

Jehovah's Witnesses believe Jesus is A God, not GOD. They quote from Dana and Mantey to support this claim. Following is the quote found in the Kingdom Interlinear page 1158.

1158

APPENDIX

with the sense of 'late on.' But Philostratus shows examples where $\epsilon\pi\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ [o-*pas*] with the ablative has the sense of 'after' like $\epsilon\pi\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ 'after these things.' . . . Hence in Mt. 28:1, $\epsilon\pi\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\epsilon\sigma\sigma\alpha\delta\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\alpha\varsigma$ may be either late on the Sabbath or after the Sabbath. Either has good support. Moulton is uncertain, while Blass prefers 'after'. It is a point for exegesis, not for grammar, to decide. If Matthew has in mind just before sunset, 'late on' would be his idea; if he means after sunset, then 'after' is correct."

A *Greek-English Lexicon*, compiled by Liddell and Scott (1948 Reprint), Volume 2, says on $\epsilon\pi\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ [o-*pas*]: "4. as preposition with genitive, $\epsilon\pi\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ after these things. Philostratus V A 6.10, compare 4.13; so perhaps $\epsilon\pi\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\epsilon\sigma\sigma\alpha\delta\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\alpha\varsigma$ after the sabbath day. Evangel Mat-

thew 28:1." As early as 1806 the *Critical Greek-German Lexicon* by J. G. Schneider had determined "after" as a meaning of $\epsilon\pi\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ [o-*pas*] saying: "Adverb. late, too late; really, after; hence also with the Genitive, long after," and then he gives examples.

In *The Four Gospels* translated from the Greek with reference to the Aramaic idiom Prof. C. C. Torrey renders Matthew 28:1: "In the night between the close of the sabbath and the dawn of the first day of the week. . . ." Dr. J. Murdock's translation renders the Syriac Peshitto Version: "And in the close of the sabbath, as the first [day] of the week began to dawn. . . ."

Hebrew versions of Matthew also here render $\epsilon\pi\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ [o-*pas*] as "after." Our translation does likewise.

John 1:1 — "a god"

($\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ [*the-os*], Greek)

The Complete Bible—An American Translation renders this expression "divine," making the entire verse read: "In the beginning the Word existed. The Word was with God, and the Word was divine." (1943 Reprint) *A New Translation of The Bible* by Dr. Jas. Moffatt reads likewise: "The Logos existed in the very beginning, the Logos was with God, the Logos was divine." (1935 edition) Every honest person will have to admit that John's saying that the Word or Logos "was divine" is not saying that he was the God with whom he was. It merely tells of a certain quality about the Word or Logos, but it does not identify him as one and the same as God.

The reason for their rendering the Greek word "divine," and not "God," is that it is the Greek noun *the-os* without the definite article, hence an anarthrous *the-os*. The God with whom the Word or Logos was originally is designated here by the Greek expression $\epsilon\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$, *the-os* preceded by the definite article *ho*, hence an articular *the-os*. Careful translators recognize that the articular construction of the noun points to an identity, a personality, whereas an anarthrous construction points to a quality about someone. That is what *A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament* by Dana and Mantey remarks

on page 140, paragraph vii. Accordingly, on page 143, paragraph (3), this same publication says about the subject of a copulative sentence, that in a copulative sentence sometimes the article makes the subject distinct from the predicate. Xenophon's *Anabasis*, 1.4.3, $\mu\alpha\rho\tau\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota$ $\tau\eta\varsigma$ $\mu\alpha\rho\tau\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$, but *the place was a market*, corresponds with what is stated in John 1:1. In both examples above the article used differentiates the subject. The market mentioned by Xenophon was not the only market. Correspondingly the same argument could be used respecting the Greek *theos* without the article *ho* in John 1:1.

Instead of translating John 1:1, and the word was *deity*, this *Grammar* could have translated it, and the word was a god, to run more parallel with Xenophon's statement, and the place was a market.

In the sentence "and the word was a god" the copulative verb "was" and the expression "a god" form the predicate of the sentence. In the original Greek there is no definite article *ho* (*the*) before *the-os* (god), and it is presumptuous to say that such a definite article is to be understood so that the sentence should therefore be translated "and the Word was God." That would mean that the Word was the God with whom the Word was said to be. This is unreasonable; for how

TRANSLATIONS WHICH DENY THE DEITY OF CHRIST

- The Kingdom Interlinear (the translated text) - "and the Word was a god".
- The New World Translation of the Holy Scriptures - "and the Word was a god".
- The Kingdom Interlinear Translation of the Greek Scriptures (the Interlinear translation of the Greek reads - "and a god was the Word".) This was translated by Benjamin Wilson, a newspaper editor in Geneva, Illinois and published in complete form in 1865. The Emphatic Diaglott became the property of the Watchtower Society in 1902.