Doctor of Philosophy Dissertation   Concordia Seminary Scholarship

Spring 5-20-2022

A Rank-Based Analysis of Word Order and Codification in the Greek of the Pastoral Epistles

James Fickenscher
fickenscherj@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholar.csl.edu/phd

Part of the Biblical Studies Commons

Recommended Citation

A RANK-BASED ANALYSIS OF WORD ORDER AND CODIFICATION IN THE GREEK
OF THE PASTORAL EPISTLES

_____

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
James Fickenscher
January, 2022

Approved by:	Dr. James W. Voelz	Dissertation Advisor
	Dr. Jeffrey Oschwald	Reader
	Dr. David R. Maxwell	Reader

For Rachel, my beloved bride, companion, and best friend. For Gabriella and Ian, my dear children, my sources of endless joy, and my greatest teachers in the Christian faith.

CONTENTS

TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

Series, Journals, and Commonly Cited Sources

AB   Anchor Bible Commentary

AnBib   Analecta Biblica

ANRW   Temporini, Hildegard, and Wolfgang Haase, eds. *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms in Spiegel der neueren Forschung*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1972–1997.

BBR   Bulletin for Biblical Research

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*. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

BDF   Blass, F., and A. Debrunner. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Translated and revised by Robert W. Funk. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

BHGNT   Baylor Handbook on the Greek New Testament

Bib   *Biblica*

BSac   *Bibliotheca Sacra*

BSR   *Bulletin for the Study of Religion*

BZNW   *Beiheifte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche*

CBET   Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology

CBQ   *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*

ConcC   Concordia Commentary

EC   *Early Christianity*

ECHC   Early Christianity in Its Hellenistic Context

EuroJTh   *European Journal of Theology*

EvQ   *Evangelical Quarterly*

ExAud   *Ex Auditu*

FCInt	Foundations of Contemporary Interpretation
FN	*Filología Neotestamentaria*
GötHögÅrs	*Göteborgs Högskalas Årsskrift*
GothStEng	Gothenburg Studies in English
GRBS	*Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies*
ICC	International Critical Commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JETS	*Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*
JSNT	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series
JSPHL	*Journal for the Study of Paul and His Letters*
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
LBS	Linguistic Biblical Studies
LEC	Library of Early Christianity
L-N	Louw, Johannes P., and Eugene A. Nida. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains.* 2 vols. 2d ed. New York: United Bible Societies, 1989.
LNTS	Library of New Testament Studies
MnBCBSup	*Mnemosyne: Bibliotheca Classica Batava, Supplementum*
NA[28]	Aland, Barbara, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M Metzger, eds. *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Nestle-Aland. 28th rev. ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012.
Neot	*Neotestamentica*
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
NovT	*Novum Testamentum*

NTL	New Testament Library
NTM	New Testament Monographs
NTS	*New Testament Studies*
PAST	Pauline Studies
PRSt	*Perspectives in Religious Studies*
ResQ	*Restoration Quarterly*
RSR	*Religious Studies Review*
SBG	Studies in Biblical Greek
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLRBS	SBL Resources for Biblical Study
SCJ	Stone-Campbell Journal
SD	Studies and Documents
SNTG	Studies in New Testament Greek
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SBLit	Studies in Biblical Literature
StGLLund	Studia Graeca et Latina Lundensia
TheoColl	SPCK Theological Collections
TNTC	Tyndale New Testament Commentaries
TQ	*Theologische Quartalschrift*
TJ	*Trinity Journal*
UBSMS	United Bible Societies Monograph Series
VC	*Vigiliae Christianiae*
WLQ	*Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly*
WUNT	*Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament*
ZNW	*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche*

Common Abbreviations for Analysis

a   Definite Article in Word Group Analysis

A   Adjunct Word Group in Clausal Analysis

A-Adv   Adjunct Word Group Consisting of One or More Adverbs, by Part of Speech

A-CU   Adjunct Word Group Consisting of a Nominal Group with Adverbial Case Usage

A-PP   Prepositional Phrase Functioning as an Adjunct Word Group

Adj   Adjective, as Part of Speech

C   Complement Word Group

C-DO   Complement Word Group Functioning as a Direct Object

C-IO   Complement Word Group Functioning as an Indirect Object

C-OP   Complement Word Group Functioning as the Object of the Prepositional Phrase

C-PN   Complement Word Group Functioning as Predicate to a Copulative Verb

Cj   Conjunction, as Part of Speech

Cj-H   Conjunction, as Part of Speech, in a Hypotactic Clause

Cj-P   Conjunction, as Part of Speech, in a Paratactic Clause

DPn   Demonstrative Pronoun, as Part of Speech

FV-H   Finite Verb, as Grammatical Form, in a Hypotactic Clause

FV-P   Finite Main Verb, as Grammatical Form, in a Paratactic Clause

HC-Cj   Clause in hypotaxis due to a hypotactic conjunction

HC-ptc Predicate participle clause functioning as a hypotactic clause

inf   Infinitive, as Grammatical Form, or, in Clausal Analysis, an Infinitive Clause

        Functioning as or within a Word Group or Clausal Element

KG   Koine Greek

N   Noun, as Part of Speech

NTG   New Testament Greek

P   Predicator Word Group

PE   Pastoral Epistles

Pn   Personal Pronoun, as Part of Speech

PP   Prepositional Phrase

Pr   Preposition, as Part of Speech

ptc   Participle, as Grammatical Form, or, in Clausal Analysis a Predicate Participle

         Clause Functioning as a Hypotactic Clause

Q   Qualifier Word Group

rel   Relative Pronoun, as Part of Speech, or, in Clausal Analysis, a Relative Clause

         Functioning as or within a Word Group or Clausal Element

S   Subject Word Group

SFG   Systemic Functional Grammar

V   Verbal Form, as Part of Speech

ABSTRACT

Fickenscher, James W. A Rank-Based Analysis of Word Order and Codification in the Greek of the Pastoral Epistles. Ph.D. diss., Concordia Seminary, 2022. 569 pp.

The relationship of word order and clausal structures with meaning, literary style, and authorial considerations in New Testament Greek is an often underdeveloped yet important field for reading, understading, and interpreting the New Testament text. Navigating between a grammatical-historical and historical-critical reading of the New Testament, this dissertation analyzes the phenomena of word order and clausal structures afresh through the lens of systemic functional grammar, following the work of Michael Halliday. This project contributes a preliminary step forward in constructing a method that can account for and understand the purpose of word order patterns and variance from those patterns within New Testament Greek without presuming that variations are simply for emphasis or that they arise from *a priori* assumptions of an historical or authorial nature behind the text. As an initial test case, this dissertation explores the Pastoral Epistles, chosen due to their similarity in content, genre, and register, constructing a linguistic profile for each work that includes the codified patterns of word order and structure on the ranks of larger sections of text, individual clauses, and word groups within each clause that have a discrete, syntactical function. It is shown that a fuller understanding of word order, especially where variations or marked syntax occurs, both contributes to an overall analysis of the text, including issues of textual criticism and interpretation, as well as identifies multiple causes for changes in word order beyond simple emphasis. The phenomenon of rank shift, where a clause functions as a single, syntactical element within another clause, also impacts expected patterns of word order and clausal structure. This study then compares the linguistic profiles of Pastoral Epistles to one another and to other select texts of the New Testament, demonstrating both areas of general consistency and difference between the works. This suggests that some patterns under investigation are likely not significant for inter-textual discussions of literary style, provenance, or register, but many areas of word order do have potential import for larger analysis of literary or historical considerations as they are manifested within each work on a strictly linguistic basis.

CHAPTER ONE

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE LINGUISTIC STUDY OF THE PASTORAL EPISTLES

This dissertation explores the use of Koine Greek (KG) on a stylistic and linguistic level within the Pastoral Epistles (PE), especially with regard to word order, syntactical relationships, and clausal structures. Following the work of Michael Halliday, this exploration results in the codification of different patterns and structures within the letters in order to establish a linguistic profile for each work and thereby provide a basis for both internal comparison within the Pastoral Epistles and external comparison to other works of the New Testament. To conclude the study, a comparison between the linguistic profiles of the Pastoral Epistles is made, followed by a preliminary external comparison to test cases within the Pauline Corpus and Acts.

The Thesis

The Pastoral Epistles 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, and Titus each utilize KG in ways that demonstrate both similarity and divergence on a strictly linguistic basis. For many, the PE stand apart from other New Testament works as a single unit, as their use of vocabulary and various theological concepts differ from the Gospels, Acts, and most importantly the Pauline corpus. A closer analysis of use of KG in the PE that moves beyond mere lexical comparison, however, reveals deeper yet specific and recurrent patterns and structures within them. Such patterns and structures are necessary for a rigorous linguistic analysis of the PE and will thereby aid in text-critical analysis and interpretation of the letters in themselves, as well as provide a basis for comparison with the linguistic profiles of other New Testament books both for intertextual interpretation and for open questions driven by historical considerations.

The Current Status of the Question

1

The Language of the Pastoral Epistles and New Testament Scholarship: An Overview

Many questions remain regarding the nature of the relationship between the PE and the other works of the New Testament, especially as compared to the other works of the Pauline Corpus.[1] While noticing that the PE have distinctive theological and lexical content among the Pauline Corpus is certainly nothing new to the modern era,[2] beginning in the early 19th century AD scholars asserted that such differences in diction, theology,[3] ecclesiology, and Greek style from the rest of the Pauline Corpus were best explained by the idea that the Apostle Paul did not compose the PE. Fully exploring the history of scholarship regarding the authorship of the PE is beyond the scope of this study, but some comments concerning this issue are appropriate as they pertain to the larger methodology and nature of comparing the PE to the other works of the Pauline Corpus.

The modern objection to the authenticity of the PE that still holds much sway was articulated at length by J.H. Holtzmann in 1880 and summarized in six major points by Martin

---

[1] The term Pauline Corpus will be used in this project in reference to the whole of the thirteen letters of the New Testament typically attributed to Paul, regardless of one's view of the authorship of individual epistles.

[2] For some brief overviews of the earliest use and interpretation of the PE in the Christian Church, see Raymond F. Collins, *1 & 2 Timothy and Titus*, NTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002), 1–11; Luke Timothy Johnson, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy*, AB 35A (New York: Doubleday, 2001), 20–30; or Philip H. Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 3–9. Particularly interesting are the rejection of 1 Timothy by Tatian and that of the PE as a whole by Marcion. See Jerome, *St. Jerome's Commentaries on Galatians, Titus, and Philemon*, trans. Thomas P. Scheck (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2010), 277–78 and F.F. Bruce, *The Canon of Scripture* (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 1988), 138–39. It is plausible that Marcion simply did not have the PE, as P^{46} also does not include them, but evidence of the PE in Polycarp and other fathers from the 2nd century CE such as Irenaeus suggest that the omission was intentional, as Tertullian also asserts. See Paul Hartog, *Polycarp and the New Testament*, WUNT 2/134 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 228–35 or Kenneth Berding, "Polycarp of Smyrna's View of the Authorship of 1 and 2 Timothy" *VC* 53 (1999): 349–60 for more discussion concerning the implications of Polycarp's use of the PE. At the very least, the omissions of one or all of the PE by Tatian and Marcion does intimate that already in the 2nd century CE these three letters were being differentiated in some way from other Pauline letters.

[3] While admittedly diction and theology are closely related, in that certain lexemes are precisely the vehicle for constructing theological arguments and by necessity bear theological connotation, here the distinction is made between word choice as individual lexemes and theology as a more holistic, relational construct of ideas.

Dibelius in 1913:

- There is a lack of strong testimony for inclusion from early manuscript evidence.

- Opponents and their arguments are handled differently than the other Pauline works.

- The events in Paul's life depicted in the PE are difficult to reconcile historically with the other New Testament works.

- The vocabulary and register of language differ from the Pauline Corpus.[4]

- The ecclesiastical structure is too developed to have been extant in Paul's time.[5]

- The letters appear to be imitations and developments of Pauline thought and theology.[6]

While the priority of the six points for determining authenticity varies from scholar to scholar,[7] what is significant to note with regard to the present study is that the modern view developed first from the single point on the language and style of the PE, 1 Timothy in particular. The study

---

[4] For a brief description of register, see James W. Voelz, *What Does This Mean?* 2nd ed (St. Louis: Concordia, 2003), 126–27; Matthew Brook O'Donnell, *Corpus Linguistics and the Greek of the New Testament*, NTM 6 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2005), 32–33, 115–37; or Stanley E. Porter, *Linguistic Analysis of the Greek New Testament: Studies in Tools, Methods, and Practice* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015), 145–57.

[5] For the quintessential argument on this issue, see Hans von Campenhausen, *Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries*, trans. J. A. Baker (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1969), 106–23. For responses to this argument, see especially Robert W. Wall, "The Function of the Pastoral Letters within the Pauline Canon of the New Testament: A Canonical Approach," in *The Pauline Canon*, ed. Stanley E. Porter, PAST 1 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 27–44; I. Howard Marshall, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999), 85–92; and Jakob van Bruggen, *Die geschichtliche Einordnung der Pastoralbriefe* (Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus, 1981). For an example of contemporary extension and application of this idea, see Michael Theobald, "*Von den Presbytern zum Episkopos (Tit 1,5-9): vom Umgang mit Spannungen und Widersprüchen im Corpus Pastorale*" ZNW 104 (2013): 209–37, arguing that the author of Titus is using the notion of *pater familias* to construct the office of the ἐπισκοπής as a dynamic authority structure from within the office of the πρεσβύτεροι. Oberlinner likewise argues for the PE as the continuation of the "*Haus-Modell*" of Pauline ecclesiology (Lorenz Oberlinner, "'*Paulus' Versus Paulus? Zum Problem des 'Paulinismus' der Pastoralbriefe*" in *Pneume und Gemeinde: Christsein in der Tradition des Paulus und Johannes*, ed. Jost Eckert, Martin Schmidl, and Hanneliese Steichele [Düsseldorf: Patmos, 2001], 170–99 and Lorenz Oberlinner, "*Gemeindeordnung und Rechte Lehre zur Fortschreibung der Paulinischen Ekklesiologie in den Pastoralbriefen*" TQ 187 (2007): 295–308).

[6] Martin Dibelius and Hanz Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, trans. Philip Buttolph and Adela Yarbro, ed. Helmut Koester, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972), 1–5. See also Towner, *Letters*, 15–26 and Claire S. Smith, *Pauline Communities as 'Scholastic Communities*,' WUNT 2/335 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 14–30 for more discussion of these points.

[7] Towner, *Letters*, 15.

by J.E.C. Schmidt in 1804/1805 argued that the lexical choices of 1 Timothy made it highly

suspect that the same hand also authored the other two PE. Likewise, Friedrich Schleiermacher

famously argued in 1807 that 2 Timothy and Titus were first and that the lexical differences

suggested that a later author used 2 Timothy and Titus to compose 1 Timothy.[8] Scholars built on

these points to deny Pauline authorship of all three PE, such as Johann Eichorn in 1812, or to

develop more arguments against it, such as F.C. Baur, who argued in 1835 that the

characterization of the opponents in the PE better fits a later Gnostic development and dated

them to the early second century.[9] But, in all the development of Holtzmann's and Dibelius' six

points, the language itself of the PE served as the primary impetus behind the modern objection

to the authenticity of the PE as Pauline.

In many ways the language of the PE still remains the primary focus of much study, albeit

typically still to serve the purpose of historical investigation.[10] Michaela Engelmann helpfully

and thoroughly outlines the various strands of research regarding the state of the study of the PE

---

[8] Note, however, the helpful addition of Jermo van Nes, who offers that a 1792 work by Edward Evanson already challenged the authenticity of Titus. Van Nes also offers that the challenge of Evanson, as well as those of Schmidt and Schleiermacher, was multiform and not only focused on the language and style of the text. Jermo van Nes, "On the Origin of the Pastorals' Authenticity Criticism: A 'New' Perspective" *NTS* 62 (2016): 315–20 and Jermo van Nes, *Pauline Language and the Pastoral Epistles: A Study of Linguistic Variation in the* Corpus Paulinum*, LBS 16 (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 8–36. In response to the last major point of van Nes, while it is certainly the case that the critique of the PE is indeed "multidimensional and cumulative" (Nes, "Origin," 320) and has been such from the beginning of the modern era, saying that theological and historical concerns are also part of the discussion does not discredit the assertion that the language and style of the text served as the primary focus, both in sequence and importance, for the modern view.

[9] Collins, *1 & 2 Timothy*, 3–4.

[10] In many ways, to be fair, the language of the PE must serve as the starting point for analysis of any kind. On the one hand, the reader can only understand the theological content and proposed historical context in order to compare them to external works as the lexemes and references of the text itself explicate them, but also, on the other hand, due to the complexity of fitting the details of the PE with the other historical data in the New Testament, the lexemes and references lead to a much larger field of investigation in itself. For an overview and critique of attempts to propose the provenance of the PE on the basis of external data, see Stanley E. Porter, "Pauline Chronology and the Question of the Pseudonymity of the Pastoral Epistles," in *Paul and Pseudepigraphy*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Gregory P. Fewster, PAST 8 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 65–88.

from Schmidt and Schleiermacher unto the contemporary era: those who maintain explicit

Pauline authorship, those who seek to retain at least some direct Pauline influence by means of a

Sekretärshypothese or *Fragmentenhypothese*, those who argue for the PE as a pseudepigraphical

corpus, and, where Engelmann herself stands, those who explore the possibility that the three PE

were each written separately by different authors to different communities.[11] Even while

Engelmann then proceeds in her own research to study specific word families of the PE in order

to construct a different *Sitz im Leben* for each work, her lament stands that modern research has

suffered from too much focus on authenticity at the expense of investigating the language and

theology of the letters, namely, that "*auch in der neueren Forschung fast durchgängig die Frage*

nach der (Un-)Echtheit der drei Schreiben in einer Weise im Vordergrund stand."[12] This is not to

say, however, that the various strands of historically focused research of the PE have not

produced a copious amount of linguistic and stylistic data for further study.[13]

---

[11] See Michaela Engelmann, *Unzertrennliche Drillinge? Motivsemantische Untersuchungen zum Literarischen Verhältnis der Pastoralbriefe*, BZNW 192 (Göttingen: de Gruyter, 2012), 10–106.

[12] Engelmann, *Unzertrennliche Drillinge*, 107. Similarly, Van Nes states that "[f]rom the end of the eighteenth century onwards, most critical study of the letters to Timothy and Titus…. has been predominated by the question of authorship." Jermo van Nes, "The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles: An Important Hypothesis Reconsidered," in *Paul and Pseudepigraphy*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Gregory P. Fewster, PAST 8 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 153. He proceeds to critique Harrison's method and argument in order state that the use of language and stylistic particularities of the PE as they relate to authorship need to be understood and analyzed in a new and more holistic manner.

[13] There has certainly been scholarship on the PE in the modern era with other concerns besides historical analysis, most notably among scholars who study the PE with explicit reference to issues of appropriation in a contemporary setting (see Jennifer H. Stiefel, "Women Deacons in 1 Timothy: A Linguistic and Literary Look at 'Women Likewise…' (1 Tim 3.11)" *NTS* 41:3 [1995]:442–57 or Daniel J. Valleskey, "The Pastor Must Be 'Above Reproach': An Examination of ἀνεπίλημπτος (1 Timothy 3:2) and ἀνέγκλητος (Titus 1:6) with Application to the Public Ministry of the Gospel" *WisLQ* 96:3 [1999]: 194–207). While a full survey of this type of scholarship is beyond the scope of this study, one issue of contemporary appropriation which has led to much linguistic and methodological discussion is the application of the PE to the role of women in the Christian Church, especially in reference to 1 Tim. 2:11–15 and more specifically the verbs διδάσκειν and αὐθεντεῖν in 1 Tim. 2:12. Hübner helpfully argues that, due to the presence of the *hapax legomenon* αὐθεντεῖν and other factors, the meaning of this passage is not clear in itself, and moves into a larger methodological discussion about how one should interpret and apply such difficult passages (Jamin Hübner, "Revisiting the Clarity of Scripture in 1 Timothy 2:12" *JETS* 59:1 [2016]:99–117, especially 100–109). In an earlier essay, Hübner also uses this passage as a means to study the phenomenon of *hapax legomena* from a methodological standpoint, arguing for the differing uses of lexicography, cognate and comparative study, etymology, as well as both literary and historical context (Jamin Hübner,

For much recent historically focused research on the PE, the language of the PE constitutes a major part and necessary step for further analysis, most frequently specific lexemes and phrases. The work of William Richards, in the same strand of research as Engelmann, compares different elements of the PE to the standards of ancient Greco-Roman rhetoric in order to argue for three different authors who each utilize specific rhetorical style and devices for three discrete audiences.[14] In this study of the rhetoric and style in the PE, it is mainly specific *verba* and *formulae* which serve as the primary focus for comparison to external rhetorical standards.[15]

"Revisiting αὐθεντέω in 1 Timothy 2:12: What Do the Extant Data Really Show?" *JSPHL* 5:1 [2015]:41–70). H. Scott Baldwin also does an extended lexical analysis of αὐθεντέω, dialoguing with various options and raising questions about the certainty of the results of such study (H. Scott Baldwin, "A Difficult Word: αὐθεντέω in 1 Timothy 2:12," in *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9–15*, eds. Andreas J. Köstenberger, Thomas R. Schreiner, and H. Scott Baldwin [Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1995], 65–80). More than lexicography and methodology for *hapax legomena*, this passage has also inspired much scholarship on syntax, specifically related to the issue of verbal hendiadys and the use of οὐδέ followed by ἀλλά. Payne helpfully outlines the similar syntactical constructions to 1 Tim. 2:12 throughout the Undisputed Pauline letters and divides them into four categories of usage (Philip Payne, "1 Tim 2.12 and the Use of οὐδέ to Combine Two Elements to Express a Single Idea" *NTS* 54:2 [2008]: 235–53). Payne's study, however, suffers from a lack of recognition of lexical assumptions behind his categories and application to 1 Tim. 2:12, and does not refine the categories to verbal, much less infinitival, hendiadys or include how the use of ἀλλά after the hendiadys alters the syntactical landscape. In response to Payne's work, Andreas Köstenberger develops a much more comprehensive yet refined analysis of the syntactical construction found in 1 Tim. 2:12, including also analysis of semantic features in such constructions (Andreas J. Köstenberger, "A Complex Sentence Structure in 1 Timothy 2:12," in *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9–15*, eds. Andreas J. Köstenberger, Thomas R. Schreiner, and H. Scott Baldwin [Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1995], 81–103). In the case of this difficult passage, the lack of persuasiveness found in predominantly historical and cultural study (see Richard Clark Kroeger and Catherine Clark Kroeger, *I Suffer Not a Woman: Rethinking 1 Timothy 2:11–15 in Light of Ancient Evidence* [Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1992], which argues that proto-Gnostic ideas about human origins best explain the passage, or Alan Padgett, "The Pauline Rationale for Submission: Biblical Feminism and the *hina* Clauses of Titus 2:1–10" *EvQ* 59:1 [1987]: 39–52, which argues that the PE are using the structure of language of the *pater familias* model within the Christian Church primarily as an evangelistic tactic to the surrounding community and not as Christian theology proper) has led to linguistic and methodological study of the text, albeit primarily in response to contemporary application of the passage within the Christian Church.

[14] William A. Richards, *Difference and Distance in Post-Pauline Christianity*, StBibLit 44 (New York: Lang, 2002), especially 189–240. See also Mark Harding, *Tradition and Rhetoric in the Pastoral Epistles*, StBibLit 3 (New York: Lang, 1998). In this work, Harding likewise compares the PE to Greco-Roman rhetoric in order to determine the oral and rhetorical nature of the PE themselves and how they were received. Fiore also analyzes the rhetorical style of the PE in a more specific way, comparing them not only to Socratic letters but also the rhetorical style of Isocrates, Plutarch, and Dio Chrysostom. See Benjamin Fiore, *The Function of Personal Example in the Socratic and Pastoral Epistles*, AnaBib 105 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1986), especially 45–67, 101–63, and 191–236. While these works, especially Richards and Fiore, do exhibit concrete ways in which the PE differ from the other works of the Pauline Corpus, their application of those differences as they pertain to authorship is less compelling.

[15] Richards and Harding provide much data on specific phrases and keywords, but Porter's critique and

Similarly, lexemes and word families form the basis for other recent historically focused research, such as the work of Lloyd Pietersen[16] and Claire Smith.[17] In each of these instances of research, the language itself of the PE provides the most fundamental, concrete data for further historical reconstruction and analysis, albeit largely focused on individual words and phrases.[18]

---

caution of the use of rhetorical criticism to analyze Paul's letters serves as a helpful reminder of the limits of such study, that establishing such connections does not necessarily determine whether they are prescriptive or descriptive for understanding the author's thought or authorial intent. Stanley E Porter, "Ancient Literate Culture and Popular Rhetorical Knowledge: Implications for Studying Pauline Rhetoric," in *Paul and Ancient Rhetoric*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Bryan R. Dyer (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 96–115, especially 112–14),

[16] Lloyd K. Pietersen, *The Polemic of the Pastorals*, JSNTSup 264 (London: T&T Clark, 2004), especially 97–137. Pietersen analyzes the description of the opponents in the PE in order to construct a more precise and historically accurate portrait of them, and, while the work deliberately utilizes social-scientific theory as its primary vehicle for analysis, many lexemes which could be understood in light of thaumaturgy are given sustained discussion, such as σῴζω and γόης. Pietersen, *Polemic*, 124–28, 132–35, 144–58.

[17] Smith, similar to Pietersen, focuses on various word families which are semantically linked to the act of teaching in order to construct a portrait of the communities addressed in the PE and 1 Corinthians with relation to their status as scholastic or learning communities. In addition to analyzing word families based on semantic connections, there are certain lexemes whose syntactical or stylistic relationships receive deliberate attention, such as λέγω in relation to the grammatical or implied subject (Smith, *Communities,* 87–100) or παρακαλέω in relation to the intended recipients of the appeal (Smith, *Communities*, 276–86). Smith primarily builds her argument about scholastic communities on the word of Edwin Judge. See Smith, *Communities*, 3–14 for an overview of Judge's work as applied to Smith's study. For an introductory overview of Judge's work, see Edwin A. Judge, "The Social Identity of the First Christians: A Question of Method in Religious History," *Social Distinctives of the Christians in the First Century*, ed. David M. Scholer (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2008), 117–35, where Judge challenges the preceding and contemporary view of early Christian communities, or Edwin A. Judge, "The Early Christians as a Scholastic Community," in *The First Christians in the Roman World* , ed. James R. Harrison, WUNT 1/229 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 526–52, where he constructs a fresh look at the earliest Christians communities, especially those associated with Paul, as more influenced by teaching and sophistic rhetoric than by concrete ritualistic practice. In doing so, Judge also analyzes the characterization of Jesus as Rabbi over against prophet (Judge, "Christians," 532–38) and, more importantly for Smith's study, the characterization of Paul as a sophist focused on "the transmission of the *logos* and the acquisition of true *gnosis*" (Judge, "Christians," 539–52, italics original).

[18] This brief overview has covered some recent larger, more comprehensive studies. The trend is the same for recent articles and essays on the PE as well, and some examples would be helpful. Gourgues analyzes the language and syntax of the Pontius Pilate reference in 1 Tim. 6:12–13 in order to compare the passage to the Johannine Passion Narrative, over against the Synoptic Gospels, and argue for the late date and advanced theology of the PE (Michel Gourgues, "Jesus's Testimony before Pilate in 1 Timothy 6:13" *JBL* 135:3 [2013]:639–48). Lappenga studies the implications of ζηλωτής in Titus 2:14 in light of both Greco-Roman and Jewish cultural uses of the term, as well as its multifaceted use in the Pauline Corpus, in order to construct a clearer picture of the opponents in the PE (Benjamin J. Lappenga, "'Zealots for Good Works': The Polemical Repercussions of the Word ζηλωτής in Titus 2:14" *CBQ* 75:4 [2013]: 704–18). Thornton similarly attempts to construct the historical situation behind the PE, focusing on key terms, verbs, and conjunctive phrases in the widow discourse in 1 Tim. 5 to suggest that the exhortation for younger widows to marry was a polemical strategy against false teaching and, via the support of widows, the misuse of church funds (Dillon T. Thornton, "'Saying What They Should Not Say': Reassessing the Gravity of the Problem of the Younger Widows (1 Tim 5:11–15)" *JETS* 59:1 [2016]: 119–29). Hoag also compares the language of apparel and dress in 1 Tim. 2 with Xenophon's *Ephesiaca* to propose that the references to types of

While these other strands identified by Engelmann utilize features of the language of the PE for their work, one particular strand of research that has reaped much linguistic benefit begins with the work of P.N. Harrison, whose 1921 monograph, *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles*, was largely responsible for inaugurating the *Fragmentenhypothese*.[19] Harrison proposes a fragmentary hypothesis specifically in response to his lexical analysis of the PE;[20] in other words, the fragmentary hypothesis was developed to explain how some portions of the PE had more prototypical Pauline style and lexical choices while other portions did not. As such, further developments within the fragmentary hypothesis, such as the influential study by James D. Miller in 1997, not only augment and refine the thesis in various ways, but do so on the basis of more rigorous lexical, grammatical, and stylistic study.[21] While many scholars find Miller's suggestion that the PE are each composite documents from various streams of traditional material compelling, this assertion has also led to proponents of the unity of the documents to analyze the language and style of the PE in more careful detail as well. In his 2004 work, for example, Ray Van Neste applies modern linguistic developments in discourse analysis and cohesion to defend the internal unity of each letter in direct conversation with, and opposition to, the work of Miller and Harrison.[22] In so doing, Van Neste represents the first comprehensive

---

clothing and adornment are in direct conversation with the Artemis cult and elite culture of the day (Gary G. Hoag, "Decorum and Deeds in 1 Timothy 2:9–10 in Light of *Ephesiaca* by Xenophon of Ephesus" *ExAud* 27 [2011]:134–60). In each case, the language and theology of the text are analyzed in great detail, but still for the larger purpose of reconstructing the history of or behind the text.

[19] Engelmann, *Unzertrennliche Drillinge,* 50–53. See especially P.N. Harrison, *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1921), 87–136.

[20] Harrison, *Problem*, 20–38, 68–86. Harrison also has some brief remarks concerning grammar and style (Harrison, *Problem*, 38–44), but these points are not the most thorough or compelling portions of his argument.

[21] See James D. Miller, *The Pastoral Letters as Composite Documents*, SNTS.MS 93 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997). Miller especially notes not only lexical changes and particularities, but changes in grammar, syntax, and epistolary flow in order to determine the seams between the various strands of traditional material.

[22] Ray Van Neste, *Cohesion and Structure in the Pastoral Epistles*, JSNTSup 280 (London: T&T Clark, 2004). The study of cohesion, as a particular subset of discourse analysis, focuses on the internal relatedness and

work on the PE blending, yet moving away from, historical scholarship with the recent insights

from Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG)[23] as applied specifically to New Testament Greek

(NTG).[24]

The study of the PE in the modern era has devoted much attention to the language of the

letters, but typically in order to discuss their theology, provenance, or proposed correspondence

with various historical factors. Many theories have been advanced in order to explain and

account for the differences in language, style, and theological content of the PE from the rest of

the Pauline Corpus, and proponents of each particular theory identify various lexemes, phrases,

and features of the texts to support their position. This is significant for the present study,

because, on one hand, while the general consensus of contemporary scholarship is that the PE are

Deutero-Pauline, the use of the same data for different and at times directly contrasting positions

demonstrates the limits of the study of the language of the PE *eo ipso* to establish issues of

---

dependency of meaning between words and units in a given text, especially as guided by semantic chains of meaning and consistent use of transitional devices. For a brief overview, see Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 8–17 or Jeffrey T. Reed, "The Cohesiveness of Discourse: Towards a Model of Linguistic Criteria for Analyzing New Testament Discourse," in *Discourse Analysis and the New Testament: Approaches and Results*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Jeffrey T. Reed, JSNTSup 170, SNTG 4 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999), 28–46. For an earlier, less comprehensive application of discourse analysis specifically in regard to 1 Timothy, see Jeffrey T. Reed, "Cohesive Ties in 1 Timothy: In Defense of the Epistle's Unity" *Neot* 26 (1992): 131–47.

[23] SFG refers specifically to the linguistic and communication theory developed by Michael Halliday. See Michael A. K. Halliday, *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 4th ed., rev. Christian M.I.M. Matthiessen (New York: Routledge, 2014). SFG was introduced to New Testament study primarily through the work of Stanley Porter and lies behind much of what Porter calls the "English and Australian" model of discourse analysis. See Stanley E. Porter, "Discourse Analysis and New Testament Studies: An Introductory Survey," in *Discourse Analysis and Other Topics in Biblical Greek*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and D.A. Carson, JSNTSup 113 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 14–35, 27–30. SFG will be discussed in more detail below.

[24] In this case, NTG is differentiated from KG as a specific instantiation of KG within a functionally-closed set of documents. (On instantiation, see Halliday, *Grammar*, 27–30). NTG, while not a separate linguistic system from KG, does show its own idiosyncrasies and verbiage to be differentiated as a distinct instantiation of KG apart from the larger whole. See, for example, the use of δικαιόω in NTG as opposed to KG, borrowing from the LXX, as argued in James Prothro, "The Strange Case of Δικαιόω in the Septuagint and Paul: The Oddity and Origins of Paul's Talk of 'Justification,'" *ZNW* 107 (2016), 48–69. In turn, the analysis of this project is only focused on KG as it is exhibited in specific documents of the New Testament. As such, KG will be used when the analysis of the text connects to the larger linguistic system, but NTG will be used when referring to the use of KG specifically within the New Testament documents.

authenticity and historical setting with certainty. On the other hand, apart from issues of authenticity and historical provenance, recent study of the PE has yielded much fruit for linguistic study in order to describe and understand the works' use of KG, especially the more recent work applying discourse analysis to the PE. Research on the PE has also highlighted the need to analyze and understand each letter in itself before taking the three as a whole. In this regard, the need for more rigorous and detailed linguistic study is evident, especially as it relates to syntactical and larger clausal patterns, in order to better understand not only the possible relationships of the PE to one another but also to the larger Pauline Corpus.

Statistical Analysis of the Language of the Pauline Corpus

Initiated in earnest through the work of A.Q. Morton,[25] the dawn of computer software allowing for the mass processing of linguistic data brought with it statistical analysis as another avenue for the study of NTG that merits consideration. Such statistical analysis of the text, also called "stylometrics" or "stylostatistics," does not directly underlie the dawn of SFG or the larger projects of Discourse Analysis as a whole, but a brief investigation into the history and goals of stylostatistics is necessary to the current project for at least three primary reasons. First, stylostatistics is another development in the study of a text that focuses primarily on the language of a text itself. It was done, especially by Morton, with historical questions of authorship as the underpinning motivation, but it was still a field dominated by analysis of the "words on the page." Second, as will be shown below, stylostatistics, especially for works outside of the New Testament, has demonstrated that issues of style can be identified and consistently demonstrated in smaller sample sizes, such as New Testament letters. Lastly, the history of stylostatistics

---

[25] See A. Q. Morton, "Statistical Analysis and New Testament Problems," in *The Authorship and Integrity of the New Testament*, TheoColl 4 (London: SPCK, 1965), 40–60 and A. Q. Morton and James McLeman, *Paul, the Man and the Myth: A Study in the Authorship of Greek Prose* (New York: Harper & Row, 1966).

demonstrates that such issues of style are only evident and beneficial for textual study if the text

is analyzed with larger and appropriate methodology that considers the most salient linguistic

features. In other words, it highlights the limits of an idiosyncratic study of the language of one

text both apart from study of other texts and apart from a clear, precise method.

Morton himself was too optimistic regarding the use of statistical analysis of language to

determine historical probability;[26] it is nevertheless the case that such analysis has reaped much

harvest for constructing an overall picture of the usage of various words, phrases, and

constructions in the New Testament. Initially, Morton's work focused on what factors may or

may not be analyzed in order to have bearing on historical and authorial questions, regarding the

more basic considerations of vocabulary too dependent on other factors to be overly useful[27] and

instead analyzing sentence length and patterns of occurrence for specific, common words he

considers inescapable in any context.[28] One other major question raised by Morton concerning

large-scale statistical analysis relates to the sample size of the documents under investigation.

The target sample size used by Morton is 150 sentences,[29] using Galatians as the test case for

---

[26] Morton posited that, in the wake of the availability of such software, "the authorship and authenticity of the epistles will soon be established." Morton, "Analysis," 59.

[27] One particular element which complicates the diction argument, according to Morton, is that the subject matter of a particular document or section tends to determine the lexical options. In response to this, Morton concludes that "[t]he simplest way to exclude the effect of subject matter is to look either at the patterns of words and not the words themselves … or at the occurrence of those words which are literally inescapable, the words which must be used in any context." Morton, *Paul*, 65.

[28] Excluding the article, whose use is too complex and variegated to be of use in Morton's study, the next five most common words are then analyzed for patterns of use: καί, δέ, ἐν, αὐτός, and εἶναι. Morton, *Paul*, 52–64 and 70–97.

[29] Morton still does include the other epistles of the Pauline Corpus which do not meet the target size, with the exception of 2 Thessalonians, Titus, and Philemon, which only appear in the initial phases of analysis. He still argues, however, that the Pauline character of Philemon and the non-Pauline character of other short letters can be seen through "gross stylistic differences" or "certain characteristics of an author" (Morton, *Paul*, 89–90). What is odd, however, is how quickly Morton brushes aside how the stylistic differences discovered by his own work impact authorship discussions internally for some epistles, while arguing that similar variation cannot be explained "without assuming a difference of authorship" for others (Morton, *Paul*, 94).

Pauline style against which to compare the other letters. Morton's conclusion, that the historical Paul wrote at most five of the letters attributed to him, was not adopted in wider scholarship, but his work did raise larger questions regarding the relationship of statistical analysis and the Biblical text, especially in terms of methodological procedure, sample size, appropriate types of data and their use, as well as the relation of such projects to ostensive historical and authorial considerations.

A full survey of the direct impact of Morton and responses to his work is beyond the scope of the study,[30] but a brief outline and discussion of stylometric approaches both to the New Testament as a whole and to the Pauline Corpus would be helpful. The first major issue to be addressed is the size and nature of the sample set for analysis.[31] Roughly contemporary to Morton's work, Alvar Ellegård's study of the authorship of the Junius letters deals more extensively with constructing authenticity from smaller samples.[32] While stating that 100 words are too few and 10,000 should be more than sufficient, Ellegård then argues that his statistical method, focusing on words and word groups offering what he calls a distinctiveness ratio, demonstrates consistency down to sample sizes of 4,000 words, only a slightly larger margin of

---

[30] For helpful overviews of A. Q. Morton's full career and specific reactions to it, see Kenneth J. Neumann, *The Authenticity of the Pauline Epistles in the Light of Stylostatistical Analysis*, SBL.DS 120 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), 2–7, 14–16, 38–44, 50–57, 61–62, 67–79, 85–86 or Matthew Brook O'Donnell, "Linguistic Fingerprints or Style by Numbers?," in *Linguistics in the New Testament: Critical Junctures*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and D. A. Carson, JSNTSup 168, SNTG 5 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 206–62, especially 216–20.

[31] Morton, for example, utilized sample sizes of 150 sentences, although he offers little extended defense of this choice. He did include Pauline letters as short as 81 sentences long, only excluding 2 Thessalonians, Titus, and Philemon in the end (Morton, *Paul*, 58, 90–91). He does reference, however, the shorter letters, only to say that his test does not exclude the possibility that Philemon is authentically Pauline (Morton, *Paul*, 90). He also references a sample block of 1500 words, which would roughly correspond to the sample size of 150 sentences (Morton, *Paul*, 96–97). Morton calculates the mean sentence length as 10.85 words, which yields, on average, just over 1600 words for the sample size (see Morton, *Paul*, 53–55).

[32] Alvar Ellegård, *A Statistical Method for Determining Authorship: The* Junius *Letters, 1769–1772*, GothStEng 13 (Göteborg: Elanders Boktryckeri Aktiebolag, 1962).

error for samples as short as 2,000 words, and a fair amount of reliability even in letters under 500 words.[33] For these smaller samples, Ellegård argues that the method itself "is of course less good, but … it is not negligible."[34] His method for the smaller text samples, which Neumann calls the "population model," is based, however, on what was already established from the analysis of the larger sample sizes then retroactively applied back onto the smaller units.[35] This proves difficult with regard to the Pauline Corpus, since they are a closed set with no larger body of Pauline material outside of the New Testament for comparison. With regard to Morton's work, the control group for the actual comparative analysis, the Pauline *Hauptbriefe*, is in itself barely over 20,000 words,[36] and sample cuts within each letter showed significant variation.[37] In this regard, Morton argues that the great variation should not challenge the unity of the *Hauptbriefe* due to demonstrable consistency through other means.[38] While this somewhat undermines the legitimacy of his own work, it does intimate the necessity of considering lexical analysis as only one part of the larger answer to the question of authorial authenticity to be used in tandem with other historical and linguistic factors. In other words, not only do the quantity and

---

[33] Ellegård, *Method*, 9, 17, 27, 65–76. This includes 23 letters between 1,000 and 2,000 words, 24 letters between 500 and 1,000 words, and 14 letters under 500 words.

[34] Ellegård, *Method*, 73–74.

[35] One example of this would be the "triplet *hardly-scarce-scarcely. Junius* never used *scarcely*. Hence we may consider the percentage of *hardly*+*scarce* as 100, and count the combined percentage as one value" (Ellegård, *Method*, 70). This population model includes a large body of literature with multiple possible authors yet with identifiable patterns against which to compare even the smaller textual units (Neumann, *Authenticity*, 19). The total body of sample texts included in the study is comprised of 1,604,800 words (Ellegård, *Method*, 25). Morton's work, by contrast, which Neumann characterizes as a consistency model (Neumann, *Authenticity*, 19), attempted to test for authenticity against a single, established group as a standard.

[36] The four *Hauptbreife*—Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and Galatians—combined have 20,647 words. Word counts are taken from O'Donnell, who computed his statistics using the Friberg text via Bibleworks software (see O'Donnell, *Linguistics*, 223–26 and O'Donnell, "Fingerprints," 233–35).

[37] See Morton, *Paul*, Tables 51–52.

[38] Morton, *Paul*, 90–91, 93–94.

size of sample sets used to establish stylostatistical patterns with certainty remain a question, but the nature and type of the patterns under investigation should also impact the discussion.

The nature of the sample set and variety of syntactical features impact the discussion of the size and multiplicity of sample sets needed for proper stylostatistical analysis. Neumann asserts that his "population model" analysis of the Pauline Corpus should utilize works that could be divided into five sample cuts of 750 words apiece, and that smaller letters can only be used with confidence to compare to the authorial styles identified in the larger analysis.[39] For Neumann, his work could utilize sample cuts of 750 words due to the variety of syntactical and grammatical features included in the analysis, such including smaller syntactical patterns such as the noun-article-noun pattern, whereas sentence length studies, word-class distributions, and discourse connectors necessitate different lengths of samples.[40] The novelty and strength of Neumann's analysis are that, while some of the tested features proved far more reliable than others,[41] the sheer amount of tests undertaken on a variety of factors served as a helpful corrective to previous studies.[42] This study, then, demonstrated the need for more comprehensive and precise stylometric tests before determinations of authorship could be made with any confidence.[43]

With the dawn of greater, multivariate stylometric study of the Pauline Corpus, the field

---

[39] Neumann, *Authenticity*, 124.

[40] Neumann, *Authenticity*, 134–40. For a full list of the features included in Neumann's analysis, see Table III.A (Neumann, *Authenticity*, 120–23). In his work, Neumann explicitly follows the words of Cluett that more fundamental stylistic patterns of an author should be detectable in a sample as small as 700 continuous words (Neumann, *Authenticity*, 134–35).

[41] Neumann admits that some of the larger variations, such as the initial *tau* test in relation to Ephesians or the initial sentence connector tests within the undisputed Pauline letters, are likely best explained by other factors than authorship or are inconclusive altogether (Neumann, *Authenticity*, 209–10).

[42] For some tests, as an example, the PE showed significant deviation from the undisputed Pauline letters, but when the whole of the study was taken together the PE still showed closer affinity to the undisputed Pauline letters than any other sampling of contemporary literature.

[43] See Neumann, *Authenticity*, 222–26.

became more precise, yet many questions remained regarding its value and results. Neumann's

work is highly praised by D. L. Mealand, yet he also argues Neumann's work is more useful for

distinguishing between Pauline style and external documents, such as those of Clement and

Ignatius, than authorship of the Pauline Corpus in itself.[44] To build on this work, Mealand then

expands and groups multiple variables together, beginning with 25 variables.[45] Then, after

removing inconclusive results, groups 19 of them into three clusters of similar features.[46] The

conclusions of this multivariate, clustered approach revealed a few items which Mealand had not

expected, such as the close distance between James and the Pauline Corpus or between 1 and 2

Peter; but generally speaking the results were consistent with expectations, namely, that there is

great similarity among the following five groups: the Pauline *Hauptbriefe*, the smaller

undisputed Pauline letters, the PE together with Hebrews as well as 1 and 2 Peter, and Colossians

with Ephesians.[47] While revealing little new or challenging information, Mealand's work and

conclusions are significant. On the one hand, his analysis provides helpful crosschecks

concerning both previous and contemporary stylometric methods,[48] and demonstrates a general

---

[44] D. L. Mealand, "The Extent of the Pauline Corpus: A Multivariate Approach," JSNT 59 (1995): 64.

[45] Mealand represents the common approach for his time in the types of variables being considered, mainly consisting on the level of the lexeme itself outside of larger syntactical connections or patterns. The twenty-five variables included the frequency of parts of speech, word length, words beginning with τ–, αὐτ–, or ὑμ–, the frequency of relative versus indefinite pronouns, as well as common conjunctions and function words (Mealand, "Extent," 65–66).

[46] After his test, Mealand determined that the six features that did not fall within the accepted range for variation were the frequency of verbs and particles, the genitive article τῆς, the words εἰς and ἐστιν, and words beginning with ὑμ– (Mealand, "Extent," 70).

[47] See especially figures 4–7 as they relate to the cluster analysis (Mealand, "Extent," 74–78), and Mealand's stated conclusions (Mealand, "Extent," 79–80, 85–86).

[48] It also provides a helpful check and balance for claims made about the text on theological or historical bases. The strong stylometric similarity between 1 and 2 Peter, as an example, does not in itself provide proof in either direction on the issue of authorship, but it does at least bring into question the common, later dating for 2 Peter and the common view that 2 Peter used Jude as a source, and not vice versa. See Mark Allan Powell, *Introducing the New Testament: A Historical, Literary, and Theological Survey* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2009), 481–91.

reliability of identifying some stylistic similarities and trends with smaller sample sizes.[49] On the

other hand, his multivariate approach provides little new information about the stylistic

similarities between New Testament letters that were not already widely accepted on other

grounds.[50] So, while providing a beneficial caution against exaggerated claims about the New

Testament texts, the value of stylometric analysis in relation to longstanding issues of authorship,

literary dependency, and style still remain a question.[51]

In many ways, stylostatistical analysis has demonstrated refinement in method and

consistency of results even with smaller samples of text, but at the same time the historical,

theological, and linguistic value of stylometrics remained dubious.[52] Already by 1999, Matthew

Brook O'Donnell observed that "[m]athematical or statistical stylistics appears to have lost much

of the popularity it once had."[53] This is partially due to the explosion of personal computers and

software that enable the non-specialist to have access to similar tools and databases, but another

major factor was that much previous stylometric study simply focused on specific features

without a larger defense of the value of those features within a linguistic framework.[54] What was

---

[49] Mealand, "Extent," 86. He argues that further methodological refinement could reduce the necessary sample size for reliable results to as few as 500 words.

[50] This point is acknowledged by Mealand after the primary cluster analysis (Mealand, "Extent," 79).

[51] See also Anthony Kenny, *A Stylometric Study of the New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986) especially 80–115, whose method of analyzing the Pauline Corpus resembles the work of A. Q. Morton yet takes an opposing position, deducing that only Titus deserves the skepticism usually attributed to the disputed letters (Kenny, *Stylometric*, 100). Kenny, however, investigates a great variety of factors, and, when analyzing word distributions, utilizes repeated 50-word samples to construct an overall portrait of a work. Kenny's similar method yet greatly divergent results from Morton also demonstrate the point above, that further refinement of boundaries is helpful yet more work is needed in order to establish firmer conclusions based on stylometric data.

[52] From Morton to Mealand, the textual samples were analyzed on the basis of a variety of factors, but, analogous to the broader realm of New Testament study during this time, the factors being considered typically consisted of key terms, common vocabulary, smaller phrases, and other elements whose value is highly questionable, such as word or sentence length.

[53] O'Donnell, "Fingerprints," 229.

[54] For example, it is highly unlikely that sentence or word length bring any benefit for determining authorship or definitive style. To make this point, O'Donnell uses the example of K.R. Buth's work regarding sentence length

needed for stylometric analysis of the New Testament, then, was not only more refined

methodology but, above all, a clearer linguistic framework that could better identify the potential

importance of various textual elements for questions of authorship and style.

Working from this basis, O'Donnell attempts to identify features of a text that are more

appropriate for linguistic analysis and thereby more helpful for discerning style and stylistic

variations of the New Testament texts. Common words and even *hapax legemona*, O'Donnell

argues, are less indicative in terms of style than collocations of specific word groups and

pairings, and even then only when those collocations are considered within their specific

grammatical and syntactic contexts and are not common in the larger use of the language of the

time period.[55] More importantly, borrowing from insights of larger linguistic study, O'Donnell

introduces the concept of "register" as a crucial factor for future stylometric analysis, defining

register as identifiable varieties of language "according to [their] use."[56] The sociolinguistic

concept of register, which will be utilized in various ways in the final applications and

conclusions of the present study, refers to differing types and levels of communication within

any one given language on the basis of factors external to the written text, including geographic,

---

analysis on works known to be authored by Johannes V. Jensen, which reveals such divergence between the works that Buth concludes proof of authorship, in either direction, cannot be determined on such a basis (see O'Donnell, "Fingerprints," 239–41). For NTG this problem is only heightened by the difficulty of determining what constitutes a sentence, especially when one recalls that the earliest manuscripts of the New Testament offer no punctuation to demarcate sentences or paragraphs. Beyond this, O'Donnell offers that "a comparison of the vocabulary of different works has not played a significant part in most linguistic analysis. It is dubious that simply by counting words one is able to differentiate between authors" (O'Donnell, "Fingerprints," 232).

[55] O'Donnell, "Fingerprints," 235–39. See O'Donnell, *Linguistics*, 331–69 for an introductory application of collocation analysis on the verbs ἐγείρω and ἀνίστημι in NTG. Further supporting his point, O'Donnell offers, in response to the rejection of the PE on the basis of *hapax legomena*, that a ten-letter Pauline Corpus would limit Paul's vocabulary to 2294 different lexemes. See the table on O'Donnell, "Fingerprints," 233 for the number of unique lexemes added by each letter of the Pauline Corpus.

[56] O'Donnell, "Fingerprints," 251. Register will be discussed more below.

social, and interpersonal context.[57] The recognition of register, according O'Donnell, means that statistical stylistic analysis needs a functional linguistic framework[58] able to account for the myriad of both internal and external factors that shape the style for an individual text in various ways.[59] The work of O'Donnell not only demonstrates the need for greater attention to functional, linguistic relationships and features of a text beyond vocabulary and key words within stylometric analysis, but it also provides a necessary caution for using such analysis as proof of historical authorship. "It is still at best questionable," he writes, "that matters regarding the authorship of the New Testament documents can be decided on the basis of statistical analysis… Instead, [it is] able to assist in the *description* of register and style, that is, [it is an exercise] in 'style by numbers'."[60]

The full fruits of stylometric analysis with a more linguistic focus have not yet been realized, but the firstfruits can be seen in not only in the work of O'Donnell but also in the more recent work of Andrew Pitts. Combining stylometrics with the concept of register, Pitts

---

[57] These factors also include provenance, genre, type of content, and purpose. For further discussion of register as a sociolinguistic concept, see Andrew W. Pitts, "Style and Pseudonymity in Pauline Scholarship: A Register Based Configuration," in *Paul and Pseudepigraphy*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Gregory P. Fewster, PAST 8 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 113–52, especially 116–33 and Eugene A. Nida, "Sociolinguistics and Translating," in *Sociolinguistics and Communication*, ed. Johannes P. Louw, UBS.MS 1 (London: UBS, 1986), 1–49, 12–15.

[58] As will be explored below, SFG and other avenues of Discourse Analysis are distinctly *functional* in their methodology and theory of language. Generally speaking, functional linguistics argues that all language can only be properly understood as it is analyzed according to its function within its linguistic system. This means, for example, that functional linguistic theories favor synchronic analysis—how a word, phrase, or clause functions within its own concrete, expressed linguistic context, over diachronic analysis—how a word's meaning is defined by its etymology or evolution over time. In light of stylometrics, then, what O'Donnell proposes is a move from what could be called a *structural* understanding of language, which identifies individual static features of a text apart from their syntactical and concrete function within the text, to a functional approach, one that takes not only the presence of various features into account but how they are used in relation to their surrounding textual and linguistic context. See Levinsohn, *Discourse*, vii–ix or Halliday, *Grammar*, 20, 30–51 for brief descriptions of a functional approach.

[59] Refer again to O'Donnell, *Linguistics*, 115–37 for a more detailed discussion how these various factors contribute to register in terms of linguistic function. For an application of the work of O'Donnell, see O'Donnell, *Linguistics*, 102–67, and for a more robust description of his method and primary results with regard to Philemon, see O'Donnell, *Linguistics*, 444–85.

[60] O'Donnell, "Fingerprints," 254, italics added.

constructs a model for analyzing the different factors which contribute to the overall register of a

given work both individually and holistically, and then applies that model to the Pauline

Corpus.[61] After grouping the thirteen traditional works of the Pauline Corpus into five discrete

register profiles based on common linguistic and external factors, Pitts examines and explores

how the register shifts between profiles contribute to variance in vocabulary and style, even

within a single author's works.[62] In this way, Pitts demonstrates how stylometrics, when focused

on more helpful types data and using a more linguistically sound model, can explain differences

between the works of the Pauline Corpus in a way that does not, in itself, necessitate an

assumption in authorial change.[63] Stylistic variations within the Pauline Corpus can possibly be

explained by differences in register and fall within established ranges of variation among other

authors.[64] To be fair, however, most of the register shifts that have been demonstrated are from

authors in the modern era, such as C.S. Lewis or William Golding. More research is needed to

indicate how analogous these register shifts are to writing in the ancient world, but, at the very

least, the idea of register shift raises the question about whether an authorial change is the most

natural explanation for variance among related works.

 Moving away from discussing register and style as it relates to historical questions of

---

[61] See Pitts, "Style," 130–42 for how this model is constructed, and especially figures 2 and 3 for a diagram of the model and its application to the Pauline Corpus (Pitts, "Style," 128, 136–37). For a theoretical overview of the register concept as utilized by Pitts, see also Matthew Brook O'Donnell, "Designing and Compiling a Register-Balanced Corpus of Hellenistic Greek for the Purpose of Linguistic Description and Investigation," in *Diglossa and Other Topics in New Testament Linguistics*, ed. Stanley E. Porter, JSNTSup 193, SNTG 6 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 255–97, especially 271–80.

[62] In this aspect Pitts is heavily dependent on the work of Allan Bell. See Pitts, "Style and Pseudonymity," 122–24, 148–49, 150–51.

[63] To be sure, this work does not prove Pauline authorship of the PE and the other disputed letters either; rather, Pitts directly states that this work is intended to be explanatory and that statistical linguistics cannot definitively prove Pauline authorship (Pitts, "Style," 119, 151–52).

[64] Pitts, "Style," 114–15, 117.

authorship, Pitts then utilizes stylometrics with regard to word order within different types of

clauses and phrases of the New Testament in order to identify potentially marked and unmarked

patterns.[65] For the present study, "markedness" will be defined as a linguistic phenomenon where

a grammatical or syntactical pattern occurs that deviates from those that are more established

within a given work or language in order to emphasize or give focus to a particular linguistic

element.[66] While Pitts includes specific details for individual New Testament works in only one

of the studies,[67] his broad-sweeping analysis is significant for a variety of reasons:

- It shows the need for further, more refined analysis of word order within various works, clause types, and word groups.

- It demonstrates how statistical stylistics can be utilized to better understand the New Testament texts as they stand without using stylistics as, functionally, merely a tool for discussing authorship.

- It presents, in an initial way, the benefits of analyzing not only vocabulary and content, but how style impacts the way the information is related.

Thereby the analysis of Pitts opens the door into a field that has been largely neglected in the

study of the New Testament, the Pauline Corpus, and the PE in the modern era.

The recent work of Van Nes also provides a significant attempt to integrate elements of

---

[65] Andrew W. Pitts, "Greek Word Order and Clause Structure: A Comparative Study of Some New Testament Corpora," in *The Language of the New Testament: Context, History, and Development*, ed. Stanely E. Porter and Andrew W. Pitts, LBS 6, ECHC 3 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 311–46. Utilizing the theory and language of SFG as applied to the annotated text of OpenText.org, Pitts studies the frequency and variance of specific types of modification for specific word and semantic families to a head word, as well as the ordering of clausal components for different types of clauses. This includes various types of modifiers in attributive position (Pitts, "Word Order," 322–30), as well larger issues of clausal syntax structures (Pitts, "Word Order," 330–39).

[66] This will be an important element as differing patterns are codified during the construction of linguistic profiles for the PE, which will be discussed below.

[67] See figure 5 in Pitts, "Word Order," 328 which presents the frequency of one specific type of modification within each work of the New Testament.

stylometric analysis with SFG and sociolinguistic factors of register to compare the PE with the

larger trends and patterns of the Pauline Corpus.[68] Van Nes applies a linear regression model to

various stylistic factors in an attempt to combine both quantitative and qualitative analysis of

those factors in order to provide a data-based balance for authorship considerations. After first

establishing a linear progression pattern on the basis of undisputed works,[69] Van Nes moves from

lexical considerations, including the use of *hapax legomena* and vocabulary differences,[70] to

stylistic considerations, using SFG, of types and frequencies of clauses.[71] In the end, Van Nes

argues that, while the PE do exhibit some deviation from the rest of the Pauline Corpus, the

observed differences lie within the range of predictability within the linear regression model on

the basis of register and sociolinguistic factors. Thus, they do not necessitate in themselves a

change of authorship as the only, or primary, explanation.[72]

The benefit of Van Nes' study for understanding and interpreting the text, similar to the

work of Pitts, is not fully demonstrated, but this work is significant to the present study for three

main reasons. First, Van Nes moves the discussion into larger syntactical features and clausal

relationships beyond vocabulary, utilizing both SFG and more specifically the concept of register

as primary tools for considering and analyzing the PE and the Pauline Corpus as a whole.

Secondly, even though this work was also written specifically as a response to questions of the

---

[68] The features of register utilized for analysis, based on larger socio-linguistics study, that are the most relevant to larger syntactical analysis include the author's age, level of emotion being communicated, the topic under discussion, the balance between written and oral communication, and, perhaps of highest importance, the nature of the relationship of the author with the addressee or addressees (Van Nes, *Pauline Language*, 158–68).

[69] Van Nes, *Pauline Language*, 120–28.

[70] Van Nes, *Pauline Language,* 140–88.

[71] This includes the frequency of paratactic and hypotactic clauses, anacoloutha, parenthetical remarks, and ellipses.

[72] Van Nes, *Pauline Language*, 203, 219–24.

authorial authenticity of the PE, it yet again provides a concrete example of how rigorous

linguistic analysis provides a necessary counter-balance to questions of historical context.[73]

Finally, the study of Van Nes, as a first step in analyzing larger frequency of clause types,

highlights the need for further application of SFG for the study of NTG to allow for greater

refinement and precision in results. While the frequency of paratactic and hypotactic clauses is

discussed at length, no patterns of clause order or syntactical relationships are established.[74]

Similarly, no distinction is made in the linear regression analysis between types of hypotactic

clauses, and, due to the scope of the study, verbal clauses that have been nominalized or used

substantively, which Van Nes calls embedded clauses, are excluded altogether.[75] The need,

therefore, is evident to include not only the frequency of clause types but patterns of use for

hypotactic clauses,[76] syntactical relationships and structural patterns between paratactic and

hypotactic clauses, and analysis of nominalized or substantive verbal clauses.

As a whole, the field of stylometrics as a discrete form of study for NTG speaks to a

variety of larger issues in the study of linguistics and style of the New Testament, especially for

smaller works such as those in the Pauline Corpus. Initially focused on identifying particular

stylistic phenomena in order to demonstrate authenticity for the Pauline Corpus, the more recent

stylometric studies have demonstrated the limitations of statistical research in relating to

---

[73] In other words, Van Nes shows, once again, that the study of the text itself, with its linguistic and stylistic features, should provide the primary norm and framework for further historical, theological, or interpretive study.

[74] It is infrequent in the PE, as an example, for a hypotactic clause to precede its governing paratactic clause, and many sentences that have a hypotactic clause contain more than one. Such distinctions are beyond the scope of Van Nes' work but provide helpful next steps.

[75] He does discuss different types of hypotaxis, including a distinction between what he calls secondary clauses (predicate position participles or clauses with a hypotactic conjunction) and embedded clauses (certain relative clauses or substantive ὅτι clauses), but all types of hypotactic clauses, including most relative clauses and infinitive clauses, are included in the linear regression analysis without distinction (Van Nes, 194–96).

[76] Some examples would be temporal, causal, purpose, or explanatory hypotactic clauses.

historical questions of authorship. They have, however, also yielded, general consistency of results even with smaller sample sizes and great potential benefit for describing and understanding the style of a particular work when the data is analyzed within a proper linguistic framework. As such, analyzing patterns of style, with or without the assistance of computer software, can serve as a descriptive activity which helps the reader understand the meaning, register, and style of even smaller texts, such as the PE, beyond lexicography and without the necessity of either assuming Pauline or non-Pauline authorship or trying to use the results prescriptively in an attempt to establish or deny their authenticity.

Systemic Functional Grammar and New Testament Greek: A Select Overview

The fruits of SFG and its insights into the structures and functions of language have begun to be produced in various aspects of the study of the Greek of the New Testament, and a fitting place to begin the discussion would be Stanley Porter's seminal 1989 work on Verbal Aspect in conjunction with the roughly contemporaneous yet independent 1990 work of Buist Fanning.[77] These works were not the first to integrate recent linguistic insights into the study of Hellenistic Greek or KG,[78] but they did embody a shift in the landscape of New Testament Studies. Putting the longstanding debate concerning the verbal network of KG in conversation with insights from Bernard Comrie, John Lyons, and Michael Halliday, Porter argues against the traditional

---

[77] Stanley E. Porter, *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament, with Reference to Tense and Mood*, SBG 1 (New York: Peter Lang, 1989) and Buist M. Fanning, *Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1990). While these works and their verbal aspect theory are not directly drawn from SFG, *per se*, they are a fitting place to begin as they successfully blended traditional study of NTG with contemporary linguistic theories for their time.

[78] For a brief overview of the landscape of linguistics in New Testament study following the work of James Barr, see Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 1–16, and for a helpful overview of previous attempts to apply linguistics to the verbal network of NTG, see Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 17–73 and Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 8–85. Porter also summarizes and describes four related but distinct approaches to the contemporary application of linguistic theory to the study of the New Testament as a whole: the SIL, the English and Australian model, the Continental European model, and the South African school (Porter, "Discourse Analysis," 14–35).

Aktionsart model for understanding verbs in KG and the typical association of verb tense

primarily with time, and instead offers a threefold aspectual network for understanding the verbal

system with respect to type, duration, and nature of the action or state depicted, particularly as

portrayed subjectively by the speaker or author himself.[79] While many scholars have offered

points of critique to the verbal aspect theory presented by Porter,[80] nuanced alternatives,[81] further

extensions and refinements,[82] or voices of dissent[83] to this portrayal of the verbal system in KG

---

[79] Or, put simply, the aspect "represents the author's grammaticalized 'conception' of a process … [no aspect] is an objective description of the process, but each represents the speaker's subjective conception" (Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 91). Fanning's argument is similar, but in his work verbal aspect is not as much the subjective conception of the activity in the mind of the speaker as much as the perspective on the action which the speaker wishes to convey (Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 84–85). For a brief but helpful overview of both the similarities and particularities of Porter and Fanning, see Daryl D. Schmidt, "Verbal Aspect in Greek: Two Approaches," in *Biblical Greek Languages and Linguistics: Open Questions in Current Research*, eds. Stanley E. Porter and D.A. Carson, JSNTSup 80 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 63–73 or Buist Fanning, "Porter and Fanning on New Testament Greek Verbal Aspect: Retrospect and Prospect," in *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach to Biblical Exegesis*, ed. Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch (Bellingham: Lexham, 2016), 7–12.

[80] For some prototypical examples, see Moisés Silva, "A Response to Fanning and Porter on Verbal Aspect," in Stanley Porter and D.A. Carson, eds., *Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics: Open Questions in Current Research,* JSNTSup 80 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993), 74–82; Robert E. Picirilli, "Time and Order in the Circumstantial Participles of Mark and Luke," *BBR* 17 (2007): 241–59; or Benjamin L. Merkle, "The Abused Aspect: Neglecting the Influence of a Verb's Lexical Meaning on Tense-Form Choice," *BBR* 26 (2016): 57–74.

[81] See the work of James W. Voelz, who offers the language of "focus" in his understanding of "aspect," which proposes a subjective view on the part of the communicator and allows for a system of three types of focus for Greek verbs based on the verbal stem itself, thereby offering a more comprehensive solution that still allows for the full force of the indicative mood as it relates to time. James W. Voelz, "Present and Aorist Verbal Aspect: A New Proposal" *Neot* 27 (1993):153–64; James W. Voelz, *Fundamental Greek Grammar*, 4th rev. ed. (St. Louis: Concordia, 2019), especially 56–62, 148–56, and 197–202; and James W. Voelz, "The Language of the New Testament," ANRW 25.2:893–977, Part 2, Principat 25.2, eds. H. Temporini and W. Haase (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1984), especially 966–70. Or, see the work of K.L. McKay, who argues for four aspects instead of three, but that time and other contextual elements still determine verb and aspect choice. K. L. McKay, "Time and Aspect in New Testament Greek" *NovT* 34 (1992): 209–28. Also, see the work of Constantine Campbell, who utilizes much of Porter's verbal aspect theory but places the perfect tenses under the imperfective aspect, leaving two instead of three aspects, and describes the difference between aspects in the spatial category of remoteness. Constantine R. Campbell, *Verbal Aspect, the Indicative Mood, and Narrative: Soundings in the Greek of the New Testament*, SBG 13 (New York: Peter Lang, 2007) and Constantine R. Campbell, *Verbal Aspect and Non-Indicative Verbs: Further Soundings in the Greek of the New Testament*, SBG 15 (New York: Peter Lang, 2008).

[82] See, for example, Rodney J. Decker, *Temporal Deixis of the Greek Verb in the Gospel of Mark with Reference to Verbal Aspect*, SBG 10 (New York: Peter Lang, 2001). For an example of refining the particulars of verbal aspect theory, see Douglas S. Huffman, *Verbal Aspect Theory and the Prohibitions in the Greek New Testament*, SBG 16 (New York: Peter Lang, 2014), who argues that testing verbal aspect theory with "NT Greek prohibitions demonstrates that the verbal aspect theory holds most consistently" (Huffman, *Prohibitions*, 104).

[83] There are some who reject Porter's view on grammatical grounds, preferring to maintain the traditional *Aktionsart* view and the full grammaticalization of time, such as Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the*

unto the present date, the fact remains that the work of Porter and Fanning served as a turning

point in the study of KG and NTG in particular; from that point onward, research and analysis of

the grammar and syntax of NTG typically utilized Porter's and Fanning's work as the starting

point, and thereby embedded modern linguistics into the discussion of NTG. This outcome was

already quickly recognized following the publication of Porter's and Fanning's work,[84] and still

reasserted decades later, as "scholars continu[e] to use Porter and Fanning as benchmarks for

positioning their own views."[85] From Porter's and Fanning's work onward, the relationship

between modern linguistics and KG has been an inescapable facet of research in New Testament

studies.

The role of modern linguistic theories in New Testament research has been much discussed

and explored, especially on a theoretical level, but a more full integration of linguistics and New

Testament studies has yet to occur.[86] This is due to at least three different factors: conceptual and

---

Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), especially 499–512. There are others who reject Porter's view because of its foundation in modern English linguistics, such as Chrys Caragounis, *The Development of Greek and the New Testament*, WUNT 1/167 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), especially pages 316–36. Still others argue that Porter's model is incorrect for a variety of other linguistic reasons, including the concepts of markedness, foregrounding, and the possibility of contrastive substitution as a basis for the non-temporal view, such as Steven E. Runge, "Contrastive Substitution and the Greek Verb: Reassessing Porter's Argument" *NovT* 56 (2014): 154–73 and Steven E. Runge, "Markedness: Contrasting Porter's Model with the Linguists Cited as Support," *BBR* 26 (2016): 43–56.

[84] As noted by D.A. Carson, who writes in 1993 that "[f]rom now on, treatments of the verbal system of New Testament Greek that do not probingly interact with Porter and Fanning will rule themselves outmoded." D.A. Carson, "An Introduction to the Porter/Fanning Debate," in Porter and Carson, *Biblical Greek*, 18–25, 25.

[85] Huffman, *Prohibitions*, 103. Indeed, this is evident even in the 2016 volume *The Greek Verb Revisited*, which Steven Runge introduces before its publication by stating that "NT studies have been hampered by how Porter initially framed the debate in 1989. The primary aim of the conference [volume] is to offer an overview of the Greek verb that draws on the most recent research available from linguistics and Classics… [Interacting with Porter] is not the purpose of the conference" (Runge, "Markedness," 56). The included essays, however, contain manifold references to Porter, Fanning, and others, showing just how inescapable their view of the Greek verb remains to the present today.

[86] Not only general linguistics, as Stanley Porter recently notes (see Porter, *Linguistic Analysis*, 14, 83–92), but Porter's work on verbal aspect in itself has yet to be applied thoroughly and tested against the New Testament Text, as noted by Decker, who writes that "the discussion of aspect theory in relation to the Greek of the NT has been carried out largely at the theoretical level… there have been very few attempts systematically to examine [Porter's] aspect theory in an extended section of NT text" (Decker, *Temporal Deixis*, 2). Although, see Voelz's

theoretical concerns about the model or models employed,[87] the ever-shifting landscape of

linguistic developments that typically have not allowed for sufficient testing and application of

various theories in order to establish the concrete contributions of such work as a whole,[88] and

the multiplicity of linguistic models, each with its own level of both independence from and

interrelatedness with other models.[89] While the first factor is indeed an important issue with the

appropriation of any recent theory into the study of the New Testament, a full exploration of this

point with regard to the various linguistic models in use is beyond the scope of this study. Some

preliminary comments, however, are appropriate as they lead into the second and third factors.

For as much theoretical debate as has occurred around various applications of contemporary

linguistics to New Testament scholarship, such as Porter's theory on verbal aspect, the "proof is

in the pudding," in that any linguistic theory must actually be shown to enhance the study and

meaning of the New Testament, especially as recent and contemporary theories are applied to an

ancient collection of texts, both in smaller samples and in larger, more comprehensive study.

Moreover, there also must always remain a sense of exploration and humility when applying

linguistic theories to the study of the New Testament; in other words, even applications of SFG

---

commentaries on Mark, where his theory on verbal aspect is applied rigorously to the text as an important feature for interpretation. James Voelz, *Mark 1:1-8:26* (St. Louis: Concordia, 2013) and James Voelz, *Mark 8:27-16:8*, Bound with Christopher W. Mitchell, *Mark 16:9-20* (St. Louis: Concordia, 2019). For an example of the application of his aspectual theory to the interpretation and meaning of the text, see his analysis of Mark 7:24–37, and especially how this differs from the same material presented in synoptic parallels. Voelz, *Mark*, 475–90 and James Voelz, "Standard/Classical Greek Constructions in the Gospel according to Mark and Their Importance for Interpretation," *NT* 62 (2020): 343–60, especially 349–50.

[87] See the above footnotes for the reactions to Porter's work as an initial example of this factor.

[88] See the third through sixth "problems" for applying linguistic study to the New Testament raised by Joseph D. Fantin, *The Greek Imperative Mood in the New Testament: A Cognitive and Communicative Approach*, SNG 12 (New York: Peter Lang, 2010), 326–29. Not only have applications of linguistic theories tended to focus on specific aspects or functions of the Greek language, but "the value of linguistic theories for New Testament studies still needs to be determined… some linguistic analyses yield few results for the effort exerted" (Fantin, *Imperative Mood*, 326–327).

[89] See the first two "problems" raised by Fantin, *Imperative Mood*, 322–26.

and other language-based models must always remain primarily descriptive activities and allow

for modification or refinement of the theory based on the findings themselves.[90]

The verbal aspect theory of Stanley Porter has yet to be fully validated and utilized in more

general New Testament study, but in recent decades many scholars have begun to integrate other

tenets of SFG in various ways while analyzing the works of the New Testament in order to test

and examine the contributions of linguistics to New Testament study.[91] One component of SFG

that was utilized in Porter's theory of verbal aspect that also has implications for other facets of

the Greek language is the issue of "foregounding."[92] At its core, foregrounding within the Greek

verbal network, especially as applied to narrative, refers to the emphasis or lack thereof typically

indicated by verbal aspect choice.[93] Recent studies have demonstrated the general consistency of

Porter's model in this regard,[94] but the larger contribution has yet to demonstrated and integrated

---

[90] Or, as Fantin asserts, "there is a danger of viewing the use of linguistics in biblical studies as some type of magical key to unlocking the meaning of the biblical text… [The use of linguistics] should not minimize the important grammatical tradition that New Testament scholars have inherited" (Fantin, *Imperative Mood*, 329). See also Stanley E. Porter, "Studying Ancient Languages from a Modern Linguistics Perspective: Essential Terms and Terminology," *FN* 2 (1989): 147–72, especially 153–55.

[91] Again, while Porter's and Fanning's works on verbal aspect were not drawn from SFG, verbal aspect and the function of tense within the language system is a major component of SFG (Halliday, *Grammar*, 151–200).

[92] Foregrounding, in itself, does not come from SFG but rather from what Porter calls "perceptual psychology," namely, the role of verbs and language in planes of discourse as exposited by S. Wallace and P.J. Hopper (see Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 92–93). The concept of foregrounding as applied by Porter to the Greek verbal system, however, is greatly indebted to the SFG concepts of verbal opposition and patterns of markedness for types of discourse. See Stanley E. Porter, *Idioms of the Greek of the New Testament*, 2d ed., BL:G 2 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 22–26, 295–96, 302–303; Stanley E. Porter, "In Defence of Verbal Aspect," in Porter and Carson, *Biblical Greek*, 26–45, 34–35; or Decker, *Temporal Deixis*, 21–22.

[93] Or, to put another way, the perfective aspect tends to move the story along as the typical background aspect, the imperfective aspect tends to narrate the main events and ideas as the foreground aspect, and the perfect aspect further defines the foregrounded material, bringing otherwise backgrounded material into the foreground for special emphasis (rf. Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 92–93). Note, however, the observation of Voelz that presenting foregrounding as discrete, grammatical categories is not always satisfactory, citing the historical present as an example. In this case, the present tense in the indicative mood, typically relating events in real time, is used by the author to bring past actions and the connection between the subject and the verb to the fore. In this way, the discrete separation of foreground and background verbs cannot be cleanly grammatical, as literary devices and authorial style impact foregrounding as well (see Voelz, "Aspect," 162–63 and Voelz, "Constructions," 350–51).

[94] Such as Ivan Shing Chung Kwong, *The Word Order of the Gospel of Luke: Its Foregrounded Messages*, LNTS 298, SNTG 12 (London: T&T Clark, 2005) or Gustavo Martin-Asensio, *Transitivity-Based Foregrounding in*

into general scholarship. Another major aspect of SFG that has begun to show great promise is

the notion of register.[95] While the socio-linguistic features of register have been explored in great

length outside of SFG,[96] the implications of register on the use and form of language itself is a

large component of SFG.[97] Due to the complexity and variety of factors that contribute to

register, it is not surprising that a more robust application and integration of register study into

New Testament scholarship has not yet taken place, but preliminary applications, especially as

noted above with the work of Pitts and Van Nes, have both validated the complexity of the issues

involved and the value for studying them while also providing helpful insight for future

research.[98] A third salient feature of SFG which has been gaining ground in NTG is that of word

order, especially within various types of clauses and syntactical structures. While this is related

to the issues of markedness and foregrounding, the study of word order and clause structures in

NTG as its own phenomenon deserves mention. Stanley Porter lamented that this field was

largely unexplored in 1993 and repeats the same sentiment over two decades later.[99] Though

---

the Acts of Apostles: *A Functional-Grammatical Approach to the Lukan Perspective,* JSNTSup 202, SNTG 8 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000). One should also note that the term "general consistency" is used above, in that foregrounding, as a pragmatic effect and application of grammatical forms, by necessity includes at least an element of subjectivity.

[95] See page 21 above as well as notes 4, 56–57. For the importance extra-linguistic phenomena for studying language, Biblical Greek in particular, see also Christopher D. Land, "Varieties of the Greek Language," in Porter and Pitts, *The Language of the New Testament,* 243–60.

[96] See Pitts, "Style and Pseudonymity," 122–30 and the discussion above.

[97] As Stanley Porter writes, "M.A.K. Halliday has done more to develop and foster the notion of register than any other" (Porter, *Linguistic Analysis*, 146n2). For a more in-depth exploration of register in the work of Halliday, see Stanley E. Porter, "Dialect and Register in the Greek of the New Testament: Theory," in *Rethinking Contexts, Rereading Texts: Contributions from the Social Sciences to Biblical Interpretation*, ed. M. Daniel Carroll R., JSOTSup 299 (Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 190–208, especially 197–207.

[98] As noted by Porter, who writes that "[w]hat is needed now, I believe, is more widespread application of register analysis to a wide range of texts" (Porter, *Linguistic Analysis*, 158).

[99] Stanley E. Porter, "Word Order and Clause Structure in New Testament Greek: An Unexplored Area of Greek Linguistics Using Philippians as a Test Case," *FN* 12 (1993): 177–206 and Porter, *Linguistic Analysis*, 347–53.

there have been studies of word order both for KG and Classical Greek,[100] the studies have been

done with various theoretical models and methods and the larger question remains concerning

the contribution for understanding and interpreting the texts involved. The SFG concept of

markedness provides a helpful framework for such study, and allows for a focus on the

distributional use of various word orders within different clausal structures.

One major aspect of SFG that has yet to be discussed or integrated into the study of the

New Testament as a whole, however, is the concept of the "rank scale" and, more importantly,

the impact that the phenomenon of "rank shift" has on syntactical and structural patterns. The

rank scale, as presented by Halliday, presents the different levels of discourse in a taxonomical

arrangement. The highest rank on the scale is the rank of "discourse," which represents an entire

act of communication, such the whole of the Gospel of Mark or the letter of Romans. The next

rank is that of the "clause," a concrete statement of thought including a verbal form. This is

followed by the rank of "word group," where one or more words form a syntactical unit with one

function within a clause.[101] The rank of "word," then, is the fundamental and basic unit at the

bottom of the rank scale.[102] Within the rank scale, every element on one level of rank is

comprised of one or more elements of the lower rank, all the way down.[103]

---

[100] See Pitts, "Word Order," 321–46; Stephen Levinsohn, *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek*, 2nd ed. (Dallas: SIL International, 2000), 14–22, 29–67; and Porter, *Idioms*, 286–97 with a focus on NTG. See also Helma Dik, "Interpreting Adjective Position in Herodotus," in *Grammar as Interpretation: Greek Literature in its Linguistic Contexts*, ed. Egbert J. Bakker, MnBibClBatSup 171 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 55–76 and Hjalmar Frisk, *Studien zur Griechischen Wortstellung*, GötHögÅrs 39 (Göteborg: Elanders Boktryckeri Aktibolag, 1932) with a focus on Herodotus. See also Kenneth J. Dover, *Greek Word Order* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960) for a more general study, albeit still with large focus on Homer and Herodotus.

[101] The different types of word groups for the study of NTG will be defined below.

[102] Halliday does identify one lower rank below the word, namely, the "morpheme." But for the sake of word order and syntactical relationships this lowest rank is not necessary for consideration (Halliday, *Grammar*, 9).

[103] A clause, for example, is comprised of one or more words groups, including a verb, that function together syntactically to form a thought. A word group is comprised of one or more words, and so on. Conversely, a single word, such as an imperative verb, can function as a verbal word group and a clause in itself (see Halliday, *Grammar*, 7–10).

While this is certainly nothing new to the study of NTG, the rank scale provides the framework for the analysis of rank shift. Rank shift occurs where an element on one level of the rank scale is used as an element or part of an element lower on the rank scale. As an example, when the sentence "I bought the groceries" is used as direct or indirect discourse – "He said that he had bought the groceries," it has been rank shifted. While properly a clause in itself, it now functions as one element of another clause on the level of word group, namely, the direct object of the main verb. This same clause could also appear as a relative clause—"The man, who bought the groceries, was ready to get home." This is another example of rank shift, where the first clause now is functioning adjectivally to modify the subject and thereby is part of the subject word group of another clause. Within the study of NTG, the primary instances of rank shift include relative clauses, recitative and appositive ὅτι clauses, quotations, direct or indirect discourse, various types of infinitive clauses, and participial clauses in attributive position. These clauses include verbal forms, and thus serve as clauses, and yet the clause is used on the level of a word group within another clause.[104] The patterns of usage for rank-shifted clauses and the impact that rank shift has on syntactical patterns has yet to be investigated at length in the study of NTG. Thus, the utilization of SFG within New Testament study has begun to take root in various aspects of the study of the language of the New Testament, but there is certainly more work to be done in concrete textual application and the overall contribution of such study.

A third factor limiting the overall integration of SFG into contemporary study of the New Testament texts is that SFG is but one of many linguistic models, each with similar but at times divergent terminology, methodology, and goals, all considered together as part of one larger field

---

[104] The use and syntax of rank-shifted clauses, as well as the word groups in which they tend to appear, will be discussed in further detail below.

called "discourse analysis."[105] While various discourse analysts differ in their method and terminology, one factor that does unite them is that they are primarily looking for the meaning of a text as whole unit of discourse, namely, that the majority of meaning is found, in the language of Stephen Levinsohn, *extrasententially*.[106] In other words, in contrast to lexico-grammatical or historical-critical methods, the focus of discourse analysts is to look for meaning in a given text on the basis of relationships, patterns, and connections each word or sentence has within the larger textual framework. Different schools of discourse analysis, however, choose to focus on different kinds of relationships and connections. The SIL, as an example, uses linguistics with a primary focus on patterns of word order relationships for the goal of proper translation, typically within each individual book or letter on its own.[107] The South African school tends to utilize sociolinguistics in order to establish the larger semantic fields and relationships between words and their meaning[108] as well as the semantic connections between cola, or individual clauses, or larger ranks of discourse to determine what is called "cohesion" within the text or discourse.[109]

---

[105] Porter, *Analysis*, 133–34. He notes that there are several distinct approaches all lumped together under the heading of discourse analysis, but that their methods, assumptions, and goals all vary.

[106] Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, viii–ix.

[107] See Porter, "Discourse Analysis," 24–25 and the note in Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, ix. This also leads some SIL work to value pragmatics over consistency in theory, especially with regard to how linguistics differs from language to language,such as Levinsohn's largely undefended decision to take the default word order for Greek as verb first without any discussion of larger theories or patterns across different works of the New Testament (Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 17), yet when a similar frequency distribution of word order occurs with adjectival modifiers and head nouns, he asserts that more "research is therefore needed" to determine the default order (Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 62).

[108] For a focus on lexemes in themselves, see Johannes P. Louw, *Semantics of New Testament Greek* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1982); Johannes P. Louw, ed., *Lexicography and Translation: With Special Reference to Bible Translation* (Roggebai: Bible Society of South Africa, 1985); Johannes P. Louw and Eugene A. Nida, eds, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains,* 2 vols. (New York: United Bible Societies, 1989); idem, *Lexical Semantics of the Greek New Testament*, SBLRBS 25 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992); or Moisés Silva, *Biblical Words and Their Meaning*, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994).

[109] See Louw, *Semantics*, 67–158 or Moisés Silva, *God, Language, and Scripture: Reading the Bible in the Light of General Linguistics*, FCInt 4 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1990). This is not to say, however, that the South African school does not also deal with translation or other linguistic fields, such as the role of the reader in interpretation and semantic analysis of the reader's response. See Johannes P. Louw, ed., *Meaningful Translation:*

The Dutch school, largely following the linguistic work of Simon Dik, uses specific terminology to describe sentence elements and connections,[110] while SIL linguists, by contrast, use different terminology to mean similar yet distinct things.[111] Both SIL linguistics and those who apply SFG to the New Testament agree that they are both dependent on the view that language is a deliberate choice among competing linguistic options,[112] but they operate differently. Different schools of thought within discourse analysis also differ in their starting point, with some beginning from a theoretical framework and working their way down through the text to the lower ranks, while others begin at the lower ranks of discourse and, on the basis of use, try to establish patterns that could appear within the larger ranks of discourse.[113] This select sampling of differences between different linguistic models in use among scholars within the field of

---

Its Implications for the Reader, UBS.MS 5 (New York: United Bible Societies, 1991); Johannes P. Louw, "Sociolinguistics and Its Role in Text Analysis," in *Sociolinguistics and Communication*, ed. Johannes P. Louw, UBS.MS 1 (London: United Bible Societies, 1986), 103–15; Willem S. Vorster, "Reader-Response, Redescription, and Reference: 'You Are the Man' [2 Sam12:7]," in *Text and Reality: Aspects of Reference in Biblical Texts*, eds. Bernard C. Lategan and Willem S. Vorster (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), 95–112.

[110] The sentence constituents are a theme, focus, predicate, and X, with "chunking devices" to delineate the features that link clauses and paragraphs together. See S.R. Slings, "Figures of Speech and Their Lookalikes: Two Further Exercises in the Pragmatics of the Greek Sentence," in *Grammar as Interpretation: Greek Literature in its Linguistic Contexts*, ed. Egbert J. Bakker, MnBibClBatSup 171 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 169–214, especially 169–75 for a brief overview.

[111] The sentence constituents are topic and comment, focus and presupposition, or presentation depending on the sentence type, and the features that link or separate clauses and statements are called factors of coherence or discontinuity. See Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 2–67.

[112] See Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 7–16 and Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, vii–viii.

[113] SIL linguists, for example, tend to work from the bottom up to arrive at their conclusions, which can lead to a development of fragmented idiolects without a cohesive theoretical whole. SFG linguistics tend to work from the top down, which can lead to privileging theory over concrete use and forcing external categories onto a text. See Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, vii–viii; Porter, "Discourse Analysis," 24–27; or Fantin, *Imperative Mood*, 328. Levinsohn himself concedes that the bottom-up approach is "a weakness of this book and a huge… area where further research is needed. I have not undertaken an in-depth study of how every author uses the different devices. For example, when I describe the ways that Matthew uses the historical present, that is all I am describing… I am not implying that Mark and Luke-Acts will use the historical present in exactly the same way" (Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, viii). For a critique of Porter's top-down approach precisely on the grounds that it privileges theory over concrete use and idiolect, see Silva, "A Response," 77–79. In the end, however, the "top-down" approach of SFG can more easily integrate the SIL's "bottom-up" approach rather than the other way around.

discourse analysis suffices to the make the case that "one cannot ignore fundamental differences between theories,"[114] but this is not to say that utilizing multiple models, especially where they overlap, cannot be a fruitful enterprise.

SFG as a distinct form of discourse analysis, especially as applied to the New Testament, has proven the most useful when deliberately integrating overlapping aspects of multiple linguistic models. On the one hand, some overlap is partially unavoidable as there will always be both intentional and unintentional mutual influence among scholars in the same field of study.[115] On the other hand, a major strength of SFG as it has been applied to the New Testament, with its interest in larger structural patterns and cohesiveness, is that scholars have been able to use SFG as the primary model while still incorporating elements of the other models, especially the South African model and the SIL, to make more comprehensive arguments. This is a central factor for why SFG was chosen was the primary model for the current project. A significant component of discourse analysis as undertaken by SFG linguists, for example, is that of semantic fields and semantic chains;[116] Ray Van Neste, in his work, regularly utilizes the work of the South African school, specifically Johannes Louw and Eugene Nida, throughout his work on cohesion for the

---

[114] Fantin, *Imperative Mood*, 330.

[115] Those applying linguistics to NTG and individual works of the New Testament are no exception. See Jeffrey T. Reed, "Identifying Theme in the New Testament: Insights from Discourse Analysis," in Porter and Carson *Discourse Analysis and Other Topics*, 75–90 for the varied influence of SIL linguistics and the Dutch school on Halliday's linguistic model, especially as applied by Porter and Reed. See also Stephen H. Levinsohn, "A Discourse Study of Constituent Order and the Article in Philippians," in Porter and Carson, *Discourse Analysis and Other Topics*, 60–74 for a deliberate use of Simon Dik and the Dutch school in a study by an SIL linguist. Lastly, Nylund also gives a more thorough demonstration of Simon Dik's influence particularly on Hallidayan linguistics as espoused by Porter and the South African school as exposited by Louw and Nida. Jan Nylund, "The Prague School of Linguistics and Its Influence on New Testament Language Studies," in Porter and Pitts, *The Language of the New Testament*, 198–220.

[116] Reed, "Cohesiveness of Discourse," 41–45; Reed, "Cohesive Ties," 134–38; and Reed, "Identifying Theme," 83–84.

PE.[117] It is also significant that Van Neste also utilizes the work of the SIL as it has focused on the use of specific devices within the idiolect of the PE.[118] In this way, Van Neste's work demonstrates how multiple branches of discourse analysis can be utilized, with SFG as the primary model, without confusing the terminology and goals thereof. Such a methodology avoids Joseph Fantin's concerns about an eclectic approach to utilizing linguistics in Biblical study,[119] but at the same time appreciates the insights from multiple linguistic models while keeping SFG as the primary vehicle for analysis.

SFG has also tended to be the primary field in which discourse analysis has been applied to the PE. On the one hand, this is expected, as SFG's more comprehensive theory of internal consistence and cohesion has been applied in the PE in response to perennial historical questions of that very issue. On the other hand, SFG introduces a fresh method with which the text can be studied strictly on the basis of the language and textual structure, without the necessity of merely using linguistics in service to historical considerations.[120] The work of Jeffrey Reed and Ray Van

---

[117] While not explicitly mentioning Louw or Nida in the methodology chapter of his work, the semantic lexicon of Louw and Nida is the primary lexicon in use and is routinely referenced throughout (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 20, 34, 46, 48, 52, 91, 95, 107, or 138–40).

[118] Similarly, the SIL is not mentioned explicitly in the introductory material, but Levinsohn's work on conjunctions in the PE is mentioned occasionally in the analysis (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 39 or 49), Banker's structural analysis also appears in the sections on Titus (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 237 or 278–80), and Jacob Heckert's work on the use of conjunctions in the PE is used where appropriate and helpful (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 24, 36, or 49). Stephen H. Levinsohn, "Some Constraints on Discourse Development in the Pastoral Epistles," in Porter and Reed, *Discourse Analysis*, 316–33; John Banker, *A Semantic and Structural Analysis of Titus* [Dallas: SIL International, 1987]; Jacob K. Heckert, *Discourse Function of Conjoiners in the Pastoral Epistles* (Dallas: SIL International, 1996).

[119] Fantin, *Imperative Mood*, 330–31.

[120] For a helpful example in this regard, see Ernst R. Wendland, "'Let No One Disregard You!' (Titus 2.15): Church Discipline and the Construction of Discourse in a Personal, 'Pastoral' Epistle," in Porter and Reed, *Discourse Analysis*, 334–51. Utilizing the work of Jeffrey Reed, Wendland uses features of discourse analysis in order to demonstrate the structural significance of Titus 2:15 within the letter and to examine its rhetorical effect. See also Cynthia Long Westfall, "A Moral Dilemma? The Epistolary Body of 2 Timothy," in *Paul and the Ancient Letter Form*, eds. Stanley E. Porter and Sean A. Adams, PAST 6 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 213–52. Westfall utilizes discourse analysis alongside rhetorical study to demonstrate how the fields can illuminate one another in understanding the genre and intended effect of letter.

Neste on cohesion and unity in the PE,[121] even though it was in response to challenges raised by historical issues, did helpfully bring the focus of studying the PE back to the text itself, letting historical considerations be subservient to the actual linguistic structures and devices of the text. Historical claims about the PE, and by extension any work of the New Testament, must always be subject to emendation or rejection based on rigorous, linguistic analysis of the language of the text itself.[122] Beyond discussion of semantic chains and cohesiveness as it relates to historical consideration, however, there has been little application of SFG to the PE. And, when it has been done, it is usually as part of a larger study of the Pauline Corpus as a whole.[123]

Since the work on verbal aspect by Porter and Fanning, SFG has become embedded in many discussions about the Greek of the New Testament and thereby in New Testament studies as a whole. The variety of linguistic models available, the rapidly changing landscape of linguistics and the New Testament, and persistent concerns about the theory, methods, and proposed benefits of linguistic study have hindered fuller integration of SFG into the study of the New Testament, and within the study of the New Testament the PE have not received the same attention as the Gospels, Acts, or the larger works of the Pauline Corpus. Discourse analysis has proven to be especially fruitful, particularly when SFG is utilized as the primary model yet integrating insights from other forms of discourse analysis. SFG also provides a helpful basis for addressing major lacunae for linguistic study of the PE that remain in the areas of word order,

---

[121] Before the comprehensive work of Van Neste, see the previous discourse analysis of 1 Timothy by Jeffrey Reed. See Reed, "In Defense," 140–46 and Jeffrey T. Reed, "To Timothy or Not? A Discourse Analysis of 1 Timothy," in Porter and Carson, *Biblical Greek*, 90–118, which was in its time "the most detailed [work of discourse analysis] to date" (Porter, "Discourse Analysis," 28).

[122] This is not say that even those doing rigorous linguistic study are not shaped in some way by historical presuppositions and conclusions about the text or that linguistics is somehow more objective than other methods, but simply that one's conclusions about the history in or behind the text must take into account all the linguistic data available.

[123] See Pitts, "Style and Pseudonymity," 133–52 or Pitts, "Greek Word Order," 322–39.

markedness, and codification of syntactical patterns, especially with deliberate consideration of how these phenomena occur within the various types of word groups, phrases, and clauses.

The Dissertation in the Context of Current Scholarship

This section will demonstrate how this dissertation will contribute to New Testament studies in direct discussion with the fields of study outlined above and the work currently underway in them. Advances in the application of SFG and other linguistic models to the works of the New Testament, the study of the PE in themselves, and the questions raised about consistency of literary style raised by stylostatistical analysis all lie in the background of the present study, and it is precisely the intersection of these fields, combined with the use of a copious amount of strictly linguistic data, that will serve as the primary contribution of this dissertation. In many ways, this study will be exploratory rather than persuasive in nature, which will also allow for the data generated by the study to raise further questions and contribute to a variety of paths for further research and exploration.

Language Study and the Pastoral Epistles

The relationship of the PE with other works of the New Testament, especially the rest of the Pauline Corpus, has been and remains a longstanding question. The nature of the historical and authorial relationship of the PE with the rest of the Pauline Corpus, and at times also with Luke-Acts, has dominated the study of the PE. The diction, structure, theology, and personal references of the PE have been analyzed in great detail, but, following Schleiermacher and Schmidt, typically in service to historical concerns and Pauline authenticity.[124] The entire field of

---

[124] The work of Smith, referenced above, is one exception to this trend, but it is nevertheless significant that she still feels the need to address issues of historical provenance and authorship, even though it is not directly necessary for her study (Smith, *Communities*, 15–27).

stylostatistics, as pioneered in New Testament study by A.Q. Morton, occurred with the goal of discerning authentic and inauthentic works.[125] While the field became far more precise with the work of Neumann, Mealand, O'Donnell, Pitts, van Nes, and others, the question remains whether or not such studies in "style by numbers"[126] can persuasively prove or disprove authenticity whatsoever.[127] Even the application of cohesion analysis to the PE was undertaken with the *Fragmentenhypothese* in mind and in direct conversation with those who would divide the PE in order to construct a proposed historical development behind the texts as they appear in the New Testament.

The historical background and development of the PE have been the underlying impetus for much study of the language of the PE and has produced much data, but language study on these terms has been problematic for at least two reasons. Firstly, as demonstrated by the history of stylostatistical analysis of the New Testament, the types of data under analysis greatly impact what can be concluded with any confidence. Secondly, linguistic data generated in service of historical concerns is, with rare exception, typically only applied insofar as the language speaks to the historical question at hand. In other words, the historical focus of research on the PE has seldom led to intentional application of linguistic data for exegesis and understanding of individual passages and the letters as a whole on a strictly textual basis. Addressing these two concerns serves as a primary focus of the present study.

---

[125] See the discussion above.

[126] O'Donnell, "Fingerprints," 254.

[127] As mentioned above, even the more detailed multivariate analysis of Mealand does little other than reinforce with statistical data what other readers had already concluded through other means.

The Nature and Type of Linguistic Data

Much scholarship has been focused on comparing the PE both to one another and the other works of the New Testament, but often on the basis of incomplete or unhelpful linguistic data.[128] It has mainly been individual terms, technical phrases, or personal references serving as the basis for comparison to other works, whether the comparison is historical, rhetorical, or theological in nature. The work of Matthew O'Donnell and Andrew Pitts, however, demonstrates how focusing on better types of linguistic data within a larger methodological framework produces a more accurate picture of the way texts exhibit linguistic phenomena, and thereby giving more helpful data for intertextual comparison.

More accurate linguistic data, focused on syntactical relationships and grammatical patterns within various types of clauses and word groups, will provide a better means of comparison among different works of the Pauline Corpus and the New Testament as a whole, but at the same time the usefulness of such data needs to be demonstrated rather than assumed. In this way, the present study will not only focus on constructing a holistic description of the linguistic profile for each work under consideration, but it will analyze three works that are closely related in terms of register yet distinct from one another in terms of content, vocabulary, and personal references. The PE will thereby provide an appropriate and manageable sample set for testing the accuracy of the generated data for comparison among smaller, closely related works, which can then be extended into other works of the Pauline Corpus and the New Testament. The present study, due to the size of the sample set, will also be able to incorporate

---

[128] Distinctive vocabulary, as an example, which was previously considered a primary basis for considering the PE as distinct from the rest of the Pauline Corpus, has now been recognized as far less important for determining authorship due to advancements in register analysis and the recognition of both textual and social factors beyond authorship that greatly influence language and vocabulary in a given work.

the data from previous linguistic work on the PE.[129] A more complete linguistic profile for each

work will be able to integrate these studies, while simultaneously offering detailed analysis of

linguistic features that have not been thoroughly investigated in previous scholarship.

The Use and Implications of Linguistic Data

The perennial focus on historical concerns and authenticity for the PE has tended to shape

not only the type of linguistic data studied, but also the ways in which the data have been applied

to the texts themselves. Rarely have the linguistic data been studied, for example, in order to ask

questions about the meaning and interpretation of the texts, even by Van Nes and Van Neste,

who have proffered the most comprehensive applications of SFG to the study of the PE to date.[130]

The question remains, then, concerning the usefulness of such linguistic data for actually aiding

in textual interpretation and theological application.[131] The present study, then, will construct a

full linguistic profile for each work of the PE, but with the express purpose of using that data in a

reciprocal fashion, namely, in order to further study and understand both the language of the PE

in itself and how each work is using KG on a purely linguistic level. In this way, the myriad

historical, theological, and authorial questions that have surrounded research of the PE will be

---

[129] Van Neste and the SIL, as examples, use linguistic data in the PE as it applies to cohesion and discourse analysis, such as the discourse function of conjunctions and semantic relationships.

[130] This can be seen throughout the history of scholarship both on the PE themselves and stylometric analysis of the Pauline Corpus as outlined above, namely, that data is generated, analyzed, and applied to the text only insofar as the data speak to the concerns of each particular study. Consequently, for scholars who use language study to argue for or against Pauline authorship of the PE use language as a means to investigate early church history and the limits of what could be considered the work of a single author.

[131] As mentioned above, this is not to say that there have not been a myriad of smaller studies focused on applying and interpreting various sections and verses of the PE in a modern setting that study various aspects of the language of the text, but these, too, only study the language insofar as they apply to the pertinent theological topic or interpretive issue. The work of the SIL, also, deserves mention in this regard. In many ways, the work of the SIL is precisely intended to study the language of the text as a means for understanding the language and structure of the text better. As Porter mentions, however, this work often lacks a comprehensively stated and defended linguistic model and focuses great energy on very particular types of data (rf. Porter, "Discourse Analysis," 24–27), and so the usefulness of the data is tempered by the reader's ability to fit the data into a more holistic framework.

altogether unaddressed in the present study, so that the language itself can be the prime object of analysis. This is not to say that the data produced in this study will not have implications for theological concerns, questions of authenticity, variant readings, and other fields of New Testament scholarship, and indeed some preliminary application for intertextual comparison will be offered after constructing the linguistic profile for each work; more accurate and holistic data concerning the language of the PE, however, must be the starting point for such application and analysis.

Methodological Procedure to Be Employed

The present study will construct a linguistic profile for each work of the PE, and this section will outline the methodological framework which will be used, as well as introduce how the usefulness of the profiles will be tested and applied in a preliminary fashion. While SFG, as expressed by Michael Halliday, will not serve as the only linguistic model or source of terminology for the present study, it will serve as a baseline, with insights from other models incorporated within that framework and appropriate modifications made with respect to NTG. The linguistic profiles will then be constructed, analyzing how different types of clauses and word groups are used, primarily in terms of order and syntactical relationships. Following the compilation of the linguistic profiles for the PE, such profiles will be compared to one another and, in a preliminary way, to four other passages from the New Testament. This will test the sensitivity and usefulness of the data and give a foretaste for how the data can be used for future research.

Systemic Functional Grammar as the Primary Linguistic Model

The work of Michael Halliday has proven to be a formative and instructive influence in the application of contemporary linguistics to the study of the New Testament texts. The full impact

of SFG as expressed by Halliday is not, however, necessary for the present, exploratory study.

Some aspects of SFG will not appear in the present study[132] and others will be used in limited

contexts.[133] The present study will mainly utilize the insights of SFG only as they pertain to the

word order and syntax of word groups, clauses, and clause complexes within the framework of

the rank scale, as discussed above.[134] The Hallidayan rank scale and especially the phenomenon

of rank shift are central to the present study. The rank scale presents the basic framework for

structural analysis for the different levels of discourse within the PE and it provides a basis for

rank shift and its impact on patterns of word order and syntax.

The present study will utilize terminology from SFG, while also noting that it must be

adapted in certain respects for the study of NTG. While the larger principles of SFG can be used

for language study of any kind,[135] the syntactical precision used for English, a configurational

language that depends on word order to convey syntactical relationships, does not apply in the

same way to a non-configurational language like KG.[136] The larger concern, however, is the

---

[132] For example, Halliday's distinction of "metafunctions" will not appear in this analysis. This study will utilize the interpersonal model as the sole clausal metafunction throughout for the sake of consistency and continuity, although, strictly speaking, one could utilize any of the three lines of meaning: clause as message, clause as exchange, or clause as representation (see Halliday, *Grammar*, 83 for an introduction to this distinction). The present study, however, is focused on the patterns of language in themselves as they appear in the text, not the pragmatic force or translational interpretation of the text; as such, the interpersonal metafunction—clause as exchange—will be used, as it provides the most useful terminology for incorporating traditional Greek grammars and scholarship. It also serves the study of NTG well, in that, unlike English, modality is built into the grammatical form of the verb itself.

[133] An example is language of semantic function between word groups and clauses (Halliday, *Grammar*, 557–92). Clausal and word group relationships are categorized by expansion or projection, and with the function of expansion Halliday describes the sub-functions of elaboration, extension, or enhancement. This will only be used insofar as it is helpful to identifying concrete linguistic patterns.

[134] See pp. 29–30 above.

[135] SFG is, by very definition, focused on the function of language as it is actually used and expressed. In this way, the functions of English as described by SFG are not primarily about English, *eo ipso*, but about the ways in which language itself communicates.

[136] Possible complications concerning the system of mood in NTG can be avoided in the present study by restricting analysis to the interpersonal metafunction, as mentioned above. The possible complication concerning the subject of the clause, which does not need to be explicitly stated in NTG, can be avoided by treating expressed

nature of word order in NTG as it relates to Hallidayan linguistics, especially at differing levels along the rank scale. The larger nature of word order in NTG still, as Stanley Porter asserts, needs much research,[137] but this is not to say that word order in NTG is without meaning. The view of this study echoes the words of Andrew Pitts, who writes:

> [In Ancient Greek] syntactic relations are not governed by phrase structure.… This does not entail, however, that word order is less important.… Non-configurational languages simply allow for word order variation to have [a different kind of] impact since syntactic relations are not semantically encoded through phrase structure, but through case morphology. *Word order simply functions at a different linguistic level* for non-configurational languages.[138]

Word order for NTG needs further analysis, and the study of word order for NTG, as a non-configurational language, must proceed first from the bottom up, assigning interpretive value to word order patterns on the basis of codified patterns that allow for such markedness to be identified. This task is precisely a central aim of the present study, namely, to codify patterns of word order and syntactical relationships in the Greek of the PE. It is beyond the scope of this study to present a comprehensive theory of word order in KG, but the identification of such patterns and comparison of them among the PE and selected chapters from other New Testament works can serve as a starting point for more comprehensive analysis.

SFG Terminology and Linguistic Components

The vocabulary of SFG will regularly appear in the present study, especially with regard to the rank scale. The highest rank of language for the terminology utilized by SFG is the level of discourse, which refers to the whole of a document or speech;[139] each of the PE, then, will be

---

subjects only as a discrete clausal component.

[137] See note 100 above.

[138] Pitts, "Word Order," 314, italics added.

[139] Halliday also speaks of the discourse as 'text,' but further defines the term as "spoken and written

considered a discrete example of discourse. The next rank below this is defined as the rank of clause, referring to a syntactical unit containing a verbal form.[140] The rank of clause refers to both paratactic and hypotactic clauses, and a clause complex thereby denotes any number of paratactic or hypotactic clauses that have been joined in an explicit syntactical relationship, such as a compound or complex sentence.[141] In KG, paratactic clauses contain a finite verbal form and are not in subordination, or hypotaxis, to another clause, while hypotactic clauses include either a finite or non-finite verbal form but depend upon another clause. Hypotaxis in NTG typically occurs via a hypotactic conjunction, a non-finite verbal form, or rank shift.[142] Between the ranks of discourse and clause, another term would be beneficial to refer to multiple clauses or clause complexes functioning as a discrete, complete unit of thought. Rather than the orthographic term "paragraph," this work will refer to such phenomena with the term "section."[143]

While there will be discussion of the sections and larger clausal complexes of the PE, the primary focus of this work will be on the ranks of clause and word group. In line with SFG as exposited by Halliday, word groups will be categorized according to one of five syntactical, functional elements within the clause: subject, predicator, complement, adjunct, or qualifier,[144]

---

discourse" (Halliday, *Grammar*, 51). For the sake of continuity, the term 'discourse' will be used to refer any single, whole instance of written or spoken communication.

[140] Typically, the verbal form is explicitly stated, but this definition also applies to nominal clauses, where the verbal element is assumed yet elided from the clause as instantiated.

[141] Halliday, *Grammar*, 7–10, 20–24, 428–556, especially 438–60 regarding parataxis and hypotaxis.

[142] The idea of rank shift, once again, occurs when a unit on one rank is embedded within a unit lower on the rank scale, thereby downgrading the unit on the rank scale (Halliday, *Grammar*, 9–10). A common example, for the sake of illustration, would be participial clauses in attributive position, in which a clause functions as an adjective within a nominal group.

[143] Van Neste also identifies a similar need for a level between discourse and clause in his discourse analysis on the PE, but his further distinction between and section and unit will be only used in passing for the present study (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 6–7). Porter, similarly, describes this phenomenon as a pericope in lieu of a paragraph (Stanley E. Porter, "How Can Biblical Discourse Be Analyzed?: A Response to Several Attempts," in Porter and Carson, D*iscourse Analysis and Other Topics*, 107–16, 113).

[144] Halliday, *Grammar*, 76–82, 139–58, 381–83. Halliday also makes a distinction between nominal, verbal,

with some modification for NTG as necessary. The "subject" (S) will be used to denote an expressed noun or nominal group that is the grammatical subject in its clause.[145] These can include single pronouns or nouns,[146] nominalized adjectives and rank-shifted clauses,[147] compound subjects,[148] or nominal groups with modifiers.[149] A "predicator" (P) is either a finite or non-finite verb or verbal word group.[150] These always include a verbal form, and can include select additional adverbs or modal particles.[151] A "complement" (C) denotes a noun or nominalized group that is either the grammatical direct object (C-DO) or indirect object (C-IO) within its clause, serving as an expressed predicate of a copulative verb (C-PN),[152] or the object

---

adverbial, and conjunction groups (Halliday, *Grammar*, 364–423), but those latter categories are not necessary for the present study. In addition to this, the term "phrase" will be used exclusively to refer to prepositional phrases, which in themselves contain a preposition and, at the very least, a nominal group. Halliday makes a further distinction between prepositional phrases and prepositional groups as they derive from different structural forms (Halliday, *Grammar*, 362–64, 423–426.), but for the present study this further distinction will also not be necessary.

[145] Here, as mentioned above, the term 'expressed' is necessary as NTG often does not need an expressed subject in the same way as English.

[146] See "Τις" in εἴ τις ἐπισκοπῆς ὀρέγεται (1 Tim. 3:1) or "θεός" in Εἷς γὰρ θεός (1 Tim. 2:5).

[147] See "Πάντες" in πάντες με ἐγκατέλιπον (2 Tim. 4:16), the participle clause "οἱ πεπιστευκότες θεῷ" in φροντίζωσιν καλῶν ἔργων προΐστασθαι οἱ πεπιστευκότες θεῷ (Titus 3:8), or the relative clause "ὅσοι εἰσὶν ὑπὸ ζυγὸν δοῦλοι" in Ὅσοι εἰσὶν ὑπὸ ζυγὸν δοῦλοι, τοὺς ἰδίους δεσπότας πάσης τιμῆς ἀξίους ἡγείσθωσαν (1 Tim. 6:1).

[148] See "Ἡ χρηστότης καὶ ἡ φιλανθρωπία" in ἡ χρηστότης καὶ ἡ φιλανθρωπία ἐπεφάνη τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ (Titus 3:4).

[149] See "Καιροὶ χαλεποί" in ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις ἐνστήσονται καιροὶ χαλεποί (2 Tim. 3:1) or "τις ἐξ αὐτῶν ἴδιος αὐτῶν προφήτης" in εἶπέν τις ἐξ αὐτῶν ἴδιος αὐτῶν προφήτης· Κρῆτες ἀεὶ ψεῦσται, κακὰ θηρία, γαστέρες ἀργαί (Titus 1:12).

[150] Halliday, *Grammar*, 151–53.

[151] See "Μὴ ὦσιν" in μὴ ὦσιν ἄκαρποι (Titus 3:14) or "οὐ κεῖται" in δικαίῳ νόμος οὐ κεῖται (1 Tim. 1:9). In addition to "μή" and "οὐ," the modal particle ἄν is common in NTG, even though it does not appear in the PE.

[152] While the grammatical case of such complements will not always be nominative, such as with the infinitive εἶναι taking the complement in the accusative case, for the sake of shorthand such complements will be called predicate nominatives or C-PNs.

of a prepositional phrase (C-OP).[153] These, like subjects, can include single pronouns or nouns,[154]

nominalized adjectives and rank-shifted clauses,[155] and compound complements,[156] with or

without additional modifiers,[157] and include both indirect and direct objects as recipients of the

verbal action. An "adjunct" (A) is any non-verbal word group or phrase that modifies something

other than a noun or nominal phrase.[158] Typically, adjuncts include word groups consisting of

adverbs (A-Advs) or nominal groups with adverbial case usage (A-CUs),[159] conjunctive word

---

[153] Halliday defines a complement as a noun or nominal group which could otherwise function as the subject, but is not functioning as such in its clause (Halliday, *Grammar*, 153). This definition functions well within English, but within NTG a complement must be defined functionally using the language of either object or predicate complement. Halliday does rightly differentiate object from complement in terms his distinction in metafunction, but that discussion is beyond the scope of this study. As such, for NTG, both direct objects and indirect objects function as complement word groups, as well as rank-shifted clauses that serve one of those functions. In English, the indirect object can be nominal, when preceding the predicator, as well as within a prepositional phrase when following the verb. In Greek, however, indirect objects fit well into the complement category, as they are nominal groups with the potential of serving as a subject in a different case, but instead receive the action of the predicator.

[154] See "ταῦτα" in ταῦτα δίδασκε καὶ παρακάλει (1 Tim. 6.2) or "Τρόφιμον" in Τρόφιμον δὲ ἀπέλιπον ἐν Μιλήτῳ ἀσθενοῦντα (2 Tim. 4:20).

[155] See "πάντα" in the participle clause θεῷ τῷ παρέχοντι ἡμῖν πάντα πλουσίως εἰς ἀπόλαυσιν (1 Tim. 6:17) or the direct quotations "βοῦν ἀλοῶντα οὐ φιμώσεις" and "ἄξιος ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ" in the sentence λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή· βοῦν ἀλοῶντα οὐ φιμώσεις, καί· ἄξιος ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ (1 Tim. 5:18). Common clauses that function as complement word groups in the PE are rank-shifted participle clauses (1 Tim. 1:12 or 2 Tim. 2:4), infinitive clauses (1 Tim. 1:3 or Titus 3:1–2), relative clauses (2 Tim. 2:7 or Titus 2:1), and recitative discourse, without or without ὅτι (1 Tim. 5:18 or 2 Tim. 2:23).

[156] See "τέκνα ἢ ἔκγονα" in εἰ δέ τις χήρα τέκνα ἢ ἔκγονα ἔχει (1 Tim. 5:4) or "ζωὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν" in φωτίσαντος δὲ ζωὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου (2 Tim. 1:10).

[157] See "τὸ μυστήριον τῆς πίστεως" in ἔχοντας τὸ μυστήριον τῆς πίστεως ἐν καθαρᾷ συνειδήσει (1 Tim. 3:9) or "πίστιν ἐκλεκτῶν θεοῦ καὶ ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας τῆς κατ᾽ εὐσέβειαν" in κατὰ πίστιν ἐκλεκτῶν θεοῦ καὶ ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας τῆς κατ᾽ εὐσέβειαν (Titus 1:1).

[158] This category generally includes adverbial groups, conjunctive groups, or prepositional phrases which have not been rank-shifted within a nominal group. In English adverbs or prepositions can also function within the verbal group itself, discussed by Halliday as phrasal verbs (Halliday, *Grammar*, 411–19), but this class of verb is not necessary for the present study with respect to New Testament Greek. Also, for the sake of clarity, indirect objects will also be included in this category; in English this clarification is not necessary, since the indirect object is typically expressed by a prepositional phrase, but in New Testament Greek, since the indirect object is a nominal group in the dative case, it is helpful to specify that the indirect object will be categorized as an adjunct, modifying the action of the verb as an interpersonal adjunct.

[159] Adverbial words groups could consist of adverbs, such as "νομίμως" in ἐάν τις αὐτῷ νομίμως χρῆται (1 Tim. 1:8), or nominal word groups with an adverbial case usage, such as the genitive of "time within which" (νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας in 2 Tim. 1:3), the dative of means (τοῖς ἔργοις in Titus 1:16), or the adverbial accusative of respect (λοιπὸν in 2 Tim. 4:8).

groups,[160] and prepositional phrases (A-PP)[161] that are not modifying nouns or adjectives.[162] In

contrast to an adjunct, a "qualifier" (Q) is any word group or phrase that functions within a single

element of the sentence yet modifies a noun or nominal group without properly being a

constituent of the group itself.[163] The grammatical form of the qualifier is more variegated in

NTG than in English, including genitive case usage that directly modifies nouns or nominal

groups,[164] nominal word groups or clauses in apposition,[165] nominal groups that modify predicate

adjectives,[166] prepositional phrases that directly modify nominal groups or adjectives,[167] relative

---

[160] These include, with reference to parts of speech, both hypotactic (ἵνα in Titus 1:5 or ὅταν in Titus 3:12) and paratactic conjunctions (γάρ in 1 Tim. 2:5 or εἶτα in 1 Tim. 3:10), as well as adverbs (ὡς in 2 Tim. 3:9) that are functioning as conjunctions within their clause.

[161] Most prepositional phrases modify the predicator and, thereby, serve as adjunct word groups, such as διὰ τὸν στόμαχον καὶ τὰς πυκνάς σου ἀσθενείας modifying χρῶ in 1 Tim. 5:23 or κατὰ πόλιν modifying καταστήσῃς in Titus 1:5). Prepositional phrases that modify nouns, discussed below, are rendered as qualifier word groups.

[162] In English adverbs or prepositions can also function within the verbal group itself, discussed by Halliday as phrasal verbs (Halliday, *Grammar*, 411–19), but this class of verb is not necessary for the present study.

[163] Halliday describes the qualifier as a rank-shifted postmodifier within a nominal clause. In English these typically occur as rank-shifted prepositional phrases, non-finite verbal clauses, or defining relative clauses (Halliday, *Grammar*, 381–83). For NTG, the sense is essentially the same, but the word order of the qualifier in relation to its referent is more fluid; so, the definition must be broadened to include premodifiers. At the same time, NTG frequently utilizes pronouns and adjectives whose position is regularly predicate, such as demonstrative pronouns like οὗτος or ἐκεῖνος, or for which predicate position determines lexical, not only syntactical, meaning, such πᾶς or αὐτός. In these cases, the adjective or pronoun stands in predicate position to the referent, but still functions within the nominal group; so, the definition must specify that the qualifier is not only in predicate position as either a premodifier or postmodifier, but also that it is not a constituent of the group itself.

[164] Some examples are πάντων τῶν κακῶν functioning as a genitive of source within the complement word group, ῥίζα πάντων τῶν κακῶν, in 1 Tim. 6:10 or τοῦ θεοῦ functioning as a subjective genitive within the subject word group, ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, in Titus 2:5. Notice that, in both examples, the qualifier is a nominal group that is modifying another nominal group, thereby distinct from an adjective, yet having no function in the clause outside of the nominal group of the head noun.

[165] Two examples are ὁ δίκιος κριτής functioning in apposition within the subject word group, ὁ κύριος… ὁ δίκαιος κριτής, in 2 Tim. 4:8 or ἀφθάρτῳ ἀοράτῳ μόνῳ θεῷ functioning in apposition to the complement word group, Τῷ δὲ βασιλεῖ τῶν αἰώνων, ἀφθάρτῳ ἀοράτῳ μόνῳ θεῷ, in 1 Tim. 1:17.

[166] This includes nominal groups that might otherwise modify a predicator as an adjunct word group, such as τῷ δεσπότῃ functioning as a dative of reference to the predicate adjective εὔχρηστον in 2 Tim. 2:21, or τοῖς ἀνθρώποις functioning as a dative of advantage to the predicate adjective ὠφέλιμα in Titus 3:8. In these cases, the qualifier word groups do not modify either the explicit or assumed copulative verb, but directly modify the adjective within the complement word group.

[167] Similar to the previous set of examples, there are times when prepositional phrases do not modify the predicator but directly modify a noun or predicate adjective, such as ἐκ καθαρᾶς καρδίας καὶ συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς καὶ πίστεως ἀνυποκρίτου modifying the noun ἀγάπη in 1 Tim. 1:5 or πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν modifying the

clauses,[168] or complementary infinitive clauses modifying a predicate adjective.[169] Qualifier word groups function within other words groups and do not have a separate syntactic function within the clause. As such, they will not be considered as a discrete word group for clausal analysis, although they will be given specific attention for word group analysis.

Below the clause and its word groups as functional units lies the foundational unit of discourse utilized in this study, the word. In a basic sense, this study will utilize the eightfold division typically presented for English grammar: noun, pronoun, adjective, verb, adverb, preposition, conjunction, or interjection. Within each category, however, there are specific forms which warrant further description for the present study. Nouns (N) will be differentiated between common and proper nouns only where appropriate for certain structural patterns.[170] Aside from nouns, one important distinction for this study would be between personal pronouns (Pn), demonstrative pronouns (DPn), and relative pronouns (Rel).[171] Adverbs (Adv), Adjectives (Adj),

---

predicate adjective ἑτοίμους in Titus 3:1. In both cases, as above, the prepositional phrase has no syntactical function within the clause outside of the word group of its referent.

[168] Relative clauses are adjectival to their referent, and thereby serve no syntactical function outside of the word group of their referent, such as εἰς ὃ ἐτέθην ἐγὼ κῆρυξ καὶ ἀπόστολος καὶ διδάσκαλος modifying τοῦ εὐαγγελίου in 2 Tim. 1:11 or ὃς ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν modifying Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in Titus 2:14. In these examples, the relative clauses adjectivally modify a noun and thereby lie within that noun's word group, yet are distinct from the word group proper itself. The only exception to this function of relative pronouns in the PE are the few cases where the relative pronoun has no referent, with the relative clauses functioning, in itself, as a syntactical element within the sentence, such as the relative clause ἃ λέγουσιν functioning as the complement word group of the predicator, μὴ νοοῦντες, in 1 Tim. 1:7 or ἐν οἷς ἔμαθες καὶ ἐπιστώθης in 2 Tim. 3:15, where the relative clause functions as the object of the prepositional phrase that serves as an adjunct to the predicator, μένε.

[169] This only occurs in 2 Tim. and Titus, where infinitive clauses complete the verbal ideas in the predicate adjectives δύνατος (2 Tim. 1:12; Titus 1:9) and ἵκανος (2 Tim. 2:2). As with the above examples, the infinitive clauses do not have a larger syntactical function outside of the complement word group that includes their referent.

[170] A common example, which is found in the PE, would be postpositive, appositional qualifiers. These regularly are arthrous when following an anarthrous proper noun (1 Tim. 1:12; 2 Tim 2:1, 4:14), especially when the qualifier is serving to further define or restrict the head noun that is a distinguishing role or title.

[171] For the sake of completeness, one could also differentiate between reflexive pronouns, indefinite pronouns, interrogative pronouns, correlative pronouns, reciprocal pronouns, or even possessive pronouns (Wallace, *Grammar*, 315–54). Such specificity is not necessary, however, since most of these types are functionally subcategories of other pronoun types and will typically be discussed by function, not word category.

and Prepositions (Pr) will be uniformly referenced as such.[172] The definite article (a) will be the only adjective explicitly distinguished in word group analysis, as its function, grammatically and structurally, is much more diverse than other adjectives.

Verbs will be categorized both by form and, in the case of finite verbs, presence in independent, dependent, and relative clauses. Within clausal analysis of non-finite predicators, participles (ptc) and infinitives (inf) will be denoted according to their grammatical form, and within finite predicator verbal groups, verbs in an independent clause will be delineated as main verb (FV-P) whereas in dependent or relative clauses they will be finite verbs (FV-H).

Only one interjection is found within the PE,[173] and it is functionally part of a nominal group in the vocative case. The instance of this singular interjection does also raise a class of words that is necessary to distinguish in NTG in relation to English syntax, namely, the particle. Generally speaking, a particle is a loose word category that includes conjunctions, independent adverbs,[174] or modal indicators.[175] For the current project, particles will be labeled according to their function in the sentence, typically as a conjunction or adverb.[176] Of particular interest with

---

[172] Further distinctions, such as predicate or attributive adjectives, are distinctions of position and syntactical relationship, not the word category *in ipse*. Similarly, SFG distinctions between deictic, numerative, epithetic, and classifying elements is fundamentally a distinction of function and not necessarily grammatical form (rf. Halliday, *Grammar*, 364–80).

[173] 1 Tim. 6:11, 20.

[174] These are adverbs that are indeclinable and not derived morphologically from other parts of speech.

[175] Smyth defines a particle as a loose category comprised of sentence adverbs and conjunctions, with some particles able to function as either one in different contexts. Herbert Weir Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, rev. Gordon M. Messing (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956; repr. Mansfield Centre: Martino, 2013), §2769, 631. Denniston begins his major work on particles by defining them as "a word expressing a mode of thought, considered either in isolation or in relation to another thought, or a mood of emotion" but generally gives their function as adverbial or conjunctive. J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, 2nd ed., rev. K.J. Dover (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1950; repr., Indianapolis: Hackett, 1996), xxxvii, xxxvii–xlii. Porter, similarly, defines a particle as "a word of set form… used for the purpose of introducing subjective semantic nuances… to a clause or to the relationship between clauses" (Porter, *Idioms*, 204).

[176] For example, μήν, 'indeed,' will be considered an adverb, and μήποτε, 'lest,' will be considered a hypotactic conjunction. Particles that can function both adverbially or conjunctively, such as καί or μέν, will be labeled according to their discrete function within the clause. For example, when καί is functioning as a conjunction,

English in mind, however, are those words which have no functional equivalent in English, such as the modal indicator ἄν. For the sake of this study, then, the only words that will retain the appellation of particle will be those that do not carry a lexical meaning in themselves and serve exclusively to modify the modality or function of their clause. Finally, conjunctions (Cj) will be distinguished between paratactic conjunctions (Cj-P) and hypotactic conjunctions (Cj-H), as conjunctions tend to function exclusively as one or the other.

Excursus: The Case of Γάρ

The only possible exception to the distinction between paratactic and hypotactic conjunctions stated above would be the conjunction γάρ. While an exhaustive study of the development and classification of γάρ for KG lies beyond the scope of this project, some preliminary considerations are appropriate, since γάρ is a regularly utilized conjunction in the PE and its categorization impacts the analysis of this project.[177] Wallace characterizes γάρ as either a paratactic or hypotactic conjunction, depending on whether it is functioning as an explanatory, inferential, or causal conjunction, with the causal use serving to introduce a hypotactic clause.[178] Porter also includes these three general functions to γάρ, but asserts that it is better treated as consistently a paratactic conjunction.[179] Robertson notes that the use of γάρ in the New Testament is in general agreement with classical use, but lists the explanatory use as primary in

it will be labeled as a paratactic conjunction, not a particle.

[177] For the sake of precision, the discussion of γάρ as an adverbial particle or in relation to questions will not be discussed here, as these uses are not relevant for the PE.

[178] Wallace, *Grammar*, 673–74. An interesting omission, however, is that no inferential uses of γάρ are included in the examples for inferential conjunctions, nor is γάρ used in any examples of causal conjunctions.

[179] Porter, *Idioms*, 207–8, 237. BDF also includes γάρ exclusively in the discussion of coordinating conjunctions but with little discussion of its status as hypotactic or paratactic (BDF, §452, 235–36).

the New Testament over against the illative use or the causal use.[180] This is somewhat dissonant

with the discussion of the classical use of γάρ in Smyth, who also omits the inferential use but

instead lists γάρ primarily as a causal conjunction.[181] Denniston, similarly, offers that the

inferential use of γάρ "has little or no claim to recognition" and that the various conjunctive uses

of γάρ are variegated aspects of the causal use.[182] In this regard, Smyth's and Denniston's

analyses are largely consonant, even though Denniston does allow for more flexibility for γάρ as

a paratactic or hypotactic conjunction. With regard, then, to NTG and, more specifically, stylistic

analysis of the PE, the question remains about the status of γάρ and its inter-clausal function. For

this study, the positions of Robertson, Porter, and Denniston will be utilized in various ways. In

terms of status, Porter's assertion will be adopted, in that γάρ is best explained as a paratactic

conjunction.[183] In terms of use, Denniston's approach suits the use of γάρ in the New Testament

and especially the PE, in that the explanatory use is not primary, and is better explained as a

subcategory of the causal use. Furthermore, the causal use of γάρ in the PE will be regarded not

as a formal cause, in Aristotelian terms, but in the confirmatory sense. In this way, for the

---

[180] A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (Nashville: Broadman, 1993; repr. 2010), 1190–91. Oddly, while Robertson asserts that the explanatory use is common in Homer in support of this argument, Denniston, in contrast, states that the explanatory use is actually rare in Homer, and that in many cases γάρ is better rendered as anticipatory (Denniston, *Particles*, 58, 68–73). The anticipatory use does appear in the NT, especially the parenthetical use within narrative, as seen in Mark 5:42 and 16:4 (Voelz, *Mark*, 5, 13, 36, 369, and 1198), but not within the PE.

[181] Furthermore, when γάρ is used causally, Smyth, unlike Wallace, makes a distinction between γάρ as "for," which introduces a confirmatory or justifying statement as a coordinating conjunction, and γάρ as "since," which also introduces a causal or justifying relationship but as a subordinating conjunction preceding the main clause. See Smyth, *Grammar*, §2803, 2808–19.

[182] Denniston, *Particles*, 56–114. It is also important to note that the prominent causal uses listed are the confirmatory and explanatory uses. In terms of status, he does speak of γάρ within both independent and dependent clauses, largely determined by the presence of other particles, logical connection between clauses, or the position of the γάρ clause with relation to other clauses, yet there is little explicit discussion of clausal dependency.

[183] Even in the cases where it could be argued that the γάρ is functioning appositively, such as 2 Tim. 2:11, it will still be considered a separate, paratactic clause. Dennistion, *Particles*, 67.

present project γάρ will be regarded as a paratactic, confirmatory conjunction, offering logical

basis, rationale, or further justification of a preceding clause or claim.[184]

<center>Constructing the Linguistic Profiles</center>

The present study has the primary objective of constructing a full linguistic profile for each

work of the PE, particularly focusing on issues of word order and syntax according to the rank

scale as exposited by Halliday. The fundamental method is to work downward along the rank

scale, focusing on sections, then clauses, then word groups.[185] Semantics is discussed regularly

throughout, but the semantic value of given morphological forms will only be discussed insofar

as it serves to identify patterns of word order and use. From beginning to end, the focus on the

present study is to identify the larger syntactical patterns in the language of the text in itself. The

primary text for this study is the latest edition of the Nestle Aland text, NA^{28}. In addition, the

work of J. Keith Elliot is regularly consulted,[186] as this remains the most thoroughgoing text-

critical work on the PE. The discussion of the text and its variants also consults commentaries,

such as Raymond or Collins, as well as more standard textual critical resources, such as work of

Metzger.[187] Using these resources, significant variant readings that impact the linguistic profiles

of the PE are addressed, especially when the variant reading applies to an otherwise codified (i.e.

---

[184] Heckert likewise asserts that "[d]iscourse linguists nearly all conclude that γάρ has one basic function, backwards confirmation… provid[ing] strengthening, reason, or explanation" (Heckert, *Discourse Function* , 29–36). See also Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 91–92.

[185] The rank of word is not given extended treatment as the diction of the PE in itself has received considerable attention, but diction must at times be addressed where word choice impacts syntactical relationships and patterns, such as specific verb-object pairings or semantic chains between clauses and sections. Many such choices of diction, however, are already included in the cohesion and semantic chain analysis of Van Neste. Grammatical forms of individual words will be discussed only as the form impacts syntactical patterns.

[186] J. Keith Elliot, *The Greek Text of the Epistles to Timothy and Titus*, SD 36 (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1968).

[187] Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 2nd ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007).

unmarked) pattern.

As the analysis proceeds downward along the rank scale, patterns of word order and syntax are identified and codified. Following the work of Pitts and Porter, various features on the different levels of rank are codified to different degrees based on variation in use.[188] Patterns that occur 60% of the time or less are regarded as "not codified;" patterns that appear more than 60% of the time but up to 75% are termed "marginally codified;" patterns that occur more than 75% of the time but up to 90% are deemed "partially codified;" features that appear over 90% of the time over against other syntactical options are considered "codified" features (see figure 1)."[189] *The overall goal of the analysis is to present, in the end, a comprehensive profile which shows how codified the various elements of NTG are for each work of the PE, showing sensitivity to how the various features appear in the appropriate rank.*

Table 1. Codification Scale

Codification	Minimum Frequency of Occurrence	Maximum Frequency of Occurrence
Not Codified	≥ 0%	≤ 60%
Marginally Codified	> 60%	≤ 75%
Partially Codified	> 75%	≤ 90%
Codified	> 90%	< 100%
Fully Codified[190]	= 100%	= 100%

To construct the linguistic profiles downward along the rank scale, as outlined above, the

---

[188] Pitts, "Word Order," 316–17 and Porter, "Word Order," 179–81.

[189] Partially codified features are those that "[follow] a general tendency but not frequent enough to be understood as a rule," whereas marginally codified features are those for which "there are almost as many breaches of the rule as there are occurrences of the pattern." See Pitts, "Word Order," 316–17.

[190] Fully codified features, such as the conjunctive use of γάρ over against the adverbial use in NTG, will not generally be given extensive treatment in the present study, in that the lack of alternative choice *de facto* excludes possibilities of markedness and distinctive use.

primary stage of analysis begins with the second largest-scale rank, the section. At this rank, very little original contribution will be made, as the cohesion analysis of Van Neste has already devoted much attention to the syntactical relationships and semantic chains between sections, as well as defending the boundaries between them.[191] With this, however, an initial analysis is made to identify general patterns of clausal relationships and structures within and between the different units, especially where Van Neste identifies shifts in cohesion. Within this stage of analysis, the focus is on paratactic and hyptotactic clauses and identifiable patterns in how they relate to one another.

Below the section along the rank scale, the next stage of analysis is at the rank of clause. At this stage, the language is analyzed for patterns according to word groups that function as four main clausal components outlined and defined above: subject, predicator, complement, and adjunct. This stage serves to explore the basic tendencies and codification of sentence structure for each work according to hypotactic and paratactic relationships, as well as identify how, if at all, different clausal components or syntactical factors impact the ordering of the subject, predicator, and complement within each specific work. To conclude this section, the issue of rank-shifted clauses will be investigated. One major argument of this project that has not been explored in other scholarship is that rank-shifted clauses have a different codification structure than clauses that operate properly on the rank of clause.

In addition to the typical codification of syntactical structure, other phenomena are examined that are found to have consistent impact both on clause structures as well as on the following rank of word group, especially the impact of hyperbaton, conclusions or changes

---

[191] As mentioned above, what Van Neste distinguishes as a larger unit is termed a section in the present study (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 6–7). The present study will also, generally utilize Van Neste's sectional divisions, which he calls units, as smaller subsections.

within lists, poetic sections, contrast, or other semantic irregularities. The phenomenon of hyperbaton, or interrupted syntax, occurs when discrete word groups are interposed within others, causing a break in otherwise contiguous syntax. In 1 Tim. 6:16, as an example, φῶς ἀπρόσιτον, the complement of the substantive participle οἰκῶν, is interrupted by that participle, reading φῶς οἰκῶν ἀπρόσιτον. This not only splits the complement word group, but also causes the clause to abrogate the expected word group order for attributive participle clauses in the PE.[192] The PE also contain several lists and asyndetic chains of logically connected sentences, and conclusions or shifts in these lists are also typically accompanied by a syntax change. To give an example, in 1 Tim. 3:4 there are two attributive participles functioning as predicate adjectives in the list of qualifications for the office of overseer, and they also, like the example above, have the complement preceding the participle rather than following.[193] Poetic sections or sections with seemingly technical phrases appear to abrogate expected syntax patterns, as well. As an example, it is a "marked" structure for a relative clause to appear prior to the main verb of the sentence in the PE,[194] and the poetic context of Titus 3:4–7 is the only place it occurs in the letter.[195] The end of the poetic section found in 2 Tim. 2:11b–13, similarly, includes unusual syntax, which will be explored in further detail in chapter six. In rank-shifted infinitive clauses, it is typical in the PE for the complement of the infinitive clause to precede the infinitive, yet in 2 Tim. 2:13 the complement appears after the infinitive. This not only provides a syntactical

---

[192] In this case, the complement is split into parts, where the direct object itself now precedes the participle, likely for emphasis, while the adjective, and thus part of the complement word group, still occurs in the expected position following the attributive participle. It is noteworthy that this example also occurs within a poetic section, which tends to have its own impact on syntactical structures.

[193] In this case, the text shifts within the list from a string of adjectives defining personal character to the quality of parenthood as a concrete type of behavior. This shift in the list is accompanied not only by the two participle clauses with irregular syntax but also an aside in anacolouthon in 1 Tim. 3:5.

[194] This occurs only six times out of sixty-two appearances of relative clauses.

[195] It is also significant that this relative clause occurs with two emphatic, contrasting prepositional phrases.

contrast from the final clause of 2 Tim. 2:12, but shifts the doublet structure that preceded it to conclude the passage with an irregularly ordered infinitive clause. It is argued, then, that these phenomena (and others) appear to overrule otherwise partially codified and codified syntax patterns, and thereby help to establish not only the typical patterns themselves but also contexts in which those patterns are abrogated for emphatic, poetic, or other types of impact on the reader.

The final stage of constructing the linguistic profile is to analyze the various structural components in themselves as word groups. The constituents of the various types of word groups will be classified according to parts of speech, as outlined above, and word order patterns within the word groups will be codified and investigated according to the type of word group and function of that group within the clause. Within subject word groups in the PE, as an example, it is a fully codified feature that subject word groups following an imperative verb appear with a definite article, while pronouns as the subject of imperative verbs always appear before the governing verb. One other feature of this stage will be a robust analysis of qualifier words groups, which are not included up to this point since they operate only within other words groups on this lower rank, because they do evince significant patterns. Qualifiers that include a use of the subjective genitive, for example, follow a codified pattern in the PE regarding their position with their referent, and this pattern differs from subjective genitives within qualifiers in the comparison chapters, as will be demonstrated in chapter six. On the other hand, the codification patterns for qualifiers that appear within complements of copulative verbs in the PE are generally consistent with what is found in the comparison chapters. Once this analysis is completed for each letter individually in chapters two through four, the full linguistic profile for the PE can be compiled and presented in chapter five.

Testing the Linguistic Profiles

The presentation of the linguistic profile with its supporting data and the analysis of marked patterns that break the expected codification serve as the primary contribution of this study, but, as mentioned above, the usefulness and accuracy of such data must be tested and defended rather than assumed. This occurs in two steps: the first step is to compare the profile for each of the works of the PE against one another in chapter five, and the second is to compare the linguistic profile of the PE against select chapters of other works in the New Testament in chapter six. In this way, the sensitivity of the compiled data can be tested both from within the same register of work and in relation to works of other registers and genres.

The first step is to place the linguistic profiles of the PE side by side and analyze them for similarity and difference along the levels of rank with respect to the features identified in the construction of each profile. The codification for each feature is compared as it appears in each of the PE, and then an overall codification for the PE can be given for that feature. This comparison follows the same downward movement along the rank scale, and concludes with an overall profile for the Greek of the PE. In this step, it will be demonstrated that the PE do indeed have many similarities in syntax and codified word order along the rank scale as well as for rank-shifted clauses.[196]

All three PE show similarity with respect to many linguistic features. At the same time, however, it will be shown that the letters of 1 Timothy and 2 Timothy are closer in their linguistic profiles to one another than they are with Titus in many respects. This includes the frequency, use, and syntax of infinitive clauses, where 1 Timothy and 2 Timothy both have a

---

[196] The syntax of infinitive clauses, for example, is fairly consistent over all three PE, as well as the clause structure for rank-shifted participle clauses. There are also many similarities in various aspects of how prepositional phrases are structured, sentence and sections transitions, and other key linguistic phenomena.

similar ratio of infinitive clauses that precede and follow the governing verb and a very frequent use of the complementary infinitive. Titus, on the other hand, has a similar frequency of infinitive clauses, yet has none that precede the main verb, and uses the complementary infinitive with far less frequency.[197] Another example of this would be the letters' use of prepositional phrases. The letters of Timothy utilize prepositional phrases with far more frequency than Titus, and their codification is closer in similarity. While all the three letters have a similar ratio of prepositional phrases that utilize a qualifier as well as their syntax structure for the use of qualifiers, the presence of adjectives within prepositional phrases shows greater affinity between 1 Timothy and 2 Timothy, including the ratio of attributive and predicate adjectives within prepositional phrases and their position with regard to their referent. The use of a nominal group in the dative case is also more similar in 1 Timothy and 2 Timothy than it is in Titus.

The greatest affinity among the PE is between 1 Timothy and 2 Timothy, yet there are instances where 2 Timothy shows some unique phenomena over against 1 Timothy and Titus. An example would be the frequency and syntax of ἵνα clauses, which consistently have the complement preceding the predicator in 2 Timothy yet show greater flexibility in the other two letters. This also fits into a larger difference in how hypotactic conjunctions are used in 2 Timothy compared to the other PE, especially in terms of the larger syntactical context of where hypotactic conjunctions are used. First Timothy and Titus tend to use hypotactic conjunctions with subjunctive verbs modifying a main verb that expresses a wish or command. Second Timothy not only uses fewer hypotactic conjunctions, but they never appear in a context of a wish or command, and rarely are used with a subjunctive verb in the hypotactic clause.

---

[197] Out of forty infinitive clauses in 1 Timothy, twenty of them are complementary infinitive clauses, and eleven are complementary infinitive clauses in 2 Timothy out of eighteen total infinitive clauses. Compare this with only five complementary infinitive clauses in Titus out of the twenty-one infinitive clauses in the letter.

Second Timothy and Titus also evince similarities over against 1 Timothy. This includes the syntax of participle clauses, where these two PE show greater similarity to one another than they do with 1 Timothy. This includes the position of participles (the ratio of attributive to predicate participles is substantially lower in 1 Timothy), as well as the syntax of the participle clause within its sentence. First Timothy includes many more participle clauses that appear prior to the governing, main verb compared with the other two letters. Hyperbaton within complement word groups functioning as a predicate nominative, as another example, tend to appear within rank-shifted clauses for 2 Timothy and Titus, while they appear predominately in paratactic clauses in 1 Timothy. These and further linguistic similarities and differences for the PE will be presented.

The final step of the study is to further test the data by comparing the profiles of the PE to other works in the New Testament. With the history of scholarship on the PE in mind, initial application will be made to chapter 15 of Romans, an undisputed Pauline letter, and to chapter 4 of Ephesians, a disputed Pauline letter. While other chapters and other works would also serve the same purpose, these two chapters were chosen for a variety of reasons. Logistically, the chapters needed to be long enough to have sufficient data for comparison, while at the same time they should not include the more conventionally formulaic portions of the letter, such as the introductory salutation and thanksgiving or the final, personal greetings and doxology. It is also beneficial to compare chapters from the same general section of the letter, rather than comparing, to use rhetorical terms, a *narratio* section like Rom. 2 with a *confirmatio* section like Eph. 3. In this case, the chapter lengths are similar, their place and function in their respective letters is similar, and they have a similar mix of content types.

In addition to these two chapters, given the possibility of Lukan influence or authorship of

the PE, which has been posited by various scholars,[198] the profiles of the PE can also be compared to one chapter and one section of Acts: Acts 18, which is largely comprised of narrative, and Acts 20:18–35, which is spoken discourse from the character of Paul. These sections were chosen over others for a variety of reasons. Firstly, only chapters within Acts 13–28 were considered for possible comparison, since these are the chapters of Acts which focus on the character, work, and speeches of the Apostle Paul and his companions. Secondly, it would be beneficial to include chapters which focus on Paul's words and activity in distinctly Gentile regions, for the sake of some possible similarities of provenance and register, especially in Achaia or Asia Minor. In this case, the speech of Paul chosen for comparison from Acts 20 is Paul's only discourse in Acts to a discretely Christian audience, and it also is addressing those in positions of church leadership. The narrative chapter, Acts 18, contains less dialogue than many other chapters, a large portion in Gentile territory, and a good mix of types of content.

For each of these selected chapters, the same features used for the analysis of the PE are compiled and compared to the profiles of the PE in order to explore, in a preliminary fashion, both similarity and dissimilarity among various genres and registers within the New Testament. It will be demonstrated how each passage for comparison shows similarity or dissimilarity to individual letters or the PE as a whole on this strictly linguistic basis. Some preliminary examples include the use of infinitive and participle clauses. The usage of infinitives in the PE aligns closest with Eph. 4, but the clause structure of infinitive clauses for the PE is the most consistent with Rom. 15. In the use of participles, Eph. 4 and Paul's speech in Acts 20 are the closest to the use of participles in the PE with relation to the ratio of rank-shifted participles as

---

[198] Such as C.F.D. Moule, *Essays in New Testament Interpretation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 113–32; Ben Witherington III, *New Testament Rhetoric* (Eugene: Cascade Books, 2009), 158–76; August Strobel, "Schreiben des Lukas? Zum Sprachlichen Problem der Pastoralbriefe," *NTS* 15 (1969): 191–210; and Stephen G. Wilson, *Luke and the Pastoral Epistles* (London: SPCK, 1979).

well as the placement of both attributive and predicate participles in the sentence in relation to the main verb. In the end, the syntax and word order patterns of the PE are least similar to the narrative comparison chapter, Acts 18, share many similarities with Rom. 15 and Paul's speech in Acts 20, and have the most similarity to Eph. 4.

Basic Conclusions

A more robust study into the nature and function of NTG from a distinctively linguistic standpoint has great value in itself, but the present study has at least four general conclusions that will further the study of the PE and the New Testament as a whole. In many ways, the data confirms basic literary similarities that have already been established via many other means both among the PE and in relation to other New Testament works;[199] this is not to say, however, that the study does not produce new data suggestive of linguistic patterns across the PE and beyond that warrant further investigation on a larger scale. The first major conclusion, then, is that there are many consistent patterns of syntax between the PE on all relevant ranks under investigation. One major component of that conclusion is that the phenomenon of rank shift impacts expectations of word order and syntactical relationships in the PE. Participle clauses in attributive position have a more consistent word order in the PE than participles in predicate position. In the marked examples where this expected word order is not observed, it is usually accompanied by other linguistic factors that also impact word order, as discussed above, such as hyperbaton (1 Tim. 6:16; Titus 1:6; 2:10), a change or conclusion to a list (1 Tim. 3:4; Titus 1:6; 2:3, 10), a direct contrast (2 Tim. 3:5), or a poetic context (1 Tim. 6:16). Rank-shifted infinitive

---

[199] See, for example, the observation that the Pauline Corpus as a whole utilizes asyndeton far more frequently than the other works of the New Testament (BDF §462, 241–42 and §494, 262) or that the PE are closest to one another in style than to any other work of the New Testament (Mealand, "Extent," 74–78).

clauses, as another example, display a generally consistent syntax pattern, with the complement preceding the predicator in the clause, as well as the subject of the infinitive clause, when expressed, appearing as the primary element. As above, when this expected word order is abrogated, it is accompanied by other syntactically significant factors, such as a relative clause that modifies and follows the complement of the clause (1 Tim. 4:3; 2 Tim. 1:6), poetic passages or seemingly technical phrases (2 Tim. 2:13; 4:1), a compound structure or a list (1 Tim. 2:9, 12; 5:5, 14; 6:5; 2 Tim. 2:13), or another unique semantic context (2 Tim. 1:18). Similar patterns appear also in relative clauses, and less frequently in rank-shifted ὅτι clauses. This assertion will be a significant contribution proceeding from the present study.

Following the construction of the linguistic profiles and the fresh analysis of the relationships between the letters of the PE, the second argument is made that, while there is great similarity of codification between all three letters of the PE, much stronger correspondence occurs in various aspects between individual letters. As aforementioned, the letters of 1 and 2 Timothy show greater uniformity in rank-shifted infinitive clauses, while 1 Timothy and Titus show greater uniformity in rank-shifted participle clauses as well as the frequency and structures of prepositional phrases. Only in rare cases do 2 Timothy and Titus show similarity over against 1 Timothy. The outcome of the comparison among the PE also supports the value of such data for determining literary relationships, as the PE do demonstrate congruity as three works that have not only been grouped together throughout Christian scholarship, but also represent a mostly common register within the same genre.[200] Even with their differences, the wealth of congruence among the PE affirms the value of such data not only to understand emphasis and structures of meaning, as stated above, but also as an important factor in the discussion of

---

[200] Rf. Pitts, "Style and Pseudonymity," 133–40.

register and inter-textual relationships.

Outside of the PE, the third conclusion arises from comparing the profiles of the PE with other New Testament works in order to further test the value and accuracy of the data compiled throughout the study. The initial expectation of the author was that the profiles of the PE would show similarity to the chapter from one of the Pauline *Hauptbriefe*, and perhaps slightly less similarity to a disputed Pauline letter. In the end, there are still points of comparison between Rom. 15 and the PE, such as the structure of infinitive clauses when they function as the complement of the larger sentence. Romans 15 is, in fact, the closest to the PE in its structure of rank-shifted infinitive clauses, with the other comparison chapters showing much more divergent structures.[201] With that, however, the PE still show greater similarity to Eph. 4, especially in relation to the use of infinitive clauses, the structure of participle clauses, and other factors. Beyond the Pauline Corpus, given the present author's own view of applying the study of orality and rhetoric to the letters of the New Testament, which lies beyond the scope of this project, it was expected that the profiles of the PE would show great similarity to discourse from the character of Paul in Acts, while having less similarity to the narrative portion. This expectation holds true on the basis of the data, as there are many similarities to Paul's speech in Acts 20, while the PE show the least similarity out of all the comparison chapters to Acts 18.[202] There is general consistency in how rank-shifted participle clauses utilize word order between the PE and all the other chapters present in this study, especially with the same linguistic features mentioned above that impact otherwise codified word order. In the end, there are some codified structural

---

[201] One notable exception to this, however, is Acts 18:15, which not only represents direct speech from Gallio, but also contains an example of hyperbaton.

[202] This is not to say, of course, that there are not areas in which the PE and Acts 18 show strong similarity, such as the frequency, order, and use of adjectives and genitive qualifiers within the prepositional phrases.

patterns identified in the present study, such as the use and order of rank-shifted clauses, that are suggestive of larger patterns in NTG, yet enough difference between the PE and the other works to suggest that differences in register, especially audience, subject matter, and genre, can be indicated in part by patterns of word order and syntax along the rank scale aside from historical or authorial concerns.

These outcomes will serve as a further yet preliminary exploration into the value of such comparison for understanding possible literary relationships among the works of the New Testament. More accurate data into the use of KG within the PE could serve a variety of functions and benefit a variety of fields within New Testament study. In addition to these conclusions, a fourth and final expected conclusion of the current project is that the myriad of compiled data and the profiles should serve as an impetus for further textual analysis and interpretation beyond what is being presently explored.

CHAPTER TWO

A RANK-BASED ANALYSIS OF WORD ORDER AND SYNTAX IN 1 TIMOTHY

In this chapter a linguistic profile for 1 Timothy will be constructed by analyzing its syntactical, grammatical, and word order patterns downward along the rank scale, moving from the rank of section to the rank of clause and ending with the rank of word group. For the initial analysis on the rank of section, the text of 1 Timothy will be established and separated into its major sections and subsections, with patterns found for the connections and transitions between them being presented throughout. The work of Van Neste on textual cohesion will be regularly consulted on this step for each letter, and any differences from his textual divisions will be defended. The analysis of the section will then conclude with the presentation of sentence types, connectors, and patterns within each section, with an emphasis on any possible patterns for comparison with other works of the NT. Following this, the rank of clause will be analyzed, examining the constituent order, syntax, and usage of clauses within the letter, focusing on paratactic clauses, hypotactic clauses,[1] and rank-shifted clauses, respectively. Hypotactic and rank-shifted clauses will be analyzed separately according to their type.[2] The final rank under investigation for the chapter will be the rank of words groups, which will be distinguished between subject word groups, complement word groups, adjunct word groups, and qualifier

---

[1] See Voelz, *Grammar*, 122–23. The view of the author is that predicate position participle clauses function as hypotactic clauses that modify the action of the main verb in a way similar to a clause with a finite verb and a hypotactic conjunction. This view is not necessary for many of the conclusions of the study; however, it is significant that participles in predicate position should be considered separately from participles in attributive position, as will be demonstrated below.

[2] Hypotactic clauses will be distinguished between clauses with hypotactic conjunctions and participle clauses in predicate position. Rank-shifted clauses will be divided into attributive and substantive participle clauses, relative clauses, ὅτι clauses functioning as complement word groups or appositive qualifiers within a clause, and simple infinitive clauses serving as or within subject or complement word groups. For the sake of clarity, the only infinitive in 1 Timothy that does not fit this description is σῶσαι in 1:15, which is used to express purpose. Hypotactic infinitive clauses with ὥστε do not occur in the PE, neither do any articular infinitives, which tend to function adverbially as adjuncts to the main verb.

word groups, analyzed according to their function. Usage and constituent order for each type of word group will be established, and any codified patterns will be demonstrated. Once the investigation of constituent order, syntax, and usage for these ranks has been completed, the chapter will then conclude with the overall presentation of the linguistic profile.

The Rank of Section

Establishing the Sections

Before discussing the rank of clause, the rank of section also provides much data that is salient for discussion syntactical and inter-textual patterns. This rank has been added to the rank scale as presented by Halliday,[3] which has a lacuna between the ranks of discourse and clause. Sections are considered to be larger groupings of clauses that function together as one unit to advance the argument or flow of the text. The division of the text into sections is primarily based on the level two reading of the text, focusing on topical discussion and indications of major shifts in content within the text.[4] Within sections, subsections are smaller subdivisions where minor transitions or shifts in topic are evident. Between the ranks of discourse and clause, then, it is beneficial for the present study to divide the text of 1 Timothy into discrete groupings of clauses that function together as sections and subsections of the text.

Van Neste identifies six larger sections for 1 Timothy that are commonly grouped together amongst scholarship: 1:3–20, 2:1–15, 3:1–13, 4:6–16, 5:3–6:2b, and 6:3–20.[5] He proposes that 5:1–2 and 6:2c (ταῦτα δίδασκε καὶ παρακάλει) both function as hinge units between sections. He

---

[3] Halliday, *Grammar*, 9.

[4] This is not to say that level one indicators do not indicate larger textual shifts and sectional divisions, but the transitional function of conjunctions or connective devices is still operating on a level two reading of the text.

[5] Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 123.

also argues that 3:14–4:5 should be grouped with 4:6–16 to function as a section, with connections and cohesion parallels to both what precedes and what follows it.[6] The sections established by Van Neste will serve as the fundamental sections for the current project, including the addition of 3:14–16 with 4:1–16 as argued below, with the exception of the two hinge units that he describes.

Along with Van Neste and other commentators, 1:1–2 will be considered a separate section of text, as epistolary greetings tend to follow their own preformed, albeit flexible, patterns of usage syntactically distinct from the main body of the letter,[7] and the final greeting will be joined with the preceding section, 6:2c–21a as the conclusion of the letter.[8] The first of the hinge units identified by Van Neste, 5:1–2, will be included in the larger section 5:1–6:2b, with 6:2c taken separately to introduce the next section. Van Neste is correct that 5:1–2 is an independent topic from the surrounding material, shifting from personal commands to Timothy to the topic of exhortation to the topic of widows.[9] The personal commands of 5:1–2 connect back to the previous section while at the same time the topic of church relations anticipates the instruction on widows that follows.[10] He rightly notes the asyndeton in transition between the sentences,[11] which is a common transitional device in 1 Timothy, especially in sections of exhortation or command. With that, however, the much stronger shift between 4:16 and 5:1 suggests that 5:1 introduces a new section. The text shifts from personal commands to Timothy to commands

---

[6] Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 125–27, 131–44.

[7] Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 18.

[8] Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 75–76.

[9] Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 54.

[10] Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 125–26.

[11] Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 54.

involving church-wide relationships, the topic changes from Timothy himself and his personal conduct to members of the church community, and the previous sections ends with an explanatory sentence (4:16b), which is common as a conclusion before introducing a new topic.[12] Similarly, the second of the hinge units, 6:2c, will be taken as the opening sentence of a new section, 6:2c-21. While Van Neste rightly argues that this sentence connects both forward and backward both logically and lexically,[13] the larger structural patterns suggest that 6:2c should be taken as the introduction that follows. An anaphoric demonstrative pronoun is a common transitional device for new sections and units of text in 1 Timothy;[14] the sentence provides a transition from words of exhortation and instruction in church relationships to word of admonition and warning concerning false teaching and wealth; in addition, the chosen verbs suggest that the verse should be joined with what follows. The first verb, διδάσκω, connects theologically and lexically to the following verses and the second, παρακαλέω, regularly appears at the beginning of a new section or smaller unit.[15]

The current project will also take, with Van Neste, 3:14–4:16 as one larger section, diverging from the commonly proposed structure of the book and, thus, warranting further

---

[12] See I Tim 2:15 or 3:15–16.

[13] Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 66–67, 127.

[14] See 1 Tim. 3:14 and 4:6, where ταῦτα is in the initial position as in 6:2c. It also appears in second position in 1 Tim 4:11 and later in the sentence in 6:11, where it also functions to connect backward to the preceding material while introducing a shift in the text. The anaphoric demonstrative does also appear in 4:16, where the sentence gives an explanatory ending to a section; in that case, however, it is the singular τοῦτο instead of the plural ταῦτα, it appears with γάρ, whose function appears to override the use of the demonstrative, and the sentence is structurally irregular, with the τοῦτο introducing a hypotactic clause that precedes the main clause (see also Rom. 12:20 for a similar structure and use). The only other uses of the anaphoric demonstrative as the sole sentence connector are 2:3 and 4:15 (it appears with γάρ in 5:4, καί in 5:7, and ἵνα in 5:21). In both of these cases, it does not introduce a new section but does recall the opening material of their respective subsections.

[15] See 1 Tim. 1:3, 2:1, and 4:11.

explanation. Many commentators group 4:1–5 with 4:6–16,[16] and, while the grouping of 3:14–16 with 3:1–13 is not consistent,[17] it is typically presented as a conclusion not only to 3:1–13 but a turning point from the first half of the letter.[18] Acknowledging these common trends, Van Neste argues that the forward and backward connections of both smaller units of text, as well as strong parallels with 1:3–20 and 6:2c–21,[19] suggest that 3:14–4:5 along with 4:6–16 function together as a middle hinge for the letter. In addition to lexical connections between this group of text and 1:3–20 and 6:3–21, the strongest argument that 3:14–4:16 should be considered an independent section is found in the parallel structural pattern among them. All three of these sections of text open with a focus on Timothy's teaching and a summary of previous instruction, continue with a discussion and rebuttal of false teachers, and conclude with a personal exhortation to Timothy and, in the case of 3:14–4:16 and 6:2c–21, a contrast and closing call to faithfulness.[20] Structural support for this view, which Van Neste does include but not specifically as syntactical indicators of transitions,[21] can also be found in the use of ταῦτα in 3:14, the use of δέ in 4:1, and poetic material in 3:16. As argued above, the anaphoric use of demonstrative pronouns is used in 1 Timothy regularly to begin a new section that builds on the previous material, and for 1:8 and 6:11, which both function as the second subsection of the larger section, the transitional marker is δέ. This lends support to the view that 4:1 is not the opening of a new section of text, but a

---

[16] See Marshall, *Commentary*, 25 and 530; Towner, *Letters*, 72 and 286–87; and Witherington, *Letters*, 181 and 248–51.

[17] See Marshall, *Commentary*, 25–31, for an overview of various commentators' textual divisions. He also argues that 3:14–16 is unique in the letter (Marshall, *Commentary*, 497–98).

[18] See Towner, *Letters*, 270–71, and Witherington, *Letters*, 232–35 and 244–48. Van Neste also notes that this is common way 3:14–16 has been treated (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 131n192), and that 3:14–16 does serve as a fitting conclusion to the preceding material (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 134).

[19] Van Neste consistently refers to this section as 6:3–21, but 6:2c is necessary for his conclusions, as he himself includes (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 142)

[20] Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 141–42.

[21] Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 135.

transition within a larger unit. Similarly, the poetic material 3:16 should be considered as a

structural unit within the text. Within 1 Timothy, there are two doxological passages in 1:17 and

6:16, and passages of a poetic or verse-like nature in 2:5–6, 3:16, 6:7–8, and 6:15–16. In each

case, with the possible exception of 3:16, the poetic or doxological passage is not used to signal a

major section transition, but rather a topical or genre shift within the section. The doxology in

1:17 concludes the subsection on thanksgiving and signals a return to the topic of 1:3–7 in 1:18–

20, namely, personal exhortation to Timothy, before the larger section change in 2:1. Similarly,

the poetic passage and doxology in 6:15–16 concludes the subsection of commands to Timothy

regarding his own personal conduct, and signals a return to the topic of riches and wealth in

6:17–19 previously discussed in 6:9–10. Similarly, the poetic portions of 2:5–6 and 6:7–8 are not

used to conclude major sections, but rather as transition indicators within subsections, with 2:5–7

serving as the transition between men and women in worship and 6:6–8 as the transition between

false teachers the nature of wealth. These structural indicators, in addition to the lexical and

logical parallels between 1:3–20 and 6:3–21 mentioned by Van Neste, suggest that 3:14–16

should be joined to 4:1–16 to function as a middle section that binds the letter together. The

section and subsection divisions for the letter are expressed below in Table 2.

Table 2. Sections and Subsections of 1 Timothy.

Section	Subsection	Verses	# of Sentences
α	α-1	1:1-2	2
β	β-1	1:3-7	2
β	β-2	1:8-11	1
β	β-3	1:12-17	6
β	β-4	1:18-20	1
γ	γ-1	2:1-7	3
γ	γ-2	2:8-15	7
δ	δ-1	3:1-7	4
δ	δ-2	3:8-13	5
ε	ε-1	3:14-16	3

ε	ε-2	4:1-5	3
ε	ε-3	4:6-10	6
ε	ε-4	4:11-16	7
ζ	ζ-1	5:1-2	1
ζ	ζ-2	5:3-16	13
ζ	ζ-3	5:17-25	10
ζ	ζ-4	6:1-2b	3
η	η-1	6:2c-10	8
η	η-2	6:11-16	5
η	η-3	6:17-19	1
η	η-4	6:20-21	2

Before proceeding to the analysis of the connections and transitions across and between the

sections and subsections of 1 Timothy, there are a handful of variant readings warranting

discussion. Most of the variants for the PE as a whole are lexical and thereby do not greatly

impact syntactical or structural analysis, but there are five specific cases in 1 Timothy that that

would impact the structural and syntactical analysis of both the letter's sentence patterns and the

transitions between the larger units of text. The first of these is found in 2:1, where the original

hand of Codex Claramontanus, Ambrosiaster, some Vulgate manuscripts, a few others replace

the indicative main verb, παρακαλῶ, with the imperative form παρακάλει.[22] Not only would this

change the genre of the sentence from exhortation to command, but it would be the only time in

1 Timothy that the conjunction οὖν appears with an explicitly imperative verb.[23] Elliot rightly

notes that, if this variant is correct, it would be the only imperative verb in the letter before 4:6,

and that, while it does occur, it is unusual in the PE as a whole for imperative verbs to appear as

the primary element of the sentence or clause.[24] While this variant would be the more difficult

reading, it is not likely original. The second variant reading significant for section analysis

---

[22] Metzger, *Commentary*, 572.

[23] It appears with βούλομαι in 2:8 and 5:14, as well as the impersonal δεῖ in 3:2. Although, see 2 Tim. 2:1.

[24] Elliot, *Greek Text*, 33–34.

occurs in 2:3; the second editor of Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Claramontanus, the Syriac tradition, the Majority Text, and others insert the conjunction γάρ following τοῦτο. Elliott notes that γάρ is a regular scribal insertion and that it was likely added here,[25] leading to a parallel with 5:4. The γάρ is not necessary as a transition, as Elliott also notes, since the anaphoric demonstrative functions already as a transitional element,[26] and it is more likely that the γάρ would have been added to parallel 5:4 rather than be removed. A third and minor variant is found in 5:20, where Codex Alexandrinus, the original hand of Codex Claramontanus, Ambrosiaster, some Vulgate manuscripts, and others add δέ in postpositive position at the beginning of the sentence. Elliott offers that the lack of attestation supports the reading without the additional conjunction, adding that the variant is due to a scribal tendency to avoid asyndeton.[27] A fourth and more significant addition takes place in 6:5, where many witnesses, including an editor of Codex Claramontanus, the Syriac tradition, some Vulgate manuscripts, Ambrosiaster, Cyprian, and the Majority Text, append "ἀφίστατσο ἀπὸ τῶν τοιούτων" ("stay away from things like these") onto the end of the sentence. Metzger argues that it is more likely that this would have been added to the text than to be removed,[28] while Elliott prefers that it would be original. The lexical choices do appear elsewhere in the PE, he argues, and it fits with the commands elsewhere in the chapter. If the text was original, it would have been a "careless omission" from other manuscripts, but if it was not original, it would simply be a gloss added to the text.[29] With Metzger, however, the present

---

[25] Elliot, *Greek Text,* 35.

[26] BDF, §459, 240.

[27] Elliot, *Greek Text,* 214. In 5:25 the conjunction δέ is also added but with even less attestation. Elliott similarly offers here that is likely not original, and that the appearance of δέ alongside ὡσαύτως would be very unusual (Elliot, *Greek Text,* 214).

[28] Metzger, *Commentary*, 575–76.

[29]Elliot, *Greek Text,* 94.

author finds it more likely that a scribal gloss would have added to the text, rather than that this material be removed. In addition, when 1 Timothy includes a direct instruction for Timothy to avoid something, it is usually followed by either a contrasting positive imperative or a further explanation.[30]

The final and most significant variant reading that would impact analysis of the sections and sentence patterns of 1 Timothy is found in 6:7, where many manuscripts add an adjective before the ὅτι.[31] There are many issues involved in this variant, including the use of ὅτι, the logical connection of the clauses, and the possible sources of the differences between the variant readings. The original hand of Codex Claramontanus, various Vulgate manuscripts, Ambrosiaster, and others add the adjective ἀληθές before the ὅτι, while a more significant group of witnesses, including an edition of Codex Sinaiticus, an edition of Code Claramontanus, the Majority Text, the Syriac tradition, and many others instead add the adjective δῆλον.[32] The Coptic tradition and Hieronymus delete the ὅτι altogether, and the reading in NA[28] with the sole ὅτι is supported by the original hand of Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Alexandrinus, Didymus of Alexandria, and others. The first step is to identify the likely original reading. Metzger argues that the sole ὅτι is likely original and best explains the rise of the other readings.[33] Elliott asserts that it is possible that δῆλον was original and deleted as a case of homoioteleuton with the κόσμον at the end of the previous clause, but agrees that the sole ὅτι is the most likely original reading.[34] Indeed, the ambiguity of the sole ὅτι both in its meaning and in its relation to the

---

[30] See 1 Tim. 4:7; 5:11–14; 5:23; 6:20–21.

[31] For a brief overview of how scholarship has debated this variant, see Marshall, *Commentary*, 646–48.

[32] Δῆλον and ὅτι are used together explicitly in this way in 1 Cor. 15:27 and Gal. 3:11.

[33] Metzger, *Commentary*, 576.

[34] Elliot, *Greek Text,* 95.

previous clause does make it the more difficult reading, much more likely to be clarified by the additions in the variant readings than the reverse. While many scholars agree that the sole ὅτι is the original reading, there is wide disagreement how it is being used and thereby the force of the sentence. Marshall, after debating the various options, finds the causal force the most attractive,[35] as does Towner, who also cites possible references from the Hebrew Scriptures with similar content, including Job 1:21, Psalm 49:16 [ET], and Eccl. 5:14.[36] While the causal force is the most common use of ὅτι in 1 Timothy,[37] it is more likely, contra Marshall, that the ὅτι is recitative, functioning as the subject of an elliptical nominal clause. George Knight argues that the causal force is unlikely due to the logical implications of such a reading,[38] which would, indeed, be the reverse of the logic used in the Hebrew Scripture parallels mentioned above. Elliott, likewise, asserts that a causal ὅτι would introduce a "preposterous statement," and that the elliptical reading is to be preferred.[39] With Knight and Elliott, the most likely explanation is that the ὅτι is the original reading within an elliptical clause. So, in this case the ὅτι functions to introduce a substantive clause as the subject of an asyndeton nominal sentence with the predicate adjective, δῆλον, elided from the text but assumed by context.

Across the Sections

Between the seven larger sections of the letter of 1 Timothy as well as its subsections, there

---

[35] He mentions the possibility that the ὅτι could be elliptical, but dismisses the option without much discussion. The rare use of ὅτι to introduce a result clause (see Wallace, *Greek Grammar,* 453–54) is also discussed, which is the position of Collins (Collins, *Timothy and Titus,* 154), but also dismissed as highly unlikely as this use is typically found in interrogative sentences (Marshall, *Commentary*, 647).

[36] Towner, *Letters,* 399–400.

[37] Out of twelve uses of ὅτι in 1 Timothy, it is used as a causal conjunction seven times. It is also used appositively twice and with recitative force twice; so, any of these uses are at least possible here in 6:7.

[38] George W. Knight III, *The Pastoral Epistles: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), 254.

[39] Elliot, *Greek Text,* 95.

are some general patterns of connection and transition that occur throughout the letter. While

there is not enough data, with twenty-one total sections and subsections, to establish any

conclusive patterns, it will be beneficial to analyze the typical means of connection and transition

between sections both for comparison with the other works of the PE and for comparison with

the larger patterns that occur between sentences in the letter itself. Structural and syntactical

indicators will be the primary focus of investigation, but the lexical and semantic connections

between the sections, especially as identified in the work of Van Neste, will be consulted where

appropriate. The section and subsection transitions, found in the table below, will be presented

and discussed throughout the subsequent analysis.

Table 3. Section and Subsection Transitions in 1 Timothy.

Transition Type	Verse	Transition	Transition Markers
Section	1:03	α-1 → β-1	καθώς, παρακαλέω, topic change
Subsection	1:08	β-1 → β-2	δέ, genre change
Subsection	1:12	β-2 → β-3	asyndeton, topic change
Subsection	1:18	β-3 → β-4	asyndeton, παραγγελία, topic change
Section	2:01	β-4 → γ-1	οὖν, παρακαλέω, πρῶτον πάντων, topic change
Subsection	2:08	γ-1 → γ-2	οὖν, topic change
Section	3:01	γ-2 → δ-1	asyndeton, topic change
Subsection	3:08	δ-1 → δ-2	ὡσαύτως, topic change
Section	3:14	δ-2 → ε-1	ταῦτα, topic change
Subsection	4:01	ε-1 → ε-2	δέ, topic change
Subsection	4:06	ε-2 → ε-3	ταῦτα, topic and genre change
Subsection	4:11	ε-3 → ε-4	ταῦτα, παραγγέλλω, genre change
Section	5:01	ε-4 → ζ-1	asyndeton, παρακαλέω, topic change
Subsection	5:03	ζ-1 → ζ-2	asyndeton, τιμάω, topic change
Subsection	5:17	ζ-2 → ζ-3	asyndeton, τιμή, topic change
Subsection	6:01	ζ-3 → ζ-4	asyndeton, τιμή, topic change, unique syntax
Section	6:02c	ζ-4 → η-1	ταῦτα, παρακαλέω, topic change
Subsection	6:11	η-1 → η-2	δέ, ταῦτα, vocative address, topic change
Subsection	6:17	η-2 → η-3	asyndeton, παραγγέλλω, topic change
Subsection	6:20	η-3 → η-4	asyndeton, vocative address, topic change

The first section transition from α to β occurs in 1:3, where the text moves from the

opening salutation into the main body of the letter. This transition is not explicitly discussed in

74

Van Neste, as opening salutations indeed tend to be discrete and follow their own structural patterns and forms,[40] but this is not to say there are not unique elements and significance to it as the letter moves into the main body. 1:3 is the only occurrence of a section or subsection in the letter beginning with a hypotactic conjunction;[41] this connection also shifts from the opening salutation directly into the main body and establishes the focus of the letter, namely, instructions concerning how Timothy should confront false teaching in the church at Ephesus and establish the "economy of God in the faith." This is only one of three occurrences in 1 Timothy where a section or subsection does not open with a paratactic clause,[42] is one of two times when a section or subsection opens with an elided main verbal idea,[43] and one of the three times when a section or subsection transition includes the use of hyperbaton.[44] While the transition into and syntax of this section are unique in 1 Timothy, its diction, semantic connections, and structure give an entrée into the rest of the letter. The most common transition between sections and subsections in

---

[40] Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 18, 77.

[41] As Van Neste mentions, an adverb with a verb of exhortation is not uncommon in ancient letters (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 19). This is, however, uncommon for the Pauline Corpus, as other Pauline letters tend to follow the salutation without a conjunction and with a verb of thanksgiving or statement of blessing (cf. Rom. 1:8; 1 Cor. 1:4; 2 Cor. 1:3; Eph. 1:3; Phil. 1:3; Col. 1:3; 1 Thess. 1:2; 2 Thess. 1:3; Phlm 4). When the main body of a Pauline letter outside of the PE does open with a verb of exhortation or desire, such as παρακαλέω (1 Cor. 1:10; 1 Thess. 4:1, and Phlm 8), θέλω (1 Cor. 1:8), βούλομαι (Phil. 1:12), or ἐρωτάω (1 Thess. 4:1 and 2 Thess. 2:1), it is always in a finite form and accompanied by a paratactic conjunction or a prepositional phrase functioning as a paratactic conjunction (δέ, γάρ, οὖν, διό, or διὰ τοῦτο). Even among the PE, this transition is unique, as 2 Timothy and Titus both move into the main instruction of the letter with a prepositional phrase functioning as a paratactic conjunction (δι' ἣν αἰτίαν with ἀναμιμνήσκω in 2 Tim. 1:6 and τούτου χάριν with ἀπολείπω in Titus 1:5). This opening transition to the main body of the letter is indeed unique among the Pauline Corpus.

[42] Cf. 1 Tim. 1:3, 4:6, and 6:1.

[43] In 1 Tim. 3:8, the subsection continues the logic of the previous subsection, assuming the verbal idea of 3:2 for 3:8, as also signaled by the anaphoric adverb ὡσαύτως (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 87). First Timothy 3:1 does open a section with a nominal sentence, but a nominal sentence will be treated as a typical sentence with εἰμί, as NTG regularly omits εἰμί without a substantial change in meaning or syntax (rf. Voelz, *Grammar*, 77). The presence or absence of εἰμί will be discussed, however, in the discussion of predicate nominatives below.

[44] Here, in the relative clause, the complement word group (ἐκζητήσεις μᾶλλον ἢ οἰκονομίαν θεοῦ τὴν ἐν πίστει) is interrupted by the verb (παρέχουσιν). In 4:6, in the main clause, the predicate nominative complement word group (καλὸς διάκονος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ) is interrupted by the main verb (ἔσῃ). And in 5:3, the main clause, the complement words group (χήρας τὰς ὄντως χήρας) is interrupted by the main verb (τίμα).

1 Timothy is a topic change, and here the opening section shifts to the topic, as noted above, of instruction for Timothy with regard to proper church management and false teaching. After the initial sentence of exhortation for the section (1:3–4), the following sentence (1:5–7) is explanatory, giving the theological rationale and purpose for the exhortation that preceded. As we will see, this is a common feature of section transitions in 1 Timothy. It is common that a section begins with a command or exhortation and then is followed immediately by a sentence of explanation, giving the personal, logical, or theological rationale behind the exhortation.[45] Prominent verbal ideas and semantic fields are introduced that will carry throughout the letter, especially faith(fulness),[46] exhortation,[47] giving charge,[48] teaching,[49] and the disputes and struggles that come with false teaching.[50] In this way, the opening subsection, 1:3–7, not only

---

[45] Five of six section transitions in 1 Timothy follow this pattern (1:3–4; 2:1–2; 3:1; 3:14; 6:2c), and three of those five include a conditional sentence in the explanatory sentence. Where this pattern is abrogated (5:1–2), it is still followed by a command (5:3), followed by a conditional sentence (5:4), with an immediately subsequent explanation (5:5–7).

[46] Πίστις, πιστός, and πιστεύω appear a combined 32 times in the letter of 1 Timothy, with the prepositional phrase ἐν πίστει (1:2, 4) occurring six times. This not only links the opening salutation (1:2) with the first exhortations of the main body of the letter (1:4, 5, 11), but establishes an underlying theme of trustworthiness (cf. 1:11 with 1:12, 15; 2:7; 3:1, 11; 4:9, 12; 6:11), especially in light of proper teaching and leadership in the church over against false teaching. This connection is only tangentially mentioned in Van Neste when discussing this section or its connections to the surrounding material (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 19–21, 77–8), but serves to heighten the cohesion and unity of this opening section with the rest of the letter.

[47] Παρακαλέω and παράκλησις appear five times in the letter. The verbal form appears in the opening sentence of four out of six major sections transitions (1:3; 2:1; 5:1; 6:2c), and, significantly, only within section transitions. It appears twice as the initial verbal form (1:3; 2:1), and twice as the final verbal form in a compound sentence (5:1; 6:2c). Van Neste mentions the use of παρακαλέω in 2:1 as it relates to the semantic field of authority and the cohesion of 2:1–7 with 2:8–15 (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 83–84), as well as its presence in the debate about the function of 6:2c within the larger structure of the letter (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 98 and 127). He also does refer to its larger use as a transitional statement alongside οὖν (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 30), but misses its predominantly forward-facing transitional function with or without οὖν in that discussion0.

[48] Παραγγέλλω and παραγγελία appear seven times in the letter. These words also tend to have a transitional function, although within subsections rather than the larger sections (1:3, 18; 4:11; 6:17), as well as in connection with a transition from more generalized instruction to personal (1:3, 18; 4:11). This also ties into the larger semantic chain of command throughout the letter (see Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 109–10).

[49] Διδάσκω and its various cognates appear 16 times in the letter. This not only adds cohesion to this opening section (1:3, 7, 10), but establishes a major semantic chain that will continue throughout, especially as a contrast between proper church leadership and misleading or false leadership (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 109–12).

[50] Here in the opening section, the key words that appear in connection with false teaching and its results are

introduces the main content and themes of the letter, but also sentence patterns, semantic chains, and diction that will perform syntactical and structural functions throughout.

This opening section of the main body, β, contains four subsections, whose transitions also evince some regular patterns that will occur throughout the letter. The first transition within the section from β-1 to β-2 occurs in 1:8, where the text shifts from the opening exhortations to theological statements and discourse. This subsection shift is marked by the conjunction δέ and a genre change. Throughout the letter, δέ is common marker for contrast,[51] and here it functions to contrast the discussion of false teachers in 1:6–7 with the proper understanding and function of the Law (νόμος) taught by Paul and his companions (1:8–11).[52] This subsection moves from the explanation for Paul's opening exhortations (1:5–7) to theological assertions (1:8–10) and a declaration of Paul's authority on the matter (1:11). The second transition within the section from β-2 to β-3 occurs in 1:12. This is the first of nine occurrences that asyndeton is used for a section or subsection change,[53] and it is always accompanied by a topic change. Here the topic shifts from Paul's assertion of his authority on the matter of the Law (1:11) to thanksgiving for how Paul came to be in his authoritative position in relation to the Gospel (1:12–17).[54] The

---

ἐκζήτησις (1:4), μύθος (1:4), ἀστοχέω (1:6), ἐκτρέπω (1:6), and ματαιολογία (1:6). These words and their cognates will appear again frequently throughout the letter, primarily in a contrasting role between the results of proper teaching and false teaching (for a more complete list, see Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 102–14).

[51] The conjunction ἀλλά is used ten times to mark a contrast, and δέ is used nineteen times to mark a contrast.

[52] Heckert gives δέ a transitional function here, giving the translation "now" (Heckert, *Discourse,* 54–5). While this is a transitional verse, moving from β-1 to β-2, and δέ is used in the PE with a transitional function on multiple occasions, the shift in grammatical subject signaled by οἴδαμεν and the corrective discourse of the nature and use of the Law favor a contrastive use.

[53] 1 Tim. 1:12, 18; 3:1; 5:1, 3, 17; 6:1, 17, 20.

[54] Van Neste mentions the seeming abnormality of the placement of thanksgiving with this letter, which has been noted by many scholars. While Van Neste argues that the placement of the thanksgiving is more fluid in ancient letters than is normally assumed and that there is "nothing amiss" in this letter (78–9), the placement of the thanksgiving is still unusual when compared with the Pauline Corpus. Even within the PE, the thanksgiving for 2 Timothy is found immediately following the salutation (2 Tim. 1:3–5) before Paul gives personal exhortation (2 Tim. 1:6–14), as opposed to 1 Timothy, which has the thanksgiving following the initial exhortation, and Titus,

thanksgiving, then, functions within the larger, and recurring, contrast between false teachers and appropriate church leadership, using his own life as an authoritative example.[55] This subsection, β-3, ends with a doxology before returning to the matter at hand in the following subsection. The third transition within this section, from β-3 to β-4, can be found in 1:18. This transition is marked by asyndeton and, as argued above, an accompanying topic change.[56] Here Paul moves from his own life and his authority for church leadership to entrusting that leadership to Timothy and explaining how Timothy's life experience and "the previously made prophecies" concerning him can give him assurance of his own role in church leadership. Thus, amidst the topic changes for each subsection, there is a thematic continuity not only to this transition, but for the whole section (1:3–20). This section establishes Paul's and, by extension, Timothy's authority for church leadership[57] and their contrast with false leaders and the consequences for false teaching.[58] This section also concludes with an *inclusio*, returning in 1:18–20 to the opening exhortation of 1:3–4 with the use of παραγγελία in 1:18[59] and a return to the theme of faith(fulness) over against those who need to be reprimanded.[60]

The opening section of the main body, β, is followed by the transition from β to γ in 2:1,

---

which omits a thanksgiving completely. It is an overstatement to say that "nothing is amiss" (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 79) with the placement of this subsection and a full discussion of conventions for ancient epistles is beyond the scope of this project. But it will suffice to say that it does fit within the larger patterns of transitions and connection in the letter.

[55] For a helpful discussion of the semantic and explicit verbal connections between 1 Tim. 1:8–11 and 1:12–17, see Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 78–81.

[56] Some have noted an abrupt transition here, and argue that this subsection belongs elsewhere in the letter. Van Neste helpfully argues for the continuity of this subsection with the previous material, especially in terms of explicit verbal and thematic connections (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 81–82).

[57] 1 Tim. 1:3–5, 8, 11–19.

[58] 1 Tim. 1:6–7, 9–10, 19–20.

[59] Recalling the verb παραγγέλλω in 1:3.

[60] Paul contrasts Timothy's faith (πίστις) in 1:19 with those who have suffered shipwreck in their faith (πίστις) in 1:20, recalling the purpose of proper teaching in 1:4, namely, the economy of God in the faith (πίστις).

where the text moves from a personal charge to Timothy to general exhortation for church-wide behavior. This section focuses on the topics of prayer, salvation, and authority, and the transition is marked by the paratactic conjunction οὖν, the presence of παρακαλέω, and the topic change from false teachers in 1:20 to an exhortation to church-wide prayer. As with section β, this section opens with a verbal form of παρακαλέω, and the opening exhortation (2:1–2) is followed by an explanatory statement supporting the rationale for the prior exhortation (2:3–4). The presence of οὖν also signals a transition,[61] although the explicit connection to the previous material is not immediately evident.[62] Οὖν is not a common conjunction in 1 Timothy, only appearing four times, but here it likely serves logically to begin the application of the charge from 1:18, giving Timothy the content that he is now authorized to teach and encourage church-wide.[63] This major shift in the letter is also marked by the adverbial accusative adjunct, πρῶτον πάντων; in this section, it signals the first church-wide instruction that Timothy is charged to present.[64] The subsection, γ-1, ends with a poetic section (2:5–6), followed by another reference to Paul's authority to teach and the truthfulness of his message (2:7).

The reference to Paul's authority in 2:7 then transitions from γ-1 to γ-2 in 2:8 with a subsection focused on behavior in worship for husbands and wives in strong connection, lexically and thematically, with 2:1–7. This transition includes the second use of the paratactic

---

[61] As mentioned above, Van Neste notes that οὖν with παρακαλέω is a common transitional marker in ancient letters (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 30).

[62] Contra Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 82–83.

[63] This view is supported by Marshall, who notes that οὖν commonly marks a return to exhortation following a digression (Marshall, *Commentary*, 418) This would fit the material in 1 Tim. 1:18–20 well, with 1:18 serving as the initial exhortation and 1:19–20 as a digression to contrast Timothy with certain false teachers. See also Knight, *Epistles,* 113–4 for a discussion of οὖν and its transitional nature in this context, and Heckert, *Discourse,* 98–99, for a discussion of this "continuative function" of οὖν in the PE.

[64] The transitional function of πρῶτον πάντων is not discussed in Van Neste (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 30–31, 82–83), but both Knight and Marshall argue that this adjunct reinforces the logical sequence of οὖν (Knight, *Epistles,* 113–14) and is a common major transitional device in ancient letters (Marshall, *Commentary*, 418).

conjunction οὖν, the first person, exhortative verb βούλομαι, and a topic change from God's universal desire for salvation and a defense of Paul's authority to more specific instructions for husbands and wives in worship.[65] As before, οὖν signals the resumption of the church instruction from 2:1–2 after theological and explanatory digression in 2:3–7,[66] giving more specific application of the general, church-wide charge to prayer[67] and leading a quiet and godly life.[68] This transition also establishes the phenomenon in 1 Timothy that a series of repeated instructions regarding different groups within a similar semantic domain elides the exhortative verbal structure, especially where ὡσαύτως is present, and assumes the verbal idea of the initial sentence.[69] In this case, the verbal structure of the transitional sentence, 2:8, carries over into the following sentence, 2:9–10, where the discussion shifts from husbands (ἄνδρας) to wives

---

[65] Van Neste, in arguing for the cohesion of the larger section, also mentions further syntactical parallels from 2:1, in that both 2:1 and 2:8 begin with a first-person verb of exhortation, the conjunction οὖν, a call to prayer, and a universalistic tone with the presence of πᾶς (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 83–84). Further parallels also include that 2:1 and 2:8 both begin with a paratactic clause with a rank-shifted infinitive clause functioning as the direct object, followed by a single hypotactic clause. In addition, both sentences are followed by another paratactic clause that includes a relative clause modifying a prepositional phrase.

[66] Contra Heckert, *Discourse,* 102–4. Heckert argues that οὖν, when preceded by γάρ in a previous sentence, has an inferential function, which is a common function of οὖν in NTG (Wallace, *Greek Grammar,* 673). While he persuasively argues for this use of οὖν in 2 Tim. 1:6–8, it is questionable that the force of οὖν in that context is dependent upon the presence of γάρ. Furthermore, there are differences between the two contexts that impact the force of οὖν more than the presence of γάρ. In 2 Timothy, it appears at the beginning of the main body of the letter, as the text moves from the initial thanksgiving into the opening exhortation, and the charge in 2 Tim. 1:8 does logically follow from the material in 2 Tim. 1:6–7. Here in 1 Tim. 2:8, the exhortation does follow from Paul's assertion of authority in 1 Tim. 2:7, but not as logically and directly as in 2 Tim. 1:8. Furthermore, the γάρ in 1 Tim. 2:5 is not serving to explain a previous directive, as in 2 Tim. 1:6–7, but giving a theological basis for the explanatory point already in 1 Tim. 2:3–4. Here, οὖν is best presented as, once again, in what Heckert calls the "continuative function" (Heckert, *Discourse,* 98–99), resuming the argument from 1 Tim. 2:1–2 following the theological digression in 1 Tim. 2:3–7.

[67] Rf. Προσευχή in 2:1 with προσεύχομαι in 2:8.

[68] Rf. Ἡσύχιος in 2:2 and εὐσεβεία in 2:2 with ἡσυχία in 2:11, 12 and θεοσέβεια in 2:10. For further lexical connections between γ-1 and γ-2, see Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 83–85.

[69] Rf. 1 Tim. 2:8; 3:8, 11. For more discussion on this use of ὡσαύτως, see Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 39. See also 1 Tim. 5:2, which also follows this basic pattern, assuming the repeated idea of the imperative παρακάλει with different groups within similar categories, but with ὡς present instead, denoting an object-complement relationship. This is also discussed in Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 54.

(γυναῖκας) and their behavior in worship. Section γ ends an explanatory sentence in 2:15 with a return to the semantic fields of salvation, faith, and self-control,[70] connecting this final sentence with both the preceding subsection, γ-1, and forming an *inclusio* for the overall section.

The transition from section γ to δ in 3:1 is accompanied by a topic change from instructions for husbands and wives in worship to qualifications for overseers. This transition is asyndeton, lacking the explicit presence of any conjunction or adverbial transitional marker; asyndeton is commonly used in the PE and the Pauline Corpus as a whole,[71] and, in addition to always being accompanied by a topic change in 1 Timothy sectional transitions, from this point onward in the letter it will only precede a section or subsection of church-wide exhortation or commands.[72] This section opens with a nominal, explanatory sentence and is followed by another explanation that includes a conditional sentence. This is one of three occurrences in 1 Timothy where a conditional sentence that gives further explanation is immediately following the opening sentence of a section change,[73] particularly when that section is predominantly exhortational or imperatival in force.[74] This subsection, δ-1, then concludes with an *inclusio*, signaled by the presence of δεῖ, with the commands regarding overseers in 3:2–7 before giving qualifications for

---

[70] Rf. Σωτήρ in 2:3 and σῴζω 2:4 with σῴζω in 2:15, ἐν πίστει in 2:7 with πίστις in 2:15 (and followed by πιστός in 3:1), and σωφροσύνη in 2:9 and 2:15. For further connections among and between the subsections, see Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 30–40, 82–86.

[71] BDF §462, 241 and §494, 262.

[72] 1 Tim. 3:1; 5:1, 3, 17; 6:1, 17, 20.

[73] 1 Tim. 3:1, 14; 6:2c.

[74] This counters the variant reading that suggests 3:1a, πιστὸς ὁ λόγος, concludes the previous section. This and similar phrases in the PE do occur in a variety of contexts, and often serve as a transitional sentence connecting previous material, especially instruction, with a following explanation. While the structural function of this and similar phrases in 1 Timothy vary, it would also be the only occurrence where a conditional sentence begins a section or subsection in 1 Timothy or all the PE. First Timothy 3:1a does serve, then, transitional function between two types of material, but is predominantly forward facing, serving to begin a new section rather than conclude the previous one. For further overview and defense on other grounds of 3:1a as cataphoric, see Knight, *Epistles,* 152–53 and Marshall, *Commentary*, 475.

deacons in the following subsection, δ-2.

The transition within section δ between δ-1 and δ-2 in 3:8 includes a topic change within a similar semantic domain, shifting from the office of overseer to a discussion of qualifications for deacons and their wives in 3:8–13. As mentioned above, this transition elides but assumes the main verbal structure from 3:2 (δεῖ + εἶναι), signaled by three factors: the subsection continues the same genre of the previous subsection, moves from one group to another within the same semantic domain, and includes the adverbial adjunct ὡσαύτως.[75] This transitional sentence, 3:8–9, is followed by a sentence that logically builds on the opening sentence of the subsection and includes a conditional participle in 3:10.[76] This subsection ends with a sentence of explanation, signaled by γάρ, and a semantic *inclusio*, returning to the semantic chains of faith/faithfulness[77] and serving "well,"[78] thus tying together both subsections of δ before moving into the following section.

The next section, as argued above, begins in 3:14 and the shift from section δ to ε is accompanied by a topic change from qualifications for deacons and deacons' wives to the purpose of the letter and personal exhortations to Timothy. The plural demonstrative pronoun ταῦτα functioning as the direct object of the opening sentence serves as the connective device.[79]

---

[75] See also Marshall, *Commentary*, 488–89, Towner, *Letters,* 260, and Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 42, 86–87. This is also the case in 3:11 and the discussion of deacons' wives, where the same verbal structure assumed for the same reasons, followed by a return in 3:12 to deacons, who were the focus in 3:8–10.

[76] Marshall, *Commentary*, 492, Towner, *Letters,* 260, 264–65. Contra Richard Lenski, *The Interpretation of St Paul's Epistles to the Colossians, to the Thessalonians, to Timothy, to Titus, and the Philemon* (Columbus: Wartburg, 1946)*,* 598, who explicitly argues that this is not a conditional participle, but predicative. This pattern occurs again in 4:1–4.

[77] πιστός in 3:1 and 3:11, and πίστις in 3:9 and 3:13. See also Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 43, for the use of the πίστις family of words in forming an *inclusio* for this subsection, although it not, oddly, mentioned in his analysis of the larger section or connection between the subsections (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 41–42, 86–87).

[78] καλός and καλῶς in 3:1, 4, 12 and twice in 3:13. Note also the presence of πολύς in 3:8, 13. For more semantic connections between the two subsections, see Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 86–87.

[79] BDF, §459, 240. See also Marshall, *Commentary*, 498, 505, Knight, *Epistles,* 178, and Lenski,

In this case, it connects to the previous material on church leadership to Paul's purpose for writing "these things" to Timothy and giving him personal warnings and exhortations.[80] This is also the second of three occurrences where the opening sentence of a new section (3:14) is followed by an explanation that includes a conditional sentence (3:15). The incomplete conditional in 3:15 is syntactically awkward, only explicitly including the protasis, which features the particle ἐάν and a subjunctive verb. It is likely that the main clause of 3:14 is assumed again as the apodosis,[81] and that the protasis, with the use of the subjunctive mood, gives the reader the likelihood of delay.[82] In this way, the conditional sentence is not likely functioning fully as a present general condition, but rather serving to highlight the probability of Paul's delay. This opening subsection, ε-1, concludes with a poetic section in 3:16, giving further theological import to the importance of Paul's instructions for church leadership in light of his delay. Poetic or doxological passages, as seen above in 1:17, typically serve as minor transitions within 1 Timothy rather than a major section change, as 3:16 also functions here.

Section ε of 1 Timothy contains four subsections, focusing on Paul's personal exhortations

---

Interpretation, 604–5. Lenski explicitly takes the presence of the anaphoric ταῦτα as a signal that the sentence is a conclusion to a previous section, but does so without discussing the larger function of ταῦτα throughout the PE. While the demonstrative is certainly anaphoric, referring in this case either to the whole of the chapters 1–3 or, more commonly asserted, the instructions regarding church leadership in chapter 3, it accompanies a topic change and a major shift in the letter. In this way, the demonstrative, when used as a connective device, is both anaphoric and cataphoric, referring to the preceding material while signaling to the reader that the previous material is the basis for the material that follows.

[80] This use of the demonstrative as a connective device in 1 Timothy, also, is always following an explanatory sentence with γάρ (3:14; 4:6; 6:11), the causal ὅτι (6:2c), or both (4:11).

[81] This is how many commentators and grammarians render the sentence, either in translation or by explicit argument (Rf. Towner, *Letters,* 270–73, Marshall, *Commentary*, 505, and Wallace, *Grammar*, 471, 699, contra Knight, *Epistles,* 179). Knight raises the possibility that ἐάν is not being used for a conditional sentence, but rather as a concessive clause following 3:14. This is certainly a possibility, although one would likely expect the presence of καί when ἐάν is being used with concessive force (BDF, §374–76, 190–91). Although, Knight is likely correct when he argues that the focus of 3:15 is not the conditional sentence proper, but rather to highlight Paul's delay.

[82] A possible translation of this idea could be, "If I should be delayed—and I likely will be, [I am writing these things to you] so that you should know…"

to Timothy before moving into instructions for specific church relationships in the following major section, ζ. Subsection ε-1 ends with a poetic passage, and the transition from ε-1 to ε-2 in 1 Tim. 4:1 is accompanied by the conjunction δέ, which appears three times as a subsection transition in 1 Timothy. In the letter, δέ only signals a contrast within subsection transitions, and, furthermore, only when moving from an initial to a second subsection.[83] The δέ is accompanied by a topic change, contrasting the apostasy of the false teachers (4:1–3) with the truth taught by Paul (3:14–16) and entrusted to Timothy (4:6–16). As with δ-2, the opening sentence of ε-2 is followed by a sentence (4:4) that contains a conditional participle clause[84] and further develops the argument of the previous sentence. Subsection ε-2 ends with an explanatory γάρ clause (4:5), as do subsections ε-3 (4:10) and ε-4 (4:16b). The transition from ε-2 to ε-3 in 4:6 is signaled by the anaphoric demonstrative pronoun ταῦτα, a change in genre from explanation (4:4–5) to exhortation and commands for Timothy (4:6–7), and a change in topic from false teachers to Timothy's own behavior and conduct. The opening sentence of ε-3 in 4:6 begins with a predicate participle clause of manner functioning as a hypotactic clause. It is one of only three times in the letter where a section or subsection change does not explicitly begin with a paratactic clause[85] and one of three times when the opening sentence includes hyperbaton.[86] In this case, it functions

---

[83] 1 Tim. 1:8; 4:1; 6:11. Knight and Marshall translate the δέ here as "but," arguing that the material in 4:1–3 serves to contrast the presentation of the true faith as presented in 3:15–16 (Knight, *Epistles,* 187 and Marshall, *Commentary*, 536). Heckert, by contrast, acknowledges that this is common position on δέ in 4:1, but yet argues that δέ is being used to show development, moving the argument from 3:14–16 forward (Heckert, *Discourse,* 46). Heckert is accurate that this presents a new part of Paul's argument from 3:14–16, but the argument is being developed through the contrast of false teaching of the apostates in 4:1–5 with the "mystery of godliness" (3:16) as professed by Paul and passed on to Timothy.

[84] Knight, *Epistles,* 191–92 and Marshall, *Commentary*, 544–45.

[85] 1 Tim. 1:3–4; 4:6; 6:1.

[86] Here, the irregularity of the syntax is also accompanied by the presence of hyperbaton in the main clause, as the complement word group (καλὸς διάκονος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ…) is interrupted by the main verb (ἔσῃ). The hyperbaton in 4:6 allows the complement word to group to precede the main verb and, thereby, be in an emphatic position, while also follow the main verb as a compound complement clause also followed by a relative clause.

to recall the teaching of the truth from 4:4–5 and 3:14–16 while pointing forward to further

instruction for Timothy in contrast to the false teachers in 4:6–16. This is followed by a set of

contrasting commands (4:7), with further explanations for those commands to end the subsection

(4:8–10). The final subsection, ε-4, transitions from the explanation of 4:8–10 back to the genre

of explicit and personal exhortation for Timothy in 4:11. This transition and genre shift is

signaled by the anaphoric ταῦτα, albeit not in initial position, and the use of παραγγέλλω. The

παραγγέλλω family of words appears in subsection shifts throughout the letter,[87] and the use of

ταῦτα in secondary position serves to heighten its cataphoric function, not only recalling the

previous material but, all the more, leaning forward to the commands that follow in 4:12–16.[88]

This section ends with a final set of commands (4:15–16a) and explanation (4:16b) and forms an

inclusio for the larger section. The use of the anaphoric demonstrative is repeated in 4:15 and

4:16, connecting these verses with 3:14, 4:6, and 4:11; the use of the demonstrative as a

connective device, however, appears in the singular in 4:16b as opposed to the plural in the rest

of section. This occurs as a signal that the text is concluding a list of personal exhortation for

Timothy by changing the final appearance of a connecting factor,[89] both explicitly summarizing

---

[87] In 1:18 and 4:11, also, this word family also signals a shift from general statements to personal. Διδάσκω, in itself, does not have a set pattern of transitional function, but its use tends to depend on other lexemes and contextual factors. Here in 4:11, for example, it appears with παραγγέλλω and serves within a subsection transition, while in 6:2c it appears in major section transition alongside παρακαλέω.

[88] Contra Marshall, who simply states "it cannot refer forwards" (Marshall, *Commentary*, 559). While indeed the grammatical referent of ταῦτα is the previous material, the *function* of ταῦτα in the letter does recall the previous material as the basis for the material that follows, linking them both together. Syntactically, the position of ταῦτα also could signal that it is serving as the grammatical object of both verbs. Although, it appears in prime position in 6:2c, where it also functions with both imperative verbs.

[89] For further semantic chains and connection through this section, especially continuity of genre and participant, the word families of διδάσκω and πίστις, and explicit structural similarities between sentences, see Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 45–53, 88–93. Lenski also identifies the shift to the singular as bringing "everything to a focus" here (Lenski, *Interpretation,* 650).

the previous instruction[90] and, with the presence of γάρ, giving final explanation for the purpose of the whole of the section.[91]

The penultimate section of 1 Timothy, ζ, begins in 5:1, and the section shift is signaled by a topic change, the presence of παρακαλέω, and the use of asyndeton. This one-sentence subsection, ζ-1, is itself transitional, serving to move the text from personalized paraenesis to Timothy himself to church-wide commands and exhortation. The opening commands here and the following subsection are still singular imperatives, addressed to Timothy, but second person, singular commands are intertwined with both singular and plural third-person imperatives throughout the section.[92] Here the topic explicitly shifts from personal exhortations to Timothy as church leader to commands concerning church relationships.[93] This begins with Timothy himself in ζ-1 and how he should navigate specific relationships as a young leader in the congregation. Then it moves into larger, church-wide issues in the following subsections. The presence of παρακαλέω also indicates the transition; as noted above, the verbal form of παρακαλέω only appears in section transitions in 1 Timothy. This is the second time a major section shift in the letter is not accompanied by an explicit connective device,[94] and asyndeton will accompany every subsection transition in this larger section. In addition to giving a staccato-type impact for the following list of commands and exhortations, asyndeton does appear commonly in paraenetic

---

[90] Knight, *Epistles,* 211.

[91] Towner, *Letters,* 328. Additional thematic elements that signal an *inclusio* for the section are the repeated use of ἔρχομαι in 3:14 and 4:13, the use of ἀναστρέφω in 3:15 with ἀναστροφή in 4:12, and, while not lexically the same, the repeated references to the church with ἐκκλησία θεοῦ ζῶντος and οἴκῳ θεοῦ in 3:15 and τῶν πιστῶν in 4:12, τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου in 4:14, and τοὺς ἀκούοντας in 4:16.

[92] The shifts between second- and third-person form are especially significant for Van Neste's argument for the cohesion of 5:17–25 as a smaller unit of text (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 65–66). To see this vacillation presented in a helpful list for the whole of section ζ, see Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 294–98.

[93] Knight, *Epistles,* 213, Marshall, *Commentary*, 572, and Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 54, 93–95.

[94] Rf. The section transition from γ to δ in 1 Tim. 3:1.

material between commands or proverbial sayings,[95] as it will here between the various topics

being addressed.[96] The initial subsection, ζ-1, is comprised of only one, compound sentence, with

the final verbal idea assumed again for the three accusative demographic groups that appear

following the initial clause appearing as an asyndeton, compound object.[97] It is worth noting that

the final object in the list is accompanied by an additional prepositional phrase; while many

commentators rightly argue that this prepositional phrase was added for the theological and

logistical importance that applies to this group above the others,[98] it is structurally significant that

the final element in the list is accompanied by a distinguishing factor from the other elements in

the list.

This opening subsection, ζ-1, is followed by three more subsections, each distinguished by

a major topic change, the use of asyndeton, and the continued use of imperative forms

accompanied by explanatory material. The first subsection shift from ζ-1 to ζ-2 occurs in 5:3,

where the topic changes from interpersonal relationships for Timothy as a young leader to

instructions and rationale for the enrollment of widows. As with the previous subsection, this

shift does not have a connective device, and the object of the imperative verb appears in the

initial position. This is the third of three appearances of hyperbaton in the opening sentence of a

transition,[99] signaling the topic (χήρας) of the subsection in primary position while setting up

---

[95] BDF, §462, 241–42, §494, 262.

[96] The asyndeton found in 1 Tim. 5 is addressed, in terms of cohesion, by Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 54, 56–57, 62–63. He argues that asyndeton is used very intentionally to signal the internal shifts within the subsections (5:3, 9, 15, 16); he concedes, however, that the use of asyndeton in ζ-3 does not appear to have the same intentional function as it does in ζ-1 and ζ-2.

[97] This is the only section transition in 1 Timothy that is not followed by an explanatory statement. Instead, the following subsection, ζ-2, will include a conditional sentence as the second sentence of the subsection, although still with an imperative mood.

[98] Towner, *Letters,* 329, 331–32, Marshall, *Commentary*, 574, and Knight, *Epistles,* 214–15.

[99] In the main clause, the complement word group (χήρας τὰς ὄντως χήρας) is interrupted by the main verb (τίμα), allowing the lexeme, χήρας, to be in both first and ultimate position of the sentence. Most commentators

what follows as an explanation (τὰς ὄντως χήρας) of the opening command. This introduces the

semantic chain of the τιμή word family, which functions structurally within this section to signal

subsection changes,[100] namely, how honor should be shown in various church relationships. The

opening sentence of ζ-2 is followed immediately by a conditional sentence[101] that sets up the

explanatory and purpose statements of 5:5–8. This subsection concludes with another simple

particular conditional sentence with closing instructions about the topic of widow enrollment,

serving with 5:4a as an *inclusio* for the subsection. The next transition from ζ-2 to ζ-3 is found in

5:17, accompanied by another topic change, another use of asyndeton, and a return to the

semantic field of τιμή. Here the topic shifts from widow enrollment to the honor accorded to

elders; the use of τιμή signals that the discussion is shifting to the topic of elders and how

Timothy, as Paul's representative, should behave with them, before τιμή shifts to a different

realm of relationships in 6:1. As Van Neste notes, this subsection uses asyndeton for the

beginning of every sentence except one,[102] which is the sentence of explanation, using γάρ,

following the opening command. The use of asyndeton ends in 5:25 with the final verse of the

subsection using the adverbial ὡσαύτως and signaling the conclusion of this list of personal

---

indeed interpret the phrase τὰς ὄντως χήρας as adjectival, modifying the initial noun χήρας, and, thereby, part of the complement word group (see Knight, *Epistles,* 215–6, Towner, *Letters,* 332, 338). Contra Lenski, who takes the latter phrase as the proper object of the verb with the initial noun modifying it within an object-complement construction (Lenski, *Interpretation,* 655). While this is a possible interpretation, it is far more common with imperative verbs for the object to precede the verb, and the possible object-complement relationship would have been better expressed, following 5:1–2, with the use of ὡς, and the complement word group would still be interrupted by the main verb.

[100] The presence of τιμή and τιμάω is commonly noted in this section (Towner, *Letters,* 333, Marshall, *Commentary*, 612–13, and Knight, *Epistles,* 215–16), but it is also structurally significant that each subsection shift within the section is also accompanied by this word family as Paul moves through different categories of relationships (see also Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 95, 126–27).

[101] Rf. 1 Tim. 3:1, 14; 6:2c. Here it is a simple particular (or first-class) conditional sentence.

[102] Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 62.

commands to Timothy regarding his own conduct with regard to other church leaders.[103] The last subsection shift from ζ-3 to ζ-4 takes place in 6:1, accompanied by a topic change from church leadership to the relationship between slaves and masters for the Christian community, the use of asyndeton, and the final instance of τιμή for the section. This subsection, as outlined above, is in itself a transitional section between the commands of section ζ and the final exhortations in section η, and this opening sentence is one of three times a transitional sentence does not open with a paratactic clause.[104] This use of relative clause, functioning without a grammatical referent to be a generalized subject of the main clause, is unique in the letter, and it is the only time a relative clause precedes the main verb of a sentence in 1 Timothy.[105] While the use of the correlative pronoun does serve to give the command a generalized application,[106] it is likely that the structural oddity of the sentence signals a major transition, namely, that the list of commands for various demographic groups, initiated in ζ-1 (5:1–2), is now coming to an end before a new section of material. The view that this subsection gives an *inclusio* before shifting to the next section is strengthened by the final use of τιμή in 6:1, the return to familial language,[107] and use

---

[103] For defense of the cohesion of this subsection, especially with the seeming incongruity of 5:23–25 with 5:17–22, see Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 60–66. Van Neste especially focuses on the continuity of topic (elders), the repeated use of imperatives, and the semantic chains that run throughout, especially Domain 88 as defined by Louw and Nida, namely, moral and ethical qualities and related behavior (L-N, §88, 742–77).

[104] The other two instances, 1 Tim. 1:3 and 4:6, have a hypotactic participle clause opening the subsection. This is the only time a relative clause begins any sentence, as relative clauses in 1 Timothy tend, instead, to be the final clause of the larger sentences in which they appear.

[105] This structural irregularity is not mentioned by commentaries on this passage. When the ὅσοι is explicitly discussed, the analysis typically involves the subject matter, the relationship with the previous section, and the referent(s) in view (Rf. Knight, *Epistles,* 243–45, Marshall, *Commentary*, 628–29, or Towner, *Letters,* 380–81). The structural implication of ὅσοι is a surprising omission from Van Neste's analysis of this subsection (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 66–68, 96–98).

[106] Marshall, *Commentary*, 628–29.

[107] Rf. ἀδελφοί in 6:2, recalling the exhortations of 5:1–2, where Timothy is charged to treat all younger men as ἀδελφούς.

of explanatory conjunctions in the final sentences.[108]

The final section of 1 Timothy, η, begins in 6:2c, accompanied by a topic change, the use of ταῦτα as a connective device, and the ultimate use of παρακαλέω in the letter. Here, the text shifts from the discussion of various relationship dynamics in the church and how best to show honor (τιμή) within them to the final exhortations for Timothy as a church leader, specifically regarding false teaching. This is the penultimate use of ταῦτα as a transitional device; in this case, as argued above, ταῦτα is grammatically anaphoric yet structurally cataphoric, recalling the preceding instruction as the basis for the material that follows. Παρακαλέω appears for the fourth and final time in this transition; additionally, this is the only occurrence of παρακαλέω together with the transitional use of ταῦτα, likely serving to highlight the summative nature of this final section within the latter.[109] The opening sentence of the section is then followed by an explanatory statement containing a simple particular conditional sentence.[110] This initial subsection, η-1, concludes, as expected, with a concluding explanation featuring γάρ.

The ultimate section of 1 Timothy contains four subsections, and the shift from η-1 to η-2 in 6:11 is accompanied by a contrastive δέ, the final transitional use of ταῦτα, a vocative address, and both genre and topic changes. While the use παραγγέλλω in 6:13 might suggest that 6:11–12 concludes η-1 rather than introduces η-2,[111] most commentators agree that 6:11 introduces a new

---

[108] In 1 Timothy, many sections or subsections end with explanatory statements, typically with γάρ or ὅτι, to give the rationale for preceding exhortations or commands before shifting into a new section or subsections. Here, Paul gives three commands, each with an explanation following (ἵνα in 6:1, and ὅτι two times in 6:2). The final explanatory sentence, also, changes the sentence structure, not ending with the governing verb like the other two, signaling a shift or end in a series of commands.

[109] This initial subsection introduces the final two topic of the main body of the letter: false teaching and wealth. Following this, the text moves into the concluding, personal exhortation to Timothy.

[110] All but one of the section transitions are followed by an explanatory statement as the second sentence (1 Tim. 1:5–7; 2:3–4; 3:2; 3:15; 6:3–5). The final three times are also accompanied by a conditional sentence, including here in section η. Thus, this section returns to the pattern following the abrogation in section ζ.

[111] See above for the transitional function of παραγγέλλω, as it will appear again in 6:17.

unit of text.[112] The topic changes from negative behaviors to avoid to positive behaviors to

emulate, and the genre shifts from explanation and warning in η-1 to commands in η-2. This is

the third and final time the contrastive δέ is used for a transition from the first to second

subsection of a larger section[113] and it is accompanied by the personal pronoun σύ, a common

transitional device in ancient letters, especially when the overall force of the letter is

paraenesis.[114] The use of the vocative, in itself, signals a shift in the letter also,[115] heightening the

contrast between the warnings in 6:4–10 and the expected behavior of Timothy in 6:11–16. The

use of ταῦτα, then, recalls the behaviors of false teaching and trust in wealth as the basis of the

subsequent charges to Timothy; while ταῦτα still precedes the verb, the vocative address and

contrastive δέ formula appear in the prime position for emphasis.[116] This initial sentence is then

followed by another contrastive δέ in 6:11b, giving the positive commands to balance the

negative warning in 6:11a.[117] The concluding sentence of this subsection is the whole of 6:13–16,

which is another imperative charge to Timothy in 6:13–14 followed by a doxological passage

expressed through relative clauses in 6:15–16. Doxological and poetic sections always conclude

a subsection, but not a major section, in 1 Timothy.[118] This doxology concludes η-2 before the

---

[112] Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 72.

[113] 1 Tim. 1:8; 4:1; 6:11.

[114] Towner, *Letters,* 407n3.

[115] The use of the vocative of address is a "common indicator of transition in papyri letters" (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 72).

[116] Knight, *Epistles,* 260.

[117] Knight argues that this is a common feature in Pauline discourse, but only cites Ephesians and Colossians as examples (Knight, *Epistles,* 261). Towner argues that this a common feature, especially with the two verbs φεύγω and διώκω, of classical Greek ethical instruction, and gives multiple citations to undisputed Pauline letters in addition to those mentioned by Knight (Towner, *Letters,* 408).

[118] 1 Tim. 1:17 concludes β-3, 2:5–7 concludes γ-1, 3:16 concludes ε-1, and 6:15–16 concludes η-2. The only possible exception to this is 6:7–8, which the editors of NA[28] give a poetic form. While the proverbial nature of these verses is commonly acknowledged (see Towner, *Letters,* 399–401 or Marshall, *Commentary*, 645–49), they do not appear to be versical or doxological in nature like the other passages mentioned, nor do they have the parallelism

transition into η-3 in 6:17. The final use of παραγγέλλω accompanies the subsection from η-2 to η-3, as well as a topic change and the use of asyndeton. Here the text returns to the topic of riches, giving the positive injunction for Timothy in contrast to the warning of riches in 6:9–10.[119] The use of asyndeton recalls 1:18, where the doxological passage is followed by the use of asyndeton with the appearance of παραγγελία and a vocative address to contrast Timothy with false teachers, contributing to the function of these final subsections as an *inclusio* for this section and the letter as a whole. The final subsection transition from η-3 to η-4 takes place in 6:20, changing topics one last time from wealth to false teaching, accompanied by asyndeton and a vocative address to Timothy. The use of the vocative address to Timothy not only indicates a new subsection,[120] but further recalls 1:18, where the injunction to keep "this charge" over against false teachers was first given to Timothy and he is addressed by name.[121] Thus, together with η-3, this final subsection forms an *inclusio* for both the section and the letter as a whole. The section, η, opens with a warning about false teaching (6:3–5) and continues with a warning about the greed that often accompanies false teaching (6:6–10). Timothy is then addressed with a contrasting picture of church leadership that he is to embody (6:11–16), followed, in reverse order from η-1, by a final return to how he should properly address wealth (6:17–19) and false teaching (6:20–21a).[122]

    This final section, η, also forms an *inclusio* for the letter as a whole, recalling not only the

---

found in the others. It is also noted by Marshall that doxologies never mark the end of letters (Marshall, *Commentary*, 668), and to that it can be added that, for 1 Timothy, neither do they conclude major sections.

    [119] Towner, *Letters,* 424

    [120] Marshall, *Commentary*, 674 and Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 75.

    [121] This connection is also noted by Knight, *Epistles,* 276, Marshall, *Commentary*, 674–75, and Towner, *Letters,* 430.

    [122] Further structural connections for this section are also outlined by Marshall (Marshall, *Commentary*, 633–5).

name of Timothy,[123] but the very structure and themes of the opening of the main body of the

letter in section β. Here the text returns to the major themes and semantic chains of the letter as

introduced in 1:3–7, including faith(fulness),[124] exhortation,[125] giving charge,[126] teaching,[127] and

the disputes and struggles that come with false teaching.[128] In addition to this, the use of τιμή in

the doxology of 6:16 recalls 1:17, followed by the use of παραθήκη in 6:20 that recalls the use of

παρατίθημι in 1:18.[129] In this way, the section and subsection transitions of the letter give shape

to the structure of the letter, and link together the major themes and semantic chains of the letter

before concluding with the final salutation in 6:21b.

Conclusion

Analysis of the text of 1 Timothy along the rank of section reveals some recurring patterns

that appear throughout the sections and subsections. This allows for a better understanding of 1

Timothy in itself, as there is enough variation in many of the patterns to suggest intentionality for

the anomalies, as well as helpful baseline for comparison with the other letters of the PE. For the

larger sections, it is partially codified[130] that the section opens with a desire, exhortation, or

command, followed by a sentence of explanation, giving the basis or rationale of the opening

---

[123] Rf. 1 Tim. 1:2, 18.

[124] Rf. Πίστις in 1:4, 5 and 6:10, 11, 12, 21.

[125] Rf. Παρακαλέω in 1:3 and 6:2c.

[126] Rf. Παραγγέλλω (and παραγγελία) in 1:3, 5 and 6:13, 17.

[127] Rf. Διδάσκω and cognates in 1:3, 7 and 6:2c, and twice in 6:3.

[128] Rf. 1 Tim. 1:4, 6–8, 19–20 and 6:4–5, 9–10, 20–21.

[129] Further parallels between sections β and η are outlined convincingly by Towner (Towner, *Letters,* 390–91).

[130] Refer to Figure 1 in Chapter 1 for explanation of the codification scale.

sentence.[131] It is marginally codified that the lexeme παρακαλέω appears for section transitions,[132] while other verbs of exhortation only appear in subsection transitions or within subsections themselves. Two other partially codified patterns for transitional sentences as a whole are that they begin with the main, paratactic clause[133] and that the transition is signified by a topic change.[134] Sections tend to end with an explanatory sentence before moving to the next section.[135] The two sections, β and η, that do not end with an explanatory sentence end with a ἵνα clause of purpose or a relative clause, respectively. While these are not technically explanatory sentences, they do give further qualification for the preceding statements or commands. Doxological or poetic sections, when they appear, always conclude subsections,[136] not sections. In addition, sections in 1 Timothy always have an *inclusio*,[137] recalling the diction, semantic domains, or major themes of the beginning of the section before changing topics in the following one.

The above analysis also evinces other noteworthy features of 1 Timothy. When δέ is used as a transitional connector in 1 Timothy, it appears only at the beginning of the second subsection of the larger section[138] and, as argued above, carries a contrastive force. Three of five

---

[131] Five of six sections follow this pattern (β, γ, δ, ε, η). Where this pattern is abrogated in section ζ, the opening subsection still evinces other section patterns, such as the use of παρακαλέω and the introduction of a semantic field that will form an *inclusio* with the final subsection. This section shift pattern, however, is seen in all the subsequent subsections of ζ, appearing in ζ-2, ζ-3, and ζ-4.

[132] Four of six sections follow this pattern (β, γ, ζ, η). The other sections, δ and ε, open with a nominal sentence and a declarative verb, respectively. Thus, no other exhortative verb appears within section transitions.

[133] Two transitional sentences begin with predicate participle clauses in hypotaxis (1:3 and 4:6), and one transitional sentence begins with a relative clause functioning as the subject of the main clause (6:1).

[134] Only three transitions do not occur with a topic change (1:8; 4:11; 5:1), and only within subsection transitions (β-2, ε-3, and ε-4). Ταῦτα is used for two of these (4:11 and 5:1), and δέ is used for the other (1:8).

[135] Two sections end with explanatory sentences using γάρ (δ in 3:13 and ε in 4:16), one uses the conjunction δέ (γ in 2:15), and the other uses the conjunction ὅτι (ζ in 6:2).

[136] β-3 in 1:17, γ-1 in 2:5–7, ε-1 in 4:16, and η-2 in 6:13–16.

[137] It is also shown above that the final section, η, recalls many themes, semantic domain, and precise diction of section β to form an *inclusio* for the letter as a whole.

[138] β-2 in 1:8, ε-2 in 4:1, and η-2 in 6:11.

sections of the main body have a conditional sentence as the second sentence.[139] Furthermore, when conditional clauses appear within the second sentence of second subsections, they tend to be conditional participles and not full conditional sentences.[140] Asyndeton is used nine times as a transitional device, always accompanying topic changes. With the exception of certain subsections that are only one sentence, subsections of 1 Timothy almost always end with an explanatory sentence,[141] a purpose clause with ἵνα,[142] or a relative clause giving clarification,[143] with the nominal doxological clause in 1:17 being the only exception. These patterns and features not only suggest structural and syntactical cohesion throughout the letter, but they also will provide a basis for comparison with the other letters of the PE and structural features found in other letters of the Pauline Corpus.

The Rank of Clause

Introduction

Throughout 1 Timothy, the syntactical relationships between word groups within clauses evince many consistent codification patterns and tendencies. These relationships appear to be dependent on many factors, including clause type, verbal mood, the illocutionary force of the clause, inter-clausal structures, and the syntax of the word groups themselves. For the analysis of

---

[139] δ-1 in 3:1, ε-1 in 3:15, and η-1 in 6:3–5.

[140] δ-2 in 3:10 and ε-2 in 4:4. Subsection ζ-2, however, does still have a conditional sentence as the second sentence of the subsection in 5:4.

[141] γ-2, δ-2, ε-2, ε-3, ε-4, ζ-2, ζ-3, ζ-4, and η-1. These sentences tend to appear with γάρ (6 of 9), but also occur with δέ, ὡσαύτως, and ὅτι.

[142] β-4, δ-1, ζ-2, and η-3. The use of a ἵνα clause of purpose to end a subsection only occurs when the final sentence of the subsection is a command. The command is followed by a ἵνα clause four of seven times that a sentence of command ends a subsection. Other occurrences are ζ-4 (6:2), when the sentence ends with a ὅτι clause, η-2 (6:13–16), when the sentence ends with a doxology using relative clauses, and η-4 (6:20–21), when the sentence ends with a relative clause.

[143] β-1, β-2, γ-1, ε-1, ε-3, η-2, and η-4. It is also noteworthy that three of the four doxological or poetic passages occur within relative clauses.

syntax and word group order on the rank of clause, the study will proceed according to clause type, beginning with paratactic clauses, then hypotactic clauses that function properly on the rank of clause. The clausal analysis will then continue with the investigation of clauses that have undergone rank shift, demonstrating how rank shift impacts the codification of syntactical patterns in the letter. This will not only present an overall profile for 1 Timothy, but also provide a baseline for comparison with the other PE.

Paratactic Clauses

In the paratactic clauses of 1 Timothy, some patterns in clausal structures and word group order emerge when the clauses are analyzed according to various factors, especially verbal mood within the clause, illocutionary force of the clause, the use of connective devices, and presence of other syntactical factors, such as contrast, relative clauses, or formulaic statements. The paratactic clauses of 1 Timothy will be analyzed below, first according to verbal mood and illocutionary force. Then the impact of connective devices will be analyzed, concluded by an overall portrait of word groups and their ordering within paratactic clauses.

Imperative Clauses

The use of imperative verbs within the paratactic clauses of 1 Timothy show some general patterns of word group order for the letter, especially regarding the placement of the complement word groups in relation to the predicator word group. There is not enough data to suggest that verbal tense impacts syntactical relationships, as only two of the forty-two imperative verbs in paratactic clauses are aorist while the other forty are all present tense. There is one use of μή with the aorist subjunctive to give a specific, negative command,[144] but that appears to fit within

---

[144] 1 Tim. 5:1.

the larger patterns established by the use of the imperative tense. The impersonal verb δεῖ and certain indicative verbs, such a βούλομαι or ἐπιτρέπω, carry a paraenetic force also, but those will be considered separately.

It is partially codified that imperative clauses in 1 Timothy have an expressed complement word group,[145] and, when complement is not expressed, it is marginally codified that the clause includes an expressed subject or adjunct word group.[146] While it is not codified that imperative clauses with a complement follow either a predicator-complement (P-C) or complement-predicator (C-P) pattern,[147] there are factors that typically accompany each one. Compound complement word groups tend only to appear in P-C clauses,[148] with compound infinitive clauses and complements with relative clauses always appearing after the predicator.[149] Imperative clauses with complements that are a single noun or nominal group tend to precede the predicator, with or without any additional qualifiers as a marginally codified pattern.[150] The occurrences where a complement consisting of a single nominal group does appear within a P-C structure are

---

[145] Thirty-two of the forty-two imperative clauses have an expressed complement word group. For two others, the imperative occurs within a compound sentence, with the second predicator assuming the complement of the first. (4:11; 6:2).

[146] Seven of the ten imperative clauses lacking an expressed complement include a subject word group or an adjunct word group beyond basic conjunctions. Two of the three imperative clauses that only include a predicator (4:11; 6:2) assume the complement of the previous clause in a compound sentence. The other example (3:10), in a compound sentence, assumes the subject of the previous clause and is followed by a hypotactic participle clause.

[147] Seventeen imperative clauses with a complement have the complement precede the predicator according to the C-P pattern. The other fifteen clauses with a complement follow the P-C pattern.

[148] Six of seven compound complement words groups appear in a P-C sentence pattern (3:12; 4:13, 16; 5:1–2, 4; 6:17–19), and the one instance of a compound sentence within a C-P sentence pattern (4:7) occurs within a context of contrast, using δέ, both conceptually with the sentence that precedes it (4:6) and directly with the imperative clause (P-C) that follows is (4:7).

[149] 1 Tim. 4:14; 5:4; 6:12, 17–19.

[150] Sixteen of twenty-two times that a complement is a single nominal group in an imperative clause, it occurs within a C-P structure. When the complement is a single nominal group with a longer qualifier, the use of hyperbaton allows the imperative sentence to follow the expected structure, such as in 4:12 and 5:2, while having a list or longer complement following the predicator as well.

typically accompanied by other factors that regularly impact syntax, such as contrast[151] or section transitions.[152] For paratactic clauses with complement word groups for imperative verbs, then, in 1 Timothy, the typical structure appears to be C-P, with a switch to P-C occurring for certain types of complement word groups, such as compound complement words groups or those modified by relative clauses, and for those functioning in contrast to another clause.

For paratactic imperative clauses in 1 Timothy, there is not a strongly codified syntax regarding the predicator and complement word groups, but some patterns are evident regarding the use of expressed subject or adjunct word groups. Expressed subjects appear in ten such clauses and it is partially codified that they occur with third person imperative forms.[153] The singular appearance of a second person subject, in 6:11, functions as a strong marker of contrast within common structural devices found in paraenetic contexts.[154] It is also partially codified that the subject word group appears before the predicator.[155] The singular exception in 5:16 is occurs at the end of a subsection as part of a compound clause, where the subject is the last word group of the main clause and also the implicit subject of the immediately following ἵνα clause. Expressed non-conjunctive adjunct word groups appear in fourteen paratactic imperative clauses. While there is no codification pattern for where they appear in general, it is worth noting that when the imperative clause does not include an expressed complement an adjunct word group

---

[151] 1 Tim. 4:7, 15; 5:22; 6:12. In each of these instances, contrast with preceding or following material, either explicitly indicated through δέ or ἀλλά or implicitly, places these clauses in contrast with C-P clauses.

[152] 1 Tim. 4:11 is a compound sentence and the beginning of a new subsection, ε-4. The complement, ταῦτα, also functions as the implicit complement of the following imperative verb in the compound sentence (cf. 6:2c). And in 1 Tim. 5:16, the class 1 conditional sentence includes a compound imperative clause as the apodosis where the initial clause evinces a P-C pattern with a single pronoun as the complement. This sentence, however, concludes the subsection ζ-2, before the following subsection opens with an imperative that follows the expected C-P pattern.

[153] 1 Tim. 2:11; 3:10, 12; 4:12; 5:9–10, 16, 17; 6:1, 2.

[154] Knight, *Epistles,* 260, Marshall, *Commentary*, 656, and Towner, *Letters,* 407n3.

[155] 1 Tim. 2:11; 3:10, 12; 4:12; 5:9–10, 17; 6:1, 2, 11.

will appear before the predicator.[156]

Indicative Clauses

Indicative paratactic clauses are the most common type of main clause in 1 Timothy, and

their structure and syntax also evince some regular tendencies and codification patterns. Before

analyzing indicative clauses as a whole, it is worthwhile to consider separately those indicative

clauses where the verb tense is technically indicative, but the illocutionary force of the verb is

exhortative or imperative.[157] There are eleven occurrences of this type of indicative clause,[158] with

some evident patterns in their use. The verb δεῖ is only expressed twice; so, while both

occurrences have the same P-S sentence pattern, there is not enough data for any conclusions.

For the other nine indicative wish clauses, it is fully codified that they will not have an expressed

subject word group. When an expressed adverbial adjunct word group appears, it always appears

after the predicator in wish clauses. Lastly, it is fully codified that indicative wish clauses, other

than those with δεῖ, will have an expressed complement word group.[159] These complement word

groups do not have any codified patterns,[160] but they do follow the same tendencies as for

imperative verbal forms. Complement words groups that are single lexemes or nominal groups

occur with a C-P sentence pattern, while compound complement word groups and rank-shifted

---

[156] 1 Tim. 2:11; 3:10; 4:15; 5:23; 6:2. Two of these examples (2:11 and 3:10) also include an adjunct word group after the predicator.

[157] This is indicated by the use of the impersonal δεῖ (3:2–6, 7), a future indicative as cohortative (6:8), as well as exhortative or permissive verbs, including βούλομαι (2:8; 5:14), διαμαρτύρομαι (5:21), ἐπιτρέπω (2:12), θέλω (5:11), παραγγέλλω (6:13–16), παρακαλέω (2:1–2), and παρατίθημι (1:18–20).

[158] There are three other occurrences where δεῖ or βούλομαι are assumed with the use of ὡσαύτως (2:9–10; 3:8–9, 11), but the predicators are not expressed.

[159] Two of the nine also have two complement word group, with the indirect object also expressed (1:18–20 and 6:13–16). Both indirect objects are after the main verb and they alternate position, relative to the predicator, with the direct object.

[160] Out of the nine wish clauses with complements, five have a P-C pattern and four have a C-P pattern.

clauses functioning as complements tend to appear within a P-C pattern. The only exception to

these tendencies occurs in 2:12, where a compound infinitive clause is the complement within a

C-P pattern; in this example, however, the compound complement is separated, by the use of

hyperbaton, so that the first infinitive occurs prior to the predicator while the rest of the

complement occurs afterward.[161] As will be argued below, hyperbaton is a common device in 1

Timothy that allows a sentence or clause to conform to expected tendencies and patterns while

allowing the movement of word groups for emphasis, such as here in 2:12.

Aside from indicative clauses that carry an illocutionary force of a command or wish, the

forty-eight other paratactic indicative clauses demonstrate several consistent or codified

syntactical patterns. Where there is an expressed indicative verb, it is marginally codified that the

clause will include a complement word group.[162] Within indicative clauses that include a

complement word group it is marginally codified that the complement will appear before the

predicator (C-P).[163] The general tendencies for when a clause occurs with a C-P or P-C pattern

are similar to those described above for imperative paratactic clauses, but with a few notable

deviations. Like with imperative clauses, complements in indicative clauses that are a single

word or one nominal group tend to appear in a C-P pattern,[164] while complements with multiple

embedded word groups or rank-shifted clauses tend to appear in a P-C pattern.[165] Unlike

imperative clauses, there are no compound complements that occur in a P-C pattern; compound

---

[161] This sentence also occurs within a context of contrast with the previous clause, and it is the only indicative wish clause that expresses a negative wish.

[162] Thirty-two of the forty-eight paratactic indicative clauses have an expressed complement word group.

[163] Twenty-one of the thirty-two indicative sentences with a complement have the complement before the predicator. One of those (5:8b) is a compound sentence including another clause where the complement follows the predicator.

[164] 1 Tim. 1:12; 3:1, 14; 5:13; 6:7a.

[165] 1 Tim. 1:5, 8; 4:1; 5:18.

complement word groups appear five times in a C-P pattern,[166] although three of those instances

evince hyperbaton that allows the complement to both precede and follow the predicator.[167] For

all three instances of hyperbaton within indicative main clauses with a compound complement,

the clause ends a section of the letter and uses an explanatory conjunction.[168] Unlike imperative

paratactic clauses, the complement word groups functioning as indirect objects (C-IO) can

appear alongside the complement word group functioning as the direct object (C-DO).[169]

Furthermore, the presence of a qualifier word group within the complement does appear to

impact the word order of the sentence. Complements with qualifier word groups tend to follow

the predicator,[170] and, when in P-C clauses, tend to appear as predicate nominative complements

(C-PN).[171] When an indicative clause is the main clause of the final sentence of a subsection or

section, it always has an impact on syntax, causing hyperbaton,[172] a switch in expected

complement placement,[173] or other structural irregularities.[174]

In addition to the structural patterns evident for complement word groups within paratactic

---

[166] 1 Tim. 3:13; 4:16b; 5:4a, 8; 6:2b.

[167] 1 Tim. 3:13; 4:16b; 6:2b.

[168] The conjunction γάρ is used for 3:13 and 4:16b, while ὅτι is used in 6:2b.

[169] 1 Tim. 3:13, 14.

[170] Five of seven complements in indicative paratactic clauses with qualifiers are within P-C clauses (1:5; 4:6, 8a; 5:4b, 8b). The two exceptions (3:13 and 6:10) both end their respective sections within the letter, both utilize the conjunction γάρ, and have other elements that impact syntax, such as hyperbaton and contrasting word group syntax in 3:13 or a subject word group concluding the main clause followed by a relative clause in 6:10.

[171] 1 Tim. 4:6, 8a; 5:4b, 8b. Two of these instances also show hyperbaton, where the head noun of the complement follows the predicator while an adjective (4:6) or qualifier (4:8a) precedes the predicator.

[172] 1 Tim. 3:13; 4:16b; 6:2b.

[173] In 3:16 and 6:2b, a predicate nominative precedes the predicator. In 5:16, a complement with a single nominal group follows the predicator, while in 6:10 a complement with a qualifier word group precedes the predicator.

[174] In 3:16, 6:2b, and 6:10, the subject word group concludes the sentence, and for 3:16 and 6:10 the subject word group includes a relative clause.

indicative clauses, 1 Timothy also includes multiple codified patterns for subject word groups, sentence structures, and other rank-shifted clauses. It is likely, although not codified, that paratactic indicative clauses have an expressed subject word group.[175] When the subject is expressed, it is partially codified that the subject will precede the predicator, and only slightly less likely that it will precede all other word groups aside from adjunct word groups serving as conjunctions.[176] The anomalies to this pattern occur where the subject word group includes a relative clause as a qualifier,[177] appears within a clause that contrasts, with δέ, the preceding clause,[178] conforms to formulaic syntax,[179] or occurs at the end of a section.[180] While no codified patterns for adjunct word groups emerge exclusively within indicative clauses, the only sentences in 1 Timothy consisting of a predicator followed by a single, non-conjunctive adjunct (P-A) occur within indicative, explanatory clauses.[181] Lastly, in relation to surrounding clauses, it is marginally codified for 1 Timothy that indicative paratactic clauses are part of a compound or complex sentence.[182]

---

[175] Paratactic indicative clauses in 1 Timothy have an expressed subjects twenty-six times out of forty-eight.

[176] The subject appears prior to the predicator twenty of twenty-six times, and prior to any complement or non-conjunctive adjunct nineteen of those twenty times. First Timothy 5:15 contains the only occurrence of a non-conjunctive adjunct preceding an expressed subject within indicative paratactic clauses.

[177] 1 Tim. 3:16; 6:10. It is worth noting that both of these example have the relative clause, within the subject word group, as the concluding element of a subsection.

[178] 1 Tim. 1:14; 6:6.

[179] 1 Tim. 5:18. See also Rom. 9:17; 10:11; 11:2; Gal. 4:30; and James 4:5. But, see also Rom. 4:3.

[180] 1 Tim. 6:2b. This example appears at the end of section ζ and includes hyperbaton for the complement word group functioning as a predicate nominative. The context of the section conclusion is likely the cause for the syntax of the subject word group rather than the presence of the rank-shifted participle clause, as other rank-shifted participle clauses functioning as subjects of indicative clauses are prior to the predicator (3:13; 5:5, 6, 25; 6:9). The subject word groups of the impersonal verb δεῖ, as found in 3:2–6 and 3:7, while included in the indicative-wish section above, also follow the predicator, but this case the subject word groups are compound, infinitive clauses that have undergone rank shift.

[181] 1 Tim. 1:13b; 2:15; 4:5, 10.

[182] Within 1 Timothy, thirty of forty-eight paratactic indicative clauses are within compound sentences and twenty-two of forty-eight are within complex sentences, with seventeen being within both. Only thirteen paratactic

Impact of Connectors on Word Group Order

For paratactic clauses in 1 Timothy, the presence or absence of certain conjunctions and connective devices impacts the expected word group order of the clause. Some connective devices do not evince any codified impact on word order beyond the syntactical factors already established above, such as asyndeton,[183] the conjunctive use of καί,[184] the conjunction ἀλλά,[185] the conjunction γάρ,[186] and the conditional conjunctions εἰ and ἐάν.[187] Others show some potential impact on word group order patterns, but with too little data to form any conclusions, such as οὖν[188] and ὡσαύτως.[189] The anaphoric demonstrative pronoun, however, in both singular and

---

indicative clauses within 1 Timothy serve as the main clause of a simple sentence.

[183] In the main body of 1 Timothy, there are thirty sentences with asyndeton for the opening paratactic clause. Thirteen of them follow a C-P pattern, nine follow a P-C pattern, and the complements and other sentence elements do not abrogate the syntactical patterns already established above.

[184] The conjunctive καί is used for six paratactic clauses in 1 Timothy. While the only sentences with both complements and predicators (3:16; 5:25) follow a C-P pattern, there is not enough data to suggest that the word group order is impacted by the conjunction itself.

[185] The conjunction ἀλλά is used six six times for paratactic clauses, with a complement only appearing in three of them (4:12; 5:1–2, 23). Even though this is not enough data to suggest any codified patterns, it is noteworthy that four of the six uses of ἀλλά occur with imperative clauses (4:12; 5:1–2, 23; 6:2).

[186] The conjunction γάρ appears thirteen times as a conjunction in paratactic clauses. Eight of those clauses include a complement word group, and the sentence pattern follows that of indicative clauses as a whole. Complements tend to appear before the predicator, and the three instances where the complement follows the predicator are due to contrast (4:8; 5:4a), rank-shifted quotations as the complement (5:18a), or formulaic syntax (5:4a).

[187] There are eight times in 1 Timothy that a conditional sentence occurs as the main clause. The general pattern is that the complement precedes the predicator in the protasis, and only the class 1, or simple particular, conditional sentences have a complement in the protasis. However, it is not clear that the condition, indicated by εἰ, is the cause of the structural pattern as much as the other factors already identified above, especially complement type and contrast with other sentences.

[188] The conjunction οὖν is only used four times in the letter of 1 Timothy (2:1–2, 8; 3:2–6; 5:14). In every instance, it appears in a paraenetic context (with βούλομαι, παρακαλέω, or δεῖ), and all three clauses that have a complement follow the P-C sentence pattern.

[189] The adverb ὡσαύτως is used as a connective device four times in 1 Timothy (2:9–10; 3:8–9, 11; 5:25), and in every instance the main verb of the sentence is elided, assuming the verbal structure of the preceding clause. The verbal structure of the previous sentence is assumed insofar as it is duplicated in the ὡσαύτως clause, including finite verbs only (5:25) or the finite verb along with any rank-shifted verbal forms (3:8–9, 11). Only the main verb of 2:8 is assumed for 2:9–10 and not the infinitive functioning as the complement of 2:8, because a different complement is used for 2:9–10.

plural forms, does evince some impact on expected word group order patterns for main clauses.

In addition, the use of the conjunction δέ, especially when δέ is used to indicate a contrast

between clauses, does establish an expectation for word group order for paratactic clauses.

The anaphoric demonstrative is a fairly common connective device in 1 Timothy,

appearing in three sentences in the singular form as a connective device and in seven sentences

in the plural form. Not only is ταῦτα used as a transitional device between sections,[190] as shown

above, but clauses that utilize the demonstrative pronoun in this manner, with one exception,[191]

have the expressed complement precede the predicator as a partially codified pattern.[192] There are

two occasions where the demonstrative pronoun is the complement of a hypotactic, participle

clause that precedes the main clause.[193] In both cases the main clause uses a future tense

indicative verb that shows hyperbaton for the complement, so that the complement both precedes

and follows the predicator. The plural demonstrative pronoun as connector also tends to appear

in main clauses with imperative verbal forms,[194] and, when in indicative clauses or hypotactic

participle clauses, the main clause tends to carry a paraenetic force.[195]

The conjunction δέ demonstrates limited influence on word group order for paratactic

clauses in 1 Timothy. Paratactic clauses introduced by δέ often follow many of the expected

patterns for word group order established above, such as for complement word groups consisting

---

[190] 1 Tim. 3:14; 4:6, 11; 6:2c, 11.

[191] 1 Tim. 4:11.

[192] 1 Tim. 3:14; 4:6, 15, 16b; 5:7; 6:2c, 11. This occurs six of seven times for the plural ταῦτα, which always appears as the complement of its clause, and also once for the singular τοῦτο, which is the only instance where the singular τοῦτο, functioning as a connector, is used as the complement of its clause. There are two paratactic clauses (2:3–4; 5:4b) where τοῦτο is the subject of the clause and functioning as a connector. Both instances are variations of the same clause, one nominal with an S-C pattern and one with a predicator following an S-P-C pattern.

[193] 1 Tim. 4:6, 16b.

[194] This occurs five of the seven times that ταῦτα is used as a connector.

[195] 1 Tim. 4:6, 16b. See Towner, *Letters,* 302–3 and 325–28, and Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 293–94.

of rank-shifted clauses,[196] a compound complement or list,[197] or a nominal group modified by a relative clause typically following the predicator,[198] while complements that are a single, nominal group precede the predicator.[199] However, paratactic clauses with a contrastive δέ as the primary connector regularly abrogate those expected structures, whether the contrast is with the preceding or the following clause. For example, 1 Timothy 4:7 contains two paratactic, contrasting clauses with δέ, and they both counter the expected word order. The first clause contrasts the previous clause and includes a compound complement that precedes an imperative verb and the second clause includes a contrasting imperative clause where the complement, a single pronoun, follows the verb. Out of the twenty-seven paratactic clauses that use δέ as the primary connector, ten do not have an expressed complement and eleven with an expressed complement adhere to the expected word group order. There are six clauses that do not follow the expected order,[200] and they all use δέ as an indicator for contrast and either explicitly change word order with their contrasted clause,[201] mirror their contrasted clause to abrogate the expected order,[202] or contrast a clause without the same word groups yet still show an abrogation of the

---

[196] 1 Tim. 1:8–11 and 4:1–3, where the complement is a rank-shifted ὅτι clause.

[197] 1 Tim. 5:5 and 6:11b.

[198] 1 Tim. 1:5–7.

[199] 1 Tim. 4:8; 5:11; 6;6.

[200] 1 Tim. 2:12; 4:7a, 7b; 5:4, 8; 6:6.

[201] In 1 Tim. 4:7, as mentioned above, the first clause, following a C-P pattern with a compound complement, contrasts an indicative clause with an expected P-C pattern, albeit with hyperbaton. The second clause, 1 Tim. 4:7b, then contrasts 4:7a and evinces a P-C pattern with a single pronoun as the complement. In 1 Tim. 6:6, the clause evinces an unexpected P-C-S pattern, contrasting a rank-shifted infinitive clause in 6:5 with a C-P-S pattern.

[202] Both in 1 Tim. 5:4 and 5:8, the clause loosely contrasts the prior clause, both of which evince expected word order, and they are protases in class 1 conditional clauses. The former, 5:4, includes a compound complement, with ἤ as the internal conjunction, preceding the predicator in an S-C-P pattern, contrasting 5:3, which does show expected word order pattern, C-P, albeit with hyperbaton. The latter, 5:8, also includes a compound complement with καί preceding the predicator in a C-P pattern, contrasting the main clause of 5:7, which shows the expected pattern, C-P.

expected order.[203] Even for the eleven δέ clauses that adhere to the expected word group order, those that contrast still often have a change in word group order, even if that contrasting order follows the expected pattern.[204] The conjunction δέ, then, does not appear to impact word group order when it is used as a conjunctive or transitional conjunction, but the contrastive δέ regularly signals a change in word group order and an abrogation of expected patterns.

Nominal Clauses, Subjects, and Adjuncts

Paratactic clauses evince some tendencies and codified patterns for expressed subject and adjunct word groups in relation to the predicator and other sentence elements, as well as nominal paratactic clauses where a predicator group with a verbal form of εἰμί is assumed rather than expressed. Aside from the opening salutation and final blessing of the letter,[205] which will not be considered together with the main body,[206] there are eleven other nominal paratactic clauses in the main body of 1 Timothy. For these eleven clauses, it is codified that there are both an

---

[203] In 1 Tim. 2:12, the contrasted clause, 2:11, does not include a complement, but displays unusual word order in itself with prepositional phrases of manner, both with ἐν, both preceding and following the imperative verb. Mirroring this yet providing contrast, 2:12 contains a compound infinitive clause as the complement with hyperbaton, both preceding and following the predicator as well.

[204] For both 1 Tim. 1:5–7 and 8–11, they contrast relative clauses that precede and show a C-P word group order. The paratactic clause with δέ in 4:8b contrasts the prior γάρ clause. The initial clause shows S-P-C word group order with hyperbaton, while the δέ clause with follows switches to S-C-P word group order and is followed by a hypotactic participle clause. The hyperbaton in the γάρ clause allows the δέ clause to have contrasting word order while the initial clause, through the hyperbaton, still has part of the complement prior to the predicator as would be expected. The addition of a hypotactic participle also occurs in 5:6, where the δέ clause adds a concessive hypotactic clause between the subject and predicator word groups.

[205] The opening salutation in 1:1–2 contains two nominal clauses following an S-C pattern. In the first, 1:1–2a, the complement is a C-IO, while in the second, 1:2b, the C-IO is assumed and the expressed complement is comprised of a prepositional phrase describing the compound subject of the nominal clause as a C-PN. Many commentators note that the prepositional phrase modify the compound subject (see Towner, *Letters,* 103 and Knight, *Epistles,* 67–68), but none discuss the syntax of the nominal phrase. The prepositional phrase is likely not a qualifier within the subject word group, as the implied syntax of the assumed verb would be nonsensical. The prepositional phrase, then, is either functioning as an adjunct to the implied verb or as a nominalized complement, the latter of which is more likely. The final blessing in 6:21b, like 1:2b, follows an S-C pattern where the complement is a prepositional phrase serving as a predicate nominative, modifying the subject.

[206] See note 5 above.

expressed subject and complement[207] and it is partially codified that the nominal clause will not include an adjunct word group other than those functioning as conjunctions.[208] There is no apparent impact of connectors on word group order for nominal paratactic clauses, and the word group order of the subject and complement does not tend toward an S-C or a C-S pattern.[209] While there are not enough nominal clauses to establish a codified pattern for this phenomenon, there are two nominal paratactic clauses that have hyperbaton, 1 Tim. 1:15 and 4:9. Both examples use the same formulaic saying,[210] although the former is followed by an appositive ὅτι clause. The only other nominal paratactic clause with a compound complement, 1 Tim. 2:3–4, evinces an S-C pattern and is another formulaic saying, paralleling 5:4b where the predicator ἔστιν is expressed, giving a word order structure of S-P-C.

In addition to nominal paratactic clauses and other sentences where the main verb is elided or assumed, the presence and placement of subject word groups do evince some codified patterns. Out of the one hundred twenty-two paratactic clauses in 1 Timothy, fifty-five have expressed subject word groups. Of those, thirty-eight occur within paratactic clauses with an expressed predicator. For paratactic clauses with both an expressed subject and predicator, it is

---

[207] Ten of eleven clauses have both an expressed subject and complement. The only marked exception to this pattern, 6:7b, is syntactically difficult with multiple variant readings. As argued above, this project takes the ὅτι as recitative, with the rank-shifted ὅτι clause serving as the subject of a nominal clause.

[208] Out of eleven clauses, there are ten that have only a subject word group (6:7b) or a subject and complement (1:15; 2:3–4, 5a, 5b–7; 3:1; 4:4a, 4b, 9). The only marked exceptions are the nominal benediction clause in 1:17 and the ὡσαύτως clause in 5:25a. The former contains a temporal PP after the complement and subject. The latter clause, which contains an adverbial καί, is both the first clause in the final, compound sentence of subsection ζ-3 and, as a ὡσαύτως clause, assuming the verbal structure (εἰσίν) of the previous clause.

[209] Five of the eleven clauses (1:17; 2:3–4; 4:4a, 4b; 5:25a) evince an S-C pattern, with a variety of connectors, while 5 others (1:15; 2:5a, 5b–7; 3:1; 4:9) evince a C-S pattern, also with a variety of connectors.

[210] The primary clause of both examples are identical. A shortened form of this same saying is found in 3:1 also, showing a C-S pattern.

partially codified that the subject will appear before the predicator.[211] When the subject follows

the predicator, there are other syntactical features that accompany it, such as the subject word

group including a relative clause as a qualifier,[212] the context of contrast with another clause,[213]

the sentence appearing at the end of a section,[214] rank-shifted clauses,[215] or formulaic syntax.[216] As

shown above, both contrast and the placement of a clause at the end of a section tend to be

accompanied by structural change or irregularities, and, as will be shown below, any word group

that includes a relative clause tends to conclude its governing clause. It is partially codified that

expressed, non-conjunctive adjunct word groups, regardless of their position relative to the

predicator, will not precede an expressed subject.[217] It is partially codified that the subject will

precede the expressed predicator, and the likelihood increases for clauses with imperative

verbs[218] and those that are in conditional sentences,[219] but there are not enough examples to

constitute a codified pattern. While there are not enough examples to determine codification, it is

---

[211] The subject is before the predicator in twenty-nine of thirty-eight occurrences.

[212] 1 Tim. 3:16; 6:10.

[213] 1 Tim. 1:14; 6:6. The former contrasts the previous paratactic clause with the causal ὅτι, showing a P-A word order for the main clause. The latter, however, contrasts a rank-shifted participle clause in the previous sentence with word group order C-P-S. In this case, the subject remains in the marked position at the end of the sentence while the complement and predicator switch to show the contrast.

[214] 1 Tim. 5:16; 6:2.

[215] Both 1 Tim. 3:2–6 and 1 Tim. 3:7 are δεῖ clauses which include an infinitive clause as the subject word group. In 3:2–6, the infinitive clause includes an extended list as the predicate nominative complement word group. In 3:7, the infinitive clause neither is compound nor includes a list, but the use of καί and parallel with 3:2–6 explained the similar syntax.

[216] 1 Tim. 5:18.

[217] There are fourteen paratactic clauses with both an expressed subject and an expressed adjunct that is not a connector, and only two of those (ἤδη in 5:15 and an additive καί in 5:25) have an adjunct preceding the subject. Both examples are a single adverb. No PP precedes an expressed subject in paratactic clauses in 1 Timothy.

[218] Within imperative paratactic clauses, the expressed subject precedes the predicator eight of nine times, with the only exception, 5:16b, being the final paratactic clause of subsection ζ-2 whose subject is also the assumed subject of the ἵνα clause that concludes the sentence.

[219] Out of six expressed subjects in paratactic, conditional clauses, five precede the predicator. The only exception, discussed in the previous footnote, is 5:16b. This is the only time an apodosis has an expressed subject.

also noteworthy that no paratactic clause with an expressed subject following the predicator uses asyndeton as the connective device, and that no pronoun serving as the subject of a paratactic clause follows the predicator.[220] Lastly, while fifty-three paratactic clauses,[221] including apodoses of conditional sentences, utilize asyndeton as a connective device in 1 Timothy, it is codified that indicative paratactic clauses with an expressed subject will include an expressed connective device.[222]

Adjunct word groups within paratactic clauses display codified patterns and general tendencies for word group order as well, especially dependent upon the type of adjunct, the illocutionary force of the clause or the adjunct, and the placement of other word groups in the clause. Within the main body of 1 Timothy, there are seventeen A-Advs and A-CUs and thirty-three A-PPs within paratactic clauses. It is marginally codified that A-Advs will appear before the predicator.[223] A-CUs typically appear after the predicator and it is partially codified that A-PPs will follow the predicator.[224] Where an adverbial adjunct appears in a clause with a C-P pattern, it is always before the predicator,[225] but it tends to follow the predicator when the clause shows a P-C pattern.[226] In relation to PPs, adverbial adjuncts of manner tend to be before the

---

[220] Of the fourteen paratactic clauses with an expressed subject that utilize asyndeton, six are in nominal clauses and 8 have the subject precede the predicator. Of the ten paratactic clauses that include a pronoun as the subject, two are in nominal clauses while eight precede the expressed predicator.

[221] Fifty-three paratactic clauses of one hundred twenty-two utilize hyperbaton, giving a 43% chance that any sentence or paratactic clause will not have an expressed connective device.

[222] Nineteen of twenty paratactic clauses with an indicative verb and an expressed subject do not utilize asyndeton.

[223] Eleven of seventeen adverbial adjuncts are before the predicator, while five follow an expressed verb.

[224] Twenty-five of thirty-three follow the predicator, while eight are before the predicator.

[225] This occurs four times, and the placement of the adjunct relative to the complement is not consistent. There are two cases where the adjunct precedes the complement also (both in 5:13), but also two cases where the adjunct comes between the complement and the predicator (5:22a, 24).

[226] Out of the four times an adverbial adjunct appears in a P-C clause, it follows the predicator three times. There are two instances where the adjunct comes between the predicator and the complement (2:1–2; 5:4a), and in

predicator; in contrast, an A-PP of manner tends to follow.[227] The only notable exception to this general tendency, that A-Advs tend to precede the predicator while an A-PP with the same illocutionary force follows, occurs with temporal adjuncts. The temporal PP in 1 Tim. 6:17–19, indicated by ἐν, is before the predicator, while only three of the five temporal A-Advs precede the predicator.[228] For the eight A-PPs that precede the predicator in paratactic clauses, five of them are in clauses with an imperative verb,[229] and the other three are all in indicative clauses without an expressed complement.[230] One noteworthy imperative clause with an A-PP that follows the predicator is 4:12, where the second clause of the compound sentence contrasts the primary clause and concludes the sentence with five PPs of sphere, with ἐν, in an asyndeton list.

The verbal context also impacts expected word order for adjuncts. It is partially codified that when an A-PP is used in a paratactic clause with asyndeton as the connective device, the verbal mood is either imperative or indicative-wish.[231] All non-conjunctive adjuncts that occur in an indicative-wish clause follow the main verb.[232] For paratactic clauses with a P-C pattern that include an adjunct, those that do not include an expressed subject are always within imperative

---

both cases it is the adverbial accusative neuter, πρῶτον. In the other example, 5:5–6, it follows the complement also.

[227] This includes the adverb ῥητῶς in 4:1, ταχέως in 5:22a, and μᾶλλον in 6:2b. Out of four prepositional phrases of manner, all indicated by the preposition ἐν, three of them follow the predicator (1:13b; 2:11; 5:1–2). The only exception also occurs in 2:11, where two prepositional phrases of manner appear, one before the predicator and one following, likely for emphasis (Larry J. Perkins, *The Pastoral Letters: A Handbook on the Greek Text,* BHGNT, [Baylor: Baylor University Press, 2017], 43). This pattern also occurs with adjuncts of accompaniment, where the lone adverbial adjunct of accompaniment, ἅμα, occurs before the predicator in 5:13 and prepositional phrases of accompaniment, indicated by μετά with the genitive case, occur following the predicator in 1:14 and 2:15.

[228] This includes πρωτός in 1 Tim. 2:13, ἤδη in 5:15, and μηκέτι in 5:23. Two temporal adverbial adjuncts follow the predicator: πρῶτον in 3:10 and the adverbial genitive νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμερας in 5:5.

[229] 1 Tim. 2:11; 4:15; 5:19, 20; 6:17–10.

[230] 1 Tim. 1:16; 2:14; 4:10.

[231] Out of the thirteen times a PP is found in a paratactic clause with asyndeton, eleven are within an imperative or indicative-wish context.

[232] 1 Tim. 1:18–20; 2:1–2, 8; 5:21; 6:13–16.

or indicative-wish contexts,[233] while the three that have expressed subjects are in an indicative context.[234] Lastly, all paratactic clauses that only include a predicator and an A-Adv following, giving a P-A pattern, are within indicative contexts.[235]

Codification and Textual Analysis: Initial Observations

Many codified patterns and tendencies emerge for paratactic clauses in 1 Timothy according to clause type, verbal mood or force, inter-clausal relationships, the presence of certain rank-shifted clauses, and type of word groups used for the various syntactical elements. These patterns vary by the mood of the predicator, especially imperative verbs, indicative verbs proper, and indicative verbs expressing a wish or exhortation. The placement of word groups within a paratactic clause also correlate with the presence of other word groups, the use of connective devices, and other syntactical phenomena. When these patterns are abrogated, it typically occurs due to predictable features, such as the context of contrast, the placement of a clause at the end of the section, the presence of relative clauses, or formulaic and poetic syntax. These patterns will allow for comparison with the other PE and other letters of the Pauline Corpus for similar or incongruous features, and serve to identify marked examples of irregular syntax for the reader.

While many of the patterns and tendencies identified in the clausal analysis above will not be largely fruitful until 1 Timothy is compared with the other letters of the PE and others in the Pauline Corpus, it would be helpful to give a few examples where marked syntax, which does not conform to expectations, can assist with interpretation and analysis of the text. In some cases,

---

[233] 1 Tim. 2:1–2, 8; 4:7b; 5:4a, 21; 6:13–16, 17–19.

[234] 1 Tim. 4:1–3; 5:5–6.

[235] 1 Tim. 1:13b; 2:15; 4:5, 10.

the marked syntax gives emphasis to a certain element within the sentence, such as 2:11, 4:11, 5:15, and 5:16. In 2:11, it is marked that the prepositional phrase, ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ, is before the predicator. As will be discussed further in chapter six, this ties together the theme of ἡσυχία, quiet orderliness or peace,[236] for section γ,[237] giving the second prepositional phrase as a means of accomplishing the primary prepositional phrase.[238] The anaphoric demonstrative pronoun ταῦτα is in marked position in 4:11, following its predicator, παράγγελλε. Typically, the demonstrative pronoun, when used as a connective device, precedes the predicator, even when the sentence is compound and it functions as the complement of both predicators.[239] In this case, the verb is given prime emphasis, allowing ταῦτα to recall the material from the previous material but giving prominence to the act itself of instruction rather than the content. The presence of ἤδη is 5:15 is marked syntax, in that it is one of only two times where a non-conjunctive adjunct precedes the expressed subject in 1 Timothy. The emphatic position of ἤδη gives to the reader a sense of urgency to Paul's commands in 5:3–16, that the dangers of not following his instructions on the issue of widow enrollment and the behavior of widows are already coming to fulfillment. Lastly, the subject of the second clause of the apodosis in 5:16 is in marked position, in that it is the only subject to follow an imperative verb. This provides an emphatic contrast between the obligations of the biological family unit and the household of faith, the church community. The church community does, Paul argues, have an obligation to care for widows, but not as the result of the neglect of family duty. The focus of the clause is not the burden caused by

---

[236] Louw-Nida, *Lexicon*, §22.43, 247, and §88.103, 754.

[237] See 1 Tim. 2:2, 11, 12.

[238] In other words, Paul is primarily concerned, in 2:11, in ἡσυχία, not ὑποταγή, just as his primary concern in praying for those in authority in 2:2 is for the purpose of ἡσυχία. In this case, the proper arrangement of the husband-wife relationship is brought up not as a means to itself, but insofar as it achieves ἡσυχία, quiet orderliness.

[239] 1 Tim. 6:2c.

caring for the widows, but rather the difference in the roles of church and family in caring for widows.

In addition to cases where marked syntax demonstrates emphasis that aids interpretation, marked syntax can also assist with text-critical questions, such as 2:9 and 6:7b, and questions of textual divisions and section transitions, such as 3:13, 4:16b, and 6:2b. The additive καί tends to precede an expressed predicator, and indicative-wish clauses with ὡσαύτως tend to have no other connector than ὡσαύτως. In 2:9, however, the NA[28] text includes a καί following ὡσαύτως, which is unusual both in an indicative-wish clause with ὡσαύτως and for καί as an adjunct. It is more likely, then, that the καί is not original to the text, based on linguistic patterns, than for the καί to have been removed. There is a longstanding question about the syntax and use of the ὅτι in 6:7, explored above, and the patterns presented here can further aid in that question. If the ὅτι is recitative, indicating a rank-shifted clause as the subject of a nominal sentence, it would indeed be unusual, as 6:7b would be the only nominal clause in 1 Timothy without an expressed complement. It is only more likely, then, that this clause, as it stands in the text of NA[28], is the more difficult, marked reading.

The syntax patterns also help with textual divisions when discerning section and subsection transitions and seams. It is common, as argued above, for the final sentence or clause of a section or subsection to have unusual syntax, especially with regard to the placement of subject and complement word groups. For 3:13, as opposed to 3:16, a compound complement begins before the predicator, and evinces double hyperbaton, appearing in three pieces and being interrupted by the C-IO and the predicator. It is more likely, according to other subsection and section conclusions, that this signals the conclusion of a section and the movement into a new section than for 3:16. The latter, instead, shows expected syntax, with the element with the relative

113

clause concluding the main clause. Furthermore, poetic sections elsewhere function within sections rather than at their beginning or end. Similar the paratactic clauses of 4:16b and 6:2b show unexpected, marked word order, with the compound complement, via hyperbaton, preceding the predicator in 4:16b[240] and the subject in 6:2b, without a relative clause following the predicator and, moreover, appearing as the final element of the sentence. The other options for the major section transitions, 5:2 and 5:25, respectively, evince codified syntax, thereby not signaling to the reader a shift in the letter in the same way as the marked patterns in 4:16b and 6:2b. While a more robust impact of the codified patterns of paratactic clauses in 1 Timothy, again, will not be realized until the letter is compared with others, they do show promise for aiding in textual study and interpretation.

<div align="center">Hypotactic Clauses</div>

In the hypotactic clauses of 1 Timothy, some patterns in clausal structures and word group order emerge when the clauses are analyzed according to various factors, especially the type of hypotactic clause, the larger context surrounding the hypotactic clause, the illocutionary force of the hypotactic clause, and the type of complement within the clause. The hypotactic clauses of 1 Timothy will be analyzed below according to the two general types of hypotactic clauses that function on the rank of clause: clauses with finite verbs in hypotaxis due to a hypotactic conjunction (HC-Cj) and participle clauses in predicate position functioning as hypotactic clauses (HC-ptc). Following this analysis an overall portrait will be given of word group order and other syntactical patterns found in hypotactic clauses in 1 Timothy.

---

[240] It is also noteworthy that demonstrative pronoun shifts in 4:16b, appearing as the plural ταῦτα in 4:6, 11, 15 before switching to the singular τοῦτο in 4:16. This also serves to signal a change or transition within the letter.

Finite Clauses with a Hypotactic Conjunction

In the letter of 1 Timothy, there are seventeen hypotactic clauses that function on the rank

of clause yet are in hypotaxis to a paratactic clause because of a hypotactic conjunction (Cj-H):

fourteen with the conjunction ἵνα and three with other hypotactic conjunctions.[241] There are not

enough hypotactic clauses with conjunctions other than ἵνα to establish any codification patterns,

but some preliminary tendencies are noteworthy, especially as they contrast with clause with ἵνα

and serve as comparison for other clauses in the PE. For the three finite clauses that are in

hypotaxis because of conjunctions other than ἵνα, all three are the initial clauses of their

sentence, with two being explicitly before the main clause and one appearing first in the sentence

but with an elided main clause.[242] Two of the three are temporal clauses, while the other is a

clause of comparison. Two of the three clauses include an expressed complement with the basic

word group order P-C,[243] while the other includes only a predicator. Lastly, no expressed subject

or adjunct, other than the conjunction, appears in any of the three such clauses.

For the fourteen ἵνα clauses that function as hypotactic clauses of purpose in 1 Timothy,[244]

some codified patterns of syntax and word group order are evident. It is a fully codified pattern

that the ἵνα clause is the final hypotactic clause proper in the sentence. It is also partially codified

that the ἵνα clause is the final clause with a finite verb in the sentence.[245] Two ἵνα clauses, 1:3–4

---

[241] These conjunctions are καθώς in 1 Tim. 1:3, ἕως in 4:13, and ὅταν in 5:11b.

[242] Both the ἕως and the ὅταν clauses in 1 Tim. 4:13 and 5:11b appear before the main clause, while the καθώς clause appears first in 1:3–4 but the main clause is inferred rather than explicitly stated.

[243] The complement of the καθώς clause in 1:3–4 in a compound infinitive clause and the complement of the ὅταν clause in 5:11 is a single nominal group.

[244] This is the use of ἵνα for fourteen of its fifteen appearances in 1 Timothy. There is only one occurrence, in 1 Tim. 5:21, where the ἵνα clause is the C-DO of its clause and not functioning as a separate, hypotactic clause.

[245] Eleven of the fourteen ἵνα clauses are explicitly the final finite clause of their larger sentence, not followed by any other rank-shifted or hypotactic clauses with a finite verb.

and 3:15, are followed by a relative clause embedded within the ἵνα clause, and one ἵνα clause, in

1:18–20, is followed by an embedded HC-ptc with three rank-shifted, relative clauses concluded

by another ἵνα clause modifying the final relative clause. It is partially codified that the ἵνα

clause will follow the main clause,[246] with the two exceptions, 1:3–4 and 3:15, being in sentences

with an elided main clause.[247] It is partially codified that ἵνα clauses are hypotactic to the main

clause of the sentence,[248] with the two exceptions being in 1:20, where the ἵνα clause in 1:20

appears within a relative clause, and 3:6, where the ἵνα clause modifies the final element of a

long, predicate nominative list functioning as the complement of an infinitive clause.[249] A

marginally codified pattern for ἵνα clauses in 1 Timothy is that they modify main clauses whose

predicators are either imperative or indicative-wish verbal forms.[250] The final codified pattern

evident among ἵνα clauses of purpose in 1 Timothy is the partially codified pattern that ἵνα

clauses have an expressed complement.[251] This pattern is noteworthy not only for the pattern

itself, but also that every abrogation of this pattern, where the ἵνα clause does not have an

expressed complement, expresses negative purpose with μή.[252] These are the only negative ἵνα

purpose clauses in 1 Timothy, with every positive ἵνα purpose clause including an expressed

---

[246] Twelve of the fourteen ἵνα clauses explicitly follow the main clause of their sentence.

[247] Even for these two exceptions, however, the ἵνα clause is the final proper clause of the sentence.

[248] Twelve of fourteen such ἵνα clauses explicitly modify the main clause of their sentence.

[249] It is possible that the ἵνα clause modifies the entirety of the infinitive clause, which is functioning as the subject of the predicator δεῖ, thereby functioning properly on the rank of the clause, as it does in 3:7. But, with the presence of the aside in 3:5 and the placement of the final element, μὴ νεόφυτον, as the only element following the aside, it is more likely that the ἵνα clause is linked with the final element rather than the whole subject clause (see also Marshall, *Commentary*, 481–82).

[250] Ten of fourteen ἵνα clauses appear within main clauses with either imperative main verbs or verbs that are indicative but expressing a command or wish (δεῖ, παρατίθημι, and παρακαλέω). For the other four ἵνα clauses, two are within clauses with an elided main verb (1:3–4; 3:15), and two modify predicators with an indicative verb (1:16 and 20).

[251] Out of fourteen ἵνα clauses, eleven have an expressed complement.

[252] 1 Tim. 3:6, 7; 6:1.

complement.

In addition to the codified patterns that occur with ἵνα clauses in 1 Timothy, there are many other tendencies for syntax and word group order that are helpful for analysis and comparison. For ἵνα clauses that appear in a main clause whose connective device is asyndeton, the predicator of the main clause is always an imperative or indicative-wish verbal form.[253] Only six ἵνα clauses have an expressed adjunct aside from the leading conjunction;[254] when they do occur, however, they tend to be an A-PP that follows the predicator.[255] The additive καί is the single A-Adv that appears in ἵνα clauses, and it precedes the predicator.[256] There are a few other noteworthy phenomena for ἵνα clauses in 1 Timothy, although they do not qualify as patterns or tendencies. Four ἵνα clauses in 1 Timothy are the final clause proper for their section or subsection.[257] There does not seem to be a tendency for the complement to precede or follow the predicator, in general, for ἵνα clauses,[258] but there are some similarities and differences from tendencies evident in paratactic clauses. Like paratactic clauses, rank-shifted clauses functioning as complements tend to follow the predicator, as it does for all three such occurrences in ἵνα clauses.[259] Unlike paratactic clauses, the single complement consisting of a compound, nominal group, found in 2:2, precedes the predicator without hyperbaton, and the five complements that include only a

---

[253] This happens in all five such occurrences: 1:18; 4:15; 5:20; 6:1, 19.

[254] 1 Tim. 1:16, 18; 2:2; 3:6, 7; 5:20.

[255] Five of six ἵνα clauses have prepositional phrases as the expressed adjunct. They all have a prepositional phrase that followed the predicator, although 1:16, which has two prepositional phrases, has both one preceding and one following the predicator.

[256] 1 Tim. 5:20.

[257] 1 Tim. 1:18–20; 3:7; 5:16; 6:19.

[258] For the eleven ἵνα clauses with an expressed complement, six follow a P-C pattern and five follow a C-P pattern.

[259] A rank-shifted πῶς clause is the complement in 3:15, a simple infinitive is the complement in 1:20, and a compound infinitive clause is the complement in 1:3–4.

single nominal group appear on both sides of the predicator.[260] Lastly, there is one instance of hyperbaton for ἵνα clauses. It occurs with a C-PN in 4:15, where the qualifier of the complement follows the predicator while the adjective itself precedes it. While these are helpful patterns and tendencies to identify for ἵνα clauses, their full impact will not occur until 1 Timothy is compared other works of the PE and the New Testament.

Predicate Participle Clauses

The most common type of hypotactic clause functioning on the rank of clause in 1 Timothy is a participle clause in predicate position, occurring thirty times across the letter.[261] HC-ptcs evince much flexibility in word group order and force of the clause, but there are some notable patterns and tendencies as well, especially when the clauses are analyzed according to complement type, force of clause, and the mood of the governing verb.

The presence of an expressed complement in a HC-ptc is marginally codified,[262] although the word group order of the complement does not tend, in general, toward either a P-C or C-P clause pattern.[263] It is also marginally codified that the HC-ptc will have nothing except the

---

[260] The complement appears after the predicator, in a P-C pattern, in 1:16, 18; 6:19, and it appears before the predicator, in a C-P pattern, in 5:16, 20. The only noteworthy example among these is 6:19 where the ἵνα clause is the final clause of a subsection, which might explain the placement of the complement in an otherwise unexpected place. Note, however, the placement of the complement in 5:16, which also concludes a subsection of the letter.

[261] As stated above, the view of the author is that participle clauses in predicate position are functioning on the rank of clause, roughly equivalent to a dependent clause in English, rather than adverbial adjuncts (see Voelz, *Grammar*, 122–23). Admittedly, many interpretive choices were made to arrive at this number, especially for participles whose position is ambiguous. For those whose position and force are disputed, such as the force of the participle clauses in 1:5–7 or the position of the participles in 5:13, the choice will be defended as they arise. In the end, any patterns that emerge, especially those involving participles whose force or position is unclear, are descriptive in nature, not prescriptive.

[262] Twenty-one of thirty predicate participle clauses have an expressed complement.

[263] Eleven of the twenty-one HC-ptcs with an expressed complement follow a P-C pattern, with the complement following the predicator, while the other ten follow a C-P pattern, with the complement preceding the predicator of the clause.

predicator or the predicator and complement,[264] and partially codified that the HC-ptc will not have either an expressed subject or an expressed adjunct.[265] When a HC-ptc does not have an expressed complement, it is partially codified that its governing verb will be in the indicative mood.[266] It is also fully codified both that such HC-ptcs only occur within paratactic and hypotactic clauses functioning properly on the rank of clause and that they will not have an expressed subject. For HC-ptcs that do not have a complement or evince a C-P structure there is no pattern about where they appear based on the presence and placement of complement,[267] but it is a codified pattern for HC-ptcs with a P-C pattern that they will follow their governing clause.[268] For HC-ptcs with a P-C clausal pattern, it is also codified that they will appear with present tense participles,[269] while aorist tense participles, when they appear in clauses with complements, follow a C-P pattern.[270] Lastly, it is partially codified that any predicate participle in 1 Timothy will be a present tense participle.[271]

While there are not enough examples to establish them as codified patterns, many tendencies in word group order of HC-ptc and their placement within the larger clause occur for

---

[264] Nineteen HC-ptcs do not have an expressed subject or adjunct word group.

[265] Twenty-six of thirthy HC-ptcs do not have an expressed subject, while twenty-three do not have an expressed adjunct. No predicate participle clause has both an expressed subject and adjunct word group.

[266] Seven of nine predicate participle clauses without an expressed complement are within clauses that have an indicative main verb. One of those nine, also, is within a nominal governing main clause.

[267] For clauses without an expressed complement, four precede their governing clause while five follow. For clauses that follow a C-P pattern, six precede their governing clause while four follow.

[268] For clauses that follow P-C clausal pattern, 10 of 11 follow the predicator. The only exception occurs in 1 Tim. 6:8, where the predicate participle clause precedes a future indicative verb functioning as a cohortative.

[269] Ten of eleven appear with present tense participles, and the only exception, found in 1 Tim. 1:8, uses the verb οἶδα in the perfect tense, which is grammatically perfect but semantically equivalent to the present tense (BDAG, s.v. οἶδα, 693).

[270] 1 Tim. 1:6, 19.

[271] Twenty-four of thirty predicate position participles are in the present tense, five are in aorist tense, and one is grammatically in the perfect tense but present in meaning.

1 Timothy. For the seven HC-ptcs that include an expressed adjunct word group, the adjuncts tend to be A-PPs over against A-Advs,[272] they tend to appear in clauses within an expressed complement,[273] and they appear following the participle.[274] While only four HC-ptcs include an expressed subject, all the examples occur within a relative clause within an indicative larger clause, they all take the relative pronoun of their clause as the complement, they appear before their governing verb, and they follow a C-S-P pattern.[275] Participles in the aorist tense tend to precede their governing verb,[276] as well as participles that modify a verb in the future tense.[277]

In addition to the presence of word groups other than the predicator and complement and the tense of the governing verb, the type or force of the HC-ptc also appears to impact word group order and placement within the clause. Causal participles tend to follow the governing verb, with the only exception, the participle ἐξαπατηθεῖσα in 2:14, being an aorist tense

---

[272] Six of seven expressed adjuncts are prepositional phrases, while only one, in 1 Tim. 1:13, is adverbial.

[273] Five of six prepositional phrases occur in a participle clause without an expressed complement. The single adverbial adjunct in 1:13 occurs in a P-C clause and precedes the predicator, while the single prepositional phrase that occurs with a complement in 5:21 follows the predicator in a C-P clause.

[274] Five of six such prepositional phrases follow the predicator. The adverbial adjunct, mentioned above, appears before the predicator of its clause, and the lone prepositional phrase that appears before the predicator, found in 4:4, modifies a conditional participle within a larger nominal clause.

[275] 1 Tim. 1:6, 19; 6:10, 21. The placement of these clauses within chapters 1 and 6 also strengthen the parallels noted by Van Neste between the two sections (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 124, 137–9), even including the placement of prepositional phrases in the larger relative clause, following the relative clause's main verb in 1:6 and 6:10 but preceding it in 1:19 and 6:21. He mentions the relative clauses, but not the word group order of the larger clauses.

[276] Four of five aorist tense predicate participles precede their governing verb. The only exception occurs in 1:12, where the participle θέμενος follows the governing verb. This participle is also the only aorist participle clause expressing manner, which tend to be present tense in 1 Timothy.

[277] All three participles that modify a future tense indicative verb precede the governing verb, functioning as either participles of manner (4:16b) or condition (4:6a; 6:8). Although, scholars consistently disagree about the force of all three of these participle, as they could all be participles of condition (see Richard C. Blight, *An Exegetical Summary of 1 Timothy* [Dallas: SIL International, 2009]*,* 235–36, 268, and 358 and Perkins, *Letters,* 83, 97, 137), and some take the participle in 6:8 to express cause or basis (Blight, *Summary,* 358). It is rare, however, for a causal participle to precede its governing verb in 1 Timothy, and the only instance appears with an aorist participle in 2:14 modifying an aorist indicative main verb.

participle.[278] All three circumstantial participles in 1 Timothy, as would be expected, are aorist

and precede aorist governing verbs.[279] Concessive HC-ptcs tend to follow their governing verb

with a P-C clausal pattern,[280] and the lone concessive clause that precedes its governing verb does

not include a complement.[281] Conditional participles in 1 Timothy do not show any strong

tendencies, other than that they are all present tense participles and they modify the main clause

of their sentence. Participles of manner are the most common predicate participles in the letter,

occurring eleven times.[282] These tend to follow the governing verb,[283] and their word group order

tends to differ based on their placement in relation to the governing verb. Those with a C-P

clausal pattern tend to be appear before the governing verb,[284] while those with a P-C clausal

pattern tend to follow.[285] There is only one predicate participle clause indicating result in 1

---

[278] Five of six causal participles follow their governing verb and are all grammatically or semantically in the present tense. For a defense of the causal force of the participle in 2:14, see Wallace, *Greek Grammar,* 631–2, Blight, *Summary,* 147, Marshall, *Commentary*, 464, or Perkins, *Letters,* 46. For a defense of the participle θέλοντες as causal, which is debated, see Perkins, *Letters,* 9, Blight, *Summary,* 36, although see also Marshall, *Commentary*, 372.

[279] Wallace, *Greek Grammar,* 641–42.

[280] 1 Tim. 1:7, 13; 3:14. For a defense of the choice to take the participle νοοῦντες in 1:7 as concessive, see Lenski, *Interpretation,* 505 or Perkins, *Letters,* 10. For a defense of the choice to take the participle ἐλπίζων in 3:14 as concessive, see Blight, *Summary,* 202 or Perkins, *Letters,* 68.

[281] 1 Tim. 5:6. It is also noteworthy that this participle occurs within a context of direct contrast, with δέ, between 5:5 and 5:6.

[282] Many of these are generally agreed upon by scholars to be participles of manner, although are debated. See Perkins, *Letters,* 18, Knight, *Epistles,* 96, Towner, *Letters,* 140, or Blight, *Summary,* 61 for a discussion and defense of the choice to render the participle ἀγνοῶν in 1:13 as manner. For the participle ἔχων in 1:19, see Perkins, *Letters,* 26, Knight, *Epistles,* 109, or Blight, *Summary,* 84.

[283] Seven of eleven participles of manner follow the governing verb.

[284] Three of four manner participle clauses with a C-P pattern precede the main verb, while the participle ποιῶν in 5:21b follows its governing clause. This is the only participle of manner to have both a complement and an adjunct, and its force is debated. Perkins takes it as a circumstantial participle (Perkins, *Letters,* 122), and Towner renders it as parallel in force with the preceding finite verb (Towner, *Letters,* 360).

[285] All four manner clauses with a P-C pattern follow the governing clause.

Timothy,[286] and one that is functioning temporally.[287] They both follow their governing clauses.

One final factor to consider for HC-ptcs in 1 Timothy is the placement of the complement within the clause. As stated above, there is no general tendency for a C-P or a P-C pattern across all HC-ptcs, but the placement does seem to follow the same general tendencies as indicative paratactic clauses. Pronouns and other single nominal groups, when they are the complement, tend to be before the predicator in a C-P pattern, including those participles appearing within a relative clause where the relative pronoun is the complement.[288] Compound complements, complements modified by an appositive ὅτι clause or relative clauses, and infinitive clauses tend to follow the predicator in P-C pattern. In this way, HC-ptcs show great flexibility in clausal structure and word group order, but with many similarities to paratactic clauses with regard to the complement.

Changing Ranks: Rank-Shifted Clauses

The phenomenon of rank-shift, as will be demonstrated below, has an impact on expected patterns of syntax and word group order. The presence of a predicator word group constitutes a clause, but clauses that have undergone rank shift no longer operate properly on the rank of clause. Rather, they have been ranked down to function as a word group or within a word group of another clause. Clauses that have undergone rank shift will be analyzed below according to the type of clause, beginning with rank-shifted infinitive clauses, followed by attributive participle clauses, then relative clauses, concluding with clauses that are functioning as direct or

---

[286] 1 Tim. 5:12. See Blight, *Summary,* 298, Knight, *Epistles,* 226, Perkins, *Letters,* 111, Marshall, *Commentary*, 599, or Towner 351.

[287] 1 Tim. 1:3.

[288] The only single nominal group that follows the predicator occurs in 2:8, where ὁσίους χεῖρας is the complement of the participle ἐπαίροντας.

indirect discourse, whether by the presence of a particle, such as ὅτι or πῶς, or as a direct

quotation. Rank-shifted clauses will analyzed according to the various features that have

demonstrated impact on word group order above, thereby giving a portrait of the patterns and

tendencies for rank-shifted clauses found in 1 Timothy.

Infinitive Clauses

Rank-shifted infinitive clauses 1 Timothy evince some strong patterns and tendencies in

their use, structural patterns, and relationships within their larger clause. The governing clause

shows much impact on expected structure and patterns. Infinitive clauses in 1 Timothy typically

function as or within complement word groups of their governing clause, giving a partially

codified pattern.[289] It is also partially codified that infinitive clauses will follow their governing

predicator,[290] with exceptions being when the infinitive clause is the complement of the verb

δύναμαι,[291] in an aside,[292] with hyperbaton in a compound infinitive clause,[293] and one instance

with the verb θέλω.[294] The most common verb type that governs an infinitive clause is a

indicative verb expressing a wish, and it is partially codified that infinitive clauses appear with

governing verbs that express a command or wish, either in grammatical form or by illocutionary

force.[295] The infinitives in 1 Timothy tend to be present tense infinitives, which is partially

---

[289] Thirty-five of forty infinitive clauses in 1 Timothy function as or within the complement word group of their governing clause. Three are functioning as the subject word group with the impersonal verb δεῖ, and two are within adjunct word groups of the governing clause.

[290] Thirty-four of forty infinitive clauses follow their governing predicator. Of the six that appear before the predicator, four with an indicative verb, which is significant in that only five infinitives, in total, appear with indicative verbs other than those that are indicative in form but exhortative in force.

[291] 1 Tim. 5:25; 6:7, 16.

[292] 1 Tim. 3:5.

[293] 1 Tim. 2:12.

[294] 1 Tim. 5:11.

[295] Infinitive clauses appear with governing verbs expressing a wish or command twenty-nine of forty times.

codified,[296] although infinitive clauses do have a much higher likelihood to have an aorist verbal

form than paratactic clauses.[297] When an indicative verb utilizes an infinitive clause, other than

those with an illocutionary force of a command or wish, it will always be an aorist infinitive.[298]

The presence and word group order of elements of the infinitive clauses themselves also

evince patterns based on their governing clause, the type of complement within the infinitive

clause, and the force of the infinitive. Infinitive clauses in 1 Timothy tend not to have expressed

subject,[299] giving a marginally codified pattern, and, when they do, it is partially codified that

they will appear only when the governing clause is expressing a wish or exhortation.[300] Similarly,

it is a marginally codified pattern that infinitive clauses do not have an adjunct word group,[301]

and, when they do, they only occur, in a fully codified pattern, within the context of governing

clauses expressing a wish or command.[302] For adjuncts within infinitive clauses, it is a fully

codified pattern that they will only be A-PPs, and it is partially codified that the A-PP will follow

the infinitive.[303] Lastly, it is marginally codified that infinitive clauses will not include an

---

Twelve of these are with indicative verbs carrying the illocutionary force of a wish, seven are with imperative verbs, four are with subjunctive verbs in a ἵνα clause, three are with indicative verbs carrying the illocutionary force of a command, and three are with the impersonal verb δεῖ expressing obligation.

[296] Twenty-nine of forty infinitives in 1 Timothy are present tense infinitives.

[297] Ten of the forthy infinitives in 1 Timothy are aorist tense infinitives, whereas only thirteen of one hundred twenty-two paratactic clauses utilize an aorist verb.

[298] All five indicative verbs that govern an infinitive clause appear with aorist infinitives.

[299] Only ten of forty infinitive clauses have an expressed subject.

[300] Nine of the ten infinitive clauses that contain an expressed subject word group appear within a paraenetic context. Seven are within indicative clauses with the force of a wish, one is within a ἵνα clause, and one appears with the impersonal verb δεῖ.

[301] Only fourteen of forty infinitive clauses have an expressed adjunct.

[302] Seven of the fourteen infinitive clauses with an expressed adjunct are within a clause with an indicative verb expressing a wish, two are governed by δεῖ, two are governed by imperative verbs, one is governing by an indicative verb with the force of a command, one is governed by a subjunctive verb in a ἵνα clause, and the only infinitive with an adjunct governed by a participle appears with a participle of the verb ἐλπίζω, which lexically connotes a wish or expectation.

[303] Within the fourteen infinitive clauses that have an adjunct word group, twelve of them have at least one PP

124

expressed complement.[304] While there is no strong pattern or tendency for the placement of the complement relative to the predicator as a whole,[305] there are some notable tendencies for the placement of expressed complement word group based on the type of complement governed by the infinitive. As with paratactic clauses, compound complements and any complement with a relative clause as a qualifier tend to follow the predicator, while single nominal groups and C-PNs tend to precede the predicator, with only a few exceptions.[306] Unlike paratactic clauses, however, one notable exception is that pronouns, when used as complements, tend to follow the predicator.[307] The syntax of the complement also varies according to the force of the infinitive and the mood of the governing verb. Complement word groups of complementary infinitives tend to follow the predicator,[308] while those with infinitives functioning as the direct object or the subject of their governing clause precede the infinitive.[309] While only three infinitive clauses within imperative sentences take a complement, they are all before the predicator.[310]

---

following the predicator, while three have a PP preceding the predicator. For the three anomalies, they occur within a poetic section (2:4), with other prepositional phrases to create a contrast (2:9), and the other is within a doubly embedded rank-shifted clause with a qualifier appearing in hyperbaton following the predicator (3:15).

[304] Only sixteen of forty infinitive clauses have an expressed complement word group.

[305] Of the sixteen infinitive clauses with expressed complements, nine precede the predicator in a C-P pattern and seven follow in a P-C pattern.

[306] In 1 Tim. 1:7, the C-PN νομοδιδάσκολοι follows the predicator εἶναι, likely for emphasis. In 2:12, the genitive ἀνδρός functions as the complement of αὐθεντεῖν, following the predicator within a compound infinitive clause with both hyperbaton and contrast. Finally, in 6:14, the object-complement word group τὴν ἐντολὴν ἄσπιλον ἀνεπίλημπτον follows the predicator τηρῆσαι. Although this is a single complement word group, the length of the object-complement might explain why it follows the predicator.

[307] There are only two instances of an infinitive taking a pronoun as the complement, in 2:9 and 6:7. This exception, while only evinced twice, is notable insofar as pronouns rarely follow the predicator in paratactic or hypotactic clauses either as complements or subjects.

[308] Six of the twenty complementary infinitive clauses take a complement, and five of those follow the infinitive. The only exception occurs in 5:14, where the direct object precedes the infinitive διδόναι. This infinitive clause, however, also includes an indirect object word group, τῷ ἀντικειμένῳ, that follows the predicator.

[309] Both direct object infinitives with complements in 5:4 show a C-P pattern, as well as both subjective infinitives with complements in 3:2 and 3:7.

[310] 1 Tim. 5:4; 6:18.

The mood of the governing verb also shows impact on the force of the infinitive in 1 Timothy. It is marginally codified that complementary infinitives, the most common use of the infinitive in the letter, will appear within indicative or subjunctive clauses expressing exhortation or a wish,[311] and indicative-wish clauses, when they include an infinitive clause, tend to use them as complementary infinitives as a marginally codified pattern.[312] Complementary infinitives, however, are never governed by a verb in the imperative mood. Imperative verbs, instead, take infinitive clauses either as the direct object[313] or, more commonly, as infinitives of indirect discourse.[314] While there are only a few examples of each, it is worth noting that subjective infinitives only appear with the impersonal verb δεῖ[315] and that rank-shifted participles only take complementary infinitive clauses.[316] It is also noteworthy that infinitives of indirect discourse, the second most common type of infinitive in 1 Timothy, tend to appear with the verb παραγγέλλω,[317] and that there are no arthrous infinitives in 1 Timothy, giving a fully codified pattern that all infinitives in 1 Timothy are simple infinitives.

---

[311] Out of the twenty complementary infinitives, nine appear within indicative-wish clauses, three within indicative clauses with the force of a command, and one within a ἵνα clause.

[312] Nine of the twelve infinitive that appear within indicative-wish clauses are complementary in force, while the other three are infinitives of indirect discourse (1 Tim. 1:3; 2:1; 6:14).

[313] 1 Tim. 5:4.

[314] 1 Tim. 6:17–18.

[315] 1 Tim. 3:2, 7, 15.

[316] 1 Tim. 4:3; 6:9.

[317] Eight of the twelve infinitives of indirect discourse occur with a form of the verb παραγγέλλω (1 Tim. 1:3–4; 6:17–18). This connection, while not mentioned in Van Neste, only strengthens his argument about the connections between 1:3–20 and 6:3–21 (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 136–39), παραγγέλλω not only links these sections lexically but also the use of the infinitives provides a syntactical parallel, as these are the only examples of παραγγέλλω taking infinitives.

Attributive Participle Clauses

The most common type of rank-shifted clause in 1 Timothy is the participle clause in attributive position, both as adjectival participles modifying nouns or functioning as a C-PN as well as substantive participles functioning as nominal elements in their larger clause. Syntactical patterns and tendencies for such participle clauses emerge when they are analyzed according to their function, position to their referent, and relationships within their governing clause. Rank-shifted participle clauses are just as likely to have an adjectival force as they are to serve as a substantive[318] and they are almost as likely not to have a complement as they are to have one.[319] For those that do have expressed complement word groups, it is marginally codified that the complement will follow the predicator in a P-C pattern,[320] with exceptions being where the complement is the only compound nominal group,[321] a C-PN,[322] or a handful of nominal groups within specific syntactical environments.[323] It is marginally codified for all rank-shifted participle

---

[318] Twenty-six of the fifty rank-shifted participles are categorized as adjectival, while twenty are function as substantival elements. Admittedly, however, this distinction is not always clear.

[319] Out of the fifty rank-shifted participle clauses, twenty-nine of them include an expressed complement word group.

[320] Out of the twenty-nine clauses that include an expressed complement, twenty-one evince a P-C pattern. This includes all the complements that consist of an infinitive clause (1:16; 4:3; 6:5, 9) or a pronoun (1:12; 2:6; 4:16), as well as most other single nominal groups. The five out of twenty nominal groups that appear within C-P clauses will be discussed below.

[321] 1 Tim. 3:12.

[322] 1 Tim. 2:2; 5:9. It is debated whether the participle γεγονυῖα in 5:9 is in attributive position or predicate position. Perkins renders it as a conditional participle (Perkins, *Letters,* 107), which would roughly parallel the syntax of 3:10 where a copulative verb functions conditionally and follows a third-person imperative verb. Taking the participle as adjectival does also have syntactical precedent in 5:3, where the qualifier τὰς ὄντως χήρας modifies the complement χήρας in hyperbaton with respect to the predicator. This rendering better accounts for the explicitly conditional clauses that follow, resolves the awkwardness of including conditional clauses directly within an apodosis of a conditional sentence, and is supported by the Latin translation of the passage in the Vulgate.

[323] Three of five complements within rank-shifted participle clauses that are single nominal groups preceding the predicator occur within adjectival participle clauses functioning as a predicate adjective within a infinitive clause of εἶναι (3:4, 8). One of the five occurs within a substantive participle clause in 6:2, where the participle clause is functioning as the subject of its governing clause and the governing clause is the final clause of its section. The final exception occurs in 6:16, where the participle οἰκῶν is the last substantive in an asyndeton list of qualifiers modifying ὁ μαρκάριος καὶ μόνος δυνάστης within a poetic section.

clauses, however, that they will not have an expressed adjunct,[324] and codified that they will not

have an expressed subject.[325] It is furthermore partially codified for all rank-shifted participle

clauses that they will follow their governing verb[326] and that the participle will appear in the

present tense.[327] While there is no pattern concerning the force of the rank-shifted participle in

themselves, there are distinct differences between clauses of adjectival and substantive

participles.

Adjectival participle clauses follow a different syntactical pattern than those functioning as

substantives. Adjectival participles tend not have an article, as a partially codified pattern,[328] and

those with the definite article tend to appear with together a word from the παραγγέλλω family[329]

and in an exhortative context either as a transition or as the opening sentence of a new

subsection.[330] Substantive participle clauses, by contrast, exhibit a partially codified pattern that

---

[324] Only fifteen rank-shifted participle clauses have an expressed adjunct. Six have adverbs (all –ως adverbs), two have dative adverbial modifiers, and nine have prepositional phrases. Two participle clauses have more than one type of adjunct (2:6; 6:17).

[325] Only one rank-shifted participle clause has an expressed subject (6:5), and it is adjectival position in a qualifier word group modifying a predicate nominative complement within a relative clause. The participle could have functions as a substantive and carried the same sense, but the addition of the subject emphatically focuses the argument about false teachers away from the realm of satanic or demonic influence (rf. 3:6–7) and toward the human motivation for the false teaching, as will be developed further in 6:6–10.

[326] This occurs for forty of the fifty participle clauses. Those that precede their governing verb are either substantives functioning as the subject (7 occurrences) or adjectival to a direct object that precedes the verb (3 occurrences).

[327] For rank-shifted participle clauses, the participle is in the present tense 38 times out of 50. There are also seven participles in the perfect tense, which still have their focus in primary time (Voelz, *Grammar*, 148–51), and five participles are in aorist tense. Rank-shifted participles in the aorist tense, as one would expect, tend to appear when past events are being related (1:12, 18; 2:6; 6:13), with the aorist substantive participle in 3:13 being the only anomaly.

[328] Out of twenty-six adjectival participles, twenty are anarthrous.

[329] Three of the six adjectival participle clauses are governed explicitly by a verbal form of παραγγέλλω (6:13, 17), and one appears within an adjunct word group of a main clause whose direct object is παραγγελία (1:18).

[330] Three of these six adjectival participle clauses appear within the first sentence of a new subsection (1:18; 5:17; 6:17), and two of six appear within a transitional shift within a subsection (6:13). All five of these examples are within an exhortative context. The exception to this is the adjectival participle ὑγιαινούσῃ in an aside (1:10).

they will appear with an article, with exceptions occurring in specific syntactical contexts.[331]

Adjectival participles rarely appear within the subject word group of their governing clause, giving a partially codified pattern,[332] while substantives are more likely to appear within the subject word group of their governing clause than within any other word group.[333] When rank-shifted participles appear as part of a C-PN, adjectival participles only appear when the governing verb is an infinitive form of a copulative verb[334] while the only substantive participle in a similar context is governed by an imperative verb within a paratactic clause.[335] Rank-shifted participle clauses, regardless of their force, tend not to appear within other rank-shifted clauses,[336] but, when they do, adjectival participle clauses are more likely than substantive participle clauses and in slightly different contexts.[337] Similarly, when rank-shifted participles occur within qualifier word groups that are embedded within other word groups, only adjectival participle clauses occur within qualifiers of adjunct word groups of their governing clause or of

---

[331] Out of twenty-four substantive participle clauses, twenty-one are arthrous. The exceptions occur in 3:12, where the substantive is within an asyndeton, predicate nominative list, in 5:10 where the substantive is a direct object within an asyndeton list of conditional protases, and 6:16, where the substantive concludes an asyndeton list of qualifiers within a poetic section.

[332] Only three of twenty-six adjectival participle clauses appear within the subject word group of their governing clause. These exceptions all occur within an imperative sentence, modifying the subject of a third-person imperative verb (5:9–10, 17). This pattern depends on rendering the participles γεγονυῖα in 5:9, as discussed above, and μαρτυρουμένη in 5:10 as adjectival participles modifying the subject χήρα in 5:9. If these participles are conditional participles in predicate position, that only makes the pattern further codified.

[333] Out of twenty-four substantive participle clauses, thirteen of them appear within or as the subject word group of the governing clause. It is worth noting, also, that all seven substantive word groups that appear as the subject of their governing clause occur within a main, paratactic clause.

[334] 1 Tim. 3:4, 8–9; 6:19. This occurs five times in total.

[335] 1 Tim. 3:12.

[336] Thirty-one of fifty rank-shifted participle clauses appear within a paratactic or hypotactic clause functioning properly on the rank of clause.

[337] Out of the nineteen rank-shifted participle clauses that appear within other rank-shifted clauses, twelve of them are adjectival participle clauses. six of them appear within infinitive clauses (3:4, 8–9; 6:17, 19), five within relative clauses (2:10; 3:15; 6:5), and one within a direct quotation (5:18). Substantive participles within rank-shifted clauses only occur within relative clauses (4:3; 6:15–16) and other rank-shifted participle clauses (5:13; 6:19).

complement word groups where the complement is a C-PN[338] while substantive participle clauses

occur within qualifier of subject word groups of their governing clause or of complement word

groups where the complement is a C-DO.[339] Lastly, the only instances of hyperbaton within rank-

shifted participle clauses occur with substantive participles,[340] allowing the complement to appear

within an expected word order pattern yet provide extra emphasis or syntactical indicators.[341]

Relative Clauses

Relative clauses have less factors that impact syntactical structures than other rank-shifted

clauses, but they are still a prominent feature of 1 Timothy with codified patterns of word group

order and syntax. Out of all the various types of clauses, both those that function on the rank of

clause and those that have undergone rank shift, relative clauses are the most likely to have an

expressed complement, being a partially codified feature,[342] and the most likely to have a verbal

---

[338] In 4:2–3, the adjectival participles κεκαυστηριασμένον and κωλυόντων modify ψευδολόγων, which functions as a qualifier to the object of the prepositional phrase ἐν ὑποκρίσει. In 3:15, the participle ζῶντος modifies θεοῦ, functioning as the qualifier to the predicate nominative ἐκκλησία. And in 6:5, the participles διεφθαρμένων and ἀπεστερημένων modify ἀνθρώπων, which in turn modifies διαπαρατριβαί, the last in an asyndeton, predicate nominative list, as a qualifier. One other possible example, also in 6:5, is νομιζόντων, which either modifies ἀνθρώπων as another adjectival participle alongside the other two or functions as a predicate position participle giving a causal hypotactic clause within the compound adjectival participle clause. While the sense of the verse would not drastically change with either choice, this project renders νομιζόντων as adjectival (Knight, *Epistles,* 252 and Towner, *Letters,* 392, 397–8, contra Perkins, *Letters,* 135).

[339] In 4:8, the substantive τῆς μελλούσης is a qualifier to the direct object, ζωῆς, of the predicate participle ἔχουσα. Other substantive participles that occur within qualifier word groups appear within qualifiers that modify the subject of their clause (2:6; 5:17; 6:15–6).

[340] 1 Tim. 3:12; 6:2, 16.

[341] In 3:12, the compound complement of προϊστάμενοι both precedes and follows the participle. This allows the complement to appear before the predicator, which is the regular exception to the P-C pattern before the participle is within a predicate nominative, while giving prominence to the leadership of children for those qualified to be deacons. In 6:2, the qualifier of the complement, πιστοὺς δεσπότας, precedes the predicator while the noun itself appears in the expected position. This gives special emphasis to the qualifier, πιστούς, while conforming as a whole to expected word order patterns. Lastly, in 6:16, the qualifier ἀπρόσιτον follows the predicator, separated from its referent, φῶς, which precedes the predicator. This substantive participle is the last in an asyndeton list within a poetic passage, and is the only substantive in the list without an article. This marked syntax allows part of the complement word group to follow the predicator, which would be expected, yet the position of φῶς before predicator indicates the end of the list proper before the relative clauses that follow.

[342] Twenty-one of the twenty-six relative clauses in 1 Timothy have an expressed complement. All five that

form in the aorist tense.[343] It is also partially codified, when the verb of the relative clause is in

the aorist tense, that the relative pronoun functions as the complement within the clause.[344] There

is no codified pattern for where the complement appears relative to the predicator, although it is

most likely to appear before the predicator in a C-P pattern,[345] especially as the relative pronoun

itself functions as the complement nine times. The relative pronoun's function within its own

clause is the most dominant feature that impacts the clausal syntax, and it is a partially codified

pattern than an expressed complement and expressed subject will not appear on the same side of

the predicator of the relative clause.[346] When the rare exceptions to this pattern occur, they are

usually accompanied by hyperbaton.[347] It is codified that the relative clause will follow the

---

do not have an expressed complement have at least one prepositional phrase as an adjunct, and three of those five begin with an embedded predicate participle clause whose direct object is the relative pronoun.

[343] Thirteen of twenty-six relative clauses in 1 Timothy have an aorist verb as the predicator, compared to ten of thirty infinitive clauses, five of fifty rank-shifted participle clauses, two of forty paratactic imperative clauses, or ten of forty-eight paratactic indicative clauses.

[344] This is the case for eleven of the thirteen relative clauses with an aorist predicator. The only exceptions are in 3:16 and 4:14, where the relative pronoun functions as the subject of the clause within either an asyndeton, compound sentence in a poetic passage (3:16) or a divine passive (4:14). Both exceptions also include multiple adjunct word groups.

[345] Twelve of the twenty-one relative clauses with an expressed predicator evince a C-P pattern, eight evince a P-C pattern, and one is a nominal clause with a C-S pattern. Those with a P-C pattern are relative clauses whose complements are nominal groups (6:9, 12), an indirect object of an expressed verb (2:10; 4:14), a predicate nominative where the relative pronoun is the subject of the clause (3:15; 4:10; 6:1), and one is an object-complement structure retained in a nominative of a passive construction (2:7). Those with a C-P pattern are relative clauses where the relative pronoun is the complement (1:7, 11, 20; 4:3, 6; 6:15, 16) or a constituent of it (1:15), as well as where the complement is a pronoun (6:10), a compound nominal group (1:4), or an infinitive clause (2:4; 6:16). This is, in many ways, counter to what you would expect in paratactic clauses, where single nominal groups tend to appear in a C-P pattern and compound nominal groups and infinitive clauses tend to appear in a P-C pattern. It is also noteworthy that the only predicate nominative with a C-P pattern is where the relative pronoun is a qualifier within the complement word group (1:15), and that both compound complements evince hyperbaton (1:4; 2:4).

[346] This occurs for thirteen of the sixteen relative clauses with both an expressed subject and complement.

[347] The only exceptions appear in 1:4, 2:4, and 4:3. For both 1:4 and 2:4, the complement word group is compound and appears on both sides of the predicator. In these cases, the hyperbaton is likely for emphasis on the part of the complement that precedes the predicator alongside the subject word group, and in 1:4 the constituents of the complement word group appear in explicit contrast. It is not the placement of the complement, in itself, before the predicator that gives it prominence (contra Perkins, *Letters,* 6–7, 33), but the placement of one portion of the complement, separated from the rest of the complement, alongside the subject word group.

predicator of its governing clause,[348] with the only exception being in 6:1, where the relative

pronoun is both its own referent and the clause functions as the subject word group of its

governing clause.[349] When the relative pronoun has an expressed referent, it is fully codified that

the relative pronoun will appear following the referent.[350] Adjunct word groups appear within

relative clause as often as they do not,[351] and, when they do, adjuncts tend to be A-PPs as a

partially codified pattern.[352] A-PPs follow the predicator in a marginally codified pattern,[353] with

the exceptions being either where the relative pronoun is the C-OP or in an specific syntactical

context.[354] Lastly, while relative clauses do not tend to appear within any one specific word group

in the governing clause, they do tend to appear within clauses proper, although there are almost

as many examples where they appear within other rank-shifted clauses.[355]

---

[348] Twenty-five of twenty-six relative clauses follow the predicator of their governing clause.

[349] There are only three of the twenty-six relative pronouns that do not have an external referent (1:7; 2:10; 6:1), and this is the only time where the relative clause, in itself, functions as a whole word group of its governing clause.

[350] This occurs for all twenty-three instances where the relative pronoun has an expressed referent.

[351] Thirteen of the twenty-six relative clauses include adjunct word groups, and often multiple adjuncts, giving twenty-three total adjunct word groups within the thirteen relative clauses that include them.

[352] Out of the twenty-three total adjuncts, twenty of them are PPs. For the three relative clauses with adverbs, two of them occur alongside PPs also, both within compound relative clauses where the adverbial modifier appears in a parallel position to the PP. Only one relative clause includes an adverbial adjunct without a PP also (6:15), which consists of a nominal group in the dative case that occurs before the predicator with a temporal force.

[353] Fifteen of the twenty prepositional phrases follow the predicator. Two of the three adverbial adjuncts also follow the predicator, as they appear in a compound sentence in parallel to the prepositional phrase in the other of the compound clause (3:16; 6:10).

[354] Three of the five PPs that precede the predicator have the relative pronoun, which always begins the clause, as the object of the PP (2:7; 6:4, 12), and two of those also include a PP following the predicator (2:7; 6:12). The other 2 occurrences are both the same prepositional phrase, περὶ τὴν πίστιν, in a relative clause that begins with an embedded predicate participle clause and describes false teachers (1:19; 6:21).

[355] Fourteen of the twenty-six relative clauses appear within paratactic or hypotactic clauses on the rank of clause, while twelve appear within other rank-shifted clauses.

Ὅτι, Ἵνα, and Πῶς Clauses and Direct Quotations

The least common type of rank-shifted clause is that of direct or indirect discourse signaled by either a particle, such as ὅτι, ἵνα, or πῶς, or as a direct quotation. In total, there are only nine such clauses: five rank-shifted ὅτι clauses,[356] one rank-shifted ἵνα clause,[357] one rank-shifted πῶς clause,[358] and two direct quotations as one compound complement.[359] There are not adequate examples to propose any patterns of word order or syntax, but enough that tendencies should be noted and compared to other types of clauses. These types of clauses in 1 Timothy are the most likely to have multiple word groups in addition to the predicator,[360] and they only appear within clauses proper, not embedded within other rank-shifted clauses.[361] Aside from the rank-shifted ὅτι clause in 6:7, these clauses only appear after their governing predicator, and the variant readings also place the recitative ὅτι clause in 6:7 following the assumed C-PN.

The placement of the various word groups within the clauses also show similarity to and difference from other clause types. Subjects tend to precede the predicator, except for the expected infinitive clause functioning as the subject word group of the impersonal verb δεῖ.[362]

---

[356] 1 Tim. 1:8, 9, 15; 4:1; 6:7. As argued above, the ὅτι in 6:7 is not rendered as a paratactic conjunction, but as a recitative ὅτι giving a rank-shifted clause as the subject of an implied nominal clause.

[357] 1 Tim. 5:21.

[358] 1 Tim. 3:15.

[359] 1 Tim. 5:18.

[360] Six of the nine clauses include a subject word group (1:8, 9, 15; 3:15; 4:1; 5:18), 6 of 9 include an expressed complement word group (1:8; 4:1; 5:18, 21; 6:7), and four of the five rank-shifted ὅτι clauses include an adjunct word group (1 Tim. 1:8, 9, 15; 4:1) as does the ἵνα clause, although the πῶς clause and both direct quotations do not.

[361] All nine of these clauses appear within a paratactic or hypotactic clause functioning on the rank of clause.

[362] The only exception to this expectation is the ὅτι clause in 4:1. The marked position of the pronoun, τινες, is likely to give prominence to the temporal prepositional phrase ἐν ὑστέροις καιροῖς. The position of the prepositional phrase itself does not necessary give it emphasis, as temporal adjuncts often appear before the predicator (1 Tim. 6:17), but the placement of both the subject and the single nominal group functioning as complement following the predicator changes the syntactical landscape of the clause. Perkins, for example, mentions the position of the prepositional phrase as having prominence, but does not include the syntax of the larger sentence

Adjuncts tend to follow expected word group order alongside paratactic and hypotactic

clauses,[363] with the exception of the compound dative of reference in 1:9, where the adjunct word

group has hyperbaton, appearing both before the predicator, as expected for A-Advs, and after

the predicator, giving a compound list in contrast for the first element of the word group.

Complements generally follow the pattern of paratactic and hypotactic clauses,[364] and the one,

marked exception is likely for emphasis.[365]

The Rank of Word Group

The rank of word group is the lowest rank on the rank scale investigated for this project, as

there are still tendencies and patterns of word order evident among them. The rank scale also

includes the rank of word, divisible into individual morpheme components, but such analysis

would be helpful for lexical and semantic patterns, not necessarily syntactical ones. This part of

the investigation will analyze the different types of word groups, as presented in chapter one, and

the syntactical relationships of individual lexemes within the word groups and with their larger

governing clause. Some of these relationships where mentioned above, as they directly impacted

clause or word group order, but further patterns emerge on the rank of word group in itself. The

first word groups to be analyzed are those that are fundamental clausal components: subject and

complement word groups. Following this, word groups giving additional information will be

---

as the more likely indicator of that emphasis (Perkins, *Letters,* 76–7).

[363] The adverb νομίμως precedes the predicator in 1:8, while PPs and the lone infinitive adjunct follow the predicator in 1:15, 4:1, and 5:21.

[364] The pronoun as direct object precedes the predicator in 1:8 and 5:21, and a single nominal group precedes it in 5:18. The infinitival clause in 6:7 precedes the predicator, which is unlike paratactic and hypotactic clauses, but the verb in the predicator is a form of δύναμαι. As explained above, δύναμαι, regardless of the clause type in which it appears, takes its supplementary infinitive clause before the predicator (rf. 1 Tim. 5:25; 6:16).

[365] The nominal group, as described above, follows the predicator in 4:1, likely to give emphasis to the temporal prepositional phrase, and the infinitival complement in 6:7 precedes the predicator

analyzed, including adjunct and qualifier word groups. Qualifier word groups are unique, in that that they do not constitute a clausal component in themselves, but only modify other word groups; thus, this will be the place where they are analyzed in detail. Predicator word groups will not be included in the analysis below, as they do not see variation of word types and patterns in the same way as the other word groups.

Subject Word Groups

Subject word groups will be analyzed according to the presence of various elements within them, including the definite article, qualifier word groups, multiple subjects, and adjectives, and other phenomena, especially where the subject word group includes a rank-shifted element or appears within a rank-shifted clause. Generally speaking, the ninety-seven subject word groups in 1 Timothy tend to be single nominal groups without extra elements within them, as only thirty-five appear with the article, fourteen have a qualifier word group, twelve include an adjective, and only six are a compound subject. With those combined, subject word groups are just as likely to have some extra element beyond a simple noun or pronoun, however, as they are not.[366] The least likely phenomenon to occur is a compound subject. These are just as likely to use asyndeton as they are a conjunction,[367] and they appear in multiple clause types.[368] They are,

---

[366] Out of the ninety-seven subject word groups, forty-eight of them have no extra phenomena or elements other than a single elements, while forty-nine include a modifier of some kind. Within those forty-eight, however, are also rank-shifted infinitive and ὅτι clauses, where no article, adjective, or qualifier appears with a single, nominal group. These subject word groups are also included, as they are, technically speaking, still a single element, even though that element is a clause that has undergone rank shift.

[367] Asyndeton is used for the compound subject three times (1:2; 2:1; 6:4–5), and a conjunction is used three times (1:20; 6:1, 16).

[368] They occur three times in a relative clause: twice with indicative verbs (1:20; 6:4–5) and once in a nominal clause (6:16). They also occur once within an infinitive clause (2:1), once within a paratactic nominal clause (1:2), and once within a hypotactic subjunctive clause (6:1). One other noteworthy element to this is that, in 6:4–5, an extended, asyndeton subject word group includes a qualifier on the final element, indicating the end of the list.

however, more likely to appear within a rank-shifted clause than a paratactic or hypotactic clause

properly on the clause rank. Two other less common phenomena are the presence of adjectives

and embedded qualifier word groups. Adjectives in predicate position appear without a definite

article in subject word groups and precede their head noun, while attributive adjectives tend to

appear with an article, both for those in repeat position and in "sandwich" position.[369] For

qualifier word groups within subject word groups, it is marginally codified that they appear with

definite head nouns and they appear following the head noun.[370] They always, within subject

word groups, match the definiteness of their head noun, and it is partially codified that they are

within clauses on the rank of clause.[371] It is rare that a subject word group has both an adjective

and an embedded qualifier modifying the head noun.[372]

Two more common phenomena for subject word groups in 1 Timothy is that they include a

definite article and that they regularly appear within rank-shifted clauses. Subject word groups

with the definite article are the most likely to include other elements beyond a head noun, except

---

[369] The adjective πᾶς appear twice in predicate position without an article (2:4; 4:4), and the demonstrative pronoun also appear three times in predicate position without an article (1:10; 5;4, 16). Out of the seven adjectives in attributive position, five of them appear on grammatically definite head nouns (4:8; 5:5, 17, 25; 6:15). For the term "sandwich" as an attributive position, see Voelz, *Grammar*, 40. In this project, "sandwich" position not only indicates attributive adjectives that lie between a definite article and a head noun but also those that precede their head noun without an article. "Sandwich" position, then, encompasses what Wallace labels as both first attributive position and anarthrous first position (Wallace, *Grammar*, 306, 309–10). In addition, the other position for attributive adjectives will be called "repeat" position throughout the project, denoting when the adjective follows its head noun but remains in attribuive position. This position, then, includes Wallace's second, third, and fourth attributive positions (Wallace, *Grammar*, 306–7, 310–11).

[370] Out of the fourteen subject word groups with qualifiers, nine of them are arthrous while five are anarthrous. Only four subject word groups with qualifiers have a qualifier preceding the head noun (3:16; 4:15; 5:24; 6:2). These are all within clauses proper, and they only occur with definite head nouns.

[371] Only two subject word groups within rank-shifted clauses have an embedded qualifier, both relative clauses (6:4–5, 15–16).

[372] This occurs only two times in 1 Timothy, in 4:4 and 6:15–16. The former contains πᾶς as a predicate adjective before the head noun with an anarthrous qualifier following, while the latter contains two attributive adjectives and many qualifier word groups within a poetic section.

for a compound subject,[373] and it is marginally codified that subject word groups with definite articles will not appear in rank-shifted clauses.[374] As mentioned above, the most likely clause type to include a expressed subject is a relative clause, but many infinitive clauses and rank-shifted ὅτι clauses also include an expressed subject word group.[375] Subject word groups in rank-shifted clauses include adjectives with a similar frequency as those in clauses proper,[376] but a few deviations for subjects in rank-shifted clauses are noteworthy: only seven subject word groups within rank-shifted clauses include a definite article, only two include qualifiers, only two includes a rank-shifted element within the subject, and four of them have a compound subject.[377] Rank-shifted subject word groups with the article tend to be single nouns,[378] while all compound subjects within rank-shifted clauses are grammatically indefinite. In general, subject word groups in rank-shifted clause are less likely to include elements beyond the head noun.

Complement Word Groups

Throughout 1 Timothy, the most common word group is that of the complement, both

---

[373] Out of the thirty-five subject word groups with articles, nine of them have qualifiers and five have adjectives, compared to fourteen and twelve, respectively, for all ninety-seven subject word groups. In addition to this, subjects with articles are the most likely to have a rank-shifted element within it, yielding eleven of the twenty that appear. Only one compound subject, however, occurs with the definite article (6:1).

[374] Only seven of the thiry-five subject word groups with a definite article appear within rank-shifted clauses.

[375] Out of the thirty-eight subject word groups within rank-shifted clauses, twenty-two are in relative clauses, nine in infinitive clauses, five in rank-shifted ὅτι clauses, one in a direct quote, and one within a rank-shifted πῶς clause.

[376] Only three of thirty-eight subject word groups in rank-shifted clauses have qualifiers, compared to twelve of ninety-seven overall.

[377] For all subject word groups, thirty-five of ninety-seven include a definite article, compared to only seven of thirty-eight rank-shifted clauses (1:8; 2:8; 3:2; 4:3; 5:18; 6:5, 15–16). Only two in thirty-eight subject word groups in rank-shifted clauses include a qualifier (6:4–5,15–16), compared to fourteen of ninety-seven overall. Twenty subject word groups include a rank-shifted element, but only two of them is in a rank-shifted clause (3:15; 6:15–16). Only six subject word groups in 1 Timothy include a compound subject (1:2, 20; 2:1; 6:1, 4–5, 16), and four of them are within rank-shifted clauses (1:20; 2:1; 6:4–5, 16).

[378] Rf. 1 Tim. 1:8; 2:8; 3:2; 4:3; 5:18; 6:5. The only exception is 6:15–16, where the subject word group is within a poetic section, including multiple qualifiers.

those functioning as complements of clauses and complements of prepositional phrases, which can appear as qualifiers, adjuncts, or nominalized complements of copulative verbs. Complement word groups will be analyzed according to type and function, beginning with complements of predicators. The most common function of a complement word group is as a C-DO.[379] C-DOs are slightly more likely to appear without any extra elements beyond one noun, pronoun, or infinitive clause than they are to appear with direct articles, adjectives, or qualifiers.[380] Within C-DOs, qualifiers tend to appear either with no other elements or along with both adjectives and articles.[381] Qualifiers of C-DOs with an imperative verb, however, always appear with extra elements.[382] Qualifiers in C-DOs, in a partially codified pattern, follow the head noun,[383] and it is a marginally codified pattern that qualifiers of C-DOs do not occur within rank-shifted clauses.[384] When C-DOs appear with a definite article, they tend to have an adjective also, and it is a codified pattern that those with both articles and adjectives have an attributive adjective between the article and the head noun in a "sandwich" pattern.[385] In addition to the C-DOs with both

---

[379] Out of the three hundred forty-three complement word groups, one hundred fifty five are C-DOs.

[380] Eighty-three C-DOs appear as single nouns, pronouns, or infinitive clauses, while seventy-two include other elements.

[381] Out of the twenty C-DOs with qualifiers, eight of them appear as the only extra element, while seven appear together with adjectives and articles (1:4; 4:14; 6:1, 3, 12, 12, 20–21). Only two qualifiers appear on a head noun with an article without an adjective (3:9; 4:12), and only three qualifiers appear on a head noun with an adjective but no article (1:19; 3:13; 4:1). It is noteworthy that all three of those latter instance appear with compound objects, where the qualifier modifies the second object and is the final element of the complement word group.

[382] Only five C-DOs of imperative verbs include a qualifier, but all of them also include other modifying elements beyond the qualifier (4:12, 14; 6:1, 12).

[383] Out of twenty C-DOs with qualifiers, only two precede the head noun (4:12; 5:10). Both occurrences are in paratactic clauses where the complement word group also precedes the predicator.

[384] Six of twenty C-DOs with qualifiers are in rank-shifted clauses.

[385] Out the forty-two C-DOs with an article, twenty-five include an adjective also. Out of those, twenty-three have an Article-Adjective-Noun pattern, with or without a qualifier also following the head noun. The only exceptions to this pattern are when the adjective is a demonstrative pronoun in predicate position (1:18), or an adjective that appears in "repeat" position, but is preceded by a qualifier and is a nominalized prepositional phrase modifying an indefinite head noun (1:4).

articles and adjectives, twenty-two others have only head nouns and adjectives. In contrast to those with articles, these tend to be attributive adjectives in "repeat" position, following the head noun.[386] While there is no noteworthy difference among these patterns between clauses proper and rank-shifted clauses, it is potentially significant that within imperative contexts, attributive adjectives are in "sandwich" position as a marginally codified pattern.[387] Lastly, for C-DOs of rank-shifted clauses within a larger clause without an expressed main verb, those with adjectives are always in repeat position.[388]

Complement word groups of predicators, both expressed and implied, also appear in 1 Timothy as C-PNs, C-IOs, direct quotes, and one retained nominative of a passive construction.[389] C-IOs tend to be single pronouns or definite nouns.[390] Qualifiers in C-IOs are infrequent, but they are always appositives.[391] No C-IO has an adjective modifying the head noun or pronoun.[392] C-PNs, by contrast, never contain a definite article in 1 Timothy and tend to include an element beside the single nominal element.[393] Over half of C-PNs include a

---

[386] Out of the twenty-two, twelve are attributive adjectives in "repeat" position, while six are attributive adjectives are in "sandwich" position.

[387] There are eleven C-DOs of imperative verbs with an adjective; among these, eight are attributive adjectives in "sandwich" position, two are attributive adjectives in "repeat" position, and one is an adjective in an object-complement construction.

[388] There are only four occurrences of this (1:4; 2:10; 3:8), but the divergence from the likelihood of adjectives in "sandwich" position is potentially significant.

[389] There are forty-three C-PNs, twenty-one C-IOs, two direct quotes (5:18), and one retained nominative with in a passive construction (2:7).

[390] Out of the twenty-one C-IOs, ten are single pronouns and five are definite nouns with no other elements.

[391] 1 Tim. 1:2, 12, 17.

[392] There are two C-IOs with adjectives appearing in embedded appositive qualifiers (1:2, 17), but not the head noun.

[393] Out of forty-three C-PNs, only fifteen include only a single element, typically a predicate adjective (1:7, 8, 15; 2:5; 3:1, 10; 4:4; 5:7, 24, 25), but also a noun (6:2) or nominalized prepositional phrase (1:17; 6:21).

qualifier,[394] and C-PNs have the highest likelihood of any word group to utilize hyperbaton.[395]

Complement word groups of prepositional phrases (C-OP) are the second-most common type of complement in 1 Timothy, and they evince both similarities and differences in comparison with complements of predicators. Roughly half of all C-OPs have no extra parts of speech beyond the head noun.[396] Qualifiers, when they appear, tend to follow the head noun as a partially codified pattern, and those that precede occur within an imperative context.[397] The definite article appears with about the same frequency as other complement word groups;[398] when the article appears, the complement is equally likely to include other elements as it is to only include the article and the head noun.[399] Adjectives also appear with a similar frequency to other complement types.[400] The only predicate adjective to appear in C-OPs is πᾶς; it always precedes the head noun, and usually modifies an anarthrous noun.[401] Attributive adjectives tend to be in "repeat" position,[402] and when prepositional phrases are nominalized to function as attributive

---

[394] Twenty-two of forty-three C-PNs include a qualifier (51%), compared to only sixty-five of three hundred forty-three total complement word groups (19%).

[395] Out of forty-three predicate nominatives, nine of them evince hyperbaton (1:15; 4:6, 8, 9, 12, 15; 5:18; 6:2, 18–19). These tend to occur within paratactic or hypotactic clauses proper, but also occur in two rank-shifted clauses (5:18; 6:18–19).

[396] Out of one hundred twenty-one complements of prepositions, sixty-one include only a single noun, while five others are compound complements with a Noun-Conjunction-Noun pattern. Fifty-five complements, then, include articles, adjectives, or qualifiers in addition to the head noun.

[397] For the nineteen C-OPs with embedded qualifiers, seventeen follow the head noun. The two exceptions are both in an imperative context, with one in the imperative clause proper (5:23) and the other in a rank-shifted infinitive clause functioning as the complement of an imperative verb (6:17).

[398] There are twenty-three C-OPs with definite articles, compared to seventy-two total complement word groups.

[399] For these twenty-three complements, ten include only the article and the head noun, while thirteen include adjectives or qualifiers also.

[400] Attributive and predicate adjectives appear with slightly more frequency than the definite article, occurring in twenty-nine C-OPs, compared to one hundred six of the total three hundred forty-three complement word groups.

[401] 1 Tim. 2:1, 2, 8, 11; 3:4; 5:2, compared with πάντων τῶν ἐν ὑπεροχῇ ὄντων in 2:2.

[402] Out the twenty-two complements of prepositions with attributive adjectives, there are fifteen in "repeat" position and nine in "sandwich" position.

adjectives they are in repeat position with an article modifying an anarthrous noun.[403] The

phenomenon of rank shift does not evince significant impact on the presence and type of parts of

speech within C-OPs.

One final phenomenon within complement word groups with syntactical import is the

method of connecting compound objects. For compound objects, the most common are those

with two nominal elements or rank-shifted clauses; for these, there is always an expressed

conjunction between them.[404] For those with more than two nominal groups in a compound

complement, the most common connective device is asyndeton.[405] Asyndeton only occurs for

complements that are C-DOs or C-PNs, typically in infinitive clauses or paratactic clauses with

an imperative or wish context.[406] Polysyndeton, the repeated use of conjunctions between

nominal elements, with one exception, only occurs within C-OPs. Furthermore, polysyndeton

within complements of prepositions always includes additional modifiers on the final nominal

group, signifying the end of the list.[407] There are also some complements that both utilize

conjunctions and asyndeton between various nominal groups of the compound complement; this

---

[403] 1 Tim. 1:14; 3:13. Note also the arthrous adjectival participle modifying an anarthrous noun in 6:17.

[404] Out of the fifty-four compound complement word groups, thirty-five consist of two nominal groups or two infinitive clauses. Of those with two nominal groups, thirty-two are connected by a conjunctive καί, two with a contrastive δέ, and one with a contrastive ἤ.

[405] For the nineteen compound complement word groups with three or more nominal elements, ten of them evince asyndeton, five evince polysyndeton, and four utilize both connective devices.

[406] Among the 10 compound complements that utilize asyndeton, six are predicate nominatives (3:2–6, 8–9, 11, 12; 5:9–10; 6:18–19) and four are direct objects (4:13; 5:1–2, 14; 6:11). These occur with infinitive clauses four times (3:2–6, 8–9, 11; 6:18–19), imperative or indicative-wish paratactic clauses five times (3:12; 4:13; 5:1–2, 14; 6:11), and once within a rank-shifted, adjectival participle clause (5:9–10). See the note on this participle clause above, as many commentators render the participles in 5:9–10 as individual conditional participle in predicate position (see Perkins, *Letters,* 107–9).

[407] There are four occurrences of polysyndeton within complements of prepositions (1:5; 2:9; 5:21; 6:9). The final nominal group of each of these compound complements includes the addition of an attributive adjective (2:9; 5:21), a relative clause as a qualifier (1:5), or both (6:9). The only polysyndeton complement that does not have a change for the final element is in 1:13, where it is a predicate nominative complement of a hypotactic participle clause.

can be within a context of contrast, but also within relative clauses that give explanation or clarification.[408] These also tend to have some change for the final element, whether from asyndeton to polysyndeton, vice versa, or additional modifiers.[409]

Adjunct Word Groups

Adjunct words groups in 1 Timothy include conjunctions between clauses, PPs not functioning as nominalized qualifiers or adjectives (A-PPs), adverbs (A-Adv) and nominal groups with adverbial case usage (A-CU), and one infinitival clause of purpose. Much of the impact of conjunctions is presented on the rank of clause above, but not the distribution and tendencies of the conjunctions themselves. Most of the conjunctive adjuncts in 1 Timothy are Cj-Ps, and adjuncts consisting of Cj-Hs, in a partially codified pattern, tend to use ἵνα.[410] Clauses with a Cj-H other than ἵνα always appear before their governing clause or at the beginning of the sentence, while those with ἵνα appear following their governing clause.[411] Clauses with a Cj-H typically occur within a context of a command or wish, as opposed to HC-ptcs, which show

---

[408] 1 Tim. 1:9–10; 2:7; 3:15; 6:17–19. For 6:17–19, the initial infinitive clauses are joined together with a μή-μηδέ construction, and then contrasted with the following infinitive clauses that appear with asyndeton. In 1:9–10, the initial nominal group, δικαίῳ, is contrasted with the rest of the complement word group by δέ, with remainder of the word group consisting of three pairs joined by καί followed by 6 more nominal elements in asyndeton, ending with an aside. The other examples, 2:7 and 3:15, are both within relative clauses giving explanation to the preceding clause, and they alternate conjunctive and asyndeton connections.

[409] In 1:9–10, the final element of the list is a full aside. In 2:7, the final nominal group appears in asyndeton following an aside that interrupts the complement word group, and includes additional qualifiers. In 3:15, the final two nominal groups are joined together by καί, indicating that the following qualifier, τῆς ἀληθείας, modifies both nouns. Lastly, in 6:17–19, the final infinitive clause, in itself, includes a compound, asyndeton predicate nominative.

[410] Out of the one hundred three adjunct word groups consisting of conjunctions, eighty-six are Cj-Ps and seventeen are Cj-Hs. HC-Cj are rare in 1 Timothy compared to HC-ptc, but the most common are ἵνα clauses, which account for fourteen of the seventeen HC-Cjs. The other Cj-Hs are ὅταν (5:11), καθώς (1:3), and ἕως (4:13).

[411] The καθώς clause in 1:3 appears at the beginning of a sentence but does not have an expressed main clause. The ἕως clause in 4:13 precedes its main clause, as does the ὅταν clause in 5:11, with the latter also having a hypotactic participle clause following the main clause. Hypotactic ἵνα clauses, by contrast, always appear after their main clause or, when there is elided main clause, as the final clause proper of the sentence. This means that it is a partially codified pattern, based on the use of ἵνα as a hypotactic conjunction, that hypotactic clauses that are in hypotaxis via a conjunction will appear as the final clause of the sentence.

much more flexibility.[412] No pattern for Cj-Ps is evident beyond the analysis on the rank of clause above, other than to note that no Cj-P appears as an adjunct word group within any rank-shifted context.[413]

A-Advs or A-CUs are fairly frequent in 1 Timothy, although only a few patterns emerge due to the limited number of samples for many uses of such adjuncts. The most common A-Advs are the additive use of καί, A-Advs of manner, and temporal A-Advs. The additive καί, as a marginally codified pattern, appears before the predicator,[414] and only appears within clauses on the rank of clause. A-Advs of manner tend to precede the predicator as a marginally codified pattern[415] and, as a codified pattern, consist of either an adverbial lexeme ending in –ως or ὡς followed by a noun.[416] A-Advs of manner also tend to appear in imperative contexts or within

---

[412] There are three clauses with hypotactic conjunctions whose main clause is elided (1:3–4; 3:15), and two others governed by an indicative clause (1:16, 20). The other clauses with hypotactic conjunctions are governed by an indicative clause with the context of a wish or desire (1:18; 2:2), the impersonal verb δεῖ (3:6, 7), in explanation to an imperative in the previous clause (5:11b–12), or directly modifying an imperative main clause (4:13, 15; 5:7, 16, 20; 6:1, 19). In total, 12 of the 17 clauses with a hypotactic conjunction are syntactically linked to an imperative context.

[413] Certainly, paratactic conjunctions appear according to their part of speech within rank-shifted contexts, but only as conjunctions within other word groups, especially subject and complement word groups, not as adjunct word groups. The only possible exception to this is in 6:7b, which is a syntactically difficult clause. In this case, the conjunction οὐδέ likely modifies the assumed nominal clause, not the rank-shifted ὅτι clause in itself.

[414] Out of the eight uses of the additive καί, five appear before the predicator (2:9; 3:10; 5:13, 20, 24). The additive καί in 5:25 appears within a nominal clause, but it is placed before both the subject and complement word groups. The only uses of additive καί that appear explicitly after the predicator are in 3:7 and 5:13, where it follows the impersonal δεῖ but preceded the subject word group and it follows the predicator in a οὐ μόνον ... ἀλλὰ κάι construction.

[415] Out of thirteen adverbial adjuncts of manner, eight precede the predicator (1:8; 3:4, 12, 13; 4:1; 5:17, 22; 6:2), while five follow their governing verb (5:1–2, 6:17). The four adverbial adjuncts that appear with ὡς in 5:1–2, however, could arguably be a part of the compound complement group and not separate adjunct word groups. The syntax makes more sense, however, if the text assumes a repetition of main verb rather than one, compound complement word group (Perkins, *Letters,* 98–9)

[416] All but one adverbial adjunct word group consists of either adverb ending with –ως or ὡς with a noun. The only exception, μᾶλλον in 6:2. While this is commonly a comparative adverb (rf. Lenski, *Interpretation*, 695) and it does retain some comparative sense with regard to the opening clause of 6:2, here it functions to emphasize how servants with Christian masters should serve "to a greater degree" or "all the more" (BDAG, s.v. πρῶτος 2.(b), 894). Perkins acknowledges this possibility, but still opts for the comparative sense (Perkins, *Letters,* 129).

rank-shifted participle clauses.[417] Temporal A-Advs are also fairly common in 1 Timothy, and

tend to appear before the predicator in a marginally codified pattern.[418] All the temporal A-Advs

appear before the predicator, and A-CUs appear on both sides of the governing verb.[419] These

patterns are significant in that for adverbial adjunct word groups in general there is not a pattern

on where they appear relative to the governing verb;[420] many uses appear after the predicator,

although not with enough examples to reach any conclusions.[421]

The most common type of adjunct word group is an A-PP. Aside from those functioning as

qualifiers or nominalized adjectives, there are one hundred ten A-PPs, modifying the action of a

verbal form. As established above, A-PPs tend to follow the predicator, which is generally the

case regardless of clause type or prepositional force,[422] with A-PPs of reference being the only

possible exception.[423] One notable difference for A-PPs compared to other adjunct types,

---

[417] Only two adverbial adjuncts of manner appear outside of an imperative paratactic clause or a rank-shifted participle clause. The first appears in the apodosis of a conditional clause embedded within a rank-shifted ὅτι clause (1:8), and the other in the opening clause of a new section (4:1).

[418] Three of nine temporal adverbial adjunct word groups appear after the predicator (2:6; 3:10; 5:5).

[419] Roughly half of temporal adverbial adjunct word groups appear before the predicator (1:13; 2:13; 6;15), while the other half appear following the predicator (2:6; 3:10; 5:5). The temporal use of the dative appears on both sides of the governing verb, as does the temporal use of the adverbial accusative. It is worth noting, however, that the only occurrences of a temporal adverbial adjunct following the predicator are nouns or nominalized adjectives with adverbial case usage.

[420] From among the forty-four adverbial adjunct word groups, twenty-one appear before the predicator, seventeen follow the predicator, and six appear in nominal clauses or those with an elided, and assumed, main verb.

[421] For example, the single use of the dative of agency (3:16) appears following its governing verb, adverbs and adverbial accusatives functioning to give emphasis appear either explicitly after the governing verb or at the end of the clause (1:17; 2:1; 5:4; 6:16), both uses of the dative of means (4:6; 6:10), and the single use of the dative of sphere or reference (4:16).

[422] Out of one hundred eleven PPs functioning as adjunct word groups, eighty-one follow the predicator, twenty-seven precede the predicator, and two appear without an expressed main verb (1:2, 17). For those latter two, however, they follow the expressed subject and complement word groups of the sentence. The prepositional phrase tends to follow the predicator for all clause types.

[423] For prepositional phrases of reference, five of seven precede the predicator (1:7, 19; 4:8; 6:21, compared to 1:18; 6:4). It is also potentially significant that those that follow modify participles, while those that precede modify indicative verbs. There are other uses of prepositional phrases that might tend toward preceding the predicator, but there are too few examples to be conclusive, such as adversative (5:19), material (2:9), or temporal

however, is that they are more likely to appear within rank-shifted clauses than they are within paratactic and hypotactic clauses on the rank of clause.[424] A-PPs are likely to include only the preposition and a single nominal element,[425] and the presence of the definite article, adjectives, and embedded qualifiers is, generally, evenly distributed among PPs regardless of use or placement in relation to the predicator. While there are not enough examples of various forces to reach conclusive tendencies for each one, the possible exceptions to this include A-PPs of manner, which never include an article or a qualifier in 1 Timothy,[426] A-PPs of purpose, which never include an article or an adjective,[427] A-PPs of reference, which never include an adjective or a qualifier,[428] and temporal A-PPs, which typically include multiple extra modifiers or parts of speech.[429]

A-PPs tend to include only the preposition and a single nominal element, but those that include other modifiers or parts of speech evince patterns both of syntax and word order. A-PPs with the definite article appear in a variety of contexts and types of clauses, but one notable

---

(4:1; 6:14, 17).

[424] Out of 110 prepositional phrase adjuncts, 57 of them occur in a rank-shifted context, 42 appear in paratactic clauses proper, and 11 appear in hypotactic clauses proper.

[425] Out of one hundred ten PP adjuncts, fifty-nine include only the preposition and a noun or nominalized element.

[426] Out of thirteen prepositional phrases of manner (1:13; 2:2, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12; 3:4, 9, 14, 16; 5:2), none include a definite article or a qualifier. Of those, five do include adjectives: three with predicate adjectives and two with attributive adjectives.

[427] Out of five prepositional phrases of purpose (1:16; 2:7; 4:3, 10; 6:17), none include a definite article or an adjective. There is one that includes a qualifier (1:16), but that is the only example with additional modifiers or parts of speech.

[428] Out of seven prepositional phrases of reference (1:7, 18, 19; 4:8; 6:4, 21), none of them include an adjective or a qualifier. Only two of them include a definite article (1:19; 6:21), and these two prepositional are verbatim and appear within a similar syntactical context, namely, before the predicator within a relative clause.

[429] There are only three temporal prepositional phrases (4:1; 6:14, 17), and all three include additional modifiers. The two without qualifiers appear before the predicator: one only with attributive adjective (4:1) and the other with both a definite article and a nominalized adverb functioning as an attributive adjective (6:17). The temporal prepositional phrase that follows the predicator includes a definite article and a qualifier (6:14).

tendency is that those with both definite articles and adjectives tend to appear in paratactic clauses;[430] furthermore, all those in paratactic clauses have attributive adjectives that tend to be between the article and head noun in "sandwich" position.[431] For A-PPs with adjectives, the adjectives tend to be in attributive position and only slightly more likely to be in "repeat" position than in "sandwich" position.[432] Attributive adjectives within A-PPs in infinitive clauses only occur in "repeat" position,[433] while in imperative paratactic clauses they only appear in "sandwich" position.[434] For the predicate adjective πᾶς, which is the only adjective in predicate position for A-PPs, it is a partially codified pattern that it will come before its head noun and other modifiers, with the only exception occurring in a unique syntactical context.[435] Lastly, when attributive adjectives occur within a compound C-OP, they always modify the final noun, differentiating them from any preceding elements.[436] For A-PPs that include an embedded

---

[430] Out of the seven prepositional phrases with both articles and adjectives, six of them appear in paratactic clauses (1:14, 18; 3:13; 5:21, 23; 6:17). The other occurrence takes place within a rank-shifted infinitive clause (2:2), and includes a predicate adjective preceding a substantive participle.

[431] The only exceptions occur in 1:14 and 3:13, where the attributive adjective is a nominalized prepositional phrase in "repeat" position, modifying a grammatically indefinite head noun.

[432] For the twenty-six prepositional phrase adjuncts with adjectives, eighteen are attributive adjectives. Of those, ten are in "repeat" position while the rest are in "sandwich" position.

[433] 1 Tim. 2:9, 10; 6:18.

[434] 1 Tim. 5:19, 23; 6:17.

[435] For the eight times πᾶς appears in prepositional phrase adjuncts, it precedes the modifier all but once (2:1, 2, 8, 11; 3:4; 5:2). The sole exception, found in 1:16, is unique for a variety of reasons. The other occurrences all use πᾶς in the distributive sense ("every" or "all"), while in 1:16 it is used to denote primacy ("first of all"). The other occurrences all appear in prepositional phrases that follow their governing predicator, while in 1:16 the prepositional phrase precedes it. Lastly, the exception of 1:16 is the only time πᾶς modifies a pronoun, which is also the only time a pronoun is modified by an adjective in prepositional phrase adjuncts in 1 Timothy.

[436] 1 Tim. 1:14; 2:9; 5:21, 23; 6:9. For predicate position adjectives, this also occurs in 2:2 for the phrase "ὑπὲρ βασιλέων καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐν ὑπεροχῇ ὄντων" within the infinitive clause, but not for the phrase "ἐν πάσῃ εὐσεβείᾳ καὶ σεμνότητι" in the following hypotactic ἵνα clause. In this case the πᾶς is not distinguishing the final noun or signaling the end of a list, but rather modifying both εὐσεβείᾳ and its related, paired noun σεμνότητι. Note, however, that for 1:14, while the nominalized prepositional phrase appears on the final noun, it likely also modifies both nouns (Perkins, *Letters,* 19).

qualifier, the qualifiers tend follow their head noun in a partially codified pattern.[437] It is also a marginally codified pattern that the qualifier will match its head noun in grammatical definiteness,[438] with exceptions being only when a definite qualifier modifies a grammatically indefinite head noun.[439] The final potentially significant detail for A-PPs with embedded qualifiers is that no qualifier appears in a prepositional phrase adjunct together with an adjective without also having the definite article.[440]

Qualifier Word Groups

The qualifier word group is unique among the word groups, in that it is always embedded within other word groups and never appears independently. Qualifiers are diverse in form and function, with the most common being relative pronouns introducing a relative clause and nominal word groups modifying another noun or adjective.[441] In addition to these more common qualifiers, there are also two ὅτι clauses in apposition,[442] seven PPs functioning as qualifiers,[443] and two instances of vocative address modifying either an expressed or assumed subject word

---

[437] For the sixteen prepositional phrase adjuncts that include an embedded qualifier, the qualifier follows the head noun within fourteen of them. The two exceptions, found in 5:23 and 6:17, are unique in that the former is only time a personal pronoun is used as a qualifier within prepositional phrase adjuncts and in that the latter directly contrasts another prepositional of basis, using ἐπί, which has its qualifier is the expected position.

[438] This is the case for eleven of sixteen PP adjuncts with qualifiers, which includes grammatically indefinite qualifiers modifying grammatically indefinite nouns, definite qualifiers modifying definite nouns, pronouns modifying grammatically definite nouns, and definite qualifiers modifying a proper name or title.

[439] 1 Tim. 1:16; 3:6, 7; 4:14; 6:17. It is noteworthy, although too infrequent to suggest a conclusive pattern, the only occurrences of a qualifier in a prepositional phrase adjunct within hypotactic ἵνα clauses have a definite qualifier modifying an indefinite noun (1:16; 3:6, 7), as well as the only instance within a relative clause (4:14).

[440] There are four instances of a qualifier appearing together with the definite article (1:11, 17; 6:13, 14), six instances of a definite article appearing together with an adjective (1:14, 18; 2:2; 3:13; 5:21), and one instance of a prepositional phrase adjunct having a definite article, an adjective, and a qualifier (5:23).

[441] Among the one hundred twenty-four qualifier word groups, there are ninety-two nominal modifiers and twenty-three relative pronouns, with one of the relative pronouns also being the object of a PP modifying the head noun (6:12).

[442] 1 Tim. 1:9–10, 15.

[443] 1 Tim. 1:1, 2, 6–7; 2:3; 3:11; 5:4; 6:12.

group.[444] The qualifiers of vocative address both appear within an imperative paratactic clause and precede the predicator, and both appositive ὅτι clauses appear within clauses proper. Otherwise, there are not enough samples to attempt to deduce any patterns or tendencies within 1 Timothy. The use of a PP as a qualifier is fairly rare both in reference to qualifier types and the syntax of PPs, which typically appear as adjuncts. PPs that do function as qualifiers always follow their referent, tend to appear with paratactic clauses proper, and tend to modify nouns or adjectives within complement word groups.[445] While there are too few instances to derive anything conclusive, it is noteworthy that for the times when PPs function as qualifier within a C-PN, they tend to modify adjectives: twice as an epexegetical modifier and once giving the sphere of reference for the predicate adjective.[446]

For the more common types of qualifier word groups, there are twenty-three times where a relative pronoun, with its subsequent clause, functions as qualifiers to nouns or pronouns.[447] The patterns of the word group order within the relative clauses themselves are established above, but there are a few notable tendencies for relative clauses as qualifiers. They tend to appear, as a marginally codified pattern, within clauses proper,[448] and, when they do appear within rank-

---

[444] 1 Tim. 6:11, 20. These instances of vocative address are considered as qualifier word groups within the subject word group, in that they are nominal groups that modify a noun, either expressed (6:11) or assumed (6:20). As such they are not adjuncts, neither are they simply adjectival or functioning as other parts of speech within the subject word group.

[445] For the seven examples of prepositional phrases functioning as qualifiers, six are within paratactic clauses, with one modifying a predicate adjective in an infinitive clause (3:11), and six are within complement word groups, with one within the subject word group of the opening salutation (1:1)

[446] In 2:3 and 5:4, the preposition ἐνώπιον is used to modify the predicate adjective ἀπόδεκτον as an epexegetical modifier, while in 3:11 the preposition ἐν is used to modify the predicate adjective πιστάς, giving the sphere in which the adjective is intended to apply. The only exception to this is 1:6–7, where the relative preposition ἐκ is used to modify the predicate noun ἀγάπη, denoting the source of the ἀγάπη.

[447] There are three relative clauses that do not function as qualifiers, as the relative clause, in itself, functions as a word group within its governing clause (1:7; 2:10; 6:1).

[448] Out of the twenty-three relative clauses functioning as qualifiers for nouns or pronouns, sixteen of them appear within paratactic or hypotactic clauses that are properly on the rank of clause.

shifted clauses, they appear within infinitive clauses or other relative clauses.[449] The majority of

relative clause qualifiers appear within the first and last chapters of 1 Timothy, further

supporting Van Neste's conclusions about the parallels between the two chapters.[450] The relative

pronouns functioning as qualifiers, as a marginally codified pattern, describe their head noun by

giving information or action that has happened to them, functioning as complements within the

relative clause, rather than further description of their qualities, behaviors, or activities, denoted

by the relative pronoun functioning as the subject or other modifier within the relative clause.[451]

Lastly, as established above, the relative pronoun as qualifier always follows its referent and,

when there is an expressed predicator, appears on a referent that follows the predicator.

The most common type of qualifier is when the qualifier is a noun or pronoun with

additional modifiers, typically definite articles, adjectives, or other embedded qualifier word

groups. These, as a marginally codified pattern, tend to appear within paratactic and hypotactic

clauses proper,[452] and the most common uses are qualifiers of apposition, subjective genitive, and

objective genitive.[453] Nominal qualifiers do often appear as only a single noun or pronoun, but

---

[449] There are three relative clause qualifiers that appear within rank-shifted infinitive clauses (3:15; 4:3; 6:15), and 4 that modify word groups within other relative clauses (1:20; 6:16). There is a relative clause qualifier in the σῶσαι infinitive clause in 1:15, but the infinitive clause is functioning as hypotactic purpose clause, not as a rank-shifted word group or modifier.

[450] There are seven relative pronoun qualifiers in 1 Tim. 1 and eight within 1 Tim. 6. See above for description of Van Neste's argument about the strong semantic parallels between chapters 1 and 6 (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 115–20, 137–39).

[451] Within the relative clauses themselves, the relative pronoun qualifiers function as the complement word group for 15 of the 23 relative clauses. Of those 15 occurrences, 14 denote where the relative pronoun functions explicitly as a complement word group, and there is 1 time when the relative pronoun is a retained accusative of a passive construction (1:11). The relative pronoun functions as the subject word group seven times, and once as a partitive genitive qualifier for a predicate adjective (1:15).

[452] For the ninety-two qualifiers consisting of a nominal word group, sixty-seven of them are within paratactic or hypotactic clauses appearing on the rank of clause. For those within rank-shifted clauses, fifteen are within relative clauses, six are within infinitive clauses, two are within rank-shifted participle clauses, and two are within direct quotations functioning as the complement of the governing clause.

[453] There twenty-one nominal qualifiers functioning as appositives, twenty-three objective genitives, and nineteen subjective genitives. These three functions alone account for roughly two thirds of all nominal qualifier

they are more likely to include other modifiers as well.[454] For nominal qualifiers with embedded qualifiers, it is a codified pattern that they will appear within appositive, subjective genitive, or objective genitive qualifiers,[455] and fully codified that they will be appear after their head noun or adjective.[456] For nominal qualifier word groups with adjectival modifiers, while they tend to follow their referent, they also precede their referent with above average frequency.[457] Those that precede their referent tend to be epexegetical genitives or genitives of relationship,[458] and tend to be within C-PNs.[459] The only predicate adjective to appear within nominal qualifiers is πᾶς. It always precedes its head noun and is only used in qualifiers that occur within paratactic clauses.[460] Attributive adjectives tend to appear before their head noun in "sandwich" position as a partially codified pattern, with the only exceptions being when the adjective is a rank-shifted

---

groups.

[454] There are forty nominal qualifiers that consist of only a noun or pronoun, but there are fifty-two nominal qualifiers that include a definite article, adjective, or another embedded qualifier.

[455] For the eighteen qualifier word groups with additional embedded qualifiers within them, eight are within appositional qualifiers, six are within subjective genitive qualifiers, and three are within objective genitive qualifiers. The only exception occurs in 5:18, where there is an epexegetical genitive qualifier modifying a predicate adjective.

[456] All eighteen qualifier word groups that are embedded within other qualifiers follow their referent. All but one of them modify nouns, and none of them modify pronouns.

[457] Out of ninety-two total nominal qualifiers, only sixteen precede their referent. Within nominal qualifiers with adjectives, however, eight of seventeen precede their referent.

[458] There are four epexegetical qualifiers with adjectives, and they all precede the referent. The only epexegetical qualifier that follows its referent is distinct from the others in that: it does not have an adjective, it is the only epexegetical to include a definite article or an embedded qualifier, and it appear within a direct quotation (5:18). The other four that precede their referent all consist of a single noun preceded by an adjective (1:15; 4:9; 5:17; 6:1). There are only three qualifiers expressed by a genitive of relationship (3:2, 12; 5:9). They all include an adjective, appear within a predicate nominative complement word group, and precede their referent. The only exception to this tendency occurs in 5:24, where a subjective genitive within a subject word group precedes its referent within a larger context of contrast between clauses.

[459] There are two epexegetical genitives that occur within predicate nominative complement word groups, and hree genitives of relationship. The other nominal qualifiers that precede their referent appear within a direct object complement word group (6:1), a subject word group (5:24), or directly modifying a predicator in a passive construction (5:17).

[460] 1 Tim. 1:15; 4:9; 6:1, 10.

participle clause.[461] One final noteworthy aspect to the word order of nominal qualifier word groups is that the presence or absence of the article does not appear to cause deviation from word order patterns established by other syntactical or semantic phenomena.[462]

The force of the qualifier word group impacts syntactical patterns of position of the qualifier in regard to the referent and the word order within the qualifier word group. Qualifiers of apposition, for example, only follow their referent, never appear before a governing verb, and are the most likely of all qualifiers to appear within a subject word group.[463] Epegexetical genitive qualifiers, by contrast, never follow a governing verb, tend to precede their referent, and tend to only consist of a single adjective preceding a single noun.[464] Qualifiers with the force of a genitive of referent always include a definite article, tend to follow their referent, and never include another embedded qualifier.[465] There are few genitives of relationship in 1 Timothy, but

---

[461] Within nominal qualifiers, there are thirteen qualifier word groups with attributive adjectives: ten include adjectives proper, one includes an indefinite pronoun functioning adjectivally, and two include participles that are rank shifted and functioning adjectivally. All eleven with adjectives proper and the indefinite pronoun have the adjective in "sandwich" position. For those with rank-shifted participles, the participle in 3:15 appears in fourth attributive position (Wallace, *Greek Grammar,* 310–11) or anarthrous "repeat" position, and the qualifier word group in 6:5 includes multiple rank-shifted participles all modifying the same noun. In that case, the first precedes the noun, while the latter two follow.

[462] In other words, the tendencies and frequencies for position of the qualifier in relation to its referent and the governing verb do not vary for qualifiers with articles compared to the overall pattern. Neither does the presence or absence or the article appear to depend on force of the qualifier or the type of governing clause.

[463] All twenty-four qualifiers of apposition with an expressed referent follow it, and fourteen appear within the subject word group of the governing sentence. Of those, four of them modify the object of a prepositional clause in the opening salutation of the letter (1:1–2), but still within the larger subject word group of the nominal clause.

[464] Out of the five epexegetical genitive qualifiers, four fit this pattern (1:15; 4:9; 5:17; 6:1), while the anomaly has a definite article and a qualifier, without an adjective, and follows its referent within a direct quotation (5:18). There are also two prepositional phrase qualifiers functioning epexegetically within a predicate nominative complement word group (2:3; 5:4), both of which follow their referent.

[465] All four within complement word groups follow the referent (3:9; 4:6, 12; 6:12), while the only genitive of referent within a subject word group precedes its referent (3:16), likely because the referent is then immediately followed by a relative clause as another qualifier. The genitive of referent qualifier within 4:6 does have the expected word order pattern of Article-Noun, but is compound word group with an adjective modifying the second genitive noun in addition to the definite article. There is also a prepositional phrase qualifier with the force of reference (1:2), which also follows its complement but consists only of a preposition and noun.

they always precede their referent and consist of a single attributive adjective preceding a single head noun within a predicate nominative complement word group.[466] Objective genitive qualifiers, which are the most common type of nominal qualifier,[467] always follow their referent, almost never include an adjective, and are the most common use of personal pronouns as qualifiers.[468] Possessive genitive qualifiers do not show many distinctive patterns, other than that they never include an embedded qualifier within them and they tend to follow their referent.[469] In contrast to objective genitive qualifiers, there are a handful of subjective genitive qualifiers that precede their referent, although the tendency is that the qualifier follows.[470] Other than that, however, subjective genitive qualifiers tend to follow the general patterns for all nominal qualifiers.

One, final syntactical phenomenon evinced by qualifier word groups is the relation of the

---

[466] 1 Tim. 3:2, 12; 5:9.

[467] The case could be made that some of the qualifiers categorized here as objective genitive are genitives of authority or subordination (see Wallace, *Greek Grammar,* 103 in reference to 1:2; 12, 14, 17; 6:3, 14, 15). While these examples do imply the referent's authority over what is expressed in the genitive case, the notion of authority is implicit in the verbal idea behind the noun rather than the use of the genitive itself (see Voelz, *Grammar*, 238 or BDF, §163, 90).

[468] All twenty-three objective genitive qualifiers follow their referent. Only one includes an adjective within the qualifier word group—the predicate adjective πᾶς that appears within the objective genitive qualifier in 4:10. Out of the twelve times that a personal pronoun is used as a qualifier, seven of them are objective genitives. Personal pronouns are also used twice as possessive genitive qualifiers (4:12; 5:18), and thrice as subjective genitive qualifiers (1:1; 4:15; 5:23).

[469] Out of the nine possessive genitive qualifiers, three include a definite article and two include adjectives, but none include an embedded qualifier. While seven of nine follow their referent (1:11; 3;5, 15; 4:14; 5:18; 6:1), the two exceptions (4:12; 5:10) both appear with main clauses, consist of a single word, and appear within a complement word group functioning as a direct object.

[470] There are four of the nineteen subjective genitive qualifiers that precede their referent (4:15; 5:23, 24; 6:17). Two of these appear within the context of contrast, with the position of qualifier itself serving as an indication (5:24; 6:17). The other two examples are both the second-person, personal pronoun σοῦ. This pronoun is only used four times as a qualifier in the genitive case in 1 Timothy, and for three of them it precedes its referent (4:12, 15; 5:23), while it follows in the singular instance it is used as an objective genitive within a rank-shifted participle clause (4:16). While there is not enough data to conclude if there is a pattern, it does appear that the position of σοῦ in 4:16 likely has more to do with the context of the rank-shifted participle clause, which tends to be P-C, than with the pronoun itself. All four times that the personal pronoun σοῦ is a genitive modifier to a regular noun, the qualifier precedes the noun.

qualifier to its referent in terms of grammatical definiteness. While there are many qualifiers for

which this consideration does not apply, such as relative pronouns, prepositional phrases

functioning as qualifiers, or qualifiers modifying predicate adjectives, it is partially codified that

the qualifier will explicitly match its referent in grammatical definiteness.[471] For those that do not

match their referent, it is marginally codified that it will be a definite qualifier modifying an

indefinite head noun, rather than an indefinite qualifier modifying a definite noun.[472] The only

instances of the latter are appositive qualifiers appearing within formulaic or poetic sections,

where the appositive qualifier is grammatically indefinite but definite in meaning. For definite

qualifier word groups modifying indefinite head nouns, they always follow their head noun, they

all include a definite article to mark their definiteness, they almost always modify a single noun

as referent,[473] and they tend to consist of only an article with a single noun.[474] One other

noteworthy feature of qualifiers that do not match their qualifiers in terms of definiteness, is that

all but one of the instances where a qualifier word group evinces hyperbaton with its referent

include a definite qualifier word group modifying an indefinite head noun.[475]

---

[471] Out of the eighty-five qualifier word groups under consideration for definiteness, seventy-one match the definiteness of their referent. For the purpose of this project, nouns with a definite article (Wallace, *Grammar,* 216–30), proper names or titles (Wallace, *Grammar,* 245–47), and, as a general rule, personal pronouns (see BDF, §284(1), 148, Wallace, *Greek Grammar,* 239–40, and Voelz, *Grammar*, 82) are considered grammatically definite. Although, proper nouns and pronouns do have the flexibility to modify grammatically indefinite head nouns as a genitive qualifier, thereby making them definite (see Wallace, *Grammar,* 250–52).

[472] Out of fourteen qualifier word groups that do not match, ten are definite qualifier groups modifying indefinite head nouns (1:16; 3:6, 7, 15; 4:8, 12, 14; 6:3, 10, 15) and four are indefinite qualifiers modifying definite head nouns (1:1, 17; 2:3; 6:16).

[473] Only two of the ten have referents other than single nouns. In 3:15, the referent is itself a qualifier word group of apposition with compound nouns, and, in 6:3, the referent is a noun modified by an adjectival participle.

[474] There are six of the ten qualifiers that consist of only a single article and noun (1:16; 3:6, 7, 15; 4:12; 6:16). Others include a predicate adjective (6:10), additional embedded qualifiers (4:14; 6:3), or a compound construction (4:8).

[475] There are five instances of hyperbaton explicitly with qualifier word groups and their referent, and four of them include this phenomenon of definiteness mismatch (3:6, 7; 4:8, 12). This is generally mismatch between the qualifier and the primary element of its larger word group, but the qualifier with hyperbaton in 4:8 has the mismatch with its own embedded qualifier. The only exception to this trend occurs in 4:15, where the dative of referent,

Conclusion: The Linguistic Profile of 1 Timothy

The letter of 1 Timothy evinces patterns of syntax and word order throughout on the ranks of section, clause, and word group. These patterns, presented here, are not only beneficial for understanding the letter itself and dealing with questions of emphasis, sectional divisions, and textual criticism, but they will be compared with those of the other PE and select chapters from the New Testament in order to establish which patterns might be relevant for investigating possible literary relationships within the larger study of register and literary style. In addition, patterns that are consistent across all texts under examination could help establish codified features word order and clausal patterns more generally within NTG and KG .

On the rank of section, sections and subsections almost always open with either an imperative verb or an indicative verb indicating a wish or exhortation as a marginally codified pattern. For sections, the opening sentence is almost always followed by an explanatory sentence. The verb παρακαλέω tends to appear for major section transitions, while other verbs of exhortation, such as παραγγέλλω, are used for subsection transitions. Asyndeton and the anaphoric demonstrative pronoun ταῦτα regularly appear in section and subsection transitions. The pronoun ταῦτα typically only appears within a paraenetic context. Sections and subsections most commonly end with an explanatory or paraenetic sentence; furthermore these final sentences typically include irregular or marked syntax. Doxological and poetic passages are not used to end a major section in 1 Timothy, only subsections. Another dominant feature in 1 Timothy is the use of an *inclusio*, explicitly recalling diction, related semantic domains, and themes from the beginning of the section, in the final sentences of a section.

---

functioning as a qualifier within the predicate nominative complement word group, is separated from its referent by the governing verb of the clause.

On the rank of clause, there are different codification patterns based on the type of clause. For paratactic clauses with an imperative verb, it is partially codified that there will be an expressed complement, and those complements tend to precede the verb, with the exception of compound complements, infinitive clauses functioning as the complement, or complements including an relative clause. When a subject is expressed for an imperative verb, it is partially codified that the verb will be in the third person and that the subject word group will precede it. Adjunct word groups, when there is no expressed complement, will always precede an imperative verb. Paratactic clauses with paraenetic indicative verbs indicating a wish or command rarely include an expressed subject, yet almost always an expressed complement, both as partially codified patterns. These complements tend to follow the same pattern as those for imperative verbs. When an adjunct word group is used, however, it will always follow an indicative verb expressing a wish.

For indicative paratactic clauses, the subject word group, which is expressed about half the time, tends to precede all other sentence elements as a marginally codified pattern and to precede the predicator as a partially codified pattern. Indicative paratactic sentences tend to have expressed complements as a marginally codified pattern; these usually precede the verb, including compound complements, as a marginally codified pattern. Compound complements in indicative clauses that end a section, however, often exhibit hyperbaton and use an explanatory conjunction, such as γάρ or ὅτι. Unlike other clause types, indicative clauses tend to be part of a compound or complex sentence as a marginally codified pattern. Indicative clauses with an expressed subject tend to include an expressed conjunction or connector as a codified pattern. Sentences utilizing asyndeton tend to be paraenetic in force as a partially codified pattern, and the only paratactic clauses to utilize asyndeton and include a non-conjunctive adjunct word

155

group are paraenetic in force. For every subject word group within a sentence whose connector is asyndeton, the subject will precede the verb. For paratactic clauses within conditional sentences, expressed subjects tend to precede the predicator, but clauses within conditional sentences tend to follow patterns according to their own clause type rather than the conditional context. Nominal clauses rarely include an adjunct as a partially codified pattern and typically include both an expressed subject and complement word group as a codified pattern.

Throughout all paratactic clauses, A-Advs tend to precede the predicator, while A-PPs tend to follow the predicator. Temporal adjunct word groups do not follow the same patterns, however, and, when A-PPs do precede the predicator, it only happens with imperative verbs or with indicative verbs that lack an expressed complement. When pronouns are used as subject word groups within paratactic clauses, regardless of verb or clause type, the pronoun will precede the predicator.

Hypotactic clauses on the rank of clause also evince differing pattern based on the type of clause. HC-Cjs with conjunctions other than ἵνα always appear in the primary position of the sentence, while HC-Cjs with ἵνα always appear in the final position as a fully codified feature. HC-Cjs tend to modify the main, paratactic clause of the sentence as a partially codified pattern and tend to include an expressed complement also as partially codified pattern. It is a marginally codified pattern that hypotactic ἵνα clauses will modify a paratactic clause whose verb is either imperative or indicative with the context of a wish or exhortation. Within hypotactic ἵνα clauses, non-conjunctive adjuncts almost always follow the predicator.

HC-ptcs, by contrast, often are in hypotaxis to indicative paratactic clauses. HC-ptcs tend to include an expressed complement word group as a marginally codified pattern, while it is partially codified that such clauses will not include an expressed subject or adjunct word group.

When an HC-ptc includes an expressed subject, it only occurs within a relative clause where the participle precedes its governing verb, takes the relative pronoun as the complement, and has the subject appear between the complement and the participle. PPs are the typical adjunct type that appears within HC-ptcs, and they only tend to appear when the participle clause does not include an expressed complement. The clausal of HC-ptcs with regard to the complement varies according to the force of the participle, but, in general, when an HC-ptc includes a complement word group that follows the participle in a P-C structure, it is codified that the HC-ptc will follow the governing clause and include a present tense participle. HC-ptcs with an aorist participle almost always precede the governing verb, as well as all HC-ptcs governed by an indicative verb in the future tense. Causal HC-ptcs tend to follow their governing clause, as do those with participles of manner, especially those with a P-C clausal structure. Participles of manner can also precede the governing verb, and, when they do, the syntax flips, showing a C-P structure. Concessive participle tend to follow their governing verb and show a P-C pattern, while circumstantial, temporal participles, as one would expect, are always aorist and precede the predicator.

Other clauses in hypotaxis are those that have undergone rank shift and appear as word groups within other clauses. These evince differing syntactical tendencies based on the type of clause, including infinitive clauses, attributive participle clauses, relative clauses, and other clauses of direct or indirect discourse. Rank-shifted infinitive clauses tend to appear as complement word groups as a partially codified pattern, follow their governing verb as a partially codified pattern, and modify a verb expressing a wish or command, either grammatically or in its illocutionary force, as a marginally codified pattern. When an infinitive clause appears with an indicative verb that does not have the illocutionary force of a wish or

157

command, the infinitive will always occur in the aorist tense. Infinitives in 1 Timothy never appear with a definite article and tend to function as a complementary infinitive or an infinitive of indirect discourse as a partially codified pattern. Complementary infinitives never modify an imperative verb, while imperative verbs regularly take infinitives of indirect discourse. Within the infinitive clause, those with subjects tend to appear within the context of a wish or exhortation as a partially codified pattern and the infinitive clauses that include adjunct word groups are those governing by a paraenetic verb as a codified pattern. It is fully codified that the only adjuncts to appear within infinitive clauses are A-PPs, which follow the infinitive as a partially codified pattern. When infinitive clauses include an expressed complement, many factors impact the word group order. Complementary infinitives, for instance, tend to have the complement following the verb in a P-C structure, while subjective or objective infinitives tend to have the complement before the infinitive in a C-P structure. Compound complements and those with a relative pronoun tend to follow the infinitive, while complements consisting of single nominal groups or C-PNs precede the infinitive. While it only happens twice, a notable deviation from other clause types is that complement word groups consisting of pronouns only follow the infinitive.

Attributive participle clauses have a more regular syntactical pattern. They tend not to include an adjunct word group as a marginally codified pattern, and it is codified that they will not include a subject within the participle clause itseflf. For those with complement word groups, it is marginally codified that the clause will have a P-C pattern. All rank-shifted, attributive participles follow their governing verb and appear in the present tense as partially codified patterns. It is partially codified that those with an adjectival force will not be modified by the definite article, while substantive participles will be modified with an article as a codified

pattern. Adjectival participles tend not to appear within subject word groups as a partially codified pattern, while it is normal for substantive participles to function as the subject word group of their governing clause. Adjectival participles within C-PNs appear within relative clauses or infinitive clauses as partially codified pattern. Adjectival and substantive participles, when they appear within qualifier word groups, appear in qualifiers subject and C-PN word groups as a codified pattern. Lastly, the only rank-shifted participle clauses to include hyperbaton are two substantive participles and a participle functiniong as a C-PN.

Other rank-shifted clauses include relative clauses and clauses of direct or indirect discourse. Relative clauses will always follow an expressed referent as a fully codified pattern and they are the most likely clause type to include an expressed complement word group, including a complement as a partially codified pattern. The syntax of the relative clause largely depends on the role of the relative pronoun, especially when it functions as the subject or complement word group of the clause. Expressed subjects and complements of a relative clause tend not appear on the same side of the predicator of the relative clause, with exceptions regularly showing hyperbaton. Adjuncts regularly appear within relative clauses. They are A-PPs as a partially codified pattern and A-PPs, when the relative pronoun is not the C-OP, follow the predicator as a partially codified pattern. Rank-shifted clauses of direct or indirect discourse are not common in 1 Timothy, and tend to follow the word group order patterns established for paratactic and hypotactic clauses. One notable feature, though, is they only appear within paratactic, main clauses and not within other rank-shifted clauses.

Word groups within 1 Timothy are the lowest rank investigated in this project, and they also evince some noteworthy patterns that prove helpful for further study, analysis, and comparison. Within subject word groups, attributive adjectives tend to appear together with a

definite article, either before or after their head noun. Qualifiers tend to modify a definite head noun as a marginally codified pattern and it is partially codified that they will follow their referent. Subject word groups with a definite article are likely to include other modifiers within the word group, but are not as common within rank-shifted clauses. Complement word groups are frequent and follow different patterns based on the type of complement. Within C-DOs, it is partially codified both that qualifiers will follow their referent and appear in clauses proper. It is codified that adjectives modifying definite nouns will appear between the article and noun in "sandwich" position while indefinite adjectives appear after the head noun in "repeat" position as a marginally codified pattern. C-IOs tend to be only a single pronoun or definite noun as a partially codified pattern, while C-PNs never include an article as a fully-codidifed pattern. C-PNs are the most likely type of complement to include a qualifier as well as to show hyperbaton. For C-OPs, qualifiers tend to follow the head noun as a codified pattern. The definite article is often accompanied by other additional elements and there does not appear to be significant difference between C-OP in clauses proper and in rank-shifted contexts. Adjunct word groups generally fall into two main types: adjunct word groups consisting of adverbs or nouns functioning adverbially and adjunct word groups consisting of PPs. The patterns for adverbial adjunct word groups vary by force and the parts of speech that comprise the word group. The additive καί as well as A-Advs of time and manner tend to precede their governing verbs; other uses, while less frequent, tend to follow the predicator. A-PPs tend to follow the predicator as a marginally codified pattern, with the possible exception being when the PP has the force of reference or respect. A-PPs are very likely to appear within rank-shifted contexts, and the presence and patterns of additional modifiers within the C-OP vary by force.

The qualifier word group functions differently than other word groups, in that it is not

syntactically necessary for the structure of the clause and only appears embedded within other word groups. The most common forms of qualifiers are nominal word groups modifying a noun or adjective and relative pronouns modifying a noun or pronoun. Relative pronouns tend to appear within paratactic clauses as a marginally codified pattern. Nominal groups functioning as qualifiers also tend to appear with paratactic or hypotactic clauses proper as a marginally codified pattern, commonly functioning as a qualifier with the force of apposition, subjective genitive, or objective genitive. All types of qualifiers follow their referent as a partially codified pattern. Those that precede commonly have the force of a genitive of relationship, subjective genitive, or epexegetical genitive. Adjectives within nominal qualifiers tend to appear in "sandwich" position. Qualifiers within other qualifier word groups appear within appositive, subjective genitive, and objective genitive qualifiers as a codified patterns. Other tendencies of word order within the qualifier vary by the force and type of qualifier. Appositive qualifiers follow their referent as a fully codified pattern and will not precede the verb of the governing clause, when it is expressed, as a fully codified pattern. Epexegetical qualifiers tend to be a single adjective preceding an indefinite noun. Genitives of reference always include a definite article. Genitives of relationship always precede their referent within a C-PN and consist of a single adjective preceding an indefinite noun. Objective genitives follow their referent as a fully codified pattern, do not include adjectives as a codified pattern, and will not precede the predicator of the governing clause as a codified pattern. Subjective genitive qualifiers follow their referent as a partially codified pattern, but do precede their referent within imperative clauses or clauses with expressed forms of εἰμί. Lastly, qualifiers tend to match their referent in grammatical definiteness as a partially codified pattern. When they do not match, it is partially codified that it will be a definite qualifier modifying an indefinite referent. One other noteworthy

feature is that instances of hyperbaton with a qualifier and its referent are typically a definite qualifier modifying an indefinite head noun.

In addition to the patterns of word order and word group order established above, there are also syntactical phenomena that would lead the reader to expect a breach in anticipated word order or word group order. The most common of these, shown throughout the analysis above, are instances where two word groups or clauses are placed in contrast, typically with δέ, a compound list of word groups within a clause or parts of speech within a word group, the use of poetic, formulaic, or doxological passages, or a clause that appears at the beginning or, more frequently, the conclusion of a section or subsection. The presence of a relative pronoun also, without exception, moves a modified word group to the end of the clause, regardless of clause type. The phenomenon of hyperbaton also appears throughout 1 Timothy, and serves commonly as a device that allows the clause or word group to follow expected patterns of word group order or word order, while highlighting one or more elements of the sentence for emphasis.

CHAPTER THREE

A RANK-BASED ANALYSIS OF WORD ORDER AND SYNTAX IN 2 TIMOTHY

In this chapter, a linguistic profile for 2 Timothy will be constructed according to the same three tiers of the rank scale presented in the previous chapter. The first rank to be analyzed is the rank of section. In this step, the text of 2 Timothy will be organized into larger units of material, with those larger units then analyzed for clausal, semantic, and transitional patterns for both sections and subsections. The second step continues downward along the rank scale to the rank of the clause, presenting patterns and tendencies in word group order and syntax found within 2 Timothy. This step will begin with independent or paratactic clauses, followed by hypotactic clauses that functions properly on the rank of clause, concluded by an examination of rank-shifted clauses, namely, clauses that do not function as a paratactic or hypotactic clause on the rank of clause but rather function on the rank of word group. The third and final step is the rank of word group, which will be analyzed for patterns of word order and usage according to the type of word group. The chapter will conclude, then, with the presentation of the larger patterns and tendencies in word group order and syntax for 2 Timothy along the rank scale.

The Rank of Section

Establishing the Sections

As established in the previous chapter, many patterns of syntax and clausal relationships present themselves on the rank of section, a rank not presented as such on the rank scale within Hallidayan linguistics.[1] The rank of section below includes both sections, i.e., groupings of clauses that function as one larger unit of text, and subsections, i.e., smaller groupings that

---

[1] Halliday, *Grammar*, 9.

indicate minor shifts in topic or content within the section. Patterns and general tendencies evident within 2 Timothy on the rank of section can then be compared among the PE, three letters that are commonly considered similar in style and register.

The analysis of the sections of 2 Timothy begins with establishing the textual divisions within the letter. In the work of Van Neste, he argues that the text of 2 Timothy can be divided into four major sections: 1:3–2:13, 2:14–3:9, 3:10–4:8, and 4:9–22.[2] Some commentators hold 3:1–9 together with what follows, giving a larger section of 3:1–4:8,[3] but Van Neste argues that 3:1–9 connects backward with 2:14–26 as a distinct unit of text between 2:1–13 and 3:10–4:8.[4] This argument is made due to semantic chains and spheres of reference that run throughout 1:6–2:13 and 2:14–3:9,[5] the transitional nature of 3:10–17,[6] and the parallels between 1:3–5 and 3:10–17.[7] He proposes also, like 1 Timothy, that the opening salutation of 2 Timothy, found in 1:1–2, should be considered its own, independent unit of text separate from the main body.[8] Without debating the elements of cohesion between the various units of text, the questions that are the most pertinent for the present project, in relation to the common textual divisions among commentators, are the relation of 3:1–9 with the text that precedes and follows as well as

---

[2] Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 224–32.

[3] See Marshall, *Commentary*, 38, and Towner, *Letters*, 80–83. Others, such as Knight and Witherington, keep 3:1–9 as its own section alongside 2:14–26 and 3:10–17 (Knight, *Epistles*, x-xi and Ben Witherington III, *A Socio-Rhetorical on Titus, 1–2 Timothy and 1–3 John*, Vol. 1 of *Letters and Homilies for Hellenized Christians* [Downer's Grove: IVP Acadmic, 2006], 305).

[4] Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 201–3, 230–2. Van Neste notes other commentators who hold 3:10–4:8 together as a larger unit of text, regardless of their treatment of 3:1–9 (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 206), as well as those who argue that 2:1–13 connect with 1:6–14 as one larger section (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 225n121).

[5] Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 201–3, 212–13, 218–22, 225–29, 230–32.

[6] Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 178–79, 232.

[7] Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 231.

[8] Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 146.

whether 2:1–13 begins a new section or serves as a subsection within a larger textual unit.

Van Neste argues that 3:1–9 concludes the previous section rather than begins a new one. He acknowledges that there are many connections and cohesive elements between 3:1–9 and 3:10–17 and does consider keeping them together within the larger section of 2:14–3:17,[9] but sees greater cohesion between 3:10–17 and 4:1–8 and strong parallels between 1:6–2:13 and 3:10–4:8, including lexical connections, similarities in the referents of the verbal forms, and similar fields of content.[10] He convincingly presents that there is a shift in 2:14–26 to the contrast between Timothy and false teachers, with 3:1–9 focusing on the false teachers and 3:10–17 providing a contrasting portrait for Timothy. In terms of transitional indicators, it is plausible that 2:14 begins a new section. The verse begins with an anaphoric ταῦτα, which, as argued in chapter two above, often summarizes a previous section while moving the discussion forward. The verse also has an imperative verb introducing a unit of exhortation followed by explanation and a topic shift from theological assertion, personal recollection, and proverbial material to Timothy and the false teachers. If 2:14–3:9 does constitute a larger section, the section would end with an assertion followed by an explanatory sentence using the conjunction γάρ, which is typical for section or subsection conclusions in 1 Timothy. Van Neste's argument also depends on 2:1–13 connecting backward with 1:6–18 as one section, largely incumbent upon semantic chains with reference to eschatology, the message entrusted to Timothy, and the role of suffering that connect the two passages while not continuing into the following material.[11]

It is very plausible, then, that 2:14–3:9 could constitute its own section of material in 2 Timothy; the present project, however, will divide the text into the following four major sections:

---

[9] Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 203–6, 230–31.

[10] Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 206–7, 231.

[11] Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 212–19.

1:3–18, 2:1–26, 3:1–4:8, and 4:9–22. While Van Neste does present a convincing case for his proposed textual divisions, the weight of evidence suggests that 2:1–13 begins a new section, instead of serving as a conclusion to 1:3–18, and that 3:1–9 connects forward with 3:10–4:8 rather than backward with 2:14–26. Beginning in 2:1–13, the major theme of the message, or λόγος, comes to the fore and remains the central focus until the final commands to Timothy as a leader in 4:1–8.[12] This theme finds its first direct, lexical appearance in 2:9, which is then repeated in 2:11 and 15 and contrasted with the message of the false teachers in 2:17. The theme of the faithful message occurs throughout 2:1–26 within the context of teaching/training,[13] thinking and mental activity,[14] hearing/speaking/sound,[15] and the results of the message being either salvation or destruction.[16] In addition to the primary thematic connection, the section transitions and diction suggest that 2:1–26 are held together as one section. The conjunction οὖν in 2:1, combined with the use of the pronoun σύ, the vocative address τέκνον μου, and the topic shift from recollection in 1:15–18 to exhortation with imperative verbs in 2:1-26 appearing together in one transition suggests that 2:1 is a major transition in the letter. The conjunction οὖν, indeed, functions to connect the material in 2:1–13 to the preceding material, but not as a development from 1:15–18.[17] Rather, the οὖν recalls the opening exhortations of 1:6–8[18] and

---

[12] Van Neste does mention this connection between 2:1–13 and 2:14–26, but not as a major factor for understanding the structure of the letter as a whole (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 200, 216–17).

[13] 2 Tim. 2:2, 24–25.

[14] 2 Tim. 2:7, 25–26.

[15] 2 Tim. 2:2, 7, 14, 16, 18, 22.

[16] 2 Tim. 2:10–13, 14, 18, 24–26.

[17] Contra Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 198.

[18] Towner, *Letters*, 488–89, Knight, *Epistles*, 389, and Lenski, *Interpretation*, 777.

1:13–14,[19] resuming the main line of thought following the digressive recollection of 1:15–18. The force of οὖν in this instance is continuative,[20] moving the argument forward rather than simply concluding the previous material. This is also demonstrated in the semantic chain of verbs of memory, with the text urging Timothy to remember (μιμνήσκω) Jesus Christ according to the gospel of Paul and the word of God in 2:8–9, and to remind (ὑπομιμνήσκω) the elect of these things in 2:14; this connects backward to Paul reminding Timothy (ἀναμιμνήσκω) to fan into flame the gift (χάρισμα) of God that was given to him in 1:6 and the grace (χάρις) that will strengthen Timothy in 2:1.[21] Finally, there is a strong *inclusio* with the opening verses of the section in 2:1–2 and the closing verses of the section in 2:24–26, with a thematic connection to the end of the first subsection in 2:11–13. The section opens with Paul commanding Timothy to be strengthened in grace and to pass along the message to faithful people that are able to teach; the section returns to this theme in 2:24–26, with the necessity of leaders to be able to teach and address opposition well, so that, perhaps, opponents might come to a recognition of the truth by God's granting. This then further connects to the poetic material in 2:11–13, which concludes with the assertion that God remains faithful even when people do not, giving the theological connection between 2:1–2 and 2:24–26. These connections suggest that 2:1–26 should be considered one larger section, rather than 2:14–26 beginning a new section.

The second major factor when considering the sectional divisions of 2 Timothy is whether 3:1–9 connects primarily backward with 2:14–26, as Van Neste argues, or forward with 3:10–4:8, as this project will argue. The transitions at both 3:1 and 3:10 could indicate a section shift.

---

[19] Perkins, *Letters*, 177 and Marshall, *Epistles*, 723–24.

[20] Heckert, *Discourse*, 98–100, contra Van Neste, 198 and Perkins, *Letters*, 177.

[21] See Towner for further connections between gift (χάρισμα) in 1:6 and grace (χάρις) in 2:1 (Towner, *Letters*, 489.

In 3:1, the transition is marked by a transitional δέ, a cataphoric τοῦτο pointing forward to an appositive ὅτι clause, an imperative verb introducing a new topic of material, and a shift in genre from exhortation to warning; in 3:10, the transition is marked by a contrastive δέ, a shift in person and focus from false teachers to Timothy, and a genre shift from warning to recollection. The contrastive δέ, however, seems less likely to indicate a major section shift than the transitional δέ; the contrastive δέ, by definition, is anaphoric, connecting the material in its own clause with the material that precedes it. Heckert notes regarding the use of δέ within the PE:

> [E]ven in the context of contrast, I would argue that the major function of δέ is development; for when δέ introduces a proposition that contrasts with the previous proposition, it also builds on the previous proposition. In fact, the contrastive δέ always marks development from less relevant to more relevant material.[22]

The use of δέ in 3:10, then, develops the contrast between the behavior of the false teachers in 3:1–9 and the behavior of Paul and Timothy in 3:10–17; and, with Heckert's observations in mind, relegates the material in 3:1–9 as the background for 3:10–17, rather than serving as the conclusion to 2:14–26. Beyond the opening sentences and transitions, while there are certainly many thematic and semantic connections between 2:14–26 and 3:1–9, as Van Neste helpfully demonstrates,[23] the thematic and semantic connections between 2:1–13 and 2:14–26 as well as between 3:1–9 and 3:10–17 better fit the larger movements of the text. Van Neste is correct that 3:1–9 has many cohesive elements with 2:14–26, including the semantic chains of desire/will,[24] godliness/godlessness,[25] faith in connection with truth,[26] and acceptability in God's eyes.[27] The

---

[22] Heckert, *Discourse*, 47.

[23] Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 201–3, 219–22, 230–31.

[24] 2 Tim. 2:22, 26; 3:2–4, 6.

[25] 2 Tim. 2:16; 3:2, 5.

[26] 2 Tim. 2:15, 18, 22, 25; 3:7–8.

[27] 2 Tim. 2:15; 3:8.

semantic connections, however, are equally strong between 3:1–9 and 3:10–17, including the themes of godliness,[28] learning and teaching,[29] power/ability,[30] advancement,[31] contrasting types of people,[32] and the contrasting use of time between Timothy's life and the false teachers.[33] While there are certainly connections both backward and forward for 3:1–9, as Van Neste helpfully argues, the weight of evidence, especially the use of the contrastive δέ, suggests that 3:1–9 connects forward with 3:10–17 and 4:1–8, giving the four major sections for 2 Timothy as outlined above.

The boundaries for the subsections for 2 Timothy are outlined and defended well in Van Neste, marked by cohesion fields due to semantic chains, verbal referent and syntax, and either developments or changes in topic.[34] The current project will utilize the subsection divisions as outlined by Van Neste, with two minor additions: 2:8–13 will considered a subsection distinct from 2:1–7 and 2:22–26 will be separated from 2:14–21. Van Neste argues that there are no significant shifts in cohesion or transitional markers to differentiate 2:8–13 from 2:1–7.[35] While the transition markers might not be as evident as the other subsection and section shifts, there are several commentators who distinguish 2:8–13 as a separate unit of material.[36] In 2:8, the text of 2

---

[28] 2 Tim. 3:5, 12.

[29] 2 Tim. 3:7, 10, 14, 16.

[30] 2 Tim. 3:5, 7, 15.

[31] 2 Tim. 3:9, 13.

[32] 2 Tim. 3:2–5, 8, 13, 17.

[33] 2 Tim. 3:1, 2–5, 12–13, 15.

[34] For the full presentation of the boundaries and cohesion of the subunits of 2 Timothy, see Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 146–93.

[35] Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 161.

[36] See Marshall, *Epistles*, 722, 731, Towner, *Letters*, 487, 498, Knight, *Epistles*, 388, 396, Lenski, *Interpretation*, 777, 785, and Perkins, *Letters*, 176.

Timothy shifts from a unit of exhortation to Timothy to theological exposition and recollection in relation to the experience of Jesus and Paul with suffering. Structurally, even with the absence of a conjunction, prepositional phrase, or other word group functioning as a distinctive transitional marker, the subsection opens with a main clause followed by a relative clause, which has been common for every transitional sentence preceding it,[37] and asyndeton is not uncommon for transitional statements in 2 Timothy.[38] The ideational shift from commands specifically addressed to Timothy to the examples of Jesus and Paul as the basis for the directive to Timothy and the universal statements of 2:11–13, though, are the most compelling argument for a subsection shift in 2:8.

The view that 2:22 inaugurates a new subsection is less common, but it is not without precedent. The material in 2:22–26 is closely connected to 2:14–21 in themes and content, as Van Neste helpfully argues,[39] and even commentators that separate 2:22–26 from the preceding material concede that the exhortations to Timothy at the end of the chapter either exemplify or generalize the material from 2:14-21.[40] There are transitional shifts in 2:22 that warrant consideration, however. The text moves from a warning about false teachers and a theological exposition back to commands to Timothy specifically. The subsection 2:22–26 structurally parallels 2:14–21, with a set of three initial, and contrasting, commands followed by the rationale for the commands, as Towner also notes.[41] Other transitional indicators are the transitional δέ in

---

[37] 2 Tim. 1:3, 6, 15; 2:1–2. Although, note 2 Tim. 2:13.

[38] 2 Tim. 1:3, 15; 4:1, 14, 16, 19.

[39] Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 173–74.

[40] See Knight, *Epistles*, 409, 419 and Perkins, *Letters*, 199. Marshall also present the relationship between 2:14–21 and 2:22–26 as either an application or generalization of the previous material (Marshall, *Epistles*, 763).

[41] Compare 2 Tim. 2:14–16a with 2:22–24 and 2:16b–21 with 2:25–26. See Towner, *Letters*, 514, 543.

2:22,[42] the shift from third-person verbs and general statements back to specific exhortation to

Timothy, and the topic shift to teaching and the rationale for the way Timothy is being exhorted

to teach, connecting back to the opening commands of 2:1–2. Consequently, the addition of the

subsections 2:8–13 and 2:22–26 to the textual divisions of Van Neste give the section and

subsection units expressed below in Table 4.

Table 4. Sections and Subsections of 2 Timothy.

Section	Subsection	Verses	# of Sentences
α	α-1	1:1-2	2
β	β-1	1:3-5	1
β	β-2	1:6-14	7
β	β-3	1:15-18	5
γ	γ-1	2:1-7	7
γ	γ-2	2:8-13	9
γ	γ-3	2:14-21	8
γ	γ-4	2:22-26	4
δ	δ-1	3:1-9	7
δ	δ-2	3:10-17	5
δ	δ-3	4:1-8	17
ε	ε-1	4:9-13	7
ε	ε-2	4:14-15	3
ε	ε-3	4:16-18	5
ε	ε-4	4:19-22	6

In addition to sectional boundaries and divisions, there are several variant readings in 2

Timothy that warrant discussion, namely, those with significant textual attestation that

potentially impact sentence structures and larger usage patterns. The first such variant occurs in

1:11, where the second hand of Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Claramontanus, the Majority Text, and

---

[42] The use of δέ here is, admittedly, fairly debated. Knight asserts that the δέ indicates a "simple connection" and does not label it as transitional or contrastive (Knight, *Epistles*, 419). Perkins states that the δέ introduces a shift to a new topic, but then says the shift is unclear (Perkins, *Letters*, 199). Heckert includes the δέ of 2:22 within the discussion of the contrastive δέ and argues that even the contrastive δέ is developmental in the PE, but does not discuss the use of the initial δέ, *in ipse*, but concentrates on the second δέ that contrasts the two imperatives (Heckert, *Function*, 48). For this project, the δέ that opens 2:22 is rendered as a developmental, transitional δέ that shifts the text into a new unit of material while maintaining a syntactical and logical connection with the preceding material.

many others include the qualifier ἔθνων following the final noun of the verse, διδάσκαλος. This addition would be appropriate for the style of PE in general, as many lists contain a change in the final element and qualifiers do commonly appear within complement word groups, even those that appear in the nominative case. The other examples from the PE where a qualifier appears on the final elements of the complement in the nominative case, however, do not appear with polysyndeton, as the variant does here. Both Metzger and Elliot argue that the qualifier is not original and was added to parallel 1 Tim. 2:7; they argue that there would be no obvious reason why, if it were original, it would have been omitted by scribes.[43] There are no syntactical reasons why either option would be the more difficult reading, so the argument of Metzger and Elliot is persuasive.

Another variant with impact for sectional analysis is the presence or absence of γάρ in 2:13. Elliott argues that the γάρ is likely unoriginal and was added to remove the asyndeton. Furthermore, he asserts that this is especially the case if the final line of the poetic section is part of the quotation and not the author's own words.[44] The absence of the γάρ, attested by the second hand of Codex Sinaiticus, the Majority Text, and others, including some in Latin, Syriac, Sahidic, and Coptic traditions, could be the original reading. Asyndeton does commonly occur for poetic passages in the PE,[45] but there are also poetic passages that include conjunctions for smoother reading.[46] There also is a textual movement for 2:13b, in that the shift away from a conditional sentence signals the end of the list, but it is not clear whether the final clause is original to the poetic material or added by the author. In the end, this project will disagree with

---

[43] Elliott, *Greek Text*, 121 and Metzger, *Commentary*, 579.

[44] Elliott, *Greek Text*, 43, 135.

[45] 1 Tim. 3:16; 6:11–12, 15–16.

[46] 1 Tim. 2:5–6; 6:7–8, 2 Tim. 1:9–11.

Elliott and take the γάρ to be the original reading. In the larger pattern of the PE, asyndeton would actually better fit poetic style and structure, and it was more likely removed to assimilate to poetic style than be added and, thereby, differ from the more common poetic style.

A third variant with potential impact for this project is the change in 2:14 from the infinitive, λογομαχεῖν, to the imperative form, λογομάχει. This variant reading finds attestation in Codex Alexandrinus, the original hand of Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus, and the Latin tradition, but Elliott argues that the infinitival form is likely original. The infinitive being used the complement of an imperative verb, he argues, is not very common; so, it is more likely that that text was changed to the imperatival form due to the infrequency of the imperatival infinitive.[47] The objective infinitive is not uncommon in the PE, although less likely as the complement of a explicitly finite, imperative verb. In this case, it would be the object of the participle, διαμαρτυρόμενος, which is common for infinitives. The more persuasive argument for why the infinitive is original, in agreement with Elliott's view, is that the imperatival form would be grammatically and structural very awkward for the PE. It would certainly be the more difficult reading, as it would make the phrase μὴ λογομάχει an object, as direct discourse, of the participle. Direct discourse is very uncommon in the PE, and only appears where the discourse is a quotation.[48] The prepositional phrases functioning as qualifiers, also, would be without precedent in the PE if they were modifying a clause of direct discourse functioning as complement. In the end, the infinitival form is very likely the original reading.

The fourth variant warranting discussion occurs in 2:18, where the article, τήν, is modifying the noun ἀνάστασιν as the subject of the infinitive phrase. Metzger notes that the

---

[47] Elliott, *Greek Text*, 137.

[48] 1 Tim. 5:18.

article was included due to "overwhelming textual support," but the brackets were included

because the omission is possibly the original reading.[49] Elliott likewise argues that the article is

likely original. In greater usage of the noun ἀνάστασις in NTG, it does appear with and without

the article, but Elliott notes that NTG includes the article when speaking to the "definite

resurrection of believers," as it does here.[50] Syntactically, there is precedent for the subject word

group of a copulative infinitive clause to have the definite article,[51] but there is no structural

reason why it should be original either. Lexical and semnatic patterns, then, must be the deciding

factor on whether the article was more likely to have been intentionally added or removed. Given

the semantic precedent, the absence of the article would actually be the more difficult reading,

but, as Elliott argues, the presence of the article is likely original, as it better fits broader usage of

the term ἀνάστασις in NTG.

The fifth variant reading with structural implications for 2 Timothy occurs with the

switching of the order for the adverb, εὐσεβῶς, and the infinitive, ζῆν, in 3:12. Both Codices

Sinaiticus and Alexandrinus have the adverb following the infinitive, while many manuscripts,

including the Majority Text, have the adverb preceding the infinitive, as it appears in the NA[28]

text. Elliott agrees with the NA[28] text, arguing that there is no reason for the typical order, as he

calls it, of "adverb-verb" to be abrogated even for an infinitive clause,[52] as does Marshall.[53]

While it is the typical pattern, even with in infinitive clauses, for an adverb to precede the verb it

---

[49] Metzger, *Commentary*, 579–80.

[50] Elliott, *Greek Text*, 139–40.

[51] 1 Tim. 6:5.

[52] Elliott, *Greek Text*, 153–54.

[53] Marshall, *Epistles*, 782.

modifies throughout the PE,[54] there is precedent for the adverb to follow an infinitive, and would make the variant reading, which is the more difficult reading, more plausible. It is more likely that editors moved the adverb to the expected syntactical pattern than for editors to have intentionally moved it to a syntactically unusual arrangement, so the variant reading, supported by both Codices Sinaiticus and Alexandrinus, will be considered the likely original reading.

The final variant reading with significant textual support and import for structural analysis is found in 2 Tim. 3:15, where Codex Sinaiticus, the original hand of Codex Claramontanus, the Coptic tradition, and Clement omit the article τά modifying ἱερὰ γράμματα. Elliot argues that the article is original to the text, as it is the standard way for referring to the Hebrew Scriptures in the era of NTG, including sources such as Philo and Josephus.[55] It could have been added to match the adjectival phrase that follows, but this addition would not be stylistically necessary. There are examples in the PE where an anarthrous noun is modified by an arthrous adjectival participle,[56] examples where the noun and adjectival participle in repeat position match in grammatical definiteness,[57] and other examples where the adjectival participle is in "sandwich" position between the article and the noun.[58] The absence of the article would still be the most difficult reading, as references to the Hebrew Scriptures include the article in the greater use of Koine Greek, but it also makes it unlikely that the original author would have omitted the article. For this project, then, the article will be considered the original reading of the text.

---

[54] In 1 Timothy, the adverb appears before its governing infinitive twice (1 Tim. 2:9) and one time in Titus (Titus 3:12). There is one explicit occasion where the adverb appears after its governing infinitive in 2 Timothy (2 Tim. 4:9), but the adverb also appears before the verb (2 Tim. 2:18).

[55] Elliott, *Greek Text*, 155.

[56] 1 Tim. 4:8; 6:17, 2 Tim. 1:9, 14.

[57] 1 Tim. 6:13, 2 Tim. 3:6, Titus 1:9.

[58] 1 Tim. 1:10, 2 Tim. 4:3, Titus 2:1.

In 2 Timothy, transitions between and across the five sections, with fifteen subsections, show some consistent structural and syntactical tendencies. Although nothing conclusive can be established with such limitations on the data, the evident tendencies and patterns provide a helpful means of comparison within the PE and within 2 Timothy itself. As with the analysis of 1 Timothy, the examination of the sections and subsections of 2 Timothy will focus on structural and syntactical indicators. Semantic chains and lexical concerns, as presented by Van Neste, will be included as they pertain to the larger patterns of the text. The following table shows the section and subsection transitions for the letter that form the basis of the section analysis.

Table 5. Section and Subsection Transitions in 2 Timothy.

Transition Type	Verse	Transition	Transition Markers
Section	1:03	α-1 → β-1	asyndeton, topic change
Subsection	1:06	β-1 → β-2	δι'ἣν αἰτίαν, topic change
Subsection	1:15	β-2 → β-3	asyndeton, τοῦτο (cataphoric), genre change
Section	2:01	β-4 → γ-1	οὖν, Σύ, vocative address, topic and genre change
Subsection	2:08	γ-1 → γ-2	asyndeton, topic change
Subsection	2:14	γ-2 → γ-3	ταῦτα, topic change
Subsection	2:22	γ-3 → γ-4	δέ, topic change
Section	3:01	γ-4 → δ-1	δέ, τοῦτο (cataphoric), topic and genre change
Subsection	3:10	δ-1 → δ-2	δέ, Σύ, topic change
Subsection	4:01	δ-2 → δ-3	asyndeton, topic change
Section	4:09	δ-3 → ε-1	asyndeton, topic and genre change
Subsection	4:14	ε-1 → ε-2	asyndeton, topic change
Subsection	4:16	ε-2 → ε-3	asyndeton, topic change
Subsection	4:19	ε-3 → ε-4	asyndeton, topic change

The first major transition in 2 Timothy occurs where the text shifts from the opening salutation, section α, into the first section of the main body of the letter, section β, in 1:3. The opening subsection, β-1, is itself one complex sentence with many hypotactic and rank-shifted clauses, and functions as the transition into the main body. Although the transition is asyndeton, the primary, kernel clause is enough to signal the topic and section shift to the opening

176

thanksgiving without the need for additional conjunctions, prepositional phrases, or other

transitional devices. [59] The transitional sentence begins with a paratactic clause that includes a

relative clause, followed by an HC-Cj, signaled by the adverb ὡς, that, in itself, includes several

other hypotactic and rank-shifted clauses. While there are a few section and subsection

transitions that include a hypotactic clause proper following the main clause,[60] it is a common

feature of such transitions in 2 Timothy that the main clause will include either a relative clause

or rank-shifted ὅτι clause.[61] As with 1 Timothy, asyndeton is also a common transitional device,

most prominently in sections of command or exhortation.[62] The transitional sentence for section

β is then followed by a sentence of exhortation in 1:6; even though the exhortation in 1:6 is in

itself another subsection transition, it is a common feature of 2 Timothy that section and

subsection transitions are followed by further exhortation, commands, or wishes.[63] Explanation,

like in 1 Timothy, also commonly follows transitional sentences, either with an explicit marker

of explanation, such as γάρ or διὰ τοῦτο,[64] or expository statements that further explain or defend

the transitional sentence.[65] Since there is only one sentence in 1:3–5, the transitional sentence is

also the final sentence of the subsection, needing further subsections to establish any syntactical

---

[59] Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 146–47.

[60] 2 Tim. 1:3; 2:8, 14.

[61] 2 Tim. 1:3, 6, 15; 2:1; 3:1, 10.

[62] 2 Tim. 1:3; 2:8; 4:1, 9, 14, 19. Although, they do also occur in transitions to subsections of recollection (see 2 Tim. 1:15 and 4:16).

[63] 2 Tim. 1:3, 15; 2:1, 14, 22; 4:1, 16. The cases where the opening sentence is also a command or exhortation are prominent and the two occurrences where second sentence is a wish, using the optative case, both follow an opening giving a recollection.

[64] 2 Tim. 1:7; 2:10; 3:2; 4:10. In every case where the second sentence is explanatory, the transitional sentence is an exhortation (1:6) or a command (2:8–9; 3:1; 4:9).

[65] 2 Tim. 3:12; 4:14–15, 20. Two of these cases follow an opening sentence giving a recollection (3:10–11 and 4:14), but one follows a command (4:19).

patterns prior to section or subsection shifts. In this opening section of the main body of the letter, the major themes and semantic chains are introduced that will be developed further throughout the letter: sincere faith and confidence,[66] passing along the faith,[67] time and eschatology,[68] suffering and shame,[69] and the contrast of opponents and proper church leadership.[70] Not only within the opening subsection, but the whole of the opening section, β,

---

[66] The word family including πίστις, πιστός, and πιστεύω are used twelve times in the letter. While not as prominent of a theme as it was in 1 Timothy, the ideas of sincere faith (ἀνυπόκριτος πίστις in 1:5), preserving the sound faith (1:13; 3:15; 4:7, contra 2:18; 3:8), and the combination of faith with confidence (1:5, 12) are raised in this section and continue throughout the letter. The combination of πίστος or πιστεύω with πείθω provides an underlying connection between Timothy's faith and Paul's faith, and it is noteworthy that the adjectival form, πιστός, only occurs within 2:1–13, before the contrast with false teachers in 2:14–21.

[67] While the lexemes and semantic domains might shift, the theme of passing along the faith, whether from Paul to Timothy (1:6, 13; 2:2, 8; 3:10–11, 14), Paul's mother and grandmother to Timothy (1:5), or Timothy to others (2:1–2, 14), is prominent in 2 Timothy. This also includes the use of the μιμνήσκομαι and μνημονεύω families of words (1:3, 4, 5; 2:8, 14), which appear five times in chapters 1 and 2 to connect what Paul remembers about Timothy to what Paul calls Timothy to pass along to others. The content being taught and passed, especially through the word families of εὐαγγέλιον, λόγος, διδασκαλία, and ἀλήθεια, also appears frequently throughout the whole main body of the letter, and is outlined very helpfully by Van Neste (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 216–17).

[68] The connection between God has done in the past, life now, and the eschaton in especially prominent in 2 Timothy. Already in 1:3–5, there are two connections between past and present: the first in relation to Paul's upbringing (ἀπὸ προγόνων) and his present worship (χαριν ἔχω and ἔχω τὴν μνείαν νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας), and second between the indwelling faith of Timothy's elders and now in him also. This is then coupled with multiple references to past (1:6, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15) and present (1:6, 8, 10, 12, 14) along with the eschaton later in section β, with the mention of life and immortality (ζωήν and ἀφθαρσίαν) in 1:10 and the eschaton itself (ἐκεῖνη ἡμέρα) in 1:12, 18. A full list is not necessary to further the point, but see Van Neste's helpful discussion about eschatology in 2 Timothy (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 212–13) or in Towner (Towner, *Letters*, 59–62, 65–67).

[69] The πάσχω family of verbs appear five times throughout the letter (1:8, 12; 2:3, 9; 4:5), and the noun appears once also (3:11). Out of the three occurrences of the verb ἐπαισχύνομαι (1:8, 12, 16), twice it appears explicitly in connection with suffering (1:8, 12). The adjectival form, ἀνεπαίστυντος, appears in 2:15 also as a contrast to the false teachers. In the middle sections of the letter, persecution is also mentioned, both in verbal (3:12) and nominal form (3:11), as well as endurance in connection with difficulties (ὑπομένω in 2:10, 12, ὑπομονή in 3:10, and ὑποφέρω in 3:11).

[70] As with the theme of passing on the faith, the lexemes and semantic domains for this theme vary throughout the letter, but there is a strong and recurring contrast between Timothy, Paul's example, and the example of Jesus and the behavior and conduct of opponents and false teachers. As Van Neste rightly notes, this contrast does not come to the fore until after 2:14, but the theme is already introduced in this opening section with the mention of Timothy's sincere faith (1:5), the example of the sound words that Timothy has received (1:13), Paul's example even in abandonment (1:15–18), and the connection of Paul's and Timothy's present conduct with the results in the eschaton (1:12, 18). This establishes a contrast with the letter's opponents and false teachers, who pervert and are unfit for the faith (2:18; 3:8), promote "their own word" (2:17) over the sounds words (1:13; 4:3) and the word of truth (2:15, 18; 3:8; 4:4), provide an example that brings corruption (2:14, 18; 3:6, 13; 4:4), and will face the consequences for their actions (2:16; 3:9; 4:14). See Van Neste for more investigation into this recurring theme, especially with regard to the different diction and semantic domains connected to it (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 219–24).

introduces the major transitional devices, syntax, and thematic elements that will appear throughout the rest of the letter.

This opening section of 2 Timothy not only introduces major themes and transition patterns that will persist throughout the letter, but includes three subsections that also demonstrate recurring tendencies and syntactical patterns. The opening subsection, β-1, is handled above, and the first subsection transition within section β, from β-1 to β-2, occurs in 1:6. Here the text moves from the thanksgiving that opens the main body of the letter to a section of exhortation focused on the larger topic of suffering for the Gospel. The transition is marked by the prepositional phrase δι' ἣν αἰτίαν and the topic change of thanksgiving and recollection to exhortation to suffering and following Paul's example. The phrase δι' ἣν αἰτίαν, functioning as a causal connective device,[71] only occurs twice in 2 Timothy, connecting this opening exhortation to Timothy with Paul's own experience of suffering for the Gospel in 1:12 and the call to emulate him in 1:13–14, and is the only time in 2 Timothy where a prepositional phrase explicitly serves as a transitional device.[72] The opening sentence includes an exhortative verb in the indicative mood and a relative clause, followed by an explanatory sentence with the conjunction γάρ, both of which are common for transitional statements in 2 Timothy.[73] The subsection then ends in 1:13–14 with two imperative clauses that echo the faith and confidence of Paul in 1:12; although an imperative clause is not common for the end of a section or

---

[71] Knight, *Epistles*, 370 and Lenski, *Interpretation*, 752–53.

[72] Van Neste mentions the shift in verbal forms and participant fields as markers of transition in 1:6, but does not mention the use of the prepositional phrase as pertinent to the discussion of structural transition (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 148–49). While the solitary use of the prepositional phrase might support those who do not see a transition in 1:6 (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 148), Van Neste is correct the shift signaled by the change in content and participants in 1:6 is sufficient to denote a new subsection of material.

[73] See notes 62 and 64 above.

subsection in 2 Timothy,[74] in this case it serves to form an *inclusio* for the passing on of the faith from Paul to Timothy in 1:6-7.[75] The second subsection shift with section β, from β-2 to β-3, occurs in 1:15, where the same topic continues from β-2 but the genre changes from exhortation to an historical recollection. This transition is accompanied by asyndeton, but there is also a postpositive, cataphoric demonstrative pronoun, τοῦτο, pointing forward to the ὅτι that follows.[76] The transitional sentence is followed by an optative wish,[77] and the final sentence of the subsection, and the larger section, consists of an expository sentence that also functions as an *inclusio* for the section and the subsection. This *inclusio* includes explicit diction, with related terms being used from within the same semantic domain, such as γινώσκω in 1:18 linking back to οἶδα in 1:15[78] and διακονέω in 1:18 linking back to λατρεύω in 1:3,[79] as well as the subsection returning to the larger themes raised in the opening subsection, specifically those of time and the

---

[74] The only other time a subsection in 2 Timothy ends with an imperative command is during the final exhortations of the letter of subsection ε-1 in 4:13. Subsection γ-4 also ends with a command in 2:24–26, but via the impersonal verb δεῖ that serves also to give the rationale and explanation for the commands that preceded throughout section γ.

[75] The mention of the gift of God being in Timothy through Paul's hands occurs in 1:6, which is then followed by the same verbs being used both for Paul's faith in 1:12 and for Timothy's faith in 1:13–14. The gift in 1:6 is then explained to the Spirit in 1:7, which is brought up again in 1:14, although shifting from Timothy alone in 1:6 and 1:13 to a plural audience in 1:7 and 1:14. The role of Paul comes up in both places, in 1:6 and 1:13, the noun ἀγάπη occurs in both 1:7 and 1:13, and the participle, τοῦ ἐνοικοῦντες, in 1:14 recalls the faith of Timothy mentioned in 1:5, which also serves as the referent for the opening prepositional phrase, δι' ἣν αἰτίαν, of 1:6.

[76] Demonstrative pronouns that occur for transitions in 1 Timothy are solely anaphoric and typically plural. While this does occur in 2 Tim. 2:1 and 2:14, it is not a common transitional device for the letter, and both 1:15 and 3:1 feature a singular, cataphoric demonstrative followed by an appositive ὅτι clause, signaling a transition forward. Van Neste describes this phraseology as transitional in nature and likely an "epistolary disclosure formula" (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 158).

[77] An optative wish occurs as the second sentence of a subsection both here and in 4:16.

[78] L-N, §28.1, 334.

[79] L-N, §53.14, 533 and §53.66, 541.

eschatology,[80] the passing on of the faith as it pertains to individuals within households,[81] and

suffering and shame.[82]

The text moves from the first section of the main body, β, to the section γ in 2:1,

accompanied by many indicators of transition within the letter. The transitional sentence includes

the continuative yet transitional use of οὖν as presented above, the explicit subjective pronoun Σύ

with a vocative address,[83] and a shift in topic from suffering for the Gospel to Timothy's role in

passing the faithful word to other leaders.[84] While the opening clause of the transitional sentence

consists only of a paratactic clause, the second clause of the compound sentence includes two

relative clauses: one functioning as the antecedent for the direct object of the clause, and the

other as a qualifier modifying the indirect object. The sentence that follows mirrors the

imperative tense of the transitional sentence, and marks the beginning of the use of imperative

clauses following the initial clause of a subsection for sections γ and δ.[85] The final sentence of the

---

[80] Paul connects the past behavior of Onesiphorus in 1:16–17 with a blessing for the eschaton in 1:18, just as his worship that derives from his ancestors (1:3) and present devotion (1:3, 11–12) give him confidence for the eschaton (1:14). See also Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 213, although he does not explicitly link the connection between confidence in the eschaton and past and present behavior, as Paul presents it here.

[81] Just as passing on the sincere faith in described for Timothy in 1:5, the blessing that Paul wishes for Onesiphorus in the final subsection also pertains to his entire household in 1:16. This connection is not explicitly mentioned in Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 225–29. The debate about whether Onesiphorus is living or deceased (see Marshall, *Epistles*, 718–19 and Lenski, *Interpretation*, 773–76), does impact this discussion, as the blessing would simply be an expression of comfort unrelated to the passing on of the faith if Onesiphorus is deceased. With Lenski, the view of this project, especially in light of the optative wish in 1:18, is that 1:16 is not an expression of condolence, but a blessing to Onesiphorus that spills over, so to speak, to his entire household.

[82] While the theme of suffering and shame is prominent in 1:15–18 with the use of ἀποστρέφω and ἐπαισχύνομαι, the opening subsection does provide the foundation for the theme, more explicitly included in 1:8–12, by describing a sincere faith and a clean conscience as the referent and background for 1:6, as well as the connection of tears (δάκρυον) and the joy (χαρά) in 1:4.

[83] On the transitional nature of the conjunction οὖν, personal pronoun, and the vocative address, in addition to the argument above, see also Towner, *Letters*, 488 and Perkins, *Letters*, 177.

[84] The anaphoric demonstrative ταῦτα does appear in 2:1 as well, but not explicitly as a transitional marker, as the referent for ταῦτα is not material of the previous section or subsection, but the relative clause that immediately precedes it.

[85] 2 Tim. 2:15, 23; 4:2.

subsection in 2:7b also marks the first occurrence of subsection ending with an explanatory sentence using γάρ, which will continue throughout the letter.[86] While there is some possible semantic connection between 2:7 and 2:1–2, including the mention of Timothy hearing things from Paul (ἀκούω) in 2:2 followed by the command to think (νοέω) about what Paul is saying (λέγω) in 2:7[87] and the connection between gift (χάρισμα) in 2:1 and giving (δίδωμι) in 2:7,[88] there is not the same explicit *inclusio* for this subsection as there has been for previous subsections.

The section γ contains three subsection transitions in addition to the section shift in 2:1. The subsection transition from γ-1 to γ-2 in 2:8 is accompanied by asyndeton and a topic change from Timothy passing the word to other leaders to the content of the faithful word. While it is not modifying the paratactic clause proper, the supplementary participle clause functioning as the complement of the main clause includes a relative clause. The following sentence in 2:9 is explanatory, signaled by the prepositional phrase διὰ τοῦτο, which functions both anaphorically, recalling the content of the proclamation in 2:8, and cataphorically, anticipating the ἵνα clause of purpose to follow. The subsection then ends with a poetic section in 2:11–13, concluding with an explanatory γάρ clause.[89] The second subsection transition from γ-2 to γ-3 in 2:14 occurs with multiple transitional indicators, including a topic change from the content of the faithful word in γ-2 to the contrast of the results of word of truth with the opponents of the letter in γ-3, an anaphoric, plural demonstrative pronoun recalling the previous material but signaling a forward

---

[86] 2 Tim. 2:7, 13; 3:9; 4:15. This phenomenon never, however, marks the end of a section in 2 Timothy.

[87] L-N §32.1–2, 380, L-N §24.52, 282–3 with §31.56, 373, §33.212, 412, and §33.69, 397.

[88] L-N §57.103, 569 and L-N §57.71, 566.

[89] If, as argued in this project, 2:14 begins a subsection and not a larger section, then this continues the tendency established in 1 Timothy that poetic or doxological sections regularly end subsections.

shift,[90] and a genre shift back from the recollection and poetic sections of γ-2 to personal

commands in γ-3. The following sentence is another sentence of command with an imperative

verb with a switch in sentence structure from the opening sentence,[91] and the closing sentence of

the subsection is an expository conditional sentence indicating a future more vivid construction.[92]

The final sentence directly recalls the semantic domain of the beginning of the subsection,

presenting the proper teacher of the faith as "of good use" (εὔχρηστος), in contrast to false

teachers who engage in disputes of words (λογομαχέω), which is "useful for nothing" (ἐπ' οὐδὲν

χρήσιμος), thus creating an *inclusio* for the subsection. The final subsection shift to γ-4 in 2:22

shifts the genre back from exposition to personal command, uses a transitional δέ, and signals a

shift in topic and participant field from the contrast of the faithful words and false teachers to the

personal conduct of Timothy, as a faithful leader, and the purpose for such conduct.[93] The

primary sentence is a compound sentence with contrasting imperative clauses, both in content

---

[90] This is the singular use of the pronoun ταῦτα in this manner for 2 Timothy, which serves as a common transitional indicator for 1 Timothy.

[91] The initial sentence follows a C-P pattern, which would be expected for cases where a pronoun functions as the complement of an imperative verb, while the following sentence evinces a P-C pattern. While this would be expected, given that the complement of the verb is a rank-shifted infinitive clause with a compound complement word group, both times that an imperative command with a complement directly follows an opening sentence with a complement and an imperative command (2:14–15 and 2:22–23), there is a shift in sentence structure.

[92] Voelz, *Grammar*, 249–50.

[93] Perkins notes that this δέ signals the shift to a new topic, but is unclear on whether this begins a new subsection or signals a continuation of the prior material (Perkins, *Letters*, 199). Van Neste argues that, indeed, 2:22–26 is a continuation of 2:13–21, with a return to a focus on Timothy after a diversion in 2:19–21, and that the thematic connections, especially the themes of avoiding evil, righteousness, and foolishness, favor keeping it together with 2:13–21 (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 173–74). While acknowledging the semantic and thematic connections as presented by Van Neste, the participant shift is not simply a return to Timothy and false teachers again. Timothy is contrasted with false teachers specifically in 2:14–18, with both functioning as grammatical subjects within the participant field. Here, however, Timothy, God, and the devil are the principal actors, with "those who oppose" serving as secondary actors in a larger, cosmic struggle. Furthermore, the use of δέ is not discussed in Van Neste, as it will serve as a transitional indicator in the next two subsection shifts also (3:1, 10). The semantic cohesion of 2:22–26 can be maintained without necessitating that is remain with 2:13–21 as one unit of text, and the shift in participants, change in topic, and use of δέ signal that this is a shift within the text.

and in structure.[94] The following sentence continues with another personal command, but switches sentence structure once more and includes a hypotactic clause to signal the end of the string of commands.[95] The final sentence of the subsection and the larger section is a complex sentence of command, opening with an impersonal δεῖ clause following by a hypotactic μήποτε clause giving the rationale for the command. The final sentence of the section explicitly recalls the semantic domain of desire from 2:22[96] and chooses a verb, παιδεύω, with related semantic connections to youth or youthfulness (νεωτερικός).[97] In addition to being an *inclusio* for the subsection γ-4, the final sentence explicitly returns to language of teaching,[98] as well as thematic connections to the role of God and a contrast between what proper teaching looks like between faithful men (2:2) and those who oppose such teaching (2:25).[99] In this way, the final sentence

---

[94] See the discussion of the "flee/pursue" structure in Marshall, *Epistles,* 657 and Towner, *Letters*, 408, 543. As with 1 Tim. 6:11, the two clauses are joined by a contrastive δέ and follow opposing structures, with the first being a C-P clause and the second being a P-C-A clause. The first clause has a single nominal group as the complement, which would be expected to precede an imperative verb, while second clause has an asyndeton, compound complement following the predicator and includes a prepositional phrase following the list. In both cases, however, the complement appears in the expected position.

[95] The second clause of 2:22 follows a P-C-A pattern, while the following sentence, with another contrastive δέ, switches back to a C-P structure. The basis for the final command is given with a causal participle clause in hypotaxis before the text moves into a more generalized final command, using the impersonal verb δεῖ, in 2:24–26.

[96] The lexeme θέλημα that concludes the section connects back with ἐπιθυμία in 2:22 (L-N, §25.2, 289 with §25.12, 290 and §25.20, 291).

[97] While the verb itself connotes teaching or discipline in this context (L-N §33.226, 414 or §36.10, 467), the family is connected to the idea of early age or youthfulness (L-N, §67.153, 649), which connects also with the lexeme νεωτερικός (L-N, §67.155, 649). If, as Van Neste asserts, 2:24–26 concludes a subsection that begins at 2:14, the final sentence also connects backward with the lexeme λογομαχεῖν in 2:14 with the mention of quarrels (μάχα) in 2:23 and the verb μάχομαι in 2:24, thereby still creating an *inclusio* for such a subsection.

[98] The verbal form διδάξαι is used in 2:2, while the adjective διδακτικόν is used in 2:24. In addition to the διδάσκω word family, παιδεύω is also used within the same semantic field, albeit with a nuance of correction or discipline (L-N §33.224, 413–4 and §33.233, 415 for the διδάσκω family, compared to L-N §33.226, 414 and §36.10, 467 for παιδεύω).

[99] In the opening of the section, it is the grace of Christ Jesus that strengthens Timothy, and at the end the role of God is highlighted in bringing opponents to repentance. Similarly, at the opening of the section, when working with faithful people, the leader's role is to pass along the faithful word to them to present to others. At the end of the section, the role of the leader, when working with those who oppose sound teaching, to teach and discipline with gentleness. In this way, even in the absence of explicit verbal connections, the themes and participants of the final sentence recall those of the opening of the section.

and subsection both serve as an *inclusio* for the larger section.

The text of 2 Timothy moves into section δ in 3:1, accompanied by a transitional δέ[100] and shift in topic from the purpose of faithful teaching to warning about the struggles of the end times and those who continue to oppose sound teaching. In addition to these structural indicators, the use of the cataphoric singular demonstrative pronoun, τοῦτο, which points ahead to the ὅτι clause, serves a transitional marker.[101] The use of the ὅτι clause also signals the first time that a rank-shifted, finite clause is used to modify the main clause for a transitional sentence since 2:1, and is the final occurrence of a string of transitional sentences with an imperative verb.[102] An explanatory sentence, with γάρ, follows this opening sentence, which is common for section transitions,[103] and the subsection also ends with an explanatory γάρ clause in 3:9b, which is the third of four appearances of this phenomenon in 2 Timothy.[104] The final sentence also hearkens back to the opening verb; the use of ἄνοια in 3:9 in reference to the false teachers contrasts Paul's command, using γινώσκω, for Timothy to understand the current time.[105] The second

---

[100] Knight asserts that δέ functions contrastively here (Knight, *Epistles*, 428). While there might be some implicit contrast between the behavior commanded in 2:22–23 and the behavior depicted in 3:1–9, the δέ here functions mainly as a transition into a new yet related topic, as argued by Lenski, *Interpretation*, 820 and Perkins, *Letters*, 204.

[101] Van Neste adds that the use of the pronoun along with δέ and γινώσκε is a common transitional marker (Van Neste, *Cohesian*, 174) in ancient letters. This is the second of two occurrences of the cataphoric demonstrative in 2 Timothy, which only appears as a transitional indicator in 2 Tim. 1:15 and 3:1 and in Titus 1:5 as the complement of a prepositional phrase that points ahead to a ἵνα clause.

[102] See the transitional sentences for γ-1 in 2:1, γ-2 in 2:8, γ-3 in 2:14, and γ-4 in 2:22.

[103] In 2 Timothy this will appear again in 4:9. It is a common feature for 1 Timothy, as well, and will appear again in Titus 1:5 and 3:1.

[104] 2 Tim. 2:7b, 13b; 3:9b; 4:15b.

[105] The noun ἄνοια lies within the semantic domain of understanding (L-N, §32.51, 387), which is also one of the semantic fields of γινώσκω in 3:1 (L-N, §32.16, 382). While the base meaning of γινώσκω is within the semantic realm of knowledge (L-N, §28.1, 334), here γινώσκω moves beyond mere knowledge, contra the use οἶδα in 1:15, and encourages Timothy to understand or comprehend the current situation and what it means for his task as a church leader (see Knight, *Epistles*, 428 and Lenski, *Interpretation*, 820).

185

subsection transition from δ-1 to δ-2 in 3:10 includes a contrastive δέ,[106] the personal pronoun Σύ, and a topic change from warning about the end times to Paul's exhortation for Timothy to remain in the faithful word. The combination of the contrastive δέ with the personal pronoun, Σύ, also appears in 1 Tim. 6:11, which is another subsection transition. While the predicator is an indicative verb, the context suggests that Paul is not primarily recollecting Timothy's past behavior but exhorting him to continued faithfulness, making this primarily a subsection of exhortation.[107] The opening sentence is followed by an expository sentence with a conjunctive δέ and the final sentence of the subsection, 3:16–17, is another expository sentence ending with a hypotactic ἵνα clause of purpose.[108] The final paratactic clause, as an *inclusio*, recalls the topic of teaching,[109] linking the teaching that Timothy has already followed with the source for continued faithful teaching, which will then form the basis for the exhortations in 4:1–5. While the transition is 4:1 is asyndeton, the final subsection shift for section δ includes a topic change from the faithful word to personal exhortations to Timothy as a church leader and the use of διαμαρτύρομαι.[110] This opening exhortation is followed by the fourth time that an imperative clause functions as the second sentence of a subsection in 4:2, and in this case there are multiple imperative clauses in asyndeton. The larger section then ends in 4:8 with an expository statement

---

[106] Perkins asserts that this δέ is mainly transitional, marking a new topic in the letter (Perkins, *Letters*, 213), but, along with the majority of commentators, here it is rendered as primarily contrastive, and all the more with the presence of emphatic personal pronoun (Knight, *Epistles*, 438, Lenski, *Interpretation*, 831, Towner, *Letters*, 570, and Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 178).

[107] See Towner, *Letters*, 570–71 or Marshall, *Epistles*, 783.

[108] While this is the only time a subsection ends with a ἵνα clause in 2 Timothy, it is a common phenomenon for the other PE (1 Tim. 1:18–20; 3:7; 5:16; 6:19 and Titus 1:9; 2:10; 3:7, 14).

[109] The lexeme διδασκαλία is used in both 3:10 and 3:16.

[110] Albeit as a participle, the verb διαμαρτύρομαι was used for the transitional sentence in 2:14 as well. The repeated use of specific lexemes for section and subsection transitions, common in 1 Timothy, is not as frequent for 2 Timothy.

that functions as the final culmination of both Paul's own ministry and the main content of the letter. This is not only indicated explicitly by the adverbial use of λοιπόν, but the reference forward to the final result of Paul's ministry and, by extension, that of Timothy.[111] The final sentence forms an *inclusio* for the subsection with a return to the role of Jesus as judge and the day of his manifestation,[112] as well as for the section with a contrast between the time and final days for those apart from God and what awaits Paul all who love the appearing of Jesus.[113]

The final section of material in 2 Timothy, consisting of final greetings and closing instructions, begins in 4:9. The transition from section δ to section ε is asyndeton, but accompanied by a topic shift from final commands to Timothy as church leader and expository statements about the return of Jesus to travel concerns and personal commands to Timothy as travelling companion. The opening sentence, including an imperative command, is followed by an explanatory γάρ sentence giving the rationale for the opening command.[114] The opening subsection concludes with another imperative travel command to Timothy, also using the verb ἔρχομαι as an *inclusio* for the travel plans.[115] The text shifts from ε-1 to ε-2 in 4:14 by changing topics to Paul's warning about Alexander. This shift, as with all subsection shifts in section ε, is

---

[111] Towner, *Letters*, 614–15.

[112] See the use of κριτής in 4:8 with κρίνω in 4:1 and the repeated use of the phrase "τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν αὐτοῦ" in 4:1 and 4:8.

[113] The lexeme καιρός is used both for the admonition in 3:1 and for the time of Paul's departure in 4:6, especially in contrast to the last days (ἔσχαται ἡμέραι) in 3:1 and the return of Jesus "on that day" (ἐκείνη ἡ ἡμέρα) in 4:8.

[114] This the third time where an explanatory γάρ is the second sentence a sectional shift (1:7; 3:2–5; 4:10). In the first two instances, the predicator appears first in the sentence, with the complement and subject following (1:7; 3:2–5); here in 4:10, however, both the subject and complement of the sentence precede the predicator, giving a sentence structure shift for this final occurrence.

[115] Other verbs of travel were used within the section, including πορεύομαι (4:10) and ἀποστέλλω (4:12), but ἔρχομαι is only used for the opening (4:9) and closing (4:12) sentences of subsection ε-1, specifically in reference to Timothy's travel.

asyndeton, but the change in both topic and participants signals a textual shift.[116] The opening

sentence, an expository sentence giving a recollection, is followed by a sentence expressing a

future wish, yet using an indicative verb in the future tense to express certainty.[117] The subsection

ends with a personal command to Timothy followed by an explanatory γάρ clause giving further

rationale for the command to Timothy. While there is not an explicit verbal *inclusio*, the final

sentence recalls the actions of Alexander again in 4:15b, which were first expressed in 4:14a.

The textual shift from ε-2 to ε-3 in 4:16 is asyndeton, but signaled by a topic and genre change.

After warning Timothy about Alexander, the text continues by recounting Paul's first defense,

giving a subsection that recalls God's rescue and ends with a doxological benediction. After the

opening sentence of recollection, using indicative verbs, the second sentence is an optative

wish.[118] The subsection ends with a compound sentence using future indicative verbs, giving

expository statements that also carry the force of a confident future wish.[119] This wish is followed

by a relative clause giving a doxology, a feature also used in 1 Timothy to close a subsection

following an assertion of God's work of salvation to come.[120] The final subsection shift in 4:19

closes the letter by giving the final blessings and personal greetings. The subsection opens with

Paul's instruction for Timothy to greet others on his behalf, using an imperative command. This

is followed by exposition about travel and a final travel command for Timothy, ending with an

---

[116] Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 191.

[117] Towner, *Letters*, 631–32.

[118] This same sequence occurs in 1:15–16.

[119] Marshall, *Epistles*, 825–26 and Knight, *Epistles*, 471–72.

[120] See 1 Tim. 1:16–17, 6:13–16. This is also one of only two occurrences in 2 Timothy where a subsection ends with a relative clause. The opening subsection of the main body of the letter, β-1, ends with a relative clause concerning the sincere faith of Timothy in 1:5. At the end of the letter, this penultimate subsection, after asserting God's continued providence for Paul, ends with a relative clause of praise to God in 4:18.

expository statement, sharing greetings to Timothy from others.[121] The letter then concludes with two final blessings: one for Timothy in the singular, and one for the church community in the plural. The second blessing is verbatim with 1 Tim. 6:21b and only slightly different than Titus 3:15b, but the first blessing does not have a parallel in the PE or other Pauline literature. While the final prepositional phrase of the first blessing does occur in other Pauline blessings, elsewhere it is always plural and is not followed a second blessing.[122] While the implications of the content of the first blessing for authorship or source considerations are beyond this project,[123] it does provide a difference in structure and content from the other PE.

The final section, ε, as a whole serves to recall many major themes and semantic chains from the opening section, β, of the main body, thereby serving as an *inclusio* for the letter. The letter ends by returning to the themes of salvation,[124] proclaiming the word,[125] keeping the faith,[126]

---

[121] While it is not the most common for instructions and other material to interrupt the greetings, it does occur in other Pauline discourse, such as in Rom. 16:16–23 or Col. 4:10–17. In this case, the command to greet others precedes the greetings that Paul is sending from others (see Rom. 16:3–23; 2 Cor. 13:12; and Phil. 4:21–22), but this pattern is flexible in the Pauline Corpus (cf. 1 Cor. 16:19–20 and Col. 4:10–17). What is noteworthy, however, is not that 2 Timothy follows the greetings patterns of other Pauline literature, but that Titus follows the opposite structure, with the indicative verbal clause preceding the imperative command (Titus 3:15).

[122] Gal. 6:18; Phil. 4:23; Phlm. 25.

[123] See Knight, *Epistles*, 478, Marshall, *Epistles*, 830–31, or Towner, *Letters*, 655–56,

[124] Compare the use of ῥύομαι and σῴζω in 4:18 with the proclamation that Jesus saved us (σῴζω) in 1:9 and is savior (σωτήρ) in 1:10, and the assertion of Paul's confidence that God will preserve him until the eschaton in 1:12.

[125] Paul's role as a herald (κῆρυξ) and teacher (διδάσκαλος) is stated in 1:12, along with his assertion that his teaching to Timothy included the testimony of the Lord (τὸ μαρτύριον) in 1:8 and the sounds words (ὑγιαίνοντοι λόγοι) of the faith that Timothy heard (ἀκούω) in 1:13. Paul then later recounts that, by the Lord's help, the proclamation (κήρυγμα) is being fulfilled and all the nations are hearing (ἀκούω) in 4:17.

[126] Paul asserts that God will guard (φυλάσσω) his deposit until the eschaton in 1:12, followed by a command to Timothy to guard (φύλασσω) his deposit also in 1:14. Timothy is then warned to be on guard (φυλάσσω) against Alexander because of his opposition to the words of Paul and his companions in 4:15.

opposition to the word,[127] and the connection of past and present situations with the eschaton.[128] In addition to these major themes, two sections share other word families, including power,[129] love,[130] ministry,[131] and the presence or absence of God and other companions.[132] These and other connections between sections β and ε serve as an *inclusio* to the main themes of the letter,[133] and the transitions and connections between the various sections and subsections of 2 Timothy provide flow and structure to the letter.

Conclusion

This analysis of the rank of section in the text of 2 Timothy evinces both tendencies and patterns for sections, subsections, and the transitions between them. There is not a sufficient number of sections to determine any conclusive patterns, but some tendencies do emerge. Section transitions in 2 Timothy tend to begin with an imperative paratactic clause,[134] tend to include a rank-shifted clause with a finite verbal form as a qualifier modifying a complement

---

[127] Alexander opposed (ἀνθίστημι) Paul's words (λόγοι) in 4:15. While direct language of opposition does not occur in 1:3–18, the opening section does speak about many turning away (ἀποστρέφω) from Paul and, thereby, his ministry, which connects semantically to Paul's recollection of many abandoning him (ἐγκαταλείπω) in 4:10 and 4:16 (L-N §34.26, 449 and §35.18, 460 for ἀποστρέφομαι and L-N §35.54, 465 for ἐγκαταλείπω).

[128] In the opening section, as presented above, Paul presents his own past (1:3) and present (1:4, 10–11) situations with the certainty of the future and God's provision (1:12), with the reference to eschaton as "that day" (ἐκείνην τὴν ἡμέραν) in 1:12 and 1:18. Similarly, Paul recollects past events in 4:10, 12, 14–17, presents his current situation in 4:11 and refers to the present time (ὁ νῦν αἰών) in 4:10, followed by his certainty of both future judgment in 4:14 and future salvation into God's heavenly Kingdom (ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ ἡ ἐπουράνιον) in 4:18, and both sections give the connection between present works (κατὰ τὰ ἔργα) and the eschaton, both in salvation in 1:9–10 and in judgment in 4:14.

[129] Rf. δύναμις in 1:7, 8 and δυνατός in 1:12 with ἐνδυναμέω in 4:17.

[130] Rf. ἀγάπη in 1:7, 13 with ἀγαπάω in 4:10.

[131] Rf. διακονέω in 1:18 with διακονία in 4:11.

[132] Rf. ἐνοικέω in 1:5, 14 and ἀποστρέφω in 1:15 with ἐγκαταλείπω in 4:10, 16, παραγίνομαι in 4:16, and παρίστημι in 4:17.

[133] For a helpful overview of the major semantic chains of the letter, see Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 212–24.

[134] Three of four section transitions, including sections γ, δ, and ε, have an imperative predicator in the opening sentence.

word group,[135] are always followed by either a sentence of explanation or paraenesis,[136] and are always accompanied by a major shift in topic. There is not one consistent conjunctive or transitional device used between the sections,[137] but, compared with 1 Timothy, it is noteworthy that the transitional δέ does appear for a larger section transition in 3:1 and not only for subsection transitions. With the exception of the final section of the main body, which itself serves as an *inclusio* to the letter as a whole, the sections β, γ, and δ all feature an *inclusio* for the section, with the final sentences of the section recalling diction, semantic domains, and themes from the opening sentences of the sections. Sections in 2 Timothy tend to end with expository statements,[138] with the only major exception being section γ, which ends with an impersonal command using δεῖ. This sentence, while not using the same force of indicative predicator as the other expository sentences, does function to give a theological exposition or elaboration behind commands and exhortations for Timothy and the other church leaders in the section.[139]

In addition to the four major sectional transitions in 2 Timothy, the ten subsection transitions also demonstrate several consistent tendencies. Asyndeton is a common transitional device, occurring with eight transitions in the letter; it tends to appear in the initial and final

---

[135] Three of four section transitions, including sections β, γ, and δ, have either a relative clause (1:3; 2:2) or an appositive ὅτι clause (3:1) serving as a qualifier to an expressed complement word group.

[136] For the section transitions in sections β and γ, the opening sentence is followed by either an exhortation (1:6) or command (2:3), and for sections δ and ε, the second sentence of the section is an explanatory sentence with the conjunction γάρ (3:2–5; 4:10).

[137] Asyndeton appears twice for sections transitions (1:3; 4:9), the transitional δέ appears once along with a cataphoric τοῦτο (3:1), and οὖν appears once alongside a vocative address, emphatic personal pronoun, and an anaphotic ταῦτα (2:1). Three of these are common for 1 Timothy also, with the exception of the use of transitional δέ and the presence of a cataphoric demonstrative pronoun.

[138] See 1:18 for section β, 4:8 for section δ, and 4:21b for section ε.

[139] See Towner, *Letters*, 548 or Lenski, *Interpretation*, 815.

chapters,[140] but does not have a consistent sentence type or structure that accompanies it.[141] The anaphoric use of the demonstrative pronoun ταῦτα appears for both section and subsection transitions,[142] but for the section transition it has a grammatical referent preceding it in the sentence and is also accompanied by a continuative οὖν. The conjunction δέ is a less common transitional device, but does still tend to appear for subsection transitions.[143] The two most common sentence types for subsection transitions are personal commands with imperative predicators and recollection with indicative predicators.[144] What follows the opening sentence also depends on the type of transitional sentence. Opening sentences of recollection are always followed by further exposition or a personal wish,[145] while opening sentences of command or exhortation have a more varied sentence type in the following material.[146] The second sentence of a subsection tends to be a simple, paratactic clause, with only five of out fourteen subsections having a compound or complex sentence following the opening transition.[147] Only two

---

[140] Compare 2 Tim. 1:3, 15; 4:1, 9, 14, 16, 19 with 2:8.

[141] Asyndeton accompanies a personal command three times (2:8; 4:9, 19), recollection three times (1:15; 4:14, 16), an exhortation one time (4:1), as well as the thanksgiving that opens the main body of the letter (1:3). Sometimes these sentences consist of only one main, paratactic clause (4:1, 9, 14, 19), sometimes a compound sentence (2:8: 4:16), and sometimes a complex sentence (1:3, 15).

[142] 2 Tim. 2:1, 14.

[143] The conjunction δέ is used for subsection transitions twice, once as a contrastive δέ (3:10) and once as a transitional δέ (2:22). The other use of δέ within a sectional transition is the transitional δέ in section δ (3:1).

[144] Out of the ten subsection transitions, four are personal commands (2:8, 14, 22; 4:19) and four are recollections (1:15; 3:10; 4:14, 16). The other two transitional sentences are exhortative, indicative predicators (1:6; 4:1).

[145] Subsections transitions giving recollections are followed twice by further exposition (3:12 in δ-2 and 4:14b in ε-2) or an optative, personal wish (1:16 in β-3 and 4:16b in ε-3).

[146] Exhortative opening sentences are followed by both commands (4:2) and explanation (1:7), and opening sentences with imperative predicators are followed by explanation (2:10), more commands (2:15, 23), and expository statements (4:20).

[147] Two are single paratactic clauses with a hypotactic clause (2:10; 3:8), two are compound paratactic clauses also with hypotactic clauses (4:10, 20), and one is a main, paratactic clause followed by a relative clause (1:6) that also serves as a subsection transition in itself.

subsections end with a poetic section or doxology, but they both signal the end of a subsection and not a larger section.[148] Subsections end with a variety of sentence types, although explanation and exposition are the most common.[149] Finally, it is a regular feature of 2 Timothy that subsections within the main body have an *inclusio*, with only one exception for subsection γ-1.[150] These tendencies are helpful for an argument of cohesion and structure for the letter of 2 Timothy in itself, and will serve useful when compared to the other PE and structural features of the greater Pauline Corpus.

The Rank of Clause

Introduction

For the letter of 2 Timothy, patterns and tendencies for clausal syntax emerge when the text is analyzed by clause type, verbal mood, the presence or absence of certain word groups, and inter-clausal relationships, especially as indicated by conjunctions and other connective devices. Clauses will be analyzed in descending order of clausal dependence, beginning with paratactic clauses, followed by hypotactic clauses that function properly on the rank of clause, and concluding with rank-shifted clauses. After the analysis and data for each clause type is presented, the codification and tendencies for clauses 2 Timothy are presented, giving an overall

---

[148] 2 Tim. 2:11b–13 and 4:18b. Although, the assertion that 2:11b–13 does not end a section depends on the structural divisions of the letter argued above, contra Van Neste (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 225–29).

[149] Out of the twelve subsections in the main body that are not only one sentence long (β-1) or at the end of the letter (ε-4), four of them end with an explanatory sentence (γ-1 in 2:7, γ-2 in 2:13, δ-1 in 3:9, and ε-2 in 4:15), and five conclude with an expository sentence (β-3 in 1:18, γ-3 in 2:21, δ-2 in 3:16–17, δ-3 in 4:8, and ε-3 in 4:18). The remaining three concluding sentences are commands, two of them personal commands to Timothy (β-2 in 1:14 and ε-1 in 4:13) and one is an impersonal command using δεῖ (γ-4 in 2:24–26).

[150] Three subsections are not included in this consideration because they are either one sentence long (β-1), or part of a more stylized conclusion or final matters (ε-3, ε-4). For the remaining eleven subsections, all but one include an *inclusio*, typically with explicit diction but also with thematic connections or larger semantic chains. The singular exception occurs in subsection γ-1, which is 2 Tim. 2:1–7. While it is possible to argue for a semantic connection between λέγω, νοέω, and σύνεσις in 2:7 with ἀκούω, μάρτυς, and διδάσκω in 2:1, the connections are not as explicit or closely related as the other subsections.

193

picture for clausal syntax and yielding a platform for comparison with the other letters of the PE and other works of the New Testament.

<div align="center">Paratactic Clauses</div>

Paratactic clauses in 2 Timothy will be analyzed for sentence structure and syntax according to the major factors, evinced in chapter two for 1 Timothy, that impact expected syntax. These include verbal mood, an exhortative or imperative illocutionary force for sentences with verbs in the indicative tense, the use of connective devices and inter-clausal relationships, and other contextual factors, such as poetic or formulaic statements. Then the overall portrait of syntax and expected word group patterns can be given for paratactic clauses in 2 Timothy.

Imperative Clauses

Within the letter of 2 Timothy, paratactic imperative clauses evince general tendencies patterns of word group order for complement, subject, and non-conjunctive adjunct word groups, as well as the syntax of the imperative clause with the clauses that follow. In addition to the clauses with a predicator in the imperative mood, there is also one example of μή with an aorist subjunctive verb, functioning as a negative command[151] that will be considered alongside the imperative forms. There are also two paratactic clauses with the impersonal verb δεῖ as the predicator (2 Tim. 2:6, 24–26), both of which include an example of hyperbaton with the subject word group of the infinitive preceding the predicator with the infinitive itself following it, but those will not be considered alongside the imperative forms. Unlike 1 Timothy, verbal tense for imperative predicators does show correlation with other syntactical factors.

---

[151] Voelz, *Grammar*, 178.

It is marginally codified that paratactic imperative clauses in 2 Timothy include an

expressed complement word group,[152] and, for those without an expressed complement, it is

marginally codified that they will include an expressed subject or non-conjunctive adjunct word

group.[153] It is slightly more likely that imperative clauses with an expressed complement follow a

C-P pattern, with the complement preceding the predicator, than follow a P-C pattern;[154] as with

1 Timothy, however, the position of the complement relative to the predicator depends on other

factors, especially the type of complement. Complement word groups that consist of a single

nominal group, with or without additional qualifiers, almost always precede the predicator as a

partially codified pattern.[155] One marked exception to this pattern in 1:8–11 appears within the

context of a contrast,[156] while the other in 4:2 depends on how the larger syntactical context is

understood. Many commentators regard the accusative word group in 4:1, καὶ τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν

αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτου, as an A-CU, specifically in light of the legal semantic context of

the main verb, διαμαρτύρομαι.[157] In this case, the five imperative clauses in 4:2, as a whole,

---

[152] There are twenty-three paratactic imperative clauses with an expressed complement out of thirty-two total clauses.

[153] Out of nine imperative clauses without an expressed complement, there are three with only predicator and adjunct word groups, and three others with both an expressed subject and adjunct word group. Only three imperative clauses consist only of a predicator word group, and they all occur within an asyndetic string of imperative clauses (2 Tim. 4:2, 5).

[154] Within the twenty-three imperative clauses with an expressed complement, there are nine with a P-C pattern and fourteen with a C-P pattern. For those that follow a C-P pattern, there are four that have hyperbaton, with part of the complement preceding the predicator and part following, giving a [C]-P-[C] pattern.

[155] Only two of the fourteen imperative clauses with a single nominal group as the complement have the complement following the predicator (2 Tim. 1:8–11; 4:2).

[156] See the second imperative clause in the compound sentence of 1:8–11, in which a positive command contrasts a preceding negative command and is accompanied by the conjunction ἀλλά.

[157] See Knight, *Epistles*, 452–53, Towner, *Letters*, 594–97, and Perkins, *Letters*, 222. The other two uses of διαμαρτύρομαι in PE do include clauses as the direct object: an objective ἵνα clause in 1 Tim. 5:21 and an infinitive clause in 2 Tim. 2:14. All three uses of διαμαρτύρομαι are accompanied by a PP with ἐνώπιον, but here in 2 Tim. 4:1 is the only occurrence of διαμαρτύρομαι with an accusative nominal group in the PE. In the larger use of διαμαρτύρομαι in NTG, however, this is not uncommon, especially in Acts when the character of Paul is speaking (Acts 20:21, 24; 23:11; 28:23). It is also common that rank-shifted clauses are the object of διαμαρτύρομαι, but only ἵνα clauses (Luke 16:28), ὅτι clauses (Acts 10:42) or infinitive clauses (Acts 18:5). If the imperative clauses in 4:2

would be the complement of the predicator of 4:1, and this shift in rank could explain the unexpected word group order for 4:2a. If the word group καὶ τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτου is instead the C-DO of διαμαρτύρομαι, as it is rendered in this project, then the string of imperative commands in 4:2 are parallel, paratactic clauses. In this case, the most likely explanation for the P-C word group order would be that the author desires to emphasize the C-DO, τὸν λόγον.[158] Imperative clauses with a rank-shifted clause as the complement follow a P-C pattern without exception,[159] and compound complement word groups tend to be P-C.[160] The only exception to this occurs in 4:13 and is accompanied by hyperbaton, where the first noun of the compound object precedes the predicator but second and third nouns follow the predicator. Not only does this hyperbaton give great emphasis to the primary object, τὸν φαιλόνην,[161] but allows the other objects in the compound construction to fit with the expected word group order. Lastly, with regard to the placement of the complement word group, it is noteworthy that the majority of

---

are the complement of διαμαρτύρομαι, then it would be the only instance of διαμαρτύρομαι taking direct discourse as an object in NTG. Most salient to this discussion is Acts 28:23, where the nominal group τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ is the accusative object of διαμαρτύρομαι as the author records the actions of Paul. It is likely, then, based on the larger usage of διαμαρτύρομαι in NTG, that the more natural reading would be to render the accusative word group in 2 Tim. 4:1, καὶ τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτου, not as an A-CU but the C-DO of διαμαρτύρομαι.

[158] It is also possible, however, that this word order is simply a feature of κηρύσσω, lexically speaking. The only other instance of κηρύσσω appearing in the imperative mood in NTG is in the longer ending of Mark, where the aorist imperative form of the verb appears in Mark 16:15 with a single nominal group as a complement in a P-C pattern. In the LXX, the aorist imperative regularly appears with a single nominal group (2 Chr. 24:9; Esth. 6:9; Hos. 5:8; Joel 1:4; 2:15; 4:9; 1 Macc. 10:63), and in every case it follows a P-C pattern. For the only two times that the verb κηρύσσω appears as a present imperative (Zeph. 3:14; Zech. 9:9), it does not take a complement, so it is inconclusive in Biblical Greek whether the P-C order is a normal feature of the verb κηρύσσω used in the aorist imperative specifically or for the imperative mood in general.

[159] Out of the five imperative predicators that take a rank-shifted clause as a complement, three are infinitive clauses (2:15; 4:9, 21a), one is a participle clause (2:8-9a), and one is a relative clause, in itself, as the complement (2:7a). In every case, the complement follows the predicator.

[160] Of the four imperative predicators with a compound nominal group as a complement, three of them have the complement following the predicator in a P-C pattern (1:8; 2:22b; 4:19).

[161] Unlike Perkins, the emphasis on the "cloak" is not from its primary placement in itself (Perkins, *Letters*, 232), since one would expect a singular nominal group as the complement to precede the predicator. The emphasis on τὴν φαιλόνην comes because it is separated from a compound object in hyperbaton and appears in an unexpected position.

imperative clauses with a P-C pattern have an aorist tense verb,[162] while the majority of those

with a C-P pattern have verbs in the present tense as a marginally codified pattern.[163] The verbal

tense is likely not the primary cause for the clausal syntax, which appears instead to be derived

mainly from the complement type, but could serve as a potential source of comparison with other

works of the New Testament alongside the other factors.

In addition to the tendencies and patterns for complement word groups in imperative

clauses, imperative clauses in 2 Timothy evince consistency with regard to the presence and

word group order of subject and adjunct word groups. It is a codified pattern that imperative

clauses in 2 Timothy do not have an expressed subject word group[164] and all three instances of a

subject word group share some features. All three imperative clauses with expressed subject

word groups include the second singular pronoun, σύ, use stative or passive present imperative

predicators, do not include a complement word group, and have an adjunct word group following

the predicator with the preposition ἐν, giving an S-P-A sentence structure. All three have

conjunctions also; one includes οὖν and begins a section (2:1), while the other two have a

contrastive δέ with the expressed subject highlighting a contrast with the preceding material

(3:14–15 and 4:5a). The contrastive δέ is the most likely use of δέ as a connective device for

imperative clauses,[165] but, while it is not likely enough to constitute a pattern, most imperative

---

[162] Out of the ten imperative clauses with a P-C pattern, only three have a present tense verb, while six include an aorist imperative verb. The other P-C clause includes an aorist subjunctive verb with μή to indicate a negative command.

[163] There are thirteen imperative clauses with a C-P pattern. Four of these include a verb in the aorist tense, while the other nine have present verbs.

[164] Out of the thirty-two paratactic imperative clauses in 2 Timothy, only three have an expressed subject word group (2 Tim. 2:1; 3:14–15; 4:5a).

[165] The conjunction δέ appears in seven imperative clauses, five of them being a contrastive δέ (2:16, 22, 23; 3:14; 4:5) and the other two transitional (2:22; 3:1).

clauses utilize asyndeton as their connector.[166] Non-conjunctive adjunct word groups appear in eleven imperative clauses, and, like those with subject word groups, these clauses evince some consistent syntax. When an imperative clause utilizes a non-conjunctive adjunct word group, it is marginally codified that the adjunct will be a PP,[167] it is marginally codified that the sentence will include a subject or complement word group,[168] and it is fully codified that the adjunct will appear after all other structural word groups in the clause.[169]

Indicative Clauses

As with 1 Timothy, indicative clauses are the most frequent paratactic clauses in 2 Timothy, with several syntactical tendencies and patterns. Unlike 1 Timothy, however, the tendencies for complements are not as codified for indicative clauses and there are substantially fewer indicative clauses with the illocutionary force of a wish or exhortation. Only two clauses utilize an indicative verb of exhortation (2 Tim. 1:6; 4:1), and, while this is too few to establish any conclusive data, there are some similarities between them. Both include an A-PP, both follow an expected P-C pattern,[170] and both are the first sentence of a subsection.[171] There are also

---

[166] Nineteen of the thirty-two imperative clauses are asyndetic, This percentage (59%) is substantially higher than the average for all paratactic clauses (47%), which have a slightly higher likelihood of having an expressed connective device rather than asyndeton.

[167] There twelve non-conjunctive adjunct word groups in eleven imperative clauses. Among these, nine clauses include a single PP (1:8, 14; 2:1, 8, 22; 3:14; 4:2, 5, 11), one A-Adv includes a single adverbial group (2:3), and one A-Adv includes two adverbs in asyndeton (4:2).

[168] Out of the eleven imperative clauses that include a non-conjunctive adjunct, five have expressed complement word groups (1:8–11, 14; 2:8-9, 22b; 4:11b) and three have expressed subject word groups (2:1; 3:14–15; 4:5a). Only three imperative clauses have a non-conjunctive adjunct without also having an expressed subject or complement word group (2:3; 4:2b, 2e).

[169] The only possible exception to this occurs in 4:2b, where there is a predicator followed by two adverbs.

[170] This pattern is expected for 1:6 because the complement is an infinitive clause, and for 4:1 because it is a compound complement. For taking "καὶ τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτου" as the complement of the clause, see note 157 above.

[171] The subsection β-2 begins with 1:6, and the subsection δ-3 begins with 4:1.

two paratactic clauses with the impersonal, indicative verb δεῖ (2 Tim. 2:6, 24–26), both with

hyperbaton for the subjective infinitive word group, giving both sentences an [S]-P-[S] pattern.[172]

The letter of 2 Timothy, in addition to the exhortation and δεῖ clauses mentioned above,

include sixty-seven paratactic clauses with indicative verbs as the predicator. Among these

indicative clauses, forty-three include a complement word group, which yields a marginally

codified pattern. Unlike 1 Timothy, the complement word groups do not evince a syntactical

tendency, as about half follow a P-C pattern while the other half follow a C-P pattern.[173] Like 1

Timothy, complements including or consisting of rank-shifted clauses tend to follow a P-C

pattern, including ὅτι clauses[174] and relative clauses.[175] For the two instances where this tendency

is abrogated, there are other syntactical considerations that explain the word group order, such as

the use of an infinitive clause as the complement of δύναμαι in 2:13b[176] or a clause with unusual

syntax concluding a section.[177] Unlike 1 Timothy, however, compound complements always

follow a P-C pattern[178] and single, nominal groups, which are the most common type of

complement in 2 Timothy, are almost just as likely to follow a P-C pattern as they are a C-P

---

[172] The latter sentence is also the concluding sentence of section γ.

[173] Of the forty-three that have complement, twenty-two follow a C-P pattern while twenty-one follow a P-C pattern in the clause.

[174] One clause takes a ὅτι clause as the complement (1:12b), while one includes a ὅτι clause as an appositive qualifier to the complement (1:15).

[175] Three clauses take a relative clause as the complement proper: two of them (1:12b; 3:10–11) follow a P-C pattern while the other (1:18) follows a C-P pattern. A relative clause is also used as a qualifier word group to the complement in 4:14b-15a, where the clause also follows a P-C pattern.

[176] As seen in 1 Timothy, complementary infinitives of δύναμαι precede the verb, while other infinitive clauses, when used as the complement, tend to follow their governing verbs.

[177] The one instance of a relative clause, functioning as a complement word group, precedes the predicator occurs where the indicative clause is the final clause of section β (1:18b).

[178] 2 Tim. 2:21–22; 3:2-5a, 10–11. It is also worth noting that all three include several nouns or predicate adjectives in asyndeton.

pattern.[179] There is no consistent pattern, based on the complement type, for the difference in sentence structure,[180] although the presence of qualifiers does appear to impact the expected syntax. Complements that include embedded qualifier word groups tend to be in clauses with a P-C structure as a partially codified pattern.[181] Some of the clauses with qualifiers follow a P-C because of the complement type or because the qualifier is a rank-shifted clause,[182] and the two instances where the complement with a qualifier precedes the predicator also have other factors that impact the expected syntax, such as contrast with the following sentence, using ἀλλά (1:16b), or hyperbaton with the conclusion of a subsection (3:9b). Like 1 Timothy, lastly, the placement of an indicative clause at the end of a section or subsection almost always impacts the syntax, most commonly through hyperbaton[183] or a switch in expected word group order,[184] but also through other structural irregularities, including a switch within a list,[185] a definite modifier on a grammatically indefinite head noun within a C-OP[186] or poetic syntax.[187]

---

[179] Out of the thirty-three indicative clauses with a single, nominal group as the complement, nineteen follow a C-P pattern while fourteen follow a P-C pattern. There are also two instances of a single, nominalized prepositional phrase appearing as the complement of a copulative verb (3:6-7; 4:11a), but they also appear in both sentence patterns, with 3:6–7 being C-P and 4:11a being P-C.

[180] In other words, complements consisting of nouns, pronouns, proper nouns, and predicate adjectives do not evince consistent patterns based on their part of speech or type of noun.

[181] Of the nine complement word groups that include a qualifier, seven of them follow the predicator.

[182] 2 Tim. 1:15; 2:21; 3:10-11; 4:14b-15a.

[183] 2 Tim. 2:24-26; 3:9; 4:8, 13. There is also hyperbaton in the ἵνα clause in 3:17 that ends the subsection, but the main clause exhibits structural irregularity in a different way.

[184] The relative clause functioning as the complement of 1:18 appears as the primary element of the clause.

[185] For the four elements within the compound predicate nominative complement in 2:21, three have qualifiers modifying a predicate noun or adjective. The first two have the qualifier following the head noun or adjective, while the final element includes the qualifier before the final predicate adjective.

[186] In 1:14, the adjectival participle clause, τοῦ ἐνοικοῦντος ἐν ἡμῖν, is definite, modifying the grammatical indefinite head noun and adjective of the prepositional phrase, διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου, and in 3:17 the final prepositional phrase that, in itself, functions as a qualifier to the predicate adjective ὠφέλιμος, includes within in a nominalized prepositional phrase, τὴν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, modifying the indefinite head noun, παιδείαν.

[187] The poetic section of 2:11b-13 ends subsection γ-2, and the doxology in 4:18 ends subsection ε-2.

Subject word groups are not as common as complement word groups within paratactic indicative clauses, only appearing in twenty-nine indicative clauses, but they do evince a marginally codified pattern to appear before the predicator with an S-P pattern.[188] For the nine clauses that have the subject following the predicator, the word group order switch is explicable through other syntactical concerns. There are four instances where the subject follows a predicator with a verbal form of εἰμί,[189] one instance where the subject word group includes a relative clause as a qualifier (4:8), and one instance where the subject is a compound list of five elements, with a change of part of speech for the final element (4:21b). The other three cases where the subject follows the predicator in a P-S pattern, found in 2:7b, 4:14b-15a, and 4:18, occur with the subject word group ὁ κύριος and a future indicative verb. Throughout 2 Timothy, the subject ὁ κύριος appears in ten different clauses. Every instance includes both expressed subject and complement word groups, and, out of the nine with explicit predicators, the subject follows the predicator eight times as a partially codified pattern.[190] These clauses with ὁ κύριος

---

[188] Out of the twenty-nine indicative clauses with subject word groups, the subject precedes the predicator twenty times. This includes nouns, pronouns, proper nouns, nominalized participles, compound subjects consisting of two elements.

[189] The subject follows the predicator for four of the six paratactic indicative clauses whose predicator is a form of εἰμί (2:20a; 3:2-5a, 6-7; 4:3). For the other two clauses with a form of εἰμί that include a subject word group preceding the predicator (3:9b; 4:11a), they include hyperbaton, either in the complement (3:9b) or the subject word group itself (4:11a). In both cases, the word group shift with hyperbaton appears to be for emphasis, as in 3:9b the subject word group and main predicate adjective are compared with the hypotactic clause that follows, and in 4:11a the adjective that follows the predicator, modifying the subject, Λουκᾶς, that appears before the predicator, highlights the adjective (Marshall, *Epistles*, 816).

This analysis does take the adjective μόνος in 4:11a as part of the subject word group nor as the C-PN. The adjective is either part of the subject word group and is in hyperbaton with Λουκᾶς with the PP as the C-PN ("Only Luke is with me"), or it is a predicate adjective within the PP as a qualifier ("Luke is the only one with me"). In the end, either option gets the sense of the clause, and the differing translations show the difficulty of choosing which option if preferred (see Eugene Minor, *An Exegetical Summary of 2 Timothy* [Dallas: SIL International, 1992], 130). Perkins lists μόνος as the predicate adjective (Perkins, *Letters*, 231), but other commentators, while not commenting directly on the syntax, give translations that prefer taking the adjective as part of the subject (see Lenski, *Interpretation*, 867, Knight, *Epistles*, 465, or Towner, *Letters*, 618). In the end, either option captures the basic sense of the clause, but for this project the adjective μόνος is rendered an attributive adjective in hyperbaton within the subject word group.

[190] 2 Tim. 1:16, 18; 2:7, 19; 3:11; 4:8, 14, 18. One sentence with ὁ κύριος is a nominal sentence (4:22), but

appear to parallel similar sayings and formulas in the LXX, especially in connection to the eschaton and the final judgment, and are peculiar to 2 Timothy among the PE.[191] So, the word group order for these three clauses is best explained as a lexical or formulaic phenomenon linked with the use of ὁ κύριος, which would also potentially explain why 4:17 differs from the other clauses. The default pattern, then, for indicative clauses with an expressed subject in 2 Timothy is to have the subject precede the predicator, with exceptions for specific syntactical contexts. In addition to subject word groups, almost half of the paratactic indicative clauses have an adjunct word group beyond an initial conjunction or connector,[192] including fourteen A-Advs or A-CUs and nineteen A-PPs. Adjuncts, as a marginally codified pattern, appear within clauses that also include a subject or complement word group[193] and are likely to appear within indicative clauses that are part of a compound sentence.[194] The word group order of these adjunct word groups follow consistent patterns. A-Advs precede the predicator as a fully codified pattern as do three of five A-CUs. It is partially codified that such adjuncts appear as the primary structural element of the clause.[195] A-PPs tend to appear after the predicator, with exceptions for the causal use of

there is one indicative clause with the subject word group, ὁ κύριος, preceding the predictor (4:17). In this case, the placement of ὁ κύριος, along with the transitional δέ, is likely emphatic to note the change in topic and move into a doxological passage (Perkins, *Letters*, 236). For those with explicit predicators, it is common that the predicator will be the primary structural element in the clause (1:16, 18; 2:7, 29; 4:14, 18), and the complement and the subject do appear in a variety of syntactical arrangements. Other than the one instance where ὁ κύριος is used within a direct quotation (2:19) and where ὁ κύριος precedes the predicator (4:17), the subject word group ὁ κύριος is only used with the verb ῥύομαι (3:11; 4:18) and forms related to δίδωμι (1:16, 18; 2:7; 4:8, 14).

[191] For a discussion of the likely LXX references for these passages, see Towner, *Letters*, 482, 496–97, 575, 632–33, 645–48).

[192] Out of the sixty-seven indicative clause in this category, there are thirty-three non-conjunctive adjunct word groups across thirty-one clauses.

[193] Out of the thirty-one indicative clauses with an adjunct word group beyond a conjunction, twenty-three of them also include an expressed subject or complement word group.

[194] Nineteen of the indicative clauses with a non-conjunctive adjunct word group are within a compound sentence structure.

[195] All fourteen of the A-Adv word groups appear before the predicator. These adjuncts appear before any subject, predicator, or complement word groups in eleven of the fourteen clauses, with the exceptions of βέλτιον in

διά and the telic use of ἐπί.[196] There are aberrations, but they do not appear to be connected to the verbal mood of the clause, so these will be discussed below within the larger analysis of the syntax of adjunct word groups in 2 Timothy. Lastly, it is likely, as a marginally codified pattern, that paratactic indicative clauses in 2 Timothy are part of a compound or complex sentence structure.[197]

Impact of Connectors on Word Order

The use of connective devices in 2 Timothy, including conjunctions, asyndeton, the anaphoric demonstrative pronoun, and certain idiomatic prepositional phrases, does not generally impact word group order with enough occurrences or consistency to constitute a pattern within the various types of paratactic clauses. Asyndeton is the most common connective device in 2 Timothy, and it appears more frequently in 2 Timothy than in 1 Timothy. But it is does not give an apparent impact on word order on the basis of the connective device itself.[198] Other conjunctions or connective devices that do not impact expected word group order for paratactic

---

1:18, ἤδη in 4:6, and the ὡς comparative group in 2:17–18. In each of these three cases, either the element that precedes the adjunct appears in the primary position for emphasis within the larger context (Perkins, *Letters*, 176, 226) or the adjunct is closely related to specific word group that appears later in the clause (2:17–18).

[196] Twelve of the nineteen prepositional phrases appear after the predicator. A few that precede the predicator appear within a context of contrast, such as the separative ἀπό phrase in 4:4a or the temporal ἐν phrase in 4:16a, while the placement of the prepositional phrase is more expected for the use of ἐπί to indicate direction or movement toward an end goal (2:16b-18 and 4:4b) or the use of διά to introduce the reason or underlying cause behind the following statement (1:12 and 2:10). This will be discussed in further detail.

[197] Of the sixty-seven paratactic indicative clauses in 2 Timothy, thirty-seven are part of a compound sentence, fifteen are part of a complex sentence, and eight are part of a compound sentence that, itself, is part of a complex sentence, yielding forty-four total clauses that are part of a compound or complex sentence structure.

[198] There are forty-four paratactic clauses of any mood that utilize asyndeton as the connective device, with fourteen following a C-P pattern, seventeen following a P-C pattern, and the remaining thirteen clauses not including an expressed complement. These sentence structures, especially with regard to complements and their position relative to the predicator, tend to follow the patterns based on verbal mood, sentence type, and other syntactical factors already established above.

clauses include γάρ,[199] the conjunctive καί,[200] the idiomatic δι' ἣν αἰτίαν,[201] and the conditional

conjunctions εἰ and ἐάν.[202]

Along with the idiomatic δι'ἣν αἰτίαν, there are a handful other conjunctions or connective

devices that are used infrequently in 2 Timothy, such as ὅτι, which is used once as a paratactic

conjunction (1:16), οὖν, which appears three times (1:8–11; 2:1–2, 21), the lone use of οὕτως in

3:8, and the anaphoric demonstrative pronoun (2:1–2, 14). The clauses with these conjunctions

and connective devices generally conform to expected syntax patterns based on verbal mood and

---

[199] The conjunction γάρ appears fourteen times in 2 Timothy, and clauses with γάρ tend to follow expected syntax patterns. Where the clauses do differ, such as in 1:7, 2:7, or 4:15b, the shifts in word group order are explicable through other phenomena. For 1:7 and 2:7, the position of the subject word group following the predicator does not come from the presence of γάρ, but the formulaic nature of the content of the clause (see above for the analysis of ὁ κύριος in 2 Timothy). In 4:15b, the complement is a single nominal group that follows the predicator, but there is enough flexibility within indicative clauses as a whole in 2 Timothy that there is no reason to assume that the presence of γάρ is the cause for the P-C word group order. This project does consider 4:15b the final clause of subsection ε-2, which might also explain the word order shift, but the section shifts and transitions in section ε do not evince the same likelihood of word group order changes as the other sections of the main body.

[200] The lexeme καί is used as a conjunction fourteen times for paratactic clauses in 2 Timothy. Most of these clauses follow expected word group patterns, with possible exceptions in 1:18 and 4:17a. Typically, relative clauses, when used as complements, follow the predicator, but in 1:18 the relative clause, functioning in itself as the C-DO of its governing clause, is in the primary position within the clause. This word order switch is likely not from the presence of καί, but by the clause's position as the final clause of the section β. Similarly in 4:17a, the pronoun με functioning as the C-DO follows the predicator. While this does happen for indicative clauses in 2 Timothy, unlike 1 Timothy, pronouns are still more likely to precede the predicator when used as complement. The shift in word group order, though, can be explained by the contrast of 4:17a with the contrast of the compound sentence in 4:17a with the preceding material in 4:16. In this case, the contrastive δέ, explained below, likely causes the word group shift rather than the καί for the second clause of the sentence.

[201] The prepositional phrase with a cataphoric relative pronoun, δι' ἣν αἰτίαν, only appears three times in the PE: twice in 2 Timothy (1:6, 12) and once in Titus (1:13). While there is not enough evidence to make any conclusions in either direction, both cases in 2 Timothy follow patterns that would be expected by the verbal mood and complement type.

[202] There are four conditional sentences in 2 Timothy using the conditional conjunction εἰ and two using ἐάν. All of the conditional sentences with εἰ are class one, or simple particular, conditional sentences and none of them include an expressed complement in the protasis. One conditional sentence with ἐάν is a third class, or future more vivid, conditional sentence (2:21), while the other is a fifth class, or present general, conditional sentence (2:5). The present general conditional sentence has no expressed complement word groups or odd syntax in either clause (2:5), but the future more vivid sentence, while having expected syntax in the apodosis, has a pronominal C-DO following the predicator as well as the conjunction οὖν in the protasis (2:21). Within indicative clauses, pronouns as complements do regularly follow the complement (2 Tim. 1:16b, 17; 2:12b; 4:17a, 18, 21b), and the verb ἐκκαθαίρω, only used four times in the Greek Scriptures, always takes an accusative C-DO following the verb regardless of verbal mood (LXX Deut. 26:13; LXX Judg. 7:4; 1 Cor. 5:7; 2 Tim. 2:21). The syntax for the protasis with οὖν, ἐάν, and a subjunctive form might be expected, then, but there are too few examples to determine that conclusively.

complement type. The conjunction οὖν, used with exhortative indicative verbs within transitions in 1 Timothy, does not appear with indicative verbs in 2 Timothy; rather, it appears with imperative clauses and other clauses that encourage desired behavior.[203] It does also appear within one section transition (2:1–2), as well as the final sentence of a subsection (2:21). The anaphoric demonstrative pronoun, in line with 1 Timothy, appears as a connective device with imperative verbs in a C-P structural pattern and is used for both section (2:1–2) or subsection transitions (2:14). The paratactic conjunction ἀλλά appears in six clauses with 2 Timothy, and only three of those clauses include an expressed complement word group (1:8–11, 17; 4:16a). The syntax of 4:16a fits within the larger patterns of 2 Timothy, with the pronominal C-DO preceding the predicator, as the complement shows greater flexibility in position in 2 Timothy within indicative clauses. The pronominal C-DO in 1:17 follows the predicator, but the conjunction ἀλλά is not the most likely explanation for this arrangement, as the complement is doing "double duty," functioning also as the complement of the following clause of the compound sentence, linked with καί. With the imperative verb in 1:8–11, however, the syntax is unusual, with the C-DO, τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ, following the predicator. Single nominal groups as C-DOs within imperative clauses tend to precede the predicator. This is the lone case where the contrast indicated by the conjunction ἀλλά appears to be the reason for the shift in syntax.

The second commonest paratactic conjunction in 2 Timothy, unsurprisingly, is the conjunction δέ, which serves three primary functions over its nineteen uses as a Cj-P. While acknowledging the fluidity of δέ and that its uses can overlap at times,[204] δέ serves primarily a

---

[203] In 1:8–11 the clause with οὖν appears with the aorist subjunctive to give a negative command, an imperative verb in 2:1–2, and in the protasis of a future more vivid conditional sentence in 2:21.

[204] See, for example, how Perkins assigns multiple possible uses to single occurrences of δέ through 2 Timothy (see Perkins, *Letters*, 192, 200, 213, 216, 217).

transitional or developmental function three times in 2 Timothy (2:20a, 22a; 3:1), and primarily a conjunctive role six times (2:5; 3:8, 12; 4:4, 12, 20). For these nine combined occurrences, the conjunction δέ does not evince impact on the syntax of clause. The conjunction δέ does show potential syntactical impact for the ten occurrences where it serves primarily to indicate contrast.[205] The contrastive δέ, unlike 1 Timothy, does not necessarily accompany a change in word group order that is not better explained by other syntactical phenomena,[206] but within 2 Timothy the clause with the contrastive δέ tends to mirror the verbal mood of the preceding, contrasted clause, sometimes with parallel structure[207] and sometimes with contrasting structure.[208] And, when the clause with δέ does not match the preceding verbal mood, the verb is usually a present imperative verb following a future indicative verb.[209] The conjunctive and transitional uses of δέ do not, then, appear with any consistent patterns or syntax changes, but the

---

[205] 2 Tim. 2:16a, 20b, 22b, 23, 24–26; 3:10–11, 13, 14–15; 4:5a, 17a. Most commentators agree with rendering δέ in these instance as indicating contrast, but a few of these deserve further discussion. Admittedly, the δέ in 2:20b is part of a μέν ... δέ construction, and does serve a development function (Heckert, *Discourse*, 53–54). But, as Perkins notes, the larger context does indicate that a contrast is also intended (Perkins, *Letters*, 197). Perkins argues that the δέ in 4:5a primarily marks a new development (Perkins, *Letters*, 225), but the majority of other commentators give it a contrastive function (Minor, *Summary*, 122).

[206] The only possible exception to this occurs in 4:17a, where the δέ introduces a compound sentence and the second clause of the sentence has a pronominal complement following the predicator. But, this clause also has other unique syntactical features. It follows an optative aside. It is the only time that ὁ κύριος, as a subject word group, precedes its governing predicator. And it is the only time that καί, the conjunction for the second clause of the compound sentence, is accompanied by a change in word group order. In this case, it is likely that the δέ does switch the subject word group of 4:17a, giving prominence to the subject word group, ὁ κύριος, as the contrasted element with the preceding clause, but the change in word group order for the pronominal complement of the second clause is likely due to the connection of the με in the paratactic clause with καί and the emphatic δι᾽ ἐμοῦ that begins the ἵνα clause that immediately follows.

[207] 2 Tim. 2:16a, 20b; 3:13; 4:17a. The occurrence of δέ in 2:24–26 could also be included here. Even though the verbal mood does not match, the main clause includes the impersonal verb δεῖ in contrast to a previous clause with an imperative verb.

[208] 2 Tim. 2:22b, 23. In both cases the syntax changes between an imperative P-C clause with a compound, asyndeton nominal group and an imperative C-P clause with a single nominal group as the complement.

[209] 2 Tim. 3:14–15; 4:5a. The only exception to this occurs in 3:10–11, where the δέ clause is S-P-C with an aorist indicative verb and a long, asyndeton list as the complement, contrasted with an S-[C]-P-[C] clause with a future indicative verb of εἰμί and predicate nominative complement in hyperbaton.

contrastive δέ usually signals a parallel predicator with the contrasted clause or an imperative form in contrast to a prior future indicative clause.

Nominal Clauses, Optative Clauses, Subjects, and Adjuncts

In addition to the paratactic clauses with indicative and imperative verbs, 2 Timothy also includes several paratactic nominal clauses and clauses with optative verbal forms. Nominal clauses are not as frequent in 2 Timothy as they are in 1 Timothy, but they do evince consistent tendencies throughout the letter. Paratactic nominal clauses in 2 Timothy, with the exception of conjunctive adjuncts, all consist of only a subject word group and a complement word group, and they are almost always in an S-C clausal pattern.[210] Complements of these nominal clauses are most commonly nominalized PP functioning as the C-PN of an assumed copulative verb,[211] but paratactic nominal clauses also include one instance each of the complement being a compound C-PN (3:16-17), a C-IO of an assumed verbal idea (1:1–2a), or a predicate adjective as the C-PN (2:11a). Lastly paratactic nominal clauses have asyndeton as their connector,[212] with the lone exception, found in 2:20, including both the conjunctive καί and a μέν ... δέ construction as connectors within the compound, nominal clause.

A unique feature of 2 Timothy among the PE is the presence of paratactic clauses with an optative predicator expressing a wish. While this phenomenon only occurs three times in the letter, all three instances occur within passages of recollection, use the aorist optative form of the verb, include a C-IO, and have asyndeton as the connective device.[213] The word group order

---

[210] Out of the eight paratactic nominal clauses in 2 Timothy, seven of them evince an S-C clausal pattern, with the only exception, found in 2:11a, being a formulaic phrase beginning a poetic section.

[211] 2 Tim. 1:2b; 2:20b; 4:22a, 22b.

[212] 2 Tim. 1:1-2a, 2b; 2:11a; 3:16–17; 4:22a, 22b.

[213] 2 Tim. 1:16a, 18; 4:16b.

within the clauses varies, with the C-DO, as a noun, preceding the subject word group in 1:16a and the C-IO following (P-[C-DO]-S-[C-IO]), but in 1:18 that order is reversed with an infinitive clause as C-DO of the predicator (P-[C-IO]-S-[C-DO]). The clause in 4:16b only includes the predicator, as a negative wish, and a pronoun a the C-IO, but the indirect object precedes the predicator (C-P), while the predicator is in the primary position in the other two examples.

The placement of subject word groups evinces some consistent tendencies and patterns in 2 Timothy. Many tendencies for subject word groups within specific types of paratactic clauses have been established above, especially for the twenty-nine paratactic indicative clause that include a subject word group, but there are some tendencies that span across the type of clause. There are forty-four paratactic clauses with an expressed subject word group.[214] While there are too few examples to establish any conclusive results, it is worth noted that all three imperative clauses with an expressed subject have an S-P-A pattern (2:1–2; 3:14–15; 4:5a), while both clauses with δεῖ have hyperbaton in the subjective infinitive clause, giving an [S]-P-[S] pattern (2:6, 24–26). The subject word group is commonly the primary syntactical element of the clause as a marginally codified pattern, occurring in the primary position twenty-eight times. There are nine times that the subject word group is neither primary or ultimate in the clause, and seven times that the subject word group is the ultimate word group in the clause.[215] Often, in the cases

---

[214] Among these forty-four clauses, three are imperative clauses, two are subjunctive, eight are nominal, two are with the impersonal verb δεῖ, and the other twenty-nine are with indicative verbs proper.

[215] This phenomenon occurs for a variety of reasons. For three instances, the subject word group is a long, compound subject with καί (2:20a; 4:21b) or a long, rank-shifted participle clause (3:6–7). One instance includes a relative clause as a qualifier to the subject word group, which always moves the element to the final position within the clause (4:8). One instance has a single pronoun as the subject, but the subject is doing "double duty" as the subject word group also of the following clause in a compound, conditional sentence (2:5). One instance is followed by hypotactic whose connective device, ὅτε, is logically connected to the subject (4:3). Finally, one more occurrence of the subject being in the ultimate position in the clause is found in 2:11a, where the clause is a formulaic, nominal clause introducing a poetic section.

that the subject is neither primary nor ultimate in the paratactic clause, it is due to an A-Adv, especially καί,[216] formulaic syntax (2:7b; 4:14b-15a, 18), or a relative clause (1:18). The subject word group does not appear frequently in the ultimate position, and, when it does, it is due to specific syntactical contexts.

In many cases, adjunct word groups follow expected word group order patterns in 2 Timothy. Aside from conjunctive adjunct word groups, there are forty-seven paratactic clauses that include at least one adjunct word group across the various verbal moods.[217] Adjunct word groups in paratactic clauses with optative verbs, subjunctive verbs, and indicative verbs functioning within a paraenetic context are not frequent and follow typical word group order patterns.[218] Within paratactic clauses with imperative verbs, the adjuncts always follow the predicator; this is the case, as would be expected, not only for the nine clauses with A-PPs, but also for two A-Advs within one clause (4:2) and one A-Adv consisting of a comparative ὡς word group (2:3). One potentially significant aspect of adjunct word groups in imperative clauses is that, when a causal PP is used, it is the causal use of ἐν and appears after the predicator while including a relative pronoun as its C-OP (2:8–9a). For the thirty-one paratactic clauses with indicative verbs, as would be expected, A-Advs always appear before the predicator and A-PPs tend to appear after the predicator, with the exception of causal PPs with διά (1:12; 2:10).[219]

---

[216] For the five occurrences where both an adjunct word group precedes a subject word group and the subject word group is not the ultimate element of the clause, the adverb βέλτιον is used one time (1:18), the adverbial case usage of "ὃν τρόπον" is used one time (3:8), and the adverbial use of καί appears three times (2:12; 3:8, 12).

[217] Thirty-one clauses with an indicative verb include such adjuncts, eleven clauses with imperative verbs, two clauses with subjunctive verbs, one clause with an optative verb, and two clauses with indicative verbs functioning as verbs of exhortation.

[218] In other words, adjuncts consisting of adverbs appear before the predicator and adjuncts consisting of prepositional phrases appear after the predicator, with the exception of causal adjuncts with διά (1:6).

[219] There is a causal δία prepositional phrase that appears after the predicator in 2:10. In this case, the causal διά is used twice in the same clause with different nuances. The first phrase with διά indicates logical cause or basis, while the second phrase with διά indicates the person or object for whose sake the action is done. The preposition διά is not used with this latter sense elsewhere in the PE.

While there are not enough examples to indicate a pattern, it is noteworthy that the single PP, with ἐν, functioning temporally within paratactic indicative clauses appears before the predicator (4:16). It is inconclusive whether adjuncts indicating manner tend to precede the predicator regardless of adjunct type, since the three A-Advs of manner appearing before the predicator (1:17, 18; 4:15) are within indicative clauses and the lone A-PP indicating manner that follows the predicator is found in an imperative clause (4:2e). Exceptions to the expected order for adjunct word groups are rare, and are explicable by the context of contrast (4:4), emphasis (2:20), or the accompaniment of other syntactical phenomena, such as hyperbaton (2:16b-8).

Codification and Textual Analysis: Initial Observations

As demonstrated above, many codified patterns and general tendencies emerge for paratactic clauses in 2 Timothy. These generally differ according the mood of the predicator, the type of complement and adjuncts word group within the clauses as well as their force, inter-clausal dynamics, the context of formulaic or poetic syntax, and the placement of a clause before a section or subsection transition. Both adverbial adjuncts and prepositional phrases follow the predicator in imperative clauses, for example, while adjuncts consisting of adverbs always precede the predicator when the governing verb is in the indicative mood. Some of these patterns mirror those found in 1 Timothy, such as the position of complements within imperative clauses or the position of complements within indicative clauses where the complement is, in itself, a rank-shifted clause. But some of the patterns differ from 1 Timothy, such as the position of complement word groups in indicative clauses both that consist of a single nominal group and that consist of a compound nominal group or the placement of adjuncts within imperative clauses. These patterns, going beyond lexical concerns or unique phraseology, will be helpful for comparison between the PE and other samples of NTG.

The word group order patterns for 2 Timothy are helpful for inter-textual comparison, but they are also helpful for interpreting the text and other considerations, such as textual criticism. One example is 2 Tim. 1:16b. In this passage, the second part of the compound, causal clause, as indicated by ὅτι, has the complement, τὴν ἅλυσίν μου, before the predicator, οὐκ ἐπαισχύνθη. While it is common for complements consisting of single, nominal groups to precede the predicator within paratactic, indicative clauses, the presence of the qualifier changes the expectation. This is the only time that a complement of any type with a qualifier word group precedes the predicator without also having hyperbaton.[220] Many major commentators explain the cultural and historical significance of the complement, but do not mention the syntax to further defend the prominence of "my chain" in this verse.[221] Perkins does note that the position of the complement is "probably for prominence," but does not include that complements consisting of single nominal groups regularly precede the predicator, thereby making the presence of the qualifier the factor that marks the syntax.[222] In this passage, the complement word group, τὴν ἅλυσίν μου, is in a marked position, giving it strong emphasis. Towner helpfully outlines the social implications for Onesiphorus with regard to Paul's imprisonment,[223] but the marked syntax gives it prominence. This not only highlights the theme of shame,[224] but strongly implies that it was Paul's chain that caused others, such as Phygelus and Hermogenes, to abandon him.

The syntax of the primary, compound clause in 4:17 also exhibits various word group

---

[220] The complement in 3:9b also precedes the predicator, but the qualifier, πᾶσιν, appears after the predicator in hyperbaton. Syntax is also much more variegated for clauses with a copulative verb, especially εἰμί.

[221] See Knight, *Epistles*, 384, Marshall, *Epistles*, 719, and especially Towner, *Letters*, 483.

[222] Perkins, *Letters*, 174.

[223] Towner, *Letters*, 483.

[224] Not being ashamed and being willing to suffer for the Gospel were included already in the second sentence of exhortation or command to Timothy in this letter (1:8).

anomalies and marked syntax. The contrastive δέ in 2 Timothy does not cause the same switch in

syntax as it does in 1 Timothy, but rather tends to cause a mirroring of verbal mood and tense.

The first paratactic clause of 4:17a does mirror the word group order and verbal syntax of the

contrasted clause, 4:16b,[225] but there is an optative wish between them in 4:16c, breaking the

typical, inter-clausal syntax. The first clause also includes ὁ κύριος as the subject word group in

prime position, which typically occurs in third or fourth position in the sentence elsewhere in 2

Timothy.[226] This word group order switches in the second clause of the compound sentence, with

the pronominal complement, με, following the predicator, ἐνεδυνάμωσεν. While it is not

uncommon for pronominal complements to follow the predictor in paratactic indicative

clauses,[227] this is the only occasion where the conjunctive use of καί is accompanied by a switch

in word group order. In this case, the word group order of the first clause, as signaled by the

contrastive δέ, mirrors the syntax of the contrasted clause, which explains the unusual position of

the subject word group, ὁ κύριος.[228] This also impacts the possible variant reading and word

group order switch in the first clause. The reading as it stands in the NA[28] text is likely original,

as it fits the pattern of the use of δέ and is the more difficult reading with regard to the second

clause in the compound sentence.[229] Towner emphasizes the presence of the Lord as a major

---

[225] The clause in 4:16b demonstrates an S-C-P clausal structure with an aorist indicative verb, and the opening clause of 4:17a also shows an S-C-P word group order with an aorist indicative verb.

[226] 2 Tim. 1:16, 18; 2:7; 4:8, 18.

[227] 2 Tim. 1:16, 17; 2:12; 4:18, 21.

[228] Perkins argues that the position of ὁ κύριος indicates a shift in topic, but yet still labels this use of δέ as adversative (Perkins, *Letters*, 236). This is not the purpose of the position of the subject word group ὁ κύριος, as the topic of Paul's legal case and the Lord's rescue from danger continue from 4:16 through 4:18.

[229] Elliott argues that the reading with reversed order for the initial clause should be adopted, reading παρέστη μοι, and that it was switched by scribes to "balance" the second clause (Elliott, *Greek Text*, 169). It is not only unclear how this switch would balance the second clause in the compound sentence, but the more difficult reading is, in fact, the reading that stands in the NA[28], as the word group order switch with καί is singular in the letter.

theme of this passage, but does not mention how the syntax itself contributes to that emphasis.[230]

In this case, the contrastive δέ gives 4:17a as a contrast to the claim that all abandoned Paul in 4:16b, already giving prominence to the theme of abandonment and presence. But this emphasis is heightened by the word group order switch in the second clause accompanied by καί. In the second clause, the complement is likely not the marked word group, but the predicator. If the optative wish in 4:16c is considered somewhat as an aside, then the final clause of 4:17a also switches the word group order of the previous three clauses: 4:16a shows an A-S-C-P word group order, 4:16b shows an S-C-P word group order, the first clause of 4:17a shows an S-C-P word group order, and this concluded by the second clause of 4:17a, which shows a P-C word group order. This gives prominence to the verbs of 4:17a, contrasting how not being present correlates with abandonment in 4:16, but the Lord's presence causes strengthening in 4:17a. The absence or presence of coworkers and the Lord is the major theme of this passage, and this emphasis is highlighted by the clausal syntax of 4:16–17, including the contrastive δέ, the conjunctive καί, and the word group order switch in the second clause of 4:17a.

A final example of where the above analysis proves useful can be found in the final clause of 2 Tim. 2:7. A variety of texts, including the Majority Text, change the future indicative form to ΔΩΗ, which could either be read as an optative form, δῴη, or an archaic, Hellenistic subjunctive form, δώῃ. Elliott argues that the original form in this verse should be regarded as the subjective, δώῃ, with scribes changing this to the future indicative to avoid confusion with the optative form and to parallel similar phrasing in the Greek of the LXX. [231] This passage does

---

[230] Towner, *Letters*, 640–42.

[231] Elliott, *Greek Text*, 131, 166–67. He argues the same case for the variant reading of ἀποδώσει in 2 Tim. 4:14.

parallel the LXX of Proverbs 2:6, although Elliott's analysis does not explain the change from

ὅτι in the LXX to γάρ in 2 Timothy, or why the conjunction was retained if the verbal mood was

switched.[232] Not only would a subjunctive reading make little sense in light of the γάρ itself, as

Marshall also notes,[233] but the placement of 2:7 at the end of a subsection makes the variant

reading even less likely in light of the larger syntactical patterns of 2 Timothy. Optative wishes,

while rare in 2 Timothy, are always followed by another paratactic clause giving rationale (1:16;

4:16) or further explanation (1:18), and subjunctive verbs in paratactic clauses are always part of

a compound sentence and within the primary clause of the sentence (1:8; 2:5, 21). Optative

wishes, assuming that the text of NA[28] is correct in 1:16 and 1:18, explicitly follow clauses with

indicative verbs giving recollection of past events. Furthermore, subsections in 2 Timothy

usually end with either an indicative clause of exposition or explanation[234] or an imperative

clause giving a command culminating logically from the preceding material in the subsection.[235]

Rendering the variant reading as original, either an optative or subjunctive form, would indeed

be the more difficult reading, but it would be only time an optative or subjunctive wish follows

an explicit command, the only time such a clause would end a section or subsection, and the only

time such a verbal form would appear with the conjunction γάρ. Syntactical patterns of the letter

make it more likely, then, that the future indicative is the preferred reading both in 2:7 and 4:14.

<p style="text-align:center">Hypotactic Clauses</p>

On the rank of clause, the two principle types of hypotactic clauses HC-Cjs and HC-ptcs.

---

[232] See Towner, *Letters*, 496 for more analysis of the parallel between 2 Tim. 2:7 and Prov. 2:6 (LXX).

[233] Marshall, *Epistles*, 723. The conjunction γάρ is only used with indicative verbs in 2 Timothy, while subjunctive verbs only appear in conditional sentences (2:5, 21) and negative commands (1:8) alongside δέ (2:5) and οὖν (1:8, 2:21).

[234] 2 Tim. 2:13; 3:9, 16; 4:15. These often occur explicitly with γάρ.

[235] 2 Tim. 1:14; 2:24–26; 4:13.

While there are not a large number of any type of hypotactic clause in 2 Timothy, each variety of clause demonstrates consistent syntax and word group order, both within the clause itself and for the inter-clausal relationships with the governing, paratactic clause. Following the presentation and analysis of hypotactic clauses on the rank of clause, clauses that have undergone rank shift will be examined, including infinitive clauses, participle clauses in attributive position, relative clauses, and other clauses functioning as complements of direct or indirect discourse. Consistent tendencies and patters for word group order and clausal syntax are evident in rank-shifted clauses, providing a beneficial standard for comparison with the other PE and with other works of the Pauline Corpus.

Finite Clauses with a Hypotactic Conjunction

Within the twenty-seven hypotactic clauses of 2 Timothy that still function on the rank of clause, ten of them are HC-Cjs. It is fully codified that such hypotactic clauses in 2 Timothy follow their governing, paratactic clause, regardless of the conjunction or the force of the clause. It is a marginally codified pattern that HC-Cjs have an expressed complement, although the expected syntax changes based on the type of clause and mood of the predicator.[236] It is common that such clauses have expressed subjects or adjuncts, and these word groups typically adhere to expected syntactical patterns as established for paratactic clauses.[237] The clausal syntax does vary according to the hypotactic conjunction and, unlike paratactic clauses, contrast does impact word group order for hypotactic clauses.

---

[236] Out of the ten HC-Cjs, seven have an expressed complement. There are different tendencies for purpose clauses with ἵνα and other types of hypotactic clauses, which will be explored below.

[237] Out of the ten HC-Cjs in this category, five have an expressed subject word group and five include at least one adjunct word group beyond the conjunction.

For HC-Cjs in 2 Timothy, five use conjunctions other than ἵνα.[238] Four of these follow the general syntax patterns established for paratactic clauses, namely, subjects appear before the predicator,[239] A-Advs appear before the predicator while the single A-CU follows the predicator and A-PPs tend follow the predicator.[240] The placement of complement word groups varies according to type of complement.[241] The A-CU in 1:3–5, νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας, concludes the clause. Within the PE, this same adjunct appears in identical word group order in 1 Tim. 5:5; the νύξ and ἡμέρα appear together before the predicator within hypotactic clauses in 1 Thessalonians,[242] although the hypotactic clauses are all HC-ptcs and not an HC-Cj. Within the LXX and other works on NTG, however, νύξ and ἡμέρα tend to follow the predicator when used together adverbially rather than precede it as here in 2 Tim. 1:3–5.[243] The other exception is found in 2 Tim. 4:3. In the second clause of the compound hypotactic clause with the conjunction ὅτε, the PP, with κατά and an accusative object, precedes the predicator and the C-DO, a single nominal group, follows the predictor, giving both a marked position. In this case, the word group order switch is likely due to the contrastive ἀλλά, as the primary hypotactic clause follows expected syntax and the secondary clause contrasts the C-DOs of the two clauses: τῆς ὑγιαινούσης διδασκαλίας and διδασκάλους. Lastly, one other factor deserving mention is that

---

[238] There is one restrictive clause with ἐὰν μή in 2:5, one negative purpose clause with μήποτε in 2:25–26, two temporal clauses with ὡς in 1:3–5 and ὅτε in 4:3, and one comparative clause with ὡς in 3:9b.

[239] 2 Tim. 2:5; 3:9b.

[240] 2 Tim. 1:3–5; 2:5, 25–26; 3:9b.

[241] Nominal groups without qualifier tends to precede the predicator (4:3–4), while nominal groups with embedded qualifiers tend to follow the predicator (1:3–5; 2:25–26).

[242] 1 Thess. 2:9 and 3:10. The noun νύξ is used adverbially by itself as a genitive of time, preceding the predicator, in 1 Thess. 5:7 and 2 Thess. 3:8.

[243] See in the LXX Numbers 9:21, Deut. 28:66, Joshua 1:8, 1 Kings 8:59, 2 Chr. 6:20, Neh. 4:3, Jdt. 11:17, Psa. 1:2; 42:3, Jer. 8:23; 14:17, and Lam. 2:18. In the New Testament, see Luke 18:7, Rev. 4:8; 7:15; 12:10; 14:11; 20:10. There are much fewer examples where νύξ and ἡμέρα precede the predicator in the LXX, including Psa. 31:4; 54:11, Isaiah 34:10; 60:11. It also precedes the predicator when used as the genitive object of διά in 2 Macc. 13:10.

this analysis renders the prepositional phrase εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας in 2:25 as a qualifier

modifying μετάνοιαν, the C-DO of the μήποτε clause.[244]

In addition to the five HC-Cjs with other conjunctions, there are five ἵνα clauses of

purpose.[245] Hypotactic ἵνα clauses of purpose tend to appear as the final clause proper of their

respective sentence, with one exception in 1:4.[246] One example, in 3:16–17, is also the final

clause proper of its subsection, δ-2. Four ἵνα clauses of purpose include C-DOs or C-PNs as

expressed complements and they are all in a C-P pattern,[247] although two of them show

hyperbaton within the complement word group, giving a [C]-P-[C] pattern.[248] The first example

with hyperbaton in 2:10 includes an indefinite noun before the predicator with a definite,

nominalized prepositional phrase as an adjective in repeat position following the predicator. This

also includes other word groups in expected positions: a subject word group before the

predicator, an A-Adv before the predicator, and an A-PP after the predicator. The second

example with hyperbaton occurs in 3:16–17 with the copulative verb εἰμί, with the initial

predicative adjective of the C-PN preceding the predicator and an attributive participle clause

functioning as a second predicate adjective following the predicator. This example also includes

the subject following the predicator, but the syntax for paratactic clauses with εἰμί varies for

paratactic clauses as well. The only ἵνα clause of purpose without a complement, found in 4:17a,

is a compound clause, linked with a conjunctive καί, with one element in unexpected position in

---

[244] Commentators, either by translation or direct reference, concur that the prepositional phrase is modifying the noun μετάνοιαν, not the verb δώῃ (Lenski, *Interpretation*, 816, Marshall, *Epistles*, 767, Minor, *Summary*, 84–85, and Towner, *Letters*, 515, 548).

[245] 2 Tim. 1:4; 2:4, 10; 3:16–17; 4:17a.

[246] This statement renders the final predicate participle clause in 1:5 as parallel to the ἵνα clause and not in subordination it. This will be discussed and defended below.

[247] 2 Tim. 1:4; 2:4, 10; 3:16–17.

[248] 2 Tim. 2:10; 3:16–17.

each. In the first of the compound clause, the A-PP δι' ἐμοῦ precedes the predictor, while the subject word group of the second clause follows the predicator. Perkins rightly notes that the initial prepositional phrase is likely there for prominence, but does not mention that the placement of the subject of the second clause also gives it prominence, with both clauses highlighting the role of people and impact on people that God has done through Paul's ministry.[249]

Predicate Participle Clauses

Participle clauses in predicate position are the most common type of hypotactic clause in 2 Timothy that still function on the rank of clause. HC-ptcs are not a prominent as they are in 1 Timothy, only occurring seventeen times. Such clauses demonstrate consistent word group order tendencies, regardless of complement type, force of participle, or the mood of the governing verb. The force of the participle clause does, however, impact inter-clausal syntax, as all predicate participle clauses follow their governing predicator with the exception of those with a temporal force, which precede their governing predicator and tend to modify imperative clauses.[250] So, it is partially codified that HC-ptcs will follow their governing clause. The force of the participle also appears to impact which elements appear within the clause, although with too few examples to constitute a pattern. It is possible that the tense of the participle is significant for the force of the clause, but the data from 2 Timothy will need to be compared with the other PE for further validation.

---

[249] Perkins, *Letters*, 237.

[250] Out of the seventeen predicate participle clauses, all fourteen with causal force, circumstantial force, or the force of manner follow their governing clause, while all three temporal participle clauses precede them (1:17; 4:11b, 13). Of these three, two modify imperative verbs (4:11b, 13) while the other precedes an indicative verb (1:17).

The majority of predicate participles in 2 Timothy are in the present tense, and these tend to function as temporal clauses, causal clauses, or clauses of manner. The four predicate participles in the aorist tense have a temporal or causal force, and the four predicate participles in the perfect tense tend to have a causal force.[251] Only present tense participles function to indicate manner,[252] while causal and temporal participles use multiple tenses. As mentioned above, the force of the participle does impact inter-clausal syntax, as participles indicating cause or manner follow the predicator, while temporal participles precede the predicator. The tense of the participle and mood of the governing verb do not appear to impact the word group order of the participle clause itself, although it is possible that it impacts the likelihood of certain word groups. HC-ptcs with adjuncts, for example, only occur four times out the seventeen clauses, and they occur together with imperative verbs twice (2:14; 3:14–15), a subjunctive verb once (2:26), and an indicative verb on only one occasion (1:17). This is significant in that most predicate

---

[251] It is generally agreed that three of the four perfect tense participles have a causal force (1:4; 2:23; 3:14–15), although two of them are participles of the verb οἶδα, whose perfect tense functions as a present. The fourth example of a perfect tense participle in predicate position occurs in 2:26 with the participle ἐζωγρημένοι, whose force is debated, depending on which clause is considered to be the governing clause and the referent of the pronoun ἐκείνου. Marshall helpfully gives an outline of the interpretative options, eventually deciding in favor of taking the pronoun to refer to the devil and taking the participle as "describing the effects" of the previous clause (Marshall, *Epistles*, 767–68). Towner takes the referent as the devil, and says that the participle "explains the situation" for previous clause (Towner, *Letters*, 550). Perkins renders the participle as concessive without a thorough defense of such a choice (Perkins, *Letters*, 203), and Knight, similar to Towner, renders the participle as causal (Knight, *Epistles*, 426). The most likely force for the participle is that has a causal force, describing the need for the previous verb, ἀνανήψωσιν, regardless of the reference of ἐκείνου. While it does not greatly impact the analysis for this section, the author prefers to take the referent of both αὐτοῦ and ἐκείνου as τοῦ διαβόλου. While this decision is made on logical grounds, *a la* Marshall's argument, it is also syntactical. There are three references to the devil in the PE (1 Tim. 3:6, 7 and 2 Tim. 2:26), and they are usually accompanied by interrupted or unusual syntax. Both references to the devil in 1 Tim. 3 are accompanied by hyperbaton, with the complement word group, in which διάβολος appears, appearing both before and after the predicator. In 2 Tim. 2:26, the syntax of the prepositional phrases, ἐκ τῆς τοῦ διαβόλου παγίδος and εἰς τὸ ἐκείνου θέλημα, is parallel, with the qualifier interrupting the definite article and the head noun. While θεός can appear in the same syntax as a qualifier (2 Tim. 3:17), this is within a subject word group, not a complement of a prepositional phrase. The more natural position, when τοῦ θεοῦ is used as a qualifier, is to follow the head noun (2 Tim. 1:1, 6, 8; 2:9, 19), and the only example within a prepositional phrase has an indefinite θεοῦ following the head noun (2 Tim. 1:8).

[252] 2 Tim. 2:16b–18 and 3:13.

participle clauses occur with governing verbs in the indicative mood, but only one participle

governed by an indicative verb includes an adjunct word group.[253]

Furthermore, there are tendencies and patterns for word groups within HC-ptcs, some

which depend on the force of the participle and some which occur regardless of the tense or the

force of the participle. All adjunct word groups in such clauses follow the predicator, but appear

before any expressed complement.[254] There are not enough examples, however, to determine if

this constitutes a pattern. Regardless of tense, it is a partially codified pattern that causal

participle clauses will include a complement word group.[255] For participle clauses with other

forces, only two of four HC-ptcs of manner include a complement, while no complement appears

in a temporal HC-ptc. For all HC-ptcs with an expressed complement, it is a codified pattern that

they will follow the predicator. The only complement word group that precedes its predicator

occurs in the HC-ptc of λάβων in 1:5. This participle clause has the nominal C-DO, ὑπόμνησιν,

before the participle, but has a qualifier modifying the head noun following the predicator in

hyperbaton. The qualifier is the final element of the clause because the qualifier itself is modified

by a relative clause, which makes the final part of the complement word group in expected

position while the initial head noun, ὑπόμνησιν, is in a marked position. This could be for

emphasis, although the position of ὑπόμνησιν is not discussed by commentators.[256] It is more

---

[253] Out of the seventeen predicate participle clauses, eleven are governed by indicative verbs, five are governed by imperative verbs, and one is governed by a subjunctive verb.

[254] The adjuncts follow the predicator in 2 Tim. 1:17; 2:14, 26; 3:14–15, and occur with a P-A-C pattern in 2:14 and 3:14–15.

[255] Out of ten causal participle clauses, eight include an expressed complement word group. This analysis does render the participle ἐζωγρημένοι in 2:26 as a causal participle as presented above, as well as the participle λάβων in 1:5. Perkins renders this participle as temporal (Perkins, *Letters*, 160), which is unlikely due to the aorist tense of the participle and the awkwardness of such a force within the larger sentence. Marshall takes the participle as circumstantial (Marshall, *Epistles*, 693), but the majority of scholars render λάβων as causal (Minor, *Summary*, 15), including Knight (Knight, *Epistles*, 368–69) and Towner (Towner, *Letters*, 445–46, 453).

[256] See Marshall, *Epistles*, 693–94 or Perkins, *Letters*, 160.

likely a word group order switch caused by the position of the λάβων clause within the larger sentence. The λάβων clause is likely not subordinate to the ἵνα clause nor to the main, paratactic clause, but parallel with the other participle clauses within the larger HC-Cj introduced by ὡς.[257] The λάβων clause is the third HC-ptc in parallel within the larger clause, and the fourth hypotactic clause in subordination to the ὡς clause. As the conclusion of a series or list, it is common for a change in syntax to occur that signals the end of the list. In this case, the two prior HC-ptcs both have a P-C clausal structure, while the final clause has a [C]-P-[Q] word group order within the clause. The position of the complement indicates, then, the final clause in the series, while the hyperbaton of the qualifier still allows the relative clause to follow the complement. Finally, subject word groups, which rarely appear within such clauses in 1 Timothy, do not occur in HC-ptcs in 2 Timothy.

Changing Ranks: Rank-Shifted Clauses

In addition to hypotactic clauses that still function properly on the clause rank, there are various types of clauses that either function in themselves as a word group within another clause or they function as an adjectival modifier or qualifier within another word group. Rank-shifted clauses will be analyzed according to type of clause, divided into four general categories: infinitive clauses, attributive participle clauses, relative clauses, and clauses of indirect or direct discourse. As these types of rank-shifted clauses are analyzed for word group order and inter-clausal relationships, these clauses evince multiple syntactical patterns and tendencies, which are helpful for a full-orbed analysis of 2 Timothy among the PE.

---

[257] Towner argues that the λάβων clause is parallel to the initial ὡς clause (Towner, *Letters*, 445–46, 453), indicating the reason for Paul's thankfulness (see also Minor, *Summary*, 15). This project adopts the position of Marshall, who argues that the participle is parallel with the other participle clauses in 1:4 (Marshall, *Epistles*, 693), not indicating the cause for Paul giving thanks in the main, paratactic clause, but the cause for Paul's constant prayers for Timothy in the hypotactic, ὡς clause.

Infinitive Clauses

Within 2 Timothy, infinitive clauses demonstrate several consistent patterns and tendencies in syntax and word group order within the clause and inter-clausal relationships with regard to the governing clause. Some of the patterns are determined by the governing clause and the force of the infinitive, but many are consistent across infinitive clauses or impacted by more specific syntactical phenomena. As in 1 Timothy, it is fully codified that infinitives appear without the definite article. Infinitive clauses, as a partially codified pattern, function as or within the complement word group of the governing clause, with the only exceptions being where the infinitive clause functions as a subject word group governed by the impersonal verb δεῖ.[258] Infinitive clauses almost always follow their referent, yielding a partially codified pattern.[259] Only two infinitive clauses precede their referent, and both are complementary infinitive clauses modifying δύνμαι (2:13; 3:7). Infinitives do not, as a pattern, consistently modify verbal forms with specific moods or illocutionary force,[260] nor is there a single type of governing clause in which infinitive appears.[261] Infinitives do regularly appear in the aorist tense,[262] and, while there are not enough examples to denote a pattern, it is noteworthy that only present tense infinitives are used as subjects of the verb δεῖ and only aorist infinitives modify imperative verbal forms.[263]

---

[258] Out of eighteen infinitive clauses, fifteen of them function within a complement word group, either directly to the predicator or within the predicate of a clause. Infinitive clauses are not the objects of prepositions in the PE. The other three infinitive clauses are the subject word group of δεῖ in 2:6 and 2:24.

[259] Sixteen of the eighteen infinitive clauses in 2 Timothy follow their governing verb or adjective.

[260] The only exception would be the impersonal verb δεῖ, but the use of the subjective infinitive with δεῖ is not particular to 2 Timothy or the PE.

[261] Nine infinitive clauses occur within main, paratactic clauses, three occur within predicate participle clauses, and six appear within rank-shifted clauses of various types.

[262] Out of eighteen infinitives, ten are in the aorist tense, one is in the perfect tense, and seven are in the present tense.

[263] 2 Tim. 2:15; 4:9, 21.

The presence and syntax of word groups within infinitive clauses vary according to the force of the infinitive, the parts of speech and elements within the word groups, and the larger syntax of the governing clause. It is marginally codified that an infinitive clause will have an expressed complement word group[264] and, for those with expressed complements, that the complement will precede the infinitive.[265] Complement word groups tend to precede the predicator as a marginally codified pattern regardless of complement type, with the possible exception of compound complements.[266] For the complements that do not follow the expected word group order, the syntax can be explained due to other phenomena, including the presence of a relative clause within the complement (1:6), contrast (2:15), and, in the case of the infinitive clause of 2:13, not only a poetic context but also that fact that the governing clause concludes both a series and a subsection. The syntax of ending a section could also lie behind the P-C word group order for the infinitive clause in 1:18a, but there are other unique features for this clause in 2 Timothy, including the force for the infinitive itself as the C-DO of an optative governing verb. Only one infinitive clause includes a complement word group functioning as an indirect object (2:15); in this case, the indirect object follows the predicator while the direct object, in hyperbaton, both precedes the predicator and follows it.

Subject word groups within infinitive clauses are infrequent, only occurring four times, but there are two notable consistencies for them. Subject word groups in infinitive clauses always

---

[264] Eleven of eighteen infinitive clauses have an expressed complement word group.

[265] Of the eleven infinitive clauses with an expressed complement word group, seven precede the predicator while four follow the predicator.

[266] The infinitive clause in 4:1 has a compound complement that follows the predicator, and the only other compound complement in 2:15 evinces a C-P pattern but with hyperbaton for the complement, which is a serial, asyndeton list. This context is also unique in that the infinitive clause takes two complement word groups in an object-complement construction, includes a C-IO after the predicator, and the first element of the complement list precedes the predicator while the rest of the list follows both the predicator and the C-IO.

appear in the primary position and they do not occur within complementary infinitive clauses.[267]

Adjuncts word groups are common for infinitive clauses, although not with enough frequency to

constitute a pattern.[268] As with paratactic and hypotactic clauses on the rank of clause, A-PPs

tend to follow the predicator, while A-Advs tend to precede the predicator.[269] The two exceptions

for A-PPs (3:7; 4:21) could be due to the force of the PP, but there is not enough data to be

certain. It is likely, instead, that the placement is marked and emphatic. Not only does the

infinitive clause in 3:7 with its governing verb, δυνάμενα, conclude a long string of rank-shifted

participles, but the placement of the PP, εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας, highlights the tragedy of the

situation in 3:6–7 and the theme of learning, teaching, and truth.[270] The temporal PP, πρὸ

χειμῶνος, that precedes the infinitive in 4:21 is also likely emphatic. It does conclude the travel

details and commands of 4:9–21 within section ε, but the placement of the adjunct highlights the

urgency of Paul's request.[271] The only instance in which an A-Adv follows the predicator (4:9)

occurs with an imperative governing verb and within the first sentence of travel details and

commands of section ε. So, while the adverb ταχέως could be in an emphatic position, the

unexpected position is more likely to be caused by the sectional transition from δ to ε in 4:9.

---

[267] Two infinitive clauses with subject word groups have a subjective force (2:6, 24) and two have the force of an infinitive of indirect discourse following a verb of speaking (1:6; 2:18).

[268] Nine of the eighteen infinitive clauses of 2 Timothy include at least one adjunct word group.

[269] Out of the seven infinitive clauses with prepositional phrases, five include the adjunct following the predicator. Three of the four adjunct word groups consisting of the adverbs precede the infinitive.

[270] While the prepositional phrase is discussed theologically and thematically by various commentators, the position of the phrase is not mentioned, which would only add more weight to the importance of the phrase within the themes of the letter as a whole (see Knight, *Epistles*, 434, Marshall, *Epistles*, 777–78, Perkins, *Letters*, 210, and Towner, *Epistles*, 563).

[271] Marshall argues that this prepositional phrase expresses the urgency of the author's request (Marshall, *Epistles*, 829–30) and Towner helpfully outlines the importance of winter for travel consideration at this time (Towner, *Letters*, 653–54). But, the placement of the prepositional phrase itself not mentioned by either scholar, which in itself gives prominence to the temporal nature of the request and would only strengthen the arguments made by each commentator.

In addition to the patterns and tendencies outlined above, there are a few other notable phenomena that could impact the comparison of infinitive clauses in 2 Timothy with the other letters of the PE and the New Testament. While it is a marginally codified pattern that infinitive clauses will have an expressed complement, infinitive that are governed by participles are less likely to have an expressed complement.[272] There are two infinitive clauses that appear within rank-shifted, recitative ὅτι clauses (1:12; 3:15). In both cases, the infinitive clause is complementary, it modifies a form of δύναμαι, it includes a PP of εἰς expressing destination or goal, and the word group order of the clause is identical, following a C-P-A structure. Lastly, as with paratactic and hypotactic clauses properly on the rank of clause, the placement of an infinitive with a sentence that begins or, more commonly, concludes a section or subsection, likely impacts the syntax and word group order of the clause.

Attributive Participle Clauses

Attributive participle clauses are very common in 2 Timothy, accounting for a large portion of the rank-shifted clauses in the letter. Of the ninety rank-shifted clauses, there are thirty-eight attributive participle clauses, functioning eighteen times as attributive adjectives, thirteen times as substantives, and seven times as predicate nominatives. For those functioning as attributive adjectives, it is partially codified that they will be in "repeat" position.[273] Attributive participles appear in the aorist, perfect, and present tenses, but the tense does very according to the force of the participle. When the participle clause is functioning as an adjective in a C-PN, it will likely

---

[272] There are seven infinitive clauses functioning as the complement of a predicate or attributive participle. Only three such infinitive clauses have an expressed complement.

[273] Fifteen of the eighteen adjectival participles are in "repeat" position.

be a perfect-tense participle, and no aorist participles are used in a C-PN.[274] Substantive participles, as a partially codified pattern, are in the present tense, with only one example each of the perfect and aorist tenses.[275] Attributive participles in adjectival position to a head noun show more variance, but according to syntactical position. The three adjectival participles in "sandwich" position only appear in the present tense, while those in "repeat" position appear commonly in all three tenses.[276] Regardless of force, rank-shifted participle clauses, as a partially codified pattern, follow their governing predicator, with exceptions generally being when the participle is functioning as or within a subject word group.[277] Attributive participles in 2 Timothy are just as likely to have the article as they are to be anarthrous *in toto*,[278] but the likelihood varies according to the usage of the participle. Adjectival participles are equally likely to be definite or indefinite,[279] while it is a partially codified pattern that substantive participles will be arthrous.[280] Participle clauses functioning as a predicate nominative, however, never include a definite article, which would generally be expected.

Within rank-shifted participle clauses themselves, word group order patterns are evident, especially with regard to complement and adjunct word groups. It is a fully codified pattern that attributive participle clauses will not have an expressed subject word group, but complement and

---

[274] Out of the seven attributive participles functioning as predicate nominatives, five are in the perfect tense while two are in the present tense.

[275] Eleven of the thirteen substantive participles not functioning as a C-PN are in the present tense.

[276] Of the fifteen adjectival participles in "repeat" position, six are in the aorist tense, three are in the perfect tense, and six are in the present tense.

[277] Thirty-four of the thirty-eight attributive participle clauses follow the predicator of their governing clause. Of the four that precede the governing predicator, two are substantive participle clauses functioning as the subject word group of the governing clause (2:4; 3:12) and one is adjectival to the subject of its governing clause (2:6).

[278] Half of all attributive participle clauses are arthrous, with the other nineteen appearing without the article.

[279] Nine of eighteen adjectival participles include a definite article.

[280] Of the thirteen substantive participle clauses, ten of them include a definite article.

adjunct word groups are common.[281] The presence or absence of the definite article does not

appear to impact which word groups appear not their order within the clause.[282] When the clause

has expressed complement, it is partially codified that the complement will follow the predicator

in a P-C pattern.[283] This pattern is consistent regardless of complement type, with the only

exceptions that follow a C-P pattern being a complementary infinitive as the C-DO modifying a

participle of δύναμαι (3:7) and a nominal group with a qualifier modifying a participle that

functions as a C-PN, appears in contrast to the previous participle clause, and concludes an

extended list (3:5). It is potentially noteworthy that complement word groups that include

qualifiers are only within participle clauses functioning as a C-PN within the governing clause.[284]

For adjunct word groups, A-PPs tend to follow expected word group order, following their

governing predicator as a partially codified pattern.[285] The only two exceptions, found in 2:21

and 3:17, are both PP of purpose,[286] within participle clauses that conclude an extended

compound C-PN, and within participle clauses that appear at the end of a subsection – γ-3 and δ-

2, respectively. A-Advs appear in different word group order than other clause types, although

not with enough frequency to determine any conclusive patterns. Only two of six A-Advs are

before the predicator (3:7), both consisting of temporal adverbs, while another temporal adverb

---

[281] While no rank-shifted participle clause includes an expressed subject, seventeen of the thirty-eight clauses have an expressed complement and fifteen have an expressed adjunct.

[282] Of the seventeen attributive participle clauses with an expressed complement, nine are arthrous while eight are anarthrous. Similarly, for the fifteen participle clauses with an expressed adjunct, eight do not have the article while seven are definite.

[283] The complement follows the predicator fifteen of seventeen times for rank-shifted participle clauses.

[284] 2 Tim. 2:15, 19; 3:5; 4:8.

[285] Eleven rank-shifted participle clauses include a prepositional phrase. Nine of them have the prepositional phrase following the predicator.

[286] One uses the preposition εἰς to expressed purpose (2:21), while the other uses πρός (3:17).

(1:10) and three A-CUs follow their governing predicator (1:9; 3:6).[287] Adverbial adjunct word groups within attributive participle clauses in 2 Timothy only occur within two sentences (1:8–11; 3:6–7), and only within other rank-shifted clauses.

Relative Clauses

Within the letter of 2 Timothy, relative clauses evince strong word group order patterns, mainly dependent on the function of the relative pronoun within its clause, and have the highest likelihood of any clause type to include multiple word groups beyond the predicator. It is a partially codified pattern that a relative clause will include an expressed complement word group,[288] and for those with both an expressed complement word group and an expressed predicator word group it is marginally codified that the relative clause will follow a C-P structure.[289] This is not necessarily indicative of a default sentence structure, however, as thirteen of the sixteen relative clauses with a C-P structure include the relative pronoun, which always takes the primary position of the clause, either as the complement word group or an element within it. For the remaining seven relative clauses with both a predicator word group and an expressed complement, the relative pronoun functions either as the subject word group[290] or part of an adjunct word group.[291] All three relative clauses without an expressed complement include

---

[287] One dative of means follows the predicator within a poetic section (1:9) and another follows the predicator of an attributive participle that is within another rank-shifted participle clause (3:6). The dative of agency in 3:6 also appears within an attributive participle clauses embedded within a larger, rank-shifted participle clause.

[288] There are twenty-six relative clauses in 2 Timothy, with twenty-three including an expressed complement word group. The relative pronoun appears as or within the complement word group for fourteen of the twenty-three relative clauses with expressed complements.

[289] Three relative clauses with an expressed complement word group are nominal (2:20; 4:18), leaving sixteen of the remaining twenty relative clauses with a C-P structure and four with a P-C pattern.

[290] One of these (1:6) follows a P-C pattern, while two (2:2; 3:11) follow a C-P pattern.

[291] One of these (1:12) follows a C-P pattern, while three (1:6, 11; 3:8) follow a P-C pattern.

at least one adjunct word group,[292] and two of them include the relative pronoun as the subject (1:5; 2:18). Relative clauses are likely to have an expressed subject word group,[293] and those with expressed subjects with always include an expressed complement word group, adjunct word group, or both.[294] Apart from the cases when the relative pronoun itself is the subject word group, in which case the subject will the primary element of the clause, there is no consistent pattern regarding the placement of the subject word group in relation to the complement or predicator word groups. For both cases in which the relative pronoun functions as a partitive genitive (1:15 and 2:17), though, the clause follows a C-P-S pattern and the subject word group is a compound subject with two nominal elements. It is a marginally codified pattern that relative clauses will include at least one adjunct word group, occurring within seventeen of the twenty-six relative clauses. These seventeen clauses include twenty-seven total adjunct word groups: twenty-two A-PPs, four A-Advs, and one A-CU. Prepositional phrases within relative clauses, aside from the four cases where the relative pronoun is within the C-OP (1:6, 11, 12; 2:9), follow the predicator as a partially codified pattern.[295] A-Advs, aside from the single instance where the relative pronoun itself is within an adverbial adjunct word group as an idiomatic connector (3:8), appear

---

[292] 2 Tim. 1:5; 2:9, 18.

[293] Fourteen of the twenty-six relative clauses include an expressed subject word group. The relative pronoun functions as the subject word group for seven of them (1:5, 6; 2:2, 18, 20; 3:11), as the complement word group for five of them (1:15; 2:17; 4:8, 15, 18), and twice as part of an adjunct word group (1:11; 3:8).

[294] Twelve of the fourteen relative clauses with an expressed subject also include an expressed complement, and nine of the fourteen include at least one adjunct word group. Seven relative clauses include all four word group types (1:6, 11; 3:8, 11; 4:8, 15, 18).

[295] For the eighteen prepositional phrases that do not include the relative pronoun as part of the phrase, fifteen follow the predicator. There is no consistent syntax for the three exceptions to this pattern. In 1:18, a locative prepositional phrase appears between the complement and predicator word groups, the relative clause itself functions as the complement of the larger clause, and it appears at the end of section. In 1:13, a prepositional phrase indicating source appears between the complement and predicator word groups, but the relative clause is adjectival to a qualifier word group modifying the direct object of the governing clause. In 2:18, the prepositional phrase of reference appears between the subject and predicator word groups within an adjectival relative clause that is, in itself, embedded within another relative clause.

on both sides of the predicator, with the additive καί preceding the predicator two times (1:12; 4:15) and the other two adjunct word groups following the predicator.[296]

In addition to the syntax within the relative clauses, they also have some consistent syntactical issues with regard to their referent and their governing clause. Relative clauses, as a partially codified pattern, follow the predicator of their governing clause.[297] Exceptions only occur when the relative pronoun is idiomatically functioning as a connective device[298] or within section transitions.[299] Similarly, relative clauses tend to follow their referent as marginally codified pattern,[300] preceding their referent only in idiomatic use (1:6, 12; 3:8), where the relative clause in pendant (2:2), and for the one correlative pronoun adjectival to the C-DO in its own clause (3:11). It is partially codified that relative clauses will only appear within paratactic and hypotactic clauses that are properly on the rank of clause, with only four relative clauses being embedded within other rank-shifted clauses.[301] Furthermore, every relative clause that is embedded within another rank-shifted clause includes an expressed subject word group.

---

[296] One is the temporal use of the adverbial accusative πρῶτον (1:5) and the other is a comparative ὡς word group (2:9).

[297] Twenty of the twenty-six relative clauses follow their governing predicator.

[298] The relative pronoun is within a prepositional phrase that, in itself, functions as a conjunction in 1:6 and 1:12 and the relative pronoun is within an adverbial group functioning as a connector in 3:8.

[299] In 1:18, the relative clause itself is the complement word group of the governing clause within the final clause of section β. In 2:2, the relative clause is pendant, anticipating the complement of the governing clause, occurs with an imperative governing verb, and is part of the opening sentence of section γ. The final exception occurs in 4:13, where the relative clause modifies the complement of the governing clause, is governed by an imperative verb, and appears within the final clause proper of subsection ε-1.

[300] For the twenty-six relative clauses, five do not have an external referent, leaving sixteen that follow their referent and five that precede it.

[301] Twenty-one relative clauses are within main, paratactic clauses, one is within a hypotactic, predicate participle clause, one is within a recitative ὅτι clause, one within an infinitive clause, one is within an attributive participle clause, and one is embedded within another relative clause.

Ὅτι Clauses, Ἵνα Clauses, and Direct Quotations

Rank-shifted clauses of indirect or direct discourse are not as common in the letter of 2

Timothy, with only six recitative or appositive ὅτι clauses, two clauses of direct quotations, and

no ἵνα clauses embedded within other clauses in rank shift.[302] More examples, therefore, would

be needed to establish any conclusive patterns or tendencies, but there are some possible

tendencies worth noting. Multiple tenses and verb types are used as the predicator within rank-

shifted ὅτι clauses, and the clauses appear within both clauses proper and other rank-shifted

clauses.[303] The usage of the ὅτι clause is potentially significant as only the two appositive ὅτι

clauses have expressed subject word groups,[304] modify the pronoun τοῦτο, are within paratactic

clauses, and appear at the beginning of a section or subsection.[305] Across both appositive and

recitative ὅτι clauses, the presence of adjunct word groups is fairly likely, occurring for three of

the six ὅτι clauses. It is also highly likely that the ὅτι clause will have an expressed complement

word group. Adjunct word groups are always before the predicator, both for the two with A-PPs

(3:1, 15) and the one with an A-Adv (1:5).[306] For the five with expressed complements, one is a

---

[302] It is possible that the ἵνα clause in 2:10 could be appositional, modifying the τοῦτο in the opening prepositional phrase of the main clause, and certainly the causality implied by διὰ τοῦτο is explained further in some way by the ἵνα clause. But, the only times τοῦτο is followed by an appositive clause (1:15; 3:1) are when the demonstrative functions as the complement of the main clause with a verb of perception. It is more likely, then, that the ἵνα clause in 2:10 functions properly as a HC-Cj indicating purpose, as is the common interpretation among commentators (Knight, *Epistles*, 399, Lenksi, *Interpretation*, 791–92, Perkins, *Letters*, 185, or Towner, *Letters*, 505).

[303] Both appositive ὅτι clauses are embedded with a paratactic clause, modifying the complement of the governing clause (1:15; 3:1), while recitative ὅτι clauses are within predicate participle clauses (2:23; 3:15) or relative clauses (1:5, 12).

[304] Furthermore, for the ὅτι clauses in 1:15 and 3:1 the subject word group is the last element of the clause.

[305] The governing clause in 1:15 is the first sentence of subsection β-3 and the governing clause in 3:1 is the opening sentence of section δ.

[306] A temporal prepositional phrase precedes is the first element of the ὅτι clause in 3:1, and a prepositional phrase indicating temporal origin or source is also the primary element in 3:15. The prepositional phrase in 1:5 does not function as an adjunct, but is nominalized as the predicate nominative of the nominal clause. Furthermore, in 1:5 the clause does not have an expressed predicator, but the adjunct is an additive καί that appears in the primary position of the clause.

nominal clause with an assumed predicator and subject, two follow a P-C structure, and the other

two follow a [C]-P-[C] structure with hyperbaton in the complement word group. Given that the

two ὅτι clauses with a P-C structure have a pronoun and a single nominal group as the C-DO,

this could be suggestive that the primary clause structure for ὅτι clauses is P-C, with the

hyperbaton in 1:12 and 3:15 serving to give emphasis to the part of the complement preceding

the predicator, but more data would be needed to validate that conclusion. Within their governing

clause, all rank-shifted ὅτι clauses in 2 Timothy appear after their governing predicator and

either serve as the complement word group of it (1:5, 12; 2:23; 3:15) or modify the complement

as an appositive qualifier (1:15; 3:1). In addition to recitative or appositive ὅτι clauses, the only

other rank-shifted clauses of discourse are two direct quotations modifying the same referent in

2:19, namely, τὴν σφραγῖδα ταύτην. Both have the predicator in the primary position and include

an expressed subject. One includes an expressed complement, while the other has a prepositional

phrase as an adjunct word group. It is difficult to establish anything conclusive, however, based

on two samples, and this difficulty is only increased due to the nature of quotations. One

quotation, taken from Numbers 16:5, parallels the word group order both in the Hebrew text and

in the LXX, while the other quotation appears to the taken from a combination of texts, and does

not have any clear word group order being paralleled from the source material.[307]

The Rank of Word Group

The lowest rank for the current project is the rank of word group, in which a word or group

of words together serve one, discrete syntactical function within a clause. The order of words

within the word groups display some patterns, according to function, and some ways in which

---

[307] See Towner, *Letters*, 534–37 for a detailed discussion of the second quotation and possible source
material.

word order reinforces syntactical patterns from the rank of clause and section. Word groups, for the below analysis, will be divided into the categories presented in chapter one, beginning with the presentation the most fundamental word groups for clausal structure: subject word groups and complement word groups. Predicator word groups, however, will not be analyzed, as they do not contain the same level of flexibility and variation as other word groups. Following this, adjunct word groups will be presented. In addition to the word groups that serve a discrete function with the clause itself, qualifier word groups will also be analyzed.

Subject Word Groups

The letter of 2 Timothy includes seventy-six explicit subject word groups, and the presence of various elements within them, such as adjective or embedded qualifiers, impacts their greater syntactical patterns. Subject word group are regularly single nouns or pronouns,[308] but it is more likely for subject word groups to include some other element beyond the noun itself.[309] While the definite article appears with a variety of other elements, qualifiers and adjectives other than the definite article tend not to appear within the same subject word group, with only one exception.[310] In addition to the presence of these additional phenomena, there are seven compound subjects in 2 Timothy. Compound subjects almost always use a conjunction, with only one compound subject appearing in asyndeton,[311] and they tend to appear as the subject word groups of main,

---

[308] Twenty-eight subject words are a single noun or pronoun only. In addition to this, there are four compound subjects that consist of nouns without additional adjectives or qualifiers and two infinitive clauses that function as rank-shifted subject word groups. In total, then, there are thirty-four word subject word groups that do not include an article, adjective, or an embedded qualifier word group.

[309] Forty-two subject word groups include at least one article, adjective, or qualifier word group.

[310] There are fourteen subject word groups with qualifiers and twelve with adjectives, but only one subject, in 2:19, word group includes both. The subject word group in 2:19, rather than introducing a new topic (contra Perkins, *Letters*, 194–95), instead has such unusual, marked syntax for the purpose of emphatic contrast to the statements of the false teachers in 2:16–18.

[311] Six compound subject word groups utilize a conjunction, with one, in 4:21, utilizing polysyndeton to

paratactic clauses, with only two of the seven serving as the subject of rank-shifted clauses.[312] Within the larger clausal syntax, it is a marginally codified pattern that subject word groups appear within clauses proper rather than rank-shifted clauses.[313]

Subject word groups in 2 Timothy are likely to appear without adjectives or embedded qualifiers, respectively, as a partially codified pattern.[314] When subject word groups do include an adjective, they are equally likely to modify definite or indefinite head and the subject word group appears both before and following the governing predicator with regularity.[315] These adjectives can be attributive adjectives in "sandwich" position (2:6, 19; 3:13), attributive adjectives in "repeat" position (2:4, 20; 3:1), or the adjective πᾶς in predicate position.[316] The adjective πᾶς in predicate position almost always precedes the head noun, with the only exception occurring in 4:21 when πᾶς follows its referent, modifying the final element of an extended list. It is a partially codified pattern that that only appear in paratactic and hypotactic clauses proper.[317] It is codified that qualifiers in subject word groups will modify definite head nouns,[318] codified that

---

combine more than two elements. The only compound subject with asyndeton as the connective device appears in a formulaic greeting within the opening salutation (1:2).

[312] Five compound subjects are the subject of the main, paratactic clause (1:2; 2:24; 3:8, 13; 4:21), and two are subject of relative clauses (1:15; 2:17).

[313] Fifty-three of the seventy-six explicit subject word groups are in paratactic or hypotactic clauses on the rank of clause, while twenty-three appear within rank-shifted clauses.

[314] There are fourteen subject word groups with an embedded qualifier and twelve with an adjectival modifier aside from the definite article.

[315] Of the twelve subject word groups with an adjectival modifier, six include definite head noun and six include indefinite head nouns. These subject word groups precede the governing verb in five clauses, follow the governing verb in six clauses, and appear in one nominal clause.

[316] Two of the attributive adjectives are rank-shifted participles (2:4, 6), appearing in both "sandwich" and "repeat" positions.

[317] Only two of the qualifier word groups modify a subject that is in a rank-shifted clause (2:24; 4:8).

[318] Thirteen qualifiers word groups modify subjects that the pronouns, proper nouns, or nouns with a definite article. The only exception occurs in 2:24, when an indefinite qualifier follows an indefinite head noun within a rank-shifted infinitive clause.

they will match in grammatical definiteness with their head noun,[319] and partially codified that they will follow their head noun.[320]

Two syntactical phenomena for subject word groups in 2 Timothy that are more common than adjectives or qualifiers are that they include a definite article and that they appear within rank-shifted clauses. The definite article appears with thirty-two expressed subjects,[321] and subjects with the definite article are more likely to include a qualifier than the average for all subject word groups.[322] Subject word groups with definite articles are less likely, however, to appear within rank-shifted clauses, making it a partially codified pattern that they will appear within clauses proper.[323] As a whole, rank shift does not appear to impact the presence of adjectives within subject word groups, the syntax of compound subjects, or the likelihood of the subject word group preceding or following the governing predicator.[324] Subject word groups within rank-shifted clauses do, however, evince some variation for other phenomena. Subject

---

[319] Thirteen of fourteen qualifier word groups match the definiteness of their head noun. The only exception occurs when two grammatically indefinite qualifiers modify a demonstrative pronoun in 3:8 by appearing in apposition. In this instance, the qualifier also appears in hyperbaton to its head noun, with the head noun as the subject preceding the governing verb but the qualifier following the governing predicator and complement word groups.

[320] Eleven subject word groups with qualifier have the qualifiers explicitly following the head noun, and in 3:9 the qualifier follows the article with the head noun elided. The qualifier precedes the head noun in 3:17 and 4:8. In both cases, the qualifier modifies a definite noun, comes between the article and the head noun in an A-Q-N structure, and appears the final paratactic clause of a subsection or section (δ-2 and δ-3, respectively).

[321] This number only includes the thirty-two subject word groups with an article modifying a noun. If this number is combined with the subject word groups consisting of personal pronouns, demonstrative pronouns, relative pronouns, and proper nouns, sixty of the seventy-six subject words in 2 Timothy are grammatically definite.

[322] For the thirty-two subject word groups that include a definite article, seven include an adjectival modifier and nine include qualifiers, compared to only twelve subject word groups of seventy-six total with an adjectival modifier or fourteen of seventy-six with an embedded qualifier. The likelihood is very similar, then, for the presence of an adjective, but almost twice as likely for a qualifier.

[323] Seven of the thirty-two subject word groups with definite articles appear within a rank-shifted context, compared with twenty-three of seventy-six overall.

[324] While this is true overall, specific types of clauses do have their own tendencies. Within infinitive clauses, expressed subjects are always before the predicator (1:6; 2:6, 28, 24), while those in rank-shifted ὅτι clauses and direct quotes are always after the predicator (1:15; 2:19; 3:1). It is not clear, however, if the tendency is due to rank shift itself or the syntax of the type of clause itself.

word groups in rank-shifted clauses are less likely to have a definite article and are less likely to have embedded qualifiers.[325] When subject word groups are expressed within a rank-shifted clause, it is marginally codified that the clause is a relative clause,[326] and relative clauses as a whole are the most likely type of clause to include an expressed subject.[327]

Complement Word Groups

Complement word groups are the most common word group in 2 Timothy, serving four chief syntactical functions: the direct object of a predicator (C-DO), the indirect object of a predicator (C-IO), the predicate complement of a copulative verb (C-PN), or the object of a prepositional phrase (C-OP). They will be analyzed here according to their function with the clause, especially as complements of a predicator serve a fundamentally different function than complements of prepositional phrases. The most common use of a complement word group is to serve as the complement of a predicator, with one hundred twenty-one as a C-DO, fourteen as a C-IO, and twenty-two as C-PNs, whether expressed or implied.

C-DOs are slightly more likely to appear with no extra elements beyond the head noun, pronoun, or rank-shifted clause.[328] Within direct objects, embedded qualifier word groups are not uncommon, tending to appear together with a definite article.[329] It is partially codified that

---

[325] Only seven subject word groups within rank-shifted clauses include a definite article and only two include an embedded qualifier.

[326] Out of the twenty-three subject word groups in rank-shifted clauses, fourteen are in relative clauses.

[327] For the twenty-six relative clauses in 2 Timothy, fourteen include an expressed subject, compared with only four of eighteen infinitive clauses, six of thirty hypotactic clauses proper, or forty-four of the one hundred sixteen total paratactic clauses.

[328] Sixty-seven of the one hundred twenty-one direct object word groups do not include a definite article, adjectival modifier, or embedded qualifier.

[329] Twenty-six direct object complements include an embedded qualifier. Of those, sixteen modify a head noun with a definite article. The other ten qualifier word groups modify a head noun with no additional phenomena. There is only one instance where a qualifier within a direct object word group in 2 Timothy modifies a head noun that also is modified by an adjective beyond the article (2:19).

qualifiers in C-DOs follow the head noun,[330] and those that precede their head noun tend to have stylistic emphasis, either as a qualifier to a compound complement (3:10) or as a conclusion of a serial list (2:18; 4:19).[331] Qualifiers in C-DOs match their head nouns in grammatical definiteness as a partially codified pattern[332] Qualifiers in C-DOs tend not to appear within rank-shifted clauses[333] and it is noteworthy, compared with 1 Timothy, that qualifiers in 2 Timothy are commonly pronouns and very rarely a relative clause.[334] C-DOs in 2 Timothy regularly appear with a definite article; it is a marginally codified pattern that C-DOs with definite articles will include another element beyond the head noun, whether an adjective or a qualifier.[335] For C-DOs with both a definite article and another adjectival modifier, it is partially codified that it is an attributive adjective between the article and the head noun in "sandwich" position.[336] Adjectives in C-DOs, regardless of the presence or absence of the direct article, are attributive adjectives in

---

[330] Twenty-two of the twenty-seven direct object complements with qualifiers have the qualifiers following their head noun.

[331] The other two examples, found in 1:4 and 2:4, do not evince larger stylistic concerns that would explain the marked syntax.

[332] Twenty-four qualifiers either explicitly match their head noun in grammatical definiteness or contain elements with ambiguity in this regard, such as a relative clause (4:13) or a direct quotation (2:19). Three qualifiers explicitly differ from their head nouns with regard to definiteness. One includes a nominalized prepositional phrase as a modifier within a qualifier of an indefinite head noun (1:5), one includes a nominalized adjective serving as the head noun (2:6), and the third is within a direct quotation (2:19).

[333] Only ten qualifiers modify direct objects in rank-shifted clauses.

[334] Ten of the qualifiers that modify direct objects in 2 Timothy are pronouns, compared with only one such pronoun in 1 Timothy. Only one relative clause serves as a qualifier to a direct object in 2 Tim. 4:13, while five of the twenty qualifiers that modify direct objects in 1 Timothy are relative clauses.

[335] Thirty-nine direct objects are modified by a definite article. Among these, sixteen also include an embedded qualifier while thirteen include an adjective. No direct object complement includes an article, another adjective, and a qualifier within the same word group.

[336] Ten of the thirteen direct objects with both definite articles and other adjectives have an attributive adjective in "sandwich" position in an Article-Adjective-Noun pattern. One of these also includes a nominalized participle clause as an adjective in "repeat position" (3:15). The only other example of an attributive adjective that is not in "sandwich" position occurs in 2:10, where a nominalized prepositional phrase modifies an indefinite noun both in "repeat" position and in hyperbaton, interrupted by the governing verb.

237

"sandwich" position as a marginally codified pattern,[337] and those in "repeat" position are always

rank-shifted participle clauses or nominalized PPs.[338] While qualifiers tend not to modify C-DOs

in rank-shifted clauses, the phenomenon of rank shift does not appear to impact the syntax of the

definite article or other adjectival modifiers within direct object word groups.

The function of direct object is the most common for complement word groups of

predicators, but in 2 Timothy fourteen complement word group function as a C-IO and twenty-

two function as a C-PN of an explicit or assumed verb. C-IOs, as a marginally codified pattern,

tend to be pronouns without any additional adjectives or qualifiers.[339] While there are too few

examples for any conclusive results, a few observations are noteworthy. When the indirect object

is a noun, it always contains an additional modifying element.[340] Additionally, C-IOs that include

nouns never appear before their governing verb, while pronouns as C-IOs can either precede or

follow the predicator of the clause.[341] C-PNs regularly include adjectives or embedded qualifiers,

but never a definite article.[342] If the C-PN is an adjective, it is marginally codified that it will

have at least one qualifier[343] and partially codified that the qualifier will follow the head

---

[337] Thirteen of the eighteen direct objects with adjectives include an attributive adjective in "sandwich" position. One of these includes two adjectives in "sandwich" position modifying the same head noun (2:23).

[338] Only four C-DOs include attributive adjectival modifiers in "repeat" position: three include one or more rank-shifted participles (2:8; 3:6, 15), and two include one or more nominalized prepositional phrases (2:8, 10).

[339] Nine of fourteen C-IOs in 2 Timothy only have the pronoun itself as the complement word group.

[340] The five indirect objects that are nouns all have additional elements, including three definite articles (1:3, 16; 2:25), three qualifiers (1:2, 3, 16), and one adjective (2:2).

[341] Indirect objects that are nouns either follow the predicator (1:3, 16; 2:2, 15) or follow the subject word group in a nominal clause (1:2). Pronominal indirect objects regularly follow the predicator (1:7, 9, 18; 2:25; 4:8), but can also precede it (3:11; 4:3, 14).

[342] Eleven complements of copulative verbs have no element beyond a noun, pronoun, or nominalized element. The other eleven predicate nominatives are predicate adjectives, with or without additional qualifiers.

[343] Eight of the eleven predicate nominative complements with predicate adjectives include at least one embedded qualifier. One predicate nominative has two qualifiers one a single predicator adjective (4:11), while a compound predicate nominative with four predicate adjectives includes qualifiers for three of them (2:21).

adjective.[344] When a qualifier precedes its head adjective, it is either the sole pronoun used as a

qualifier to a predicate adjective (4:11) or it is a marked syntax switch on the final element of an

asyndetic, compound complement (2:21). C-PNs regularly appear on both sides of the predicator,

but anytime a C-PN with an embedded qualifier precedes the predicator it will also evince

hyperbaton, with the predicate adjective preceding the predicator and the qualifier following.[345]

Hyperbaton, when included in a complement word group, is the most likely to occur within C-

PNs, especially when the sentence is a transition between sections and subsections.[346]

C-OPs demonstrate some consistent syntactical patterns and tendencies in 2 Timothy. They

regularly have no extra element within the word group beyond the head noun or pronoun,

although definite articles, adjectives, and qualifiers are common.[347] C-OPs with embedded

qualifiers tend to include the definite article,[348] and it is partially codified that the qualifier will

follow the head noun.[349] It is codified that qualifiers within C-OPs will match their referent in

grammatical definiteness, with the only exception occurring in 2:14, where a definite qualifier

---

[344] Nine qualifier word groups across the eight predicate nominatives follow their head adjective.

[345] 2 Tim. 1:12; 2:2, 24; 3:9.

[346] Five of the twenty-two predicate nominative complements evince hyperbaton (1:12; 2:2, 24; 3:9, 17). This is compared to seven of one hundred twenty-one direct object complements, no indirect object complements, and only one of one hundred twenty-one complement word groups serving as the object of prepositions. Of these five predicate nominatives with hyperbaton, four are within sentences that begin or end a section or subsection. In 2:2, the complement is within a relative clause that ends the opening sentence of γ-1. In 2:24, the complement is within the subjective infinitive clause of the main, paratactic clause that ends subsection γ-4 and section γ. In 3:9, the complement is the predicate nominative of the final main clause of δ-1, while the predicate nominative in 3:17 is within the ἵνα clause in 3:17, which serves as the final clause of δ-2.

[347] Sixty-four of the one hundred twenty-one complement word groups of prepositions consist of only a single noun or pronoun. Thirty-three include a definite article, twenty-four have a qualifier word group, and twenty-six include additional adjectival modifiers.

[348] Fourteen of twenty-four complements of prepositions with qualifiers modify a noun that is also modified by the definite article.

[349] Only three qualifiers within complements of prepositions precede the head noun. All three also include the definite article, appearing in an Article-Qualifier-Noun pattern or some variant of it. Furthermore, in 2 Timothy this phenomenon occurs only within paratactic and hypotactic clauses proper, and two of them are within a context in which the discussion includes ὁ διάβολος (2:26).

modifies a common noun without an article.[350] The presence of the definite article within C-OPs

is not particularly common, but when it does appear, it is partially codified that the complement

will also include an adjective or qualifier in addition to the article.[351] Thirty-one adjectival

modifiers appear within twenty-six C-OPs.[352] These tend to be attributive adjectives, and it is

marginally codified that they will be in "repeat" position.[353] All eight attributive adjectives in

"sandwich" position are adjectives proper,[354] while rank-shifted participle clauses and

nominalized PPs always appear in "repeat" position within C-OPs.[355] Adjectives proper will

always match their referent in grammatical definiteness, regardless of syntactical position,[356]

while five of the seven nominalized elements functioning as adjectives do not match their

referent, with the nominalized element including a definite article modifying a grammatically

indefinite head noun.[357] There are also seven predicate adjectives within C-OPs: four uses of the

adjective πᾶς in predicate position and three uses of the demonstrative pronoun ἐκεῖνος used as a

predicate adjective. When used in this way, πᾶς always precedes the head noun, never appears

---

[350] In this instance, the qualifier occurs within the context of contrast with the preceding PP and the qualifier itself concludes the opening sentence of subsection γ-3.

[351] Thirty-three complements of prepositions include the definite article. Among these, thirteen also include an attributive or predicate adjective, fourteen include an embedded qualifier, and two include all three elements (4:16, 18).

[352] Two of these include relative pronouns functioning as adjectives for an idiomatic use of the prepositional phrase, δι'ἣν αἰτίαν, as a conjunctive element (1:6, 12).

[353] There are twenty-two attributive adjectives within twenty prepositional phrases, fourteen of which are in "repeat" position.

[354] 2 Tim. 1:3, 9; 2:2, 20, 22; 3:1; 4:3, 16.

[355] There are four nominalized prepositional phrases used as adjectives (1:13; 2:1; 3:15, 16), and three rank-shifted participle clauses (1:9, 14; 4:1).

[356] This is true for all eight attributive adjectives in "sandwich" position and all seven adjectives proper in "repeat" position.

[357] See 2 Tim. 1:9, 13, 14; 3:15, 16. The nominalized prepositional phrase in 2:1 modified a definite head noun, as does the definite participle phrase in 4:1.

with the article, and usually appears in an Adjective-Noun-Adjective formulaic structure.[358]

When ἐκεῖνος is used as a predicate adjective, is also always precedes its head noun, only

appears within temporal prepositional phrases, and only modifies ἡμέρα with a definite article in

an Adjective-Article-Noun pattern.[359] Both predicate adjectives and attributive adjectives in

"repeat" position tend to appear in PPs that follow the governing verb, while any adjectives

within prepositional phrases that precede their governing verb tend to be attributive adjectives in

"sandwich" position.[360] The only exception, found in 2:21, is where the prepositional phrase is

itself within a rank-shifted participle clause that functions as the final element of a compound

predicate nominative within the final sentence of subsection γ-3. In this case, the marked syntax

not only signals the end of the list, but the end of the subsection. Finally, within C-OPs

compound complements are not common, only occurring within four PPs;[361] when they do occur,

however, they always use a conjunction to join the nouns together rather than asyndeton.

It is possible that the force of the preposition impacts the expected word order in some

cases. Within C-OPs, many of the patterns and tendencies of word order either do not depend on

the force of the preposition or the data is lacking to determine the impact of the prepositional

force, but some patterns might be evident for PPs with the forces of source, norm or standard,

means, and time. PPs indicating source or origin occur with παρά on five occasions (1:13, 18;

---

[358] These three instances all include the noun ἔγρον and an attributive adjective following the head noun, either ἀγαθός (2:21; 3:17) or πονηρός (4:18). The other appearance of πᾶς is found in 4:2, where the adjective modifies both indefinite nouns in the compound complement.

[359] 2 Tim. 1:12, 18; 4:18.

[360] All the predicate adjectives and attributive adjectives in "repeat" position follow their governing predicator except for one complement word group that includes both a predicate adjective and an attributive adjective in "repeat" position (2:21). On the contrary, out of the seven complements of predicators that precede their governing verb, six of them include an adjectival modifier that precedes its referent in "sandwich" position (1:6, 12, 20; 3:1; 4:3, 16).

[361] 2 Tim. 1:2, 13; 4:1, 2

241

2:2; 3:14),[362] ἐκ on two occasions (2:8, 22), and once with ἀπό (1:2). When the preposition is παρά, the C-OP is only a single noun (1:18) or pronoun (1:13; 2:2; 3:14) in the genitive case, indicating a personal source, while the complements of ἐκ or ἀπό always include an adjective (2:22) or a qualifier (1:2; 2:8), indicating origin or cause. The preposition κατά occurs seven times in 2 Timothy with the accusative case to indicative norm or standard (1:1, 8, 9; 2:8; 4:3, 14), with additional elements beyond the head noun in every instance.[363] PPs indicating means occur ten times in the letter: eight times with διά and the genitive case and twice with ἐν. When the C-OP of a preposition of means is a common noun, it will always include additional elements beyond the head noun.[364] The only two instances where the complement does not include additional modifying elements is when the word group is a single pronoun (4:17) or proper noun (1:9). Temporal PPs, in addition to almost always appearing within a rank-shifted context,[365] tend to include elements beyond the head noun depending on the preposition that is used and the temporal referent. Temporal PPs indicating present time, with ἐν (1:18; 3:1; 4:8, 16), or future time, with εἰς (1:12; 4:18), always include additional elements modifying the head noun, while those of past time with πρό (1:9; 4:21) or ἀπό (1:3; 3:15) are typically a single common noun.[366]

---

[362] The παρά phrase in 3:14 is doing double duty in this analysis, as it serves as an adjunct word group within a hypotactic clause but also as the opening adjunct word group of a relative clause.

[363] Five of the seven include an additional qualifier, five include a definite article, and two include an attributive adjective.

[364] This occurs for eight of the ten examples (1:1, 3, 6, 10, 14; 2:2; 3:15).

[365] Nine of the ten temporal prepositional phrases occur with a rank-shifted context (1:3, 9, 12, 18; 3:1, 15; 4:8, 18).

[366] The only exception to this occurs in 1:9, when the complement of the πρό phrase includes an attributive adjective in "repeat" position. By contrast, adjectives in temporal phrases of present or future times are either predicate adjectives before a definite head noun (1:12, 18; 4:8) or an attributive adjective in "sandwich" position (3:1; 4:16).

Adjunct Word Groups

The text of 2 Timothy demonstrates patterns and tendencies of word order within the various types of adjunct word groups, especially A-PPs, A-Advs, and A-CUs. In addition to these main types of adjunct word groups, conjunctions function as adjunct word groups when they serve to connect clauses or indicate clausal dependency. Adjunct word groups consisting of conjunction do not evince patterns of word group order, *per se*, in that they are typically single words, but there are tendencies in the types and distribution of conjunctions used as adjunct word groups. Cj-Hs are infrequent in 2 Timothy, only serving five times as conjunctive adjuncts (1:3; 2:10; 3:9; 4:3, 17), while Cj-Ps appear sixty-two times. The use of ἵνα as a Cj-H is infrequent (2:10; 4:17), and Cj-H always follow their governing clause and subordinate their clauses to paratactic clauses with indicative predicators. In contrast to 1 Timothy, no Cj-Hs in 2 Timothy modify a clause with an imperative verbal form. The syntactical impact of Cj-Ps is outlined above in the ranks of section and clause, but there are some phenomena worth mentioning here as well. The most common force of a Cj-P is to indicate contrast, with the other two most common forces being to indicate a clause that explains the previous clause or is conjoined to it.[367] Contrastive conjunctions tend to be the contrastive use of δέ,[368] while conjunctive Cj-Ps are almost equally likely to be καί or δέ.[369] And, unlike 1 Timothy, Cj-Ps do occur in rank-shifted contexts, albeit infrequently.[370] Finally, when a Cj-P occurs in a rank-shifted context, it is usually

---

[367] For the sixty-two adjunct word groups consisting of Cj-Ps, twenty-one indicate contrast, fourteen are explanatory, and thirteen are conjunctive.

[368] Fourteen of the twenty-one Cj-Ps of contrast are the conjunction δέ, although ἀλλά is used to indicate contrast seven times.

[369] Of the thirteen conjunctive Cj-Ps, six are the conjunction δέ while five are καί.

[370] Only seven of sixty-two Cj-Ps appear within rank-shifted contexts. Six of these are within relative clauses (1:5; 2:18, 20; 4:8), while the other joins contrasting, rank-shifted participle clauses (1:10).

indicating a conjoined clause rather than a contrast.[371]

A-Advs and A-CUs are common adjunct types in 2 Timothy. Among the thirty-six A-Advs, twelve are the additive use of καί, ten are indeclinable adverbs, nine are either word groups introduced by ὡς or the adverbial form of adjectives ending with –ως, and the other five are collocated groups of adverbs or particles that function together as a single adjunct word group. As with 1 Timothy, the most common uses of A-Advs are the additive use of καί, adjuncts of manner, and temporal adjuncts. The additive use of καί spans across clause types but always precedes its governing predicator when it is expressed as a fully codified pattern.[372] Adjuncts of manner tend to be a word group introduced by ὡς or an adverbial form ending in –ως with only two exceptions: βέλτιον in 1:15 and λίαν in 4:18.[373] They also tend to precede the predicator within clauses proper but follow the predicator in rank-shifted clauses.[374] There are also ten A-CUs in 2 Timothy; five are in the accusative case, four are in the dative case, and one in the genitive case. A-CUs of reference are always in the accusative case with a definite article on the head noun (3:8; 4:3) while temporal A-CUs, both in the accusative (1:3, 5; 4:8) and genitive case (1:3) are always anarthrous. A-CUs follow their predicator as a marginally codified pattern, with exceptions for temporal A-CUs (1:3; 4:8)[375] or an A-CU of disadvantage within an

---

[371] Cj-Ps serve to indicate contrast three times within rank-shifted clause (1:10; 2:20), while they indicate a simple compound clause four times (1:5; 2:18, 20; 4:8).

[372] In eleven of twelve instances, καί explicitly precedes its governing predicator. One of these is within the combined form κἀκεῖνος (2:12). The additive καί also appears in prime position within a rank-shifted, nominal clause (1:5).

[373] Three adjuncts of manner are word groups introduced by ὡς and four are adverbs ending in –ως.

[374] Five of the six that appear within clauses proper precede the predicator (1:17, 18; 2:5, 17; 4:15), with the only exception being with an imperative verb (2:3). All three within rank-shifted clauses follow the predictor (2:9; 3:12; 4:9). This analysis adopt the variant reading in 3:12, supported by Codices Sinaiticus and Alexandrinus, where the adverb follows the infinitive, as outlined above.

[375] Both of these examples are in transitional sentences, either at the beginning (1:3) or conclusion (4:8) of a major section of text.

optative clause (4:16). There are twelve adverbial adjunct word groups with temporal force, appearing with regularity on both sides of the predicator. One potential pattern is that indeclinable adverbs tend to appear before the predicator while adverbs derived from other parts of speech or A-CUs tend to follow the predicator.[376] A-Advs as a whole precede the predicator as marginally codified pattern,[377] while A-CUs, as stated above, tend to follow their governing verb.

A-PPs are the commonest type of adjunct word group, with patterns and tendencies of word order that depend on the type of governing clause, larger syntactical concerns, and especially the force of the preposition. A-PPs generally appear after the governing predicator as a marginally codified pattern, although it is not uncommon for them to precede the predicator also.[378] It is just as likely for a A-PP to have no additional elements beyond the preposition and a noun or pronoun as it is for the phrase to include an article, adjective, or qualifier.[379] The definite article is the most common modifier with A-PPs, occurring within thirty-one of them, and it is marginally codified that the definite article will be accompanied by another modifying element.[380] The presence or absence of the definite article, in itself, does not appear to impact

---

[376] Out of six indeclinable adverbs, five of them precede the predicator (1:16; 2:18; 3:7; 4:6). The only exception occurs when the adverb νῦν follows the predictor within a rank-shifted participle clause (1:10), but this is also within poetic section where the adverb parallels a temporal prepositional phrase in the previous clause. Similarly, for the six temporal adjuncts with derived adverbial forms or adverbial case usage, four of them follow the predicator (1:3, 5; 4:2). Both exceptions (1:3; 4:8) are adverbial accusative forms of adjectives within clauses proper, and occur with section transitions: the single sentence of section β and subsection β-1, and the first word of the final sentence of subsection δ-3 and section δ.

[377] Out of the thirty-six A-Advs, twenty-three precede the predicator, two are within nominal clauses, and eleven follow the predicator.

[378] There are ninety-six A-PPs and two of them, with relative pronouns as the complement, are doing double duty as both an adjunct with a clause and the primary element of its own relative clause. There are sixty-seven prepositional phrase adjuncts that follow their governing predicator, twenty-seven precede it, and four appear in clauses with an elided verb.

[379] Forty-eight prepositional phrases functioning as adjuncts have no additional elements, while forty-eight include some additional modifier the head noun or pronoun.

[380] Eleven iinclude both the article and another adjectival modifier, twelve include the article and a qualifier, and two include the article, an adjective, and a qualifier (4:16, 18).

structure patterns as much as the presence of the other modifying elements.[381]

With A-PPs, there are twenty-six adjectival modifiers within twenty-three prepositional phrases. Adjectives in A-PPs, as a partially codified pattern, are typically attributive adjectives.[382] Attributive adjectives in "repeat" position are more likely than those in "sandwich" position.[383] Any nominalized or rank-shifted adjectives will appear in repeat position with a definite article, regardless of the definiteness of the head noun (1:13, 14; 2:1; 3:15; 4:1). For adjectives proper, according to part of speech, it is partially codified that they will not appear alongside the definite article.[384] Predicate adjectives, by contrast, will always precede the head noun and are as likely to modify a definite noun as an indefinite noun.[385] The likelihood of an A-PP with an adjectival modifier preceding or following the governing verb does not significantly differ from the overall expectation for A-PPs; when they do precede the governing verb, however, the adjective is almost always an adjective proper in "sandwich" position.[386]

---

[381] For example, for prepositional phrase adjuncts with the definite article and no additional modifiers, seven follow the predicator and three precede it, which roughly matches the ratio overall. For those with adjectives, however, nine follow the predicator while two precede it. Similarly, for those with qualifiers only one precedes the governing predicator.

[382] Nineteen of the twenty-five adjectival modifiers are in attributive position to their head noun. These include adjectives proper, rank-shifted participles functioning as adjectives (1:14; 4:1), and nominalized prepositional phrases functioning as adjectives (1:13; 2:1; 3:15).

[383] There are eleven attributive adjectival modifiers in "repeat" position compared to eight in "sandwich" position. Two in repeat position appear together with a predicate adjective that precedes the head noun (3:17; 4:18).

[384] Only one adjective proper of six in "repeat" position includes an article (4:18), while only two adjectives in "sandwich" position modify a grammatically definite head noun (4:3, 16).

[385] There are six prepositional phrase adjuncts with a predicate adjective (1:12, 18; 3:17; 4:2, 8, 18). All three phrases with the demonstrative ἐκεῖνος functioning as a predicate adjective are temporal phrases that include a definite article on the head noun (1:12, 18; 4:8). The three phrases with the predicate use of πᾶς have indefinite head nouns, and all have different prepositions with differing forces (3:17; 4:2, 18). It is inconclusive, though, whether the presence of the definite article depends on the type of predicate adjective, the force of the preposition, or other syntactical factors, especially with so few samples.

[386] Seventeen such phrases follow the predicator, while five appear before the governing predicator (2:20; 3:1, 17; 4:3, 16). For the five that precede the predicator, four of them include an attributive adjective in "sandwich" position (2:20; 3:1; 4:3, 16).

Embedded qualifier word groups are included as modifiers within nineteen A-PPs. It is partially codified that these qualifiers will follow their head noun and that they will appear in PPs following their governing predicator.[387] There are two A-PPs with qualifiers that precede their governing predicator: one indicating destination with εἰς in 3:7 and a temporal prepositional phrase in 4:16.[388] For the three in which the qualifier precedes its head noun, one also precedes the governing verb and appears within the context of contrast (4:16) and the other two are both references to "the devil" (2:26).[389] It is fully codified that qualifiers in A-PPs will match their head noun in definiteness and A-PPs with qualifiers tend to include a definite article on the head noun as a marginally codified pattern.[390] The most common type of qualifier within an A-PP is a subjective genitive and it is fully codified that a subjective genitive qualifier within an A-PP will modify a head noun with a definite article.[391]

A-PPs have a variety of forces in 2 Timothy, with most of them not occurring with enough examples to derive any conclusions. The single PP indicating agency (2:26), for example, occurs

---

[387] For the nineteen prepositional phrase adjuncts with qualifiers, seventeen precede their governing predicator and sixteen have the qualifier following the head noun.

[388] It is not clear if the syntax of the larger clause is impacted by the presence of the qualifier as much as the clause type and the force of the prepositional phrase. Two other prepositional phrases of destination also precede the predicator in 2:16 and 4:4, although they both appear with ἐπί with the accusative case rather than εἰς. Similarly, these other examples appear within paratactic clauses proper, while the phrase with the qualifier appears within a rank-shifted infinitive clause. Three other temporal prepositional phrase adjuncts precede the predicator (3:1, 15; 4:21), including another with ἐν as the preposition, as in 4:16. All three of those examples appear within rank-shifted clauses, while the temporal phrase in 4:16 appears within a paratactic clause proper.

[389] These two references still have the qualifier match the head noun in definiteness, while the two examples in 1 Timothy have "the devil" as a definite qualifier on grammatically indefinite head nouns (1 Tim. 3:6, 7).

[390] Twelve of the nineteen such phrases include a definite article on a common noun as the head noun. Among the seven without an article on the head noun, only one is proper noun (1:2).

[391] Nine of the nineteen such prepositional phrases include a qualifier with the force of a subjective genitive, and all of them modify common nouns with a definite article. This is especially significant given that only twenty-four out of one hundred ten qualifiers throughout the letter are subjective genitive qualifiers and that the next most common type of qualifier within a prepositional phrase adjunct is an objective genitive, with only three examples (1:6; 2:25; 3:7).

within a clause with unusual syntax. Similarly, the sole partitive PP (3:6) precedes the predicator, but also has an anaphoric demonstrative pronoun as the C-OP, directly referring to the prior clause. There are some forces with only a few examples but potentially significant similarities. All three PPs of accompaniment follow the predicator in an imperative or subjunctive context,[392] all four causal PPs precede indicative predicators,[393] and the five PPs of norm or standard with qualifiers follow their governing predicator (1:8, 9; 2:8; 4:14) while the only κατά phrase without a qualifier precedes its governing verb (4:3).[394] Other potential patterns are evident within the more common forces of A-PPs. Locative PPs and PPs of means tend to follow their predicator and appear within rank-shifted clauses.[395] Temporal PPs and PPs of source both precede and follow the predicator with regularity, but almost exclusively occur in rank-shifted clauses.[396] PPs of destination, purpose, separation, and sphere tend to follow the larger expected patterns for PPs, regularly following the predicator and appearing frequently in both clauses proper and rank-shifted clauses.

Qualifier Word Groups

Qualifier word groups appear in various and diverse forms throughout 2 Timothy. Among

---

[392] Two of the three μετά phrases with the genitive case follow an imperative verb in a paratactic clause (2:22; 4:11) and one follows a subjunctive verb in a hypotactic ἵνα clause (2:10).

[393] Three phrases use the preposition διά with the accusative case to indicate cause (1:6, 12; 2:10) and one is with the causal use of ἐν (2:9).

[394] It is also significant that five of the six κατά phrases include a qualifier, compared with nineteen of ninety-eight total prepositional phrases.

[395] Thirteen of the sixteen locative prepositional phrases follow their predicator, with eleven of the sixteen occurring within rank-shifted clauses. Similarly, eight of the nine phrases of means follow the predicator, with seven of the nine appearing within rank-shifted clauses.

[396] Nine of the ten temporal prepositional phrases are within rank-shifted clauses, with four of the ten preceding their predicator (3:1, 15; 4:16, 21) and five following (1:3, 10, 12, 18; 4:8). Prepositional phrases of source occur within rank-shifted clauses six of eight times, but are more likely to follow their predicator (1:18; 2:2, 22; 3:14) than they are to precede it (1:13; 3:14). One example, however, is doing double duty, concluding a hypotactic predicate participle clause and being the first structural element of a relative clause (3:14).

the one hundred ten qualifier word groups, the most common type is a nominal word group

modifying a noun or adjective, occurring eighty-two times, but relative clauses and PPs are also

common qualifiers.[397] In addition to these, there are two infinitive clauses functioning as

qualifiers (1:12; 2:2), two direct quotations in apposition as qualifiers (2:19), and one ὅτι clause

also in apposition (1:15). Both infinitive qualifiers have an epexegetical force, modify an

adjective within a C-PN, occur within rank-shifted contexts, and have the governing verb come

between the head adjective and the qualifier in hyperbaton. The lone ὅτι clause in apposition

follows the governing predicator, modifying the C-DO of an indicative paratactic clause. PPs

serving as embedded qualifiers tend to follow their referent,[398] never appear in a word group that

precedes an expressed predicator,[399] and most commonly serve as an epexegetical qualifier.[400]

Relative clauses in 2 Timothy tend to serve as qualifier word groups and, when they are

used as qualifiers, tend to be adjectival as a partially codified pattern.[401] It is fully codified that

relative clause qualifiers will follow their referent and codified that the relative clause will

---

[397] There are fifteen relative clauses that modify a preceding noun as an adjectival qualifier and ten prepositional phrases that serve as qualifier word groups, two of which have a relative pronoun as the object (1:11; 2:9).

[398] Eight of the ten follow their referent. For the two that precede their referent, one is an epexegetical qualifier that occurs with another qualifier on the same referent, which is another prepositional phrase as qualifier that follows the referent, and is within the opening sentence of subsection γ-3 (2:14). The other occurs in 2:21, where the qualifier modifies the final element of a compound, asyndeton predicate nominative complement and is within the final sentence of subsection γ-3. Furthermore, the first and third elements of the predicate nominative have qualifiers that follow their referent, with the order switching for the fourth and final element.

[399] Seven are in word groups that follow the governing verb (1:11; 2:9. 12. 21; 3:8) and three are within nominal clauses (1:1; 3:8).

[400] Aside from the two prepositional phrase qualifiers with a relative pronoun as the object (1:11; 2:9), four serve as epexegetical qualifiers (2:14; 3:8, 16), two indicate purpose (2:21), one indicates means (1:1), and one indicates norm or standard (1:1).

[401] There are twenty-three relative pronoun uses in 2 Timothy. Three are idiomatic and, rather than introducing a clause, are part of as adjunct word group: δι᾽ ἥν αἰτίαν in 1:6 and 1:12 and ὃν τρόπον in 3:8. Five do not have an external referent, with the relative clause itself serving as a rank-shifted word group within the governing clause (1:12, 18; 2:7; 3:11, 14). Out of the remaining fifteen relative clauses, thirteen serve as adjectival modifiers to their referent while the other two are partitive genitive qualifiers (1:15; 2:17).

appear in a word group that follows the governing verb.[402] These relative clause qualifiers modify

head nouns in a variety of word groups types, but never within a C-PN or a nominal clause.[403] It

is marginally codified that relative clause qualifiers appear within clauses proper and, when they

modify a head noun that is in itself part a qualifier word group, it is only within clauses proper.[404]

For relative clauses functioning as qualifier, the relative pronoun tends to serve as the

complement of the predicator within the relative clause, although they do occur as the subject of

the relative clause or a C-OP within an adjunct word group.[405] Lastly, as with 1 Timothy, it is

marginally codified that relative clauses as qualifiers will appear within the first and final

chapters of the letter.[406]

Nominal word groups consisting of a noun or pronoun with additional modifiers are the

commonest type of qualifier word groups, occurring eighty-two times in Timothy. It is

marginally codified that they will appear within clauses proper, although they do regularly

appear within relative clauses and rank-shifted participle clauses.[407] The most common use of

---

[402] Fourteen of the fifteen relative clause qualifiers are in word groups that follow the governing verb. A relative clause modifies the first element of a compound object in 4:13. This element with the relative clause precedes an imperative predicator, while the second and the third elements of the complement follow the predicator in hyperbaton; furthermore, this unusual syntax occurs in the final sentence of subsection ε-1.

[403] Four relative clause modify a head noun within a subject word group (1:15; 2:17, 18; 4:8), four modify a head noun within a complement of a prepositional phrase (1:11; 2:9; 4:15, 18), five modify a head noun within a complement functioning as a direct object (1:5, 6, 13; 3:11; 4:13), and two modify a head noun in an indirect object complement word group (1:3; 2:2). All relative clauses qualifiers appear within a clause with an expressed predicator.

[404] Ten relative clause qualifiers occur within paratactic clauses, six of which have indicative verbs and four of which have imperative verbs, one appears within a hypotactic, predicate participle, and four are part of rank-shifted clauses. Five relative clause qualifiers modify head noun that are already part of a qualifier word group (1:5, 13; 2:17; 4:15, 18), and none are within a rank-shifted clause.

[405] The relative pronoun functions as the complement of the relative clause eight times: three times as the predicate of a copulative verb (1:15; 2:17; 4:18) and five times as the direct object (1:3, 13; 4:8, 13, 15). The relative pronoun serves as the subject of the relative clause on five occasions (1:5, 6; 2:2, 18; 3:11) and twice as the complement of a prepositional phrase adjunct (1:11; 2:9).

[406] Ten of the fifteen relative clause qualifiers appear within the first and fourth chapters of 2 Timothy. Four appear within chapter 2 (2:2, 9, 17, 18) and there is only one within chapter three (3:11).

[407] Among the eight-two nominal qualifier word groups, fifty-five are within paratactic or hypotactic clauses

---

nominal qualifiers is as a subjective genitive qualifier, with other common uses being appositive

qualifiers, adjectival or attributive genitive qualifiers, objective genitive qualifiers, or possessive

genitive qualifiers.[408] It is marginally codified that a nominal qualifier word group will consist of

nouns or pronouns with additional modifying elements, with adjectives being the least common

modifying element within a nominal qualifier word group.[409] As a whole, nominal qualifier word

groups follow their referent as a partially codified pattern and it is also partially codified that

nominal qualifiers will not precede an expressed, governing verb.[410] These patterns and

tendencies vary, however, by the presence of additional modifying elements and the force of the

qualifier word group.

The presence of additional modifying elements within qualifier word groups impacts the

expected syntax and word order tendencies. Twelve nominal qualifier word groups also have

further embedded qualifiers within them. These additional embedded qualifiers tend to modify a

head noun with the definite article,[411] tend to be pronouns,[412] and are most common within

---

proper. One appears within a rank-shifted quotation (2:19), six appear within rank-shifted infinitive clauses (1:6, 12; 2:6, 14, 24; 3:7 eight within relative clauses (1:5, 6; 4:8, 18), and twelve within rank-shifted participle clauses (1:9, 10; 2:8, 15, 19; 3:5; 4:8).

[408] Twenty-four nominal qualifier word groups are subjective genitive qualifiers. Twelve are objective genitive qualifiers, eleven are adjectival or attributive genitives, eleven are appositives, and eleven are genitives of possession.

[409] Fifty-one of the eighty-two nominal qualifier word groups do not include any additional modifiers. Twelve include additional embedded qualifiers, twenty-four include the definite article, and six include adjectives. It is codified, then, that nominal qualifiers will not include an adjective, making qualifiers the least likely word group, aside from predicators, to include an adjective.

[410] Seventy of eighty-two nominal qualifier word groups follow their referent while twelve precede it. All twelve that precede their referent are within paratactic or hypotactic clauses proper. Out of the eighty-two, fifty-four appear within word groups that follow the governing predicator, eleven are within nominal clauses or clauses with an elided verb, and only seventeen are in word groups that precede their governing predicator.

[411] Seven of the twelve additional, embedded qualifier word groups modify a common noun made definite by the presence of the article (1:2, 5, 6, 8, 10; 4:6).

[412] Seven of the twelve feature a personal pronoun as one of the embedded qualifiers (1:2, 6, 8, 10; 2:1; 4:6), six of which are those with also include a definite article on the head noun. One of them includes a relative pronoun as the qualifier, introducing an adjectival relative clause (1:5).

qualifiers of apposition.[413] These qualifiers almost always follow their referent and typically appear within word groups that follow the governing verb.[414] Twenty-four nominal qualifier word groups include the definite article, with nine of them also including an additional adjective or qualifier.[415] All nine with both the article and either an adjective or qualifier follow their referent, and the only one that precedes the governing verb, in 4:6, is within a subject word group. Those with the article and no additional modifiers, however, are more likely to precede their referent than other qualifier types, but still tend to follow their referent and not precede the governing verb.[416] It is uncommon for nominal qualifier word groups to include adjectives, only occurring six times, but those with adjectives always follow their referent, never occur in a word group that precedes their governing verb, and only include attributive adjectives.[417] Only appositional and objective genitive nominal qualifiers include adjectives in 2 Timothy.[418] For the fifty-two that

---

[413] Four of the twelve qualifier word groups that include additional qualifiers are in apposition to their referent (1:1, 2, 8; 3:8).

[414] The only example with an embedded qualifier that precedes its referent occurs in 2:14, where the qualifier is a nominalized prepositional phrase of purpose modifying an adjective that is, in itself, an adjectival qualifier to a infinitive. Six are within word groups that follow an explicit governing verb (1:6, 8, 9, 10; 3:8), while two are within nominal clauses (1:1, 2). One follows the governing verb while its referent precedes it in hyperbaton (1:5). The only two that precede an expressed verb are within subject word groups (2:1; 4:6), one of which also occurs in the first sentence of a new section, γ, and subsection, γ-1 (2:1).

[415] 2 Tim. 1:1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 10; 4:6, 8.

[416] Four nominal qualifier word groups precede their referent (2:4, 26; 3:17; 4:7). All four appear within clauses proper, modify common nouns that are definite by means of the article, and come between the article and the head noun of the referent. This mean that roughly one in four nominal qualifier word group with only an article and noun precede their referent, compared to only roughly one is six for all qualifier word groups. Only three of the fifteen nominal qualifier word groups with only an article and a head noun are in a word group that precedes the governing verb (2:6, 9, 19). Two modify a subject word group and are both subjective genitive qualifiers (2:9, 19), and the third is a partitive genitive qualifier modifying the direct object of a rank-shifted, subjective infinitive clause (2:6).

[417] 2 Tim. 1:1, 2, 5, 13; 3:8; 4:8. Two of these occur within nominal clauses (1:1, 2), while the rest all occur within word groups that follow the governing verb (1:5, 13; 3:8; 4:8). Within the six nominal qualifiers with adjectives, there are four with attributive adjectives in "sandwich" position (1:2, 5, 13; 4:8) and two with attributive adjectives in "repeat" position (1:1; 3:8).

[418] Three of the nominal qualifier word groups with adjectives are appositives proper (1:2; 3:8; 4;8), one is a appositive genitive (1:1), and two are objective genitives (1:5, 13). The example in 1:5 also includes hyperbaton, with the governing verb interrupting the complement word group, separating the direct object, which precedes the

only consist of a noun or pronoun, they tend to follow the expected patterns for nominal qualifiers overall. One potentially significant phenomenon for such qualifiers, is that, out of the eight qualifiers that precede their referent, five are subjective genitive qualifiers.[419] Similarly, it is marginally codified that a qualifier that both consists of only a noun or pronoun and precedes its governing verb will be subjective or objective genitive qualifier.[420]

Expected syntactical patterns of position and word order also vary by the force of the qualifier word group. Many forces do not occur with enough examples to warrant any conclusive patterns, such as genitive of relationship qualifiers, which occur six times in 2 Timothy, or epexegetical qualifiers, which also occur six times, but they might impact larger considerations when compared with the other PE. Epexegetical qualifiers only modify adjectives, twice as infinitive clauses as qualifiers (1:12; 2:2) and four times as PPs functioning as qualifiers (2:14; 3:8, 16).[421] Qualifiers functioning as genitives of relationship precede their referent two of six times (1:16; 4:19), and, when they do, they are a proper noun in a paratactic clause with a non-indicative predicator.[422] Adjectival qualifiers occur twenty-one times in 2 Timothy, both as relative clauses and nominal word groups. It is fully codified that they will follow their referent

governing verb, from its qualifier, which follows the governing verb. The qualifier in 1:5 is followed by a relative clause as an embedded qualifier, which pulls the head to the end of its clause.

[419] Eight qualifiers that consist of only a noun or pronoun precede their referent (1:4, 16; 2:18, 26; 3:10; 4:16, 18, 19). Five of these are subjective genitive qualifiers (2:18, 26; 3:10; 4:16, 18), compared to only twenty-four subjective genitive qualifiers out of eighty-two nominal qualifiers overall.

[420] Out of the twelve that are in a word group that precedes the governing verb, six are subjective genitive qualifiers (2:17; 3:9; 4:5, 6, 16) and three are objective genitive qualifiers (1:16; 2:24; 3:7).

[421] Only one of six epexegetical qualifiers precedes its referent (2:14), occurring within a rank-shifted infinitive clause with two epexegetical qualifier on the same adjective, one preceding and one following. No epexegetical qualifier occur within a word group that precedes the governing verb.

[422] Three genitive of relationship qualifiers are pronouns (1:5; 2:1), and three are proper nouns (1:16; 2:8; 4:19). The only proper noun that does not precede (2:8) its referent is in rank-shifted participle clause where the governing verb is elided. Both genitives of relationship that precede their referent are proper nouns that modify a common noun with a definite article, appearing between the article and head noun of the referent (1:16; 4:19). One follows an imperative predicator (4:19) while the other follows an optative predicator (1:16).

and codified that they will modify a word group that follows its governing verb.[423] Genitives of possession tend to be personal pronouns, almost always follow their referent, and, on the rare occasion that they precede their governing verb, only precede their governing verb in rank-shifted clauses.[424] It is fully codified, furthermore, that they will never appear within a subject word group.[425] All fourteen appositive qualifier word groups follow their referent, and none of them appear prior to their governing verb.[426] Objective genitive qualifiers, similarly, always follow their referent, and tend not to appear within subject word groups.[427] The most common force of qualifier, the subjective genitive, tends to be a pronoun, never includes an adjective, only includes further embedded qualifiers on one occasion, and rarely appears within a rank-shifted clause.[428] It is also the most likely type of qualifier to precede its referent and precede the governing verb.[429]

---

[423] All twenty-one qualifiers with an adjectival force follow their referent, including all thirteen relative clauses and eight nominal qualifiers. Only one adjectival qualifier precedes its governing verb (4:13), modifying the first element of a compound complement that is separated from the second and third elements in hyperbaton and appearing in the final sentence of subsection ε-1.

[424] Seven of the eleven genitives of possession are personal pronouns (1:4, 6, 8, 12; 2:19; 3:5; 4:22). Only one genitive of possession precedes its referent (1:4); it is also the only genitive of possession within a hypotactic clause proper, and occurs within the sole sentence of subsection β-1. Only two of the eleven are in word groups that precede the governing predicator (1:12; 4:17), and they are both within rank-shifted clauses.

[425] Four genitives of possession modify the object of a prepositional phrase, six modify direct objects, and one modifies an adjunct word group.

[426] This include the thirteen qualifiers in direct apposition and the one example of the genitive of apposition (1:1). All five appositive qualifiers that appear within 1:1–2 are in nominal clauses, while the other nine all follow an expressed predicator.

[427] All twelve objective genitive qualifiers follow their referent, and only one occurs within a subject word group (2:24). Two of the three that precede their governing verb modify complement word groups within rank-shifted infinitive clauses (2:24; 3:7), and the other example is within a paratactic clause but could be another use of the genitive case (1:16). The derivation of the head noun, ἄλυσις, is uncertain (LSJ, 39), but the act of binding, imprisoning, or putting someone in chains likely lies behind the noun form.

[428] Seventeen of the twenty-four instances of the subjective genitive are a single personal or demonstrative pronoun. Only five include articles, making a common noun definite (1:6; 10; 2:9, 19, 26), and one with an article also includes multiple qualifiers (1:10). Only four of the twenty-four subjective genitive qualifiers appear within rank-shifted clauses (1:6, 9, 10; 4:8); these four examples all follow their referent and occur in complement word groups that follow their predicator.

[429] Six subjective genitive qualifiers precede their referent (2:18, 26; 3:10; 4:16, 18), only occurring within

The relationship of the qualifier to its referent with regard to grammatical definiteness is one final phenomenon to consider for qualifier word groups in 2 Timothy. There are thirty qualifiers that are not considered for this phenomenon, either because the qualifier itself does carry grammatical definiteness, such as with ὅτι clauses, relative clauses, or PPs functioning as qualifiers, or because the qualifier modifies a predicate adjective or a predicator itself. Of the eighty that remain under consideration, it is a codified pattern that the qualifier will match the grammatical definiteness of its head noun. For the seven that do not match definiteness with their head noun, they all follow their referent and occur within complement word groups.[430] Six of the seven occur in word groups that follow their governing predicator, with the only exception being in 2:6, where the qualifier modifies a direct object within a rank-shifted infinitive clause.[431] Six of them are grammatically definite qualifiers on an indefinite head noun, while only one, in 2:19, is an indefinite qualifier word group modifying a definite head noun; this lone anomaly is within a direct quotation, mirroring the LXX where the Tetragrammaton is translated as "κύριος." The most common force of qualifier for such mismatches is an adjectival force, occurring three times (1:9, 14), with two objective genitive qualifiers (1:5; 2:14), one possessive genitive qualifier (2:19), and one partitive genitive qualifier (2:6) also showing a difference in grammatical definiteness from the head noun. It is further codified that qualifiers will modify a referent that is explicitly definite or indefinite grammatically. Only nine qualifiers modify grammatically

paratactic or hypotactic clauses proper. This is especially significant given that only fourteen qualifier word groups precede their referent across all qualifier types. Eight subjective genitive qualifiers precede their governing verb (2:9, 17, 19; 3:9; 4:5, 6, 16), also only within paratactic or hypotactic clauses proper, with six of those being qualifiers within a subject word group (2:9, 17, 19; 3:9; 4:6). These eight subjective genitive qualifiers that precede their governing predicator are eight of only eighteen total qualifiers that precede governing verbs.

[430] 2 Tim. 1:5, 9, 14; 2:6, 14, 19. Three modify direct objects (1:5; 2:6, 19) while four modify objects of prepositions (1:9, 14; 2:6).

[431] It is common for complements to precede the predicator in infinitive clauses, even those with qualifiers.

ambiguous referents: eight are adjectives within C-PN or adjectives that, in themselves, are serving as qualifiers and one is where a qualifier explicitly modifies a verb.[432] When the referent is an adjective, the qualifiers almost always carries an epexegetical force, and most qualifiers on grammatically ambiguous referents are PPs.[433]

Conclusion: The Linguistic Profile of 2 Timothy

Tendencies and patterns of syntax, word group order, and word order within groups are evident within 2 Timothy on the ranks of section, clause, and word group. Such patterns are helpful for interpretation, especially with regard to markedness and emphasis, textual criticism, and understanding the larger movements of the letter. In addition to this, the patterns will be compared to those found in the other PE to establish larger tendencies within this group of letters for comparison with both the other letters of the Pauline Corpus and other works of the New Testament. This will not only aid in textual criticism and interpretation, but help to determine the linguistic data most relevant for questions of register, especially in authorial considerations.

Within the rank of section, some potentially significant tendencies can be seen with regard to sectional boundaries and transitions. Sections tend to begin with an imperative, paratactic clause, a major shift in topic, and a rank-shifted clause within the complement, and are followed by an explanatory or paraenetic sentence. Sections tend to end with expository sentences and

---

[432] Five modify predicate adjectives of an expressed or implicit copulative verb (1:12; 2:2, 21; 3:16), one modifies an adjective that is itself an adjectival qualifier of a head noun (3:8), and two modify an adjective that is itself a qualifier of an infinitive predicator (2:14). The adjective χρήσιμον in 2:14 modifies the infinitive λογομαχεῖν descriptively (see Perkins, *Letters*, 189–90), best translated into English as "which is useful." In this case, the infinitive is a verbal form but also functioning as the complement of the participle διαμαρτυρόμενος, doing double duty as a verbal form and a nominalized element capable of being modified by an adjective.

[433] Of the eight qualifier word groups that modify adjectives, six of them are have an epexegetical force (1:12; 2:2, 14; 3:8, 16). Five qualifiers that modify grammatically ambiguous referents are prepositional phrases (2:14, 21; 3:8, 16). Two are also epexegetical infinitive clauses (1:12; 2:2) and two are nominal: one adjective (2:14) and one nominal group (2:21). The nominal qualifier in 2:21, τῷ δεσπότῃ, is a qualifier of reference within the final sentence of subsection γ-3.

have their boundaries marked by an *inclusio*. Subsections within the larger sections tend to begin with either a personal, imperative command or indicative clause of recollection. When they begin with recollection, the second sentence is typically with a sentence of exposition or a personal wish. The most common types of clauses that end subsections are explanatory and expository clauses. Section and subsection transitions use a variety of transitional or connective devices, including asyndeton, the anaphoric demonstrative ταῦτα, and the conjunctions οὖν and δέ. Like sections, subsections within the main body of the letters tend to have an *inclusio*. Transitional sentences for sections and subsections, also, commonly include marked syntax.

Many patterns and tendencies of are evident on the rank of clause, varying largely based on the type of the clause, the content of the various word groups, larger syntactical concerns, and mood of the predicator. Imperative paratactic clauses tend to include a complement word group, and the placement of the complement depends on the type of the complement and the tense of the imperative verb. It is a codified pattern that imperative clauses will not include an expressed subject word group, marginally codified that non-conjunctive adjuncts, when present, will be a prepositional phrase, and marginally codified that, when a non-conjunctive adjunct is present, the imperative clause will also include an expressed subject or complement word group. It is fully codified that all non-conjunctive adjunct word groups will be the final element of the imperative clause. Imperative clauses also regularly use asyndeton and δέ as their connective devices.

Indicative paratactic clauses tend to include a complement, and the placement of the complement varies more than with other clause types. While compound complements, complements with rank-shifted elements, and complements with embedded qualifiers tend to follow the predicator in a P-C pattern, single, nominal groups as complements do not follow any consistent patterns. When expressed, subject word groups in indicative paratactic precede the

257

predicator as a marginally codified pattern. Non-conjunctive adjuncts are common in indicative clauses. A-PPs tend to appear after the predicator in a marginally codified pattern, but it is fully codified that A-Advs and A-CUs will precede the predicator. It is marginally codified that indicative paratactic clauses are part of a compound or complex sentence, and it is fully codified that when an indicative clause is the final clause proper of a section or subsection it will exhibit some form of marked or unusual syntax.

Other paratactic clause types are infrequent, including nominal clauses and optative clauses. Nominal clauses tend to have an S-C word group order and use asyndeton as the connective device. Optative clauses are rare, but all feature an aorist tense verb, occur within the context of recollection, include a C-IO, and have asyndeton as the connective device. As a whole, connective devices within indicative or imperative clauses do not appear to impact expected patterns of syntax or word group order, with the possible exception of the contrastive δέ. The contrastive δέ, however, does not usually cause a switch in word group order but does evince impact between the predicator word groups of the contrasted clauses.

Hypotactic clauses show consistent syntax and word group order based on the type of clause and relationship with the governing, paratactic clause. It is fully codified that HC-Cjs will follow their governing clause and partially codified that the clause will include an expressed complement word group. Such clauses generally follow the same patterns for word group order as paratactic clauses. Those with ἵνα as the conjunction tend to follow a C-P clausal pattern, although two such examples show hyperbaton. HC-ptcs have some syntax variation based on the force of the participle and some consistent syntax regardless of the force or tense of the participle. HC-ptcs tend to follow their governing clause except for temporal participle clauses, which precede their governing clause and tend to be in hypotaxis to an imperative predicator. For

all HC-ptcs, adjunct word groups will follow the participle but come before an expressed complement. While some forces of participle clause have a lower tendency to include an expressed complement, it is partially codified that HC-ptc will include a complement word group and it is codified that expressed complements follow the predicator.

Rank-shifted clauses also display syntactical patterns according to their differing types: infinitive clauses, attributive participle clauses, and relative clauses. Infinitive clauses in 2 Timothy will never have an article on the infinitive and it is partially codified that the rank-shifted infinitive clause will function as or within the complement word of its governing clause. It is partially codified that the infinitive clause will follow its referent, except for complementary infinitive clauses with forms of δύναμαι. Within the infinitive clause, it is partially codified that there will be an expressed complement word group and that the complement will be precede the infinitive in a C-P pattern. Subject word groups, when they appear, come before the infinitive and do not appear within infinitive clauses with a complementary force. Adjunct word group syntax tends to follow the patterns established for indicative paratactic clauses and, like with paratactic clauses, if an infinitive clause occurs within the closing sentence of section or subsection it will display some deviation or anomaly in syntax or word group order.

The expected syntax for attributive participle clauses varies based on the force of the participle clause, but word group order patterns are evident across all attributive participle clauses. When rank-shifted participles clauses are serving as adjectives, it is partially codified that they are in "repeat" position to their head noun. Perfect tense participles are the most likely to be an adjective within a C-PN, and aorist participles never serve this function. It is partially codified that substantive participles will be in the present tense. It is partially codified that the rank-shifted participle clause will follow its governing predicator, with exceptions mainly being

those serving as or within the subject word group. Rank-shifted participle clauses serving within a C-PN will never have a definite article on the participle, while it is partially codified that a substantive participle will be modified by the definite article. When rank-shifted participle clauses have an expressed complement, it is partially codified that the complement will follow the predicator in a P-C pattern. A-PPs in rank-shifted participle clauses will follow the predicator in a partially codified pattern. A-CUS always follow the predicator in such clauses while A-Advs regularly precede the participle.

The syntax of relative clauses largely depend on the how the relative pronoun, which will always be in the primary word group, is functioning within its own clause. Relative clause have the highest likelihood among all clauses to contain a multiplicity of word group types. It is partially codified that the relative clause will include an expressed complement word group and, largely because of the use of the relative pronoun, it is marginally codified that the sentence will have a C-P structure. It is fully codified that when the relative clause includes an expressed subject word group, it will also include either a complement word group, adjunct word group, or both. It is marginally codified that a relative clause will include a non-conjunctive adjunct word group. When the relative pronoun is not a part of the C-OP, it is partially codified that PPs will follow the predicator, while other adjunct types do not have a consistent pattern. Within the larger syntax, it is marginally codified that relative clauses will follow their referent, partially codified that they will follow their governing predicator, and partially codified that they only appear within clauses proper and not within other rank-shifted clauses.

Below the rank of clause, 2 Timothy demonstrates various patterns and tendencies on the rank of word group, divided among subject, complement, adjunct, and qualifier word groups. Subject word groups evince a few patterns based on the elements within them. It is partially

codified that subject word groups will not include an adjective and partially codified that they will not include qualifier word groups. When subject word groups do include qualifiers, it is codified that the head noun will be definite and that the qualifier will match in definiteness with the head noun. It is partially codified that a qualifier within a subject word group will follow the head noun. Rank shift does appear to impact tendencies for the presence of different elements in subject word groups, as it is partially codified that subjects with qualifiers will not appear within a rank-shifted clause and that subjects modified by the definite article will only appear within clauses properly on the rank of clause.

Complement word groups demonstrate various tendencies of syntax and word order according to their function within the clause. For C-DOs, it is common that the direct object is a single nominal group, pronoun, or rank-shifted clause. For those with qualifiers, it is partially codified that the qualifier will follow its head noun and match the definiteness of their head noun. C-DOs with qualifiers also tend to include the definite article on the head noun. It is marginally codified that adjectives within C-DOs will be attributive adjectives in "sandwich" position, with "repeat" position attributive adjectives only being rank-shifted participle clauses or nominalized PPs. C-IOs, as a marginally codified pattern, tend to be single pronouns and when the indirect object is a noun it will always be after the governing predicator. C-PNs never include a definite article. When the C-PN includes an adjective, it is marginally codified that the word group will also include at least one qualifier. When C-PNs include a qualifier, it is partially codified that the qualifier will follow the head adjective. The phenomenon of hyperbaton is the most common within C-PNs out of all complement types.

Aside from complement word groups that directly modify an expressed or implied predicator, C-OPs also demonstrate some consistent patterns. C-OPs with embedded qualifiers

261

have the qualifier following the head noun as a partially codified pattern, have the qualifier match the definiteness of the head noun as a codified pattern, and regularly have the article in the complement as well. When C-OPs include a definite article, it is partially codified that the complement word group will also include either another adjective or an embedded qualifier. Attributive adjectives in C-OPs, as a marginally codified pattern, are in "repeat" position; additionally, rank-shifted clauses and nominalized word groups functioning as attributive adjectives always appear in "repeat" position. Predicate adjectives show consistent syntax according to the lexeme, but with too few examples to be conclusive. When a PP precedes the verb, the adjective is regularly attributive and in "sandwich" position; similarly, when a PP follows the predicator, the adjective is likely an attributive adjective in "repeat" position or a predicate adjective. The force of the qualifier might impact expected syntax for the complement word group, especially for PPs indicating source, standard, means, or time.

Adjunct word groups in 2 Timothy show various patterns of word order and syntax according to type, especially for A-PPs, A-Advs, and A-CUs. For A-Advs, the additive καί always precedes the predicator as a fully codified pattern. Other potential patterns for adverbial adjunct word groups are evident as tendencies rather than established patterns. Adjuncts of manner tend to be forms with –ως, and the position relative to the predicator depends on the clause type. The placement of temporal adverbial modifiers relative to the predicator tends to depend on the adjunct word group itself, whether it is an indeclinable adverb or a derived form.

A-PPs are the most common type of adjunct word group and do evince many consistent patterns. The definite article is a common element within PPs, and it is marginally codified that it will be accompanied by either another adjectival modifier or an embedded qualifier. When the adjectival modifier is an adjective proper, according to part of speech, the definite article will not

appear with the adjective as a partially codified feature. Predicate adjectives within PPs can modify either definite or indefinite head noun, but will always precede it. It is partially codified that embedded qualifiers will their head noun and that the prepositional phrase will follow its predicator. Within prepositional phrase adjuncts, it is fully codified that qualifier will match their referent in grammatical definiteness and it is marginally codified that the qualifier will modify a head noun with a definite article. When the qualifier functions as a subjective genitive, it is fully codified that the head noun will have a definite article. The force of the A-PP has potential impact on the word group itself and its larger syntactical patterns, especially with PPs of standard, location, and time, but there are too few examples for conclusive determinations.

Qualifier word groups evince patterns of syntax and word order according to their type and force. The three types of qualifiers with enough examples to show tendencies and patterns are PPs that directly modify a noun or adjective as a qualifier, relative clauses, and nominal word groups including a noun or pronoun and additional modifiers. When a PP functions as a qualifier, it tends to follow its referent and have an epexegetical force; it is fully codified that PPs as qualifiers will follow their governing predicator, when it is expressed. Relative clauses, as a fully codified pattern, follow their referent and, as a codified pattern, follow their governing verb. Relative clauses never appear within a nominal clause or within a C-PN. It is marginally codified that relative clauses, as a whole, will only appear within clauses on the rank of clause and not within rank-shifted clauses.

For qualifier word groups consisting of nominal elements and modifiers, many patterns are evident. For all nominal qualifiers, it is partially codified that such qualifiers follow their referent and that they will not precede their governing verb. It is marginally codified that they will not appear in rank-shifted clauses and that they will only consist of a single noun or pronoun without

additional adjectives or modifiers. The addition of other elements, such an article, an adjective, or another embedded qualifier, does appear to impact syntax somewhat, but more data would be needed for any solid conclusions. For those that consist only of nouns and pronouns, however, it is marginally codified that, when they precede the predicator, the qualifier has the force of a subjective or objective genitive.

The force for the qualifier does impact word order and syntax, especially for adjectival, possessive, appositive, objective genitive, and subjective genitive qualifiers. It is fully codified that adjectival qualifiers will follow their referent and codified that they will follow the governing verb. It is fully codified that qualifiers of possession will follow their referent and not appear within a subject word group. They also tend to be personal pronouns and follow their governing verb. It is fully codified that appositive qualifiers will follow their referent and that they will never precede an expressed verb. It is fully codified that objective genitive qualifiers will follow their referent and they tend not to appear in subject word groups. It is fully codified that subjective genitive qualifiers will not include an adjective. They also tend to be pronouns, tend not to include embedded qualifiers, and, unlike other qualifiers, regularly precede their referent and their governing verb. Finally, for all qualifiers, it is codified that they will match the grammatical definiteness of their referent, and all exceptions follow the referent within complement word groups. For qualifiers that modify grammatically ambiguous referents, they tend to be PPs and epexegetical in force.

CHAPTER FOUR

A RANK-BASED ANALYSIS OF WORD ORDER AND SYNTAX IN TITUS

This chapter constructs and presents a linguistic profile for Titus by analyzing the text according to the rank scale for patterns of syntax, word group order, and word order. The analysis proceeds downward along the rank scale, beginning with sections and subsection, then moving into various types of clauses both on the rank of clause and those that have undergone rank shift, and concluding with word groups in themselves. Before such examination of the text, first the text will be established, presenting the author's choices on various issues of textual divisions and variant readings. Exegetical choices that do not impact the level one reading of the text[1] will be presented as they apply to specific ranks and potential patterns.

The Rank of Section

Establishing the Sections

Before the sections and subsections can be analyzed, the textual divisions will be established in consultation with Van Neste and other textual commentaries. The letter of Titus, as noted by commentators, evinces a chiastic structure, centering on the contrast between good leaders, teaching, and the lifestyle that corresponds with the Gospel and bad leaders, teaching, and the lifestyle that opposes the Gospel in Titus 2:1–3:8. This is flanked by a discussion of the opponents themselves in 1:10–16 and 3:9–11 and the opening and closing of the body in 1:5–9 and 3:12–14.[2] Some commentators have variations on this basic structure, but there is a general consensus on the chiastic flow of the letter. Where there is difference, however, is for the

---

[1] See Voelz, *What Does This Mean?* 156–67.

[2] Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 281.

boundaries between sections and subsections within the larger structure. Van Neste argues that

2:1–15 and 3:1–8 are each one larger textual unit, while dividing the larger unit into six smaller

portions: 2:1–10, 2:11–14, 2:15, 3:1–2, 3:3–7, and 3:8. The other portions of the chiasm, as noted

above, Van Neste keeps in the unit divisions as they appear within the chiasm, leaving many

smaller sections on the outside of the chiasm and one larger unit in the center.[3] Other

commentators also hold that 2:1 begins a new and central section of the letter, but they generally

keep 1:5–9 and 1:10–16 together, keep 3:9–11 with 3:1–8, and begin a new larger section at 3:1.[4]

Along with Van Neste and the majority of commentators, 1:5–3:11 will be considered the main

body of the letter for this project, with 1:1–4, the opening salutation, functioning as its own

syntactical unit and 3:12–15 giving the final travel plans and closing benediction. Within the

final instructions, this project will also divide 3:12–14 and 3:15 into two smaller subsections, one

giving travel instructions and one giving the final greetings.[5] The main issues concerning the

structure of the text that remain, then, revolve around the relationship of 1:5–9 with 1:10–16 as

one or two sections, the block of text in 2:1–3:8 as one or two larger sections, and the

relationship of 3:9–11 with 3:8 and 3:1–7.

The current project will combine 1:5–9 and 1:10–16 as subsections into one larger section.

In his chiastic treatment of Titus, Van Neste argues for the parallel between 1:10–16 and 3:9–11

in their discussion of the problem of Titus' opponents and the roles of 1:5–9 and 3:12–14 as the

---

[3] Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 234–51, 273–82.

[4] Towner and Marshall both present 1:5–16 as one larger unit of text and combine 3:9–11 with 3:1–8 (Marshall, *Epistles*, 24 and Towner, *Letters*, 75–79). Towner, however, separates 1:5 from 1:6–9 as a smaller unit and, like Van Neste, treat 3:8 as its own smaller unit, both connecting backward and forward. Knight generally follows the textual division of Van Neste, although he separates 2:1–15 and 3:1–8 as two larger sections (Knight, *Epistles*, x). Witherington has a separate structure, combining 1:13b–16 with 2:1–15 as one larger unit and placing 3:8 with 3:9–11 rather than with 3:1–7 (Witherington, *Letters*, 91–92).

[5] This is also a division made by many commentators, including Towner (Towner, *Letters*, 75–79), Marshall (Marshall, *Epistles*, 24), and Van Neste (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 250–51).

opening and closing of the body of the letter.[6] Van Neste demonstrates many connections, both lexical and thematic, between 1:5–9 and 1:10–16 and argues that the former "has been shaped in such a way as to introduce" the latter,[7] yet he still argues that the main purpose of 1:5–9 is to introduce the rest of the main body, 1:10–3:11, which has strong cohesion throughout.[8] While not denying the parallels between 1:10–16 and 3:9–11 nor that 1:5–9 introduces the main themes and issues of the letter, this project combines 1:5–9 and 1:10–16 into one section. Unlike the parallel section of the chiasm, 3:12–14, which is detached from the theological and thematic purposes of Titus, the opening subsection of the body, 1:5–9, is thematically and lexically connected not only to 1:10–16 but to the rest of the letter.[9] Forcing a parallel between 1:5–9 and 3:12–14 and thereby separating it from 1:10–3:11, then, does not do justice to the importance of 1:5–9 within the letter. Another factor that supports joining 1:5–9 with 1:10–16 is the presence of γάρ in 1:10. While Van Neste does mention the use of γάρ as a uniting factor when discussing the connections between 1:5–9 and 1:10–16,[10] he does not address how it impacts the grouping of the text into larger units.[11] As argued in chapter one of this project, the primary use of γάρ in the PE is as a confirmatory conjunction, giving rationale or further information to explain a prior statement.[12] The text does certainly shift topics in 1:10, moving from the discussion of overseers and their characteristics to a discussion of false teachers, but 1:10–16 is better understood as

---

[6] Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 276–81.

[7] Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 253–55.

[8] Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 278.

[9] See Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 264–273 for a presentation on the larger semantic chains of the letter, and how 1:5–9 plays a role in them in a different way than 3:12–14.

[10] Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 253.

[11] Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 276–78.

[12] Heckert, *Discourse*, 31–32. He does offer that, on occasion, the γάρ might be seen as not only backward-facing but anticipatory (Heckert, *Discourse*, 35–36), but Titus 1:10 is not listed an example.

giving further information and confirmation behind the closing command of 1:9, that Titus

reprove or correct those who contradict him. So, while γάρ does introduce 1:10 as a shift within

the section, it is unlikely that γάρ introduces a new topic or major section of the letter.

The current project also divides 2:1–3:8 into two sections rather than one. Van Neste

argues that 2:1–3:8 function together as one larger unit of text and helpfully defends his choice

by demonstrating the parallels in content and textual flow between 2:1–15 and 3:1–8.[13] Both

passages open with the topic of lifestyle and behavior that correction to sound teaching (2:1–10;

3:1–2), are followed by the theological basis for the previous statements (2:11–14; 3:3–7) and

conclude with a final exhortation and summary (2:15; 3:8). He further argues that 2:1–15 has a

"more complete introduction" while 3:1–8 has a "more complete conclusion," giving the

indication that both passages are meant to read together as one.[14] This argument, however,

depends on the idea that 3:8 concludes 3:1–7 rather than introduces 3:9–11, which is discussed

more below,[15] and that there are no significant shifts in topic between the two passages. Along

with many commentators, this project divides Titus 2 and 3 into separate sections.[16] While not

denying the parallels that are helpfully presented by Van Neste, there are differences between the

sections. The instructions in 2:1–10 are focused on individual groups within the church

community, and each set of commands is followed by a purpose clause with ἵνα (2:5, 8, 10). The

instructions in 3:1–2, are shorter and more generalized for the entire community, followed by an

explanatory γάρ clause (3:3). Similarly, the instructions in 2:1–10 are focused on positive

---

[13] Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 275–76, 281.

[14] Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 275.

[15] Commentators are divided on whether 3:8 connects backward or forward, and Van Neste does concede that connects in both directions (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 248–49, 261–63).

[16] See Marshall, *Epistles*, 24, Knight, *Epistles*, x, and Witherington, *Letters*, 91–92. Although, see also Towner, *Letters*, 75–79, who does combine all of 2:1–3:11 into one larger section.

behavior that is encouraged among the various church groups, while the behaviors and qualities depicted in 3:1–11 are, generally speaking, negative qualities to be avoided that correspond with a rejection of the sound teaching. Finally, the summary exhortation of 2:15 indicates movement in the text to a new topic, as the anaphoric demonstrative itself functions both as a backward-facing connective device and as a signal of transition or movement, lending support to rendering 3:1 as the beginning of a new section.

The final major issue that determines larger textual divisions is the relationship of 3:8 with both the preceding and the following material. Many commentators include 3:9–11 with 3:1–8 as a larger section,[17] but they are divided on whether 3:8 is grouped with 3:1–7 or 3:9–11.[18] The strongest argument for uniting 3:8 with 3:1-7 is helpfully laid out by Van Neste. The final commands with the anaphoric ταῦτα in 3:8 parallel 2:15 as the conclusion to the preceding commands (2:1–10; 3:1–2) and theological exposition (2:11–14; 3:3–7).[19] In addition to this, the opening phrase of 3:8, Πιστός ὁ λόγος, and the τούτων in 3:8 both refer backward to 3:4–7,[20] the conjunction δέ, appearing in 3:9, is a common transitional device,[21] and there is a shift from positive commendation to the church community in 3:8 to rebuking opponents in 3:9–11.[22] These factors notwithstanding, the present project instead groups 3:8 with 3:9–11 to give 3:8–11 as the concluding subsection of 3:1–11.[23] While in this case the opening clause, πιστός ὁ λόγος, in

---

[17] See Marshall, *Epistles*, 24 and Towner, *Letters*, 75–79.

[18] Knight groups 3:8 with 3:1–7 (Knight, *Epistles*, x), Towner keeps 3:8 as its own hinge unit between 3:1–7 and 3:9–11 (Towner, *Letters*, 75–79), and Marshall and Witherington join 3:8 with 3:9–11 (Marshall, *Epistles*, 24 and Witherington, *Letters*, 91–92).

[19] Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 275–76.

[20] Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 261–62.

[21] Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 250.

[22] Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 249.

[23] Witherington (Witherington, *Letters*, 91–92) and Marshall (Marshall, *Epistles*, 24) also group 3:8 together

conjunction with the anaphoric demonstrative pronoun τούτων, does refer backward, the same

phrase elsewhere in the PE points forward (1 Tim. 3:1) or does not necessarily indicate a

transition (1. Tim. 1:15). Similarly, the demonstrative pronoun, when used as an anaphoric

connective device, can still serve in itself as a transitional device, both recalling the previous

material but also using it as the basis for a new topic or thematic shift.[24] Another factor for this

decision is the contrastive δέ in 3:9. The contrastive δέ can introduce a subsection transition in

the PE, as it does in 1 Timothy and 2 Timothy,[25] and faces both backward and forward, building

on a previous statement or idea yet using the previous information for a different purpose or turn

in the argument more relevant for the current situation.[26] It could be serving the same function

here, but the context differs from the places in 1 Timothy and 2 Timothy where it serves a

transitional function. In Titus 3:8–11, the field of participants remains the same throughout, the

genre does not shift, and the topic does not shift. While there are third person verbal forms at the

end of 3:8, it is still within the context of the author directly addressing Titus and giving him

instructions about his own teaching and conduct throughout 3:8–11. The genre remains

paraenetic throughout 3:8–11, shifting from theological exposition in 3:3–7.[27] Opposition is

mentioned in this section, but, as mentioned above, only within the context of direct exhortation

to Titus and within the topic of how the discussion of the letter should impact Titus' own

---

with 3:9–11 as a summary section.

[24] As it regularly functions in 1 Timothy (1 Tim. 3:14; 4:6, 11; 6:2c).

[25] 1 Tim. 1:8; 6:11; 2 Tim. 3:10. In both of these cases, the contrastive δέ introduces the second subsection of a larger section, switches from third person verbal forms to either second singular (1 Tim. 6:11; 2 Tim. 3:10) or first plural (1:8), and changes the genre of the text.

[26] Heckert, *Discourse*, 47–49.

[27] Van Neste acknowledges this as well (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 314).

ministry and behavior, not as a self-contained topic.[28] Finally, the semantic connections shift

from 3:3–7 to 3:8–11. The author encourages Titus to commend good works that are good and

useful (ὠφέλιμα) to people in 3:8, while commanding Titus to avoid things that are

disadvantageous (ἀνωφελεῖς) and pointless (μάταιοι) in 3:9. These words are in the same

semantic domains, thereby uniting 3:8 with 3:9 both lexically and semantically.[29] For these

reasons, even though Van Neste makes a compelling case for the cohesion of 3:8 with 3:3–7 and

the transitional function of 3:8, this project instead groups 3:8 with 3:9–11 as one subsection,

giving the section and subsection units expressed below in Table 6.

Table 6. Sections and Subsections of Titus.

Section	Subsection	Verses	# of Sentences
α	α-1	1:1-4	2
β	β-1	1:5-9	2
β	β-2	1:10-16	7
γ	γ-1	2:1-10	5
γ	γ-2	2:11-15	3
δ	δ-1	3:1-2	1
δ	δ-2	3:3-7	2
δ	δ-3	3:8-11	4
ε	ε-1	3:12-14	4
ε	ε-2	3:15	3

Before analyzing the sections and subsections of Titus, the text will also be established in

light of variant readings with potential import for patterns of syntax and word order. Many

variants in Titus are purely lexical, poorly attested, or otherwise have little impact on syntactical

patterns. There six variant readings that warrant discussion for the current project: four that are

---

[28] Contra Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 314.

[29] "Useful" (ὠφέλιμα) in 3:8 and "pointless" (μάταιοι) in are in the same semantic domain (L-N, §65.40, 625 and §65.37, 625) and "disadvantageous" (ἀνωφελεῖς) is both lexically related to "useful" and from the same semantic domain (L-N, §65.50, 626).

minor with a fairly consistent scholarly consensus and two more significant variant readings for which there are different positons and attestation. The four minor variants are found with regard to καί in 1:10 and 1:16, ἀγαθόν in 1:16, and word order switch between Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Alexandrinus in 2:9.

With regard to the presence of καί in 1:10 and 1:16, both will be retained for the current project. In 1:10, both Codices Sinaiticus and Alexandrinus omit the additive καί, as do Ambrosiaster, the Syriac and Coptic traditions, various Latin manuscripts, and others. Knight omits the καί, citing the stronger manuscript evidence for its omission than inclusion,[30] but the majority of commentators include the καί. Marshall states that it is more likely to have been omitted than to have been added back in for unnecessary hendiadys,[31] and Elliott argues that it is probably original, as its addition would warrant a clumsy move by "unintelligent scribes," which is not likely.[32] This project will include the καί, whose position impacts the syntax of adjunct word groups, as it is more likely to have been removed as redundant than to have been added to become the more difficult reading. Fewer scholars discuss the omission of the conjunctive καί within the compound C-PN in 1:16, with Elliott arguing that it should be retained and Marshall echoing Elliott's assertion.[33] Elliott states that, while it is common for scribes to remove the copula with lists of nouns, the consideration here differs in that it is a list of predicate adjectives. But he does conclude that it was more likely to have been omitted as a stylistic change, rather than to have been added to create polysyndeton.[34] While the original hand of Codex Sinaiticus

---

[30] Knight, *Epistles*, 296. Metzger comments that their committee chose to include the καί, but that it was retained in brackets due to the "weighty authorities" that omit it (Metzger, *Commentary*, 584–85).

[31] Marshall, *Epistles*, 193.

[32] Elliott, *Greek Text*, 211.

[33] Elliott, *Greek Text*, 211 and Marshall, *Epistles*, 194.

[34] Elliott, *Greek Text*, 211.

and Ambrosiaster omit the καί, this project will, following Elliott's argument, retain the καί, which impacts the discussion of section and subsection transitions in addition to the expected syntax of lists, both predicate nominative and otherwise.

Two other minor variants involve the presence and syntax of adjectives in 1:16 and 2:9. The original hand of Codex Sinaiticus omits the adjective ἀγαθόν in 1:16, which would impact word group analysis within complement word groups, especially C-PNs. On one hand, this would be the more difficult reading and greatly changes the sense the final element of the C-PN. It does seem more likely that the adjective would have been added to match the phrase elsewhere in the PE and make better sense of the passage.[35] Elliott and Marshall, however, argue that it should be retained, arguing that the deletion is the result of homoioteleuton with ἔργον and ἀγαθόν.[36] Other scholars include theological discussion of the adjective or even its syntax, but do not discuss the variant.[37] While the omission of ἀγαθός is the more difficult reading, this project, alongside the majority of scholars, will retain the adjective in 1:16, not only for the reason that homoioteleuton could reasonably explain its omission but also in that ἔργον almost never appears within the PE without either ἀγαθός, καλός, or an additional modifying element[38] and that the adjective ἀγαθός is necessary for the sense of the clause. The other salient variant occurs in 2:9, where the NA[28] text retains the Adjective-Noun word order for ἰδίοις δεσπόταις as found in

---

[35] The phrase "every good work" appears in 1 Tim. 5:10, 2 Tim. 2:21, and 2 Tim. 3:17. The adjective ἀγαθός also joins the noun ἔργον without πᾶς in 1 Tim. 2:10.

[36] Elliott, *Greek Text*, 143, 180 and Marshall, *Epistles*, 194.

[37] See Towner, *Letters*, 710, Knight, *Epistles*, 304, or Perkins, *Letters*, 258

[38] It appears with ἀγαθός regularly (1 Tim. 2:10; 5:10; 2 Tim. 2:21; 3:17; Titus 3:1), but also appears with καλός in 1 Timothy and Titus (1 Tim. 3:1; 5:10, 25; 6:18; Titus 2:7, 14; 3:8, 14). The noun ἔργον can also take other adjectives or modifiers, include πονηρός (2 Tim. 4:18), a personal pronoun as a subjective genitive qualifier (2 Tim. 1:9; 4:14), or another modifying element (2 Tim. 4:5; Titus 3:5). The only instance where ἔργον does not appear with an attributive adjective or qualifier is in 1:16, the same verse as the variant in question. In this case, however, the sense of the passage is clear without a subjective genitive qualifier or another modifying element. For the variant, however, the adjective ἀγαθός is necessary for the sense of the passage.

Codex Sinaiticus, the Majority Text, and many other witnesses over against the Noun-Adjective word order, reading δεσπόταις ἰδίοις, found in Codex Alexandrinus, Codex Claramontanus, and a handful of other witnesses. Elliott argues that the variant should be adopted on stylistic grounds. It is more natural within the PE, he asserts, that an adjective would precede an arthrous noun but follow an anarthrous noun, and the Noun-Adjective word order reflects Semitic influence.[39] Marshall retains the Adjective-Noun word order as seen in the Nestle-Aland text, while conceding that Elliott's proposal is "possible."[40] While Elliott is correct that attributive adjectives in "repeat" position tend to be anarthous while those in "sandwich" positon tend modify definite nouns, there are many exceptions to this tendency, as shown above.[41] With that in mind, it is possible that either reading could have preceded the other, with scribes either assimilating the text to the general tendencies of the PE, *a la* Elliott, or scribes changing the expected word order to a less likely, but very possible, word order for stylistic reasons. The current project will retain the word order as seen in the NA[28] text, then, due to weightier manuscript evidence for the Adjective-Noun pattern.

The two more significant variant readings occur in 2:10 with the rank-shifted participle clause "πᾶσαν πίστιν ἐνδεικνυμένους ἀγαθήν," as it appears in NA[28], and the adjective σωτήριος in 2:11. For the former, the original hand of Codex Sinaiticus omits the noun πίστιν, the Majority Text and few witness switch the order of πᾶσαν and πίστιν, Codices Augiensis and Boernerianus

---

[39] Elliott, *Greek Text*, 184.

[40] Marshall, *Epistles*, 258–59.

[41] See 1 Tim. 2:8; 5:11; 2 Tim. 2:2; 3:1 4:14; Titus 1:11; 3:8, 14. It is especially noteworthy, also, that four infinitive clauses in Titus have attributive adjectives in the complement word group (2:8, 9; 3:8, 14). All of them are anathrous, with two undisputedly appearing in "sandwich" position (3:8, 14) and one in "repeat" position (2:8). Additionally, the single example with a Noun-Adjective pattern has hyperbaton, with the verb interrupting the pronoun and the adjective (2:8).

swap the participle and πίστιν, and miniscule 33 omits the noun πίστιν with Sinaiticus but also changes ἀγαθήν to ἀγάπην. The text as it stands in NA[28] is supported by a revised hand of Sinaiticus, Codices Alexandrinus, Ephraemi Rescriptus, Claramontanus, and others. Many commentators include the adjective ἀγαθήν in their discussion of the text but discuss neither the variant issues with the word nor the syntax of the larger phrase,[42] and Marshall mentions the text-critical issues here but defers to Elliott.[43] As Elliott helpfully argues, all the different readings likely stem from the attempt to smooth out the hyperbaton of πίστιν and ἀγαθήν.[44] The switch of Codices F and G would solve the hyperbaton with πίστιν and ἀγαθήν but create another hyperbaton with πᾶσαν and πίστιν, which is very unlikely. The move of the Majority Text would be the more difficult reading, with πᾶσαν following its head noun, but not only is this rare in the New Testament but would create an unlikely, and singular, occurrence in the PE where a complement word group with the predicate adjective πᾶς and an attributive adjective would have this syntax. Elliott argues, contra the original hand of Sinaiticus, that the πίστιν should be retained as its removal was an attempt to handle the "awkward position" of ἀγαθήν.[45] And, indeed, hyperbaton does not occur elsewhere in the PE within complements that include both the predicate adjective πᾶς and an attributive adjective on one head noun,[46] although both C-DOs with πᾶς in Titus do have hyperbaton in the complement word group.[47] The single miniscule that changes ἀγαθήν to ἀγάπην also omits the noun πίστιν, and likely includes the other change because the removal of noun πίστιν necessitates a different noun to serve as the complement. The

---

[42] See Towner, *Letters*, 738 or Lenski, *Interpretation*, 917.

[43] Marshall, *Epistles*, 259.

[44] Elliott, *Greek Text*, 185.

[45] Elliott, *Greek Text*, 185.

[46] 1 Tim. 5:10; 2 Tim. 2:21; 3:17; 4:18; Titus 3:1.

[47] Titus 2:10; 3:2.

current project, then, will follow Elliott's suggestion that the syntax of the participle clause as it appears in NA[28] will be retained as the hyperbaton can most satisfactorily explain the rise of the other variant possibilities.

The final significant variant readings for consideration of syntactical patterns occur in 2:11 for the adjective σωτήριος in predicate position to the subject, ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ. The original hand of Sinaiticus and various Latin manuscripts have the genitive noun, σωτῆρος, in apposition to τοῦ θεοῦ. Codices Augiensis, Boernerianus, and a few other traditions add the article and the qualifier ἡμῶν to the reading of Sinaiticus, giving τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν. An editor of Codex Claramontanus and other manuscripts, including the Majority Text, retain the adjective form but also have a definite article to change the position of the adjective from predicate to attributive. The text as it reads in NA[28] is supported by second editor of Sinaiticus, the original hands of Ephraemi Rescrpitus and Claramontanus, Codex Alexadrinus, some Latin manuscripts, Clement, and other sources. Many commentators retain the adjectival form in predicate position, but do not discuss the variant readings of the article nor the change to the noun form.[48] Elliott argues that the adjective is the original reading, with editors changing it to the nominal form to assimilate the text to 2:10 and remove the adjectival form, which is an *hapax legomenon* in the New Testament.[49] Elliott also prefers the reading of the Majority Text, which includes the article on the adjective, giving what Elliott calls a Semitic order.[50] Marshall, however, prefers to keep the adjective without the article. He argues that the article would be necessary if the adjective

---

[48] See Knight, *Epistles*, 319, Lenski, *Interpretation*, 919, and Towner, *Letters*, 745n7.

[49] Elliott, *Greek Text*, 186–87. The neuter singular nominative form is used elsewhere as a noun in the New Testament (Luke 2:30; 3:6; Acts 28:28; Eph. 6:7), but this is the only occurrence of the adjective as an adjective proper.

[50] Elliott, *Greek Text*, 186–87.

were in attributive position, but the article is not necessary as the adjective is predicative to its

head noun.[51] With Elliott and others, this project will retain the adjectival form, σωτήριος. It is

more likely that editors would assimilate the text to match 2:10 elsewhere than that they would

change the text to the adjective and to an *hapax legomenon*. There is significant evidence both

for the inclusion and the omission of the article, but this project will side with Marshall's reading

and the text as it stands in the NA[28]. This would be the more difficult reading, as predicate

position adjectives, aside from πᾶς and demonstrative pronouns, are very rare in the PE, and it is

more likely that an editor would desire to change it into attributive position than vice versa.

Additionally, reading the adjective as predicate would make better sense of the patterns of

qualifiers in the PE, as it is very rare that a grammatically indefinite qualifier, πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις,

would modify a definite head noun or adjective, σωτήριος.[52] This project, then, will read 2:11 as

it appears in NA[28] as the most probable original reading.

<div align="center">Across the Sections</div>

There are not as many section and subsection transitions in the letter of Titus as the other

PE, with only four section transitions and nine total subsection transitions, but some regular

tendencies for syntax emerge within and across the sections and subsections. Such tendencies,

albeit on a tentative basis due to the lack of a larger data set, are helpful for analysis and

interpretation of Titus in itself in addition to comparison to the other PE and letters of the New

Testament. The linguistic analysis of sections below will focus on patterns of structure,

connective devices, and transitional indicators, as well as semantic and lexical chains insofar as

---

[51] Marshall, *Epistles*, 266, 267n95.

[52] This does interpret the qualifier, πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις, as modifying the adjective σωτήριος rather than the verb ἐπεφάνη or the head subject itself, ἡ χάρις. This also the position explicitly taken by many commentators (Marshall, *Epistles*, 268, Knight, *Epistles*, 319, Lenski, *Interpretation*, 919, Perkins, *Letters*, 267–68, and Towner, *Letters*, 746n10).

they contribute to stylistic tendencies. The table below summarizes the transition markers

between sections and subsections for the letter of Titus.

Table 7. Section and Subsection Transitions in Titus.

Transition Type	Verse	Transition	Transition Markers
Section	1:05	α-1 → β-1	Τούτου (cataphoric), topic change
Subsection	1:10	β-1 → β-2	γάρ, topic change and genre change
Section	2:01	β-2 → γ-1	δέ, Σύ, topic change and genre change
Subsection	2:11	γ-1 → γ-2	γάρ, topic change and genre change
Section	3:01	γ-2 → δ-1	asyndeton, topic change and genre change
Subsection	3:03	δ-1 → δ-2	γάρ, topic change and genre change
Subsection	3:08	δ-2 → δ-3	asyndeton, formulaic syntax, topic change
Section	3:12	δ-3 → ε-1	asyndeton, topic change
Subsection	3:15	ε-1 → ε-2	asyndeton, topic change

Titus, as is commonly noted, has a longer, theologically-motivated salutation than the other

PE, causing the first section change from section α to section β to occur in 1:5. A cataphoric

demonstrative pronoun, τούτου, that points ahead to the ἵνα clause helps to signal the transition

as the text changes from the opening salutation to the topic at hand for the letter—the issue of

church leadership. The opening subsection, β-1, consists of two complex sentences, each with

exhortation and instruction for Titus in selecting and appointing church leaders. The opening

sentence centers on an indicative paratactic clause with a paraenetic context, and is followed by a

sentence that is both explanatory, with γάρ as the connector, and paraenetic, with the use of the

impersonal verb δεῖ. This second sentence that opens with the conjunction γάρ and ends with a

ἵνα clause of purpose is also the final sentence of the subsection. This opening subsection

introduces many semantic and syntactical tendencies for the letter as a whole. It is common for

the opening sentence of a subsection to be followed by an explanatory sentence with γάρ (1:5–9;

3:1–3, 12). It is also common for an opening subsection to end with a ἵνα clause of purpose (1:7–

9; 2:9–10; 3:14),[53] and opening subsections in Titus are always exhortative in nature.[54]

The first subsection transition occurs in 1:10 as the text moves from β-1, the opening reminder and exhortation for Titus to appoint leadership, to β-2, exposition concerning the opponents and false teachers whom church leaders should be prepared to identify and rebuke. The subsection opens with an explanatory sentence, utilizing γάρ, that gives the theological or expository background for the exhortation of the preceding section. This will be common for the first sentence of a second subsection within the main body of the text (1:10–11; 2:11–14; 3:3). The opening sentence is followed by an expository sentence with asyndeton and the subsection concludes with a contrastive, compound indicative sentence that includes a list in a C-PN with hyperbaton as the complement of a final HC-ptc. One other section also ends with a causal HC-ptc (3:10–11), while this is the only section of the main body to end with indicative, expository clauses.[55]

The opening section, β, also establishes the syntactical and thematic expectations for the letter of Titus. As aforementioned, the section opens with a subsection of exhortation followed by a subsection of explanation and exposition, which continues for sections γ and δ as well. The opening sentence of the section is followed by an explanatory sentence with γάρ, which will be seen also in sections δ and ε. The opening subsection ends with a ἵνα clause of purpose, as

---

[53] While the opening subsection of section δ is a single imperative sentence, the second subsection, δ-2, also ends with a ἵνα clause of purpose (3:4–7).

[54] The opening subection of the main body, β-1, switches from the opening salutation to an exhortative subsection on the topic of appointing leaders. Subsection γ-1 switches from a subsection of explanation and exposition, β-2, back to exhortation in 2:1. Subsection δ-1, similarly, switch from explanation and exposition in γ-2 back to exhortation in 3:1. The final instance in subsection ε-1 is also exhortative, although not as a change from the previous subsection, δ-3, which is also exhortative.

[55] As will be shown below, the other two sections of the main body end with imperative commands (2:15; 3:10–11), and the final sentence of the main body also includes an imperative verb (3:15b).

appears also in subsections γ-1 and ε-1.[56] There is a minor *inclusio* between 1:5–6 and 1:16 with the semantic fields of discipline and moral qualities. Titus is charged not to select church leaders whose children are rebellious (ἀνυπότακτος) or are known for reckless behavior (ἀσωτία) in 1:5–6,[57] following this in 1:16 by describing the false teachers as disobedient (ἀπειθής), as known for bad or evil behavior (ἀδόκιμος), and as denying God with their actions (ἀρνέομαι).[58] These lexemes connect the two passages within the semantic domains of discipline and the subdomains of obedience and following, as well as the semantic domain of moral or immoral qualities and the subdomains of senseless and harmful behavior. The semantic domain of communication appears in both 1:5–6 and 1:16 with the words διατάσσω, ἀνέγκλητος, κατηγορία, and ὁμολογέω.[59] But not only is there no common subdomain between the two sentences, but the domain itself is very broad and variegated, making a deliberate, semantic connection on those grounds somewhat dubious. In addition to the *inclusio*, the opening section introduces the main semantic chains and themes of the letter, especially authority and discipline,[60] teaching,[61]

---

[56] For section δ, the opening subsection is only one imperative sentence, with the second subsection, δ-2, ending with a ἵνα clause of purpose.

[57] See L-N, §36.26, 469 for ἀνυπότακτος in the domain of discipline and the subdomain of obedience and disobedience, and L-N, §88.96, 753 for ἀσωτία in the domain of moral and ethical qualifiers in the subdomain of senseless or reckless behavior.

[58] See L-N, §36.24, 469 for ἀπειθής in the same domain and subdomain as ἀνυπότακτος and L-N, §36.43, 471 for ἀρνέομαι, as it is used in Titus 1:16, in the same domain as ἀνυπότακτος but the subdomain of following someone as leader. In this case, ἀρνέομαι is not used to describe spoken words of denial (L-N, §33.277, 420), but the lifestyle that corresponds with confessing or denying allegiance to a leader. See also L-N, §88.111, 755 for ἀδόκιμός as in the same domain as ἀσωτία but the subdomain of harmful or evil behavior. Van Neste makes a helpful and similar connection here with the larger sematic chain of virtue and vice that runs through the letter (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 264–68), but does not directly connect the lexemes of 1:5–6 and 1:16 by semantic domain.

[59] See L-N, §33.325, 425, for διατάσσω in the subdomain of command, L-N, §33.428, 437, and §33.433, 437, for κατηγορία and ἀνέγκλητος in the subdomain of accusation or blame, and L-N, §33.221, 413, for ὁμολογέω in the subdomain of declaration.

[60] This includes the verbs διατάσσω (1:5), ὑποτάσσω (2:5, 9; 3:1), παιδεύω (2:12), παρακαλέω (1:9; 2:6, 15), βούλομαι (3:8), ἐλέγχω (1:9, 13; 2:15), ἐπιδιορθόω (1:5), καθίστημι (1:5), πειθαρχέω (3:1), and δουλεύω (2:3; 3:3), and the nouns and adjectives ἐπιταγή (1:3), ἀνυπότακτος (1:6, 10), δοῦλος (1:1; 2:9), ἀρχή (3:1), and ἐξουσία (3:1). See also Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 273.

[61] This includes the verbs διδάσκω (1:11) and μανθάνω (3:14) and the nouns and adjectives κήρυγμα (1:3),

knowledge,[62] obedience,[63] faith(fulness),[64] and good works.[65]

The text shifts from section β to section γ in 2:1, moving from the depiction of false leaders and opponents to exhortation to various groups within the church and what Titus should authoritatively instruct about their conduct and behavior to befit proper church teaching. The transition includes a contrastive δέ, the subjective pronoun Σύ as the expressed subject of an imperative verb,[66] and a shift in genre and topic. The opening sentence includes an imperative command with a rank-shifted, relative clause as the complement word group, and it is followed by a serial list of imperative sentences, often with the main verb elided (2:2, 3, 9), exhorting

---

διδασκαλία (1:9; 2:1, 7, 10), διδαχή (1:9), and καλοδιδάσκαλος (2:3). See also Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 271, as he links this theme with a semantic chain of references to the message or the content of the teaching.

[62] In addition to the verb οἶδα (1:16; 3:11) and the noun ἐπίγνωσις (1:1), there are references to the mind and mental capacity with συνείδησις (1:15), νοῦς (1:15), ἀνόητος (3:3), νουθεσία (3:10), as well as knowledge that is good and true or useless and false, using ἀλήθεια (1:1; 14), ἀληθής (1:13), ἀψευδής (1:2), ψεύστης (1:12), μῦθος (1:14), μάταιος (3:9) and ματαιολόγος (1:10), and μωρός (3:9). This connection is not mentioned by Van Neste in his discussion of semantic chains.

[63] This includes the adjectives ἀνυπότακτος (1:6, 10) and ἀπειθής (1:16; 3:3) and the verbs ἀντιλέγω (1:9; 2:9), ὑποτάσσω (2:5, 9; 3:1), and also the way that ἀρνέομαι is used in Titus (1:16; 2:12). See also Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 267.

[64] The verb πιστεύω and its cognates appear eleven times in the letter: the verb πιστεύω twice (1:3; 3:8), the noun πίστις five times (1:1, 4; 2:2, 10; 3:15), the adjective πιστός thrice (1:6, 9; 3:8), and the adjective ἄπιστος once (1:15). In addition to this word family, other lexemes carry the connotation of trustworthiness or dishonesty, including ἀνέγκλητος (1:6, 7), αἰσχροκερδής (1:7) and αἰσχρος (1:11), φρεναπάτης (1:10), ἀδόκιμος (1:16), διάβολος (2:3), ἀκατάγνωστος (2:8), νοσφίζω (2:10), and πλανάω (3:3). Van Neste does mention many of these lexemes in his broader presentation of the semantic chain of vice and virtue in the letter, but not within the context specifically of trustworthiness (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 264–68).

[65] Throughout the letter, good works and godly behavior are emphasized, not only through the nominal groups καλός with ἔργον (2:7, 14; 3:8, 14) and ἀγαθός with ἔργον (1:16; 3:1), but other lexemes focusing on concrete actions and behavior, including εὐσέβεια (1:1), ἐνδείκνυμι (2:10; 3:2), ἁμαρτάνω (3:11), ἄκαρπος (3:14), references to the importance or unimportance of works (ἔργοι) within various arenas (1:16; 3:5), and many other lexemes that describe qualities and dispositions (φιλότεκνος in 2:4 or οἰκουργός in 2:5) or metaphors for one's lifestyle (ζάω in 2:12) that imply the behavior and actions that correspond to that attitude or characteristic. Van Neste outlines the use of "good works" specifically, but does not trace the connection to other lexemes that deal with actions or behavior (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 268).

[66] It is infrequent for imperative verbs to have expressed subjects across the PE, with this being the only occurrence of a second-person imperative verb taking an expressed subject in Titus (cf. Titus 2:15 and 3:14, where subject word groups appear with third-person imperative forms). When the second person pronoun is used, in general, it typically indicates a strong contrast and transition (1 Tim. 6:11; 2 Tim. 2:1; 3:10, 14; 4:5). It is also used in section or subsection transitions in 1 Tim. 6:11 and 2 Tim. 2:1 and 3:10. See also Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 241 for the boundary markers of 2:1.

various groups within the church community to positive behaviors. The subsection γ-1 ends in 2:10 with a sentence of command with an elided main verb, followed by a ἵνα clause of purpose as the final clause of the sentence.

The lone subsection transition within section γ, from γ-1 to γ-2, occurs in 2:11, where the opening sentence of γ-2, found in 2:11–14, is a long, complex sentence ending with a hypotactic ἵνα clause of purpose that includes multiple embedded clauses and concludes with a relative clause that also, in itself, includes a ἵνα clause of purpose as the final clause of the sentence. This transition is accompanied by the explanatory conjunction γάρ, which is common for the transitions to second subsection within Titus, a genre change from commands and exhortation to explanation and exposition, and a topic change from commands toward godly behavior to salvation as the theological basis rationale for the preceding paraenesis. Subsection γ-2 only consists of two sentences, with the second being a compound sentence of contrasting imperatives joined by asyndeton. The final sentence of γ-2 and the larger section, γ, begins with an anaphoric demonstrative pronoun that recalls not only 2:11–14 but the commands of 2:2–10 that flow from the opening command of 2:1, before moving into the contrast of godly conduct and the conduct of the opponents in section δ.[67] Not only does the demonstrative pronoun, ταῦτα, explicitly provide an *inclusio* for section γ, but the verbs in 2:15, λαλέω and παρακαλέω, provide an explicit connection to the commands to 2:1–10 that utilize the verbs λαλέω and παρακαλέω as both stated (2:1, 6) and elided (2:2, 3, 9) predicators.[68]

---

[67] Unlike 1 Timothy, however, the anaphoric demonstrative does not recall previous material as the basis for a new command or shift in the argument (rf. 1 Tim. 3:14; 4:6, 11; 6:2c, 11, and 2 Tim. 2:14).

[68] Van Neste isolates 2:15 as its own subsection, arguing that there are too many textual shifts, especially the genre of the sentence and the persons involved, to consider 2:15 as part of 2:11–14 (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 245). With these shifts noted, however, they do not necessitate a break from 2:11–14. The text regularly shifts between explanation and paraenesis, even within the same subsection (rf. Titus 1:10–16 or 3:8–11), not only with explanation following imperatives but also imperatives summarizing or following from theological rationale or explanation. The

The transition from section γ to section δ occurs in 3:1, where the text moves from the discussion of salvation to more exhortation about the impact of salvation on behavior, especially in connection to negative behaviors. This transition does not use an explicit conjunction or connective device, instead including an imperative verb in asyndeton as the primary word of the opening sentence. This opening sentence also includes a long list of rank-shifted infinitive clauses within the complement, switching to a list within a C-PN with the infinitive of the copula at the end, showing hyperbaton in the final element of the list. The opening subsection, δ-1, only consists of one sentence, with 3:3 beginning a new subsection, δ-2. The opening sentence of δ-2 does, however, fit with the general pattern for the second sentence of a section, being an explanatory sentence with γάρ (1:7; 3:12).

Section δ includes two more subsection transitions: the shift from δ-1 to δ-2 in 3:3 and the shift from δ-2 to δ-3 in 3:8. The second subsection opens in 3:3 with an explanatory sentence with the conjunction γάρ,[69] accompanied by both a genre change from exhortation to explanation and a topic change from behavior in subsection δ-1 to the nature and impact of salvation on such behavior in δ-2.[70] The second sentence is long, complex, and expository, opening with a contrastive δέ and giving a poetic description of salvation, its cause, and its purpose. The second sentence is also the final sentence of the subsection, ending with a poetic section and a final ἵνα clause of purpose that includes a C-PN with hyperbaton. The shift to the third subsection, δ-3, in

---

personal referents do shift from 2:11–14 to 2:15, as Van Neste notes, but all the commands of 2:2–10 and the explanation of 2:11–14 are given within the context of the personal command to Titus in 2:1. Similarly, the explanation and theological discourse of 3:3–7 is given within the context of personal exhortation to Titus, as seen in 3:1–2 and 3:9–11. While there are shifts in the letter at 2:15, the verse serves better as a final exhortation summarizing 2:2–14 and recalling the opening command of 2:1.

[69] See also Titus 1:10 and 2:11.

[70] Other shifts in the text, including verbal mood and tense and the persons in view, are helpfully outlined in Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 246–47.

3:8 is an asyndeton transition for the opening clause of a compound sentence. The sentence

begins with formulaic syntax and a topic change from the nature of salvation to the final,

personal commands to Titus as a church leader.[71] The second clause of the compound sentence

includes both a conjunctive καί and an anaphoric demonstrative pronoun, τούτων, as a C-OP

referring to the theological content of 3:4–7 and it concludes with a hypotactic ἵνα clause of

purpose. The second sentence of the subsection is an expository sentence with the demonstrative

pronoun, ταῦτα, an anaphoric connector, explicitly referring to the "good works" (καλῶν ἔργων)

from the first sentence. The subsection then ends with a final imperative sentence in 3:10–11 that

concludes with a causal, predicate participle clause. The topic of good works connects the

subsections in 3:2 and 3:8 and the subsections give contrast between proper behavior for the

Christian community (3:1–2 and 3:8) and the behavior of false teachers and opponents to avoid

(3:9–11); section δ does not end, however, with an explicit or semantic *inclusio* that recalls the

themes and lexemes of 3:1–2.[72]

 The final section shift occurs in 3:12 with the move from section δ to section ε. This shift is

accompanied by an asyndeton imperative clause and a topic change from the main body of the

letter to personal travel instructions and plans for Titus. The opening sentence is a compound

sentence with a rank-shifted clause in the complement word group, which is common for

---

 [71] In many ways 3:8 parallels 2:15 and could function as the final verse of δ-2. Both include a command with the anaphoric demonstrative following a ἵνα clause modifying an indicative sentence. Additionally, both conclude with an anaphoric demonstrative pronoun and are immediately followed by present-tense imperative clauses. See Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 248–49 for more connections and see above for the decision to connect 3:8 with 3:9–11. This difficulty is also evinced by the Marshall discussion of Banker's decision to split 3:8, keeping 3:1–8c together and joining 3:8d with 3:9–11 as different units for analysis (Marshall, *Epistles*, 20).

 [72] The lexeme ἄνθρωπος does occur in both 3:2 and 3:10, which could provide a contrast between the good works that benefit all people (3:2) and the negative behavior that show the kind of person to be avoided (3:10), but the connection does not seem explicit or strong enough to serve as an *inclusio* without other significant semantic connections.

sectional transitions in the main body,[73] and is the third and final time a section transition opens with a command.[74] The opening sentence is followed by an explanatory sentence with γάρ, a common transitional element for sections in Titus,[75] and the subsection ends with an imperative clause followed by a ἵνα clause of purpose.[76] The last subsection transition, from ε-1 to ε-2, occurs in 3:15 with topic shift to the final greetings. This last subsection, consisting of only two full clauses and the final, nominal benediction, does not give enough data for much comparison. What is significant, however, is that the order of the greeting is switched from 2 Tim. 4:19–21, where the imperative clause was primary and the indicative clause followed. The final section does form an *inclusio* with the opening section of the main body, β, with regard to the main themes and semantic domains of the letter. The command in 3:13 to ensure that Zenas and Apollos are not lacking anything uses the verb λείπω, recalling the opening statement of Titus being left behind in Crete, using ἀπολείπω, to straighten out the remaining items, using λείπω (1:5). The themes of learning (μανθάνω)[77] and good works (καλὸν ἔργον)[78] return in the final sentence of ε-1, as well the goal for God's people not to be fruitless (ἄκαρπος), connecting to the

---

[73] The opening sentence of γ has a relative clause as the direct object of the predicator (2:1), the opening sentence of sentence of δ has a compound infinitive clause as the direct object of the predicator (3:1), and the opening sentence of ε has a complementary infinitive clause with the main verb, σπουδάζω (3:12). The opening sentence of β, in 1:5, does have a ἵνα clause that could be appositional to the τούτου in the opening prepositional phrase (rf.. Harold J. Greenlee, *An Exegetical Summary of Titus and Philemon* [Dallas: SIL International, 1989], 19 or Lenski, *Interpretation*, 895), but this project will render the ἵνα clause in 1:5 as a hypotactic clause of purpose (rf. Marshall, *Epistles*, 151, Towner, *Letters*, 677–78, and Perkins, *Letters*, 247).

[74] Sections γ, δ, and ε open with imperative verbs (2:1; 3:1, 12), but this third and final iteration precedes the verb with a hypotactic ὅταν clause (3:12).

[75] Three of the four sections of the main body of Titus have a second sentence of explanation with the paratactic conjunction γάρ (1:7; 3:3, 12).

[76] Three of the four opening subsections of the main body of Titus end with a ἵνα clause of purpose as the final clause proper of the subsection (1:9; 2:10; 3:12). The only exception to this occurs in section δ. In this case, the opening clause of the second subsection is also the second sentence of the larger section, and serves as a sentence of explanation with γάρ. The second subsection, δ-2, then ends with a ἵνα clause of purpose (3:7).

[77] See the use of the διδάσκω word family in 1:9, 11 and παρακαλέω within a context of instruction of 1:9.

[78] See the use of ἔργον in 1:16 compared with 3:14.

larger theme of knowledge and behavior that is useful rather than purposeless. The final greeting

also ends with a command to greet all who love the authors in the faith (πίστις), recalling the

theme of faith(fulness) that runs throughout the letter.[79] In this way, the section and subsections

of Titus, along with their transitional sentences, provide a tendency for the structural and

syntactical makeup of the letter.

Conclusion

Within the letter of Titus, there are only four sections for the main body and nine

subsections excluding the opening salutation. Thus, sectional analysis does not yield enough data

for concrete patterns, but some tendencies are evident. Section transitions are always

accompanied by a topic change, and the opening subsection is exhortative. The opening sentence

of a section also typically has an imperative predicator and a rank-shifted clause as or within the

complement word group; it is typically followed by an explanatory clause with an indicative verb

and the conjunction γάρ. Section and subsection transitions use a variety of connective devices;

asyndeton, however, does not occur for section or subsection transitions in sections β and γ,

while it is the connective device for all the section and subsection transitions but one in sections

δ and ε.[80] It is also noteworthy that the anaphoric plural demonstrative ταῦτα is not used for any

section or subsection transitions in Titus, but instead appears after a section of theological

exposition (2:15; 3:8). Sections in Titus tend to include an *inclusio* between the opening and

closing sentences, though not as directly and strongly as the other PE, and the opening and

---

[79] This is especially significant for the semantic chains of Titus in that this is the only time that the lexeme πίστις is used with ἀσπάζομαι for the greetings portion of the letter within the Pauline Corpus (Cf. Rom. 16:3–16, 21–23; 1 Cor. 16:19–20; Phil. 4:21–22; Col. 4:15–16; 1 Thess. 5:26; 2 Tim. 4:19–21; Phlm 23–24).

[80] The sole exception is the subsection transition to δ-2 in Titus 3:3, where the opening sentence of the subsection is also the second sentence of the section and utilizes γάρ as a connective device with an indicative predicator.

286

closing sections of the main body, β and ε, do evince an *inclusio* with multiple major themes and semantic chains of the letter.

Subsection transitions in Titus also evince regular tendencies over the letter of Titus. The opening subsection tends to be paraenetic and end with a ἵνα clause of purpose, with the only exception being for subsection δ-1. In this case, the opening subsection is paraenetic but is in itself one sentence; the next subsection, δ-2, concludes with a ἵνα clause instead. It is common for the second subsection to open with an indicative clause accompanied by the conjunction γάρ and to change from exhortation to exposition or explanation.[81] There is only one extended poetic section in Titus 3:4–7, and, similar to the other PE, it concludes a subsection but not a larger section. Subsections in Titus only use γάρ or asyndeton as connective devices[82] and they commonly conclude with either an imperative clause or a causal HC-ptc.[83] Finally, it is noteworthy that three of the subsections of Titus show hyperbaton in the final sentence, always in a C-PN (1:9, 16; 3:7).

The Rank of Clause

Introduction

On the rank of clause, Titus evinces many syntactical tendencies and patterns when the clauses are analyzed according to their clause type, verbal mood, inter-clausal relationships, and the presence of other phenomena both inside and outside the clause, such as section and subsection transitions or a word group containing an asyndeton, serial list. Clauses that operate

---

[81] The only exception occurs in the final section with the transition to subsection ε-2 (3:15).

[82] Three subsections use γάρ as the connective device (β-2, γ-2, δ-2), and the two other subsection transitions use asyndeton (δ-3, ε-2).

[83] Subsections γ-2 and δ-3 conclude with an imperative sentence, while β-2 and δ-3 conclude with a causal participle clause. The only subsection that does end with a command or a causal participle is δ-2, which concludes with a poetic section.

properly on the rank of clause will be analyzed first, beginning with paratactic clauses and then hypotactic clauses. Following this, rank-shifted clauses will be analyzed according to clause type, including infinitive clauses, attributive participle clauses, and others. Once the various types of clauses have been analyzed according to the expected syntax and word group order, the overall profile for clauses in Titus will be presented.

Paratactic Clauses

Paratactic clauses operating on the rank of clause demonstrate tendencies and patterns of syntax according to various factors, including verbal mood, the illocutionary force of indicative clauses, connective devices, and other contextual factors, especially the placement of a clause within a section or subsection transition. Titus has fewer sentences and paratactic clauses than the other PE, only including thirty-four total sentences, but some tendencies for paratactic clauses are still evident. Following this analysis, initial observations for paratactic clauses will be presented before continuing with hypotactic clauses.

Imperative Clauses

Titus includes seventeen imperative clauses, with three such clauses being one compound, polysyndeton imperative sentence that all share a single complement (2:15). In addition to explicit imperative clauses, there is one clause with the impersonal verb δεῖ that functions as a command (1:7–9) and another clause with an indicative verb expressing a wish or desire as its illocutionary force (3:8). Those two verses, however, will be discussed with indicative clauses. Sentences with imperative main clauses regularly include a ἵνα clause of purpose (1:13b–14; 2:6–8; 3:13, 14) and are followed by explanatory sentences with the conjunction γάρ (3:1–2, 9a, 12a). Asyndeton is the most common connective device for imperative paratactic clauses, occurring for nine of the fifteen sentences with an imperative verb in the main clause. The

contrastive δέ is used thrice (2:1; 3:10–11, 14), but does not appear to impact expected syntax as it does in the other PE.

With regard to the imperative verbs themselves, three imperative clauses have elided main verbs (2:2, 3–5, 9–10), three have verbs in the aorist tense (3:12, 13, 15), and the rest are all in the present tense. It is noteworthy that every imperative clause within sections β, γ, and δ, dealing with the main exhortation and instruction of the letter, have the verb in the present tense, while only clauses giving temporal and personal instruction to Titus with regards to travel plans in section ε are in the aorist tense.[84] While there are not enough samples to infer any tendencies based on verbal tense, it is potentially significant that imperative clauses with aorist tense verbs never include an expressed subject and include an adjunct word group two of three times (3:13, 15b), compared to only four of eleven imperative clauses with present tense verbal forms.

Imperative clauses express consistent syntax with regard to the presence and placement complement word groups. In Titus, every paratactic imperative clause has an expressed complement, with the second and third imperative clauses in the compound sentence of 2:15 sharing the same complement with the first clause. It is fully codified, then, that imperative clauses will have an expressed complement. The placement of the complement word group relative to the predicator is generally consistent, depending primarily on the type of complement. Complements consisting of pronouns and nominal groups tend to precede the predicator in a C-P pattern,[85] while complements consisting of rank-shifted clauses tend to follow the predicator in

---

[84] Furthermore, even in section ε when travel plans are being presented, the one imperative clause that refers back to the content of what should be taught in the churches uses a present tense verbal form (3:14).

[85] This includes one demonstrative pronoun (2:15a) and one personal pronoun (2:15b), and both single (3:10–11) and compound (3:9a, 13) nominal groups. There is one imperative clause with a pronoun as the complement where the pronoun follows the verb (1:13b), which will be discussed below.

P-C pattern.[86] This trend is consistent with only two possible exceptions. One imperative clause with an infinitive clause as the complement demonstrates hyperbaton, with the subject of the infinitive clause appearing before the imperative verb and the infinitive itself following in a [C]-P-[C] pattern (2:6–8). In this case, the infinitive still follows the predicator, as would be expected, but the subject of the infinitive clause appears in marked syntax to highlight that nominal group as the new topic in focus[87] and parallel the syntax of the preceding and following clauses where the subject of the infinitive clause is the primary element of the sentence but the imperative verb is elided (2:2, 3–5, 9–10). The other exception occurs in 1:13b, where a pronominal C-DO follows the imperative verb in a P-C pattern. The referent of this pronoun is a point of debate among many scholars,[88] but the word group order is not discussed. It is possible that the placement of the pronoun after the verb could be due to the pronoun's function as the implied subject of the following ἵνα clause (1:13), but other ἵνα clauses with the implied subject in the preceding clause do not cause a word order change.[89] The clause does not occur within a context of contrast, section transition, or other factors that otherwise impact expected syntax.

---

[86] One imperative clause has a relative clause as the complement (2:1), one takes a rank-shifted participle clause as the complement (3:15b), and four take infinitive clauses as the complement (2:6–8; 3:1–2, 12a, 14).

[87] Perkins, *Letters*, 262.

[88] Greenlee gives three general opinions about commentators about the referent of the pronoun αὐτούς: it refers to all the believers receiving the letter, it refers to the false teachers and opponents, or it refers to only those in the congregation who were being led astray by the false teachers (Greenlee, *Summary*, 41). Knight opts for the third option, specifies that it is specifically for believers who were ethnically Cretan (Knight, *Epistles*, 299–300). Marshall, however, concludes that the text is intentionally ambiguous, making no distinction between Cretan and Jewish believers and exhorting all of them to remain steadfast (Marshall, *Epistles*, 204–5).

[89] See Titus 2:2–4, 9–10; 3:13. In 3:13, the complement of the preceding imperative clause is the primary element of the clause and the pronoun that refers back to them in the ἵνα clause is not in primary position either. There are two occasions were a pronoun is the final element of the preceding clause before the ἵνα clause in which is the implied subject (2:12; 3:6–7), but in both cases the preceding clause follows expected syntax for its clause type. But, in 1:13, the pronoun is not the final element of the imperative clause, as it is followed by an adverb. In the end, there is no other parallel structure in Titus to suggest that the verb of the ἵνα clause would "pull" its implied referent closer within the preceding clause.

One other possible explanation for the word group order switch could be issues of orality, as both the pronoun and the following adverb begin with α– and end with a long vowel followed by –ς, but such discussions, while beneficial, are outside the scope of this study.[90] In the end, the imperative clause in 1:13b contains marked syntax, likely not to give emphasis to the complement but rather to the verbal form and its connection to the ἵνα clause that follows. Finally, imperative clauses are commonly used for subsection and especially section transitions, with eight imperative clauses appearing either within the last sentence of a section or subsection or within the first sentence of a section. Those with a C-P pattern are used three times in the final sentence of a section (2:15a, 15b; 3:10–11), and those with a P-C pattern are used three times within the first sentence of a section (2:1; 3:1–2, 12), one time within the final sentence of a subsection (3:14), and one time as the final sentence of the main body of the letter, just prior to the closing benediction (3:15). The context of section and subsection transitions, however, do not appear to impact the word group order of the imperative clause itself with regard to the relationship of the predicator and complement for imperative clauses.

Subject and adjunct word groups appear with less frequency in imperative sentences, but show great flexibility in word group order. Three imperative clauses have expressed subject word groups and, while they are all with present tense verbs and two of three occur with third-person verbal forms, they all have differing syntax within the clause. One has the subject as the primary element in a P-C clause (2:1), one has the subject as the primary element in a C-P clause (2:15b), and another has the subject as the third of four elements in a P-C clause (3:14). It is possible that sectional transitions impact the two clauses where the subject is the primary

---

[90] Speaking the clause out loud with variations of word group order do sound very different in emphasis and sentence flow, especially the only switch is between the verb and the pronoun.

element (2:1, 15b), but there are too few examples to determine any conclusions. Non-conjunctive adjuncts occur with slightly more frequency, with seven adjunct word groups across six imperative sentences. While, once again, there are only a handful of examples, adjuncts with aorist imperative verbs have the A-Adv preceding the predicator (3:13) and the A-PP follow the predicator (3:15b). This tendency is switched for present tense imperative verbs, with both A-Advs following the predicator (1:13b–4; 3:14) and two of three A-PPs preceding the predicator (1:13b–14; 3:10-11). The only exception occurs in 2:15, where the PP of accompaniment (μετά) follows the predicator. In this case, however, the PP likely modifies all the imperative verbs that precede it in the compound sentence,[91] causing its placement relative to the final verb.

Indicative Clauses

Sentences with indicative paratactic clauses are not as common as they are in the other PE, but they do evince strong tendencies and patterns of syntax, especially in contrast to those in 1 and 2 Timothy. There is only one indicative clause with the impersonal δεῖ, functioning as a command, and this clause follows expected syntax based on the other PE with a P-S clausal word group order (1:7–9). Similarly, the single indicative clause with a verb expressing a wish, from βούλομαι, follows expected syntax, with an infinitive clause as the complement following the predicator in a P-C word group order. There is an A-PP of reference, with the preposition περί, preceding the verb, but this placement is likely from the anaphoric demonstrative pronoun, τούτων, that serves as the C-OP. Aside from those two sentences with an indicative verb in the paratactic clause expressing a wish or desire, there are fourteen paratactic clauses with an expressed, indicative verb as the predicator, evincing consistent tendencies with regards to the

---

[91] See Towner, *Letters*, 767n8.

syntax of the various word groups.

Indicative paratactic clauses regularly include a complement word group, yielding a partially codified pattern.[92] Among those with a complement word group, it is furthermore marginally codified that the clause will include additional word groups beyond the predicator and complement.[93] Regardless of complement type, it is fully codified that complements will follow the predicator within paratactic, indicative clauses: nine paratactic clauses follow a P-C pattern and two with infinitive clauses as the complement follow as [C]-P-[C] pattern with the infinitive following the governing, indicative verb and another word group of the infinitive clause preceding it (1:16; 3:12b). For the infinitive clause in 1:16 serving as the complement of the indicative clause, the placement of the complement of the infinitive clause prior to the governing verb gives it prominence. This marked syntax does not indicate a topic shift, contra Perkins,[94] but rather further highlights the contrast between the false teachers, who do not know God, and the correct teaching that should be instructed by leaders in the church, which will form the content of the following two sections, γ and δ. In 3:12b, it is a locative A-Adv within the infinitive clause that precedes the governing verb, giving prominence to the location to which Titus is being called to come with haste, whose referent is also the final word of the preceding clause. The other indicative clauses with complement word groups, all of which follow a P-C pattern, have pronouns (1:5–6; 3:4–7, 15a), C-PNs (1:10–11, 13a; 3:3, 8b, 9b), or a rank-shifted,

---

[92] Out of the fourteen paratactic, indicative clauses, eleven include an expressed complement.

[93] Eight of the eleven indicative clauses with an expressed complement also have an expressed subject or adjunct word group.

[94] Perkins states that the placement of the noun θεόν indicates that the verse begins a new topic (Perkins, *Letters*, 257). This verse, however, continues the focus on the false teachers that began with the reference to "ἀνθρώπων ἀποστρεφομένων τὴν ἀλήθειαν" in 1:14. Instead, the syntax highlights the noun θεόν to emphasize further the ungodliness of the false teachers.

direct quotation as the complement (1:12).

Subject word groups and adjunct word groups in paratactic, indicative clauses in Titus, while not as common as complement word groups, also evince tendencies of syntax and word group order. Subject word groups are fairly common, appearing in eight of fourteen indicative clauses, and they tend to follow the predicator directly.[95] The two exceptions to this tendency, occurring in 1:13a and 3:8b, share similarities. Not only are they both clauses with a present indicative form of the copulative verb εἰμί,[96] but they both include an anaphoric demonstrative pronoun that refers to a complement in the immediately preceding clause. In 1:13a, the demonstrative pronoun αὕτη is used as a predicate adjective to the head noun ἡ μαρτυρία, and explicitly refers back to the quotation that serves as the complement of 1:12. In 3:8b, the demonstrative pronoun ταῦτα is the subject of the clause, refering to the complement of the infinitive clause, καλῶν ἔργων, that ends 3:8a. In Titus, then, subject word groups tend to follow the predicator in paratactic indicative clauses. Only five indicative clauses have a non-conjunctive adjunct word group, with three of them containing multiple adjunct word groups (1:5–6; 3:3, 4–7). The two simple sentences with adjuncts contain A-Advs (1:10–11; 3:3), and in both cases the A-Advs follow the predicator but precede an expressed complement.[97] The A-CU

---

[95] Of the eight clauses with an expressed subject word group, two have a P-S pattern with no complement (1:15b; 2:11–14), and three have a P-S-C pattern (1:10–11, 12; 3:3). One clause also includes the subject after the predicator, but the subject also follows the complement in a P-C-S pattern (3:15a). In this case, the subject word group is in a unique context for multiple reasons. First, this is the subject word group among the eight to include an attributive adjective, and it is a nominalized PP of accompaniment, using μετά. Second, this is the only time that the adjective πᾶς is nominalized as the subject in Titus with the definite article. And third, the nature of the clause as the final greeting does seem to impact the expected syntax, as 2 Tim. 4:21 mirrors this syntax as a P-C-S phrase. Beyond the presence of the PP and the use of πᾶς, it is likely that the P-C-S word group order is formulaic in some way for the final greeting. See also Rom. 16:21–23; 1 Cor. 16:19–20; 2 Cor. 13:12; Phil. 4:21–22; Col. 4:10–14; Phlm. 23; Heb. 13:24; 1 Peter 5:13; 2 John 13; 3 John 15. Each of these passages contain the indicative use of ἀσπάζομαι with a pronominal complement and a definite subject in a P-C-S word group order.

[96] Although, see also 1:10–11; 3:3, 9b.

[97] In 1:10–11, the additive καί follows the predicator and the first part of the subject, which is split in hyperbaton, but preceded the predicator nominative complement in a P-[S]-A-C-[S] word group order. In 3:3, both

294

in 1:16, a dative of means, precedes the verb in an A-P word group order within the second

clause a compound sentence; the context of contrast, using δέ, with the preceding clause likely

explains the switch in expected word order.[98] The two complex sentences with adjunct word

groups, 1:5–6 and 3:4–7, both include A-PPs that appear on both sides of the predicator. In 1:5–

6, a causal A-PP, with χάριν, precedes the governing verb while a locative A-PP, with ἐν,

follows the predicator. In 3:4–7, contrastive A-PPs of basis and norm, using ἐκ and κατὰ,

precede the predicator while an A-PP of means, using διά, follows the governing verb. The

tendency for A-PPs in the PE is that they follow the predicator, with the general exception of

locative and causal A-PPs. This would normalize the causal A-PP in 1:5. In the case of 3:4–7, the

two A-PP that precede the predicator are in contrast, emphatic, and within a poetic section,

which would explain their marked position relative to the predicator. It is likely, then, that A-

CUs and A-PPs in paratactic indicative clauses have the general tendency to follow the

predicator, in line with the other PE; the tendency of A-Advs to follow their predicator, however,

contrasts the word group order found in the other PE.

 Conjunctions and other connective devices within paratactic, indicative clauses in Titus do

not occur with enough frequency to determine any regular tendencies and patterns, but a few are

suggestive of a potential tendency. The two most common connectors for indicative clauses are

asyndeton and the conjunction γάρ.[99] Clauses with asyndeton tend to include subject and

---

the temporal adverb ποτε and the additive καί follow the predicator but precede the subject and predicate nominative complmemt in a P-A-A-S-C word group order.

 [98] A-CUs consisting of nominal groups in the dative, genitive, and accusative cases tend to follow their governing predicator in 1 and 2 Timothy.

 [99] Asyndeton occurs five times for paratactic, indicative clauses (1:12, 13a, 16; 3:8b, 15a), as does the conjunction γάρ (1:10–11; 2:11–14; 3:3, 9b, 12b). There is no conjunction for the main clause in 1:5–6, but the causal prepositional phrase τούτου χάριν, with the cataphoric demonstrative pronoun, serves as the connective device.

complement word groups but the word group order therein is not consistent.[100] None of them, however, include an adjunct word group. Clauses with γάρ tend to have complements, may or may not have expressed subject or adjunct word groups, and regularly appear as the initial clause of the second subsection of their larger section.[101] Both a contrastive ἀλλά (1:15b) and cataphoric demonstrative pronoun (1:5–6) appear once with paratactic indicative clauses, but without any apparent impact on word group order. The contrastive δέ, which only appears twice (1:16; 3:4–7) and is the only use of δέ for such clauses, does appear to impact word group order. In both cases, the clause with δέ includes a word group order switch regarding an adjunct word group. In 1:16, the A-CU τοῖς ἔργοις, a dative of means, appears before the predicator. This does not only give prominence to the word group itself, contra Perkins,[102] but strengthens the contrast between its own clause and the preceding clause. In 3:4–7, two A-PPs appear before the predicator of the main clause. While this does not necessarily strengthen the contrast indicated by the δέ, it does give the two PPs prominence within the clause on the nature of salvation and its impact on the behavior of the Christian.[103] Additionally, both paratactic, indicative clauses that utilize the contrastive δέ are the final sentences of their subsection (β-2 and δ-2), with 1:16 also concluding section β.

---

[100] All five indicative clauses with asyndeton include an expressed complement, and four of them also include an expressed subject.

[101] Four of five indicative clauses with γάρ have an expressed complement, three of which are compound predicative nominatives (1:10–11; 3:3, 9b). Two clauses have an adverbial adjunct (1:10–11; 3:3) and three have expressed subject word groups (1:10–11; 2:11–14; 3:3). All three with expressed subjects are the initial paratactic clause of a second subsection: β-2, γ-2, and δ-2, respectively.

[102] Perkins, *Letters*, 257.

[103] Oddly, the word group order of the prepositional phrases is not mentioned by Perkins in his discussion of this verse (Perkins, *Letters*, 277).

Impact of Connectors on Word Order

Paratactic conjunctions and other connective devices for paratactic clauses within Titus, such asyndeton, PPs, and the demonstrative pronoun, do not impact word group order consistently across the letter with a few exceptions. The phenomenon of asyndeton is the most common connective device in Titus, occurring for nineteen of the thirty-nine paratactic clauses. The presence of asyndeton does not, in itself, impact word group order for its clause, which tends to be impacted instead by verbal mood, complement type, and other syntactical and contextual factors such as transitions between subsections.[104] Other conjunctions and connective devices that do not appear to impact word group order include the six uses of the explanatory γάρ,[105] the single use of ἀλλά (1:15b), the single use of the idiomatic δι' ἣν αἰτίαν (1:13b–14), and the single use of the cataphoric demonstrative pronoun (1:5–6).

Paratactic conjunctions that are accompanied by expectations for syntax or word group order include the two instances of ὡσαύτως (2:3, 6), the three uses of the conjunctive καί (2:15; 3:8), and the five uses of the contrastive δέ (1:15, 16; 2:1; 3:4, 9a).[106] The connective device ὡσαύτως, as it does in 1 Tim. 2:9, 3:8, and 3:11, mirrors the syntax of the preceding sentence while eliding the predicator in Titus 2:3. In 2:6, a predicator is added that is absent in the preceding sentences, but the word group order is still mirrored. The conjunctive καί does not

---

[104] Titus 1:13a; 3:10–11, 15a.

[105] Titus 1:7–9, 10–11; 2:11–14; 3:3, 9b, 12b.

[106] Four of the five uses of the contrastive δέ are not contested (see Perkins, *Letters*, 256, 257, 258, 281). Perkins, however, argues that the conjunction δέ in 3:4 is not contrastive, not indicates a new topic (Perkins, *Letters*, 276). Contra Perkins, this project will render the content of 3:4–7 as contrast or counterpart to 3:3, where the text moves from discussing negative behaviors that precede salvation (3:3) to the cause and impact of salvation on behavior (3:4–8). This rendering is supported by many commentators (Marshall, *Epistles*, 312, Towner, *Letters*, 777, Knight, *Epistles*, 337–38, Lenski, *Interpretation*, 929, and Greenlee, *Summary*, 88). The only use of δέ as a paratactic conjunction that is not contrastive in Titus occurs in 3:14, where the conjunction instead offers one additional parting command as a means of conclusion. Is it not transitional *per se*, contra Perkins (Perkins, *Letters*, 285), but resumes a major theme of the letter as an additional command to conclude the letter's exhortation (see Lenski, *Interpretation*, 946 or Greenlee, *Summary*, 108).

produce parallel syntax in Titus, but it does function to unite two or more clauses with regard to referents and modifiers. In 2:15, the conjunctive καί conjoins three imperative clauses into one compound sentence that shares one C-DO and one A-PP for all three. In 3:8, the conjunctive καί does not connect the two clauses in terms of shared word groups, but the subject of the first clause, ὁ λόγος, and the opening A-PP of the second clause, περὶ τούτων, have the same referent, recalling the material from 3:4–7. The contrastive use of δέ, which is its function for five of its six appearances as a Cj-P for paratactic clauses, always brings either a switch in word group order or an additional word group for emphasis. For both 1:15a and 1:16, the second clause of a compound sentence, with δέ, the contrast shifts an A-CU in the dative case to the front of the clause. In 1:15, this is direct shift from the S-C-A word group order in the first clause to an A-S-C word group order in the second. In 1:16, the adjunct word group is in marked position, as A-CUs in the dative case tend to follow the predicator in the PE. Similarly, the δέ in 3:4–7 brings a switch in syntax both for the opening HC-Cj and the main, paratactic clause. The previous use of ἐπιφαίνω in 2:11 occurs in a P-S word group order and the immediately preceding clause, in 3:3, also has a P-S-C word group order. In 3:4 the order in the HC-Cj, with ἐπιφαίνω, switches to [S]-P-[Q] with hyperbaton in the subject word group, and in the main clause, found in 3:5, two A-PPs occur before the predicator for strong and contrasting emphasis. The contrastive δέ in 3:9a does not switch the word group order within the clause itself to have marked syntax, but the surrounding clauses all switch word group order for the larger subsection. The preceding clause in 3:8b is an indicative clause with an S-P-C word group order and the opening clause of 3:9, with the δέ, switches to a C-P word group order with an imperative clause. This is followed by another indicative clause with P-C word group order (3:9b), which is then followed again by imperative clause with C-A-P word group order (3:10–11). Lastly, the use of δέ in 2:1 is both

contrastive and transitional, introducing a new section. In this case, there is not a switch in word group order, but the imperative clause adds an explicit subject, the pronoun σύ, in primary position for emphasis. This is also the only occurrence of a subject word group with a second-person imperative verb in Titus. In this way, the connective device ὡσαύτως is accompanied by parallel syntax and word group order, the conjunctive καί unites multiple clauses with a single referent or modifier, and the contrastive δέ always brings a switch in or addition to word group order between clauses.

Nominal Clauses, Subjects, and Adjuncts

In addition to paratactic clauses with expressed predicators or parallel syntax with assumed imperative verbs (2:2, 3, 9), there are six nominal clauses with an assumed copulative verb.[107] The possibility of determining syntactical patterns is diminished further when it is considered that three of those six are in the opening salutation and final blessing of the letter, which tend to follow their own stylistic conventions aside from the main body. Within the main body, all three nominal clauses are in a compound sentence (1:15; 3:8), and each has differing word group order. The nominal clause in 3:8a follows a C-S word group order, but the clause appears to be following formulaic syntax found also in 1 Tim. 1:15, 3:1, 4:9 and 2 Tim. 2:11. The two nominal clauses in Titus 1:15a form one compound sentence, and they both have the complement word group following the subject word group in a S-C pattern. As noted above, these two clauses are joined by a contrastive δέ, with a dative of reference following the subject and complement in the first clause and another appearing in the primary position in the second position, giving the word group order S-C-A in the first clause and A-S-C in the second. This suggests that the

---

[107] Titus 1:1–4a, 4b, 15a; 3:8a, 15c.

typical word group order for nominal clauses might be S-C with A-CUs following the complement, but there simply are not enough corroborating examples to establish a dominant pattern.

The presence of subject word groups and its relationship with other word groups in Titus have been explored according to verbal mood above, but there are tendencies across sentence type worth mention, especially in preparation for comparison with the other PE. Subject word groups are very frequent for paratactic clauses in Titus, occurring in eighteen of thirty-nine clauses. There is no regular position for the subject word group in imperative clauses, the only subject word group to appear with the impersonal verb δεῖ follows a P-S word group order (1:7–9) and, for the five times that an adjunct word group appears together in a clause with a subject, it is in a nominal clause without a predicator three times (1:4b, 15).[108] The subject appears as the primary element of a clause, the final element of a clause, and between other word groups within the clause with equal frequency,[109] but it is the tendency of subjects in indicative clauses to follow the predicator, as established above. Finally, subject word groups rarely appear in a paratactic clause without a complement word group, yielding a partially codified pattern.[110]

Non-conjunctive adjunct word group appear with slightly less frequency than subject word groups,[111] and without many meaningful patterns. This, in itself, contrasts Titus from the other

---

[108] For the other two occurrences where a paratactic clause includes both a subject and adjunct word group, the predicator is in primary position and the adjunct is between the predicator and the subject in a P-A-S-C or P-A-A-S-C word group order (3:3, 14).

[109] There are six times the subject is the first word group of its clause, six times where it is the final element, and six times where it is neither.

[110] Fourteen of eighteen paratactic clauses with an expressed subject also include an expressed complement. The exceptions are the sole use of the impersonal δεῖ in a paratactic clause (1:7–9), the second clause of the opening salutation in which the prepositional phrase is rendered as an adjunct and not a nominalized complement (1:4b), the clause with a perfect passive form of μιαίνω (1:15b), and the clause with the aorist passive form of ἐπιφαίνω (2:11–14). The word order with ἐπιφαίνω switches in 3:4 within a hypotactic clause, which will be discussed below.

[111] Sixteen of the thirty-nine paratactic clauses include a non-conjunctive adjunct word group.

PE, where word group order patterns with adjuncts are more solidified according to types of paratactic clauses. A-PPs appear on both sides of the predicator, although many anomalies from the patterns established in 1 and 2 Timothy are explicable by contrast or other syntactical factors.[112] There are three instances of an A-CU in the dative case (1:15, 16), and the two instances where it appears in prime position the dative word group provides contrast. As argued above, the first clause of 1:15, in which the A-CU appears in final position, should likely be considered the default position. A-Advs, however, show the greatest irregularity. There are seven A-Advs within paratactic clauses in Titus, and they follow the predicator for five of those seven occurrences (1:10, 13b; 3:3, 14). The adjunct follows the predicator twice for imperative clauses (1:13b; 3:14) and three times for indicative clauses (1:10; 3:3). In contrast, A-Advs precede the predicator only once for each of those verbal moods (3:12b, 13).[113] In this way, the placement of adverbs shows much great fluidity for paratactic clauses in Titus than in 1 or 2 Timothy.

Codification and Textual Analysis: Initial Observations

Paratactic clauses in Titus demonstrate some codified patterns according to clause type as well as many potential tendencies. In imperative clauses, it is fully codified that the clause will include an expressed complement. The position of the complement, with one exception, is

---

[112] The two causal prepositional phrases (1:5, 13) and the one temporal preposition phrase (3:10) precede the predicator, which would be somewhat expected. Two of those three, however, appear with imperative verbs (1:13; 3:10), which always have prepositional phrases following the predicator in 2 Timothy. The others that precede the predicator are prepositional phrases of basis and standard in 3:5 and of reference in 3:8. These, as discussed above, have their position either for emphasis (3:5) or because of an anaphoric demonstrative pronoun (3:8). Prepositional phrases, then, likely follow a similar expected word group order as they do in 1 and 2 Timothy, but that assertion cannot be fully defended without more examples.

[113] Based on the data from 1 and 2 Timothy, one would expect adverbial adjuncts to precede the predicator in indicative clauses and follow the predicator in imperative clauses. In Titus, however, an adverbial adjunct also appears before the predicator in an imperative clause without a context of contrast (3:13) and follows the predicator in an indicative clause with the explanatory γάρ and a copulative verb (3:3). There are too few examples to determine anything definitive, but the difference in word group order is suggestive.

consistently preceding or following the imperative verb based on the type of complement. The position of adjuncts appears to differ based on the tense of the imperative verb, but the syntax is more fluid than in 1 or 2 Timothy. It is partially codified that paratactic clauses with indicative predicator will include an expressed complement and fully codified that expressed complements will follow the verb, regardless of complement type. Subject word groups in indicative clauses tend to follow the predictor directly except when the subject includes an anaphoric, demonstrative pronoun. A-PPs tend to follow expected patterns but A-Advs tend to follow the predicator in indicative clauses. Nominal clauses tend to be formulaic. Only one nominal clause, which is a compound sentence consisting of two nominal clauses, does not follow formulaic syntax. It is partially codified that subject word groups will appear together with a complement word group across all paratactic clause types, but too few examples of non-conjunctive adjuncts appear to establish conclusive patterns. Many connectors do not impact expected word group order for paratactic clauses, but in Titus the connector ὡσαύτως accompanies parallel syntax, the conjunctive καί indicates a shared referent or word group, and the contrastive δέ always brings a word group order switch, either within the clause or between clauses. These patterns will be helpful for analysis of Titus in itself and also for comparison with other works of the PE and other passages of the New Testament.

The patterns and tendencies established above will serve as a basis for intertextual comparison, but they can also benefit the study of the text of Titus itself. There is some disagreement, for example, about the referent of the prepositional phrase μετὰ πάσης ἐπιταγῆς in 2:15. Knight notes that it could modify only the final verb, ἔλεγχε, but that it likely modifies all

three imperative verbs.[114] Towner asserts the same, citing Mounce's argument that it only

modifies the final verb as too restrictive but not directly stating that it modifies all three either.[115]

Greenlee also outlines various positions that commentators have taken, including taking the

prepositional phrase to modify only the final verb, the final two verbs, or all three.[116] In this case,

the conjunctive καί is not mentioned by any such commentators for this consideration. The

conjunctive καί in Titus, as argued above, links two more elements with regard to a common

referent or modifier. While most commentators agree that the second and third verbal forms

assume the complement, ταῦτα, of the first predicator,[117] the polysyndetic use of καί also implies

that the A-PP is a shared modifying element. When the final element of a list or chain does take

its own modifier, it is typically an asyndetic list often with a rank-shifted final element,[118] an

otherwise asyndetic list with a conjunction preceding only the final element of the list or chain,[119]

or a series in which final element has the modifier, either with asyndeton or polysyndeton,

preceding the final element.[120] One potential counterexample occurs in the complement word

group of 3:9, where the final element has the adjectival modifier following the head noun to

counterbalance the first element in the compound list, which has the adjective prior to the head

noun. In this case, however, the word order switch likely serves to indicate the final element of

---

[114] Knight, *Epistles*, 329.

[115] Towner, *Letters*, 767.

[116] Greenlee, *Summary*, 80.

[117] Oddly, while Towner argues that the prepositional phrase could correspond to all three verbal forms, his translation separates the first clause from the second and third clause, giving the impression that the complement only goes with the primary clause and the prepositional phrase only modifies the second and third clauses (Towner, *Letters*, 767).

[118] Titus 1:6, 9; 2:2, 5; 3:1–2.

[119] Titus 1:10 and 2:9–10.

[120] Titus 1:16; 2:7.

the list rather than introduce a shared adjective for all the elements of the list. When all these factors are considered together, word group order and syntactical patterns suggest that the prepositional phrase μετὰ πάσης ἐπιταγῆς modifies all three imperative verbs in 2:15. There is also some disagreement, especially in various English translations, about the referent of the A-CU πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις in 2:11. Many commentators argue that the referent of the dative word group is the adjective σωτήριος, rather than the verb ἐπεφάνη.[121] The King James Version, however, explicitly takes it in reference to the verb, while several other translations are ambiguous.[122] This project also renders the dative word group as modifying the adjective σωτήριος, with word group order tendencies only strengthening the case.[123] Non-conjunctive adjunct word groups tend to come between the predicator and the subject (3:3, 14) in paratactic clauses with an expressed predicator, regardless of mood, and in the only other passage where a A-CU in the dative case modifies a predicator without a complement, it precedes the predicator (1:16). The additive καί does follow the subject word group in 1:10, but the subject word also include hyperbaton and comes at the end of the clause also. Thus, in terms of word group order alone, it is more likely that the dative modifier functions as a qualifier within the subject word group rather than an adjunct word group modifying the predicator.

These patterns and tendencies can also assist with various questions of textual criticism and variant readings in Titus. The original hand of Codex Sinaiticus, for example, adds the conjunction δέ in 1:12, supported also by Codices Augiensis and Boernerianus. The conjunction

---

[121] Such Marshall, *Epistles*, 267–68, Knight, *Epistles*, 319, Towner, *Letters*, 746n10, and Lenski, *Interpretation*, 919.

[122] See also Greenlee, *Summary*, 69.

[123] And this also provides a better argument than that given by Marshall, who offers that taking the dative word group in referent to the verb produces a "false statement," while at the same time undermining his own argument by stating that the adjective itself is about potential, not result (Marshall, *Epistles*, 267–68).

δέ is not common with paratactic indicative clauses in Titus and for the two instances is does appear with an indicative verb it serves a contrastive function (1:16; 3:4). The only instance, as presented above, that the conjunction δέ does not serve a contrastive function occurs in 3:14 with an imperative verb following a string of commands, better translated as "moreover" or "besides" than as "and" or "but."[124] In this case, the conjunctive δέ in 3:14 would be stylistically unique in the letter and would not fit the letter's tendency for asyndeton with expository clauses.[125] Another example can be found in 3:8b, where the plural definite article τά is added to the C-PN, καλὰ καὶ ὠφέλιμα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, by an editor of Codex Claramontanus, various other majuscules, and the Majority Text. Elliott simply offers that the article is likely not original,[126] but further syntactical considerations give greater support to this argument. C-PNs never include a definite article in Titus, even when the expressed subject word group is definite (1:13a; 3:3, 8a). The presence of the article would also render the following qualifier, πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις, as modifying both predicate adjectives. Not only does the predicate adjective καλός rarely take such a qualifier compared to other predicate adjectives such as ἄξιος, ἀπόδεκτος, or ὠφέλιμος,[127] but qualifiers on compound word groups typically precede the head nouns when they modify all items in a compound group or list[128] or have another article to make it explicit that they modify a compound group.[129] All these factors, when considered together, would certainly make the addition of the definite article the more difficult reading, but only strengthen Elliott's assertion that is very

---

[124] See Lenski, *Interpretation*, 946.

[125] This only strengthens Elliott's argument, who does not mention sentence type or the broader use of δέ in Titus but simply argues that asyndeton is the most likely reading to give rise to the other variant options (Elliott, *Greek Text*, 178).

[126] Elliott, *Greek Text*, 193.

[127] 1 Tim. 1:8, 15; 2:3; 4:8, 9; 5:4, 18; 2 Tim. 3:16; Titus 3:8.

[128] Titus 1:15b

[129] Titus 2:13; 3:4.

likely unoriginal to the text of Titus 3:8.

Hypotactic Clauses

There are two general types of hypotactic clauses that still properly function on the rank of clause: HC-Cjs and HC-ptcs. The most common Cj-H in Titus is ἵνα, which is used thirteen times, with only three other Cj-Hs each appearing once. Such clauses, however, do show several consistent tendencies for word group order and syntax. HC-ptcs appear with slightly less frequency, with only eleven examples in Titus, but also have several consistent patterns that will be beneficial for both analysis of Titus and comparison with the other letters of PE.

Finite Clauses with a Hypotactic Conjunction

Within the sixteen HC-Cjs, thirteen are purpose clauses with ἵνα, two are temporal clauses with ὅτε (3:4) and ὅταν (3:12a), and one clause recalls a past directive as a standard with ὡς (1:5).[130] Two of the ἵνα clauses are compound clauses (1:5–6; 2:14b), with five clauses between them.[131] All three HC-Cjs with conjunctions other than ἵνα include aorist verbal forms and are in

---

[130] Many commentators take the ὡς clause in 1:5 to have the force of manner (such as Knight, *Epistles*, 289, Towner, *Letters*, 681, or Greenlee, *Summary*, 19–20). Perkins, as an anomaly, renders the force as comparative; this force makes little sense of the passage, however, within the larger sentence (Perkins, *Letters*, 248). Marshall posits that that the force of the clause could be either manner or standard, preferring the force of manner in light of the further instructions that follow (Marshall, *Epistles*, 153). In the end, either manner or standard could make sense of the clause within the sentence, as it is generally agreed that the ὡς clause is recalling a past directive that should guide the teaching and instruction of the present letter. The force of manner, *a la* Marshall, is to be preferred if the ὡς clause connects forward with the following conditional protasis in 1:6. The force of standard, however, is to be preferred if the ὡς clause refers backward to the predicators of the ἵνα clause, which, as Marshall concedes, is the majority opinion among scholarship (Marshall, *Epistles*, 153n17). This project will render the force of ὡς as a clause of standard.

[131] This assertion not only takes the two subjunctive verbal forms in 1:5 and 2:14 as part of compound clauses, but also the conditional protasis with εἰ in 1:6. Many scholars take the clause introduced by εἰ in 1:6 as a protasis with a lacking or implied apodosis (Towner, *Letters*, 681–82, Knight, *Epistles*, 289, Lenski, *Interpretation*, 896, or Greenlee, *Summary*, 23). This is likely due to the apparently formulaic opening of the clause with εἴ τις and its use in 1 Timothy (Marshall, *Epistles*, 154). While stating this, Marshall also concedes that that clause could also be "loosely connected" to the verbs of the preceding ἵνα clause (Marshall, *Epistles*, 154), and Van Neste, in his discussion of the cohesion of 1:5–10, also proffers that the clause in 1:6 does seem to be dependent on 1:5 (Van Neste, *Cohesion*, 236–37). While, as Marshall asserts, the sense of the passage is clear either way, this project will

transitional sentences. The clause with ὡς is in the opening sentence of section β (1:5) and the temporal ὅταν clause is the first clause of section ε (3:12a). The temporal clause with ὅτε is in the final sentence of subsection δ-2, which is also a poetic passage.[132] In addition to these unified features, the two temporal HC-Cjs both precede their governing clause and evince hyperbaton,[133] while the HC-Cj with the force of standard follows its governing clause and does not have hyperbaton. In 3:4, the hyperbaton allows the qualifier to appear where the subject word group would be expected, based on paratactic indicative clauses, but gives emphasis to the nouns that precede the verb.[134] For 3:12, the word order of the complement and its hyperbaton likely gives emphasis to Artemas as the primary object with the other individual, Tychicus, as secondary, showing indefiniteness and lack of certainty involving which individual would be the one sent in real life.[135] It is possible that the context of transition could impact the use of hyperbaton, but it is

---

take the εἰ clause in 1:6 as a reverse-order protasis in connection with the second predicator in the ἵνα clause in 1:5. This is done for multiple reasons. First, while the εἴ τις opening does tend to open an conditional sentence where the apodosis follows in 1 Timothy, there is no reason to demand that the syntax of 1 Timothy must be prescriptively applied to Titus. Second, if the syntax of 1 Timothy is consulted with regard to Titus, it should be at least equally important not only that sentences with εἴ τις have the apodosis following the protasis, but that they *always* have an expressed apodosis, even when they are in an aside (1 Tim. 5:8). The only conditional clause in 1 Timothy without an expressed apodosis occurs in 1 Tim. 3:15, with ἐάν and a subjunctive verb, also loosely connected to the preceding clause. Lastly, most scholars assume that the elided apodosis borrows either the exact verb or a similar one from the ἵνα clause, specifically the verb καθίστημι. It is unnecessary to add an additional, elided clause when the expressed clauses already have the verbal idea necessary for the sense of the passage. Thus, for this project the εἰ clause 1:6 is considered the protasis in a reverse-order, simple particular conditional clause with the apodosis being the second clause of the compound ἵνα clause in 1:5.

[132] The clause also includes a contrastive δέ as the connector for the paratactic clause that follows. This δέ, however, does not appear to impact the syntax of the hypotactic ὅτε clause, but the placement of the prepositional phrases in the main clause, as outlined above.

[133] The subject word group proper in 3:4 precedes the predicator with a qualifier following the predicator, and the compound complement word group in 3:12, with the conjoiner ἤ, is interrupted by a prepositional phrase.

[134] The word order of the subject and the hyperbaton are not, however, discussed by Perkins (Perkins, *Letters*, 276–77) or other scholars (see Marshall, *Epistles*, 312–13 or Knight, *Epistles*, 338).

[135] Knight comments that the word order shows that Paul had not decided which of the two to send at the time of the letter's composition (Knight, *Epistles*, 356). Marshall, similarly, offers that the ἤ implies alternate possibilities and implies that the plans are not yet certain (Marshall, *Epistles*, 341). Neither one, however, mentions the hyperbaton and its impact on the ordering or primacy between the two individuals in the compound object.

more likely that the hyperbaton occurs for the sake of emphasis.

The conjunction ἵνα is the most common Cj-H in Titus with several areas of consistent syntactical patterns and tendencies within their clauses. With two being compound clauses, there are sixteen verbal forms within thirteen ἵνα clauses. It is fully codified that ἵνα clauses of purpose will not precede their governing clause[136] and codified that they occur within clauses proper and not rank-shifted clauses.[137] It is marginally codified that ἵνα clauses will include an expressed complement.[138] Furthermore, when a complement is expressed, it is marginally codified that the complement will follow the predicator in a P-C word group order.[139] Only two complements in ἵνα clauses precede the predicator (1:5; 2:10),[140] and two others show hyperbaton, with the complement proper preceding the predicator and a qualifier to the complement following (1:9; 3:7). Both examples with hyperbaton include a copulative verb as the predicator with the head noun or adjective of the C-PN preceding the predicator. They are both also the final clauses of a subsection (β-1 and δ-2). Nominal groups are the most common type of complement word group, but ἵνα clauses also regularly have C-PNs and infinitive clauses as complements also.[141] Subject

---

[136] Eleven of the thirteen ἵνα clauses explicitly follow their governing clause. The other two, found in 2:4 and 2:8, modify paratactic clauses without an expressed predicator. Even in these cases, however, the ἵνα clause follows all word groups of the governing clause.

[137] Of the thirteen ἵνα clauses, twelve occur either modifying the main, paratactic clause or within another hypotactic clause proper (2:5, 8, 12–14). Only one ἵνα clause appears within a rank-shifted context (2:14).

[138] For the sixteen verbal forms within ἵνα clauses, eleven of them take an expressed complement.

[139] Seven of eleven ἵνα clauses with an expressed complement have the complement following the predicator.

[140] The word group order of 2:10 could be due to is placement as the final clause of subsection γ-1 and as a hypotactic clause modifying the final command in a long list (2:2–10). The word group order of 1:5, adversely, could be due to both its placement at the beginning of a subsection (β-1) and the contrasting word group order of the second clause within the compound ἵνα structure. Perkins comments that the placement of the two complements in 1:5 and 2:10 gives them emphasis (Perkins, *Letters*, 247, 266), but the larger structure might suggest not that the lexemes themselves are emphasized but that their word group order emphasizes other syntactical phenomena.

[141] Six ἵνα clauses include a nominal group as the complement, four include a predicate nominative, and two take an infinitive clause as the complement.

and adjunct word groups regularly appear in ἵνα clauses, and follow consistent tendencies.[142]

Subject word groups tend to precede the predicator, with the only exception being in 3:8, when

the subject is a rank-shifted participle clause. For adjunct word groups, five ἵνα clauses include

A-PPs (1:5, 13b; 2:10, 12, 14), one includes multiple A-Advs (2:12), and one includes a dative

A-CU of advantage (3:13). A-PPs always follow the predicator, the lone dative A-CU precedes

the predicator, and all three A-Advs, which appear in one adjunct word group with polysyndeton,

precede their governing predicator. Across all ἵνα clauses of purpose, it is common that they will

include another hypotactic clause within them, typically an HC-ptc or another ἵνα clause,[143] and it

is fully codified that ἵνα clauses within paratactic clauses will be the final clause proper of their

sentence to modify the main, paratactic clause.

Predicate Participle Clauses

Within Titus, there are eleven participle clauses that appear in predicate position to their

governing predicator as an HC-ptc still functioning on the rank of clause. While there are fewer

predicate participle clauses in Titus than in 1 or 2 Timothy, they evince consistent syntactical

patterns both within the clause and in relation to their surrounding clauses. HC-ptcs have present

tense participles as a marginally codified pattern[144] and they follow their governing clause as a

partially codified pattern,[145] with the only exception being two clauses with aorist participles

---

[142] Five ἵνα clauses include an expressed subject and six include at least one expressed, non-conjunctive adjunct.

[143] Several ἵνα clauses include a predicate participle clause in hypotaxis, either before the ἵνα clause (2:12; 3:7) or following it (1:13b–14; 2:8, 12–14). Other hypotactic clauses embedded within ἵνα clauses include a ὡς clause (1:5) and another ἵνα clause (2:3–5).

[144] Eight of the eleven participles in predicate position are in the present tense. One is a perfect tense participle of οἶδα, but as such functions as a present participle (3:11) and there are two aorist participles (2:12; 3:7).

[145] Nine of the eleven such clauses follow their governing predicator, including causal, manner, temporal, and attendant circumstance participles (according to Voelz, *Grammar*, 117–18). It is noteworthy that the lone temporal participle clause in Titus follows the predicator (2:13) and the two temporal hypotactic clauses via a hypotactic

denoting action temporally and theologically connected with the action of the governing verb (2:12; 3:7).[146] The two aorist participle clauses that precede their governing verb also both appear within ἵνα clauses of purpose with aorist subjective governing verbs. Aside from the clause's position relative to the governing clause, the force and the tense of the participle do not appear to impact the syntax of word groups within the clause itself. Present tense participles have the force of manner three times (1:11, 14; 2:7),[147] a causal force three times (1:16; 2:8; 3:11),[148] a temporal force one time (2:13), and one participle is what Voelz calls circumstances attendant upon the

---

conjunction precede the predicator (3:4, 12). This is the opposite syntax from that evinced in 2 Timothy.

[146] Perkins renders the participle ἀρνησάμενοι in 2:12 as indicating means. While this is possible, most other commentators take it as a condition or circumstance subsidiary to the main verb (Towner, *Letters*, 748n18, Knight, *Epistles*, 319, and Lenski, *Interpretation*, 920), leading Greenlee, in his exegetical summary of Titus, that it is most likely a verb of attendant circumstance (Greenlee, *Summary*, 71), according to Wallace's definition (Wallace, *Grammar*, 640–45). It is likely best understood as what Voelz would call an aorist participle of concomitant action with the main verb (Voelz, *Grammar*, 260). Similarly, the force of the participle δικαιωθέντες in 3:7 is debated. Perkins states that it is either temporal or causal (Perkins, *Letters*, 279). Knight offers that it denotes action prior to the governing verb (Knight, *Epistles*, 346), while Marshall argues that it is contemporaneous with the governing verb (Marshall, *Epistles*, 323). As with 2:12, this participle is likely best rendered as what Wallace calls attendant circumstance (Wallace, *Grammar*, 640–45) or what Voelz considers to be action contemporaneous with the governing verb (Voelz, *Grammar*, 260).

[147] This renders both παρεχόμενος in 2:7 and προσέχοντες in 1:14 as participles of manner. Scholarship generally agrees that διδάσκοντες in 1:11 indicates manner, but there is division about the other two. For παρεχόμενος in 2:7, Perkins states that it is a participle of means (Perkins, *Letters*, 263) and Marshall, after some discussion, offers that the participle carries an imperatival force, continuing the mood of the governing verb παρακάλει (Marshall, *Epistles*, 731). While either force could make sense in the passage, it is less likely that the participle would be used to indicate a parallel imperative, as in the PE parallel imperative mood verbs are common (Titus 2:15 or 3:9–11). It is more likely, *a la* Perkins, that the participle is indicating manner or means, specifying a means by which Titus is called to fulfill the imperative in 2:6. Similarly, the participle προσέχοντες in 1:14 likely indicates a manner in which the previous verb, ὑγιαίνωσιν, is fulfilled. Perkins states that it is a participle of means (Perkins, *Letters*, 255) and Marshall states that participle contains behavior that is part of the "character of" those who are sound in the faith (Marshall, *Epistles*, 205). Knight perhaps overstates the role of the participle by arguing that the participle is "requisite for" and demanded by the previous verb (Knight, *Epistles*, 300). The participle does, however, give a behavior that is a way in which the governing verb is expressed, leading the best rendering to be a participle of manner.

[148] Two of these participle are generally understood to be causal in force: ὄντες in 1:16 and ἔχων in 2:8. The force of ὤν in 3:11, is not as clear. Perkins states that is a likely causal (Perkins, *Letters*, 283), while Knight states that the participle clause is the manifestation of the previous two verbal forms (Knight, *Epistle*, 355). Greenlee offers that it could be causal or indicating manner (Greenlee, *Summary*, 103–4), giving Lenski as an example. Lenski interprets the participle as giving the manner in which such a person sins (Lenski, *Interpretation*, 944). The participle ὤν in 3:11 could be indicating manner, but the more likely force is giving the grounds or basis for the previous two verbal forms. In their behavior and refusal to adhere and submit sound teaching, they are condemning themselves, which leads to their being twisted and sinful.

governing verb (2:12). It is worth noting, however, that the single perfect tense participle serves

a causal function (3:11), which is the common force for perfect tense participle clauses in 2

Timothy (2 Tim. 1:4; 2:23; 3:14) and the only perfect participle clause in 1 Timothy (1 Tim. 1:9).

It is also partially codified that HC-ptc appear within clauses proper, with only two within a

rank-shifted clause (1:11; 3:11).

HC-ptcs, regardless of force or tense, show consistent patterns for the types of word groups

that appear and their word group order within the clause. It is fully codified that HC-ptcs will not

have an expressed subject word group, codified that they will include an expressed

complement,[149] and partially codified that they will not include an expressed adjunct word

group.[150] Both adjunct word groups, a causal A-PP with χάριν and a dative A-CU indicating

means, follow the predicator and are the last element of the participle clause (1:11; 3:7).[151] While

adjuncts are too few to determine any tendencies or patterns, complement word groups follow a

consistent pattern. Seven participle clauses have the complement following the predicator in a P-

C pattern, yielding in itself a marginally codified pattern,[152] and the other three participle clauses

with complements show hyperbaton, with compound complements appearing both before and

after the participle in a [C]-P-[C] pattern (1:16; 2:7, 8). One is an object-complement

construction, with the primary object preceding the participle preceding the predicator and the

---

[149] Ten of eleven predicate participle clauses include an expressed complement. The only clause not to include a complement is a passive participle, which instead includes a dative of means as an adjunct word group (3:7).

[150] Only two of eleven predicate participle clauses include an expressed adjunct word group (1:11; 3:7). One include a causal prepositional phrase (1:11) and the other is a passive voice participle with a dative of means (3:7).

[151] Compare this to the few examples in 2 Timothy, there the adjunct precedes an expressed complement in predicate participle clauses.

[152] This includes nominal groups with or without qualifiers (1:14; 2:12, 13), rank-shifted clauses (1:11; 2:8; 3:11), and a predicate nominative (3:11).

complement following (2:7). The objective infinitive clause in 2:8, which is the complement of the participle ἔχων, has part of its own complement group precede the participle and the rest of the infinitive clause follow it (2:8). The third hyperbaton is a compound C-PN, with the first element preceding the predicator and the second and third elements following it (1:16). Two instances of hyperbaton do appear to be for the sake of emphasis (2:7, 8),[153] while the compound C-PN shows hyperbaton due to its context of contrast and position as the final clause of section β (1:16). With this in mind, it is likely fully codified that complements follow their predicator in hypotactic participle clauses, with three examples showing hyperbaton for emphasis or sectional transition.

Changing Ranks: Rank-Shifted Clauses

In the letter of Titus, there are fifty-three rank-shifted clauses functioning as a word group. These word groups regularly function as a complement word group within another clause or a qualifier word group embedded within another word group, which are the two most common functions for rank-shifted clauses in Titus. Such clauses appear in the same four categories demonstrated in the other PE: infinitive clauses, attributive participle clauses, relative clauses, and clauses of direct or indirect discourse. Such clauses evince various patterns of syntax based on their clause type, their force, and inter-clausal factors. The most common rank-shifted clauses are infinitive clauses and attributive participle clauses, with twenty-one instances each. In addition to these, there are nine relative clauses, one recitative ὅτι clause, and one direct quotation.

---

[153] Perkins comments on the two different accusative objects in each case, but does not discuss the word order or the hyperbaton (Perkins, *Letters*, 263–64).

Infinitive Clauses

Infinitive clauses in Titus show consistent syntax and word group order within the infinitive clause and in relation to the governing verb. Infinitive clauses always follow their governing verb as a fully codified pattern, although on four occasions an element of the infinitive clause precedes the verb in hyperbaton (1:11, 16; 2:8; 3:12).[154] It is codified that infinitive clauses appear within clauses proper, with only one infinitive clause occurring within a rank-shifted clause (1:11). It is common that infinitive clauses will be governed by an imperative verb, and less common that they will be governed by an indicative verb or a subjunctive verb.[155] Only one infinitive clause is governed by a participle (2:8). Infinitive clauses regularly appear within section and subsection transitions,[156] although the section transitions do not appear to impact the syntax of the word groups within the infinitive clause itself. Within their governing clause, it is codified that the infinitive clause will serve as or within the complement word group,[157] with two exceptions for those serving as the subject of the impersonal δεῖ (1:7, 11). It is fully codified, as with the other PE, that infinitives, regardless of force or function within their governing clause, will not appear with the definite article.

---

[154] In each case of hyperbaton, the infinitive itself still follows the governing predicator.

[155] Eight infinitive clauses modify an expressed imperative verb, with three others appearing in clauses with an assumed imperative form (2:2, 9). Five infinitive clauses modify an indicative verb and four modify subjunctive verbs within ἵνα clauses of purpose.

[156] The opening sentence of section δ, 3:1–2, has five infinitive clauses as a compound complement. Two infinitive clauses appear in the opening sentence of δ-3, 3:8: one in the main, paratactic clause and one in the ἵνα clause of purpose. An infinitive clause serves as the complement of the main clause also in 3:12a, which serves as the opening sentence of section ε. The final paratactic clause of subsection ε-1 in 3:14 has an infinitive clause as the complement, as do the final sentences of subsections β-1 in 1:9 and β-2 in 1:16. In 1:9, there are two infinitive clauses in the ἵνα clause that concludes the sentence, and the first clause in the compound sentence of 1:16 includes an infinitive clause as the complement.

[157] Nineteen of twenty-one infinitive clauses appear within the complement word group of their governing clause. Within those nineteen, twelve function as infinitive of indirect discourse with a verb of speaking or perception (1:11, 16; 2:2, 4, 6, 9; 3:1, 12), five function as complementary infinitives (1:9; 3:8, 12), and two function as infinitives of direct object (2:8; 3:14).

Within the infinitive clauses of Titus, the word groups and word group order show strong

patterns. For the predicators themselves, it is partially codified that the infinitive will be in the

present tense,[158] with only two infinitives in the aorist tense (3:12) and one infinitive of οἶδα in

the perfect tense, whose perfect tense functions as a present. In this case, the two aorist

infinitives signify momentary decisions only applicable to the time of writing and reception,

while all the other infinitives occur within the context of Titus' ongoing instruction and role in

the church community. It is marginally codified that infinitive clauses will have an expressed

complement word group.[159] This pattern holds generally true across all infinitive clauses, with the

only possible exceptions being for the those with a complementary force and those whose tense

is aorist. Of the five complementary infinitive clauses, only two include an expressed

complement (1:9; 3:8). Additionally, both aorist infinitives do not have an expressed

complement (3:12). More samples would be needed, however, to determine if these pieces of

data are meaningful for any larger tendencies. For those with expressed complements, it is fully

codified that the clause will not have a P-C structure. Nine infinitive clauses have the full

complement before the predicator in a C-P pattern[160] and six infinitive clauses show hyperbaton,

with the complement word group both preceding and following the predicator in a [C]-P-[C]

pattern. For these six examples, five are compound C-PNs with the first element before the

---

[158] Eighteen of the infinitives are in the present tense. Additionally, the lone infinitive in the perfect tense (1:16), from οἶδα, functions as if it is in the present tense.

[159] Fifteen infinitive clauses have an expressed complement. Five of the six without an expressed complement include at least one other expressed subject or adjunct word group (1:9; 2:6; 3:8, 12). Only one infinitive clause consists of only the infinitive itself (πειθαρχεῖν in 3:1), which occurs within an asyndeton list of five infinitive clauses as one compound complement.

[160] This includes five nominal groups consisting of one head noun (1:9, 16; 2:9; 3:2, 8, 14), one compound nominal group (3:1), one predicate nominative (3:1), and one relative functioning as the complement of the infinitive within its own relative clause (1:11). One noteworthy aspect of this is that two such complements are indirect objects of the present passive infinitive of ὑποτάσσω (2:9; 3:1), where the opposite word group order occurs with the present passive participle of ὑποτάσσω in 2:5. This will be discussed below.

infinitive and the following elements, in asyndeton, after the infinitive (1:7; 2:2, 4, 9; 3:2). The other example includes a single nominal group as the complement before the infinitive with an adjective (2:8) following the infinitive,[161] and this is the only case in which there is an adjunct word group with a complement showing hyperbaton. In each case, however, the first element of a compound complement or the head noun is before the infinitive.[162] For the five compound C-PNs as lists, this allows the complement to conform to the expected C-P pattern with the remainder of the list following. In the case of 2:8, the hyperbaton places the adjective, φαῦλον, in marked, emphatic position. Only five infinitive clauses with complements also have expressed subjects: three with a C-PN showing hyperbaton (1:7; 2:2, 4) and two with the passive infinitive of ὑποτάσσω (2:9; 3:1).[163] Two other infinitive clauses also have an expressed subject word group (2:6; 3:8). Subject word groups in infinitive clauses, which occur in seven total instances, always appear in the primary position for the clause and, as mentioned above, tend to also have a complement word group in the same clause. Adjunct word groups appear with the same frequency as subject word groups, with eight adjunct word groups within seven infinitive clauses. But, unlike subject word groups, adjuncts tend to appear in clauses without expressed complements.[164] The single A-Adv precedes the infinitive in 3:12, while all A-PPs follow the

---

[161] The syntax of 2:8 is debated, especially regarding the relationship of the pronoun, μηδέν, and the adjective, φαῦλος. Perkin offers that the two are a first and second object in a double-complement construction (Perkins, *Letters*, 264). Marshall connects the adjective and the noun together in translation with a genitive construction: "no report of our worthlessness" (Marshall, *Epistles*, 256), but does not directly comment on their grammatical relationship. Towner renders the adjective as attributive both in translation and in analysis (Towner, *Letters*, 718, 734), but, as with Marshall, does not directly state the relationship in grammatical terms. Rather than a double accusative, as Perkins suggests, it is more natural to render the adjective, φαῦλον, as an attributive adjectival modifier to the pronoun μηδέν separated by hyperbaton.

[162] It is also noteworthy that the lone predicate nominative with a single element, found in 3:1, precedes the infinitive.

[163] These two examples are also the only passive infinitives in Titus.

[164] Four infinitive clauses with adjunct word group do not have an expressed complement (1:9; 2:6; 3:12), compared with three clauses with both a complement and an adjunct (2:8, 9; 3:14).

predicator, regardless of the force of the PP.[165] With one exception (2:8), A-PPs not only follow the infinitive but are the final element of the clause.

Attributive Participle Clauses

In the letter of Titus, rank-shifted, attributive participle clauses are common, comprising twenty-one of the fifty-four rank-shifted clauses. It is marginally codified that attributive participle clauses will appear as or within a C-PN.[166] Attributive participle clauses also function as substantives five times and as adjectival modifiers three times. Some tendencies for rank-shifted participle clauses hold for all attributive participles, while some potential tendencies and patterns for rank-shifted participle clauses vary according to the function of the participle within its governing clause. It is partially codified that attributive participle clauses will appear after the their governing predicator, with the only exceptions being three substantive participle clauses (1:5, 9, 15).[167] It is fully codified, then, that attributive participles a C-PN will follow the predicator. All three adjectival participles follow the predicator (1:9, 14; 2:1), while only two of five substantive participles follow the predicator (3:8, 15).[168] Attributive participles in Titus appear in the present tense as a partially codified pattern,[169] with none in the aorist tense and only three in the perfect tense (1:15; 2:3; 3:8). Attributive participle clauses that function within a C-PN are the most likely to include a complement word group as a marginally codified pattern, but

---

[165] This includes prepositional phrases of reference or respect with ἐν and περί (2:6, 8, 9), sphere with ἐν (1:9), locative direction or destination with πρός and εἰς (3:12), or purpose with εἰς (3:14).

[166] Thirteen of the twenty-one attributive participle clauses are in complement word groups of the verb εἰμί.

[167] Additionally, these three substantive participle clauses are all preceded by the definite article and include no word groups beyond the predicator. Two function as the complement of their governing verb (1:5, 9) and functions as an adjunct word group, as a dative of reference (1:15).

[168] One functions as the subject of its governing, hypotactic ἵνα clause (3:8) and the other functions as the complement of its governing, paratactic imperative clause (3:15).

[169] Eighteen of twenty-one attributive participles are in the present tense in Titus.

complement word groups do appear within attributive participle clauses functioning as substantives or adjectives also.[170]

Among all attributive participle clauses with expressed complements, it is marginally codified they will follow a P-C clause pattern, including both of the substantive participle clauses and the lone adjectival participle clause that includes a complement.[171] One exception to this pattern follows a C-P clausal structure (2:3)[172] and the other three all evince hyperbaton, showing a [C]-P-[C] clausal structure (1:6; 2:10; 3:2). These exceptions are all functioning within C-PNs, typically within an infinitive clause of εἶναι. [173] Those that modify infinitives are all within a larger complement word group that is an asyndeton, compound list (2:3, 10; 3:2) and those with hyperbaton, while differing in structure, share some similarities. Two with hyperbaton have the primary complement (i.e. the noun) before the predicator and adjectival modifiers following the predicator, yielding a [**C**]-P-[C] clausal structure (1:6; 2:10), while the other example has the noun following the predicator and adjectival modifiers preceding it in a [C]-P-[**C**] structure (3:2). The participle clause in 3:2 also includes an A-PP appearing last in the clause, while the others

---

[170] Eight of thirteen participle clauses functioning as predicate nouns or adjectives include an expressed complement. In addition to this, two substantive clauses include a complement word group (3:8, 15) and one adjectival participle (1:14). Both substantive participles with an expressed complement follow their governing predicator, in contrast to all three substantive participle that consist of only the predicator, which precede their governing verb.

[171] Seven of eleven such clauses include the complement following the predicator in a P-C pattern.

[172] Perkins takes the complement, οἴνῳ πολλῷ, as an adjunct word group functioning as a dative of reference (Perkins, *Letters*, 260). Other commentators do not directly discuss the grammatical connection between the passive form, δεδουλωμένας, and this dative word group. The active form of the verb does take both an accusative and a dative object, denoting *who*, in the accusative case, is being enslaved *to whom*, in the dative case (BDAG, 260). In this case, it is more natural to take the subject of the passive verb to be what would be expressed via the accusative case in the active form, while the retaining the dative form to denote the indirect object or entity to which the subject is enslaved. The word group, οἴνῳ πολλῷ, will thus be retained as a complement word group within the clause. Similar constructions are found with the passive participle form of ὑποτάσσω (2:5) and the active participle form of δουλεύω (3:3), both of which express their complement in the dative case but following the predicator.

[173] All four are with εἰμί, three are predicate adjectives within an infinitive clause of εἶναι (2:3, 10; 3:2).

only include the complement and the predicator.[174] All three with hyperbaton, however, appear within transitional sentences: two at the beginning of sections (1:6; 3:2) and one at the end of a subsection (2:10). Furthermore, all three attributive participle clauses with hyperbaton in the complement are the final elements of an asyndeton, compound list. For attributive participle clauses, then, the primary clausal pattern is P-C, with exceptions typically tending to be due to syntactical changes both due to section transitions and the position of the rank-shifted clause within a list. The only exception that does not fit this pattern in 2:3, where the attributive participle clause with a C-P structure is within a list, but neither the final element nor part of a transitional sentence. This clause is the only attributive participle clause with both the negative particle μή and an expressed complement, but the anomaly could also be lexical in nature.[175]

In addition to the presence and position of complement word groups within attributive participle clauses, it is marginally codified that attributive participles will not include an adjunct word group and fully codified that they will not include an expressed subject.[176] Adjectival and substantive participle clauses never include an adjunct or a subject, as the three attributive participle clauses to include an adjunct are all functioning as predicate adjective to a copulative

---

[174] This might explain the difference between 2:10 and 3:2, both of which utilize the participle ἐνδεικνυμένους and the predicate adjective πᾶσαν modifying the head noun but have the head noun of the complement of differing sides of the predicator. Both clauses with the head noun before the predicator in a [**C**]-P-[C] structure do not include an adjunct word group (1:6; 2:10), while the clause with the head noun after the predicator includes a prepositional phrase concluding the clause, giving a [C]-P-[**C**]-A structure (3:2).

[175] For finite forms of δουλόω, the dative complement appears both before (Wis. 19:14; 1 Cor. 9:19; 2 Pet. 2:19) and after (Gen. 15:13; 1 Macc. 8:11; Rom. 6:18) the predicator elsewhere in the New Testament and the LXX. In Rom. 6:22, the dative complement appears after a passive governing participle, while in 4 Macc. 13:2 the dative complement appears before the passive participle.[175] In both cases, however, the participle is in predicate position, unlike Titus 2:3. It is possible, then, that the anomalous, marked syntax of Titus 2:3 is due to Septuagintal influence, the impact of rank-shift on participle clauses, or the impact of the negative particle μή on attributive participle clauses in Titus, but none of those options are conclusive as an explanation.

[176] Only three attributive participle clauses include an expressed adjunct word group (2:2; 3:2, 3) and none include an expressed subject word group. It is possible that ἀνθρώπων in 1:14 could be considered the subject of the participle clause, but, technically speaking, the participle clause is not, as a whole, the qualifier to the noun ἐντολαῖς. Rather, the noun ἀνθρώπων is the qualifier proper and the participle clause is adjectival to the noun.

318

governing verb (2:2; 3:2, 3). The participle clause in 2:2 includes three A-CUs, all of which are datives of sphere that follow the predicator. This participle clause is also the last element of a C-PN list with an infinitive of εἰμί. The other two clauses include A-PPs. One is an A-PP of advantage that follows the participle (3:2) and the other is an A-PP of manner that precedes the participle (3:3).[177]

Some patterns, as shown above, are consistent across the force or tense of the attributive participle clause, but there are some tendencies that vary according to the force of the clause. For example, every substantive participle clause is preceded by the definite article, as well as two of the three adjectival participle clauses (1:9; 2:1). For those functioning within C-PNs, however, it is fully codified that they will not include a definite article. Participle clauses functioning as predicate adjectives, similarly, are also more likely to include an expressed complement word group and are the only rank-shifted participle clauses to include an adjunct word group. Only one adjectival participle clause includes a complement (1:14). This participle clause is in "repeat" position, and it is the only adjectival participle clause to be indefinite. Substantive participle clauses without complements always precede their governing predicator (1:5, 9, 15), while those with expressed complements only appear with a P-C structure and follow their governing predicator (3:8, 15). Attributive participle clauses functioning as adjectives or substantives always have a "simple" complement, consisting of a single definite or indefinite noun (1:14; 3:8) or pronoun (3:15) in a P-C structure. Attributive participle clauses functioning as predicate adjectives, however, show the greatest flexibility in structure, with four following a P-C structure, one following a C-P structure, and three evincing hyperbaton with respect to the

---

[177] While there are too few examples to make any assertions of tendencies or patterns, it is worth noting that the position of the PP in 3:3 is opposite the PP of manner modifying a finite form of the same verb in 1 Tim. 2:2. An A-PP with the preposition ἐν, however, also precedes a finite form of διάγω in 3 Macc. 4:8.

complement. Furthermore, only one complement of such clauses, is a "simple" complement (3:3). Instead, complements within predicate adjective participle clauses tend to include more than a single nominal element, whether it is a compound complement (3:3) or a noun with one or more adjectival modifiers (1:6, 9; 2:3, 5, 10; 3:2).

Relative Clauses

Relative clauses in Titus show strong tendencies and patterns, similar to 1 and 2 Timothy, with the highest likelihood of any clause type to include additional word groups beyond the predicator.[178] It is partially codified that relative clauses will include an expressed complement and at least one other type of word group beyond the predicator.[179] The clausal structure, however, varies according to the function of the relative pronoun. When the relative pronoun is the complement of its clause, as would be expected, the clause follows a C-P structure (1:2, 3; 3:5, 6). When the relative clause includes a complement word group that is not the relative pronoun, it tends to follow a P-C structure.[180] It is partially codified that the relative clause will include an expressed subject word group,[181] with five of those instances being where the relative pronoun serves as the subject word group or an element within a subjective infinitive clause (1:11; 2:1, 14). When the relative includes a subject word group that does not include the relative

---

[178] On the one hand, this would be expected, as the relative pronoun, *de facto*, functions as a nominal word group within its clause. On the other hand, eight of ten total relative clauses include another nominal word group beyond the word group that includes the relative pronoun. Additionally, the only two relative clauses with only one word group beyond the predicator are impersonal δεῖ clauses with a rank-shifted, subjective infinitive word group whose complement is the relative pronoun (1:11). The relative clause introduces by the pronoun ἅ in 1:11 does not have an expressed subjective infinitive, but the verbal idea of διδάσκειν is strongly implied (Perkins, *Letters*, 253).

[179] There are nine relative pronouns with one compound clause (1:2), giving ten total relative clauses. Of these ten, eight include an expressed complement as well as at least one expressed subject or adjunct word group.

[180] Three of four relative clauses with an expressed complement other than the relative pronoun follow a P-C structure (1:2; 2:1, 14). Only one such clause follows a C-P pattern (1:11), which is also the second and final relative clause to modify οἱ ἐκ τῆς περιτομῆς in 1:10 and includes a participle clause of manner following the primary clause.

[181] Eight of the ten relative clauses include an expressed subject word group.

pronoun, the clause follows a C-P-S structure with the relative pronoun as the complement (1:2, 3; 3:5). Five relative clauses include at least one adjunct word group (1:2, 3; 2:14; 3:6), with two including two or more (1:2; 3:6). Within relative clauses in Titus, adjunct word groups always follow the predicator. With one exception (1:3), expressed adjunct word groups are the final structural element of the clause. The only exception, which is part of a compound clause, includes a dative A-CU of time between the predicator and the complement and still includes an A-PP of means as the final element of the clause. Furthermore, every clause with an expressed adjunct word group also includes an expressed complement.

In additional to patterns of clausal structure, relative pronouns and clauses demonstrative consistent tendencies within their governing clause. Relative clauses tend to appear within clauses proper as a partially codified pattern,[182] with only two relative clauses embedded within other rank-shifted, relative clauses (1:3, 11). Relative clauses, as a fully codified pattern, never precede their referent, either appearing after their referent or functioning as their own referent (1:11; 2:1). It is partially codified that relative clauses will not precede their governing clause, with the only exception being in 3:5.[183] This lone exception appears within a poetic passage and its marked position is very likely for the purpose of emphasis, as is the position of the prepositional phrase of which the relative clause is a modifier.[184] Relative clauses are the most likely clause type to include an aorist verbal form, delineating previous activity pertinent to

---

[182] Seven of nine relative clauses occur within a paratactic or hypotactic clause on the rank of clause. Five are within main, paratactic clauses (1:2, 11; 2:1; 3:6), one is are within a predicate participle clauses (2:14), and one is within a hypotactic clause with a temporal conjunction (3:5). One is directly embedded as an element within the relative clause proper (1:3), and the other is within a predicate participle clause of manner that is, in itself, part of a relative clause (1:11).

[183] Two relative clauses are within a subject word group of a nominal clause (1:2, 3) and six explicitly follow their governing verb (1:11; 2:1, 14; 3:6).

[184] See Towner, *Letters*, 779 or Marshall, *Epistles*, 313–14. Oddly, Perkins does not mention the emphatic word group order or position of the relative clause in his treatment of these verses (Perkins, *Letters*, 277–78).

referent's function in the governing clause.[185] Finally, it is partially codified that relative pronouns will not modify the subject or complement of a clause, but either a qualifier (1:2, 11; 2:14; 3:6) or object of a preposition (1:3; 3:5).[186]

Ὅτι Clauses, Ἵνα clauses, and Direct Quotations

Rank-shifted clauses of direct or indirect discourse functioning as complement word groups are very rare in Titus, with only one recitative ὅτι clause and one direct quotation. Ἵνα is not used as a marker of discourse in Titus. The single rank-shifted ὅτι clause in Titus, found in 3:11, is a compound clause with a subject word group in the first clause and only a predicator in the second. It appears within a causal HC-ptc, follows its governing verb, and includes verbs in both the perfect and present tenses. The sole direct quotation, occurring in 1:12, is a nominal clause with an expressed subject, compound complement word group with asyndeton, and an A-Adv in an S-A-C structure. The quotation appears within a main, paratactic clause and follows its governing verb, εἶπεν. These two samples are too few for any conclusive analysis within Titus itself, but they will be placed alongside rank-shifted clauses of discourse from the other PE in subsequent chapters.

The Rank of Word Group

The word group is the lowest rank from the rank scale analyzed in this project, divided into five major, functional categories. Word groups demonstrate both flexibility and consistency in their word order, depending on the word group type, clausal syntax, and other stylistic phenomena on the rank of clause and section. Word groups will be analyzed according to their

---

[185] Six of the ten total relative clauses include an aorist verbal form.

[186] The only relative pronouns that do not modify a qualifier word group or a prepositional object within in adjunct word group are those that function, in themselves, as the complement of their governing clause (1:11; 2:1).

type, beginning with subject and complement word groups, which comprise the most basic clausal elements aside from the predicator. Predicator word groups, as with 1 and 2 Timothy, will not analyzed as a discrete word group, as the only variable within them with regard to word order is the presence or absence of the negative particle μή. Analysis will continue with adjunct word groups, consisting of conjunctions, A-PPs, A-Advs, and A-CUs. The qualifier word group will be the final word group under investigation.

<div align="center">Subject Word Groups</div>

In the letter of Titus, forty-three clauses include expressed subject word groups, with syntactical patterns and tendencies that depend on the presence of various elements within the word group itself and the placement of the subject within different types and ranks of clauses. Subject words are as equally likely to be a single noun or pronoun as they are to include additional elements, such as adjectives or qualifiers,[187] with the most common additional element being the definite article.[188] The presence of an adjective is the least common additional element, yielding a codified pattern that a subject word group will not include an adjective,[189] and qualifiers are only slightly more common, giving a partially codified pattern that subject word groups will not include an embedded qualifier word group.[190] The two adjectives that appear within subjects in paratactic clauses are both predicate adjectives that follow the head noun (αὕτη in 1:13 and πάντες in 3:15), while the lone adjective that appears within a rank-shifted clause is

---

[187] Twenty-one subject word groups consist of a single noun or pronoun.

[188] Sixteen of the forty-three subject word group include the article.

[189] Only three subject word groups include an explicit adjective on the head noun. All three subject word groups with an adjective also include the definite article (1:2, 13; 3:15).

[190] Seven subject word groups include at least one embedded qualifier word group (1:1, 10, 12, 15; 2:5, 11; 3:4). Four of these include a definite article (1:15; 2:5, 11; 3:4) and qualifiers never appear in subject word group that also include an adjective.

an attributive adjective in "sandwich" position (ἀψευδής in 1:2). In addition to these phenomena, three subject word groups in Titus are compound subjects (1:4, 15; 3:4). Both compound subjects with an expressed predicator include both an article and a qualifier word group that modify both subjects, although the one that follows the predicator has the qualifier preceding the head nouns (1:15) and the one that precedes the predicator has the qualifier following the head nouns in hyperbaton (3:4). The single compound subject that only includes two nouns occurs within a nominal clause in the salutation of the letter (1:4). All compound subjects include an expressed, conjunctive καί as a linking device.[191]

Qualifiers are not common within subject word groups in Titus, as noted above, but subject word groups with qualifiers do display some consistent tendencies in syntax and word order. Qualifiers appear regularly in subject word groups with or without the article.[192] Two of three compound subject word groups include an embedded qualifier word group (1:15; 3:4), and subject word groups with embedded qualifiers never appear within a rank-shifted clause.[193] Qualifiers within subject word groups tend to follow their head noun, with only one exception (1:15).[194] Qualifiers in subject word groups also tend to match their head noun in respect to definiteness, with the qualifier in 1:10 being the only exception. In this case, the qualifier is definite and serving as an emphatic appositive to an indefinite subject. Lastly, qualifiers tend to modify definite subjects and the two that modify indefinite subjects both follow their referent, are in subject word groups that follow the predicator, and both appear within paratactic,

---

[191] Additionally, the subject word group in 1:15 includes a "καί…καί" construction.

[192] Four subject word groups with qualifiers include a definite article (1:15; 2: 5, 11; 3:4) and three do not (1:1, 10, 12).

[193] There are eighteen subject word groups in rank-shifted clauses and twenty-five in clauses proper.

[194] This exception, noted above, occurs within a compound subject word group that follows the predicator.

indicative clauses (1:10, 12).

The two most common syntactical phenomena for subject word groups in Titus are that they include the definite article, which appears within sixteen subject word groups, and that they occur within a rank-shifted context, which occurs eighteen times.[195] The article is commonly accompanied by other elements beyond the head noun or pronoun, occurring alongside qualifiers four times (1:15; 2:5, 11; 3:4), adjectives three times (1:2, 13; 3:15), and twice within a compound subject (1:15; 3:4). Subject word groups with the article tend to appear within clauses proper as a marginally codified pattern.[196] Only one subject word group with a definite article that appears within a rank-shifted clause includes an additional element (1:2). Subject word groups within rank-shifted clauses are significantly less likely to include additional elements beyond the head noun or pronoun, especially qualifiers.[197] Additionally, subject word groups in rank-shifted clauses are slightly more likely to precede their governing predicator compared with those in a clause proper.[198]

Complement Word Groups

Complement words groups, as with the other PE, are the most common type of word

---

[195] Within Titus, eight subject word groups appear within a relative clause (1:2, 3, 11; 2:1, 14; 3:5), eight appear within an infinitive clause (1:7; 2:2, 3, 4, 6, 9; 3:1, 8), one appears within a direct quotation (1:12), and one appears in a recitative ὅτι clause (3:11).

[196] Only five of sixteen subject word groups with a definite article appear within a rank-shifted context. Three occur within an infinitive clause and all precede their governing verb (1:7; 2:4, 6), one occurs within a relative clause (1:2) and follows an indicative predicator, and one appears within a recitative ὅτι clause and follows the predicator (3:11).

[197] Only one subject word group in a rank-shifted context includes an adjective (1:2). Only five of eighteen subject word groups in rank-shifted clauses include a definite article (27%), compared to eleven of twenty-five within clauses proper (44%) or sixteen of forty-three overall (37%). No subject word groups in rank-shifted clauses include an embedded qualifier, compared to seven of the twenty-five that are not in a rank-shifted context.

[198] Ten of eighteen subject word groups within rank-shifted clauses appear before the governing verb (56%) compared with ten of the twenty-five subject word groups that appear within clauses proper (40%).

groups in Titus, generally serving as C-DOs, C-IOs, or C-PNs within a clause or as C-OP within a PP. While some patterns and tendencies span the different functions of a complement word group, the word group order and the syntax of complement word groups tend to differ according to the function of the complement and the type of clause in which the complement appears. Thus, complements will be analyzed below according to their function within their clause, beginning with the most common type of complement—C-DOs.[199] This will be followed by the other types of complements explicitly linked with predicators: C-IOs and C-PNs.[200] Finally, C-OPs, which are the second most common type of complement,[201] will be analyzed.

C-DOs regularly include additional elements beyond the head noun or pronoun, but more often appear with no elements beyond nouns, pronouns, or a rank-shifted clause that, in itself, serves as object of the predicator.[202] Qualifiers are the least common additional element within C-DOs, with eight qualifiers embedded within seven such word groups.[203] Qualifiers tend to appear within C-DOs that also include an adjective,[204] both when the qualifier modifies a head noun that is also modified by an adjective (2:13, 14)[205] or when the qualifier modifies one element in a list in which other elements include adjectives (1:14; 2:7). Qualifiers within C-DOs tend to appear

---

[199] There are sixty-five expressed complements serving as direct objects of a predicator.

[200] Within Titus, there are four complements functioning as indirect objects and twenty-three complement word groups accompanying copulative verbs. In addition to these two types of complements, there is one direct quotation functioning as the complement of a predicator (1:12).

[201] There are forty-six complements serving as the object of a prepositional phrase.

[202] Thirty-eight of the sixty-five direct objects do not include definite articles, adjectives, or any embedded qualifiers.

[203] Titus 1:3, 14; 2:7, 10, 13, 14; 3:13. The complement word group in 2:7 includes two qualifier word groups modifying different elements within the compound complement.

[204] Four of the seven complement word groups with an embedded qualifier also include an adjective.

[205] This assumes that the qualifier word group in 2:13, beginning with τῆς δόξης, modifies both head nouns in the compound complement, not only the immediately preceding noun, ἐπιφάνειαν (contra Perkins, *Letters*, 269–70).

within a hypotactic or paratactic clause proper[206] and regularly appear in compound objects.[207] Qualifiers within C-DOs always match their referent in grammatical definiteness and, with one exception, follow their head noun.[208] One other noteworthy and syntactically marked case is found in 2:10, where the subjective genitive qualifier appears in explicit "repeat" position as if it were an attributive adjective. This is a singular occurrence in the PE, accompanied by a variant reading that eliminates the repeated article. Articles are slightly more common within C-DOs, occurring in eleven such complements. It is marginally codified that C-DOs with a definite article will include another modifying element, whether a qualifier or an adjective.[209] All C-DOs that include both the definite article and an adjective have the attributive adjective in "sandwich" position; these tend to be within participle clauses.[210] Adjectives are the most common modifying element within C-DOs, with twenty-six adjectives appearing within twenty C-DOs. Unlike definite articles and qualifiers, adjectives tend to appear within C-DOs in rank-shifted contexts as a marginally codified pattern, and most often within rank-shifted participles clauses.[211] Furthermore, when a C-DO within a clause proper includes an adjective, it is always in a

---

[206] Five of the seven complement word groups with embedded qualifiers are within a clause proper. Only one complement within an imperative context includes a qualifier (3:13).

[207] Four compound direct objects include embedded qualifiers out of eleven total compound direct objects.

[208] The only exception, found in 2:7, is within an object-complement construction where the complement is a four-part, compound list. In this case, the qualifier on the first element of the list, a nominal group functioning as an objective genitive, follows the head noun and another qualifier on the second element, a PP of sphere, precedes its head noun. This is the only occurrence of a PP functioning as a qualifier within a C-DO in Titus. The complement word group also displays hyperbaton, with the governing verb interrupting the object-complement construction.

[209] Seven of eleven direct objects with articles also include an adjective (1:9; 2:1, 5), a qualifier (1:3; 2:10), or both (2:13).

[210] Four of the five direct objects with both an article and an adjective are in participle clauses, both rank-shifted participle clauses (1:9; 2:5) and hypotactic participle clauses (2:12, 13).

[211] Fourteen of the twenty direct objects that include an adjective are within a rank-shifted clause. Seven of those fourteen are rank-shifted participle clauses.

paratactic, imperative clause (3:9, 10) or an HC-ptc (1:14; 2:7, 12, 13).[212] Attributive adjectives

are in "sandwich" or "repeat" position with similar frequency,[213] but those in "repeat" position

tend to be in C-DOs that precede the governing verb,[214] never modify a head noun with a definite

article, and often have hyperbaton in the complement word group when it precedes the verb.[215]

Only two C-DOs include a predicate adjective (2:10; 3:2). In both cases, the adjective is a form

of πᾶς, it precedes it head noun, the complement word group shows hyperbaton, and it appears in

a rank-shifted participle clause of the verb ἐνδείκνυμι.

C-IOs and C-PNs are much less common than C-DOs, but some tendencies are evident

especially for C-PNs. There are only C-IOs in Titus, but they do show consistency (1:4; 2:10, 14;

3:13). They tend to occur in clauses proper,[216] follow their governing verb, and consist of a single

pronoun (2:14; 3:13) or a noun with an additional modifier (1:4; 2:10).[217] C-PNs occur twenty-

three times in Titus, with some notable features. Such complements, as a partially codified

pattern, tend to consist of predicate adjectives,[218] with only three C-PNs including a noun (1:12;

3:7) or a nominalized PP as the complement (3:15). While it is expected that predicate adjectives

---

[212] All four direct objects with adjectives that occur with hypotactic participle clauses are also compound complements.

[213] Thirteen attributive adjectives are in "sandwich" position within twelve complement word groups, and eleven attributive adjectives are in "repeat" position within eight complement word groups.

[214] For attributive adjectives in "sandwich" position, the complement precedes the verb in six clauses and follows the verb in six clauses. For those in "repeat" position, the complement precedes the governing predicator six of eight times.

[215] For the six direct objects with attributive adjectives in "repeat" position that precede the governing verb, four of those clauses have hyperbaton with the complement word group (1:6; 2:7, 8, 10).

[216] Two indirect objects are in paratactic clauses (1:4; 2:10), and two are within hypotactic ἵνα clauses (2:14; 3:13). One of the ἵνα clauses, however, is embedded within relative clause (2:14), and thereby in a rank-shifted context.

[217] Both indirect objects that are within ἵνα clauses are pronouns only and both within a paratactic clause consist of nouns with one additional modifier.

[218] Twenty of the twenty-three complements of copulative verbs consist of one or more predicate adjectives.

will not be accompanied by the definite article, the other such complements also do not include

an article in the word group. Six C-PNs include one embedded qualifier (1:6, 9, 16; 2:3; 3:1, 8),

which only modify predicate adjectives. Qualifiers within C-PNs tend to precede their head

adjective[219] and appear within a compound complement.[220] C-PNs appear regularly on both sides

of their governing verb, but those that come before the governing verb tend to be compound

complements that show hyperbaton.[221] It is also noteworthy that all six C-PNs of an infinitive

precede their governing verb, with five of them showing hyperbaton.[222] In addition, those within

rank-shifted contexts tend to precede the governing verb, while those in clauses proper are more

likely to follow the governing verb.[223] While there are numerically more cases of hyperbaton

among C-DOs, hyperbaton is the most likely within C-PNs among all types of complement word

groups.[224] These do occur within section and subsection transitions (1:9, 16; 3:2), but appear

within the body of sections and subsections also (1:7; 2:2, 4, 9).

---

[219] Four qualifiers precede their head adjective (1:6, 16; 2:3; 3:1) and two follow their head adjective (1:9; 3:8). Those that precede include three prepositional phrases (1:16; 2:3; 3:1) and one nominal group in the genitive case (1:6), while those that follow are an infinitive clause (1:9) or a nominal group in the dative case (3:8).

[220] Four of the six complements of copulative verbs that include a qualifier are within compound complement word groups.

[221] Eight complements of copulative verbs follow their governing verb (1:6, 10, 13; 3:3, 8, 9, 11, 14), with seven of these being within a paratactic or hypotactic clause proper (cf. 3:11). Six complements of copulative verbs are in nominal clauses (1:12, 15; 3:8, 15) or have an elided, assumed governing verb (2:3). There are nine complements of copulative verbs that precede their governing verb (1:7, 9, 16; 2:2, 4, 9; 3:1, 2, 7). Among those nine, six are within compound complements (1:7, 16; 2:2, 4, 9; 3:2). All six of those complement word groups evince hyperbaton, as well as one other complement word group with an infinitive clause as an epexegetical qualifier (1:9). In total, seven of the nine such complements that precede the governing verb show hyperbaton.

[222] The six complements of expressed infinitives of εἰμί in Titus are found in 1:7; 2:2, 4, 9; 3:1, 2. All those except the complement word group in 3:1 are also compound complement word groups with hyperbaton.

[223] Of the nine complements of copulative verbs in a rank-shifted context, six precede the governing verb, all within infinitive clauses. Only one follows the governing verb (3:11), but example is the complement of a predicate participle clause embedded within a recitative ὅτι clause. For the fourteen complements of copulative verbs that are not in a rank-shifted context, three precede the governing verb (1:9, 16; 3:7), with all three being in hypotactic clauses, and seven follow the governing verb (1:6, 10, 13; 3:3, 8, 9, 14). All those within paratactic either appear within a nominal clause (1:15; 3:8, 15) or follow the governing verb (1:10, 13; 3:3, 8, 9).

[224] Nine of sixty-five direct object word groups show hyperbaton (14%), compared with seven of twenty-three complements of copulative verbs (30%).

C-OPs are the second most common type of complement word group in Titus, showing

some consistent syntactical patterns across all prepositions and some according to the force of

the PP. C-OPs regularly only include a single head noun or pronoun,[225] but tend to include

additional elements. Ten C-OPs include an embedded qualifier. As a partially codified pattern,

these tend to include only head nouns and qualifiers, with only two exceptions in 3:5. One

includes an article and the other both an article and an adjectival modifiers. Both exceptions are

in one clause, are in PPs in direct contrast, and appear within a poetic context. It is codified that

qualifiers in C-OPs will follow their head noun.[226] Similarly, it is codified that qualifiers within

C-OPs match their head noun with regard to grammatical definiteness.[227] For the only two

examples of compound complements with embedded qualifiers, both head nouns include

qualifiers that follow the head noun, as opposed to compound C-DOs or C-PNs, which tend to

include qualifiers on only one of the head nouns or adjectives.[228] C-OPs include the definite

article for eight word groups, and these tend to include additional elements as well.[229] The most

common element beyond the head noun or pronoun is an adjectival element, with fifteen

adjectives occurring within fourteen C-OPs. All five predicate adjectives are variations of πᾶς

and precede an anarthrous head noun, with only one occurring in a PP that precedes the

---

[225] Nineteen of the forty-six complements of prepositions include only a single noun or pronoun.

[226] Nine of ten complements of prepositional phrases with embedded qualifiers have the qualifier following the head noun. The single, marked exception, found in 3:5, occurs within a poetic context, a context of direct contrast, and is emphatic.

[227] Nine of ten complements of prepositions with embedded qualifiers have the qualifier match its head noun with regard to grammatical definiteness. The lone, marked exception occurs in 1:3 with the definite qualifier τοῦ σωτῆρος modifying the anarthrous head noun ἐπιταγήν. This also occurs in a compound relative clause embedded in another relative clause within the subject word group of the opening salutation.

[228] Titus 1:16; 2:13; 3:13.

[229] Five of the eight complement word groups of prepositions that include an article also include a qualifier (3:5), an adjectival element (1:9; 2:12; 3:14), or both (3:5).

governing verb (3:1).[230] The ten adjectival modifiers in attributive position tend to be adjectives proper and appear in "sandwich" word order,[231] but the word order also depends on the type of modifier. The lone adverb functioning as an adjective (2:12) and the lone relative pronoun functioning as an adjectival modifier (1:13) are in "sandwich" position, while a nominalized PP functioning as an adjective (3:5) and an adjectival, rank-shifted participle clause (1:9) are both definite and in "repeat" position. Adjectives proper tend not to appear on definite head nouns,[232] while other parts of speech or nominalized adjectival modifiers tend to modify definite head nouns. Additional, attributive adjectives occur regularly in PP both preceding and following the governing verb.[233]

C-OPs also demonstrate tendencies of word group order based on the force of the preposition. PPs do not have any single force frequently enough to suggest any definitive patterns, but some initial tendencies are noteworthy. Within PPs of accompaniment using μετά (1:6; 2:15; 3:15), the C-OP tends to include additional elements beyond the noun and only occurs within clauses proper.[234] Within PPs of destination, using εἰς, ἐπί, and πρός (3:6, 12), the C-OPs are always a single noun or pronoun and tend to be within rank-shifted clauses.[235] PPs of means with διά or ἐν always include an embedded qualifier within the complement (1:3; 3;5, 6). C-OPs

---

[230] Four of the five prepositional phrases with πᾶς follow their governing verb, with the only exception in 3:1 also including an attributive adjective on the head noun within the first sentence of a new section (δ-1).

[231] Four of the six adjectives, by part of speech, appear in "sandwich" position, compared with only two of six in "repeat" position. Overall, six of the ten attributive adjectival modifiers are in "sandwich" position.

[232] Five of six adjectives modify grammatically indefinite head nouns, while three of four adjectival modifiers consisting of other parts of speech include an article.

[233] Four complements of prepositions with attributive adjectives precede their governing verb (1:13; 3:1, 5, 10), five follow their governing verb (1:2, 9, 11; 2:12; 3:14), and one appears within a nominal clause (1:4).

[234] Of the four prepositional phrases of accompaniment, one includes a qualifier (1:6) and two include the predicate adjective πᾶς (2:15; 3:15).

[235] Three of the four are within a rank-shifted context.

within PPs of standard or norm with κατά (1:1, 3, 4, 9; 3:5, 7) tend to have additional elements beyond the head noun[236] and usually include a subjective genitive (1:1, 3; 3:5) or objective genitive qualifier (1:1; 3:7). PPs of reference or respect with ἐν, περί, or πρός (2:7, 8, 9, 10; 3:1, 8) tend to include C-OPs comprised of a single pronoun (2:8; 3:8), or nominalized adjective (2:7, 9, 10).[237] PPs of sphere, with ἐν (1:9, 13; 2:7; 3:15), tend to include articles in the C-OP (1:9, 13; 2:7). Finally, temporal PPs, using ἐν, μετά, and πρό (1:2; 2:12; 3:10) always include an adjective in the C-OP and all three occur in different syntactical contexts.[238]

Adjunct Word Groups

Adjunct word groups in Titus show tendencies and patters of word order and syntax according to their type and context. A-PPs are the most common type of adjunct, with thirty-five of the forty-six PPs in Titus serving as adjunct word groups.[239] In addition to A-PPs, there are thirty-four conjunctions functioning as adjunct word groups and seventeen A-Advs and A-CUs. Adjunct word groups comprised of conjunctions do not display word order variations like A-PPs or other adjuncts, but they do exhibit tendencies of conjunction type, force, and clausal context. Cj-Hs are almost as common as Cj-Ps in Titus, with sixteen Cj-Hs and Cj-Ps. The Cj-H of purpose, ἵνα, occurs for thirteen of those sixteen conjunctions, with only three other Cj-Hs used

---

[236] Six of the seven prepositional phrases with κατά and a complement in the accusative case include elements beyond the head noun. The only exception, found in 1:1, is within the opening salutation, embedded within a qualifier word group that is, itself, within another κατά phrase, and only one of two times that a κατά phrase functions as a nominalized adjective (1:1; 1:9).

[237] The only exception occurs in 3:1, where the preposition is πρός, the clause has formulaic syntax, the PP is functioning as a qualifier word group, and it is within the first sentence of subsection δ-1. The other five PPs of reference or respect use περί (2:7, 8; 3:8) or ἐν (2:9, 10) and function as A-PPs within their clause.

[238] One precedes an imperative verb in a paratactic clause (3:10), one follows a subjective verb in a hypotactic ἵνα clause (2:12), and one following the verb within a relative clause (1:2). Additionally, one includes an adjective proper in "repeat" position (1:2), one includes two adjectives in "sandwich" position (3:10), and one include an adverb nominalized as an adjective (2:12).

[239] Eleven function instead as nominalized adjectives (1:9; 3:5) or qualifier word groups (1:4; 3:1).

in the letter: ὅταν (3:12), ὅτε (3:4), and ὡς (1:5). Aside from ἵνα, two hypotactic Cj-Hs introduce

a temporal HC-Cj (3:4, 12) and one a comparative HC-Cj (1:5). Every ἵνα clause follows its

governing clause as a codified pattern, even when the governing verb is elided, as well as the

comparative ὡς clause. Both temporal HC-Cjs, however, precede their governing clause. HC-

CJs, as a marginally codified pattern, are subordinate to clauses expressing a command or

wish.[240] Cj-Ps, especially as they function to indicate inter-clausal syntax or connections between

sections and subsections, are discussed above, but some tendencies among the conjunctions

themselves are noteworthy. Of the eighteen Cj-Ps functioning as adjunct word groups, the two

most common uses are to indicate contrast, occurring twice with ἀλλά (1:15; 3:5) and seven

times with δέ (1:3, 15, 16; 2:1, 3:4, 9, 14), and explanation, with five uses of γάρ (1:7, 10; 3:3, 9,

12). The conjunction δέ only serves a contrastive function as an adjunct in Titus. The only Cj-P

serving a conjunctive function is καί in 3:8 and no Cj-Ps serve a primarily transitional function.

The conditional conjunction εἰ occurs one time in Titus (1:6), but it is embedded within a

hypotactic ἵνα clause. Additionally, the comparative ὡσαύτως is used twice (2:3, 6), but only

assumes the syntax of the previous clause for one of its two clauses (2:3). Only one Cj-P, a

contrastive δέ, serves as an adjunct word group within a rank-shifted clause (1:3).

A-Advs and A-CUs occur seventeen times in Titus, demonstrating potential tendencies of

word order and syntax according to the type and the force of the adjunct. There are four uses of

the additive καί as an A-Adv (1:9, 10; 3:3, 14), all within clauses proper with the additive καί

following the governing verb. There are six A-Advs of manner within four clauses, all using –ως

---

[240] Five HC-Cjs are subordinate to a clause with an expressed imperative verb (1:13; 2:8; 3:12, 13, 14), three
are subordinate to a clause with an elided but assumed imperative context (2:4, 5, 10), one is subordinate to a clause
with the impersonal verb δεῖ (1:9), and one is subordinate to a clause with an indicative verb expressed a desire or
wish (3:8). The other six HC-Cjs are all subordinate to indicative paratactic clauses that are either explanatory or
expository (1:5; 2:12, 14; 3:4, 7).

adverbs formed from adjectives (1:13; 2:12; 3:6, 13).[241] They follow the governing verb in two clauses (1:13; 3:6) and precede the predicator in two clauses (2:12; 3:13).[242] For three of the four clauses with –ως adverbs of manner, the clause also includes at least one PP as an adjunct (1:13; 2:12; 3:6). Other A-Advs include two temporal adjuncts, with ἀεί in 1:12 and ποτε in 3:3, and one locative adjunct with ἐκεῖ in 3:12. The locative ἐκεῖ precedes the predicator within an infinitive clause, while the temporal ποτε follows the governing verb in an indicative, paratactic clause.[243]

In addition to A-Advs there are six dative A-CUs. One A-CU is a dative of time (1:3), two are datives of reference or respect (1:15), two are datives of means (1:16; 3:7), and one is a compound dative of sphere with three, asyndeton nouns in a list (2:2). A-CUs tend to follow the governing verb[244] and include an article.[245] Only one dative A-CU includes an adjective (1:3); this instance is also the only dative adjunct not to include the definite article.[246] Only one dative A-CU, a dative of means, includes an embedded qualifier (3:7). This qualifier precedes the head noun and occurs within a poetic context.[247] As with A-Advs, dative A-CUs tend to appear in

---

[241] The adjunct word group in 2:12 includes three –ως adverbs as a compound word group with polysyndeton.

[242] Clausal mood does not appear to impact the position of the –ως adverbs, as two imperative clauses (1:13; 3:13) include them on differing sides of the predicator.

[243] The temporal adverb ἀεί is within a rank-shifted direct quotation that is nominal.

[244] Three of the six explicitly follow their governing verb (1:3; 2:2; 3:7) and two are within a compound nominal clause (1:15). For the two in 1:15, the dative adjunct is the final word group in the first clause and the dative adjunct is the primary word group in the second clause. In this case, the two are in explicit contrast. The only dative adjunct to precede an expressed verb it the dative of means in 1:16. In this instance, the main clause is in a context of contrast and the final clause of section β.

[245] Five of the six include a definite article, with the dative of time in 1:3 being the only exception.

[246] The dative adjunct in 1:3 is also the only dative of time and one of only two dative adjuncts within a rank-shifted clause (with 2:2).

[247] Furthermore, in this same poetic passage another qualifier precedes its head noun in a prepositional phrase (3:5). Both qualifiers are pronouns and both refer to God (3:5) or Jesus (3:7) within an explicitly context of salvation: σῴζω in 3:5 and σωτήρ in 3:7.

clauses proper, but rank-shift does not have any apparent impact on their syntax.[248]

There are thirty-five A-PPs Titus, with syntax patterns that vary according to function. Word order within PPs as a whole is explored above, but the syntax of the A-PPs will be explored according to the function of the PP. A-PPs tend to follow their governing verb as a marginally codified pattern.[249] Some that precede the predicator likely are in that position due to their force. For example, the lone A-PP of basis precedes the governing verb but is both emphatic and occurs within a poetic section (3:5). Causal A-PPs precede their governing verb two of three times (1:5, 13); the exception, with the preposition χάριν, is within a HC-ptc that is embedded within two relative clauses. Others that precede their governing predicator change their position due to other syntactical phenomena. The two A-PPs with the force of reference or respect, for example, that precede their predicator (3:1, 8) are both within the opening transitional sentences of γ-1 and δ-1.[250] The A-PP of standard in 3:5 precedes the predicator also, but it does so within a poetic context with strong emphasis. One potentially significant phenomenon is that two of the three temporal A-PPs follow their governing verb (1:2; 2:12), while only one precedes the governing verb (3:10).[251] Most A-PPs, however, tend to follow their

---

[248] Four of six dative adjuncts are in paratactic or hypotactic clauses, compared to twelve of seventeen total adjunct word group consisting of adverbs or adverbial nominal groups.

[249] Twenty-six of thirty-five prepositional phrase adjuncts follow their governing predicator. Eight precede the predicator while one occurs within a nominal clause (1:4).

[250] The syntax of 3:1 could also be due to rank-shift. The prepositional phrase of reference precedes the predicator as part of a list in an infinitive clause in 3:1, while an identical prepositional phrase follows the predicator as the final element of a list in a hypotactic participle clause in 1:16. In that case, however, it is not clear whether rank-shift is the cause of the change in syntax, the usage of the prepositional phrase as an adjunct in 3:1 as opposed to a qualifier in 1:16, or the context of a transition between sections. It is more likely that the position of the prepositional phrase πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον in relative to the governing predicator depends on the difference in word group context, not rank-shift.

[251] The two that follow the governing verb refer to past (1:2) and current (2:12) time, while the one that precedes the predicator refers to future time (3:10). The one that precedes the predicator is in an imperative paratactic clause, while the other two are in a hypotactic ἵνα clause and a relative clause. It is not clear which syntactical phenomenon best explains the word group order difference within the clause.

governing verb, largely corresponding with the patterns from 1 and 2 Timothy.

One significant difference for A-PPs compared with other adjunct word groups in Titus is the presence of the A-PP within a rank-shifted context. Over half of the A-PPs in Titus are within rank-shifted context, with relative clauses and infinitive clauses being the most common types of rank-shifted clauses to include an A-PP.[252] Additionally, some forces of A-PPs tend to appear more commonly within a rank-shifted context. For example, both A-PPs with the force of advantage in Titus are within a rank-shifted context (2:14; 3:2). Three of the four A-PPs with the force of destination are in rank-shifted clauses (3:6, 12), as are four of six A-PPs of reference or respect (2:7, 8, 9; 3:1). All four A-PPs of reference or respect within rank-shifted clauses are within infinitive clauses. Within rank-shifted clauses, A-PPs are much less likely to precede their governing verb, yielding a partially codified pattern that an A-PP will follow its governing predicator within a rank-shifted clause.[253]

Qualifier Word Groups

Within Titus, there are sixty-three word groups functioning as qualifiers embedded within other word groups. The most common type of qualifier word group, as a marginally codified pattern, is a nominal word group that modifies another noun or adjective,[254] with PPs and relative clauses also regularly functioning as qualifiers.[255] There is one infinitive clause serving as a

---

[252] Eighteen of thirty-five prepositional phrase adjuncts are within rank-shifted clauses. Among those, seven are in relative clauses and eight are within infinitive clauses.

[253] Sixteen of eighteen prepositional phrase adjuncts within rank-shifted clauses follow their governing verb. The two exceptions are a phrase of manner within an attributive participle clause (3:3) and a phrase of reference or respect within an infinitive clause (3:1). No relative clause has a prepositional phrase adjunct precede the governing verb.

[254] Forty-seven of the sixty-three qualifier word groups are comprised of a nominal group.

[255] In addition to nominal groups, there are seven relative clauses and eight prepositional phrases serving as qualifiers.

qualifier (1:9). This infinitive qualifier has an epexegetical force, modifies a predicate adjective within a C-PN, and shows hyperbaton with the governing verb interrupting the head adjective and the infinitive qualifier. In addition to the lone infinitive clause serving as a qualifier, the other types of qualifier evince tendencies and patterns based on their type and force.

PP qualifier word groups in Titus show difference in word group order depending on the syntax of its governing word group and governing clause. They precede and follow their referent with equal frequency; all those that follow their referent, however, occur within paratactic clauses proper (1:1, 2, 4, 12), while all those that precede their referent either appear within a HC-ptc (1:16; 2:7) or an infinitive clause (2:3; 3:1). Furthermore, those that precede their referent appear in either a C-PN (1:16; 2:3; 3:1) or a C-DO (2:7) and those that follow their referent are within a subject word group (1:1, 12), a C-OP (1:2), or a C-IO (1:4). PP qualifiers that follow their referent also tend to appear as embedded qualifiers within another qualifier word group.[256] It is also possible their word group order with respect to their referent could also coordinate with the force of the phrase. Those that precede their referent are either have an epexegetical force (1:16; 3:1) or the force of sphere (2:3, 7); those that follow their referent are partitive phrases (1:12), phrase of standard (1:1, 4), or purpose (1:2).

Relative clauses, as a marginally codified pattern, tend to serve as qualifier word groups to a nominal word group, as opposed to a self-standing clause serving as a subject or complement word group. [257] When they function as qualifiers, they always carry an adjectival force, always

---

[256] Three of the four prepositional phrase qualifier word groups that follow their referent are within other qualifier word groups (1:1, 2, 4).

[257] Seven of the ten relative clauses in Titus function as qualifier word groups with an adjectival force (1:2, 3, 11; 2:14; 3:5, 6). Two function as complement word groups proper within their governing clause (1:11; 2:1) and one functions idiomatically within a prepositional phrase as a causal connective device (1:13).

follow their referent, and almost always follow the governing verb of the clause.[258] With one

exception, a relative clause embedded within another relative (1:3), relative clause qualifier word

groups appear within clauses proper.[259] Relative clause qualifier word groups in Titus modify

nominal groups functioning as subject word groups (1:11), C-OPs (1:2; 3:5), or other qualifier

word group (1:2; 2:14; 3:6).

Nominal word groups are the most common type of qualifier word group in Titus,

occurring forty-seven times out of sixty-three total qualifiers, and they demonstrate tendencies

and patterns of word order and syntax based on their force, elements within the word group, and

the syntax of the governing word group and clause. Within their word group, it is partially

codified that they will follow their referent.[260] For the six qualifier word groups that precede their

referent, two are subjective genitive qualifiers (3:5, 7), two are possessive genitive qualifiers

(1:7, 15), and two are qualifiers with the force of a genitive of association or relationship (1:6,

12).[261] Among these, five of the six consist of a single noun (1:7) or pronoun (1:12, 15; 3:5, 7),[262]

---

[258] Five of the seven relative clause qualifiers follow the governing verb of their surrounding clause (1:3, 11; 2:14; 3:6) and one appears within a paratactic nominal clause (1:2). The sole exception occurs in 3:5, where the relative clause modifies a C-OP that appears before the governing verb in a poetic context, in a context of contrast, and for the purpose of strong emphasis.

[259] Five occur within paratactic clauses (1:1, 3, 11; 3:5, 6) and one occurs within a hypotactic, predicate participle clause (2:14). In every paratactic clause with an expressed predicator, the relative clause qualifier is governed by a verb in the indicative mood (1:11; 3:5, 6).

[260] Forty-one of forty-seven qualifier word groups consisting of a noun and its modifiers follow their referent.

[261] Perkins states that the pronoun αὐτῶν in 1:12 is a possessive genitive modifier (Perkins, *Letters*, 254). It is unlikely, contra Perkins, that the pronoun is implying that the prophet is under the ownership or possession of the larger group. It is also unlikely, with reference to the PP qualifier ἐξ αὐτῶν earlier in the subject word group, that the second αὐτῶν is functioning as another, redundant qualifier with a partitive force. It is more likely, then, that the second αὐτῶν emphasizes the relationship or association of the προφήτης with the larger group, translated best with italics in English as "*their own* prophet." Towner supports this reading, arguing that the αὐτῶν most likely indicates status or membership within the larger group (Towner, *Letters*, 699).

[262] Compare this to only twenty-two of forty-seven total nominal qualifier word group that consist solely of a single noun or pronoun. Furthermore, the two subjective genitive qualifiers that precede their referent are in a context of emphasis (3:5, 7) or contrast (3:5).

and five of the six are within clauses proper (1:6, 12, 15; 3:5, 7).[263] Nominal qualifiers tend to appear within word groups that follow the governing verb as a marginally codified pattern, but do regularly appear also within nominal clauses and in word groups that precede the governing predicator.[264]

The presence of additional modifying elements with nominal qualifier word groups tends to accompany other syntactical factors. For all nominal qualifier word groups, they are only slightly more likely to include additional modifying elements beyond the head noun or pronoun than not.[265] All twelve with the definite article follow their referent as do all thirteen with an additional, embedded qualifier. Eleven of the twelve nominal qualifier word groups with adjectives follow their referent, with the only exception being the word group μιᾶς γυναικός in 1:6.[266] Nominal qualifiers with the article tend to have the force of a subjective genitive or an appositional modifier, as do those with another qualifier embedded with them.[267] Those with

---

[263] This is similar to the overall expectation for nominal qualifiers, as only nine of the forty-seven nominal qualifier word groups occur within a rank-shifted context. One noteworthy factor is that the nominal qualifier, θεοῦ, that precedes its referent in 1:7 is the only time a nominal qualifier appearing in an infinitive clause.

[264] Twenty-nine nominal qualifier word groups are embedded within word groups that follow the predicator, twelve are within nominal clauses with an assumed verbal idea, and six are within word groups that precede their governing predicator.

[265] Twenty-seven or forty-seven nominal qualifier word groups include at least one additional modifier on the head noun or pronoun, including an article, an adjective, or an additional, embedded qualifier word group.

[266] It is codified, then, that nominal qualifiers with additional modifying elements will follow their referent. The lone exception in 1:6 could be due to the type of clause, the force of the qualifier, the presence of the sentence as the beginning of a section, or a combination of a variety of syntactical factors, but it is most likely that the word group order is simply due to lexical concerns or customary syntax. Constructions with ἀνήρ modified by a qualifier with γυνή only include the qualifier before the head noun in the PE (1 Tim. 3:2, 12). This is also the case when the nouns are reversed and ἀνήρ is the qualifier on γυνή as the head noun (1 Tim. 5:9). These examples include the qualifier word group both within a paratactic, imperative clause (1 Tim. 3:12; 5:9) and an infinitive clause (1 Tim. 3:2), as it is here in Titus 1:6. These are the only examples of this construction (μιᾶς γυναικὸς ἀνήρ), however, in the whole of the NT or the LXX. The reverse order of the nouns, however, is found a few places in the LXX (Judg. 18:19; 2 Sam. 17:3; 19:15; Jdt. 14:6), and in those cases the qualifier word groups ἑνὸς ἀνδρός (2 Sam. 17:3) or ἀνδρὸς ἑνός (Judg. 18:19; 2 Sam. 19:15; Jdt. 14:6) follow the referent and never modifies a form of γυνή. Additionally, genitives of relationship modifying ἀνήρ or γυνή elsewhere in the NT always follow their head noun (Luke 16:18; Acts 18:2; 1 Cor. 7:39; Eph. 5:31).

[267] For nominal qualifiers with the definite article on the head noun, six are subjective genitive qualifiers (1:3; 2:5, 10, 11, 13; 3:4) and three are appositional (1:4; 3:6, 13). For those with an embedded qualifier, six are

339

adjectives, however, tend to be objective genitive or subjective genitive qualifiers.[268] Adjectival

modifiers within qualifier word groups tend to be in attributive position as a codified pattern,

equally likely to be in "sandwich" or "repeat" position.[269] Those with adjectives in "repeat"

position only occur with subjective genitive (1:14; 3;5) or objective genitive qualifiers (1:1, 2;

3:7), include every instance where something other than an adjective is nominalized and

functioning adjectivally (1:1, 14), and only occur in qualifier word groups embedded within a C-

DO (1:14) or a C-OP (1:1, 2; 3:5, 7). Those with adjective in "sandwich" position, on the other

hand, never occur within subjective genitive qualifier word groups or C-OPs, only include

adjectives proper, and are found within qualifier word groups with a variety of forces and

surrounding syntactical contexts.[270] The single adjective in predicate position within qualifier

word groups is the adjective σωτήριος in 2:11, which occurs within a subjective genitive

qualifier and has significant variant issues, as discussed above. For the thirteen nominal qualifier

word groups with additional embedded qualifiers within them, there are nineteen embedded

qualifiers across the thirteen word groups. These embedded qualifiers tend to be single pronouns,

nouns, or titles as a marginally codified pattern,[271] tend to be objective genitive qualifiers (1:1, 3,

---

subjective genitive qualifiers (1:1, 3, 2:10, 13; 3:4, 5) and five are appositional (1:1, 4, 12; 2:14).

[268] Five nominal qualifiers with adjectival modifiers are objective genitive qualifiers (1:1, 2; 2:7, 14; 3:7) and three are subjective genitive modifiers (1:14; 2:11; 3:5).

[269] For eleven of the twelve nominal qualifiers with adjectival modifiers, the adjectives are in attributive position. Among those, six are in "sandwich" position and five are in "repeat" position.

[270] Qualifier word groups with attributive adjectives in "sandwich" position function as qualifiers of apposition (1:4, 12), possession (2:13), relationship (1:6), and those with an objective genitive force (2:7, 14). These qualifiers occur most commonly with direct object complement word groups (2:7, 13, 14), but are also found in a subject word group (1:12), an indirect object word groups (1:4), and a complement of a copulative verb (1:6).

[271] Seven qualifiers embedded within nominal qualifiers are single pronouns (1:3, 4, 12; 2:10, 13; 3:4, 6) and seven are either a single noun (1:1, 3; 2:10; 3:4) or the title Ἰησοῦς Χριστός (1:1; 2:13). Those consisting of nouns or the title Ἰησοῦς Χριστός regularly function appositionally and are accompanied by a pronoun serving as a qualifier on the same referent (1:3; 2:10, 13; 3:4).

4; 2:10, 13, 14; 3:4, 6), subjective genitive qualifiers (1:1; 2:13), or appositional qualifiers (1:3;

2:10, 13; 3:4), and almost always occur within a qualifier word group with either a subjective

genitive or an appositional force.[272]

For qualifier word groups in Titus, tendencies of word order and syntax are also evident

according to the force of the qualifier. The most common forces for nominal qualifiers are

subjective genitive qualifiers and appositive qualifiers. For subjective genitive qualifiers, the

word group tends to include additional elements and appear within clauses proper with a similar

ratio as all nominal qualifiers with the exception of the frequency of embedded qualifiers, which

are far more likely within subjective genitive word groups.[273] Subjective genitive qualifiers tend

to follow their referent as a partially codified pattern, with the two exceptions (3:5, 7) both being

single pronouns that modify a definite head noun within a word group functioning as an adjunct

within a poetic context.[274] Like subjective genitive qualifiers, appositive qualifier word groups

tend to include at least one additional modifying element beyond the head noun and appear

within clauses proper, with the same exception, namely, that embedded qualifiers are more

---

[272] Twelve of the thirteen nominal qualifier word group with additional embedded qualifiers are either subjective genitive qualifier word groups (1:1, 3; 2:10, 13; 3:4, 5) or appositional qualifiers (1:1, 4, 12; 2:14; 3:6). The lone exception is the qualifier word group τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in 2:13, which for the current project is rendered as a genitive of possession modifying the head noun τῆς δόξης. While the relationship of Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ as appositional to τῆς δόξης or to τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος has been greatly debated (see Towner, *Letters*, 752–58 or Marshall, *Epistles*, 276–82), it is likely that the qualifier τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος functions as a possessive genitive to τῆς δόξης rather than a subjective genitive or another force of qualifier. This is supported by Perkins, who labels this as a possessive genitive (Perkins, *Letters*, 270), and Greenlee, who lists the idea that the glory belongs to God as the primary interpretive option (Greenlee, *Summary*, 74–75).

[273] Nine of the fourteen subjective genitive qualifier word groups include at least one additional modifying element beyond the head noun or pronoun. Six of the fourteen subjective genitive qualifiers include an embedded qualifier word group (43%), compared to only twelve of forty-seven nominal groups overall (26%) or only six of the thirty-three nominal qualifiers other than subject genitives (18%). Twelve of the fourteen subject genitive qualifiers are in clauses proper (86%) compared with thirty-eight of forty-seven total nominal groups (81%). The other two both appear within the context of the relative clause in 1:3.

[274] One is within an adjunct word directly (3:7), modifying a dative of means, and the other is within a prepositional phrase of standard (3:5).

common than with other forces of qualifier word groups.[275] Appositive qualifiers always follow their referent and tend to modify grammatically definite head nouns as a marginally codified pattern.[276] Objective genitive qualifiers are only slightly less common than subjective or appositive qualifiers, occurring twelve times in Titus. Objective genitive qualifier word groups always follow their referent, never include an embedded qualifier, tend to be embedded within other qualifier groups as a marginally codified pattern,[277] and are exceptionally likely to include an adjectival modifier.[278] Objective genitive qualifiers are equally likely to be pronouns as they are to be nouns with or without modifiers. When the objective genitive is a pronoun, it is always ἡμῶν modifying a definite form of σωτήρ and always embedded within another qualifier. When the objective genitive is a noun, it is almost always accompanied by an adjectival modifier and always modifies a referent that is a single, grammatically indefinite noun.[279]

In addition to the three most common forces of qualifier word groups, other forces do not occur with enough frequency to suggest any definite patterns; some forces do, however, evince potentially significant tendencies when compared with the other PE and letters of the Pauline Corpus. Four of six qualifier word groups appearing within a C-PN are epexegetical qualifiers

---

[275] Eight of the fourteen appositive qualifier word groups includes at least one article, adjective, or embedded qualifier. Five include an embedded qualifier word group (36%). Eleven of fourteen appositive qualifiers appear within clauses proper (79%), which is very similar to the overall likelihood for all nominal groups (81%). The three exceptions all appear within the context of a relative clause (1:3; 2:14; 3:6)

[276] Ten of the fourteen appositive qualifiers modify a common noun with the definite article or a proper noun. One exception, πατρός in 1:4 modifying θεοῦ, is definite in meaning but not grammatically.

[277] Eight of the twelve objective genitive qualifiers are embedded within other qualifier word groups. These tend to be subjective genitive qualifiers (1:3; 2:10; 3:4) or appositive qualifiers (1:1, 4; 2:14; 3:6), but one is also a possessive genitive qualifier (2:13).

[278] Five of the twelve objective genitive qualifier word groups include an adjectival modifier: four include adjectives proper (1:2; 2:7, 14; 3:7) and one includes a nominalized prepositional phrase functioning as an adjective (1:1). The latter is the only time an objective genitive qualifier includes a definite article, serving to nominalize the prepositional phrase. Compared with the likelihood of adjectives for all other nominal qualifier (20%), they are over twice as likely within objective genitive qualifiers (42%).

[279] Only one objective genitive qualifier is a single noun without additional modifiers (θεοῦ in 1:1).

(1:9, 16; 3:1, 8). Epexegetical qualifiers only modify predicate adjectives connected to a copulative verb, with those consisting of a PP as a qualifier preceding their referent (1:16; 3:1) and those consisting of an infinitive clause (1:9) or nominal group (3:8) following their referent. Two PPs of sphere function as qualifier word groups (2:3, 7). They both precede their referent and appear within a C-PN (2:3) or within the second part of an object-complement construction (2:7). The single genitive of relationship qualifier precedes it referent (1:6), as do two of the three genitive of possession qualifier word groups (1:7, 15). The only possessive genitive qualifier that follows its referent is embedded with another qualifier word groups and includes additional qualifiers within it (2:13). The lone partitive PP functioning as a qualifier follows its referent (1:12), as do both PPs of standard that function as qualifiers (1:1, 4).

One final phenomenon to consider when analyzing qualifier word groups is the relationship of the qualifier to its referent with regard to grammatical definiteness. Among the sixty-three qualifier word groups, seventeen are not considered for this grammatical phenomenon as either the qualifier or the referent are grammatically ambiguous for definiteness.[280] For those where grammatical definiteness is unambiguous, it is codified that the qualifier will match the definiteness of the head noun, with twenty instances of a definite qualifier modifying a definite head noun and twenty-two instances of a qualifier matching an indefinite head noun. For the four exceptions to this pattern, all of them follow their referent. Every occurrence in Titus where the noun θεοῦ, without an article, serves as an appositive qualifier to the definite head noun τοῦ σωτῆρος, which itself serves as a subjective genitive qualifier (1:3; 2:10; 3:4), accounts for three of the four exceptions, and the other exception occurs within one of those same examples, where

---

[280] This includes both PPs and relative clauses when they function as qualifiers, as well as predicate adjectives that are modified by a qualifier word group.

the definite qualifier τοῦ σωτῆρος modifies a grammatically indefinite head noun, ἐπιταγήν, which functions as the complement of a PP of standard (1:3). All four exceptions, then, involve a subjective genitive qualifier, and three also include an appositive qualifier. It is codified that a qualifier will modify a head noun that is explicitly definite or indefinite, with only five of sixty-three qualifiers modifying a predicate adjective. When the referent is a predicate adjective, the qualifiers tends to have an epexegetical force and tend to be PPs.[281]

Conclusion: The Linguistic Profile of Titus

Titus evinces patterns of word group order, word order, and syntax along the rank scale, from sections to word groups. These patterns not only assist with text-critical considerations, but help the reader recognize patterns of word order, markedness, and emphasis for interpreting and understanding the letter. In subsequent chapters, the tendencies and patterns presented here will be compared to those of the other PE and select chapters of the NT, which will help establish how these patterns coincide with larger tendencies within NTG. This, in turn, will contribute data for the discussion of register with regard to the PE.

Titus is shorter than the other PE with fewer sections and subsections, but some tendencies with potential impact do occur on the rank of section. Within Titus, section changes always include a change of topic. Furthermore, opening subsections, aside from the salutation, are always paraenetic in force and typically end with a ἵνα clause of purpose. The first sentence for sections typically include an imperative predicator and a rank-shifted clause as part of the complement word group, followed by an explanatory clause with the conjunction γάρ.

---

[281] Four of the five qualifier word groups that modify predicate adjectives have an epexegetical force (1:9, 16; 3:1, 8). The sole exception is a prepositional phrase of sphere functioning as a qualifier (2:3). Three of the five qualifiers modifying predicate adjectives are prepositional phrases (1:16; 2:3; 3:1). The other two are an infinitive clause (1:9) and an nominal clause (3:8) both functioning as epexegetical qualifiers.

Asyndeton is uncommon within sections β and γ as a transitional device but the principal transitional device in sections δ and ε. Second subsections commonly begin with an indicative clause accompanied by γάρ. Subsections, rather than sections, also commonly conclude with an imperative clause or a causal HC-ptc. Finally, the presence of an *inclusio* is common between the first and closing sentences of a section, with the first and final sections, β and ε, showing an *inclusio* with regard to many major themes and semantic chains.

Many patterns and tendencies of syntax, clausal structure, and word group order are demonstrable on the rank of clause according to clause type and mood. For paratactic clauses, verbal mood, complement type, and inter-clausal phenomena impact expected patterns of structure. It is fully codified that imperative paratactic clauses will include an expressed complement word group, although their position in the clause depends on the complement type. It is partially codified that imperative clauses will not include an expressed subject word group; when they are present, their position is not consistent. The position of non-conjunctive adjunct word groups within imperative clauses within the clause shows flexibility, but it is possible that it depends on the tense of the imperative verb. Asyndeton is the most common connective device for imperative clauses.

Paratactic clauses with an indicative verb, other than those functioning as a wish or command, include an expressed complement as a partially codified pattern. Complements within indicative clauses, as a fully codified pattern, will always follow the predicator. Expressed subject word groups tend to follow the predicator unless the subject includes an anaphoric pronoun. Non-conjunctive adjuncts in Titus vary in their patterns according to their type. A-PPs tend to follow expected patterns, but A-Advs only follow the predicator for indicative clauses in Titus. Nominal clauses are not frequent in Titus and they typically show formulaic syntax.

Across all types of paratactic clauses, it is partially codified that a clause with a subject word group will also include a complement word groups. Too few examples of specific connectors and conjunctions occur in Titus for definitive patterns, but some tendencies are extant. Ὡσαύτως accomanies parallel syntax with the previous clause. When used as a conjunction, καί indicates a shared or word group either within the clause or with the previous material. The contrastive δέ always brings a switch in expected word group order, either within the clause or with the previous clause. More than the placement of the clause within a section or subsection transition, contrast commoly causes marked syntax in word group order for paratactic clauses in Titus.

Hypotactic clauses functioning on the rank of clause show patterns of word group order and syntax according to the type and force of the clause. HC-Cjs are the most common type of hypotactic clause in Titus, with a partially codified pattern that the conjunction will be a ἵνα of purpose. All three with other conjunctions are within transitional sentences, within clauses proper, and include aorist verbal forms. The temporal HC-Cjs both precede their governing clause and have hyperbaton within the clause, while the HC-Cj of standard follows its governing clause without hyperbaton. It is fully codified that ἵνα clauses will follow every word group of their governing clause, fully codified that they are the final clause proper of their sentence when within paratactic clauses, and codified that they will be in hypotaxis to clauses proper. It is marginally codified that ἵνα clause will include an expressed complement word group and marginally codified that expressed complements follow the predicator in a P-C clausal structure. Two exceptions to this pattern have hyperbaton, are within final clauses of subsections, and feature a copulative verb within the clause. Subject word groups in ἵνα clauses tend to precede the predicator. A-PPs always follow the predicator while the single dative A-CU and all three

adverbs, functioning as one, compound A-Adv, precede their predicator.

HC-ptcs show patterns based on their force and tense. Most HC-ptcs include present tense participles as a marginally codified pattern, follow their governing clause as a partially codified pattern, and appear within clauses proper as a partially codified pattern. The only HC-ptcs that precede their main clause are aorist participles with the force of being actions connected temporally and theologically with the main governing verb. Present participles serve a variety of functions, while the only perfect tense participle, from the verb οἶδα, has a causal force. Within the HC-ptc, regardless of tense or clause, it is fully codified that the clause will not include an expressed subject word group, codified that it will include an expressed complement word group, and partially codified that it will not include an adjunct word group. Both adjunct word groups within HC-ptcs are the final word group of their clause. It is marginally codified that complements within HC-ptc will follow the predicator in a P-C clausal structure. All exceptions show hyperbaton, giving the clause a [C]-P-[C] structure. With hyperbaton in mind, it is likely fully codified that the natural position for complements within HC-ptcs is following the verb.

Clauses that have been rank-shifted show patterns of clausal structure, word group order, and inter-clausal syntax according to their type and function: infinitive clauses, participle clauses in attributive position, and relative clauses. Infinitive clauses in Titus show consistent word group order and syntax. Sometimes a word group of the infinitive clause precedes the governing verb, but the infinitive itself always follows its governing clause as a fully codified pattern. It is codified that infinitive clauses appear within clauses proper. They are most commonly governing by a verb in the imperative mood and regularly appear in section and subsection transitional sentences. It is codified that infinitive clauses function as or within the complement word of their governing clause. As with the other PE, it is fully codified that infinitive clause will not include a

definite article on the infinitive. The infinitive themselves tend to be in the present tense as a partially codified pattern. It is marginally codified that infinitive clauses will include an expressed complement and, when they do, it is fully codified that the clause will not show a P-C clausal structure. Instead, infinitive clauses with complements either have a C-P or a [C]-P-[C] clausal structure. Those with hyperbaton tend to be compound lists with the primary element before the infinitive and the remainder of the list following. Subject word groups, when expressed, always appear in the primary position within the clause. Adjunct word groups tend to appear in clauses that do not have a complement. The lone A-Adv precedes the infinitive, but every A-PP follows the predicator and tends to be the final element in the infinitive clause.

Participle clauses in attributive position show patterns of word group order and syntax that are consistent both across all attributive participle clauses and according to their force. It is marginally codified that attributive participles will function as part of a C-PN. It is fully codified that attributive participles functioning either as predicate adjectives in a C-PN or as attributive adjectives will follow the predicator. Participles functioning as substantives, however, appear on both sides of the governing verb. Attributive participles are in the present as a partially codified pattern, with all exceptions being in the perfect tense. When an attributive participle clause includes a complement word group, it is marginally codified that it will follow the predicator in a P-C clausal structure. All exceptions to this pattern are predicate adjectives following εἰμί and tend to conclude a list, appear within a transitional sentence, and have hyperbaton, giving a [C]-P-[C] structure. Attributive participle clauses, as a fully codified pattern, never include an expressed subject word group. They rarely include an adjunct word group, as a marginally codified pattern. Furthermore, adjunct word groups only appear within participles within a C-PN. The attributive participle clause with an A-CU including datives of sphere have the adjunct

348

following the participle, as does the clause with a A-PP of advantage with πρός. The clause with an A-PP of manner has the adjunct preceding the participle, contrary to a similar construction in 1 Tim. 2:2. There are some other differences between the participle clauses according to their force. Every substantive participle clause includes a definite article on the participle, as do two of three participle functioning as attributive adjectives. Participles functioning within a C-PN, however, are anarthrous as a fully codified pattern. Substantive participle clauses without an expressed complement always precede their governing predicator; those with complements, however, always follow their predicator and have a P-C structure. Participles functioning as substantives or attributive adjectives with an expressed complement always have a P-C structure with a complement consisting of a single noun or pronoun. Complements within participle clauses functioning as predicate adjectives, however, show more flexibility both with regard to the complement word group's position within the clause and the composition of the complement.

Relative clauses demonstrate tendencies and codified patterns both within their clauses and in relation to their governing clause. Relative clauses, as a partially codified pattern, appear within clauses proper and not within other rank-shifted clauses. It is fully codified that relative clauses, when they modify a discrete referent, follow their referent. Relative clauses, regardless of the word group in which they occur, will not precede their governing predicator as a partially codified pattern. Relative clauses are the most likely clause type to include an aorist verbal form of all clause types on all ranks. Within their governing clause, it is partially codified that relative clauses will appear within a qualifier of a C-OP. Within the relative clause itself, they are the most likely type of clause to include word groups beyond the predicator. Because of the presence of the relative pronoun, which always functions as a non-verbal word group within its own clause, it is fully codified that the relative clause will include an additional word group beyond

the predicator. It is partially codified that they will include a complement word group and at least one another additional word group beyond the predicator. The word group structure of relative clauses largely depends on the function of the relative pronoun. When the relative pronoun is not the complement of its clause, it tends to follow a P-C structure. It is partially codified that relative clauses will include an expressed subject word group. Relative clauses that include a subject word group that does not include the relative pronoun, it will follow a C-P-S structure. Adjunct word groups within relative clauses always follow the predicator, are always accompanied by an expressed complement within the clause, and tend to be the final element in the clause.

Titus also demonstrates consistent tendencies and patters for word order and syntax on the rank of word group within subject, complement, adjunct, and qualifier word groups. Subject word groups feature patterns based on the elements within the word group and the syntax of the governing clause. Definite articles are common within subject word groups. It is partially codified, however, that subject word groups will not include an adjectival modifier and also partially codified that they will not include an embedded qualifier. Compound subject word groups, while not common, tend to include both an article and a qualifier and always include the conjunction καί as a connective device between the compound elements. For those with embedded qualifier word groups, the qualifier tends to follow the head noun, tend to match its referent with regard to definiteness, and tend to modify definite subjects. Subject word groups with qualifiers never appear within rank-shifted clauses. Subject word group do commonly occur within rank-shifted clauses, but those within a rank-shifted context are less likely to include additional elements beyond the head noun or pronoun and more likely to precede the governing verb compared to those within clauses proper.

Complement word groups are the most common word group in Titus, with their tendencies and patterns of word order and syntax based on their function within their clause. C-DOs are the most common function of a complement word group and regularly consist only a single noun, pronoun, or rank-shifted clause. C-DOs with qualifiers tend also to include an adjectival element, regularly appear within compound complements, and tend be within clauses proper. Qualifiers within C-DO always match their referent in relation to definiteness and almost always follow the head noun. When a C-DO includes a definite article, it is marginally codified that it will also include an adjectival modifier or a qualifier word group. When a C-DO includes both the article and an adjective on the head noun, which typically occurs within participle clauses, the adjective will always be in "sandwich" position. Adjectives are the most common for C-DOs within rank-shifted participle clauses and appear with rank-shifted clauses as a marginally codified pattern. When a C-DO includes an adjective in "repeat" position, the complement tends to precede the governing verb, never includes a definite article, and show hyperbaton with higher frequency. C-IOs tend to occur with clauses proper, follow the governing verb, and are either a single pronoun or a noun with a modifier. For C-PNs, it is partially codified that the word group will consist of adjectives, by part of speech, rather than nouns or other nominalized elements. Qualifiers within such complements only modify adjectives, tend to precede their head adjective, and tend to appear within a compound complement word group. C-PN within an infinitive clause always precede the governing and are especially likely to demonstrate hyperbaton. The context of the governing clause also impacts the word group order, as C-PNs within a clause proper tend to follow the governing verb but those within rank-shifted clauses tend to precede them. C-PNs are also the most likely word group to show hyperbaton.

C-OPs are the second most common type of complement word group, showing general

patterns of word order and syntax and those that depend on the force of the PP. When C-OPs include qualifiers, it is partially codified that the word group will only include the head noun and the qualifier. It is codified that qualifiers will follow their head noun and match the definiteness of their head noun. When the complement includes a definite article, it tends to also include an additional modifying element on the head noun, especially adjectives. The only predicate adjective in C-OPs is the adjective πᾶς. When the complement includes an adjectival form of πᾶς, it will always precede an anarthrous head noun and tends to be in a PP that follows its governing verb. Attributive adjectives tend to be in "sandwich" position. When the adjectival modifier is an adjective, according to part of speech, it tends to modify an indefinite head noun. Adjectival modifiers that consist of other parts of speech nominalized to function as adjectives tend, however, to modify definite head nouns. These patterns also vary according to the force of the PP. PPs of destination tend to have a complement consisting of a single noun or pronoun and occur within rank-shifted clauses. PPs of means always include a qualifier in the word group. Qualifiers almost always occur within the C-OP of a PP of standard and tend to be objective or subjective qualifiers. C-OP of PPs of reference tend to be single pronouns or nominalized adjectives. C-OPs of PPs of sphere tend to include an article on the head noun. Finally, C-OPs of temporal PPs always include an adjectival modifier on the head noun.

Adjunct word groups show tendencies of word group order and syntax according to their type and function. Conjunctions, which function as single-word adjunct word groups, do not have any patterns of word order, per se, but they do demonstrate from syntactical tendencies. The most common Cj-H is the ἵνα of purpose as a partially codified pattern. The most common Cj-Ps are δέ and γάρ. Connected to that, the most common purposes of Cj-Ps are to indicate a relationship of contrast or explanation between clauses. The only force of δέ as an adjunct word

group in Titus is that of contrast. Cj-Ps do not occur within a rank-shifted context as a codified pattern, with a single contrastive δέ as the lone exception. Adjunct word groups are also commonly A-Ads and A-CUs The additive καί always follows its governing verb in Titus. A-Advs derived from adjectives, ending in –ως, precede and follow the predicator with equal frequency and tend to be in clauses that also have an A-PP modifying the same predicator. Other A-Advs, by part of speech, both precede and follow the governing predicator. A-CUs always include the head noun in the dative case, tend to follow the governing verb, and tend to include a definite article on the head noun. It is marginally codified that A-Advs and A-CUs will appear within clauses proper.

A-PPs are the most common type of adjunct word groups and, in addition to the word order of the C-OP, they display patterns of syntax according to their force. A-PPs, when considered altogether, tend to follow their governing verb as a marginally codified pattern. Exceptions to this pattern include those with the force of basis or cause, but not those with a temporal force. Typically, when those with another force precede the governing predicator, such as the forces of reference or standard, the word group order is likely due to the context of a section or subsection transition or a poetic context. Unlike other types of adjuncts, A-PPs are more often than not within a rank-shifted clause, especially relative and infinitive clauses. Those with the forces of advantage, destination, and reference are especially likely to appear within a rank-shifted context. Whether the primary factor is the force of the PP or the rank-shifted context, it is much more likely that an A-PP within a rank-shifted clause will follow its governing verb compared to those within clauses proper, giving a partially codified pattern that A-PPs in rank-shifted clauses will follow their governing predicator.

Like other word groups, the qualifier word group in Titus also demonstrates patterns of

word order and syntax according to the type and force of the qualifier, in addition to the larger

clausal context. PPs, when functioning as qualifier word groups, follow their referent within

paratactic clauses but precede their referent within participle and infinitive clauses. The

placement of the PP qualifier in relation to its referent also possibly depends on the function of

the referent's word group within the clause and the force of the PP serving as the qualifier. It is

notable that PP qualifiers have a variety of forces, compared to the other PE, and appear on both

sides of their governing predicator. Relative clauses, as a marginally codified pattern, serve as

qualifier word groups. When they serve as qualifiers, relative clauses are always adjectival in

force and always follow their referent. Additionally, they tend to follow the predicator of the

governing clause and appear within clauses proper, not other rank-shifted clauses.

The most common type of qualifier word group are those consisting of nominal groups,

typically with the head noun in the genitive case. The elements within the word group, the force

of the qualifier, and the context of the surrounding clause all contribute to their patterns of

expected word order and syntax. It is partially codified that such qualifiers follow their referent.

Exceptions tend to be single nouns or pronouns and within clauses proper. When the qualifier

includes additional modifiers beyond a single noun or pronoun, it is codified that it will follow

the referent. Those with articles tend to be a subjective genitive or appositional in force.

Subjective genitive and appositional qualifiers are also the most likely forces of qualifier to

include an embedded qualifier. Qualifier word groups that are embedded within nominal

qualifier word groups are almost always subjective genitive, objective genitive, or appositional in

force. Objective genitive qualifiers, in contrast, never include an embedded qualifier but are far

more likely to include an adjectival modifier. Nominal qualifiers with adjectives, however, tend

to be subjective or objective genitive in force. Adjectives within nominal qualifiers are

attributive adjectives as a codified pattern. Their word order, namely, being in "sandwich" or "repeat" position, depends on the force of the qualifier and the role of the governing word group within its clause. There are some other possible tendencies on the basis of the force of the qualifier. Epexegetical qualifiers only modify adjectives in a C-PN and their position relative to their referent varies according to the type of qualifier. PPs of sphere, when functioning as a qualifier, precede their referent, as do those with an epexegetical force. Those with other forces, however, follow their referent. Genitives of relationship and possession also tend to precede their referent in Titus. Finally, it is codified that nominal qualifiers, as a whole, will match the definiteness of their head noun. All exceptions involve a subjective genitive qualifier, occur within qualifiers that follow their referent, and tend to also include an appositive qualifier.

CHAPTER FIVE

COMPARING THE PROFILES OF THE PASTORAL EPISTLES

This chapter will advance this project in two significant ways. First, the linguistic profiles of the PE, constructed in the second through fourth chapters, will be compared to one another along the rank scale, noting both similarities and differences among them. This will include patterns in which all three PE agree, patterns in which two of the PE agree over against the third, and patterns in which all three differ. Following this, the second step will be to construct a singular profile for the PE as a whole, which will then be used in chapter six for comparison with the selected, external chapters of the NT. On the basis of the similarities and differences of the profiles of the PE in themselves, some initial conclusions and observations will also be made.

A Comparison of the Pastoral Epistles

The first major task of this chapter is to compare the linguistic profiles of the PE with one another downward along the rank scale. While, as has been argued above, the profile for each work is helpful for analysis of each letter in itself, this chapter will demonstrate where the profiles show both similarity and difference with one another as a first step toward testing the method used in this project for larger questions of NTG syntax and the possibility of inter-textual comparison. Phenomena for which all three PE disagree or have differing patterns, for example, are likely not indicative of larger syntax patterns. On the other hand, phenomena for which all three PE show consistency are possibly indicative of larger syntax patterns, especially as other NT documents of different genres and registers show similarity and difference with regard to those patterns as found in the PE.

The Rank of Section

The syntax of sections, subsections, and the transitional devices between them shows both similarity and difference among the PE. For 1 Timothy, five of six body sections have a paraenetic or imperative context for the opening paratactic clause.[1] For five of them, the opening sentence is also followed by a sentence of explanation or rationale.[2] For 2 Timothy, three of four body sections also have a paraenetic or imperative context for the opening sentence.[3] Two sectional transitions include a sentence of explanation, with γάρ, following the opening sentence (2 Tim. 3:2; 4:10). Similarly, for Titus three of the four body sections open with an imperative, paratactic clause, while the fourth has an indicative verb but a paraenetic context.[4] Three such sectional transitions in Titus also include an explanatory sentence, with γάρ, following the first sentence (Titus 1:7; 3:3, 12).[5] Section openings, then, are similar across the PE, giving a partially codified pattern that a section will open with an imperative or paraenetic sentence and a marginally codified pattern that the second sentence of a section will have an explanatory force. For 2 Timothy and Titus, the opening sentence also tends to include a rank-shifted clause as the

[1] This is the case for sections β, γ, ε, ζ, and η in 1 Timothy. Section δ opens instead with a formulaic, nominal clause, followed by an explanatory conditional sentence. The following sentence, beginning in 3:3, does have the impersonal δεῖ, giving an imperative context.

[2] This is the case for sections β, γ, δ, ε, and η in 1 Timothy. The opening subsection of ζ is a single sentence, followed by another command in the opening sentence of ζ-2.

[3] This is the case for sections γ, δ, and ε in 2 Timothy. Section β begins with an indicative clause of thanksgiving. The second subsection, β-2, opens with a paraenetic clause and is followed by an explanatory clause with γάρ (2 Tim. 1:6–7).

[4] Sections γ, δ, and ε have an imperative verb in the first sentence of the section. For section ε, the imperative clause is preceded by a temporal, hypotactic clause (3:12), while the other sections open with the paratactic clause itself. The first main body section, β, opens with an indicative clause, but the sentence includes instructions for Titus to complete (1:5-6).

[5] The second sentence of section β is an clause with γάρ and the impersonal verb δεῖ. The sentence does have an imperative context, but gives the information as a means of explaining the necessity of the instructions in Titus 1:5-6.

complement as a marginally codified pattern.[6] First Timothy, however, only includes a rank-

shifted clause as the complement for one opening sentence of a section (1 Tim. 2:1–2). Sections

in 1 Timothy and 2 Timothy typically end with either an explanatory sentence, with γάρ or ὅτι,

or an indicative, expository sentence, yielding a partially codified pattern.[7] Titus does end one

section with an expository sentence (Titus 1:16), but more often concludes a section with an

imperative clause (Titus 2:15; 3:10–11, 15).[8] Every section in 1 Timothy ends with an *inclusio*,

as do three of the four sections in 2 Timothy and two of four sections in Titus, yielding a

partially codified pattern overall,[9] and the final section of the letter serves an *inclusio*, linking

back semantically and thematically to the opening section of the letter, for all three PE.

Asyndeton is the most common connector for section transitions in the PE, occurring for six of

the fourteen total sectional transitions. Both letters of Timothy use οὖν (1 Tim. 2:1; 2 Tim. 2:1)

and an anaphoric demonstrative pronoun (1 Tim. 3:14; 6:2c; 2 Tim. 2:1) as connectors; Titus, by

contrast, includes a cataphoric demonstrative pronoun in the opening sectional transition (Titus

1:5), only using an anaphoric demonstrative pronoun as a connector for the penultimate sentence

of section γ (Titus 2:15) and the second sentence of subsection δ-3 (Titus 3:8). Second Timothy

and Titus both use the conjunction δέ as a connector for section transitions (2 Tim. 3:1; Titus

---

[6] Three of four opening sentences include either a relative clause (2 Tim. 1:3; 2:2) or an appositive ὅτι clause (2 Tim. 3:1) as the complement within 2 Timothy, while three of four opening sentences in Titus include a relative clause (Titus 2:1) or an infinitive clause (3:1–2, 12) as the complement.

[7] With both 1 and 2 Timothy, nine of ten sections end with either a sentence of exposition (1 Tim. 1:18–20; 2:15; 2 Tim. 1:18; 2:24–26; 4:8, 21) or explanation with γάρ or ὅτι (1 Tim. 3:13; 4:16; 6:2). The only exception is found in 1 Tim. 6:20–21, where the final sentence of the main body, before the closing benediction, in a final command.

[8] It is worth noting that within the final greetings, 2 Timothy includes the imperative clause, of those Timothy should greet, before the indicative clause stating whose greetings are being shared (2 Tim. 4:19–21), while this order is switched for Titus, ending with the imperative clause (Titus 3:15).

[9] While two of the four sections of Titus end with an *inclusio*, as noted above, they are not as strongly connected, semantically, as those in 1 and 2 Timothy.

2:1) while 1 Timothy only includes δέ for subsection transitions (1 Tim. 1:8; 4:1; 6:11). The force of δέ, however, is not the same between them.[10] First Timothy, as a unique feature among the PE, includes a consistent, lexical difference between section and subsection transitions. Section transitions are often signaled by a word form of παρακαλέω (1 Tim. 1:3; 2:1; 5:1; 6:2c) and paraenetic subsection transitions use a word from of παραγγέλλω (1 Tim. 1:18; 4:11; 6:17).

In addition to sectional transitions and syntax, there are both differences and similarities among the PE in how they structure subsections and transition between them. Within Titus, the opening subsection always functions as paraenesis, followed by a second subsection largely comprised of exposition. Second Timothy does have this same pattern, with two sections opening with a paraenetic initial subsection (γ and ε), but also with subsections of thanksgiving (β) or expositional warning (δ).[11] Second subsections in 2 Timothy are either comprised of exhortation (β-2, γ-2) or recollection (δ-2, ε-2). First Timothy aligns generally with 2 Timothy. Initial subsections in 1 Timothy also have multiple types of content, including paraenesis (β-1, γ-1, ζ-1), exposition (δ-1, ε-1), and warning (η-1), with five of six second subsections comprised of commands or exhortation.[12]

Asyndeton is the most common connective device for subsections in 1 Timothy, occurring for nine of twenty total transitions; it typically appears within the first and final sections[13] and is usually accompanied by imperative or exhortative verbs.[14] Within 1 Timothy, the anaphoric

---

[10] Second Timothy 3:1 uses δέ with a primarily transitional force, while Titus 2:1 uses δέ to highlight the contrast between the false teachers and what Titus is charged to teach.

[11] Subsection δ-1 does opening with an imperative clause, but the content of the subsection is informational in nature, not imperatival.

[12] The only exception to this in 1 Timothy is subsection β-2, which is exposition.

[13] Eight of nine uses of asyndeton for a subsection transition are in chapters 1, 5 and 6 of 1 Timothy.

[14] Of the nine subsections that begin with asyndeton, all six within the final two sections are explicitly with imperative verbs (1 Tim. 5:1, 3, 17: 6:1, 17, 20) and two others are with an indicative (1 Tim. 1:18) or a nominal

demonstrative pronoun is also a regular connective device, appearing five times for both section (1 Tim. 3:14; 6:2c) and subsection transitions (1 Tim. 4:6, 11; 6:11).[15] The conjunction δέ is used for three subsection transitions in 1 Timothy (1 Tim. 1:8; 4:1; 6:11). It is always the second subsection of a larger section and its force can be contrastive (1 Tim. 1:8; 6:11) or transitional (1 Tim. 4:1). Finally, the conjunction οὖν is used twice in 1 Timothy (1 Tim. 2:1, 8) with a continuative function, transitioning from the opening section to the main content of the letter.

Asyndeton is also the most common connective device for subsection transitions in 2 Timothy, used for eight of the fourteen total transitional sentences, and, like 1 Timothy, typically within the first and final chapters of the letter.[16] Asyndeton does appear with imperative verbs (2 Tim. 2:8; 4:9, 19) and a verb of exhortation (2 Tim. 4:1) like 1 Timothy, but also with indicative clauses giving thanksgiving (2 Tim. 1:3) or recollection (2 Tim. 1:15; 4:14, 16). The anaphoric demonstrative pronoun and the conjunction δέ both appear as connective devices for subsection transitions. The anaphoric demonstrative is used twice, both for a section (2 Tim. 2:1–2)[17] and a subsection transition (2 Tim. 2:14), and appears with an imperative verb for both occurrences. Unlike 1 Timothy, however, a cataphoric demonstrative is used for a section transition in 2 Tim. 3:1 and a subsection transition in 2 Tim. 1:15. The pronoun precedes its governing verb in an imperative clause (2 Tim. 3:1) but follows it in an indicative clause (2 Tim. 1:15).[18] The conjunction δέ is used for both section (2 Tim. 3:1) and subsection transitions (2 Tim. 2:22; 3:10), with both a contrastive (2 Tim. 3:10) and a transitional force (2 Tim. 2:22; 3:1). The

---

clause (1 Tim. 3:1), but with paraenetic content within the subsection.

[15] Three times it appears with an imperative verb (1 Tim. 4:11; 6:2c, 11).

[16] Seven of the eight uses of asyndeton within transitional sentences are in chapters 1 and 4 of 2 Timothy.

[17] The second clause in 2 Tim. 2:2, after the pendant relative clause, opens with "ταῦτα παράθου…"

[18] Both anaphoric demonstrative pronouns, when used as connective devices for transitional sentences, appears before their governing, imperative verbs.

conjunction οὖν appears one time in 2 Tim. 2:1 and, like 1 Timothy, signals the movement from the opening section, β, to the main instructive content of the letter. Unlike 1 Timothy, however, οὖν does not serve a continuative function but mainly a transitional one.

Asyndeton is a common connective device between subsections in Titus, appearing for four of nine total transitions (Titus 3:1, 8, 12, 15) and only in the final chapter of the letter. It appears with both imperative (Titus 3:1; 12) and indicative clauses (Titus 3:8, 15).[19] The anaphoric demonstrative pronoun is never used for section or subsection transitions in Titus, unlike 1 and 2 Timothy, but Titus does include a cataphoric demonstrative pronoun in the opening sentence of the main body of the letter in Titus 1:5. Unlike 2 Timothy, however, it is the first word of the sentence. The conjunction δέ is only used one time in Titus for transitional sentence; it appears within the section transition in Titus 2:1 with a contrastive force. Unlike 1 and 2 Timothy, the conjunction γάρ is used for every second subsection transition except one (Titus 1:10; 2:11; 3:3).

Subsection conclusions show some similarity but great difference between the PE. Subsections in Titus end with a command as a marginally codified pattern, occurring for six of nine subsections (Titus 2:9–10; 15; 3:1–2, 10–11, 14, 15).[20] Two other common phenomena for subsection conclusions in Titus are hyperbaton with a copulative verbal form, which occurs three times (Titus 1:9,[21] 16; 3:7), and a ἵνα clause as the final clause, which occurs four times (Titus 1:9; 2:10; 3:7, 3:14). Three of four opening subsections end with a ἵνα clause (Titus 1:9; 2:10; 3:14) and the only exception is where the opening subsection is a single sentence (Titus 3:1–2),

---

[19] The clause in Titus 3:8 is nominal, but with an implied indicative copula.

[20] This considers the final benediction in Titus 3:15 outside of the main body proper of the letter. Also, the imperative verb παρακάλει is elided in Titus 2:9–10 but assumed from Titus 2:6.

[21] The hyperbaton in this case occurs for the C-PN, where the predicate adjective serving properly as the C-PN precedes the governing predicator while a compound infinitive clause functioning as a qualifier follows the govering verb.

in which case the second subsection ends with a ἵνα clause (Titus 3:7). Subsection conclusions in

2 Timothy end most commonly with exposition, which occurs seven times (2 Tim. 1:3–5, 18;

2:21; 3:16–17; 4:8, 18, 21), or explanatory clauses with γάρ, which occurs four times (2 Tim.

2:7, 13; 3:9; 4:15). Four of the seven final expository sentences conclude also with a relative

clause (2 Tim. 1:3–5, 18; 3:9; 4:18). While commands are not as common as they are in Titus,

only concluding subsections three times (2 Tim. 1:14; 2:24–26; 4:13),[22] hyperbaton in a C-PN (2

Tim. 2:24–26; 3:9) does also occur for two subsection conclusions in 2 Timothy. First Timothy

shows similarities to both 2 Timothy and Titus, but aligns closer with 2 Timothy. Expository

sentences are the most common type of sentence to conclude a subsection, occurring for eight of

the twenty subsections within the main body (1 Tim. 1:5–7, 8–11, 17, 18–20; 2:5–7, 15; 3:16;

5:25). Five of those final expository sentences end with a relative clause (1 Tim. 1:5–7, 8–11,

18–20; 2:5–7; 3:16), similar to 2 Timothy. Subsections concluding with explanatory sentences

and with sentences expressing a command or wish are equally common in 1 Timothy, occurring

six times each. Such explanatory sentences are introduced by γάρ on five occasions (1 Tim. 3:13;

4:5, 10, 16; 6:10) and ὅτι once (6:2). Such paraenetic sentences include an explicit, imperative

verb four times (1 Tim. 5:1–2, 16; 6:17–19, 20–21), the impersonal verb δεῖ expressing

expectations once (1 Tim. 3:7), and an indicative verb expressing a wish on one occasion (1 Tim.

6:13–16). It is slightly less common than Titus and does not only occur for initial subsections,

but four subsections of 1 Timothy conclude with a ἵνα clause as the final clause proper (1 Tim.

1:20; 3:7; 5:16; 6:19), with three of four of those being paraenetic sentences. Similar to both 2

Timothy and Titus, hyperbaton regularly occurs at the end of subsections, both for first (γ-1, δ-1)

---

[22] Two of these are explicit, imperative verbal forms (1:14; 4:13), while the other is a sentence with the impersonal δεῖ giving paraenetic material (2:24–26).

362

and final subsections (δ-2, ε-4, ζ-4). The hyperbaton occurs within two C-PNs (1 Tim. 2:7;[23] 6:2), two C-DOs (1 Tim. 3:13; 4:16), and one C-OP (1 Tim. 3:7), showing more flexibility than the other PE.

The Rank of Clause

The PE show similarity and difference in the clausal structure, word group order, and syntax of clauses, according to clause type, the mood and force of the clause, and other syntactical factors.

Paratactic Imperative Clauses

It is partially codified in 1 Timothy and 2 Timothy that paratactic imperative clauses will have an expressed complement word group and fully codified in Titus. For all three PE, the position of the complement word group depends on the type of complement. In 1 Timothy, compound complements, complements consisting of an infinitive clause, and complements with an embedded relative clause follow the predicator in a codified pattern, while complements consisting of a single noun or nominal group precede the predicator as a marginally codified pattern. The context of contrast or a sectional transition are the typical reason when this pattern is not followed. Similarly, in 2 Timothy compound complements and complement word groups consisting of a rank-shifted clause follow the predicator as a codified pattern, while those

---

[23] This example might not be considered hyperbaton in the proper sense, in that the aside that interrupts the syntax pertains specifically either anaphorically to the noun ἀπόστολος (Knight, *Epistles*, 126) or cataphorically to the noun διδάσκολος (Marshall, *Epistles*, 434 and Towner, *Letters*, 188) and not to the C-PN as a whole. This project interprets the aside as pertaining to the noun ἀπόστολος due to the consistent defense of Paul's apostleship throughout the Pauline Corpus, even in the opening salutations (1 Cor. 1:1; 2 Cor. 1:1; Gal. 1:1; Eph. 1:1; Col. 1:1; 1 Tim. 1:1; 2 Tim. 1:1). As such, this aside could be considered similarly to a qualifier that follows its referent and thereby does not create hyperbaton by interrupting the word group. It does, however, interrupt the syntax of the word group, assuming that the asyndetic διδάσκολος is part of the C-PN proper and not merely an appositive (contra Perkins, *Letters*, 37). This interruption does create a staccato-like break in the word group that changes the syntax from the two nouns joined by καί to a final noun in asyndeton and allows the final element to be modified by multiple qualifiers while emphazing the second element, ἀπόστολος.

consisting of a single noun or nominal precede the predicator as a partially codified pattern. When these patterns are not followed in 2 Timothy, it is either due to contrast or for emphasizing a particular element. Titus does not have enough examples to conclude any patterns about the placement of the complement word group within paratactic imperative clauses, but their placement generally aligns with 1 and 2 Timothy. Five of six complements consisting of single pronouns or nominal groups precede the predicator, and all six complements that include a rank-shifted clause follow the predicator. The cause for the single abrogation of this pattern, found in Titus 1:13b–14, is not clear.

For all three PE, expressed subject and adjunct word groups are not as common as complement word group, but there are some evident patterns for them. In 1 Timothy it is partially codified that imperative clauses will not include an expressed subject. When they do, it is partially codified that they will appear with third person verbal forms and that they will precede the predicator. The singular exception occurs within the context of a subsection transition. It is codified in 2 Timothy that imperative clauses will not include an expressed subject. When they do, like 1 Timothy, they precede the predicator. But, unlike 1 Timothy, they are always second person pronouns that appear within the context of contrast or a transition. It is partially codified in Titus that imperative clauses will not include an expressed subject. Titus shows some similarity to 1 Timothy in that two of the three subjects are with third person verbal forms and that one of three follows the predicator. Furthermore, they always appear within the context of a section or subsection transition. Adjunct word groups are slightly more common than expressed subjects for all three PE. Their syntax appears to vary according to their type and force but not with enough examples to conclude any patterns. Temporal adjuncts for imperative clauses in 1 Timothy tend to precede the predicator, with the sole exception occurring within a

context of contrast. A-PPs tend to follow the predicator, but that tendency depends on a single clause with five PPs of reference in immediate succession. In 2 Timothy, however, adjunct word groups always appear in the final position of the imperative clause, giving a fully codified pattern, regardless of their type or force. In Titus, the position of adjuncts is more variegated, similar to 1 Timothy. For examples, A-PPs of manner follow the predicator, while A-Advs of manner both precede and follow.

Other syntactical factors show similarity and variation among the PE within imperative clauses, including the tense of the predicator and the connecters that are used. It is codified in 1 Timothy and partially codified in Titus that expressed, imperative verbs in paratactic clauses are in the present tense, while 2 Timothy has more aorist tense imperative forms than those in the present tense. Aorist imperative verbs in 1 Timothy and Titus only occur in the final section of the letter, where the author gives specific, personal commands to the recipient. In 2 Timothy, both aorist tense and present tense imperative verbs occur in all sections of the main body. Second Timothy does include more personal instruction to Timothy himself throughout the letter rather than commands that apply to church-wide teaching and conduct, but, at the same time, personal commands that only apply to Timothy are also found in both tenses. For all three PE, asyndeton is the most common connective device for imperative clauses, occurring for over half of all paratactic imperative clauses. The second commonest connector for imperative clauses, for all three PE, is the conjunction δέ, typically to indicate contrast. Beyond those two, other connective devices differ between the PE. In 1 Timothy, the anaphoric demonstrative pronoun, ταῦτα, is used as a connective device for imperative clauses almost as often as δέ is used, and it also appears both in the plural and singular form in 2 Timothy four times. Titus, however, does not use the anaphoric demonstrative pronoun as a connective device in imperative clauses. The

logical conjunction οὖν is used for two compound, imperative clauses in 2 Timothy, but it does not appear within imperative clauses in 1 Timothy or Titus.

In addition to paratactic clauses with explicit, imperative verbs, the PE include other paratactic clauses with an indicative verbal form that carries the force of a command or paraenesis, including five clauses with the impersonal δεῖ and twelve clauses with an indicative verb expressing the author's strong wish or desire.[24] In 1 Timothy and Titus the clauses with δεῖ follow a P-S clausal structure within the context of presenting expectations for church leadership. In 2 Timothy, both paratactic clauses with δεῖ exhibit hyperbaton in an [S]-P-[S] clausal structure, but in both cases the subjective infinitive itself does follow the predicator and they occur within the author's personal instructions to Timothy rather than church-wide instruction. Other clauses expressing a wish or desire always have an expressed complement word group as a fully codified pattern across all the PE. Both such clauses in 2 Timothy and the single such clause in Titus have the complement following the predicator in a P-C structure, while only five of nine have a P-C clausal structure in 1 Timothy, yielding a marginally codified pattern for the PE overall. While there are not enough examples to determine a pattern, the position of the complement for wish or desires clauses in 1 Timothy tends to follow the pattern set by imperative clauses, with single nominal groups usually before the predicator and compound complements and those consisting of rank-shifted clauses following the predicator.[25] There are eight paratactic clauses in the PE with an indicative verb expressing a desire or wish that include

---

[24] There are multiple clauses, typically with ὡσαύτως, that assume either the verb δεῖ or a paraenetic verbal form (1 Tim. 2:9–10; 3:11). This only considers those paratactic clauses with expressed predicators.

[25] One exception is a compound infinitive complement with the first infinitive before the predicator and a second following in hyperbaton within a context of contrast (1 Tim. 2:12) and the other is an infinitive clause consisting of a single word (1 Tim. 5:11).

a non-conjunctive adjunct word group. All but one of these is an A-PP and six of them have the adjunct following the predicator. The two that precede the predicator are an A-PP of reference with περί in Titus 3:8 and an A-PP of cause with διά in 2 Tim. 1:6. It is common for A-PPs with such forces to precede the predicator, so their position is not necessarily marked.[26] One noteworthy feature is that three adjuncts are locative A-PPs with ἐνώπιον, all three of which lie between the predicator and the C-DO in a P-A-C structure (1 Tim. 5:21; 6:13–16; 2 Tim. 4:1).[27]

Paratactic Indicative Clauses and Nominal Clauses

Many syntactical features are similar for paratactic clauses with an expressed, indicative verb across the PE, with a few that do significantly differ. It is marginally codified for 1 and 2 Timothy that paratactic indicative clauses will include an expressed complement word group and partially codified for Titus. It is marginally codified in 1 Timothy that complements will precede the predicator, generally depending on complement type in a similar way to imperative clauses differing with regard to compound complements. Paratactic indicative clauses in 2 Timothy are equally likely to have clauses with a C-P structure as they are to have clauses with a P-C structure. Compound complements differ from 1 Timothy and the complement type does not appear to impact clausal syntax with the same consistency. Titus, unlike both 1 and 2 Timothy, shows a fully codified P-C pattern, with the complement always following the predicator in paratactic indicative clauses.

Expressed subject word groups are common for paratactic indicative clauses for all three PE, though not enough to yield a pattern. For 1 Timothy, it is partially codified that the subject

---

[26] See, for example, 1 Tim. 1:19 or 6:21 for PPs of reference with περί and 2 Tim. 2:10 or Titus 1:13 for the causal force of διά.

[27] In 1 Tim. 6:13–16 there is also a C-IO that appears immediately after the predicator, so the fuller structure is P-[C-IO]-A-[C-DO] in that case.

will precede the predicator, with exceptions for contrast, formulaic syntax, the presence of relative clauses, or sectional transitions. For 2 Timothy, it is only marginally codified that the subject will precede the predicator, but with similar exceptions to 1 Timothy, most notably with apparently formulaic syntax of ὁ κύριος with a future indicative verbal form. Within Titus, unlike 1 and 2 Timothy, expressed subject word groups tend to follow the predicator in paratactic indicative clauses, with exceptions only occurring when the subject word group includes an anaphoric, demonstrative pronoun.[28] Non-conjunctive adjuncts regularly appear within paratactic indicative clauses, with a few tendencies and patterns therein according to their type and force. For 1 Timothy, A-Advs always precede the verb. The genitive A-CU, functioning as a temporal adjunct, appears after the predicator (1 Tim. 5:5). It is partially codified that A-PPs in paratactic indicative clauses will follow the predicator, with exceptions being for a causal PP with διά (1 Tim. 1:6), a purpose PP with εἰς (1 Tim. 4:10), and a PP of sphere with ἐν in a context of contrast (1 Tim. 2:14). Second Timothy shows great similarity to 1 Timothy for non-conjunctive adjuncts in paratactic indicative clauses. It is fully codified that A-Advs precede their governing verb, regardless of force. Aside from two accusative A-CUs (2 Tim. 3:8; 4:8), there are no other A-CUs within paratactic indicative clauses. A-PPs, as a marginally codified pattern, follow their governing verb. Consistent exceptions to this pattern occur for causal phrases with διά (2 Tim. 1:12; 2:10) and phrases with ἐπί taking an accusative object indicating destination or purpose (2 Tim. 2:16; 4:4).[29] Titus shows similarity to 1 and 2 Timothy with regard to A-PPs and likely also

---

[28] While not enough to constitute a pattern, six of eight paratactic indicative clauses with expressed subjects have the subject following the predicator.

[29] There are also two phrases of ἐπί with an accusative object where the phrase appears after the predicator (2 Tim. 3:9, 13). In both cases, however, the clause includes a context of contrast with no other elements of the syntax in marked or unexpected positions, suggesting that the placement of the prepositional phrase is likely due to contrast and that the expected placement is likely before the predicator.

A-CUs, but differs in its syntax of A-Advs in paratactic indicative clauses.[30] A-Advs follow their predicator in all three instances, including a temporal adverb (Titus 3:3) and two additive uses of καί (Titus 1:10; 3:3).

Three other phenomena with significance for paratactic indicative clauses in the PE are the use of connectors and conjunctions, the presence of the clause within a compound or complex sentence, and the placement of the clause at the end of a section or subsection. For 1 Timothy, it is always the case that a paratactic indicative clause, when placed at the end of a section or subsection, will include marked syntax of some kind. Paratactic indicative clauses in 2 Timothy also show irregularities in syntax when they conclude a section or subsection, but not as fully as 1 Timothy.[31] Titus, on the other hand, does not regularly have marked syntax in indicative clauses that conclude sections and subsections. The only counterexample is the dative A-CU in Titus 1:16; the placement of this adjunct is likely due to contrast, however, not the context of transition. It is marginally codified in both 1 and 2 Timothy that paratactic indicative clauses are part of a compound or complex sentence. In Titus, however, it is marginally codified that paratactic indicative clauses will be simple sentences. Finally, the use of connective devices in 2 Timothy and Titus show similarity over against 1 Timothy. For all three PE, the conjunction γάρ is either the second commonest connective device for paratactic indicative clauses or the most

---

[30] A-PPs precede their predicator more than they follow, but this is due to the force of the A-PP and clausal syntax. Two A-PPs of means (3:5) and location (1:5) are in expected position after their predicator and one causal A-PP with χάριν precedes the predictor (1:5). Two A-PPs precede the predicator in marked position: one of basis with ἐκ and one of standard with κατά in 3:5. In this case, both phrases are strongly emphasized, within a context of contrast, and with within a poetic section. It is likely, then, that Titus follows the same syntax with A-PPs as 1 and 2 Timothy. The sole A-CU, a dative word group of means in Titus 1:16, does appear before the predicator in unexpected or marked position, but this, also, is likely due to the direct contrast of its clause with the previous one.

[31] On the rare occasion that the indicative clause does not show marked syntax, the marked syntax is within a hypotactic clause (2 Tim. 3:17) or an embedded, rank-shifted clause (2 Tim. 2:13) instead of the main clause itself.

common alongside another connective device.[32] Where they differ, however, is in their use of asyndeton and the conjunction δέ. For both 2 Timothy and Titus, the most common connective device for paratactic indicative clauses is asyndeton, occurring twenty-three times in 2 Timothy and five times in Titus.[33] The conjunction δέ, however, is only used in this way ten times for 2 Timothy and twice for Titus. In 1 Timothy, the conjunction δέ is the most common connective device, occurring sixteen times in the letter. Asyndeton only occurs six times, by contrast, for paratactic indicative clauses in 1 Timothy.[34]

Nominal clauses, while appearing to operate differently between 1 Timothy and the other PE, are likely consistent across all three letters. Aside from the opening greeting and the closing benediction, Titus only has three paratactic, nominal clauses. Two occur in one, compound sentence in Titus 1:15 and both have an S-C structure. The other example is found in Titus 3:8 with a C-S structure, but has formulaic syntax. Second Timothy, similarly, includes four paratactic nominal clauses in the main body. Three of those four show an S-C structure; the only exception, found in 2 Tim. 2:11, shows the same formula as Titus 3:8. One difference, however, is that in Titus both of the S-C clauses include a non-conjunctive adjunct, while no nominal clause in 2 Timothy includes such as adjunct. First Timothy includes eleven paratactic nominal clauses in the main body, with six showing a C-S structure, four showing an S-C structure, and one only including a subject word group. Those with a C-S structure, however, are formulaic in syntax (1 Tim. 1:15; 3:1; 4:9), a benediction (1 Tim. 1:17), or poetic with seemingly formulaic

---

[32] The conjunction γάρ is the second most common connective device in both 1 and 2 Timothy, occurring eleven times in paratactic indicative clauses for 1 Timothy and thirteen for 2 Timothy. Asyndeton and γάρ both occur five times for paratactic indicative clauses in Titus.

[33] Five of the twenty-three uses of asyndeton in 2 Timothy include the apodosis of a conditional sentence. While technically asyndeton, the syntactical connection between the two clauses is given by the syntax of the conditional sentence.

[34] As with 2 Timothy, though, three of those six uses of asyndeton are the apodoses of conditional sentences.

syntax (1 Tim. 2:5). So, while 1 Timothy statistically has more nominal clauses with a C-S structure, it is likely that S-C is the normal structure for non-formulaic clauses. Like 2 Timothy, also, 1 Timothy rarely includes a non-conjunctive adjunct in nominal clauses, with only two of eleven including either an A-PP (1 Tim. 1:17) or an additive καί (1 Tim. 5:25).

Hypotactic Clauses on the Rank of Clause

There are consistent and divergent patterns of syntax and word group order for hypotactic clauses in the PE that remain on the rank of clause. These vary according to the type and force of the clause. For both 1 Timothy and Titus, it is partially codified that HC-Cjs include the conjunction ἵνα to indicate purpose, while 2 Timothy only uses ἵνα for five of ten HC-Cjs. For all three PE, it is fully codified that ἵνα clauses of purpose will follow their governing clause and codified, with one exception in 2 Tim. 1:4, that they will be the final clause proper of their sentence. It is codified that the ἵνα clause will be subordinate to the main, paratactic clause of the sentence in 1 Timothy; this same phenomenon hold for five of the six such ἵνα clauses in 2 Timothy and it is a marginally codified pattern in Titus. For all three PE, it is codified as a whole that ἵνα clauses of purpose will not appear within a rank-shifted context. It is partially codified in 1 Timothy and marginally codified in Titus that ἵνα clauses of purpose will include an expressed complement word group. In addition, four of five ἵνα clauses of purpose in 2 Timothy also include an expressed complement. In Titus, ἵνα clauses show a P-C structure in seven of eleven clauses with a complement, yielding a marginally codified pattern. Second Timothy, however, shows a C-P structure for all four ἵνα clauses with an expressed complement. First Timothy is fairly equally likely to have either structure, with six showing a P-C structure and five showing a C-P structure. There are four ἵνα clauses across the PE that have hyperbaton with the complement; three are C-PNs (2 Tim. 3:17; Titus 1:9; 3:7) and all four include the head noun or

371

adjective before the predicator with additional modifiers or adjectives following. Subject word groups, when expressed, tend to precede the predicator. While there are too few examples in each of the PE individually to constitute a pattern, it is a marginally codified pattern overall. Adjunct word groups beyond the initial conjunction are fairly common, and they also show consistent syntax. Only five A-Advs appear in ἵνα clauses of purpose in the PE and they all precede the predicator. The lone A-CU, a dative of advantage, precedes the predicator (Titus 3:13). A-PPs tend to follow the predicator as a marginally codified pattern overall, but each letter differs somewhat in this regard. Within Titus, all five A-PPs in ἵνα clauses of purpose follow the predicator. For 2 Timothy, there are only two A-PPs in such ἵνα clauses, with one following (2 Tim. 2:10) and one preceding (2 Tim. 4:17). The one that precedes, a PP with διά indicating means, is most likely in marked, emphatic position. First Timothy includes three A-PPs after the predicator and three before the predicator. Two of those that precede, however, show hyperbaton, modify the same verbal root in the same voice and person, include the qualifier τοῦ διαβόλου, and are εἰς phrases of destination (1 Tim. 3:6, 7). The other example, an ἐν phrase of means, is most likely in marked position for emphasis, further supported by the adjective πρώτῳ modifying the head noun (1 Tim. 1:16). It is the default position, then, for A-PPs to follow their governing verb, even in 1 and 2 Timothy, with exceptions to this pattern for the likely purpose of emphasis.

In addition to ἵνα clauses of purpose, there are eight HC-Cjs in the PE with other conjunctions. In 1 Timothy, a clause of comparison modifies an elided main clause (1 Tim. 1:3), but the two temporal HC-Cjs, with ἕως (1 Tim. 4:13) and ὅταν (1 Tim. 5:11), precede their governing clause. One includes a complement in a P-C structure. In Titus, two temporal HC-Cjs with ὅτε (Titus 3:4) and ὅταν (Titus 3:12) also precede their governing clause and the lone

372

temporal clause that includes a complement also shows a P-C structure. The HC-Cj of standard

in Titus, with ὡς (Titus 1:5), has a C-IO in a C-P structure but no C-DO. Second Timothy has

five such clauses, two of which are compound clauses. Unlike 1 Timothy and Titus, however, all

five HC-Cjs with Cj-Hs other than ἵνα follow their governing clause, regardless of force.

Including compound clauses, there are seven clauses with a discrete verbal form, four of which

include an expressed complement. Three of those four follow a P-C structure; furthermore, it is

noteworthy that two of them include both a C-IO and a C-DO, with the C-IO before the

predicator, as with Titus 1:5, but the C-DO following the governing verb. The lone C-DO that

precedes its governing verb, giving a clause with a C-P structure, is within a context of contrast

with ἀλλά connecting it to its following clause. It is likely then, that HC-Cjs with Cj-Hs other

than ἵνα follow a P-C structure. There are too few subject or adjunct word groups in such

clauses, however, to make any meaningful comparison.

The second principle type of hypotactic clauses that still function on the rank of clause is

the HC-ptc. For all the PE, HC-ptcs tend to follow their governing clause. This pattern is

marginally codified for 1 Timothy and partially codified for 2 Timothy and Titus. As would be

expected, aorist participles functioning as action contemporaneous with the main verb, which

Wallace calls "attendant circumstance,"[35] abrogate this pattern in Titus, as do all three temporal

participles in 2 Timothy. In 1 Timothy, every aorist participle in predicate position except one

precedes the governing clause, as well as some participle clauses with the force of concession,

condition, or manner. HC-ptcs of manner and cause always follow the governing clause in 2

Timothy and Titus. In 1 Timothy, the sole causal HC-ptc with an aorist tense participle precedes

the governing clause while those with a present tense participle follow. HC-ptcs of manner in 1

---

[35] Wallace, *Grammar*, 640–45.

Timothy tend to follow the main clause also, with four exceptions including those with aorist and present tense participles. Across the PE, HC-ptcs tend to be in the present tense. This occurs as a partially codified pattern in 1 Timothy, a marginally codified pattern in Titus, and as a tendency without enough frequency to constitute a pattern in 2 Timothy. This difference for 2 Timothy is likely due to the fact that, relative to the other PE, it has more causal participles in the perfect tense and less participles of manner. It is also the only of the PE to include predicate participles in the perfect tense beyond forms of the verb οἶδα. In addition to the tense and placement of the participle clause, it is codified for 2 Timothy, partially codified for Titus, and marginally codified for 1 Timothy that HC-ptcs will be subordinate to a paratactic or hypotactic clause properly on the rank of the clause. HC-ptcs, across the PE, regularly appear in ἵνα clauses of purpose, explanatory clauses with γάρ or ὅτι, and expository clauses. They appear more often in imperative clauses in 2 Timothy compared to the other PE, in ἵνα clauses most frequently in Titus, and in explanatory clauses the most frequently in 1 Timothy.

Within the HC-ptcs of the PE, clausal structures are generally consistent with minor variations. All HC-ptcs in the PE tend to include an expressed complement word group. This pattern is marginally codified in 1 Timothy, codified with only one exception in Titus, and a tendency in 2 Timothy but not frequent enough to be codified. It is codified, however, that HC-ptcs with an expressed complement will show a P-C structure across all three PE, although the likelihood varies. Second Timothy shows a codified pattern that HC-ptcs with complements will have a P-C structure regardless of the verbal tense or force.[36] Titus shows a partially codified

---

[36] The only exception is the λάβων clause in 2 Tim. 1:5, which is the last the four consecutive hypotactic clauses, shows hyperbaton, and the qualifier within the complement word group is further modified by a relative clause.

pattern that HC-ptcs with a complement will show a P-C structure.[37]

The clausal structure for HC-ptcs in 1 Timothy, unlike the other PE, is more nuanced. Overall, HC-ptcs with complements are equally likely to show a P-C structure as they are a C-P structure. Four of those with a C-P structure, however, are HC-ptcs embedded within a relative clause where the relative pronoun, which is always in primary position, is the complement of the participle (1 Tim. 1:6, 19; 6:10, 21). These are also the only four HC-ptc in the PE to include an expressed subject word group. In addition to these, two HC-ptcs in 1 Timothy that show a C-P structure include an anaphoric demonstrative pronoun as the complement (1 Tim. 4:6, 16). These are the two of three instances where an HC-ptc takes the anaphoric demonstrative pronoun as the complement in the PE;[38] furthermore, both examples appear within transitional sentences, at the beginning of a subsection (1 Tim. 4:6) or the conclusion of a section (1 Tim. 4:16). Aside from these seven examples where a C-P would be expected, there are only three others where the HC-ptc follows a C-P structure with a complement that might be expected to appear following the predicator (1 Tim. 3:10; 4:8; 6:4). Two of these are in a context of contrast, either with another HC-ptc (1 Tim. 6:4) or within the larger, governing clause (1 Tim. 4:8). If the HC-ptc with the relative pronoun as the C-DO are excluded, then 1 Timothy shows a marginally codified pattern that HC-ptcs with a complement follow a P-C structure. If those with an anaphoric demonstrative are excluded as well, then then pattern for 1 Timothy becomes partially codified. Unlike 2 Timothy and Titus, only one of three exceptions to the pattern show hyperbaton (1 Tim. 4:8).

---

[37] As with 2 Timothy, all exceptions to this pattern show hyperbaton. One example, in Titus 2:8, has an infinitive clause as the complement and places the infinitive following the governing participle in expected position while having part of the complement of the infinitive clause precede the participle. Another example is a copulative participle with a compound complement and occurs as the final clause of a section (Titus 1:16). And the third exception has an object-complement construction as the complement of the HC-ptc, which is the only such example in the PE (Titus 2:7–8).

[38] The singular pronoun τοῦτο is the complement of εἰδώς in 1 Tim. 1:9 with a P-C clausal structure.

The PE show general consistency in HC-ptc with regard to subject and adjunct word groups. The only four HC-ptcs with expressed subjects are those in 1 Timothy whose complement is the relative pronoun of the participle's governing relative clause. Otherwise, HC-ptcs do not have expressed subjects in the PE. Adjuncts are infrequent in HC-ptcs, being a partially codified feature that such clauses will not include an adjunct word group. When adjuncts appear in HC-ptcs, it is partially codified that it will be an A-PP. Among the A-PPs in the participle clauses of the PE, it is codified that they will follow the participle. The only exception in 1 Tim. 4:4 is likely in its position for strong emphasis based on the previous material.[39] Aside from A-PPs, there is a single temporal, accusative A-CU in 1 Tim. 1:13 that precedes the participle and one dative A-CU of means in Titus 3:7 that follows the participle. With too few examples, however, it is inconclusive to determine if those positions are due to the force of the adjunct, the case of the nominal group, or other syntactical factors.

Changing Ranks: Rank-Shifted Clauses

The PE show both similarity and difference with regard to the word group order, structure, and syntax of rank-shifted clauses. These patterns and tendencies between the PE will be presented below, beginning with infinitive clauses, followed by participle clauses in attributive position, and concluding with relative clauses.

Infinitive Clauses

Within their larger, governing clause, infinitive clauses show many similarities across the PE. It is partially codified in 1 and 2 Timothy and codified in Titus that infinitive clauses will

---

[39] The position of the A-PP, μετὰ εὐχαριστίας (1 Tim. 4:4), is not discussed by commentators (see Perkins, *Letters*, 81 or Marshall, *Epistles*, 544–45), even when the emphasis of the overall clause is mentioned (rf. Knight, *Epistles*, 191–92).

function as or within the complement word of their governing clause. It is fully codified across all three PE that all infinitives are simple, without the article. Within their governing clause, infinitive clauses tend to follow their governing verb, yielding a partially codified pattern in 1 and 2 Timothy and a fully codified pattern in Titus.[40] Exceptions almost always have a complementary force, have a governing verb in the indicative mood, and are in the aorist tense;[41] they also regularly modify a form of the verb δύναμαι (1 Tim. 5:25; 6:7, 16; 2 Tim. 2:13; 3:7). Infinitive clauses tend to accompany verbs expressing purpose, wishes, or commands in the PE, including verbs explicitly in the imperative mood, verbs in the indicative mood with a paraenetic force, and subjunctive verbs expressing purpose in ἵνα clauses. This is a marginally codified pattern in 1 Timothy and a partially codified pattern in Titus. In 2 Timothy, however, infinitive clauses are comparatively more common within participle clauses and never appear within ἵνα clauses of purpose. Across all three PE, however, when an infinitive clause does accompany an indicative governing verb with an expository or explanatory force, it generally tends to precede the governing predicator and, with one exception in Titus 1:16, always has the infinitive in the aorist tense. This is tendency is all the more noticeable in 1 Timothy and Titus, as they have marginally codified and partially codified patterns, respectively, that infinitives will be in the present tense. In 2 Timothy, however, ten of eighteen infinitives are in the aorist tense. These tendencies hold regardless of the force of the infinitive with the exception of subjective infinitive clauses governed by the impersonal verb δεῖ, which always have the infinitive in the present tense for all three PE. The most common forces for infinitive clauses in the PE are

---

[40] There are three infinitive clauses with an elided governing verb in Titus (Titus 2:2, 3, 9).

[41] There is only one infinitive clause that precede its governing verb with the force of indirect discourse (1 Tim. 3:5). All but one precede a finite verb in the indicative mood, with the exception appearing within a rank-shifted participle clause (2 Tim. 3:7). Additionally, only two infinitives that precede their governing verb are in the present tense (1 Tim. 2:12; 5:11) and are the only infinitives that precede their governing verb to appear within a paraenetic context.

complementary infinitive and infinitives of indirect discourse following a verb of speaking or cognition, although the frequency varies by letter. In 1 and 2 Timothy, complementary infinitive clauses are the most common force of infinitive, accounting for over half of the infinitive clauses, with those of indirect discourse being the second-most common. In Titus, however, infinitive clauses with the force of indirect discourse account for over half of all infinitive clauses, with complementary infinitive clauses being the second-most common.

The word group order and clausal structure patterns vary across the PE. It is marginally codified in Titus and partially codified in 2 Timothy that infinitive clauses will have an expressed complement word group, but over half of the infinitive clauses in 1 Timothy do not have an expressed complement. The word group order with respect to the complement also varies by letter. It is fully codified in Titus that infinitive clauses with an expressed complement will have part or all of the complement precede the infinitive in a C-P or [C]-P-[C] structure, with C-PNs often being compound complements and showing hyperbaton. It is marginally codified in 2 Timothy that complements will precede the infinitive in a C-P structure; exceptions either have marked syntax within transitional sentences (2 Tim. 1:6; 2:13; 4:1) or another unique syntactical context (2 Tim. 1:18). In 1 Timothy, the word group order varies by type of complement and the force of the infinitive clause. Complementary infinitive clauses tend to have a P-C pattern, with the complement following the infinitive. Infinitive clauses of indirect discourse are slightly more likely to have a C-P pattern than a P-C pattern, while infinitive clauses functioning as direct objects or subjects always have a C-P pattern. Infinitives with single, nominal groups as complement tend to show a C-P pattern, as do copulative infinitives with a C-PN. Infinitives with complements consisting of pronouns or a nominal group that includes a relative clause, however, always show a P-C pattern. Overall, the most common

clausal structure in 1 Timothy for infinitive clauses with complements is a C-P structure, but not with as much consistency as the other PE.

The presence and syntax of subject word groups within infinitive clauses show consistent tendencies and patterns across all three PE. It is marginally codified for all three that an infinitive clause will not have an expressed subject word group. In 2 Timothy and Titus the subject always appears in the primary position of the clause and it is marginally codified that the subject will appear in the primary position in 1 Timothy. Two exceptions are within the opening sentence of a section or subsection with the conjunction οὖν (1 Tim. 2:1, 8) and one has the subject in marked, emphatic position as the final element of the clause (1 Tim. 6:5).[42] Infinitive clauses with subject word groups have the force of indirect discourse for two of the four examples in 2 Timothy, five of ten in 1 Timothy, and five of seven in Titus. Thus, indirect discourse infinitive clauses are the most common type of infinitive clause to have an expressed subject but not enough to constitute a pattern across the PE. Subject word groups also appear in subjective and complementary infinitive clauses in the PE. It is partially codified across the PE that infinitive clauses with expressed subjects will have the infinitive in the present tense. All seven examples in Titus have present tense infinitives, as do three of four in 2 Timothy and seven of ten in 1 Timothy. Within the larger clause, it is partially codified that infinitive clauses with expressed subject word groups will occur within a paraenetic context, governed by imperative predicators or indicative predicator with the illocutionary force of a wish or command. Two additional infinitive clauses with expressed subjects occur within ἵνα clauses of purpose, giving a codified pattern that infinitive clauses with expressed subjects will occur within the context of purpose, a

---

[42] Although, the unique position of this subject word group in the PE is not mentioned in commentaries (see Perkins, *Letters*, 135).

wish, or a command. It is fully codified in the PE that infinitive clauses with subject word groups will follow their governing clause.

Adjunct word groups within infinitive clauses in PE also demonstrate a general consistency with regard to word group order and syntax. They appear with greater frequency than subject word groups; it is marginally codified in 1 Timothy and Titus that infinitive clauses will not have an expressed adjunct, but adjunct word groups appear in half of the infinitive clauses in 2 Timothy. In Titus, A-PPs always follow the infinitive and the single, locative A-Adv precedes the infinitive. In 2 Timothy, six of eight A-PPs follow the infinitive with one temporal A-PP (2 Tim. 4:21) and one of destination (2 Tim. 3:7) preceding the infinitive. The word group order of the latter is either due to the syntax of lists or possible formulaic syntax with ἐλθεῖν, a PP of destination with εἰς, and the abstract complement ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας.[43] Three of four A-Advs precede the infinitive, with the sole exception appearing in the opening sentence of a section (2 Tim. 4:9). No A-Advs occur within infinitive clauses in 1 Timothy, but it is partially codified that A-PPs will follow the infinitive. Exceptions either occur to indicate contrast between the A-PPs (1 Tim. 2:9), potential formulaic syntax (1 Tim. 2:4), or within a unique syntactical context (1 Tim. 3:15). This yields a codified pattern for the PE that A-PPs in infinitive clauses will follow their governing predicator, with 1 and 2 Timothy having a closer ratio compared to Titus.

Attributive Participle Clauses

Attributive participles show both areas of similarity and difference in their word group order and syntax across the PE. With regard to their governing clause, they appear within a

---

[43] See 1 Tim. 2:4 and 2 Tim. 3:7. Compare these examples with Titus 3:12, where the prepositional phrase follows the infinitive but the complement of the εἰς phrase is a concrete, physical location. The only other prepositional phrase to precede ἐλθεῖν in the PE is the temporal πρό phrase in 2 Tim. 4:21.

variety of clause types in the PE and the frequencies vary letter by letter.[44] When they do appear within infinitive clauses, it is partially codified for 1 Timothy and Titus that they will function as predicate adjectives governed by the copulative verb εἶναι, while only one of three attributive participles within infinitive clauses in 2 Timothy functions in this way. The force of attributive participle clauses also varies by letter but show much closer affinity between 1 and 2 Timothy. It is marginally codified that attributive participles in Titus will function within a C-PN and only three of twenty-one attributive participles function have an attributive adjectival force. Attributive participle clauses in 2 Timothy, however, predominantly have an attributive adjectival force, accounting for eighteen of thirty-eight examples, with only seven of thirty-eight attributive participles functioning as a predicate adjective. First Timothy is closer in this regard to 2 Timothy than Titus, with substantive participles being the most common force of attributive participles, twenty-one of fifty also functioning as attributive adjectives, and only six of fifty serving as predicate adjectives in a C-PN. Across all three PE, however, participle clauses functioning as attributive adjectives tend to be in "repeat" position to their referent, giving a marginally codified pattern overall.[45] They also rarely occur within subject word groups, giving a partially codified pattern that they will not appear within the subject word group of their governing clause.[46] Lastly, within their governing clause, attributive participle clauses tend to

---

[44] For example, in Titus almost half of all attributive participle occur within an infinitive clause but never within another rank-shifted participle clause. In 2 Timothy they rarely occur within infinitive clauses but commonly within other attributive participle clauses. In 1 Timothy, the most common rank-shifted clauses to include an attributive participle clause are relative clauses, with only one relative clause including an attributive participle clauses in both 2 Timothy and Titus.

[45] It is partially codified in 2 Timothy with fifteen of eighteen examples being in "repeat" position, marginally codified in 1 Timothy with fourteen of twenty-one examples, and a tendency in Titus with two of three examples. Overall, it is almost partially codified with 74% of adjectival participles appearing in "repeat" position.

[46] Only five of forty-two participle clauses functioning as attributive adjectives are within the subject word group of the governing clause, which means that 88% do not appear within subject word groups.

appear as or within word groups that follow their governing predicator as a partially codified pattern for all three PE. When they precede the predicator, they tend to function as or within the subject word group of the governing clause as a partially codified pattern for 1 and 2 Timothy.[47] Within Titus, the three that precede the governing verb are substantives functioning as a C-DO (Titus 1:5, 9) or a dative A-CU with the force of reference (Titus 1:15).

Within the attributive participle clause itself, some patterns of word group order and syntax are consistent across the PE but some differ. It is fully codified for all three PE that attributive participles functioning as predicate adjectives within C-PNs will not be modified by the definite article. Those with a substantive force, however, almost always include the definite article, yielding a codified pattern in 1 Timothy, partially codified pattern in 2 Timothy, and a partially codified overall for the PE.[48] The presence of the article with an participle clause functioning as an attributive adjective, however, varies by letter. In Timothy, it is marginally codified that participles functioning as attributive adjective will be anarthrous, while almost half of such participle clauses in 2 Timothy are arthrous and two of three examples in Titus. It is marginally codified overall for the PE that attributive participles will be in the present tense, but the frequency differs for each letter. It is partially codified in 1 Timothy and Titus that attributive participles will be in the present tense; over half of the attributive participles in 2 Timothy are in the present tense, but not with enough frequency to constitute a pattern. Attributive participles in the aorist tense, when they do occur, tend to function as substantives or attributive adjectives in 1 and 2 Timothy, but Titus does not include any attributive participles in the aorist tense. When

---

[47] All four attributive participle clauses that precede their governing predicator function as or within the subject word of the clause in 2 Timothy, as do seven of ten in 1 Timothy.

[48] All five substantive participles in Titus are arthrous.

attributive participles are in the perfect tense, they tend to be in the passive voice, as a marginally codified pattern overall,[49] and function as substantives in Titus, predicate adjectives in 2 Timothy, and attributive adjectives in 1 Timothy.[50]

There is consistency across the PE with regard to complement, subject, and adjunct word groups within attributive participle clauses. Roughly half of all attributive participle clauses in the PE include an expressed complement word group, regardless of force, and their placement is generally consistent; it is marginally codified in 1 Timothy and Titus that they will follow the participle in a P-C clausal structure and partially codified in 2 Timothy, yielding a partially codified pattern overall. Exceptions to this pattern across the PE are typically found in the context of contrast or an asyndetic list structure, especially when the list is part of a C-PN. The presence of the definite article with an attributive participle clause varies in frequency by letter and by force. It is fully codified that attributive participle clauses will not have an expressed subject, with the sole possible exception in 1 Tim. 6:5.[51] Adjunct word groups are common within attributive participle clause, although less common in Titus compared to 1 and 2 Timothy and within different types of participle clauses. Only three of twenty-one attributive participle clauses in Titus include an adjunct word group and all three are functioning as predicate adjectives in a C-PN. Fifteen of thirty-eight attributive participle clauses in 2 Timothy include an adjunct word group with eleven of them functioning as attributive adjectives in "repeat" position.

---

[49] Attributive participles in the perfect tense are in the passive voice for four of seven examples in 1 Timothy, seven of nine in 2 Timothy, and two of three in Titus.

[50] For attributive participles in the perfect tense, two of three function as substantives in Titus, five of nine function as predicate adjectives in 2 Timothy, and five of seven function as attributive adjectives in 1 Timothy.

[51] Participle clauses functioning as attributive adjectives in "sandwich" position tend to include the whole clause before the referent, but in 1 Tim. 6:5 the participle itself precedes the referent while the rest of the participle clause follows. The genitive noun ἀνθρώπων, however, still functions proper as the genitive qualifier within the governing clause with three attributive participle clauses modifying it.

Fifteen of fifty attributive participle clauses in 1 Timothy include an adjunct word group, appearing regularly in substantive, attributive adjective, and predicate adjective clauses. A-PPs tend to follow the participle as a partially codified pattern in 1 Timothy and a codified pattern in 2 Timothy, yielding a partially codified pattern overall for the PE.[52] A-Advs precede the participle in seven of nine occurrences across the PE, with exceptions in 1 Tim. 6:17 and 2 Tim. 1:10, and both counterexamples are explicitly within the context of contrast. All nine dative or accusative A-CUs within attributive participle clauses follow the predicator in the PE, regardless of case or force.

Relative Clauses

Relative clauses, across the PE, are the most likely clause type to include multiple word groups beyond the predicator and their word group order and syntax, as would be expected, depends greatly on the role of the relative pronoun both within its own clause and its governing clause. It is partially codified in 2 Timothy and Titus that relative clauses will appear within paratactic and hypotactic clauses proper; over half of the relative clauses in 1 Timothy also occur within clauses proper, but not with enough frequency to constitute a pattern. Relative clauses are the most likely clause type to include an aorist verbal form, with roughly half of the predicators in relative clauses being in the aorist tense for all three PE. Aside from idiomatic relative clauses functioning as connective devices[53] and those without an expressed governing clause, it is codified that relative clauses will follow their governing clause in the PE. Exceptions typically occur when the relative clause is, in itself, functioning as an emphasized word group within its

---

[52] There are only two prepositional phrases in attributive participle clauses for Titus: one preceding the verb (Titus 3:3) and one following (Titus 3:15).

[53] Four examples are ὃν τρόπον in 2 Tim. 3:8 and δι᾽ ἣν αἰτίαν in 2 Tim. 1:6, 12; Titus 1:13.

governing clause or is modifying an emphasized referent.

Within relative clauses, it is partially codified for all three PE that the relative clause will include an expressed complement word group. For those with expressed complements, it is marginally codified in 1 Timothy and Titus that the relative clause will show a C-P structure and partially codified in 2 Timothy. This pattern is due to the predominance of the relative pronoun to serve as or within the complement word group of its own clause, which accounts for twenty-seven of thirty-three clauses with a C-P structure. Those with a P-C structure tend to have the relative pronoun functioning as the subject of the clause, which accounts for nine of the fifteen clauses with a P-C structure, or within an adjunct word group of the relative clause. Subject word groups are common within relative clauses, giving a marginally codified pattern in 1 Timothy and a partially codified pattern in Titus that relative clauses will include an expressed subject. Furthermore, with only two exceptions,[54] when the relative clause includes a subject word group, it will also include a complement word group, adjunct word group, or both. This is a fully codified pattern in 1 and 2 Timothy and a partially codified pattern in Titus. Also, when the relative clause includes an expressed subject, predicator, and complement, it is marginally codified that the subject and the complement will appear on opposite sides of the predicator, although the strength of this tendency varies in each letter. Titus shows the strongest tendency that subjects and complements will not appear on the same side of the predicator, occurring for seven of eight possible examples. It is marginally codified in 1 Timothy, occurring for eleven of fifteen examples. This tendency is the weakest in 2 Timothy, only occurring for five of nine possible examples. Adjunct word groups are common in relative clauses, occurring in half of the relative clauses in 1 Timothy and Titus and in seventeen of twenty-six relative clauses in 2

---

[54] Both occur within Titus 1:11, where the relative clause uses the impersonal verb δεῖ.

Timothy as a marginally codified pattern. In Titus, all adjunct word groups, including A-PPs, the single use of an A-CU, and the single A-Adv, follow the predicator; additionally, A-PPs, when they occur, are almost always the final element(s) of the relative clause with one exception. In 2 Timothy, A-Advs and A-CUs also tend to appear at the end of the clause, with the exception of one additive καί in 2 Tim. 4:15. There are twenty-two A-PPs within relative clauses in 2 Timothy, with four phrases taking the relative pronoun as the complement. This leaves fifteen of eighteen A-PPs within relative clauses that follow the predicator or appear at the end of a nominal clause, giving a partially codified pattern. The marked exceptions either carry great emphasis (2 Tim. 1:13; 3:11) or occur at the end of section (2 Tim. 1:18). Within the relative clauses of 1 Timothy, two of three A-CUs in the dative case follow the predicator (1 Tim. 3:16; 6:10), while one precedes it (1 Tim. 6:15) within a poetic section. There are twenty A-PPs within relative clauses in 1 Timothy, with four A-PPs taking the relative pronoun as the complement. Fourteen of the sixteen remaining A-PPs follow the governing verb, giving a partially codified pattern. The two counterexamples, found in 1 Tim. 1:19 and 6:21, are both identical PPs of reference—περὶ τὴν πίστιν. For all the PE, this gives a partially codified pattern that not only A-PPs but all adjunct word groups will follow the predicator within relative clauses.

<div align="center">The Rank of Word Group</div>

With the exclusion of predicator word groups, which only contain verbal forms and select few adverbs or particles, patterns and tendencies are evident across the PE on the rank of word group. The analysis below will compare the three PE with respect to subject, complement, adjunct, and qualifier word groups.

Subject Word Groups

Subject word groups show both similarity and difference in their word order in the three

<div align="center">386</div>

letters of the PE. For 1 Timothy and Titus, roughly half of subject word groups consist of a

single noun or pronoun, while it is slightly more likely in 2 Timothy that a subject word group

will include an additional modifying element beyond the head noun or pronoun. It is partially

codified in 1 and 2 Timothy that subject word groups will not include an adjective beyond the

definite article and codified in Titus. It is partially codified for all three that subject word groups

will not include an embedded qualifier word group. The definite article is the most common

modifying element within subject word groups for all three PE, occurring with a similar ratio

across the PE.[55] Titus only includes three subject word groups with adjectives; all three have

head nouns also modified by the definite article but not a qualifier. First Timothy includes twelve

subject word groups with one or more adjectives modifying the head noun or pronoun: six with

attributive adjectives and six with predicate adjectives. Five of six of those with attributive

adjectives also include a definite article on the head noun, while none of those with predicate

adjectives include the article. Ten of twelve with adjectives do not include a qualifier. Second

Timothy includes twelve subject word groups with one or more adjectives also: five with

attributive adjectives and seven with predicate adjectives. Like 1 Timothy, eleven of twelve of

those with adjectives do not include a qualifier word group. Unlike 1 Timothy, only two of five

with attributive adjectives also include the definite article, while five of seven with predicate

adjectives have a definite article on the head noun. It is partially codified, then, that subject word

groups in the PE with an adjective will not also include a qualifier on the head noun or pronoun,

but the collocation of adjectives with articles is variegated across the three PE. The word order

and syntax of subject word groups in the PE show consistency across the three letters, however,

with regard to embedded qualifiers. It is marginally codified in 1 Timothy that qualifiers within

---

[55] Roughly 40% of subject word groups within each letter and across the PE include a definite article.

subject word groups will follow their referent and partially codified for 2 Timothy. There are only seven subject word groups with qualifiers in Titus, with six of those seven having the qualifier following its referent. This yields a partially codified pattern across the PE. Similarly, it is marginally codified that qualifiers will modify a grammatically definite referent in 1 Timothy and codified in 2 Timothy. In Titus, six of the seven subject word groups with embedded qualifier include a grammatically definite referent. This yields a partially codified pattern across the PE also. Qualifiers within subject word groups, as will be explored below, are most commonly appositional, objective genitive, or subjective genitive in force for all three PE.

In addition to presence of various modifying elements within subject word groups, the presence of subject word groups in rank-shifted clauses also impacts expected syntax. Overall, subject word groups tend to appear within clauses proper, with only 30%–40% of subject word groups appearing within rank-shifted clauses for each of the PE. The presence of a subject word group within a rank-shifted clause does not have significant impact on the likelihood of an adjective within the word group, but there is a noticeable difference in likelihood for qualifiers and the definite article. Of thirty-five subject word groups with the definite article in 1 Timothy and thirty-two in 2 Timothy, only seven apiece appear within a rank-shifted clause. Five of sixteen subject word groups in Titus that include a definite article appear within a rank-shifted context. It is partially codified, then, for 1 and 2 Timothy that subject word groups with an article will not appear within a rank-shifted clause and marginally codified for Titus. This difference is most noticeable in 1 Timothy, where almost 40% of the subject word groups appear within rank-shifted clauses but only 20% of those with definite articles. Subject word groups with qualifiers are even less likely within rank-shifted context, as twelve of fourteen subject word groups with qualifiers in both 1 and 2 Timothy occur within a clause proper and all seven in Titus. This

yields a partially codified pattern in 1 and 2 Timothy, as well as for the PE overall.

Lastly, subject word groups tend to precede their governing verb across the PE and across clause types with one noteworthy exception. Overall, it is marginally codified in 1 Timothy, when both the subject and predicator word groups are expressed, that the subject will precede the predicator. It does not occur with enough frequency qualify as a pattern in 2 Timothy or Titus,[56] but subjects still tend to precede an expressed predicator. For 1 Timothy and 2 Timothy, the likelihood is generally consistent, when there are enough samples, across clause rank and type, with a possible exception for imperative clauses. In Titus, however, subjects within paratactic clauses with expressed predicators tend to follow the governing verb as a marginally codified pattern, while hypotactic and rank-shifted clauses tend to have the subject precede the governing verb in line with the overall tendency.

Complement Word Groups

Complement word groups evince tendencies and patterns according to their function within their governing clause, with some consistent patterns across the PE and some that vary letter by letter. Across the PE, complement word groups most commonly serve as C-DOs to an expressed or implied predicator. C-DOs in all three PE are slightly more likely to consist of single nouns, pronouns, or rank-shifted clauses, but do regularly include additional modifying elements. When C-DOs include a qualifier, it is partially codified in 1 and 2 Timothy that they will follow their referent, with six of seven such complements in Titus also following this pattern. C-DOs with qualifiers tend to appear in clauses proper as a marginally codified pattern in 1 and 2 Timothy, as well as for five of seven in Titus. One difference between the PE, however, is that, while C-DOs

---

[56] The likelihood of a subject word group to precede an expressed predicator is 59.7% in 2 Timothy and 58.8% in Titus, not quite attaining the threshold for a marginally codified pattern.

regularly include the definite article for all three PE, those with qualifiers regularly also include an adjectival modifier in 1 Timothy and Titus. For 2 Timothy, only one of twenty-seven C-DOs with qualifiers also include an adjective. For 1 and 2 Timothy, the most common modifying element within a C-DO is the definite article, which appears with less frequency in Titus. For all three PE, when a C-DO includes the definite article, it is marginally codified that the word group will also include another modifying element, such as an adjective or embedded qualifier, in addition to the article. When a C-DO has both a definite article and an adjective, it is codified in 1 Timothy and partially codified in 2 Timothy that the adjective will be between the article and the head noun in "sandwich" position. This is also the case for all five examples in Titus. When an adjective modifies an indefinite head noun, however, they are slightly more likely to follow the head noun in "repeat" position in 1 Timothy and Titus, although not with enough frequency to constitute a pattern. For all C-DOs, it is marginally codified in 1 and 2 Timothy that adjectives will appear in "sandwich" position, with exceptions generally for adjectival participles or nominalized PPs functioning as adjectives. Adjectives also tend to be in "sandwich" position in Titus, but not as strongly as in 1 and 2 Timothy. The position of C-DOs with adjectives, both those in "sandwich" position and those in "repeat" position, varies between the PE. One noteworthy difference among C-DOs with adjectives, however, is that it is marginally codified that C-DOs with adjectives in Titus will be within rank-shifted clauses, while it is more likely in both 1 and 2 Timothy that such complements will appear within clauses proper.

Complement word groups, in addition to serving as C-DOs, also regularly serve as C-IOs, expressing a person or entity receiving the action of an expressed or implied verbal idea. Across the PE, C-IOs are likely to consist of only a single noun or pronoun, with enough likelihood to be a marginally codified pattern in 2 Timothy. When there is an expressed predicator, it is

marginally codified in 1 Timothy that the C-IO will follow the predicator and partially codified in 2 Timothy. All three C-IOs in clauses with expressed predicators follow their governing verb in Titus also, yielding a partially codified pattern for the PE as a whole. Exceptions to this pattern sometimes have syntactical causes, such as contrast (1 Tim. 1:9), hyperbaton with a C-DO (1 Tim. 3:13; 2 Tim. 4:14), or the context of transition (1 Tim. 3:13, 14; 6:17); sometimes, however, there is no apparent reason for the word group order (1 Tim. 5:22; 2 Tim. 3:11; 4:3). If pronouns are considered to be grammatically definite with the exception of indefinite pronouns (1 Tim. 1:3; 5:22), it is partially codified that C-IOs will be definite in 1 Timothy and codified in 2 Timothy, with three of four C-IOs in Titus also. This yields a partially codified pattern for the PE overall.[57] Aside from pronouns, it is codified for the PE that C-IOs with a head noun will also include additional elements in the word group modifying the head noun. These additional modifiers tend to be the definite article or an embedded qualifier, which both occur with regularity. It is codified, however, that C-IOs will not include an adjective as a modifier on a head noun.[58] Across the PE, C-IOs tend to be within clauses proper, but the likelihood is much stronger in 2 Timothy and Titus. It is marginally codified in 2 Timothy and three of four C-IOs in Titus are within clauses proper. It is a tendency in 1 Timothy, but not with enough frequency to constitute a pattern.

C-PNs show some similarities across the PE with some differences in 1 and 2 Timothy compared to Titus. It is fully codified in the PE that C-PNs will not include a definite article on the head adjective or noun. When there is an expressed predicator, there is not one strong

---

[57] The only exceptions are two indefinite pronouns in (1 Tim. 1:3; 5:22), a compound and contrasting complement word group consisting of nominalized, indefinite adjectives (1 Tim. 1:9–10), and one indirect object with ἀνθρώποις modified by an adjective (2 Tim. 2:2).

[58] The only exception occurs with the indefinite head noun ἀνθρώποις modified by the attributive adjective πιστοῖς (2 Tim. 2:2). This assumes that the dative word group in Titus 2:11, πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις, is a qualifier to the predicate adjective, σωτήριος, and not an A-CU to the predicator.

tendency to precede or follow the governing verb for such complements in general, as the position of the complement tends to depend on other syntactical factors. Titus demonstrates a tendency that C-PNs follow an expressed predicator in clauses proper but precede it in rank-shifted clauses,[59] but it is unclear if the phenomenon of rank shift causes this tendency that differs from 1 and 2 Timothy or simply the type of predicator and clause.[60] Within the complement word groups themselves, C-PNs across the PE are the most likely word group type to include an embedded qualifier, most notably for 1 and 2 Timothy.[61] The position of the qualifier differs between the letters, however. In Titus, qualifiers in C-PNs tend to precede the head noun or adjective of the complement word group, occurring for four of the six such examples. In 2 Timothy, only two of eight C-PNs have a qualifier before the head noun or adjective (2 Tim. 2:21; 4:11). In both cases, there is also at least one qualifier that also follows its head noun or adjective and one example occurs at the end of a subsection and has the qualifier placement switch for the last element of a compound, asyndeton complement (2 Tim. 2:21). In 1 Timothy it is marginally codified that qualifiers in C-PNs will follow their referent, with exceptions that appear to depend primarily on the force of the qualifier itself.[62] C-PNs are also

---

[59] For nine such complements that precede their governing predicator, six are within rank-shifted clauses and three are in clauses proper. For those that follow their governing predicator, seven are in paratactic or hypotactic clauses proper with only one in a rank-shifted clause.

[60] All the rank-shifted clauses in which a complement precedes a copulative verb in Titus are infinitive clauses, which, as a pattern, tend to have the complement preceding the predicator in the PE overall, as shown above.

[61] Twenty-two of forty-two such complements in 1 Timothy include at least one embedded qualifier, compared to only twenty of one hundred fifty-five C-DOs or nineteen of one hundred twenty-one C-OPs. Eight of twenty-two such complements in 2 Timothy include a qualifier. In Titus, six of twenty-three complements of copulative verbs include an embedded qualifier, which is not as stark of a difference compared to other complement types.

[62] Three of the qualifiers are genitives of relationship (1 Tim. 3:2, 12; 5:9), two are epexegetical genitives (1 Tim. 1:15; 4:9), and one is a comparative genitive (1 Tim. 5:8).

the most common word group type to include the phenomenon of hyperbaton for all three PE.[63]

In 1 Timothy, the hyperbaton interrupts a compound object four times (1 Tim. 1:15; 4:9; 6:2, 18–19) and separates a referent from a modifier five times. Among those, two have the modifier preceding the referent (1 Tim. 4:6, 8) and three have the modifier following the referent (1 Tim. 4:12, 15; 5:18). In 2 Timothy, four instances of hyperbaton separate a modifier from its referent, with all four have the modifier following the referent (2 Tim. 1:12; 2:2, 24; 3:9). Only one instance of hyperbaton in 2 Timothy separates elements within a compound complement (2 Tim. 3:17). For Titus, on the other hand, six of seven instances of hyperbaton separate elements within a compound complement (Titus 1:7, 16; 2:2, 4, 9; 3:2), with only one example of hyperbaton interrupting a referent and its following modifier (Titus 1:9). In this regard, all three PE differ in the type of hyperbaton, with 1 and 2 Timothy showing slightly more similarity. C-PNs in Titus tend to be predicate adjectives with or without modifiers as a partially codified pattern, with only two such complements not consisting of adjectives: one with both a head noun and head adjectives (Titus 1:6), and one with a nominalized PP as the complement (Titus 3:15). For 1 and 2 Timothy, C-PNs most commonly consist of head adjectives, but not with enough frequency to constitute a pattern. Complements with a head noun are the most common in 1 Timothy, occurring fifteen times without head adjectives, and nominalized PPs as the C-PN are the most common in 2 Timothy, occurring six times. Second Timothy is also the only letter of the PE to have the relative pronoun, in itself, function as the C-PN in its relative clause, which occurs three times (2 Tim. 1:15; 2:17; 4:18).

---

[63] Nine of forty-two such complements in 1 Timothy show hyperbaton, interrupted by the governing verb one six occasions (1 Tim. 4:6, 8, 12, 15; 6:2, 18–19) and by the subject word group three times (1 Tim. 1:15; 4:9; 5:18). In the latter three examples, it is a nominal clause without an expressed verb. Five examples of twenty-two occur in 2 Timothy, with all five interrupted by the governing verb (2 Tim. 1:12; 2:2, 13, 24; 3:9). Seven examples out of twenty-three occur in Titus (Titus 1:7, 9, 16; 2:2, 4, 9; 3:2); like 2 Timothy, in every instance it is the governing verb that interrupts the complement word group.

Complement word groups most commonly occur as structural elements within their governing clause, but they also commonly occur as C-OPs. While the syntax of the PP as an A-PP will be discussed below, there are some areas of similarity and difference among the PE with regard to the C-OP in itself. C-OPs are generally just as likely to consist of a single noun or pronoun as they are to include additional modifiers and elements across the PE.[64] It is partially codified in 1 Timothy and Titus that C-OPs will not include the definite article and marginally codified in 2 Timothy. When a C-OP word group includes the article, it is likely that the word group will include other modifiers on the head noun as well. This phenomenon does not occur with enough frequency to constitute a pattern in 1 Timothy or Titus, but it is partially codified in 2 Timothy. Qualifiers regularly appear within C-OPs, and it partially codified in 1 and 2 Timothy and codified in Titus that the qualifier will follow its referent.[65] The most common modifier within C-OPs, with the sole exception of the definite article in 2 Timothy, is the presence of an adjective. Adjectives tend to be in attributive position as a marginally codified pattern in 2 Timothy and Titus and a partially codified pattern in 1 Timothy. Predicate adjectives in C-OPs in the PE always precede their referent as a fully codified pattern. The adjective πᾶς in predicate position almost always modifies an indefinite head noun, with the sole exception of 1 Timothy 2:2, which is the only time πᾶς modifies a nominalized, substantive participle phrase, yielding a codified pattern. In 2 Timothy, the demonstrative pronoun ἐκεῖνος is used three times as a

---

[64] Sixty of one hundred twenty-one complements of prepositional phrases in 1 Timothy include only a single noun, proper title, or pronoun, with six more compound complements consisting only of single nouns and the conjunction καί. Sixty-four of one hundred twenty-one complements of prepositional phrases in 2 Timothy include only a single element in the word group, with no compound complements that do not include other modifiers. In Titus, only nineteen of forty-seven such complement word groups consist of a single noun or pronoun, with one compound complement consisting of two nouns joined by a καί.

[65] Exceptions can be for emphasis (1 Tim. 6:17; Titus 3:5) or connected to references to the devil (2 Tim. 2:26); it is most likely connected to the qualifier, however, as all exceptions are qualifiers with a subjective genitive force (1 Tim. 5:23; 6:17; 2 Tim; 2:26; 4:16; Titus 3:5).

predicate adjective within a C-OP (2 Tim. 1:12, 18; 4:8). In all three instances, the adjective modifies a definite form of ἡμέρα. For those in attributive position, it is marginally codified in 1 and 2 Timothy that they will be in "repeat" position, but are in "sandwich" position as a marginally codified pattern in Titus. This pattern is likely determined by the type of adjectival modifier, as adjectives proper are in both "sandwich" and "repeat" position with regularity; adverbs functioning as adjectives are always in "sandwich" position,[66] however, while nominalized participles and PPs functioning as adjectives are almost always in "repeat" position.[67] In 2 Timothy, when the referent precedes the governing verb, the attributive adjective tends to be in "sandwich" position[68] while it tends to be in "repeat" position when the referent follows the governing predicator.[69] First Timothy and Titus do not show this pattern, as it might be more related to the type of adjectival modifier rather than it is to the letter itself.[70]

The force of the preposition does potentially impact patterns of word order and syntax for C-OPs. Some are consistent across the PE, while some vary according to available examples. PPs of advantage, with ὑπέρ or πρός, are all in rank-shifted clauses in the PE and four of five examples include the predicate adjective πᾶς either as a nominalized object or a predicate adjective.[71] PPs of basis, with ἐπί or ἐκ, tend to have additional elements beyond the head noun

---

[66] 1 Tim. 6:17; Titus 2:12.

[67] The only exception occurs in 1 Tim. 1:18, where the adjectival participle clause includes an A-PP. Having the participle clause in "sandwich" position makes it clear that the PP is part of the participle clause and not a further adjectival element, a qualifier, or part of the governing clause.

[68] Only one attributive adjective whose referent precedes the predicator is in "repeat" position in 2 Timothy 2:21, but this is part of a seemingly formulaic complement word group with πᾶς, the noun ἔργον, and an adjective following.

[69] Four attributive adjectives whose referent follows the predicator are in "sandwich" position (2 Tim. 1:3, 9; 2:2, 22), compared to thirteen in "repeat" position.

[70] Seven of the thirteen adjectives in "repeat" position within complements prepositional phrases in 2 Timothy are nominalized participles and prepositional phrases.

[71] 1 Tim. 2:1, 2, 6; Titus 3:2. Compare this to Titus 2:14, where the complement is the pronoun ἡμῶν. There

or pronoun, but not with enough examples to constitute a pattern.[72] PPs of manner, with ἐν or

μετά, never have a definite article or embedded qualifier for all seventeen examples in the PE.

Twelve PPs of manner have only nouns as the complement, with five others including the

adjectives on the head noun. Four of those five adjectives are πᾶς in predicate position (1 Tim.

2:2, 11; 5:2; 2 Tim. 4:2) and one is an attributive adjective in "sandwich" position (1 Tim. 3:8).

Across the PE, PPs of reference or respect, which happen with a variety of prepositions,[73] have a

single noun or pronoun as the C-OP as a marginally codified pattern. Additional elements,

however, vary by letter. In 1 and 2 Timothy, the only additional element for complements of

phrases of respect is the definite article (1 Tim. 1:19; 6:21; 2 Tim. 2:18; 3:8), while in Titus one

PP of respect includes multiple adjectives (Titus 3:1). None, however, include an embedded

qualifier word group. PPs of source rarely occur in Titus, but they show some similarities across

eleven examples in 1 and 2 Timothy. For the four examples when παρά takes a complement in

the genitive case to indicate source, the C-OP is always a single noun or pronoun and indicates a

personal source (2 Tim. 1:13, 18; 2:2; 3:14). For the four PPs of source with the preposition ἀπό,

the phrase still indicates a personal source but there is always an extra element within the

complement (1 Tim. 1:2; 3:7; 2 Tim. 1:2; Titus 1:4). The four PPs of source with ἐκ, however,

only indicate an impersonal source and tend to have an extra element in the complement beyond

the head noun (1 Tim. 1:5; 2 Tim. 2:8, 22), with the only exception being a relative pronoun as

the C-OP in 1 Tim. 6:4.[74] PPs of sphere with ἐν are common, occurring thirty-four times in the

---

are no phrases of advantage in 2 Timothy.

[72] Of the eight phrases of basis in 1 Timothy and Titus, two include adjectival modifiers, three include an embedded qualifier, and one includes both. None include an article on the head no itself.

[73] In the PE, phrases of reference occur with the prepositions εἰς, ἐν, ἐπί, περί, and πρός.

[74] The distinction and personal and impersonal sources is not surprising, as this has been noted by grammars for NTG in general (see Wallace, *Grammar*, 368, 378 and Murray J. Harris, *Prepositions and Theology in the Greek New Testament* [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012], 58–59, 62).

PE, it is partially codified for 1 and 2 Timothy, as opposed to Titus, that the complement will consist only of nouns and pronouns. In 1 Timothy, PPs of sphere have no articles or qualifiers in the complement and the three complements with adjectives have the adjective in "repeat" position modifying an indefinite head noun (1 Tim. 3:13; 5:10; 6:18). In 2 Timothy and Titus, however, five such C-OPs include the definite article on the head noun. Two of those also include adjectival modifiers on the definite head noun in "repeat" position (2 Tim. 2:1; Titus 1:9), while in 2 Tim. 1:13 the adjective is a nominalized PP modifying an indefinite head noun, similar to 1 Tim. 3:13. PPs of standard, with κατά, tend to have additional elements within the complement word group across the PE as a partially codified pattern. Qualifiers are a common additional element within the complement of PPs of standard, occurring in eleven of nineteen examples, and they are always qualifiers with a subjective genitive or an objective genitive force.[75] The three that only include nouns as the complement are syntactically unique to the PE.[76] Temporal PPs, which occur with a variety of prepositions,[77] show both similarity and difference across the PE. In 1 and 2 Timothy, they tend to be in rank-shifted contexts as a partially codified pattern. It is partially codified, however, for all the PE that they will include additional elements beyond a head noun in the complement and fully codified that they will include additional elements in the complement when the phrase is referring to present or future time. When the phrase is referring to past time, which only occurs in 2 Timothy and Titus,[78] only two of five

---

[75] Within the eleven examples, there are eight subjective genitive qualifiers and four objective genitive qualifiers.

[76] One example is the phrase κατὰ πρόσκλισιν in 1 Tim. 5:21. The noun πρόσκλισις is an *hapax legomenon* both in the LXX and the NT. Similarly, the other two examples are both the phrase κατ' εὐσέβειαν in 1 Tim. 6:3 and Titus 1:1. These are the only two occurrences of εὐσέβεια with κατά in the LXX or the NT.

[77] Temporal phrases occur with ἀπό, εἰς, ἐν, μετά, μέχρι, and πρό in the PE.

[78] 2 Tim. 1:3, 9; 3:15; 4:21; Titus 1:2.

examples include additional elements in the complement beyond a head noun (2 Tim. 1:9; Titus

1:2). Aside from the force of the PP, it is not evident that the phenomenon of rank-shift, in itself,

has any large-scale impact on word order or expected elements within C-OPs for any of the PE.

C-OPs are also the least likely complement type to demonstrate hyperbaton, with only three

examples within two hundred eighty-nine such complements (1 Tim. 3:6, 7; 2 Tim. 2:16).[79]

Adjunct Word Groups

The PE show much similarity but also some dissimilarity in the syntactical and word order

patterns for adjunct word groups. Adjunct word groups fall into four main categories: those

consisting of conjunctions, A-Advs, A-CUs, and A-PPs that modify an expressed or implied

predicator. Most conjunctive adjunct word groups consist of only a single conjunction,

eliminating the need to discuss word order within the group, but there are some patterns of

syntax for them. For Cj-Hs, it is partially codified for both 1 Timothy and Titus that the

conjunction will be the ἵνα of purpose. Only two of five Cj-Hs in 2 Timothy are the ἵνα of

purpose. This could be linked to clausal type, as it is marginally codified in 1 Timothy and Titus

that hypotactic clauses, as a whole, will modify a paratactic clause with an imperative or

paraenetic force. In 2 Timothy, however, no hypotactic clause proper modifies an paraenetic

paratactic clause, appearing instead with explanatory or expository main clauses. For all three

PE, the most common Cj-P is δέ followed by γάρ as the second commonest. One difference,

however, is that in Titus the conjunction δέ only serves a contrastive function. In 1 and 2

Timothy, the contrastive force is the most common for δέ, but it also regularly serves a

---

[79] Two of these examples, 2 Tim. 3:6 and 3:7 are references to the devil (διάβολος), which display highly unusual syntax in the PE. For the other example, found in 2 Tim. 2:16, the relationship between ἐπὶ πλεῖον and ἀσεβείας is not clear, as discussed above.

conjunctive or transitional force. Lastly, it is fully codified in 1 Timothy and codified in Titus

that Cj-Ps will not appear within rank-shifted clauses, with the sole exception being a contrastive

δέ within a relative clause in Titus 1:3.[80] It is only partially codified in 2 Timothy, with six

examples within relative clauses (2 Tim. 1:5; 2:18, 20; 4:8) and one within a rank-shifted

participle clause (2 Tim. 1:10).

A-Advs and A-CUs also display similarity and dissimilarity across the PE, depending on

the type and force of the adjunct itself as well as the governing clause. The most common A-Adv

for all three PE is the additive use of καί. It is partially codified in 2 Timothy and marginally

codified in 1 Timothy that the additive καί will precede an expressed verb. In Titus, all four

appearances of the additive καί follow the expressed, governing predicator. In addition to the

additive καί, 1 and 2 Timothy show closer affinity, compared with Titus, for other forces of A-

Advs. A-Advs of time and manner for 1 and 2 Timothy generally precede their governing verb as

a marginally codified pattern in 1 Timothy and a tendency in 2 Timothy. In Titus, however, no

temporal A-Advs precede an expressed verb and only two of four adverbs of manner. The

position of A-Advs with the forces of time or manner in 1 and 2 Timothy somewhat depend on

the word group type and the clause type. For A-Advs of manner, they tend to follow the

governing predicator for imperative clauses in 1 Timothy and for infinitive clauses, imperative

clauses, and the single relative clause with a manner adjunct in 2 Timothy. In Titus, these

patterns are not as evident. For temporal adjuncts, the type of the adjunct itself appears to impact

word group order in addition to the governing clause type. In 1 Timothy, the only temporal

adjuncts to follow the predicator are A-CUs.[81] For 2 Timothy, two of the five temporal adjuncts

---

[80] While still paratactic clauses, it is worth noting that five paratactic conjunctions in 1 Timothy occur within asides (1 Tim. 1:10; 3:5).

[81] This includes one group in the genitive case (1 Tim. 5:5), one in the dative case (1 Tim. 2:6), and one in the

that follow their predicator are A-CUs,[82] but three are A-Advs. Furthermore, temporal adjuncts

that follow their predicator, for both 1 and 2 Timothy, tend to be in either imperative or rank-

shifted clauses. For Titus, there are only three temporal adjuncts, with only two of them

occurring with an expressed predicator. One is an A-CU in the dative case and follows the verb

in a relative clause (Titus 1:3) and the other is an A-Adv that occurs within an explanatory

paratactic clause (Titus 3:3). It could be that Titus follows a similar pattern as 1 and 2 Timothy,

but there are too few examples to establish certainty in either direction.

A-CUs show strong patterns of word order within the group for the PE. Across the PE, A-

CUs tend to be in the dative case, with 1 and 2 Timothy including about half of their A-CUs in

the dative case and all six examples from Titus being in the dative case. Only two A-CUs are in

the genitive case, both with a temporal force (1 Tim. 5:5; 2 Tim. 1:3). Only one A-CU includes

the group in the nominative case (1 Tim. 2:13), which functions as a retained nominative with a

passive verb, technically functioning as a predicate adjective in an object-complement

construction.[83] Embedded qualifiers are rare for A-CUs, with two examples in 1 Timothy (1 Tim.

2:1; 4:6) and one in Titus 3:7. There are six A-CUs with an adjectival modifier on a head noun in

the PE. All six are attributive adjectives in repeat position modifying anarthrous head nouns (1

Tim. 2:6; 6:10, 15; 2 Tim. 1:9; 3:6; Titus 1:3). For 1 and 2 Timothy, it is rare for an A-CU to

include an definite article, with only two examples each. For Titus, however, five of six

examples include a definite article. One other area of difference is that all five with articles in

Titus are in the dative case, while three of four in 1 and 2 Timothy with articles are in the

---

accusative case (1 Tim. 3:10). Two other groups in the dative and accusative cases also precede their governing predicator (1 Tim. 1:13; 6:15).

[82] One is in the genitive case (2 Tim. 1:3) and one is in the accusative case (2 Tim. 1:5).

[83] Knight, *Epistles*, 143 and Perkins, *Letters*, 45

accusative case.[84] For all three PE, it is marginally codified overall that A-CUs follow an expressed predicator. Exceptions tend to be when the A-CU is in the dative or accusative case with a temporal force. The other two examples that precede an expressed predicator are a dative of means within the context of contrast (Titus 1:16) and a dative of disadvantage within a negative, optative wish clause between two contrasted clauses (2 Tim. 4:16). One other notable phenomenon depends on the presence of the A-CU within participle clauses, which commonly include an A-CU usage in the PE. There are ten A-CUs within seven rank-shifted participle clauses and three HC-ptcs. For those within participle clauses, across all three PE, it is codified that the word group will include a modifying element beyond the head noun, with only one exception in 2 Tim. 3:6. Furthermore, only two of eleven A-CUs with a temporal force occur within participle clauses (1 Tim. 1:13; 2 Tim. 2:6), but four of six with a force of means (1 Tim. 4:6; 2 Tim. 1:9; 3:6; Titus 3:7).

Only a few patterns for the remaining type of adjunct word group, A-PPs, can be discussed here, as the word order within the C-OP is discussed above. It is marginally codified for the PE, both individually and overall, that A-PPs will follow their governing predicator. Exceptions to this tendency vary by letter. Five of seven A-PPs of reference, with περί or πρός, precede the predicator in 1 Timothy. These five examples are all in relative or paratactic clauses with indicative verbs, while the two that follow their predicator, with ἐπί and περί, are in participle clauses (1 Tim. 1:18; 6:4). Within 2 Timothy, the only force that dominantly precedes the governing verb is when the A-PPs indicate cause with διά or ἐν (2 Tim. 1:6, 12; 2:9, 10). Temporal A-PPs also regularly precede their governing verb (2 Tim. 3:1, 15; 4:16, 21). It is also

---

[84] Furthermore, both examples in 2 Timothy are accusative A-CUs with the force of reference or respect, which are the only examples of case usage with this force in 1 or 2 Timothy.

noteworthy that nine of ten temporal A-PPs are within rank-shifted clauses in 2 Timothy.[85]

Within Titus, the only potentially consistent exceptions are for A-PPs of basis with ἐκ (Titus 3:5) and cause with διά (Titus 1:13) or χάριν (Titus 1:5). Lastly, it is common for all three that A-PPs occur within a rank-shifted context, with slightly over half of all PPs for every letter occurring within a rank-shifted context with nearly identical frequency.[86]

Qualifier Word Groups

Qualifier word groups show many consistent and varying syntactical patterns across the PE, according to their type, force, and other factors. The three general types of qualifier word groups are PPs that function to modify a head noun or adjective, relative clauses, and nominal groups that modify a head noun or adjective, typically in the genitive case. There are a handful of other types of qualifiers, including ὅτι clauses in apposition (1 Tim. 1:9–10, 15; 2 Tim. 1:15), direct quotations in apposition (2 Tim. 2:19), or epexegetical infinitive clauses modifying the predicate adjectives δυνατός or ἱκανός (2 Tim. 1:12; 2:2; Titus 1:9). While these to do not occur with enough frequency to propose any patterns, there are a few noteworthy features regarding the three infinitive clauses functioning as qualifiers. All three occur, as would be expected, within a C-PN and modify a predicate adjective with an underlying verbal idea that takes a complementary infinitive. All three examples also include hyperbaton within the governing complement word group, with the governing verb interrupting the predicate adjective and its following epexegetical qualifier. Relative clauses, whose regular function is to serve as a qualifier with an adjectival force, tend to appear within clauses proper as a marginally codified

---

[85] Two of three temporal A-PPs in 1 Timothy are in rank-shifted clauses, but one of three in Titus.

[86] For 1 Timothy, fifty-seven of one hundred ten such are examples are in a rank-shifted context (51.8%). For 2 Timothy, fifty of ninety-eight examples are in rank-shifted contexts (51%). Eighteen of thirty-five prepositional phrase adjuncts in Titus appear within a rank-shifted context (51.4%).

pattern for the PE. They always follow their referent as a fully codified pattern and they follow their governing verb as a codified pattern in 1 and 2 Timothy. Other patterns for the word group order of the relative clause itself are presented above.

PPs, in addition to serving as adjunct word groups, nominalized adjectives, or complement word groups, function as embedded qualifier word groups twenty-five times across the PE. The most common force for PP qualifiers to carry across the PE is an epexegetical force, followed by the force of purpose. It is partially codified for the PE overall that such qualifiers will follow their head noun or adjective and, when there is an expressed governing predicator, it is codified that PP qualifiers will appear within word groups that follow the verb. This pattern, however, varies according to the letter. It is fully codified in 1 Timothy that PP qualifiers will follow their referent and appear within a word group that follows an expressed verb. It is partially codified in 2 Timothy that PP qualifiers will follow their referent and fully codified that they will not appear in word groups that precede an expressed predicator. In Titus, however, PP qualifiers precede and follow their referent with equal frequency. It is partially codified that they will not appear in word groups that precede an expressed predicator, with Titus 3:1 being the only example within the PE of a PP qualifier preceding its governing verb. Within 2 Timothy and Titus, PP qualifiers that precede their referent are almost always in infinitive or participle clauses, while those in paratactic clauses follow their referent with only one exception (2 Tim. 2:21). The two PP qualifiers that precede their referent in 2 Timothy either occur on a head adjective with multiple qualifiers for emphasis (2 Tim. 2:14) or have the word group order switch at both the end of a list and the end of a subsection (2 Tim. 2:21). For the four exceptions in Titus, one is part of the final element of list and a subsection (Titus 1:16) and one is both part of the first sentence of a section and the beginning element of a list (Titus 3:1). The exceptions in Titus 2:3 and 2:7 are also

within the beginning of a list, but without any other factors that would explain the word group order switch.

Nominal groups are the most common type of qualifier within the PE, with a variety of patterns across the letters. For all three letters, nominal qualifiers tend to appear within paratactic and hypotactic clauses proper as a marginally codified pattern in 1 and 2 Timothy and as a partially codified pattern in Titus. It is partially codified for all three PE that nominal qualifiers will follow their referent, and, for all three PE, nominal qualifiers most commonly have an appositive, subjective genitive, or objective genitive force. Nominal qualifiers with a possessive force also regularly occur. It is marginally codified that nominal qualifiers in 2 Timothy will consist of a single noun, pronoun, or title, but less than half of the nominal qualifiers in 1 Timothy and Titus consist of a single word or title. Nominal qualifiers regularly include a definite article across the PE; the presence of the definite does not appear to depend on the force of the qualifier or clause type but rather on the definiteness of the head noun or pronoun, which will be discussed below. Many qualifier word groups also include an embedded qualifier within the word group. In 1 Timothy and Titus, these are the most common within qualifiers of apposition or those with a subjective genitive force, although some with additional qualifiers in 1 Timothy also have an objective genitive force. In 2 Timothy, those with additional embedded qualifiers tend to have an appositional or objective genitive force. Only one such qualifier has a subjective genitive force in 2 Timothy (2 Tim. 1:10),[87] while none have an objective genitive force in Titus. Before discussing patterns that relate to the presence and placement of adjectives

---

[87] The force of τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν is debated (Perkins, *Letters*, 167), as Christ Jesus could sensibly be rendered as either the cause of the revelation (subjective) or what is being revealed (objective). Within the context, the subjective genitive rendering is the most likely, as the entirety of the compound participle clause modifies the referent χάριν from 2 Tim. 1:9. Thereby the most likely idea behind the qualifier is that Jesus is the one revealing the purpose (πρόθεσις) and grace (χάρις) of God.

within nominal qualifiers, it is also codified in 2 Timothy and Titus and partially codified in 1 Timothy that the qualifier will match the definiteness of the head noun, whether definite or indefinite. Exceptions in Titus occur when θεοῦ appears as an appositive to τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν, and always within the context of a subjective genitive qualifier. Exceptions in 1 and 2 Timothy occur in a variety of contexts, but also commonly include objective genitive, subjective genitive, and appositive qualifiers. When the qualifier does not match the definiteness of the referent, it is partially codified that it will be a definite qualifier on a grammatically indefinite referent for 1 and 2 Timothy, while three of four examples in Titus are a grammatically indefinite qualifier on a definite referent. When the mismatch includes an indefinite qualifier on a definite referent, the qualifier is always an explicit reference to God, either in apposition to the referent (1 Tim. 1:17; 2:3; 6:16; Titus 1:3; 2:10; 3:4) or as a possessive qualifier (2 Tim. 2:19).

The word order and type of adjectives within nominal qualifiers both show general consistency across the PE. It is fully codified in 2 Timothy, codified in Titus, and partially codified in 1 Timothy that adjectives within nominal qualifier word groups will be in attributive position to their referent, yielding a partially codified overall. The adjective πᾶς appears in predicate position before its head noun four times in 1 Timothy, with three occurrences appearing within epexegetical qualifiers that precede their referent (1 Tim. 1:15; 4:9; 6:1) and one within a genitive of source that follows its referent (1 Tim. 6:10). The adjective σωτήριος also appears in predicate position in Titus 2:11 and follows its head noun; this is a syntactically difficult passage discussed above. When adjectives within nominal qualifier are in attributive position, they tend to be in "sandwich" position before their head noun; this is a partially codified pattern in 1 Timothy, a marginally codified pattern in 2 Timothy, and a tendency in Titus, yielding a marginally codified pattern overall. Across qualifiers in the PE, adjectives

proper, by part of speech, almost always appear in "sandwich" position as a partially codified

pattern.[88] By contrast, nominalized PPs and participles, functioning as adjectives, almost always

appear in "repeat" position also as a partially codified pattern.[89] Lastly, when a nominal qualifier

includes an attributive adjective, it is fully codified in 2 Timothy, codified in Titus, and

marginally codified in 1 Timothy that the qualifier will follow its referent, yielding a partially

codified pattern overall for the PE. Exceptions are almost always qualifiers functioning as a

genitive of relationship within a C-PN (1 Tim. 3:2, 12; 5:9; Titus 1:6), with two other exceptions

when an epexegetical modifier directly modifies the predicator (1 Tim. 5:17) and when a

subjective genitive qualifier modifies the subject and appears within a context of contrast (1 Tim.

5:24). Furthermore, every time a nominal, epexegetical qualifier word group includes an

adjectival modifier on the head noun the qualifier precedes its referent.

Nominal qualifier word groups also display patterns of word order and syntax based on the

force of the qualifier word group. Appositive nominal qualifiers in 1 and 2 Timothy follow their

---

[88] The three exceptions are all found in Titus (Titus 1:2; 3:5, 7). In all three cases, the position of the adjective—αἰώνιος in Titus 1:2; 3:7 and ἅγιος in Titus 3:5—appears to be lexical, if not formulaic. The adjective αἰώνιος regularly appears in "repeat" position to the noun ζωή elsewhere in the NT, especially when in the genitive case as part of a nominal qualifier word group. With the adjective αἰώνιος modifying the noun ζωή in general, see Matt. 19:16, 29; 25:46; Mark 10:17, 30; Luke 10:25; 18:18, 30; Acts 13:48; Rom. 2:7; 6:22, 23; Gal. 6:8; 1 Tim. 1:16; 1 John 1:2; 2:25; 3:15; 5:11, 13, 20; Jude 21. Although, see also 1 Tim. 6:12. As a genitive qualifier, see John 6:68 and Titus 1:2; 3:7. But, see also Acts 13:46, where the nominal qualifier reads τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς. Similarly, references to the Holy Spirit in the NT regularly have the adjective, ἅγιος, in "repeat" position, most pertinently when it is used as a genitive qualifier and the head noun is anarthrous. When the Holy Spirit is used a qualifier word group in the genitive case, the adjective regularly appears in both "sandwich" position (Acts 2:38; 9:31; 10:45; 2 Cor. 13:13) and "repeat" position (Acts 2:33; 6:5; 7:55; 11:24; 1 Thess. 1:6; Heb. 2:4). When the adjective is in "repeat" position, it can be arthrous (Acts 2:33) but more often appears when both the head noun, πνεύματος, and the referent are anarthrous (Acts 6:5; 7:55; 11:24; 1 Thess. 1:6; Heb. 2:4). When the adjective is in sandwich position, it is always on a definite head noun modifying an arthrous referent (Acts 2:38; 9:31; 10:45; 2 Cor. 13:13). With this in mind, the qualifier as it appears in Titus 3:5 fits with the larger patterns of NTG.

[89] The two exceptions to the latter pattern are found in 1 Tim. 6:5 and 2 Tim. 1:5. There is one PP functioning as an adjective that appears in "sandwich" position in 2 Tim. 1:5, but it also occurs alongside an adjective proper on the same head noun. Similarly, there is one participle functioning as an adjective that appears in "sandwich" position in 1 Tim. 6:5, but it is in hyperbaton, with the participle preceding the head noun and the rest of the participle clause following the head noun, and part of a compound adjectival group with another participle clause.

referent as a fully codified pattern and it is fully codified that, when there is an expressed

predicator, appositive nominal qualifiers will only appear in word groups that follow the

governing verb. In Titus, it is still fully codified that appositive nominal qualifiers will follow

their referent, but only partially codified that the governing word group will follow an expressed

predicator.[90] Appositive nominal qualifiers appear in a variety of contexts, but are very unlikely

within C-PNs[91] and especially likely within C-IOs.[92] Objective genitive qualifiers, like those of

apposition, always follow their referent as a fully codified pattern for all three PE, but their word

order depends on the letter. In Titus, objective genitive qualifiers will never include an embedded

qualifier, almost never include a definite article, and regularly include an adjectival modifier.[93] In

1 and 2 Timothy, objective genitive qualifiers almost never include an adjectival modifier, do

include qualifiers on multiple occasions, and are much more likely to include a definite article.[94]

Subjective genitive qualifiers tend to follow their referent also, but regularly precede their

referent in all three PE.[95] It is rare for subjective genitive qualifiers to include an adjectival

element, which only occurs in five such word groups across 1 Timothy and Titus.[96] All three PE

---

[90] The two exceptions occur in Titus 2:10, which contains very odd syntax and is the end of a subsection, and Titus 3:13. In both cases, though, the qualifier modifies a C-DO within a paraenetic context.

[91] Only one appositive nominal qualifier in all the PE occurs in such a context (1 Tim. 3:15).

[92] Seven of forty-six appositive qualifiers, or 15%, occur within C-IOs, which is significant considering how infrequent indirect objects are compared to types of complement word groups. C-IOs only account for roughly 3% to 6% of complement word groups for each letter.

[93] Only one objective genitive qualifier word group includes an article in Titus. In this case, the article is not on the head noun, but on the adjectival element, which is a nominalized prepositional phrase (Titus 1:1). Five of twelve objective genitive qualifiers include an adjectival element.

[94] Only three of thirty-five objective genitive qualifiers between 1 and 2 Timothy include an adjectival modifier within the word group (1 Tim. 4:10; 2 Tim. 1:5, 13). Twelve include the definite article modifying the head noun and six include further embedded qualifiers with a variety of functions (1 Tim. 1:11; 4:8, 11; 2 Tim. 1:5, 6, 8).

[95] Twelve of fifty-seven subjective genitive qualifiers across the PE precede their referent,

[96] Both subjective genitive qualifier word groups with adjectives in 1 Timothy include attributive adjectives in "sandwich" position (1 Tim. 5:24; 6:20), while all three in Titus follow their referent in attributive, "repeat" position or predicate position (Titus 1:14; 2:11; 3:5).

regularly include a definite article on the head noun within subjective genitive qualifiers, and only one with a definite article precedes its referent (2 Tim. 2:26). Qualifiers are the most common additional element within subject genitive qualifiers in 1 Timothy and Titus but only one includes another embedded qualifier in 2 Timothy. Subjective genitive qualifiers with further embedded qualifiers always follow their referent in all three PE and, with one exception (1 Tim. 4:14), always have a Divine referent as either the head noun or one of the embedded qualifiers. With the sole exception of the relative clause modifying πνεύματος ἁγίου in Titus 3:5 and the possessive genitive qualifier in Titus 2:13, the qualifiers embedded within subjective genitive qualifiers only have a subjective genitive, objective genitive, or appositive force.

Patterns of syntax and word order are evident for other types and forces of qualifier word groups in addition to the three most common. Nominal qualifier word groups indicating possession are also common among the PE. Only one of twenty-three includes an additional embedded qualifier word group (Titus 2:13) and five include a definite article. Adjectival elements are also uncommon, only occurring in four possessive qualifiers, but they do follow the general tendencies for adjectives in nominal qualifiers as outlined above. Nominal qualifiers of reference or respect are not as common in the PE and do not appear at all in Titus, but they always include a definite article when the word group is in the genitive case (1 Tim. 3:9, 16; 4:6, 12; 6:12). For the two qualifiers of referent in the dative case, one includes an article (2 Tim. 2:21) and one does not (1 Tim. 4:15).[97] Only one qualifier of referent includes an adjective and none includes a qualifier, but there are not enough examples to draw any conclusions. Qualifier word groups functioning as a genitive of relationship also show both consistency and difference across the PE. Only four qualifiers of relationship occur in 1 Timothy and Titus, but all four

---

[97] The lack of an article on πᾶσιν in 1 Tim. 4:15 could be due to the qualifier's presence within a C-PN.

precede an anarthrous referent, include a single, attributive adjective in "sandwich" position, and occur within a C-PN. Two of six qualifiers of relationship in 2 Timothy precede their referent, with both examples occurring within a complement word group: one C-DO (2 Tim. 4:19) and one C-IO (2 Tim. 1:16). The four that follow their referent in 2 Timothy occur within a subject word group (2 Tim. 2:1) or a C-OP (2 Tim. 1:5; 2:8). Qualifiers of relationship in the genitive case, then, are very likely to precede their referent compared to other forces of qualifier, especially when the qualifier is within a complement word group other than a C-OP. Finally, epexegetical qualifiers tend to have their own tendencies among the PE, depending on the type of qualifier. The only nominal qualifier word groups with an epexegetical force occur in 1 Timothy. Four of the five precede their referent and have a single adjective preceding the head noun (1 Tim. 1:15; 4:9; 5:17; 6:1). The other nominal, epexegetical qualifier occurs within a direct quotation in 1 Tim. 5:18 and, rather than an adjective, includes both a definite article and possessive qualifier following the head noun. All five modify a form of the adjective ἄξιος or the verb ἀξιόω. There are also eight PPs functioning as epexegetical qualifiers in the PE and three infinitive clauses. All three infinitive clauses functioning as epexegetical qualifiers follow their referent and modify a predicate adjective in a C-PN (2 Tim. 1:12; 2:2; Titus 1:9). All eight PPs that function as epexegetical qualifiers also modify an adjective as their referent, but show a little more variance in syntax. Both such qualifiers in 1 Timothy follow their head adjective (1 Tim. 2:3; 5:4), both such qualifiers in Titus precede their head adjective (Titus 1:16; 3:1), and three of four such qualifiers in 2 Timothy follow their head adjective (2 Tim. 2:14; 3:8, 16). Five modify head adjectives within C-PNs (1 Tim. 2:3; 5:4; 2 Tim. 3:16; Titus 1:16; 3:1), two are within C-DOs (2 Tim. 2:14), and one is within a subject word group (2 Tim. 3:8). While there are differences based on the letter of the PE and the type of qualifier, epexegetical qualifiers are

among the most likely forces of qualifier to precede their referent, with seven of sixteen examples preceding their referent, especially for nominal and PP qualifiers.

Summary of Comparison

The linguistic profiles for the three PE, downward along the rank scale, show both similarity and difference for various linguistic phenomena. In the following section, the three profiles will be presented as one holistic profile for testing and comparison with other samples from NTG, but some initial observations are salient. On the rank of section, all three PE show general similarity with regard to the illocutionary force of opening and second sentences of sections throughout the body of the letter, but differ on the presence of rank-shifted clauses within those sentences. Sections for all three PE typically include a lexical and semantic *inclusio*, but only 1 Timothy has consistent diction with certain verbs in section transitions over against subsection transitions. Initial subsections within sections tend to be paraenetic in nature for all three PE, but 1 and 2 Timothy show similarity in having second subsections of paraenesis over against Titus, whose second subsections are expository in nature. Asyndeton is the most common connective device for sections and subsections for all three letters, typically within the opening and closing sections. There is difference with other connective devices, especially the use and force of δέ, anaphoric and cataphoric demonstrative pronouns, and γάρ as a connective device for subsections. Subsections generally end with commands, explanatory clauses with γάρ, ἵνα clauses of purpose, and the presence of hyperbaton, but the frequency varies by letter. Subsection conclusions show much greater affinity between 1 and 2 Timothy than either letter with Titus.

On the rank of section, the three PE show general consistency in the word group order of paratactic imperative clauses with regard to complement word groups, but some variation with regard to the placement of adjunct word groups according to their type. They also show

410

consistency of word groups, including subject, complement, and adjunct word groups, with regard to indicative clauses with the illocutionary force of a wish or command. For paratactic indicative clauses, the PE show both similarity and difference, with 1 and 2 Timothy having the closest affinity. 1 and 2 Timothy agree over against Titus with regard to placement of the subject word group in the clause, the placement of A-Advs, and the frequency of marked syntax when the indicative clause concludes a section or subsection. They are also closer with regard to the placement of complement word groups. First Timothy and Titus do, however, show closer affinity with regard to the word group order of A-CUs. All three PE show a similar frequency is the appearance of complement word groups in paratactic indicative clauses, however, as well as similarity in the placement of A-PPs. One area where 2 Timothy and Titus agree over against 1 Timothy, however, is the use of connective devices in paratactic indicative clauses. The conjunction δέ is the most common connective device in such clauses for 1 Timothy followed by γάρ, while asyndeton is more common in 2 Timothy and Titus. Paratactic nominal clauses generally tend to have an S-C structure for non-formulaic clauses and a C-S structure for formulaic clauses, with 1 and 2 Timothy showing closer affinity with regard to the frequency of adjunct word groups.

Also on the rank of section, the syntax of hypotactic clauses proper show both consistency and difference among the PE depending on the type and force of the clause. HC-Cjs of purpose, with ἵνα, are more common in 1 Timothy and Titus, but their syntax with respect their governing clause is generally consistent across the PE. The clausal structure for ἵνα clauses of purpose varies according to each letter, but they are all similar with regard to the presence of complement word groups and the word group order of both subject and adjunct word groups. HC-Cjs with conjunctions other than ἵνα have a consistent clausal structure across the PE, but 1 Timothy and

Titus agree over against 2 Timothy about the placement of the HC-Cj relative to the governing, paratactic clause. All three PE show general consistency with regard to a P-C clausal structure, syntax within the larger, governing clause, the presence and placement of subject and adjunct word groups, and even verbal tense for the other type of hypotactic clause proper, namely, HC-ptcs. There are some minor variations, however, between the PE for the position of the HC-ptc relative to the main clause depending on the force and the tense of the participle and 1 Timothy does show some variation for clausal structure depending on other syntactical phenomena.

Rank-shifted clauses, depending on their type, show great similarity but also some dissimilarity across the PE. The syntax of infinitive clauses is similar across the PE with regard to their function and position within their governing clause, the complete absence of an article on the infinitive, the tense of infinitive relative to the illocutionary force of the governing clause, as well as the frequency and syntax of subject and adjunct word groups within the clause. Second Timothy and Titus are closer in frequency for complement word groups and a C-P clausal structure. First Timothy has complement word groups both with less frequency and with greater variation. All three PE, however, generally show a default infinitive clausal structure of C-P. 1 and 2 Timothy, however, show greater similarity over against Titus with regard to the force of the infinitive clause and the syntax of adjunct word groups. Attributive participle clauses show great similarity across the PE for the frequency and placement of word groups within the clause, with P-C serving as the expected clausal structure when there is an expressed complement. The three PE show dissimilarity, however, regarding the force of the participle, the frequency of a definite article according to the force, the tense of the participle, and the syntax of the governing clause. Generally, 1 and 2 Timothy show greater similarity over against Titus with regard to these various phenomena, especially in the force and placement of the participle clause within its

governing clause. The syntax, frequency of word groups, and clausal structure of relative clauses is consistent across the PE, with the only issue of difference being that relative clauses in 1 Timothy are more likely to appear within rank-shifted clauses than those in 2 Timothy and Titus.

The last rank under consideration is the word group, where the PE show many areas of agreement and disagreement. Within the subject word group, the frequency of elements beyond a single head noun or pronoun is consistent across the PE, as well as the placement and function of adjectives and embedded qualifiers. 1 and 2 Timothy disagree, however, on the collocation of the definite article alongside attributive or predicate adjectives. The PE also agree on the placement of the subject word group itself within the governing clause, with the sole exception of Titus showing great difference in the placement of subject word groups in paratactic clauses over against 1 and 2 Timothy.

Areas of agreement and disagreement vary for complement word groups according to their function. The PE generally agree on the presence of various elements and the word order for C-DOs. First Timothy and Titus, however, regularly collocate qualifiers with an adjectival modifier on the same head noun while 2 Timothy rarely does so. 1 and 2 Timothy rarely have adjectival modifiers in C-DOs of rank-shifted clauses, while most of those with adjectives in Titus are within rank-shifted clauses. C-IOs show consistency across the PE, with the only area of notable difference being that in 2 Timothy and Titus, compared with 1 Timothy, C-IOs are more likely to appear within clauses proper. For C-PNs, 1 and 2 Timothy show great agreement over against Titus, including the likelihood and word order of qualifiers, the placement of the complement in its own clause, and the frequency of the word group consisting of head nouns or head adjectives. All three PE agree on the frequency of the definite article in such complements and the frequency of hyperbaton. The presence and word order impact of hyperbaton differs among all

three letters, but 1 and 2 Timothy show closer similarity compared to Titus.

For C-OPs, the PE show agreement with regard to the frequency and word order of various additional elements, especially the definite article, predicate adjectives, and embedded qualifiers. There is some disagreement concerning the position of attributive adjectives, concerning which 1 and 2 Timothy show agreement against Titus. The three PE also show much agreement in word order and the frequency of additional elements beyond the head noun according the force of the PP. Potential areas of disagreement are the presence of modifying elements beyond the definite article in PPs of reference and phrases of sphere and the likelihood of a temporal PP occurring within a rank-shifted context; in each of these areas 1 and 2 Timothy agree over against Titus.

Adjunct word groups in the PE demonstrate much agreement between the three letters, especially regarding the word group order of A-PPs within their clause and their frequency within rank-shifted clauses, the word group order of A-CUs within their governing clause and the presence of such adjunct groups within participle clauses, and the frequency of the most common conjunctions serving as conjunctive adjuncts. 1 and 2 Timothy, however, agree over Titus in the variegated use of δέ, the placement of A-Advs within their governing clause, the frequency of the definite article within A-CUs and the case used with the article. All three PE show some minor difference in the word group order of A-PPs according to their force, but a general consistency overall.

The PE both agree and disagree on many syntactical and word order patterns for qualifier word groups according to their type, force, and syntactical context. The placement, force, and clausal context for infinitive clauses and relative clauses functioning as qualifiers are consistent across the PE, as well as the force and placement relative to the governing verb for PP qualifiers. 1 and 2 Timothy, however, are more consistent in the placement of the PP qualifier relative to

the referent compared with Titus. For nominal groups functioning as qualifier word groups, the PE generally agree on the type of governing clause, the position of the qualifier word group following the referent, the most common forces for qualifier word groups, the frequency of the definite article within the word group, and the frequency and syntax of adjectival elements within the word group. In 1 Timothy and Titus, over against 2 Timothy, qualifier word groups are more likely to include additional modifying elements beyond the head noun or pronoun. First Timothy and Titus also show closer affinity in the frequency of additional embedded qualifiers within qualifier word groups according to the force of the governing qualifier. When the qualifier does not match in definiteness with its referent, 1 and 2 Timothy typically have a definite qualifier on a grammatically indefinite qualifier, while this likelihood is switched for Titus.

There are also areas of both agreement and disagreement across the PE for qualifier word groups when they are analyzed according to their force. The syntax and word order for qualifiers of apposition are consistent across the PE. The position of objective genitive qualifiers relative to their referent is consistent across the PE, but 1 and 2 Timothy agree concerning the additional elements and modifiers within objective genitive qualifiers over against Titus. All three PE agree on the position of subjective genitive qualifiers relative to their referent and the frequency of the definite article within the word group. First Timothy and Titus agree over against 2 Timothy, however, concerning the presence and placement of adjectives and embedded qualifiers within subjective genitive qualifier word groups. The PE show general consistency concerning the syntax and word order of genitive qualifiers of possession and qualifiers of reference. First Timothy and Titus show strong consistency in the syntax of genitive qualifiers of relationship, while 2 Timothy demonstrates more variance. The PE all differ in the syntax of epexegetical qualifiers depending on the type of qualifier. First Timothy is the only PE to include nominal

groups as epexegetical qualifiers, 1 Timothy and Titus are closer with regard to the placement of the epexegetical qualifier relative to its referent, and 2 Timothy and Titus agree concerning the syntax of infinitive clauses functioning as epexegetical qualifiers. Across the PE, however, epexegetical qualifiers are statistically the most likely kind of qualifier to precede its referent.

The Linguistic Profile of the Pastoral Epistles

Here the similarities and differences among the PE downward through the rank scale will be presented briefly in one, cohesive linguistic profile. With the previous section on the differences between the PE, together these sections will then provide the basis for comparison with other select chapters of the NT and yield initial data for considerations of how the elements of syntax, clausal structures, and word order presented in this study could potentially contribute to the larger issues of register and stylistic variation across NTG.

The Rank of Section

On the rank of section, sections in the PE open with an imperative or paraenetic sentence as a partially codified pattern and it is marginally codified that the second sentence will be explanatory. It is marginally codified that a section will end with an expository or explanatory sentence and partially codified that a section will end with a lexical and semantic *inclusio*, recalling the word and themes of the opening sentence of the section. Asyndeton is the most common connective device between sections, but the PE also commonly use the conjunction οὖν, an anaphoric demonstrative pronoun, or the conjunction δέ.

For the syntax of subsections in the PE, the common pattern is that the opening subsection of a larger section has a paraenetic force and is followed by a second subsection of continued commands or exhortation. Second subsections are also commonly expository in force. Asyndeton is the most common transitional device for subsections, especially as the beginning

and end of the body of each letter, and typically occur with imperative and indicative verbs. Other connective devices for subsection transitions include the conjunction δέ, the conjunction οὖν, the anaphoric demonstrative pronoun, the cataphoric demonstrative pronoun, and the conjunction γάρ. Subsections most commonly conclude with expository clauses or explanatory clauses with γάρ, but can also conclude with imperative clauses or a ἵνα clause of purpose. Finally, it is common for subsections to conclude with hyperbaton or other structural irregularities, especially for the first or final subsection of a larger section.

The Rank of Clause

For paratactic clauses, codified patterns depend on the type of clause. For imperative paratactic clauses in the PE, it is partially codified that the clause will have an expressed complement word group. Generally, for all three PE, complements consisting of a single noun or nominal group precede the predicator, while compound complements, infinitive clauses functioning as the complement, and those with a relative clause follow the predicator. Abrogation of this pattern occurs for emphasis, contrast, or as a transitional marker. Subject word groups are not common, but, when expressed, they almost always precede the predicator and typically appear within the context of contrast or a sectional transition. Adjunct word groups are slightly more common than subject word groups, but the PE all show differing syntax for the placement of adjunct word groups in imperative clauses. There is no consistent pattern concerning the tense of the imperative predicators, but the most common connectors for imperative clauses are asyndeton and the conjunction δέ. In addition to clauses with explicit imperative verbs, it is fully codified that indicative clauses with the force of a command or wish, other than those with the impersonal verb δεῖ, will have an expressed complement word group, and it is marginally codified that the complement will follow the predicator.

For paratactic indicative clauses, it is marginally codified that the clause will include an expressed complement word group, but there is no consistent pattern across the PE for the placement of the complement relative to the predicator. Similarly, there is no single, consistent pattern for the placement of subject word groups in indicative clauses in the PE. The default position for most A-PPs and A-CUs is to follow the predicator, with exceptions both for specific forces of A-PPs and for the purpose of contrast or emphasis. There is not a single, consistent pattern across the PE, however, for A-Advs. It is common that paratactic, indicative clauses will be part of a compound sentence and that those concluding a section or subsection will have marked syntax, but not consistently across all three PE. Similarly, the most common connectors for indicative clauses are asyndeton, the conjunction γάρ, or the conjunction δέ, but the frequency varies between the letters. For all three PE, the default structure for nominal, paratactic clauses is an S-C structure, with those following a C-S structure being formulaic in nature.

Hypotactic clauses for the PE also show both consistency and divergence, depending on the type of clause and other syntactical considerations. It is marginally codified for the PE that HC-Cjs will be ἵνα clauses of purpose. It is fully codified, as would be expected, that ἵνα clauses follow their governing clause, codified that they will be the final clause proper of the their sentence, and codified that they will modify clauses proper and not appear within a rank-shifted context. It is a marginally codified pattern that ἵνα clauses of purpose will include an expressed complement word group, but each letter has a differing distribution of clausal structures. It is marginally codified that subject word groups in ἵνα clauses will precede their governing predicator and marginally codified that A-PPs will follow the predicator. A-Advs precede the predicator within ἵνα clauses. There is little consistent syntax for HC-Cjs with conjunctions other

than ἵνα, other than that they tend to follow a P-C clausal structure.

HC-ptcs show much similarity across the PE. Outside the clause, it is marginally codified that the participle clause will follow its governing clause and partially codified that they will modify clauses proper, not appearing within a rank-shifted context.[98] Within the clause, it is marginally codified that the clause will include an expressed complement word group and, when there is an expressed complement, it is marginally codified that the clause will show a P-C clausal structure, with exceptions either showing hyperbaton (1 Tim. 4:8; 2 Tim. 1:3-5; Titus 1:16; 2:6-8) or having other unique syntactical contexts. The participle itself within HC-ptcs tends to be in present tense as a marginally codified pattern. When the participle is perfect tense, the clause is almost always causal in force, while HC-ptcs whose participle is aorist can be causal, temporal, or circumstantial in force. HC-ptcs in the PE rarely have an expressed subject as a codified pattern and it is codified that A-PPs will follow the predicator.

Changing Ranks: Rank-Shifted Clauses

For all three major types of rank-shifted clauses, the PE show many common patterns but also some differences. It is fully codified that infinitive clauses will include a simple infinitive, without the definite article. Outside of the infinitive clause itself, it is partially codified that infinitive clauses will function as or within the complement word group of their governing clause and partially codified that they will follow their governing predicator. Exceptions usually have the infinitive in the aorist tense, modify an indicative governing verb, and are complementary in force. Generally, infinitive clauses in the PE are found within governing clauses expressing purpose, a wish, or a command. The most common forces for infinitive clauses in the PE are

---

[98] I.e., they will appear within a paratactic clause or hypotactic clause properly on the rank of clause and as an HC-ptc within a relative clause, clause of indirect or direct discourse, or another rank-shifted clause.

complementary infinitive clauses and those of indirect discourse with a predicator of cognition or communication. Within the clause, the tense of the infinitive varies between the letters and the clause tends to have an expressed complement but not within enough frequency to constitute a pattern. Similarly, infinitive clauses with an expressed complement word group tend to demonstrate a C-P structure, but this is not consistent between the letters. It is marginally codified that infinitive clauses will not include an expressed subject word group. When the infinitive includes an expressed subject word group, it is partially codified that the subject will be in the prime position of the clause, partially codified that the infinitive will be in the present tense, codified that the clause will be within a paraenetic context, and fully codified that the clause will follow its governing predicator. Adjunct word groups appear with more frequency than subject word groups, also demonstrating general consistency. It is codified that A-PPs within infinitive clauses will follow the predicator and A-Advs almost always precede it.

Rank-shifted participle clauses in show some areas of consistency but great variation among the PE. The PE do not show common patterns among all three letters regarding the position of the clause as attributive or substantive, the type of clause in which the participle clause appears, and the word group of the governing clause in which the participle clause appears. It is marginally codified, however, that attributive adjectival participle clauses will appear in "repeat" position to their referent, partially codified that attributive participle clauses, regardless of force, will not appear within a subject word group, and partially codified that attributive participle clauses will follow the predicator of their governing clause. There are also some syntactical similarities with in the clause according to force. It is fully codified that participle clauses functioning as predicate adjectives in a C-PN will be anarthrous and partially codified across the PE that those functioning as substantives will be arthrous. It is marginally

codified that participle clauses functioning as attributive adjectives will include the participle in the present tense. For the clausal structure of the attributive participle clause, the PE show many areas of similarity. Roughly half of all such clauses include an expressed complement and it is partially codified that clauses with a complement will follow a P-C structural pattern. Exceptions, across the PE, are usually within the context of contrast or an asyndetic, extended list. It is fully codified that attributive participle clauses will not include an expressed subject. Adjunct word groups are somewhat frequent in the PE and their syntax is consistent. A-PPs will follow the predicator as a partially codified pattern and A-CUs will always follow the predicator. A-Adv precede the predicator as a partially codified pattern, with exceptions always within the context of contrast.

Relative clauses, the final major type of rank-shifted clause, show much consistency across the PE. It is marginally codified that relative clauses will appear within clauses proper and not within other rank-shifted clauses and codified that they will follow the predicator of the governing clause. Almost half of all relative clauses have the predicator in the aorist tense. Within the clause, it is partially codified relative clauses will include a complement word group and marginally codified for those with a complement to follow a C-P pattern. When the relative clause follows a C-P structure, it is partially codified that the relative pronoun itself is the complement word group. When the relative pronoun is functioning as the subject word group of its clause, the clause tends to show a S-P-C structure instead. When the clause includes a subject word group, it is codified that the clause will also include at least another structural word group, a complement or adjunct, beyond the predicator. It is marginally codified that the subject and complement, when both are expressed, will appear on opposite sides of the predicator. The presence of adjunct word groups in relative clauses is very common in the PE and it is partially

codified for all adjunct word groups in relative clauses, regardless of their type, that they will follow the predicator.

The Rank of Word Group

The PE show many consistent patterns on the rank of word group, according to the type of word group. For subject word groups, it is partially codified for the PE that they will not include an adjectival modifier beyond the definite article nor an embedded qualifier. Subjects, instead, tend to consist only of nouns and pronouns with or without the definite article. There is no single, consistent pattern for the collocation of the definite article with adjectival modifiers, and adjectives are in attributive and predicate position with similar frequency. When the subject word group does include an adjective, it is partially codified that it will not include an additional, embedded qualifier. For subject word groups with embedded qualifiers, it is partially codified in the PE that the qualifier will follow its referent and that the referent will be grammatically definite. Furthermore, it is partially codified that subject word groups with a definite article and those with embedded qualifiers will not appear within a rank-shifted clause. Lastly, there is no one pattern for the position of the subject word group within its governing clause, as 1 and 2 Timothy differ greatly from Titus in this regard.

Complement word groups show many consistent patterns in the PE based on the type of complement. C-DOs in the PE include additional modifying elements beyond a head noun or pronoun with great frequency. When they include a qualifier, it is partially codified that they will follow their referent and marginally codified that the complement will appear within a clause proper. When a C-DO includes a definite article, it is marginally codified that the word group will include another modifying element on the head noun. When the head noun is modified by both the definite article and an attributive adjectival modifier, it is codified that the adjective will

be in "sandwich" position between the article and the head noun, while those modifying

indefinite head nouns are more likely to be in "repeat" position. There is not a consistent pattern

across the PE, however, about the presence of C-DOs, with or without the article and additional

adjectives, within rank-shifted clauses.

C-IOs, unlike direct objects, have more consistent syntax. They will follow their governing

verb as a partially codified pattern in the PE and it is also partially codified that they will be

grammatically definite. It is codified, when the C-IO includes a head noun and not a pronoun,

that the C-IO will include an additional modifying element, but it is also codified that such

modifiers will not be an adjective other than the article. Qualifiers within C-IOs will almost

always follow their head noun, always modify a common noun with a proper noun or a definite

article, and are typically appositive qualifiers in force.

C-PNs show some similarity across the PE, but much difference between Titus and both

letters of Timothy. As would be expected, it is fully codified for the PE that such complements

will not include a definite article on the head noun or adjective. They are the most common type

of complement word group to include an embedded qualifier word group as well as the most

common type of complement to show hyperbaton. There is no consistent pattern, however, for

the placement of the complement relative to an expressed predicator, the likelihood of the

complement including a head noun or head adjective, the placement of qualifiers relative to their

referent, or the type of hyperbaton within the complement. In these respects, 1 and 2 Timothy

generally agree against Titus.

The PE include much similarity with regard to the non-structural type of complement word

groups, namely, C-OPs. For the PE, such complements occur as a single head noun or

nominalized element with the same frequency as a head object with additional modifiers. It is

partially codified that C-OPs will not include the definite article across the PE; furthermore, those with the article tend to have other additional modifying elements. When the word group includes an embedded qualifier, it is partially codified—and nearly codified—that the qualifier will follow its referent; all exceptions are qualifiers with the force of a subjective genitive. Adjectives are common within C-OPs and it is partially codified that they will be in attributive position to their referent. Attributive adjectives are not in "sandwich" or "repeat" position as a pattern, but adverbs functioning as adjectives are always in "sandwich" position while nominalized PPs and participles functioning as adjectives are in "repeat" position as a codified pattern. It is fully codified that predicate adjectives precede their referent and partially codified that it will be a form of πᾶς modifying an indefinite head noun. Across the PE, it is not evident that rank shift impacts the word order of C-OPs as a whole, and C-OPs are the least likely type of complement to show hyperbaton.

C-OPs also show come tendencies and patterns according to force. PPs of advantage are always in rank-shifted clauses and almost always include the adjective πᾶς. PPs of basis tend to include additional elements beyond the head noun or pronoun. PPs of manner never include a definite article as a fully codified pattern and it is marginally codified that the C-OP will consist of only a head noun. It is marginally codified for the PE that the C-OP of PPs of reference or respect will consist only of a single noun or pronoun. It is fully codified that such phrases will never include an embedded qualifier in the complement word group. C-OPs of PPs of source with παρά are always a single noun or pronoun as a personal source, a personal source with additional elements when the preposition is ἀπό, and an impersonal source usually with an additional element when the preposition is ἐκ. It is marginally codified that C-OP of ἐν, when it has the force of sphere, will only include a head noun, pronoun, or title. For C-OPs of κατά,

when it indicates standard or norm, it is partially codified that it will include additional elements

beyond a head noun or pronoun, with qualifiers as the most common additional modifier.

Qualifiers within the C-OP of PPs of standard, as a fully codified pattern, are always objective or

subjective genitive in force. Lastly, for C-OPs within temporal PPs, it is partially codified that

they will include an additional modifying element on the head noun and it is fully codified that

PPs referring to present or future time will include an additional element beyond a single noun.

Adjunct word groups in the PE show tendencies and patterns according to their type and

force. When the adjunct word group consists of a Cj-H, it is partially codified that the

conjunction will be the ἵνα of purpose. These tend to occur within paratactic clauses with a

paraenetic force, but not as a pattern. The most common Cj-Ps are δέ and γάρ; when δέ is used, it

is marginally codified that it will have a contrastive force. It is codified that Cj-Ps will occur

within clauses proper and not within a rank-shifted context. It is marginally codified that A-PPs

will follow their governing predicator; exceptions to this pattern regularly occur for A-PPs with

the force of reference, basis, or cause. A-PPs are very common within rank-shifted contexts, with

slightly over half of all A-PPs occurring within a rank-shifted context.

A-Advs and A-CUs are the most variegated in the PE. The additive καί precedes its

governing verb as a marginally codified pattern. There is no single consistent pattern, however,

for A-Advs of time or manner. Generally, A-Advs of manner that follow their governing verb

tend to appear within imperative, infinitive, and relative clauses, while those that precede occur

within multiple syntactical environments. Temporal A-Advs occur on both sides of the

predicator with similar frequency, and temporal adjuncts that follow the predicator, including

both A-Advs and A-CUs, tend to be within imperative or rank-shifted clauses as a marginally

codified pattern. For A-CUs, it is marginally codified across the PE that they will follow their

governing predicator. Those that precede the predicator are emphatic (1 Tim. 1:13; 2:13), in a poetic context (1 Tim. 6:15), in a context of contrast (2 Tim. 4:16; Titus 1:16), or in transitional sentences (2 Tim. 1:3; 4:8; Titus 1:16). Overall, half of all A-CUs are in the dative case. Both examples of genitive A-CUs have a temporal force in the PE. A-CUs rarely include an embedded qualifier or an adjectival modifier. All adjectives in A-CUs are in attributive position modifying an anarthrous head noun. The definite article is slightly more common, appearing within groups in the dative and accusative cases. It is also especially common for A-CUs to occur within participle clauses. For those within participle clauses, it is codified that the A-CU will follow the governing predicator and include an additional element beyond head noun. Furthermore, it is marginally codified that the A-CU will be in the dative case, most commonly with the force of means but with other forces as well.

The PE demonstrate many consistent patterns for qualifier word groups according to their type, force, and governing context. Differences, when they do occur, tend to occur with 1 and 2 Timothy agreeing against Titus, but there are a few exceptions where Titus agrees with 1 Timothy against 2 Timothy. Infinitive clauses functioning as qualifiers always modify a predicate adjective within a C-PN, always include hyperbaton between the referent and infinitive clause, and always follow their referent. For relative clauses functioning as qualifiers, it is marginally codified that they will appear within clauses proper and codified that, when there is an expressed predicator, they will appear within word groups following the governing verb. PPs, when they function as qualifier word groups, most commonly are epexegetical in force but also regularly have the force of purpose. It is partially codified that PP qualifiers will follow their referent and, when the predicator is expressed, it is codified that they will appear within word groups following the governing verb. PP qualifiers that precede their referent almost always

426

appear within infinitive or participle clauses and usually occur within the context of a transitional sentence or a list structure.

Nominal qualifier word groups, the most common type of qualifier, show many consistent patterns in the PE. It is marginally codified that nominal qualifier word groups appear within clauses proper and partially codified that they will follow their referent. Nominal qualifiers most commonly are appositive, subjective, or objective in force. Across the PE, nominal qualifiers are a single noun, pronoun, or title with the roughly the same frequency as those that include additional elements within the word group. The presence of a definite article almost always depends on the definiteness of the referent, as it is partially codified that nominal qualifiers will match the definiteness of their referent. It is marginally codified that nominal qualifiers that do not match the definiteness of their referent are definite qualifiers modifying an indefinite head noun, although 1 and 2 Timothy show much similarity over against Titus in this regard. When the mismatch includes an indefinite qualifier modifying a definite head noun, the qualifier is always an explicit reference to the Divine. Nominal qualifiers do often include an additional embedded qualifier word group, but the context differs between the PE. Within the qualifier word group, it is partially codified that adjectives within qualifiers will be in attributive position; furthermore, it is marginally codified that attributive adjectives within nominal qualifier word groups will be in "sandwich" position. This depends also on the part of speech functioning as an adjectival modifier. Adjectives proper appear in "sandwich" position as a partially codified pattern, while participles and PP, when functioning as adjectives, appear in "repeat" position as a partially codified pattern. When a nominal qualifier includes an attributive adjective, it is partially codified that the qualifier will follow its referent.

Nominal qualifier word groups also show consistency in word order and syntax according

to their force. It is fully codified in the PE that appositive qualifier word groups will follow their referent and codified that they will not appear in word groups that precede an expressed governing verb. Exceptions to the latter only occur for C-DOs within a paraenetic context. Objective genitive qualifier word groups always follow their referent as a fully codified pattern, but 1 and 2 Timothy agree on additional modifying elements and their word order over against Titus. It is partially codified that subjective genitive qualifiers will follow their referent, but they precede their referent frequently compared to the other common forces of qualifier word groups. They rarely include adjectival modifiers. The definite article is more common, but it codified that a subjective genitive qualifier with a definite article will follow the referent. Subjective genitive qualifiers regularly include additional, embedded qualifier word groups; such qualifiers always follow their referent as a fully codified feature and it is codified that in such cases either the governing qualifier or the embedded qualifier will refer to the Divine. Possessive qualifiers rarely include additional modifying elements, being a marginally codified pattern that the word group will consist of a single noun, pronoun, or title. Furthermore, over half of all possessive qualifiers have a Divine referent as the head noun or pronoun. For qualifiers with the force of reference or respect, those in the genitive case will always include a definite article in the PE while the single example in the dative case does not. Qualifiers of relationship in the genitive case always precede their referent in the PE when they appear within a C-DO, C-IO, or C-PN, but they follow the referent when appearing within a subject word group or a C-OP. When they appear within a C-PN, they always precede an indefinite head noun and include an attributive adjective in "sandwich" position. Qualifiers with an epexegetical force have varying syntax and word order depending on the type of qualifier and differ between the letters of the PE. Nominal qualifiers with an epexegetical force always have an additional element in the word group

beyond the head noun and modify a form of ἄξιος or ἀξιόω, and epexegetical qualifiers as a whole frequently precede their referent.

Conclusion and Initial Observations

This chapter has demonstrated areas of agreement and disagreement within the PE respecting syntactical and word order patterns along the rank scale. There are areas in which differences are evident between all three PE, but more commonly two letters more closely align compared to the third. Generally, 1 and 2 Timothy show closer affinity in the analysis above, but there are areas in which Titus agrees with 1 or 2 Timothy against the other. The areas of agreement were then compiled and presented within the linguistic profile of the PE as a whole.

This analysis has multiple benefits. First, it helps to identify the general syntax and word order patterns of the PE within themselves, and, as demonstrated by example in the preceding chapters, allows for identification of marked examples of syntax and word order. Second, this analysis is potentially suggestive for discussion of style and register, as the PE are all of the same genre, namely, paraenetic, personal epistles, and generally considered together as a similar group of texts. Building upon the second, a third benefit of this analysis is that the areas of agreement and difference among the PE provides a baseline for comparison to other works with differing genres, registers, and authors as well as to patterns for NTG and KG in general. For example, it will be demonstrated below that Acts 18, the only chapter selected for comparison that is strictly narrative, shows the least similarity to the syntax and word order of the PE among the selected chapters, while Eph. 4, a paraenetic chapter of letter within the Pauline Corpus considered deutero-Pauline, shows the greatest similarity. Similarities are also evident between the PE and Rom. 15, a paraenetic chapter of a letter considered authentically Pauline, and Paul's speech in Acts 20. This might suggest, syntactically speaking, a closer connection between letters and

speeches in the New Testament as opposed to narrative, potentially contributing to other larger discussions of orality and composition for works of the New Testament.

Some initial observations are helpful regarding the second benefit of this analysis before continuing to the intertextual comparisons of chapter six. The linguistic profiles of the PE show similarity and variance along the rank scale. This already suggests both potential areas that are irrelevant for discussions of register or style, especially where all three PE disagree or where two show minor agreement over the third, and potential areas of significance for intertextual analysis or for larger patterns of KG in general. Areas that appear to be inconsequential for intertextual comparison or establishing a distinct linguistic profile of a given author beyond a single work on the rank of section include:

- The use of rank-shifted clauses in section transitions,

- A lexical difference between section and subsection transitions,

- The specific connective devices used for section or subsection transitions beyond asyndeton,

- The content of closing sentences of sections, and

- The presence of an *inclusio* for subsections as opposed to sections.

On the rank of clause, areas that are likely not relevant include:

- Many areas of syntax for paratactic imperative clauses including the tense of verb,

- The person of the subject for imperative clauses and the presence of the clause within a transitional sentence,

- The general syntax of A-PPs in indicative clauses or the use of connective devices within such clauses,

- The frequency of ἵνα clauses of purpose over against other HC-Cjs,

- The syntax of subjects or complements within ἵνα clauses,

- The position of HC-ptcs relative to their governing clause and the syntax of A-PPs within them,

- The frequency of complement and subject word groups within infinitive clauses,

- The tense of subjective infinitives within δεῖ clauses,

- The frequency of rank-shifted participle clauses in C-PNs over other types of complement word groups,

- The position of such participle clauses relative to their governing verb,

- The syntax of adjuncts specifically for such participle clauses, and

- Many areas of syntax for relative clauses.

On the rank of word group, many areas prove likely irrelevant for further study beyond an idiosyncratic study of a single work, including:

- The collocation of articles and adjectives within subject word groups,

- The presence of qualifiers on definite referents in subject word groups,

- The syntax of qualifiers within C-DOs and the frequency of the definite article in general for C-DOs,

- Most areas of syntax for C-IOs,

- The position of C-PNs within their clause and the type of content within them,

- The position of qualifiers within C-OPs,

- The frequency of γάρ and δέ as conjunctive adjuncts and the force of δέ in general,

- The most common type of A-CU,

- The specific forces of A-PPs that precede or follow their governing verb in different works,

- The presence of nominal qualifiers in differing clause types and the syntax of qualifiers within other qualifiers,

- The presence and frequency of additional modifiers within objective genitive qualifiers, subjective genitive qualifiers, and possessive genitive qualifiers, and

- The difference between qualifiers of reference or respect according to their case.

The claim that these areas are not relevant for discussions of register and compiling a distinctive linguistic profile will be further tested in the following chapter as these phenomena appear within the comparison chapters.

There are many areas of potential import within the linguistic profile of the PE for further comparison with other works, either due to the agreement of all three PE for that phenomenon or the strong agreement of two PE over the third, typically 1 and 2 Timothy over against Titus. On the rank of section, these include:

- The sentence type of section opening and subsection opening and closing sentences,

- The use of *inclusio* for sections,

- The frequency of asyndeton as a connective device,

- The presence of hyperbaton within a C-PN in the closing sentence of a subsection, and

- The frequency of marked or irregular syntax in transitional and closing sentences.

On the rank of clause, areas of potential import include:

- The frequency and placement of complement and subject word groups within paratactic imperative clauses,

- The syntax of asyndeton and δέ as connective devices for imperative clauses,

- The clausal structure for impersonal δεῖ clauses,

- The clausal structure of paratactic indicative clauses with a paraenetic force,

- The clausal structure for paratactic indicative clauses as a whole regarding subject, complement, and adjunct word groups,

- The presence of indicative clauses within simple, compound, or complex sentences,

- The clausal structure of nominal clauses,

- The syntax of adjunct word groups within ἵνα clauses of purpose,

- The position of other HC-Cjs relative to their governing clause,

- The clausal structure of HC-ptcs,

- The position of infinitive clauses relative to their governing clause and the syntax of exceptions to the established pattern,

- The syntax of subject and adjunct word groups within infinitive clauses,

- The correlation of the force of rank-shifted participle clauses and the presence of the definite article on the participle,

- The clausal structure of rank-shifted participle clauses,

- The syntax of relative clauses with both a subject and a complement word group, and

- The syntax of adjunct word groups within relative clauses.

On the rank of word group, many potential areas of import are evident, including:

- The impact of subject word groups appearing with a rank-shifted context,

- The position of subject word groups especially within paratactic indicative clauses,

- The correlation of adjectives in C-DOs that are in "sandwich" position with arthrous referents and those in "repeat" position with anarthrous referents,

- The impact of rank shift for the presence of adjectives within C-DOs,

- The frequency and position of qualifiers within C-PNs,

- The frequency and type of hyperbaton with C-PNs,

- The frequency, type, and position of adjectives within C-OPs,

- The presence or absence of modifying elements within C-OPs according to the force of the PP,

- The position of the additive καί and other A-Advs within their clause,

- The presence and syntax of elements beyond a head noun or pronoun within A-CUs,

- The prevalence and force of A-CUs that appear within participle clauses,

- The syntax and clausal structure of infinitive clauses functioning as qualifiers,

- The force and position of PPs functioning as qualifiers,

- The syntax of qualifier word groups that do not match the definiteness of their referent,

- The type and position of adjectives within nominal qualifier word groups,

- The presence of appositive qualifiers within certain word group types, as well as

- The position of subjective genitive qualifiers, genitive qualifiers of relationship, and epexegetical qualifiers to their referent.

These various phenomena have potential import for questions of authorial style, register, or larger patterns of KG in general, but they will need to be compared with other chapters of the New Testament from various genres and contexts to test their relevance for such discussions.

CHAPTER SIX

COMPARISON TO OTHER WORKS AND FINAL IMPLICATIONS

This chapter will build on the methods and conclusions of the previous chapters to analyze selected chapters of other NT works and compare their word order and syntax to what has been demonstrated in the PE. The analysis in this chapter will pay particular attention to those areas identified as potentially significant for intertextual comparison and for discussions of register from chapter five. Consequently, this will provide further data to help test and determine the usefulness of the method for questions of textual analysis, interpretation, and intertextual comparison. The detailed linguistic profile analysis for each comparison chapter, downward along the rank scale, will be included in full as appendices. The chapter will begin with the chapters selected from the Pauline Corpus: Rom. 15 and Eph. 4. Then the selected material from Acts will be compared to the PE, both a speech (Acts 20:18–35) and a narrative portion (Acts 18). Finally, closing observations will be presented on the method, its results, and its implications for future research.

The PE and Romans 15

As argued above, Rom. 15 was selected a test chapter for comparison to the PE due its nature as part of the Pauline Corpus considered authentic by wider scholarship, its length and availability of differing clause and word group types, and its genre as a paraenetic chapter of an epistle. For this section, observable phenomena on each rank along the rank scale, as evinced by a full analysis of the linguistic profile for Rom. 15 as found in appendix one, will be compared to the profile of the PE. While the single chapter does not give enough data on its own for a robust analysis on the rank of section, the comparison will begin with those elements of section and subsection analysis that can be observed in Rom. 15 with its surrounding section and

subsections, as many commentators do hold that the chapter in itself contains multiple sectional

transitions. This will be followed by analysis on the ranks of clause and word group. Finally,

initial observations will be offered as they pertain to the implications of the method and data for

further study.

Comparison of Romans 15 and the PE

When compared to the PE, the linguistic profile of Rom. 15 show areas of similarity but

also areas of great divergence. The syntax of the section transition matches the PE with the

paraenetic opening clause.[1] The second sentence, being a contrastive sentence, does not fit the

general pattern of the PE, neither does the nominal blessing clause that concludes the section.

Romans 15:14–16:27 does, however, form an *inclusio* with the opening sentences of the letter,

Rom. 1:8–17, which corresponds to all three PE. For the syntax of subsections, asyndeton, which

is the most common subsection transitional device in the PE, does not appear in Rom. 15.[2]

Where Rom. 15 shows the greatest difference, however, is that three of four subsections in this

chapter conclude with a blessing, whether with an optative verb or with a nominal clause, and do

not generally display structural irregularities in the final sentence. It also does not display

hyperbaton within a C-PN in the final sentences of subsections, although this could simply be for

lack of relevant data. Only one subsection ends with an explanatory γάρ clause, which is

common in 1 and 2 Timothy over against Titus.[3]

On the rank of clause, only some types of clauses have enough examples to reasonably

---

[1] While not likely significant, Rom. 15 also matches 2 Timothy and Titus with regard to the rank-shifted complement and the use of δέ in the opening sentence.

[2] The use of δέ and διό for subsection transitions most closely aligns with 1 Timothy, although the lexeme διό is not used in the PE.

[3] Romans 15 does, however, include ἵνα clauses of purpose in two of the four subsection conclusions, which does generally align with Titus.

compare to the PE. There are only two paratactic, imperative clauses and three indicative paratactic clauses with a paraenetic force in Rom. 15, for example, and their structure fits within the patterns of the PE. Paratactic indicative clauses are almost always within compound or complex sentences, which matches the data from 1 and 2 Timothy, and the syntax of subjects within them also generally aligns with 1 and 2 Timothy. The frequency of complements within paratactic indicative clauses aligns closer with Titus than 1 and 2 Timothy, as well the typical structure of the clause in a P-C pattern with little deviation for complement type. Adjunct word groups appear within the indicative paratactic clauses of Rom. 15 with frequency and syntax very similar to 1 and 2 Timothy, with the position of A-Advs agreeing with them over against Titus. For hypotactic clauses proper, the structure of ἵνα clauses generally falls within the range of difference evinced in the PE with noticeable difference for A-PPs.[4] The placement of other HC-Cjs relative to their governing clause aligns most closely with 2 Timothy. The position of HC-ptcs in relation to the governing clause aligns with the PE, as well as the tense of the participle. The frequency of complement word groups in predicate participle clauses in Rom. 15 aligns closest with Titus. The position of complement fits with the pattern of the PE, 1 Timothy most of all. One major difference, however, is that the position of the complement appears to be impacted by the participle force in Rom. 15, which does not appear to be a factor in the PE. Adjunct word groups appear within HC-ptcs with much greater frequency than the PE, but their syntax is similar.

Rank-shifted clauses in Rom. 15 both differ from the PE in some regards but show similarity in others, especially to 2 Timothy. Infinitive clauses are common within main clauses

---

[4] Some of these deviations are potentially the result of being in the final sentence of a subsection (15:6), but others are also evident that do not occur in such a context (15:4, 20, 32).

expressing a wish, as with the PE, but not with the same level of frequency. Rank-shifted infinitive clauses always follow their governing verb, unlike the position of infinitives within explanatory clauses in the PE. The force of the infinitive more closely matches 1 and 2 Timothy than Titus. Within the infinitive clause, both the frequency of complement word groups and their position in the clause most closely matches 2 Timothy and differs the most from 1 Timothy. Romans 15 differs from the PE with regard to subject word groups, but matches 1 and 2 Timothy fairly well with regard to the type and position of adjunct word groups within infinitive clause. For the force of rank-shifted participle clauses, the distribution of attributive participles functioning as predicate adjectives or attributive adjectives aligns most closely with Titus, but the frequency of substantive participles aligns more with 1 Timothy. As with the PE, however, the sole participle serving as an attributive adjective is in "repeat" position. The presence of the definite article on substantive participles matches the PE, and the tense of rank-shifted participles aligns most closely with 2 Timothy. The syntax of complement word group generally aligns with the PE as do the word group order of A-PPs. The single A-Adv also follows the predicator in Rom. 15:14, which disagrees with the pattern found in the PE but not with enough examples to determine anything conclusive.[5] There are too few examples of other types of rank-shifted clauses for any meaningful comparison.

On the rank of word group, subject word groups include similar elements to the PE, have similar syntax with regard to definite article, adjectives, and qualifiers, showing slightly closer affinity to 2 Timothy. The impact of rank-shift for the frequency of definite articles and qualifiers within subject word groups does not appear to be as strong as the PE, but this could be

---

[5] This anomaly could also be due to the participle clause both appearing at the end of a C-PN list and being within the first sentence of a new section.

caused by the prevalence of subjects within direct quotations in Rom. 15. The position of the subject word group within the clause falls within the range evinced by the PE, with the subject following the predicator in many paratactic indicative clauses similar to Titus.

For complement word groups, the frequency and placement of additional modifiers within C-DOs generally fits in line with what is found in the PE, with the major difference being that adjectives are far less likely in Rom. 15 and do not correlate with any type of governing clause. C-IOs in Rom. 15 match the profile for the PE overall. The use and type of hyperbaton and the syntax of embedded qualifiers for C-PNs both show close affinity to 2 Timothy, especially compared with Titus. For C-OPs, the syntax of the definite article matches the PE, but the syntax of attributive adjectives and qualifiers most closely matches Titus over against the other PE. Adjectives are also noticeably less common within C-OPs in Rom. 15, however, and the syntax of predicate adjectives differs. The only pattern for specific forces of PPs is that the syntax of the C-OPs in PPs of sphere in Rom. 15 shows close affinity with Titus over against 1 and 2 Timothy.

For adjunct word groups, the use of conjunctions, especially δέ, falls in line with use in the PE, showing slightly closer similarity to 1 and 2 Timothy. The position of A-Advs also shows closer affinity to 1 and 2 Timothy over against Titus. The syntax of A-CUs matches the PE overall, although the syntax of adjectives in them differs from all three PE and the frequency of the definite article aligns with 1 and 2 over against Titus. There also does not appear to be any connection between A-CUs and participle clauses in Rom. 15. A-PPs show similarity to the PE with slightly more affinity to 2 Timothy with regard to A-PPs of cause and means with διά.

Qualifier word groups are the final word group for comparison, showing much consistency overall with the PE. Infinitive clauses functioning as qualifiers, however, do not show hyperbaton and occur within a C-PN like the PE, and PPs functioning as qualifiers show a

greater variety in their force. The frequency and type of nominal qualifiers that do not match their referent align with 1 and 2 Timothy over against Titus, and adjectives within nominal qualifiers have more variance in type and position than the PE. Like the PE, appositive qualifiers do not tend to appear within C-PNs, and Rom. 15 shows some agreement with 1 Timothy regarding the tendency for subjective genitive qualifiers to be more common in C-OPs over against objective genitive qualifiers. Unlike the PE, nominal qualifiers never precede their referent, regardless of the force of the qualifier.

Initial Observations

Romans 15 shows some affinity with the PE with regard to the syntax of sections and subsections, including the syntax and sentence type for opening and closing sentences and the use of *inclusio*, but differs in the type of sentence that concludes a subsection, the impact of transitional sentences on clausal syntax, including the presence of hyperbaton. The syntax of paratactic clauses generally agrees with the PE, showing the closest similarity to 1 and 2 Timothy for adjuncts and subjects but Titus for complements. Hypotactic clauses, likewise, show much similarity to various PE in different respects, typically aligning with one letter over the other PE, but they differ from all the PE in the impact of participle force on the clausal structure. Rank-shifted infinitive clauses most closely align with 2 Timothy both in their force and their use of complement and adjunct word groups, but differ from all three PE in the use of subject word groups. Rank-shifted participle clauses generally agree with all three PE, but with 1 or 2 Timothy specifically in some respects. On the rank of word group, Rom. 15 either aligns with a specific letter of the PE or falls within areas of between them with regard to many areas of syntax and word order for word groups. The type of modifiers within subject word groups aligns closest with 2 Timothy but their position in the clause resembles Titus. C-DOs are far less likely

in Rom. 15 to include an adjective. The syntax of C-PNs shows the closest affinity to 2 Timothy, but the syntax of C-OPs aligns closer to Titus. Difference with all three PE occurs, however, with regard to predicate adjectives within C-OPs. Adjunct and qualifier word groups align the closest with 1 and 2 Timothy over against Titus, but differ from the PE in the force and clausal syntax for infinitive clauses and PPs functioning as qualifier word groups.

The PE and Ephesians 4

The Profile Sample of Ephesians 4

Following the comparison of the PE to Rom. 15, the next chapter for analysis is Eph. 4. This chapter is similar in force to Rom. 15 as a paraenetic passage toward the end of an epistle, yet is commonly regarded as Deutero-Pauline and to be quite different in diction and style. Here, the linguistic structures of syntax and word order, as evinced by the full linguistic analysis found in appendix two, will be compared to the PE downward along the rank scale in order to determine which features align with the PE and which differ, especially in light of those of Rom. 15.

Comparison of Ephesians 4 and the PE

Ephesians 4 shows great similarity in many areas of syntax and word group order when compared to the PE. On the rank of section, the paraenetic force of transitional sentences and the frequency of expository sentences as subsection conclusions align with the PE and especially 1 and 2 Timothy.[6] The frequency of an *inclusio* for both sections and subsections matches the PE well, especially 1 and 2 Timothy. The presence of structural irregularities both in the first and the

---

[6] Additionally, the use of the conjunctions οὖν and δέ aligns well with the PE, the presence of infinitive clauses as complements for transitional sentences aligns with 2 Timothy, and the presence of a cataphoric demonstrative pronoun within a section transition fits with 2 Timothy and Titus.

final sentences of a subsection matches the PE well. Notable differences, however, include the absence of γάρ in Eph. 4 and the absence of asyndeton as a transitional device.

On the rank of clause, Eph. 4 also shows great similarity to the PE. For paratactic clauses, while there are only a few examples of each, indicative clauses with the force of paraenesis and nominal clauses align with expected structures from the PE, especially 2 Timothy. For paratactic imperative clauses, asyndeton is the most common connective device, which coincides with the syntax of the PE. The placement of complements, due to the presence of additional modifiers and rank-shifted elements in three of four complements for paratactic imperative clauses, aligns with the PE.[7] The syntax of subject word groups for imperative clauses fits within the range of use for the PE. The presence and syntax of both subject and complement word groups within paratactic indicative clauses for Ephesians aligns closer with 1 and 2 Timothy over against Titus.[8] The use of adjunct word groups within such clauses aligns with the 1 and 2 Timothy and it is noteworthy that abrogation of excepted patterns typically occurs due to contrast or transition, which aligns closely with causes of marked syntax in the PE.

Hypotactic clauses in Eph. 4 on the rank of clause also show similarity to the PE. The position relative to the main clause of HC-Cjs with Cj-Hs other than ἵνα aligns with 2 Timothy over against the other PE. The word group order of such HC-Cjs aligns with the patterns of the PE, as does the position of adjuncts within ἵνα clauses. For HC-ptcs, their verbal tense and position relative to the governing clause aligns with the PE, most closely with 1 Timothy. The presence and placement of complement word groups aligns most closely with 2 Timothy and

---

[7] The sole example where a single noun as the complement follows the predicator, found in Eph. 4:27, appears within the context of contrast, which aligns with irregularities in 1 and 2 Timothy.

[8] The majority of complements that precede their predicator in paratactic indicative clauses, however, are within transitional sentences.

Titus.[9] The type and position of adjunct word groups within HC-ptcs corresponds to what is found in the PE. One prominent difference, however, is that adjuncts are more common in Eph. 4 than they are in the PE.

Rank-shifted clauses in Eph. 4 show much similarity to PE but also some variation. The presence of infinitive clauses within complement word groups and their position following the governing verb closely aligns with Titus.[10] Like the PE, infinitive clauses are always simple and they appear frequently within a paraenetic context, but Eph. 4 has only one complementary infinitive, differing from all three PE. The position of complement word groups within the infinitive clause differs from the pattern of the PE, but show some similarity to 1 Timothy over against 2 Timothy and Titus. Subject word groups are infrequent and they do not conform to the patterns of the PE. Adjunct word groups within infinitive clauses fall in line with the variance seen within the PE.[11] For participles functioning as substantives, the presence of the definite article aligns with the PE and the frequency aligns most closely with 2 Timothy over against Titus. For those functioning as attributive adjectives, their "repeat" position to their referent also aligns with the PE. Within the clause, the position of the complement fits within the pattern of the PE and most closely with 2 Timothy, as well as that of adjunct word groups. There are too few examples of other types of rank-shifted clauses in Eph. 4 for meaningful comparison, but they tend to fit within the patterns of the PE.

On the rank of word group, subject word groups appear within clauses proper with a similar frequency to the PE and their position to their governing predicator aligns with the PE,

---

[9] The sole counterexample in Eph. 4:18 shows hyperbaton in the C-PN of the HC-ptc and it is within a compound and complex transitional sentence.

[10] Additionally, there are no infinitive clauses that precede their governing verb in Ephesians 4.

[11] Exceptions in Ephesians 4 typically occur within transitional sentences.

especially 1 Timothy. The frequency of adjectives and the definite article within subject word groups differs from the PE, but the impact of rank-shift on the presence of the definite article and embedded qualifiers matches the PE, 2 Timothy most of all.

C-DOs generally match the PE in the distribution of adjective types, although adjectives appear less frequently in Eph. 4 than the PE. Adjectives within C-DOs are more likely to occur when the C-DO is within a rank-shifted context, favoring Titus over against 1 and 2 Timothy. The syntax of C-IOs in Eph. 4 generally aligns with the PE.[12] For C-PNs, they show similarity to the PE in that qualifiers are especially common, and the position of the qualifier lies between the difference of Titus with 1 and 2 Timothy. Hyperbaton is also likely in C-PNs, but the type of hyperbaton varies with a frequency similar to 1 Timothy.

C-OPs show both similarity and difference from the patterns evident in the PE. The presence of additional modifiers within the groups is slightly higher in Eph. 4 than the PE, although adjectives are not as common. When they do appear, adjectives within C-OPs have similar positions to the PE, especially the synax of πᾶς and the prominence of attributive adjectives to be in "sandwich" position. There is also noticeable similarity with 1 and 2 Timothy in the C-OPs for PPs of manner and sphere with ἐν as well as PPs of standard with κατά in terms of the elements within the word group.

Adjunct word groups show some similarity but much difference from the PE. The frequency of conjunctive adjuncts with clauses proper is similar to PE, but the lack of γάρ is striking, especially as a connective device on the rank of section and subsection. For A-Advs, they tend to precede the governing predicator, showing similarity to 1 Timothy and especially 2

---

[12] C-IOs in Eph. 4 include the definite article with much greater frequency than the PE, but this is due to the presence of more common head nouns as opposed to pronouns or proper nouns. The use of the article in Ephesians 4, then, causes a similar frequency of grammatically definite C-IOs compared to the PE.

Timothy; this also holds true regarding the position of the additive καί, showing the most similarity with 2 Timothy over against Titus. A-CUs show similarity to the PE in terms of the frequency of such groups being in the dative case, their frequency within participle clauses, and their position in the clause. Definite articles are common within A-CUs, showing closest affinity to Titus. For A-PPs, there are some differences regarding which A-PPs, according to the force of the PP, follow the predicator or precede it. A-PPs of source, with ἐκ, only precede the predicator in Eph. 4, while they appear on both sides of the predicator in PE. A-PPs of cause, however, in the PE regularly precede their predicator, while they only follow in Eph. 4. Other noticeable differences in word group order are evident for A-PPs of means, both with ἐν and διά, and A-PPs of sphere with ἐν.

Qualifier word groups within Eph. 4 generally match many patterns found in the PE. The sole qualifier to precede its referent is a genitive of relationship, which also regularly precedes its referent in all three PE. As with the PE, qualifiers match their referent as a partially codified pattern and exceptions tend to be definite qualifiers on indefinite head nouns, aligning with 1 and 2 Timothy over against Titus. As with the PE, adjectives are the least common additional modifier within qualifier word groups, but the type of adjective differs for Eph. 4. Some patterns of Eph. 4 correspond to the PE but occur with much greater frequency. For example, objective genitive qualifiers are commonly within C-OP in the PE, but they occur within them as a fully codified feature of Eph. 4. There are also patterns that do not correspond. For example, no subjective genitive qualifier or qualifier of possession precedes its referent in Eph. 4, a common phenomenon in the PE. Additionally, the syntax of infinitive clauses and the force of PPs serving as qualifiers do not match the PE.

Ephesians 4 has great similarity to the PE on the rank of section, especially 2 Timothy. It agrees in the syntax of transitional and concluding sentences and the use of inclusio, often favoring 1 and 2 Timothy over against Titus. Asyndeton and γάρ, however, are absent as connective devices for transitions. On the rank of clause, the syntax of paratactic clauses generally matches the patterns of the PE for every type of clause, typically, as with sections, favoring 1 and 2 Timothy over Titus. The syntax for HC-Cjs and HC-ptcs generally aligns with the PE, 2 Timothy most of all, with the exception of adjunct word groups being more common in HC-ptcs than in the PE. Rank-shifted infinitive clauses in Eph. 4 show similarity to the PE in the lack of a definite article, their presence within a paraenetic context, and the syntax of adjunct word groups. They show similarity to Titus in their position relative to their governing clause and to 1 Timothy in the word group order of complements. Ephesians 4 differs from the PE, however, in the syntax of subject word groups and the lack of complementary infinitives. For attributive and substantive participle clauses, Eph. 4 shows great similarity to PE and, in many respects, to 2 Timothy most of all. On the rank of word group, subject word groups in Eph. 4 generally match the PE, showing the closest affinity to 1 Timothy regarding their position within the clause and 2 Timothy regarding the presence of elements and modifiers within the word group. C-DOs generally align with the PE. Adjectives, however, appear with far less frequency in C-DOs, but the impact of rank shift shows similarity to Titus. As with C-DOs, C-PNs generally align with the PE in syntax, showing the closest affinity to 1 Timothy. The syntax of C-OPs generally aligns with the PE in clausal context. Although adjectives are not as common as the PE, their type and position fit patterns established in the PE. For adjunct word groups, Eph. 4 is similar to 1 and 2 Timothy in the position of A-Advs and especially the additive καί, to all three PE in the case and position of A-CUs, and to Titus in the presence of definite articles in A-

CUs. The syntax of qualifiers falls within the variance of the PE in some regard and differs in others. For qualifier word groups, Eph. 4 generally aligns with the PE in most respects, agreeing with 2 Timothy most of all. Ephesians 4 differs from the PE, however, in the force and syntax of infinitive clauses and PPs functioning as qualifiers.

The PE and Speech in Acts: Acts 20:18b–35

The Profile Sample of Acts 20:18b–35

The speech of Paul to the Ephesian elders in Acts 20:18b–35 follows Rom. 15 and Eph. 4 as the next passage for comparison to the PE. This speech is on the mouth of Paul in the narrative, is spoken within a Gentile context, and contains exhortation to a group of leaders. In this way, it serves as an appropriate textual comparison to the PE, which also are presented as the recorded words and exhortations of Paul to church leadership. The full profile and analysis for this passage can be found in appendix three. This comparison of the profile of this passage to the PE will also test, in a preliminary way, if the data compiled by this project shows similarity or difference between written epistles and recorded speech.

Comparison of Acts 20:18b–35 and the PE

On the rank of section, Paul's Miletus speech in Acts 20:18b–35 shows some similarity but also great dissimilarity to the PE. Given the small amount of data present in the speech, however, all comparisons are tentative at best. The opening sentence is not paraenetic in force, which does not align with the PE.[13] The section ends with an expository sentence, common for 1 and 2 Timothy over against Titus, but does not have an *inclusio*, which is common for larger sections

---

[13] The presence of a rank-shifted clause as the complement, however, does align with section transitions in 2 Timothy and Titus

within all three PE. Three of four subsection transitions have an expository opening sentence, which is not common within the PE but does occur.[14] The second sentence of subsections is always expository, which occurs in 2 Timothy and Titus but not exclusively as it does in the Miletus speech. Subsection conclusions, however, do show similarity to 1 and 2 Timothy over against Titus with the distribution of expository and imperative sentences. Lastly, both transitional and concluding sentences in the Miletus speech consistently cause abnormal syntax, typically within hypotactic and rank-shifted clauses, which corresponds to the PE.

On the rank of clause, Paul's Miletus speech shows much similarity to all three PE in many regards, but also shows similarity with one PE over against the other in many respects and disagrees with all three in others. The use of asyndeton for paratactic clauses aligns with 2 Timothy and Titus, but Paul's speech differs in the lack of δέ, which is the most common connector for paratactic clauses in 1 Timothy. The frequency of complex sentences somewhat corresponds with 1 and 2 Timothy over Titus. The syntax of both imperative and indicative clauses with paraenetic verbs aligns the most closely with 2 Timothy, with minor differences both with Titus and 1 Timothy. The position of subject word groups within paratactic indicative clauses aligns with 1 and 2 Timothy, but the position of complements aligns with Titus over against 1 and 2 Timothy. Adjunct word groups, however, generally fall within expected patterns from the PE. There are no HC-Cjs in the Miletus speech. HC-ptcs differ from the PE in their clausal context, but generally align with the PE, especially 1 Timothy, in the word group order of the clause itself, including the tense of the participle, the position of the clause following its governing clause, the lack of subject word groups, and the frequency and position of complement

---

[14] The transitional device καὶ νῦν is not used in the PE, but its use only for subsections recalls 1 Timothy, where section and subsection transitional devices are consistently distinct throughout the letter.

word groups.[15]

Rank-shifted clauses show general alignment with the PE but also minor variation. Rank-shifted infinitives match all three PE in their position relative to their governing clause, their variety of verbal tense, the lack of subject word groups,[16] and the general syntax of adjunct word groups. They tend to appear within HC-ptcs, aligning with 2 Timothy over against 1 Timothy and Titus. Most rank-shifted infinitive clauses are complementary in force, matching 1 and 2 Timothy over against Titus, but the Miletus speech differs greatly with all three PE in that there are no infinitives of indirect discourse, which are the most common type in Titus. Three rank-shifted infinitive clauses appear with the definite article, which never occurs in the PE. The frequency of complement word groups aligns with 2 Timothy and Titus over against 1 Timothy, but the P-C clausal structure aligns with complementary infinitives in 1 Timothy over against 2 Timothy and Titus.[17] The syntax of rank-shifted participle clauses and ὅτι clauses, however, generally aligns with the PE. For rank-shifted participle clauses, this agreement includes adjectival participles appearing in "repeat" position to their referent, the frequency of definite articles on substantive participles, the infrequency of subject word groups, and the P-C clausal syntax. There are few adjunct word groups in such participle clauses, but their position is not consistent with the PE. For rank-shifted ὅτι clauses, which are especially common in the Miletus speech, the verbal mood, frequency of additional word groups as a whole, and the frequency of subject and complement word groups generally aligns with what is found in the PE.

---

[15] The speech also includes two infinitive clauses of purpose serving as hypotactic clauses, which do not appear in the PE.

[16] The syntax of the sole infinitive clause with an expressed subject word group (Acts 20:35) matches the PE also, in that the subject is in primary position in a present tense infinitive clause within a paraenetic context.

[17] Furthermore, the clausal structure of direct object infinitive clauses disagrees with all three PE.

On the rank of word group, some types of word groups show similarity to the PE while others show great difference. Subject word groups show some affinity to the PE in the frequency of additional modifiers with subject word groups. Additionally, the position of subject word groups within their clause aligns closest with 1 Timothy but differs greatly from Titus,[18] while the position of predicate adjectives within the word group and the collocation of adjectives and the definite article align with Titus over against 1 and 2 Timothy. Paul's Miletus speech differs greatly with the PE, however, in the impact of rank shift on the presence of additional modifiers, the frequency of adjectival modifiers, and the position of adjectives in relation to their referent.

C-DOs show general alignment with the syntactical patterns of the PE. While additional modifiers are more common in the Miletus speech than the PE, the frequency the definite article aligns well with 1 and 2 Timothy. The collocation of the article with other modifiers, the position of qualifiers within the clause and their typical force, as well the position of both predicate and attributive adjectives all align with the PE overall. Although adjectives are not quite as common within C-DOs in the Miletus speech, their presence within clauses proper aligns with 1 and 2 Timothy over against Titus. C-IOs fit within the patterns of the PE, aligning most closely with 2 Timothy. The position of C-PNs and the elements within them fall within the variance evident in the PE, although their appearance only within rank-shifted contexts in the Miletus speech differs from the clausal syntax of the PE. The presence of qualifiers and their position to their referent within C-PNs as well as the presence and type of hyperbaton within the Miletus speech all align with 1 and 2 Timothy over Titus.

The syntax and word order of C-OPs in Paul's Miletus speech both agrees and disagrees

---

[18] No subject word group in a paratactic clause follows its governing predicator. The only subjects to follow their governing verb occur within rank-shifted, recitative ὅτι clauses (Acts 20:25, 29, 30, 34).

with the PE in various respects. The frequency of additional modifiers with such word groups, the collocation of the definite article with other modifiers, the position of qualifiers after their referent, the position of the adverb σήμερον when used as an adjective, and the tendency of phrases of ἐν to include few additional modifiers all align with the PE overall. The frequency of the definite article aligns with 2 Timothy over against 1 Timothy and Titus and the tendency of attributive adjectives to appear in "repeat" position aligns with 1 and 2 Timothy over against Titus, especially when the PP follows its governing verb. The position of predicate adjectives, however, disagrees with the PE, as does the syntax of PPs of source with ἐκ and παρά.[19]

Adjunct word groups differ the most with the PE out of all types of word groups. For conjunctions, the use of καί as the most common Cj-P and the dearth of the conjunction δέ differ greatly from the PE. It is the general tendency in the PE that adverbs within indicative clauses will precede the governing predicator, but not as consistently as in Acts 20:18b–35. The frequency of A-CUs in the accusative case over against the dative case disagrees with the patterns of the PE as does their position before their governing verb.[20] They also do not show any correlation with participle clauses. The lack of adjectives and qualifiers within A-CUs, however, does align with the PE, and the frequency of the definite article aligns with Titus. The syntax of specific prepositions and their force do not align with the PE, including the frequency of A-PPs of accompaniment to precede the governing verb and the syntax of A-PPs of source.[21]

---

[19] The PP of source with παρά in Acts 20:24 does indicate a personal source, like the PE, but includes multiple additional modifiers. Additionally, the PP of source with ἐκ in Acts 20:30 includes an additional modifier, aligning with the PE, but it takes a personal referent as the complement, unlike the PE. In this case, the A-PP could be partitive in force, which would alleviate the discrepancy, but the force of source or origin is more likely (see Bruce, *Acts*, 393 or Marshall, *Acts*, 334–35).

[20] This could due to the prominence of A-CUs to have a temporal force in the Miletus speech. A-CUs with a temporal force do regularly precede the governing verb in the PE, however, but not with the same frequency.

[21] Additionally, the tendency of A-PPs of destination or purpose, with εἰς, and temporal A-PPs to follow their governing verb disagrees with 1 and 2 Timothy, but does align with Titus.

Qualifier word groups show general agreement with the PE, with only a few features that directly disagree with all three PE. The position of the qualifier both within the clause and with its referent matches the PE.[22] The lone qualifier to precede its referent is an epexegetical qualifier; in the PE, epexegetical qualifiers also regularly precede their referent and include adjectives, as in Acts 20:24. One qualifier differs in definiteness from its referent (Acts 20:26); it is an indefinite qualifier on a definite referent, aligning with Titus over against 1 and 2 Timothy. Like the PE, appositive qualifiers tend not to appear within C-PNs. However, the syntax of adjectives within qualifiers does not align with the PE.

Initial Observations

Paul's speech at Miletus shows dissimilarity to the PE in many respects on the rank of section. The lack of an inclusio, content of transitional sentences, and the content of second sentences for subsections do not align with the PE overall, but the type of concluding sentences and the frequency of abnormal syntax for transitions matches the PE. The syntax and word group order of paratactic clauses generally agree with the PE, closest in similarity to 2 Timothy in most respects but closest to Titus regarding the position of complement word groups. The syntax of HC-ptcs generally aligns with the PE and 1 Timothy most of all. Rank-shifted infinitive clauses typically agree with one or two PE over another in clausal context, the syntax of complement word groups, and infinitive force, although they agree with all three in the syntax of subject and adjunct word groups. It is noticeable, however, that the Miletus speech does not include any

---

[22] Additionally, other minor details align with all three PE as well. These include: the presence of the definite article as the most common additional modifier, the frequency of subjective genitive qualifiers as the most common force, the lack of additional modifiers in possessive qualifiers, and the tendency of subjective genitive qualifiers embedded within other qualifiers to be references of the Divine. The connection of the subjective genitive with qualifiers that modify other qualifiers is somewhat present in 1 Timothy and Titus, but not 2 Timothy. The lack of adjectives in subjective genitive qualifiers matches all three PE, but the presence of qualifiers aligns with 2 Timothy over against 1 Timothy and Titus. The lack of adjectives and frequency of qualifiers within objective genitive qualifier word groups aligns with 1 and 2 Timothy over against Titus.

infinitives of indirect discourse, instead preferring to use ὅτι clauses. Rank-shifted participle clauses and ὅτι clauses fit within the patterns of the PE with the only possible exception of adjunct word groups within such participle clauses. On the rank of word group, the syntax of subject word groups does not consistent agree with any single letter of the PE, at times showing similarity with 1 Timothy and at times with Titus. Subject word groups also disagree with the PE with regard to adjectives and the impact of rank shift. Complement word groups, however, generally align with 2 Timothy, although the appearance of C-PNs within rank-shifted contexts and the position of predicate adjectives within C-OPs differs from all three PE. The syntax of adjunct word groups shows the greatest difference from the PE, especially A-CUs and the syntax of A-PPs, only finding agreement in a few respects and often with a stronger pattern than is evident in the PE. The syntax of qualifier words groups agrees with the PE in many respects but also agrees with only one or two of the PE in others. There is not one PE, however, that consistently agrees the most often with Acts 20:18b–35 over the other PE.

The PE and Narrative in Acts: Acts 18

The Profile Sample of Acts 18

The final chapter from the New Testament selected for comparison with the PE is the narrative of Paul concluding his so-called second missionary journey in Acts 18. This chapter contains narrative and dialogue within the context of Corinth and Ephesus as well as a variety of sentence types and content. The full analysis and compilation of the linguistic profile for this comparison can be found in appendix four. The comparison of Acts 18 with the PE will also test in a preliminary way similarities and differences between epistles and narrative, especially those presented as being within a primarily Gentile context.

Comparison of Acts 18 and the PE

On the rank of section, Acts 18 aligns with individual letters of the PE in various ways but rarely all three. The opening sentence aligns with 2 Timothy and Titus in the use of δέ as a sectional transition and its nature as a complex sentence, but differs from all the PE in that the section opens with a paratactic, indicative clause. The second sentence is an explanatory sentence with γάρ, however, which is common in the PE. For subsections, there is much difference from the PE. All subsections open with an expository clause, which differs from all three PE, as does the lack of asyndeton as a transitional device for subsections. The use of δέ and the demonstrative pronoun does occur within the PE, but not commonly. The use of hypotactic clauses in subsection transitions also disagrees with all three PE, as does the lack of ἵνα clauses in the final sentence. The second sentences of subsections are always expositional or explanatory in Acts 18, which does occur in the PE, but the lack of commands or exhortation in the second sentence is uncharacteristic for the PE. Subsection conclusions show similarity to 1 and 2 Timothy in the type of main clause, but differ significantly from Titus. The use of an *inclusio* also matches 1 Timothy over against 2 Timothy and Titus. The lack of structural anomalies and hyperbaton with a C-PN for transitional sentences also differs from the PE.

On the rank of clause, Acts 18 agrees with the PE is some respects but significantly differs in others. All paratactic clauses proper in Acts 18 are indicative clauses with either aorist or imperfect verbs, disagreeing with the PE where indicative clauses also regularly have predicators in the present, perfect, and future tenses. They are regularly complex sentences, however, which aligns with the PE. The use of δέ generally agrees with 1 Timothy over against 2 Timothy and Titus but the infrequency of γάρ and asyndeton disagrees with all three PE. The placement of subject word groups generally agrees with 1 and 2 Timothy but not Titus, and the collocation of

subject word groups with complement word groups agrees with the PE.[23] The placement of complements following the predicator agrees with Titus but disagrees with 1 and 2 Timothy. The syntax of adjuncts for paratactic indicative clauses generally agrees with 1 Timothy with regard to A-PPs and A-CUs but agrees with Titus over against 1 and 2 Timothy with regard to A-Advs. For hypotactic clauses, the sole temporal HC-Cj preceding its governing clause does align with 1 and 2 Timothy over against Titus. The three arthrous infinitive clauses functioning as hypotactic clauses disagrees with the PE. HC-ptcs disagree with the PE in their placement before their governing clause and with 1 Timothy and Titus in the frequency of aorist participles.[24] The difference in the syntax of subject word groups with the PE is likely due to the presence of genitive absolute clauses in Acts 18, as they do not appear in the PE and they are the only participle to include an expressed subject in Acts 18. The placement of complements and adjuncts within HC-ptcs generally aligns with the PE, although with slightly stronger patterns.

Rank-shifted clauses in Acts 18, as opposed to clauses proper, show general similarity to the PE, albeit with some areas of difference. The position of rank-shifted infinitive clauses after their governing clause, the lack of the definite article, and the frequency of complementary infinitives and infinitives of indirect discourse all align with the PE. The frequency of present tense infinitive agrees with 1 Timothy and Titus over against 2 Timothy. Within the infinitive clause, there are few areas of agreement. The position of subject and complement word groups somewhat agrees with 1 Timothy, especially for infinitives of indirect discourse, but disagrees with the PE overall. The frequency of A-PPs over other adjunct types general matches 1 Timothy, but the mutual exclusion of complement and adjunct word groups disagrees with all

---

[23] The correlation of subject word groups with clauses introduced by δέ or τε, as well its impact on clauses that also include complement word groups, does not appear whatsoever in the PE.

[24] This difference is likely due to the frequency of HC-ptcs with a temporal force in Acts 18.

three PE. Like the PE, however, infinitive clauses regularly appear both within HC-ptcs and with paraenetic contexts. For rank-shifted participle clauses, the frequency of such participles as predicate adjectives matches Titus over against 1 and 2 Timothy. While there are few examples of substantive or adjectival participle clauses, their syntax, position to expressed referents, and word group order all fit within the examples of the PE. Relative clauses are also infrequent in Acts 18. Their frequency of word groups beyond the predicator and their word group order align with patterns found in the PE. Rank-shifted of direct discourse are especially common in Acts 18, with only five examples total in the PE. The placement of direct quotations modifying a form of λέγω matches 1 Timothy and Titus and their placement within clauses proper fits with all three PE. Their clause type generally aligns with the PE, but the word group order of complement word groups agrees with 2 Timothy and Titus over against 1 Timothy.

Agreement between Acts 18 and the PE on the rank of word group depends on various factors. Subject word groups generally agree with 1 and 2 Timothy of the frequency of single nouns or pronouns as opposed to the presence of other modifiers. Their clausal syntax also agrees with the PE in terms of the tendency to appear within clauses proper and the distribution of subjects that precede and follow their predicator. In this way, Acts 18 lies between Titus and the other two PE for the position of subject word groups in paratactic clauses. The definite article is the most common additional modifier for both Acts 18 and the PE, and adjectives are especially uncommon. The lone predicate adjective precedes its head noun (Acts 18:2), which aligns with the PE, but modifies an anarthrous head noun, which agrees only with 2 Timothy over against 1 Timothy. Attributive adjectives also tend to modify arthrous head nouns in 1 Timothy, while Acts 18 shows closer affinity to 2 Timothy. Rank shift does not appear to impact

the likelihood of definite articles and qualifiers within subject word group, unlike the PE.[25]

C-DOs differ in many respects from the PE. The placement of C-DOs in the clause, the marginally codified pattern that C-DOs with the definite article will include no other modifiers, and the placement of C-DOs with qualifiers in their clause all disagree with the PE. However, the frequency of single nouns and pronouns compared to the presence of additional modifiers, the collocation of qualifiers with the definite article, and the syntax of adjectives within C-DOs all lie within the patterns of the PE. C-DOs with adjectives, which are infrequent in Acts 18, tend to be within clauses proper, aligning with 1 and 2 Timothy over against Titus. The syntax of C-IOs in Acts 18 generally agrees with the PE; however, C-IOs never include embedded qualifiers, which disagrees with the PE. C-PNs greatly differ from the patterns found in the PE with a few exceptions. Acts 18 agrees with 2 Timothy and Titus over against 1 Timothy that those preceding the predicator show hyperbaton. The type of hyperbaton agrees with 1 and 2 Timothy over Titus as does the postion of qualifiers within C-PNs. Such complements in Acts 18 disagree with all three PE in their tendency to appear within rank-shifted contexts, the appearance of nouns with a definite article, and the frequency of nouns over against predicate adjectives.

In Acts 18, C-OPs also disagree with the tendencies and patterns found in the PE. Acts 18 agrees with the PE in the syntax of both predicate and attributive adjective modifiers.[26] But the tendency of those that precede their predicator to be in a rank-shifted context, the tendency that they will include additional modifiers beyond a single noun or pronoun, the frequency of the

---

[25] This could be due to the prevalence of subjects within clauses of direct discourse, but more data is needed to deduce anything conclusive.

[26] Acts 18 includes attributive adjectives in both "sandwich" and "repeat" positions with regularity, lying between the patterns found in 1 and 2 Timothy over against Titus. Only one predicate adjective of πᾶς occurs within a C-OP (Acts 18:4) and it aligns with the patterns of the PE.

457

definite article and the tendency that they will not appear alongside other modifiers, the lack of adjectival modifiers, the presence of a predicate adjective following its head noun, the prevalence of predicate adjectives over attributive adjectives, and the tendency of C-OPs of ἐν to include additional modifiers all disagree with the PE as a whole.[27] The collocation of qualifiers with definite article shows similarity to 2 Timothy over against 1 Timothy and Titus and the tendency that those with qualifiers will not precede the governing verb aligns with 1 and 2 Timothy but not Titus.

Adjunct word groups in Acts 18, like subject word groups, show both similarity with and divergence from the PE. The conjunction δέ is the most common as in the PE, but γάρ is less frequent in Acts 18. The syntax of A-Advs shows similarity to the PE with regard to the tendency that they appear with clauses proper and with regard to the word group order of temporal adverbs, but it differs for adverbs of manner.[28] A-CUs tend to follow their governing verb, aligning with the PE. The infrequency of the definite article in A-CUs aligns with 1 and 2 Timothy over against Titus, but the presence of the article on dative A-CUs aligns with Titus over against 1 and 2 Timothy. A-CUs in Acts 18 also lack embedded qualifiers and have attributive adjectives in "repeat" position to indefinite head nouns, aligning with the PE overall. A-PPs follow their governing verb with slightly more regularity than in the PE, but, unlike the PE, they tend to appear only within clauses proper.

The syntax of qualifier word groups in Acts 18 show similarity but also much dissimilarity with the PE. Like the PE, qualifiers tend to follow their referent, match the definiteness of their referent, and include the definite article with similar frequency. Those that appear in word groups

---

[27] Additionally, Acts 18 disagrees with the patterns found in the PE for modifiers within C-OPs of PPs of reference or respect, PPs of standard, and PPs of time, especially as the PP refers to past, present, or future time.

[28] Four of five A-Advs of manner follow the governing predicator (18:12, 23, 25, 28).

preceding the predicator tend to be in a subject word group in Act 18, which greatly differs from the PE. The syntax of the lone adjective does not fit with the syntax of the PE, nor does the lack of qualifiers that modify other qualifiers.[29] The tendency of those that do not match their referent to be definite qualifiers modifying indefinite referents matches 1 and 2 Timothy over Titus. Acts 18 disagrees with the PE, however, in the placement of appositive qualifiers as well as the presence and frequency of additional modifiers within objective and subjective modifiers. Acts 18 does agree with 2 Timothy over against 1 Timothy and Titus in the syntax of qualifiers serving as genitives of relationship and agrees with 1 and 2 Timothy over against Titus in the tendency of epexegetical qualifiers to follow their head noun or adjective.[30]

Initial Observations

On the rank of section, Acts 18 shows very little similarity to the PE, only agreeing with specific letters in certain aspects. There is also much dissimilarity with the PE on the rank of clause, both for paratactic and hypotactic clauses alike. Acts 18 agrees with 1 and 2 Timothy regarding subject word groups in paratactic clauses, with 1 Timothy regarding A-PPs and A-CUs, but Titus over against 1 and 2 Timothy in the position of complements and the syntax of A-Advs. Acts 18 agrees with the syntax of complement and adjunct word groups in HC-ptcs, but it shows stronger patterns than the PE and disagrees in other factors. There is not a single letter of the PE for which Acts 18 shows consistently greater affinity with regard to the syntax and patterns of clauses proper. Rank-shifted clauses, however, show general agreement with the PE in many respects and, when it disagrees, usually shows the closest affinity to 1 Timothy. The

---

[29] Qualifiers that modify other qualifiers also tend to involve the subjective genitive in the PE, but this tendency does not appear in Acts 18. Additionally, the lack of objective genitive qualifiers in Acts 18 is a stark difference from the PE.

[30] Both of these features, however, could simply be due to a lack of appropriate samples in Acts 18.

position of subject and complement word groups within rank-shifted infinitive clauses generally disagrees with the PE, but Acts 18 agrees with the PE in the prevalence of infinitive clauses to appear within an HC-ptc. Rank-shifted participle clauses and relative clauses generally align with the PE. On the rank of word group, Acts 18 shows some similarity but much disagreement with the PE and does not consistently align with any one letter over the others in areas of disagreement. Subject word groups do agree with the PE in many aspects, but disagree in the syntax of additional modifiers and their correlation with clausal syntax. For complement word groups, C-IOs in Acts 18 show general similarity with the PE, but the other types of complement types all show much disagreement. C-DOs, C-PNs, and C-OPs all show disagreement with the PE in clausal syntax, the collocation of the definite article with other modifiers, and the types of additional modifiers within the word group. C-DOs with adjectives do have syntax that somewhat aligns with 1 and 2 Timothy, along with the type of hyperbaton found in C-PNs. The syntax of complement word groups in Acts 18 show the closest affinity overall with 2 Timothy, but still with areas of difference. Aside from the lack of some common adjuncts of the PE within Acts 18, such as the ἵνα of purpose or the additive καί, adjunct word groups tend either generally to agree with the PE or fall within the variance evident between the individual letters of the PE. A-Advs in Acts 18 agree with 1 and 2 Timothy for temporal A-Advs but Titus for A-Advs of manner. The lack of the definite article in A-CUs, similarly, aligns with 1 and 2 Timothy but Acts 18 aligns with Titus over against 1 and 2 Timothy on the presence of the definite article on dative A-CUs. The syntax of qualifiers rarely agrees with all three PE but often does agree with one or two letters of the PE when there is disagreement.

Final Conclusions and Observations

The syntactical and word order analysis of the PE and the four selected comparison

chapters from other NT works downward along the rank scale demonstrates both areas of congruence and disagreement. Within each work, the patterns of use and structure for each feature contribute to the idiosyncractic study of that particular text and are helpful with issues of text criticism, identifying marked syntax and patterns of word order, and textual interpretation. These purposes have been established in previous chapters and will demonstrated afresh below. The comparison to other chapters and texts, however, helps to provide a baseline for examining which features might have import for intertextual considerations of register, style, and authorship. Most salient for intertextual consideration, as proposed in chapter five, are those areas in which the PE all agree over against one or more comparison chapters, areas for which two PE agree consistently with the comparison chapters over against the other PE, and areas in which the PE and the comparison chapters show mixed similarity.

Accuracy of Data

Within the Pastoral Epistles

Within the PE, as demonstrated in chapter five, there are many areas of agreement between all three letters. On the rank of section, where the PE disagree, it is usually 1 and 2 Timothy showing closer affinity over against Titus, such as sentence type in section conclusions, the use of οὖν, and subsection transitional devices. The PE agree in the syntax of opening and second sentences of sections and subsections, the use of asyndeton, and that transitional sentences, both at the beginning and conclusion of sections and subsections, regularly cause irregular word group order and syntax. They also show similarity in the use of poetic and doxological passages as subsection conclusions. These areas of agreement could be due to the any potential issues of register, including that they are letters written to a single recipient, the force of each letter being largely paraenesis, or the similarity of content. The areas where 1 and 2 Timothy agree over

against Titus in themselves could also be connected to changes in register, including provenance, different recipients, or differences in amanuensis or authorship.

On the rank of clause, the PE shows general agreement in most respects for both paratactic and hypotactic clauses proper. Word group order and clausal syntax for paratactic imperative clauses, indicative clauses with the illocutionary force of paraenesis, and nominal clauses are consistent across the PE. Exceptions include the use of an anaphoric demonstrative pronoun in imperative clauses, in which 1 and 2 Timothy agree and the flexibility of temporal adjuncts in imperative clauses, in which 1 Timothy and Titus agree. The tense of imperative predicators, also, shows variance across all three PE. Paratactic indicative clauses, however, show more difference regarding the word group order of complement word groups and the word group order of nominal word groups serving as adjuncts between all three PE. In other areas, such as the word group order of subject word groups, the word group order of A-Advs and A-PPs, and the tendency of indicative clauses to be part of complex sentences, 1 and 2 Timothy agree over against Titus. This suggests that the former areas, in which all three PE disagree, are less salient for considerations of markedness and register, while the latter areas could correlate to changes in register and style, especially when compared to other NT works. It is also noteworthy that many structural deviations, both on the rank of clause but also on the rank of word group, are consistently caused by a context of contrast, the syntax of asyndetic or serial lists, poetic or formulaic syntax, or the presence of a clause or word group within a transitional sentence between sections and subsections.

Hypotactic clauses show agreement in most respects, with a few significant deviations. The word group order of ἵνα clauses of purpose with regard to the predicator and complement is not consistent across the PE, while the PE agrees in most other issues of intra-clausal and inter-

clausal syntax for such clauses. First Timothy and Titus agree over against 2 Timothy in the position of other HC-Cjs relative to their governing clause as well as the tense of HC-ptcs. The latter appears to correlate with the amount of recollection and narrative that appears within the text, while the former does not align with any single feature in the text itself. HC-ptcs show consistent word group order across all three PE, but deviations occur with hyperbaton in 2 Timothy and Titus as opposed to the use of ταῦτα or a relative pronoun as the complement in 1 Timothy.

Rank-shifted clauses show more variance between the PE. Rank-shifted infinitive clauses show similarity in many areas, including position and function within the governing clause and the word group order of the clause. First Timothy and Titus agree against 2 Timothy, however, in the tense of the infinitive and the type of clause in which the infinitive clause appears. For rank-shifted participle clauses, 1 and 2 Timothy agree over against Titus with regard to the force of the participle and the type of participle clause that does not appear in expected position within the larger clause. They all agree in most other factors for rank-shifted participle clauses, especially regarding participle tense and the word group order of the participle clause. Relative clauses, whose word group order largely depends on force of the relative pronoun within the clause, show general agreement between all three PE as well. The areas of full agreement will be more salient when compared to other works, but the areas of disagreement, taken together with other areas in which two PE agree over against another, could be indicative of a register change.

The rank of word group is where the PE show the most variance with one another. They generally show agreement in many aspects, but several areas of variance are apparent. The presence of the article alongside attributive or predicate adjectives within subject word groups differs from letter to letter and 1 and 2 Timothy disagree with Titus regarding the position of

463

subject word groups, especially in paraenetic contexts. For C-DOs, 1 Timothy and Titus agree in the collocation of qualifiers and adjectives within the word group and the tendency of adjectives modifying indefinite head nouns to be in "repeat" position, but 1 and 2 Timothy agree in the correlation of adjectival modifiers in C-DOs to occur with clauses proper. C-IOs show consistency across the PE, but C-PNs show variance. There is no consistent position of C-PNs relative to its governing predicator. While qualifiers and hyperbaton are common in such word groups, 1 and 2 Timothy disagree with Titus about the position of qualifiers with their referent and the type and word order of the hyperbaton. C-OPs show general consistency in the PE with few areas of disagreement. Adjunct word groups show commonality in the PE regarding the position of A-PPs and A-CUs, but 1 and 2 Timothy generally agree regarding the position of the additive καί, the position of A-Advs of time and manner, the frequency of the definite article in A-CUs, and which type of A-CU tends to include the definite article. The type of A-PPs to precede the governing verb also varies according to the letter. In general, then, for structural word groups the PE either generally agree or 1 and 2 Timothy agree over against Titus. Areas of disagreement between all three PE, such as the position of C-PNs relative to their governing predicator or the collocation of the definite article with attributive or predicate adjectives within subject word groups, are likely not indicative of issues of register. But the consistent agreement of 1 and 2 Timothy against Titus in various features could suggest a change in register or style, similar to such agreement in rank-shifted clauses.

Qualifier word groups show general agreement in the PE regarding to the use of infinitives as qualifiers and many aspects of nominal qualifiers. 1 and 2 Timothy disagree with Titus in the position of relative clauses with regard to their governing predicator, the position of PP qualifiers relative to their head noun, the position of appositive qualifiers with their governing verb, the

occasions when the referent and the qualifier do not match in definiteness, and the types of modifiers within objective genitive qualifiers. The presence of further embedded qualifiers within subjective genitive qualifiers shows similarity between 1 Timothy and Titus, as does the position of genitives of relationship to their referent. The potential impact of these differences for larger considerations of register are not clear without more comparison to other works, but there are enough areas of agreement that marked examples within the PE can be identified.

Overall, then, the analysis above does present many areas in which the PE show cohesive and consistent syntax, word group order, and word order along the rank scale. This does provide a profile for the PE in themselves that can be used to identify marked examples and show that 1 and 2 Timothy are typically closer in many areas where the PE do disagree with one another. The question of whether these similarities and areas of difference are pertinent to questions of style and register has been raised in an initial way at the conclusion to chapter five, but comparison to other works with similar and differing components related to register will further clarify the potential significance of those areas.

In Comparison with External Works

Comparing the profile of the PE along the rank scale to other selected works helps establish which features could correlate to various issues of register. In this regard, it is significant, though not surprising, that the PE show the least similarity to Acts 18, a chapter that is strictly narrative. The closest affinity between the PE and the comparison chapters occurs with Eph. 4. Ephesians differs from the PE in that it is written to a group, not a person, but gives similar paraenetic instructions to the church community. Compare this with Rom. 15, which is also written to a group, although to a group that the author asserts not to have met face to face and in a very different geographical and cultural context. Paul's speech at Miletus in Acts 20 has potential

significance as a speech directly toward a group, like Eph. 4 and Rom. 15, but a group presented as church leadership, like the PE. It also matches in potential provenance to Eph. 4 and the letters of Timothy, the two of which are traditionally connected to Ephesus. It also allows for comparison of recorded speech, albeit within a narrative context, with written paraenesis, whose connection to orality and the role of the amanuensis is debated, as presented in chapter 1.

On the rank of section, Acts 18 disagrees with the PE in many regards, including the syntax of the opening sentence of the section, the opening sentences of subsections, the second sentences of subsections, as does the lack of asyndeton and ἵνα clauses for transitional sentences. Compare this to Paul's Miletus speech in Acts 20, which also disagrees with the PE in the syntax of section transitions, transitional devices, and second sentences of subsections. But it also agrees with 1 or 2 Timothy in other areas such as section and subsection conclusions and the impact of transitional sentences on word group order patterns. On the other hand, Rom. 15 aligns with the PE in many areas on the rank of section, especially in opening sentences of sections and subsections and the use of δέ. It differs, however, in section and subsection conclusions, the lack of asyndeton, and the lack of structural irregularities in transitional sentences. Ephesians 4, however, shows alignment with the syntax of the PE for sections and subsections, with the dearth of γάρ being the only major, noticeable difference. The PE, then, show the closest affinity with Eph. 4 and the most divergence from Acts 18. The PE differ from Rom. 15 in section and subsection conclusions as well as irregularities in transitional sentences, but agrees with Paul's speech at Miletus in those same features. The genre of narrative in Acts 18 likely accounts for the differences in transition, although Acts 20 also disagrees in opening sentences of sentences and subsections as well. The similarity of opening sentences between the PE, Rom. 15, and Eph. 4 might be suggestive of epistolary style, but it is significant that section and subsection

conclusions differ between the PE and Rom. 15 yet agree with Eph. 4.

On the rank of clause, the closest comparison chapters to the PE are Eph. 4 and Paul's speech at Miletus in Acts 20. Ephesians 4 either directly agrees with the PE or falls between the variance of the PE in most areas of syntax for paratactic and hypotactic clauses, especially the impact of contrast or transitional syntax on word group order. When it differs from one of the PE, it usually agrees with 1 and 2 Timothy over Titus. The abundance of adjunct word groups in HC-ptcs, however, is one area of disagreement with all three PE. Paul's speech at Miletus lacks δέ on the rank of clause, which is the commonest conjunction for paratactic clauses in the PE, but the word group order of HC-ptcs in Acts 20 agrees the closest with the PE of all the comparison chapters. Acts 20 also shows closer affinity to 2 Timothy on the rank of clause, which might be significant in that 2 Timothy and Acts 20:18b–35 are presented as the final words of Paul to the recipients, typically correlated with Asia Minor. Romans 15 generally falls within the patterns of the PE for paratactic clauses but differs for hypotactic clauses. This includes the position of subjects within ἵνα clauses of purpose and the impact of participle force on word group order for HC-ptcs. Acts 18, however, is quite divergent from the PE on the rank of clause. This includes verbal tense for paratactic clauses, the lack of γάρ and asyndeton and the correlation of subjects and specific conjunctions. This is likely due to the nature of Acts 18 as narrative depicting prior events. For hypotactic clauses, HC-ptcs are in genitive absolute or in the aorist tense with a temporal force with much higher frequency than the PE, leading to differences also in subject word groups and placement in the clause. Acts 18 also lacks ἵνα clauses, greatly diverging from the PE. Furthermore, when Acts 18 agrees with one PE over the others, such as the position of subjects and complements in paratactic clauses, it is usually Titus, which contains frequent passages of narrative recollection. These differences on the rank of clause, then, are

likely due to differences in genre, although it is noteworthy that Paul's speech in Acts 20 shows

nearly the same similarity as Eph. 4. Perhaps it is the presentation of material to church

leadership over against general readership that lies behind this correlation, but more research

would need to be done to give further defense of such a claim.

For rank-shifted clauses, Acts 18 shows closer affinity to the PE compared with other

clause types. Rank-shifted infinitive clauses fit within the patterns of the PE in most regards

except the position of subject word groups and the collocation of complement and adjunct word

groups. Acts 18 does, however, show general agreement in attributive participle clauses, relative

clauses, and even direct discourse clauses. Ephesians 4 shows the closest affinity to rank-shifted

clauses overall with the PE, with the only major difference being that complementary infinitives

are infrequent in Eph. 4. However, the syntax of direct object infinitives and complementary

infinitives match the PE. Romans 15 shows slightly more variation. The position of infinitive

clauses in their governing clause differs from the PE as well as the syntax of subject word groups

in infinitive clauses. Romans 15 generally aligns with PE in other aspects and favors 2 Timothy

in areas of difference. Paul's speech in Miletus shows the least similarity to the PE for rank-

shifted clauses, including the lack of infinitives of indirect discourse, the presence of the article

on three complementary infinitives, and the clausal structure of direct object infinitive clauses.

The syntax, however, of other types of rank-shifted clauses generally aligns with the PE. As a

whole, this suggests that the syntax of rank-shifted participle clauses is likely not indicative of

stylistic differences, nor the syntax of relative clauses and rank-shifted discourse clauses.

Infinitives show the greatest difference, with the syntax of subject word groups, the position of

the infinitive relative to its governing verb, and the force of the infinitive showing variance in the

comparison chapters. In Paul's speech in Acts 20, for example, ὅτι clauses are preferred to

infinitives of direct discourse, which is not the case for the PE nor any other comparison chapter. Other differences, such as the syntax of direct object infinitives, might simply be due to the lack of sufficient examples, but the difference in word group order of subjects within infinitive clauses differentiates Acts 18 from both Eph. 4 and Rom. 15.

On the rank of word group, Eph. 4 once again shows the greatest affinity to the PE with regard to subject word groups. The only difference, as is common for other word groups also, is that patterns in the PE are stronger in frequency in Eph. 4. Romans 15 is the next closest to the PE, agreeing in most respects but disagreeing in the frequency of objective genitive qualifiers in subject word groups. Acts 18 disagrees with the impact of definite articles and embedded qualifiers on the position of the subject within its clause, while Paul's speech in Acts 20 differs with respect to adjectives and their position within the word group as well as the correlation of rank-shift with modifiers. The two comparison chapters from epistles, then, generally agree with the PE regarding most aspects, while the two chapters from Acts disagree with regard to various additional elements within the word group. Generally, however, the comparison chapters show the closest alignment with 2 Timothy except for Paul's speech in Acts 20, which aligns with 1 Timothy or Titus in various respects.

Complement word groups show similarity between the PE and Eph. 4, with Eph. 4 at times showing similar but stronger patterns than the PE. Ephesians 4 differs, however, is the use of the definite article to make C-IOs definite, the lack of adjectival modifiers in C-OPs, and some notable differences specifically with the word order within C-OPs of εἰς and πρός phrases. Romans 15 also shows close affinity with complement word groups of the PE, with the only differences being the lack of adjectives in C-DOs and the placement of predicate adjectives in C-OPs. Romans 15 aligns most closely with 2 Timothy for most complement types but with Titus

with C-OPs. Paul's speech in Acts 20 shows much similarity to the PE also, disagreeing only in the clausal syntax of C-PNs, the placement of predicate adjectives in C-OPs and the syntax of C-OPs of PPs of source.

Acts 18, however, disagrees greatly with the PE for all types of complements. C-DOs, the placement of such complements in their clause, the impact of embedded qualifiers on word group order, and the lack of collocation of the definite article with other modifiers all disagree with the PE. For C-IOs, they are definite via the article, as with Eph. 4, but they never include embedded qualifiers and only appear within clauses proper, unlike the PE. For C-PNs, their clausal syntax, the word order and word group order of those with qualifiers, and the frequency of nouns all disagree with the PE. Lastly, for C-OPs, Acts 18 disagrees in many respects with the PE, generally with regard to the impact of rank-shift and the presence and syntax of every kind of modifier, especially within ἐν phrases.

Many areas of variance for complement word groups likely do not necessarily correlate to differences in register, although both Rom. 15 and Paul's speech in Acts 20 disagree with the PE in the position of predicate adjectives in C-OPs. Ephesians 4 and Rom. 15, similarly, disagree in the frequency of adjectives within different kinds of complement word groups. Acts 18 and Paul's speech in Acts 20 also both differ regarding the position of C-PNs within their clause. C-PNs overall, however, are the most likely type of complement to include hyperbaton and C-OPs are the least likely to include it. The differences in the C-OP for individual PPs, with the exception of ἐν in Acts 18 and presence of qualifiers in εἰς and πρός phrases in Eph. 4, would need additional examples to infer any impact on considerations of style and register.

For adjunct word groups Rom. 15 shows the most similarity to the PE and with 2 Timothy most of all, with no areas of major difference. Ephesians 4 also shows general similarity

especially for conjunctions, A-Advs, and ACUs. The only significant difference lies in the placement of A-PPs according to the preposition and its force, in that Eph. 4 differs for certain forces, especially A-PPs of cause and source. Acts 18 shows some similarity to the PE for adjuncts also. With the exception of specific conjunctions, mentioned with sections and clauses, the salient differences include the lack of the additive καί, the stronger tendency for A-PPs to follow their governing predicator, and the tendency of A-PPs not to appear in rank-shifted clauses. Paul's Miletus speech in Acts 20 shows the least similarity to the PE regarding adjunct word groups. Differences include the use of καί as a conjunction and the lack of the conjunction δέ, even when contrast is implied. The case of A-CUs disagrees with the PE as does the word group order of such adjuncts within their clause. Finally, as with Eph. 4, some forces of A-PPs differ in syntax and word group order, especially A-PPs of accompaniment and source. As with complement word groups, the differences in word group order for specific forces of A-PPs are not likely indicative of major stylistic changes, as individual letters of the PE also show some variance in this regard. Noticeable differences, however, are the lack of the additive καί in Acts 18 and Acts 20:18b–35 and the differences in A-CUs in Acts 20:18b–35. The latter, however, could be due to the predominance of A-CUs to carry a temporal force in Acts 20:18b–35.

Many aspects of qualifier word groups show similarity between the PE and the comparison chapters. Paul's speech at Miletus shows the closest affinity with the PE for qualifiers, with no areas of significant disagreement. Ephesians 4 also shows great affinity with the PE, with some patterns being similar but stronger in Eph. 4. It disagrees with the PE regarding the frequency of the definite article in qualifiers that modify other qualifiers. No possessive or subjective genitive qualifier precedes its referent in Eph. 4, but a genitive of relationship does, a common feature in the PE. Romans 15 also shows a similarity to the PE for qualifier word groups, disagreeing only

in the position of adjectival modifiers and in the tendency that objective genitive qualifiers will not appear within C-OPs. These disagreements, however, might simply need more examples from Romans to compare with the PE. Acts 18, as with adjuncts, shows much disagreement with the PE. These differences include the syntax of qualifiers that precede the governing verb, the syntax of adjectives and qualifiers that modify other qualifiers, the lack of objective genitive qualifiers, the position of appositional qualifiers, and the type and frequency of additional modifiers with subjective and objective qualifiers. There are many areas where all the texts agree and, thereby, are likely not significant for intertextual comparison, including the tendency of qualifiers to follow their referent, match the referent in definiteness, and the tendency of word groups with qualifiers to follow their governing predicator. There also similarities in the syntax of subjective genitives, possessive genitives, genitives of relationship, and epexegetical genitives, but some comparison chapters differ in the word order of specific forces of qualifiers. The major differences with Acts 18 could be due to the genre of narrative, although it is noteworthy that Acts 20:18b–35 shows the closest affinity with the PE regarding qualifiers over against Eph. 4 or Rom. 15.

Consequently, the compiled data analyzing syntax and word order patterns in the PE and the comparison chapters does prove accurate for many patterns. The great disagreement with Acts 18 within each rank does show difference for various types and genres of text, although analysis of other narratives, such as Matthew or John, would be needed to show if different narratives have further deviation with one another. The analysis on the rank of section does show general consistency for the PE and Eph. 4, with some similarity to Rom. 15 and little similarity to both Acts passages. This could correlate with genre, although Rom. 15 and Paul's Miletus speech also contain paraenesis, so the differences are likely indicative of a different component

of register such as the illocutionary force and content of the material. The similarities between Acts 20:18b–35 and the PE over against the other comparison chapters on the ranks of clause and word group might be indicative of speech or exhortation to church leadership over against a congregational context while the similarities between Eph. 4 and the PE might correlate to provenance and local context, as they are both associated with Ephesus and southwest Asia Minor. The differences between 1 and 2 Timothy and Titus could also correlate with provenance, although Rom. 15 most closely aligns with 2 Timothy over the other PE in many areas of variance. There are few areas in which the PE disagree with all four comparison chapters, especially on the rank of section, which could align letters to individuals as opposed to letters to groups, but there are too few examples of personal letters in the NT to pursue that possibility sufficiently. So, while there are many features that likely correspond to general NTG syntax, this method does highlight differences that could impact considerations of style and syntax on a linguistic basis over against issues of diction and assumed changes in authorship.

With this comparison in mind, then, the list of potentially significant features from chapter five can be further refined into areas that are likely salient to discussions of style, register, and distinctive elements within a work's linguistic profile, areas that are likely indicative of larger patterns of NTG or KG in general, and areas that, upon further investigation, are likely not relevant to such discussions. On the rank of section, areas that are likely relevant to considerations of genre, register, and style include:

- The use of paraenesis for section transitions, which are likely epistolary in style,
- The sentence type for section conclusions, in which only Titus differs,
- The use of *inclusio* for larger sections, which is likely epistolary in style,
- The use of asyndeton for section and subsection transition, for which the PE, Rom.

15 and Acts 18 differ from Eph. 4 and Paul's Miletus speech,

- The presence of markedness and irregular syntax for section and subsection transitions and conclusions, in which only Acts 18 consistently differs, and

- The presence of hyperbaton in a C-PN for closing sentences of subsections, in which the PE agree over all the comparison chapters.

As proposed in chapter five, the present of rank-shifted clauses and ἵνα clauses of purpose do not appear to be salient for larger considerations, nor the content and mood of the main clause for subsection conclusions. Although, it is noteworthy that only Rom. 15 includes optative blessings as subsection conclusions and poetic sections do not conclude sections in the PE nor any comparison chapter.

On the rank of clause proper, there are some features that show import for intertextual considerations and some that suggest larger patterns within NTG or KG in general. Those that are likely salient for further study within KG as a whole on the rank of clause proper include:

- The frequency and position of subject word groups in imperative clauses,

- The clausal structure and infinitive tense for impersonal δεῖ clauses,

- The frequency of complements and clausal structure for indicative clauses with the illocutionary force of a wish or command,

- The clausal structure for formulaic and non-formulaic nominal clauses, and

- The frequency and clausal structure for complements within HC-ptcs.

The syntax of ἵνα clauses might also be relevant to larger patterns within KG with regard to subject and adjunct word groups, but too many other factors appear to impact these patterns both for the PE and the comparison chapters to make any conclusive determinations. In addition to

these patterns, features that are salient for intertextual comparison and considerations of style on the rank of clause proper include:

- The position of the complement within paratactic imperative clauses, in which the PE all agree over against the limited examples of the comparison chapters,

- The position of the complement within paratactic indicative clauses, in which 1 and 2 Timothy agree with Rom. 15 and Eph. 4 over against Titus and both chapters from Acts,

- The position of the subject within paratactic indicative clauses, in which all the passages agree over against Titus,

- The position of adjuncts, especially A-Advs consisting of a single word, within paratactic indicative clauses, in which Titus and Acts 18 agree over against the other PE and comparison chapters,

- The likelihood of paratactic indicative clauses to be part of a compound or complex sentence, in which Titus alone prefers simple sentences,

- The position of HC-Cjs of any force with Cj-Hs other an ἵνα relative to the governing clause, in which 1 Timothy, Titus, and Acts 18 agree against 2 Timothy, Rom. 15, and Eph. 4,

- The frequency of adjuncts within HC-ptcs, in which the PE agree with both passages from Acts over against Rom. 15 and Eph. 4, and

- The syntax of adjuncts within HC-ptcs, in which the PE and the comparison chapters agree against the limited samples from Paul's Miletus speech.

Some of these patterns might suggest a difference between genres, such as the position of subject and complement word groups within paratactic indicative clauses. Some might show stylistic

peculiarities, such as Titus' preference for simple sentences and the syntax of adjuncts within HC-ptcs. More research would be needed for each of these phenomena to determine the nature and the potential import of their variation across works of the New Testament.

For rank-shifted clauses, some features, especially for rank-shifted participle clauses and relative clauses, are likely indicative of general tendencies and patterns across NTG or KG. These patterns include:

- The predominant tendency for rank-shifted participles functioning as attributive adjectives to be in "repeat" position to their referent,

- The presence of a definite article on rank-shifted participles with the force of substantives or attributive adjectives and the absence of the definite article on participles functioning as predicate adjectives within C-PNs,[31]

- The P-C clausal structure for rank-shifted participle clauses with expressed complements,

- The general tendency for subject and complement word groups, when expressed, to appear on opposite sides of the predicator within relative clauses, and

- The tendency for all adjunct word groups in relative clauses to follow the predicator except when the adjunct includes the relative pronoun.

The PE and the comparison chapters tend to agree in many areas of syntax for rank-shifted participle clauses and relative clauses, with areas of difference likely irrelevant, as evinced by the variations within the PE themselves. For rank-shifted clauses, areas of potential import for

---

[31] The only potential deviation occurs in Acts 18, where both participles functioning as attributive adjectives appear in "repeat" position but without the article (Acts 18:2, 7). In both cases, however, the participles modify proper names, and the article would cause the participle to read as an appositive, substantive participle distinguishing that individuals from others, rather than being adjectival.

intertextual comparison and establishing a distinctive linguistic profile for a given work mainly

occur within infinitive clauses. These patterns include:

- The tendency for infinitive clauses that precede their governing predicator to be aorist in tense, complementary in force, and modifying an indicative verb,[32]

- The syntax of complements within infinitive clauses, for which 2 Timothy and Titus agree with Rom. 15 and Paul's Miletus speech over against 1 Timothy, which in turn also disagrees with Eph. 4 and Acts 18,[33]

- The position of subject word groups within infinitive clauses along with the force and clausal context of the infinitive clause in which subjects appear, in which the single sample in Acts 20 agrees with the PE over against Eph. 4 and Acts 18,[34]

- The syntax of adjunct word groups within infinitive clauses, in which the PE and both samples from other epistles agree over against Acts 20, and

- The syntax of adjunct word groups within rank-shifted participle clauses, in which the PE agree with Rom. 15, Eph. 4, and Acts 18 over against Acts 20.

This research suggests that the position of infinitive clauses and the syntax of subject and

complement word groups within them are potentially significant for issues of intertextual

comparison and identifying changes in style, but more data would be needed to confirm such an

implication.

---

[32] This could be larger pattern within NTG or KG, but there are no infinitive clauses that precede their governing predicator within the comparison chapters to compare with the PE. The pattern is, however, consistent in the PE.

[33] For 1 Timothy, the clausal structure varies according to the force of the infinitive and the type of complement, while Ephesian 4 and Acts 18 show a consistent P-C structure in opposition to 2 Timothy and Titus.

[34] No rank-shifted infinitive clause in Rom. 15 includes a subject word group. The syntax for the three infinitive clauses functioning as hypotactic clauses that include subjects, however, varies for each example (Rom. 15:9, 16, 19).

On the rank of word group, the comparison of the PE with the selected chapters from other works suggests that some of areas of potential import, identified in chapter five, likely have relevance for larger patterns of NTG or KG, some have relevance for intertextual comparison and further investigation of register and style, and others are likely not relevant for further consideration. Those with salience for broader patterns of KG include:

- The likelihood of qualifiers and hyperbaton with C-PNs,

- The lack of qualifiers within A-CUs,[35]

- The tendency of A-CUs to follow their governing verb with exceptions likely having a temporal force, great emphasis, or a context of contrast, and

- The placement of appositive qualifiers in many word group types except C-PNs.

In addition to these areas, some features on the rank of word group identified in chapter five have been shown likely to be irrelevant for further study with relation to register and style. These include:

- The impact of rank shift on the likelihood of the definite article and qualifiers within subject word groups, although it is still potentially noteworthy that exceptions in the comparison chapters all tend to be in rank-shifted clauses of discourse,[36]

- The tendency of πᾶς to modify an indefinite head noun in C-OPs,

- The correlation of rank-shift and temporal meaning for C-OPs to include additional elements,

---

[35] The only exception to this tendency occurs in Ephesians 4, there three A-CUs include qualifiers on the head noun (Eph. 4:14, 18, 23). This could, then, be indicative of a stylistic peculiarity, but more analysis of Ephesians is needed to determine if these examples or marked or unmarked with the letter.

[36] Subjects within clauses of direct quotation (Rom. 15), recitative ὅτι clauses (Acts 20:18b–35), or direct discourse (Acts 18) regularly include the definite article or an embedded qualifier in the comparison chapters.

- The position and frequency of PPs serving as epexegetical qualifiers, and

- The distribution of attributive and predicate adjectives within nominal qualifier word groups.

There are, however, some patterns on the rank of word group that do show salience for establishing a distinctive linguistic profile and comparing the style of different works. These include:

- The position of subject word groups specifically within paratactic indicative clauses, in which Titus and Rom. 15 agree over against 1 and 2 Timothy, Eph. 4, and Pauls' Miletus speech,[37]

- The tendency of adjectives modifying head nouns with the definite article in C-DOs to be in "sandwich" position and those modifying indefinite head nouns to be in "repeat" position,[38]

- The tendency of C-DOs with adjectives to appear within clauses proper, as they do in 1 and 2 Timothy and both passages from Acts, or within rank-shifted clauses, as they do within Titus and Eph. 4,[39]

- The position of qualifiers to their referent in C-PNs, for which 1 and 2 Timothy agree with Rom. 15 and both passages from Acts over against Titus,[40]

- The type of hyperbaton within C-PNs, for which 1 and 2 Timothy tend to be a

---

[37] As shown above, Acts 18 lies between the tendencies of Titus and the letters of Timothy, favoring neither pattern.

[38] Some comparison chapters show minimal similarity to this tendency, but with too few samples to compare meaningfully. In fact, for all four comparison chapters adjectives are noticeably less likely within C-DOs than they are within the PE.

[39] There is no such tendency evident in Rom. 15 for either direction.

[40] Ephesians 4 does not show either tendency strongly.

separation of the head adjective or noun and a following qualifier in agreement with Rom. 15 and both passages from Acts over against Titus, which tends to have the hyperbaton separate elements of a compound complement,[41]

- The frequency of adjectives with C-OPs, for which the PE agree over against the comparison chapters,

- The tendency of adjectives proper within C-OPs to be in "sandwich" position, for which Titus agrees with Rom. 15 and Eph. 4, or to be "repeat" position, for which 1 and 2 Timothy agree with Paul's speech in Acts 20,[42]

- The presence of additional modifiers within the C-OP for PPs of sphere, for which 1 and 2 Timothy with Ephesians tend to have only a single noun or pronoun over against Titus and Rom. 15, which tend to include a definite article,

- The position of the additive καί and other A-Advs consisting of a single adverb, for which 1 and 2 Timothy agree with Rom. 15, Eph. 4, and Paul's speech in Acts 20 strongly over against Titus,[43]

- The presence or absence of the definite article within A-CUs, for which 1 and 2 Timothy agree with Rom. 15 and Acts 18 over against Titus, Eph. 4, and Paul's speech in Acts 20,

- The prevalence of A-CUs within participle clauses, for which the PE only agree

---

[41] As with the previous pattern, Ephesians 4 demonstrates both phenomena and does not strongly favor Titus or the letters of Timothy.

[42] Adjectives within C-OPs in Acts 18 are in "sandwich" and "repeat" positions to their referent with fairly similar frequency.

[43] Acts 18 agrees with 1 and 2 Timothy with regard to temporal A-Advs but with Titus with regard to A-Advs of manner.

with Eph. 4,[44]

- The tendency of infinitive clauses functioning as qualifiers to be within C-PNs, modifying adjectives whose verbal root takes a complementary infinitive, and to appear in hyperbaton to their governing adjective, for which no comparison chapter agrees with the PE,

- The tendency of nominal qualifiers that do not match their referent in definiteness to be definite qualifiers modifying an indefinite referent, for which 1 and 2 Timothy agree with Rom. 15, Eph. 4, and Acts 18 over against Titus,[45] and

- The likelihood of both subjective genitive qualifiers, genitives of relationship, and epexegetical qualifiers to precede their referent, which rarely occurs in any of the comparison chapters.[46]

For these patterns that are evident on the rank of word group, some are potentially related to idiosyncratic style rather than genre or other areas of register, such as the position of subject word groups in paratactic clauses, the position of A-Advs, the syntax of qualifiers and hyperbaton within C-PNs, the syntax of qualifiers that do not match the definiteness of their referent. Some could be indicative of epistolary style or the role of an amanuensis, such as the syntax of A-CUs and adjectives within C-OPs. And some could be indicative of a distinctive style for the PE in themselves, such as the syntax of adjectives within C-DOs, the syntax of

---

[44] This could be, however, because of the frequency of A-CUs of manner in Ephesians 4, which tend to appear within participle clauses in the PE, and temporal A-CUs in Paul's Miletus speech, which tend not to appear within participle clauses in the PE.

[45] Only one example occurs in Paul's Miletus speech (Acts 20:26), but it agrees with Titus over 1 and 2 Timothy.

[46] One exception is for genitives of relationship, for which 1 Timothy and Titus show similarity over 2 Timothy and Eph. 4.

infinitive clauses functioning as qualifiers, and the types of qualifiers that precede their referent with regularity.

In addition to the various linguistic phemonema that appear on various ranks of discourse, this project also demonstrates that marked syntax regularly occurs on various ranks due to the context of contrast, list syntax, poetic or formulaic syntax, and the presence of a clause or word group within a transitional or concluding sentence of a section or subection. The PE already show some difference with the chapters from Acts on the impact of transitional sentences on expected structures of syntax, but more research would also need to be done to verify whether these other causes of marked syntax are particular to the PE or indicative of larger patterns within NTG or KG.

Usefulness of Data for Analysis and Interpretation

While further research would be necessary to conclude anything decisive about the impact of this project for intertextual comparison, historical considerations, questions of register, and larger patterns within NTG or KG, the idiolect established within the PE themselves can already be useful for analysis and interpretation of the PE in at least three key ways. First, it is useful for identifying areas of marked syntax that are specific to each letter, allowing for further analysis into the potential cause of the anomalies in word order and their impact for interpretation and theological application. Second, the syntactical patterns identified in this project do have implications for more broad considerations of word order in NTG, especially the impact of contrast, serial lists, and transitional sentences. Finally, the word order patterns also aid in considerations of textual criticism, giving further data concerning variant reading possibilities. Examples for the first two points will follow, but many of the instances in which this project is useful for text-critical analysis are already presented above in chapters two, three, and four as the

text is established for each letter and the codification of word group order is presented.

For questions of interpretation within the PE, some examples are found in 1 Tim. 2:11, 2 Tim. 1:16b, and Titus 2:11. The first example where this data could be helpful for interpretation occurs in 1 Tim. 2:11 with the prepositional phrase ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ. While prepositional phrases can occur both before (1 Tim. 4:15; 5:19, 20) or after (1 Tim. 2:11; 4:7; 5:2, 12, 23) an imperative predicator in 1 Timothy, A-PPs of manner, with ἐν, follow their governing predicator in 1 Timothy as a codified pattern, regardless of the mood of the verb. This is also the only paratactic clause in 1 Timothy in which A-PPs occur on both sides of the predicator within the main clause itself (cf. 1 Tim. 5:19). When adjuncts do appear on both sides of the predicator, even for imperative clauses, it tends to be A-PPs on one side and A-Advs on the other (1 Tim. 5:5, 15, 19) or A-Advs on both sides (1 Tim. 3:10). When there are multiple A-PPs within a paratactic clause, they tend to appear on the same side of the predicator, either before (1 Tim. 2:5) or after (1 Tim. 2:15; 4:12) the predicator. With all of this in mind, the A-PP, ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ, is in marked position while the other phrase of manner, ἐν πάσῃ ὑποταγῇ, appears in expected, unmarked position. This, alongside the repeated of the phrase ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ in 1 Tim. 2:12, gives the A-PP great emphasis both for 1 Tim. 2:11 and the passage as a whole. This ties together the theme of ἡσυχία for section γ of 1 Timothy (1 Tim. 2:1–15) and highlights ἡσυχία as an important theme not only for the Christian life (1 Tim. 2:1–2) but also for the order of the church (1 Tim. 2:11–12). While there has been much discussion of this passage, especially the *hapax legomenon* αὐθεντεῖν in 1 Tim. 2:12, the question of hendiadys within the relationship of the two infinitives in 1 Tim. 2:12, and the historical relevance of this passage to an ancient or contemporary context,[47] the marked syntax for ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ suggests it is of thematic importance of this passage

---

[47] See footnote 13 in chapter one above.

for interpretation and theological application.

The complement word group, τὴν ἅλυσίν μου, in 2 Tim. 1:16b is the only time a C-DO in a paratactic, indicative clause modified by a qualifier precedes its governing verb, as mentioned in chapter three. C-DOs in indicative clauses regularly precede their predicator, especially when it is comprised of a single noun with an article (2 Tim. 4:4, 7) but those with qualifiers almost always follow the predicator (2 Tim. 1:7, 15; 2:4; 3:10, 4:1). It is, then, not the placement of the C-DO in itself that gives it marked syntax for emphasis, contra Perkins,[48] but the addition of the qualifier. While this does not detract from the cultural and historical significance of τὴν ἅλυσιν, as it is discussed by commentators, the prominence is not only on the "chain" but on the genitive qualifier, namely, that it was *Paul's* chain. This not only links Paul's own experience with his charge for Timothy not to be ashamed of the testimony nor of Paul as a prisoner (2 Tim. 1:8), but the prominence with the personal pronoun gives further weight to Paul's charge, highlighting the personal cost that he has experienced and strongly implying that was his chain that caused Phygelus and Hermogenes to abandon him (2 Tim. 1:15).

Lastly, while presented in chapter four in a brief way regarding text-critical concerns, the analysis of Titus 2:11 is aided by the research of this project. As presented above, it is debated whether the dative word group πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις modifies the predicator, ἐπεφάνη, as an A-CU or modifies the adjective, σωτήριος, as a qualifier. While the presence of a predicate adjective within a subjective genitive qualifier, τοῦ θεοῦ, is already unusual for the PE as a whole, the syntax of adjuncts and dative word groups in Titus helps the reader. While dative word groups, when serving as A-CUs, tend to follow the predicator, non-conjunctive adjuncts in general lie between the predicator and the subject in paratactic clauses that lack a C-DO (Titus 3:3, 14).

---

[48] Perkins, *Letters*, 174.

Furthermore, albeit within the context of contrast, the one instance where a dative word group does serve as an A-CU in a paratactic clause without a C-DO, it precedes the predicator (Titus 1:16). The following participle clause in Titus 2:12 also continues with ἡ χάρις as its referent, which would also suggest that the dative modifier πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις, if taken with the predicator, would interrupt the syntactial flow of the sentence and the focus on ἡ χάρις that follows. When all of this is considered together, the word order patterns support taking the dative word group as a qualifier modifying σωτήριος, emphasizing the capacity of God for the salvation of all rather than the universality of the revelation itself.

In the above analysis, it is also demonstrated that contrast, serial lists, and transitional contexts regularly cause syntactical changes and marked syntax. Examples of contrast include 1 Tim. 4:7 and Titus 1:15; examples of list structure include 2 Tim. 2:11b–13 and Titus 2:9–10; examples of the impact of transitional syntax include 1 Tim. 6:2b and 2 Tim. 2:21. In 1 Tim. 4:7, two imperative clauses contrast the prior clause, each including a contrastive δέ. The first clause follows a C-P structure with a compound complement, with is marked syntax for compound complements within imperative clauses. This is followed by a clause with a P-C structure where the complement is a single pronoun, which typically precedes the predicator. While the syntax is not necessarily marked for the second clause, as single pronouns can follow the predicator in other imperative clauses (1 Tim. 4:11, 16), it does switch the clausal structure in contrast. The next verse, 1 Tim. 4:8, also shows a word group order change between the two clauses in that verse, also connected by a contrastive δέ. Another example can be found in Titus 1:15, where two nominal clauses are joined in contrast with δέ. The first clause shows an S-C-A word group word order, where the A-CU is a dative of reference, and the second clause has an A-S-C structure with another dative of reference as the A-CU. In this case, the first clause has the

adjunct in the expected, unmarked position while the second clause has the A-CU in primary, marked position. This does not mean that the A-CU in the second clause is emphatic, but rather that the syntax embodies the contrast between the two adjunct word groups.[49]

List structure can impact both word groups and clauses that are in parallel or asyndetic succession. The poetic section in 2 Tim. 2:11b–13 shows an example for clauses. There are four conditional clauses in parallel with the first three following an εἰ ... καί connector pattern. The third and fourth both show minor difference, in that the third has the apodosis begin with the contracted form κἀκεῖνος with an S-P-C word group order and the fourth omits καί, only has ἐκεῖνος, and switches to an S-C-P word group order. This lack of καί and the change in structure already likely indicates the conclusion of the parallel list of statements, but then the last conditional sentence is also followed by a single clause with a C-P structure and, as argued in chapter three, an explanatory γάρ. For an example of list structure within a word group, the C-PN of εἶναι in Titus 2:9–10 serves well. This complement is a compound, serial list of four predicate adjectives, three of which are rank-shifted participle clauses. The list moves from a positive adjective to two negative adjectives in asyndeton to a final positive adjective. The final adjective is introduced by the conjunction ἀλλά, which already likely signals the end of the list in itself, and the participle clause shows both hyperbaton and marked syntax. While only one, unlikely variant reading for this participle clause eliminates the hyperbaton altogether, every variant with significant textual support shifts the head noun after the participle to fit within unmarked, expected syntax with only the adjective πᾶσαν preceding the participle. Issues of interpretation for πίστιν and ἀγαθήν aside, the faith(fulness) to be shown is likely not emphasized more than

---

[49] The contrast between the A-CUs is mentioned by Perkins and the "partial chiasm" of the two clauses (Perkins, *Letters*, 256). There is not a partial chiasm, however. The syntax is instead caused by the context of contrast and the contrastive δέ.

the other adjectives in the compound complement, but the marked position rather indicates both

the conclusion of the list and the contrast, with ἀλλά, with the previous adjective.

Some examples of the impact of section and subsection transitions include 1 Tim. 6:2b and

2 Tim. 2:21. The conclusion of section ζ (1 Tim. 5:1–62b) occurs in 1 Tim. 6:2 with two parallel

doublets. Both doublets in 1 Tim. 6:2 are an imperative clause followed by an explanatory ὅτι

clause. The final ὅτι clause displays multiple irregularities in syntax, including hyperbaton in the

complement of the main, paratactic clause and a marked, C-P structure in the substantive

participle clause serving as the subject word group. Paratactic indicative clauses with compound

objects overall tend to have a C-P structure, but the other compound C-PN of an expressed,

copulative verb occurs in a P-C structure (1 Tim. 4:6). It is not clear, then, which side of the

compound complement is in marked or unmarked syntax within the main clause. For the

participle clause, however, there is a marginally codified pattern that both rank-shifted participle

clauses overall and substantive participle clauses with an expressed complement will have a P-C

pattern. This marked syntax likely does not emphasize the complement word group within the

clause, but rather marks the end of the section. The conclusion of subsection γ-3 in 2 Timothy (2

Tim. 2:14–21) also demonstrates irregular syntax. The final sentence is a future more vivid

conditional sentence, with a compound C-PN following the predicator, ἔσται, in the final clause.

There are four elements within the compound C-PN, three of which include an additional

modifier on the element, whether qualifiers on a head noun (σκεῦος εἰς τιμήν) or a head adjective

(εὔχρηστον τῷ δεσπότῃ) or an A-PP within a rank-shifted participle clause (εἰς πᾶν ἔργον

ἀγαθὸν ἡτοισμασμένον). The final element switches the word order of the modifier from

following its referent to preceding it. This is one of only two times an A-PP precedes its

governing predicator for such clauses in 2 Timothy, with the other also being a purpose phrase

within a rank-shifted participle clause serving as the final element of a compound C-PN at the end of a subsection (2 Tim. 3:17). While in both cases the compound C-PN could be the reason for the marked syntax of the A-PP, it is likely marked to signal the end of the subsection, especially in 2 Tim. 3:17 where the compound C-PN only includes two elements. While, certainly, more examples could be given for each of these areas, these are sufficient to prove the benefit of this project's findings for these issues of syntax and word order.

Implications for Future Research

The results of this project continue the investigation into the larger functions, both on level two and level three readings, of word order and word group order for NTG. While there has been much advancement in the field of word order in NTG, as Steven Runge recently stated, "much remains to be done."[50] This holds true especially as it pertains to potential differences of authorial style and the larger context of discourse and register. With this in mind, the current study represents one more step forward into a more nuanced approach to the syntax and style of NTG evident in a text. In this case, three letters that are often assumed and demonstrated to be very similar in register also show many recurrent structures and patterns of syntax and word order for the different ranks of discourse on a strictly linguistic basis. These patterns, in themselves, provide a basis for examining the PE afresh, especially where they demonstrate marked syntax based on their own internal syntactical patterns. The PE also consistently demonstrate that contrast, poetic and formulaic syntax, the structure of asyndetic or serial lists, and the context of transitional sentences often create marked syntax. More research is needed into these phenomena in other NT works to determine if this is a feature of KG in general or if it belongs within the

---

[50] Steven E. Runge, "Interpreting Constituent Order in Koine Greek," in *Linguistics and New Testament Greek: Key Issues in the Current Debate*, eds. David Alan Black and Benjamin L. Merkle (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2020), 125–45, especially 144–45.

consideration of register changes between kinds of texts. This project was focused on syntactical and structural patterns directly as they relate to word order and word group order, but more research should also be done on the prevalence of literary devices, such as metonymy or synecdoche, and their possible impact for markedness and word order. Further analysis on the rank of section between the letters of the Pauline Corpus would help to identify typical features and indicators of transitions within the letters, potentially revealing inter-textual relationships often overlooked on the basis of diction alone. The phenomenon of rank shift also appears to impact syntax and word order patterns in various ways throughout the PE, yet not necessarily in the same ways for the comparison chapters. Further research is needed into the differing patterns of syntax, then, for hypotactic and rank-shifted participle clauses, infinitive clauses, and clauses of indirect or direct discourse, to see how rank shift impacts expected clausal structures across the NT. Additionally, further refinement on the linguistic profiles presented in this project and comparison with both NT works and other related works, such as texts of the LXX and other early Christian writings, can help to create a more complete—and more nuanced—picture pertaining to the features that remain consistent across works of the same time period and the features that show divergence. Not only will this help to analyze and interpret works composed in NTG in particular or KG in general, but it will help to put potential historical and authorial considerations for specific works within the larger, more nuanced fields of register and text-focused linguistic analysis.

APPENDIX ONE

Full Profile Analysis of Romans 15

The Rank of Section

Romans 15 includes one section and multiple subsection transitions, although their amount and location vary by scholar. Many are in agreement that Rom. 14:1–15:13 is one major section of text, focused on Paul's treatment of the "strong" and the "weak" in relation to matters of adiaphora. A few scholars see no subsection divisions with that unit,[1] while many see a minor transition at 15:7[2] and some also at 15:1.[3] The theme of weakness (ἀσθενεία) in matters of adiaphora indeed continues throughout the whole of 14:1–15:13, yet there is a discernible shift in 15:1. Here, the idea of strength (δύναμις) is added, the example of Christ tempers and reinforces the previous, specific exhortations with a larger theological principle, and the unity of the church is stressed over against personal choice.[4] The transition from 15:1–6 to 15:7–13 is not as stark, but there are indicators of taking 15:7–13 as a separate subsection. First, the larger principle of Christ's example and the appeal for unity is applied specifically to the Jew-Gentile socio-religious tension within the church, which has not been explicitly named in the previous material. Second, the present tensions and exhortation give way to an eschatological focus and vision of

---

[1] C.E.B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, 2 Vols., ICC (London: T&T Clark, 2006), 28–29, 690 and Richard Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans* (Columbus: Wartburg, 1945), 811, 856.

[2] F.F. Bruce, *Romans: An Introduction and Commentary*, TNTC (Downer's Grove: IVP Academic, 1985), 64–66, Ernst Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans*, trans. Geoffrey Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), ix–xi, Michael P. Middendorf, *Romans 1–8*, ConcC (St. Louis: Concordia, 2013), 31, Michael P. Middendorf, *Romans 9–16*, ConcC (St. Louis: Concordia, 2016), x, 1470, and William Sanday and Arthur Headlam, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, 5th ed., ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1960), xlvii–li. Middendorf also includes 15:7 with 15:1–6, seeing it a pivot verse that is both anaphoric and cataphoric (Middendorf, *Romans*, 1462–63, 1473–74).

[3] Bruce, *Romans*, 64–66, Leon Morris, *The Epistle to the Romans* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 18–19, 495, and Käsemann, *Romans*, ix–xi, 380.

[4] See also Käsemann, *Romans*, 380–81 and Morris, *Romans*, 495–96.

future unity.[5] Lastly, there is a parallel structure between 15:1–6 and 15:7–13 including an opening sentence of exhortation (15:1, 7),[6] a second sentence of explanation with γάρ including a quotation introduced by καθὼς γέγραπται (15:3, 8–9), and an optative wish clause as the final paratactic clause (15:5–6, 13). For these reasons, this project will consider 15:1–6 and 15:7–13 as parallel yet separate subsections of 14:1–15:13.

Scholars strongly agree that 15:14 signals a major transition in the letter, but the extent of the section and the subsection divisions following it are less clear. Many scholars see no significant shifts or subsection divisions within 15:14–33, considering those verses as a whole to be personal matters that either constitute the closing of the body of the letter proper[7] or begin the epilogue to the letter.[8] Some see a shift in 15:30 from travel and visitation intentions to a request for intercessory prayer,[9] while others see a shift, either in 15:22[10] or 15:23,[11] from Paul's guiding principle of ministry to the Gentiles to specific travel plans for visiting Rome. There is a discernible thematic and structural shift from Paul's personal motivation and ministry in 15:14–21 to his intention and purpose for visiting Rome in 15:22–33. The question remains, however, whether that shift occurs in 15:22 or 15:23. There is an elided main, paratactic clause in the sentence of 15:23–24a, followed by an explanatory γάρ clause in 15:24b. While this might

---

[5] Käsemann, *Romans*, 384–85. Middendorf, *Romans*, 1474–75.

[6] See, however, Middendorf, who argues well that the use of προσλαμβάνω in 15:7 ties backward to the use of προσλαμβάνω in 14:1–15:6 (Middendorf, *Romans*, 1462). Certainly, as Middendorf argues, 15:7 is a hinge verse that links 14:1–15:6 with 15:8–13.

[7] See Käsemann, *Romans*, ix–xi, 389. Käsemann does, however, grant that the text can be divided into three smaller units "[i]f it is to be split into sections for the sake of clarity" (Käsemann, *Romans*, 389).

[8] Bruce, *Romans*, 64–66, Lenski, *Romans*, 875, Middendorf, *Romans*, 1500, and Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, xlvii–li.

[9] Cranfield, *Romans*, 28–29, 749, 775–76 and Käsemann, *Romans*, 389, 406.

[10] Käsemann, *Romans*, 389, 396–97.

[11] Morris, *Romans*, 508, 516 and Middendorf, *Romans*, 1502, 1521.

suggest a transition, the contrastive δέ with νυνί instead connects 15:23–24a backward to 15:22. While it possible that this construction could introduce a new unit of material, as in 3:21, it is more likely, toegether with the use of the construction in 15:25, that 15:22 introduces the topic of travel to Rome with 15:23–33 continuing that theme.[12] Furthermore, while διό commonly does not introduce a new unit of material in Romans[13] or other NT works,[14] it can function as a transitional device within the Pauline Corpus.[15] For this project, then, 15:22 will be considered a transitional sentence, moving from Paul's general aims and purpose for ministry in 15:14-21 to his specific travel plans for Rome. On the other hand, while it is possible that 15:30 introduces a new subsection, as the text does move from exposition in 15:22–29 to an exhortatory request in 15:30–32, there is no major shift in topic. Structurally, the use of the transitory δέ in 15:30 with a form of παρακάλεω would suggest a specific type of transition in 1 Timothy, but no such consistent pattern exists in the letter of Romans.[16] It is more likely that 15:30–33 serves as a conclusion, thematically and structurally, to the desire of Paul to visit Rome as expressed in 15:22–29. Therefore, 15:14 will be considered a major section transition with 15:14–21 and 15:22–33 as subsections within it. This yields the section and subsection divisions in Rom. 15 as presented in the table below.

Table 8. Sections and Subsections in Romans 15.

---

[12] Middendorf, who takes Rom. 15:23 as the trasitional sentence, notes the νυνὶ δέ construction in 15:23 and 15:25, but does not address the transitional use of such a contrastive construction nor the transitional function of διό (Middendorf, *Romans*, 1519–20, 1525).

[13] Rom. 1:24; 4:22; 13:5.

[14] Matt. 27:8; Luke 1:35; Acts 20:31; 1 Cor. 12:3; Gal. 4:31; or Phlm 8.

[15] Rom. 15:7; 2 Cor. 4:16; Eph. 2:11; 4:25; 1 Thess. 3:1.

[16] In Rom. 12:1, the verb appears alongside οὖν to introduce a major section and the parallel structure, παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, which appears in 16:17, is dubious, as evinced by variant readings.

Section	Subsection	Verses	# of Sentences
α	α-1	15:1–6	5
α	α-2	15:7–13	6
β	β-1	15:14–21	4
β	β-2	15:22–33	11

The single section transition within Rom. 15 occurs in 15:14. It is accompanied by a transitional use of δέ,[17] a vocative address, and an emphatic personal pronoun. The section opens with an indicative paratactic clause with a paraenetic illocutionary force and a rank-shifted, recitative ὅτι clause as the complement. The second sentence of the section is another indicative clause with a contrastive δέ, and the final clause, whether the section concludes at 15:33 or 16:27, is a nominal clause of blessing. The final major section of Romans, if considered to be 15:14–16:27, also shares any lexical and semantic connects with the opening of the letter, especially 1:8–17,[18] including the word families of ἐπιποθέω, δύναμις, χάρις, εὐαγγέλιον, παρακαλέω, θέλω, and ὀφείλω. The final section, then, does serve as a lexical and semantic *inclusio* for the letter.

There are four subsection transitions present within Rom. 15, with various transitional devices and structures. Subsection α-1, as defined in Table 8 above, begins with a transitional δέ[19] and an emphatic, personal pronoun within an indicative paratactic clause with the force of an exhortation. This exhortative verb, ὀφείλομεν, includes a compound, rank-shifted, complementary infinitive clause, giving the sentence a P-S-C clausal structure. This opening sentence is followed by a third-person imperative clause continuing the theme of the initial

---

[17] Lenski, *Romans*, 876.

[18] Or, as Cranfield notes, it is commonly accepted among scholars that Rom. 15:14 picks up the main themes and continues the thought of 1:8–16a (Cranfield, *Romans*, 27). See also Middendorf's excellent treatment in Middendorf, *Romans*, 1475–76, 1500–1.

[19] Lenski, *Romans*, 856.

clause, which is followed in turn by an explanatory γάρ clause. The subsection closes with a

paratactic clause that includes a blessing, using the optative mood, and a ἵνα clause of purpose as

the conclusion. This final ἵνα clause has an A-A-P-C structure, which will be discussed below.

The second subsection in this chapter, α-2, begins at 15:7, signaled by a paratactic imperative

clause and the conjunction διό. This opening sentences includes a comparative, HC-Cj with

καθώς and is followed by an explanatory γάρ clause. The final paratactic clause is another

blessing with an optative predicator, but instead of including a ἵνα clause the sentence includes

two hypotactic infinitive clauses following the main clause. The opening of subsection β-1 is

outlined above, with the subsection concluding with an explanatory γάρ clause in 15:18–21,

which contains multiple hypotactic clauses including an infinitive clause and comparative καθώς

clause. The final subsection in this chapter of Romans, β-2, begins with an indicative clause and

the conjunction διό that includes a rank-shifted, separative infinitive clause that completes the

verbal thought. This is followed by a contrastive, complex sentence in 15:23–24a with an elided

paratactic clause, which in turn is followed by an explanatory γάρ clause. The final clause is a

nominal clause of benediction. Within the subsections, few show lexical or semantic connections

between the first and final sentences. There is a loose *inclusio* for subsection β-1, as γνῶσις in

15:14 connects with ὁράω in 15:21 in the same subdomain of understanding.[20] The lexemes of

ἀκούω (15:21) and συνίημι (15:21) also occur within the same domain, but different

subdomains.[21] There is also a loose semantic connection between νουθετέω (15:14) and

ἀναγγέλλω (15:21), which appear in differing subdomains of communication.[22] Aside from these

---

[20] Both occur within the same semantic subdomain of coming to understanding (L-N, §32.11, 381 and §32.16, 382).

[21] L-N, §32.1, 380, §32.5, 380, and §32.26, 383.

[22] L-N, §33.197, 411 and §33.231, 415.

semantic connections, there is no lexical or strong semantic *inclusio* within the other three subsections of Rom. 15.

Amidst these differences, there are some observable commonalities in the transitions of Roman 15. Three of the four transitional sentences are paraenetic and all four are complex sentences, including either hypotactic or rank-shifted clauses. Two transitional sentences utilize διό as a conjunction, while the other two include a transitional δέ. Both sentences with δέ also include an emphatic, personal pronoun as the subject word group. Three of the four subsections include an explanatory γάρ clause as the second (α-2) or third sentence (α-1, β-2) of the subsection. The only exception is found in β-1, which is the first subsection a new section. This subsection, however, ends with an explanatory γάρ clause instead (15:18–21). Two of the subsections include a contrastive δέ clause as the second sentence (β-1, β-2). Three of the four subsections conclude with a blessing (β-2) or an optative wish (α-1, α-2), with the only exception being the first subsection of a new section (β-1). Furthermore, three of the four subsection conclusions are complex sentences with hypotactic clauses (α-1, α-2, β-1).

The Rank of Clause

Romans 15 includes twenty-nine discrete paratactic clauses. Connective devices and conjunctions, with such few examples, do not have a discernible impact on syntax or sentence structures, but it is noteworthy that most of the paratactic clauses in Rom. 15 are complex clauses. This occurs with enough frequency to yield a partially codified pattern.[23] Furthermore, three of the five paratactic clauses that are not part of complex sentences are part of compound clauses (15:24b, 27a). This yields a codified pattern for Rom. 15 that paratactic clauses will not

---

[23] Twenty-four of twenty-nine paratactic clauses in Rom. 15 are part of a complex sentence.

be in a simple sentence. Verbal tense varies, with no single tense appearing in a majority of cases. In terms of mood, indicative clauses are the most prevalent, with eighteen indicative clauses without the context of an exhortation or wish. In addition to those with expressed predicators, two paratactic clauses are elided (15:11, 23–24a) and one is a nominal clause with an S-C structure (15:33). The lone subjunctive paratactic clause is part of a present general conditional sentence with a C-P structure and A-Advs before the predicator (15:24b). Both optative paratactic clauses follow an S-P-C structure with a conjunctive δέ as the connector (15:5–6, 13). The two imperative clauses, while both including the predicator in the present tense, have differing structures and syntax. One shows a P-C structure with no additional word groups beyond the connector, διό, but includes a hypotactic καθώς clause following the main clause (15:7). The other is a simple sentence showing a S-C-P structure with multiple A-PPs (15:2). All three indicative clauses with a paraenetic context show a P-C structure (15:1, 14, 30–32), with the two that introduce a subsection also including an expressed subject in a P-S-C structure (15:1, 14). Adjunct word groups in such indicative clauses follow the predicator but appear before the (final) complement word group.

Indicative paratactic clauses in Rom. 15 show both similarity and difference. Five include an expressed subject word group. Three of the them, including single, proper nouns (15:3, 12) and a substantive relative clause (15:4), precede the predicator, while the single compound subject (15:26) follows the predicator as does the subject within a conditional sentence doing double duty (15:27b). When such a clause includes an expressed subject, it almost always includes an expressed complement also, with the sole exception being a clause with the predicator in the passive voice (15:4). It is partially codified overall that indicative paratactic

496

clauses will include an expressed complement word group,[24] and, when a complement is

expressed, it is partially codified that the basic clausal structure will follow a P-C pattern.[25] All

three exceptions occur within a sentence introduced by γάρ (15:3, 27a, 27b) and are simple

complements.[26] When the complement follows the predicator, it is partially codified that the

complement will be a rank-shifted clause, with only two complements that follow the predicator

consisting of a pronoun (15:15) or nominal group (15:17). It is fully codified, with other types of

paratactic clauses included, that complements including rank-shifted clauses will follow the

predicator. While not with enough frequency to constitute a pattern, over half of the indicative

paratactic clauses in Rom. 15 include an adjunct word group beyond conjunctions. A-PPs always

follow the predicator with one exception (15:4), as do A-CUs (15:17, 22). A-Advs, however,

almost always precede the predicator with one exception (15:27b).

There are numerous hypotactic clauses in Rom. 15, including HC-ptcs, HC-Cjs, and, unlike

the PE, infinitive clauses functioning as hypotactic clauses. There are twelve HC-Cjs in Rom. 15.

Aside from the one clause that modifies an elided main clause (15:24), it is fully codified that

HC-Cjs will follow the main clause. Among these, seven are ἵνα clauses of purpose, four are

καθώς clauses giving a standard or reference, and one is a temporal ὡς ἄν clause. The temporal

ὡς ἄν clause only consists of a predicator and an A-PP of destination in a P-A structure. Three of

the four καθώς clauses include quotations as the subject word group with the perfect passive

form γέγραπται in a P-S structure. The fourth includes an aorist predicator with a subject and

complement in an S-P-C structure. The seven ἵνα clauses of purpose include predicators in both

---

[24] Fourteen of eighteen such clauses include an expressed complement.

[25] Eleven of fourteen paratactic indicative clauses have the complement following the predicator.

[26] One occurs within a context of contrast (15:3), one includes hyperbaton (15:27a), and the other is followed another clause within a compound sentence with the complement following the predicator (15:27b).

the present and aorist tenses, but there is no consistent clausal structure. For instance, two have a complement preceding the predicator (15:4, 31) and two have it following the predicator (15:6, 16). Similarly, subjects are infrequent and appear on both sides of the predicator (15:16, 31). One consistent phenomenon is that expressed adjunct word groups almost always precede the predicator. The only non-conjunctive adjunct word to follow a predicator within a ἵνα clause of purpose is a dative A-CU with the force of agency modifying a passive verb (15:32).

Among the ten HC-ptcs that appear properly on the rank of clause, there are some tendencies and patterns evident in their syntax and structure. It is marginally codified that the participle will be in the present tense, fully codified that the clause will not include an expressed subject word group, and partially codified that the clause will include an expressed complement word group. Complement word groups tend to follow the predicator, with those that precede the predicator showing hyperbaton (15:23), occurring with an unusual syntactical context (15:23), or consisting of an anaphoric demonstrative pronoun (15:28). Complement word groups that follow the predicator consist of rank-shifted clauses, nominal groups, and personal pronouns. Adjunct word groups are common, with A-Advs always preceding the predicator and A-PPs always following the predicator regardless of force. HC-ptcs tend to follow their governing clause, with all three exceptions having a temporal force, both with present and aorist governing verbs. With regard to the various forces of participle clauses, a couple tendencies are suggestive. Both clauses of manner show a P-C structure (15:16, 20) as do both clauses of purpose (15:15, 25),[27]

---

[27] The position and force of the HC-ptc in 15:15, introduced by ὡς, is debated. Käsemann interprets the participle clause as substantive, modifying the implied subject of ἔγραψα (Käsemann, *Romans*, 389). Lenski renders the clause as predicate position, but leaves the force unclear (Lenski, *Romans*, 877–78). The construction of ὡς with a participle, in this case, indicates the motivation of the speaker (BDF, §425(3), 219–20) and not a temporal force (contra Middendorf, *Romans*, 1503). As such, it likely best interpreted not as an attributive clause modifying the subject as a substantive, but as an HC-ptc indicating the cause or purpose for the main clause. The force of purpose for the participle clause in 15:24, however, is generally consistent among scholars (Cranfield, *Romans*, 770–71, Morris, *Romans*, 519n125, and Lenski, *Romans*, 890).

while both causal participle clauses show a C-P structure (15:23).

In addition to these hypotactic clauses, Rom. 15 includes six infinitive clauses serving as hypotactic clauses proper, occurring with a preposition (εἰς, ἐν) or a conjunction (ὥστε). Such infinitive clauses always modify the main, paratactic clause of the sentence, but include verbs in present, aorist, and perfect tenses. Four of the six infinitives appear with the definite article, with exceptions for an infinitive in a compound clause (15:9) and the infinitive within the ὥστε clause (15:19). All four that include complement word groups have the complement after the predicator in a P-C pattern, while expressed subject word groups both precede (15:9, 19) and follow (15:13, 16) the predicator. Three of the four subject word groups consist of personal pronouns, while the only nominal group that serves as a subject is part of a compound infinitive clause and indicates a change in subject (τὰ ἔθνη in 15:9). For those infinitive clauses whose force is indicated by a preposition and an article, the infinitive is always in prime position. The only adjunct word groups in such infinitive clauses are A-PPs, with their position varying according to their force. Locative and causal A-PPs precede the infinitive (15:9, 19), while those of manner, sphere, and purpose follow the infinitive (15:13, 16). There are too few examples and too many variegated factors, however, to yield any conclusive patterns.

Changing Ranks: Rank-Shifted Clauses

Rank-shifted clauses in Rom. 15 show some consistent patterns but also much variation in syntax and structure. Rank-shifted infinitive clauses, especially those functioning as complementary infinitives, direct objects, and infinitives of indirect discourse, are the most common type of rank-shifted clause in the chapter. Complementary infinitives account for half of the total number of rank-shifted infinitive clauses, with seven occurrences. Across all rank-shifted infinitive clauses, it is marginally codified that they will include an expressed

complement word group, partially codified that they will appear within clauses proper, fully codified that they will not include an expressed subject within the infinitive clause itself, and fully codified that they will follow their referent or governing verb. Those with expressed complements include the complement before the infinitive in a C-P structure as a marginally codified pattern, with all three exceptions being personal pronouns (15:24, 27, 30). Two of those that follow a C-P structure also show hyperbaton, with a qualifier following the predicator (15:8, 18). Adjunct word groups are common, and it is partially codified that adjuncts within rank-shifted infinitive clauses will be A-PPs. A-PPs tend to follow the predicator, with both counterexamples appearing within the apodosis of a conditional clause and likely in their position for emphasis (15:24, 27). Rank-shifted infinitives are in the present and aorist tenses with similar frequency, although complementary infinitives tend to be in the present tense. Complementary infinitives and those of indirect discourse never have an article modifying the infinitive. The two occurrences of a rank-shifted infinitive clause serving as a qualifier, including an epexegetical infinitive modifying a finite verb (15:22)[28] and an objective infinitive modifying the C-DO of a HC-ptc (15:23), however, have an article governing the infinitive.[29]

Many fewer examples of the other types of rank-shifted clauses appear in Rom. 15, including direct quotations, attributive and substantive participle clauses, relative clauses, and recitative ὅτι clauses. It is dubious to conclude anything about syntactical patterns from the structure of direct quotations, since their structure and variation likely depend on a variety of extra-textual influences, but there are a few tendencies of how they are used within the text of Rom. 15. Direct quotations only appear within clauses proper, equally likely in paratactic (15:10,

---

[28] Middendorf, *Romans*, 1508.

[29] Both cases are aorist active infinitives of ἔρχομαι and the only instances where ἔρχομαι is used as a rank-shifted infinitive in the chapter. The infinitive clauses, furthermore, are verbatim.

11, 12) and hypotactic clauses (15:3, 9, 21). Similarly, they are equally likely to function as the subject word group or the complement of their governing clause; they are always the subject of a governing hypotactic clause and the complement of a governing paratactic clause. Finally, within hypotactic clauses, they only appear as the subject of the perfect passive verbal form γέγραπται, while in paratactic clauses they are the complement of the indicative active verbal form λέγει, whether expressed (15:10, 12) or implied (15:11).

In Rom. 15, there are seven rank-shifted participle clauses: three functioning as substantives (15:3, 12, 31) and four functioning as adjectives: three as predicate adjectives in a C-PN (15:14, 16) and one as an attributive adjective modifying a noun (15:15). Within all rank-shifted participle clauses, both complement and adjunct word groups always follow the predicator. All three participle clauses functioning as substantives have the article on the participle and include the participle in the present tense. All four participle clauses functioning as adjectives include an expressed adjunct and follow their referent. The single participle clause functioning as an attributive adjective is in "repeat" position to its referent and includes a definite article. Relative clauses are infrequent in Rom. 15, only occurring four times (15:4, 18, 21). Three relative clauses serve as the substantive subject of their governing clause (15:4, 21),[30] while the other serves as a partitive genitive qualifier (15:18). Within the relative clause, as would be expected, the word group consisting of the relative pronoun is in primary position, with any other structural word groups following the predicator. Finally, for the two recitative ὅτι clauses, one clause consists of a predicator preceded by an A-PP of accompaniment with a HC-

---

[30] For the first clause of the direct quotation, the relative pronoun οἷς serves as the C-IO of its relative clause, while the relative clause itself, as a whole, serves as the understood subject of the verb ὄψονται. Many English translations render the οἷς as "those who" (see the ESV's rendering, "Those who have never been told of him…"), taking the relative pronoun as "double duty," both serving as the C-IO of its own clause while taking the pronoun with the clause, perhaps as an elided οἱ, as the subject of the governing verb. Middendorf, in translation, includes both "those who…" as well as an expressed "they" before the governing verb (Middendorf, *Romans*, 1502).

ptc before the main clause (15:29), and one includes a copulative verb with an expressed subject preceding, a compound C-PN with hyperbaton, and an additive καί in prime position (15:14).

The Rank of Word Group

Aside from the rank-shifted direct quotations that serve as subject word groups examined above, there are thirty expressed subject word group within the clauses of Rom. 15. Subject word groups are slightly less likely to consist of a single noun or pronoun as they are to be a compound subject or include additional modifying elements. The definite article and embedded qualifier word groups are common in subject word groups, but only four subject word groups in Rom. 15 include an adjective, making it a partially codified pattern that subjects will not include adjectival modifiers on a head noun.[31] The three adjectival modifiers in predicate position, including two uses of πᾶς (15:11) and one emphatic use of the pronoun αὐτός (15:14), all precede their referent and appear in subject word groups following their governing predicator. Embedded qualifiers within subject word groups always follow their referent as a fully codified pattern and modify grammatically definite referents as a partially codified feature.[32] Qualifiers carry a variety of forces, including subjective genitive (15:3, 16, 31), partitive genitive (15:2), genitive of source (15:5, 13, 33),[33] genitive of relationship or association (15:12), and apposition (15:1). Subject word groups with embedded qualifiers tend to appear with clauses proper, but subject word groups overall appear in clauses proper and rank-shifted clauses with roughly

---

[31] Three subject word groups include an adjectival modifier in predicate position (15:11, 14), while the only modifier in attributive position is not an adjective proper but a nominalized prepositional phrase in "repeat" position to its referent (Rom. 15:31).

[32] This include both nouns with a definite article and personal pronouns, which are definite by nature. Only one qualifier within subject word groups in Rom. 15 modifies an indefinite referent (15:2).

[33] See Lenski, *Romans,* 862, 874, 897, Middendorf, *Romans*, 1458, 1484, 1537, and Cranfield, *Romans*, 736–37. These genitive qualifiers both describe the characteristics of God but also identify God as the source of those characteristics as gifts to believers.

equivalent frequency. Finally, subject word groups both precede and follow their governing predicator with regularity both for clauses proper and rank-shifted clauses. The only potential tendency is that they precede the verb in both optative clauses (15:5, 13) but follow in three of four imperative clauses (15:10, 11; cf. 15:2).

Complement word groups are the most common type of word group in Rom. 15. There are fifty-three C-DOs, with sixteen of those being rank-shifted ὅτι clauses, direct quotations, and infinitive clauses analyzed above. For the thirty-seven remaining C-DOs, it is equally likely that the word group will consist of only a single noun or pronoun as opposed to a nominal element with additional modifiers. C-DOs tend to follow their governing predicator, but break that structure with regularity within a variety of clausal types and moods. Within the word group, the definite article is the most common modifier, but it does not appear to impact other issues of syntax. Adjectival modifiers, by part of speech, are rare in C-DOs, being a codified feature that C-DOs will not include an adjectival element. There is a single indefinite pronoun serving as a predicate adjective that follows its referent (15:26) and single demonstrative pronoun also following its referent (15:28). Embedded qualifiers occur within nine C-DOs. They appear within both clauses proper and rank-shifted clauses, but it is fully codified that qualifiers will follow their referent. Qualifiers within C-DOs are most commonly objective in force (15:8, 16, 19, 23),[34] but also possessive (15:9, 27), subjective (15:1), adjectival (15:18), and relational (15:6). Embedded qualifiers are typically grammatically definite and modify a grammatically definite referent, with two exceptions being a relative clause modifying an indefinite pronoun adjectivally (15:18) and a definite infinitive clause serving as an objective genitive qualifier to

---

[34] For the objective force of the single occurrence in Romans of τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ (15:19), see Cranfield, *Romans*, 762.

the indefinite noun ἐπιποθίαν (15:23). These two cases are also the only C-DOs in Rom. 15 to show hyperbaton, with the governing predicator interrupting the head noun or pronoun and the qualifier that follows (15:18, 23).

Within Rom. 15, C-IOs and C-PNs are less common, with only five C-IOs (15:5, 15, 21, 28) and seven C-PNs (15:8, 14, 16, 27, 31, 33). C-IOs tend to be personal pronouns, with the sole exception of a relative pronoun serving as a retained indirect object within a passive construction (15:21). Those consisting of personal pronouns always follow their governing verb, while the relative pronoun, as would be expected, appears in the prime position of its clause. C-PNs, when the verb is expressed, tend either to follow their governing verb (15:16) or precede it with hyperbaton between the head noun or adjective and a following qualifier (15:8, 14, 27).[35] Hyperbaton is especially common in C-PNs. Qualifiers almost always appear in such complements, with six of the seven including at least one embedded qualifier (15:8, 14, 16, 27, 31).[36] The sole exception occurs when the PP μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν functions as the C-PN within a nominal clause of blessing (15:33). Embedded qualifiers always follow their referent, and are the only additional, modifying element in such word groups beyond the head noun or adjective. Like within C-DOs, the most common force for qualifiers is an objective force (15:8, 16, 27, 31), but they also carry the force of content (15:14), agency (15:16), or an epexegetical force (15:14).

C-OPs also show some consistent patterns of structure and syntax. If the four infinitive clauses with εἰς τό and ἐν τῷ are excluded as hypotactic clauses, there are sixty-one C-OPs. It is

---

[35] The only instance where a qualifier precedes the governing verb yet does not display hyperbaton occurs in 15:31. In this case, the complement is within the first of two ἵνα clauses of purpose and part of the latter half of a compound clause.

[36] Technically, two qualifiers are structural elements within rank-shifted participle clauses, πάσης τῆς γνώσεως modifying πεπληρωμένοι in 15:14 and ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ modifying ἡγιασμένη in 15:16. But, as the participles are functioning as predicate adjectives within their clause, those qualifiers are best rendered as qualifiers modifying head adjectives, according to their function.

marginally codified that such complements will follow their governing verb, though that depends on the preposition and its force more than the complement, which will be discussed below. Such complements regularly consist of a single noun or pronoun, but more commonly include additional elements. Articles are the most common modifier and it is partially codified that when the complement includes an article it will include no other additional modifiers. Qualifiers are also common, occurring seventeen times within fifteen C-OPs. It is fully codified that qualifiers in C-OPs will follow their referent. They modify both grammatically definite and indefinite head nouns regularly but it is codified that they will match the definiteness of their referent.[37] The most common force of embedded qualifiers is a subjective force, other examples including a possessive (15:10), partitive (15:26), objective (15:7, 30), or appositive force (15:30). There are also three PPs functioning as qualifiers, carrying the force of their preposition (15:30, 31). While the position of the C-OP relative to its governing verb depends greatly on the prepositional force and other syntactical factors, it is noteworthy, that only two C-OPs with embedded qualifiers in the complement precede their governing verb, yielding a partially codified pattern that such C-OPs will follow their governing verb. Only eight C-OPs include an adjective: six attributive adjectives and two predicate adjectives. One predicate adjective is a form of πᾶς and precedes its referent (15:33) while the other is a demonstrative pronoun that follows its referent (15:23). Four attributive adjectives are in "sandwich" position before their referent (15:4, 6, 20, 23) and two are in "repeat" position following their referent (15:15, 16). Only one adjective is a rank-shifted clause, namely, a participle clause in "repeat" position following a definite head noun (15:15). With regard to force, not many of the C-OPs show distinctive phenomena on the basis of the

---

[37] The sole exception occurs in 15:7, where the definite qualifier τοῦ θεοῦ modifies the indefinite object δόξαν.

prepositional force, but there are some tendencies evident. PPs of means, both with διά and ἐν, are very likely to contain embedded qualifiers, accounting for seven of the fifteen such complements. PPs of sphere, while few, always contain an additional modifying element in addition to a head noun. Phrases of destination, with εἰς, ἐπί, μέχρι, or πρός, never include a qualifier or an adjective as a fully codified pattern for all twelve examples.

Adjunct word groups in Rom. 15 show both variation and similarity across the chapter. Conjunctions, when used as an adjunct within a clause, tend to appear with clauses proper as a partially codified pattern. The most common conjunctions are δέ and the explanatory γάρ, with δέ carrying a basic, conjunctive force for most of its occurrences. In addition to conjunctions, there are twenty-six A-Advs and A-CUs. It is marginally codified that such adjuncts will appear within clauses proper, with their position in the clause varying by their force and type. The additive καί appears six times, preceding the governing verb four times (15:3, 7, 14, 22) and following the verb twice (15:14, 27). Temporal adjuncts, both A-Advs (15:23, 25) and accusative A-CUs (15:24), always precede an expressed predicator. Both genitive A-CUs of content follow their governing predicator (15:13, 14), while both A-Advs of manner precede their referent (15:6, 15). Iterative adjuncts precede an expressed verb when the word group consists of the adverb πάλιν (15:10, 12), while the iterative use of an accusative A-CU, τὰ πολλά, follows the governing verb (15:22). According to the type of adjunct, it is partially codified that A-Advs will precede their governing verb, while it is marginally codified that A-CUs in the genitive, dative, and accusative cases will follow their governing verb, regardless of clausal rank and mood.

A-PPs are the most common type of adjunct word group within a clause for Rom. 15. They are equally likely to appear within clauses proper as they are within rank-shifted clauses. The word order of the complement word group was explored above, but there are tendencies of word

group order that depend on the force of the preposition and the larger syntactical context. It is marginally codified for all prepositional phrases that they will follow their governing predicator, with those in a rank-shifted context being more likely to precede the predicator than those in clauses proper. Temporal A-PPs, with ἀπό and ἐν, both follow (15:13, 23) and precede (15:24) the governing verb, compared with temporal A-Advs. A-PPs of sphere, with ἐν, both precede (15:27) and follow (15:13) their governing verb, but only appear within infinitive clauses. Both separative A-PPs, with ἀπό, follow their governing verb and appear within clauses proper (15:15, 31). A-PPs of purpose, with εἰς and πρός, almost always appear with clauses proper and follow their predicator with a single exception (15:4).[38] A-PPs of means tend to appear in clauses proper when the preposition is διά but are more likely in rank-shifted clauses when the preposition is ἐν. Furthermore, all the A-PPs of means that precede their governing verb are only with διά (15:4, 30), while all those with ἐν follow their governing verb (15:16, 19, 30). A-PPs of destination, occurring with a variety of prepositions, follow their governing verb as a partially codified pattern, with both exceptions being within a rank-shifted context (15:19, 29). A-PPs of location with ἐν, however, always follow their governing verb. Both A-PPs of basis, with ἐπί, precede their governing verb (15:12, 20), while only one causal A-PP, with διά, precedes its governing predicator (15:9). This causal phrase takes the demonstrative pronoun τοῦτο as the C-OP (15:9), while another causal A-PP with διά has a C-OP with many modifiers, including a rank-shifted participle clause functioning as an attributive adjective (15:15).

Qualifier word groups in Rom. 15 show some flexibility but some dominant patterns. Qualifier word groups always follow their referent as a fully codified pattern, regardless of

---

[38] The word group order of the predicator (ἐγράφη) and adjunct (εἰς τὴν ἡμετέρον διδασκαλίαν) in this case is likely either for emphasis or due to auditory issues, namely, to avoid the final word of the subjective relative clause, προεγράφη, and the predicator of the main clause, ἐγράφη, from being juxtaposed.

clausal context or the force of the qualifier. The two most common forces for qualifier word groups are subjective and objective, with subjective qualifiers being noticeably more common in C-OPs and objective qualifiers being more common in C-DOs and C-PNs.[39] All three qualifiers of source appear within subject word groups, two in optative blessing clauses (15:5, 13) and one in a nominal blessing (15:33). It is codified that qualifiers will explicitly match the grammatical definiteness of their referent, with one exception (15:7).[40] Within the qualifier word group, the use of PPs, relative clauses, and infinitive clauses as qualifiers is very rare in Rom. 15, yielding a codified pattern that a qualifier word group will consist of a nominal word group. Nominal qualifier groups are equally likely to be a single noun, pronoun, or title as they are to include other modifying elements. The most common modifying element within nominal qualifiers is the definite article, which typically appears to help the qualifier match the definiteness of its referent. Three nominal qualifiers, all within rank-shifted clauses, include adjectival modifiers (15:11, 13, 26). The two adjectival modifiers in attributive position are in "repeat" position, both an adjective proper (15:13) and a nominalized PP (15:26). The sole predicate adjective, a form of πᾶς, precedes its definite referent (15:11). Only four qualifiers include additional embedded qualifiers (15:6, 14, 19, 29). Three of them are within C-OPs, with all three being indefinite head nouns (15:14, 19, 26). The other appears within a C-DO and modifies a definite head noun (15:6). Qualifiers that appear within other qualifiers carry the force of a subjective genitive (15:29), an objective genitive (15:6), a genitive of relationship (15:14, 19), and apposition (15:6).

---

[39] Only two objective genitive qualifiers appear the complement of a prepositional phrase compared with nine subjective genitive qualifiers. Conversely, only one subjective genitive qualifier appears within a direct object complement compared with eight objective genitive qualifiers within direct object complements and complements of copulative verbs.

[40] This exception appears within a C-OP and is objective in force.

APPENDIX TWO

Full Profile Analysis of Ephesians 4

The Rank of Section

Ephesians 4 contains multiple section and subsection transitions, although the details vary scholar by scholar. It is agreed that 4:17 indicates a major shift in the letter, with some disagreement about whether the larger unit concludes at 5:21 before the *Haustafeln*[1] or extends all the way until 6:9 before the closing exhortation.[2] Scholars tend to treat 4:1–16 as a discrete unit of text, whether as a major unit itself[3] or a concluding subunit of a larger one.[4] Lenski sees minor divisions also at 4:4, 4:7, and 4:25, with another minor division at 5:1.[5] Foulkes also notes similar minor textual units within chapter 4, but see the next division at 5:3 instead of 5:1.[6] Winger does not divide either major section as noted above, and, with Foulkes, extends the minor unit beginning at 4:17 unto 5:2.[7] For the current project, there is a shift in topic from 4:1–6 to 4:7–16, as the exhortation and basis for unity in the church moves into the diversity of gifts within that unity. Similarly, there is a shift in 4:25, as 4:17–24 deals with the theme of the old and new ways of life in a larger, theological context and then 4:25–32 applies that new way of life to concrete human relationships. The remaining question, then, is whether the final

---

[1] Francis Foulkes, *The Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians: An Introduction and Commentary*, TNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 41 and Richard Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistles to the Galatians to the Ephesians and to the Philippians* (Columbus: Wartburg, 1946), 550, 613, 624.

[2] Thomas M. Winger, *Ephesians*, CC (St. Louis: Concordia, 2015), x–xi, 160–63.

[3] Foulkes, *Ephesians*, 41 and Lenski, *Epistles*, 504.

[4] Winger, *Ephesians*, 160–61.

[5] Lenski, *Epistles*, 505, 510, 516, 572, 624.

[6] Foulkes, *Ephesians*, 41.

[7] Winger, *Ephesians*, 160–61.

subsection of Eph. 4 concludes at 4:32 or continues until 5:2.[8] Two key considerations for this

are the use of οὖν with an imperative verb and the use of parallel structure with περιπατέω. The

conjunction οὖν does serve both transitional (4:1, 17; 5:15) and non-transitional functions (2:19;

5:7; 6:14) throughout the letter and typically is accompanied by an paraenetic verbal form,

whether indicative or explicitly imperative in mood. In the cases where οὖν does function as a

transitional device, though, it appears with ἄρα in the final sentence of subsection (2:19), appears

within a parallel, repeated "command clause–explanatory γάρ clause" pattern of 5:3–14 (5:7), or

repeats the immediately preceding verb and is the sixth in a string of seven related commands in

6:10–20 (6:14). The opening οὖν with an imperative verb in 5:1–2, however, shows a parallel

"command—καθώς clause" structure with 5:3–4. Furthermore, the use of περιπατέω in 5:2

parallels other section and subsection transitions in the letter (2:2; 4:1, 17; 5:15). In each case,

with or without οὖν, a verbal form of περιπατέω appears within a paraenetic context to begin a

section or subsection. While the themes and semantic connections of 5:1–2 could connect

backward to 4:17–25 or forward to 5:3–14, the appearance of οὖν with an imperative, the parallel

structure of 5:1–2 with 5:3–4, and the use of περιπατέω suggests that 5:1–2 begins a new

subsection, rather than concludes 4:17–25. This yields the following section and subsection

divisions for Eph. 4 as presented in the table below.

Table 9. Sections and Subsections in Ephesians 4.

Section	Subsection	Verses	# of Sentences
α	α-1	4:1–6	3
α	α-2	4:7–16	5
β	β-1	4:17–24	3
β	β-2	4:25–32	9

---

[8] When discussing 4:17–5:2, Wingers refers the reader to his earlier discussion of rhetoric to explain the textual division, but does not actually explicitly defend this specific division in either location (Winger, *Ephesians*, 160–63, 533).

The two section transitions with Eph. 4 both include the conjunction οὖν, an indicative verb with the force of an exhortation or wish, and an infinitive of indirect discourse as a complement word group (4:1, 17). The section transition in 4:17 is a compound clause that also includes a cataphoric demonstrative pronoun, looking ahead to the infinitive that follows but also all the commands of 4:17–32.[9] One opening sentence is followed by a poetic section with nominal clauses (4:4–6) and the other is followed by a contrastive, compound indicative clause with δέ (4:20–24). The only section conclusion occurs in 4:11–16, with one long indicative clause with various hypotactic and rank-shifted clauses.

In addition to the two section transitions, the other two opening subsection transitions include an expository sentence with a transitional δέ and a C-P-S-A structure (4:7)[10] and an imperative clause with διό with an A-P-C-S-A structure (4:25). These are followed by an inferential διό clause (4:8) and an explanatory clause with ὅτι (4:25), respectively. Out of the four subsection conclusions, three consist of long, complex sentences (α-1, α-2, β-1), with all three having indicative clauses as the main paratactic clause. One subsection conclusion is asyndeton and poetic (4:5–6), two have contrastive δέ (4:20–24, 32), and one includes a conjunctive καί as the connective device (4:11–16). The poetic section of 4:4–6 has five nominal clauses in asyndetic succession: the first is a compound clause joined by καί, the second through fourth are only a single subject word group, and the last is a compound subject with additional modifiers. While these final sentences display other syntactical irregularities, as will be shown below, they also all show a list structure with a change or addition in the final element (4:4–6, 14–16, 22–24, 32). Subsections do also tend to show a minor *inclusio*, with κύριος (α-1), δίδωμι

---

[9] Lenki, *Epistles*, 551.

[10] Lenski, *Epistles*, 516.

and ἕν ἕκαστος (α-2), νοῦς and the semantic domain of behavior with περιπατέω and ἀναστροφή

(β-1),[11] and ἀλλήλος (β-2). In addition there does appear to be an *inclusio* for the larger section of

4:17–5:21 with the lexemes of καρδία, κύριος, and περιπατέω. Most of these *inclusio* are

explicitly lexical in nature, however, with only one implicit, semantic connection for β-1.

The Rank of Clause

Within the twenty sentences of Eph. 4, there are thirty discrete paratactic clauses. These

clauses almost always part of a compound or complex sentence, yielding a codified pattern that

paratactic clauses in Eph. 4 will not be in a simple sentence. Two paratactic clauses have an

indicative verb but with the force of a wish or exhortation (4:1–2, 17). Both occur in the opening

sentence of a section and include an infinitive clause as a complement following the predicator in

a P-C structure. There also seven nominal clauses, six of which are within the poetic section of

4:4–6. All six within the poetic section only include a single subject word group and five of them

are joined with asyndeton. The other nominal clause, found in 4:29, has an S-C structure and is a

protasis with an elided apodosis. Ten paratactic clauses have an expressed indicative predicator

without the context of exhortation. Such clauses have the verb in the present and aorist tenses

with equal frequency and with a variety of connective devices. It is noteworthy, however, that

four of five in the aorist tense are within transitional sentences, while four of five in the present

tense are not within transitional sentences. All ten indicative, paratactic clauses include an

expressed complement, yielding a fully codified pattern. Six include the complement following

the predicator in a P-C structure (4:8, 10, 11, 20, 21–24, 25). Of the four that include the

complement before the predicator, one has the complement as a cataphoric demonstrative

---

[11] See the subdomain of general behavior or conduct in L-N, §41.11, 505 and §41.3, 504.

pronoun within a section transition (4:17), one is within an interrogative clause (4:9), one contains an emphatic adverb with the complement in the final sentence of a subsection (4:21), and the other is the first clause of a subsection (4:7). It appears, then, that the default structure for indicative clauses is a P-C structure, with emphasis and transitional contexts causing a switch in syntax. Subject word groups, when expressed, almost always precede their governing predicator, with one exception (4:7). The two A-Advs precede their predicator (4:20, 21), while A-PPs follow their predicator (4:7, 11–12) with one exception (4:21). This exception is within the context of a compound clause where the other clause also shows unusual word group order and appears within the final sentence of a subsection.

In addition to paratactic indicative clauses, there are eleven paratactic clauses with an imperative predicator. Asyndeton is the most common connective device, with both καί and δέ used as connectors for compound clauses. All eleven imperative clauses appear within the final subsection of Eph. 4, with only two paratactic clauses in subsection β-2 that do not have imperative verbs. It is codified that imperative clauses will have the predicator in the present tense, as much of the chapter is general, ongoing instruction. Both subject, complement, and adjunct word groups are all common within the imperative clauses, with fairly consistent word group order. Complements always immediately follow the predicator and subjects almost always precede the predicator. The only exception occurs in 4:25, where the subject follows both the predicator and complement; this clause is a subsection transition, is the only imperative clause with a HC-ptc, which precedes the main clause, and is the only imperative clause with διό as the connector. A-Advs always precede the predicator while A-PPs almost always follow, with the A-PP of source in 4:29 being the only exception a context of contrast with ἀλλά.

Hypotactic clauses on the rank of clause in Eph. 4 are comprised of HC-Cjs and HC-ptcs.

513

All ten HC-Cjs follow their governing clause as a fully codified feature and all but one (4:32) modify main, paratactic clauses. Of those ten, the most common are ἵνα clauses of purpose and καθώς clauses of standard (4:21) or comparison (4:4, 32). Complement word groups are common in HC-Cjs, especially those with ἵνα and καθώς, and they always follow their predicator. Subject word groups are not as common, never appearing within a ἵνα clause of purpose, and follow their predicator when the clause is in hypotaxis to the main clause (4:13, 21) but precede it when within a rank-shifted context (4:32). The latter is also the final clause of a subsection. Adjunct word groups are common in every type of finite hypotactic clause except ἵνα clauses of purpose, and they follow consistent patterns.[12]

Ephesians 4 also contains ten HC-ptcs, with the majority of them found within rank-shifted contexts. HC-ptcs are in the present tense as a marginally codified pattern, with both in the aorist tense serving a temporal function (4:8, 25) and the sole example in the perfect tense having a causal force (4:19). HC-ptcs tend to follow their governing clause; three of the four that precede their clause are not in the present tense, including two with a temporal function, one with a causal force, and one with the force of manner, while all those that follow are present tense participles with the force of manner or cause. Manner is the most common force for HC-ptcs. Within the clause, it is fully codified that HC-ptcs will not include a subject word group. Complement words are common, appearing in half of the samples; four follow the predicator (4:2, 3, 25, 28) and one both precedes and follows the predicator in hyperbaton as a compound C-PN (4:18). Adjunct word groups are also common and they are almost always A-PPs. Every A-PP, regardless of force, as well as the sole dative A-CU (4:28), follows the predicator.

---

[12] A-Advs always precede the predicator, A-PPs always follow, and the single A-CU also follows.

Changing Ranks: Rank-Shifted Clauses

Rank-shifted clauses in Eph. 4, which include infinitive clauses, participle clauses in attributive position, relative clauses, and a few others, show some consistent tendencies across the chapter. For the seven rank-shifted infinitive clauses, they all function as complement word groups, most commonly with the force of direct object (4:22, 23, 24, 28) or indirect discourse (4:1, 17).[13] Infinitive clauses always follow their governing clause and never appear with a definite article modifying the infinitive. The infinitives themselves are in the present and aorist tenses with similar frequency regardless of force. Within the clause, subject word groups are not common, appearing both before the infinitive once (4:17) and once following the infinitive (4:22). The sentence in which the subject word group precedes the infinitive, however, is the opening sentence of a section. Complement word groups frequently appear in infinitive clauses and always follow the infinitive. Adjunct word groups are the most common additional word group within infinitive clauses. A-PPs always follow their governing predicator (4:1, 3, 22), as does the single dative A-CU (4:23).[14] The position of A-Advs, however, is not as consistent. A temporal A-Adv precedes the infinitive in 4:17. An A-Adv of manner precedes the verb in 4:1, but its epexegetical qualifier follows in hyperbaton. A καθώς clause follows the infinitive in 4:17 also, functioning to indicate manner. In both cases where the A-Adv follows the governing prediactor, it is within a section transition.

Among the twelve participle clauses in attributive position in Eph. 4, their position and syntax depends on their force. Four attributive participle clauses are functioning as substantives

---

[13] The three infinitives in 4:22–24 that modify ἐδιδάχθητε in 4:21 could also have the force of indirect discourse, since διδάσκω could refer either to the act or the content of teaching. The infinitives, in this case, are taken as the general content of what was taught, instead of taking them to indicate a quotation of some kind (Lenski, *Epistles*, 562 and Winger, *Ephesians*, 513–18). Furthermore, as noted above, the two infinitives of indirect discourse modify verbs of exhortation that appear in the opening sentence of a new section (4:1, 17).

[14] This adjunct either has the force of respect (Lenski, *Epistles*, 566) or sphere (Foulkes, *Ephesians*, 130).

within their governing clause, twice as subject (4:10, 28) and twice as complement (4:10, 28). All four include a definite article on the participle. Two are within a nominal clause, but for those in clauses with expressed predicators the one functioning as a subject precedes the verb (4:28) while the one functioning as a C-IO follows (4:28). One substantive clause includes a complement that precedes the participle (4:28)[15] and one substantive clause includes a locative A-PP that follows the verb (4:10). Eight participle clauses function as adjectives, whether predicate adjectives following a copulative verb (4:14, 18, 32) or attributive adjectives modifying a noun (4:18, 22, 24). Adjectival participles always appear within a complement word group and almost always follow their governing verb, with the sole exception occurring in 4:18, where the adjectival participle is part of a compound clause and a second adjectival participle follows the verb, causing hyperbaton within a compound complement.[16] Participles functioning as attributive adjectives always appear in "repeat" position with a definite article modifying an explicitly definite referent (4:18, 22, 24). Within adjectival participle clauses, complement word groups are not common and they follow the participle (4:18, 32). Adjunct word groups are fairly common, however, typically being A-CUs (4:14, 18)[17] or A-PPs (4:14, 18, 22, 24). A-CUs always follow their governing participle as do all but one A-PP. The sole exception, a PP of standard in 4:24 using κατά, appears within a compound infinitive clause with a context of contrast.[18] No rank-shifted participle clause includes an expressed subject word group.

Other rank-shifted clauses are uncommon in Eph. 4, with only five relative clauses (4:1, 15,

---

[15] The C-DO χρείαν follows the article but precedes participle ἔχοντι in 4:28.

[16] Furthermore, these participle clauses also appear within the first sentence of a new section with other structural abnormalities (4:17–19).

[17] Uses include a dative of agency (4:14), a genitive of separation (4:18), and a dative of respect (4:18).

[18] A prepositional phrase with κατά follows the participle in 4:22 where the text describes the "old man," but precedes the participle in 4:24 when the text describes the "new man." A contrastive δέ is also used in 4:23 to indicate the relationship between the infinitive clause in 4:22 and the two infinitive clauses in 4:23–24.

19, 30), one appositive ὅτι clause (4:9), and one direct quotation functioning as a complement word group following λέγει (4:8). With the ὅτι clause, there is an additive καί that precedes the predicator and a A-PP of destination, with εἰς, that follows, which conforms to other patterns for indicative clauses. Relative clauses always follow their referent and do not appear as substantives. As would be expected, the word group order of relative clauses depends greatly on the function of the relative pronoun within the clause. The relative pronoun functions within an adjunct word group of the relative clause three times (4:1, 16, 30)[19] and as the subject of its clause twice (4:15, 19), with its word group always being in prime position. Complements both precede (4:16, 19) and follow the predicator (4:15, 19), subjects always precede, and adjunct word groups, when they do not include the relative pronoun, tend to follow the predicator (4:16, 19, 30). There are two A-PPs that precede the predicator in 4:16 as well two that follow. In this case, the relative clause concludes a lengthy final sentence of a major section (4:11–16) and likely has word group order changes to signal the transition.

The Rank of Word Group

Ephesians 4 includes twenty-seven discrete subject word groups within various clauses. It is partially codified that subject word groups will appear within clauses proper and not within a rank-shifted context and marginally codified that they will precede an expressed governing verb. It is marginally codified that subject word groups will include an additional element beyond the head noun or pronoun, with adjectival modifiers and the definite article being the most common. Within rank-shifted contexts, additional elements are less common, with only one in five subject word groups consisting of more than a single pronoun (4:16). The presence or absence of a

---

[19] One time the relative pronoun occurs in the genitive case as a genitive of means (4:1) and the other two occurrences include the relative pronoun as the complement of a prepositional phrase (4:15, 30).

definite article does not directly correspond to many other issues of syntax with one exception;

subject word groups with the definite article rarely include other modifiers, yielding a partially

codified pattern.[20] The same is true for subject word groups with adjectives; only two of nine

subject word groups with an adjective include another modifying element (4:6, 16), yielding a

partially codified pattern. Furthermore, subject word groups with adjectives will never follow an

expressed verb as a fully codified feature. Adjectives within subject word groups tend to be

attributive and almost always in "sandwich" position to an indefinite head noun. There is only

one adjective in "repeat" position (4:29), which follows a noun also modified by πᾶς in a πᾶς-N-

Adj pattern. The three adjectives in predicate position are all forms of πᾶς that precede their head

noun (4:16, 29, 31). Only three subject word groups include embedded qualifiers (4:1, 6, 10).

They all follow their head noun and are either appositional (4:1, 6) or intensive (4:10) in force.

Complement word groups serve various functions and are the most frequent word group

type in Eph. 4. There are twenty-seven C-DOs. Six of those are a direct quotation (4:8) or a rank-

shifted infinitive clause (4:1, 3, 17, 22–24, 28). For the twenty-one remaining C-DOs, it is

equally likely that they will be a single noun or pronoun as that they will include additional

modifying elements. It is partially codified that they will follow their governing predicator, but

the pattern is different between simple complements and those with additional elements. Only

one with additional modifiers precedes its governing verb (4:16), yielding a codified pattern that

those with definite articles, adjectives, or qualifiers will follow their governing verb.[21] For those

composed of single nouns or pronouns, four of eleven precede their governing verb, yielding

---

[20] The subject word group in 4:10 includes an article on a substantive participle followed by an intensive use of the personal pronoun and the subject word group in 4:16 includes both a predicate adjective of πᾶς and the definite article.

[21] Additionally, the sole complement word group with additional modifiers that precedes its governing verb within a relative clause that concludes the final sentence of a section (4:16).

only a marginally codified pattern that they will follow. The definite article is the commonest additional modifier; furthermore, every C-DO with additional modifiers includes a definite article. Three also include adjectival modifiers (4:22, 24, 30). All three follow their predicator and have an adjective in "repeat" position and two also have an adjective in "sandwich" position as well (4:22, 24). In those two cases, the two in "sandwich" position are adjectives proper while the two in "repeat" position are rank-shifted participle clauses. Three also include embedded qualifiers (4:3, 16, 30). The qualifiers always follow their referent and match their referent in definiteness. They carry the force of a genitive of source (4:3), a subjective genitive (4:16), and an adjectival relative clause (4:30).

C-IOs and C-PNs show some consistent syntax in Eph. 4. C-IOs almost always follow their governing predicator; the only exception, found in 4:7, occurs within the first sentence of new subsection and is the only indirect object with an adjective or an embedded qualifier. The other seven C-IOs are either a definite article followed by a head noun or nominalized group (4:8, 19, 27, 28, 29) or a single pronoun (4:32). They are just as likely to appear within clauses proper as they are within rank-shifted clauses. C-PNs tend to appear within clauses proper and follow their governing predicator, each as a marginally codified pattern. Both such complements that precede their governing verb show hyperbaton, either with a compound complement (4:18) or with the head noun before the verb and a qualifier following (4:9). It is fully codified that C-PNs will include more than a single noun, pronoun, or adjective. Three include a definite article preceding a noun or nominalized participle (4:9, 10, 15). Four include at least one predicate adjective, two of which are modified by an embedded qualifier also (4:29, 32). Five total such complements include embedded qualifiers, three of which follow their referent (4:9, 15, 29) and two of which precede it (4:25, 32). The three that follow are either appositive (4:9, 15) or epexegetical (4:29),

while the two that precede are a genitive of relationship (4:25) and a PP indicating advantage with εἰς (4:32). Both qualifiers that precede are within the first (4:25) and last (4:32) sentences of subsection β-2, the latter also being part of a compound, asyndeton list.

C-OPs are common in Eph. 4, appearing in a variety of syntactical contexts. They are slightly more likely to appear within a rank-shifted context than a clause proper and it is partially codified that they follow the governing predicator when it is expressed. It is marginally codified that the complement will include additional modifiers beyond a single noun or pronoun; when the complement is a single lexeme, it is typically a C-OP of the preposition ἐν, especially when it has the force of manner or sphere. Half of the C-OPs in Eph. 4 include an embedded qualifier. Roughly one third of C-OPs include the definite article, most of which also include an embedded qualifier as marginally codified feature. Adjectival modifiers are less common, only occurring in nine complements of this type. The presence of the definite article does not correlate with the syntax of the governing clause's rank, but those with definite articles follow their governing predicator as a codified pattern, with the ἐκ phrase of source in 4:29 being the only exception. Adjectives are in attributive and predicate positions with roughly equal frequency; they only appear in C-OPs of ἐν once (4:4), and they are always in PPs that follow their predicator. Predicate adjectives are always forms of πᾶς and they always precede the head noun (4:2, 10, 16, 31). Attributive adjectives are found in both "sandwich" (4:4, 9, 22) and "repeat" positions (4:13, 18). As would be expected, the sole use of an adjectival participle within a C-OP appears in "repeat" position to a definite head noun (4:18). Qualifiers within complements of this type always follow their referent as a fully codified pattern and match the definiteness of their referent as a partially codified pattern. Those that do not match are always definite qualifiers on a grammatically indefinite head noun (44, :12, 16, 17, 29) or head nouns (4:24) and typically are

subjective (4:17, 24) or objective (4:12, 29) in force.[22] The most common forces of qualifiers within complements of this type are objective and subjective genitive qualifiers, with objective genitive qualifiers especially common in PPs of purpose using εἰς and πρός and subjective genitive qualifiers especially common in PPs of manner with ἐν. Some other patterns are evident within the complement word group according to the preposition and its force. The preposition εἰς, when carrying the force of destination or purpose, includes additional modifiers beyond a head noun in the C-OP as a codified pattern and an embedded qualifiers as a partially codified pattern. Furthermore, every PP of purpose, with εἰς and πρός, includes an embedded qualifier; those with εἰς only include a qualifier and a head noun (4:12, 16, 19) while those with πρός can be either a single noun and a qualifier (4:29) or a noun modified by both a definite article and a qualifier (4:12). For PPs of standard with κατά, the C-OP almost always includes at least one additional modifier on the head noun and appears within a rank-shifted context.

Adjunct word groups in Eph. 4 show both consistent and variegated patterns according to their type and force. Conjunctions serving as adjuncts appear within clauses proper as a codified pattern.[23] The most common conjunction is δέ, which only serves a contrastive function in Eph. 4. The conjunction γάρ is not used in Eph. 4, instead including a single use of ὅτι for an explanatory purpose (4:25) and preferring inferential conjunctions διό (4:8, 25) and οὖν (4:1, 17). There are twenty A-Advs and A-CUs in Eph. 4. It is marginally codified that such adjuncts will appear within clauses proper with their position typically depending on the type of adjunct rather than force. The additive καί appears four times, with three preceding their governing predicator (4:4, 17, 32) and one following (4:10). In the latter case, though, the additive καί

---

[22] Both objective genitive qualifiers modify an indefinite form of οἰκοδομή within a PP of purpose.

[23] The only exception involves a contrastive δέ and a conjunctive καί in a compound infinitive clause serving as a direct object complement word group (4:22–24).

appears within a copulative clause that links the complement to the subject. With that exception

as well as the restrictive use of εἰ μή in 4:9, it is partially codified that all A-Advs will precede

their governing verb. Additionally, there is a single A-Adv that is modified by an epexegetical

qualifier (4:1), with the adverb preceding the governing verb and the qualifier following in

hyperbaton. A-CUs tend not to appear within paratactic clauses and follow their governing

predicator with one exception (4:1). For this exception, however, the relative pronoun serves a

genitive A-CU of means within its own clause, which explains its primary position. Other uses of

A-CUs include a dative of referent (4:18), two datives of means (4:14, 28), a dative of sphere

(4:23), a separative genitive (4:18), and an adverbial accusative of respect (4:15).

There also forty-five A-PPs in Eph. 4. They are equally likely to appear within clauses

proper as they are rank-shifted clauses. Their C-OPs were presented above, but they display

some consistent tendencies according to their force. For all A-PPs, it is partially codified that

they will follow their governing predicator, with exceptions occurring where a relative pronoun

is the C-OP (4:16, 30), the governing sentence is the final sentence of section (4:16, 21) or

subsection (4:32), or within the context of contrast (4:29). A-PPs of accompaniment with μετά or

σύν, cause with διά, destination with εἰς, manner with ἐν, and purpose with πρός or εἰς always

follow their governing predicator regardless of clausal context. The lone A-PP of means with διά

follows its predicator (4:16) while those with ἐν both precede (4:16, 32) and follow their

predicator (4:14). The two A-PPs of source with ἐκ both precede their predicator (4:16, 29), but

one of those takes a relative pronoun as its C-OP (4:16). A-PPs of sphere with ἐν both precede

(4:21, 30) and follow their predicator (4:3, 4, 17) with no consistent syntactical difference

between the two positions. A-PPs of standard with κατά almost always follow their predicator,

with one exception appearing within a relative clause that is part of a section conclusion (4:16).

Qualifier word groups in Eph. 4 show many strong patterns. It is codified that qualifiers will always follow their referent; the only exception is a genitive of relationship in 4:25. It is partially codified that qualifier word groups will consist of a nominal word group instead of a relative clause or nominalized PP and marginally codified that they will appear in clauses proper. Objective genitive and subjective genitive qualifiers are the most common force for qualifiers in Eph. 4, with the forces of apposition, possession, and relationship also appearing with regularity. It is partially codified that qualifiers will match the definiteness of their referent; every exception features an arthrous qualifier modifying an anarthrous referent with a variety of forces for the qualifier (4:4, 6, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 24, 29). It is marginally codified for nominal qualifiers that the word group will include a definite article, especially common among those with an appositional or subject genitive force. Only two nominal qualifier word groups include an adjective, both being objective genitive qualifiers modifying a C-OP within a relative clause (4:16, 19). One includes a predicate adjective of πᾶς following the head noun (4:19) and the other includes an attributive adjective preceding an indefinite referent in "sandwich" position. There are also twelve nominal qualifier word groups that include additional embedded qualifiers within them. Such qualifier word groups are variegated in their force but it is codified that they will also include the definite article. Only one qualifier that includes an additional qualifier does not have a definite article on the head noun (4:13). The qualifiers that are embedded within other qualifier word groups also show variety in force, but it is noteworthy that four are possessive in force (4:12, 17, 18, 23) while only two apiece are subjective genitive (4:7, 13) or objective genitive in force (4:4, 13). Such qualifiers appear within clauses and modify qualifiers within C-OPs as partially codified patterns. According to their force, objective genitive qualifiers only appear within the C-OPs as a fully codified feature, while subjective genitive qualifiers appear

within C-DOs also (4:3, 16). Subjective genitive qualifiers include a definite article as a codified pattern, with the only exception being a personal pronoun, which is definite without needing the article (4:26). Similarly, qualifiers with an appositive force almost always include the definite article. The only exception includes the proper title Χριστός modifying a personal pronoun (4:15). Possessive qualifiers, on the contrary, are typically a single noun or pronoun (4:17, 18, 23, 29, 30) with one exception (4:12) and, as mentioned above, tend to appear within other qualifier word groups.

APPENDIX THREE

Full Profile Analysis of Acts 20:18b–35

The Rank of Section

On the rank of section, the sectional divisions of the speech of Paul at Miletus are not as debated as the other comparison chapters. It is generally treated both as one unit of text[24] and as part of one larger unit that includes all of Acts 20[25] or multiple chapters.[26] Bruce treats the speech as one unit within the larger section of Acts 20:7–21:16, but does give four subdivisions within the speech. Acts 20:18b–21 records Paul's review of his Ephesian work, Acts 20:22–24 records Paul's present direction and plan, Acts 20:25–31 contains his charge to the elder following his departure, and Acts 20:32–35 concludes the speech with a final exhortation.[27] These textual divisions are not only based on shifts in topic and content, but they follow the use of the structure καὶ νῦν in Acts 20:22, καὶ νῦν with ἰδού in Acts 20:25, and καὶ τὰ νῦν in Acts 20:32.[28] So, while the speech is indeed one cohesive unit of text within the larger narrative, the speech can helpfully be divided into subsections according to the content and structure of the speech, as presented by Bruce.[29] This divides the speech into four subsections as presented in the table below.

---

[24] I. Howard Marshall, *The Acts of the Apostles: An Introduction and Commentary*, TNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 53.

[25] Richard Lenski, *The Interpretation of the Acts of the Apostles* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1964), 818.

[26] F.·F. Bruce, *The Book of the Acts*, Rev. Ed., NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), xii, 383.

[27] Bruce, *Acts*, 383–95.

[28] The use of καὶ νῦν and its variants as a structural and transitional device is not discussed by Bruce, but supports his divisions well.

[29] Lenski treats the speech as part of Acts 20 as one larger section (Lenski, *Acts*, 818), but then breaks up the speech into much smaller units, often a single sentence or verse, for textual analysis (Lenski, *Acts*, 836–54). These divisions are too small to be helpful for potential section analysis.

Table 10. Sections and Subsections in Acts 20:18b–35.

Section	Subsection	Verses	# of Sentences
α	α-1	20:18b–21	1
α	α-2	20:22–24	2
α	α-3	20:25–31	6
α	α-4	20:32–35	4

Treating the whole speech of Paul in Acts 20:18b–35 as one section, the opening sentence is a complex sentence introduced by a paratactic, main clause with an indicative predicator, an emphatic pronoun, and multiple clauses of indirect discourse, using πῶς and ὡς, as a compound complement in an S-P-A-C structure. This sentence concludes with an HC-ptc embedded within the rank-shifted ὡς clause. The opening sentence continues until 20:21, making the indicative clause of 20:22–23 the second sentence of the section. The section concludes in 20:35 with an asyndeton indicative clause with an adverbial accusative A-CU preceding the predicator and both a C-IO and a recitative ὅτι clause as the C-DO in an A-P-[C-IO]-[C-DO] structure. The recitative ὅτι clause includes another embedded ὅτι clause, concluding the sentence with a nominal clause with a compound subject consisting of subjective infinitives. There are no lexical or semantic connections that form an *inclusio* for this section, but there are common word families and semantic connections across the speech.

Subsection transitions show common elements throughout the speech of Acts 20:18b–35. Subsections α-1, α-2, and α-3 open with an indicative, expository clause with an emphatic subject preceding the predicator and an adjunct (α-2), complement (α-3), or both (α-1) following the predicator. Subsections α-2 and α-3 also include the interjection ἰδοῦ after the connective καὶ νῦν and before the subject word group. Subsection α-4 also opens with the connective καὶ νῦν but adds an article to nominalize the adverb, reading καὶ τὰ νῦν. It also includes an indicative predicator with paraenetic force with a pronominal C-DO and a C-IO in a P-[C-DO]-[C-IO]

526

structure; the C-IO includes two rank-shifted participle clauses and an infinitive clause. Second sentences for subsections are all indicative, expository clauses with either asyndeton (α-4), διότι (α-3), or a contrastive ἀλλά (α-2). Closing sentences, aside from the one-sentence subsection α-1, are either expository (α-2, α-4) or imperative (α-3) in force. They always include hypotactic or rank-shifted clauses following the main, paratactic clause. The closing sentences with asyndeton (α-4) and διό (α-3) do not show structural abnormalities in the main clause, but the contrastive sentence with ἀλλά shows hyperbaton; a qualifier word group precedes the predicator while its referent, the second complement in an object-complement construction, follows (20:24).

<center>The Rank of Clause</center>

Paul's speech in Acts 20:18b–35 includes thirteen discrete sentences. While it is codified that sentences in the speech are complex, none are compound sentences. Asyndeton is the most common connector for paratactic clauses and the conjunctive καί is used three times as a transitional device, while the conjunction δέ is not used in this speech. It is partially codified that paratactic clauses will have the main verb in the indicative mood and partially codified that it will be present tense in form or in meaning.[30] Two clauses include present imperative predicators, one with asyndeton (20:28) and one with διό (20:31). One includes only a predicator followed by an HC-ptc (20:31) and the other includes a compound complement modified by a relative clause in a P-C structure (20:28). Two paratactic indicative clauses also include verbs with the force of paraenesis (20:26, 32). One introduces the final subsection and includes an accusative A-CU before the predicator, altering the transitional device of previous subsections (20:32). Both clauses include both C-IOs and C-DOs following the main predicator in a P-C

---

[30] Eight clauses have the predicator explicitly in the present tense and two feature the perfect verb οἶδα, which functions as if it were present tense (20:25, 29).

<center>527</center>

structure, but the order of the two complement word groups varies. The word group order of the complement word groups, however, likely depends on the elements within the word groups themselves, as the word group with rank-shifted elements appears last in each case,[31] while the complement that immediately follows the predicator, whether the C-DO or the C-IO, is a single, personal pronoun.

Paratactic indicative clauses regularly include subject word groups, which always appear immediately preceding the predicator within the clause itself,[32] and are the only type of paratactic clause to include an expressed subject word group. It is partially codified both for paratactic indicative clauses and for paratactic clauses overall that they will include at least one expressed complement word group. It is also partially codified that the complements will follow the predicator in a P-C structure. One sentence includes a compound complement before the predicator (20:33), but this sentence also contrasts in meaning, without the use of ἀλλά or δέ, with the following sentence (20:34). One sentence also includes a qualifier to the complement before the predicator with the complement following (20:24); this clause, as explored above, still has the complement itself following the predicator and is also a transitional sentence for subsection α-2. Adjunct word groups beyond conjunctions are also common in indicative clauses. The only A-Adv is the temporal adverb νῦν, which only appears before the predicator (20:22, 25), as does the modified, adverbial accusative form, τὰ νῦν (20:32). The other A-CU is the dative reflexive pronoun in 20:24, which follows the predicator with the force of respect or

---

[31] The direct object complement of 20:26 is a recitative ὅτι clause, while the indirect object complement in 20:32 includes a rank-shifted participle clause that in itself also includes two rank-shifted infinitive clauses.

[32] The one exception occurs in 20:22, where a participle clause interrupts the main clause in hyperbaton, causing the adjunct word group of the participle clause, τῷ πνεύματι, to lie between the subject and the predicator of the main, paratactic clause. This clause is also the opening clause of subsection α-2.

advantage. All three A-PPs follow the predicator, regardless of force.[33]

Paul's speech in Acts 20 includes thirteen clauses in direct hypotaxis to a governing clause, most of which lie within rank-shifted contexts as a marginally codified feature. No clause uses a Cj-H, and it is partially codified that hypotactic clauses will be HC-ptc. The two other hypotactic clauses include a single, present infinitive clause (20:30) and compound, aorist infinitive clause (20:24), both with the force of purpose. Hypotactic infinitive clauses always follow their governing clause, never include an expressed subject, always include a complement following the predicator, and one includes an A-PP at the end of the clause (20:30). One also includes an article in the genitive case preceding the infinitive (20:30). HC-ptcs are present tense in form or meaning as a partially codified feature, with the one exception being a perfect passive participle clause that precedes its governing clause with a causal force (20:22). HC-ptcs typically follow their governing clause, giving a partially codified pattern for participle clauses and for hypotactic clauses as a whole.[34] Only one example, the participle κοπιῶντας in 20:35 whose position and force is debatable, precedes its governing predicator.[35] HC-ptcs never include an expressed subject word group as a fully codified pattern and almost never include an adjunct word group as a marginally codified feature.[36] It is partially codified that HC-ptcs will include an expressed

---

[33] Two have a temporal force, with ἀπό (20:18) and ἐν (20:26), and one has the force of destination (20:22).

[34] This includes participle clauses of manner (20:19, 21, 31), concession (20:22), accompanying action (20:25, 29, 30), and a pleonastic participle (20:23). The sole causal participle in the perfect tense is the only hypotactic participle clause to precede the predicator (20:22).

[35] This participle could be the substantive subject of the infinitive clause of ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι or a participle of manner modifying the same infinitive. Both Lenski and Bruce translate the participle as one of manner, describing how Christians care for the weak (Bruce, *Acts*, 394 and Lenski, *Acts*, 855–56). In the context of giving his own work as an example in the previous clauses, it is likely Paul includes himself in this clause, making the participle most likely as a clause of manner. In either case, however, the sense of the passage the same.

[36] The three exceptions are the perfect passive participle clause in 20:22, the clause of manner in 20:19, and complementary participle clause in 20:31. One includes a dative word group of agency after the predicator and is the only HC-ptc without an expressed complement (20:22). Another includes an A-PP of accompaniment with μετά that follows both the predicator and complement (20:19). The final example includes an A-PP of accompaniment with

complement and fully codified that they will follow their predicator. The only anomaly within

this pattern occurs in the εἰδῶς clause of 20:22, where the predicator takes a compound

complement. In this case, the complement both precedes and follows the predicator, joined by

the restrictive conjunction πλήν.[37] This gives the clause with compound complement, which

appears in the opening sentence of subsection α-2, a [C]-P-[C] pattern.

<div align="center">Changing Ranks: Rank-Shifted Clauses</div>

Rank-shifted clauses in Paul's speech at Miletus show consistent patterns. Infinitive

clauses, the most common type of rank-shifted clause, always follow their governing predicator

as a fully codified pattern, but they appear in the present and aorist tenses with similar frequency.

There are no infinitives of indirect discourse in the speech, as recorded speech in this passage

tends to be expressed with recitative ὅτι clauses, explored below. Half of the rank-shifted

infinitive clauses are complementary in force,[38] with four also serving as subjective infinitives

(20:35) and one serving as a direct object (20:28).[39] The three infinitives that follow ὑποστέλλω

are arthrous, while all other rank-shifted infinitives are simple. It is codified that infinitive

---

μετά that precedes the predicator within a recitative ὅτι clause that concludes a subsection.

[37] To handle the syntactical awkwardness of this clause, translators either make the clause into two separate clauses and repeat the verb (Bruce, *Acts*, 390) or translate πλήν as "save," regarding it as a prepositional phrase instead of a compound complement (Lenski, *Acts*, 841). The use of πλήν as a preposition, typically followed by an complement in the genitive case, could theoretically modify the complement word group that precedes the participle as a qualifier, but that is unlikely. The clause would best be translated, then, as separate clauses, *a la* Bruce, or as a compound clause with the verbal idea repeated ("even though I do not know the things that will happen to me in that place; I do know, however, that…").

[38] The infinitives in 20:20 and 20:27 following ὑποστέλλω are categorized in this project as complementary infinitives. They carry a separative force, but that force still completes the verbal idea of ὑποστέλλω.

[39] The syntax of ποιμαίνειν in 20:28 is debatable, especially in relation to the dative word group that precedes since προσέχω typically takes complements in the dative case. Bruce translates it as a parallel command to προσέχετε, taking ἑαυτοῖς καὶ παντὶ τῷ ποιμνίῳ as the object proper of προσέχετε (Bruce, *Acts*, 391). Marshall describes the infinitive as the "task" given to the leaders (Marshall, *Acts*, 334), while Lenski explicitly argues that the infinitive is the object of the preceding verb (Lenski, *Acts*, 848). In this case, then, the infinitive is either a second complement in asyndeton to the dative word group for which the verbal idea is repeated, or it is the direct object proper and the dative word group is adverbial, likely indicating advantage or respect, to the main verb.

clauses will not include an expressed subject word group, with the sole example preceding the infinitive within an impersonal δεῖ clause (20:35). Complement word groups are very common, appearing within rank-shifted infinitive clauses as a marginally codified pattern.[40] Complements almost always immediately follow the predicator and precede any adjunct in a P-C structure. The only anomaly occurs in 20:20, where the C-DO (οὐδὲν τῶν συμφερόντων) precedes the predicator and the C-IO follows (ὑμῖν). In this case, the complement word group shows hyperbaton, with the infinitive's governing verb interrupting the pronoun and its qualifier, is part of a compound clause, and is still part of the opening sentence of the speech. Adjunct word groups are infrequent, only occurring within two rank-shifted infinitive clauses, and they always follow the predicator and the complement regardless of type and force (20:20, 32).

Rank-shifted participle clauses in attributive or substantive position are less common than infinitives, but display consistent syntax. Both participles in attributive position are modified by a definite article and are in "repeat" position to their referent. Substantive participles almost always are modified by the definite article, with διεστραμμένα in 20:30 being the only exception. Rank-shifted participles appear in various tenses according to their sense, with aorist participles referring to completed events (20:19, 22), present participles referring to ongoing instruction or activity (20:20, 32, 34, 35), and perfect participles referring to an attribute or characteristic (20:30, 32). Additionally, they always occur as or within a complement word group. Within the clause, no rank-shifted participle clause includes an expressed subject, only two include an adjunct word group (20:19, 22) and four include an expressed complement word group (20:19, 22, 32, 34). Complement word groups always immediately follow the predicator in a P-C

---

[40] If the three hypotactic infinitive clauses are included, then it is a partially codified pattern that infinitive clauses will include an expressed complement.

structure, while the two locative A-PPs both precede (20:22) and follow the predicator (20:19). Relative clauses, direct quotations, and clauses of discourse with πῶς and ὡς are uncommon in Paul's speech, with the syntax of relative clauses depending largely on the role of the relative pronoun, as would be expected.

One type of rank-shifted that is noticeably common with Paul's speech are recitative and appositive ὅτι clauses. The majority of examples are recitative, directly following a verb of speaking or communication, with one appositive ὅτι clause also modifying a complement of a verb of cognition (20:35). The predicator of rank-shifted ὅτι clauses is always indicative and regularly appears in present, aorist, and future tense. Rank-shifted ὅτι clauses include additional word groups beyond the predicator with the greatest frequency of all clause types, with every ὅτι clause except one including at least three different structural word groups. The only exception, found in 20:26, includes hyperbaton in a C-PN, with the head adjective before the verb, εἰμί, and its qualifier following. Such clauses include subject word groups as a partially codified pattern, but the position of the subject varies. It precedes the verb three times (20:23, 35), follows the predicator four times (20:25, 29, 30, 34), and appears in hyperbaton within one impersonal δεῖ clause (20:35). The only potential tendency for subjects is that ὅτι clauses that serve as the complement of paratactic clauses have the subject after the predicator, while those within other rank-shifted clauses have the subject before the predicator. Complements word groups appear within such clauses as a marginally codified pattern, both preceding (20:23, 26, 34) and following the predicator (20:23, 25, 31, 35) with regularity. Those that precede the predicator are plural complements within a context of contrast (20:23, 34) or a C-PN with hyperbaton (20:26). Those that follow are a direct quotation (20:35), a complementary participle (20:31), a single nominal group (20:25), or a pronoun (20:23). Regarding adjunct word groups, both A-Advs

precede the predicator (20:25, 35) as does the accusative A-CU with a temporal force (20:31). A-PPs both precede (20:23, 30) and follow (20:29) the predicator. Those that precede have the force of location (20:23) or source (20:30), while those that follow have the force of time and destination (20:29). Rank-shifted ὅτι clauses also regularly include a hypotactic clause following the main clause and those that do always have an adjunct word group in the primary ὅτι clause.

The Rank of Word Group

Aside from rank-shifted, subjective infinitive clauses, Paul's speech at Miletus includes thirteen expressed subject word groups. Subjects are roughly equally likely to consist of a single pronoun as they are to be a compound subject or include additional elements within the word group, but this depends on the type of clause. Paratactic clauses on the rank of clause only include single pronouns as subject word groups (20:18, 22, 25, 29, 34), while only one subject within a rank-shifted context is a single, emphatic pronoun (20:35). On the contrary, almost every subject word group within a rank-shifted context, typically within a ὅτι clause, is a compound subject (20:23) or includes additional modifiers on a head noun (20:23, 25, 28, 29, 30, 34). Subject word groups precede their predicator as a marginally codified pattern, including every subject word group within a paratactic clause. Every exception is found within a recitative ὅτι clause, either within a compound clause (20:29, 30), a context of contrast (20:34), or with a relative clause modifying the subject (20:25). Adjectives are the most common additional element within subject word groups. All three attributive adjectives are in "repeat" position to their referent, two with definite articles (20:23, 28) and one modifying an anarthrous referent (20:29). Both predicate adjectives, including a form of πᾶς (20:25) and a demonstrative pronoun (20:34), follow their referent and modify nouns with other modifiers also. Every subject word group with a definite article also includes an adjectival modifier. Only one subject word group

533

includes a qualifier, which is the relative clause modifying the pronoun ὑμεῖς in 20:25.

Complement word groups most commonly function as C-DOs within their governing clause. Aside from rank-shifted infinitive clauses and clauses of direct and indirect discourse, there are twenty-seven C-DOs consisting of pronouns, nouns, and nominalized elements in Paul's Miletus speech. It is partially codified for all C-DOs to follow their predicator, but only marginally codified when the rank-shifted clauses are excluded. Those that precede typically modify indicative predicators, with those in infinitive and participle clauses almost always following the predicator. It is marginally codified that C-DOs include additional modifiers beyond a noun or pronoun and also marginally codified that C-DOs will include a definite article. It is partially codified that those with definite articles will follow their governing predicator and marginally codified that they will include another modifier on the head noun. Qualifier word groups are also common in C-DOs. It is partially codified that C-DOs with embedded qualifiers will also include the definite article, codified that qualifiers will follow their head noun, and fully codified that they will match their referent in definiteness. The only exception to the position of such qualifiers occurs in 20:24, where an epexegetical qualifier precedes the governing verb and its head adjective follows. In this case, it is the final sentence of a subsection and occurs within the context of contrast.[41] Qualifiers within C-DOs are regularly subjective genitive (20:24, 27, 34, 35) or possessive (20:25, 28, 33) in force. Adjectives are the least common additional modifier within C-DOs with six adjectives within five direct objects, and almost always occur together with the definite article and a qualifier within the word group. One adjective is part of an object-complement construction (20:24). There are two predicate

---

[41] Lenski also notes the odd syntax here, arguing that the position of the qualifier brings great emphasis to the complement word group (Lenski, *Acts*, 842).

adjectives, both forms of πᾶς, that precede their referent (20:27, 28). There is single attributive adjective proper, appearing in "sandwich" position to an indefinite referent (20:31). Additionally, there are two PPs functioning as adjectival modifiers within one compound C-DO (20:21). They are both PPs of εἰς modifying a verbal noun with an objective force, though one is in "sandwich" position to a definite referent and the other is in "repeat" position to an indefinite referent.

Paul's speech at Miletus also includes ten C-IOs and three C-PNs. C-IOs follow their governing verb as a fully codified pattern, and it is partially codified they will consist of a single pronoun. One compound C-IO includes two nominalized adjectives functioning as noun in a τε ... καί construction (20:21). Only one C-IO, another compound complement, includes additional modifiers, including the definite article and multiple qualifiers (20:32).[42] For the three C-PNs, they all occur within a rank-shifted context, with two preceding their governing verb (20:26, 35) and one following it (20:34). The one that follows is a nominalized PP functioning as the C-PN of οὖσιν (20:34). The two that precede both include predicate adjectives as the C-PN. One also includes a separative PP with ἀπό appearing in hyperbaton as an epexegetical qualifier modifying the verbal idea implicit within its head adjective, καθαρός (20:26).

C-OPs show strong patterns of structure and syntax. Paul's speech at Miletus includes twenty-five C-OPs, with one A-PP serving double duty within both a paratactic clause and relative clause. These occur within a rank-shifted context as a partially codified feature and they follow their governing verb as a partially codified pattern.[43] C-OPs appear as a single noun or pronoun and with additional modifiers with roughly equal likelihood, the definite article being

---

[42] The first noun includes a definite article and an appositive qualifier following the second nominal group in hyperbaton. The second noun is modified by a definite article and an objective genitive qualifier that follows. This C-IO is also within the paratactic clause of the first sentence of subsection α-4.

[43] Three counterexamples are relative pronouns serving as the complement of a preposition phrase, which always appears in prime position in its own relative clause.

the most common additional element in the word group. It is fully codified that those with the definite article follow their governing verb and codified that they will appear together with additional modifiers. Five of those with the definite article also include at least one embedded qualifier word group. Qualifiers within such complements always follow their referent, match their referent in definiteness, appear within phrases that follow their governing verb, and appear within a rank-shifted context. These include two subjective genitive qualifiers (20:19, 29), two appositive qualifiers (20:21, 24), one objective genitive qualifier (20:21), and one possessive genitive qualifier (20:26). Adjectival modifiers occur within six C-OPs, with seven adjectives in total. Four such complements include the definite article and none include embedded qualifiers. Only four of six appear within a rank-shifted context and five of six follow their governing verb. Adjectives within C-OPs include two predicate adjectives and five attributive adjectives. Both predicate adjectives are forms of πᾶς, with one example preceding an indefinite referent (20:19) and one following a definite referent (20:32). Attributive adjectives tend to appear in "repeat" position, including a rank-shifted participle serving as an adjective (20:19). Only one attributive adjective is in "sandwich" position with its referent, which is the adverb σήμερον functioning adjectivally (20:26). Few potential patterns are evident according to the force of governing preposition. When ἐν has the force of accompaniment or location, it rarely includes additional modifiers, while C-OPs of ἐν when it has a temporal (20:26) or causal force (20:19) both include additional modifiers. The ἐκ phrase of source both precedes its governing verb and includes an adjectival modifier (20:30) while the παρά of source follows its governing verb but also includes multiple additional modifiers (20:24). Lastly, PPs of accompaniment with ἐν or μετά, the most common force for PPs in Paul's speech, never include an embedded qualifier.

Patterns and syntax for adjunct word groups in Paul's Miletus speech depend on the type

and force of the adjunct. Conjunctive adjuncts appear within clauses proper as a marginally codified pattern and consist of Cj-Ps over against Cj-Hs as a codified pattern. The conjunctive καί is the most common conjunction, with δέ not appearing within the Miletus speech. The speech includes eleven A-Advs and A-CUs. Both types of adjuncts precede their governing verb as a partially codified pattern, it is marginally codified that they will appear within a rank-shifted context, and it is marginally codified that they will carry a temporal force. The only A-Adv to follow its governing verb appears within a compound adjunct word group together with a PP (20:20), while every instance of A-CU that precedes the governing verb appears within the initial (20:18, 32) or concluding sentences (20:31, 35) of a subsection, mostly toward the end of the speech. So, while five of the six A-CUs precede their governing verb, it is most likely due to emphasis and transitional syntax. Every A-CU that precedes the predicator, furthermore, occurs in the accusative case (20:18, 31, 32, 35) while the single group in the dative case, indicating agency, follows its governing, passive predicator (20:22).

There are twenty A-PPs in the Miletus speech, with some consistent syntactical tendencies. It is partially codified that they will appear within a rank-shifted context and marginally codified that they will follow their governing predicator, with all three that appear within a clause proper following the governing verb. The most common force for A-PPs in the speech is the force of accompaniment, both with μετά (20:18, 19, 31) and ἐν (20:25, 28, 32), and they regularly precede their governing predicator. Two C-OPs for A-PPs of accompaniment, however, are relative pronouns (20:25, 28), which impacts this tendency. A-PPs of destination or direction, with εἰς (20:18, 22, 29) or ὀπίσω (20:30), always follow their governing verb. Temporal A-PPs also tend to follow their governing verb, with the sole exception appearing within a relative clause with the relative pronoun as the C-OP (20:18). There are only two A-PPs of source, but it

is potentially significant that the phrase with ἐκ precedes it governing verb and describes a plural, personal group (20:30) while the phrase with παρά follows the predicator and describes a single, personal source (20:24).

Qualifiers show syntactical consistency within the Miletus speech in Acts 20:18b–35. The speech includes twenty-seven embedded qualifier word groups. Among them, twenty are nominal word groups, five are relative clauses, one is a PP (20:26), and one is an appositive ὅτι clause (20:35). For all qualifier word groups, it is codified that they will follow their referent and partially codified they will appear with word groups following the governing verb. The sole qualifier to precede its referent is an epexegetical qualifier modifying an adjective within an object-complement construction and shows hyperbaton (20:24). It is also the only nominal qualifier word group to modify an adjective and the only nominal qualifier to include an adjective in the word group. For nominal qualifier word groups, they appear the most often within C-DOs. They also appear regularly within C-OPs, rarely within C-IOs, and never within subject word groups. It is codified, then, that they will appear within C-DOs or C-OPs and fully codified that nominal qualifiers will not appear within subject word groups. Within the word group, nominal qualifiers are slightly more likely to include only a single noun or pronoun than they are to include additional modifiers. Definite articles appear with the most frequency. Three qualifier word groups include additional embedded qualifiers (20:24, 32, 35), all of which also include the definite article. Two of them are objective genitive qualifiers that include a subjective genitive qualifier on the head noun (20:24, 32) and one is a subjective genitive qualifier with an appositive qualifier on the head noun (20:35). In all three cases, qualifier word groups within other qualifiers involve the use of the subjective genitive. Subjective genitive qualifiers are the most common force for qualifiers, appearing eight times in the speech. Half of them include a

definite article within the word group and they tend to appear within C-DOs. Qualifiers

indicating possession appear four times, only one of which includes a definite article; they, like

subjective genitive qualifiers, tend to appear within C-DOs. Objective genitive qualifiers only

appear three times and two of them include both the article and an embedded qualifiers.

Additionally, there are three nominal groups serving as appositive qualifiers (20:21, 24, 35). All

three include a form of the proper name Ἰησοῦς and two of them appear within C-OPs.

APPENDIX FOUR

Full Profile Analysis of Acts 18

The Rank of Section

Acts 18 contains one major sectional transition as well as multiple subsection divisions. Scholars agree that Acts 18:18 is a major transition in the narrative of Acts with Acts 18:1–17 concluding a previous section.[1] Lenski describes Acts 18:18–28 as a hinge unit, both concluding the previous material and looking forward to a new section, with Paul famously visiting Jerusalem in 18:22 and Apollos being introduced in 18:24–28 before Paul returns to Ephesus in 19:1.[2] While Acts 18:18–28 does connect both ways, it is geographically tied forward to Ephesus (18:18–21; 19:1–20). For this project, then, Acts 18:18–28 will be considered the beginning of a new section rather than concluding the previous material or serving as a standalone section.[3] The material in Acts 18:1–17 is either treated as a single subunit[4] or divided until multiple smaller subunits.[5] Similarly, the material in Acts 18:18–28 is divided into smaller units, typically by geographical movement and the introduction of Apollos.[6] With Bruce, the scene of Paul before Gallio in 18:12–17 will be considered a subsection, with the transitional δέ and change in characters in 18:12 signaling a change in the text, but 18:1–11 will be considered as one subsection narrating Paul's ministry in Corinth. Similarly, with Bruce and Marshall the introduction of Apollos in 18:24–28 will considered a new subsection within 18:18–28, signaled by a transitional δέ and a change of characters in 18:24. Bruce and Marshall also treat 18:18–21

---

[1] Bruce, *Acts*, xi–xii, Marshall, *Acts*, 52–53, and Lenski, *Acts*, 632, 742, 761.

[2] Lenski, *Acts*, 761, 779.

[3] Bruce, *Acts*, 354 and Marshall, *Acts*, 299.

[4] Marshall, *Acts*, 291 and Lenski, *Acts*, 742.

[5] Bruce, *Acts*, 345–51.

[6] Bruce, *Acts*, 354–58 and Marshall, *Acts*, 299–302.

and 18:22–23 as different subunits, but the use of καί in 18:22 and 18:23 and the parallel

structure with 18:20–21, 18:22, and 18:23 suggest taking 18:18–23 as one unit. This separates

Acts 18 into four subsections between two sections as presented below.

Table 11. Sections and Subsections in Acts 18.

Section	Subsection	Verses	# of Sentences
α	α-1	18:1-11	12
α	α-2	18:12-17	5
β	β-1	18:18-23	7
β	β-2	18:24-28	6

The lone section transition in 18:18 contains an indicative, paratactic clause, a transitional

δέ, and a complex sentence with multiple hypotactic participles: two before the main clause and

one following to conclude the sentence. The paratactic clause shows an S-P-A structure and what

appears to be a Hebraism with Παῦλος serving as the subject of the singular verb and Πρίσκιλλα

and Ἀκύλας being included, in the nominative case, after the main action of the clause.[7] The

opening sentence is followed by a simple, explanatory clause with γάρ. This section ends beyond

the scope of the project, either in 19:20 with a compound expository clause introduced by οὕτως[8]

or in 20:38 with a simple expository clause using a conjunctive δέ.[9] The previous section ends in

18:17 with an expository paratactic clause with a conjunctive καί, a common connector in this

passage.

---

[7] In this case, Paul is highlighted as the chief actor of the passage while including the others as secondary. See Bruce K. Waltke and M. O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990), §16.3.2c, 294. This use of the detached nominative with a singular verb is not discussed in typical grammars of NTG. The Hebraism of a singular verb with multiple subjects is mentioned in the grammar of the LXX, but not with the distinction between primary and secondary actors. See F. C. Conybeare and St. George Stock, *Grammar of Septuagint Greek* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2010), §49, 54. This also argues against Lenski's decision to render Ἀκύλας as the referent of the participle κειράμενος (Lenski, *Acts*, 762–63).

[8] Bruce, *Acts*, 370.

[9] Marshall, *Acts*, 337.

Acts 18 contains four subsections spread across the two major sections that shift in 18:18. Opening sentences for all four subsections are expository sentences with indicative paratactic clause (18:1, 12–13, 18, 24). The first subsection, α-1, does not include a conjunction as a transitional device, but rather an anaphoric demonstrative pronoun within the temporal A-PP μετὰ ταῦτα. The other three subsections (α-2, β-1, β-2) include a transitional δέ in the opening sentence. Furthermore, opening sentences are all complex sentences, with three of four subsection transitions including an HC-ptc before the main, paratactic clause. Two are aorist HC-ptcs depicting action contemporaneous with the main verb (α-1, β-1) and one is a present HC-ptc serving as a temporal genitive absolute clause (α-2). The exception in 18:24 (β-2) potentially includes a present participle clause following the main clause, but the position and force of the participle are unclear and will be explored below. In every case, the second sentence of each subsection is an indicative clause. Three are expository clauses with asyndeton (β-2), a conjunctive καί (α-1), or a contrastive δέ (α-2) as the connective device. The other second sentence, found in the first subsection of a larger section, includes an explanatory clause with γάρ (β-1). All four subsections conclude with an indicative clause as well. Three are expository with καί (α-2, β-1) or a conjunctive δέ (α-1) as connective devices. The final subsection of Acts 18 concludes with an explanatory γάρ clause and, like α-1 and β-1, includes an HC-ptc following the main clause (β-2). Finally, subsections do each include an *inclusio*, whether directly lexical (α-2, β-2)[10] or semantic (α-1, β-1).[11]

---

[10] The *inclusio* of subsection α-2 (18:12, 17) includes the name of Gallio, the judgment seat (βῆμα), and the Jews either explicitly named (18:12) or as an implicit subject (18:17). The *inclusio* of subsection β-2 (18:24, 28) includes Apollos as a referent and his ability or use of the Scriptures (γραφαί).

[11] The *inclusio* of subsection α-1 (18:1, 11) both include references to time, either through the means of an anaphoric demonstrative within a temporal prepositional phrase (18:1) or an accusative word group indicating duration of time (18:11). Similarly, the *inclusio* of subsection β-1 (18:18, 23) include a temporal reference as the complement of a HC-ptc preceding the main clause, references to specific locations of Paul's travel, and a reference to fellow believers as either brothers (18:18) or disciples (18:23).

The Rank of Clause

The narrative of Acts 18 shows consistent patterns on the rank of clause. This chapter includes thirty-nine paratactic clauses within thirty sentences. Among these, there are no paratactic imperative clauses, nominal clauses, or indicative clauses with a paraenetic force; instead, every paratactic clause proper has an indicative verb as a fully codified pattern. Thereby it is a codified pattern that paratactic clauses will be expository in force, with every exception being explanatory with γάρ as the connective device. Every predicator in paratactic clauses is either in the imperfect or aorist tense, aorist being the most common. It is partially codified that paratactic clauses will be part of a complex sentence; furthermore, it is codified with only one exception that complex sentences will include an HC-ptc subordinate to the main clause. Both the conjunctions δέ and καί are very common for paratactic clauses, together accounting for thirty-one of the thirty-nine such clauses. Only one paratactic clause is truly asyndeton (18:25)[12] and two clauses include the enclitic τε with a conjunctive force (18:4, 26).

Within the paratactic clause, it is partially codified that the clause will include a predicator and at least one additional structural word group beyond a conjunction. Subject word groups are common with many areas of consistent syntax. It is partially codified that they will precede the governing predicator, partially codified that they will appear in a clause with δέ or τε as the connector, and marginally codified that the clause will also include an expressed complement. One subject word group appears both before and after the governing verb in the Hebraism described above (18:18). The three subject word groups that follow their governing predicator are in the context of contrast (18:14–15), a subject doing double duty in a compound clause in

_____

[12] The only other clause that lacks an explicit conjunction is found in 18:1. This sentence, however, opens with an anaphoric demonstrative pronoun as a connective device that links back to the preceding material.

the first sentence of a subsection (18:12–13), or likely in formulaic or emphatic position with a Divine referent speaking to a character in the narrative (18:9–10).[13] Complement word groups are frequent, appearing in over half of all paratactic clauses. It is partially codified that they will follow their governing verb in a P-C structure and partially codified that they will appear together with either an expressed subject or adjunct word group. When they appear with a subject word group it is partially codified that the Cj-P for the clause will be δέ or τε, but when they do not appear together with a subject word group it is partially codified that the clauses will not have δέ or τε as the Cj-P. For complements that precede the governing verb, two are within the final paratactic clause of a section and have a definite article modifying a proper noun (18:17b, 28), two have καί as the connective device (18:17b, 19), and one is a κἀκείνους contracted form within a compound sentence (18:19). Adjunct word groups beyond conjunctions are the most common non-verbal word group within paratactic clauses. Five clauses include six A-Advs. Four A-Advs follow their predicator with either a locative force (18:19, 28) or the force of manner (18:12, 15). Two A-Advs with the force of manner also precede their governing predicator (18:26b, 28). Two clauses include A-CUs in the accusative case (18:11) and the dative case (18:3b). They both follow their governing verb. Finally, nineteen A-PPs appear within sixteen paratactic clauses. It is codified that they will follow their predicator regardless of force.[14]

Acts 18 also demonstrates many consistent patterns for hypotactic clauses. It is partially codified that hypotactic clauses will be modify paratactic clauses proper and it is partially codified that they will be HC-ptcs. There is only one HC-Cj (18:5a). This temporal clause with

---

[13] See when "the Lord" speaks within the narrative Acts 7:33, 49; 9:10, 15; 13:47. But, see also when Paul recounts his conversion in Acts 22:10; 23:11; 26:15.

[14] The sole exception, occurring in 18:1, is the temporal μετὰ ταῦτα phrase functioning as a connective device at the beginning of a new subsection; the same clause also includes a phrase of destination with εἰς following the predicator.

ὡς precedes its governing clause. There are three infinitive clauses functioning as a hypotactic

clauses: two indicating cause with a διὰ τό construction (18:2, 3) and one with the force of

purpose following a genitive definite article (18:10). Two such infinitive clauses are within a

rank-shifted context and follow their governing clause (18:2, 10), while the one within a

paratactic clause proper precedes it governing clause (18:3). All three include an expressed

complement. Two follow their governing verb (18:2, 10) and the complement that precedes

modifies a participle of εἰμί (18:3). Aside from these, there are thirty-four HC-ptcs. They precede

their governing clause as a marginally codified. pattern. Furthermore, it is fully codified that

those with a temporal force will precede their governing clause and that those that precede their

governing verb will carry a temporal force.[15] Other forces that follow the governing clause

include attendant circumstance *a la* Voelz (18:11, 23, 24),[16] manner (18:5b, 28), cause (18:18b),[17]

concession (18:25b), and a pleonastic participle (18:18:13). Within the clause, the only HC-ptcs

to include an expressed subject word group are genitive absolute clauses. Two include the

subject before participle (18:12, 21): one is a concessive participle within Paul's speech (18:21)

and the other is the first clause of a new subsection and includes hyperbaton in the complement

with a verbal form of εἰμί (18:12). The other four examples all immediately follow the participle

within the clause (18:6a, 14, 20, 27a). Complement word groups are very common within

---

[15] This includes the all but one use of present participles in genitive absolute and aorist participles expressing action contemporaneous with the main verb.

[16] The participle clause δυνατὸς ὢν ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς (18:24) is rendered here as an participle of attendant circumstance. The syntax and force of the participle is either not discussed (Marshall, *Acts*, 303 and Bruce, *Acts*, 358–59) or presented as descriptive (Lenski, *Acts*, 769) by commentators. It is possible that this participle clause, while being in predicate position, could be functioning as an adjectival participle in its position for emphasis. Attendant circumstance participles typically appear in the present tense and describe an action that accompanies a verb of arrival or movement. In this case, the participle ὢν does not describe an action, *per* se, but rather a state or characteristic of Apollos especially salient for his arrival (καταντάω) in Ephesus and the subsequent material.

[17] The participle καιράμενος is not causal in the strictest sense (Lenski, *Acts*, 762), but rather provides additional information that explains the timing and route of Paul's travels (Marshall, *Acts*, 300).

predicate participle clauses. It is codified that the complement will follow the participle and codified that, when other word groups are present, they will be the final word group of the participle clause. The only participle clauses that include the complement before the participle are C-PNs with hyperbaton that appear within transitional sentences (18:12, 24). Adjunct word groups are less frequent for predicate participle clauses, with eleven adjunct word groups appearing within ten HC-ptcs. Three are A-Advs, with two following the participle (18:7, 25b) and one preceding it (18:18a). The two that follow the participle are locative (18:7) or restrictive (18:25b), while the one that precedes is a temporal A-Adv that precedes the verb in a participle clause that appears within the first sentence of a new section (18:18a). The sole A-CU is a dative word group of accompaniment that follows both the participle and its complement in the same clause as an A-Adv that precedes it (18:18a). A-PPs in HC-ptcs always follow the participle regardless of force and, when there is also an expressed complement, lie between the participle and its complement (18:11, 18b, 28). A-PPs typically indicate location or spatial movement with a variety of prepositions, with the only exception being an A-PP of means with διά (18:28).

<center>Changing Ranks: Rank-Shifted Clauses</center>

Rank-shifted clauses in Acts 18 tend to be infinitive clauses or direct quotations over against relative clauses or participle clauses in attributive position. Aside from the three infinitive clauses serving as hypotactic clauses, there are ten rank-shifted infinitive clauses. It is fully codified that they will follow their governing predicator and that they will be anarthrous. They also tend to be in the present tense as a marginally codified pattern. Rank-shifted infinitives are equally likely to be complementary or infinitives of indirect discourse following a verb of communication. No infinitive clause has the force of a direct object or an epexegetical qualifier. Within the clause, it is fully codified that they will include additional word groups beyond the

<center>546</center>

predicator. Subject word groups are not common, but when they are expressed they always follow the predicator and appear within a clause of indirect discourse. Complement word groups are the most common additional word group, but they never appear alongside an adjunct word group. Every rank-shifted infinitive clause in Acts 18, then, has either an expressed complement or an expressed adjunct, but never both. Complements almost always immediately follow their predicator, with the only exception being a C-PN that both concludes an extended direct quotation and shows hyperbaton within the complement word group and with the infinitive clause (18:15). Adjunct word groups in rank-shifted infinitive clauses are always A-PPs indicating location and movement (18:2, 26, 27) or time (18:20). Those with a locative force follow the predicator, while the temporal A-PP precedes the infinitive.

Aside from direct speech, other kinds of rank-shifted clauses are less common in Acts 18. There are six rank-shifted participle clauses, with three of them serving as a C-PN within a periphrastic construction (18:7, 25). There is one substantive participle, serving as a definite C-IO within a relative clause (18:27). And there are two functioning as adjectives in "repeat" position, both indefinite participles modifying proper names (18:2, 7). All rank-shifted participle clauses follow their governing predicator and, when expressed, their referent. They also regularly appear in both the perfect and present tenses. Within the clause, they never include an expressed subject word group. Complements always follow the participle (18:7, 25). The single A-Adv precedes the participle (18:2), while the single instance of both an A-PP (18:2) and a dative A-CU (18:25) follow the participle. For the only two relative clauses in Acts 18 (18:7, 27), the clause follows an S-P-C pattern, with the relative pronoun serving as or within the subject word group of the clause. There is also a single recitative ὅτι clause (18:13), with Acts 18 tending to express recorded speech with direct quotations or infinitives of indirect discourse. This ὅτι clause

includes a present indicative verb and both subject and complement word groups following the predicator. The A-PP either modifies ἀναπείθω, indicating that Paul is acting contrary to Roman law,[18] or belongs within the embedded infinitive clause, [19] focusing on the form of worship being in itself contrary to Jewish practice as sanctioned by Romans law. This project renders it as belonging within the ὅτι clause proper, but both its sense and emphatic position are evident in either case.[20]

Acts 18 contains fifteen clauses of direct discourse within four speech units (18:6, 9–10, 14–15, 21). All fifteen clauses, as a fully codified pattern, follow an aorist form of λέγω as the complement word group. It codified, with one exception (εἰπών in 18:21), that the discourse will follow the aorist indicative verb εἶπεν within a main, paratactic clause and fully codified that they will only appear within clauses proper. Three clauses of direct discourse are one compound imperative clause joined by the conjunctions ἀλλά and καί but without any other additional word groups; two include present imperative forms and one is a aorist subjunctive with μή (18:9). Aside from those three, rank-shifted clauses of direct discourse tend to be indicative or nominal as a partially codified feature. This includes two conditional sentences: one contrary-to-fact sentence (18:14) and one simple particular sentence (18:15). Subject word groups are the most common additional word groups within such clauses, but they are not consistent in their word group order. They appear in prime position (18:6, 10), they follow the predicator (18:14, 15) or the complement (18:6), and they also appear in hyperbaton with forms of εἰμί (18:10, 15). Complement word groups are also common and consistently tend to follow the predicator or,

---

[18] Lenski, *Acts*, 755–56.

[19] Bruce, *Acts*, 351, 353.

[20] Gallio's response in 18:15 questioning the validity of the Jews' claim by asserting that it is a dispute concerning their own law according to them (νόμου τοῦ καθ' ὑμᾶς) also supports taking the A-PP in a way that highlights the actions of Paul as breaking Roman law.

within a nominal clause, the subject. One nominal clause, however, has a C-S structure (18:6) and one clause has hyperbaton with the complementary infinitive clause (18:15). Adjunct word groups in such clauses are less common. The sole A-Adv, πάλιν, appears before its governing predicator (18:21), while A-PPs, sometimes with the same force, both precede (18:6, 14, 21) and follow the predicator (18:10, 21). Clauses of direct speech show consistency in the complement word group and their surrounding clausal syntax, but great variance with regard to subject and adjunct word groups with no consistent correlation to other syntactical factors.

The Rank of Word Group

Subject word groups in Acts show much variation with a few consistent tendencies. For the thirty-seven expressed subject word groups, they are slightly more likely to appear within clauses proper than in rank-shifted clauses and to precede their governing predicator than to follow, but not with enough frequency to constitute a pattern. They are equally likely to include additional modifiers as they are to include only nouns and pronouns, with no correlation to appearance in difference types of clauses. The definite article is the most common modifier within subject word groups and seven of twelve with definite articles following their governing verb. For the seven with embedded qualifiers, they precede their governing predicator or, within a nominal clause, precede the complement. Qualifiers within subject word groups follow their referent, with the only exception being when a relative pronoun functions as a possessive genitive qualifier within its clause (18:7). Qualifiers within subject word groups tend to be possessive genitive, partitive genitive, or appositive in force. There are also four adjectival modifiers within three subject word groups. The single predicate adjective is a form of πᾶς that precedes an arthrous head noun (18:2). All three attributive adjectives are in "repeat" position, including two indefinite pronouns (18:14, 24) and adjective proper (18:14).

C-DOs show more consistent patterns in Acts 18. For the fifty-two C-DOs, it is codified that they will follow their governing predicator and marginally codified that they will appear within clauses proper. All three that precede their governing verb are within indicative paratactic clauses and either appear within a transitional sentence (18:17, 28) or are part of a contracted form in a compound sentence (18:19). They are equally likely to consist of a noun or pronoun as they are to include additional modifiers. The definite article is the most common, appearing within twenty-two C-DOs. Sixteen of those contain no other modifiers on the head noun, making it a marginally codified pattern that head nouns with the definite article will contain no other modifiers. Seven C-DOs include embedded qualifier word groups and all of them follow their governing verb. All seven qualifiers follow their referent and match their referent in definiteness. Four of the seven C-DOs with qualifiers also include the definite article on the head noun. Such qualifiers tend to be subjective genitive or appositional in force. Five adjectival modifiers are found within four C-DOs. These direct objects only appear within HC-ptcs and always follow their predicator. Three of the four with adjectives also include other modifiers on the head noun. The sole predicate adjective is a form of πᾶς that precedes its arthrous head noun (18:23). Two attributive adjectives are in "sandwich" position: one to a definite head noun (18:23) and one to an indefinite head noun (18:2). Two attributive adjectives are in "repeat" position to indefinite head nouns: one indefinite pronoun functioning as an adjective (18:23) and one adjectival participle (18:2).

Acts 18 includes four C-IOs. Three of four follow their governing verb (18:5, 9, 27), with the exception serving to indicate contrast (18:26). Three C-IOs include nouns or proper nouns with a definite article and one only consists of a personal pronoun. All four C-IOs appear within clauses proper and include no modifiers other than the definite article. C-PNs tend to appear

within rank-shifted clauses in Acts 18 as a marginally codified pattern. They appear before and after expressed verbs frequently, but three of four that precede their predicator show hyperbaton in which the head noun or adjective precedes the predicator and a qualifier follows (18:12, 15, 24). Furthermore, these are the only instances of qualifiers within C-PNs, which have an associative genitive (18:12), objective genitive (18:15), or epexegetical genitive force (18:24). Two such complements include the definite article (18:5, 28). They are both within infinitive clauses of indirect discourse with εἶναι, with Ἰησοῦν as the subject and τὸν χριστόν as the complement. Three C-PNs include only a single predicate adjective (18:3, 6, 10) and one includes a PP as the C-PN of a nominal clause (18:6).

Acts 18 also includes forty-six C-OPs. It is partially codified that C-OPs will follow their governing verb, marginally codified that they will appear within clauses proper, and marginally codified that they will include additional modifiers beyond a single head noun or pronoun. Of the seven that precede their governing verb, five are within a rank-shifted context. The definite article is the most common additional modifier, appearing in over half of C-OPs. It is partially codified that C-OPs with the definite article will include no other additional modifiers on the head noun. Other modifiers are not common. Only three C-OPs include an embedded qualifier (18:6, 7, 8). Two qualifiers modify an arthrous head noun (18:6, 8). All three follow their referent and match their referent in definiteness, but none appear in C-OPs that precede their governing predicator. Qualifiers within C-OPs have an associative genitive (18:7, 8) or possessive genitive force (18:6). Five C-OPs include adjectival modifiers on the head noun. Three are predicate adjectives, with the forms of ὅλος and πᾶς preceding their referent (18:4, 8) and the demonstrative pronoun following its referent (18:10). This final example appears at the end of an extended passage of direct discourse. One attributive adjective appears in "sandwich"

position to an indefinite referent (18:20) while the other, a nominalized PP, appears in "repeat"

position to an indefinite referent yet includes the article on the adjectival modifier (18:15).

Modifiers appear within C-OPs of a variety of prepositions with different forces, and those that

precede the governing verb also serve as the C-OPs of various prepositions.[21]

Adjunct word groups in Acts 18 show both divergent and consistent syntax based on their

type. Conjunctions are Cj-Ps as a codified pattern and appear within clauses proper as a partially

codified pattern. Only one conjunctive adjunct is a Cj-H (18:5) and seven Cj-Ps appear within

clauses of direct discourse (18:9, 10, 14, 15). The conjunction δέ appears with the greatest

frequency, with the conjunctive καί as the second commonest. A-Advs and A-CUs show both

consistency and variance. It is partially codified that such adjuncts will appear in clauses proper

and not within a rank-shifted context. A-Advs precede and follow their governing verb with

equal frequency. All those that follow their governing verb are in clauses proper. All three

temporal A-Advs precede their governing predicator (18:2, 18, 21) and both locative A-Advs

follow their predicator (18:7, 19). A-Advs of manner, however, both precede (18:28) and follow

(18:12, 23, 25) their predicator. A-CUs almost always follow the predicator, with the sole

exception of an adverbial neuter accusative comparative adjective within a compound clause

(18:26). Five of the seven A-CUs are in the accusative case, with only two in the dative case

(18:3, 25). A-PPs are common in Acts 18; they follow their governing predicator as a partially

codified pattern and it is marginally codified that they will appear within clauses proper. Five of

the seven that precede their predicator are within a rank-shifted context (18:6, 13, 14, 20), one is

a transitional device (18:1), and the other introduces a causal infinitive clause (18:3). The only

---

[21] One potentially significant feature is that five of the seven complements that precede their governing predicator are in the accusative case with multi-case prepositions. But, this is likely due to meaning rather than being a syntactical pattern.

consistent syntactical patterns that are evident based on prepositional force are that three of four temporal A-PPs precede their predicator (18:1, 6, 20) and only one A-PP indicating location or movement precedes its predicator (18:6). This latter example is within the final clause of three in asyndeton, in a passage of direct discourse, and contrastive within its context.

Qualifier word groups in Acts 18 demonstrate consistent syntax in some regards but lack sufficient examples to determine conclusive patterns in others. Qualifiers modify word groups that follow the governing verb as a marginally codified pattern. Those that precede are typically within subject word groups (18:8, 17, 24), with one other in hyperbaton within a C-PN (18:15). Moreover, all qualifiers within subject word groups either precede an expressed predicator or precede the complement in a nominal clause (18:6). It is codified that all qualifiers will follow their referent.[22] Qualifier word groups in Acts 18 consist of nominal groups as a partially codified pattern, with only two relative clauses (18:7, 27) and one PP (18:24) serving as a qualifier word groups. It is fully codified that nominal qualifiers will follow their referent and codified that they will match their referent in definiteness. The two exceptions are both definite qualifiers modifying an indefinite referent (18:8, 12). Nominal qualifiers in Acts 18 are more likely to include additional elements within the word group than a single noun or pronoun. Five appositional qualifiers include a dative adjunct within the word group when they introduce a name (18:2, 7, 24) or ethnic background (18:2, 24). Those introducing a name both precede (18:2, 7) and follow (18:24) the name itself, while both that include ethnic heritage follow the place of origin (18:2, 24). Seven include definite articles, especially those with an appositional or subjective genitive force, and those with definite articles include no additional modifiers. Only

---

[22] The only counterexample occurs when a relative pronoun serves as a possessive genitive to the subject within its own clause (18:7).

one qualifier includes an adjectival modifier on the head noun, which appears in "repeat" position to an indefinite noun (18:24). Two qualifiers word groups include additional embedded qualifiers on the head noun or pronoun. One includes a genitive of relationship within a qualifier of apposition (18:2) and the other includes both appositional and adjectival qualifiers within a qualifier of association (18:7). Nominal qualifiers tend to be qualifiers of apposition, with subjective genitive and associative genitive qualifiers appearing with less frequency. Only one qualifier has an objective genitive force (18:15). The only potential word order pattern based on qualifier force is that three of four subjective genitive qualifiers include the definite article on the head noun (18:11, 25, 26) and other is a proper name (18:25).[23]

---

[23] On taking Ἰωάννου as a subjective genitive, see Bruce, *Acts*, 359 or Lenski, *Acts*, 772–73.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aageson, James W. "The Pastoral Epistles, Apostolic Authority, and the Development of the Pauline Scriptures." In *The Pauline Canon*, edited by Stanley E. Porter, 5–26. PAST 1. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Anderson, R. Dean, Jr. *Glossary of Greek Rhetorical Terms*. CBET 24. Leuven: Peeters, 2000.

Aune, David E. *The New Testament in Its Literary Environment*. LEC 8. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1989.

Bakker, Egbert J. "Verbal Aspect and Mimetic Description in Thucydides." In *Grammar as Interpretation: Greek Literature in Its Linguistic Contexts*, edited by Egbert J. Bakker, 7–54. MnBibClBatSup 171. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Baldwin, H. Scott. "A Difficult Word: αὐθεντέω in 1 Timothy 2:12." In *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9–15*, edited by Andreas J. Köstenberger, Thomas R. Schreiner, and H. Scott Baldwin, 65–80. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1995.

Banker, John. *A Semantic and Structural Analysis of Titus*. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1987.

Barr, James. *The Semantics of Biblical Language*. London: SCM Press, 1983.

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*. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Berding, Kenneth. "Polycarp of Smyrna's View of the Authorship of 1 and 2 Timothy." *VC* 53 (1999): 349–60.

Blass, F., and A. Debrunner. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Translated and revised by Robert W. Funk. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Blight, Richard C. *An Exegetical Summary of 1 Timothy*. Dallas: SIL International, 2009.

Botha, Pieter J.J. "The Verbal Art of the Pauline Letters: Rhetoric, Performance and Presence." In *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht, 409–28. JSNTSup 90. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993.

Bruce, F.F. *The Book of the Acts*. Rev. ed. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.

———. *The Canon of Scripture*. Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 1988.

———. *Romans: An Introduction and Commentary*. TNTC. Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 1985.

Bruggen, Jakob van. *Die Geschichtliche Einordnung der Pastoralbriefe*. Wuppertal: Brockhaus, 1981.

Burton, Ernest DeWitt. *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek*. Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1978.

Campbell, Barth. "Rhetorical Design in 1 Timothy 4." *BSac* 154.614 (1997): 189–204.

Campbell, Constantine R. *Verbal Aspect and Non-Indicative Verbs: Further Soundings in the Greek New Testament*. SBG 15. New York: Peter Lang, 2008.

———. *Verbal Aspect, the Indicative Mood, and Narrative*: *Soundings in the Greek New Testament*. SBG 13. New York: Peter Lang, 2007.

Campenhausen, Hans von. *Ecclesiatical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries*. Translated by J.A. Baker. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1969.

Caragounis, Chrys C. *The Development of Greek and the New Testament*. WUNT 1/167. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.

Carson, D.A. "An Introduction to the Porter/Fanning Debate." In *Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics: Open Questions in Current Research*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and D.A. Carson, 18–25. JSNTSup 80. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993.

Cirafesi, Wally V. *Verbal Aspect in Synoptic Parallels: On the Method and Meaning of Divergent Tense-Form Usage in the Synoptic Narratives*. LBS 7. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Classen, C. Joachim. "St Paul's Epistles and Ancient Greek and Roman Rhetoric." In *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht, 265–91. JSNTSup 90. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993.

Collins, Raymond F. *1 & 2 Timothy and Titus*. NTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002.

Conybeare, F. C. and St. George Stock. *Grammar of Septuagint Greek*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2010.

Cranfield, C.E.B. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. 2 Vols. ICC. London: T&T Clark, 2006.

Decker, Rodney J. *Temporal Deixis of the Greek Verb in the Gospel of Mark with Reference to Verbal Aspect.* SBG 10. New York: Peter Lang, 2001.

Denniston, J.D. *The Greek Particles*. 2nd ed. Revised by K. J. Dover. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1950; reprinted Indianapolis: Hackett, 1996.

———. *Greek Prose Style*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952.

Devine, Andrew M. and Laurence D. Stephens. *Discontinuous Syntax: Hyperbaton in Greek*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Dibelius, Martin and Hans Conzelmann. *The Pastoral Epistles*. Translated by Philip Buttolph and Adela Yarbro. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972.

Dik, Helma. "Interpreting Adjective Position in Herodotus." In *Grammar as Interpretation: Greek Literature in its Linguistic Contexts*, edited by Egbert J. Bakker, 55–76. MnBibClBatSup 171. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Dover, Kenneth J. *Greek Word Order*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960.

Downs, David J. "Faith(fulness) in Christ Jesus in 2 Timothy 3:15." *JBL* 131 (2012): 143–60.Eisele, Wilfried. "Chronos und Kairos: zum soteriologischen Verhältnis von Zeit und Ewigkeit in den Pastoralbriefen." *EC* 3 (2012): 468–91.

Ellegård, Alvar. *A Statistical Method for Determining Authorship: The* Junius *Letters, 1769–1772*. GothStEng 13. Göteborg: Elanders Boktryckeri Aktiebolag, 1962.

Elliott, J.K. *The Greek Text of the Epistles to Timothy and Titus*. SD 36. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1968.

Engelmann, Michaela. *Unzertrennliche Drillinge? Motivsemantische Untersuchungen zem literarischen Verhältnis der Pastoralbriefe*. BZNW 192. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012.

Fanning, Buist M. "Porter and Fanning on New Testament Greek Verbal Aspect: Retrospect and Prospect." In *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach to Biblical Exegesis*, edited by Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch, 7–12. Bellingham: Lexham, 2016.

———. *Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.

Fantin, Joseph D. *The Greek Imperative Mood in the New Testament: A Cognitive and Communicative Approach*. SNG 12. New York, Peter Lang, 2010.

Ferguson, Everett. "Τόπος in 1 Timothy 2:8." *ResQ* 33.2 (1991): 65–73.

Fewster, Gregory P. "'Can I Have Your Autograph?': On Thinking about Pauline Authorship and Pseuedpigraphy." *BSR* 43.3 (2014): 30–39.

Fiore, Benjamin. *The Function of Personal Example in the Socratic and Pastoral Epistles*. AnBib 105. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1986.

Foulkes, Francis. *The Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians: An Introduction and Commentary*. TNTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.

Frisk, Hjalmar. *Studien zur Griechischen Wortstellung*. GötHögÅrs 39. Göteborg: Elanders Boktryckeri Aktibolag, 1932.

Fuchs, Rüdiger. "Bisher unbeachtet—zum unterschiedlichen Gebrauch von ἀγαθός, καλός und καλῶς in den Schreiben an Timotheus and Titus." *EuroJTh* 15 (2006): 15–33.

Goetchius, Eugene Van Ness. *The Language of the New Testament*. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1965.

Goodwin, William W. *A Greek Grammar*. Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2003.

Gourgues, Michel. "Jesus's Testimony before Pilate in 1 Timothy 6:13." *JBL* 135 (2016): 639–48.

Greenlee, J. Harold. *An Exegetical Summary of Titus and Philemon*. Dallas: SIL International, 1989.

Haarbeck, Th. *Griechische Formenlehre: Samt der Lehre von den Präpositionen zum Neuen Testament*. Basel: Heinrich Maier, 1927.

Halliday, Michael A.K. *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*. 4th ed. Revised by Christian M.I.M. Matthiessen. New York: Routledge, 2014.

Ham, Clay. "The Christ Hymn in 1 Timothy 3:16." *SCJ* 3 (2000): 209–28.

Harding, Mark. "Disputed and Undisputed Letters of Paul." In *The Pauline Canon*, edited by Stanley E. Porter, 129–68. PAST 1. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

———. *Tradition and Rhetoric in the Pastoral Epistles*. StBibLit 3. New York: Peter Lang, 1998.

Harris, Murray J. *Prepositions and Theology in the Greek New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012.

Harrison, Percy N. *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1921.

Hartog, Paul. *Polycarp and the New Testament*. WUNT 2/134. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002.

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

Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.

Heckert, Jacob K. *Discourse Function of Conjoiners in the Pastoral Epistles*. Dallas: SIL International, 1996.

Herzer, J. "'Das Geheimnis der Frömmigkeit' (1 Tim 3, 16): Sprache und Stil der Pastoralbriefe im Kontext hellenistisch-römischer Popularphilosophie – Eine methodische Problemanzeige." *TQ* 187 (2007): 309–29.

Hincks, E. Y. "The Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles." *JBL* 16 (1897): 94–117.

Hoag, Gary G. "Decorum and Deeds in 1 Timothy 2:9-10 in Light of *Ephesiaca* by Xenophon of Ephesus." *ExAud* 27 (2011): 134–60.

Hübner, Jamin. "Revisiting αὐθεντέω in 1 Timothy 2:12: What do the Extant Data Really Show?" *JSPHL* 5 (2015): 41–70.

———. "Revisiting the Clarity of Scripture in 1 Timothy 2:12." *JETS* 59 (2016): 99–117.

Huffman, Douglas, S. *Verbal Aspect Theory and the Prohibitions in the Greek New Testament*. SBG 16. New York; Peter Lang, 2014.

Janssen, Stephen A. "The Greek Article in Pauline Literature: Traditional Grammar and Discourse Perspectives." PhD diss., Dallas Theological Seminary, 2013. ProQuest Database.

Jerome. *St. Jerome's Commentaries on Galatians, Titus, and Philemon*. Translated by Thomas P. Scheck. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2010.

Johnson, Luke Timothy. *The First and Second Letters to Timothy*. AB 35A. New York: Doubleday, 2001.

Judge, Edwin A. "The Early Christians as a Scholastic Community." In *The First Christians in the Roman World*, edited by James R. Harrison, 526–52. WUNT 1/229. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

———. "The Social Identity of the First Christians: A Question of Method in Religious History." In *Social Distinctives of the Christians in the First Century*, edited by David M. Scholer, 117–35. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2008.

Kaestli, Jean–Daniel. "Luke-Acts and the Pastoral Epistles: The Thesis of a Common Authorship." In *Luke's Literary Achievement: Collected Essays*, edited by C. M. Tuckett, 110–26. JSNTSup 116. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995.

Käsemann, Ernst. *Commentary on Romans*. Translated and Edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.

Kenny, Anthony. *A Stylometric Study of the New Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.

Klinker-De Klerck, Myriam. "The Pastoral Epistles: Authentic Pauline Writings." *EuroJTh* 17 (2008): 101–8.

Knight, George W. III. *The Pastoral Epistles: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.

Köstenberger, Andreas J. "A Complex Sentence Structure in 1 Timothy 2:12." In *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9–15*, edited by Andreas J. Köstenberger, Thomas R. Schreiner, and H. Scott Baldwin, 81–103. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995.

———. *Entrusted with the Gospel: Paul's Theology in the Pastoral Epistles*. Nashville: B&H Academic, 2010.

Kroeger, Richard Clark and Catherine Clark Kroeger. *I Suffer Not a Woman: Rethinking 1 Timothy 2:11–15 in Light of Ancient Evidence*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1992.

Kwong, Ivan Shing Chung. *The Word Order of the Gospel of Luke: Its Foregrounded Messages*. LNTS 298. SNTG 12. London: T&T Clark, 2005.

Land, Christopher D. "Varieties of the Greek Language." In *The Language of the New Testament: Context, History, and Development*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and Andrew W. Pitts, 243–60. LBS 6. ECHC 3. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Lappenga, Benjamin J. "'Zealots for Good Works': The Polemical Repercussions of the Word ζηλωτής in Titus 2:14." *CBQ* 75 (2013): 704–18.

Lategan, Bernard C. and Willem S. Vorster. *Text and Reality: Aspects of Reference in Biblical Texts*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.

Lenski, Richard C. H. *The Interpretation of the Acts of the Apostles*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1964.

———. *The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*. Columbus: Wartburg, 1945.

———. *The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians, to the Thessalonians, to Timothy, to Titus and to Philemon*. Columbus: Wartburg, 1946.

———. *The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistles to the Galatians to the Ephesians and to the Philippians*. Columbus: Wartburg, 1946.

Levinsohn, Stephen H. *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek*. 2nd ed. Dallas: SIL International, 2000.

———. "A Discourse Study of Constituent Order and the Article in Philippians." In *Discourse Analysis and Other Topics in Biblical Greek*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and D.A. Carson, 60–74. JSNTSup 113. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

———. "Some Constraints on Discourse Development in the Pastoral Epistles." In *Discourse Analysis and the New Testament: Approaches and Results*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and Jeffrey T. Reed, 316–33. JSNTSup 170. SNTG 4. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999.

Lips, Hermann van. "Die Timotheus- und Titusakten und die Leidensthematik in den Pastoralbriefen: Aspekte zur Entstehungszeint und Intention der Pastoralbriefe." *EC* 2 (2011): 219–41.

Louw, Johannes P., ed. *Lexicography and Translation*. Cape Town: Bible Society of South Africa, 1985.

———, ed. *Meaningful Translation: Its Implications for the Reader*. UBS.MS 5. Reading: United Bible Societies, 1991.

———. *Semantics of New Testament Greek*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1982.

———. "Sociolinguistics and Its Role in Text Analysis." In *Sociolinguistics and Communication*, edited by Johannes P. Louw, 103–15. UBS.MS 1. London: United Bible Societies, 1986.

Louw, Johannes P. and Eugene A. Nida, eds. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*. 2 Vols. New York: United Bible Societies, 1989.

Malherbe, Abraham J. "'In Season and out of Season': 2 Timothy 4:2." *JBL* 103 (1984): 235–43.

Markovic, Daniel. "Hyperbaton in the Greek Literary Sentence." *GRBS* 462 (2006): 127–45.

Marshall, I. Howard. *The Acts of the Apostles: An Introduction and Commentary*. TNTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989.

———. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999.

Marshall, John W. "'I Left You in Crete': Narrative Deception and Social Hierarchy in the Letter to Titus." *JBL* 127 (2008): 781–803.

Martin, Troy W. "Investigating the Pauline Letter Body: Issues, Methods, and Approaches." In *Paul and the Ancient Letter Form*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and Sean A. Adams, 185–212. PAST 6. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Martin–Asensio, Gustavo. *Transitivity-Based Foregrounding in the Acts of Apostles*: *A Functional-Grammatical Approach to the Lukan Perspective*. JSNTSup 202. SNTG 8. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000.

Massey, Preston T. "Cicero, the Pastoral Epistles, and the Issue of Pseudonymity." *ResQ* 56:2 (2014): 65-84.

McKay, K. L. "Time and Aspect in New Testament Greek." *NovT* 34 (1992): 209–28.

Mealand, D. L. "The Extent of the Pauline Corpus: A Multivariate Approach." *JSNT* 59 (1995): 61–92.

———. "Positional Stylometry Reassessed: Testing a Seven Epistle Theory of Pauline Authorship." *NTS* 35 (1989): 266–86.

Merkle, Benjamin L. "The Abused Aspect: Neglecting the Influence of a Verb's Lexical Meaning on Tense-Form Choice." *BBR* 26.1 (2016): 57–74.

Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.

Middendorf, Michael P. *Romans 1–8*. ConcC. St. Louis: Concordia, 2013.

———. *Romans 9–16*. ConcC. St. Louis: Concordia, 2016.

Miller, James D. *The Pastoral Letters as Composite Documents*. SNTSMS 93. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Minor, Eugene E. *An Exegetical Summary of 2 Timothy*. Dallas: SIL International, 1992.

Mitchell, Margaret M. "New Testament Envoys in the Context of Greco-Roman Diplomatic and Epistolary Conventions: The Example of Timothy and Titus." *JBL* 111 (1992): 641–62.

Morris, Leon. *The Epistle to the Romans*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.

Morton, Andrew Queen. "Statistical Analysis and New Testament Problems." In *The Authorship and Integrity of the New Testament*, 40–60. TheoColl 4. London: SPCK, 1965.

Morton, Andrew Queen and James McLeman. *Paul, the Man and the Myth: A Study in the Authorship of Greek Prose*. New York: Harper & Row, 1966.

Moser, Amalia. "Aspect and Aktionsart: A Study on the Nature of Grammatical Categories." In vol. 1 of *Major Trends in Theoretical and Applied Linguistics*, edited by Nikolaos Lavidas, Thomai Alexiou, and Areti-Maria Sougari, 40–60. London: Versita, 2013.

———. "Tense and Aspect after the New Testament." In *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*, edited by Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch, 539–62. Bellingham: Lexham, 2016.

Mott, Stephen Charles. "Greek Ethics and Christian Conversion: The Philonic Background of Titus II 10-14 and III 3-7." *NovT* 20 (1978): 22–48.

Moule, C.F.D. *Essays in New Testament Interpretation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

———. *An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.

Mowery, Robert L. "The Articular Prepositional Attributes in the Pauline Corpus." *Bib* 71 (1990): 85–92.

Nes, Jermo van. "On the Origin of the Pastorals' Authenticity Criticism." *NTS* 62 (2016): 315–20.

———. *Pauline Language and the Pastoral Epistles: A Study of Linguistic Variation in the Corpus Paulinum*. LBS 16. Leiden: Brill, 2018.

———. "The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles: An Important Hypothesis Reconsidered." In *Paul and Pseudigraphy*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and Gregory P. Fewster, 153–69. PAST 8. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Neste, Ray Van. *Cohesion and Structure in the Pastoral Epistles*. JSNTSup 280. London: T&T Clark, 2004.

Neumann, Kenneth J. *The Authenticity of the Pauline Letters in the Light of Stylostatistical Analysis*. SBLDS 120. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.

Nida, Eugene A. "Sociolinguistics and Translating." In *Sociolinguistics and Communication*, edited by Johannes P. Louw, 1–49. UBS.MS 1. London: United Bible Societies, 1986.

Nida, Eugene A. and Johannes P. Louw. *Lexical Semantics of the Greek New Testament*. SBLRBS 25. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.

Nylund, Jan H. "The Prague School of Linguistics and Its Influence on New Testament Language Studies." In *The Language of the New Testament: Context History and Development*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and Andrew W. Pitts, 155–221. LBS 6. ECHC 3. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

O'Donnell, Matthew Brook. *Corpus Linguistics and the Greek of the New Testament*. NTMon 6. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2005.

———. "Designing and Compiling a Register-Balanced Corpus of Hellenistic Greek for the Purpose of Linguistic Description and Investigation." In *Diglossa and Other Topics in New Testament Linguistics*, edited by Stanley E. Porter, 255–97. JSNTSup 193. SNTG 6. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000.

———. "Linguistic Fingerprints or Style by Numbers?" In *Linguistics in the New Testament: Critical Junctures*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and D.A. Carson, 206–62. JSNTSup 168. SNTG 5. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999.

Oberlinner, Lorenz. "Gemeindeordnung und Rechte Lehre: Zur Fortschreibung der Paulinischen Ekklesiologie in den Pastoralbriefen." *TQ* 187 (2007): 295–308.

———. "'Paulus' versus Paulus? Zum Problem des 'Paulinismus' der Pastoralbriefe." In *Pneuma und Gemeinde: Christsein in der Tradition des Paulus und Johannes*, edited by Jost Eckert, Martin Schmidl, and Hanneliese Steichele, 170–99. Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 2001.

Padgett, Alan. "The Pauline Rationale for Submission: Biblical Feminism and the *hina* Clauses of Titus 2:1–10." *EvQ* 59 (1987): 39–52.

Payne, Philip B. "1 Tim 2.12 and the Use of οὐδέ to Combine Two Elements to Express a Single Idea." *NTS* 54 (2008): 235–53.

Perkins, Larry J. *The Pastoral Letters: A Handbook on the Greek Text*. BHGNT. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2017.

Picirilli, Robert E. "Order and Relative Time in the Participles of the Greek New Testament." *JETS* 57 (2014): 99–110.

———. "Time and Order in the Circumstantial Participles of Mark and Luke." *BBR* 17 (2007): 241–59.

Pieterson, Lloyd K. *The Polemic of the Pastorals: A Sociological Examination of the Development of Pauline Christianity*. JSNTSup 264. London T&T Clark, 2004.

Pitts, Andrew W. "Greek Word Order and Clause Structure: A Comparative Study of Some New Testament Corpora." In *The Language of the New Testament: Context, History, and Development*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and Andrew W. Pitts, 311–46. LBS 6. ECHC 3. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

———. "Style and Pseudonymity in Pauline Scholarship: A Register Based Configuration." In *Paul and Pseudigraphy*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and Gregory P. Fewster, 113–52. PAST 8. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Porter, Stanley E. "Ancient Literate Culture and Popular Rhetorical Knowledge: Implications for Studying Pauline Rhetoric." In *Paul and Ancient Rhetoric*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and Bryan R. Dyer, 96–115. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.

———. "Dialect and Register in the Greek of the New Testament: Theory." In *Rethinking Contexts, Rereading Texts: Contributions from the Social Sciences to Biblical Interpretation*, edited by M. Daniel Carroll R, 190–208. JSOTSup 299. Sheffield, Sheffield Academic, 2000.

———. "Discourse Analysis and New Testament Studies: An Introductory Survey." In *Discourse Analysis and Other Topics in Biblical Greek*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and D.A. Carson, 14–35. JSNTSup 113. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995.

———. "A Functional Letter Perspective: Towards and Grammar of Epistolary Form." In *Paul and the Ancient Letter Form*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and Sean A. Adams, 9–31. PAST 6. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

———. "How Can Biblical Discourse Be Analyzed?: A Response to Several Attempts." In *Discourse Analysis and Other Topics in Biblical Greek*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and D.A. Carson, 107–16. JSNTSup 113. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995.

———. *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*. 2d ed. BL:G 2. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999.

———. "In Defence of Verbal Aspect." In *Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics: Open Questions in Current Research*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and D.A. Carson, 26–45. JSNTSup 80. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.

———. *Linguistic Analysis of the Greek New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015.

———. "Luke: Companion or Disciple of Paul?" In *Paul and the Gospels*, edited by Michael F. Bird and Joel Willitts, 146–68. LNTS 411. London: T&T Clark, 2011.

———. "Pauline Chronology and the Question of Pseudonymity of the Pastoral Epistles." In *Paul and Pseudigraphy*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and Gregory P. Fewster, 65–88. PAST 8. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

———. "Studying Ancient Languages from a Modern Linguistics Perspective: Essential Terms and Terminology." *FN* 2 (1989): 147–72.

———. "Time and Order in Participles in Mark and Luke: A Response to Robert Picirilli." *BBR* 17 (2007): 261–67.

———. *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament, with Reference to Tense and Mood*. SBG 1. New York: Peter Lang, 2010.

———. "What More Shall I Say? A Response to Steve Runge and Benjamin Merkle." *BBR* 26 (2016): 75–79.

———. "Word Order and Clause Structure in New Testament Greek: An Unexplored Area of Greek Linguistics Using Philippians as a Test Case." *FN* 12 (1993): 177–206.

Porter, Stanley E. and Matthew Brook O'Donnell. "The Greek Verbal Network Viewed from a Probabilistic Standpoint: An Exercise in Hallidayan Linguistics." *FN* 14 (2001): 3–41.

———, eds. *The Linguist as Pedagogue*. NTMon 11. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2009.

Powell, Mark Allan. *Introducing the New Testament: A Historical, Literary, and Theological Survey*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2009.

Poythress, Vern Sheridan. "The Meaning of μάλιστα in 2 Timothy 4:13 and Related Verses." *JTS* 53 (2002), 523–32.

Prothro, James B. "The Strange Case of Δικαιόω in the Septuagint and Paul: The Oddity and Origins of Paul's Talk of 'Justification.'" *ZNW* 107 (2016): 48–69.

Ramelli, Ilaria L.E. "The Pastoral Epistles and Hellenistic Philosophy: 1 Timothy 5:1-2, Hierocles, and the 'Contraction of Circles.'" *CBQ* 73 (2011): 562–81.

Reed, Jeffrey T. "Cohesive Ties in 1 Timothy: In Defense of the Epistle's Unity." *Neot* 26 (1992): 131–47.

———. "The Cohesiveness of Discourse: Towards a Model of Linguistic Criteria for Analyzing New Testament Discourse." In *Discourse Analysis and the New Testament: Approaches and Results*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and Jeffrey T. Reed, 28–46. JSNTSup 170. SNTG 4. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999.

———. "Identifying Theme in the New Testament: Insights from Discourse Analysis." In *Discourse Analysis and Other Topics in Biblical Greek*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and D.A. Carson, 75–101. JSNTSup 113. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995.

———. "To Timothy or Not? A Discourse Analysis of 1 Timothy." In *Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics: Open Questions in Current Research*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and D.A. Carson, 90–118. JSNTSup 80. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993.

Richards, William A. *Difference and Distance in Post-Pauline Christianity: An Epistolary Analysis of the Pastorals*. StBibLit 44. New York: Lang, 2002.

Robertson, A.T. *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*. Nashville: Broadman, 1993; repr. 2010.

Roller, Otto. *Das Formular der Paulinischen Briefe: Ein Beitrag zur Lehre vom Antiken Briefe*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1933.

Runge, Steven R. "Contrastive Substitution and the Greek Verb: Reassessing Porter's Argument." *NovT* 56 (2014): 154–73.

———. "Interpreting Constituent Order in Koine Greek." In *Linguistics and New Testament Greek: Key Issues in the Current Debate*, edited by David Alan Black and Benjamin L. Merkle, 125–45. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2020.

———. "Markedness: Contrasting Porter's Model with the Linguists Cited as Support." *BBR* 26 (2016): 43–56.

Sanday, William and Arthur Headlam. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. 5th. ed. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1960.

Schmidt, Daryl D. "The Study of Hellenistic Greek Grammar in the Light of Contemporary Linguistics." *PerRelSt* 11:4 (1984): 27–38.

———. "Verbal Aspect in Greek: Two Approaches." In *Biblical Greek Languages and Linguistics: Open Questions in Current Research*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and D.A. Carson, 63–73. JSNTSup 80. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993.

Silva, Moisés. *Biblical Words and Their Meaning*. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994.

———. *God Language and Scripture: Reading the Bible in the Light of General Linguistics*. FCInt 4. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1990.

———. "A Response to Fanning and Porter on Verbal Aspect." In *Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics: Open Questions in Current Research*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and D.A. Carson, 74–82. JSNTSup 80. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993.

Slings, S. R. "Figures of Speech and Their Lookalikes: Two Further Exercises in the Pragmatics of the Greek Sentence." In *Grammar as Interpretation: Greek Literature in its Linguistic Contexts*, edited by Egbert J. Bakker, 169–214. MnBibClBatSup 171. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Smith, Claire S. *Pauline Communities as 'Scholastic Communities': A Study of the Vocabulary of 'Teaching' in 1 Corinthians, 1 and 2 Timothy and Titus*. WUNT 2/335. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.

Smyth, Herbert Smyth. *Greek Grammar*. Revised by Gordon M. Messing. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956; reprinted Mansfield Centre: Martino, 2013.

Spencer, Aida Besançon. *Paul's Literary Style: A Stylistic and Historical Comparison of II Corinthians 11:16-12:13, Romans 8:9-39, and Philippians 3:2-4:13*. Lanham: University Press of America, 2008.

Stiefel, Jennifer H. "Women Deacons in 1 Timothy: A Linguistic and Literary Look at 'Women Likewise…' (1 Tim 3.11)." *NTS* 41 (1995): 442–57.

Strobel, August. "Schreiben des Lukas? Zum Sprachlichen Problem der Pastoralbriefe." *NTS* 15 (1969): 191–210.

Theobald, Michael. "Von den Presbytern zum Episkopos (Tit 1,5-9): vom Umgang mit Spannungen und Widersprüchen im Corpus Pastorale." *ZNW* 104 (2013): 209–37.

Thomson, Christopher J. "What Is Aspect?: Contrasting Definitions in General Linguistics and New Testament Studies." In *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*, edited by Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch, 13–80. Bellingham: Lexham, 2016.

Thornton, Dillon T. "'Saying What They Should Not Say': Reassessing the Gravity of the Problem of the Younger Widows (1 Tim 5:11–15)." *JETS* 59:1 (2016): 119–29.

Towner, Philip H. *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.

Tsuji, M. "Persönliche Korrespondenz des Paulus: Zur Strategie der Pastoralbriefe als Pseudepigrapha." *NTS* 56 (2010), 253–72.

Valleskey, David J. "The Pastor Must Be 'Above Reproach': An Examination of ἀνεπίλημπτος (1 Timothy 3:2) and ἀνέγκλητος (Titus 1:6) with Application to the Public Ministry of the Gospel." *WisLQ* 96 (1999): 194–207.

Voelz, James W. *Fundamental Greek Grammar*. 4th. Revised ed. St. Louis: Concordia, 2019.

———. "The Language of the New Testament." *ANRW* 25.2:893–977. Part 2, *Principat* 25.2. Edited by H. Temporini and W. Haase. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1984.

———. *Mark 1:1–8:26*. ConcC. St. Louis: Concordia, 2013.

———. *Mark 8:27-16:8.* Bound with Christopher R. Mitchell, *Mark 16:9-20*. ConcC. St. Louis: Concordia, 2019.

———. "Present and Aorist Verbal Aspect: A New Proposal." *Neot* 27 (1993): 153–64.

———. "Standard/Classical Greek Constructions in the Gospel according to Mark and Their Importance for Interpretation." *NT* 62 (2020): 343–60.

———. *What Does This Mean?* 2nd ed. St. Louis: Concordia, 2003.

Vorster, Willem S. "Reader-Response, Redescription, and Reference: 'You Are the Man' [2 Sam 12:7]." In *Text and Reality: Aspects of Reference in Biblical Texts*, edited by Bernard C. Lategan and Willem S. Vorster, 95–112. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.

Walker, Peter. "Revisiting the Pastoral Epistles–Part I." *EuroJTh* 21 (2012): 4–16.

———. "Revisiting the Pastoral Epistles–Part II." *EuroJTh* 21 (2012): 120–32.

Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.

Walser, Georg. *The Greek of the Ancient Synagogue: An Investigation on the Greek of the Septuagint, Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament*. StGLLund 8. Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell International, 2001.

Wall, Robert W. "The Function of the Pastoral Letters within the Pauline Canon of the New Testament: A Canonical Approach." In *The Pauline Canon*, edited by Stanley E. Porter, 27–44. PAST 1. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Waltke, Bruce K and M. O'Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990.

Weima, Jeffrey A. D. "Sincerely, Paul: The Significance of the Pauline Letter Closings." In *Paul and the Ancient Letter Form*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and Sean A. Adams, 307–45. PAST 6. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Wendland, Ernst R. "'Let No One Disregard You!' (Titus 2.15): Church Discipline and the Construction of Discourse in a Personal, 'Pastoral' Epistle." In *Discourse Analysis and the New Testament: Approaches and Results*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and Jeffrey T. Reed, 334–51. JSNTSup 170. SNTG 4. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999.

Westfall, Cynthia Long. "A Moral Dilemma? The Epistolary Body of 2 Timothy." In *Paul and the Ancient Letter Form*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and Sean A. Adams, 213–52. PAST 6. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Wilson, Stephen G. *Luke and the Pastoral Epistles*. London: SPCK, 1979.

Winger, Thomas M. *Ephesians*. ConcC. St. Louis: Concordia, 2015.

Witherington, Ben III. *New Testament Rhetoric*. Eugene: Cascade Books, 2009.

———. *A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on Titus, 1–2 Timothy and 1–3 John*. Vol. 1 of *Letters and Homilies for Hellenized Christians*. Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2006.

Zamfir, Korinna and Joseph Verheydan. "Text-Critical and Intertextual Remarks on 1 Tim 2:8–10." *NovT* 50 (2008): 376–406.

Zerwick, Maximilian. *Biblical Greek Illustrated by Examples*. Translated by Joseph Smith. Rome: Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici, 1963.

VITA

James William Fickenscher

July 9, 1986

Enid, Oklahoma, USA

Collegiate Institutions Attended

The University of Texas at Dallas, Richardson, Texas, Bachelor of Science in Mathematical Sciences, 2008.

Graduate Institutions Attended

Concordia Seminary, Saint Louis, Missouri, Master of Divinity, 2012.

Concordia Seminary, Saint Louis, Missouri, Doctor of Biblical Studies, 2022.

Previous Theses and Publications

Fickenscher, James. Review of the book *Verbal Periphrasis in Ancient Greek: Have- and Be Constructions* by Klass Bentein. RSR 43 (2017): 278.

Fickenscher, James. Review of the book *The Biblical Greek Companion for Bible Software Users: Grammatical Terms Explained for Exegesis* by Mark L. Strauss. RSR 44 (2018): 468.

Fickenscher, James. Review of the book *Philippians and Philemon* by James W. Thompson and Bruce W. Longenecker. RSR 44 (2018): 477.

Current Memberships in Academic Societies

Society of Biblical Literature

Evangelical Theological Society