examples of this such as John 4:24, I John 4:16; I John 1:5; and John 1:1. According to Mantey then, since the Greek word O(CO) is not preceded by the definite article in the latter part of John 1:1, emphasis is placed on the nature of God and the Greek word O(CO) should be translated "God". Thus the latter part of John 1:1 should be translated "and the Word was God" with emphasis being placed on the nature of God rather than His identity.

ii. Colwell says a definite predicate nominative has the definite article when it follows the verb, but it does not have the definite article when it precedes the verb. According to Colwell then, the Greek word Geos in the latter part of John 1:1 must be regarded as definite even though it does not have the definite article because it is a predicate nominative and it precedes the verb. Colwell says the only way for a predicate nominative that precedes the verb to be indefinite is for the context to demand it, but he says the context of the Gospel of John does not demand that the Greek word Geos in the latter part of John 1:1 be indefinite especially in light of Thomas' confession at the end of the book when he addresses Jesus and says, "My Lord and my God."

Note: It is interesting to observe that the Jehovah's Witnesses follow Colwell's rule in the New World Translation of John 19:21 where the chief priests of the Jews say to Pilate: "Do not write 'The King of the Jews', but that he (Jesus) said, 'I am King of the Jews.'" In the latter part of this verse the word "King" is a predicate nominative and it precedes the yerb, but it does not have a definite article. Yet, the Jehovah's Witnesses translate the word "king" as definite for they translate it with a capital "K". But when the same Greek construction appears in the latter part of John 1:1, instead of translating the Greek word Geos as definite -"God" - like they translated the word "King" as definite in John 19:21, they translated it as"definite - "a god." Why? Because of their theological prejudice.