

## ADVERBIAL CLAUSES: STATISTICAL STUDIES

JAMES L. BOYER

*This third article in a series of studies dealing with subordinate clauses in the Greek NT will be concerned with the adverbial clauses. The over-all classification is functional, based on the kinds of adverbial modification made by the clauses. Only in the case of the conditional clauses is it necessary to carry the classification further. Attention will be given to the conjunctions or conjunctive relative phrases used to introduce the clauses, to the moods used, and to the clause order. A special feature of this series of studies is the attempt to give statistical information at every level, so that the student may begin to appreciate the relative magnitude of each structure.*

\* \* \*

JUST as adjectives modify nouns so adverbs modify verbs, limiting and defining the circumstances under which the action of the verb is to be understood. As adjectives answer the questions "who?" "what?" "what kind?" so adverbs answer such questions as "when?" "where?" "why?" "how?" "under what circumstances?" They may be single words (as **νῦν**), or phrases (as **διὰ τούτο**), or full clauses. The clauses are the subject of our present study.

They will be taken primarily in the order of frequency of occurrence in the NT, except that in a couple of instances similarity or relationship between classes will bring two together out of the numerical order.

### CAUSAL CLAUSES

#### *Meaning*

As the name adequately indicates, causal clauses modify the main verb of a sentence by stating the cause or reason for that main assertion. Their meaning is reflected in the way they are translated into

English. Using the NASB<sup>1</sup> as point of comparison these clauses are introduced by "for" (473 times), "because" (224), "since" (26) and a variety of at least 16 other ways, each occurring less than six times.

No attempt is made in this study to refine the classification further, no sub-classification will be attempted.

One problem of identification needs to be considered; the distinction between coordinate (main clause) and subordinate clauses. For example, it is not always easy, or even possible, to decide whether **gar** or even **oti** is introducing a subordinate or a main clause. Actually GRAMCORD has listed 800 occurrences of **gar** as introducing main clauses (CX)<sup>2</sup> and only 241 with subordinate clauses (SC). The reverse is the case with **oti**, 1291 are connected with subordinate clauses (SN,SC,SR) and only 10 with main clauses (CG,CX).

Ordinarily one would expect that a causal clause at the beginning of a sentence would be either (1) subordinate to a main clause which comes later, or (2) the explanation of something that is present in the preceding context or to the mind. Unfortunately it cannot always be known where a sentence begins. The lack of punctuation in the original manuscripts and the tendency to hook long sentences together with many subordinate clauses, complicates the problem, particularly in the light of our precisely opposite modern preference.

In a few instances in this study such ambiguous identifications are called to attention, but usually a choice is made and that is followed.

### *Structure*

#### Conjunctions Used

These may best be shown in table form.

| Causal Conjunctions,<br>Conjunctive Phrases | NT<br>Count | Mood<br>Used | Before or After Main Verb |         | ? |
|---|-------------|--------------|---------------------------|---------|---|
|   |             |              | > before                  | < after |   |
| <b>oti</b>                                  | 439         | Ind.         | 16                        | 423     |   |
| <b>dioti</b>                                | 21          | Ind.         |                           | 21      |   |
| <b>kaqoti</b>                               | 4           | Ind.         |                           | 4       |   |
| <b>gar</b>                                  | 243         | Ind.         | 1                         | 241     | 1 |
| <b>epei&lt;</b>                             | 26          | Ind.         | 2                         | 24      |   |
| <b>epeidh&lt;</b>                           | 9           | Ind.         | 4                         | 5       |   |
| <b>epeidhper</b>                            | 1           | Ind.         | 1                         |         |   |

<sup>1</sup> Unless otherwise indicated all formal translations of the Bible text will be given from the NASB version.

<sup>2</sup> These letters in parenthesis are coded tags used by GRAMCORD to identify the various functional classifications of conjunctions. The first letter in the code indicates whether the clause is coordinate (C) or subordinate (S). The second letter designates the function: CG for interroGative, CX for eXplanatory, SC for Causal, SN for Nominal, SR for Result. Others will be identified as they occur.

| Causal Conjunctions,<br>Conjunctive Phrases | NT<br>Count | Mood<br>Used | Before or After Main Verb |         | ? |
|---|-------------|--------------|---------------------------|---------|---|
|   |             |              | > before                  | < after |   |
| <b>di ih [aijian]</b>                       | 7           | Ind.         |                           | 7       |   |
| <b>ahq jwñ</b>                              | 5           | Ind.         |                           | 5       |   |
| <b>ef j&amp;S</b>                           | 2           | Ind.         |                           | 2       |   |
| <b>ou\$iheken</b>                           | 1           | Ind.         |                           | 1       |   |
| <b>ou\$arin</b>                             | 1           | Ind.         |                           | 1       |   |

**Oti** and **gar** account for 93% of all the subordinate causal clauses. **epei** and its compounds are comparatively rare. I have already called attention to the relative phrases which by antecedent or by context become in effect causal conjunctions.<sup>3</sup>

### Mood

In every instance the mood of the verbs within the causal clause is indicative. This is to be expected, since causes and explanations are characteristically simple statements.

### Clause Order

The causal clause follows the main verb in 97% of the instances. Even the **epei** group, which show more tendency to precede the main clause, are still 74% following. Again, it is more logical that causes and explanations should follow that which is being explained.

**Gar**, here as elsewhere, is post-positive; it never stands as the first word in its clause. Usually it is second or third in sequence, in three instances<sup>4</sup> it stands as the fourth word in its clause.

### *Other Causal Constructions*

Beside these conjunctive and relative clauses there are other ways of expressing what amounts to a causal clause in the Greek NT.

### Adverbial Participles

The anarthrous participle very frequently functions as an adverb in the sentence. While it may not technically be called a clause (there is no finite verb in the construction) yet it clearly functions as one; in most instances the best way to translate it is by an English clause. Of these adverbial or circumstantial participles, 303 are causal in sense, including 35 genitive absolutes.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>3</sup> See my article, "Relative Clauses in the Greek New Testament: A Statistical Study," *GTJ* 9 (1988) 233-56.

<sup>4</sup> Luke 6:23, 26, 2 Cor 1:19.

<sup>5</sup> See my article, "The Classification of Participles: A Statistical Study," *GTJ* 5 (1984) 163-79. At the time that article was prepared I did not have the computer facilities now available for tabulating and collecting information, so the identification of the adverbial functions expressed by the participles was not included. Later this inadequacy

### Articular Infinitives with the Preposition **Dia**<

The articular infinitive after prepositions, while no finite verb is involved, is so completely clausal in character that it is impossible to translate into English without converting it into a full clause. Those which as causal in sense are **dia**<with the neuter accusative article and an infinitive (32 examples); also, **ehēken tou?**and **ek tou?**+ an infinitive (one each).<sup>6</sup>

### CONDITIONAL CLAUSES

An extensive and detailed consideration of the conditional sentences has previously been published by this writer<sup>7</sup> so this section will be primarily a summary and collection of statistics. For a fuller discussion and support for some statements made here the reader is referred to these article's.

The conditional sentences proper are composed of four classes.

#### *First Class Conditions* Significance, Meaning

Its meaning is very simple: "If this. . . then that . . ." It indicates nothing as to the actual situation, whether the condition is true or false; in fact it is frequently used for both sides of a true / false condition. Its use of the indicative does not in any way indicate that the protasis is true, or even that it is "assumed for the sake of argument." Sometimes it may be true that the English word *since* is a possible translation, but it is never a "proper" translation. *Since* carries an implication that the condition is true; the Greek first class condition does not. If used to translate a statement which is actually true then the translation would not be "wrong" or "untrue," but it would not be a correct translation in that it would be saying something more than the Greek says.

was met by my *Supplementary Manual of Information: Participles*. This is now available by inter-library loan from the Morgan Library, Grace Theological Seminary, 200 Seminary Dr., Winona Lake, IN 46590.

<sup>6</sup> See my article, "The Classification of Infinitives: A Statistical Study," *GTJ* 6 (1985) 29-48. Complete listings are available in the *Supplemental Manual on Infinitives* (see previous footnote).

<sup>7</sup> There are four articles in the series: James L. Boyer, "First Class Conditions: What Do They Mean?" *GTJ* 2 (1981) 74-114; "Second Class Conditions in NT Greek," *GTJ* 3 (1982) 81-88; "Third (and Fourth) Class Conditions," *GTJ* 3 (1982) 163-75; and "Other Conditional Elements in NT Greek," *GTJ* 4(1983) 173-88. No supplemental manuals are available for these studies.

## Structure

First Class conditions use **ei]** with an indicative verb in the protasis; the apodosis may be of any type.

## Statistics

| Conjunctions     | *** Protasis |      |        | Order | Apodosis ***            |     |
|------------------|--------------|------|--------|-------|-------------------------|-----|
|                  | Count        | Mood |        |       | Sentence Type           |     |
| <b>ei]</b>       | 302          | ALL  |        |       | S --Statement           | 138 |
| <b>ei@e</b>      | 5            | I    | Prot.  |       | M --Command             | 76  |
| <b>ei]mh&lt;</b> |              | N    | before |       | RQ --Rhetorical quest.  | 52  |
|                  |              | D    | Apod.  |       | MR --Request            | 11  |
|                  |              | I    |        |       | PR --Promise            | 11  |
| <b>ei]mhti</b>   | 1            | C    | >267   |       | AS --In subordinate cl. | 5   |
|                  |              | A    |        |       | O --Oath                | 5   |
| <b>ei]@wj</b>    | 1            | T    |        |       | P --Potential           | 5   |
|                  |              | I    | Prot.  |       | TH --Threat             | 4   |
| <b>ei]@er</b>    | 6            | V    | after  |       | X --Exclamation         | 3   |
|                  |              | E    | Apod.  |       | CH --Challenge          | 2   |
| <b>ei]@e</b>     | 1            | S    |        |       | HS --Hortatory subj.    | 2   |
|                  |              |      | < 43   |       | Q --Question            | 2   |
|                  |              |      |        |       | RC --Rel. Clause equiv. | 2   |
| <b>eh]n</b>      | 2            |      |        |       | MN --Emphatic negative  | 1   |
|                  |              |      |        |       | MP --Prohibition        | 1   |
|                  |              |      |        |       | () --(No apodosis)      | 1   |

It will be noted that all except the last are introduced by the conjunction **ei]** or a combination of **ei]** with another particle. Even **eh]n** is, of course, a combination of **ei]**+ **an**, an indefinite particle.

The mood in every instance is indicative, even with **eh]n**. The two instances where **eh]n** has the indicative, Rom 11:14 and Rev 11:5, seem to be first class in sense, even though **eh]n** normally is used in third class conditions, sometimes there with the indicative.

The protasis precedes the apodosis in 267 out of 310 examples (86%). There are 13 instances where the apodosis is missing.

A great variety of sentence types form the apodosis of first class conditions.

*Second Class Conditions*

## Significance, Meaning

Probably the least controversial, its significance is clear: The protasis sets forth a condition which is not true or is thought to be not

true, and the apodosis states the potential consequence if it had been true. "If this were the case (which is not), then that would be. . . ."

### Structure

Second Class conditions use **ei]** with a secondary (past) tense of the indicative verb in the protasis; the apodosis characteristically is some potential construction such as a secondary tense indicative, usually but not always with **ai@**

The conjunction used is always **ei]** sometimes with the negative **nh<** added (10 times); once it also has **de<** in **ei]de<nh<**

### Analysis of Verb Forms: Statistics<sup>8</sup>

| Protasis:  |    |              | Apodosis:  |    |
|------------|----|--------------|------------|----|
| Tense:     |    | Order        | Tense:     |    |
| Imperfect  | 21 | Proto before | Imperfect  | 21 |
| Aorist     | 14 | > = 42       | Aorist     | 18 |
| Pluperfect | 6  | Proto after  | Pluperfect | 3  |
| [. . . ]   | 7  | < = 6        | [. . . ]   | 5  |
| Total      | 48 |              | ----       | 1  |

The mood of the protasis is always indicative. The apodosis is always some potential construction, almost always a secondary tense of the indicative, usually with **ai@** (31 times).

### *Third Class Conditions*

#### Significance, Meaning

This is properly labelled the Future Condition. It always deals with a future potential, uncertain (subjunctive) because it hasn't happened yet.<sup>9</sup> The subjunctive does not indicate the degree of uncertainty, only the fact of uncertainty by reason of futurity.

<sup>8</sup> Some symbols appearing in this and following charts are codes I have used for abbreviation and convenience:

- [. . . ] = Verb is not present; left to be supplied
- = There is no apodosis present
- > = Protasis precedes the apodosis
- < = Protasis follows the apodosis

<sup>9</sup> This statement seems to ignore a large number of condition sentences which use **ehn** with subjunctive, the so-called "present general conditions". I have already given extensive treatment of these elsewhere in my article on Third Class Conditions, *GTJ* 3 (1982) 172-75. The "general" or "whenever" idea always introduces potentiality or futurity, and to the Greek mind was expressed naturally by this construction.

## Structure

Third Class conditions use **εἴη** with a subjunctive verb in the protasis, the apodosis may be of any type, usually future in its time-reference.

## Conjunctions Used

Almost always it is some form or combination of **εἴη**; the simple **εἴη** (213 times), **αἴε** (a contracted form, 3), **καίε** (by crasis for **καί**>**εἴη**, 14), **εἴηπερ** 3; it has the negative added (**εἴη μή**<52); total **εἴη**, 286 times. **Εἰ** is used 5 times; simple **εἰ** once, **εἰπερ** once, **εἴε** (twice, in correlative clauses), and **εἴτο** **εἰμή** once.

## Analysis of Verb Forms: Statistics

## Verb in the Protasis:

## Tense:

|                |     |
|----------------|-----|
| Present        | 105 |
| Future         | 2   |
| Aorist         | 177 |
| Perfect        | 2   |
| [. . .]        | 4   |
| Present. (1?3) | 1*  |
| Perfect (1?3)  | 1*  |

## Mood:

|             |     |
|-------------|-----|
| Indicative  | 2   |
| Subjunctive | 284 |
| [. . .]     | 4   |
| Indicative  | 1*  |
| Indicative  | 1*  |

## Verb in the Apodosis:

## Tense:

|               |     |
|---------------|-----|
| Present       | 129 |
| Future        | 97  |
| Aorist        | 42  |
| Perfect       | 7   |
| [. . .]       | 12  |
| ----          | 3   |
| Present (1?3) | 1*  |
| Perfect (1?3) | 1*  |

## Mood:

|             |     |
|-------------|-----|
| Indicative  | 218 |
| Subjunctive | 21  |
| Optative    | 1   |
| Imperative  | 33  |
| Infinitive  | 2   |
| [. . .]     | 12  |
| ----        | 3   |
| Indicative  | 1*  |
| Indicative  | 1*  |

[Explanation: \* = Double or doubtful entry; also counted elsewhere]

## Order of Clauses:

|                                |     |
|--------------------------------|-----|
| > = Protasis precedes Apodosis | 241 |
| < = Protasis follows Apodosis  | 48  |
| = No apodosis                  | 3   |

## Sentence type of Apodosis:

|      |     |                             |
|------|-----|-----------------------------|
| > AS | 8   | Within a subordinate clause |
| > M  | 42  | Command                     |
| > MN | 11  | Emphatic Negation           |
| > MP | 2   | Prohibition                 |
| > MR | 1   | Request                     |
| > P  | 3   | Potential                   |
| > PR | 22  | Promise                     |
| > RQ | 32  | Rhetorical question         |
| > S  | 158 | Statement                   |
| > TH | 11  | Threat                      |

*Fourth Class Conditions*

Fourth Class conditions use **ei]** with an optative verb in the protasis and supposedly (from the ancient pattern) **ai@** with an optative verb in the apodosis. But there are no complete examples in the NT, only a few (9) protases. It has the same significance as the Third Class, only stated a bit less dramatically.

## Conjunctions Used

The conjunction is always **ei]** once with the indefinite particle **pwj** added.

## Verb Forms in the Protasis

The protasis in all 9 instances is regular, with an optative verb, six are present tense, 3 are aorist.

## Verb Forms in the Apodosis

In every instance the apodosis is either incomplete, irregular, or missing. In four the apodosis is an infinitive in the predicate of the main clause (Acts 17:27, 20:16, 27:12, 39). In two the protasis is in effect a single word, a parenthetic expression adverbially attached to the verb of the main sentence (1 Cor 14:10, 15:37: **ei]tuxoi**, "if it should turn out so"; translated in NASB by "perhaps"). In only three instances is there an actual apodosis present. Two of these leave the verb unexpressed so it is not possible to tell mood and tense (1 Pet 3:14, 17). Conceivably an optative (**eite** v 14, **eik** v 17) might be supplied in conformity with the normal fourth class pattern, but the sense is not right for that. Probably it is better to supply the indicative, as this makes good sense. The third does have a complete apodosis (Acts 24:19). The verb is imperfect indicative, not the optative expected in



fourth class conditions, but possibly it may be taken as a potential indicative equivalent to an optative. The absence of **an** is not a problem.

### Clause Order

In the seven examples where an apodosis can be identified it stands after the protasis twice, before it five times.

### EXCEPTIVE CLAUSES

Exceptive clauses are a form of conditional clause. They use the conditional conjunctions, particularly the combination **ei jnh** and involve a special kind of conditional situation. They are treated separately here because they represent a sizable group in themselves and have several distinctive features.

The name reflects the fact that these clauses usually are translated into English by the word "except." They point to a general situation which is not true (the apodosis) except for (**ei jnh** ← "if not") some specific case (the protasis). Usually the exception is a part of the general, but the parallelism is not always precise.

The conjunction used is **ei jnh** so in form they are first or second class conditions. **Ei jnh** is not always exceptive; in 10 instances it is simply a negative second class condition. There are two of the first class passages which are extremely elliptical and the construction is unsure.<sup>10</sup>

Is **epn nh** ever exceptive? There are 43 third class conditions which use **ei jnh**. Only one of these shows the structural pattern of exceptive clauses.<sup>11</sup> All the rest are simply negative third class conditions.

### *Structural Classification*

In Greek, these clauses may be grouped into four classes on the basis of their structure.

### Adverbial

I have used this term to describe the first group because the conditional phrase used becomes in effect an adverbial introduction to the "apodosis" or main clause of the sentence. Example: Matt 6:1 **ei jde> nh<ge, nisqon ouk exete para t&?patri>uwn t&?h toij ouj anoiij** "otherwise you have no reward with your Father who is in heaven." There is an extreme ellipsis involved. Starting with **ei jnh** if not, the

<sup>10</sup> 1 Cor 7:17, 2 Cor 13:5.

<sup>11</sup> Mark 4:22.

sense expanded may be "if the situation is not the one stated in the context" then this is the result," or simply, "otherwise." I have listed 14 examples in this class.<sup>12</sup>

The conditional phrases involved in this construction are **ei]de>nh<** **ge**, (8 times), **ei]de>nh<** (3), and **ei]hnti** (1). There is never a verb in the protasis; in fact, there is no protasis at all except this phrase. The rest of the sentence is the apodosis.

"No One. . . Except"

The second group, 31 examples, shows a regular pattern. The conditional conjunction is **ei]nh<**. The apodosis always stands before the protasis. It uses the word **ou]dei]j** or **nhdeijj** and makes a statement about "no one" or "nothing." Then in the following protasis it states the exception to that blanket statement. Example: Phil 4:15 **ou]denia moi ekkl hsia ekoinwnhsin ei] logon dosewj kai]l hnyewj ei]nh> u]pei]j monoi**. "no church shared with me in the matter of giving and receiving but you alone." The protasis is **ei]nh>u]pei]j monoi**; the verb is always omitted, left to be supplied mentally: "if you [did] not."

"Not. . . Except"

The third group, 33 examples, shows almost the same pattern, except that the negative in the apodosis is a simple negation of the verb rather than a negative pronoun. The negative particle **ou** in one of its forms is usually used, once it is **ou]de<**. **Mh<** is used 4 times, once in **ou]nh<**. Again the protasis uses **ei]nh<**; it always follows the apodosis and there is no verb stated in the protasis. Example: John 19:15 **Ouk exomen basilea ei]nh> Kaisara**. "We have no king but Caesar," or more precisely, "We do not have a king if [we do] not [have] Caesar."

"Who . . . Except?"

The fourth group, 10 examples, follows the same pattern except that the apodosis is stated as a rhetorical question: "Who fits this situation except . . .?" Example: Luke 5:21 **Tij dunatai a]partiaj a]f ei]h>ai ei]nh>monoj o]lqeo]j**; "Who can forgive sins, but God alone?" Note again that **ei]nh<** is the conjunction, the protasis follows the apodosis, the verb is omitted in the protasis, and the negative is implied by the rhetorical question.

<sup>12</sup> This and all other listings referred to in this paper are available through a *Supplemental Manual of Information: Adverbial Clauses*, by inter-library loan from Morgan Library, Grace Theological Seminary, 200 Seminary Dr., Winona Lake, IN 46590.

## CONCESSIVE CLAUSES

*A Class of Conditional Sentences*

There are two groups of concessive clauses. Some (31) are a special group of conditional clauses. They are to be distinguished from other conditional sentences by their use of the conjunction **kai** in combination with the conditional conjunctions **ei** and **eph**, and by their distinctive meaning.

Usually translated "though," "although," "even if," these clauses state a conclusion which is affirmed in spite of the condition stated: "even if this is the case, the result follows". Sometimes the condition is considered as an extreme, unlikely case; an objection in spite of which the conclusion is affirmed. Sometimes the condition is treated as a matter of little consequence (like our English "So what?").<sup>13</sup> These clauses may be First Class (20 examples), Third Class (10), even one Fourth Class.

Structurally the only signal that a clause is concessive is the use of **kai** in association with the **ei** or **eph**. But it is not a clear signal. **Kai** occurs frequently in conditional clauses when it is not concessive (104 out of 746, 14%). Here is a summary of my conclusions after tabulating the information.

(1) **Ei kai** is clearly concessive (18 times). There are a very few exceptions (4),<sup>14</sup> but they each involve another particle along with the **kai** (**ei de kai** 3 times, **ei ge kai** once).

(2) **Kai ei** is rarely concessive (3 times<sup>15</sup> out of 22); it is usually simply "and if."

(3) **Kai** with **eph**, whether it stands before or after, does not signal concession. Out of 45 examples only three<sup>16</sup> are concessive. With **kai eph** (= **kai eph**) 517 of the 14 occurrences are concessive.

(4) Sometimes the sense is concessive when the form does not signal it.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>13</sup> These two concepts are not mutually exclusive. It is the judgment of this writer that A. T. Robertson's strong distinction between the two, particularly his association of it with the position of **kai** before and after the conjunction, breaks down when the actual examples are studied. See his *A Historical Grammar of New Testament Greek in the Light of Historical Research* (Nashville: Broadman, 1934) 1026.

<sup>14</sup> For full lists, see footnote 12 above. The exceptions are **ei de kai** Luke 11:18, 1 Cor 4:7, Gal 3:4; **ei ge kai** 2 Cor 5:3.

<sup>15</sup> 1 Cor 8:5, Heb 11:5, 1 Pet 3:1.

<sup>16</sup> With **eph kai** 1 Cor 7:11, 28; with **kai eph**: Gal 1:8.

<sup>17</sup> Matt 26:35, Mark 16:18, John 8:14, 10:38, 11:25.

<sup>18</sup> A very interesting situation occurs in the parallel accounts of Peter's dual remonstrance to Jesus' announcement of his denial (Matt 26:33, 35 and Mark 14:29, 31). All four statements are clearly concessive in sense. In both accounts the first statement uses

*Conjunctive Concessive Clauses*

The second group of concessive clauses<sup>19</sup> are introduced by concessive subordinate conjunctions, **kaiper** (5), **kaitoi** (2), and **kaitoige** (1); translated in NASB by "although," "though," "and yet." They are not conditional, and are included in this place because they are equivalent in sense to those which use the conditional conjunctions. As a possible link between the two, note that they both to some extent involve the use of **kaiç** in these the **kaiç**s compounded with other particles.

The verb in these clauses is indicative (3 times), a participle (4), and once it is elliptical. Half of them are found in the book of Hebrews.

## COMPARATIVE CLAUSES

*Meaning*

Comparative clauses are quite common in the Greek NT, 331 examples. They augment the statement by comparing it to something which presumably is understood. Often they come in pairs, as in English "as. . . so. . ." the comparative clause is introduced by a comparative conjunction, the one to which it is compared may open with a correlative adverb.

These clauses either *describe* or *emphasize*<sup>20</sup> the thought expressed in the principal clause. Following this lead I have attempted to assign each comparative clause to one of these categories. The result was: descriptive, 253 or 76%, emphatic, 78 or 24%. But there were many where the choice was arbitrary.

I have attempted another approach to classification which I believe is more helpful in understanding the possible significances of these clauses. It is based on an attempt to discern what was the point or reason for the particular comparison chosen; the primary element of that comparison which the writer wanted to call to attention. For example, in Matt 6:2, "When therefore you give alms, do not sound a trumpet before you, as the hypocrites do in the synagogue and in the streets, that they may be honored by men," it does not appear that Jesus was warning against the manner, or the place, in which they blew their trumpets, but in the fact that they did so at all.

**ei** and the second **ehn**. But in Matthew's account **kaiç**s added to the first statement and not to the second. In Mark's account the reverse is true, **kaiç**s used with the second and not with the first. In both instances the presence or absence of **kaiç** makes no difference in the concessive nature of the statement.

<sup>19</sup> There are eight; John 4:2, Acts 14:17, Phil 3:4, Heb 4:3, 5:8, 7:5, 12:7, 2 Pet 1:12.

<sup>20</sup> H. Dana and J. Mantey, *A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament* (New York: MacMillan, 1948) 275.

In studying the comparative clauses from this point of view, I have chosen five categories into which these "main point concepts" seem to fit. The first is the one just illustrated; the action or fact or situation itself. The comparison points to a similar or parallel situation "in accord with which" the other is to be seen; a frequent example is the comparative clause which says, ". . . as the Scripture says. . ." This is by far the type found most frequently, 199 out of 331, or 60%.

The others are more specific in their thrust and more easily described. The second is a comparison in the manner of doing something (75 examples); the third, a comparison in quality or character (37); the fourth, a comparison in degree (17); and fifth, a "parable-type" comparison, amounting in effect to a short parable (only 3 such).<sup>21</sup>

### *Structure*

#### Conjunctions Used

The most frequently occurring subordinating comparative conjunction is **kaqwj** (175 times, plus one compounded with the particle **per, kaqwsper**. It is translated by the NASB as "just as" (91), "as" (64), "even as" (14) and by a few other phrases.

The word **wj** appears in the NT much more frequently than **kaqwj**, but often in relations other than the one we are presently considering. As a comparative conjunction it occurs 108 times, plus 29 times compounded with the particle **per, wsper**. To translate it the NASB uses "as" (93), "just as" (16), "even as" (6), "like" or "just like" (10) and several other phrases.

**Kaqa** occurs in this construction 11 times, plus once as **kaqaper**. It is from **kaq ja!** the neuter plural accusative of the relative pronoun **oj** ("according to which things," or "after the pattern of these things").

**Kaqa** is found 4 times. It is from **kaq jo!** the neuter singular accusative of the relative, with meaning similar to **kaqa**. Once it is used along with the indefinite particle **ehh**.

**Kaqoti** (from **kaq jolti**, neuter of the indefinite relative) occurs twice as a comparative conjunction, both times with the indefinite particle **ah**.

#### Correlative adverbs used

In 66 instances (20%) the comparative clause is countered in the main clause by the use of a correlative adverb (cf. English "as. . . so. . ."). They occur in many combinations and in either sequence. The list of correlatives, with counts and clause order noted, is as follows:

<sup>21</sup> Matt 25:14, Mark 4:26, 13:34.

|                     | Before the Comparative | After |
|---------------------|------------------------|-------|
| <b>outwj</b>        | 16                     | 31    |
| <b>kai&gt;outwj</b> | 1                      | 1     |
| <b>kai&lt;</b>      | 1                      | 12    |
| <b>outw</b>         | 1                      | 1     |
| <b>oḡiwiw</b>       | 1                      | 1     |

It should be noted that **kai<** occurs many more times than appears in this list, and is used not only with the correlative but also with the comparative. However, it usually is simply the adverbial **kai<**. Only when it appears to be a part of a pair has it been tabulated as correlative.

#### Mood of the Verb in Comparative Clauses

The mood is almost always indicative. There are four exceptions. Three are subjunctives; in each the sense is indefinite, the indefinite particle **eḡn** is present in one. The other (Heb 7:9) is an infinitive, and the whole expression is an old classical idiom, "**wj eḡoj eipeiñ**, *to put it in a word or if one may say so*, used to soften a statement."<sup>22</sup>

#### Clause Order

The comparative clause usually follows the main clause (241, or 73% of the time). It precedes the main clause (76, or 23%). The other 14 are instances where there is no main clause expressed.

#### Other Comparative Constructions

Our present study is limited to clauses, so such structures as the use of comparative particles with single words and phrases are excluded. But it is not always easy to decide whether a particular expression is a clause or not. If a verb is present, that decides it as a clause; but if there is no verb it may be questionable. For example, Acts 8:32, **Wj probaton epi>sf agħn hēqħ, kai>wj aḡnoj eḡantion toukeirantoj auḡton aḡwnoj, outwj ouk aḡoigei to>stoma auḡtou?** "He was led as a sheep to slaughter; and as a lamb before its shearer is silent, so He does not open His mouth." The first **wj** stands with the noun **probaton**, there is no need to supply a verb, and the **wj** is probably a comparative particle; there is no comparative clause. But the second **wj** while there is no actual verb present, clearly introduces a statement and needs a verb to be supplied; it is a comparative clause. Another example may

<sup>22</sup> W. W. Goodwin, *Greek Grammar*, rev. C. B. Gulick (Boston: Ginn, 1930) 323.

not be so easy to decide. Matt 6:5 **ouk esesqe wj oi lupokritai** "You are not to be as the hypocrites;" Is **wj** a particle? or is it a conjunction introducing a clause, "as the hypocrites (are)"? Perhaps the question is as insignificant in Greek as it is in English.

A group of relative clauses functioning adverbially and expressing degree or measure need also to be listed here, since they involve a comparative sense. They are introduced by the relative **osoj** (sometimes correlative with **tosoutoj**, they all use a verb in the indicative mood. There are 10 examples.<sup>23</sup>

## FINAL CLAUSES (PURPOSE AND RESULT)

### *Meaning*

Final clauses, sometimes called telic (Gr. **teloj**, end), point to the "end" of the sentence action, the direction toward which the action is directed. They involve the two closely related concepts of purpose and result. Purpose is intended result; result is accomplished purpose. Unfortunately for NT exegetes neither NT Greek nor modern English is careful to distinguish between them. In the vast majority of cases there is no clue in the Greek text to differentiate between them. Usually the sense of the context will decide rather clearly; when that is inconclusive or controversial it will be so noted. There are some grammatical structures which identify some result clauses, they will be indicated.

In this study 597 clauses have been identified as final; 521 are classified as purpose clauses, 65 as result clauses, and 11 have been listed as doubtful.

### *Conjunctions Used*

**Ina** (398), **iha nh** (81), **iha nhpote** (1)

More than 8 out of 10 times (80.2%) the final conjunction is **iha** or **iha nh**. It is used in clauses classified as purpose (460), as result (10), and as doubtful (9). Its normal construction uses the subjunctive mood (464), but it occurs also with the indicative (11 times, 9 future and 2 present). In 4 cases the verb is omitted, hence the mood is not discernible. It is translated as "that" (206), "in order that" (66), "so that" (64), and by an infinitive (65). With the negative particle **nh** or **nhpote** it is translated "in order that. . . not" (10), "that. . . not" (26), "so that. . . not" (15), or by "lest" (18).

<sup>23</sup> See my article on "Relative Clauses," 240.

**Opwj** (38)

This conjunction is very similar to **iha** in usage and meaning, but much less common. It is used almost totally in clearly purpose clauses, only twice in doubtful passages. It always has the subjunctive mood, except once the verb is omitted. The same translations are used for **opwj** as listed above for **iha**, even approximately in the same proportion.

**Mh<**(8), **nhpote** (15)

The use of the negative particle **mh<** as a conjunction equivalent to **iha mh<** in negative purpose clauses is rare (8 examples), only slightly more frequent when strengthened to **nhpote** (15 examples). They all show the subjunctive mood, and the translations are simply the translations given for **iha mh<** above. Neither of these occur in clauses that have been classified as result clauses.

**Wste** (53)

This conjunction is the only one that is specifically associated with result clauses. In classical Greek it was "used with the infinitive and with the indicative to express result. With the infinitive (the negative being **mh<** the result is stated as one which the action of the verb tends to produce; with the indicative (the negative is **ou**), as one which that action actually does produce."<sup>24</sup> Both constructions are found in the NT, although the difference between them is no longer strictly observed.<sup>25</sup>

There are 53 clauses introduced by **wste** in the NT. All but two have an infinitive verb. The two exceptions have an indicative verb. They are most frequently translated by "so that" or "so as to" plus an infinitive.

**Wj** (4)

**Wj** is a word with many and varied uses in the NT; its use in final clauses is rare. Twice with an infinitive it is a purpose clause, twice with the indicative it is a result clause.

<sup>24</sup> Goodwin and Gulick, *Grammar*, 308.

<sup>25</sup> The difference should not be construed as a complete change of the sense, but rather as a weakening of the distinction between them. A result actually produced would also be one tending to be produced, so **wste** with infinitive would be possible in every case. In the NT the use of **wste** with the indicative has almost disappeared, and the sense of actual results is taken over by the infinitive construction, which it could properly do. But **wste** with infinitive still can express the result which tends to follow. It is not correct to insist that result clauses are always actually realized. This insight can help in the understanding of such passages as Mark 4:37, Luke 5:7, Acts 19:10, 12, Rom 7:6, 1 Cor 13:2.



**Oti** (1)

**Oti** introducing a result clause is surprising, and very rare; only one is so identified in this study (John 7:35). Result fits the sense well, and there seems to be evidence of other such uses.<sup>26</sup>

*Moods Used*

The mood in final clauses is almost always subjunctive, as is to be expected in a clause which speaks of purpose, intent, of future outcome. But there are some which do not use the subjunctive. The largest group consists of 52 result clauses which show an infinitive as verb, a normal construction from classical times and in no sense an exception.

The seeming exceptions are 18 examples which use an indicative verb. Of these, 11 are future indicatives. Elsewhere<sup>27</sup> I have shown that the future indicative is very frequently in the NT a practical substitute for the aorist subjunctive. It is identical in form in many instances, and differs only in spelling in many others. Its sense is basically the same, expressing the potentiality that always is associated with the future. In the NT it is actually used in almost every syntactical construction that ordinarily uses the subjunctive. In the light of these facts it should not be considered strange or exceptional when a future indicative is used in a final clause.

Five indicatives are used with conjunctions which properly use the indicative. **Wste** occurs twice with the indicative, a normal usage from classical times, and both expressing actual result. **Wj** occurs twice with the indicative, again classical usage in result clauses. **Wj** universally uses the indicative, and while its use for a final clause is very unusual, its use of the indicative is not.

There remain two<sup>28</sup> indicatives which are significantly unusual. They are 1 Cor 4:6 **iha mh< . . f usiouʒqe** "in order that no one of you might become arrogant in behalf of one against the other," and Gal 4:17 **iha auʒouj zhl ouʒe** "in order that you may seek them."

Grammarians suggest several explanations. A. T. Robertson<sup>29</sup> discusses the orthography and the possibility that by NT times the

<sup>26</sup> BAGD, 589; John 14:22 "**ti gegonen oti** . . . ; what has happened, so that (= to bring it about that) . . . ?" They suggest that this may possibly be the explanation also of 1 Tim 6:7 and Heb 2:6.

<sup>27</sup> See my article, "The Classification of Subjunctives: A Statistical Study," *GTJ* 7 (1986) 16-19.

<sup>28</sup> A third example is often listed, 1 John 5:20 **iha ginwskomen**. But there is textual variance in this case, and the NA26 and UBS3 texts have decided for the subjunctive **ginwskvmen**.

<sup>29</sup> A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (Nashville: Broadman, 1934) 203, 325.

indicative and subjunctive of **-ow** verbs have become alike as they are in **-aw** verbs. Blass-Debrunner suggest the same; "**f usiouſqe** 1 Cor 4:6 and **zhlouſe** Gal 4:17 are subjunctives."<sup>30</sup> In another place, apparently speaking more generally, they say "The present indicative after **ihā** is; of course, only a corruption of the text."<sup>31</sup> No one suggests that there is a difference in meaning intended by the use of the indicative after **ihā**.

### *Clause Order*

Final clauses normally follow the main clause. This is true in all of the result clauses, and in all but 15 of the purpose clauses (97%). In 4 instances there is no main clause.

### *Other Final Constructions*

Relatively infrequent is the use of the adverbial or circumstantial participle to express purpose. According to my count there are about 56 examples, five with the future participle which in classical was generally used in this way, but 48 with the present participle. Only three aorist participles are used thus in the NT.

Articular infinitives with certain prepositions are used to express purpose; **ej to**<(73) and **proj to**<(11).<sup>32</sup> At least one of these is understood to be expressing result in the NASB (1 Thess 2:16 **ej to> aḥapl hrwſai auſwn taj aḥartiaj pantote**. "with the result that they always fill up the measure of their sins."

Another structure indirectly expressing purpose is a substantive or noun clause which structurally stands in apposition to a pronoun whose antecedent refers to a purpose. Example: Eph 6:22 **oh epenya proj uḥaj ej auſtoſouto iha gnwte ta>perihḥaj** "I have sent him to you for this very purpose, so that you may know about us . . ." If the words **ej auſtoſouto** were not present, the **ihā** clause would be a purpose clause; as it stands it is a noun clause in apposition to that phrase, stating the content of that purpose.<sup>33</sup>

## TEMPORAL CLAUSES

### *Meaning*

Temporal Clauses are those which modify the main clause by relating it in some manner to the concept of time, answering such

<sup>30</sup> F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, trans. and rev. by Robert Punk (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago, 1961) 188.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 187.

<sup>32</sup> See footnote 6.

<sup>33</sup> See my article "Noun Clauses in the Greek NT: A Statistical Study," *GTJ* 10 (1990) 225-39.

questions as "when?," "how often?," "how long?," "before?," "after?," "until?," "while?," etc. A variety of conjunctions and conjunctive relative phrases occur, also more variety in the moods used.

### *Conjunctions Used*

The subordinate temporal clauses included in this study are of two kinds. Most (360 or 86%) are introduced by proper conjunctions. The rest are introduced, not by conjunctions per se, but by relative phrases which function as temporal conjunctions, wither with or without the antecedent (**hperaj** or **xronou**) of the relative being actually expressed. If the antecedent is present the clause can of course be considered a simple adjectival relative clause modifying a noun which is functioning as a temporal adverb. But they seem by their number and frequency to have become fixed expressions, virtual conjunctions.<sup>34</sup> Sixty such clauses are included in this list, and the relative phrase is listed as a conjunction.

### **Otan** (123), **Ote** (102)

**Ote** alone, and **otan**, which is **ote** + **ae**, comprise 54% of all temporal clauses. They are the less explicit in time relation, expressing simple concurrence. Most often they are translated by the NASB as "when" (197 times); **otan**, reflecting the particle **ae** is also translated "whenever" (10 times). Rarely they are translated more specifically as "after" (**ote** 5, **otan** 2), "while" (**ote** 3, **otan** 2), "as" (**ote** once), and "as soon as" (once each), even "until" (**otan** 2). These more specific renderings apparently are derived from the context rather than from the conjunction itself.

**Ote** normally is followed by the indicative mood, only twice does the subjunctive appear; once the verb is left unexpressed. **Otan**, as is expected with **ae** normally uses the subjunctive (5 with indicative).

### **Wj** (69), **Wj ae**(3)

**Wj** has many other uses, but as a temporal conjunction it occurs 72 times. These are translated with almost identical expressions as were **ote** and **otan**, most frequently "when" (**wj**; 50, **wj ae**1), also "while" (10), "after" (2), "whenever" and "as soon as" (once each). Renderings other than those used for **ote** are "as" (5) and "since" (2).

With **wj** the mood is indicative. When it is used with the indefinite particle **ae** the mood is subjunctive.

<sup>34</sup> As we have already seen, they are not limited to temporal clauses. Similar phrases are found introducing causal clauses, and clauses expressing manner, degree or measure, a total of 90 NT examples. See my article, "Relative Clauses," 238-40.

**Ewj** (18), **Ewj a@**(20), **Ewj ou\$**(17), **Ewj otou** (5)

The conjunction **ewj** occurs alone or with the indefinite particle **a@** 38 times. As a relative phrase which functions as a temporal conjunction it is found 22 times. They are translated "until" (54), "while" (4), and "as long as" (once). The basic meaning seems to refer to a period of time up to a designated point.

The mood is indicative 13 times, and subjunctive 45 times, once the verb is unexpressed. This is one of a group of words with the meaning "until" which involve some special rules regarding mood, and will be discussed separately below, under "Moods Used."

**@xri** (5), **@xri h\$** (4), **@xri ou\$**(4), **@xrij ou\$**(4), **@xrij ou@a@**(1)

As a conjunction **a@ri** appears 5 times. More commonly (13) it appears in a conjunctive relative phrase. It is translated "until" in every instance except one, where "as long as" is used.

The mood is indicative 7 times and subjunctive 11 times. For the use of moods with words meaning "until" see below.

**Prin** (8), **Prin h@**(4), **Prin h@a@**(1)

This is the only conjunction in the NT translated "before." The usual construction with **prin** is with an infinitive following (11 times). Once it is followed by a subjunctive and once by an optative.

**Af Jh\$** (6), **Af Jou\$**(3), **Af Jous@a@**(1)

These are all relative phrases functioning as temporal conjunctions. Literally translated, the meaning would be "from which day, or time." The NASB translates them, 6 of the 10 times, by "since" (the others are freer, paraphrastic renderings: "once," "ago," even "for" and "that"). In every instance it is used in measuring time starting from a specific point; when that starting point is in the past the mood is indicative (9 times), when it is in the future the mood is subjunctive (1).

**Ef Jo\$on** (5), **Oson xronon** (1)

Again this is a relative phrase functioning as a conjunction. **@soj** is a correlative expressing a quantitative concept "how much"; the phrase thus means "for how much time." It is translated in every instance by "as long as" (5) or "so long as" (once), and it always uses the indicative mood.

**En &\$**(4)

Another relative phrase in which the time word **xron&** is to be supplied, it carries the meaning "in (or during) which time." It is

translated "while" (3 times) and "until" (once). The mood is always indicative.

**Mexri** (1), **Mexri ou\$2**

Once it is a conjunction, twice it is in a relative phrase. Like its synonym **axri** it is translated "until." The mood is always subjunctive.

**Qsakij eħn** (3)

**Qsakij** is made up of the correlative **o\$oj**, "how much," and the adverbial ending **-kij**, "times"; thus "how many times." It is translated "as often as." It always has the indefinite particle **eħn** and is followed by the subjunctive mood.

**Epan** (3)

Arising from **epei** (or **epeidh**) plus the indefinite particle **ax**, this conjunction seems to be a full synonym of **otan** (twice, in Luke 11:21, 22 and 11:34, they are used interchangeably in parallel sentences). Like **otan** it is translated "when." It is indefinite and takes the subjunctive mood.

**Hnika ax** (1), **Hnika eħn** (1)

Both forms are identical, differing only in the spelling of the indefinite particle **ax**. Translated "whenever," it is indefinite and takes the subjunctive mood.

**Epeidh** (1)

This conjunction is more frequently causal, but once it is temporal (Luke 7:1), translated "when." The mood is indicative.

**Kaqwj** (1)

**Kaqwj** is usually comparative or causal, but in one place it seems to be temporal (Acts 7:17). The NASB translates it "as." The mood is indicative.

*Moods Used*

Basic Principles

In the review of conjunctions we have already given statistics of the moods used with each. Unlike the causal and comparative clauses which were predominantly indicative, and the final which were subjunctive, these like the relative and conditional clauses freely use both moods. Here we shall discuss the basic distinctions which govern the

moods used, giving special attention to the seeming "exceptions" to those principles.

The choice between indicative and subjunctive in temporal clauses is determined by the distinction between actual and potential, and between specific and indefinite. If it speaks of a specific time past or present the indicative is the natural choice. If the time is future and thus unknown and doubtful, or if it is indefinite, the mood expected is subjunctive. These same factors also control the conjunctions used, so that there is a close correlation between the conjunction and the mood; we expect, for example, that **ote** will use an indicative verb and that **otan** will use a subjunctive.

Since these two conjunctions account for more than half of all the temporal clauses in the NT, we will use them as examples to illustrate the distinction between the moods. **Ote** is followed by an indicative verb 102 times out of 104; once it introduces a clause which has no verb so the mood is not indicated, once it occurs with a subjunctive verb. Examining the indicatives, 92 times it is used of an actual historically past event, in four instances it speaks of actual contemporary time.<sup>35</sup> The other five are future in time (either a future indicative or a futuristic present indicative), but in every case they are specific (several have the form, "the hour is coming when. . .").

In just one passage the NA26 text shows a possible place where **ote** may be found with a subjunctive verb; in Luke 13:35. This will be discussed later, in the section on "Until Clauses."

**Otan**, which is simply the same **ote** with the indefinite particle **an** is almost as exclusively followed by the subjunctive. There are 5 instances of **otan** with the indicative. Three occur with statements of a general truth, "whenever," which usually (44 times) is expressed with the subjunctive. One of these (Rev 4:9) has the future indicative, which as we have seen is practically synonymous with the subjunctive. The other two (Mark 3:11, 11: 19) refer specifically to that which had happened repeatedly in past time, hence the indicative is appropriate.

That leaves two instances of **otan** with the indicative which are more difficult to account for. Mark 11:25 seems clearly to be general and future, so that a subjunctive would be expected. There are textual variants showing a subjunctive form. Rev 8:1, after six times stating the same fact using **ote** with the indicative, on the seventh of the series changes to **otan** with the indicative. It is simple description of an actual event, past from the vantage-point of the writer, and with the same

<sup>35</sup> In Mark 14:12 **ote to pasxa e@on** "the day. . . when the Passover is [always] sacrificed," (my rendering) seems to be the imperfect of customary action. The NASB rendering, "When the Passover lamb was being sacrificed" is grammatically possible, but it seems impossible that the actual sacrificing was going on at the time when the disciples inquired about "preparing" for it.

sense as the first six. It clearly calls for a verb in the indicative. Apparently the problem is with the conjunction, and some texts read **ote**.

With several other of the conjunctions the addition of the indefinite particle **ae** or **eh** means a change from indicative to subjunctive, and for the same reasons. When the temporal clause is definite the mood is indicative, when the **ae** changes it to indefinite the mood changes to subjunctive. This is true with **wj** and **wj ae epeidh** and **epan**, **af lou** and **af lou ae kaqwj**, **ef lon**, and **eh** do not use **ae** and are always indicative; **hika** and **ofakij** always have **ae** and always use subjunctive.

"Until" Clauses.

From classical times some special consideration was given to those temporal clauses which express the notion of "until." The conjunctions involved were **ej**, **este** (not found in NT), **aeri** and **maxri**. When they meant "while, so long as" they were regular in construction. But when they meant "until" they showed many peculiarities,

The same situation is mostly true of their NT use, but without some of the rather complicated "rules." The list of conjunctions include some of the relative phrases we have described already, and the indefinite particle **ae** is not so strictly required, but the use is basically unchanged. When these words mean "until" two constructions occur. If the clause is referring to a definite past action the mood used is indicative. If they refer to an indefinite future action the mood is subjunctive. This statement of the case is probably over-simplified for the classical, but it will serve quite well for the NT pattern.

I have taken these conjunctions which are translated "until"<sup>36</sup> and in every instance evaluated the "point until which" intended, whether it is definite and past to the outlook of the speaker or writer, or potential (i.e., general or indefinite) future. The results were then compared with the actual structure used. These observations are the result.

(1) There are 76 passages in the list. Eighteen are indicative, and 58 subjunctive.

(2) In 12 instances the "time until" has been judged to be actually past. In every instance the mood used is indicative, and proper,

(3) The indicative is used in one passage (Rev 17:17) where the "time until" seems to be future from the standpoint of the persons involved, which might suggest a subjunctive verb. Two explanations

<sup>36</sup> For the most part I have followed the NASB. In some instances they have used "until" where in my judgment the sense should be "while." (For the lists in this section, see footnote 12 above.)

may be suggested. The time may be considered from the vantage of the One whose purpose was being executed and that purpose was a past reality. Or, it should be noted that the verb used is future indicative, which is often in Greek a substitute for the subjunctive. My preference is for this last explanation.

(4) In 63 instances the temporal clause has been judged to be future or indefinite, indicating the subjunctive should be expected. 58 of them are actually subjunctive, leaving 5 examples where the verb is indicative when we might expect the subjunctive.

Most difficult is Luke 13:35 ~~ου μη ιδητε με ενωπιον υμων~~ [hcei ote] ~~ειρηνη~~ "you shall not see Me until the time comes when you say. . ." A textual problem is apparent; does the verb ~~ειρηνη~~ go with ~~ενωπιον~~ or ~~ote~~? If the bracketed words are omitted it goes with ~~ενωπιον~~ and the subjunctive is proper (the time is indefinite future). If the bracketed words are left in ~~ειρηνη~~ must be construed with ~~ote~~ and an indicative is indicated. Also, in that case ~~ενωπιον~~ governs ~~hcei~~ and that verb should be subjunctive. The NA26 edition puts the words in the text, but in brackets; the UBS3 edition gives the same text but gives the extra words a D (poor) rating. Westcott and Hort rejected them. The principle that the more difficult reading is more apt to be the correct one would argue for their inclusion, but perhaps that principle is not 100% correct.

The other four (Luke 19:13, John 21:22, 23, 1 Tim 4:13) are all of a similar nature. All are examples of the futuristic use of the present indicative of ~~ερχομαι~~, "I am coming." In each case the sense is future and the time is indefinite, indicating that a subjunctive verb should be expected. The nature of this particular verb may help to explain the indicative.

But there may be more than this involved. The first of these four has the conjunctive phrase ~~εως~~ which nowhere else means "until." Even the NASB has in the margin the rendering, "while I am coming." If we follow this meaning, it suggests that these present indicatives may be placing the emphasis on the meantime activity ("while") rather than on the future point of termination ("until"). The last three examples use a different conjunction, ~~καθως~~, but ~~καθως~~ too frequently means "while."<sup>37</sup> If that is the case here, it makes the special "until" rule inapplicable and the present indicative are natural and proper.

### *Clause Order*

Temporal clauses precede the main clause 267 times, or 63%, they follow the main clause 155 times.

<sup>37</sup> Robertson, *Grammar*, 975, says, "When the present ind appears with ~~καθως~~ the notion is while, not 'until.'" He lists another example, Mark 6:45.



*Other Temporal Constructions*

By far the most frequently used temporal construction in the NT is not the conjunctive clause, rather it is the adverbial or circumstantial participle. At least 765 participles function as the equivalent of a temporal clause. Of course these participles do not constitute "clauses" in the technical sense, but they contain every element of a clause: --the participle itself is a verb form, the subject of the clause is always the word with which the participle is in agreement. In most cases it is best to translate them by temporal clauses, in many cases it is impossible to do it any other way.<sup>38</sup> The precise temporal significance is not explicit and must be gathered from the tense used and the context.

Another prominent substitute for a temporal clause in the NT is the use of the articular infinitive with a proposition. Four prepositions are used in the temporal sense in this construction. **En t&?+** infinitive is the most common (56 examples). It is always used of concurrent time ("in, or during, the time when," and is usually translated "while." **Meta> to<+** infinitive occurs 15 times, translated "after." **Pro>to?+** infinitive is found 9 times, translated "before." **Ewj tou?+** infinitive, once only in this construction, is translated "until." Again, while these may not fit the definition of a clause, they function in every respect like a clause. Indeed, it is impossible to translate them into understandable English except by converting them into a clause.

## LOCAL CLAUSES

*Meaning*

Local clauses, or locational to use a term parallel with temporal, are those which tell where the action of the main clause is located. It answers the question "where?" They are the fewest in number of all the kinds of clauses in the NT, but they still number 112.

*Conjunctions Used*

**Opou** (72), **Opou a@** / **e@n** (10)

The most frequent of the local conjunctions, it is translated "where" (61) and with **e@n** "wherever" (11), plus a variety of renderings once each, such as "from which," "in which," "on which," "there," even "since" and "whenever." The last two are unusual departures from the normal sense, and to me seem unnecessary. In both instances (Mark 9:18, 1 Cor 3:3) a location in place is a natural and more vivid sense, even in English.

<sup>38</sup> Listings of these temporal participles are available from the library at Grace Theological Seminary, in my *Supplemental Manual, Participles*.

**Ou\$22), ou\$ħn** (1)

**Ou\$**Originally the genitive singular of the relative pronoun, came to be used as a conjunction of place, "where," and with the indefinite particle **ħn**, "wherever."

**Oqen** (7)

With the adverbial suffix **-qen**, place "whence" or "from which," **oqen** is the equivalent of **eħeiqen opou** "from the place where" or "from which." It is translated "from which" (4), "from there" (1), and simply "there" (2).

*Moods Used*

When these clauses are without the indefinite particle **an** or **ħn** the mood is always indicative. When the indefinite particle is present the mood is subjunctive with one exception. Mark 6:56 has **opou an** with an imperfect indicative. The sense seems clearly to be indefinite or general, the use of the imperfect with **an** for a potential or iterative sense is classical.<sup>39</sup>

*Clause Order*

Local clauses follow the main clause 75% of the time. The count is 84 following and 28 preceding.

<sup>39</sup> Goodwin and Gulick, *Grammar*, 275-76.

This material is cited with gracious permission from:

Grace Theological Seminary  
200 Seminary Dr.  
Winona Lake, IN 46590  
www.grace.edu

Please report any errors to Ted Hildebrandt at: thildebrandt@gordon.edu