1976

Copy-raising in Koine Greek

Stephen A. Marlett
SIL-UND

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/sil-work-papers>

Part of the [Linguistics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Marlett, Stephen A. (1976) "Copy-raising in Koine Greek," *Work Papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, University of North Dakota Session*: Vol. 20, Article 6.

DOI: 10.31356/silwp.vol20.06

Available at: <https://commons.und.edu/sil-work-papers/vol20/iss1/6>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Work Papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, University of North Dakota Session by an authorized editor of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact und.commonso@library.und.edu.

COPY-RAISING IN KOINE GREEK

by
Stephen A. Marlett
Bachelor of Arts, The King's College

A Thesis
Submitted to the Graduate Faculty
of the
University of North Dakota
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Master of Arts

Grand Forks, North Dakota

July
1976

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my appreciation to the men who made up my Advisory Committee: Dr. Donald Frantz, chairman, Dr. John Daly, and Dr. Demetrius Georgacas. I am especially indebted to Dr. Frantz for his guidance and helpful criticism.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
ABSTRACT	vii
INTRODUCTION	1
Section	
I. SUMMARY OF PAST WORK BY OTHERS	3
II. PROPOSAL: COPY-RAISING	7
III. ALTERNATIVE ANALYSES	18
IV. EVIDENCE FOR COPY-RAISING	20
<u>Double Entendres?</u> The Logical Structure of 'CAUSE' Constructions Clause-Boundary Constraints Consistency	
V. COPY-RAISING IN EXTRA-NEW TESTAMENT LITERATURE AND IN OTHER LANGUAGES	29
Extra-New Testament Literature Hebrew and Aramaic Latin Other Languages	
VI. DISCUSSION OF OCCURRENCES OF COPY-RAISING IN THE NEW TESTAMENT	33
VII. SIMILAR CONSTRUCTIONS NOT PRODUCED BY COPY-RAISING	54
VIII. FUNCTIONS OF COPY-RAISING IN THE NEW TESTAMENT	64
Not Obligatory Clause-Boundary Constraints Semitic Influence Discourse-related Functions	

APPENDIXES

A. EXAMPLES OF COPY-RAISING IN THE NEW TESTAMENT	74
B. VERBS WITH WHICH COPY-RAISING OCCURS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT .	75
C. EXAMPLES OF COPY-RAISING IN EXTRA-NEW TESTAMENT LITERATURE .	77
D. COPY-RAISING IN THE OLD TESTAMENT	81
E. ADDITIONAL CONSTRUCTIONS NOT RESULTING FROM COPY-RAISING . .	82
LISTS OF ABBREVIATIONS	85
BIBLIOGRAPHY	88

ABSTRACT

This thesis deals with a phenomenon of Koiné Greek known in traditional grammars as prolepsis or attraction. Though occurrences of prolepsis have not been ignored in the past, modern linguistic theory in general and relational grammar in particular have much to contribute to the understanding of this phenomenon. This thesis proposes that one major type of proleptic construction results from the application of the rule COPY-RAISING in the derivation of a sentence. COPY-RAISING claims that any noun phrase that is a constituent of a complement clause may be duplicated or copied, the copy being then raised into the clause of which the complement clause is a constituent. It is significant that variations of this rule account for similar constructions in various stages of Greek, as well as in Hebrew, Aramaic, Latin, Blackfoot and other languages. This thesis also gives evidence for the claim that COPY-RAISING best explains the proleptic constructions found in Koiné Greek. Examples from the New Testament are discussed and are distinguished from other constructions which may appear to be similar, but which do not result from the application of COPY-RAISING. Consideration is also given to the function of COPY-RAISING in Koiné Greek.

INTRODUCTION

Koiné Greek exhibits a phenomenon most commonly known as prolepsis. Briefly, it is a special kind of extraposition in which a noun phrase from an embedded complement clause is not only removed from its clause and placed before the complementizer, but also becomes the direct object of the higher clause; the remainder of the complement clause remains intact, except for the usual pronominalization of the NP of which a copy was made. (As would be expected in Greek, this pronoun will generally not appear if it is the subject of the complement clause.) An example of prolepsis is found in Matt. 25:24--Egnōn se hoti sklēros ei anthrōpos; literally, 'I know you that you are a hard man.'

Even though several well-known New Testament Greek grammarians of the past have written about prolepsis, more needs to be said for several reasons. First of all, the references to prolepsis in grammars are generally brief and imprecise. The phenomenon I have illustrated above is usually mentioned in conjunction with other phenomena; thus the issue is clouded rather than explained. Second, the references to prolepsis are usually incomplete, even with respect to its occurrences in the NT. Third, the analysis by these grammarians is either not well known or not well accepted (except perhaps by certain 19th century exegetical commentators such as Meyer, Eadie, Burton, and Ellicott), as a review of translations and commentaries will reveal. The remark by Winer (1881:626) that there are a number of occurrences of this phenomenon

in the NT "which were not recognized as such by earlier expositors, and which, to say the least, created no small difficulty in interpretation" is still true today. Fourth, in earlier treatments there is no effort made to prove the validity of the notion of prolepsis. Fifth, there is a need to probe the possible reasons why prolepsis occurs.

The goal of this study, then, is to describe this phenomenon in more precise terms, distinguishing it from a similar process of SUBJECT-RAISING (Marlett 1975), and taking into account all of its occurrences in the NT; to set forth evidence in favor of the analysis here proposed, utilizing insights from modern linguistic theory; and to discuss the function of prolepsis and the implications for the understanding of the sentences in which prolepsis has occurred.

I. SUMMARY OF PAST WORK BY OTHERS

The term "prolepsis" is a Greek word meaning 'anticipation'. Although it appears in many grammars of Koiné Greek, it is used most broadly by Robertson. He uses it first to describe the simple extraposition of a NP from a subordinate clause to precede either the complementizer, as in 2 Cor. 2:4, or the conjunction, as in 1 Cor. 6:4 (1934:423). Robertson also uses the term in the more restricted sense described above in the Introduction in which "the subject of the subordinate clause even becomes the object of the previous verb" (1934:423). (This process differs from the preceding in that the grammatical relations between the words are changed.) He later (1934:1034) calls this an "irregularity of construction" and "a rather common idiom." It is this latter phenomenon which is the topic of this study.

Also in the same volume (1934:488), Robertson refers to the "accusative by antiptosis" concerning which he says, "it is not in reality a special use of the accusative, but merely a shifting of the noun or pronoun out of its usual order and into the government of the preceding clause, and thus it becomes accusative whereas it would otherwise be nominative." He cites Mark 1:24 and Luke 19:3 as examples. This is identical to prolepsis.

Robertson is not the first to discuss this phenomenon, however. Classical Greek grammars of the 19th century discuss it as well as those of New Testament Greek (see Section V), and all of them distinguish constructions in which prolepsis occurs from sentences to which

SUBJECT-RAISING has been applied because the surface structures of these sentences are so different (see Section II).

Buttmann (1873:376) refers to prolepsis, a "syntactic phenomenon which reappears in many kinds of sentences," under the term "attraction", as did most grammarians of that period. He says that "the subject is rendered sufficiently familiar by the general grammars," and then lists the NT occurrences.

Kühner (1853:569) says that it is a "very common mode of blending the principal with the subordinate clause."

Blass and Debrunner (1961:252) define prolepsis as the "anticipation of the subject (object) of the subordinate clause by making it the object of the main clause."

Turner (1963:325) says prolepsis occurs "when the subject (object) of the dependent clause is brought forward into the main clause. Such interlacing was frequent in classical Greek but is relatively rare in Koiné."

Arndt and Gingrich (1952:593) do not refer to prolepsis by name, but say that "very often the subject of the hoti-clause is drawn into the main clause, and becomes the object of the latter."

Black (1946:36) refers to the phenomenon as an extension of hyperbaton and says that it "consists of the displacement of the subject or object of a subordinate clause to become subject [when the matrix verb is passive] or object of another clause, usually the main clause of the sentence, thus giving special emphasis to it." Black also mentions that Wellhausen noted several occurrences of it in the gospels.

Green (1912:352) describes this construction in a slightly different fashion. He says, "An idiom to be especially noticed is that in which

an Accusative Object and an Object-sentence are both appended to the verb."

Other later grammars also mention prolepsis, but beyond what is quoted above, none of these sources says very much. The effect of this anticipation of the subject on the meaning of the sentence is not clearly stated. But Winer (1881:625) discusses the subject of prolepsis (he also calls it "attraction") very explicitly and clearly.

The name of Attraction, as is well known, has been given by modern grammarians to that mode of expression by means of which two portions of discourse (especially clauses), logically (in sense) connected, are also grammatically (formally) blended. A word (or assemblage of words), which properly belongs to but one of these portions (clauses), is grammatically extended to the other, and so applies to both at once (to the one clause, logically, and to the other, grammatically.)

Unfortunately, Winer also uses the term "attraction" broadly and includes under it EQUI NP DELETION¹ and the assimilation of the case of the relative pronoun to its antecedent, as well as other things (1881:627-9).

Most of the definitions given by these grammarians speak of the subject of the subordinate clause being "drawn into" the matrix clause. A few extend the definition to include objects as well. But Winer explicitly allows for other NP's to be attracted, even NP's that are neither subject nor object. Meyer, who generally cites Winer when discussing verses where prolepsis occurs, however, disagrees with Winer as to what elements may be attracted, himself restricting it to subjects.²

¹EQUI NP DELETION (an optional rule in Koiné Greek) deletes the subject of a complement clause if it is coreferential with a NP (subject or object) in the higher clause. INFINITIVIZATION later renders an infinitive in place of the finite verb in the complement clause. See Rom. 1:22.

²See comments by Meyer on 2 Cor. 13:5 and Gal. 4:11 in Section VI.

It is this imprecision that points to the need for this study.

II. PROPOSAL: COPY-RAISING

Definition

I have stated that there is a need to be more precise when discussing the phenomenon of prolepsis. Since I am approaching the subject from the transformational-generative and relational grammar framework, I will define the rule as follows: Any noun phrase that is a constituent of a complement clause may be duplicated or copied, that copy being then raised into the clause of which the complement clause is a constituent. Henceforth, I will refer to this process as COPY-RAISING (COPY) to avoid confusion with earlier definitions of prolepsis.¹

Illustrative Derivation

To illustrate COPY, I will derive the sentence found in Matt. 25:24.²

- (1) Egnōn se hoti sklēros ei anthrōpos.³
know-1-aor you-acc that hard-nom be-2 man-nom

'I know that you are a hard man.'

¹This rule and name are proposed by Frantz (forthcoming) for Blackfoot. See Section V for other languages in which rule of COPY occur.

²Derivations in this paper, and especially logical structures, will be necessarily simplified so as to not introduce confusing detail. In these derivations, when a word or root of a word is written in capital letters, it will be used to represent a meaning without indicating person, gender, or case. If the voice of the verb is not marked, it is understood to be active. Likewise, verbs not marked for tense or mood are understood to be in the present tense and indicative mood. (Verbs that regularly have a middle-passive form but an active meaning will not be cited as middle-passive. Likewise, verbs such as oida that regularly have the perfective form but present meaning will be cited as the latter. Lists of abbreviations follow the appendixes.

³Unless otherwise indicated, the Greek text used is Nestle's and translations are my own.

The logical structure (LS) for (1), assuming a COPY analysis, would be (2).

COPULA INSERTION would be applied, yielding (3), and then PREDICATE RAISING, yielding (4).

(3) COPULA INSERTION →

(4) PREDICATE RAISING →

At this point I will switch to a different type of notation for convenience' sake. In this way both the Greek and the meaning will be seen. The grammatical relations will continue to be indicated by Roman numerals. Thus, (4) will be rewritten as (5).

COMPLEMENTATION would insert the correct complement marker before the complement.

(6) COMPLEMENTATION →

PAST-GINŌSK-	EM-	hoti	EI-	ANTHRŌP-	SKLĒR-	S-
PAST-KNOW	1s	that	BE	MAN	HARD	2s
	I	II				I

COPY would then be applied to yield (7). It duplicates the subject (in this particular example) of the embedded clause and raises it into the matrix clause in which it becomes the direct object.

(7) COPY →

PAST-GINŌSK-	EM-	S-	hoti	EI-	ANTHRŌP-	SKLĒR-	S-
PAST-KNOW	1s	2s	that	BE	MAN	HARD	2s
	I	II					I

The next rule (CASE ASSIGNMENT) would assign the correct case to each constituent, depending on its role and any particular requirements given in the lexicon or grammar for that particular verb.

(8) CASE ASSIGNMENT →

PAST-GINŌSK-	egō	se	hoti	EI-	anthrōpos	sklēros	su
PAST-KNOW	I	you	that	BE	man	hard	you
	I	II					I

VERB AGREEMENT would render the correct form of the verb.

(9) VERB AGREEMENT →

egnōn	egō	se	hoti	ei	anthrōpos	sklēros	su
knew	I	you	that	are	man	hard	you

Since in Koiné Greek subject pronouns are overtly expressed only in special circumstances (such as for emphasis), a late rule would delete them.¹

¹This rule is necessary in this illustrative derivation because I have chosen to begin with all lexical items inserted for the sake of simplicity of presentation. Theoretically, all NP's are represented by indices until lexical insertion takes place. In many languages indices

(10) SUBJECT PRONOUN DELETION →

egnōn se hoti ei anthrōpos sklēros
 knew you that are man hard

The exact word order of a sentence depends on several factors, some non-grammatical; a late rule will alter the word order as necessary. The result is the sentence found in Matt. 25:24.

(11) WORD ORDER →

Egnōn se hoti sklēros ei anthrōpos.
 knew you that hard are man

'I knew that you are a hard man.'

The difference between the rule COPY and the rule SUBJECT-RAISING (see Marlett 1975) should be clearly understood. The application of SUBJECT-RAISING results in an infinitive in place of the original finite verb of the complement clause. Matt. 5:32 illustrates the result of the application of SUBJECT-RAISING to a LS meaning something like 'anyone who divorces his wife causes that she commit adultery.'

(12) Pas ho apoluōn tēn gunaika autou ... poiei
 all-nom the dismissing the wife-acc his-gen cause-3
 autēn moikheuthēnai.
 her-acc commit adultery-inf

'Anyone who divorces his wife ... causes her to commit adultery.'

As has been already seen, however, COPY does not generate infinitives as does SUBJECT-RAISING.

are spelled as pronouns if a coreferential index, usually preceding, has been spelled with the full lexical information. In Greek, however, it seems to be the case that subject pronouns are spelled as zero morphemes unless specially marked. Thus in reality the rule SUBJECT PRONOUN DELETION is superfluous.

Theoretical Claims

Now that I have illustrated COPY, there are some basic theoretical claims that need to be presented. These claims follow from the theoretical framework in which I am working. I will present the claims here briefly, and then present evidence for them from Koiné Greek. Since they are not my claims, but the claims of relational grammar (à la Postal and Perlmutter mainly--see Johnson (Forthcoming)) and generative semantics, I will not attempt to present evidence for their universal validity; rather, I will demonstrate their applicability to the phenomenon I am examining here.

1) Derivational rules are used to relate LS's and their respective surface structures (SS's). As a derivational rule, then, COPY does not affect the basic cognitive meaning of the sentence--only its surface realization and presentation. (This is not meant to imply that COPY may not have some discourse-related function. See Section VIII.) Among these rules are processes which affect grammatical relations. Relational grammar has proposed several constraints on such processes, including the following laws and principles.

2) A verb is related to the NP's that are in the same clause (its arguments) by means of grammatical relations. Each NP can bear only one grammatical relation to the verb at any one stage in the derivation. This is part of the Unique Dependency Law. NP's that bear the "pure" grammatical relations of subject, direct object, or indirect object are called terms. Other NP's are labelled non-terms. The class distinction is based on the very observable difference in how these NP's act.

3) The Stratal Uniqueness Law states that only one NP may bear any one of the pure grammatical relations in any one stage of the derivation

of a clause. (That is, there cannot be more than one subject of a verb in a given clause, nor more than one direct object, nor more than one indirect object.)

4) The Relational Succession Law states that a NP assumes the grammatical relation of the NP out of which it ascended. In the case of COPY, this law would require that the copy-raised NP always assume the same grammatical relation to the higher verb as had the embedded clause from which it ascended. Accordingly, if the copy-raised NP originates in an object complement clause (as do all the examples of COPY of which I am aware in the NT), it will become the new grammatical direct object of the matrix verb.

5) The Relational Annihilation Law states that when a NP_i assumes the grammatical relation held by NP_j , NP_j loses its original grammatical relation. It is then labelled a chômeur and is no longer treated as a term. In the case of COPY, this law would require that the clause from which the copy-raised NP ascended lose its grammatical relation of direct object of the verb.

6) The Cyclicity principle states that rules marked "cyclic" which are needed in the derivation are applied in the given order to the most deeply embedded clause first. When that has been done, all necessary rules are applied to the next most deeply embedded clause and so forth until all necessary cyclic rules have been applied to all the clauses. At that time, necessary post-cyclic rules are applied.

COPY is a cyclic rule. It must be applied after PASSIVE is applied to the complement clause and it appears that it is applied before PASSIVE is applied to the matrix clause. The reason for the latter claim is that if PASSIVE were applied to the matrix clause before COPY (thereby implying

that COPY is not a cyclic rule), we would have to allow for subject-to-subject copy-raising for which I have found no strong evidence in Greek. Any possible evidence for subject-to-subject copy-raising is weakened by the fact that the matrix verb is always passive in those cases.

It is also demonstrable that the verb of the complement clause agrees with its surface subject (by classical agreement) and not with the NP that was its subject before the application of COPY (by cyclical agreement). The following example is from Ignatius' letter to the Romans, Section I.

- (13) Phoboumai tēn humōn agapēn, mē autē me adikēsē.
 fear-1 the your-gen love-acc not it-nom me-acc hurt-3-subj

'I am afraid that your love might hurt me.'

The verb adikēsē is inflected to agree with its surface subject, the pronoun autē, which replaced the NP hē humōn agapē that was copy-raised. (In most instances, subject pronouns do not occur except for special reasons such as prominence.)

The claims I have stated above are helpful in understanding more precisely the sentence that was derived to illustrate COPY. First, the basic meaning of the sentence is 'I knew that you are a hard man.' The proposition 'I knew you' is only an implication that may possibly be drawn from the meaning of the sentence. It is not in the LS, nor is it an assertion to be understood from the SS. The application of COPY did not change the meaning expressed in the LS, (2).

Second, the syntactic object of the verb egnōn 'I knew' is se 'you'. After COPY was applied, the Relational Succession Law required that se become a direct object because the clause to which it belongs semantically was the object complement of egnōn at the stage of the derivation at which COPY was applied. All of the examples of COPY that I have found support

this law.

Third, the Relational Annihilation Law requires that the former complement clause sklēros ei anthrōpos 'you are a hard man' no longer be considered the object of the verb grammatically, though it is still to be considered the object semantically. This third claim is not easily proved because clauses do not have case markings. But neither is there any counterevidence in Koiné Greek to this predicted result of this universal law of relational grammar. (In Section III I show that COPY constructions cannot be interpreted as having compound objects.) There is one example, nevertheless, that, though not constituting conclusive evidence, does strongly support this law's application to COPY constructions. It is found in 1 Cor. 15:12.

- (14) Ei de Khristos kērussetai hoti ek nekrōn
if but Christ-nom preach-3-pass that out of dead-gen

egēgertai ...?
raise-3-pass-perf

'But if it is preached that Christ has been raised from
the dead ...?'

The derivation (simplified) of this clause would be as follows (Δ = unspecified subject):

- (15) LS

(16) PREDICATE RAISING →

KĒRUSS-Δ [PAST-EGEIR-Δ KHRIST-]
 PREACH Δ [PAST-RAISE Δ CHRIST]
 I I II

(17) COMPLEMENTATION →

KĒRUSS-Δ hoti PAST-EGEIR-Δ KHRIST-
 PREACH Δ that PAST-RAISE Δ CHRIST
 I I II

(18) PASSIVE →

KĒRUSS-Δ hoti PASS-PAST-EGEIR- KHRIST-
 PREACH Δ that PASS-PAST-RAISE CHRIST
 I II I

(19) COPY →

KĒRUSS-Δ KHRIST- hoti PASS-PAST-EGEIR- KHRIST-
 PREACH Δ CHRIST that PASS-PAST-RAISE CHRIST
 I II ch I

(20) PASSIVE →

PASS-KĒRUSS- KHRIST- hoti PASS-PAST-EGEIR- KHRIST-
 PASS-PREACH CHRIST that PASS-PAST-RAISE CHRIST
 I ch I

(21) PRONOMINALIZATION →

PASS-KĒRUSS- KHRIST- hoti PASS-PAST-EGEIR- AUT-
 PASS-PREACH CHRIST that PASS-PAST-RAISE 3s
 I ch I

(22) CASE ASSIGNMENT →

PASS-KĒRUSS- Khristos hoti PASS-PAST-EGEIR- autos
 PASS-PREACH Christ that PASS-PAST-RAISE he

(23) VERB AGREEMENT →

kērussetai Khristos hoti egēgertai autos
 is preached Christ that has been raised he

(24) SUBJECT PRONOUN DELETION →

kērussetai Khristos hoti egēgertai
 is preached Christ that has been raised

(25) WORD ORDER →

Khristos kērussetai hoti egēgertai
 Christ is preached that has been raised

It is important to notice that KHRIST- is copy-raised into the matrix clause before PASSIVE is applied to that clause. Thus when PASSIVE is applied, KHRIST- (which had received the grammatical relation of direct object because this was the relation of the complement clause to the matrix verb) becomes the new subject of the verb KĒRUSS-. Had KHRIST- not been the grammatical object of the verb KĒRUSS- at the time PASSIVE was applied, it would not have been eligible to become the subject of KĒRUSS-. Notice that the structure and position of the hoti-clause was not affected by the application of PASSIVE.¹

As was mentioned in Section I, there is disagreement over exactly what constituents may be copy-raised into the higher clause. In Appendix A I have listed the COPY-produced constructions that are found in the NT and there are several that I feel support the view that any NP in a complement clause may be copy-raised--whether it be a subject, direct object, indirect object, or even a NP out of a prepositional phrase. Each of these constructions is presented in Section VI and the evidence for the

¹There is another way this sentence could be derived--by omitting COPY and proposing a stronger extraposition rule that would extrapose the subject of egēgertai to precede kērussetai. It seems less acceptable, however, to allow for such a powerful rule. The extraposition rule in Greek that moves constituents out of an embedded clause seems to have the constraint that the new position for the NP be immediately in front of the complementizer (see Section VII for a more detailed discussion of this rule). A solution using this rule and another movement rule to derive (12) would be quite ad hoc.

less restrictive COPY rule for Koiné Greek can be clearly seen.

III. ALTERNATIVE ANALYSES

I have proposed that the derivational rule COPY-RAISING is operating in Koiné Greek. Without such a rule, one is obliged to propose an alternative analysis.

The major alternative is to consider that both the NP that is the direct object of the verb and the object complement clause both are true semantic complements of the higher verb. This can be illustrated by examining John 5:42.

- (26) Alla egnōka humas hoti tēn agapēn tou theou
but know-1-perf you-acc that the love-acc the God-gen
ouk ekhete en heautois.
not have-2 in yourselves-dat

This alternative analysis would claim Jesus is asserting that he knew the Pharisees in the way that one knows a person--intimately and personally.¹ It would also claim Jesus is asserting that he knew the fact that they do not have the love of God in them. Then, by some grammatical rule or other mechanism, these two assertions are blended and the result is (26), with the same matrix verb governing both objects. This analysis is adopted by some recent translations for this particular sentence and others. It is vividly seen in modern Romance language translations. In Spanish, for example, there are two major verbs that are used for 'know'. Conocer is used for knowing a person or place, whereas saber is used for

¹Notice, for example, the translation by Wuest (The Gospels, 1956): "I have known you from experience, that the love of God you do not have in yourselves." See also Moulton and Milligan (1898:68): "I know,--that is, I have discerned you, I have read your hearts"

knowing a fact, or if the object is a proposition. Thus, if one adopts the view that (26) represents two separate propositions, one must also split the Spanish translation into two major clauses, as the modern translators have done.

- (27) Además, yo los conozco a ustedes y sé que no
 moreover I you know you and I know that not
 aman a Dios. (Versión Popular)
 love God

It is interesting to note that even those who adopt this analysis for this sentence rarely follow it elsewhere in the New Testament.

Another alternative, sometimes referred to as the epexegetical use of hoti (Robertson 1934:1034), is really only a variant of the above.¹ It asserts that the correct understanding of the sentence is that Jesus is declaring that he knows the Pharisees, and this knowledge is specified in the ensuing clause. This analysis also requires the blending of two major propositions, but the emphasis seems to be on the second, the sentential complement.

¹See Section VII for a discussion of the true epexegetical use of hoti.

IV. EVIDENCE FOR COPY-RAISING

Double Entendres?

In Section III I showed that the alternative analyses understand the matrix verb to be governing both the NP and the clause as complements. But whereas in (1) it may be argued that the meaning is that the servant knew the master and also knew that he was a hard man, there are examples that do not readily lend themselves to this type of analysis. Mark 12:34 is one case.

- (28) Kai ho Iēsous, idōn auton hoti nounekhōs
 and the Jesus-nom seeing him-acc that sensibly
 apekrithē, eipen autō.
 answer-3-aor-pass say-3-aor him-dat

If we adopt the view that the participial phrase (enclosed by commas) is the result of a merger of two propositions, then we would have to say that it represents both (29) and (30).

- (29) Jesus saw him.

- (30) Jesus saw (discerned) that he answered intelligently.

There is one serious objection to this analysis: it forces one to understand the participle idōn 'seeing' both in the literal and the figurative sense simultaneously. Although it is not impossible, it is highly unlikely that Mark meant this clause as a double entendre.

A second objection is based on the meaning of the sentence in its context. Jesus' response to the man is connected with the fact that Jesus recognized how well he answered the question, not with the idea of Jesus' seeing the man in front of him physically. To insert the

latter meaning into the construction would violate the sense of the passage.

Many other constructions where COPY has been applied cannot be divided into two propositions without either one of them making no sense contextually or the verb being forced to mean two things at once. A few of these are listed below.

- (31) ... hapantes gar eikhon ton Iōannēn ontōs
 all-nom for hold-3-pl-imperf the John-acc really

hoti prophētēs ēn. (Mark 11:32)
 that prophet-nom be-3-imperf

'... because everyone considered that John really was a prophet.'

It would not make sense to say that the people were "holding" John.

(He had been beheaded for some time.) However, ekhō with a complement, or a direct object plus hōs plus a noun (or eis plus a noun) has the meaning 'consider, look upon, view' (Arndt and Gingrich 1957:333).

- (32) Hoi oun Ioudaioi ..., idontes tēn Mariam
 the therefore Jews-nom seeing the Mary-acc

hoti takheōs anestē kai exēlthen ... (John 11:31)
 that quickly arise-3-aor and go out-3-aor

'Therefore the Jews ..., when they saw Mary get up and hurry out ...' (TEV)

It would likewise not make sense for the author of the gospel to say at this point "when they saw Mary," because these people had been in Mary's house comforting her for some time.

- (33) ... epeginōskon te autous hoti sun tō Iēsou
 know-3-pl-imperf and them-acc that with the Jesus-dat

ēsan. (Acts 4:13)
 be-3-pl-imperf

'... and they realized that these men had been with Jesus.'

If this sentence were divided into two propositions, the verb epeginōskon would mean 'recognize' in the first and 'realize' in the second. This

sort of double entendre in ordinary narrative seems to be an unrealistic overworking of the verb.

The Logical Structure of "CAUSE" Constructions

COPY provides a means of relating sentences that are different structurally on the surface, but which are of necessity similar in their underlying structures.

The verb poiēō, when it means 'cause', requires precisely two arguments in the LS: a subject and a sentential object complement. Thus a sentence such as John 11:37 (34) would be represented by a LS (simplified) something like (35). (Non-coreferential NP's are indicated by "i" and "j".)

- (34) Ouk edunato houtos ... poiēsai hina kai
not be able-3-imperf this-nom cause-inf that even

houtos mē apothanē;
this-nom not die-3-subj

'Could not this man_i ... have caused that even this man_j
should not have died?'

or: 'Wasn't this man ... able to prevent him from dying?'

Closely related to this is the clause found in Matt. 5:32.

- (36) Pas ho apoluōn tēn gunaika autou ...
all-nom the dismissing the wife-acc his-gen

poiei autēn moikheuthēnai.
cause-3 her-acc commit adultery-inf

'Anyone who divorces his wife ... causes her to commit adultery.'

This would be represented by a LS similar to (35) in that poiei would have a sentential complement ('she commits adultery'). SUBJECT-RAISING would be applied and, with other rules, render the correct SS.

Even with sentences where there is no finite verb or infinitive expressed, an underlying sentential complement with a verb such as einai 'to be' is evidently necessary (see Acts 15:3, Rom. 16:7, and Rev. 12:15).

Since poieō 'cause' can have only a sentential complement and a subject in the LS, another rule is needed to derive Rev. 13:12 because poiei occurs with a non-sentential complement in the SS.

- (37) Kai poiei tēn gēn kai tous en autē
and cause-3 the earth-acc and the-acc in it-dat

katoikountas hina proskunēsousin to thērion to prōton.
dwelling-acc that worship-3-pl-subj the beast-acc the first-acc

'And he causes the earth and they who dwell in it to worship the first beast.'

COPY neatly relates this structure to the others by copying the coordinate subject of proskunēsousin 'worship' and raising it to become the grammatical object of poiei. Since this sentence could not be divided into two propositions and still retain the sense of 'cause' for poieō, the alternative analysis cannot explain the construction adequately.

Clause-Boundary Constraints

In the cases of John 8:54 and John 1:15, COPY provides a neat explanation of otherwise difficult constructions. Robertson (1934:1034) accedes to this when he notes, "see esp. Jo. 8:54," in his discussion of prolepsis (the specific type I am calling COPY).¹ I will deal with John 8:54 in detail here.

- (38) Estin ho patēr mou ho doxazōn me,
 be-3 the father-nom my-gen the glorifying-nom me-acc
 hon humeis legete hoti theos hēmōn estin.
 whom-acc you-nom say-2-pl that God-nom our-gen be-3

'It is my father who glorifies me, concerning whom you say,
 "He is our God."'

The sentence is complex. It is composed of two less complex propositions:

- (39) Estin ho patēr mou ho doxazōn me.
 is the father my the glorifying me
 'It is my father who glorifies me.'
- (40) Humeis legete hoti theos hēmōn estin.
 you say that God our is

'You say, "He is our God."'

The author apparently wished to relate (40) to (39). However, the NP of (40) that is coreferential to patēr in (39) is the subject of the embedded direct quotation. Now, there seems to be a constraint that would prohibit the movement of a NP out of an embedded direct quotation. If a direct quotation is tampered with, it ceases to be such. Even if the NP could be moved out of the direct quotation, there would be a problem because relative pronoun movement is bounded in Koiné Greek. That is, it appears from the evidence available that relative pronouns in Koiné Greek may not normally be moved except to precede the clause to which they directly

¹See also Winer 1881:626.

belong.¹ Also, even if the NP could be moved under these circumstances so that it could be relativized, RELATIVIZATION would not change the case of the noun or pronoun that is being relativized.² Thus the construction of (38) cannot be explained by ordinary rules of movement and relativization.

COPY does provide an explanation by producing a constituent that is not restricted by clause-boundary constraints, a constituent that is in the higher clause and that can therefore be extraposed and relativized. If COPY is applied to (40), the result would be (41).

(41) *humeis legete auton hoti theos hēmōn estin*
 you say him that God our is

RELATIVIZATION is then applied and the result would be (42).

(42) *hon humeis legete hoti theos hēmōn estin*
 whom you say that God our is

In this way, proposition (40) can be related to (39) as the author wished.

Bernard (1928:319), recognizing the problem of the construction of John 8:54, refers the reader to John 10:36. The situation here, however, is quite different because 'say' can take both a direct object and an indirect object in the LS and because the relative clause is simple.

(43) *Hon ho patēr hēgiasen kai apesteilen*
 whom-acc the father-nom sanctify-3-aor and send-3-aor

 eis ton kosmon humeis legete hoti blasphēmeis ...;
 into the world-acc you-nom say-3-pl that blaspheme-2

'Do you say to him whom the Father sanctified and sent into the world, "You are blaspheming!" ...?'

This complex sentence could be stated in the two propositions which follow:

¹This is discussed further in Section VIII.

²In Greek, assimilation sometimes occurs later and the case of the relative pronoun is changed to agree with its antecedent. But in John 8:54 the antecedent of 'he' is in the nominative case. Thus assimilation could not be used to explain the accusative case of the relative pronoun.

(44) Do you say to him, "You are blaspheming!"?

(45) The Father sanctified and sent him into the world.

By applying RELATIVIZATION to the object of 'sanctified' and 'sent', propositions (44) and (45) can be combined into one sentence. Robertson (1934:425) quite adequately explains that the antecedent of hon 'whom' has dropped out, something that is not rare in Koiné Greek (see Robertson 1934:719-21). The antecedent would have been 'him', the indirect object of 'say' in (44). Notice also that the relative clause is simple, and there is no need to posit an ad hoc rule to move something out of a direct quotation.

There may be perhaps one more argument against the COPY analysis of John 8:54 that needs to be dealt with. Legō 'say' can sometimes take the accusative case of the person to mean 'talk about someone' as Arndt and Gingrich (1957:469) point out. An example is found in John 6:71 and is listed below. (Other examples are Mark 14:71 and 1 Cor. 10:29.)

(46) Elegen de ton Ioudan Simōnos Iskariōtou.
 talk-3-imperf now the Judas-acc Simon-gen Iscariot-gen

'Now he was talking about Judas Iscariot, son of Simon.'

If legete had a NP such as auton 'him' (meaning 'concerning him') as an argument in the LS of John 8:54, then the clause-boundary constraints would not be a problem. This use of legō does not apply to John 8:54, however, because when legō is used with the person in the accusative case to mean 'to talk about someone', it is never followed by another object.¹ (When legō is followed by two objects it means 'call' or 'name'.) The person (or thing) in the accusative case is actually the direct object, though it may

¹A somewhat similar SS, only with the verb akouō, is found in Gal. 1:13. Here it is not COPY, however, but the epexegetical use of hoti that is the correct analysis. See Section VII.

not be translated into English as such. For evidence for this claim, see Matt. 3:3 where the articular aorist passive participle of legō occurs, probably representing a reduced relative clause.

- (46) Houtos gar estin ho rhētheis dia Esaïou
 this-nom for be-3 the say-part-aor-pass by Isaiah-gen

'For this is the one who was spoken of through Isaiah'

The underlying structure of the participial phrase would probably be (47).

- (47) LEG-Δ AUT- dia ESAI-
 TALK ABOUT Δ 3s by ISAIAH
 I II

AUT- must be the grammatical direct object if it is to become the subject when PASSIVE is applied in the derivation of (46).

If one wishes to express what is said and also concerning whom it is said when COPY is not possible (or if it is simply not applied), the construction used is some preposition such as peri or epi plus the person.¹ Since in (38) the complement of legō in the LS is clearly the clause theos hēmōn estin 'He is our God', legō cannot also have the antecedent of hon 'whom' as the direct object in the LS. Therefore, the relative pronoun must have originated in the embedded clause; and, as I have said, since there are constraints that would not allow it to be removed from a direct quotation, only COPY neatly explains this construction. John 1:15

¹Notice the following sentences:

- (i) Panta de hosa eipen Iōannēs peri toutou alēthē. (John 10:41)

'But everything that John said about this man was true.'

- (ii) Eph' hon gar legetai tauta, phulēs heteras meteskhēken. (Heb. 7:13)

'He of whom these things are said belonged to a different tribe.' (NIV)

I have found no examples of legō followed by two apparent objects, one meaning 'concerning whom/which', that cannot be explained by a COPY analysis.

is similarly explained.

Consistency

Whereas some translations in some places adopt the analysis that views the Greek construction as representing two propositions, none follows it in all occurrences of similar construction. The COPY analysis, however, provides a consistent and reasonable explanation for each of these occurrences and in fact helps one to grasp the real meaning of each sentence with greater facility.

V. COPY-RAISING IN EXTRA-NEW TESTAMENT LITERATURE AND IN OTHER LANGUAGES

COPY is not a rule that is observed to be operating only in the language of the NT. It is found in literature of various stages of the Greek language, and in other languages also. In fact, it appears that it should be classified as a member of the set of "universal" rules of languages. ("Universal" is used here in contrast to "language-specific.") This is important since a grammar that appeals more to the set of universal rules than to language-specific rules is to be preferred over a grammar that does the contrary if both are able to adequately handle the data.

Extra-New Testament Literature

Examples of COPY can be found in Greek from at least Classical through to Middle Greek, and possibly in Modern Greek in certain styles of writing. I have not been able to substantiate the claim made by Winer (1881:626) that "the copious diversity of this mode of expression [i.e., attraction] encountered in Greek authors, does not, indeed, occur in the New Testament," for COPY specifically, as I will demonstrate below. Turner (1963:325) says that "such interlacing was frequent in classical Greek" to which Blass and Debrunner (1961:252) give their assent, adding that COPY is found in the papyri also. Classical and later Greek grammarians discuss prolepsis and give examples from various works. These grammarians include Crosby, Hadley, Jannaris, Kühner,

Smyth, and Trollope, and all restrict the phenomenon to the attraction of the subject of the dependent clause except for Hadley (1884:278) who simply says "substantive." As for why this phenomenon occurs, a few maintain that it serves to emphasize or give prominence to the copy-raised NP; the rest do not give any reason or explanation.

An example of a subject NP that has been copy-raised is found in Xenophon's Anabasis 1.8.21.

- (48) Ēdei auton hoti meson ekhoi tou Persikou
 know-3-ppl him-acc that center-acc hold-3-opt the Persian-gen
 strateumatos.
 army-gen

'He knew that he held the center of the Persian army.'

Most of the examples of COPY cited in the grammars are similar to the one above in that it is the subject of the embedded clause that is copy-raised. There are sentences, however, that demonstrate clearly that other NP's may be copy-raised in Classical Greek also. One, found in Sophocles' Oedipus Tyrannos 760, involves the NP that was the subject of the dependent clause in the LS but which became a chômeur when the verb in the dependent clause was passivized. It is a chômeur that is copy-raised. (Since PASSIVE is a cyclic rule in Greek, it must be applied to the embedded clause before COPY may be applied to the sentence.)

- (49) Dedoik' emauton ... mē poll' agan eirēmen
 fear-1-perf myself-acc not many things-nom too say-part-pass
 ē moi.
 be-3-subj me-dat

'I was afraid that too much had been said by me.'

A number of other examples of COPY from various Greek sources other than the NT are provided in Appendix C.

Hebrew and Aramaic

It is interesting that COPY seems to be operating in Hebrew also, as Blass and Debrunner (1961:252) point out. The numerous occurrences are listed in Appendix D and that list is not exhaustive by any means, but only includes the examples that I have found after a cursory search. Keil and Delitzsch (1971:1.50) call the occurrence of COPY in one place an example of a "frequently recurring antiptosis." Kautasch (1898:382) says that "frequently ... the second object is expressed by a separate clause." It is especially noteworthy that only two (or possibly three)¹ Hebrew verbs allow COPY to be applied, insofar as I have been able to ascertain; and furthermore, COPY is restricted to subjects in the clear examples that I have found.

It is quite natural, then, that COPY should be found operating in Aramaic. Black (1946:36-7) discusses this under the term "hyperbaton." Brown (1966:1.226) calls it a "frequent Aramaic construction," and Swete (1952:20) believes the construction of Mark 1:24 to be "perhaps due to an Aramaic original."

Latin

There are indications that COPY also operates in Latin in certain sentences. Bennett (1918:250) says that examples of prolepsis are "chiefly confined to poetry." He cites one example:

(50) Nōsti Mārcellum quam tardus sit
 know-2 Marcellus-acc how slow-nom be-3-subj

'You know how slow Marcellus is.'

¹It is uncertain whether the constructions with the verb shâmar 'watch, take heed' should be included with COPY-produced constructions. Several occurrences of shâmar present no problems (see Deut. 4:23, 12:13, 12:19, 12:30 and Exod. 19:12). Deut. 11:16 and Mal. 2:16 are interesting but difficult to explain, however. Eccl. 8:17 is a possible example of COPY.

Other Languages

It is not unimportant that various rules of COPY have been described in recent linguistic articles, and it is expected that as this rule becomes more well known, it will be used in grammars of yet other languages. Frantz (forthcoming) describes the operation of the rule in Blackfoot in some detail. Blackfoot is an Algonkian language of North America. Frantz and Milanowski (in preparation) also describe a somewhat different and special COPY rule for Upper Tanana, an Athapaskan language of Alaska. Munro (1976) proposes a rule of subect-to-subject copy-raising for Mohave that is used with certain predicates.

VI. DISCUSSION OF OCCURRENCES OF COPY-RAISING
IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

In this section I will present every bona fide occurrence of COPY in the NT of which I am aware, noting any problems or interesting features, and show how the COPY analysis might affect the understanding and hence the translation of that sentence. I will also note the grammars and commentaries (and in highly disputable cases, translations) that are pertinent. The occurrences of COPY will be discussed in their order in the NT.

Matt. 6:26

Emblepsate eis ta peteina tou ouranou
look at-2-pl-imper at the birds-acc the heaven-gen

hoti ou speirousin oude therizousin oude sunagousin
that not sow-3-pl nor reap-3-pl nor gather-3-pl

eis apothēkas,
into barns-acc

'Notice that the birds of the air do not sow nor reap nor gather
into barns,

Cited as COPY: none.

Unfortunately, this first example of COPY in the NT is one of the more disputable due to the use of the preposition after the verb emblepsate 'look at'. Perhaps this is why no grammar or commentary cites it as an example of COPY. Several reasons cause me to believe that this is an example of COPY, however. First, the analagous structure in Luke 12:24, the parallel passage to Matt. 6:26, is certainly COPY-produced. Second,

the presence of the preposition is not a problem because the preposition is only a surface structure device used to Mark the surface object of emblemsate (see Arndt and Gingrich 1957:254). Third, if this is not analyzed as a COPY-produced construction, the hoti must be taken in its causal sense (as in CBW) since hoti functions only as either a complementizer, an optional direct discourse marker, or as a causal conjunction. Some translations (ASV, BV, and NASB) are hesitant to translate hoti in its causal sense, and instead translate the construction literally, using 'that' for hoti. This rendering actually supports the view that Matt. 6:26 is a COPY-produced construction. A number of other translations simply leave the hoti untranslated overtly, perhaps to signal a weak causal connection, perhaps because the two most common options listed above were not considered viable, either contextually or grammatically.

Matt. 6:28

Katamathete ta krina tou agrou,
consider-2-pl-imper the lilies-acc the field-gen

pōs auxanousin.
how grow-3-pl

'Look how the lilies of the field grow.' (MV)

Cited as COPY: Blass and Debrunner (1961:252), Turner (1963:325).

This is very similar to Luke 12:27.

Matt. 25:24

Egnōn se hoti sklēros ei anthrōpos
know-1-aor you-acc that hard-nom be-2 man-nom

'I knew that you are a hard man'

Cited as COPY: Arndt and Gingrich (1957:593), Bloomfield (1836:1.126), Buttmann (1873:376), Meyer (1884f:441), Robertson (1934:1034), Trollope (1842:155), Zerwick (1963:66).

Mark 1:24

Oida se tis ei.
 know-1 you-acc who-nom be-2

'I know who you are.'

Cited as COPY: Arndt and Gingrich (1957:558), Blass and Debrunner (1961:252), Buttman (1873:377), Robertson (1934:466), Turner (1963:325), Winer (1881:626).

This is identical to Luke 4:34. Swete (1952:20) calls the se "slightly pleonastic" and Taylor (1952:174) says it is "redundant."

Mark 7:2

Kai idontes tinas tōn mathētōn autou
 and seeing some-acc the disciples-gen his-gen

hoti koinais khersin ... esthiousin tous artous
 that unclean-dat hands-dat eat-3-pl the bread-acc

'And when they saw that some of his disciples were eating their bread with unclean hands'

Cited as COPY: Blass and Debrunner (1961:252), Turner (1963:325).

Cranfield (1959:232) mentions the variant reading for this sentence:

"The v.l. (supported by A D W θ ...) which omits hoti and substitutes esthiontas for esthiousin is clearly an attempt to improve the grammar."

I do not agree with Cranfield's judgment because the variant reading represents a different LS from that represented by the text above. It would be translated: "And when they saw some of his disciples eating their bread with unclean hands"

Mark 11:32

Hapantes gar eikhon ton Iōannēn ontōs
 all-nom for had-3-pl-imperf the John-acc really

hoti prophētēs ēn.
 that prophet-nom be-3-imperf

'For all the people held that John had been really a prophet.' (MV)

Cited as COPY: Blass and Debrunner (1969:252), Buttmann (1873:376), Green (1912:317), Meyer (1884e:146), Trollope (1842:155), Turner (1963:325), Winer (1881:626).

A number of manuscripts (including D, W, and 0) have edeisan 'knew' instead of eikhon 'had'. Regardless of what reading is chosen, the derivation would involve COPY.

Mark 12:34

Kai ho Iēsous, idōn auton hoti nounekhōs apekrithē,
and the Jesus-nom seeing him-acc that sensibly answer-3-aor

eipen autō
say-3-aor him-dat

'And when Jesus saw that he had answered intelligently, He said to him' (NASB)

Cited as COPY: Blass and Debrunner (1961:252), Bloomfield (1836:1.207), Buttmann (1873:376), Edwards (1885:383), Green (1912:317), Meyer (1884e: 155), Turner (1963:325), Winer (1881:626).

The UBS has auton in square brackets. If auton is not genuine, this would not be an example of COPY, but the uncertainty of auton supports the view that the logical object of the construction above is only the hoti-clause.

Luke 4:34

See the identical parallel passage, Mark 1:24. In addition to the grammars cited there, Trollope (1842:155) lists this sentence as an example of COPY.

Luke 12:24

Katanoēsate tous korakas, hoti oute speirousin
consider-2-pl-imper the ravens-acc that neither sow-3-pl

oute therizousin.
nor reap-3-pl

'Notice that the ravens do not sow nor reap.'

Cited as COPY: none.

Some translations (ANT, CBW, KJV, NASB) translate hoti by 'because' or 'for'. Others (ASV, BV) do not so interpret it, but render it 'how' or 'that', thereby allowing for a COPY analysis. To my knowledge, no grammarian or commentator cites this sentence as an example of COPY. This may be due to the fact that katanoēō 'notice' is not commonly used in the NT with a sentential object complement. In Luke 12:27 COPY applies to a similar structure, however, and Arndt and Gingrich (1957:416) seem to indicate that katanoēō is used with sentential object complements in other literature. Rom. 4:19 is interesting since it appears that katanoēō is used with an underlying sentential complement, but the sentence has undergone major structural changes. Thus it seems entirely possible for katanoēō to take sentential objects and for Luke 12:24 and Luke 12:27 to be examples of COPY.

Luke 12:27

Katanoēsate ta krina, pōs oute nethei
consider-2-pl-imper the lilies-acc how neither spin-3-pl
oute huphainei.
nor weave-3-pl

'Look how the lilies neither spin nor weave.' (MV)

Cited as COPY: none, but see Moffat's translation above.

See discussion under Luke 12:24.

Luke 13:25

Ouk oida humas pothen este.
not know-1 you-acc from where be-2

'I don't know where you are from.'

Cited as COPY: Arndt and Gingrich (1957:558), Blass and Debrunner (1961:252).

See also Luke 13:27.

Luke 13:27

This sentence in the TR is identical to Luke 13:25. In the UBS, COPY has not been applied. Trollope (1842:155) cites this verse as an example of COPY.

Luke 19:3

Kai ezētei idein ton Iēsoun tis estin.
and seek-3-imperf see-inf the Jesus-acc who-nom be-3

'He wanted to see who Jesus was.' (NIV)

Cited as COPY: Buttmann (1873:377), Green (1912:317), Robertson (1934:423, 488), Trollope (1842:155), Winer (1881:626).

John 1:15

Houtos ēn hon eipon ho opisō mou erkhomenos
this-nom be-3-imperf whom-acc say-1-aor the after me-gen coming-nom

'This is he concerning whom I said, "He that is coming after me"'

Cited as COPY: none except Buttmann (1873:377) who puts it in a separate sub-class, "in the spirit" of COPY.

John 3:21

... hina phanerōthē autou ta erga
so that show-3-aor-pass his-gen the works-nom

hoti en theō estin eirgasmena.
that in God-dat be-3 work-part-pass

'... to make it plain that his actions have been divinely prompted.'
(MV)

Cited as COPY: none.

Cited as not COPY: Godet (1893:1.400), Meyer (1884d:135).

Both Meyer and Godet (see above) suggest hoti is used in its causal sense. Most translations render it following a COPY analysis, however, and Plummer (1890:107) and Westcott (1954:124) indicate that hoti is not

to be taken in its causal sense.

Although this construction may be the result of LEFT DISLOCATION (see Section VII) instead of COPY, I choose the latter analysis for one reason. As I understand it now, LEFT DISLOCATION in Koiné Greek is applied to emphasize the extraposed NP. It does not appear from the context of John 3:21 that the movement of autou ta erga 'his works' was for that purpose.

John 4:35

Theasasthe tas khōras hoti leukai eisin pros therismon.
see-2-pl-imper the fields-acc that white-nom be-3-pl to harvest-acc

'See how the fields are already white for harvest.' (RSV)

Cited as COPY: Arndt and Gingrich (1957:353), Buttmann (1873:376), Green (1912:317), Meyer (1884d:162), Plummer (1890:124), Trollope (1842:155), Winer (1881:626), Zerwick (1963:66).

Some translations, including the KJV, translate hoti in the causal sense. Most commentators and grammarians do not agree with that rendering here, however.

John 5:42

Alla egnōka humas hoti tēn agapēn tou theou
but know-1-perf you-acc that the love-acc the God-gen

ouk ekhete en heautois.
not have-2-pl in yourselves-dat

'I know there is no love for God in you.' (MV)

Cited as COPY: Brown (1970:1.226), Buttmann (1873:376), Green (1912:317), Trollope (1842:155), Winer (1881:626), Zerwick (1963:66).

The NEB translate hoti with 'because'. Most other translations treat the hoti-clause as the complement of egnōka, though several translations render it with two complements because of the COPY construction.

As I indicated in Section III, the latter way of translating the construction cannot be followed consistently elsewhere, and so it is improbable that John 5:42 should be translated with two complements.

John 7:27

Alla touton oidamen pothen estin.
but this one-acc know-1-pl from where be-3

'Yet we know where this man comes from.' (RSV)

Cited as COPY: Buttmann (1873:377), Green (1912:317), Trollope (1842:155), Turner (1963:252), Winer (1881:626).

John 8:54

This construction was discussed in Section IV. The following cite it as an example of COPY: Buttmann (1873:376), Robertson (1934:1034), Trollope (1842:155), and Winer (1881:626).

John 9:19

Houtos estin ho huios humōn,
this-nom be-3 the son-nom your-gen

hon humeis legete hoti tuphlos egennēthē;
whom-acc you-nom say-2-pl that blind-nom bear-3-aor-pass

'Is this your son who you claim was born blind?'

Cited as COPY: Trollope (1842:155).

See discussion of this construction in Section VIII.

John 9:29

Touton de ouk oidamen pothen estin.
this one-acc but not know-1-pl from where be-3

'As for this fellow, we know not from whence he is.' (KJV)

Cited as COPY: Blass and Debrunner (1961:252).

This sentence is very similar to John 7:27.

John 11:31

... idontes tēn Mariam hoti takhēos anestē kai exēlthen
 seeing the Mary-acc that quickly rise up-3-aor and go out-3-aor

'... seeing that Mary rose up quickly and went out'

Cited as COPY: Green (1912:352), Trollope (1842:155), Winer (1881:626), Zerwick (1963:66).

John 13:28

Touto [de] oudeis egnō tōn anakeimenōn
 this-acc but nobody-nom know-3-aor the reclining-part-gen

pros ti eipen autō.
 why say-3-aor him-dat

'No one understood why he told him this.'

Cited as COPY: Buttmann (1873:377), Winer (1881:626).

Touto has been moved from a near-sentence-final position to a sentence-initial position by COPY. Because touto was the object of the embedded clause, Moulton (Winer 1882:782) doubts that COPY has in fact been applied here. The lack of a pronoun in the embedded clause does make that an open question; but because touto has been extraposed from an embedded clause to the beginning of the matrix clause, I feel that a COPY analysis is better than proposing a very powerful extraposition rule.

John 16:4

Alla tauta lelalēka humin hina hotan elthē hē hōra
 but these-acc say-1-perf you-dat so that when come-3-subj the hour-nom

mnēmoneuete autōn hoti egō eipon humin.
 remember-2-pl-subj them-gen that I-nom say-1-aor you-dat

'But I have told you these things so that when the hour comes you may remember that I told you them.'

Cited as COPY: Meyer (1884d:445).

Mnēmoneuō 'remember' takes its direct object in the genitive case often,

as it does here. The pronoun has been deleted in the hoti-clause in the example, but in most cases in which an object has been copy-raised, a pronoun is left behind in the hoti-clause.

Acts 3:10

Epeginōskon de auton, hoti houtos ēn
know-3-pl-imperf and him-acc that this one-nom be-3-imperf

ho pros tēn eleēmosunēn kathēmenos epi tē hōraia
the for the alms-acc sitting-part-nom at the beautiful-dat

pulē tou hierou
gate-dat the temple-gen

'And when they recognized that this was the very man who used to sit at the Gate Beautiful' (MV)

Cited as COPY: Buttmann (1873:376), Green (1912:317), Meyer (1883:78), Trollope (1842:155), Winer (1881:626).

Acts 4:13

Epeginōskon te autous hoti sun tō Iēsou ēsan.
know-3-pl-imperf them-acc that with the Jesus-dat be-3-pl-imperf

'They realized that they had once been with Jesus.'

Cited as COPY: Buttmann (1873:376), Green (1912:352), Winer (1881:626).

Meyer (1883:94) does not follow a COPY analysis here and translates instead, "and recognised them, namely, that they were, at an earlier period, with Jesus."

Acts 5:26

Ephobounto gar ton laon, mē lithasthōsin.
fear-3-pl-imperf for the people-acc not stone-3-pl-pass

'They were afraid that they might be stoned by the people.'

Cited as COPY: Buttmann (1873:242, 377).

After PASSIVE was applied to the complement clause, COPY was applied,

and ton laon 'the people' became the object of the matrix verb 'fear'. The redundant phrase 'by the people' was then later deleted from the clause that was formerly the object complement.

Acts 9:20

Kai eutheōs en tais sunagōgais ekērussen ton Iēsoun,
and immediately in the synagogues-dat proclaim-3-imperf the Jesus-acc

hoti houtos estin ho huios tou theou.
that this - nom be-3 the son-nom the God-gen

'And immediately he began to preach in the synagogues that Jesus is the Son of God.'

Cited as COPY: Arndt and Gingrich (1957:593), Buttmann (1873:376), Green (1912:352), Turner (1963:325), Robertson (1934:1034), Trollope (1842:155).

Some translations (such as NEB and RSV) treat this as a direct quotation. But if this were the case in the Greek, one would expect a second verb, a participle such as legōn 'saying', to introduce the hoti-clause. Of course, the translations may be using the direct quote for stylistic purposes.

Acts 13:32-33

Kai hēmeis humas euaggelizometha tēn pros tous pateras
and we-nom you-dat proclaim-1-pl the to the fathers-acc

epaggelian geromenēn, hoti tautēn ho theos
promise-acc having come-acc that this-acc the God-nom

ekpeplērōken tois teknois hēmin anastēsas Iēsoun.
fulfill-3-perf the children-dat us-dat raise up-part-aor Jesus-acc

'So now we preach to you the glad news that the promise made to the fathers has been fulfilled by God for us their children, when he raised Jesus.' (MV)

Cited as COPY: Blass and Debrunner (1961:252), Bloomfield (1836:1.519), Buttmann (1873:376), Robertson (1934:423), Winer (1881:626).

Cited as not COPY: Meyer (1883:257).

Moulton (Winer 1882:782) questions the inclusion of this sentence as an example of COPY. Meyer definitely does not include it. He says that the hoti-clause "contains the particular part of the eppaggelia, the promise of the Messiah generally, which is announced." As I point out in Section VII, the exegetical use of the hoti-clause is more precise than many, including Meyer, suppose it to be.

Acts 15:36

Epistrepsantes dē episkepsōmetha tous adelphous
returning then go see-1-pl-imper the brothers-acc

kata polin pasan en hais katēggeilamen ton logon
throughout city-acc every-acc in which announce-1-pl-aor the word-acc

tou kuriou, pōs ekhousin?
the Lord-gen how have-3-pl

'Ought we not to go back now to see how our brothers are faring
in the various towns where we proclaimed the word of the
Lord?' (NEB)

Cited as COPY: Bloomfield (1836:1.534), Buttmann (1873:377),
Green (1912:317), Meyer (1883:74), Winer (1881:626).

Munck (1967:147) translates pōs ekhousin as the object complement of episkepsōmetha. The fact that episkepsomai is often translated 'visit' has caused many translations to do likewise here and then to insert the phrase 'to see' before pōs. Although this is a possibility, all the other instances in the NT where it seems necessary to insert 'to see' when translating (as in Mark 3:2, Luke 14:28, Acts 17:11, 2 Cor. 13:5, and 1 John 4:1) the clause is an if-clause. Thus I feel that COPY provides a more probable means of interpreting this construction.

Acts 16:3

Ēdeisan gar hapantes hoti Hellēn ho patr̄ autou
know-3-pl-aor for all-nom that Greek-nom the father-nom his-gen

hupērkhen.
be-3-imper

'For they all knew that his father was a Greek.'

Cited as COPY: Green (1912:352), Winer (1881:626).

This COPY-produced construction occurs only in the TR.

Acts 21:29

... hon enomizon hoti eis to hieron
whom-acc suppose-3-pl-imperf that into the temple-acc
eisēgagen ho Paulos.
bring-3-perf the Paul-nom

'... whom they believed Paul had brought into the temple.'

Cited as COPY: none.

This construction is discussed in Section VIII.

Acts 26:5

... proginōskontes me anōthen ... hoti kata
know-part me-acc from the first that according to
tēn akribestatēn hairesin tēs hēmeteras thrēskeias
the most exact sect the our-gen religion
ezēsa Pharisaios.
live-1-aor Pharisees-nom

'... for they have known for a long time ... that according to the strictest party of our rite I lived as a Pharisee.' (Johnson and Lake 1965:315-6)

Cited as COPY: Winer (1881:626).

Moffat translates it, inconsistent with his usual manner of treating COPY-produced constructions, "They know me of old. They know ... that as a Pharisee"

1 Cor. 3:20

Kurios ginōskei tous dialogismous tōn sophōn
Lord-nom know-3 the reasonings-acc the wise-gen

hoti eisin mataioi.
that be-3-pl vain-nom

'The Lord knows that the reasoning of the wise is futile.' (MV)

Cited as COPY: Buttmann (1873:376), Eadie (1869:34), Edwards (1885:383), Green (1912:317), Winer (1881:626).

This is a quotation of Ps. 94:11. Godet (1957:1.197) treats the construction as follows:

The verb knowing has two objects in the original texts (Hebrew and Greek), as is often the case; first, the object known, the thought; then what God knows of those thoughts: that they are vain.

It is seen that he chooses that analysis which theorizes that in the LS ginōskō actually has two objects and that somewhere in the derivation the expected conjunction is lost. I explained and rejected this analysis in Section III.

1 Cor. 14:37

... epiginosketo ha graphō humin
acknowledge-3-imper things which-acc write-1 you-dat

hoti kuriou estin entole.

'... let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord.' (KJV)

Cited as COPY: Bloomfield (1836:2.159), Edwards (1885:383), Ellicott (1887:284), Winer (1881:626).

1 Cor. 15:12

This example was discussed in Section II.

Cited as COPY: Bloomfield (1885:2.163), Buttmann (1873:377), Ellicott (1887:294), Green (1912:317), Trollope (1842:155), Winer (1881:626).

Cited as not COPY: Edwards (1885:402).

1 Cor. 16:15

Oidate tēn oikian Stephanas, hoti estin aparkhē
 know-2-pl the house-acc Stephanas-gen that be-3 firstfruit-nom

tēs Akhaias
 the Achaia-gen

'You know that the household of Stephanas were the first converts
 in Achaia' (NIV)

Cited as COPY: Buttmann (1873:376), Edwards (1885:383), Green
 (1912:352), Héring (1962:185), Meyer (1884a:400), Turner (1963:
 325), Robertson (1934:1034), Trollope (1842:155).

2 Cor. 3:3

... phaneroumenoi hoti este epistolē Khristou
 reveal-part-pass-nom that be-2-pl letter-nom Christ-gen

'... it is being revealed that you are a letter from Christ'

Cited as COPY: Bloomfield (1885:2.185).

2 Cor. 12:3-4

Kai oida ton toiouton anthrōpon ... hoti hērpagē
 and know-1 the such-acc man-acc that catch up-3-aor

eis ton paradeison
 into the paradise-acc

'I simply know that ... this man was caught up to paradise' (MV)

Cited as COPY: Eadie (1869:34), Meyer (1884a:676), Winer (1881:626).

2 Cor. 13:5

Hē ouk epiginōskete heautous hoti Iēsous Khristos
 or not know-2-pl yourselves-acc that Jesus-nom Christ-nom

en humin ...?
 in you-dat

'Do you not understand that Christ Jesus is within you ...?' (MV)

Cited as COPY: Buttmann (1873:377), Green (1912:317), Trollope
 (1842:156), Winer (1881:626).

Cited as not COPY: Meyer (1884a:706).

Meyer objects to this sentence being cited as an example of COPY because it was not a subject that was copy-raised. His explanation that "hoti defines more precisely" what is known is based on a loose definition of the epexegetical use of hoti as I have already pointed out.

Barnes (1949:269) misunderstands this construction and strongly asserts that the sentence means that "they [the Corinthians] might know themselves, i.e. their character, principles, conduct. This proves that Christians may know their true character." This is but one example of faulty exegesis resulting from the misunderstanding of COPY-produced constructions.

Gal. 1:11

Gnōrizō gar humin, adelphoi, to euaggelion to euaggelisthen
make known-1 for you-dat brothers-nom the gospel-acc the preach-part-pass

hup' emou hoti ouk estin kata anthrōpon.
by me-gen that not be-3 according to man-acc

'No, brothers, I tell you the gospel that I preach is not a human affair.' (MV)

Cited as COPY: Bloomfield (1885:2.229), Eadie (1869:34), Ellicott (1880:33), Meyer (1884c:22).

Gal. 4:11

Phoboumai humas mē pōs eikē kekopiaka eis humas.
fear-1 you-acc not how in vain work-1-perf among you-acc

'I fear that in vain I have spent my labour upon you.' (Burton 1921: 234).

Cited as COPY: Arndt and Gingrich (1957:870), Blass and Debrunner (1961:252), Burton (1921:235), Buttmann (1873:377), Turner (1963: 325), Winer (1881:626).

Cited as not COPY: Bloomfield (1885:2.246), Eadie (1869:317), Ellicott (1880:99-100), Meyer (1884c:181).

It is very much debated whether this construction should be viewed

as COPY-produces or not. Meyer (1884c:181) cites the following additional grammarians (of another era) that apparently followed Winer in listing Gal. 4:11 under COPY: Usteri, Olshausen, Hilgenfeld, and Wieseler.

Meyer, Eadie, and Ellicott disagree with these grammarians simply because they have extended the application of COPY to NP's other than subjects.

The COPY-analysis seems to give a better meaning to the sentence than an analysis without COPY. I do not agree with the KJV ('I am afraid of you, lest') nor with Ridderbos (1953:162), who says, "the humas following phoboumai in the sense of I fear for you, or have fears in respect of you, is unusual. Still, that is unmistakably the meaning."

Gal. 5:21

... ha prolegō humin kathōs proeipon
which-acc tell before-1 you-dat as say-1-aor

hoti hoi ta toiauta prassontes basileian
that the-nom the-acc such things-acc practicing-nom kingdom-acc

theou ou klēronomēsousin.
God-gen not inherit-3-pl-fut

'I warn you now, as I have before: those who do these things will not receive the Kingdom of God.' (TEV)

Cited as COPY: Blass and Debrunner (1961:252), Turner (1963:325).

Cited as not COPY: Ellicott (1880:134).

It is impossible to reproduce the Greek construction literally into English. COPY occurs here for relativization purposes. In the sentence preceding Gal. 5:21, Paul has listed the depravations into which man has fallen. In order for v. 21 to be made into a relative clause referring to these depravations, COPY had to be applied first, as I explain in

Section VIII.

Burton (1921:311) seems to be puzzled by the construction.

Ha is doubtless accusative as hon clearly is in John 8:54, hon humeis legete hoti theos humōn estin, but in precisely what relation Paul meant to set it, when he wrote it, it is impossible to say, for the reason that after kathōs proeipon he has reproduced the thought of ha in ta toiauta and given it a new construction.

Ellicott (1880:134) argues:

It is not necessary to refer ha to prassontes as an accus. derived by attraction from the accus. objecti after that word ...; the ordinary explanation ... being perfectly satisfactory. In such cases, the relative is really governed by the finite verb as a species of 'quantitative' accus.; its prominence in the sentence and appy. absolute use being designed to call attention to that on which the thought or action principally turns; comp. John viii.54 Such sentences often involve a slight but perfectly intelligible anacoluthon.

Ellicott notwithstanding, COPY seems to provide a very neat and reasonable solution.

Col. 4:17

Blepe tēn diakonian hēn parelabes en kuriō
see-2-imper the ministry-acc which-acc receive-2-aor in Lord-dat

hina autēn plērois.
that it-acc fulfill-2-subj

'See to it that you complete the work you have received in the Lord.' (NIV)

Cited as COPY: Green (1912:317), Winer (1881:626).

Cited as not COPY: Eadie (1884:295), Ellicott (1876:210), Meyer (1885:391-2).

Moulton (Winer 1882:782) doubts that this sentence should be cited as an example of COPY. Ellicott and Meyer object quite strongly to its inclusion under COPY. Ellicott (1876:210) says, "Grotius and others assume here a Hebraistic inversion for blepe hina plēr.,--a needless violation of the order of the words and of the more usual meaning of

hina." Meyer (1885:391-2), who interprets the hina-clause as a purpose-clause, cites Grotius, Wolf, Flatt, Bühr, and "many" as arbitrarily favoring a COPY analysis and argues that "the very autēn should have precluded them." Of course, COPY would explain why the pronoun is found there, and indeed we would expect to find it.

1 Thess. 2:1

Autoi gar oidate adelphoi, tēn eisodon
yourselves-nom for know-2-pl brothers-voc the entrance-acc

hēmōn tēn pros humas hoti ou kenē gegonen
our-gen the to you-acc that not in vain become-3-perf

'You know, brothers, that our visit to you was not a failure.' (NIV)

Cited as COPY: Ellicott (1880b:15), Green (1912:317), Lünemann (1880:464), Winer (1881:626).

2 Thess. 2:4

... apodeiknunta heauton hoti estin theos.
proclaiming himself-acc that be-3 God-nom

'... claiming that he is God.'

Cited as COPY: Winer (1881:626), Arndt and Gingrich (1957:89).

The copy-raised NP has been reflexivized because it is coreferential with the subject (underlying) of apodeiknunta.

Rev. 3:9

... poiēsō autous hina hēxousin kai proskunēsousin
cause-1-fut them-acc that come-3-pl-fut and worship-3-pl-fut

enōpion tōn podōn sou
before the feet-gen you-gen

'I will make them come before you and fall down and worship you'
(TEV)

Cited as COPY: Beckwith (1919:481), Blass and Debrunner (1961:252), Buttmann (1873:377), Dürstendieck (1886:170), Turner (1963:325), Trollope (1842:156), Winer (1881:626).

Rev. 13:12

Kai poiei tēn gēn kai tous en autē katoikountas
and cause-3 the earth-acc and the ones-acc in it-dat dwell-part-acc

hina proskunēsousin to thērion to prōton
that worship-3-pl-fut the beast-acc the first-acc

'And [he] made the earth and its inhabitants worship the first
beast.' (NIV)

Cited as COPY: Beckwith (1919:640).

Rev. 13:16

Kai poiei pantas, tous mikrous kai tous megalous,
and cause-3 all-acc the small-acc and the great-acc

kai tous plousious kai tous ptōkhous,
and the rich-acc and the poor-acc

kai tous eleutherois kai tous doulous,
and the free-acc and the slaves-acc

hina dōsin autois kharagma epi tēs kheiros autōn
that give-3-pl-subj them-dat mark-acc on the hand-gen them-gen

tēs dexias ē epi to metōpon autōn.
the right-gen or on the forehead-acc them-gen

'He also forced everyone, small and great, rich and poor, free and
slave, to receive a mark on his right hand or on his forehead.'
(NIV)

This is the only example in the NT in which an indirect object is
copy-raised. The sentence (simplified) has the remote structure "He
caused that they (unspecified) give a mark ... to all, the small and
great," COPY is applied to this sentence and later PRONOMINALIZATION
is applied, leaving autois.

Rev. 21:23

Kai hē polis ou khreian ekhei tou hēliou oude tēs selēnēs,
and the city-nom not need have-3 the sun-gen nor the moon-gen

hina phainōsin autē
that shine-3-pl-subj it-dat

'And the city did not need the sun or the moon to shine on it'
(NIV)

The objects of ekho khreian 'need' are usually in the genitive case,
as here.

VII. SIMILAR CONSTRUCTIONS NOT PRODUCED BY COPY-RAISING

There are five major types of constructions that are quite similar to those produced by COPY which should not be confused with the latter.

One type is that which has a matrix verb which may legitimately have three arguments in the LS, such as the verb erōtaō 'ask', the indirect object of which is normally found in the accusative case.¹ An example is found in Luke 7:36.

- (51) Ērōta de tis auton tōn Pharisaion
ask-3-aor and certain-nom him-acc the Pharisees-gen

 hina phagē met' autou.
 that eat-3-subj with him-gen

'And one of the Pharisees asked him to eat with him.'

In this example the direct object is a sentential complement and the indirect object is auton 'him'. There is no need to posit a COPY analysis for this construction. (See also Mark 7:26 and Luke 16:27.)

A second, and less obvious, type of construction that is confused with COPY-produced constructions is caused by an extraposition rule we will call LEFT DISLOCATION. This rule moves the subject or object or a prepositional phrase out of an embedded clause (complement or purpose) to directly precede the word introducing the embedded clause,² apparently

¹Some of these NP's in the accusative case may actually have resulted from a dative advancement rule. Further investigation is needed here.

²The only exception to this rule that I have found in the NT is 1 John 5:16 where peri ekeinēs 'about that' is extraposed to directly precede the matrix verb. The constraint on the placement of the NP

for the purpose of emphasis or focus. This rule differs from COPY in that it does not affect grammatical relations. Below is one example of each type of embedded clause to which LEFT DISLOCATION has been applied. The first, Luke 24:7, is classified by Blass and Debrunner (1961:252) and Turner (1963:325) under prolepsis (the COPY type). Wellhausen (cited by Black 1946:325) notes Luke 24:7 as an example of hyperbaton (Black's term for COPY).

- (52) ... legōn ton huion tou anthrōpou hoti dei
 saying the son-acc the man-gen that must-(impersonal)
 paradothēnai eis kheiras
 deliver-inf-pass into hands-acc
 'saying that the Son of Man must be delivered into the
 hands'

This construction may actually have resulted from COPY. Two reasons, however, make me inclined to believe that it resulted from LEFT DISLOCATION. First, in seven of ten examples in the NT in which a non-subject NP has been copy-raised into the higher clause, a coreferential pronoun has been retained in the embedded clause. In constructions with dei it seems best to consider the associated infinitive as the subject of the impersonal verb. Had COPY been applied to the underlying structure of (52), we would normally have expected a pronoun in place of ton huion tou anthrōpou. This is assuming that COPY takes place in the derivation after the rule which would trigger the infinitivization of paradothenai 'to be delivered'. Second, COPY only occurs with legō in

apparently does not apply to prepositional phrases. This is not at all surprising since the grammatical relation that a prepositional phrase bears to the verb is considerably more defined semantically than is the grammatical relation that a term might bear. Hence its position in the sentence will be much less critical to the understanding of that sentence.

the NT when there is a need to relativize the copied NP. This is not the case here.

Turner (1963:325) cites the next example of LEFT DISLOCATION, Acts 19:4, under prolepsis also.

- (53) ... legōn eis ton erkhomenon met' auton hina
saying in the one coming after him-acc that

pisteusōsin.
believe-3-pl-subj

'... telling [the people] that they should believe in the one coming after him.'

The presence of the preposition eis with a verb that does not introduce its direct objects with eis is the clue that (53) does not result from COPY because prepositions are not copy-raised.

2 Cor. 2:4 is an example in which LEFT DISLOCATION has been applied, moving tēn agapēn out of a purpose clause.

- (54) Egrapsa humin ... oukh hina lupēthēte
write-1-aor you-dat not so that grieve-2-pl-subj-pass

alla tēn agapēn hina gnōte
but the love-acc so that know-2-pl-subj

'I wrote to you ... not so that you would be grieved, but so that you might know the love'

Other, undisputed, examples of the sort of extraposition described above are found in Rom. 11:31; John 13:29, 34; 1 Cor. 7:29; Gal. 2:10; and Col. 4:16b.

The third and fourth types of constructions that are sometimes confused with COPY-produced constructions are those sentences with a transitive matrix verb followed by a hoti- or hina-clause, the subject of which is coreferential with the object of the matrix verb. But rather than being complement clauses, these are cause and purpose clauses respectively. I will discuss below certain examples of these from the NT which

have been attributed to COPY by others, but which I have dismissed as not having resulted from COPY. John 9:8 reads:

- (55) Hoi oun geitones kai hoi theōrountes auton
 the therefore neighbors-nom and the beholding-nom him-acc
 to proteron, hoti prosaitēs ēn, elegon
 formerly beggar-nom be-3-imperf say-3-pl-imperf

Since hoti could be functioning here as either a complementizer or as a causal conjunction, there are two possible translations of this sentence. (56) is the meaning if hoti is a complementizer and (57) is the meaning if hoti is a causal conjunction.

- (56) Therefore the neighbors and those who had seen before that he was a beggar said
 (57) Therefore the neighbors and those who used to see him (because he had been a beggar) said

In favor of (56) are all the English translations I have checked except one; that is, they do not translate hoti as 'because'. Arndt and Gingrich (1957:593) cite John 9:8 as an example of COPY. However, the sense of (56) is quite awkward. For that reason, most translations reword the clause freely. The RSV has "... who had seen him before as a beggar" and the NIV has "... who had formerly seen him begging." The latter indicates that possibly John 9:8 does not result from COPY and that the hoti-clause is not the logical complement of theōrountes.

In favor of (57) is only one English translation--CKW. Also in favor of (57) is the fact that no grammar--including Winer--cites John 9:8 as an example of prolepsis, although admittedly most of these grammars are far from being comprehensive on the subject. Bernard (1928:2.330) says, "They noticed the man because he was a familiar figure, as a blind beggar," and "they had noticed the man formerly because he used to beg from them." Westcott (1954:2.35) likewise says, "The particle hoti is capable of both meanings

(that, because). In other passages (iv 19, xii 19) St. John uses the phrase certainly for 'see ... that ...'; here, however, 'because' suits the context better; because he was a beggar in a public spot, they were very familiar with his appearance." This sense does suit the context better. The fact that the blind man was a beggar had not been told yet in the account and it seems entirely possible that the mentioning of people seeing the man (over a period of time) caused John to include some explanation, almost parenthetically. Spence and Exell (n.d.:2.6) say, "This is the first time that this well-known position is mentioned, and (if we translate hoti--"because") the very fact of his begging (probably with a loud voice) had made him a well-known individual." The introduction of parenthetical explanations is totally in harmony with John's style of writing. Though most often this material is prefaced by gar (see 3:24, 4:8, 6:64, 7:5, 7:39, 19:31, 21:7, and 21:8), this is not always the case (see 4:2, 7:50, 9:14, 11:32, and 1 John 3:20). Other possible instances of hoti used this way by John are John 18:2 and John 19:20.

For the reasons stated above, I do not believe John 9:8 to have resulted from COPY.

Galatians 6:1 is another disputable case:

- (58) Katartizete ton toiouton en pneumati prautētos
 restore-2-pl-imper the such a one-acc in spirit-dat meekness-gen
 skopōn seauton, mē kai su peirasthēs.
 watching yourself-acc not also you-nom tempt-subj-pass

The situation is discussed quite well by Burton (1921:328) who lists the three alternatives for understanding the clause introduced by mē. The clause may be:

- (a) "a clause of purpose after skopōn seauton," or

- (b) "an object clause after skopōn as a verb of effort ..., seauton being in that case proleptic and pleonastic," or
- (c) "a clause of fear, the verb of fearing to be supplied in thought" as in 1 Thess. 3:5 and Gal. 2:2.

The three corresponding translations would be:

- (59a) 'Watch yourself, so that you won't be tempted also.'
- (59b) 'Watch (or: be careful) that you aren't tempted also.'
- (59c) 'Watch yourself, for fear that you might be tempted also.'

In favor of (59a) are most English translations and commentaries. Buttmann (1873:243) prefers this view over (b). Burton claims that (a) is less probably the correct interpretation because "the purpose of skopōn as here referred to is manifestly not so much to avoid falling into temptation as to render one considerate in dealing with those who do so fall."

In favor of (59b), using a COPY analysis, are Winer (1881:626) and Green (1912:352). Burton says about (b) that it is less probably the correct interpretation because "Paul elsewhere constantly uses skopeō, not as a verb of effort, but in the sense 'to consider, observe'." Moulton (Winer 1882:782) questions the validity of the COPY analysis for Gal. 6:1 and Buttmann (1873:377) rejects it on grammatical and semantical grounds, the first of which probably do not constitute a valid objection.

In favor of (59c) are Burton, and the translations LSF and NTBE. Burton says that this interpretation is the most probable.

The decision is not an easy one. Burton's reason for rejecting (b) is certainly inconclusive, and his reason for rejecting (a) and accepting (c) is quite subjectively based, reasonable as it may be. However, because I feel that (b) is less likely to be the correct interpretation of the construction, I have not included Gal. 6:1 in the list of COPY-produced

constructions in the New Testament.

2 John 8 is another disputable construction. It reads:

(60) Blepete heautous, hina mē apolesēte ha
 see-2-imper yourselves-acc not lose-2-subj what-acc-pl
 ērgasametha, alla misthon plērē apolabēte.
 accomplish-1-pl-aor but reward-acc full receive-2-pl-subj

The hina may be understood in two ways--either as a complementizer or as the introduction to a purpose clause. Although no grammar mentions 2 John 8 as an example of prolepsis, apparently the NIV interprets it that way: "Watch out that you do not lose what you have worked for, but that you may be rewarded fully."¹ Huther (1887:43) defends this interpretation; he says, "The construction hina after blepein only in 1 Cor. xvi. 10 besides; by hina it is not the purpose ('take heed to yourselves, sc. of them, so that'), but the immediate object of their foresight that is stated (contrary to De Wette, Braune, and A. Buttm, p, 209)." In a footnote, Huther continues to explain why: "Braune here adduces various passages of the N.T. in order to vindicate for the particle hina the meaning of purpose ('so that'); but he has not paid attention to the distinction whether the verbal idea with which hina is connected is absolute or relative (requiring supplement), and he has not reflected that if the clause beginning with hina forms the supplement of the preceding verbal idea; hina cannot be = 'so that'."

Huther notwithstanding, I feel that 2 John 8 cannot be construed as an example of COPY, but that the hina-clause is indeed to be taken as a purpose clause. Huther's arguments against this do not hold. That a "verbal idea" is "relative" and that the following clause could be the

¹The "you" of "you have worked for" is due to a manuscript variant.

"supplement" are only necessary conditions for a clause to be interpreted as the complement of that "verbal idea," but they do not demand that it be so interpreted. The fact that blepō 'watch out' can be used without a complement (see Mark 13:23, 33), or with a reflexive pronoun (see Mark 13:9), as well as with a sentential complement, allows the verb in 2 John 8 to be considered "absolute." The fact that the hina-clause here can be understood as a purpose clause very easily removes Huther's second objection. In fact, it is more difficult to see the second hina-clause, preceded by alla 'but', as anything but telic, as most translations render it. And since conjunctions coordinating dependent clauses generally coordinate like clauses (see 2 Cor. 2:4 cited above, for example), if the second hina-clause is to be taken as a purpose clause, the first hina-clause should be taken as a purpose clause, and the construction translated, 'Watch yourselves, so that you won't lose what we (you) have worked for, but receive your full reward.'

Rev. 17:8 is the last disputable construction I will discuss in this section. It reads:

- (61) Kai thaumasthesontai hoi katoikountes epī tēs gēs, ...
 and wonder-3-pl-fut the dwelling-nom on the earth-gen
 blepontōn ton thērion hoti ēn kai ouk
 seeing-gen the beast-acc that be-3-imperf and not
 estin kai parestai.
 be-3 and be present-3-fut

The hoti may be a complementizer or mean 'because'. The translations that correspond to these possibilities are:

- (62) 'The inhabitants of the earth will be astonished ... when they see that the beast (once) was (alive), (now) is not (alive), and will appear (again).'
- (63) 'The inhabitants of the earth will be astonished ... when they see the beast, because he (once) was (alive), (now) is not (alive), and will appear (again).'

Several translations (EJG, NASB, JBP, ASV, NTBE, TCNT, and CBW) translate similarly to (62) and treat the hoti-clause as the object complement of blepontōn, implying a COPY analysis.¹ Winer (1881:626) cites Rev. 17:8 as an example of COPY, as do Buttmann (1873:376) and Trollope (1842:155). In their view, the hoti-clause tells what the inhabitants will see (or realize).

Several translations also translate similarly to (63). They include ANT, NEB, RSV, TEV, NIV, TNT, RFW, LSF. In their view, the hoti-clause tells why the inhabitants will be astonished.

Since (62) seems to make less sense than (63) in the immediate context in which it is found, I do not regard Rev. 17:8 as a COPY-produced construction.

A fifth type of construction that might be confused with COPY-produced constructions is what is sometimes referred to as the explanatory or epexegetical use of the hina- and hoti-clauses. Blass and Debrunner discuss it under the "explanatory (epexegetical) infinitive" (1961:202). In these constructions, a demonstrative pronoun or a NP has replaced the complement clause (and often precedes the verb). This construction occurs often in didactic passages (such as 1 John 3:8, 11, 16, 23) and draws greater attention to the complement. This is not COPY because in the latter, one NP of the complement is copy-raised into the matrix clause. In these epexegetical clause constructions, however, a demonstrative pronoun or a NP replaces the entire complement clause as object of the matrix verb; the clause then becomes a chômeur. The NP which replaced the clause

¹A textual variant found in the TR is responsible for the reading in the KJV, as well as the BV and CKW. Instead of hoti, the variant reads ho ti, making the clause a relative clause: '... when they see the beast which (once) was (alive), (now) is not (alive), and which will appear (again).' This is a very possible reading on the basis of internal evidence.

is equivalent to the whole clause in meaning. A few examples will demonstrate this construction clearly.

1 Thess 4:15 is an example of the replacement of a hoti-clause, complement of the verb legō 'say', by the demonstrative pronoun touto 'this'.

- (64) Touto gar humin legomen ..., hoti hēmeis
 this-acc for you-dat say-1-pl that we-nom
- hoi zōntes ... ou mē phthasōmen tous koimēthentas.
 the living not not precede-1-pl-fut the having slept-acc
- 'For we say this ... that we who are alive ... will be no
 means go ahead of those who are asleep.'

Phil. 1:9 is an example of the replacement of a hina-clause, complement of the verb proseukhomai 'pray', by the demonstrative pronoun touto 'this'.

- (65) Kai touto proseukhomai, hina hē agapē humōn
 and this-acc pray-1 that the love-acc your-gen
- eti mallon kai mallon perisseuē
 yet more and more abound-3-subj
- 'And this I pray, that your love may abound yet more and
 more'

Examples of NP's replacing clauses are numerous: Gal. 1:13 ("my former conduct in Judaism"); 2 Cor. 8:9 ("the grace of the Lord"); Rom. 1:32 ("judgment"); Acts 17:5 ("commandment"); Acts 20:38 ("word"); Acts 21:31 ("information"); Phil. 1:27 ("the things concerning you"); and Rom. 13:11 ("time"). See also Acts 17:6 where the adverb houtōs 'thus' is used in the same way with a hoti-clause.

There are other constructions of minor importance that have been attributed to prolepsis which are quite clearly not to be explained with a COPY analysis. These are briefly discussed in Appendix E.

VIII. FUNCTIONS OF COPY-RAISING IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

By far, the explanation most commonly given as to why COPY occurs is that it emphasizes the NP that is copy-raised. Black (1946:36) says that COPY displaces "the subject or object of a subordinate clause to become subject or object of another clause ... thus giving special emphasis to it." Green (1912:362) somewhat ambiguously says that "the double expression conveys an emphasis, the attention being first called to the object and then to that which is said about it."¹

Winer (1881:625) gives a somewhat different reason for why COPY occurs when he states that attraction gives "discourse still greater compactness and conciseness." This is hard to believe in the case of COPY since COPY usually makes a sentence longer.

Buttmann (1873:376) merely says that by attraction "the great advantage accrues, that the two sentences can be melted in this way in substance and in form completely into one sentence." Where COPY occurs to bypass clause-boundary constraints so that RELATIVIZATION may be applied this is true. For most occurrences, however, this explanation is inadequate.

Not Obligatory

Perhaps it should be said first that COPY is not an obligatory rule in Koiné Greek; that is to say, it apparently is applied or not applied

¹See also Smyth (1963:488) and Hadley (1884:278) for Classical Greek grammars that express the same idea.

for other than grammatical reasons.¹ A sentence to which COPY has not been applied is neither less nor more grammatical than a sentence to which COPY has been applied. For example, a sentence to which COPY could have been applied, but was not, is found in Mark 15:39. It contrasts with several occurrences of COPY in otherwise parallel situations as in Mark 7:2, Mark 12:34, Luke 19:3, and John 11:31.

- (66) Idōn de ho kenturiōn ... hoti houtōs
 seeing and the centurion-nom that thus
 exepneusen, eipen
 expire-3-aor say-3-aor

'And when the centurion saw ... that he died that way, he said'

If COPY had been applied, the construction would probably have looked something like (67).

- (67) Idōn de auton ho kenturiōn ... hoti houtōs
 seeing and him-acc the centurion that thus
 exepneusen, eipen
 expire-3-aor say-3-aor

Also, if the UBT is correct in its textual choice, Luke 13:25 and Luke 13:27 are excellent evidence that COPY is not grammatically obligatory since COPY is the only rule needed to derive the former from the latter.

Clause-Boundary Constraints

One important function of COPY in Koiné Greek is that of changing a construction in such a way that relativization can take place. This involves a language-specific characteristic of relative pronoun movement. Relative-pronoun movement (WH-MOVEMENT) is bounded in some languages and

¹It is interesting and perhaps significant, however, that apparently indefinite NP's such as 'a man' or 'a crowd' (see Mark 9:25) are never copy-raised in Greek, so far as I am aware.

unbounded in others. In English, for example, WH-MOVEMENT is unbounded. Thus a sentence such as (68), though it is clumsy, is possible.

- (68) The man that Mary said John told her Bill thought was coming tomorrow is already here.

The relative pronoun 'that', logically belonging to the embedded clause 'he was coming tomorrow', has been moved to follow a NP in the clause in which the other clause is deeply embedded.

In Koiné Greek, however, WH-MOVEMENT is bounded; that is, relative pronouns cannot be moved except to precede the clause to which they pertain grammatically.¹ I have already alluded to this clause-boundary constraint in discussing the direct quotation in John 8:54. The basis for this claim is the fact that I have not found any non-suspect cases of WH-MOVEMENT across clause boundaries. But this constraint applies to other sentential complements besides direct quotations.

John 9:19 is an example of an indirect quotation embedded in a direct quotation. COPY has been applied to it because of the clause-boundary constraint on WH-MOVEMENT.²

- (69) Houtos estin ho huios humōn,
 this-nom be-3 the son-nom your-gen
 hon humeis legete hoti tuphlos egennēthē;
 whom-acc you-nom say-2-pl that blind-nom bear-3-aor-pass
 'Is this your son who you claim was born blind?'

¹Accordingly, if the embedded clause has undergone any operation that removes the clause boundary, this restriction does not apply. (The presence of an infinitive or participle after the main verb instead of the finite verb of the embedded clause often indicates that the clause boundary has been removed.) See Acts 3:18 and Acts 3:21, for example.

²It is possible that it is a direct quotation. It cannot be decided on grammatical grounds which it is because there is no obligatory marker of direct quotations in Koiné Greek and there is no shift in point of reference here to indicate that it is a direct quotation.

This is composed of two clauses:

- (70) Houtos estin ho huios humōn;
this is the son your

'Is this your son?'

- and (71) Humeis legete hoti tuphlos egennēthē.
you say that blind he was born

'You claim that he was born blind.'

If RELATIVIZATION had been applied to (71) in the way it does in English, the relative pronoun would be in the nominative case because it replaces the subject of the embedded clause tuphlos egennēthē. Because of the clause-boundary constraint in Koiné Greek, however, (71) cannot be relativized as it is. COPY must be applied first.

- (72) COPY →

humeis legete auton hoti tuphlos egennēthē.
you say him that blind he was born

Now that there is a NP in the higher clause which is able to be fronted to precede the entire construction, RELATIVIZATION can be applied to it and (69) can be derived.

Gal. 5:21 is an example of a sentence containing an embedded clause that was the complement of the verb prolegō in the LS.

- (73) ... ha prolegō humin kathōs proeipon
which-acc tell before-1 you-dat as say-1-aor

hoti hoi ta toiauta prassontes basileian
that the-nom the-acc such things-acc practicing-nom kingdom-acc

theou ou klēronomēsousin.
God-gen not inherit-3-pl-fut

'I warn you now, as I have before: those who do these things
will not receive the Kingdom of God.' (TEV)

Before COPY, RELATIVIZATION, and WH-MOVEMENT were applied to this construction, the sentence would be something like (74).

- (74) Prolegō humin kathos proeipon hoti hoi ta
 I tell before you as I told before that the the
 toiauta prassontes basileian theou ou klēronomēsousin.
 such things practicing kingdom of God not they will inherit

The clause-boundary constraints on WH-MOVEMENT prevent RELATIVIZATION from being applied to any constituent of (74) as it is except the understood subject of prolegō or the indirect object, humin. In order for WH-MOVEMENT to move one of the NP's of the embedded clause to precede the matrix verb, COPY must be applied and in this case ta toiauta is copy-raised and becomes the direct object of prolegō.

- (75) COPY →

prolegō ta toiauta humin kathōs proeipon
 I tell before the such things you as I told before
 hoti hoi ta toiauta prassontes basileian theou
 that the the such things practicing kingdom of God
 ou klēronomēsousin.
 not they will inherit

There is now a NP in the higher clause that is both coreferential in meaning with the NP's in the preceding clauses and also not bound by clause-boundary constraints. This NP is therefore able to be moved to precede the main clause and undergo RELATIVIZATION.

Acts 21:29 is another example of COPY that can be taken to involve the clause-boundary constraint.

- (76) ... hon enomizon hoti eis to hieron
 whom-acc suppose-3-pl-imperf that into the temple-acc
 eisēgagen ho Paulos.
 bring-3-perf the Paul-nom

'... whom they thought that Paul had brought into the temple.'

This example, however, offers no compelling evidence either for COPY or for the clause-boundary constraint. In fact, because there is no pronoun

in the hoti-clause that is coreferential to the relative to the relative pronoun hon, it is not readily apparent that COPY has been applied. Evidence elsewhere supports the clause-boundary constraint on WH-MOVEMENT in Greek, however, and COPY is a means by which this constraint could be bypassed in the above construction so that WH-MOVEMENT could take place.

2 Cor. 3:3 is a slightly different case, though it also results from COPY. In this sentence, a participle which is probably derived from a relative clause is used to further describe the Corinthians.

- (77) Hē epistolē hēmōn humeis este, ... phaneroumenoi
 the epistle-nom our-gen you-nom be-2-pl reveal-part-pass-nom-pl
 hoti este epistolē Khristou (2 Cor. 3:2-3)
 that be-2-pl epistle-nom Christ-gen

This could be stated in two simple sentences.

- (78) Hē epistolē hēmōn humeis este.

'You are our epistle.'

- (79) Phanerousthe hoti este epistolē Khristou

'It is being revealed (or: made known) that you are the
 epistle of Christ'

As they stand, these two sentences cannot be related except by a conjunction such as kai 'and'. RELATIVIZATION cannot be applied. But beginning with a remote structure for (79), I will show it can be altered structurally by first applying COPY in such a way that it is consequently able to undergo participial relativization.

- (80) Remote Structure

PHANERO-Δ	EI- HUM- EPISTOL- KHRIST-
REVEAL Δ	BE 2-pl EPISTLE CHRIST
	I II
I	

(81) COMPLEMENTATION →

PHANERO-Δ hoti EI- HUM- EPISTOL- KHRIST-
 REVEAL Δ that BE 2-pl EPISTLE CHRIST

I I II

(82) COPY →

PHANERO-Δ HUM- hoti EI- HUM- EPISTOL- KHRIST-
 REVEAL Δ 2-pl that BE 2-pl EPISTLE CHRIST

I II I ch

(83) PASSIVE →

PASS-PHANERO- HUM- hoti EI- HUM- EPISTOL- KHRIST-
 PASS-REVEAL 2-pl that BE 2-pl EPISTLE CHRIST

(84) CASE ASSIGNMENT →

PASS-PHANERO- humeis hoti EI- humeis epistolē Khristou
 PASS-REVEAL you that BE you epistle Christ

(85) VERB AGREEMENT →

phanerousthe humeis hoti este humeis epistole Khristou
 are revealed you that are you epistle of Christ

(86) SUBJECT PRONOUN DELETION →

phanerousthe hoti este epistole Khristou
 are revealed that are epistle of Christ

The subject of (86) is now coreferential with a term (the subject) of (78) and a rule yielding the participle is now possible, allowing this sentence to be joined to (78).

Semitic Influence

Sometimes prolepsis is referred to as being a semitism. This is not strictly true. As I have pointed out in Section V, COPY is found in Classical and Middle Greek literature, literature to which a semitic influence cannot be ascribed. The use of COPY in the NT, however, could be considered as having been influenced greatly by the Hebrew and Aramaic background of

the speakers, writers, and culture. As Munck (1967:xxvii) points out, "a semitism is more than the use of a Semitic word or of a Semitic but non-Greek idiom in Greek. The term can also be applied to idioms existing in both Greek and Semitic, which in the New Testament occur with a frequency characteristic of Semitic." Winer (1882:32) calls these idioms "imperfect Hebraisms." Turner's comments are also appropriately noted at this time.

It does not follow that if a construction occurs as frequently in the epistles as in the gospels it will be less likely to have a Semitic origin, for direct translation is not the only possible medium of Semitic influence. When the LXX was established its idioms powerfully influenced free compositions of Biblical Greek. The idiosyncrasies of Bibl. Greek syntax are shared in varying degrees by almost all the NT writers, whether they were translating or not. There is a family likeness among these Biblical works, setting them apart from the papyri and from contemporary literary Greek, although the books with Semitic sources may have these features to an especial degree. (Turner 1963:4-5)

In the NT, many of the occurrences of COPY have matrix verbs meaning 'know', 'see', and 'consider (or: notice)'. In the gospels this is true for most of the occurrences of COPY. The verbs meaning 'know' and 'see' correlate in meaning with the verbs in the Hebrew Old Testament with which COPY most generally occurs (see Appendix D). The fact that most of these occurrences are found in quoted speech makes the possibility of Semitic influence on the Greek versions of Jesus' sayings very plausible. Recognizing Semitic influence on the constructions does not entirely answer the question as to why COPY occurs, however, since Paul used COPY as much as any NT author. Discussions of constructions in the gospels in which COPY occurs would be benefited by better understanding of how COPY operates in Hebrew and Aramaic, however.

Discourse-Related Functions

It seems most probable at this time that the major functions of COPY besides that of altering constructions so that WH-MOVEMENT can be applied are discourse-related. COPY is a rule that gives prominence to the NP that is moved into the higher clause. The function in most instances, however, seems not be to "emphasize" that NP, as has often been asserted,¹ but to signal that a NP which otherwise would not be considered the topic of the sentence or paragraph because of its position is now the topic. The functions of COPY in respect to discourse structure warrant further study.

¹The term "emphasize" as used by traditional grammarians is used very broadly and it is not certain precisely what was meant. I am assuming here that the principle meaning is that of putting a higher degree of stress on something as opposed to the discourse function of prominence.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

EXAMPLES OF COPY-RAISING IN THE NEW TESTAMENT¹

<u>COPY-I</u>	<u>COPY-I, con.</u>	<u>COPY-II</u>
Matt. 6:26	Acts 3:10	John 13:28*
6:28*	4:13	16:4
25:24	9:20	
	15:36*	Acts 13:32
Mark 1:24*	(16:3)	21:29
7:2	26:5	
11:32		Gal. 5:21
12:34	1 Cor. 3:20	
	14:37	Col. 4:17
Luke 4:34*	15:12	
12:24	16:15	
12:27*		<u>COPY-III</u>
13:25*	2 Cor. 3:3	
(13:27)*	12:3-4	Rev. 13:16
19:3*		
	Gal. 1:11	
John 1:15		<u>COPY-Non-Term</u>
3:21	1 Thess. 2:1	
4:35		Acts 5:26
5:42	2 Thess. 2:4	
7:27*		2 Cor. 13:5
8:54	Rev. 3:9	
9:19	13:12	Gal. 4:11
(9:29)*	21:23	
11:31		

¹Verses that are in parentheses are examples of COPY found in the TR only. Asterisks indicate that the embedded clause was an indirect question.

APPENDIX B

VERBS WITH WHICH COPY-RAISING OCCURS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

Verb	Number of Occurrences in NT	Meaning	Page in Arndt and Gingrich (1957)
apodeiknumi	1	proclaim	89
blepō	1	see to it	143
ekhō	1	consider	333
ekhō khreian	1	need	893
emblepō eis	1	consider	254
epiginōskō	4	perceive-3 acknowledge-1	291
episkeptomai	1	go to see	298
euaggelizō	1	proclaim	317
ginōskō	4	know	159-61
gnōrizō	1	make known	162
horaō	4	see	581-2
katamanthanō	1	notice	415
katanoēō	2	notice	416
kērussō	2	proclaim	432
legō	4	say	469-71
mnēmoneuō	1	remember	526-7
nomizō	1	think, suppose	543
oida	10*	know	558-9

*Includes 2 occurrences in the TR.

Verb	Number of Occurrences in NT	Meaning	Page in Arndt and Gingrich (1957)
phanerōo	2	reveal, show	860
phobeō	2	be afraid	870
poieō	3	cause	687-9
proginōskō	1	know before	710
theaomai	1	see, notice	353-4

APPENDIX C

EXAMPLES OF COPY-RAISING IN EXTRA-NEW TESTAMENT LITERATURE

Xenophon's Anabasis 1.1.5

Kai tōn par' heautō de barbarōn epemeleito
and the with himself-gat barbarians-gen take care-3-imperf

hōs polemein te hikanoi eiēsan
that make war-inf competent-nom be-3-pl-opt

'He took care also that the barbarians with him should be in
condition to make war'

Xenophon's Anabasis 3.5.18

Tēn gar hyperbolēn tōn oreōn edēdoikesan
the for pass-acc the mountains-gen fear-3-pl-plperf

mē prokatalēphtheie.
not occupy-3-perf-opt-pass

'They were afraid that the mountain pass might be occupied.'

Xenophon's Anabasis 6.4.23

Heōra tous anthrōpous hōs eikhon deinōs.
see-3-imperf the men-acc that have-3-pl-imperf terribly

'He saw that the men were in a terrible plight.'

Xenophon's Anabasis 7.1.2

... phoboumenos to strateuma mē epi tēn hautou khōran
fearing-nom the army-acc not over the his-gen district-acc

strateuētai,
march-3-subj

'... fearing that the army might march against his district,'

Xenophon's Cyropaedia 8.1.44

Epemeleto autōn hopōs aei andrapoda
take care-3-imperf them-gen that always slaves-nom

diateloien.
continue being-3-pl-opt

'He took care that they should always continue to be slaves.'

Xenophon's Oeconomicus 4.21

Ethaumazen auton ho Lusandros hōs kala
wonder-3-imperf him-acc the Lysander-nom how good-nom

ta dendra eiē.
the trees-nom be-3-subj

'Lysander marvelled at the beauty of his trees.' (Or: 'Lysander
marvelled at the beauty of the trees in it [the garden].')

Sophocles' The Ajax 118

Horas, Odusseu, tēn theōn iskhun hosē.
see-2 Odysseus-vocative the gods-gen strength-acc how great-nom

'You see, Odysseus, how great is the strength of the gods.'

Euripides' Medea 39

Dedoika d' autēn mē ti bouleusē neon.
fear-1 but her-acc not something-acc devise-3-subj evil-acc

'But I fear that she may devise something evil.'

Diodorus Siculus 4.40.3

... ton d' adelphon eulabeisthai mēpote ... epithētai
the brother-acc fear-inf lest pursue-3-subj

tē basileia.
the kingdom-dat

'He was afraid that his brother might attack the kingdom.'

Plato's Phaedrus 232.C

... phoboumenoi tous men ousian kektēmenous,
 fearing-nom the property-acc acquire-perf-part-acc

mē khrēmasin autous huperbalōntai.
 not wealth-dat them-acc exceed-3-pl-subj

'... fearing that those who had acquired property might exceed
 them in wealth.'

Plato's Laws 10.886.A

Phoboumai ge ... tous mokhthērous ... mē pōs hēmōn kataphronēsōsin.
 fear-1 the knaves-acc not how us-gen despise-3-pl-subj

'I fear that the knaves might despise us.'

Herodotus 3.68

Houtos ho Otanēs prōtos hupōpteuse ton Magon
 this-nom the Otanes-nom first suspect-3-aor the Magus

hōs ouk eiē ho Kurou Smerdis.
 that not be-3-subj the Cyrus-gen Smerdis

'This Otanes first suspected that the Magus was not Smerdis the
 son of Cyrus.'

Herodotus 3.80

Eidete men gar tēn Kambuseō hubrin ep' hoson
 see-2-pl for the Cambyses-gen insolence-acc unto how much-acc

epexēlthe.
 reach-3-aor

'You see what a height Cambyses' insolence has reached.'

2 Clement 17:7

... hotan theasōntai tous arnēsamenous hopōs kolazontai.
 when see-3-pl the deny-aor-part-acc how punish-3-pl-pass

'... when they see how those who have denied are punished.'

Ignatius' Letter to the Romans I

Phoboumai tēn humōn agapēn, mē autē me adikēsē.
 fear-1 the your-gen love-acc not it-nom me-acc hurt-3-subj

'I am afraid that your love might hurt me.'

APPENDIX D

COPY-RAISING IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

Reference	Matrix Verb in Hebrew	Type	COPY in LXX?	Matrix Verb in LXX	Gloss
Gen. 1:4	râ'âh	I	X	horaō	'see'
6:2	râ'âh	I	X	horaō	'see'
12:14	râ'âh	I	X	horaō	'see'
13:10	râ'âh	I	X	horaō	'see'
49:15	râ'âh	I	X	horaō	'see'
Exod. 2:2	râ'âh	I	0		
32:22	yâda'	I	0		
Num. 13:18	râ'âh	I	X	horaō	'see'
1 Sam. 25:11	yâda'	I	X	oida	'know'
2 Sam. 3:25	yâda'	I	X	oida	'know'
17:8	yâda'	I	X	oida	'know'
1 Kings 5:3	yâda'	I	X	oida	'know'
11:28	râ'âh	I	X	horaō	'see'
Job 22:12	râ'âh	I	X	horaō	'see'
Ps. 25:19	râ'âh	I	X	horaō	'see'
93:11	yâda'	I	X	ginōskō	'know'

APPENDIX E

ADDITIONAL CONSTRUCTIONS NOT RESULTING FROM COPY-RAISING

Robertson (1934:1034) mentions Rom. 9:6 as an example of COPY. Arndt and Gingrich (1957:565) explain the use of the relative pronoun here in a more adequate manner, however, and it is quite difficult to see how COPY could explain it at all.

Robertson (1934:423) also mentions 1 Cor. 6:4 under his broad definition of prolepsis. This construction is due to another rule of extraposition different from LEFT DISLOCATION, however. He also points out Luke 10:26, a construction to which COPY could not have been applied. The best explanation for it is either that the sentence is actually two questions or that the entire complement has been extraposed to precede the matrix clause. His references to Rom. 9:19, 20; Rom. 14:4, 10; 1 Cor. 15:36; and Acts 3:12 are also explained by the simple extraposition of the subject or indirect object to precede the interrogative. COPY is not involved.

Black (1946:37), discussing COPY under the name of hyperbaton, cites Wellhausen as noting several examples of the latter in the gospels. Matt. 10:25 is probably not an example of COPY, however, since the predicate ENOUGH can take two arguments in the LS. EQUI NP DELETION would explain this construction. Black's treatment of Mark 8:24 under hyperbaton is interesting, but difficult as this construction may be in the Greek, Black's hypothesis requires too much emendation of the text and too much imagination to be considered seriously. Also, if the

underlying Aramaic structure means what he believes, COPY would not render the Aramaic surface form he proposes.

LISTS OF ABBREVIATIONS

LINGUISTIC AND GRAMMATICAL ABBREVIATIONS

acc, accusative	subj, subjunctive
aor, aorist	V, predicate
ch, <u>chômeur</u>	I, grammatical relation is subject
dat, dative	II, grammatical relation is direct object
fut, future	III, grammatical relation is indirect object
gen, genitive	
imper, imperative	1, first person
imperf, imperfect	2, second person
inf, infinitive	3. third person
LS, logical structure	
neg, negative	
nom, nominative	
NP, noun phrase	
opt, optative	
part, participle	
pass, passive	
perf, perfect	
plperf, pluperfect	
pres, present	
pl, plural	
s, singular	
S, proposition	
SS, surface structure	

ABBREVIATIONS OF BIBLE TEXTS AND VERSIONS

ASV, American Standard Version
ANT, Amplified New Testament
NTBE, New Testament in Basic English
BV, Berkeley Version
CBW, Charles B. Williams's version
CKW, Charles Kingsley Williams's version
EJG, Edgar J. Goodspeed's version
JBP, J. B. Phillips's version
JB, Jerusalem Bible
KJV, King James Version
LSF, Louis Segond's version (French)
LXX, Septuagint (Greek Old Testament)
MV, James Moffat's version
NASB, New American Standard Bible
NEB, New English Bible
NIV, New International Version
RSV, Revised Standard Version
TCNT, Twentieth Century New Testament
TEV, Today's English Version
TNT, Translator's New Testament
TR, Textus Receptus
UBS, Critical Text of the United Bible Society
RFW, Richard Francis Weymouth's version

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bible Texts and Versions

Amplified New Testament. 1958. 5th ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House.

Berkeley Version of the New Testament from the Original Greek with Brief Footnotes. 1945. Tr. by Gerrit Verkuyl. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House.

Dios Llega al Hombre: El Nuevo Testamento de Nuestro Señor Jesucristo: Version Popular. 1970. 2d ed. Mexico City: Sociedades Bíblicas Unidas.

Gospels, The. 1956. Tr. by Kenneth S. Wuest. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Greek New Testament, The. 1968. Edited by Kurt Aland, Matthew Black, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce M. Metzger, and Allen Likgren. 2d ed. New York: United Bible Society, American Bible Society.

Holy Bible, The: Authorized Version. 1611.

Holy Bible, The: American Standard Version. tr. 1611. rev. 1881. rev. 1901. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons.

Holy Bible, The: New International Version: New Testament. 1973. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Bible Publishers.

Holy Bible, The: Revised Standard Version. tr. 1611. rev. 1881-1885 and 1901. rev. 1952. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons.

Interlinear Greek-English New Testament, The: The Nestle Greek Text with a Literal English Translation. 1959. Translation by Alfred Marshall. Foreword by J. B. Phillips. 2d ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House.

Interlinear Literal Translation of the Greek New Testament. 1946. Edited by George Ricker Berry. Stephen's text of 1550. Chicago: Wilcox & Follett Co.

La Sainte Bible qui comprend l'Ancien et le Nouveau Testament traduits d'après les textes originaux Hébreu et Grec. rev. 1959. Translated by Louis Segond. British and Foreign Bible Society.

- New American Standard Bible: New Testament. 1960. Chicago: Moody Press.
- New English Bible, The: New Testament. 1961. n.p.: Oxford University Press and Cambridge University Press.
- New Testament, The: A New Translation. 1935. Tr. by James Moffat. rev. ed. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers.
- New Testament, The: A New Translation in Plain English. 1952. Tr. by Charles Kingsley Williams. London: S. P. C. K. and Longmans, Green & Co.
- New Testament, The: A Private Translation in the Language of the People. 1949. Tr. by Charles B. Williams. Chicago: Moody Press.
- New Testament, The: An American Translation. 1923. Tr. by Edgar J. Goodspeed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- New Testament in Basic English, The. 1941. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co.
- New Testament in Modern English, The. 1958. Tr. by J. B. Phillips. New York: Macmillan Co.
- New Testament in Modern Speech, The: An Idiomatic Translation into Everyday English from the Text of the Resultant Greek Testament. 1943. Tr. by Richard Francis Weymouth. 5th ed. revised by James Alexander Robertson. Boston: The Pilgrims Press.
- New Testament of the Jerusalem Bible, The. 1966. Edited by Alexander Jones. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co.
- Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes. 1935. Edited by Alfred Rahlfs. 8th ed. Württembergische Bibelanstalt Stuttgart.
- Today's English Version of the New Testament. 1966. New York: Macmillan Co.
- Translator's New Testament, The. 1973. London: British and Foreign Bible Society.
- Twentieth Century New Testament, The: A Translation into Modern English. 1904. rev. ed. New York: Fleming H. Revell Co.

Other References

- Abbott, T. K. 1897. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians. The International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Arndt, William F., and Gingrich, F. Wilbur. 1957. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. A translation and adaptation of Walter Bauer's Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur, 4th rev. and aug. ed. 1952. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Barnes, Albert. 1949. Notes on the New Testament: Explanatory and Practical: II Corinthians and Galatians, ed. Robert Frew. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.
- Beckwith, Isbon T. 1919. The Apocalypse of John: Studies in Introduction with a Critical and Exegetical Commentary. New York: Macmillan Co.
- Bengel, John Albert. 1860. Gnomon of the New Testament Pointing ... Its Divine Thoughts, trans. Charlton T. Lewis and Marvin R. Vincent. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Perkinpine & Higgins.
- Bennett, Charles E. 1918. New Latin Grammar. New York: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bernard, J. H. 1928. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John. 2 vols. The International Critical Commentary, ed. A. H. McNeile. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Black, Matthew. 1946. An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts. London: Oxford University Press, Clarendon Press.
- Blass, F. and Debrunner A. 1961. A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, ed. Robert W. Funk. A translation and revision of Blass-Debrunner's Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch, 9th-10th German ed. incorporating notes of A. Debrunner. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bloomfield, S. T. 1836. The Greek Testament, with English Notes, Critical, Philological, and Exegetical ... for the Use of Theological Readers in General. 2 vols. 5th American ed. from the 2nd London ed. Philadelphia: Henry Perkins.
- Bratcher, Robert G. and Nida, Eugene A. 1961. A Translator's Handbook on the Gospel of Mark. Leiden: United Bible Societies, E. J. Brill.
- Brown, Raymond E. 1966, 1970. The Gospel According to John. 2 vols. The Anchor Bible. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co.
- Burton, Ernest De Witt. 1921. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians. The International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

- Buttmann, Alexander. 1873. A Grammar of the New Testament Greek, trans. J. H. Thayer. Andover, Mass.: Warren F. Draper.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. 1959. The Gospel According to Saint Mark. Cambridge: University Press.
- Crosby, Alpheus. 1856. A Grammar of the Greek Language. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co.
- Düsterdieck, Friedrich. 1886. Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Revelation of John, trans. and ed. Henry E. Jacobs, from the 3rd German ed. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co.
- Eadie, John. 1869. A Commentary on the Greek Text of the Epistle of Paul to the Galatians. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- _____. 1883. Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians, ed. W. Young. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- _____. 1884. A Commentary on the Greek Text of the Epistle of Paul to the Colossians, ed. W. Young. 2d ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Edwards, Thomas Charles. 1885. A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians. 2nd ed. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Ellicott, Charles J. 1876. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles to the Philippians, Colossians, and to Philemon, with a revised translation. Andover, Mass.: Warren F. Draper.
- _____. 1880a. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians with a revised translation. Andover, Mass.: Warren F. Draper.
- _____. 1880b. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians and a revised translation. 4th ed. London: Longmans, Green & Co.
- _____. 1887. St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians: With a Critical and Grammatical Commentary. London: Longmans, Green & Co.
- Frantz, Donald G. 1974. Generative Semantics: An Introduction, with Bibliography. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- _____. Forthcoming. "Copying from Complements in Blackfoot," Linguistic Studies of Native Canada, ed. Eung-Do Cook and Jonathan Kaye.
- Frantz, Donald G. and Milanowski, Paul. In preparation. "Embedded Wishes in Upper Tanana."
- Godet, Frederick Louis. 1886, 1887. Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles to the Romans, trans. A. Cusin. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

- _____. 1957. Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, trans. A. Cusin. 2 vols. London: T. & T. Clark, 1886; reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House.
- _____. n.d. Commentary on the Gospel of John, translated from 3rd French ed. with notes and preface by Timothy Dwight. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1893; reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House.
- Goodwin, William W. and White, John Williams, ed. 1894. The First Four Books of Xenophon's Anabasis, with Notes. rev. ed. Boston: Ginn & Co.
- Green, Samuel G. [1912.] Handbook to the Grammar of the Greek Testament, Together with a Complete Vocabulary and Examination of the Chief New Testament Synonyms. New York: Fleming H. Revell Co.
- Grosheide, F. W. 1953. Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.
- Hadley, James. 1884. A Greek Grammar for Schools and Colleges, revised and in part rewritten by Frederic De Forest Allen. New York: American Book Co.
- Hering, Jean. 1962. The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians, translated from the 2d French ed. by A. W. Heathcote and P. J. Allcock. London: Epworth Press.
- Huther, Joh. Ed. 1887. Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the General Epistles of James, Peter, John, and Jude, translated from the 3rd German ed. by Paton J. Gloag and Clarke H. Irwin. Preface and supplementary notes by Timothy Dwight. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co.
- Jackson, F., Faokes, J. and Lake, Kirsopp, ed. 1965. The Beginnings of Christianity: Part I: The Acts of the Apostles. English translation and commentary by Kirsopp Lake and Henry Cadbury. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1932; reprint ed., 1965.
- Jannaris, Antonius N. 1968. An Historical Greek Grammar Chiefly of the Attic Dialect. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Jebb, Richard C. 1907. Sophocles: The Plays and Fragments: With Critical Notes, Commentary, and Translation in English Prose. Cambridge: University Press.
- Johnson, David E. Forthcoming. "On Relational Constraints on Grammars," Syntax and Semantic: Grammatical Relations, ed. J. Sadock and P. Cole. New York: Academic Press.
- Kautzsch, E., ed. 1898. Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, trans. G. W. Collins from the 25th German ed. Revised and adjusted to the 26th ed. by A. E. Cowley. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Keil, C. F. and Delitzsch F. 1971. Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament, trans. James Martin. Vol. 1. n.p.: reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.
- Kühner, Raphael. 1853. Grammar of the Greek Language, for the Use of High Schools and Colleges, trans. B. B. Edwards and S. H. Taylor. Rev. ed. New York: D. Appleton & Co.
- Landerman, Peter and Frantz, Donald. 1972. Notes on Grammatical Theory. Lima: Summer Institute of Linguistics in cooperation with the Ministry of Education.
- Lane, William L. 1974. The Gospel According to Mark: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes. New International Commentary on the New Testament, ed. F. F. Bruce. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co..
- Lenski, R. C. H. 1934. The Interpretation of the Acts of the Apostles. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House.
- _____. 1946. The Interpretation of St. Paul's First and Second Epistle to the Corinthians. Columbus, Ohio: Wartburg Press.
- Liddell, Henry George and Scott, Robert, ed. [1897?] A Greek-English Lexicon. 8th ed., rev. New York: American Book Co.
- Lünemann, Gottlieb. [1880?] Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistles to the Thessalonians, trans. Paton J. Gloag. Additional Notes by Timothy Dwight. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co.
- Marlett, Stephen A. 1975. "Evidence for Raising in Koine Greek," 1975 Work Papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, University of North Dakota, ed. Richard A. Rhodes. 19:1-21. Grand Forks, N.D.: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Meyer, Heinrich August Wilhelm. 1874. Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistles to the Romans, trans. John C. Moore and Edwin Johnson from the 5th German ed. English ed. revised and edited by William P. Dickson. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- _____. 1883. Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Acts of the Apostles, trans. Paton J. Gloag from the 4th German ed. English ed. revised and edited by William P. Dickson. Preface and supplementary notes by William Ormiston. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co.
- _____. 1884a. Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistles to the Corinthians, trans. D. Douglas Bannerman from the 5th German ed. English ed. revised and edited by William P. Dickson. Preface and supplementary notes by Talbot W. Chambers. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co.

- _____. 1884b. Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the Ephesians, trans. Maurice J. Evans. English ed. revised and edited by William P. Dickson. Preface and supplementary notes by Henry E. Jacobs. New York: Funk Wagnalls Co.
- _____. 1884c. Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the Galatians, trans. G. H. Venables from the 5th German ed. Preface and supplementary notes by Henry E. Jacobs. New York: Funk Wagnalls Co.
- _____. 1884d. Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Gospel of John, trans. William Urwick from the 5th German ed. English ed. revised and edited by Frederick Crombie. Preface and supplementary notes by A. C. Kendrick. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co.
- _____. 1884e. Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Gospels of Mark and Luke, trans. Robert Ernest Wallis from the 5th German ed. English ed. revised and edited by William P. Dickson. Preface and supplementary notes by Matthew B. Riddle. New York: Funk Wagnalls Co.
- _____. 1884f. Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Gospel of Matthew, trans. Peter Christie from the 6th German ed. English ed. revised and edited by Frederick Crombie and William Stewart. Preface and supplementary notes by George R. Crooks. New York: Funk Wagnalls Co.
- _____. 1885. Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistles to the Philippians and Colossians and to Philemon, trans. John C. Moore from the 4th German ed. English ed. revised and edited by William P. Dickson. Preface and supplementary notes by Timothy Dwight. New York: Funk Wagnalls Co.
- Milligan, Wm. and Moulton Wm. F. 1898. Commentary on the Gospel of St. John. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Moulton, James Hope and Milligan, George. 1930. The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament: Illustrated from the Papyri and other Non-literary Sources. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.
- Munck, Johannes. 1967. The Acts of the Apostles: Introduction, Translation and Notes. Revised by William F. Albright and C. S. Mann. The Anchor Bible. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co.
- Munro, Pamela. 1976. "Subject Copying, Auxiliarization, and Predicate Raising; The Mojave Evidence," International Journal of American Linguistics 42.99-112.
- Plummer, Alfred, ed. 1890. The Gospel According to S. John. Cambridge: University Press.

- _____. 1914. The Gospel According to St. Mark. Cambridge: University Press.
- Postal, Paul M. 1970. "On Coreferential Complement Subject Deletion," Linguistic Inquiry 4.439-500.
- Reiling, J. and Swellengrebel, J. L. 1971. A Translator's Handbook on the Gospel of Luke. Leiden: United Bible Societies, E. J. Brill.
- Rhodes, Richard Alan. 1976. "The Morphosyntax of the Central Ojibwa Verb." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan.
- Ridderbos, Herman N. 1953. The Epistle of Paul to the Churches of Galatia. The New International Commentary on the New Testament, ed. N. B. Stonehouse. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.
- Robertson, Archibald T. 1934. A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research. 4th ed. Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman Press.
- Smyth, Herbert Weir. 1963. Greek Grammar. Revised by Gordon M. Messing. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Spence, H. D. M. and Exell, Joseph S., eds. n.d. The Pulpit Commentary: The Gospel of St. John. 2 vols. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co.
- Stoeckhardt, G. 1952. Commentary on St. Paul's Letter to the Ephesians, trans. Martin S. Sommer. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House.
- Swete, Henry Barclay. 1952. The Gospel According to St. Mark: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Indices. 3rd ed., rev., n.p.; reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.
- Taylor, Vincent. 1952. The Gospel According to St. Mark: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Indexes. London: Macmillan & Co.
- Trollope, Wm. 1842. A Greek Grammar to the New Testament and to the Common or Hellenic Diction of the Later Greek Writers. London: Whittaker & Co.
- Turner, Nigel. 1963. Syntax. Vol. 3 of A Grammar of New Testament Greek by James Hope Moulton. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Turner, Samuel H. 1856. The Epistle to the Ephesians in Greek and English, with an Analysis and Exegetical Commentary. New York: Dana & Co.
- Westcott, Brooke Foss. 1954. The Gospel According to St. John: The Greek Text with Introduction and Notes. 2 vols. in one. n.p.; reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.
- _____. 1966. The Epistles of St. John: The Greek Text with Notes. New Introduction by F. F. Bruce. n.p.; reprint ed.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Winer, George Benedict. 1881. A Grammar of the Idiom of the New Testament, trans. Edward Masson. Edited and revised by J. H. Thayer. 7th ed. Andover, Mass.: W. F. Draper.

_____. 1882. A Treatise on the Grammar of New Testament Greek. Translated with large additions and full indices by W. F. Moulton. 3rd ed., rev. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

Zerwick, Maximilian. 1963. Biblical Greek: Illustrated by Examples. English ed. adapted from the 4th Latin ed. by Joseph Smith. Rome: Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici, 1963.