



2 Weeks Ago

#21

**flunky**

Junior Member

Join Date: Jan 2006  
Posts: 208  
20 Reputation Points

**The Lord of me and the God of me.**

Quote:

Originally Posted by **jonniel**  
*How is it I am not comparing similar Greek sentence constructs? [John 20:28](#) has article-noun-kai-article-noun, so that both substantives have the article. Now, if when we have article-noun-kai-noun and this in itself must mean one person is in view then what of construction where both substantives have the article? -Must\_ mean two subjects? No, as you have shown it is not the case always. Others considerations come into play(personal possessive pronoun at [John 20:28](#) for instance). What I am pointing out(and in fact how you argued you ought to agree with me) is that the Greek is AMBIGUOUS(excuse caps) and one can not make the construction itself determine whether one or two subjects are in view. This is the reason why simliar constructs are translated dis-similarly.*

The point of the Granville Sharp rule is to show that article-noun-kai-noun is not ambiguous (when all its criteria are met), and that the nouns refer to one subject.

[John 20:28](#) is irrelevant to the discussion. Thomas says "the Lord of me and the God of me" aka "My Lord and my God". Is there an equivalent of the "Granville Sharp" rule for this situation, which says "art-noun-kai-article-noun" always has two subjects in mind? I don't know of one, but I am not a Greek expert.

If I was talking to my Christian friend, and I said "Hello my friend and my brother", we would not think there were 2 individuals. If I said in Greek "Hello, the friend of me and the brother of me", we would still not think there were two individuals.

Context. context. context. Thomas is looking at Jesus and saying "My Lord and my God." How can anyone suppose Thomas is talking to two people?

By the way, the entire Gospel of John start with the presupposition that Jesus is God ([Jn 1:1-3, 14](#)), consistently shows that Jesus is God, and arrives at the culminating statement of Thomas: My Lord and My God. Lovely.

flunky.



2 Weeks Ago

#22

**jonniel**

Member

Join Date: Mar 2007  
Location: USA  
Gender: ♀  
Posts: 445  
13 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by **flunky**

*The point of the Granville Sharp rule is to show that article-noun-kai-noun is not ambiguous (when all its criteria are met), and that the nouns refer to one subject.*

*[John 20:28](#) is irrelevant to the discussion. Thomas says &quot;the Lord of me and the God of me&quot; aka &quot;My Lord and my God&quot;. Is there an equivalent of the &quot;Granville Sharp&quot; rule for this situation, which says &quot;art-noun-kai-article-noun&quot; always has two subjects in mind? I don't know of one, but I am not a Greek expert.*

*If I was talking to my Christian friend, and I said &quot;Hello my friend and my brother&quot;, we would not think there were 2 individuals. If I said in Greek &quot;Hello, the friend of me and the brother of me&quot;, we would still not think there were two individuals.*

*Context. context. context. Thomas is looking at Jesus and saying &quot;My Lord and my God.&quot; How can anyone suppose Thomas is talking to two people?*

*By the way, the entire Gospel of John start with the presupposition that Jesus is God ([Jn 1:1-3, 14](#)), consistently shows that Jesus is God, and arrives at the culminating statement of Thomas: My Lord and My God. Lovely.*

*flunky.*

The fact is the Greek is ambiguous. This is the reason why alternative translations are given in the footnotes in various English translations at [Titus 2:13](#) in spite of this Sharp's Rule. There are various considerations when determining whether one or two subjects are in view in this construct. For instance hO THEOS can be said to be a proper name in te NT, "God" and so Sharp's Rule would not apply at [Titus 2:13](#)! My point with [John 20:28](#) though is that if the article was not needed before the second substantive when one person is in veiw, as Sharp's Rule says, then why did John employ it? But John did and only one person is in view.

A trinitarian here said Jesus' disciples were 'false' light of the world(Mt.5:14) like the same way false teeth are false! Msg me to find out who or see "False" thread, 1st post.



2 Weeks Ago

#23

**flunky**

Junior Member

Join Date: Jan 2006  
Posts: 208  
20 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by **jonniel**

*My point with [John 20:28](#) though is that if the article was not needed before the second substantive when one person is in veiw....*

The article is not needed before the second substantive when one person is in view. A true fact (according to Ye Olde G-S rule).

Quote:

[Empty quote box]

Originally Posted by **jonniel** 

*as Sharp's Rule says, then why did John employ it? But John did and only one person is in view.*

Ye Olde G-S rule does not say you are REQUIRED to leave it out when referring to one subject. It only addresses the situation of when the 2nd article is not there.

Again, I am not a Greek expert (although I am studying it), but I understand that the article can be included for emphasis. So [John 20:28](#) might have two articles for:

1. it is normal Greek, -or-
2. emphasis -or-
3. some other reason that I don't understand yet.

We could always ask on the BGreek forum! 😊

flunky.



2 Weeks Ago

#24

**jonniel**

Member

Join Date: Mar 2007

Location: USA

Gender: ♀

Posts: 445

13 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by **flunky** 

*The article is not needed before the second substantive when one person is in view. A true fact (according to Ye Olde G-S rule).*

Well, thats my point. John at [John 20.28](#) did use it. Perhaps then John knew nothing of Ye Olde GS Rule? 😊

Quote:

Ye Olde G-S rule does not say you are REQUIRED to leave it out when referring to one subject. It only addresses the situation of when the 2nd article is not there.

If it not required then why did John use it? Perahps then there are \_several\_ reasons why the article is not employed? And as I said, it can be arued that hO QEOS is in the NT used as a proper name, "God" and so then this would mean that Sahrp's own criteria does not apply at [Titus 2:13](#).

Quote:

Again, I am not a Greek expert (although I am studying it), but I understand that the article can be included for emphasis. So [John 20:28](#) might have two articles for:1. it is normal Greek, -or-. emphasis -or-. some other reason that I don't understand yet. We could always ask on the BGreek forum! flunky.

Good idea! That is ask on the B-greek thingy. Would you do that for us and see what entails?

A trinitarian here said Jesus' disciples were 'false' light of the world(Mt.5:14) like the same way false teeth are false! Msg me to find out who or see "False" thread, 1st post.



2 Weeks Ago

#25

**debbie**

Junior Member

Join Date: Jan 2006  
Location: Nevada  
Gender: ♀  
Posts: 64  
19 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Bonnie**

*"But only Jesus is coming back again, not the Father."*

It's amazing how just a little context goes such a long way. 😊

[Hebrews 9:28](#)  
So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for Him shall He appear the second time without sin unto salvation.

*"Holy, Holy, Holy is The Lord God, The Almighty, Who Was And Who Is And Who Is To Come."*

*"Yes, I am coming quickly." Amen. Come, Lord Jesus.*

Quote



2 Weeks Ago

#26

**humdaddy**

Junior Member



Join Date: Apr 2007  
Posts: 104  
16 Reputation Points

You can also refer to the scripture where Jesus is speaking before a crowd in the temple that included the Pharisees, he said to them: "Before Abraham was, I AM! Moses asked Jehovah God what his name was and he said "I am that I am." Jesus was telling them that HE WAS GOD! [John 8:58](#) reads: **I** tell you the truth," Jesus answered, "before Abraham was born, **I am!**"

*Humdaddy* 🇺🇸

Quote



2 Weeks Ago

#27

**humdaddy**

Junior Member



Join Date: Apr 2007  
Posts: 104  
16 Reputation Points

I didn't think I would get a rebuttal on this. The fact is clear. Jesus is/was God. God the father, God the son, God the Holy Spirit

*Humdaddy* 🇺🇸

Quote



2 Weeks Ago

#28

**Bonnie**

CARM Super Member



Join Date: Jan 2006  
Posts: 6,438

Hi humdaddy. Any relation to humdinger? 😊

*"Man stands in his own shadow, and wonders why it is dark."*

236 Reputation Points



2 Weeks Ago

#29

## Agon

CARM Super Member



Join Date: Mar 2007  
Location: Medford, Oregon  
Gender: ♂  
Posts: 521  
50 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Bonnie**   
*Hi humdaddy. Any relation to humdinger? 😊*

I know a guy named hommerding, but this is off topic. 😊

But the goal of our instruction is love from a pure heart and a good conscience and a sincere faith.

~1 Timothy 1:5

Light of the world you stepped down into darkness. Amazing love, how can it be? That you my King would die for me.



2 Weeks Ago

#30

## tkkclark

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006  
Posts: 275  
18 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **jonniel**   
*Well, thats my point. John at [John 20.28](#) did use it. Perhaps then John knew nothing of Ye Olde GS Rule? 😊 If it not required then why did John use it? Perahps then there are several reasons why the article is not employed? And as I said, it can be arued that hO QEOS is in the NT used as a proper name, "God" and so then this would mean that Sahrp's own criteria does not apply at [Titus 2:13](#). Good idea! That is ask on the B-greek thingy. Would you do that for us and see what entails?*

[John 20:28](#) does not apply because only one subject (said unto HIM) is specifically indicated in Thomas' address. Said unto HIM. Not said unto THEM.

The fact that [John 20:28](#) doesn't even meet the criteria of G-S (i.e. use of the 2nd article) removes it from the field of comparison. You're comparing one verse with **2** articles to another verse with **1** article. And somehow - mysteriously - you think this proves a point. It doesn't. Other than, perhaps, a fundamental misunderstanding of what the G-S Rule is and under what parameters G-S applies.

Yammering on about how the NAB translated [Titus 2:13](#) doesn't prove anything, either. Just proves you cherrypick translations to suit your purposes. I will give you credit, though. At least you found a contemporary translation, one in use today. Not a translation from, I dunno, a German no one's ever heard of who died 300 yrs ago or something.

In re [Titus 2:13](#), quoting myself, LOL:

Quote:

The grammar of [Titus 2:13](#)'s the great God and Savior Jesus Christ (NASB) and [2 Peter 1:1](#)'s our God and Savior, Jesus Christ (NASB) adhere

to the parameters of Sharp's rule and as such, both God and Savior refer to one person, Jesus Christ, thereby calling Jesus ho theos, THE God, Almighty God.

Sharp's rule is defined by Mr. Bowman as follows:

Quote:

In Greek, when two nouns of the same case are connected by kai ("and"), and the definite article appears before the first noun but not before the second, both nouns refer to the same person if the nouns are (1) personal, (2) singular, and (3) non-proper nouns, and if the nouns are (d) not normally paired semantically as denoting two persons.[39]

According to Mr. Bowman, "It describes how the NT and other Greek writers of the period wrote, and appears to do so with high consistency, but it does not prohibit Greek writers from having used the article-noun-kai-noun construction with the specified kind of nouns to refer to two referents, if they wished. What Sharp's rule shows is that Greek readers would be expected to understand two nouns in such a construction to refer to the same person unless the author clearly indicated the contrary..."[40] And further, "In all, some 80 NT texts may be cited as fitting the rule, and none that do not..."[41]

Sharp's rule, therefore, proves that God and Savior in [Titus 2:13](#) and [2 Peter 1:1](#) both refer to Jesus, calling him God.

Context also indicates that God and Savior refers to one person, Jesus.

In [Titus 2:13](#), the noun *epiphaneia* (appearing, KJV) "...is used by Paul six times (five times in the Pastorals), always with reference to Christ ([2 Thess. 2:8](#); [1 Tim. 6:14](#); [2 Tim. 1:10, 4:1, 8](#); [Titus 2:13](#)), unless one counts [Titus 2:13](#) as the sole exception."[42] Significantly, *sôtêr* (savior) refers to Yahweh in the Greek translation of the Old Testament, the Septuagint, 18 out of 22 times and "in all but one of these texts the noun *sôtêr* is directly linked with the noun *theos*...14 out of the 18 texts referring to God as Savior are in Psalms and Isaiah, the two books that are most heavily cited in the New Testament as prophetic of the redemptive ministry of Jesus Christ."[43] Furthermore,"

Quote:

Because the two terms *theos* and *sôtêr* were so commonly linked in biblical usage, as well as in the general culture, readers encountering the terms linked grammatically in a way easily taken as referring to a single subject would naturally be expected to construe the terms in that way...**Sharp's rule, combined with the natural linkage of the two titles, establishes a strong presumption in favor of the two titles applying to the same person.**[44] (Emphasis mine.)

The contextual evidence supporting God and Savior both referring to Jesus are equally strong in [2 Peter 1:1](#):

Quote:

That Jesus is being called "God" in [2 Peter 1:1](#) is confirmed by four parallel expressions applied to Jesus in 2 Peter: "Our Lord and Savior" in three texts (1:11; 2:20; 3:18), and "the Lord and

Savior" once (3:2)... "God" and "Lord" were both divine titles in Greek (and indeed Hebrew and Aramaic as well), so that their use in the expression "our Lord/God and Savior" is precisely parallel." [45]

What of WTS objections? I refer the reader to pp. 9-17 of Mr. Bowman's paper for his responses and refutations.

Moreover, commentaries are uniform in supporting both God and Savior referring to Jesus.

Of [Titus 2:13](#):

Quote:

... here is a very illustrious proof of the true and proper deity of Christ. (John Gill) [46]

... There can be little doubt, if any, that by "the great God" here, the apostle referred to the Lord Jesus... this furnishes an important proof of the divinity of Christ. (Albert Barnes) [47]

... the expression "great God," as applied to Christ, is in accordance with the context, which refers to the glory of His appearing; just as "the true God" is predicated of Christ, [1 John 5:20](#)... Believers now look for the manifestation of His glory, inasmuch as they shall share in it. Even the Socinian explanation, making "the great God" to be the Father, "our Saviour," the Son, places God and Christ on an equal relation to "the glory" of the future appearing: a fact incompatible with the notion that Christ is not divine; indeed it would be blasphemy so to couple any mere created being with God. (Jamieson, Fausset, & Brown) [48]

And of [2 Peter 1:1](#):

Quote:

... that is, of Christ Jesus, who is our God and Saviour: so that here is a testimony of the deity of Christ. (John Gill) [49]

...it is an absolute proof that St. Peter calls Jesus Christ God, even in the properest sense of the word, with the article prefixed. (Adam Clarke) [50]

So the one article (tou) with theou and sōtēros requires precisely as with tou kuriou hēmōn kai sōtēros Iēsou Christou (of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ), one person, not two, in 2Pe 1:11 as in 2Pe 2:20; 2Pe 3:3; 2Pe 3:18. So in 1Pe 1:3 we have ho theos kai patēr (the God and Father), one person, not two. The grammar is uniform and inevitable (Robertson, Grammar, p. 786), as even Schmiedel (Winer-Schmiedel, Grammatik, p. 158) admits: "Grammar demands that one person be meant." Moulton (Prol., p. 84) cites papyri examples of like usage of theos for the Roman emperors. See the same idiom in [Tit 2:13](#). (A.T. Robertson) [51]

In [Titus 2:13](#) and [2 Peter 1:1](#), Jesus is called ho theos, THE God.

<http://www.thearmchairscholar.org/id54.html>

The paper referred to in the articles is Bowman's, previously linked in this

thread.

Hippolytus (3rd cent.) quoted [Titus 2:13](#), but I can't seem to lay my hands on it at the moment.

If you really want to present a relevant argument, jonniel, you'd be better served in producing **valid** exceptions to G-S. I mean, verses under which the paramters of G-S actually apply, to which [John 20:28](#) does not. Arguing against context, (i.e. *epiphaneia*, and the OT linkage between *theos* and *sôtêr*) would be helpful as well.

Til then, *adieu*.



2 Weeks Ago

#31

### Bonnie

CARM Super Member



Join Date: Jan 2006  
Posts: 6,438  
236 Reputation Points



Good work and God bless!

"Man stands in his own shadow, and wonders why it is dark."



2 Weeks Ago

#32

### jonniel

Member

Join Date: Mar 2007  
Location: USA  
Gender: ♀  
Posts: 445  
13 Reputation Points



thats easy,as hO QEOS is a proper name in the NT, "God," then this puts it out of the criteria of the GS Rule. The thought I had with [John 20:28](#) was that two articles were used by John and I was not saying then there were two persons in view just that John seems to be ignorant of this 'Rule' for why did he use it if the rule says he need not to have used a 2nd article?

A trinitarian here said Jesus' disciples were 'false' light of the world(Mt.5:14) like the same way false teeth are false! Msg me to find out who or see "False" thread, 1st post.



2 Weeks Ago

#33

### John Milton

Member

Join Date: Dec 2006  
Posts: 1,683  
22 Reputation Points



Hi jonniel

Quote:

thats easy,as hO QEOS is a proper name in the NT, "God," then this puts it out of the criteria of the GS Rule.

That's exactly correct!

King James Version

John 17:3 And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.



2 Weeks Ago

#34

**TJohnson**

Member



Join Date: Mar 2007  
Location: Gardner, KS  
Gender: ♂  
Posts: 324  
28 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **humdaddy**

*I didn't think I would get a rebuttal on this. The fact is clear. Jesus is/was God. God the father, God the son, God the Holy Spirit*

I agree... but [John 8:58](#) has gone around and around in this forum. The Jews claim it is "properly" translated as "I have been". Even if that's so, they still have a hard time telling us why the Jews went to stone him in 8:59.

Believe me Humdaddy, any and all verses through out the NT stating Christ's divinity will cause these Jews to start screaming and talking about proper translations. That's when we get into long drawn out lectures about Greek grammar by individuals that have absolutely no formal knowledge of ancient Greek. The best thing to do is try to catch them in contradictions... that's what I find most effective.

*With open arms He's welcoming me home  
Even though no righteousness I've shown  
I am spared by mercy a child of His grace  
Received into His favor despite my selfish ways*



2 Weeks Ago

#35

**tkkclark**

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006  
Posts: 275  
18 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **jonniel**

*thats easy, as ho QEOS is a proper name in the NT, "God," then this puts it out of the criteria of the GS Rule.*

Oh, I see.

So every time you see *ho theos* in the NT, it's a proper name now?

I doubt you'd agree with that.

So under what criteria do you establish that *ho theos* is being used as a proper name and when it is not? And how do those criteria fit [Titus 2:13](#)?

Would you care to provide any supports for your assertion that *ho theos* in [Titus 2:13](#) is a proper name? Greek scholars, commentaries, ANF support...I'm not picky. Well, okay, actually, I **am** picky when it comes to references, but I'll try not to be in this instance. I know the standard sources I checked in my personal study of this matter said no such thing. Perhaps, there's something I missed. But I rather doubt it.

And would you please respond to the contextual supports Mr. Bowman listed in his paper for *ho theos* referring to Jesus? Those being Paul's use of *epiphaneia*, and the OT linkage between *theos* and *sôtêr* as previously noted.

Quote:

Originally Posted by [jonniel](#)  
*The thought I had with [John 20:28](#) was that two articles were used by John and I was not saying then there were two persons in view just that John seems to be ignorant of this 'Rule' for why did he use it if the rule says he need not to have used a 2nd article?*

You seem to have a fundamental misunderstanding of the G-S rule. Another poster on this thread has pointed this out, but since you seem to have a problem remembering it, I shall repeat. The rule applies only when the 2nd article is absent, but **absence of the 2nd article is not required** to refer to 1 rather than 2 person(s). Proving that 2 articles refers to one person (circa [John 20:28](#)) doesn't refute G-S because, at least as much as I am aware, no one (barring yourself) has proposed 1 and 1 article only is **required** when referring to a single person. It's a strawman argument. You're answering your own fallacious arguments, but have yet to address mine.

Would you care to provide supports for your assertion that the writers of the NT were **required** to have both articles? I.e. again, any **valid** exceptions to the G-S rule, of which I have already asked. And supports for *ho theos* as a proper name. And address the arguments from context also previously noted.

Until you provide supports for your assertions, you're just blowing a lot of hot air.



2 Weeks Ago

#36

[jonniel](#)

Member

Join Date: Mar 2007  
 Location: USA  
 Gender: ♀  
 Posts: 445  
 13 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by [tkkclark](#)  
*Oh, I see.*

*So every time you see *ho theos* in the NT, it's a proper name now?*

*I doubt you'd agree with that.*

*So under what criteria do you establish that *ho theos* is being used as a proper name and when it is not? And how does those criteria fit [Titus 2:13](#)?*

*Would you care to provide any supports for your assertion that *ho theos* in [Titus 2:13](#) is a proper name? Greek scholars, commentaries, ANF support...I'm not picky. Well, okay, actually, I **am** picky when it comes to references, but I'll try not to be in this instance. I know the standard sources I checked in my personal study of this matter said no such thing. Perhaps, there's something I missed. But I rather doubt it.*

*And would you please respond to the contextual supports Mr. Bowman listed in his paper for *ho theos* referring to Jesus? Those being Paul's use of *epiphaneia*, and the OT linkage between *theos* and *sôtêr* as previously noted.*

*You seem to have a fundamental misunderstanding of the G-S rule.*

Another poster on this thread has pointed this out, but since you seem to have a problem remembering it, I shall repeat. The rule applies only when the 2nd article is absent, but **absence of the 2nd article is not required** to refer to 1 rather than 2 person(s). Proving that 2 articles refers to one person (circa [John 20:28](#)) doesn't refute G-S because, at least as much as I am aware, no one (barring yourself) has proposed 1 and 1 article only is **required** when referring to a single person. It's a strawman argument. You're answering your own fallacious arguments, but have yet to address mine.

Would you care to provide supports for your assertion that the writers of the NT were **required** to have both articles? I.e. again, any **valid** exceptions to the G-S rule, of which I have already asked. And supports for ho theos as a proper name. And address the arguments from context also previously noted.

Until you provide supports for your assertions, you're just blowing a lot of hot air.

I just don't have enough time to respond to every thing at the moment but I promise to try soon. However, that hO QEOS functions as a proper name and so this would exclude [Titus 2:13](#) from what is Sharp's Rule is born out by it being a fixed reference to the Father. Ezra Abbott years ago shows this when he rightly stated: "I do not see how any one can read the Epistles of Paul without perceiving that, in speaking of the objects of Christians faith, he constantly uses QEOS as a proper name, as the designation of the Father in distinction from Christ." The expression "great God" would restrict it even more so. See [Psalm 85:10](#). There YHWH alone is the great God. But if, as it does, the OT shows that this God is the God of the Messiah(see [Micah 5:4](#) and see also [Revelation 3:12](#)) and in the NT Paul refers to the Father as the God of Jesus( [Ephesians 1:3, 7](#); [2 Corinthians 1:3](#); 11:31; [Romans 15](#): 5,6.) this creates a distinction between Jesus Christ and this one. So, if the expression "great God" is a reference to YHWH then is it a reference to the Father and the expression can stand in its own in [Titus 2:13](#). What about [2 Thessalonians 1:12](#)? How come the RSV translates as two persons when there is only the article before the first substantive? Does not this fit GS's rule? It does not because Lord Jesus Christ is a compound proper name. But so is Savior Jesus Christ. See Abbott.

A trinitarian here said Jesus' disciples were 'false' light of the world(Mt.5:14) like the same way false teeth are false! Msg me to find out who or see "False" thread, 1st post.



2 Weeks Ago

#37

**John Milton**

Member

Join Date: Dec 2006

Posts: 1,683

22 Reputation Points



Hi jonniel

Quote:

I just don't have enough time to respond to every thing at the moment but I promise to try soon. However, that hO QEOS functions as a proper name and so this would exclude [Titus 2:13](#) from what is Sharp's Rule is born out by it being a fixed reference to the Father.

Paul uses THEOS (not to mention HO THEOS) about 500 times in his epistles and not once does this word signify the son. It s exclusive used of the Father.

"God" in [Titus 2:13](#) is a semantic equivalent to a proper name, as a titular name and therefore Sharp's exception to his rule applies to this verse.

Quote:

Ezra Abbott years ago shows this when he rightly stated: "I do not see how any one can read the Epistles of Paul without perceiving that, in speaking of the objects of Christians faith, he constantly uses QEOS as a proper name, as the designation of the Father in distinction from Christ." The expression "great God" would restrict it even more so. See [Psalm 85:10](#).

Absolutely.

Quote:

It does not because Lord Jesus Christ is a compound proper name. But so is Savior Jesus Christ. See Abbott.

Not only is THEOS the equivalent of a proper name but as you note Saviour Jesus Christ is also a compound proper name. "God" and "Savior" are NOT used in Jewish or Greco-Roman literature in the same way as they are used in [Titus 2:13](#), namely, with an adjectival modifier in the first instance ("the great God") and with a proper name ("Jesus Christ") in the second instance. Nor are these terms used of two distinct individuals in the same body of literature, with different senses for each term (see below) when used of the different referents. This is very significant, for it has a direct bearing on the issue of whether or not these two expressions were understood to denote distinct individuals. This is undoubtedly the case in [Titus 2:13](#) and [2 Peter 1:1](#).

Trinitarians are simply clutching at straws here.

King James Version

**John 17:3 And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.**



2 Weeks Ago

#38

[jonniel](#)

Member

Join Date: Mar 2007

Location: USA

Gender: ♀

Posts: 445

13 Reputation Points



Thanks for this John, what you say clearly delineates who Paul meant when he spoke of the "great God" at [Titus 2:13](#), the Father. And when you end by your:

Quote:

Trinitarians are simply clutching at straws here.

You are right, and this includes the Trinitarian Granville Sharp too! So of Sharp's Rule? Firstly, trinitarian Sharp was trying to find a rule to show that Jesus Christ was "God." That was his aim. Also, he only looked at the Greek New Testament. One would be ill advised to obtain a 'rule' from such a small corpus of Greek. These two observations should make one careful about accepting this 'rule.' But did Sharp find anything or see something? Yes, he did. But not something that would show that the "great God" and "Savior Jesus Christ" are necessarily the same person. What he saw can be described as "a combined enumeration." This is "an enumeration of two or more persons or things, joined by a connective particle [such as kai, "and"] and where the Article [ho, "the"] before the first only

intimates a connection between the whole, forming one object of thought."(Handbook To the Grammar of the Greek Testament section 232, by Rev. Samuel G. Green). We can find many examples of this in the Greek N.T.(I have highlighted with \*\* the Greek article and the connective particle in each in red for are readers.)[Ephesians 2:20](#): "EPI TW QEMELIW \*\*TWN\*\* APOSTOWN \*\*KAI\*\* PROPHHTWN," "upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets. Here, the "apostles" are not the same subjects as the "prophets" but as Green says there is a connection between them, one which is "one object of thought." We see this at [Colossians 2:12](#): "\*\*TA\*\* ENTALMATA \*\*KAI\*\* DIDASKALIAS TWN ANQRWPWN," "the commandments and teachings of men." The "commandments" and "teachings" of men where not being here identified as one and the same but "together constituting one system"(Green). [Matthew 17:1](#) : "\*\*TON\*\* PETRON \*\*KAI\*\* IAKWBON \*\*KAI\*\* IWANNHM," "Peter and James and John." The three were not the same person but an inseparable group. This nicely leads us to [Titus 2:13](#). Paul was not there necessarily identifying the "great God" with "Savior Jesus Christ" as one and the same but they were an inseparable two subjects in "the blessed hope and manifestation" Paul mentions here. Green's last example is in fact [Titus 2:13](#) where he writes after giving the Greek and Ellicott's translation: "Here are two cases of enumeration, each with a single article: (1) the "manifestation" is but another expression for the "hope;" and (2) the latter phrase may imply, on the above stated principle, either that God(the Father) and Jesus Christ the Saviour are so inseparably conjoined that the glory of each is the same(R[evised] V[ersion][1881] marg[in]) or else, as the R.V. has it....that God in this passage is, like Saviour, an epithet of Christ...."Did you see the two options given by Green there? So, 'Sharp's Rule' is nothing more than the above stated principle(not a rule!)and in connection with [Titus 2:13](#) the Greek is in fact amibiguous and may mean either of the two choices Green gives so that one could legitimately translate and make the "great God" and the "Savior Jesus Christ" two seperate subject or one. Yes, the grammar here does not decide it. Any appeal to Sharp's rule as decisive then is invalid.

A trinitarian here said Jesus' disciples were 'false' light of the world(Mt.5:14) like the same way false teeth are false! Msg me to find out who or see "False" thread, 1st post.



2 Weeks Ago

#39

[tkkclark](#)

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006

Posts: 275

18 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by [jonniel](#)  
*I just don't have enough time to respond to every thing at the moment but I promise to try soon. However, that hO QEOS functions as a proper name and so this would exclude [Titus 2:13](#) from what is Sharp's Rule is born out by it being a fixed reference to the Father. Ezra Abbott years ago shows this when he rightly stated: "I do not see how any one can read the Epistles of Paul without perceiving that, in speaking of the objects of Christians faith, he constantly uses QEOS as a proper name, as the designation of the Father in distinction from Christ."*


Oh yes. Ezra Abbott. I vaguely recall mention of him, perhaps in a NWT appendix? I also remember his work was dated to no later than the 1880s.

How many mss do you think have been discovered since the 1880s? 1000s. I couldn't begin to ballpark a figure, but literally 1000s. Do you not agree that the discovery of these mss has significantly added to our knowledge of NT Greek?

**One** outdated source doesn't impress me in comparison with many, many contemporary sources that support G-S and reflect the latest scholarship of mss discoveries.

In regards to time being a factor in responding...The only reason I've been on here is I'm taking a necessary breather from my normal routine. Take your time replying. My schedule is so hideously bad, who knows when or if I'll find time to respond further myself.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **jonniel**   
*The expression "great God" would restrict it even more so. See [Psalm 85:10](#). There YHWH alone is the great God.*

**Psalm 85:10** *Lovingkindness and truth have met together; Righteousness and peace have kissed each other. (NASB)*


Is this the correct Scripture reference? It does not say what you assert.

And in regards to a title belonging to God alone:

**Isaiah 43:11** *I, even I, am the LORD, And there is no savior besides Me. (NASB)*

Funnily enough, Jesus is referred to as Savior in [Titus 2:13](#) and [2 Peter 1:1](#). So your insistence that Great God applies to the Father alone on the basis that he is referred to as the Great God alone in the OT (lacking the proper Scriptural citation, of course) is bogus. If there is no other savior besides God in the OT and Jesus is legitimately called Savior in the NT...Rather makes my point.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **jonniel**   
*But if, as it does, the OT shows that this God is the God of the Messiah (see [Micah 5:4](#) and see also [Revelation 3:12](#))*

**Micah 5:4** *And He will arise and shepherd {His flock} In the strength of the LORD, In the majesty of the name of the LORD His God. And they will remain, Because at that time He will be great To the ends (141) of the earth. (NASB)*

You do realize Micah is speaking prophetically of the Messiah herein? Glancing through commentaries (Gill, Clarke, Barnes), all indicate the 'great' description belongs to the Messiah. Particularly:

Quote:


For He (the Messiah) will now (עתה, now, referring to the time when He feeds Israel, in contrast with the former oppression) be great (auctoritate et potentia valebit: Maurer) to the ends of the earth, i.e., His authority will extend over the whole earth.(Keil & Delitzsch Commentary on the Old Testament)

**Revelation 3:12** *He who overcomes, I will make him a pillar (184) in the temple of My God, and he will not go out from it anymore; and I will write on him the name of My God, and the name of the city of My God, the new Jerusalem, which comes down out of heaven from My God, and My new name. (NASB)*

For the life of me, I cannot understand why JW's demand the functional


subordination of Jesus must be some monumental stumbling block for orthodox Christians. It isn't. As an obedient man, Yahweh (the Father) was Jesus' God. But that doesn't diminish Jesus any more than my husband having headship over me makes me inferior to him. The fact that Jesus, functionally, has a God does not demand that Jesus cannot also be God ontologically.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **jonniel**   
*...and in the NT Paul refers to the Father as the God of Jesus( [Ephesians 1:3, 7](#); [2 Corinthians 1:3](#); [11:31](#); [Romans 15: 5,6.](#)) this creates a distinction between Jesus Christ and this one.*

It creates a distinction in person, standard orthodox position. There is no demanded distinction in ontology.

Quote:


Originally Posted by **jonniel**   
*So, if the expression "great God" is a reference to YHWH then is it a reference to the Father and the expression can stand in its own in [Titus 2:13](#).*

Let me make sure I have your reasoning correct.

Great God refers to the Father and cannot refer to anyone else because the title belongs only to the Father, therefore Great God does not refer to Jesus.

Circular logic = fallacious logic.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **jonniel**   
*What about [2 Thessalonians 1:12](#)? How come the RSV translates as two persons when there is only the article before the first substantive? Does not this fit GS's rule? It does not because Lord Jesus Christ is a compound proper name. But so is Savior Jesus Christ. See Abbott.*

Bowman's paper addresses this issue and answers it quite readily. See pp. 9-17 as noted in my prior quote.

In the meantime...

**2 thessalonians 1:12** *so that the name of our Lord Jesus will be glorified in you, and you in Him, according to the grace of our God and the Lord Jesus Christ.* (NASB)

RWP notes:

Quote:

Here strict syntax requires, since there is only one article with theou and kuriou that one person be meant, Jesus Christ, as is certainly true in [Tit 2:13](#); [2Pe 1:1](#) (Robertson, Grammar, p.786). This otherwise conclusive syntactical argument, admitted by Schmiedel, is weakened a bit by the fact that **Kurios is often employed as a proper name without the article, a thing not true of sōtēr in [Tit 2:13](#); [2Pe 1:1](#)**. So in [Eph 5:5](#) en tēi basileiāi tou Christou kai theou the natural meaning is in the Kingdom of Christ and God regarded as one, but here again theos, like Kurios, often occurs as a proper name without the article. So it has to be admitted that here Paul may mean "according to the grace of our God and

the Lord Jesus Christ," though he may also mean "according to the grace of our God and Lord, Jesus Christ. (Emphasis mine.)

Robert Hommel's article on [2Peter 1:1](#) is even more relevant:

Quote:

Mr. Stafford suggests that [2 Thessalonians 1:12](#) is similar grammatically to [2 Peter 1:1](#) ("the grace of our God and [the] Lord Jesus Christ." Greek: τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ), but here most scholars agree that God and Jesus are distinguished from one another. Mr. Stafford is correct - just as he is when he says that "Grammar is not the sole criterion by which a text should be translated" (Stafford, p. 403). The difference between this verse and [2 Peter 1:1](#) is that here we have "Lord Jesus Christ," which is a common New Testament formula (occurring 63 times). While Jesus is called "Savior" many times, He is only referred to with the phrase "Savior Jesus Christ" 4 times - all in 2 Peter. The fact that "Lord" appears so often before "Jesus Christ" makes it likely that it had come to be considered part of a compound proper name. But the same cannot be said of "Savior." When Peter writes "Savior Jesus Christ," he is using a title ("Savior") followed by a name which further defines who that Savior is.<sup>3</sup> This is not the case with "Lord Jesus Christ." There may have been a time in the early church where a believer might say: "I serve my Lord, Jesus Christ," and by this, mean to further define "Lord" as the person named "Jesus Christ." But by the time the New Testament was written, the title "Lord" had become synonymous with "Jesus Christ," and when appearing before it, was thought to be virtually part of His name. This same phenomenon occurred with "Christ." No New Testament author would think of separating "Christ" from "Jesus," as in: "Jesus, Christ" (as if "Christ" further defined who Jesus was), and the same is true of "Lord."

The fact that "Lord Jesus Christ" may be taken as a unit makes it unlikely that "Jesus Christ" is appositional to "God and Lord" (as in, "the grace of our God and Lord, who is Jesus Christ"). It is grammatically possible, and some scholars have taken it that way (most notably, Bultmann), but most scholars, grammarians, and commentators agree that it is more natural to take "Lord Jesus Christ" as a unit, in which case "God" is a separate subject. But this is not true of "Savior Jesus Christ." In this case, it is unlikely that Peter would expect his readers to take "Savior" as part of Jesus' name. Instead, because Peter knew that simply saying "our God and Savior" would lead his readers to assume that the Father was in view<sup>4</sup>, he added "Jesus Christ" to make clear to whom he was referring.

It may be supposed that "God" functions as a proper name in [2 Peter 1:1](#), in which case it could be isolated from "Savior, Jesus Christ" as a second subject. However, while "God" may function as a proper name in some contexts, the possessive pronoun in this verse militates against "God" being a proper name. Further, there are no examples in the NT or LXX in which "God" appears in the same construction as [2 Peter 1:1](#) (articular theos joined by kai to an anarthrous singular, personal noun that is not a proper name) where two persons are in view.

([http://www.forananswer.org/2Peter/2Peter1\\_1.htm](http://www.forananswer.org/2Peter/2Peter1_1.htm) )

Does that answer your question?



[jonniel](#)

Member

Join Date: Mar 2007

Location: USA

Gender: ♀

Posts: 445

13 Reputation Points



See John Milton's and my latest posts. However, you write and quote this:

Quote:

According to Mr. Bowman, "It describes how the NT and other Greek writers of the period wrote, and appears to do so with high consistency, but it does not prohibit Greek writers from having used the article-noun-kai-noun construction with the specified kind of nouns to refer to two referents, if they wished. What Sharp's rule shows is that Greek readers would be expected to understand two nouns in such a construction to refer to the same person unless the author clearly indicated the contrary..."[40] And further, "In all, some 80 NT texts may be cited as fitting the rule, and none that do not..."[41]

You write about this by Bowman:

Quote:

Sharp's rule, therefore, proves that God and Savior in [Titus 2:13](#) and [2 Peter 1:1](#) both refer to Jesus, calling him God.

No, Bowman does NOT (excuse caps) state here that the RULE (excuse caps) decides if there are one or two subjects here! Yes, you have not even understood Bowman whom you quote. Bowman does not claim Sharp's Rule is the determining factor but that "it does not prohibit Greek writers from having used the article-noun-kai-noun construction with the specified kind of nouns to refer to two referents." He adds "What Sharp's rule shows is that Greek readers would be expected to understand two nouns in such a construction to refer to the same person unless the author clearly indicated the contrary." Can you see there that something else other than Sharp's 'rule' comes into play? Now, go back to TJ first post in which he started this thread, my reply which I mentioned this Sharp's Rule, his next post where he says he researched Sharp's Rule and see that I simply rejected this rule that try to make [Titus 2;13](#) only refer to one subject. It can not. In fact the rest of your post would be unnecessary if it did and you argued on exegetical, contextual grounds why the "great God" and "Savior Jesus Christ" here are one and the same. What you did not factor in and so completely ignored was that for Paul the QEOS is invariably the Father. In Titus the QEOS occurs 13 times, 12 definitely refer to the father... [Titus 2;13](#) of course is the one in dispute. But let's go to Romans. QEOS occurs 153 times. How often does it refer to the Father out of this 153 times? 152. One in dispute, Rom. 9:5... but some think here it also refers to the Father. Let's go to 1 Cor. QEOS occurs 106 times. It refers to the Father 104 times, twice for others. Not once for the Christ. [2 Cor. 79](#) times, 78 for the father, once for another being, not once for the Christ... and so it goes on. So, do you see now that 1) Sharp's Rule does NOT (excuse the caps) that the Christ is the "great God" here at [Titus 2;13](#) and there are good reasons to think that it refers to the Father based on Paul's own writings where QEOS is clearly restricted to the Father.

A trinitarian here said Jesus' disciples were 'false' light of the world (Mt. 5:14) like the same way false teeth are false! Msg me to find out who or see "False" thread, 1st post.

[Post Reply](#)Page 2 of 8 < 1 **2** 3 4 5 6 > Last »[« 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?



#### 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 06:36 AM.

As of July 6, 2006, Total Page Views: 22,353,110, Page Views Today: 22,353,110

-- 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: