9-1-2014

An Analysis of the Attributive Participle and the Relative Clause in the Greek New Testament

Michael Hayes
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, mhayes@stjohnsorange.org

AN ANALYSIS OF THE ATTRIBUTIVE PARTICIPLE AND THE RELATIVE CLAUSE IN THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT

A Dissertation Presented to the Faculty of
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of Exegetical Theology
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

By
Michael E. Hayes
September 2014

Approved by _____

James W. Voelz   Advisor

_____

Jeffrey A. Oschwald   Reader

_____

David R. Maxwell   Reader

In Memory of Byron Douglas Porisch, foremost of my fathers in the faith, 1950–2013

λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὕτως χαρὰ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἔσται ἐπὶ ἑνὶ ἁμαρτωλῷ μετανοοῦντι ἢ ἐπὶ ἐνενήκοντα ἐννέα δικαίοις, οἵτινες οὐ χρείαν ἔχουσιν μετανοίας.

Jesus of Nazareth (Luke 15:7)

CONTENTS

ILLUSTRATIONS

TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

COPYRIGHT ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

ASV   *American Standard Version of the Holy Bible*. New York: Thomas
                 Nelson & Sons, 1901.

BDAG   Bauer, Walter, Frederick W. Danker, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur
                 Gingrich. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other
                 Early Christian Literature*. 3d ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press,
                 2000.

BHS   Karl Elliger and Willhelm Rudolph, eds. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*.
                 5th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997.

BYZ   Robinson, Maurice A. and William G. Pierpont. *The New Testament in
                 the Original Greek: Byzantine Textform*. Southborough, Mass: Chilton,
                 2005.

CAB   *La Biblia*. Barcelona: Herder, 2003.

DNT   Ioannidis, Symeon. *Discipleship New Testament in Modern Greek*.
                 Chattanooga, Tenn.: AMG Publishers, 2011.

ECM   Institut für Neutestamentliche Textforschung, hrsg. *Novum Testamentum
                 Graecum editio critica maior.*, IV: Die katholische Briefe. 1. Lieferung:
                 Der Jakobusbrief. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997.

                 Institut für Neutestamentliche Textforschung, hrsg. *Novum Testamentum
                 Graecum editio critica maior.*, IV: Die katholische Briefe. 2. Lieferung:
                 Der Petrusbriefe. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2000.

                 Institut für Neutestamentliche Textforschung, hrsg. *Novum Testamentum
                 Graecum editio critica maior.*, IV: Die katholische Briefe. 3. Lieferung:
                 Der 1. Johannesbrief. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2003.

                 Institut für Neutestamentliche Textforschung, hrsg. *Novum Testamentum
                 Graecum editio critica maior* . IV: Die katholische Briefe. 4. Lieferung:
                 Zweite und Dritte Johannesbrief. Der Judasbrief. Stuttgart: Deutsche
                 Bibelgesellschaft, 2005.

ESV   *The Holy Bible: English Standard Version*. Crossway Bibles, 2007.

GWN   *God's Word Translation*. Holiday, Florida: Green Key Books, 2003.

LBA   *La Biblia De Las Américas*. The Lockman Foundation, 1986.

MET   *Metaglottisis Greek New Testament*. Spiridon Karalis, 2004.

NA^{27} Aland, Barbara, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger, eds. *Novum Testamentum Graece,* Nestle-Aland. 27th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgeksellschaft, 1998.

NASB^{95} *New American Standard Bible.* The Lockman Foundation, 1995.

NASB^{77} *New American Standard Bible.* The Lockman Foundation, 1977.

NEG   *Nouvelle Édition de la Bible.* Société Biblique de Genève, 1975.

NIV   *The Holy Bible: New International Version.* Colorado Springs, International Bible Society, 1984.

NKJV   *Holy Bible: The New King James Version.* Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1982.

NRSV   *New Revised Standard Version.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.

NVI   *La Santa Biblia, Nueva Versión Internacional.* Colorado Springs: International Bible Society, 1999.

PER   *Biblia del Peregrino.* Bilbao: Mensajero, 1997.

R95   Reina, Casiodoro de, and Cipriano de Valera. *Santa Biblia: Reina-Valera 1995.* Bogotá, Colombia: Sociedades Bíblicas Unidas, 1995.

RSV   *Revised Standard Version.* New York: Thomas Nelson, 1971.

RVA   Reina, Casiodoro de, and Cipriano de Valera. *Santa Biblia: Antiguo y Nuevo Testamentos : Versión Reina-Valera Actualizada.* El Paso, Texas: Editorial Mundo Hispano, 1989.

SBLGNT   Holmes, Michael W. ed. *The Greek New Testament: SBL Edition.* Atlanta Georgia: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010.

SRV   *La Santa Biblia: Reina-Valera: Antiguo Testamento y Nuevo Testamento.* 1909.

TGV   *The Holy Bible in Today's Greek Version with Deuterocanonicals.* New York: American Bible Society, 2011.

TWOT   Harris, R. Laird, Gleason L. Archer Jr. and Bruce K. Waltke. *The Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament.* Chicago: Moody Press, 1980.

WH   Westcott, Brooke Foss, and Fenton John Anthony Hort. *The Greek New Testament: with Comparative Apparatus Showing Variations from the Nestle-Aland and Robinson-Pierpont Editions*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2007.

ABSTRACT

Hayes, Michael, E. "An Analysis of the Attributive Participle and the Relative Clause in the Greek New Testament." Ph.D. diss., Concordia Seminary, 2014. 379 pp.

Many New Testament Greek grammarians assert that the Greek attributive participle and the Greek relative clause are "equivalent." A survey of those assertions reveals a lack of comprehensive and original research with respect to this grammatical "rule."

James W. Voelz originally asserted that the two constructions were equivalent. In recent times, however, he has made exploratory observations concerning the restrictive nature of attributive participles and the possible nonrestrictive nature of relative clauses, thereby questioning the notion of equivalence. His observations have served as an impetus to reassess these grammatical constructions especially with respect to the restrictive/nonrestrictive distinction.

The present work puts forth the findings of an analysis of every attributive participle and relative clause in the Greek New Testament. The linguistic categories of restrictivity and nonrestrictivity are thoroughly presented. Multiple restrictive and nonrestrictive clauses (both attributive participles and relative clauses) are analyzed and general tendencies are noted. The Accessibility Hierarchy provides a helpful framework for accurately comparing the two constructions, focusing the central and critical analysis to the *subject* relative clause and the attributive participle.

The analysis of the present work leads to the conclusion that with respect to the restrictive/nonrestrictive distinction these two constructions could in no way be described as "equivalent." The attributive participle is primarily utilized to restrict its antecedent except under certain prescribed circumstances, and when both constructions are grammatically and stylistically feasible, the relative clause is predominantly utilized to relate nonrestrictively to its antecedent. As a result, this study serves as a call to clarity and correction for New Testament Greek grammarians, exegetes/commentators, and modern editors and translators of the Greek New Testament.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION: AN ANALYSIS OF THE ATTRIBUTIVE PARTICIPLE AND THE RELATIVE CLAUSE IN THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT

> And let us be sure of this: we will not long preserve the gospel without the languages. The languages are the sheath in which this sword of the Spirit is contained; they are the casket in which this jewel is enshrined; they are the vessel in which this wine is held; they are the larder in which this food is stored; and, as the gospel itself points out, they are the baskets in which are kept these loaves and fishes and fragments. If through our neglect we let the languages go (which God forbid!), we shall . . . lose the gospel.[1]

Martin Luther, in "To The Councilmen of All Cities in Germany That They Establish and Maintain Christian Schools," asserts the necessity for studying the Scriptures in the original languages.[2] Luther condemns the Waldensian brothers upon their disregard for the Biblical languages when he states, "In short, they may lead saintly lives and teach sacred things among themselves, but so long as they remain without the languages they cannot but lack what all the rest lack, namely, the ability to treat Scripture with certainty and thoroughness and to be useful to other nations."[3] This sentiment demonstrates the underlying motivation for this dissertation, namely to treat Scripture with "thoroughness."

This thoroughness is not an end in itself but exists "to be useful to other nations" by bringing clarity not only to the exegesis of the Greek New Testament but its translation into other languages. The theologian and pastor must not merely utilize translated texts but must work in

---

[1] Martin Luther, "To The Councilmen of All Cities in Germany That They Establish and Maintain Christian Schools," in *The Christian In Society II* (ed. Walther I. Brandt; vol. 45 of *Luther's Works,* ed. Helmut T. Lehmann; Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1962), 360.

[2] *LW,* 45:357–66.

the original languages of the Bible with thoroughness. Our study aids exegetes to interpret the

text more readily with thoroughness so that all nations might be able to rightly understand its

message.

Amongst its many roles, the Church serves as steward of the Scriptures. If the Church does

not seek linguistic clarity at all levels, it neglects its duty to preserve, guard, and bring the

message of the Scriptures to all nations. This study seeks to add to this linguistic understanding

through analyzing the attributive participle and the relative clause in the Greek New Testament.

The problem we aim to address consists of a lack of clarity concerning how rightly to

interpret certain adjectival clauses (both attributive participles and relative clauses). For example,

the exegete/translator has some decisions to make with the relative clause in Rom 11:2a: οὐκ

ἀπώσατο ὁ θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ὃν προέγνω. The NIV translates the clause, "God did not reject

his people, whom he foreknew," while the ESV translates the clause, "God has not rejected his

people whom he foreknew." By placing the comma after *people*, the NIV seems to be saying

something additional about God's people. That is, God did not reject all of his people, and by the

way, he foreknew all his people. The ESV, however, by not placing the comma after *people*,

seems to be saying that God may have rejected some of his people, but the ones he foreknew, a

subset of all of his people, those he did not reject. So, did God not reject all of his people or did

he not reject only a remnant of them?

Another example to illustrate the problem comes from 1 Thess 2:14–15 and the usage of an

attributive participle: τὰ αὐτὰ ἐπάθετε καὶ ὑμεῖς ὑπὸ τῶν ἰδίων συμφυλετῶν καθὼς καὶ αὐτοὶ ὑπὸ

τῶν Ἰουδαίων, τῶν καὶ τὸν κύριον ἀποκτεινάντων Ἰησοῦν καὶ τοὺς προφήτας.[4] How should the

exegete interpret the attributive participle? The ESV translates, "the Jews, who killed both the

---

[3] Luther, "Christian Schools," in *LW*, 45:366.

[4] ESV: "You suffered the same things from your own countrymen as they did from the Jews, who killed both

2

Lord Jesus and the prophets," while GWN translates, "the Jews who killed the Lord Jesus and the prophets." By placing the comma after *the Jews*, the ESV seems to be saying something additional about all Jews. In essence, it assigns the killing of Jesus and the prophets to the Jewish people as a whole. The GWN, however, by not placing the comma after *the Jews*, seems to be limiting the referent of *the Jews* to a subset of the Jewish peoples as a whole. Such a reading assigns the killing of Jesus and the prophets to a limited number of the Jewish people not the Jewish people as a whole.

Scholars have looked at examples such as these and taken either side, or they are oblivious to the distinction and don't address it at all. The exegete must decide whether or not the clauses are to be taken as restrictive or nonrestrictive. The purpose of this study is to bring linguistic clarity and provide direction for the exegete/translator when confronted with such interpretive difficulties.

The Thesis

Many scholars (Chrys Caragounis, Ernest Burton, Friedrich Blass, BDF, Archibald Robertson, Nigel Turner, and James W. Voelz[5])[6] assert that the Greek attributive participle and the Greek relative clause are "equivalent." This study demonstrates, however, that the attributive participle is primarily utilized to restrict its antecedent except under certain prescribed circumstances, and that when both constructions are grammatically and stylistically feasible, the relative clause is predominantly utilized to relate nonrestrictively to its antecedent. It is proposed

---

the Lord Jesus and the prophets."

[5] James W. Voelz changes his initial assertions on this topic in later years. This will be discussed below. His later observations are the primary impetus for this dissertation.

[6] See "Explicit Assertions of Equivalence" section on p. 6.

that a comprehensive survey of the relative clause and the attributive participle in the Greek New Testament demonstrates the limitations of their purported equivalence.

The Restrictive/Nonrestrictive Distinction

While the nature of restrictive and nonrestrictive strategies will be further addressed in their respective chapters, it will prove helpful to offer an introduction into this often confused distinction. Generally speaking, in linguistic typology, various restrictive and nonrestrictive modifying strategies can be employed to modify a head-noun: words, phrases, or clauses. "In 'restrictive' modification, the linguistic identity of the head is dependent upon the accompanying modification; if it is not, the modification being inessential, the term non-restrictive is used."[7] So, nonrestrictive modifiers add nonessential descriptive detail to their heads but do not limit, specify, or identify them; they can be eliminated from the sentence without changing its basic meaning.[8] In English and Spanish, nonrestrictive clauses are set off by commas. In the following examples, the nonrestrictive strategies (in italics) could be eliminated from the sentence without changing the essential meaning of the sentence:

1. My father, *who was here yesterday*, is fine.

2. My father, *hale and hearty*, was here yesterday.[9]

3. Mi hermano, *que vive en México*, tiene dos hijos.[10] Translation: My brother, *who lives in Mexico*, has two sons (i.e. there is only one brother, and he lives in Mexico).

---

[7] David Crystal, *A First Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview, 1980), 305.

[8] Arnold Lazarus, Andrew MacLeish, and H. Wendell Smith, *Modern English: A Glossary of Literature and Language* (New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1972), 407.

[9] English Examples taken from Arnold Leslie Lazarus, Andrew MacLeish, and H. Wendell Smith, *Modern English: A Glossary of Literature and Language*, 407.

[10] Example taken from Benjamin F. Elson and Velma B. Pickett, *Beginning Morphology and Syntax* (Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1988), 132.

Restrictive modifiers limit the head concept, narrowing or specifying the meaning of the noun-phrases they modify. The information provided is essential to the meaning of the sentence. In English and Spanish, restrictive clauses are not set off by commas. In the following examples, the restrictive clauses (in italics) could not be eliminated from the sentence without changing the essential meaning of the sentence:

1. The car *that I bought yesterday* is newer than my other one.[11]

2. Linguists *who tire easily* never finish the job.[12]

3. Mi hermano *que vive en México* tiene dos hijos. Translation: My Brother *who lives in Mexico* has two sons (i.e. other brothers live elsewhere).[13]

The major part of our study looks at the restrictive and nonrestrictive tendencies of the attributive participle and the relative clause in the Greek New Testament.

The Current Status of the Question

An analysis of a variety of factors and fields of study with respect to the purported equivalence of the attributive participle and the relative clause in the Greek New Testament reveals a somewhat convoluted state of affairs. Many grammarians explicitly state that the attributive participle and the relative clause are equivalent while others seem to imply it. Grammarians treat the relative clause quite extensively, but not consistently. Less attention has been given to the attributive participle when compared to the relative clause, but grammarians do analyze it. However, like the relative clause, they do not do so consistently.

---

[11] Example taken from Lazarus, MacLeish, and Smith, *Modern English*, 432.

[12] Example taken from Elson and Pickett, *Beginning Morphology and Syntax*, 132.

[13] Example taken from Elson and Pickett, *Beginning Morphology and Syntax*, 132.

Attributive Participle Equivalent to Relative Clause

Since the turn of the 20th century, a variety of scholars have explicitly stated that the attributive participle and the relative clause are equivalent in the Greek New Testament. Additionally, others do not assert this conclusion explicitly, but an analysis of their work demonstrates they do so implicitly.

Explicit Assertions of Equivalence. In his treatment of the attributive participle, Caragounis maintains that the New Testament follows Classical Greek by often substituting a relative clause for the attributive participle.[14] To illustrate his point, Caragounis cites John 12:1: Λάζαρος, ὃν ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν Ἰησοῦς. He maintains that this relative clause takes the place of the participial form ἐγερθείς.[15] Additionally, he contends that analogically the phrase τοῦ πέμψαντός με πατρός found in John 14:24 "could have been substituted for by the relative ὃς ἔπεμψεν με."[16] Furthermore, he asserts, "This parallel use of the attributive participle and its equivalent, the relative clause, continues to obtain in literary compositions until B[yzantine] times."[17]

Many grammarians since the turn of the 20th century have purported, similar to Caragounis, that the attributive participle is equivalent to the relative clause. In the following paragraphs the assertions of Ernest Burton, Friedrich Blass, BDF, Archibald Robertson, Nigel Turner, and James W. Voelz will be considered.

---

[14] Chrys C. Caragounis, *The Development of Greek and the New Testament: Morphology, Syntax, Phonology, and Textual Transmission* (WUNT 167; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 175.

[15] Caragounis, *Development of Greek*, 175.

[16] Caragounis, *Development of Greek*, 175.

[17] Caragounis, *Development of Greek*, 175. Caragounis abbreviates the Byzantine phase (A.D. 600–1000, Early Neohellenic) of Modern Greek (A.D. 600–2000) with *B*. See p. *xx*.

Burton contends that an "attributive adjective participle" is equivalent to a relative clause.[18] He actually makes a distinction between two types of attributive participles; they are either "restrictive or explanatory" (nonrestrictive).[19] Burton highlights the restrictive attributive participle stating that "an attributive Adjective Participle [sic] may be used to define or identify its subject, pointing out what person or thing is meant. It is then equivalent to a restrictive relative clause."[20] Burton then cites John 6:50 as an example of such a restrictive attributive participle: "οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβαίνων, *this is the bread which cometh down out of heaven.*"[21] Notice that in his translation he utilizes an English restrictive relative clause (*the bread which cometh down out of heaven*), further illustrating his assertion of equivalence for the attributive participle and the relative clause. The relative clause limits the idea from all bread to only that bread that comes down out of heaven. After addressing the restrictive attributive participle Burton continues on to address the "explanatory" (nonrestrictive) attributive participle, stating that it is utilized to "describe a person or thing already known or identified. It is then equivalent to an explanatory relative clause."[22]

Blass, similarly to Burton, states that attributive participles are equivalent to relative clauses in a section heading: "Participle as attribute (or in apposition) with or without an article, equivalent to a relative sentence."[23] He cites the attributive participle found in Matt 25:34 and gives what its relative clause equivalent would be as follows: "τὴν ἡτοιμασμένην ὑμῖν βασιλείαν,

---

[18] Ernest De Witt Burton, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek* (3d ed.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1898; repr., 1955), 164, 166.

[19] Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, 164.

[20] Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, 164.

[21] Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, 165. We will take note of this example below. Burton also cites Jude 17 as an example.

[22] Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, 166. It should be noted that the four explanatory attributive participle examples cited by Burton modify proper nouns and one of his examples may be considered to fall into a different category.

[23] Friedrich Wilhelm Blass, *Grammar of New Testament Greek* (trans. Henry St. John Thackeray. rev. and enl. ed.; London: Macmillan, 1911), 242.

= τὴν β. ἣ ὑμῖν ἡτοίμασται."[24] Furthermore, Blass also cites Luke 6:48 and Matt 7:24 where the

synonyms ἄνθρωπος and ἀνήρ, in the context of direct parabolic speech, are modified by an

attributive participle and relative clause respectively:

Luke 6:48: ἀνθρώπῳ οἰκοδομοῦντι οἰκίαν

Matt 7:24: ἀνδρὶ φρονίμῳ, ὅστις ᾠκοδόμησεν[25]

These same assertions are maintained in the later edition of Blass's work, BDF, which

states that the attributive participle is "equivalent to a relative clause."[26]

Robertson refers to Blass and states that the "articular-attributive participle . . . is

equivalent to a relative."[27] Robertson cites proof for this by referring to Acts 10:18 and 10:32,[28]

which Blass had also cited.[29] He maintains this notion of equivalence based upon the observation

that Peter's name is clarified by an attributive participle in Acts 10:18, Σίμων ὁ ἐπικαλούμενος

Πέτρος, and then by a relative clause in Acts 10:32, Σίμωνα ὃς ἐπικαλεῖται Πέτρος.[30] He also

repeats Blass's claims with respect to the synonymous words ἄνθρωπος and ἀνήρ, in Luke 6:48

and Matt 7:24.[31]

Turner follows suit and contends that the attributive participle "is equivalent to a relative

clause."[32] Turner also cites Luke 6:48 and Matt 7:24 as the prime example that attributive

---

[24] Blass, *New Testament Greek*, 242.

[25] Blass, *New Testament Greek*, 242.

[26] BDF, § 412.

[27] Archibald Thomas Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (Nashville: Broadman, 1934), 1105.

[28] Robertson, Grammar, 1105.

[29] Blass, *New Testament Greek*, 242.

[30] Robertson, *Grammar*, 1105.

[31] Robertson, *Grammar*, 1105. Robertson also utilizes the following verses: Luke 6:49, Rom 8:24, Matt 27:33 and Mark 5:25, 27.

[32] Nigel Turner, *Syntax* (vol. 3 of *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1963), 152.

participles and adjectival relative clauses are equivalent.[33] Turner puts forth a number of

examples of attributive participles without giving much explanation as to how or why they might

be equivalent to a relative clause.[34] Following that section Turner states, "Also equivalent to a

relative clause is the very frequent apposition ὁ λεγόμενος, (ἐπι)καλούμενος, with proper name

following, always with an article after the person or object named."[35] Following Blass and

Robertson, Turner claims proof for this reality by also claiming that the attributive participle in

Acts 10:18, Σίμων ὁ ἐπικαλούμενος Πέτρος, is equivalent to the adjectival relative clause found

in Acts 10:32, Σίμωνα ὃς ἐπικαλεῖται Πέτρος.[36]

Similarly, though with slightly different terminology than the aforementioned scholars,

Voelz states, "An attributive position participle is the equivalent of a subordinate clause

introduced by a relative pronoun. Thus, when interpreting such participles, one tends to use a

relative pronoun in English translation."[37] Voelz has composed two sentences to show how

essentially the two constructions are equivalent. The first is an attributive participle: ὁ

στρατιώτης ὁ διώκων τὸν δοῦλον εἶδε τὸν λῃστήν.[38] He provides a translational equivalent as

follows, "The soldier *pursuing* the slave saw the bandit."[39] Voelz then puts forth the equivalent

phrase in the form of a subordinate clause introduced by the relative pronoun as: ὁ στρατιώτης ὃς

ἐδίωκε τὸν δοῦλον εἶδε τὸν λῃστήν.[40] He translates this sentence as follows: "The soldier *who*

---

[33] Turner, *Syntax*, 152.

[34] Turner, *Syntax*, 152.

[35] Turner, *Syntax*, 152.

[36] Turner, *Syntax*, 152.

[37] James W. Voelz, *Fundamental Greek Grammar* (2d ed.; St. Louis: Concordia, 1993), 139.

[38] Voelz, *Fundamental Greek*, 139.

[39] Voelz, *Fundamental Greek*, 139.

[40] Voelz, *Fundamental Greek*, 139.

was pursuing the slave saw the bandit."[41] Both Voelz's Greek sentences, and English

equivalents, demonstrate his assertion that the attributive participle and the relative clause are

equivalent constructions.

Implicit Assertions of Equivalence. As we have considered the explicit assertions

concerning the equivalence of the attributive participle and the relative clause, some scholars

lean toward this assertion of equivalence even though they explicitly do not use such

terminology. The work of Herbert Smyth, James Boyer and Daniel Wallace will be considered

below.

Smyth states, "Relative clauses correspond to attributive adjectives (or participles), since

like adjectives they serve to define substantives."[42] Smyth provides an example from Xenophon's

Cyropaedia 3.1.33: "σὺν τοῖς θησαυροῖς οἷς ὁ πατὴρ κατέλιπεν ... *with the treasures which my*

father left."[43] Smyth basically contends that this relative clause's equivalent consists of, "τοῖς ὑπὸ

τοῦ πατρὸς καταλειφθεῖσι."[44]

Boyer examines the participle, and with respect to its adjectival use he states that it can

usually be translated into English as a relative clause, but he makes no explicit statement of the

purported equivalence to the relative clause.[45] However, further analysis of his work on the

participle as compared to his work on the relative clause reveals an implicit adherence that the

two constructions are equivalent. In his work on the participle, with respect to the adjectival

functions of an attributive participle, Boyer contends, "As an adjective it stands in gender,

---

[41] Voelz, *Fundamental Greek*, 139.

[42] Herbert Weir Smyth, *Greek Grammar* (rev. ed. by Gordon M. Messing; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984), § 2488.

[43] Smyth, *Greek*, § 2488.

[44] Smyth, *Greek*, § 2488. See n. 29 of ch. 6, which mentions attributive participles of this nature.

[45] James L. Boyer, "The Classification of Participles: A Statistical Study," *Grace Theological Journal* 5 (1984): 163–79.

number and case agreement with a noun or other substantive, and in some way modifies, describes, or limits that substantive."[46] Essentially he is stating here that attributive participles modify a substantive either nonrestrictively ("describes") or restrictively ("limits"). Boyer contends that attributive participles modify their substantives in both of these ways. Then, when one analyzes his work on the relative clause, one sees that he describes it similarly, "Adjectival relative clauses may be descriptive or restrictive (identifying), just as other adjectives. Adjectival clauses are descriptive when they ascribe a quality or attribute to the antecedent, and restrictive when they define or identify the antecedent."[47] Boyer essentially asserts that both the attributive participle and the adjectival relative clause modify their substantives in an identical manner and there exists no difference between the two in respect to the nature of their modification, especially in terms of the restrictive and nonrestrictive distinction.

Wallace also states that with respect to translation one "should normally translate the *attributive* participle as though it were a relative clause (e.g., ὁ πατήρ σου ὁ βλέπων ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ ἀποδώσει σοι ['your Father *who* sees in secret will reward you'] in Matt 6:4)."[48] While he makes no explicit statement of equivalence, in his discussion of adjectival clauses (which include adjectival participles and relative pronoun clauses, among others) he states that, "Every adjectival clause *describes*, *explains*, or *restricts* a noun, pronoun, or other substantive. It has no functional subcategories."[49] Wallace then cites examples of the various adjectival clauses, two of which are the "adjectival participle" and the "relative pronoun clause." Essentially, therefore, he would maintain that his cited examples in 2 Cor 3:3, θεοῦ ζῶντος, and in Eph 6:17, τὴν μάχαιραν

---

[46] Boyer, "Classification of Participles," 163–64.

[47] James L. Boyer, "Relative Clauses in the Greek New Testament: A Statistical Study," *GTJ* 9 (1988): 235.

[48] Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 1996), 617–18 .

[49] Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 662.

τοῦ πνεύματος, ὅ ἐστιν ῥῆμα θεοῦ, are equivalent.[50] That is to say, they both modify their substantives, the first is restrictive and the other is nonrestrictive. He makes no distinction as to whether one tends toward one modifying strategy or the other; so, one could infer that Wallace implicitly contends the two constructions to be equivalent in their function as adjectival clauses.

Summary of Explicit and Implicit Assertions of Equivalence. The survey of the aforementioned grammarians has revealed a recurring consensus concerning the nature of the attributive participle. Caragounis, Burton, Blass, BDF, Robertson, Turner, and Voelz explicitly asseverate that the attributive participle is equivalent to a relative clause. While not explicitly stating this grammatical assertion, Smyth, Boyer and Wallace all seem to imply that there is no difference in the nature in which attributive participles modify their respective substantives in comparison to relative clauses.

Evaluation of Assertions of Equivalence. An analysis of the assertions of equivalence reveals some items of concern. First, Robertson's argumentation seems to rely heavily on Blass. He also repeats Blass's claims with respect to the synonymous words ἄνθρωπος and ἀνήρ in Luke 6:48 and Matt 7:24. Turner also cites these two verses as the prime example that attributive participles and relative clauses are equivalent. In fact, as one looks at the argumentation from Blass to BDF to Robertson to Turner, one notices a very similar line of reasoning with practically identical argumentation and proof texts. This gives the appearance of a lack of original research by multiple grammarians. Additionally, all of the scholars in the above two sections give limited examples of the phenomenon and there exists no reference to comprehensive studies that could validate their assertions. This seems to indicate that no comprehensive analysis exists to verify their conclusions. Furthermore, Burton is the only grammarian that makes reference to the restrictive and nonrestrictive (his term is "explanatory")

---

[50] Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 662.

distinction. And, although he seems to be somewhat aware of this linguistic category, he still contends that they are fully equivalent constructions yet he does not provide substantial data to back up his claim. All of these items of concern demonstrate that valid questions need to be answered with respect to the equivalence of the attributive participle to the relative clause. These issues underscore the need for this inquiry.

Relative Clause

When examining the syntactical functions of the relative clause, several grammarians assert both parallel and contradictory ideas. We will consider assertions pertaining to restrictive and nonrestrictive relative clauses. Additionally, the concept of a relative connective will be presented (also labeled relative continuative or continuative relative clause).

Restrictive and Nonrestrictive Relative Clauses. In their respective treatments of the relative clause, Burton, Boyer, Wallace, and Stephen Levinsohn all comment on the nature of the adjectival modification in which relative clauses participate.[51] Their language and terminology vary but they all essentially assert that the relative clause modifies substantives both restrictively and nonrestrictively.

In his treatment of the relative clause, Burton contends that relative clauses may be either "restrictive or explanatory. A restrictive clause defines its antecedent, indicating what person, thing, place, or manner is signified. An explanatory clause adds a description to what is already known or sufficiently defined. The former *identifies*, the latter *describes*."[52] Burton cites John 15:20 as an example of a restrictive relative clause as follows: μνημονεύετε τοῦ λόγου οὗ ἐγὼ

---

[51] These scholars are highlighted because of their direct assertions regarding nonrestrictive and restrictive modification.

[52] Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, 119.

εἶπον ὑμῖν, *remember the word that I said unto you.*[53] As far as explanatory (nonrestrictive)

relative clauses are concerned, Burton cites Eph 6:17 as follows: "τὴν μάχαιραν τοῦ πνεύματος,

ὅ ἐστιν ῥῆμα θεοῦ, *the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God.*"[54]

Similarly, as we noted above under our treatment of the participle, Boyer treats adjectival

relative clauses and states that they "may be descriptive or restrictive (identifying), just as other

adjectives. Adjectival clauses are descriptive when they ascribe a quality or attribute to the

antecedent, and restrictive when they define or identify the antecedent."[55] Boyer maintains that

the categories are not mutually exclusive and can overlap, which requires the reader to deduce

from context the intended meaning of the author.[56] He asserts that the relative clause found in

Matt 1:16 could go either way and that the interpreter must judge from context alone. He

maintains that the phrase, τὸν ἄνδρα Μαρίας, ἐξ ἧς ἐγεννήθη Ἰησοῦς, could be either describing

Mary as Jesus' mother, nonrestrictive, or it could be identifying her as distinct from other women

who have the same name ("the Mary who bore Jesus"), restrictive.[57] Additionally, he cites Matt

2:9, καὶ ἰδοὺ ὁ ἀστήρ, ὃν εἶδον ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ, and maintains that the relative clause is clearly

restrictive.[58] One can readily determine that Boyer contends that relative clauses can be translated

either restrictively or nonrestrictively; he holds that one must determine this solely from context.

---

[53] Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, 119. We agree that this classification is true but also point out that it would be stylistically awkward to construct this phrase with an attributive participle. See ch. 6 and the discussion of the Accessibility Hierarchy. Furthermore Burton also cites Matt 28:6 and Mark 2:20 as restrictive relative clauses. Burton's scope of analysis is somewhat broader then the concerns of our study since these examples utilize subordinating conjunctions, ὅπου and ὅταν, respectively.

[54] Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, 119. Eph 6:17 will be discussed further below. It should be noted that Burton also cites Luke 4:16 as an explanatory relative clause. This modifying clause, however, utilizes the adverb of place, οὗ. This type of phrase lies outside the area of our study which focuses primarily upon relative clauses that contain a relative pronoun.

[55] Boyer, "Relative Clauses," 235.

[56] Boyer, "Relative Clauses," 235.

[57] Boyer, "Relative Clauses," 235.

[58] Boyer, "Relative Clauses," 235.

Wallace speaks along similar lines, though somewhat more generally, in his discussion of the relative pronoun ὅς. He states that the relative pronoun "is routinely used to link a noun or other substantive to the relative clause, which either describes, clarifies, or restricts the meaning of the noun."[59] In this statement Wallace upholds that relative clauses qualify substantives both restrictively ("clarifies, or restricts") and nonrestrictively ("describes"). Wallace provides a number of examples; two of which he presents as follows:[60]

Rev. 1:1: Ἀποκάλυψις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἣν ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς

The Revelation of Jesus Christ, **which** God gave to him

Matt. 1:16: Ἰακὼβ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰωσὴφ τὸν ἄνδρα Μαρίας, ἐξ ἧς ἐγεννήθη Ἰησοῦς

Jacob became the father of Joseph, the husband of Mary, by **whom** was born Jesus

Wallace also cites three other verses explicitly: John 1:26, Acts 4:10 and Eph 2:2–3.[61] Wallace then invites the reader to independently consider "also Mark 14:71; Luke 2:11; John 1:13; Acts 17:3; Rom 1:2; 2 Cor 7:7; Eph 1:6; Phil 3:8; 1 Pet 2:22."[62] On the whole, Wallace contends that relative clauses are capable of both restrictive and nonrestrictive modification, even though he does not use that specific vocabulary.

Levinsohn follows current linguistic typology in dividing the relative clause into restrictive and nonrestrictive categories stating, "Linguists commonly divide relative clauses into two types: restrictive and nonrestrictive."[63] He cites linguist Bernard Comrie and maintains that a restrictive clause, "'serves to delimit the potential referents' (Comrie 1989:138)."[64] He gives the following

---

[59] Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 336.

[60] Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 336.

[61] Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 336.

[62] Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 337.

[63] Stephen H. Levinsohn, *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek: A Coursebook on the Information Structure of New Testament Greek* (2d ed.; Dallas: SIL International, 2000), 190.

[64] Levinsohn, *New Testament Greek*, 190.

English example to illustrate this, "The man {who arrived yesterday} left this morning."[65]

Levinsohn defines a nonrestrictive clause by citing Comrie again, "A nonrestrictive relative

clause 'serves merely to give the hearer an added piece of information about an already

identified entity, but not to identify that entity.' (loc. Cit.), as in: Mr. Smith, {who arrived

yesterday}, left this morning."[66] With respect to the Greek New Testament, Levinsohn contends

that both restrictive and nonrestrictive relative clauses are contained therein.[67] To illustrate a

restrictive relative clause he refers to Luke 1:26, "εἰς πόλιν τῆς Γαλιλαίας ᾗ ὄνομα Ναζαρέθ,"

and maintains that, "The clause 'whose name is Nazareth' delimits the potential referents of 'a

city of Galilee'."[68] As far as nonrestrictive clauses are concerned, he cites Acts 9:36, "Ταβιθά, ἥ

διερμηνευομένη λέγεται Δορκάς ."[69] He maintains that "the clause 'which means Dorcas' adds a

piece of information about an already identified entity."[70] We should point out that Levinsohn

labels the simple nonrestrictive adjectival modification strategy for relative clauses as

"appositional." Acts 9:36, quoted above, is an example of this. He then cites three more

examples that fall into this "appositional" category: Acts 8:27c; Acts 8:27d; and Acts 16:12b.[71]

Summary and Evaluation of Restrictive and Nonrestrictive Relative Clause

Assertions. While they state it differently and may have slightly different nuances, Burton,

Boyer, Wallace and Levinsohn all maintain that relative clauses can be either restrictive or

---

[65] Levinsohn, *New Testament Greek*, 190.

[66] Levinsohn, *New Testament Greek*, 190.

[67] Levinsohn, *New Testament Greek*, 190.

[68] Levinsohn, *New Testament Greek*, 190.

[69] Levinsohn, *New Testament Greek*, 191.

[70] Levinsohn, *New Testament Greek*, 191. Additionally, Levinsohn's analysis of the relative clause goes beyond classifying adjectival modification as restrictive or nonrestrictive. We will deal with that aspect of his analysis in the "Relative Connective/Continuative" discussion below.

[71] Levinsohn, *New Testament Greek*, 193–95.

nonrestrictive. A cursory evaluation of some of their assertions, however, supports the need for our study.

Boyer demonstrates unclear and inconsistent reasoning when he addresses the restrictive/nonrestrictive nature of the relative clause. For example, when he states that the categories are not mutually exclusive, it would benefit the reader if he had provided examples. Does he mean that there exist relative clauses that are both restrictive and nonrestrictive? Or does he assert that there exists another category somewhere in between restrictive and nonrestrictive modification? His assertion remains nebulous. Furthermore, when Boyer cites Matt 2:9, καὶ ἰδοὺ ὁ ἀστήρ, ὃν εἶδον ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ, and maintains that the relative clause is clearly restrictive,[72] it is ironic that he chooses to provide the following translation from the NASB[77], "the star, which they had seen in the East."[73] The NASB[77] clearly translates it as nonrestrictive, as one can easily determine from the comma placed after the substantive and before the relative clause.[74] This coupled with his elusive assertion above causes one to wonder if Boyer readily understands the restrictive/nonrestrictive distinction. Boyer's inconsistencies support the need for further clarity in this study.

With respect to Wallace, the two cited examples above, Rev 1:1 and Matt 1:16, both modify their substantives nonrestrictively. Wallace also cites three other verses explicitly: John 1:26, Acts 4:10 and Eph 2:2–3.[75] John 1:26 falls outside of our study because the relative clause is functioning substantively with no explicit antecedent. Additionally, the other two verses modify their substantives nonrestrictively. Then, out of the additional nine verses that he invites

---

[72] Boyer, "Relative Clauses," 235.

[73] Boyer, "Relative Clauses," 235.

[74] See the section titled "Translation Practices of the Greek New Testament" on p. 50 of this chapter. The necessity of this study is discussed with respect to a lack of consistency in translations depicting the restrictive/nonrestrictive distinction.

[75] Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 336.

the reader to independently review, only two of the relative clauses that they contain could be possibly considered restrictive:

Mark 14:71: τὸν ἄνθρωπον τοῦτον ὃν λέγετε.[76]

2 Cor 7:7: ἐν τῇ παρακλήσει ᾗ παρεκλήθη ἐφ’ ὑμῖν

On the whole, Wallace seeks to demonstrate that relative clauses are capable of both restrictive and nonrestrictive modification. However, one should note that of the examples provided and referred to, eleven are nonrestrictive, two are possibly restrictive,[77] and one functions as a substantive with no antecedent.

Levinsohn's assertions also give rise to questioning. He gives only one explicit example of a restrictive relative clause. However, for nonrestrictive adjectival relative clauses, he presents a total of four examples.[78] In addition he labels this type of adjectival modification "appositional." In fact, Levinsohn has two categories for nonrestrictive relative clauses, which he bases on George Winer's assertions.[79] Levinsohn states, "Nonrestrictive relative clauses in Greek are traditionally subdivided into *appositional* (as in Acts 9:36) *and continuative.* "[80] Levinsohn's nonrestrictive appositional category seems to be tantamount to nonrestrictive adjectival modification. This choice of terminology seems somewhat confusing. At first it appears that

---

[76] Boas, "Deep and Surface Structure Problems of Restrictive and Non-restrictive Constructions," *Folia Linguistica* 21 (1977): 39, and Jespersen, *The Philosophy of Grammar* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1968), 112, assert that with determiners like οὗτος, restrictive modification is impossible.

[77] Note that the nature of the relative clauses cited: Mark 14:71 contains a direct object relative clause and 2 Cor 7:7 an oblique relative clause. This will be discussed more thoroughly in ch. 6.

[78] Levinsohn also gives more examples of nonrestrictive relative clauses; these are discussed in the section titled "Relative Connective/Continuative" below.

[79] George B. Winer, *A Treatise on the Grammar of New Testament Greek: Regarded as a Sure Basis for New Testament Exegesis* (trans. W. F. Moulton; 3d rev. ed.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1882), 680.

[80] Levinsohn, *New Testament Greek*, 191. We will discuss this second category, *continuative*, in the next section. Matthews states that apposition differs "from modification (or attribution) in that there is no clear tendency for either element to qualify the other." Matthew Peters, *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 22. However, it should be noted that T-G (Transformational Grammar) linguists often utilize the term *appositive* to refer to nonrestrictive clauses.

18

Levinsohn ostensibly subsumes both adjectival modification and apposition under the category "appositional." However, when one looks at Winer's definition of appositional, it appears that Winer is referring to adjectival modification alone (which would include both restrictive and nonrestrictive types), but his assertions are somewhat cryptic when he describes appositional clauses as "more or less essential to the integrity of the sentence."[81]

This brief evaluation of the aforementioned scholars demonstrates that some work needs to be done with respect to grammatical assertions concerning the restrictive and nonrestrictive relative clause. There seems to exist a lack of clarity with respect to the application, parameters and definitions of the terms. Furthermore, we should note the nature of the majority of examples utilized by these scholars. Most of these examples relate to their substantives nonrestrictively. This raises the question as to whether or not this is a tendency in the Greek of the New Testament. Do relative clauses tend to relate to their substantives nonrestrictively as this subset of examples seems to suggest?

Relative Connective/Continuative. Another category of relative clause classification exists beyond that of strict adjectival modification. Though they articulate the phenomenon differently, essentially Boyer, BDF, Levinsohn, Winer, and H. E. Dana & Julius Mantey provide argumentation for an additional category to be considered in a taxonomy of the relative clause.

While speaking about restrictivity and nonrestrictivity with regard to the adjectival relative clause, Boyer highlights another category, which he describes as the "relative connective," a term that he borrows from BDF.[82] He cites the treatment of sentence structure in BDF for this category.[83] BDF, based on Aristotle, distinguish two types of style in Greek when it comes to

---

[81] Winer, *Treatise on the Grammar*, 680.

[82] Boyer, "Relative Clauses," 235.

[83] BDF, § 458.

sentence structure, "the running or continuous and the compact or periodic."[84] In the running or

continuous style, elements "are strung loosely together one after the other," which normally

characterizes "plain and unsophisticated language."[85] BDF maintain that a form of this "running

style" of Greek occurs when "the first sentence is extended by means of a participial phrase, a

clause introduced by ὅτι, a *relative clause*, or a similar construction".[86] BDF assert that a relative

connective can be characterized by "a loosening of the connection of the relative clause to the

preceding complex sentence; something intermediate between a relative clause and a

demonstrative clause: "ὅς = and this, but this, this very thing."[87] BDF cite a number of examples

of this. Acts 3:15, they maintain, has two occurrences of the relative clause functioning in the

relative connective capacity: τὸν δὲ ἀρχηγὸν τῆς ζωῆς ἀπεκτείνατε ὃν ὁ θεὸς ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν,

οὗ ἡμεῖς μάρτυρές ἐσμεν."[88] Another example they provide is 2 Tim 4:14–15: Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ

χαλκεὺς πολλά μοι κακὰ ἐνεδείξατο· ἀποδώσει αὐτῷ ὁ κύριος κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ· ὃν καὶ σὺ

φυλάσσου, λίαν γὰρ ἀντέστη τοῖς ἡμετέροις λόγοις.[89] The ESV translates as follows: "Alexander

the coppersmith did me great harm; the Lord will repay him according to his deeds. Beware of

him yourself, for he strongly opposed our message." Notice how the translators highlight the

loosening of the connection to the referent of the relative clause; they start a completely new

sentence. This highlights the emphasis that perhaps the relative clause here has moved beyond a

function of pure adjectival modification of a substantive.

---

[84] BDF, § 458.

[85] BDF, § 458. While BDF maintain this we do not necessarily agree with the conclusion that this style is "plain and unsophisticated." Both Lysias and the author of Hebrews exhibit this style and would not represent such a categorization.

[86] BDF, § 458 (emphasis mine).

[87] BDF, § 458.

[88] BDF, § 458. ESV: "and you killed the Author of life, whom God raised from the dead. To this we are witnesses."

[89] BDF, § 458.

Boyer highlights this phenomenon as well in his comparison to English translations. He contends that "long sentences are broken down into many shorter ones in conformity to modern style" when one looks at more recent translations as compared to older ones.[90] Boyer cites Paul's long sentence in Eph 1:4–14, where the KJV makes it into three sentences, and more modern translations such as the NASB[77] and the NIV break it into six sentences.[91] He notes that in the KJV the last two sentences of the three-sentence division are started by a relative clause. With respect to the NASB[77] and the NIV, he notes that after the first sentence "all but two breaks come at a relative."[92] Boyer then highlights that "even the Nestle26 Greek text divides the passage into four sentences; after the opening one each begins with a relative."[93] Boyer also notes that in an analysis of the translations of relative clauses in the NASB[77], nearly 10% of them are translated with a personal or demonstrative pronoun or an actual noun.[94] Boyer highlights all of this to reinforce his claim that this separate category should be recognized because these relative clauses of the relative connective type go "beyond the functions of regular adjectives."[95]

We have previously discussed Levinsohn's assertion of relative clauses functioning restrictively and nonrestrictively. Levinsohn, as noted earlier, also further divides the nonrestrictive category, stating, "Nonrestrictive relative clauses in Greek are traditionally subdivided into *appositional* (as in Acts 9:36) *and continuative.*"[96] He cites Winer as his authority for the appositional and continuative category (Winer's position is discussed below).[97]

---

[90] Boyer, "Relative Clauses," 235.

[91] Boyer, "Relative Clauses," 235.

[92] Boyer, "Relative Clauses," 235–36.

[93] Boyer, "Relative Clauses," 236.

[94] Boyer, "Relative Clauses," 236.

[95] Boyer, "Relative Clauses," 235.

[96] Levinsohn, *New Testament Greek*, 191.

[97] Winer, *Treatise on the Grammar*, 680.

Levinsohn contends that continuative relative clauses "typically describe an event that involves the referent of the relative pronoun and occurs subsequent to the previous event or situation in which the referent featured."[98] His nonrestrictive continuative category seems to go beyond adjectival modification and demonstrates similarities to Boyer's relative connective classification. Levinsohn contends that Acts 28:23 provides an illustrative example of this phenomenon: ἦλθον πρὸς αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν ξενίαν πλείονες οἷς ἐξετίθετο διαμαρτυρόμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.[99] Levinsohn maintains that the referent of the relative pronoun is the people who came to Paul in his lodging and that the continuative relative clause "describes an event that involves these referents and that occurs subsequent to the event of 23b."[100] Whether one agrees with Levinsohn's conclusions or not, one can agree that something more is happening with these relative clauses than mere adjectival modification. For our purposes it is important to observe that his continuative relative clause distinction appears to be a valid distinction and something more akin to coordination rather than modification seems to be present.

Winer, from whom Levinsohn bases his continuative relative clause category, states that "ὅς is continuative, and can be resolved into καὶ οὗτος; examples of this kind are mainly found in narration."[101] Winer provides 14 examples, all from Acts except one from Luke.[102] He cites Acts 16:23–24 as follows: ἔβαλον εἰς φυλακὴν παραγγείλαντες τῷ δεσμοφύλακι . . . ὃς παραγγελίαν τοιαύτην."[103] The NASB[77] reads as follows: "they threw them into prison, commanding the jailer; 24 and he, . . . such a command." The NASB[77] translation demonstrates what Winer contends.

---

[98] Levinsohn, *New Testament Greek*, 191.

[99] Levinsohn, *New Testament Greek*, 191. KJV: "There came many to him into *his* lodging; to whom he expounded and testified the kingdom of God."

[100] Levinsohn, *New Testament Greek*, 191.

[101] Winer, *Treatise on the Grammar*, 680.

[102] Winer, *Treatise on the Grammar*, 680. Acts 13:43; 16:23–24; Luke 10:30; Acts 3:2–3; 13:30–31; 14:9; 16:14,16; 17:10; 19:25; 21:4; 23:14; 28:23.

Essentially, when the relative clause continues the idea beyond adjectival modification, it functions more like coordination with a demonstrative or personal pronoun. Winer seems to describe a relative clause's restrictive or nonrestrictive adjectival modification as whether or not the relative sentence is "more or less essential to the integrity of the sentence."[104] When the clause seems to go beyond this definition, then it falls into the continuative category, according to Winer.

Comparable to Winer, Dana, and Mantey assert, "The relative was originally identical with the demonstrative."[105] They summarize the relative's diachronic history stating that while in Sanskrit the relative lost its demonstrative force, in Greek it has persisted.[106] Dana and Mantey maintain that in Homer ὅς is used both as demonstrative and relative, and that in Attic prose it sometimes retains its demonstrative nature.[107] This demonstrative usage of the relative "continues into the Koine, and is found in the New Testament."[108] Essentially, Dana and Mantey have established a relative connective category for the relative clause that goes beyond normal adjectival modification and resembles coordination.

Summary and Evaluation of Relative Connective/Continuative Assertions. Upon surveying the aforementioned scholars, a congruency and similarity between their assertions is evident. Levinsohn's continuative category demonstrates similarities to Boyer's relative connective classification (following BDF) and similar to Dana and Mantey's contentions. Winer's diachronic and synchronic summary of ὅς also lines up well with these assertions. On

---

[103] Winer, *Treatise on the Grammar*, 680.

[104] Winer, *Treatise on the Grammar*, 680.

[105] H. E. Dana and Julius R. Mantey, *A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament* (New York: Macmillan, 1927), 125.

[106] Dana and Mantey, *Manual Grammar*, 125.

[107] Dana and Mantey, *Manual Grammar*, 125.

[108] Dana and Mantey, *Manual Grammar*, 125.

the whole, according to these grammarians, one could reasonably establish that when analyzing relative clauses, one might not only utilize the restrictive and nonrestrictive distinction to describe adjectival modification but could also consider the relative connective/continuative clause as an aspect of the taxonomy.

However, while a certain level of congruency exists among these scholarly assertions, a lack of clarity and consistency can also be discerned. Boyer, for example, claims relative clauses of the relative connective type go "beyond the functions of regular adjectives."[109] However, in what appears to be a somewhat contradictory statement, Boyer contends that "such relative connectives are still adjectival and could probably be classified as either descriptive or restrictive, but the consideration that has prompted their separate treatment is the fact that they move the thought of the sentence into a new area."[110] Boyer seems to indicate that an analysis of the adjectival relative clause should account for those clauses that seem to go beyond merely modifying a substantive, but are more readily functioning as demonstrative or personal pronouns. The assertion, however, that these clauses go beyond the regular function of adjectival modification and yet at the same time are still simple adjectival clauses (functioning both restrictively and nonrestrictively) does appear inconsistent.

Whereas Boyer contends that the relative connective can be classified as either restrictive or explanatory (nonrestrictive), Levinsohn maintains that continuative relative clauses can only be nonrestrictive in that they are a subset or extension of the nonrestrictive typology. So, Levinsohn, contrary to Boyer, contends that a continuative relative clause is incapable of being restrictive. Furthermore, Levinsohn makes no statement as to the adjectival nature of the relative continuative. Boyer seems to assert two contradictory truths: that the relative connective goes

---

[109] Boyer, "Relative Clauses," 235.

[110] Boyer, "Relative Clauses," 236.

beyond adjectival modification and yet still modifies adjectivally. Levinsohn, however, gives no explicit indication about the adjectival nature of the relative continuative. The fact that he bases his continuative category on Winer's assertions that "ὅς is continuative, and can be resolved into καὶ οὗτος,"[111] seems to indicate that adjectival modification is not in mind here.

We contend that a relative connective/continuative category exists; our study will provide clarity to the contradictory and vague assertions above through a clear framework for understanding such constructions.[112]

General Summary and Evaluation of Approaches to the Relative Clause. Some level of agreement exists in the classification of relative clauses in that grammarians utilize the categories *restrictive* (identifying, clarifying) or *nonrestrictive* (explanatory, descriptive). A certain level of congruence exists also with Levinsohn's continuative relative clause category (based on Winer), Boyer's relative connective classification (based upon BDF) and Dana and Mantey's assertions.

So, while most grammarians treat the various functions of the relative clause that are pertinent to our study (restrictive and nonrestrictive adjectival modification and relative connective/continuative clauses), uniformity does not exist in the terminology, definitions, application, and parameters of these categories. For example, the relative clause in Eph 6:17, τὴν μάχαιραν τοῦ πνεύματος, ὅ ἐστιν ῥῆμα θεοῦ, is labeled as "explanatory" by Burton, which would be considered as an adjectival relative clause modifying the substantive nonrestrictively.[113] Boyer, however, categorizes this clause as a relative connective but does not state whether or not he considers it to be restrictive or nonrestrictive (Boyer contends that relative connective clauses

---

[111] Winer, *Treatise on the Grammar*, 680.

[112] See section titled "Continuum of Nonrestrictivity—Modification to Coordination" on pp. 163–68 of ch. 4.

[113] Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, 119.

could be considered either way).[114] Additionally, Wallace labels this as an adjectival clause ("*Relative pronoun* clause") but does not designate whether or not it is restrictive or nonrestrictive.[115] Our study will help to bring clarity to analyses such as these.

The Attributive Participle

When examining the attributive participle and its syntactical functions, grammarians do not treat it as extensively as they do the relative clause. In our initial analysis of explicit assertions of attributive participles being equivalent to relative clauses only Burton made the distinction between restrictive and nonrestrictive attributive participles. The other grammarians made no such mention of that classification. Other scholars, though, do assert that the attributive participle exhibits some of the same functions as the relative clause. We will consider the nature of the adjectival modification of the attributive participle, its status compared to the relative connective clause, and its possible designation as a substantival participle standing in apposition.

Restrictive and Nonrestrictive Attributive Participles. Various assertions regarding the type of adjectival modification that the attributive participle participates in will now be considered, especially with respect to the restrictive/nonrestrictive distinction. Stanley Porter, Wallace, William MacDonald, Burton and Richard Young all assert slightly different perspectives with respect to this distinction.[116]

Porter states that a "participle may serve as a modifier of verbal and substantival elements in a Greek clause."[117] Our study concerns itself with how participles relate to substantival

---

[114] James L. Boyer, *Supplemental Manual of Information: Relative Clauses* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Boyer, 1988), 23.

[115] Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 662.

[116] These grammarians have been selected for analysis due to the fact that they speak directly to the concept of restrictive and nonrestrictive modification. The other grammarians highlighted thus far in our study make no explicit identification of this linguistic distinction.

[117] Stanley E. Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament* (Biblical Languages: Greek; 2d ed.; Sheffield:

elements. Concerning this, Porter contends that they, "like an adjective, may modify substantives (adjectival, attributive, restrictive use)."[118] Porter notes in his introduction to his grammar that the words he places in parentheses consist of "the labels and categories often found in other, similar grammars."[119] Porter explicitly states that attributive participles function adjectivally, modifying their substantives. He also, in a somewhat passive manner, agrees that the nature of that modification can be labeled as restrictive in that he cites that parenthetically. Porter cites five different verses to demonstrate how participles can modify substantives as follows:

> Matt 17.27: τὸν ἀναβάντα πρῶτον ἰχθὺν (the fish coming up first).
>
> Mark 3.22: οἱ γραμματεῖς οἱ ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων καταβάντες ἔλεγον (the scribes coming down from Jerusalem were saying).
>
> Rom 3.5: μὴ ἄδικος ὁ θεὸς ὁ ἐπιφέρων τὴν ὀργήν; (the God who brings wrath is not unjust, is he?).
>
> 1 Tim 1.18: τὰς προαγούσας ἐπὶ σὲ προφητείας (the prophecies previously made concerning you).
>
> 2 Tim 2.6: τὸν κοπιῶντα γεωργὸν (the hard-working farmer).[120]

The first two verses and the last two verses are clearly modifying their substantives restrictively. With respect to Rom 3:5, Porter seems to translate the attributive participle restrictively.

Wallace, as stated above, includes the adjectival participle in his discussion of the adjectival clause, which "*describes, explains*, or *restricts* a noun, pronoun, or other substantive."[121] This statement indicates that Wallace contends that attributive participles participate in both nonrestrictive ("describes, explains") and restrictive ("restricts") adjectival

---

Sheffield Academic, 1994; repr., 1999). 186.

[118] Porter, *Idioms*, 186.

[119] Porter, *Idioms*, 14.

[120] Porter, *Idioms*, 186. Translations are Porter's.

modification. He cites 2 Cor 3:3 as an example. This verse reads as follows: φανερούμενοι ὅτι

ἐστὲ ἐπιστολὴ Χριστοῦ διακονηθεῖσα ὑφ' ἡμῶν, ἐγγεγραμμένη οὐ μέλανι ἀλλὰ πνεύματι θεοῦ

ζῶντος, οὐκ ἐν πλαξὶν λιθίναις ἀλλ' ἐν πλαξὶν καρδίαις σαρκίναις.[122]

Additionally, MacDonald has three categories for "Adjectival Participles:" "Ascriptive

Attributive," "Restrictive Attributive," and "Predicate Attributive."[123] MacDonald's observations

with respect to participles that directly modify substantives, his first two categories, pertain

directly to our study. MacDonald connects the nature of modification to syntactical construction.

He contends that an adjectival participle functions as an "ascriptive attributive" when it "occurs

anarthrously somewhere after the word it modifies, or it comes before the word it modifies, but

always without an *intervening* article."[124] He then cites the following two verses as examples:

John 6:57: καθὼς ἀπέστειλέν με ὁ ζῶν πατὴρ

Luke 6:48: ὅμοιός ἐστιν ἀνθρώπῳ **οἰκοδομοῦντι** οἰκίαν[125]

For his second category, "Restrictive Attributive," he also cites syntax and states that

restrictive attributives have a set order to demonstrate "emphatic distinctiveness," which is:

"article + noun + article + participle."[126] He advises to "translate this construction into English by

a restrictive relative clause or by an adjective."[127] MacDonald then cites John 6:27 as an example

---

[121] Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 662.

[122] ESV: "And you show that you are a letter from Christ delivered by us, written not with ink but with the Spirit of the living God, not on tablets of stone but on tablets of human hearts."

[123] William Graham Macdonald, *Greek Enchiridion: A Concise Handbook of Grammar for Translation and Exegesis* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1986), 58.

[124] MacDonald, *Greek Enchiridion*, 58.

[125] MacDonald, *Greek Enchiridion*, 58.

[126] MacDonald, *Greek Enchiridion*, 58.

[127] MacDonald, *Greek Enchiridion*, 58.

of this category: "ἐργάζεσθε μὴ τὴν βρῶσιν τὴν ἀπολλυμένην ἀλλὰ τὴν βρῶσιν τὴν μένουσαν εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον."[128]

Like his statement for the relative clause, Burton asserts that an adjective participle used attributively "may be either restrictive or explanatory."[129] As noted earlier, Burton cites John 6:50 as a restrictive attributive participle as follows: "οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβαίνων, *this is the bread which cometh down out of heaven*."[130] He also cites Jude 17 as an example of a restrictive attributive participle: "ὑμεῖς δέ, ἀγαπητοί, μνήσθητε τῶν ῥημάτων τῶν προειρημένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, *remember the words which have been spoken before by the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ*."[131]

Burton also deals with the nonrestrictive attributive participle. He labels it the "Explanatory Attributive Participle."[132] As we highlighted earlier, Burton maintains that these participles "describe a person or thing already known or identified."[133] His first example comes from 2 Tim 1:8, 9. He cites it as follows: "κατὰ δύναμιν θεοῦ, τοῦ σώσαντος ἡμᾶς καὶ καλέσαντος κλήσει ἁγίᾳ, *according to the power of God; who saved us, and called us with a holy* calling."[134] Additionally in this discussion, Burton cites 1 Thess 1:10 as follows: "Ἰησοῦν τὸν ῥυόμενον ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς ὀργῆς τῆς ἐρχομένης, *Jesus, which delivereth us from the wrath to come*. In this example ῥυόμενον is explanatory, ἐρχομένης is restrictive."[135]

---

[128] MacDonald, *Greek Enchiridion*, 58.

[129] Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, 164.

[130] Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, 165.

[131] Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, 165.

[132] Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, 166.

[133] Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, 166.

[134] Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, 166.

[135] Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, 166. He also encourages the reader to look up Acts 20:32 and Heb 7:9.

Young, in his treatment of the participle, upholds the restrictive and nonrestrictive

distinction with respect to the nature of attributive participle adjectival modification. In his

discussion, "Participles Functioning in Adjectival Phrases," Young asserts, "Participles often

function in adjectival phrases, modifying a noun or pronoun . . . as restrictive adjective phrases,

as descriptive adjective phrases, and as predicate adjectives."[136] In his treatment of the adjectival

attributive participle he discusses restrictive adjective phrases and provides a helpful definition:

> A restrictive adjective phrase is one that is essential for the proper identification of
> the head noun. It will limit the noun to a particular individual, thing, or group in
> order for the readers to identify it. Without the modifier, they would not know for
> sure which of the many possible referents of the noun is being discussed. Such
> modifiers are therefore essential to the meaning of the sentence. The restrictive use is
> by far the most common type of adjectival participle. When it is transformed into a
> restrictive relative clause in English, it is not to be set off by commas.[137]

Young then proceeds to state that restrictive adjectival participles occur in three basic

syntactical forms and cites them with examples as follows:

> *Article-participle-noun*—Examples include Rom 3:25 τῶν προγεγονότων
> ἁμαρτημάτων (the sins which happened before) and Luke 15:12 τὸ ἐπιβάλλον μέρος
> (the part which belongs to me).

> *Article-noun-article-participle*—This is the most common position for
> adjectival participles: John 6:50 ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβαίνων (the bread
> which comes down from heaven)

> *Noun-participle*—Gal 5:3 παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ περιτεμνομένῳ (to every man who
> allows himself to be circumcised).[138]

While Young contends, "The restrictive use is by far the most common type of adjectival

participle," [139] he also maintains that nonrestrictive adjectival participles exist as well.[140] He

states:

---

[136] Richard A. Young, *Intermediate New Testament Greek: A Linguistic and Exegetical Approach* (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1994), 150. Young's predicate adjective category falls outside the scope of this study.

[137] Young, *Intermediate New Testament Greek*, 150.

[138] Young, *Intermediate New Testament Greek*, 151.

When the readers already know what is being discussed, a modifier is not necessary to identify the head term for them. When a modifier does occur it simply gives additional description. This is called a *descriptive* or *nonrestrictive adjective phrase*. A non-restrictive adjective is not essential to the meaning of the sentence: Matt 16:16 τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος (the living God). Phrases with words meaning 'surpassing' are descriptive: "the surpassing grace of God" (2 Cor. 9:14), "the surpassing greatness" (Eph. 1:19), and "the surpassing riches" (Eph. 2:7).[141]

Young contends that both modification strategies are represented with the attributive participle but that the restrictive adjectival participle is the most common.

Summary and Evaluation of Restrictive and Nonrestrictive Attributive Participle Assertions. Porter, Wallace, MacDonald, Burton and Young all assert slightly different perspectives with respect to adjectival modification of attributive participles, especially with reference to the restrictive/nonrestrictive distinction.

Porter contends that attributive participles modify substantives adjectivally. He also described the nature of this modification as "restrictive" in that he cites that label parenthetically. While too much should not be deduced from his parenthetical categories, it should be noted that he did not include the nonrestrictive category for classification. Furthermore, of the five examples that Porter cites, four of them are clearly restrictive. The debatable example he cites as follows, "Rom. 3.5: μὴ ἄδικος ὁ θεὸς . . . ὁ ἐπιφέρων τὴν ὀργήν; (the God who brings wrath is not unjust, is he?).[142] This verse could possibly be considered nonrestrictive but notice that Porter translates it with a restrictive clause (he does not place a comma after "the God"). It seems somewhat incongruous, however, that he capitalizes god, "God." Perhaps he is emphasizing the different aspects of God, or the different parts of his personality; it is hard to determine from his translation. For the purposes here, it is noted that four of his examples are restrictive and the

---

[139] Young, *Intermediate New Testament Greek*, 150.

[140] Young, *Intermediate New Testament Greek*, 151.

[141] Young, *Intermediate New Testament Greek*, 151.

other seems to be translated restrictively. Does Porter contend that attributive participles may modify substantives nonrestrictively? He does not speak clearly to this question and his examples leave the reader uncertain as how to answer that question.

Wallace seems to contend that attributive participles participate in both nonrestrictive and restrictive adjectival modification, though he does not use that terminology. Wallace treats this topic in a very general and sparse way. In fact he leaves the reader somewhat wanting when he cites 2 Cor 3:3 as an example but does not describe which participles he is focusing on.[143] This verse reads as follows: φανερούμενοι ὅτι ἐστὲ ἐπιστολὴ Χριστοῦ διακονηθεῖσα ὑφ' ἡμῶν, ἐγγεγραμμένη οὐ μέλανι ἀλλὰ πνεύματι θεοῦ ζῶντος, οὐκ ἐν πλαξὶν λιθίναις ἀλλ' ἐν πλαξὶν καρδίαις σαρκίναις.[144] It is plausible to consider the participle to be functioning restrictively in the phrase θεοῦ ζῶντος; however, Wallace does not explicitly declare what he has in mind when quoting this verse. We might also wonder how he considers διακονηθεῖσα and ἐγγεγραμμένη to be functioning. Wallace does not indicate if he is including those participles under the adjectival clause category, though they may be functioning in that capacity. For such a comprehensive grammar one would think that Wallace would be more explicit and more aware of the restrictive/nonrestrictive distinction.

MacDonald's observations concerning participles that modify substantives directly appear to be unique in that he connects the nature of modification to syntactical construction. His assertions, however, are questionable. He cites the following as examples of his *ascriptive* category:

John 6:57 καθὼς ἀπέστειλέν με ὁ ζῶν πατὴρ

---

[142] Porter, *Idioms*, 186.

[143] Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 662.

[144] ESV: "And you show that you are a letter from Christ delivered by us, written not with ink but with the Spirit of the living God, not on tablets of stone but on tablets of human hearts."

Luke 6:48: ὅμοιός ἐστιν ἀνθρώπῳ **οἰκοδομοῦντι** οἰκίαν[145]

Without presenting a complete analysis of each of these verses, it is noted, however, that both of these adjectival participles, which he labels as "Ascriptive Attributive," appear to be modifying their respective substantives restrictively. This seems to contradict the label of his second category, "Restrictive Attributive." Then, he seems to limit himself when he cites John 6:27 as an example of this "Restrictive Attributive" category as follows: "ἐργάζεσθε μὴ τὴν βρῶσιν τὴν **ἀπολλυμένην** ἀλλὰ τὴν βρῶσιν τὴν **μένουσαν** εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον."[146] He correctly identifies these participles as restrictive but he seems to contradict and constrain himself by limiting restrictive attributive participles to a certain syntactical construction, especially since the two "ascriptive" examples he provides appear to be modifying their substantives restrictively.

Concerning Burton's assertions, initially his analysis of the restrictive attributive participle seems in agreement with current linguistic categories. However, Burton then moves his discussion to participles functioning substantively. He states, "The subject of the Restrictive Attributive Participle [sic] is often omitted. The participle is then an Adjective Participle [sic] used substantively."[147] The problem with this assertion is that no other grammarian or modern linguist researched thus far has utilized the notion of restrictive modification with respect to a substantive. Usually when a participle functions substantivally, one does not speak of adjectival modification because there does not exist a relationship to another substantive that it modifies. Usually it is just labeled as a substantival participle. Additionally, it is noted that with respect to the nonrestrictive attributive participle, three of his four examples have a proper noun (two of which are divine) as the substantive ostensibly being modified (2 Tim 1:8, 9—θεοῦ; 1 Thess

---

[145] MacDonald, *Greek Enchiridion*, 58.

[146] MacDonald, *Greek Enchiridion*, 58.

[147] Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, 165.

33

1:1—Ἰησοῦν; Heb 7:9—Λευί).[148] While Burton contributes much to the discussion, clarity in terminology and further analysis would enhance his assertions. This dissertation contributes in this manner.

Young brings the most sophisticated and linguistically sound argumentation of the aforementioned scholars. He offers a new perspective, and one that we agree with, when he states that the restrictive use of the attributive participle is the most common type. He does, however, maintain that nonrestrictive adjectival participles do exist as well (see examples above).[149]

Though Young contends these examples to be nonrestrictive, one could reasonably argue that the few examples that he provides should be put into the restrictive category. *The living God* example, τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος, can plausibly be taken as restrictive. In the Old Testament, Yahweh stood distinct from dead gods of wood and stone because he is the god that lives, not the god that is inanimate. TWOT confirm as much when they state, "In contradistinction from all false "els" (gods), he is declared to be 'ēl ḥay the 'Living EL.'"[150] Hezekiah's prayer illustrates this quite well from Isa 37:16–20:

> O LORD of hosts, God of Israel, enthroned above the cherubim, you are the God, you alone, of all the kingdoms of the earth; you have made heaven and earth. Incline your ear, O LORD, and hear; open your eyes, O LORD, and see; and hear all the words of Sennacherib, which he has sent to mock **the living God**. Truly, O LORD, the kings of Assyria have laid waste all the nations and their lands, and have cast **their gods** into the fire. **For they were no gods, but the work of men's hands, wood and stone.** Therefore they were destroyed. So now, O LORD our God, save us

---

[148] The unique nature of attributive participles with proper/divine names will be treated in ch. 6.

[149] Young, *Intermediate New Testament Greek*, 151.

[150] TWOT, אֱלֹהִים. They also put forth the following verses for consideration: "Josh 3:10; 1Sam 17:26, 36; 2Kings 19:4, 16; Psa 42:2 [H 3]; Psa 84:2 [H 3]; Isa 37:4; Jer 10:10; Jer 23:36; Dan 6:20, 26 [H 21,27]; Hos 1:10 [H 2:1]." See also TWOT, מָחָה. They state that the modifier "living" is often used with God "in contrast to what is dead."

from his hand, that all the kingdoms of the earth may know that you alone are the LORD.[151]

The usage of this modifier with "God" in the New Testament seems to carry the same restrictive and confessional force.

Young's analysis of verses with "surpassing" also could be questioned. The writer clearly differentiates different levels of grace, greatness, and riches. So, if the few examples that Young provides are possibly untenable, this begs the question as to whether or not nonrestrictive attributive participles are prevalent in the New Testament.[152] Furthermore, how does this purported tendency toward restriction compare to the pattern of modification with regard to the relative clause? Are they equivalent in this distinction? Young does not answer these questions but his work does support the necessity of them. This dissertation will confirm his observation that restrictive attributive participles are more common than nonrestrictive ones. It will also bring clarity to the specifics, peculiarities and nuances of this assertion.

When looking at all five of these grammarians as a whole, they exhibit similarities and disparities. They all contend that attributive participles modify substantives adjectivally. Porter seems to imply that this modification can be described as restrictive and at least four of his five examples are restrictive. Wallace brings little sophistication and lacks depth on this topic. He implicitly contends that the nature of the modification is both restrictive and nonrestrictive without saying much more. MacDonald seems to be aware of the restrictive attributive participle but rigidly connects the occurrence to a set syntactical pattern and contradicts himself with his

---

[151] Taken from the ESV. Also, consider Isaiah 41–48, which contrasts Yahweh with idols/gods of other nations. For example: "They have no knowledge who carry about their wooden idols, and keep praying to a god that cannot save . . . . And there is no other god besides me, a righteous God and a Savior; there is none besides me" (Isa 45:20–21).

[152] Young, *Intermediate New Testament Greek*, 151.

35

nebulous "ascriptive" category. Burton is aware of the restrictive/nonrestrictive[153] distinction yet

lacks precision. Additionally, his nonrestrictive examples primarily modify proper nouns, which

begs the question as to whether attributive participles modify common nouns/substantives

nonrestrictively. Young contradicts MacDonald's syntax/structure assertions (and rightly so) by

demonstrating that restrictive attributive participles take on a variety of different syntactical

structures. According to our analyses, his observation that restrictive attributive participles

represent the majority of attributive participles demonstrates a clearer understanding than most.

His nonrestrictive examples, however, can plausibly be contested. In addition to these five

grammarians, the work of Boyer should also be considered. As seen in the section on the relative

clause, Boyer widely utilizes the nonrestrictive and restrictive distinction. In his analysis of the

participle, however, he makes no mention of it at all. The variety of perspectives, lack of

perspective, varying degrees of sophistication, and both congruous and incongruous assertions

all demonstrate that further study needs to be done to bring clarity to these varying observations

with respect to the restrictive/nonrestrictive distinction and the attributive participle.

Attributive Participle as "Relative Connective/Continuative" in Running Style. With

respect to the relative connective/continuative classification that was explored with the relative

clause, one might consider whether or not the attributive participle functions in a similar manner.

As stated earlier, BDF speaks of the "running style" of Greek wherein "the first sentence is

extended by means of *a participial phrase,* a clause introduced by ὅτι, a relative clause, or

similar construction" (emphasis mine).[154] Boyer highlights that BDF's discussion of the relative

connective[155] functions in this "running style."[156] So, as Boyer interprets BDF and by what we

---

[153] His term for the notion of nonrestrictivity is *explanatory.*

[154] BDF, § 458. Both Lysias and the author of Hebrews exhibit the running style.

[155] BDF, § 458.

also believe BDF to be asserting, it appears that both contend that the participle can function in a capacity equivalent to the relative connective running style of Greek. Ironically, however, as BDF give numerous examples of the relative connective,[157] they cite no examples of the participial phrase functioning in the running style of Greek. Additionally, Boyer, who brings this distinction to the fore in his examination of the relative clause,[158] makes no such assertion in his treatment of the participle.[159] No other grammarian seems to speak explicitly of this category and our analysis suggests that the *attributive* participle does not function in this capacity.

Attributive Participle or Substantival Participle in Apposition? When considering the attributive participle, one must also consider the substantival participle in apposition to another substantive. Both MacDonald and Young speak of this category.

Beyond the notion of adjectival modification, MacDonald speaks of an "Appositive" category, which he describes as one of seven different types of "Substantival participles."[160] This assertion is not in his section on adjectival participles.[161] He puts forth the following verse as an example of an appositive substantival participle: "κύριος ὁ θεός, ὁ ὢν . . . καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος (Rev 1:8)."[162]

Young also treats the appositional substantival participle and places it under the overall category labeled: "Participles Functioning in Noun Phrases."[163] Young's appositional classification differs from adjectival modification, which he further supports when he states that

---

[156] Boyer, "Relative Clauses," 235.

[157] BDF, § 458.

[158] Boyer, "Relative Clauses," 235.

[159] Boyer, "Participles," and James L. Boyer, *Supplemental Manual of Information: Participles* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Boyer, 1986).

[160] MacDonald, *Greek Enchiridion*, 55–56.

[161] MacDonald, *Greek Enchiridion*, 55–56.

[162] MacDonald, *Greek Enchiridion*, 56.

substantival participles "function as subject, direct object, indirect object, object of preposition, apposition, or predicate nominative."[164] Furthermore, it clearly represents a category distinct from restrictive and nonrestrictive modification in that he thoroughly addresses this under a separate section.[165] Young provides an example of an appositional substantival participle in 1 Thess 1:10 as follows: "Ἰησοῦν τὸν ῥυόμενον ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς ὀργῆς τῆς ἐρχομένης (Jesus, the one who delivers us from the coming wrath)."[166] Young contends that τὸν ῥυόμενον functions substantivally in apposition to Ἰησοῦν.[167] He also gives two other examples of substantival participles functioning in apposition: "Matt 1:16 Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος χριστός (Jesus, the one called Christ); Mark 6:14 Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτίζων (John the Baptist)."[168] Young seems to contend that these participles are not functioning adjectivally but rather are independent substantives. He demonstrates this by treating them in separate categories and in his translations when he utilizes "the one who . . ." and not a relative pronoun alone, "who . . . ."

The reason this discussion is applicable to our study has to do with how certain scholars apply these categories to the text. So, while Young cites the participle in 1 Thess 1:10 as an appositional substantival participle,[169] Burton classifies 1 Thess 1:10 differently. Burton cites it as follows: "Ἰησοῦν τὸν ῥυόμενον ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς ὀργῆς τῆς ἐρχομένης, *Jesus, which delivereth us from the wrath to come*. In this example ῥυόμενον is explanatory, ἐρχομένης is restrictive."[170] So, Burton contends that τὸν ῥυόμενον is an attributive participle adjectivally modifying Ἰησοῦν

---

[163] Young, *Intermediate New Testament Greek*, 148.

[164] Young, *Intermediate New Testament Greek*, 148.

[165] Young, *Intermediate New Testament Greek*, 150.

[166] Young, *Intermediate New Testament Greek*, 150.

[167] Young, *Intermediate New Testament Greek*, 150.

[168] Young, *Intermediate New Testament Greek*, 150.

[169] Wallace seems to indicate substantival usage as well. Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 620.

[170] Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, 166.

nonrestrictively, while Young states they are two substantives standing in apposition to each other. This demonstrates a lack of consistency in application and demonstrates the necessity to investigate the implications (or lack thereof) of classifying certain participles as a substantive in apposition to another substantive or in attributive position to a substantive. Furthermore, an understanding of whether or not one could describe the nature of the relationship between two substantives in apposition as restrictive or nonrestrictive will prove relevant to this study as well.

General Summary and Evaluation of Approaches to the Attributive Participle. As stated earlier, when examining the attributive participle and its syntactical functions, grammarians do not treat it as extensively as they do the relative clause. The case may be that since many assert it to be equivalent to a relative clause that one would then refer to their work on the relative clause to see how an attributive participle functions. However, no references as such have been noted by grammarians thus far.

Additionally, as with the relative clause, uniformity does not exist in the terminology, definitions, application, and parameters for the functions of the attributive participle. So, as with the analyses of the relative clause considered above, the question at hand is whether or not grammarians contend that the attributive participle modifies substantives both restrictively and nonrestrictively, and is there a tendency toward one or the other. Furthermore, a consideration of the classification of participles as substantival in apposition to a substantive may help illumine the assessment of the purported equivalence of attributive participle and relative clause in the Greek New Testament.

To put forth another illustration that demonstrates some of the inconsistencies, we might look to Matt 1:16. Young asserts that Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος χριστός is an example of an appositional substantival participle. This seems to differ from Blass, Robertson and Turner, who

39

categorized such attributive participles as equivalent to adjectival relative clauses.[171] Turner states, "Also equivalent to a relative clause is the very frequent apposition ὁ λεγόμενος, (ἐπι)καλούμενος, with proper name following, always with an article after the person or object named."[172] Though Turner utilizes the term *apposition* he clearly speaks of this in terms of adjectival modification not two substantives standing side by side. This can be discerned by the fact that he essentially starts with a "Substantival Participle" category, moves to the "Attributive Participle" category, and then to the "Adverbial Participle."[173] His discussion of "the frequent apposition ὁ λεγόμενος, (ἐπι)καλούμενος" is included in the attributive participle section not the substantival section.

The information we have presented so far in this analysis of the attributive participle serves to highlight a lack of clarity among scholars on how to classify certain participles. Are they functioning adjectivally, modifying a substantive? Is that modification restrictive or nonrestrictive? Or, is the participle substantival standing in apposition to a substantive? Could that appositional relationship still be categorized as restrictive or nonrestrictive? Our study seeks to bring more clarity and comprehensiveness to the analysis.

Necessity of This Study

Thus far the assertions of a variety of grammarians have been surveyed. A summary evaluation of their work and an explicit call for inquiry will further demonstrate the need for this research. Furthermore, an analysis of related fields of study will demonstrate both the need for the study and the implied benefits beyond the area of grammatical analysis.

---

[171] See section titled "Explicit Assertions of Equivalence" starting on p. 6. This section deals with explicit assertions stating that attributive participles are equivalent to relative clauses.

[172] Turner, *Syntax*, 152.

[173] Turner, *Syntax*, 150–53.

Grammatical Necessity

A summary of our evaluations from the *Current Status of the Question* section will be put forth below. Additionally, James W. Voelz's later assertions regarding our topic of inquiry will be considered.

Grammatical Evaluations. The grammatical analysis presented thus far has centered on grammarians' assertions that the attributive participle is equivalent to a relative clause and respective individual treatments of the relative clause and the attributive participle.

An analysis of the assertions of equivalence reveals some items of concern. There appears to be lack of original research by multiple grammarians. Additionally, scholars give limited examples of the phenomenon and no comprehensive studies exist that could validate their assertions. Furthermore, among those grammarians who explicitly contend the equivalence of the attributive participle and the relative clause, Burton is the only one that makes reference to the restrictive and nonrestrictive (his term is "explanatory") distinction. And, although he seems to be somewhat aware of this linguistic category, he still contends that they are fully equivalent constructions without providing substantial data to back up his claim.

With respect to grammatical analyses of the relative clause, some level of agreement exists among grammarians. The categories "restrictive" (identifying, clarifying) or "nonrestrictive" (explanatory, descriptive) are employed. Furthermore, a certain level of congruence exists also with Levinsohn's continuative relative clause category (based on Winer) and Boyer's relative connective typology (based upon BDF). However, while most grammarians treat the various functions of the relative clause that are applicable to our study (restrictive and nonrestrictive adjectival modification and relative connective/continuative clauses), uniformity does not exist in the terminology, definitions, application, and parameters of these categories.

As stated earlier, when examining the attributive participle and its syntactical functions, grammarians do not treat it as extensively as they do the relative clause. Additionally, as with the relative clause, uniformity does not exist in the terminology, definitions, application, and parameters for these functions. There exists a lack of clarity on how to classify certain participles.

All of these items of concern demonstrate that valid questions need to be answered with respect to the ostensible equivalence of the attributive participle to the relative clause. Our study aims to bring clarity to the variety of grammatical analyses as we seek to determine the differences and similarities of the two constructions especially with reference to the restrictive/nonrestrictive distinction.

Explicit Call For Inquiry. Young, in his treatment of the adjectival attributive participle, discusses restrictive adjective phrases and states, "The restrictive use is by far the most common type of adjectival participle."[174] The previous evaluations of other grammarians coupled with Young's observations establish and support the need of this study.

Additionally, however, Voelz's insights into this question should be noted. As cited above, Voelz, in his Greek grammar, contends that "an attributive position participle is the equivalent of a subordinate clause introduced by a relative pronoun."[175] Over the years, however, Voelz has reconsidered this notion and has asked whether there may be more to the two constructions than previously considered. His observations are the primary starting point for this dissertation and his summary of the situation follows:

> But are these two formulations, i.e., a participle and a clause headed by a relative pronoun, actually full equivalents? That is an important question with exegetical implications. Generally, the answer given by grammarians, including myself, has

---

[174] Young, *Intermediate New Testament Greek*, 150.

[175] Voelz, *Fundamental Greek*, 139.

been a strong "Yes" . . . , but I have increasingly been led to question the assertion of equivalence. Indeed . . . Michael Hayes is currently working on a dissertation that focuses on this point.[176]

Voelz raises the initial question in this journal article entry and then further elaborates upon this question in the subsequent issue of that same journal.[177] In that subsequent issue Voelz defines the restrictive and nonrestrictive distinction and, as does this dissertation, asserts that the attributive participle tends to modify restrictively and the relative clause nonrestrictively under certain prescribed circumstances.[178]

Voelz's examples and analyses will be considered in more detail in chs. 3 and 5 of this dissertation.[179] However, a couple of examples serve to highlight Voelz's assertions. Voelz cites Matt 21:15 as an example of a restrictive attributive participle as follows: "ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς τὰ θαυμάσια . . . καὶ τοὺς παῖδας τοὺς **κράζοντας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ**."[180] Voelz translates as follows: "And the chief priest and the scribes, upon seeing the wonders . . . and the children **crying out in the temple**."[181] Voelz points out that, "the clause represented is properly understood to be restrictive, i.e., the entity in the clause represents a smaller subcategory of a larger group."[182] So, in the example above from Matt 21:15, "the children who were crying out were a subgroup of all children in Jerusalem at the time."[183] Voelz also gives examples of nonrestrictive adjectival relative clauses. He cites, "John 8:53: μὴ σὺ μείζων εἶ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἀβραάμ, ὅστις ἀπέθανεν; 'You are not greater than our father Abraham, who died

---

[176] James W. Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part II," *ConcJ* 32 (2006): 314.

[177] James W. Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part III," *ConcJ* 32 (2006): 401–3.

[178] Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part III," 401–3.

[179] See pp. 98 ff. of ch. 3 and pp.178 ff. of ch. 5.

[180] Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part III," 401.

[181] Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part III," 401.

[182] Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part III," 401.

[183] Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part III," 402.

are you?"[184] Clearly, ὅστις ἀπέθανεν does not restrict the proper noun Ἀβραάμ but adds explanatory nonrestrictive adjectival modification to it.

Finally, Voelz observes that "the analysis we suggest is not without its minor problems, especially attributive position participles . . . that seem to be a restriction, not on what they modify directly but upon all other alternative possibilities."[185] Voelz cites 1 Pet 1:3 as an example as follows:

> Εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ κατὰ τὸ πολὺ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος ἀναγεννήσας ἡμᾶς εἰς ἐλπίδα ζῶσαν.

> "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the one who has, according to his great mercy, begotten us again unto a living hope (as opposed to anyone else who might attempt such a salvation)."[186]

Said "problems" and other clarifications will be addressed in ch. 6. So, as Voelz highlights areas that need further investigation, he indicates the necessity of this dissertation: "This is why Mr. Hayes is doing his in-depth analysis."[187]

On the whole, grammarians have more thoroughly expounded upon the relative clause than the attributive participle. So not only does a lack of clarity exist in the terminology, definition, application, and parameters of the categories that describe the function of the relative clause; there is also a lack of clarity as to whether or not the attributive participle (though purported to be equivalent) functions in the same way as the relative clause in all its possible functions. Furthermore, no comprehensive or exhaustive study has been done heretofore that seeks to verify the equivalence of these two grammatical constructions. Young makes a helpful distinction (and perhaps new insight) when he states that adjectival participles are commonly restrictive. Though

---

[184] Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part III," 402.

[185] Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part III," 403.

[186] Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part III," 403. Voelz also notes a possible minor problem with respect to relative pronouns in the accusative.

[187] Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part III," 403.

his examples are few and cursory, his statement alone fosters and supports the need for an inquiry and investigation into the veracity of the purported equivalence of the attributive participle and the relative clause in the Greek New Testament, and specifically with respect to the restrictive/nonrestrictive distinction. Additionally, Voelz's later work explicitly reinforces this necessity and in essence calls for such a study to be done to analyze every occurrence of the attributive participle and the relative clause in the Greek New Testament, especially with respect to the restrictive and nonrestrictive distinction.

Related Fields of Study

Not only does an analysis of the work of Greek grammarians and their assertions prove the necessity of this study, but a cursory look into other related fields of study further supports the need for this inquiry. Related areas of exegesis, punctuation practices for Greek New Testament texts, and translation practices will be considered.

Exegesis. While the primary focus and analysis thus far has consisted of work mainly with grammar, a look into other exegetical disciplines demonstrates a need for an analysis of the attributive participle and the relative clause in the Greek New testament. Specifically speaking, commentary work, as it ties together multiple disciplines, could benefit from the analysis of this dissertation.

Commentators look at a text and use all sorts of *tools* to enable them to bring out the meaning of the text. Douglas Moo does this in his exegesis of Rom 11:2a[188]: οὐκ ἀπώσατο ὁ θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ὃν προέγνω.[189] While he utilizes theology, cultural context, biblical context, etc .

---

[188] Douglas J. Moo, *The NIV Application Commentary: Romans* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000), 354.

[189] NIV: "God did not reject his people, whom he foreknew."

. ., he also seeks linguistic understanding as to the nature of the relative clause in Rom 11:2a

especially with respect to restrictive and nonrestrictive modification as follows:

> The placement of the comma in this statement is critical. Some commentators
> remove the comma and so treat "whom he foreknew" as a "restrictive" clause—that
> is, a clause that restricts the word it modifies by identifying it. On this view, Paul is
> asserting that God has not rejected *the people whom he chose*. Such a statement
> would build on the "remnant" idea of 9:6–29, claiming that God remains faithful to
> that "Israel within an Israel" whom he has chosen for salvation. But almost all
> modern versions, following most of the commentaries, rightly add the comma,
> making the clause nonrestrictive. "Whom he foreknew" does not identify the
> "people" Paul is talking about; rather, it explains why God remains faithful to that
> people.[190]

Without assessing all of Moo's exegetical and theological claims, we should note,

however, the importance of being able to determine if a clause modifies a substantive

restrictively or nonrestrictively. Moo rightly demonstrates how exegetically significant this

choice can be for the interpreter. This study helps answer the question as to whether or not the

interpreter is merely confined to context to determine this, or if syntax can play a role. We

maintain that at times one can only determine the nature of modification from context. However,

this study will help determine when one can confidently say that an attributive participle or

relative clause is restrictive or nonrestrictive and when context alone must decide. Commentary

work would greatly benefit from being able to confidently know how to handle the restrictive

and nonrestrictive nature of the attributive participle/relative clause and the potentially

significant exegetical implications.

Punctuation Practices for Greek New Testament Texts. Most early manuscripts of the

Greek New Testament contained very little, if any, punctuation.[191] As a result, editors of modern

---

[190] Moo, *Romans*, 354.

[191] "The scriptio continua of the original texts not only ignored the division of words, but naturally also lacked any punctuation. Occasionally this can be critical for the interpretation of a sentence . . . . The difference can be quite significant exegetically and theologically, e.g., in John 1:3–4." Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, *The Text of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1989), 287.

editions must make choices as to where punctuation marks should be placed. As Voelz points

out, modern editors of Greek New Testament texts essentially utilize four punctuation marks. He

lists them with their English counterparts as follows:

1. . (period) = . (period)

2. , (comma) = , (comma)

3. ; (semicolon) = ? (question mark)

4. ˙ (raised period) = : (colon) or ; (semicolon)[192]

A variety of issues that come about when considering the punctuation of the text could be

explored. However, for the purposes here, the usage of the comma relates directly to this study.

As has been noted earlier, the usage of the comma in English and Spanish relative clauses

determines whether or not the relative clause modifies its substantive nonrestrictively or

restrictively.[193] In the German language, however, commas are not used in this manner. DuVal

makes no mention of a differentiation in restrictive and nonrestrictive clauses and asserts that in

the German language "a relative clause is separated from the rest of the sentence by a comma (or

commas)."[194] Additionally, when we consider the well-respected German grammar, *Duden,*

Grammatik Der Deutschen Gegenwartssprache, in the section "Relativsätze," no mention is

made whatsoever to restrictive or nonrestrictive adjectival modification.[195] In fact the very first

---

[192] Voelz, *Greek Grammar*, 20.

[193] This is also the case for Modern Greek. See pp. 62 and following of the section titled "Restrictivity in Modern Languages" in ch. 2.

[194] F. Alan Duval, *Moderne Deutsche Sprachlehre* (New York: Random House, 1967), 521. Duval then gives two examples as follows: "Kennen Sie die Frau, die eben eingestiegen ist?" "Der Mann, der das Geld verloren hatte, war der Wirt." Both of these examples are restrictive relative clauses yet, unlike English, the comma has been utilized. This illustrates how German does not employ commas to demonstrate whether or not a clause functions restrictively or nonrestrictively. A quick survey of a basic German grammar also illustrates this point quite well. Consider Annemarie Künzl-Snodgrass, *Upgrade Your German* (London: Arnold, 2003), 44–48. Snodgrass puts forth 17 examples of relative clauses, representing both restrictive and nonrestrictive clauses. Every example utilizes commas to set off the relative clause.

[195] Günther Drosdowski, ed., *Duden, Grammatik Der Deutschen Gegenwartssprache* (5th ed.; Mannheim: Bibliographisches Institut & F.A. Brockhaus AG, 1995), 730–37.

sentence of the section demonstrates the differentiation in punctuation between English and German: "Ein Relativsatz ist ein Nebensatz, der durch ein Relativpronomen oder eine Relativpartikel eingeleitet ist . . . ."[196] The relative clause, set off by a comma, clearly modifies its substantive restrictively. In English, no comma would be present. Furthermore, the introduction to NA^{27} does not explain the nature of the punctuation at all. A reasonable question directed to the editors of NA^{27}, a modern edition with a German introduction and an English introduction, would be to ask how the comma should be considered with respect to the Greek text.[197] Is it a *German* comma, an *English* comma, or something else? Unfortunately the introduction of NA^{27} states very little regarding the punctuation and merely indicates that the text of NA^{27} "reproduces that of the 26th edition unchanged. Consequently, with rare exceptions, the paragraphing and punctuation remains the same, avoiding the necessity for altering the page makeup."[198] So, how should one understand the punctuation of NA^{27}? To further complicate matters, a vague statement regarding the punctuation of NA^{26} can be found by two of its primary editors in their work, *The Text of the New Testament*.[199] Aland and Aland contend that "*GNT* followed the rules of English usage until the revised third edition, and Nestle-Aland^{26} attempted (with success, we dare hope) to represent Greek usage, departing from it only when strict consistency might cause difficulties for the modern reader." This statement is completely vague and gives no clarity as to what "Greek usage" is.

Punctuation of a text does affect how a translator or exegete should treat the text. Robinson and Pierpont acknowledge this in the introduction of their edition of the Greek New Testament.

---

[196] *Duden*, 730. Notice the lack of the presence of the comma in the restrictive clause in the English translation: "A relative clause is a subordinate clause that is introduced by a relative pronoun or a relative particle."

[197] NA^{27} contains first a German Introduction and then an English one. However, we know that this text has a rich history in Germany and with German scholars as editors.

[198] NA^{27}, 46*.

[199] Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and*

"Although alternative accentuation, aspiration, or punctuation could alter the interpretation of many passages and affect exegetical comprehension, the editors have followed the general usage found in standard printed editions."[200] They acknowledge exegetical implications of punctuation marks and then contend they have followed "general usage." What is "general usage?" Furthermore, if different editions of the Greek New Testament are compared, differing punctuation practices are found. For example, notice the differences between Robinson and Pierpont's Byzantine edition (BYZ) and NA[27] in Matt 24:45:

> BYZ: Τίς ἄρα ἐστὶν ὁ πιστὸς δοῦλος καὶ φρόνιμος, ὃν κατέστησεν ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς θεραπείας αὐτοῦ, τοῦ διδόναι αὐτοῖς τὴν τροφὴν ἐν καιρῷ;

> NA[27]: Τίς ἄρα ἐστὶν ὁ πιστὸς δοῦλος καὶ φρόνιμος ὃν κατέστησεν ὁ κύριος ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκετείας αὐτοῦ τοῦ δοῦναι αὐτοῖς τὴν τροφὴν ἐν καιρῷ;

Notice how the substantive ὁ πιστὸς δοῦλος καὶ φρόνιμος has a comma following it in BYZ and no punctuation following it in NA[27]. Consider Matt 2:9 in the following three editions:

> BYZ: Οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες τοῦ βασιλέως ἐπορεύθησαν· καὶ ἰδού, ὁ ἀστήρ, ὃν εἶδον ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ, προῆγεν αὐτούς, ἕως ἐλθὼν ἔστη ἐπάνω οὗ ἦν τὸ παιδίον.

> NA27: οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες τοῦ βασιλέως ἐπορεύθησαν καὶ ἰδοὺ ὁ ἀστήρ, ὃν εἶδον ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ, προῆγεν αὐτούς, ἕως ἐλθὼν ἐστάθη ἐπάνω οὗ ἦν τὸ παιδίον.

> SBLGNT: οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες τοῦ βασιλέως ἐπορεύθησαν, καὶ ἰδοὺ ὁ ἀστὴρ ὃν εἶδον ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ προῆγεν αὐτούς, ἕως ἐλθὼν ἐστάθη ἐπάνω οὗ ἦν τὸ παιδίον.[201]

In this example, we are considering the substantive ὁ ἀστήρ. Notice how in both BYZ and NA[27] a comma follows the substantive. However, in SBLGNT, no punctuation follows.

These two examples serve to illustrate two points. First, the punctuation of the Greek Text is inconsistent in modern editions. Secondly, the nature of the punctuation is nebulous,

---

to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1995).

[200] Maurice A Robinson, and William G. Pierpont, *The New Testament in the Original Greek: Byzantine Textform* (Southborough, Mass: Chilton, 2005), xvii. Referenced in the body of this work as BYZ.

[201] Michael W. Holmes, ed. *The Greek New Testament: SBL Edition* (Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010). Referenced in the body of this work as SBLGNT.

especially with reference to the restrictive/nonrestrictive distinction. These two points demonstrate a need for consistency in punctuation and also transparency with respect to the nature of such punctuation. This dissertation helps clarify the nature of modification for certain clauses. This in turn also serves as a call to editors, for the sake of exegesis and translation, to be aware of these issues and address them clearly in future editions.

Translation Practices of the Greek New Testament. A look at various translations into different languages reveals discrepancies in translation with respect to the restrictive and nonrestrictive distinction, especially as it relates to the attributive participle and the relative clause in the Greek New Testament.

As has been noted under the preliminary discussion of nonrestrictive and restrictive clauses, in English a nonrestrictive clause is set off by a comma (or commas). A restrictive clause has no comma after the antecedent. With this in mind we consider Mark 12:38: βλέπετε ἀπὸ τῶν γραμματέων τῶν θελόντων ἐν στολαῖς περιπατεῖν καὶ ἀσπασμοὺς ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς. The attributive participle τῶν θελόντων adjectivally modifies τῶν γραμματέων. How is the English translator going to portray this modification in the English language? A look at three very reputable translations reveals a fascinating disparity. The ESV renders the modification nonrestrictively, "Beware of the scribes, who like to walk around in long robes and like greetings in the marketplaces." The ESV essentially contends that all scribes like to walk around in long robes and like greetings in the marketplaces. The NIV, however, seems to render it almost like a relative connective in that it starts a new sentence, "Watch out for the teachers of the law. They like to walk around in flowing robes and be greeted in the marketplaces." The NIV, then, contends that the participle is not functioning restrictively or necessarily nonrestrictively in an adjectival sense, but something more akin to a demonstrative pronoun. Finally, the NASB[95] renders the adjectival modification restrictively, "Beware of the scribes who like to walk around

in long robes, and *like* respectful greetings in the market places." The NASB[95] seems to indicate

that there are scribes out there that do not walk around in long robes and do not like respectful

greetings in the market places. That is to say that not all scribes behave in this manner but

beware of the ones that do. Three major English translations all interpret and translate the

attributive participle differently.

A look at Col 1:29 also reveals some similar disparities with respect to translation:

ἀγωνιζόμενος κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν δυνάμει. The attributive

participle τὴν ἐνεργουμένην adjectivally modifies τὴν ἐνέργειαν. Different English and Spanish

versions handle the translation of this adjectival modification differently. The ESV renders the

modification restrictively, "struggling with all his energy that he powerfully works within me."

The ESV, therefore, depicts Paul speaking of the energy of Christ that is working in him, not the

energy that is working in another believer, or in creation, or to heal someone, etc. Paul limits and

restricts the subset of Christ's energy to specifically that energy directed to and working in him.

(Notice how this attributive participle has been interpreted restrictively by the ESV but the one in

Mark 12:38 was taken nonrestrictively.) On the other hand, both the NASB[95] and the NIV, contra

the ESV, render the attributive participle in Col 1:29 nonrestrictively:

NASB[95]: striving according to His power, which mightily works within me.

NIV: struggling with all his energy, which so powerfully works in me.

(Notice that the NASB[95] renders the attributive participle as nonrestrictive but in Mark 12:38 the

NASB[95] translates the construction restrictively.) A confusing disparity also occurs when one

considers the Spanish counterpart to the NIV, the NVI (Nueva Versión Internacional).[202] The

NVI, opposite of the NIV, renders the adjectival modification restrictively, "fortalecido por el

---

[202] *La Santa Biblia, Nueva Versión Internacional* (Colorado Springs: International Bible Society, 1999).

51

poder de Cristo que obra en mí." Furthermore, another Spanish translation, *Reina Valera*,[203] renders the attributive participle with a nonrestrictive relative clause, "luchando según la fuerza de él, la cual actúa poderosamente en mí."

A quick survey of the various renderings of adjectival clauses in Mark 12:38 and Col 1:29 demonstrates a lack of consistency in multiple translations in both English and Spanish. This study aims to provide clarity for translators, especially those who work in languages that have restrictive and nonrestrictive strategies. Such clarity will allow the translator to know when a Greek attributive participle or relative clause can be confidently translated restrictively or nonrestrictively based on syntax and when context alone must be considered.

Summary of Related Fields. While other related fields may also benefit from this dissertation, it has been cursorily demonstrated that commentary work, punctuation of modern editions of the Greek New Testament, and translation work into languages with restrictive and nonrestrictive strategies will all benefit from a clearer understanding of the relationship between the attributive participle and adjectival relative clause in the Greek New Testament.

The Plan of the Dissertation

The dissertation seeks to clarify the nature of the relationship between the relative clause and the attributive participle within the scholarship of Hellenistic Greek Grammar (specifically that of the New Testament as a representative of Koine). It assesses the various explicit and implicit statements of those scholars discussed above and seeks to provide clarity in the terminology and typology of these two grammatical constructions especially as relates to the restrictive/nonrestrictive distinction and their supposed equality. The dissertation offers a survey of every example found in the Greek New Testament. No study heretofore has sought to analyze

---

[203] *La Santa Biblia, Antiguo y Nuevo Testamento, Antigua Version de Casiodoro de Reina* (Miami: United

every attributive participle and relative clause in the New Testament in order to assess their

similarities, differences and purported equivalence.

The Methodological Procedure Employed

Following the methodology of current linguistic scholarship, the dissertation consists of a

synchronic analysis of the corpus of the Greek New Testament, specifically the text of NA^{27}.[204]

Porter states in his Greek grammar that "the Greek of the NT . . . constitutes an established

corpus suitable for linguistic analysis."[205] He maintains that the New Testament is representative

of the Hellenistic Greek of the first century and should be analyzed synchronically in accord with

modern linguistic practice.[206] Additionally, Karleen limits his study on the participle to the New

Testament maintaining that "The New Testament is a significant body of ancient Greek

literature" and it offers "a varied, yet coherent and easily accessible corpus of material for

analysis."[207] Palmer follows a similar approach by limiting the corpus of study to the New

---

Bible Society, 1995).

[204] NA^{27} will be the text utilized for this inquiry. It should be noted that variants have been checked in NA^{27} and no significant syntactical variants that would greatly affect our study were observed. Furthermore since ECM has replaced NA^{27} in the Catholic Epistles, the approximately 54 differentiations from the NA^{27} text were checked and no significant variants to our study were observed. Additionally, a sample test was executed on the examples located in 1 Corinthians. Variants in SBLGNT and in Swanson's work on 1 Corinthians were checked and no significant syntactical variants were identified: Reuben Swanson, ed., *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines Against Codex Vaticanus: 1 Corinthians* (Wheaton, Ill.: Tyndale House, 2003). Additionally, thorough research has been conducted and no significant variants have been identified with respect to the specific examples cited in the body of this dissertation.

[205] Porter, *Idioms*, 13.

[206] See Porter, *Idioms*, 13, 15, and 18. The synchronic approach originates in Ferdinand de Saussure, *Course in General Linguistics* (eds. Charles Bally and Albert Secheaye; trans. Roy Harris; La Salle: Open Court, 1986), 81, 89. A synchronic study limits the analysis of language to one time period, for our purposes the first century. That is to say, our study does not analyze the linguistic patterns diachronically. A diachronic analysis would compare, for example, the grammar of 1st century A.D. Greek to the grammar of 5th century B.C. Greek and to the grammar of 5th Century A.D. Greek.

[207] Paul Stuart Karleen, *The Syntax of the Participle in the Greek New Testament* (Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1980), 3.

Testament books of Luke-Acts and the undisputed letters of Paul, also utilizing a synchronic approach.[208]

Furthermore, Voelz has also considered the place of the Greek of the New Testament within the context of Hellenistic Greek and has demonstrated that "there is no single NT usage of the Greek language"[209] and that the various features of New Testament Greek are "in evidence in both standard and not so standard Hellenistic Greek."[210] Voelz's assessment includes both overall structural features[211] and specific linguistic features.[212] He concludes that "the authors of the NT wrote a language that is fully representative of Hellenistic Greek."[213] He continues, "we may assert that in the NT there are only various linguistic manifestations in *parole* of the *langue* of Hellenistic Greek, the presence of Semitisms notwithstanding."[214] On the basis of the investigations of the aforementioned scholars we will undertake a synchronic analysis of the corpus of the Greek New Testament as representative of Hellenistic Greek.

Confined to the NA^{27} corpus, all relative clauses and attributive participles were identified by means of comprehensive manual readings of the text.[215] This comprehensive identification of

---

[208] Micheal W. Palmer, *Levels of Constituent Structure in New Testament Greek* (New York: Peter Lang, 1995), 18–20, 29.

[209] James W. Voelz, "The Greek of the New Testament: Its Place Within the Context of Hellenistic Greek," Pages177–198 in *Greek: A Language in Evolution: Essays in Honour of Antonios N. Jannaris* (ed. Chrys C. Caragounis; Hildesheim, Germany: Georg Olms, 2010), 185.

[210] Voelz, "Greek of the New Testament," 185.

[211] Voelz, "Greek of the New Testament," 185–88.

[212] Voelz, "Greek of the New Testament," 188–90.

[213] Voelz, "Greek of the New Testament," 195.

[214] Voelz, "Greek of the New Testament," 195.

[215] These examples are listed in app. 1 and 2 of the dissertation. App. 2 includes every relative clause in the Greek New Testament. Furthermore, app. 1, in addition to attributive participles, also includes every substantival participle and predicate adjective participle. Additionally, many adverbial participles and a few periphrastic participles have been included in this appendix due to the debatable nature of their classification (this allows for independent assessment by those studying this dissertation). All of the additional examples beyond the primary focus of attributive participles and adjectival/adnominal relative clauses have been identified and included in these appendices for the sake of thoroughness and transparency. These appendices, which in total contains 4,185 examples, will allow for scholars to independently assess the assertions maintained in this dissertation and

every example in the corpus was then compared to Boyer's classifications[216] and searches

performed with BibleWorks 7[217] in order to determine if any relative pronouns or participles were

overlooked in the manual identification.

Once this pool of examples was established, each participle and relative clause was

analyzed with respect to its function. For relative clauses the following designations were

utilized: adjectival/adnominal, substantival, and adverbial.[218] For the participles the following

designations were used: attributive (adjectival), substantival, predicate adjective, periphrastic and

adverbial.[219]

Next, every adjectival clause (both attributive participle and adjectival/adnominal relative

clause)[220] was analyzed and preliminarily categorized as either restrictive or nonrestrictive.[221] The

primary assertions of this dissertation find their basis in this comprehensive analysis. Additional

categorization and work has been done to note the specific nuances and intricacies to our thesis

and will be further developed in subsequent chapters. Some examples of such categorization

include: noun-phrase formation pattern; location of clause within the hierarchy of subordinate

---

understand how each occurrence has been categorized.

[216] Boyer, *Relative Clauses*, and Boyer, *Participles*.

[217] *BibleWorks 7: Software for Biblical Exegesis and Research* (Norfolk, Va.: BibleWorks, LLC, 2006).

[218] Additionally an "alternating" category was utilized with the relative clause to designate those examples where the relative pronoun is utilized with the particles μέν and δέ to express alternatives. For example in Matt 22:5: ἀπῆλθον, ὃς μὲν εἰς τὸν ἴδιον ἀγρόν, ὃς δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν ἐμπορίαν αὐτοῦ. Furthermore, the limited amount of sentential relative clauses are subsumed under the adjectival/adnominal designation.

[219] As noted earlier, every example of an attributive, substantival, and predicate adjective participle were identified. Additionally certain adverbial and periphrastic participles were included for the sake of thoroughness and transparency allowing for independent assessment of the assertions maintained here.

[220] Approximately 800 attributive participles and 1,040 adjectival/adnominal relative clauses have been identified.

[221] Both nonrestrictive adjectival clauses and those clauses of the relative connective or relative continuative type have been assumed under the general label "nonrestrictive" (following the pattern of Levinsohn; see p. 22 of section titled "Relative Connective/Continuative" above). See also section titled "Continuum of Nonrestrictivity—Modification to Coordination" on pp. 163 ff. of ch. 4.

relative constructions;[222] nature of substantive modified; nature of verb in clause and various grammatical considerations.

Essentially the method could be described as follows:

1. Investigate a tentative thesis: attributive participles are restrictive and relative clauses are nonrestrictive.

2. Identify every attributive participle and relative clause in order to test the tentative thesis.

3. Classify each attributive participle and adjectival/adnominal relative clause as restrictive or nonrestrictive.

4. Identify exceptions to tentative thesis.

5. Categorize exceptions.

6. Establish overall thesis that accounts for taxonomy of exceptions.

The tentative thesis has merely served as a starting point to begin to test the leanings of Voelz[223] regarding the necessity to reevaluate the purported equivalence of the two constructions with respect to the restrictive/nonrestrictive distinction.[224] It has logically followed that one must then identify every example to be analyzed within the established corpus. Upon identification, classification in order to test the tentative thesis has helped to reveal the patterns and tendencies of each grammatical construction. Exceptions to the tentative hypothesis have been categorized and have informed the actual thesis of this dissertation. Further analysis of the data then revealed other patterns that further clarify the specifics of the thesis. In this sense the process has been cyclical.

---

[222] The linguistic term for this phenomenon is "Accessibility Hierarchy." This linguistic universal will be thoroughly explicated in ch. 6.

[223] See section titled "Explicit Call for Inquiry" starting on p. 42 for a presentation of Voelz's position.

[224] Young's assertions regarding the dominance of restrictive adjective participles also serve as impetus for this

The Outcomes Anticipated

The dissertation assesses the purported equivalence of the attributive participle and the relative clause. In so doing it makes several contributions to the scholarly study of New Testament Greek grammar and linguistics. It contributes to a typology of the relative clause and the attributive participle of the Greek New Testament by clarifying, modifying, and further understanding restrictivity/nonrestrictivity, relative connective/continuative clauses, and apposition as they relate to these two constructions. In addition, it offers an analysis of every example of the attributive participle and relative clause in NA[27].

The dissertation seeks to establish the rationale for the presence of the attributive participle instead of the relative clause (and the relative clause instead of the attributive participle) specifically in those instances where either construction references an antecedent. The dissertation seeks to establish that the attributive participle tends to be utilized to restrict the modified substantive, except in various cases where the usage of said construction is not feasible due to grammatical and stylistic reasons.[225] Furthermore, when both constructions are grammatically and stylistically feasible, the relative clause is predominantly utilized nonrestrictively.

In general, the following seem to obtain: when both constructions are feasible, the attributive participle is utilized to modify substantives restrictively and the relative clause relates to its antecedent nonrestrictively. The dissertation, then, assesses the purported equivalence of the attributive participle and the relative clause. It demonstrates that on certain levels they may be considered equivalent. However, the dissertation seeks to demonstrate that when an author

---

tentative thesis.

[225] For example, it is grammatically impossible to render the relative clause in Matt. 11:20 into an attributive participle (τὰς πόλεις ἐν αἷς ἐγένοντο αἱ πλεῖσται δυνάμεις αὐτοῦ/the cities in which most of his miracles were done). Additional examples and categories will be explored more thoroughly in ch. 6.

had a choice between the two constructions, certain factors, "rules" or tendencies of the language influenced his utilization of one construction over the other. These factors serve to highlight the aspects in which the attributive participle and the relative clause in the Greek New Testament are different. On the whole, the dissertation aims to provide a comprehensive depth and clarity toward understanding the restrictive/nonrestrictive nature of the attributive participle and the relative clause toward an assessment of their purported equivalence.

CHAPTER TWO

RESTRICTIVITY

Introduction

An analysis and examination of restrictivity as a linguistic category coupled with a general survey of restrictive clauses will be presented. This exploration of restrictivity establishes a necessary foundation for the survey of restrictive clauses in the Greek New Testament in chapter 3.

Restrictivity as a Linguistic Category

An exploration of the validity of restrictivity as a linguistic category, a clear definition of restrictivity, an understanding of the constraints of an antecedent upon modification, and an awareness of various restrictive strategies all contribute to developing an understanding of restrictivity.

Validity of Restrictivity as a Linguistic Category

A review of the history and acceptance of restrictivity as a linguistic category coupled with a brief presentation of restrictivity in modern languages helps establish the validity of this linguistic distinction and underscores the need to explore restrictive tendencies in the Greek New Testament.

History and Acceptance of Restrictivity as a Linguistic Category. The concept of restrictive (and nonrestrictive) modification originated in areas of traditional grammar, yet the

notion has been widely embraced and utilized in formal linguistic studies as a valid distinction.[1]

Brock Haussamen puts forth a helpful summary of the history of the restrictive/nonrestrictive

distinction:

> The contrast between restrictive and nonrestrictive has historically been one of the most successful conceptualizations of recent grammar theory. It is relatively young as grammar terms go, dating back to Goold Brown's first use of the term restrictive in 1823. The term emerged from discussions of the lightening of punctuation. That is, in the 17th and 18th centuries, all relative clauses were bordered by commas. An example from a 1785 book on punctuation: "Never open your heart to persons, whom you do not know." But ten years later, in 1795, Lindley Murray included in his great grammar text a mention of an exception in the changing practice of the time. "When two members are closely connected by a relative, restraining the general notion of the antecedent to a particular sense, the comma should be omitted." Murray's word, restraining, was replaced by Brown's use of restricting in his version of the rule shortly after, and the new term stuck. So the inconvenience of having a positive term, restrictive, refer to an absence of punctuation arose from the description of conditions under which certain traditional commas should be left out. Without shifting patterns of punctuation in the 18th century, we might not have the terms at all.
>
> One sign of the success of the two terms is that they have spread from conventional grammar to linguistics, a field which has been very careful about its terminology. Linguistic grammars use the terms, as conventional grammars do, to describe not only relative clauses but modifiers of all kinds in their relation to the term they modify. The main idea is that all modifiers have one of two qualities--they are either essential, tightly bound, defining . . . or they are unessential, parenthetic, loosely bound.[2]

Haussamen demonstrates that initially the term and the category came about with respect to

English grammar, but also that both have been accepted widely by traditional grammars and

linguistic studies across many languages.[3]

---

[1] Brock Haussamen, "Between Restrictive and Nonrestrictive: Amplifying Clauses" (Williamsport, Penn.: NCTE Assembly for the Teaching of English Grammar, 1995), 2.

[2] Haussamen, "Restrictive and Nonrestrictive," 2.

[3] Crystal states, "The contrast between restrictive (or defining) and non-restrictive (or non-defining)" is widely "recognized in traditional as well as linguistic grammars." David Crystal, *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics* (4th ed.; Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell, 1997), 329.

Additionally, Michael Lucas contends that "almost all grammarians have accepted without question the traditional binary classification" (most notably he cites Poutsma, Kruisinga and Jespersen).[4] With respect to modern linguistics, he asserts that linguists of T-G (Transformational Grammar) also uphold this distinction (most notably Lees, Carlota Smith, Bach, Jacobs and Rosenbaum, Langendon, as well as Chomsky himself).[5]

The assertions of Haussamen and Lucas establish that a vast number of grammarians and linguists uphold the existence of a restrictive/nonrestrictive distinction that aids in analyzing a variety of strategies for adnominal modification (and coordination) in any language.

Restrictivity in Modern Languages. A presentation of a few restrictive strategies within modern languages serves as a beneficial heuristic to validate the restrictive distinction.[6] The restrictive tendencies of English and Spanish that were introduced in chapter 1[7] will be expounded.[8] Additionally, some brief illustrations of restrictive strategies cited in the literature will be presented. Finally, the restrictivity of relative clauses in Modern Greek will be presented with the consideration of how the restrictive tendencies of Modern Greek might be relevant to our study of the Greek of the New Testament. The analysis of these languages will consider, to varying degrees, the orthographic, syntactic and prosodic[9] nature of restrictivity.

---

[4] Michael A. Lucas, "The Surface Structure of Relative Clauses," *Linguistics* 139 (1974): 83.

[5] Lucas, "Relative Clauses," 83–84. It should be noted that T-G grammarians utilize the terms *restrictive* and *appositive* as opposed to *restrictive* and *nonrestrictive*. This has to do with their analysis of deep structures, which goes beyond the scope of this dissertation.

[6] A more detailed survey of strategies will be presented later in the chapter; highlighting a few strategies from a variety of languages here helps demonstrate the validity of the restrictive/nonrestrictive distinction.

[7] See section titled "The Restrictive/Nonrestrictive Distinction" on p. 4 of ch. 1.

[8] Since English speakers represent the major readership for this dissertation and since Spanish is the second most spoken language in the U. S. A, a consideration of the restrictive tendencies of these languages proves to be a beneficial heuristic to validate the restrictive distinction and to elucidate the assertions made throughout this dissertation. For this reason, English and Spanish examples will be utilized often in the dissertation.

[9] In the field of linguistics prosody refers to the rhythm, stress and/or intonation of speech. Most native speakers employ quite naturally the restrictive prosodic strategies of English and Spanish. Most, however, are not

In English, as was noted in chapter 1,[10] relative clauses serve as a restrictive strategy. Orthographically this is noted with the absence of a comma before and after the entire relative clause (e.g. *The boy who raised his hand is well-mannered*). One also observes this distinction prosodically. There exists a very distinct prosodic variance between restrictive relative clauses and nonrestrictive relative clauses. Jespersen states that there is "a marked difference in tone, a non-restrictive clause beginning on a deeper tone than a restrictive one; besides, a pause is permissible before a non-restrictive, but hardly before a restrictive clause."[11] So, essentially Jespersen notes that when voicing a restrictive relative clause, one will not pause and the tone remains constant, but when voicing a nonrestrictive clause one normally pauses, and the tone one utilizes for the relative pronoun will be deeper.[12] If a native English speaker naturally speaks the following sentences, Jespersen's assertions are confirmed: "*John likes the girl who plays soccer.*" "*Mary, who plays soccer, is a nice girl.*"[13]

---

aware or conscious of the restrictive/nonrestrictive distinction, linguistically speaking. The awareness of this reality helps to confirm the validity of the restrictive/nonrestrictive distinction within English and Spanish and demonstrates the need for precision in translating Biblical texts with respect to restrictive and nonrestrictive strategies.

[10] See section titled "The Restrictive/Nonrestrictive Distinction" on p. 4 of ch. 1.

[11] Otto Jespersen, *The Philosophy of Grammar* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1968), 112.

[12] Randolph Quirk, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartik, eds. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language* (New York: Longman, 1985), 366, confirm as much: "restrictive relative clauses are closely connected to their antecedent or head prosodically." With respect to nonrestrictive relative clauses he asserts that their "'parenthetic' relation is endorsed by being given a separate tone unit (frequently with reduced prominence and narrow pitch range)," 1242. Edward L. Keenan, "Relative Clauses," in *Language Typology and Syntactic Description Vol 2. Complex Constructions* (ed. Timothy Shopen; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 169, notes that in English (and modern Hebrew) nonrestrictive relative clauses differ from restrictive ones by parenthetical intonation..

[13] Kleanthes K. Grohmann, "Clause." Pages 210–11 in *A–N* (vol. 1 of *Encyclopedia of Linguistics*, ed. Philipp Stranzy; New York: Fitzroy Dearborn, 2005), 211. One should also note that this phenomenon applies to restrictive and nonrestrictive appositional constructions. One observes this phenomenon when voicing the following: "John the Baptist" (restrictive) and "Jesus Christ, the Son of God" (nonrestrictive).

Syntactically speaking, Borsley states that "English restrictive relatives fall into two broad

types: those that contain a *wh*-word (*wh*-relatives) and those that do not (non-*wh*-relatives)."[14]

Those that do not contain a *wh*-relative "fall into two subtypes: those that contain *that* (*that*-

relatives) and those that do not (zero relatives)."[15] Essentially, restrictive relative clauses in

English can employ a variety of strategies (*wh*-relatives, *that*, zero relatives), but when the

strategy consists of the relativizer *that* or a zero relative, the relative clause must be restrictive

(nonrestrictive relative clauses can only utilize *wh*-relatives).

English adjective modifiers may also function restrictively, which is discerned

prosodically. Crystal asserts: "The contrast is illustrated by the two meanings of the sentence

Look at John's black dog; with the [prosodic] emphasis on *dog*; the implication is that John has

one dog with him, which happens to be black (i.e. the modification is non-restrictive); but with

[prosodic] emphasis on *black* the implication is that John has more than one dog with him, and

our attention is being drawn to the black one (i.e., the blackness is crucial to the identity of the

dog, and the modification is thus restrictive)."[16]

With respect to the Spanish language, orthographically speaking, similarly to English,

restrictive relative clauses in Spanish are not set off by commas. Pountain and Solé & Solé

address the prosodic restrictive tendencies of Spanish. Pountain contends that Spanish

nonrestrictive relative clauses "are characterized in speech by a falling terminal juncture . . .

---

[14] Robert D. Borsley, "Relatives Clauses and the Theory of Phrase Structure," *Linguistic Inquiry* 28 (1997): 630.

[15] Borsley, "Relatives Clauses," 630. A zero relative describes a relative clause where the relative pronoun is only implied and is not explicitly present (i.e., *Jack built the house I was born in* or *He is the person I saw*).

[16] Crystal, *Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*, 332. Quirk highlights this distinction: "restrictive modification tends to be given more prosodic emphasis than the head, since there is a built-in contrast." He cites, "Susan is my *ELDER* daughter" and "John is my *LAZY* son." With respect to nonrestrictive modification, he states it tends "to be unstressed in prehead position." He cites, "My *beautiful* WIFE." Quirk et al., *Grammar*, 1242. Also, see Talmy Givón, *Syntax: A Functional-Typological Introduction* (Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1990), 2:473.

Restrictive relative clauses have no such terminal juncture."[17] He cites such a restrictive clause:

"¿Conoces *el restauraunte que está en la Calle Argüelles?*"[18] Additionally, Solé & Solé assert

that restrictive relative clauses are not voiced with a pause.[19] The prosodic assertions of Pountain

and Solé & Solé closely parallel those assertions made above with respect to relative clauses in

the English language.

Syntactically speaking, Solé & Solé address the restrictive nature of adjectives. They

contend that in Spanish post-nominal adjectives tend to be restrictive.[20] They cite the following

restrictive example: "Conocí a un violinista **famoso** en casa de unos amigos."[21]

Nikolaeva and Wellens highlight a few restrictive strategies in Persian, Somali and Nubi.

Nikolaeva examines the restrictive/nonrestrictive distinction quite thoroughly and notes the

universal nature of the distinction. She maintains, "In some languages, restrictive and

nonrestrictive clauses have a consistently different surface structure. For example, in Persian the

suffix-*i* can only be hosted by the head of a restrictive relative. In Somali . . . the restrictive

clause is not" preceded by the "conjunction *oo.*"[22] With respect to Nubi, Wellens notes that

"Nubi adjectives often modify the noun in a kind of relative clause construction;"[23] restrictive

adjectives are connected by a relativizer (such as *al*).[24]

---

[17] Christopher J. Pountain, *Exploring The Spanish Language* (London: Arnold, 2003), 87–88.

[18] Pountain, *Spanish Language,* 88. "Do you know the restaurant that is on Argüelles street?"

[19] Yolanda R. Solé and Carlos A. Solé, *Modern Spanish Syntax: A Study In Contrast* (Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath and Company, 1977), 116.

[20] Solé and Solé, *Spanish Syntax,* 234–35.

[21] Solé and Solé, *Spanish Syntax,* 234–35."I met a **famous** violinist at the house of some friends."

[22] Irina Nikolaeva. "Relative Clauses." Pages 501–8 in *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics.* (ed. Keith Brown. 2d ed.; Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2006), 502.

[23] Inneke Hilda Werner Wellens, *The Nubi Language of Uganda: An Arabic Creole in Africa* (Boston: Brill, 2005), 105.

[24] Other relative markers in Nubi consist of "*'ali, a'li, al, 'abu, a'bu,* or *ab.*" Wellens notes that the difference between *'ragi ke 'bir* and *'ragi al ke 'bir* "is related to the distinction between non-restrictive and restrictive modifiers

Finally, relative clauses in Modern Greek may function restrictively. In fact, these relative clauses exhibit prosodic and orthographic tendencies similar to those of English and Spanish relative clauses. Aikaterini Chatsiou states with respect to Modern Greek that "in order to disambiguate between a restrictive or a non-restrictive reading of the relative clause, speakers rely heavily on prosodic/intonational information."[25] David Holton et al. maintain that restrictive relative clauses in Modern Greek lack prosodic pauses and orthographic commas.[26] Conversely, they state that "non-restrictive relative clauses are set off by pauses (and by commas in written discourse)."[27] Consider the following respective restrictive and nonrestrictive examples of Modern Greek relative clauses as set forth by Holton et al.:

Ο καθηγητής που μας έκανε ιστορία ήταν πολύ καλός

'The teacher who taught us history was very good'

Ο καινούργιος μας καθηγητής, που σπούδασε στο Reading, είναι πολύ καλός

'Our new teacher, who studied at Reading, is very good'[28]

In Modern Greek relative clauses are introduced by "the relative complementizer που" (as above) or by "the pronoun phrase ο οποίος" (as below). Consider two additional examples of restrictive relative clauses in Modern Greek:

Η συζήτηση την οποία κάναμε πρέπει να μείνει μεταξύ μας

'The conversation which we had must remain between us'

---

respectively." "Thus beside *'ragi ke 'bir*, we often find *'ragi al ke 'bir*, where the noun *'ragi* 'man' and the adjective *ke 'bir* 'big' are linked with a relative marker . . . *al* . . . " (Nonrestrictive: *'ragi ke 'bir*. Restrictive: *'ragi al ke 'bir*). Wellens, *Nubi*, 105.

[25] Aikaterini Chatsiou, "A Lexical Functional Grammar Approach to Modern Greek Relative Clauses," (Ph.D. diss., University of Essex, 2010), 63.

[26] David Holton et al., *Greek: A Comprehensive Grammar* (2d ed.; New York: Routledge, 2012), 532.

[27] Holton et al., *Greek*, 532.

[28] Sentences and translations taken from Holton et al., *Greek*, 532.

Καταλαβαίνω πάντα τους ανθρώπους οι οποίοι λένε ψέματα

'I can always tell people who lie'[29]

The orthographic, prosodic, and syntactic manifestations of restrictivity (and nonrestrictivity) presented above illustrate the reality of this linguistic distinction in modern languages, a linguistic distinction that is at the very least potentially valid for the analysis of older languages, including ancient Greek. Furthermore, the analysis of Modern Greek presented above is very important. According to Caragounis, Greek has "never given birth to any daughter languages... [And] the changes it has sustained are far smaller than the changes that have come over other languages with a much briefer history, as e.g. German and English."[30] Caragounis maintains that "much of the life-stream of the ancient phase still forms the *backbone* of present Greek, and that the modern user is no stranger to the ancient form of Greek."[31] Modern Greek "has its roots in the Koine period. The basic changes, morphological and syntactical, that differentiate it from ancient Greek, actually go back to the 900 year period from Alexander to Justinian, during which the NT came into being."[32] On the whole Greek has changed relatively little (in linguistic terms), less than virtually any other language. Caragounis asserts "that Greek has changed less over the past two thousand years, and that *N* [Neohellenic/Modern Greek] is much closer to the New Testament than is generally supposed."[33] Thus, if restrictive (and nonrestrictive) strategies exist not only in many modern languages but also in Modern Greek, it

---

[29] Sentences and translations taken from Holton et al., *Greek*, 533.

[30] Caragounis, *Development of Greek*, 2. For a very thorough presentation of this reality see Caragounis, *Development of Greek*, chs. 1 through 6.

[31] Caragounis, *Development of Greek*, 7. Emphasis mine.

[32] Caragounis, *Development of Greek*, 7.

[33] Caragounis, *Development of Greek*, 89.

is entirely proper to seek to discern the restrictive (and nonrestrictive) strategies of the Greek of the New Testament.[34]

Summary of the Validity of Restrictivity (and Nonrestrictivity) as a Linguistic Category. A review of the history and acceptance of restrictivity (and nonrestrictivity) as a linguistic category has demonstrated the universal acceptance and application of this distinction across a wide variety of languages and strategies. Furthermore, the examples of these strategies presented above help establish the validity of this linguistic distinction and support the inquiry into the existence of specific restrictive/nonrestrictive strategies for the study of any language. Furthermore, for the sake of exegesis and translation of the New Testament, a study that takes this grammatical/linguistic classification into account is necessary, even if the Greek of the New Testament may not seem to have specific orthographic, prosodic or syntactic strategies to demonstrate the restrictive/nonrestrictive distinction. Our study cannot take into account orthographic considerations, as punctuation was not prevalent in ancient Greek texts.[35] Furthermore, while it is difficult in this study to take into account prosodic research due to the nature of dead languages, the presence of prosodic (and orthographic) restrictive (and nonrestrictive) relative clauses in Modern Greek provides an impetus to discern the restrictive/nonrestrictive strategies of ancient Greek. We will, therefore, attempt to demonstrate that on a syntactic basis the Greek of the New Testament does exhibit certain restrictive tendencies, especially with respect to the attributive participle.

---

[34] Furthermore, it is probably true to say that it is likely that what Modern Greek evidences can be seen already in Koine Greek, rather than that what Modern Greek evidences is probably fundamentally different than what is true of Koine Greek.

[35] See section titled "Punctuation Practices for Greek New Testament Texts" on pp. 46–50 of ch. 1.

Clarification of Terminology

At a basic level the definition of restrictive and nonrestrictive modification has been presented. However, the terminology and definitions utilized by traditional grammarians and modern linguists vary with respect to, specifically, restrictive modification. A clarification of terminology related to relative clauses coupled with a more comprehensive definition of restrictive modification benefits the study of restrictive modification as it relates to the attributive participle and the relative clause in the Greek New Testament.

Definition of Relative Clause. One of the difficulties encountered in our study has to do with an inconsistency of terminology in modern linguistics and traditional grammar. Specifically, the term *relative clause* has a different usage in traditional and linguistic grammars. Most grammarians of the Greek New Testament operate with a traditional understanding of the term and apply it to a finite clause that begins with a relative pronoun and modifies a substantive/antecedent (e.g. Matt 1:23: καὶ καλέσουσιν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἐμμανουήλ, ὅ ἐστιν μεθερμηνευόμενον Μεθ᾽ ἡμῶν ὁ θεός). However, in modern linguistics the term *relative clause* has come to cover also various (other) strategies that modify substantives. So, sometimes when linguists make assertions about relative clauses, they may also be speaking of attributive participles (or other modifying/relativization strategies), which they consider to be a type of *relative clause* (e.g. Matt 3:7: τίς ὑπέδειξεν ὑμῖν φυγεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς μελλούσης ὀργῆς;). Consequently, some scholars use the term *relative clause* yet are referring to adjectival clauses in general.[36]

In the context of modern linguistics, therefore, a broader understanding of the term *relative clause* would include the modifying strategy of the attributive participle. For example, Nikolaeva

---

[36] See Platzack and Safir below.

68

states that, "the term 'relative clause' may be misleading."[37] She maintains that in a large number

of languages "participial constructions . . . conform to the functional definition of the R[elative]

C[lause] but are not clauses from a syntactic viewpoint. Some languages have no clear

distinction between RCs and attributive modification, so that RCs and what can be referred to as

adjectives show identical patterns."[38] She cites the phrase "the book written by me" as a prime

example of a relative clause in this broader sense, which, in traditional grammatical form, is an

attributive participle.[39]

Edward L. Keenan and Bernard Comrie address this terminological challenge as well when

they note that "our semantically based notion of R[elative] C[lause] justifies considering as RCs

certain constructions that would perhaps not have been so considered in traditional grammar.

Thus, in German, alongside the traditional RC in (1) we also count the participial construction in

(2):"[40]

(1) der Mann, der in seinem Buro arbeitet

---

[37] Nikolaeva, "Relative Clauses," 502.

[38] Nikolaeva, "Relative Clauses," 502. She demonstrates this implicitly in a Finnish example that includes a participle that she labels as an RC [Relative Clause], 503.

[39] Nikolaeva, "Relative Clauses," 502. Matthews confirms Nikolaeva's assertions regarding participial constructions when he puts forth the term participial relative clause. He claims that these are forms "with a participle whose role is like that of a relative clause." Matthews, Linguistics, 267. Avery Andrews utilizes the terminology: "nonfinite (participial) relative clauses." Avery D. Andrews, "The Major Functions of the Noun Phrase," in Clause Structure (ed. Timothy Shopen; vol. 1 of Language Typology and Syntactic Description; 2d ed.; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 172. Matthew Dryer asserts that participial modifiers are tantamount to relative clauses. Matthew S. Dryer, "Noun Phrase Structure," in Complex Constructions (ed. Timothy Shopen; vol. 2 of Language Typology and Syntactic Description; 2d ed.; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 192. Downing highlights this terminological problem as well when he states, "Linguists tend to use the term 'relative clause' as if it referred to a universal grammatical entity." He notes the difficulty with this when he states that "attempts to justify a common deep syntactic representation for relative clauses have not escaped arbitrariness." Finally Downing observes that when pushed to the cross-linguistic extreme, "a universal characterization of the notion 'relative clause' can only be given in semantic terms." He finally concludes that while "a universal semantic definition can be provided for the notion 'relative clause,' there is no single set of syntactic properties by which RC's can be identified as a universal syntactic category." Bruce T. Downing, "Some Universals of Relative Clause Structure," in Syntax (ed. Joseph H. Greenberg; vol. 4 of Universals of Human Language; Stanford; Stanford University Press, 1978): 377–80.

[40] Edward L. Keenan and Bernard Comrie, "Noun Phrase Accessibility and Universal Grammar," Linguistic Inquiry 8 (1977): 64.

the man who in his study works
'the man who is working in his study'

(2) der in seinem Buro arbeitende Mann
the in his study working man
'the man who is working in his study'[41]

As a result of this data, Keenan and Comrie further note that "not only do different languages

vary with respect to the way RCs are formed, but also within a given language there is often

more than one distinct type of RC."[42] They refer to these "distinct ways of forming RCs as

different relative clause forming strategies"[43] or relativization strategies.[44] Keenan and Comrie

note that "many European languages (e.g. German, Russian, and Polish) have participial RC-

forming strategies that apply only to subjects; cf. (2) above."[45] This observation will prove

relevant to our study of the Greek New Testament and will be elaborated upon in subsequent

chapters. It will be seen that the Greek of the New Testament also employs this "participial RC-

forming strategy" to subjects only. This fact will prove relevant to the comparison of attributive

participles and relative clauses and the Accessibility Hierarchy discussed in chapter 6 of the

dissertation.

The assertions of Nikolaeva and Keenan & Comrie[46] demonstrate that a lack of clarity

exists with respect to the term relative clause and what exactly constitutes one. Traditional

grammars for the Greek New Testament (and any other language) would normally not include

participial constructions under relative clauses, but some modern linguists do. An awareness of

---

[41] Keenan and Comrie, "Noun Phrase Accessibility," 64.

[42] Keenan and Comrie, "Noun Phrase Accessibility," 64.

[43] Keenan and Comrie, "Noun Phrase Accessibility," 64.

[44] Paul R. Kroeger, Analyzing Syntax: A Lexical-Functional Approach (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 176.

[45] Keenan and Comrie, "Noun Phrase Accessibility," 70.

[46] Also Matthews, Downing, Andrews, and Dryer; Cf. n. 39 above.

this difference helps inform the nature of scholars' definitions of restrictive (and nonrestrictive) modification. So, some of what is stated linguistically about relative clauses refers to a broader category that includes a variety of modifying strategies such as, for our purposes, the attributive participle in Koine Greek. An awareness of this ambiguity will add clarity to the assertions regarding restrictive modification set forth by scholars such as Platzack and Safir below.

Definition of Restrictivity. Many scholars define restrictivity similarly, yet not all assertions are completely identical. It is our contention that the concept of "limiting" describes the nature of restrictive modification most accurately.

Platzack asserts, "The restrictive relative clause is a necessary modification, delimiting the set of elements referred to by the relative head and thereby determining its referent."[47] Jespersen speaks of restrictive modifiers and states that "their function is to restrict the primary, to limit the number of objects to which it may be applied . . . ."[48] Limiting describes the nature of restrictive modification, which then has the effect[49] of specializing,[50] contrasting,[51] classifying,[52] qualifying,[53] determining,[54] defining,[55] and/or identifying.[56]

---

[47] Christer Platzack, "A Complement-of-N⁰ Account of Restrictive and Non-Restrictive Relatives: The Case of Swedish," in *The Syntax of Relative Clauses* (ed. Artemis Alexiadou, Paul Law, Andre Meinunger and Chris Wilder; Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2000), 268. Similarly, the terms *narrowing* and *restricting* describe the act of limiting. Christian Lehmann, "Relative Clauses." in *Mande Languages—Selection* (vol. 3 of *International Encyclopedia of Linguistics* (ed. William Frawley; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 460–62, likewise writes, "A R[elative] C[lause] is *restrictive* if it narrows the head concept," like in the example, "the book which you are consulting.". Givón, *Syntax 2*, 473, too, writes, "Restrictive modifiers *restrict the domain* of the noun." See also Matthews, *Linguistics*, 319 and Downing, "Relative Clause Structure," 379.

[48] Jespersen, *Philosophy of Grammar*, 108. John Butt and Carmen Benjamin, *A New Reference Grammar of Modern Spanish* (4th ed.; San Francisco: McGraw-Hill, 2004), 518, state that "restrictive clauses limit the scope of what they refer to." Cf. also Pountain, *Spanish Language*, 87–88.

[49] Or as Nikolaeva states, "serves the purpose of ." Nikolaeva, "Relative Clauses," 501–2.

[50] Cf. Jespersen, *Philosophy of Grammar*, 108.

[51] Cf. Crystal, *Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*, 332.

[52] Cf. Ray Jackendoff, *X Syntax: A Study of Phrase Structure* (Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 1977), 194.

[53] Cf. Jespersen, *Philosophy of Grammar*, 108.

[54] Cf. Platzack, "Restrictive and Non-Restrictive Relatives," 268.

Christian Lehmann considers the limiting nature of restrictive modification and describes

the effects of such limiting by means of a scale between two poles: "eine Skala von der

Begriffsbildung bis zur Gegenstandsidentifikation."[57] Lehmann's assertions represent a more

detailed perspective in contrast to other linguists. The continuum between these poles extends

from generic (concept formation) to specific (entity identification). At the concept formation

pole, one observes a concept that is general in nature; at the entity identification pole, one

observes a concept, but since it is limited so specifically it identifies the precise entity intended

by the author/speaker. An example of restrictive modification toward the concept formation pole

would consist of: *the man who works hard* (*the hard-working man*). Consider a similar example

from the New Testament in 2 Tim 2:6: τὸν κοπιῶντα γεωργὸν δεῖ πρῶτον τῶν καρπῶν

μεταλαμβάνειν (ESV: "It is the hard-working farmer who ought to have the first share of the

crops.").[58] An example of restrictive modification toward the entity identification pole would

consist of: *the man whom we met yesterday*. Consider a similar example from the New

Testament in John 5:12: τίς ἐστιν ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ εἰπών σοι· ἆρον καὶ περιπάτει; (ESV: "Who is

the man who said to you, 'Take up your bed and walk'?"). So, Lehmann's contention that the

"function of restrictive RCs[59] varies between the poles of *entity identification* and *concept*

---

[55] Cf. Brown and Jackson: Keith Brown, ed. *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* (2d ed; Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2006), 1:111; Howard Jackson, *Key Terms in Linguistics* (New York: Continuum, 2007), 51.

[56] Keenan, "Relative Clauses," 142. Keenan focuses on this notion of identification in his analysis of noun phrases. He refers to noun phrases with "a common noun and a restrictive clause . . . Semantically the common noun determines a class of objects" which he labels "the *domain* of relativization, and the restrictive clause identifies a subset of the domain, those elements which satisfy the condition given by the restrictive clause."

[57] Christian Lehmann. *Der Relativsatz* (Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1984), 189. "A scale from concept formation to entity identification."

[58] Note that the use of a participial construction as restrictive under the rubric of *relative clause* conforms to the modern linguistic proclivity to widen the definition of *relative clause* beyond a relativizer plus a verb. See the discussion in "Clarification of Terminology" section above on pp. 68 ff.

[59] It should be remembered that Lehmann uses the term *R[elative] C[lause]* in the wide sense, which includes constructions such as the attributive participle in Greek. See discussion in the "Clarification of Terminology" section above on pp. 68–71.

formation" details more precisely some of the specific effects of the limiting nature of restrictive modification.[60]

Along with the notion of limiting Platzack asserts that "the restrictive relative clause is a necessary modification."[61] Safir speaks of this necessary modification as follows: "It has often been noted that restrictive and nonrestrictive relatives crucially differ in that the head of a nonrestrictive relative has reference independent of the modifying clause, whereas the head of a restrictive relative does not."[62] Safir contends then that a restrictive modifier is necessary in that the antecedent is dependent upon the modification for reference. Collectively the two units (antecedent and restrictive modifier) constitute a noun phrase that refers to one specific entity/concept.[63] For example, consider the noun phrase τὰ τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ τὰ διεσκορπισμένα in John 11:52. The antecedent τὰ τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ, by itself, refers to the children of God (in general). The intended referent, however, consists of the children of God who are scattered abroad; the restrictive participle τὰ διεσκορπισμένα provides the necessary modification. The antecedent and restrictive modifier together refer to one specific entity; the antecedent depends upon it for reference.

We may say in summary, then, that restrictive modifiers limit their antecedents and can be characterized as necessary to the linguistic identity of the noun phrase. Lehmann's continuum of entity identification and concept formation accurately describes the effect of this modification.

---

[60] Christian Lehmann, "Relative Clauses," 461.

[61] Platzack, "Restrictive and Non-Restrictive Relatives," 268.

[62] Ken Safir, "Relative Clauses in a Theory of Binding and Levels," *Linguistic Inquiry* 17 (1986): 668.

[63] Similarly the term *essential* has been utilized to treat this concept of necessary modification. Cf. Grohmann and Haussamen: Grohmann, "Clause," 211; Haussamen, "Restrictive and Nonrestrictive," 2. The *necessary* and *essential* nature of restrictive modification has led some scholars to focus on the connection between the antecedent and modifier and describe it as *tight*. Cf. Lucas, who speaks of *tight* (restrictive) and *loose* (nonrestrictive) clauses. Lucas. "Relative Clauses," 117. Cf. Haussamen, who utilizes "tightly bound." Haussamen, "Restrictive and Nonrestrictive," 2.

Restrictivity and the Nature of Antecedents

Certain types of substantives or noun phrases tend to attract or accept either restrictive or nonrestrictive modification. We label this the "continuum of acceptability."

Continuum of Acceptability. Generally speaking Nikolaeva states, "Restrictive R[elative] C[lause]s are headed by common nouns, whereas nonrestrictive RCs can modify personal pronouns and proper nouns."[64] Nikolaeva contends that the semantic identity of the substantive plays a role in whether restrictive or nonrestrictive modification is acceptable. In many ways there seems to be a continuum of acceptability for restrictive (and nonrestrictive) modification. Substantives that are very generic represent one extreme and substantives that are very specific represent the other. The farther to the generic extreme the more acceptable is restrictive modification. The farther to the specific extreme the less acceptable is restrictive modification.[65]

The General Extreme of the Acceptability Continuum. Quirk and Lucas discuss the type of modification that generic antecedents tend to attract.

Quirk labels the most generic of substantives as nonassertive heads. This would include such generic nouns as ἄνθρωπος, ἀνήρ, γυνή, λαός, πρᾶγμα, etc. He states, "Nonassertive heads cannot have nonrestrictive modification."[66] In his treatment of the role of determiners, however, he asserts more accurately the tendency of generic antecedents toward restrictive modification and states that "nonspecific determiners like *any, all,* and *every* usually have only restrictive modification."[67] Additionally, Quirk in his discussion of compound pronouns, asserts that very

---

[64] Nikolaeva, "Relative Clauses," 502.

[65] Exceptions do exist, but Nikolaeva points out that these are the general tendencies within languages.

[66] Quirk et al., *Grammar,* 1241. Quirk overstates himself in that his assertion does not allow for exceptions (e.g., *All people, whom God created, bear the image of God in their being*).

[67] Quirk et al., *Grammar,* 1241. Emphasis mine. Also see Grosu, who also asserts similar ideas with respect to certain determiners that are utilized to disambiguate readings toward restrictive modification. Grosu, "Relative Construction," 115–16.

generic substantives tend to attract restrictive modification. Such compounds "are the least

problematic of the indefinite pronouns, since they behave in general like noun phrases of very

general meaning . . . *everybody, everyone, everything.*"[68] He puts forth the following as

examples, the first of which is a restrictive relative clause and the second a restrictive participial

construction: "Everyone (*that*) *you meet*" and "anything *made of silver.*"[69]

Lucas deals with generic antecedents in his treatment of what he calls "categorical

nominals." He describes these as "*any-, no-* and *every-*nominals."[70] He asserts, "It seems to be a

general rule that these nominals do not occur with loose [nonrestrictive] clauses, although they

freely occur with tight [restrictive] clauses."[71] For the Greek New Testament, most substantives

that are coupled with the determiner πᾶς fall into this category (see examples below).

Whether it is the nature of the noun itself or the nature of the substantive as qualified by

certain determiners and quantifiers, *the more generic the substantive the more probable that*

restrictive modification will be employed. The Greek of the New Testament conforms to this

tendency, as the following examples illustrate:

> Matt 13:52: πᾶς γραμματεὺς μαθητευθεὶς τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν
> (ESV: "every scribe who has been trained for the kingdom of heaven")

> Luke 1:1: τῶν πεπληροφορημένων ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμάτων
> (ESV: "the things that have been accomplished among us")

---

[68] Quirk et al., *Grammar*, 378

[69] Quirk et al., *Grammar*, 379. Quirk's assertions are supported by other authors. Cf. also: Greg N. Carlson, "Amount Relatives," *Language* 53 (1977): 520; Jackendoff, *Syntax*, 175. Quirk addresses another class of substantives that leans toward the more generic extreme of the acceptability continuum for restrictive and nonrestrictive modification. He states that "demonstrative pronouns, *that* and *those* can function not only as coreferential pro-forms but as substitute pro-forms. In this latter function, they are always followed by restrictive postmodification, and are equivalent to *the one* and *the ones* respectively." He puts forth the following example to illustrate: "The *paintings* of Gauguin's Tahiti period are more famous than *those* [= the ones] he painted in France." Quirk et al., *Grammar*, 872.

[70] Lucas, "Relative Clauses," 93.

[71] Lucas, "Relative Clauses," 94.

Luke 12:36: ἀνθρώποις προσδεχομένοις τὸν κύριον ἑαυτῶν
(ESV: "men who are waiting for their master")

1 Cor 11:4: πᾶς ἀνὴρ προσευχόμενος ἢ προφητεύων
(ESV: "Every man who prays or prophesies")

Heb 5:1: Πᾶς γὰρ ἀρχιερεὺς ἐξ ἀνθρώπων λαμβανόμενος
(ESV: "For every high priest chosen from among men")[72]

The Specific Extreme of the Acceptability Continuum. Substantives that stand on the

specific end of the spectrum tend to attract nonrestrictive modification, for example, proper

nouns.[73] Keenan contends that "non-restrictives modify fully specified, definite N[oun] P[hrase]s

such as proper nouns."[74]

Schachter has indicated "that the reason that proper nouns without preceding determiners

do not occur as heads of [restrictive] relative constructions . . . is that they are in themselves

interpreted as complete designations for specific people, places, etc."[75] While Schachter labels

the proper noun as a complete designation, Quirk speaks in terms of unique denotation, "When

they have the normal unique denotation,[76] proper nouns can be modified only by nonrestrictive

modifiers, such as a nonrestrictive relative clause or nonrestrictive apposition:"[77]

Dr. Brown, *who lives next door*, comes from Australia.

---

[72] Consider also: Acts 9:7: οἱ δὲ ἄνδρες οἱ συνοδεύοντες αὐτῷ (ESV: "the men who were traveling with us"); Acts 16:13: ταῖς συνελθούσαις γυναιξίν (ESV: "the women who had come together").

[73] Keenan, "Relative Clauses," 169, states that personal pronouns attract nonrestrictive modification as well. He contends that these substantives, like proper nouns, stand toward the very specific extreme of the acceptability continuum. However, instances do exist when personal pronouns may require restrictive modification. Quirk et al., *Grammar*, 352, points out, "In modern English, restrictive modification with personal pronouns is extremely limited." He does, however, note a few examples: "*He who* hesitates is lost. *She who* must be obeyed." Quirk notes that "Here *he* and *she* are cataphoric in that their meaning is defined by the following post modifier, which is a restrictive relative clause.". See also Lucas, "Relative Clauses," 92.

[74] Keenan, "Relative Clauses," 169.

[75] Paul Schachter, "Focus and Relativization," *Language* 49 (1973): 43. Jespersen, *Grammar*, 108–9, states that "proper names are highly specialized."

[76] Rarely, very specific entities, such as proper nouns, will attract restrictive modification. See add. 2-A for a discussion of this phenomenon.

[77] Quirk et al., *Grammar*, 289–90.

Theseus, *a Greek hero*, killed the Minotaur.[78]

Consider the following New Testament correlatives to Quirk's examples. Second Peter 2:15

contains a nonrestrictive relative clause modifying a proper noun:

> ἐξακολουθήσαντες τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ τοῦ Βοσόρ, ὃς μισθὸν ἀδικίας ἠγάπησεν
> (ESV: "They have followed the way of Balaam, the son of Beor, who loved gain
> from wrongdoing")

Matthew 1:1 contains an example of nonrestrictive apposition with a proper noun:

> Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ υἱοῦ Δαυὶδ υἱοῦ Ἀβραάμ (ESV: "Jesus Christ, the son of David, the
> son of Abraham.")

Summary of Restrictivity and the Nature of Antecedents. The semantic identity of the

substantive being modified places some constraints upon whether restrictive or nonrestrictive

modification will be utilized. There seems to exist a continuum of acceptability in which the

more generic substantives tend to attract restrictive modification, and the more specific

substantives lean toward nonrestrictive modification.[79] The semantic identity of the substantive

should be considered when seeking to understand restrictive and nonrestrictive modification

within a given language.

Specific Restrictive Strategies

A survey of restrictive strategies reveals that restrictive modification exists on multiple

levels. A few examples of restrictive (and nonrestrictive) modification strategies were considered

in the section titled *Restrictivity in Modern Languages*, above. It was asserted that to varying

degrees adjectives, participles and relative clauses exhibit restrictive (and nonrestrictive)

modification in English, Spanish and Modern Greek. Furthermore, it was noted that Nikolaeva,

---

[78] Quirk et al., *Grammar*, 290.

[79] Rarely, in certain semantic contexts very specific substantives are capable of accepting restrictive
modification. See add. 2-A.

citing examples in Persian and Somali, asserted that "in some languages, restrictive and nonrestrictive clauses have a consistently different surface structure."[80] Alexiadou et al. confirm as much and state, "The semantic distinction (restrictive vs. non-restrictive modification) is reflected in differing syntactic properties in different languages."[81]

Though it is not possible to produce an exhaustive analysis of all restrictive modification strategies cross-linguistically, a survey of some of these strategies reveals just how widespread this linguistic category reaches. The following restrictive modification strategies will be considered: articles, demonstrative pronouns, adjectives, prepositional phrases, genitive constructions, appositional constructions, relative clauses, and attributive participles.

Articles. While different determiners exist at different levels across languages, Downing notes that, generally speaking, the article participates in restrictive modification cross-linguistically. He notes the usage of the article as restrictive in that it can limit the referent to a previously identified class.[82] Jespersen also places the article in the "restrictive adjunct" category and gives an example from English. "In *the rose, rose* is restricted to that one definite rose which is at this very moment in my thought and must be in yours, too, because we have just mentioned it, or because everything in the situation points towards that particular rose."[83] Though Wallace does not use the term restrictive in his discussion of the article, he does speak restrictively when he states that the article in the Greek New Testament "is used predominantly to stress the identity of an individual or class or quality . . . it may distinguish one entity (or class) from another,

---

[80] Nikolaeva, "Relative Clauses," 502.

[81] Artemis Alexiadou, Paul Law, Andre Meinunger, and Chris Wilder, eds., *The Syntax of Relative Clauses* (Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2000), 21. Crystal, *Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*, 332, also asserts that "several areas of grammar illustrate this contrast."

[82] Downing, "Relative Clause Structure," 379.

[83] Jespersen, *Philosophy of Grammar*, 109. It should be noted that this example falls toward the entity identification pole of restrictive modification. *The Rose* could also restrictively fall toward the concept formation pole.

identify something as known or unique, point to something physically present, or simply point out. The identifying function of the article covers a multitude of uses."[84] His usage of such descriptors as *distinguish*, *identify*, *point to*, and *point out* demonstrates he is referring to restrictive modification. Wallace puts forth John 4:50 as an example: λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Πορεύου, ὁ υἱός σου ζῇ. ἐπίστευσεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος . . . .[85] Wallace states that the article modifies and identifies to "us which man is in view."[86] On the whole, the article is capable of participating in restrictive modification.

Demonstrative Pronouns. Jespersen includes demonstrative pronouns (that adjectivally modify a substantive) in his analysis of restrictive adjuncts. He contends that "among restrictive adjuncts, some of a pronominal character should be noticed. *This* and *that*, in *this rose*, *that rose*" modify their substantive restrictively in that "what they do . . . is to *specify*."[87] Though Young does not explicitly address this issue, he implies restrictive modification when he states that the demonstrative pronoun in the Greek New Testament "points out or specifies something . . . as adjectives that point out the noun they are modifying."[88] Consider Matt 3:9: δύναται ὁ θεὸς ἐκ τῶν λίθων τούτων ἐγεῖραι τέκνα τῷ Ἀβραάμ (ESV: "God is able from these stones to raise up children for Abraham"). The assertions of Jespersen and Young confirm the restrictive nature of demonstrative pronoun modification.

---

[84] Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 209–10.

[85] ESV: "Jesus said to him, 'Go; your son will live.' **The** man believed."

[86] Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 219.

[87] Jespersen, *Philosophy of Grammar*, 109.

[88] Young, *New Testament Greek*, 78. In the New Testament, when a demonstrative functions as a restrictive modifier it is in predicate position.

Adjectives. The restrictive nature of adjectives has been addressed in the section *Restrictivity in Modern Languages* above, but, further consideration will elucidate this phenomenon.[89]

Jespersen contends that "*red* in *a red rose* restricts the applicability of the word *rose* to one particular sub-class of the whole class of roses, it specializes and defines the rose of which I am speaking by excluding white and yellow roses . . . ."[90] Consider Matt 17:5: νεφέλη φωτεινὴ ἐπεσκίασεν αὐτούς (ESV: "a bright cloud overshadowed them"). The adjective φωτεινὴ limits the head noun νεφέλη to a certain type of cloud (bright) and excludes other types of clouds (dark, black, faint, normal, etc . . .). Consider also Matt 7:13: Εἰσέλθατε διὰ τῆς στενῆς πύλης (ESV: "Enter by the narrow gate"). The adjective στενῆς limits the head noun πύλης to a certain type of gate (narrow) and excludes other types of gates (specifically, in this context, wide gates).

The assertions of Solé and Solé stated above[91] deal primarily with the Spanish language and contend that post-nominal adjectives tend to be restrictive while prenominal adjectives tend to be nonrestrictive.[92] For example: Esta mañana vimos al profesor **anciano**. *This morning we saw the*

---

[89] While many adjectives clearly modify a substantive restrictively, occasionally an ambiguity can exist. Peter Sells, *Restrictive and Non-restrictive Modification* (Stanford, CA: Center for the Study of Language and Information, 1985), 30, states that "the ambiguity of the phrase *the industrious Swedes* derives from interpreting the relation between adjective and noun as either restrictive or non-restrictive." This phrase could refer to all Swedes and describes them all as industrious. Or it could refer to the subset of Swedes that are industrious, implying that some Swedes aren't industrious. Cf. also Jespersen, *Grammar,* 112. As has already been stated, for English, prosodic stress upon the adjective signals restrictive modification. Furthermore, Grosu contends that authors/speakers can utilize determiners to denote restrictive modification; such constructions signal to the reader/hearer that the adjective modifier must be restrictive. "The restrictive reading can be teased out by using certain D[eterminer]s or particles that are inconsistent with appositive [nonrestrictive] readings, yielding such unambiguously restrictive constructions as *the only industrious Japanese, every industrious Japanese,* and *no industrious Japanese.*" Alexander Grosu, "Type-Resolution in Relative Constructions," in *The Syntax of Relative Clauses* (ed. Artemis Alexiadou, Paul Law, Andre Meinunger and Chris Wilder; Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2000), 115–6. Though outside the scope of this dissertation, an area of beneficial study would be to determine how these assertions play out in the Greek of the New Testament.

[90] Jespersen, *Philosophy of Grammar,* 108. Cf. Matthews, *Linguistics,* 319.

[91] Cf. section titled "Restrictivity in Modern Languages" on pp. 61–67 above.

[92] Solé and Solé, *Spanish Syntax,* 234–35.

elderly *professor.*"[93] They contend that the syntax of the adjective, being post-nominal, conveys restrictive modification in Spanish.

While not a comprehensive analysis of the nature of adjective modification, these examples demonstrate that the adjective should be considered a valid strategy for restrictive modification.

Prepositional Phrases. Prepositional phrases represent another strategy for restrictive modification. Jackendoff asserts that prepositional phrases can be "interpreted as restrictive modifiers."[94] Lehmann provides an example of a restrictive prepositional phrase: the "book on the table."[95] In the Greek New Testament Young contends that most prepositional phrases function adverbially but they do function adjectivally as well.[96] The adjectival prepositional phrase "is usually in the attributive position."[97] He cites the following examples: "Romans 11:21 τῶν κατὰ φύσιν κλάδων (the according to nature branches) means 'the natural branches,' and 1 Timothy 6:3 τῇ κατ' εὐσέβειαν διδασκαλίᾳ (the according to godliness instruction) means 'the godly instruction.'"[98] He also cites 1 Pet 1:10, περὶ τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς χάριτος, and Matt 3:17, φωνὴ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν.[99] Adjectival prepositional phrases represent a viable strategy for restrictive modification. Furthermore, Young's examples seem to indicate that attributive prepositional phrases tend to be restrictive in the Greek New Testament.

Genitive Constructions. Jespersen contends that a genitive construction serves as a strategy for restrictive modification. He states that "an adjunct consisting of a genitive or a

---

[93] Solé and Solé, *Spanish Syntax*, 234–35.

[94] Jackendoff, *Syntax,* 179.

[95] Christian Lehmann. "Relative Clauses," 461. Quirk et al., *Grammar*, 1321, likewise provides the example "the car *outside the station*.".

[96] Young, *New Testament Greek*, 87–88. These prepositional phrases are generally deemed to be in predicate position and attributive position respectively.

[97] Young, *New Testament Greek*, 88.

[98] Young, *New Testament Greek*, 88.

[99] Young, *New Testament Greek*, 88. Cf. also Luke 9:38 and Matt 27:21. Young, *New Testament Greek*, 91.

possessive pronoun always restricts."[100] Wallace evinces a restrictive understanding of the

genitive when he states that the genitive "defines . . . qualifies, restricts, limits."[101] Wallace

demonstrates the restrictive nature of the genitive with an example from John 2:16, οἶκον

ἐμπορίου. "The idea is 'a house in which merchandise is sold.'"[102] Notice that he interprets the

phrase with an English restrictive relative clause. Additionally, Stanley Porter, basing his

findings on such scholars as Dana & Mantey,[103] Roberston,[104] and Louw,[105] describes the genitive

as a strategy for restrictive modification by using such descriptors as *definition*, *specification* and

restriction respectively.[106] Genitive constructions represent one more strategy for restrictive

modification.

Appositional Constructions. With respect to appositional constructions serving as a

strategy to highlight the restrictive/nonrestrictive contrast, there seems to be some debate among

scholars.[107] Matthews states that apposition is "distinguished from modification (or attribution) in

that there is no clear tendency for either element to qualify the other."[108] Crystal highlights the

notions above but also asserts that problems exist with such a definition of apposition. He states,

> Apposition(al) [is] a traditional term retained in some models of grammatical
> description for a sequence of units which are constituents at the same grammatical
> level, and which have an identity or similarity of reference . . . There are, however,

---

[100] Jespersen, *Philosophy of Grammar*, 110.

[101] Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 76.

[102] Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 80.

[103] Dana and Mantey, *Manual Grammar*, 72.

[104] Robertson, *Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, 493.

[105] J. P. Louw, "Linguistic Theory and the Greek Case System," *Acta Classica* 9 (1966): 83–84.

[106] Porter, *Idioms*, 92.

[107] Matthews, *Linguistics*, 22.

[108] Matthews, *Linguistics*, 22. Similarly, Matthews, *Linguistics*, 22, states that "apposition" refers to a "syntactic relation in which an element is juxtaposed to another element of the same kind. Especially between noun phrases that do not have distinct referents." Jackson, *Linguistics*, 23, seems to agree with these sentiments when he states that apposition refers to "two contiguous linguistic items with the same reference, usually two noun phrases ."

many theoretical and methodological problems in defining the notion of apposition, because of several constructions which satisfy only some of these criteria, and where other semantic or syntactic issues are involved.[109]

Crystal highlights the problem with Matthews's assertion that appositional constructions do not qualify each other in any way, and Crystal eventually directly contradicts the assertions of Matthews. He does so in his discussion of the restrictive/nonrestrictive contrast by stating, "Several areas of grammar illustrate this contrast, such as relative clauses and appositional constructions."[110]

Quirk affirms Crystal's assertions and contends that "apposition may be nonrestrictive or restrictive."[111] Quirk gives the following example of restrictive apposition between two substantives: "Mr. Campbell the lawyer was here last night. (i.e., Mr. Campbell the lawyer as opposed to any other Mr. Campbell we know.)"[112] Quirk contends that this example of apposition is an instance "where the first appositive is the name of a person and the second is the designation of an occupation, relationship, etc."[113] For the purposes of this dissertation, this type of apposition describes certain substantival participles that exist in apposition to a proper noun.

---

[109] Crystal, *Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*, 24.

[110] Crystal, *Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*, 332.

[111] Quirk et al., *Grammar*, 1303–4. Quirk applies this assertion to nouns juxtaposed to each other, nouns coupled with personal pronouns, nouns with complex noun phrases, and nouns with infinitives and participial clauses.

[112] Quirk et al., *Grammar*, 1303–4. Quirk elaborates on this relationship for the English language and highlights three types of restrictive apposition. "The first appositive is preceded by a definite determiner (and possibly premodifier) and is more general than the second appositive," for example, "That famous critic Paul Jones" and "The soprano Janet Baker." "The second [type of restrictive] appositive is preceded by the determiner *the*, and is more general than the first" appositive, for example, "Paul Jones the critic" and "Janet Baker the soprano." The third type of restrictive apposition, according to Quirk et al., *Grammar*, 1316–17, is like the first one "but with omission of the determiner," for example, critic Paul Jones and "Soprano Janet Baker." Quirk et al., *Grammar*, 1317, also notes that personal "pronouns followed by noun phrases, such as *you girls, you British*, and *we men*, can also be analysed as restrictive apposition." Additionally, Quirk et al., *Grammar*, 1321, details the restrictive contrast with respect to common nouns that are specified with complex noun-phrases in apposition. "Restrictive apposition is common with such general nouns as *the fact, the view, the question, your duty*: *The fact that she wouldn't betray her friends* is very much to her credit."

[113] Quirk et al., *Grammar*, 1319.

A clear New Testament example of this phenomenon comes from Mark 6:14, Ἰωάννης ὁ

βαπτίζων. Clearly, the participle ὁ βαπτίζων stands in apposition to Ἰωάννης. The nature of the

relationship between the two substantives appears to be restrictive. ὁ βαπτίζων seems to limit the

referent Ἰωάννης, which has the effect of identifying which Ἰωάννης is being discussed, John

the Baptizer.

Quirk also asserts that appositive modification by infinitives and participial clauses can be

either restrictive or nonrestrictive.[114] Additionally, Porter speaks of the appositional nature of the

infinitive and notes its ability "to serve as a modifier, specifying or defining the modified

element."[115] Though he does not use the term *restrictive*, Porter does speak of restrictive

modification when he utilizes the terms *specifying* and *defining*.

Young treats the topic of apposition and states that "apposition occurs when one nominal is

followed by another that explains or identifies the first one by giving more specific information.

The two nominals are usually of the same case, whether nominative, genitive, dative, or

accusative."[116] The way he speaks of apposition seems to highlight the restrictive (identifies) and

nonrestrictive (explains) contrast. Additionally, the examples that he gives highlight this as

well.[117] As we have noted earlier, Young additionally speaks of apposition with respect to

substantival participles. He states, "Some examples of participles functioning in appositional

noun phrases include Matthew 1:16, Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος χριστός (Jesus, the one called Christ);

Mark 6:14, Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτίζων (John the Baptist); and 1 Thess 1:10, Ἰησοῦν τὸν ῥυόμενον

---

[114] Quirk et al., *Grammar*, 1271.

[115] Porter, *Idioms*, 198.

[116] Young, *New Testament Greek*, 12.

[117] Young, *New Testament Greek*, 12.

ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς ὀργῆς τῆς ἐρχομένης (Jesus, the one who delivers us from the coming wrath)."[118]

Matt 1:16[119] and 1 Thess 1:10[120], he translates as nonrestrictive, but he translates Mark 6:14 with

a restrictive contrast as is noted by the omission of the comma after *John*. So, while Young does

not explicitly state it, his usage of *identifies* and examples like Mark 6:14 indicate that he

includes apposition as a strategy to demonstrate the restrictive/nonrestrictive contrast.

While some debate does exist as to how to describe the nature of apposition, we contend

that appositional constructions are capable of demonstrating the restrictive/nonrestrictive

contrast. The relationship between the two substantives can represent one of contrast and that for

examples like *Mr. Campbell the lawyer* and Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτίζων (*John the Baptizer*) the second

appositive limits the domain of the first noun to one specific entity. Appositional constructions

represent one more restrictive strategy.

Relative Clauses. Whether it is in the broad sense of the term, which covers a variety of

strategies (including nonfinite participial clauses), or in the narrow, traditional sense of the term

(relativizer + finite clause),[121] it has been demonstrated that the relative clause serves as a

strategy for restrictive modification. In this section, the focus centers on the narrow definition of

relative clause. For the English language it has been noted that restrictive relative clauses can

employ zero-heads, *wh*-relatives and the relativizer *that*. Specifically, in English, zero-heads and

that can only be employed for restrictive modification.[122] It has also been demonstrated that in

---

[118] Young, *New Testament Greek*, 150.

[119] One could argue this to be restrictive, an example of entity differentiation, identifying which particular Jesus is being discussed.

[120] This seems to be an example of what Voelz would call "attributive position participles . . . that seem to be a restriction, not on what they modify directly but upon all other alternative possibilities." Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part III," 403. This will be discussed more thoroughly in ch. 6.

[121] See section titled "Definition of Relative Clause" on pp. 68–71 above.

[122] Keenan, "Relative Clauses," 169. See also section above titled "Restrictivity in Modern Languages" on pp. 61–67.

English, Spanish and Modern Greek restrictive relative clauses lack both commas (orthography) and parenthetical intonation (prosody).[123]

Relative clauses that are introduced by an adverb of place may also modify substantives restrictively. Quirk notes that in English *where* is equivalent to *in which*. His example is: "That's the place *where/in which* she was born."[124] In the Greek of the New Testament οὗ exists as an adverb of place and functions in the same way as ἐν ᾧ (as in Acts 4:31 ὁ τόπος ἐν ᾧ ἦσαν συνηγμένοι: "the place in which they were gathered"). Consider the similar usage of οὗ in verses such as Rom 9:26 (ἐν τῷ τόπῳ οὗ ἐρρέθη αὐτοῖς: "in the place where it was said to them") and Luke 4:17 (τὸν τόπον οὗ ἦν γεγραμμένον: "the place where it was written"). Each of these Greek relative clauses modifies the substantive restrictively. Other examples of adverbs of place used in relative constructions could be noted cross-linguistically. However, the examples above demonstrate one more strategy for restrictive modification.

Relative Clauses will be treated more thoroughly in subsequent chapters. It is noted, however, that examples like Acts 4:31 (above) demonstrate that, under certain prescribed circumstances, Greek relative clauses do modify substantives restrictively.[125] Consider also Rom 4:6: τὸν μακαρισμὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ᾧ ὁ θεὸς λογίζεται δικαιοσύνην χωρὶς ἔργων.[126]

In English, Spanish, Modern Greek and Koine Greek, relative clauses represent one of many strategies for restrictive modification.

---

[123] Keenan, "Relative Clauses," 169. See also section above titled "Restrictivity in Modern Languages" on pp. 61–67.

[124] Quirk et al., *Grammar*, 1254.

[125] This will be surveyed more thoroughly in ch. 3 and 6.

[126] ESV: "the blessing of the one to whom God counts righteousness apart from works."

Attributive Participles. As noted above, in much of modern linguistics, adjectival participial constructions fall under the more general category of *relative clause*.[127] The focus in this section, however, centers on the traditional understanding of participial constructions, which have been labeled as "attributive" participles.

As far as English is concerned, Quirk notes the restrictive nature of attributive participle modification. He labels post-modifying attributive participles as "-*ing* clauses" and "-*ed* clauses."[128] Quirk maintains that both of these "postmodifying -*ed* and -*ing* participle clauses are . . . usually restrictive."[129] This includes, however, both post- and pre-modifying constructions. Consider, for example, the restrictive attributive participles in John 8:31 and Luke 18:31: τοὺς πεπιστευκότας αὐτῷ Ἰουδαίους (John 8:31 ESV: "the Jews who had believed in him") and τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ (Luke 18:31 ESV: "the age to come").

The analysis in chapter 3 will consider restrictive attributive participles in greater detail; for our purposes at this point, we note that participial constructions (attributive participles) represent one more strategy for restrictive modification.

Summary of Restrictive Strategies. A cursory survey of several scholars dealing with different aspects of grammar and linguistics has demonstrated that restrictivity finds representation through a variety of strategies. Articles, demonstrative pronouns, adjectives, prepositional phrases, genitive constructions, appositional constructions, relative clauses, and attributive participles all participate in restrictive modification.

---

[127] See "Clarification of Terminology" section above, pp. 68 ff.

[128] Quirk et al., *Grammar*, 1264–65. These attributive participles correspond "only with relative clauses that have the pronoun as subject." He states it another way, "The antecedent is always identical with the implied subject of the -*ed* postmodifying clause, as it is with the -*ing* construction." This reality also corresponds to the Greek of the New Testament, a fact that is very important for our purposes and that will be highlighted in subsequent chapters.

[129] Quirk et al., *Grammar*, 1265. We maintain that the attributive participles of the Greek New Testament are usually restrictive as well.

<center>**Restrictive Clauses**</center>

A preliminary survey of a variety of restrictive clauses reinforces previous assertions on restrictive modification and makes preparation for a survey of restrictive clauses in the Greek New Testament (chapter 3).

Attributive Participles and Relative Clauses.

The restrictive clauses specifically referred to in this dissertation consist of both restrictive attributive participles and restrictive relative clauses.[130] It has been demonstrated that these clauses are two of many different syntactical strategies that are capable of the semantic notion of restrictive modification. English, Spanish, Modern Greek and Koine Greek all exhibit some form of attributive participle and relative clause.[131] As a result, there exists some freedom to utilize these terms (attributive participle and relative clause) somewhat universally and interchangeably with respect to these languages.

Examples of Restrictive Clauses

A variety of examples of restrictive clauses will be set forth in order to reinforce the existence of clausal restrictive modification and to specifically introduce an analysis of the restrictive clauses in the Greek New Testament. English, Spanish and Modern Greek restrictive clauses will be considered. Additionally, examples from the Greek New Testament coupled with English, Spanish and Modern Greek translations of the Bible will be presented.

English. While discussing restrictive modification above, many examples of English restrictive participial constructions and restrictive relative clauses were utilized by scholars to

---

[130] The traditional definition of *relative clause* is in mind here: relativizer + finite clause.

[131] Spanish only utilizes the past participle as an attributive. Modern Greek actually uses the relative clause more often than the attributive participle. See further discussion in the section titled "Modern Greek" on pp. 90–91.

<center>88</center>

demonstrate their assertions.[132] Consider this brief sampling of examples to reinforce the

existence of restrictive modification via two types of adjectival clauses in the English language.

Attributive Participles:[133]
The dog barking next door sounded like a terrier.
A tile falling from a roof shattered into fragments at his feet.
The car repaired by that mechanic . . .
A report written by my colleague appeared last week.

Relative Clauses:[134]
The woman who is approaching us seems to be somebody I know.
The book which I was reading . . .
They are delighted with *the person that has been appointed.*
The woman whose daughter you met is Mrs. Brown.

Spanish. In the discussion of restrictive modification above, a few examples of Spanish

restrictive clauses were utilized by scholars in their assertions. Consider this brief sampling of

examples to reinforce the existence of restrictive modification via two types of adjectival clauses

in the Spanish language.

Attributive Participles:
Hay *tres personas heridas.*[135]
La oficina tiene *dos puertas abiertas.*[136]
Compre *la casa renovada.*[137]
Los viajeros llegados fueron al restaurante.[138]

Relative Clauses:
dejamos *las manzanas que estaban verdes.*[139]
Las muchachas que vinieron ayer son mis primas.[140]

---

[132] Examples of English restrictive relative clauses (zero-relatives, *that*-relatives, *wh*-relatives) and restrictive attributive participles have been presented above.

[133] Examples of English attributive participles taken from Quirk, *Grammar*, 1263–65.

[134] Examples of English relative clauses taken from Quirk, *Grammar*, 1247–49.

[135] "There are *three wounded people.*"

[136] "The office has *two open doors.*"

[137] "I bought *the renovated house.*"

[138] "*The passengers who had arrived* went to the restaurant."

[139] Butt and Benjamin, *Modern Spanish*, 518. "'We left the apples that were unripe'. This refers only to the unripe apples and therefore implies that some of them were ripe."

[140] Eduardo Neale-Silva and John M. Lipski, *El Español En Síntesis* (New York: CBS College Publishing,

Esta es *la habitación en la que murió Felipe II*.[141]

Mi hermano que vive en México tiene dos hijos.[142]

Modern Greek. Modern Greek utilizes specific orthographic and prosodic means to

indicate restrictive and nonrestrictive relative clauses. Modern Greek, however, seems to differ

from Koine Greek with respect to the usage of the participle. All active voice, passive present

and passive past participles that are found in Modern Greek "are those introduced into Standard

Greek from the learned tradition.[143] They are found in older written texts and even today in

journalistic writing or in discourse which uses learned features to achieve high style, formality or

irony."[144] So, while restrictive attributive participles are present in Greek, their utilization seems

to be due to the author/writer's choice of register. For this reason, the relative clause is utilized

more often than the attributive participle. Nevertheless, restrictive attributive participles do seem

to exist in Modern Greek, though to a lesser degree and for different purposes than Koine

Greek.[145] Consider this brief sampling of examples of these two types of adjectival clauses.

<u>Attributive Participles</u>:

Δεν θέλει να ανατρέψει το τρέχον γούστο.[146]

Οι επιζήσαντες προσκυνητές ενίσχυσαν αυτήν την υποψία.[147]

Τα αγγλοκρατούμενα εδάφη ...[148]

1981), 263. "The girls who arrived yesterday are my cousins."

[141] Pountain, *Spanish Language*, 87. "This is the room in which Philip II died."

[142] Elson and Pickett, *Beginning Morphology and Syntax*, 132."My Brother who lives in Mexico has two sons (i.e. other brothers live elsewhere)."

[143] Holton et al. utilize the terminology *learned tradition* to denote borrowing grammar and vocabulary "from *katharevousa* or directly from Ancient Greek." Holton et al., *Greek*, xxxiii.

[144] Holton et al., *Greek*, 307–9.

[145] While the literature clearly states that relative clauses in Modern Greek function restrictively and nonrestrictively, grammatical assertions pertaining to the restrictive/nonrestrictive nature of the attributive participle do not appear to be readily available.

[146] "He does not wish to overturn *current taste*." Example and translation are taken from Holton et al., *Greek*, 307.

[147] "*The surviving pilgrims* strengthened this suspicion." Example and translation are taken from Holton et al., *Greek*, 308.

[148] "*The British-occupied lands...*" Example and translation are taken from Holton et al., *Greek*, 309.

Τα μη εισπραχθέντα χρέη του δημοσίου . . . [149]

Relative Clauses:
'Ηρθε *η κοπέλα που είδαμε χθες.*[150]
Ο άνθρωπος που ήρθε και σε γύρευε . . . [151]
Η συζήτηση την οποία κάναμε πρέπει να μείνει μεταξύ μας.[152]
Απέλυσαν τους καθηγητές και τις καθηγήτριες οι οποίοι έκαναν απεργία.[153]

Greek New Testament. An introductory sampling of restrictive attributive participles and restrictive relative clauses from the Greek New Testament will be presented below. They are followed by English, Spanish and Modern Greek translations. The restrictive clauses present in the translations support the restrictive assessment of these Greek examples.

Restrictive Attributive Participles

Matt 11:21
αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ γενόμεναι ἐν ὑμῖν
the miracles that were performed in you (NIV)
los milagros que se hicieron en medio de ustedes (NVI)
οι θαυματουργικές δυνάμεις που έγιναν ς' εσάς (MET)

Mark 11:10
ἡ ἐρχομένη βασιλεία τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Δαυίδ (Mark 11:10)
the kingdom of our father David that is coming (RSV)
the coming kingdom of our father David (ESV)
el reino de nuestro padre David que viene (LBA)
η ερχόμενη βασιλεία του πατέρα μας Δαβίδ (MET)

Luke 7:32
παιδίοις τοῖς ἐν ἀγορᾷ καθημένοις καὶ προσφωνοῦσιν ἀλλήλοις
children who sit in the market place and call to one another (NASB[77])
children sitting in the marketplace and calling to one another (ESV)
los niños sentados en la plaza y que gritan unos a otros (CAB)
los muchachos que se sientan en la plaza y se llaman unos a otros (LBA)

---

[149] "*The non-collected debts* of the state." Example and translation are taken from Holton et al., *Greek*, 309.

[150] "*The girl [that] we saw yesterday* came." Example and translation are taken from Holton et al., *Greek*, 355.

[151] "*The man who came looking for you.*" Example and translation are taken from Holton et al., *Greek*, 536.

[152] "*The conversation which we had* must remain between us." Example and translation are taken from Holton et al., *Greek*, 533.

[153] "They fired *the male and female teachers who went on strike.*" Example and translation are taken from Holton et al., *Greek*, 534.

παιδιά που κάθονται στην αγορά και φωνάζουν το ένα προς το άλλο (MET)

John 15:2
πᾶν κλῆμα ἐν ἐμοὶ μὴ φέρον καρπὸν
Every branch in me that does not bear fruit (ESV)
Toda rama que en mí no da fruto (NVI)
Κάθε κλήμα ενωμένο μ' εμένα που δε φέρει καρπό (MET)

Rom 8:24
ἐλπὶς δὲ βλεπομένη
hope that is seen (ESV)
una esperanza que se ve (RVA)
Ελπίδα όμως που βλέπεται (MET)

1 Cor 1:2
τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Κορίνθῳ
to the church of God that is in Corinth (ESV)
a la iglesia de Dios que está en Corinto (NVI)
προς την εκκλησία του Θεού που είναι στην Κόρινθο (MET)

1 Tim 5:17
Οἱ καλῶς προεστῶτες πρεσβύτεροι
the elders who rule well (ESV)
Los ancianos que dirigen bien (NVI)
Οι πρεσβύτεροι που υπήρξαν καλοί (MET)

1 Pet 1:10
προφῆται οἱ περὶ τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς χάριτος προφητεύσαντες
the prophets who prophesied about the grace that was to be yours (ESV)
Los profetas que profetizaron de la gracia destinada a vosotros (R95)
προφήτες που προφήτεψαν για τη χάρη που θα δινόταν ς' εσάς (MET)

Restrictive Relative Clauses

Luke 13:1
τῶν Γαλιλαίων ὧν τὸ αἷμα Πιλᾶτος ἔμιξεν μετὰ τῶν θυσιῶν αὐτῶν
the Galileans whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices (NASB[77])
los galileos cuya sangre Pilato había mezclado con los sacrificios de ellos (R95)
τους Γαλιλαίους των οποίων το αίμα ο Πιλάτος ανάμειξε μαζί με τις θυσίες τους (MET)

John 17:22
τὴν δόξαν ἣν δέδωκάς μοι
The glory that you have given me (ESV)
La gloria que me has dado (CAB)
τη δόξα που μου έχεις δώσει (MET)

Acts 4:22

92

ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐφ' ὃν γεγόνει τὸ σημεῖον τοῦτο τῆς ἰάσεως
the man on whom this sign of healing was performed (ESV)
el hombre en quien se había realizado este signo de la curación (CAB)
ο άνθρωπος στον οποίο είχε γίνει αυτό το θαυματουργικό σημείο (MET)

Rev 7:2
τοῖς τέσσαρσιν ἀγγέλοις οἷς ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς ἀδικῆσαι τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν
to the four angels to whom it was granted to harm the earth and the sea (NASB[95])
a los cuatro ángeles a quienes se les había permitido hacer daño a la tierra y al mar (NVI)
στους τέσσερις αγγέλους που τους δόθηκε να βλάψουν τη γη και τη θάλασσα (MET)

It is significant to note the nature of the restrictive modification in the Modern Greek verses cited above. Every relative clause in Koine is represented by a Modern Greek restrictive relative clause. Of the eight attributive participles presented above, the Modern Greek orthographically represents seven of them as *restrictive* relative clauses. Mark 11:10 is the only example where the attributive participle has been retained. While Modern Greek tends to utilize the relative clause instead of the attributive participle, the fact that the Modern Greek restrictively renders at least seven of the eight participles is significant.[154]

Summary of Restrictivity

The restrictive (and nonrestrictive) distinction has been widely embraced and utilized in linguistic studies. Restrictive modifiers limit their antecedents and can be characterized as necessary to the linguistic identity of the noun phrase. The continuum of acceptability describes the tendency for general antecedents to attract restrictive modifiers. As a result, the semantic identity of the substantive being modified should be considered when seeking to understand the variety of restrictive (and nonrestrictive) strategies within a given language. The restrictive clauses set forth above confirm the existence of restrictive modification by attributive participles and relative clauses in English, Spanish, Modern Greek and Koine Greek. We will now look

---

[154] It should be noted that this is not to say that Modern Greek translations of the New Testament always portray the restrictive nonrestrictive distinction accurately.

more closely at the restrictive clauses present in the Greek of the New Testament, specifically the

attributive participle and the relative clause.

ADDENDUM 2-A

RESTRICTIVE MODIFICATION OF VERY SPECIFIC SUBSTANTIVES

Normally, very specific substantives (e.g. proper nouns) tend to attract nonrestrictive

modification. In certain semantic contexts, however, these very specific substantives are capable

of accepting restrictive modification.[155] Such restrictive modification can be classified in two

different ways: *entity differentiation* and *partitive restrictive modification*. It should be noted that

these occurrences are very rare.

The first category, *entity differentiation*, is represented in the following English example:

"*The Dr. Brown I know* comes from Australia."[156] Here the speaker differentiates between two

different doctors named *Dr. Brown*, a very specific substantive. Matt 11:14 contains a similar

example of entity differentiation: αὐτός ἐστιν Ἠλίας ὁ μέλλων ἔρχεσθαι (ESV: "he is the Elijah

who was to come"). Jesus differentiates the identity of Ἠλίας, denoting not the prophet Elijah of

the Old Testament, but rather John the Baptist, the Elijah to come.[157] Each of these examples

differentiates between two or more entities (proper nouns) that bear the same designation.

The second category, *partitive restrictive modification*, splits up the very specific

substantive into parts *or* aspects in order to limit to one of those parts *or* aspects at the exclusion

---

[155] Though proper nouns are very specific, Jespersen, *Grammar*, 108–9, maintains that "it is possible to specialize them still more by adjuncts." Lucas, "Relative Clauses," 91, also treats this topic in a similar way. Schachter, "Focus and Relativization," 43, speaks of the presence of determiners and contends, "When a determiner precedes the proper noun, the noun is no longer interpreted as necessarily expressing a complete designation, and so may be used as the head of a [restrictive] relative construction, e.g. *the Marsha that John loves, every Marsha that John loves*."

[156] Quirk et al., *Grammar*, 290.

[157] Consider also the following possible examples: John 11:2: Μαριὰμ ἡ ἀλείψασα τὸν κύριον μύρῳ (NASB[95]: "the Mary who anointed the Lord with ointment"); Acts 7:37: ὁ Μωϋσῆς ὁ εἴπας τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραήλ ("the Moses who said to the Israelites"); Matt 28:5: Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον (ESV: "Jesus who was crucified").

of the others.[158] Consider the following example put forth by Jackendoff: "the Paris that I love."[159] This could refer to an aspect of Paris, for example its embrace of the arts, as opposed to an aspect that the speaker does not love, for example the city's lack of efficient infrastructure. "The Paris that I love" could also refer to a part, for example the North part as opposed to the South. A possible New Testament corollary can be found in 1 Cor 1:23: ἡμεῖς δὲ κηρύσσομεν Χριστὸν ἐσταυρωμένον, Ἰουδαίοις μὲν σκάνδαλον, ἔθνεσιν δὲ μωρίαν (ESV: "but we preach **Christ crucified**, a stumbling block to Jews and folly to Gentiles"). Paul appears to refer to a teaching or perspective about Christ that focuses on the reality of his crucifixion. The emphasis does not lie with Christ the great teacher, Christ the miracle-worker, Christ the King, etc. The preaching of a crucified messiah did not exist in the frame of reference to the typical Jew and sounded like pure foolishness to the Gentiles. Paul preaches of this type of christ/messiah.[160]

---

[158] Quirk et al., *Grammar*, 290, labels this *partitive meaning* and states it has "the effect of splitting up the unique referent . . . into different parts or aspects." He contends that in English "in such cases, a determiner (especially *the*) is usual."

[159] Jackendoff, *Syntax*, 177.

[160] For further discussion on the relationship between partitive restrictive modification and metonymy, see Antonio Barcelona Sánchez, "Partitive Restrictive Modification of Names in English: Arguments for Their Metonymic Motivation," *Quaderns de Filologia. Estudis Lingüístics* 19 (2009): 33–56.

CHAPTER THREE

RESTRICTIVE CLAUSES IN THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT

Introduction

In chapter 2 restrictive modification as a linguistic category was presented. A variety of strategies were considered across languages and it was demonstrated in a cursory manner that restrictive clauses exist in the Greek New Testament. Here, in chapter 3, the restrictive nature of two major subordinate clauses of the Greek New Testament, the attributive participle and the relative clause, will be considered. First, grammatical assertions pertaining to these restrictive clauses are presented. Next, a thorough survey of *restrictive* attributive participles will be presented followed by a survey of *restrictive* relative clauses. Finally, an observation of the general tendencies of these restrictive clauses in the Greek New Testament will be offered.

Grammatical Assertions of Restrictive Clauses in the Greek New Testament

Grammatical assertions previously presented with respect to the restrictive nature of attributive participles and relative clauses in the Greek New Testament will be summarized. Furthermore, the grammatical assertions of James W. Voelz will be explored more comprehensively. These assertions underscore the need to understand the restrictive nature of attributive participles and relative clauses in the Greek New Testament.

Summary of Previous Grammatical Assertions

The grammatical assertions regarding the attributive participle and its relation to restrictive modification vary amongst grammarians. In chapter 1, it was established that there exists a lack

of clarity among scholars with respect to syntax/semantic issues of the attributive participle.[1]

While grammarians such as Porter, Wallace, MacDonald, Burton, and Young all at varying

levels deal with restrictive modification of attributive participles, their treatments vary

considerably and demonstrate the need for this dissertation. Young's observations of the

attributive participle stand above the others when he states, "The restrictive use is by far the most

common type of adjectival participle."[2] The evaluation of grammatical assertions coupled with

Young's helpful observations establish and support the need for this study. Additionally,

however, as will be demonstrated below, Voelz's later observations stand, in essence, as an

explicit call for inquiry.

The grammatical assertions regarding the relative clause and its relation to restrictive

modification vary as well. In chapter 1, we noted that grammarians such as Burton, Boyer,

Wallace and Levinsohn all essentially assert that relative clauses in the Greek New Testament

function both restrictively and nonrestrictively.[3] With that said, however, no scholar makes any

statement of tendencies or patterns as Young and Voelz have for the attributive participle.

Additionally, most of their examples are nonrestrictive. Voelz, however, cursorily indicates some

of the tendencies of the restrictive relative clause and his assertions will be considered below.

The paucity of examples and the general cursory nature of these grammatical assertions support

the need to consider the relative clause and its restrictive tendencies.

Grammatical Assertions of James W. Voelz. In chapter 1, we noted that Voelz, in recent

years, has observed that the assertions of grammarians regarding the attributive participle lacked

---

[1] See "The Attributive Participle" section of ch. 1.

[2] Young, *Intermediate New Testament Greek*, 150.

[3] See "The Relative Clause" section of ch. 1.

precision.[4] In fact Voelz observes that attributive participles tend to modify their antecedents restrictively. He thereby questions the generally accepted "assertion of equivalence" that states that an attributive participle is tantamount to an adjectival relative clause.[5] Voelz provides four primary examples from the New Testament to illustrate this reality: 1 Cor 12:22, Acts 9:7, Heb 11:10 and Matt 21:15.[6] Consider his translations and observations below:[7]

1 Cor 12:22: τὰ **δοκοῦντα** μέλη τοῦ σώματος **ἀσθενέστερα ὑπάρχειν** ἀναγκαῖά ἐστιν
"The members of the body **seeming actually to be weaker** are necessary"

Acts 9:7: οἱ δὲ ἄνδρες οἱ **συνοδεύοντες αὐτῷ** εἰστήκεισαν ἐνεοί
"The men **travelling with him** were standing speechless"

Heb 11:10: ἐξεδέχετο γὰρ τὴν **τοὺς θεμελίους ἔχουσαν** πόλιν
"For he was looking forward to the city **having the foundations**"

Matt 21:15: ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς τὰ θαυμάσια . . . καὶ τοὺς παῖδας τοὺς **κράζοντας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ**
"And the chief priests and the scribes, upon seeing the wonders...and the children **crying out in the temple**"

Voelz contends that each of the attributive participles in these verses "is properly understood to be restrictive, i.e., the entity in the clause represents a smaller subcategory of a larger group."[8]

Voelz explicates the restrictive nature of each attributive participle in these verses. For 1 Cor 12:22 he notes that "the members of the body that seem to be weaker are a subcategory of all members of the body, some of which are not weaker."[9] In Acts 9:7 Voelz asserts that "the men

---

[4] See "Explicit Call For Inquiry" section of ch. 1.

[5] Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part II," 314.

[6] Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part II," 312 and Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part III," 401.

[7] Verses and translations are from Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part II," 312 and are reconsidered as well in Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part III," 401. Bolded emphasis is from Voelz.

[8] Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part III," 401.

[9] Voelz notes, "Put another way, 'weaker' does not apply to all members of the body as it would in a non-restrictive clause," Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part III," 401–2.

who were traveling with Paul were a subgroup of all men."[10] With respect to Heb 11:10 he states

that "the city which has foundations is a subcategory of all cities."[11] Furthermore, Voelz contends

that in Matt 21:15 "the children who were crying out were a subgroup of all children in

Jerusalem at the time."[12] Voelz's examples are drawn from a wide variety of New Testament

texts and clearly illustrate the restrictive nature of attributive participles.

Voelz also notes the restrictive nature of attributive participles located in Col 1:12, Luke

20:46 and John 6:27.

Col 1:12: εὐχαριστοῦντες τῷ πατρὶ τῷ ἱκανώσαντι ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν μερίδα τοῦ κλήρου
τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῷ φωτί
"giving thanks to the father who has made you sufficient for the/your share of the
portion of the saints in light"[13]

Luke 20:46: Προσέχετε ἀπὸ τῶν γραμματέων τῶν θελόντων περιπατεῖν ἐν στολαῖς
"Beware of the scribes who desire to walk around in flowing robes"[14]

John 6:27: ἐργάζεσθε μὴ τὴν βρῶσιν τὴν ἀπολλυμένην ἀλλὰ τὴν βρῶσιν τὴν
μένουσαν εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον
"Do not work for food that spoils, but for food that endures to eternal life"[15]

Voelz notes the limiting nature of the attributive participle in Col 1:12 when he states, "There is

only one father who has made us sufficient (it's not our earthly one), hence, the attributive

position participle providing a restrictive clause."[16] In Luke 20:46 Voelz observes that Jesus is

advising his disciples to beware "of the (subcategory of) scribes who desire to walk around

---

[10] Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part III," 402.

[11] Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part III," 402.

[12] Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part III," 402. These assertions pertaining to Matt 21:15 have been explicated in ch. 1 as well; see "Explicit Call For Inquiry" section of ch. 1.

[13] Translation is from Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part III," 402.

[14] Translation is from Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part III," 401.

[15] Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part III," 402. English translation has been taken from NIV.

[16] Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part III," 402.

gaining attention."[17] In John 6:27, two restrictive attributive participles limit the concept of food. The first identifies perishable food, which merely feeds the body for a moment. The second participle limits to food that does not perish but feeds the whole person forever. Notice that these two examples from John 6:27 represent the aspect of restrictivity that falls toward the concept formation pole (contra the entity identification pole, which is clearly presented in Col 1:12 above).

Voelz considers the restrictive nature of the attributive participle in relation to the relative clause and in the context of questioning the assertions of grammarians who assert that the two constructions are "equivalent." With respect to the relative clause he states that "subordinate clauses headed by a relative pronoun seem to be non-restrictive in their meaning."[18] Voelz does note, however, that on one level restrictive relative clauses do exist. He refers to "relative pronouns in the accusative" and states, "See e.g., John 6:51c: καὶ ὁ ἄρτος δὲ ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω ἡ σάρξ μού ἐστιν. This seems to be restrictive, but, it should be noted, one could not use a participle to convey this idea unless it were in the passive voice (future tense!), viz., ὁ δοθησόμενος ὑπ' ἐμοῦ."[19] Voelz indicates that restrictive relative clauses do exist but that certain factors, constraints and tendencies may need to be considered.

On the whole, Voelz puts forth an introductory and compelling case for the restrictive attributive participle in the Greek New Testament. Our study, which examines every example in the Greek New Testament, confirms Voelz's general assertions. Furthermore, his statements with respect to restrictive relative clauses support the need for a more thorough analysis of the

---

[17] Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part III," 402.

[18] Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part III," 402.

[19] Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part III," 402.

tendencies of the Greek language with respect to every restrictive relative clause in the Greek New Testament.

The Restrictive Attributive Participle in the Greek New Testament

The validity of restrictive modification as a linguistic category and the existence of this modification through various strategies cross-linguistically have been established. A general survey of restrictive clauses has confirmed the existence of restrictive attributive participles in English, Spanish, Modern Greek and Koine Greek. A presentation of restrictive attributive participles in the Greek New Testament will demonstrate the reality of these constructions. Restrictive attributive participles exist in multiple noun-phrase formation patterns, in various genres, among all authors of the New Testament, and with antecedents that range from very generic to very specific.

Noun Phrase Formation Patterns Containing An Attributive Participle.

Restrictive modification is commonly done through attributive participles. Four major noun phrase formation patterns containing an attributive participle can be discerned in the Greek New Testament:[20]

1. Article + Substantive + Article + Participle (ASAP)

2. Substantive + Participle (SP)

3. Article + Participle + Substantive (APS)

---

[20] Young treats noun phrase formation patterns containing attributive participles and states, "The restrictive adjectival participle occurs in three basic forms." He describes them as follows: *article-participle-noun*; *article-noun-article-participle* (which he claims is "the most common position for adjectival participles); and *noun-participle*. He neglects to mention the SAP category but the three he does cite (which correspond to APS, ASAP, and SP) do represent a large number of attributive participles. Young, *New Testament Greek*, 151.

Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 618, highlights four different noun phrase formation patterns containing attributive participles that correspond to the designations set forth here: *first attributive position* (APS), *second attributive position* (ASAP, which he claims is "the most common construction for attributive participles"), *third attributive position* (SAP, he states this is "a frequent construction with participles, but not with adjectives") and *fourth attributive position* (SP).

4. Substantive + Article + Participle (SAP)

An assessment of each of these formation patterns, noting frequency of occurrence, will be presented.[21] Additionally, multiple examples from each formation pattern will be offered to demonstrate a wide variety of restrictive attributive participles from various authors, genres, and books of the Greek New Testament.

Article + Substantive + Article + Participle (ASAP). The ASAP formation pattern occurs more frequently in the Greek New Testament than any other formation pattern. The Greek New Testament contains 296 occurrences representing 37% of all attributive participles in the Greek New Testament.

Restrictive attributive participles of the ASAP pattern are distributed evenly throughout the Greek New Testament. They find representation in the Synoptic gospels, the gospel of John, Acts, Pauline Epistles (Romans, 1 & 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, 1 Thessalonians, 2 Timothy, and Titus), Hebrews, James, 1 Peter, 1 & 2 John, Jude, and Revelation. Various examples that lean toward concept formation and entity identification from a cross section of these books will be presented in order to demonstrate the existence of these restrictive participles and to familiarize the reader with this formation pattern.

First, a few examples will be presented and analyzed thoroughly to demonstrate the nature of these participles. Second, a succinct list of examples will be presented to familiarize the reader with a wide variety of occurrences. Finally, a few notable examples will be presented.

Matthew 7:13–14 contains two attributive participles of the ASAP formation pattern, both modifying two separate occurrences of the common noun ἡ ὁδός: Εἰσέλθατε διὰ τῆς στενῆς πύλης· ὅτι πλατεῖα ἡ πύλη καὶ εὐρύχωρος ἡ ὁδὸς ἡ ἀπάγουσα εἰς τὴν ἀπώλειαν καὶ πολλοὶ

---

[21] The data put forth for each noun phrase formation pattern has been determined from the comprehensive list of verses located in app. 1.

103

εἰσιν οἱ εἰσερχόμενοι δι᾽ αὐτῆς· τί στενὴ ἡ πύλη καὶ τεθλιμμένη ἡ ὁδὸς ἡ ἀπάγουσα εἰς τὴν

ζωὴν καὶ ὀλίγοι εἰσὶν οἱ εὑρίσκοντες αὐτήν.[22] In the first instance the participial phrase ἡ

ἀπάγουσα εἰς τὴν ἀπώλειαν limits the referent to the road or way that leads to destruction as

opposed to the road or way that leads to life, which is demonstrated by the second restrictive

participial phrase ἡ ἀπάγουσα εἰς τὴν ζωήν. Both participial phrases limit the possible referents

of ἡ ὁδός. Therefore, they function restrictively. This restrictive modification sets up a contrast

between two opposite roads/ways.

   John 6:27 contains two examples of attributive participles of the ASAP formation pattern.

In one of the few instances where grammarians deal with restrictive attributive participles,

MacDonald cites this verse as his lone example.[23] Both participles modify the common noun τὴν

βρῶσιν· ἐργάζεσθε μὴ τὴν βρῶσιν τὴν ἀπολλυμένην ἀλλὰ τὴν βρῶσιν τὴν μένουσαν εἰς ζωὴν

αἰώνιον....[24] The participle τὴν ἀπολλυμένην limits the referent to physical earthly bread that

spoils. The participial phrase τὴν μένουσαν εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον limits the referent to a type of bread

that supersedes this-worldly bread and remains forever, pointing to a figurative interpretation of

the complete noun phrase. Both restrictive participles limit the referent of the antecedent to set

up a contrast between two different types of bread; therefore, they both function restrictively and,

furthermore, lean toward the concept formation pole.

---

[22] NIV: "Enter through the narrow gate. For wide is the gate and broad is **the road that leads to destruction,** and many enter through it. But small is the gate and narrow **the road that leads to life,** and only a few find it."

[23] MacDonald, *Greek Enchiridion*, 58. See also ch. 1, section titled "Grammatical Assertions Concerning the Nature of the Attributive Participle's Adjectival Modification." MacDonald erroneously equates restrictive modification solely with the ASAP noun phrase formation pattern. Additionally, see Voelz's treatment of this verse on p. 101 of this chapter

[24] ESV: "Do not work for **the food that perishes,** but for **the food that endures to eternal life.**"

In 1 Thess 4:5 consider the modification of the specific noun τὰ ἔθνη: μὴ ἐν πάθει

ἐπιθυμίας καθάπερ καὶ τὰ ἔθνη τὰ μὴ εἰδότα τὸν θεόν.[25] The participial phrase τὰ μὴ εἰδότα τὸν

θεόν limits the referent from all Gentiles to that subset of Gentiles who do not know God.[26]

Therefore, it functions restrictively; and, furthermore, it leans toward entity identification. The

context of 1 Thessalonians supports this restrictive understanding. In 1 Thess 2:16 Paul

implicitly states that Gentiles are capable of knowing God and that he in turn desires for them to

do so: τοῖς ἔθνεσιν λαλῆσαι ἵνα σωθῶσιν.[27]

Consider the following additional restrictive examples of the ASAP formation pattern:

Mark 3:22: καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς οἱ ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων καταβάντες ἔλεγον[28]
• limits referent to specifically those scribes that came down from Jerusalem
• leans toward entity identification

Mark 4:15: ὅπου σπείρεται ὁ λόγος καὶ ὅταν ἀκούσωσιν, εὐθὺς ἔρχεται ὁ Σατανᾶς
καὶ αἴρει τὸν λόγον τὸν ἐσπαρμένον εἰς αὐτούς[29]
• limits the referent to that word that is sown in the ones along the path[30]
• leans toward entity identification

Luke 7:39: ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Φαρισαῖος ὁ καλέσας αὐτὸν[31]
• limits referent to the Pharisee who had invited him
• leans strongly toward entity identification

---

[25] ESV: "not in the passion of lust like **the Gentiles who do not know God**"

[26] Consider also the attribute participles of the SAP formation pattern with the substantive ἔθνη in the Pauline epistle to the Romans in Rom 2:14 and 9:30, which appear to function restrictively. See p. 128.

[27] ESV: "speaking to the Gentiles that they might be saved"

[28] ESV: "And **the scribes who came down from Jerusalem** were saying"

[29] ESV: "where the word is sown: when they hear, Satan immediately comes and takes away **the word that is sown in them**."

[30] If the restrictive participial phrase were left out it remains possible that from context the reader could deduce that τὸν λόγον refers back to ὁ λόγος in the preceding clause. However, the restrictive participial clause definitively limits the referent to that word that is sown in the ones along the path.

[31] ESV: "Now when **the Pharisee who had invited him** saw this"

Luke 9:32: εἶδον . . . τοὺς δύο ἄνδρας τοὺς συνεστῶτας αὐτῷ.[32]
- limits referent to specifically the two men standing with him[33]
- leans toward entity identification

John 6:22 : ὁ ὄχλος ὁ ἑστηκὼς πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης[34]
- limits referent to the crowd that remained on the other side of the sea
- leans toward entity identification

John 6:58: ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς[35]
- Limits referent to the bread that came down from heaven (metaphorical application)
- Leans toward entity identification

John 11:52: τὰ τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ τὰ διεσκορπισμένα[36]
- limits referent to those children of God who are scattered abroad
- leans slightly toward entity identification

John 21:24: ὁ μαθητὴς ὁ μαρτυρῶν περὶ τούτων καὶ ὁ γράψας ταῦτα[37]
- limits to the disciple who testified to these things and wrote them down
- leans strongly toward entity identification

Acts 21:38: οὐκ ἄρα σὺ εἶ ὁ Αἰγύπτιος ὁ πρὸ τούτων τῶν ἡμερῶν ἀναστατώσας καὶ ἐξαγαγὼν εἰς τὴν ἔρημον τοὺς τετρακισχιλίους ἄνδρας τῶν σικαρίων;[38]
- limits the referent to identify specifically the Egyptian who some time ago stirred up a revolt and led 4,000 assassins out into the wilderness
- leans strongly toward entity identification

Rom 7:23: τῷ νόμῳ τῆς ἁμαρτίας τῷ ὄντι ἐν τοῖς μέλεσίν μου.[39]
- limits to specifically the law of sin that exists within the apostle Paul
- leans toward entity identification

---

[32] ESV: "they . . . saw his glory and **the two men who stood with him.**"

[33] Similar to Mark 4:15, above, the restrictive modification serves to reinforce the identity of the referent to a previously established entity in the immediate context of the pericope. The cardinal δύο coupled with the participial phrase solidify definitively for the reader the two men who are standing (and talking) with Jesus, Moses and Elijah.

[34] ESV: "**the crowd that remained on the other side of the sea.**"

[35] ESV: "**the bread that came down from heaven**"

[36] ESV: "**the children of God who are scattered abroad.**"

[37] NASB[95]: "**the disciple who is testifying to these things and wrote these things**" Note that two restrictive attributive participles modify one substantive. This commonly occurs with attributive participles.

[38] NASB[95]: "Then you are not **the Egyptian who some time ago stirred up a revolt and led the four thousand men of the Assassins out into the wilderness?**"

[39] ESV: "**to the law of sin that dwells in my members.**"

106

1 Cor 1:2: τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Κορίνθῳ.[40]
- limits to the church that exists in Corinth
- leans strongly toward entity identification

2 Cor 1:8: τῆς θλίψεως ἡμῶν τῆς γενομένης ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ.[41]
- limits referent to the affliction that happened to them in Asia
- leans toward entity identification

Eph 2:2: τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ νῦν ἐνεργοῦντος ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς τῆς ἀπειθείας.[42]
- limits to specific spirit that is currently working in the sons of disobedience
- leans toward entity identification

Phil 4:17: τὸν καρπὸν τὸν πλεονάζοντα εἰς λόγον ὑμῶν.[43]
- limits fruit to metaphorical meaning: "advantage, gain, [or] profit" that was "accruing to the Philippians fr[om] their generous giving."[44]
- leans toward entity identification

Col 1:5: διὰ τὴν ἐλπίδα τὴν ἀποκειμένην ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.[45]
- limits to the hope that is laid up in heaven for the Colossian believers
- leans toward entity identification

Titus 1:9: ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ τῇ ὑγιαινούσῃ.[46]
- limits to teaching that is sound/healthy
- leans toward concept formation

Heb 9:4: ἡ ῥάβδος Ἀαρὼν ἡ βλαστήσασα[47]
- limits complex substantive to identify Aaron's staff that budded[48]
- leans strongly toward entity identification

---

[40] ESV: "to the church of God that is in Corinth"

[41] NASB[95]: "our affliction which came *to us* in Asia."

[42] ESV: "the spirit that is now at work in the sons of disobedience."

[43] ESV: "the fruit that increases to your credit."

[44] BDAG, s.v. καρπός, 2.

[45] ESV: "because of the hope laid up for you in heaven...."

[46] ESV: "in sound doctrine...."

[47] ESV: "Aaron's staff that budded..."

[48] See Exod 7 and Num 17 for reference to the staffs of Aaron. This example of restrictive modification could be partitive, distinguishing from the normal functions of Aaron's staff or the role it played as a serpent in Exod 7. However, in Num 17 Aaron's staff buds and is placed before the testimony permanently (according to Heb 9:4). Thus it is assumed that Aaron must have had another staff after the one in Num 17. Additionally, it is likely that Aaron had other staffs at different periods of his life.

Jas 5:4: ἰδοὺ ὁ μισθὸς τῶν ἐργατῶν τῶν ἀμησάντων τὰς χώρας ὑμῶν ὁ ἀπεστερημένος ἀφ᾽ ὑμῶν κράζει.[49]

- the first participle limits to workers who mowed their fields; the second participle limits to specifically the pay that the rich oppressors fraudulently withheld from them
- both participles lean toward entity identification

1 Pet 1:25: τοῦτο δέ ἐστιν τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν εἰς ὑμᾶς.[50]

- limits to the word preached to the recipients of Peter's epistle
- leans toward entity identification

1 John 5:4: καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ νίκη ἡ νικήσασα τὸν κόσμον.[51]

- limits to specifically that victory which overcomes the world
- leans toward entity identification

2 John 2: διὰ τὴν ἀλήθειαν τὴν μένουσαν ἐν ἡμῖν.[52]

- limits referent to specifically that truth that remains in John and all believers
- leans slightly toward concept formation

Rev 10:8: Ὕπαγε λάβε τὸ βιβλίον τὸ ἠνεῳγμένον ἐν τῇ χειρὶ τοῦ ἀγγέλου τοῦ ἑστῶτος ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.[53]

- second participle limits to the angel who is standing on the sea and the land; first participle limits to the book that is open in the hand of that angel
- both participles lean strongly toward entity identification

Rev 11:4: οὗτοί εἰσιν αἱ δύο ἐλαῖαι καὶ αἱ δύο λυχνίαι αἱ ἐνώπιον τοῦ κυρίου τῆς γῆς ἑστῶτες.[54]

- limits to the two olive trees and two lampstands that stand before the Lord of the earth
- leans strongly toward entity identification

---

[49] "The pay of *the workers who mowed your field* that was fraudulently held back from you cries out."

[50] NASB[95]: "And this is **the word which was preached to you**."

[51] ESV: "And this is **the victory that has overcome the world**."

[52] ESV: "because of **the truth that abides in us**."

[53] ESV: "Go, take **the scroll that is open** in the hand of **the angel who is standing on the sea and on the land**."

[54] ESV: "These are **the two olive trees and the two lampstands that stand before the Lord of the earth**."

Notice that the article of the participle is feminine while the actual participle is masculine. "Revelation exhibits a quantity of striking solecisms which are based especially on inattention to agreement (a rough style), in contrast to the rest of the NT and to the other writings ascribed to John . . . . The masculine is often substituted for the feminine or neuter: 11:4 αἱ δύο λυχνίαι αἱ . . . ἑστῶτες," BDF, § 136. Or it could refer to the two witnesses of verse three (*constructio ad sensum*).

Rev 14:13: οἱ νεκροὶ οἱ ἐν κυρίῳ ἀποθνῄσκοντες ἀπ᾽ ἄρτι.[55]
- limits to people who die trusting in the Lord from the present time onward
- leans toward concept formation

Rev 16:2: τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τοὺς ἔχοντας τὸ χάραγμα τοῦ θηρίου καὶ τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας τῇ εἰκόνι αὐτοῦ.[56]
- limits to people who have the mark of the beast and worship its image
- leans slightly toward entity identification

Rev 22:8: τῶν ποδῶν τοῦ ἀγγέλου τοῦ δεικνύοντός μοι ταῦτα.[57]
- limits to that angel that was showing to John the visions of the future [58]
- leans toward entity identification

Rev 22:18: τὰς πληγὰς τὰς γεγραμμένας ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τούτῳ.[59]
- limits to plagues written about in the book of Revelation
- leans toward entity identification

Having surveyed a wide variety of examples of restrictive attributive participles of the

ASAP formation pattern, a few notable examples will be presented and more thoroughly

discussed.

In Acts 3:2, 11, the modification of two attributive participles seems to coordinate well

with archaeological evidence. In Acts 3:2 a participle limits a complex substantive: ὃν ἐτίθουν

καθ᾽ ἡμέραν πρὸς τὴν θύραν τοῦ ἱεροῦ τὴν λεγομένην Ὡραίαν.[60] First the genitive modifier

τοῦ ἱεροῦ limits the referent of τὴν θύραν from all gates to a gate of the temple. Then the

attributive participle τὴν λεγομένην limits the reference further to the gate of the temple called

Beautiful. A non-contemporary reader of the text who is unfamiliar with the physical layout of

---

[55] ESV: "the dead who die in the Lord from now on."

[56] ESV: "the people who bore the mark of the beast and worshiped its image." In this context, τοὺς ἀνθρώπους represents all of humanity, persons "of either sex, w[ith] focus on participation in the human race." BDAG, s.v. ἄνθρωπος, 1.

[57] ESV: "the feet of the angel who showed them to me."

[58] This angel stands in contrast to, for example, one of the seven angels with the seven bowls (21:9) or one of the twelve angels at the gates (21:12).

[59] ESV: "the plagues described in this book."

[60] ESV: "whom they laid daily at the gate of the temple that is called the Beautiful Gate."

109

the temple would not know whether or not there would be one or more gates to the temple. With

respect to Herod's temple Bimson et al. assert, "Four gates gave access on the N[orth] and

S[outh] sides and one on the E[ast]. This last had doors of Corinthian bronze-work and may be

the Beautiful Gate of Acts 3:2."[61] From these assertions one can readily conclude that there were

at least five temple gates. The attributive participle limits the complex substantive to one specific

entity thereby identifying the gate where the lame man was daily placed (entity identification).

Thus, it functions restrictively. The restrictive participle points the reader toward an

understanding of more than one gate and the archaeological evidence corroborates this view.

In Acts 3:11, the attributive participle also seems to coordinate with archaeological

realities: συνέδραμεν πᾶς ὁ λαὸς πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τῇ στοᾷ τῇ καλουμένῃ Σολομῶντος.[62] The

attributive participle τῇ καλουμένῃ appears to limit the reference of τῇ στοᾷ to that portico

(porch) that is called Solomon's. This implies that more than one portico exists. Bimson et al.

confirm as much, "As described by Josephus (Ant. 15.410–416), the S[outh] porch had four rows

of columns and was called the Royal Porch. The porticoes of the other sides each had two rows.

Solomon's Porch stretched along the E[ast] side (Jn. 10:23; Acts 3:11; 5:12)."[63] This example of

restrictive modification lies toward the extreme of entity identification and corroborates well

with the archaeological realities as attested by Josephus.

Acts 17:24 contains a unique example of modification with the substantive ὁ θεὸς: ὁ θεὸς ὁ

ποιήσας τὸν κόσμον καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ.[64] In the middle of the Areopagus, the apostle Paul

---

[61] J. J. Bimson, J. P. Kane, J. H. Paterson, D. J. Weisman and D. R. W. Wood, eds. New Bible Atlas (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1985) 111.

[62] ESV: "all the people . . . ran together to them in **the portico called Solomon's.**"

[63] Bimson et al., New Bible Atlas, 111.

[64] ESV: "**The God who made the world and everything in it**" Notice that the translation for ὁ θεὸς here is capitalized "God." This tendency for translations to capitalize any reference to the Christian god diminishes and contradicts the function of the restrictive clause to identify the god referenced to be God.

speaks to the men of Athens after encountering an altar for "the unknown god."[65] In the New

Testament, the term θεός does not only refer to the Christian god (God)[66] but can also refer to

any "transcendent being," non-transcendent being "considered worthy of special reverence or

respect," or even the devil himself.[67] With the usage of the attributive participial phrase ὁ

ποιήσας τὸν κόσμον καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ Paul seems to identify the unknown transcendent

being (Ἀγνώστῳ Θεῷ) in the previous verse to be the god/God who made the world and

everything in it. The usage of ὁ Θεὸς in this context, in and of itself, refers to a transcendent

being. While Paul clearly holds to the tenets of monotheism, he speaks to a polytheistic culture.

His use of the participle limits the referent to the sole transcendent being that has created

everything. Therefore, it is taken to be functioning restrictively. The restrictive participle coupled

with the antecedent collectively refers then to the Christian god (God), but ὁ Θεὸς alone does not,

contrary to the assertions of Johannes Louw and Eugene Nida.[68]

---

[65] See Acts 17:22–23. ESV: "So Paul, standing in the midst of the Areopagus, said: 'Men of Athens, I perceive that in every way you are very religious. For as I passed along and observed the objects of your worship, I found also an altar with this inscription, "To the unknown god." What therefore you worship as unknown, this I proclaim to you....'"

[66] BDAG, s.v. θεός, 3. This is the predominant usage in the New Testament.

[67] BDAG, s.v. θεός, 1,4, 5. Consider the following respective usages. First, in Acts 28:6 we see people claiming Paul to be a God: οἱ δὲ προσεδόκων αὐτὸν μέλλειν πίμπρασθαι ἢ καταπίπτειν ἄφνω νεκρόν. ἐπὶ πολὺ δὲ αὐτῶν προσδοκώντων καὶ θεωρούντων μηδὲν ἄτοπον εἰς αὐτὸν γινόμενον μεταβαλόμενοι ἔλεγον αὐτὸν εἶναι θεόν (ESV: "They were waiting for him to swell up or suddenly fall down dead. But when they had waited a long time and saw no misfortune come to him, they changed their minds and said that he was a god"). Second, Phil 3:19 contains a reference to the stomach as god, an example of a nontranscendent entity receiving special reverence or respect: ὧν τὸ τέλος ἀπώλεια, ὧν ὁ Θεὸς ἡ κοιλία καὶ ἡ δόξα ἐν τῇ αἰσχύνῃ αὐτῶν, οἱ τὰ ἐπίγεια φρονοῦντες (ESV: "Their end is destruction, their god is their belly, and they glory in their shame, with minds set on earthly things"). Third, 2 Cor 4:4 contains a reference to the devil as god of this world: ἐν οἷς ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἐτύφλωσεν τὰ νοήματα τῶν ἀπίστων εἰς τὸ μὴ αὐγάσαι τὸν φωτισμὸν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς δόξης τοῦ Χριστοῦ (ESV: "In their case the god of this world has blinded the minds of the unbelievers, to keep them from seeing the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ").

[68] Louw-Nida describe this usage of θεός to be "the one supreme supernatural being as creator and sustainer of the universe," Johannes E. Louw and Eugene A. Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains* (New York: United Bible Societies, 1989), s.v. θεός. However, in the context of this verse this meaning appears to be derived not from θεός alone but from θεός coupled with the restrictive modification.

Attributive participles of the ASAP formation pattern occur throughout the New Testament, among different authors and various genres. Many of these constructions occur with very generic and common nouns, as well as with specific nouns and complex substantives.

Substantive + Participle (SP). The SP formation pattern occurs more frequently in the Greek New Testament than the APS and SAP formation patterns and slightly less frequently than the ASAP pattern. The Greek New Testament contains 244 occurrences representing 31% of all attributive participles in the Greek New Testament.

Restrictive attributive participles of the SP pattern are distributed evenly throughout the Greek New Testament. They find representation in the Synoptic gospels, the gospel of John, Acts, Pauline Epistles (Romans, 1 & 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, 1 & 2 Thessalonians, 1 & 2 Timothy, and Titus), Hebrews, James, Petrine Epistles, Jude and Revelation. Various examples that lean toward concept formation and entity identification from a cross section of these books will be presented in order to demonstrate the existence of these restrictive participles and to familiarize the reader with this formation pattern.

First, a few examples will be presented and analyzed thoroughly to demonstrate the nature of these participles. Second, a succinct list of examples will be presented to familiarize the reader with a wide variety of occurrences. Finally, a few notable examples will be presented.

Matthew 2:23 contains an example of a common noun modified by an attributive participle: καὶ ἐλθὼν κατῴκησεν εἰς πόλιν λεγομένην Ναζαρέτ.[69] Jesus went and lived in a city. The author/narrator limits the referent from a (any) city to that one which is specifically called Nazareth. This example of restriction modification leans toward the entity identification pole.

---

[69] ESV: "And he went and lived in **a city called Nazareth.**"

First Corinthians 11:4–5 contains two very generic substantives that are coupled with the

determiner πᾶς and modified by two attributive participles: **πᾶς ἀνὴρ προσευχόμενος ἢ**

προφητεύων κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων καταισχύνει τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ. **πᾶσα δὲ γυνὴ**

προσευχομένη ἢ προφητεύουσα ἀκατακαλύπτῳ τῇ κεφαλῇ καταισχύνει τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτῆς.[70]

It is noted that when the determiner πᾶς modifies a substantive, further adjectival modification

tends to be restrictive. In both cases the participial forms of προσεύχομαι and προφητεύω limit

the reference of the two very generic substantives ἀνὴρ and γυνή; therefore, they function

restrictively. Both examples lean toward the concept formation pole of restrictive modification

describing a type of person, not necessarily pointing out one entity in particular.

James 1:6 contains a complex substantive modified by two participles: ὁ γὰρ

διακρινόμενος ἔοικεν **κλύδωνι θαλάσσης ἀνεμιζομένῳ καὶ ῥιπιζομένῳ**.[71] The participles

ἀνεμιζομένῳ and ῥιπιζομένῳ limit the referent of κλύδωνι θαλάσσης to a certain type of wave of

the sea, a wave that is driven and tossed by the wind, as opposed to, for example, a small, calm

wave that barely disturbs the surface; therefore, they are restrictive.

Consider the following additional restrictive examples of the SP formation pattern:

Matt 13:24: Ὡμοιώθη ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν **ἀνθρώπῳ σπείραντι καλὸν σπέρμα**
ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ αὐτοῦ.[72]
- limits from all men to specifically one who sowed good seed in his field
- leans slightly toward entity identification

---

[70] ESV: "**Every man who prays or prophesies with his head covered** dishonors his head, but **every wife [woman] who prays or prophesies with her head uncovered** dishonors her head."

[71] ESV: "for the one who doubts is **like a wave of the sea that is driven and tossed by the wind**."

[72] ESV: "The kingdom of heaven may be compared to **a man who sowed good seed in his field**...."

113

Matt 13:47: Πάλιν ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν **σαγήνῃ βληθείσῃ** εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ ἐκ παντὸς γένους συναγαγούσῃ.[73]

- limits to net that has been thrown into the sea and gathered fish of every kind
- leans slightly toward entity identification

Mark 6:34: ἦσαν ὡς **πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα**[74]

- limits to sheep not having a shepherd
- leans toward concept formation

Luke 2:23: **Πᾶν ἄρσεν διανοῖγον μήτραν**[75]

- limits to every male that opens the womb, which means the firstborn son
- leans toward concept formation

Luke 12:33: ποιήσατε ἑαυτοῖς **βαλλάντια μὴ παλαιούμενα**.[76]

- limits to money bags that do not grow old, metaphorical application
- leans toward concept formation

John 4:10: καὶ ἔδωκεν ἄν σοι **ὕδωρ ζῶν**.[77]

- limits to living water, water that gives life, metaphorical application
- leans slightly toward concept formation

John 15:2: **πᾶν κλῆμα ἐν ἐμοὶ μὴ φέρον καρπὸν** αἴρει αὐτό.[78]

- limits to those branches in Jesus that remain fruitless
- leans slightly toward concept formation

Acts 7:38: ὃς ἐδέξατο **λόγια ζῶντα** δοῦναι ἡμῖν.[79]

- limits to words that are not dead but living and effective.[80]
- leans toward concept formation

---

[73] ESV: "Again, the kingdom of heaven is like **a net that was thrown into the sea and gathered fish of every kind**."

[74] NKJV: "they were like **sheep not having a shepherd**."

[75] ESV: "**Every male who first opens the womb**."

[76] ESV: "Provide yourselves with **moneybags that do not grow old**."

[77] ESV: "and he would have given you **living water**."

[78] ESV: "**Every branch in me that does not bear fruit** he takes away."

[79] NIV: "he received **living words** to pass on to us."

[80] ESV translates λόγια as *oracles*. BDAG translates *saying* but notes in the Greek New Testament it is found only in the plural and refers specifically here to "the revelations received by Moses." See BDAG, s.v. λόγιον. Additionally BDAG states that one could describe these as words that "offer life" or "words that meant life," BDAG, s.v. ζάω, 5.

Acts 15:22: Ἰούδαν . . . καὶ Σιλᾶν, ἄνδρας ἡγουμένους ἐν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς.[81]
- limits to the type of men that are leaders among the brothers
- leans slightly toward concept formation

Rom 8:24: ἐλπὶς δὲ βλεπομένη οὐκ ἔστιν ἐλπίς· ὃ γὰρ βλέπει τίς ἐλπίζει;[82]
- limits to the idea of hope that is seen
- leans toward concept formation

Rom 10:21: πρὸς λαὸν ἀπειθοῦντα καὶ ἀντιλέγοντα.[83]
- limits to a type of people that are disobedient and opposing (obstinate)
- leans toward concept formation

Gal 5:3: παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ περιτεμνομένῳ[84]
- limits to a subcategory of men who accept circumcision
- leans strongly toward concept formation

Gal 5:6: πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη.[85]
- limits to a faith that manifests in love
- leans toward concept formation

1 Tim 2:10: γυναιξὶν ἐπαγγελλομέναις θεοσέβειαν....[86]
- limits to subset of women who profess godliness
- leans toward concept formation

Titus 1:14: ἀνθρώπων ἀποστρεφομένων τὴν ἀλήθειαν.[87]
- limits to subset of humanity typified by a disposition to turn from the truth
- leans toward concept formation

Heb 4:15: ἀρχιερέα μὴ δυνάμενον συμπαθῆσαι ταῖς ἀσθενείαις ἡμῶν....[88]
- limits to high priest that is unable to sympathize with human weaknesses
- leans toward concept formation

---

[81] ESV: "Judas . . . and Silas, **leading men among the brothers**."

[82] ESV: "Now **hope that is seen** is not hope. For who hopes for what he sees?"

[83] ESV: "to **a disobedient and contrary people**."

[84] ESV: "to **every man who accepts circumcision**."

[85] GWN: "**a faith that expresses itself through love**."

[86] ESV: "for **women who profess godliness**."

[87] ESV: "**people who turn away from the truth**." In this context, ἄνθρωπος represents all of humanity, persons "of either sex, w[ith] focus on participation in the human race."BDAG, s.v. ἄνθρωπος, 1.

[88] ESV: "**a high priest who is unable to sympathize with our weaknesses**."

Heb 12:29: καὶ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν **πῦρ καταναλίσκον.**[89]
- limits the type of fire to one that is not weak and diminishing, but consumes
- leans strongly toward concept formation

Heb 13:15: καρπὸν χειλέων ὁμολογούντων τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ.[90]
- limits to lips that confess the name of God (example of synecdoche)
- leans strongly toward concept formation

1 Pet 5:8: ὁ ἀντίδικος ὑμῶν διάβολος ὡς **λέων ὠρυόμενος** περιπατεῖ.[91]
- limits to a certain type of lion, one that roars
- leans strongly toward concept formation

2 Pet 1:19: ὡς **λύχνῳ φαίνοντι ἐν αὐχμηρῷ τόπῳ.**[92]
- limits to lamp shining in a dark place
- leans toward concept formation

Rev 3:18: συμβουλεύω σοι ἀγοράσαι παρ᾽ ἐμοῦ **χρυσίον πεπυρωμένον ἐκ πυρός.**[93]
- limits from all types of gold to that which has been refined by fire
- leans slightly toward concept formation

Rev 6:14 – καὶ ὁ οὐρανὸς ἀπεχωρίσθη ὡς **βιβλίον ἑλισσόμενον.**[94]
- limits to a scroll that is being rolled up (simile with vivid imagery)
- leans strongly toward concept formation

Rev 12:1: **γυνὴ περιβεβλημένη τὸν ἥλιον.**[95]
- limits from all possible women to one who is clothed with the sun
- leans slightly toward entity identification

Rev 19:13: καὶ περιβεβλημένος **ἱμάτιον βεβαμμένον αἵματι.**[96]
- limits to a robe/garment that is dipped in blood
- leans slightly toward entity identification

---

[89] ESV: "for our God is **a consuming fire.**"

[90] ESV: "the fruit of **lips that acknowledge his name.**"

[91] ESV: "Your adversary the devil prowls around like **a roaring lion.**"

[92] ESV: "as to **a lamp shining in a dark place**"

[93] ESV: "I counsel you to buy from me **gold refined by fire.**"

[94] ESV: "The sky vanished like **a scroll that is being rolled up.**"

[95] ESV: "**a woman clothed with the sun.**"

[96] NASB[95]: "*He is* clothed with **a robe dipped in blood.**"

Having surveyed a wide variety of examples of restrictive attributive participles of the SP

formation pattern, a few notable examples will be presented and examined.

In Acts 27:2 and Acts 27:6, two similar attributive participles of the SP formation pattern

occur. Both instances contain complex substantives that consist of the noun πλοῖον coupled with

adjectives that designate cities of origin. In Acts 27:2 the author describes not only an

Adramyttium ship but one that specifically was about to set sail along the coast of Asia:

ἐπιβάντες δὲ **πλοίῳ Ἀδραμυττηνῷ μέλλοντι πλεῖν εἰς τοὺς κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν τόπους.**[97] In Acts

27:6 the author describes not only an Alexandrian ship, but one that specifically was sailing for

Italy: κἀκεῖ εὑρὼν ὁ ἑκατοντάρχης **πλοῖον Ἀλεξανδρῖνον πλέον εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν.**[98] In both cases

the attributive participles, μέλλοντι and πλέον, modify their antecedents by limiting the referent

to one specific ship; therefore, they function restrictively. These examples lean toward the entity

identification pole of restrictive modification. A look at English translations of these two verses

reveals the inconsistencies of translators with respect to the restrictive and nonrestrictive

distinction. For Acts 27:2 the RSV translates the attributive participle nonrestrictively, "And

embarking in a ship of Adramyttium, which was about to sail to the ports along the coast of

Asia." The later edition of this translation, the NRSV, translates the verse restrictively.[99] The

ESV translates the participle nonrestrictively, "And embarking in a ship of Adramyttium, which

was about to sail to the ports along the coast of Asia." Ironically, the ESV then translates the

nearly identical construction in Acts 27:6 restrictively.[100]

---

[97] NRSV: "Embarking on **a ship of Adramyttium that was about to set sail to the ports along the coast of Asia....**"

[98] ESV: "There the centurion found **a ship of Alexandria sailing for Italy.**"

[99] See n. 97 above.

[100] See n. 98 above.

First Corinthians 1:23 contains a rarely occurring example of an SP formation pattern with a very specific noun: ἡμεῖς δὲ κηρύσσομεν **Χριστὸν ἐσταυρωμένον**, Ἰουδαίοις μὲν σκάνδαλον, ἔθνεσιν δὲ μωρίαν.[101] Since Χριστὸν stands toward the very specific extreme of the acceptability continuum the tendency for restrictive modification decreases. However, in this case, an example of partitive restrictive modification with the participle ἐσταυρωμένον seems to occur.[102] Paul appears to refer to a teaching or perspective about Christ that focuses on the reality of his crucifixion. The emphasis does not lie with Christ the great teacher, Christ the miracle-worker, Christ the King, etc. The preaching of a crucified messiah did not exist in the frame of reference to the typical Jew and sounded like pure foolishness to the Gentiles. Paul preaches of this type of christ/messiah.

First Thessalonians 1:9 contains an attributive participle coupled with an adjective: καὶ πῶς ἐπεστρέψατε πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἀπὸ τῶν εἰδώλων δουλεύειν **Θεῷ ζῶντι καὶ ἀληθινῷ**.[103] The first mention of God, τὸν θεὸν, clearly refers to the god of the Old and New Testaments, that is, "God in Israelite/Christian monotheistic perspective."[104] The second mention ultimately references this same god but does so by means of restriction in contrast to τῶν εἰδώλων. In the New Testament, the term θεός does not only refer to the Christian god but can also refer to any "transcendent being," non-transcendent being "considered worthy of special reverence or respect," or even the devil himself.[105] The attributive participle and the adjective, ζῶντι καὶ ἀληθινῷ, limit the broad reference of θεῷ to the deity that never dies and is true. This stands in direct contradiction to the

---

[101] ESV: "but we preach **Christ crucified**, a stumbling block to Jews and folly to Gentiles." This verse has been treated briefly on p. 96 of add. 2-A, "Restrictive Modification of Very Specific Substantives."

[102] For a discussion of partitive restrictive modification see add. 2-A.

[103] ESV: "and how you turned to God from idols to serve **the living** and true **God**."

[104] BDAG, s.v. θεός, 3. This is the predominant usage in the New Testament.

[105] BDAG, s.v. θεός, 1,4, 5. See n. 67 above.

idols, or "fabricated deities"[106] that are by nature dead and completely false. As a result, the participle and the adjective function restrictively.

Attributive participles of the SP formation pattern occur throughout the New Testament, among different authors and various genres. As can be expected many of these constructions occur with very generic and common nouns, while also occasionally occurring with very specific nouns and complex substantives.

Article + Participle + Substantive (APS). The APS formation pattern occurs less frequently in the Greek New Testament than the ASAP and SP formation patterns. The Greek New Testament, however, does contain 108 occurrences representing 14% of all attributive participles in the Greek New Testament.

Restrictive attributive participles of the APS pattern are found in the Synoptic gospels, the gospel of John, Acts, Pauline epistles (Romans, 1 & 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, 1 & 2 Timothy, Titus), Hebrews, Petrine epistles, and Jude. A cross section of examples that lean toward concept formation and entity identification will be presented to demonstrate the existence of these restrictive participles and to familiarize the reader with these constructions.

First, a few examples will be presented and analyzed thoroughly to demonstrate the nature of these participles. Second, a succinct list of examples will be presented to familiarize the reader with a variety of occurrences. Finally, a few notable examples will be presented and discussed.

In Mark's account of Jesus' triumphal entry into Jerusalem the people shouted out these words from Mark 11:10: Εὐλογημένη ἡ ἐρχομένη βασιλεία τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Δαυίδ· Ὡσαννὰ ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις.[107] The genitive modifier τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Δαυίδ limits ἡ βασιλεία, creating a specific complex antecedent. This specific complex antecedent, *The kingdom of our father*

---

[106] BDAG, s.v. εἴδωλον, 2.

[107] ESV: "Blessed is **the coming kingdom of our father David!** Hosanna in the highest!"

David, could refer to the actual kingdom over which David (or one of his descendants) reigned in history or it could refer to the prophesied messianic kingdom of David. The attributive participle ἐρχομένη limits the complex substantive ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Δαυίδ indicating that the kingdom referred to is in the future and is *coming*. Therefore, it functions restrictively. In fact it appears to limit the referent to the coming (בָּאִים) days of the kingdom prophesied about in Jer 23:5:

הִנֵּה יָמִים בָּאִים נְאֻם־יְהוָה וַהֲקִמֹתִי לְדָוִד צֶמַח צַדִּיק וּמָלַךְ מֶלֶךְ וְהִשְׂכִּיל וְעָשָׂה מִשְׁפָּט וּצְדָקָה בָּאָרֶץ[108]

Luke's prologue (Luke 1:1) provides us with an occurrence of an APS construction that contains the very generic neuter noun πραγμάτων: …διήγησιν περὶ **τῶν πεπληροφορημένων ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμάτων**.[109] The attributive participle πεπληροφορημένων modifies πραγμάτων and limits this nonassertive head to refer to those things that have been accomplished among the author and his associates. Therefore, the participles functions restrictively. Furthermore, since the substantive being modified stands toward the very generic extreme of the acceptability continuum, restrictive modification is expected.

In Rom 8:18 one observes an attributive participle coupled with the common noun δόξα: Λογίζομαι γὰρ ὅτι οὐκ ἄξια τὰ παθήματα τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ πρὸς **τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι εἰς ἡμᾶς**.[110] The modification is necessary and appears to limit the potential referents of the substantive. The modification seems to limit the glory chronologically (to a

---

[108] ESV: "Behold, the days are coming, declares the LORD, when I will raise up for David a righteous Branch, and he shall reign as king and deal wisely, and shall execute justice and righteousness in the land." All Hebrew Scriptures cited in this dissertation come from BHS.

[109] ESV: "a narrative of **the things that have been accomplished among us**."

[110] NIV: "I consider that our present sufferings are not worth comparing with the glory that will be revealed in us."

future moment) and also to something that will be manifested within Paul, the Roman Christians and all who exist in Christ.[111] Thus, the participle functions restrictively. Furthermore, in this example a common structure that occurs with participles in the APS formation pattern can be discerned. μέλλουσαν plus ἀποκαλυφθῆναι εἰς ἡμᾶς constitute a restrictive participial clause that collectively modifies the substantive. However, notice that ἀποκαλυφθῆναι εἰς ἡμᾶς comes after the substantive syntactically. Voelz notes this to be quite natural in the New Testament, "Not infrequently Greek allows portions of the participial phrase in the 'sandwich' [APS] position to extend beyond the article and noun."[112]

Consider the following additional restrictive examples of the APS formation pattern:

Matt 3:7: τίς ὑπέδειξεν ὑμῖν φυγεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς μελλούσης ὀργῆς;[113]
- limits from the concept of wrath in general to specifically the coming wrath
- leans toward entity identification

John 8:31: Ἔλεγεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς πρὸς τοὺς πεπιστευκότας αὐτῷ Ἰουδαίους.[114]
- limits from all Jews in general to those Jews who had believed in him[115]
- leans toward entity identification

Acts 16:13: καὶ καθίσαντες ἐλαλοῦμεν ταῖς συνελθούσαις γυναιξίν.[116]
- limits to the women who came "together w[ith] others as a group."[117]
- leans toward entity identification

---

[111] Glory in this context refers to the followers of Christ and explains their "state of being in the next life . . . described as participation in the radiance or glory," BDAG, s.v. δόξα, 1.

[112] Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part II," 312. Though quite rare, it has also been asserted that at times the actual participle will extend beyond the article and the noun while the dependent modification will remain between the article and the noun. Acts 26:6 contains such an example: τῆς εἰς τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν ἐπαγγελίας γενομένης... (ESV: "the promise made by God to our fathers"). See also Acts 13:32. See Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, 166–7.

[113] NIV: "Who warned you to flee from **the coming wrath?**"

[114] ESV: "So Jesus said to **the Jews who had believed him.**"

[115] These Jews most likely consist of the many who believed in Jesus in the previous verse (John 8:30: πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτόν).

[116] ESV: "and we sat down and spoke to **the women who had come together.**"

[117] BDAG, s.v. συνέρχομαι, 1.

Acts 23:11: Τῇ δὲ ἐπιούσῃ νυκτὶ ἐπιστὰς αὐτῷ ὁ κύριος εἶπεν.[118]

- limits chronologically what night the Lord stood by and spoke to Paul
- leans strongly toward entity identification

Rom 10:5: Μωϋσῆς γὰρ γράφει τὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ [τοῦ] νόμου ὅτι **ὁ ποιήσας αὐτὰ ἄνθρωπος** ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς.[119]

- limits to the type of person who does these things (i.e. *the commandments*)
- leans toward concept formation

1 Cor 7:26: Νομίζω οὖν τοῦτο καλὸν ὑπάρχειν διὰ **τὴν ἐνεστῶσαν ἀνάγκην**, ὅτι καλὸν ἀνθρώπῳ τὸ οὕτως εἶναι.[120]

- limits to the very distress that stands presently before Paul
- leans toward entity identification

1 Cor 12:22: ἀλλὰ πολλῷ μᾶλλον **τὰ δοκοῦντα μέλη τοῦ σώματος ἀσθενέστερα** ὑπάρχειν ἀναγκαῖά ἐστιν.[121]

- limits to specific parts of the body that seem to be weaker
- leans slightly toward concept formation

Heb 12:12: Διὸ **τὰς παρειμένας χεῖρας** καὶ **τὰ παραλελυμένα γόνατα** ἀνορθώσατε.[122]

- both παρειμένας and παραλελυμένα limit the possible referents to hands and feet that are respectively weak and feeble
- both examples lean toward concept formation

---

[118] ESV: "**The following night** the Lord stood by him and said." Though Boyer's identification of attributive participles are quite comprehensive, he neglects to identify this example in Acts 23:11. See Boyer, "Participles" and Boyer, *Participles*.

[119] NIV: "Moses describes in this way the righteousness that is by the law: '**The man who does these things** will live by them.'" ἄνθρωπος is by nature a very generic noun and in this context even more so. It functions as a basic place holder for any person or human being. BDAG, s.v. ἄνθρωπος, 4.

[120] ESV: "I think that in view of **the present distress** it is good for a person to remain as he is." Paul is not speaking of any past distress or a distress that may be looming in the distant future. He speaks of the present or impending distress. See BDAG, s.v. ἐνίστημι, 2 and 3. See also NRSV: "I think that, in view of the impending crisis, it is well for you to remain as you are."

[121] ESV: "On the contrary, **the parts of the body that seem to be weaker** are indispensable."

Voelz highlights this verse as well. See Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part III," 401–2 and "The Grammatical Assertions of James W. Voelz" section, above. Additionally, similarly to Romans 8:18 above, note that part of the attributive participial phrase (ἀσθενέστερα ὑπάρχειν) falls outside of the APS structure. Voelz highlights this tendency of the Greek language and cites this verse specifically to illustrate this reality. Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part II," 312.

[122] NASB[95]: "Therefore, strengthen **the hands that are weak** and **the knees that are feeble**."

Heb 2:2: εἰ γὰρ ὁ δι᾽ ἀγγέλων λαληθεὶς λόγος ἐγένετο βέβαιος.[123]
- limits to word or message that was spoken through the angels
- leans toward entity identification

1 Pet 4:3 γὰρ ὁ παρεληλυθὼς χρόνος.[124]
- limits to the time that is past
- leans slightly toward entity identification

1 Pet 5:1: ὁ καὶ τῆς μελλούσης ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι δόξης κοινωνός.[125]
- limits to a specific glory, one that is to be revealed
- leans toward entity identification

2 Pet 1:12: ἐν τῇ παρούσῃ ἀληθείᾳ.[126]
- limits to the truth that remains in the possession of the Petrine readers
- leans toward entity identification

Having surveyed a variety of examples of restrictive attributive participles of the APS

formation pattern, a couple notable examples will be presented and more thoroughly examined.

First, consider John 6:57: καθὼς ἀπέστειλέν με ὁ ζῶν πατὴρ κἀγὼ ζῶ διὰ τὸν πατέρα, καὶ

ὁ τρώγων με κἀκεῖνος ζήσει δι᾽ ἐμέ.[127] In the immediate context the most recent preceding

reference to πατήρ occurs in John 6:49: οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν ἔφαγον ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τὸ μάννα καὶ

ἀπέθανον.[128] In verse 49 the context coupled with the personal pronoun clearly helps determine

the fact that πατέρες refers to mortal human beings, ancestors, men "from whom one is

descended and generally at least several generations removed."[129] In John 6:57, ζῶν appears to

limit the referent of πατήρ. Jesus identifies not just a living earthly father, in distinction from the

mortal fathers who ate manna and died, but the eternal father. In this context ζάω refers to

---

[123] NASB[95]: "For if the word spoken through angels proved unalterable."

[124] ESV: "For the time that is past."

[125] NASB[95]: "and a partaker also of the glory that is to be revealed." Compare with Rom 8:18, above.

[126] NASB[95]: "in the truth which is present with you."

[127] ESV: "As the living Father sent me, and I live because of the Father, so whoever feeds on me, he also will live because of me."

[128] ESV: "Your fathers ate the manna in the wilderness, and they died."

[129] BDAG, s.v. πατήρ, 2.

"life in contrast to death" and here specifically refers to "beings that in reality... are not subject to death."[130] Immediately following in John 6:58 the noun πατέρες occurs again and denotes the same referents of John 6:49. ὁ ζῶν πατὴρ stands in the middle of these two occurrences with the effect that ζῶν appears to limit πατὴρ to identify the only eternal father, God the Father, in contrast to the earthly fathers/ancestors who die. Therefore, a restrictive reading is understood.

Second Corinthians 3:10 contains an example of an attributive participle of the APS pattern that modifies the common noun δόξης: καὶ γὰρ οὐ δεδόξασται τὸ δεδοξασμένον ἐν τούτῳ τῷ μέρει εἵνεκεν τῆς ὑπερβαλλούσης δόξης.[131] Young contends that "phrases with words meaning 'surpassing' are descriptive [nonrestrictive]."[132] Young's general observations have been noted to be quite helpful in that his work (and that of Voelz) concerning restrictive attributive participles is unique to the field of New Testament Greek grammar. Nevertheless, Young seems to misunderstand the nature of restrictive modification in this instance. The attributive participle ὑπερβαλλούσης appears to limit δόξης in that the linguistic identity of this noun is dependent on the modification. If one were to remove the attributive participle, this sentence would lack semantic precision. The participle limits the potential referents of δόξης and thereby distinguishes it from the referent of τὸ δεδοξασμένον and points to a glory that is "surpassing, extraordinary, [or] outstanding."[133] This glory consists of a glory that is superior to any other sort of glory in existence. The limiting nature of this participles points to its restrictive function.

Attributive participles of the APS formation pattern occur throughout the New Testament, among different authors and various genres. Many of these constructions occur with very generic

---

[130] BDAG specifically cites this usage in John 6:57. BDAG, s.v. ζάω, 1aε.

[131] NIV: "For what was glorious has no glory now in comparison with **the surpassing glory**."

[132] Young, *Intermediate New Testament Greek*, 151.

[133] This is especially the case when this verb is used in participial form. See BDAG, s.v. ὑπερβάλλω.

and common nouns, while also occasionally occurring with specific nouns and complex substantives.

Substantive + Article + Participle (SAP). The SAP formation pattern occurs less frequently in the Greek New Testament than the ASAP and SP formation patterns and slightly more frequently than the APS formation pattern. The Greek New Testament contains 122 occurrences representing 15% of all attributive participles in the Greek New Testament.

The attributive participles of the SAP pattern that are restrictive are distributed somewhat evenly throughout the Greek New Testament. They find representation in the Synoptic gospels of Matthew and Luke, the gospel of John, Acts, Pauline Epistles (Romans, Galatians, Colossians and 2 Timothy), Hebrews, James, 1 Peter and Jude. Various examples that lean toward concept formation and entity identification will be presented in order to demonstrate the existence of these restrictive participles and to familiarize the reader with this formation pattern.

First, a few examples will be presented and analyzed thoroughly to demonstrate the nature of these participles. Second, a brief list of examples will be presented to familiarize the reader with more occurrences. Finally, a few notable examples will be presented and discussed.

Luke 23:49 contains an attributive participle of the SAP formation pattern that modifies the very generic substantive γυναῖκες: καὶ γυναῖκες αἱ συνακολουθοῦσαι αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας.[134] The participial phrase αἱ συνακολουθοῦσαι αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας limits the antecedent γυναῖκες from all women to specifically identify that group of women who followed Jesus from Galilee; therefore, it functions restrictively. This example of restrictive modification leans toward the entity identification pole.

---

[134] ESV: "and **the women who had followed him from Galilee**."

Matthew 4:18 contains an example of modification in the SAP formation pattern with a proper name: εἶδεν δύο ἀδελφούς, **Σίμωνα τὸν λεγόμενον Πέτρον** καὶ Ἀνδρέαν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ.[135] The participial clause τὸν λεγόμενον Πέτρον limits Σίμωνα from all men named Simon to one who is not only named Simon but also called Peter; therefore, it functions restrictively. As has been stated above, very specific antecedents, such as proper names, tend to attract nonrestrictive modification. However, when they are modified restrictively, they tend to exhibit either a partitive meaning or, as is the case here, entity differentiation.[136] This can be readily demonstrated in another SAP formation example in Luke 6:15: καὶ Μαθθαῖον καὶ Θωμᾶν καὶ Ἰάκωβον Ἀλφαίου καὶ **Σίμωνα τὸν καλούμενον Ζηλωτὴν**.[137] The participial clause τὸν καλούμενον Ζηλωτὴν limits the referent from all men who are named Simon to specifically the one who is called Zealot and distinguishes him from Simon Peter in Luke 6:14, the previous verse. Therefore, it functions restrictively in an instance of entity differentiation.

Gal 3:21 contains an SAP formation pattern with a common noun: εἰ γὰρ ἐδόθη **νόμος ὁ δυνάμενος ζῳοποιῆσαι**, ὄντως ἐκ νόμου ἂν ἦν ἡ δικαιοσύνη·[138] Paul limits the potential referents of νόμος from all possible aspects, notions, or realities of law to form the concept of a law that is able to give life. Therefore it functions restrictively, leaning toward the concept formation pole of restrictive modification.

Consider the following additional restrictive examples of the SAP formation pattern:

Luke 7:32: ὅμοιοί εἰσιν παιδίοις τοῖς ἐν ἀγορᾷ καθημένοις καὶ προσφωνοῦσιν ἀλλήλοις.[139]

---

[135] NASB[95]: "He saw two brothers, **Simon who was called Peter**, and Andrew his brother."

[136] See add. 2-A, "Restrictive Modification of Very Specific Substantives."

[137] ESV: "and Matthew, and Thomas, and James the son of Alphaeus, and Simon who was called the Zealot."

[138] ESV: "For if **a law** had been given **that could give life**, then righteousness would indeed be by the law" (or alternatively: "if **a law that could give life** had been given").

[139] NASB[95]: "They are like **children who sit in the market place and call to one another**."

- limits to the type of children that sit in the marketplace and call to one another
- leans toward concept formation

John 11:2: ἦν δὲ **Μαριὰμ ἡ ἀλείψασα τὸν κύριον μύρῳ καὶ ἐκμάξασα τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ ταῖς θριξὶν αὐτῆς.**[140]
- limits to specifically the Mary who anointed the Lord with ointment and wiped his feet with her hair[141]
- exhibits entity differentiation representative of proper noun modification[142]

Acts 7:35: σὺν χειρὶ **ἀγγέλου τοῦ ὀφθέντος αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ βάτῳ.**[143]
- limits to the angel who appeared to Moses in the bush
- leans strongly toward entity identification

Acts 11:21: πολύς τε **ἀριθμὸς ὁ πιστεύσας** ἐπέστρεψεν ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον.[144]
- limits the complex substantive to that great number (of people) who believed
- leans slightly toward entity identification

Acts 20:19: πειρασμῶν **τῶν συμβάντων μοι ἐν ταῖς ἐπιβουλαῖς τῶν Ἰουδαίων.**[145]
- Limits to specifically the trials that happened to Paul through the plot of the Jews
- Leans toward entity identification

Col 4:11 καὶ **Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος Ἰοῦστος.**[146]
- limits from all men named Jesus to the one specifically called Justus[147]
- leans strongly toward entity identification

Heb 6:7: **γῆ** γὰρ **ἡ πιοῦσα τὸν ἐπ᾽ αὐτῆς ἐρχόμενον πολλάκις ὑετὸν καὶ τίκτουσα βοτάνην.**[148]

---

[140] NKJV: "It was *that* **Mary who anointed the Lord with fragrant oil and wiped His feet with her hair.**"

[141] The narrative of the New Testament presents various women with the name Mary: Mary the mother of Jesus, Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James and Joses, Mary the wife of Clopas, Mary the mother of John Mark, the Mary of Rom 16:6, and the Mary presented here in this verse (sister of Martha). See BDAG, s.v. Μαρία.

[142] See add. 2-A, "Restrictive Modification of Very Specific Substantives."

[143] ESV: "by the hand of **the angel who appeared to him in the bush.**"

[144] ESV: "and **a great number who believed** turned to the Lord."

[145] ESV: "**Trials that happened to me through the plots of the Jews....**"

[146] ESV: "and **Jesus who is called Justus.**" For the usage of λέγω to specifically identify an entity see BDAG, s.v. λέγω, 4.

[147] The name Ἰησοῦς was "common among Jews" and this example confirms the existence of other men named Jesus besides Jesus Christ. Ἰησοῦς is tantamount to the Hebrew יְשׁוּעַ/יְהוֹשׁוּעַ (Joshua). Furthermore, other instances of Ἰησοῦς that do not refer to Jesus Christ are found in Luke 2:39, variants of Matt 27:16 and some have conjectured in Phlm 23. See BDAG, s.v. Ἰησοῦς.

[148] NIV: "**Land that drinks in the rain often falling on it and that produces a crop useful.**" Notice the

- limits to the type of land that is both able to receive the rain that often falls on it and to produce a useful crop
- leans toward concept formation

Jas 4:12: εἷς ἐστιν νομοθέτης καὶ κριτὴς ὁ δυνάμενος σῶσαι καὶ ἀπολέσαι.[149]
- limits to the concept of a lawgiver-judge that is able to save and destroy
- leans toward concept formation

1 Pet 1:10: Περὶ ἧς σωτηρίας ἐξεζήτησαν καὶ ἐξηραύνησαν προφῆται οἱ περὶ τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς χάριτος προφητεύσαντες.[150]
- limits to the subset of prophets who prophesied about the grace that was for the recipients of Peter's letter
- leans toward entity identification

Jude 1:6: ἀγγέλους τε τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν ἀλλὰ ἀπολιπόντας τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον.[151]
- limits to precisely those angels that did not keep their own sphere of influence and left behind their own (proper) dwelling place
- leans toward entity identification

Having surveyed examples of restrictive attributive participles of the SAP formation pattern, a couple notable examples will be presented and examined.

Romans 2:14 and 9:30 both contain examples of the SAP formation pattern with the noun ἔθνη. In both instances Paul appears to speak of a limited subset of all Gentiles. Consider Rom 2:14: ὅταν γὰρ ἔθνη τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα φύσει τὰ τοῦ νόμου ποιῶσιν.[152] The participial phrase τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα limits the referent from all Gentiles to precisely those that do not have the law. Gentiles that do have the law would consist of Gentile God-fearers and proselytes.

Consider, also, the similar example in Rom 9:30: Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν; ὅτι ἔθνη τὰ μὴ διώκοντα

---

restrictive attributive participle of the APS formation pattern within this SAP pattern: τὸν ἐπ᾽ αὐτῆς ἐρχόμενον πολλάκις ὑετόν.

[149] NRSV: "There is one **lawgiver and judge who is able to save and to destroy.**"

[150] ESV: "Concerning this salvation, **the prophets who prophesied about the grace that was to be yours** searched and inquired carefully."

[151] NIV: "And **the angels who did not keep their positions of authority but abandoned their own home.**"

[152] NASB[95]: "For when **Gentiles who do not have the Law** do instinctively the things of the Law."

δικαιοσύνην κατέλαβεν δικαιοσύνην, δικαιοσύνην δὲ τὴν ἐκ πίστεως.[153] The participial clause τὰ

μὴ διώκοντα δικαιοσύνην appears to limit the referent from all Gentiles to specifically that

subset of Gentiles who did not pursue righteousness (from the law). Paul speaks of Gentile

Christians (and possibly some God-fearers and proselytes) who have attained righteousness by

faith. Both of these examples limit their referents and, therefore, function restrictively.

Furthermore, they lean toward the concept formation pole of restrictive modification.

Restrictive attributive participles of the SAP formation pattern modify very generic,

common and at times very specific substantives. These participles occur throughout the New

Testament, among various authors and genres.

Less Frequently Occurring Formation Pattern: Participle + Substantive (PS). The PS

formation pattern occurs very infrequently within the text of the Greek New Testament. The

analysis performed for this dissertation has revealed only 18 occurrences in the New Testament.

As can be inferred from above, Young and Wallace do not treat this formation pattern at all.[154]

Boyer, however, does identify this "extremely rare" formation pattern in his discussion of

"Adjectival Uses" of the participle.[155]

Restrictive participles of the PS formation pattern are found in Mark, John, Acts, 1 & 2

Corinthians, Galatians, 1 & 2 Timothy, Hebrews and 2 Peter. A representative sample will be

presented to demonstrate their existence and familiarize the reader with these constructions.

> Mark 15:23: καὶ ἐδίδουν αὐτῷ ἐσμυρνισμένον οἶνον· ὃς δὲ οὐκ ἔλαβεν.[156]
> - limits from wine in general to specifically wine that is mixed with myrrh
> - leans toward concept formation

---

[153] ESV: "What shall we say, then? That **Gentiles who did not pursue righteousness** have attained it, that is, a righteousness that is by faith."

[154] See section titled "Noun Phrase Formation Patterns Containing An Attributive Participle" on p. 102 above.

[155] Boyer, "Classification of Participles," 164, 167.

[156] ESV: "And they offered him **wine mixed with myrrh**, but he did not take it."

Acts 2:2: ἦχος ὥσπερ φερομένης πνοῆς βιαίας.[157]
- limits to a rushing mighty wind
- leans toward concept formation

1 Tim 6:3: ὑγιαίνουσιν λόγοις τοῖς τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.[158]
- limits to those words that are correct/sound
- leans toward concept formation

Heb 6:5: καὶ καλὸν γευσαμένους θεοῦ ῥῆμα δυνάμεις τε μέλλοντος αἰῶνος.[159]
- limits from all possible ages (past, present, etc...) to the coming (future) age
- leans toward entity identification

Heb 7:8 δεκάτας ἀποθνῄσκοντες ἄνθρωποι λαμβάνουσιν.[160]
- limits to specifically that subset of men who die[161]
- leans toward concept formation

2 Pet 1:16: Οὐ γὰρ σεσοφισμένοις μύθοις ἐξακολουθήσαντες.[162]
- limits from all types of myths to specifically those that are cleverly devised
- leans toward concept formation

Every participle of the PS formation pattern participates in restrictive modification. These participles modify both common and generic substantives. Though only 18 examples exist, these participles occur fairly evenly throughout the New Testament.

Summary of the Restrictive Attributive Participle in the Greek New Testament

A presentation of restrictive attributive participles in the Greek New Testament has demonstrated the reality and prevalence of these constructions. Restrictive attributive participles

---

[157] ESV: "a sound like **a mighty rushing wind**."

[158] ESV: "**sound words** of our Lord Jesus Christ."

[159] NIV: "who have tasted the goodness of the word of God and the powers of **the coming age**."

[160] KJV: "**men that die** receive tithes."

[161] The restrictive modification sets up a contrast with Melchizedek who has "neither beginning of days nor end of life, but resembling the Son of God he continues a priest forever" (Heb 7:3, ESV).

[162] ESV: "For we did not follow **cleverly devised myths**."

exist in multiple noun-phrase formation patterns, in various genres, among all authors of the New

Testament, and with antecedents that range from very generic to very specific.

The Restrictive Relative Clause in the Greek New Testament

The validity of restrictive modification as a linguistic category and the existence of this

modification through various strategies cross-linguistically have been established. A general

survey of restrictive clauses has confirmed the existence of restrictive relative clauses in English,

Spanish, Modern Greek and Koine Greek. The relative clause in the Greek New Testament

participates in two noun-phrase formation patterns and five different types of subordinate

relationships.[163] Restrictive relative clauses find representation in both patterns and all five types

of subordinate relative clauses. The thesis of this dissertation contends that when both the

attributive participle and relative clause are *grammatically and stylistically feasible*, the relative

clause is predominantly utilized to modify a substantive nonrestrictively. It is, therefore,

maintained that restrictive relative clauses exist within certain grammatical and stylistic

parameters. A presentation of these restrictive relative clauses in the Greek New Testament will

demonstrate the reality of their existence and familiarize the reader to these constructions.

Relative Clause Formation Patterns

While the above analysis of the attributive participle indicated four major formation

patterns, the relative clause exhibits only one major noun-phrase formation pattern. Linguists

normally speak of three patterns of relative clauses when considering the position of the relative

clause with respect to its antecedent: pre-nominal, post-nominal, and internally-headed.[164] Of the

approximately 1,040 restrictive/nonrestrictive relative clauses in the Greek New Testament, the

---

[163] This will be explicated more thoroughly in ch. 6.

[164] Martin M. Culy, "A Typology of Koine Relative Clauses," in *Work Papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics* (University of North Dakota, 1989), 3:76.

post-nominal type "is by far the most common, encompassing more than 95% of the relative

clauses found in the New Testament."[165] Internally-headed relative clauses make up the

remainder.[166] An example of a restrictive post-nominal relative clause can be found in Matt 2:6:

ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ ἐξελεύσεται ἡγούμενος, ὅστις ποιμανεῖ τὸν λαόν μου τὸν Ἰσραήλ.[167] The relative

clause follows (post-) its antecedent ἡγούμενος. An example of the rare restrictive internally-

headed relative clause can be found in Mark 4:24: ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.[168]

The head-noun μέτρῳ stands in the middle (internally) of the relative clause. While internally-

headed relative clauses exist and are considered in this study, the majority of relative clauses in

the Greek New Testament stand in post-nominal position and as a result make up the primary set

of examples considered for analysis in this dissertation.

Types of Subordinate Relative Clauses

Whereas the attributive participle functions in one type of subordinate clause, the relative

clause is capable of representing five different subordinate relationships. All attributive

participles essentially function as subordinate subject clauses; the antecedent always functions as

the subject within the subordinate participial clause. With respect to relative clauses, not only can

antecedents serve the role of subject in the subordinate clause, but they can also serve as direct

object, indirect object, oblique, or possessor. Restrictive examples of these five types of

---

[165] Culy, "Koine Relative Clauses," 76.

[166] Culy, "Koine Relative Clauses," 80. Additionally, Culy notes that while "some linguists have posited that Koine does in fact have prenominal RCs...all verses that are putative examples of prenominal RCs can be analyzed as I[nternally] H[eaded] R[elative] C[lause]s." He also notes that "the majority of the traditional Greek grammarians have treated what appear to be prenominal RCs as IHRCs (e.g., Robertson 1934:718; Blass and Debrunner 1961:154)."

[167] ESV: "for from you shall come a ruler **who will shepherd my people Israel**."

[168] "with the measure **with which you measure**, it shall be measured to you."

subordinate relative clauses will be presented in order to demonstrate their existence and to familiarize the reader with these types of subordinate relative clauses.[169]

Restrictive Relative Clauses—Subject. Subject relative clauses occur slightly less frequently than direct object relative clauses[170] and more frequently than the rest of the other types of subordinate relative clauses. The Greek New Testament contains 364 occurrences representing 35% of all restrictive/nonrestrictive relative clauses. In each of these occurrences it can be readily discerned that the antecedent referenced within the subordinate clause fills the role of subject within that clause. All relative pronouns in subject relative clauses stand in the nominative case.

Restrictive subject relative clauses are distributed somewhat sparsely throughout the Greek New Testament. They find representation in the Gospels, Acts, Romans, 1 Corinthians, Philippians, 2 Timothy, Hebrews, James, 1 John and Revelation. A representative sample of examples that lean toward concept formation and entity identification are presented in order to demonstrate the existence and familiarize the reader with these restrictive subject relative clauses.

> Matt 2:6: ἡγούμενος, ὅστις ποιμανεῖ τὸν λαόν μου τὸν Ἰσραήλ.[171]
> * Limits to a ruler who will shepherd/lead Israel
> * Leans slightly toward entity identification
>
> Luke 8:2: καὶ γυναῖκές τινες αἳ ἦσαν τεθεραπευμέναι ἀπὸ πνευμάτων πονηρῶν καὶ ἀσθενειῶν.[172]

---

[169] The categorization of the five types of subordinate relative clauses stems from linguistic universals established by what linguists refer to as the Accessibility Hierarchy. The linguistic realities of this hierarchy will be fully explicated in ch. 6.

[170] One might think that there would be more subject relative clauses than direct object relative clauses. While this will be treated more thoroughly in ch. 6, it is noted here that only one strategy for relativizing direct object clauses exists, the relative clause. Attributive participles do not directly relativize direct object clauses; they only relativize subject clauses. So, two strategies for relativizing subject clauses exist, the attributive participle and the relative clause. As a result, overall, there are more subject clauses than direct object clauses.

[171] ESV: "**a ruler who will shepherd my people Israel.**"

- Limits to women who had been healed
- Leans slightly toward entity identification

Acts 7:40: Ποίησον ἡμῖν θεοὺς οἳ προπορεύσονται ἡμῶν...[173]
- Limits to tangible "gods" who will go before the Israelites, ultimately referencing idols/statues that can be seen
- Leans toward concept formation

1 Cor 6:5: οὕτως οὐκ ἔνι ἐν ὑμῖν οὐδεὶς σοφός, ὃς δυνήσεται διακρῖναι ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ;[174]
- Limits to a wise man that will be able to judge between his brothers
- Leans toward concept formation

Restrictive Relative Clauses—Direct Object. Direct object relative clauses occur slightly more frequently than subject relative clauses[175] and more frequently than the remaining types of subordinate relative clauses. The Greek New Testament contains 369 occurrences representing 35% of all restrictive/nonrestrictive relative clauses. With direct object relative clauses the antecedent referenced by a relative pronoun fills the role of direct object within that subordinate clause. Accusative relative pronouns make up the majority of relative pronouns utilized in these clauses. Genitive and dative relative pronouns also occur in direct object relative clauses due to attraction of the relative pronoun to the case of the antecedent and due to the fact that certain verbs require the genitive or dative case for the direct object.[176]

Restrictive direct object relative clauses are distributed evenly and quite prevalent throughout the Greek New Testament. They find representation in the Synoptic Gospels, John, Acts, Pauline Epistles (Romans, 1 & 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, 2 Thessalonians, 1 & 2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon) Hebrews, James, 1 Peter, 1 & 3

---

[172] ESV: "and also **some women who had been healed of evil spirits and infirmities.**"

[173] ESV. "Make **for us gods who will go before us.**"

[174] "so, there is among you **no wise man that will be able to judge between his brothers?**"

[175] See n. 170, above.

[176] See add. 5-A, "Relative Pronoun Agreement."

John, Jude and Revelation. A representative sample of examples that lean toward concept

formation and entity identification are presented in order to demonstrate their existence and

familiarize the reader with these restrictive direct object relative clauses.

Luke 15:16: καὶ ἐπεθύμει χορτασθῆναι ἐκ τῶν κερατίων ὧν ἤσθιον οἱ χοῖροι.[177]
- Limits to pods that the pigs ate
- Leans toward entity identification
- Relative pronoun genitive by attraction to antecedent

John 17:22: κἀγὼ τὴν δόξαν ἣν δέδωκάς μοι δέδωκα αὐτοῖς.[178]
- Limits specifically to that glory given to Jesus by the Father
- Leans toward entity identification
- Relative pronoun accusative

Acts 7:7: καὶ τὸ ἔθνος ᾧ ἐὰν δουλεύσουσιν κρινῶ ἐγώ.[179]
- Limits to the nation that the Israelites serve
- Leans toward entity identification
- Relative pronoun dative; verb takes direct object in the dative

Rom 16:17: παρὰ τὴν διδαχὴν ἣν ὑμεῖς ἐμάθετε.[180]
- Limits to the teaching that the Romans learned
- Leans toward entity identification
- Relative pronoun accusative

2 Cor 12:21: ἐπὶ τῇ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ καὶ πορνείᾳ καὶ ἀσελγείᾳ ᾗ ἔπραξαν.[181]
- Limits to impurity, sexual immorality and sensuality that many of the Corinthian believers practiced
- Leans toward entity identification
- Relative pronoun dative by attraction to antecedent

Col 4:17: Βλέπε τὴν διακονίαν ἣν παρέλαβες ἐν κυρίῳ, ἵνα αὐτὴν πληροῖς.[182]
- Limits to the ministry that Archippus received in the Lord
- Leans strongly toward entity identification
- Relative pronoun accusative

---

[177] ESV: "And he was longing to be fed with **the pods that the pigs ate**."

[178] ESV: "**The glory that you have given me** I have given to them."

[179] ESV: "But I will judge **the nation that they serve**."

[180] NASB[95]: "contrary to **the teaching which you learned**."

[181] ESV: "of **the impurity, sexual immorality, and sensuality that they have practiced**."

[182] ESV: "See that you fulfill **the ministry that you have received in the Lord**."

Heb 2:13: ἐγὼ καὶ τὰ παιδία ἅ μοι ἔδωκεν ὁ θεός.[183]
- Limits to the children God has given to Jesus
- Leans toward entity identification
- Relative pronoun accusative

1 Pet 4:11: ἰσχύος ἧς χορηγεῖ ὁ θεός.[184]
- Limits to the strength that God supplies
- Leans slightly toward concept formation
- Relative pronoun genitive by attraction to antecedent

Rev 3:8: θύραν ἠνεῳγμένην, ἣν οὐδεὶς δύναται κλεῖσαι αὐτήν.[185]
- Limits to an open door that no one is able to close
- Leans toward concept formation
- Relative pronoun accusative

Restrictive Relative Clauses—Indirect Object. Indirect object relative clauses occur less

frequently than any other type of subordinate relative clause. The Greek New Testament contains

only 11 occurrences representing 1% of all restrictive/nonrestrictive relative clauses. With

indirect object relative clauses the antecedent referenced by a relative pronoun fills the role of

indirect object within that subordinate clause. Dative relative pronouns make up the majority of

relative pronouns utilized in these clauses.[186]

Only three *restrictive* indirect object relative clauses exist in the Greek New Testament;

they are found in Luke 19:15, Rom 4:6 and Rev 7:2. Rom 4:6 serves as a representative example:

Rom 4:6: τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ᾧ ὁ θεὸς λογίζεται δικαιοσύνην χωρὶς ἔργων.[187]
- Limits from anyone to the one to whom God credits righteousness apart from works

---

[183] ESV: "I and **the children God has given me**."

[184] ESV: "**the strength that God supplies**."

[185] NASB[95]: "**an open door which no one can shut**." Notice the combination of restrictive strategies. The attributive participle limits the door to an open door and the restrictive direct object relative clause limits to an open door incapable of being closed by anyone.

[186] The nonrestrictive indirect object relative clause in Acts 26:17 utilizes a preposition with the accusative to indicate the indirect object: ἐκ τῶν ἐθνῶν εἰς οὓς ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω σε (NASB[95]: "from the Gentiles, to whom I am sending you").

[187] ESV: "**the one to whom God counts righteousness apart from works**."

- Leans toward concept formation

Restrictive Relative Clauses—Oblique. Oblique relative clauses occur slightly less frequently than subject and direct object relative clauses but more frequently than indirect object and possessor relative clauses. The Greek New Testament contains 253 occurrences representing 24% of all restrictive/nonrestrictive relative clauses.

In an oblique relative clause the antecedent referenced by a relative pronoun fills the role of an oblique within that subordinate clause. Genitive, Dative and Accusative relative pronouns are utilized in these clauses. The oblique category contains a variety of roles which are not covered in the direct object, indirect object, and possessor categories. Roles such as locative, instrument, means, source, etc... describe this category. Oblique relative clauses often utilize prepositions with the pronoun in the subordinate clause (e.g. εἰς, ἐν, διὰ, ἐπὶ, ἀπὸ, περὶ, πρὸς, μετὰ, χωρὶς, κατὰ, ὑπὲρ, ἐκ, παρὰ).

Restrictive oblique relative clauses are distributed somewhat evenly throughout the Greek New Testament. They find representation in the Synoptic Gospels, John, Acts, Romans, 1 & 2 Corinthians, Ephesians, Hebrews and Revelation. A representative sample of examples that lean toward concept formation and entity identification are presented in order to demonstrate their existence and familiarize the reader with these restrictive oblique relative clauses.

Matt 18:7: πλὴν οὐαὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ δι᾽ οὗ τὸ σκάνδαλον ἔρχεται.[188]
- Limits from any man to the type of man through whom an offence comes
- Leans toward concept formation

Luke 22:10: ἀκολουθήσατε αὐτῷ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν εἰς ἣν εἰσπορεύεται.[189]
- Limits to the specific house the man enters into
- Leans strongly toward entity identification

---

[188] ESV: "but woe **to that man through whom the stumbling block comes!**"

[189] "Follow him into **the house into which he enters.**"

John 13:5: καὶ ἤρξατο νίπτειν τοὺς πόδας τῶν μαθητῶν καὶ ἐκμάσσειν τῷ λεντίῳ ᾧ ἦν διεζωσμένος.[190]
- Limits to the towel that was wrapped around Jesus
- Leans strongly toward entity identification

Acts 9:17: Ἰησοῦς ὁ ὀφθείς σοι ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ᾗ ἤρχου.[191]
- Limits to the specific road by which Paul came to Damascus
- Leans toward entity identification

1 Cor 7:20 – ...ἐν τῇ κλήσει ᾗ ἐκλήθη....[192]
- Limits to the condition in which the believer was called
- Leans slightly toward concept formation

Heb 13:10: ἔχομεν θυσιαστήριον ἐξ οὗ φαγεῖν οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἐξουσίαν οἱ τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες.[193]
- Limits to an altar distinct from the one from which those who serve the tent have a right to eat to an altar from which they do not have a right to eat
- Leans slightly toward concept formation

Restrictive Relative Clauses—Possessor. Possessor relative clauses occur slightly more frequently than indirect object relative clauses and less frequently than the other types of subordinate relative clauses. The Greek New Testament contains 43 occurrences representing 4% of all restrictive/nonrestrictive relative clauses. In a possessor relative clause the antecedent referenced by a relative pronoun fills the role of a possessor within that subordinate clause. Only genitive relative pronouns are utilized in these clauses.

Restrictive possessor relative clauses are distributed sparsely throughout the Greek New Testament. Mark, Luke, Acts, Romans, 2 Corinthians, and Hebrews contain one occurrence each

---

[190] ESV: "and began to wash the disciples' feet and to wipe them **with the towel with which He was girded.**" Robertson labels this relative pronoun as "instrumental." Robertson, *Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, 716.

[191] ESV: "Jesus who appeared to you on **the road by which you came.**" Robertson, *Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, 716, labels the relative pronoun as "locative."

[192] ESV: "in **the condition in which he was called.**" Robertson, *Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, 716, describes this relative pronoun as "locative." Maximilian Zerwick and Mary Grosvenor, *A Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament* (vol. 2; Rome: Biblical Institute, 1979), 510, describes the relative pronoun as an "instrumental dative."

[193] ESV: "**We have an altar from which those who serve the tent have no right to eat.**" Robertson describes the preposition as the "partitive use of ἐκ." Robertson, *Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, 599.

and Revelation contains two occurrences. Consider Luke 13:1 and 2 Cor 8:18 as representative examples:

Luke 13:1: τῶν Γαλιλαίων ὧν τὸ αἷμα Πιλᾶτος ἔμιξεν μετὰ τῶν θυσιῶν αὐτῶν.[194]
- Limits from all Galileans to those whose blood Pilate mixed with their sacrifices
- Leans toward entity identification

2 Cor 8:18: τὸν ἀδελφὸν οὗ ὁ ἔπαινος ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ διὰ πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν.[195]
- Limits to the brother whose fame in the gospel is through all the churches
- Leans strongly toward entity identification

Summary of the Restrictive Relative Clause in the Greek New Testament

A presentation of restrictive relative clauses in the Greek New Testament has demonstrated the reality and existence of these constructions. Restrictive relative clauses exist in two noun-phrase formation patterns (post-nominal and internally-headed) but find representation primarily in the post-nominal pattern. Restrictive relative clauses exist in all of the five types of subordinate relative clauses: subject, direct object, indirect object, oblique and possessor. These restrictive clauses, to varying degrees, exist among all authors of the New Testament.

General Tendencies of Restrictive Clauses in the Greek New Testament

Having surveyed restrictive attributive participles and restrictive relative clauses in the Greek New Testament, a presentation of the general tendencies of these restrictive clauses contributes to the analysis of these two constructions toward an assessment of their purported equivalence.

---

[194] ESV: "the Galileans whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices."

[195] "the brother whose fame in the gospel *is* through all the churches."

Restrictive Attributive Participles

The general tendencies gathered from a thorough survey of noun phrase formation patterns that contain an attributive participle demonstrate the strong proclivity of the attributive participle toward restrictive modification.

Article + Substantive + Article + Participle (ASAP). The ASAP formation pattern occurs more frequently in the Greek New Testament than any other formation pattern and demonstrates a high percentage of restrictive modification. At least 240 of the 296 occurrences modify their respective substantives restrictively, representing at least 81% of all occurrences.

Substantive + Participle (SP). The SP formation pattern occurs more frequently in the Greek New Testament than the APS and SAP formation patterns and slightly less frequently than the ASAP pattern. This syntactical pattern demonstrates a very high percentage of restriction. At least 234 of the 244 instances participate in restrictive modification, representing at least 96% of all occurrences.

Article + Participle + Substantive (APS). The APS formation pattern occurs less frequently in the Greek New Testament than the ASAP and SP formation patterns. This syntactical pattern also demonstrates a very high percentage of restriction. At least 96 of the 108 instances are restrictive representing at least 89% of all occurrences.

Substantive + Article + Participle (SAP). The SAP formation pattern occurs less frequently in the Greek New Testament than the ASAP and SP formation patterns and slightly more frequently than the APS formation pattern. Overall, this syntactical pattern does not demonstrate as high of a percentage of restrictive modification when compared to the other formation patterns.[196] Only 59% percent of participles in the SAP formation pattern (72 of 122

---

[196] Additionally, it does not demonstrate as high a percentage as the infrequent PS formation pattern, which will be treated in the next section.

occurrences) could be described as restrictive. Many of the exceptions to the rule are located in this formation pattern. The tendencies of these exceptions are consistent and quite revelatory; they will be explored more thoroughly in chapter 6. For now, two statistics demonstrate some of the interesting tendencies of this formation pattern. First, 100% of all common or generic substantives modified in the SAP formation pattern are restrictive. Second, Only 11% of divine names[197] modified in the SAP formation pattern are restrictive.

Less Frequently Occurring Formation Pattern: Participle + Substantive (PS). The PS formation pattern occurs very infrequently within the text of the Greek New Testament. While the number of occurrences is small (18), 100% percent of these participles modify their respective substantives restrictively.

Summary of General Tendencies of Restrictive Attributive Participles. It has been demonstrated that a high percentage of attributive participles in the Greek New Testament participate in restrictive modification. 81% of ASAP formation pattern participles restrict their antecedents. 96% of the participles in the SP formation pattern participate in restrictive modification. 89% of the participles in the APS formation pattern are restrictive. 100% of the participles in the PS formation pattern are restrictive. Overall, approximately 84% of the nearly 800 attributive participles in the Greek New Testament participate in restrictive modification. These tendencies of the attributive participle support the assertion of this dissertation that the attributive participle is primarily utilized to restrict the substantive except under certain prescribed circumstances.

---

[197] For example: Jesus, God, Holy Spirit, etc. This will be treated more thoroughly in ch. 6.

Restrictive Relative Clauses

The existence of five different types of subordinate relative clauses contributes

significantly to the analysis undertaken in this dissertation. The general tendencies of restrictive

relative clauses within the respective types of subordinate relative clauses will be considered.

Specifically, the tendencies of restrictive subject clauses significantly contribute to the analysis

of this dissertation.

Restrictive Relative Clauses—Subject. Subject relative clauses occur slightly less

frequently than direct object relative clauses and more frequently than the rest of the other types

of subordinate relative clauses. Only 68 of the 364 definitively function restrictively,

representing merely 19% of all subject relative clauses.

Since attributive participles participate solely in subject relativization, the category of

subject relative clauses is of primary significance. While the specific nature of restrictive subject

relative clauses will be discussed more thoroughly in chapter 6, some generalizations are noted.

The restrictive subject relative clauses tend to exhibit one or more of the following

characteristics:

1. Verb constructions that are incapable of participial representation

2. Semitic *Vorlagen*

3. Very generic antecedents

4. Unique usage of ὅστις

5. Idiomatic usage of οὐδεὶς ἐστιν

Restrictive Relative Clauses—Direct Object. Direct object relative clauses occur slightly

more frequently than subject relative clauses and more frequently than the remaining types of

subordinate relative clauses. 223 of the 369 instances modify their antecedents restrictively,

representing 60% of all direct object relative clauses.

142

Restrictive Relative Clauses—Indirect Object. Indirect object relative clauses occur less frequently than any other type of subordinate relative clause. 3 of the 11 occurrences are restrictive, representing 27% of all indirect object relative clauses. Due to the paucity of occurrences the percentage is almost inconsequential.

Restrictive Relative Clauses—Oblique. Oblique relative clauses occur slightly less frequently than subject and direct object relative clauses but more frequently than indirect object and possessor relative clauses. 84 of the 253 occurrences participate in restrictive modification, representing 33% of all oblique relative clauses.

Restrictive Relative Clauses—Possessor. Possessor relative clauses occur slightly more frequently than indirect object relative clauses and less frequently than the other types of subordinate relative clauses. 9 of the 43 instances restrict their antecedents, representing 21% of all possessor relative clauses.

Summary of General Tendencies of Restrictive Relative Clauses. Relative clauses exhibit a wide range of participation in restrictive modification across the five types of subordinate relative clauses. The percentages vary from 19% for subject relative clauses up to 60% for direct object clauses. Overall, only 37% percent of all relative clauses participate in restrictive modification. Since all attributive participles function as subordinate subject clauses, the tendencies of subject relative clauses contributes significantly to our thesis. While 84% of all attributive participles are restrictive only 19% of subject relative clauses participate in restrictive modification.[198]

Summary of Restrictive Clauses in the Greek New Testament

The presentation of restrictivity as a linguistic category in chapter two and the grammatical

---

[198] This will be explicated more thoroughly in ch. 6.

assertions pertaining to restrictive clauses presented here have revealed the need for studying the restrictive nature of attributive participles and relative clauses in the Greek New Testament. For both constructions the scholarly research with respect to restrictive modification is both cursory and inconsistent.

The writings of Young and Voelz have suggested the restrictive nature of attributive participles but no comprehensive study has been done to confirm these observations heretofore. Our survey of the attributive participle has confirmed the inclinations of Voelz and demonstrated that overall the majority of attributive participles (84%) participate in restrictive modification, particularly those of the ASAP (81%), SP (96%), APS (89%) and PS (100%) formation patterns.

Grammatically speaking much less has been asserted regarding the restrictive nature of the relative clause. Our study, however, has demonstrated that overall only 37% of relative clauses participate in restrictive modification. Since all attributive participles are subordinate subject clauses, it is quite significant that only 19% of subject relative clauses modify their antecedents restrictively. The specific nuances of these tendencies will be explored in chapter 6 of this dissertation in connection with the explication and application of the Accessibility Hierarchy.

The goal of this dissertation to assess the purported equivalence of the attributive participle and the relative clause in the Greek New Testament has led us to assess their respective restrictive and nonrestrictive tendencies. The nature of restrictivity has been explicated in chapter 2 and those findings have been applied to the attributive participle and relative clause here in chapter 3. The other side of that inquiry involves the nonrestrictive nature of these grammatical constructions. In chapter 4, nonrestrictivity as a linguistic category will be explored, and in chapter 5 the nonrestrictivity of the attributive participle and the relative clause in the Greek New Testament will be presented. In chapter 6, the specific nuances of these tendencies will be presented toward a final synthesis.

CHAPTER FOUR

NONRESTRICTIVITY

Introduction

Restrictive modification as a linguistic category was presented in chapter 2, which laid a

necessary foundation for a survey of restrictive clauses in the Greek New Testament in chapter 3.

Nonrestrictivity as a linguistic category will be explored in this chapter, coupled with an

introductory presentation of nonrestrictive clauses. This exploration of nonrestrictivity

establishes a necessary foundation for the survey of nonrestrictive clauses in the Greek New

Testament in chapter 5.[1]

Nonrestrictivity As A Linguistic Category

A study of the validity of nonrestrictivity as a linguistic category, a clear definition of

nonrestrictivity, an understanding of the nature of antecedents connected to nonrestrictive

strategies, an awareness of a variety of nonrestrictive strategies, and the framework of a

continuum of nonrestrictivity contribute to an overall understanding of the concept of

nonrestrictivity.

Validity of Nonrestrictivity as a Linguistic Category

A review of the history and acceptance of nonrestrictivity as a linguistic category coupled

with a brief presentation of nonrestrictivity in modern languages helps establish the validity of

---

[1] In many ways this chapter mirrors the structure of ch. 2, but from the perspective of nonrestrictivity instead of restrictivity. As a result, some of the information will be redundant.

this linguistic distinction and underscores the need to explore nonrestrictivity in the Greek New Testament.

History and Acceptance of Nonrestrictivity as a Linguistic Category. As was asserted in chapter 2, the nonrestrictive/restrictive distinction originated in areas of traditional grammar, yet the distinction has been widely embraced and utilized in formal linguistic studies.[2] Consider Haussamen's helpful summary:

> The contrast between restrictive and nonrestrictive has historically been one of the most successful conceptualizations of recent grammar theory . . . . One sign of the success of the two terms is that they have spread from conventional grammar to linguistics, a field which has been very careful about its terminology. Linguistic grammars use the terms, as conventional grammars do, to describe not only relative clauses but modifiers of all kinds in their relation to the term they modify.[3]

It has been established that a vast number of grammarians and linguists uphold the existence of nonrestrictivity (and restrictivity) as a helpful distinction for analyzing a variety of strategies for adnominal modification (coordination) in any language.[4]

Nonrestrictivity in Modern Languages. A presentation of a few nonrestrictive strategies within modern languages serves as a beneficial heuristic to validate and clarify the existence of the nonrestrictive distinction.[5] The nonrestrictive tendencies of English and Spanish that were introduced in chapter 1[6] will be expounded.[7] Additionally, some brief illustrations of

---

[2] See section titled "History and Acceptance of Restrictivity as a Linguistic Category" on pp. 59–61 of ch. 2.

[3] Haussamen, "Restrictive and Nonrestrictive," 2. For more details of Haussamen's assertions see section titled "History and Acceptance of Restrictivity as a Linguistic Category" on pp. 59–61 of ch. 2.

[4] For a more detailed presentation see section titled "History and Acceptance of Restrictivity as a Linguistic Category" on pp. 59–61 of ch. 2.

[5] A more detailed survey of strategies will be presented later in the chapter; highlighting a few strategies from a variety of languages here helps demonstrate the validity of the restrictive/nonrestrictive distinction.

[6] See section titled "The Restrictive/Nonrestrictive Distinction" on p. 4 of ch. 1.

[7] Since English speakers represent the major readership for this dissertation and since Spanish is the second most spoken language in the U.S.A, a consideration of the restrictive tendencies of these languages proves to be a beneficial heuristic to validate the nonrestrictive distinction and to elucidate the assertions made throughout this dissertation. For this reason, English and Spanish examples are utilized often in the dissertation.

nonrestrictive strategies cited in the literature will be presented. Finally, the nonrestrictivity of

relative clauses in Modern Greek will be presented with the consideration of how this might be

relevant to our study of the Koine Greek of the New Testament. The analysis of these languages

will consider, to varying degrees, the orthographic, syntactic and prosodic[8] nature of

nonrestrictivity.

In English, as was noted in chapter 1,[9] relative clauses serve as a nonrestrictive strategy.

Orthographically this is noted with the presence of a comma before (and after if necessary) the

entire relative clause (e.g. *My father, who was here yesterday, is fine.*).[10] One also observes this

distinction prosodically. There exists a very distinct prosodic variance between nonrestrictive

and restrictive relative clauses. Jespersen states that there is "a marked difference in tone, a non-

restrictive clause beginning on a deeper tone than a restrictive one; besides, a pause is

permissible before a non-restrictive, but hardly before a restrictive clause."[11] So, essentially

Jespersen notes that when voicing a nonrestrictive relative clause, the tone of the clause is deeper

than the intonation of the rest of the sentence and one may voice a pause.[12] If a native English

speaker naturally speaks the following sentences, Jespersen's assertions are confirmed: "*Mary,*

---

[8] In the field of linguistics prosody refers to the rhythm, stress and/or intonation of speech. Most native speakers employ quite naturally the restrictive prosodic strategies of English and Spanish. Most, however, are not aware or conscious of the restrictive/nonrestrictive distinction, linguistically speaking. The awareness of this reality helps to confirm the validity of the restrictive/nonrestrictive distinction within English and Spanish and demonstrates the need for precision in translating Biblical texts with respect to restrictive and nonrestrictive strategies.

[9] See section titled "The Restrictive/Nonrestrictive Distinction" on p. 4 of ch. 1.

[10] Lazarus, MacLeish Smith, *Modern English: A Glossary of Literature and Language*, 407.

[11] Otto Jespersen, *The Philosophy of Grammar* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1968), 112.

[12] Randolph Quirk, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartik, eds. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language* (New York: Longman, 1985), 366, confirm as much: "restrictive relative clauses are closely connected to their antecedent or head prosodically." With respect to nonrestrictive relative clauses he asserts that their "'parenthetic' relation is endorsed by being given a separate tone unit (frequently with reduced prominence and narrow pitch range)," 1242. Edward L. Keenan, "Relative Clauses," in *Complex Constructions* (vol. 2 of *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*; ed. Timothy Shopen; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 169, notes that in English (and Modern Hebrew) nonrestrictive relative clauses differ from restrictive ones by parenthetical intonation.

who plays soccer, is a nice girl." "*John likes the girl who plays soccer.*"[13] Syntactically speaking,

English nonrestrictive relative clauses must contain a *wh*-word (*wh*-relatives: *which, who, whom,*

whose). Consider Eph 4:30 (ESV) as an example: "And do not grieve the Holy Spirit of God, by

whom you were sealed for the day of redemption." Relative clauses "that contain *that* (*that*-

relatives) and those that do not (zero relatives)"[14] cannot be nonrestrictive.

English adjective modifiers may also function nonrestrictively, which is discerned

prosodically. As was asserted in chapter 2: "The contrast is illustrated by...the sentence *Look at

John's black dog*; with the [prosodic] emphasis on *dog*; the implication is that John has one dog

with him, which happens to be black (i.e. the modification is non-restrictive)...."[15]

With respect to the Spanish language, nonrestrictive relative clauses in Spanish are set off

by commas (orthography). Prosodically speaking, Spanish nonrestrictive relative clauses "are

characterized in speech by a falling terminal juncture"[16] and the presence of a pause.[17] Notice the

pauses present when voicing: "Madrid, que es la capital de España, es una ciudad muy

interesante."[18] The prosodic and orthographic tendencies of Spanish relative clauses closely

parallel the tendencies in English. Additionally, syntactically speaking, the relative pronoun *el*

---

[13] Kleanthes K. Grohmann, "Clause" in *Encyclopedia of Linguistics* (ed. Philipp Stranzy; New York: Fitzroy Dearborn, 2005), 1:210–11. One should also note that this phenomenon applies to restrictive and nonrestrictive appositional constructions. One observes this phenomenon when voicing the following: "John the Baptist" (restrictive) and "Jesus Christ, the Son of God" (nonrestrictive).

[14] Borsley, "Relatives Clauses," 630. A zero relative describes a relative clause where the relative pronoun is only implied and is not explicitly present (i.e., *Jack built the house I was born in* or *He is the person I saw*).

[15] Crystal, *Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics,* 332. Quirk highlights this distinction: "restrictive modification tends to be given more prosodic emphasis than the head, since there is a built-in contrast. He cites: "Susan is my *ELDER* daughter" and "John is my *LAZY* son." With respect to nonrestrictive modification, he states it tends "to be unstressed in prehead position." He cites, "My *beautiful* WIFE." Quirk et al., *Grammar,* 1242. Also, see Talmy Givón, *Syntax: A Functional-Typological Introduction* (Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1990), 2:473.

[16] Christopher J. Pountain, *Exploring The Spanish Language* (London: Arnold, 2003), 87–88.

[17] Yolanda R. Solé and Carlos A. Solé, *Modern Spanish Syntax: A Study In Contrast* (Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath and Company, 1977), 116.

[18] Solé and Solé, *Spanish Syntax,* 116. "Madrid, which is the capital of Spain, is a very interesting city."

148

cual (and its derivative forms) can only be utilized for nonrestrictive relative clauses. Consider Eph 4:30 as a representative example: "No agravien al Espíritu Santo de Dios, con *el cual* fueron sellados para el día de la redención" (NVI).[19]

Additionally, prenominal adjectives tend to be nonrestrictive in Spanish. Solé & Solé put forth the following example: "Conocí a un famoso violinista en casa de unos amigos."[20] They maintain that this example would be the equivalent to the following nonrestrictive relative clause: "Conocí a un violinista, que es famoso, en casa de unos amigos."[21]

Nikolaeva, Wellens and Keenan highlight a few nonrestrictive strategies in Somali, Nubi, French and Modern Hebrew. Nikolaeva maintains: "In some languages, restrictive and nonrestrictive clauses have a consistently different surface structure . . . . In Somali the nonrestrictive clause is preceded by the conjunction *oo*, whereas the restrictive clause is not."[22] In Nubi, nonrestrictive adjectives are not connected with a relative marker to the substantives they modify.[23] Additionally, in Nubi, "Very often, non-restrictive relative clauses (head + relative modifier) are modified by the definite article, or a demonstrative."[24] Also, similar to English (*wh-*relatives) and Spanish (*el cual* and derivative forms), in French, Keenan notes that the relative pronoun *lequel* (and derivative forms) is used solely in nonrestrictive clauses.[25] Consider Eph

---

[19] ESV: "And do not grieve the Holy Spirit of God, by whom you were sealed for the day of redemption."

[20] Their translation: "*I met a famous violinist at the house of some friends.*" Solé & Solé, *Spanish Syntax*, 234–35.

[21] Their translation: "*I met a violinist, who happens to be famous, at the house of some friends.*" Solé & Solé, *Spanish Syntax*, 234–35.

[22] Irina Nikolaeva. "Relative Clauses." Pages 501–8 in *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. (ed. Keith Brown. 2d ed.; Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2006), 502.

[23] Inneke Hilda Werner Wellens, *The Nubi Language of Uganda: An Arabic Creole in Africa* (Boston: Brill, 2005), 105–7; 127–36. See *Adjectives* section below for an example of this phenomenon.

[24] Wellens, *Nubi*, 126. Additionally Wellens, *Nubi*, 136, states, "Non-restrictive relative clauses are often marked by a determiner while restrictive relative clauses are not."

[25] Keenan, "Relative Clauses," 169.

4:30: "N'attristez pas le Saint -Esprit de Dieu, par *lequel* vous avez été scellés pour le jour de la

rédemption" (NEG). Furthermore, Keenan Keenan notes that in Modern Hebrew nonrestrictive

relative clauses differ from restrictive ones by parenthetical intonation (prosody).[26]

Finally, as was briefly asserted in chapter 2, relative clauses in Modern Greek may function

nonrestrictively (and restrictively).[27] In Modern Greek "speakers rely heavily on

prosodic/intonational information."[28] Furthermore, "non-restrictive relative clauses are set off by

pauses (and by commas in written discourse)."[29] These relative clauses exhibit prosodic and

orthographic tendencies similar to those of English and Spanish. Consider the following

nonrestrictive examples of Modern Greek relative clauses:[30]

Ο καινούργιος μας καθηγητής, που σπούδασε στο Reading, είναι πολύ καλός

'Our new teacher, who studied at Reading, is very good'[31]

Ο Γιάννης, του οποίου η πρόταση με συγκίνησε, . . .

'John, whose proposal touched me, . . .'[32]

The orthographic, prosodic, and syntactic manifestations of nonrestrictivity (and

restrictivity) presented above demonstrate the reality of this linguistic distinction in modern

languages. As was asserted in chapter 2, this linguistic distinction is at the very least potentially

valid for the analysis of older languages, including ancient Greek. Furthermore, the analysis of

Modern Greek is very important since, on the whole, Greek has changed relatively little (in

---

[26] Keenan, "Relative Clauses," 169.

[27] See p. 65 of ch. 2.

[28] Chatsiou, "Modern Greek Relative Clauses," 63.

[29] Holton et al., *Greek*, 532.

[30] In Modern Greek relative clauses are introduced by "the relative complementizer που" or by "the pronoun phrase ο οποίος." Holton et al., *Greek*, 532.

[31] Sentence and translations taken from Holton et al., *Greek*, 532.

[32] Sentences and translation taken from Holton et al., *Greek*, 535.

linguistic terms), less than virtually any other language. "Greek has changed less over the past two thousand years, and . . . N [Neohellenic/Modern Greek] is much closer to the New Testament than is generally supposed."[33] Thus, if nonrestrictive (and restrictive) strategies exist not only in many modern languages but also in Modern Greek, it is entirely proper to seek to discern the nonrestrictive (and restrictive) strategies of the Greek of the New Testament.[34]

Summary of the Validity of Nonrestrictivity (and Restrictivity) as a Linguistic Category. The review of the history and acceptance of nonrestrictivity (and restrictivity) as a linguistic category has demonstrated the universal acceptance and application of this distinction across a variety of languages and strategies. Furthermore, the examples of these strategies presented above help establish the validity of this linguistic distinction and support the inquiry into the existence of specific nonrestrictive/restrictive strategies for the study of any language. Furthermore, for the sake of exegesis and translation of the New Testament, a study that takes this grammatical/linguistic classification into account is necessary even if the Greek of the New Testament may not seem to have specific orthographic, prosodic or syntactic strategies to demonstrate the restrictive/nonrestrictive distinction. Our study cannot take into account orthographic considerations, as punctuation was not prevalent in ancient Greek texts. Furthermore, while it is difficult to take into account prosodic research due to the nature of dead languages, the presence of prosodic (and orthographic) nonrestrictive (and restrictive) relative clauses in Modern Greek provides an impetus to discern the nonrestrictive/restrictive strategies of ancient Greek. We will, therefore, attempt to demonstrate that on a syntactic basis the Greek

---

[33] Caragounis, *Development of Greek*, 89.

[34] Furthermore, it is probably true to say that it is likely that what Modern Greek evidences can be seen already in Koine Greek, rather than that what Modern Greek evidences is probably fundamentally different than what is true of Koine Greek.

of the New Testament does exhibit certain nonrestrictive tendencies, especially with respect to the relative clause.

Strictly Defining Nonrestrictivity—Negatively and Positively

Scholars tend to describe nonrestrictivity in both negative and positive terms.[35] Since *nonrestrictive* is a negative term (*non*), negative terms are to be expected. At an obvious, basic level, as Lehmann asserts, a nonrestrictive strategy does "not further restrict the concept" of its referent.[36] In line with our assertions regarding restrictive modification (*limiting*), the concept of *non-limiting* is preferred with respect to nonrestrictivity. Nonrestrictive strategies "do not limit the scope of what they refer to."[37] Positive definitions, however, provide clarity as well. Positively speaking, a nonrestrictive strategy provides additional information to an established (independent) antecedent.[38] This additional information has been described as habitually

---

[35] Additionally, traditional grammarians and Transformation Grammar linguists refer to nonrestrictivity differently. "The traditional classification" utilizes the terms "restrictive and non-restrictive" while the "T-G classification" employs the terms "restrictive and appositive." Lucas, "Relative Clauses," 83. (See also: Christian Lehmann, "Relative Clauses." 461; Jackendoff, *Syntax*, 194; Mark De Vries, "The Syntax of Appositive Relativization," *Linguistic Inquiry* 37 (2006): 230, 267.) Joseph Emonds contends that appositive (nonrestrictive) relative clauses are really main clauses in the deep structure and on the surface appear as parentheticals. Joseph Emonds, "Appositive Relatives Have No Properties," *Linguistic Inquiry* 10 (1979): 211. Lucas elaborates stating that "the view has emerged among T-G grammarians that restrictive and non-restrictive clauses are quite different constructions in that, although they may have identical internal surface structures, the former type derives from a sentence embedded within a noun phrase and the latter from a sentence in apposition to a noun phrase—hence the latter being termed 'appositive'." Lucas, "Relative Clauses," 100. Similarly, Matthews states that nonrestrictive clauses may also be called *appositional*. Peter H. Matthews, *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 246. Additionally, Levinsohn utilizes the term *appositional* for nonrestrictive adjectival modification. See his assertions on p. 16 of ch. 1. While there is much to be commended with respect to Transformation Grammar distinctions, the usage of the term *appositive/appositional* to denote nonrestrictivity offers confusion. In ch. 2, it was demonstrated that a variety of appositional constructions participate in restrictive (and nonrestrictive) modification. The preferred nomenclature in this dissertation remains with the terms *restrictive* and *nonrestrictive*. Awareness, however, that linguists often utilize the term *appositive/appositional* instead of *nonrestrictive* proves beneficial when surveying the literature.

[36] Christian Lehmann, "Relative Clauses." 461. Matthews similarly states, "does not restrict the reference." Peter H. Matthews, *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 246.

[37] Butt and Benjamin, *Modern Spanish*, 518. Furthermore others describe the nonrestrictive distinction in negative terms as follows: "non-defining" (Jackson, *Linguistics*, 51); "do not further define" (Quirk et al., *Grammar*, 366); "not essential for identification" (Quirk et al., *Grammar*, 1239); "not required for identification" (Grohmann, "Clause." 211); "not distinctive" and "inessential" (Wellens, *Nubi*, 105).

[38] See Lucas, "Relative Clauses," 85; Jackson, *Linguistics*, 51; Christopher J. Pountain, *Exploring The Spanish*

152

known,[39] ornamental,[40] or parenthetical.[41] So, nonrestrictivity is defined negatively by the notion of a non-limiting relationship between nonrestrictive strategy and referent, and positively by the notion of providing additional information.

Nonrestrictivity and the Nature of Antecedents

Certain types of substantives tend to attract or accept either restrictive or nonrestrictive strategies. This topic was dealt with in chapter 2 in the section titled "Restrictivity and the Nature of Antecedents."[42] A summary and expansion of those assertions will be presented below as they relate specifically to nonrestrictivity and both nominal and non-nominal antecedents.

In chapter 2 it was asserted that the semantic identity of the referent places constraints upon whether or not restrictive or nonrestrictive strategies will be utilized. In general, there seems to exist a continuum of acceptability in which generic substantives tend to attract and accept restrictive modification and specific substantives tend to attract and accept nonrestrictive strategies. For example, consider the very general substantive with a restrictive attributive participle in Luke 1:1 and the very specific substantive with a nonrestrictive relative clause in John 4:12:

> Luke 1:1: τῶν πεπληροφορημένων ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμάτων.[43] (Note that many matters exist. The participle limits those many matters down to specifically matters that have been accomplished, and specifically "among us." Context requires a restrictive reading.)

Language (London: Arnold, 2003), 87–88; Platzack, "Restrictive and Non-Restrictive," 268.

[39] Talmy Givón, *Syntax: A Functional-Typological Introduction* (Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1990), 2:473. He also contends that this information may be described as "part of the normal characterization" of the referent, "a habitual generic quality." See also Quirk et al., *Grammar*, 366. Similarly Jespersen, *Grammar*, 112, contends that nonrestrictive strategies "characterize" their referents.

[40] Jespersen, *Grammar*, 112.

[41] See: Jespersen, *Grammar*, 112; Quirk et al., *Grammar*, 366.

[42] See pp. 74–77 of ch. 2.

[43] ESV: "the things that have been accomplished among us."

John 4:12: πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἰακώβ, ὃς ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν τὸ φρέαρ.[44] (Note that there is not another father named Jacob for the Samaritan people. Context requires a nonrestrictive reading)

We will consider the continuum of acceptability with respect to nominal and non-nominal antecedents, especially as it pertains to nonrestrictivity.

Nominal Antecedents and Nonrestrictivity. As was stated in chapter 2,[45] substantives/nominals that stand on the specific end of the continuum of acceptability (e.g. proper nouns) tend to attract nonrestrictive strategies.[46] Quirk cites the following nonrestrictive examples coupled with very specific substantives:

Dr. Brown, *who lives next door*, comes from Australia.

Theseus, *a Greek hero*, killed the Minotaur.[47]

Consider the following New Testament correlatives to Quirk's examples. 2 Pet 2:15 contains a proper noun modified by a relative clause that is naturally understood as non-restrictive:

ἐξακολουθήσαντες τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ τοῦ Βοσόρ, ὃς μισθὸν ἀδικίας ἠγάπησεν
(ESV: They have followed the way of Balaam, the son of Beor, who loved gain from wrongdoing)

---

[44] NIV: "our father Jacob, who gave us the well."

[45] See pp. 74–77 with subsections "Continuum of Acceptability," "The General Extreme of the Acceptability Continuum" and specifically the section titled "The Specific Extreme of the Acceptability Continuum."

[46] Schachter and Quirk refer to proper nouns as "complete designations" and "unique denotations" respectively. See also Jespersen, *Grammar*, 112. Butt & Benjamin also contend that "A relative clause which refers to the whole of a unique entity is bound to be nonrestrictive." Butt and Benjamin, *Modern Spanish*, 518. Furthermore Solé & Solé assert, "Unique referents, such as proper names and pronouns, can only take non-restrictive clauses since the antecedents are already identified and cannot be further restricted." Solé & Solé, *Spanish Syntax*, 116. Keenan contends that "non-restrictives modify fully specified, definite N[oun] P[hrase]s such as proper nouns." He also states that personal pronouns attract nonrestrictive modification as well. He contends that these substantives, like proper nouns, stand toward the very specific extreme of the acceptability continuum. However, instances do exist when personal pronouns may require restrictive modification. Keenan, "Relative Clauses," 169. Quirk points out, "In modern English, restrictive modification with personal pronouns is extremely limited." He does, however, note a few examples: "*He who* hesitates is lost. *She who* must be obeyed." Quirk notes that "Here *he* and *she* are cataphoric in that their meaning is defined by the following post modifier, which is a restrictive relative clause." Quirk et al., *Grammar*, 352. See also Lucas, "Relative Clauses," 92. See also add. 2-A.

[47] Quirk et al., *Grammar*, 290.

154

Matthew 1:1 contains an example with nouns in apposition that are naturally understood as nonrestrictive:

Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ υἱοῦ Δαυὶδ υἱοῦ Ἀβραάμ (ESV: Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham.)

Generally, the more specific the antecedent, the more likely it will attract strategies that are nonrestrictive.

Specific antecedents have also been described as "independent entities."[48] A substantive coupled with a nonrestrictive strategy is not dependent upon that strategy (modification) for reference;[49] the substantive is "independently established."[50] Otherwise expressed, the nonrestrictive adjunct merely provides additional information to an already established concept or entity.[51] To see what this means, consider, for example, Mark 15:43: Ἰωσὴφ ὁ ἀπὸ Ἀριμαθαίας, ὃς καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν προσδεχόμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.[52] The substantive Ἰωσὴφ ὁ ἀπὸ Ἀριμαθαίας is independently established, referentially unique. It does not depend upon the non-limiting relative clause ὃς καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν προσδεχόμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ for entity identification. Certainly only one Joseph of Arimathea is referenced here; the relative clause

---

[48] Quirk describes these substantives as assertive heads and contends they accept nonrestrictive strategies. Quirk et al., *Grammar*, 1241.

[49] This is unlike the case of restrictive modification, in which the referent is not known apart from the modification.

[50] Platzack, "Restrictive and Non-Restrictive," 268. Safir also states "that the head of a nonrestrictive relative has reference independent of the modifying clause." Safir, "Relative Clauses," 668. See also the section titled "Definition of Restrictivity" on p. 71 of ch. 2.

[51] Wellens rightfully notes that the substantive referred to "is referentially unique, which implies that it belongs to the culturally or textually shared information, or that it is deictically available." Furthermore, he observes that the nonrestrictive clause "is not distinctive but may have some value for the hearer[/reader]."Wellens, *Nubi*, 127.

[52] ESV: "Joseph of Arimathea . . ., who was also himself looking for the kingdom of God." As Wellens notes, the nonrestrictive clause "is not distinctive but may have some value for the hearer[/reader]." Wellens, *Nubi*, 127.

provides additional non-limiting information about him in order to further describe this very specific entity to the hearer/reader and is, therefore, nonrestrictive.[53]

On the opposite side of the continuum exist more generic substantives/nominals.[54] With respect to these types of antecedents, Nikolaeva observes that "nonrestrictives are generally unavailable for nominals combined with negative and indefinite determiners"[55] (for example πᾶς, τίς, οὐδείς, etc.).[56] Quirk similarly observes that "nonspecific determiners...usually have only restrictive modification.[57] Generally, the more generic the antecedent, the less likely it will attract a nonrestrictive strategy.

Non-nominal Antecedents and Nonrestrictivity. Non-nominal antecedents can only accept nonrestrictive clauses.[58] Essentially, when "the relative clause refers to the 'contents of a whole sentence or clause,'" which is a non-nominal antecedent, the clause must be nonrestrictive.[59] Quirk says as much when speaking about restrictive clauses, "Nor are restrictive relative clauses possible with non-nominal antecedents ('sentential relative clauses')."[60] Consider Eph 6:2: τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἐντολὴ πρώτη ἐν ἐπαγγελίᾳ.[61] The relative clause headed by ἥτις clearly refers to the entire preceding clause and is naturally

---

[53] It should be noted that the restrictive element here is the prepositional phrase ὁ ἀπὸ Ἀριμαθαίας. This restrictive prepositional phrase coupled with Ἰωσήφ constitutes a very specific entity. Thus the following relative clause does not limit but provides additional information.

[54] Quirk labels these substantives as nonassertive heads and contends that they do not attract nonrestrictive strategies. Quirk et al., *Grammar*, 1241.

[55] Nikolaeva, "Relative Clauses." 502.

[56] Similarly Alexiadou states that nonrestrictive "relative clauses may not attach to certain quantified heads." Alexiadou, *Relative Clauses*, 31.

[57] Quirk et al., *Grammar*, 1241.

[58] This topic will be treated more thoroughly below in the discussion of sentential relative clauses. See section titled "Continuum of Nonrestrictivity: Modification to Coordination," specifically pp. 164 ff., below.

[59] Lucas, "Relative Clauses," 85.

[60] A relative clause coupled with a non-nominal antecedent is categorizes as a *sentential relative clause*. Quirk et al., *Grammar*, 1241.

[61] CSB: "Honor your father and mother, which is the first commandment with a promise."

understood as nonrestrictive. A restrictive clause would be impossible with such a non-nominal antecedent.[62]

Summary of Nonrestrictivity and the Nature of Antecedents. The nature of the antecedent places some constraints upon whether or not a restrictive or nonrestrictive strategy will be utilized. For nominal antecedents, as was asserted in chapter 2,[63] a continuum of acceptability seems to exist. Generally, the more specific the antecedent, the more likely it will attract a nonrestrictive strategy; the more generic the antecedent, the less likely it will attract such a strategy. Non-nominal antecedents can only accept nonrestrictive clauses. The nature of the antecedent should be considered when seeking to understand nonrestrictive strategies within a given language, including ancient languages.

Specific Nonrestrictive Strategies

A survey of nonrestrictive strategies reveals that nonrestrictivity exists on multiple levels. Some examples were considered in the section titled "Validity of Nonrestrictivity as a Linguistic Category," above.[64] It was demonstrated that nonrestrictive strategies exist in English, Spanish, Modern Greek, Somali, Nubi, French, and Modern Hebrew.

Though it is not possible to produce an exhaustive analysis of all nonrestrictive strategies cross-linguistically, a survey of strategies coupled with additional analysis of strategies already presented reveals just how wide this linguistic category reaches. This reality underscores the need to understand the possibility of nonrestrictive strategies in the Greek of the New Testament.

---

[62] As Quirk et al., *Grammar*, 1118, point out, sentential relatives refer to non-nominals that are "the predicated or predication of a clause," "a whole clause or sentence," "a series of sentences," or in theory "could refer back to the whole length of [a] story."

[63] See section titled "Summary of Restrictivity and the Nature of Antecedents" on p. 77.

[64] See pp. 145–52.

The following nonrestrictive strategies will be considered: adjectives, prepositional phrases, appositional constructions, relative clauses, and attributive participles.

Adjectives. The nonrestrictive nature of certain English, Spanish and Nubi adjectives was considered above,[65] but additional consideration will further demonstrate the existence of this nonrestrictive strategy.

With respect to Nubi, Wellens notes that "Nubi adjectives often modify the noun in a kind of relative clause construction."[66] Thus beside *'ragi ke'bir*, we often find *'ragi al ke'bir*, where the noun *'ragi* 'man' and the adjective *ke'bir* 'big' are linked with a relative marker . . . *al* . . . ."[67]

Wellens notes that the difference between *'ragi ke'bir* and *'ragi al ke'bir* "is related to the distinction between non-restrictive and restrictive modifiers respectively."[68] Essentially, Wellens states that nonrestrictive adjectives do not have a relativizer.

Nonrestrictive: *'ragi   ke'bir*
Restrictive: *'ragi al ke'bir*

With respect to English, Jespersen observes the nonrestrictive nature of adjectives in noun phrases such as: *my dear little Ann*.[69] Furthermore, in line with the assertions above concerning the nature of antecedents and nonrestrictivity,[70] he states that nonrestrictive adjectives modify very specific antecedents, very often proper names: "*Rare Ben Johnson | Beautiful Evelyn Hope is dead* (Browning) | *poor, hearty, honest, little Miss La Creevy* (Dickens)..."[71] Consider a

---

[65] See pp. 148–49 above.

[66] Wellens, *Nubi*, 105.

[67] The relative markers in nubi consist of "*'ali, a'li, al, 'abu, a'bu*, or *ab*." Wellens, *Nubi*, 105.

[68] Wellens, *Nubi*, 105.

[69] Jespersen, *Grammar*, 112.

[70] See section titled "Nominal Antecedents and Nonrestrictivity" on p. 154 above.

[71] Jespersen, *Grammar*, 112.

similar adjective that appears to function nonrestrictively in Rom 16:9: Στάχυν τὸν ἀγαπητόν

μου.[72] Also, a comparable example exists in 3 John 1 coupled with a similar relative clause: Ὁ

πρεσβύτερος Γαΐῳ τῷ ἀγαπητῷ, ὃν ἐγὼ ἀγαπῶ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ.[73]

Quirk notes the role of context with respect to nonrestrictive adjectives and illustrates that

in a monogamous society, "the premodifier *beautiful* is understood as nonrestrictive: Come and

meet my *beautiful* wife."[74] In John chapter 17, Jesus addresses his father in prayer in verses 1, 5,

21 and 24. The context of prayer and the broader theological context of Jesus relationship with

the heavenly father within the triune God-head dictate that the recipient of this prayer is God the

Father, not Jesus' earthly father. Jesus also addresses God the Father in John 17:11 and 25.

Given the context, in both instances a nonrestrictive adjective modifies πάτερ:

John 17:11: Πάτερ ἅγιε, τήρησον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου[75]

John 17:25: πάτερ δίκαιε, καὶ ὁ κόσμος σε οὐκ ἔγνω[76]

While not a comprehensive analysis of the nature of adjective modification, these examples

demonstrate that the adjective should be considered as a valid nonrestrictive strategy.

Prepositional Phrases. Prepositional phrases represent another strategy for nonrestrictive

modification. Like other nonrestrictive strategies, nonrestrictive prepositional phrases provide

"supplementary information, not essential information."[77] Consider the following English

example in the context of a graduation ceremony: "The graduates, in black robes and

---

[72] ESV: "my **beloved** Stachys."

[73] ESV: "The elder to the **beloved** Gaius, whom I love in truth." Consider also Luke 1:3, Acts 19:35, Acts 24:3, and 1 Cor 15:58.

[74] Quirk et al., *Grammar*, 1240.

[75] ESV: "**Holy** Father, keep them in your name."

[76] ESV: "O **righteous** Father, even though the world does not know you."

[77] Gary Lutz and Diane Stevenson, *The Writer's Digest Grammar Desk Reference* (Cincinnati: Writer's Digest Books, 2005), 223.

mortarboards, looked quite ceremonial." The prepositional phrase *in black robes and mortarboards* does not limit the meaning of *the graduates*.

In chapter 2, the assertions of Young pertaining to adjectival prepositional phrases in the Greek New Testament were noted.[78] While Young does not indicate whether or not prepositional phrases tend to be restrictive or nonrestrictive, the examples he utilizes modify restrictively. It appears that most adjectival prepositional phrases in the New Testament participate in restrictive modification. Some examples of nonrestrictive prepositional phrases may, however, exist. Consider John 11:1: Λάζαρος ἀπὸ Βηθανίας, ἐκ τῆς κώμης Μαρίας καὶ Μάρθας τῆς ἀδελφῆς αὐτῆς.[79] The prepositional phrase appears to be non-limiting and provide additional information about the specific entity Λάζαρος ἀπὸ Βηθανίας. Prepositional phrases represent another strategy for nonrestrictivity.

Appositional Constructions. In the presentation of appositional constructions in chapter 2 it was asserted that while some debate exists as to how to describe the nature of apposition, Crystal, Quirk and Young contend that appositional constructions are capable of demonstrating the restrictive and nonrestrictive distinction.[80]

Quirk puts forth the following English example of a noun in nonrestrictive apposition: *Mr. Campbell, a lawyer,* was here last night.[81] Consider Matt 1:1, which contains an example of apposition with a proper noun: Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ υἱοῦ Δαυὶδ υἱοῦ Ἀβραάμ.[82] Clearly, only one Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ exists; therefore, υἱοῦ Δαυὶδ and υἱοῦ Ἀβραάμ stand in nonrestrictive apposition.

---

[78] See section titled "Prepositional Phrases" on p. 81 of ch. 2.

[79] ESV: "Lazarus of Bethany, **of the village of Mary and her sister Martha.**"

[80] See pp. 82–85 of ch. 2, section titled "Appositional Constructions," for a more detailed analysis.

[81] Quirk et al., *Grammar*, 1303–4.

[82] ESV: "Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham."

Additionally, Young speaks of apposition with respect to substantival participles. He states,

"Some examples of participles functioning in appositional noun phrases include Matt 1:16,

Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος χριστός (Jesus, the one called Christ)...and 1 Thessalonians 1:10, Ἰησοῦν

τὸν ῥυόμενον ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς ὀργῆς τῆς ἐρχομένης (Jesus, the one who delivers us from the coming

wrath)."[83] Whether or not one completely agrees with Young's assessment, it is noted that at

least one New Testament Greek grammarian considers nonrestrictive appositional

constructions.[84] Luke 9:35 also seems to contain an example of a substantival participle standing

nonrestrictively in apposition: Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος, αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε.[85]

Consider also Acts 18:7: τινὸς ὀνόματι Τιτίου Ἰούστου σεβομένου τὸν θεόν.[86] Appositional

constructions represent a viable nonrestrictive strategy.

Relative Clauses. In chapter 2[87] and in the section titled "Validity of Nonrestrictivity as a

Linguistic Category," above,[88] it was demonstrated that nonrestrictive relative clauses exist in a

variety of syntactical forms in English, Spanish, Modern Greek, and French.[89] Nonrestrictive

relative clauses will be treated more thoroughly below[90] and especially in chapter 5. Quirk puts

forth the following example of an English nonrestrictive relative clause: "They operated like

---

[83] Young, *New Testament Greek*, 150.

[84] One could argue Matt 1:16 to be restrictive, an example of entity differentiation, identifying which particular Jesus is being discussed. 1 Thess 1:10 could be considered an example of what Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part III," 403, would call "attributive position participles . . . that seem to be a restriction, not on what they modify directly but upon all other alternative possibilities."

[85] CSB: "This is My Son, **the Chosen One**; listen to Him!" Multiple scholars view this participle as a substantive. See: Darrell L. Bock, *Luke. Volume 1* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books, 1994), 874; Arthur A. Just, *Luke 9:51–24:53* (St. Louis, Mo.: Concordia, 1997), 401; I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 388.

[86] ESV: "a man named Titius Justus, **a worshiper of God**."

[87] See the section titled "Restrictivity in Modern Languages" on pp. 61–67 of ch. 2.

[88] See pp. 145–53.

[89] It was also asserted there that scholars note certain strategies for Somali, Nubi and Modern Hebrew as well.

[90] See section titled "Nonrestrictive Clauses" on p. 169 below.

politicians, *who notoriously have no sense of humor at all.*"[91] Consider the relative clause in

Luke 6:16:

Koine Greek: καὶ Ἰούδαν Ἰσκαριώθ, ὃς ἐγένετο προδότης.[92] (NA[27])

Modern Greek: και τον Ιούδα Ισκαριώτη, ο οποίος έγινε προδότης. (MET)

As in the English example, the relative clauses headed by ὃς and ο οποίος respectively do

not seem to restrict the noun they reference and so are nonrestrictive. Relative clauses represent

one more strategy for nonrestrictivity.

Attributive Participles. As was noted in chapter 2, in much of modern linguistics,

adjectival participial constructions fall under the more general category of *relative clause.*[93] The

focus in this section, however, centers on the traditional understanding of participial

constructions, which have been labeled as "attributive" participles.[94] Consider the following

English example: The apple tree, *swaying gently in the breeze,* was a reminder of old times.[95]

While the thesis of this dissertation contends that attributive participles in the Greek New

Testament are commonly restrictive, nonrestrictive attributive participles do exist (as attested by

the English example above involving the apple tree). In the New Testament, consider 1 Thess

2:4: οὐχ ὡς ἀνθρώποις ἀρέσκοντες ἀλλὰ θεῷ τῷ **δοκιμάζοντι** τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν.[96]

Nonrestrictive attributive participles will be considered more below and more thoroughly in

---

[91] Quirk et al., *Grammar,* 366.

[92] ESV: "and Judas Iscariot, **who became a traitor.**"

[93] See "Clarification of Terminology" section in ch. 2, pp. 68 ff.

[94] Quirk states, "Nonrestrictive postmodification can also be achieved with nonfinite clauses," which includes attributive participles. Quirk et al., *Grammar,* 1270.

[95] Quirk et al., *Grammar,* 1270.

[96] NASB[77]: "not as pleasing men but God, **who examines** our hearts." 1 Thess 2:4 could be considered an example of what Voelz would call "attributive position participles . . . that seem to be a restriction, not on what they modify directly but upon all other alternative possibilities." Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part III," 403. While we agree with some of the sentiment of Voelz's assertions here, we prefer to use the term "restriction" to refer specifically to strategies that limit referents. This will be considered in ch. 6.

chapter 5 and 6; it is to be noted, however, that at times attributive participles can function nonrestrictively.

Summary of Nonrestrictive Strategies. A survey of nonrestrictive strategies has revealed that nonrestrictivity exists on multiple levels in a variety of languages.[97] Adjectives, prepositional phrases, appositional constructions, relative clauses, and attributive participles can be considered viable nonrestrictive strategies.

Continuum of Nonrestrictivity—Modification to Coordination

In our study thus far, when referring to the restrictive/nonrestrictive contrast, restrictive strategies have often been labeled as "modifiers." Hence, the terminology *restrictive modification* has been employed. While restrictivity can be described as a type of modification, a *description of nonrestrictivity that utilizes the terminology of "modification" alone is deficient.* A continuum of nonrestrictivity, from *nonrestrictive modification* to *nonrestrictive coordination*, provides a clearer framework for understanding this linguistic distinction. Many nonrestrictive relative clauses fall under the classification of *coordination* rather than modification.[98] Additionally, certain nonrestrictive relative clauses seem to lie somewhere toward the middle of the continuum.[99] See the following chart:

---

[97] English, Spanish, Modern Greek, Somali, Nubi, French, Modern Hebrew and Koine Greek have been considered above.

[98] For example consider the following English sentence with two coordinate clauses linked with *and*: *This is John, and he will be managing our new store.* Or the two coordinate clauses can be linked with a relative pronoun, thus the relative clause leans toward coordination: *This is John, who will be managing our new store.*

[99] It appears that nonrestrictive appositional constructions and nonrestrictive attributive participles span across modification and coordination as well. See fig. 1 below.

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────┐
│     CONTINUUM OF NONRESTRICTIVITY         │
└─────────────────────────────────────────┘
                      │
                      │
MODIFICATION          │               COORDINATION
◄─────────────────────▼──────────────────────►
```

| ADJECTIVES PREPOSITIONAL PHRASES | PROPER RELATIVE CLAUSES | CONNECTIVE RELATIVE CLAUSES |
| | APPOSITIONAL CONSTRUCTIONS ATTRIBUTIVE PARTICIPLES | • *Continuative RC*
 • *Sentential RC* |

Figure 1. Continuum of Nonrestrictivity: Modification to Coordination.

Figure 1 above helps to provide some clarity and order to the understanding of nonrestrictive strategies (including nonrestrictive relative clauses) and their place on the continuum of nonrestrictivity.[100] Nonrestrictive adjectives and prepositional phrases lie toward the modification pole.[101] Appositional constructions and attributive participles stand toward the middle and can lean toward either pole.[102] As far as relative clauses are concerned, *proper* nonrestrictive relative clauses (e.g., *Give this to John, who sorely needs it*[103]) stand toward the middle of the continuum and may lean to greater or lesser degrees to either pole. *Connective* nonrestrictive relative clauses (which include *continuative* relative clauses [e.g., *he gave the letter to the clerk, who then copied it*[104]] and *sentential* relative clauses [e.g., *Pam didn't go to the*

---

[100] In ch. 1 it was demonstrated that a lack of clarity exists with respect to terminology referring to relative clauses. See section titled "Relative Clause" (and subsections) in ch. 1 on pp. 13 ff.

[101] See sections "Adjectives" and "Prepositional Phrases" on pp. 159–60, above.

[102] See "Appositional Constructions" and "Attributive Participles" on pp. 160–63, above.

[103] Lucas, "Relative Clauses," 84–85. Lucas also describes the following as an example of a proper relative clause: *The soldiers, who were brave, ran forward.*

[104] Jespersen, *Grammar*, 113.

show, which is a pity[105]) are always nonrestrictive and fall toward the coordination pole of nonrestrictivity.[106]

Concerning proper nonrestrictive relative clauses, Lucas states that these "offer additional information about the antecedent."[107] An example from the Greek New Testament can be found in Matthew 1:23: Ἰδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἕξει καὶ τέξεται υἱόν, καὶ καλέσουσιν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἐμμανουήλ, ὅ ἐστιν μεθερμηνευόμενον Μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ θεός.[108] The relative clause ὅ ἐστιν μεθερμηνευόμενον Μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ θεός refers to Ἐμμανουήλ in a non-limiting capacity, providing additional parenthetic information for the benefit of the hearer/reader. This example seems to lean strongly toward modification (though not as much as a nonrestrictive adjective would).

Certain proper nonrestrictive relative clauses, however, seem to stand somewhere in between or only lean slightly toward one extreme or the other. The notion of a continuum allows for flexibility and ambiguity while still striving toward clarity in exegesis and translation. For example, consider Luke 23:50–52: (50) Καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀνὴρ ὀνόματι Ἰωσὴφ βουλευτὴς ὑπάρχων [καὶ] ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς καὶ δίκαιος (51)—οὗτος οὐκ ἦν συγκατατεθειμένος τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῇ πράξει αὐτῶν—ἀπὸ Ἁριμαθαίας πόλεως τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ὃς προσεδέχετο τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, (52) οὗτος ... ᾐτήσατο τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. Does the relative clause ὃς προσεδέχετο τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ represent modification or coordination? It seems that the ESV and NIV lean toward

---

[105] Quirk et al., *Grammar*, 983.

[106] Levinsohn subdivides nonrestrictive relative clauses into two different categories, *appositional* and *continuative*. Levinsohn's division points to a helpful understanding but his terminology is lacking. See ch. 1, pp. 18–19 for Levinsohn's position. Lucas also points to a subdivision of nonrestrictive relative clauses. He contends that one can "subdivide non-restrictive clauses into two, or sometimes three, types: non-restrictive clauses proper...; continuative clauses... And...a type of clause...where the relative clause refers to the 'contents of a whole sentence or clause'." Lucas, "Relative Clauses," 85.

[107] Lucas, "Relative Clauses," 85. These *proper* clauses appear to be equivalent to Levinsohn's *appositional* clauses. See ch. 1, pp. 18–19.

[108] NRSV: "'Look, the virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and they shall name him Emmanuel,' which means, 'God is with us.'"

coordination when they translate, "...and he was waiting...." However, NASB[95] and NKJV

appear to lean toward modification in their respective translations: "...who was waiting..." and

"...who himself was also waiting...." The framework of a continuum helps to provide categories

to classify this example. One could plausibly argue that this relative clause may lean slightly

toward either end of the continuum. The continuum, however, allows the exegete to entertain a

certain amount of ambiguity and place the example toward the middle. The clause may simply be

described as a proper nonrestrictive relative clause that stands in the middle of the nonrestrictive

modification/coordination continuum.

Connective relative clauses, by contrast, lean strongly toward the coordination pole of the

nonrestrictive continuum.[109] BDF's description of the connective relative clause is to be

embraced. It states that connective relative clauses can be characterized by "a loosening of the

connection of the relative clause to the preceding complex sentence."[110] It conceives of them as

two conjoined sentences;[111] indeed, at times a connective relative clause could be considered

equivalent to an independent clause following the main clause.[112] Consider Eph 1:6–7:

> εἰς ἔπαινον δόξης τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ ἧς ἐχαρίτωσεν ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἠγαπημένῳ.[7] ἐν ᾧ
> ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ, τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν παραπτωμάτων,
> κατὰ τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ.

---

[109] This position is contra Boyer, who contends that relative connective clauses can be both restrictive and nonrestrictive. See sections titled "Relative Connective/Continuative" and "Summary and Evaluation of Relative Connective/Continuative Assertions" on pp. 19–25 of ch. 1.

[110] BDF, § 458.

[111] Schachter states that "constructions involving non-restrictive relative clauses may be closely related to conjoined sentences." Paul Schachter, "Focus and Relativization," *Language* 49 (1973): 19.

[112] Peter Sells has gone so far as to say that the "interpretation of a non-restrictive appears to be practically the same as the interpretation of a following independent clause." He contends that the following are equivalent: *Every rice-grower in Korea owns a wooden cart, which he uses when he harvests the crop* and *Every rice-grower in Korea owns a wooden cart. He uses it when he harvests the crop.* Peter Sells, *Restrictive and Non-restrictive Modification* (Stanford, CA: Center for the Study of Language and Information, 1985), 2–3.

ESV: to the praise of his glorious grace, with which he has blessed us in the Beloved. [7] **In him** we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses, according to the riches of his grace.

The relative clause ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν . . . seems clearly to go beyond modification to coordination.

Notice that the ESV translates this relative clause with a new sentence. Similarly, NA[27] has a period after ἠγαπημένῳ.

Continuative clauses are a subset of connective nonrestrictive relative clauses. As Lucas asserts, "continuative clauses . . . are used to convey information temporally subsequent to the information in the clause containing the antecedent."[113] Levinsohn presents Acts 17:10 as an example of a continuative relative clause: Οἱ δὲ ἀδελφοὶ εὐθέως διὰ νυκτὸς ἐξέπεμψαν τόν τε Παῦλον καὶ τὸν Σιλᾶν εἰς Βέροιαν, οἵτινες[114] παραγενόμενοι εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἀπῄεσαν.[115] He states that "the effect of the relative pronoun is to background the journey with respect to the event performed on arrival at the destination."[116]

Sentential relative clauses[117] are also a subset of connective relative clauses.[118] Similar to continuative relative clauses, they are always nonrestrictive and stand toward the coordination pole of the nonrestrictivity continuum. A sentential relative clause "refers to the 'contents of a

---

[113] Lucas, "Relative Clauses," 85.

[114] Note that "quite oft[en] ὅστις takes the place of the simple rel[ative] ὅς." Cf. BDAG, s.v. ὅστις, 3.

[115] ASV: "And the brethren immediately sent away Paul and Silas by night unto Beroea: who when they were come thither went into the synagogue of the Jews."

[116] Levinsohn, *New Testament Greek*, 192. See also Acts 12:13–14. Additionally, see Levinsohn's assertions on p. 22 of ch. 1 where Acts 28:23 is referenced. Additionally, Jespersen affirms our assessment of the nonrestrictive nature of continuative relative clauses and states, "A so-called continuative relative clause is, of course, non-restrictive: *he gave the letter to the clerk, who then copied it.*" Jespersen, *Grammar*, 113.

[117] See Quirk et al., *Grammar*, 983, 1048, 1118, 1245.

[118] Quirk et al., *Grammar*, 983, highlights the notion of nonrestrictive coordination and the sentential relative when he states that certain "nonrestrictive relative clauses have also been considered semantically equivalent to coordinated clauses. Such a classification seems particularly appropriate in the case of sentential relative clauses, where the relative clause has the rest of the superordinate clause as its antecedent."

whole sentence or clause'."[119] The antecedent does not consist of an individual substantive (noun,

noun phrase, substantival participle, etc.); the antecedent is non-nominal.[120] An example of such

a clause in the Greek New Testament can be found in Eph 6:2: τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν

μητέρα, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἐντολὴ πρώτη ἐν ἐπαγγελίᾳ.[121] The sentential relative clause refers to the

entire clause τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα. Consider also Phil 1:28: καὶ μὴ πτυρόμενοι ἐν

μηδενὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀντικειμένων, ἥτις ἐστὶν αὐτοῖς ἔνδειξις ἀπωλείας.[122] Robertson affirms this

analysis of Phil 1:28, stating that "the antecedent is the general idea of the preceding clause."[123]

Quirk puts forth the following English example of a sentential relative clause being equivalent to

a coordinate clause: "Pam didn't go to the show, *which is a pity*. ('. . . and that is a pity')."[124]

These examples demonstrate that the relationship between the relative clause and its non-

nominal antecedent goes beyond modification and is more akin to coordination.

The modification/coordination continuum of nonrestrictivity helps categorize a variety of

nonrestrictive strategies, in particular both proper relative clauses and connective relative

clauses. The continuum of nonrestrictivity allows for a certain level of ambiguity when

classifying proper nonrestrictive relative clauses. Furthermore, all connective relative clauses

(including continuative and sentential relative clauses) stand at the coordination pole of

nonrestrictivity.

---

[119] Lucas, "Relative Clauses," 85.

[120] See "Non-nominal Antecedents and Nonrestrictivity" on pp. 156 ff. above. Quirk et al., *Grammar*, 1048, further explain the sentential relative and its non-nominal antecedent, "The sentential relative clause does not function as a modifier of a noun phrase; its relative item refers anaphorically to a unit larger than a phrase, usually to a clause but sometimes even to a series of sentences."

[121] CSB: "Honor your father and mother, which is the first commandment with a promise.

[122] NKJV: "and not in any way terrified by your adversaries, which is to them a proof of perdition."

[123] Robertson, *Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, 729. Furthermore he states that the gender of the relative pronoun (feminine) reflects the gender of the predicate noun ἔνδειξις.

[124] Quirk et al., *Grammar*, 983.

Nonrestrictive Clauses

A preliminary survey of a variety of nonrestrictive clauses reinforces previous assertions on nonrestrictivity and makes preparation for a survey of nonrestrictive clauses in the Greek New Testament (chapter 5).

Relative Clauses and Attributive Participles

The nonrestrictive clauses specifically referred to in this dissertation consist of both nonrestrictive relative clauses and nonrestrictive attributive participles.[125] It has been demonstrated that these clauses are two of many different nonrestrictive strategies. English, Spanish, Modern Greek and Koine Greek all exhibit some form of relative clause and attributive participle.[126] As a result, there exists some freedom to utilize these terms (relative clause and attributive participle) somewhat universally and interchangeably with respect to these three languages.

Examples of Nonrestrictive Clauses

A variety of examples of nonrestrictive clauses will be set forth in order to reinforce their existence and to specifically introduce an analysis of the nonrestrictive clauses in the Greek New Testament. English, Spanish and Modern Greek nonrestrictive clauses will be considered. Additionally, examples from the Greek New Testament coupled with English, Spanish and Modern Greek translations of the Bible will be presented.

English. Consider this brief sampling of examples to reinforce the existence of nonrestrictive clauses in the English language.

---

[125] The traditional definition of *relative clause* is in mind here: relativizer + finite clause.

[126] Spanish only utilizes the past participle as an attributive. Modern Greek actually uses the relative clause more often than the attributive participle. See further discussion in the section titled "Modern Greek" on pp. 171–72 below.

<u>Relative Clauses:</u>
Mary, who plays soccer, is a nice girl.[127]
My father, who is very sorry, can't come.[128]
They acted like children, who are known to be immature.
The Bible, which I often read, is my favourite book.[129]

<u>Attributive Participles:</u>
Jonathan Smith, described as eccentric, achieved great success as an investor.
The quarterback, wearing number 15 on his jersey, threw for a touchdown.
The living room, recently remodeled, looked great.
My mother, sitting by the window, is talking to herself.[130]

Spanish. Consider this brief sampling of examples to reinforce the existence of

nonrestrictive clauses in the Spanish language.

<u>Relative Clauses:</u>
Dejamos las manzanas, que/las cuales estaban verdes.[131]
las pirámides egipcias, que/las cuales son uno de los monumentos más visitados por los
    turistas.[132]
Fuimos a visitar el Prado, que es el museo más conocido de todo Madrid.[133]
Juan, que no es tonto, se dejó convencer por ese hombre.[134]

<u>Attributive Participles:</u>
La Guardia Civil, reconocido y valorado por los ciudadanos, es muy importante en este
    país.[135]
El Papa, conocido previamente como el cardenal Jorge Bergoglio, es un hombre humilde.[136]

---

[127] Grohmann, "Clause." 211.

[128] Peter H. Matthews, *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 246.

[129] Crystal, *Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics,* 329.

[130] Martha Kolln, *Rhetorical Grammar: Grammatical Choices, Rhetorical Effects* (New York: Longman, 2003), 274.

[131] Their translation: "'we left the apples, which were unripe.'" Butt and Benjamin, *Modern Spanish,* 518.

[132] Their translation: "the Egyptian pyramids, which are one of the monuments most visited by tourists." Butt and Benjamin, *Modern Spanish,* 518.

[133] "We went to visit the Prado, which is the most well known museum of all Madrid." Pountain, *Spanish Language,* 88.

[134] Their translation: "John, who is not stupid, let himself be convinced by that man." Solé and Solé, *Spanish Syntax,* 116.

[135] "The Civil Guard, recognized and valued by the citizens, is very important in this country."

[136] "The Pope, known previously as Cardenal Jorge Bergoglio, is a humble man."

El vicepresidente asistió a la ceremonia de asunción del Presidente, realizada en el Palacio Legislativo nacional.[137]

Santa Ana es una gran Santa de la Iglesia católica, conocida por los fieles como madre de la Virgen María.[138]

Modern Greek. Modern Greek utilizes specific orthographic and prosodic means to indicate nonrestrictive and restrictive relative clauses. Modern Greek, however, seems to differ from Koine Greek with respect to the usage of the participle. All active voice, passive present and passive past participles that are found in Modern Greek "are those introduced into Standard Greek from the learned tradition.[139] They are found in older written texts and even today in journalistic writing or in discourse which uses learned features to achieve high style, formality or irony."[140] For this reason, the relative clause is utilized far more frequently than the attributive participle. While restrictive attributive participles seem to exist on a limited basis in Modern Greek, this does not appear to be the case for nonrestrictive attributive participles. Utilization of the relative clause appears to be preferred.[141] For this reason a brief sampling of only nonrestrictive relative clauses will be presented:

---

[137] "The Vice President attended the inauguration ceremony of the President, held at the national Legislative Palace.

[138] "Saint Ana is a great saint of the Catholic Church, known to the faithful as the mother of the Virgin Mary."

[139] Holton et al. utilize the terminology *learned tradition* to denote borrowing grammar and vocabulary "from *katharevousa* or directly from Ancient Greek." Holton et al., *Greek*, xxxiii.

[140] Holton et al., *Greek*, 307–9.

[141] While an exhaustive study of the existence of nonrestrictive attributive participles has not been done, it is noted that every example of an attributive participle put forth in one of the definitive grammars of Modern Greek is restrictive. Furthermore, while a discussion exists as to the restrictive and nonrestrictive nature of relative clauses, no such discussion exists regarding attributive participles. See Hotlon et al., *Greek*. In general, while the literature clearly states that relative clauses in Modern Greek function restrictively and nonrestrictively, grammatical assertions pertaining to the restrictive/nonrestrictive nature of the attributive participle do not appear to be readily available.

Relative Clauses:

Ο πατέρας μου, ο οποίος/που ηταν εδω χθες, ειναι καλά.[142]

Η Μαρία, η οποία/που παίζει ποδοσφαιρο, ειναι καλό κορίτσι.[143]

Η Αγία Γραφή, την οποία/που διαβάζω συχνα, ειναι το αγαπημένο μου βιβλίο.[144]

Κάλεσαν τον φίλο τους, που νομίζω ότι μόνο αυτός θα μπορέσει να τους βοηθήσει.[145]

Greek New Testament. An introductory sampling of nonrestrictive relative clauses and

nonrestrictive attributive participles from the Greek New Testament will be presented below.

They are followed by English, Spanish and Modern Greek translations. The nonrestrictive

clauses present in the translations support the nonrestrictive assessment of these Greek examples.

Nonrestrictive Relative Clauses

Mark 15:43

Ἰωσὴφ [ὁ] ἀπὸ Ἀριμαθαίας..., ὃς καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν προσδεχόμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ

Joseph of Arimathea..., who was also himself looking for the kingdom of God (ESV)

José de Arimatea..., que también esperaba el reino de Dios (R95)

ο Ιωσήφ...που καταγόταν από την Αριμαθαία, ο οποίος προσδοκούσε επίσης τη βασιλεία
του θεού (DNT)

(There clearly was not a Joseph from Arimathea who was <u>not</u> anticipating the Kingdom of
God)

2 Cor 4:4

τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅς ἐστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ

of Christ, who is the image of God (ESV)

de Cristo, el cual es la imagen de Dios (R95)

του Χριστού, ο οποίος είναι εικόνα του θεού (TGV)

(Paul clearly is not distinguishing from Christ who is <u>not</u> the image of God)

John 14:26

τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ὃ πέμψει ὁ πατὴρ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου

the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name (ESV)

el Espíritu Santo, a quien el Padre enviará en mi nombre (R95)

το Πνεύμα το γιο, που θα στείλει ο Πατέρας στο όνομά μου (MET)

(Jesus is not distinguishing from the Holy Spirit whom the father will <u>not</u> send)

---

[142] "My father, who was here yesterday, is fine."

[143] "Mary, who plays soccer, is a nice girl."

[144] "The Bible, which I often read, is my favourite book."

[145] "They called their friend, who[m] I think is the only one who can help." Example and translation are taken from Holton et al., *Greek*, 536.

Gal 2:10[146]

μόνον τῶν πτωχῶν ἵνα μνημονεύωμεν, ὃ καὶ ἐσπούδασα αὐτὸ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι

only they would that we should remember the poor; which very thing I was also zealous to do (ASV)

Solamente...que nos acordáramos de los pobres; lo cual también me apresuré a cumplir con diligencia (R95)

Ζήτησαν μόνο να θυμούμαστε τους φτωχούς, το οποίο και φρόντισα αυτό ακριβώς να κάνω (MET)

(sentential antecedent requires a nonrestrictive reading)

Rom 4:24

ἀλλὰ καὶ δι' ἡμᾶς, οἷς μέλλει λογίζεσθαι

but for our sake also, to whom it will be credited (NASB[95])

sino también para nosotros, a quienes nos habría de ser contada (RVA)

αλλά και για εμάς, στους οποίους μέλλει να λογαριάζεται (MET)

(Paul clearly does not distinguish two different types of ἡμᾶς)

Luke 8:2

Μαρία ἡ καλουμένη Μαγδαληνή, ἀφ' ἧς δαιμόνια ἑπτὰ ἐξεληλύθει

Mary who was called Magdalene, from whom seven demons had gone out (NASB[95])

María Magdalena, de la que habían salido siete demonios (PER)

η Μαρία, που καλείται Μαγδαληνή, από την οποία είχαν εξέλθει εφτά δαιμόνια (MET)[147]

(clearly two different women called Mary Magdalene are not being referenced)

Jas 1:17

τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν φώτων, παρ' ᾧ οὐκ ἔνι παραλλαγὴ ἢ τροπῆς ἀποσκίασμα

the Father of lights, with whom there is no variation or shifting shadow (NASB[95])

del Padre de las luces, en el cual no hay mudanza ni sombra de variación (R95)

τον Πατέρα των φώτων, στον οποίο δεν υπάρχει διακύμανση ή εμφάνιση σκιάσ εξαιτίας κάποιας αλλαγής στη θέση του (DNT)

(clearly two or more different "Father of Lights" are not being distinguished)

Matt 3:11

ὁ δὲ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος ἰσχυρότερός μού ἐστιν, οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς τὰ ὑποδήματα βαστάσαι

but he who is coming after me is mightier than I, whose sandals I am not worthy to carry (ESV)

pero el que viene tras mí, cuyo calzado yo no soy digno de llevar, (R95)

αλλά αυτός που έρχεται ύστερα από εμένα είναι ισχυρότερός μου, του οποίου δεν είμαι ικανός να βαστάξω τα υποδήματα (MET)

(there is clearly not being referenced here more than one man coming after John that is mightier than him)

---

[146] Gal 2:10 contains a sentential relative clause; therefore the antecedent is non-nominal.

[147] Note that MET seems to incorrectly render the attributive participle nonrestrictively.

<u>Nonrestrictive Attributive Participles</u>[148]

<u>1 Pet 1:3</u>
ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ . . . ἀναγεννήσας ἡμᾶς[149]
the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who . . . has caused us to be born again (NASB[95])
el Dios y Padre de nuestro Señor Jesucristo, que . . . nos hizo renacer (R95)
ο Θεός και Πατέρας του Κυρίου μας Ιησού Χριστού, ο οποίος μας αναγέννησε (MET)
(there is not another God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ who has not caused us to be born again)

<u>Col 2:12</u>
τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν
of God, who raised him from the dead (ESV)
de Dios, quien lo resucitó de entre los muertos (NVI)
του θεού, ο οποίος τον ανέστησε από τους νεκρούς (TGV)
(Paul clearly describes the powerful working of God as raising Christ from the dead)

<u>Acts 15:17</u>
λέγει κύριος ποιῶν ταῦτα
says the Lord, who does these things (NIV)
Dice el Señor, que hace todas estas cosas (SRV)
λέγει ο Κύριος, ο οποίος τα πραγματοποιεί όλα αυτά (DNT)
(clearly a distinction is not being made between the Lord who does these things and the Lord who does <u>not</u> do these things)

<u>1 Tim 6:17</u>
ἀλλ᾽ ἐπὶ θεῷ τῷ παρέχοντι ἡμῖν πάντα πλουσίως εἰς ἀπόλαυσιν
but on God, who richly provides us with everything to enjoy (ESV)
sino en Dios, que nos provee de todo en abundancia para que lo disfrutemos (NVI)
αλλά στο Ζωντανό Θεό, ο οποίος μας παρέχει τα πάντα με αφθονία για να τα απολαμβάνουμε (DNT)
(Paul describes God and does not seem to be distinguishing between multiples Gods)

Summary of Nonrestrictivity

The concept of nonrestrictivity (and restrictivity) has been widely embraced and utilized in

linguistic studies as a valid distinction and the existence of a variety of nonrestrictive strategies

---

[148] These examples could be viewed as what Voelz would call "attributive position participles . . . that seem to be a restriction, not on what they modify directly but upon all other alternative possibilities." Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part III," 403. Occurrences of this nature will be treated more thoroughly in ch. 6.

[149] It seems that Voelz would translate such an example as follows: "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the one (and not anyone else) who has caused us to be born again." See Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part III," 403.

establishes the prevalence of this grammatical category. Nonrestrictivity can be defined negatively by the notion of a non-limiting relationship of the strategy to the antecedent and positively by the notion of providing additional information to an independent antecedent. Additionally, a continuum of nonrestrictivity, from modification to coordination, provides a helpful framework for understanding this linguistic category and a variety of nonrestrictive strategies.

The nature of the antecedent places some constraints upon whether or not a nonrestrictive strategy will be utilized. For nominal antecedents, the more specific the antecedent, the more likely it will attract a nonrestrictive strategy; the more generic the antecedent, the less likely it will attract such a strategy. Non-nominal antecedents can only accept nonrestrictive clauses. The identity of the antecedent should be considered when seeking to understand nonrestrictive (and restrictive) strategies within a given language.

With respect to nonrestrictive clauses, the examples set forth above confirm the existence of nonrestrictive clauses in English, Spanish, Modern Greek and Koine Greek. We will now look more closely at the nonrestrictive clauses present in the Greek of the New Testament, specifically the nonrestrictive relative clause and the nonrestrictive attributive participle.

CHAPTER FIVE

NONRESTRICTIVITE CLAUSES IN THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT

Introduction

In chapter 4, an exploration of nonrestrictivity as a linguistic category coupled with an introduction to nonrestrictive clauses in English, Spanish, Modern Greek and Koine Greek was presented. We now turn to consider specifically the nonrestrictive nature of two major subordinate clauses of the Greek New Testament, the relative clause and the attributive participle. First, grammatical assertions concerning these nonrestrictive clauses will be presented. Next, a thorough survey of *nonrestrictive* relative clauses will be presented followed by a survey of *nonrestrictive* attributive participles. Finally, an observation of the general tendencies of these nonrestrictive clauses in the Greek New Testament will be offered.

Grammatical Assertions of Nonrestrictive Clauses in the Greek New Testament

Grammatical assertions that were previously presented pertaining to the nonrestrictive nature of relative clauses and attributive participles in the Greek New Testament will be summarized. In addition, the grammatical assertions of James W. Voelz will be explored more comprehensively.

Summary of Previous Grammatical Assertions

In chapter 1, we noted that grammarians such as Burton, Boyer, Wallace and Levinsohn all essentially assert that relative clauses in the Greek New Testament function both

nonrestrictively and restrictively,[1] though, it was noted that a lack of clarity and continuity exists among these scholars. Additionally, we observed that most of the examples of relative clauses given by these grammarians modify their respective antecedents nonrestrictively. This raises the question as to whether or not relative clauses tend to be nonrestrictive in the Greek of the New Testament.

The grammatical assertions regarding the attributive participle and its relation to nonrestrictivity vary amongst scholars as well. In chapter 1, it was established that there exists a lack of clarity among scholars with respect to syntax/semantic aspects of the attributive participle.[2] While grammarians such as Porter, Wallace, MacDonald, Burton, and Young all deal with the nonrestrictive nature of attributive participles, their treatments vary considerably and demonstrate a need for clarity. Most of the examples utilized by these scholars consisted of restrictive attributive participles. Young's observations of the attributive participle stand above the others when he contends that the nonrestrictive use is the least common type of attributive participle.[3]

On the whole, the paucity of examples, the general cursory nature of the grammatical assertions, and the leanings of Young concerning the nonrestrictive capabilities of relative clauses and attributive participles support the need for a survey which considers every example in the Greek New Testament.

---

[1] See "The Relative Clause" section of ch. 1 on pp. 13–26.

[2] See "The Attributive Participle" section of ch. 1 on pp. 26–40.

[3] Young, *Intermediate New Testament Greek*, 151. Young implicitly contends this when he states that the "restrictive use is by far the most common type of adjectival participle."

Grammatical Assertions of James W. Voelz

In chapter 1, it was noted that Voelz, in recent years, has observed that the assertions of

grammarians regarding the attributive participle and the relative clause lacked precision.[4] Voelz

notes that attributive participles tend to modify their antecedents restrictively and relative clauses

nonrestrictively. He thereby questions the generally accepted "assertion of equivalence" that

states that an attributive participle is tantamount to an adjectival relative clause.[5] In so doing, he

considers the nonrestrictive nature of relative clauses and to a lesser degree the nonrestrictivity of

attributive participles.

Voelz states concerning relative clauses (in contrast to restrictive participles), "By contrast,

subordinate clauses headed by a relative pronoun seem to be non-restrictive in their meaning. A

clear example is 1 Pet 2:11:"[6]

> Ἀγαπητοί, παρακαλῶ ὡς παροίκους καὶ παρεπιδήμους ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν σαρκικῶν
> ἐπιθυμιῶν αἵτινες στρατεύονται κατὰ τῆς ψυχῆς·
> "Beloved, I exhort (you) as sojourners and exiles to abstain from the fleshly desires,
> which war against the soul."[7]

Voelz explicates: "Are there fleshly desires that do not war against the soul? Most certainly not.

So, one could almost translate this verse thus: '...to abstain from the fleshly desires, which, by

their very nature/which, by definition, war against the soul.'"[8] Voelz puts forth other examples as

follows:

> Luke 2:4: εἰς πόλιν Δαυὶδ ἥτις καλεῖται Βηθλέεμ
> "unto the city of David, which is called Bethlehem"

---

[4] See "Explicit Call For Inquiry" section of ch. 1.

[5] Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part II," 314.

[6] Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part III," 402.

[7] Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part III," 402. Translation is from Voelz.

[8] Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part III," 402.

178

John 8:53: μὴ σὺ μείζων εἶ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἀβραάμ, ὅστις ἀπέθανεν;
   "You are not greater than our father Abraham, who died are you?"

Acts 1:10–11a: καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνδρες δύο παρειστήκεισαν αὐτοῖς . . . οἳ καὶ εἶπαν
   "and behold, two men were standing by them . . ., who also said"[9]

Voelz presents five examples of relative clauses. His treatment is not exhaustive and he merely states that relative clauses "seem to be non-restrictive."[10] All his examples of nonrestrictive relative clauses are subject clauses[11] and he cites only one example of a restrictive relative clause, which is a direct object clause.[12] Voelz appears to indicate that subject relative clauses lean toward nonrestrictivity.

Voelz's initial inclinations and inquiry into nonrestrictive relative clauses support the need to analyze every relative clause toward understanding the nonrestrictive nature and tendencies of all types of relative clauses: subject, direct object, indirect object, oblique and possessor.

While Voelz puts forth many restrictive attributive participles and asserts their prevalence, he also observes that nonrestrictive attributive participles exist. He cites 1 Pet 1:3 as follows:

Εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ κατὰ τὸ πολὺ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος ἀναγεννήσας ἡμᾶς εἰς ἐλπίδα ζῶσαν
"Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the one who has, according to his great mercy, begotten us again unto a living hope (as opposed to anyone else who might attempt such a salvation)"[13]

This participle does not participate in the grammatical/linguistic notion of restrictive modification. Voelz explicates the nonrestrictive nature of the attributive participle when he states, "The sentence is certainly not implying that there are multiple gods and fathers of our

---

[9] Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part III," 402. Translations are from Voelz.

[10] Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part III," 402.

[11] The referenced antecedent serves as subject in a subject relative clause.

[12] With respect to a direct object relative clause he states: "John 6:51c: καὶ ὁ ἄρτος δὲ ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω ἡ σάρξ μού ἐστιν. This seems to be restrictive." Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part III," 402.

[13] Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part III," 403. Translation is from Voelz.

Lord Jesus Christ so that it is restricting us to the one among these who did the begetting anew!"[14] Voelz maintains the prevalence of restrictive attributive participles, but he also states that this "analysis we suggest is not without its minor problems, especially attributive position participles . . . that seem to be a restriction, not on what they modify directly but upon all other alternative possibilities."[15] Voelz interprets 1 Pet 1:3 in this way. In this statement Voelz seems to preliminarily identify a classification of a small number of attributive participles that seem to be nonrestrictive.

Voelz's initial inclinations and inquiry support the need to analyze every type of relative clause (subject, direct object, indirect object, oblique and possessor) and attributive participle toward understanding their nonrestrictive tendencies.

The Nonrestrictive Relative Clause in the Greek New Testament

The validity of nonrestrictivity as a linguistic category and its representation through various strategies have been established.[16] As was discussed in chapter 3, the relative clause in the Greek New Testament participates in two noun-phrase formation patterns and five different types of subordinate relationships.[17] Nonrestrictive relative clauses find representation in both patterns and all five types of subordinate relative clauses. A presentation of nonrestrictive relative clauses in the Greek New Testament will demonstrate the nature of these constructions.

---

[14] Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part III," 403.

[15] Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part III," 403.

[16] See ch. 4.

[17] See "The Restrictive Relative Clause in the Greek New Testament" on pp. 131–43 of ch. 3.

Relative Clause Formation Patterns

As was discussed in chapter 3, the relative clause exhibits only one major noun-phrase formation pattern.[18] Of the approximately 1,040 restrictive/nonrestrictive relative clauses in the Greek New Testament, the post-nominal type "is by far the most common, encompassing more than 95% of the relative clauses found in the New Testament."[19] Internally-headed relative clauses make up the remainder.[20] An example of the former can be found in Mark 12:42: λεπτὰ δύο, ὅ ἐστιν κοδράντης.[21] The relative clause follows ("post-") its antecedent, λεπτὰ δύο. An example of the latter can be found in 1 Pet 1:10: περὶ ἧς σωτηρίας ἐξεζήτησαν καὶ ἐξηραύνησαν προφῆται οἱ περὶ τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς χάριτος προφητεύσαντες"[22] The head-noun σωτηρίας stands in the middle (internally) of the relative clause. While internally-headed relative clauses exist and are part of the data set considered in this study,[23] the majority of relative clauses in the Greek New Testament stand in post-nominal position and thus make up the primary set of examples considered for analysis in this dissertation.

Types of Subordinate Relative Clauses

As was discussed in chapter 3, the relative clause is capable of representing five different subordinate relationships (whereas the attributive participle represents only one). Not only can relative pronouns serve the role of subject in the subordinate clause, but they can also serve as

---

[18] See "Relative Clause Formation Patterns" on p. 131 of ch. 3.

[19] Culy, "Koine Relative Clauses," 76.

[20] Culy, "Koine Relative Clauses," 80. Additionally, Culy notes that while "some linguists have posited that Koine does in fact have prenominal RCs . . . all verses that are putative examples of prenominal RCs can be analyzed as I[nternally] H[eaded] R[elative] C[lause]s." Additionally he notes that "the majority of the traditional Greek grammarians have treated what appear to be prenominal RCs as IHRCs (e.g., Robertson 1934:718; Blass and Debrunner 1961:154)."

[21] ESV: "two small copper coins, **which make a penny**."

[22] "[this] salvation, **concerning which the prophets** who prophesied of the grace to you **searched and sought out**."

[23] These constructions are present throughout app. 2.

direct object, indirect object, oblique, or possessor. Nonrestrictive examples of these five types of

subordinate relative clauses will be presented in order to demonstrate the nature of these types of

subordinate relative clauses.[24]

Nonrestrictive Relative Clauses—Subject. As was asserted in chapter 3, subject relative

clauses occur slightly less frequently than direct object relative clauses and more frequently than

the rest of the other types of subordinate relative clauses.[25] The Greek New Testament contains

364 occurrences representing 35% of all restrictive/nonrestrictive relative clauses. In each of

these occurrences it can be readily discerned that the relative pronoun fills the role of subject

within the subordinate clause. All relative pronouns in subject relative clauses stand in the

nominative case.

Nonrestrictive subject relative clauses are distributed extensively throughout the Greek

New Testament. They find representation in all the Gospels, Acts, Pauline Epistles (all except

Philemon) Hebrews, 1 & 2 Peter, 1 & 3 John, and Revelation. A representative sample of

examples that lean toward nonrestrictive modification and coordination will be presented.

First, several examples will demonstrate clearly the nature of these relative clauses.

Second, a succinct list of examples will familiarize the reader with a wide variety of occurrences.

Finally, a few notable examples will be analyzed more thoroughly.

Luke 17:12–13 contains a proper relative clause that refers to a specific noun-phrase: καὶ

εἰσερχομένου αὐτοῦ εἴς τινα κώμην ἀπήντησαν [αὐτῷ] δέκα λεπροὶ ἄνδρες, οἳ ἔστησαν

---

[24] The categorization of the five types of subordinate relative clauses stems from linguistic universals established by what linguists refer to as the Accessibility Hierarchy. The universal linguistic realities of this hierarchy will be explicated in ch. 6.

[25] See section titled "Restrictive Relative Clauses—Subject" on p. 133 of ch. 3. One might think that there would be more subject relative clauses than direct object relative clauses. While this will be treated more thoroughly in ch. 6, it is noted here that only one strategy for relativizing direct object clauses exists, the relative clause. Attributive participles do not directly relativize direct object clauses; they only relativize subject clauses. So, two strategies for relativizing subject clauses exist, the attributive participle and the relative clause. As a result, overall, there are more subject clauses than direct object clauses.

πόρρωθεν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἦραν φωνὴν λέγοντες, Ἰησοῦ ἐπιστάτα, ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς.[26] The relative clause

provides additional information about the specific noun-phrase δέκα λεπροὶ ἄνδρες. The relative

clause does not limit the ten leprous men but provides the additional information that they stood

at a distance. Therefore, it functions nonrestrictively. Furthermore, this relative clause helps

move the thought forward as it leads into the idea that as a result of standing at a distance the ten

lepers needed to lift up their voices so that Jesus could hear them as they cried out for mercy.

This proper relative clause lies toward the middle of the nonrestrictive modification/coordination

continuum.

Consider the subject relative clause in Rom 16:12: ἀσπάσασθε Περσίδα τὴν ἀγαπητήν,

ἥτις πολλὰ ἐκοπίασεν ἐν κυρίῳ.[27] The relative clause provides additional information about the

very specific substantive Περσίδα τὴν ἀγαπητήν. Paul does not distinguish or limit to one of

many different beloved women named Persis. Paul provides additional information about the

beloved Persis, namely that she has worked hard in the Lord. This example of a proper

nonrestrictive relative clause conveys nonrestrictive modification

Luke 10:30 contains a subject relative clause: ἄνθρωπός τις κατέβαινεν ἀπὸ Ἰερουσαλὴμ

εἰς Ἰεριχὼ καὶ λῃσταῖς περιέπεσεν, οἳ καὶ ἐκδύσαντες αὐτὸν καὶ πληγὰς ἐπιθέντες ἀπῆλθον

ἀφέντες ἡμιθανῆ.[28] The relative clause refers to λῃσταῖς and clearly conveys additional

information about the robbers that is temporally subsequent to the information in the clause of

the antecedent, namely that the man encountered the robbers. Therefore, it is classified as a

continuative nonrestrictive relative clause, which by nature leans strongly toward coordination.

---

[26] "and as he entered into a certain village, **ten leprous men** met him, **who stood at a distance** and they lifted up their voices saying, 'Jesus, Master, have mercy on us.'"

[27] ESV: "Greet **the beloved Persis, who has worked hard in the Lord**."

[28] "a certain man was going down from Jerusalem to Jericho and encountered **robbers, who also, having stripped him and inflicted blows, departed, leaving [him] half-dead.**"

Consider the following additional examples of nonrestrictive subject relative clauses:

Matt 23:27: τάφοις κεκονιαμένοις, οἵτινες ἔξωθεν μὲν φαίνονται ὡραῖοι, ἔσωθεν δὲ γέμουσιν ὀστέων νεκρῶν καὶ πάσης ἀκαθαρσίας.[29]
- describes commonly known aspects of tombs that have been white washed
- proper relative clause (RC):[30] lies toward middle of modification/coordination continuum

Matt 27:57: ἦλθεν ἄνθρωπος πλούσιος ἀπὸ Ἀριμαθαίας, τοὔνομα Ἰωσήφ, ὃς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐμαθητεύθη τῷ Ἰησοῦ.[31]
- provides additional information about Joseph, the rich man from Arimathea
- proper RC: leans slightly toward modification

Mark 3:17: καὶ ἐπέθηκεν αὐτοῖς ὀνόμα[τα] βοανηργές, ὅ ἐστιν υἱοὶ βροντῆς.[32]
- parenthetically explains what Boanerges means
- proper RC: conveys modification

Mark 5:2–3: εὐθὺς ὑπήντησεν αὐτῷ ἐκ τῶν μνημείων ἄνθρωπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ, ὃς τὴν κατοίκησιν εἶχεν ἐν τοῖς μνήμασιν.[33]
- provides additional information about the man with an unclean spirit who had met Jesus immediately as he was exiting a boat
- proper RC: lies toward middle of modification/coordination continuum

John 1:12–13: ὅσοι δὲ ἔλαβον αὐτόν, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τέκνα θεοῦ γενέσθαι, τοῖς πιστεύουσιν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, οἳ οὐκ ἐξ αἱμάτων οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος σαρκὸς οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος ἀνδρὸς ἀλλ᾽ ἐκ θεοῦ ἐγεννήθησαν.[34]
- describes the nature of the "birth" of the children of God, those who have received/believed Jesus
- proper RC: leans toward modification

John 15:26: ὁ παράκλητος…τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας ὃ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται.[35]

---

[29] ESV: "whitewashed tombs, which outwardly appear beautiful, but within are full of dead people's bones and all uncleanness." Notice that the substantive modified consists of a noun plus restrictive attributive participle: τάφοις κεκονιαμένοις (tombs having been whitewashed).

[30] The abbreviation "RC" will be utilized in subsequent examples for the terminology "Relative Clause."

[31] ESV: "there came a rich man from Arimathea, named Joseph, who also was a disciple of Jesus."

[32] NIV: "to them he gave the name Boanerges, which means Sons of Thunder."

[33] NASB[95]: "immediately a man from the tombs with an unclean spirit met Him, and he had his dwelling among the tombs."

[34] NKJV: "But as many as received Him, to them He gave the right to become children of God, to those who believe in His name: who were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God."

- provides additional information about the Helper/the Spirit of Truth
- proper RC: leans slightly toward modification

John 21:20: Ἐπιστραφεὶς ὁ Πέτρος βλέπει τὸν μαθητὴν ὃν ἠγάπα ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀκολουθοῦντα, ὃς καὶ ἀνέπεσεν ἐν τῷ δείπνῳ ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος αὐτοῦ καὶ εἶπεν, Κύριε, τίς ἐστιν ὁ παραδιδούς σε;[36]
- provides additional information about the disciple whom Jesus loved
- proper RC: modification

Acts 1:12: Τότε ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἰερουσαλὴμ ἀπὸ ὄρους τοῦ καλουμένου Ἐλαιῶνος, ὅ ἐστιν ἐγγὺς Ἰερουσαλήμ....[37]
- provides additional parenthetical information about the location of Mt. Olivet
- proper RC: modification

Acts 8:27: καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀνὴρ Αἰθίοψ εὐνοῦχος δυνάστης Κανδάκης βασιλίσσης Αἰθιόπων, ὃς ἦν ἐπὶ πάσης τῆς γάζης αὐτῆς, ὃς ἐληλύθει προσκυνήσων εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ.[38]
- the first relative clause describes the Ethiopian eunuch and the second describes his circumstances.
- first relative clause leans toward modification (proper RC) and the second leans toward coordination (connective RC)

Acts 10:47 Μήτι τὸ ὕδωρ δύναται κωλῦσαί τις τοῦ μὴ βαπτισθῆναι τούτους, οἵτινες τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἔλαβον ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς;[39]
- describes these people (the gentiles who received the Holy Spirit)
- proper RC: modification

Acts 12:10: ἦλθαν ἐπὶ τὴν πύλην τὴν σιδηρᾶν τὴν φέρουσαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν, ἥτις αὐτομάτη ἠνοίγη αὐτοῖς.[40]

---

[35] ESV: "the Helper..., the Spirit of truth, who proceeds from the Father."

[36] "Peter, turning around, saw the **disciple whom Jesus loved** following, **who also reclined at the supper upon his back and said, 'Lord, who is the one who betrays you?**" Notice that the noun-phrase referenced consists of a noun with a restrictive direct object relative clause. Additionally, Boyer wrongly labels the subject relative clause as restrictive. Boyer, *Relative Clauses*, 14.

[37] ESV: "then they returned to Jerusalem from **the mount called Olivet, which is near Jerusalem.**"

[38] "And there was **an Ethiopian, a eunuch, a court official of Candace,** queen of the Ethiopians, **who was in charge of all her treasure, who had come to Jerusalem to worship.**"

[39] ESV: "Can anyone withhold water for baptizing **these people, who have received the Holy Spirit just as we have?**" : James W. Voelz, "The Language of the New Testament," in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Romischen Welt* (ed. Hildegard Temporini and Wolfgang Haase; New York: de Gruyter, 1984), 2:955, labels this verse nonrestrictive.

[40] NASB[95]: "they came to **the iron gate that leads into the city, which opened for them by itself.**"

185

- provides information regarding the iron gate that leads into the city; it is temporally subsequent to the event in the preceding clause
- continuative RC: strong coordination

Acts 28:7: τῷ πρώτῳ τῆς νήσου ὀνόματι Ποπλίῳ, ὃς ἀναδεξάμενος ἡμᾶς τρεῖς ἡμέρας φιλοφρόνως ἐξένισεν....[41]
- provides additional information concerning the specific actions of Publius
- connective RC: strong coordination

Rom 1:25: καὶ ἐσεβάσθησαν καὶ ἐλάτρευσαν τῇ κτίσει παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα, ὅς ἐστιν εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ἀμήν.[42]
- provides additional information about the Creator
- proper RC: modification

Rom 2:14–15: ὅταν γὰρ ἔθνη τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα φύσει τὰ τοῦ νόμου ποιῶσιν, οὗτοι νόμον μὴ ἔχοντες ἑαυτοῖς εἰσιν νόμος· οἵτινες ἐνδείκνυνται τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου γραπτὸν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν.[43]
- provides additional information about gentiles who do not have the law
- connective RC: coordination

Rom 4:16: ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ ἐκ πίστεως Ἀβραάμ, ὅς ἐστιν πατὴρ πάντων ἡμῶν.[44]
- describes the patriarch Abraham as the father of us all
- proper RC: modification

Rom 5:14: ἀλλὰ ἐβασίλευσεν ὁ θάνατος ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ μέχρι Μωϋσέως καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς μὴ ἁμαρτήσαντας ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιώματι τῆς παραβάσεως Ἀδὰμ ὅς ἐστιν τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος.[45]
- provides additional information about Adam as type
- proper RC: modification

2 Cor 4:4: τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς δόξης τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅς ἐστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεου.[46]
- describes Christ as the image of God
- proper RC: modification

---

[41] ESV: "to the chief man of the island, named Publius, who received us and entertained us hospitably for three days."

[42] ESV: "and worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed forever! Amen."

[43] "for when gentiles who do not have the law by nature do the things in the law, these, although not having the law, are a law to themselves, who show the work of the law written on their hearts." Voelz, "The Language of the New Testament," 955, labels this verse nonrestrictive.

[44] ESV: "but also to the one of the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all."

[45] ESV: "Yet death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over those whose sinning was not like the transgression of Adam, who was a type of the one who was to come."

[46] ESV: "of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God."

Gal 1:6–7: εἰς ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον, ὃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο.[47]

- describes the other gospel to which the Galatians were turning
- proper RC: modification

Gal 2:4: τοὺς παρεισάκτους ψευδαδέλφους, οἵτινες παρεισῆλθον κατασκοπῆσαι τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἡμῶν ἣν ἔχομεν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.[48]

- provides additional information about the false brothers who were secretly brought in
- proper RC: coordination

Gal 5:19–21: φανερὰ δέ ἐστιν τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκός, ἅτινά ἐστιν πορνεία, ἀκαθαρσία, ἀσέλγεια, εἰδωλολατρία, φαρμακεία, ἔχθραι, ἔρις, ζῆλος, θυμοί, ἐριθεῖαι, διχοστασίαι, αἱρέσεις, φθόνοι, μέθαι, κῶμοι καὶ τὰ ὅμοια τούτοις.[49]

- describes what are the works of the flesh
- proper RC: modification

Eph 1:22–23: τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἥτις ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ.[50]

- provides additional information about the church, describing it as the body of Christ
- proper RC: modification

Eph 5:4: καὶ αἰσχρότης καὶ μωρολογία ἢ εὐτραπελία, ἃ οὐκ ἀνῆκεν.[51]

- provides additional parenthetical information
- proper RC: modification

Eph 6:17: τὴν μάχαιραν τοῦ πνεύματος, ὅ ἐστιν ῥῆμα θεου.[52]

- provides additional parenthetical information about the sword of the spirit
- proper RC: modification

Col 3:5: τὴν πλεονεξίαν, ἥτις ἐστὶν εἰδωλολατρία.[53]

---

[47] NASB[95]: "for a different gospel; which is *really* not another."

[48] NASB[95]: "the false brethren secretly brought in, who had sneaked in to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus." Notice the example of a restrictive direct object relative clause: "τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἡμῶν ἣν ἔχομεν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ."

[49] "and manifest are the works of the flesh, which are sexual immorality, impurity, sensuality, idolatry, sorcery, enmity, strife, jealousy, fits of anger, rivalries, dissensions, divisions, envy, drunkenness, orgies, and things like these."

[50] ESV: "to the church, which is his body." See a similar example in Colossians 1:24: "ὑπὲρ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, ὅ ἐστιν ἡ ἐκκλησία" ("for the sake of his body, which is the church").

[51] NASB[95]: "and . . . filthiness and silly talk, or coarse jesting, which are not fitting."

[52] ESV: "the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God." See add. 5-A for treatment of the gender of this relative pronoun.

- describes covetousness parenthetically
- proper RC: modification

Col 3:14: τὴν ἀγάπην, ὅ ἐστιν σύνδεσμος τῆς τελειότητος.[54]
- provides additional information about love
- proper RC: modification

2 Tim 2:17–18: ὧν ἐστιν Ὑμέναιος καὶ Φίλητος, οἵτινες περὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἠστόχησαν, λέγοντες [τὴν] ἀνάστασιν ἤδη γεγονέναι, καὶ ἀνατρέπουσιν τήν τινων πίστιν.[55]
- provides additional information about Hymenaeus and Philetus
- connective RC: leans strongly toward coordination

Heb 7:2 βασιλεὺς Σαλήμ, ὅ ἐστιν βασιλεὺς εἰρήνης.[56]
- describes what "king of Salem" means
- proper RC: leans toward modification

Heb 10:11: καὶ τὰς αὐτὰς πολλάκις προσφέρων θυσίας, αἵτινες οὐδέποτε δύνανται περιελεῖν ἁμαρτίας.[57]
- describes "the same sacrifices"
- proper RC: lies toward middle of modification/coordination continuum

Heb 11:32–34: Γεδεών, Βαράκ, Σαμψών, Ἰεφθάε, Δαυίδ τε καὶ Σαμουὴλ καὶ τῶν προφητῶν, οἳ διὰ πίστεως κατηγωνίσαντο βασιλείας, εἰργάσαντο δικαιοσύνην, ἐπέτυχον ἐπαγγελιῶν, ἔφραξαν στόματα λεόντων, ἔσβεσαν δύναμιν πυρός, ἔφυγον στόματα μαχαίρης, ἐδυναμώθησαν ἀπὸ ἀσθενείας, ἐγενήθησαν ἰσχυροὶ ἐν πολέμῳ, παρεμβολὰς ἔκλιναν ἀλλοτρίων.[58]
- describes what these men did by faith
- connective RC: leans strongly toward coordination

---

[53] ESV: "covetousness, which is idolatry"

[54] "love, which is the bond of perfection." See add. 5-A for treatment of this relative pronoun.

[55] "of whom are Hymenaeus and Philetus, who, concerning the truth, have swerved, saying the resurrection to already have happened, and are upsetting the faith of some."

[56] NASB[95]: "king of Salem, which is king of peace." BDAG asserts, "The neut[er] is used . . . in explanations, esp[ecially] of foreign words . . . which or that is, which means: βασιλεὺς Σαλήμ, ὅ ἐστιν βασιλεὺς εἰρήνης." BDAG, ὅς, 1gα. Also, see add. 5-A.

[57] ESV: "offering repeatedly the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins."

[58] ESV: "of Gideon, Barak, Samson, Jephthah, of David and Samuel and the prophets—who through faith conquered kingdoms, enforced justice, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the power of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, were made strong out of weakness, became mighty in war, put foreign armies to flight." Note that Boyer, Relative Clauses, 27, neglects to identify this example in his examination of relative clauses.

1 Pet 2:9–10: Ὑμεῖς δὲ γένος ἐκλεκτόν, βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα, ἔθνος ἅγιον, λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν . . . οἵ ποτε οὐ λαὸς νῦν δὲ λαὸς θεοῦ.[59]
* describes the recipients of Peter's epistle, 2nd person address
* connective RC: leans toward coordination

1 Pet 2:11: τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν αἵτινες στρατεύονται κατὰ τῆς ψυχῆς.[60]
* describes nature of fleshly lust
* proper RC: leans toward modification

1 John 2:8: πάλιν ἐντολὴν καινὴν γράφω ὑμῖν, ὅ ἐστιν ἀληθὲς ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν.[61]
* provides additional information about the new commandment
* proper RC: leans toward modification

Rev 2:7: δώσω αὐτῷ φαγεῖν ἐκ τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ζωῆς, ὅ ἐστιν ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ τοῦ θεοῦ.[62]
* provides additional information about the tree of life (location)
* proper RC: modification

Rev 5:6: κέρατα ἑπτὰ καὶ ὀφθαλμοὺς ἑπτὰ οἵ εἰσιν τὰ [ἑπτὰ] πνεύματα τοῦ θεοῦ.[63]
* describes the seven horns and seven eyes
* proper RC: modification

Rev 9:20: τὰ εἴδωλα τὰ χρυσᾶ καὶ τὰ ἀργυρᾶ καὶ τὰ χαλκᾶ καὶ τὰ λίθινα καὶ τὰ ξύλινα, ἃ οὔτε βλέπειν δύνανται οὔτε ἀκούειν οὔτε περιπατεῖν.[64]
* describes the nature of idols
* proper RC: modification

---

[59] NKJV: "But you are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, His own special people . . . who once were not a people but are now the people of God." Note that Boyer, Relative Clauses, 28, neglects to identify this example in his examination of relative clauses.

[60] NASB[77]: "fleshly lusts, which wage war against the soul." See Voelz's nonrestrictive assessment of this verse on p. 179 above and as follows: Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part III," 402; Voelz, "The Language of the New Testament," 955.

[61] ESV: "On the other hand, I am writing a new commandment to you, which is true in Him and in you." See add. 5-A for treatment of this relative pronoun.

[62] ESV: "To the one who conquers I will grant to eat of the tree of life, which is in the paradise of God."

[63] NASB[95]: "seven horns and seven eyes, which are the seven Spirits of God." Consider a similar example in Rev 4:5.

[64] ESV: "idols of gold and silver and bronze and stone and wood, which cannot see or hear or walk."

Having surveyed a wide variety of clear examples of proper and connective nonrestrictive subject relative clauses, a few notable examples will be presented and more thoroughly discussed.

Luke 15:7 contains a unique example of a noun phrase with a subject relative clause that is compared to a noun phrase with an attributive participle: λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὕτως χαρὰ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἔσται ἐπὶ ἑνὶ ἁμαρτωλῷ μετανοοῦντι ἢ ἐπὶ ἐνενήκοντα ἐννέα δικαίοις οἵτινες οὐ χρείαν ἔχουσιν μετανοίας.[65] The first complex substantive consists of the antecedent ἑνὶ ἁμαρτωλῷ modified by μετανοοῦντι. The participle limits the referent to a sinner that repents as opposed to one that does not, therefore it is restrictive.[66] This type of sinner is compared to 99 righteous [ones/men/people]. The relative clause οἵτινες οὐ χρείαν ἔχουσιν μετανοίας refers to the 99 righteous (ἐνενήκοντα ἐννέα δικαίοις). A righteous person, by definition, does not need to repent, so, this proper relative clause, in a non-limiting manner, merely provides additional information about righteous people. Therefore it functions nonrestrictively and furthermore, it leans toward modification.

Additionally when considering translations of this text, most English and Spanish translations do not punctuate the relative clause correctly. Consider the following:

```
ESV; NASB95; NASB77:   ninety-nine righteous persons who need no repentance
NIV:                   ninety-nine righteous persons who do not need to repent
R95; LBA; NVI; PER:    noventa y nueve justos que no necesitan [arrepentirse]
```

These translations, which utilize restrictive relative clauses, imply that there exists a certain type of righteous person that needs to repent. This contradicts the very definition of what it means to be righteous.

---

[65]ASV: "I say unto you, that even so there shall be joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine righteous persons, who need no repentance.

[66] An example of restrictive modification that leans toward concept formation.

Consider two examples of subject relative clauses in 1 Cor 4:17: διὰ τοῦτο ἔπεμψα ὑμῖν

Τιμόθεον, ὅς ἐστίν μου τέκνον ἀγαπητὸν καὶ πιστὸν ἐν κυρίῳ, ὅς ὑμᾶς ἀναμνήσει τὰς ὁδούς

μου τὰς ἐν Χριστῷ [Ἰησοῦ], καθὼς πανταχοῦ ἐν πάσῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ διδάσκω.[67] The first relative

clause seems to be an example of a proper nonrestrictive relative clause that leans toward

modification. The apostle Paul is not identifying Timothy but is providing additional

information; he describes Timothy as his beloved son and faithful in the Lord. The second

relative clause contains information that is temporally subsequent to the clause containing the

referent. In the clause with the antecedent (Τιμόθεον), Paul sent Timothy. Temporally

subsequent to this sending, Timothy will remind the Corinthian believers of Paul's ways in

Christ. The relative clause moves the argument forward and into a new direction; therefore, it is a

continuative nonrestrictive relative clause. As with all continuative clauses, it leans strongly

toward coordination. Notice the treatment of these two relative clauses in the following English

translation (NASB[95]), which seems to be correct: "For this reason I have sent to you Timothy,

who is my beloved and faithful child in the Lord, **and he** will remind you of my ways which are

in Christ, just as I teach everywhere in every church." The first relative clause is translated with a

relative pronoun, "who," and the second with a coordinating conjunction and personal pronoun,

"and he." Both of these clauses demonstrate the nonrestrictive nature of subject relative clauses

as well as the continuum of nonrestrictivity from modification to coordination.

1 Pet 2:21–4 contains three subject relative clauses in series:

εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐκλήθητε, ὅτι καὶ **Χριστὸς** ἔπαθεν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ὑμῖν ὑπολιμπάνων
ὑπογραμμὸν ἵνα ἐπακολουθήσητε τοῖς ἴχνεσιν αὐτοῦ, [22] ὅς ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν
οὐδὲ εὑρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ, [23] ὅς λοιδορούμενος οὐκ ἀντελοιδόρει
πάσχων οὐκ ἠπείλει, παρεδίδου δὲ τῷ κρίνοντι δικαίως· [24] ὅς τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν

---

[67] NASB[95]: "For this reason I have sent to you **Timothy, who is my beloved and faithful child in the Lord,
and he will remind you of my ways which are in Christ**, just as I teach everywhere in every church."

αὐτὸς ἀνήνεγκεν ἐν τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον, ἵνα ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἀπογενόμενοι τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ ζήσωμεν, οὗ τῷ μώλωπι ἰάθητε.[68]

Each of the subject relative clauses refers back to Χριστὸς (and αὐτοῦ) in verse 21. Since each relative clause clearly provides additional information about Christ and keeps the narrative moving forward building upon the previous clause, these are clearly connective relative clauses. These three connective subject relative clauses demonstrate a unique aspect of the coordinate capability and nonrestrictive nature of connective relative clauses. Most English translations reflect this with either coordinate clauses (NASB[95], NASB[77]) or independent clauses (ESV, NIV, CSB, NRSV). See, for examples the NASB[77] and ESV below:

Coordinate Clauses (NASB[77]): For you have been called for this purpose, since **Christ** also suffered for you, leaving you an example for you to follow in **His** steps, [22] **who** committed no sin, nor was any deceit found in His mouth; [23] **and** while being reviled, **He** did not revile in return; while suffering, He uttered no threats, but kept entrusting *Himself* to Him who judges righteously; [24] **and He** Himself bore our sins in His body on the cross, that we might die to sin and live to righteousness; for by His wounds you were healed.

Independent Clauses (ESV): For to this you have been called, because **Christ** also suffered for you, leaving you an example, so that you might follow in **his** steps. [22] **He** committed no sin, neither was deceit found in his mouth. [23] When he was reviled, **he** did not revile in return; when he suffered, he did not threaten, but continued entrusting himself to him who judges justly. [24] **He** himself bore our sins in his body on the tree, that we might die to sin and live to righteousness. By his wounds you have been healed.

Revelation 19:2 contains a notable example of a subject relative clause: ὅτι ἀληθιναὶ καὶ δίκαιαι αἱ κρίσεις αὐτοῦ· ὅτι ἔκρινεν τὴν πόρνην τὴν μεγάλην ἥτις ἔφθειρεν τὴν γῆν ἐν τῇ

---

[68] NASB[77]: "For you have been called for this purpose, since Christ also suffered for you, leaving you an example for you to follow in **His** steps, [22] **who** committed no sin, nor was any deceit found in His mouth; [23] **and** while being reviled, **He** did not revile in return; while suffering, He uttered no threats, but kept entrusting *Himself* to Him who judges righteously; [24] **and He** Himself bore our sins in His body on the cross, that we might die to sin and live to righteousness; [by whose] wounds you were healed." Notice also the nonrestrictive oblique connective relative clause in verse 24: οὗ τῷ μώλωπι ἰάθητε.

πορνείᾳ αὐτῆς, καὶ ἐξεδίκησεν τὸ αἷμα τῶν δούλων αὐτοῦ ἐκ χειρὸς αὐτῆς.[69] NA[27] and most

English/Spanish translations seem to treat this relative clause as restrictive since no intervening

comma exists between the referent and relative clause. When one considers the context,

however, it is quite clear that this is a nonrestrictive proper relative clause that leans toward

modification; there is no other great harlot.

In Rev 17:1 the first mention of this prostitute occurs: Δεῦρο, δείξω σοι τὸ κρίμα τῆς

πόρνης τῆς μεγάλης τῆς καθημένης ἐπὶ ὑδάτων πολλῶν.[70] The complex substantive occurs

with a restrictive attributive participle that helps to identify her as the one who is seated on many

waters. The subsequent narrative describes this great prostitute, the many waters, her actions and

her judgment.

In chapter 17, the kings of the earth commit sexual immorality with her and are intoxicated

with her wine (17:2). She is referenced in 17:15 where the waters are described as multitudes of

a variety of peoples; furthermore, she has dominion over the kings of the earth (17:18).

In chapter 18 she is identified as Babylon, where she is again described as follows: "all

nations have drunk the wine of the passion of her sexual immorality, and the kings of the earth

have committed immorality with her, and the merchants of the earth have grown rich from the

power of her luxurious living" (Rev 18:3 ESV). Chapter 18 continues to describe her fall and the

kings of the earth mourning over her: "And the kings of the earth, who committed sexual

immorality and lived in luxury with her, will weep and wail over her when they see the smoke of

her burning" (Rev 18:9 ESV). God's judgment over her is announced, "Rejoice over her, O

heaven, and you saints and apostles and prophets, for God has given judgment for you against

---

[69] "for true and just are his judgments, for he has judged **the great prostitute, who was corrupting the earth with her immorality**, and [he] has avenged the blood of his servants against her hand."

[70] ESV: "Come, I will show you the judgment of **the great prostitute who is seated on many waters**."

193

her! (Rev 18:20 ESV)." Additionally, the corruption of the earth by the great prostitute, Babylon, is described again in 18:23, "all nations were deceived by your sorcery" (ESV).

So, when τὴν πόρνην τὴν μεγάλην is mentioned in 19:2, contextually speaking, this is a very specific entity and there would be no doubt of her identity in the hearer's mind. The proper relative clause (ἥτις ἔφθειρεν τὴν γῆν ἐν τῇ πορνείᾳ αὐτῆς) clearly modifies nonrestrictively, providing additional, non-limiting information about her; she was corrupting the earth with her immorality. By contrast, the modification of the great prostitute in 17:2 necessarily must be restrictive, since this is the first mention of her; therefore, the attributive participial clause (τῆς καθημένης ἐπὶ ὑδάτων πολλῶν) is utilized.

Subject relative clauses occur throughout the New Testament, among different authors and various genres. These constructions commonly relate nonrestrictively to their antecedents and do so at all points across the modification/coordination continuum of nonrestrictivity.

Nonrestrictive Relative Clauses—Direct Object. As was asserted in chapter 3, direct object relative clauses occur slightly more frequently than subject relative clauses[71] and more frequently than the other types. The Greek New Testament contains 369 occurrences representing 35% of all restrictive/nonrestrictive relative clauses. In each of these occurrences it can be readily discerned that the relative pronoun fills the role of direct object within the subordinate clause. Accusative relative pronouns make up the majority of relative pronouns utilized in these clauses. Genitive and dative relative pronouns also occur in direct object relative clauses due to attraction of the relative pronoun to the case of the antecedent[72] or due to the fact that certain verbs require the genitive or dative case for the direct object.

---

[71] See n. 25 above.

[72] See add. 5-A for more information on relative pronoun attraction.

194

Nonrestrictive direct object relative clauses are distributed evenly throughout the Greek

New Testament. They find representation in the Synoptic Gospels, John, Acts, Pauline Epistles

(all except Philippians) Hebrews, James, 1 & 2 Peter, 1–3 John, and Revelation. A representative

sample of examples that lean toward nonrestrictive modification and coordination will be

presented.

First, several examples will clearly demonstrate the nature of these relative clauses.

Second, a succinct list of examples will familiarize the reader with a wide variety of occurrences.

Finally, a few notable examples will be analyzed.

John 12:1 contains a direct object relative clause that refers to the specific entity Lazarus:

Ὁ οὖν Ἰησοῦς πρὸ ἓξ ἡμερῶν τοῦ πάσχα ἦλθεν εἰς Βηθανίαν, ὅπου ἦν Λάζαρος, ὃν ἤγειρεν ἐκ

νεκρῶν Ἰησοῦς.[73] The immediate context of the verse establishes that this is the Lazarus from

Bethany. The context of the preceding chapter, however, definitively establishes this fact:

John 11:1	Λάζαρος ἀπὸ Βηθανίας
John 11:2	ὁ ἀδελφὸς Λάζαρος
John 11:5	τὸν Λάζαρον
John 11:11	Λάζαρος ὁ φίλος ἡμῶν
John 11:14	Λάζαρος ἀπέθανεν
John 11:43	Λάζαρε, δεῦρο ἔξω

So, when John 12:1 mentions Bethany, where Lazarus was, the relative clause in no way could

be construed as limiting. Rather, it provides non-limiting parenthetical information, presenting

again the facts of John 11. This proper relative clause is therefore nonrestrictive and leans toward

the modification end of the continuum of nonrestrictivity.

Titus 3:5–6 contains an example of a direct object relative clause coupled with a very

specific referent: πνεύματος ἁγίου, οὗ ἐξέχεεν ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς πλουσίως διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ

---

[73] ESV "Six days before the Passover, Jesus therefore came to Bethany, where **Lazarus was, whom Jesus had raised from the dead.**" Boyer wrongly classifies this example as restrictive. Boyer, *Relative Clauses*, 13. See also John 12:9.

σωτῆρος ἡμῶν.[74] Clearly Paul does not limit the referent; more than one Holy Spirit does not

exist. The relative clause describes the source of the Holy Spirit (verse 4: τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν

θεοῦ) and the vehicle through which the Holy Spirit was poured out (verse 6: διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν). This proper nonrestrictive relative clause lies toward the middle of the

nonrestrictive modification/coordination continuum. Additionally, the relative pronoun would

usually be in the accusative but stands in the genitive here due to attraction to the antecedent.[75]

Consider the following additional examples of nonrestrictive direct object relative clauses:

Matt 23:35: τοῦ αἵματος Ζαχαρίου υἱοῦ Βαραχίου, ὃν ἐφονεύσατε μεταξὺ τοῦ ναοῦ καὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου.[76]
- provides additional information about the specific entity Zechariah the son of Barachiah
- proper RC: leans toward modification

Mark 2:26: τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως ἔφαγεν, οὓς οὐκ ἔξεστιν φαγεῖν εἰ μὴ τοὺς ἱερεῖς.[77]
- describes an aspect of the bread of the Presence
- proper RC: leans toward modification

Luke 2:30–31: τὸ σωτήριόν σου, ὃ ἡτοίμασας κατὰ πρόσωπον πάντων τῶν λαῶν.[78]
- describes God's salvation
- proper RC: leans toward modification

John 6:27: τὴν βρῶσιν τὴν μένουσαν εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, ἣν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὑμῖν δώσει.[79]

---

[74] ESV: "the Holy Spirit, whom he poured out on us richly through Jesus Christ our Savior." Boyer, *Relative Clauses*, 26, wrongly classifies this example as restrictive.

[75] See Robertson, *Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, 716. See add. 5-A for treatment of relative pronoun agreement.

[76] ESV: "the blood of Zechariah the son of Barachiah, whom you murdered between the sanctuary and the altar."

[77] "he ate the bread of the Presence, which it is not lawful to eat except for the priests." See also parallel verses: Matt 12:4, Luke 6:4.

[78] NIV: "your salvation, which you have prepared in the sight of all people."

[79] ESV: "the food that endures to eternal life, which the Son of Man will give to you." Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part III," 403, labels this example specifically as "the relative pronoun introducing a non-restrictive clause." Boyer, *Relative Clauses*, 12,.erroneously labels this relative clause as

- provides additional information about the food that endures to eternal life
- proper RC: coordination

John 17:11: ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ᾧ δέδωκάς μοι.[80]

- provides additional information about God's name/authority
- proper RC: leans toward modification

Acts 3:15: τὸν δὲ ἀρχηγὸν τῆς ζωῆς ἀπεκτείνατε ὃν ὁ θεὸς ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν, οὗ ἡμεῖς μάρτυρές ἐσμεν.[81]

- provides information about the author of life that is temporally subsequent to event in clause where antecedent is located
- continuative RC: coordination

Acts 11:29-30: εἰς διακονίαν πέμψαι τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ ἀδελφοῖς· ὃ καὶ ἐποίησαν ἀποστείλαντες πρὸς τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους διὰ χειρὸς Βαρναβᾶ καὶ Σαύλου.[82]

- provides additional information with reference to the act of sending relief (non-nominal antecedent)
- sentential RC: coordination[83]

Rom 3:24-25: διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ· ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἱλαστήριον....[84]

- provides additional information about Jesus Christ
- proper RC: leans toward coordination

1 Cor 6:19: τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν ναὸς τοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν ἁγίου πνεύματός ἐστιν οὗ ἔχετε ἀπὸ θεοῦ.[85]

- provides additional information about the source of the Holy Spirit within the believer
- proper RC: leans toward modification

---

restrictive.

[80] ESV: "in your name, which you have given me." See also John 17:12. Boyer, *Relative Clauses*, 13, erroneously labels this relative clause as restrictive. The relative pronoun is in the dative case due to attraction to antecedent. See Robertson, *Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, 716. See also add. 5-A.

[81] ESV: "and you killed the Author of life, whom God raised from the dead. To this we are witnesses." BDF label this a "Relative Connective." BDF, §458. Boyer, *Relative Clauses*, 14, erroneously labels this relative clause as restrictive. Notice the second relative clause is a sentential oblique relative clause.

[82] ESV: "to send relief to the brothers living in Judea. And they did so, sending it to the elders by the hand of Barnabas and Saul."

[83] With sentential antecedents BDAG, ὅς, 1gβ, asserts that the neuter is used "when the relative pronoun looks back upon a whole clause." See also add. 5-A.

[84] ESV: "through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God put forward as a propitiation."

[85] ESV: "our body is a temple of the Holy Spirit within you, whom you have from God."

Gal 2:10: μόνον τῶν πτωχῶν ἵνα μνημονεύωμεν, ὃ καὶ ἐσπούδασα αὐτὸ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι.[86]

- provides additional information with respect to the request to remember the poor (non-nominal antecedent)
- sentential RC: coordination[87]

Eph 6:21-22: Τύχικος ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἀδελφὸς καὶ πιστὸς διάκονος ἐν κυρίῳ, ὃν ἔπεμψα πρὸς ὑμᾶς.[88]

- provides additional information about Tychicus
- proper RC: leans toward coordination

Col 1:5: διὰ τὴν ἐλπίδα τὴν ἀποκειμένην ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ἣν προηκούσατε ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῆς ἀληθείας τοῦ εὐαγγελίου.[89]

- provides additional information about the hope laid up in the heavens
- proper RC: leans toward coordination.

1 Tim 6:14-15: μέχρι τῆς ἐπιφανείας τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἣν καιροῖς ἰδίοις δείξει.[90]

- describes the manifestation of Jesus Christ at his second coming
- proper RC: leans toward coordination

Phlm 1:10-13: Ὀνήσιμον, τόν ποτέ σοι ἄχρηστον νυνὶ δὲ [καὶ] σοὶ καὶ ἐμοὶ εὔχρηστον, ὃν ἀνέπεμψά σοι, Ὃν ἐγὼ ἐβουλόμην πρὸς ἐμαυτὸν κατέχειν.[91]

- Both relative clauses describe Onesimus in relation to Paul
- connective RCs: coordination

Heb 9:7: εἰς δὲ τὴν δευτέραν ἅπαξ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ μόνος ὁ ἀρχιερεύς, οὐ χωρὶς αἵματος ὃ προσφέρει ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τῶν τοῦ λαοῦ ἀγνοημάτων.[92]

---

[86] "only that we might remember the poor, which also I was eager to do this very thing."

[87] Robertson supports this assessment, "Once more, ὅ is used to refer to a verbal idea or to the whole sentence." Robertson, *Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, 714. See also Acts 11:29-30, above, as well as add. 5-A.

[88] "Tychicus the beloved brother and faithful servant in the Lord, whom I have sent to you." See also a similar example in Col 4:8.

[89] "because of the hope laid up for you in heaven, which you have heard before in the word of the truth of the gospel." Notice the antecedent is a noun phrase with a restrictive attributive participle of the ASAP formation pattern. Boyer, *Relative Clauses*, 24, mislabels this relative clause as restrictive.

[90] ESV: "until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ, which he will display at the proper time."

[91] "Onesimus, formerly he was useless to you, but now he is indeed useful to you and to me, whom I have sent to you . . ., whom I wished to keep with me."

[92] ESV: "but into the second only the high priest goes, and he but once a year, and not without taking blood, which he offers for himself and for the unintentional sins of the people."

- Describes what priest does with blood in the second tent
- proper RC: lies toward middle of modification/coordination continuum

Jas 1:12: τὸν στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς ὃν ἐπηγγείλατο τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν.[93]
- provides additional information about the crown of life
- proper RC: lies toward middle of modification/coordination continuum

1 Pet 5:8–9: ὁ ἀντίδικος ὑμῶν διάβολος· ᾧ ἀντίστητε.[94]
- Describes relationship one should have toward the devil/adversary
- connective RC: coordination

1 John 4:3: καὶ τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ τοῦ ἀντιχρίστου, ὃ ἀκηκόατε ὅτι ἔρχεται.[95]
- provides additional information about the spirit of the antichrist
- proper RC: leans toward coordination

Rev 2:6: μισεῖς τὰ ἔργα τῶν Νικολαϊτῶν ἃ κἀγὼ μισῶ.[96]
- provides parenthetic information about Christ's hatred of the works of the Nicolaitans
- proper RC: leans toward modification

Having surveyed a variety of examples of nonrestrictive direct object relative clauses, several notable examples will be presented and more thoroughly discussed.

Acts 3:20–21 contains two direct object relative clauses: καὶ ἀποστείλῃ τὸν προκεχειρισμένον ὑμῖν χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, ὃν δεῖ οὐρανὸν μὲν δέξασθαι ἄχρι χρόνων ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων ὧν ἐλάλησεν ὁ θεὸς διὰ στόματος τῶν ἁγίων ἀπ᾽ αἰῶνος αὐτοῦ προφητῶν.[97] The first relative clause goes beyond modification to coordination and moves the thought process forward. The referent is definitely the specific entity of Jesus Christ; so, clearly there is no possibility of a limiting relationship between the clause and referent. Furthermore, the

---

[93] ESV: "the crown of life, which God has promised to those who love him."

[94] "Your adversary the devil . . ., whom you must resist." The relative pronoun is in the dative case due the fact that ἀνθίστημι takes the direct object in the dative.

[95] ESV: "This is the spirit of the antichrist, which you heard was coming." Boyer, Relative Clauses, 29, incorrectly classifies this example as restrictive.

[96] ESV: "you hate the works of the Nicolaitans, which I also hate."

[97] "and that he may send the Christ appointed for you, Jesus, whom heaven must receive until the time of the restoration of everything, which God spoke of through the mouth of his holy prophets long ago."

information provided leads into the explanation of the time of the restoration of everything at

Jesus' second coming. So, this first relative clause is a connective nonrestrictive relative clause.

The second relative clause provides non-limiting information about the time of the restoration of

everything. This additional information partly modifies the referent yet also moves the argument

forward in a coordinate manner. Therefore, it is a proper nonrestrictive relative clause that lies

toward the middle of the modification/coordination continuum of nonrestrictivity. Additionally,

the relative pronoun would usually be in the accusative but stands in the genitive here due to

attraction to the antecedent.[98] So, Acts 3:20–21 contains two nonrestrictive direct object relative

clauses, a connective relative and a proper relative.

First Corinthians 15:1 contains two direct object relative clauses: Γνωρίζω δὲ ὑμῖν,

ἀδελφοί, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν, ὃ καὶ παρελάβετε.[99] The first relative clause, ὃ

εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν, restricts its referent, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.[100] This complex and very specific

entity, "the gospel that I preached to you," stands as the referent for the subsequent relative

clause.[101] The direct object relative clause ὃ καὶ παρελάβετε contains additional information

about the antecedent that is temporally subsequent to the event of the preceding clause; therefore

it is labeled a continuative nonrestrictive relative. The progression of events is that Paul preached

the gospel to the Corinthians, who then received it. So, the first direct object relative clause

limits the referent to establish a very specific complex substantive and is thus restrictive. The

---

[98] See Robertson, *Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, 716 and add. 5-A.

[99] NASB[95]: "Now I make known to you, brethren, the gospel which I preached to you, which also you received."

[100] Note that in order for this referent to be modified by a restrictive attributive participle, the participle would have to be in the passive. Additionally it would have to be coupled with the indirect object ὑμῖν and an expression of agency such as ὑπ᾽ ἐμοῦ. While one could argue the grammatical possibility of such a structure, it would be stylistically awkward. See n. 29 on p. 234 of ch. 6.

[101] Note that two additional relative clauses follow and will be treated in a section below that treats oblique nonrestrictive relative clauses. See p. 203.

continuative nonrestrictive relative clause following moves the argument forward temporally, providing additional information about the gospel that Paul preached to the Corinthians. This example is particularly informative in that it shows two direct object relative clauses within close proximity. It has already been demonstrated in chapter 3,[102] that restrictive direct object relative clauses exist and here, in chapter 5, that nonrestrictive direct object relative clauses exist. Note that in this example, context alone determines the restrictive and nonrestrictive nature of these two direct object relative clauses.

Direct object relative clauses occur throughout the New Testament, among different authors and various genres. These constructions are capable of relating nonrestrictively to their antecedents and do so at all points across the modification/coordination continuum of nonrestrictivity.

Nonrestrictive Relative Clauses—Indirect Object. Indirect object relative clauses occur less frequently than any other type of subordinate relative clause. The Greek New Testament contains only 11 occurrences representing 1% of all restrictive/nonrestrictive relative clauses. In each of these occurrences it can be readily discerned that the relative pronoun fills the role of indirect object within the subordinate clause. Dative relative pronouns make up the majority of relative pronouns utilized in these clauses.[103]

Only eight *nonrestrictive* indirect object relative clauses exist in the Greek New Testament; they are found in Acts, Romans, Colossians, Hebrews and 1 Peter. Consider Colossians 1:26–27 as a representative example:

---

[102] See pp. 134 and 142 of ch. 3.

[103] The nonrestrictive indirect object relative clause in Acts 26:17 utilizes a preposition with the accusative to indicate the indirect object: ἐκ τῶν ἐθνῶν εἰς οὓς ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω σε (NASB[95]: "from the Gentiles, to whom I am sending you").

Col 1:26–27: νῦν δὲ ἐφανερώθη τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ, οἷς ἠθέλησεν ὁ θεὸς γνωρίσαι τί τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.[104]

- Provides additional information about God's saints
- connective RC: coordination

Nonrestrictive Relative Clauses—Oblique. As was asserted in chapter 3, oblique relative clauses occur slightly less frequently than subject and direct object relative clauses but more frequently than indirect object and possessor relative clauses. The Greek New Testament contains 253 occurrences representing 24% of all restrictive/nonrestrictive relative clauses. In each of these occurrences it can be readily discerned that the relative pronoun fills the role of an oblique within the subordinate clause. Genitive, dative and accusative relative pronouns are utilized in these clauses. The oblique category contains a variety of roles which are not covered in the direct object, indirect object, and possessor categories. Roles such as locative, instrument, means, source, etc... describe this category. Oblique relative clauses often utilize prepositions with the pronoun in the subordinate clause (e.g. εἰς, ἐν, διὰ, ἐπὶ, ἀπὸ, περὶ, πρὸς, μετὰ, χωρὶς, κατὰ, ὑπέρ, ἐκ, παρὰ).

Nonrestrictive oblique relative clauses are distributed fairly evenly throughout the Greek New Testament. They find representation in the Synoptic Gospels, John, Acts, Pauline Epistles (all except 1 Thessalonians and Philemon) Hebrews, James, 1 & 2 Peter, Jude, and Revelation. A representative sample of examples that lean toward nonrestrictive modification and coordination will be presented.

First, several examples will clearly demonstrate the nature of these relative clauses. Second, a succinct list of examples will familiarize the reader with a variety of occurrences. Finally, a few notable examples will be analyzed.

---

[104] NASB[95]: "but has now been manifested **to His saints, to whom God willed to make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles.**"

Mark 16:9 contains an oblique relative clause modifying a very specific entity: **Μαρίᾳ τῇ Μαγδαληνῇ, παρ' ἧς ἐκβεβλήκει ἑπτὰ δαιμόνια.**[105] The proper relative clause provides additional information about Mary Magdalene. The context naturally dictates this relative clause to be nonrestrictive as the narrator clearly does not distinguish between two different women named Mary Magdalene. On the continuum of nonrestrictivity, this proper oblique relative clause leans toward modification.

First Corinthians 15:1–2 contains two examples of oblique relative clauses: **Γνωρίζω δὲ ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν, ὃ καὶ παρελάβετε, ἐν ᾧ καὶ ἑστήκατε, δι' οὗ καὶ σῴζεσθε.**[106] This complex and very specific entity, "**τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν**/the gospel that I preached to you," stands as the referent for the subsequent relative clauses. The direct object relative clause, **ὃ καὶ παρελάβετε**, leans strongly toward coordination and was discussed above. The next two oblique relative clauses (**ἐν ᾧ καὶ ἑστήκατε**[107] and **δι' οὗ καὶ σῴζεσθε**) function similarly by providing additional information that is subsequent to the event in the immediately preceding relative clause; therefore, they are continuative. The progression of events is that Paul preached the gospel to the Corinthians, who then received it and as a result now stand in that Gospel and are saved by it. So, the first direct object relative clause limits the referent to establish a very specific complex substantive. The following continuative direct object relative clause and the following two continuative oblique relative clauses move the argument forward temporally, providing additional information about the gospel that Paul preached to the Corinthians. As continuative clauses, they naturally lean toward coordination.

---

[105] ESV: "**Mary Magdalene, from whom he had cast out seven demons.**" See parallel example at Luke 8:2.

[106] NASB[95]: "Now I make known to you, brethren, **the gospel which I preached to you**, which also you received, **in which also you stand, by which also you are saved**." See the treatment of this verse with respect to direct object relative clauses on p. 201 above. The first relative clause, **ὃ εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν**, restricts its referent, **τὸ εὐαγγέλιον**.

[107] Boyer incorrectly classifies this example as restrictive. Boyer, *Relative Clauses*, 21.

Consider the following additional examples of nonrestrictive oblique relative clauses:

Matt 1:16: Ἰακὼβ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰωσὴφ τὸν ἄνδρα Μαρίας, ἐξ ἧς ἐγεννήθη Ἰησοῦς.[108]
- describes Mary, the wife of Joseph, as also the one who gave birth to Jesus
- proper RC: modification

Luke 1:78: διὰ σπλάγχνα ἐλέους θεοῦ ἡμῶν, ἐν οἷς ἐπισκέψεται ἡμᾶς ἀνατολὴ ἐξ ὕψους, ἐπιφᾶναι τοῖς ἐν σκότει καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου καθημένοις, τοῦ κατευθῦναι τοὺς πόδας ἡμῶν εἰς ὁδὸν εἰρήνης.[109]
- provides additional information about God's mercy and loosens connection with previous clause
- connective RC: coordination

John 5:45: ἔστιν ὁ κατηγορῶν ὑμῶν Μωϋσῆς, εἰς ὃν ὑμεῖς ἠλπίκατε.[110]
- describes hearer's relationship to Moses
- proper RC: lies toward modification

Acts 3:15" τὸν δὲ ἀρχηγὸν τῆς ζωῆς ἀπεκτείνατε ὃν ὁ θεὸς ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν, οὗ ἡμεῖς μάρτυρές ἐσμεν.[111]
- describes Peter (and others) as witness of Jesus' murder and resurrection
- sentential RC: coordination[112]

Acts 13:22: καὶ μεταστήσας αὐτὸν ἤγειρεν τὸν Δαυὶδ αὐτοῖς εἰς βασιλέα ᾧ καὶ εἶπεν μαρτυρήσας· εὗρον Δαυὶδ τὸν τοῦ Ἰεσσαί, ἄνδρα κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου.[113]
- describes King David

---

[108] ESV: "And Jacob begot Joseph the husband of **Mary, of whom was born Jesus.**"

[109] ESV: "because of **the tender mercy of our God, by which the rising sun will come to us from heaven to shine on those living in darkness and in the shadow of death,** to guide our feet into the path of peace." Zerwick identifies this as the instrumental use of the dative. See Zerwick, *Grammatical Analysis*, 175, and Maximilian Zerwick and Joseph Smith. *Biblical Greek: Illustrated by Examples* (Rome: Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici, 1963), 40.

[110] ESV: "There is one who accuses you: **Moses, on whom you have set your hope.**"

[111] "**and you killed the Author of Life, whom God raised from the dead, of which we are witnesses.**" Note that the antecedent consists of the entire clause: "and you killed the Author of Life, whom God raised from the dead." Note that this sentential antecedent contains a nonrestrictive direct object relative clause (ὃν ὁ θεὸς ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν). See p. 198 for an analysis of this nonrestrictive direct object continuative relative clause.

[112] BDAG confirms the sentential assessment of this relative clause and cites this verse stating, "The neut[er] is used...when the relative pron[oun] looks back upon a whole clause..." BDAG, ὅς, 1gβ. BDF confirm our assessment and label this relative clause as a "relative connective." BDF, §458. Boyer, *Relative Clauses*, 14, incorrectly classifies this as a restrictive relative clause.

[113] ESV: "After He had removed him, He raised up **David** to be their king, **concerning whom He also testified and said, 'I HAVE FOUND DAVID the son of Jesse, A MAN AFTER MY HEART.**" The dative relative pronoun, ᾧ, seems to be functioning as a dative of respect/reference.

- proper RC: lies toward coordination.

Acts 26:26: ἐπίσταται γὰρ περὶ τούτων ὁ βασιλεὺς πρὸς ὃν καὶ παρρησιαζόμενος λαλῶ.[114]
- describes relationship to the king
- proper RC: lies toward coordination

Rom 5:1–2: διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δι᾽ οὗ καὶ τὴν προσαγωγὴν ἐσχήκαμεν [τῇ πίστει] εἰς τὴν χάριν ταύτην....[115]
- Provides additional information about Jesus Christ and relation to believer, loosens connection with previous clause
- connective RC: coordination

Eph 5:18: καὶ μὴ μεθύσκεσθε οἴνῳ, ἐν ᾧ ἐστιν ἀσωτία.[116]
- describes being drunk with wine as an action in which debauchery may be found
- sentential RC: coordination

Phil 3:20: ἡμῶν γὰρ τὸ πολίτευμα ἐν οὐρανοῖς ὑπάρχει, ἐξ οὗ καὶ σωτῆρα ἀπεκδεχόμεθα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν.[117]
- Provides additional information about heaven and loosens connection to preceding clause
- connective RC: coordination

Col 1:28–29: ἵνα παραστήσωμεν πάντα ἄνθρωπον τέλειον ἐν Χριστῷ· εἰς ὃ καὶ κοπιῶ ἀγωνιζόμενος κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ.[118]
- provides additional information about presenting everyone mature in Christ; it is the reason for Paul's work
- sentential RC: coordination

Col 3:5–7: πορνείαν ἀκαθαρσίαν πάθος ἐπιθυμίαν κακήν, καὶ τὴν πλεονεξίαν . . ., δι᾽ ἃ ἔρχεται ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ . . . ἐν οἷς καὶ ὑμεῖς περιεπατήσατέ ποτε.[119]

---

[114] "for the king knows about these things, with whom also I speak boldly."

[115] NASB[95]: "through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom also we have obtained our introduction by faith into this grace."

[116] NKJV: "And do not be drunk with wine, in which is dissipation."

[117] NASB[95]: "For our citizenship is in heaven, from which also we eagerly wait for a Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ...."

[118] ESV: "...that we may present everyone mature in Christ. For this I toil, struggling with all his energy." Robertson observes, "ὅ is used to refer to a verbal idea or to the whole sentence." Robertson, *Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, 714. See also add. 5-A.

[119] ESV: "sexual immorality, impurity, passion, evil desire, and covetousness .... On account of these the wrath of God is coming .... In these you too once walked."

- both relative clauses loosen connection to previous clause providing additional information about the list of evils
- connective RCs: coordination

Col 4:10: καὶ Μᾶρκος ὁ ἀνεψιὸς Βαρναβᾶ (περὶ οὗ ἐλάβετε ἐντολάς)[120]
- provides parenthetical information about Mark the cousin of Barnabas
- proper RC: lies toward modification

2 Thess 1:5: εἰς τὸ καταξιωθῆναι ὑμᾶς τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ, ὑπὲρ ἧς καὶ πάσχετε[121]
- describes Thessalonians as suffering for the kingdom of God
- proper RC: lies toward modification

Heb 11:4: Πίστει πλείονα θυσίαν Ἅβελ παρὰ Κάϊν προσήνεγκεν τῷ θεῷ, δι᾽ ἧς ἐμαρτυρήθη εἶναι δίκαιος.[122]
- provides additional information about Abel's more acceptable sacrifice
- proper RC: lies toward coordination

Jas 1:17: καταβαῖνον ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν φώτων, παρ᾽ ᾧ οὐκ ἔνι παραλλαγὴ ἢ τροπῆς ἀποσκίασμα.[123]
- describes the Father of lights
- proper RC: lies toward modification

1 Pet 2:8: προσκόπτουσιν τῷ λόγῳ ἀπειθοῦντες εἰς ὃ καὶ ἐτέθησαν.[124]
- refers to complete clause, describing the unbelievers as being appointed to stumbling and disobedience to the word
- sentential RC: coordination

Rev 17:1–2: δείξω σοι τὸ κρίμα τῆς πόρνης τῆς μεγάλης τῆς καθημένης ἐπὶ ὑδάτων πολλῶν, μεθ᾽ ἧς ἐπόρνευσαν οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς.[125]

---

[120] ESV: "and **Mark the cousin of Barnabas (concerning whom you have received instructions)**." Boyer, *Relative Clauses*, 25, wrongly labels this as a restrictive relative clause.

[121] ESV: "that you may be considered worthy of **the kingdom of God, for which you are also suffering**."

[122] ESV: "By faith Abel offered to God **a more acceptable sacrifice** than Cain, **through which he was commended as righteous**."

[123] NASB[95]: "coming down from **the Father of lights, with whom there is no variation or shifting shadow**."

[124] NKJV: "**They stumble, being disobedient to the word, to which they also were appointed**." "Once more, ὅ is used to refer to a verbal idea or to the whole sentence." Robertson, *Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, 714. See also add. 5-A.

[125] ESV: "I will show you the judgment of **the great prostitute who is seated on many waters, with whom the kings of the earth have committed sexual immorality**." Boyer wrongly labels this as a restrictive relative clause. Boyer, *Relative Clauses*, 31.

206

- provides additional information about the great prostitute who is seated on many waters
- proper RC: stands toward middle of the modification/coordination continuum

Having surveyed a variety of examples of nonrestrictive oblique relative clauses, several notable examples will be presented and more thoroughly discussed.

Luke 11:22 contains a proper relative clause: ὅταν ὁ ἰσχυρὸς καθωπλισμένος φυλάσσῃ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ αὐλήν, ἐν εἰρήνῃ ἐστὶν τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ· ἐπὰν δὲ ἰσχυρότερος αὐτοῦ ἐπελθὼν νικήσῃ αὐτόν, **τὴν πανοπλίαν αὐτοῦ** αἴρει ἐφ' ᾗ ἐπεποίθει καὶ τὰ σκῦλα αὐτοῦ διαδίδωσιν.[126] The relative clause ἐφ' ᾗ ἐπεποίθει provides additional information about the specific entity τὴν πανοπλίαν αὐτοῦ. Jesus does not limit the referent with the usage of the relative clause; he does not seek to contrast "the strong man's armor that he trusted in" over and against, for example, "his armor that he did not trust in." The relative clause relates nonrestrictively to its referent. Most English and Spanish translations, however, incorrectly translate this relative clause restrictively:[127]

ESV/NRSV/RSV/NKJV	his armor in which he trusted
NASB[95]	his armor on which he relied
NVI/R95/RVG	las armas en que confiaba
R60/RVA	sus armas en que confiaba

Hebrews 12:14 contains a proper relative clause: Εἰρήνην διώκετε μετὰ πάντων καὶ **τὸν ἁγιασμόν, οὗ χωρὶς οὐδεὶς ὄψεται τὸν κύριον.**[128] First, notice that the preposition χωρὶς is post-positive.[129] The relative clause headed by οὗ provides additional information about the referent τὸν ἁγιασμόν. The author of Hebrews clearly does not distinguish between a "holiness that

---

[126] "When a strong man, fully armed, guards his own palace, his goods are in peace; but when a stronger man than he attacks him, he takes away **his armor, in which he had trusted**, and he divides his spoils."

[127] Boyer, *Relative Clauses*, 9, agrees with our assessment of this verse and labels it as a nonrestrictive relative clause that is descriptive in nature.

[128] KJV: "Pursue peace with all *people*, **and holiness, without which no one will see the Lord.**"

[129] Robertson, *Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, 648. BDAG, χωρίς, 2. BDF, §216.

enables one to see the Lord" and "a holiness that does not enable one to see the Lord." The author of Hebrews provides additional descriptive information about the nature of holiness/sanctification. This relative clause seems to lie in the middle of the modification/coordination continuum of nonrestrictivity. One who has holiness/sanctification will see the Lord. An assessment of English and Spanish translations reveals a noteworthy incongruity. Most English translations incorrectly translate this noun-phrase restrictively while most Spanish translations correctly render it nonrestrictively.

<u>Restrictive English Translations</u>:
the holiness without which . . .   ESV/NRSV/RSV/NJB
the sanctification without which . . .   NASB^{95}/NASB^{77}/ASV

<u>Nonrestrictive Spanish Translations</u>:
la santidad, sin la cual . . .   LBA/NBH/NVI/R60/R95/RVG/SRV
la santificación, sin la cual . . .   CAB

Oblique relative clauses occur throughout the New Testament, among different authors and various genres. These constructions often relate nonrestrictively to their antecedents and do so at all points across the modification/coordination continuum of nonrestrictivity.

Nonrestrictive Relative Clauses—Possessor. As was asserted in chapter 3, possessor relative clauses occur slightly more frequently than indirect object relative clauses and less frequently than the other types of subordinate relative clauses. The Greek New Testament contains 43 occurrences representing 4% of all restrictive/nonrestrictive relative clauses. In each of these occurrences it can be readily discerned that the relative pronoun fills the role of possessor within the subordinate clause. Only genitive relative pronouns are utilized in these clauses.

Nonrestrictive possessor relative clauses are distributed somewhat evenly throughout the Greek New Testament. They find representation in the Synoptic Gospels, John, Acts, Pauline

Epistles (Romans, 2 Corinthians, Ephesians, Philippians, 2 Thessalonians), Hebrews, 1 Peter,

and Revelation. Consider the following representative examples:

> Matt 3:11–12: Ἐγὼ μὲν ὑμᾶς βαπτίζω ἐν ὕδατι εἰς μετάνοιαν, ὁ δὲ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος ἰσχυρότερός μού ἐστιν, οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς τὰ ὑποδήματα βαστάσαι· αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί· οὗ τὸ πτύον ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ[130] καὶ διακαθαριεῖ τὴν ἅλωνα αὐτοῦ καὶ συνάξει τὸν σῖτον αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν ἀποθήκην, τὸ δὲ ἄχυρον κατακαύσει πυρὶ ἀσβέστῳ.[131]

- 1ˢᵗ RC describes the mightier nature of the one coming after John the Baptizer; 2ⁿᵈ RC refers to personal pronoun αὐτός (which refers to referent of first RC) and describes what he has in his hand
- 1ˢᵗ RC: proper RC: modification
- 2ⁿᵈ RC: connective RC: coordination

> John 6:42: καὶ ἔλεγον· οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς ὁ υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ, οὗ ἡμεῖς οἴδαμεν τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα;[132]

- Provides additional information about the speakers relation to Jesus son of Joseph
- proper RC: lies toward modification

> Phil 4:3: αὐταῖς...μετὰ καὶ Κλήμεντος καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν συνεργῶν μου, ὧν τὰ ὀνόματα ἐν βίβλῳ ζωῆς.[133]

- Provides additional information about Paul's coworkers
- proper RC: modification

> Heb 12:25–26: τὸν ἀπ' οὐρανῶν . . ., οὗ ἡ φωνὴ τὴν γῆν ἐσάλευσεν τότε, νῦν δὲ ἐπήγγελται λέγων· ἔτι ἅπαξ ἐγὼ σείσω οὐ μόνον τὴν γῆν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν οὐρανόν.[134]

- describes the One from heaven's voice and moves argument forward
- connective RC: coordination

---

[130] Note the pleonastic use of the personal pronoun, which "above all is suggested by Semitic languages." BDAG, ὅς, 1cα.

[131] KJV: "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance: but **he that cometh after me** is mightier than I, **whose shoes I am not worthy to bear**: he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and *with* fire: [12] **Whose fan *is* in his hand**, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire."

[132] "Isn't this one **Jesus the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know**?" Boyer, *Relative Clauses*, 12, wrongly labels this as a restrictive relative clause.

[133] ESV: "these women . . . **with Clement and the rest of my fellow workers, whose names are in the book of life**."

[134] "the One from heaven . . ., **whose voice shook the earth then**, but now he has promised saying, 'Yet once more I will shake not only the earth but also the heavens.'"

1 Pet 2:24: ὃς τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν **αὐτὸς** ἀνήνεγκεν ἐν τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον, ἵνα ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἀπογενόμενοι τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ ζήσωμεν, οὗ τῷ μώλωπι ἰάθητε.[135]

- describes the wounds of Christ as means by which recipients of the letter were healed
- connective RC: coordination.[136]

Summary of the Nonrestrictive Relative Clause in the Greek New Testament

A presentation of nonrestrictive relative clauses in the Greek New Testament has demonstrated the reality and existence of these constructions among all the authors of the New Testament. Nonrestrictive relative clauses find representation primarily in the post-nominal noun-phrase formation pattern and exist in all of the five types of subordinate relative clauses: subject, direct object, indirect object, oblique and possessor. These nonrestrictive clauses are both proper and connective (including continuative and sentential) and exist across the modification/coordination continuum of nonrestrictivity.

The Nonrestrictive Attributive Participle in the Greek New Testament

A general survey of nonrestrictive clauses has confirmed the existence of nonrestrictive attributive participles in English, Spanish and Koine Greek.[137] As was discussed in chapter 3, the attributive participle in the Greek New Testament participates in four major noun-phrase formation patterns (and one less frequently occurring pattern).[138]

---

[135] NKJV: "**who Himself** bore our sins in His own body on the tree, that we, having died to sins, might live for righteousness-- **by whose stripes you were healed**." "who himself/ὃς . . . αὐτὸς" ultimately refers back to Χριστὸς in 1 Pet 2:21.

[136] Notice the progression of connective relative clauses from 1 Pet 2:21–24, all referring back to Christ and all moving the argument forward and loosening the connection with the previous clause.

[137] See ch. 4 (p. 162, n. 96). It was noted there that Voelz describes many of these nonrestrictive attributive participles in Koine Greek as "attributive position participles . . . that seem to be a restriction, not on what they modify directly but upon all other alternative possibilities." Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part III," 403. This will be treated more thoroughly in ch. 6.

[138] See section titled "Noun Phrase Formation Patterns Containing An Attributive Participle" on pp. 102 ff. of ch. 3.

Noun Phrase Formation Patterns Containing an Attributive Participle

Four major noun phrase formation patterns containing an attributive participle can be

discerned in the Greek New Testament:[139]

1. Article + Substantive + Article + Participle (ASAP)

2. Substantive + Participle (SP)

3. Article + Participle + Substantive (APS)

4. Substantive + Article + Participle (SAP)

A fifth less frequently occurring formation pattern also exists:

5. Participle + Substantive (PS)

An assessment of each of these formation patterns is presented below.[140]

Article + Substantive + Article + Participle (ASAP). As was asserted in chapter 3, the

ASAP formation pattern occurs more frequently in the Greek New Testament than any other

formation pattern. The Greek New Testament contains 296 occurrences representing 37% of all

attributive participles in the Greek New Testament.

Nonrestrictive attributive participles of the ASAP pattern are distributed sparsely

throughout the Greek New Testament. They find representation in Matthew, Luke, Acts,

Romans, 1 & 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Colossians, 1 & 2 Thessalonians, 1 Timothy,

---

[139] Young treats noun phrase formation patterns containing attributive participles and states, "The restrictive adjectival participle occurs in three basic forms." He describes them as follows: *article-participle-noun; article-noun-article-participle* (which he claims is "the most common position for adjectival participles); and *noun-participle.* He neglects to mention the SAP category but the three he does cite (which correspond to APS, ASAP, and SP) do represent a large number of attributive participles. Young, *New Testament Greek,* 151.

Wallace highlights four different noun phrase formation patterns containing attributive participles that correspond to the designations set forth here: *first attributive position* (APS), *second attributive position* (ASAP, which he claims is "the most common construction for attributive participles"), *third attributive position* (SAP, he states this is "a frequent construction with participles, but not with adjectives") and *fourth attributive position* (SP). Wallace, *Greek Grammar,* 618.

[140] The data put forth for each noun phrase formation pattern has been determined from the comprehensive list of verses located in app. 1.

James, 1 Peter, and Revelation. A few examples will be presented in order to familiarize the

reader with the reality of this formation pattern.

Consider Matt 9:8: καὶ ἐδόξασαν τὸν θεὸν τὸν δόντα ἐξουσίαν τοιαύτην τοῖς

ἀνθρώποις.[141] This verse occurs in the context of Jesus healing a paralytic in Jesus' own town

(τὴν ἰδίαν πόλιν).[142] Because of this, the crowd present would be comprised of predominantly

monotheistic Jews. As a result, it appears that the crowd who observed Jesus' healing and

glorified τὸν θεὸν were referencing "God" in the "Israelite/Christian monotheistic

perspective."[143] The attributive participle then provides additional information about God;

therefore, it is considered to be nonrestrictive.[144] Notice that NA^{27} does not place a comma after

τὸν θεὸν. Most English and Spanish translations, however, do render this verse nonrestrictively.

Consider the following additional examples of what appear to be nonrestrictive attributive

participles of the ASAP formation pattern:[145]

Col 2:12: συνταφέντες αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ βαπτισμῷ, ἐν ᾧ καὶ συνηγέρθητε διὰ τῆς πίστεως
τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν.[146]
- provides additional parenthetic information about God
- leans toward modification

1 Pet 5:10: Ὁ δὲ θεὸς πάσης χάριτος, ὁ καλέσας ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον αὐτοῦ
δόξαν ἐν Χριστῷ [Ἰησοῦ], ὀλίγον παθόντας αὐτὸς καταρτίσει, στηρίξει, σθενώσει,
θεμελιώσει.[147]

---

[141] ESV: "and they glorified **God, who had given such authority to men.**"

[142] See Matt 9:1.

[143] See BDAG, s.v. θεός, 3.

[144] It could be possible that the crowd is referencing θεός as "any transcendent being who exercises extraordinary control in human affairs or is responsible for bestowal of unusual benefits." See BDAG, s.v. θεός, 1. This understanding would then make the attributive participle restrictive. It does not appear, however, that the intent of the crowd is to single out one god of many, but rather they seem to be describing a specific entity, God, from their monotheistic perspective.

[145] Note that all four examples presented in this section occur with ὁ θεός as the antecedent. It appears that a significant number of nonrestrictive attributive participles occur with divine names. See ch. 6 for further discussion.

[146] ESV: "having been buried with him in baptism, in which you were also raised with him through faith in the powerful working of **God, who raised him from the dead.**"

212

- provides additional information about the God of all grace and his call to the recipients of the epistle
- leans toward modification

Heb 13:20: Ὁ δὲ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης, ὁ ἀναγαγὼν ἐκ νεκρῶν τὸν ποιμένα τῶν προβάτων τὸν μέγαν ἐν αἵματι διαθήκης αἰωνίου....[148]
- provides additional information about the God of peace, describing his resurrection of Jesus
- leans toward modification

Substantive + Participle (SP). As was asserted in chapter 3, the SP formation pattern occurs more frequently in the Greek New Testament than the APS and SAP formation patterns and slightly less frequently than the ASAP pattern. The Greek New Testament contains 244 occurrences representing 31% of all attributive participles in the Greek New Testament.

Nonrestrictive attributive participles of the SP pattern are extremely rare in the Greek New Testament. A very small number of possible examples exist in Acts, 2 Timothy and 1 Peter.[149] Consider, for example, the attributive participle in Acts 21:8: τῇ δὲ ἐπαύριον ἐξελθόντες ἤλθομεν εἰς Καισάρειαν καὶ εἰσελθόντες εἰς τὸν οἶκον **Φιλίππου τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ, ὄντος ἐκ τῶν ἑπτά,** ἐμείναμεν παρ' αὐτῷ.[150] If the participle is taken to be functioning attributively, it modifies a very specific entity, Φιλίππου τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ. The narrator/author, Luke, clearly does not differentiate between two (or more) men designated Φιλίππου τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ. Rather, he provides additional parenthetic information about Philip, namely that he is one of the seven described in Act 6:3. Thus, the participle functions nonrestrictively.

---

[147] ESV: "And **the God of all grace, who called you to his eternal glory in Christ,** after you have suffered a little while, will himself restore you and make you strong, firm and steadfast."

[148] NASB[95]: "Now **the God of peace, who brought up from the dead the great Shepherd of the sheep through the blood of the eternal covenant.**"

[149] See Acts 15:17, Acts 21:8, two occurrences in 2 Tim 1:10, and 1 Pet 1:12. Note the variant "ὁ" for Acts 15:17, which could make this an example of the SAP formation pattern (See NA[27]).

[150] ESV: "On the next day we departed and came to Caesarea, and we entered the house of **Philip the evangelist, who was one of the seven,** and stayed with him."

Article + Participle + Substantive (APS). The APS formation pattern occurs less frequently in the Greek New Testament than the ASAP and SP formation patterns. The Greek New Testament, however, does contain 108 occurrences representing 14% of all attributive participles in the Greek New Testament.

Nonrestrictive attributive participles of the APS pattern are extremely rare in the Greek New Testament. Two possible examples occur in Romans and 3 John. Consider Rom 8:11: εἰ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἐγείραντος τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐκ νεκρῶν οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν, ὁ ἐγείρας Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῳοποιήσει καὶ τὰ θνητὰ σώματα ὑμῶν διὰ **τοῦ ἐνοικοῦντος αὐτοῦ πνεύματος ἐν ὑμῖν**. It is possible to consider this attributive participle to be functioning nonrestrictively as the NIV translates: "And if the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead is living in you, he who raised Christ from the dead will also give life to your mortal bodies through **his Spirit,**[151] **who lives in you**." This interpretation would takes τοῦ . . . αὐτοῦ πνεύματος as a very specific entity with the attributive participle merely providing additional information about the referent.[152]

Consider also 3 John 9: Ἔγραψά τι τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ· ἀλλ' **ὁ φιλοπρωτεύων αὐτῶν Διοτρέφης** οὐκ ἐπιδέχεται ἡμᾶς. It is possible to consider the participle to be an attributive participle functioning nonrestrictively as the ESV translates: "I have written something to the church, but **Diotrephes, who likes to put himself first**, does not acknowledge our authority." The ESV renders the attributive participle as providing additional non-limiting information about a very specific entity.[153]

---

[151] The antecedent could also be rendered "the same Spirit."

[152] Though instances are very rare, it may also be possible to consider this participle to be exhibiting partitive restrictive modification (see add. 2-A) as the NRSV may be rendering it: "his Spirit that dwells in you." The participle would be splitting up the unique referent into different aspects of the Spirit, focusing upon the role of the Spirit living within the recipient of the epistle in contrast to, perhaps, the role of the Spirit living in others. Context seems to suggest, however, that a nonrestrictive reading is preferred.

[153] It is also possible to consider ὁ φιλοπρωτεύων αὐτῶν as a substantival participle with Διοτρέφης standing in nonrestrictive apposition to it. The MIT renders this understanding in the following translation: "I wrote something

Substantive + Article + Participle (SAP). The SAP formation pattern occurs less frequently in the Greek New Testament than the ASAP and SP formation patterns and slightly more frequently than the APS formation pattern. The Greek New Testament contains 122 occurrences representing 15% of all attributive participles in the Greek New Testament.

Nonrestrictive attributive participles of the SAP pattern are distributed sparsely throughout the Greek New Testament. They find representation in Matthew, Luke, John, Acts, Romans, 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Colossians, 1 Thessalonians, 1 & 2 Timothy, Hebrews, and 1 Peter. A few examples will be presented in order to familiarize the reader with the reality of this formation pattern.

Consider 2 Cor 1:21–22: ὁ δὲ βεβαιῶν ἡμᾶς σὺν ὑμῖν εἰς Χριστὸν καὶ χρίσας ἡμᾶς θεός, ὁ καὶ σφραγισάμενος ἡμᾶς καὶ δοὺς τὸν ἀρραβῶνα τοῦ πνεύματος ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν.[154] Like the ASAP example in Matt 9:8 above, due to context, it is quite evident that the author's usage of θεός refers specifically to "God" in the "Israelite/Christian monotheistic perspective."[155] This can be surmised in two ways. First, from the broader context, this is a letter from the apostle Paul to the Corinthian church; both have the same understanding of "God." This is established from the outset of the letter in 2 Cor 1:1: Παῦλος ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ καὶ Τιμόθεος ὁ ἀδελφὸς τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Κορίνθῳ σὺν τοῖς ἁγίοις πᾶσιν τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ....[156] Secondly, the immediate textual context demonstrates this same understanding of θεός. Consider the following verses surrounding 2 Cor 1:21–22:

---

to the church. But **the one who loves to be dominant among them, Diotrephes,** does not accept our authority."

[154] NASB[95]: "Now He who establishes us with you in Christ and anointed us is **God, who also sealed us and gave** *us* **the Spirit in our hearts as a pledge.**"

[155] See BDAG, s.v. θεός, 3.

[156] ESV: "Paul, an apostle of Christ Jesus by the will of **God,** and Timothy our brother, To the church of **God** that is at Corinth, with all the saints who are in the whole of Achaia."

2 Cor 1:18:	πιστὸς δὲ ὁ θεὸς	God is faithful
2 Cor 1:19	ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ γὰρ υἱὸς	for the Son of **God**
2 Cor 1:20	ἐπαγγελίαι θεοῦ	(the) promises of **God**
	τὸ ἀμὴν τῷ θεῷ	Amen to **God**
2 Cor 1:23	μάρτυρα τὸν θεὸν	**God** as witness

These surrounding verses seem to utilize θεός in the manner of monotheistic Christianity. So, both the broad and immediate context support this understanding of θεός in 2 Cor 1:21. As a result, the following participial constructions in 2 Cor 1:22, ὁ καὶ σφραγισάμενος ἡμᾶς καὶ δοὺς, are understood as relating to θεός nonrestrictively.[157] Notice that NA[27] places a comma after θεός and most English and Spanish translations render this verse nonrestrictively.

Consider the following additional examples of what appear to be nonrestrictive attributive participles of the SAP formation pattern:

Gal 4:27: εὐφράνθητι, **στεῖρα ἡ οὐ τίκτουσα**.[158]
- provides pleonastic information about the barren woman
- modification

1 Tim 2:5–6: **ἄνθρωπος Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, ὁ δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων**.[159]
- provides additional information about the specific entity of the man Christ Jesus

---

[157] It is also possible to understand this to be an example of nonrestrictive apposition. Rogers labels the participles in this construction as substantival. Cleon L. Rogers Jr. and Cleon L. Rogers III, *The New Linguistic and Exegetical Key to the Greek New Testament* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 1998), 394.

[158] NIV: "Be glad, **O barren woman, who bears no children**." This OT quote follows the Hebrew of Isaiah 54:1: רָנִּי עֲקָרָה לֹא יָלָדָה.

[159] ESV: "**the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself as a ransom for all**." It is noted that this nonrestrictive attributive participle occurs in the context of verbless poetic/hymnic material. NA[27] renders this poetic cluster as follows:

εἷς γὰρ θεός,
εἷς καὶ μεσίτης θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων,
ἄνθρωπος Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς,
ὁ δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων,
τὸ μαρτύριον καιροῖς ἰδίοις.

For description of this material as poetic and hymnic see Gerald F. Hawthorne, Ralph P. Martin, and Daniel G.Reid, *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1993), 664; T. Desmond Alexander, and Brian S. Rosner, *New Dictionary of Biblical Theology* (Electronic ed. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2001).

- leans toward modification

2 Tim 1:14: τὴν καλὴν παραθήκην φύλαξον διὰ **πνεύματος ἁγίου τοῦ ἐνοικοῦντος ἐν ἡμῖν.**[160]
- provides additional information about the specific entity of the Holy Spirit
- modification

Less Frequently Occurring Formation Pattern: Participle + Substantive (PS). The PS formation pattern occurs very infrequently within the text of the Greek New Testament. The analysis performed for this dissertation has revealed only 18 occurrences in the New Testament.[161] *Nonrestrictive* attributive participles of the PS formation pattern do not exist in the Greek New Testament.

Summary of the Nonrestrictive Attributive Participle in the Greek New Testament

A presentation of nonrestrictive attributive participles in the Greek New Testament has demonstrated the reality and existence of these constructions. Nonrestrictive attributive participles are quite rare in the New Testament and seem to find representation in a limited way in the ASAP and SAP formation patterns. Additionally, a few examples may exist in the APS and SP formation patterns, while no examples exist in the less frequently occurring PS formation pattern. The antecedents of these attributive participles are often very specific.

---

[160] "Guard the good deposit through **the Holy Spirit, who dwells within us.**" Most English and Spanish translations punctuate this verse restrictively. This may be due to either a misunderstanding of the nature of the restrictive/nonrestrictive distinction or the possibility that most translators do understand this attributive participle to be functioning restrictively. One could argue that partitive restrictive modification is present here (see Addendum 2-A), distinguishing between aspects/functions of the Holy Spirit, at the exclusion of others. If so, Paul is commanding Timothy to guard the good deposit through that aspect/part of the Holy Spirit which dwells within the believer as opposed to the other functions/roles of the Holy Spirit at work in the world and throughout the heavens. Context, however, seems to favor the nonrestrictive reading rendered above.

[161] Young and Wallace do not treat this formation pattern at all. See ch. 3, section titled "Noun Phrase Formation Patterns Containing An Attributive Participle" on p. 102. Boyer, "Classification of Participles," 164, 167, however, does identify this "extremely rare" formation pattern in his discussion of "Adjectival Uses" of the participle.

General Tendencies of Nonrestrictive Clauses in the Greek New Testament

Having surveyed the nonrestrictive relative clauses and attributive participles of the Greek

New Testament, a presentation of their general characteristics contributes to the analysis of their

purported equivalence.

Nonrestrictive Relative Clauses

The characteristics of usage of nonrestrictive relative clauses within the respective types of

subordinate relative clauses will now be presented. Indeed, such characteristics contribute

significantly to the analysis of this dissertation.

Nonrestrictive Relative Clauses—Subject. As was asserted in chapter 3, generally

speaking, subject relative clauses occur slightly less frequently than direct object relative clauses

and more frequently than the rest of the other types of subordinate relative clauses.[162] At least 291

of the 364 occurrences are *nonrestrictive*, representing at least 80% of all subject relative clauses.

Nonrestrictive Relative Clauses—Direct Object. Direct object relative clauses occur

only slightly more frequently than subject relative clauses and more frequently than the

remaining types of subordinate relative clauses.[163] In 142 of the 369 instances the relative clauses

relate nonrestrictively to their antecedents, representing 38% of all direct object relative clauses.

Nonrestrictive Relative Clauses—Indirect Object. Indirect object relative clauses occur

less frequently than any other type of subordinate relative clause.[164] Only eleven examples can

be discerned in the New Testament and eight of these eleven occurrences are nonrestrictive,

representing 73% of all indirect object relative clauses. Due to the paucity of occurrences the

percentage may be inconsequential.

---

[162] See p. 142 of ch. 3, section titled "Restrictive Relative Clauses—Subject."

[163] See p. 142 of ch. 3, section titled "Restrictive Relative Clauses—Direct Object."

[164] See p. 143 of ch. 3, section titled "Restrictive Relative Clauses—Indirect Object."

Nonrestrictive Relative Clauses—Oblique. Oblique relative clauses occur slightly less

frequently than subject and direct object relative clauses but more frequently than indirect object

and possessor relative clauses.[165] 169 of the 253 occurrences relate to their antecedents

nonrestrictively, representing 67% of all oblique relative clauses.

Nonrestrictive Relative Clauses—Possessor. Possessor relative clauses occur slightly

more frequently than indirect object relative clauses and less frequently than the other types of

subordinate relative clauses.[166] In 34 of the 43 instances the relative clauses relate

nonrestrictively to their antecedents, representing 79% of all possessor relative clauses.

Summary of General Characteristics of Nonrestrictive Relative Clauses. Relative

clauses exhibit a wide range of participation in nonrestrictivity across the five types of

subordinate relative clauses. The percentages vary from 38% to 80%. Overall, 62% of all relative

clauses relate to their antecedents nonrestrictively. Since all attributive participles function as

subordinate *subject* clauses, the tendencies of *subject* relative clauses are significant to our thesis.

A very high percentage (80%) of subject relative clauses function nonrestrictively; by contrast,

only 13% of attributive participles function nonrestrictively.

Nonrestrictive Attributive Participles

The general characteristics of usage gathered from a thorough survey of noun phrase

formation patterns that contain an attributive participle demonstrate the paucity of nonrestrictive

attributive participles in the Greek New Testament. The tendencies of each formation pattern is

as follows:

---

[165] See p. 143 of ch. 3, section titled "Restrictive Relative Clauses—Oblique."

[166] See p. 143 of ch. 3, section titled "Restrictive Relative Clauses—Possessor."

Article + Substantive + Article + Participle (ASAP). The ASAP formation pattern

occurs more frequently in the Greek New Testament than any other formation pattern and

demonstrates a low percentage of nonrestrictivity.[167] In 47 of the 296 occurrences the attributive

participles relate to their referents nonrestrictively, representing 16% of all occurrences.

Substantive + Participle (SP). The SP formation pattern occurs more frequently in the

Greek New Testament than the APS and SAP formation patterns and slightly less frequently than

the ASAP pattern.[168] This syntactical pattern demonstrates a very low percentage of

nonrestrictivity. It appears that 7 of the 244 instances function nonrestrictively, representing

approximately 3% of all occurrences.

Article + Participle + Substantive (APS). The APS formation pattern occurs less

frequently in the Greek New Testament than the ASAP and SP formation patterns.[169] This

syntactical pattern also demonstrates a very low percentage of nonrestrictivity. It seems that 7 of

the 107 instances are nonrestrictive, representing roughly 7% of all occurrences.

Substantive + Article + Participle (SAP). The SAP formation pattern occurs less

frequently in the Greek New Testament than the ASAP and SP formation patterns and slightly

more frequently than the APS formation pattern.[170] Overall, this syntactical pattern exhibits the

highest percentage of nonrestrictivity among attributive participles. 38% percent of participles in

the SAP formation pattern (46 of 122 occurrences) could definitively be described as

nonrestrictive.[171]

---

[167] See p. 140 of ch. 3, section titled "Article + Substantive + Article + Participle (ASAP)."

[168] See p. 140 of ch. 3, section titled "Substantive + Participle (SP)."

[169] See p. 140 of ch. 3, section titled "Article + Participle + Substantive (APS)."

[170] See p. 140 of ch. 3, section titled "Substantive + Article + Participle (SAP)."

[171] Approximately nine examples of attributive participles of the SAP pattern are ambiguous constructions. This will be treated more thoroughly in ch. 6.

Less Frequently Occurring Formation Pattern: Participle + Substantive (PS). The PS

formation pattern occurs very infrequently within the text of the Greek New Testament.

Nonrestrictive attributive participles of the PS formation pattern do not exist in the Greek New

Testament.[172]

Summary of General Characteristics of Nonrestrictive Attributive Participles. It has

been demonstrated that an overall low percentage of attributive participles in the Greek New

Testament function nonrestrictively, approximately only 13%. *These tendencies of the attributive*

participle support the assertion of this dissertation that the attributive participle is primarily

utilized to restrict the substantive except under certain prescribed circumstances.

Summary of Nonrestrictive Clauses in the Greek New Testament

The presentation of nonrestrictivity as a linguistic category in chapter 4 and the

grammatical assertions pertaining to nonrestrictive clauses presented here in chapter 5 have

underscored the need for studying the nonrestrictive nature of relative clauses and attributive

participles in the Greek New Testament. For both constructions the scholarly research with

respect to nonrestrictivity is both cursory and inconsistent.

With respect to the relative clause the observation was made that most examples put forth

by scholars function nonrestrictively.[173] Furthermore, Voelz appears to indicate that subject

relative clauses tend to function nonrestrictively.[174] Our survey of the relative clause has brought

clarity to these observations and inclinations. Relative clauses exhibit a wide range of

participation in nonrestrictivity. The percentages vary from 38% to 80% across the five different

---

[172] See p. 217 above, section titled, "Less Frequently Occurring Formation Pattern: Participle + Substantive
(PS)." See also section titled by the same on p. 141 of ch. 3.

[173] See p. 177 above.

[174] See p. 179 above.

types of subordinate relative clauses with an overall 62% of relative clauses functioning nonrestrictively.

Since attributive participles participate solely in subject relativization, the category of subject relative clauses is of primary significance in the assessment of the purported equivalence between the two constructions. *The fact that 80% of all subject relative clauses refer to their antecedents nonrestrictively supports the thesis of this dissertation, which states that when both the attributive participle and the relative clause are grammatically and stylistically feasible, the relative clause predominantly relates to its referent nonrestrictively.*[175]

With respect to the attributive participle, the assertions of Young and Voelz suggest a limited participation in nonrestrictivity.[176] Our survey of the attributive participle has confirmed their inclinations and demonstrated that overall approximately only 13% of the nearly 800 attributive participles in the Greek New Testament seem to clearly function nonrestrictively: ASAP (16%), SP (3%), APS (7%), SAP (38%) and PS (0%). These tendencies of the attributive participle support the thesis of this dissertation, which states that the attributive participle is primarily utilized to restrict the substantive except under certain prescribed circumstances.

The goal of this dissertation to assess the purported equivalence of the attributive participle and the relative clause in the Greek New Testament has led us to assess their respective restrictive and nonrestrictive tendencies. The nature of restrictivity has been explicated in chapter 2 and those findings have been applied to the attributive participle and relative clause in chapter 3. The other side of that inquiry involves the nonrestrictive nature of these grammatical constructions. In chapter 4, nonrestrictivity as a linguistic category was explored, and here in chapter 5 the nonrestrictivity of the attributive participle and the relative clause in the Greek New

---

[175] This topic will be treated more thoroughly in ch. 6 under the discussion of the Accessibility Hierarchy.

[176] See pp. 177 and 179 respectively above.

Testament was presented. Next, in ch. 6, the specific nuances of these tendencies will be presented to move toward a final synthesis.

ADDENDUM 5-A

RELATIVE PRONOUN AGREEMENT

Normally a relative pronoun agrees with its antecedent in gender and number while its case is derived from its function within the subordinate relative clause. Exceptions to these tendencies, however, do exist.[177] At times the relative pronoun will agree with the gender or number of the predicate. Additionally, the neuter relative pronoun is utilized in certain prescribed circumstances. Furthermore, the case of the relative pronoun will occasionally be attracted to the case of the antecedent.

With respect to number consider Eph 3:13: διὸ αἰτοῦμαι μὴ ἐγκακεῖν ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσίν μου ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, ἥτις ἐστὶν δόξα ὑμῶν.[178] Note that the relative pronoun agrees in number with the predicate.[179]

Ephesians 6:17 may contain a case where the relative pronoun agrees with the gender of the predicate: τὴν μάχαιραν τοῦ πνεύματος, ὅ ἐστιν ῥῆμα θεοῦ.[180]

Additionally, the neuter relative pronoun has some unique tendencies. "In explanatory phrases Koine employs the ὅ ἐστιν . . . 'that is to say', a formulaic phrase used without reference

---

[177] For a more exhaustive treatment see: BDAG, ὅς; BDF, §123, 132; and Robertson, *Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, 713ff.

[178] NIV: "I ask you, therefore, not to be discouraged because of **my sufferings for you, which are your glory.**"

[179] See BDF, §132 and Robertson, *Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, 729.

[180] ESV: "**the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God.**" Citing this verse BDAG states that a "relative pron[oun] somet[imes] agrees in gender and number not w[ith] the noun to which it refers, but w[ith] the predicate." BDAG, ὅς, 1dγ.

224

to the gender of the word explained or to that of the word which explains."[181] Consider

Colossians 3:14, noting that the antecedent is feminine, the relative pronoun neuter and the

predicate substantive masculine.: τὴν ἀγάπην, ὅ ἐστιν σύνδεσμος τῆς τελειότητος.[182]

Neuter relative pronouns are also utilized with sentential antecedents. Consider Galatians

2:10, where the antecedent consists of the idea of remembering the poor: μόνον τῶν πτωχῶν ἵνα

μνημονεύωμεν, ὃ καὶ ἐσπούδασα αὐτὸ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι.[183] Additionally, consider 1 John 2:8:

πάλιν ἐντολὴν καινὴν γράφω ὑμῖν, ὅ ἐστιν ἀληθὲς ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν.[184] Robertson states

concerning the neuter relative pronoun here, "Sometimes also the relative agrees neither with the

antecedent nor with a predicate substantive, but gathers the general notion of 'thing.' A good

example occurs in 1 Jo. 2:8 . . . 'which thing is true.'"[185]

With respect to case, at times the relative pronoun will be attracted to the antecedent.

Consider Titus 3:5–6: πνεύματος ἁγίου, οὗ ἐξέχεεν ἐφ᾽ ἡμᾶς πλουσίως διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν.[186] The relative pronoun would normally be in the accusative but stands in

the genitive here due to attraction to the antecedent.[187]

---

[181] BDF, §123.

[182] "love, which is the bond of perfection."

[183] "only that we might remember the poor, which also I was eager to do this very thing." Robertson, *Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, 714, supports this assessment, "Once more, ὅ is used to refer to a verbal idea or to the whole sentence."

[184] ESV: "On the other hand, I am writing a new commandment to you, which is true in Him and in you."

[185] Robertson, *Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, 713.

[186] ESV: "the Holy Spirit, whom he poured out on us richly through Jesus Christ our Savior."

[187] See Robertson, *Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, 716.

CHAPTER SIX

FINAL SYNTHESIS, IMPLICATIONS AND PROSPECTS

Introduction

Many grammarians assert that the attributive participle and the relative clause in the Greek

New Testament are equivalent; the observations of Voelz and Young, however, have led us to

reassess those assertions, especially with respect to the restrictive/nonrestrictive distinction. A

thorough presentation of restrictivity and nonrestrictivity has been given. Numerous examples of

restrictive and nonrestrictive clauses in the Greek New Testament have been examined, and their

respective general characteristics illustrated. We now move toward a final synthesis by

indicating how the two constructions are equivalent and how they are not. We will do so by

employing the *Accessibility Hierarchy*, which provides the framework for accurately comparing

the two constructions. The Accessibility Hierarchy aids in accurately focusing the field of

comparison to the *subject* relative clause and the attributive participle. Finally, implications of

our findings will be presented along with prospects for further study.

The Question of Equivalence

In certain respects the attributive participle and the relative clause could be considered

equivalent, yet in many ways they function quite differently. Both constructions relate to

antecedents, participate in modification, and relativize subjects. Both constructions, however, do

not relate similarly with respect to coordination. While both constructions are capable of

modification, relative clauses are also capable of leaning strongly toward coordination;[1] attributive participles tend not to have this capability. Additionally, both constructions do not participate equally along and within the Accessibility Hierarchy. We turn now to consider the Accessibility Hierarchy more thoroughly.

The Accessibility Hierarchy

The Accessibility Hierarchy helps provide a structure for what has been observed throughout the analysis of this dissertation; it provides a framework that aids in more clearly assessing the purported equivalence of the attributive participle and relative clause in the Greek New Testament. We will lay the foundation for the explanation of this hierarchy by considering both relativization strategies and relativized positions.

Relativization Strategies

In chapter 2 it was observed that different languages employ different strategies for forming relative clauses.[2] Alternatively, one could say that there are different *relativization strategies*. Essentially, it was asserted there that the term *relative clause* often refers to various relativization strategies beyond the traditional notion of a relative clause (relative pronoun + finite clause). Keenan and Comrie assert that "our semantically based notion of R[elative] C[lause] justifies considering as RCs certain constructions that would perhaps not have been so considered in traditional grammar."[3] Furthermore it has been widely established in linguistics that "not only do different languages vary with respect to the way RCs are formed, but also within a given language there is often more than one distinct type of RC."[4] The two main

---

[1] See section of ch. 4 titled "Continuum of Nonrestrictivity—Modification to Coordination" on pp. 165 ff.

[2] See section titled "Definition of Relative Clause" on pp. 68–71 of ch. 2.

[3] Keenan and Comrie, "Noun Phrase Accessibility," 64.

[4] Keenan and Comrie, "Noun Phrase Accessibility," 64.

relativization strategies ("RCs") considered in this dissertation are what have been traditionally labeled the *attributive participle* and the *relative clause*.

Relativized Positions

Relativized position refers to the role the referenced antecedent fills within the relativization strategy.[5] In general, linguists refer to six different relativized positions: subject, direct object, indirect object, oblique, possessor and object of comparison.[6] For example in the following clause the relativized position is subject: *the man who stands in the corner*. Alternatively, one could say that the subject position is relativized (that is to say *the man* is the subject of the action *stands in the corner*). Consider the following English examples of all six relativized positions:

Subject:	*the man*	*who*	*walked to the store*	
Direct Object:	*the man*	*whom*	*I saw at the bank*	
Indirect Object:	*the man*	*to whom*	*I gave the check*	
Oblique:	*the man*	*about whom*	*I was talking*	
Possessor:	*the man*	*whose*	*car was stolen*	
Object of Comparison:	*the man*	*who[m]*	*Mary is taller*	*than*[7]

---

[5] See, J. Albert Bickford, *Tools for Analyzing the World's Languages: Morphology and Syntax* (Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1998), 334. Alternatively, Kroeger utilizes the terminology *relativized function*. Kroeger, *Analyzing Syntax*, 175.

[6] See Keenan and Comrie, "Noun Phrase Accessibility," 66; Nikolaeva, "Relative Clauses," 504; Bickford, *Morphology and Syntax*, 340–41.

[7] This example comes from Keenan and Comrie, "Noun Phrase Accessibility," 74. They note that phrases like these do occur in the English language, but they also allow for the possibility that some may consider them ungrammatical when they state, "some find them rather uncomfortable." See also Bickford, *Morphology and Syntax*, 340. Furthermore, it seems that perhaps the proper grammatical form should be rendered "whom" as in the brackets above: "the man *whom* Mary is taller than."

228

The Accessibility Hierarchy Defined

The Accessibility Hierarchy observes what *positions* a given *relativization strategy* can relativize, as well as the strategy's distribution tendencies.[8] The Accessibility Hierarchy can be depicted as follows:

Subject > Direct Object > Indirect Object > Oblique > Possessor > Obj. of Comp.

The symbol ">" signifies "is more accessible to relativization."[9] Thus, the Accessibility Hierarchy generalizes that subjects are the most accessible to relativization, direct objects are the next most accessible and so on down the hierarchy.

The following generalizations that stem from the research behind the Accessibility Hierarchy have been noted by linguists:[10]

1. Every language appears to have a relativization strategy for subjects but not necessarily for the lower positions.

2. Any given strategy can only relativize a continuous segment of the hierarchy.

3. If a language can relativize a given position on the hierarchy, it can relativize all positions higher up.

4. Strategies that can relativize a given position on the hierarchy may cease to relativize a position at a lower point.

5. *Primary strategies* are those strategies that can relativize subjects.

   a. A language is capable of having more than one primary strategy.

---

[8] The seminal work for the Accessibility Hierarchy is Keenan and Comrie, "Noun Phrase Accessibility," 63–99. For further information and development see Nikolaeva, "Relative Clauses," 504–5; Bickford, *Morphology and Syntax*, 340–41; Kroeger, *Analyzing Syntax*, 180–84; Christian Lehmann. "Relative Clauses." 462.

[9] Keenan and Comrie, "Noun Phrase Accessibility," 66.

[10] See works in n. 8 above.

b. If a primary strategy in a given language applies to a low position on the hierarchy, then it applies to all higher positions.[11]

c. A primary strategy may cut off at any point on the hierarchy.[12]

The Accessibility Hierarchy and Specific Languages

In order to understand the implications of the Accessibility Hierarchy for our study, some observations with respect to modern languages will be considered. Next, the Accessibility Hierarchy and its implications for the assessment of the attributive participle and the relative clause in the Greek New Testament will be presented.

The Accessibility Hierarchy and Modern Languages. In general, the observation of the Accessibility Hierarchy and relativization strategies in modern languages informs the inquiry of this dissertation. For example, Keenan and Comrie have observed that "many European languages (e.g. German, Russian, and Polish) have participial RC-forming strategies that apply only to subjects."[13]

Keenan and Comrie specifically cite the German language and note two different relativization strategies and their participation in the Accessibility Hierarchy. As cited above, they maintain that "our semantically based notion of R[elative] C[lause] justifies considering as RCs certain constructions that would perhaps not have been so considered in traditional grammar."[14] With respect to German they state, "Thus, in German, alongside the traditional RC in (1) we also count the participial construction in (2):

---

[11] Primary strategies may also relativize other positions on the Accessibility Hierarchy. However, to be considered a primary relativization strategy it must at least be able to relativize subjects.

[12] So, primary strategies may occupy only the subject position or may cease to occupy lower positions at any point on the hierarchy.

[13] Keenan and Comrie, "Noun Phrase Accessibility," 70.

[14] Keenan and Comrie, "Noun Phrase Accessibility," 64.

(1) der Mann, der in seinem Buro arbeitet
   the man   who in his   study works
   'the man who is working in his study'

(2) der in seinem Buro arbeitende Mann
   the in his   study working   man
   'the man who is working in his study'[15]

Keenan and Comrie demonstrate that different languages vary with respect to how relativization

strategies are formed. Furthermore, within a language there may be more than one distinct

relativization strategy. Additionally they maintain, "Different strategies differ with regard to

which N[oun] P[hrase] positions they can relativize. Thus, the participial strategy in (2) above

can only relativize subjects (that is, the head NP can only be understood to function as the

subject of the main verb of the restricting clause), whereas the strategy in (1) above functions to

relativize"[16] all positions on the Accessibility Hierarchy except object of comparison.[17]

English also utilizes the traditional relative clause and a nonfinite participial clause as

primary relativization strategies. Like German, the traditional relative clause in English

relativizes the *subject* through *possessor* positions.[18] Additionally, Quirk finds English participial

relativization strategies similar to German. He cites the following as an example of the subject

position relativized by a participial relativization strategy: "The person *writing reports* is my

colleague."[19] He notes that "In all instances, the antecedent head corresponds to the implicit

subject of the nonfinite clause."[20] So, similarly to German, the participial relativization strategy is

---

[15] Keenan and Comrie, "Noun Phrase Accessibility," 64.

[16] Keenan and Comrie, "Noun Phrase Accessibility," 64.

[17] Keenan and Comrie, "Noun Phrase Accessibility," 77. See also Boas, "Restrictive and Non-restrictive," 49.

[18] See section titled "Relativized Positions" on p. 228, above. It was noted there that English may also be able to relativize the object of comparison position though some find these constructions to be ungrammatical or awkward.

[19] Quirk et al., *Grammar*, 1263. As a relative clause: "The person *who is writing reports* is my colleague."

[20] Quirk et al., *Grammar*, 1263. See also Quirk et al., *Grammar*, 1264–65, 1270. See also Boas, "Restrictive and Non-restrictive," 49 and Downing, "Relative Clause Structure," 395.

confined to the subject position on the Accessibility Hierarchy. Downing agrees with this assessment of the English language and adds that in general, cross-linguistically, participial relativization strategies tend to be confined to the subject position of the Accessibility Hierarchy.[21] Furthermore, Downing states, "The participial relative constructions of Dyirbal and Turkish suggest the following generalization: the verb of a relative clause may assume a nonfinite, participial form if the relative NP is the subject of its clause. If the relative NP is not the subject, then either relativization is impossible or a distinct process is used."[22]

The observations of Keenan and Comrie, coupled with the English examples in the presentation of relativized positions above, demonstrate the usage of the traditional relative clause as a strategy capable of relativizing *subject* through *possessor* positions on the Accessibility Hierarchy. Furthermore, Keenan and Comrie, Quirk, and Downing have all demonstrated a tendency for participial relativization strategies to be confined to the subject position on the Accessibility Hierarchy. We turn now to consider the similarities of these tendencies to the Greek New Testament.

The Accessibility Hierarchy and the Greek of the New Testament. Two primary relativization strategies exist in the Greek New Testament, the relative clause and the attributive participle.[23] Their distribution along the Accessibility Hierarchy provides further clarity toward assessing the similarities and differences of these two constructions.

The relative clause in the Greek New Testament is capable of relativizing the subject, direct object, indirect object, oblique and possessor positions on the Accessibility Hierarchy. It

---

[21] Downing, "Relative Clause Structure," 395–97.

[22] Downing, "Relative Clause Structure," 395–97.

[23] The traditional understanding of these constructions is assumed here (e.g. *relative clause* = *relative pronoun* + *finite clause*).

does not relativize the object of comparison position. This reality has been observed throughout

the dissertation, with multiple examples presented in chapters 3 and 5.[24]

The attributive participle is capable of relativizing the subject position alone.[25] Though he

utilizes a different grammatical framework and terminology, Karleen confirms as much and

essentially asserts that in the Greek New Testament a participial relativization strategy, such as

the attributive participle, is incapable of relativizing the *direct object* through *object of*

comparison positions on the Accessibility Hierarchy.[26] He demonstrates this reality with a

relative clause that relativizes the indirect object position: "ho anēr hō legō tauta/the man to

whom I say these things" (ὁ ἀνὴρ ᾧ λέγω ταῦτα).[27] Karleen shows the grammatical impossibility

of representing such a noun phrase with an attributive participle in the following ungrammatical

example: "*ho anēr tō legonti tauta" (*ὁ ἀνὴρ τῷ λέγοντι ταῦτα).[28]

This assessment of the capabilities of these two strategies on the Accessibility Hierarchy

helps bring clarity to assessing their purported equivalence. The Accessibility Hierarchy reveals

a definite area of equivalence: both the relative clause and the attributive participle are primary

relativization strategies; they both relativize subjects. Indeed, this is one way in which it can be

---

[24] See section titled "The Restrictive Relative Clause in the Greek New Testament" on pp. 131–39 of ch. 3 and section titled "The Nonrestrictive Relative Clause in the Greek New Testament" on pp. 180–210 of ch. 5.

[25] This reality has been assumed at various places in the dissertation thus far. See the following sections: "Types of Subordinate Relative Clauses" on p. 132 of ch. 3; "Restrictive Relative Clauses—Subject" on p. 142 of ch. 3; "Summary of General Tendencies of Restrictive Relative Clauses" on p. 143 of ch. 3; "Summary of Nonrestrictive Clauses in the Greek New Testament" on p. 221 of ch. 5.

[26] Karleen's assertions do not reflect the terminology or grammatical framework of the Accessibility Hierarchy, relativization strategies or relativized functions. Despite this, his assertions essentially confirm the singular capability of the attributive participle to relativize the subject position alone. He states that "relative clauses are not paraphrasable by attributive participles and vice-versa" with respect to "oblique cases." He states, "If the case of the noun in the subordinate sentence is anything other than nominative, a relative clause cannot be transformed to an attributive participle." Karleen, *Syntax of the Participle*, 88.

[27] Karleen, *Syntax of the Participle*, 88. Transliteration is Karleen's and Greek font is our rendition of the transliteration.

[28] Karleen, *Syntax of the Participle*, 89. Transliteration is Karleen's and Greek font is our rendition of the transliteration. * signifies ungrammatical.

asserted that the two constructions are equivalent. On the other hand, the Accessibility Hierarchy reveals a very significant area of nonequivalence. The relative clause is able to relativize the direct object position through the possessor position, while the attributive participle is not.[29] It appears that no grammarian heretofore has utilized the Accessibility Hierarchy to assert this significant difference.[30] Furthermore, no grammarian has made use of this significant difference in order to assess the purported equivalence of the attributive participle and the relative clause in the Greek New Testament.

Some significant conclusions can be drawn from this difference. First, it informs us that for the exegete there are no predominant restrictive/nonrestrictive tendencies for relative clauses that relativize the direct object through possessor positions. Second, when comparing the two constructions, the tendencies of attributive participles should only be compared to the tendencies of subject relative clauses. It is impossible to overstate the importance of these conclusions. The following two paragraphs elucidate these two conclusions respectively.

So, our thesis states that the attributive participle tends to relate to an antecedent restrictively and that when both the attributive participle and the relative clause are *grammatically* and *stylistically feasible*, relative clauses are predominantly utilized nonrestrictively. The attributive participle is grammatically incapable of relativizing any other position than subject; therefore, relative clauses do and must relativize those lower positions. As a result, since the relative clause is the only strategy utilized in positions other than subject for

---

[29] One could argue that direct object clauses could be transformed into attributive participle position by placing the verb in the passive and expressing agency. Out of the approximately 800 attributive participles, however, only 22 of them do this. See, for example, 2 Pet 2:17: ὁμίχλαι ὑπὸ λαίλαπος ἐλαυνόμεναι. ESV: "mists driven by a storm." All 22 of these examples are restrictive and seem to be utilized for stylistic reasons. Furthermore, they are still subject clauses with the verb in the passive and explicit agency expressed. These are marked in app. 1.

both restrictivity and nonrestrictivity, there does not exist any predominant tendency toward one

or the other. In other words, there is an equal chance that direct object through possessor relative

clauses will be either restrictive or nonrestrictive. To see what this means, consider a question

that was surfaced in chapter 1[31] about the restrictive/nonrestrictive nature of the relative clause in

Rom 11:2a: οὐκ ἀπώσατο ὁ θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ὃν προέγνω.[32] Moo's treatment of this verse

was cited and is reproduced here:

> The placement of the comma in this statement is critical. Some commentators
> remove the comma and so treat "whom he foreknew" as a "restrictive" clause—that
> is, a clause that restricts the word it modifies by identifying it. On this view, Paul is
> asserting that God has not rejected *the people whom he chose*. Such a statement
> would build on the "remnant" idea of 9:6–29, claiming that God remains faithful to
> that "Israel within an Israel" whom he has chosen for salvation. But almost all
> modern versions, following most of the commentaries, rightly add the comma,
> making the clause nonrestrictive. "Whom he foreknew" does not identify the
> "people" Paul is talking about; rather, it explains why God remains faithful to that
> people.[33]

Moo demonstrates the exegetical significance of a restrictive versus nonrestrictive reading. In

chapter 1 it was noted that this study will help determine when syntactical tendencies can aid the

interpreter in determining a restrictive or nonrestrictive reading. Since an attributive participle is

grammatically incapable of relativizing direct object clauses, the exegete must discern the

restrictive/nonrestrictive nature of the relative clause in Rom 11:2a from context alone. *Indeed,*

the exegete must use context alone to discern restrictive/nonrestrictive readings of all relative

clauses that relativize positions lower than subject on the Accessibility Hierarchy.

---

[30] Though Karleen maintains this distinction, he does so with different terminology and grammatical framework. He does not mention the Accessibility Hierarchy and furthermore he does not make his assertions with respect to assessing the purported equivalence of the attributive participle and the relative clause in the Greek New Testament.

[31] See section titled "Exegesis" on pp. 45–46 of ch. 1.

[32] NIV: God did not reject his people, whom he foreknew.

[33] Moo, *Romans*, 354.

The only area of overlap for the attributive participle and the relative clause on the Accessibility Hierarchy, then, consists of subject position relativization. So, when comparing the restrictive and nonrestrictive capabilities of these two constructions, one must compare attributive participles to *subject* relative clauses only. This is to say, if an attributive participle is grammatically incapable of relativizing any position lower than subject, there does not exist a logical reason to compare it to relative clauses that relativize positions other than subject. To put it another way, the question at hand is why the attributive participle is used in certain contexts instead of the relative clause and vice versa (which implies they are both grammatically possible). If the attributive participle cannot grammatically exist for certain relativized positions, it cannot be compared to or analyzed with respect to the relative clauses that do relativize those positions. In fact, this narrowing of the field of comparison informs a major part of our thesis with respect to the restrictive/nonrestrictive distinction. It, in essence, dictates the central analysis to be that of a comparison of *subject* relative clauses and attributive participles. It is to this task that we now turn.

Subject Relative Clauses and Attributive Participles in the Greek New Testament

A consideration of the general characteristics of the *subject* relative clause and the attributive participle is presented below. Next an examination of the specific nuances of each construction is put forth followed by a presentation of illustrative examples.

General Characteristics

In general, there are approximately 360 subject relative clauses and 800 attributive participles in the Greek New Testament. Furthermore, based upon our contextual analysis, subject relative clauses tend to relate nonrestrictively to their antecedents (80%) and attributive participles restrictively (84%). Concomitantly, subject relative clauses may relate restrictively (19%) and attributive participles may relate nonrestrictively (13%), but in each case with much

less frequency. Approximately 1% of subject relative clauses and 3% of attributive participles are ambiguous.

Table 1. General Statistics for Subject Relative Clauses and Attributive Participles

	% Restrictive	% Nonrestrictive	% Ambiguous
Subject Relative Clause	19	80	1
Attributive Participle	84	13	3

We turn now to consider the specific restrictive and nonrestrictive nuances of these two constructions with an eye toward discovering other instances of when, according to our thesis, both constructions might *not* be grammatically and stylistically feasible.

Subject Relative Clauses

Nonrestrictive, restrictive and ambiguous subject relative clause will be considered.

Nonrestrictive Subject Relative Clauses. As has been asserted above and in chapter 5, 80% of the approximately 360 subject relative clauses in the Greek New Testament relate nonrestrictively to their antecedents.[34] A comparison to the relative clauses lower on the Accessibility Hierarchy is revealing. While 80% of subject relative clauses are nonrestrictive only 52% of the remaining relative clauses (*direct object* through *possessor* relative clauses) definitively function nonrestrictively. Multiple examples of nonrestrictive subject relative clauses have been presented in chapter 5.[35] The question naturally arises as to the restrictive/nonrestrictive nature of the remaining 20% of subject relative clauses (19% restrictive and 1% ambiguous). This question is considered in the two subsequent sections.

---

[34] See section titled "General Tendencies of Nonrestrictive Clauses in the Greek New Testament" on pp. 218–220 of ch. 5.

[35] See section titled "Nonrestrictive Relative Clauses—Subject" on pp. 182–94 of ch. 5.

Restrictive Subject Relative Clauses. It was asserted above and in chapter 3 that, at most, 19% of the approximately 360 subject relative clauses function restrictively.[36] Comparing this statistic to relative clauses lower on the Accessibility Hierarchy is revealing. While only 19% of subject relative clauses seem to be restrictive, 47% of the remaining relative clauses appear to function restrictively (*direct object* through *possessor* relative clauses). The question naturally arises as to why 19% of subject relative clauses function restrictively.

Most subject relative clauses that are restrictive seem to require the relative clause relativization strategy due to verb tense considerations. Additionally, some examples are restrictive due to other grammatical and stylistic reasons: texts with Semitic *Vorlagen*, very generic substantives, certain relative clauses headed by ὅστις, and possibly "the idiom οὐδεὶς ἐστιν."[37] Additionally, a few examples may be ill-formed. It is to these factors that we now turn.

Most restrictive subject relative clauses contain a verb tense that seems to require the usage of a relative clause over an attributive participle. Most of these examples occur with the future tense.[38] In the New Testament, there exist only twelve total future participles and only one of these is an attributive participle (1 Cor 15:37).[39] Except for this single occurrence, the usage of future attributive participles in the Greek New Testament is not a grammatical reality. This tendency of the Greek of the New Testament seems to necessitate the usage of a relative clause with a future indicative even when the modification is restrictive. That is to say, the usage of the future indicative allows the author to explicitly indicate future time, which is not convenient with

---

[36] See section titled "Restrictive Relative Clauses—Subject" on p. 142 of ch. 3.

[37] Robertson, *Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, 726.

[38] The future tense predominates but examples of subjunctive in various tenses and pluperfect periphrastics exist, as well, as do a few examples with the imperfect and perfect.

[39] "The twelve future participles can be found in Matt 27:49; Luke 22:49; John 6:64; Acts 8:27; 20:22; 22:5; 24:11, 17; 1 Cor 15:37; Heb 3:5; 13:17; 1 Pet 3:13." Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 567.

the usage of available participial tenses. This appears to be a grammatical and stylistic reality of the language. Consider 1 Cor 6:5: ...οὕτως οὐκ ἔνι ἐν ὑμῖν οὐδεὶς σοφός, ὃς δυνήσεται διακρῖναι ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ;"[40]

It also appears that some texts seem to retain the Semitic *Vorlage* from which they are derived.[41] Consider Rom 11:4 as it reflects the Old Testament: ἑπτακισχιλίους ἄνδρας, οἵτινες οὐκ ἔκαμψαν ... τῇ Βάαλ.[42] The Greek relative clause mirrors the syntax of the Hebrew relative clause in 1 Kgs 19:18: אֲשֶׁר לֹא־כָרְעוּ לַבַּעַל.[43]

Another small category of exceptions may be certain occurrences with the relative ὅστις, where the sense is distinct from ὅς. Consider Rev 9:4: τοὺς ἀνθρώπους οἵτινες οὐκ ἔχουσι τὴν σφραγῖδα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ τῶν μετώπων.[44] Thayer cites this verse explicitly to be an example where ὅστις is utilized specifically to note "a general notion or class . . . and thus it indicates quality: *one who, such a one as, of such a nature that.*"[45] This distinct semantic thrust appears to necessitate the usage of a relative clause headed by ὅστις over an attributive participle.

A smaller number of restrictive subject relative clauses seem to exist with extremely generic substantives (e.g. as ἄνθρωπος, ἀνήρ, γυνή, etc.).[46] Consider John 4:29: ᾽δεῦτε ἴδετε

---

[40] "Is it so that there is among you no wise man that might/will be able to decide between his brothers?" Consider also 2 Tim 2:2.

[41] The words of Jesus (and others) that surely have Aramaic roots could also be included in this category. See Kenneth Bailey, who discusses the controlled nature of direct speech and the oral tradition behind it: Kenneth Bailey, "Middle Eastern Oral Tradition and the Synoptic Gospels," *Expository Times* 106 (1995): 363–67.

[42] ESV: "seven thousand men who have not bowed . . . to Baal."

[43] ESV: "that have not bowed to Baal."

[44] ASV: "such men as have not the seal of God on their foreheads."

[45] Joseph Henry Thayer, Carl Ludwig Wilibald Grimm, and Christian Gottlob Wilke, *Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Coded with Strong's Concordance Numbers* (Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson, 2003), ὅστις, 2.

[46] See section titled "The General Extreme of the Acceptability Continuum" on p. 74 of ch. 2, where Quirk calls these "nonassertive heads."

ἄνθρωπον ὃς εἶπέν μοι πάντα ὅσα ἐποίησα."[47] BDAG cites this verse specifically and claims

that this usage of ἄνθρωπος is "practically equiv[alent] to the indef[inite] pron[oun], w[ith] the

basic [meaning] of ἄ[νθρωπος] greatly weakened."[48] These antecedents are so generic that any

modification is necessarily restrictive. It should be noted that most of these occurrences also

exhibit one of the other characteristics: verb tense incompatibility, Semitic *Vorlage*, and/or a

unique usage of ὅστις.[49]

Additionally, Robertson notes "the idiom οὐδεὶς ἐστιν" as a stylistic reality of the Greek of

the New Testament.[50] Consider Mark 9:39: ...οὐδεὶς γάρ ἐστιν ὃς ποιήσει δύναμιν ἐπὶ τῷ

ὀνόματί μου καὶ δυνήσεται ταχὺ κακολογῆσαί με.[51] It should be noted, however, that most of

these examples exhibit verb tense incompatibility and/or a Semitic *Vorlage*. Additionally, οὐδεὶς

is an extremely generic substantive.

The few exceptions presented so far are due to grammatical and stylistic reasons.[52] The

problem with corpus study of ancient languages consists in the fact that no native speakers exist

to confirm whether or not these exceptions are ungrammatical or ill-formed. Palmer notes this

reality when he states that "it is possible that some sentences may be included in the corpus

which the authors themselves would reject as ill-formed if they were to reread them. The

---

[47] ESV: "'Come, see a man who told me all that I ever did.'" This example also appears to have an underlying Aramaic derivation.

[48] BDAG, ἄνθρωπος, 4aδ.

[49] So, for example, John 4:29 cited above may reflect the Aramaic *Vorlage* of direct speech.

[50] Robertson, *Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, 726.

[51] NASB[95]: "for there is **no one who will perform a miracle in My name**, and be able soon afterward to speak evil of Me."

[52] It should be noted that many of these example seem to have more than one of the categories of exception occurring at one time. For example Matt 2:6 utilizes a future verb and may occur with the unique sense of ὅστις (BDAG, ὅστις, 2a): ἡγούμενος, ὅστις ποιμανεῖ τὸν λαόν μου τὸν Ἰσραήλ.

grammarian must also be ready to characterize such sentences as ill-formed."[53] Since there does

seem to be some pattern for the restrictive subject relative clauses examined above, they may

very well be accepted as proper formations. There do seem to exist a few examples, however,

that may very well be considered "ill-formed." Consider the two beasts found in Rev 13. One

rises out of the sea (13:1) and has a healed mortal wound (Rev 13:3). Then John sees another

beast rising out of the earth (Rev 13:11: Καὶ εἶδον ἄλλο θηρίον ἀναβαῖνον ἐκ τῆς γῆς). In Rev

13:14 the relative clause appears to identify the first beast: τῷ θηρίῳ, ὃς ἔχει τὴν πληγὴν τῆς

μαχαίρης καὶ ἔζησεν.[54] The restrictive relative clause does not appear to fall into any of the

categories of exception.

Ambiguous Subject Relative Clauses. In our classification of subject relative clauses,

approximately 1% remain ambiguous as to their restrictive/nonrestrictive nature.[55] Status as an

"amplifying clause"[56] and multiple possibilities of interpretation account for their ambiguous

designation.

In the terminology of Hausammen, an "amplifying clause" occurs with complex

antecedents that exist with some sort of adjectival modifier. These examples seem to "spread the

task of description over both the general adjective . . . and the more detailed clause."[57] Consider 2

Tim 1:6 as a possible example: ἀναμιμνῄσκω σε ἀναζωπυρεῖν τὸ χάρισμα τοῦ θεοῦ, ὅ ἐστιν ἐν

σοὶ διὰ τῆς ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν μου. Note the confusion on how to interpret this clause with

the difference between the NRSV and ESV. The NRSV renders restrictively: "I remind you to

---

[53] Palmer, *Constituent Structure in the New Testament*, 26.

[54] "the beast that has the wound of the sword and lived."

[55] These have been labeled with a "?" in app. 2 under the restrictive/nonrestrictive column. It may very well be that more examples could be considered ambiguous. For this reason, the appendices has been included to show how every example has been categorized and allows the reader to independently examine our assessment.

[56] Haussamen, "Restrictive and Nonrestrictive," 2.

[57] Haussamen, "Restrictive and Nonrestrictive," 3.

rekindle **the gift of God that is within you through the laying on of my hands.**" The ESV

renders nonrestrictively: "I remind you to fan into flame **the gift of God, which is in you**

through the laying on of my hands." On the one hand, the relative clause seems to amplify the

adjectival genitive modifier τοῦ θεοῦ ("of/from God"), and could be seen to provide additional

information about the overall complex substantive τὸ χάρισμα τοῦ θεοῦ. While it does not

grammatically modify the genitive modifier, semantically speaking the clause appears to amplify

or give more detail to how this gift came *from God*, namely through the laying on of hands. On

the other hand, the relative clause does not seem to be nonessential. Haussamen points out that

there seems to be, at times, difficult examples such as these that seem to lie in between a

restrictive and nonrestrictive reading. An example like this may slightly lean toward restrictivity

or nonrestrictivity. Since there seems to be some level of ambiguity, we have left it in a

questionable status, allowing for the exegete to take this into consideration when applying all the

tools of exegesis to the task of interpretation.

Additionally, see the discussion of the ambiguous example in Jas 5:10 below. Essentially, it

has been labeled ambiguous due to multiple possibilities of interpretation.[58]

Attributive Participles

The majority of attributive participles modify their antecedents restrictively (84%). There

seems to be a smaller number of occurrences that function nonrestrictively (13%). Additionally,

some examples remain ambiguous as to their restrictive/nonrestrictive nature (3%).

Restrictive Attributive Participles. As was asserted above and in chapter 3, nearly 84%

of the approximately 800 attributive participles in the Greek New Testament restrictively modify

---

[58] See p. 254 below under the section titled "Illustrative Examples."

their antecedents.[59] Numerous examples of restrictive attributive participles have been presented in chapter 3 and should be familiar to the reader thus far.[60] The question naturally arises as to the restrictive/nonrestrictive nature of the remaining 16% of attributive participles (13% nonrestrictive and 3% ambiguous). This question is considered in the two subsequent sections.

Nonrestrictive Attributive Participles. It was asserted above and in chapter 5 that 13% of the approximately 800 attributive participles appear to function nonrestrictively.[61] Some examples were presented in chapter 5[62] and some initial patterns have been noted previously as to why this may be the case.[63] We turn now to identify these patterns more comprehensively.

On the whole, most nonrestrictive attributive participles occur in the ASAP and SAP formation patterns with divine proper names (e.g. ὁ θεὸς) and to a lesser degree with other proper names of supernatural beings and humans. Additionally, some nonrestrictive attributive participles occur with personal pronouns. Furthermore, at times a very small number of nonrestrictive attributive participles occur in connection with adjectives and texts that reflect Semitic *Vorlagen*. Additionally, a few examples may be considered ill-formed.

The majority of nonrestrictive attributive participles occur with a divine proper name.[64] Specifically, most antecedents contain ὁ θεός, θεός, or some other denotation of God (the

---

[59] See section titled "Summary of General Tendencies of Restrictive Attributive Participles" on p. 141 of ch. 3.

[60] See section titled "The Restrictive Attributive Participle in the Greek New Testament" on pp. 102–31 of ch. 3.

[61] See section titled "Summary of General Characteristics of Nonrestrictive Attributive Participles" on p. 221 of ch. 5.

[62] See section titled "The Nonrestrictive Attributive Participle in the Greek New Testament" on pp. 210–18.

[63] See sections titled "Summary of the Nonrestrictive Attributive Participle in the Greek New Testament" on p. 217 of ch.5 and "Substantive + Article + Participle (SAP)" on p. 140 of ch. 3.

[64] A handful of examples occur with supernatural beings (Gabriel, Devil) and humans (Levi, Mary, Jezebel).

Father), Jesus Christ, or the Holy Spirit.[65] It may be that this tendency reflects a stylistic

preference of the Greek of the New Testament and that, when considering relativization

strategies with divine names, either the attributive participle or the relative clause can be utilized.

Alternatively, the participle may be utilized in these instances to demonstrate an emphasis that

the relative clause would not convey. Furthermore, it may very well be that these examples

should be considered more akin to articular substantival participles that stand in apposition to

another substantive. The assertions of Voelz, Dana & Mantey, Wallace, Young, and Rogers &

Rogers will be considered with respect to these articular participles.

Voelz appears to label these participles as "attributive position participles . . . that seem to

be a restriction, not on what they modify directly but upon all other alternative possibilities."[66]

Voelz cites 1 Pet 1:3 as an example:

> Εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ κατὰ τὸ πολὺ αὐτοῦ
> ἔλεος ἀναγεννήσας ἡμᾶς εἰς ἐλπίδα ζῶσαν....
> "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the one who has, according
> to his great mercy, begotten us again unto a living hope (as opposed to anyone else
> who might attempt such a salvation)."[67]

Voelz's assertions are by no means exhaustive and in many ways exploratory, calling for the

research done in this dissertation. After further analysis of these types of participles, it was

discovered that most of them (such as 1 Pet 1:3) consist of articular participles. An examination

of the tendencies of the article reveals a similarity between Voelz's exploratory assertions above

---

[65] For example: Ὁ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης, θεοῦ πατρὸς, ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς, ὁ κύριος, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, πνεύματος ἁγίου, etc. Note that most the examples of nonrestrictive attributive participles cited thus far in this dissertation have a divine proper name as an antecedent. See "Attributive Participles" on p. 162 of ch. 4; p. 174 of ch. 4; "The Nonrestrictive Attributive Participle in the Greek New Testament" on pp. 210–17 of ch. 5.

[66] Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part III," 403.

[67] Voelz, "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part III," 403.Translation is from Voelz.

244

and the way grammarians speak about the individualizing use of the article with substantives.[68]

Dana and Mantey assert with respect to the individualizing nature of the article: "Nearest to the

real genius of its function is the use of the article *to point out a particular object*."[69] In fact this

example from 1 Pet 1:3 seems to resemble a subset of the individualizing article, *par excellence*.

Wallace describes the *par excellence* usage of the individualizing article to be those instances

where the article is "used to point out a substantive that is, in a sense, 'in a class by itself.' It is

the only one deserving" that designation.[70] It should be noted that this emphasis could not be

accomplished by means of a nonrestrictive relative clause. The article before the participle and

the participle itself are necessary to bring this emphasis to the fore. In fact, it should be noted that

93 of the 107 nonrestrictive attributive participles consist of articular participles of the ASAP

(47) or SAP (46) formation pattern.

Additionally, with respect to the SAP formation pattern, as was noted in chapter 3, 100% of

all common or generic substantives modified in this formation pattern are restrictive. On the

other hand, 89% of divine names modified in the SAP formation pattern are nonrestrictive.[71]

The question at hand, then, becomes whether or not these articular participles are

attributive participles, substantival participles standing in apposition to another substantive, or

something in between. From certain examples in the New Testament it is clear that the

substantival participle in apposition to another substantive does exist. This was treated more

---

[68] This is similar to our treatment of the restrictive nature of the article in ch. 2. See section titled "Articles" on pp. 78 ff. of ch. 2.

[69] Dana and Mantey, *Manual Grammar*, 141. Emphasis mine.

[70] Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 222. Cyril of Alexandria. *Commentary on John* (vol. 1; ed. Joel C. Elowsky; trans. David Maxwell; Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2013), 26, may be highlighting this as well when he states, "When Holy Scripture puts the definite article in front of nouns, it indicates the one entity that is called by that name in the true and strict sense."

[71] See section titled "Substantive + Article + Participle (SAP)" on p. 140 of ch. 3.

thoroughly in chapter 2 and chapter 4 in the respective sections titled "Appositional Constructions."[72] Mark 6:14 contains a clear example: Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτίζων.[73]

Additionally, consider 2 Cor 5:5 as a possible example of the substantival participle in apposition: …θεός, ὁ δοὺς ἡμῖν τὸν ἀρραβῶνα τοῦ πνεύματος.[74] It seems that the article could be functioning in an individualizing manner. Furthermore, Rogers and Rogers contend that this is an example of the "Substantival use of the part[iciple] to emphasize a defining character trait." Not only do they claim the participle is substantival and in apposition to θεός, but they also assert that the substantival participle has been purposely utilized for emphasis. The example from Mark 6:14 also seems to fit this usage of emphasizing a defining character trait. Once again, a nonrestrictive relative clause would not be able to so readily bring this emphasis to the fore.

In chapter 2, it was noted that Young cites Mark 6:14 (see above), Matt 1:16 (Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος χριστός/Jesus, the one called Christ), and 1 Thess 1:10 (Ἰησοῦν τὸν ῥυόμενον ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς ὀργῆς τῆς ἐρχομένης/Jesus, the one who delivers us from the coming wrath) as examples of substantival participles in apposition.[75] It was noted, however, that Burton claims 1 Thess 1:10 to be an example of a nonrestrictive attributive participle.[76]

In fact, this is where the difficulty lies. Some examples are clearly substantival participles in apposition and others seem to be taken either way. Voelz appears to demonstrate this tension in his citation of 1 Pet 1:3 above. He labels the participial phrase (ὁ κατὰ τὸ πολὺ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος ἀναγεννήσας ἡμᾶς εἰς ἐλπίδα ζῶσαν) as "attributive" but then translates it into English as a

---

[72] See pp. 82–85 of ch. 2 and pp. 160–61 ff. of ch. 4.

[73] See our treatment of this verse in section titled "Appositional Constructions" on p. 84 of ch. 2.Additionally, examples like these that are clearly appositional have been labeled as substantival participles and are included in app. 1.

[74] "God, the one who has given to us the pledge of the Spirit."

[75] See section titled "Appositional Constructions" on pp. 82–85 of ch. 2.

[76] See p. 37 of section titled "Attributive Participle or Substantival Participle in Apposition?" in ch. 1.

substantival participle with the apparent usage of the individualizing article *par excellence*: "the one who has, according to his great mercy, begotten us again unto a living hope (as opposed to anyone else who might attempt such a salvation)." If we are to take examples such as these as substantival, then we can label the individualizing article as restrictive, limiting the substantival participle. So, for example, in 1 Pet 1:3, it is not just any "one who has begotten us" but rather it is "*THE* one who has begotten us." The article serves "*to point out a particular object*"[77] and could, therefore, be considered restrictive. Whether or not, however, the articular participle as a whole is described as an attributive participle or a substantive in apposition, the relationship between the articular participle and the antecedent/substantive is nonrestrictive. For this reason we prefer not to describe the actual articular participle as restrictive.

Overall, the usage of the articular participle in these nonrestrictive relationships with very specific divine names seems to be utilized to emphasize something that the nonrestrictive relative clause cannot. With the usage of the article an individualizing notion (perhaps *par excellence*)[78] may be emphasized and with the usage of the substantival participle a characteristic trait may be underscored. It remains difficult to discern whether one should categorize these participles as attributive or substantival. In the end, a rigid adherence to such categories may very well be unnecessary and pedantic. In our data set located in appendix 1, most of these examples have been labeled as Voelz has described them, "attributive position participles," and have been categorized as nonrestrictive. If they were to be relabeled as substantival participles in apposition, the percentage of attributive participles functioning restrictively would increase significantly beyond 84%.

---

[77] Dana and Mantey, *Manual Grammar*, 141. Emphasis mine.

[78] See Wallace for more sub-functions of the individualizing article. Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 216–27.

A smaller number of nonrestrictive attributive participles occur with personal pronouns.

Consider 1 Thess 2:10: ὑμεῖς μάρτυρες καὶ ὁ θεός, ὡς ὁσίως καὶ δικαίως καὶ ἀμέμπτως ὑμῖν τοῖς

πιστεύουσιν ἐγενήθημεν....[79] Paul does not seem to be singling out only those recipients of the

letter who believe, but describing those recipients as believers; therefore, the participle appears

to be functioning nonrestrictively. Karleen's observations of the participle in the New Testament

reveal the stylistic preference of the Greek of the New Testament to modify personal pronouns

with attributive participles and not relative clauses. He goes so far as to say, "Whereas pronouns

can be followed by articular participles, there is no equivalent relative clause construction."[80] It

should be noted, however, that some scholars consider these participles to be substantival,

standing in apposition to the personal pronoun. In fact, in Wallace's treatment of the article as a

"Substantiver (With Certain Parts of Speech),"[81] he specifically cites 1 Thess 2:10 as an example

of the article functioning in this capacity "with participles."[82] In our data set located in appendix

1, these examples have been labeled as attributive participles and have been categorized as

restrictive or nonrestrictive depending on the context. If they were to be relabeled as substantival

participles in apposition, the percentage of attributive participles functioning restrictively would

obviously increase beyond 84%.

A couple of examples occurring in the SP formation pattern seem to be nonrestrictive due

to a connection to an adjective. Consider Col 3:12: ὡς ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ ἅγιοι καὶ

---

[79] "You are witnesses, God also, how devoutly and righteously and blamelessly we were to **you, the believers.**"

[80] Karleen, *Syntax of the Participle*, 90. While he may be overstating the case, this does seem to be the overall tendency of the Greek of the New Testament.

[81] Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 231.

[82] Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 234. Leedy also labels this participle to be in apposition with the personal pronoun., Randy, A Leedy. *BibleWorks New Testament Greek Sentence Diagrams* in *BibleWorks 7: Software for Biblical Exegesis and Research*. Norfolk, Va.: BibleWorks, LLC. 2006.

ἠγαπημένοι.[83] The attributive participle parallels the nonrestrictive adjective and functions

essentially as a nonrestrictive adjective. Stylistically speaking it would be awkward to utilize a

nonrestrictive relative clause in instances such as these.

Additionally, a couple of examples seem to reflect Semitic *Vorlagen*.[84] Consider the

quotation of Amos 9:12 in Acts 15:17: λέγει κύριος ποιῶν ταῦτα.[85] The participle does not seem

to be distinguishing between different Lords; therefore, it functions nonrestrictively. A

consideration of the Hebrew Text of Amos 9:12 reveals the Greek text to be mirroring the

Hebrew:

נְאֻם־יְהוָה עֹשֶׂה זֹּאת[86]

Finally, as was noted above in our treatment of the restrictive subject relative clause, it is

possible that in any language some constructions are "ill-formed" and such occurrences are

normal for any language.[87] A very small number of occurrences may very well be "ill-formed."

For example Jas 3:9 seems to exist without parallel: καταρώμεθα τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τοὺς καθ᾽

ὁμοίωσιν θεοῦ γεγονότας.[88] Clearly, men who are not made in the likeness of God do not exist;

therefore a nonrestrictive reading is understood.[89]

---

[83] NIV: "as God's chosen people, holy and dearly loved."

[84] It should be noted that attributive participles reflecting Semitic *Vorlage* are very rare. They seem to be confined to mirroring the text of the Old Testament. Subject relative clauses that reflect a Semitic *Vorlage* are more prevalent and include both Old Testament texts and direct speech reflecting the underlying Aramaic.

[85] NIV: "says the Lord, who does these things."

[86] "declares the LORD, who does these things."

[87] See the discussion in relation to Palmer on p. 240 above.

[88] NASB[95]: "we curse men, who have been made in the likeness of God."

[89] It might be possible to consider this to be a case where the articular participle is utilized to convey something that the relative clause could not, similar to the participles with divine names discussed above. Consider the following gloss: "we curse men, THE ones who have been made in the likeness of God (as opposed to everything else that has been made, not in the likeness of God)."

Ambiguous Attributive Participles. In our categorization of attributive participles, close to 3% have been classified as ambiguous with respect to their restrictive or nonrestrictive nature.[90] These examples are ambiguous due to multiple possibilities of interpretation, amplification status, and/or long-distance dependencies.

For example, consider the attributive participial usage of πέμπω with πατήρ in the Gospel of John. Seven times this pairing occurs in John: five in the APS formation pattern[91] and two in the ASAP pattern.[92] Consider John 5:37: ὁ πέμψας με πατήρ.[93] It appears that this could be an example of titular restriction, where the attributive participle may have originally distinguished between Jesus' earthly father, Joseph, and his heavenly father. In fact this usage seems to be peculiar to the gospel of John. Alternatively, since this is a divine proper name, the usage of the attributive participle could be a stylistic tendency of the language, as was presented above. Or, it could just be that this is a nonrestrictive usage. On the whole, there are too many factors to decide definitively without the aid of native readers from the first century. So, a small number of examples such as these have been left in a questionable status.

Furthermore, a few examples remain questionable as to status and could be described, per Hausammen, as "amplifying clauses."[94] They occur with complex antecedents that are usually modified by an adjective. These examples seem to "spread the task of description over both the general adjective . . . and the more detailed clause."[95] Consider 1 Pet 3:5: οὕτως γάρ ποτε καὶ αἱ ἅγιαι γυναῖκες αἱ ἐλπίζουσαι εἰς θεὸν ἐκόσμουν ἑαυτάς. Note the confusion on how to interpret

---

[90] These have been labeled with a "?" in app. 1 under the restrictive/nonrestrictive column.

[91] John 5:37; 8:16; 8:18; 12:49 and 14:24.

[92] John 5:23 and 6:44.

[93] ESV: "the Father who sent me"

[94] Haussamen, "Restrictive and Nonrestrictive," 2. See section titled "Ambiguous Subject Relative Clauses" on p. 241 above.

this clause with the difference between the ESV and NASB[95]. The ESV renders restrictively: "For this is how **the holy women who hoped in God** used to adorn themselves." The NASB[95] renders nonrestrictively: "For in this way in former times **the holy women also, who hoped in God,** used to adorn themselves." On the one hand, the participial clause seems to amplify the adjectival descriptor, ἅγιαι, yet does not seem to limit the complex substantive αἱ ἅγιαι γυναῖκες. On the other hand, the participial clause does not seem to be nonessential. Haussamen points out that there seems to be, at times, difficult examples such as these that seem to lie in between a restrictive and nonrestrictive reading. Even though examples like these may slightly lean toward restrictivity or nonrestrictivity, since there seems to be some level of ambiguity, we have left them in a questionable status, allowing for the exegete to take this into consideration.

One last possible area of ambiguity lies with attributive participles in long distance dependencies. Indeed these examples may very well be considered substantival participles. Consider Phil 3:18–19: πολλοὶ γὰρ περιπατοῦσιν οὓς πολλάκις ἔλεγον ὑμῖν, νῦν δὲ καὶ κλαίων λέγω, τοὺς ἐχθροὺς τοῦ σταυροῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, [19] ὧν τὸ τέλος ἀπώλεια, ὧν ὁ θεὸς ἡ κοιλία καὶ ἡ δόξα ἐν τῇ αἰσχύνῃ αὐτῶν, **οἱ τὰ ἐπίγεια φρονοῦντες.**"[96] Three relative clauses intervene before the occurrence of the participle. If we describe this as an attributive participle, it appears to be functioning nonrestrictively, further describing the many who walk as enemies of the cross of Christ. Boyer and Leedy, however, interpret this as a substantival participle in apposition to πολλοί.[97] Since there seems to exist a certain level of ambiguity, a few examples such as these have been left to a questionable status.

---

[95] Haussamen, "Restrictive and Nonrestrictive," 3.

[96] NASB[95]: "For **many** walk, of whom I often told you, and now tell you even weeping, *that they are* enemies of the cross of Christ, [19] whose end is destruction, whose god is *their* appetite, and *whose* glory is in their shame, **who set their minds on earthly things.**"

[97] Boyer, *Participles*, 64. Leedy, *Sentence Diagrams*.

Summary of Subject Relative Clauses and Attributive Participles

In General, the subject relative clause predominantly relates nonrestrictively to its antecedent. It is significant to note, that 80% of subject relative clauses relate nonrestrictively compared to only 52% of the rest of the relative clauses on the Accessibility Hierarchy (direct object through possessor). Furthermore, the attributive participle primarily modifies its antecedents restrictively (84%).

Exceptions to these general tendencies exist and can be categorized relatively coherently.[98] The majority of restrictive subject relative clauses seem to exist due to verb tense issues. Other exceptions seem to exist with texts with Semitic *Vorlagen*, very generic substantives, a unique usages of ὅστις, and the idiom οὐδεὶς ἐστιν. With respect to the participle, nonrestrictive attributive participles occur predominantly with divine proper names and are articular (SAP and ASAP formation patterns). The presence of the articular participle seems to be utilized to demonstrate an emphasis that cannot be achieved with the relative clause. A small number of nonrestrictive attributive participles seem to exist in connection with personal pronouns, nonrestrictive adjectives and texts with Semitic *Vorlagen*, while a few may be considered "ill-formed."

A small percentage of examples remain difficult to categorize. The ambiguous examples of subject relative clauses and attributive participles are due to multiple possibilities of interpretation and possible status as an amplifying clause. Additionally, for attributive participles, a few with long distance dependency may be considered nonrestrictive.

---

[98] Only a very small number of examples may be ill-formed.

Illustrative Examples

Throughout the dissertation multiple examples of restrictive attributive participles and nonrestrictive (subject) relative clauses have been presented; these have demonstrated the tendencies of these constructions. We have noted above the patterns of exceptions with examples of nonrestrictive attributive participles and restrictive subject relative clauses. We turn now to examine some illustrative examples in light of the predominant tendencies of these constructions along with the patterns of exception. We also consider the predominant example traditionally used by grammarians to establish the ostensible equivalence of the attributive participle and the relative clause.

In General, Luke 15:7 depicts the overall tendency of attributive participles to be restrictive and subject relative clauses to be nonrestrictive: λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὕτως χαρὰ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἔσται ἐπὶ ἑνὶ ἁμαρτωλῷ μετανοοῦντι ἢ ἐπὶ ἐνενήκοντα ἐννέα δικαίοις οἵτινες οὐ χρείαν ἔχουσιν μετανοίας.[99] The attributive participle μετανοοῦντι limits the referent to a sinner that repents as opposed to one that does not, therefore it is restrictive.[100] The relative clause οἵτινες οὐ χρείαν ἔχουσιν μετανοίας, in a non-limiting manner, merely provides additional information about righteous people; therefore it functions nonrestrictively. This simple verse illustrates the major tendencies of these constructions. Multiple examples have been given in previous chapters and the general statistics based on the data in the appendices greatly support this reality.

The general tendencies of attributive participles toward restrictivity and subject relative clauses toward nonrestrictivity helps inform the exegesis of ambiguous examples. We turn now to consider an ambiguous relative clause and an ambiguous attributive participle.

---

[99]ASV: "I say unto you, that even so there shall be joy in heaven over <u>one sinner that repenteth</u>, *more* than over **ninety and nine righteous persons, who need no repentance.**" See the treatment of this verse on p. 190 of ch. 5 in the section titled "Nonrestrictive Relative Clauses—Subject."

[100] An example of restrictive modification that leans toward concept formation.

With respect to subject relative clauses, consider Jas 5:10: τοὺς προφήτας οἳ ἐλάλησαν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου. At first glance, it seems to be that the relative clause should be taken restrictively, as it is in most English translations. Consider the ESV: "**the prophets who spoke in the name of the Lord.**" This would be a restriction from all prophets to only those who spoke in the name of the Lord, *i.e.*, contra false prophets. This may very well be the case. However, it does not seem to fit any of the patterns of exception for restrictive subject relative clauses. It could be the case that this example is ill-formed. Or, in light of the tendencies and patterns thus far demonstrated, perhaps it should be considered to be nonrestrictive. The only English version to render it thusly is the NKJV: "**the prophets, who spoke in the name of the Lord.**" Actually, when considering the whole verse, this nonrestrictive reading, is conceivably plausible and perhaps preferable: ὑπόδειγμα λάβετε, ἀδελφοί, τῆς κακοπαθίας καὶ τῆς μακροθυμίας τοὺς προφήτας οἳ ἐλάλησαν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου.[101] The recipients of the letter (ἀδελφοί) are exhorted to take as an example of suffering and patience, the prophets. Most likely, false prophets would not be considered an example of patience and suffering. So the immediate context may very well limit the referent τοὺς προφήτας to the prophets of the Lord from the Old Testament. The predominant tendency for subject relative clauses to relate nonrestrictively to antecedents coupled with contextual clues plausibly supports a nonrestrictive reading, contra most English translations.

Romans 16:11 contains an example of an attributive participle: ἀσπάσασθε τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Ναρκίσσου τοὺς ὄντας ἐν κυρίῳ. Context alone does not permit a definitive restrictive or nonrestrictive reading. The NIV renders restrictively, "**those of the household of Narcissus who are in the Lord,**" while the NASB[95] renders nonrestrictively, "**those of the *household* of**

---

[101] "Brothers, as an example of suffering and patience, take **the prophets, who spoke in the name of the Lord.**"

Narcissus, who are in the Lord." The attributive participle does not seem to fit any of the

exceptions to restrictivity. So, based upon the predominant tendency for attributive participles to

be restrictive, Paul seems to be indicating a Christian subset of the ones of Narcissus.[102]

Not only might the general tendencies of the attributive participle and subject relative

clause inform the exegesis of certain passages, the patterns of exception may as well.

One of the most interesting and puzzling set of examples surfaced by the research of this

dissertation has to do with texts of the Lord's Supper. Consider the following four participles

from Matthew, Mark and Luke:

> Matt 26:28: τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν τὸ **αἷμά μου** τῆς διαθήκης τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυννόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν.

> Mark 14:24: τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ **αἷμά μου** τῆς διαθήκης τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν.

> Luke 22:19: τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ **σῶμά μου** τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον.

> Luke 22:20: τοῦτο τὸ **ποτήριον** ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον.

Clearly not one of these participles serves to restrict the antecedent. Furthermore, the

occurrences in Luke could not be designated as amplifying clauses. The examples in Matthew

and Mark could possibly be considered as amplifying clauses, but it seems unlikely. One could

assert that they are ill-formed. Since there are four similar examples, however, this too seems

unlikely. At first glance, these examples seem to be unique and without precedent. Upon closer

examination, however, they align rather well with the nonrestrictive articular participles that

accompany divine entities (God the Father, Son and Holy Spirit). These types of articular

participles make up the majority of exceptions to the tendency of attributive participles to be

---

[102] Consider also Mark 15:39: ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ **κεντυρίων** ὁ παρεστηκὼς ἐξ ἐναντίας αὐτοῦ ὅτι οὕτως ἐξέπνευσεν εἶπεν· ἀληθῶς οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος υἱὸς θεοῦ ἦν. Could the syntax be pointing to more than one centurion being present at the crucifixion of Jesus?

restrictive. Furthermore, such articular participles seem to be utilized with divine entities in an individualizing and emphatic manner. As was asserted above, it is possible that such participles may more appropriately be considered substantival participles or lie somewhere between an attributive and substantival participle. However one classifies the syntax, the usage of the articular participle in these verses of the Lord's Supper may very well serve to elevate their respective referents as the very divine "things" or "entities" (*par excellence*) above all others that might attempt to be poured out (τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον) and given (τὸ διδόμενον) for the forgiveness of sins (εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν), on behalf of the many/you (περὶ πολλῶν; ὑπὲρ πολλῶν; ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν). Furthermore, since most of these types of articular participles occur with divine entities, they may very well be highlighting the divine attributes of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus in the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper. Certainly, there are many scholarly assertions about the nature of these texts and multiple tools of exegesis should be applied. It appears, however, that the exegete of these texts surrounding the Lord's Supper should seriously consider the individualizing and emphatic nature of these articular participles.

In chapter 1, it was demonstrated that multiple scholars asserted that the attributive participle is equivalent to the relative clause.[103] Furthermore, they all exhibited a very similar line of reasoning with practically identical argumentation and proof texts, giving the appearance of a lack of original research.[104] The key proof texts consistently cited consist of Luke 6:48 (ἀνθρώπῳ οἰκοδομοῦντι οἰκίαν) and Matt 7:24 (ἀνδρὶ φρονίμῳ, ὅστις ᾠκοδόμησεν). We agree that both the

---

[103] See section titled "Explicit Assertions of Equivalence" on pp. 6–10 of ch. 1.

[104] See section titled "Evaluation of Assertions of Equivalence" on p. 12 of ch. 1.

attributive participle and the relative clause relate restrictively to their respective antecedents.[105]

Luke 6:48 follows the predominant tendency for the attributive participle to relate restrictively to its antecedent. Furthermore, Matt 7:24 seems to align well with the pattern of exceptions. In fact, Matt 7:24 may contain a unique usage of the relative pronoun ὅστις. Robertson cites Matt 7:24 specifically as an example where the distinct meaning of the indefinite relative pronoun is retained and states, "ὅστις is correctly used in connection with a substantive of indefinite reference."[106] Additionally, since the text is a direct quote of a parabolic teaching of Jesus, it may reflect a mirroring of its Semitic *Vorlagen*. Even if this example did not align with these patterns, it seems that the grammatical "rule" of the attributive participle being equivalent to a relative clause should not have been formulated upon this exception to the norm. Regrettably, it appears that multiple scholars have repeated this "rule" without conducting independent and comprehensive analysis.[107]

---

[105] Note the nebulous punctuation of NA[27] for Matt 7:24. Does the comma signify nonrestrictivity (as it does in Modern Greek, English and Spanish) or does it merely signify a subordinate clause (as it would in German)? Furthermore, some may argue that the adjective, φρονίμῳ, restricts ἀνδρί and the additional information provided in the relative clause is non-limiting, and therefore nonrestrictive. The ASV, NASB[77], and KJV render the relative clauses nonrestrictively. Most English translations, however, translate it restrictively. The context of the following verse seems to require a restrictive reading.

[106] Robertson, *Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, 153. While we may disagree with Robertson's usage of the word "correctly," his assertions demonstrate a unique usage of ὅστις that is different from the common relative pronoun ὅς.

[107] Additionally the examples in Acts 10 could be considered as another case where the exception is cited to establish a grammatical "rule." See discussion on pp. 8 ff. of ch. 1. Acts 10:18 and 10:32 are cited to demonstrate the two constructions as being equivalent. Admittedly there are some ambiguous occurrences in this section of Scripture, which includes also Acts 10:5 and 11:13. Furthermore, the relative clause in Acts 10:5 also has multiple variants with an attributive participle. As well there exist multiple levels of quotation and narration that further complicate the analysis. Without addressing all the issues, it should be noted, however, that these verses should never have been used as proof texts to establish the general "rule" that attributive participles are equivalent to relative clauses.

Implications for Related Fields of Study

It was asserted in chapter 1 that related fields of study support the need for the analysis of this dissertation.[108] The analysis performed in this dissertation has demonstrated this support and in turn demonstrates implications for these related fields: exegesis, punctuation practices of modern editions of the Greek New Testament, and translation practices of the Greek New Testament.

Exegesis

In terms of exegesis, Moo's treatment of Rom 11:2a demonstrated the importance of determining the restrictive/nonrestrictive nature of adjectival clauses.[109] The research of this dissertation demonstrates that when considering subordinate subject clauses, the majority of the time attributive participles function restrictively except under certain prescribed circumstances; and the majority of subject relative clauses function nonrestrictively except under certain prescribed circumstances. So, consider again Rom 11:2a: οὐκ ἀπώσατο ὁ θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ὃν προέγνω.[110] When the exegete approaches texts like Rom 11:2a, it is known that there are no major tendencies toward restrictivity or nonrestrictivity for a direct object relative clause such as this.

Furthermore, in chapter 1, the restrictive/nonrestrictive nature of the attributive participle in 1 Thess 2:14–15 was discussed: τὰ αὐτὰ ἐπάθετε καὶ ὑμεῖς ὑπὸ τῶν ἰδίων συμφυλετῶν καθὼς καὶ αὐτοὶ ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, τῶν καὶ τὸν κύριον ἀποκτεινάντων Ἰησοῦν καὶ τοὺς προφήτας.[111]

---

[108] See section titled "Related Fields of Study" on pp. 45–52 of ch. 1.

[109] See p. 236 above and section titled "Exegesis" on pp. 45–46 of ch. 1.

[110] NIV: "God did not reject his people, whom he foreknew."

[111] ESV: "you suffered the same things from your own countrymen as they did from the Jews, who killed both the Lord Jesus and the prophets."

How should the exegete interpret the attributive participle?[112] Despite the overwhelming

contextual evidence for a restrictive reading,[113] the majority of commentators and translators have

interpreted the participle nonrestrictively.[114] In essence, doing so assigns the killing of Jesus and

the prophets to the Jewish people as a whole. The predominant tendency for attributive

participles to modify restrictively coupled with strong contextual evidence strongly support a

restrictive reading, assigning the killing of Jesus and the prophets to a limited number of the

Jewish people, not the Jewish people as a whole.

Additionally, with examples such as Rom 16:11, the exegete has precedence for relying on

the major tendencies discovered in order to interpret the text: ἀσπάσασθε τοὺς ἐκ τῶν

Ναρκίσσου τοὺς ὄντας ἐν κυρίῳ. As was asserted above,[115] Paul seems to be indicating a

Christian subset of the ones of Narcissus. BDAG agrees with this restrictive understanding when

they gloss: "those belonging to the household of Narcissus who are Christians."[116]

Punctuation Practices for Greek New Testament Texts

In terms of punctuation, it was demonstrated in chapter 1 that, first, the punctuation of the

Greek Text is inconsistent in modern editions.[117] Secondly, the nature of the punctuation is

---

[112] This includes the subsequent participles as well.

[113] See Rom 9–11 and Gal. See also Frank D. Gilliard, "The Problem of the Antisemitic Comma Between 1 Thessalonians 2.14 and 15," *New Testament Studies* 35 (1989): 499–500.

[114] For a more thorough treatment of this reality see Gilliard, "1 Thessalonians 2.14 and 15," 481–502. Gilliard's assessment of the restrictive nature of the attributive participle, though very limited in scope, aligns well with our analysis. His assertions regarding the restrictive/nonrestrictive nature of the relative clause, however, lack precision and neglect the distinctions provided by the framework of the Accessibility Hierarchy. His work was made known to us through a congruent work to this dissertation: Stanley E. Porter, "Translation, Exegesis, and 1 Thessalonians 2.14–15: Could a Comma Have Changed the Course of History?" *The Bible Translator* 64 (2013): 82–98. Following Gilliard, Porter's assertions regarding the attributive participle align well with our work; his assertions with respect to the relative clause, however, like Gilliard, lack precision and inaccurately describe the restrictive/nonrestrictive tendencies of relative clauses, especially with respect to the Accessibility Hierarchy.

[115] See p. 254 above.

[116] BDAG, Νάρκισσος.

[117] See section titled "Punctuation Practices for Greek New Testament Texts" on pp. 46 ff. of ch. 1.

259

nebulous, especially with reference to the restrictive/nonrestrictive distinction. These two points

demonstrate a need for consistency in punctuation and also transparency with respect to the

nature of such punctuation. *Editors of the Greek New Testament need to determine whether or*

not the comma functions as a restrictive/nonrestrictive designator, as in Modern Greek and

English, or whether it merely signals a subordinate clause, as in German. This should be made

explicit in introductions. Furthermore, the actual classification of attributive participles and

relative clauses in the appendices serves as a guide for punctuating these restrictive and

nonrestrictive clauses.

Consider the inconsistency of punctuation found in Luke 15:7.[118] NA[27] punctuates the

relative clause without a comma: ἐνενήκοντα ἐννέα δικαίοις οἵτινες οὐ χρείαν ἔχουσιν

μετανοίας.[119] It was demonstrated in chapter 1 that the editors of NA[27] do not clearly define the

nature of the comma when they claim to represent "Greek usage."[120] BYZ, however, punctuates

the verse with a comma: ἐπὶ ἐνενήκοντα ἐννέα δικαίοις, οἵτινες οὐ χρείαν ἔχουσιν μετανοίας. It

was also demonstrated in chapter 1 that the editors of BYZ acknowledge the exegetical

implications of punctuation but their claim to have followed the "general usage found in standard

printed editions" remains vague and unhelpful, especially since it does not align with the

---

[118] See the treatment of this verse on p. 190 of ch. 5 in the section titled "Nonrestrictive Relative Clauses—Subject" and on p. 253 above in the section titled "Illustrative Examples."

[119] SBLGNT also punctuates this verse without a comma.

[120] See p. 48 of ch. 1 in the section titled "Punctuation Practices for Greek New Testament Texts."

punctuation of NA^{27}, SBLGNT, or WH.[121] The apparent contradiction between "Greek usage" and "general usage" further demonstrates the need for clarity with respect to punctuation.[122]

Translation Practices of the Greek New Testament

In terms of translation practices for the Greek New Testament, languages that have explicit strategies for demonstrating the restrictive/nonrestrictive distinction benefit greatly from the major tendencies (and their exceptions) discerned in this study. Additionally, the appendices can serve as a helpful tool to consult when translating these clauses. Multiple examples have been presented that demonstrate that a variety of inconsistencies exist within and between translations with respect to the restrictive/nonrestrictive distinction.[123] In essence, the patterns discerned here serve as a call to translators to consider more diligently the restrictive/nonrestrictive distinction, especially in languages that exhibit specific restrictive/nonrestrictive orthographic, prosodic and syntactic strategies.

To illustrate the inconsistency and necessity for more precision in translation, consider two verses previously examined from Acts 27.[124] Both instances (Acts 27:2 and 6) contain complex substantives that consist of the noun πλοῖον coupled with adjectives that designate cities of origin. In Acts 27:2 the author describes not only an Adramyttium ship but one that specifically

---

[121] See p. 49 of ch. 1 in the section titled "Punctuation Practices for Greek New Testament Texts." Furthermore, it is noted that SBLGNT claims that its punctuation "generally follows that of Westcott and Hort" (Holmes, *The Greek New Testament*, xiv). WH make no explicit assertions concerning the nature of its punctuation. See Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort, *The Greek New Testament: with Comparative Apparatus Showing Variations from the Nestle-Aland and Robinson-Pierpont Editions* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2007), introduction.

[122] For an example with an attributive participle consider Col 1:29. NA^{27} does not utilize a comma: τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν δυνάμει. BYZ, however, does: τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ, τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν δυνάμει.

[123] See pp. 50–51 of ch. 1, section titled "Translation Practices of the Greek New Testament," where Mark 12:38 and Col 1:29 are treated. Consider also the treatment of Luke 15:7 (p. 190 of ch. 5), Luke 11:22 (p. 207 of ch. 5), and Heb 12:14 (p. 207 of ch. 5).

[124] See a more thorough treatment of these verses on p. 117 of ch. 3.

was about to set sail along the coast of Asia: ἐπιβάντες δὲ πλοίῳ Ἀδραμυττηνῷ μέλλοντι πλεῖν

εἰς τοὺς κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν τόπους.[125] In Acts 27:6 the author describes not only an Alexandrian

ship, but one that specifically was sailing for Italy: κἀκεῖ εὑρὼν ὁ ἑκατοντάρχης πλοῖον

Ἀλεξανδρῖνον πλέον εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν.[126] In both cases the attributive participles, μέλλοντι and

πλέον respectively, modify their antecedents by limiting the referent to one specific ship.[127] A

look at English translations of these two verses reveals the inconsistencies of translators with

respect to the restrictive and nonrestrictive distinction. For Acts 27:2 the RSV translates the

attributive participle nonrestrictively while the later edition of this translation, the NRSV,

translates the verse restrictively. The ESV translates the participle in 27:2 nonrestrictively, but

ironically, translates the nearly identical construction in 27:6 restrictively.[128]

Summary of Implications

While it may be discovered that other related fields may also benefit from this dissertation,

it has been demonstrated that exegesis, punctuation practices for modern editions of the Greek

New Testament, and translation practices into languages with restrictive and nonrestrictive

strategies all may benefit from the restrictive and nonrestrictive tendencies of attributive

participles and relative clauses discerned in this study.

Prospects for Further Study

Two potential prospects for further study consist of additional synchronic studies of the

Greek language and further analyses of restrictive/nonrestrictive strategies in the Greek New

---

[125] NRSV: "Embarking on a ship of Adramyttium that was about to set sail to the ports along the coast of Asia...."

[126] ESV: "There the centurion found a ship of Alexandria sailing for Italy."

[127] These examples lean toward the entity identification pole of restrictive modification.

[128] The RSV also punctuates these two verses as does the ESV.

Testament. Multiple synchronic studies, similar to the one conducted here, covering different

time periods of the Greek language could help toward a diachronic understanding of the

tendencies of attributive participles and relative clauses throughout the centuries. Do the major

tendencies and their exceptions identified in this study exist in earlier and later iterations of the

Greek Language? How are they similar or different?

In establishing an understanding of the restrictive/nonrestrictive distinction, a variety of

strategies were identified: articles, demonstrative pronouns, adjectives, prepositional phrases,

genitive constructions, appositional constructions, relative clauses, and attributive participles.[129]

No comprehensive studies heretofore have analyzed the restrictive and nonrestrictive tendencies

of each of these grammatical constructions in the Greek New Testament. Additional studies on

each of these constructions would be beneficial in and of themselves; furthermore, these

additional analyses coupled with the analysis of this dissertation would contribute to a

comprehensive synchronic understanding of restrictivity and nonrestrictivity in the Greek New

Testament.

Conclusion

The underlying motivation for this dissertation stems from Martin Luther's elevation of the

church's responsibility to serve as steward of the Scriptures. Luther writes, "And let us be sure of

this: we will not long preserve the gospel without the languages . . . . If through our neglect we

let the languages go (which God forbid!), we shall . . . lose the gospel."[130] The pursuit of

---

[129] See section titled "Specific Restrictive Strategies" on pp. 77–87 of ch. 2 and section titled "Specific Nonrestrictive Strategies" on pp. 157–63 of ch. 4. Furthermore, it seems that adjectives, prepositional phrases, appositional constructions, relative clauses, and attributive participles are all in some capacity able to relate to referents both restrictively and nonrestrictively.

[130] Luther, "Christian Schools," in *LW*, 45:360. See p. 1 of ch. 1.

linguistic clarity has led us to reassess the often maintained assertion that the attributive participle and the relative clause are equivalent in the Greek New Testament.

The writings of James W. Voelz have indicated that the two constructions may very well not be equivalent, especially as it relates to the restrictive/nonrestrictive distinction. Voelz's work has clearly demonstrated the need for this study and in essence has explicitly called for the inquiry undertaken in this dissertation. As a result, the linguistic realities of restrictivity and nonrestrictivity as a universal reality have been thoroughly considered. Furthermore, every attributive participle and relative clause has been analyzed with respect to this distinction. Multiple examples have been presented to illustrate this reality and the general tendencies (and exceptions) of these constructions have been presented.

It has been discovered that these constructions may be considered equivalent on some basic fundament levels, but that in many ways they function quite distinctively. Attributive participles are not capable of subordinate relationships on the Accessibility Hierarchy below the subject position. This demonstrates a significant area where the two constructions are not equivalent, which no grammarian heretofore has made explicit. The relative clause serves as the only relativization strategy to relativize the direct object through possessor positions. The subject position, however, is relativized by the two primary relativization strategies: the attributive participle and the relative clause. Our analysis has led us to conclude that with respect to the restrictive/nonrestrictive distinction these two constructions could in no way be described as "equivalent." The attributive participle is primarily utilized to restrict its antecedent except under certain prescribed circumstances, and when both constructions are grammatically and stylistically feasible, the relative clause is predominantly utilized to relate nonrestrictively to its antecedent.

Martin Luther not only asserted the necessity to attend to the languages of Scripture for the sake of the Gospel, but also described this pursuit as "the ability to treat Scripture with certainty and thoroughness and to be useful to other nations."[131] Not only have we endeavored to thoroughly investigate the purported equivalence of the attributive participle and the relative clause; we have also added more certainty toward the ability of the exegete to interpret Scripture. In so doing our findings have demonstrated themselves to be "useful to other nations," especially those languages in which the restrictive and nonrestrictive distinction is made explicit through orthographic, prosodic and syntactic means.

As a result, our study serves as a call to clarity and correction for New Testament Greek grammarians, exegetes/commentators, and modern editors and translators of the Greek New Testament. Furthermore, this study provides a starting point for further synchronic studies of the attributive participle and relative clause in the Greek language and further analyses of the various restrictive and nonrestrictive strategies within the Greek New Testament.

---

[131] *LW*, 45:366.

APPENDIX ONE

PARTICIPIAL CONSTRUCTIONS IN THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT

This appendix includes every attributive, substantival, and predicate adjective participle in the Greek New Testament. Furthermore, many adverbial participles (including predicate position participles of additional statement, idiomatic usages, object complement, etc.) and a few periphrastic participles have been included in this appendix due to the possible debatable nature of their classification.

All of the examples beyond the primary focus of attributive participles have been identified and included in this appendix for the sake of thoroughness and transparency. This allows the reader to discern the greater pool of examples from which the specific set for analysis has been derived. This appendix, which in total contains 2,612 examples, allows for an independent assessment of the assertions maintained in this dissertation and an understanding of how each occurrence has been categorized. Furthermore, the data contained herein serves as a resource to consult for modern editors, translators, and exegetes of the Greek New Testament.

Seven columns comprise the table of this appendix. The identification of each column and its contents are explained below.

> *Verse* (Column 1). This column identifies what verse is being considered and follows the traditional ordering of the books of the New Testament.

> *Text* (Column 2). This column contains the actual participial construction located in the text.

266

Case (**Column 3**). This column contains the case of the cited participle. The cases are abbreviated as follows:

N: Nominative
G: Genitive
D: Dative
A: Accusative
V: Vocative

Fnctn (**Column 4**). The grammatical function of the participle is cited here and is abbreviated as follows:

A: Adjectival/Adnominal/Attributive
B: Adverbial
I: Idiomatic
P: Predicate Adjective
PP: Periphrastic Participle
S: Substantival
?: Ambiguous

Rest (**Column 5**). The restrictivity/nonrestrictivity of the cited attributive participle is identified here as follows:

NR: Nonrestrictive
R: Restrictive
- : Not applicable
?: Ambiguous

Ptrn (**Column 6**). The formation pattern of the cited participle is abbreviated here as follows:

Attributive Participles:
ASAP: Article + Substantive + Article + Participle
SP: Substantive + Participle
APS: Article + Participle + Substantive
SAP: Substantive + Article + Participle
PS: Participle + Substantive

Substantival Participles:
AP: Article + Participle
P: Participle

PA (**Column 7**). This column identifies the small number of passive attributive participles with agency (abbreviated by *PA*).

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
Matt 1:16	ὁ λεγόμενος	N	A	NR	SAP	
Matt 1:20	τὸ . . . γεννηθὲν	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 2:2	τεχθείς	N	A	R	APS	
Matt 2:6	ἡγούμενος	N	S	-	P	
Matt 2:7	φαινομένου	G	A	R	APS	
Matt 2:15	τὸ ῥηθὲν	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 2:17	τὸ ῥηθὲν	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 2:18	κλαίουσα	N	B	-	-	
Matt 2:20	οἱ ζητοῦντες	N	S	-	AS	
Matt 2:23	λεγομένην	A	A	R	SP	
Matt 2:23	τὸ ῥηθὲν	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 3:3	ὁ ῥηθείς	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 3:3	βοῶντος	G	S	-	P	
Matt 3:7	μελλούσης	G	A	R	APS	
Matt 3:10	ποιοῦν	N	A	R	SP	
Matt 3:11	ὁ . . . ἐρχόμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 4:3	ὁ πειράζων	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 4:4	ἐκπορευομένῳ	D	A	R	SP	
Matt 4:14	τὸ ῥηθὲν	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 4:16	ὁ καθήμενος	N	A	R	ASAP	
Matt 4:16	τοῖς καθημένοις	D	S	-	AP	
Matt 4:18	τὸν λεγόμενον	A	A	R	SAP	
Matt 4:24	τοὺς . . . ἔχοντας	A	S	-	AP	
Matt 4:24	συνεχομένους	A	S	-	P	
Matt 4:24	δαιμονιζομένους	A	S	-	P	
Matt 4:24	σεληνιαζομένους	A	S	-	P	
Matt 5:4	οἱ πενθοῦντες	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 5:6	οἱ πεινῶντες	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 5:6	οἱ . . . διψῶντες	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 5:10	οἱ δεδιωγμένοι	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 5:14	κειμένη	N	A	R	SP	
Matt 5:22	ὁ ὀργιζόμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 5:28	ὁ βλέπων	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 5:32	ὁ ἀπολύων	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 5:32	ἀπολελυμένην	A	S	-	P	
Matt 5:40	τῷ θέλοντι	D	S	-	AP	
Matt 5:42	τῷ αἰτοῦντι	D	S	-	AP	
Matt 5:42	τὸν θέλοντα	A	S	-	AP	
Matt 5:44	τῶν διωκόντων	G	S	-	AP	
Matt 5:46	τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας	A	S	-	AP	
Matt 6:4	ὁ βλέπων	N	A	R	ASAP	
Matt 6:6	ὁ βλέπων	N	A	R	ASAP	
Matt 6:18	ὁ βλέπων	N	A	R	ASAP	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
Matt 6:30	ὄντα	A	B	-	-	
Matt 6:30	βαλλόμενον	A	B	-	-	
Matt 7:8	ὁ αἰτῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 7:8	ὁ ζητῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 7:8	τῷ κρούοντι	D	S	-	AP	
Matt 7:11	ὄντες	N	B	-	-	
Matt 7:11	τοῖς αἰτοῦσιν	D	S	-	AP	
Matt 7:13	ἡ ἀπάγουσα	N	A	R	ASAP	
Matt 7:13	οἱ εἰσερχόμενοι	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 7:14	τεθλιμμένη	N	P	-	-	
Matt 7:14	ἡ ἀπάγουσα	N	A	R	ASAP	
Matt 7:14	οἱ εὑρίσκοντες	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 7:19	ποιοῦν	N	A	R	ASAP	
Matt 7:21	ὁ λέγων	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 7:21	ὁ ποιῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 7:23	οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 7:26	ὁ ἀκούων	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 7:26	ὁ... ποιῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 7:29	ἔχων	N	S	-	P	
Matt 8:9	ἔχων	N	B	-	-	
Matt 8:10	τοῖς ἀκολουθοῦσιν	D	S	-	AP	
Matt 8:16	δαιμονιζομένους	A	S	-	P	
Matt 8:16	τοὺς... ἔχοντας	A	S	-	AP	
Matt 8:17	τὸ ῥηθὲν	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 8:28	δαιμονιζόμενοι	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 8:30	βοσκομένη	N	A	R	SP	
Matt 8:33	οἱ... βόσκοντες	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 8:33	δαιμονιζομένων	G	S	-	P	
Matt 9:2	βεβλημένον	A	A	R	SP	
Matt 9:8	τὸν δόντα	A	A	NR	ASAP	
Matt 9:9	λεγόμενον	A	A	R	SP	
Matt 9:12	οἱ ἰσχύοντες	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 9:12	οἱ... ἔχοντες	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 9:20	αἱμορροοῦσα	N	A	R	SP	
Matt 9:32	δαιμονιζόμενον	A	A	R	SP	
Matt 9:36	ἐσκυλμένοι	N	PP	-	-	
Matt 9:36	ἐρριμμένοι	N	PP	-	-	
Matt 9:36	ἔχοντα	N	A	R	SP	
Matt 10:2	ὁ λεγόμενος	N	A	R	SAP	
Matt 10:4	ὁ... παραδοὺς	N	A	NR	SAP	
Matt 10:6	τὰ ἀπολωλότα	A	A	R	ASAP	
Matt 10:8	ἀσθενοῦντας	A	S	-	P	
Matt 10:20	οἱ λαλοῦντες	N	S	-	AP	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
Matt 10:20	τὸ λαλοῦν	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 10:22	ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 10:28	τῶν ἀποκτεννόντων	G	S	-	AP	
Matt 10:28	τῶν ... δυναμένων	G	S	-	AP	
Matt 10:28	τὸν δυνάμενον	A	S	-	AP	
Matt 10:37	Ὁ φιλῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 10:37	ὁ φιλῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 10:39	ὁ εὑρὼν	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 10:39	ὁ ἀπολέσας	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 10:40	Ὁ δεχόμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 10:40	ὁ ... δεχόμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 10:40	τὸν ἀποστείλαντα	A	S	-	AP	
Matt 10:41	ὁ δεχόμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 10:41	ὁ δεχόμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 11:3	ὁ ἐρχόμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 11:7	σαλευόμενον	A	A	R	SP	PA
Matt 11:8	ἠμφιεσμένον	A	A	R	SP	
Matt 11:8	οἱ ... φοροῦντες	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 11:14	ὁ μέλλων	N	A	R	SAP	
Matt 11:15	ὁ ἔχων	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 11:16	καθημένοις	N	A	R	SP	
Matt 11:21	αἱ γενόμεναι	N	A	R	ASAP	
Matt 11:23	αἱ γενόμεναι	N	A	R	ASAP	
Matt 11:28	οἱ κοπιῶντες	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 11:28	οἱ ... πεφορτισμένοι	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 12:10	ἔχων	N	A	R	SP	
Matt 12:17	τὸ ῥηθὲν	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 12:20	συντετριμμένον	A	A	R	SP	
Matt 12:20	τυφόμενον	A	A	R	SP	
Matt 12:22	δαιμονιζόμενος	N	S	-	P	
Matt 12:25	μερισθεῖσα	N	A	R	SP	
Matt 12:25	μερισθεῖσα	N	A	R	SP	
Matt 12:30	ὁ μὴ ὢν	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 12:30	ὁ μὴ συνάγων	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 12:32	τῷ μέλλοντι	D	S	-	AP	
Matt 12:48	τῷ λέγοντι	D	S	-	AP	
Matt 13:3	ὁ σπείρων	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 13:9	ὁ ἔχων	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 13:14	ἡ λέγουσα	N	A	R	ASAP	
Matt 13:18	τοῦ σπείραντος	G	S	-	AP	
Matt 13:19	τὸ ἐσπαρμένον	A	S	-	AP	
Matt 13:19	ὁ ... σπαρείς.	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 13:20	ὁ ... σπαρείς	N	S	-	AP	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
Matt 13:20	ὁ . . . ἀκούων	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 13:20	ὁ . . . λαμβάνων	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 13:22	ὁ . . . σπαρείς	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 13:22	ὁ . . . ἀκούων	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 13:23	ὁ . . . σπαρείς	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 13:23	ὁ . . . ἀκούων	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 13:23	ὁ . . . συνιείς	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 13:24	σπείραντι	D	A	R	SP	
Matt 13:35	τὸ ῥηθὲν	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 13:35	κεκρυμμένα	A	S	-	P	
Matt 13:37	ὁ σπείρων	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 13:39	ὁ σπείρας	N	A	R	ASAP	
Matt 13:41	τοὺς ποιοῦντας	A	S	-	AP	
Matt 13:43	ὁ ἔχων	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 13:44	κεκρυμμένῳ	D	A	R	SP	
Matt 13:45	ζητοῦντι	D	A	R	SP	
Matt 13:47	βληθείσῃ	D	A	R	SP	
Matt 13:47	συναγαγούσῃ	D	A	R	SP	
Matt 13:52	μαθητευθείς	N	A	R	SP	
Matt 14:9	τοὺς συνανακειμένους	A	S	-	AP	
Matt 14:20	τὸ περισσεῦον	A	S	-	AP	
Matt 14:21	οἱ δὲ ἐσθίοντες	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 14:35	τοὺς . . . ἔχοντας	A	S	-	AP	
Matt 15:4	ὁ κακολογῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 15:11	τὸ εἰσερχόμενον	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 15:11	τὸ ἐκπορευόμενον	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 15:17	τὸ εἰσπορευόμενον	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 15:18	τὰ δὲ ἐκπορευόμενα	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 15:20	τὰ κοινοῦντα	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 15:24	τὰ ἀπολωλότα	A	A	R	ASAP	
Matt 15:27	τῶν πιπτόντων	G	A	R	ASAP	
Matt 15:30	ἔχοντες	N	B	-	-	
Matt 15:37	τὸ περισσεῦον	A	S	-	AP	
Matt 15:38	οἱ δὲ ἐσθίοντες	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 16:16	τοῦ ζῶντος	G	A	R	ASAP	
Matt 16:28	τῶν ὧδε ἑστώτων	G	S	-	AP	
Matt 17:5	λέγουσα	N	A	R	SP	
Matt 17:17	διεστραμμένη	V	A	R	SP	
Matt 17:24	οἱ . . . λαμβάνοντες	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 17:27	ἀναβάντα	A	A	R	APS	
Matt 18:6	τῶν πιστευόντων	G	A	R	ASAP	
Matt 18:12	τὸ πλανώμενον	A	S	-	AP	
Matt 18:13	τοῖς μὴ πεπλανημένοις	D	A	R	ASAP	

271

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
Matt 18:30	τὸ ὀφειλόμενον	A	S	-	AP	
Matt 18:31	τὰ γενόμενα	A	S	-	AP	
Matt 18:31	τὰ γενόμενα	A	S	-	AP	
Matt 18:34	τὸ ὀφειλόμενον	A	S	-	AP	
Matt 19:4	ὁ κτίσας	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 19:12	ὁ δυνάμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 19:21	τὰ ὑπάρχοντα	A	S	-	AP	
Matt 19:28	οἱ ἀκολουθήσαντές	N	A	NR	SAP	
Matt 20:12	τοῖς βαστάσασι	D	A	R	SAP	
Matt 20:30	καθήμενοι	N	A	R	SP	
Matt 21:4	τὸ ῥηθὲν	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 21:5	ἐπιβεβηκὼς	N	B	-	-	
Matt 21:9	οἱ προάγοντες	N	A	R	ASAP	
Matt 21:9	οἱ ἀκολουθοῦντες	N	A	R	ASAP	
Matt 21:9	εὐλογημένος	N	P	-	-	
Matt 21:9	ὁ ἐρχόμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 21:12	τοὺς πωλοῦντας	A	S	-	AP	
Matt 21:12	τοὺς ... ἀγοράζοντας	A	S	-	AP	
Matt 21:12	τῶν πωλούντων	G	S	-	AP	
Matt 21:15	τοὺς κράζοντας	A	A	R	ASAP	
Matt 21:15	τοὺς ... λέγοντας	A	B	-	-	
Matt 21:16	θηλαζόντων	G	S	-	P	
Matt 21:42	οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 21:43	ποιοῦντι	D	A	R	SP	
Matt 21:44	ὁ πεσὼν	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 22:3	τοὺς κεκλημένους	A	S	-	AP	
Matt 22:4	τοῖς κεκλημένοις	D	S	-	AP	
Matt 22:4	τεθυμένα	N	P	-	-	
Matt 22:8	οἱ δὲ κεκλημένοι	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 22:10	ἀνακειμένων	G	S	-	P	
Matt 22:11	τοὺς ἀνακειμένους	A	S	-	AP	
Matt 22:23	λέγοντες	N	B	-	-	
Matt 22:31	τὸ ῥηθὲν	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 22:32	ζώντων	G	S	-	P	
Matt 23:13	τοὺς εἰσερχομένους	A	S	-	AP	
Matt 23:16	οἱ λέγοντες	N	A	R	SAP	
Matt 23:17	ὁ ἁγιάσας	N	A	R	ASAP	
Matt 23:19	τὸ ἁγιάζον	N	A	R	ASAP	
Matt 23:20	ὁ οὖν ὀμόσας	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 23:21	ὁ ὀμόσας	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 23:21	τῷ κατοικοῦντι	D	S	-	AP	
Matt 23:22	ὁ ὀμόσας	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 23:22	τῷ καθημένῳ	D	S	-	AP	

272

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
Matt 23:24	οἱ διϋλίζοντες	N/V	A	R	SAP	
Matt 23:24	καταπίνοντες	N/V	A	R	SAP	
Matt 23:27	κεκονιαμένοις	D	A	R	SP	
Matt 23:31	τῶν φονευσάντων	G	S	-	AP	
Matt 23:35	ἐκχυννόμενον	N	A	R	SP	
Matt 23:37	ἡ ἀποκτείνουσα	N	?	?	?	
Matt 23:37	λιθοβολοῦσα	N	?	?	?	
Matt 23:37	τοὺς ἀπεσταλμένους	A	S	-	AP	
Matt 23:39	εὐλογημένος	N	P	-	-	
Matt 23:39	ὁ ἐρχόμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 24:13	ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 24:14	τῇ οἰκουμένῃ	D	S	-	AP	
Matt 24:15	τὸ ῥηθὲν	A	A	R	ASAP	
Matt 24:15	ὁ ἀναγινώσκων	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 24:19	ταῖς . . . ἐχούσαις	D	S	-	AP	
Matt 24:19	ταῖς θηλαζούσαις	D	S	-	AP	
Matt 24:47	τοῖς ὑπάρχουσιν	D	S	-	AP	
Matt 24:49	τῶν μεθυόντων	G	S	-	AP	
Matt 25:9	τοὺς πωλοῦντας	A	S	-	AP	
Matt 25:14	ἀποδημῶν	N	A	R	SP	
Matt 25:14	τὰ ὑπάρχοντα	A	S	-	AP	
Matt 25:16	ὁ . . . λαβὼν	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 25:18	ὁ δὲ τὸ ἓν λαβὼν	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 25:20	ὁ . . . λαβὼν	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 25:24	ὁ . . . εἰληφὼς	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 25:24	θερίζων	N	B	-	-	
Matt 25:24	συνάγων	N	B	-	-	
Matt 25:28	τῷ ἔχοντι	D	S	-	AP	
Matt 25:29	τῷ γὰρ ἔχοντι	D	S	-	AP	
Matt 25:29	τοῦ δὲ μὴ ἔχοντος	G	S	-	AP	
Matt 25:34	οἱ εὐλογημένοι	V	S	-	AP	
Matt 25:34	ἡτοιμασμένην	A	A	R	APS	
Matt 25:41	κατηραμένοι	V	S	-	-	
Matt 25:41	τὸ ἡτοιμασμένον	A	A	R	ASAP	
Matt 26:3	τοῦ λεγομένου	G	A	R	ASAP	
Matt 26:14	ὁ λεγόμενος	N	A	R	SAP	
Matt 26:23	ὁ ἐμβάψας	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 26:25	ὁ παραδιδοὺς	N	A	?	SAP	
Matt 26:28	τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυννόμενον	N	A	NR	ASAP	
Matt 26:36	λεγόμενον	A	A	R	SP	
Matt 26:43	βεβαρημένοι	N	P	-	-	
Matt 26:46	ὁ παραδιδούς	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 26:48	ὁ δὲ παραδιδοὺς	N	S	-	AP	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
Matt 26:52	οἱ λαβόντες	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 26:63	τοῦ ζῶντος	G	A	R	ASAP	
Matt 26:68	ὁ παίσας	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 26:73	οἱ ἑστῶτες	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 26:75	εἰρηκότος	G	B	-	-	
Matt 27:3	ὁ παραδιδοὺς	N	A	?	SAP	
Matt 27:9	τὸ ῥηθὲν	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 27:9	τοῦ τετιμημένου	G	S	-	AP	
Matt 27:16	λεγόμενον	A	A	R	SP	
Matt 27:17	τὸν λεγόμενον	A	A	R	SAP	
Matt 27:22	τὸν λεγόμενον	A	A	R	SAP	
Matt 27:33	λεγόμενον	A	A	R	SP	
Matt 27:34	μεμιγμένον	A	A	R	SP	
Matt 27:37	γεγραμμένην	A	P	-	-	
Matt 27:39	Οἱ δὲ παραπορευόμενοι	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 27:40	ὁ καταλύων	V	S	-	AP	
Matt 27:40	ὁ . . . οἰκοδομῶν	V	S	-	AP	
Matt 27:44	οἱ συσταυρωθέντες	N	A	R	ASAP	
Matt 27:47	τῶν ἐκεῖ ἑστηκότων	G	S	-	AP	
Matt 27:52	κεκοιμημένων	G	A	R	APS	
Matt 27:54	οἱ . . . τηροῦντες	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 27:54	τὰ γενόμενα	A	S	-	AP	
Matt 27:55	θεωροῦσαι	N	B	-	-	
Matt 28:1	τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ	D	S	-	AP	
Matt 28:4	οἱ τηροῦντες	N	S	-	AP	
Matt 28:5	τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον	A	A	R	SAP	
Matt 28:11	τὰ γενόμενα	A	S	-	AP	
Mark 1:3	βοῶντος	G	S	-	P	
Mark 1:4	[ὁ] βαπτίζων	N	S	-	AP	
Mark 1:4	κηρύσσων	N	S	-	-	
Mark 1:22	ἔχων	N	S	-	P	
Mark 1:32	τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας	A	S	-	AP	
Mark 1:32	τοὺς δαιμονιζομένους	A	S	-	AP	
Mark 1:34	ἔχοντας	A	S	-	P	
Mark 1:38	ἐχομένας	A	A	R	APS	
Mark 2:3	αἰρόμενον	A	B	-	-	
Mark 2:17	οἱ ἰσχύοντες	N	S	-	AP	
Mark 2:17	ἔχοντες	N	S	-	P	
Mark 2:26	τοῖς σὺν αὐτῷ οὖσιν	D	S	-	AP	
Mark 3:1	ἔχων	N	A	R	SP	
Mark 3:1	ἐξηραμμένην	A	B	-	-	
Mark 3:3	τῷ . . . ἔχοντι	D	A	R	ASAP	
Mark 3:22	οἱ . . . καταβάντες	N	A	R	ASAP	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
Mark 3:34	τοὺς . . . καθημένους	A	S	-	AP	
Mark 4:3	ὁ σπείρων	N	S	-	AP	
Mark 4:14	ὁ σπείρων	N	S	-	AP	
Mark 4:15	τὸν ἐσπαρμένον	A	A	R	ASAP	
Mark 4:16	οἱ . . . σπειρόμενοι	N	S	-	AP	
Mark 4:18	οἱ . . . σπειρόμενοι	N	S	-	AP	
Mark 4:18	οἱ . . . ἀκούσαντες	N	S	-	AP	
Mark 4:20	οἱ . . . σπαρέντες	N	S	-	AP	
Mark 5:11	βοσκομένη	N	A	R	SP	
Mark 5:14	οἱ βόσκοντες	N	S	-	AP	
Mark 5:14	τὸ γεγονὸς	N	S	-	AP	
Mark 5:15	τὸν δαιμονιζόμενον	A	S	-	AP	
Mark 5:15	τὸν ἐσχηκότα	A	S	-	AP	
Mark 5:16	οἱ ἰδόντες	N	S	-	AP	
Mark 5:16	τῷ δαιμονιζομένῳ	D	S	-	AP	
Mark 5:18	ὁ δαιμονισθεὶς	N	S	-	AP	
Mark 5:25	οὖσα	N	B	-	-	
Mark 5:26	παθοῦσα	N	B	-	-	
Mark 5:26	δαπανήσασα	N	B	-	-	
Mark 5:26	ὠφεληθεῖσα	N	B	-	-	
Mark 5:26	ἐλθοῦσα	N	B	-	-	
Mark 5:32	τὴν τοῦτο ποιήσασαν	A	S	-	AP	
Mark 6:2	ἀκούοντες	N	S	-	P	
Mark 6:2	ἡ δοθεῖσα	N	A	R	ASAP	
Mark 6:2	γινόμεναι	N	P	-	-	
Mark 6:9	ὑποδεδεμένους	A	B	-	-	
Mark 6:14	ὁ βαπτίζων	N	S	-	AP	
Mark 6:22	τοῖς συνανακειμένοις	D	S	-	AP	
Mark 6:24	τοῦ βαπτίζοντος	G	S	-	AP	
Mark 6:26	τοὺς ἀνακειμένους	A	S	-	AP	
Mark 6:31	οἱ ἐρχόμενοι	N	S	-	AP	
Mark 6:31	οἱ ὑπάγοντες	N	S	-	AP	
Mark 6:34	ἔχοντα	N	A	R	SP	
Mark 6:44	οἱ φαγόντες	N	S	-	AP	
Mark 6:55	τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας	A	S	-	AP	
Mark 7:10	ὁ κακολογῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Mark 7:15	τὰ . . . ἐκπορευόμενα	N	S	-	AP	
Mark 7:15	τὰ κοινοῦντα	N	S	-	AP	
Mark 7:18	τὸ . . . εἰσπορευόμενον	N	S	-	AP	
Mark 7:20	τὸ . . . ἐκπορευόμενον	N	S	-	AP	
Mark 8:17	πεπωρωμένην	A	P	-	-	
Mark 9:1	τῶν ἐστηκότων	G	S	-	AP	
Mark 9:3	στίλβοντα	N	P	-	-	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
Mark 9:7	ἐπισκιάζουσα	N	B	-	-	
Mark 9:17	ἔχοντα	A	B	-	-	
Mark 9:23	τῷ πιστεύοντι	D	S	-	AP	
Mark 9:37	τὸν ἀποστείλαντά	A	S	-	AP	
Mark 9:42	τῶν πιστευόντων	G	A	R	ASAP	
Mark 10:23	οἱ...ἔχοντες	N	S	-	AP	
Mark 10:30	τῷ ἐρχομένῳ	D	A	R	ASAP	
Mark 10:32	οἱ δὲ ἀκολουθοῦντες	N	S	-	AP	
Mark 10:32	τὰ μέλλοντα	A	S	-	AP	
Mark 10:42	οἱ δοκοῦντες	N	S	-	AP	
Mark 11:5	τῶν ἐκεῖ ἐστηκότων	G	S	-	AP	
Mark 11:8	κόψαντες	N	B	-	-	
Mark 11:9	οἱ προάγοντες	N	S	-	AP	
Mark 11:9	οἱ ἀκολουθοῦντες	N	S	-	AP	
Mark 11:9	εὐλογημένος	N	P	-	-	
Mark 11:9	ὁ ἐρχόμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Mark 11:10	εὐλογημένη	N	P	-	P	
Mark 11:10	ἐρχομένη	N	A	R	APS	
Mark 11:13	ἔχουσαν	A	A	R	SP	
Mark 11:15	τοὺς πωλοῦντας	A	S	-	AP	
Mark 11:15	τοὺς ἀγοράζοντας	A	S	-	AP	
Mark 11:15	τῶν πωλούντων	G	S	-	AP	
Mark 12:10	οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες	N	S	-	AP	
Mark 12:27	ζώντων	G	S	-	P	
Mark 12:38	τῶν θελόντων	G	A	R	ASAP	
Mark 12:40	οἱ κατεσθίοντες	N	S	-	AP	
Mark 12:40	προσευχόμενοι	N	S	-	AP	
Mark 12:43	τῶν βαλλόντων	G	S	-	AP	
Mark 12:44	τοῦ περισσεύοντος	G	S	-	AP	
Mark 13:11	οἱ λαλοῦντες	N	S	-	-	
Mark 13:13	ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας	N	S	-	AP	
Mark 13:14	ὁ ἀναγινώσκων	N	S	-	AP	
Mark 13:17	ταῖς ἐν γαστρὶ ἐχούσαις	D	S	-	AP	
Mark 13:17	ταῖς θηλαζούσαις	D	S	-	AP	
Mark 14:3	ἔχουσα	N	B	-	-	
Mark 14:4	ἀγανακτοῦντες	N	P	-	-	
Mark 14:13	βαστάζων	N	A	R	SP	
Mark 14:15	ἐστρωμένον	A	A	R	SP	
Mark 14:18	ὁ ἐσθίων	N	S	-	AP	
Mark 14:20	ὁ ἐμβαπτόμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Mark 14:24	τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον	N	A	NR	ASAP	
Mark 14:42	ὁ παραδιδούς	N	S	-	AP	
Mark 14:44	ὁ παραδιδοὺς	N	S	-	AP	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
Mark 14:47	τῶν παρεστηκότων	G	S	-	AP	
Mark 14:51	περιβεβλημένος	N	A	R	SP	
Mark 14:69	τοῖς παρεστῶσιν	D	S	-	AP	
Mark 14:70	οἱ παρεστῶτες	N	S	-	AP	
Mark 15:7	ὁ λεγόμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Mark 15:21	παράγοντα	A	S	-	P	
Mark 15:21	ἐρχόμενον	A	B	-	-	
Mark 15:23	ἐσμυρνισμένον	A	A	R	PS	
Mark 15:29	ὁ καταλύων	N	S	-	AP	
Mark 15:29	οἰκοδομῶν	N	S	-	P	
Mark 15:32	οἱ συνεσταυρωμένοι	N	S	-	AP	
Mark 15:35	τῶν παρεστηκότων	G	S	-	AP	
Mark 15:39	ὁ παρεστηκώς	N	A	?	ASAP	
Mark 15:41	αἱ συναναβᾶσαι	N	S	-	AP	
Mark 16:6	τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον·	A	S	-	-	
Mark 16:10	τοῖς ... γενομένοις	D	S	-	AP	
Mark 16:14	τοῖς θεασαμένοις	D	S	-	AP	
Mark 16:16	ὁ πιστεύσας	N	S	-	AP	
Mark 16:16	βαπτισθείς	N	S	-	AP	
Mark 16:16	ὁ δὲ ἀπιστήσας	N	S	-	AP	
Mark 16:17	τοῖς πιστεύσασιν	D	S	-	AP	
Mark 16:20	ἐπακολουθούντων	G	A	R	APS	
Mark 16:20	τὰ παρηγγελμένα	A	S	-	AP	
Luke 1:1	τῶν πεπληροφορημένων	G	A	R	APS	
Luke 1:2	οἱ ... γενόμενοι	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 1:6	πορευόμενοι	N	P	-	-	
Luke 1:17	κατεσκευασμένον	A	A	R	SP	
Luke 1:18	προβεβηκυῖα	N	P	-	-	
Luke 1:19	ὁ παρεστηκώς	N	A	NR	SAP	
Luke 1:27	ἐμνηστευμένην	A	A	R	SP	
Luke 1:28	κεχαριτωμένη	V	S	-	P	
Luke 1:35	γεννώμενον	N	A	R	APS	
Luke 1:36	τῇ καλουμένῃ	D	A	NR	SAP	
Luke 1:42	εὐλογημένη	N	P	-	-	
Luke 1:42	εὐλογημένος	N	P	-	-	
Luke 1:45	ἡ πιστεύσασα	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 1:45	τοῖς λελαλημένοις	D	S	-	AP	
Luke 1:50	τοῖς φοβουμένοις	D	S	-	AP	
Luke 1:53	πεινῶντας	A	S	-	P	
Luke 1:53	πλουτοῦντας	A	S	-	P	
Luke 1:65	τοὺς περιοικοῦντας	A	S	-	AP	
Luke 1:66	οἱ ἀκούσαντες	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 1:71	τῶν μισούντων	G	S	-	AP	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
Luke 1:79	τοῖς ... καθημένοις	D	S	-	AP	
Luke 2:1	τὴν οἰκουμένην	A	S	-	AP	
Luke 2:5	τῇ ἐμνηστευμένῃ	D	A	NR	SAP	
Luke 2:15	τὸ γεγονὸς	A	A	R	ASAP	
Luke 2:17	τοῦ λαληθέντος	G	A	R	ASAP	
Luke 2:18	οἱ ἀκούσαντες	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 2:18	τῶν λαληθέντων	G	S	-	AP	
Luke 2:21	τὸ κληθὲν	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 2:23	διανοῖγον	N	A	R	SP	
Luke 2:24	τὸ εἰρημένον	A	S	-	AP	
Luke 2:25	προσδεχόμενος	N	P	-	-	
Luke 2:27	τὸ εἰθισμένον	A	S	-	AP	
Luke 2:33	τοῖς λαλουμένοις	D	S	-	AP	
Luke 2:34	ἀντιλεγόμενον	A	A	R	SP	
Luke 2:36	προβεβηκυῖα	N	P	-	-	
Luke 2:38	τοῖς προσδεχομένοις	D	S	-	AP	
Luke 2:47	οἱ ἀκούοντες	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 3:4	βοῶντος	G	S	-	P	
Luke 3:7	ἐκπορευομένοις	D	A	R	APS	
Luke 3:7	μελλούσης	G	A	R	APS	
Luke 3:9	ποιοῦν	N	A	R	SP	
Luke 3:11	ὁ ἔχων	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 3:11	τῷ μὴ ἔχοντι	D	S	-	AP	
Luke 3:11	ὁ ἔχων	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 3:13	τὸ διατεταγμένον	A	S	-	AP	
Luke 3:14	στρατευόμενοι	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 3:23	ὢν	N	B	-	-	
Luke 4:5	τῆς οἰκουμένης	G	S	-	AP	
Luke 4:16	τὸ εἰωθὸς	A	S	-	AP	
Luke 4:18	τεθραυσμένους	A	S	-	P	
Luke 4:22	τοῖς ἐκπορευομένοις	D	A	R	ASAP	
Luke 4:33	ἔχων	N	A	R	SP	
Luke 4:40	ἀσθενοῦντας	A	S	-	-	
Luke 5:24	τῷ παραλελυμένῳ	D	S	-	AP	
Luke 5:31	οἱ ὑγιαίνοντες	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 5:31	οἱ κακῶς ἔχοντες	N	S	-	-	
Luke 6:3	οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ [ὄντες]	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 6:8	τῷ ξηρὰν ἔχοντι	D	A	R	ASAP	
Luke 6:15	τὸν καλούμενον	A	A	R	SAP	
Luke 6:18	οἱ ἐνοχλούμενοι	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 6:21	οἱ πεινῶντες	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 6:21	οἱ κλαίοντες	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 6:25	οἱ ἐμπεπλησμένοι	N	A	R	SAP	

278

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
Luke 6:25	οἱ γελῶντες	N	S	-	-	
Luke 6:27	τοῖς ἀκούουσιν	D	A	R	SAP	
Luke 6:27	τοῖς μισοῦσιν	D	S	-	AP	
Luke 6:28	τοὺς καταρωμένους	A	S	-	AP	
Luke 6:28	τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων	G	S	-	AP	
Luke 6:29	τῷ τύπτοντι	D	S	-	AP	
Luke 6:29	τοῦ αἴροντό	G	S	-	AP	
Luke 6:30	αἰτοῦντί	D	S	-	P	
Luke 6:30	τοῦ αἴροντος	G	S	-	AP	
Luke 6:32	τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας	A	S	-	AP	
Luke 6:32	τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας	A	S	-	AP	
Luke 6:33	τοὺς ἀγαθοποιοῦντας	A	S	-	AP	
Luke 6:38	πεπιεσμένον	A	A	R	SP	
Luke 6:38	σεσαλευμένον	A	A	R	SP	
Luke 6:38	ὑπερεκχυννόμενον	A	A	R	SP	
Luke 6:43	ποιοῦν	N	PP	-	-	
Luke 6:43	ποιοῦν	N	PP	-	-	
Luke 6:47	ὁ ἐρχόμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 6:47	ἀκούων	N	S	-	P	
Luke 6:47	ποιῶν	N	S	-	P	
Luke 6:48	οἰκοδομοῦντι	D	A	R	SP	
Luke 6:49	ὁ δὲ ἀκούσας	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 6:49	ποιήσας	N	S	-	P	
Luke 6:49	οἰκοδομήσαντι	D	A	R	SP	
Luke 7:2	ἔχων	N	A	R	SP	
Luke 7:8	τασσόμενος	N	A	R	SP	
Luke 7:8	ἔχων	N	B	-	-	
Luke 7:9	ἀκολουθοῦντι	D	A	R	APS	
Luke 7:10	οἱ πεμφθέντες	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 7:11	καλουμένην	A	A	R	SP	
Luke 7:12	τεθνηκὼς	N	S	-	P	
Luke 7:14	οἱ δὲ βαστάζοντες	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 7:19	ὁ ἐρχόμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 7:20	ὁ ἐρχόμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 7:24	σαλευόμενον	A	A	R	SP	PA
Luke 7:25	ἠμφιεσμένον	A	A	R	SP	
Luke 7:25	οἱ ... ὑπάρχοντες	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 7:32	τοῖς ... καθημένοις	D	A	R	SAP	
Luke 7:32	προσφωνοῦσιν	D	A	R	SAP	
Luke 7:39	ὁ καλέσας	N	A	R	ASAP	
Luke 7:49	οἱ συνανακείμενοι	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 8:2	ἡ καλουμένη	N	A	R	SAP	
Luke 8:3	τῶν ὑπαρχόντων	G	S	-	AP	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
Luke 8:5	ὁ σπείρων	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 8:8	ὁ ἔχων	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 8:12	οἱ ἀκούσαντες	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 8:14	τὸ . . . πεσόν	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 8:14	οἱ ἀκούσαντες	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 8:16	οἱ εἰσπορευόμενοι	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 8:21	οἱ . . . ἀκούοντες	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 8:21	ποιοῦντες	N	S	-	P	
Luke 8:27	ἔχων	N	A	R	SP	
Luke 8:32	βοσκομένη	N	PP	-	-	
Luke 8:34	οἱ βόσκοντες	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 8:34	τὸ γεγονὸς	A	S	-	AP	
Luke 8:35	τὸ γεγονὸς	A	S	-	AP	
Luke 8:36	οἱ ἰδόντες	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 8:36	ὁ δαιμονισθείς	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 8:43	οὖσα	N	A	R	SP	
Luke 8:45	ὁ ἀψάμενός	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 8:56	τὸ γεγονός	A	S	-	AP	
Luke 9:7	τὰ γινόμενα	A	S	-	AP	
Luke 9:10	καλουμένην	A	A	R	SP	
Luke 9:11	τοὺς χρείαν ἔχοντας	A	S	-	AP	
Luke 9:17	τὸ περισσεῦσαν	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 9:27	τῶν αὐτοῦ ἑστηκότων	G	S	-	AP	
Luke 9:29	ἐξαστράπτων	N	P	-	-	
Luke 9:31	ὀφθέντες	N	B	-	-	
Luke 9:32	τοὺς συνεστῶτας	A	A	R	ASAP	
Luke 9:35	λέγουσα	N	B	-	-	
Luke 9:35	ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 9:41	διεστραμμένη	V	A	R	SP	
Luke 9:48	τὸν ἀποστείλαντά	A	S	-	AP	
Luke 9:48	ὁ . . . ὑπάρχων	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 10:8	τὰ παρατιθέμενα	A	S	-	AP	
Luke 10:11	τὸν κολληθέντα	A	A	R	ASAP	
Luke 10:13	αἱ γενόμεναι	N	A	R	ASAP	
Luke 10:16	Ὁ ἀκούων	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 10:16	ὁ ἀθετῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 10:16	ὁ δὲ ἐμὲ ἀθετῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 10:16	τὸν ἀποστείλαντα	A	S	-	AP	
Luke 10:23	οἱ βλέποντες	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 10:36	τοῦ ἐμπεσόντος	G	S	-	-	
Luke 10:37	ὁ ποιήσας	N	S	-	-	
Luke 10:39	καλουμένη	N	A	R	SP	
Luke 11:4	ὀφείλοντι	D	S	-	P	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
Luke 11:10	ὁ αἰτῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 11:10	ὁ ζητῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 11:10	τῷ κρούοντι	D	S	-	AP	
Luke 11:13	ὑπάρχοντες	N	B	-	-	
Luke 11:13	τοῖς αἰτοῦσιν	D	S	-	AP	
Luke 11:17	διαμερισθεῖσα	N	A	R	SP	
Luke 11:21	καθωπλισμένος	N	B	-	-	
Luke 11:21	τὰ ὑπάρχοντα	A	S	-	-	
Luke 11:23	Ὁ μὴ ὢν	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 11:23	ὁ μὴ συνάγων	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 11:27	ἡ βαστάσασα	N	A	R	ASAP	
Luke 11:28	οἱ ἀκούοντες	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 11:28	φυλάσσοντες.	N	S	-	P	
Luke 11:33	οἱ εἰσπορευόμενοι	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 11:40	ὁ ποιήσας	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 11:41	τὰ ἐνόντα	A	S	-	AP	
Luke 11:44	[οἱ] περιπατοῦντες	N	A	R	ASAP	
Luke 11:50	τὸ ἐκκεχυμένον	N	A	R	ASAP	
Luke 11:51	τοῦ ἀπολομένου	G	A	R	SAP	
Luke 11:52	τοὺς εἰσερχομένους	A	S	-	Ap	
Luke 12:4	τῶν ἀποκτεινόντων	G	S	-	AP	
Luke 12:4	ἐχόντων	G	S	-	P	
Luke 12:5	τὸν ... ἔχοντα	A	S	-	AP	
Luke 12:9	ὁ δὲ ἀρνησάμενός	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 12:10	τῷ ... βλασφημήσαντι	D	S	-	AP	
Luke 12:15	τῶν ὑπαρχόντων	G	S	-	AP	
Luke 12:19	κείμενα	A	A	R	SP	
Luke 12:21	ὁ θησαυρίζων	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 12:21	πλουτῶν.	N	S	-	P	
Luke 12:28	ὄντα	A	B	-	-	
Luke 12:28	βαλλόμενον	A	B	-	-	
Luke 12:33	τὰ ὑπάρχοντα	A	S	-	AP	
Luke 12:33	παλαιούμενα	A	A	R	SP	
Luke 12:36	προσδεχομένοις	D	A	R	SP	
Luke 12:44	τοῖς ὑπάρχουσιν	D	S	-	AP	
Luke 12:47	ὁ γνοὺς	N	A	R	ASAP	
Luke 12:47	μὴ ἑτοιμάσας	N	A	R	ASAP	
Luke 12:47	ποιήσας	N	A	R	ASAP	
Luke 12:48	ὁ δὲ μὴ γνούς	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 12:48	ποιήσας	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 13:4	τοὺς κατοικοῦντας	A	A	R	ASAP	
Luke 13:6	πεφυτευμένην	A	P	-	-	
Luke 13:9	τὸ μέλλον	A	S	-	AP	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
Luke 13:11	ἔχουσα	N	A	R	SP	
Luke 13:16	οὖσαν	A	B	-	-	
Luke 13:17	οἱ ἀντικείμενοι	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 13:17	τοῖς γινομένοις	D	A	R	ASAP	PA
Luke 13:23	οἱ σῳζόμενοι	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 13:33	τῇ ἐχομένῃ	D	S	-	AP	
Luke 13:34	ἡ ἀποκτείνουσα	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 13:34	λιθοβολοῦσα	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 13:34	τοὺς ἀπεσταλμένους	A	S	-	AP	
Luke 13:35	εὐλογημένος	N	P	-	-	
Luke 13:35	ὁ ἐρχόμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 14:7	τοὺς κεκλημένους	A	S	-	AP	
Luke 14:9	ὁ . . . καλέσας	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 14:10	ὁ κεκληκώς	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 14:10	τῶν συνανακειμένων	G	S	-	AP	
Luke 14:11	ὁ ὑψῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 14:11	ὁ ταπεινῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 14:12	τῷ κεκληκότι	D	S	-	AP	
Luke 14:15	τῶν συνανακειμένων	G	S	-	AP	
Luke 14:17	τοῖς κεκλημένοις	D	S	-	AP	
Luke 14:24	τῶν κεκλημένων	G	A	R	ASAP	
Luke 14:28	θέλων	N	B	-	-	
Luke 14:29	οἱ θεωροῦντες	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 14:31	πορευόμενος	N	B	-	-	
Luke 14:31	τῷ . . . ἐρχομένῳ	D	S	-	AP	
Luke 14:33	τοῖς . . . ὑπάρχουσιν	D	S	-	AP	
Luke 14:35	ὁ ἔχων	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 15:4	ἔχων	N	B	-	-	
Luke 15:4	ἀπολέσας	N	B	-	-	
Luke 15:4	τὸ ἀπολωλός	A	S	-	AP	
Luke 15:6	τὸ ἀπολωλός	A	A	R	ASAP	
Luke 15:7	μετανοοῦντι	D	A	R	SP	
Luke 15:8	ἔχουσα	N	B	-	-	
Luke 15:10	μετανοοῦντι	D	A	R	SP	
Luke 15:12	ἐπιβάλλον	A	A	R	APS	
Luke 15:24	ἀπολωλὼς	N	P	-	-	
Luke 15:30	ὁ καταφαγών	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 15:32	ἀπολωλὼς	N	P	-	-	
Luke 16:1	τὰ ὑπάρχοντα	A	S	-	AP	
Luke 16:14	ὑπάρχοντες	N	B	-	-	
Luke 16:15	οἱ δικαιοῦντες	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 16:18	ὁ ἀπολύων	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 16:18	γαμῶν	N	S	-	AP	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
Luke 16:18	ὁ ... γαμῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 16:18	ἀπολελυμένην	A	S	-	P	
Luke 16:21	τῶν πιπτόντων	G	S	-	AP	
Luke 16:26	οἱ θέλοντες	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 17:7	ἔχων	N	B	-	-	
Luke 17:7	ἀροτριῶντα	A	A	R	SP	
Luke 17:7	ποιμαίνοντα	A	A	R	SP	
Luke 17:9	τὰ διαταχθέντα	A	S	-	AP	
Luke 17:10	τὰ διαταχθέντα	A	S	-	AP	
Luke 17:18	ὑποστρέψαντες	N	S	-	P	
Luke 18:2	φοβούμενος	N	A	R	SP	
Luke 18:2	ἐντρεπόμενος	N	A	R	SP	
Luke 18:7	τῶν βοώντων	G	A	R	ASAP	
Luke 18:9	τοὺς πεποιθότας	A	S	-	AP	
Luke 18:9	ἐξουθενοῦντας	A	S	-	AP	
Luke 18:14	ὁ ὑψῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 18:14	ὁ δὲ ταπεινῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 18:24	οἱ τὰ χρήματα ἔχοντες	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 18:26	οἱ ἀκούσαντες	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 18:30	τῷ ἐρχομένῳ	D	A	R	ASAP	
Luke 18:31	τὰ γεγραμμένα	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 18:34	τὰ λεγόμενα	A	S	-	AP	
Luke 18:39	οἱ προάγοντες	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 19:2	καλούμενος	N	A	R	SP	
Luke 19:8	τῶν ὑπαρχόντων	G	S	-	AP	
Luke 19:10	τὸ ἀπολωλός	A	S	-	AP	
Luke 19:22	αἴρων	N	B	-	-	
Luke 19:22	θερίζων	N	B	-	-	
Luke 19:24	τοῖς παρεστῶσιν	D	S	-	AP	
Luke 19:24	τῷ ... ἔχοντι	D	S	-	AP	
Luke 19:26	τῷ ἔχοντι	D	S	-	AP	
Luke 19:26	τοῦ μὴ ἔχοντος	G	S	-	AP	
Luke 19:27	τοὺς μὴ θελήσαντάς	A	A	R	ASAP	
Luke 19:29	τὸ καλούμενον	A	A	R	ASAP	
Luke 19:32	οἱ ἀπεσταλμένοι	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 19:38	εὐλογημένος	N	P	-	-	
Luke 19:38	ὁ ἐρχόμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 19:45	τοὺς πωλοῦντας	A	S	-	AP	
Luke 20:2	ὁ δούς	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 20:17	τὸ γεγραμμένον	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 20:17	οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 20:18	ὁ πεσών	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 20:20	ὑποκρινομένους	A	A	R	SP	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
Luke 20:27	οἱ [ἀντι]λέγοντες	N	A	NR	SAP	
Luke 20:35	οἱ δὲ καταξιωθέντες	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 20:38	ζώντων	G	S	-	P	
Luke 20:46	τῶν θελόντων	G	A	R	ASAP	
Luke 20:46	φιλούντων	G	A	R	ASAP	
Luke 21:1	βάλλοντας	A	A	R	APS	
Luke 21:4	τοῦ περισσεύοντος	G	S	-	-	
Luke 21:22	τὰ γεγραμμένα	A	S	-	AP	
Luke 21:23	ταῖς ... ἐχούσαις	D	S	-	AP	
Luke 21:23	ταῖς θηλαζούσαις	D	S	-	AP	
Luke 21:26	τῶν ἐπερχομένων	G	S	-	AP	
Luke 21:26	τῇ οἰκουμένῃ	D	S	-	AP	
Luke 21:35	τοὺς καθημένους	A	S	-	AP	
Luke 21:36	τὰ μέλλοντα	A	S	-	AP	
Luke 21:37	τὸ καλούμενον	A	A	R	ASAP	
Luke 22:1	ἡ λεγομένη	N	A	NR	ASAP	
Luke 22:3	τὸν καλούμενον	A	A	R	SAP	
Luke 22:3	ὄντα	A	B	-	-	
Luke 22:10	βαστάζων	N	A	R	SP	
Luke 22:12	ἐστρωμένον	A	A	R	SP	
Luke 22:19	τὸ ... διδόμενον	N	A	NR	ASAP	
Luke 22:20	τὸ ... ἐκχυννόμενον	N	A	NR	ASAP	
Luke 22:21	τοῦ παραδιδόντος	G	S	-	AP	
Luke 22:22	τὸ ὡρισμένον	A	S	-	AP	
Luke 22:23	ὁ ... μέλλων	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 22:25	οἱ ἐξουσιάζοντες	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 22:26	ὁ ἡγούμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 22:26	ὁ διακονῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 22:27	ὁ ἀνακείμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 22:27	ὁ διακονῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 22:27	ὁ ἀνακείμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 22:27	ὁ διακονῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 22:28	οἱ διαμεμενηκότες	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 22:36	ὁ ἔχων	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 22:36	ὁ μὴ ἔχων	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 22:37	τὸ γεγραμμένον	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 22:44	καταβαίνοντες	N	A	R	SP	
Luke 22:47	ὁ λεγόμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 22:49	τὸ ἐσόμενον	A	S	-	AP	
Luke 22:52	παραγενομένους	A	A	R	APS	
Luke 22:63	οἱ συνέχοντες	N	A	R	ASAP	
Luke 22:64	ὁ παίσας	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 23:14	ἀποστρέφοντα	A	S	-	P	

284

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
Luke 23:19	γενομένην	A	A	R	SP	
Luke 23:25	τὸν ... βεβλημένον	A	S	-	AP	
Luke 23:33	τὸν καλούμενον	A	A	R	ASAP	
Luke 23:39	κρεμασθέντων	G	A	R	APS	
Luke 23:47	τὸ γενόμενον	A	S	-	AP	
Luke 23:48	συμπαραγενόμενοι	N	A	R	APS	
Luke 23:48	τὰ γενόμενα	A	S	-	AP	
Luke 23:49	αἱ συνακολουθοῦσαι	N	A	R	SAP	
Luke 23:50	ὑπάρχων	N	A	R	SP	
Luke 24:4	ἀστραπτούσῃ	D	A	R	SP	
Luke 24:5	τὸν ζῶντα	A	S	-	AP	
Luke 24:12	τὸ γεγονός	A	S	-	AP	
Luke 24:13	ἀπέχουσιν	A	A	R	SP	
Luke 24:14	τῶν συμβεβηκότων	G	S	-	AP	
Luke 24:18	τὰ γενόμενα	A	S	-	AP	
Luke 24:21	ὁ μέλλων	N	S	-	AP	
Luke 24:44	τὰ γεγραμμένα	A	S	-	AP	
John 1:6	ἀπεσταλμένος	N	A	R	SP	
John 1:12	τοῖς πιστεύουσιν	D	S	-	AP	
John 1:15	ὁ ... ἐρχόμενος	N	S	-	AP	
John 1:18	ὁ ὢν	N	A	NR	SAP	
John 1:22	τοῖς πέμψασιν	D	S	-	AP	
John 1:23	βοῶντος	G	S	-	P	
John 1:27	ὁ ... ἐρχόμενος	N	S	-	AP	
John 1:29	ὁ αἴρων	N	A	R	ASAP	
John 1:33	ὁ πέμψας	N	S	-	AP	
John 1:33	ὁ βαπτίζων	N	S	-	AP	
John 1:40	τῶν ἀκουσάντων	G	A	R	ASAP	
John 1:40	ἀκολουθησάντων	G	A	R	ASAP	
John 2:6	κείμεναι	N	PP	-	-	
John 2:6	χωροῦσαι	N	A	R	SP	
John 2:9	γεγενημένον	A	B	-	-	
John 2:9	οἱ ἠντληκότες	N	A	R	ASAP	
John 2:14	τοὺς πωλοῦντας	A	S	-	AP	
John 2:16	τοῖς ... πωλοῦσιν	D	S	-	AP	
John 3:6	τὸ γεγεννημένον	N	S	-	AP	
John 3:6	τὸ γεγεννημένον	N	S	-	AP	
John 3:8	ὁ γεγεννημένος	N	S	-	AP	
John 3:13	ὁ ... καταβάς	N	S	-	AP	
John 3:15	ὁ πιστεύων	N	S	-	AP	
John 3:16	ὁ πιστεύων	N	S	-	AP	
John 3:18	ὁ πιστεύων	N	S	-	AP	
John 3:18	ὁ δὲ μὴ πιστεύων	N	S	-	AP	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
John 3:20	ὁ φαῦλα πράσσων	N	S	-	AP	
John 3:21	ὁ δὲ ποιῶν	N	S	-	AP	
John 3:29	ὁ ἔχων	N	S	-	AP	
John 3:29	ὁ ἑστηκὼς	N	A	R	ASAP	
John 3:29	ἀκούων	N	A	R	ASAP	
John 3:31	Ὁ ἄνωθεν ἐρχόμενος	N	S	-	AP	
John 3:31	ὁ ὢν	N	S	-	AP	
John 3:31	ὁ . . . ἐρχόμενος	N	S	-	AP	
John 3:33	ὁ λαβὼν	N	S	-	AP	
John 3:36	ὁ πιστεύων	N	S	-	AP	
John 3:36	ὁ δὲ ἀπειθῶν	N	S	-	AP	
John 4:5	λεγομένην	A	A	R	SP	
John 4:9	ὢν	N	B	-	-	
John 4:9	οὔσης	G	B	-	-	
John 4:10	ὁ λέγων	N	S	-	AP	
John 4:10	ὕδωρ ζῶν	A	A	R	SP	
John 4:11	τὸ ζῶν	A	A	R	ASAP	
John 4:13	ὁ πίνων	N	S	-	AP	
John 4:14	ἁλλομένου	G	A	R	SP	
John 4:23	τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας	A	S	-	AP	
John 4:24	τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας	A	S	-	AP	
John 4:25	ὁ λεγόμενος	N	A	NR	SAP	
John 4:26	ὁ λαλῶν	N	S	-	AP	
John 4:34	τοῦ πέμψαντός	G	S	-	AP	
John 4:36	ὁ θερίζων	N	S	-	AP	
John 4:36	ὁ σπείρων	N	S	-	AP	
John 4:36	ὁ θερίζων	N	S	-	AP	
John 4:37	ὁ σπείρων	N	S	-	AP	
John 4:37	ὁ θερίζων	N	S	-	AP	
John 4:39	μαρτυρούσης	G	B	-	-	
John 5:2	ἡ ἐπιλεγομένη	N	A	?	SAP	
John 5:2	ἔχουσα	N	I	-	-	
John 5:3	τῶν ἀσθενούντων	G	S	-	AP	
John 5:5	ἔχων	N	A	R	SP	
John 5:7	ὁ ἀσθενῶν	N	S	-	AP	
John 5:10	τῷ τεθεραπευμένῳ	D	S	-	AP	
John 5:11	ὁ ποιήσας	N	S	-	AP	
John 5:12	ὁ εἰπών	N	A	R	ASAP	
John 5:13	ὁ δὲ ἰαθεὶς	N	S	-	AP	
John 5:15	ὁ ποιήσας	N	S	-	AP	
John 5:23	ὁ μὴ τιμῶν	N	S	-	AP	
John 5:23	τὸν πέμψαντα	A	A	?	ASAP	
John 5:24	ὁ . . . ἀκούων	N	S	-	AP	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
John 5:24	πιστεύων	N	S	-	AP	
John 5:24	τῷ πέμψαντι	D	S	-	AP	
John 5:25	οἱ ἀκούσαντες	N	S	-	AP	
John 5:29	οἱ ... ποιήσαντες	N	S	-	AP	
John 5:29	οἱ δὲ τὰ φαῦλα πράξαντες	N	S	-	AP	
John 5:30	τοῦ πέμψαντός	G	S	-	AP	
John 5:32	ὁ μαρτυρῶν	N	S	-	AP	
John 5:35	ὁ καιόμενος	N	A	R	ASAP	
John 5:35	φαίνων	N	A	R	ASAP	
John 5:37	πέμψας	N	A	?	APS	
John 5:39	αἱ μαρτυροῦσαι	N	S	-	AP	
John 5:45	ὁ κατηγορῶν	N	S	-	AP	
John 6:2	τῶν ἀσθενούντων	G	S	-	AP	
John 6:11	τοῖς ἀνακειμένοις	D	S	-	AP	
John 6:12	περισσεύσαντα	A	A	R	APS	
John 6:13	τοῖς βεβρωκόσιν	D	S	-	AP	
John 6:14	ὁ ἐρχόμενος	N	A	R	ASAP	
John 6:22	ὁ ἑστηκὼς	N	A	R	ASAP	
John 6:27	τὴν ἀπολλυμένην	A	A	R	ASAP	
John 6:27	τὴν μένουσαν	A	A	R	ASAP	
John 6:33	ὁ καταβαίνων	N	S	-	AP	
John 6:33	διδοὺς	N	S	-	AP	
John 6:35	ὁ ἐρχόμενος	N	S	-	AP	
John 6:35	ὁ πιστεύων	N	S	-	AP	
John 6:37	τὸν ἐρχόμενον	A	S	-	AP	
John 6:38	τοῦ πέμψαντός	G	S	-	AP	
John 6:39	τοῦ πέμψαντός	G	S	-	AP	
John 6:40	ὁ θεωρῶν	N	S	-	AP	
John 6:40	πιστεύων	N	S	-	AP	
John 6:41	ὁ καταβὰς	N	A	R	ASAP	
John 6:44	ὁ πέμψας	N	A	?	ASAP	
John 6:45	ὁ ἀκούσας	N	S	-	AP	
John 6:45	μαθὼν	N	S	-	AP	
John 6:46	ὁ ὢν	N	S	-	AP	
John 6:47	ὁ πιστεύων	N	S	-	AP	
John 6:50	ὁ ... καταβαίνων	N	A	R	ASAP	
John 6:51	ὁ ζῶν	N	A	R	ASAP	
John 6:51	ὁ ... καταβάς	N	A	R	ASAP	
John 6:54	ὁ τρώγων	N	S	-	AP	
John 6:54	πίνων	N	S	-	AP	
John 6:56	ὁ τρώγων	N	S	-	AP	
John 6:56	πίνων	N	S	-	AP	
John 6:57	ζῶν	N	A	R	APS	

287

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
John 6:57	ὁ τρώγων	N	S	-	AP	
John 6:58	ὁ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς	N	A	R	ASAP	
John 6:58	ὁ τρώγων	N	S	-	AP	
John 6:63	τὸ ζῳοποιοῦν	N	S	-	AP	
John 6:64	οἱ μὴ πιστεύοντες	N	S	-	AP	
John 6:64	ὁ παραδώσων	N	S	-	AP	
John 7:16	τοῦ πέμψαντός	G	S	-	AP	
John 7:18	ὁ ἀφ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ λαλῶν	N	S	-	AP	
John 7:18	ὁ δὲ ζητῶν	N	S	-	AP	
John 7:18	τοῦ πέμψαντος	G	S	-	AP	
John 7:28	ὁ πέμψας με	N	S	-	AP	
John 7:33	τὸν πέμψαντά	A	S	-	AP	
John 7:38	ὁ πιστεύων	N	S	-	AP	
John 7:38	ζῶντος	G	A	R	SP	
John 7:39	οἱ πιστεύσαντες	N	S	-	AP	
John 7:49	ὁ μὴ γινώσκων	N	A	R	ASAP	
John 7:50	ὁ ἐλθὼν	N	S	-	-	
John 8:3	[[κατειλημμένην]]	A	A	R	SP	
John 8:9	[[οὖσα]]	N	B	-	-	
John 8:12	ὁ ἀκολουθῶν	N	S	-	AP	
John 8:16	ὁ πέμψας με πατήρ	N	A	?	APS	
John 8:18	ὁ μαρτυρῶν	N	S	-	AP	
John 8:18	ὁ πέμψας με πατήρ	N	A	?	APS	
John 8:26	ὁ πέμψας με	N	S	-	AP	
John 8:29	ὁ πέμψας με	N	S	-	AP	
John 8:31	πεπιστευκότας	A	A	R	APS	
John 8:34	ὁ ποιῶν	N	S	-	AP	
John 8:47	ὁ ὢν	N	S	-	AP	
John 8:50	ὁ ζητῶν	N	S	-	AP	
John 8:50	κρίνων	N	S	-	AP	
John 8:54	ὁ δοξάζων	N	S	-	AP	
John 9:4	τοῦ πέμψαντός	G	S	-	AP	
John 9:7	ἀπεσταλμένος	N	S	-	P	
John 9:8	οἱ θεωροῦντες	N	S	-	AP	
John 9:8	ὁ καθήμενος	N	S	-	AP	
John 9:8	προσαιτῶν	N	S	-	AP	
John 9:11	ὁ λεγόμενος	N	A	R	ASAP	
John 9:18	τοῦ ἀναβλέψαντος	G	A	R	SAP	
John 9:32	γεγεννημένου	G	S	-	P	
John 9:37	ὁ λαλῶν	N	S	-	AP	
John 9:39	οἱ μὴ βλέποντες	N	S	-	AP	
John 9:39	οἱ βλέποντες	N	S	-	AP	
John 9:40	οἱ...ὄντες	N	S	-	AP	

288

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
John 10:1	ὁ μὴ εἰσερχόμενος	N	S	-	AP	
John 10:1	ἀναβαίνων	N	S	-	AP	
John 10:2	ὁ δὲ εἰσερχόμενος	N	S	-	AP	
John 10:12	ὤν	N	S	-	-	
John 10:21	δαιμονιζομένου	G	S	-	P	
John 10:33	ὤν	N	B	-	-	
John 11:2	ἡ ἀλείψασα	N	A	R	SAP	
John 11:2	ἐκμάξασα	N	A	R	SAP	
John 11:16	ὁ λεγόμενος	N	A	R	SAP	
John 11:25	ὁ πιστεύων	N	S	-	AP	
John 11:26	ὁ ζῶν	N	S	-	AP	
John 11:26	πιστεύων	N	S	-	AP	
John 11:27	ὁ . . . ἐρχόμενος	N	S	-	-	
John 11:31	οἱ ὄντες	N	A	R	ASAP	
John 11:31	παραμυθούμενοι	N	A	R	ASAP	
John 11:33	συνελθόντας	A	A	R	APS	
John 11:37	ὁ ἀνοίξας	N	S	-	AP	
John 11:39	τοῦ τετελευτηκότος	G	S	-	AP	
John 11:42	τὸν περιεστῶτα	A	A	R	ASAP	
John 11:44	ὁ τεθνηκὼς	N	S	-	AP	
John 11:45	οἱ ἐλθόντες	N	A	R	SAP	
John 11:45	θεασάμενοι	N	A	R	SAP	
John 11:49	ὤν	N	B	-	-	
John 11:52	τὰ διεσκορπισμένα	A	A	R	ASAP	
John 11:54	λεγομένην	A	A	R	PS	
John 12:2	τῶν ἀνακειμένων	G	S	-	AP	
John 12:4	ὁ μέλλων	N	S	-	-	
John 12:6	τὰ βαλλόμενα	A	S	-	AP	
John 12:12	ὁ ἐλθὼν	N	A	R	ASAP	
John 12:13	εὐλογημένος	N	P	-	-	
John 12:13	ὁ ἐρχόμενος	N	S	-	AP	
John 12:17	ὁ ὤν	N	A	R	ASAP	
John 12:20	τῶν ἀναβαινόντων	G	S	-	AP	
John 12:25	ὁ φιλῶν	N	S	-	AP	
John 12:25	ὁ μισῶν	N	S	-	AP	
John 12:29	ὁ ἑστὼς	N	A	R	ASAP	
John 12:29	ἀκούσας	N	A	R	ASAP	
John 12:35	ὁ περιπατῶν	N	S	-	AP	
John 12:44	ὁ πιστεύων	N	S	-	AP	
John 12:44	τὸν πέμψαντά με	N	S	-	AP	
John 12:45	ὁ θεωρῶν	N	S	-	AP	
John 12:45	τὸν πέμψαντά με.	A	S	-	AP	
John 12:46	ὁ πιστεύων	N	S	-	AP	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
John 12:48	ὁ ἀθετῶν	N	S	-	AP	
John 12:48	μὴ λαμβάνων	N	S	-	AP	
John 12:48	τὸν κρίνοντα	A	S	-	AP	
John 12:49	πέμψας	N	A	?	APS	
John 13:10	ὁ λελουμένος	N	S	-	AP	
John 13:11	τὸν παραδιδόντα	A	S	-	AP	
John 13:16	τοῦ πέμψαντος	G	S	-	AP	
John 13:18	ὁ τρώγων	N	S	-	AP	
John 13:20	ὁ λαμβάνων	N	S	-	AP	
John 13:20	ὁ δὲ ἐμὲ λαμβάνων	N	S	-	AP	
John 13:20	τὸν πέμψαντά με	A	S	-	AP	
John 13:28	τῶν ἀνακειμένων	G	S	-	AP	
John 14:9	ὁ ἑωρακὼς	N	S	-	AP	
John 14:10	μένων	N	B	-	-	
John 14:12	ὁ πιστεύων	N	S	-	AP	
John 14:21	ὁ ἔχων	N	S	-	AP	
John 14:21	τηρῶν	N	S	-	AP	
John 14:21	ὁ ἀγαπῶν με	N	S	-	AP	
John 14:21	ὁ δὲ ἀγαπῶν με	N	S	-	AP	
John 14:24	ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν	N	S	-	AP	
John 14:24	τοῦ πέμψαντός	G	A	?	APS	
John 15:2	μὴ φέρον	A	A	R	SP	
John 15:2	φέρον	A	S	-	P	
John 15:5	ὁ μένων	N	S	-	AP	
John 15:21	τὸν πέμψαντά	A	S	-	AP	
John 15:23	ὁ ἐμὲ μισῶν	N	S	-	AP	
John 15:25	ὁ ... γεγραμμένος	N	A	R	ASAP	
John 16:2	ὁ ἀποκτείνας	N	S	-	AP	
John 16:5	τὸν πέμψαντά με	A	S	-	AP	
John 16:13	τὰ ἐρχόμενα	A	S	-	AP	
John 17:13	πεπληρωμένην	A	P	-	-	
John 17:20	τῶν πιστευόντων	G	S	-	AP	
John 18:2	ὁ παραδιδοὺς	N	?	?	?	
John 18:4	τὰ ἐρχόμενα	A	S	-	AP	
John 18:5	ὁ παραδιδοὺς	N	?	?	?	
John 18:10	ἔχων	N	B	-	-	
John 18:14	ὁ συμβουλεύσας	N	S	-	AP	
John 18:21	τοὺς ἀκηκοότας	A	S	-	AP	
John 18:22	παρεστηκὼς	N	S	-	P	
John 18:26	ὤν	N	B	-	-	
John 18:37	ὁ ὤν	N	S	-	AP	
John 19:11	ὁ παραδούς με	N	S	-	AP	
John 19:12	ὁ ... ποιῶν	N	S	-	AP	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
John 19:13	λεγόμενον	A	A	R	SP	
John 19:17	λεγόμενον	A	A	R	APS	
John 19:24	[ἡ λέγουσα]	N	A	R	ASAP	
John 19:32	τοῦ συσταυρωθέντος	G	A	R	ASAP	
John 19:35	ὁ ἑωρακὼς	N	S	-	AP	
John 19:38	ὢν	N	B	-	-	
John 19:38	κεκρυμμένος	N	B	-	-	
John 19:39	ὁ ἐλθὼν	N	S	-	-	
John 20:8	ὁ ἐλθὼν	N	A	R	ASAP	
John 20:24	ὁ λεγόμενος	N	S	-	-	
John 20:29	οἱ μὴ ἰδόντες	N	S	-	AP	
John 20:29	πιστεύσαντες	N	S	-	AP	
John 21:2	ὁ λεγόμενος	N	A	R	SAP	
John 21:20	ὁ παραδιδούς σε	N	S	-	AP	
John 21:24	ὁ μαρτυρῶν	N	A	R	ASAP	
John 21:24	ὁ γράψας	N	A	R	ASAP	
John 21:25	γραφόμενα	A	A	R	APS	
Acts 1:11	ὁ ἀναλημφθεὶς	N	A	NR	ASAP	
Acts 1:12	τοῦ καλουμένου	G	A	R	SAP	
Acts 1:16	τοῦ γενομένου	G	A	R	SAP	
Acts 1:16	τοῖς συλλαβοῦσιν	D	S	-	AP	
Acts 1:19	τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν	D	S	-	AP	
Acts 1:20	ὁ κατοικῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Acts 1:21	συνελθόντων	G	A	R	APS	
Acts 1:23	τὸν καλούμενον	A	A	R	SAP	
Acts 2:2	φερομένης	G	A	R	PS	
Acts 2:3	διαμεριζόμεναι	N	A	R	PS	
Acts 2:7	οἱ λαλοῦντες	N	S	-	AP	
Acts 2:9	οἱ κατοικοῦντες	N	S	-	AP	
Acts 2:10	οἱ ἐπιδημοῦντες	N	S	-	AP	
Acts 2:14	οἱ κατοικοῦντες	N	S	-	AP	
Acts 2:16	τὸ εἰρημένον	N	S	-	AP	
Acts 2:22	ἀποδεδειγμένον	A	A	R	SP	
Acts 2:23	ὡρισμένη	D	A	R	APS	
Acts 2:41	οἱ . . . ἀποδεξάμενοι	N	S	-	AP	
Acts 2:44	οἱ πιστεύοντες	N	S	-	AP	
Acts 2:47	τοὺς σῳζομένους	A	S	-	AP	
Acts 3:2	ὑπάρχων	N	A	R	SP	
Acts 3:2	τὴν λεγομένην	A	A	R	ASAP	
Acts 3:2	τῶν εἰσπορευομένων	G	S	-	AP	
Acts 3:10	ὁ . . . καθήμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Acts 3:10	τῷ συμβεβηκότι	D	S	-	AP	
Acts 3:11	τῇ καλουμένῃ	D	A	R	ASAP	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
Acts 3:20	προκεχειρισμένον	A	A	R	APS	
Acts 4:4	τῶν ἀκουσάντων	G	S	-	AP	
Acts 4:11	ὁ ἐξουθενηθεὶς	N	A	R	ASAP	PA
Acts 4:11	ὁ γενόμενος	N	?	?	?	
Acts 4:12	τὸ δεδομένον	N	A	R	SAP	
Acts 4:14	τὸν τεθεραπευμένον	A	A	R	ASAP	
Acts 4:16	τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν	D	S	-	AP	
Acts 4:21	τῷ γεγονότι	D	S	-	AP	
Acts 4:24	ὁ ποιήσας	N	S	-	-	
Acts 4:25	ὁ . . . εἰπών	N	S	-	-	
Acts 4:32	τῶν πιστευσάντων	G	S	-	AP	
Acts 4:32	τῶν ὑπαρχόντων	G	S	-	AP	
Acts 4:34	τῶν πιπρασκομένων	G	S	-	AP	
Acts 4:36	ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς	N	A	R	SAP	PA
Acts 5:5	τοὺς ἀκούοντας	N	S	-	AP	
Acts 5:7	τὸ γεγονὸς	A	S	-	AP	
Acts 5:9	τῶν θαψάντων	G	S	-	AP	
Acts 5:11	τοὺς ἀκούοντας	N	S	-	AP	
Acts 5:14	πιστεύοντες	N	S	-	P	
Acts 5:16	ὀχλουμένους	A	S	-	P	
Acts 5:17	οὖσα	N	A	R	APS	
Acts 5:22	παραγενόμενοι	N	A	R	APS	
Acts 5:25	παραγενόμενος	N	B	-	-	
Acts 5:32	τοῖς πειθαρχοῦσιν	D	S	-	AP	
Acts 6:3	μαρτυρουμένους	A	A	R	SP	
Acts 6:9	τῆς λεγομένης	G	A	R	ASAP	
Acts 6:15	οἱ καθεζόμενοι	N	S	-	AP	
Acts 7:10	ἡγούμενον	A	S	-	P	
Acts 7:24	τῷ καταπονουμένῳ	D	S	-	AP	
Acts 7:26	ἐπιούσῃ	D	A	R	APS	
Acts 7:27	ὁ δὲ ἀδικῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Acts 7:35	τοῦ ὀφθέντος	G	A	R	SAP	
Acts 7:37	ὁ εἴπας	N	A	R	ASAP	
Acts 7:38	ὁ γενόμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Acts 7:38	τοῦ λαλοῦντος	G	A	R	ASAP	
Acts 7:38	ζῶντα	A	A	R	SP	
Acts 7:44	ὁ λαλῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Acts 7:52	τοὺς προκαταγγείλαντας	A	S	-	AP	
Acts 7:58	καλουμένου	G	A	R	SP	
Acts 8:4	Οἱ . . . διασπαρέντες	N	S	-	AP	
Acts 8:6	τοῖς λεγομένοις	N	S	-	AP	
Acts 8:7	τῶν ἐχόντων	G	S	-	AP	
Acts 8:7	παραλελυμένοι	N	S	-	P	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
Acts 8:10	ἡ καλουμένη	N	A	R	ASAP	
Acts 8:26	τὴν καταβαίνουσαν	A	A	R	ASAP	
Acts 8:32	τοῦ κείραντος	G	S	-	AP	
Acts 9:7	οἱ συνοδεύοντες	N	A	R	ASAP	
Acts 9:11	τὴν καλουμένην	A	A	R	ASAP	
Acts 9:14	τοὺς ἐπικαλουμένους	A	S	-	AP	
Acts 9:17	ὁ ὀφθείς	N	A	NR	SAP	
Acts 9:21	οἱ ἀκούοντες	N	S	-	AP	
Acts 9:21	ὁ πορθήσας	N	S	-	AP	
Acts 9:21	τοὺς ἐπικαλουμένους	A	S	-	AP	
Acts 9:22	τοὺς κατοικοῦντας	A	A	R	ASAP	
Acts 9:32	τοὺς κατοικοῦντας	A	A	R	ASAP	
Acts 9:33	κατακείμενον	A	B	-	-	
Acts 9:33	παραλελυμένος	N	P	-	-	
Acts 9:35	οἱ κατοικοῦντες	N	S	-	AP	
Acts 9:41	ζῶσαν	A	P	-	-	
Acts 10:1	τῆς καλουμένης	G	A	R	SAP	
Acts 10:2	φοβούμενος	N	B	-	-	
Acts 10:2	ποιῶν	N	B	-	-	
Acts 10:2	δεόμενος	N	B	-	-	
Acts 10:3	εἰσελθόντα	A	B	-	-	
Acts 10:3	εἰπόντα	A	B	-	-	
Acts 10:7	ὁ λαλῶν	N	A	R	ASAP	
Acts 10:7	τῶν προσκαρτερούντων	G	S	-	AP	
Acts 10:17	οἱ ἀπεσταλμένοι	N	A	R	ASAP	PA
Acts 10:18	ὁ ἐπικαλούμενος	N	A	R	SAP	
Acts 10:22	φοβούμενος	N	A	R	SP	
Acts 10:22	μαρτυρούμενός	N	B	-	-	
Acts 10:33	τὰ προστεταγμένα	A	S	-	AP	
Acts 10:35	ὁ φοβούμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Acts 10:35	ἐργαζόμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Acts 10:37	γενόμενον	A	A	R	APS	
Acts 10:38	τοὺς καταδυναστευομένους	A	S	-	AP	
Acts 10:41	τοῖς προκεχειροτονημένοις	D	A	R	SAP	PA
Acts 10:42	ὁ ὡρισμένος	N	S	-	AP	
Acts 10:42	ζώντων	G	S	-	P	
Acts 10:43	τὸν πιστεύοντα	A	S	-	AP	
Acts 10:44	τοὺς ἀκούοντας	A	S	-	AP	
Acts 11:1	οἱ ὄντες	N	A	R	ASAP	
Acts 11:3	ἔχοντας	A	A	R	SP	
Acts 11:11	ἀπεσταλμένοι	N	A	?	SP	
Acts 11:13	τὸν ἐπικαλούμενον	A	A	R	SAP	
Acts 11:19	Οἱ . . . διασπαρέντες	N	S	-	AP	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
Acts 11:19	τῆς γενομένης	G	A	R	ASAP	
Acts 11:21	ὁ πιστεύσας	N	A	R	SAP	
Acts 11:22	τῆς οὔσης	G	A	R	ASAP	
Acts 11:28	τὴν οἰκουμένην	A	S	-	AP	
Acts 11:29	κατοικοῦσιν	D	A	R	APS	
Acts 12:9	τὸ γινόμενον	N	S	-	AP	
Acts 12:10	τὴν φέρουσαν	A	A	R	ASAP	
Acts 12:12	τοῦ ἐπικαλουμένου	G	A	R	SAP	
Acts 12:25	τὸν ἐπικληθέντα	A	A	R	SAP	
Acts 13:1	οὖσαν	A	A	R	APS	
Acts 13:1	ὁ καλούμενος	N	A	R	SAP	
Acts 13:12	τὸ γεγονὸς	N	S	-	AP	
Acts 13:16	οἱ φοβούμενοι	N	S	-	AP	
Acts 13:26	οἱ ἐν ὑμῖν φοβούμενοι	N	S	-	AP	
Acts 13:27	οἱ γὰρ κατοικοῦντες	N	S	-	AP	
Acts 13:27	τὰς . . . ἀναγινωσκομένας	A	A	R	ASAP	
Acts 13:29	τὰ . . . γεγραμμένα	A	S	-	AP	
Acts 13:31	τοῖς συναναβᾶσιν	D	S	-	AP	
Acts 13:32	γενομένην	A	A	R	ADSP	
Acts 13:39	ὁ πιστεύων	N	S	-	AP	
Acts 13:40	τὸ εἰρημένον	N	S	-	AP	
Acts 13:43	σεβομένων	G	A	R	APS	
Acts 13:44	ἐρχομένῳ	D	A	R	APS	
Acts 13:45	τοῖς . . . λαλουμένοις	D	S	-	AP	
Acts 13:50	σεβομένας	A	A	R	APS	
Acts 14:2	ἀπειθήσαντες	N	A	R	APS	
Acts 14:3	τῷ μαρτυροῦντι	D	A	NR	ASAP	
Acts 14:12	ὁ ἡγούμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Acts 14:13	τοῦ ὄντος	G	A	R	ASAP	
Acts 14:15	εὐαγγελιζόμενοι	N	B	-	-	
Acts 14:15	ζῶντα	A	A	R	SP	
Acts 14:16	παρῳχημέναις	D	A	R	APS	
Acts 15:5	πεπιστευκότες	N	S	-	P	
Acts 15:16	τὴν πεπτωκυῖαν	A	A	R	ASAP	
Acts 15:16	τὰ κατεσκαμμένα	A	S	-	AP	
Acts 15:17	ποιῶν	N	A	NR	SP	
Acts 15:19	τοῖς . . . ἐπιστρέφουσιν	D	S	-	AP	
Acts 15:21	τοὺς κηρύσσοντας	A	S	-	AP	
Acts 15:22	τὸν καλούμενον	A	A	R	SAP	
Acts 15:22	ἡγουμένους	A	A	R	SP	
Acts 15:24	[ἐξελθόντες]	N	S	-	P	
Acts 15:26	παραδεδωκόσι	D	A	R	SP	
Acts 15:27	ἀπαγγέλλοντας	A	B	-	-	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
Acts 15:32	ὄντες	N	B	-	-	
Acts 15:33	τοὺς ἀποστείλαντας	A	S	-	AP	
Acts 15:37	τὸν καλούμενον	A	A	R	ASAP	
Acts 15:38	τὸν ἀποστάντα	A	S	-	AP	
Acts 15:38	μὴ συνελθόντα	A	S	-	AP	
Acts 16:3	τοὺς ὄντας	A	A	R	ASAP	
Acts 16:4	τὰ κεκριμένα	A	A	R	ASAP	PA
Acts 16:11	τῇ δὲ ἐπιούσῃ	D	S	-	AP	
Acts 16:13	συνελθούσαις	D	A	R	APS	
Acts 16:14	σεβομένη	N	S	-	P	
Acts 16:14	τοῖς λαλουμένοις	D	S	-	AP	
Acts 16:16	ἔχουσιν	A	A	R	SP	
Acts 16:37	ὑπάρχοντας	A	B	-	-	
Acts 17:2	τὸ εἰωθὸς	A	S	-	AP	
Acts 17:4	σεβομένων	G	A	R	APS	
Acts 17:6	τὴν οἰκουμένην	A	S	-	AP	
Acts 17:6	οἱ ... ἀναστατώσαντες	N	S	-	AP	
Acts 17:8	ἀκούοντας	A	B	-	-	
Acts 17:15	οἱ δὲ καθιστάνοντες	N	S	-	AP	
Acts 17:17	τοῖς σεβομένοις	D	S	-	AP	
Acts 17:17	τοὺς παρατυγχάνοντας	A	S	-	AP	
Acts 17:19	λαλουμένη	N	A	R	APS	PA
Acts 17:20	ξενίζοντα	A	S	-	P	
Acts 17:21	ἐπιδημοῦντες	N	A	R	APS	
Acts 17:24	ὁ ποιήσας	N	A	R	ASAP	
Acts 17:26	προστεταγμένους	A	A	R	PS	
Acts 17:31	τὴν οἰκουμένην	A	S	-	AP	
Acts 18:2	ἐληλυθότα	A	B	-	-	
Acts 18:7	σεβομένου	G	S	-	P	
Acts 18:24	ὤν	N	B	-	-	
Acts 18:27	τοῖς πεπιστευκόσιν	D	S	-	AP	
Acts 19:4	τὸν ἐρχόμενον	A	S	-	AP	
Acts 19:13	τοὺς κατοικοῦντας	A	S	-	AP	
Acts 19:11	τὰς τυχούσας	A	A	R	SAP	
Acts 19:12	τοὺς ἀσθενοῦντας	A	S	-	AP	
Acts 19:13	περιερχομένων	G	A	R	APS	
Acts 19:13	τοὺς ἔχοντας	A	S	-	AP	
Acts 19:17	τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν	D	A	R	SAP	
Acts 19:18	τῶν πεπιστευκότων	G	S	-	AP	
Acts 19:19	τῶν ... πραξάντων	G	S	-	AP	
Acts 19:22	τῶν διακονούντων	G	S	-	AP	
Acts 19:24	ποιῶν	N	B	-	-	
Acts 19:26	οἱ ... γινόμενοι	N	A	R	SAP	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
Acts 19:27	ἡ οἰκουμένη	N	S	-	AP	
Acts 19:37	βλασφημοῦντας	A	S	-	P	
Acts 20:12	ζῶντα	A	B	-	-	
Acts 20:15	τῇ ἐπιούσῃ	D	S	-	AP	
Acts 20:15	τῇ δὲ ἐχομένῃ	D	S	-	AP	
Acts 20:19	τῶν συμβάντων	G	A	R	SAP	
Acts 20:20	τῶν συμφερόντων	G	S	-	AP	
Acts 20:22	τὰ . . . συναντήσοντά	A	S	-	AP	
Acts 20:30	διεστραμμένα	A	S	-	P	
Acts 20:32	τῷ δυναμένῳ	D	A	NR	ASAP	
Acts 20:32	τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις	D	S	-	AP	
Acts 20:34	τοῖς οὖσιν	D	S	-	AP	
Acts 20:35	τῶν ἀσθενούντων	G	S	-	AP	
Acts 21:8	ὄντος	G	A	NR	SP	
Acts 21:9	προφητεύουσαι	N	A	NR	SP	
Acts 21:18	Τῇ δὲ ἐπιούσῃ	D	S	-	AP	
Acts 21:20	τῶν πεπιστευκότων	G	S	-	AP	
Acts 21:23	ἔχοντες	N	A	R	SP	
Acts 21:25	πεπιστευκότων	G	A	R	APS	
Acts 21:26	τῇ ἐχομένῃ	D	A	R	APS	
Acts 21:28	ὁ . . . διδάσκων	N	A	R	ASAP	
Acts 21:38	ὁ . . . ἀναστατώσας	N	A	R	ASAP	
Acts 21:38	ἐξαγαγὼν	N	A	R	ASAP	
Acts 22:3	γεγεννημένος	N	B	-	-	
Acts 22:3	ἀνατεθραμμένος	N	B	-	-	
Acts 22:3	πεπαιδευμένος	N	B	-	-	
Acts 22:3	ὑπάρχων	N	B	-	-	
Acts 22:5	τοὺς ἐκεῖσε ὄντας	A	S	-	AP	
Acts 22:5	δεδεμένους	A	B	-	-	
Acts 22:9	οἱ δὲ σὺν ἐμοὶ ὄντες	N	S	-	AP	
Acts 22:9	τοῦ λαλοῦντός	N	S	-	AP	
Acts 22:11	τῶν συνόντων	G	S	-	AP	
Acts 22:12	μαρτυρούμενος	N	B	-	-	
Acts 22:12	κατοικούντων	G	A	R	APS	
Acts 22:19	τοὺς πιστεύοντας	A	S	-	AP	
Acts 22:20	τῶν ἀναιρούντων	G	S	-	AP	
Acts 22:25	ἑστῶτα	A	A	R	APS	
Acts 22:29	οἱ μέλλοντες	N	S	-	AP	
Acts 23:2	τοῖς παρεστῶσιν	D	S	-	AP	
Acts 23:3	κεκονιαμένε	V	A	R	SP	
Acts 23:4	οἱ δὲ παρεστῶτες	N	S	-	SP	
Acts 23:11	ἐπιούσῃ	D	A	R	APS	
Acts 23:13	οἱ . . . ποιησάμενοι	N	S	-	AP	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
Acts 23:25	ἔχουσαν	A	A	R	SP	
Acts 23:27	συλλημφθέντα	A	B	-	-	
Acts 23:27	μέλλοντα	A	B	-	-	
Acts 23:31	τὸ διατεταγμένον	A	S	-	AP	
Acts 24:5	κινοῦντα	A	S	-	P	
Acts 24:5	τὴν οἰκουμένην	A	S	-	AP	
Acts 24:14	τοῖς . . . γεγραμμένοις	D	S	-	AP	
Acts 24:24	οὔσῃ	D	B	-	-	
Acts 24:25	τοῦ μέλλοντος	G	A	R	ASAP	
Acts 25:7	καταβεβηκότες	N	A	R	APS	
Acts 25:16	ὁ κατηγορούμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Acts 25:19	τεθνηκότος	G	A	R	SP	
Acts 25:24	συμπαρόντες	N	A	R	APS	
Acts 26:4	τὴν...γενομένην	A	A	NR	ASAP	
Acts 26:6	γενομένης	G	A	R	ADSP	PA
Acts 26:13	τοὺς . . . πορευομένους	A	S	-	AP	
Acts 26:18	τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις	D	S	-	AP	
Acts 26:22	μελλόντων	G	S	-	P	
Acts 26:29	τοὺς ἀκούοντάς	A	S	-	AP	
Acts 26:30	οἱ συγκαθήμενοι	N	S	-	AP	
Acts 27:2	μέλλοντι	D	A	R	SP	
Acts 27:6	πλέον	A	A	R	SP	
Acts 27:8	καλούμενον	A	A	R	SP	
Acts 27:11	τοῖς . . . λεγομένοις	D	S	-	AP	
Acts 27:12	βλέποντα	A	A	R	SP	
Acts 27:14	ὁ καλούμενος	N	A	R	SAP	
Acts 27:16	καλούμενον	A	A	R	SP	
Acts 27:24	λέγων	N	B	-	-	
Acts 27:24	τοὺς πλέοντας	A	S	-	AP	
Acts 27:39	ἔχοντα	A	A	R	SP	
Acts 27:40	τῇ πνεούσῃ	D	S	-	AP	
Acts 27:43	τοὺς δυναμένους	A	S	-	AP	
Acts 28:2	τυχοῦσαν	A	A	R	APS	
Acts 28:2	τὸν ἐφεστῶτα	A	A	R	ASAP	
Acts 28:9	οἱ . . . ἔχοντες	N	A	R	ASAP	
Acts 28:11	παρακεχειμακότι	D	A	R	SP	
Acts 28:16	φυλάσσοντι	D	A	R	APS	
Acts 28:17	τοὺς ὄντας	A	S	-	AP	
Acts 28:24	τοῖς λεγομένοις	D	S	-	AP	
Acts 28:30	τοὺς εἰσπορευομένους	A	S	-	AP	
Rom 1:1	ἀφωρισμένος	N	S	-	P	
Rom 1:3	τοῦ γενομένου	G	A	NR	ASAP	
Rom 1:4	τοῦ ὁρισθέντος	G	A	NR	ASAP	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
Rom 1:7	τοῖς οὖσιν	D	S	-	AP	
Rom 1:16	τῷ πιστεύοντι	D	S	-	AP	
Rom 1:18	τῶν ... κατεχόντων	G	A	R	SAP	
Rom 1:25	τὸν κτίσαντα	A	S	-	AP	
Rom 1:28	τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα	A	S	-	AP	
Rom 1:32	οἱ ... πράσσοντες	N	S	-	AP	
Rom 1:32	τοῖς πράσσουσιν	D	S	-	AP	
Rom 2:1	ὁ κρίνων	V/N	S	-	AP	
Rom 2:1	ὁ κρίνων	V/N	S	-	AP	
Rom 2:2	τοὺς ... πράσσοντας.	A	S	-	AP	
Rom 2:3	ὁ κρίνων	V/N	?	?	?	
Rom 2:3	τοὺς ... πράσσοντας	A	S	-	AP	
Rom 2:3	ποιῶν	V/N	?	?	?	
Rom 2:7	τοῖς ... ζητοῦσιν	D	S	-	AP	
Rom 2:8	τοῖς ... ἀπειθοῦσι	D	S	-	AP	
Rom 2:8	πειθομένοις	D	S	-	AP	
Rom 2:9	τοῦ κατεργαζομένου	G	A	R	SAP	
Rom 2:10	τῷ ἐργαζομένῳ	D	S	-	AP	
Rom 2:14	τὰ...ἔχοντα	N	A	R	SAP	
Rom 2:18	τὰ διαφέροντα	A	S	-	AP	
Rom 2:20	ἔχοντα	A	B	-	-	
Rom 2:21	ὁ οὖν διδάσκων	V/N	S	-	-	
Rom 2:21	ὁ κηρύσσων	V/N	S	-	-	
Rom 2:22	ὁ λέγων	V/N	S	-	-	
Rom 2:22	ὁ βδελυσσόμενος	V/N	S	-	-	
Rom 3:5	ὁ ἐπιφέρων	N	A	NR	ASAP	
Rom 3:11	ὁ συνίων	N	S	-	AP	
Rom 3:11	ὁ ἐκζητῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Rom 3:12	ὁ ποιῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Rom 3:13	ἀνεῳγμένος	N	A	R	SP	
Rom 3:22	τοὺς πιστεύοντας.	A	S	-	AP	
Rom 3:25	προγεγονότων	G	A	R	APS	
Rom 3:26	δικαιοῦντα	A	S	-	P	
Rom 4:4	τῷ δὲ ἐργαζομένῳ	D	S	-	AP	
Rom 4:5	τῷ δὲ μὴ ἐργαζομένῳ	D	S	-	AP	
Rom 4:5	πιστεύοντι	D	S	-	AP	
Rom 4:5	τὸν δικαιοῦντα	A	S	-	AP	
Rom 4:11	τῶν πιστευόντων	G	S	-	AP	
Rom 4:12	τοῖς στοιχοῦσιν	D	S	-	AP	
Rom 4:17	τοῦ ζῳοποιοῦντος	G	A	NR	SAP	
Rom 4:17	καλοῦντος	G	A	NR	SAP	
Rom 4:17	τὰ μὴ ὄντα	A	S	-	AP	
Rom 4:17	ὄντα	A	S	-	P	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
Rom 4:18	τὸ εἰρημένον	A	S	-	AP	
Rom 4:24	τοῖς πιστεύουσιν	D	S	-	-	
Rom 4:24	τὸν ἐγείραντα	A	S	-	AP	
Rom 5:5	τοῦ δοθέντος	G	A	NR	SAP	
Rom 5:14	τοὺς μὴ ἁμαρτήσαντας	A	S	-	AP	
Rom 5:14	τοῦ μέλλοντος	G	S	-	AP	
Rom 5:16	ἁμαρτήσαντος	N	S	-	P	
Rom 5:17	οἱ ... λαμβάνοντες	N	S	-	AP	
Rom 6:7	ὁ γὰρ ἀποθανὼν	N	S	-	AP	
Rom 6:11	ζῶντας	A	P	-	-	
Rom 6:13	ζῶντας	A	S	-	P	
Rom 7:1	γινώσκουσιν	D	S	-	P	
Rom 7:2	ζῶντι	D	A	R	APS	
Rom 7:4	τῷ...ἐγερθέντι	D	S	-	AP	
Rom 7:14	πεπραμένος	N	P	-	-	
Rom 7:17	οἰκοῦσα	N	A	R	APS	
Rom 7:20	οἰκοῦσα	N	A	R	APS	
Rom 7:21	τῷ θέλοντι	D	S	-	AP	
Rom 7:23	τῷ ὄντι	D	A	R	ASAP	
Rom 8:4	τοῖς ... περιπατοῦσιν	D	A	NR	SAP	
Rom 8:5	οἱ ... ὄντες	N	S	-	AP	
Rom 8:8	οἱ δὲ ἐν σαρκὶ ὄντες	N	S	-	AP	
Rom 8:11	τοῦ ἐγείραντος	G	S	-	AP	
Rom 8:11	ὁ ἐγείρας	N	S	-	AP	
Rom 8:11	ἐνοικοῦντος	G	A	NR	APS	
Rom 8:18	μέλλουσαν	A	A	R	APS	
Rom 8:20	τὸν ὑποτάξαντα	A	S	-	AP	
Rom 8:23	ἔχοντες	N	B	-	-	
Rom 8:24	βλεπομένη	N	A	R	SP	
Rom 8:27	ὁ δὲ ἐραυνῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Rom 8:28	τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν	D	S	-	AP	
Rom 8:28	τοῖς ... οὖσιν	D	S	-	AP	
Rom 8:33	ὁ δικαιῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Rom 8:34	ὁ κατακρινῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Rom 8:34	ὁ ἀποθανών	N	S	-	AP	
Rom 8:34	ἐγερθείς	N	S	-	AP	
Rom 8:37	τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντος	G	S	-	AP	
Rom 8:38	ἐνεστῶτα	N	S	-	P	
Rom 8:38	μέλλοντα	N	S	-	P	
Rom 9:5	ὁ ὢν	N	S	-	AP	
Rom 9:12	τοῦ καλοῦντος	G	S	-	AP	
Rom 9:16	τοῦ θέλοντος	G	S	-	AP	
Rom 9:16	τοῦ τρέχοντος	G	S	-	AP	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
Rom 9:16	ἐλεῶντος	G	A	NR	APS	
Rom 9:20	ὁ ἀνταποκρινόμενος	N/V	?	?	?	
Rom 9:20	τῷ πλάσαντι	D	S	-	AP	
Rom 9:22	κατηρτισμένα	A	A	R	SP	
Rom 9:25	τὴν οὐκ ἠγαπημένην	A	S	-	AP	
Rom 9:25	ἠγαπημένην	A	S	-	P	
Rom 9:26	ζῶντος	G	A	R	SP	
Rom 9:30	τὰ μὴ διώκοντα	A	A	R	SAP	
Rom 9:33	ὁ πιστεύων	N	S	-	AP	
Rom 10:4	τῷ πιστεύοντι	D	S	-	AP	
Rom 10:5	ποιήσας	N	A	R	APS	
Rom 10:11	ὁ πιστεύων	N	S	-	AP	
Rom 10:12	τοὺς ἐπικαλουμένους	A	S	-	AP	
Rom 10:14	κηρύσσοντος	G	S	-	P	
Rom 10:15	τῶν εὐαγγελιζομένων	G	S	-	AP	
Rom 10:18	τῆς οἰκουμένης	G	S	-	AP	
Rom 10:20	τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ζητοῦσιν	D	S	-	AP	
Rom 10:20	τοῖς ... ἐπερωτῶσιν	D	S	-	AP	
Rom 10:21	ἀπειθοῦντα	A	A	R	SP	
Rom 10:21	ἀντιλέγοντα.	A	A	R	SP	
Rom 11:17	ὤν	N	B	-	-	
Rom 11:22	τοὺς πεσόντας	A	S	-	AP	
Rom 11:26	ὁ ῥυόμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Rom 12:1	ζῶσαν	A	A	R	SP	
Rom 12:3	τῆς δοθείσης	G	A	R	ASAP	
Rom 12:3	τῷ ὄντι	D	S	-	AP	
Rom 12:6	τὴν δοθεῖσαν	A	A	R	ASAP	
Rom 12:7	ὁ διδάσκων	N	S	-	AP	
Rom 12:8	ὁ παρακαλῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Rom 12:8	ὁ μεταδιδοὺς	N	S	-	AP	
Rom 12:8	ὁ προϊστάμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Rom 12:8	ὁ ἐλεῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Rom 12:14	τοὺς διώκοντας	A	S	-	AP	
Rom 12:15	χαιρόντων	G	S	-	P	
Rom 12:15	κλαιόντων.	G	S	-	P	
Rom 13:1	ὑπερεχούσαις	D	A	R	SP	
Rom 13:1	αἱ δὲ οὖσαι	N	S	-	AP	
Rom 13:2	ὁ ἀντιτασσόμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Rom 13:2	οἱ δὲ ἀνθεστηκότες	N	S	-	AP	
Rom 13:4	τῷ ... πράσσοντι	D	S	-	AP	
Rom 13:6	προσκαρτεροῦντες	N	B	-	-	
Rom 13:8	ὁ γὰρ ἀγαπῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Rom 14:1	Τὸν δὲ ἀσθενοῦντα	A	S	-	AP	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
Rom 14:2	ὁ δὲ ἀσθενῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Rom 14:3	ὁ ἐσθίων	N	S	-	AP	
Rom 14:3	τὸν μὴ ἐσθίοντα	A	S	-	AP	
Rom 14:3	ὁ δὲ μὴ ἐσθίων	N	S	-	AP	
Rom 14:3	τὸν ἐσθίοντα	A	S	-	AP	
Rom 14:4	ὁ κρίνων	N	?	?	?	
Rom 14:6	ὁ φρονῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Rom 14:6	ὁ ἐσθίων	N	S	-	AP	
Rom 14:6	ὁ μὴ ἐσθίων	N	S	-	AP	
Rom 14:9	ζώντων	G	S	-	P	
Rom 14:14	τῷ λογιζομένῳ	D	S	-	AP	
Rom 14:18	ὁ ... δουλεύων	N	S	-	AP	
Rom 14:20	τῷ ... ἐσθίοντι.	D	A	R	ASAP	
Rom 14:22	ὁ μὴ κρίνων	N	S	-	AP	
Rom 14:23	ὁ δὲ διακρινόμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Rom 15:3	τῶν ὀνειδιζόντων	G	S	-	AP	
Rom 15:12	ὁ ἀνιστάμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Rom 15:14	πεπληρωμένοι	N	P	-	-	
Rom 15:14	δυνάμενοι	N	P	-	-	
Rom 15:15	τὴν δοθεῖσάν	A	A	R	ASAP	PA
Rom 15:16	ἱερουργοῦντα	A	B	-	-	
Rom 15:16	ἡγιασμένη	N	P	-	-	
Rom 15:31	τῶν ἀπειθούντων	G	S	-	AP	
Rom 16:1	οὖσαν	A	B	-	-	
Rom 16:11	τοὺς ὄντας	A	A	?	ASAP	
Rom 16:12	τὰς κοπιώσας	A	S	-	AP	
Rom 16:17	τοὺς ... ποιοῦντας	A	S	-	AP	
Rom 16:22	ὁ γράψας	N	S	-	-	
Rom 16:25	[Τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ]	D	S	-	AP	
Rom 16:25	σεσιγημένου	G	A	R	SP	
Rom 16:26	φανερωθέντος	G	B	-	-	
Rom 16:26	γνωρισθέντος	G	B	-	-	
1 Cor 1:2	τῇ οὔσῃ	D	A	R	ASAP	
1 Cor 1:2	ἡγιασμένοις	D	S	-	P	
1 Cor 1:2	τοῖς ἐπικαλουμένοις	D	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 1:4	τῇ δοθείσῃ	D	A	R	ASAP	
1 Cor 1:18	τοῖς μὲν ἀπολλυμένοις	D	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 1:18	τοῖς δὲ σῳζομένοις	D	S	-	-	
1 Cor 1:21	τοὺς πιστεύοντας	A	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 1:23	ἐσταυρωμένον	A	A	R	SP	
1 Cor 1:28	τὰ ἐξουθενημένα	A	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 1:28	τὰ μὴ ὄντα	A	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 1:28	τὰ ὄντα	A	S	-	AP	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
1 Cor 1:31	ὁ καυχώμενος	N	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 2:2	ἐσταυρωμένον	A	A	R	SP	
1 Cor 2:6	τῶν καταργουμένων	G	A	?	ASAP	
1 Cor 2:7	τὴν ἀποκεκρυμμένην	A	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 2:9	τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν	D	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 2:12	τὰ . . . χαρισθέντα	A	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 3:7	ὁ φυτεύων	N	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 3:7	ὁ ποτίζων	N	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 3:7	ὁ αὐξάνων	N	A	NR	APS	
1 Cor 3:8	ὁ φυτεύων	N	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 3:8	ὁ ποτίζων	N	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 3:10	τὴν δοθεῖσάν	A	A	R	ASAP	
1 Cor 3:11	τὸν κείμενον	A	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 3:19	ὁ δρασσόμενος	N	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 3:22	ἐνεστῶτα	N	S	-	P	
1 Cor 3:22	μέλλοντα	N	S	-	P	
1 Cor 4:4	ὁ δὲ ἀνακρίνων	N	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 4:19	τῶν πεφυσιωμένων	G	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 5:2	ὁ . . . πράξας	N	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 5:3	τὸν . . . κατεργασάμενον	A	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 5:11	ὀνομαζόμενος	N	B	-	-	
1 Cor 6:1	ἔχων	N	B	-	-	
1 Cor 6:4	τοὺς ἐξουθενημένους	A	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 6:16	ὁ κολλώμενος	N	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 6:17	ὁ δὲ κολλώμενος	N	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 6:18	ὁ δὲ πορνεύων	N	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 7:10	Τοῖς δὲ γεγαμηκόσιν	D	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 7:22	ὁ . . . κληθεὶς	N	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 7:22	ὁ . . . κληθεὶς	N	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 7:25	ἠλεημένος	N	S	-	P	
1 Cor 7:26	ἐνεστῶσαν	A	A	R	APS	
1 Cor 7:29	οἱ ἔχοντες	N	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 7:29	μὴ ἔχοντες	N	B	-	-	
1 Cor 7:30	οἱ κλαίοντες	N	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 7:30	μὴ κλαίοντες	N	B	-	-	
1 Cor 7:30	οἱ χαίροντες	N	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 7:30	μὴ χαίροντες	N	B	-	-	
1 Cor 7:30	οἱ ἀγοράζοντες	N	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 7:30	μὴ κατέχοντες	N	B	-	-	
1 Cor 7:31	οἱ χρώμενοι	N	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 7:31	μὴ καταχρώμενοι	N	B	-	-	
1 Cor 7:33	ὁ δὲ γαμήσας	N	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 7:34	ἡ δὲ γαμήσασα	N	S	-	AP	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
1 Cor 7:37	μὴ ἔχων	N	B	-	-	
1 Cor 7:38	ὁ γαμίζων	N	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 7:38	ὁ μὴ γαμίζων	N	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 8:5	λεγόμενοι	N	S	-	-	
1 Cor 8:10	τὸν ἔχοντα	A	A	NR	SAP	
1 Cor 8:10	ὄντος	G	B	-	-	
1 Cor 8:11	ὁ ἀσθενῶν	N	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 8:12	ἀσθενοῦσαν	A	B	-	-	
1 Cor 9:3	τοῖς ἐμὲ ἀνακρίνουσίν	D	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 9:10	ὁ ἀροτριῶν	N	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 9:10	ὁ ἀλοῶν	N	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 9:13	οἱ . . . ἐργαζόμενοι	N	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 9:13	οἱ . . . παρεδρεύοντες	N	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 9:14	τοῖς . . . καταγγέλλουσιν	D	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 9:24	οἱ . . . τρέχοντες	N	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 9:25	ὁ ἀγωνιζόμενος	N	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 10:4	ἀκολουθούσης	G	A	R	PS	
1 Cor 10:12	ὁ δοκῶν	N	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 10:18	οἱ ἐσθίοντες	N	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 10:25	τὸ . . . πωλούμενον	A	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 10:27	τὸ παρατιθέμενον	A	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 10:28	τὸν μηνύσαντα	A	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 11:4	προσευχόμενος	N	A	R	SP	
1 Cor 11:4	προφητεύων	N	A	R	SP	
1 Cor 11:5	προσευχομένη	N	A	R	SP	
1 Cor 11:5	προφητεύουσα	N	A	R	SP	
1 Cor 11:5	τῇ ἐξυρημένῃ	D	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 11:22	τοὺς μὴ ἔχοντας	A	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 11:29	ὁ γὰρ ἐσθίων	N	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 11:29	πίνων	N	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 12:3	λαλῶν	N	A	R	SP	
1 Cor 12:6	ὁ ἐνεργῶν	N	A	NR	ASAP	
1 Cor 12:7	τὸ συμφέρον	A	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 12:22	δοκοῦντα	N	A	R	APS	
1 Cor 12:24	τῷ ὑστερουμένῳ	D	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 13:1	ἠχῶν	N	A	R	SP	
1 Cor 13:1	ἀλαλάζον	N	A	R	SP	
1 Cor 13:3	τὰ ὑπάρχοντά	A	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 14:2	ὁ γὰρ λαλῶν	N	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 14:3	ὁ δὲ προφητεύων	N	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 14:4	ὁ λαλῶν	N	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 14:4	ὁ δὲ προφητεύων	N	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 14:5	ὁ προφητεύων	N	S	-	AP	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
1 Cor 14:5	ὁ λαλῶν	N	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 14:7	διδόντα	N	B	-	-	
1 Cor 14:7	τὸ αὐλούμενον	N	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 14:7	τὸ κιθαριζόμενον	N	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 14:9	τὸ λαλούμενον	N	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 14:11	τῷ λαλοῦντι	D	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 14:11	ὁ λαλῶν	N	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 14:13	ὁ λαλῶν	N	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 14:16	ὁ ἀναπληρῶν	N	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 14:22	τοῖς πιστεύουσιν	D	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 14:22	τοῖς πιστεύουσιν	D	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 14:30	καθημένῳ	D	S	-	P	
1 Cor 15:18	οἱ κοιμηθέντες	N	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 15:20	τῶν κεκοιμημένων	G	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 15:27	τοῦ ὑποτάξαντος	G	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 15:28	τῷ ὑποτάξαντι	D	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 15:29	οἱ βαπτιζόμενοι	N	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 15:37	τὸ γενησόμενον	A	A	R	ASAP	
1 Cor 15:45	ζῶσαν	A	A	R	SP	
1 Cor 15:45	ζῳοποιοῦν	A	A	R	SP	
1 Cor 15:54	ὁ γεγραμμένος	N	A	R	ASAP	
1 Cor 15:57	τῷ διδόντι	D	A	NR	ASAP	
1 Cor 15:58	περισσεύοντες	N	P	-	-	
1 Cor 16:9	ἀντικείμενοι	N	S	-	P	
1 Cor 16:16	τῷ συνεργοῦντι	D	S	-	AP	
1 Cor 16:16	κοπιῶντι	D	S	-	AP	
2 Cor 1:1	τῇ οὔσῃ	D	A	R	ASAP	
2 Cor 1:1	τοῖς οὖσιν	D	A	R	ASAP	
2 Cor 1:4	ὁ παρακαλῶν	N	A	NR	SAP	
2 Cor 1:6	τῆς ἐνεργουμένης	G	A	R	ASAP	
2 Cor 1:8	τῆς γενομένης	G	A	R	ASAP	
2 Cor 1:9	τῷ ἐγείροντι	D	A	NR	ASAP	
2 Cor 1:19	ὁ . . . κηρυχθείς	N	A	NR	SAP	
2 Cor 1:21	ὁ δὲ βεβαιῶν	N	S	-	AP	
2 Cor 1:21	χρίσας	N	S	-	AP	
2 Cor 1:22	ὁ καὶ σφραγισάμενος	N	A	NR	SAP	
2 Cor 1:22	δούς	N	A	NR	SAP	
2 Cor 2:2	ὁ εὐφραίνων	N	S	-	AP	
2 Cor 2:2	ὁ λυπούμενος	N	S	-	AP	
2 Cor 2:14	τῷ . . . θριαμβεύοντι	D	A	NR	ASAP	
2 Cor 2:14	φανεροῦντι	D	A	NR	ASAP	
2 Cor 2:15	τοῖς σῳζομένοις	D	S	-	-	
2 Cor 2:15	τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις	D	S	-	-	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
2 Cor 2:17	καπηλεύοντες	N	PP	-	-	
2 Cor 3:2	ἐγγεγραμμένη	N	P	-	-	
2 Cor 3:2	γινωσκομένη	N	P	-	-	
2 Cor 3:2	ἀναγινωσκομένη	N	P	-	-	
2 Cor 3:3	διακονηθεῖσα	N	P	-	-	
2 Cor 3:3	ἐγγεγραμμένη	N	P	-	-	
2 Cor 3:3	ζῶντος	G	A	R	SP	
2 Cor 3:7	ἐντετυπωμένη	N	P	-	-	
2 Cor 3:7	τὴν καταργουμένην	A	A	R	ASAP	
2 Cor 3:10	τὸ δεδοξασμένον	N	S	-	AP	
2 Cor 3:10	ὑπερβαλλούσης	G	A	R	APS	
2 Cor 3:11	τὸ καταργούμενον	N	S	-	AP	
2 Cor 3:11	τὸ μένον	N	S	-	AP	
2 Cor 3:13	τοῦ καταργουμένου.	G	S	-	AP	
2 Cor 3:18	ἀνακεκαλυμμένῳ	D	A	R	PS	
2 Cor 4:3	τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις	D	S	-	AP	
2 Cor 4:6	ὁ εἰπών	N	S	-	-	
2 Cor 4:11	οἱ ζῶντες	N	A	?	SAP	
2 Cor 4:13	τὸ γεγραμμένον	A	S	-	AP	
2 Cor 4:14	ὁ ἐγείρας	N	S	-	AP	
2 Cor 4:15	πλεονάσασα	N	B	-	ASP	
2 Cor 4:18	τὰ βλεπόμενα	A	S	-	AP	
2 Cor 4:18	τὰ μὴ βλεπόμενα	A	S	-	AP	
2 Cor 4:18	τὰ γὰρ βλεπόμενα	N	S	-	AP	
2 Cor 4:18	τὰ δὲ μὴ βλεπόμενα	N	S	-	AP	
2 Cor 5:4	οἱ ὄντες	N	S	-	AP	
2 Cor 5:5	ὁ δὲ κατεργασάμενος	N	S	-	AP	
2 Cor 5:5	ὁ δούς	N	A	NR	SAP	
2 Cor 5:12	τοὺς . . . καυχωμένους	A	S	-	AP	
2 Cor 5:15	οἱ ζῶντες	N	S	-	AP	
2 Cor 5:15	τῷ . . . ἀποθανόντι	D	S	-	AP	
2 Cor 5:15	ἐγερθέντι	D	S	-	AP	
2 Cor 5:18	τοῦ καταλλάξαντος	G	A	NR	ASAP	
2 Cor 5:18	δόντος	G	A	NR	ASAP	
2 Cor 5:21	τὸν μὴ γνόντα	A	S	-	AP	
2 Cor 6:9	ἀγνοούμενοι	N	S	-	P	
2 Cor 6:9	ἐπιγινωσκόμενοι	N	S	-	P	
2 Cor 6:9	ἀποθνῄσκοντες	N	S	-	P	
2 Cor 6:9	παιδευόμενοι	N	S	-	P	
2 Cor 6:9	θανατούμενοι	N	S	-	P	
2 Cor 6:10	λυπούμενοι	N	S	-	P	
2 Cor 6:10	χαίροντες	N	S	-	P	
2 Cor 6:10	πλουτίζοντες	N	S	-	P	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
2 Cor 6:10	ἔχοντες	N	S	-	P	
2 Cor 6:10	κατέχοντες	N	S	-	P	
2 Cor 6:14	ἑτεροζυγοῦντες	N	P	-	-	
2 Cor 6:16	ζῶντος	G	A	R	SP	
2 Cor 7:6	ὁ παρακαλῶν	N	S	-	AP	
2 Cor 7:12	τοῦ ἀδικήσαντος	G	S	-	AP	
2 Cor 7:12	τοῦ ἀδικηθέντος	G	S	-	AP	
2 Cor 8:1	τὴν δεδομένην	A	A	R	ASAP	
2 Cor 8:16	τῷ δόντι	D	A	NR	ASAP	
2 Cor 8:19	τῇ διακονουμένῃ	D	A	R	ASAP	PA
2 Cor 8:20	τῇ διακονουμένῃ	D	A	R	ASAP	PA
2 Cor 9:5	προεπηγγελμένην	A	A	R	APS	
2 Cor 9:6	ὁ σπείρων	N	S	-	AP	
2 Cor 9:6	ὁ σπείρων	N	S	-	AP	
2 Cor 9:10	ὁ δὲ ἐπιχορηγῶν	N	S	-	AP	
2 Cor 9:10	τῷ σπείροντι	D	S	-	AP	
2 Cor 9:14	ὑπερβάλλουσαν	A	A	R	APS	
2 Cor 10:2	τοὺς λογιζομένους	A	S	-	AP	
2 Cor 10:2	περιπατοῦντας	A	B	-	-	
2 Cor 10:5	ἐπαιρόμενον	A	A	R	SP	
2 Cor 10:10	ἐξουθενημένος	N	P	-	-	
2 Cor 10:12	τῶν . . . συνιστανόντων	G	S	-	AP	
2 Cor 10:17	Ὁ δὲ καυχώμενος	N	S	-	AP	
2 Cor 10:18	ὁ ἑαυτὸν συνιστάνων	N	S	-	AP	
2 Cor 11:4	ὁ ἐρχόμενος	N	S	-	AP	
2 Cor 11:12	τῶν θελόντων	G	S	-	AP	
2 Cor 11:13	μετασχηματιζόμενοι	N	S	-	P	
2 Cor 11:31	ὁ ὢν	N	S	-	AP	
2 Cor 12:2	ἁρπαγέντα	A	P	-	-	
2 Cor 12:21	τῶν προημαρτηκότων	G	S	-	AP	
2 Cor 12:21	μὴ μετανοησάντων	G	S	-	AP	
2 Cor 13:2	τοῖς προημαρτηκόσιν	D	S	-	AP	
2 Cor 13:3	λαλοῦντος	G	A	NR	APS	
Gal 1:1	τοῦ ἐγείραντος	G	A	NR	SAP	
Gal 1:4	τοῦ δόντος	G	A	NR	SAP	
Gal 1:4	ἐνεστῶτος	G	A	R	ASAP	
Gal 1:6	τοῦ καλέσαντος	G	S	-	AP	
Gal 1:7	οἱ ταράσσοντες	N	S	-	AP	
Gal 1:7	θέλοντες	N	S	-	AP	
Gal 1:11	τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν	A	A	R	ASAP	PA
Gal 1:15	ὁ ἀφορίσας	N	A	NR	ASAP	
Gal 1:15	καλέσας	N	A	NR	ASAP	
Gal 1:23	ὁ διώκων	N	S	-	AP	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
Gal 2:2	τοῖς δοκοῦσιν	D	S	-	AP	
Gal 2:6	τῶν δοκούντων	G	S	-	AP	
Gal 2:6	οἱ δοκοῦντες	N	S	-	AP	
Gal 2:8	ὁ γὰρ ἐνεργήσας	N	S	-	AP	
Gal 2:9	τὴν δοθεῖσάν	A	A	R	ASAP	
Gal 2:9	οἱ δοκοῦντες	N	S	-	AP	
Gal 2:14	ὑπάρχων	N	B	-	-	
Gal 2:20	τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντός	G	A	NR	ASAP	
Gal 2:20	παραδόντος	G	A	NR	ASAP	
Gal 3:1	ἐσταυρωμένος	N	P	-	-	
Gal 3:5	ὁ οὖν ἐπιχορηγῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Gal 3:5	ἐνεργῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Gal 3:10	τοῖς γεγραμμένοις	D	S	-	AP	
Gal 3:12	ὁ ποιήσας	N	S	-	AP	
Gal 3:13	ὁ κρεμάμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Gal 3:15	κεκυρωμένην	A	A	R	PS	
Gal 3:17	προκεκυρωμένην	A	A	R	SP	PA
Gal 3:17	γεγονὼς	N	A	R	APS	
Gal 3:21	ὁ δυνάμενος	N	A	R	SAP	
Gal 3:22	τοῖς πιστεύουσιν	D	S	-	AP	
Gal 3:23	μέλλουσαν	A	A	R	APS	
Gal 4:8	τοῖς φύσει μὴ οὖσιν	D	S	-	AP	
Gal 4:21	οἱ ὑπὸ νόμον θέλοντες	N	S	-	AP	
Gal 4:27	ἡ οὐ τίκτουσα	V/N?	A	NR	SAP	
Gal 4:27	ἡ οὐκ ὠδίνουσα	V/N?	S	-	AP	
Gal 4:27	ἢ τῆς ἐχούσης	G	S	-	AP	
Gal 4:29	ὁ ... γεννηθεὶς	N	S	-	AP	
Gal 5:3	περιτεμνομένῳ	D	A	R	SP	
Gal 5:6	ἐνεργουμένη	N	A	R	SP	
Gal 5:8	τοῦ καλοῦντος	G	S	-	AP	
Gal 5:10	ὁ δὲ ταράσσων	N	S	-	AP	
Gal 5:12	οἱ ἀναστατοῦντες	N	S	-	AP	
Gal 5:21	οἱ ... πράσσοντες	N	S	-	AP	
Gal 6:6	ὁ κατηχούμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Gal 6:6	τῷ κατηχοῦντι	D	S	-	AP	
Gal 6:8	ὁ σπείρων	N	S	-	AP	
Gal 6:8	ὁ δὲ σπείρων	N	S	-	AP	
Gal 6:13	οἱ περιτεμνόμενοι	N	S	-	AP	
Eph 1:1	τοῖς οὖσιν	D	A	R	ASAP	
Eph 1:3	ὁ εὐλογήσας	N	A	NR	ASAP	
Eph 1:6	τῷ ἠγαπημένῳ	D	S	-	AP	
Eph 1:11	τοῦ ... ἐνεργοῦντος	G	S	-	AP	
Eph 1:12	τοὺς προηλπικότας	A	A	NR	SAP	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
Eph 1:19	ὑπερβάλλον	N	A	R	APS	
Eph 1:19	τοὺς πιστεύοντας	A	A	R	SAP	
Eph 1:21	ὀνομαζομένου	G	A	R	SP	
Eph 1:21	τῷ μέλλοντι	D	S	-	AP	
Eph 1:23	τοῦ ... πληρουμένου.	G	S	-	AP	
Eph 2:2	τοῦ νῦν ἐνεργοῦντος	G	A	R	ASAP	
Eph 2:7	τοῖς ἐπερχομένοις	D	A	R	ASAP	
Eph 2:7	ὑπερβάλλον	A	A	R	APS	
Eph 2:11	οἱ λεγόμενοι	N	S	-	-	
Eph 2:11	λεγομένης	G	A	R	APS	
Eph 2:12	ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι	N	P	-	-	
Eph 2:12	ἔχοντες	N	P	-	-	
Eph 2:13	οἵ ποτε ὄντες	N	A	NR	SAP	
Eph 2:14	ὁ ποιήσας	N	A	NR	SAP	
Eph 2:14	λύσας	N	A	NR	SAP	
Eph 3:2	τῆς δοθείσης	G	A	R	ASAP	
Eph 3:7	τῆς δοθείσης	G	A	R	ASAP	
Eph 3:9	τοῦ ἀποκεκρυμμένου	G	A	R	ASAP	
Eph 3:9	τῷ τὰ πάντα κτίσαντι	D	A	NR	ASAP	
Eph 3:19	ὑπερβάλλουσαν	A	A	R	APS	
Eph 3:20	Τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ	D	S	-	AP	
Eph 3:20	τὴν ἐνεργουμένην	A	A	R	ASAP	
Eph 4:10	ὁ καταβὰς	N	S	-	AP	
Eph 4:10	ὁ ἀναβὰς	N	S	-	AP	
Eph 4:14	κλυδωνιζόμενοι	N	P	-	-	
Eph 4:14	περιφερόμενοι	N	P	-	-	
Eph 4:16	συναρμολογούμενον	N	B	-	-	
Eph 4:16	συμβιβαζόμενον	N	B	-	-	
Eph 4:18	τὴν οὖσαν	A	A	R	ASAP	
Eph 4:22	τὸν φθειρόμενον	A	A	?	ASAP	
Eph 4:24	τὸν κατὰ θεὸν κτισθέντα	A	A	?	ASAP	
Eph 4:28	ὁ κλέπτων	N	S	-	AP	
Eph 4:28	τῷ χρείαν ἔχοντι	D	S	-	AP	
Eph 4:29	τοῖς ἀκούουσιν	D	S	-	AP	
Eph 4:32	χαριζόμενοι	N	P	-	-	
Eph 5:12	τὰ ... γινόμενα	A	S	-	AP	
Eph 5:14	τὸ φανερούμενον	N	S	-	AP	
Eph 5:14	ὁ καθεύδων	N/V	S	-	AP	
Eph 5:27	μὴ ἔχουσαν	A	P	-	-	
Eph 5:28	ὁ ἀγαπῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Eph 6:16	[τὰ] πεπυρωμένα	A	A	R	ASAP	
Eph 6:24	τῶν ἀγαπώντων	G	S	-	AP	
Phil 1:1	τοῖς οὖσιν	D	A	R	ASAP	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
Phil 1:6	ὁ ἐναρξάμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Phil 1:10	τὰ διαφέροντα	A	S	-	AP	
Phil 1:11	πεπληρωμένοι	N	P	-	-	
Phil 1:28	τῶν ἀντικειμένων	G	S	-	AP	
Phil 2:13	ὁ ἐνεργῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Phil 2:15	διεστραμμένης	G	A	R	SP	
Phil 3:3	οἱ ... λατρεύοντες	N	S	-	-	
Phil 3:3	καυχώμενοι	N	S	-	-	
Phil 3:3	πεποιθότες	N	S	-	-	
Phil 3:6	διώκων	N	S	-	P	
Phil 3:6	γενόμενος	N	S	-	P	
Phil 3:8	τὸ ὑπερέχον	A	S	-	AP	
Phil 3:17	τοὺς ... περιπατοῦντας	A	S	-	AP	
Phil 3:19	οἱ ... φρονοῦντες	N	?	?	?	
Phil 4:7	ἡ ὑπερέχουσα	N	A	?	ASAP	
Phil 4:13	τῷ ἐνδυναμοῦντί	D	S	-	AP	
Phil 4:17	τὸν πλεονάζοντα	A	A	R	ASAP	
Col 1:5	τὴν ἀποκειμένην	A	A	R	ASAP	
Col 1:6	τοῦ παρόντος	G	A	R	ASAP	
Col 1:8	ὁ καὶ δηλώσας	N	?	?	?	
Col 1:12	τῷ ἱκανώσαντι	D	A	R	ASAP	
Col 1:18	πρωτεύων	N	P	-	-	
Col 1:23	τοῦ κηρυχθέντος	G	A	R	ASAP	
Col 1:25	τὴν δοθεῖσάν	A	A	R	ASAP	
Col 1:26	τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον	A	A	R	ASAP	
Col 1:29	τὴν ἐνεργουμένην	A	A	R	ASAP	
Col 2:8	ὁ συλαγωγῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Col 2:12	τοῦ ἐγείραντος	G	A	NR	ASAP	
Col 2:13	ὄντας	A	B	-	-	
Col 2:17	τῶν μελλόντων	G	S	-	AP	
Col 3:10	τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον	A	A	R	ASAP	
Col 3:10	τοῦ κτίσαντος	G	S	-	AP	
Col 3:12	ἠγαπημένοι	N	A	NR	SP	
Col 3:25	ὁ γὰρ ἀδικῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Col 4:6	ἠρτυμένος	N	P	-	-	
Col 4:11	ὁ λεγόμενος	N	A	R	SAP	
Col 4:11	οἱ ὄντες	N	A	NR	SAP	
Col 4:12	ἀγωνιζόμενος	N	B	-	-	
Col 4:12	πεπληροφορημένοι	N	P	-	-	
1 Thess 1:4	ἠγαπημένοι	V	A	R	SP	PA
1 Thess 1:7	τοῖς πιστεύουσιν	D	S	-	AP	
1 Thess 1:9	ζῶντι	D	A	R	SP	
1 Thess 1:10	τὸν ῥυόμενον	A	A	NR	SAP	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
1 Thess 1:10	τῆς ἐρχομένης	G	A	R	ASAP	
1 Thess 2:4	τῷ δοκιμάζοντι	D	A	NR	SAP	
1 Thess 2:10	τοῖς πιστεύουσιν	D	A	NR	SAP	
1 Thess 2:12	τοῦ καλοῦντος	G	A	NR	ASAP	
1 Thess 2:13	τοῖς πιστεύουσιν	D	A	NR	SAP	
1 Thess 2:14	τῶν οὐσῶν	G	A	R	ASAP	
1 Thess 2:15	τῶν . . . ἀποκτεινάντων	G	A	R	ASAP	
1 Thess 2:15	ἐκδιωξάντων	G	A	R	ASAP	
1 Thess 2:15	ἀρεσκόντων	G	A	R	ASAP	
1 Thess 2:16	κωλυόντων	G	B	-	-	
1 Thess 3:5	ὁ πειράζων	N	S	-	AP	
1 Thess 4:5	τὰ μὴ εἰδότα	A	A	R	ASAP	
1 Thess 4:8	ὁ ἀθετῶν	N	S	-	AP	
1 Thess 4:8	τὸν [καὶ] διδόντα	A	A	NR	ASAP	
1 Thess 4:13	τῶν κοιμωμένων	G	S	-	AP	
1 Thess 4:13	οἱ μὴ ἔχοντες	N	A	R	ASAP	
1 Thess 4:14	τοὺς κοιμηθέντας	A	S	-	AP	
1 Thess 4:15	οἱ ζῶντες	N	A	R	SAP	
1 Thess 4:15	οἱ περιλειπόμενοι	N	A	R	SAP	
1 Thess 4:15	τοὺς κοιμηθέντας	A	S	-	AP	
1 Thess 4:17	οἱ ζῶντες	N	A	R	SAP	
1 Thess 4:17	οἱ περιλειπόμενοι	N	A	R	SAP	
1 Thess 5:3	τῇ ἐν γαστρὶ ἐχούσῃ	D	S	-	AP	
1 Thess 5:7	Οἱ γὰρ καθεύδοντες	N	S	-	AP	
1 Thess 5:7	οἱ μεθυσκόμενοι	N	S	-	AP	
1 Thess 5:10	τοῦ ἀποθανόντος	G	A	NR	ASAP	
1 Thess 5:12	τοὺς κοπιῶντας	A	S	-	AP	
1 Thess 5:12	προϊσταμένους	A	S	-	AP	
1 Thess 5:12	νουθετοῦντας	A	S	-	AP	
1 Thess 5:24	ὁ καλῶν	N	S	-	AP	
2 Thess 1:6	τοῖς θλίβουσιν	D	S	-	AP	
2 Thess 1:7	τοῖς θλιβομένοις	D	A	NR	SAP	
2 Thess 1:8	τοῖς μὴ εἰδόσιν	D	S	-	AP	
2 Thess 1:8	τοῖς μὴ ὑπακούουσιν	D	S	-	AP	
2 Thess 1:10	τοῖς πιστεύσασιν	D	S	-	AP	
2 Thess 2:4	ὁ ἀντικείμενος	N	S	-	AP	
2 Thess 2:4	ὑπεραιρόμενος	N	S	-	AP	
2 Thess 2:4	λεγόμενον	A	S	-	P	
2 Thess 2:6	τὸ κατέχον	A	S	-	AP	
2 Thess 2:7	ὁ κατέχων	N	S	-	AP	
2 Thess 2:10	τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις	D	S	-	AP	
2 Thess 2:12	οἱ μὴ πιστεύσαντες	N	S	-	AP	
2 Thess 2:12	εὐδοκήσαντες	N	S	-	AP	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
2 Thess 2:13	ἠγαπημένοι	N/V	A	R	SP	PA
2 Thess 2:16	ὁ ἀγαπήσας	N	A	NR	ASAP	
2 Thess 2:16	δοὺς	N	A	NR	ASAP	
2 Thess 3:6	περιπατοῦντος	G	A	R	SP	
1 Tim 1:10	ὑγιαινούσῃ	D	A	R	APS	
1 Tim 1:12	τῷ ἐνδυναμώσαντί	D	S	-	AP	
1 Tim 1:16	τῶν μελλόντων	G	S	-	AP	
1 Tim 1:18	προαγούσας	A	A	R	APS	
1 Tim 2:2	τῶν...ὄντων	G	S	-	AP	
1 Tim 2:6	ὁ δοὺς	N	A	NR	SAP	
1 Tim 2:10	ἐπαγγελλομέναις	D	A	R	SP	
1 Tim 3:4	προϊστάμενον	A	P	-	-	
1 Tim 3:4	ἔχοντα	A	P	-	-	
1 Tim 3:8	προσέχοντας	A	P	-	-	
1 Tim 3:9	ἔχοντας	A	P	-	-	
1 Tim 3:12	προϊστάμενοι	N	S	-	P	
1 Tim 3:13	οἱ . . . διακονήσαντες	N	S	-	AP	
1 Tim 3:15	ζῶντος	G	A	R	SP	
1 Tim 4:2	κεκαυστηριασμένων	G	A	R	SP	
1 Tim 4:3	κωλυόντων	G	B	-	-	
1 Tim 4:3	τοῖς . . . ἐπεγνωκόσι	D	S	-	AP	
1 Tim 4:8	τῆς μελλούσης	G	S	-	AP	
1 Tim 4:10	ζῶντι	D	A	R	SP	
1 Tim 4:16	τοὺς ἀκούοντάς	A	S	-	AP	
1 Tim 5:5	ἡ . . . μεμονωμένη	N	S	-	AP	
1 Tim 5:6	ἡ δὲ σπαταλῶσα	N	S	-	AP	
1 Tim 5:10	θλιβομένοις	D	S	-	P	
1 Tim 5:13	λαλοῦσαι	N	B	-	-	
1 Tim 5:13	τὰ μὴ δέοντα	A	S	-	AP	
1 Tim 5:14	τῷ ἀντικειμένῳ	D	S	-	AP	
1 Tim 5:17	προεστῶτες	N	A	R	APS	
1 Tim 5:17	οἱ κοπιῶντες	N	S	-	AP	
1 Tim 5:18	ἀλοῶντα	A	B	-	-	
1 Tim 5:20	Τοὺς ἁμαρτάνοντας	A	S	-	AP	
1 Tim 5:25	τὰ ἄλλως ἔχοντα	A	S	-	AP	
1 Tim 6:2	οἱ δὲ πιστοὺς ἔχοντες	N	S	-	AP	
1 Tim 6:2	οἱ . . . ἀντιλαμβανόμενοι	N	S	-	AP	
1 Tim 6:3	ὑγιαίνουσιν	D	A	R	PS	
1 Tim 6:5	διεφθαρμένων	G	A	R	PS	
1 Tim 6:5	ἀπεστερημένων	G	A	R	SP	
1 Tim 6:5	νομιζόντων	G	B	-	-	
1 Tim 6:9	οἱ δὲ βουλόμενοι	N	S	-	AP	
1 Tim 6:13	τοῦ ζῳογονοῦντος	G	A	NR	ASAP	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
1 Tim 6:13	τοῦ μαρτυρήσαντος	G	A	NR	SAP	
1 Tim 6:15	τῶν βασιλευόντων	G	S	-	AP	
1 Tim 6:15	τῶν κυριευόντων	G	S	-	AP	
1 Tim 6:16	ὁ μόνος ἔχων	N	A	NR	ASAP	
1 Tim 6:16	οἰκῶν	N	A	NR	ASAP	
1 Tim 6:17	τῷ παρέχοντι	D	A	NR	SAP	
1 Tim 6:19	τὸ μέλλον	A	S	-	AP	
2 Tim 1:9	τοῦ σώσαντος	G	A	NR	SAP	
2 Tim 1:9	καλέσαντος	G	A	NR	SAP	
2 Tim 1:9	τὴν δοθεῖσαν	A	A	R	SAP	
2 Tim 1:10	φανερωθεῖσαν	A	A	R	SAP	
2 Tim 1:10	καταργήσαντος	G	A	NR	SP	
2 Tim 1:10	φωτίσαντος	G	A	NR	SP	
2 Tim 1:13	ὑγιαινόντων	G	A	R	PS	
2 Tim 1:14	τοῦ ἐνοικοῦντος	G	A	NR	SAP	
2 Tim 2:4	στρατευόμενος	N	A	R	SP	
2 Tim 2:4	τῷ στρατολογήσαντι	D	S	-	AP	
2 Tim 2:6	κοπιῶντα	A	A	R	APS	
2 Tim 2:8	ἐγηγερμένον	A	B	-	-	
2 Tim 2:14	τῶν ἀκουόντων	G	S	-	AP	
2 Tim 2:15	ὀρθοτομοῦντα	A	A	R	SP	
2 Tim 2:19	τοὺς ὄντας	A	S	-	AP	
2 Tim 2:19	ὁ ὀνομάζων	N	S	-	AP	
2 Tim 2:21	ἡγιασμένον	N	P	-	-	
2 Tim 2:21	ἡτοιμασμένον	N	P	-	-	
2 Tim 2:22	τῶν ἐπικαλουμένων	G	S	-	AP	
2 Tim 2:25	τοὺς ἀντιδιατιθεμένους	A	S	-	AP	
2 Tim 3:4	τετυφωμένοι	N	P	-	-	
2 Tim 3:5	ἔχοντες	N	P	-	-	
2 Tim 3:5	ἠρνημένοι	N	P	-	-	
2 Tim 3:6	οἱ ἐνδύνοντες	N	S	-	-	
2 Tim 3:6	αἰχμαλωτίζοντες	N	S	-	P	
2 Tim 3:6	σεσωρευμένα	A	A	R	SP	
2 Tim 3:6	ἀγόμενα	A	B	-	-	
2 Tim 3:7	μανθάνοντα	A	B	-	-	
2 Tim 3:7	δυνάμενα	A	B	-	-	
2 Tim 3:8	κατεφθαρμένοι	N	A	R	SP	
2 Tim 3:12	οἱ θέλοντες	N	S	-	AP	
2 Tim 3:15	τὰ δυνάμενά	A	A	R	ASAP	
2 Tim 3:17	ἐξηρτισμένος	N	P	-	-	
2 Tim 4:1	τοῦ μέλλοντος	G	A	NR	SAP	
2 Tim 4:1	ζῶντας	A	S	-	P	
2 Tim 4:3	ὑγιαινούσης	G	A	R	APS	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
2 Tim 4:8	τοῖς ἠγαπηκόσι	D	S	-	AP	
Titus 1:5	τὰ λείποντα	A	S	-	AP	
Titus 1:6	ἔχων	N	P	-	-	
Titus 1:9	ἀντεχόμενον	A	P	-	-	
Titus 1:9	τῇ ὑγιαινούσῃ	D	A	R	ASAP	
Titus 1:9	τοὺς ἀντιλέγοντας	A	S	-	AP	
Titus 1:14	ἀποστρεφομένων	G	A	R	SP	
Titus 1:15	τοῖς δὲ μεμιαμμένοις	D	S	-	AP	
Titus 2:1	ὑγιαινούσῃ	D	A	R	APS	
Titus 2:2	ὑγιαίνοντας	A	P	-	-	
Titus 2:3	δεδουλωμένας	A	P	-	-	
Titus 2:5	ὑποτασσομένας	A	P	-	-	
Titus 2:9	ἀντιλέγοντας	A	P	-	-	
Titus 2:10	μὴ νοσφιζομένους	A	P	-	-	
Titus 2:10	ἐνδεικνυμένους	A	P	-	-	
Titus 3:2	ἐνδεικνυμένους	A	P	-	-	
Titus 3:3	πλανώμενοι	N	P	-	-	
Titus 3:3	δουλεύοντες	N	P	-	-	
Titus 3:3	διάγοντες	N	P	-	-	
Titus 3:3	μισοῦντες	N	P	-	-	
Titus 3:8	οἱ πεπιστευκότες	N	S	-	AP	
Titus 3:15	τοὺς φιλοῦντας	A	S	-	AP	
Phlm 8	τὸ ἀνῆκον	A	S	-	AP	
Heb 1:6	τὴν οἰκουμένην	A	S	-	AP	
Heb 1:7	ὁ ποιῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Heb 1:14	ἀποστελλόμενα	N	A	R	SP	
Heb 1:14	τοὺς μέλλοντας	A	S	-	AP	
Heb 2:1	τοῖς ἀκουσθεῖσιν	D	S	-	AP	
Heb 2:2	λαληθεὶς	N	A	R	APS	
Heb 2:3	τῶν ἀκουσάντων	G	S	-	AP	
Heb 2:5	τὴν οἰκουμένην	A	S	-	AP	
Heb 2:5	τὴν μέλλουσαν	A	A	R	ASAP	
Heb 2:9	τὸν ... ἠλαττωμένον	A	S	-	AP	
Heb 2:11	ὅ τε γὰρ ἁγιάζων	N	S	-	AP	
Heb 2:11	οἱ ἁγιαζόμενοι	N	S	-	AP	
Heb 2:14	τὸν τὸ κράτος ἔχοντα	A	S	-	AP	
Heb 2:18	τοῖς πειραζομένοις	D	S	-	AP	
Heb 3:2	ὄντα	A	B	-	-	
Heb 3:2	τῷ ποιήσαντι	D	S	-	AP	
Heb 3:3	ὁ κατασκευάσας	N	S	-	AP	
Heb 3:4	ὁ ... κατασκευάσας	N	S	-	AP	
Heb 3:5	τῶν λαληθησομένων	G	S	-	AP	
Heb 3:12	ζῶντος	G	A	R	SP	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
Heb 3:16	οἱ ἐξελθόντες	N	S	-	AP	
Heb 3:17	τοῖς ἁμαρτήσασιν	D	S	-	AP	
Heb 3:18	τοῖς ἀπειθήσασιν	D	S	-	AP	
Heb 4:2	τοῖς ἀκούσασιν	D	S	-	AP	
Heb 4:3	οἱ πιστεύσαντες	N	S	-	AP	
Heb 4:6	οἱ . . . εὐαγγελισθέντες	N	S	-	AP	
Heb 4:10	ὁ γὰρ εἰσελθὼν	N	S	-	AP	
Heb 4:12	Ζῶν	N	P	-	-	
Heb 4:12	διϊκνούμενος	N	P	-	-	
Heb 4:13	τετραχηλισμένα	N	P	-	-	
Heb 4:14	διεληλυθότα	A	A	R	SP	
Heb 4:15	δυνάμενον	A	A	R	SP	
Heb 4:15	πεπειρασμένον	A	S	-	P	
Heb 5:1	λαμβανόμενος	N	B	-	-	
Heb 5:2	τοῖς ἀγνοοῦσιν	D	S	-	AP	
Heb 5:2	πλανωμένοις	D	S	-	AP	
Heb 5:5	ὁ λαλήσας	N	S	-	AP	
Heb 5:7	τὸν δυνάμενον	A	S	-	AP	
Heb 5:9	τοῖς ὑπακούουσιν	D	S	-	AP	
Heb 5:12	ἔχοντες	N	P	-	-	
Heb 5:13	ὁ μετέχων	N	S	-	AP	
Heb 5:14	τῶν . . . ἐχόντων	G	S	-	-	
Heb 5:14	γεγυμνασμένα	A	P	-	-	
Heb 6:4	τοὺς . . . φωτισθέντας	A	S	-	AP	
Heb 6:4	γευσαμένους	A	S	-	AP	
Heb 6:4	γενηθέντας	A	S	-	AP	
Heb 6:5	γευσαμένους	A	S	-	AP	
Heb 6:5	μέλλοντος	G	A	R	PS	
Heb 6:6	παραπεσόντας	A	S	-	P	
Heb 6:7	ἡ πιοῦσα	N	A	R	SAP	
Heb 6:7	ἐρχόμενον	A	A	R	APS	
Heb 6:7	τίκτουσα	N	A	R	SAP	
Heb 6:9	τὰ . . . ἐχόμενα	A	S	-	AP	
Heb 6:12	τῶν . . . κληρονομούντων	G	S	-	AP	
Heb 6:18	οἱ καταφυγόντες	N	S	-	AP	
Heb 6:18	προκειμένης	G	A	R	APS	
Heb 6:19	εἰσερχομένην	A	A	R	SP	
Heb 7:1	ὁ συναντήσας	N	S	-	AP	
Heb 7:1	εὐλογήσας	N	S	-	AP	
Heb 7:2	ἑρμηνευόμενος	N	B	-	-	
Heb 7:3	ἔχων	N	P	-	-	
Heb 7:3	ἀφωμοιωμένος	N	P	-	-	
Heb 7:5	οἱ . . . λαμβάνοντες	N	S	-	AP	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
Heb 7:6	ὁ . . . γενεαλογούμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Heb 7:6	τὸν ἔχοντα	A	S	-	AP	
Heb 7:8	ἀποθνῄσκοντες	N	A	R	PS	
Heb 7:8	μαρτυρούμενος	N	S	-	P	
Heb 7:9	ὁ...λαμβάνων	N	A	NR	SAP	
Heb 7:18	προαγούσης	G	A	R	PS	
Heb 7:21	τοῦ λέγοντος	G	S	-	AP	
Heb 7:25	τοὺς προσερχομένους	A	S	-	AP	
Heb 7:26	κεχωρισμένος	N	A	R	SP	
Heb 7:26	γενόμενος	N	A	R	SP	
Heb 7:28	ἔχοντας	A	B	-	-	
Heb 7:28	τετελειωμένον	A	A	R	SP	
Heb 8:1	τοῖς λεγομένοις	D	S	-	AP	
Heb 8:4	τῶν προσφερόντων	G	S	-	AP	
Heb 8:5	τὸν δειχθέντα	A	A	R	ASAP	
Heb 8:13	τὸ δὲ παλαιούμενον	N	S	-	AP	
Heb 8:13	γηράσκον	N	S	-	AP	
Heb 9:3	ἡ λεγομένη	N	A	R	SAP	
Heb 9:4	ἔχουσα	N	P	-	-	
Heb 9:4	περικεκαλυμμένην	A	P	-	-	
Heb 9:4	ἔχουσα	N	A	R	SP	
Heb 9:4	ἡ βλαστήσασα	N	A	R	ASAP	
Heb 9:5	κατασκιάζοντα	N	A	R	SP	
Heb 9:9	τὸν ἐνεστηκότα	A	A	R	ASAP	
Heb 9:9	μὴ δυνάμεναι	N	A	R	SP	
Heb 9:9	τὸν λατρεύοντα	A	S	-	AP	
Heb 9:10	ἐπικείμενα	N	A	R	SP	
Heb 9:11	γενομένων	G	A	R	APS	
Heb 9:13	ῥαντίζουσα	N	A	R	SP	
Heb 9:13	τοὺς κεκοινωμένους	A	S	-	AP	
Heb 9:14	ζῶντι	D	A	R	SP	
Heb 9:15	οἱ κεκλημένοι	N	S	-	AP	
Heb 9:16	τοῦ διαθεμένου	G	S	-	AP	
Heb 9:17	ὁ διαθέμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Heb 9:28	τοῖς . . . ἀπεκδεχομένοις	A	S	-	AP	
Heb 10:1	μελλόντων	G	A	R	APS	
Heb 10:1	τοὺς προσερχομένους	A	S	-	AP	
Heb 10:2	τοὺς λατρεύοντας	A	S	-	AP	
Heb 10:14	τοὺς ἁγιαζομένους	A	S	-	AP	
Heb 10:20	ζῶσαν	A	A	R	SP	
Heb 10:23	ὁ ἐπαγγειλάμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Heb 10:27	μέλλοντος	G	A	R	SP	
Heb 10:28	ἀθετήσας	N	S	-	-	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
Heb 10:29	ὁ . . . καταπατήσας	N	S	-	AP	
Heb 10:29	ἡγησάμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Heb 10:29	ἐνυβρίσας	N	S	-	AP	
Heb 10:30	τὸν εἰπόντα	A	S	-	AP	
Heb 10:31	ζῶντος	G	A	R	SP	
Heb 10:33	τῶν . . . ἀναστρεφομένων	G	S	-	AP	
Heb 10:34	τῶν ὑπαρχόντων	G	S	-	AP	
Heb 10:34	μένουσαν	A	A	R	SP	
Heb 10:37	ὁ ἐρχόμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Heb 11:1	ἐλπιζομένων	G	S	-	P	
Heb 11:1	οὐ βλεπομένων	G	A	R	SP	
Heb 11:3	φαινομένων	G	S	-	P	
Heb 11:3	τὸ βλεπόμενον	A	S	-	AP	
Heb 11:6	τὸν προσερχόμενον	A	S	-	AP	
Heb 11:6	τοῖς ἐκζητοῦσιν	D	S	-	AP	
Heb 11:7	τῶν . . . βλεπομένων	G	S	-	AP	
Heb 11:10	ἔχουσαν	A	A	R	APS	
Heb 11:11	τὸν ἐπαγγειλάμενον	A	S	-	AP	
Heb 11:14	οἱ . . . λέγοντες	N	S	-	AP	
Heb 11:17	ὁ . . . ἀναδεξάμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Heb 11:20	μελλόντων	G	S	-	P	
Heb 11:28	ὁ ὀλοθρεύων	N	S	-	AP	
Heb 11:31	τοῖς ἀπειθήσασιν	D	S	-	AP	
Heb 12:1	περικείμενον	A	A	R	PS	
Heb 12:1	προκείμενον	A	A	R	APS	
Heb 12:2	προκειμένης	G	A	R	APS	
Heb 12:3	τὸν . . . ὑπομεμενηκότα	A	S	-	AP	
Heb 12:10	τὸ δοκοῦν	A	S	-	AP	
Heb 12:10	τὸ συμφέρον	A	S	-	AP	
Heb 12:11	τὸ παρὸν	A	S	-	AP	
Heb 12:11	τοῖς . . . γεγυμνασμένοις	D	S	-	AP	
Heb 12:12	παρειμένας	A	A	R	APS	
Heb 12:12	παραλελυμένα	A	A	R	APS	
Heb 12:18	ψηλαφωμένῳ	D	S	-	P	
Heb 12:18	κεκαυμένῳ	D	A	R	PS	
Heb 12:19	οἱ ἀκούσαντες	N	S	-	AP	
Heb 12:20	τὸ διαστελλόμενον	A	S	-	AP	
Heb 12:21	τὸ φανταζόμενον	N	S	-	AP	
Heb 12:22	ζῶντος	G	A	R	SP	
Heb 12:23	ἀπογεγραμμένων	G	A	R	SP	
Heb 12:23	τετελειωμένων	G	A	R	SP	
Heb 12:24	λαλοῦντι	D	A	R	SP	
Heb 12:25	τὸν λαλοῦντα	A	S	-	AP	

316

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
Heb 12:25	παραιτησάμενοι	N	B	-	-	
Heb 12:25	τὸν χρηματίζοντα	A	S	-	AP	
Heb 12:25	οἱ ... ἀποστρεφόμενοι	N	A	R	SAP	
Heb 12:27	τῶν σαλευομένων	G	S	-	AP	
Heb 12:27	πεποιημένων	G	S	-	AP	
Heb 12:27	τὰ μὴ σαλευόμενα	A	S	-	AP	
Heb 12:29	καταναλίσκον	N	A	R	SP	
Heb 13:3	τῶν κακουχουμένων	G	S	-	AP	
Heb 13:5	τοῖς παροῦσιν	D	S	-	AP	
Heb 13:7	τῶν ἡγουμένων	G	S	-	AP	
Heb 13:9	οἱ περιπατοῦντες	N	S	-	AP	
Heb 13:10	οἱ ... λατρεύοντες	N	S	-	AP	
Heb 13:14	μένουσαν	A	A	R	PS	
Heb 13:14	τὴν μέλλουσαν	A	S	-	AP	
Heb 13:15	ὁμολογούντων	G	A	R	SP	
Heb 13:17	τοῖς ἡγουμένοις	D	S	-	AP	
Heb 13:17	ἀποδώσοντες	N	S	-	P	
Heb 13:20	ὁ ἀναγαγὼν	N	A	NR	ASAP	
Heb 13:24	τοὺς ἡγουμένους	A	S	-	AP	
Jas 1:4	λειπόμενοι	N	P	-	-	
Jas 1:5	διδόντος	G	A	NR	APS	
Jas 1:5	ὀνειδίζοντος	G	A	NR	APS	
Jas 1:6	ὁ γὰρ διακρινόμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Jas 1:6	ἀνεμιζομένῳ	D	A	R	SP	
Jas 1:6	ῥιπιζομένῳ	D	A	R	SP	
Jas 1:12	τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν	D	S	-	AP	
Jas 1:21	τὸν δυνάμενον	A	A	R	ASAP	
Jas 1:22	παραλογιζόμενοι	N	B	-	-	
Jas 1:23	κατανοοῦντι	D	A	R	SP	
Jas 1:25	ὁ δὲ παρακύψας	N	S	-	AP	
Jas 1:25	παραμείνας	N	S	-	AP	
Jas 1:25	γενόμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Jas 2:3	τὸν φοροῦντα	A	S	-	AP	
Jas 2:5	τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν	D	S	-	AP	
Jas 2:7	τὸ ἐπικληθὲν	A	A	R	ASAP	
Jas 2:11	ὁ γὰρ εἰπών	N	S	-	AP	
Jas 2:12	μέλλοντες	N	S	-	P	
Jas 2:13	τῷ μὴ ποιήσαντι	D	S	-	AP	
Jas 2:15	λειπόμενοι	N	P	-	-	
Jas 2:23	ἡ λέγουσα	N	A	R	ASAP	
Jas 3:4	τοῦ εὐθύνοντος	G	S	-	AP	
Jas 3:6	ἡ σπιλοῦσα	N	S	-	AP	
Jas 3:6	φλογίζουσα	N	S	-	AP	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
Jas 3:6	φλογιζομένη	N	S	-	AP	
Jas 3:9	τοὺς . . . γεγονότας	A	A	NR	ASAP	
Jas 3:15	κατερχομένη	N	PP	-	-	
Jas 3:18	τοῖς ποιοῦσιν	D	S	-	AP	
Jas 4:1	τῶν στρατευομένων	G	A	R	ASAP	
Jas 4:11	ὁ καταλαλῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Jas 4:11	κρίνων	N	S	-	AP	
Jas 4:12	ὁ δυνάμενος	N	A	R	SAP	
Jas 4:12	ὁ κρίνων	N/V	A	NR	SAP	
Jas 4:14	ἡ . . . φαινομένη	N	A	R	SAP	
Jas 4:14	ἀφανιζομένη	N	A	R	SAP	
Jas 4:17	εἰδότι	D	S	-	P	
Jas 4:17	ποιοῦντι	D	S	-	P	
Jas 5:1	ταῖς ἐπερχομέναις	D	A	R	ASAP	
Jas 5:4	τῶν ἀμησάντων	G	A	R	ASAP	
Jas 5:4	ὁ ἀπεστερημένος	N	A	R	ASAP	
Jas 5:4	τῶν θερισάντων	G	S	-	AP	
Jas 5:11	τοὺς ὑπομείναντας	A	S	-	AP	
Jas 5:15	τὸν κάμνοντα	A	S	-	AP	
Jas 5:16	ἐνεργουμένη	N	B	-	-	
Jas 5:20	ὁ ἐπιστρέψας	N	S	-	AP	
1 Pet 1:3	ὁ . . . ἀναγεννήσας	N	A	NR	ASAP	
1 Pet 1:3	ζῶσαν	A	A	R	SP	
1 Pet 1:4	τετηρημένην	A	A	R	SP	
1 Pet 1:5	τοὺς . . . φρουρουμένους	A	A	NR	SAP	
1 Pet 1:7	τοῦ ἀπολλυμένου	G	A	R	SAP	
1 Pet 1:7	δοκιμαζομένου	G	B	-	-	
1 Pet 1:8	δεδοξασμένῃ	D	A	R	SP	
1 Pet 1:10	οἱ . . . προφητεύσαντες	N	A	R	SAP	
1 Pet 1:12	τῶν εὐαγγελισαμένων	G	S	-	AP	
1 Pet 1:12	ἀποσταλέντι	D	A	NR	SP	
1 Pet 1:13	φερομένην	A	A	R	APS	
1 Pet 1:15	τὸν καλέσαντα	A	S	-	AP	
1 Pet 1:17	τὸν . . . κρίνοντα	A	S	-	AP	
1 Pet 1:21	τὸν ἐγείραντα	A	A	NR	SAP	
1 Pet 1:21	δόντα	A	A	NR	SAP	
1 Pet 1:23	ζῶντος	G	A	?	SP	
1 Pet 1:23	μένοντος	G	A	?	SP	
1 Pet 1:25	τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν	N	A	R	ASAP	
1 Pet 2:4	ζῶντα	A	A	R	SP	
1 Pet 2:4	ἀποδεδοκιμασμένον	A	A	R	SP	
1 Pet 2:5	ζῶντες	N	A	R	SP	
1 Pet 2:6	ὁ πιστεύων	N	S	-	AP	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
1 Pet 2:7	τοῖς πιστεύουσιν	D	A	NR	SAP	
1 Pet 2:7	ἀπιστοῦσιν	D	S	-	P	
1 Pet 2:7	οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες	N	S	-	AP	
1 Pet 2:9	τοῦ . . . καλέσαντος	G	S	-	AP	
1 Pet 2:10	οἱ οὐκ ἠλεημένοι	N	S	-	AP	
1 Pet 2:10	ἐλεηθέντες	N	S	-	AP	
1 Pet 2:13	ὑπερέχοντι	D	S	-	P	
1 Pet 2:14	πεμπομένοις	D	S	-	P	
1 Pet 2:16	ἔχοντες	N	B	-	-	
1 Pet 2:23	τῷ κρίνοντι	D	S	-	AP	
1 Pet 3:5	αἱ ἐλπίζουσαι	N	A	?	ASAP	
1 Pet 3:9	ἀποδιδόντες	N	B	-	-	
1 Pet 3:9	εὐλογοῦντες	N	B	-	-	
1 Pet 3:10	ὁ γὰρ θέλων	N	S	-	AP	
1 Pet 3:12	ποιοῦντας	A	S	-	P	
1 Pet 3:13	ὁ κακώσων	N	S	-	AP	
1 Pet 3:15	τῷ αἰτοῦντι	D	S	-	AP	
1 Pet 3:16	οἱ ἐπηρεάζοντες	N	S	-	AP	
1 Pet 3:20	ἀπειθήσασίν	D	B	-	-	
1 Pet 4:1	ὁ παθὼν	N	S	-	AP	
1 Pet 4:3	παρεληλυθὼς	N	A	R	APS	
1 Pet 4:5	τῷ ἑτοίμως ἔχοντι	D	S	-	AP	
1 Pet 4:5	ζῶντας	A	S	-	P	
1 Pet 4:12	γινομένῃ	D	B	-	-	
1 Pet 4:17	τῶν ἀπειθούντων	G	S	-	AP	
1 Pet 4:19	οἱ πάσχοντες	N	S	-	AP	
1 Pet 5:1	μελλούσης	G	A	R	APS	
1 Pet 5:8	ὠρυόμενος	N	A	R	SP	
1 Pet 5:10	ὁ καλέσας	N	A	NR	ASAP	
2 Pet 1:1	τοῖς . . . λαχοῦσιν	D	S	-	AP	
2 Pet 1:3	τοῦ καλέσαντος	G	S	-	AP	
2 Pet 1:12	παρούσῃ	D	A	R	APS	
2 Pet 1:16	σεσοφισμένοις	D	A	R	PS	
2 Pet 1:19	φαίνοντι	D	A	R	SP	
2 Pet 2:1	ἀγοράσαντα	A	A	R	APS	
2 Pet 2:6	μελλόντων	G	S	-	P	
2 Pet 2:7	καταπονούμενον	A	B	-	-	
2 Pet 2:10	τοὺς . . . πορευομένους	A	S	-	AP	
2 Pet 2:10	καταφρονοῦντας	A	S	-	AP	
2 Pet 2:12	γεγεννημένα	N	S	-	-	
2 Pet 2:12	βλασφημοῦντες	N	B	-	-	
2 Pet 2:13	ἀδικούμενοι	N	B	-	-	
2 Pet 2:13	ἡγούμενοι	N	B	-	-	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
2 Pet 2:13	ἐντρυφῶντες	N	B	-	-	
2 Pet 2:14	ἔχοντες	N	B	-	-	
2 Pet 2:14	δελεάζοντες	N	B	-	-	
2 Pet 2:14	ἔχοντες	N	B	-	-	
2 Pet 2:14	γεγυμνασμένην	A	A	R	SP	
2 Pet 2:17	ἐλαυνόμεναι	N	A	R	SP	PA
2 Pet 2:18	τοὺς ... ἀποφεύγοντας	A	S	-	AP	
2 Pet 2:18	τοὺς ... ἀναστρεφομένους	A	S	-	AP	
2 Pet 2:21	παραδοθείσης	G	A	R	APS	
2 Pet 2:22	ἐπιστρέψας	N	B	-	-	
2 Pet 2:22	λουσαμένη	N	B	-	-	
2 Pet 3:2	προειρημένων	G	A	R	APS	PA
2 Pet 3:5	συνεστῶσα	N	P	-	-	
2 Pet 3:15	δοθεῖσαν	A	A	R	APS	
1 John 2:4	ὁ λέγων	N	S	-	AP	
1 John 2:4	τηρῶν	N	S	-	AP	
1 John 2:6	ὁ λέγων	N	S	-	AP	
1 John 2:9	Ὁ λέγων	N	S	-	AP	
1 John 2:9	μισῶν	N	S	-	AP	
1 John 2:10	ὁ ἀγαπῶν	N	S	-	AP	
1 John 2:11	ὁ δὲ μισῶν	N	S	-	AP	
1 John 2:17	ὁ δὲ ποιῶν	N	S	-	AP	
1 John 2:22	ὁ ἀρνούμενος	N	S	-	AP	
1 John 2:22	ὁ ἀρνούμενος	N	S	-	AP	
1 John 2:23	ὁ ἀρνούμενος	N	S	-	AP	
1 John 2:23	ὁ ὁμολογῶν	N	S	-	AP	
1 John 2:26	τῶν πλανώντων	G	S	-	AP	
1 John 2:29	ὁ ποιῶν	N	S	-	AP	
1 John 3:3	ὁ ἔχων	N	S	-	AP	
1 John 3:4	ὁ ποιῶν	N	S	-	AP	
1 John 3:6	ὁ ἐν αὐτῷ μένων	N	S	-	AP	
1 John 3:6	ὁ ἁμαρτάνων	N	S	-	AP	
1 John 3:7	ὁ ποιῶν	N	S	-	AP	
1 John 3:8	ὁ ποιῶν	N	S	-	AP	
1 John 3:9	ὁ γεγεννημένος	N	S	-	AP	
1 John 3:10	ὁ μὴ ποιῶν	N	S	-	AP	
1 John 3:10	ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν	N	S	-	AP	
1 John 3:14	ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν	N	S	-	AP	
1 John 3:15	πᾶς ὁ μισῶν	N	S	-	AP	
1 John 3:15	μένουσαν	A	B	-	-	
1 John 3:24	ὁ τηρῶν	N	S	-	AP	
1 John 4:6	ὁ γινώσκων	N	S	-	AP	
1 John 4:7	ὁ ἀγαπῶν	N	S	-	AP	

320

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
1 John 4:8	ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν	N	S	-	AP	
1 John 4:16	ὁ μένων	N	S	-	AP	
1 John 4:18	ὁ δὲ φοβούμενος	N	S	-	AP	
1 John 4:20	ὁ γὰρ μὴ ἀγαπῶν	N	S	-	AP	
1 John 4:21	ὁ ἀγαπῶν	N	S	-	AP	
1 John 5:1	ὁ πιστεύων	N	S	-	AP	
1 John 5:1	ὁ ἀγαπῶν	N	S	-	AP	
1 John 5:1	τὸν γεννήσαντα	A	S	-	AP	
1 John 5:1	τὸν γεγεννημένον	A	S	-	AP	
1 John 5:4	τὸ γεγεννημένον	N	S	-	AP	
1 John 5:4	ἡ νικήσασα	N	A	R	ASAP	
1 John 5:5	ὁ νικῶν	N	S	-	AP	
1 John 5:5	ὁ πιστεύων	N	S	-	AP	
1 John 5:6	ὁ ἐλθών	N	S	-	AP	
1 John 5:6	τὸ μαρτυροῦν	N	S	-	AP	
1 John 5:7	οἱ μαρτυροῦντες	N	S	-	AP	
1 John 5:10	ὁ πιστεύων	N	S	-	AP	
1 John 5:10	ὁ μὴ πιστεύων	N	S	-	AP	
1 John 5:12	ὁ ἔχων	N	S	-	AP	
1 John 5:12	ὁ μὴ ἔχων	N	S	-	AP	
1 John 5:13	τοῖς πιστεύουσιν	D	S	-	AP	
1 John 5:16	τοῖς ἁμαρτάνουσιν	D	S	-	AP	
1 John 5:18	ὁ γεγεννημένος	N	S	-	AP	
1 John 5:18	ὁ γεννηθεὶς	N	S	-	AP	
2 John 2	τὴν μένουσαν	A	A	R	ASAP	
2 John 7	οἱ μὴ ὁμολογοῦντες	N	S	-	AP	
2 John 7	ἐρχόμενον	A	B	-	-	
2 John 9	ὁ προάγων	N	S	-	AP	
2 John 9	μένων	N	S	-	AP	
2 John 9	ὁ μένων	N	S	-	AP	
2 John 11	ὁ λέγων	N	S	-	AP	
3 John 9	φιλοπρωτεύων	N	A	NR	APS	
3 John 10	τοὺς βουλομένους	A	S	-	AP	
3 John 11	ὁ ἀγαθοποιῶν	N	S	-	AP	
3 John 11	ὁ κακοποιῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Jude 1	τοῖς ... ἠγαπημένοις	D	S	-	AP	
Jude 1	τετηρημένοις	D	S	-	AP	
Jude 3	παραδοθείσῃ	D	A	R	APS	
Jude 4	οἱ ... προγεγραμμένοι	N	A	R	SAP	
Jude 4	μετατιθέντες	N	B	-	-	
Jude 4	ἀρνούμενοι	N	B	-	-	
Jude 5	τοὺς μὴ πιστεύσαντας	A	S	-	AP	
Jude 6	τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας	A	A	R	SAP	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
Jude 6	ἀπολιπόντας	A	A	R	SAP	
Jude 8	ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι	N	S	-	P	
Jude 12	οἱ . . . συνευωχούμενοι	N	B	-	-	
Jude 12	ποιμαίνοντες	N	B	-	-	
Jude 12	παραφερόμεναι	N	A	R	SP	PA
Jude 12	ἀποθανόντα	N	A	R	SP	
Jude 12	ἐκριζωθέντα	N	A	R	SP	
Jude 13	ἐπαφρίζοντα	N	A	R	SP	
Jude 16	πορευόμενοι	N	A	R	SP	
Jude 16	θαυμάζοντες	N	B	-	-	
Jude 17	τῶν προειρημένων	G	A	R	ASAP	PA
Jude 18	πορευόμενοι	N	A	R	SP	
Jude 19	οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες	N	S	-	AP	
Jude 19	ἔχοντες	N	P	-	-	
Jude 22	διακρινομένους	A	B	-	-	
Jude 23	ἐσπιλωμένον	A	A	R	APS	
Jude 24	Τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ	D	S	-	AP	
Rev 1:3	ὁ ἀναγινώσκων	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 1:3	οἱ ἀκούοντες	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 1:3	τηροῦντες	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 1:3	τὰ . . . γεγραμμένα	A	S	-	AP	
Rev 1:4	ὁ ὢν	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 1:4	ὁ ἐρχόμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 1:5	Τῷ ἀγαπῶντι	D	S	-	AP	
Rev 1:5	λύσαντι	D	S	-	AP	
Rev 1:8	ὁ ὢν	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 1:8	ὁ ἐρχόμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 1:9	τῇ καλουμένῃ	D	A	R	ASAP	
Rev 1:11	λεγούσης	G	B	-	-	
Rev 1:13	ἐνδεδυμένον	A	B	-	-	
Rev 1:13	περιεζωσμένον	A	B	-	-	
Rev 1:15	πεπυρωμένης	G	A	R	SP	
Rev 1:18	ὁ ζῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 2:1	ὁ κρατῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 2:1	ὁ περιπατῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 2:2	τοὺς λέγοντας	A	S	-	AP	
Rev 2:7	Ὁ ἔχων	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 2:7	Τῷ νικῶντι	D	S	-	AP	
Rev 2:9	τῶν λεγόντων	G	S	-	AP	
Rev 2:11	Ὁ ἔχων	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 2:11	Ὁ νικῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 2:12	ὁ ἔχων	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 2:14	κρατοῦντας	A	S	-	P	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
Rev 2:15	κρατοῦντας	A	S	-	P	
Rev 2:17	Ὁ ἔχων	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 2:17	Τῷ νικῶντι	D	S	-	AP	
Rev 2:17	τοῦ κεκρυμμένου	G	A	R	ASAP	
Rev 2:17	γεγραμμένον	A	A	R	SP	
Rev 2:17	ὁ λαμβάνων	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 2:18	ὁ ἔχων	N	A	NR	ASAP	
Rev 2:20	ἡ λέγουσα	N	A	NR	ASAP	
Rev 2:22	τοὺς μοιχεύοντας	A	S	-	AP	
Rev 2:23	ὁ ἐραυνῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 2:26	ὁ νικῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 2:26	ὁ τηρῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 2:29	Ὁ ἔχων	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 3:1	ὁ ἔχων	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 3:2	γρηγορῶν	N	P	-	-	
Rev 3:5	Ὁ νικῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 3:6	Ὁ ἔχων	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 3:7	ὁ ἔχων	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 3:7	ὁ ἀνοίγων	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 3:7	κλείων	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 3:8	ἠνεῳγμένην	A	A	R	SP	
Rev 3:9	τῶν λεγόντων	G	S	-	AP	
Rev 3:10	τῆς μελλούσης	G	A	R	ASAP	
Rev 3:10	τῆς οἰκουμένης	G	S	-	AP	
Rev 3:10	τοὺς κατοικοῦντας	A	S	-	AP	
Rev 3:12	Ὁ νικῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 3:12	ἡ καταβαίνουσα	N	A	R	ASAP	
Rev 3:13	Ὁ ἔχων	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 3:18	πεπυρωμένον	A	A	R	SP	
Rev 3:21	Ὁ νικῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 3:22	Ὁ ἔχων	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 4:1	ἠνεῳγμένη	N	A	R	SP	
Rev 4:1	λαλούσης	G	A	R	SP	
Rev 4:2	καθήμενος	N	S	-	P	
Rev 4:3	ὁ καθήμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 4:6	γέμοντα	N	A	R	SP	
Rev 4:7	πετομένῳ	D	A	R	SP	
Rev 4:8	ἔχων	N	I	-	-	
Rev 4:8	ὁ ὢν	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 4:8	ὁ ἐρχόμενος.	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 4:9	τῷ καθημένῳ	D	S	-	AP	
Rev 4:9	τῷ ζῶντι	D	S	-	-	
Rev 4:10	τοῦ καθημένου	G	S	-	AP	

323

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
Rev 4:10	τῷ ζῶντι	D	S	-	AP	
Rev 5:1	τοῦ καθημένου	G	S	-	AP	
Rev 5:1	γεγραμμένον	A	A	R	SP	
Rev 5:1	κατεσφραγισμένον	A	A	R	SP	
Rev 5:6	ἐσφαγμένον	N	P	-	-	
Rev 5:6	ἔχων	N	I	-	-	
Rev 5:6	ἀπεσταλμένοι	N	P	-	-	
Rev 5:7	τοῦ καθημένου	G	S	-	AP	
Rev 5:8	γεμούσας	A	A	R	SP	
Rev 5:12	τὸ ἐσφαγμένον	A	A	R	ASAP	
Rev 5:13	τῷ καθημένῳ	D	S	-	AP	
Rev 6:2	ὁ καθήμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 6:2	ἔχων	N	I	-	-	
Rev 6:4	τῷ καθημένῳ	D	S	-	AP	
Rev 6:5	ὁ καθήμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 6:8	ὁ καθήμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 6:9	τῶν ἐσφαγμένων	G	S	-	AP	
Rev 6:10	τῶν κατοικούντων	G	S	-	AP	
Rev 6:11	οἱ μέλλοντες	N	A	R	ASAP	
Rev 6:14	ἑλισσόμενον	N	A	R	SP	
Rev 6:16	τοῦ καθημένου	G	S	-	AP	
Rev 7:2	ἔχοντα	A	B	-	-	
Rev 7:2	ζῶντος	G	A	R	SP	
Rev 7:4	τῶν ἐσφραγισμένων	G	S	-	AP	
Rev 7:4	ἐσφραγισμένοι	N	P	-	-	
Rev 7:5	ἐσφραγισμένοι	N	P	-	-	
Rev 7:8	ἐσφραγισμένοι	N	P	-	-	
Rev 7:10	τῷ καθημένῳ	D	S	-	AP	
Rev 7:13	οἱ περιβεβλημένοι	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 7:14	οἱ ἐρχόμενοι	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 7:15	ὁ καθήμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 8:3	ἔχων	N	B	-	-	
Rev 8:6	οἱ ἔχοντες	N	A	R	ASAP	
Rev 8:7	μεμιγμένα	N	A	R	SP	
Rev 8:8	καιόμενον	N	A	R	SP	
Rev 8:9	τὰ ἔχοντα	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 8:10	καιόμενος	N	A	R	SP	
Rev 8:13	τοὺς κατοικοῦντας	A	S	-	AP	
Rev 8:13	τῶν μελλόντων	G	A	R	ASAP	
Rev 9:7	ἡτοιμασμένοις	D	A	R	SP	
Rev 9:9	τρεχόντων	G	A	R	SP	
Rev 9:14	ὁ ἔχων	N	A	R	ASAP	
Rev 9:14	τοὺς δεδεμένους	A	A	R	ASAP	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
Rev 9:15	οἱ ἡτοιμασμένοι	N	A	R	ASAP	
Rev 9:17	τοὺς καθημένους	A	S	-	AP	
Rev 9:17	ἔχοντας	A	B	-	-	
Rev 9:18	τοῦ ἐκπορευομένου	G	A	R	ASAP	
Rev 9:19	ἔχουσαι	N	I	-	-	
Rev 10:1	περιβεβλημένον	A	B	-	-	
Rev 10:2	ἠνεῳγμένον	A	A	R	SP	
Rev 10:6	τῷ ζῶντι	D	S	-	AP	
Rev 10:8	τὸ ἠνεῳγμένον	A	A	R	ASAP	
Rev 10:8	τοῦ ἑστῶτος	G	A	R	ASAP	
Rev 11:1	τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας	A	S	-	AP	
Rev 11:4	αἱ ... ἑστῶτες.	N	A	R	ASAP	
Rev 11:7	τὸ ἀναβαῖνον	N	A	R	ASAP	
Rev 11:10	οἱ κατοικοῦντες	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 11:10	τοὺς κατοικοῦντας	A	S	-	AP	
Rev 11:11	τοὺς θεωροῦντας	A	S	-	AP	
Rev 11:16	[οἱ] ... καθήμενοι	N	A	R	ASAP	
Rev 11:17	ὁ ὢν	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 11:18	τοῖς φοβουμένοις	D	S	-	AP	
Rev 11:18	τοὺς διαφθείροντας	A	S	-	AP	
Rev 12:1	περιβεβλημένη	N	A	R	SP	
Rev 12:2	ἔχουσα	N	B	-	-	
Rev 12:3	ἔχων	N	I	-	-	
Rev 12:4	τῆς μελλούσης	G	A	R	ASAP	
Rev 12:6	ἡτοιμασμένον	A	A	R	SP	PA
Rev 12:9	ὁ καλούμενος	N	S	-	-	
Rev 12:9	ὁ πλανῶν	N	S	-	-	
Rev 12:9	τὴν οἰκουμένην	A	S	-	AP	
Rev 12:10	ὁ κατηγορῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 12:12	οἱ ... σκηνοῦντες	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 12:17	τῶν τηρούντων	G	S	-	AP	
Rev 12:17	ἐχόντων	G	S	-	AP	
Rev 13:1	ἔχον	A	I	-	-	
Rev 13:5	λαλοῦν	N	A	R	SP	
Rev 13:6	τοὺς ... σκηνοῦντας	A	S	-	AP	
Rev 13:8	οἱ κατοικοῦντες	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 13:8	τοῦ ἐσφαγμένου	G	A	R	ASAP	
Rev 13:12	τοὺς ... κατοικοῦντας	A	S	-	AP	
Rev 13:14	τοὺς κατοικοῦντας	A	S	-	AP	
Rev 13:14	τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν	D	S	-	AP	
Rev 13:17	ὁ ἔχων	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 13:18	ὁ ἔχων	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 14:1	ἔχουσαι	N	A	R	SP	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
Rev 14:1	γεγραμμένον	A	P	-	-	
Rev 14:2	κιθαριζόντων	G	A	R	SP	
Rev 14:3	οἱ ἠγορασμένοι	N	A	R	ASAP	
Rev 14:4	οἱ ἀκολουθοῦντες	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 14:6	ἔχοντα	A	I	-	-	
Rev 14:6	τοὺς καθημένους	A	S	-	AP	
Rev 14:7	τῷ ποιήσαντι	D	S	-	AP	
Rev 14:10	τοῦ κεκερασμένου	G	A	R	ASAP	
Rev 14:11	οἱ προσκυνοῦντες	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 14:12	οἱ τηροῦντες	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 14:13	οἱ ... ἀποθνῄσκοντες	N	A	R	ASAP	
Rev 14:14	καθήμενον	A	B	-	-	
Rev 14:14	ἔχων	N	I	-	-	
Rev 14:15	τῷ καθημένῳ	D	S	-	AP	
Rev 14:16	ὁ καθήμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 14:17	ἔχων	N	I	-	-	
Rev 14:18	[ὁ] ἔχων	N	S	-	-	
Rev 14:18	τῷ ἔχοντι	D	S	-	AP	
Rev 15:1	ἔχοντας	A	A	R	SP	
Rev 15:2	μεμιγμένην	A	A	R	SP	
Rev 15:2	τοὺς νικῶντας	A	S	-	AP	
Rev 15:2	ἔχοντας	A	B	-	-	
Rev 15:6	[οἱ] ἔχοντες	N	A	R	ASAP	
Rev 15:7	γεμούσας	A	A	R	SP	
Rev 15:7	τοῦ ζῶντος	G	A	NR	ASAP	
Rev 16:2	τοὺς ἔχοντας	A	A	R	ASAP	
Rev 16:2	τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας	A	A	R	ASAP	
Rev 16:5	ὁ ὤν	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 16:9	τοῦ ἔχοντος	G	A	NR	ASAP	
Rev 16:10	ἐσκοτωμένη	N	P	-	-	
Rev 16:14	ποιοῦντα	N	PP	-	-	
Rev 16:14	τῆς οἰκουμένης	G	S	-	AP	
Rev 16:15	ὁ γρηγορῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 16:15	τηρῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 16:16	τὸν καλούμενον	A	A	R	ASAP	
Rev 17:1	τῶν ἐχόντων	G	A	R	ASAP	
Rev 17:1	τῆς καθημένης	G	A	R	ASAP	
Rev 17:2	οἱ κατοικοῦντες	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 17:3	γέμον[τα]	A	A	R	SP	
Rev 17:3	ἔχων	N	I	-	-	
Rev 17:4	γέμον	A	A	R	SP	
Rev 17:5	γεγραμμένον	N	B	-	-	
Rev 17:7	τοῦ βαστάζοντος	G	A	R	ASAP	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
Rev 17:7	τοῦ ἔχοντος	G	A	R	ASAP	
Rev 17:8	οἱ κατοικοῦντες	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 17:9	ὁ ἔχων	N	A	R	ASAP	
Rev 17:16	ἠρημωμένην	A	P	-	-	
Rev 17:18	ἡ ἔχουσα	N	A	R	ASAP	
Rev 18:1	ἔχοντα	A	I	-	-	
Rev 18:2	μεμισημένου	G	A	R	SP	
Rev 18:8	ὁ κρίνας	N	A	NR	ASAP	
Rev 18:9	οἱ . . . πορνεύσαντες	N	A	R	ASAP	
Rev 18:9	στρηνιάσαντες	N	A	R	ASAP	
Rev 18:15	οἱ πλουτήσαντες	N	A	R	ASAP	
Rev 18:16	ἡ περιβεβλημένη	N	A	R	ASAP	
Rev 18:16	κεχρυσωμένη	N	A	R	ASAP	
Rev 18:17	ὁ ἐπὶ τόπον πλέων	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 18:19	οἱ ἔχοντες	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 18:24	τῶν ἐσφαγμένων	G	S	-	AP	
Rev 19:4	τῷ καθημένῳ	D	A	NR	ASAP	
Rev 19:5	οἱ φοβούμενοι	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 19:9	οἱ . . . κεκλημένοι	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 19:10	τῶν ἐχόντων	G	A	R	ASAP	
Rev 19:11	ὁ καθήμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 19:12	γεγραμμένον	A	B	-	-	
Rev 19:13	βεβαμμένον	A	A	R	SP	
Rev 19:14	ἐνδεδυμένοι	N	B	-	-	
Rev 19:16	γεγραμμένον	A	B	-	-	
Rev 19:17	τοῖς πετομένοις	D	A	R	ASAP	
Rev 19:18	τῶν καθημένων	G	S	-	AP	
Rev 19:19	τοῦ καθημένου	G	S	-	AP	
Rev 19:20	ὁ ποιήσας	N	A	R	ASAP	
Rev 19:20	τοὺς λαβόντας	A	S	-	AP	
Rev 19:20	τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας	A	S	-	AP	
Rev 19:20	τῆς καιομένης	G	A	R	ASAP	
Rev 19:21	τοῦ καθημένου	G	S	-	AP	
Rev 19:21	τῇ ἐξελθούσῃ	D	A	R	ASAP	
Rev 20:1	ἔχοντα	A	I	-	-	
Rev 20:4	τῶν πεπελεκισμένων	G	S	-	AP	
Rev 20:6	ὁ ἔχων	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 20:9	τὴν ἠγαπημένην	A	A	R	ASAP	
Rev 20:10	ὁ πλανῶν	N	A	NR	ASAP	
Rev 20:11	τὸν καθήμενον	A	S	-	AP	
Rev 20:12	τῶν γεγραμμένων	G	S	-	AP	
Rev 21:2	ἡτοιμασμένην	A	B	-	-	
Rev 21:2	κεκοσμημένην	A	A	R	SP	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	PA
Rev 21:5	ὁ καθήμενος	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 21:6	τῷ διψῶντι	D	S	-	AP	
Rev 21:7	ὁ νικῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 21:8	ἐβδελυγμένοις	D	S	-	P	
Rev 21:8	τῇ καιομένῃ	D	A	R	ASAP	
Rev 21:9	τῶν ἐχόντων	G	A	R	ASAP	
Rev 21:9	τῶν γεμόντων	G	A	R	ASAP	
Rev 21:11	ἔχουσαν	A	I	-	-	
Rev 21:11	κρυσταλλίζοντι	D	A	R	SP	
Rev 21:12	ἐπιγεγραμμένα	A	B	-	-	
Rev 21:15	ὁ λαλῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 21:19	κεκοσμημένοι	N	P	-	-	
Rev 21:27	[ὁ] ποιῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 21:27	οἱ γεγραμμένοι	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 22:2	ποιοῦν	A	B	-	-	
Rev 22:2	ἀποδιδοῦν	A	B	-	-	
Rev 22:7	ὁ τηρῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 22:8	ὁ ἀκούων	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 22:8	βλέπων	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 22:8	τοῦ δεικνύοντός	G	A	R	ASAP	
Rev 22:9	τῶν τηρούντων	G	S	-	AP	
Rev 22:11	ὁ ἀδικῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 22:14	οἱ πλύνοντες	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 22:15	φιλῶν	N	S	-	P	
Rev 22:15	ποιῶν	N	S	-	P	
Rev 22:17	ὁ ἀκούων	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 22:17	ὁ διψῶν	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 22:17	ὁ θέλων	N	S	-	AP	
Rev 22:18	τῷ ἀκούοντι	D	S	-	AP	
Rev 22:18	τὰς γεγραμμένας	A	A	R	ASAP	
Rev 22:19	τῶν γεγραμμένων	G	S	-	AP	
Rev 22:20	ὁ μαρτυρῶν	N	S	-	AP	

APPENDIX TWO

RELATIVE CLAUSES IN THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT

This appendix includes every relative clause in the Greek New Testament: adnominal, substantival, and adverbial.[1] All of the examples beyond the primary focus of adnominal relative clauses have been identified and included in this appendix for the sake of thoroughness and transparency. This allows the reader to discern the greater pool of examples from which the specific set for analysis has been derived. This appendix, which in total contains 1,573 examples, allows for an independent assessment of the assertions maintained in this dissertation and an understanding of how each occurrence has been categorized. Furthermore, the data contained herein serves as a resource to consult for modern editors, translators, and exegetes of the Greek New Testament.

Seven columns comprise the table of this appendix. The identification of each column and its contents are explained below.

> *Verse* (Column 1). This column identifies what verse is being considered and follows the traditional ordering of the books of the New Testament.

> *Text* (Column 2). This column contains the actual relative pronoun that heads the relative clause in the verse. At times it includes a preposition or particle associated with it.

---

[1] Additionally an "alternating" category was utilized with the relative clause to designate those examples where the relative pronoun is utilized with the particles μέν and δέ to express alternatives. For example in Matthew 22:5: ἀπῆλθον, ὃς μὲν εἰς τὸν ἴδιον ἀγρόν, ὃς δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν ἐμπορίαν αὐτοῦ (ESV: "they . . . went off, one to his farm, another to his business."). Furthermore, sentential relative clauses have been subsumed under the adnominal category.

Case (**Column 3**). This column contains the case of the cited relative pronoun. The cases are abbreviated as follows:

> *N*: Nominative
> *G*: Genitive
> *D*: Dative
> *A*: Accusative
> *V*: Vocative

Fnctn (**Column 4**). The grammatical function of the cited construction is cited here and is abbreviated as follows:

> *A*: Adjectival/Adnominal
> *B*: Adverbial
> *L*: Alternating Relative Clause
> *S*: Substantival

Rest (**Column 5**). The restrictivity/nonrestrictivity of the relative clause under consideration is identified as follows:

> *NR*: Nonrestrictive
> *R*: Restrictive
> - : Not applicable
> *?*: Ambiguous

Ptrn (**Column 6**). The formation pattern of the cited relative clause is abbreviated here as follows:

> *PST*: Post-nominal relative clause
> *IHRC*: Internally-headed relative clause
> - : Not applicable

RP (**Column 7**). This column contains the relativized position for adnominal and sentential relative clauses.The relativized positions are abbreviated as follows:

> *Su*: Subject
> *DO*: Direct object
> *IO*: Indirect object
> *Ob*: Oblique
> *Po*: Possessor

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	RP
Matt 1:16	ἐξ ἧς	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
Matt 1:23	ὅ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Matt 1:25	ἕως οὗ	G	B	-	-	
Matt 2:6	ὅστις	N	A	R	PST	Su
Matt 2:9	ὃν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Matt 2:9	ἐπάνω οὗ	G	S	-	-	
Matt 2:16	ὃν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Matt 3:11	οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	Po
Matt 3:12	οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	Po
Matt 3:17	ἐν ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Matt 5:19	ὃς ἐάν	N	S	-	-	
Matt 5:19	ὃς δ' ἄν	N	S	-	-	
Matt 5:21	ὃς δ' ἄν	N	S	-	-	
Matt 5:22	ὃς δ' ἄν	N	S	-	-	
Matt 5:22	ὃς δ' ἄν	N	S	-	-	
Matt 5:25	ἕως ὅτου	G	B	-	-	
Matt 5:31	ὃς ἄν	N	S	-	-	
Matt 5:32	ὃς ἐάν	N	S	-	-	
Matt 5:39	ὅστις	N	S	-	-	
Matt 5:41	ὅστις	N	S	-	-	
Matt 6:8	ὧν	G	S	-	-	
Matt 7:2	ἐν ᾧ	D	B	-	-	
Matt 7:2	ἐν ᾧ	D	B	-	-	
Matt 7:9	ὃν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Matt 7:15	οἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Matt 7:24	ὅστις	N	S	-	-	
Matt 7:24	ὅστις	N	A	R	PST	Su
Matt 7:26	ὅστις	N	A	R	PST	Su
Matt 8:4	ὅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
Matt 10:11	εἰς ἣν δ' ἄν	A	A	R	IHRC	Ob
Matt 10:14	ὃς ἄν	N	S	-	-	
Matt 10:26	ὅ	N	A	R	PST	Su
Matt 10:26	ὅ	N	A	R	PST	Su
Matt 10:27	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
Matt 10:27	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
Matt 10:32	ὅστις	N	S	-	-	
Matt 10:33	ὅστις	N	S	-	-	
Matt 10:38	ὅς	N	S	-	-	
Matt 10:42	ὃς ἄν	N	S	-	-	
Matt 11:4	ἅ	A	S	-	-	
Matt 11:6	ὃς ἐάν	N	S	-	-	
Matt 11:10	περὶ οὗ	G	S	-	-	
Matt 11:10	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	RP
Matt 11:16	ἅ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Matt 11:20	ἐν αἷς	D	A	R	PST	Ob
Matt 11:27	ᾧ ἐὰν	D	S	-	-	
Matt 12:2	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
Matt 12:4	ὅ	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Matt 12:11	ὅς	N	A	R	PST	Su
Matt 12:18	ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Matt 12:18	εἰς ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	Ob
Matt 12:32	ὃς ἐὰν	N	S	-	-	
Matt 12:32	ὃς δ' ἂν	N	S	-	-	
Matt 12:36	ὅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
Matt 12:50	ὅστις γὰρ ἂν	N	S	-	-	
Matt 13:4	ἃ μὲν	N	L	-	-	
Matt 13:8	ὃ μὲν	N	L	-	-	
Matt 13:8	ὃ δὲ	N	L	-	-	
Matt 13:8	ὃ δε	N	L	-	-	
Matt 13:12	ὅστις	N	S	-	-	
Matt 13:12	ὅστις	N	S	-	-	
Matt 13:12	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
Matt 13:17	ἃ	A	S	-	-	
Matt 13:17	ἃ	A	S	-	-	
Matt 13:23	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Matt 13:23	ὃ μὲν	N	L	-	-	
Matt 13:23	ὃ δὲ	N	L	-	-	
Matt 13:23	ὃ δὲ	N	L	-	-	
Matt 13:31	ὅν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Matt 13:32	ὅ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Matt 13:33	ἥν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Matt 13:33	ἕως οὗ	G	B	-	-	DO
Matt 13:44	ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Matt 13:48	ἥν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Matt 13:52	ὅστις	N	A	R	PST	Su
Matt 14:7	ὃ ἐὰν	A	S	-	-	
Matt 14:22	ἕως ου	G	B	-	-	
Matt 15:5	ὃς ἂν	N	S	-	-	
Matt 15:5	ὃ ἐὰν	A	S	-	-	
Matt 15:13	ἥν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Matt 16:19	ὃ ἐὰν	A	S	-	-	
Matt 16:19	ὃ ἐὰν	A	S	-	-	
Matt 16:25	ὃς γὰρ ἐὰν	N	S	-	-	
Matt 16:25	ὃς δ' ἂν	N	S	-	-	
Matt 16:28	οἵτινες	N	A	R	PST	Su
Matt 17:5	ἐν ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	Ob

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	RP
Matt 17:9	ἕως οὗ	G	B	-	-	
Matt 18:4	ὅστις	N	S	-	-	
Matt 18:5	ὃς ἐὰν	N	S	-	-	
Matt 18:6	Ὃς δ' ἂν	N	S	-	-	
Matt 18:7	δι' οὗ	G	A	R	PST	Ob
Matt 18:19	οὗ ἐὰν	G	A	R	PST	DO
Matt 18:23	ὃς	N	A	R	PST	Su
Matt 18:28	ὃς	N	A	R	PST	Su
Matt 18:34	ἕως ου	G	B	-	-	
Matt 19:6	ὃ	A	S	-	-	
Matt 19:9	ὃς ἂν	N	S	-	-	
Matt 19:11	οἷς	D	S	-	-	
Matt 19:12	οἵτινες	N	A	R	PST	
Matt 19:12	οἵτινες	N	A	R	PST	
Matt 19:12	οἵτινες	N	A	R	PST	
Matt 19:29	ὅστις	N	S	-	-	
Matt 20:1	ὅστις	N	A	R	PST	Su
Matt 20:4	ὃ ἐὰν	N	S	-	-	
Matt 20:15	ὃ θέλω	A	S	-	-	
Matt 20:22	ὃ	A	A	R	PST	DO
Matt 20:23	οἷς	D	S	-	-	
Matt 20:26	ὃς ἐὰν	N	S	-	-	
Matt 20:27	ὃς ἂν	N	S	-	-	
Matt 21:15	ἃ	A	A	R	PST	DO
Matt 21:24	ὃν ἐὰν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Matt 21:33	ὅστις	N	A	R	PST	Su
Matt 21:35	ὃν μὲν	N	L	-	-	
Matt 21:35	ὃν δὲ	N	L	-	-	
Matt 21:35	ὃν δὲ	N	L	-	-	
Matt 21:41	οἵτινες	N	A	?	PST	Su
Matt 21:42	ὃν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Matt 21:44	ἐφ' ὃν δ' ἂν	A	S	-	-	
Matt 22:2	ὅστις	N	A	R	PST	Su
Matt 22:5	ὃς μὲν	N	L	-	-	
Matt 22:5	ὃς δε	N	L	-	-	
Matt 22:10	οὓς	A	S	-	-	
Matt 23:12	ὅστις	N	S	-	-	
Matt 23:12	ὅστις	N	S	-	-	
Matt 23:16	ὃς ἂν	N	S	-	-	
Matt 23:16	ὃς δ' ἂν	N	S	-	-	
Matt 23:18	ὃς ἂν	N	S	-	-	
Matt 23:18	ὃς δ' ἂν	N	S	-	-	
Matt 23:27	οἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	RP
Matt 23:35	ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Matt 23:37	ὅν	A	B	-	-	
Matt 24:2	ὅς	N	A	R	PST	Su
Matt 24:38	ἄχρι ἧς	G	B	-	-	
Matt 24:44	ᾗ	D	A	R	IHRC	DO
Matt 24:45	ὅν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Matt 24:46	ὅν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Matt 24:50	ᾗ	D	A	R	PST	DO
Matt 24:50	ᾗ	D	A	R	PST	DO
Matt 25:1	αἵτινες	N	A	R	PST	Su
Matt 25:15	ᾧ μὲν	D	L	-	-	
Matt 25:15	ᾧ δε	D	L	-	-	
Matt 25:15	ᾧ δε	D	L	-	-	
Matt 25:29	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
Matt 26:13	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
Matt 26:24	δι' οὗ	G	A	R	PST	Ob
Matt 26:36	ἕως [οὗ]	G	B	-	-	
Matt 26:48	ὅν ἄν	A	S	-	-	
Matt 26:50	ἐφ' ὅ	A	S	-	-	
Matt 27:9	ὅν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Matt 27:15	ὅν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Matt 27:33	ὅ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Matt 27:55	αἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Matt 27:56	ἐν αἷς	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Matt 27:57	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Matt 27:60	ὅ	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Matt 27:62	ἥτις	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Matt 28:16	οὗ	G	B	-	-	
Mark 1:2	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Mark 1:7	οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	Po
Mark 1:44	ἅ	A	S	-	-	
Mark 2:19	ἐν ᾧ	D	B	-	-	
Mark 2:24	ὅ	N	S	-	-	
Mark 2:26	οὕς	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Mark 3:13	οὕς	A	S	-	-	
Mark 3:14	[οὕς]	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Mark 3:17	ὅ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Mark 3:19	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Mark 3:29	ὅς δ' ἄν	N	S	-	-	
Mark 3:35	ὅς [γὰρ] ἄν	N	S	-	-	
Mark 4:4	ὅ μὲν	N	L	-	-	
Mark 4:9	ὅς	N	S	-	-	
Mark 4:16	οἵ	N	A	NR	PST	Su

334

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	RP
Mark 4:20	οἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Mark 4:24	ἐν ᾧ	D	A	R	IHRC	Ob
Mark 4:25	ὅς	N	S	-	-	
Mark 4:25	ὅς	N	S	-	-	
Mark 4:25	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
Mark 4:31	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Mark 5:3	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Mark 5:33	ὅ	N	S	-	-	
Mark 5:41	ὅ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Mark 6:11	ὃς ἄν	N	A	R	IHRC	Su
Mark 6:16	ὅν	A	S	-	-	
Mark 6:22	ὃ ἐάν	A	S	-	-	
Mark 6:23	ὅ τι ἐάν	A	S	-	-	
Mark 7:4	ἅ	A	S	-	-	
Mark 7:11	ὅ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Mark 7:11	ὃ ἐάν	A	S	-	-	
Mark 7:13	ᾗ	D	A	R	PST	DO
Mark 7:15	ὅ	N	A	R	PST	Su
Mark 7:25	ἧς	G	A	NR	PST	Po
Mark 7:34	ὅ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Mark 8:35	ὃς γὰρ ἐάν	N	S	-	-	
Mark 8:35	ὃς δ' ἄν	N	S	-	-	
Mark 8:38	ὃς γὰρ ἐάν	N	S	-	-	
Mark 9:1	οἵτινες	N	A	R	PST	Su
Mark 9:9	ἅ	A	S	-	-	
Mark 9:37	ὃς ἄν	N	S	-	-	
Mark 9:37	ὃς ἄν	N	S	-	-	
Mark 9:39	ὅς	N	A	R	PST	Su
Mark 9:40	ὅς	N	S	-	-	
Mark 9:41	Ὃς γὰρ ἄν	N	S	-	-	
Mark 9:42	ὃς ἄν	N	S	-	-	
Mark 10:9	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
Mark 10:11	ὃς ἄν	N	S	-	-	
Mark 10:15	ὃς ἄν	N	S	-	-	
Mark 10:29	ὅς	N	A	R	PST	Su
Mark 10:35	ὃ ἐάν	A	S	-	-	
Mark 10:38	ὅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
Mark 10:38	ὅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
Mark 10:39	ὅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
Mark 10:39	ὅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
Mark 10:40	οἷς	D	S	-	-	
Mark 10:43	ὃς ἄν	N	S	-	-	
Mark 10:44	ὃς ἄν	N	S	-	-	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	RP
Mark 11:2	ἐφ' ὃν	A	A	NR	PST	Ob
Mark 11:21	ἣν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Mark 11:23	ὃς ἂν	N	S	-	-	
Mark 11:23	ὃ	A	S	-	-	
Mark 12:5	οὓς μὲν	A	L	-	-	
Mark 12:5	οὓς δε	A	L	-	-	
Mark 12:10	ὃν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Mark 12:18	οἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Mark 12:42	ὃ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Mark 13:2	ὃς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Mark 13:11	ὃ ἐὰν	N	S	-	-	
Mark 13:19	ἣν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Mark 13:20	οὓς	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Mark 13:30	οὗ	G	B	-	-	
Mark 13:37	ὃ δε	A	S	-	-	
Mark 14:8	ὃ	A	S	-	-	
Mark 14:9	ὃ	A	S	-	-	
Mark 14:21	δι' οὗ	G	A	R	PST	Ob
Mark 14:32	οὗ	G	A	R	PST	Po
Mark 14:44	ὃν ἂν	A	S	-	-	
Mark 14:71	ὃν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Mark 15:6	ὃν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Mark 15:7	οἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Mark 15:12	[ὃν]	A	S	-	-	
Mark 15:16	ὃ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Mark 15:22	ὃ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Mark 15:23	ὃς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Mark 15:34	ὃ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Mark 15:40	ἐν αἷς	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Mark 15:41	αἳ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Mark 15:42	ὃ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Mark 15:43	ὃς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Mark 15:46	ὃ	N	A	R	PST	Su
Mark 16:9	παρ' ἧς	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
Luke 1:4	ὧν	G	A	R	IHRC	DO
Luke 1:20	ἄχρι ἧς	G	B	-	-	
Luke 1:20	ἀνθ' ὧν	G	B	-	-	
Luke 1:20	οἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Luke 1:25	αἷς	D	A	R	PST	Ob
Luke 1:26	ᾗ	D	A	R	PST	Ob
Luke 1:27	ᾧ	D	A	R	PST	Ob
Luke 1:61	ὃς	N	A	R	PST	Su
Luke 1:73	ὃν	A	A	R	PST	DO

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	RP
Luke 1:78	ἐν οἷς	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Luke 2:4	ἥτις	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Luke 2:10	ἥτις	N	A	R	PST	Su
Luke 2:11	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Luke 2:15	ὃ	A	A	R	PST	DO
Luke 2:20	οἷς	D	S	-	-	
Luke 2:25	ᾧ	D	A	R	PST	Ob
Luke 2:31	ὃ	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Luke 2:37	ἣ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Luke 2:50	ὃ	A	A	R	PST	DO
Luke 3:16	οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	Po
Luke 3:17	οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	Po
Luke 3:19	ὧν	G	A	R	IHRC	DO
Luke 4:6	ᾧ ἐάν	D	S	-	-	
Luke 4:16	οὗ	G	B	-	-	
Luke 4:17	οὗ	G	B	-	-	
Luke 4:18	οὗ	G	B	-	-	
Luke 4:29	ἐφ᾽ οὗ	G	A	R	PST	Ob
Luke 5:3	ὃ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Luke 5:9	ὧν	G	A	R	PST	DO
Luke 5:10	οἳ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Luke 5:17	οἳ	N	A	R	PST	Su
Luke 5:18	ὅς	N	A	R	PST	Su
Luke 5:21	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Luke 5:25	ἐφ᾽ ὃ	A	S	-	-	
Luke 5:29	οἳ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Luke 5:34	ἐν ᾧ	D	B	-	-	
Luke 6:2	ὃ	N	S	-	-	
Luke 6:3	ὃ	A	A	R	PST	DO
Luke 6:4	οὓς	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Luke 6:13	οὓς	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Luke 6:14	ὃν	A	A	?	PST	DO
Luke 6:16	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Luke 6:18	οἳ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Luke 6:34	παρ᾽ ὧν	G	S	-	-	
Luke 6:38	ᾧ	D	A	R	IHRC	Ob
Luke 6:46	ἃ	A	S	-	-	
Luke 6:48	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Luke 6:49	ᾗ	D	A	NR	PST	DO
Luke 7:2	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Luke 7:4	ᾧ	D	S	-	-	
Luke 7:22	ἃ	A	S	-	-	
Luke 7:23	ὃς ἐάν	N	S	-	-	

337

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	RP
Luke 7:27	περὶ οὗ	G	S	-	-	
Luke 7:27	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Luke 7:32	ἅ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Luke 7:37	ἥτις	N	A	R	PST	Su
Luke 7:39	ἥτις	N	A	R	PST	Su
Luke 7:43	ᾧ	D	S	-	-	
Luke 7:45	ἀφ' ἧς	G	B	-	-	
Luke 7:47	οὗ χάριν	G	B	-	-	
Luke 7:47	ᾧ	D	S	-	-	
Luke 7:49	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Luke 8:2	αἵ	N	A	R	PST	Su
Luke 8:2	ἀφ' ἧς	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
Luke 8:3	αἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Luke 8:5	ὃ μὲν	N	L	-	-	
Luke 8:13	οἱ	N	S	-	-	
Luke 8:13	οἱ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Luke 8:15	οἵτινες	N	S	-	-	
Luke 8:17	ὅ	N	A	R	PST	Su
Luke 8:17	ὅ	N	A	R	PST	Su
Luke 8:18	ὃς ἄν	N	S	-	-	
Luke 8:18	ὃς ἄν	N	S	-	-	
Luke 8:18	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
Luke 8:26	ἥτις	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Luke 8:35	ἀφ' οὗ	G	A	R	PST	Ob
Luke 8:38	ἀφ' οὗ	G	A	R	PST	Ob
Luke 8:41	ᾧ	D	A	R	PST	Ob
Luke 8:43	ἥτις	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Luke 8:47	δι' ἥν	A	B	-	-	
Luke 9:4	εἰς ἥν ἄν	A	A	R	IHRC	Ob
Luke 9:9	περὶ οὗ	G	A	R	PST	Ob
Luke 9:24	ὃς γὰρ ἄν	N	S	-	-	
Luke 9:24	ὃς δ' ἄν	N	S	-	-	
Luke 9:26	ὃς γὰρ ἄν	N	S	-	-	
Luke 9:27	οἱ	N	A	R	PST	Su
Luke 9:30	οἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Luke 9:31	οἱ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Luke 9:31	ἥν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Luke 9:33	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
Luke 9:36	ὧν	G	S	-	-	
Luke 9:43	οἷς	D	S	-	-	
Luke 9:48	ὃς ἐάν	N	S	-	-	
Luke 9:48	ὃς ἄν	N	S	-	-	
Luke 9:50	ὅς	N	S	-	-	

338

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	RP
Luke 10:1	οὗ	G	B	-	-	
Luke 10:5	εἰς ἣν δ' ἂν	A	A	R	IHRC	Ob
Luke 10:8	εἰς ἣν ἂν	A	A	R	IHRC	Ob
Luke 10:10	εἰς ἣν δ' ἂν	A	A	R	IHRC	Ob
Luke 10:22	ᾧ	D	S	-	-	
Luke 10:23	ἃ	A	S	-	-	
Luke 10:24	ἃ	A	S	-	-	
Luke 10:24	ἃ	A	S	-	-	
Luke 10:30	οἳ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Luke 10:35	ὅ τι ἂν	A	S	-	-	
Luke 10:39	[ἣ]	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Luke 10:42	ἥτις	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Luke 11:6	ὃ	A	S	-	-	
Luke 11:22	ἐφ' ᾗ	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Luke 11:27	οὓς	A	A	R	PST	DO
Luke 12:1	Ἐν οἷς	D	B	-	-	
Luke 12:1	ἥτις	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Luke 12:2	ὃ	N	A	R	PST	Su
Luke 12:2	ὃ	N	A	R	PST	Su
Luke 12:3	ἀνθ' ὧν	G	B	-	-	
Luke 12:3	ὃ	A	S	-	-	
Luke 12:8	ὃς ἂν	N	S	-	-	
Luke 12:10	ὃς	N	S	-	-	
Luke 12:12	ἃ	A	S	-	-	
Luke 12:20	ἃ	A	S	-	-	
Luke 12:24	οἷς	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Luke 12:37	οὓς	A	A	R	PST	DO
Luke 12:40	ᾗ	D	A	R	IHRC	DO
Luke 12:42	ὃν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Luke 12:43	ὃν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Luke 12:46	ᾗ	D	A	R	PST	DO
Luke 12:46	ᾗ	D	A	R	PST	DO
Luke 12:48	ᾧ	D	S	-	-	
Luke 12:48	ᾧ	D	S	-	-	
Luke 12:50	ἕως ὅτου	G	B	-	-	
Luke 13:1	ὧν	G	A	R	PST	Po
Luke 13:4	ἐφ' οὓς	A	A	R	PST	Ob
Luke 13:7	ἀφ' οὗ	G	B	-	-	
Luke 13:8	ἕως ὅτου	G	B	-	-	
Luke 13:14	ἐν αἷς	D	A	R	PST	Ob
Luke 13:16	ἣν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Luke 13:19	ὃν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Luke 13:21	ἣν	A	A	R	PST	DO

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	RP
Luke 13:21	ἕως οὗ	G	B	-	-	
Luke 13:25	ἀφ' οὗ ἄν	G	B	-	-	
Luke 13:30	οἳ	N	A	R	PST	Su
Luke 13:30	οἳ	N	A	R	PST	Su
Luke 13:34	ὃν	A	B	-	-	
Luke 14:15	ὅστις	N	S	-	-	
Luke 14:22	ὃ	A	S	-	AP	
Luke 14:27	ὅστις	N	S	-	-	
Luke 14:33	ὃς	N	S	-	-	
Luke 15:7	οἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Luke 15:8	ἕως οὗ	G	B	-	-	
Luke 15:9	ἣν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Luke 15:16	ὧν	G	A	R	PST	DO
Luke 16:1	ὃς	N	A	R	PST	Su
Luke 17:1	δι' οὗ	D	S	-	-	
Luke 17:7	ὃς	N	A	NR	PST	SU
Luke 17:10	ὃ	A	S	-	-	
Luke 17:12	οἳ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Luke 17:27	ἄχρι ἧς	G	B	-	-	
Luke 17:29	ᾗ	D	A	R	IHRC	Ob
Luke 17:30	ᾗ	D	A	R	IHRC	Ob
Luke 17:31	ὃς	N	S	-	-	
Luke 17:33	ὃς ἐάν	N	S	-	-	
Luke 17:33	ὃς δ' ἄν	N	S	-	-	
Luke 18:17	ὃς ἄν	N	S	-	-	
Luke 18:29	ὃς	N	A	R	PST	Su
Luke 18:30	ὃς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Luke 19:13	ἐν ᾧ	D	B	-	-	
Luke 19:15	οἷς	D	A	R	PST	IO
Luke 19:20	ἣν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Luke 19:21	ὃ	A	S	-	-	
Luke 19:21	ὃ	A	S	-	-	
Luke 19:22	ὃ	A	S	-	-	
Luke 19:22	ὃ	A	S	-	-	
Luke 19:26	ὃ	A	S	-	-	
Luke 19:30	ἐν ᾗ	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Luke 19:30	ἐφ' ὃν	A	A	NR	PST	Ob
Luke 19:37	ὧν	G	A	R	IHRC	DO
Luke 19:44	ἀνθ' ὧν	G	B	-	-	
Luke 20:17	ὃν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Luke 20:18	ἐφ' ὃν δ' ἄν	A	S	-	-	
Luke 20:47	οἳ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Luke 21:4	ὃν	A	A	R	PST	DO

340

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	RP
Luke 21:6	ἅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
Luke 21:6	ἐν αἷς	D	A	R	PST	Ob
Luke 21:6	ὃς	N	A	R	PST	Su
Luke 21:15	ᾗ	D	A	R	PST	DO
Luke 21:24	ἄχρι οὗ	G	B	-	-	
Luke 22:7	[ἐν] ᾗ	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Luke 22:10	εἰς ἥν	A	A	R	PST	Ob
Luke 22:16	ἕως ὅτου	G	B	-	-	
Luke 22:18	ἕως οὗ	G	B	-	-	
Luke 22:22	δι' οὗ	G	A	R	PST	Ob
Luke 22:60	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
Luke 23:14	ὧν	G	S	-	-	
Luke 23:19	ὅστις	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Luke 23:25	ὃν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Luke 23:27	αἵ	N	A	R	PST	Su
Luke 23:29	ἐν αἷς	D	A	R	PST	Ob
Luke 23:29	αἵ	N	A	R	PST	Su
Luke 23:29	οἵ	N	A	R	PST	Su
Luke 23:33	ὃν μὲν	A	L	-	-	
Luke 23:33	ὃν δὲ	A	L	-	-	
Luke 23:41	ὧν	G	S	-	-	
Luke 23:51	ὃς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Luke 23:53	οὗ	G	B	-	-	
Luke 23:55	αἵτινες	N	A	R	PST	Su
Luke 24:1	ἅ	A	A	R	IHRC	DO
Luke 24:13	ᾗ	D	A	R	PST	Ob
Luke 24:17	οὕς	A	A	R	PST	DO
Luke 24:19	ὃς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Luke 24:21	ἀφ' οὗ	G	B	-	-	
Luke 24:23	οἵ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Luke 24:25	οἷς	D	S	-	-	
Luke 24:28	οὗ	G	B	-	-	
Luke 24:44	οὕς	A	A	R	PST	DO
Luke 24:49	ἕως οὗ	G	B	-	-	
John 1:3	ὅ	N	S	-	-	
John 1:9	ὅ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
John 1:13	οἵ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
John 1:15	ὃν	A	S	-	-	
John 1:26	ὃν	A	S	-	-	
John 1:27	οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	Po
John 1:30	οὗ	G	S	-	-	
John 1:30	ὃς	N	A	R	PST	Su
John 1:33	ἐφ' ὃν ἄν	A	S	-	-	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	RP
John 1:38	ὅ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
John 1:41	ὅ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
John 1:42	ὅ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
John 1:45	ὅν	A	S	-	-	
John 1:47	ἐν ᾧ	D	A	R	PST	Ob
John 2:5	ὅ τι ἂν	A	S	-	-	
John 2:22	ὅν	A	A	R	PST	DO
John 2:23	ἅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
John 3:2	ἅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
John 3:11	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
John 3:11	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
John 3:26	ὅς	N	S	-	-	
John 3:26	ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	DO
John 3:32	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
John 3:34	ὅν	A	S	-	-	
John 4:5	ὅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
John 4:12	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
John 4:14	ὅς δ' ἂν	N	S	-	-	
John 4:14	οὗ	G	A	R	PST	DO
John 4:14	ὅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
John 4:18	ὅν	A	S	-	-	
John 4:22	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
John 4:22	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
John 4:29	ὅς	N	A	R	PST	Su
John 4:32	ἥν	A	A	R	PST	DO
John 4:38	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
John 4:39	ἅ	A	S	-	-	
John 4:46	οὗ	G	A	R	PST	Po
John 4:50	ὅν	A	A	R	PST	DO
John 4:52	ἐν ᾗ	D	A	R	PST	Ob
John 4:53	ἐν ᾗ	D	A	R	PST	Ob
John 5:7	ἐν ᾧ	D	B	-	-	
John 5:19	ἅ γὰρ ἂν	A	S	-	-	
John 5:20	ἅ	A	S	-	-	
John 5:21	οὕς	A	S	-	-	
John 5:28	ἐν ᾗ	D	A	R	PST	Ob
John 5:32	ἥν	A	A	R	PST	DO
John 5:36	ἅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
John 5:36	ἅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
John 5:38	ὅν	A	S	-	-	
John 5:45	εἰς ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	Ob
John 6:2	ἅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
John 6:9	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	RP
John 6:13	ἅ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
John 6:14	ὅ	A	A	R	IHRC	DO
John 6:21	εἰς ἥν	A	A	R	PST	Ob
John 6:27	ἥν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
John 6:29	ὅν	A	S	-	-	
John 6:37	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
John 6:39	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
John 6:42	οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	Po
John 6:51	ὅν	A	A	R	PST	DO
John 6:63	ἅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
John 6:64	οἵ	N	S	-	-	
John 7:3	ἅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
John 7:25	ὅν	A	S	-	-	
John 7:28	ὅν	A	S	-	-	
John 7:31	ὧν	G	S	-	-	
John 7:36	ὅν	A	A	R	PST	DO
John 7:39	ὅ	A	A	NR	PST	DO
John 7:50	ὧν	G	B	-	-	
John 8:25	ὅ τι	A?	S	-	-	
John 8:26	ἅ	A	S	-	-	
John 8:38	ἅ	A	S	-	-	
John 8:38	ἅ	A	S	-	-	
John 8:40	ὅς	N	A	R	PST	Su
John 8:40	ἥν	A	A	R	PST	DO
John 8:53	ὅστις	N	A	NR	PST	Su
John 8:54	ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
John 9:7	ὅ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
John 9:14	ἐν ᾗ	D	A	R	IHRC	Ob
John 9:18	ἕως ὅτου	G	B	-	-	
John 9:19	ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
John 9:24	ὅς	N	A	R	PST	Su
John 10:6	ἅ	A	S	-	-	
John 10:12	οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	Po
John 10:16	ἅ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
John 10:25	ἅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
John 10:29	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
John 10:35	πρὸς οὕς	A	A	NR	PST	Ob
John 10:36	ὅν	A	S	-	-	
John 11:2	ἧς	G	A	NR	PST	Po
John 11:3	ὅν	A	S	-	-	
John 11:6	ἐν ᾧ	D	A	R	IHRC	Ob
John 11:45	ἅ	A	S	-	-	
John 11:46	ἅ	A	S	-	-	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	RP
John 12:1	ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
John 12:9	ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
John 12:38	ὅν	A	A	R	PST	DO
John 12:48	ὅν	A	A	R	PST	DO
John 12:50	ἅ	A	S	-	-	
John 13:5	ᾧ	D	A	R	PST	Ob
John 13:7	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
John 13:23	ὅν	A	A	R	PST	DO
John 13:24	περὶ οὗ	G	S	-	-	
John 13:26	ᾧ	D	S	-	-	
John 13:27	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
John 13:29	ὧν	G	S	-	-	
John 13:38	ἕως οὗ	G	B	-	-	
John 14:10	ἅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
John 14:12	ἅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
John 14:13	ὅ τι ἂν	A	S	-	-	
John 14:17	ὅ	A	A	NR	PST	DO
John 14:24	ὅν	A	A	R	PST	DO
John 14:26	ὅ	A	A	NR	PST	DO
John 14:26	ἅ	A	S	-	-	
John 15:3	ὅν	A	A	R	PST	DO
John 15:7	ὅ ἐάν	A	S	-	-	
John 15:14	ἅ	A	S	-	-	
John 15:15	ἅ	A	S	-	-	
John 15:16	ὅ τι ἂν	A	S	-	-	
John 15:20	οὗ	G	A	R	PST	DO
John 15:24	ἅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
John 15:26	ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
John 15:26	ὅ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
John 16:17	ὅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
John 16:18	[ὅ]	A	A	R	PST	DO
John 17:2	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
John 17:3	ὅν	A	A	NR	IHRC	DO
John 17:4	ὅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
John 17:5	ᾗ	D	A	R	PST	DO
John 17:6	οὓς	A	A	R	PST	DO
John 17:8	ἅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
John 17:9	ὧν	G	S	-	-	
John 17:11	ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	DO
John 17:12	ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	DO
John 17:22	ἥν	A	A	R	PST	DO
John 17:24	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
John 17:24	ἥν	A	A	NR	PST	DO

344

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	RP
John 17:26	ἥν	A	A	R	PST	DO
John 18:1	εἰς ὃν	A	A	NR	PST	Ob
John 18:9	ὃν	A	A	R	PST	DO
John 18:9	οὓς	A	S	-	-	
John 18:11	ὃ	A	A	R	PST	DO
John 18:13	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
John 18:21	ἅ	A	S	-	-	
John 18:26	οὗ	G	S	-	-	
John 18:32	ὃν	A	A	R	PST	DO
John 19:17	ὃ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
John 19:22	ὃ	A	S	-	-	
John 19:26	ὃν	A	A	R	PST	DO
John 19:37	ὃν	A	S	-	-	
John 19:41	ἐν ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
John 20:2	ὃν	A	A	R	PST	DO
John 20:7	ὃ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
John 20:16	ὃ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
John 20:30	ἅ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
John 21:7	ὃν	A	A	R	PST	DO
John 21:10	ὧν	G	A	R	PST	DO
John 21:20	ὃν	A	A	R	PST	DO
John 21:20	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
John 21:25	ἅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
John 21:25	ἅτινα ἐὰν	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 1:1	ὧν	G	S	-	-	
Acts 1:2	ἄχρι ἧς	G	B	-	-	
Acts 1:2	οὓς	A	A	R	PST	DO
Acts 1:3	οἷς	D	A	NR	PST	IO
Acts 1:4	ἥν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Acts 1:7	οὓς	A	A	R	PST	DO
Acts 1:11	οἳ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 1:11	ὃν	A	B	-	-	
Acts 1:12	ὃ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 1:13	οὗ	G	B	-	-	
Acts 1:16	ἥν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Acts 1:21	ᾧ	D	A	R	PST	Ob
Acts 1:22	ἧς	G	A	R	PST	Ob
Acts 1:23	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 1:24	ὃν	A	S	-	-	
Acts 1:25	ἀφ' ἧς	G	A	R	PST	Ob
Acts 2:2	οὗ	G	B	-	-	
Acts 2:8	ἐν ᾗ	D	A	R	PST	Ob
Acts 2:21	ὃς ἂν	N	S	-	-	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	RP
Acts 2:22	οἷς	D	A	NR	PST	DO
Acts 2:24	ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Acts 2:32	οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
Acts 2:33	ὅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
Acts 2:36	ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Acts 3:2	ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Acts 3:3	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 3:6	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
Acts 3:13	ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Acts 3:15	ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Acts 3:15	οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
Acts 3:16	ὅν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Acts 3:18	ἅ	A	S	-	-	
Acts 3:21	ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Acts 3:21	ὧν	G	A	NR	PST	DO
Acts 3:23	ἥτις ἐὰν	N	A	R	PST	Su
Acts 3:25	ἧς	G	A	R	PST	DO
Acts 4:10	ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Acts 4:10	ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Acts 4:12	ἐν ᾧ	D	A	R	PST	Ob
Acts 4:20	ἅ	A	S	-	-	
Acts 4:22	ἐφ' ὅν	A	A	R	PST	Ob
Acts 4:27	ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Acts 4:31	ἐν ᾧ	D	A	R	PST	Ob
Acts 4:36	ὅ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 5:16	οἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 5:25	οὓς	A	A	R	PST	DO
Acts 5:30	ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Acts 5:32	ὅ	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Acts 5:36	ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	DO
Acts 5:36	Ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 6:3	οὓς	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Acts 6:6	οὓς	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Acts 6:10	ᾧ	D	A	R	PST	Ob
Acts 6:14	ἅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
Acts 7:3	ἥν ἄν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Acts 7:4	εἰς ἥν	A	A	R	PST	Ob
Acts 7:7	ᾧ ἐὰν	D	A	R	PST	DO
Acts 7:16	ᾧ	D	A	R	PST	DO
Acts 7:17	ἧς	G	A	R	PST	DO
Acts 7:18	ἄχρι οὗ	G	B	-	-	
Acts 7:18	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 7:20	Εν ᾧ	D	A	R	IHRC	Ob

346

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	RP
Acts 7:20	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 7:28	ὅν	A	B	-	-	
Acts 7:29	οὗ	G	B	-	-	
Acts 7:33	ἐφ' ᾧ	D	A	R	PST	Ob
Acts 7:35	ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Acts 7:38	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 7:39	ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	DO
Acts 7:40	οἵ	N	A	R	PST	Su
Acts 7:40	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 7:43	οὕς	A	A	R	PST	DO
Acts 7:44	ὅν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Acts 7:45	ἥν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Acts 7:45	ὧν	G	A	R	PST	DO
Acts 7:46	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 7:52	οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	DO
Acts 7:53	οἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 8:6	ἅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
Acts 8:10	ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	DO
Acts 8:15	οἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 8:19	ᾧ ἐὰν	D	S	-	-	
Acts 8:24	ὧν	G	S	-	-	
Acts 8:27	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 8:27	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 8:30	ἅ	A	S	-	-	
Acts 8:32	ἥν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Acts 9:5	ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Acts 9:6	ὅ τί	A	S	-	-	
Acts 9:17	ᾗ	D	A	R	PST	Ob
Acts 9:33	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 9:35	οἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 9:36	ἥ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 9:36	ὧν	G	A	NR	PST	DO
Acts 9:39	ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Acts 10:5	ὅς	N	A	?	PST	Su
Acts 10:6	ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Acts 10:12	ἐν ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Acts 10:15	ἅ	A	S	-	-	
Acts 10:17	ὅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
Acts 10:21	ὅν	A	S	-	-	
Acts 10:21	δι' ἥν	A	A	R	PST	Ob
Acts 10:32	ὅς	N	A	?	PST	Su
Acts 10:36	[ὅν]	A	A	R	PST	DO
Acts 10:37	ὅ	A	A	R	PST	DO

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	RP
Acts 10:38	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 10:39	ὧν	G	S	-	-	
Acts 10:39	ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Acts 10:41	οἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 10:47	οἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 11:6	εἰς ἥν	A	A	NR	PST	Ob
Acts 11:9	ἅ	A	S	-	-	
Acts 11:11	ἐν ᾗ	D	A	R	PST	Ob
Acts 11:14	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 11:14	ἐν οἷς	D	A	R	PST	Ob
Acts 11:20	οἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 11:23	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 11:28	ἥτις	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 11:30	ὅ	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Acts 12:4	ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Acts 12:10	ἥτις	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 12:12	οὗ	G	B	-	-	
Acts 12:23	ἀνθ' ὧν	G	B	-	-	
Acts 13:2	ὅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
Acts 13:6	ᾧ	D	A	R	PST	Ob
Acts 13:7	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 13:22	ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Acts 13:22	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 13:25	οὗ	G	S	-	-	
Acts 13:31	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 13:31	οἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 13:37	ὅν	A	S	-	-	
Acts 13:38	ὧν	G	S	-	-	
Acts 13:41	ὅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
Acts 13:43	οἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 14:8	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 14:9	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 14:11	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
Acts 14:15	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 14:16	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 14:23	εἰς ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	Ob
Acts 14:26	ὅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
Acts 15:10	ὅν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Acts 15:11	καθ' ὅν	A	B	-	-	
Acts 15:17	ἐφ' οὕς	A	A	R	PST	Ob
Acts 15:24	οἷς	D	A	NR	PST	DO
Acts 15:29	ἐξ ὧν	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
Acts 15:36	ἐν αἷς	D	A	R	PST	Ob

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	RP
Acts 16:2	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 16:12	ἥτις	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 16:13	οὗ	G	B	-	-	
Acts 16:14	ἧς	G	A	NR	PST	Po
Acts 16:16	ἥτις	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 16:17	οἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 16:21	ἅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
Acts 16:24	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 17:3	ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Acts 17:7	οὓς	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Acts 17:10	οἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 17:11	οἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 17:23	ἐν ᾧ	D	A	R	PST	Ob
Acts 17:23	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
Acts 17:31	ἐν ᾗ	D	A	R	PST	Ob
Acts 17:31	ᾧ	D	A	R	PST	DO
Acts 17:34	ἐν οἷς	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Acts 18:7	οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	Po
Acts 18:27	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 19:13	ὅν	A	A	?	PST	DO
Acts 19:16	ἐν ᾧ	D	A	R	PST	Ob
Acts 19:25	οὓς	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Acts 19:27	ἥν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Acts 19:35	ὅς	N	A	R	PST	Su
Acts 19:40	περὶ οὗ	G	A	R	PST	Ob
Acts 20:8	οὗ	G	B	-	-	
Acts 20:18	ἀφ᾽ ἧς	G	A	R	PST	Ob
Acts 20:24	ἥν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Acts 20:25	ἐν οἷς	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Acts 20:28	ἐν ᾧ	D	A	R	PST	Ob
Acts 20:28	ἥν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Acts 20:38	ᾧ	D	A	R	PST	DO
Acts 21:4	οἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 21:11	οὗ	G	A	R	PST	Po
Acts 21:16	παρ᾽ ᾧ	D	A	NR	IHRC	Ob
Acts 21:19	ὧν	G	S	-	-	
Acts 21:23	ὅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
Acts 21:24	ὧν	G	S	-	-	
Acts 21:26	ἕως οὗ	G	B	-	-	
Acts 21:29	ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Acts 21:32	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 22:4	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 22:5	παρ᾽ ὧν	G	A	NR	PST	Ob

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	RP
Acts 22:8	ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Acts 22:10	ὧν	G	S	-	-	
Acts 22:15	ὧν	G	S	-	-	
Acts 22:24	δι' ἥν	A	B	-	-	
Acts 23:12	ἕως οὗ	G	B	-	-	
Acts 23:14	οἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 23:14	ἕως οὗ	G	B	-	-	
Acts 23:19	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
Acts 23:21	οἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 23:21	ἕως οὗ	G	B	-	-	
Acts 23:28	δι' ἥν	A	A	R	PST	Ob
Acts 23:29	ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Acts 23:33	οἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 24:1	οἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 24:6	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 24:6	ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Acts 24:8	παρ' οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
Acts 24:8	ὧν	G	S	-	-	
Acts 24:11	ἀφ' ἧς	G	B	-	-	
Acts 24:13	περὶ ὧν	G	S	-	-	
Acts 24:14	ἥν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Acts 24:15	ἥν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Acts 24:18	ἐν αἷς	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Acts 24:19	οὕς	A	A	NR	PST	Ob
Acts 24:21	ἧς	G	A	R	PST	DO
Acts 25:7	ἅ	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Acts 25:10	οὗ	G	B	-	-	
Acts 25:11	ὧν	G	S	-	-	
Acts 25:15	περὶ οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
Acts 25:16	πρὸς οὕς	A	A	NR	PST	Ob
Acts 25:18	περὶ οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
Acts 25:18	ὧν	G	S	-	-	
Acts 25:19	ὅν	A	A	?	PST	DO
Acts 25:21	ἕως οὗ	G	B	-	-	
Acts 25:24	περὶ οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
Acts 25:26	περὶ οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
Acts 26:2	ὧν	G	S	-	-	
Acts 26:7	εἰς ἥν	A	A	NR	PST	Ob
Acts 26:7	περὶ ἧς	G	A	R	IHRC	Ob
Acts 26:10	ὅ	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Acts 26:12	Ἐν οἷς	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Acts 26:15	ὅν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Acts 26:16	ὧν	G	S	-	-	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	RP
Acts 26:16	ὧν	G	S	-	-	
Acts 26:17	εἰς οὓς	A	A	NR	PST	IO
Acts 26:22	ὧν	G	S	-	-	
Acts 26:26	πρὸς ὃν	A	A	NR	PST	Ob
Acts 27:8	ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Acts 27:17	ἥν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Acts 27:23	οὗ	G	A	NR	IHRC	Po
Acts 27:23	ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	DO
Acts 27:25	καθ' ὃν	A	B	-	-	
Acts 27:33	"Αχρι δὲ οὗ	G	B	-	-	
Acts 27:39	εἰς ὃν	A	A	NR	PST	Ob
Acts 27:44	οὓς μὲν	A	L	-	-	
Acts 27:44	οὓς δὲ	A	L	-	-	
Acts 28:4	ὃν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Acts 28:7	ὃς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 28:8	πρὸς ὃν	A	A	NR	PST	Ob
Acts 28:10	οἳ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 28:14	οὗ	G	B	-	-	
Acts 28:15	οὓς	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Acts 28:18	οἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Acts 28:22	ἃ	A	S	-	-	
Acts 28:23	οἷς	D	A	NR	PST	IO
Rom 1:2	ὃ	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Rom 1:5	δι' οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
Rom 1:6	ἐν οἷς	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Rom 1:9	ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	DO
Rom 1:25	οἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Rom 1:25	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Rom 1:27	ἥν	A	A	R	IHRC	Ob
Rom 1:32	οἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Rom 2:1	ἐν ᾧ	D	S	-	-	
Rom 2:6	ὃς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Rom 2:15	οἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Rom 2:23	ὃς	N	S	-	-	
Rom 2:29	οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	Po
Rom 3:8	ὧν	G	A	NR	PST	Po
Rom 3:14	ὧν	G	A	NR	PST	Po
Rom 3:25	ὃν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Rom 3:30	ὃς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Rom 4:6	ᾧ	D	A	R	PST	IO
Rom 4:7	ὧν	G	S	-	-	
Rom 4:8	οὗ	G	A	R	PST	Po
Rom 4:15	οὗ	G	B	-	-	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	RP
Rom 4:16	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Rom 4:17	οὗ	G	A	R	IHRC	DO
Rom 4:18	Ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Rom 4:21	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
Rom 4:24	οἷς	D	A	NR	PST	IO
Rom 4:25	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Rom 5:2	δι' οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
Rom 5:2	ἐν ᾗ	D	A	R	PST	Ob
Rom 5:11	δι' οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
Rom 5:12	ἐφ' ᾧ	D	B	-	-	
Rom 5:14	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Rom 5:20	οὗ	G	B	-	-	
Rom 6:2	οἵτινες	N	S	-	-	
Rom 6:10	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
Rom 6:10	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
Rom 6:16	ᾧ	D	S	-	-	
Rom 6:16	ᾧ	D	S	-	-	
Rom 6:17	εἰς ὅν	A	A	R	IHRC	Ob
Rom 6:21	ἐφ' οἷς	D	S	-	-	
Rom 7:6	ἐν ᾧ	D	S	-	-	
Rom 7:15	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
Rom 7:15	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
Rom 7:15	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
Rom 7:16	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
Rom 7:19	ὅ	A	A	R	IHRC	DO
Rom 7:19	ὅ	A	A	R	IHRC	DO
Rom 7:20	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
Rom 8:3	ἐν ᾧ	D	B	-	-	
Rom 8:15	ἐν ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Rom 8:24	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
Rom 8:25	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
Rom 8:29	οὕς	A	S	-	-	
Rom 8:30	οὕς	A	S	-	-	
Rom 8:30	οὕς	A	S	-	-	
Rom 8:30	οὕς	A	S	-	-	
Rom 8:32	ὅς	N	S	-	-	
Rom 8:34	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Rom 8:34	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Rom 9:4	οἵτινές	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Rom 9:4	ὧν	G	A	NR	PST	Po
Rom 9:5	ὧν	G	A	NR	PST	Po
Rom 9:5	ἐξ ὧν	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
Rom 9:15	ὅν	A	S	-	-	

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	RP
Rom 9:15	ὅν	A	S	-	-	
Rom 9:18	ὅν	A	S	-	-	
Rom 9:18	ὅν	A	S	-	-	
Rom 9:21	ὅ	A	L	-	-	
Rom 9:21	ὅ	A	L	-	-	
Rom 9:23	ἅ	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Rom 9:24	Οὕς	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Rom 9:26	οὗ	G	B	-	-	
Rom 10:8	ὅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
Rom 10:13	ὅς ἂν	N	S	-	-	
Rom 10:14	ὅν	A	S	-	-	
Rom 10:14	οὗ	G	S	-	-	
Rom 11:2	ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Rom 11:4	οἵτινες	N	A	R	PST	Su
Rom 11:7	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
Rom 11:25	ἄχρι οὗ	G	B	-	-	
Rom 12:3	παρ' ὅ	A	S	-	-	
Rom 14:2	ὅς μὲν	N	L	-	-	
Rom 14:5	Ὃς μὲν	N	L	-	-	
Rom 14:5	ὃς δὲ	N	L	-	-	
Rom 14:15	ὑπὲρ οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
Rom 14:21	ἐν ᾧ	D	S	-	-	
Rom 14:22	[ἣν]	A	A	R	PST	DO
Rom 14:22	ἐν ᾧ	D	S	-	-	
Rom 14:23	ὅ	N	S	-	-	
Rom 15:18	ὧν	G	S	-	-	
Rom 15:21	οἷς	D	S	-	-	
Rom 15:21	οἳ	N	S	-	-	
Rom 16:2	ἐν ᾧ	D	A	R	IHRC	Ob
Rom 16:4	οἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Rom 16:4	οἷς	D	A	NR	PST	DO
Rom 16:5	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Rom 16:6	ἥτις	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Rom 16:7	οἵτινές	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Rom 16:7	οἳ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Rom 16:12	ἥτις	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Rom 16:17	ἣν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Rom 16:27	ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
1 Cor 1:8	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
1 Cor 1:9	δι' οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
1 Cor 1:30	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
1 Cor 2:7	ἣν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
1 Cor 2:8	ἣν	A	A	NR	PST	DO

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	RP
1 Cor 2:9	ἅ	A	S	-	-	
1 Cor 2:9	ἅ	A	S	-	-	
1 Cor 2:13	ἅ	A	A	NR	PST	DO
1 Cor 2:16	ὅς	N	B	-	-	
1 Cor 3:5	δι' ὧν	G	A	R	PST	Ob
1 Cor 3:11	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
1 Cor 3:14	ὅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
1 Cor 3:17	οἵτινές	N	A	NR	PST	Su
1 Cor 4:5	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
1 Cor 4:6	ἅ	A	S	-	-	
1 Cor 4:7	ὅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
1 Cor 4:17	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
1 Cor 4:17	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
1 Cor 5:1	ἥτις	N	A	NR	PST	Su
1 Cor 6:5	ὅς	N	A	R	PST	Su
1 Cor 6:18	ὅ ἐὰν	A	A	R	PST	DO
1 Cor 6:19	οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	DO
1 Cor 7:1	ὧν	G	S	-	-	
1 Cor 7:20	ᾗ	D	A	R	PST	Ob
1 Cor 7:24	ἐν ᾧ	D	S	-	-	
1 Cor 7:36	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
1 Cor 7:37	ὅς	N	S	-	-	
1 Cor 7:39	ᾧ	D	S	-	-	
1 Cor 8:6	ἐξ οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
1 Cor 8:6	δι' οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
1 Cor 8:11	δι' ὅν	A	A	R	PST	Ob
1 Cor 10:11	εἰς οὓς	A	A	NR	PST	Ob
1 Cor 10:13	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
1 Cor 10:13	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
1 Cor 10:15	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
1 Cor 10:16	ὅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
1 Cor 10:16	ὅν	A	A	R	PST	DO
1 Cor 10:20	ἅ	A	S	-	-	
1 Cor 10:30	ὑπὲρ οὗ	G	S	-	-	
1 Cor 11:21	ὅς μὲν	N	L	-	-	
1 Cor 11:21	ὅς δὲ	N	L	-	-	
1 Cor 11:23	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
1 Cor 11:23	ᾗ	D	A	R	PST	Ob
1 Cor 11:26	ἄχρι οὗ	G	B	-	-	
1 Cor 11:27	ὅς ἂν	N	S	-	-	
1 Cor 12:8	ᾧ μὲν	D	L	-	-	
1 Cor 12:23	ἅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
1 Cor 12:28	οὓς	A	A	NR	PST	DO

354

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	RP
1 Cor 14:37	ἅ	A	S	-	-	
1 Cor 15:1	ὅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
1 Cor 15:1	ὅ	A	A	NR	PST	DO
1 Cor 15:1	ἐν ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
1 Cor 15:2	δι' οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
1 Cor 15:3	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
1 Cor 15:6	ἐξ ὧν	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
1 Cor 15:9	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
1 Cor 15:10	ὅ	N	S	-	-	
1 Cor 15:15	ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
1 Cor 15:25	ἄχρι οὗ	G	B	-	-	
1 Cor 15:31	ἥν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
1 Cor 15:36	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
1 Cor 15:37	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
1 Cor 16:2	ὅ τι ἐάν	A	S	-	-	
1 Cor 16:3	οὓς ἐάν	A	S	-	-	
1 Cor 16:6	οὗ ἐάν	G	B	-	-	
2 Cor 1:4	ἧς	G	A	R	PST	Ob
2 Cor 1:6	ὧν	G	A	R	PST	DO
2 Cor 1:10	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
2 Cor 1:10	εἰς ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	Ob
2 Cor 1:13	ἅ	A	S	-	-	
2 Cor 1:17	ἅ	A	S	-	-	
2 Cor 2:3	ὧν	G	S	-	-	
2 Cor 2:4	ἥν	A	A	R	PST	DO
2 Cor 2:10	ᾧ	D	S	-	-	
2 Cor 2:10	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
2 Cor 2:16	οἷς μέν	D	L	-	-	
2 Cor 2:16	οἷς δέ	D	L	-	-	
2 Cor 3:6	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
2 Cor 4:4	ἐν οἷς	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
2 Cor 4:4	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
2 Cor 4:6	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
2 Cor 5:10	ἅ	A	S	-	-	
2 Cor 7:7	ᾗ	D	A	R	PST	Ob
2 Cor 8:10	οἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
2 Cor 8:18	οὗ	G	A	R	PST	Po
2 Cor 8:22	ὅν	A	A	R	PST	DO
2 Cor 9:2	ἥν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
2 Cor 9:11	ἥτις	N	A	NR	PST	Su
2 Cor 10:1	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
2 Cor 10:2	ᾗ	D	A	R	PST	Ob
2 Cor 10:8	ἧς	G	A	NR	PST	DO

355

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	RP
2 Cor 10:13	οὗ	G	A	R	PST	DO
2 Cor 10:18	ὃν	A	S	-	-	
2 Cor 11:4	ὃν	A	A	R	PST	DO
2 Cor 11:4	ὃ	A	A	R	PST	DO
2 Cor 11:4	ὃ	A	A	R	PST	DO
2 Cor 11:12	Ὃ	A	S	-	AP	
2 Cor 11:12	ἐν ᾧ	D	S	-	-	
2 Cor 11:15	ὧν	G	A	NR	PST	Po
2 Cor 11:17	ὃ	A	S	-	-	
2 Cor 11:21	Ἐν ᾧ	D	S	-	-	
2 Cor 12:4	ἃ	A	A	NR	PST	DO
2 Cor 12:6	ὃ	A	S	-	-	
2 Cor 12:13	ὃ	A	A	R	PST	DO
2 Cor 12:17	ὧν	G	S	-	-	
2 Cor 12:21	ἣ	D	A	R	PST	DO
2 Cor 13:3	ὃς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
2 Cor 13:10	ἣν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Gal 1:5	ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Gal 1:7	ὃ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Gal 1:8	ὃ	A	S	-	-	
Gal 1:9	ὃ	A	S	-	-	
Gal 1:20	ἃ	A	S	-	-	
Gal 1:23	ἣν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Gal 2:2	ὃ	A	A	R	PST	DO
Gal 2:4	οἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Gal 2:4	ἣν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Gal 2:5	οἷς	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Gal 2:10	ὃ	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Gal 2:18	ἃ	A	S	-	-	
Gal 2:20	ὃ	A	S	-	-	
Gal 3:1	οἷς	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Gal 3:10	ὃς	N	S	-	-	
Gal 3:16	ὃς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Gal 3:19	ἄχρις οὗ	G	B	-	-	
Gal 3:19	ᾧ	D	S	-	-	
Gal 4:9	οἷς	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Gal 4:19	οὓς	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Gal 4:19	μέχρις οὗ	G	B	-	-	
Gal 4:24	ἅτινά	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Gal 4:24	ἥτις	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Gal 4:26	ἥτις	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Gal 5:4	οἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Gal 5:10	ὅστις	N	A	NR	PST	Su

356

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	RP
Gal 5:17	ἃ ἐὰν	A	S	-	-	
Gal 5:19	ἅτινά	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Gal 5:21	ἃ	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Gal 6:7	ὃ γὰρ ἐὰν	A	S	-	-	
Gal 6:14	δι' οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
Eph 1:6	ἧς	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
Eph 1:7	Ἐν ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Eph 1:8	ἧς	G	A	NR	PST	DO
Eph 1:9	ἣν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Eph 1:11	Ἐν ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Eph 1:13	Ἐν ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Eph 1:13	ἐν ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Eph 1:14	ὅ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Eph 1:20	Ἣν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Eph 1:23	ἥτις	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Eph 2:2	ἐν αἷς	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Eph 2:3	ἐν οἷς	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Eph 2:4	ἣν	A	A	R	PST	Ob
Eph 2:10	οἷς	D	A	NR	PST	DO
Eph 2:21	ἐν ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Eph 2:22	ἐν ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Eph 3:4	πρὸς ὃ	A	A	NR	PST	Ob
Eph 3:5	ὃ	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Eph 3:7	οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	Po
Eph 3:11	ἣν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Eph 3:12	ἐν ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Eph 3:13	ἥτις	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Eph 3:15	ἐξ οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
Eph 3:20	ὧν	G	S	-	-	
Eph 4:1	ἧς	G	A	R	PST	Ob
Eph 4:15	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Eph 4:16	ἐξ οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
Eph 4:19	οἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Eph 4:30	ἐν ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Eph 5:4	ἃ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Eph 5:5	ὅ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Eph 5:18	ἐν ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Eph 6:2	ἥτις	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Eph 6:16	ἐν ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Eph 6:17	ὅ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Eph 6:20	ὑπὲρ οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
Eph 6:22	ὃν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Phil 1:28	ἥτις	N	A	NR	PST	Su

357

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	RP
Phil 2:5	ὅ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Phil 2:6	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Phil 2:15	ἐν οἷς	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Phil 2:20	ὅστις	N	A	R	PST	Su
Phil 3:7	ἅτινα	N	S	-	-	
Phil 3:8	δι' ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	Ob
Phil 3:12	ἐφ' ᾧ	D	S	-	-	
Phil 3:16	εἰς ὅ	A	S	-	-	
Phil 3:18	οὓς	A	A	R	PST	DO
Phil 3:19	ὧν	G	A	NR	PST	Po
Phil 3:19	ὧν	G	A	NR	PST	Po
Phil 3:20	ἐξ οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
Phil 3:21	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Phil 4:3	αἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Phil 4:3	ὧν	G	A	NR	PST	Po
Phil 4:9	ἃ	A	S	-	-	
Phil 4:10	ἐφ' ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Phil 4:11	ἐν οἷς	D	S	-	-	
Col 1:4	ἣν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Col 1:5	ἣν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Col 1:6	ἀφ' ἧς	G	B	-	-	
Col 1:7	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Col 1:9	ἀφ' ἧς	G	B	-	-	
Col 1:13	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Col 1:14	ἐν ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Col 1:15	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Col 1:18	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Col 1:23	οὗ	G	A	?	PST	DO
Col 1:23	οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
Col 1:24	ὅ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Col 1:25	ἧς	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
Col 1:27	οἷς	D	A	NR	PST	IO
Col 1:27	ὅ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Col 1:28	ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Col 1:29	εἰς ὅ	A	A	NR	PST	Ob
Col 2:3	ἐν ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Col 2:10	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Col 2:11	Ἐν ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Col 2:12	ἐν ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Col 2:14	ὅ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Col 2:17	ἅ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Col 2:18	ἃ	A	S	-	-	
Col 2:19	ἐξ οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	Ob

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	RP
Col 2:22	ἅ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Col 2:23	ἅτινά	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Col 3:1	οὗ	G	B	-	-	
Col 3:5	ἥτις	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Col 3:6	δι' ἃ	A	A	NR	PST	Ob
Col 3:7	ἐν οἷς	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Col 3:14	ὅ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Col 3:15	εἰς ἣν	A	A	NR	PST	Ob
Col 3:17	ὅ τι ἐὰν	A	S	-	-	
Col 3:23	ὃ ἐὰν	A	S	-	-	
Col 3:25	ὃ	A	S	-	-	
Col 4:3	δι' ὃ	A	A	NR	PST	Ob
Col 4:8	ὃν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Col 4:9	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Col 4:10	περὶ οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
Col 4:11	οἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Col 4:17	ἣν	A	A	R	PST	DO
1 Thess 1:10	ὃν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
1 Thess 2:13	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
1 Thess 3:9	ᾗ	D	A	R	PST	Ob
1 Thess 5:24	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
2 Thess 1:4	αἷς	D	A	R	PST	DO
2 Thess 1:5	ὑπὲρ ἧς	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
2 Thess 1:9	οἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
2 Thess 1:11	Εἰς ὃ	A	A	NR	PST	Ob
2 Thess 2:8	ὃν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
2 Thess 2:9	οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	Po
2 Thess 2:10	ἀνθ' ὧν	G	B	-	-	
2 Thess 2:14	εἰς ὃ	A	A	NR	PST	Ob
2 Thess 2:15	ἃς	A	A	R	PST	DO
2 Thess 3:3	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
2 Thess 3:4	ἃ	A	S	-	-	
2 Thess 3:6	ἣν	A	A	R	PST	DO
2 Thess 3:17	ὅ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
1 Tim 1:4	αἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
1 Tim 1:6	ὧν	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
1 Tim 1:7	ἃ	A	S	-	-	
1 Tim 1:11	ὃ	A	A	NR	PST	DO
1 Tim 1:15	ὧν	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
1 Tim 1:19	ἥν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
1 Tim 1:20	ὧν	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
1 Tim 1:20	οὓς	A	A	NR	PST	DO
1 Tim 2:4	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	RP
1 Tim 2:7	εἰς ὅ	A	A	NR	PST	Ob
1 Tim 2:10	ὅ	N	A	NR	IHRC	Su
1 Tim 3:15	ἥτις	N	A	NR	PST	Su
1 Tim 3:16	ὅς	N	S	-	-	
1 Tim 4:3	ἅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
1 Tim 4:6	ᾗ	D	A	R	PST	DO
1 Tim 4:10	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
1 Tim 4:14	ὅ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
1 Tim 6:4	ἐξ ὧν	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
1 Tim 6:9	αἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
1 Tim 6:10	ἧς	G	A	NR	PST	DO
1 Tim 6:12	εἰς ἥν	A	A	NR	PST	Ob
1 Tim 6:15	ἥν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
1 Tim 6:16	ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
1 Tim 6:16	ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
1 Tim 6:21	ἥν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
2 Tim 1:3	ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	DO
2 Tim 1:5	ἥτις	N	A	NR	PST	Su
2 Tim 1:6	Δι' ἥν	A	B	-	-	
2 Tim 1:6	ὅ	N	A	?	PST	Su
2 Tim 1:11	εἰς ὅ	A	A	NR	PST	Ob
2 Tim 1:12	δι' ἥν	A	B	-	-	
2 Tim 1:12	ᾧ	D	S	-	-	
2 Tim 1:13	ὧν	G	A	R	PST	DO
2 Tim 1:15	ὧν	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
2 Tim 2:2	ἅ	A	S	-	-	
2 Tim 2:2	οἵτινες	N	A	R	PST	Su
2 Tim 2:7	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
2 Tim 2:9	ἐν ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
2 Tim 2:17	ὧν	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
2 Tim 2:18	οἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
2 Tim 2:20	ἅ μὲν	N	L	-	-	
2 Tim 2:20	ἅ δὲ	N	L	-	-	
2 Tim 3:8	ὅν	A	B	-	-	
2 Tim 3:14	οἷς	D	S	-	-	
2 Tim 4:8	ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
2 Tim 4:13	ὅν	A	A	R	PST	DO
2 Tim 4:15	ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
2 Tim 4:18	ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Titus 1:2	ἥν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Titus 1:3	ὅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
Titus 1:11	οὕς	A	A	NR	PST	Ob
Titus 1:11	οἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	RP
Titus 1:11	ἅ	A	S	-	-	
Titus 1:13	δι' ἥν	A	B	-	-	
Titus 2:1	ἅ	A	S	-	-	
Titus 2:14	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Titus 3:5	ἅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
Titus 3:6	οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	DO
Phlm 5	ἥν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Phlm 10	ὅν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Phlm 12	ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Phlm 13	Ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Phlm 21	ἅ	A	S	-	-	
Heb 1:2	ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Heb 1:2	δι' οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
Heb 1:3	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Heb 2:3	ἥτις	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Heb 2:5	περὶ ἧς	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
Heb 2:10	δι' ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	Ob
Heb 2:10	δι' οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
Heb 2:11	δι' ἥν	A	B	-	-	
Heb 2:13	ἅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
Heb 2:18	ἐν ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Heb 3:6	οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	DO
Heb 3:9	οὗ	G	B	-	-	
Heb 3:13	ἄχρις οὗ	G	B	-	-	
Heb 3:17	ὧν	G	A	NR	PST	Po
Heb 4:13	πρὸς ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	Ob
Heb 5:7	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Heb 5:8	ὧν	G	S	-	-	
Heb 5:11	Περὶ οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
Heb 6:7	δι' οὕς	A	A	R	IHRC	Ob
Heb 6:8	ἧς	G	A	NR	PST	Po
Heb 6:10	ἧς	G	A	R	PST	DO
Heb 6:17	ἐν ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Heb 6:18	ἐν οἷς	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Heb 6:19	ἥν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Heb 7:2	ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	IO
Heb 7:2	ὅ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Heb 7:4	ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	IO
Heb 7:13	ἐφ' ὅν	A	S	-	-	
Heb 7:13	ἀφ' ἧς	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
Heb 7:14	εἰς ἥν	A	A	R	IHRC	Ob
Heb 7:16	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Heb 7:19	δι' ἧς	G	A	NR	PST	Ob

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	RP
Heb 7:27	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Heb 8:1	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Heb 8:2	ἥν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Heb 8:3	ὅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
Heb 8:5	οἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Heb 8:6	ἥτις	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Heb 8:9	ἥν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Heb 8:10	ἥν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Heb 9:2	ἐν ᾗ	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Heb 9:2	ἥτις	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Heb 9:4	ἐν ᾗ	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Heb 9:5	περὶ ὧν	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
Heb 9:7	ὅ	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Heb 9:9	ἥτις	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Heb 9:9	καθ' ἥν	A	A	NR	PST	Ob
Heb 9:14	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Heb 9:20	ἧς	G	A	R	PST	DO
Heb 10:1	ἅς	A	A	R	PST	DO
Heb 10:8	αἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Heb 10:10	ἐν ᾧ	D	A	NR	IHRC	Ob
Heb 10:11	αἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Heb 10:16	ἥν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Heb 10:20	ἥν	A	A	R	IHRC	DO
Heb 10:29	ἐν ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Heb 10:32	ἐν αἷς	D	A	R	PST	Ob
Heb 10:35	ἥτις	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Heb 11:4	δι' ἧς	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
Heb 11:7	δι' ἧς	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
Heb 11:8	ὅν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Heb 11:10	ἧς	G	A	NR	PST	Po
Heb 11:15	ἀφ' ἧς	G	A	R	PST	Ob
Heb 11:18	πρὸς ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	Ob
Heb 11:29	ἧς	G	A	NR	PST	DO
Heb 11:33	οἵ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Heb 11:38	ὧν	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
Heb 12:2	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Heb 12:5	ἥτις	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Heb 12:6	ὅν	A	S	-	-	
Heb 12:6	ὅν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Heb 12:7	ὅν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Heb 12:8	ἧς	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
Heb 12:14	οὗ χωρὶς	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
Heb 12:16	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	RP
Heb 12:19	ἧς	G	A	R	PST	DO
Heb 12:26	οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	Po
Heb 12:28	δι' ἧς	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
Heb 13:7	οἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Heb 13:7	ὧν	G	A	NR	PST	Po
Heb 13:9	ἐν οἷς	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Heb 13:10	ἐξ οὗ	G	A	R	PST	Ob
Heb 13:11	ὧν	G	A	R	IHRC	Po
Heb 13:21	ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Heb 13:23	μεθ' οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
Jas 1:12	ὅς	N	A	R	PST	Su
Jas 1:12	ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Jas 1:17	παρ' ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Jas 2:5	ἧς	G	A	R	PST	DO
Jas 2:10	ὅστις	N	S	-	-	
Jas 4:4	ὅς ἐάν	N	S	-	-	
Jas 4:5	ὅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
Jas 4:13	οἱ λέγοντες	N/V	S	-	AP	
Jas 4:14	οἵτινες	N	B	-	-	
Jas 5:10	οἵ	N	A	?	PST	Su
1 Pet 1:6	ἐν ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
1 Pet 1:8	ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
1 Pet 1:8	εἰς ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	Ob
1 Pet 1:10	περὶ ἧς	G	A	NR	IHRC	Ob
1 Pet 1:12	οἷς	D	A	NR	PST	IO
1 Pet 1:12	ἅ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
1 Pet 1:12	εἰς ἅ	A	A	NR	PST	Ob
1 Pet 2:4	πρὸς ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	Ob
1 Pet 2:7	ὅν	A	A	R	PST	DO
1 Pet 2:8	οἵ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
1 Pet 2:8	εἰς ὅ	A	A	NR	PST	Ob
1 Pet 2:10	οἵ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
1 Pet 2:11	αἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
1 Pet 2:12	ἐν ᾧ	D	S	-	-	
1 Pet 2:22	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
1 Pet 2:23	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
1 Pet 2:24	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
1 Pet 2:24	οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	Po
1 Pet 3:3	ὧν	G	A	NR	IHRC	Po
1 Pet 3:4	ὅ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
1 Pet 3:6	ἧς	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
1 Pet 3:16	ἐν ᾧ	D	S	-	-	
1 Pet 3:19	ἐν ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	Ob

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	RP
1 Pet 3:20	εἰς ἣν	A	A	NR	PST	Ob
1 Pet 3:21	ὅ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
1 Pet 3:22	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
1 Pet 4:4	ἐν ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
1 Pet 4:5	οἳ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
1 Pet 4:11	ἧς	G	A	R	PST	DO
1 Pet 4:11	ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
1 Pet 5:9	ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	DO
1 Pet 5:12	εἰς ἣν	A	A	NR	PST	Ob
2 Pet 1:4	δι' ὧν	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
2 Pet 1:9	ᾧ	D	S	-	-	
2 Pet 1:17	εἰς ὅν	A	A	NR	PST	Ob
2 Pet 1:19	ᾧ	D	A	NR	PST	DO
2 Pet 1:19	ἕως οὗ	G	B	-	-	
2 Pet 2:1	οἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
2 Pet 2:2	δι' οὓς	A	A	NR	PST	Ob
2 Pet 2:3	οἷς	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
2 Pet 2:12	ἐν οἷς	D	S	-	-	
2 Pet 2:15	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
2 Pet 2:17	οἷς	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
2 Pet 2:19	ᾧ	D	S	-	-	
2 Pet 3:1	ἐν αἷς	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
2 Pet 3:4	ἀφ' ἧς	G	B	-	-	
2 Pet 3:6	δι' ὧν	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
2 Pet 3:10	ἐν ᾗ	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
2 Pet 3:12	δι' ἣν	A	B	-	-	
2 Pet 3:13	ἐν οἷς	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
2 Pet 3:16	ἐν αἷς	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
2 Pet 3:16	ἃ	A	A	NR	PST	DO
1 John 1:1	Ὃ	N	S	-	-	
1 John 1:1	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
1 John 1:1	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
1 John 1:1	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
1 John 1:2	ἥτις	N	A	NR	PST	Su
1 John 1:3	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
1 John 1:5	ἣν	A	A	R	PST	DO
1 John 2:5	ὃς δ' ἂν	N	S	-	-	
1 John 2:7	ἣν	A	A	R	PST	DO
1 John 2:7	ὃν	A	A	R	PST	DO
1 John 2:8	ὅ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
1 John 2:24	ὃ	A	S	-	-	
1 John 2:24	ὃ	A	S	-	-	
1 John 2:25	ἣν	A	A	R	PST	DO

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	RP
1 John 2:27	ὅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
1 John 3:11	ἥν	A	A	R	PST	DO
1 John 3:17	ὃς δ' ἂν	N	S	-	-	
1 John 3:22	ὃ ἐὰν	A	S	-	-	
1 John 3:24	οὗ	G	A	R	PST	DO
1 John 4:2	ὃ	N	A	R	PST	Su
1 John 4:3	ὃ	N	A	R	PST	Su
1 John 4:3	ὃ	A	A	NR	PST	DO
1 John 4:6	ὃς	N	S	-	-	
1 John 4:15	Ὃς ἐὰν	N	S	-	-	
1 John 4:16	ἥν	A	A	R	PST	DO
1 John 4:20	ὃν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
1 John 4:20	ὃν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
1 John 5:10	ἥν	A	A	R	PST	DO
1 John 5:14	ἥν	A	A	R	PST	DO
1 John 5:15	ὃ ἐὰν	A	S	-	-	
1 John 5:15	ἃ	A	A	R	PST	DO
2 John 1	οὓς	A	A	NR	PST	DO
2 John 5	ἥν	A	S	-	-	
2 John 8	ἃ	A	S	-	-	
3 John 1	ὃν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
3 John 5	ὃ ἐὰν	A	S	-	-	
3 John 6	οἳ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
3 John 6	οὓς	A	A	NR	PST	DO
3 John 10	ἃ	A	A	R	PST	DO
Jude 13	οἷς	D	A	NR	PST	Ob
Jude 15	ὧν	G	A	R	PST	DO
Jude 15	ὧν	G	A	R	PST	DO
Jude 22	οὓς μὲν	A	L	-	-	
Jude 23	οὓς δὲ	A	L	-	-	
Jude 23	οὓς δὲ	A	L	-	-	
Rev 1:1	ἥν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Rev 1:1	ἃ	A	S	-	-	
Rev 1:2	ὃς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Rev 1:4	ἃ	N	A	R	PST	Su
Rev 1:7	οἵτινες	N	S	-	-	
Rev 1:11	ὃ	A	S	-	-	
Rev 1:12	ἥτις	N	A	R	PST	Su
Rev 1:19	ἃ	A	S	-	-	
Rev 1:19	ἃ	N	S	-	-	
Rev 1:19	ἃ	N	S	-	-	
Rev 1:20	οὓς	A	A	R	PST	DO
Rev 2:6	ἃ	A	A	NR	PST	DO

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	RP
Rev 2:7	ὅ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Rev 2:8	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Rev 2:10	ἅ	A	S	-	-	
Rev 2:13	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Rev 2:14	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Rev 2:17	ὅ	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Rev 2:24	οἵτινες	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Rev 2:25	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
Rev 2:25	ἄχρι[ς] οὗ	G	B	-	-	
Rev 3:2	ἅ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Rev 3:4	ἅ	N	A	R	PST	Su
Rev 3:8	ἥν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Rev 3:11	ὅ	A	S	-	-	
Rev 4:1	ἥν	A	A	NR	PST	DO
Rev 4:1	ἅ	A	S	-	-	
Rev 4:5	ἅ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Rev 5:6	οἵ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Rev 5:8	αἵ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Rev 5:13	ὅ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Rev 6:9	ἥν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Rev 7:2	οἷς	D	A	R	PST	IO
Rev 7:9	ὅν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Rev 8:2	οἵ	N	A	R	PST	Su
Rev 9:4	οἵτινες	N	A	R	PST	Su
Rev 9:20	οἵ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Rev 9:20	ἅ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Rev 10:4	ἅ	A	S	-	-	
Rev 10:5	ὅν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Rev 10:6	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Rev 10:8	ἥν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Rev 11:8	ἥτις	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Rev 12:5	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Rev 12:13	ἥτις	N	A	R	PST	Su
Rev 12:16	ὅν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Rev 13:2	ὅ	A	A	R	PST	DO
Rev 13:8	οὗ	G	A	R	PST	Po
Rev 13:12	οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	Po
Rev 13:14	ἅ	N	A	R	PST	DO
Rev 13:14	ὅς	N	A	R	PST	Su
Rev 14:2	ἥν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Rev 14:4	οἵ	N	S	-	-	
Rev 14:8	ἥ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Rev 16:14	ἅ	N	A	NR	PST	Su

Verse	Text	Case	Fnctn	Rest	Ptrn	RP
Rev 16:18	ἀφ' οὗ	G	B	-	-	
Rev 17:2	μεθ' ἧς	G	A	NR	PST	Ob
Rev 17:8	ὃ	A	A	R	PST	DO
Rev 17:8	ὧν	G	A	R	PST	Po
Rev 17:11	ὃ ἦν	N	A	R	PST	Su
Rev 17:12	ἃ	A	A	R	PST	DO
Rev 17:12	οἵτινες	N	A	R	PST	Su
Rev 17:15	ἃ	A	A	R	PST	DO
Rev 17:15	οὗ	G	B	-	-	
Rev 17:16	ἃ	A	A	R	PST	DO
Rev 17:18	ἣν	A	A	R	PST	DO
Rev 18:6	ᾧ	D	A	R	PST	DO
Rev 18:19	ἐν ᾗ	D	A	R	PST	Ob
Rev 19:2	ἥτις	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Rev 19:12	ὃ	A	A	R	PST	DO
Rev 19:20	ἐν οἷς	D	A	R	PST	Ob
Rev 20:2	ὅς	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Rev 20:4	οἵτινες	N	S	-	-	
Rev 20:8	ὧν	G	A	NR	PST	Po
Rev 20:11	οὗ	G	A	NR	PST	Po
Rev 20:12	ὃ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Rev 21:8	ὃ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Rev 21:12	ἃ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Rev 21:17	ὃ	N	A	NR	PST	Su
Rev 22:6	ἃ	A	S	-	-	

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aland, Barbara, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger, eds. *Novum Testamentum Graece.* Nestle-Aland. 27th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgeksellschaft, 1998.

Aland, Kurt and Barbara Aland. *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism.* Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1995.

Alexander, T. Desmond and Brian S. Rosner. *New Dictionary of Biblical Theology.* Electronic ed. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2001.

Alexiadou, Artemis, Paul Law, Andre Meinunger and Chris Wilder, eds. *The Syntax of Relative Clauses.* Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2000.

Andrews, Avery D. "The Major Functions of the Noun Phrase," in *Language Typology and Syntactic Description. Vol. 1: Clause Structure.* 2d. ed.; Edited by Timothy Shopen; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Bache, Carl, and Leif Kvistgaard Jakobsen. "On the Distinction Between Restrictive and Non-restrictive Relative Clauses in Modern English," *Lingua* 52 (1980): 243–67.

Bailey, Kenneth. "Middle Eastern Oral Tradition and the Synoptic Gospels." *Expository Times* 106 (1995): 363–67.

Bakke, Ray. *A Theology As Big As The City.* Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1997.

Barcelona Sánchez, Antonio. "Partitive Restrictive Modification of Names in English: Arguments for Their Metonymic Motivation." *Quaderns de Filologia. Estudis Lingüistics* 19 (2009): 33–56.

Bauer, Walter, Frederick W. Danker, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature.* 3d ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Beyer, Klaus. *Semitische Syntax im Neuen Testament. Bd. 1, Satzlehre.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968.

BibleWorks 7: Software for Biblical Exegesis and Research. Norfolk, Va.: BibleWorks, LLC, 2006.

Bickford, J. Albert. *Tools for Analyzing the World's Languages: Morphology and Syntax.* Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1998.

368

Bimson, J. J., J. P. Kane, J. H. Paterson, D. J. Weisman and D. R. W. Wood, eds. *New Bible Atlas*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1985.

Black, David Alan, Katharine Barnwell, and Stephen Levinsohn. *Linguistics and New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Discourse Analysis*. Nashville: Broadman, 1992.

Black, David Alan. "The Study of New Testament Greek in the Light of Ancient and Modern Linguistics." Pages 230–52 in *Interpreting the New Testament: Essays on Methods and Issues*. Edited by David Alan Black and David S. Dockery. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2001.

Blass, Friedrich Wilhelm. *Grammar of New Testament Greek*. Trans. by Henry St. John Thackerary. Rev. and enl. ed. London: Macmillan, 1911.

Blass, Friedrich, and Albert Debrunner. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature: A Translation and Revision of the Ninth–Tenth German Edition Incorporating Supplementary Notes of A. Debrunner*. Trans. and rev. ed. by Robert W. Funk. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Boas, Hans. "Deep and Surface Structure Problems of Restrictive and Non-restrictive Constructions." *Folia Linguistica* 21 (1977): 39–56.

Bock, Darrell L. *Luke. Volume 1*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books, 1994.

Borsley, Robert D. "Relatives Clauses and the Theory of Phrase Structure." *Linguistic Inquiry* 28 (1997): 629–47.

Boyer, James L. "The Classification of Participles: A Statistical Study." *Grace Theological Journal* 5 (1984): 163–79.

———. "Relative Clauses in the Greek New Testament: A Statistical Study." *Grace Theological Journal* 9 (1988): 233–56.

———. *Supplemental Manual of Information: Participles*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Boyer, 1986.

———. *Supplemental Manual of Information: Relative Clauses*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Boyer, 1988.

Bright, William, ed. *International Encyclopedia of Linguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Brown, Keith, ed. *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. 2d ed; Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2006.

Burton, Ernest De Witt. *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek*. 3d ed.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1898; repr., 1955.

Butt, John and Carmen Benjamin. *A New Reference Grammar of Modern Spanish*. 4th ed.; San Francisco: McGraw-Hill, 2004.

Cadbury, Henry Joel. "The Relative Pronouns in Acts and Elsewhere." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 42 (1923): 150–57.

Caragounis, Chrys C. *The Development of Greek and the New Testament: Morphology, Syntax, Phonology, and Textual Transmission*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 167. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.

Carlson, Greg N. "Amount Relatives." *Language* 53 (1977): 520–42.

Chatsiou, Aikaterini. "A Lexical Functional Grammar Approach to Modern Greek Relative Clauses." Ph.D. diss., University of Essex, 2010.

Comrie, Bernard. *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology: Syntax and Morphology*. 2d ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.

Crystal, David. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. 4th ed. Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell, 1997.

Crystal, David. *A First Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview, 1980.

Crystal, David. *An Encyclopedic Dictionary of Language and Languages*. Vol. 3. Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell, 1992.

Culy, Martin M. "A Typology of Koine Relative Clauses." Pages 67–92 in vol. 33 of *Work Papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics*, University of North Dakota, 1989.

———. "Distinguishing Adjectival and Adverbial Participles." *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 30 (2003): 441–53.

Cyril of Alexandria. *Commentary on John*. Vol. 1. Edited by Joel C. Elowsky. Translated by David Maxwell. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2013.

Dana, H. E., and Julius R. Mantey. *A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament*. New York: Macmillan, 1927.

De Vries, Mark. "The Syntax of Appositive Relativization," *Linguistic Inquiry* 37 (2006): 229–70.

Downing, Bruce T. "Some Universals of Relative Clause Structure." Pages 375–418 in *Universals of Human Language*. Edited by Joseph Harold Greenberg. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1978.

Drosdowski, Günther, ed. *Duden, Grammatik Der Deutschen Gegenwartssprache*, 5th ed. Mannheim: Bibliographisches Institut & F.A. Brockhaus AG, 1995.

Dryer, Matthew S. "Noun Phrase Structure," in *Language Typology and Syntactic Descriiption. Vol II: Complex Constructions*. 2d ed.; Edited by Timothy Shopen: New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Duval, F. Alan. *Moderne Deutsche Sprachlehre*. New York: Random House, 1967.

Eliger, Karl and Wilhelm Rudolph, eds. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. 5th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997.

Elson, Benjamin F. and Velma B. Pickett, *Beginning Morphology and Syntax*. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1988.

Emonds, Joseph. "Appositive Relatives Have No Properties." *Linguistic Inquiry* 10 (1979): 211–43.

Fox, Barbara. "The Discourse Function of the Participle in Ancient Greek." Pages 23–41 in *Discourse Perspectives on Syntax*. Edited by Flora Klein-Andreu. New York: Academic, 1983.

Funk, Robert Walter. *A Beginning-Intermediate Grammar of Hellenistic Greek 2. Syntax*. Missoula, Mont.: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973.

Gilliard, Frank D. "The Problem of the Antisemitic Comma Between 1 Thessalonians 2.14 and 15." *New Testament Studies* 35 (1989): 481–502.

Givón, Talmy. *Syntax: A Functional-Typological Introduction*. 2 Vols. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1984–1990.

Grohmann, Kleanthes K. "Clause." Pages 210–11 in *Encyclopedia of Linguistics Vol. 1*. Edited by Philipp Stranzy. New York: Fitzroy Dearborn, 2005.

Grosu, Alexander. "Type-Resolution in Relative Constructions." Pages 83–119 in *The Syntax of Relative Clauses*. Edited by Artemis Alexiadou, Paul Law, Andre Meinunger and Chris Wilder; Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2000.

Guthrie, George H. "Discourse Analysis." Pages 253–71 in *Interpreting the New Testament: Essays on Methods and Issues*. Edited by David Alan Black and David S. Dockery. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2001.

Harris, R. Laird, Gleason L. Archer Jr. and Bruce K. Waltke. *The Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*. Chicago: Moody, 1980.

Haussamen, Brock. "Between Restrictive and Nonrestrictive: Amplifying Clauses." Williamsport, Penn.: NCTE Assembly for the Teaching of English Grammar, 1995.

———. *Revising the Rules: Traditional Grammar and Modern Linguistics*. 2d ed. and rev. printing. Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt, 2000.

Hawthorne, Gerald F., Ralph P. Martin, and Daniel G.Reid. *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1993.

Healey, Phyllis, and Allen Healey. "Greek Circumstantial Participles: Tracking Participants with Participles in the Greek New Testament." *Occasional Papers in Translation and Textlinguistics* 4 (1990): 177–259.

Holmes, Michael W. ed. *The Greek New Testament: SBL Edition*. Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010.

Holton, David, Peter Mackridge, Vassilios Spyropoulos and Irene Philippaki-Warburton. *Greek: A Comprehensive Grammar*. 2d ed. New York: Routledge, 2012.

The Holy Bible: English Standard Version. Crossway Bibles, 2007.

The Holy Bible: New International Version. Colorado Springs, International Bible Society, 1984.

The Holy Bible in Today's Greek Version with Deuterocanonicals. New York: American Bible Society, 2011.

Hurtjen, André. *The Longman Dictionary of Spanish Grammar and Idioms*. White Plains, N.Y.: Longman, 1991.

Institut für Neutestamentliche Textforschung, ed. *Novum Testamentum Graecum editio critica maior.*, IV: Die katholische Briefe. 1. Lieferung: Der Jakobusbrief. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997.

————, ed. *Novum Testamentum Graecum editio critica maior.*, IV: Die katholische Briefe. 2. Lieferung: Der Petrusbriefe. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2000.

————, ed. *Novum Testamentum Graecum editio critica maior.*, IV: Die katholische Briefe. 3. Lieferung: Der 1. Johannesbrief. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2003.

————, ed. *Novum Testamentum Graecum editio critica maior* . IV: Die katholische Briefe. 4. Lieferung: Zweite und Dritte Johannesbrief. Der Judasbrief. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2005.

Ioannidis, Symeon. *Discipleship New Testament in Modern Greek*. Chattanooga, Tenn.: AMG Publishers, 2011.

Jackendoff, Ray. *X Syntax: A Study of Phrase Structure*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 1977.

Jackson, Howard. *Key Terms in Linguistics*. New York: Continuum, 2007.

Jespersen, Otto. *Essentials of English Grammar*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1956.

————. *The Philosophy of Grammar*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1968.

Johnston, J. William. *The Use of Πᾶς in the New Testament*. New York: Lang, 2004

Just, Arthur A. *Luke 9:51–24:53*. St. Louis, Mo.: Concordia, 1997.

Karleen, Paul S. "The Syntax of the Participle in the Greek New Testament." Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1980.

Keenan, Edward L. "Relative Clauses" Pages 141–70 in *Language Typology and Syntactic Desxription Vol 2. Complex Constructions*. Edited by Timothy Shopen. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Keenan, Edward L. and Bernard Comrie, "Data on the Noun Phrase Accessibility Hierarchy," *Language* 55 (1979): 333–51.

————. "Noun Phrase Accessibility and Universal Grammar." *Linguistic Inquiry* 8 (1977): 63–99.

Kolln, Martha. *Rhetorical Grammar: Grammatical Choices, Rhetorical Effects*. New York: Longman, 2003.

Kroeger, Paul R. *Analyzing Syntax: A Lexical-Functional Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Künzl-Snodgrass, Annemarie. *Upgrade Your German*. London: Arnold, 2003.

Lazarus, Arnold, Andrew MacLeish, and H. Wendell Smith, *Modern English: A Glossary of Literature and Language*. New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1972.

Leedy, Randy, A. *BibleWorks New Testament Greek Sentence Diagrams* in *BibleWorks 7: Software for Biblical Exegesis and Research*. Norfolk, VA: BibleWorks, LLC, 2006.

Lehmann, Christian. *Der Relativsatz*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1984.

————. "On the Typology of Relative Clauses," *Linguistics* 24 (1986): 663–80.

————. "Relative Clauses." Pages 460–62 in *International Encyclopedia of Linguistics Vol. 3, Mande Languages—Selection*. Edited by William Frawley. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Levinsohn, Stephen H. *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek: A Coursebook on the Information Structure of New Testament Greek*. 2d ed. Dallas: SIL International, 2000.

Louw, J. P. "Linguistic Theory and the Greek Case System." *Acta Classica* 9 (1966): 73–88.

Louw, Johannes E. and Eugene A. Nida. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains*. New York: United Bible Societies, 1989.

Lucas, Michael A. "The Surface Structure of Relative Clauses." *Linguistics* 139 (1974): 83–120.

Luther, Martin. "To The Councilmen of All Cities in Germany That They Establish and Maintain Christian Schools," in *The Christian in Society II.* Edited by Walther I. Brandt; vol. 45 of *Luther's Works,* Edited by Helmut T. Lehman; Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1962.

Lutz, Gary, and Diane Stevenson. *The Writer's Digest Grammar Desk Reference.* Cincinnati: Writer's Digest Books, 2005.

Macdonald, William Graham. *Greek Enchiridion: A Concise Handbook of Grammar for Translation and Exegesis.* Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1986.

Maloney, Elliott C. *Semitic Interference in Marcan Syntax.* Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1981.

Marshall, I. Howard. *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.

Matthews, Peter H. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Metaglottisis Greek New Testament. Spiridon Karalis, 2004.

Moo, Douglas J. *The NIV Application Commentary: Romans.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000.

Moule, C. F. D. *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959.

Mueller, Theodore H. *New Testament Greek: A Case Grammar Approach.* Fort Wayne, Ind.: Concordia Theological Seminary Press, 1978.

Neale-Silva, Eduardo, and John M. Lipski. *El Español En Sintesis.* New York: CBS College Publishing, 1981.

New American Standard Bible. La Habra, Calif.: Lockman Foundation, 1995.

Nikolaeva, Irina. "Relative Clauses." Pages 501–8 in *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics Vol. 10.* Edited by Keith Brown. 2d ed.; Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2006.

Novum Testamentum Graecum: Editio Critica Maior. Stuttgart: Deutsch. Bibelgesell, 1997.

Palmer, Micheal W. *Levels of Constituent Structure in New Testament Greek.* New York: Lang, 1995.

Pei, Mario A., and Frank Gaynor. *A Dictionary of Linguistics.* New York: Philosophical Library, 1954.

Perschbacher, Wesley J. *New Testament Greek Syntax: An Illustrated Manual.* Chicago: Moody, 1995.

Peters, Matthew. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Petzer, Kobus. "Style and Text in the Lucan Narrative of the Institution of the Lord's Supper (Luke 22.19–20)," *New Testament Studies* 37 (1991): 113–29.

Platzack, Christer. "A Complement-of-N⁰ Account of Restrictive and Non-Restrictive Relatives: The Case of Swedish." Pages 265–308 in *The Syntax of Relative Clauses*. Edited by Artemis Alexiadou, Paul Law, Andre Meinunger and Chris Wilder; Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2000.

Porter, Stanley E. "Greek Grammar and Syntax." Pages 76–103 in *The Face of New Testament Studies: A Survey of Recent Research*. Edited by Scot McKnight and Grant R. Osborne. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2004.

———. *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*. Biblical Languages: Greek 2. 2d ed. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994; repr. 1999.

———. "Studying Ancient Languages from a Modern Linguistic Perspective," *Fiología Neotestamentaria* 2 (1989): 147–72.

———. "Translation, Exegesis, and 1 Thessalonians 2.14–15: Could a Comma Have Changed the Course of History?" *The Bible Translator* 64 (2013): 82–98.

Porter, Stanley E., and D. A. Carson, eds. *Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics: Open Questions in Current Research*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993.

———, eds. *Discourse Analysis and Other Topics in Biblical Greek*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995.

Pountain, Christopher J. *Exploring The Spanish Language*. London: Arnold, 2003.

Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartvik, eds. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. New York: Longman, 1985.

Radermacher, Ludwig. *Neutestamentliche Grammatik: Das Griechisch des Neuen Testaments im Zusammenhang mit der Volkssprache*. Tübingen: Paul Siebeck, 1925.

Rijksbaron, Albert. "Relative Clause Formation in Ancient Greek." Pages 236–59 in *Predication and Expression in Functional Grammar*. Edited by M. Bolkestein et al. London: Academic, 1981.

Robertson, Archibald Thomas. *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*. Nashville: Broadman, 1934.

Robins, R. H. *A Short History of Linguistics*. 4th ed. London: Longman, 1997.

Robinson, Maurice A. and William G. Pierpont. *The New Testament in the Original Greek: Byzantine Textform*. Southborough, Mass: Chilton, 2005.

Rogers Jr., Cleon L. and Cleon L. Rogers III. *The New Linguistic and Exegetical Key to the Greek New Testament*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 1998.

La Santa Biblia, Antiguo y Nuevo Testamento, Antigua Version de Casiodoro de Reina. Miami: United Bible Society, 1995.

La Santa Biblia, Nueva Versión Internacional. Colorado Springs: International Bible Society, 1999.

Safir, Ken. "Relative Clauses in a Theory of Binding and Levels," *Linguistic Inquiry* 17 (1986): 663–89.

Saussure, Ferdinand de. *Course in General Linguistics*. Edited by Charles Bally and Albert Secheaye. Translated by Roy Harris. La Salle: Open Court, 1986.

Schachter, Paul. "Focus and Relativization." *Language* 49 (1973): 19–46.

Schmidt, Daryl. "Semitisms and Septuagintalisms in the Book of Revelation," *New Testament Studies* 37 (1991): 592–603.

Schwyzer, Eduard. *Griechische Grammatik: Auf der Grundlage von Karl Brugmanns Griechischer Grammatik*. 4 Vols. Munchen: Beck, 1939–1970.

Smyth, Herbert Weir. *Greek Grammar*. Rev. ed. by Gordon M. Messing, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984.

Solé, Yolanda R. and Carlos A. Solé. *Modern Spanish Syntax: A Study In Contrast*. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath & Company, 1977.

Spottorno, Victoria. "The Relative Pronoun in the New Testament." *New Testament Studies* 28 (1982): 132–41.

Swanson, Reuben, ed. *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines Against Codex Vaticanus: 1 Corinthians*. Wheaton, Ill.: Tyndale House, 2003.

————, ed. *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines Against Codex Vaticanus: Matthew*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995.

————, ed. *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines Against Codex Vaticanus: Mark*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995.

————, ed. *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines Against Codex Vaticanus: Luke*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995.

————, ed. *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines Against Codex Vaticanus: John.* Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995.

————, ed. *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines Against Codex Vaticanus: The Acts of the Apostles.* Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998.

————, ed. *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines Against Codex Vaticanus: Galatians.* Wheaton, Ill.: Tyndale House, 1999.

————, ed. *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines Against Codex Vaticanus: Romans.* Wheaton, Ill.: Tyndale House, 2001.

————, ed. *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines Against Codex Vaticanus: 2 Corinthians.* Wheaton, Ill.: Tyndale House, 2005.

Thayer, Joseph Henry, Carl Ludwig Wilibald Grimm, and Christian Gottlob Wilke.*Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Coded with Strong's Concordance Numbers.* Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson, 2003.

Thompson, Sandra Annear. "The Deep Structure of Relative Clauses." Pages 79–94 in *Studies in Linguistic Semantics.* Edited by Charles J. Fillmore and D. Terrence Langendoen; New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1971.

Touratier, Christian. *La Relative: Essai de théorie syntaxique.* Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1980.

Turner, Nigel. *Syntax.* Vol. 2 of *A Grammar of New Testament Greek.* Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1963.

Voelz, James W. *Fundamental Greek Grammar.* 2d ed. St. Louis: Concordia, 1993.

————. "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part II," *Concordia Journal* 32:3 (2006): 312–14.

————. "Grammarian's Corner: Participles, Part III," *Concordia Journal* 32:4 (2006): 401–3.

————. "The Greek of the New Testament: Its Place Within the Context of Hellenistic Greek," Pages 177–98 in *Greek: A Language in Evolution: Essays in Honour of Antonios N. Jannaris.* Edited by Chrys C. Caragounis; Hildesheim, Germany: Georg Olms, 2010.

————. "The Language of the New Testament." Pages 893–977 in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Romischen Welt. Volume 2.* Edited by Hildegard Temporini and Wolfgang Haase; New York: de Gruyter, 1984.

————. *What Does This Mean?* St. Louis: Concordia, 1995.

Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament.* Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 1996.

Wellens, Inneke Hilda Werner. *The Nubi Language of Uganda: An Arabic Creole in Africa*. Boston: Brill, 2005.

Westcott, Brooke Foss, and Fenton John Anthony Hort. *The New Testament in the Original Greek*. Cambridge: Macmillan, 1892.

———. *The Greek New Testament: with Comparative Apparatus Showing Variations from the Nestle-Aland and Robinson-Pierpont Editions*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2007.

Wifstrand, Albert. *Epochs and Styles*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 179. Edited by Lars Rydbeck and Stanley E. Porter. Translated by Denis Searby. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.

Winer, George B. *A Treatise on the Grammar of New Testament Greek: Regarded as a Sure Basis for New Testament Exegesis*. Translated by W. F. Moulton. 3d rev. ed. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1882.

Yoder, James D. *Concordance to the Distinctive Greek Text of Codex Bezae*. Leiden: Brill, 1961.

Young, Richard A. *Intermediate New Testament Greek: A Linguistic and Exegetical Approach*. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1994.

Zerwick, Maximilian, and Joseph Smith. *Biblical Greek: Illustrated by Examples*. Rome: Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici, 1963.

Zerwick, Maximilian, and Mary Grosvenor. *A Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament*. 2 vols. Rome: Biblical Institute, 1979.

VITA

Michael Edward Hayes

May 31, 1974

Orange, California

Collegiate Institutions Attended

Concordia University, Seward, NE, B.A. Theology, 1997

Graduate Institutions Attended

Concordia University, Irvine, CA, M.A. Theology and Culture, 2003
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, MO, Ph.D. Exegetical Theology, 2014

Current Memberships in Academic Societies

Society of Biblical Literature
Evangelical Theological Society