The Great Deception

How internet posts by members of a sect become “authoritative statements by experts”

Including a Review by Dr Trevor R Allin of the internet article

“The Greek conjunction και Applied to the Exegesis of John 20:28 – A Fresh Grammatical and Contextual Analysis”

Part 1

https://livingwater-spain.com/

First published 27th November 2020

© Trevor R Allin 2022

This revision: 1st September 2026

This review has been written at the request of a visitor to https://livingwater-spain.com/.

The second part of this review can be found here: https://livingwater-spain.com/internet_plot.pdf

The article by "Gregory Blunt" that is reviewed here can at the time of writing be found here: https://www.academia.edu/43428437/June_24_2020_S_The_Greek_Conjunction_%CE%BA%CE%B1%CE%B9_Applied_to_the_Exegesis_of_John_20_28_A_Fresh_Grammatical_and_Contextual_analysis_ Accessed on 22.11.20.

NIB = The Holy Bible, New International Version, Anglicised edition, © 1979, 1984, 2001 by Biblica, formerly International Bible Society. Used by permission of Hodder & Stoughton Publisher, an Hachette UK company. All rights reserved.

NETS = "The New English Translation of the Septuagint", New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007

ASV = The Holy Bible, American Standard Version, based upon the Hebrew Masoretic text for the OT and upon the Westcott-Hort Greek text for the NT 1901 (out of copyright)

About the Author

Dr Trevor R Allin graduated from the University of Leeds with a 1st Class Honours degree in Phonetics, French, Spanish and Philosophy and History of Religion. Following studies in linguistics, he undertook original research on a South American indigenous language, for which purpose he lived within the indigenous community and studied the language with native speakers over a period of more than a year. The University of St Andrews subsequently awarded him a Ph.D. for his thesis "A Grammar of Resígaro".

For many years he taught a range of languages up to "Advanced" level standard in state schools in England and in Germany, and in state-recognised schools in Scotland and Spain. He also worked full time over a period of many years supporting and inspecting qualified Modern Language teachers and giving them professional development training. Teaching and examination materials written by him for French, German and Spanish at a wide range of levels, up to and including "A" Level, have been published by mainstream U.K. educational publishers and examination boards, for whom he has written and marked examination question papers.

He is also the published translator of books from Spanish and German into English and is the author of "Curso de Griego Bíblico: Los elementos del Griego del N.T."[1], the Spanish edition of the leading textbook on New Testament Greek, Jeremy Duff's "The Elements of New Testament Greek".[2] He has taught New Testament (Koiné) Greek to Spanish-speaking adult students in Spain and has delivered lectures in various places in Spain and England on the most important early Greek manuscripts of the Bible, including Codex Sinaiticus.

[1] CLIE, 2019 See https://www.clie.es/curso-de-griego-biblico

[2] Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005

Introduction

In this article we look at how some writers on the internet come to be considered "experts", and then we examine in detail an article by one such "expert".

Facebook, internet chat rooms and discussion groups

Other articles are advertised on the same internet page where this article is to be found, two of them by the same author, some by others. These appear to be postings on internet chat rooms, discussions groups or Facebook by people with no formal training in linguistics, Koiné Greek or theology. They often repeat speculative ideas presented by other posters and technical linguistic or theological terms, some of which have clearly not been fully understood, thus frequently revealing fundamental weaknesses in the writer's grasp of the most basic aspects of theology, Koiné Greek or linguistics in general, such as the difference between singular and plural.

Some postings are written by people who are trying to understand, synthesize and summarise the relevant information and points of view, and trying to draw appropriate conclusions. Some other postings are written to support a particular doctrinal stance, rather than to understand or explain what a given biblical text says. Such postings frequently ignore or omit evidence that is contrary to the views being promoted.

Some postings appear to have been written by people whose mother tongue is not English, or to have been machine-translated, at least in places, resulting in some English language errors.

Many of the writers referred to by the authors of these articles as supporting the point of view espoused by the writer turn out not to be recognised experts in the field, but merely other people posting their opinions on one internet forum or another.

Some of these postings are then quoted by others who erroneously assume that those who wrote the items posted on-line are experts in the relevant fields. This creates a false impression of authoritative pronouncements from leading academics or even implies a consensus of academic thought, but in reality it merely reveals circular arguments in which non-experts quote from other non-experts who agree with them.

Others who quote from such articles actively claim that the author is an expert, even without evidence to confirm this claim, and the Jehovah's Witnesses in particular quote from writers who they claim are not Jehovah's Witnesses. But when the writer refuses to reveal his or her true identity, this is impossible to verify. On the contrary, it enables the Jehovah's Witnesses to manufacture "authoritative statements" whose true source and purpose are hidden from the reader.[3]

Of course, a title with a word or words in a foreign language – and in a different alphabet! – is bound to impress readers even before they start. Add grammatical and theological terms to the title, and readers are certain to think that they are in the presence of an expert.

A case in point: The article by a "Mr Blunt"

In John 20:28, the Apostle Thomas calls Jesus "My Lord and my God". This verse presents enormous problems for the Jehovah's Witnesses, who claim that Jesus is not Divine but merely "the Archangel Michael". They therefore allege that wherever the Bible does call Jesus "God", it has been mistranslated. It is not possible to apply this argument to the unambiguous Greek on John 20:28. The article that we here review therefore purports to demonstrate that Thomas does not in fact call Jesus "God", because he was not speaking to Jesus when he said "my God".

[3] We have seen this in the case of an entire book, "Truth in Translation" by Jason BeDuhn. See the review of it on this website, here: http://livingwater-spain.com/beduhn.pdf

Anonymity

The author gives his or her name as "Gregory Blunt", but this appears to be a pseudonym, as the same page reports that "Gregory Blunt" was the "pseudonym of Thomas Pearne, of Peterhouse, Cambridge (c. 1753-1827) B.A. 1777, M.A. 1780. The same page informs us that Mr Pearne was "Fellow at Cambridge and a good classical scholar. Author of "Six More Letters to Granville Sharp, Esq., on his Remarks upon the Uses of the Article in the Greek Testament. London: J. Johnston, 1803"."

Posters on internet forums sometimes use pseudonyms in order to hide their lack of the relevant academic qualifications or to hide their religious affiliation. This particular article by "Mr Blunt" is used by Jehovah's Witnesses to support their attacks on biblical statements about the deity of Christ, and one must assume that the anonymous author of this article is a Jehovah's Witness who is seeking to defend the doctrines of the sect.

We don't know anything about the writer: which country he or she is located in, his or her qualifications or his or her beliefs. For convenience, in this article the writer is referred to with the masculine pronouns "he" and "his", without implying any inference as to the actual gender of the mystery writer.

The article

Page numbers are not printed on the pages of the article by "Mr Blunt", but a contents page does give page numbers, so I have used these when referring to his article.

On the front cover, "Mr Blunt" writes, "I forgive Granville Sharp and Daniel Wallace for their blunt comments." This attempt at humour appears to be mis-placed, as Granville Sharp died more than 200 years ago. As regards Daniel Wallace, he is the author of "Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics".[4] Those who read "Mr Blunt's" article will not be surprised that Wallace was critical of it.

Internet-based research

On page 3, "Mr Blunt" refers to "a Greek rule" that was "introduced on the B-GREEK discussion list", an internet "chat room", "roughly 20 years ago". Introduced by whom? Did that person have qualifications in Koiné Greek from a recognised academic body? Where is the link to the original statement? "Mr Blunt" does not give it.

On page 4 "Mr Blunt" provides support for the current paper by referring to the other two articles that he has written, both of them available on-line. This is of course quite legitimate, but it does reveal a paucity of support by other authors for his point of view. In a footnote on the same page he refers to an example that he found on the internet. It is of course very convenient to refer to the internet for information and many scholars now do this as a time-saving measure. However, the picture is reinforced of someone developing their ideas only on the basis of internet research, without the foundation of advanced studies of Koiné Greek or of Linguistics as an integral part of a degree-level university qualification.

This impression becomes even clearer when we see from the same footnote that Daniel Wallace was critical of something that "Mr Blunt" had posted on Facebook. Wallace is of course currently one of the leading authorities world-wide on Koiné Greek and the text of the Bible, but the author naturally disputes what Wallace wrote.

Page 6 continues with a reference to "an online review". "Mr Blunt" refers to a writer by the name of Raija Sollamo and says that "The corpus of data used by Sollamo included every instance in the

[4] Wallace, Daniel B., "Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament", Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 1996.

 © Trevor R Allin 2022

Septuagint *of the Pentateuch*" (emphasis added), although he then says that she reached her conclusions "after surveying the *entire* Greek Septuagint" (emphasis added). It is not clear which of these two statements is accurate of if they can in some way both be reconciled.

As indicated above, it is the nature of such internet groups and Facebook discussions that one poster is quoted by another, and this quotation is repeated or re-sent by someone else. As this happens, a transformation occurs. The original poster may have made statements that are totally unsubstantiated or even that go against clear evidence. However, at some point someone refers to this poster as an "authority" on the matter being discussed and it is soon assumed that he or she is an "expert" in the field in question. Soon this person's opinions or claims are quoted as "proving" that the real experts are "wrong". Such is the nature of *internet conspiracy theories*.

As we study this article, we soon realise that it has no solid foundations, being based – at best – on misunderstandings by "Mr Blunt" and – at worst – on his own unsubstantiated prejudices, which he presents as though they were "the truth".

The basis for the study by "Mr Blunt"

The article by "Mr Blunt" is quite disjointed, since it consists of a series of unrelated topics that do not follow logically from one topic to another, nor are they related to any of the others. We investigate the reasons for this in Part 2 of this review, which can be found here: http://livingwater-spain.com/internet_plot.pdf In this first part of our investigation, we follow the order in which the themes are presented by the author or authors.

On page 7 "Mr Blunt" states that the focus for his study is "the construction ***"noun genitive personal pronoun και noun (repeat of the same) pronoun"***." It is not easy to understand what he is trying to say here. It seems that he is speaking of phrases like "my mother and my father". "Mr Blunt" explains that "The NT study that follows presents the results of a search of this syntax in the **GNT**." He could of course have used the word "structure" instead of "syntax", and instead of using the abbreviation "the **GNT**", he could have written out the words "the Greek New Testament", but "**GNT**" is more impressive!

A circular argument

In a circular argument, the statement that needs to be proved or disproved is used as evidence to "prove" itself. An example of this would be if someone said:

a) I am setting out to prove that **a** = **b** in this sentence.
b) I have decided that **a** does equal **b** in this sentence.
c) Therefore this sentence proves that **a** = **b**.

This is precisely the reasoning used by "Mr. Blunt".

His footnote 8 on page 7 states: "In native KOINE Greek when the copulative KAI connects two titles of personal description … and a personal pronoun in the genitive case modifies the first of the said titles, and is repeated with respect to the second title, there are always two persons (e.g. Jn 20:28 …) or groups of persons … in view."

We will disregard the opaque nature of this statement, which would be even more opaque if we quoted it in full. Our use of ellipsis (…) has not changed the meaning of the statement. What is important is to see that this statement is the supreme circular argument. In John 20:28, Thomas says to Jesus, "My Lord and my God!" The 'rule' presented by "Mr Blunt" states that in such constructions "there are always two persons … in view". In other words "My Lord" is one "person" and "my God" is another "person". They are not the same person. *The author then refers to John 20:28 to support this claim*. But the purpose of the article is to examine *whether or not* this 'rule" is a valid rule. The obvious and clear meaning of John 20:28 is that Thomas is calling *the same person* – Jesus – both "My Lord" and "my

God". Thus "Mr Blunt's" 'rule' turns out not to be valid. When this structure is used, it is clearly *not* the case that "there are *always* two persons … in view" (emphasis added).

However, "Mr. Blunt" states that John 20:28 is an example of "two persons". He thus starts with his conclusion and works back from there. For him, in John 20:28 Thomas *must be speaking, separately, to Christ and to God*. So, by his interpretation of what Thomas says, John 20:28 supports his rule, whereas in fact it demonstrates his 'rule' to be false.

This is what "Mr Blunt" says:

a) When there are two phrases with a possessive pronoun, *two different people are referred to*.
b) John 20:28 has two phrases with a possessive pronoun, so "My Lord" and "my God" must be *different "people"*.
c) This proves that my rule is right.

It does of course prove no such thing. On the contrary, it indicates that John 20:28 proves his 'rule' to be *wrong*.

The fact that elsewhere, in a different context there may be a statement with two different referents is irrelevant. Because one type of phrase is used to refer to two different people on one occasion, it does not follow that it must, on every occasion, *always* refer to two different people. I could say, "I love my brother and my sister" and here there are clearly two different referents, "my brother" and "my sister". But I can also say, "My wife is my best friend and my constant companion" and there is here obviously *only one referent*, my wife. The person who is "my best friend" (my wife) is also "my constant companion". *According to the 'rule' stated by "Mr Blunt", I must have **two** wives, **one** of whom is my best friend and **the other of whom** is my constant companion*. This is clearly *nonsense*.

Of course, "Mr Blunt" does not apply this 'rule' to English, where its absurdity would be obvious. He claims that *it is a rule in New Testament Greek* – not in modern Greek, of course, and not in Classical Greek, but only in New Testament (Koiné) Greek. He says that he bases this claim and this "rule" on "a search of this syntax in the **GNT**".

The nature of languages

But at the most fundamental level, Greek is not different from English. Languages communicate facts and human experience. There must be a way of communicating any fundamental fact of common human experience in any language.[5] To use my example above, many people have a brother and a sister, and that has always been a possibility. Many people have one wife, and that has been the case in some cultures and for some human beings over thousands of years. It is no good creating a rule that prohibits speaking about such experience. For instance, I might wish to express the idea, "My brother is my friend and my example." This does not mean that I must have two different brothers. On the contrary, the opening phrase "My brother" implies that I have only one brother, or at least that I am currently speaking about only one of my brothers, the one who is both my friend and my example.

At the time of Christ, Greek was a major world language. It was used as the principal means of communication by large sectors of the populations in many countries over three continents. It was a highly-developed language and the leading cultural language used by mathematicians, philosophers, doctors, poets, dramatists and others to explore complex ideas and express them clearly. For centuries, Greek rhetoricians had explored and developed speaking and writing styles and had taught Greek speakers the best ways to express any idea, no matter how complex. These skills enriched the Greek in

[5] We recognise that in the polar regions there may be a language with 18 different words for different types of snow, and that there would not be such variety in a language spoken in the desert, but here we are speaking of human experiences common in all cultures.

 © Trevor R Allin 2022

which the New Testament was written and into which the Old Testament was translated, as is demonstrated by numerous academic textbooks on the subject.[6]

At the time of Christ, the history of the language went back more than 1,000 years, and it had a prolific literary tradition that went back at least 800 years into the Classical period. As well as being used by hundreds of thousands of people, it also had a rich vocabulary and was capable of expressing complicated concepts unambiguously. At a more simple level, it could also express relationships amongst human beings as well as between human beings and God or the gods of the culture.

In spite of all these facts, "Mr Blunt" seeks to prohibit Greek from using two phrases to refer to the same person (Jesus) in John 20:28 because he says that on another occasion, in a different context, *expressing a different idea* it referred to two different people or two different referents (as, for instance, in a phrase such as "my house and my donkey"). His argument is a *non sequitur*. In other words, his conclusion about John 20:28 does not follow from the use of a similar structure ***in a different sentence***, *or even if the structure is identical to the one under consideration*. What counts is *the intended message*, not "the syntax".

I can say, "My house is my shelter and my favourite place". This does not mean that I must have two houses. On the contrary, the phrase "My house" implies that I have only one house. Otherwise, I might have said, "One of my houses is my shelter and the other one is my favourite place." *Inventing a 'rule' that states that using two phrases – each with a "genitive personal pronoun!" – (in this example, "**my** shelter" and "**my** favourite place") must mean that I must have two houses, is both illogical and does not change the facts.*

In all languages and all centuries, it must be possible to express similar concepts, and indeed we see similar phrases in the Hebrew Old Testament. For instance, David sang, "The LORD is my rock, my fortress and my deliverer" (2 Samuel 22:2). In fiercely monotheistic Judaism, only **one God** was possible, yet according to "Mr Blunt's" 'rule', David was referring to ***three different "gods"***, ***one*** *who was "my rock",* ***a second one*** *who was "my fortress" and* ***a third one*** *who was "my deliverer"*. This is clearly nonsense. It goes totally against the cultural and religious context and the plain meaning of what David said. And this was not a "one off" that "broke a 'rule' ". We could easily give numerous similar examples from the Old Testament.

Of course, that was in Hebrew. However, those who translated the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek had no difficulty with this verse. The Greek says,
"καὶ εἶπεν κύριε πέτρα μου καὶ ὀχύρωμά μου καὶ ἐξαιρούμενός με ἐμοί" (2 Samuel 22:2)
[kai eipen kurie petra mou kai ochurōma mou kai exairoumenos me emoi]
The literal translation of this given in "NETS"[7] is "And he said: O Lord, my rock and my fortress, and for me one who delivers me" (2 Samuel 22:2 NETS)

A "special form of Greek"?

Although "Mr Blunt" does not refer to this particular verse, he says that there was "a special form of Greek" that, according to him, was used when translating from Hebrew. The Hebrew Scriptures contain hundreds of pages and reportedly seventy translators were employed in the translation of these texts into Greek, resulting in it receiving the name "the Septuagint" and the use of the Roman numeral for seventy, LXX, being used in references to it.

Some of these translators followed the Hebrew structures more closely than others, so there are variations in the style of the Greek in different parts of the translation. "Mr Blunt" even claims that there was a special form of "Hebrew Greek" that was used in the Septuagint and that this Hebrew style influenced

[6] See, for instance, Witherington, Ben III, "New Testament Rhetoric", Eugene, OR: CASCADE Books, 2009.
[7] "The New English Translation of the Septuagint", New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007

the speakers and writers in the time of Christ. It is clearly the case that a phrase such as "Then Jesus spoke to the crowds and to his disciples, saying …"[8] (Matthew 23:1-2) reflects a Hebrew style of speech ("Jesus spoke, saying"). *However, this is irrelevant to an understanding of John 20:28* and to claim otherwise is based on a misunderstanding, at best, or perhaps "Mr Blunt" is seeking to mislead the reader.

Basic grammatical errors

On page 8 "Mr Blunt" presents other examples from the New Testament of his chosen structure **"*noun genitive personal pronoun και noun (repeat of the same) pronoun*"**. This is designed to show that in phrases such as "**my** mother and **my** brethren" (Matthew 12:48), the referents are *different people*. i.e., "my mother" and "my brethren" are different people. This could be described as stating the blindingly obvious. However, the existence such phrases in no way proves that it is impossible to say two things about *the same person*, as explained above.

Surprisingly, these are not taken by "Mr Blunt" from the Greek text of the New Testament, but from the American Standard Version of 1901 (New Testament completed in 1900[9]). Is this an indication that "Mr Blunt" is not comfortable working on the Greek text? Was his Greek not of a standard that would enable him to understand continuous passages of Greek? Would he have difficulties using a Greek concordance? His decision cannot have been taken for the sake of readers. His article is burdened down by a mass of rarely-encountered terminology about the nature of the Greek language. If readers can cope with this, understand it and follow it, they should have no difficulties with a few short, selected phrases in Greek. "Mr Blunt" could always add a figurative pronunciation guide, if he wished, and provide his own translation. If he has sufficient knowledge of Greek to do that.

We do of course note that the Greek text used by the American Standard Version for its translation of the New Testament was the at that time recently-published Westcott and Hort text.[10] The Jehovah's Witnesses state that they base their version of the New Testament on this edition of the Greek text.

However, more striking still is "Mr Blunt's" fundamental lack of understanding of basic linguistic structures. On page 8 he presents what he calls "The NT Study". Here he says that in Mark 6:4 "both [terms are] plural". It is impossible to understand to which terms he is referring, because the word "both" can only refer to *two* words or phrases, whereas there are *three* "terms" (his word) in the verse that he is quoting. He writes, "**his own** country and among **his own** kin, and in **his own** house". Three things, not two. What is more, "Mr Blunt" says that "Both [terms are] plural". But in Greek, as in most English translations, we have a *singular* phrase ("his own country"), a *plural* phrase ("his own kin" in the ASV; the Greek means "his own relatives") and another *singular* phrase ("his own house"). So there are not two "plural terms", as he says, but only one.

So we observe that "Mr Blunt" is lacking in understanding of the most basic Greek, the difference between singular and plural. Frankly, his arguments do not merit further consideration. Conclusions based on such a faulty analysis cannot be taken seriously nor can they have validity. Nevertheless, at the request of a reader of the www.livingwater-spain.com articles, I will continue.

In any case, as stated above, the verses presented are *irrelevant* to the understanding of John 20:28.

What if …?

Even if in the New Testament there were no examples of two phrases of this type referring to the **same** person, it would not mean that such a meaning was **impossible** in Greek. Nor would it mean that it was

[8] Τότε ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐλάλησεν τοῖς ὄχλοις καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ [2] λέγων [tote ho iēsous elalēsen tois ochlois kai tois mathētais autou legōn] Translation in the text above by the author of this article.
[9] This is an undisputed and commonly-known fact. However, it can also be confirmed on Wikipedia, here: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/American_Standard_Version (Consulted on 24.11.20.)
[10] Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort, "The New Testament in the Original Greek", 1881.

 © Trevor R Allin 2022

impossible for Greek speakers to express such an idea. It would only mean that within the limited data provided by the 27 books of the New Testament, no examples of a sentence containing two phrases with the structure chosen by "Mr Blunt" referring to the same person were found. It would not mean that there was a 'rule' *prohibiting* Greek speakers from saying two things to someone or about someone within one sentence.

In fact, there *is* of course in the New Testament at least one example of the use of a sentence containing two phrases both of which refer to *the same person*: John 20:28. And of course there are numerous examples of two phrases referring to the same person in the Greek Septuagint text of the Old Testament. We have given one example above and could easily give more.

An example of **the same structure** that is in John 20:28, and that refers to **the same *one* "person"**

In Psalm 5 verse 2 (Masoretic Text, equivalent to verse 3 in the Septuagint), David prays to God, calling Him

ὁ βασιλεύς μου καὶ ὁ θεός μου
[ho basileus mou kai ho theos mou]
Oh king my and Oh God my

This structure is ***identical*** to the structure in John 20:28. The Greek article ὁ [ho] is in the nominative, a grammatical case that is frequently used with a vocative meaning, here translated "Oh", which indicates that David, who is praying to God, calls him, "my King and my God". *It is totally indisputable that David knows that **there is only one true God**, and that his use of these phrases absolutely does not indicate that he might have believed that there were **two** "Gods", to one of whom he was saying "my King" and to the other "my God".*

Nor is he speaking to some person, calling him "my King", only then to divert his attention from that person to speak to God and call him "my God." Whoever wishes to read the entire Psalm will see that David is speaking only to God, and he calls him, "my King and my God".

In the same way – *and **with the identical same Greek structure*** – Thomas is speaking to **one** person – Jesus Christ – and he calls him "My Lord and My God."

Here are the two verses, side by side:

Psalm 5:2 (LXX: 5:3)	John 20:28
ὁ βασιλεύς μου καὶ ὁ θεός μου	ὁ κύριός μου καὶ ὁ θεός μου
[ho basileus mou kai ho theos mou]	[ho kurios mou kai ho theos mou]
Oh king my and Oh God my	Oh Lord my and Oh God my
"my King and my God!"	"My Lord and my God!"

An example of **the same structure** *and* **the same words** as in John 20:28

In Psalm 35 verse 23 (Masoretic text, equivalent to Psalm 34:23 in the Septuagint numbering as used by Rahlfs[11]), David prays to God, saying

ὁ θεός μου καὶ ὁ κύριός μου
[ho theos mou kai ho kurios mou]
Oh God my and Oh Lord my

The NRSV translates this (from the Hebrew text, of course] as "my God and my Lord!"

[11] Rahlfs, Albert & Hanhart, Robert: "Septuaginta: Duo volumina in uno", Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006. The numbering of the verses in Brenton, Sir Launcelot C.L.: "The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English", London: Samuel Bagster & Sons Ltd, 1851, is slightly different. In Brenton, the verse numbers in the Psalms are generally one less than in Rahlfs. (Brenton reprinted: Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1986, 14th printing 2011)

NETS translates this (from the Greek text) s "my God and my Lord".

Not only is the structure ***identical*** to the structure in John 20:28, the words are ***identical***, too! In John 20:28 the two vocative phrases are in the opposite order, but the meaning of each phrase is the same.

Here are the two verses, side by side:

Psalm 35:23 (LXX: 34:23)	John 20:28
ὁ θεός μου καὶ ὁ κύριός μου	ὁ κύριός μου καὶ ὁ θεός μου
[ho theos mou kai ho kurios mou]	[ho kurios mou kai ho theos mou]
Oh God my and Oh Lord my	Oh Lord my and Oh God my
"my God and my Lord!"	"My Lord and my God!"

It is indisputable that both phrases are addressed to the same "person", God. David is not addressing the first phrase to God and the second phrase to someone else whom he calls "my Lord". Even the Jehovah's Witness version of the Bible accepts this (even though they erroneously introduce the word "Jehovah"), putting "O my God, even Jehovah" in their 1961 edition. In the 2013 revision this becomes "My God, Jehovah".

Two further examples

Many more examples from the Greek Scriptures could be given. Here we give just two additional examples.

Psalm 27:1

Psalm 27:1 (LXX: 26:1)
κύριος φωτισμός μου καὶ σωτήρ μου
[kurios fōtismos mou kai sōtēr mou]
Lord light my and saviour my
"[The] Lord [is] my light and my Saviour"

NETS: "The Lord is my illumination and my savior"

This verse, like the others previously quoted, has precisely *the same* structure that "Mr Blunt" claims *must mean* that there are *two **different** referents*. So, *according to "Mr Blunt"*, if it is the Lord who is "my light", ***someone else** must be "my Saviour"*. This is clearly not the case. This verse says that the one and same Lord is *both* "my light" and "my Saviour".

Psalm 44:4

Psalm 44:4 (LXX: 43:5[12])
σὺ εἶ αὐτὸς ὁ βασιλεύς μου καὶ ὁ θεός μου
[su ei autos ho basileus mou kai ho theos mou]
You are yourself the King my and the God my
"You yourself are my King and my God"

NETS: "You are my very King and my God"

Here the nominative article ὁ does not have a vocative meaning, but the structure is identical with that found in John 20:28, even to the detail of the second noun phrase being identical: ὁ θεός μου [ho theos mou], "my God". Again it is indisputable that the Psalmist is speaking to **one** Being only, *to God*; he does not start by addressing a human king, then interrupting his address to that king in order to utter a prayer to God, as "Mr Blunt" claims is happening in John 20:28. Even the Jehovah's Witness versions of the Bible recognise this.

Let us compare the key phrases in Psalm 44:4 and John 20:28, side by side:

[12] Brenton 43:4

 © Trevor R Allin 2022

Psalm 44:4 (LXX: 43:5)	John 20:28
ὁ βασιλεύς μου καὶ ὁ θεός μου	ὁ κύριός μου καὶ ὁ θεός μου
[ho basileus mou kai ho theos mou]	[ho kurios mou kai ho theos mou]
the King my and the God my	Oh Lord my and Oh God my
"my King and my God"	"My Lord and my God!"

As already indicated, the structure is identical and indeed *there is only one **word** different* in the two statements: "King" in the Psalm and "Lord" in John 20:28.

So the 'rule' presented by "Mr Blunt" is wrong. It does not exist.

> What "he" says is quite simply unacceptable: "If you exclude John 20:28, this is the rule. Oh, John 20:28 does include this structure referring to one person. But our rule can't be wrong. So John 20:28 is wrong. *And we will **also** exclude all other examples of this structure in the Bible.*"

This is logically unsound. It is just saying, "We base the rules that we state on what we see. Except that if we see data that falsifies the rule, we don't change (or abandon!) the rule. *We change or exclude that data instead*." That is what "Mr Blunt" is saying in his article. It is therefore not surprising that he wishes to hide his true identity! His method is scientifically, linguistically and academically indefensible. It is a breach of professional ethics.

On page 9, "Mr Blunt" says,
"Based upon statistics alone, since there are no examples of "*the construction*" that has two persons in view …."

Here he must have become muddled. Based on what he says before this phrase and what he says after it, he clearly meant to say,
"Based upon statistics alone, since there are no examples of "*the construction*" that has ***one person*** in view …"

However, we continue with his sentence: "Based upon statistics alone, since there are no examples of "*the construction*" that has two persons in view, *with the exception of quotations of the **LXX*** …" (emphasis added)

So here he deliberately excludes *most* of the data available. As the Septuagint is more than twice the length of the New Testament, it contains many more examples of most structures. *However, "Mr Blunt" excludes them without giving a reason.*

We need to let him finish his sentence, which he continues with,
"one would conclude that two persons are in view in **John 20:28**."

This is the presupposition with which he started his article and his investigation: "Since all examples of this structure refer to two people [if we exclude the numerous cases where it refers to one person!], it must refer to two people in John 20:28."

He is saying that Thomas is not calling Jesus "My Lord and my God"; "Mr Blunt" says that Thomas is only calling Jesus "My Lord" and then – for no rational reason – after this Thomas **interrupts his conversation with Christ**, *who is standing in front of him*, and decides to pray to God the Father, using the phrase "*and my God*!" *If Thomas were doing this, **he would not start his prayer with the word "and"**.*

I repeat the same point as above because "Mr Blunt" constantly repeats the same argument, over and over again. It is presented calmly, and many readers may be persuaded by it – provided that they don't "step back" and realise what "Mr Blunt" is doing.

Is there a comma in the text, or isn't there?

On page 10 "Mr Blunt" says that the word και [kai, "and"] may have a "coordinated" meaning, in which it means "and" or an "additive" meaning, in which it means "also". By his arguing, if it means "and" in John 20:28, then Thomas is applying both phrases ("My Lord" and "my God") to Christ. If it has an additive meaning, Thomas is applying only the first phrase ("My Lord") to Christ, and then, as an addition, he separately addresses God the Father with the phrase "and my God".

"Mr Blunt" goes on to state, "Another way "*addition*" is tagged in a translation is by separating items with a comma, so that the items are not coordinated."

There are various problems with this statement:

1) He has not demonstrated that his claim here is the case.
2) Understanding this verse should not be based on a translation, any translation, but on the Greek.
3) Koiné Greek was normally written with no punctuation at all.
4) Therefore, the presence or absence of a comma in a given translation merely reflects the decision of the translator – or even sometimes the translator's lack of consistency!

"Mr Blunt" goes on to draw conclusions from the presence and absence of commas in the American Standard Version translation of various verses. He here refers to "correlative" και, without defining it, as far as I can see. Perhaps this is the same as "coordinating", but I cannot be sure. Frankly, do we care? This has nothing to do with the Greek text of John 20:28. Any argument based on the presence or absence of commas in the text of one translation chosen by the author is totally lacking in validity. It is of no significance whatsoever and is irrelevant to the understanding of the Greek text.

On page 11 "Mr Blunt" writes about "Hebraisms in the NT, but not in John" and continues giving examples from the American Standard Version in which commas are present.

He then refers to John 11:48, which in the American Standard Version is rendered as:

"If we let him thus alone, all men will believe on him: and the Romans will come and take away both our place and our nation." (ASV) "Mr Blunt" does not quote the entire verse, as his focus is on the phrase "our place and our nation".

> Unfortunately, his quotation and the conclusions he draws from it are based on the ASV text, But *he has failed to observe that the structure of the **Greek** text in John 11:48 is totally different from the structure of the Greek text in John 20:28*, so his conclusions are totally invalid and irrelevant to the meaning of John 20:28.[13]

Next he says, "It has been demonstrated that the syntax found in **John 20:28** could only be considered coordinating if it were to exhibit a specific grammatical Hebraism". However, *he has not demonstrated this at all, so his conclusions do not have any foundation*. He says, "this is highly unlikely in the gospel of John as *attested by Greek grammarians*." (Emphasis added) However, this unjustified inference is apparently based on various, unnamed "Greek grammarians". "Mr. Blunt" makes this claim as though it were an established, obvious and undisputed fact, whereas this is not the case at all.

[13] The Greek of John 11:28 is ἐλεύσονται οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι καὶ ἀροῦσιν ἡμῶν καὶ τὸν τόπον καὶ τὸ ἔθνος [eleusontai hoi rōmaioi kai arousin hēmōn kai ton topon kai to ethnos], which means "the Romans will come and they will take away from us both the place and the nation."

 © Trevor R Allin 2022

He draws his conclusion from these undemonstrated and unsubstantiated claims. He says: "**John 20:28** must have the adjunctive sense of "*My Lord, and [also] my God*," and not the correlative, copulative "*my Lord and my God*." (We observe that "Mr Blunt" has here changed his terminology. What he here calls "adjunctive" is presumably the same as what he previously called "additive".)

He claims that he has demonstrated that his interpretation is the correct one, *but it is based on a series of unproved assumptions, on unnamed "Greek grammarians" and on the presence or absence of commas in an old American translation of the Bible.* This is logically unsound. His conclusion has in fact not been demonstrated at all.

He had said that his article was based on "a study of the **GNT**", but it seems to be based on a study of the American Standard Version, *and not even of the **words** in that translation, but on the presence or absence of **commas** in it!*

He says that:

- When the American Standard Version *has* a comma before its translation of the Greek word και [kai, "and"], that word must mean "also", and that this indicates that **two** *different* people are referred to (as in "my brother and my sister" – clearly two *different* people).
- When the American Standard Version *does not have* a comma before the translation of the Greek word και [kai, "and"], that word must mean "and", and that this indicates that *only **one** person* is referred to.

From this he concludes that in John 20:28 the Greek word και [kai, "and"] must mean "also", and that this indicates that two *different* people are referred to: Jesus as "My Lord" and God the Father as "my God".

But he doesn't tell us what the American Standard Version has in John 20:28.
Does it **have** a comma before its translation of the Greek word και [kai, "and"]?
According to him, this would mean two ***different*** "people" (Christ and God the Father) are referred to.
This would mean that Christ is ***not*** called "God".

Or does it ***not*** have a comma before its translation of the Greek word και [kai, "and"]?
According to him, this would mean that ***only one person*** (Christ) is referred to.
This would mean that Christ ***is*** called "God".

He claims that the American Standard Version supports his argument that in John 20:28 Christ ***is not called "God"***.

If he is to have any chance of being right – or at least of having the support of the American Standard Version – ***he needs it to have a comma before its translation of the word και [kai, "and"] in John 20:28***, but ***he doesn't tell us*** whether it ***does*** have a comma or it ***doesn't*** have a comma.

Let us look. Here is John 20:28 in the American Standard Version:

"Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord and my God." (John 20:28, ASV).

*There is **no comma** before the ASV translation of the Greek word και [kai, "and"].*

In other words, ***the translation on which he has based his argument actually turns out to prove him wrong!*** But of course he doesn't tell us! He *hides* this information from his readers, because ***it destroys his argument!*** *It proves him **wrong***.

To claim that the American Standard Version supports his argument, but then to *hide the evidence* that proves him *wrong* is ***intellectually dishonest and unacceptable***. It is ***deception***.

What Thomas "must have had in mind"

On page 12, "Mr. Blunt's" main claim is that, rather than calling Jesus "my God", "Thomas must have had something else in mind." "Mr. Blunt" is *imagining* what Thomas "must have had … in mind", but this is unwarranted by anything in the biblical text.

"Poor Greek"

On page 13 "Mr Blunt" states that "Psalms is known to have very poor translation Greek". He then refers to an 18th and 19th century German writer who is a favourite source of quotations for Jehovah's Witnesses, Winer. This reference to "poor Greek" is then quoted by Jehovah's Witnesses on-line who are promoting the ideas presented in "Mr Blunt's" article. And so we see how a claim by an apparently unqualified poster on the internet suddenly becomes an "expert evaluation" of the quality of the Greek.

It is significant that "Mr Blunt" and the Jehovah's Witnesses *have not been able to find a single Greek expert from the 200 years since Winer wrote* who supports what he apparently said. That is because the claim is wrong. It is not supported by the contents of the Biblical texts themselves.

We are entitled to ask **why** "Mr Blunt" wants to reject the text of the Psalms. The reason must be that "he" knows that *it proves his claims to be false*. Otherwise, why would he even bother to mention them? In John 20:28, Thomas is addressing Jesus as God. Many times in the Psalms the Psalmist is addressing God *and we see that the language structures are frequently identical to Thomas's words* and many times *even the words are identical*. "Mr Blunt" is not unaware of this; he knows that the evidence from the Psalms shows his arguments to be wrong. However, he does not address the evidence. He does not quote from the Psalms. He does not seek to demonstrate that they are wrong. He does not explain which are the supposed "problems" of the "poor Greek". Of course not, because that is impossible. They are not wrong. There are no problems with the Greek. They show us the structure of Biblical Greek and give us numerous examples that confirm the clear meaning of John 20:28.

So "Mr Blunt" ***hides this information***, and rejects in advance any reference to this mass of data, which totally destroys his argument. He is not writing in ignorance here; he knows what the Psalms say and he rejects that. He bears a very heavy responsibility for this attitude and for his deception in hiding the relevant data from his readers. (He also seems to be unaware that the same structure and very similar phrases also occur elsewhere in the Old Testament Greek Scriptures, as demonstrated above in 2 Samuel 22:2.)

When the Jehovah's Witnesses find themselves unable to defend their claims from the Bible, eventually they don't just blame Bible translations; they reach the point where they blame the original text itself, which is what we are seeing here.

As regards the evaluation of the Greek of the Psalms made by "Mr Blunt", his allegation that "the Greek that was used for these Psalms is very poor" goes against all the undisputed evidence. The Greek used in the translation of the Holy Scriptures of the Jews (our Old Testament, which includes the Psalms) has the *same* form as the Greek used at the time when Christ was on earth and is *the same as the Greek used to write the New Testament*. If the Greek that was used "for these Psalms" is "very poor", then the Greek used to write the New Testament would be equally "poor". But that is the language that God chose in order to communicate His message to human beings when Christ came, and to write the text of the New Testament.

"The *Objective Contextual* view"

Also on page 13, "Mr Blunt" introduces a new interpretation method, which he calls "the *Objective Contextual* view." This is pseudo-grammar and pseudo-interpretation and "Mr. Blunt" applies them without regard to the actual context of John 20:28.

 © Trevor R Allin 2022

To give the reader a glimpse of "Mr Blunt's" style, we quote from page 14:

"Since a correlative και is out of the question, I propose interpreting the context as not "*predicative*" but as "*objective.*" … At **John 20:28** we propose nominatives for accusative for the *Objective Contextual* interpretation."

Two comments on this will suffice:

First, "a correlative και" is *not* out of the question. This has not been demonstrated. So his conclusions are based on an *assumption* that he has made.

Secondly, if the reader has not quite followed this point made by "Mr Blunt", he or she should not feel embarrassed; the purpose of such writing is not to *communicate and explain* but to *intimidate* the reader into believing that they are reading the words of an expert whose knowledge is so advanced that the reader must not expect to understand it, *but should just accept it uncritically*.

"Mr Blunt" goes on to state, "In effect, Thomas said [I believe in] "*My Lord, and [also] my God*!" However, in order to achieve this meaning, he has had to add numerous words to the passage – words that are not in the Greek text nor in any manuscript. But in reality Thomas did not say any of the words added by "Mr Blunt", with the addition of which he changes the meaning of the biblical text. The Bible gives very stern warnings to those who add to the text of the Bible. (See Revelation 22:18-19, Deuteronomy 4:2, 12:32, Proverbs 30:5-6.) Would it perhaps be wise for "Mr Blunt" to read these passages?

"The immediate context"

On page 14 "Mr Blunt" continues by stating: "The immediate context also includes **John 20:17**, where Jesus calls his Father "*my God,*" which Thomas repeats in verse 28." (His footnote 31)

However, both claims made here are demonstrably false:

1) John 20:17 is not the immediate context. Jesus' words recorded by the Evangelist in verse 17 were spoken to Mary Magdalene at dawn on Resurrection Sunday, and no-one else was present. Along with the other women who had been at the tomb, she went and told the apostles that Christ had risen, but "they did not believe the women, because their words seemed to them like nonsense" (Luke 24:10-11).

   When Jesus showed himself to the disciples at least twelve hours later (John 20:19), Thomas was not present (v. 24), and when he was told about it later, he did not believe what the other ten disciples told him (vv 24-25). The incident when Thomas said "My Lord and my God" to Jesus occurred *eight days later* (v. 26). Clearly verse 17 did not refer to "the immediate context".

2) Thomas could not "repeat" Jesus' words to Mary Magdalene reported in verse 17, because he was not present and so did not hear them.

In addition to this, the Greek form of the word "God" in John 20:17 is different from the form in John 20:28, so Thomas clearly does not "repeat" what Jesus said. "Mr Blunt" will not have observed this as he obviously didn't consult the Greek text.

The use of the verb "believe"

On page 14 "Mr Blunt" adds to his quotation from John 20:27-29 the Greek words for "believe", "believing", etc. and links this to the use of the word "believe" in John 14:1, showing that the same verb occurs in both places. But references to other passages where some part of the verb "believe" is used are irrelevant, *and adding the Greek word doesn't change this*. It is possible that this tactic may impress readers who are unfamiliar with Greek, as it seems to imply that there is something about the use of Greek words that look similar to each other that proves that "Mr Blunt" must be right, even if the reader

can't work out exactly why. This is a pseudo-technique. In other words, it proves nothing and in reality it doesn't even imply any link between the different uses of the word.

A quick check[14] reveals that some form of the Greek verb πιστεύω [pisteuō], "believe", occurs 289 times in the Greek text of the Bible, spread over 264 verses and in 69 different forms.[15] However, this is irrelevant to John 20:27-29. There is no justification for "Mr. Blunt" to choose from these hundreds of examples *one* that suited him in order to support the meaning that he wished to impose on John 20:27-29.

"Mr Blunt" makes further mistaken grammatical claims on page 14 (in a long footnote), but I will spare readers the details of the refutation, as the claims are irrelevant anyway.

"An expository rendering"

On page 15 "Mr Blunt" presents what he calls "An expository rendering", a phrase that he seems to have invented that indicates that *he will supply the meaning*, even though this "meaning" is not explicit in the text.

He says that "The verbal command of Jesus to Thomas (**John 14:1,5**) to "*believe*" in the Father and the Son is repeated in **John 20:27-29**."

However, we note that the "command" in John 14:1 and 5 was not "to Thomas", as stated by "Mr Blunt", but *to all the disciples*.

And when we actually read John 20:27-29, we see that here Jesus is not repeating what he said in chapter 14. He is not saying "believe in God". He is telling Thomas to "believe that I have risen from the dead", because *this* was what Thomas had refused to believe (vv 24-25). This is very clear if we read verse 27:

"Then he said to Thomas, 'Put your finger here; see my hands. Reach out your hand and put it into my side. Stop doubting and believe.'" (John 20:27, NIB)

Jesus was in effect saying, "This really is me. Check! And believe that I really have risen from the dead."

Here is "Mr Blunt's" "expository rendering" of John 20:28:

> "In answer Thomas said to him: [I **believe** in] "***My Lord*** [the Lord Jesus from verse **25**] and [also] my God!" [The "**My God**" of Jesus and the disciples in verse **17**]"

As we saw above, not only was Thomas not present when Jesus spoke to Mary Magdalene as reported in verse 17, *neither were the disciples*. "Mr Blunt's" mistake here is probably due to carelessness: he would appear not to have read the passage through, instead just selecting a verse that said what he wanted to say, without noticing the context. Quoting verses out of context from elsewhere in the Bible in order to "prove their point" is of course a standard tactic of Jehovah's Witnesses. Regardless whether or not "Mr. Blunt" is a Jehovah's Witness, he has used the same tactic, whether intentionally or in error.

The *real* context

If we look at the *real* context of John 20:28, we find the context in the verse itself, and in the rest of the context in this chapter of John's Gospel. We note three details:

[14] Using the program Bibleworks 10. Other software should yield the same result.
[15] If we include the Deuterocanonical books, this rises to 329 times in the Greek text of the Bible, spread over 302 verses and in 73 different forms.

 © Trevor R Allin 2022

1) In the *preceding verse*, v. 27, Christ "said **to Thomas**, 'Put your finger here; see my hands. Reach out your hand and put it into my side. Stop doubting and believe.'" (John 20:27, NIB) (Greek λέγει **τῷ Θωμᾷ** [legei **tō Thōma**])
2) We see *in verse 28* that Thomas replies **to Christ**: "Thomas said **to him** (Greek αὐτῷ [autō]), 'My Lord and my God!'" (John 20:28, NIB). This "**him**" is Christ (just read verse 26!). **αὐτῷ** [autō], "**to him**", is in the singular (a concept with which "Mr Blunt" had difficulties earlier). Thomas is ***not*** speaking ***firstly*** to Jesus *and **then** to God the Father*, as alleged by "Mr Blunt", but ***only** to Jesus*. *The passage does not say, "Thomas said **to them**".*
3) The *next verse* gives us Jesus' response. It says: "Then Jesus told **him**, 'Because **you** have seen **me**, you have believed; blessed are those who have not seen and yet have believed.'" (John 20:29, NIB) The interaction between Jesus and Thomas continues. Jesus speaks again **to Thomas**. Jesus recognises that Thomas has spoken **to Him**. And He congratulates him for what he has just said to Him, "My Lord and my God!" The focus continues being **Jesus Christ** and **His** resurrection. There is no reference to the Father here. Christ is not interrupting Thomas while he is praying to the Father, because *he is not praying to the Father; he is speaking **to Christ***. The verse itself says so. And Christ does not rebuke Thomas for calling him "God". He does not "correct" him. He commends him for his faith **in Christ** and for his recognition that **Christ is God**.

We thus see that "Mr Blunt" has ignored the real context and imposed on the passage a meaning that it *cannot have*. This is of course clear from the fact that in order to achieve the "meaning" that he claims for the passage, *he has had to add multiple words in multiple places*.

In subsequent conversations on the internet about these verses, "Mr. Blunt" continues appealing to a supposedly "Greek rule" to justify his distortion of the text. *No such "rule" exists*. *What is more, it is not necessary to introduce a "rule" – least of all, an **invented** rule! – to understand what Thomas says; the meaning is clear and completely without any ambiguity*.

Nor do we need a different "rule" to counter "Mr. Blunt's" "rule"; *we just need to read what the text says*. That is how languages work. They mean what they say.

Why does "Mr. Blunt" not accept what the text says? It is clear that the Bible passage does not support his argument. On the contrary, it shows that his argument is wrong. He is clearly motivated by his opposition to the Deity of Christ, and he is determined to change this verse, which speaks clearly of that Deity.

No-one is obliging "Mr. Blunt" to *believe* in the Deity of Christ. But this truth is what this verse shows us and teaches us (along with other verses), and *neither "Mr. Blunt" nor anyone else has the right to change the Biblical text*. What "Mr. Blunt" says *is not a possible meaning* of the original text. What is more, the words that he adds *do not appear in any Greek manuscript*.

It is clear that in John 20:28 the Bible contradicts the Jehovah's Witness teaching about Christ that is being promoted by "Mr. Blunt".

"How to Falsify the Conclusion"

This is the title given by "Mr Blunt" on the final page of his article. It sounds very positive, as it apparently suggests an easy way to disprove his conclusion, if it is wrong. But this turns out to be a fake offer. He says that readers "would need to dispute Sollamo's research or find grammatical solecisms in the gospel of John relevant to the syntax of **John 20:28**."

Most readers are likely to conclude, "I can't do either of those things:
"1) I don't know where to find Sollamo's research and don't in any case have the specialist academic knowledge that would enable me to engage with it, let alone to challenge it.

"2) I don't know what a "grammatical solecism" is and wouldn't be able to identify one in John's gospel, let alone know if it is "relevant to the syntax of **John 20:28**."

"So the author must be right (or at least, I am not able to demonstrate that he isn't)."

Nothing could be further from the truth. "Mr Blunt" has presented two false options here, options that he is confident will floor the opposition and leave him as the victor.

But his claimed options are irrelevant. To falsify his conclusion, *all we have to do is to read John chapter 20 without changing the obvious meaning as he manages to do only by plucking verses from other occasions, other events and other contexts* and by *then by adding words to the text*!

"Mr Blunt" does then give a third option to "falsify his conclusion". He says:

"One would need to find an example in native Greek to harm the conclusion of this paper."

Once again, he sets a task that he knows that virtually all readers of his paper will be unable to complete, again leaving his conclusion as the only option.

However, for the person who is familiar with Koiné Greek, the example that he demands to have is easy to find: *it is right there in front of us, in John 20:28 itself,* ***which he rejected from the start when defining his fake "rule".***

Conclusion

I congratulate the reader who has reached the end of this review. It has been hard going and I apologise for the amount of grammatical terminology used, which is merely a consequence of the arguments used and the style of the article written by the anonymous writer "Gregory Blunt".

The whole of his article is a supreme example of circular reasoning: "Mr Blunt" starts with his conclusion and excludes John 20:28 a priori from the data on which he claims to base his analysis of Greek. He thus creates a "rule" that excludes the clear meaning of John 20:28, in which Thomas calls Jesus "My Lord and my God". When he gets to this verse, "Mr Blunt" should recognise that his "rule" ignores and rejects the data that don't suit him and that this verse (along with many others!) disproves his "rule". Instead of this, he claims that his rule "proves" that John 20:28 cannot actually mean what it obviously states.

We have also seen that "Mr. Blunt" makes fundamental errors in his understanding of Greek and actually prefers to work with an English translation of the Bible that he has selected. He supports his argument by referring to the presence or absence of commas in the American Standard Version. He quotes large amounts of grammatical terminology, much of which will be incomprehensible to the average reader, while most of it is irrelevant to John 20:28, anyway. He also repeatedly commits fundamental linguistic and logical errors throughout his article.

We have shown above that "Mr Blunt's" claims are false and the evidence for this is not limited to the Greek text in John 20:28 alone, as there are also numerous other examples of this structure in the Greek Bible, where two or more characteristics are frequently attributed to God ("the same person", in "Mr Blunt's" jargon), in the same sentence, *with the same structure* that we find in John 20:28.

Sometimes, writers on the internet can sound very convincing, but we must never forget that they control which information they present and which they withhold. If, on top of this, they actually *change some of the "facts",* some readers will be persuaded that the writer has revealed "the truth", even when he or she has done no such thing.

Such writers seek to convey the impression that they have information that other people don't have, or don't understand, or even that they possess information that other people are trying to hide from the

 © Trevor R Allin 2022

public, according to some conspiracy theorists. However, above we have seen that in fact *it is "Mr. Blunt" who hides inconvenient evidence from his readers*.

The mysterious "Mr Blunt" turns out not to be an expert in Koiné Greek at all, nor in the Greek text of the Bible, nor in linguistics, but merely someone who not only hides pertinent facts but also wishes to hide his true identity, in order to promote better his opposition to the Biblical statements of the deity of Christ, who in John 20:28 is called "Lord" and "**God**".

See the second part of this investigation here: https://livingwater-spain.com/internet_plot.pdf