

# THE SEMANTICS AND EXEGETICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE OBJECT-COMPLEMENT CONSTRUCTION IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

DANIEL B. WALLACE

*A survey of the grammatical terminology, identification, and semantics of the object-complement construction in the Greek NT demonstrates that the treatment of this construction in the major grammars is inadequate. A rather extensive listing of NT examples of this construction supports the thesis that the object complement construction is semantically equivalent to the subject-predicate nominative construction. Thus, any principles which apply to subject-predicate nominative constructions (e.g., "Colwell's Rule") are equally applicable to object-complement constructions.*

\* \* \*

## INTRODUCTION

Although some would insist that grammar is one of those elementary things which is better left behind as we press on to maturity, there are still a few die-hards who feel that not all has been said on the topic. Lars Rydbeck, for example, recently asked the question, "What happened to New Testament Greek grammar after Albert Debrunner?"<sup>1</sup> His answer is that it "has come almost to a standstill, one of the reasons being that "There is a prevalent but false assumption that everything in NT Greek scholarship has been done already."<sup>2</sup> Rydbeck goes on to suggest that one major area in NT grammar which has yet to be resolved is the nature of NT Greek.<sup>3</sup> This, indeed,

<sup>1</sup> The title of a paper presented to the *Fifth International Congress on Biblical Studies* (Oxford: September, 1973), published in *NTS* 21 (1974-75) 424-27.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 424.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 425.

is a critical issue; but there are others. Among them is the relation of structure to semantics. This is a problem area because most grammars are satisfied with presenting the structural phenomena of the NT in a *descriptive* manner (i.e., a mere tagging of structures as belonging to certain syntactical categories), while hardly raising the question of the differences in the fields of meaning that 'synonymous' structures can possess.<sup>4</sup> One construction which can be profitably put through the structure-semantics grid is that of the object-complement double accusative.

### DEFINITION OF TERMS

Not all are agreed on which terms to use when describing this grammatical phenomenon. Thus it is appropriate to begin by defining terms.

#### *Double Accusative*

The nomenclature "double accusative" is customarily used in grammars to refer to two different kinds of constructions:<sup>5</sup> (1) a person-thing double accusative (in which a verb takes two direct objects in the accusative, one being the person affected, the other being the thing effected);<sup>6</sup> and (2) an object-complement double

<sup>4</sup> Some specific areas of inquiry with reference to this problem are: the genitive of possession vs. the dative of possession; the simple infinitive vs. the genitive articular infinitive (or **ειj/proj** plus the accusative articular infinitive) to express purpose; the overlap in the use of simple cases and prepositions plus cases (e.g., simple dative vs. **ειj** plus the dative); the anarthrous generic noun vs. the articular generic noun; the various structures used to express result, causality, etc. To be sure, some of these topics are discussed in the grammars, but as of yet, grammars by and large make no attempt to be systematic in dealing with the differences in the fields of meaning that 'synonymous' structures can have.

<sup>5</sup> There are other double accusative constructions as well, but which occur so infrequently as to call for little attention in the grammars. Besides the person-thing and object-complement constructions, BDF list the "accusative of object and cognate accusative" and "accusative of object and of result" (86-87).

<sup>6</sup> Cf. BDF, 85; A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (4th ed.; Nashville: Broadman, 1934) 482-84; G. B. Winer, *A Treatise on the Grammar of New Testament Greek*, translated and revised by W. F. Moulton (3d ed., revised; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1882) 284-85; H. W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, revised by G. M. Messing (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, 1956) 363-64. Others call this construction "an Accusative of the remoter object as well as of the immediate object" (C. F. D. Moule, *An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek* [2d ed.; Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1959] 33), or a double accusative of "personal and impersonal object" (H. E. Dana and J. R. Mantey, *A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament* [Toronto: Macmillan, 1927] 94).

accusative. This paper is concerned only with this second type of construction.

### *Object-Complement*

An object-complement double accusative is a construction in which one accusative is the direct object of the verb and the other accusative (either noun, adjective or participle) complements the object in that it predicates something about it.<sup>7</sup> This construction is called a double accusative of object and predicate accusative by Robertson, Blass-Debrunner, Turner, Smyth, Mayser, Kuhner, Jannaris, and others.<sup>8</sup> It is described as "an accusative of the object affected and an object complement" by Funk,<sup>9</sup> "accusative of subject [!] and predicate" by Winer,<sup>10</sup> and "A *direct and predicate object*" by Dana and Mantey.<sup>11</sup> Others describe the construction in still different terms,<sup>12</sup> even as I have done. I use the name "object-complement" because it is brief and to the point.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Another way of defining this construction which perhaps is technically more correct is that given by Goodwin and Gulick: "A verb and an accusative depending on it may together be treated as a single word having another accusative as its object" (W. W. Goodwin, *Greek Grammar*, revised by C. B. Gulick [Boston: Ginn & Co., 1930] 227).

<sup>8</sup> Robertson, *Grammar*, 480; BDF, 86; J. H. Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, vol. 3: *Syntax*, by N. Turner (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963) 246; Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, 362; E. Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemaerzeit*, vol. 2, part 2: *Satzlehre* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1934) 320 ("Ein Akkusativ des Objekts und ein Prädikatsakkusativ"); R. Kuhner, *Grammar of the Greek Language* (Boston: B. B. Mussey, 1849) 398; A. N. Jannaris, *An Historical Greek Grammar* (London: Macmillan, 1897) 332; H. P. V. Nunn, *A Short Syntax of New Testament Greek* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1943) 41; Goodwin and Gulick, *Greek Grammar*, 228; C. Vaughan and V. E. Gideon, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (Nashville: Broadman, 1979) 66.

<sup>9</sup> R. W. Funk, *A Beginning-Intermediate Grammar of Hellenistic Greek* (2 vols.; 2d, corrected ed; Missoula: Scholars, 1973) 2:725.

<sup>10</sup> Winer, *Treatise*, 285.

<sup>11</sup> Dana and Mantey, *Manual Grammar*, 94.

<sup>12</sup> J. A. Brooks and C. L. Winbery (*Syntax of New Testament Greek* [Washington, D. C.: University Press of America, 1979] 47) describe the construction as involving "a direct or primary object and a predicate or secondary object"; William Webster (*The Syntax and Synonyms of the Greek Testament* [London: Rivingtons, 1864] 64) states that "The second accusative often appears as a tertiary predicate or an apposition"; Moule (*Idiom-Book*, 35) comes close to the 'normal' description when he speaks of "The Accusative used Predicatively, i.e. to 'predicate' something of a noun already in the Accusative."

<sup>13</sup> It should be observed that those grammars which do speak of the "object complement" mean by this the second accusative only, i.e., the predicate accusative. By the use of the hyphen in "object-complement," I am indicating both accusatives (hence, the whole construction)--the object and its complement.

### THE PROBLEM

There are three issues I wish to discuss, namely, (1) the identification of the construction (i.e., how does one know when he has an object-complement construction?), (2) the identification of the components (i.e., how can one tell which is object and which is complement?), and (3) the semantics of the construction (i.e., in addition to the obvious fact that predication is involved, what else can the construction indicate?).

#### *Identification of the Construction*

The problem in identifying the construction is due primarily to the fact that every verb which can take an object-complement construction is not required to do so.<sup>14</sup> Consequently, not all would make a positive identification of the construction in a given instance.<sup>15</sup> For example, Phil 3:18 reads, **ouj poll lakij elegon ufiñ, nuñ de kai> klaiwn legw [,] touj ekqrouj tou?staurou?** It is possible to take **touj ekqrouj** as an appositive to **ouj** (thus, "whom often I used to mention to you, and now weeping I say, [they are] the enemies of the cross. . .").<sup>16</sup> But a second possibility is to consider **legw** as having the meaning 'I call' here and to treat **touj ekqrouj** as the complement to an implied pronominal object (thus, ". . . but now, weeping, I call [them] the enemies of the cross. . .").<sup>17</sup> There are not many questionable constructions such as this, but there are a few that are exegetically significant.

#### *Identification of the Components*

The problem in identifying the components is that occasionally the natural order of object, then complement, is reversed. In most of

<sup>14</sup> E. V. N. Goetchius, *The Language of the New Testament* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965) 141. It is to be noted, however, that some verbs regularly or almost exclusively take object-complements (e.g., **hgeomai**, **ophomazw**, and **f askw**).

<sup>15</sup> No grammar gives an exhaustive list of object-complements in the NT. Consequently such lists cannot be compared to discover the questionable instances. But by comparing translations and by attempting to reconstruct the semantic range of every possible object-complement construction (i.e., to see whether the construction in question must be or might be an object-complement), the definite and the questionable instances can be determined.

<sup>16</sup> In support of this view, cf. Winer, *Treatise*, 665; Robertson, *Grammar*, 413; M. R. Vincent, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians and to Philemon* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1897) 117.

<sup>17</sup> In support of this view, cf. H. A. A. Kennedy, "The Epistle to the Philippians" in vol. 3 of *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, ed. W. R. Nicoll (New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1897) 461.

the instances it is obvious which is object and which is complement. For example, Phil 3:17 reads **exete tupon hñaj**. A very literal translation would not render this, "you have a pattern/example *in* us," for that would require **exete tupon hñin**. Rather, it should be rendered, "you have *us* as [a] pattern/example." It is obvious, then, that this is an object-complement construction and that the order has been reversed. Such a clear instance demonstrates the reversal phenomenon and, at the same time, raises two questions: (1) What are the criteria for determining which is which since word order is not an infallible guide? and (2) Why is the order sometimes reversed?

### *The Semantics of the Construction*

The third issue involves the semantics of the construction. As mentioned earlier, by definition an object-complement construction is a construction in which a predication is made. But beyond this given, what else can the construction indicate? Specifically, what is the difference semantically between the order of object, then complement and complement, then object? For example, is it possible that when Paul wrote **exete tupon hñaj** in Phil 3:17 he did not mean exactly the same thing as **exete hñaj tupon**?

### THE INADEQUATE TREATMENT IN THE GRAMMARS

Concerning the identification of the construction, the standard grammars make almost no advances beyond defining the construction<sup>18</sup> and giving an abridged list of the kinds of verbs which take object-complements. Some of the grammars do point out that the complement is often preceded by **ej** or **wj**.<sup>19</sup> Unfortunately, not only is there a very high percentage of cases where **ej** and **wj** are absent, but even when either one is present, there is not, *ipso facto*, an object-complement construction.<sup>20</sup> With reference to the identification of the components, only one of the more than thirty grammars examined explicitly addressed the question of order in an object-complement

<sup>18</sup> Goetchius (*Language*, 141) is a lone exception to the silence of the grammarians: "Object complements occur only with certain verbs (all of which also occur with 'ordinary' direct objects, i.e., without object complements), e.g., *call, make, find, think, deem, choose, elect*. Some of these verbs also occur with indirect objects (e.g., *call, make, find*), so that it may not always be immediately apparent whether sentences containing them are structurally similar to (3) ['The child gave the dog a bone'] or to (4) ['The general called the captain a fool']; usually, however, the meanings of the nouns N<sub>2</sub> and N<sub>3</sub> [in the construction N<sub>1</sub>-V-N<sub>2</sub>-N<sub>3</sub>] are compatible with only one interpretation (and, hence, with only one structural analysis) of a sentence."

<sup>19</sup> Robertson, *Grammar*, 480-81; BDF, 86-87; Turner, *Syntax*, 246-47.

<sup>20</sup> Cf., for example, Matt 9:38; 22:13; Mark 1:12; Rom 6:22; 2 John 10.

construction.<sup>21</sup> Some grammars did, however, deal with the issue of order implicitly, giving some guidelines which will be discussed below. Concerning the semantics of the construction, apart from the fact that the complement is making an assertion about the object, again only one grammar gave any explicit guidelines.<sup>22</sup> But not one addressed the question of the difference in force between the normal order and the reversed order.

## SOLUTIONS TO THE PROBLEMS

### *Method of Research Used*

In order to come to any sound conclusions, it was necessary to be as exhaustive in the inductive process as possible. By means of the grammars, thesaurus, concordance, and lexicon, I discovered more than fifty verbs which take object-complements<sup>23</sup> and more than three hundred object-complement constructions in the NT. The raw data gathered is at least enough to provide guidelines which may help to inform and possibly resolve the three issues.

### *Solution Proper*

In dealing with each of the three issues, some guidelines or principles that have been derived from the study are first set forth, and then some of the exegetically significant passages affected by this study are briefly discussed.

<sup>21</sup> Goetchius (*Language*, 142) again was the lone exception, stating, "The constituents of these Greek sentences may, as we might expect, occur in any order; both the direct object and the object complement are in the accusative case, but the direct object is always more 'definite' than the object complement."

<sup>22</sup> Goetchius, *Language*, 142.

<sup>23</sup> Included in the list of verbs are the following: **agiazw, agw, aifew, ahatref w, apodeiknumi, apoluw, apostel lw, geuomai, ginwskw, dexomai, didwmi, dokew, egeirw, eidon, eipon, ekbal lw, ekl egw, eideiknumi, epikalew, eufiskw, ew, hgeomai, qel w, qewrew, ikanow, isthni, kaqisthni, kalew, khruww, kriaw, lambanw, legw, logizomai, nonizw** (in spite of the protests by BDF [86] and Robertson [Grammar, 480] that **nonizw** does not take an object-complement in the NT, there are two unmistakable instances [cf. I Cor 7:26—**nonizw ou# tou#to kal on uparxein** and I Tim 6:5—**nonizontwn porismon eifai tha eusebeian**]), **oida, ofnologew, ofhomazw, paralambanw, paraxw, paristhni, peiqw, periagw, pisteuw, poiew, proorizw, prof erw, protiqhmi, proxeirizw, sunikni, sunisthni (sunistanw), tighni, upokrinomai, uponoew, ufow, f askw, xrhmatizw**. In addition to these are three questionable verbs—**kataklinw, katanoeuw**, and **ofizw**. As well, the NT uses **epilew, eponomazw**, and **prosagoreuw** in the passive which, in the active, would take object-complements (in the passive, the object is converted to the subject and the complement to the predicate nominative/adjective).

## Identification of the Construction

*General Principles.* With reference to the identification of the construction, I have counted about thirty questionable instances. The most common of these involved an infinitive as the complement.<sup>24</sup> The question here is whether the infinitive is functioning substantively as the complement to the direct object or in some other capacity.<sup>25</sup> But however the infinitive is tagged, the meaning of the total construction is not altered. A second group of instances was debatable because the alleged complement could possibly be a simple appositive to the direct object.<sup>26</sup> Other constructions were questionable because of the relation of the adjective to the direct object,<sup>27</sup> the function of **ειj** before a second accusative,<sup>28</sup> the ambiguity of the case of the second noun,<sup>29</sup> etc.<sup>30</sup>

Since there was a positive identification of more than 90% of all possible object-complements examined,<sup>31</sup> and since the questionable instances fell into very specific structural categories, certain principles for determining the identification of the construction become evident. First, what must be established is that the verb related to the construction in question can, indeed, take an object-complement. In the case of hapax legomena and other rare verbs, appeal can certainly be made to extra-NT Greek literature for verification.<sup>32</sup> Second, the

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Rom 1:13; 11:25; I Cor 10:1; 12:1; 2 Cor 9:5; Phil 2:25; 3:13; I Thess 4:13; I Tim 2:4.

<sup>25</sup> In particular, as a complementary infinitive to the verb.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Matt 27:32 (here **αἰρωπον Kurhnaion** might be a Semitic periphrastic construction [cf. Matt 11:19] in which **ψ̄ κ** is left untranslated when followed by an appositional substantive. The idiom, however, is also found in Greek. Cf. W. E. Jelf, *A Grammar of the Greek Language Chiefly from the German of Raphael Kuhner* [2d ed.; 2 vols.; Oxford: James Wright, 1851] 1:102; and Demosthenes I. I, 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10; 9. 19, 23, 25, 36, etc.); Acts 13:6, 23; Rom 10:9; Phil 3:18; Col 2:6; I Pet 3:15; Rev 13:17.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Acts 6:13; 24:20 (interrogative pronoun); Titus 2:10.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Eph 1:5.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Heb 4:7 and Rev 9:11 (here, of course, **Απολυων** is nominative in form, but the author may possibly be treating it as an indeclinable noun functioning as an accusative).

<sup>30</sup> Other constructions were debatable because the adjective could be substantival and the pronominal adjective related to it could be modifying it (John 2:11; 4:54), or the verb was not found with any clear object-complements (I Pet 3:15), or **αἰα** was wedged between **ωσει** and the second accusative (Luke 9:14).

<sup>31</sup> When the instances involving infinitives are discounted, the positive identification is closer to 95%.

<sup>32</sup> E.g., **αγιαζω** seems to take an object-complement construction in I Pet 3:15 (though there are some dissenters among the translations), but no other clear NT examples can be found (though I Thess 5:23 comes close). However, in the LXX there

specifics of the structure in question must have parallels in positively identified object-complements. Thus, for example, if the possibility that **eþthsan te marturaj yeudeiþ** is an object-complement in Acts 6:13<sup>33</sup> is even to be entertained, clear instances of an anarthrous object with a predicate adjective must be found. Finally, once these first two points are established in a given text, I believe that, barring contradictory contextual factors,<sup>34</sup> the antecedent probability is that the construction in question is indeed an object-complement.<sup>35</sup>

*Exegetically Significant Texts.* From my count, there are at least eight exegetically significant passages which are affected by the issue of the identification of the construction.<sup>36</sup> Four of these passages are affected by the other two issues as well,<sup>37</sup> and consequently will not be discussed here. Of the remaining four, two passages, Phil 3:18 and Titus 2:10, warrant a brief treatment at the present time.<sup>38</sup>

are two examples (Exod 29:1 and 30:30) in which an infinitive probably functions as a complement as well as one example (Isa 8:13, the text which lies behind I Pet 3:15) in which **agiazw** clearly takes an object-complement.

<sup>33</sup> The difference exegetically between taking **yeudeiþ** predicatively and attributively is that a predicative **yeudeiþ** makes more explicit the intention of Stephen's enemies to produce false witnesses (thus, "and they brought forth witnesses [to be] false").

<sup>34</sup> An illustration of possibly contradictory contextual factors is found in Acts 13:23—**o[geoj . . . hgagen t&?Israhł swthfa İhsouh**. If the construction is taken as an object-complement ("God has brought to Israel Jesus [as] Savior") rather than simple apposition ("God has brought to Israel a savior, [namely] Jesus"), one is faced with the difficulty that Jesus is introduced in the message as though the residents of Pisidian Antioch were already familiar with his name.

<sup>35</sup> This antecedent probability varies in certainty directly in proportion to how well the first two principles are established in a given instance. If they are established at all, tagging the construction as object-complement must at least be given serious consideration.

<sup>36</sup> John 2:11; 4:54; Acts 13:23; Rom 10:9; Phil 3: 18; Col 2:6; Titus 2: 10; I Pet 3:15.

<sup>37</sup> Acts 13:23 (for a brief discussion, see n. 34 above); Rom 10:9; Col 2:6; I Pet 3:15.

<sup>38</sup> The two remaining constructions are found in John 2:11 and 4:54. John 2: 11 reads, **Tauthn epoiksen aþxha twh shmeiwn o[İhsouþ**. The *ASV*, *RSV*, *NASB* and *NIV* all take **epoiksen** here in the sense of 'he did,' with the *RSV* and *NIV* treating **aþxha** as an appositive to **Tauthn** and the *ASV* and *NASB* regarding **Tauthn** as modifying **aþxha**. However, if **epoiksen** has the sense of 'he made' here, then the construction is an object-complement (thus, "Jesus made this [to be] [the] first of his signs"). The object-complement construction makes more explicit the idea of design on the part of Jesus while the other reconstruction of the text only speaks of his power. John 4:54 reads, **touto depal in deuteron shmeiwn epoiksen o[İhsouþ**. Here again the translations all treat **epoiksen** as 'he did.' Although they all seem to recognize the construction to be an object-complement, they weaken its force by treating **epoiksen** as though it belonged in a relative clause (almost as though they were translating **touto depal in h# deuteron shmeiwn o(epoiksen)**). But if **epoiksen** has the force of 'he made' (thus, "Now again, Jesus made this [to be] [the] second sign"), then not only is there design in the selection of miracles recorded (cf. John 20:30-31), but also in the sequence and performance of them as well.

In Phil 3:18 Paul says, **poll oi-gar peripatousoin ouf poll lakij egegon ufiñ, nuñ de kai klaiwn legw [,] touj ekqrouj tou?staurou? tou?Xristou?** If **touj ekqrouj** is in apposition to **ouf**, then there appears to be a change in description, but not a change in status, of the object. One of the problems with this view, however, is the function of **gar**. Unless it is equivalent to **de**, the **poll oi** of v 18 apparently belong to the same camp as "those who are thus walking" (**touj outw peripatouñtaj**) in the previous verse. However, if **legw** has the sense of 'I call,' and if **nuñ de** has a contrastive force rather than a continuative force, then there is an object-complement construction here. If so, it becomes apparent that there is a shift in status from the **ouf** to the **touj ekqrouj** (thus, "For many are walking, about whom often I used to speak to you, but now, even weeping, I call [them] the enemies of the cross of Christ.")<sup>39</sup> Obviously the interpretation of this text cannot be solved on the basis of grammar alone, but the fact that an object-complement construction is at least possible here gives some breathing room to the exegete in this thorny passage.

In Titus 2:9-10 Paul commands Titus to exhort Christian slaves to be obedient to their earthly masters. In v 10 he describes both a negative and a positive aspect of what their conduct is to be. The positive aspect is described in the participial clause **pašan pistin ephdeiknumenouj aqahñ**. Although most would understand **aqahñ** as an attributive adjective modifying **pistin** (thus, "showing forth all good faith"), it is possible that **aqahñ** is a predicate adjective, functioning as the complement to **pistin** (thus, "showing forth all faith [to be] good"). Grammatically and exegetically this may be valid, though the grammarians and exegetes do not mention the possibility.

Although there are other grammatical arguments in favor of a predicate **aqahñ**,<sup>40</sup> the concern here is only with those which are

<sup>39</sup> It should be mentioned that there are several clear examples of the omission of a pronominal object in an object-complement construction (thus paralleling the construction here). Cf. Matt 23:9; John 6:15; Rom 1:22; 2 Cor 11:2; Phil 3:8; I Thess 2:13; 3:15; Heb 11:11; 2 Pet 1:8; 2 John 4.

<sup>40</sup> In particular, the relation of adjective to noun in anarthrous constructions could be cited in favor of a predicate **aqahñ** here. In cursory form, the evidence derived from such a consideration is as follows. In non-equative clauses and phrases I have discovered over forty completely attributive relations in adjective-noun-adjective constructions in the NT (e.g., Matt 7:17; 23:35; Eph 1:3; Rev 18:2). However, none of the constructions involving **paj** and only one other attributive construction had an intervening word between the noun and second adjective (cf. Rom 1:11). Also, seven of the **paj** constructions were in prepositional phrases, a situation which does not parallel Titus 2:10 (e.g., Col 1:10; 2 Tim 3:17; Titus 3:1).

I also discovered thirteen instances in which one adjective was attributive and one was predicate in non-equative clauses/phrases (e.g., Matt 5:36; John 7:23; Col 1:28 [here with **paj** and, interestingly enough, an object-complement construction]). In four instances the second adjective was separated from the noun by an intervening word or

directly relevant to object-complements. By applying the three maxims related to the identification of an object-complement construction, at least the possibility of an object-complement construction here can be established.

First, **eḥdeiknumi** does indeed take an object-complement elsewhere in the NT.<sup>41</sup> Second, there are other instances of object-complements which involve an anarthrous object and a predicate adjective,<sup>42</sup> as well as scores of passages which exhibit the more general parallel of a predicate relation in an anarthrous noun-adjective construction.<sup>43</sup> Third, other exegetical considerations do allow for this possibility,<sup>44</sup> and there are apparently not any contextual factors which exclude it

phrase (cf. Mark 7:2; 8:19; Acts 4:16; Rev 15:1). John 10:32 also has an intervening verb between the noun and adjective (**pol la xega edeica uḥiñ kal a**), but there is ambiguity as to the function of the second adjective.

Therefore, although the attributive constructions outnumbered the constructions in which the second adjective was predicate three to one, the second type of construction commonly had an intervening word between noun and second adjective. Furthermore, none of the definitely attributive relations with **paḥ**; in the first attributive position had an intervening word between the noun and second adjective. Thus, although the construction in Titus 2:10 is similar to wholly attributive constructions in that it has **paḥ** before the noun (but cf. Col 1:28 for an example in which the **paḥ** preceding the noun is attributive and the adjective following is predicate), it is similar to part attributive/ part predicate constructions in that there is an intervening word between the noun and second adjective. There is, then, a good possibility (might one even say, an antecedent probability?) grammatically that **aḡaqha** is a predicate adjective in Titus 2:10.

For more information on the whole area of the relation of adjective to noun in anarthrous constructions, see D. B. Wallace, "The Relation of Adjective to Noun in Anarthrous Constructions in the New Testament" (unpublished Th.M. thesis; Dallas Theological Seminary: May, 1979) and the article by the same title (which is derived from the thesis) in *NovT* 26 (1984) 128-67.

<sup>41</sup>Cf. Rom 2:15. As well, at least one of the cognate verbs also takes an object-complement (**aḥodeiknumi**, 1 Cor 4:9). Furthermore, 2 Macc 9:8 has a precise parallel to Titus 2:10 (**f aneran tou? qeou? paḥsin tha dunamin eḥdeiknumenoi**). This is obviously an object-complement construction because the adjective **f aneran** is outside of the article-noun group **tha dunamin**.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Luke 3:8; John 9:]; Acts 10:28; Col 1:28.

<sup>43</sup> See Wallace, "The Relation of Adjective to Noun"(thesis), Appendix II:73-102 in which almost 400 such constructions are charted. For the more precise parallel, cf. n. 40 above.

<sup>44</sup> The main question exegetically has to do with the meaning of **pistij**. This noun seems to be used in the pastoral epistles frequently as a technical term for the Christian religion (cf. I Tim 1:2; 3:9; 4: 1, 6; 2 Tim 2:18; 3:8; Titus 1:13; 3:15). In two of the three occasions in which **pistij** is modified by an adjective (in Titus 1:4 **koinha** modifies **pistin**, suggesting more about the scope of this faith than about its character), the adjective used is **aḥupokritoj** (cf. I Tim 1:5; 2 Tim 1:5). The author seems concerned that one's faith be a sincere faith. An insincere faith is apparently not genuine (cf. I Tim 1:19; 4:1; 5:8; 6:21; 2 Tim 3:8), but a sincere faith is closely associated with holy

from consideration. Consequently, the antecedent probability is that Titus 2:10 does contain an object-complement construction. If it does then the sense of Titus 2:9-10 could be expressed in the following loose translation: "Slaves should be wholly subject to their masters . . . demonstrating that all [genuine ]<sup>45</sup> faith is productive, with the result<sup>46</sup> that they will completely adorn the doctrine of God."<sup>47</sup>

Again, grammar does not solve all of the exegetical problems by any means, but if the principles for identifying object-complement constructions have any validity at all, then one must at least deal seriously with the possibility of such a construction in Titus 2:10, even though such a possibility apparently has hitherto gone unnoticed.

### Identification of the Components

*General Principles.* With reference to the identification of the components of an object-complement construction, it has already been pointed out that word order is not an infallible guide. Therefore, some other criteria must be used to supplement if not supplant the principle of word order.

On the basis of several strands of evidence, I believe the following overall thesis for solving the problem of the identification of the components can be stated: the object-complement construction is semantically equivalent to the subject-predicate nominative construction. This thesis is the major point of this article. Therefore, any principles which help to resolve the identification of the components in a subject-predicate nominative construction are equally applicable to the object-complement construction. Two points must be established in order to validate this thesis. First, it needs to be established that there is analogy between the two types of constructions. And

behavior (cf. 2 Tim. 3:15-17; Titus 1:13-16--the author links faith with holy behavior outside the pastorals as well (cf. Eph 2:8-10; Col:4, 6, 10)).

Thus if a more technical sense for **pistij** is understood in Titus 2:10 (J. W. Roberts ["Every Scripture Inspired by God," *Restoration Quarterly* 5 (1961) 35] apparently leans toward a more technical sense for **paʃ** here, for he writes, ". . . the context shows that the word *pas* means 'perfect' or 'complete' faith"), the author maybe instructing Titus to exhort slaves to demonstrate that their faith is sincere and that it results in holy behavior.

<sup>45</sup> 'Genuine' may either be implied from the flow of argument or may be considered as part of the field of meaning for **paʃ** when it is used with abstract nouns (cf. BAGD on **paʃ** I. a. 0.). .

<sup>46</sup> **Ina** here is taken as having an ecbatic force.

<sup>47</sup> A further argument to help validate this sense is the possibility of a synthetic parallel between the two halves of v 10 which is evident only when **agaqhm** is taken as a predicate adjective. Thus, to demonstrate that genuine faith is productive is to adorn the doctrine of God.

second, the thesis needs to be tested on specific object-complement constructions.

The following lines of evidence establish, I believe, that the object-complement construction is semantically equivalent to the subject-predicate nominative construction. (1) By definition, both the complement and the predicate nominative make an assertion about another noun in the same case. (2) The terms used to describe the object-complement construction in most grammars strongly suggest such semantic equivalence. As the reader will recall, it was mentioned earlier that many of the major grammars call this construction an object and predicate accusative construction.<sup>48</sup> And Winer goes so far as to call the construction an "accusative of *subject* and predicate [italics mine]."<sup>49</sup> (3) The infinitive of the copula occasionally occurs in an object-complement construction, linking this construction to the subject-predicate nominative construction semantically.<sup>50</sup> (4) Many of the verbs which take an object-complement also take a declarative/recitative **oti** clause (and even, occasionally, some other use of **oti** which involves its own subject-predicate nominative clause) in which there is a subject-predicate nominative construction.<sup>51</sup> (5) Occasionally, the manuscripts even vacillate between an object-complement construction and a subject-predicate nominative construction in a **oti** clause,<sup>52</sup> illustrating that the scribes probably considered the two constructions to be semantically equivalent. (6) As several grammars point out, when a verb which takes an object-complement construction in the active is transformed into a passive, the object becomes the nominative subject and the complement becomes the predicate

<sup>48</sup> See the definition of terms above and n. 8.

<sup>49</sup> Winer, *Treatise*, 285.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. Matt 16:13; Mark 8:27, 29; Luke 9:20; 20:41; 23:2; Acts 5:36; 8:9; 16:5; 17:7; 19:35 (in D), 20:6, 28:6, Rom 1:22, 14:14, 15:8, 16:19, I Cor 7:7, 26, 32, 10:20, 2 Cor 11:16; Phil 3:8, etc.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. John 4: 19; 10:34-36 (though a slightly different situation here); 20:31; Matt 21:26-Mark 11:32; Acts 16:3; Rom 8:18; Phil 2:11; etc.

<sup>52</sup> Cf. Rom 10:9 (**oꝑologhs^j . . . kurion Ihsouh** in most manuscripts; **oꝑologhs^j . . . oti kurioj Ihsouj** in B). We might add here that the biblical authors occasionally vacillate between the two constructions. For example, Mark 11:32 has a mixed construction (object-**oti**-predicate nominative: **eikon ton Iwannhn oꝑwj oti prof hthj hn**) which parallels the object-complement in Matt 21:26 (**wj prof hthn eousin ton Iwannhn**). In John 10:34-35 there are parallel thoughts in which one is an object-complement and the other is direct discourse (though not directly introduced by a recitative **oti**: **oti egw eipa: qeoi este . . . eilekeinouj eipen qeouj**). Notice also v 36 in which the thought is carried on: **uioj tou qeou eimi**). Cf. also Rom 9:25 and I Pet 2:10 for a similar parallel.

nominative.<sup>53</sup> (7) Occasionally, such a passive transform is in a parallel text to an object-complement.<sup>54</sup> (8) "The predicate nom. and the predicate acc. are somet. replaced by **ειj** w. acc.",<sup>55</sup> suggesting that both constructions were treated as semantically identical by the biblical and Koine writers. (9) Finally, the few principles which the grammars do mention for distinguishing object from complement are identical with the ones they suggest for distinguishing subject from predicate nominative.<sup>56</sup>

Now all of this may seem like a case of linguistic overkill. However, by firmly establishing that the object-complement construction is semantically equivalent to the subject-predicate nominative construction, it is possible to make logical deductions both with regard to the identification of the components and with regard to the semantics of the construction.<sup>57</sup>

Having established that the object-complement construction is semantically equivalent to the subject-predicate nominative construction, principles used in identifying the components in this latter construction can now be applied to the former. Unfortunately, as McGaughy laments, "Although the problem of subject identification . . . appears to be elementary, traditional grammars provide little or no help in solving it."<sup>58</sup> The introductory grammar by Goetchius is a rare exception.<sup>59</sup> Therefore, I will begin with his principles, making

<sup>53</sup> Cf. Robertson, *Grammar*, 485; Radermacher, *Grammatik*, 120; Goodwin and Gulick, *Greek Grammar*, 228; Kuhner, *Grammar*, 398. For examples of texts, cf. Matt 21:13; Luke 1:76; 15:21; Acts 1:23; 4:36; 10:5, 18, 32; 11:13; 1 Cor 4:2; 2 Cor 5:3; Gal 2:11; Rev 5:4; etc.

<sup>54</sup> For similar texts (though not strictly parallel), cf. Luke 1:13 (**καλεσειj τοϝομα αυτου? Ιωαννην**), v 59 (**εκαλουν αυτου . . . Ζαχαριαν**), and 2:21 (**εκληqh τοϝομα αυτου? Ιησουj**). These may be considered parallel in the sense that the verbage is similar though expressed by two different constructions.

<sup>55</sup> BAGD, s.v., "**ειj**," 230. sec. 8.

<sup>56</sup> Normally the only principle mentioned for either construction is that the article will be with subject/object, but not with predicate nominative/complement. Goetchius is a lone exception, giving five principles by which to identify the subject and predicate nominative. Furthermore, he does, via analogy, apply these principles to the object-complement construction (cf. *Language*, 45-46, 142).

<sup>57</sup> Although the exegetical implications are far greater in relation to the semantics of the construction, it is necessary first to establish this semantic equivalence argument in consideration of the identification of the components.

<sup>58</sup> L. C. McGaughy, *Toward a Descriptive Analysis of Eitai as a Linking Verb in New Testament Greek* (Missoula: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972) 25.

<sup>59</sup> Of the more traditional grammars, S. G. Green (*Handbook to the Grammar of the Greek Testament* [revised ed.; New York: Fleming H. Revell, n.d.] 179) is the only one examined to mention that, besides the fact that the subject will have the article, the subject will often be a pronoun.

refinements along the way.<sup>60</sup> Goetchius states:

We may lay it down as a general principle that, if two nouns in the nominative case are connected by an equative verb in Greek, the more definite of the two is the subject. Thus:

- (a) If one of the two nouns is a proper name, it is the subject. . . .
- (b) If only one of the nouns has the article, it is the subject. . . .
- (c) If both nouns are equally definite (or indefinite), the one which has the narrower reference is the subject. . . .
- (d) If one of the two nouns has been referred to in the immediately preceding context, it is the subject. . . .
- (e) If an equative verb joins a noun to a pronoun, the pronoun is the subject. . . .<sup>61</sup>

From a pragmatic point of view, only two refinements need to be made of Goetchius' principles. (1) The grid of definiteness vs. indefiniteness is overly simplistic. One should at least bear in mind that this semantic range is not cut and dried. Rather, there is a continuum from indefiniteness to qualitiveness to definiteness.<sup>62</sup> (2) Goetchius apparently does not believe that the subject-predicate nominative construction can sometimes be a convertible proposition.<sup>63</sup> If so, he virtually stands alone among grammarians.<sup>64</sup>

<sup>60</sup> From a linguistic standpoint, McGaughy's critique of Goetchius' principles is well taken (*Analysis of Eitai*, 29-33; cf. 36-54 for McGaughy's solution). However, from a practical standpoint, Goetchius' treatment does solve the problems in most cases.

<sup>61</sup> Goetchius, *Language*, 46.

<sup>62</sup> P. B. Harner has ably pointed out the importance of seeing this continuum ("Qualitative Anarthrous Predicate Nouns: Mark 15:39 and John 1:1," *JBL* 92 [1973] 75-87). Perhaps the grid of general to specific might be better nomenclature (so M. Zerwick, *Biblical Greek Illustrated by Examples* [Rome: Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici, 1963] 55).

<sup>63</sup> Goetchius (*Language*, 46) uses I John 3:4 as an example of his principle '(c)' with the suggestion that "there are other kinds of lawlessness besides sin." McGaughy (*Analysis of Eitai*, 32-33) rightly questions Goetchius' use of I John 3:4 in this way: "rule (c) must be questioned since the meaning of 'definite-indefinite' has been shifted from a grammatical to a semantic one. In the example under this rule Goetchius explains that he has chosen **anartia** as the subject of the sentence because '. . . there are other kinds of lawlessness besides sin.' In other words, sin is the subject, according to Goetchius, because it is the more definite of the two concepts. If one were to interpret this verse theologically, however, he could argue for just the opposite interpretation on the basis of Goetchius' rule: **haphomia** is the subject because there are other kinds of sin besides lawlessness. In either case, the point to be noted is that the determination of the subject on the basis of rule (c) is arbitrary and inadmissible, therefore, as a grammatical rule."

<sup>64</sup> Cf. Robertson, *Grammar*, 768; Zerwick, *Biblical Greek*, 56; Harner, "Qualitative Anarthrous Predicate Nouns," 75, 77; et al. Robertson (*Grammar*, 769), in fact, uses Goetchius' same proof text (I John 3:4) as an illustration of a convertible proposition!

As far as the application of these principles to the object-complement construction is concerned, all that needs to be said here is that they are, indeed, valid. Of the more than sixty constructions examined in which the order had been reversed between object and substantival complement, the identification of the object could be positively made in every instance by using these principles.<sup>65</sup> The verification of this is that in only one passage was there even a slight possibility of confusion between the object and complement.<sup>66</sup> Therefore, our examination of the reversed order in object-complement constructions has overwhelmingly confirmed the thesis that the object-complement construction is semantically equivalent to the subject-predicate nominative construction.

*Exegetically Significant Texts.* The only exegetically significant text which is affected by the issue of the identification of the components is also the only one which was slightly ambiguous. But both the context and the fact that one accusative had the article rendered the components in John 5:18 as clearly identifiable. The text reads **patera idon egen ton qeon**. It must, of course, be rendered, "he called God his own father," rather than, "he called his own father God."

<sup>65</sup> For examples involving a proper noun as the object, cf. Matt 3:9; 21:26; 27:22; Luke 3:8; Acts 8:37 (v.1.); 17:7; Rom 10:9; Rev 9:11. For examples involving a pronoun as the object, cf. Matt 14:5; 21:46; Mark 10:6; John 16:2; 19:7, 12; Acts 2:36; 17:22; Rom 4:17; 2 Cor 11:16; Gal 4:14; Phil 3:17; 1 Pet 3:6; I John 1:10. For examples involving the definite article with the object, cf. Matt 16:13; John 8:41; Phil 2:6; Heb 7:24; 11:26; Jas 5:10; I Pet 1:17; 2:16.

I would also suggest that this analogy between the object-complement and subject-predicate nominative constructions is valid in distinguishing the subject of an infinitive from a predicate accusative. Thus, whereas H. R. Moeller and A. Kramer ("An Overlooked Structural Pattern in New Testament Greek," *NovT* 5 [1962] 27) argue for word order as the normal guide when one is faced with "two consecutive case substantives constructed with an infinitive," when such a construction also involves an object-complement, there is a better semantic approach than mere word order. Perhaps the principles for distinguishing subject from predicate nominative are even valid for *all* seventy-seven infinitival constructions examined by Moeller and Kramer (and would thus supplant their word order principle which, at bottom, strikes me more as a phenomenological approach than a semantic one).

<sup>66</sup> I.e., in all but one text (John 5:18) the considerations of sense determined what was object and what was complement. In all of these the 'rules' coincided with the obvious sense of the passage. John 5:18 was the lone exception for, apart from these 'rules,' one could conceivably see **patera** as object and **ton qeon** as complement. However, in light of the overall context, such a meaning would be absurd. And even if the context had been ambiguous, since the validity of the 'rules' has been established in all other reversed order constructions, such grammatical evidence would be wholly on the side of taking **patera** as complement and **ton qeon** as object.

### The Semantics of the Construction

*General Principles.* With reference to the semantics of the construction, the main question has to do with the difference in force between the order object followed by complement and the order complement followed by object. In order to resolve this issue, one can start with the established thesis that an object-complement construction is semantically equivalent to a subject-predicate nominative construction.

Specifically, a "rule" developed by E. C. Colwell comes into consideration here. In an article in *JBL* in 1933, Colwell stated the following rule: "Definite predicate nouns which precede the verb usually lack the article."<sup>67</sup> He went on to point out that "a predicate nominative which precedes the verb cannot be translated as an indefinite or a "qualitative" noun solely because of the absence of the article; if the context suggests that the predicate is definite, it should be translated as a definite noun. . . "<sup>68</sup> The implication from this study is that to the extent that Colwell's rule is applicable to predicate nominatives it is equally applicable to predicate accusatives. But before making the transfer from nominative to accusative, a warning is in order. Colwell's rule has been abused almost from the time it was penned. Most grammarians and exegetes have assumed the converse of Colwell's rule to be equally true, namely, that anarthrous predicate nominatives which precede the copula will usually be definite. But such is not the case, as Harner<sup>69</sup> and Dixon<sup>70</sup> pointed out. Suffice it

<sup>67</sup> E. C. Colwell, "A Definite Rule for the Use of the Article in the Greek New Testament," *JBL* 52 (1933) 20.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>69</sup> Harner, "Qualitative Anarthrous Predicate Nouns," 75-87.

<sup>70</sup> P. S. Dixon, "The Significance of the Anarthrous Predicate Nominative in John," (unpublished Th.M. thesis; Dallas Theological Seminary, 1975). Dixon illustrates the illegitimate application of the converse of Colwell's rule: "The rule does not say: an anarthrous predicate nominative which precedes the verb is definite. This is the converse of Colwell's rule and as such is not a valid inference. (From the statement 'A implies B,' it is not valid to infer 'B implies A.' From the statement 'Articular nouns are definite,' it is not valid to infer 'Definite predicate nominatives are articular.' Likewise, from the statement 'Definite predicate nominatives preceding the verb are anarthrous,' it is not valid to infer 'Anarthrous predicate nominatives preceding the verb are definite.')." (pp. 11-12).

The problem, methodologically speaking, is that Colwell began his study with a semantic category (definite predicate nominatives which precede the verb) rather than a structural category (anarthrous predicate nominatives which precede the verb). This problem was compounded by the fact that Colwell assumed definiteness in certain passages (e.g., John 1:1) which were highly debatable. Both Harner and Dixon began with structural categories and determined the semantic range of such. Their conclusions were virtually identical: anarthrous predicate nominatives which precede the verb are usually qualitative (cf. Harner, "Qualitative Anarthrous Predicate Nouns," 87; Dixon, "Anarthrous Predicate Nominatives," 54-55).

to say here that anarthrous pre-copulative predicate nominatives will fall within the semantic range of qualitative-definite<sup>71</sup> and anarthrous post-copulative predicate nominatives will usually fall within the semantic range of qualitative-indefinite.<sup>72</sup>

Unfortunately, the application of Colwell's rule to the object-complement construction is severely hampered by the fact that (1) the infinitive of the copula does not usually occur and (2) when it is present, the complement usually follows the verb.<sup>73</sup>

However, there is a further implication derived from Colwell's study which may prove beneficial to the issue at hand. I have discovered that, as a general rule, in verbless sentences, when the predicate nominative precedes the subject it has the same semantic range as though it had preceded a verb.<sup>74</sup> Thus, by analogy, when an

<sup>71</sup> Cf. Harner, "Qualitative Anarthrous Predicate Nouns," 75-87 and Dixon, "Anarthrous Predicate Nominatives," 31-53, 54-55. As well, from my cursory observation of this phenomenon in the entire NT, I would agree substantially with their conclusions (allowing for a somewhat higher percentage of definite predicate nominatives), noting that I have not discovered one clear example of an indefinite pre-copulative anarthrous predicate nominative. (The implication of this for John 1:1, then, is still that, on grammatical grounds, the translation of **qeoꝓ h# o[logoꝓ** as "the Word was a god" is inadmissible.) The passages in the NT which contain an anarthrous pre-copulative predicate nominative that I have discovered thus far are: Matt 4:3, 6; 5:34, 35 (twice); 12:8, 50; 13:39 (twice); 14:26, 33; 23:8, 10; 27:40, 42, 54; Mark 2:28; 3:35; 6:49; 11:17, 32; 12:35; 14:70; 15:39; Luke 4:3, 9, 22; 5:8; 6:5; 11:48; 22:59; 23:6; John 1:1, 12, 14, 49; 2:9; 3:4, 6 (twice), 29; 4:9, 19; 5:27; 6:63 (twice), 70; 7:12; 8:31, 33, 34, 37, 39, 42, 44 (twice), 48, 54; 9:5, 8, 17, 24, 25, 27, 28, 31; 10:1, 2, 8, 13, 33, 34, 36; 11:49, 51; 12:6, 36, 50; 13:35; 15:14; 17:17; 18:26, 35, 37 (twice); 19:21; Acts 3:15; 7:26, 33, 52; 9:15; 10:27, 36; 13:33; 16:3, 17 (v. 1.), 21, 37; 22:27, 29; 23:6, 27; 28:4; Rom 1:9; 13:4 (twice), 6; 14:23; I Cor 1:18 (twice); 2:14; 3:16, 19; 4:4, 16; 6:15, 16, 19; 11:3 (twice); 2 Cor 1:24; 2:15; 6:16; 11:22 (thrice), 23; Gal 3:29; 4:1, 25, 28; 5:4; Phil 2:13; I Thess 5:5; I Tim 6:2, 10; Heb 1:5, 10; 3:6; 5:5, 13; 9:15; 11:16; Jas 1:27; 2:23; 4:4; 5:17; I John 1:5; 2:2, 4; 4:8; and Rev 17:4; 21:22.

<sup>72</sup> Cf. Harner, "Qualitative Anarthrous Predicate Nouns," 76.

<sup>73</sup> It should be noted here that the verb which takes the object-complement construction only introduces the construction but does not play a part in the semantic equivalence of this construction with the subject-predicate nominative construction. Therefore, its position is inconsequential with regard to the semantic range of the substantival complement (cf., e.g., Mark 11:17 and Luke 19:46; I Cor 9:5).

<sup>74</sup> When an anarthrous predicate nominative stands before the subject, it will either be qualitative or definite. This is apparently due to the fact that (1) had the verb been present, it more than likely would have come after the predicate nominative (thus approximating the semantic range of the anarthrous pre-copulative predicate nominative), and (2) by placing the predicate nominative before the subject, an author is making the predicate nominative emphatic (cf. BDF, 248) and if emphatic, then by the nature of the case, it is moving toward the semantic range of qualitative-definite and away from the semantic range of indefinite-qualitative (since it is difficult to conceive of an indefinite predicate nominative being emphasized, though not entirely impossible). A few illustrations ought to suffice. In John 4:24 Jesus says to the woman at the well, **pneuŋa o[qeoꝓ**. The anarthrous predicate nominative comes before the subject and

anarthrous complement precedes the object, it will fall within the semantic range of qualitative-definite. And when an anarthrous complement follows the object, it will tend to fall within the semantic range of qualitative-indefinite.

For example, when Jesus is called **uiɸj qeou? aɸqrwpou** in an object-complement construction, either **uiɸn** is anarthrous and precedes the object (as in John 19:7), or it is articular and follows the object (as in Matt 16:13). When this is compared with the subject-predicate nominative constructions, the same pattern emerges. Thus, in John 10:36 **uiɸj** is anarthrous and it precedes the verb, while in John 20:31 and 1 John 5:5 it is articular and it follows the verb.<sup>75</sup>

*Exegetically Significant Texts.* There are literally scores of exegetically significant passages which are affected by the issue of the semantics of the object-complement construction.<sup>76</sup> However, one passage in particular holds some interest for me. In Rom 10:9 there is, apparently, a soteriological-christological confession: **ɸn oɸnlogh< s^j ɸ t&?stomati sou kurion Ihsouh . . . swqhs^**. Not only is this passage exegetically significant, but it serves as an ideal model text to illustrate the validity of all three issues related to the object-complement construction. Therefore, this passage will be approached one issue at a time.

there is no verb. Here, despite the KJV's rendering, **pneuma** is most certainly qualitative, stressing the nature or essence of God. In Phil 2:11 Paul proclaims that **kurioj Ihsouj Xristoj** ("Jesus Christ is Lord"). Here, as in John 4:24, there is no copula and the anarthrous predicate nominative precedes the subject. In light of the allusion to Isa 45:23, it is most probable that **kurioj** should be taken as definite ("the Lord"). In the least, it should be taken as qualitative, not indefinite. By the use of parallel passages it is possible to confirm the semantic equivalence a bit further. Phil 1:8 reads **martuj gar mou oɸqeoɸj**. Rom 1:9 reads **martuj gar mou eɸtin oɸqeoɸj**. The force of the two constructions appears to be identical, though only in one is the verb present. However, in both constructions the predicate nominative precedes the subject. Rom 10:4 reads **teɸoj gar nomou Xristoj** in which the sense is most probably, "Christ is the end of the law." Cf. also Mark 13:8 and 1 Thess 4:6 for other examples.

<sup>75</sup> For other texts which seem to demonstrate this analogy, cf. Matt 21:26 with Mark 11:32 (in which the construction in Matt 21:26 is a reversed order object-complement and the construction in Mark 11:32 approximates an anarthrous pre-copulative predicate nominative [see discussion in n.52]); 1 Pet 1:17; John 19:7 with Matt 26:63. For examples of the semantic range of qualitative-indefinite for a complement which follows the object, cf. Mark 12:23 (note that **eɸxon auɸna gunaika** ["they had her as a wife"] is parallel to the subject-predicate nominative construction in the first part of the verse: **tinoj auɸwn eɸtai gunh<** ["for which of them shall she be a wife?"]); John 10:33 (in which both **aɸqrwpoɸj** and **qeon** are apparently qualitative, stressing the nature or essence of Jesus); Luke 20:43 (Acts 2:35 and Heb 1:13); Acts 26:28; Rev 3: 12.

<sup>76</sup> Cf., e.g., Matt 10:25; 22:43, 45; Mark 12:37; Luke 20:6, 41; 23:2; John 4:46; 5:18; 10:33, 35, 36; 19:7; Acts 2:36; 13:23; 14:5; 17:7; 28:6; Rom 2:19; 2 Cor 4:5; Phil 2:6, 11; 2 Thess 2:4; 1 Pet 1:17; 2:3 (v. 1.); 3:6, 15; 1 John 1:10 and 5:10 (cf. John 8:44).

(1) The first question that needs to be asked here is, Is this an object-complement construction? In answer to that, note that it meets all three of the principles used in identifying an object-complement construction: (a) **ofnol ogew** is used elsewhere with the object-complement construction;<sup>77</sup> (b) there are several clear instances of an object-complement construction involving two anarthrous nouns, thus affording a parallel to this text;<sup>78</sup> and (c) not only are there no contextual factors barring the object-complement from consideration here, but there are in fact compelling factors to argue in its favor.<sup>79</sup> Consequently, the antecedent probability is extremely high that this construction is, indeed, an object-complement.

(2) The next question involves the identification of the components. The analogy of the subject-predicate nominative construction indicates that the proper noun, **Ihsouñ**, must be the object and **kurion** its complement.

(3) Finally, the semantics of the construction needs to be examined. Specifically, what is the meaning of **kurion** here? Because it precedes the object, it has already been established that it falls within the qualitative-definite range. If qualitative, then the meaning is probably "master." If definite, then the meaning is more likely "Yahweh" (i.e., "the Lord").<sup>80</sup> I believe that the meaning "Yahweh" is probably what is meant here. In support of this are the following lines of evidence.

(a) From my count, there are five other passages in which the assertion is made that Jesus Christ is Lord (i.e., **kurioj** is not in simple apposition with **Ihsouj** / **Xristoj**, but the two are in a predicate relation). In Col 2:6, the most dubious example, the text reads **parelabete ton Xriston Ihsouñ ton kurion**. This may be read, "you received Christ Jesus the Lord" (a statement in which no predication is made), or "you received Christ Jesus [as] the Lord" (an object-complement construction). If the construction is an object-complement, it is not insignificant that, although the complement

<sup>77</sup> Cf. John 9:22; I John 4:1; 2 John 7. Curiously, Robertson only admits these, ignoring Rom 10:9 (480), contra BDF (86).

<sup>78</sup> Cf. Luke 23:2; 2 Cor 5:4; Jas 1:2; Rev 9:11.

<sup>79</sup> Although the force of **ofnol oge,w** is most compelling on the side of an object-complement, I found the Douay and *KJV* to deny the construction here; and of the modern texts examined, I found the same error curiously enough 'preserved' only in the *New KJV*.

<sup>80</sup> The qualitative idea, of course, would stress more what he does rather than specifying who he is (cf. I Pet 3:6). A definite **kurion** would probably have a *par excellence* force to it. Thus, by implication, since Yahweh is the one who deserves the name "Lord" above all others, Yahweh could well be implied by a definite **kurion**.

(**kurion**) follows the object (**Xriston Ihsouh**), it too has the article.<sup>81</sup> 2 Cor 4:5 records the apostle's proclamation: **khrussonen . . . Xriston Ihsouh kurion**. Since Paul has placed the complement (**kurion**) after the object (**Xriston Ihsouh**), and has not added the article, this could be an exception to the suggestion made here about Rom 10:9 (i.e., it seems, by the grammatical principles laid down, that Paul is only declaring Christ to be master here, not Yahweh). But the context makes it clear that the author's emphasis is indeed that Christ is master, without reference to his deity, for the apostle goes on with the mildly antithetic parallel: **khrussonen . . . eputouj dedoulouj**. Therefore, this text in no way nullifies the proposal for Rom 10:9. In I Cor 12:3 the apostle puts up the challenge: **oudeij dunatai eipeih: Kurioj Ihsouj eihhreh pneumati agi&**. There is dissension among the Greek witnesses, with several of the key Western and Byzantine texts converting this into the accusative (and hence, an object-complement construction). But even in these manuscripts, the order is the same.<sup>82</sup> These three texts, in the least, do not argue against the view of Rom 10:9 suggested here. In the first text (Col 2:6), the complement followed the object and was articular; in the second (2 Cor 4:5), though the complement was anarthrous, it was argued that Paul's emphasis was on Christ as master, not as Yahweh; and in the third (1 Cor 12:3), the statement and word order were parallel to Rom 10:9.

There are two other texts, however, which make a substantial contribution to this discussion. In one, Phil 2:11, a subject-predicate nominative construction is in a **oti** clause (**eol mologhshtai oti kurioj Ihsouj Xristoj**); in the other, 1 Pet 3:15, there is a probable object-complement construction introduced by **agiazw** (**kurion dexton Xriston agiasate**). In both of these texts, there is an allusion to the OT and specifically to Yahweh himself (Isa 45:23 and 8:13 respectively).<sup>83</sup> Thus, in the two parallel passages where the **kurioj** clearly

<sup>81</sup> This, of course, is in keeping with Colwell's rule which asserts that a definite predicate nominative will either lack the article and precede the verb or have the article and follow the verb (or, in this case, the object).

<sup>82</sup> This text is in reality parallel to Rom 10:9 for it too makes a particular confession the test of faith. Rom 10:9 should be the basis for interpreting I Cor 12:3, rather than vice versa, because the evidence for I Cor 12:3 is far more scanty than in the Romans text.

<sup>83</sup> Isa 45:23 reads, כִּי־לִי תִכְרַע כָּל־בֶּרֶךְ תִּשְׁבַּע צֶל־לְשׁוֹן (cf. vv21-22 for the identification of the speaker as God [v 22—אֱלֹהִים אֲנִי־אֵל], i.e., Yahweh [v 21—אֲנִי יְהוָה]), and the LXX translates, **oti ehoikanyei pan gonu kai eolomlogysetai pa&sa glw&sa t&? qe&?** Paul quotes this text in Rom 14:11 with reference to God and alludes to it in Phil 2:11 with reference to Jesus. Isa 8:13 reads, אֵת־יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת אַתָּה תִקְדֵּשׁ (LXX: **kurion au&ton agiasate**). (Note that the direct object marker אַתָּה makes possible an object-complement

refers to Yahweh, even though this predicate noun is anarthrous, the biblical author places it before the object/subject to indicate that it is definite. Apparently, not only was the article unnecessary, but the reversed order seems to be the 'normal' way to express the idea that **kurioj** is definite.<sup>84</sup>

(b) Codex Vaticanus strays from the pack in Rom 10:9, changing the object-complement to a subject-predicate nominative construction following **oti**. If the preceding argument has any validity at all, then the variant only strengthens the view that **kurion** is equivalent to Yahweh here.

(c) Finally, Paul continues his message in v 13 by adding a quote from Joel 3:5, "Everyone who calls upon the name of the Lord shall be saved." The Hebrew text of Joel 3:5 has יהוה for 'Lord' here. In vv 11 and 12 of Rom 10, Christ is still clearly in view; thus, to suggest that **kurioj** refers to the Father ignores the obvious connection Paul is making here: to confess that Jesus is Lord is to confess that he is the Lord of v 13. If so, then the confession is of Jesus as Yahweh.

### CONCLUSION

The object-complement construction can be profitably put through the structure-semantics grid. Three issues with respect to this construction were raised in this study: (1) the identification of the construction, (2) the identification of the components, and (3) the semantics of the construction. With reference to the identification of the construction, three principles were suggested: (a) the verb related to the construction must be able to take an object-complement, (b) the specifics of the structure in question must have parallels in positively identified object-complements, and (c) there must be strong contextual overrides to prevent one from so tagging such a construction.

Under the heading of the identification of the components the major thesis of the paper was stated, namely, the object-complement construction is semantically equivalent to the subject-predicate nominative construction. Hence, the guidelines for one are guidelines for the other--both with reference to the identification of the components and with reference to the force of the construction semantically.

construction in the Hebrew; the Greek is very clear. Elsewhere in the LXX, **agiazw** takes an object-complement [cf. Exod 29:1 and 30:30 and the discussion of these texts in n. 32].)

<sup>84</sup> It is possible that the article was not added to **kurioj** in order to distinguish the subject/object from the predicate noun.

Concerning the semantics of the construction, it was noted that when the order was complement then object, the complement would fall within the semantic range of qualitative-definite. When the complement followed the object it would tend to fall within the range of qualitative- indefinite.

With application to exegesis, just a few of the scores of passages affected by this study were noted. Among them, Titus 2:10 and Rom 10:9 received lengthy treatments and I suggested that the perseverance of the saints and the deity of Christ were implicit in these texts, respectively.

In conclusion, although the reader may find some of the exegetical suggestions stated herein to be debatable, he should remember that the purpose of this paper is not primarily to come to exegetical conclusions, but to raise exegetical questions on the basis of a better understanding of the semantics of a particular grammatical construction. Therefore, if the grammatical arguments set forth in this paper help the exegete to see new possibilities (e.g., in Titus 2: 10; John 2:11; 4:54), or to strengthen old views (e.g., in John 5:18; Rom 10:9), this purpose has been accomplished.

This material is cited with gracious permission from:

Grace Theological Seminary  
200 Seminary Dr.  
Winona Lake, IN 46590  
[www.grace.edu](http://www.grace.edu)

Please report any errors to Ted Hildebrandt at: [thildebrandt@gordon.edu](mailto:thildebrandt@gordon.edu)