



Discussion Forums

You are responsible for knowing and following the rules.

MAIN | RELIGIONS | CHURCHES | HETERODOX | THEOLOGY | SECULAR | ISSUES | MINISTRY | LIFE STYLE | YOUTH | OTHER | DEBATES | ADMIN | PRIVATE | EVANGELICAL | WWW.CARM.ORG | REGISTER | RULES | PURPOSE | ABREV | RADIO | PODCASTS | MUSIC | CHAT | STORE | SUPER | FORUM'S AUTHORITY STRUCTURE

CARM.ORG - Christian Discussion Forums > RELIGIONS > Jehovah's Witnesses
Titus 2:13

Welcome, tkkclark.
You last visited: 10 Hours Ago at 11:46 PM
Instant Messages: Unread 0, Total 20.

User CP FAQ Donate Members List Calendar Arcade New Posts Search Quick Links Log Out



Page 12 of 12 << First < 2 8 9 10 11 12

View First Unread Thread Tools Search this Thread Rate Thread Display Modes

5 Minutes Ago

#221

tkkclark

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006
Posts: 327
20 Reputation Points

Part 1

Quote:

Originally Posted by John Milton
BDAG 405-406 2 "Some writings in our lit. use the word Q. w. ref. to Christ (without necessarily equating Christ with the Father and therefore in harmony with the Shema of Israel Dt. 6:4... (Post #201)

Misrepresenting BDAG, are we?

Well, OldSheperd on TheologyWeb answered your assertions re BDAG supporting the JW position for *theos* quite thoroughly so I'll just quote him:

...In Fred's quote, Danker refers us to [John 10:34](#), [Exodus 7:1](#), and [Psalm 81:6](#)(LXX), without any explanation of the relevance of these texts. We may or may not infer what Fred would like us to - that QEOS in [Jn 1:1](#) is used in the same sense as in these verses; but even if we do, none of these verses is the same grammatical construction as [Jn 1:1c](#), nor are their contexts remotely similar.

Having said that, I don't think Fred views the entry correctly. For example, Danker includes [Hebrews 1:8](#) in both section 2 (QEOS used in reference to Christ) and in section 3 ("God in Israelite/Christian monotheistic perspective"). So, even taking Fred's argument at face value, Danker says Christ is called "a god" in a representational sense in [Jn 1:1](#), but says He is called "God" in the sense of the true God of Jewish/Christian monotheism in [Heb 1:8](#).

Perhaps Danker is simply inconsistent. Or perhaps he doesn't actually believe [Jn 1:1](#) should be rendered 'a god.' Or perhaps he wishes to split the difference, and leave both neo-Arian and Trinitarian solutions on the table. Either way, it appears Fred's argument from authority falls well short of the mark.

BDAG 405-406 2 "Some writings in our lit. use the word Q. w. ref. to Christ (without necessarily equating Christ with the Father and therefore in harmony with the Shema of Israel Dt. 6:4; cp [Mk 10:18](#) and 4a below), though the

interpretation of some of the pass. is in debate. In Mosaic and Gr-Rom traditions the fundamental semantic component in the understanding of deity is the factor of performance, namely saviorhood or extraordinary contributions to one's society. Dg. 10:6 defines the ancient perspective: hOS hA PARA TOU QEOU LABWN EXEI TAUTA TOIS EPIDEOMENOIS XORHGWN QEOS GINETAI TWN LAMBANANTWN one who ministers to the needy what one has received from God proves to be a god to the recipients (cp. Sb III, 6263, 27 of a mother). (...) In any event Q. certainly refers to Christ, as one who manifests primary characteristics of deity, in the foll. NT pass.: J 1:1b (w. hO QEOS 1:a, which refers to God in the monotheistic context of Israel's tradition. [color=red] On the problem raised by such attribution s. J

Dear Fred:

Above is your rendition of the BDAG quote with the use of standard B-Greek transliteration.

Now let me begin by saying that this Lexicon was originally known and referred to as the "BAG", which initials stood for Bauer, Arndt, and Gingrich". With the 2nd Edition, Fredrick Danker was added as an editor, and so the Initials changed to "BAGD", which held for several years. The Editor of this relatively new 3rd Edition is Danker himself, and so the choice has been made to move the initial "D" to 2nd place. Evidently they did not want to usurp Bauer's recognition as the original Author, thus it is now called the BDAG.

The issue you've raised with the above quote is whether the BDAG has presented evidence and/or opinion favorable to JW Theology. It is obvious that you think BDAG has, and so now you're citing it as such. Therefore my goal will be to answer three questions; first, does Danker's additional material change anything that had been indicated in the 2nd Edition (BAGD), and second, does the point (with and without the added material) intend to favor one side over the other. And third, I will point to other additions in the same BDAG that would lend support to the Orthodox Theology in the same way you have done.

The first statement in the quote above has the 2nd Edition BAGD saying "Some writings in our lit. use the word Q. w. ref. to Christ (without necessarily equating Christ with the Father)...at this point in the parenthesis BDAG (Danker) adds the following information within that parenthesis... "and therefore in harmony with the Shema of Israel Dt. 6:4; cp [Mk 10:18](#)and 4a below)".

So let's consider the first question, "does Danker's additional material change anything that had been indicated in the 2nd Edition BAGD?" No it does not. Danker merely adds clarification. First note the statement "without necessarily equating Christ with the Father.." Well, that is exactly what the Orthodox view has always said, we don't "equate" Christ with the Father in reference to identity, but Danker's additional info simply clarifies what the traditional Jewish conception of who "God" was, as the Jews understood the Shema". To them "God" (meaning what JW's mean with "Jehovah"... Almighty God...etc) was only the Father. Danker means to clarify what the 2nd Edition meant by bringing in the Jewish understanding of the Shema

and Jesus' meaning of "good" in his response to the one who called him "good master". At this point BDAG returns to the BAGD quote and continues with, "though the interpretation of some of the pass. is in debate." Danker then adds that the people in both the Jewish and Roman traditions applied the designation "theos" to someone they thought was just a minister from God, and he will in a moment supply actual and specific references in support, something BAGD did not do.

However, since Danker has only clarified BAGD's statement by bringing in the Jewish conception of the Shema and Jesus' meaning of applying "good" to him in [Mark 10:18](#), as well as providing specific references in other literature to support BAGD's original statement, nothing Danker adds changes anything as far as making a judgment about the true identity of the Logos. What both editions are saying is that back then it was not unheard of for people to regard another person as "a god" rather than their conception of the Shema...God Almighty. Well for goodness sakes, Fred, that's no biggie...we've always disagreed on that particular point. Jews back then and orthodox Jews today, and others such as JWs still take the applications of "theos" to Jesus along such lines. This is not a brand new revelation! And neither the BAGD nor Danker (BDAG) is making a judgment at this point. Both editions demonstrate that they are not intending to make a judgment (on the ultimate issue) by including the words "Though the interpretation of some of the passages is in debate." On the other hand, BDAG by including specific references actually helps to demonstrate a point to some detractors in regard to the interpretation of [John 1:1](#).

What is it? Some detractors have attempted to confute the Trinitarians by insisting that "ton theon" in [John 1:1b](#) be taken to mean "three Persons" by Trinitarians, and then they attempt a "gotcha" by saying "See, now you end up with four Personages instead of the three you're arguing for." Trinitarians have responded in at least one of two ways to this point, either "ton theon" can be taken as a reference to the Father and the HS, since neither "became flesh", or "ton theon" may be John's method of introducing the Logos, by bringing in the standard Jewish Shema conception of God as the object of comparison, and BDAG's clarification of this point supports the Trinitarian explanation perfectly!

That is the position I myself hold, that "ton theon" in [John 1:1b](#) points only to the Father, not because John himself believed only that at the time of writing, but because he understood the traditional Jewish conception and was simply using it as the standard of comparison...meaning, "now this information about the Logos must be factored into the traditional conception of God, and this will require an up-dated understanding of monotheism" i.e. the progressive revelation that I'm including here. Orthodox Jews today still refuse to take what Orthodox Christians see as John's intended update to their monotheism, in fact they refuse to accept any additional revelation beyond their OT Scriptures, and deny that the NT writers were inspired at all.

Other detractors, however, who claim to be Christian obviously cannot reject the inspiration of the NT Writers, and so they must explain John's additional information in some way that would allow them to retain the traditional Jewish conception of Almighty God as only the Father, and find some other explanation for the Logos. But

their situation is complicated by the NT's bringing the Son into the picture. What to do with him has always perplexed people. Some have incorporated the information about him into the traditional "One Person" monotheism and with other harmonized material made the necessary update, and so have eventually concluded that the "ONE GOD" is actually three Persons (Orthodox). Others have concluded only two Persons, Father and Son (either binitarian, or with even some, the Jesus only view). And still others have attempted to account for the extra information without updating their conception of monotheism (JWs and other detractors, as already mentioned). So we can move on in your quote of the BDAG knowing that so far neither the 2nd Edition BAGD nor 3rd BDAG is opining on the ultimate issue, although Danker has clarified and provided specific support to the point made in the 2nd Edition BAGD. Neither side gains so far.

cont...



1 Minute Ago

#222

tkkclark

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006

Posts: 327

20 Reputation Points

Part 2

snip [cutting out quite a bit re [Romans 9:5](#)]

Now at this point the BDAG returns again to the quote from the 2nd Edition with, "In [2 Pt 1:1](#); 1J 5:20 the interpretation is open to question...and now BDAG (Danker) adds something curious, something that was not in the 2nd Ed. BAGD quote: He adds in parenthesis,

"(but cp. Ismyrna McCabe .0010, 100 ho theos kai swtnr Antioxos)"

So what does this addition mean? It means that taking both nouns of [Titus 2:13](#) in Granville Sharp fashion (TSKS construction...see Wallace, pages 270-277) as a reference to Jesus Christ is indeed possible, even in the secular literature of the Koine period. The reason this is curious, though, is because he adds a note of caution in the entry for swtnr (page 985), saying that the kai in [Titus 2:13](#) may suggest a different semantic aspect from what NRSV has in their text, to what they have in the margin. Well, NRSV has "our Great God and Savior, Jesus Christ" in the text, and in the margin, "or of the Great God and our Savior, Jesus Christ.". Interestingly Danker's own reference above would seem to contradict his caution, since it also has kai. Both are valid examples of the TSKS construction, and Sharp himself stated that when the copulative "kai" connects two nouns of the same case, if the article "ho", or any of its cases, appears before the first noun, and not repeated before the second noun, both refer to the same person (Wallace, 271).

I would say that given BDAG's reference above which also contains the copulative kai, that we'd have to consider the NRSV's actual text version as correct in both [Titus 2:13](#) and [2nd Pet. 1:1](#), and Danker's example above supports that conclusion and undermines the stated basis ("kai") for his own caution on page 985. At any rate, the McCabe reference was actually cited by Danker himself, and translates "The God and Savior, Antiochus"....thus..."our Great God

and Savior, Jesus Christ"

Then BDAG again returns to the 2nd Ed. BAGD quote with, "On the other hand)BAGD)...BDAG reads "In any event, TH. certainly refers to Christ (BDAG adds, "as one who manifests primary characteristics of deity")...then both proceed... "in the foll. NT pass.: J 1:1b (w. ho theos 1:1a, which refers to God)...here both BDAG and BAGD have a mistake, J 1:1a does not contain the noun "theos" at all, so both must mean 1:1b which is the ref. But Danker, true to form so far, adds: "in the monotheistic context of Israel's tradition". Again, BDAG (Danker) seems more apt to clarify the reference to "theos" in 1:1b as a reference to the Father, and I would applaud that clarification. I'm sure detractors will not like Danker's clarification since it comes against their insistence that Trinitarians take "ton theon" in 1:1b as a reference to three Persons, thus making four altogether when the Logos is added. No, Danker agrees that John may have had the Jewish Shema tradition in mind in [John 1:1b](#) with "ton theon"...and therefore there would be no need to end up with 4 Persons. Also, we would expect no less from an equal member of the Godhead, if one were to condescend to become one of us and be our "Kinsman Redeemer", that such a one would indeed at least manifest himself as one who ministers to the needy what one has received from God. In fact he did much more than that, he even acknowledged that while still a man on earth he deserved to be honored and valued just as we would honor and value God the Father ([John 5:22-23](#)), recall John's having just said that by calling God his own Father, he was making himself equal with God ([Jn 5:18](#)).

So Danker's clarifications actually aid the Orthodox explanation of [John 1:1](#)! BDAG then adds "on the problem raised by such attribution s. J 10:34 {cp. [Ex 7:1](#); [Ps 81:6](#)}: s. beg of this entry. As said above, I applaud his clarification of "ton theon" in [John 1:1b](#), and welcome the comparison because a low Christological view will not make muster when making the comparison. But if you thought BDAG was intending to support the JW theology, how would you explain not only the further references where "theos" was clearly applied to Jesus in the NT, but also the reference to Ignatius' calling Christ "theos" in many passages. Reads like this: "But above all Ignatius calls Christ theos in many pass."

Yet I have no idea what Danker's theology is, and I'm not in any way disagreeing with Sola's discovery that he is far from Orthodox in his personal views. I'm merely saying that his decision to emphasize these passages when interpreting [John 1:1](#) is fine with me, as it should be with all. Yet if Danker saw no need to harmonize the Scripture, perhaps Sola should have asked him what he was trying to do by citing these passages when considering [John 1:1](#). It sure looks like he's advocating some kind of harmonization, doesn't it? Yet such harmonization would not be detrimental at all to the Orthodox view, therefore it cannot be taken as suggestive that he intends to favor one view over another. On the other hand, perhaps Danker was trying to be fair by acknowledging both sides of the argument, and I have no problem with that at all...for I remind you again where he above also added a koine' reference that supports the Orthodox interpretation of [Titus 2:13](#) and [2nd Pet. 2:1](#) in agreement with Granville Sharp's rule, Jesus is our Great God and Savior. Makes sense to me, like in [Jude 4](#) where Jesus is said to be our "only Owner and Lord", even in the NWT, and with Greg Stafford's blessing, no friends of the Trinity are they. Passages like these have tended to

cause the detractors fits, and why should that surprise anyone?

This is the point where you broke off the quote from BDAG, Fred, but in addition to BDAG's adding the reference above that supports the Orthodox understanding of passages like [Titus 2:13](#) and [2nd Peter 1:1](#) (Our great God and Savior, Jesus Christ), despite his inconsistent caution, note that Danker continues with the following clear references to the title "theos" being applied to the Son, both with and without the article.

18b. ho kurios mou kai ho theos mou..my Lord and my God! (nom. w. art.=voc; s. beg. of this entry.–On a resurrection as proof of divinity cp. Diog. L. 8, 41, who quotes Hermippus: Pythagoras returns from a journey to Hades and appears among his followers {eiserchesthai eis tnv ekklnsian}, and they consider him theion tina) J 20:28 (on the combination of kurios and theos s. 3c below.) [Tit 2:13](#)(megas th.). Hb 1:8, 9 (in a quot. fr [Ps 44:7, 8](#)). S. Tglasson, NTS 12, '66, 270-272. [Jd 5P72](#). But above all Ignatius call Christ theos in many pass. theos Insous Christos 1Tr 7:1; Christos theos 1Sm 10:1. ho theos hemwn Ieph ins: 15:3; 18:2; Iro ins (twice); Ieph 1:1. hen sarki yenomenos theos 7:2. theos anthrwpinws Phaneroumenos 19:3. Theos ho houtws humas sophisas Ism 1:1.–Hdb.exc 193f; Mrackl, DieChristologie d.hl. Ign. v. Ant. 1914. ho theos mou christe' Insou AcPl Ha 3, 10; Christos Insous ho theos 6, 24; cp In 34 (also cp. Just., A I, 63, 15, D. 63, 5 al.; Tat. 13, 3; Ath. 24, 1; Mel., P. 4, 28 al.). –Slosch, Deitas Jesu u. antike Apotheose '33. Cp. Awlosk, Romischer Kaiserkult '78."

Now, in view of BDAG's further additions that naturally support the Orthodox position, both with the TSKS construction ([Titus 2:13](#) and [2nd Peter 1:1](#)), as well citing other passages where Jesus is clearly called "theos" even in the definite sense ([John 20:28](#)), I think it reads too much into Danker's additions to assume that these additions intend to favor one position over the other. As I said, I don't know Danker's personal theology, but I see no need to take these additions as in any way damaging to the Orthodox view, or even favorable to the WT's theology, and if you do wish to continue making such a claim, you'll need to explain the other additions as well, additions that obviously would not be helpful to your view.

<http://www.theologyweb.com/campus/sh...1&postcount=41>(Bold emphasis mine.)

As OldShepherd painstakingly shows, BDAG does not support your position of *theos* as "a god," quite contrary to your post #201 here.

How's that for a valid point, John?



Post Reply



Page 12 of 12 << First < 2 8 9 10 11 12 >

<< [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 09:58 AM.
 As of July 6, 2006, Total Page Views: 23,905,657, Page Views Today: 23,905,657

-- Default Style

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