

TITUS Part 7 Exhortation to Bondservants; Is Jesus God?

Granville Sharp Rule (3/18/2017)

The following text is based on a message from Corner Fringe Ministries that was presented by Daniel Joseph.

*Portions of this sermon message have been edited to better transcribe the message. All verses are in red text and are from the New King James Version unless otherwise noted.

***Special Note: Due to special context within this document, it is highly suggested that this document be printed in color.

Looking at what we did last week as we covered chapter 2, Paul began to address the community as a whole. He covered the older women, the older men, and then we actually ended on the younger women. There is something critical that we did not cover, so we are going to circle back and look at it because it puts the whole passage into context. Let's take a peek at this. Going to Titus 2:3-5 we read—²the older women likewise, that they be reverent in behavior, not slanderers, not given to much wine, teachers of good things-- ⁴ that they admonish the young women to love their husbands, to love their children, ⁵ to be discreet, chaste, homemakers.... And that's kind of where we ended. From there it goes on; they are to be—good, obedient to their own husbands—and here's the thing—pay attention to this: *that the Word of God may not be blasphemed.*

You want to appreciate the gravity of the situation and how important it is that these young women are obedient to their husbands, they love their husbands, they love their children, and that they're discreet and chaste. This is how important it is; the name of Yeshua is at stake.

Paul uses the word “blasphemy” in his statement. Let me clarify this statement. It does not just apply to the young women; this applies to the groups mentioned in the entire passage. In fact, you find in Romans 2:21-24 Paul makes a charge of blasphemy toward his own Jewish brothers—²¹ You, therefore, who teach another, do you not teach yourself? You who preach that a man should not steal, do you steal? ²² You who say, “Do not commit adultery,” do you commit adultery? You who abhor idols, do you rob temples? ²³ You who make your boast in the law, do you dishonor God through breaking the law? ²⁴ For “the name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles because of you.” This puts it in a completely different context. We are supposed to have integrity when we carry the name of Yeshua on our lips. He is supposed to be living in our heart; and if He does and we walk the walk, we will bring glory to His name versus blaspheming His name. So that is what is at stake. That puts this into context. Amen. Paul is not offering suggestions here; this is as serious as it gets.

Now as we continue, Paul is going to address another group in Titus 2:6—⁶ Likewise exhort the young men to be sober-minded, ⁷ in all things showing yourself to be a pattern of good works; in doctrine showing integrity, reverence, incorruptibility, ⁸ sound speech that cannot be condemned, that one who is an opponent may be ashamed, having nothing evil to say of you. I want you to think about something. This is basically the same thing that he desires from the older men. The older men are to be reverent and so forth. So where I'm going with this is that the younger men should be looking at the Godly older men. You should look just like them. You should be a pattern of good works like the older men.

This nation is devoid of young men who look like this. It is devoid of holy young men who have conviction, and hate and despise the lust of the world. These are the men we need. These are the men who are to bear light in a very dark place, even to the point that people will rise up to speak against them because they are walking in holiness. When they speak against us, they are going to look like the fool, and that's where we need to be, that no matter what accusation comes against us we will stand and we will bring Him glory.

Now continuing on, Paul is going to get to his last group, and this one is a little peculiar. Titus 2:9—**exhort bondservants**. The transliteration for the Greek words used for the paraphrase “exhort bondservants” is *doulos*. It literally means slave. Let me ask you a question: Why is Paul addressing slaves? I get the whole concept of older men, older women, younger men, and younger women. That should pretty much sum up the community. There is no reason to address slaves. So why does Paul address slaves? The answer to that is because they were a significant part of society in his day.

Let me share with you a little bit of history from the Baker Encyclopedia of the Bible. This is what it says—**Slavery was widespread in the ancient Near East, although the economy was not dependent upon it. By Roman times Slavery was so extensive that in the early Christian period one out of every two people was a slave.**¹ You want some perspective here from the first century as to why Paul would be addressing the slaves (*doulos*)? Because they were everywhere. Now, for the sake of clarification, I want you to understand that when we hear the term slavery we tend to cringe. Why are we cringing? Because we know the history of this nation; we know what happened with racism here in this country. We basically took a people of color and told them that they were not human beings. Because of that they were told they should be a slave. So our history is fraught with a mentality that is not Torah-like. And when we hear the term slave, mentally, that is the place we go.

I want to be very careful that, when we are talking about the context of what Paul is presenting here, we understand that we are dealing with apples and oranges. This is very different from the system of slavery we experienced in this country. In fact, the reason that we find one out of every two people during Paul's time was a slave primarily had nothing to do with color. It actually had to do with debt. Let me share as we continue in this passage. This is what it says—**Debt was the basic cause for many families being reduced to slavery (in the early Christian period); an entire family could be subject to slavery.**¹

I want to understand what was going on and differentiate between the two. Remember that the statement implies that debt was the primary reason; it doesn't say that debt was the only reason. I don't have time to get into the different tiers of the types of slaves and the different periods when this was going on. But know that debt was primarily why one out of every two people was in some type of slave status.

The Torah has a lot to reveal about slavery. And, interestingly enough, it addresses this very context. Look at 2 Kings 4:1—**A certain woman of the wives of the sons of the prophets cried out to Elisha, saying, “Your servant my husband is dead, and you know that your servant feared the LORD. And the creditor is coming to take my two sons to be his slaves.”** This was the reality of the culture. Look at the directive given in Exodus 22:2-3—**22 If the thief is found breaking in, and he is struck so that he dies,**

there shall be no guilt for his bloodshed. ²³ If the sun has risen on him, there shall be guilt for his bloodshed. He should make full restitution; if he has nothing, then he shall be sold for his theft. The consequence of his actions was that he was sold into slavery.

I also caution you to be careful because I have heard atheists come out to vilify the Bible. They will try to claim that the Bible is a book of hate and oppression because it promotes slavery. People who claim this have never read it; they have no idea what the Bible says. Let me add something here. The way the Torah lays out the relationship of a master to the slave is nothing like what we're accustomed to in this country. In fact, Torah actually mandates that if a master abuses his authority and harms his slave, whether he knocks out a tooth or gouges an eye out, he was to set the slave free immediately. Why? Because the Torah promotes kindness, love, respect, and honor in that relationship; and that master is not worthy of it if he mistreats his slave. The master is immediately stripped of his position of authority. This is the type of relationship that the Torah promotes—holiness.

In regard to the history of slavery in this country, if we had been clinging on to the precepts of Torah and that reality, we would not have had to wait for the Emancipation Proclamation. It would have happened on its own. Do you understand the difference between the two?

I want to move on and give you a little backdrop here as to what Paul is dealing with. Paul is going to give the characteristics that these bondservants need to possess. He begins by saying—**Exhort bondservants to be obedient to their own masters (Titus 2:9)**. Now you are going to see, as we get further into this, how the relationship of a husband and a wife is actually paralleled to that of a master and a slave. Let me clarify that statement and show you what I mean. Slaves are to be obedient to their own masters. Where have we heard that before? We just read it in the passages from Paul. Wives are to be obedient to their husbands. This is what they're supposed to do. So there is the first parallel. But as we continue, you will see what I'm really after. Bondservants are to be—**well pleasing in all things, not answering back (Titus 2:9)**—don't get into arguments, and don't talk back or be sharp tongued. Continuing on—¹⁰**not pilfering**—meaning do not manipulate; do not get caught up in stealing that which is the master's property. Finally—**but showing all good fidelity, that they may adorn the doctrine of God our Savior in all things**.

What Paul is saying is that a bondservant is to have Yeshua living in his heart. And it is so powerful that his life, his deeds, his actions, and his words fall upon the ears of his own master. He does this so that the master sees these attributes in action, and it causes him to adore the gospel of the Living God. These actions will move him.

Where have we heard that before? It is with the wife. Peter wrote in 1 Peter 3:1—**Wives, likewise, be submissive to your own husbands, that even if some do not obey the word, they, without a word, may be won by the conduct of their wives**. That is power! It is power when a wife can bring life to her dead husband. It is power when a slave can bring life to his dead master. That is powerful! The love of Yeshua is supposed to be in us so deeply that it promotes them to love Him. That is who we are supposed to be.

Now you might say, “How does this apply to me?” It applies to almost every one. This principle applies because you all go to work; you are all hired servants. A lot of you work for nonbelievers. At your place of work, you do what they tell you to do or you get fired. In the workplace, we should be bringing Yeshua with this principle in mind—that He is so much in our heart, and they see how we behave differently. They see that you are not trying to bilk them for every penny, nor are you trying to manipulate every situation on your own behalf. You are not skimming the till. You are not doing any of that. You are above reproach, and your employer stands in awe and says that you are different than all his other employees. This is the effect that we should be having on the world. We should be bringing Yeshua into the workplace. It is mandated. This is what Paul is getting at, and it applies to us today. Amen?

Let me take it a step further. I want to take it to Ephesians 6:5—**Bondservants, be obedient to those who are your masters according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in sincerity of heart, as to Christ.** Your service is done unto Him. Whether you like your job or not does not matter. When you serve your employer, you should be doing it as unto the Lord. That, then, will change who you are; that will change the kind of employee you are.

Think about it this. It is important and critical for us to implement this type of behavior. And here is the beauty of it. When your employer sees your actions, you are bringing Yeshua to him. That man or that woman might be saved because you showed the love of Yeshua. That is the difference we can make.

Continuing on in Ephesians 6:6—**not with eyeservice, as men-pleasers, but as bond-servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart, with goodwill doing service, as to the Lord, and not to men.** I love that last part—**as to the Lord, and not to men.**

I know some of you are thinking, “Dan, you don't know my boss. He is a worthless bum. He is a cheapskate.” Whatever the case may be, you focus on the Lord and what He has asked us to do. The further you get into Scripture you realize, “Man, it is a hard road.” We must die to ourselves every single day. We cannot walk with Yeshua; we cannot follow Him unless we are crucified with Him first. That is just the reality.

Continuing on in Ephesians 6:8—**knowing that whatever good anyone does, he will receive the same from the Lord.** So here's the concept—do not worry about what your employer is going to give you; worry about what the Lord is going to give you because that is eternal. Continuing—**whether he is a slave or free. And you, masters....** Now here is what I am after. Paul doesn't address masters in his letter to Titus, but he takes it one step further in Ephesians, and this is beautiful—**Masters, do the same things to them, giving up threatening, knowing that your own Master also is in heaven, and there is no partiality with Him.** In other words, you business owners should be very careful how you treat your employees because this principle is absolutely active. Be careful you treat others according to the code of Torah—**Therefore, whatever you want men to do to you, do also to them, for this is the Law and the Prophets (Matthew 7:12).** If you're in a management position, if you're a boss, even if you own your own company, treat your employees the way you would want to be treated. If you want to reference Matthew 18:21-35, there's a nice little parable there that will strike the fear of God into you in regard to a master and servant relationship. It is an example of when the master abuses that role and the

resulting scourging of the master. It is serious.

We continue in Titus 2:11—**For the grace of God that brings salvation has appeared to all men.** This is one of my favorite passages in the New Testament. And the reason is because right here Paul reveals something that is so pinnacle to the faith. Here he literally calls Yeshua, or identifies Him as, the grace of God. Why does that matter? Go back and start paging through the Scriptures, start paging through the Gospels, and start paging in the New Testament. When you come across grace, what you should be thinking is what Paul thought. He had one thing come to his mind—Yeshua. That is what came to mind. And you know what happens to the Scriptures? They come alive like never before. Let me give you an example, and I always give this example when I deal with this. Paul says in Ephesians 2:8—**For by grace you have been saved through faith, and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God.** If we take what Paul teaches us, we should read it this way—**For by [Yeshua] you have been saved through faith, and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God.** He is the grace of God. This is very powerful. So when we read what he's saying here in Titus 2:11, it makes perfect sense—**For the grace of God that brings salvation has appeared to all men.** But now listen to what he says as we continue—¹² **teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in the present age.**

When someone asks you, “Why have you left grace? Why have you abandoned the grace of God and gone back to the Law?” When they ask you this, and they are bewildered at you because they’ve known you for 20 years because you have been a good believer, you've been serving the church, and now you have, according to them, walked away from grace and gone to the Law. This is your answer: because the grace of God has taught me to walk away from Lawlessness. It teaches me to turn my back on sin and unrighteousness and to go to what the antithesis of that is: God's Torah. That is where we are to go. And it is all because of the grace of God. That is why we do it.

Who is the grace of God? Yeshua. So why do I return to the Law? Because of Yeshua, or because of what he did. Look at 2 Timothy 2:19—**Nevertheless the solid foundation of God stands, having this seal: "The Lord knows those who are His," and, "Let everyone who names the name of Christ depart from iniquity."** You want to confess that you're saved by Yeshua? You want to call Him your master? Depart from iniquity. **Whoever commits sin also commits lawlessness, and sin is lawlessness (1 John 3:4).** So if I am turning my back away from lawlessness, I am turning to law.

Let's look at Galatians 2:16—**knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law but by faith in Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Christ Jesus, that we might be justified by faith in Christ and not by the works of the law; for by the works of the law no flesh shall be justified.** This is a very simple concept. We as believers know we are not justified by the works of the law. If that were the case, I don't need Yeshua, I don't need a savior, and I don't need forgiveness of sins. So the Torah, in and of itself, and my actions and deeds in the flesh trying to keep Torah do not cut it. I need a savior; I need atonement. This is what I need now.

I love Paul because he knows exactly where your carnal mind of flesh is going to go after he makes a statement like this. They are going to say, “Run from the Law because this is clearly what Paul is saying. He is telling me to reject the Law.” Well, look at the very next statement—**But if, while we seek to be justified by Christ, we ourselves also are found sinners, is Christ therefore a minister of sin? Certainly**

not! (Galatians 2:17). In other words, I take the holy name of Yeshua, and I say, "I'm saved by grace," but then I continue in lawlessness, and I walk carrying his holy name, and now I tell everyone, "The Messiah that I serve, this Yeshua, He is a minister of lawlessness [sin]," A belief like that is the Antichrist. That is the greatest form of blasphemy!

Now continuing on in Titus 2:13—**looking for the blessed hope and glorious appearing of our great God and Savior Jesus Christ**. This is where we need to be—vertical. And again, how many times have I talked about the fact that we are walking around in a daze, this horizontal faith, looking at the things of the world with the world's values, and we're trying to grab onto it? We are trying to build a kingdom here on earth. We are trying to excel in the eyes of other men because we want to be exalted in the sight of men, so we start exalting the things that they exalt. Remember what Yeshua said—**You are those who justify yourselves before men, but God knows your hearts. For what is highly esteemed among men is an abomination in the sight of God (Luke 16:15)**.

So we need to be vertical in our faith. Look at the words of Yeshua—¹⁹ **Do not lay up for yourselves treasures on earth, where moth and rust destroy and where thieves break in and steal; ²⁰ but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust destroys and where thieves do not break in and steal (Matthew 6:19-20)**. He also said—**Nevertheless do not rejoice in this, that the spirits are subject to you, but rather rejoice because your names are written in heaven (Luke 10:20)**. There is nothing here for us on this earth. And there is nothing here that is going to survive because it's going to be put through the holy fire. Only the righteous are going to come through that fire.

Having said that, I want to draw your attention to this statement found in Titus 2:13—**our great God and Savior Jesus Christ**. One of the things that I mentioned right at the beginning of the series was how Paul intentionally employs a very powerful reality by using a specific literary technique. He presents the Father and the Son right next to each other and always in the context that you see that they are *echad* (one); they are inseparable and completely unified.

Let's go back to Titus 1:1 and look at this briefly— **Paul, a bondservant of God**. What is interesting is that at times in other epistles he calls himself a bondservant of Yeshua. He does this interchangeably. I do not believe this is an accident. He continues—**and an apostle of Jesus Christ**. So here he literally takes the Father and the Son in this composition and shows that they are unified. He shows that they are *echad*.

Now here's where I'm going with this. Paul weaved this principle throughout this epistle. As you know, the statement is not very long. Basically Paul is showcasing a concept he wants you to get your arms wrapped around. Let's look at Titus 1:3 for an example—**but has in due time manifested His word through preaching, which was committed to me according to the commandment of God our Savior**. God is what? Our Savior. There is no debate who the Savior is. It is God. He has saved us; He is the Savior. Now pay close attention the very next statement—⁴ **To Titus, a true son in our common faith: Grace, mercy, and peace from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ our Savior (Titus 1:4)**. In verse 3 Paul specifically and intentionally calls God (Elohim) his Savior. Then we come to the very next verse, the very next statement, and he calls Yeshua (Jesus) his Savior. This is not a coincidence. He keeps showing the *echadness*, the oneness, of these two.

Let me take it a step further. We are going to go to Titus 3:4—**But when the kindness and the love of God our Savior toward man appeared, ⁵ not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us, through the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit, ⁶ whom He poured out on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Savior [emphasis added].** Paul first calls the Father the Savior, and then he specifically gives the title to Yeshua (Jesus Christ).

What is Paul doing here? He is revealing to you the divine nature of the Son, and who he really is. Paul is showing just how one (*echad*) He is. These predominant titles are used between the Father and the Son so that you see the glory and honor that is scattered throughout Scripture.

In fact, Isaiah 45:21 states—**And there is no other God besides Me, A just God and a Savior; there is none besides Me.** And it is interesting that when you go to the Septuagint, which is the Greek translation of the Old Testament Hebrew, you will find the same Greek word *sōtēr* used there for the word “Savior” that Paul uses in his letter to Titus and other epistles. It is the same exact word. So when you go to the Tanakh in Isaiah 45:21, there is no question who the Savior is. Yet, as Paul is weaving this concept, he is applying this concept to Yeshua.

Let me take it a step further. Let me take you to Luke 8:38-39. I just want to show you one more example—**³⁸ Now the man from whom the demons had departed begged Him [Yeshua just cast demons out of this man, so the man came back to Him] that he might be with Him. But Jesus sent him away, saying, ³⁹ "Return to your own house, and tell what great things God has done for you."** This is what Yeshua commands the man to do: go tell everyone—**what great things God has done for you [emphasis added].** Notice what happened—**And he went his way and proclaimed throughout the whole city what great things Jesus had done for him [emphasis added].**

We see this all over Scripture. It is like the “structure of the faith” we already talked about. Once your eyes are open to it you're like, “This is crazy. You begin to notice the intensity and the intentionality in this, if you will. You cannot get away from the writers conveying this message about the deity of Yeshua, His nature, and His character.”

Having said that, there is something that I debated about covering in this series, and I went back and forth wrestling with the idea. I just didn't want to cover it simply because, number one, to do it justice I would want three weeks, and I'm not going to do that with this particular thing because it doesn't affect theology one way or another with us. However, because of its importance and because of the fact that we are going through it, we are going to cover this. It is a bit technical, but we're going to do this because of how important this specific verse really is.

So I want to take you back to Titus 2:13—**looking for the blessed hope and glorious appearing of our great God and Savior Jesus Christ.** We look at the construct of what I just expressed to you in regard to how, all throughout Scripture, the Apostle Paul is phenomenal at showing the unity between the Father and the Son in that they are parallel with each other. This looks pretty cut and dry. We could say that this is just Paul showing the *echadness*, the oneness, of the Father and the Son.

However, that is not exactly what Paul is saying here. When you go to the Greek and look at this statement—**our great God and Savior Jesus Christ**—it isn't referring to the Father and the Son as two separate pieces. It is explicitly referring to Yeshua alone. Now that's pretty radical. When you look at this in the English and say, "Well Daniel, I guess I never thought it could be expressed like that. I never thought it could be Yeshua, our Great God and Savior Yeshua. I guess I could see it going both ways." Let me tell you this: when you get into the Greek on this, it doesn't go both ways; there is only one way. And this is radical because when you start talking about Yeshua (Jesus) being God and insist that there are no Scriptures that say He is God, you need to take a closer look at this in the Greek.

I want to introduce you to a man by the name of Granville Sharp. I don't know if any of you have heard of him, but he's a scholar from the eighteenth century. Granville Sharp, a modern scholar, recognized patterns in the Greek language. He found that there were consistent multiple patterns and multiple rules. And today one of those rules is now called the Granville Sharp construction, which is how modern scholars phrase it. I want to share with you this rule.

Granville Sharp Rule: *When the copulative και connects two nouns of the same case, if the article ó, 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.*¹

Let's break this down. The word και in the English translation would simply mean "and" such as Bob and (και) Larry. So *when the copulative (which means the connecting) και connects two nouns of the same case, if the article ó (Ha with rough breathing—ha, which in the English means "the." Greek is different than English in that it doesn't have an indefinite article. It just has what they call the article, or what we would call the definite article. So this Greek word ó is "the." This gets a little more complex in Greek because there are twenty-four different cases of the "the" article. Thus it makes sense because it pairs with the noun it's modifying.) ...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.*

Now some of you are thinking, "I have no idea what that said." Perfect! Because I'm going to give you an example; you're going to understand this because this is not as complex as it sounds. My example is a little more comprehensive than what was displayed here, and it might explain it better.

Example:

Greek: Romans 3:21- **νυνὶ δὲ χωρὶς νόμου δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ πεφανέρωται, μαρτυρουμένη ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν,**

English: Romans 3:21- **But now the righteousness of God apart from the law is revealed, being witnessed by the Law and the Prophets.**

In the verses above you will notice that on the top I have the Greek and on the bottom I have the English. There are different variables of articles. Here is the example from the Greek. I've highlighted

the articles in this example: Romans 3:21—**νυνὶ δὲ χωρὶς νόμου δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ πεφανέρωται, μαρτυρουμένη ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν**

So here you have two articles— **τοῦ** which means “the” and is used in front of the word “law” (νόμου), the law. And then **τῶν** which again is “the” in front of the word “prophets” (προφητῶν). I just want to add that this specific verse would not represent the Granville Sharp rule, but I’m sharing the principle of the Granville Sharp rule here because it will make perfect sense.

Now the Granville Sharp Rule says—if the article **ὁ**, or any of its cases, precedes the first of the said nouns or participles—then it would not be repeated again if the second noun was not an exact representation of the first noun. So we have **τοῦ** (the) preceding the noun νόμου (law). But if a form of “the” is repeated in front of the second noun, then it could mean two separate things entirely. It would say the Law and the Prophets. Well now we know that there are two articles in this verse (**τοῦ** and **τῶν**). There is a second article in front of the second noun. Because of that, it could be referencing two different things, which is the case in this verse—the Law and the Prophets.

Let me take this a step further and take you to another example, and this is a Granville Sharp example.

II Corinthians 1:3—**Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies and God of all comfort.**

II Corinthians 1:3—**Εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεὸς καὶ Πατὴρ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ Πατὴρ τῶν οἰκτιρῶν καὶ Θεὸς πάσης παρακλήσεως**

Now you’ll notice that nobody would question what “God and Father” is. This is referencing the same person. No question about it. Notice the definite article **ὁ** (the) preceding the word for God: **Θεός**. Also notice the **καὶ**, which is the connector. But notice what is missing. The verse does not include the second article between the words **καὶ** and Πατὴρ which is the Greek for “and Father.” Therefore, the term Father refers directly to God as one in the same.

When you look at this rule and how this is in the Greek, it’s very interesting. Now when we go to Titus, we find that this is exactly how it is.

Titus 2:13—**looking for the blessed hope and glorious appearing of our great God and Savior Jesus Christ.**

Titus 2:13—**προσδεχόμενοι τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ**

So here you have **τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ** or “the great God.” And then you have **καὶ σωτῆρος**. In the English it is “our great God and Savior” or “the great God and Savior.” But look at the major point here in this verse. You will notice that there is no article after **καὶ**. This, therefore, makes “the great God and Savior Jesus Christ” in the Greek language the same person.

This is what Granville recognized. It is not that he created a new Greek rule; it is simply that he recognized that this is a reality in the Greek language. And when this happens, it is referring to one and the same person.

To help you appreciate this further, I want to quote to you a world-class scholar. I mean a world-class textual critic. I mean par excellence, and his name is Dr. Wallace. Dr. Wallace took up this issue of the Granville Sharp rule, and he literally weighed out all the evidence internal and external. I want to preface this: if you've ever followed Dr. Wallace's work, you know that Dr. Wallace's nature is not to go to information to really confirm his theology. He is simply after the evidence; he doesn't care where it leads him. He has made statements today that frankly have made a lot of Christians squirm in their chairs because he just simply states, "This is the evidence; this is what it says." He does not let his preconceived notions affect that. That information about him is critically important.

Dr. Wallace took up this challenge of looking at the Granville Sharp Rule. He gathered all the information that scholars before him have come out with whether for it or against it, and deals with literally every article. I want to show you what he says in order to put some perspective on this, and it's only a fragment of his work because it would literally take months for me to cover what he is saying. It is very comprehensive. Dr. Wallace is going to quote a scholar by the name of Kuehne. This is what Dr. Wallace says—[He \[C. Kuehne\] summarizes his findings by stating that "Sharp claimed that his rule applied uniformly to such passages, and I indeed could not find a single exception." Kuehne is not alone in his view of these texts. None of Sharp's adversaries was able to produce a single exception to his rule within the pages of the NT.](#)²

I want you understand how dramatic this statement is because in every language you can go to whether the Hebrew, Greek, or English language, there are exceptions to rules. Rules govern the languages and help us navigate the languages. Rules help us understand the languages and how they operate. They help us with the syntax and all that good stuff.

But there always seems to be exceptions to the rules. When I was in grade school, I never was a good speller so mnemonic devices were very helpful. I'm still not a good speller today; my daughters are better spellers than I am, but I learned "i" before "e" except after "c." What a beautiful thing, and I clung to that with my life. Problem is when you go to spell weight, height, and freights there are exceptions to the rule. Right? The rule is very helpful; I will get it right a lot of the times, but there are exceptions to the rule. So that is my point. There are no exceptions to this rule. If you want to feel the weight of this, let me continue.

Dr. Wallace is going to quote another scholar by the name of Middleton—[In his *Doctrine of the Greek Article*, he \[Middleton\] devotes the first 120 pages to showing the usage of the article in classical Greek as an illustration of its use within the NT. In the NT portion of his work he spends several pages on Sharp's controversial passages—and affirms the rule in Titus 2:13; 2 Peter 1:1, and Eph 5:5. In the first part of his work, however, he has dedicated fifteen pages \(56-70\) of proof in order to demonstrate the validity of the rule in classical Greek. \(The term classical Greek is not talking about the New Testament. This is in reference to secular writings.\) To illustrate his point, he cites texts from such authors as Plutarch, Demosthenes, Plato, Aeschylus, Herodotus, and Aristophanes.](#)³

You want to talk about weight of evidence! This is not just looking at the Greek in the New Testament; this has now spanned to the Greek as a whole in classical Greek literature where he is still looking for that rule to hold. Taking it a step further, here is what Dr Wallace says next—the [Greek patristic writers](#). What does he mean by Greek patristic writers? He is talking about the early church fathers like Justin Martyr, Irenaeus of Lyons, and Clement of Alexander. Continuing—not only implicitly knew of the [requirements of Sharp’s canon, but understood them better than Sharp did himself!](#) In other words, Granville Sharp did not create this rule out of thin air. This is something you can go to the early church fathers and find they understood the construct of what we now call the Granville Sharp Rule.

Let me introduce you to someone who was alive in Granville Sharp’s day and studied his work. His name is Christopher Wordsworth. He was a scholar and Bishop of the Anglican Church. This is his commentary—I fully believe, that there is no one exception to your first rule [Granville Sharp Rule] in the whole New Testament: and the assertion might be extended infinitely further. After an exhaustive investigation, from Greek Christian literature covering a span of over 1000 years, Wordsworth was able to make the astounding comment, [And here it is] I have observed more than a thousand instances of the form ὁ Χριστος και Θεος (Ephes. v. 5)[,] [The Hebrew of that would be “Mashiach and Elohim” or in English—the Christ and God] some hundreds of instances of the ὁ μεγας θεος και σωτηρ (Tit. ii. 13); [Meaning the great God and Savior] and not fewer than several thousands of the form ὁ θεος και σωτηρ [The God and Savior] (2 Pet. i. 1.)[,] while in no single case, have I seen (where the sense could be determined) any of them used, but only of one person. A second confirmation (related to Titus 2:13 and 2 Pet 1:1) can be found in the juxtaposition of θεός and σωτήρ [God and Savior] in the milieu of the first Christian century. Several scholars have pointed out the fact that θεός and σωτήρ were often predicated of one person in the ancient world.

And here is his conclusion—In sum, Sharp’s rule outside of the NT has been very strongly confirmed both in the classical authors and in the koine. And although a few possible exceptions to his rule were found in the literature, the phrase ὁ θεός και σωτήρ (Titus 2:13 and 2 Pet 1:1) admitted of no exceptions—either in Christian or secular writings. Indeed, the researches of Wendland, Moulton, Moehlmann, Cullmann, et al., are so compelling that exegetes nowadays are more apt to deny Paul and Peter than they are Christ—that is to say, precisely because of the high Christology of Titus and 2 Peter the authenticity of these letters is usually denied.⁴

Do you understand what he just said? He just said that when you look at the evidence of Titus 2:13 or 2 Peter 1:1 textually or syntactically, you cannot argue about what is in the Greek. The rules governing Greek don’t allow for an argument. Many have tried to argue it. It doesn't work. The only thing you're left with is one of two things—either you deny Paul and Peter are legitimate apostles, or you say that their works are fraudulent, and they are imposters. If you believe the book of Titus is a fraudulent document, then that is the hill you're going to have to die on. But you cannot argue this textually. There is too much proof.

So when we read this verse in Titus 2:13—[looking for the blessed hope and glorious appearing of our great God and Savior Jesus Christ](#)—in the Greek, it is a direct reference to Yeshua alone. It clearly states in the Greek that He is God and Savior. Talk about hitting the bull's eye on this thing and making the Unitarians squirm out of their seats. They don't like this; they don't know what to do with it because

their theology is dictating their doctrine. In fact, there are other commentators and scholars trying to argue this, but it's completely indisputable from a theological standpoint because they can't argue with the way it was written and recorded in the Greek.

Let me take this a step further. Note the word "appearing" in the Titus 2:13 verse—**looking for the blessed hope and glorious appearing of our great God and Savior Jesus Christ** (emphasis added). The word "appearing" in the Greek is *ἐπιφάνεια* (transliteration is *epiphaneia*). The word is used explicitly and exclusively in the New Testament in regard to the coming of Yeshua. It is used in the context of Him and Him alone.

When you start unpacking this in the Greek, it is really powerful. We are confronted with the reality—is Yeshua God? When you look at the text in the Greek, Paul himself calls Yeshua God. When people ask you where Yeshua [Jesus] is called God and insist that He is not called God anywhere in the Bible, you can take them to Titus 2:13, 2 Peter 1:1, and John 1:1. John, in his writings, referred to as the book of John, stated in John 1:1—**In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God** (emphasis added).

Let me take it a step further in John 20:27-28—**Then He said to Thomas, "Reach your finger here, and look at My hands; and reach your hand here, and put it into My side. Do not be unbelieving, but believing."** ²⁸ **And Thomas answered and said to Him, "My Lord and my God!"** (emphasis added). Are you reading what I am reading? Thomas calls Yeshua God.

He just called Yeshua his Lord. And by the way, in the Greek, the transliteration for the word Lord is *kyrios*. That same word is the very word used for the Tetragrammaton (יהוה or Yehovah) in the Septuagint. That's how they translate the Tetragrammaton. Theos is more of a general term which would fit *'elohiyim*. But here Thomas just called Yeshua—**My Lord and My God**.

Let me take it one step further. I am going to go to the Tanakh, and I'm going to show you where Yeshua is explicitly and literally called God. Looking at Jeremiah 23:5—**Behold, the days are coming," says the Lord, "That I will raise to David a Branch of righteousness;** (This is a messianic prophesy of Yeshua) **A King shall reign and prosper, And execute judgment and righteousness in the earth. ⁶ In His days Judah will be saved, And Israel will dwell safely; Now this is His name by which He will be called: THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS** (emphasis added). Think about this statement. It just said this—His name is Mashiach. The Mashiach that was to come, this Jewish Messiah that was to come, His name is Yod Hey Vav Hey (יהוה or God). I don't know about you, but I think it's safe to say we can legitimately translate Yod Hey Vav Hey into God. Yod Hey Vav Hey is God. So when you look at the Jeremiah 23:5 verse and it says that His name will be called God or Righteousness, that is Yeshua's name. You can wrestle with the theology all you want, but that is His name. Why is Yeshua called Immanuel (Matthew 1:23) which means God with us?

The divinity of Yeshua is under attack like never before, and these are things that we need to be equipped with. This is why I didn't want to skip over this despite the technical stuff. You need to know this stuff. What Paul called Yeshua was exactly what the prophet Jeremiah acknowledged Him as—Yod Hey Vav Hey. And one of two things happens if you are to say that there are two Gods. You have got a problem because that is blasphemy. The Mashiach, this Jewish Mashiach that was to come, He is One (echad).

Why does Yeshua say— **No one comes to the Father except through Me** (John 14:6)? Yet earlier on He says—**No one can come to Me unless the Father who sent Me draws him** (John 6:44). These two statements are literally a perfect circle. It is not possible to have one without the other.

References:

1. Baker encyclopedia of the Bible (1971). Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House. Elwell, W. A., & Beitzel, B. J. (1988).
2. Dr. D.B. Wallas. <https://bible.org/article/sharp-redivivus-reexamination-granville-sharp-rule>
3. Dr. D.B. Wallas. <https://bible.org/article/sharp-redivivus-reexamination-granville-sharp-rule>
4. Christopher Wordsworth, quoted by Dr. D.B. Wallace. <https://bible.org/article/sharp-redivivus-reexamination-granville-sharp-rule>