TWO CONSTRAINTS ON SUBORDINATION IN NEW TESTAMENT GREEK

Bruce E. Hollenbach

[Bruce Hollenbach has a B.A. in Anthropology from Wheaton College. He joined SIL in 1966. He and his wife, Barbara, have done linguistics and translation among the Trique Indians of Copala, Oaxaca, Mexico, since that time. Bruce has served as translation consultant for the past fourteen years. At the present time, he is the translation coordinator for the Mexico Branch of SIL and an International Translation Consultant.]

In this paper I would like to demonstrate that some of the apparent ambiguities in the New Testament text can be resolved by the application of two hitherto unpublished generalizations or "laws" respecting New Testament Greek.[1] I call these generalizations the ordering constraint and the subordination constraint.

The Ordering Constraint

As an example of an ambiguity which can be resolved by the ordering constraint, I submit Eph. 2:4-5, part of which reads:[2]

ho de theos (finite)

    plousios ōn en eleei, (participial)

        dia tēn pollēn agapēn autou (nominal)

           hēn ēgapēsen hēmas,

    kai ontas hēmas nekrous

        tois paraptōmasin

sunezōopoiēsen

    tō Christō

The ambiguity resides in the relation of dia tēn pollēn agapēn autou... to its context: does it relate to the main clause ho de theos...sunezōopoiēsen, explaining why God made us alive, or does it relate to the participial clause plousios ōn en eleei, explaining why God is rich in mercy? H. A. W. Meyer[3] and R. C. H. Lenski[4] take the former interpretation,[5] which appears also among translations in RSV, J. B. Phillips, NEB, NIV, Berkeley, K. Taylor, E. J. Goodspeed, J. Moffatt, W. F. Beck, NASB, TEV, 20th Century, C. K. Williams, and R. F. Weymouth. The latter interpretation is taken by T. K. Abbott,[6] M. Barth,[7] and F. Foulkes,[8] and among translations appears only in C. B. Williams and the Jerusalem Bible, the AV being ambiguous. Either interpretation makes perfectly good sense, but as a matter of fact, the latter interpretation is almost unquestionably the only correct one. How can we know this?

The phrase dia tēn pollēn agapēn autou... is a nominal construction,
comprising a preposition plus a noun with various modifiers attached to it. If
it had been intended to relate directly to the main clause, as the participial
construction plousios ōn en eleei does, it would have had to precede that
construction in the sentence, since it is a less specific construction than the
participial construction.

The above is a specific application of the ordering constraint, which
states that if two or more constructions are subordinate to the same
construction, they are typically ordered from least specific to most specific.
In this example the application would be: if a nominal construction and a
participial construction are both subordinated to the same main clause, the
nominal construction, being a less specific construction, should precede the
participial construction. Since it does not in fact precede the participial
construction, we may deduce that it does not relate directly to the main clause;
therefore, it must relate to something else, i.e. to the participial
construction.

The ordering constraint does not relate only to nominal and participial
constructions, it also includes infinitival and finite constructions in its
scope. These constitute the four ways in which a clausal idea[9] can be expressed
in New Testament Greek, which is to say that, besides main and subordinate
clauses, New Testament Greek has three other clause-like constructions in which
information which is typically expressed as a clause can alternatively be
expressed in a less specific way. These four construction types can be placed
in the following order, moving from most specific to least specific: finite
constructions (main and subordinate clauses with finite verbs), participial
constructions, infinitival constructions, and nominal constructions (including
prepositional phrases). I call this order the cline of specificity.[10]

This cline of specificity expresses the relative importance to a sentence
or paragraph of its various constituent clausal ideas: an idea more pertinent
to the sentence or paragraph as a whole will be expressed more specifically and
completely, i.e. as a finite construction; a less pertinent idea will tend to be
expressed less specifically as a participial, infinitival, or nominal
construction, depending upon just how peripheral it may be. For example, the
second and third times that Jesus prophesies the resurrection of the Son of Man
in Mark, he refers to that resurrection very explicitly: meta treis hēmeras
anastēsetai (Mark 9:31; 10:34). The use of the finite verb communicates not
only the basic idea of resurrection but also all of the information of its
inflections, namely: third person singular subject, future (one of six choices
here), middle, indicative. Not only that, but the use of this specific form
shows us that this event is central to the narration here: it is what Jesus is
talking about. In Mark 9:9 there is a pointed reference to the resurrection in
a subordinate clause: hotan ho huios tou anthrōpou ek nekrōn anastē. Since it
is subordinate, we know it is not the main thing being discussed. Nevertheless,
it is still quite in focus and a fairly new idea. (Note how the disciples pick
it up in the next verse.) For this reason, it also has been expressed as a
finite construction.

The idea of resurrection can be expressed with slightly less specific
inflectional information in the participial construction, as in Mark 16:9,
Anastas de prōi prōtē sabbatōn, which form does not so much declare the
resurrection of Jesus Christ as presuppose that we understand it to have

occurred. Instead of person of the subject, the form expresses his gender; number is also expressed. The tense is aorist, one of only four choices with participles. Voice is indicated, but no information is included regarding mood; presumably the mood of an adverbial participle can be interpreted as the same as that of the verb to which it is subordinated. Notice also that whereas the relationship of a finite construction to its context can be expressed through conjunctions, participial constructions cannot occur with conjunctions (except rarely kaiper), and their relationship to their context must be left implicit.[11]

Less specific yet is the expression of the idea of resurrection in the form of an infinitive, as in Acts 10:41, meta to anastēnai auton ek nekrōn. The infinitive form is not marked for person, gender, or number, but it is, like the participial form, marked for tense and voice. It occasionally occurs, like nouns, with the definite articles declined for case and number and sometimes, as in this example, with a preposition. The infinitive construction is appropriate to this context because the resurrection has been declared very explicitly in the previous verse and serves in this verse only to define the time during which the apostles, as Peter declares, ate and drank with Jesus. The infinitive construction frequently occurs as subject of another verb, as in Mark 8:31, where anastēnai is subject of dei, and in Luke 24:46, where it is subject of gegraptai. This is a function which is more characteristic of nouns than of verbs and tends again to move the information expressed to the periphery of the discourse. (Participles can also function in this way, but cannot in this function represent a state of action per se but only the subject of the appropriate state or action, e.g. Rom. 15:12, where ho anistamenos represents not the event of resurrection but the subject of that event.)

The least specific expression of the idea of resurrection is a nominal construction based upon an abstract noun derived from the verb root, as in Phil. 3:10, tou gnōnai auton kai tēn dunamin tēs anastaseōs autou. Nominal constructions can include prepositions and the definite article and are declined. They are always related as subject, object, etc., to a verb, or, more vaguely yet, to another abstract noun, as in the example. The idea of Christ's resurrection is peripheral to this discussion: the topic is Paul's aspirations as a convert from legalistic Judaism to Christianity, and he brings in reference to Christ's resurrection in such a vague fashion as to assume that we must know what he is talking about without any specific elaboration. Another type of nominal construction represents an event by referring only to some person or thing involved in that event: for instance, dia tou staurou in Eph. 2:16 refers to the event of Jesus' death by naming only the instrument with which he was killed. Such an indirect reference is meaningful only to someone who is thoroughly acquainted with the event. With reference to the whole cline of specificity, it should also be noted that the more specific constructions tend to include mention of more of those persons and things which participate in the action or state being expressed (e.g. subject of the verb, object of the verb, etc.) than the less specific constructions do.

An example of how the ordering constraint operates with respect to the cline of specificity is Eph. 1:4-5a, which reads:

kathōs exelexato hēmas (finite)

    en autō (nominal)

    pro katabolēs kosmou, (nominal)

    einai hēmas hagious kai amōmous (infinitival)

        katenōpion autou

        en agapē

    proorisas hēmas (participial)

        eis huiothesian

        dia Iēsou Christou

        eis auton,

Focusing on the labeled constructions, we have here a finite construction with
two nominal constructions, an infinitival construction, and a participial
construction subordinated to it. Their order conforms to the ordering
constraint. See also John 1:7; Acts 7:5; Rom. 1:28-29; 1 Cor. 4:6; 12:24-25;
Col. 1:9-12, 28; Jas. 1:18. (I have not succeeded in finding an example which
includes all four constructions subordinated to the same construction.)

    I have found four apparent exceptions to the ordering constraint, three of
which will be discussed here and one later. All are instances where other
stylistic considerations have taken precedence over the ordering constraint.[12]
The first is Eph. 5:8b-10:

    hōs tekna phōtos peripateite (finite)

        —ho gar karpos tou phōtos en pasē agathōsunē

        kai dikaiosunē kai alētheia—(finite)

        dokimazontes ti estin euareston tō kuriō (participial)

The subordinate finite clause, with understood finite verb estin, seems out of
place with the rest of the material. (This reaction was apparently shared by
the editors of this edition of the text:[13] they set it off in dashes to
indicate that it is parenthetical with reference to the context.) This
strangeness can be explained by the fact that the order of the subordinate
finite and participial clauses is in violation of the ordering constraint:
since they are both subordinate to the same finite clause, the participial
clause would have been expected to precede the subordinate finite clause. Note
that if we reverse the finite and participial clauses to conform to the ordering
constraint, the apparent strangeness disappears, but the parenthetical effect is
also lost. This parenthetical effect tends to set apart and highlight the
statement regarding the "fruit of the light", and this is at least a possible
reason why the ordering constraint was violated here.

Another apparent violation of the ordering constraint occurs in 2 Cor. 10:11b:

hoti hioio esmen (finite)

    tō logō (nominal)

      di epistolōn

    apontes, (participial)

  toioutoi kai [esometha]

    parontes (participial)

    tō ergō (nominal)

The problem here is that in the last two constructions, both subordinate to the finite clause, the participial construction precedes the nominal, whereas the ordering constraint would have indicated the reverse order. It is clear from the whole example, however, that the ordering constraint has been overridden by a chiasmus (tō logō apontes—parontes tō ergō) which balances the two halves and places the focal tō ergō in final position.

A third apparent violation of the ordering constraint occurs in Matt. 5:11:

makarioi este

    hotan oneidisōin humas

    kai diōxōsin

    kai eipōsin pan ponēron kath humōn (finite)

      pseudomenoi (participial)

      heneken emou (nominal)

According to the ordering constraint, we should have expected the last two constructions to occur in reverse order to that in which they in fact occur. That they occur in this distinctive order seems to focus attention at least upon the nominal construction if not upon the participial construction, which takes on something of a parenthetical flavor, as well. When they are reversed to conform to the ordering constraint, the statement becomes less interesting.

If the ordering constraint should seem sufficiently supported by the examples cited and not greatly weakened by the apparent exceptions noted here or elsewhere in the future, it can safely be applied to passages like Eph. 2:4-5 to yield conclusions such as that suggested above.

The Subordination Constraint

The ordering constraint expresses certain limitations on the order in which two or more clause-like constructions can occur when they are all subordinate to the same clause-like structure. The subordination constraint expresses certain

limitations with respect to the question of which clause-like constructions can
be subordinated to which others in New Testament Greek. An instance in which
the subordination constraint serves to resolve an otherwise bewildering
ambiguity is Eph. 3:16-18:

    hina dō humin (finite)

        kata to ploutos tēs doxēs autou (nominal)

          dunamei[14]

        krataiōthēnai dia tou pneumatos autou eis ton

        esō anthrōpon, (infinitival)

        katoikēsai ton Christon dia tēs pisteōs en tais

        kardiais humōn, (infinitival)

          en agapē errizōmenoi kai tethemeliōmenoi (participial)

        hina exischusēte (finite)

        katalabesthai...

The ambiguity in question is the relation of hina exischusēte to the preceding
context: presuming it to be a purpose clause, is it the purpose of en agapē
errizōmenoi kai tethemeliōmenoi, as indicated implicitly by F. Foulkes[15] and H.
C. G. Moule[16] and as translated by Berkeley, E. J. Goodspeed, J. Moffatt, W. F.
Beck, and C. B. Williams? Or is it the purpose of both the krataiōthēnai and
katoikēsai constructions, as stated by W. Hendriksen?[17] Or is it the purpose of
the katoikēsai construction alone, as indicated by R. C. H. Lenski[18] and
translated by AV, R. F. Weymouth, and the Jerusalem Bible? Or is it the purpose
of the krataiōthēnai, katoikēsai, errizōmenoi, and tethemeliōmenoi constructions
together, as indicated by J. Eadie?[19] Or is it the purpose of hina dō humin, as
found in no translation or commentary, to my knowledge?[20] Actually, one can
safely assert that the last interpretation is the only correct one, by reason of
the subordination constraint, which states that no construction can be
subordinated to one less specific than itself, thus in this passage excluding
the possibility that hina exischusēte, a finite and maximally explicit
construction, could be subordinated to any of the participial or infinitival
constructions.

It is necessary, however, to redefine the cline of specificity when
applying the subordination constraint, in that infinitival and participial
constructions must be combined and treated as one unit of the cline, thus
yielding a total of only three construction types: the nominal construction,
the infinitival/participial construction, and the finite construction.[21]

All of the illustrations given so far in this article serve also as
illustrations of this second constraint. Two more passages with considerable
subordination are offered here as examples. First consider Eph. 1:11-12:

en hō kai eklērōthēmen (finite)

    prooristhentes (participial)

        kata prothesin tou ta panta energountos kata tēn

        boulēn tou thelēmatos autou, (nominal)

        eis to einai hēmas (infinitival)

          eis epainon doxēs autou (nominal)

        tous proēlpikotas en tō Christō

We have here the following subordinations: participial to finite, infinitival
to participial, nominal to participial, and nominal to infinitival. Then, in
Col. 1:21-23a, we have the following subordinations: finite to finite,
participial to finite (four instances), infinitival to finite, nominal to
participial, nominal to finite, and nominal to nominal:

Kai humas (finite)

    pote ontas apēllotriōmenous kai echthrous tē

    dianoia (participial)

        en tois ergois tois ponērois, (nominal)

nuni de apokatēllaxen

    en tō sōmati tēs sarkos autou (nominal)

        dia tou thanatou, (nominal)[22]

    parastēsai humas hagious kai amōmous kai

    anegklētous katenōpion autou, (infinitival)

    ei ge epimenete tē pistei (finite)

        tethemeliōmenoi (participial)

        kai hedraioi (participial)[23]

        kai mē metakinoumenoi apo tēs elpidos tou

        euaggeliou (participial)

See also Matt. 5:28; Acts 2:38, 42; 7:2, 5; 10:36-37; 26:17-18; Rom. 1:5; 2 Cor.
8:3-4; Gal. 2:20; Phil. 1:20; 2:2-4, 17; Col. 2:8, 11, 13, 14-15, 23; 1 Thess.
2:9; 3:11-13; 1 Tim. 1:16; Phlm. 15-16; Heb. 4:12; Jas. 1:4; 1 Peter 1:5. Col.
1:19-20 contains a clear example of a participial construction subordinated to
an infinitival construction.

These passages should be sufficient to establish the general validity of
the subordination constraint and of the exegesis of Eph. 3:16-18 suggested
above. There exist, however, clear instances in which the subordination
constraint, like the ordering constraint, is violated. All I have noted to date
involve finite clauses subordinated to less specific constructions. In all
cases but one, however, the finite clause is introduced by a subordinating
conjunction which marks a semantic relation that to my knowledge could not have
been expressed in the context without violating the constraint. 1 Cor. 10:6,
for example, has a finite construction with kathōs subordinated to an
infinitival construction:

   tauta de tupoi hēmōn egenēthēsan,

      eis to mē einai hēmas epithumētas kakōn, (infinitival)

         kathōs kakeinoi epethumēsan. (finite)

Apparently the subordination constraint is violated here because kathōs is the
only available expression of the subordinating relation of comparison and
because kathōs occurs in the New Testament only with finite constructions.[24] A
similar explanation can be proposed for the conjunction hopōs, as in Gal. 1:4:

   tou dontos heauton huper tōn hamartiōn hēmōn (participial)

      hopōs exelētai hēmas... (finite)

Given the author's intention to state that "to rescue us" is the purpose of the
giving of himself expressed in the participial clause, he had little choice but
to use either hopōs or hina with a finite clause. He might have expressed the
relation of purpose by using eis followed by the abstract noun exairesis, but so
far as we know, exairesis simply was not used in theological contexts.
(Likewise, the noun form "rescue," in contrast with the verb form, seems to be
contrary to modern English usage in theological contexts.) A participial form
of exaireō could have been used to express purpose, but such a use of the
participle must be recognized to be rare. A more likely candidate for
expressing purpose here is the infinitival form exelesthai, but, unfortunately,
neither of the two ways in which an infinitive is used with didōmi in the New
Testament would be appropriate here: One way is that the infinitive is itself
the direct object of an active form, or the subject of a passive form, of
didōmi, which then should be translated "cause" or "grant". (See Matt. 13:11;
Luke 1:74; 8:10; John 5:26; Acts 2:4, 27; 4:29; 13:35; 14:3; Rom. 15:5; Eph.
3:16; 2 Tim. 1:18; Rev. 2:7; 3:21; 6:4; 7:2; 13:7, 14, 15; 16:8; 17:17.) The
other way is that in which didōmi is translated "give" and shares a direct
object with the infinitive, which can be either phagein or piein (Matt. 14:16;
25:35, 42; 27:34; Mark 5:43; 6:37 (bis); Luke 8:55; 9:13; John 4:7, 10; 6:31,
52; Rev. 16:6) or paratithēmi (Luke 9:16). This use is indeed an expression of
purpose, but since the direct objects of didōmi and the infinitive would be
distinct in Gal. 1:4, this use could not have been employed in it. Otherwise,
the infinitive of purpose occurs only after verbs of motion and after apostellō
(which includes a component of motion),[25] and so cannot occur after didōmi.
None of this proves absolutely that a construction with a nonfinite form of
exaireō appropriate to express purpose could not have been created, if
necessary, for use in this context. It demonstrates merely that such a
construction would have been unusual. The natural tendency of language users to

prefer the more familiar patterns of their language even over patterns which might seem more logical or consistent may be a sufficient explanation for this violation of the subordination constraint through the use of hopōs with a finite verb.[26]

One final example of an exception, 1 Peter 5:6, 7, is particularly interesting, since it involves violations of both the ordering constraint and the subordination constraint in one sentence:

Tapeinōthēte oun hupo tēn krataian cheira tou theou,

    hina humas hupsōsē en kairō, (finite)

      pasan tēn merimnan humōn epiripsantes ep auton, (participial)

        hoti autō melei peri humōn. (finite)

The ordering constraint is violated by the ordering of the second and third constructions with respect to each other. Both are subordinate to the first construction, and, according to the ordering constraint, we should have expected the third (participial) construction to have preceded the second (finite) construction. The subordination constraint is violated by the subordination of the last (finite) construction to the third (participial) construction.

To investigate this phenomenon, we observe that if the third construction had been finite instead of participial, no violation would have occurred. Instead we would have had something like the following structure:

Tapeinōthēte oun hupo tēn krataian cheira tou theou,

    hina humas hupsōsē en kairō, (finite)

  kai epiripsate pasan tēn merimnan humōn ep auton, (finite)

    hoti autō melei peri humōn. (finite)

All of the constructions are now finite, and there are no violations. Another difference is that the third construction is now coordinate and parallel to the first instead of subordinate to it, which reflects the understanding generally derived from this passage that it enjoins us to do two things, not one. In other words, we generally interpret the participial construction in the text as if it were an imperative, and the above modification simply reflects this interpretation. This is then a peculiar function of the participial construction. We do not know why the participial construction was used instead of the finite construction, unless it be to represent a close relationship between the humbling and the casting of the care, but we can see that at least it functions equivalently to a finite construction, and this may make the violations easier to understand.

Recognizing that the subordination constraint is limited in some contexts, I would like to further illustrate its application to exegesis. For example, consider Phil. 1:9, 10:

kai touto proseuchomai,

    hina he agapē humōn eti mallon kai mallon perisseuē   (finite)

        en epignōsei kai pasē aisthēsei,   (nominal)

        eis to dokimazein humas ta diapheronta,   (infinitival)

        hina ēte eilikrineis kai aproskopoi   (finite)

            eis hēmeran Christou,

The element to be examined here is the last finite clause hina ēte...:

1. Is it parallel to the first hina clause, expressing with that clause the content of proseuchomai;

2. Is it subordinate to the first hina clause, expressing the purpose for which the love of the Philippians should abound more and more;

3. Is it subordinate to the coordinate nominal construction en epignōsei kai pasē aisthēsei, indicating the purpose for which they should have knowledge and insight; or

4. Is it subordinate to the immediately preceding infinitival construction, expressing the purpose for which they should discern the best things?

The first interpretation is found in the J. B. Phillips, R. Knox, and 20th Century translations; the second is offered by W. Hendriksen[27] and F. B. Meyer, [28] among commentators, and is found among translations in RSV, NIV, E. J. Goodspeed, W. F. Beck, TEV, C. B. Williams, K. Taylor, and probably Berkeley, NEB, and the Jerusalem Bible; the third is offered by R. P. Martin;[29] and the fourth is offered by J. J. Muller[30] and also found among translations in J. Moffatt, NASB, C. K. Williams, and R. F. Weymouth. (The AV is ambiguous, and most commentaries do not touch on the question.)

The subordination constraint helps us by excluding the third and fourth options: either would involve the subordination of the last clause to a construction less specific than itself. The decision between options one and two will have to be made on other grounds: I prefer the second, since I would have expected a kai to mark the parallelism of the two hina clauses were they in fact parallel, since there is some distance between them.

Finally, I would like to present an instance of an interpretation to which the subordination constraint, in opposition to virtually all commentaries and translations, leads us: Eph. 2:14-16:[31]

Autos gar estin hē eirēnē hēmōn, (finite)

    ho poiēsas ta amphotera hen (participial)

    kai to mesotoichon tou phragmou lusas, tēn echthran, (participial)

        en tē sarki autou, (nominal)

        ton nomon tōn entolōn en dogmasin katargēsas, (participial)

    hina tous duo ktisē (finite)

        en autō (nominal)

    eis hena kainon anthrōpon

        poiōn eirēnēn, (participial)

    kai apokatallaxē tous amphoterous (finite)

        en heni sōmati (nominal)

    tō theō

        dia tou staurou, (nominal)

        apokteinas tēn echthran (participial)

        en autō. (nominal)

The subordination constraint excludes the possibility that the compound clause hina...ktisē...kai apokatallaxē... should be subordinate to anything save the finite clause Autos gar estin hē eirēnē hēmōn. In particular, it excludes the possibility that the hina clause is subordinate to ton nomon tōn entolōn en dogmasin katargēsas, as this passage is customarily interpreted. Therefore, the main development of this sentence, excluding the relative clauses and other subordinated material, should read: "For he himself is our peace,...in order that he might make the two (of us) into one new man,...and reconcile both (of us)...to God...."

    There are at least two reasons why this interpretation will be difficult for English speakers to accept, neither of which has anything to do with what we know about New Testament Greek or any problem with the resultant sense of the passage. The first is that when the passage is rendered literally into English (and unfortunately too much exegesis begins with this step), we find that the verb forms tend to be converted into more specific ones, thus appearing less peripheral than they should. Because of this, the distance created between the hina clause and the first clause by the intervening relative construction becomes too great to permit the perception of a relationship between them. This is a special case of the general fact that New Testament Greek allows sentences of greater complexity than does English. The second reason is that in English and some other European languages it is very rare to subordinate a purpose clause to a clause expressing a state and containing the verb to be. However, at least for the Greek of Paul, precedent for such a construction with estin is

clearly established in Eph. 4:10 and Col. 1:18.   Therefore, while recognizing
the difficulty that this analysis adds to those already borne by translators
into English, for example, I maintain that it is, nevertheless, the only
defensible one.

NOTES

[1]The accuracy of these generalizations was checked by means of a scan of
the New Testament text. A scan was also made of A. Wikgren, Hellenistic Greek
Texts (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1947). In neither of these
was contradictory evidence found besides that mentioned in the paper. However,
discourses of sufficient complexity to employ these generalizations to a large
degree are rare in the New Testament and more so in the extrabiblical Koine
available to us.

Whereas the scope of this paper includes only New Testament Greek, it is
likely that the generalizations discussed here apply as well to English and to
other languages that have nonfinite verb forms and abstract nouns. The function
of these forms, to distinguish peripheral material from material that is more
important to the argument or narration, as discussed here, serves as perhaps the
principle raison d'etre of these forms in those languages which have them.

[2]I have attempted to display relationships involving subordination, as I
interpret them, by indenting any subordinated item to the item to which it is
subordinated. Occasionally, this same mechanism is used to display
relationships such as those expressed by relative clauses, constructions serving
as subjects or objects of verbs, or direct and indirect quotations, which are
beyond the scope of this paper. If not helpful, the indentations can be
ignored.

[3]H. A. W. Meyer, Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the
Ephesians (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1884).

[4]R. C. H. Lenski, The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistles to the
Galatians, to the Ephesians, and to the Philippians (Columbus: The Wartburg
Press, 1946).

[5]H. C. G. Moule, The Epistle to the Ephesians (The Cambridge Bible for
Schools and Colleges) (Cambridge: The University Press, 1889) understands the
dia construction to be related to the plousios ōn... clause as "another aspect
of the same fact".

[6]T. K. Abbott, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the
Ephesians and to the Philippians (The International Critical Commentary)
(Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1897).

[7]M. Barth, Ephesians (The Anchor Bible) (Garden City: Doubleday, 1974).

[8]F. Foulkes, The Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians (London: The Tyndale
Press, 1963).

[9]The term "clausal idea" as used here is limited to mean the idea of an
action or state-of-being, including the ideas of the participating things or
persons. It is the counterpart in thought of what a clause is in language,
although, as is shown in this paper, it does not always appear as a clause.
This use of "clausal idea" is like that of "proposition" in J. Beekman and J.
Callow, Translating the Word of God (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974) and in J.
Grimes, The Thread of Discourse (Janua Linguarum, Series Minor, 207) (The Hague:
Mouton, 1975), but those propositions of which the predicate is what Grimes
calls a rhetorical predicate are excluded from this study.

[10]R. W. Langacker, "Functional Stratigraphy", Papers from the Parasession
on Functionalism (Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, 1975) 376-380, describes
for English essentially the same cline as I describe here, contrasting the

construction types in terms of how many of his four functional strata are included in the semantic representation of each.

[11]The vagueness of the subordinating relations of participial constructions is a problem in describing this cline. (The prepositions of nominal constructions and the prepositions plus tense and voice of infinitival constructions communicate much more information about their relations.) The main reason for positing the cline is the fact that it does operate syntactically. There are four phenomena which further support the relatively greater specificity of participial constructions over infinitival constructions. First, the participial construction includes information (gender, number, and case) which helps to identify its subject. Second, the participial construction can represent more of the persons and things involved in the event being represented. Third, the participial construction, since it has no preposition, seems to be more autonomous than the infinitival; it is not as easily interpretable as playing a role (subject, object, etc.) within another construction but rather must be interpreted as being a separate subordinate construction. Fourth, as described in note 21 below, the participial construction is capable of representing a wider range of subordinating relations than the infinitival.

[12]While exceptions to "rules" of grammar may put those rules to the test, they do not necessarily disprove them. A "rule" or "law" of grammar is simply a generalization summarizing observations on how a language tends to operate. Exceptions occur when two such rules come into conflict in a given environment and one must necessarily take precedence over the other. The definitions of the ordering constraint and the subordination constraint are understood to refer to unmarked (typical, normal) ordering and subordination, where no other rules or mechanisms take precedence. Violations of these constraints can then be viewed as marked (unusual, distinctive) patterns, in which some grammatical limitation, topic status, focus, or other phenomenon intervenes to give a less expected pattern, as discussed later in this paper. The principle of markedness permeates language. It is discussed in R. Jakobson, "Zur Struktur des russischen Verbums", A Prague School Reader in Linguistics (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1964).

I am limiting the discussion to those constructions which follow the constructions to which they are subordinated and ignoring those constructions which precede or interrupt the constructions to which they are subordinated, e.g. Eph. 3:16, Col. 2:23, Phlm. 9.

[13]K. Aland et al., The Greek New Testament (Stuttgart: American Bible Society, British and Foreign Bible Society, National Bible Society of Scotland, Netherlands Bible Society, Wurttemberg Bible Society, 1975), from which all selections in this paper are taken.

[14]The line over dunamei here indicates that I interpret it as subordinate to the infinitival construction below it rather than to the nominal construction above it.

[15]op. cit.

[16]op. cit.

[17]W. Hendriksen, Exposition of Ephesians (New Testament Commentary) (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1967).

[18]op. cit.

[19]J. Eadie, Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1883).

[20]Another possible interpretation is that hina exischusēte is parallel to hina do..., and this

interpretation is rendered by J. B. Phillips, NEB, NIV, R. Knox, K. Taylor, TEV, 20th Century, and C. K. Williams. One weakness of this interpretation is that the structures of the two hina clauses are not parallel, one being active and one passive. Being as distant as they are, we would also have expected them to be joined by kai if they were parallel. Furthermore, the sense of the second kai clause treated as a separate petition to God is definitely inferior to the sense which that clause gives as the purpose of the gift of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit and of Christ petitioned in the first hina clause with its complements.

The RSV is ambiguous at this point. NASB has hina exischusete parallel to katoikēsai..., an interpretation not warranted by the internal structures of the two, and also subordinate to krataiōthēnai, in violation of the subordination constraint.

This survey does not represent the full range of variation in the interpretation of the grammatical structure of this passage that can be found in commentaries and translations. I have focused only upon the relation of the second hina clause to its context. Also, I have not dealt with those interpreters who ignore the question. Nevertheless, it is interesting to observe that every possible interpretation is represented by someone. It is hard to believe that such a breadth of ambiguity actually exists in the text.

[21]This combining of participial and infinitival constructions into one level of specificity with respect to the subordination constraint is required by the data, since the subordination of participials to infinitivals is about as common as the reverse. I suggest that this is true because of the complementary usage of these two constructions. Even though the potential ranges of usage of these constructions are similar, the more common uses of the participle in subordinate constructions are to communicate attendant circumstances, means, temporal relations, and further specification of predicates. Infinitives, on the other hand, are more commonly used for purpose. Both are used about equally to express cause and result. The result is that the relation to be communicated often takes priority over the difference in specificity between the two types of constructions. Notice also that both have the same range of tense and voice in their inflections.

[22]In this example, dia tou thanatou could also be interpreted as subordinated directly to the main clause. It would still conform to the subordination constraint.

[23]I presume the construction kai edraioi here to be elliptical, with ontes implied, since it is parallel to a participial construction. I have not investigated the status of adjectives relative to the cline of specificity.

[24]See also Eph. 1:4; 4:17; and Col. 1:6 for examples of violations of the subordination constraint by a finite clause with kathōs.

[25]F. Blass and A. Debrunner, trans. R. W. Funk, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and other early Christian Literature (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961) 197.

[26]There is another violation of the subordination constraint involving hopōs with a finite verb in Heb. 2:9. It can be handled in the same way as Gal. 1:4, but the verse is fraught with so many unrelated interpretational difficulties that I have elected not to discuss it.

[27]W. Hendriksen, Exposition of Philippians (New Testament Commentary) (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1962).

[28]F. B. Meyer, The Epistle to the Philippians (London: The Religious Tract Society, 1912).

[29]R. P. Martin, The Epistle of Paul to the Philippians (London: The Tyndale Press, 1954).

[30]J. J. Muller, The Epistles of Paul to the Philippians and to Philemon (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1955).

[31]Commentaries consulted with reference to Eph. 2:14-16 include H. A. W. Meyer (op. cit.), R. C. H. Lenski (op. cit.), M. Barth (op. cit.), B. F. Westcott, St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, n. d., republished from 1906), F. Foulkes (op. cit.), W. Hendriksen (op. cit.), C. Hodge, A Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians (A Geneva Series Commentary) (reprinted London: The Banner of Truth Trust, n. d., from 1856 edition), T. K. Abbott (op. cit.), and F. F. Bruce, The Epistle to the Ephesians (London: Pickering and Inglis Ltd., 1961).

Translations consulted included NIV, NEB, K. Taylor, NAB, Berkeley, AV, RSV, J. B. Phillips, and R. Knox. The NASB, being a very literal rendition of the Greek structure into English, could be read according to the analysis proposed here, but it probably will not be so read by most English readers.

HOLLENBACH'S CONTRAINTS

I. The "cline of specificity":

HOLLENBACH'S CONSTRAINTS

		Relation	Arguments	Center	Illocution
1. Nominal Phrase	-LESS SPECIFIC	Vague	+ one or two (with adnominal genitive phrase; or with figurative use of nominal head)	Non-verbal form (predicate indicated with abstract noun or only implied)	------
2. Infinitival Clause		Vague (with preposition and article, if present)	+ one or two (Agent is accusative case)	Predicate notion is present in verbal form, but without indication of time or person	Aspect and voice
3. Participial Clause		Vague	One obligatory, + any number of others	Predicate notion is present in verbal form, with indication of person and perhaps relative time	Aspect and voice
4. Finite Clause	MORE SPECIFIC	Relatively specific, with greater variety	One obligatory, + any number of others	Predicat notion is present in verbal form, with indication of person and time	Aspect, voice and mood

II. The ordering constraint (as modified by subsequent studies): When two or more propositions are to be subordinated to the same head proposition, but not all bearing the same relation to the head, the grammatical forms of the subordinate propositions will range from less specific to more specific moving out from the head. The head will have a form equal to or more specific than the highest ranked subordinate form in the sequence.

III. The subordination constraint (as modified: When a proposition is to be subordinated "adverbially" in its relation to another, the grammatical form of the subordinate proposition will be of equal or lesser specificity than the grammatical form of the superordinate proposition.

[Note: in applying the subordination constraint, levels 2 (infinitival clauses) and 3 (participial clauses) combine to form a single class of intermediate specificity.]

IV. In attempting to apply the constraints to 1 Timothy, it was recognized that nonadverbial modifiers and frequently the content propositions of orienters are excluded from the constraints. The constraints apply only to modifiers with an adverbial function and which represent propositions. The following factors were stated specifically:

1. In applying the constraints, the following propositions are excluded:

a. Those which define or delimit a constituent of another proposition, i.e. those that would encode as an adjective with an implied verbal notion, an adjectival participle or a relative clause.

b. Those which function as a nuclear constituent of a clause, i.e. those that encode as subject, direct object, or indirect object.

c. Those which derive from abverbs with a verbal root.

d. Those which function as the content of simple speech or nonspeech orienters, i.e. those content propositions that would encode as hoti and hina noun clauses or an infinitive preceded or followed by an accusative in indirect statements.

2. Prominence factors may interfere with the consistent application of subordination constraints.

3. A serial list in which each item has the same relation to the same head does not consistently adhere to the subordination constraints.

RECOGNIZING PROMINENCE FEATURES IN THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT

By Robert E. Smith

[Robert E. Smith is working in the International Translation Department. He studied at Multnomah School of the Bible and has been with SIL since 1976. He is currently working on the semantic structure of Hebrews, as well as giving