phrase then captures John's meaning of the Word becoming sarx. So your assertion that here sarx has no countability from "context" is erroneous. It has a indefinite sense, as well as qualitative, both from the word's semantic range and its context as I have shown you.

But how does the connection between the word sarx which is a mass noun with a qualitative nuance means that only for theos which is a count noun of [John 1:1c](#)? It certainly does not and your assertion it does is just that, an assertion! I have of course shown you that you are wrong to think that there is no indefinite sense to sarx at this place.

Interestingly, a recent Revised Standard Version study edition has an explanatory comment for "flesh" here at [John 1;14](#) which states:

Quote:

Flesh, i.e., **human**, with all the limitations and mortality that this implies.."

Yes, it means "human." The Word's becoming "flesh" **means** the Word became "a human." So in what way does the indefinite noun phrase "became a human" not accurately capture John's meaning here? It does. As does then an indefinite noun phrase for John's meaning of the Word being theos which you say [John 1:14](#) is connected in train of thought.

But lets quote one more authoritative source for you.

Our BAG says under sarx:

Quote:

3. a man of flesh and blood ho logos sarx egento J[ohn] 1:14.

Did you read that OK?



09-08-2006

#132

[katierussell](#)

Member

Join Date: May 2006

Posts: 1,481

16 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by katierussell
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."

Are you asserting that all definite nouns must be translated with capitalization now?

My car (definite noun) is in the driveway.

According to you, though...

My Car is in the driveway.

snicker, snicker

I did not say that all definite nouns must begin with a capital! I said that all words that begin with a capital are definite and that all nouns with capital in the predicate would be definite and identifying the subject with the predicate not describing something of the subject. "Spirit" would be a definite noun if so translated at [John 3:6](#). But its not, its "spirit." And of course God is, it is definite. It is a proper noun. Such nouns name specific peoples, animals, places, times etc. They have unique reference and in writing they begin with a capital letter. They are non-count. Hence, for these reasons your sentence "My car" though definite(because of the possessive pronoun) should not be capitalized because you can pluralize "car" to "cars.". Its definite due to the possessive pronoun but not a proper noun.

(And of course it "car," is the *subject* not the predicate(as theos is in [John 1:1c](#) of course) of your sentence "My car is in the driveway." The predicate noun "driveway" is articular but not *necessarily* definite btw.)

And of course you are just plain wrong to say that pneuma at [John 3:6](#) has been translated definitely by the NWT. It did not!

Quote:

I didn't say pneuma is definite. I said it was Q. I also said the NWT translates it as a definite -- because it lacks the definite article you insistently demand is required of your purported Q-I theos in 1:1c!

You said the NWT's "spirit" here was a definite translation. It is not. It would need the article before it, capitalization or some other definitizing factor all of which are not there. I have said that "the Word was god" is a qualitative translation so I have not "demanded" for such a sense with an anarthrous predicate noun any definite article!!! You have it here completely back to front! It is because it does not have the article it is qualitative and/or indefinite!

Quote:

Ah and here's the crux of the matter.

According to you, a count noun isn't determined by its properties (whether it can be plural or take the indefinite article), but rather by what you determine it should be. Instead of a clear, consistent and objective method for determining the category to which a noun belongs, we have only your subjective interpretation as a "guide."

Your methodology leaves far, far too much to your interpretation. It lacks consistency, reliability, and any manner of objectivity.

But if you want your personal interpretations to steer your grammar...Well, that's your business.

But your subjective methodology certainly isn't mine.

But what I have explained can be found in any good book on grammar! But of course you misrepresent me to boot. I have not claimed "a count noun isn't determined by its properties (whether it can be plural or take the indefinite article), but rather by what you determine it should be." That is exactly what I have claimed! But its you and your reliance on Hartley says that placing a predicate noun before the verb changes the meaning of the noun to point to quality and only to quality! And is true that some nouns can be both count and non-count depending on hiw they are used, such as pneuma can be.

I asked if you have read Harner's article for yourself? You did not answer. Does this mean that you have once again been quoting Harner "second hand" as you did Harris? And what happened there with Harris my friend?

Yes, I will maintian that Harner let his theology influence him in what he thought John meant at [John 1:1](#). If you wish to read this and see this for yourself then I would advise you to. But I have no need to prove it to you. This is a side issue and I will not be led down the garden path by it. But of course, despite your attempt to categorize my belief that Harner was influenced by his theolgy, his christology, was slanderous or demeaning is itself demeaning of me for all of us to some degree or other are!

However:

Quote:

Quote:

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!

Ev-i-dence. Accusation without evidence is smearing someone, slandering them and/or their work. Perhaps "dictated" was too strong a word, I'll allow, but the fact is you were demeaning Harner's work with a hollow claim of theological bias. Hollow meaning -- lack of evidence to support your accusation.

You have not addressed what I said! Are you saying that Harner did not reject the translation "and the Word was God"? He certainly did. You have even quoted him as saying that the anarthrous noun in [John 1:1c](#) is not definite. Harner says if John had wanted to say "the Word was God" he could have written *ho logos en ho theos*. But John didn't. Beduhn rightly remarks: "Harner rejects outright the renderings "the Word was God" and "He was the same as God." *-Truth in Translation*, p.124. This is true. He rejects it because it is a definite translation not a qualitative one! Hence, if you agree with Harner that *theos* in [John 1:1c](#) is purely qualitative then you too will have to reject outright "the Word was God." But, if you do not reject it outright then you will have to disagree with Harner somewhat. Which is it and why?

Last edited by *katierussell* : 09-08-2006 at 05:55 AM.



09-08-2006

#133

[kelton graham](#)

Member

Join Date: Jan 2006

Posts: 331

19 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ongyo no Kiheiji**

*I agree. However, since we are discussing the use of *proskuneo* from a Jewish/biblical standpoint (in regards to whom the Jews gave *proskuneo* to), and also that Jewish kings received *proskuneo* without them being deified (in the Jews' eyes), such an argument is invalid.*

Response: It is true the Jews did not deify kings with regard to PROSKUNEW but they did deify idols and worship it just like the Persians & Greeks such as in [Exodus 32:8](#) LXX.

So I think the use of the word PROSKUNEW is the same in all three cultures. Greek, Persian & Israelite. Just different objects of worship.

Quote:

[Numbers 22:31](#) is one.

Response: I'll have to add this one to memory.



09-08-2006

#134

tkkclark

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006

Posts: 275

18 Reputation Points

Quote:

You have never addressed this question and when I ask it now you still do not. So, I will ask again: How does one determine if any particular anarthrous PNV is "qualitative" or indefinite.

Are you being deliberately obtuse?

Quote:

We've only been arguing about **whether or not Q demands class membership** for how many days now?"

Your insinuations that I haven't "addressed" your absurd question are just that absurd.

Quote:

For instance, phoneus is not 'qualitative' at [Acts 28:4](#) is it? Well, every translation you could consult translates in by an indefinite noun. So, by what means does one determine phoneus is indefinite and theos of [John 1:1c](#) is 'Q'?

Oh, for pity's sake. You're like a feral dog with a bone over [Acts 28:4](#). Fine. Murderer in [Acts 28:4](#) takes the indefinite article because we, logically and extra-grammatically, know that Paul wasn't the only murderer ever to exist. Given that other murders are clearly illustrated in the Bible to be as such in the Bible, we already know there is a class of murderers.

Happy now?

Quote:

And where should we find this place in the NT where the Greek noun meaning "sinner" should be translated "sinful" please? You do not cite a place for us to evaluate it!!! Please now do so.

Katie, listen very, **very** carefully. I said that Q could be translated as an adjective – sometimes. I did not say they **should** be translated as such. Given that the translation I say is best **does not** give an adjective, you are blowing a lot of hot air over **nothing**. If you think I'm going to look through a dynamic equivalent or a paraphrase to find adjectival translations of Q, just to make you happy, you are completely mental.

Quote:

So, you think "God" is a qualitative translation? I thought that you thought that theos of [John 1:1c](#) was 'qualitative'? But as you know "God" is a proper name and does not convey qualities but it identifies, it is a definite noun. You then want to have theos qualitative but retain what in the past has often been said to be a definite translation (which it is) and argued that it should be so translated for the anarthrous theos was indeed definite! If this is so then one would translate "the Word was God." But not now if one considers theos here to have no definiteness only conveying qualities of the noun! Can you please explain this to us all?

Would you **please** pay attention when I post about something?

I have – **repeatedly** – addressed this issue in this thread. I have said, **repeatedly**, that God is the best literal translation and I have previously explained why:

Quote:

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.

Emphasis above mine. Given a choice between an unwarranted demand of class membership in "a god" and the D "God" -- I believe "God" is the best literal translation. Perfect? No. But the best of the two? Yes.

Quote:

And I did not say above that you said that it would be "best" translated with an adjective! But I asked if you would choose which adjective would you? I said to you that neither "Deity" nor "Divine"(both of which you brought up as possible ways to translate) are adjectives. But "divine" is and "deity" would be a noun. So, I will ask again: What adjective would you choose? As you have said one could translate with an adjective.

Please see where I addressed this same (repetitive) argument above.

Katie, I have said – repeatedly – what I think the best literal translation is. I have also said – repeatedly – that an adjective can **sometimes** be used to translate Q – not that an adjective **should** be used in 1:1c. If YOU want to provide an adjective from a dynamic or paraphrase Bible that expresses Q in 1:1c, by all means, **do so**. I, personally, am not going to waste **my** time on another one of your repetitive, trivial arguments. I've offered the NEB, substituting Deity of Divine and if that isn't good enough for you, TOUGH.

Quote:

I said:

Quote:

...You can interpret the context to fit whatever notion you want it to fit.

And you said:

Quote:

As Hartley has done you mean?

Prove it. Prove Hartley's methodology is as subjective if not more so than yours.

You turn to context from the very start and allow subjective context determine what kind of noun you're dealing with.

Hartley has clear, objective and consistent rules to determine noun category. He looks at whether or not the noun can take an indefinite article or be plural. If the answer to both of those questions is yes, it's a count noun. If it can't, it's a mass noun. Please note, neither of these parameters involves consulting context as you demand to categorize nouns according to **your** methodology.

Quote:

I shew you what "flesh" meant at [John 1:14](#).

And I **showed** you that grammar doesn't ask or require that we determine what flesh means or represents. Does *the Word became flesh* mean the Word became human? Even **a** human being? Logically, yes. You quote a few sources (congratulations, btw, on actually **supporting** an argument) that say so, but I did not argue that flesh did not **ultimately** mean any of those things.

Grammar, however, isn't determined by what a word may ultimately refer to, mean, and/or represent. 1:14 isn't asking you to determine the category of the noun that flesh may **ultimately** represent in 1:14.

Quote:

And as for your "Flesh" became "magically" a count noun? Could I not retort that "sinner," a count noun, has become, for you, "magically" an adjective "sinful"?

Yes, and "sinful" would be a paraphrase – as in **not** a literal word-for-word translation, just as "a human being" is a paraphrase and not a word-for-word translation. If you want to **paraphrase** flesh, then by all means, have at it. But your paraphrase doesn't determine the NT grammar.

Quote:

Of course, I never said that "flesh" becomes a count noun! But that here it could be translated by an indefinite noun. And of course it has as you can see above with the translations I quoted.

Yes. These translations show us what "flesh" can ultimately mean.

What flesh may ultimately mean does **not** determine its grammatical category!

Quote:

May I ask was [John 1:14](#) one of Hartley's qualitative nouns?

I believe Hartley formally classified mass nouns with the Q nuance as Q-d.

If you want an answer more specific than that, **look it up yourself**.

Quote:

Not at all. It is not definite and there is nothing wrong with "lord" without the indefinite article. But if one wishes to parallel this with the theos of [John 1:1c](#) we would have of course have "god" not "God."

I cited it as an example of single count nouns with the Q nuance that **lack the indefinite article even in the NWT**. The very same indefinite article you insist **must** be present in 1:1c. You say that the lowercase 'lord' shows that here the NWT translates it as indefinite – so where's the indefinite article?

Quote:

Yes, you can ask why. Definiteness requires either the definite article before it or one has to capitalize it. There is no warrant for either in the Greek.

Well, I'm relieved to hear that.

Quote:

Those who have translated it with a lower case have not then translated it as definite.

But alas, no indefinite article.

Quote:

They are Q translation (or even QI) and with a lower case letter. Just as one would if one thought theos of [John 1:1c](#) should be so, i.e., "god" not "God."

But alas, again, **no indefinite article**.

Quote:

Skipping over the rest of your comments on Hartley (whose pool would not rule out subjectivity and which Beduhn is aware of his thesis and have rejected it)

And I asked you, if Beduhn is so knowledgeable – in fact more so than Hartley – where is **Beduhn's** study? What was in and how did he determine his pool of examples? Where is his statistical analysis? Where has he stated his methodology? Has he published his results? If so, did his peers recognize his work?

Quote:

Well, you just asked me to prove "Hartley's study wrong" did you not? And it is you that is leaning so much on Hartley's thesis.

OK then, please provide what I asked and I will attempt to with this one example. Over to you

No, I did not "ask" you to prove Hartley's study wrong. I, in effect, once again told you to **put your money where your mouth is**. If Hartley's study is wrong or biased as you so insistently assert – PROVE IT. Provide **evidence** for your accusations and sly insinuations.

And again, **I AM NOT YOUR SECRETARY**. I am not answerable **to you**. It is not **my** job to provide **your** research. If you want to quote Hartley, by all means, **do so**. I've even made it easy for you by providing links both to his article **and** to his debate with Stafford. You seem to think that since I provided

the link and quote Hartley myself, I should be expected to pony up for you as well. **You are much mistaken.** Quoting Hartley for you **is not my responsibility.** It is **yours.** It is **you** who seems to have a point to make – not **I.** So stop yammering on about how I should dig up a quotation for you. Knuckle down. Do **your** work **yourself** and make **your** point. I am neither your research assistant, nor your secretary and I refuse to allow you to treat me as such. If you can't or won't accept that, **TOUGH.**

I will also note, since you seem to have some point or another to make with "this one example," that being [Luke 7:39](#), that **one** example (given that you **can** actually prove whatever point I imagine you think you can make) does not discredit an entire study whose statistical pool numbers in the neighborhood of 750. Have you ever studied statistics? Well, I have. Horrid subject. I loathe it even more than grammar and trust me, that's saying a great deal.

Anyway, my point is proving – and yes, I do mean **proving** – that Hartley may (or may not have, I certainly haven't ceded any points here) identified **one** semantic tag incorrectly, proves **nothing** about the other 749 (figuratively speaking) precop anarthrous PNs. One example only proves the maxim that anybody can make a mistake. To prove the systematic bias you insinuate, you must prove that a **significant percentage** of his sample has been improperly tagged – that there is a **pattern** of biased/improper tagging. One example, given the vast pool in which Hartley based his work, does not prove a **pattern** of biased behavior. It only proves that he incorrectly tagged one example. It would **not** prove a motivation of bias in his semantic tagging **until and unless** you provide evidence that his **pattern** of tagging is fundamentally flawed.



09-08-2006

#135

[katierussell](#)

Member

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



tkkkclark, may I ask this from you?

[John 1:1c](#) in Greek is kai theos en ho logos.

Could you translate as literally as is possible the anarthrous theos here three different ways?

1. Understanding theos as a definite noun.
2. Understanding theos as a purely qualitative noun.
3. Understanding theos as an indefinite noun.



09-08-2006

#136

[tkkclark](#)

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006
 Posts: 275
 18 Reputation Points



Quote:

"Oh God" does not help you with either as you are still using it definitely. It means "oh, the god."

No, it doesn't. We're talking about common usage in English. Not Greek.

Quote:

"Oh my God" means "oh the god of me."

No, it doesn't. That's an English translation of the same phrase in **Greek**. We are talking about common usage in English – not Greek.

Quote:

Both are definite.

Not in English, they aren't.

Quote:

As you can see, your eager search for "exceptions" were not examples of "exceptions"!

As you can see, how you think the English should translate to Greek then translate back to English has **zero** applicability to common usage in contemporary English.

Quote:

"God" is a proper name and hence is definite. You will not get around this.

God is a proper name. I've never denied it. But it isn't the **only** use for **God** in contemporary English in common usage. It's the most predominant, which I've said previously. But it isn't the **only** use.

Quote:

Of course you must if you wish to cling to your preferred "best literal" translation and also understanding the anarthrous theos as purely qualitative, not definite! Its not looking good for you is it?

Katie, I don't have to "prove" there is another legitimate use of **God** in English to "cling" to anything. I can't imagine why you insist this is so. *And the Word was God* reflects the best literal translation of the qualitative sense of *theos*. Again, I repeat:

Quote:

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.

Continuing...

Quote:

And you did not mention anything about "Webster's" this time. Why? Was it not you who asked me to look at one? Yes, you did. And did I not tell you I did? Yes, I did. And did I not tell you it shows that "God" is a definite noun? Yes I did. So, what was it about Webster's you wished for me to see?

Websters:

Quote:

1 capitalized : the supreme or ultimate reality: as a : the Being perfect in power, wisdom, and goodness who is worshipped as creator and ruler of the universe b Christian Science : the incorporeal divine Principle ruling over all as eternal Spirit : infinite Mind (<http://www.m-w.com/dictionary/god+>)

You seem to think I'm running from Websters because I did not specifically note it. Much the same way you **presumed** I agreed with your position on 1:1b because I failed to specifically say "person" in a post.

snort

I've given you several instances of God not being used as a definite, i.e. referring to a specific being, in common usage.

Nor have you addressed the other exception I noted, i.e. capitalization for emphatic use in poetry.

There **are** exceptions, Katie. Deal with it.

Quote:

I said:

Quote:

Katie, I quoted the translation Harner offered for 1:1c. In fact, I'll do so again, with a little more context:

Quote:

Perhaps the clause could be translated 'the Word had the same nature as God.' This would be one way of representing John's thought, which is, as I understand it, that ho logos, no less than ho theos, had the nature of theos."

And you said:

Quote:

This is not very clever at all!

Oh? You're certainly entitled to that opinion, but I think I more than adequately show what Harner's position was. You woodenly insist I must adhere to one element of his position while all the time also rejecting the other element of his position. I, meanwhile, accept **both elements of his position** as valid.

Quote:

Harner is against a definite translation of [John 1:1c](#), against the

translation "the Word was God."

Yes. Yes, he is. So what?

Quote:

Your quotation shows him that he thought theos as qualitative and this shows that the logos was no less theos than ho theos was theos. But this does not mean he thinks that "the Word of God" shows this.

No, he thinks it should be translated "And the Word has the same nature as God." I accept this as a credible, valid translation. I simply don't believe it is the best **literal** translation because it is, in fact, a **paraphrase**.

Quote:

He does not. He rejects it. If then you agree with Harner you ought to reject it also!

Why? Am I a Phillip Harner clone? Accepting a translation as valid does not mean I must also reject every other translation offered. **That** is where you err.

Quote:

It really does look like you have not read the full article for yourself? Is this the case? Then are you once again quoting "second hand"? Remember what you said about quoting "second hand" from Harris book????

Yes, I do recall what I said about quoting Harris "secondhand." I remember saying there wasn't enough quoted material to properly determine Harris' intention and meaning. That is not the case for Harner. If you wander over to http://www.forananswer.org/John/Jn1_1.htm, Hommel offers several, lengthy quotes from Harner's article, certainly enough for me to grasp Harner's intention and meaning. 9 or 10 directly cited quotations, some of them quite lengthy.

Are you asserting that I'm misrepresenting Harner?

Are you asserting that I do not properly grasp what Harner meant ?

If so, please provide (properly cited) direct quotations to **prove** my understanding of Harner's article contradicts Harner's position. **PROVE** that I've misunderstood him.

Yes, I'm relying on secondhand sources, secondary quotations, but I've yet to see any proof from you that I've either (A) misunderstood Harner, (B) misrepresented Harner or (C) in any way failed to grasp his position.

Quote:

I know you do not consider them the best literal translations. How could I when they are not even literal translations?

I am pointing out that I believe there are several translations that are acceptable to me. Not the best. But acceptable.

Quote:

You can agree with the NEB but has I have shown you in another post doing so would once again mean you ought then to disagree/reject "the Word was God" for those behind the NEB did and offered their

paraphrased translation as one against the "Word was God" as they felt the latter did not convey what John wrote but their translation did.

I'm supposed to be a clone of the NEB translators now, too? They offered a paraphrase of *And the Word was God* to bring out the qualitative nuance more fully, sure. Notice they didn't choose your rendition in this paraphrase or anything even resembling your rendition. They chose something that reflects **exactly what I've been saying all along**.

The fact that others do not accept *And the Word was God* does not demand nor require that I adopt your **indefinite** rendering. Rejecting a definite rendering does not equate to accepting the NWT rendering. By insistently demand one (rejection of the definite rendering) without recognizing the other offered in its place (the Q paraphrase), you fallaciously limit the pool of translations. Which are: (A) definite rendering (*And the Word was God*), (B) indefinite rendering (*And the Word was a god*), or (C) paraphrased Q rendering (*And what God was, the Word was*.) I chose A as the best literal, though I certainly recognize C. The fact that I recognize C's paraphrases has no bearing on whether or not I (or those who translators who opted for C) believe an indefinite rendering is acceptable. A is the best literal while C brings out the Q nuance more fully.

Quote:

And neither "Divine" and "Diety" are purely qualitative translations of theos but which you say theos of [John 1:1c](#) is!

Can **you** provide a purely qualitative translation of 1:1c that does **not** include any sense of class membership or any ambiguity therein? It's a failing of the English language, Katie. Languages do not always neatly line up as regards to translation and this happens to be one of those instances. There is no noun that is Q alone in English that would bring out the full sense of *theos* in nature but not as a member of a class. That is why those who object to *And the Word was God* offer paraphrases that express the Q nuance (without class membership) instead. They hold to Q. All of them. **None** of them suggest your Q-I or anything of the sort. As I've said before, *And the Word was God* is not a **perfect** translation. But it is the best **literal** translation.

Quote:

Why should I accept what Harner offers when I do not agree that [John 1:1c](#)'s theos is purely qualitative?

Harner rejected the definite. He also **rejected the indefinite rendering**. He then substituted with a Q paraphrase. While you point, madly, to his rejection of D, you also madly avoid his rejection of I (which I also agree with) and only vaguely recognize his Q paraphrase (or rather, I should say, recognize a perversion of what he intended and meant with his Q paraphrase, see below). You demand I turn a blind eye to his rejection of I. Sorry. I agree with what Harner said, not just the bits and pieces that agrees with my theology.

Quote:

You are the one who thinks it is(leaning on Hartley)!

In regards to leaning on Hartley...Do you think that's some manner of insult?

Ooooooooooooooh, tkkclark is leaning on Hartley!

LOL

And do suppose Hartley is the only grammarian to ever hold the Q position? I posted a link to Hommel's site in which he quotes/cites others who held to Q in 1:1c as well.

If you want to toss around "you're just leaning on xyz" insinuations, might I reply that **your** position is virtually identical to Stafford's? I think I will. In fact, I just did. LOL

Anyway, I don't **think** Harner's offered substitution for 1:1c is Q. I **know** it is. He rejected both D **and** I in favor of Q. You scream that he rejected D as some sort of justification for you I position, but Harner does not support your I position, either. He supports Q! He wrote his paraphrase of 1:1c to represent neither D nor I (which he'd previously rejected), but to represent **Q**.

Quote:

So, if Harner thinks it is purely qualitative and rejects the definite translation "the Word was God" you either have to also reject this translation or disagree with Harner somewhat? Which is it?

Again, you are fallaciously limiting the available choices. You say I must either accept Harner's rejection of D or reject Harner entirely. Either/or. But it's **not** an either/or proposition, Katie. It never has been, which is why I keep talking about other translations that are acceptable to me as well. The fact is, Harner's "And the Word had the same nature as God" is a paraphrase. As in not literal. If I did a generic word search on nature (rather than searching by Strong's number, which is, of course, much more reliable), Harner's 1:1c would pop up even though the word "nature" is not in the text. The idea is. But the word isn't. While recognizing Harner's translation as valid and credible, I can **still** hold to the D rendering as the best literal translation.

Unless, of course, you can provide a direct, explicit quotation from Harner stating that his "And the Word had the same nature as God" is the **best literal translation**? If Harner said his paraphrase was the best literal translation, then, yes, I would disagree with Harner.

Quote:

Yes, it acceptable. But one can read into it more or less into it as one sees fit!

How is "the Word had the **same** nature as God" in any way ambiguous?

Quote:

This is why I would certainly not outright reject it but it is also certainly not the best literal translation.

So...You're saying you believe the Word had the **same** nature as *theos* now? As in the identical nature of the *theos* in 1:1b, considering **you haven't cited any supports for your assertion that fronting a noun with the definite article changes the characteristics of the noun**.

Quote:

There are only two strictly literal translations. "the Word was God" or "the Word was god."

Exactly.

Quote:

The first is not 'qualitative' at all. The second is but not good English but one can bring out the qualities of the noun god by using an indefinite noun phrase....."and the Word was a god."

No, the second demands that *theos* is a member of a class. The second – your demanded translation – **requires** an indefinite sense. The second inserts ambiguity into the text in regards to class membership that has nothing to do with the Q *theos* therein. And that is **precisely** why it is to be rejected. It demands an indefinite. *Theos* in 1:1c makes no such demands.

Quote:

(As for "the Word had the same nature as God." Lets give a parallel analogous sentence." "Don had the same nature as Fred." Both are of the class "man" and both have the nature of "man."

Again, you presume class membership here. Can you point out where Harner states or implies anything of the sort? I mean, it **is** his translation you're perverting.

Quote:

Do you think this means that Fred and Don are equal in all respects? Why, could not Don be 18 years old, 4ft 10ins, with two withered weak arms, an IQ which is subnormal, poor eyesight and almost deaf? And Fred 101 years old, 6ft 3ins, extremely strong arms and with an IQ of 150, 20-20 vision and could hear a pin drop at 20 feet? Yes, because they are both "men" they share the same nature. And of course the angels as spirits have the same nature as God but they certainly are not God nor his equal by having God's nature!)

Again, you presume class membership in all of the above. That's your stated position, sure. But it certainly isn't mine and I imagine if you set the same "parallel analogous sentence" before Harner, he certainly wouldn't agree your perversion of what he wrote is in any way a reflection of what he meant and intended.

Quote:

I know that "the Word was God" is what you think, despite it being not 'qualitative' at all, the "best literal translation." But you said that a qualitative noun in the predicate can be translated with a predicate adjective and that also an indefinite noun phrase can accomplish what that same predicate adjective can. So, I will ask again: If *theos* in [John 1:1c](#) is purely 'qualitative' what adjective would you use (and remember, one can not have "Divine" but one could have "divine") and then what indefinite noun phrase would you think would do the same as this adjective?

Endlessly repeating an argument doesn't lend strength to an argument -- or your position.

It's just **annoying**.



09-08-2006

#137

[tkkclark](#)

Member



Quote:

Join Date: Apr 2006
 Posts: 275
 18 Reputation Points

I did not say a non-count noun became a count noun! I said we can achieve countability with non-count nouns through partitive expressions. Read me more carefully! This is basic English grammar.

ROTFL!!!!

Oh, you're a good one to speak to **me** about reading more carefully.

LOLOL!

You want to compare notes on who has been misreading whom in this thread? I didn't **unilaterally** proclaim that you had changed your position because you failed to insert "person" into one of your posts (see my post #88), compadre. While you're crowing about how **I** should read more carefully, perhaps you should chew on **that**.

Quote:

If then the Word's taking on "flesh" does not mean what I said it mean then what does it mean? You have not said!

I don't need to because what it means is immaterial to the **grammar**.

Quote:

It can hardly be that "flesh" here denotes what the Word was made of only? As Vincent rightly remarks:

"The phrase became flesh, means more that that He assumed a human body. He assumed human nature entire.."

And it can hardly mean that the Word became sinful(Galatians 5:19). Is it not amenable to reason then that the semantic signal of "flesh" here is that of becoming "human."([Romans 3:20](#)) Yes, that the Word became a human being, denoting he became a weak human creature contrasting what he was before when with God as we are told in [John 1:1](#).

And yet again, you wander from grammar.

Quote:

Why is this an "extra-grammatical leap"? It is not of course! We are talking here of semantics not grammar or lexemes!!!!!!

No. **You** are talking about letting a word's interpretation determine its grammar. Which makes your grammar **subjective**.

I am talking about allowing the properties of the noun (Is it countable? Can it take an indefinite article?) determine its category. Which is **objective**.

See the difference?

As I said before, if you're willing to allow so much personal interpretation and subjectivity into **your** methodology, that's entirely your business. But I certainly will **not** accept or adopt your **subjective** methodology as mine.

Identifying the noun's category is **not** dependent upon what you interpret that noun to mean and if you're using meaning as a basis for doing so, you're grammar is subjective, not **objective**.

You list several translations that argue that the **meaning** of flesh is "a human,"
 – I say again, **meaning is immaterial to the categorization of nouns.**



09-08-2006

#138

[katierussell](#)

Member

Join Date: May 2006

Posts: 1,481

16 Reputation Points



This post of yours, which has not even been placed under one of my posts(!) does absolutely nothing to refute my position that usage, yes, usage in a given context, and not "interpretation(!), not a nouns lexical form, determines its meaning in context! You have totally ignored almost every thing I posted! I not only listed noted translations but the BAG, a very note worthy Greek-English Lexicon and commentaries and I shew you that "flesh" could not be composition of the fleshly body, or sinful nature but **human nature, being human, and that the Word's becoming "flesh" then was the Word becoming a human.** I asked you what "flesh" meant here but you have chosen not to reply, just a flat out denial of what I shew you and a misconstrual of the basis for the meaning of sarx here. I am then, as anyone in my position would have to be, extremely disappointed in you and your response which really was a response of closing ones eyes to the arguments I proffered you, the translations that showed there was indeed an indefiniteness to sarx here, and so could just as well be translated as they did with an indefinite noun, though the stress was of course on the characteristics of sarx, and of course the BAG lexicon which I think you did not even make any comment on whatsoever!. What more need I say! Your post condemns you as one who will not listen, will not learn, will not depart from your Hartley! In your other posts above, again, not placed in the thread where they are meant to be, in reply to mine, you flat out deny that God" is as a proper name a definite noun. It is. It is very clear that you want to have theos as purely qualitative but want to retain the capital "G" in "God." You just can't to it tkkclark! You can't have both. But though I have shown you can not you just sail on denying like you denying you have anose on your face. I then can not help you, no one it seem will be able to, you are then, beyond any help. Best wishes, KR. 😊

Last edited by katierussell : 09-08-2006 at 11:58 AM.



09-08-2006

#139

[katierussell](#)

Member

Join Date: May 2006

Posts: 1,481

16 Reputation Points



Quote:

Quote:

"Oh God" does not help you with either as you are still using it definitely. It means "oh, the god."

No, it doesn't. We're talking about common usage in English. Not Greek.

Quote:

"Oh my God" means "oh the god of me."

No, it doesn't. That's an English translation of the same phrase in Greek . We are talking about common usage in English – not Greek.

Quote:

Both are definite.

Not in English, they aren't

I said nothing about Greek! You wrote in English I addressed you in English!

I have said that the **English** noun "God" is definite as it is a proper noun and all proper nouns are definite and that is why capital letters are used. Harris, whom you quoted "second hand" will tell you God is. Beduhn, whose book you have not got would tell you it is. Websters or any good English dictionary will tell you it is. You then gave me what you thought was two **English** phrases that used "God" in a non definite sense. I shew you that these **English** uses of "God" *are* definite by re-writing them so that both can be shown to be definite. The English possessive pronoun makes "God" definite in "Oh my God" as well as the use of the capital "G." And "Oh God" certainly does not mean "Oh a god" and certainly is no 'qualitative' noun either! God here then is also definite. That you got all this wrong, that you cannot comprehend this simple piece of English grammar shows it is a useless excercise for me to try to rehabilitate you away from Hartley as you need to be. You have become a Hartley "clone," to use a word you denied you were in reference to another, Harner. But a clone you are and you do not know you have been misled. You have been misled by cleverer people than you but their cleverishness(is that a word?) does not mean they have not set out with one agenda and one agenda only, to create a category of a Greek noun that actually does not exist(as Beduhn shew Hommell btw) and an effort to retain a captial "G" when they retain this translation for the anarthrous theos of [John 1:1c](#). I will then leave you to them.



09-09-2006

#140

[katie russell](#)

Member

Join Date: May 2006

Posts: 1,481

16 Reputation Points

Quote:

Oh, for pity's sake. You're like a feral dog with a bone over [Acts 28:4](#). Fine. Murderer in [Acts 28:4](#) takes the indefinite article because we, logically and extra-grammatically, know that Paul wasn't the only murderer ever to exist. Given that other murders are clearly illustrated in

the Bible to be as such in the Bible, we already know there is a class of murderers.

Happy now?

Yes, I am, very happy but a little sad for you. The fact is that theos can be applied to others not the one true god, God, as a common noun just as phoneus can be. So, there are beings in the class of 'god.' Its just that your western mind has been conditioned to think of God as the only one in the "god" category. For Christians and others at the times they could and did use the term theos as a common noun for others. That they could for the Word is shown that he was not the god, "God," he was with. However, your answer also shows that you have not gotten the 'Q' sense for theos of [John 1:1c](#) from its grammar...you have had to interpret both phoneus and theos from both [Acts 28:4](#) and [John 1:1c](#) respectively from the wider literary context where others are so called and exist. But this is in contradiction to what you have said in another post! So, you have just admitted that its not, for you, if the singular noun that is anarthrous and is placed before the verb or not that makes it qualitative. This is why I have been persistent over [Acts 28:4](#)...it has forced you to come out in the open. Being that this is the case, that there is such a thing as the category of the class god, that the Word was said to be with the god, with "God" then this shows, as you have yourself argued with "murderer" with Paul at [Acts 28:4](#) that the Word can be a theos other than the one he was said to be with.....yes, we have then an indefinite theos at [John 1:1c](#). 😊

Quote:

Given a choice between an unwarranted demand of class membership in "a god" and the D "God" -- I believe "God" is the best literal translation. Perfect? No. But the best of the two? Yes.

Yes, this shows it has been you that have been "obtuse." While you have indeed repeatedly said what you think is the "best literal" translation is "the Word was **God**," this is the first time you have admitted that "God" is a "D," that is, a definite noun and that this translation is a definite translation! You are accepting a definite translation for what you have been led to believe is a purely qualitative noun! Then why oh why have you been disputing all this while that "God" is not always (but it is) a definite noun? But the simple clear plain fact is that you are accepting a translation that does **not** convey what you think is a "qualitative" noun! But you have accepted that an English indefinite noun phrase can do that....so why don't you adopt one *here* with the 'qualitative' theos? You have said that such a noun can be translated with a predicate adjective. The why don't you adopt one. For both these ways of translating what you believe is a "qualitative" noun **would** convey the qualities of the noun better than a definite one. That

much you ought now to accept and acknowledge. You can not and should not deny this. Being this is the case, then what adjective could you choose? What of "divine"(No, not **D**ivine, as a predicate adjective is not capitalized!) in "the Word was divine." But then tell us all what is the difference between this and the Word's being a "divine being"? For how could the being, the Word, be divine and not at the same time be "a divine being"? And then tell us all the difference between this and "the Word was a god." For are not those who are a god divine beings? But what if one wants to retain in translation the substantive? Would not this be "god"? So, the best literal translation would then be for you, yes you, not "the Word was God," for "God" here is definite not qualitative in any way shape or form, but "god" and in "the Word was god." One could leave it like that I should think and then let the passage speak for itself. But you would be hard pressed then to criticise the translation "the Word was a god"!

But from what you have written it seems that your objective has been to just not accept what you so obviously should. That there is nothing wrong with the "the Word was a god" translation, though not perfect, no translation will be, but as to conveying that the Word had the qualities of the noun theos and being as literal as possible this is the best one can do.

This is all from me at this point.

When I ask you to show me how Hartley determines how "sinner" means "sinful" at [Luke 7:39](#) you launch yourself into reason why you are not my "secretary," blah blah blah. Well, that is your choice. You are in fact just grabbing hold of the coat tails of the one Hartley and where he goes you go. This of course should remind us all of Jesus words at [Luke 6:39](#). I have tried to raise you up out of the pit you have placed yourself in with Hartley. But you want to stay there. So be it.

Last edited by katierussell : 09-09-2006 at 01:25 AM.










Post Reply

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

<< [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 07:57 AM.

As of July 6, 2006, Total Page Views: 22,355,395, Page Views Today: 22,355,395

-- 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