



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

Welcome, tkkclark.
You last visited: 19 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 6 of 8 << First < 2 3 4 5 **6** 7 8 >

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

2 Weeks Ago

#101

imJR

CARM Super Member

Join Date: Jan 2006
Posts: 4,473
99 Reputation Points



John Milton is suspended.



2 Weeks Ago

#102

lionking

New Member

Join Date: Apr 2007
Posts: 1
10 Reputation Points



my dear brother, don't be phased by that...in fact, with how they answered your previous questions with their Hebrew and Greek, compare it to the Hebrew and Greek as "Christian scholars" use it. God said in [Isaiah 43:11](#) that "I, even I, am the LORD, and besides Me there is no Savior." Well, it says in [Titus 2:13](#) "Great God and Savior Jesus Christ"...does that mean that the God is not the only Savior then? No, "The Father and I are one."-[John 10:31](#)...and don't let the JW's tell you otherwise...also, a few verses before 2:13, it states that God is the Savior, then as you know it, our Great God and Savior, Jesus Christ! Amen. Stand in wise council building yourself up in the faith...if the JW's don't want to listen then just hang with the brethren...I speak from a caring heart as a brother...I always love reaching out to all my brothers! God bless you bro!! Keep fighting that good fight of faith; especially in these last days.

-In Christ,
Jason

Quote:

Originally Posted by **TJohnson**
I've recently had several JW's tell me there is no where in the Bible where Jesus Christ is called God. I've pointed out several verses including [John 1:1](#), [Hebrews 1:8](#), [John 20:28](#), [Col. 2:9](#), [Hebrews 1:3](#), etc. They've all found illegitimate and illogical reasons to deny these verses. Please note that these verses are not open for discussion in this thread. We can beat that dead horse elsewhere.

While reading through Titus the other day, I found this:

[Titus 2:13](#)

while we wait for the blessed hope—the glorious appearing of our great God and Savior, Jesus Christ,

So... what's wrong with this one?



2 Weeks Ago

#103

tkkclark

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006

Posts: 275

18 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by **imJR**

John Milton is suspended.

Does suspended mean banned altogether or is it just temporary?

Wow.

I was on here, briefly, to print the thread yesterday, so I could at least stay current on reading posts, but no time to post myself. I really don't know why I jumped into the fray, so to speak, to start with, my calendar doesn't clear up until June. Still, I was going to try to squeeze in some time to respond this morning...Should've carved out time somewhere yesterday, I guess.

I suppose it doesn't matter, though. Heading into the busy part of my week, I would've been out of the loop this afternoon clear through Sunday afternoon, anyway. 😞



2 Weeks Ago

#104

imJR

CARM Super Member

Join Date: Jan 2006

Posts: 4,473

99 Reputation Points



No worries - Hope you have a good week.

His suspension, as I understand it, will be for about a month.



2 Weeks Ago

#105

Bonnie

CARM Super Member



Join Date: Jan 2006

Posts: 6,438

236 Reputation Points



I hate to break it to YOU, but I know. ALL names are proper nouns, but not all proper nouns are names.

"God" or "Great God" is NOT YHWH's personal name. It's His attribute, dignity, office, "species" if you will (no disrespect to the Big Guy 😊), etc.

Personal names are excluded from the Rule. Proper nouns are not, so far as I know. God may be a proper noun but it is NOT a PERSONAL name. There is a difference.

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



2 Weeks Ago

#106

Bonnie

CARM Super Member



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



What is wrong with the "quality" of my discussion, and TK's? It's "low quality" just because we don't agree with you, is that it? That is merely your opinion. Opinions aren't facts.

I can't speak of myself, but I think TK is doing a great job. Keep it up, girlfriend.



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



2 Weeks Ago

#107

Bonnie

CARM Super Member



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



Robert F. read BeDuhn's book and critiqued it on here, a couple of years ago, pointing out all kinds of fallacy's in the book, that BeDuhn made.

So BeDuhn's book would not survive close scrutiny, either. 😊

Oh, he used to post on here, a couple of years ago. He once told a poster, twolaws, that "no one has seen A god at any time," from [John 1](#), is a "proper" translation, even though, in the context, only the one True God is being spoken of. I showed him the fallacy of calling that a "proper" translation, but he never responded. He left the boards permanently after that.

So, you may not want to use BeDuhn as a source of info, not when he says something really GOOFY like THAT....

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



2 Weeks Ago

#108

Bonnie

CARM Super Member



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



NO, it's NOT strange. It is a proper noun, but not a personal, proper name. Personal names are excluded from Sharp's rule. Learn the difference.

JWs make a HUGE deal out of the fact that Jehovah is God's name and that we should be calling Him that, not just "God." The JWs who came to my door for 3 months certainly made a big deal out of the Name. Said it was His name and we should call Him that, as we would call our best friends by their first names.

Reread [Ex. 3:15](#) again. God says His name is "I AM" which is what YHWH is derived from. NOT "God." Read [Ex. 15:3](#). "LORD" is all in caps, which means it is a substitute for YHWH.

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



2 Weeks Ago

#109

Bonnie

CARM Super Member



I reread this. I meant that "God" isn't a proper NAME in the NT; it is proper NAMES that Sharp said were excluded from the rule, but I will double check.



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

He wrote this:

Quote:

And there is no exception or instance of the like mode of expression, that I know of, which necessarily requires a construction different from what is here laid down, EXCEPT the nouns be proper names, or in the plural number; in which cases there are many exceptions; though there are not wanting examples, even of plural nouns, which are expressed exactly agreeable to this rule. ...

Proper NAMES are excluded, but NOT proper nouns. There is a difference, and "God" isn't His name; YHWH is, as JWs are always telling us. 😊

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



2 Weeks Ago

#110

Sojourner

Senior Member



Join Date: Nov 2006
Gender: ♂
Posts: 2,643
51 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **TJohnson**
I've recently had several JWs tell me there is no where in the Bible where Jesus Christ is called God. I've pointed out several verses including [John 1:1](#), [Hebrews 1:8](#), [John 20:28](#), [Col. 2:9](#), [Hebrews 1:3](#), etc. They've all found illegitimate and illogical reasons to deny these verses. Please note that these verses are not open for discussion in this thread. We can beat that dead horse elsewhere.

While reading through Titus the other day, I found this:

[Titus 2:13](#)

while we wait for the blessed hope—the glorious appearing of our great God and Savior, Jesus Christ,

So... what's wrong with this one?

It is a mistranslation.

Check out other translations (that are NOT the NWT). You will find they say, "the appearing of the glory of..." The KJV and NIV somehow decided to change the noun glory into an adjective and change the entire meaning of the text. The literal Greek is, "the appearing of the glory of..."

Yes, we are awaiting the appearing of Jesus who IS the glory of our great God and Savior, the glory of the Father, just as Matthew describes him at [Matthew 16:27](#).

So many people get so caught up with fighting for the side they want to be true that they forget to look for what is really the truth.



2 Weeks Ago



#111

Robert V Frazier

Senior Member

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Sojourner**

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

It is a mistranslation.

No, it isn't. Although if you read the rest of this thread, you'll see that the question is not about the meaning of επιφανειαν της δοξης, but about the meaning of του μεγαλου θεου και σωτηρος ημων χριστου ιησου.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Sojourner**

Check out other translations (that are NOT the NWT). You will find they say, "the appearing of the glory of..." The KJV and NIV somehow decided to change the noun glory into an adjective and change the entire meaning of the text. The literal Greek is, "the appearing of the glory of..."

Yes, a lot of translations do translate the phrase επιφανειαν της δοξης literally, but not very accurately, as ""appearing of the glory of". It was clear to the translators of other translations, not only the KJV and NIV, that της δοξης is an adjectival genitive, modifying επιφανειαν. See this discussion, for instance:

<http://lists.ibiblio.org/pipermail/b...st/039642.html>

The translation "glorious appearing of" is a perfectly good one. Literal translation is not always good translation. Many times, it's terrible.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Sojourner**

Yes, we are awaiting the appearing of Jesus who IS the glory of our great God and Savior, the glory of the Father, just as Matthew describes him at [Matthew 16:27](#).

No, that is not "just as Matthew describes" Jesus. Look at the verse. It says Jesus will come IN His Father's glory, not AS His Father's glory! The Bible nowhere calls Jesus the Father's glory. An imaginative reinterpretation, but not a useful one.

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

#112

Sojourner

Senior Member



Join Date: Nov 2006
 Gender: 
 Posts: 2,643
 51 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Robert_V_Frazier** 

No, it isn't. Although if you read the rest of this thread, you'll see that the question is not about the meaning of επιφανειαν της δοξης, but about the meaning of του μεγαλου θεου και σωτηρος ημων χριστου ιησου.

Yes, a lot of translations do translate the phrase *επιφανειαν της δοξης* literally, but not very accurately, as ""appearing of the glory of". It was clear to the translators of other translations, not only the KJV and NIV, that *της δοξης* is an adjectival genitive, modifying *επιφανειαν*. See this discussion, for instance:

<http://lists.ibiblio.org/pipermail/b...st/039642.html>

The translation "glorious appearing of" is a perfectly good one. Literal translation is not always good translation. Many times, it's terrible.

No, that is not "just as Matthew describes" Jesus. Look at the verse. It says Jesus will come **IN His Father's glory, not **AS His Father's glory!** The Bible nowhere calls Jesus the Father's glory. An imaginative reinterpretation, but not a useful one.**

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!*

There is no reason whatsoever to believe it is an adjective.

And that's why most scholars do not agree with the KJV and NIV translators. Apparently, you do not wish to acknowledge these other men because they do not suit your needs.

So many people get so caught up with fighting for the side they want to be true that they forget to look for what is really the truth.



2 Weeks Ago

#113

moderator13

Moderator

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



Attention, Sojourner: You are not a JW, and you are not to be debating Christian beliefs with Christians on this board. You have been spoken to about this matter before, and because of that, there will be no patience exercised with you. Continue to debate with Christians, and your posts will be deleted and you will receive infraction points.

Moderator 13



2 Weeks Ago

#114

Robert V Frazier

Senior Member

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



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Sojourner**
There is no reason whatsoever to believe it is an adjective.

Apart from Greek grammar, you're probably right. But since Greek

89 Reputation Points

grammar gives us reason to believe that this phrase functions as an adjective, what else do we really need?

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Sojourner**
And that's why most scholars do not agree with the KJV and NIV translators. Apparently, you do not wish to acknowledge these other men because they do not suit your needs.

How many have you personally polled to arrive at your "most"? I acknowledge that most translators translated this verse literally, but that does not mean that they denied that "of glory" functions adjectivally. After all, it's not as though the New Testament teaches that Jesus will not return, but His glory will show up in His stead!

I'm reasonably certain that no scholars whatsoever have adopted your novel view that Jesus is the glory of the Father, and it's the Father's glory, not Jesus as such, which is to appear.

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!



1 Week Ago

#115

Bonnie

CARM Super Member



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



I had more stuff on this, back in August, under another thread, that someone resurrected. Here it is:

<http://www.christiandiscussionforums...#post13286> 96

The only reason I can see, for the NWT having "the" in front of the second noun in this construction, is because "God" is also one of the nouns, and the JW's don't want anybody to get the impression that Jesus is God. They didn't do that in the other verses, where it is "Lord and Savior". They don't mind that Jesus is called both Lord and Savior. But Lord and God??? Heavens to Betsy, NO! 😊

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



1 Week Ago

#116

John Milton

Member

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



I'm back.

Hi Kelton,

Quote:

Originally Posted by **kelton graham** @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 ADELPHOS **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.

Exactly! Neither **brother** nor **minister** are proper names. Therefore you're begging the question because GREAT GOD and SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST in [Titus 2:13](#) are proper names.

And you misunderstood what I was saying. In [Eph 6:21](#)

Quote:

Tychicus, the beloved brother and faithful servant

we have one of the clearest examples of Sharp's rule construction, but it falls outside of the so-called "Sharp's rule example" we are discussing, namely [Titus 2:13](#). **In Eph. 6:21, there is no controversy that both beloved brother and faithful refer to the proper name Tychicus.** That's not the case in [Titus 2:13](#). GOD, and especially GREAT GOD, is a proper name. And the same can be said about SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST.



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 : 1 Week Ago at 11:37 PM.



1 Week Ago

#117

[kelton graham](#)

Member

Join Date: Jan 2006
Posts: 331



@John Milton

John: Hi Kelton,

19 Reputation Points

Response: Hello.

John: Exactly! Neither **brother** nor **minister** are proper names. Therefore you're begging the question because GREAT GOD and SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST in [Titus 2:13](#) are proper names.

Response: Since brother nor minister are not proper names then [Eph 6:21](#) does fall into Grandville sharp construction therefore I was correct in my assertions and you were wrong in saying

Quote:

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.

This falls directly into Sharp's rule. Secondly QEOS & SWTEROS are not proper names. Even according to JW theology there are many people who are called QEOS, each with their own proper names.

Quote:

we have one of the clearest examples of Sharp's rule construction , but it falls outside of the so-called "Sharp's rule example" we are discussing, namely [Titus 2:13](#). **In Eph. 6:21 , there is no controversy that both beloved brother and faithful refer to the proper name Tychicus.** That's not the case in [Titus 2:13](#). GOD, and especially GREAT GOD, is a proper name. And the same can be said about SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST.



Response: No Jesus Christ is a proper name, but 'saviour' is not a proper name. Just like in [Eph 6:21](#) Jesus Christ is the proper name just like Tychicus preceded by two substantives with a kai inbetween governed by an article.



1 Week Ago

#118

[John Milton](#)

Member

Join Date: Dec 2006

Posts: 1,683

22 Reputation Points



Hi kelton graham

Quote:

John: Hi Kelton,

Response: Hello.

John: Exactly! Neither **brother** nor **minister** are proper names. Therefore you're begging the question because GREAT GOD and SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST in [Titus 2:13](#) are proper names.

Response: Since brother nor minister are not proper names then [Eph 6:21](#) does fall into Grandville sharp construction therefore I was correct in my assertions and you were wrong in saying

You keep attacking a strawman. I've already explained this. **Once more: Eph. 6:21 is not a parallel example to Titus 2:13.** [Titus 2:13](#) falls outside of

Sharp's rule but [Eph. 6:21](#) is one of the clearest examples of the so-called Sharp's rule .

If you do not stop playing games, I'm going to stop responding to you.

Quote:

Secondly QEOS & SWTEROS are not proper names. Even according to JW theology there are many people who are called QEOS, each with their own proper names.

The issue here is not whether GOD or THEOS can be used as a common noun .It most certainly can be and is used as a common noun, as in [John 1:1c](#), etc. **The issue here is how Paul saw the word THEOS or GOD in his Epistles.** He uses this word about 500 times and not once does he mean it of other than the Father. **To Paul THEOS is invariably a proper name, a designate of the Father.** Therefore [Titus 2:13](#) falls outside of Sharp's so-called rule. And to seal the case, GREAT GOD has the restrictive force of a proper name. This makes it virtually impossible that Paul in [Titus 2:13](#) meant anyone other than the Father when he used GOD, and GREAT GOD . See previous posts in this regard.

If you do not improve the quality of this discussion, I will lose interest pretty quick, kelton, and will stop rsponding to you altogether.

Quote:

Response: No Jesus Christ is a proper name, but 'saviour' is not a proper name. Just like in [Eph 6:21](#) Jesus Christ is the proper name just like Tychicus preceded by two substantives with a kai inbetween governed by an article.

But [Titus 2:13](#) doesn't just say Saviour, it says SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST, it is a compound proper name. 🙄🙄 Even so, taking the word SAVIOUR by itself, there is good reason to believe that it began to be seen as a fixed title for Jesus (and especially in opposition to the GREAT GOD) by the early Christians.

Look man. You can argue till the cows come home but if Jesus were indeed YHWH you would have more than just a very feeble "proof text" for the so-called *Deity* of Jesus in [Titus 2:13](#), it seems to me.

Here's the bottom line.

(a)[Titus 2:13](#) is a highly dubious Sharp's rule construction.

(b) "Sharpe' rule" is not even a legitimate rule of Greek grammar . There are exceptions to it (see old posts in this thread). And we all know that it only takes one expection to prove a "rule" wrong.

So, do you have something **concrete** (especially from the mouth of Jesus himself) that Jesus is YHWH?

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 : 1 Week Ago at 05:29 PM.



1 Week Ago

#119

kelton graham

Member

Join Date: Jan 2006

Posts: 331

19 Reputation Points



@John Milton

John:Hi kelton graham

Response: Hello:

John:You keep attacking a strawman. I've already explained this. **Once more: Eph. 6:21 is not a parallel example to Titus 2:13.** [Titus 2:13](#) falls outside of Sharp's rule but [Eph. 6:21](#) is one of the clearest examples of the so-called Sharp's rule .

If you do not stop playing games, I'm going to stop responding to you.

Response: Let's compare then another passages that seem to fit the rule and use the word QEOS in them.

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

Blessed the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Here we have an example of the rule using QEOS followed by a KAI and another substantive both referring to the same person.



You can also check [2 Cor 11:31](#);[Eph 1:3](#);4:6;[1 Th 3:11](#). Each has the same grammer as [Titus 2:13](#) with QEOS.

John:The issue here is not whether GOD or THEOS can be used as a common noun .It most certainly can be and is used as a common noun, as in [John 1:1c](#), etc. **The issue here is how Paul saw the word THEOS or GOD in his Epistles.** He uses this word about 500 times and not once does he mean it of other than the Father. **To Paul THEOS is invariably a proper name, a designate of the Father.** Therefore [Titus 2:13](#) falls outside of Sharp's so-called rule. And to seal the case, GREAT GOD has the restrictive force of a proper name. This makes it virtually impossible that Paul in [Titus 2:13](#) meant anyone other than the Father when he used GOD, and GREAT GOD . See previous posts in this regard.

Response: Couple thoughts. 1) Paul does not have some special meaning for QEOS than anyone else. QEOS does not all of a sudden become a proper noun just because Paul is using it. 2) Paul does call someone else QEOS other than the Father, remember [2 Cor 4:4](#)? Satan is called QEOS, does this mean that he is Jehovah? If Satan can be called QEOS, this proves that QEOS is not a proper noun in Paul's eyes and therefore must be a common noun. 3) And Great God does not seal the case because an adjective does not change a common noun into a proper noun unless you know something about Greek that I don't.

John: f you do not improve the quality of this discussion, I will lose interest pretty quick, kelton, and will stop rspnding to you altogether.

Response: Totally up to you. I don't mind if you want to stop or keep going.

John:But [Titus 2:13](#) doesn't just say Saviour, it says SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST, it is a compound proper name.   Even so, taking the word SAVIOUR by itself,

there is good reason to believe that it began to be seen as a fixed title for Jesus (and especially in opposition to the GREAT GOD) by the early Christians.

Look man. You can argue till the cows come home but if Jesus were indeed YHWH you would have more than just a very feeble "proof text" for the so-called *Deity* of Jesus in [Titus 2:13](#), it seems to me.

Response: It is more likely that Jesus Christ is standing appositional to SWTEROS. In other words " ...our saviour, namely Jesus Christ. It is not being used here as a compound proper name.

John:Here's the bottom line.

(a)[Titus 2:13](#) is a highly dubious Sharp's rule construction.

(b) "Sharpe' rule" is not even a legitimate rule of Greek grammar . There are exceptions to it (see old posts in this thread). And we all know that it only takes one exeption to prove a "rule" wrong.

So, do you have something **concrete** (especially from the mouth of Jesus himself) that Jesus is YHWH?[/quote]

Response: a) I disagree, see other examples above. b) there are answers to those other post. c) [John 8:58](#) would fir the bill for that and if you are curious as to why I think it is you may read my paper over on forananswer.org.



1 Week Ago

#120

John Milton

Member

Join Date: Dec 2006

Posts: 1,683

22 Reputation Points



Hi kelton graham

Quote:

Response: Let's compare then another passages that seem to fit the rule and use the word QEOS in them.

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

Blessed the **God and Father** of our Lord Jesus Christ. Here we have an example of the rule using QEOS followed by a KAI and another substantive both referring to the same person.

If *God* is a proper name and *father* a common name, then what do you do? 😊

Quote:

You can also check [2 Cor 11:31](#);[Eph 1:3](#);4:6;[1 Th 3:11](#). Each has the same grammer as [Titus 2:13](#) with QEOS.

I already told you I'm not going on a wild Goose chase with you..

Quote:

Response: Couple thoughts. 1) Paul does not have some special meaning for QEOS than anyone else.

Who said he had a special meaning for *Theos*? I'm saying he invariably used *Theos* as a designate of the Father.

Quote:

QEOS does not all of a sudden become a proper noun just because Paul is using it.

Strawman. Who's saying *Theos becomes a proper name simply because Paul is using it*? **It's the way Paul uses Theos** which makes it a proper name in his epistles. If you're not satisfied with GOD, then GREAT GOD in [Titus 2:13](#) leaves no room for doubt. GREAT GOD definitively has the restrictive force of a proper name in [Titus 2:13](#).

Quote:

2) Paul does call someone else QEOS other than the Father, remember [2 Cor 4:4](#)?

Nice try. He calls Satan **THE GOD OF THIS WORLD**, not **GOD**.

Quote:

Satan is called QEOS, does this mean that he is Jehovah?

Satan is called THE GOD OF THIS WORLD, not GOD.

Quote:

If Satan can be called QEOS, this proves that QEOS is not a proper noun in Paul's eyes and therefore must be a common noun. 3) And Great God does not seal the case because an adjective does not change a common noun into a proper noun unless you know something about Greek that I don't.

Nice strawman.

Quote:

Response: Totally up to you. I don't mind if you want to stop or keep going.

I'm 99% there. If your next response is not an improvement, I will simply limit my responses to you.

Quote:

Response: It is more likely that Jesus Christ is standing appositional to SWTEROS. In other words " ...our saviour, namely Jesus Christ. It is not being used here as a compound proper name.

This is not an irrefutable argument, infact it's not even an argument, but an opinion. Do you expect people to start believing Jesus is YHWH just because it's your opinion that **Saviour Jesus Christ** is not being used as a compound proper name? 🙄 Infact even the term Saviour on it's own came to be regarded as a proper name of Jesus by the early Christians.

Quote:

c) [John 8:58](#) would fir the bill for that and if you are curious as to why I think it is you may read my paper over on forananswer.org.

So [John 8:58](#) is your strongest proof text that Jesus is YHWH? Do you know that *ego eimi* is not the name of God and even the blind man in [John 9:9](#) uses *ego eimi*? Is he *God* ?

You're simply clutching at straws.

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.



Post Reply

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

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

Quick Reply

Message:

B
I
U
A

ABC

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 06:38 AM.
As of July 6, 2006, Total Page Views: 22,353,149, Page Views Today: 22,353,149

-- 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](#)