

REVISITING THE CASE OF AN INFINITIVE WITH TWO SUBSTANTIVAL ACCUSATIVES

Paul W. Cheung

Introduction

To readers whose native languages have largely lost their inflections (e.g., English) or are non-inflectional (e.g., Chinese), the first encounter with the fully inflectional Greek language can be bewildering. Besides being confronted with a myriad of morphological paradigms, the beginning student is often puzzled by the apparent freedom in the word order of the language. In both English and Chinese, word orders are highly grammaticalized. For example, the basic word order of the English verb with respect to its arguments is often regarded as SVO, with the expressed subject (S) generally preceding its verbal predicate (V) and the direct object (O) following it. The indirect object can be indicated by word order or by a preposition.¹ The case for Greek is a lot more volatile.

¹ See John A. Hawkins, *Word Order Universals* (New York: Academic Press, 1983), 333. The necessity of the qualifier "generally" is reflected in statements like "Here comes the bus,"

Greek word order has been variously characterized as "free"² or even "indeterminate."³ The argument usually goes something like this: As an inflected language, linguistic elements like nouns, verbs, adjectives, etc. take on various endings that grammaticalize their relationship to each other. Morphological distinctions are thus supposed to mitigate the need for strict word order patterns to arrive at meaning. As the reasoning goes, then, it is not surprising that there is significant freedom in the placement of particular words in a sentence while retaining more or less the same meaning.⁴ Still, this freedom is only relative to the syntactic structure under consideration, as in the case of English.⁵ Even in Cantonese, an isolating language for which constraints on word order are presumably widespread, certain stock phrases (an example would be one that is roughly translated by the English phrase "No wonder") allow rather

"There you go again," "I could not do it, nor do I want to," and "The guy you were talking about, I saw him walking over the bridge the other day," etc. K.J. Dover (*Greek Word Order* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960], 7) suggests that exceptions like these are not really instances of subordinate syntactical rules, and hence a foreigner can only grasp their usage through exhaustive lists and examples. This has proved to be erroneous from the modern linguistic perspective. However, it does illustrate why poetry is generally the most difficult genre for non-native speakers to grasp (or even native speakers, for that matter). Still, the issue of basicness is not trivial. It needs to be carefully defined. Even then it does not mean that the word order of a particular syntactic structure is unique, or even decidable. For example, English is known to accommodate both prenominal and postnominal genitives ("the border of Wisconsin"/"Wisconsin's border"), but occasionally only the former is acceptable ("Paul's car"/*"the car of Paul"), other times only the latter ("The storm of the century"/*"The century's storm"). See Hawkins, *Word Order Universals*, 11-17.

² A.T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934), 417.

³ Dover, *Greek Word Order*, 1.

⁴ See A.T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament*; S.E. Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*, 2nd ed. (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 287.

⁵ For example, E. V. N. Goetchius lists a total of twenty-four permutations in Greek for the English clause "God loves a cheerful giver" = ἰλαρὸν δότην ἀγαπᾷ ὁ θεός, 2 Cor. 9:7). The point to note, however, is of course that there are only twenty-four, and not 120 different possible combinations, for ὁ θεός have been kept together and in the same order to avoid grammatical nonsense (*The Language of the New Testament* [New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965], 24). In general, only a linearization rule needs to be maintained for ὁ θεός, as interstitial constituents like verb phrases and noun phrases may be inserted in between the article and its head without trouble. In the above example, however, both constraints have to be maintained for grammaticality, a point Porter overlooked when he faulted D.L. Black for overspecifying the restriction in his example (see S. E. Porter, "Word Order and Clause Structure in New Testament Greek: An Unexplored Area of Greek Linguistics Using Philippians as a Test Case," *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 6 [1993]: 181, n. 16).

surprising movements among the individual elements within them and still maintain the same basic meaning. Greek, as is indicated above, is not without codified patterns of word order either.⁶ It is now regarded as a commonplace that all natural languages have rules that govern word order to one extent or another,⁷ and that there is no language in which word order is completely codified grammatically.⁸ The relevance of all these to the study of Biblical Greek is obvious. Compared with all the other natural languages, Greek word order bears on all three areas of syntax, semantics, and pragmatics. A proper understanding of the phenomenon is essential to fruitful interpretation of the Christian Bible.

⁶ In addition to the linear precedence of the article, there is also the class of particles called postpositives, which never, or only under very specific conditions, begin a clause. Greek prepositions are also required to precede the noun phrase they modify, although exceptions do occur in the cases of *χάριτι* (Lk. 7:47; Gal. 3:19; Eph. 3:1, 14; 1 Tim. 5:14; Tit. 1:5, 11; Jude 16), *ἐνεκα* (Lk. 4:18; Acts 19:32), and *χωρίς* (Heb. 12:14). In extra-biblical Greek, the scrambling of prepositions is usually due to metrical requirements (see S.E. Porter, "Word Order," 185-6). Indeed, as students of beginning Greek are quick to find out, the attributive position and the predicate position carry different meanings for the adjective in question, and a reversal in the positions of *λόγος* and *θεός* in Jn. 1:1c would have entailed a major revision in Christology. Other word order patterns are also well-documented (see, e.g., N. Turner, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, vol. III, *Syntax* [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark], 344-50; F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature*, trans. R.W. Funk [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961], 248-53 [hereafter BDF]). Some of these constraints may be readily coded in a grammatical formalism like that of the Generalized Phrase Structure Grammar (GPSG). GPSG has been applied to English in the rigorous work by G. Gazdar, E. Klein, G. Pullum, and I. Sag (*Generalized Phrase Structure Grammar* [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1985]). Both German and Makua (a language with relatively free word order) have come under the scrutiny of a GPSG formalism. See S. Stucky, "Word Order Variation in Makua: a Phrase Structure Grammar Analysis," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1981) and H. Uszkoreit, *Word Order and Constituent Structure in German*, CSLI Lecture Notes No. 8 (Stanford: CSLI Publications, 1987).

⁷ However, one may argue that in many instances word order is simply a matter of convention. There is no logic in prohibiting, for example, the Greek postpositives in beginning a clause. It is simply not done. But in this paper we are not so much interested in telling sense from nonsense as in distinguishing different senses from different word orders.

⁸ The fact is simply that no comprehensive account of order can succeed without considering a wide variety of controlling factors, regardless of the grammatical framework in which a particular language is analysed. After examining the linearization procedures of four major grammatical frameworks (S.C. Dik's Functional Grammar, J.W. Bresnan's Lexical Functional Grammar, Gazdar *et al*'s Generalized Phrase Structure Grammar, and R.A. Hudson's Word Grammar), Anna Siewierska concludes that the following factors must be accounted for in specifying order: (1) grouping relations, (2) grammatical relations, (3) thematic relations, (4) semantic roles, (5) syntactic features, (6) semantic features, and (7) pragmatic factors (see A. Siewierska, *Word Order Rules* [New York: Croom Helm, 1988], 263). The analysis in this paper would tend to confirm her observations.

Despite the fact that one could find an occasional Greek grammar that dedicates separate space for discussion on the word order issue, relevant comments are generally widely scattered. Where attention does become focused, the emphasis is mostly on codification. One would be hard pressed to find extended discussions on the semantics and pragmatics of instantiations with acceptable alternative word orders and the ramifications of such variability. This is no doubt in part due to a long-standing tradition of relegating the discussion of word order to stylistics and rhetorics, which are not seen as part of the grammar proper. The trend began early, with the ancient Greek grammarians like Aristotle (*Rhetoric*, 4th cent. B.C.), Demetrius (*On Style*, ca. 2nd cent. B.C.), and Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Critical Essays* and *On Literary Composition*, ca. 1st cent. B.C.), when grammatical and literary questions were one amalgamated whole.⁹ Apollonius Dyscolus (*On Syntax*, 2nd cent. A.D.) stood out as a rather interesting exception, however, and was more interested in grammatical formulations than in stylistics. Another reason for a lack of investigations in this area can probably be attributed to the intractability of the phenomenon itself. Dionysius of Halicarnassus admitted as much when he gave up on the subject:¹⁰

Ἐδόκει δὴ μοι τῆ φύσει μάλιστα ἡμᾶς ἐπομένους οὕτω δεῖν ἀρμόττειν τὰ μόρια τοῦ λόγου, ὡς ἐκείνη βούλεται. αὐτίκα τὰ ὀνόματα πρότερα ἤξιουν τάττειν τῶν ῥημάτων (τὰ μὲν γὰρ τὴν οὐσίαν δηλοῦν, τὰ δὲ τὸ συμβεβηκός, πρότερον δ' εἶναι τῆ φύσει τὴν οὐσίαν τῶν συμβεβηκότων) [...] πιθανὸς ὁ λόγος, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀληθὴς ἔδοξεν εἶναι μοι. [...] ἔτι πρὸς τούτοις ἀμεινον ἐδόδουν εἶναι τὰ ῥήματα προτάττειν τῶν ἐπιρρημάτων, ἐπειδὴ πρότερον ἐδοι τῆ φύσει τὸ ποιοῦν ἢ πάσχον τῶν συνεδρευόντων αὐτοῖς, τρόπου λέγω καὶ τόπου καὶ χρόνου καὶ τῶν παραπλησίων, ἃ δὴ καλοῦμεν ἐπιρρήματα. [...] καὶ τοῦτο πιθανὸν μὲν ὡς τὸ πρῶτον, οὐκ ἀληθὲς δὲ ὡς οὐδ' ἐκεῖνο. [...] ἔτι καὶ τότε ὦμην δεῖν κὴ παρέργως φυλάττειν, ὅπως τὰ πρότερα τοῖς χρόνοις καὶ τῆ τάξει πρότερα λαμβάνηται. [...] ἔτι πρὸς τούτοις ἤξιουν τὰ μὲν ὀνοματικὰ προτάττειν τῶν ἐπιθέτων, τὰ δὲ προσηγορικὰ τῶν ὀνοματικῶν, τὰς δ' ἀντονομασίας τῶν προσηγορικῶν, ἐν τε τοῖς ῥήμασι φυλάττειν, ἵνα τὰ ὀρθὰ τῶν ἐγκλινομένων ἡγῆται καὶ τὰ

⁹ Cf. the comment made by W. R. Roberts, "... historically the confusion (i.e., between grammar and style) is as natural as the great interest shown in what now seem peculiarly arid points of grammar." W.R. Roberts, *Demetrius on Style: The Greek Text of Demetrius De Elocutione* (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1969), 36.

¹⁰ As cited by H. Dik, *Word Order in Ancient Greek: A Pragmatic Account of Word Order Variation in Herodotus* (Amsterdam: J. G. Gieben Publisher, 1995), 1-2. Both the Greek and the English translation follow the Loeb editions. Omissions are indicated by square brackets. They are the examples and counter-examples provided by Dionysius for each preceding rule that he put up.

παρεμφατικὰ τῶν ἀπαρεμφάτων, καὶ ἄλλα τοιαῦτα πολλά. πάντα δὲ ταῦτα διεσάλευεν ἢ πεῖρα καὶ τοῦ μηδενὸς ἄξια ἀπέφαινε.¹¹ (Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *On Literary Composition* 5)

Modern grammars on Classical and Biblical Greek generally eschew stylistics and stick to the canons of grammar proper, and the problem of word order has really been more or less sidelined until the advent of computerized textual databases and dedicated syntactical search engines.¹² In addition, the appropriation of statistical tools in linguistics has helped to quantify the issues and advances in linguistic theories have provided alternative frameworks to theorize about the subject.¹³ But both

¹¹ "Well, it seemed to me that we should follow nature as much as possible, and to fit together the parts of speech as she demands. For example, I thought I should place nouns before verbs (since the former indicate the substance, and the latter the accident, and in the nature of things the substance is prior to its accidents). [...] The theory is persuasive, but I decided that it was not valid. [...] Again, I thought it was better to place verbs in front of adverbs, since that which acts or is acted upon is prior to those auxiliaries indicating manner, place, time and the like, which we call adverbs. [...] This principle, like the first one, is attractive, but it is equally unsound. [...] Yet again, I thought that I should never relax my efforts to see that things which were prior in time should also be taken prior in order. [...] And still further, I thought it right to put my nouns before my adjectives, common before proper nouns, and pronouns before common nouns; and with verbs, to take care that the indicative should precede the other moods, and finite verbs infinitives, and so on. But experience upset all those assumptions and showed them to be completely worthless. Sometimes the composition was rendered pleasing by these and similar arrangements, but at other times not by these but by the opposite sort. So for these reasons I abandoned such theories."

¹² To be fair, progress has been made since Dionysius aired his despair on the matter. Major works includes H. Weil, *The Order of Words in the Ancient Languages Compared with that of the Modern Languages*, new ed. (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1978), whose approach was further developed by A. Loepfe, *Die Wortstellung im griechischen Sprechsatz (erklärt an Stücken aus Platon und Menander)* (Diss. Freiburg, Switzerland: Paulusdruckerei, 1940); Dover, *Greek Word Order*; and H. Frisk, *Studien zur griechischen Wortstellung* (Göteborg: Wettergren & Kerbers, 1933). For a concise review of these works, see H. Dik, *Word Order in Ancient Greek*, 259-81. Now the entire corpus of Ancient Greek literature up to 600 A.D. is available from the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae CD databank, which employs only a simple markup scheme that more or less limits its use to lexeme searches. The text of the New Testament, however, is much better tagged, lending it to the much more powerful morphological search engines like GRAMCORD. Still, syntactical searches like the one performed in this paper can only be done rather clumsily, morphology being only a subset of syntax.

¹³ More recent works on both Classical and Biblical Greek include G. Dunn, "Syntactic Word Order in Herodotean Greek," *Glotta* 66 (1988): 63-79; M.E. Davidson, "New Testament and Greek Word Order," *Literary and Linguistic Computing* 4 (1989): 19-28; H. Dik, *Word Order in Ancient Greek*; S.E. Porter, "Word Order", and R.S. Cervin, "Word Order in Ancient Greek: VSO, SVO, SOV, or All of the Above?" (Ph.D. diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1990). Regarding the use of statistics in linguistics, see A. Woods, P. Fletcher, & A. Hughes, *Statistics in Language Studies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986) and C.

the efforts and the rewards are still rudimentary at this point. The present work does not claim to break new ground.¹⁴ The objective here is to answer a relative simple question by looking at a relatively simple construction: the case of an infinitive constructed with two substantival accusatives. The question posed is this: In situations where inflections are not sufficient to discriminate syntactical relationships, and word order is variable, how can meaning be discerned? The corpus studied is the New Testament, and the search engine used to produce the analysis is GRAMCORD.

The issue of ambiguity involving the use of Greek infinitives was first noticed by Apollonius Dyscolus. In Book 3 of his *On Syntax*, Apollonius considered the case of a clause placed in indirect statement. The example he used is this:

Direct statement: Θεῶν ὕβρισε Δίωνα. ("Theon insulted Dion.")

Indirect statement: λέγουσι Θεῶνα ὑβρίσαι Δίωνα. ("They are saying that Theon insulted Dion.")

The verb of the clause is made an infinitive in the indirect statement and its subject put into the accusative case. Thus subject and object become indistinguishable. The solution Appollonius proposed to disambiguate the situation is simply to claim that the subject NP should precede the object NP (an SO basic pattern?) by arguing somewhat philosophically: The "producer" (ἐνεργητική) of the action should "naturally" precede the "feeler" (παθητική) of the action. Variant departures from this basic pattern are simply regarded as "transpositions." This is obviously an inadequate assessment, but for native speakers of Greek, it appeared to have been sufficient.

Butler, *Statistics in Linguistics* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1985). Cervin in particular has an axe to grind regarding statistical practice in Biblical linguistics, see his "On the Use and Misuse of Statistics in Biblical Studies," a paper presented at the Annual Meeting for the Society of Biblical Literature, Pacific Coast Region, Santa Clara University, 25 March 1992.

¹⁴ The author is aware of at least three works dealing with the same subject as the present paper. They are, H.R. Moeller and A. Kramer, "An Overlooked Structural Pattern in New Testament Greek," *NovT* 5 (1962): 25-35; J.T. Reed, "The Infinitive with Two Substantival Accusatives: An Ambiguous Construction?" *NovT* 33 (1991): 1-27; and M. A. Cripe, "An Analysis of Infinitive Clauses Containing Both Subject and Object in the Accusative Case in the Greek New Testament" (Th.M. thesis, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1992).

Two thousand years later, Moeller and Kramer tackled the same question again, this time not limiting to the study of indirect statements only. Since the subject of the infinitive takes the accusative case,¹⁵ and since the object of the infinitive is naturally in the accusative, how then can one tell the subject of the action from the object in the case of a transitive verb? This is a case of grammatical homonymy, in which more than one grammatical structure can be assigned to the same linguistic unit.¹⁶ An example is 2 Cor. 2:13 (τῷ μὴ εὐρεῖν με Τίτον). Did Paul mean here "I didn't find Titus" (as in all English versions) or "Titus didn't find me"?¹⁷ Reed concedes that in the absence of a syntactical rule, even

¹⁵ See H.W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956), 260; BDF §406; W.W. Goodwin, *Syntax of The Mood and Tenses of the Greek Verb* (New York: St. Martin Press, 1965), 298; M. Zerwick, *Biblical Greek Illustrated by Examples* (Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1963), 136. Robertson (*Grammar*, 489f) objects to calling the accusative the subject of the infinitive, for the infinitive, being non-finite, can have no subject in the grammatical sense. He regards this as a case of adverbial accusative of reference. This stance is taken up by J.A. Brooks & C.L. Winbery, *Syntax of NT Greek* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1979), 51, 120. Nevertheless, this strict view need not be taken too seriously. The unmarkedness of the infinitive with respect to person is obviously balanced its participation in the opposition of voices, which implies an unspecified person with regard to whom the direction of action may differ, e.g., in παιδεύειν vs. παιδεύεσθαι. G. Mussies, *The Morphology of Koine Greek as Used in the Apocalypse of St. John: A Study in Bilingualism (SuppNovT XXXVII)* (Leiden: Brill, 1971), 247. As with most other grammatical rules, there are caveats. For example, an infinitive can take a nominative if it agrees with the subject of the main verb when it is also the unexpressed subject of the infinitive (see Zerwick, *Biblical Greek Illustrated by Examples*; W.W. Goodwin, *Greek Grammar* [Boston: Ginn & Company, 1958], 202f). But this phenomenon does not concern us here: we are only interested in explicitly expressed subject and object of the infinitive.

¹⁶ See the discussion by J.G. Kooij, *Ambiguity in Natural Language: An Investigation of Certain Problems in its Linguistic Description* (Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1971), ch. 3. Homonymy is traditionally discussed from a lexical perspective, where multiple meanings of a lexical entry poses particularly challenges in dictionary making (see J. Lyons, *Semantics* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977], ch. 13). Strictly speaking, homonymous terms have an identity of grammatical function (cf. the word "port" in "They passed the port at midnight" [Lyons, *Semantics*, 397]). The situation here is more generally described as simply a grammatical ambiguity (Lyons, *Semantics*, 396ff). However, the term "grammatical homonymy" does capture the situation here and relaxes the restriction of identity of grammatical function by the adjective "grammatical". From here on, with no loss in clarity, "grammatical homonymy" will simply be referred to as "homonymy" along with its adjectival and adverbial modifications.

¹⁷ A more familiar case of homonymy to the student of Greek is the choice between an objective genitive rendering and a subjective genitive of a given construction. (A well-known Chomskyan example serves as an illustration: "The shooting of the hunters was terrible." The most famous biblical example probably comes from Rom. 3:22, where the phrase πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ has been the source of endless discussions (see the dissertation by R.B. Hays, *The Faith of Jesus Christ* [Chico: Scholars Press, 1983], 157-176; and S. E. Porter, *Idioms*, 95, n. 1). Again there are

the surrounding context is not so helpful in determining the reading in this instance.¹⁸ This may be an overstatement, for Paul's anxiety (ἄνεσιν) surely cannot be caused by his ignorance of whether Titus was looking for him, whereas it would make perfect sense if he had been looking for Titus in Troas without success. Moreover, ἀλλά is logically linked to the open door for evangelism in Troas, not to the failure of either Paul or Titus to find the other.¹⁹ To have said this is to reinforce the impression even more strongly that in and of itself the expression τῷ μὴ εὐρεῖν με Τίτον is grammatically homonymous, or ambiguous, than merely to use a more familiar word.²⁰

Moeller and Kramer vs. Reed

Writing in the early sixties, Moeller and Kramer lacked the powerful machinery that we today enjoy in retrieving instances of grammatical constructions from electronic databases. They based their expanded study on a much earlier study by Votaw,²¹ and they limited their search to two *consecutive* accusative case substantives in construct with an infinitive of a transitive verb. The exclusion of the case where an infinitive splits the two accusatives (AIA) is most unfortunate. Not only did it lead to a loss of a larger base for inductive examination, but it also rendered their reasoning rather circular, for if grammaticalization of the accusative substantives depended on their proximity to the infinitive, as they claimed it did, then an AIA pattern would surely create problems in the application

no structural hints of preference. However there are two important differences: word order does not come into play, and the choices are not necessarily mutually exclusive. The same cannot be said for τῷ μὴ εὐρεῖν με Τίτον.

¹⁸ J.T. Reed, "The Infinitive with Two Substantival Accusatives: An Ambiguous Construction?" *NovT* 33, (1991): 1.

¹⁹ V.P. Furnish translates ἀλλά "So despite the opportunity". V.P. Furnish, *II Corinthians* (New York: Doubleday, 1984), 168.

²⁰ Reed ("The infinitive with Two Substantival Accusatives," 2, n. 2) cautions that "ambiguity" should only be established after "inspecting all possible linguistic elements which the language may have used to convey understanding." This is certainly prudent, for, as we shall see, many instances of infinitive-plus-double-accusative constructions (IPDAC) can be "disambiguated" quite simply by noting the +animate/-animate opposition of the two substantives involved (cf. Kooij, *Ambiguity*, 131). Thus the term homonymous will only be applied to homonymous sentence-types as a category in linguistic description, and not homonymous sentences as sentence-tokens in a uniquely defined text situation (Kooij, *Ambiguity*, 6).

²¹ C.C. Votaw, *The Use of the Infinitive in Biblical Greek* (Chicago, 1896).

of the rule: it is simply powerless in deciphering the AIA situation, where both accusatives are "equidistant" from the infinitive. Kramer and Moeller's solution can be rephrased in this fashion:

1. The order IA_1A_2 grammaticalizes the pattern ISO (= infinitive-subject-object, where the infinitive can be either transitive or copulative²²). The only exceptions occur when $\kappa\acute{o}\pi\omicron\nu$ is used with $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\iota\nu$, and when $\tau\iota\nu\alpha$ is used with $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota$, where the pattern grammaticalized is IOS.

2. The order A_1A_2I grammaticalizes the pattern OSI (again, the infinitive can be either transitive or copulative; in addition, A_1 can be an interrogative $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ or $\tau\acute{\iota}$ in a direct question), except when the infinitive is constructed with $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ or $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu$, or when A_1 is a reflexive pronoun; there the pattern grammaticalized is SOI.

As Reed observed²³ and as any reader would immediately detect, Moeller and Kramer's rule is unwieldy to use, being rather cumbersome in structure and full of significant exceptions. This can be traced back to the lack of robustness of their initial testing hypothesis:²⁴

When two consecutive accusative case substantives occur with a transitive infinitive after a preposition, the one nearest the infinitive functions as subject and the other as an object.

The limitations of this hypothesis are obvious:

1. The hypothesis does not really test fully whether syntax is grammaticalized by word order. The word "consecutive" excludes the A_1IA_2 word order for a complete set of possibilities.²⁵

²² That is, $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota$, $\gamma\epsilon\nu\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, or $\upsilon\pi\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\epsilon\iota\nu$.

²³ Reed, "The Infinitive with Two Substantival Accusatives," 3, n. 5.

²⁴ Moeller and Kramer, "Overlooked Structural Pattern," 26.

²⁵ This exclusion is serious. By failing to account for all possible word orders, the rule becomes one of testing word-proximity. Moeller and Kramer did not give a reason for their choice. But proximity becomes a rather unfruitful concept if the case of A_1IA_2 is included, for then there can be degrees of proximity, especially when modifying phrases are allowed to intervene (Moeller and Kramer, "Overlooked Structural Pattern," 28). Moreover in that situation it is uncertain how sensitive the human mind is to indications of proximity, both in listening and in reading. The omission of a valid group of data by design is called by Reed the "Achilles' heel" of their rule (Reed, "The Infinitive with Two Substantival Accusatives," 7). It must be emphasized that a proximity rule is generally

2. It is not clear why the restriction "after a preposition" is necessary. Again this leaves out a class of valid structures such as the command in 1 Cor. 7:11, ἀνδρα γυναῖκα μὴ ἀφιέναι.

3. The qualification that the infinitive be transitive seems to be reasonable to begin with, for the construction requires the infinitive to take a direct object. However, as Moeller and Kramer eventually discovered, they also had to include a large class of instances with copulatives like εἶναι as the infinitive.²⁶

Reed has criticized extensively the methodology of Moeller and Kramer. The most prominent complaint is that of a proliferation of exceptions due to their unwillingness to restate their hypothesis (their working theory).²⁷ In his words, "It appears that their rule is determining their analysis rather than the analysis determining the rule."²⁸ Moeller and Kramer were certainly aware of the fact that the data set they examined did not give a simple pattern agreeing with their criterion of proximity.²⁹ To make matters worse, their final rule (appearing twice in

incompatible with a comprehensive word-order rule. The former is not really a subset of the latter through omission. They are two fundamentally different rules with some overlap.

²⁶ Moeller and Kramer, "Overlooked Structural Pattern," 29.

²⁷ See Reed, "The Infinitive with Two Substantival Accusatives," 4-7, especially 4, n. 7; 6, n. 10.

²⁸ Reed, "The Infinitive with Two Substantival Accusatives," 5.

²⁹ To quote: "From these, a more generalized pattern began to emerge, and a general descriptive statement covering *all* the patterns was evolved from the descriptions of the individual types" (Moeller and Kramer, "Overlooked Structural Pattern," 27, italics mine). For one case, Reed concluded that Moeller and Kramer really only had five valid instances for their rule of OSI when the infinitive was last, with three compliances and two violations. Dover's insightful remarks are pertinent here: "Statistics may or may not give a clear picture; we do not know until we have them. If, for example, we are testing the syntactical rule 'the subject precedes the predicate', and we find that the ratio of SP to PS is 10:1, we can embark with some confidence on the next stage of the enquiry, the discovery of the determinants of abnormality. On the other hand, if the ratio is 2:1 or lower, it is unlikely that we have discovered a primary determinant of order and more likely that we are on the track of a secondary phenomenon" (Dover, *Greek Word Order*, 5). In Moeller and Kramer's case, the ratio is 3:2, on a very small data set. Dover's remarks point out another puzzling phenomenon, one which we will have the occasion to return to again: Both Moeller and Kramer, as well as Reed are looking for a predictive rule in a potentially homonymous situation (namely, "Given a certain word order the syntactical relationships between the two accusative substantives can be specified."). The question posed was: What does this word order pattern tell us? Dover, on the other hand, asked the "opposite" question: What accounts for this particular word order pattern? For him word order is not presupposed by syntactical relationship, but instead presupposes it. In other words, in the sentence "I saw you", is "I" the subject because it stands first or does it stand first because it is the subject? Dover's stance

the paper, pp. 27 and 32) contains exceptions that span several categories. They could be based on a class of pronouns (interrogative), a class of verbs (the copulatives), the fact that the main verb is of a certain kind (the impersonal verbs), or even a single lexical or grammatical element (κόπον, τινα, etc.). By all criteria, their rule of proximity has, in its final form, collapsed under the weight of exceptions and actually points to the rejection of proximity as a useful discriminating variable. It does, however, point to a direction of further research.

Reed's methodology is more robust. His initial testing hypothesis is not explicitly given, although the final rule is:

Of two accusative case nominal, pronominal, or adjectival substantives with an infinitive, the first in order functions as the subject, the second as the object/predicate.³⁰

One could even adopt this as the primary testing hypothesis in examining the data. The advantage is two-fold: (1) The discriminating criterion is rigorous. There is no ambiguity in deciding order.³¹ (2) The formulation of the hypothesis itself suggests a search strategy through the various

is vindicated by the fact that in formulating their rules, both Moeller/Kramer and Reed examine their data using reasoning that has nothing to do with word order (However, see Reed's examples in pp. 10, 13, and 22. It can almost be said that Reed has been guilty of some degree of circular reasoning by including these examples in his final statistics to substantiate the rule while at the same time using the rule to categorize them). Rather, the logic is like this: Since we are confident that the subject precedes the predicate in all these eighty or so examples (obtained through contextual analysis and examination of lexical/semantic oppositions), we are now confident that the subject should precede the predicate in other similar instances. Thus all rules of word order do predicate upon a prior knowledge of syntactical relationship. In science, such a rule will be labelled an "empirical relationship." Namely, it has no explanatory power, only provisionally prescriptive power. Furthermore, such rules are always approximate, and seldom form an important part of a comprehensive theory, for they are always in danger of being replaced by a more deductively based theory (see Dover, *Greek Word Order*, 64f for an instructive example of how he attempted to reason that "from the first the scales were weighted in favour of [the order] subject-verb and object-verb" rather than the other way around. This, however, is not reflected in the case studied here, it being a more complex structure than simply verb + noun). As it is, one cannot stop at the level of a word-order rule in formulating an overall theory of Greek linguistics.

³⁰ Reed, "The Infinitive with Two Substantival Accusatives," 8.

³¹ Examples like Jn. 12:18, ἤκουσαν τούτο αὐτον πεποιηκέναι τὸ σημεῖον, pose no problem, for τούτο is obviously not independent, but modifies τὸ σημεῖον, which follows the infinitive, thus making it an emphatic demonstrative pronoun. See Reed, "The Infinitive with Two Substantival Accusatives," 11.

possible patterns.³² Thus a comprehensive search would involve retrieving six possible patterns (A_1A_2I , giving SOI and OSI; A_1IA_2 , giving SIO and OIS; and IA_1A_2 , giving ISO and IOS), with each substantive spanning the three different categories noted in the rule above. Including the possibility of an accusative participle functioning substantively, each of the six patterns would then be further divided into sixteen different combinations involving the two substantives, creating a total of forty-eight search patterns. Following the results of Moeller and Kramer and of Reed, non-copulative and copulative verbs are searched separately, making a total of ninety-six search patterns.³³ The search comes up with ninety-four valid instances of the construction in the entire New Testament.³⁴ It misses four of Reed's examples,³⁵ rejects six,³⁶ and discovers eleven additional instances not registered by Reed, six of which do not follow the dominant pattern of SO.³⁷ The order of the following discussion of the instances follows that of Reed's for easy comparison.

Non-copulative Infinitive The IA_1A_2 Category ISO (19 Instances)

As mentioned in notes 25 and 29 earlier, a word-order rule is really a second order construct that is useful mainly in dealing with genuine

³² This is an especially desirable feature in searching through today's huge databases electronically.

³³ The search is carried out using the GRAMCORD Grammatical Concordance System developed by the GRAMCORD Institute, a Washington non-profit corporation. See Appendix 1 for details concerning the search.

³⁴ A quick perusal of the retrieved instances reveals that the IPDAC is a predominantly Lukan and Pauline phenomenon. The Lukan corpus takes up just over a quarter of the NT writings, but 44% (42 instances out of a total of 95) of the IPDAC are Lukan. Of the rest 16 instances are neither Pauline nor Lukan.

³⁵ They are: Rom. 4:13; 15:19; 1 Tim. 2:9; and Heb. 10:4. See Appendix 1 for reasons of missing these entries, and ways to correct them.

³⁶ They are: Mk. 7:12; Acts 18:13; 20:28; 2 Cor. 7:11; Col. 2:1; and Heb. 6:11. These are all cases where the infinitive is really complementary to the main verb of the sentence, and has no independent subject of its own.

³⁷ They are: Jn. 10:16; Acts 3:21; 4:30; 9:6; 1 Cor. 5:1; and 1 Thes. 1:8. They will be discussed below.

homonymous (ambiguous) cases and in perhaps also composition.³⁸ In all other situations the syntactic scenario is almost always determined by examining linguistic data immediately presented by the text itself, without resorting to some extraneous rules. For example, in Acts 26:18 we have τοῦ λαβεῖν αὐτοὺς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. Even standing alone this adverbial clause is not homonymous, for the +animate/-animate opposition of the substantives with respect to the verb resolves the issue readily. Thus a combination of verbal lexis and aspects of semantic opposition between the substantives provides the necessary deixis for disambiguation in this instance. The same is true for examples like Lk. 4:43 (εὐαγγελίσασθαι με δεῖ τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ); Lk. 11:27 (ἐν τῷ εὐλογεῖν αὐτὸν ταῦτα [a neuter demonstrative pronoun]); Acts 15:7 (ἀκοῦσαι τὰ ἔθνη τὸν λόγον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου); Acts 21:25 (φυλάσσεσθαι αὐτοὺς τό τε εἰδωλόθυτον καὶ κ.τ.λ.); and others like Rom. 12:2; 2 Cor. 13:7; Phil. 1:10; 1 Tim. 6:14; and Heb. 10:34. +Animate/-animate is just one such pair of semantic opposition. There can be others: e.g., +quality/-quality in Acts 5:3 (ψεύσασθαι σε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον) and Acts 21:21 (μὴ περιτέμνειν αὐτοὺς τὰ τέκνα). It will be difficult indeed, if not in fact impossible, to imagine the Holy Spirit deceiving Ananias, or anyone for that matter, and it borders on absurdity that a child is told to circumcise adults. In Acts 28:17 (συγκαλέσασθαι αὐτὸν τοὺς ὄντας τῶν Ἰουδαίων), verbal deixis (συν-) and a +plurality/-plurality opposition clear up the difficulty readily. Grammatical homonymy is ruled out in these instances

³⁸ That this is the case is not recognized with sufficient seriousness. This is particularly relevant to the study of a dead language like Hellenistic Greek. As demonstrated abundantly by how Reed and Moeller/Kramer conduct their studies, the syntactic role of a substantive is really determined by means other than the application of a word-order rule (except for a few examples of Reed's as remarked in n.19). Thus to call it a "rule" is to perhaps over-indulge in the prescriptive ability of something that is primarily descriptive in origin. Moreover, this "rule" is obtained by observing only a very limited number of linguistic exemplars. The repertoire of a living language (one with an active community of indigenous and competent speakers) is virtually unlimited. Not so a dead language. There one is endowed only with a limited number of linguistic instances. The validity of a rule constructed inductively on a finite data set will be repeatedly challenged if we are not cognizant of its primarily descriptive function. When one composes Greek, however, one does need rules of grammar and the like to justify a certain composition as valid or otherwise. Dover's example is instructive. In discussing the possibilities of word order of an utterance consisting of the three words πάντα ἄν ἔγραψεν, he writes "Nor, I hope, would a student write this [referring to ἔγραψε πάντ' ἄν]; but I should be surprised if he could say why, except to say [truly] that if we search for an example, in Classical Greek prose, of verb+πάντ'+ἄν arranged, as a complete utterance, in this order, our search will be long" (Dover, *Greek Word Order*, 2). In other words, the text judges the student, not vice versa.

without the need to consult the wider contexts in which these clauses occur. There are of course cases where simple consideration of verbal lexis and semantic opposition of the substantives does not resolve the syntax at hand. Examples in this category include Lk. 2:27 (ἐν τῷ εἰσαγαγεῖν τοὺς γονεῖς τὸ παιδίον Ἰησοῦν); Lk. 24:51 (ἐν τῷ εὐλογεῖν αὐτὸν αὐτούς); Acts 4:2 (διὰ τὸ διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς τὸν λαόν); 2 Cor. 2:13 (τῷ μὴ εὐρεῖν με Τίτον);³⁹ 2 Cor. 8:6 (εἰς τὸ παρακαλέσαι ἡμᾶς Τίτον); Phil. 1:7 (διὰ τὸ ἔχειν με ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμᾶς); and even Lk. 11:18 (ἐν βεελζεβούλ ἐκβάλλειν με τὰ δαιμόνια). Almost all of them may be labelled homonymous (Lk. 11:18 is a borderline case, because when standing alone one can imagine verbal lexis allowing action both ways). However, on examining deictic indicators in the wider context, the difficulty is rather easily resolved. Thus whereas a *child* could presumably *lead* his parents into the temple, an eight-day-old *infant* cannot help but be *brought* in by his parents. In Lk. 24:51, the previous verse makes clear who was blessing whom, and in Acts 4:2, it is the apostles' teaching activity that got them into trouble. The clearest contextual deictic indicator here is 4:4 (πολλοὶ δὲ τῶν ἀκουσάντων τὸν λόγον). At first sight 2 Cor. 8:6 may be argued both ways,⁴⁰ but *παρακαλέσαι* suggests an objective, and the only objective in the context is for Titus to take a collection from the Corinthians, not Paul. Hence the urging must be directed from Paul (we) to Titus. Even with semantic contribution from the wider literary context, sometimes ambiguity might still remain. Phil. 1:7 (διὰ τὸ ἔχειν με ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμᾶς) is one such example.⁴¹ It is here that the word-order pattern is helpful in deciding the case, in which case *με* will be taken as the subject.

³⁹ The only instance in the NT for the articular infinitive with the dative to have the causal sense. See BDF §401.

⁴⁰ See Reed, "The Infinitive with Two Substantival Accusatives," 10, although he resolves the issue by appealing to the word-order rule.

⁴¹ NRSV renders it "because you hold me in your heart," noting that it could also be translated "because I hold you in my heart." NEB likewise regards ὑμᾶς as the subject. The ambiguity does not escape the attention of the commentators. Lightfoot (*St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians* [reprint ed., Peabody: Hendrickson, 1981], 84) takes *με* as the subject by appealing to word order without further comment. G.F. Hawthorne (*Philippians*, WBC 43 [Waco: Word, 1983], 22-23) notes that while the context of v. 8 favors the translation "I have you in my heart," v. 7 favors the opposite, and he opts for the latter. His examination of evidence is not conclusive. M. Silva (*Philippians*, Wycliffe Exegetical Comm. [Chicago: Moody Press, 1988], 56) appeals to proximity through his searches on GRAMCORD, and suggests that "Ambiguous instances should no doubt be interpreted according to the usual pattern" (Silva, *Philippians*, 56, n. 21). He makes a rather significant

IOS (1 Instance)

Reed regards Lk. 18:5 as an instance of ISO by rejecting Moeller and Kramer's analysis that κόπον παρέχειν is really an idiomatic phrase and hence forms an exception on its own. This is perhaps where Reed ignored his own advice by letting a rule bend a reasonable interpretation of the data. BAGD cites a number of examples which suggest that even if κόπον παρέχειν is not idiomatic the syntactical pattern of OIS (κόπον παρέχειν τινί) is certainly customary whenever the phrase is used,⁴² unless one wants to translate every one of those occurrences "trouble (subject) brings someone (object) to somebody," which sounds obtuse, rather than "someone (subject) brings trouble (object) to somebody" (=someone bothers somebody), which is expected. Nevertheless this is the only instance of certain IOS out of 20 retrieved cases.

A₁IA₂ Category SIO (11 Instances)

The analysis of this category and others will be similar to the one performed above. Thus a SIO pattern can be ascertained by considering +animate/-animate opposition in the substantives in the cases of Matt. 25:27 (ἔδει σε οὖν βαλεῖν τὰ ἀργύριά μου); Jn. 9:4 (ἡμᾶς δεῖ ἐργάζεσθαι τὰ ἔργα); Jn. 12:18 (τοῦτο αὐτὸν πεποιηκέναι τὸ σημεῖον); Acts 19:10 (τοὺς κατοικοῦντας τὴν Ἀσίαν ἀκοῦσαι τὸν λόγον); and Rom. 15:19 (με... πεπληρωκέναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον). The other instances could be resolved by deixis in the larger literary context. In Jn. 2:24, though both αὐτόν and τὰ πάντα can be the subject of γινώσκειν, ἐγίνωσκεν in the next verse tells us who the omniscient one is. In Jn. 21:25, it is natural that books would have multiplied if all of Jesus' deeds were written down. Hence τὰ γραφόμενα βιβλία must be the object of χωρῆσαι to emphasize its amount. In a similar fashion, then, the SIO pattern can also be established for Matt. 18:33 (σε ἐλεῆσαι τὸν σύνδουλόν σου); Rom. 15:9 (τὰ δὲ ἔθνη ὑπὲρ ἐλέους δοχάσαι τὸν θεόν); and 1 Cor. 15:53 (τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι ἀφθαρσίαν).

observation that "Chrysostom, a Greek speaker himself who often weighs alternate positions, takes με as the subject and shows no awareness of the alternate possibility."

⁴² W. Bauer, W. Arndt, and F. Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1979), 443d.

Four of the examples listed by Reed in this section are really invalid instances for an SIO pattern demands that one of the substantives be the subject of the infinitive. In all cases the infinitive serves as a complement to the main verb and what would have been the subject of the infinitive is really the object of the main verb. These verbs are all verbs that take up an infinitive complement. In Acts 18:13, σέβεσθαι is a complement to ἀναπείθει;⁴³ in Acts 20:28, ποιμαίνειν is a complement to ἔθετο;⁴⁴ in Col. 2:1, εἰδέναι is a complement to θέλω;⁴⁵ and in Heb. 6:11, ἐνδείκνυσθαι is a complement to ἐπιθυμοῦμεν.⁴⁶ In all these cases one of the substantives is the object of the main verb and the other substantive is the object of the infinitive itself.

OIS (2 Instances)

The real surprise lies in the two instances where the first substantive is actually the object of the infinitive. The first case is Acts 4:30 (ἐν τῷ τὴν χεῖρα [σου] ἐκτείκειν)⁴⁷. The other instance is 1 Thes. 1:8 (μὴ χρεῖαν ἔχειν ἡμᾶς λαλεῖν τι). Both are indisputable in that verbal lexis and semantic opposition alone are sufficient to establish the OIS order. The context of Acts 4:30 is a prayer by the believers for boldness from God to speak His word after Peter and John had been released by the council. It could be that the believers were earnestly beseeching God to manifest His power through healing, signs, and wonders, and thus placed "the hand of God" at an emphatic position⁴⁸ during the petition. For the

⁴³ Cf. περὶθεῖν in BDF § 392(1e).

⁴⁴ BDF § 392(1e).

⁴⁵ BDF § 392(1a).

⁴⁶ BDF § 392(1a).

⁴⁷ E. Haenchen (*The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary* [Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1971], 227, n.9) remarks that there ἐκτείκειν τὴν χεῖρα occurs some eighty times in the LXX. However, ἐκτείνω appears only once as an infinitive in this construction (1 Chron. 10:13) with an unexpressed subject.

⁴⁸ One should, of course, be wary that one does not use "emphasis" to explain away every instance which does not fit into the "average pattern." The reasoning is easily circular. Dover (*Greek Word Order*, 32ff) makes this poignant remark: "We suspect that there is a certain semantic difference between two alternative formulations; we find certain examples in which the difference of formulation coincides with this semantic difference; upon these examples we base a general rule; we then translate all other examples of the alternative formulations in such a way as to make them conform to the rule; and finally we treat our translations as evidence for the validity of the rule." Moreover, one should generally distinguish between the referential and emotive meanings of an utterance (Lyons,

case of *χρείαν ἔχειν*, of the forty-nine instances of *χρεία* in the NT, thirty-seven instances are constructed with *ἔχω* and *χρεία* is placed before *ἔχω* in all but three cases. This might indicate that the frontal position of *χρείαν* with *ἔχειν* is really customary and represents the unmarked pattern despite violating another common pattern of word order.⁴⁹

A₁A₂I

SOI (6 Instances)

Almost all the instances in this category are constructed with an impersonal noun (*δεῖ* or *ἔξεστιν*). The SOI pattern can be confirmed rather readily using the strategy illustrated above. The examples include Mk. 8:31 and Lk. 9:22 (*δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πολλὰ παθεῖν*); Lk. 17:25 (*δεῖ αὐτὸν πολλὰ παθεῖν*); Lk. 20:22 (*ἔξεστιν ἡμᾶς Καίσαρι φόρον δοῦναι ἢ οὐ;*); and Acts 19:21 (*δεῖ με καὶ Ῥώμην ἰδεῖν*). The only troublesome case is 1 Cor. 7:11 (*ἄνδρα γυναῖκα μὴ ἀφιέναι*). However, vv. 10 and 11 are clearly two parallel halves of a full prohibition for divorce from Paul. No other support is necessary to settle the issue. Conzelmann's comment that the change in word order of the woman and the man between v. 10 (*γυναῖκα ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς μὴ χωρισθῆναι*) and v. 11 "is purely a matter of choice" reflects an insensitivity to the problem of word order in the Greek language.⁵⁰

OSI (6 Instances)

The number of unambiguous OSI patterns in this category is rather discomfoting. The instances include 1 Cor. 5:1 (*ὥστε γυναῖκα τινα*

Semantics, 1.175). Yet "emphasis" is often used indiscriminantly to describe both formulations which express the focus of the writer's emotion and that which are essential to the clarity of his argument. This is one caveat one must bear in mind when using "emphasis" as a category of semantic distinction.

⁴⁹ A cursory look at the entries in BAGD (884d) tends to confirm this conjecture. Dover (*Greek Word Order*, 8) remarks that "it would be a very unusual language in which all the utterances of a given individual speaker were wholly and exhaustively determined by *mutually exclusive* rules belonging all to the same type" (italics mine).

⁵⁰ H. Conzelmann, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), 120.

τοῦ πατρὸς ἔχειν); Jn. 1:48 (πρὸ τοῦ σε Φίλιππον φωνῆσαι); Jn. 10:16 (κακεῖνα δεῖ με ἀγαγεῖν); Acts 3:21 (ὄν δεῖ οὐρανὸν μὲν δέξασθαι); Acts 9:6 (λαληθήσεταιί σοι ὅ τί σε δεῖ ποιεῖν); and Acts 25:25 (μηδὲν ἄξιον αὐτὸν θανάτου πεπραχέναι). Although none of these instances can be completely disposed of through verbal lexis and semantic opposition to establish the OIS order (except Acts perhaps 25:25), the wider contexts generally confirm the pattern without much dispute. Thus in 1 Cor. 5:1 γυναῖκα is obviously the subject and placed in the emphatic position to express outrage,⁵¹ whereas the deixis in Jn. 10:16 and surrounding verses dispels any chance of its conforming to an SIO pattern. The ὄν δεῖ οὐρανὸν μὲν δέξασθαι of Acts 3:21 is a rather strange way of saying "Jesus must stay in heaven" (NRSV), but it may be used as a rhetorical foil against the rejection (ἀνέομαι vs. δέχομαι) of the Messiah by the Jews in v. 14. In this context then it would not make sense to say that "Jesus received heaven." The relative pronoun is placed in a marked position for more emphasis. The positions of the two accusatives in Jn. 1:48 are already marked for notice by intervening between the preposition governing the infinitive and its article.⁵² The emphasis on Nathanael in Jesus' conversation is plausibly demonstrated by the repeated use of σε, the purpose is perhaps to elicit a response from Nathanael towards Jesus himself. In Acts 9:6 the infinitive appears in an indirect speech which functions somewhat like a question. This explains why the order between subject and object is reversed: this is a general pattern for interrogatives.⁵³ In our last example, it becomes rather clear in the context that Festus was really at a loss as to what with which to charge Paul. His repeated emphasis of "nothing" (μηδὲν, οὐκ) is then understandable.

Summary

The above survey indicates that in the majority of cases the substantive first in order is also the subject of the infinitive. The ratio of

⁵¹ The large number of OSI examples makes the claim of emphasis suspect of circularity. Nevertheless, along with the rest of the data, the claim seems warranted.

⁵² See discussion in Reed, "The Infinitive with Two Substantival Accusatives," 13, and his extended note on p.14.

⁵³ Cf. Acts 17:20 and Reed, "The Infinitive with Two Substantival Accusatives," 8. I was able to extract exactly the same instances of copulative infinitives with τίς and τί using one of my GRAMCORD command files. However, we will not deal with interrogatives in this paper.

SO to OS is 36:9. It is further demonstrated that the OS pattern very often involves emphasis and focus unless the attachment of the object to the infinitive is idiomatic, in which one pattern may take precedence over another without increase in markedness. To be more complete one needs to proceed to the copulative infinitives.

Copulative Infinitive **The IA₁A₂ Category** **The ISP Cases (16 Instances)**

It may immediately be noticed that most of the examples contain at least one pronoun. Only three (Acts 18:5, 28; and Eph. 3:6) do not contain a pronoun in their construction. With the copulative infinitive, verbal lexis becomes useless in deciding the syntax between the two accusatives. But it is still relatively easy to ascertain from context that the pronoun constitutes the subject of the infinitive. This is true for Lk. 9:18, 11:1, Rom. 1:20; 3:26; 4:11; 4:16; 4:18; 7:3; 8:29; 15:16; 1 Cor. 10:6; Eph. 1:4, 3:6; 1 Thes. 1:7; and Jas. 1:18. Two of the cases worth noting are Acts 18:5 and 18:28, both with the construction εἶναι τὸν χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν. NRSV renders both instances the Messiah was Jesus, contra AV, NASB, and NIV. In this case, the question is not simply one of emphasis, for the context has to be established first. The solution hinges on which question that was more commonly asked as the disciples attempted to evangelize: "Who is the Messiah?" Or, "Who is Jesus?" It seems reasonable to take the former, for it was one of the central questions for the Jews of the time. Thus it becomes more plausible to take τὸν χριστὸν as the subject.⁵⁴

⁵⁴ See Reed, "The Infinitive with Two Substantival Accusatives," 2. However, he could have employed rule 3c (his p.17, n.26); he cited from L.C. McGaughey (*Toward a Descriptive Analysis of ἜΙΝΑΙ as a Linking Verb in NT Greek* [Missoula: Scholars Press, 1972]) to establish that the noun carrying the article was the subject. This seems to be the position taken by F.F. Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles: Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary*, 3rd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 344; as well as C.K. Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Acts of the Apostles*, vol. II (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1998), 866, 892. But see D.B. Wallace, "The Semantics and Exegetical Significance of the Object-Complement Construction in the New Testament," *Grace Theological Journal* 6 (1985):91-112, for a dissenting opinion based on an argument for the semantic equivalence of predicate-nominative and predicate-accusative constructions. See also Cripe, *Analysis*, 36-59.

IPS (3 Instances)

Two of the three instances of the PS (P=predicate) pattern are identical, involving the indefinite pronoun *τινα* (Acts 5:36, λέγων εἶναι *τινα* ἑαυτόν; Acts 8:9, λέγων εἶναι *τινα* ἑαυτόν μέγαν). Moeller and Kramer regard this an exception, with the reflexives assuming the subject position, rendering the indefinite pronoun a predicate by necessity.⁵⁵ Reed, however, is more subtle.⁵⁶ Whether one regards ὃ προσεκλίθη ἀνδρῶν κ.τ.λ. as an explanatory remark by Gamaliel or as a quote from the claim of Theudas himself, it remains clear that *τινα* is the predicate and it is fronted to highlight the fact that the Jesus whom the apostles were preaching was also claiming to be someone (*τινα*). Thus it is emphatic. In 8:9, however, one gets two different syntactical patterns depending on whether μέγαν is treated as an adjective attributive to *τινα* (and thus a marked IPS pattern) or as the main predicate with *τινα* qualifying it (an unmarked ISP pattern). In either case the translation is not affected ("he is someone great") because ἑαυτόν remains the subject. Rom. 4:16 gives another IPS pattern (εἶναι βεβαίαν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν παντὶ τῷ σπέρματι) where the subject is easily identified by the article and the fronted position of the predicate may be regarded as marked and thus emphatic.⁵⁷

A₁IA₂ Category

SIP (7 Instances)

In Lk. 20:41, the articular accusative (τὸν χριστόν) again identifies itself as the subject. At any rate, the quotation of Ps. 110:1 in the following verses makes this conclusion inescapable. Acts 28:6 (ἔλεγον αὐτὸν εἶναι θεόν) is another instance where the subject is easily identified by considering the question that led to this exclamation (i.e., "who is he?" not "who is God?" Cf. Acts 18:28 discussed earlier). The other cases

⁵⁵ Their pattern IV. Moeller and Kramer, "An Overlooked Structural Pattern," 31.

⁵⁶ See his analysis in Reed, "The Infinitive with Two Substantial Accusatives," 19.

⁵⁷ See C.E.B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Epistle to the Romans*, vol. I (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1975), 242, for an exegesis leading to the same conclusion regarding emphasis from context. It is quoted extensively by Reed ("The Infinitive with Two Substantial Accusatives," 20f).

(Acts 17:29; 26:29; 27:4; Rom. 6:11; and 1 Pet. 5:12) may be resolved fairly readily.

PIS (2 Instances)

Both 1 Tim. 6:5 (νομιζόντων πορισμὸν εἶναι τὴν εὐσέβειαν) and Rev. 2:9 (λεγόντων Ἰουδαίους εἶναι ἑαυτοὺς καὶ οὐκ εἰσὶν) present themselves very clearly in an PIS pattern. The former is because of the articular accusative and the latter because of the contrast between Ἰουδαίους and συναγωγὴ τοῦ Σατανᾶ which follows. The contrast between the PS order here and the SP order in a similar saying in 3:9 is puzzling. The fact that John is rather free with grammatical convention may be one reason. Reed's suggestion that emphasis is grammaticalized in the first instance and not in the second instance is weak.⁵⁸ This is one illustration that warns us against taking any word-order rule too seriously. No human language is deciphered by an exhaustive set of mutually exclusive rules.⁵⁹

A₁A₂I

SPI (21 Instances)

By and large the syntactical relationship between the two accusative substantives in these 24 entries (Mk. 14:64; Lk. 4:41; 20:6; 20:20; 23:2; Acts 10:40; 16:15; 19:36; Rom. 2:19; 14:14; 15:8; 1 Cor. 7:26; 2 Cor. 9:5; 11:16; Phil. 1:13; 3:8; 1 Tim. 3:2; Titus 1:7; 2:2; 2:4; and Rev. 3:9) resolve themselves in ways similar to those described above. There is one interesting example, however. The parallel to Lk. 4:41 (ὅτι ἤδεισαν τὸν χριστὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι) is Mk. 1:34 (ὅτι ἤδεισαν αὐτόν) for which UBS⁴ lists three other variants (αὐτὸν χριστὸν εἶναι; αὐτὸν τὸν χριστὸν εἶναι; τὸν χριστὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι, down from the five variants of UBS³) and an A rating is given to the adopted reading. In all cases the subject is αὐτόν. There are two readings in which τὸν χριστὸν precedes αὐτόν, reflecting perhaps a difference in scribal understandings of what the passage is saying.

⁵⁸ "The Infinitive with Two Substantival Accusatives," 22.

⁵⁹ Unless, of course, one is willing to embrace the rather unhelpful and trivial claim that every linguistic instance is a rule to itself.

Summary

In this section the observations of Moeller and Kramer that the subject precedes the predicate in a copulative infinitive construction coincide with the word-order analysis. The ratio of SP to PS for our analysis is 44:5. Deviation from the SP order can largely be attributed to emphasis, except for one or two instances for which the reason for a different pattern is not clear.

Conclusion and Statistical Matters

After an exhaustive search of instances of an infinitive (transitive/copulative) constructed with two accusative substantives, where the infinitive is not complement to some main verb (exemplified by those contained in BDF §392), it is found with reasonable confidence that the customary, unmarked order is for the subject to precede the object in the construction. The final ratio of SO:OS is found to be 80:14 (36:9 for non-copulatives and 44:5 for copulatives [where the predicate (P) is labelled an object (O) for ease of discussion in this section]). However, this conclusion is not precise enough for statistical purposes. A major issue in statistical sampling is the randomness of the sample. Since we examine the population here (it being the entire New Testament), the issue is moot. However, this feature also limits the application of our conclusions to the Greek of the New Testament. Inferences drawn on a wider corpus based on this exercise may be faulty because then the New Testament could no longer be regarded as representative of the population. The sample has to be redrawn. Another related question has to do with the independence of the data. For example, within a certain source-critical theory (say, the Oxford Hypothesis) of the synoptic Gospels, parallels indicate the presence of literary dependence. In this instance double- and triple-traditions should only be counted once to preserve the statistical weighting. In our data, then, Mk. 8:31 and Lk. 9:22 should count as one instance of SOI, not two. It may also affect Lk. 17:25. There does not seem to be other instances of synoptic parallel. Moreover, it is not unreasonable to assume that very closely situated instances of the same syntactic structure under study may not be in fact independent.⁶⁰ This

⁶⁰ For discussions on the independence of linguistic data, see Woods, Fletcher, & Hughes, *Statistics in Language Studies*, 147-49.

may be the case for the two SIO occurrences in 1 Cor. 15:53. Other examples include Acts 18:5 and 18:28; Rom. 4:11 and 4:18; Acts 5:36 and 8:9; etc. Other factors that may affect independence include chiasmic constructions, repeated idiomatic expressions, etc. The upshot is that the raw frequencies often need to be processed further before useful conclusions can be drawn. As yet little has been written on the subject of independence in linguistic data, thus rigor is often lacking in their statistical analysis,⁶¹ our study not excepted. However, the general observations made here seem to be valid.

A final comment needs to be made regarding the interpretation of figures thus obtained. Many studies on New Testament grammatical phenomena (word order, for example) stop at the level of frequencies, and then proceed to draw conclusions based on such counting.⁶² The problem with such a procedure of drawing inference is that it is largely subjective and imprecise. Thus when it was stated earlier on that "it is found with reasonable confidence that the customary, unmarked order is for the subject to precede the object in the construction," it is not clear how this statement should be interpreted. The proper procedure is to resort to a χ^2 test, which allows one to determine whether or not the observed frequencies could be attributed to chance.⁶³ For our data, *if* we ignore the issue of independence, the χ^2 score against the null hypothesis that there is no significance to the distribution to these frequencies is 46.34, which is significant even at the 0.01 probability level (whose critical value is 10.83). Thus the null hypothesis is soundly rejected, and we may conclude that in a statistical sense at least, SO seems to be the basic pattern for the syntactic structure under consideration.

During the discussion it is seen that the criterion of word order is a much more robust discriminating variable than that of proximity. Such a rule, once established, would be helpful in deciphering truly homonymous cases where the wider context gives no clarification. Nevertheless it must be emphasized that a rule like this is a second order construct created through grammatical reasoning (in the broader sense that includes

⁶¹ A fact bemoaned by Woods, Fletcher, & Hughes (*Statistics*, 149).

⁶² Dover, *Greek Word Order*, is one such example. Many studies cited in this paper would fall into the same category.

⁶³ A description of the χ^2 test can be found in almost any standard textbook on elementary statistics. See also the references given in note 13 above.

consideration of semantics and pragmatics) that is much more basic. Hence priority must still be given to those basic considerations as verbal lexis, semantic oppositions, pragmatic use, and the like that are inherent in both the linguistic elements being examined and the wider contexts in which they are found. A word-order rule describes an observed pattern, which is constantly being modified whenever new examples are being discovered in contemporary literature. It is useful as an empirical guidance, given the rather high (and thus satisfactory) ratio of demarcation, but it must always be used with care.

Appendix 1

As mentioned in the paper, a total of ninety-six search patterns were targeted (three major categories of word order, multiplied by sixteen combinations of the four different kinds of substantives, and multiplied by the two classes of infinitives being studied in the paper). Ninety-six command files were written in GRAMCORD to perform the retrievals. The differences among the command files reflect the differences in the order of the construction being searched (e. g., A_1A_2I versus A_1IA_2) and the differences between individual target elements being searched (e.g., participle versus noun). GRAMCORD does not allow searching for multiple target classes within the same target element (e.g., element 1 = verb or noun or adjective). Thus command files for all possible patterns have to be written individually. This greatly decreases the flexibility of the search system. Also the morphologically based search system is ignorant of higher grammatical categories like "substantive," "subject/object," "verbal complement," or "subordination/coordination," etc. Thus a lot of manual sifting work still needs to be done after retrieval, except perhaps for lemma-based searches.

The search parameters for the construction were quite simple. Only accusative substantives were searched. This ruled out the predicative nominative as the object of the infinitive, thus overlooking Rom. 4:13, which is the only nominative predicate listed by Reed. A contextfield of six to eight words was imposed to limit the number of retrievable instances. This led to a loss of at least one instance (Rom. 15:9) in which the two substantives ($\mu\epsilon$ and $\tau\omicron$ $\epsilon\upsilon$ αγγέλιον) are separated by ten words, thus requiring an eleven word-length contextfield to discover. It was also specified that no prepositions or verbs should intervene between

the three elements, except that 3rd person singular verbs were permitted to allow for impersonal verbs like δεῖ and ἔξεστιν. The infinitives associated with these verbs were not technically considered complements (see BDF §393). The conjunction καί was also excluded between elements. This turned out to be a loss, missing three valid instances that Reed carried, although one of them was retrieved serendipitously as an invalid instance by another command file. The exclusion of conjunction is probably not necessary in retrospect. In some command files apredata on verbs was imposed to avoid retrieving infinitive complements. In total 631 instances were retrieved, with a number of repeated retrievals due to agreement of interdata with the target elements. Only ninety-five instances were deemed on target, of which 11 examples were not listed by Reed.

The GRAMCORD retrieved examples listed below have been weeded to include only the valid instances. Instances are grouped according to the search pattern given above, following the order of noun, pronoun, adjective, and participle for each combination of A₁, A₂, and I. Within each substantive subcategory, the retrievals will be listed in the canonical order, with a blank line between the subcategories. Asterisked instances indicate my addition to Reed's listing. The number at the beginning of each retrieval is simply a GRAMCORD tag on the various substantive subcategories, equivalent to the headings that I have provided at the top of each of these subcategories.

Appendix 2: GRAMCORD Retrievals

Non-copulative Infinitive

ISO/IOS

i/n/n

- (2) LK 2 27-27 καὶ ἐν τῷ εἰσαγαγεῖν τοὺς γονεῖς τὸ παιδίον Ἰησοῦν τοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτοὺς κατὰ
 (2) LK 18 5-5 ἄνθρωπον ἐντρέπομαι, ⁵ διὰ γε τὸ παρέχειν μοι κόπον τὴν χήραν ταύτην ἐκδικήσω αὐτήν, ἵνα μὴ
 (2) AC 15 7-7 θεὸς διὰ τοῦ στόματός μου ἀκούσαι τὰ ἔθνη τὸν λόγον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου καὶ πιστεῦσαι.

i/pr/pr

- (1) LK 24 51-51 καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εὐλογεῖν αὐτὸν αὐτοὺς διέστη ἀπ' αὐτῶν καὶ ἀνεφέρετο
 (1) PP1 7-7 ὑπὲρ πάντων ὑμῶν διὰ τὸ ἔχειν με ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμᾶς, ἐν τε τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου

i/pr/n

- (2) LK 4 43-43 ὅτι καὶ ταῖς ἐτέραις πόλεσιν εὐαγγελίσασθαι με δεῖ τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, ὅτι ἐπὶ τοῦτο
 (2) LK 11 18-18 ὅτι λέγετε ἐν Βεελζεβούλ ἐκβάλλειν με τὰ δαιμόνια.
 (2) LK 11 27-27 Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ λέγειν αὐτὸν ταῦτα ἐπάρασά τις φωνὴν γυνὴ ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου εἶπεν
 (2) AC 4 2-2 οἱ Σαδδουκαῖοι, ² διαπονούμενοι διὰ τὸ διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς τὸν λαὸν καὶ καταγγέλλειν ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ
 (2) AC 5 3-3 ὁ σατανᾶς τὴν καρδίαν σου, ψεύσασθαι σε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον καὶ νοσφίσασθαι ἀπὸ
 (2) AC 21 21-21 ἔθνη πάντας Ἰουδαίους λέγων μὴ περιτέμνειν αὐτοὺς τὰ τέκνα μηδὲ τοῖς ἔθεσιν περιπατεῖν.
 (2) AC 21 25-25 πεπιστευκότων ἐθνῶν ἡμεῖς ἐπεστείλαμεν κρίναντες φυλάσσεσθαι αὐτοὺς τό τε εἰδωλόθυτον καὶ αἷμα καὶ πνικτὸν καὶ
 (2) AC 26 18-18 σατανᾶ ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν, τοῦ λαβεῖν αὐτοὺς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ κληρὸν ἐν τοῖς
 (2) 2C 2 13-13 τῷ πνεύματί μου τῷ μὴ εὐρεῖν με Τίτον τὸν ἀδελφόν μου, ἀλλὰ ἀποταξάμενος
 (2) 2C 8 6-6 διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ ⁶ εἰς τὸ παρακαλέσαι ἡμᾶς Τίτον, ἵνα καθὼς προενήρξατο οὕτως καὶ

(2) 1T 6 14-14 Ποντίου Πιλάτου τὴν καλὴν ὁμολογίαν, ¹⁴ τηρῆσαι σε
τὴν ἐντολὴν ἄσπιλον ἀνεπίλημπτον μέχρι τῆς
ἐπιφανείας

(2) HB 10 34-34 ὑμῶν μετὰ χαρᾶς προσεδέξασθε γινώσκοντες ἔχειν
ἑαυτοὺς κρείττονα ὑπαρξιν καὶ μένουσαν.

i/pr/a

(3) 2C 13 7-7 δὲ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν μὴ ποιῆσαι ὑμᾶς κακὸν μηδὲν, οὐχ ἵνα
ἡμεῖς δόκιμοι φανώμεν,

i/pr/pp

*(4) AC 28 17-17 Ἐγένετο δὲ μετὰ ἡμέρας τρεῖς συγκαλέσασθαι
αὐτὸν τοὺς ὄντας τῶν Ἰουδαίων πρώτους·

(4) PP 1 10-10 καὶ πάσῃ αἰσθήσει ¹⁰ εἰς τὸ δοκιμάζειν ὑμᾶς τὰ
διαφέροντα, ἵνα ἦτε εἰλικρινεῖς καὶ ἀπρόσκοποι

SIO/SOI

n/i/pr

*(1) AC 4 30-30 λόγον σου, ³⁰ ἐν τῷ τὴν χεῖρά [σου] ἐκτείνειν σε
εἰς ἴαριν καὶ σημεῖα καὶ

*(1) 1Q 1 8-8 τὸν θεὸν ἐξελέλυθεν, ὥστε μὴ χρεῖαν ἔχειν ἡμᾶς λαλεῖν
τι.

n/i/n

(2) JN 21 25-25 ἔν, οὐδ' αὐτὸν οἶμαι τὸν κόσμον χωρῆσαι τὰ
γραφόμενα βιβλία.

(2) RM 15 9-9 ἐπαγγελίας τῶν πατέρων, ⁹ τὰ δὲ ἔθνη ὑπὲρ ἐλέους
δοξάσαι τὸν θεόν, καθὼς γέεραται·

(2) 1C 15 53-53 ἐνδύσασθαι ἀφθαρσίαν καὶ τὸ θνητὸν τοῦτο
ἐνδύσασθαι ἀθανασίαν.

pr/i/n

*(2) MT 18 33-33 οὐκ ἔδει καὶ σὲ ἐλεῆσαι τὸν σύνδουλόν σου, ὡς
καγὼ σὲ

*(2) MT 25 27-27 ἔδει σε οὖν βαλεῖν τὰ ἀργύριά μου τοῖς τραπεζίταις,
καὶ ἐλθῶν

(2) JN 9 4-4 ἡμᾶς δεῖ ἐργάζεσθαι τὰ ἔργα τοῦ πέμψαντός με ἕως ἡμέρα

(2) JN 12 18-18 ὁ ὄχλος, ὅτι ἤκουσαν τοῦτο αὐτὸν πεποικέναι τὸ σημεῖον.

(2) AC 21 5-5 ὅτε δὲ ἐγένετο ἡμᾶς ἐξαρτίσαι τὰς ἡμέρας, ἐξεληθόντες ἐπορευόμεθα προπεμτόντων ἡμᾶς πάντων

(2) 1C 15 53-53 Δεῖ γὰρ τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι ἀφθαρσίαν καὶ τὸ θνητὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι

pr/i/a

(3) JN 2 24-24 ἐπίστευεν αὐτὸν αὐτοῖς διὰ τὸ αὐτὸν γινώσκειν πάντας²⁵ καὶ ὅτι οὐ χρείαν εἶχεν

pp/i/n

(2) AC 19 10-10 ἔτη δύο, ὥστε πάντας τοὺς κατοικοῦντας τὴν Ἰουδαίαν ἀκούσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ κυρίου, Ἰουδαίους τε καὶ

SOI/OSI

n/pr/i

*(1) 1C 5 1-1 οὐδὲ ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ὥστε γυναῖκά τινα τοῦ πατρὸς ἔχειν.

n/n/i

(2) 1C 7 11-11 ἢ τῷ ἀνδρὶ καταλλαγῆτω, - καὶ ἄνδρα γυναῖκα μὴ ἀφίεναι

n/a/i

(3) MK 8 31-31 διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς ὅτι δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πολλὰ παθεῖν καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων

(3) LK 9 22-22 τοῦτο²² εἰπὼν ὅτι δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πολλὰ παθεῖν καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ἀπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων

pr/pr/i

*(1) JN 10 16-16 κακεῖνα δεῖ με ἀγαγεῖν καὶ τῆς φωνῆς μου ἀκούσουσιν,

*(1) AC 9 6-6 πόλιν καὶ λαληθήσεται σοι ὅ τί σε δεῖ ποιεῖν.

pr/n/i

(2) LK 20 22-22 ἔξεστιν ἡμᾶς Καίσαρι φόρον δοῦναι ἢ οὐ;

(2) JN 1 48-48 πρὸ τοῦ σε Φίλιππον φωνῆσαι ὄντα ὑπὸ τὴν συκῆν εἶδον

*(2) AC 3 21-21 τὸν προκεχειρισμένον ὑμῖν χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν,²¹ ὃν δεῖ οὐρανὸν μὲν δέξασθαι ἄχρι χρόνων ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων ὧν

- (1) AC 19 21-21 Ἱεροσόλυμα εἰπὼν ὅτι μετὰ τὸ γενέσθαι με ἐκεῖ δεῖ
με καὶ Ῥώμην ἰδεῖν.

pr/a/i

- (3) LK 17 25-25 πρῶτον δὲ δεῖ αὐτὸν πολλὰ παθεῖν καὶ
ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς

a/pr/i

- (1) AC 25 25-25 ἐγὼ δὲ κατελαβόμενῃ μηδὲν ἄξιον αὐτὸν θανάτου
πεπραχέναι, αὐτοῦ δὲ τούτου ἐπικαλεσαμένου τὸν
-

ISO/IOS - copulative infinitive

i/n/n

- (2) AC 18 5-5 ὁ Παῦλος διαμαρτυρούμενος τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις εἶναι τὸν
χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν.
(2) AC 18 28-28 δημοσίᾳ ἐπιδεικνύς διὰ τῶν γραφῶν εἶναι τὸν
χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν.

i/n/a

- (3) EP 3 6-6 αὐτοῦ καὶ προφήταις ἐν πνεύματι, ⁶ εἶναι τὰ ἔθνη
συγκληρονόμα καὶ σύσσωμα καὶ συμμετοχα τῆς

i/pr/pr

- (1) AC 5 36-36 τῶν ἡμερῶν ἀνέστη Θεοδᾶς λέγων εἶναι τινα ἑαυτὸν,
ὃ̄ προσεκλίθη ἀνδρῶν ἀριθμὸς ὡς
(1) AC 8 9-9 τὸ ἔθνος τῆς Σαμαρείας, λέγων εἶναι τινα ἑαυτὸν μέγαν,
¹⁰ ὃ̄ προσεῖχον πάντες ἀπὸ

i/pr/n

- (2) RM 3 26-26 τῷ νῦν καιρῷ, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον καὶ
δικαιοῦντα τὸν ἐκ πίστεως
(2) RM 4 11-11 ἐν τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πατέρα πάντων
τῶν πιστευόντων δι' ἀκροβυστίας,
(2) RM 4 18-18 ἐπὶ ἐλπίδι ἐπίστευσεν εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι αὐτὸν πατέρα
πολλῶν ἐθνῶν κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον·
(2) RM 7 3-3 ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, τοῦ μὴ εἶναι αὐτὴν μοιχαλίδα γενομένην
ἀνδρὶ ἑτέρῳ.
(2) RM 15 16-16 ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ¹⁶ εἰς τὸ εἶναι με λειτουργὸν Χριστοῦ
Ἰησοῦ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη,

(2) IC 10 6-6 ἡμῶν ἐγενήθησαν, εἰς τὸ μὴ εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἐπιθυμητὰς κακῶν, καθὼς κακεῖνοι ἐπεθύμησαν.

(2) IQ 1 7-7 μετὰ χαρᾶς πνεύματος ἁγίου,⁷ ὥστε γενέσθαι ὑμᾶς τύπον πᾶσιν τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ἐν τῇ

(2) JM 1 18-18 ἡμᾶς λόγῳ ἀληθείας εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἀπαρχὴν τινα τῶν αὐτοῦ κτισμάτων.

i/pr/a

(3) RM 1 20-20 δύνάμις καὶ θειότης, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἀναπολογήτους,²¹ διότι γνόντες τὸν θεὸν οὐχ

(3) RM 8 29-29 τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς·

(3) EP 1 4-4 ἐν αὐτῷ πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἁγίους καὶ ἀμόμους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ ἐν

i/pr/pp

(4) LK 9 18-18 Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτὸν προσευχόμενον κατὰ μόνας συνῆσαν αὐτῷ οἱ

(4) LK 11 1-1 Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτὸν ἐν τόπῳ τινὶ προσευχόμενον, ὡς ἐπαύσατο, εἶπέν τις τῶν

i/a/n

(2) RM 4 16-16 ἵνα κατὰ χάριν, εἰς τὸ εἶναι βεβαίαν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν παντὶ τῷ σπέρματι, οὐ τῷ

SIO/OIS - copulative infinitive

n/i/n

(2) LK 20 41-41 πῶς λέγουσιν τὸν χριστὸν εἶναι Δαυὶδ υἱόν;

(2) IT 6 5-5 καὶ ἀπεστερημένων τῆς ἀληθείας, νομιζόντων πορισμὸν εἶναι τὴν εὐσέβειαν.

n/i/a

(3) AC 27 4-4 τὴν Κύπρον διὰ τὸ τοὺς ἀνέμους εἶναι ἐναντίους,⁵ τὸ τε πέλαγος τὸ κατὰ

pr/i/n

(2) AC 28 6-6 εἰς αὐτὸν γινόμενον μεταβαλόμενοι ἔλεγον αὐτὸν εἶναι θεόν.

(2) 1P5 12-12 ὀλίγων ἔγραψα παρακαλῶν καὶ ἐπιμαρτυρῶν ταύτην εἶναι ἀληθῆ χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς ἣν στήτε.

pr/i/a

(3) RM 6 11-11 οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς λογίζεσθε ἑαυτοὺς εἶναι νεκροὺς μὲν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ζῶντας δὲ

a/i/pr

(1) RV 2 9-9 τὴν βλασφημίαν ἐκ τῶν λεγόντων Ἰουδαίους εἶναι ἑαυτοὺς καὶ οὐκ εἰσὶν ἀλλὰ συναγωγὴ

a/i/a

(3) AC 17 29-29 τέχνης καὶ ἐνθυμήσεως ἀνθρώπου, τὸ θεῖον εἶναι ὅμοιον.

pp/i/pr

*(1) AC 26 29-29 σὲ ἀλλὰ καὶ πάντα τοὺς ἀκούοντάς μου σήμερον γενέσθαι τοιούτους ὅποιος καὶ ἐγὼ εἰμι καὶ παρεκτὸς

SOI/OSI - copulative infinitive

n/pr/i

(1) LK 4 41-41 αὐτὰ λαλεῖν, ὅτι ἤδεισαν τὸν χριστὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι.

(1) LK 20 20-20 Καὶ παρατηρήσαντες ἀπέστειλαν ἐγκαθέτους ὑποκρινομένους ἑαυτοὺς δικαίους εἶναι, ἵνα ἐπιλάβωνται αὐτοῦ λόγου, ὥστε

n/n/i

(2) LK 20 6-6 καταλιθάσει ἡμᾶς, πεπεισμένος γὰρ ἐστὶ Ἰωάννην προφήτην εἶναι.

(2) RM 15 8-8 λέγω γὰρ Χριστὸν διάκονον γεγενῆσθαι περιτομῆς ὑπὲρ ἀληθείας θεοῦ, εἰς

n/a/i

(3) PP 1 13-13 τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἐλήλυθεν, ¹³ ὥστε τοὺς δεσμούς μου φανεροὺς ἐν Χριστῷ γενέσθαι ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ πραιτωρίῳ καὶ

(3) 1T3 2-2 δεῖ οὖν τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἀνεπίλημπτον εἶναι, μιᾶς γυναικὸς ἄνδρα, νηφάλιον σώφρονα

- (3) TI 1 7-7 δεῖ γὰρ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἀνέγκλητον εἶναι ὡς θεοῦ οἰκονόμον, μὴ αὐθάδη,
 (3) TI 2 2-2 Πρεσβύτας νηφαλίους εἶναι, σεμνοὺς, σώφρονας, ὑγιαίνοντας τῇ πίστει,

pr/n/i

- (2) LK 23 2-2 φόρους Καίσαρι διδόναι καὶ λέγοντα ἑαυτὸν χριστὸν βασιλέα εἶναι.
 (2) RM 2 19-19 ἐκ τοῦ νόμου, ¹⁹ πέποιθάς τε σεαυτὸν ὁδηγὸν εἶναι τυφλῶν, φῶς τῶν ἐν σκότει,

pr/a/i

- (3) MK 14 64-64 οἱ δὲ πάντες κατέκριναν αὐτὸν ἔνοχον εἶναι θανάτου.
 (3) AC 10 40-40 τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν ἐμφανῆ γενέσθαι, ⁴¹ οὐ παντὶ τῷ λαῷ, ἀλλὰ
 (3) AC 16 15-15 εἰ κεκρίκατέ με πιστὴν τῷ κυρίῳ εἶναι, εἰσελθόντες εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου
 (3) RM 14 14-14 ἑαυτοῦ, εἰ μὴ τῷ λογιζομένῳ τι κοινὸν εἶναι, ἐκεῖνον κοινόν.
 (3) IC 7 26-26 Νομίζω οὖν τοῦτο καλὸν ὑπάρχειν διὰ τὴν ἐνεστῶσαν ἀνάγκην, ὅτι
 (3) 2C 9 5-5 προκαταρτίσωσιν τὴν προεπηγγελμένην εὐλογίαν ὑμῶν, ταύτην ἐτοίμην εἶναι οὕτως ὡς εὐλογίαν καὶ μὴ
 (3) 2C 11 16-16 Πάλιν λέγω, μὴ τίς με δόξη ἄφρονα εἶναι·
 (3) RV 3 9-9 συναγωγῆς τοῦ σατανᾶ τῶν λεγόντων ἑαυτοὺς Ἰουδαίους εἶναι, καὶ οὐκ εἰσὶν ἀλλὰ ψεύδονται.

pr/pp/i

- (4) AC 19 36-36 οὖν ὄντων τούτων δέον ἐστὶν ὑμᾶς κατεσταλμένους ὑπάρχειν καὶ μηδὲν προπετὲς πράσσειν.

a/n/i

- (2) PP 3 8-8 ἀλλὰ μενοῦνγε καὶ ἡγοῦμαι πάντα ζημίαν εἶναι διὰ τὸ ὑπερέχον τῆς γνώσεως

a/a/i

- (3) TI 2 4-4 δεδουλωμένας, καλοδιδασκάλους, ⁴ ἵνα σωφρονίζωσιν τὰς νέας φιλάνδρους εἶναι, φιλοτέκνους ⁵ σώφρονας ἀγνὰς οἰκουργοὺς ἀγαθὰς,

ABSTRACT

This paper focuses on the question of the syntactic parsing of ambiguous linguistic situations. The case examined is the Greek infinitive constructed with two substantival accusatives in the New Testament. It is found that while more often than not the subject would precede the object/predicate in the construction, what tells them apart is not the existence of a word-order rule. Instead, more fundamental linguistic processes are at work which allow a reader/hearer to discern the respective grammatical roles of the two accusatives. The conclusion is that while a plausible word-order pattern may be established, linguistic investigation would fare a lot better by focusing more on those fundamental linguistic processes than on the instituting of a word-order rule. A few remarks are also made regarding the statistical nature of linguistic samples.

撮 要

本文嘗試透過新約希臘文中一個文法含混的結構，研究澄清含混的方法。一般學者都指出得出一個語言的大體字詞次序原則的重要性，但字詞次序原則並不是澄清含混的最佳方法，因為這一類原則通常都是建基於一些更基本的、用來澄清含混的語言溝通因素和做法，以致致力研究後者能為語言運作了解帶來更大的裨益，在文章結論中亦提及一些有關語言樣本的統計問題，指出語言學者雖然使用統計學來分析語言樣本，卻未曾對樣本的獨立性作出廣泛和深入的探討，導致一些結論的可靠性容易受到質疑。