

JEHOVAH'S WITNESSES DEFENDED

AN ANSWER
TO SCHOLARS
AND CRITICS

SECOND EDITION

GREG STAFFORD

JEHOVAH'S WITNESSES DEFENDED

AN ANSWER
TO SCHOLARS
AND CRITICS

SECOND EDITION

GREG STAFFORD



ELIHU BOOKS
Huntington Beach, California

Copyright © 2000 by Greg Stafford

Published by:
Elihu Books
PO Box 3533
Huntington Beach, CA 92605-3533
www.elihubooks.com

All rights reserved. Except for brief quotations embodied in printed reviews or critical articles, no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means (printed, written, photocopying, visual, electronic, audio or otherwise), without the prior written permission of the author and publisher.

Printed in the United States of America by
KNI, Anaheim, California

Publisher's Cataloging-in-Publication
(Provided by Quality Books, Inc.)

Stafford, Greg (Greg G.)

Jehovah's Witnesses defended : an answer to
scholars and critics / Greg Stafford. -- 2nd ed.
p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index

LCCN: 99-66423

ISBN: 0-9659814-8-7

1. Jehovah's Witnesses.--Doctrines.
 2. Jehovah's Witnesses--Apologetic works.
- I. Title.

BX8526.S69 2000

289.9'2

QBI99-1280

Excursus

The Significance of Article-Noun-Καί-Noun Constructions In Passages Relating to the Divinity of Christ

In christological discussions centering on passages where the divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ may or may not be asserted, one inevitably comes to several verses where the interpretation hinges on how we interpret article-noun-καί-noun constructions. In 1798 Granville Sharp put forth his *Remarks on the Use of the Definitive Article in the Greek Text of the New Testament: Containing Many New Proofs of the Divinity of Christ, from Passages which are wrongly Translated in the Common English Version*.¹ In his monograph Sharp articulated a rule of Greek grammar which has survived many controversies and critical reviews, although it is almost always misunderstood in one way or another, even by its proponents. But times are changing.

Daniel Wallace has taken a giant step forward in clarifying Sharp's rule, so that its true exegetical value can be realized, and the abuses, hopefully, eliminated. His doctoral thesis² contains excellent historical information on the controversy surrounding Sharp's rule, as well as insights into Sharp's life and other writings.

Wallace also offers several explanations to what some have considered exceptions to Sharp's rule, and in the process he has helped refine it. Sharp himself qualified his rule by imposing various limitations on it. Wallace has limited it even further. To help us appreciate the differences between Sharp's rule and Wallace's revision of it, let us consider them side by side:

¹ Throughout this study we will quote only from the first American edition of Sharp's work, published by B. B. Hopkins, Philadelphia, 1807.

² Daniel B. Wallace, "The Article with Multiple Substantives Connected by Καί in the New Testament: Semantics and Significance" (Ph.D. dissertation: Dallas Theological Seminary, 1995). Wallace's *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 270-290, also contains a valuable discussion of Sharp's rule.

Sharp:

When the copulative καί connects two nouns of the same case, [viz. nouns (either substantive or adjective, or participles) of personal description, respecting office, dignity, affinity, or connexion, and attributes, properties, or qualities, good or ill,] if the article ο', or any of its cases, precedes the first of the said nouns or participles, and is not repeated before the second noun or participle, the latter always relates to the same person that is expressed or described by the first noun or participle: i.e. it denotes a farther description of the first-named person.³

Wallace:

In native Greek constructions (i.e., not translation Greek), when a single article modifies *two* substantives connected by καί (thus, article-substantive-καί-substantive), when both substantives are (1) singular (both grammatically and semantically), (2) personal, (3) and common nouns (not proper names or ordinals), they have the same referent.⁴

Though not given in his actual statement of the rule, Sharp also excluded proper names and plural nouns.⁵ Thus, two key differences between Sharp's rule and what Wallace considers the "Sharper" rule are: 1) this rule would not apply when the Greek is that which is used to translate another language (for example, from Hebrew to Greek, as in the case of the LXX), and 2) the nouns must not only be grammatically singular, but *semantically* singular as well (that is, not generic nouns, which are used in a general or universal sense). Wallace makes other refinements to Sharp's rule, particularly as they relate to proper names and what constitutes them.

The focus of this excursus will be to discuss the application of Wallace's refined version of Granville Sharp's rule to four passages which are most often considered in this light, namely, Ephesians 5:5 (τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ), 2 Thessalonians 1:12 (τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ), Titus 2:13 (τοῦ

³ Sharp, *Remarks*, 3.

⁴ Wallace, "Multiple Substantives," 134-135, 279.

⁵ Sharp, *Remarks*, 6.

μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ), and 2 Peter 1:1 (τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ).⁶

We believe a careful examination of the evidence will reveal that while these passages appear to fit the specifications of the "Sharper rule," there are several reasons for seeing them in a somewhat different light than the 78 passages listed by Wallace as meeting the requirements of the rule.⁷ However, before we discuss these four passages of christological importance, we will consider several other exceptions to Sharp's rule, and what it is that makes them exceptions.

Exceptions to Sharp's Canon

The response by Calvin Winstanley. Among the first to respond to Sharp's work was Calvin Winstanley.⁸ Winstanley was the only one who actually sought to prove Sharp wrong by citing examples in Greek literature where his rule did not hold. Wallace considers the second edition (1819) of Winstanley's work "the latest and most complete list of exceptions to Sharp's rule," referring particularly to the "*categories* of exceptions which he found."⁹

Sharp himself attempted to answer Winstanley's first edition (1805),¹⁰ but even Wallace acknowledges that "Sharp's response to [Winstanley's] work was less than satisfactory."¹¹ This is because Sharp did not address the exceptions Winstanley listed

⁶ Sharp also applied his rule to Ac 20:28, 1Ti 5:21, 2Ti 4:1, and Jude 4. In the case of Ac 20:28 and Jude 4, they are removed from consideration due to textual uncertainty. We will discuss 1Ti 5:21 and 2Ti 4:1 together with Eph 5:5 (see below).

⁷ Wallace, "Multiple Substantives," Appendix, 283-289.

⁸ Calvin Winstanley, *A Vindication of Certain Passages in the Common English Version of the New Testament. Addressed to Granville Sharp, Esq.* (Cambridge: University Press—Hilliard and Metcalf, 1819). The first edition of Winstanley's work was published in 1805. We will be quoting only from the 1819 edition.

⁹ Wallace, "Multiple Substantives," 59 (emphasis original).

¹⁰ Granville Sharp, *A Dissertation on the Supreme Divine Dignity of the Messiah: in reply to a Tract, entitled, "A Vindication of Certain Passages in the Common English Version of the New Testament"* (London: B. Edwards, 1806).

¹¹ Wallace, "Multiple Substantives," 56, note 101.

from sources other than NT, and simply replied that his rule "relates only to the language of the *inspired writers of the Greek Testament*."¹² Still, Wallace believes the exceptions given by Winstanley "can be readily explained on sound linguistic principles."¹³

Although they will have little impact on our main focus (namely, to determine whether or not the four significant passages referred to earlier are subject to the limitations of Sharp's rule), we will consider two categories of Winstanley's exceptions. Also, we will consider how Wallace explains them "on sound linguistic principles."

Translation Greek. The LXX translation of Proverbs 24:21 has caused more than a few problems for those who wish to have Sharp's canon preserved without exception. C. Kuehne authored a six-part series of articles wherein he sought to expound upon what he considers "evidences of Christ's deity," particularly in relation to passages involving Sharp's rule.¹⁴ When Kuehne comes to the point of our present inquiry, namely, whether or not Proverbs 24:21 (φοβοῦ τὸν θεόν υἱέ καὶ βασιλέα) is an exception to Sharp's rule, he states:

The translators of the Septuagint appear in many places to have been overly servile to the Hebrew text, translating into Greek at times with an almost slavish literalism. In this verse the Hebrew text lacks an article before the word 'king.' That the Septuagint should also lack the article is therefore not surprising—*especially since the two nouns, 'God' and 'king,' are so distinct that no confusion could possibly have arisen through the omission of a second article.*¹⁵

¹² Sharp, *Dissertation*, 56 (emphasis original).

¹³ Wallace, "Multiple Substantives," 134.

¹⁴ C. Kuehne, "The Greek Article and the Doctrine of Christ's Deity," *Journal of Theology* 13 (September 1973), 12-28; (December 1973), 14-30; 14 (March 1974), 11-20; (June 1974), 16-25; (September 1974), 21-33; (December 1974), 8-18. Kuehne also wrote two articles in this same journal concerning Colwell's rule. See Chapter 6, pages 326-330.

¹⁵ Kuehne, "The Greek Article," (June 1974), 19 (emphasis added).

The fact is, though, some books of the LXX, including Proverbs, did not comply strictly with the Hebrew text. Thus, Müller points out: "In the case of some books, for example, the books of Jeremiah, Job, Proverbs, the divergencies are so considerable, even with respect to volume, that it must be assumed that the Hebrew text underlying the translation cannot have been identical with the text we know today."¹⁶ Also, the general argument that "God" and "king" are "*so distinct that no confusion could possibly have arisen through the omission of a second article*" is not entirely convincing. After all, God Himself is called "King" in the Psalms alone no less than 20 times!¹⁷ But if the argument is made specific to Proverbs then Kuehne may have a point, since God is nowhere else in Proverbs referred to as "King"; it is always applied to a human ruler. The significance of this distinction will be seen shortly.

That Proverbs 24:21 is not referring to one person with the titles "God" and "king" is clear from the plural reference that follows, "and do not disobey either of them [αὐτῶν]." This is significant since it shows that even though this text is clearly referring to *two* persons, the translation used to convey this is what is claimed to involve only *one* person. Wallace offers three admittedly speculative explanations for the anarthrous βασιλέα.¹⁸ But he nonetheless agrees that Proverbs 24:21 (LXX) "does stand as an exception to Sharp's rule." The reason for this, Wallace

¹⁶ Mogens Müller, *The First Bible of the Church: A Plea for the Septuagint* (JSOTSup 206; CIS 1; England: Sheffield, 1996), 40.

¹⁷ See, for example, Ps 5:2; 10:16; 24:10; 29:10; 44:4; 47:2, 6, 7, 8; 68:24; 74:12; 84:3; 93:1; 95:3; 96:10; 97:1; 98:6; 99:1; 145:1; 146:10.

¹⁸ Wallace, "Multiple Substantives," 125-127. The three explanations he gives are: 1) the translator, using formal fidelity and dynamic equivalence in his translation, may have been distracted by יָדָא ("my son"), resulting in an unintentional violation of Greek grammar; 2) the translator may have deliberately chosen the anarthrous βασιλέα, believing that the location of the syntactically unrelated οὐδέ disrupted the semantics of Sharp's rule; (However Wallace himself acknowledges that verbs, adjectives and pronouns occasionally interfere with article-noun-καί-noun constructions; in any event "the καί in Prov 24:21 still connects the two accusatives syntactically, in spite of the presence of the vocative." [Ibid., 126, notes 116, 117].); and 3) "the syntax of poetry is known to deviate from that of prose in many and substantial ways. . . the article is frequently dispensed with for metrical convenience" (Ibid., 126-127).

believes, is uncertain, though he feels "it is almost exclusively tied to the LXX as translation Greek."¹⁹

Of course, the fact that Greek was used to translate the Hebrew text of Proverbs 24:21 is really not the issue, as the translators, had he/they been aware of Sharp's rule, could have translated the passage in a manner consistent with the meaning of the Hebrew text, without using a Sharp construction. As it is, they were either unaware of the limitations of Sharp's rule or they ignored its implications in this instance. But why? The reasons given by Wallace are not very convincing, and there would appear to be a much simpler explanation.

Although we disagree with Kuehne's suggestion that the LXX is simply "overly servile to the Hebrew text," his statement, "the two nouns, 'God' and 'king,' are so distinct that no confusion could possibly have arisen through the omission of a second article," is worth a closer look. In an attempt to rid himself of the exception to Sharp's rule in Proverbs 24:21, Kuehne unknowingly provides the same answer that one might very well offer in reply to the four christologically significant passages in the NT! This is particularly true for 2 Peter 1:1, where God and Christ are clearly distinguished in the next verse (see below for further discussion of 2Pe 1:1).

Wallace realizes the implications of this argument, and we will consider his response in our discussion of the possible exceptions to Sharp's rule found in Patristic Greek literature. In any event, the significance of Proverbs 24:21 as an exception to Sharp's rule does not weigh heavily on our interpretation of any of the four Christologically significant passages. Still, it does stand as an exception, probably for the reason Kuehne gives, namely, there was no reason to repeat the article since the identity of God and the "king" in the LXX of Proverbs 24:21 was not dependent on the use of the article, but on the sense of the terms as used in this context.

The longer version of Ignatius contains this passage in his epistle to the Smyrnaeans (ANF 1, chap. 9, 90). Wallace also

¹⁹ Ibid., 127.

notes that other, later Fathers quote it as well. We fail to see how these references should be excluded on the basis of being considered "translation Greek." After all, these writers, had they understood the idiom in the Greek of Proverbs 24:21 to denote one person and not two, could have cited it in a way that would have been free from ambiguity; the Fathers were known to reference certain passages of Scripture in less-than-exact fashion (see below on Titus 2:13).

Indeed, while John Chrysostom (c. 350—407) and John of Damascus (c. 675—749) quote Proverbs 24:21 *verbatim*,²⁰ the longer version of Ignatius contains a rewording of the text, φησὶν, υἱέ, τὸν Θεὸν καὶ βασιλέα (Migne 853.10). Here we can see that while Ignatius or those responsible for the longer version of his epistle to the Smyrnaeans chose to change the wording of the passage in some respects (note that the vocative *huie* comes before *ton theon* [compare note 18 above]) no change was made concerning the article-noun-*kai*-noun construction.

The LXX of Proverbs 24:21 does not reflect a sensitivity to any known rule that might have otherwise moved the translators to present a different translation in this theologically sensitive passage, and those Fathers who quote the passage do not make any changes so as to correct the LXX per their knowledge of a rule governing the use of the Greek article. This is true even where we find that liberties have been taken with other portions of the text (Ignatius).

The syntax of Sharp's rule is not of itself a valid guide for interpretation, for the terms involved in the construction are equally if not more significant for proper exegesis in terms of telling us their generic or proper character. We could exclude the quotations of Proverbs 24:21 in Ignatius based on the possible generic character of *basilea*. But this only underscores the fact that the syntax of Sharp's rule does not tell us anything definitive in the first place; rather, the meaning of the text must be determined from an analysis of the sense of the terms in their respective contexts.

²⁰ I have verified the citations in Wallace, "Multiple Substantives," 127, note 121.

If we begin by assuming that the presence of a particular construction clinches the interpretation, then *basilea* in Proverbs 24:21 or its quotation in various Fathers is not generic, for Sharp's rule makes it specific to the referent in the first part of the construction! That is why I believe that we should not look simply for Sharp's rule, but for the sense of the terms involved in the construction, and then proceed with our exegesis. This approach is further validated by several examples from the patristic writings.

Patristic Greek. Before we begin our analysis of the four key texts in the NT, a discussion of the most significant exceptions in extra-NT literature, namely, those found in Patristic Greek writings, is in order. One of the first to react to Sharp's monograph was Christopher Wordsworth. In support of Sharp's canon he sent him six letters wherein he sought to buttress Sharp's rule by appealing to the understanding of the Greek "Fathers" who lived and wrote during the centuries following the death of the last apostle. According to Wordsworth, "If Mr. Sharp's rule be true, then will their interpretations of those texts [including the four key NT passages] be invariably in the same sense in which he understands them."²¹

In his *Six Letters*, Wordsworth claims that, in the Fathers, there is a universal acceptance that the four christologically significant passages teach Christ's divinity. In view of this, he believes that even if Sharp's rule was not the ground work for affirming Christ's divinity in those passages, "there can no longer be any doubt respecting the required translation; and if, in the ignorance of all this evidence, a different one had been adopted, or a notion entertained, that the texts might, from some supposed ambiguity in the expression, admit of two interpretations, no one would deny but that either of those errors must be renounced, *and men's ideas be reformed according to the standard of the primitive authorities.*"²²

²¹ Christopher Wordsworth, *Six Letters to Granville Sharp, Esq. on his Remarks on the Uses of the Definitive Article, in the Greek Text of the New Testament* (London: F. and C. Rivington, 1802), 3.

²² *Ibid.*, 8 (emphasis added).

What must be remembered with respect to the interpretation certain theologians gave to the four christologically significant passages, is this: No one objects that the construction of these texts *can* bear the meaning some Fathers or even modern-day scholars give to them. But, as Moses Stuart points out: "If the writer [of Titus 2:13] designed to make σωτήρος ['Savior'] merely an explicative or attributive of θεοῦ ['God'] in this case, he would, beyond all doubt, have expressed himself as he now has; but if he did not design this, but meant to make the usual distinction so often made in Paul's epistles, between God the Father and Christ, he might still have used the same expression. The whole argument then, on either side, so far as the *article* is concerned, falls to the ground."²³

Stuart's dismissal of the article, however, is not for good reason. He refers to note 7 in his article to show that Middleton's statement, "It is impossible to understand θεοῦ καὶ σωτήρος [in Titus 2:13] otherwise than of one person,"²⁴ has "little ground" to stand on.²⁵ But most of his examples are not singular nouns of personal description,²⁶ and, hence, are not subject to the limitations of Sharp's rule. Nevertheless, we do believe Stuart is correct in saying that in passages such as Titus 2:13 the author's words can be construed *grammatically* to refer to one person or two, though for different reasons, which will be considered as we discuss each of the four christologically significant passages in turn.²⁷

²³ M. Stuart, "Hints and Cautions Respecting the Greek Article," *Biblical Repository* 4.13 (January 1834), 323. Stuart did believe, however, that Titus 2:13 calls Christ "the great God," but for reasons other than those relating to the use of the article. His reasons shall be considered shortly.

²⁴ Thomas Fanshaw Middleton, *The Doctrine of the Greek Article Applied to the Criticism and Illustration of the New Testament*, New ed., Revised by Hugh J. Rose (London: J. G. & F. Rivington, 1833). 394. All references to Middleton's work will be from the 1833 edition.

²⁵ Stuart, "Hints and Cautions," 322.

²⁶ The only valid example he gives is Acts 3:13, τὸν ἅγιον καὶ δίκαιον ("the holy and righteous [one]"), where the adjectives are substantival and both refer to one person, not two.

²⁷ C. F. D. Moule, *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek*, 2d ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959), 109, also agrees that in passages such as Titus 2:13 it is possible that two persons are in view. But he does not explain *why* this is

Still, the truth is the Fathers do not give Sharp the kind of support Wordsworth believed. It is not until the fourth or fifth century CE that he finds support for Sharp's view of Ephesians 5:5,²⁸ and for 2 Thessalonians 1:12 he cannot produce even one quotation in support of Sharp's interpretation.²⁹ Regarding Titus 2:13, Kuehne notes that Wordsworth cites a large number of Greek and Latin Fathers who support Sharp. Kuehne then concludes, "The Greek interpreters *uniformly* ascribe both titles, 'the great God' and 'Savior' to Jesus Christ."³⁰ But the fact is Wordsworth's first citation from the "Greek Fathers" regarding Titus 2:13 is indeterminate.³¹ His second citation comes from

"possible." If we are going to assert that such a meaning is possible, then we must at least give a credible reason *why* this is so.

²⁸ Wordsworth, *Six Letters*, 12-38. From the writings of Justin Martyr (who died about 165 CE), there is evidence that "Christ" was indeed considered a proper name by some post-biblical writers (evidence from the NT will be evaluated below). Justin wrote, "His Son . . . is called Christ, in reference to His being anointed and God's ordering all things through him; this name itself also containing an unknown significance" (ANF 1, 190). Justin here contrasts the *name* "Christ" (Χριστός . . . ὄνομα . . . αὐτὸ) with various terms such as "God," "Creator," and "Lord" which he does not view as "names" (οὐκ ὀνόματά ἐστιν). Still, there is some ambiguity as to whether Justin views "Christ" as a name in the same sense as "Jesus," to which he next refers. In making it known a second time that "'God' is not a name" he prefaces his statement with a comparison between "God" and "Christ," using ὄν τρόπον, meaning "in the same way as." This could be understood as meaning that "God" is *not* a "name" in the same way that "Christ" is not a name, even though Justin clearly uses ὄνομα in reference to "Christ." Below we will examine the use of "God" in the NT and other writings, showing that it frequently serves as a semantic signal for the Father, and thus functions as the equivalent to a proper name in the writings of Paul, Peter and elsewhere.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 39-47. On page 39 he begins his third letter to Sharp by saying: "On your next example (2 Thess. i. 12) my references are few; so few, that at the most, I have not more than *one* quotation, exclusive of those which are derived from the regular commentators: and so *indeterminate*, that in all which I can produce, there is not one of the passages which is decisive, either way, with respect to the required [that is, Sharp's 'required'] interpretation." Similarly, Wordsworth cannot find support for Sharp's interpretation of 1Ti 5:21 or 2Ti 4:1 (*Six Letters*, 48-64).

³⁰ Kuehne, "The Greek Article," *Theology* 14 (March, 1974), 17 (emphasis added).

³¹ It comes from Clement of Alexandria's *Exhortation to the Heathen* (written sometime toward the end of the second century CE), chap. 1, p. 173 of Wilson's translation (ANF 2). His rendering, "looking for the blessed hope, and appearing of the glory of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ," shows that Wilson understood two persons to be in view. Also, there does not appear to be anything in the context to

Hippolytus (c. 170—235 CE), in his *Treatise on Christ and Antichrist*. It reads according to Salmond's translation, "looking for the blessed hope and appearing of our God and Saviour."³² The context shows that these words are applied to Jesus, but there are several reasons why this text from Hippolytus cannot be considered representative of the true interpretation of Titus 2:13. Abbot gives a lucid explanation of the problem:

Hippolytus (*De Antichristo* c. 67), in an *allusion* to the passage [Titus 2:13], uses the expression ἐπιφάνειαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ["manifestation of our God and Savior"] of Christ, which may seem to indicate that he adopted the construction just mentioned [that is, in Titus 2:13]. But it is to be observed that he omits the τῆς δόξης ["of the glory"], and the μεγάλου ["great"], and the Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ["Jesus Christ"] after σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ["our Savior"], so that it is not certain that if he had quoted the passage fully, instead of merely borrowing some of its language, he would have applied all the terms to one subject.³³

The significance of Abbot's observation will be more fully explored when we discuss the use of the proper name "Jesus" together with "Christ," "Lord," and "Savior." After Hippolytus there is no support for Sharp's interpretation of Titus 2:13 until Athanasius (c. 296—373 CE) and then Cyril of Jerusalem (c. 315—368 CE), who along with other Fathers "were influenced in part by theological motives in choosing (*b*) [= 'our great God and Saviour, Christ Jesus.']."³⁴ As for 2 Peter 1:1, Wordsworth cannot cite a single Father in support of Sharp's interpretation.³⁵

support the idea that Clement was speaking of only one person (Jesus Christ) when he quoted Titus 2:13.

³² ANF 5, 219.

³³ Ezra Abbot, "On the Construction of Titus ii. 13," *JBL* 1 (1882), 7-8.

³⁴ J. N. D. Kelly, *The Pastoral Epistles* (London: A. & C. Black, 1963), 246. Abbot ("Titus ii. 13," 8) likewise points out: "It is true that many writers of the fourth century and later apply the passage to Christ. At that period, and earlier, when θεός had become a common appellation of Christ, and especially when he was very often called 'our God' or 'our God and Saviour,' the construction of Tit. ii. 13 which refers the θεοῦ to him would seem the most natural. *But the New Testament use of language is widely different*; and on that account a construction which would seem most natural

However, our primary concern at this point is whether or not the Fathers employed the construction articulated by Sharp in his first rule, even though *two* persons were intended. In his response to Sharp's *Remarks*, Winstanley lists several such examples.³⁶ Two of these exceptions have yet to be given a satisfactory explanation, though there have been a few seemingly desperate attempts to do so.

Exceptions to Sharp's rule in Patristic literature. The first example we will consider is a citation from Justin Martyr (who died about 165 CE) that has, to my knowledge, never before been mentioned in a discussion of exceptions to Sharp's rule. In his *Dialogue with Trypho* (110.55) Justin refers to Christians as a "vine planted by God and Christ the Saviour."³⁷ Here τοῦ θεοῦ precedes καὶ which is followed by σωτήρος Χριστοῦ. This text parallels Titus 2:13 and 2 Peter 1:1 (both of these texts are discussed below) in using the article with *theos* but not before *soteros*, the noun following *kai*.

in the fourth century, might not even suggest itself to a reader of the first century. That the orthodox Fathers should give to an ambiguous passage the construction which suited their theology and the use of language in their time, was almost a matter of course, and furnishes no evidence that their resolution of the ambiguity is the true one. The cases are so numerous in which the Fathers, under the influence of a dogmatic bias, have done extreme violence to very plain language, that we can attach no weight to their preference in the case of a construction really ambiguous, like the present [Titus 2:13]" (emphasis added). Wallace ("Multiple Substantives," 251, note 214) replies by saying, "What seems to be a significant blow to Abbot's sweeping statement is the fact that the patristic writers did not invoke the language of 1Tim 5:21 or 2Thess 1:12 in their appeals to Christ's deity—the very passages which have [as we will see below] proper names and are thus not valid examples of Sharp's rule." Of course, Wallace seems to assume that, like the compound names "Lord Jesus Christ" (2Th 1:12) or "Christ Jesus" (1Ti 5:21), "Savior Jesus Christ" cannot likewise be considered a compound proper name, and, thus, also an invalid example of Sharp's rule. This matter will be considered in greater detail below. But all this aside, it is hard to understand the logic of Wallace's objection here, for he seems to forget that the Fathers of the fourth century and following applied both nouns ("Christ" and "God") of Eph 5:5 to Jesus, yet Wallace considers Χριστός the equivalent of a proper name! See the discussion of Eph 5:5 below.

³⁵ Wordsworth, *Six Letters*, 105-108.

³⁶ Winstanley, *Vindication*, 9-11.

³⁷ ANF 1, 254. Migne's text reads, Ἡ γὰρ φυτευθεῖσα ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἄμπελος καὶ σωτήρος Χριστοῦ, ὁλαὸς αὐτοῦ ἐστι.

This example from Justin further parallels Titus 2:13 in that, following the Sharp construction, a third person *singular* pronoun (αὐτοῦ, "of him") is used where, if two persons were in view, one might have expected a plural pronoun (as in the LXX of Pr 24:21). However, even though 2 Timothy 4:1 speaks of "God and Christ Jesus" (τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ) Paul follows with the singular *autou* in reference to Christ alone. That "Christ" is here the equivalent to a proper name will be demonstrated below, but here we should note the unmistakable use of "Christ Jesus" as a proper name in 1 Timothy 6:13. For further discussion of this text, see below under "Ephesians 5:5." Thus, we need not be deterred by the use of the singular pronoun in Titus 2:13 or in the present passage from Justin (compare 2Pe 1:2, 3, also).

If we go back ten chapters in Justin's dialogue and trace his use of "God," it is clear that he has only one referent in mind, and that referent does not change. In every one of the thirty-six uses of "God" (excluding our present passage) it is either used in such a way as to identify the referent as the "Father" or the term is used without any qualification, suggesting that no change in referent has been made. In fact, God and Jesus are regularly distinguished in these chapters, and elsewhere in Justin's writings.

It is true, however, that Justin does, on occasion, call Jesus *theos*, and it is quite possible that he does so again in this text. But the context does not suggest it, and "God" is so frequently used in reference to the Father that he most certainly could have Him in mind here; the use of "Savior Christ" is itself semantically restricted to Jesus. If Justin did intend to apply *theos* to Jesus in this passage then it would be with the meaning he elsewhere attributes to the term when used of Jesus, as "another God and Lord subject to the Maker of all things."³⁸ Justin further describes this one as "Wisdom" who was "God begotten of the Father" (compare Joh 1:18).³⁹ This is not to suggest that Justin believes in two ontologically equal Gods, but that "God" is one of the titles

³⁸ ANF 1, 223.

³⁹ ANF 1, 227.

that the Christ "received from the Father."⁴⁰ Justin says that Christians should "reverence no other god." But he then points out that "since God wishes it, he [a Christian] would reverence *that angel* who is beloved by the same Lord and God."⁴¹

Still, in view of the context and Justin's use of *theos* in the preceding chapters of his *Dialogue*, we should take the reference to "God" in 110.55 as a reference to the Father. This, then, provides a parallel text to Titus 2:13 and 2 Peter 1:1 in its use of *theos* and *soter*, as terms that have a generally fixed reference so that their use in article-noun-καὶ-noun constructions does not subject them to the restrictions of Sharp's rule, at least not in all cases.

One of the next two examples from the patristics is found in the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* 22:1, where Polycarp calls for δόξα τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ καὶ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι ("glory to God and the Father and the Holy Spirit").⁴² Here the article is found only before θεῷ, which would, according to Sharp, make ἁγίῳ πνεύματι ("holy spirit") a further description of the Father! The second example is from Clement of Alexandria, where he gives praise τῷ μόνῳ πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ ("to the only Father and Son").⁴³ From these examples we can see that if Sharp's rule is true in all cases, then these writings contain instances where the Father is identified as both the Son and holy spirit, presumably in some sort of modalistic sense.

These examples from the patristics texts refer to God, the Father, the Son or the holy spirit. It is significant that we find exceptions to Sharp's rule in patristic literature that involve roughly the same terms or subjects as the four New Testament passages mentioned at the beginning of this excursus.

⁴⁰ ANF 1, 242. Notice, in addition to his specific mention of the titles "King," "Christ," "Priest" and "Angel," Justin then refers to the "other titles which He bears or did bear."

⁴¹ ANF 1, 246.

⁴² The Greek text and English translation is that of Kirsopp Lake, *The Apostolic Fathers*, vol. 2 (LCL), 341.

⁴³ *Paedagogus* 3.12. In the ANF this text can be found in vol. 2 of Clement's *Instructor*, p. 295.

Wallace offers two explanations for these exceptions to Sharp's rule: 1) "It is just possible that by the second century the terms used for the first person of the Trinity became so fixed that the writers regarded them as virtual proper names." But he goes on to point out that there "are problems with this view," as one would have expected similar phrases (such as, "the God over all" [Ro 9:5] and "Almighty God" [Rev 16:14]) to likewise have been regarded as equivalents of proper names, but they are occasionally applied to both the Father and Son in the writings of the Fathers.⁴⁴ 2) Wallace considers it a better approach to "recognize that we are assuming too much about their [the Fathers'] own christological articulation . . . of the distinctions between members of the Trinity."⁴⁵ He goes on to argue that these alleged exceptions to Sharp's rule are really just examples of the Fathers 'overstating their case.' But the facts show otherwise.

Although Wallace gives examples of certain Fathers who use language which he apparently construes as modalistic,⁴⁶ he does not illustrate how this is allegedly the case with either Polycarp or Clement. He also claims that "in their [the Fathers'] zeal to defend the deity of Christ they proved too much."⁴⁷ But nowhere in the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* is there an attempt to "defend the deity of Christ." There is an account of Christian martyrdom, and an issue of loyalty relating to Caesar and Christ does arise (8:2), but this is hardly an occasion which would lead to confusion over the identity of the Father and the holy spirit. Also, in Clement's *Instructor*, where our second example comes from, Clement

⁴⁴ See Chapter 3, pages 143-152 for a discussion of Romans 9:5.

⁴⁵ Wallace, "Multiple Substantives," 268-269.

⁴⁶ For example, he quotes Ignatius (Eph 1:1) who speaks of "the blood of God," but this is not necessarily an indication that Ignatius identified the Father with the Son. The fact is Ignatius understood Christ to be θεός in some sense, but nonetheless maintained a clear distinction between the Father and the Son, for he refers to "the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ" (ὁ πατήρ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [Eph 2:1]), he talks of singing "to the Father through Jesus Christ" (διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τῷ πατρὶ [Eph 4:2]), and he speaks of those who are joined with God "as the Church is to Jesus Christ, and as Jesus Christ is to the Father" (ὡς ἡ ἐκκλησία Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ καὶ ὡς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς τῷ πατρὶ [Eph 5:1]).

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 269.

speaks of Jesus as "the Son of God, the child of the Father."⁴⁸ He also talks of "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus," and further states:

He [Jesus] proclaims His Father to be good, and to be the Creator. And that the Creator is just, is not disputed. And again he says, 'My Father sends the rain on the just, and on the unjust.' In respect of His sending rain, He is the Creator of the waters, and of the clouds. And in respect of His doing so on all, He holds an even balance justly and rightly. And as being good, he does so on just and unjust alike. . . . Our Lord says in His prayer, 'Our Father, who art in heaven.' And the heavens belong to Him, who created the world. It is indisputable, then, that the Lord is the Son of the Creator; then the Lord is the Son of Him who is just."⁴⁹

Wallace is not saying that such distinctions are never made in the Fathers, but he does state that "they are not consistently made."⁵⁰ While that may be true, he does not demonstrate how this is so in the writings of Polycarp or Clement's *Instructor*, and even if he were to show that there was some form of modalism present in these works, it would not automatically mean that the examples under consideration were intended to convey this kind of thinking. Rather, there seems to be a much more likely explanation for the construction of these examples from Polycarp and Clement.

In his attempt to discredit the force of Winstanley's exceptions from the Fathers, Kuehne states concerning the example from the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*: "One would indeed have expected a repetition of the article before ἀγίω πνεύματι ['holy spirit']. Yet its absence here could hardly result in any ambiguity, for the distinction between the first and the third persons of the Trinity was apparently deemed too clear for any

⁴⁸ ANF 2, 215.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 227-228 (emphasis added).

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 270, note 266.

confusion to arise."⁵¹ Of course what Kuehne fails to realize is this very same line of reasoning could be used in relation to the four christologically significant passages in NT. Wallace, however, understands the implications of this kind of argument, which is why he ventured to offer the two alternative explanations just considered. Still, we believe Kuehne was correct in his explanation of the patristic exceptions, but, again, failed to realize that this could also be true of the four passages from the NT we are most interested in, namely, 2 Thessalonians 1:12, Titus 2:13, 2 Peter 1:1, and Ephesians 5:5. It is to these four passages that we now turn our attention.

Sharp's Rule and the New Testament

There are forty-four instances in the New Testament where only nouns are involved in Sharp's rule, and sixteen times these are in the form of ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατήρ ("the God and Father"), while seven (Eph 5:5; 2Th 1:12; 1Ti 5:21; 6:13; 2Ti 4:1; Tit 2:13; 2Pe 1:1) potentially call Christ θεός, if Sharp's rule is valid in each of them.⁵² Three of these seven (1Ti 5:21; 6:13; 2Ti 4:1) are usually ignored when it comes to discussions centering on the question of whether or not Christ is called "God" in Scripture. These three will be considered when we discuss the meaning of Ephesians 5:5, since the nouns involved in these texts are the same.

We believe that the following analysis will reveal that in each of the four christologically significant passages there is a reason, other than that given by Sharp, Wallace, and others, why only one article precedes the first of two nouns connected by καί.

⁵¹ Kuehne, "The Greek Article," *Theology* 14 (June, 1974), 18-19. See also the note by Rose in Middleton's *Doctrine of the Greek Article*, 58-59, note 1, where he says "the distinction between the persons of the Trinity was, of course, deemed too clear for any confusion to arise."

⁵² Excluding these seven passages, Wallace ("Multiple Substantives," Appendix, 283-288) lists eighty-seven texts that fit the requirements of Sharp's rule: thirty-seven nouns, forty-one substantival participles, five substantival adjectives, and four involving mixed constituents.

Ephesians 5:5. In this passage the apostle Paul reminds the Ephesians that "no fornicator or impure man, or one who is covetous (that is, an idolater), has any inheritance *in the kingdom of Christ and of God* [ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ]." (RSV, emphasis added) Here the RSV makes a clear distinction between "Christ" and "God." But is this distinction justified?

According to Sharp, this passage should, in accordance with his first-stated rule, be translated "in the kingdom of Christ, (even) of God," showing an identification of Jesus as God in this passage.⁵³ Middleton agrees, stating: "On the whole, I regard the present text, as it stands in the Greek, to be among the least questionable of the authorities collected by Mr. Sharp, and as being, when weighed impartially, a decisive proof, that in the judgment of St. Paul, Christ is entitled to the appellation of God."⁵⁴

When we come to Winstanley, however, there is a much different sentiment expressed. He argues that Χριστός "assumes the nature of a proper name,"⁵⁵ which would put Ephesians 5:5 outside the parameters of Sharp's rule. Kuehne's sole objection to this is that if Χριστοῦ is taken as a *quasi*-proper name in this passage, then it should be anarthrous and in the second position.⁵⁶

⁵³ Sharp, *Remarks*, 28-29.

⁵⁴ Middleton, *Doctrine of the Greek Article*, 367.

⁵⁵ Winstanley, *Vindication*, 23. See note 29 above.

⁵⁶ Kuehne, "The Greek Article," *Theology* 14 (June, 1974), 20. Of course, even if this were true, the possibility would still remain that θεός, standing in the second position, could have the force of a proper name as in 2Th 2:16. UBS⁴ and NA²⁶ contain the reading, ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς καὶ [ὁ] θεὸς ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν ("our Lord Jesus Christ and God our Father"). The article before θεός is enclosed in brackets, for it is lacking in B D* K 33 1175 1739 1881 and other witnesses, though it is found in ℵ* D² F G and others. The article also occurs before θεός in several other witnesses (including A I Ψ), but these readings contain different variants of ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν (see, B. M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 3d edition [New York: United Bible Societies, 1971], 637). If ὁ θεός is the true reading, it is difficult to understand its articularity, being in the second position, if indeed θεός is here the equivalent of a proper name. On the other hand, if ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς καὶ θεός ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν is the true reading, with an anarthrous θεός following καί, then several possibilities exist: 1) Jesus Christ is identified as "God the Father"; 2) it is an exception to Sharp's rule; 3) it is an invalid example of Sharp's rule because θεός, standing in the second position, has the force of a proper name; 4) the entire phrase θεός ὁ πατὴρ is taken together as the equivalent of a proper name, as ὁ

However, the fact is Χριστός is often anarthrous in the writings of Paul, even though "the messianic designation comes to be a personal name."⁵⁷ Wallace, though admitting that "one would be hard-pressed to view this ['Christ'] as less than a proper name in the epistles,"⁵⁸ believes that nothing definite can be said about the position of Χριστός in this passage, for even though he examined mixed constructions such as this (which involve a proper name and a personal noun) in the NT and papyri, all having the proper name in the second position, almost none of these mixed constructions applied both nouns to the same person.⁵⁹

Similarly, 1 Timothy 5:21 (τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ ["of God and Christ Jesus"], 6:13 (τοῦ θεοῦ . . . καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ), and 2 Timothy 4:1 (τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ) all have the proper name in the second position and are thus clearly not governed by Sharp's rule. Χριστός ("Christ") does not need the article to stand on its own apart from τοῦ θεοῦ, particularly in these examples since it is accompanied by Ἰησοῦ ("Jesus"). Note also that in 1 Timothy 6:13 τοῦ ζωογονοῦντος τὰ πάντα is clearly in apposition to τοῦ θεοῦ, and τοῦ μαρτυρήσαντος ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου τὴν καλὴν ὁμολογίαν is in apposition to Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ.

The Hebrew equivalent to the Greek *christos* ("Christ") is *mashiach* ("Messiah") The Hebrew Bible never uses *mashiach* with the article. Laurin believes that by the time the events of

πατήρ restricts the anarthrous θεός to a person who is everywhere in the New Testament distinguished from "our Lord Jesus Christ" (see, for example, Ro 15:5-6; 1Co 1:3; Eph 1:3, 17); or 5) ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός is a compound proper name and is, therefore, distinct from what follows.

⁵⁷ Robert W. Funk, "The Syntax of the Greek Article: Its Importance for Critical Pauline Problems" (Ph.D. Dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1953), 192. In Ephesians, when Paul uses Χριστός by itself (that is, apart from an accompanying term such as Ἰησοῦς ["Jesus"]), we find that it is anarthrous seven times (1:3; 2:12; 4:15, 32; 5:21, 32; 6:6), and twenty times it is arthrous (1:9, 12, 20; 2:5, 13; 3:4, 8, 17, 19; 4:7, 12, 13, 20; 5:2, 14, 23, 24, 25, 29; 6:5). When used together with Ἰησοῦς, it is anarthrous thirteen times (1:1 [twice], 2, 5; 2:6, 7, 10, 13; 3:6, 21; 5:20; 6:23, 24), and arthrous only twice (3:1 [supported by P⁴⁶ Ⳉ² A B (C) D² Ψ], 11) Thus, it is hardly a surprise that we find Χριστός preceded by the article in 5:5.

⁵⁸ Wallace, "Multiple Substantives," 247.

⁵⁹ Ibid., 247, note 202.

John 4:25 take place *mashiach* "has become a proper name."⁶⁰ The Hebrew Bible does not identify the Messiah as Jehovah God. In fact, he is distinguished from Jehovah in almost every way possible: The kings of the earth are prophetically said to take their stand against Jehovah *and* against "his" anointed one (Ps 2:1-2); Isaiah says the one who comes from the root of Jesse (the Messiah) would have Jehovah's spirit upon him, and serve in the "fear of Jehovah" (Isa 11:1-3); and the messianic Son of man receives royal authority from Jehovah, "the ancient of days" (Dan 7:13).

Still, Isaiah 9:6 does say the future Messiah would be called "mighty God,"⁶¹ and Ephesians 5:5 would fit well with this description, for the reference to the "kingdom" in Ephesians 5:5 parallels the "princely rule" of Isaiah 9:6. In this case it could be that Ephesians 5:5 refers to Christ as *theos* in a qualified sense, but this is not a necessary conclusion, as the kingdom is a possession of both Christ and God. (Rev 11:15; 12:10) In any event, the OT makes it clear that Jehovah is the God of the Messiah, and the NT maintains this same distinction. (Mic 5:4; Eph 1:3, 17; Ro 15:5-6; Rev 3:12) Thus, there is a semantic distinction between Jehovah and His Christ, which is impossible to miss when the texts are examined apart from post-biblical theology.

From a purely grammatical perspective, Ephesians 5:5 does not fall into the general category of article-noun-καὶ-noun constructions, for it contains the equivalent of a proper name in the first position, while none of Wallace's eighty-seven examples fit this description. Therefore, it would seem only natural to maintain the same distinction in our English translations of Ephesians 5:5 as the apostle Paul does some twelve other times in this epistle, between "Christ" and "God."⁶²

2 Thessalonians 1:12. This is another text where we appear to have all the requirements of Sharp's rule. The portion of this verse we are concerned with reads, κατὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ

⁶⁰ See Chapter 2, page 91, note 71.

⁶¹ See Chapter 2, pages 81-84 for a discussion of this verse.

⁶² 1:1, 2, 3, 17; 2:4-5, 10, 19-20; 3:10-11; 4:32; 5:2, 20; 6:23.

θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. The RSV reads, "according to the grace of our God and the Lord Jesus Christ." As we can see, the article, in Greek, only precedes θεοῦ ("God"), yet the RSV translates this verse as if it were also before κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ("Lord Jesus Christ"). Is this justified, or should the translators have followed Sharp's suggested rendering, "according to the grace of the God and Lord of us, Jesus Christ," or "according to the grace of Jesus Christ, our God and Lord"?⁶³

According to Middleton, "Κύριος Ἰ. Χρ. is a common title of Christ, and is often used independently of all that precedes it"; therefore, its occurrence in 2 Thessalonians 1:12 "affords no certain evidence in favor of Mr. Sharp."⁶⁴ C. J. Davis has produced a chart listing all the occurrences of compound names for Jesus with κύριος, concluding that "when κύριος is joined to θεός by καί, κύριος generally lacks the definite article."⁶⁵ In fact, when following καί, κύριος has the article only once (1Th 3:11),⁶⁶ while every other time it is anarthrous.⁶⁷ Thus, it is no surprise that we find it anarthrous in 2 Thessalonians 1:12, for while τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου might be understood of one person, "the simple addition of Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ to κυρίου makes the reference to the two distinct subjects clear without the insertion of the article."⁶⁸

2 Thessalonians 1:12, like Ephesians 5:5 (and 1Ti 5:21; 6:13; 2Ti 4:1), contains the equivalent of a proper name, in this case a compound proper name. It is therefore not a valid example of Sharp's rule, as even Wallace acknowledges.⁶⁹ These uses of compound proper names, or nouns that may serve as the

⁶³ Sharp, *Remarks*, 34.

⁶⁴ Middleton, *Doctrine of the Greek Article*, 381, 382.

⁶⁵ C. J. Davis, "The Use of the Articular and Anarthrous Κύριος in the Pauline Corpus" (M. A. thesis, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 1989), 31-33.

⁶⁶ Davis (*ibid.*, 33) notes that the repetition of the article here may be because ἡμῶν occurs with each noun. This may also be why, if original, the article precedes θεός in 2Th 2:16.

⁶⁷ Ro 1:7; 1Co 1:3; 2Co 1:2; Ga 1:3; Eph 1:2; 6:23; Php 1:2; 1Th 1:1; 2Th 1:1, 2, 12; Phm 3. Davis' citation of 2Th 2:12 as containing the reading τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ was apparently made in error.

⁶⁸ Abbot, "Titus ii. 13," 15.

⁶⁹ Wallace, "Multiple Substantives," 250, note 211.

equivalent to a proper name (for example, "Christ"), may or may not take the article, but in either case the nouns are applied to different individuals (compare 2Ti 4:1 with Rev 20:6)

Titus 2:13. This text is perhaps the most frequently cited passage when discussing Sharp's rule, and most commentators and grammarians of recent times see this as an instance where Christ is not only called "God," but "the great God."⁷⁰ Richard Young, after stating that in Titus 2:13 "the construction τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν (our great God and Savior) means that our savior, Jesus Christ, is God," goes on to say that the translations of Phillips ("the great God and of Jesus Christ our savior") and the KJV ("the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ") tend to "separate the nouns." But NWT ("of the great God and of our Savior Christ Jesus"), according to Young, "separates the two nouns even more."⁷¹ Is the separation indicated by these (and other⁷²) translations justified?

Naturally, Sharp believed this text applied to one person, Jesus Christ. In his words, "The text in question, if the truth of the original be duly regarded, must inevitably be rendered, *'Expecting the blessed hope and appearance of the glory of our great God and Savior, Jesus Christ.'*"⁷³ Middleton believes that "it is impossible to understand θεοῦ and σωτῆρος otherwise than of one person."⁷⁴ Wallace, with more caution than Sharp or Middleton, states, "Titus 2:13 appears to be secure as a reference to Christ as θεός."⁷⁵ But there are problems with this view. Again we raise the issue of whether or not one of the two nouns should be considered a proper name. Here the question must be posed with respect to both "the great God" and "Savior Jesus Christ."

⁷⁰ See Murray J. Harris, *Jesus as God: The New Testament Use of Theos in Reference to Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992), 185, for a listing of some grammarians, commentators, and lexicographers who favor a one-person translation of Titus 2:13, as well as a list of some who favor a two-person translation.

⁷¹ Richard Young, *Intermediate New Testament Greek: A Linguistic and Exegetical Approach* (Nashville: Broadman, 1994), 63.

⁷² See Chapter 3, page 161.

⁷³ Sharp, *Remarks*, 46-47.

⁷⁴ Middleton, *Doctrine of the Greek Article*, 394.

⁷⁵ Wallace, "Multiple Substantives," 265.

We begin with the question of whether or not τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ could have been a fixed title of the Father so that the first-century Christians regarded it as a virtual proper name. We noted earlier in our discussion of the patristic exceptions that Wallace considered it possible for the descriptions "the only Father" and "the God and Father" to be considered virtual proper names. In light of the OT description of Jehovah as "the great God"⁷⁶ it is equally possible, if not more likely, that "the great God" was understood as the equivalent of a proper name, and a clear reference to the Father.

The use of this title for Jehovah in Psalm 85:10 is of particular interest. There we are told that Jehovah "alone" is "the great God." Since the OT makes it clear that Jehovah is the God of the Messiah (Mic 5:4; Rev 3:12) and Paul refers to the Father as the God of Jesus (Ro 15:5,6; Eph 1:3, 17; 2Co 1:3; 11:31), a description such as "the great God" which is, in the OT, restricted to Jehovah, would naturally create a semantic distinction between "the great God" (the Father, Jehovah) and Jesus Christ. Since Jesus can only have one who is God to him, if we take the expression "the great God" as a reference to Jehovah, then it is *ipso facto* a reference to the Father.

Consequently, if "the great God" is a fixed expression for Jehovah, the Father, then there is no doubt it could stand on its

⁷⁶ Abbot ("Titus ii. 13," 19) lists a number of examples from the LXX which "show how naturally Paul might apply this designation to the Father." See (as numbered in the LXX) De 7:21 (θεὸς μέγας καὶ κραταιός, "[is] a great and powerful God"); 10:17 (ὁ θεὸς ὁ μέγας καὶ ἰσχυρὸς καὶ ὁ φοβερὸς. This is the text as printed in Rahlfs' edition of the LXX. One might have expected φοβερὸς to be anarthrous. But the reading is uncertain, as A [and the Göttingen] has the article before all three adjectives, and in B the article is found only before μέγας. In the case of the former, we would translate, "The great God, the strong and the fear-inspiring [One]." If we take μέγας as the only adjective with the article, then it would read, "The great God, strong and fear-inspiring." It is also possible to translate each, respectively, "God, the great, the strong and the fear-inspiring One," or "God, the great, strong, and fear-inspiring One."); Neh 8:6 (τὸν θεὸν τὸν μέγαν, "the great God"); Ps 77[76]:13[14] (τίς θεὸς μέγας ὡς ὁ θεός, "who is a great God as is our God?" [revealing, of course, that Jehovah is a "great God," and that He is distinguished as such from others]); 85:10 (ὅτι μέγας εἶ σὺ . . . σὺ εἶ ὁ θεὸς μόνος ὁ μέγας, "For you are great . . . you alone are the great God"); see also Ezr 5:8 (2 Ezra in Rahlfs); Neh 4:14; Ps 95(94):3; Isa 26:5; Jer 39(32):19; Da 2:45 and 9:4 (note the two readings in Rahlfs).

own in Titus 2:13. The first descriptive phrase is made specific by having a restricted reference (Ps 85:10), and the second noun ("Savior") is without question restricted to the person named, "Jesus Christ." Indeed, even without the added description of "great," *theos* in Paul's writings is clearly restricted to the Father, as the following chart reveals:

Figure E.1
Use of θεός in the Pauline Corpus

| Book | Frequency | For the Father | For Jesus | For others | Grammatically Ambiguous |
|------|-------------------|----------------|-----------|-----------------|-------------------------|
| Rom | 153 ⁷⁷ | 152 | 0 | 0 | 1 ⁷⁸ |
| 1Co | 106 ⁷⁹ | 104 | 0 | 2 ⁸⁰ | 0 |

⁷⁷ In 15:19 *theos* occurs in P⁴⁶ & D¹ but not in B. See Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 537, for an explanation about UBS3's use of *theos* in brackets (the same reading is found in NA26).

⁷⁸ Romans 9:5 could grammatically be taken in reference to *ho Christos* ("the Christ"), but there are several reasons why it should be seen as a doxology to the Father. See Chapter 3, pages 143-152. Another verse which, though not grammatically ambiguous, does put "God" and "Christ" in close relation to one another, is 8:9. It reads: "However, you are in harmony, not with the flesh, but with the spirit, if God's spirit truly dwells in you. But if anyone does not have Christ's spirit, this one does not belong to him." The context of Romans 8 is very similar to Galatians 4, for in both chapters Paul highlights the minding of spiritual things versus fleshy desires, and he also refers to the spirit they have received, which cries out, "Abba, Father!" (Ro 8:13) In Galatians 4:6 he says, "Now because you are sons, God has sent forth the spirit of his Son into our hearts and it cries out: 'Abba, Father!'" Naturally the use of "his Son" involves the Father; it is easy to see the consistency in Romans 8:9, where "God" refers to the Father, and where "Christ" refers to "his Son." The spirit that the Christians have been given is indeed God's spirit, for *He* sent it forth; it comes from Him. This spirit makes them "God's children" which constitutes them "heirs indeed of God, but joint heirs with Christ" (Ro 8:17).

⁷⁹ The use of *theos* in 1:14 is textually uncertain. & B and others have *theos*, and & C D F G and others do not. See Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 544, for an explanation about UBS3's use of *theos* in brackets. The same reading is given in NA26.

⁸⁰ 1Co 8:5. See Chapter 4, pages 201-202.

| | | | | | |
|-----|------------------|----|---|-----------------|-----------------|
| 2Co | 79 | 78 | 0 | 1 ⁸¹ | 0 ⁸² |
| Gal | 31 ⁸³ | 30 | 0 | 1 ⁸⁴ | 0 |
| Eph | 31 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 1 ⁸⁵ |
| Php | 23 ⁸⁶ | 22 | 0 | 1 ⁸⁷ | 0 |
| Col | 21 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1Th | 36 ⁸⁸ | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

⁸¹ Satan (2Co 4:4).

⁸² While they are not listed as grammatically ambiguous, there are five uses of *theos* that are sometimes translated as adjectives. In 1Co 1:12 NWT reads, "godly sincerity," which could mean simply "the sincerity of [or 'given by'] God." Plummer (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians* [ICC; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915], 25) states: "The exact force of τοῦ Θεοῦ is uncertain; 'superlative,' 'approved by God,' 'divine,' 'godlike,' 'godly' have been suggested and are possible; but 'derived from God' or 'God-given' is more likely to be right, and the gen. probably belongs to both nouns; 'God-given holiness (simplicity) and sincerity.'" In 7:9 Paul's refers to the fact that the Corinthians were "saddened in a godly way," or "according to God [']s way]," that is, a sadness in harmony with God's will, as it lead them to 'repentance' (ἐλπιθήτε εἰς μετάνοιαν). The same is true regarding κατὰ θεὸν in verses 10 and 11. Paul's reference to "godly jealousy" in 11:2 reveals that he has the same concern for preserving the (spiritual) chastity of Christ's bride and presenting them to him (see the latter part of verse 2), as God does.

⁸³ In 1:15 *theos* is found in P⁴⁶ and B, but not in ⱼ A D. In 3:21 *theos* is found in ⱼ A D, but not in P⁴⁶ or B. See Metzger, *A Textual Commentary*, 590, 594-595.

⁸⁴ Paul refers to "those who by nature are not gods," which is likely a reference to idols or other man-made gods that do not really exist. See Chapter 2, page 99, note 90.

⁸⁵ Though I do not think it is truly ambiguous, I list Eph 5:5 in this category since it is possible that *theos* was here given as a title for Christ, in view of the messianic reference in Isaiah 9:5-6. But, again, it is unlikely that this is the case, for several reasons. See above, page 386. In any case, if Paul is here using *theos* in reference to Christ it is not used in a sense commensurate with the Trinitarian definition for God, nor with the distinctions they create for the "persons within God." See Chapter 2, pages 56-59 for further discussion of this point.

⁸⁶ In Php 1:14 *tou theou* occurs in ⱼ A B D* the Vulgate, Syriac and Coptic witnesses; P⁴⁶ and D² omit.

⁸⁷ Php 3:19, "their god is their belly."

⁸⁸ The variant reading *tou theou* in 1Th 2:16 (found in D F G 629) is not included in this total.

| | | | | | |
|---------------|------------|------------|----------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 2Th | 18 | 16 | 0 | 2 ⁸⁹ | 0 ⁹⁰ |
| 1Ti | 22 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 ⁹¹ |
| 2Ti | 13 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 ⁹² |
| Tit | 13 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 ⁹³ |
| Phm | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Heb | 68 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 1 ⁹⁴ |
| Totals | 616 | 605 | 0 | 7 | 4 |

After considering these numbers it is easy to understand what Professor Ezra Abbot meant when, over a hundred years ago, he wrote: "I do not see how any one can read the Epistles of Paul without perceiving that, in speaking of the objects of Christian faith, he constantly uses θεός as a *proper name*, as the designation of the Father in distinction from Christ."⁹⁵

Figure E.1 substantiates the view that, for Paul, *theos* was basically restricted to the Father, thus serving as the equivalent to a proper name. A careful analysis of the discourse of Paul's writings, including the letter to the Hebrews, shows that throughout each letter there are numerous texts that use *theos* in reference to the Father, as distinct from Jesus Christ. Then, as the discourse continues, Paul uses *theos* without any indication that it

⁸⁹ In 2Th 2:4 the first use of *theos* is generic, and the third is in reference to "the man of lawlessness" (verse 3).

⁹⁰ The semantic significance of the expressions in 2Th 1:12, *tou theou hemon* in contrast to *kyriou Iesou Christou* ("Lord Jesus Christ"), leaves little room for doubt as to the application of *theos* in this text, but grammatically it is possible to take *theos* in reference to Jesus in this verse (compare note 83), even if we take "Lord Jesus Christ" as a fixed expression.

⁹¹ The construction in 5:21 and 6:13 is really not ambiguous, since it is quite evident that *Christou Iesou* is the equivalent to a proper name. See pages 376, note 28, and page 377, note 34.

⁹² In 2:14 *theos* is omitted in A D, the Vulgate and in the Syriac witnesses. For *Christou Iesou* in 4:1, see page 387.

⁹³ Tit 2:13. See discussion above/below.

⁹⁴ Heb 1:8. See Chapter 3, pages 164-169 for a discussion of this text.

⁹⁵ Ezra Abbot, "On the Construction of Romans ix. 5," *JBL* 1 (1881), 121. See Chapter 3, pages 143-152 for a discussion of Romans 9:5.

has a different referent, or is being used with a different meaning.⁹⁶

Of course, we would expect to find some other articulation for *theos* if in fact Paul had ever used the term for a consubstantial triad of "persons."⁹⁷ Several times *theos* is used in of the Father in reference to the position He occupies in relation to His Son.⁹⁸ Because "the great God" is made more specific by

⁹⁶ Here is a list of those texts that explicitly use *theos* in reference to the Father, as distinct from Jesus. This is done in one of several ways, either through an explicit distinction that is made between God and Jesus, the additional description of God as "the Father," or the reference is to "his Son" (or "God's Son") and other, similar descriptions/qualifications that effectively distinguish the *theos* to which reference is made, from Jesus. Most of the time these additional descriptions/qualifications are made in the same verse in which *theos* is used, but there are instances where the immediate context makes the aforementioned distinction, as is the case with our first example from the book of Romans. **ROMANS**: 1:1 (note the use of *theos* in this verse in relation to τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, "the Son of him" in verse 3), 4, 7 (second occurrence), 8, 9; 2:16; 3:22, 23 (compare verse 24), 25 (note that here Paul refers to "God" as the one who "sent him ['Jesus Christ' (verse 24)] forth," while John says that the "Father" [1Jo 4:14] "sent forth his Son," showing that the two terms "God" and "Father" were practically interchangeable in the first century CE; the same could not be said of "God" and "Son" as these very same texts [and others] reveal); 5:1, 10, 11; 6:10, 11, 23; 7:25 (first occurrence); 8:3, 17; 10:9; 15:6; 16:27; **ICORINTHIANS**: 1:3, 9, 24 (twice); 3:23; 6:14; 8:6; 11:3; 15:15, 24, 28; **2CORINTHIANS**: 1:2, 3 (twice), 19, 20; 4:4 (second occurrence); 5:18, 19; 11:3; 13:(13)14; **GALATIANS**: 1:1, 3, 4, 15 (note the use of "his Son" in verse 16); 2:20; 3:26; 4:4, 6; 4:14; **EPHESIANS**: 1:2, 3, 17; 2:4 (compare verse 5); 3:10 (compare verse 11); 4:6, 13, 32; 5:2, 5 (see pages 384-386), 20; 6:23; **PHILIPPIANS**: 1:2; 2:6 (twice), 9, 11; 4:20; **COLOSSIANS**: 1:2, 3, 15; 2:12; 3:1, 17; **1THESSALONIANS**: 1:1, 3, 9 (twice; note the use of "his Son" in verse 10); 3:11, 13; **2THESSALONIANS**: 1:1, 2, 12 (see pages 386-388); 2:16; **1TIMOTHY**: 1:1, 2; 2:5 (twice); 5:21 (see pages 377-378, note 34); 6:13 (see page 379); **2TIMOTHY**: 1:2; 4:1 (see page 387); **TITUS**: 1:1 (twice), 4; 3:4 (see verse 6); **PHILEMON**: 1:3; **HEBREWS**: 1:1, 9 (twice); 2:17; 4:14; 5:10; 6:6; 7:3; 7:25; 9:14 (twice); 9:24; 10:7, 12, 21, 29; 12:2, 23 (compare verse 24); 13:15, 20. These references reveal that those instances where Paul uses *theos* in a positive sense without specifically mentioning the Father, or distinguishing Him from Jesus, the term conveys a semantic signal for the Father. There is no evident change in Paul's thought when he uses *theos* specifically for the Father, and when he uses it without a specific reference to the Father. The few exceptions are noted in figure E.1.

⁹⁷ Aside from a couple ambiguous passages (see figure E.1 and the accompanying notes), when Paul uses the term positively, that is, not in reference to false gods, it always refers to the being of the Father. The term is never used in reference to a Trinity of "persons." See Chapter 2, pages 56-63 for a discussion of the post-biblical distinction between a "person" and a "being."

⁹⁸ See, for example, Ro 15:5, 6; 1Co 1:3; 2Co 11:31; Eph 1:3, 17; Heb 1:9. Attempts to downplay the significance of these references based on a false dichotomy

the use of "great" it has even greater restrictive force than *theos* alone, or even an actual proper name (like "Peter" or "James") which can be applied to more than one person (though the context would limit the reference). According to the OT LXX, "the great God" was only considered applicable to one person! (Ps 85:10) Thus, J. E. Huther rightly observes: "The addition of the adjective μεγάλου indicates that θεοῦ is to be taken as an independent subject."⁹⁹ The subsequent mention of our "Savior Jesus Christ," then, creates a semantic distinction between the Father and Jesus, for this expression contains a proper name ("Jesus Christ") which removes all doubt about the application of the term "Savior" in this instance.

In addition to the evidence from the OT LXX which supports the view that "the great God" was a fixed expression for the Father, Jehovah, the Dead Sea Scrolls also distinguish "the great God" from His Son, the Messiah. The Aramaic "Son of God" text (4Q246), which is strikingly similar to Luke 1:32-35, speaks of the "Son of the Most High" (column 2, line 1) whose "kingdom will be an everlasting kingdom" (column 2, line 5). In line 7 of column 2 we are told that "the great God [אל רבא¹⁰⁰] will be his patron."¹⁰¹

between Jesus' human nature and his divine nature (a qualification that is never made in the Bible regarding the Father's position as *theos* in relation to Jesus) are merely appeals to post-biblical theology.

⁹⁹ J. E. Huther, *Critical and Exegetical Hand-Book to the Epistles of Timothy and Titus* (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1883), 303.

¹⁰⁰ G. A. Cooke, *A Text-Book of North-Semitic Inscriptions* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1903), 250, refers to inscriptions and coins where the two terms used in this description (אל רבא) are combined to form the proper name רבאל ("Rabel"), which is used for the last Nabataean king.

¹⁰¹ John J. Collins, "A Pre-Christian 'Son of God' Among the Dead Sea Scrolls," *BR* 9.3 (June 1993), 37. Émile Puech, "Some Remarks on 4Q246 and 4Q521 and Qumran Messianism," in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, eds. Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich (STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 546, dates this manuscript to sometime prior to 150 BCE. This would indicate that "the great God" was an established designation for Jehovah for some time in Jewish, non-biblical literature. Indeed, the close relationship between 4Q246 and Luke 1:32-35 would seem to indicate that Christians other than Paul were familiar with the term, if in fact the angel Gabriel made use of an existing tradition (as found in 4Q246) in announcing the birth of the Messiah. The parallels between 4Q246 and the book of Daniel, which also uses the expression "the great God" in reference to Jehovah (see note 76 above), are

There are also references to "the great God" in the OT Pseudepigrapha. For example, 3 Enoch 22B:5 refers to "YHWH, the God of Israel," as "the great God." In the Sibylline Oracles reference is made to "the great God" no less than forty-six times!¹⁰² Two of the references in the Sibylline Oracles (1.324 and 3.776) are particularly interesting. Both are considered Christian interpolations that refer to "the son of the great God," where "the great God" is clearly used of the Father. Thus, there is evidence that sometime during Paul's life or shortly thereafter, Christians recognized "the great God" as a description of the Father.

In the OT Apocrypha 3 Maccabees 7:2 uses τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ and the superlative of μέγας (μέγιστος, "greatest") modifies *theos* in several texts (2 Maccabees 3:36; 3 Maccabees 1:9, 16; 3:11; 4:16; 5:25; 7:22 [Codex A reads *megalou*]). This usage is similar to what we find in Josephus, who regularly refers to the God of the OT as ὁ μέγιστος θεός.¹⁰³ In Philo's work *On the Special Law Books* (4.177) he quotes Deuteronomy 10:17-18, where ὁ θεὸς ὁ μέγας ("the great God") is used. In *On the Cheribum* (30.1) Philo refers to τοῦ μεγάλου καὶ φιλοδώρου θεοῦ

also significant in establishing the importance of the language of 4Q246. See Chapter 2, pages 90-95 for further discussion of this text.

¹⁰² J. J. Collins discusses the dates and content of each book in OTP1, 317-324 and in the introduction to each book. Books 1 and 2 (the Jewish portion of which is dated between 30 BCE to 250 CE, and the Christian portion dated to no later than 150 CE) use "the great God" seven times (1.165; 1.268; 1.283; 1.324; 1.399-400; 2.27; 2.317). Book 3 (dated confidently to between 163 and 45 BCE) uses the description twenty-nine times (3.71; 3.91; 3.97; 3.194; 3.246; 3.274; 3.284; 3.297; 3.306; 3.490; 3.549; 3.556; 3.557; 3.565; 3.575; 3.584; 3.632; 3.656; 3.657; 3.665; 3.671; 3.687; 3.702; 3.740; 3.773; 3.776; 3.781; 3.784; 3.818). Book 4 (dated to the late first century CE [the original oracle is dated to sometime after the death of Alexander]) refers to "the great God" three times (4.6; 4.25; 4.163) and in Book 5 (dated to between 70 and 80 CE) it is used twice (5.176; 5.406). In Book 7 (no precise date is given, though it should probably be dated to sometime before the third century CE) it is used once (7.24). In Book 8 (dated to about 175 CE) it is also used once (8.135). In Book 11 (dated tentatively to about the turn of the era) it is used twice (11.85; 11.87) and in Book 13 (dated to about 265 CE) it is used once (13.54).

¹⁰³ See *A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus*, Karl H. Rengstorff, ed., vol. 3 (Leiden: Brill, 1979), 63-70. Examples include *The Antiquities of the Jews* 6.86; 7.353; 8.319 [*megalou* is a variant reading for *megistou*]; 9.133, 288-289; 11.3, 90; and others.

("the great and bountiful God"), and in *On Dreams* (1.94) He is called τοῦ πάντα μεγάλου θεοῦ ("the infinitely great God" [LCL translation]).

The description "the great God" is frequently found in Greco-Roman literature. Rather than list the many different references here, the reader is better off consulting the different sources that list instances of the "great God" in Greco-Roman literature.¹⁰⁴ If in Titus 2:13 Paul is making use of the description "the great God" as it is used in Greco-Roman society, then the semantic signal ("the great God") would not necessarily signal the concept associated with the same description as used in the OT LXX. Paul may be using the expression with a sense common in different cultural and religious circles, such as when he contrasts the pagan lords and gods with the "one God" and "one Lord" of Christianity. (1Co 8:4-6) In this light, Paul's intent could have been to put Christ in the place of the 'great gods' of Greco-Roman religion, without using the term "God" in the same sense as when he refers to the Father as the "one God."

Thus, it is possible, in view of the fact that Jesus is the "only-begotten god" (Joh 1:18) and because he was (and since his resurrection is again) "in the form of God" (Php 2:6-9), that Paul, against the Greco-Roman religious usage of this expression, called Jesus "the great God" in a manner consistent with the biblical presentation of Jesus as a divine being under the authority of the One who is God and Father to him. This use of "the great God," then, would be in contrast to the Greco-Roman deities, not in contrast to or as a means of identifying him with "the great God" of the OT LXX.

However, if the sense of the descriptive phrase "the great God" is taken from the OT LXX, then it is restricted in its application to Jehovah, the Father, the God of Jesus. (Mic 5:4; Ro 15:5-6). But rather than dogmatically assert that "the great God"

¹⁰⁴ See W. Grundmann, "μέγας," TDNT 4, 529-530; E. A. Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Period*, vol. 1 (New York: Frederick Ungar, 1957), 577; J. H. Moulton and George Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1952), 392-393. See also *Corpus Hermeticum*, tractate 12.

must relate to the OT LXX and other related uses of this expression for the God of the Jews, we must consider all the options. I therefore hold out the possibility that Paul could have borrowed the term from Greco-Roman society and applied it to Jesus in view of fact that the Bible speaks of him as *theos* in a qualified sense.

Still, in view of the Synoptic teaching that Jesus is said to appear "*in the glory of his Father*" (Mt 16:27; Mr 8:38; Lu 9:26 [see discussion of this point below]) and Paul's obvious familiarity with this teaching (notice that he refers, not to the appearing of the great God, but to the "appearing of the *glory* of the great God") it is more likely that "the great God" is distinct from Jesus in Titus 2:13. Paul was obviously familiar with the LXX, and was no doubt familiar with the expression "the great God." In view of the above considerations, it is likely that he used it in reference to the One whom he elsewhere consistently refers to as *theos*, namely, the Father.

For a Trinitarian interpretation to fit with Paul's words in Titus 2:13 it would have to be shown that "the great God" was understood by Paul as in some way consistent with the meaning, "the great God the Son the second person of a consubstantial triad," for that is the meaning of the expression when applied to Jesus, by Trinitarians. Since this cannot be demonstrated, and in view of the evidence we have presented above and will present below, it is quite likely that Paul uses the description "the great God" as a semantic signal for the Father, Jehovah. It is thus the equivalent to a proper name, and therefore Sharp's rule does not necessarily apply in this instance. But like "Christ Jesus" and "Lord Jesus Christ," might "Savior Jesus Christ" also be considered a compound proper name?

According to Alford, "there is no doubt that σωτήρ ['Savior'] was one of those words which gradually dropped the article and became a *quasi proper name*."¹⁰⁵ He appears to base his conviction on the fact that in a few instances σωτήρ, in Paul's

¹⁰⁵ Henry Alford, *The Greek Testament*, vol. 3, rev. Everett F. Harrison (Chicago: Moody, 1958), 420 (emphasis added). See also, Winstanley, *Vindication*, 49-50.

writings, is used without the article. But the fact is 1 Timothy 1:1 and 4:10 are the only verses cited by Alford where Paul (excluding Tit 2:13) uses the anarthrous σωτήρ, and they are both applied to God (Eph 5:23 and Php 3:20 are two other examples where σωτήρ is anarthrous). The other seven occurrences of σωτήρ in Paul's writings (1Ti 2:3; 2Ti 1:10; Tit 1:3, 4; 2:10; 3:4, 6)¹⁰⁶ have the article, but none of them follow καί, as is the case with the example from Titus 2:13. Thus we do not see σωτήρ, *by itself*, as a "quasi proper name."¹⁰⁷ But what about the use of σωτήρ together with Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ? Abbot states:

In the case before us, the omission of the article before σωτήρος ["Savior"] seems to me to present no difficulty; not because σωτήρος is made sufficiently definite by the addition of ἡμῶν ["of us"] (Winer), for since God as well as Christ is often called "our Saviour," ἡ δόξα τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτήρος ἡμῶν, *standing alone*, would most naturally be understood of one subject, namely, God, the Father; but the addition of Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν changes the case entirely, restricting the σωτήρος ἡμῶν 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 ὁ θεός, so that there was no need of the repetition of the article to prevent ambiguity.¹⁰⁸

Against this view, Harris states: "It is not clear, however, that an appositional noun that precedes a proper name is necessarily anarthrous. Second Timothy 1:10 has διὰ τῆς ἐπιφανείας τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ ['through the manifestation of our Savior Christ Jesus'], while in four other passages in the Pastorals

¹⁰⁶ Paul's use of σωτήρ seems to alternate between God and Christ, "God being the primal source of salvation, and Christ the medium of communication." (Abbot, "Titus ii. 13," 11) Thus, 2Co 5:18 tells us, "But all things are from God, who reconciled us to himself through Christ" (NWT).

¹⁰⁷ Abbot, "Titus ii. 13," 4, footnote, says with regard to Alford's remarks, "I find no sufficient proof of his statement that σωτήρ had become in the N. T. 'a quasi proper name.'" Wallace, "Multiple Substantives," 263, note 247, citing Harris, makes a similar point.

¹⁰⁸ Abbot, "Titus ii. 13," 14.

[namely, 1Ti 2:3; Tit 1:3; 2:10; 3:4] σωτήρ ἡμῶν is articular preceding the anarthrous quasi-proper name θεός.¹⁰⁹ But none of the examples Harris gives are parallel to Titus 2:13, for only in Titus 2:13 does "our Savior Jesus Christ" *follow* καί. The significance of this was also seen in our discussion of the compound name "Lord Jesus Christ."¹¹⁰

Additionally, Harris tries to establish a connection between the use of the expression "God and Savior" by first-century Jews in reference to Jehovah, which, he says, "invariably denoted one deity, not two," and the use of "God" and "Savior" in Titus 2:13.¹¹¹ But this is quite beside the point, as the situation in Paul's writings is such that the term "Savior" is applied to *two individuals*, namely, God and Christ. Therefore, sensitivity must be given to each instance where "Savior" is used; we must not arbitrarily assume that just because the two titles "God" and "Savior" are used together in such close proximity that they *ipso facto* apply to one person. The semantic signaled by the use of "Savior" for God and for Christ is not the same, and can be easily illustrated based on NT soteriological statements.¹¹²

Indeed, the NT does not merely use "God and Savior," but "Savior" is, in this pairing of terms, always followed by "Jesus

¹⁰⁹ Harris, *Jesus as God*, 182.

¹¹⁰ Similarly, Wallace's examples from *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. 58 (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1991) do not parallel Titus 2:13. He refers to several documents where Christians of the 6th through the 7th century call Christ their "God and Savior." But in none of these examples do we have a description of the *great* God, nor do we have σωτήρ used together with "Jesus Christ." The construction is invariably Ἰη[σ]οῦ Χρι[σ]τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ [σ]ωτήρο[ς] ἡμῶν (P. Oxy 3936, 3937 [598 CE], 3938, 3939 [601 CE], 3949 [610 CE], 3954 [without ἡμῶν], 3955, 3956 [611 CE], 3958 [614 CE], 3959 [620 CE], 3961 [631/2 CE]). Still, even if they were parallel "all of these references are late" (Wallace, "Multiple Substantives," 253, note 219), so that by this time "God" was a common description of Christ, though with a much different meaning than it had, say, in John's Gospel. (Joh 1:1, 18) These documents were apparently written with the Trinitarian concept of God in mind. Thus, P. Oxy 3940 [604 CE] speaks of "the immaculate and consubstantial trinity, father, son and holy spirit," and 3957 [611(?)612 CE] tells of "the holy and consubstantial trinity, father and son and holy spirit, and of our mistress the mother of god, and of all the saints."

¹¹¹ Harris, *Jesus as God*, 179.

¹¹² See the chart and discussion of this issue regarding the use of "Savior" for God and for Christ in Chapter 3, page 163.

Christ," changing the idiom from that used by the Jews of the Diaspora and those in Palestine. Even Harris acknowledges: "If the name Ἰησοῦς Χριστός did not follow the expression, undoubtedly it would be taken to refer to one person; yet Ἰησοῦς Χριστός is simply added in epexegetis."¹¹³ But the fact that "Jesus Christ" does follow the expression gives cause for carefully considering the application of the terms, not in accordance with non-biblical uses of "God and Savior," but in light of the biblical presentation of God and His Christ. "Jesus Christ" may indeed be added in epexegetis, but this does not mean it defines *both* "God" and "Savior," especially not in Titus 2:13, for reasons considered earlier.

In this case, the only issue that remains is whether or not the proper name "Jesus Christ" is also epexegetical to "the great God." If so, then Paul appears to be using it to contradict the use of the same expression ("the great God") in Greco-Roman religion. But if Paul is drawing from the OT LXX then the expression is fixed to Jehovah, the Father, the God of Jesus, who sent Jesus as Savior of the world. (Ps 85:10; Mic 5:4; 1Jo 4:14) This would create a semantic distinction between "the great God" and "Savior Jesus Christ" that is unavoidable from a biblical perspective.

In Titus 2:13 it is likely that "Savior Jesus Christ" is a compound proper name, separate from "the great God" in identity, but related in connection with the manifestation of the Son in the Father's glory. Even if "Savior Jesus Christ" is not a compound proper name, the use of the proper name "Jesus Christ" certainly restricts the application of "Savior," which, if "the great God" be taken in reference to the Father, creates a semantic distinction between the two. The context, drawing from the Synoptic teaching of Jesus' appearing in the Father's glory at his future manifestation, also supports this distinction.

The use of ἐπιφάνεια ('manifestation') in Titus 2:13. Earlier we mentioned that Stuart believed Titus 2:13 applied only to Jesus, not because of the presence or absence of the article, but

¹¹³ Ibid.

because he believed the *context*, specifically the use of ἐπιφάνεια, indicates as much. He asks:

Where in the New Testament, is the ἐπιφάνεια of God the Father asserted or foretold? It is Christ who is to appear "in the clouds of heaven, with great power and glory." . . . I know of no New Testament analogy for any other than he, who is to make such a development of himself. How can I then refer this ἐπιφάνεια in Tit. 2:13 to God the Father? . . . On other and very different grounds, then, than that of the presence or absence of the article in this case, I arrive at the full persuasion, that ["the great God and Savior"], are both appellatives applied in this case to ["Jesus Christ"].¹¹⁴

However, Abbot, responding to a similar argument by Ellicot, points out that this argument is really founded on a mis-statement of the question:

The expression here is not "the appearing *of the great God*," but "the appearing *of the glory* of the great God," which is a very different thing. When our Saviour himself had said, "The Son of man shall come *in the glory of his Father*, with his angels" (Matt. xvi. 27, comp. Mark viii. 38), or as Luke expresses it, "in his own glory, *and the glory of the Father*, and of the holy angels" (ch. ix. 26), can we doubt that Paul, who had probably often heard Luke's report of these words, might speak of "the appearing of the *glory*" of the Father, as well as of Christ, at the second advent?¹¹⁵

Thus, in accordance with Matthew 16:27 and Mark 8:38, Paul could speak of the manifestation of the Son *in the glory of* "the great God." Far from proving that Jesus is called "the great God" in this passage, the use of ἐπιφάνεια seems to support the teaching that Christ will appear "in the glory of his Father," the "great God."

¹¹⁴ Stuart, "Hints and Cautions," 323.

¹¹⁵ Abbot, "Titus ii. 13," 4-5.

Some Bibles translate ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης as "glorious manifestation" (NWT) or "glorious appearing" (KJV, NIV), while others read, "the appearing of the glory." (RSV, NASB) Although "glorious manifestation" is grammatically possible, we must take note of Abbott's insights and other reasons given by scholars for preferring the RSV translation. Harris notes that "to render τῆς δόξης by the adjective 'glorious' not only obscures the relation between verses 11 and 13 but also weakens the import of the term δόξα ['glory']."¹¹⁶ He continues:

It is one thing to say that a person's appearance will be "resplendent" or "attended by glory." It is another thing to assert that his *own* "glory" will be revealed. A further problem with the KJV rendering is that nowhere in the NT is ἐπιφάνεια used of the Father (but five times of Christ)—or are two persons said to appear at the Last Day? . . . [As Abbot pointed out earlier] it is not the Father himself who will be visibly manifested but the *glory* that belongs to the great God. It is unlikely that τῆς δόξης is a "Hebrew" genitive ("the glorious appearing of the great God") or that "the appearance of the glory of the great God" is simply a circumlocution for "the great God will appear."¹¹⁷

The fact that "no man may see [Jehovah] and yet live" is also strong testimony that the Father Himself will not appear. But, as was the case with Moses, His glory will be revealed, this time along with that of His Son (Ex 33:20-22; Mt 16:27).

2 Peter 1:1. With reference to both Titus 2:13 and 2 Peter 1:1, G. B. Winer states: "For reasons which lie in the doctrinal system of Paul, I do not regard σωτήρος ['Savior'] as a second predicate by the side of θεοῦ ['God'], as if Christ were first styled ὁ μέγας θεός ['the great God'] and then σωτήρ ['Savior']. The

¹¹⁶ Harris, *Jesus as God*, 176.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 176, 184 (5. b). Jehovah's Witnesses often use Bible translations other than NWT, as does the Watchtower Society in their publications. They recognize that while NWT is an excellent translation, others are more accurate or more explicit in various places. The Witnesses are well aware of the fact that no translation of the Bible is perfect.

Article is omitted before σωτήρος, because the word is made definite by the Genitive ἡμῶν ['of us'], and the apposition *precedes* the proper name: *of the great God and of our Savior Jesus Christ*. Similar is 2 Pet. 1:1, where there is not even a pronoun with σωτήρος."¹¹⁸

A. T. Robertson took issue with Winer's appeal to the "doctrinal system of Paul," and insisted that several instances of the same idiom in 2 Peter (1:11; 2:20; 3:2, 18) are reason enough "for one to translate 2 Peter i. 1 'our God and Saviour Christ Jesus.'"¹¹⁹ Grammatical, theological, contextual and other considerations must be equally considered when translating any passage. Grammar is not the sole criterion by which a text should be translated. Other factors, such as the author's habitual use of language and the presupposition pool that he shares with his readers, must be considered along with the possibilities presented by the grammar of the sentence, paragraph, or discourse.¹²⁰

Regarding Robertson's appeal to grammatical parallels in the book of 2 Peter, we believe that rather than being evidence in support of the view that Christ is called "God" in 2 Peter 1:1, these "parallel" examples are proof to the contrary. A consideration of the alleged parallels will help illustrate the point:

2 Peter 1:1 τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτήρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

2 Peter 1:11 τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτήρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

2 Peter 2:20 τοῦ κυρίου [ἡμῶν] καὶ σωτήρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

2 Peter 3:2 τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτήρος

2 Peter 3:18 τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτήρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

¹¹⁸ George B. Winer, *A Grammar of the Idiom of the New Testament*, trans. J. Henry Thayer (Andover: Warren F. Draper, 1897), 130.

¹¹⁹ A. T. Robertson, "The Greek Article and the Deity of Christ," *The Expositor*, 8th Series, vol. 21 (1921), 184, 187. See also his *Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934), 786.

¹²⁰ For an informative and helpful discussion of the legitimate use of theology in Bible translation, see Rolf Furuli, *The Role of Theology and Bias in Bible Translation: With a Special Look at the New World Translation of Jehovah's Witnesses* (Huntington Beach, CA: Elihu Books, 1999).

From the above comparison we can see that four out of the five articulated nouns are the same; one is significantly different. In 2 Peter 1:1 we have θεός and in the other four Peter uses κύριος. The question we ask is, Why would Peter call Christ "God" in verse 1, but in 1:11, 2:20, 3:2, and 3:18 use "Lord"? That he might do just that is, of course, not impossible. But he uses "Lord" for Jesus in a number of instances. In addition to the four passages above, he refers to Christ as κύριος in 1 Peter 1:3, 2:3, 13, 3:15, 2 Peter 1:2, 8, 14, 16, a total of 12 times. Yet nowhere else in his letters¹²¹ does he call Jesus "God." However, when referring to the Father, Peter uses θεός 45 times, excluding 2 Peter 1:1 (1Pe 1:2-3, 5, 21 [twice], 23; 2:4-5, 10, 12, 15-17, 19-20, 3:4-5, 17-18, 20-22; 4:2, 6, 10-11 [three times], 14, 16-17 [twice], 19; 5:2 [twice], 5-6, 10, 12; 2Pe 1:2, 17, 21; 2:4, 3:5, 12).

Thus, it is very likely that in 2 Peter 1:1 the apostle did not repeat the article before the second noun because the use of θεός in the first verse made it clear enough that he was speaking of the Father, while the addition of "Jesus Christ" after σωτήρος would have stood on its own as a second subject.¹²² This would give us another example of an opening reference to both God and Jesus Christ, which is typically made in the epistles of the New Testament. As Karl Rahner observed: "St Paul often speaks of the Father as the θεός where he predicates κύριος of Christ; and a mention of the Father as well as the Son is to be expected at the beginning of 2 Peter, in accordance with the usual practice at the beginning of a letter."¹²³

Of course, it would appear that Peter removes all doubt as he goes on to distinguish Christ and God in the very next verse. (2Pe 1:2) But this cannot be used to say that he could not have called

¹²¹ Jehovah's Witnesses accept Petrine authorship (or dictation through Silvanus in the case of 1 Peter) for both 1 and 2 Peter. See, *"All Scripture Is Inspired of God and Beneficial,"* 2d ed. (Brooklyn: Watchtower Bible and Tract Society, 1990), 251-254.

¹²² Compare the statement in F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, trans. Robert W. Funk (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), 145, sec. 276 (3), "σωτήρος ἡμ. Ἰ. Χρ. may be taken by itself and separated from the preceding."

¹²³ Karl Rahner, *Theological Investigations*, vol. 1, trans. Cornelius Ernst (Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1961), 136.

Christ θεός in verse 1, and then use θεός of the Father in verse 2. However, this seems unlikely given his preference for calling Christ "Lord" and reserving the term "God" for the Father. And, again, as is the case with Titus 2:13, the second noun, "Savior," is joined to "Jesus Christ," creating a compound proper name which makes it sufficiently definite to stand on its own as a second subject, without the article.

The proper name "Jesus Christ" may be used in apposition to "Savior," in which case "Jesus Christ" restricts the application of "Savior," much the same way as the repetition of the article could have done. We must look at the grammatical, theological and contextual factors in order to properly understand and explain the meaning of this and other passages. We must not perform "limited" exegesis by considering only the grammar or only the theology of the author in question.

Indeed, there are Trinitarian scholars like Murray Harris who would label the rendering "a god" in John 1:1 as "impossible" due to his view of John's "theological context."¹²⁴ Also, Trinitarian's perceived view of the theology of the letter to the Hebrews certainly has an impact on how they translate the grammar of passages like Hebrews 3:2. This text could be translated, "He was faithful to the one that made him," or "He was faithful to the one that appointed him." Due to the fact that Trinitarians will not accept Jesus as the first of God's creations, they would also exclude this rendering because of their theology.

1 John 5:20. Another text that has been linked to the GS rule is 1 John 5:20. However, Wallace has two concerns about classifying 1 John 5:20 as a legitimate Granville Sharp (GS) construction. They are, 1) does the adjective αἰώνιος (*aionios*, "everlasting") and 2) does the change in gender between *theos* ("God") and ζωῆ (*zoe*, "life") nullify the construction?

Regarding his first concern, Wallace admits that in other examples, such as Revelation 20:1, "the postpositive adjective effectively breaks the construction."¹²⁵ But he then presents four

¹²⁴ See Chapter 6, page 349, note 110.

¹²⁵ Wallace, "Multiple Substantives," 272.

reasons why 1 John 5:20 should be understood under the confines of Sharp's rule, in spite of the postpositive adjective *aionios*:

- 1) He believes the limited pool of examples containing a trailing adjective with the second noun "is hardly a large enough data base on which to build a compelling principle."¹²⁶ Of course, we could argue similarly regarding those examples containing a proper name with the second noun.
- 2) Wallace points to *zoe aionios* as a rare example of an attributive adjective used without the article in the noun-adjective order. This is a legitimate observation, and should be carefully considered.
- 3) He then highlights what he initially calls "one parallel to 1 John 5:20 in the papyri."¹²⁷ He adds that the parallel is only in terms of the adjective, and further notes that it is not even completely parallel in this respect, since the adjective occurs with the first noun, not the second. Still, he believes that "the principle is the same." But I fail to see how this is the case, since we are concerned with whether or not the postpositive adjective used with the second noun in a *kai*-joined phrase can account for its use without the article. Also, Wallace's example (*humas . . . tous theous megistous kai antileptoras* [P. Lond. 23:17-18]) contains plural nouns. Thus, it is not a proper parallel to 1 John 5:20.
- 4) Wallace argues that "the most natural reading of 1 John 5:20 is to see the subject, *houtos* ["this one"], as referring to both *theos* and *zoe*. This is a subjective observation, and it may or may not be true. But in this context (see below) it may be equally natural to understand *theos* and *zoe* as having different referents, though closely associated with each other. (Compare Jesus' close association of *aionios zoe* ["everlasting life"] with a knowledge of the Father ["the only true God (see below)], in John 17:3, and the fact that 1 John 5:20 speaks of the Son coming to give us a knowledge of "the true one.")

Regarding the change in gender, Wallace notes that no other GS construction in NT contains this mixture.¹²⁸ He offers the following two considerations:

¹²⁶ Ibid., 273.

¹²⁷ Ibid.

¹²⁸ Ibid., 274.

- 1) In mixed constructions of this sort the NT and the papyri regularly use a second article.
- 2) Wallace sites just one example from a fourth century CE letter (P. Oxy. 1298) that contains a GS construction with two masculine nouns followed by a feminine abstract noun, and where the nouns have the same referent. But there is no postpositive adjective used with the feminine noun.

Wallace concludes by observing that of the seventy or so instances in which *houtos* has a personal referent, about forty-four of them refer to the Son. But this argument has little force behind it. If *houtos* were used exclusively of the Son, then there might be some significance to this observation, but since it is used of Nicodemus, and even of the antichrist (!), it can hardly be significant in this instance, as somehow limiting the referent to the Son (Joh 3:2; 2 Joh 7).

There are two very significant observations to keep in mind when interpreting 1 John 5:20, and for some reason Wallace does not address either one of them. The first has to do with the immediate context. In the first part of 1 John 5:20 we are told that the Son of God has come and given us the ability to know *ton alethinon* ("the true one"). This creates a distinction between the two, for one gives us a knowledge of the other, but *ton alethinon* is clearly the most natural antecedent for *ho alethinus theos* ("the true God"), who is distinguished from Jesus (*zoe aionios* ["everlasting life"]—compare 1Jo 1:2) *ho huios autou* ("the Son of him" [*autos* = "the true one"]). The reference to "the Son of him" appears to be decisive evidence for applying *ton alethinon* ("the true one") to the Father. It is only natural, then, to view *ho alethinus theos* and *ton alethinon* as the same individual, namely, the Father.

The second observation has to do with the fact that Jesus restricted the application of *ho alethinus theos* to his Father in John 17:1-3 (note the use of *monos* ["only"]).¹²⁹ Thus, if *ho alethinus theos* is a title that is said to belong "only" to the Father, and if Jesus was the one commonly understood as

¹²⁹ See Chapter 2, pages 120-122.

"everlasting life" (1Jo 1:2) then we likely have a situation where both nouns and their accompanying adjectives created a semantic distinction between the two. The concepts associated with each semantic signal, in the mind of John and his readers, were only properly associated with distinct individuals.

Conclusion

What must not be forgotten in all this discussion about the absence of the article before the second noun in an article-noun-καί-noun construction, is that even if the article were repeated this would not guarantee that both nouns are not to be applied to the same person. Consider John 13:13, ὁ διδάσκαλος καὶ ὁ κύριος, or Revelation 1:5, ὁ πρωτότοκος. . . καὶ ὁ ἄρχων, or Matthew 22:32, ὁ θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ ὁ θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ καὶ ὁ θεὸς Ἰακώβ. The latter example is especially interesting, considering the parallel account in Luke 20:37, τὸν θεὸν Ἀβραὰμ καὶ θεὸν Ἰσαὰκ καὶ θεὸν Ἰακώβ. Are we to understand that in Luke's account there is only one God spoken of, while in Matthew there is a God for Abraham, a God for Isaac and a God for Jacob? Thus, it is not legitimate to argue that the repetition of the article in the christologically significant passages previously discussed would have made it clear that two persons are in view.¹³⁰

Even if Christ were called "God" in Titus 2:13 or 2 Peter 1:1, it would not add two verses "to the side of the Trinitarian argument."¹³¹ The Bible writers show no awareness of the Trinity doctrine, which arose centuries later, and with much controversy. In fact, the writings of the apostles stand in direct contradiction to

¹³⁰ See also Rev 1:17; 2:8, 26; 12:9; 20:6. This inaccurate argument is frequently advanced by those who try to convince others that only one person (Jesus Christ) is in view in passages such as Titus 2:13 and 2 Peter 1:1. For example, Robert Morey, *The Trinity: Evidence and Issues* (Grand Rapids: Word Publishing, 1996), 354, says regarding 2 Peter 1:1, "If Peter *wanted* to indicate that two persons were in view in II Peter 1:1, all he had to do was to add the article before the second noun."

¹³¹ Robertson, "The Greek Article and the Deity of Christ," 187.

such a teaching. The author of Titus 2:13¹³² speaks of the "God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ" many times (Ro 15:5-6; 2Co 1:3; 11:31; Eph 1:3, 17), and Peter does the same. (1Pe 1:3) So if these verses did call Jesus θεός it would be with the understanding communicated throughout the Bible that Jesus is a divine being who is dependent on the Father, his God, for his authority and life. (Joh 5:26-27) It would be another qualified reference to Jesus as θεός,¹³³ with the understanding that Jesus has one who is God to him. This is hardly equivalent to the Trinitarian understanding of God, which would explain these qualifying references in terms of Christ allegedly having two natures in one person. Such a teaching is foreign to the whole of Scripture. Before he came to earth Jesus was divine. (Joh 1:1) When he came to earth he was a man, "lower than the angels." (Heb 2:9; compare 2Co 8:9) When he returned to heaven he became a "life-giving spirit" (1Co 15:45).

In Ephesians 5:5 (as well as 1Ti 5:21, 6:13, and 2Ti 4:1), Χριστός is the equivalent of a proper name, and, therefore, does not fit the general description of the nouns in the other eighty or so article-noun-καί-noun constructions in the New Testament. It is similar with 2 Thessalonians 1:12, where the compound name "Lord Jesus Christ" does not require the article to be considered a second subject. In Titus 2:13 and 2 Peter 1:1 the use of σωτήρ, together with "Jesus Christ," puts these examples outside the general category of article-noun-καί-noun constructions, which do not have the equivalent of a proper name in either the first or second position. This is not to say that such constructions cannot describe one person with two nouns, for, clearly, in the case of 2 Peter 1:11, 2:20, 3:18 and Jude 4, they do. There are several grammatical differences between 1 John 5:20 and the other christologically significant article-noun-*kai*-noun texts, and both nouns are modified by adjectives and appear to be semantically restricted to distinct individuals. It also appears rather obvious that we should identify *ho alethinous theos* and *ton alethinon* as the same individual, who is distinct from "the Son of him."

¹³² Jehovah's Witnesses do not consider the letter to Titus deuterio-Pauline. See "All Scripture Is Inspired of God and Beneficial," 239-240.

¹³³ See Chapter 6, pages 355-362.

When we interpret grammatical constructions, which involve compound proper names or their semantic equivalents, we cannot simply turn to other constructions that are not precise parallels (that is, which do not contain proper or compound proper names) and say, "It must be rendered this way or that way." Each verse has its own peculiarities that must be carefully weighed before a rule of grammar, which is loaded with limitations, is allowed the final say.