Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Word order and information structure in New Testament Greek

Kirk, A.

Citation

Kirk, A. (2012, November 21). *Word order and information structure in New Testament Greek*. *LOT dissertation series*. Retrieved from https://hdl.handle.net/1887/20157

Version:	Not Applicable (or Unknown)
License:	Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden
Downloaded from:	https://hdl.handle.net/1887/20157

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page

Universiteit Leiden

The handle http://hdl.handle.net/1887/20157 holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Kirk, Allison
Title: Word order and information structure in New Testament Greek
Issue Date: 2012-11-21

References

Aboh, E. O. (2004). *The morphosyntax of complement-head sequences: Clause structure and word order patterns in Kwa*. Oxford/ New York: Oxford University Press.

Adger, D., Harbour, D., & Watkins, L. J. (2009). *Mirrors and microparameters*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Agbayani, B. (2000). Wh-Subjects in English and the vacuous movement hypothesis. *Linguistic Inquiry, 31*, 703-713.

Aikhenvald, A. (2004). *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kurt Aland et al. (Eds.) (1979). The Greek New Testament, 26th edition, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979; 27th edition, 1993.

Alexiadou, A. (Ed.). (2000). *The syntax of relative clauses*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Alexiadou, A. (2006). Uniform and non-uniform aspects of pro-drop languages. In P. Ackema (Ed.), *Arguments and Agreement* (pp. 127-158). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Alexiadou, A., & Anagnostopoulou, E. (1998). Parametrizing AGR: Word order, V movement and EPP-checking. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 16*, 491-539.

Alexiadou, A., & Anagnostopoulou, E. (2001). The subject in situ generalization and the role of Case in driving computations. *Linguistic Inquiry, 32*, 193-231.

Alexiadou, A., & Anagnostopoulou, E. (2007). The subject in situ generalization revisited. In H. M. Gärtner & U. Sauerland (Eds.), *Interfaces + Recursion = Language* (pp. 31-60). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Ambar, M. M. (1992). *Para uma sintaxe da inversão sujeito-verbo em Português*. PhD diss., University of Lisbon, Colibri.

Anagnostopoulou, E. (1994). *Clitic dependencies in Modern Greek*. PhD diss., University of Salzburg.

Anagnostopoulou, E., & Giannakidou, A. (1995). Clitics and prominence, or Why specificity is not enough. In A. Dainora (Ed.), *CLS 31: Papers from the 31st annual meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society, Volume 2: Parasession on Clitics* (pp. 1-15). Chicago.

Anderson, H. (1988). Markedness theory: The first 150 years. In O. Tomic (Ed.), *Markedness in Synchrony and Diachrony*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Aoun, J., Benmamoun, E., & Sportiche, D. (1994). Agreement, word order and conjunction in some varieties of Arabic. *Linguistic Inquiry, 25*, 195-220.

Arsenijević, B. (2009). {Relative {conditional {correlative clauses}}}. In A. Liptak (Ed.), *Correlatives cross-linguistically* (pp. 131-156). Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Arvaniti, A. (2002). The intonation of yes-no questions in Greek. In M. Makri-Tsilipakou (Ed.), *Selected papers on theoretical and applied linguistics* (pp. 71-83). Thessaloniki.

Bach, E., & Cooper, R. (1978). The NP-S analysis of relative clauses and compositional semantics. *Linguistics and Philosophy, 2*, 145-150.

Bagnall, R. S. (Ed.). (2009). *The Oxford handbook of papyrology*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.

Bahloul, M., & Harbert, W. (1993). Agreement asymmetries in Arabic. In J. Mead (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Eleventh West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics* (pp. 15-31).

Baker, M. C. (2001). *The atoms of language: The mind's hidden rules of grammar*. New York: Basic Books.

Baker, M. C. (2008). The natures of nonconfigurationality In M. Baltins & C. Collins (Eds.), *The handbook of contemporary syntactic theory* (pp. 407-438). Oxford: Blackwell.

Baker, M. C., & McCloskey, J. (2007). On the relationship of Typology to Theoretical Syntax. *Linguistic Typology, 11*, 273-284.

Bakker, E. J. (1993). Boundaries, topics and the structure of discourse: An investigation of the Ancient Greek particle dé. *Studies in Language, 17*, 275-311.

Bakker, S. J. (2007). *The noun phrase in Ancient Greek*. PhD diss., Rijksuniversiteit Groningen.

Baltazani, M. (2002). *Quantifier scope and the role of intonation in Greek*. PhD diss., UCLA.

Barbosa, P. (1994). *Towards a new look at the Null Subject Parameter*. Paper presented at the ConSOLE, Venice.

Belletti, A. (1988). The Case of Unaccusatives. *Linguistic Inquiry, 19*, 1-34.

Belletti, A. (2001). "Inversion" as Focalization. In A. Hulk & J.-Y. Pollock (Eds.), *Subject Inversion in Romance and the Theory of Universal Grammar* (pp. 60-90). Oxford:

Oxford University Press.

Belletti, A. (2004). Aspects of the low IP area. In L. Rizzi (Ed.), *The structure of CP and IP: The cartography of syntactic structures* (Vol 2, pp. 16-51). Oxford/ New York: Oxford University Press.

Benincà, P., & Poletto, C. (2004). Topic, Focus and V2: Defining the CP sublayers. In L. Rizzi (Ed.), *The structure of CP and IP. The cartography of syntactic structures* (Vol. 2, pp. 52-75). New York/ Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Benmanoun, E. (2000). *The feature structure of functional categories: a comparative study of Arabic dialects*. New York/ Oxford: Oxford University Press.

den Besten, H. (1983). On the Interaction of Root Transformations and Lexical Deletive Rules. In A. Werner (Ed.), *On the Formal Syntax of the West-germania. Papers from the Third Groningen Grammar Talks*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Beyer, K. (1966). Der reichsaramäische Einschlag in der ältesten syrischen Literatur. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft 116, 116*, 242-254.

Bhatt, R., & Pancheva, R. (2006). Implicit arguments. In M. Everaert & H. van Riemsdijk (Eds.), *Blackwell companion to syntax* (pp. 638-687). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Bhatt, R., & Lipták, A. K. (2009). Matching effects in the temporal and locative domain. In A. Lipták (Ed.), *Correlative cross-linguistically* (pp. 343-372). Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Bianchi, V. (1999). *Consequences of asymmetry: headed relative clauses*. Berlin/ New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bianchi, V. (2000a). The raising analysis of relative clauses: A reply to Borsley. *Linguistic Inquiry, 31*, 123-140.

Bianchi, V. (2000b). The syntax of relative determiners. In A. Alexiadou, P. Law, A. Meinunger & C. Wilder (Eds.), *The syntax of relative clauses* (pp. 53-82). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Biberauer, T. (2010). Semi null-subject languages, expletives and expletive pro. In T. Biberauer, A. Holmberg, M. Sheehan & I. Roberts (Eds.), *Parametric variation: Null subjects in Minimalist theory* (pp. 152-199). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Biberauer, T., & Roberts, I. (2010). Subjects, Tense and verb-movement. In T. Biberauer, A. Holmberg, M. Sheehan & I. Roberts (Eds.), *Parametric Variation: Null Subjects in Minimalist Theory* (pp. 263-302). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blass, F. (1898). *Grammar of NT Greek*, tr. H. St J. Thackeray. London.

Blass, F., Debrunner, A., & Funk, R. W. (1961). *A Greek grammar of the New Testament*. Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press.

Bobaljik, J. D. (2002). Realizing germanic inflection: Why morphology does not drive syntax. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics 6*, 129-167.

Bobaljik, J. D., & Carnie, A. (1996). A Minimalist approach to some problems of Irish word order. In R. D. Borsley & I. Roberts (Eds.), *The syntax of the Celtic languages: a comparative perspective* (pp. 223-240). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bobaljik, J. D., & Jonas, D. (1996). Subject positions and the roles of TP. *Linguistic Inquiry, 27*, 195-236.

Bobaljik, J. D., & Thráinson, H. (1998). Two Heads Aren't Always Better Than One. *Syntax, 1*, 37-71.

Boeckx, C., & Grohmann, K. K. (Eds.). (2003). *Multiple Wh-fronting*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Borer, H. (1986). I-subjects. *Linguistic Inquiry, 17*, 375-416.

Bošković, Ž. (1997). Superiority effects with multiple wh-fronting in Serbo-Croatian. *Lingua, 102*, 1-20.

Bošković, Ž. (2002). On multiple wh-fronting. *Linguistic Inquiry, 33*, 351-383.

Bošković, Ž. (2003). On wh-islands and obligatory wh-movement contexts in South Slavic. In C. Boeckx & K. K. Grohmann (Eds.), *Multiple wh-fronting* (pp. 27-51). Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Bresnan, J., & Grimshaw, J. (1978). The syntax of free relatives in English. *Linguistic Inquiry, 9*, 331-391.

Bresnan, J., & Mchombo, S. A. (1987). Topic, pronoun, and agreement in Chichewa. *Language, 63*, 741-782.

Brody, J. (1984). Some problems with the concept of basic word order. *Linguistics, 22*, 711-736.

Brody, M. (1990). Some Remarks on the Focus Field in Hungarian. *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics, 2*, 201-225.

Brown, R. E. (1997). *An introduction to the New Testament*. New York: Doubleday.

Browning, R. (1983). *Medieval and modern Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bubenik, V. (1989). *Hellenistic and Roman Greece as a sociolinguistic area* (Vol. 57). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Buijs, M. (2005). *Clause combining in Ancient Greek narrative discourse*. Leiden: Brill.

Büring, D. (1997). *The Meaning of Topic and Focus: The 59th Street Bridge Accent*. London: Routledge.

Bury, D. (2010). Verb-second, particles, and flexible verb-initial orders. *Lingua, 120*, 303-314.

Calboli, G. (2008). The accusative as a 'default' case in Latin subordinate clauses. *Indogermanische Forschungen, 10*, 235-266.

Caponigro, I. (2003). *Free not to ask: On the semantics of free relatives and wh-words cross-linguistically*. PhD diss., University of California, Los Angeles.

Cardinaletti, A. (1997). Subjects and clause structure. In L. Haegeman (Ed.), *The New Comparative Syntax* (pp. 33-63). London: Longman.

Cardinaletti, A. (2004). Towards a Cartography of Subject Positions. In L. Rizzi (Ed.), *The Structure of CP and IP: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures* (Vol. 2, pp. 115-165). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cardinaletti, A., & Starke, M. (1999). The typology of structural deficiency: A case study of three classes of pronouns. In H. v. Riemsdijk (Ed.), *Clitics in the languages of Europe* (pp. 145-233). Berlin: Mouton.

Carlson, G. (1977). Amount relatives. *Language, 53*, 520-542.

Carnie, A., Harley, H., & Pyatt, E. (2000). VSO order as raising out of IP? Some evidence from Old Irish. In A. Carnie & E. Guilfoyle (Eds.), *The syntax of verb initial languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chafe, W. (1976). Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics, and points of view. In C. N. Li (Ed.), *Subject and topic* (pp. 25-55). New York: Academic Press.

Cheng, L. L.-S., & Demirdash, H. (1990). Superiority violations. In L. L.-S. Cheng & H. Demirdash (Eds.), *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 13: Papers on Wh-Movement* (pp. 27-46). Cambridge, Mass.: MITWPL.

Cheng, L. L.-S. (1991). *On the typology of wh-questions*. PhD diss., MIT, Cambridge, Mass.

Chomsky, N. (1973). Conditions on transformations. In S. R. Anderson & P. Kiparsky (Eds.), *A Feestschrift for Morris Halle* (pp. 232-286). New Nork: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Chomsky, N. (1977). On Wh-movement. In P. C. e. al. (Ed.), *Formal syntax* (pp. 71-132). New York: Academic Press.

Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on government and binding*. Dordrecht, Holland ; Cinnaminson, N.J.: Foris Publications.

Chomsky, N. (1982). *Some concepts and consequences of the theory of government and binding*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Chomsky, N. (1986a). *Knowledge of language: its nature, origins, and use*. New York: Praeger.

Chomsky, N. (1986b). *Barriers*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Chomsky, N. (1993). A Minimalist Program for Linguistic Theory. In K. Hale & S. J. Keyser (Eds.), *The view from building 20* (pp. 1-52). Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Chomsky, N. (1995). *The minimalist program*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Chomsky, N. (2000). Minimalist inquiries: The framework. In R. Martin, D. Michaels & J. Uriagereka (Eds.), *Step by step: Essays on Minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik* (pp. 89-156). Cambridge, Mass. : MIT Press.

Chomsky, N. (2001). Derivation by phase. In M. Kenstowicz (Ed.), *Ken Hale, A Life in Language* (pp. 1-52). Cambridge, Mass./ London: MIT press.

Chomsky, N. (2008). On phases. In R. Freidin, O. Peregrín & M. L. Zubizarreta (Eds.), *Foundational issues in linguistic theory* (pp. 133-166). Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Chomsky, N., & Halle, M. (1968). *The sound pattern of English*. New York,: Harper & Row.

Chomsky, N., & Lasnik, H. (1977). Filters and Control. *Linguistic Inquiry, 8*, 425-504.

Chung, S. (1988). *The Design of Agreement: Evidence from Chamorro*. Chicago/ London: University of Chicago Press.

Chung, S., & McCloskey, J. (1983). On the interpretation of certain island facts in GPSG. *Linguistic Inquiry, 14*, 704-713.

Cinque, G. (1990). *Types of A' dependencies*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Cinque, G. (1999). *Adverbs and functional heads*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Cinque, G. (Ed.). (2002). *The Cartography of syntactic structures: Functional structure in DP and IP (Vol 1)*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Comrie, B. (1989). *Language universals and linguistic typology: Syntax and Morphology* (Second ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Corver, N. (2007). Freezing effects. In M. Everaert & H. van Riemsdijk (Eds.), *The Blackwell companion to syntax* (Vol 2, pp. 383-406). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Costa, J. (1998). *Word Order Variation: a constraint-based approach*. PhD diss., Leiden University.

Costa, J. (2001). Marked vs. unmarked inversion in Optimality Theory. In J. Grimshaw & S. Vikner (Eds.), *Inversion in Romance* (pp. 91 - 106). New York: Oxford University Press.

Costa, J. (2004). *Subject positions and interfaces. The case of European Portuguese*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Croft, W. (1990). *Typology and Universals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Davies, W. D., & Dale, A. C. (1988-1997). *A critical and exigetical commentary on the gospel according to Saint Matthew, 3 volumes*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

Davison, M. E. (1989). New Testament Greek Word Order. *Literary and Linguistic Computing, 4*1, 19-28.

Davison, A. (2009). Sanskrit and Hindi/Urdu correlatives. In A. K Lipták (Ed.), *Correlatives cross-linguistics* (pp. 223-262). Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Dayal, V. (1996). *Locality in Wh-quantification*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Dayal, V. (2006). Multiple Wh-questions. In M. Everaert & H. van Riemsdijk (Eds.), *The blackwell companion to syntax,* (Vol 3, pp. 275-326). Malden MA: Blackwell.

Demirdache, H., & Etxebarria, M. (2004). The syntax of time adverbs. In J. Gueron & J. Lecarme (Eds.), *The syntax of time* (pp. 143-180). Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Denniston, J. D. (1954). *The Greek particles*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Déprez, V., & Hale, K. (1986). Resumptive Pronouns in Irish *Proceedings of the Harvard Celtic Colloquium* (Vol. 5, pp. 38-48): Department of Celtic Languages and Literature, Harvard University.

Devine, A. M., & Stephens, L. D. (2000). *Discontinuous syntax: hyperbaton in Greek*. New York/ Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Diessmann, A. (1991). Hellenistic Greek with special consideration of the Greek Bible. In S. E. Porter (Ed.), *The language of the New Testament: Classical essays* (pp. 39-59). Sheffield: JSOT Press. Translated by M. Walter, H. Biessmann, from (1899) A. Hauck (Ed.), *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche* Leipzig: Hinrichs (Vol 7, pp. 627-39).

Dik, S. C. (1978). *Functional Grammar*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Dik, S. C. (1989). *The theory of Functional Grammar: The structure of the clause*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Dik, H. (1995). *Word order in Ancient Greek: A pragmatic account of word order variation in Herodotus*. Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben.

Dik, H. (2007). *Word order in Greek tragic dialogue*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dobrovie-Sorin, C. (1994). *The syntax of Romanian. Comparative studies in Romance*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Doron, E. (2000). VSO and left-conjunct agreement: Bibilical Hebrew vs. Modern Hebrew. In A. Carnie & E. Guilfoyle (Eds.), *The syntax of verb-initial languages* (pp. 75-95). Oxford: Oxford Univeristy Press.

Downing, B. (1973). Some universals of relative clause structure. In J. H. G. et.al. (Ed.), *Universals of Human Language* (Vol. 4, pp. 375-418).

Dryer, M. S. (1992). The greenbergian word order correlations. *Language, 68*, 81-138.

Dryer, M. (1995). Frequency and pragmatically unmarked word order. In P. M. N. Downing (Ed.), *Word order in discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Dryer, M. S. (1997). On the six-way word order typology. *Studies in Language, 21*, 69-103.

Dryer, M. S. (2005). Order of subject, object, and verb. In M. Haspelmath, M. S. Dryer, D. Gil & B. Comrid (Eds.), *The world atlas of language structures* (pp. 330-334). Oxford University Press.

Dryer, M. S. (2007). Word order. In T. Shopen (Ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description, Complex Constructions* (Vol 2, pp. 151-205). Cambridge University Press.

Eckman, F. R., Moravscik, E. A., & Wirth, J. R. (Eds.). (1986). *Markedness*. New York/

London: Plenum Press.

Ehrman, B. D. (2004). *The New Testament: A historical introduction to the early christian writings*. New York: Oxford University Press.

É.Kiss, K. (1995). *Discourse configurational languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

É.Kiss, K. (1995). *Discourse configurational languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

É.Kiss, K. (2008). Free word order, (non)configurationality, and phases. *Linguistic Inquiry, 39*, 441-475.

Embick, D., & Noyer, R. (2001). Movement operations after syntax. *Linguistic Inquiry, 32*, 555-596.

Emonds, J. (1976). *A Transformational Approach to English Syntax*. New York: Academic Press.

Emonds, J. (1980). Word order in generative grammar. *Journal of Linguistic Research, 1*, 33-54.

Ernst, T. (1992). The phrase structure of English negation. *The Linguistic Review, 9*, 109-144.

Erasmus, D. (1516). *Novum Instrumentu omne, diligenter ad Erasmo Roterodamo recognitum et emendatum [The entire New Testament, diligently researched and corrected by Erasmus of Rotterdam, &c]*. Basel: Johann Froben, 1516; 2nd ed. 1519; 3rd ed. 1522; 4th ed. 1527; 5th ed. 1535.

Etxepare, R., & Uribe-Etxebarria, M. (2008). On negation and focus in Spanish and Basque. In X. Artiagoitia & J. Lakarra (Eds.), *Gramatika Jaietan. Paxti Goenagaren omenez* (pp. 287-310). The University of the Basque Country (UPV/EHU).

Fassi Fehri, A. (1993). *Issues in the structure of Arabic clauses and words* (Vol. 29). Dordrecht/ Boston/ London: Kluwer.

Fitzmyer, J. A. (1974). The contribution of Qumran Aramaic to the Study of the New Testament. *New Testament Studies, 20*, 382-407.

Fitzmyer, J. A. (1991). The languages of Palestine in the First Century AD. In S. E. Porter (Ed.), *The language of the New Testament: Classic essays* (pp. 126-162). Sheffield: JSOT Press.

Frascarelli, M. (2000). The Syntax-Phonology interface in Focus and Topic constructions in Italian *Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* (Vol. 50). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Frascarelli, M. (2004). Dislocation, clitic resumption and minimality: A comparative analysis of left and right topic constructions in Italian. In R. Bok-Bennema, B. Hollebrandse, B. Kampers-Manhe & P. Sleeman (Eds.), *Romance languages and linguistic theory* (pp. 98-118). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Frascarelli, M., & Hinterhölzl, R. (2007). Types of Topics in German and Italian. In S. Winkler & K. Schwabe (Eds.), *On Information Structure, meaning and form* (pp. 87-116). Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Friberg, T. (1982). *New Testament Greek word order in light of discourse considerations*. PhD diss., University of Minnesota.

Garret, A. (1994). Relative clause syntax in Lycian and Hittite. *Die Sprache, 36*, 29-69.

George, L. M. (1980). *Analogical generalization in natural language syntax*. Ph D diss., Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Dept. of Linguistics and Philosophy.

Giannakidou, A. (1998). *Polarity sensitivity as (non)veridical dependency*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Giannakidou, A. (2000). Negative...concord? *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory, 18*, 457-523.

Giannakidou, A. (2006). N-words and negative concord. In M. Everaert (Ed.), *Blackwell companion to syntax* (Vol. 3, pp. 327-391). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Givón, T. (1983). Topic continuity in discourse: An introduction. In T. Givón (Ed.), *Topic continuity in discourse: A quantitative crosslanguage study* (pp. 5-41). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Givón, T. (1990). *Syntax: A Functional-Typological Introduction* (1st ed. Vol. 2). Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Goodall, G. (2001). The EPP in Spanish. In W. Davies & S. Dubinsky (Eds.), *Objects and other subjects* (pp. 193-223). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Greenberg, J. H. (1966). Some Universals of Grammar with Particular Reference to the Order of Meaningful Elements. In J. H. Greenberg (Ed.), *Universals of Language* (2nd ed., pp. 73-113). Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Groos, A., & van Riemsdijk, H. (1981). Matching effects in free relatives: a parameter of core grammar. In A. Belletti (Ed.), *Theory of markedness in gemerative grammar: Proceedings of the IV GLOW Conference*. Pisa: Scuola Normale Superiore.

Grosu, A. (1988). Pied piping and the matching parameter. *The linguistic review, 6*, 41-58.

Grosu, A., & Landman, F. (1998). Strange relatives of the third kind. *Natural Language Semantics, 6*, 125-170.

Gryllia, S. (2008). *On the nature of pre-verbal focus in Greek*. PhD diss., Leiden University, LOT.

Guilfoyle, E. (1990). *Functional Categories and Phrase Structure Parameters*. PhD diss., McGill University.

Gundel, J. K., Houlihan, K., & Sanders, G. (1988). On the function of marked and unmarked terms. In M. Hammond et al. (Ed.), *Studies in Syntactic Typology* (pp. 285-302). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Haegeman, L. (1995). *The syntax of negation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hahn, E. A. (1964). Relative and antecedent. *Transactions and proceedings of the American Philological Society, 95*, 111-141.

Hale, K. (1983). Warlpiri and the grammar of non-configurational languages. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory, 1*, 5-47.

Hale, M. R. (1987). Notes on Wackernagel's Law in the language of the Rigveda. In C. Watkins (Ed.), *Studies in memory of Warren Cogwill: papers from the fourth East Coast Indo-European conference, Cornell University, June 6-9, 1985* (pp. 38-49). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hale, M. R. (2007). *Historical linguistics: Theory and method*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Halle, M., & Marantz, A. (1993). Distributed Morphology and the pieces of inflection. In K. Hale & S. J. Keyser (Eds.), *The view from building 20* (pp. 111-176). Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1967). Notes on transitivity and theme in English. *Journal of Linguistics, 3*, 199-244.

Halpern, A. (1995). *Topics in the placement and morphology of clitics*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Harbert, W. (1983). On the nature of the matching parameter. *The Linguistic Review, 2*, 237-284.

Harbert, W., & Bahloul, M. (2002). Postverbal subjects in Arabic and the theory of agreement. In J. Ouhalla & U. Shlonsky (Eds.), *Themes in Arabic and Hebrew Syntax* (pp. 45-70). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Haspelmath, M. (2006). Against markedness (and what to replace it with). *Journal of Linguistics, 42*, 25-70.

Haudry, J. (1973). Parataxe, hypotaxe et correlation dans la phrase latine. *Bulletin de la Societe Linguistique de Paris, 68*, 147-186.

Hawkins, J. A. (1983). *Word order universals*. New York: Academic Press.

Heath, J. (1986). Syntactic and lexical aspects of nonconfigurationality in Nunggubuyu. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory, 4*, 375-408.

Hengeveld, K., & Mackenzie, J. L. (2008). *Functional discourse grammar: a typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Herburger, E. (2000). *What counts. Focus and Quantification*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Hirschbühler, P. (1978). *The syntax and semantics of wh-constructions*. PhD diss., University of Ottawa, Ottawa.

Hirschbühler, P., & Rivero, M.-L. (1983). Remarks on free relatives and matching phenomena. *Linguistic Inquiry, 14*, 505-520.

Hock, H. H. (1989). Conjoined we stand: theoretical implications of Sanskrit relative structures'. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences, 19*, 93-126.

Hodges, Z. C., & Farstad, A. L. (1982). *The Greek New Testament according to the majority text*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson.

Holmberg, A. (1986). *Word order and the syntactic features in the Scandinavian languages and English*. PhD diss., University of Stockholm.

Holmberg, A. (1999). Remarks on Holmberg's generalization. *Studia Linguistica, 53*, 1-39.

Holmberg, A. (2005). Is there evidence for a little pro? Evidence from Finnish. *Linguistic Inquiry*(36), 533-564.

Holmberg, A., & Nikanne, U. (2002). Expletives, subjects, and topics in Finnish. In P. Svenonius (Ed.), *Subjects, expletives, and the EPP* (pp. 71-106). Oxford: Oxford University press.

Horn, L. R. (1989). *A natural history of negation*. Chicago/ London: University of Chicago Press.

Horrocks, G. (1997). *Greek: A history of the language and its speakers*. London, New York: Longman.

Huang, C.-T. J. (1984). On the distribution and reference of empty pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry, 15*, 531-574.

Hulk, A. C., & Pollock, J.-Y. (Eds.). (2001). *Subject inversion in Romance and the theory of universal grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Izvorski, R. (1996a). (Non-)matching effects in free relatives and pro-drop *Proceedings of ESCOL 12, Dartmouth College, November 1995*.

Izvorski, R. (1996b). The syntax and semantics of correlative pro-forms. In K. Kusumu (Ed.), *Proceedings of NELS 26, 1996* (pp. 133-147). Harvard University and MIT.

Jackendoff, R. (1972). *Semantic interpretation in generative grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jacobson, P. (1995). On the quantificational force of English free relatives. In E. Bach, E. Jelinek, A. Kratzer & B. H. Partee (Eds.), *Quantificational in Natural Languages* (pp. 451-486). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Jonas, D. (1996). *Clause structure and verb syntax in Scandinavian and English*. PhD diss., Harvard University.

Joseph, B. D. (1983). *The synchrony and diachrony of the Balkan infinitive: A study in areal, general, and historical linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kayne, R. S. (1994). *The anti-symmetry of syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Keenan, E. (1985). Relative clauses. In T. Shopen (Ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description: complex constructions* (Vol. 2, pp. 141-170). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kim, J.-B., & Sag, I. A. (2002). Negation without head-movement. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory, 20*, 339-412.

Kiparksy, P. (1995). Indo-European origins of Germanic syntax. In A. Battye & I. Roberts (Eds.), *Clause structure and language change*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kirk, A. (2007). *A syntactic account of split DPs in Herodotus*. M.A. diss., Concordia University, Montréal.

Kirk, A. (2012). Word order variation in New Testament wh-questions. In A. N. d. H. van Kemenade (Ed.), *Historical Linguistics 2009: Selected papers from the 19th international conference on historicla linguistics, Nijmegen, 10-14 August, 2009* (pp. 293-313). Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Kirk, A. (2012). The syntax of correlatives in New Testament Greek. In R. N. M. Elenbaas (Ed.), *Linguistics in the Netherlands 2011* (pp. 61-73). Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Ko, H. (2005). Syntax of Why-in-situ: merge into [Spec,CP] in overt syntax. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory, 23*, 867-916.

Koeneman, O. (2000). *The flexible nature of verb movement*. PhD diss., Utrecht University.

König, E. (1991). *The meaning of focus particles: a comparative perspective*. London: Routledge.

König, E., & Gast, V. (2004). Focused expressions of identity: A typological perspective. In Z. Frajzyngier & T. S. Curl (Eds.), *Reflexives: forms and functions* (pp. 41-74). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Koopman, H., & Sportiche, D. (1991). The Position of Subjects. *Lingua, 85*, 211-259.

Kotzoglou, G. (2006). Subject-verb inversion in Greek: Implications for head movement and typology. *Journal of Universal Language, 7*, 91-137.

Krifka, M. (2007). Interdisciplinary studies in Information Structure. In C. Féry, G. Fanselow & M. Krifka (Eds.), *The notions of Information Structure* (Vol. 6, pp. 13-55). Potsdam: Universitätverlag Potsdam.

Kühner, R., & Gerth, B. (1898-1904). *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*. Hannover/ Leipzig.

Kuno, S. (1976). Subject, theme, and the speaker's empathy - A reexamination of relativization phenomena. In C. N. Li (Ed.), *Subject and topic* (pp. 417-444). New York: Academic Press.

Kuroda, S.-Y. (1988). Whether we agree or not. *Lingvisticae Investigationes, 12*, 1-47.

Lamers, H., & Rademaker, A. (2007). Talking about myself: A pragmatic approach to the use of aspect forms in Lysias 12.4-19. *Classical Quarterly, 57*, 458-476.

Laskaratou, C. (1989). Basic characteristics of Modern Greek word order. In A. Siewierska (Ed.), *Constituent order in the languages of Europe* (Vol. 151-174). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Lasnik, H., & Saito, M. (1984). On the nature of proper government. *Linguistic Inquiry, 15*, 235-289.

Ledgeway, A., & Lombardi, A. (2005). Verb movement, adverbs and clitics in Romance. *Probus* 17: 79-113.

Lehmann, W. P. (1980). The reconstruction of non-simple sentences in Proto-Indo-European. In P. Ramat (Ed.), *Linguistic reconstruction and Indo-European syntax: Proceedings of the Colloquium of the Indogermanische Gesellschaft* (pp. 113-144). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Li, C. N. (Ed.). (1976). *Subject and topic*. New York: Academic Press.

Lipták, A. K. (2005). *Correlative topicalization*. Ms., Leiden.

Maloney, E. C. (1979). *A study of Semitic interference in Marcan syntax*. PhD diss., Fordham University.

Manzini, R. (1994). Syntactic dependencies and their properties: a note on strong islands. *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics, 6*, 205-218.

Massam, D. (2000). VSO is VOS: Aspects of Niuean word order. In A. Carnie & E. Guilfoyle (Eds.), *The syntax of verb initial languages* (pp. 97-117). Oxford: Oxford University press.

Massam, D. (2005). Predicate Fronting and Lexical Category in Niuean. In A. Carnie, H. Harley & S. A. Dooley (Eds.), *Verb first: Studies in predicate initial languages* (pp. 227-242). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Mathieu, E., & Sitaridou, I. (2005). Split wh-constructions in Classical and Modern Greek: A diachronic perspective. In M. Batllori & F. Roca (Eds.), *Grammaticalization and parametric change* (pp. 236-250). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

May, R. (1985). *Logical Form: Its struccture and derivation*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

McCloskey, J. (1985). Case, movement and raising in Modern Irish. In J. Goldberg, S. MacKaye & M. Westcoat (Eds.), *WCCFL Vol. 4:* Proceedings of the fourth west coast conference on formal linguistics, Stanford Linguistics Association, (pp. 190-205).

McCloskey, J. (1986). Inflection and conjuction in Modern Irish. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory, 4*, 245-281.

McCloskey, J. (1996a). Subjects and subject positions in Irish. In R. D. Borsley & I. Roberts (Eds.), *The syntax of the Celtic languages: A Comparative Perspective* (pp. 241-283). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McCloskey, J. (1996b). On the scope of verb movement in Irish. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory, 14*, 47-104.

McCloskey, J. (1997). Subjecthood and Subject Positions. In L. Haegeman (Ed.), *Elements of Grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

McCloskey, J. (2001). On the Distribution of Subject Properties in Irish. In W. D. Davies & S. Dubinsky (Eds.), *Objects and other subjects* (pp. 157-192). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

McCloskey, J. (2005). Predicates and Heads in Irish Clausal Syntax. In A. Carnie, H. Harley & S. A. Dooley (Eds.), *Verb first: On the Syntax of Verb-Initial Languages* (pp. 155-174). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Metzger, B. M. (1992). *The text of the New Testament: Its transmission, corruption, and restoration*. New York / Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Milsark, G. L. (1977). Toward an explanation of certain peculiarities of the existential construction in English. *Linguistic Analysis, 3*, 1-29.

Miyagawa, S. (2010). *Why Agree? Why Move? Unifying Agreement-based and Discourse Configurational Languages*. Cambridge, Mass. : MIT Press.

Mohammad, A. (1990). The problem of subject-verb agreement in Arabic: Towards a solution. In M. Eid (Ed.), *Perspectives on Arabic Linguistics* (Vol. 1). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Monro, D. B. (1998). *Homeric grammar*. London: Bristol Classical Press.

Moro, A. (1997). *The raising of predicates. Predicative noun phrases and the theory of clause structure*: Cambridge University Press.

Moulton, J. H. (1906). *A grammar of New Testament Greek, vol. 1, Prolegomena.* Edinburgh: T & T Clark. Digitized by Ted Hildebrandt, Gordon College, Wenham, MA, March 2006.

Moulton, J. H., Turner, N., & Howard, W. F. (2006). *Moulton-Howard-Turner Greek Grammar Collection*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

Neeleman, A., & Szendröi, K. (2007). Radical pro drop and the morphology of pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry, 38*, 671-714.

Neeleman, A., Titov, E., van de Koot, H., & Vermeulen, R. (2009). A syntactic typology of topic, focus and contrast. In J. van Craenenbroeck (Ed.), *Alternatives to Cartography* (pp. 15-51). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Nestle, Eberhard. (1898). *Novum Testamentum Graece cum apparatu critico ex editionibus et libris manuscriptis collecto*. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1898; 9th ed. 1912.

Newmeyer, F. J. (2004). Against a parameter-setting approach to typological variation *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* (Vol. 4, pp. 181-234).

Ordóñez, F. (1997). *Word order and clause structure in Spanish and other Romance languages*. PhD diss., City University of New York.

Payne, J. R. (1985). Negation. In T. Shopen (Ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description: Clause structure*. (*Vol 1* pp. 197-242). Cambridge: Cambridge Unviersity Press.

Perlmutter, D. M. (1971). *Deep and surface structure constraints in syntax*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Pesetsky, D. (1987). Wh-in-situ: movement and unselective binding. In E. Reuland & A. ter Meulen (Eds.), *The representation of (in)definiteness* (pp. 98-129). Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Pesetsky, D. (2000). *Phrasal movement and its kin*. Cambridge, Mass. : MIT Press.

Philippaki-Warburton, I. (2008). Word order in Modern Greek. *Transactions of the philological society, 83*, 113-143.

Pinto, M. (1997). *Licensing and Interpretation of Inverted Subjects in Italian*. PhD diss., Utrecht University.

Platzack, C. (2003). Agreement and null subjects. In A. Dahl, K. Bentzen & P. Svenonius (Eds.), *Nordlyd 31: Proceedings of the 19th Scandinavian Conference on Linguistics* (pp. 326-355).

Platzack, C., & Holmberg, A. (1989). The role of AGR and finiteness in Germanic VO languages. *Working papers in Scandinavian syntax, 43*, 51-76.

Poletto, C. (2000). *The Higher Functional Field: Evidence from Northern Italian Dialects*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pollock, J.-Y. (1989). Verb-movement, Universal Grammar, and the Structure of IP. *Linguistic Inquiry, 20*, 365-424.

Porter, S. E. (1991). The Greek of the New Testament as a disputed area of research. In S. E. Porter & L. D. Porter (Eds.), *The language of the New Testament: Classical essays* (pp. 11-38). Sheffield: JSOT Press.

Porter, S. E. (1997). The Greek Language of the New Testament. In S. E. Porter (Ed.), *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament* (pp. 99-130). Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Porter, S. E. (Ed.). (2000). *Diglossia and other topics in New Testament linguistics*.

Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Puskás, G. (1998). On the Neg-criterion in Hungarian. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica, 45*, 167-213.

Rando, E. N., & Napoli, D. J. (1978). Definiteness in there-sentences. *Language, 54*, 300-313.

Reinhart, T. (1981). Pragmatics and linguistics: An analysis of sentence topics. *Philosophica, 27*(1), 53-93.

Richards, M. (2004). *Object shift and scrambling in North and West Germanic: A case study in symmetrical syntax*. PhD diss., University of Cambridge.

Richards, N. (1997). *What moves where when in which language?* PhD diss., MIT.

Rife, J. M. (1933). The mechanics of translation Greek. *Journal of Biblical Literature, 52*, 244-252.

van Riemsdijk, H. (2006). Free relatives. In M. Everaert & H. van Riemsdijk (Eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax* (pp. 338-382). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Rijksbaron, A. (2006). *The syntax and semantics of the verb in Classical Greek: An Introduction* (Third ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rizzi, L. (1982). *Issues in Italian syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Rizzi, L. (1990). *Relativized Minimality*. Cambridge Mass.: MIT Press.

Rizzi, L. (1996). Residual verb second and the wh-criterion. In A. Belletti & L. Rizzi (Eds.), *Parameters and functional heads* (pp. 63-91). New York / Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rizzi, L. (1997). The fine structure of the left periphery. In L. Haegeman (Ed.), *Elements of Grammar* (pp. 281-337). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Rizzi, L. (1999). *On the position of Int(errogative) in the Left Periphery of the clause*. Ms., Siena.

Rizzi, L. (2006). On the form of chains: Criterial positions and ECP effects. In L. L.-S. Cheng & N. Corver (Eds.), *Wh-Movement: Moving on* (pp. 97-133). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Rizzi, L., & Roberts, I. (1989). Complex inversion in French. *Probus, 1*, 1-30.

Roberts, I. (1993). *Verbs and Diachronic Syntax: A Comparative History of English and French*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Roberts, I. (2005). *Principles and parameters in a VSO language: a case study in Welsh*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Roberts, I. (2007). *Diachronic Syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Roberts, I., & Roussou, A. (1999). A formal approach to "grammaticalization". *Linguistics, 37*, 1011-1041.

Roberts, I., & Roussou, A. (2003). *Syntactic Change: A Minimalist Approach to Grammaticalization*: Cambridge University Press.

Roberts, I., & Holmberg, A. (2005). On the role of parameters in Universal Grammar: a reply to Newmeyer. In H. Broekhuis (Ed.), *Organizing grammar: Linguistici studies in Honor of hen van Riemsdijk* (pp. 538-553). The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter.

Roberts, I., & Holmberg, A. (2010). Introduction: Parameters in Minimalist theory. In T. Biberauer, A. Holmberg, I. Roberts & M. Sheehan (Eds.), *Parametric variation: Null subjects in minimalist theory* (pp. 1-57). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Robertson, A. T. (1934). *A grammar of the Greek New Testament in the light of historical research*. Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman Press.

Robinson, J. A. T. (1976). *Redating the New Testament*. Philadelphia, PA: The Westminster Press.

Rochemont, M. S. (1986). *Focus in Generative Grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Rohrbacher, B. W. (1999). *Morphology-Driven Syntax, A Theory of V to I raising and pro-drop*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Rooth, M. (1985). *Association with Focus*. PhD diss., University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Ross, J. R. (1967). *Constraints on variables in syntax*. PhD diss., MIT, Cambridge, Mass. .

Roussou, A. (1998). Wh-Interrogatives from Classical Greek to Modern Greek. In S. Lambropoulou (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 12th International Symposium of Theoretical and Applied Linguistics, April. 2-4*. Thessaloniki.

Roussou, A., & Tsimpli, I.-M. (2006). On Greek VSO again!. *Journal of Greek Linguistics, 42*, 317-354.

Rudin, C. (1988). On multiple questions and multiple wh-fronting. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory, 6*, 445-501.

Schachter, P. (1973). Focus and relativization. *Language, 49*, 19-46.

Schwabe, K., & Winkler, S. (2007). *On information structure, form and meaning*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Sevdali, C. (2005). Tense and Ancient Greek infinitives. In M. Coene & L. Tasmovski (Eds.), *On space and time in language* (pp. 129-150). Cluj-Napoca: Clusium.

Sheehan, M. (2010). 'Free' inversion in Romance and the Null Subject Parameter. In T. Biberauer, A. Holmberg, I. Roberts & M. Sheehan (Eds.), *Parametric Variation: Null Subjects in Minimalist Theory* (pp. 231-262). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Simpson, J. (1991). *Warlpiri Morpho-Syntax*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Sinopoulou, O. (2008). Multiple questions and apparent wh-in-situ: evidence from GreekProceedings of ConSOLE XV, 2008 (pp. 223-246). Leiden University.

Smith, C. (1964). Determiners and relative clauses in a generative grammar of English. *Language, 40*, 37-52.

Smyth, H. W. (1984). *Greek Grammar, revised by G.M. Messer*: Harvard University Press.

Sportiche, D. (1988). A Theory of Floating Quantifiers and its Corollaries for Constituent Structure. *Linguistic Inquiry, 19*, 425-451.

Sproat, R. (1985). Welsh synax and VSO structure. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory, 3*, 173-216.

Srivastav, V. (1991). The syntax and semantics of correlatives. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory, 9*, 637-686.

Strawson, P. F. (1964). Identifying reference and truth-values. *Theoria, 30*(2), 96-118.

Steele, S. (1978). Word order variation: a typological survey. In J. H. Greenberg (Ed.), *Universals of human language* (Vol. 4, pp. 585-623). Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Stjepanović, S. (2003). Multiple wh-fronting in Serbo-Croatian matrix questions and the matrix sluicing construction. In C. Boeckx & K. K. Grohmann (Eds.), *Multiple wh-fronting* (pp. 255-285). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Stowell, T. (1989). Raising in Irish and the projection principle. *Natural Language and*

Linguistic Theory, 7, 317-359.

Svenonius, P. (Ed.). (2002). *Subjects, expletives and the EPP*. Oxford/ New York: Oxford University Press.

Szendröi, K. (2002). Stress-focus correspondence in Italian. In C. Beyssade, R. Bok-Bennema, D. F. & P. Monachesi (Eds.), *Romance languages and linguistic theory 2000. Selected papers from 'Going Romance' 2000, Utrecht, 30 November- 2 December* (pp. 287-303). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Szendröi, K. (2003). A stress-based approach to the syntax of Hungarian focus. *The Linguistic Review, 20*, 37-78.

Taraldsen, K. T. (1980). On the nominative island constraint, vacuous application and the that-trace filter *Indiana Linguistics Club*. Bloomington, Indiana.

Taylor, A. (1994). The Change from SOV to SVO in Ancient Greek. *Language Variation and Change, 6*, 1-37.

Terry, B. R. (1993). *An analysis of certain features of discourse in the New Testament book of I Corinthians*. PhD, University of Texas at Arlington.

Tischendorf, C. (1862). Bibliorum Codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus. St. Petersburg, 1862. 4 vols. New Testament volume 4. Reprinted in Hildersheim, 1969.

Tischendorf, C. (1867). *Novum Testamentum Vaticanum post Angeli Maii aliorumque imperfectos labores ex ipso codice edidit Æ.F.C. Tischendorf [The Vatican New Testament, after the imperfect work of Angelo Mai and others, edited from the manuscript itself]*. Leipsig: Giesecke et Devrient.

Tischendorf, C. (1869). *The New Testament: The Authorised English Version; With Introduction, and Various Readings From the Three Most Celebrated Manuscripts of the Original Greek Text*. Leipzig: Bernhard Tauchnitz.

Torrego, E. (1984). On inversion in Spanish and some of its effects. *Linguistic Inquiry, 15*, 103-129.

Torrego, E. (1985). *On empty categories in nominals*. Ms., University of Massachusetts. Boston.

Tsimpli, I.-M. (1990). The clause structure and word order of Modern Greek. *UCL working papers in linguistics, 2*, 226-255.

Tsimpli, I.-M. (1995). Focusing in Modern Greek. In K. É.Kiss (Ed.), *Discourse configurational languages* (pp. 176-206): Oxford University Press.

Tsimpli, I.-M., & Roussou, A. (1996). Negation and polarity items in Modern Greek. *The Linguistic Review, 13*, 49-81.

Tzartzanos, A. (1963). *Neoeliniki sintaksis (Modern Greek Syntax)*. Athens: OEDV.

Uriagereka, J. (1995). Aspects of the syntax of clitic placement in western Romance. *Linguistic Inquiry, 26*, 79-123.

Vallduví, E., & Vilkuna, M. (1998). On Rheme and Kontrast. In P. Culicover & L. McNally (Eds.), *The limits of syntax* (pp. 79-106). New York: Academic Press.

van Valin, R. D., & Lapolla, R. J. (1997). *Syntax. Structure, meaning and form*: Cambridge University Press.

Vergnaud, J.-R. (1974). *French relative clauses*. PhD diss., MIT.

Vermeulen, R. (2008). *Topics in Japanese: A unified analysis of contrastive and non-contrastive topics*. Unpublished ms. University College London.

Vikner, S. (1994). Scandinavian object shift and West Germanic scrambling. In N. Corver & H. van Riemsdijk (Eds.), *Studies on scrambling: movement and non-movement approaches to free word order phenomena* (pp. 487-515). Berlin/ New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Vikner, S. (1995). *Verb Movement and Expletive Subjects in the Germanic Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Vikner, S. (1997). V-to-I movement and inflection for person in all tenses. In L. Haegeman (Ed.), *The New Comparative Syntax* (pp. 189-213). London: Longman

Vikner, S. (2005). Object shift. In H. van Riemsdijk & M. Everaert (Eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax* (pp. 392-436). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

de Vries, M. (2002). *The syntax of relativization*. PhD diss., University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam.

de Vries, M. (2004). Head-internal relative clauses in Dutch? In L. Cornips & J. Doetjes (Eds.), *Linguistics in the Netherlands 2004* (pp. 193-204). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

de Vries, M. (2006). The syntax of appositive relativization: On specifying coordination, false free relatives, and promotion. *Linguistic Inquiry, 37*, 229-270.

Ward, G., & Birner, B. (1995). Definiteness and the English Existential. *Language, 71*, 722-742.

Watt, J. M. (2000). The current landscape of diglossia studies: The diglossic continuum in first-century Palestine. In S. E. Porter (Ed.), *Diglossia and other topics in New Testament linguistics*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Webster, J. J. (Ed.). (2009). *The essential Halliday*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Westcott, B.F. & F.J.A. Hort. (1881). *The New Testament in the Original Greek*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Weymouth, R.F. (1892). *The Resultant Greek Testament: Exhibiting the text in which the majority of modern editors are agreed, and containing the readings of Stephens (1550), Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf, Lightfoot, Ellicott, Alford, Weiss, The Bale Edition (1880), Westcott and Hort, and the revision committee*. New York: Funk & Wagnalls.

Woolford, E. (2006). Lexical Case, inherent Case, and argument structure. *Linguistic Inquiry, 37*, 111-130.

Young, K. M. (1988). *Multiple case assignments*. PhD diss., MIT.

Zanuttini, R. (1991). *Syntactic properties of sentential negation: A comparative study of the Romance languages*. PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Zanuttini, R. (1997). *Negation and clausal structure*. New York/ Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zeijlstra, H. (2004). *Sentential negation and negative concord*. PhD diss., University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam.

Appendix I: Criteria for the clauses included in Chapter 2, Section 4.

I. Clausal elements and structure

1 The clause contains at least an S, V and O

Table 4 in Section 4.2 contains clauses that contain at least an S, V and O, I do include clauses that contain more than just these elements. Indirect objects (IOs), prepositional phrases (PPs), negation, particles and adverbs can also be present in the clauses, and can intervene between S, V and O. For example, I include the SVO clause in (1), where an adverb occurs initially, and negation intervenes between the S and V.

(1) ADV-(dé)-S-NEG-V-O (included)
ho:saúto:s dè kaì hoi heptà
similarly PCL also D.NOM.SG.M seven.INDCL
ou katélipon tékna
NEG leave.3PL.AOR.IND.ACT child.ACC.PL.N
'And similarly, the seven did not leave children.'
ώσαύτως δὲ καὶ οἱ ἑπτὰ οὐ κατέλιπον τέκνα (Lk 20:31)

2 The clause is continuous

The clause is not necessarily an isolated sentence. I include, for example, the apodoses of conditionals, and conjoined clauses. I also include clauses like (2).

(2) S V O [PARTP] (included)
kaì hoi telô:nai edikaío:sin
and D.NOM.PL.M publican.NOM.PL.M justify.3PL.PRES.IND.ACT
tòn t^{h}eòn [baptist^{h}éntes …]
D.ACC.SG.M God.ACC.SG.M baptize.NOM.PL.AOR.PART.PAS
'And the publicans justified God, being baptized (with the baptism of John).'
καὶ οἱ τελῶναι ἐδικαίωσιν τὸν θεὸν βαπτισθέντες (τὸ βάπτισμα Ἰωάννου) (Lk 7:29)

In (2), a participial clause (PARTP) modifies the subject of the MC. The PARTP does not interrupt the MC elements, occurring following all of them. I include clauses like these, whether the participial clause refers to the S or the O.

However, I don't include clauses in which Ss or Os are modified by subordinate clauses that interrupt the elements of the MC. An example of this excluded case is given in (3).

(3) S [PARTP] VO (excluded)
pâs anè:r [proseuk^{h}ómenos
each.NOM.SG.M man.NOM.SG.M pray.NOM.SG.M.PRES.PART.MID
è: prop^{h}e:teúo:n] […]
or prophesy.NOM.SG.M.PRES.PART.ACT
kataisk^{h}únei tè:n kep^{h}alè:n
dishonour.3SG.PRES.IND.ACT D.ACC.SG.M head.ACC.SG.M
autoû
his.GEN.SG
'Every man, when praying or prophesying, (and having his head down), dishonours his head.'
πᾶς ἀνὴρ προσευχόμενος ἢ προφητεύων (κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων) καταισχύνει τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ· (1 Cor 11:4)

In (3), the S *pâs anè:r* "every man", is interrupted from the finite V, *kataisk^{h}únei* "dishonours" by three participial clauses. The first two are disjunct, "praying or prophesying", and the third, "having his head covered" is appositional to these, i.e., is also used predicatively. I have left the third participial clause out of the glossed example.

I exclude this construction from the pool of clauses because the relationship between the S and the finite V is not at all straightforward, and the structure is likely different from a regular SVO clause. Similarly, I would exclude clauses in which a participial clause modifying an O intervenes between O and the other main clause elements, however I have not found this.

- **S and O are not embedded in a participial clause (PARTP)**

This criterion is related to the restriction just stated about participial arguments, or participial clauses. Consider the clause in (4).

(4) [$_{PartP}$…S…] V O (excluded)
[Idô:n dè ho hekatontárk^{h}e:s
see.NOM.SG.M.PRES.PART.ACT PCL D.NOM.SG.M centurion.NOM.SG.M
tò genómenon]
D.ACC.SG.N happen.ACC.SG.N.AOR.PART.MID
edóxasden tòn t^{h}eòn
glorify.3SG.IMPF.IND.ACT D.ACC.SG.M god.ACC.SG.M
'And seeing what was done, the centurion glorified God.'
Ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ ἑκατοντάρχης τὸ γενόμενον ἐδόξαζεν τὸν θεὸν (Lk 23:47)

The nominative participial clause *Idô:n dè ho hekatontárk^{h}e:s tò genómenon* "The centurion seeing what was done", appears preceding the MC, *edóxasden tòn t^{h}eòn* "[he] glorified God". *Ho hekatontárk^{h}e:s* "the centurion" seems to be the subject of the MC and of the participial clause. In this instance, this subject occurs in a medial position, i.e., is embedded within the PARTP.

The structure of this bi-clausal construction is unclear. How are these clauses linked? Since the relationship between the DP and the finite verb is so unclear, I leave these constructions out.

II. The Verb

3 The verb is transitive

As stated in section 4.1, the verb must be finite, and transitive. This requirement excludes all instances of the following copular verbs, as well as all intransitive predicates. Some examples are given in (5) and (6).

(5) Copular predicates (excluded)

εἰμί	γίνομαι	ὑπάρχω
eimí	gígnomai	hupárk^{h}o:
"be"	"become"	"be"

(6) Intransitive verbs (excluded)

-ἔρχομαι	πορεύμαι
-érk^{h}omai	poreúomai
"come", "go"	"travel", "jouney", "depart"

4 The verb assigns ACC, GEN, or DAT to an argument that is a patient or theme

I consider direct objects to be patients or themes. They most often occur in the accusative case in Greek, but not always. Certain verbs consistently occur with patients that carry dative or genitive case. In some cases, the V carries a prepositional prefix, and the case that this preposition assigns is the case that appears on the direct object. I include clauses with these verbs. The ones I have found in my survey are in (7). If a prepositional prefix occurs, it is bolded.

(7) Verbs that take non-accusative Os (included)
βοηθέω (boe:t^{h}é:o:), "help", "assist" + DAT (Rev 12:16)
προσρήγνυμι (**pros**ré:gnumi), "dash against" + DAT (Lk 6:48)
ἐπετίμαω (**ep**etímao:), "rebuke" + DAT (Lk 9:42)
ἐξουσιάζω (**ex**ousiásdo:), "exercise power over" + GEN (1 Cor 7:4)
μιμνήσκω (mimné:sko:), "remind" +GEN (Mt 26:75)
ὑπομμνήσκω (**hupo**mimné:sko:), "remind" +GEN (Lk 22:61)

- **The verb consists of one word**

That the verb must consist of one word covers the following restrictions.

• The verb is not periphrastic

I exclude periphrastic verbal forms, which contain an auxiliary (AUX) and a participial (PART).[87] These are not very common in the NT, but there are a significant number of them. Consider (8), which contains the finite auxiliary *estin* "is", and the participle *poioûn* "making".

(8) Periphrastic verb (excluded)
ou gàr **estin** déndron kalòn
NEG PTCL is.3SG.PRES.IND.ACT tree.NOM.SG.N good.NOM.SG.N
poioûn kárpòn saprón
make.NOM.SG.N.PRES.PART.ACT fruit.ACC.SG.M rotten.ACC.SG.M
'For, a good tree does not make rotten fruit, (nor does a rotten tree make good fruit).'
οὐ γὰρ ἐστιν δένδρον καλὸν ποιοῦν κάρπὸν σαπρόν (οὐδὲ πάλιν δένδρον σαπρὸν ποιοῦν καρπὸν καλόν.) (Lk 6:43)

The practical reason for excluding these constructions is that the auxiliary is often split from the participle in the string, and it's unclear which should be treated as the verb.

Aside from this, there are various possible readings and structures of the clause in (16), and other sequences of AUX…PART. With respect to (16), an episodic reading would mean that at the moment of the utterance there was no good tree in the middle of making rotten fruit. All Bible translations give this clause a gnomic (generic) interpretation, meaning that as a general rule, a good tree doesn't make rotten fruit.

Aside from the semantic interpretation, the structure of (16) is unclear. The possible parses, and paraphrases of these are summarized below.

i. True periphrastic construction (*déndron kalón*, "a good tree" is the subject of the AUX):
lit., "A good tree isn't making rotten fruit."
ii. Negative existential construction:
lit, "There is not a good tree making rotten fruit."
iii. Cleft construction:
lit, "It is not the good tree making rotten fruit"
iv. Predicative adjective reading (*déndron*, "tree" is the subject of the AUX):
lit., "A tree is not good, [if/when] making rotten fruit."

• The verb is not a modal + infinitival

I exclude modal verbs with infinitival complements, such as (9).

[87] I use 'periphrastic' rather loosely, referring to sequences of AUX… PART.

(9) Infinitival complement (excluded)
t^{h}emélion gàr állon oudeìs
foundation.ACC.SG.M PRTCL other.ACC.SG.M no-one.NOM.SG.M
dúnatai t^{h}eînai
can.3SG.PRES.IND.MID put.AOR.INFIN.ACT
'For, no one can lay another foundation (than what is laid).'
θεμέλιον γὰρ ἄλλον οὐδεὶς δύναται θεῖναι (παρὰ τὸν κείμενον)
(1 Cor 3:11)

- **The predicate is not complex**

I exclude clauses with complex predicates containing the light verb *ék^{h}o:* "have". A fairly common example is the complex *k^{h}reían ék^{h}o:* "have need", or "need". It occurs with a genitive complement, which is the thing needed. For example, in (10), *k^{h}reían* "need" occurs preverbally, and the genitive complement *toû he:líou* "the sun" occurs postverbally.

(10) Complex predicate *k^{h}reían ék^{h}ei* (excluded)
kaì he: polis ou **k^{h}reían**
and D.NOM.SG.F city.NOM.SG.F NEG need.ACC.SG.F
ék^{h}ei **toû he:líou**
have.3SG.PRES.IND.ACT D.GEN.SG.M sun.GEN.SG.M
'And the city does not have need of the sun.'
καὶ ἡ πόλις οὐ χρείαν ἔχει τοῦ ἡλίου (Rev 21:23)

III. The arguments

5 Arguments are DPs or QPs

I include clauses with arguments that are either NP/DPs (Determiner Phrases) or QPs (Quantifier Phrases). This includes nouns, and many other categories. For example, proper names are syntactically NP/DPs, so I include them. Various other categories, such as adjectives and adverbs are used as DPs (substantivized) with the article, and I include these as arguments. The constituents may also contain additional genitive complements or adjectives. Examples of the types of phrases included as DPs are summarized in Table 1.

DP	Example
Bare noun (anarthrous noun)	φίλους p^{h}ílous friend.ACC.PL.M (Lk 12:30) ((1) above) "friends"
Noun + indefinite	ἄνθρωπός τις ánt^{h}ro:pós tis man.NOM.SG.M INDEF.NOM.SG.M "a man" (Lk 14:6) ((61) below)
Article + noun	τὸν κύριον tòn kúrion D.ACC.SG.M lord.ACC.SG.M "the lord" (Lk 1:46) ((2) above)
Bare proper name	Ἀβραὰμ Abraam "Abraham" (Mt 1:2)((1) above)
Article + proper name	τὸν Ἰσαακ tòn Isaak D.ACC.SG.M Isaac, "Isaac" (Mt 1:2)((1) above)
Article + adjective	ὁ ἄγαμος ho ágamos D.NOM.SG.M unmarried.NOM.SG.M "the unmarried [one]" (1 Cor 7:32)
Article + genitive[88]	τὰ τοῦ κυρίου tà toû kuríou D.ACC.PL.N D.GEN.SG.M lord.GEN.SG.M "the [things] of the lord" (1 Cor 7:32)
Article + adverb	τοὺς ἔξω toùs éxo: D.ACC.PL.M without "the [ones] without" (1 Cor 5:13)
Article + pronoun	τὸ ἑαυτοῦ tò heautoû D.ACC.SG.N himself.GEN.SG.M "the [thing] of his own" (1 Cor 10:24)

Table 1: DPs included as arguments

The quantified expressions that I find as arguments are summarized in Table 2. I organize these into the categories strong and weak, as distinguished in Milsark (1977).

[88] I have only found this in First Corinthians.

QP	Q type	Example
Bare Q	Strong	ἕκαστος hékastos each.NOM.SG.M "each [man]" (1 Cor 3:8) ((35) above)
	Strong (negative)	οὐδεῖς oudeis no-one.NOM.SG.M "no-one" (Lk 5:37)
Article + Q	Weak	οἱ ἑπτά hoi heptà D.NOM.PL.M seven.INDCL "the seven" (Lk 20:31)
Demonstrative + Q	Strong	ταῦτα πάντα taûta pánta DEM.ACC.PL.N all.ACC.PL.N "all these things" (L 13:30) ((8)above)
Q + article + noun	Strong	πάντα τὰ ῥήματα pánta tà r^{h}é:mata all.ACC.PL.N D.ACC.PL.N thing.ACC.PL.N (Lk 2:51)
Article + Q + noun	Weak	αἱ ἑπτὰ βρονταὶ hai heptà brontaì D.NOM.PL.F seven.INDCL thunder.NOM.PL.F "the seven thunders" (Rev 10:3)
Q + noun	Strong	πᾶσα σάρξ pâsa sàrx all.NOM.SG.F flesh.NOM.SG.F "all flesh" (Lk 3:6)
	Weak	πέντε μνᾶς pénte mnâs five.INDCL mina.ACC.PL.F "five minas" (Lk 19:18)
Q + GenP (partitive)	Weak	εἷς τις ἐξ αὐτῶν one.NOM.SG.M "one of these" (Lk 22:50)

Table 2: QPs included as arguments

6 Arguments are not pronominal forms

Pronouns are known to behave differently syntactically than NP/DPs. The position of clitic pronominals, such as the indefinite pronoun *tis* is also partly due to phonology. Therefore, the arguments considered must not consist entirely of

pronouns.

(11) Pronominal O (excluded)
Tóte paralambánei **autòn** ho diábolos
then take.3SG.PRES.IND.ACT him.ACC.SG D.NOM.SG.M devil.NOM.SG.M
'Then the devil took him (into the holy city).'
Τότε παραλαμβάνει αὐτὸν ὁ διάβολος (εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν πόλιν)
(Mt 4:5)

This applies to the pronominal paradigms listed in table 3.

Personal pronouns	**Reflexive pronouns**	**Demonstrative pronouns**	**Indefinite pronouns**
ἐγώ (egó:) "I" (strong & weak forms)	ἐμαυτοῦ (emautoû) "myself"	οὗτος (hoûtos) "this"	τις (tis) "some x", "any x", "a (certain) x"
σύ (sú) "you" (strong & weak forms)	σεαυτοῦ (seautoû) "yourself"	ἐκεῖνος (ekeînos) "that"	
αὐτός (autós) "pro-self" / "him"	ἑαυτοῦ (heautoû) "himself"		

Table 3: bare pronouns excluded as arguments

However, I do include clauses whose arguments contain pronominal forms, along with other elements. For example, example (12) is included, since the pronoun (from the *autós* paradigm) is part of a larger DP.

(12) OVS clause (included)
pánta dè taûta energeî
all.ACC.PL.N PRTCL DEM.ACC.PL.N operate.3SG.PRES.IND.ACT
tò hèn kaì tò autò
D.NOM.SG.N one.NOM.SG.N and D.NOM.SG.N same.NOM.SG.N
pneûma
spirit.NOM.SG.N
'And one and the same spirit works all these things, (distributing to each [one] equally, as he wishes.)'
πάντα δὲ ταῦτα ἐνεργεῖ τὸ ἓν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα, διαιροῦν ἰδίᾳ ἑκάστῳ καθὼς βούλεται. (1 Cor 12:11)

Autós used in this way is traditionally called an adjective pronoun (see Smyth 1984:302, §1205). It has the meaning "the same", when preceded by the definite article. In (12), combined with the other S elements, yields the meaning "one and the

same spirit". Notice also that the O in this example contains the demonstrative *taûta*, but it occurs along with the strong quantifier *pánta*, and so is counted as an object.

If a pronominal S or O is conjoined with a full DP object, I include the clause. In (13) the pronoun *autòn* "him" is conjoined with the QP *pántas toùs sùn autô:i* "all those with him".

(13) O pronoun conjoined with full DP (included)
t^{h}ámbos gàr periésk^{h}en
amazement.NOM.SG.M PCL surround.3SG.AOR.IND.ACT
autòn kaì **pántas toùs sùn autô:i**
him.ACC.SG and all.ACC.PL.M D.ACC.PL.M with him.DAT.SG
'For, he became amazed, and all those with him, (at the catch of fish).'
θάμβος γὰρ περιέσχεν αὐτὸν καὶ πάντας τοὺς σὺν αὐτῷ (ἐπὶ τῇ ἄγρᾳ τῶν ἔχθύων) (Lk 5:9)

Finally, if a pronoun is preceded by the definite article, it is included, as already shown in Table 1.

7 Arguments are continuous strings

If arguments consist of more than one word, the words have to be in continuous strings. For example, the clause in (14) is excluded, as the object consists of both *déka*, "ten" and *mnâs*, "mina" (a currency measure). The first occurs preverbally and the second postverbally. It could be described as SVO or SOV, so I exclude it.

(14) Split argument (excluded)
he: mnâ sou
D.NOM.SG.F mina.NOM.SG.F your.GEN.SG
déka prose:grásato **mnâs**
ten.INDCL produce.3SG.AOR.IND.MID mina.ACC.PL.F
'(Master), your mina made ten minas.'
(κύριε), ἡ μνᾶ σου δέκα προσηργάσατο μνᾶς (Lk 19:16)

8 Arguments are not clausal

I do not include arguments that are clausal, such as participles, relative clauses, infinitivals and indirect questions. I illustrate the restriction against participle subjects in Chapter 2, subsection 4.1. In example (14) therein, the participle is bare.

I also exclude participles that are preceded by the definite article. Example (15) is an illustration of this.

(15) S = participle (excluded)
ho dè **egert^{h}eìs**
D.NOM.SG.M and wake.NOM.SG.M.AOR.PART.PAS
parélaben tò paidíon …
take.3SG.AOR.IND.ACT the.ACC.SG.N child.ACC.SG.N
'And he, when he awoke, took the child (and his mother by night, and departed into Egypt.)'
ὁ δὲ ἐγερθεὶς παρέλαβεν τὸ παιδίον καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ νυκτὸς καὶ ἀνεχώρησεν εἰς Αἴγυπτον, (Mt 2:14)

The participle *egert^{h}eìs* "having awoken" inflects with nominative morphology, and is preceded by the definite article, and so the D and the participle could form a constituent of the MC, "the one who awoke took the child". However, none of the standard translations give this interpretation. They give a translation structured like the one I have given below the example, where the participial clause is used predicatively, "when he awoke", or "having awoken". Such a translation reflects a structure where there is no explicit subject of the participial clause or the main clause, other than the determiner, which would function as an independent pronoun.

The article is actually found quite commonly in the nominative with no complement of any kind, as the example in (16) illustrates.

(16) **hoi** dè eîpan autô:i
D.NOM.PL.M PRTCL say.3PL.AOR.IND.ACT him.DAT.SG
'(And when he had gathered all the chief priests and scribes of the people together, he demanded of them where Christ would be born).'
(καὶ συναγαγὼν πάντας τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ γραμματεῖς τοῦ λαοῦ ἐπυνθάνετο παρ' αὐτῶν ποῦ ὁ Χριστὸς γεννᾶται). (Mt 2:5)

In (16) the D occurs with no complement, morphologically agreeing with the verb *eîpan* "they said". The D resumes referents from the previous discourse, in this case, the chief priests and scribes of the people. It behaves like an independent pronoun. This opens up the possibility that nominative participles following the definite article do not necessarily form constituents with these articles. I exclude all arguments made of participles to be consistent.

Example (17) illustrates a clause in which the object is the free relative clause "[a place] where he shall lay his head" is the object of the negated finite verb *ék^{h}ei* "have". The clause is excluded.

(17) O = Adjunct free relative clause (excluded)
ho dè huiòs (…) ouk ék^{h}ei
D.NOM.SG.M PRTCL son.NOM.SG. NEG have.3SG.PRES.IND.ACT
poû tè:n kep^{h}alè:n klíne:i
where D.ACC.SG.F head.ACC.SG.F lay.3SG.PRES.SUBJ.ACT
'but the son (of man) does not have anywhere to lay his head.'
ὁ δὲ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἔχει ποῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν κλίνῃ.
(Mt 8:20; Lk 9:58)

Appendix II: Citations corresponding to Table 4, Chapter 2

Matthew

SVO (52)	VSO (7)	OVS (3)	SOV (2)
1:1 – 1:16[89]	9:35	10:5	8:20
3:4	10:21	13:34	16:4
6:15	13:41	27:1	
9:16	14:1		
11:27	17:1		
12:35	19:5		
13:22	22:24		
19:11			
21:1			
21:8			
21:28			
24:29			
25:4			
26:20			
26:65			

Luke

SVO (14)	VSO (13)	SOV (5)	VOS (3)	OVS (1)	OSV (1)
1:13	1:32	6:33	5:29	2:35	12:30
2:51	1:46	7:30	7:6		
5:9	3:6	9:58	16:14		
5:26	5:37	10:42			
5:37	6:48	11:39			
6:45	7:16				
6:45	9:42				
7:29	10:1				
14:16	15:27				
15:11	16:8				
16:15	19:43				
19:18	22:50				
20:9	22:61				
20:31					

[89] Within verses 1-16, there are 38 SVO clauses listing the genealogy of Christ.

First Corinthians

SOV (13)	SVO (8)	OVS (5)	OSV (2)	VOS (1)
3:8	2:14	1:27	2:11	15:33
4:9	2:15	1:27	5:13	
6:9-10	3:20	1:28		
6:14	7:32	5:7		
7:2	7:34	7:28		
7:2	12:18	12:11		
7:3	12:24			
7:4	15:38			
7:4				
10:3				
10:24				
11:21				
14:26				

Revelation

VSO (12)	SVO (11)	SOV (1)
7:17	12:4	22:11
8:15	13:2	
9:6	16:3	
10:3	16:4	
12:16	16:8	
12:16	16:10	
14:19	16:12	
16:21	16:17	
18:5	20:6	
18:21	20:13	
20:13	21:24	
22:19		