



Discussion Forums

You are responsible for knowing and following the rules.

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

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

Welcome, **tkkclark**.
You last visited: 6 Hours Ago at 11:00 AM
Instant Messages: Unread 0, Total 17.

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



Page 9 of 10 < First < 5 6 7 8 9 10 >

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

4 Days Ago

#161

[kelton graham](#)

Member

Join Date: Jan 2006
Posts: 322
21 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by [John Milton](#)
*Infact, even in the case of two proper names in a TSKS construction, there is no rule of Greek grammar which states that two different persons **must** be in view, let alone where only one of the two nouns is a proper name. Here's [Wallace](#):*

Response: Well show me an example where two proper nouns are governed by the same article and divided by a KAI and is referring to the same person then we can talk. Until then you are speaking in the hypothetical and I do not wish to go there.



4 Days Ago

#162

[John Milton](#)

Member

Join Date: Dec 2006
Posts: 1,783
23 Reputation Points



Kelton,

Quote:

Originally Posted by [kelton graham](#)
Response: Well show me an example where two proper nouns are governed by the same article and divided by a KAI and is referring to the same person then we can talk. Until then you are speaking in the hypothetical and I do not wish to go there.

Nice try. The expression *God and Father* is **not** a TSKS construction with **two** proper names. Even if it was, there is no rule of Greek grammar which states two persons must be in view.

Two can play this asenine game. Unless you can show me "God" is a common noun in the epistles of Paul "you're speaking in the hypothetical and I do not wish to go there."

P.S. I'm still waiting for you to show me this mysterious rule of Greek grammar which states if one of the two nouns in a TSKS construction is proper, then two

people are in view. Are you going to deliever or not?

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.



4 Days Ago

#163

John Milton

Member

Join Date: Dec 2006
Posts: 1,783
23 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by **kelton graham**
Response: John, this is pretty simple. And I am not back to square one. You asked me this:

I replied that it was talking about two different people. Then you asked

I said there is no rule for this because such a construction does not exist. Which means John, that there is no construction in the NT that has an article followed by a proper noun, kai, and a common noun that is referring to the same person. There is no rule that I can give you for a construction that does not exist, which means you are asking a question that does not have an answer because it does not exist.

Why? Because as I've stated earlier KAI is connective, if they are referring to the same person then the KAI is not necessary and we would take it as appositional. So John, it is clear that I am no where near square one & with regards to [2 Tim 4:1](#) referring to the same person, I'd have to see there argument.

Yeah right!

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.



4 Days Ago

#164

kelton graham

Member

Join Date: Jan 2006
Posts: 322
21 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **John Milton**
Kelton,

*Nice try. The expression God and Father is **not** a TSKS construction with **two** proper names. Even if it was, there is no rule of Greek grammar which states two persons must be in view.*

Response: Nice Try? I did not say anything about God and Father in this post. I am just pointing out that there is not TSKS construction which has two proper nouns in it referring to the same person. That is why there is no rule about it, because there is no such construction to put a rule too. They don't make up Greek rules for hypothetical constructions John, they have to actually exist.

John:Two can play this asenine game. Unless you can show me "God" is a common noun in the epistles of Paul "you're speaking in the hypothetical and I do not wish to go there."

Response: Easy, [2 Cor 4:4](#). Unless you think that Satan is the Yahweh of this world but that would be strange. And if you want another one check out [1 Cor 8:5](#). Unless you want to translate it as "many Yahwehs or many Jehovahs."

John:P.S. I'm still waiting for you to show me this mysterious rule of Greek grammar which states if one of the two nouns in a TSKS construction is proper, then two people are in view. Are you going to deliever or not?

Response: There can only be a rule for things that actually happen in the language. If there was an example of a TSKS construction with a proper noun and a common noun pointing to the same person somewhere in the NT, they there would be some discussion about it. But since there is not one, unless you have one in your back pocket somewhere there is no rule about it. Because it only exist in your mind. You can't refute something that does not happen other than saying "that does not happen."



4 Days Ago

#165

kelton graham

Member

Join Date: Jan 2006
Posts: 322
21 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by **John Milton**

Yeah right!

Response: Lets see, I lost count of the non responses. So this must be number 4.



4 Days Ago

#166

John Milton

Member

Join Date: Dec 2006
Posts: 1,783
23 Reputation Points



Hi kelton graham

Quote:

Response: Easy, [2 Cor 4:4](#). Unless you think that Satan is the Yahweh of this world but that would be strange.

You keep repeating this nonsense. In [2Cor. 4:4](#) Satan is theos in a qualified sense, *the god of this world not the God*.

Quote:

And if you want another one check out [1 Cor 8:5](#). Unless you want to

translate it as "many Yahwehs or many Jehovahs."

This is another inane argument. *Gods* are clearly distinguished from **the God** . There is no ambiguity between the two.

Quote:

Try Joh 10:34 where Jesus refers to humans as the gods are in the plural

Exactly! Jesus clearly knew the difference between *the God* and *gods*. But trinitarians have a hard time with this because they believe in multiple persons in the Godhead, they are polypersontheists.

It has been shown that God is a proper name in the writings of Paul . Your circular argument that a proper noun and a common noun in a TSKS construction cannot refer to one person is therefore blown to bits. Out of the over 500 times Paul uses THEOS in an unqualified sense, it never refers to anyone other than the Father. Thus the expression *God and Father of Jesus* refer to the same person.

Quote:

Response: There can only be a rule for things that actually happen in the language. If there was an example of a TSKS construction with a proper noun and a common noun pointing to the same person somewhere in the NT, they there would be some discussion about it. But since there is not one, unless you have one in your back pocket somewhere there is no rule about it. Because it only exist in your mind. You can't refute something that does not happen other than saying "that does not happen."

Let's see. It took you about 10 sentences to say what you could have honestly said in four or five words, "There is no such rule."

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.

Last edited by John Milton : 4 Days Ago at 12:09 PM.



4 Days Ago

#167

[kelton graham](#)

Member

Join Date: Jan 2006

Posts: 322

21 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **John Milton** Hi kelton graham

You keep repeating this nonsense. In [2Cor. 4:4](#) Satan is theos in a qualified sense, the god of this world not the God.

Response:

You are using theology not grammar. Proper nouns don't change because of there sense. Like if I used your name John, John is always a proper noun no matter what sense I use it in because proper nouns always refer to something particular. The very idea that you have to use context to tell whether or not this is referring to Jehovah illustrates beyond a shadow of a doubt that QEOS here is a common noun not a proper one. Because if a noun like Jehovah was used here there would be no doubt.

Quote:

This is another inane argument. *Gods* are clearly distnguished from **the God** . There is no ambiguity between the two.

Response: By the way calling an argument 'inane' does not refute the argument. It would be nice if you actually dealt with the argument itself your not fooling anyone with name calling. Secondly, if the basis of you calling QEOS a proper name is simply because of the article then you have no reason to reject [2 Cor 4:4](#) then because the article is present there. See: EV hOIS hO QEOS TOU AIWNOS TOUTOU, and QEOS does not have an article in [1 Cor 7:40](#) does this mean that God here is not a proper noun?

John:Exactly! Jesus clearly knew the difference between *the God* and *gods*. But trinitarians have a hard time with this because they believe in multiple persons in the Godhead, they are polypersontheists.

It has been shown that God is a proper name in the writings of Paul . Your circular argument that a proper noun and a common noun in a TSKS construction cannot refer to one person is therefore blown to bits. Out of the over 500 times Paul uses THEOS in an unqualified sense, it never refers to anyone other than the Father. Thus the expression *God and Father of Jesus* refer to the same person.

Response: You say there are 500 times where Paul uses QEOS to refer to the Father, I've shown you two examples which don't. Sense does not change a proper noun into a common one. Secondly, I did not bring up [John 10:30](#) but if you want to discuss it I'd be more than happy. Third God and Father could refer to the same person because QEOS is common and fits under Grandville's rule, I am glad you agree.

Quote:

Let's see. It took you about 10 sentences to say what you could have honestly said in four or five words, "There is no such rule."

best wishes,

Response: Because there is no construction in which to apply a rule. You are making up your own rules, by the way, can you prove that opposite? Show me an example (other than the ones in question).



3 Days Ago

#168

[tokwat baboy](#)

New Member

If Jesus were inferior to the Father...

Join Date: May 2007
 Posts: 6
 15 Reputation Points

Flowerchild thank you, [Titus 2:13](#) is taking of just one person, here is another one...

I have copied the following verses from the NWT.

In these passages from Isaiah the title THE FIRST AND THE LAST is being ascribed to the LORD (The Almighty God, the Creator of heaven and earth), for He alone is **God Eternal – Jehovah or Yahweh**.

[Isaiah 41:4](#) “... I, Jehovah, the First One; and with the last ones I am the same.”

[Isaiah 44:6](#) “This is what Jehovah has said, the King of Israel and the Repurchaser of him, Jehovah of armies. I am the first, and I am the last, and besides me there is no God.”

[Isaiah 48:12](#) “Listen to me, O Jacob, and you Israel my called one. I am the same One. I am the first. Moreover, I am the last.”

In the Book of Revelation the title THE FIRST AND THE LAST is also mention and the author attributes this to the **Lord Jesus Christ**, thus proving He is the God Eternal. Consider the following passages.

[Revelation 22:12 – 14](#) “Look! I am coming quickly, and the reward I give is with me, to render to each one as his work is. I am the Alpha and the Omega, the first and the last, the beginning and the end. Happy are those who wash their robes, that the authority [to go] to the trees of life may be theirs and that they may gain entrance into the city by its gates.”

The context of the passage proves this point, that this passage is referring to Jesus Christ ([Revelation 22:12](#)) as THE FIRST AND THE LAST, since He is the one who **promise** to COME AGAIN, ([John 14:3](#); [Acts 1:11](#); [Revelation 1:7 - 8](#)) “quickly” and with Him are the “reward” to be given “to each one as his work is...” ([1 Corinthians 3:14](#); [Colossians 3:24](#); [Revelation 20:12 – 15](#))

The next verse [Revelation 22:14](#) also support this point that Jesus Christ is the FIRST and the LAST, saying that “**happy or blessed**” are they “...who wash their robes” (or them that **do or follows** “His commandments.” [KJV]). Only the King of Kings and Lord of Lords ([Revelation 17:14](#); [19:16](#)) has the authority to “bless” and give the “right” to approach the tree of Life and grant “access” or “permission” to enter the gates of the city.

The passage from [Revelation 22:13](#), ALSO attributed the title ALPHA AND OMEGA, THE BEGINNING AND THE END to the **Lord Jesus Christ**, just like the following passage where the Apostle John first mention the title in the first chapter of the Book of Revelation.

[Revelation 1:7](#) “Look! He is coming with the clouds, and every eye will see him, and those who pierced him; and all tribes of the earth will beat themselves in grief because of him. Yes, Amen.

[Revelation 1:8](#) “I am Alpha and Omega,” says Jehovah God, “the One who is and who was and who is coming, the Almighty.”

Jesus Christ is the one who promise to COME AGAIN as mention previously, and [Revelation 1:7](#) described His coming as, “Look! He is coming with the clouds, and every eye will see him, and those who pierced him...”, (meaning His appearing or second coming will be seen by people during that particular time, and it will not happen in secret) and [Revelation 1:8](#) also calls Him **the Almighty**. I personally believe that this particular passage is talking about the **Lord Jesus Christ**.

Strong’s (3801) concordance have this notes, on the word “to come” [erchomenos], “*the one being and the one that was and the one coming*, that is, *the Eternal*, as a divine epithet of Christ.” (I don’t claim to be a Greek expert, I am just using my available references, I’m also aware of other views regarding this particular verse, attributing it to God the Father, I have no problem with that.)

Returning to the passage, the Apostle John continued introducing the Book of Revelation, then the Lord Jesus Christ talk to him again, (v. 8) introduce Himself as ... "I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last..." (Jesus Christ introduces Himself as the God Eternal.)

Reading further the Lord Jesus again spoke, repeating the same... (v. 11) (Omitted in some translations)

[Revelation 1:11](#) Saying, I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last: and, What thou seest, write in a book, and send *it* unto the seven churches... (KJV)

After a few more verses, the apostle John describe a personal experience, he could not stand the majestic vision of the Lord Jesus Christ, he "fell at his feet as dead ..." The Lord Jesus answered him and introduce himself as, "the FIRST and the LAST..."

[Revelation 1:17 - 18](#) And when I saw him, I fell as dead at his feet. And he laid his right hand upon me and said: "Do not be fearful. I am the First and the Last, and the living one; and I became dead, but look! I am living forever and ever, and I have the keys of death and of Hades."

No doubt this passages refer to the Lord Jesus Christ, who introduce himself as **the FIRST and the LAST**, since the passage also state that He "became dead," meaning Jesus died this happen when He died on the CROSS for our sins ([Romans 5:8](#) – 12).

The Lord Jesus died to bring us closer to God as stated in [1Peter 3:18](#) "For Christ also died for sins once for all, the righteous for the unrighteous, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh but made alive in the spirit..." After Jesus died for our sins, [Revelation 1:18](#) added, what Jesus said, "...but look! I am living forever and ever..." The grave could not hold Him, since He is eternal.

If the FIRST and the LAST in the Book of Isaiah refers to Jehovah, when did Jehovah die? [Revelation 1:17](#) – 18 said He died.

Since the Lord Jesus Christ also holds "the keys of death and of Hades," ([Revelation 1:18](#)) He alone determines who **enters Hades or hell** and **experience death**. ([Psalm 68:20](#); [Isaiah 25:8](#); [Jeremiah 13:16](#); [2 Corinthians 1:9](#); [Revelations 21:4](#))

Jesus Christ is the God Almighty who has authority to give life or death.

The divine title **the FIRST and the LAST** spoken by the prophet Isaiah is **Yahweh the Eternal God**, He is referred to as **Jehovah** in NWT.

He is the **LORD JESUS CHRIST** ...

- the **Almighty God** referred to in [Revelation 1:8](#),
- the **FIRST and the LAST** who **died** for our sins ([Revelation 1:17](#) – 18),
- The God who will **come** "quickly" to execute judgment and to distribute rewards, "...to render to each one as his work is..." ([Revelation 22:12](#) – 14),
- Since He is, "... **the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last...**"
- **THE LORD GOD ALMIGHTY, CREATOR, ETERNAL.**

In Isaiah 45:22 – 23, God said "By my own self I have sworn – out of my own mouth in righteousness the word has gone forth, so that it will not return – that to me every knee will bend down, every tongue will swear,"

Philippians 2:10 says, "... so that in the **name of Jesus** every knee should bend of those in heaven and those on earth and those under the ground"

If Jesus were inferior to the Father, how could the same words, first applied to the Father, be applied to him?

And I'm His son, saved by His grace; limited in knowledge cannot explain Him.



3 Days Ago

#169

John Milton

Member

Join Date: Dec 2006

Posts: 1,783

23 Reputation Points



Hi Kelton,

Quote:

Originally Posted by **kelton graham** >

Response:

You are using theology not grammar. Proper nouns don't change because of there sense. Like if I used your name John, John is always a proper noun no matter what sense I use it in because proper nouns always refer to something particular. The very idea that you have to use context to tell whether or not this is referring to Jehovah illustrates beyond a shadow of a doubt that QEOS here is a common noun not a proper one. Because if a noun like Jehovah was used here there would be no doubt.

Response: By the way calling an argument 'inane' does not refute the argument. It would be nice if you actually dealt with the argument itself your not fooling anyone with name calling. Secondly, if the basis of you calling QEOS a proper name is simply because of the article then you have no reason to reject [2 Cor 4:4](#) then because the article is present there. See: EV hOIS hO QEOS TOU AIWNOS TOUTOU, and QEOS does not have an article in [1 Cor 7:40](#) does this mean that God here is not a proper noun?

John:Exactly! Jesus clearly knew the difference between the God and gods. But trinitarians have a hard time with this because they believe in multiple persons in the Godhead, they are polypersontheists.

It has been shown that God is a proper name in the writings of Paul . Your circular argument that a proper noun and a common noun in a TSKS construction cannot refer to one person is therefore blown to bits. Out of the over 500 times Paul uses THEOS in an unqualified sense, it never refers to anyone other than the Father. Thus the expression God and Father of Jesus refer to the same person.

Response: You say there are 500 times where Paul uses QEOS to refer to

the Father, I've shown you two examples which don't. Sense does not change a proper noun into a common one. Secondly, I did not bring up [John 10:30](#) but if you want to discuss it I'd be more than happy. Third God and Father could refer to the same person because QEOS is common and fits under Grandville's rule, I am glad you agree.

Response: Because there is no construction in which to apply a rule. You are making up your own rules, by the way, can you prove that opposite? Show me an example (other than the ones in question).

Let's have it your way! Let's assume for the sake of discussion that THEOS is a common noun in the epistles of Paul, just to get your red herring off the table..

You still have insurmountable problems to overcome.

Argument (1)

(a) The claim is that in [Titus 2:13](#) the phrase *the great God* is a fixed title for the Father, not just *God*.

(b) In addition, *Saviour Jesus Christ* is a compound proper name.

Argument (2)

If we grant that Jesus is called *the great God* in [Titus 2:13](#), how does calling Jesus *the great God* make him God(YHWH)? As you know (and as you admit), others are called 'elohim' and 'theos', but to argue on such grounds that they are God Himself would commit the fallacy of equivocation, because they are not 'elohim' in the same way. The LXX acknowledges the idiom of 85:10 by adding the adjective 'great'. Even this does not bring us to strict literal accuracy: God is not simply "a great god"; He transcends the whole class of gods, being "a great King above all gods" [Psa. 95:3](#)...Are you aware that even humans are called "Mighty Gods" or "El Gibborim" in the OT? But this hardly makes them YHWH, now does it?

Don't you understand that your position is a first class circular argument? If you argue Jesus is God(YHWH) in [Titus 2:13](#) because *the great God* is only predicated of God(YHWH), you're inadvertently excluding [Titus 2:13](#) from Sharp's rule because the Old Testament and the New Testament both teach that God(YHWH) is one person, the Father. Therefore the phrase *the great God* is a fixed title of the Father, one person, **and thus it is the functional equivalent of a proper name of the Father.** 🙄 🙄

Are you aware of how hopeless your position is, no matter how you slice it?

.

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 : 3 Days Ago at 03:40 PM.



2 Days Ago

#170

[kelton graham](#)

Member

Join Date: Jan 2006

Posts: 322

21 Reputation Points



@John Milton

Hi Kelton,

Response: Hello;

John:Let's have it your way! Let's assume for the sake of discussion that THEOS is a common noun in the epistles of Paul, just to get your red herring off the table.

Response: Sure, I'll play along,

John:You still have insurmountable problems to overcome.

Response: I don't think so.

Argument (1)

(a) The claim is that in [Titus 2:13](#) the phrase *the great God* is a fixed title for the Father, not just *God*.

Response: No I don't think so because it does not say 'great God' it says 'great God and Savior.' And I don't see how anyone can argue that this is a title for the Father alone. As a matter of fact I don't even think Paul is using it as a title at all here.

Secondly, even if you could separate 'great God' from 'savior' [which I don't think you can] I don't see how this is any different than the expression 'mighty God' found in [Isaiah 9](#) & 10 grammatically or contextually.

John 😞 b) In addition, *Saviour Jesus Christ* is a compound proper name.

Response: This one cannot be a compound proper name because SWTHROS (savior) is linked to the KAI preceding it. Making IHSOU CRISTOU appositional to the SWTHROS.

John:Argument (2)

If we grant that Jesus is called *the great God* in [Titus 2:13](#) , how does calling Jesus *the great God* make him God(YHWH)?

Response: Because he is 'our God & Savior.' Far as I know, Paul only had one God & savior.

John:As you know (and as you admit), others are called 'elohim' and 'theos', but to argue on such grounds that they are God Himself would commit the fallacy of equivocation, because they are not 'elohim' in the same way. The LXX acknowledges the idiom of 85:10 by adding the adjective 'great'. Even this does not bring us to strict literal accuracy: God is not simply "a great god"; He transcends the whole class of gods, being "a great King above all gods" [Psa. 95:3](#)...Are you aware that even humans are called "Mighty Gods" or "El Gibborim" in the OT ? But this hardly makes them YHWH, now does it?

Response: Yes I think so because he is 'our God' only Yahweh is our God. And those other references to people being called Elohiym is easily cleared up one we dissect them.

John 🙄 Don't you understand that your position is a first class circular argument? If you argue Jesus is God(YHWH) in [Titus 2:13](#) because *the great God* is only predicated of God(YHWH), you're inadvertently excluding [Titus 2:13](#) from Sharp's rule because the Old Testament and the New Testament both teach that God (YHWH) is one person, the Father. Therefore the phrase *the great God* is a fixed title of the Father, one person, **and thus it is the functional equivalent of a proper name of the Father.** 🙄 🙄

Response: No, I don't think this is a circular argument by any means. Jesus is YHWH in [Titus 2:13](#) because he is 'our God' (common noun) and he is our savior, only YHWH is our God and our savior. Secondly, this does not exclude Grandvilles rule because it is still two substantives governed by a single article separated by a KAI. Grammar is Grammar no matter how one view the OT & NT teaching of YHWH being one person. [by the way I would disagree with that assertion but that would be a another post.] And again, it is not 'great God' it is great God and savior. And it is not functioning as a proper name because QEOS is not a proper name and neither is 'Savior' a proper name, combined together they still are not a proper name.

John: Are you aware of how hopeless your position is , no matter how you slice it?

Response: Nope, it looks pretty good from over here.



2 Days Ago

#171

John Milton

Member

Join Date: Dec 2006

Posts: 1,783

23 Reputation Points



Hi Kelton,

Greetings. First, a simple request. Do you know how to use quote tags? I would appreciate it if you do so; it would make your posts far more legible.

Quote:

Response: No I don't think so because it does not say 'great God' it says 'great God and Savior.' And I don't see how anyone can argue that this is a title for the Father alone. As a matter of fact I don't even think Paul is using it as a title at all here.

The terms "The great God" and "Saviour Jesus Christ" can be understood as referring to two distinct individuals. A parallel example in this regard would be,

"The Governor of California and President, Bill Clinton [or, President Bill Clinton]."

Quote:

Secondly, even if you could separate 'great God' from 'savior' [which I don't think you can] I don't see how this is any different than the expression 'mighty God' found in [Isaiah 9](#) & 10 grammatically or contextually.

You're not seriously suggesting a person is YHWH simply because they are referred to as "Mighty God" ([Isaiah 9:6](#)) or "El Gibbor" are you now?

Quote:

Response: This one cannot be a compound proper name because SWTHROS (savior) is linked to the KAI preceding it. Making IHSOU CRISTOU appositional to the SWTHROS.

Unfortunately Ezra Abbot disagrees with you. In "The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel and Other Critical Essays", Boston, 1888, pp. 439-457. On p. 452 of this work he wrote the following :

Quote:

"Take an example from the New Testament. ... In the case before us [[Titus 2:13](#)], the omission of the article before soterios seems to me to present no difficulty, -- not because soterios is made sufficiently definite by the addition of hemon (Winer), **for, since God as well as Christ is also called "our Savior," he doxa tou megalou Theou kai soterios hemon, STANDING ALONE, would most naturally be understood of one subject, namely, God, the Father; but the addition of Iesou Khristou to soterios hemon changes the case entirely, restricting the soterios hemon to a person or being who, according to Paul's HABITUAL USE OF LANGUAGE, is distinguished from the person or being whom he designates as ho theos**, so that there was no need of the repetition of the article to prevent ambiguity. "

Quote:

Response: Because he is 'our God & Savior.' Far as I know, Paul only had one God & savior.

This is extremely weak. Consider [Exodus 5:21](#)

Quote:

King James Version
5:21 And they said unto them, The LORD look upon you, and judge; because ye have made **our savour** to be abhorred in the eyes of Pharaoh, and in the eyes of his servants, to put a sword in their hand to slay us.

Does that mean Moses is YHWH ? Or consider [Gen. 42:13](#),

Quote:

Thy servants *are* twelve brethren, the sons of one man in the land of Canaan; and, behold, the youngest *is* this day with **our father**, and one *is* not.

Does that mean Jacob is YHWH, because he is called "our father", just as YHWH is ? Such examples can be compounded.

Kelton, God is not the only "God" in some lexical sense. He is the only God in the same way that He is the only Rock, the only Savior. The ones through whom God

accomplishes His deeds of salvation became "saviors" (cf. [Judges 3:9](#); [2 Kings 13:5](#); [Obadiah 21](#)), but not saviors apart from God (*mibbal`ādhō*), nor to be reckoned along with God. The principle of delegation will help you understand these things, if you give it a chance. God has given Christ power to save just as he gave this same power to Moses.. So if you are asking where salvation principally originates, it is from the Father.

[Acts 13:23](#)

Quote:

Of this man's seed hath God according to his promise raised unto Israel a Saviour, Jesus.

[Acts 5:31](#)

Quote:

Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins.

The above verses (and many others) show Christ is not intrinsically a saviour , but by delegation.

Quote:

Response: Yes I think so because he is 'our God' only Yahweh is our God. And those other references to people being called Elohiym is easily cleared up one we disect them.

Kelton, Jesus is "our" god and "our" saviour, our Christ and our Lord because God has made him so. Consider [Acts 2:36](#),

Quote:

"Therefore let all Israel be assured of this: God has **made** this Jesus, whom you crucified, both Lord and Christ."

If Jesus was God, he wouldn't need to be **made** Lord(Kurious) and Christ. He would already be Lord.

Quote:

No, I don't think this is a circular argument by any means. Jesus is YHWH in [Titus 2:13](#) because he is 'our God' (common noun) and he is our savior, only YHWH is our God and our savior.

The dilemmas you have tried to force regarding Christ could be forced in respect to Othniel ben Kenaz, who is called a savior (*mōshīā`*) of Israel, or in respect of the judges of Israel who are called (*'elohīm*), etc.

Quote:

Secondly, this does not exclude Grandvilles rule because it is still two substantives governed by a single article separated by a KAI. Grammar is Grammar no matter how one view the OT & NT teaching of YHWH being one person. [by the way I would disagree with that assertion but that

would be a another post.] And again, it is not 'great God' it is great God and savior. And it is not functioning as a proper name because QEOS is not a proper name and neither is 'Savior' a proper name, combined together they still are not a proper name.

I've already shown how "the great God" and "Saviour Jesus Christ" in [Titus 2:13](#) can be seen as refering to two persons.

And finally, to discover whether Jesus is YHWH or not, we simply have to consult [John 17:3](#). Once we have verified who Jesus is, then it will be as clear as day what [Titus 2:13](#) is actually saying. So we turn to [John 17:3](#).

Quote:

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

Here Jesus says his Father is the **only true God**. Had Jesus said his Father is "the true God" without specifying **only**, trinity doctrine might have had a chance. From [John 17:3](#) we know that the Father (or *the person of the Father* as trinitarians like to put it), is the **only** true God. So obviously if the *person of the Father* is the **only** true God, then the *persons of the Son and of the Holy Spirit* cannot also be the true God, if language has meaning, that is.

Trinity doctrine insists **not only** the *Father* is "true God" . Jesus says **only** the *Father* is "true God." -- only vs. not only. Two points of view could hardly be more contradictory.

best wishes, and I will be looking forward to an expeditious reply,

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 Days Ago

#172

[kelton graham](#)

Member

Join Date: Jan 2006

Posts: 322

21 Reputation Points



@John Milton;

Quote:

Hi Kelton,

Greetings. First, a simple request. Do you know how to use quote tags? I would appreciate it if you do so; it would make your posts far more legible.

Response: Sure no problem. I just don't use them all the time but I will in this case.

Quote:

The terms "The great God" and "Saviour Jesus Christ" can be understood as referring to two distinct individuals. A parallel example in this regard would be,

"The Governor of California and President, Bill Clinton [or, President Bill

Clinton]."

Response: In English yes, the problem is that the article in English does not function the same as in Greek. The Greek article is able to govern multiple nouns and have them referring to the same person. For example [Gal 1:7](#) ΟΙ ΤΑΡΑΣΣΟΝΤΕΣ ... ΚΕΛΟΝΤΕΣ (those who are disturbing and desiring...) are under the same article and referring to the same group. By the way this is not even a Grandville construction because both groups are plural, but it shows how the article works in Greek.

Quote:

You're not seriously suggesting a person is YHWH simply because they are referred to as "Mighty God" ([Isaiah 9:6](#)) or "El Gibbor" are you now?

Response: You missed my point. You were arguing that 'Great God' in [Titus 2:13](#) was a title for the Father alone. At the end of my response, I made the point that the expression 'Great God' is no different than 'mighty God' found in [Isaiah 9](#) & 10. Since 'Mighty God' can be used for both the Father and the Son, I don't see why 'Great God' has to be a title for the Father alone.

Quote:

Unfortunately Ezra Abbot disagrees with you. In "The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel and Other Critical Essays", Boston, 1888, pp. 439-457. On p. 452 of this work he wrote the following :

Response: I am not worried about Ezra Abbot disagreeing with me because unfortunately he has not backed up his opinion with any type of grammatical analysis. (Unless you did not paste the whole argument) In other words he did not deal with,

1: The function of the article.

2: Function of KAI.

3 The role of two common nouns found in TSKS.

4: The similarities with regard to grammar to passages such as [Gal 1:4](#). etc. Until he has dealt with this issues all he is doing is giving an opinion and nothing that I can interact with.

Quote:

This is extremely weak. Consider [Exodus 5:21](#)

Response: I think you were going to fast here. You did not read the text, the word savour there does not mean savior but rather scent or smell. "you have made our scent/smell a stench in the eyes of Pharaoh." Isn't it amazing how they can say "you caused us to stink in the eyes of Pharaoh?"

One normally does not associate stinking with eyes, but anyway back to the point.

Quote:

Does that mean Moses is YHWH ? Or consider [Gen. 42:13](#),

Response: No it means that Moses made them look bad in front of Pharaoh and as a result they had to do more work. By the way, this is getting away from [Titus 2:13](#) grammar. If you don't have anything more to say about it, we can call this

quits.

Quote:

Does that mean Jacob is YHWH, because he is called "our father", just as YHWH is ? Such examples can be compounded.

Response: I never mentioned the expression 'our father.' I said 'our God and savior.' Paul only had one of those.

Quote:

Kelton, God is not the only "God" in some lexical sense.

snip

The above verses (and many others) show Christ is not intrinsically a saviour , but by delegation.

Response: And I have no problem with that. Because I believe Christ humbled himself and was exalted to his rightful position after the resurrection. But the point is that for Paul, he only had one 'our God & savior.' Namely Jesus Christ. For him to say he is 'our God & savior' limits the scope so to speak. But again this is getting away from [Titus 2:13](#), if you don't have anymore to add, I suggest you start another post and in box me in case I miss it. I am not on here every day.

Quote:

Kelton, Jesus is "our" god and "our" saviour, our Christ and our Lord because God has made him so. Consider [Acts 2:36](#),

If Jesus was God, he wouldn't need to be **made** Lord(Kurious) and Christ. He would already be Lord.

Response: Now, this is another post, if you really want to discuss this one you should consider starting up a separate post. This has nothing to do with Grandville Sharp. But I am sure you already know the trinitarian responses to these verses.

Quote:

The dilemmas you have tried to force regarding Christ could be forced in respect to Othniel ben Kenaz, who is called a savior (*mōshīa`*) of Israel, or in respect of the judges of Israel who are called (*'elohīm*), etc.

Response: This is not a problem at all. But this is also a different post.

Quote:

I've already shown how "the great God" and "Saviour Jesus Christ" in [Titus 2:13](#) can be seen as referring to two persons.

Response: That works fine in english, just not in Greek.

Quote:

And finally, to discover whether Jesus is YHWH or not, we simply have to consult [John 17:3](#). Once we have verified who Jesus is, then it will be as

clear as day what [Titus 2:13](#) is actually saying. So we turn to [John 17:3](#).

Here Jesus says his Father is the **only true God**. Had Jesus said his Father is "the true God" without specifying **only**, trinity doctrine might have had a chance. From [John 17:3](#) we know that the Father (or *the person of the Father* as trinitarians like to put it), is the **only** true God. So obviously if the *person of the Father* is the **only** true God, then the *persons of the Son and of the Holy Spirit* cannot also be the true God, if language has meaning, that is.

Response: Whoa dude, you've jumped all over the place. I mean you went from Exodus to John, again this verse is not a problem at all. Just start up another post, in box me if I miss it. And we can discuss this verse as much as you wish. But this has zero to do with the grammar of [Titus 2:13](#).

Quote:

Trinity doctrine insists **not only** the *Father* is "true God" . Jesus says **only** the *Father* is "true God." -- only vs. not only. Two points of view could hardly be more contradictory.

best wishes, and I will be looking forward to an expeditious reply,

Response: Again, not a problem for us trinitarians.



1 Day Ago

#173

John Milton

Member

Join Date: Dec 2006

Posts: 1,783

23 Reputation Points



Hi kelton graham

Quote:

Response: In English yes, the problem is that the article in English does not function the same as in Greek. The Greek article is able to govern multiple nouns and have them referring to the same person. For example [Gal 1:7](#) OI TARASSONTES ... QELONTES (those who are disturbing and desiring...) are under the same article and referring to the same group. By the way this is not even a Grandville construction because both groups are plural, but it shows how the article works in Greek.

Response: You missed my point. You were arguing that 'Great God' in [Titus 2:13](#) was a title for the Father alone. At the end of my response, I made the point that the expression 'Great God' is no different than 'mighty God' found in [Isaiah 9](#) & 10. Since 'Mighty God' can be used for both the Father and the Son, I don't see why 'Great God' has to be a title for the Father alone.

Quote:

Response: I never mentioned the expression 'our father.' I said 'our God and savior.' Paul only had one of those.

Point is if others can be called **our** Father without making them YHWH then others can also be called **our great god and saviour** without making them YHWH. You placed great emphasis on the word **our** last post , implying that somehow it's presence in the phrase **our great god and saviour** restricted it's application to YHWH. So don't play dumb.

Here's another example.

In 1 King 1:47 we have the following:

Quote:

moreover the king's servants came to bless **our lord** king David, saying,

In [Acts 15:26](#) we have the following:

Quote:

26Men that have hazarded their lives for the name of **our Lord** Jesus Christ.

Ofcourse we also know from the Bible that YHWH is referred to as **our Lord** . But that doesn't mean King David or Jesus are YHWH . Similarly it's a stretch for you to suggest Jesus is YHWH because he is **our great god and saviour**.

In short, there is nothing in the expression *our great god and saviour* which restricts it to YHWH alone. It is like any other exulted title such as *Lord*, or *mighty god*, or *god*, or *saviour* or *king* etc. . These can be predicated of others apart from YHWH.

Quote:

Response: And I have no problem with that. Because I believe Christ humbled himself and was exalted to his rightful position after the resurrection. **But the point is that for Paul, he only had one 'our God & savior.'** Namely Jesus Christ.

Actually for Paul there was **only one God, the Father**. So insofar as Jesus is God he is not God in the same sense as the Father is God . [Cor. 8:6](#),

Quote:

yet for us **there is one God, the Father**, from whom all things are and for whom we exist, and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom all things are and through whom we exist.

Quote:

Response: Now, this is another post, if you really want to discuss this one you should consider starting up a separate post. This has nothing to do with Grandville Sharp. But I am sure you already know the trinitarian

responses to these verses.

This might not have anything to do with Granville Sharp but everything to do with the context of Titus 2:13. You cannot expect to discuss Titus 2:13 in isolation from the rest of the NT, though I suspect that is your preference!

Quote:

Response: Whoa dude, you've jumped all over the place. I mean you went from Exodus to John, again this verse is not a problem at all. Just start up another post, in box me if I miss it. And we can discuss this verse as much as you wish. But this has zero to do with the grammar of [Titus 2:13](#).

Again, [John 17:3](#) is context for [Titus 2:13](#). If it can be shown that Jesus himself did not claim to be YHWH, then it immediately puts to rest any speculations that the phrase *our great god and saviour* implies Jesus is YHWH.

Quote:

Response: Again, not a problem for us trinitarians.

Explain why it is not a problem !!

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.



1 Day Ago

#174

[John Milton](#)

Member

Join Date: Dec 2006
Posts: 1,783
23 Reputation Points



Kelton,

Quote:

Response: I think you were going to fast here. You did not read the text, the word savour there does not mean savior but rather scent or smell. "you have made our scent/smell a stench in the eyes of Pharaoh." Isn't it amazing how they can say "you caused us to stink in the eyes of Pharaoh?"

My bad. You're right.

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.



1 Day Ago

#175

[tkkclark](#)




Oh my goodness, I may faint

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006
 Posts: 290
 18 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **John Milton** 
Kelton,

My bad. You're right.



This is the first time I can ever recall seeing a JW - **any** JW - on this forum admit he or she was wrong. About anything. Granted, this was in regards to only one small point in your much broader argument, but...Wow.

I know I drive you up the wall, mondo, (it's all that breathing I do, ROTFL), but I try to give credit where credit is due. It takes a load of guts to own up to a mistake, minor or otherwise. I hadn't thought you had it in you. I'm happy to be wrong.

Back to lurking, where I fervently practice clutching my straws whilst I bark up trees. 🤪



1 Day Ago


#176

[kelton graham](#)

Member

Join Date: Jan 2006
 Posts: 322
 21 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **John Milton** 
Hi kelton graham

Response: Hello.

Quote:

Actually he dealt with the grammatical arguments at length but I didn't paste them. In anycase, Glorifyyeshua on another thread makes the observation that Murdock translates Titus2:13 this way:

snip

He correctly notes that "they were simply looking forward to the day of YHWH when the Messiah comes back (or from your perspective the first time) and sets things straight for all mankind. That will be a manifestation of YHWH's glory."

So your speculations are neither here nor there. [Titus 2:13](#) is a disputed text, hardly the cornerstone upon which to build the Trinity doctrine upon. But from the looks of it so far, that's all you seem to have.

Response: Murdock's argument did not interact with any sort of grammar only theology. Unless he deals with the grammar then his argument does not hold much weight in my eyes. Not saying theology is not important but if it is contrary to the grammar and he does not interact with it, it is difficult for me to agree with him.

Quote:

I'm actually going to be very generous and concede for the sake of discussion that Paul calls Jesus *the/our great god and saviour*. Question is , so what?

Response: then Jesus is God almighty. Because Paul only serves one God.

Quote:

I'm not sure about that. I will consult the Jews and get back to you on this one.

Response: No problem.

Quote:

This is hardly getting away from Titus, Kelton, and I don't want to call it quits. I've just begun!

Response: What I am saying is that each verse needs exegetical consideration. Each has its own context, grammar, etc. If you want to deal with [Titus 2:13](#), then we need to exegete that passage first then exegete the others and then compare. You can't just jump from verse to verse without dealing with them in their context and their own grammar. that is why I said it is best to start another post.

Quote:

Point is if others can be called **our** Father without making them YHWH then others can also be called **our great god and saviour** without making them YHWH. You placed great emphasis on the word **our** last post , implying that somehow it's presence in the phrase **our great god and saviour** restricted it's application to YHWH. So don't play dumb.

Response: Well actually Jacob was referring to his father, we don't have the same father as he does.

Quote:

Here's another example.

In 1 King 1:47 we have the following:

In [Acts 15:26](#) we have the following:

Ofcourse we also know from the Bible that YHWH is referred to as **our Lord** . But that doesn't mean King David or Jesus are YHWH . Similarly it's a stretch for you to suggest Jesus is YHWH because he is **our great god and saviour**.

Response: david was their lord, in his office as king. He is neither our king nor our lord but Christ is presently our Lord and our King.

Quote:

In short, there is nothing in the expression *our great god and saviour* which restricts it to YHWH alone. It is like any other exulted title such as *Lord*, or *mighty god*, or *god*, or *saviour* or *king* etc. . These can be predicated of others apart from YHWH.

Response: Sure there is, because he is presently 'our great God and savior' we only have one God and savior.

Quote:

Actually for Paul there was **only one God, the Father**. So insofar as Jesus is God he is not God in the same sense as the Father is God . [Cor. 8:6](#),

Response: This verse is not a problem, but again deserves its on special attention and is not a factor in determining Grandville sharp constructions.

Quote:

This might not have anything to do with Granville Sharp but everything to do with the context of Titus 2:13. You cannot expect to discuss Titu s2:13 inisolation from the rest of the NT Kelton, though I suspect that is your preference!.

Response: And I am not trying too, I am just saying that the other verses deserve exegesis separately first. Because I can do just the opposite of what you are doing. I can say, "we need to interpret [John 17](#) in light of [Titus 2:13](#). Just because the Father is the only God, it is evident that because of Grandville sharp construction found in [Titus 2:13](#) that Jesus is also God almighty and thus the only true God as well." See what I mean?

Quote:

Again, [John 17:3](#) is context for [Titus 2:13](#). If it can be shown that Jesushimself did not claim to be YHWH, then it immediately puts to rest any speculations that the phrase *our great god and saviour* implies Jesus is YHWH.

Response: Likewise, I can do the opposite. I can say we need to see the context of [Jn 17:3](#) in light of [Titus 2:13](#).

Quote:

Explain why it is not a problem !!

best wishes,

Response: Because we don't stop at verse 3. But you can start here if you are not familiar with our response.

<http://aomin.org/John175.html>

23 Hours Ago

#177

John Milton

Member

Join Date: Dec 2006

Posts: 1,783

23 Reputation Points



Hi kelton graham

Quote:

Response: then Jesus is God almighty. Because Paul only serves one God.

I know you're smarter than that Kelton. **Paul says we only have one God, and he identifies this one God as one person , not as three persons, as the person of the Father.** Therefore the person of the son when he is called *god* or *great god* is *god* in a different sense than the Father is *God*, just as when humans are called *gods* in [John 10:34](#) they are *gods* in a different sense than the Father is *God*.

Quote:

Response: Well actually Jacob was referring to his father, we don't have the same father as he does.

First of all, in [Gen. 42:13](#) the children of Jacob were referring to Jacob as **our father** and not Jacob referring to his own father as you're suggesting. But I get what you mean. Kelton, you're proving my argument once again! Ofcourse we don't have the **same** father as the children of Jacob do , and that's precisely the point! The point here is that Jacob's children could refer to their father as **our father** and also to God as **our father** without the implication that *their own father* is the **same** father as YHWH . Similarly, , we can refer to Jesus as **our god** and to YHWH as **our God** without the implication that Jesus is the **same** god as YHWH . Jesus is **our god** in a different sense than YHWEH is **our God**, just as Jacob is **our father** (or the Father of the Israelites) in a difference sense that YHWH is **our father**.

Quote:

Response: david was their lord, in his office as king. He is neither our king nor our lord but Christ is presently our Lord and our King.

Are you deliberately playing dumb? The Israelites could refer to King David as **our Lord** and also to YHWH as **our Lord** without the implication that King David is YHWH.

In the same way we can refer to Jesus as **our Lord** and also to YHWH as **our Lord** without the implication that Jesus is YHWH.

Quote:

King David was their Lord, just as God was their Lord

Exactly! In the same way , Jesus is *our Lord*, just as YHWH is *our Lord*, but that doesn't mean Jesus is YHWH.

Quote:

Response: Sure there is, because he is presently '**our great God and savior**' we only have **one God** and savior.

That's the point! The Israelites also had only **one** LORD, yet they could still refer to King David as **our** Lord.

Quote:

Response: Likewise, I can do the opposite. I can say we need to see the context of [Jn 17:3](#) in light of [Titus 2:13](#).

Here's the difference. In [Titus 2:13](#) it can easily be argued that the expression *our great god and saviour* is not a fixed title of YHWH and others can be called *our great god and saviour* without making them YHWH by citing NT verses as proof in this regard. But how are you going to argue that the person of Jesus is also the **only true God** without contradicting Jesus when he says the person of the Father is **the only true God!**?

Quote:

Response: Because we don't stop at verse 3. But you can start here if you are not familiar with our response.

'Argument' by link is not an argument at all. Please offer an explanation in your own words. Are you saying after verse 3 the bible contradicts Jesus and says the Father is not the only true God?

All in all, I would much rather be arguing my position than yours, Kelton, that's for sure!

And that's the way the cookie crumbles,

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 : 23 Hours Ago at 05:34 PM.



18 Hours Ago

#178

[kelton graham](#)


Member

Join Date: Jan 2006

Posts: 322

21 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by [John Milton](#) 
Hi kelton graham

*I know you're smarter than that Kelton. **Paul says we only have one God, and he identifies this one God as one person , not as three persons, as the person of the Father.** Therefore the person of the son when he is called god or great god is god in a different sense than the Father is God, just as when humans are called gods in [John 10:34](#) they are gods in a different sense than the Father is God.*

Response: Well I would disagree with your opinion and interpretation of both [1 Cor 8:6](#) & [John 10:34](#) but you did not provide any exegesis to interact with. You just told me what you think, well if that is the case, I would argue that in [1 Cor](#)

[8:6](#) Jesus' deity is shown clearly and in [John 10:30-34](#) Jesus deity is clearly illustrated.

By the way, I think you jumping from verse to verse shows that you no longer have any arguments dealing with [Titus 2:13](#) and the TSKS. So unless you have nothing else to add to it, I think we can let this post rest. But feel free to start another one on a different topic, but inbox me because I am not here everyday.

Quote:

First of all, in [Gen. 42:13](#) the children of Jacob were referring to Jacob as **our father** and not Jacob referring to his own father as you're suggesting. But I get what you mean. Kelton, you're proving my argument once again! Ofcourse we don't have the **same** father as the children of Jacob do , and that's precisely the point! The point here is that Jacob's children could refer to their father as **our father** and also to God as **our father** without the implication that *their own father* is the **same** father as YHWH . Similarly, , we can refer to Jesus as **our god** and to YHWH as **our God** without the implication that Jesus is the **same** god as YHWH . Jesus is **our god** in a different sense than YHWEH is **our God**, just as Jacob is **our father** (or the Father of the Israelites) in a difference sense that YHWH is **our father**.

Response: Well John, you are no longer monotheistic if you maintain that we can refer to Jesus as our God, when [1 Cor 8:6](#) makes it clear that there is only one God for us.

And again, this has nothing to do with this topic. I mean you are bringing up [Gen 42](#) now? Talk about off topic.

Quote:

Are you deliberately playing dumb? The Israelites could refer to King David as **our Lord** and also to YHWH as **our Lord** without the implication that King David is YHWH. In the same way we can refer to Jesus as **our Lord** and also to YHWH as **our Lord** without the implication that Jesus is YHWH.

Response: But the difference is that Jesus is our Lord and our God and our savior. Now you could try to say that all of these are in a different sense but unfortunately for you there can only be one 'our God and Savior.'

Quote:

Exactly! In the same way , Jesus is *our Lord*, just as YHWH is *our Lord*, but that doesn't mean Jesus is YHWH.

Response: Lord, God, and Savior. This sort of narrows down the sense that you are looking for.

Quote:

That's the point! The Israelites also had only **one** LORD, yet they could still refer to King David as **our Lord**.

Response: Same response.

Quote:

Here's the difference. In [Titus 2:13](#) it can easily be argued that the expression *our great god and saviour* is not a fixed title of YHWH and others can be called *our great god and saviour* without making them YHWH by citing NT verses as proof in this regard. But how are you going to argue that the person of Jesus is also the **only true God** without contradicting Jesus when he says the person of the Father is **the only true God!**?

Response: Because I don't see them as separate gods. And really, I've never heard of anyone arguing against Grandville Sharp with [John 17](#). I mean you could at least pick a passage with the same grammar.

Quote:

'Argument' by link is not an argument at all. Please offer an explanation in your own words. Are you saying after verse 3 the bible contradicts Jesus and says the Father is not the only true God?

Response: No I am saying that the entire chapter 17 of John proves his deity instead of refutes it. And again, if we start discussing [John 17](#) that would take the heat off of [Titus 2:13](#) which is a) the topic of this post. b) a serious problem for your view.

So let me ask, do you have anything else dealing with [Titus 2:13](#), TSKS? If not start another post, otherwise you are jacking this one.

Quote:

All in all, I would much rather be arguing my position than yours, Kelton, that's for sure!

And that's the way the cookie crumbles,

Response: I am not too worried about it. I have put in a great deal of work into my views for each of the passages mentioned. The problem is each one requires a great deal of exegesis & background and context to solve which is why they need to be treated in their own right.



12 Hours Ago

#179

[John Milton](#)

Member

Join Date: Dec 2006

Posts: 1,783

23 Reputation Points



Hi Kelton,

Quote:

Well I would disagree with your opinion and interpretation of both [1 Cor 8:6](#) & [John 10:34](#) but you did not provide any exegesis to interact with.

[1 Cor 8:6](#)

Quote:

yet for us there is one God, the Father, of whom *are* all things, and we for Him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, through whom *are* all things, and through whom we *live*.

What part of "yet for us there is one God, the Father" don't you understand? Paul is saying *for us there is one God who is the person of the Father*.

Regarding [John 10:34](#) the fact that Jesus answered the Jews by quoting [Psalm 82:6](#) (where beings other than YHWH are called "gods" or "elohim") shows that they had accused him of claiming to be "god" not "God" [since the word "God" or "THEOS" is a common noun and can mean either god(or a god) or God]. If the Jews had accused Jesus of being God, then his response in citing a text where others are not called God but god/s would not refute their point and would be essentially meaningless in reply.

Quote:

By the way, I think you jumping from verse to verse shows that you no longer have any arguments dealing with [Titus 2:13](#) and the TSKS.

In case you haven't caught on, I've already admitted for the sake of discussion that [Titus 2:13](#) does indeed refer to Jesus as *our great god and saviour*. So what?

Quote:

So unless you have nothing else to add to it, I think we can let this post rest.

But you have not been able to make even half a case that the phrase *our great god and saviour* means Jesus is YHWH.

Quote:

Response: Well John, you are no longer monotheistic if you maintain that we can refer to Jesus as our God, when [1 Cor 8:6](#) makes it clear that there is only one God for us.

On the contrary. [1 Cor. 8:6](#) makes it clear that the one God is the Father, or as trinitarians are apt to put it, *the person of the Father*. So to say the *person of Jesus* is also the one God, is polytheism.

Quote:

And again, this has nothing to do with this topic. I mean you are bringing up [Gen 42](#) now? Talk about off topic.

How can scriptures which feed context for [Titus 2:13](#) be considered off topic? I think you're complaining because you prefer to read [Titus 2:13](#) eisegetically.

Quote:

Response: But the difference is that Jesus is our Lord and our God and our savior. Now you could try to say that all of these are in a different sense but unfortunately for you there can only be one 'our God and Savior.'

So Jesus is God because he is called *our Lord* and *our God* and *our saviour* but King David isn't God because he is just called *our Lord*? If calling another *our God* is polytheism because "we only have one God" then calling another *our Lord* should also be polytheism because "we only have one Lord ." Whether one title or three titles predicated of YHWH are applied to another, the same logic must be

applied with each title , else your argument breaks down because of equivocation. For then it would follow that King David is able to be called *our Lord* because there can be more than *one LORD*. Besides [Titus 2:13](#) only calls Jesus *our great god and saviour* and not *Lord, God and Saviour*. Does that mean the phrase in [Titus 2:13](#) on it's own does not prove Jesus YHWH?

Quote:

Response: Lord, God, and Savior. This sort of narrows down the sense that you are looking for.

So any person who is called *Lord , God and Saviour* is YHWH but any person who is called *Lord and God* or just called *Lord* isn't YHWH? Why does it have to be three titles? Why not *Lord, God, Saviour, King*? Looks like sheer desperation to me. Not to mention that your position is logically inconsistent . Even then, you don't have a case because Moses is called *Lord, God and Saviour* in the writings of the Jews. Is he God then? Next you'll be telling us a person is YHWH if they are called *Lord, God and Saviour and born in Bethlehem*. 🙄

Quote:

Response: Because I don't see them as separate gods.

That's not even an attempt at answering the question. It is precisely because the three persons are the same God that it would be an **outright lie** for Jesus to say "my Father is the only true God" if he himself was also the true God.

Quote:

And really, I've never heard of anyone arguing against Grandville Sharp with [John 17](#).

Kelton, I'm not arguing Granville Sharp in [Titus 2:13](#). I'm conceding it! I told you that a few posts ago. For the sake of argument let's assume Jesus is called *our great god and saviour* .

Quote:

I mean you could at least pick a passage with the same grammar.

Again, this shows me you're not following our discussion.

Quote:

Response: No I am saying that the entire chapter 17 of John proves his deity instead of refutes it. And again, if we start discussing [John 17](#) that would take the heat off of [Titus 2:13](#) which is a) the topic of this post. b) a serious problem for your view.

On the contrary Kelton. The paucity of your position is apparent because even though I've conceded [Titus 2:13](#) you're feeling **more** heat than before I conceded it. If I was trying to take the heat off [Titus 2:13](#) why would I concede it ? [Titus 2:13](#) says Jesus is *our great god and saviour*. Fine. Now prove to us that calling someone *our great god and saviour* means they are YHWH.

Quote:

So let me ask, do you have anything else dealing with [Titus 2:13](#), TSKS?

kelton, I've already conceded [Titus 2:13](#) TSKS. From you inability to show *our great god and saviour* means Jesus is YHWH it becomes obvious that you have but a bogus argument.

.

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.

Last edited by John Milton : 11 Hours Ago at 05:18 AM.



9 Hours Ago

#180

[kelton graham](#)

Member

Join Date: Jan 2006

Posts: 322

21 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **John Milton**

Hi Kelton,

[1 Cor 8:6](#)

What part of "yet for us there is one God, the Father" don't you understand? Paul is saying for us there is one God who is the person of the Father.

Response: I would see Lord and God to mean basically the same thing in that passage. If you flip to verse 5. I think Paul is lumping all idols under the category of '*lords and gods*.' Kinda like if I said "there are many pastors and elders." So Paul has lumped them all together under the title "so-called gods."

But to us on the other hand just as they have many lords and gods, we have one God and one Lord. So in my view I would see Jesus being called the one Lord as being equivalent to the Father being called the one God.

Quote:

Regarding [John 10:34](#) the fact that Jesus answered the Jews by quoting [Psalm 82:6](#) (where beings other than YHWH are called "gods" or "elohim") shows that they had accused him of claiming to be "god" not "God" [since the word "God" or "THEOS" is a common noun and can mean either god (or a god) or God]. If the Jews had accused Jesus of being God, then his response in citing a text where others are not called God but god/s would not refute their point and would be essentially meaningless in reply.

Response: Well, again I think [Psalm 82](#) needs to have special attention but I'll try

to give you my view as simple as possible. I don't think Jesus was calling the leaders QEOS in a positive sense. In [Psalm 82](#), the judges were called gods because of their authority, but the way I take the verse is that God is being sarcastic. "Sure, go ahead think you are god, but you will die like mere men." Their power and authority had gone to their heads similar to the way the current opposition of Jesus did in that day. So I think when Jesus quotes that verse he is applying it to them. "Sure you are a god, go ahead and think it, but you like them will die like mere men." And if those who did not have the right to be called God were called God and you did not trip out, how much more of a right do I have?

Quote:

In case you haven't caught on, I've already admitted for the sake of discussion that [Titus 2:13](#) does indeed refer to Jesus as *our great god and saviour*. So what?

Response: Then we can leave this post alone and start another one. Unless you are just comfortable here.

Quote:

But you have not been able to make even half a case that the phrase *our great god and saviour* means Jesus is YHWH.

Response: It is just monotheism I suppose. I don't Paul can make a statement like the one over in [1 Cor 8](#) and have Jesus being a lesser God.

Quote:

On the contrary. [1 Cor. 8:6](#) makes it clear that the one God is the Father, or as trinitarians are apt to put it, *the person of the Father*. So to say the *person of Jesus* is also the one God, is polytheism.

Response: I don't think so, I think Paul is linking Lord and God under the same boat. It is almost like he is saying 'they have a bunch of gods and lords or whatever you want to call what they worship.' But we have only one.

I almost envision Paul referring to different groups where one group may praise a deity which they refer to as lord, and the other group refer to a deity as god and Paul just lumps them together.

Quote:

How can scriptures which feed context for [Titus 2:13](#) be considered off topic? I think you're complaining because you prefer to read [Titus 2:13](#) eisegetically.

Response: No I just know that exegesis for verses is very long. Anyone can simply keep spitting out verse after verse and if you don't make the room or time to deal with each verse then you blur the conversation. In otherwords, I can answer Titus, then you may go to [Col 1](#), then I answer that, then you could go to [Rev 3](#), then I'd have to answer that, then you could go somewhere in the LXX, after a while I would have replied to 20 different verses each of which could potentially be a 10 page paper to do proper exegesis. No thanks.

Quote:

So Jesus is God because he is called *our Lord* and *our God* and *our saviour* but King David isn't God because he is just called *our Lord*? If calling

another *our God* is polytheism because "we only have one God" then calling another *our Lord* should also be polytheism because "we only have one Lord ." Whether one title or three titles predicated of YHWH are applied to another, the same logic must be applied with each title , else your argument breaks down because of equivocation. For then it would follow that King David is able to be called *our Lord* because there can be more than *one LORD*. Besides [Titus 2:13](#) only calls Jesus *our great god and saviour* and not *Lord, God and Saviour*. Does that mean the phrase in [Titus 2:13](#) on it's own does not prove Jesus YHWH?

Response: Well no, David is not our lord at all. He was the people he was ruling over lord but in no way our lord. When Paul is speaking he is saying that Christ is our God meaning us, the church. We, the church have only one God and no one else fits that category.

Quote:

So any person who is called *Lord , God and Saviour* is YHWH but any person who is called *Lord and God* or just called *Lord* isn't YHWH? Why does it have to be three titles? Why not *Lord, God, Saviour, King*? Looks like sheer desperation to me. Not to mention that your position is logically inconsistent . Even then, you don't have a case because Moses is called *Lord, God and Saviour* in the writings of the Jews. Is he God then? Next you'll be telling us a person is YHWH if they are called *Lord, God and Saviour and born in Bethlehem*. 🙄

Response: But they would have to be our (meaning the church's) Lord, God, and Savior. Moses was not our Lord, God or Savior. That is the whole point of what Paul is saying, that for the church Christ is ours.

Quote:

That's not even an attempt at answering the question. It is precisely because the three persons are the same God that it would be an **outright lie** for Jesus to say "my Father is the only true God" if he himself was also the true God.

Response: Again, [John 17](#) is a very lengthy discussion. But in brief, we do not think Jesus is lying when he calls the Father the only true God, but we do not think he was denying his own deity in that verse. I think he was speaking as an incarnate human who had a God over him, giving him proper praise and glory like a human would. But at the same time, his prayer is that people may know both his God and himself (that is the kicker) in order to be saved. And knowing here is not intellectual knowledge but an intimate relationship, the way one is saved is to have a relationship with both the Father and Son, and I would propose an equal relationship with both. That is why later on Jesus could command the Father to glorify him because he is no longer speaking as a servant but as the second person. etc

snip

Quote:

On the contrary Kelton. The paucity of your position is apparent because even though I've conceded [Titus 2:13](#) you're feeling **more** heat than before I conceded it. If I was trying to take the heat off [Titus 2:13](#) why would I concede it ? [Titus 2:13](#) says Jesus is *our great god and*

saviour. Fine. Now prove to us that calling someone *our great god and saviour* means they are YHWH.

Response: No it is not that I am feeling heat, I just know that if you keep coming with verses that means more explaining from my part. And of course the explaining would take a lot of explaining because each of the NT verses you mentioned require a lot of work.

snip



Post Reply

Page 9 of 10 << First < 5 6 7 8 **9** 10 > ▾

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

Quick Reply

Message:

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 05:13 PM.
 As of July 6, 2006, Total Page Views: 22,973,980, Page Views Today: 22,973,980

-- 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