



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

**Welcome, tkkclark.**  
You last visited: 18 Minutes Ago at 06:19 AM  
[Instant Messages](#): Unread 0, Total 0.

User CP    FAQ    [Donate](#)    Members List    Calendar    New Posts    Search ▾    Quick Links ▾    Log Out



Page 5 of 8 < 1 2 3 4 **5** 6 7 8 > ▾

Thread Tools ▾    Search this Thread ▾    Rate Thread ▾    Display Modes ▾

2 Weeks Ago

#81

### moderator13

Moderator

Join Date: Jan 2006  
Location: Pennsylvania  
Posts: 671  
19 Reputation Points



Feel free to leave then. You yourself have already received infraction points for violating board rules  
moderator13

Last edited by Diane S : 2 Weeks Ago at 10:07 PM.



2 Weeks Ago

#82

### Ongyo no Kiheiji

Senior Member

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



Quote:

Originally Posted by **jonniel** ▾  
*Yes, because when we turn to standard works on Greek Grammar we do not find Sharp's Rule there but we do see a pattern in the Greek that Sharp saw then tried his best to fix as a rule to determine that Christ is called "God" which of course is what he set out to do from the beginning! Are we alone in stating that Sharp's rule is invalid? And this in spite of trinitarian Daniel B. Wallace and his entry in his Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics, An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament, Zondervan, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1996, pages 270-290 on "The Article with Multiple Substantives Connected by KAI(Granville Sharp Rule and Related Constructions)" where he concludes that Titus 2:13 is "an explicit affirmation of the diety of Christ"? (See also Wallace "The Article with Multiple Substantives Connected by KAI in the New Testament: Semantics and Significance"(Ph.D. dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1995) which I believe has been published.) No. Professor Jason Beduhn in his book "Truth in Translation, Accuracy and Bias in English Translations of the New Testament" in a chapter "Words Together and Apart"(pages 89-95) concerning such Greek sentences rejects out right Sharp's Rule and he is well aware of Wallace's treatment of it. BeDuhn states: BeDuhn turns to the standard work of Greek Grammar, Herbert Weir Smyth's Greek Grammar. What we find in this standard work on Greek grammar it what I found from Green's Handbook to the Grammar of the Greek Testament. What Sharp saw but tried to make a rule to determine that Christ is the "great God" of Titus 2:13 was none other than Smyth section 1143: Please compare this with what Green stated as I have quoted him previously(and has been ignored by our antagonistic friend tkkclark): Such then does not necessarily mean that the two nouns are being identified as the same thing or person. Beduhn adds though "While we're*

on the subject of Sharp's attempt to distinguish personal names from personal titles in constructing his rule, it should be pointed out that ho theos("the God") functions as a proper name("God") in the New Testament. So by a strict reading of "Sharp's Rule," it wouldn't even apply to verses Sharp hoped to interpret." We would add that swteros "savior" as Beduhn makes clear from Smyth's Greek Grammar section 1129, like words such as "man," "soldier" and "god," being words that denote persons "may omit the article." BeDuhn then cites Smyth's section 1140 "Several appellatives, treated like proper names, may omit the article." Smyth's has the word "king" as an example. Beduhn rightly says then "the term "Savior" certainly would have the same level of definiteness for a Christian writer." It certainly would when it is enjoined to the proper name "Christ Jesus" as it is in [Titus 2:13](#) so that one has "Savior Christ Jesus" which is a compound proper name. This also would exclude [Titus 2:13](#) from what is Sharp's Rule.

It is strange to hear many say that hO QEOS doesn't function as a proper name, when in fact the first verse of the Bible, [Genesis 1:1](#) (LXX) demonstrates that it does (along with a host of NT passages such as [John 3:16](#); [John 4:24](#); [1 Corinthians 11:3](#), ect).



2 Weeks Ago

#83

## John Milton

Member

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



Well done jonniel.

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

#84

## John Milton

Member

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



Moderator 13,

Quote:

Originally Posted by **moderator13**

*Poster John Milton - Be careful how you address another poster. Refrain from put downs or insults to intelligence or other board rule violations.*

*OR, don't post here anymore.*

*Consider this post "a word of caution" to you, and not an official warning. However, please know that your posts are being reviewed.*

*..Feel free to leave then. You yourself have already received infraction points for violating board rules. I suggest you look to yourself rather seriously before you talk about the quality of posting by anyone else.*

*By the way, it's "lose", not "loose".*

*(Just thought I'd improve the quality)*

moderator13

I was referring to the quality of tk's **arguments** ,regarding [Titus 2:13](#) and Sharp's rule.

In case you haven't noticed, this isn't a spelling contest, moderator 13, but an discussion of whether [Titus 2:13](#) is an exception to Sharp's rule..🙄

good luck,

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

#85

[kelton graham](#)

Member

Join Date: Jan 2006  
Posts: 331  
19 Reputation Points



@John Milton

John: Hi kelton graham

Response: Hello John,

John:It is a big deal because he never refers to Jesus as THEOS . Your argument about KURIOS actually strengthens my point since Paul uses Lord of the Father and of Jesus but THEOS is only ever a designate of the Father throughout his writings.

Response: But one point that I think is over looked is that Paul does use the TSKS construction in other parts of his writtings in the same manner as described in Grandville Sharp. For instance [Eph 6:21](#) has hO.. ADELFOC KAI ..DIAKONOC.

[2 Cor 1:3](#) EULOGHTOC hO QOC KAI PATER TOU KURIOU hHMWN

[Gal 1:4](#) TOU QEOU KAI PATROC hHMWN.

[Eph 1:3](#) same as [2 Cor 1:3](#).

[Eph 5:20](#) TWi QEWi KAI PATRI.

Now seeing that Paul does imply the TSKS the same way as described in Grandville Sharp's rule there really is not a reason to argue that [Titus 2:13](#) is any different than these other constructions. Unless you'd like to illustrate some different uses in Paul that I have overlooked. Now, arguing that Paul never calls Jesus QEOS does not mean that [Titus 2:13](#) cannot be calling him God because as I have pointed out it is the same as the other TSKS constructions in his writtings, no need to think that Paul has become inconsistant with his use of the Greek article.

-----

John:Which begs the question. If Jesus is Deity then why he is never called THEOC by Paul?

Response: Because KURIOS is the equivalent to YHWH. The Father he normally calls hO QEOS and the Son he calls KURIOS.

---

John: This is an argument from silence.

best wishes.

Response: Actually your argument is one from silence, I am just pointing out his writing style.



2 Weeks Ago

#86

## John Milton

Member

Join Date: Dec 2006

Posts: 1,683

22 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by **kelton graham**

@John Milton

*John: Hi kelton graham*

*Response: Hello John,*

*John: It is a big deal because he never refers to Jesus as THEOS . Your argument about KURIOS actually strengthens my point since Paul uses Lord of the Father and of Jesus but THEOS is only ever a designate of the Father throughout his writings.*

*Response: But one point that I think is over looked is that Paul does use the TSKS construction in other parts of his writings in the same manner as described in Grandville Sharp. For instance [Eph 6:21](#) has hO.. ADELFOI KAI ..DIAKONOS.*

*[2 Cor 1:3](#) EULOGHTOS hO QEOS KAI PATER TOU KURIOU hHMWN*

*[Gal 1:4](#) TOU QEOU KAI PATROS hHMWN.*

*[Eph 1:3](#) same as [2 Cor 1:3](#).*

*[Eph 5:20](#) TWi QEWi KAI PATRI.*

*Now seeing that Paul does imply the TSKS the same way as described in Grandville Sharp's rule there really is not a reason to argue that [Titus 2:13](#) is any different than these other constructions. Unless you'd like to illustrate some different uses in Paul that I have overlooked. **Now, arguing that Paul never calls Jesus QEOS does not mean that [Titus 2:13](#) cannot be calling him God because as I have pointed out it is the same as the other TSKS constructions in his writings**, no need to think that Paul has become inconsistent with his use of the Greek article.*

---

*John: Which begs the question. If Jesus is Deity then why he is never called THEOS by Paul?*

*Response: Because KURIOS is the equivalent to YHWH. The Father he normally calls HO QEOS and the Son he calls KURIOS.*

*John: This is an argument from silence.*

*best wishes.*

*Response: Actually your argument is one from silence, I am just pointing out his writing style.*

Again, you're arguing from silence.

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

#87

**jonniel**

Member

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

Quote:

Now, arguing that Paul never calls Jesus QEOS does not mean that [Titus 2:13](#) cannot be calling him God..

I don't think anyone is saying the grammar can not be understood that Jesus here is being called QEOS but that the grammar does not necessitate it, it being ambiguous. Looking at the first post here and the originator of this thread, TJohnson, he appears to believe and demand that the grammar, Granville Sharp's Rule, itself is decisive and rules out how the NWT have translated it. It, the 'rule,' does not. It can be translated based on the grammar either way. For me personally, so I am not arguing to convince anyone else, as Paul's referent for QEOS is the Father in his writings then I see no overwhelming reason why he departed from his usual practice of meaning God the Father at [Titus 2:13](#).

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

#88

**kelton graham**

Member

Join Date: Jan 2006  
Posts: 331  
19 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by [John Milton](#)  
*Again, you're arguing from silence.*

Response: This is a non response. I've shown you how Paul uses the TSKS in his writings now unless you can provide me with something contrary I really don't think you have a point any longer.





2 Weeks Ago

#89

### kelton graham

Member

Join Date: Jan 2006  
Posts: 331  
19 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by [joniell](#)

*I don't think anyone is saying the grammar can not be understood that Jesus here is being called QEOS but that the grammar does not necessitate it, it being ambiguous. Looking at the first post here and the originator of this thread, TJohnson, he appears to believe and demand that the grammar, Granville Sharp's Rule, itself is decisive and rules out how the NWT have translated it. It, the 'rule,' does not. It can be translated based on the grammar either way. For me personally, so I am not arguing to convince anyone else, as Paul's referent for QEOS is the Father in his writings then I see no overwhelming reason why he departed from his usual practice of meaning God the Father at [Titus 2:13](#).*

Response: I've demonstrated how Paul uses the TSKS in his writings, there is nothing different here. The grammar is not ambiguous at all, it is the exact same as every other time he has used it. So unless you can prove otherwise, you can not say your points are based upon grammar by any means. Your whole point about QEOS is not a grammatical argument, and normally he calls the Father hO QEOS, here it is different because it is found inside of a construct which is the same as every other time he uses it. So unless there is contrary evidence here, I don't see why anyone would want to argue that [Titus 2:13](#) is any different than all the others.



2 Weeks Ago

#90

### John Milton

Member

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

Quote:

Originally Posted by [kelton graham](#)

*Response: This is a non response. I've shown you how Paul uses the TSKS in his writings now unless you can provide me with something contrary I really don't think you have a point any longer.*

Response: Demonstrate THEOS **is** a designate for Jesus in the epistles of Paul. "**Could have**", "**would have**" and what not are simply arguments from **silence**.

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

#91

### kelton graham

Member

Join Date: Jan 2006  
Posts: 331  
19 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by [John Milton](#)

*Response: Demonstrate THEOS **is** a designate for Jesus in the epistles of Paul. "**Could have**", "**would have**" and what not are simply arguments*

from *silence*.

Response: I have, by showing you that [Titus 2:13](#) follows the *excate* same grammatical construction as all the other TSKS in Paul's writings. Unless you can explain to me how this one is different than all the other ones that have QEOS in them or even ones without, then I have demonstrated my point without the "would have, could have."



2 Weeks Ago

#92

### John Milton

Member

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



duplicate

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 04:42 PM.



2 Weeks Ago

#93

### John Milton

Member

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



Kelton,

Quote:

Originally Posted by [kelton graham](#)  
Response: I have, by showing you that [Titus 2:13](#) follows the *excate* same grammatical construction as all the other TSKS in Paul's writings. Unless you can explain to me how this one is different than all the other ones that have QEOS in them or even ones without, then I have demonstrated my point without the "would have, could have."

The examples you furnished were irrelevant because they begged the question. For example you listed [Eph 6:21](#):

Quote:

Tychicus, the beloved brother and faithful servant

But in this text the sense is so plain that there can be no controversy. Isn't Tychicus a proper name? So this falls outside of Sharp's rule. Also, some others of your so-called "examples" didn't even remotely resemble a Sharp's construction.

**In the construction article-noun-kaiv-noun**, Sharp delineated four requirements which he felt needed to be met if the two nouns were necessarily to be seen as having the same referent: **both nouns must be** (1) personal—i.e., they must refer to a person, not a thing; (2) common epithets—i.e., **not proper names**; (3) in the same case; and (4) singular in number. The significance of these requirements can hardly be overestimated, for those like you who have misunderstood Sharp's rule have done so almost without exception because they were unaware of the restrictions that Sharp set forth.

Basically Sharp's remarks was a discussion of only eight christologically significant texts -- [Acts 20:28](#); [Eph 5:5](#); [2 Thess 1:12](#); [1 Tim 5:21](#); [2 Tim 4:1](#); [Titus 2:13](#); [2 Pet 1:1](#); [Jude 4](#).

So either show Jesus is also THEOS in the epistles of Paul or hold your peace.

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 05:38 PM.



2 Weeks Ago

#94

[kelton graham](#)

Member


Join Date: Jan 2006

Posts: 331

19 Reputation Points



@John Milton

John: The examples you furnished were irrelevant because they begged the question. For example you listed [Eph 6:21](#): But in this text the sense is so plain that there can be no controversy. Isn't Tychicus a proper name?  So this falls outside of Sharp's rule. Also, some others of your so-called "examples" didn't even remotely resemble a Sharp's construction.

Response: Oh my fault, I thought you could read the Greek text. Let me type it out for you and underline the relevant portions.

[Eph 6:21](#) TUCIKOS **hO** AGAPHTOS ADELFO **KAI** PISTOS DIAKONOS

The portion that is relevant to the Grandville construction are the things after the article. The faithful brother and faithful minister, both refer to Tychicus. And neither brother nor minister are proper names. So this does fit Sharp's rule. And all my examples fit the rule, I can go over them later on if you'd like.

-----

John: In the construction article-noun-kaiv-noun, Sharp delineated four requirements which he felt needed to be met if the two nouns were necessarily to be seen as having the same referent: both nouns must be (1) personal—i.e., they must refer to a person, not a thing; (2) common epithets—i.e., not proper names; (3) in the same case; and (4) singular in number. The significance of these requirements can hardly be overestimated, for those like you who have misunderstood Sharp's rule have done so almost without exception because they were unaware of the restrictions that Sharp set forth.

Basically Sharp's remarks was a discussion of only eight christologically significant texts -- [Acts 20:28](#); [Eph 5:5](#); [2 Thess 1:12](#); [1 Tim 5:21](#); [2 Tim 4:1](#); [Titus 2:13](#); [2 Pet 1:1](#); [Jude 4](#).

So either show Jesus is also THEOS in the epistles of Paul or hold your peace. [/quote]

Response: No John, there are many verses that Grandville Sharp covers, I have to run right now but tomorrow if I have time I will run through some of them. And my argument still stands by the way, those examples I gave were good.



2 Weeks Ago

#95

## nathan p

Junior Member

Join Date: Feb 2007  
 Location: puget sound region  
 Gender: ♂  
 Posts: 238  
 11 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **jonniel**

*Fallacy. Just because I disagree with how the NAB translates [John 1:1c](#) does not mean then I can not accept how they translated [Titus 2:13](#)! I did not cite the NAB because "it agree with me" but that is disagree with Sharp's Rule! Get it? But this simple fact that you wish to ignore is that this Sharp's Rule does NOT(excuse caps) convince everyone and at [Titus 2:13](#) included.Which means then this, the Greek, can be translated this way...but as they translated it in their main text as of two subjects being refered to then they decided that Sharp's rule does not 'apply' here. And there are translations that will translate as if Jesus Christ is this "Great God"....but in a foot note offer the translation where he is not. Take for example the NRSV and REB footnotes. Obviously, then, they do not let Sharp's rule disallow the two subject translation.The NWT does not but it does have a good appendix why they did translate how they did so they fully inform their readers as to their decision. 😊[quoteAnyone that reads the context of the whole NAB won't need to use Titus to affirm their knowledge of Christ being God. There are a slew of other verses that will take care of that.*

Then I am pleased that you won't rest your case on ambiguous Greek then. Thats wise. 😊 It, the NAB, though decided not in the favor of the one subject translation. They then did not apply [Titus 2:13](#) here. This shows that not all scholars have let this 'rule' over weigh other considerations. To say that an entry in Wikipedia has to be totally unbiased is extraordinary! Now, you ask me about Wikipedia. Let me ask you this then. Have you read Prof.Jason BeDuhn's book? In a chapter there is discusses Sharp's Rule and shows it really "does not survive close scrutiny."-Truth in Translation, page 92. Will you get this book for yourself? [/quote]

a good point was made that there are two seperate subjects being referred to. so when it gets to the part where some say the word was god and someone else says the word was a god, both transalations seem wrong. it would seem that it should say the word was godlike, since it says the word was with god, identifying them as seperate.



2 Weeks Ago

#96

## John Milton

Member

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



Kelton,

Quote:

Originally Posted by **kelton graham**

*Response: No John, there are many verses that Grandville Sharp covers, I have to run right now but tomorrow if I have time I will run through some of them. And my argument still stands by the way, those examples I gave were good.*

Unfortunately, the examples you furnished begged the question. As I have told you a few times now, you're arguing from silence.

I'm not going on a wild goose chase with you tomorrow. I've already looked at all the examples you furnished and there's nothing there; tomorrow's not going to change anything.

I'm putting you on ignore for wasting my time until such time you are able to furnish a valid argument.

In this regard, you can start by showing us a verse from the writings of Paul where he indisputably refers to Jesus as **THEOS**.

good luck,

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

#97

### moderator13

Moderator

Join Date: Jan 2006  
Location: Pennsylvania  
Posts: 671  
19 Reputation Points



No, you were not talking about "arguments". The editing done of your post where you received your infraction was the deletion of a remark you made directly toward another poster's reading ability and intelligence. That kind of thing is not allowed; it will not be tolerated. I suggest you re-read the board rules before you post further.

If you wish to pursue this particular matter any further, you will do it via p.m. and not here. For my part, this matter is closed. Your post has been edited, you have been warned for violating Board Rules, you have received your infraction points, and you have received an explanation as to where your violation of Board Rules took place.



2 Weeks Ago

#98

### John Milton

Member

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



What strikes me as incredible is that Trinitarians have the entire GNT to work with, yet they only ever bring to the table disputable "proof texts" for the so-called *Deity of Christ* from it.

If Jesus was as much *God* as the Father, it seems to me trinitarians could furnish more than feeble "proof texts" like [Titus 2:13](#) for his so-called *Deity*. If Jesus was indeed God, the apostles, it seems to me, would have made this fact clear in the NT..Just as they make it indisputable for us that the Father is *God*. And Jesus would also have made it clear to us. But do we have such clarity of confidence about Jesus being God, as we do of the Father, after reading the NT ? Hardly.

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

#99

**John Milton**

Member

Join Date: Dec 2006

Posts: 1,683

22 Reputation Points

**This Poster Is Now Suspended**

Quote:

Originally Posted by **moderator13**

*No, you were not talking about "arguments". The editing done of your post where you received your infraction was the deletion of a remark you made directly toward another poster's reading ability and intelligence. That kind of thing is not allowed; it will not be tolerated. I suggest you re-read the board rules before you post further.*

*If you wish to pursue this particular matter any further, you will do it via p.m. and not here. For my part, this matter is closed. Your post has been edited, you have been warned for violating Board Rules, you have received your infraction points, and you have received an explanation as to where your violation of Board Rules took place.*

\*\*\*\*\* Comments Deleted By Moderator. Poster is now suspended.

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 moderator13 : 2 Weeks Ago at 07:39 PM.



2 Weeks Ago

#100

**kelton graham**

Member

Join Date: Jan 2006

Posts: 331

19 Reputation Points



[@John Milton

John: Unfortunately, the examples you furnished begged the question. As I have told you a few times now, you're arguing from silence.

Response: Uh no. The examples I gave were Grandville sharp constructions every last one of them. Now I have given you ample time to illustrate a verse that contradicts any of those in Paul's writings and you have not. So I think it is safe to assume that you have none or you are still looking. Silence is not providing sentences from grammar.

-----

John: I'm not going on a wild goose chase with you tomorrow. I've already looked at all the examples you furnished and there's nothing there; tomorrow's not going to change anything.

Response: Well I got done early today so you can talk about it today, we don't have to wait until tomorrow. And obviously when you looked at my examples you were not quite sure what you were looking at. I think the grammar spoke for itself.

-----

John: I'm putting you on ignore for wasting my time until such time you are able

to furnish a valid argument.

In this regard, you can start by showing us a verse from the writings of Paul where he indisputably refers to Jesus as **THEOS**.

good luck

Response: Well the truth of the matter is this, it is obvious that you did not understand my argument to begin with so I now understand why you don't think it is valid because you do not fully grasp the significance of it.

Secondly, [Titus 2:13](#) is that indisputable verse you are looking for as I have demonstrated but you mis-understood.



Post Reply

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

<< [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 06:37 AM.  
 As of July 6, 2006, Total Page Views: 22,353,128, Page Views Today: 22,353,128

-- Default Style

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

Get Weather for any City, State, Zipcode, or Country:

Fast Forecast