



09-09-2006

#141

### AmazingGrace

CARM Super Member



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

Quote:

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

I just see this as a desperate and weak argument. It doesn't take a lot of discernment to know that gods are not the same as God or Jesus and that proskuneo given to a god isn't the same as that given to God or Jesus.

All JWs do this as well.[/quote]

Since when do JW's honor Jesus just as they honor Jehovah? In over 20 years I never saw it. So perhaps it's something new?

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



09-09-2006

#142

### katierussell

Member

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

Quote:

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

Having a bit more time(I have always been rushed for time to read/reply to lengthy posts, not printing any thing out as you said you did but reading and replying off the top of my head at the time with only a minimum of referencing) I have revisited your post and wish now to comment on the above. Well, if you are going to incorporate "God" as it is sometimes in poetry for emphasis *only* you had better employ a footnote explaining *that* this is the reason it is capitalized and for this reason *only* and its not here used as a

title or a name which otherwise your readers would have thought it was! No, lets us not decieve our readers by this 'device' but simply translate the common use of theos here in Greek with the common usage of "God" or "god."....but as we know that "God" is a title or even a proper name then that is ruled out as theos in [John 1:1c](#) is not being used in that way. The only other literal translation then is by the substantive "god."



09-10-2006

#143

[tkkclark](#)

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006  
Posts: 275  
18 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by [katierussell](#)  
*This post of yours, which has not even been placed under one of my posts (!)..*

My apologies. This is one of those occasions when I printed your responses out. I composed my replies in Word off-line, then clicked on the generic reply to c/p those replies after reconnecting again later. I did not search for your individual posts and click on quote because I already had your quoted material, complete with html tags, written into my responses in Word. And because I'm still sick (which is why I'm not at church spreading my germly self around the nursery this morning). I was much more concerned with the **contents** of my replies, posting my arguments to the thread, and not so much concerned with nesting my replies just so. At the time, priority #1 was posting my arguments. Priority #2 was not to crack a rib coughing.

But...I don't read in threaded mode and sometimes forget others do. Regardless of personal circumstances, I **should** have been more precise in **how** I posted and will try to be so in future.

Again -- my apologies.

Quote:

...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 haven't **ignored** your methodology, Katie. I've discussed your methodology previously and explained why I find it lacking. No, I don't **ignore** your arguments. I simply **reject** your arguments because your underlying methodology is **fundamentally flawed**.

And since I've visited this before...

Quote:

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.

Continuing...

Quote:

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.**

And I visited this argument before as well:

Quote:

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.

Continuing...

Quote:

I asked you what "flesh" meant here but you have chosen not to reply,...

Also:

Quote:

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!

Quote:

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

See above in regards to my alleged refusal to answer what *sarx* ultimately means or metaphorically represents. I've answered. And I've **also** said that **meaning is immaterial to noun categorization.**

Quote:

...just a flat out denial of what I shew you and a misconstrual of the basis

for the meaning of sarx here.

No flat-out denials or "misconstruals" or whatever it is you mean here. I simply reject -- and continue to reject -- your subjective methodology. Again, if you choose a methodology that is so subjective in your categorization of nouns, that is entirely **your** business. **I**, however, choose an **objective** means to determine noun category (i.e. can the noun take a plural, indefinite article?).

Quote:

...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,...

I'm disappointed that you would allow so much subjectivity into your grammar. And if "closing ones eyes" means rejecting that subjective methodology, then you are quite right. I have closed my eyes to it, turned my back on it and outright will **NOT** allow such subjectivity to sway and/or influence **objective** methodology!

Quote:

Your post condemns you as one who will not listen, will not learn, will not depart from your Hartley!

I'd rather be "condemned" (LOL) to objectivity than drown in subjectivity, any time, any day. No. I will not "listen" to subjective methodology. I will not "learn" (\*snort\*) from subjective methodology. And given his (and others') great work, no, I will not "depart" from Hartley (or others who've taken Hartley's position). Why should I? **You've yet to prove his methodology wrong.**

Oh, I'm disappointed as well. Very disappointed.

I'm disappointed that you failed to cite/quote one source to support your demanded position that nouns change characteristics when fronted with the definite article. I'm disappointed that you felt the need to slander two respected scholars (Harner and Hartley) without providing a single sliver of **evidence** to support your sly (and apparently baseless) insinuations.

Quote:

In your other posts above, again, not placed in the thread where they are meant to be, in reply to mine,...

My replies are in the proper thread -- "How can Jesus be Worshipped if only 'a god' II." Please note these replies were not in, for instance, the "Altering the Word of God" thread or who knows, "Cajun Cooking for Christmas" or some such nonsense. My replies weren't properly nested, no, but they **are** in the correct thread.

Quote:

...you flat out deny that "God" is as a proper name a definite noun.

Please point out where I have denied that "God" can be a proper name or definite noun. Explicit quotations please.

I agreed that "God" is predominantly used as a name, a definite. I simply **also** pointed out that there are exceptions in which "God" is not a definite or proper name.

Quote:

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 do it tkkclark!

ROTFL! The vast majority of Bibles would disagree with that last in regards to 1:1c.

Quote:

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 seems will be able to, you are then, beyond any help. Best wishes, KR. 😊

La dee da, I've addressed this before:

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.

Will you be able to "help" me?

ROTFL!

Katie, I don't recall asking for your "help" beyond clarifying and **supporting** your (or the NWTTTC's) position!

I understand the subject at hand well, quite well, thank you. For that, I neither need, nor have I requested, your "help."

And if your "helping" me means I must adopt your subjective methodology and bow to your blind denial of my quote immediately above, then you are quite right. We are at an impasse.



09-10-2006

#144

tkkclark

Member



Quote:

Join Date: Apr 2006  
 Posts: 275  
 18 Reputation Points

Originally Posted by [katierussell](#)

*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.*

Your logical is circular. If it's capitalized, it **must** be a proper name, according to you, and therefore, definite.

I've shown you that people say Oh God and G.D. without using the definite sense and that words are capitalized in poetry for emphasis.

Quote:

Harris, whom you quoted "second hand" will tell you God is.

Yet another delayed ship notice in my mailbox this morning. \*sigh\*

But I don't need Harris to tell me who God is, thanks anyway.

Quote:

Beduhn, whose book you have not got would tell you it is.

I don't need Beduhn to tell me who God is, either.

Quote:

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!

Oh? Did I say these examples were Q? I don't recall saying that.

I say that "oh God" and G.D. certainly **can** refer to **an** indefinite being, rather than **the** specific being, however. Set forth in common usage, its idiomatic usage, that these phrases certainly do not refer to a specific, definite being.

Quote:

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 keep demeaning and slandering Hartely and Hartley's work. Yet, you provide no **EVIDENCE** to **PROVE** either scholar's work is biased or wrong.

Repetitively saying it ain't so doesn't **prove** it ain't so.

**PROVE** Hartley (and others) are biased. **PROVIDE EVIDENCE** of your slanderous (libelous?) accuastions.

**PUT YOUR MONEY WHERE YOUR MOUTH IS.**

Until you do, you have not **proven** that Hartley's (or my) position requires any

sort of rehabilitation and you are **blowing hot air**.

Quote:

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.

No. I don't know that I've been misled. For you have **FAILED TO PROVE IT**.

You have offered **NO EVIDENCE** of **YOUR** assertion that Harner allowed his "theological view" to influence his work. And you've certainly offered **NO EVIDENCE** of bias in regards to Hartley.

Quote:

You have been misled by cleverer people than you but their cleverishness (is that a word?)...

I assume you're speaking rhetorically, but the appropriate word here is cleverness.

Quote:

...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.

**YOU** made this assertion in regards to Harner **and** Hartley. **YOU**, therefore, bear the burden of proof. **YOU** must provide **EVIDENCE** that these scholars did what you say.

**UNTIL** you do, you are **blowing hot air** and prove **nothing** save a **DISGRACEFUL** pattern of tossing around insulting accusations to which you consistently fail to provide **any** manner of foundation or grounds.



09-10-2006

#145

[tkkclark](#)

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006  
Posts: 275  
18 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by [katierussell](#)  
*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.*

Please note that I said **logical, extra-grammatical reasons** tell us there is a class of murderers, that there is more than one member. **Grammar** does not tell us this.

If you want to say extra-grammatical reasons demand a class of *theos*, you're more than welcome to. I don't agree, but that's beside the point. The point is there is no **grammatical** reason to demand a class of *theos* in 1:1 and you **import** that **into** the grammar of the text. This argument, then, is based **NOT** on grammar, but your theology instead.

Quote:

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.

My "western mind" has nothing to do with it. I think the Bible clearly shows that there is one true god ([John 17:3](#)) and that others are called God either falsely or figuratively, which I've stated previously in this thread. Quite OT to the matter we are discussing at the moment, however, which is the grammar.

Quote:

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...

We've discussed this quite thoroughly before as well. 1:1b personally identifies *theos* whereas 1:1c notes one who has the identical nature of *theos*. 1 person + 1 nature does not = 2 beings unless we presume and woodenly insist that person = nature = being, then go **outside** the text of John's prologue (a thematic unit) to look for a class of gods.

None of which is **required** by the grammar.

Quote:

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.

These are **extra-grammatical** reasons. As in **not required by the grammar**.

Quote:

But this is in contradiction to what you have said in another post!

Did I state that murderer in [Acts 28:4](#) demanded an indefinite article for **grammatical** reasons?

No.

I said we use the indefinite article for **extra-grammatical** reasons. **Again, this asserted parallel with [Acts 28:4](#) is not based on grammar!**

Quote:

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 quaitative. 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](#). 😊

Congratulations. You've proven that an English indefinite article can at times be inserted for extra-grammatical reasons -- which I have said is what would be required to include an indefinite article in 1:1c, **extra-grammatical reasons**.

### An indefinite article is not required by the grammar.

Quote:

Yes, this shows it has been you that have been "obtuse."

\*SNORT\*

You're arguing a parallel in [Acts 28:4](#), in which the English indefinite article in [Acts 28:4](#) is inserted **for extra-grammatical reasons**. As such, [Acts 28:4](#) only suggests that an indefinite article **may** be inserted for, again, **extra-grammatical reasons**. Class membership is imported **into** that text. **Not because of the grammar.**

If you're arguing that you can turn to **extra-grammatical reasons** to include the indefinite article in 1:1c, you're welcome to do so, but **the grammar does not demand it. You are importing that into the text.**

We **are** arguing, however, the requirements of **grammar** in 1:1c, are we not?

Quote:

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?

I've been arguing it because **you** kept insisting there are absolutely no exceptions. I believe there are and have demonstrated there are. And I also noted, at least once though perhaps more so, that I couldn't imagine why on earth **you kept bringing it up**. You said something to the effect that I must cling to it and I said something to the effect that I couldn't imagine why you'd insist so.

Quote:

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.

Oh, for pity's sake. How many times do I have to keep c/p my same answer over and over and over again?

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.

Cutting a bit of repetitive yammering...

Quote:

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.

The English indefinite article demands class membership. Nothing in the grammar of the text demands class membership and allowing such ambiguity into the text...Well, you know what? Just see my c/p answer above.

Quote:

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're exactly right.

I **CHOOSE** not to allow you to treat me as your secretary, your lackey or your research assistant.

If you want to quote Hartley, **nobody's stopping you**.

Dig out **your** quote, do **your** work **yourself** and make **your** point!

Your bizarre instance that **I** must ferret out **your** quotation for you is personally demeaning to me (I am your peer, not your subordinate) and in so doing, you mysteriously attempt to transfer **your** responsibility to provide **your** argument to **me**.

You're the one with the point to make, not I.

It is your responsibility to make that point, not I.

AND in insisting I provide this quotation, **you assume that I'm aware of whatever point you claim to be making!** For goodness' sake, **I** would want to state **my** position **myself**, if for no other reason, to make sure somebody else didn't louse the job up! But noooooooooooooooooo, not you.

Not to mention that it shows a concerted scholastic **laziness** on your part. I've certainly provided the links to the article and the debates. **Find whatever it is you're babbling about yourself. That isn't MYjob.**

If you can't or won't grasp/understand how **utterly ridiculous and insulting**

your inane demands are in regards to this, you are really quite hopeless.

Quote:

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.

Again, more sly insinuations and slander against Hartley's work without a stingy sliver of evidence and/or proof.

Again -- **PUT YOUR MONEY WHERE YOUR MOUTH IS!!!** If Hartley's study is systematically biased as you so repetitively insinuate, then the burden is on you to **PROVE IT!!!**



09-12-2006

#146

[katierussell](#)

Member

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

Quote:

Not to mention that it shows a concerted scholastic **laziness** on your part

All the **laziness** has been on your part. You just rely totally on Hartley, you do not realise his methodology is wrong and totally warped by his subjectiveness. So be it.



09-12-2006

#147

[katierussell](#)

Member

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

\*\*\*\*\*edited by mod\*\*\*\*\*

You side-stepped by post as if you were doing the Tango. Just another Hartley clone, \*\*\*\*\*edited by mod\*\*\*\*\* but when trying does not say anything at all, which was what your post summed up is. All sound no substance. Enough said.

\*\*\*Do not imply that a poster can't think. \*\*\*\*\*

*Last edited by moderator9 : 09-15-2006 at 07:01 AM.*



09-12-2006

#148

[upnylou](#)

Junior Member

Join Date: Mar 2006  
Posts: 175  
16 Reputation Points

Quote:

Mondo: Did Jesus say he(Jesus) was to be worshipped? NO, not once .. That leads me to think that the greek word for worship must also mean something else such as, kneel down, bow, do obeisance.

**Not even the wts believed that one!**

craaaazy times we live in ....

***"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]



09-12-2006

#149

## katierussell

Member

Join Date: May 2006

Posts: 1,481

16 Reputation Points



For goodness sake tkkclark:

Quote:

Please note that I said logical, extra-grammatical reasons tell us there is a class of murderers, that there is more than one member. Grammar does not tell us this.

If you want to say extra-grammatical reasons demand a class of theos, you're more than welcome to. I don't agree, but that's beside the point. The point is there is no grammatical reason to demand a class of theos in 1:1 and you import that into the grammar of the text. This argument, then, is based NOT on grammar, but your theology instead

**I did not and never have** "based" nor "demanded" the indefinite sense for the anarthrous theos of [John 1:1c](#) on "extra-grammatical reasons" but **you** argued, faslely as I showed you, that "extra-grammatical reasons," that is there is no class "god," shows that one can not have this sense here! **You** tkkclark argued on this basis, and wrongly, based on an apparent ignorance or perhaps just an oversight (but a very important oversight of course) that there is no class "god"! What **I** have said is that the sentence structures of [Acts 28.4](#) and [John 1:1](#) shows that in both cases the singular anarthrous predicate nominatives before the verb is an indefinite noun and should be and can properly be translated by an English indefinite noun phrase and with **both** there are no, what you call "extra-grammatical reasons," against these translation. This is proof positive you are simply not grasping simple arguments and simply arguing to save your face and hoping no one will notice and even perhaps some might even think you have argued for something!

Last edited by katierussell : 09-12-2006 at 10:33 AM.



09-13-2006

#150

## Ongyo no Kiheiji

Senior Member

Join Date: Jan 2006

Posts: 2,280

18 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by **AmazingGrace**

*I just see this as a desperate and weak argument. It doesn't take a lot of discernment to know that gods are not the same as God or Jesus and that proskuneo given to a god isn't the same as that given to God or Jesus.*

I agree that proskuneo given to God is different than that which is given to others God has bestowed the title elohim/theoi (theos) on. However, since Jesus is bestowed the title elohim/theos by God Himself (just as the angels are) and both receive proskuneo (without any dire consequences), why is it that when Jesus receives proskuneo, it is okay, while when other elohim/theoi (who God

has bestowed this title on, such as the angels) receive it, it is equated with polytheism?

Quote:

Originally Posted by **AmazingGrace**   
*Since when do JW's honor Jesus just as they honor Jehovah? In over 20 years I never saw it. So perhaps it's something new?*

What is your definition of 'honor', since can honor someone without worshipping them?




09-13-2006


#151

## Ongyo no Kiheiji

Senior Member

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

Quote:

Originally Posted by **kelton graham**   
*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.*

You are correct in that aspect. But again, I am speaking about the beings that God himself has called elohim/theoi, and how proskuneo is rendered to them without any dire consequences and without infringing on Jewish montheism.




09-13-2006

#152

## katierussell

Member

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

Having more time to go thru your replies I would like to add these comments on this part:

Quote:

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.

And I visited this argument before as well:

Quote:

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.

False: I did **not** use "grammar" to shows what sarx meant here!(I shew what the semantic signal of sarx was here)  
 False: I did **not** use "grammar" to "determine" the "category" the noun was! (I never denied that is was a mass noun here.)  
 You also seem to have forgotten it was *you* who brought up [John 1:14](#) in the first place and *why* you did!



09-14-2006

#153

[katierussell](#)

Member

Join Date: May 2006

Posts: 1,481

16 Reputation Points

**\*\*\*edited by moderator\*\*\*8**

Quote:

Quote:

Originally Posted by katierussell

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.

Your logical is circular. If it's capitalized, it must be a proper name, according to you, and therefore, definite.

I did not say that "if" "God" has the capital "G" it must be a proper name but that as it is a proper noun then naturally it is capitalized as all proper nouns are in English! And as it is a proper name then it is a definite noun.

Quote:

Quote:

Harris, whom you quoted "second hand" will tell you God is.

Yet another delayed ship notice in my mailbox this morning. \*sigh\*

But I don't need Harris to tell me who God is, thanks anyway.

Not "who" God is but that "God" is a proper noun, hence is a definite noun. That is what we are talking about not "who" God is! Are you trying to befuddle things on purpose so as you get yourself off the hook you are well and truly on? Yes, you do need Harris, **\*\*\*\*\*edited by moderator--do not impugn a person's character. This poster has said he has been trying to get Harris' book, but has been unable to do so, so far\*\*\*\*\*** to tell you that "God" is a proper noun and hence is definite.

Quote:

Quote:

Beduhn, whose book you have not got would tell you it is.

I don't need Beduhn to tell me who God is, either.

No, not "who" God is but that "God" is a proper name (and this is what we are here discussing so are you doing this on purpose. Looks like it!) and hence is a definite noun. Yes, you need BeDuhn (and Harris) to instruct you in *that*.

Quote:

Quote:

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!

Oh? Did I say these examples were Q? I don't recall saying that.

I say that "oh God" and G.D. certainly can refer to an indefinite being, rather than the specific being, however. Set forth in common usage, its idiomatic usage, that these phrases certainly do not refer to a specific, definite being.

Both "Oh my God" and "Oh God" are definite uses of "God" for the person who so speaks these. They are not 'qualitative' and they are not indefinite. They would not be exclamations toward the qualities of "God" nor to a god. They are then, "God" in both, definite. As I said: **"That you got all this wrong, that you cannot comprehend this simple piece of English grammar** shows it is a useless exercise for me to try to rehabilitate you away from Hartley as you need to be."

*Last edited by moderator9 : 09-15-2006 at 07:09 AM.*



09-14-2006

#154

[tkkclark](#)

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006

Posts: 275

18 Reputation Points



I must say, I'm amazed -- and I admit, amused -- that you are **still** babbling on and on here. About a whole lot of nothing that hasn't been addressed before (and at great length) that I can see.

You **still** haven't provided supports for your (thus far) unsubstantiated allegations that Harner's work was swayed by his "theological view", nor that Hartley's study was biased. **You** made the assertions. **You**, therefore, bear the burden of proof. Rather than providing supports for those assertions, you continue to blow a lot of hot air about both scholars, how I need rehabilitated from so-and-so and such-and-such...But not so much as a stingy sliver of evidence in regards to your oft-repeated allegations. It's really quite tiresome. Funny, yes, in its own droll way. But tiresome.

Nor have you provided any supports whatsoever for your assertion that a noun changes its characteristics when fronted with the definite article.

You say I'm lazy because I purportedly lean on (rely on?) Hartley, that I've been

lazy in procuring Harris' book (ROTFL!), slander me by repeating an issue to which I've already admitted my error and retracted (in regards to quoting Harris inappropriately previously)...

Honestly, is this the best you've got?

Maligning my character and integrity whilst repeating the same sad arguments you've consistently failed to support?

**My** conduct in this thread (and elsewhere) stands as testimony to both my character and my integrity.

And if this is the sort of behavior you wish to engage in, I have zero interest in discussing the matter with you further.

But if you want to continue with your malicious insinuations and ad homs, it's a free country. It's not as though I can stop you. I will say however, that such conduct, **your** conduct stands as testimony of both **your** character and integrity as well.

tk -- who does **not** have pneumonia, but whose car no longer has a transmission, either. We left it about half an hr outside the city. (Or rather, the transmission left us. LOL)



09-14-2006

#155

[katierussell](#)

Member

Join Date: May 2006

Posts: 1,481

16 Reputation Points



In this post you have not acknowledged your mistakes. You have *tried* to show that "God" can sometimes not be definite. But I shew you that your "Oh my God" and "Oh God" **are** definite. Webster's would even tell you this and says "...4. **God**, in monotheistic religions, the creator and ruler of the universe , regarded as eternal, infinite, all-powerful, and all knowing. Supreme Being; Almighty. **Often used in exclamations, as good God! God almighty! my God!**"

As "God" is a proper name it is definite as the English definite article is not the only signal of definite reference but proper names are as they are uniquely identifiable, either because the reference is generally known or because the speaker/writer expects the particular hearer/reader to know who or what is referred to. **The personal pronoun are also definite signals.** That you did not know this shows you lack comprehension of the English language written and spoken. Now, there are four types of noun in English. Proper names/nouns, collective nouns, abstract nouns and common nouns. As "God" only fits the first then it is a definite noun. So, "God" in the translation "the Word was God" is a definite translation, which you say is the best literal one. But you, siding with Hartley of course, says that the anarthrous theos of [John 1:1c](#) is purely qualitative! Do you not see this problem? I think you do and this is the reason why you have tried and tried again to show that "God" is not always a proper name and is then not always a definite noun. But I have shown you it is. You then must reject

your "best literal translation" of "the Word was God" as this is not a 'qualitative' translation. It is a definite one!

May I ask:

How would it, theos en ho logos, be best translated literally if

- a) Theos here is definite
- b) is purely qualitative
- c) is indefinite.

Also, as you have said that an English indefinite noun phrase can satisfactorily convey the qualities of the noun predicated of the subject in an equative sentence then how would you accomplish this with translating the qualitative theos of [John 1:1c](#).

I also shew you that you were wrong to think that there is no indefiniteness in sarx of [John 1:14](#). That the semantic signal is of the Word becoming "human" and so *means* he became "a human" can not be controverted. Yet it was you who brought up [John 1:14](#) in connection with [John 1:1](#)'s anarthrous theos!

I have also shown that when asked what adjective you would use in translation of theos of [John 1:1c](#) and you wrote "Divine" and "Deity" that neither were adjectives. This shows you just can not lose that capital in whatever word, noun or adjective you use in translation. 😊 This is telling. For you know that to drop the capital you would be hard pressed not to come to agree that the translation "the Word was a god" is not only a possible translation but the "best literal translation."! 😊

And as a last gasp from you you now play the 'you have maliciously maligned me and my character' card by "insinuations" and "ad hominem." Well, I have described your posts as they *are* and from my arguments which you have been unable to refute they also condemn your posts.

*Last edited by katierussell : 09-14-2006 at 08:46 AM.*



09-14-2006

#156

[tkkclark](#)

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006

Posts: 275

18 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by [katierussell](#)

*And as a last gasp from you you now play the 'you have maliciously maligned me and my character' card by "insinuations" and "ad hominem." Well, I have described your posts as they are and from my arguments which you have been unable to refute they also condemn your posts.*

What, pray tell, of the following are **not** personal attacks?:

Quote:

Originally Posted by [katierussell](#)

*...Yes, you do need Harris, (whom you quoted "second hand" recently due to your "laziness" of not acquiring his book for yourself but relying on quotes you glean off the internet)...*

1. I did not "glean" my quotations from the internet as you fallaciously assert, nor have I indicted as such. You simply **presume** I got the quotes from the net and make snide remarks based on those (**your**) faulty assumptions.

For the sake of accuracy, if you must know, I took the quote(s) from **a book**: Dr. Robert Morey's The Trinity: Evidences and Issues, p. 319.

2. You claim I am lazy because I have not acquired the book. What evidence do you have of this purported laziness? Have you been looking over my shoulder so as to ascertain what efforts I have and have not made in order to obtain the book?

I've noted on the forum, a couple of times at the very least, that I ordered the book and have received delayed ship notices since last May. When I received the first delayed ship notice, I searched the secondary/used bk market to see if I could get it there in like-new condition, at a reasonable price: amazon marketplace, half.com and abebooks. The only copies I saw were priced way outside my price range and/or were offered by suppliers whose reputation was unacceptable to me so I approved the delayed-ship. When I got the second delayed ship notice, I repeated that search in the secondary market with the same results. Another delayed ship, same deal.

**HOW DARE YOU CALL MY EFFORTS TO OBTAIN THIS BOOK "LAZY"!** You have **no idea** what I have done and continue to do in order to obtain this book. None whatsoever. You have **no basis** to make such an insult except (again) **your faulty assumptions**, but you nevertheless feel you **must** deliver said insult.

3. I **retracted** that quotation. I made a mistake in that there wasn't enough quoted material **in the book** in which I found that quotation of Harris. I **ceded** the point you had made. I said you were right **twice**.

Let me ask you something, Katie -- have you admitted you were mistaken, wrong, in error -- **EVER?** Apologized for making a mistake? **EVER?** For instance, when you unilaterally proclaimed to the entire thread that I had changed my position in regards to personal distinction in 1:1b? Or maybe when you claimed I had mysteriously accepted the "And the Word was God" as a wrong translation when the immediate antecedent of **my** post reflected nothing of the sort and in fact indicated the exact opposite? Did you say, gee, I was wrong. I made a mistake.

\*SNORT\*

No, sirree. Not a chance.

Instead, you said you weren't going to waste your time with such matters. Admitting you're wrong, apparently, is a waste of time. Apologizing, apparently, is a waste of time.

Maybe it is -- **to you**. It is not, however, **to me**.

And now, you're going to slam me upside the head with something I had the grace and integrity to admit I was wrong about? As though I hadn't admitted it? As though I hadn't repented of it?

Unless, of course, you mysteriously believe Jesus' 70 times 7 doesn't apply to you.

So, yes, I consider your above-quoted remarks to be **personally** and maliciously attacking.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **katierussell**   
*...Just another Hartley clone, one who can't think for themselves...*

I'm a "clone" who cannot think for myself.

Does this address the argument?

No.

But it certainly attacks **ME**.

Quote:

My quote: "Not to mention that it shows a concerted scholastic laziness on your part..."

Your quote: "**All the laziness has been on your part.** You just rely totally on Hartley, you do not realise his methodology is wrong and totally warped by his subjectiveness. So be it."

You insisted that I must furnish your quote. I refused to do so, pointing out that it is **your** responsibility to state **your** argument -- **NOT MINE**. Then, you say I'm lazy because I refuse to fetch like a good little puppy.

Where/when have I failed to support any of **MY** arguments?

And since when is it **my** responsibility to provide supports (or even identify) **your** position?

You **HAVE** maliciously maligned me **and** my character. It's no card to be played. It's Grade A fact. Trying to trivialize your behavior or pass it off as no big deal doesn't negate that behavior. Of course, it's no big deal to you. You aren't the one being called a clone, one who cannot think for herself, are you?

Your posts have devolved into demeaning and disrespectful attacks against me, personally, scattered amongst chunks of juicy bits that have been repeatedly and thoroughly chewed already.

By all means, continue slandering me and repeating your same sad (and unsubstantiated) arguments. Whatever floats your boat.

From this point forward, I, however, decline to participate in such inane and mean-spirited behavior.



09-14-2006

#157

**katierussell**

Member



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

Quote:

Quote:

Originally Posted by katierussell

And as a last gasp from you you now play the 'you have maliciously maligned me and my character' card by "insinuations" and "ad hominem." Well, I have described your posts as they are and from my arguments which you have been unable to refute they also condemn your posts.

What, pray tell, of the following are not personal attacks?:

Quote:

Originally Posted by katierussell

...Yes, you do need Harris, (whom you quoted "second hand" recently due to your "laziness" of not acquiring his book for yourself but relying on quotes you glean off the internet)...

1. I did not "glean" my quotations from the internet as you fallaciously assert, nor have I indicted as such. You simply presume I got the quotes from the net and make snide remarks based on those (your) faulty assumptions.

It was **you**, tkkclark, who used the word "laziness" towards me (re not looking into Hartley whom you quoted/relied upon so much) so I simply quoted **your own word that you used towards me back at you** (note that I used quotation marks!) Was this a case of **you** saying I was being 'lazy' a "personal attack" by you on me then?

Also, that you admitted that your "second hand" quotes from Harris was an error on your part is no assumption on mine. 😊 My remarks about gleaning things off the internet was a general one and which was true. That you now say you gleaned your quotation from Harris from a book is not that much different for you quoted Harris previously without first mentioning it was "second hand." Was this omission on your part then "laziness"?

Of course, in this post, as in your previous one, you are just playing the 'oh look how she has maligned me again' card. Go play it with your 5 year old tkkclark, I am not interested. What was interesting though is you publicly showing you not only relied on Hartley 99.9%, repeating his mistakes and making them your own and hence *this* makes you a "Hartley clone" (for instance, by being this you then *had* to disagree with Harner, *had* to agree with Hartley that "God" is not a definite noun in the translation "the Word was God" when it surely is, etc etc etc etc), that you do not know Greek and even showed a lack of comprehension in your own language, English (in your failure to comprehend that "God" in OMG and "Oh God" it still definite and that the personal pronoun "my" makes it so also 😊).

PS. Non-witnesses here often say we Witnesses are "robots" and such like of the WTB&TS.....are these then "personal attacks" on

us? 😊

Last edited by [katierussell](#) : 09-14-2006 at 12:22 PM.



09-15-2006

#158

[katierussell](#)

Member

Join Date: May 2006

Posts: 1,481

16 Reputation Points



Quote:

And since when is it my responsibility to provide supports (or even identify) your position?

It is **you** who have relied on Hartley. I asked something about [Luke 7.39](#) re "sinner" and Hartley's tag for this and his basis for his tag. That you did not do so replying that if I needed to know I should go to that link is no "laziness" on my part, nor am I asking you to fetch like a good little puppy as you insinuate I was asking you as I would a dog! No, but I was only wishing for you to lay the ground for a discussion where I might see where I can show that Hartley's tagging is not to be swallowed hook line and sinker, to use an angling term.

However, be that as it may, I would like to ask you to do the following simple exercise:

Translate theos en ho logos as *literally as possible* where

- 1)theos is *definite*
- 2)theos is *qualitative*
- 3)theos is *indefinite*.

But I will do so first.

- 1)the Word was God("God" here is a definite noun as it is a proper noun)
- 2)the Word was divine("divine" is an adjective and means the Word was of or like God and so was a divine being)
- 3)the Word was a god.("god" is a common noun and shows that the Word was a member of the class "god.")

Do you disagree with any of these? If so why?



09-15-2006

#159

[Trinity-child](#)

Member



Join Date: Mar 2006



Quote:

Originally Posted by [newWitness](#)  
Did the God of the OT(Jehovah) say to worship him? YES!!!!

Did the God of the OT(Jehovah) say all the angels were to worship The Son?

Posts: 884  
20 Reputation Points

YES!!!!

Quote:

Originally Posted by **newWitness**  
*Did Jesus say he(Jesus) was to be worshipped? NO, not once!!!!*

Did Jesus ever rebuke those who did worship Him? NO, not once!!!!



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

### Quick Reply

Message:

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: 22,355,396, Page Views Today: 22,355,396

-- 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