



2 Weeks Ago #41

jonniel
Member

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

Quote:

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 One outdated source doesn't impress me in comparison with many, many contemporary sources that support G-S and reflect the latest scholarship of mss discoveries.

Please tell us all the mss that have been found since Abbott that refutes his observations? I ask because I know that you will not be able to show me any mss that have changed anything about the article noun "and" noun constructions nor the fact that QEOS in the NT is virtually a proper name! Nope, no amount of mss dicoveries since Abbot has changed anything in this matter. I think you ought to realize and acknowledge this. Its a fact.

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 #42

tkkclark
Member

Join Date: Apr 2006
Posts: 275
18 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **jonniel** ▾
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!

I will read over the remainder of this post and if I've time, will respond to both your and John Milton's posts perhaps tomorrow. But I really have to get started

on my preps for next wk, too. End of year ceremony in Awanas, Blue & Gold banquet for Cub scouts, Nominating Committee meeting of which I am chairman my daughter's band concert, and I'm setting up displays for both Cub Scouts and 4-H (I am leaders in both) during a block party on the 12th. Not to mention the little fact that if I don't get to grocery store soon...Buy stock in Dominos. Nobody else will deliver out here. LOL.

Basically, if I don't respond, it's not because I cannot answer your argument but rather that I lack time to compose a coherent reply supported by proper references.

But I did want say one thing, specifically of the quote I grabbed above.

Clutching at straws?

I'm clutching at straws?



Whatever floats your boat, pal.

Perhaps I should switch to my snide and condescending mode rather than keeping the debate courteous and respectful? You seem to relate better to that.



2 Weeks Ago

#43

jonniel

Member

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



Quote:

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.

No, the title savior is applied to others not YHWH so it does not belong to God alone in the OT. See [Judges 3:9](#) for example(same Hebrew word YHWH applies to himself at Is.43:10). [Isaiah 43:10](#) does not mean there are no others that can not be called a savior but that YHWH alone is the source of salvation and he can use others as a means to give that salvation and so they can be called saviors also. [Jude 25](#) shows this is the case with God the Father and Jesus Christ. God the Father there is shown to be the source of salvation, he is "the only God our Savior" but is "our Savior _through_ Jesus Christ our Lord." So, God the Father alone is the source of our salvation just as YHWH was in the OT for Israel. And as others not YHWH can be called saviors in the OT because although they are not the source of salvation but the means by which YHWH accomplished salvation so it is with God the Father, the only source of our salvation but through Jesus Christ our Lord who then can be called a savior also, but not the source of salvation.

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


#44

jonniel

Member

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

Quote:

Originally Posted by **tkkclark** 
I will read over the remainder of this post and if I've time, will respond to both your and John Milton's posts perhaps tomorrow. But I really have to get started on my preps for next wk, too. End of year ceremony in Awanas, Blue & Gold banquet for Cub scouts, Nominating Committee meeting of which I am chairman, my daughter's band concert, and I'm setting up displays for both Cub Scouts and 4-H (I am leaders in both) during a block party on the 12th. Not to mention the little fact that if I don't get to grocery store soon...Buy stock in Dominos. Nobody else will deliver out here. LOLBasically, if I don't respond, it's not because I cannot answer your argument but rather that I lack time to compose a coherent reply supported by proper references.

Please take your time. Things are pressing for me too.

Quote:

But I did want say one thing, specifically of the quote I grabbed above Clutching at straws? I'm clutching at straws? Whatever floats your boat, pal. >Perhaps I should switch to my snide and condescending mode rather than keeping the debate courteous and respectful? You seem to relate better to that.

You have writtne to me earlier:

Quote:

YAMMERING ON ABOUT how the NAB translated [Titus 2:13](#) doesn't prove anything, either.

and...

Quote:

Until you provide supports for your assertions, YOUR'E JUST BLOWING HOT AIR.

In what way is "clutching at straws" anymore "snide" and "discourteous" than your "Yammering on about" and "blowing hot air" my friend???

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

#45

jonniel

Member

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

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.

Look at the LXX at Ps.85:10 my friend, a Greek translation Paul was familiar with

and quoted from. The Greek there is: "hoti megas ei su....so ei ho Qeos monos o' megas" translates into English as "For you are great....you alone are the great God." YHWH alone is the "great God." Now you can address my point.

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

#46

John Milton

Member

Join Date: Dec 2006

Posts: 1,683

22 Reputation Points



Hi tkkclark

Quote:

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.

What's this got to do with the fact that THE GREAT GOD is the functional equivalent of a proper noun in the writings of Paul? 🙄

Quote:

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.

🙄 We'll be waiting.


Quote:

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.


Hello, get with the programme. We're saying the phrase **Saviour Jesus Christ**

is a compound proper name in [Titus 2:13](#). 

Quote:

[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?

Where does [Micah 5:4](#) refer to Messiah as THE GREAT GOD?  You're simply clutching at straws aren't you?

Quote:

Glancing through commentaries (Gill, Clarke, Barnes), all indicate the 'great' description belongs to the Messiah. Particularly:

[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)

What's your point? Are you suggesting Jesus is being referred to as God in the above, let alone THE GREAT GOD.

Quote:

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.

Relevance please?

Quote:

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.

What's the relevance of this ?

Quote:

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.

Talk of the pot calling the kettle black. Sharp's rule is infact a circular argument par excellence since one already has to assume Jesus is God for it to be applicable. There is not the slightest indication that the early Church would have mistaken THE GREAT GOD with SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST, therefore the kai can be excluded without problem. The early Church would have seen both referents as functional proper names.

Quote:

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:

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

Actually Bowman got soundly thrashed by Stafford on the issue of Sharp's rule.

Quote:

Does that answer your question?



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

#47

John Milton

Member

Join Date: Dec 2006

Posts: 1,683

22 Reputation Points



Hi jonniel

Quote:

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: 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.

Yes, the so-called "Sharp's rule" is not a rule of Greek grammar, it was a haphazard attempt by a trinitarian to find evidence for the "Deity of Christ." I think Sharp's rule is passe today, and not many scholars (even some trinitarian

ones) believe it proves anything about the "Deity of Christ" since ultimately it's a first class circular argument; one already has to have the a priori assumption that Jesus is God for this rule to even make sense. There is no evidence to suggest that the early Church saw Jesus as a member of the Triune Godhead and a second, co-equal person of the Trinity. This idea would come about centuries later, in 325AD. So there would have been absolutely no doubt in the minds of the early readers who THE GREAT GOD (the functional equivalent of a proper name) hinted to, and who SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST referred to.

In anycase, Sharp's isn't even a valid rule because of

[Proverbs 24:21](#) in the LXX >> of "**FOBOU TON QEON UIE KAI BASILEA**"?

This nails the coffin shut.

Quote:

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 were not being here indentified 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 indentifying 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 separate subject or one. Yes, the grammar here does not decide it. Any appeal to Sharp's rule as decisive then is invalid.

Excellent!

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.

Last edited by John Milton : 2 Weeks Ago at 03:25 PM.



2 Weeks Ago

[John Milton](#)

This message has been deleted by [moderator13](#).

2 Weeks Ago

#48

Bonnie

CARM Super Member



Join Date: Jan 2006

Posts: 6,438

236 Reputation Points



It was NOT a haphazard attempt at all. Sharp wasn't a Greek expert, but he WAS an expert linguist, if I remember right.

If Sharp's rule is followed exactly, there are no exceptions to it, in the NT.

The NWT "translators" weren't expert in Greek or Hebrew, either, but that didn't stop them from producing their own "translation" of the sacred scriptures.

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



2 Weeks Ago

#49

Bonnie

CARM Super Member



Join Date: Jan 2006

Posts: 6,438

236 Reputation Points



Ho Theos isn't a proper name; it's what YHWH is. It's like saying "the human" or "the man." But since there is only one true God, we capitalize it. Like, "the Son of Man." It's a special title.

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



2 Weeks Ago

#50

John Milton

Member

Join Date: Dec 2006

Posts: 1,683

22 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Bonnie**
Ho Theos isn't a proper name; it's what YHWH is. It's like saying "the human" or "the man." But since there is only one true God, we capitalize it. Like, "the Son of Man." It's a special title.

Origen the church father disagrees with you, and he was the foremost Greek scholar of his time. 😊 ... Next you'll be telling us THE GREAT GOD is not a proper name either.

"the Lord your God among you [is] a great and awesome God" ([Deut. 7:21](#))
 kurios ho theos sou en soi theos megas kai krataios
 "the Lord . . . the great and strong and fearsome God" ([Deut. 10:17](#))
 ho kurios . . . ho theos ho megas kai ischuros kai ho phoberos
 "the Lord, the God of heaven, the strong, great, and fearsome" (Neh.
 1:5)
 ho theos tou ouranou ho ischuros ho megas kai ho phoberos
 "the Lord, the great God" ([Neh. 8:6](#))
 kurion ton theon ton megan
 "our God, the strong, great, awesome, and fearsome" ([Neh. 9:32](#))
 ho theos hêmôn ho ischuros ho megas ho krataios kai ho phoberos
 "For you are great . . . you alone are the great God" (Ps.85:10)
 hoti megas ei su . . . su ei ho theos monos ho megas
 "the great God" ([Dan. 2:45](#))
 ho theos ho megas
 "the Lord, the great God" ([Dan. 9:4](#))
 kurios ho theos ho megas

In the NT "great God" is only used in [Titus 2:13](#). Couple this with the fact that "great God" is only ever predicated of the Father in the LXX, there is little doubt that it is a proper name of the Father.

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

#51

[John Milton](#)

Member

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



Quote:

Originally Posted by [Bonnie](#)
If Sharp's rule is followed exactly, there are no exceptions to it, in the NT.

In other words, there are exceptions but just not IN THE NT. 😊 Fact is there are exceptions, and a pretty obvious one in the LXX. Isn't the LXX koine Greek? 😊

What does this tell you about this so-called "rule" of Greek grammar?

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

#52

[John Milton](#)

Member



By the way,

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



Quote:

Ho Theos isn't a proper name; it's what YHWH is. It's like saying "the human" or "the man." But since there is only one true God, we capitalize it. Like, "the Son of Man." It's a special title.

If HO THEOS is a "special title", isn't that equivalent to saying it's a proper noun?

Do you even know what you're talking about?



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

#53

Robert V Frazier

Senior Member

Join Date: Jan 2006
 Location: Coral Springs,
 Florida, USA
 Gender: ♂
 Posts: 3,173
 89 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **John Milton**

In other words, there are exceptions but just not IN THE NT. 🙄 Fact is there are exceptions, and a pretty obvious one in the LXX. Isn't the LXX koine Greek? 🙄

What does this tell you about this so-called "rule" of Greek grammar?

Mostly, that you haven't read up on it much. You might want to read "Sharp Redivivus? A Reexamination of the Granville Sharp Rule" by Daniel B. Wallace, Th.M., Ph.D. Here's a link to it:

http://www.bible.org/page.php?page_id=1496

You'll find that Dr. Wallace discusses [Proverbs 24:21](#) at some length, but does not conclude that "This nails the coffin shut." He proposes a more precise formulation of the rule, as follows:

In native Greek constructions (i.e., not translation Greek), when a single article modifies two substantives connected by kaiv (thus, article-substantive-kaiv-substantive), when both substantives are (1) singular (both grammatically and semantically), (2) personal, (3) and common nouns (not proper names or ordinals), they have the same referent.

This rule has no exceptions in any Greek writing, in any age, regardless of dialect. It is not a circular argument. It has nothing to do with any attempt to shore up the doctrine of the deity of Christ. It is simply a fact of Greek grammar.

Robert V Frazier

The Watchtower is not the instrument of any man or any set of men, nor

is it published according to the whims of men. No man's opinion is expressed in *The Watchtower*. (*The Watchtower*, 1931 November 1 p.327) **If you believe that, you'll believe ANYTHING!**



2 Weeks Ago

#54

Ongyo no Kiheiji

Senior Member

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

Quote:

Originally Posted by **jonniel**

See John Milton's and my latest posts. However, you write and quote this: You write about this by Bowman: 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 QEOS is invariably the Father. In Titus alone 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.

Excellent work.



2 Weeks Ago

#55

John Milton

Member

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



Hi Robert,

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Robert_V_Frazier**

Mostly, that you haven't read up on it much. You might want to read "Sharp Redivivus? A Reexamination of the Granville Sharp Rule" by Daniel B. Wallace, Th.M., Ph.D. Here's a link to it:

http://www.bible.org/page.php?page_id=1496

You'll find that Dr. Wallace discusses [Proverbs 24:21](#) at some length, but does not conclude that "This nails the coffin shut." He proposes a more precise formulation of the rule, as follows:

In native Greek constructions (i.e., not translation Greek), when a single article modifies two substantives connected by kaiv (thus, article-substantive-kaiv-substantive), when both substantives are (1) singular (both grammatically and semantically), (2) personal, (3) and common nouns (not proper names or ordinals), they have the same referent.

This rule has no exceptions in any Greek writing, in any age, regardless of dialect. It is not a circular argument. It has nothing to do with any attempt to shore up the doctrine of the deity of Christ. It is simply a fact of Greek grammar.

Robert V Frazier

The Watchtower is not the instrument of any man or any set of men, nor is it published according to the whims of men. No man's opinion is expressed in The Watchtower. (The Watchtower, 1931 November 1 p.327) If you believe that, you'll believe ANYTHING!

More exceptions to Sharp's rule? 🤔 I like the way your source puts it: "he (Wallace) proposes a more precise formulation of the rule." Ofcourse Wallace(a highly biased trinitarian) want's to propose a "modified Sharp's rule" 🤔 , because the original is passe, defunct.. Sharp himself did not discount translational Greek from his rule. The only motivating factor for Wallace to exclude translational Greek(so-called modified Sharp's rule 🤔) is to try and by-pass [Proverbs 24:21](#). Nice try!

Here's Greg Stafford at [B-greek](#), he nails the coffin shut:

Quote:

I do not believe the case for excluding translation Greek is sound, and it seems predicated on eliminating a notable exception to Sharp's rule, namely, [Proverbs 24:21](#). The longer version of Ignatius contains this passage in his epistle to the Smyrnaeans (ANF 1, chap. 9, 90). Wallace also notes that other, later Fathers quote it as well. (Wallace, "Multiple Substantives," 127, note 121) **But, again, I fail to see how these references can**

rightly be excluded on the basis of being considered "translation Greek." After all, these writers, had they understood the idiom in the Greek of [Proverbs 24:21](#) to denote one person, not two, could have cited it in a way that would have been free from ambiguity. They obviously did not believe that their use of an article-noun-KAI-noun construction in this case would create any confusion concerning the identity of God and the king, otherwise they would have translated the passage in such a way as to be free from ambiguity.

Wallace accepts "Lord Jesus" or "Lord Jesus Christ" as the equivalent to a proper name, and possibly even "Christ" when used alone. I agree, and would add that any compound expression containing a proper name (!), such as "Savior Jesus Christ" similarly functions with the restrictive force of a proper name, there being no doubt regarding the one to whom "Savior" applies. I also accept other compound expressions and titles as the equivalent of proper names, for reasons given elsewhere.
Greg Stafford

best wishes,

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

#56

[John Milton](#)

Member

Join Date: Dec 2006

Posts: 1,683

22 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by [Ongyo no Kiheiji](#)

Excellent work.

I second that opinion. Excellent work indeed.

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

#57

[jonniel](#)

Member

Join Date: Mar 2007

Location: USA

Quote:

Originally Posted by [gww](#)

Sharpe's Rule aside, just look at the passage as a whole and we can see

Gender: ♀
 Posts: 445
 13 Reputation Points

that the title of 'Saviour' is given to God, in v10. So, why strip God of the title 'Saviour' a few verses on in v13 and give it to Jesus Christ, unless of course they are one and the same??

But as "God" in Titus is a reference to the Father and "God" and Jesus Christ are "one and the same" you ipso facto make the Christ 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.



2 Weeks Ago

#58

Bonnie

CARM Super Member



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



Nonsense. You non-Trinitarians don't know what you are talking about. They are the same GOD, but NOT the same PERSON. There is a difference.

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



2 Weeks Ago

#59

Bonnie

CARM Super Member



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



No, there are NO exceptions, if one stays strictly to within the parameters of Sharp's rule. "God" is not a proper noun in the original Greek. It's proper NAMES that are excluded from the rule. Here is a URL that shows the full rule:

<http://209.85.165.104/search?q=cache...k&cd=2 &gl=us>

It doesn't list this Titus verse as an example, but the list given is by no means a complete list.

The word "God" in the NT certainly fits the first rule.

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



2 Weeks Ago

#60

tkkclark

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006
 Posts: 275
 18 Reputation Points



Just a quick note...I made a list of chores for my week and if I can knock off several of them early this afternoon, I may be able to reply to your counter-arguments later this evening. Fingers duly crossed, etc, etc.

Regardless, I must say -- katie (or rather, I should say, jonniel since that seems to be the handle you're going by now 🙄), you were completely, 100% right. I was already being snide and condescending in my remarks re "yammering" and "blowing hot air," much to my chagrin. For that, I apologize -- profusely - and ask that your or anyone else I may have offended forgive my rude remarks. I shall try to refrain from such behavior in future.

See? I can admit when I'm wrong and have wronged others, responding with the appropriate Christian attitude. Can you do the same? Rather, will you?

Also...Robert is right as well, John Milton. (Your syntax seems oddly familiar, too. Have I debated you before?) If you look at Wallace's paper, he reviewed the TSKS construction in ANF literature and if I remember correctly, even in secular Greek. Although he did find a **possibility** of exceptions in other constructs (for which he provides explanation/answer), he found **NONE** for theos kai soter in **ANY** of the literature.

You might also like to review Mr. Bowman's paper (pp. 24-27) in regards to your assertion that Great God and Savior Jesus Christ serves as compound proper names. Particularly, I challenge you to find instances in which Great God functions as a proper name in either the OT or the NT.

If I can, I'll be back with proper supports and a more thorough response.



Page 3 of 8 < 1 2 **3** 4 5 6 7 > Last »

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

Quick Reply

Message:

X | **B** | *I* | U | **A** | | |

| |

Please click one of the Quick Reply icons in the posts above to activate Quick Reply.

Options

Quote message in reply?

Post Quick Reply

Go Advanced

Posting Rules

You **may** post new threads
 You **may** post replies
 You **may not** post attachments
 You **may** edit your posts

[vB code](#) is **On**
[Smilies](#) are **On**
[\[IMG\]](#) code is **On**
 HTML code is **Off**

All times are GMT -4. The time now is 06:36 AM.

As of July 6, 2006, Total Page Views: 22,353,117, Page Views Today: 22,353,117

-- 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