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1 Introduction

In this paper I endeavor to give a broad description of Koine Greek relative clauses. My database consists primarily of the Greek New Testament (Marshall and Nestle 1960). I begin by pointing out that Koine uses the strategy of relative pronouns in all relative clauses (Sect. 2). This section is followed by a description of the other ways in which relative pronouns are used besides introducing a relative clause (Sect. 3). In section 4, I discuss the position of the relative clause with respect to its head, arguing that only postnominal and internally headed relative clauses occur. Finally, in section 5, I give a description of the types of internally headed relative clauses (IHRCs) found in Koine and note three instances where they function adverbially.

Although this paper for the most part does not deal with formal syntax, I have noted several potential problem areas for current transformational syntax.
2 Strategies employed

Every relative clause in Koine Greek is introduced by a relative pronoun. Whereas many languages utilize different strategies for relativizing different types of nominals, e.g., obliques as opposed to subjects, Koine uses the same type of strategy for all nominals. This is exemplified in the data below. In (1) we have subject relativization:

(1) Acts 1:23

Kai ἔστησαν δύο, Ἰωάννη τὸν καλούμενον
and they set two Joseph the being called

Barsabbān [δς ἐπεκλήθη Ἰούστος], καὶ
Barsabbas RP:NOM was surnamed Justus and

Μαθθίαν.
Matthews

'And they appointed two, Joseph, called Barsabbas, who was surnamed Justus, and Matthias.'

In (2) we have object relativization:

(2) Acts 1:4

καὶ συναφεῖς ὑπ' αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ
and meeting with he charged them from

'Ἰερουσαλήμων μὴ χωρίζεσθαι ἄλλα περιμένειν τὴν
Jerusalem not to depart but to await the

ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρὸς [ἡν ἡκούσατε' promise of the father RP:ACC you heard

μου],
of me

'And meeting with them He charged them not to depart from Jerusalem, but to wait for the promise of the Father which you have heard from me.'

In (3) we have indirect object relativization:

(3) Hebrews 7:4

Θεωρεῖτε δὲ περίκος οὗτος, [δς (καὶ)]
Behold but how great this RP:DAT also
a tenth Abraham gave of the spoils

the patriarch


Behold how great this man was to whom the patriarch Abraham gave a tenth of his spoils.'

And in (4) we have oblique relativization:

(4) Acts 20:18

when but they came to him he said to them you understand from first day

from RP:GEN I set foot in the Asia

'you understand that from the first day on which I set foot in Asia'

There are, however, some curious examples where other strategies are used in combination with the relative pronoun. Consider Mark 7:25:

(5) Mark 7:25

but immediately hearing woman about him coming fell at the feet of him

'But immediately, a woman hearing about Him, whose daughter had an unclean spirit, came and fell at His feet.'

Here we have a relative pronoun ης that is the possessor of the NP το θυγάτριον 'the daughter'. Notice, however, that the same NP also has a pronominal possessor αυτης 'her'. This is what has traditionally been described as a "pleonastic" or "redundant" pronoun. Such a construction, was attested, but rare, in classical Greek.
Its more frequent usage in the New Testament (although it is still used sparingly, see Appendix B) may be related to the frequency of use in the LXX (the Septuagint, a third century translation of the Hebrew Old Testament). In the LXX, this is clearly due to a literal following of the Hebrew text, where pleonastic pronouns are common. Presumably, out of reverence for the text, and since the usage was not unknown in Greek, these passages were translated literally. For examples of this in the LXX see Gen. 1:11, Ex. 6:26, Num. 13:33; 35:25.

(6) Exodus 6:26

οὗτος Ἀαρὼν καὶ Μωυσῆς, [οὗτος εἶπεν αὐτοῖς] this Aaron and Moses RP:DAT said to them

ὁ θεὸς ἔξεσαμεῖν τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραήλ
the God to bring out the sons Israel

ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου
out of the land of Egypt

'This is Aaron and Moses to whom God said to bring the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt.'

This presents a difficult structural problem. What is the D-Structure of examples such as (6)? The relative pronoun οὗτoς and the pronoun replacer αὐτοῖς 'them', if both present at D-Structure, would occupy the same node. This is clearly unacceptable. There is evidence, however, that relative pronouns in Koine are actually relative specifiers. This would eliminate the problem of two constituents filling one node.

The redundant use of a pronoun replacer is not the only such "pleonasm" found in Koine relative clauses. There is one example in the New Testament where in addition to the relative pronoun, there also appears to be noun retention, i.e., the head noun is present both in the matrix clause and in the embedded clause.

(7) 2 Corinthians 10:13

ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐκ εἰς τὰ ἁμετρα καυχησόμεθα ἀλλὰ we but not in the excess will boast but

κατὰ τὸ μέτρον τοῦ κανόνος according to the measure of the length

[οὗ ἐμέρισεν ἡμῖν ὁ θεὸς μέτρον] RP:GEN divided to us the God measure:GEN to reach
as far as even you

'But we will not boast in excess, but according to the measure of length which God has given to us, to reach even to you.'

This verse is problematic in several ways. First of all, we have the unusual retention of the head noun in the relative clause in addition to the presence of the relative pronoun. To complicate matters more, both are "attracted" to the case of the genitive NP that modifies the antecedent, i.e., the relative pronoun has assumed the case of its antecedent. (The verb μερίζω 'to divide', excluding cases of attraction, takes its object in the accusative case.)

3 Idiomatic usages of relative pronouns

In order to give a thorough account of the relative clauses found in the New Testament, it is necessary to mention several instances where the relative pronoun is used idiomatically. In some cases it is not even used to introduce a relative clause. Each of these cases is listed in the appropriate Appendix with the references in which they occur in the New Testament. Traditional grammarians have used both the term "relative phrase" and "idiomatic phrase" to describe these constructions, although in the case of interpretative relative "phrases" they are clearly relative clauses.

3.1 Interpretative relative "phrases"

There are three constructions that fall under the category of interpretative relative "phrase", which in fact is a type of non-restrictive relative clause. All use a neuter nominative relative pronoun and are distinguished according to which of the following verbs they use: ἔστιν 'is' (most common), ἔρμηνευται 'is translated', or λέγεται 'is called'. The latter two are used exclusively in John’s Gospel, although he utilizes ὅ ἔστιν (plus a verb) as well. All three are used to elaborate on the meaning of the antecedent. Consider these three examples from John.

(8) John 1:38

οἱ δὲ εἶπαν σὺ τῷ ἀββᾶ, [ὁ] λέγεται μεθερμηνευόμενον διδάσκαλε], ποῦ

is called being interpreted Teacher where
μένεις; you remain

'And they said to him, "Rabbi, (which means 'Teacher'), where are you staying?"'

(9) John 1:41

εὑρήκαμεν τὸν Μεσσίαν, [ὁ ἐστίν
we have found the Messiah:MASC RP:NOM is

μεθερμηνεύομενον χριστός].
being interpreted Christ

'"we have found the Messiah," (which means Christ).'

(10) John 1:42

σὺ κληθήσῃ Κατάρας, [ὁ ἐρμηνεύεται
you shall be called Cephas:MASC RP:NOM is translated

Πέτρος].
Peter

'"you shall be called Cephas" (which is translated Peter).

While interpretative relative "phrases" most often elaborate on the meaning of an antecedent that is a proper name, they are not limited to such. Consider (11):

(11) Mark 15:16

οἱ δὲ στρατιῶται ἁπίσταν αὐτὸν ἐσώ τῆς
the but soldiers led away him inside the

αὐλῆς, [ὁ ἐστίν πραετώριον]
court:FEM RP:NOM is praetorium

"But the soldiers led him away inside the court, which is the praetorium"

For an exhaustive list of the examples found in the New Testament see Appendix C.

3.2 Conjoining relative phrases

I have placed two kinds of constructions under this heading following Robertson (1934). The first is formed by
combining the preposition ἐν 'in, on, etc.' with a dative masculine relative pronoun. This can be either singular or plural, resulting in the adverbial meanings 'while' or 'meanwhile'. Consider these examples:

(12) Luke 5:34

μὴ δύνασθε τοὺς υἱούς τοῦ νυμφώνος
not you are able the sons of the bride-chamber

ἐν φίλῳ νυμφίος μετ' αὐτῶν ἔστιν ποιήσαι
in RP:DAT the bridegroom with them is to make

νηστεύσαι;
to fast

'Are you able to make the children of the bride-chamber fast, while the bridegroom is with them?'

(13) Luke 12:1

'Εν οἷς ἐπισυναγαγθείσῳ τῶν μυριάδων τοῦ σώλου
in RP:DAT:PL being assembled the myriads the crowd

'Meanwhile, as a multitude of a crowd was assembled'

Of course, not all instances of this combination are idiomatic usages; some are normal relative clauses modifying an antecedent.

(14) Matthew 3:17

οὗτος ἔστιν ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός,
this is the son of me the beloved

[ἐν φίλῳ εὐδόκησα]
in RP:DAT I am well pleased

'This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased.'

There are other examples that are less clearcut than those listed above and in Appendix D that some might want to include in this category.

The second construction coming under this heading is formed by combining the preposition ἀντί 'for, instead of, etc.' with a genitive plural relative pronoun. The semantic force of the relative phrase being something like the
English "because". This is illustrated below:

(15) Luke 12:3

\[
\text{ἀνθ' ὁν ὅσα ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ for RP:GEN:PL as many things as in the darkness}
\]

\[
\text{εἰπατεῖν τῷ φωτὶ ἀκουσθῆσαι, you said in the light will be heard}
\]

'Because as many things as you said in the darkness will be heard in the light.'

Other examples of this construction can be found in Luke 19:44 and Acts 12:23.

3.3 Demonstrative relative phrases

In this relative phrase the relative pronoun is combined with μὲν/δὲ (particles used to introduce clauses that contrast, μὲν being the particle that introduces the first clause) to give the semantic force of "the one/the other" or "some/other".

(16) Matthew 21:35

\[
\text{καὶ λαβόντες οἱ γεωργοὶ τοὺς δούλους αὐτοῦ and taking the husbandmen the slaves of him}
\]

\[
\text{δὲν μὲν ἐδείπναν δὲν δὲ RP:ACC:SING some they flogged RP:ACC:SING other}
\]

\[
\text{ἀπεκτείναν, δὲν δὲ ἔλιθοβολήσαν. they killed RP:ACC:SING other they stoned}
\]

'And the husbandmen, taking his slaves, flogged one, killed another, and stoned another.'

The reader should notice that the relative pronouns do not individually agree in number with their antecedent, i.e., three "singular" relative phrases have been used to modify a plural antecedent.

This construction is virtually identical in its semantics to the combination of the article and μὲν/δὲ. Romans 14:2 is a perfect example of the apparent interchangeability of the two constructions.
(17) Romans 14:2

\[ \text{1. \( \delta \zeta \mu \nu \pi v s t \epsilon \nu \phi \gamma \epsilon \nu \pi \acute{\alpha} \eta \)} \]

\[ \text{2. \( \delta \varepsilon \delta \sigma \vartheta \varepsilon \nu \nu \lambda \chi \varsigma \alpha \nu \delta \theta i \epsilon \iota \)} \]

\[ \text{3. \( \text{One man believes he may eat anything, another, who is weak, eats only herbs.} \)} \]

The first clause uses the relative pronoun \( \delta \zeta \) plus \( \mu \nu \), while in the second part of this \( \mu \nu / \delta \varepsilon \) construction the article \( \delta \) is used with \( \delta \varepsilon \).

In demonstrative relative phrases the relative pronoun, in combination with \( \mu \nu / \delta \varepsilon \), functions as a type of nominal. Notice that in (16) the verbs \( \delta \varepsilon \rho \omega \) 'flog', \( \delta \rho \sigma \kappa \tau e \iota \nu \omega \) 'kill', and \( \lambda \theta \beta \beta \lambda \epsilon \omega \) 'stone' are not part of a relative clause introduced by the relative pronoun but rather are conjoined VPs in the matrix clause. This is true in all examples of demonstrative relative phrases. For an exhaustive list of the examples of this construction in the New Testament see Appendix E.

3.4 Other relative phrases

There are other constructions similar to those mentioned above that could possibly be included as relative phrases. However, since the evidence that they are idiomatic usages is less clear, I will only mention them in passing.

A dative relative pronoun combined with \( \delta \nu \omicron \omicron \alpha \) (in the nominative case) is the formula for ascribing a name to the antecedent. This usage seems to be a typical example of what has been called the "dative of possession" by traditional grammarians.

(18) Luke 1:26

\[ \text{1. \( \text{a city of Galilee, named Nazareth} \)} \]


Another possible example is the combination of the preposition \( \delta \pi \omicron \omicron \) 'from' with a relative pronoun. However, it is difficult to call this an idiomatic phrase since the
relative pronoun varies in gender. It seems to agree with an implicit head noun, perhaps ἡμέρα 'day, time', which is feminine, in some instances (e.g., Luke 7:45), and χρόνος 'time', which is masculine, in others (e.g., Luke 13:25).

(19) Luke 7:45

αὕτη δὲ ἀφ’ ἡς εἰσῆλθον οὐ διελείπεν she but from RP:FEM:GEN I entered not ceased

καταφιλοῦσά μου τοὺς πόδας fervently kissing of me the feet

'But she has not ceased from the time when I entered to kiss my feet.'

(20) Luke 13:25

ἀπὸ οὖ ἄν ἐγερθη ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης from RP:MASC:GEN-IND is risen the house master

'From the time when the house master rises'

The positing of these antecedents is, however, somewhat speculative. Of course, even if this should be called an instance of an idiomatic phrase, there are numerous examples where the combination of ἀπό with a relative pronoun is used in the normal way to modify an antecedent.

4 Position of the head noun with Koine relative clauses

At first glance Koine appears to be peculiar cross-linguistically in that it seems to have evidence of all three relative clause types: prenominal, postnominal and internally-headed. The postnominal type is by far the most common, encompassing more than 95% of the relative clauses found in the New Testament. Other than those listed in Appendix A, all relative clauses in the corpus are postnominal. The following examples illustrate the construction:

(21) John 2:22

ἐπίστευσαν τῇ γραφῇ καὶ τῷ λόγῳ they believed the scripture and the word

[ὅν εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς] RP:ACC said the Jesus

'they believed the scripture and the word which Jesus had said.'
(22)

They believed in the scripture. RP:ACC said the Jesus.

(23) 1 Corinthians 4:17

because of this very thing I sent to you Timothy

'Because of this very thing I sent Timothy to you who is my beloved child'

(24)
In both (21) and (23) the bracketed relative clause follows the head noun which it modifies. This, however, is not always the case. Consider (25) below, which appears to contain a prenominal relative clause:

(25) Luke 24:1

\[
\tau\eta\ \delta\varepsilon\ \mu\dot{i}\dot{a}\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \sigma\alpha\beta\beta\acute{a}\tau\omicron\nu\ \dot{o}\rho\acute{e}\rho\omicron\nu\ \beta\alpha\theta\acute{e}\dot{w}\varsigma
\]
the but one the week while still very early

\[
\epsilon\pi\iota\ \tau\omicron\ \mu\nu\eta\omicron\ \eta\lambda\theta\omicron\nu\ \phi\epsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon\sigma\omicron\iota
\]
upon the tomb they came carrying

\[
\text{[\epsilon\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicr
With this example, and in fact in all the possible examples of prenominal relative clauses, there is no way to give a definitive answer, based on the data, as to whether it is a prenominal or internally-headed relative clause. The reasons for this are simple: whether the head is a constituent of the relative clause or the matrix clause it would receive the same case marking in most of the examples. In the remaining examples the case marking could be attributed to attraction. Romans 16:2 is one of the most likely candidates for a prenominal RC, but it can still be analyzed as an IHRC.

(29) Romans 16:2

\[
\text{παραστήτε αὐτή ἐν ὧν ὅ ἄν ὑμῶν} \\
\text{you may stand by her in RP:DAT-IND of you}
\]

\[
\text{χρῆξῃ πράγματι} \\
\text{she may have need of thing:DAT}
\]

'you may stand by her in whatever thing she might need.'
In this verse the head πράγματι 'thing' is clearly getting its dative case marking from the preposition ἐν 'in, on, etc.', which would appear to be in the matrix clause (although this too is subject to debate since ἐν could be in SPEC of C having been pied piped by the moved Wh-phrase).

Although some linguists have posited that Koine does in fact have prenominal RCs, e.g., Friberg (cited in Callow 1983a:34-36), all verses that are putative examples of prenominal RCs can be analyzed as IHRCs. It should be noted that the opposite is not true, i.e., all putative examples of IHRCs cannot be analyzed as prenominal RCs. Cross-linguistically, prenominal RCs have never been observed to use relative pronouns as a relativization strategy (Maxwell 1979:364); yet all the Koine RCs that Friberg posits as prenominal use a relative pronoun. Friberg's analysis of basic word order in Koine also indirectly provides counter-evidence to his prenominal RC analysis. He presents strong evidence for positing VSO as the basic word order in Koine. Typologists, however, have observed that postnominal RCs are almost without exception the only strategy found in verb-initial languages (Shopen 1985:144).

Neither of these are strong arguments against the prenominal RC analysis; however, before making claims that go against the cross-linguistic norm, a reasonably strong argument or presentation of strong evidence should be produced. This has not been done nor do I believe it is possible, in the case of Koine RCs.

On the other hand, we must deal with the fact that IHRCs have been observed exclusively in SOV languages (Keenan 1978:44). Of those who have proposed an analysis of Koine basic word order, none have posited that it is SOV. Thus the fact that IHRCs are present in Koine is as typologically odd as the putative prenominal RC examples—at least in terms of word order typology. Here, however, the fact that Koine has IHRCs (in the traditional sense) is undisputed. I have therefore chosen to treat all putative prenominal RCs as IHRCs.

Additionally, I might note that the majority of the traditional Greek grammarians have treated what appear to be prenominal RCs as IHRCs (e.g., Robertson 1934:718; Blass and Debrunner 1961:154).
4.1 Extraposition

Finally, we should note that Koine relative clauses may optionally be extraposed. For the purposes of this paper it is not necessary to give a detailed account of this phenomenon but simply to note its occurrence. An example of extraposition is found in Hebrews 7:13.

(30) Hebrews 7:13

\[\text{He belongs to another tribe from which no one has devoted himself to the altar.}\]

In (30) the relative clause has been postposed to follow the verb phrase.

5 Internally headed relative clauses

There is a phenomenon in Koine that has been variously described by traditional grammarians as "incorporation", "assimilation", "transposition", etc. of a head noun into the relative clause. This corresponds to the linguistic notion of an internally-headed relative clause (IHRC). An exhaustive list of those verses exhibiting this phenomenon can be found in Appendix A. Mark 4:24 is a good example.

(31) Mark 4:24

\[\text{With the measure with which you measure, it shall be measured to you.}\]

We need to consider what it is that makes this an IHRC. Our first clue comes from the position of the head noun in relation to the relative pronoun. The relative clause in Koine always has a relative pronoun in the clause-initial position. Anything that follows the relative pronoun is thus a constituent of the embedded clause. Secondly, we notice that there is no overt head external to the relative clause.

IHRCs in Koine can be subdivided into various
categories. The first of these contains IHRCs that function as adverbials.

5.1 Adverbial internally-headed relative clauses

There are three types of adverbial IHRCs: manner, reason, and time.

5.1.1 Manner. The construction ὁν τρόπον 'in the manner in which' functions as a manner adverbial. This construction is found in the following verses: Matthew 23:37, Luke 13:34, Acts 1:11; 7:28; 15:11; 27:25, and 2 Timothy 3:8. Consider the following example:

(32) Acts 27:25

οὕτως ἦσται καθ' ὁν τρόπον
thus it will be in RP:ACC manner

λελάληται μοι
it has been spoken to me

'thus it will be in the manner in which it was spoken to me.'

The preposition here has been elided from κατά to καθ', a very common practice in Greek. This phrase is always used with both the relative pronoun and the head noun in the accusative case. The preposition is optional to the construction occurring only in Acts 15:11 and 27:25. Matthew 23:37 is an example where the preposition is absent.

(33) Matthew 23:37

ποσάκις ἦθελησα ἐπισυναγαγεῖν τὰ τέκνα
how often I wished to gather the children

σου, ὁν τρόπον ὄνως ἐπισυνάγει τὰ
of you RP:ACC manner bird gathers the

νοσσία αὐτῆς ὑπὸ τὰς πτέρυγας
young of her under the wings

'How often I wanted to gather your children in the manner in which (as) a bird gathers her young under her wings.'

5.1.2 Reason. A second adverbial construction is δι' ἂν ἀιτίαν 'the reason for which'. This IHRC, which functions as a reason adverbial, can be found in the following verses: Luke 8:47, Acts 22:24, 2 Timothy 1:6,12, Titus 1:13, and Hebrews 2:11.
(34) Luke 8:47

看到和妇人那不被她隐藏的

颤抖着，她前来和倒在他前

因为她 [有] 使他触碰

‘妇人，看到她那个被隐藏的，进来颤抖并倒在他前

因为她触动他并宣告在所有人

‘妇人，看到她那个被隐藏的，进来颤抖并倒在他前宣告在所有人

这特殊构造在新约中从不没有使用前介词。


(35) Matthew 24:38

直到 GEN 日进入诺亚

直到 GEN 日进入诺亚

‘直到日之诺亚进入诺亚进入。

(36) Acts 7:20

在 DAT 时间出生摩西

在 DAT 时间出生摩西

‘在时间之摩西出生。'
(37) Luke 12:40

καὶ ὑμεῖς γίνεσθε ἐτοιμοὶ, δι', [ἐκ] ἡ ώρα and you be prepared because RP:DAT hour

οὐ δοκεῖ̉τε] ὡς οὖς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχεται.

not you think the son of man comes

'And you, be prepared because the Son of Man comes in an hour which you do not expect.'

The word ἡμέρα can also occur as an IHRC with the prepositions ἐν 'in, on, etc.' and ἀπὸ 'from'.

(38) John 9:14

ἐσώθησεν δὲ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἀνέφεξεν αὐτοῦ τοὺς made the Jesus and opened of him the

ἐφαρμούς].

eyes

'It was the sabbath on the day in which Jesus made the clay and opened his eyes.'

(39) Colossians 1:6

ἐκ' [ἡς ἡμέρας ἠκούσατε καὶ ἐπεύγωσε from RP:GEN day you heard and fully knew

τὴν ἥφαρίν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ].
the grace of God in truth

'From the day in which you heard and fully knew the grace of God in truth.'

This construction also occurs without the preposition:

(40) Luke 17:30

κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ ἔσται [ἡ ἡμέρα according to the same it shall be RP:DAT day

ὁ νῦν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀποκαλύπτεται].
the son the of man is revealed

'It shall be the same way in the day in which the Son of Man is revealed.'
It is interesting to note that if the writer/speaker wishes to modify the time word in any way, e.g., with an adjective, a postnominal RC construction must be used. This is exemplified below:

(41) Acts 20:18

\[ \text{ὑμεῖς ἐπιστασθε ἀπὸ πρώτης ἡμέρας} \]
you understand from first day

\[ [ \text{αὕτη} \text{ ἔπεβην εἰς τὴν Ἐσθήν}] \]
from RP:GEN I set foot in Asia

'You understand that from the first day from which I set foot in Asia'

Occasionally, the time word is omitted, leaving simply the preposition and the RP. Compare (42) with (40):

(42) 2 Peter 3:4

\[ \text{αὕτη} \text{ γὰρ οἱ πατέρες ἔκοιμησαν}, \text{πάντα} \]
from RP:GEN for the fathers fell asleep all

\[ \text{οὕτως διαμένει απ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως} \]
thus remains from beginning of creation

'From (the day) when the fathers died, all things remain as they were from the beginning of creation.'

5.2 Other types

The remainder of the IHRC examples do not fall into any obvious category. First of all, we have those that are "normal" in terms of what has been attested in other languages. Two of these are the parallel passages to Mark 4:24 (29); namely Matthew 7:2 and Luke 6:38. The three other basic IHRCs are found in Matthew 10:11, Hebrews 7:14 and 1 Peter 1:10.

(43) Matthew 10:11

\[ \text{[εἰς ἣν (ἤ) ἄν πόλιν ἥ κώμην} \]
into RP:ACC-(and)-IND city or village

\[ \text{εἰσέλθητε}, \]
you might enter

'And into whatever city or village you might enter'
(44) Hebrews 7:14

\[\text{εἰς ἦν φυλὴν περὶ ἱερέων οὐδὲν as to RP:ACC tribe concerning priests nothing}\]

\[\text{Mωϋσῆς ἐλάλησεν]}\]

Moses spoke

'the tribe of which Moses spoke nothing concerning priests'

(45) 1 Peter 1:10

\[\text{περὶ ἡς σωτηρίας ἐξεζητήσαν καὶ concerning RP:GEN salvation sought out and}\]

\[\text{ἐξηράνθησαν προφηταὶ searched out prophets}\]

'concerning the salvation which the prophets sought after and searched for'

Second, we have a small set of IHRCs that present us with some peculiar case marking facts. Consider the following two examples:


\[\text{περὶ πάντων [ἂν ἐποίησεν πονηρῶν ὁ Ἰησοῦς] conc. all:GEN RP:GEN had done evils:GEN the Herod}\]

'concerning all the evil things which Herod had done.'

(47) Luke 19:37

\[\text{περὶ ποσῶν [ἂν εἶδον δύναμεων] conc. all:GEN RP:GEN they saw powerful deeds:GEN}\]

'concerning all the powerful deeds which they saw.'

Notice in these two examples there are two factors that lead us to analyze the head noun as an internal head.

The primary evidence comes from their physical position. They are definitely inside the relative clause; the relative pronoun and verb are adjacent on the left and the subject NP of the relative clause is adjacent on the right.

There is, however, a peculiar case marking fact presented by these examples. Consider example (46). The
verb ποιέω 'do' subcategorizes for a direct object in the accusative case. However, the head noun πονηρός 'evils' is in the genitive case. It is therefore not case marked as the direct object of the relative clause. Furthermore, neither the syntax nor the semantics of the relative clause allow πονηρός 'evils' to fill any other constituent node within the relative clause. The only case assigner in the entire sentence that assigns genitive case is the preposition περί 'concerning'. The enigma that faces us, then, is that while the head noun πονηρός 'evils' is in the right position to receive accusative case marking from the verb of the relative clause it is somehow receiving genitive case marking from the preposition περί 'concerning' which is external to the relative clause.

6 Conclusion

In this paper I have sought to provide the reader with a concise typology of Koine relative clauses. I have shown that the Koine relative pronoun is used in various ways other than within the relative clause. I have shown that Koine has two types of relative clauses in terms of the order of the head noun in relation to the relative clause, namely postnominal and internally-headed. I argued that all putative examples of prenominal RCs can be analyzed as IHRCs. Finally, I illustrated the peculiar case marking facts presented by Koine IHRCs.

Appendices

APPENDIX A

EXAMPLES OF INTERNALLY HEADED RELATIVE CLAUSES
IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

MATTHEW

GEN--24:38
DAT--7:2,2; 24:44
ACC--10:11; 23:37

MARK

NOM--6:11
DAT--4:24
ACC--2:19; 6:16;

1 CORINTHIANS

ACC--7:39

2 CORINTHIANS

GEN--10:13

GALATIANS

ACC--2:10, 18; 4:1
APPENDIX B
EXAMPLES OF RELATIVE CLAUSES WITH REDUNDANT PRONOUNS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

MARK
NOM--13:19
GEN--1:7; 7:25

LUKE
NOM--23:51
GEN--3:16
DAT--12:48,48

ACTS
ACC--15:17

1 PETER
NOM--2:24

REVELATION
GEN--13:8,12; 20:8
DAT--7:2
ACC--3:8; 7:9

TOTALS
NOMINATIVE -- 3
GENITIVE -- 6
DATIVE -- 3
ACCUSATIVE -- 3
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EXAMPLES OF INTERPRETATIVE RELATIVE PHRASES
IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

MATTHEW
NOM--1:23; 27:33

MARK
NOM--3:17; 5:41; 7:11,34; 12:42; 15:16,22,34,42

JOHN
NOM--1:38,41,42

ACTS
NOM--4:36

COLOSSIANS
NOM--1:24

HEBREWS
NOM--7:2

REVELATION
NOM--21:17

TOTALS
NOMINATIVE -- 18

APPENDIX D
EXAMPLES OF CONJOINING RELATIVE PHRASES
IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

MARK
DAT--2:19

LUKE
GEN--12:3; 19:44
DAT--5:34; 12:1; 19:13

JOHN
DAT--5:7

ACTS
GEN--12:23
DAT--26:12

ROMANS
DAT--8:3

1 PETER
DAT--2:12; 3:16

TOTALS
GENITIVE -- 3
DATIVE -- 9

SIL-UND Workpapers 1989
## APPENDIX E
### EXAMPLES OF DEMONSTRATIVE RELATIVE PHRASES IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MATTHEW</th>
<th>1 CORINTHIANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM--13:8,8,8,23,23</td>
<td>NOM--14:2,5,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:5,5</td>
<td>DAT--12:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT--25:15,15,15</td>
<td>ACC--12:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC--21:35,35,35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARK</th>
<th>2 CORINTHIANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM--4:4</td>
<td>DAT--2:16,16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC--2:5,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LUKE</th>
<th>2 TIMOTHY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM--8:5</td>
<td>NOM--2:20,20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC--23:33,33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTS</th>
<th>JUDE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC--27:44,44</td>
<td>ACC--22,23,23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROMANS</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM--14:2,5,5</td>
<td>NOMINATIVE -- 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC--9:21,21</td>
<td>GENITIVE -- 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DATIVE -- 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACCUSATIVE -- 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES**

1. I use the following abbreviations and conventions throughout this paper:

- ACC -- accusative case
- DAT -- dative case
- FEM -- feminine
- GEN -- genitive case
- IHRC -- internally-headed relative clause
- IND -- indefinite
- LXX -- the Septuagint
- MASC -- masculine
2. Koine also has what has generally been referred to as "free" or "headless" relative clauses. In this type of RC there is no overt antecedent. A good example of this is Matthew 10:38.

(1) Matthew 10:38

καὶ [δὲς οὐ λαμβάνει τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ]
and RP:NOM not take the cross of him

καὶ ἀκολουθεῖ μου], οὐκ ἔστιν μου ἄξιος.
and follow me not is of me worthy

'And (the one) who does not take his cross and follow me is not worthy of me.'

This, and other, "free relatives" are characterized by the following phrase marker:

(2)

3. I will refrain from using accent or breathing marks in the Koine phrase markers (PMs) as this will improve the format of the PMs.

4. There are a couple of other slightly different types of verses that might be construed as further examples of prenominal RCs. These come from Appendix A and include John 3:32; 5:38; 8:26 and Galatians 2:18. In these verses there is no overt head noun. However, there is a noun modifier which follows the relative clause. I rule out the possibility of them being prenominal RCs for the same reasons that were listed in section 4. These can be treated as postnominal RCs with a null head since Koine grammar would allow for a relative clause to occur between the head noun and its determiner.
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