John 1:1 Anarthrous Theos: The Big Lie of the NWT

"and the Word was God"

(John 1:1 [TR]) εν αρχη ην ο λογος και ο λογος ην προς τον θεον και θεος ην ο λογος

(John 1:1 [NIV]) In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.

The NWT renders it:

(John 1:1 [NWT]) In the beginning the Word was, and the Word was with God, and the Word was a god.

The argument given for using "a god" is: Since  $\theta \epsilon o v$  (in John 1:1b) is preceded by the definite article  $\tau o v$ , it is And Since  $\theta \epsilon o \varsigma$  (in John 1:1c) isn't preceded by a definite article (anarthrous), it is translated "a god", thus imply

So, what should it be? "God" or "a god"?

#### **Contents:**

- I) Brief introduction to cases in Greek
- II) Let's examine the argument that anarthrous  $\theta \epsilon o \zeta$  (without a definite article,  $\theta \epsilon o \zeta$ ,  $\theta \epsilon o \gamma$ ,...) refers to "a god"
- III) Let's examine the opposite: Can "o  $\theta \epsilon o \zeta$ " (with definite article) refer to "a god" and not "God"?
- IV) But why is  $\theta \epsilon o \varsigma$  anarthrous in John 1:1c?
- V) Conclusions

#### I) Brief introduction to cases in Greek

In English the words do not change according to their function in the sentence. So the word "God" as a subject, of word used as a subject is in nominative case. While a word used as direct object and after some prepositions is in used for objects (like  $\theta \epsilon o \varsigma$  in John 1:1c). Even the definite article takes different forms according to its function So  $\theta \epsilon o \varsigma$  and  $\theta \epsilon o v$  are the same word, but the difference is due to the function of each word in the sentence. One

II) Let's examine the argument that anarthrous  $\theta \epsilon o \varsigma$  (without a definite article,  $\theta \epsilon o \varsigma$ ,  $\theta \epsilon o \varsigma$ ,...) refers to "a

1-Actually reading John 1 in Greek, we find many uses of  $\theta \epsilon o \varsigma$  without the definite article (like in John 1:6,1

(John 1:18a [NIV]) No one has ever seen God

(John 1:18a [TR]) deon oudeic ewraken papote

(John 1:18a [NWT]) No man has seen God at any time

We see that  $\theta \epsilon o v$  (the accusative form of  $\theta \epsilon o \varsigma$ ) isn't preceded by a definite article ( $\tau o v$ ), and is translated God, even meaningless. So this is an "Anarthrous theos" referring to God.

2-

(Nahum 1:2a [NIV]) The LORD is a jealous and avenging God

(Nahum 1:2a [LXX]) θεος ζηλωτης και εκδικων κυριος

(Nahum 1:2a [HiSB]) אַל קנָא וָנקם יְהוָה נקָם יְהוָה

(Nahum 1:2a [NWT]) Jehovah is a God exacting exclusive devotion and taking vengeance

So here YHVH (יְהְוָהְ) is  $\theta$ εος. Which is anarthrous!!!

3-

(Isaiah 37:16 [NIV]) O LORD Almighty, God of Israel, enthroned between the cherubim, you alone are God ov (Isaiah 37:16 [LXX]) κυριε σαβαωθ ο θεος ισραηλ ο καθημενος επι των χερουβιν συ θεος μονος ει πασης βασώ (Isaiah 37:16 [HiSB]) אָלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל יֹשֶׁב הַּכְּרֵבִים אַתָּה־ הָוֹא הֵאֱלְהִים ׁ לְבַדְּךְּ לְכָל מִמְלְכְוֹת הָאָרֶץ אַתָּה עָשִׂית אֶת־ הַשְּׁמֵיִם וְאָת־ הָאֵרֶץ. (Isaiah 37:16 [NWT]) "O Jehovah of armies, the God of Israel, sitting upon the cherubs, you alone are the true heavens and the earth.

Here, YHVH (LORD Almighty, O Jehovah) is  $\theta$ εος. **Again aranrthrous!!!** Note that  $\sigma$ υ means "you", it isn't an article.

4-

(Isaiah 41:4b [NIV]) I, the LORD--with the first of them and with the last--I am he."

(Isaiah 41:4b [LXX]) εγω θεος πρωτος και εις τα επερχομενα εγω ειμι

(Isaiah 41:4b [HiSB]) אַנִי־ הְוֹא: אָחָרֹנִים אָחָרֹנִים אָנִי־ הְוֹא

(Isaiah 41:4b [NWT]) "I, Jehovah, the First One; and with the last ones I am the same."

Here, YHVH (the LORD, Jehovah) is translated  $\theta \epsilon o \varsigma$ . Again anarthrous!!!

5-

(Jeremiah 23:23 [NIV]) Am I only a God nearby, declares the LORD, "and not a God far away?

(Jeremiah 23:23 [LXX]) θεος εγγιζων εγω ειμι λεγει κυριος και ουχι θεος πορρωθεν

(Jeremiah 23:23 [HiSB]) בּאֱלֹהָי מָרָחָׁק: יְהְוָה וְלָאׁ אֱלֹהָי יְהְוָה וְלָאׁ

(Jeremiah 23:23 [NWT]) "Am I a God nearby," is the utterance of Jehovah, "and not a God far away? "

Again, YHVH (the LORD, Jehovah) is θεος. **Again anarthrous!!! No definite article!!!** 

```
(Ezekiel 45:9 [NIV]) 'This is what the Sovereign LORD says: ...
(Ezekiel 45:9 [LXX]) ταδε λεγει κυριος θεος ...
(Ezekiel 45:9 [HiSB]) ...הֹוָה... (ָבְּלֹנֵי יְהֹוָה אֲלֹנֵי יְהוֹה...
(Ezekiel 45:9 [NWT]) "This is what the Sovereign Lord Jehovah has said, ...
κυριος θεος (the Sovereign LORD) is anarthrous!!!
Actually there are many other examples, but I think these examples are enough to show that Anarthrous to
translated "a god".
III) Let's examine the opposite:
Can "o θεος" (with definite article) refer to "a god" and not "God"?
1-
(2 Corinthians 4:4 [NIV]) The god of this age has blinded the minds of unbelievers, so that they cannot see the
(2 Corinthians 4:4 [TR]) εν οις ο θεος του αιωνος τουτου ετυφλωσεν τα νοηματα των απιστων εις το μη αυγασ
εικων του θεου
(2 Corinthians 4:4 [NWT]) among whom the god of this system of things has blinded the minds of the unbeliev
who is the image of God, might not shine through.
Here, "the god", is o \theta \epsilon o \varsigma, with definite article.
2-
(Isaiah 36:19 [NIV]) Where are the gods of Hamath and Arpad? Where are the gods of Sepharvaim? Have they
(Isaiah 36:19 [LXX]) που εστιν ο θεος αιμαθ και αρφαθ και που ο θεος της πολεως σεπφαριμ μη εδυναντο ρυσο
(Isaiah 36:19 [NWT]) Where are the gods of Ha'math and Ar'pad? Where are the gods of Seph-ar-va'im? And h
Here again, o \theta \epsilon o \zeta with definite article refers to gods.
From these examples, we can see that, o \theta \epsilon o \varsigma, with definite article, can refer to "god" and not "God".
I think so far we have destroyed the argument of the Anarthrous theos, or "a god"
IV) But why is \theta \epsilon o \varsigma anarthrous in John 1:1c?
```

From:

# http://www.christiandefense.org/NWT.....1\_article.htm

Simply put, if John had written: ho theos ēn ho logos (lit., "the God was the Word" making theos definite), he we words, the passage would have indicated that "God" in 1:1b (the Father) and "God" in 1:1c (the Word) were the (and surely not indefinite).

"Definite" nouns point to the specific identification of someone or something (thus, in 1:1b "the God" identifies someone or something [1]. The anarthrous theos indicates exactly as to what John was communicating: As to the specific identity), He was not identified as the Father, but personally distinct from Him: "The Word was with [property or specific identity] is a specific identity of the specific identity."

[Footnote 1] Nouns generally fall under three semantic categories: **Definite** (identity), **Indefinite** (one of a class anarthrous *theos* in John 1:1c is *qualitative*. As with the noun "flesh" in John 1:14: "The Word became flesh," no (qualitative)—as to the Word's new nature. Likewise, it would be most unnatural to translate "ho theos agapē es (tagging  $agap\bar{e}$  ["love"] as indefinite) or "God is the love" (definite) "o  $\theta \epsilon o \zeta \alpha \gamma \alpha \pi \eta \epsilon \sigma \tau v$ ". Here  $agap\bar{e}$  is qualitate predicate nominative. A predicate nominative describes the class or category to which the subject (the "Word") to His *essence* or *nature*—not His personal identity.

Besides the blatant polytheism that an indefinite rendering of *theos* in 1:1c produces, there are two additional proplaced *theos* \*first in the clause\* to *draw attention to it* as if he wanted the reader to shout out the word of emphasis of many gods) all the more improbable. And second, John 1:1a ("In the beginning *was* [ $\bar{e}n$ ] the Word") indicates

The verb translated "was" (ēn) is an *imperfect* tense (from the verb eimi). An imperfect tense denotes an on-goin no beginning. And in verses 3, 6, and 10, the acrist verb egeneto (from ginomai), which does denote a beginning being (egeneto) through Him" (v. 3) while the imperfect verb ēnegeneto is used of the Word to describe the Word became [egeneto] flesh." ("was") is used of the eternal Word. It is not until verse 14 that egeneto is used beginning: "The Word became [egeneto] flesh."

We find the same verb contrast (eternal vs. origin) in John 8:58: "Before Abraham was born [genesthai], I Am born") in 8:58 are from the same baseverb ginomai denoting a beginning. And  $\bar{e}n$  in 1:1 ("was") is from eimi ("A those contexts. Thus, in 1:1 and 8:58 the contrast is clear: the Word's eternal existence (eimi) vs. all things create

[Footnote 2] Of all the Greek prepositions that John could have used in 1:1b (such as *en, para, sun,* which all car or "toward"). *Pros* (when persons are in view) signifies more than being near or beside. Rather, *pros* denotes into 1:1b, *pros* expresses the inseparable communion and loving intercourse that the Word shared *with* the Father—*b faith* haspeace *pros ton theon* (lit., "with the God," same rendering as John 1:1b). *Pros* in 2 Cor. 5:8 (*pros ton ku* that Christians will experience "at home *with* [*pros*] the Lord." And in 1 Cor. 13:12, the double use of *pros* described face" (*prosōpon pros prosōpon*).

Here's another detailed explanation from Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics - Exegetical Syntax of the New

**John 1:1** states: Ἐν ἀρχῆ ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν, καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος. In the last part of the verbanarthrous and comes before the verb. Therefore, it fits Colwell's *construction*, though it might not fit the rule (frontext, not by the grammar). Whether it is indefinite, qualitative, or definite is the issue at hand.

### a. Is Θεός in John 1:1c Indefinite?

If θεός were indefinite, we would translate it "a god" (as is done in the *New World Translation* [NWT]). If so, the suggesting that the Word was merely a secondary god in a pantheon of deities.

(Isaiah 43:10 [NIV]) You are my witnesses, declares the LORD, "and my servant whom I have chosen, so that y no god was formed, nor will there be one after me.

The grammatical argument that the PN here is indefinite is weak. Often, those who argue for such a view (in par is anarthrous. Yet they are inconsistent, as R. H. Countess pointed out:

In the New Testament there are 282 occurrences of the anarthrous  $\theta \epsilon \delta \zeta$ . At sixteen places NWT has either a god, faithful to *their* translation principle only six percent of the time. ... The first section of John-1:1–18-furnishes a verses 1, 2, 6, 12, 13, 18-and has the article only twice-verses 1, 2. Yet NWT six times translated "God," once "a If we expand the discussion to other anarthrous terms in the Johannine Prologue, we notice other inconsistencies *Translation* renders  $\theta \epsilon \delta \zeta$  as "a god" on the simplistic grounds that it lacks the article. This is surely an insufficient that  $\dot{\alpha}\rho\chi\tilde{\eta}$  should be "a beginning" (1:1, 2),  $\zeta\omega\tilde{\eta}$  should be "a life" (1:4),  $\pi\alpha\rho\tilde{\alpha}$   $\theta\epsilon\tilde{\omega}$  should be "from a god" (1:6) Yet none of these other anarthrous nouns is rendered with an indefinite article. One can only suspect strong theological strains that  $\dot{\alpha}\rho\chi\tilde{\eta}$  is the contraction of the second strains and  $\dot{\alpha}\rho\chi\tilde{\eta}$  should be "a life" (1:4),  $\dot{\alpha}\rho\tilde{\alpha}$   $\dot{\alpha}$  should be "from a god" (1:6)

According to Dixon's study, if  $\theta \epsilon \delta \varsigma$  were *indefinite* in John 1:1, it would be the only anarthrous pre-verbal PN in somewhat overstated, the general point is valid: The indefinite notion is the most poorly attested for anarthrous p is improbable. Also, the context suggests that such is not likely, for the Word already existed in the beginning. T Logos could be "a god" according to John. Finally, the evangelist's own theology militates against this view, for Jesus Christ is identified as God (cf. 5:23; 8:58; 10:30; 20:28, etc.).

## b. Is Θεός in John 1:1c Definite?

Grammarians and exegetes since Colwell have taken  $\theta \epsilon \delta \zeta$  as definite in John 1:1c. However, their basis has *usua* the rule to say that an anarthrous pre-verbal PN will usually be definite (rather than the converse). But Colwell's the *context* which precedes a verb will usually be anarthrous. If we check the rule to see if it applies here, we wo Therefore, if the same person being referred to there is called  $\theta \epsilon \delta \zeta$  in 1:1c, then in both places it is definite. Although qualitative), the evidence is not very compelling. The vast majority of *definite* anarthrous pre-verbal predicate no none of which is true here, diminishing the likelihood of a definite  $\theta \epsilon \delta \zeta$  in John 1:1c.

Further, calling  $\theta \epsilon \delta \zeta$  in 1:1c definite is the same as saying that if it had followed the verb it would have had the a Word" = "God" and "God" = "the Word"). The problem of this argument is that the  $\theta \epsilon \delta \zeta$  in 1:1b is the Father. The Word was the *Father*." This, as the older grammarians and exegetes pointed out, is embryonic Sabellianism or many the same as saying that if it had followed the verb it would have had the a word" = "God" and "God" = "the Word").

modalism in the NT.

# c. Is Θεός in John 1:1c Qualitative?

The most likely candidate for  $\theta \epsilon \delta \zeta$  is qualitative. This is true both grammatically (for the largest proportion of proportion) theologically (both the theology of the Fourth Gospel and of the NT as a whole). There is a balance between the  $\dot{\alpha}\rho\chi\tilde{\eta}$  ...  $\theta\epsilon\dot{\delta}\zeta$   $\dot{\eta}\nu$  [1:1], and his humanity, which was added later ( $\sigma\dot{\alpha}\rho\xi$   $\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\dot{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\tau$ 0 [1:14]). The grammatical structure of the Word, rather than his identity. But  $\theta\epsilon\dot{\delta}\zeta$  was his nature from eternity (hence,  $\epsilon\dot{i}\mu\dot{i}$  is used), while  $\sigma\dot{\alpha}\rho\xi$  was

Such an option does not at all impugn the deity of Christ. Rather, it stresses that, although the person of Christ is translations are as follows: "What God was, the Word was" (NEB), or "the Word was divine" (a modified Moffa that can be applied *only* to true deity. However, in modern English, we use it with reference to angels, theologian translation. The *idea* of a qualitative  $\theta$ só $\varsigma$  here is that the Word had all the attributes and qualities that "the God" though they differed in person. *The construction the evangelist chose to express this idea was the most concise we from the Father*.

### V) Conclusions

- 1. An anarthrous theos ( $\theta \epsilon o \varsigma$ ) can actually refer to God.
- 2. Articled theos (ο θεος) does not always refer to God.
- 3. θεος in John 1:1c is qualitative, not indefinite.

(John 1:1 [TR]) εν αρχη ην ο λογος και ο λογος ην προς τον θεον και θεος ην ο λογος

(John 1:1 [NIV]) In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.

In the end, I'll leave you with my favorite translation of this verse:

John 1 Aramaic Bible in Plain English

(John 1:1)

In the origin The Word had been existing, and That Word had been existing with God, and That Word was hin