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THE USE OF THE PERIPHRASTIC CONSTRUCTION IN THE NEW TESTAMENT
WITH REFERENCE TO MATTHEW 16:19 AND 18:18

ὅ ἐὰν δῆσῃς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔσται δεδεμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς
cαι ὃ ἐὰν λύσῃς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔσται λελυμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (Matt 16:19)

ὅσα ἐὰν δήσητε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔσται δεδεμένα ἐν οὐρανῷ
cαι ὃσα ἐὰν λύσητε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔσται λελυμένα ἐν οὐρανῷ (Matt 18:18)

I. INTRODUCTION
Matthew 16:19 and 18:18 are two difficult NT passages. The issues that contribute to their
difficulty are theological, historical, and linguistic. Among the several linguistic issues over
which much ink has been spilled is the issue of the future perfect periphrastic constructions that
are used in both passages. This paper will examine the form and meaning of the periphrastic
construction in general to enable a better interpretation of the verbs in these two passages in
particular.

II. OVERVIEW OF PERIPHRASTICS
The first section of this paper will give an overview of the periphrastic constructions. The first
part of the section will examine the definition and form of periphrastics.
1. Definition and Form

The question of what constitutes a periphrastic construction is a more difficult question that it first appears.\(^1\) An appropriate provisional definition might be the one supplied by Robert E. Green: “A periphrastic is a ‘be’ verb in combination with a participle forming a single verbal unit.”\(^2\) This definition, though it is preliminary, highlights several components that make up periphrastic constructions: (1) a “be” verb, (2) a participle, and (3) the two form a single unit. This first section will examine the issue of how periphrastics are defined, then examine the

\(^1\) Robert E. Green, *Understanding Eimi Periphrastics in the Greek of the New Testament* (Ph.D. diss.; Clarks Summit, PA: Baptist Bible Seminary, 2012), 7. He believes there is no real unanimity about how to define the periphrastic: “. . . there has simply been no consensus regarding the definition of a periphrastic . . . even the question of which verbs can serve as an auxiliary remains as an open question” (p. 85). Green’s dissertation, completed under Rodney Decker, is a must-read on the topic of periphrastic constructions. In it, he attempts to answer three questions: (1) how to identify the periphrastic; (2) how to parse the periphrastic; which is concerned with the question of what each element contributes to the construction as a whole; (3) what the construction means (pp. 6–11). Green claims that there are 211 passages with periphrastics, and 243 periphrastics in the NT (p. 12). He makes two assumptions that shape his final count: 1) syntax is the primary defining factor for what constitutes a periphrastic (formal rather than functional definition, on which see below), and 2) the only auxiliary verb under consideration is εἰμί. While not every one of his conclusions was equally persuasive, his dissertation was extremely helpful for especially the first part of this paper.

\(^2\) Green, *Understanding Eimi Periphrastics*, 3. With regard to origin, James L. Boyer says that periphrastic constructions are more common in Hellenistic Greek than in Classical Greek (James L. Boyer, “The Classification of Participles: A Statistical Study,” *GTJ* 5.2 [1984], 171). However, there is debate regarding the role of Semiticism in the development of this construction. BDF say that “Since, however, the Hellenistic language (even the more vernacular of the papyri) is familiar with this development only to a very limited degree . . . and since, on the other hand, the frequency of NT examples is highest in Lk (Gospel and first half of Acts) then Mark (less in Mt), this idiom, which is just possible in Greek, was at least strongly supported by the extensive Semitic use of such periphrases, especially in the imperfect” (Friedrich Blass, Albert Debrunner, and Robert W. Funk. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961], §353). Moulton likewise says that “No one denies that periphrasis is thoroughly Greek . . . It is only that where Aramaic sources underlie the Greek, there is inordinate frequency of a use which Hellenistic has not conspicuously developed” (James Hope Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek, Vol. 1: Prolegomena*, 3rd ed. [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1908], 226). Green says that “it is agreed that the periphrastic is a Greek construction since examples of periphrastics can be found throughout the history of the language. There remains a difference on the relative importance of the Semitic languages among the scholars, but most scholars would allow for Semitic enhancement, even if they were reluctant to commit to Semitic influence. Even in the midst of the differences, however, it is generally agreed that the combination of an auxiliary and a present participle would be a logical extension of the prevalent use of an auxiliary with a perfect participle” (Green, *Understanding Eimi Periphrastics*, 85). See also Buist M. Fanning, *Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek* (Oxford Theological Monographs; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 316–317; K. L. McKay, *A New Syntax of the Verb in New Testament Greek: An Aspectual Approach* (New York: Peter Lang, 1994), 9.
various parts of the construction, and conclude with a set of criteria for distinguishing periphrastics.

**Definition**

According to Green, periphrastics can be defined either by their form or by their function.\(^3\) He cites T. V. Evans and Buist M. Fanning as examples of scholars who define periphrastic based on function (emphasizing that what makes a construction periphrastic is that it functions as “a substitute for a finite form”).\(^4\) Fanning defines periphrasis as follows: “Periphrasis with the participle consists essentially of a *participle* used in connection with another *verb-form* . . . in such a way that the two function together as a unit, as a verb-phrase which is equivalent or nearly equivalent to a simple (or ‘monolectic’) verb.”\(^5\) McKay’s definition is also functional. He says regarding periphrastics, “Under this heading I include any combination of verb forms which equals or approximates the meaning of another single verb inflexion.”\(^6\) Each of these definitions focus on the function of the verb-participle combination as a substitute, or an approximate equivalent to, a finite verb form.

In contrast with the functional definitions, Stanley E. Porter is representative of those who attempt to define periphrastics according to their form.\(^7\) This approach attempts to define the periphrastic according to its formal syntactical features. Porter’s full definition is as follows:

> A periphrastic construction contains, first, a form of the aspectually vague auxiliary verb ἐμί (not γίνομαι or ἔχω, since they are not aspectually vague). Aspectually vague verbs

---

\(^3\) Green, *Understanding Eimi Periphrastics*, 7.

\(^4\) Ibid. Evans defines it as an “auxiliary verb plus participle or infinitive as a near equivalent to a synthetic verbal form” (T. V. Evans, *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch: Natural Greek Usage and Hebrew Interference* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001], 221).

\(^5\) Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 310, italics his.


\(^7\) Green, *Understanding Eimi Periphrastics*, 7–8.
are those very few verbs which “lack choice” in their formal paradigm, in that they are confined to a single stem form and hence offer no corresponding aspectual opposition. Second, a periphrastic construction contains a participle in grammatical agreement with its referent, which participle may either precede or follow the auxiliary but cannot be separated from it by anything more than elements completing the participle (such as adjuncts or complements). According to this understanding of periphrasis, the auxiliary places the periphrasis in its proper modal category, while the participle conveys its verbal aspect.8

This definition focuses on formal features that set it apart from other constructions.

While the formal definition is much clearer about what is included under the heading of “periphrastic,” it is limited in its ability to define the construction because, as Green points out, “Porter’s consistent syntactical qualifications do not describe all the possible constructions whose pragmatics might be the same.”9 In other words, Porter’s formal definition excludes constructions that seem to be genuinely functioning periphrastically.10 For this reason the functional approach to defining the periphrastic seems to be preferred and is the one adopted in this paper.

The Auxiliary Verb

There are a number of words that have been suggested as the auxiliary verb for periphrastic constructions, but the main ones are the verbs of being εἰμί, γίνομαι, and ὑπάρχω.11 Other words

9 Green, Understanding Eimi Periphrastics, 8.
10 McKay rejects Porter’s definition as being too narrow (McKay, A New Syntax of the Verb, 9, 36). He similarly rejects the assertion that εἰμί is aspectually vague, claiming that εἰμί is takes all of the normal aspectual values of the present, imperfect and future, and uses the aorist and prefect tense of γίνομαι to complete the choices (p. 9). Evans also criticizes Porter’s approach: “Porter’s attempt to establish objective formal criteria for identification fails to advance our understanding of the feature, since it includes its own arbitrary judgments and offers a definition of periphrasis rather insensitive to the nuances of the Greek language” (Evans, Verbal Syntax, 255–256).
suggested for the auxiliary include ἔχω and ἄρχομαι. In terms of other structures beyond the finite verb and participle, μέλλω plus the infinitive has been proposed. There is also the question of whether the auxiliary can be a participle (e.g. Eph 4:18–19; Col 1:21), an infinitive (Luke 9:18), or even implied (Acts 2:29). There is a minority of scholars who limit periphrastics exclusively to εἰμί.

On a functional definition, the key is discerning when the auxiliary is combining with the participle (or infinitive) to form a single unit. If verbs other than εἰμί are not to be excluded by definition, then the question is how to discern which verbs are to be included as auxiliaries. One way of delimiting the auxiliaries is to focus on verbs that do not contribute lexical content to the construction. This is supported by Green’s claims (based on Porter) that in the periphrastic, the

---

12 Robertson includes ἔχω as an auxiliary in NT periphrasis (Robertson, Grammar, 375); Fanning states, “Periphrasis with ἔχω and the aorist participle occurs in classical Greek but not in the NT” (Fanning, Verbal Aspect, 310, n. 255). Lane C. McGaughy suggests ἄρχομαι (Lane C. McGaughy, Toward a Descriptive Analysis of Einai As a Linking Verb in New Testament Greek ([Missoula, Mont.]: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972), 80).

13 BDF §356; Green, Understanding Eimi Periphrastics, 7.

14 BDF §352.

15 Boyer, “The Classification of Participles,” 172. Green rejects this as non-periphrastic, but his arguments are not ultimately convincing (Green, Understanding Eimi Periphrastics, 103–108). He rightly notes that “if the infinitive and the participle combine, the resulting combination would function as an infinitive rather than a finite verb form” (p. 107). In this case it may depend on whether periphrastic is defined narrowly (a construction that functions as a finite verb) or broadly (a construction that functions in place of another verbal construction). The present writer is in favor of expanding the definition if necessary to capture all of the phenomena.

16 BDF suggest this example (§353[5]); see also Boyer, who comments that “In a few cases a participle has been identified as periphrastic when an auxiliary is not present but seems to be implied by the sense of the context or by parallels where the same construction has the auxiliary” (Boyer, “The Classification of Participles,” 172).

17 For example, Porter, as mentioned above, and Boyer, who says, “The auxiliary verb is almost always the present or imperfect of εἰμί. Some grammarians tentatively list γίνομαι and ὑπάρχω as also involved, but to the present writer a participle occurring with these verbs seems more probably to be understood as supplementary” (Boyer, “The Classification of Participles,” 172).
participle contributes the lexis to the construction. Similarly, one of the ways that Boyer distinguishes between the predicate adjective use of the participle and the periphrastic use is that “those places where the verbal sense seemed to be primarily in the participle, where the connecting verb was ‘semantically empty,’ were classified as periphrastic.”

Based on this criteria, verbs of being such as εἰμί, γίνομαι, and ὑπάρχω are all potential auxiliaries for periphrastic constructions. On a functional definition it seems possible that other verbs besides these could function as the auxiliary in the periphrastic construction. However, these are the most promising candidate, and among them, εἰμί is by far the most numerous.

Based on an examination of the occurrences, it appears that the auxiliary can be found in the infinitive, the participle, and even implied.

The Participle

The participles used in periphrastic constructions are normally found in the nominative case.

With regard to the tense of the participles used in periphrastics, it is generally agreed that

---

18 Green, Understanding Eimi Periphrastics, 68.
20 In the case of ἔχω, whether it is used outside of the NT as a periphrastic, within the NT writings there do not seem to be any examples (see Appendix 1: Preliminary List of NT Periphrastics; cf. Fanning, Verbal Aspect, 310, n. 255, contra Robertson, Grammar, 375). ἔχω + the infinitive may very well function as a substitute for the future tense, but more study is needed to determine whether it is truly “semantically empty,” or whether it is functioning with its own semantic content, with the infinitive complementing it (see Wallace, Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics, 598–599 for complementary [or supplementary] infinitives).
21 See Appendix 1, where I conclude that there are approximately 255 εἰμί periphrastics, while periphrastics with γίνομαι number five, and periphrastics with ὑπάρχω total two.
22 Fanning, Verbal Aspect, 309. See Appendix 1 for examples of participle, infinitives, and implied verbs which I believe are functioning periphrastically.
23 Boyer points out that there are a few exceptions in which the participle is found in the accusative case (p. 172). He lists Luke 9:18 and Col 1:21. (I would add Luke 11:1 and remove Col 1:21, as the latter verse has an adjective that is predicated by the auxiliary, in addition to the participle, which seems to demonstrate that the participle is functioning as a predicate adjective.) These still follow the general rule because they are cases in which the accusative is expected. In the case of Luke 9:18, “the auxiliary is an infinitive, which has its ‘subject’ in the accusative” (Boyer, “The Classification of Participles,” 172).
periphrastics take either present or perfect participles.\textsuperscript{24} There may be a few aorist participle periphrastics, but these are open to debate, and even if they are granted, they are infrequent.\textsuperscript{25} The expression of verbal aspect in the present and perfect participles seems to be the motivating factor for their use, as well as the non-use of the aorist.

**Syntactical Issues**

There are some other syntactical issues that relate to the formation of the periphrastic. First, there is the matter of word order in periphrastic constructions. The normal word order seems to be finite verb first.\textsuperscript{26} When the participle is fronted, “the effect is to give it focal prominence.”\textsuperscript{27} However there appear to be some cases in which the participle is normally placed first, such as with the words δέον, πρέπον, and ἐξόν.\textsuperscript{28}

Secondly, there is the issue of intervening elements between the participle and the finite verb. Porter says that intervening elements between the verb and the participle must be either a postpositive conjunction, or “adjuncts or complements of the participle.”\textsuperscript{29} Therefore, if there are

\begin{thebibliography}{99}


\bibitem{25} Levinsohn says that periphrastics occur only with the present and perfect tenses (Levinsohn, “Functions of Copula-Participle Combinations,” 307). Porter lists three possible examples (Luke 23:19; Acts 8:13; 2 Cor 5:19), but says that they are “open to question” (Stanley E. Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament* [2nd ed., with corrections; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999], 49). Boyer says that “perhaps” there are aorist periphrastics, and that there are “two very doubtful instances,” namely Luke 23:19 and 2 Cor 5:19 (Boyer, “The Classification of Participles,” 172). BDF accept the presence of aorist periphrastics, and notes that it was “not unknown in classical” (§355). Fanning sees Luke 23:19 and 2 Cor 5:19 as aorist periphrastics, and he says that the “sense of these is similar to the pluperfect” (*Verbal Aspect*, 310, n. 254).

\bibitem{26} Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, 647. Boyer says that “it precedes in only 28 instances” (Boyer, “The Classification of Participles,” 172).

\bibitem{27} Levinsohn, “Functions of Copula-Participle Combinations,” 321.

\bibitem{28} Ibid, 322–323.


\end{thebibliography}
intervening words that “modify or specify the subject,” it is not a periphrastic.\(^{30}\) Levinsohn clarifies that under the description, periphrastics should be thought of as a combination of “εἰμί and a participial clause.”\(^{31}\) Levinsohn, however, disagrees that nothing can intervene except elements of the participial clause.\(^{32}\) For example, he says that it is not uncommon to find the subject following the auxiliary and preceding the participle.\(^{33}\) It is probably best not to prescribe too inflexibly matters of word order as a means for identifying periphrastics.\(^{34}\)

Identifying Periphrastics

Based on the above analysis, a periphrastic can be defined as an auxiliary verb (normally εἰμί or some other verb of being) that combines with a participle to form one verbal idea.\(^{35}\) From this definition a set of criteria can be developed by which periphrastic constructions can be identified in the NT. The following criteria were used to construct the list of participles in Appendix 1 (using the auxiliaries εἰμί, γίνομαι, and ὑπάρχω), based in part off of the work of Green and Fanning.\(^{36}\)

---

\(^{30}\) Green, *Understanding Eimi Periphrastics*, 66.

\(^{31}\) Levinsohn, “Functions of Copula-Participle Combinations,” 308.

\(^{32}\) Ibid., 308–309.

\(^{33}\) Ibid.

\(^{34}\) In agreement with Nicholas Andrew Bailey, who says, “Constituent order is usually not very helpful in identifying the periphrastic construction. In looking at the clear instances, both with and without a lexical subject, it is true that, more often than not, εἰμί and its participle come very close to each other, with either nothing intervening or only words that modify the predicate (postpositive conjunctions can of course occur between εἰμί and the participle). Still, most grammarians assume that several words, including part or all of the subject (against Porter 1994:45), can intervene” (Nicholas Andrew Bailey, *Thetic Constructions in Koine Greek: With Special Attention to Clauses with εἰμί ‘Be,’ γίνομαι ‘Occur,’ ἔρχομαι ‘Come,’ ὑδόι/ὕδε ‘Behold,’ and Complement Clauses of ὁράω ‘See’* [Ph.D. Dissertation; Amsterdam: Vrije Universiteit, 2009], 199).

\(^{35}\) This definition attempts to do justice to the fact that most periphrastics consist of a finite εἰμί combined with a participle, while also not artificially limiting the variety of phenomena that actually occur.

\(^{36}\) See Appendix 1. I include there also occurrences of μέλλω + the infinitive, which may be a form of periphrastic, for the sake of completeness (BDF accept it as a periphrastic; §356). However, I am uncertain as to whether this construction is a true periphrastic, because it is unclear whether μέλλω asserts lexical information in these cases. McKay argues that μέλλω + the infinitive were used “in place of a simple future form” and that “the
Criteria pertaining to the auxiliary:
1. The auxiliary is normally a finite verb of “being” (most frequently εἰμί).  
2. In order for the verb to be an auxiliary, it cannot be functioning independently.  
   - Fanning gives two helpful criteria for when verbs should not be considered auxiliary verbs: “(1) independent εἰμί denoting existence, location, or a quality . . . and (2) equative εἰμί with the participle functioning as a predicate adjective or substantive.”  
   - Some signals that the verb is functioning independently (and therefore not periphrastically) include the following:  
     - The verb is asserting its lexical meaning independent of the participle.  
     - The verb has both subject and predicate nominative.  
     - The presence of locative phrases or adverbs that modify the finite verb rather than the participle and verb combination (Matt 8:30; Mark 7:15).

Criteria Pertaining to the Participle:
1. The participle should be anarthrous. This ensures that the participle is adverbial rather than adjectival (excluding verses such as Matt 3:3).
2. Regarding case, the vast majority of participles will be nominative.

37 These are normally finite verbs, but see Appendix 1 for seven potential non-finite periphrastics: two using an infinitive of εἰμί, two using a participle of εἰμί, and three using an “implied” εἰμί.

38 Fanning, Verbal Aspect, 311

39 One rare situation is when there are datives of possession related to the verb (Acts 21:9, 23)

40 In violation of the principle above that the auxiliary should be “semantically empty.”

41 Green, Understanding Eimi Periphrastics, 112–115.

42 Ibid, 118–134.

43 Ibid, 91.

44 Ibid, 100–112. He has a discussion on whether the accusative participles functioning with an infinitive of εἰμί (such as in Luke 9:18 and 11:1) are periphrastic, and concludes that they are not. However, he helpfully points out that even if it is accepted that they are legitimate periphrastic, this does not “overturn” the general principle that seeks the participle in the nominative case; “it simply expands the periphrastic options beyond the finite form” (p. 109). That is to say, it would remain consistent that the participle must be in the “subject” case (normally nominative, but in the accusatives with infinitives). See also the discussion above on the case of the participle, and note as well the inclusion of Col 1:21 as well.
3. Participles functioning as predicate adjectives are eliminated.⁴⁵ These are easiest to identify when they are syntactically parallel to adjectives (e.g. Matt 10:26; James 3:15; Col 1:21; 1 Tim 3:4; Titus 3:3).⁴⁶ Some cases will be ambiguous.

The last point deserves comment. It can often be difficult to tell the difference between participles functioning as periphrastics and participles functioning as predicate adjectives. Wallace says that this “is particularly problematic with perfect passive participles (in which the simple adjectival idea seems more pronounced than with other participles).”⁴⁷ According to Boyer,

There are obvious similarities; both agree in gender, number and case with the subject of the verb, the same verbs are involved (εἰμί, perhaps γίνομαι), and the sense is similar. Two considerations have been used to help decide. First, those places where the verbal sense seemed to be primarily in the participle, where the connecting verb was “semantically empty,” were classified as periphrastic. Those in which the copulative verb seemed to be predicking to the subject some quality, act or state expressed by the participle were classified as predicate adjectives. . . . . Second, where the participle appears in a list of predications along with predicate adjectives or predicate complements, its parallelism with the other predicates was taken to indicate its own predicate nature, even when it could well have been taken as periphrastic if it had stood alone.⁴⁸

These are helpful criteria. The reality seems to be that the periphrastic, at times, overlaps semantically with the predicate adjective, so that it is hard to make a clean distinction. As a result, there are some ambiguous examples (e.g. 2 Cor 5:19). However, there are real differences between periphrastics and participles functioning as predicate adjectives and there are clear examples which fall into one category or the other, and so making the distinction is correct even if some examples are ambiguous.

---

⁴⁵ This can be difficult (Wallace, Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics, 647, n. 83).
⁴⁶ Green, Understanding Eimi Periphrastics, 115–117.
⁴⁷ Wallace, Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics, 647, n. 83.
2. Meaning

It is appropriate at this point to move from the form to the meaning of the periphrastic construction. This will be looked at first with regard to the periphrastic meaning generally considered, and the meaning of specific periphrastic tenses.

General Meaning

Most work on the meaning of the periphrastic tenses has to take into account the influential work by W. J. Aerts.49 According to Green,

In Aerts’ view, Classical Greek periphrasis was used for one of three possible reasons: (1) substitute periphrasis where the periphrastic and the monolectic forms have no distinction in meaning; (2) suppletive periphrasis when the periphrastic is used to replace a monolectic form that is not available in the language; and (3) expressive periphrasis when the periphrastic is used with some type of emphasis. Aerts revises these categories only slightly as he writes about Koine literature (e.g., with the present Aerts explains that the Koine period included more emphasis on duration called progressive periphrasis; he also explains that the aorist participle used in periphrasis is simply a development of the language).50

The following discussion will follow the three main uses identified by Aerts. This will be supplemented by a brief discussion on the pragmatics of periphrastics.

1. Substitute Periphrasis

Regarding the first category (“substitute periphrasis”), it is often noted that the periphrastic construction sometimes seems to function interchangeably with the finite form (the “monolectic” form) of the verb.51 For example, Boyer says that “In meaning, the periphrastic tenses seem in

---

49 W. J. Aerts, Periphrastica: An Investigation into the Use of Einai and Ekein as Auxiliaries or Pseudo-auxiliaries in Greek from Homer up to the Present Day (Amsterdam: A.M. Hakkert, 1965).

50 Green, Understanding Eimi Periphrastics, 47.

51 BDF §352.
many instances to be no different from their inflected counterparts.”\textsuperscript{52} However, Porter rightly questions whether the two forms should be thought of as exactly synonymous. He clarifies,

Why would the language support two different forms with identical meanings? It is better to say that the two are synonymous denotationally, in the sense that they may on occasion be compatible with the same context, but not with regard to sense, i.e. they are cognitive synonyms, not absolute. For example, if two people are talking in the room next door, one might turn to a companion and say “That’s Dennis and Helen talking,” or “Dennis and Helen are talking next door,” or any number of other sentences that refer to the same event (the truth-conditions are identical), have generally the same sense, and yet would not be synonymous in all contexts, and in fact can be distinguished in this context . . . The same is true of periphrastics in Greek. In answer to the question of whether they serve as substitutes for simple forms, they do often occur in similar contexts, though the periphrastic itself contributes a certain marked semantic meaning on the basis of its construction.\textsuperscript{53}

Therefore, while they might be said to “mean” roughly the same thing as their monolectic counterparts (in terms of “denotative” meaning), we should not think of them as being in all ways synonymous, especially as regards to the pragmatics of a passage.\textsuperscript{54}

\textbf{2. Suppletive Periphrasis}

Aerts’ second category (“suppletive periphrasis”) involves the use of periphrastic constructions in order to supplement defective paradigms for particular tenses or verbs when no corresponding finite forms are available. Green helpfully explains, “There are some periphrastics that do not occur as a result of semantic choice, but are used because that is the only option available to the speaker.”\textsuperscript{55} The periphrastic, in such cases, is chosen “to make up for missing forms within the verbal network.”\textsuperscript{56} The periphrastic construction is used in a suppletive manner for the following

\textsuperscript{52} Boyer, “The Classification of Participles,” 172.
\textsuperscript{54} More on this below, under “expressive” periphrastics.
\textsuperscript{55} Green, \textit{Understanding Eimi Periphrastics}, 47.
\textsuperscript{56} Ibid, 262.
three constructions: the perfect subjunctive, the 3rd person plural of perfect middle/passive form verbs, and the future perfect.\textsuperscript{57}

Regarding the perfect subjunctive, Green says the following:

> It appears that the perfect subjunctive form was dying from the language especially since only perfect subjunctives of οἶδα are in use by NT writers and their contemporaries. It seems best to conclude that this periphrastic form, as a category, is suppletive. Thus, any emphasis for a periphrastic in this category is based on factors such as lexis, discourse or argument flow, and the normal force of a simple perfect expressed through the subjunctive mood.”\textsuperscript{58}

Along these lines, note the fact that the NT periphrastics in the subjunctive are all take a participle in the perfect tense.\textsuperscript{59}

Regarding the third person plural form of perfect middle/passive verbs, Fanning says that “all middle-passive third-person plural forms of verbs whose bases end in a consonant . . . began to lose [their] monolectic forms in the late classical period, and the periphrastic construction filled the gap.”\textsuperscript{60} Bailey agrees: “there is a strong preference in classical and later times for using the periphrastic forms instead of the simple perfect and pluperfect indicative forms when the verb is middle or passive; in fact, this is always so for third person plural forms when the stem ends in a consonant or adds σ (Smyth §405, §408).”\textsuperscript{61}

\textsuperscript{57} Green, \textit{Understanding Eimi Periphrastics}, 263–267. BDF note two of the three of these: “The cases in the NT where periphrasis is necessary include the future perfect and (as already in classical in the passive) the perfect subjunctive (optative), except of course for εἰδο (subjunctive of οἶδα)” (§352).

\textsuperscript{58} Ibid, 265. Cf. Robertson, who says that the perfect subjunctive is seen in the NT only in the periphrastic construction (\textit{Grammar}, 375).

\textsuperscript{59} See Appendix 1.

\textsuperscript{60} Fanning, \textit{Verbal Aspect}, 320; cf. Green, \textit{Understanding Eimi Periphrastics}, 263. McKay says that “in the middle passive the third plural of the perfect and pluperfect tenses of verbs with consonant stems was regularly periphrastic although in the rest of those tenses the simple forms remained more common” (McKay, \textit{A New Syntax of the Verb}, 9).

\textsuperscript{61} Bailey, \textit{Thetic Constructions}, 195, n. 317. This quote was pointed out by Levinsohn, “Functions of Copula-Participle Combinations,” 315.
Regarding the future perfect, it is a rare form, but there seems to be a preference to form it by way of periphrasis rather than the finite form. So Fanning says, “In the NT this periphrastic substitutes entirely for the monolectic future perfect forms which were fading from usage.” This is supported by evidence from the papyri, according to BDF, who claim that “Periphrasis of the fut. perf. is also the rule in the [papyri].” So it seems that for the future perfect, though there is a finite form available, the periphrastic seems to be the preferred form.

The suppletive periphrastic raises the question of whether in such cases the periphrastic has any significance. For example, in Green’s comment about the perfect subjunctive cited above, he says that the suppletive periphrastic has no special “emphasis.” However, perhaps this should be qualified. While it is true that if a verb has both a monolectic and periphrastic form available, there is a meaning distinction, it may not be true that suppletive use of the periphrastic means no more than the monolectic form would. Rather, it might be better to think of suppletive periphrastics as parallel to the middle/passive form, in which two different functions share the same form and are disambiguated by the context. In a similar way, a given suppletive periphrastic might simply be functioning as a replacement for the monolectic form that is missing, or they could be functioning as a true periphrastic; only context would be able to disambiguate them.

---

62 Green, Understanding Eimi Periphrastics, 265–267.
63 Fanning, Verbal Aspect, 322
64 BDF §352.
3. **Expressive Periphrasis**

This last category indicates instances in which the construction communicates “either something different or something beyond the semantic range of the finite form.”\(^65\) Katrin Hauspie says that in the case of expressive periphrasis, “[t]heir presence always produced a special effect.”\(^66\) One kind of expressive periphrastic that is noteworthy is the future periphrastic (the future of εἰμὶ + the present participle).\(^67\) Green points out that out of the several periphrastic tenses, “the future periphrastic is the only one that does not have an exact finite form equivalent.”\(^68\) The present participle allows the periphrastic to attach imperfective aspect to future time action.\(^69\)

Green also lists under the category of expressive periphrastics those that can be shown to have “emphasis” that would not be present with the use of a monolectic verb.\(^70\) He believes that this can be claimed when it is shown that “(1) the periphrastic is not suppletive; (2) that style cannot explain the particular periphrastic use; and (3) that the periphrastic occurs at a place of emphasis in its context.”\(^71\) He concludes that “only about 10% of the periphrastics in the NT can be considered expressive.”\(^72\)

By way of evaluation, it seems helpful to note forms of periphrasis that accomplish something that the finite verb cannot. However, the idea of “emphasis” as expressed by Green is

\(^{65}\) Green, *Understanding Eimi Periphrastics*, 314.


\(^{67}\) Green, *Understanding Eimi Periphrastics*, 315–320.

\(^{68}\) Ibid, 315.

\(^{69}\) Ibid, 316. Cf. BDF, who say that “its use in the future makes it possible to express linear action” (§353[1]).

\(^{70}\) Green, *Understanding Eimi Periphrastics*, 321.

\(^{71}\) Ibid.

\(^{72}\) Ibid, 331.
somewhat vague. It has already been suggested above that while the denotative meaning of the monolectic forms and periphrastics might often be synonymous, it might be unwise to think of them as strictly synonymous constructions. In this sense, there is always a “special effect,” or “something different” about the periphrastic; the question is whether the difference is one of semantics (the denotational meaning) or pragmatics (i.e. the different effect that is brought about by the use of the periphrastic in context).

4. Pragmatics

This seems to indicate that the discussion by Aerts should be supplemented by some consideration of the pragmatics of the periphrastic construction. Levinsohn compares the periphrastic constructions with the finite forms to determine the particular function of the periphrastic. He reasons that

The functions of constructions that are judged to be periphrastic are best determined by comparing them with the equivalent simple (“synthetic”) forms. So, periphrastics with present participles are best compared with simple imperfective forms (presents and imperfects), while periphrastics with perfect participles are best compared with simple perfects and pluperfects.  

In comparing imperfective finite verbs with imperfective periphrastics, he says that the periphrastics tend to be more “stative.” This contrasts with the finite form, which tends to be more “active.” This makes it useful for presenting iterative action, while the finite verb is useful for presenting continuous action. “So, when the copular imperfective is used for iterative events, it is of a more stative nature than the simple imperfect. In other words, it is less dynamic

74 Ibid.
75 Ibid.
than its simple equivalent.”76 He also says that it can occurs at the beginning of a pericope expressing progressive action that functions as background for later action.77

In comparing perfect tense finite verbs with perfect periphrastics, he says that the finite verb is usually “portrayed as a completed event with ongoing (usually stative) results,” while periphrastics are usually “portrayed as an ongoing state (which results from a completed event).”78 He concludes that “copular perfects are less dynamic than their simple equivalents, with the copular form typically used for ongoing states (which result from completed events).”79

Specific Meanings of the Periphrastic Tenses

This section will briefly discuss the meaning of each of the periphrastic tenses.80 Table 1 is a standard presentation of the periphrastic tenses.81

---

76 Levinsohn, “Functions of Copula-Participle Combinations,” 313.
77 Ibid, 314. For the “background-progressive” use he draws on Bailey.
78 Ibid, 317.
79 Ibid, 320.
80 This presentation largely follows Fanning, Verbal Aspect, 312–323. His presentation of the individual periphrastic tenses is the most satisfying. Wallace, though helpful in the numerous examples he gives, does not the meaning of the constructions much (Wallace, Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics, 648–749). Porter’s discussion suffers from a somewhat idiosyncratic nature (Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament 454–478).
81 Some version of this chart can be derived from authors such as Fanning, Evans, Robertson, Wallace (Green, Understanding Eimi Periphrastics, 57–58, 81). Wallace, curiously, omits the future perfect from his discussion (Wallace, Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics, 647–649).
Table 1: The Periphrastic Tenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense of finite verb</th>
<th>Tense of participle</th>
<th>Periphrastic tense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Present periphrastic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfect</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Imperfect periphrastic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Future periphrastic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td>Perfect periphrastic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfect</td>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td>Pluperfect periphrastic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td>Future perfect periphrastic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfect</td>
<td>Aorist</td>
<td>Aorist periphrastic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Present Periphrastic**

Fanning says that the present periphrastic is “infrequent in all of ancient Greek as well as in the NT,” and “developed by analogy with the imperfect periphrastic pattern.” He says that these “are parallel in meaning to the uses of the monolectic present, displaying usually a progressive or customary sense with little difference from the simple present.”

2. **Imperfect Periphrastic**

These are “the most common periphrastic construction in the NT.” The present participle brings its aspectual value to the fore in these constructions, though Fanning notes that “for the most part it is equivalent in meaning to the monolectic imperfect.” They are often used to communicate progressive or customary action.

---

82 This is not usually included in discussions of the periphrastic because of its rarity. The presentation of it in this chart comes from Green (Understanding Eimi Periphrastics, 72) who is dependent on Porter at this point.

83 Fanning, Verbal Aspect, 312.

84 Ibid.

85 Ibid, 313.

86 Ibid, 314.

87 Ibid. On the progressive action use, Fanning says that “One can notice how they provide a descriptive
3. Future Periphrastic

Fanning says that the future periphrastic “occurs almost exclusively in biblical Greek,” with a few occurrences in the LXX and NT.\textsuperscript{88} He says that verbs that are stative by nature take on a future stative meaning in periphrasis, while verbs with more “active” lexemes take on a “progressive or iterative sense.”\textsuperscript{89}

4. Perfect Periphrastics

“Perfect periphrastics contain far more middle-passive participles than active ones (the ratio is 31 to 6), and as a result they predominantly reflect the stative sense common to passive perfects in general.”\textsuperscript{90} The emphasis with these periphrastics tends to be on the resultant state than on the completed action, though the latter occurs as well.\textsuperscript{91} With a few verbs, there is a purely present meaning (for example, with ἵστημι; cf. Acts 5:25; 25:10).\textsuperscript{92}

5. Pluperfect Periphrastic

Fanning says that these constructions are “almost identical” to the monolectic pluperfect verb. Regarding the significance,

The normal use is to denote a state which existed in the past, with implication of a prior occurrence which produced it. Here also the most common voice-form is the middle-passive (the ratio over actives is 38 to 14), and a stative, almost adjectival sense narration of a particular occurrence ‘as it is going on’ or denote something which was in process at the time of another occurrence, with greater stress on the aspectual meaning in some cases” (p. 314). On the customary use, he says that “the imperfect periphrastic denotes a generalized multiple occurrence or one which is characteristic of a broad period” (p. 315). He notes the following total uses of the imperfect periphrastic in the NT writings: “Matt. (6), Mark (15), Luke (28), John (10), Acts (25), 2 Cor. (1), Gal. (2), Phil. (1), and 1 Pet. (1)” (p. 316).

\textsuperscript{88} Fanning, \textit{Verbal Aspect}, 317.
\textsuperscript{89} Ibid, 318.
\textsuperscript{90} Ibid, 319.
\textsuperscript{91} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{92} Ibid, 320.
predominates. But some implication of the occurrence which produced the past state is normally to be found even in these expressions.  

It is more common for pluperfect periphrastics to “highlight a past condition with some reference to the occurrence which produced it,” but there are also instances in which the emphasis is on “the completion of the occurrence in the past and the past state fades into the background.”  

Often these constructions demonstrate “background information” when found in explanatory clauses.  

6. Future Perfect Periphrastic  

This form is seen as a suppletive periphrasis because the monolectic form was falling out of use at the time of the NT. There are six occurrences four future perfect periphrastics in the NT in four passages:  

1. Matt 16:19: δῶσω σοι τὰς κλείδας τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ ὅ ἐὰν δήσης ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔσται δεδεμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ὅ ἐὰν λύσης ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔσται λελυμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς  

2. Matt 18:18: ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅσα ἐὰν δήσητε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔσται δεδεμένα ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ὅσα ἐὰν λύσητε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔσται λελυμένα ἐν οὐρανῷ  


4. Heb 2:13: καὶ πάλιν ἐγὼ ἔσομαι πεποιθός ἐπ’ αὐτῷ καὶ πάλιν ἰδοῦ ἐγὼ καὶ τὰ παιδία ἀμοι ἑδωκέν ὁ θεός  

Hauspie says that in Classical Greek, “the passive future perfect is expressed by a simple verb form . . . [but] the use of a periphrastic construction for a future perfect is not unusual either . . . .”  

The active future perfect mostly appears as periphrasis while the middle and passive future
perfect as simple verb form.”97 However, in the Hellenistic Greek represented by the papyri, “the future perfect formed by εἰμι and perfect participle is even the common construction (the simple form being rather rare), for the active as well as for the middle and passive voice.”98

In terms of meaning, Fanning says that these are rare constructions which “denote the basic sense of the perfect (a condition produced by an antecedent occurrence) moved into future time.”99 Applying Levinsohn’s work (discussed above) to the future perfects, it may be the case that a normal use of the future perfect periphrastic is to indicate “ongoing states (which result from completed events)” in the future.100

7. Aorist Periphrastics

BDF accept the presence of aorist periphrastics, and notes that it was “used to emphasize the verbal idea,” and was “not unknown in classical” (§355). Porter notes that there is debate regarding “whether the Aorist periphrasis has the sense of a Perfect or of an Aorist.”101 He argues, probably correctly, that it is the equivalent of an aorist finite form since the perfect tense already has a periphrastic option.102 His explanation for the rarity of the construction is helpful:

The reason for its recognized infrequency in ancient Greek through to the Hellenistic period may be bound up closely with the less heavily marked nature of its verbal aspect when used in a marked periphrastic construction. Present and Perfect periphrastics are used to mark the semantic meaning of an already more heavily marked form (or the periphrasis is the marked term of the simple/periphrasis opposition), while speakers of Greek do not seem to have required often a marked form of the least heavily marked

97 Hauspie, “Periphrastic Tense Forms,” 136.
98 Ibid.
99 Fanning, Verbal Aspect, 322.
100 Levinsohn, “Functions of Copula-Participle Combinations,” 320. However, we must not push the results of his study too hard, since he specifically studied periphrastics that have distinct monolectic forms in use, and were thereby chosen as an alternative; in the case of the future perfect periphrastics, they tended to be used almost to the exclusion of the monolectic form, so the same kind of contrast probably is not intended.
102 Ibid.
verbal aspect, though the presence of the Aorist periphrasis attests further to the great flexibility of Greek that where such a form is needed it can be provided.\textsuperscript{103}

One need not agree with Porter’s use of markedness theory to appreciate his main insight that the periphrastics are used to provide an alternative for more semantically “heavy” tenses, and since the aorist is used when such tenses are being avoided, there is not much reason for an alternate form of it. His comment that “the presence of the Aorist periphrasis attests further to the great flexibility of Greek that where such a form is needed it can be provided” is also helpful.

III. THE FUTURE PERFECT PERIPHRASTIC CONSTRUCTIONS IN MATTHEW 16:19 AND 18:18

Having looked at the periphrastic construction, it now remains to apply the above information to Matthew 16:19 and 18:18.

Translation Options

Tables 2 and 3 show the various translations of the future perfect periphrastic in comparison to each other and the NA/UBS text.

\textsuperscript{103} Porter, \textit{Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament}, 477.
Table 2: Translations of Matthew 16:19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Matt 16:19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA/UBS</td>
<td>ὃ ἐὰν δήσῃς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐσται δεδεμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, καὶ ὃ ἐὰν λύσῃς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐσται λελυμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASB</td>
<td>. . . whatever you bind on earth shall have been bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth shall have been loosed in heaven.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCSB</td>
<td>. . . whatever you bind on earth is already bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth is already loosed in heaven.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESV</td>
<td>. . . whatever you bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIV</td>
<td>. . . whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth will be loosed in heaven.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRSV</td>
<td>. . . whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth will be loosed in heaven.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISV</td>
<td>Whatever you prohibit on earth will have been prohibited in heaven, and whatever you permit on earth will have been permitted in heaven.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLT</td>
<td>Whatever you forbid on earth will be forbidden in heaven, and whatever you permit on earth will be permitted in heaven.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Message</td>
<td>A yes on earth is yes in heaven. A no on earth is no in heaven.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Translations of Matthew 18:18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Matt 18:18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA/UBS</td>
<td>ὅσα ἐὰν δήσητε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐσται δεδεμένα ἐν οὐρανῷ, καὶ ὅσα ἐὰν λύσητε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐσται λελυμένα ἐν οὐρανῷ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASB</td>
<td>. . . whatever you bind on earth shall have been bound in heaven; and whatever you loose on earth shall have been loosed in heaven.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCSB</td>
<td>. . . Whatever you bind on earth is already bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth is already loosed in heaven.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESV</td>
<td>. . . whatever you bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIV</td>
<td>. . . whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth will be loosed in heaven.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRSV</td>
<td>. . . whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth will be loosed in heaven.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISV</td>
<td>Whatever you prohibit on earth will have been prohibited in heaven, and whatever you permit on earth will have been permitted in heaven.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLT</td>
<td>Whatever you forbid on earth will be forbidden in heaven, and whatever you permit on earth will be permitted in heaven.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Message</td>
<td>A yes on earth is yes in heaven; a no on earth is no in heaven.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some Observations and Arguments for the Two Main Options

The following are a few observations about these passages and their translations: (1) The passages are almost identical. The differences are as follows: first, the number of the subjunctive verb is second singular in Matt 16:19 (δήσῃς) and second plural in 18:18 (δήσητε). Second, in Matt 16:19, a singular relative pronoun is used with the conditional conjunction (ὅ ἐὰν), while in Matt 18:18, a plural correlative pronoun is used (ὅσα). Third, in Matt 16:19, the phrase ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς is articular and the noun plural, while in Matt 18:18, the noun is anarthrous and singular (ἐν οὐρανῷ).

(2) Regarding the translation of the future perfect periphrastic, the two basic options are the English future perfect passive “will have been” (used by the NASB and ISV, “is already” in HCSB) and the English simple future passive “shall/will be” (used by the ESV, NIV, NRSV, and NLT). According to Porter, these are the “two major competing options.” The arguments for each of these translations is discussed below.

1. Future Perfect Passive

D. A. Carson notes that “During most of the twentieth century, the debate circled around whether not the perfect tense is invariably used to signal action or state that has come about in the past with continuing effect.” Julius R. Mantey argues forcefully against the simple future sense, in fact saying that it is “distorted” and “badly mistranslated.” His main argument is that the

---

104 Because of this, I will focus on 16:19 and will only address 18:18 if it contributes something additional to the discussion. This is standard for commentaries (see, for example, Carson’s six pages on 16:19, compared to one paragraph for 18:18 [D. A. Carson, “Matthew,” In The Expositor’s Bible Commentary (Rev. ed.; Tremper Longman III and David E. Garland, eds.; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2006), 421–426; cf. 457]).


106 Carson, “Matthew,” 421.

perfect tense should be given its normal sense here, in which there is a completed action in the past with a continuing state or result. Though the author might be focusing on one or the other, the perfect tense “always implies past action.” Mantey supports this position by pointing out parallels such as Gen 30:33 (LXX), in addition to other Greek sources that he says supports his view.

Mantey’s main concern was that the simple future translation supports sacerdotalism, and his strenuous argument attempts to dismantle the sacerdotal position. According to Mantey, “the proper translation is, Whatever you bind on earth shall have been bound in heaven.” He says that the significance of the periphrastic is Matt 16 and 18 is as follows: “Man is to ratify and obey God’s decrees. This passage does not teach that God concurs in men’s conclusions; but rather it teaches that those who live in accordance with Christ’s directions will decide to do just what God has already decided should be done.” This approach is also taken by William Foxwell Albright and C. S. Mann, who say that “It is the Church on earth carrying out heaven’s decisions, communicated by the Spirit, and not heaven ratifying the Church’s decisions.”

_Note:_ The references are from various sources cited in the text, including the New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (AB 26; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1971), 193, 197; R. T. France, _The Gospel of Matthew_ (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 626–627; Leon Morris is somewhat guarded against being too dogmatic about 16:19, but on 18:18 he says that “as the church is responsive to the guidance of God it will come to the decisions that have already been made in heaven” (Leon Morris, _The Gospel according to Matthew_ [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992], 426–427, 469).

---


110 Mantey, “Mistranslation,” 243–244.

111 Ibid, 247, italics his.

112 Ibid, 246. One attempt to describe how it might play out that the disciples would bind/loose what has already been bound/loosed in heaven is Paul Elbert, “Perfect Tense in Matthew 16:19 and Three Charismata,” _JETS_ 17 no. 3 (Sum 1974): 149–155. He says, “The consensus of ensuing interpretation . . . is that the church on earth is to be carrying out heaven’s decisions, already sanctioned there. These decisions are communicated by the Spirit via inspiration or guidance. The reverse process is definitely not in view in this verse” (p. 149).

113 Albright and Mann. _Matthew_, 197.
He also claims that some might be making this error as a result of translating the periphrastics as non-periphrastics.\footnote{Mantey, “Mistranslations,” 247–248.} He says that Luke 12:52 is non-periphrastic because there are intervening words between the verb and the participle, and so the simple future passive translation is allowable, but not so with Matt 16:19 and 18:18.\footnote{Ibid, 247–248.}

2. Simple Future

Cadbury, \textit{contra} Mantey, argued that because the sentences are conditional, the periphrastic construction does not necessarily mean that the action of the perfect participles happened in the past from the perspective of the other verbs in the sentence.\footnote{Henry Joel Cadbury, “The Meaning of John 20:23, Matthew 16:19, and Matthew 18:18,” \textit{JBL} 58 no. 3 (1939): 251–254. Porter agrees with this Cadbury on the significance of the conditional nature of the sentences (Porter, “\textit{Vague Verbs},” 161). A very helpful article that brings out this element is D. Ekem, “Another Look at the Translation of Matthew 16.19,” \textit{BT} 55 no. 1 (2004): 119–124. He writes, “Greek grammarians generally agree that such conditionals [third class conditions] do usually posit a hypothetical situation with prospects of fulfillment. In line with this grammatical principle, the text in Matt 16.19 more probably reflects a projected event, which though initially hypothetical, has the dynamism of becoming a fulfilled reality, if carried out. Hence what Jesus seems to be saying, from the Matthean perspective, is that: in case the necessity of binding or loosing something on earth arises and it is duly executed, the expected outcome is a ‘situation of boundness or loosedness’ in heaven, precisely because the keys [\textit{tas kleidas}] symbolizing co-operative divine/human authority: mutual partnership between God and human agents, is already in operation dynamically. It is the dynamic extension of God’s sovereignty from the heavenly to the earthly domain through co-operation with inspired human channels” (Ekem, “Another Look,” 122). Again, “This observation also implies that caution must be exercised in translating the text futuristically as ‘will be bound/loosed’ since the syntax of Matt 16.19 [see also 18.18] does not necessarily express a strict chronological event. The phenomenon being described here is essentially simultaneous rather than sequential. Interpreting it sequentially will tend to swing the pendulum in favour of ‘human initiative and divine response,’ which is not the thought being conveyed by Matt 16.19” (Ekem, “Another Look,” 122–123). John Nolland supports the use of the simple passive in his translation and in his comments states that ‘The choice of the perfect participles is best explained as motivated by the desire to represent coordinated action: ‘What you bind/loose on earth will have been [at that precise moment also] bound by God’ (John Nolland, \textit{The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text} [NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005], 654–655; 681); W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison also reject the future perfect passive as an over-translation (W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, \textit{The Gospel According to Matthew, Vol 2} [ICC; London: T&T Clark, 1991], 638).}
the time of the [protasis].” He cites 1 John 2:5, James 2:10, Rom 13:8 and 14:23 as evidence that in conditional sentences the perfect in the apodosis does not necessarily indicate action prior to the protasis. He concludes that “the action or condition implied in the perfect is not necessarily prior to that of the other clause.” Porter agrees with Cadbury:

An internal logical order is all that can be posited for the conditional or conditional-like statement apart from temporal deictic indicators. Jesus in essence states, “if something might be bound (subjunctive) upon the earth, then the consequence is a state of boundness in heaven, and if something might be loosed (subjunctive) on earth, then the consequence is a state of loosedness in heaven.”

Our examination of the pragmatics of the periphrastic construction seems to argue against Mantey’s view inasmuch as we discovered that periphrastics constructed with the perfect participle often lend themselves to a stative sense, emphasizing the state of “boundness/loosedness” rather than focusing on the temporal relationship between the protasis and apodosis. Luke 12:52 gives evidence for just such an interpretation. Furthermore, Porter demonstrates that many of Mantey’s extra-biblical parallels actually do not support his position.

However, it also seems important to note that the results of studying the periphrastics are somewhat modest; they do not prove conclusively that the simple future is the better translation.

---

118 Ibid.
119 Ibid, 252.
As important as the verb tenses are, by themselves they seem limited in what they prove. In order to definitively prove the correct translation, the results of this study would have to be brought together with a full analysis of all of the dimensions of the text, especially the discourse.

IV. CONCLUSION

This paper has shown that the periphrastic construction is a frequent use of a verb of being and a participle that combine to form one verbal idea. It is used for various reasons: sometimes it is “roughly synonymous” with a finite verb (though it was argued above that they are not exactly synonymous), sometimes it is used to supplement the verbal system when some of its forms have fallen out of use, and sometimes it is used because it communicates something that the finite verbal system cannot. In addition, it seems to be the case that the periphrastic construction lends itself to being used to communicate stative or progressive action (with the present participle) or ongoing states (with perfect participles).

With regard to Matthew 16:19 and 18:18, our study of the periphrastic lends some support to the use of the simple future in translation, and seems to suggest that a future perfect passive (“shall have been bound”) is somewhat of an over-translation; yet a definitive decision about the best translation awaits a fuller analysis of the multiple dimensions of the text.

As this paper has examined the periphrastic construction, as well as the two passages in Matthew, there are a number of avenues for further research. Regarding periphrastics, there is a remaining question about whether μελλω plus the infinitive is a true periphrastic. Furthermore, it would be helpful to discover a more rigorous criteria for discerning periphrastic participle from

---

123 This seems to be one of the shortcomings of many of the treatments of the periphrastic constructions of this passage—they attempt to deal decisively with the issue by analyzing the phrases out of its context.
adjectival predicate participles, and to revise of the provisional list of periphrastics provided here on the basis of such criteria. Finally, as the analysis given here has been one of breadth more than depth, it would be useful to make a more detailed examination of the periphrastics constructed with the perfect participle to see if the assertions about their stative tendency are accurate.

In addition, there are several questions that still need answered regarding Matthew 16:19 and 18:18. There is first the question of the meaning of “binding and loosing.” Second, there is the question of the significance of the conditional clauses to the meaning of the passages. Finally, there remains the question of how the broader discourse constrains the interpretation of the passages. Answering these questions would give some much needed insight into the meaning of these passages, and equip the church to carry out the instructions that Christ gave his people.

124 Though a full examination of the ramifications of the conditional construction is outside the scope of this study, it appears that a good case can be made from it that the emphasis of the sentence is on the logical relationship between the clauses rather than the temporal one (Porter, “Vague Verbs,” 161).
APPENDIX 1: PRELIMINARY LIST OF NT PERIPHERASTICS

The base of this list of periphrastics comes from a Logos search, which was then sifted to remove non-periphrastics (e.g. occurrences of ἐγὼ with adjectival participles). See the section of the paper “Identifying Periphrastics” for a list of criteria that was applied. The resulting list was then double checked by comparing to several other lists, as a result of which a number of examples were added.¹²⁵ Other notes:

- My total number of ἐγὼ periphrastics is 255.
- There are some ambiguous examples in which the verb may or may not be functioning independently (e.g. 2 Cor 5:19; Col 3:1). Further work is needed to disambiguate some of these examples.
- Notes on authors’ uses:
  - “Mark and Luke use this periphrastic construction much more commonly than the other NT Writers.”¹²⁶
  - Luke uses this construction clearly, unambiguously, and frequently.
  - John uses it repeatedly with “he was baptizing” and “it is written.” However, he also causes many false hits because of his preference for the phrase “this is the one who . . .”
  - The use of the periphrastic in Mark, Luke and John seems to be somewhat stylistic.¹²⁷

¹²⁵ Charles Irons, A Syntax Guide for Readers of the Greek New Testament (Grand Rapids: Kregel Academic & Professional, 2016), 621. He also mentioned several more that had not been included in that list in personal communication with me. Also, BDF §§352–256; Wallace, Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics, 647–649; Green, Understanding Eimi Periphrastics, 403–441.


¹²⁷ Green, Understanding Eimi Periphrastics, 333.
Preliminary List of NT Periphrastics

The following list is grouped according to the following categories:

1. Indicative εἰμί: present periphrastic = present εἰμί + present ptcp. (23)
2. Indicative εἰμί: imperfect periphrastic = imperfect εἰμί + present ptcp. (102)
3. Indicative εἰμί: future periphrastic = future εἰμί + present ptcp. (12)
4. Indicative εἰμί: perfect periphrastic = present εἰμί + perfect ptcp. (36)
5. Indicative εἰμί: pluperfect periphrastic = imperfect εἰμί + perfect ptcp. (51)
6. Indicative εἰμί: future perfect periphrastic = future εἰμί + perfect ptcp. (6)
7. Indicative εἰμί: aorist periphrastic = imperfect εἰμί + aorist ptcp. (2)
8. Subjunctive εἰμί (12, all perfect participles)
9. Imperative εἰμί (4)
10. Infinitive εἰμί (2, both present participles)
11. Participle εἰμί (2, both perfect participles)
12. Implied εἰμί (3 possible, all present participles)
13. γίνομαι (5)
14. ὑπάρχω (2)
15. ἔχω (0)

Indicative εἰμί: Present Periphrastic

2. Matt 3:15: ἃφες ἄρτι, οὗτος γὰρ πρέπον ἐστιν ἡμῖν πληρῶσαι πάσαν δικαιοσύνην
3. Matt 27:33: καὶ ἐλθόντες ἐπὶ τὸν κατήμανθον Γολγοθᾶ ὁ ἐστιν κρανίου τόπος ἐγέρμονος
4. Mark 5:41: καὶ κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς τοῦ παιδίου λέγει αὐτῷ· ταλιθα κουμ, ὁ ἐστιν μεθερμηνευόμενον· τὸ κοράσιον, σοὶ λέγω, ἐγειρε.
5. Mark 15:22: καὶ φέρουσιν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸν Γολγοθᾶν τόπον ὁ ἐστιν μεθερμηνευόμενον κρανίου τόπος
8. John 1:41: εὐρίσκει οὗτος πρῶτον τὸν ἀδελφὸν τὸν Ἰδον Σίμωνα καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· εὐρήκαμεν τὸν Μεσσίαν, ὁ ἐστιν μεθερμηνευόμενον χριστός
9. Acts 4:36: Ἰωσήφ δὲ ὁ ἐπίκλητες Βαρναβᾶς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων ὁ ἐστιν μεθερμηνευόμενον υἱὸς παρακλήσεως Λευίτης Κύπριος τῷ γένει

---

128 BDF (§§353[4] and cf. 132[2]) deny that this is a periphrastic, but Wallace, (Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics, 648) accepts it.
10. Acts 5:25: paragvenomeno de tis aptirgeileven autous oti idou oi andreis ouc ethese en th phulaki eisiv en to theo estotes kai didaskontes ton lovan
11. Acts 19:36: anantirrhitwn ouc dntow touton deon estin umas katostalmenoous uparchein kai mihen protettex praassan
12. 1 Cor 11:13: propon estin gunaika akatakulitpont to theo prosechetha;
13. 2 Cor 2:17: ou gar emen ois oi pollloi kathlebontes ton logon to theou, alli' ois eis eilikrineias, alli' ois ek theou katavanthe theou en Christo laloymen.
14. 2 Cor 9:12: oti e diakonia tis leitourgias taunhs ou monon estin prosoanapleousa tis usterhmatia ton agion, allia kai perissseousa dia pollon evgharistion ton theo.
15. 2 Cor 9:12: oti e diakonia tis leitourgias taunhs ou monon estin prosoanapleousa tis usterhmatia ton agion, allia kai perissseousa dia pollon evgharistion ton theo.
16. Gal 4:24: atina estin allaigroumena auta gar eisin duo diaothke mia men apo drous Sina eis douleian gevnoisa htes estin Agar
17. Col 1:6: to parontos eis umas kathos kai en panti to kosmou estin karposteresoun en ayzanomewen kathos kai en umin apr' h' hemeras hkoousate kai epengwite th charin ton theou en altheia
18. Col 1:6: to parontos eis umas kathos kai en panti to kosmou estin karposteresoun en ayzanomewen kathos kai en umin apr' h' hemeras hkoousate kai epengwite th charin ton theou en altheia
19. Col 2:23: atina estin lagon men ezhonta sorphes en athelothreskia kai taseinofrosunh kai afedidia symatos ouc en timh tini pro plasmismoni ths sarakos
20. Col 3:1:29: eis ouv synhgerethe to Christo to anw zhtite o o Christos estin en dejia ton theou kathmenos
22. 1 Pet 1:6: en ou agalliasde olignon arhti ei deon estin lupthontes en poikilos peirasmoi

Indicative eimi: Imperfect Periphrastic

1. Matt 7:29: h' gar didaskon autous ois exousian exoun kai oux ois oi grammateis auton
2. Matt 12:4: podis eisphileven eis touto oikon tou theou kai tois arton tis prorhesoos exagoun o ouk exou h' autou faathen oude tois met' autou ei mi tois ierwson monois
3. Matt 19:22: akousas de o neaniskos ton logon apellhen lypoymenos h' gar exoun ktmata polla
4. Matt 24:38: h' gar hson en taix hemerax ekainas taix pro to katanlwmou trقومontes kai pinontes gamouontes kai gamizontes chr' h' hemeras eisphileven Nobe eis thn kibedomn

This is ambiguous. Green says that it is not a periphrastic, but rather that the locative phrase is modifying the finite verb (Green, Understanding Eimi Periphrastics, 133). I think it is more likely that it is a locative, because the locative phrase forms a unit with the participle and is derived from Psalm 110:1 (109:1 LXX).
5. Matt 24:38: ὥς γὰρ ἦσαν ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἑκείναις ταῖς πρὸ τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ τρώγοντες καὶ πίνοντες γαμιζόντες καὶ γαμιζόντες ἄχρι ἣς ἡμέρας εἰσῆλθεν Νῶε εἰς τὴν κιβωτόν
6. Matt 24:38: ὥς γὰρ ἦσαν ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἑκείναις ταῖς πρὸ τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ τρώγοντες καὶ πίνοντες γαμιζόντες ἄχρι ἣς ἡμέρας εἰσῆλθεν Νῶε εἰς τὴν κιβωτόν
7. Matt 24:38: ὥς γὰρ ἦσαν ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἑκείναις ταῖς πρὸ τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ τρώγοντες καὶ πίνοντες γαμιζόντες ἄχρι ἣς ἡμέρας εἰσῆλθεν Νῶε εἰς τὴν κιβωτόν
8. Mark 1:6: καὶ ἦν ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐνδεδυμένος τρίχας καὶ καμήλου καὶ ζόνην δερματίνην περὶ τὴν ὀσφυν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐσθίων ἀκρίδας καὶ μέλι ἀγρίου
10. Mark 2:6: ἦσαν δὲ τῖνες τῶν γραμματέων ἐκεῖ καθήμενοι καὶ διαλογιζόμενοι ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν·
11. Mark 2:6: ἦσαν δὲ τῖνες τῶν γραμματέων ἐκεῖ καθήμενοι καὶ διαλογιζόμενοι ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν·
12. Mark 2:18: Καὶ ἦσαν οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι νηστεύοντες
13. Mark 5:5: καὶ διὰ παντὸς νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας ἐν τοῖς μνήμασιν καὶ ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν ἦν κράγον καὶ κατακόπτον ἐστότων λίθους
14. Mark 5:5: καὶ διὰ παντὸς νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας ἐν τοῖς μνήμασιν καὶ ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν ἦν κράγον καὶ κατακόπτον ἐστότων λίθους
15. Mark 9:4: καὶ ὠφθη αὐτοῖς Ἡλίας σὺν Μωϋσεὶ καὶ ἦσαν συλλαμβάνοντες τῷ Ἰησοῦ
17. Mark 10:32130: ἦσαν δὲ ἐν τῇ ὀδῷ ἀναβαινοντες εἰς Ἰεροσολύμα καὶ ἦν προάγων αὐτοῦς ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἐθαμβοῦντο οἱ δὲ ἀκολουθοῦντες ἐροζοῦντο
18. Mark 14:4: ἦσαν δὲ τῖνες ἀγανακτοῦντες πρὸς ἐαυτοὺς εἰς τῇ ἀπόλεια αὐτῆ τοῦ μύρου γέγονεν
19. Mark 14:40: καὶ πάλιν ἐλθὼν εὑρέν αὐτοὺς καθεύδοντας ἦσαν γὰρ αὐτῶν οἱ όφθαλμοι καταβαρυνόμενοι καὶ συν ἤδεισαν τι ἀποκριθῶσιν αὐτῶ
20. Mark 14:54: καὶ ὁ Πέτρος ἀπὸ μακρόθεν ἤκουσάν τί ὦς ἔσω εἰς τὴν αὐλήν τοῦ ἁρχιερεῖος καὶ ἦν συγκαθήμενος μετά τῶν ὑπηρετῶν καὶ θεραπεύοντος πρὸς τὸ φῶς
21. Mark 14:54: καὶ ὁ Πέτρος ἀπὸ μακρόθεν ἤκουσάν τί ὦς ἔσω εἰς τὴν αὐλήν τοῦ ἁρχιερεῖος καὶ ἦν συγκαθήμενος μετά τῶν ὑπηρετῶν καὶ θεραπεύοντος πρὸς τὸ φῶς
23. Mark 15:43: ἐλθὼν Ἰωσήφ ὁ ἀπὸ Ἀριμαθαίας εὐσχήμως βουλευτὴς ὡς καὶ αὐτῶς ἦν προσδεχόμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ τολμήσας εἰσῆλθεν πρὸς τὸν Πιλάτου καὶ ἦτοράτο τὸ σῶμα τὸ Ἰησοῦ

130 Green sees the second construction here as a periphrastic and the first as an independent use of the verb (Green, Understanding Eimi Periphrastics, 131). I was initially inclined to see both as periphrastic, but after careful consideration, it seems like it is more likely that in this discourse the locative is primary in order to set the stage for the action of the scene. This would make the verb independent.
27. Luke 2:33: καὶ ἦν ὁ πατήρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ θαυμάζοντες ἐπὶ τοῖς λαλουμένοις περὶ αὐτοῦ
29. Luke 4:20: καὶ πτόξα τὸ βιβλίον ἄποδους τῷ ύπηρέτῃ ἐκάθισεν καὶ πάντων οἱ ωφθαλμοὶ ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ ἦσαν ἄτενίζοντες αὐτῷ
34. Luke 5:16: αὐτὸς δὲ ἦν υποχωροῦν ἐν ταῖς ἐρήμοις καὶ προσευχόμενος
35. Luke 5:17: καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν διδάσκων καὶ ἦσαν καθήμενοι Φαρισαῖοι καὶ νομοδιδάσκαλοι οἱ ἦσαν ἐλληνικὲς ἐκ πάσης κόμης τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ Ἰουδαίας καὶ Ἰερουσαλήμ
36. Luke 5:17: καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν διδάσκοντας καὶ ἦσαν καθήμενοι Φαρισαίοι καὶ νομοδιδάσκαλοι οἱ ἦσαν ἐλληνικὲς ἐκ πάσης κόμης τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ Ἰουδαίας καὶ Ἰερουσαλήμ
41. Luke 11:14: καὶ ἦν ἐκβάλλον δαιμόνιον καὶ αὐτὸ ἦν κωφὸν ἐγένετο δὲ τοῦ δαιμονίου ἐξελθόντος ἐλάλησεν ὁ κωφὸς καὶ ἤθαμασαν οἱ ὄχλοι
42. Luke 13:10: ἦν δὲ διδάσκον ἐν μιᾷ τῶν συναγωγῶν ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν
44. Luke 13:11: καὶ ἦσαν δώδεκα μνημή σαβενείας ἐσθηνείας ἐτη δεκαοκτώ καὶ ἦν συγκύπτουσα καὶ μὴ δυναμένη ἀνακύψαι εἰς τὸ ταντελές
45. Luke 14:1: καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ἐλθεῖν αὐτῶν εἰς οἰκίας τοὺς ἀρχόντων τῶν Φαρισαίων σαββάτῳ φαγεῖν ἄρτον καὶ αὐτοὶ ἦσαν παραποτούμενοι αὐτῶν
47. Luke 19:47: καὶ ἢν διδάσκον τὸ καθ’ ἡμέραν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς ἐξήτουν αὐτὸν ἀπολέσαι καὶ οἱ πρῶτοι τοῦ λαοῦ
49. Luke 23:8: ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἤγγικεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐχάρη λίαν ἢν γὰρ ἦν ἐκ ικανῶν χρόνων θέλων ἤδειν αὐτὸν διὰ τὸ ἀκούσειν περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἠζητεῖν τι σημεῖον ἦδειν ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ γινόμενον
55. John 1:28: ταῦτα ἐν Βηθανίᾳ ἐγένετο πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου ὅπου ἢν ὁ Ἰωάννης βαπτίζον
56. John 3:23: ἢν δὲ καὶ ὁ Ἰωάννης βαπτίζον ἐν αὐτῶν ἐγώς τοῦ Σαλείμ ὅτι ὕδατα πολλὰ ἦν ἐκεῖ καὶ παρεγύνοντο καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο
57. John 10:40: καὶ ἀπήλθεν πάλιν πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου εἰς τὸν τόπον ὅπου ἢν Ἰωάννης τὸ πρῶτον βαπτίζον καὶ ἔμεινεν εἰς
58. John 11:1: ἢν δὲ τὰς ἀσθενῶν, Ἀζαριας ἀπὸ Βηθανίας
60. John 18:18: εἰσήκουσαν δὲ οἱ δούλοι καὶ οἱ υπηρέται ἀνθρακίᾳ πεποιηκότες ὅτι ψύχος ἢν καὶ ἐθερμαίνοντο ἢν δὲ καὶ ὁ Πέτρος μετ’ αὐτῶν ἐστώς καὶ θερμαίνομενος
61. John 18:25: ἢν δὲ Σίμων Πέτρος ἔστώς καὶ θερμαίνομενος εἶπον οὖν αὐτῷ μὴ καὶ σὺ ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ εἰ ἤρνησατο ἐκεῖνος καὶ εἶπεν οὖν εἰμὶ
62. John 18:30: ἀπεκρίθησαν καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ εἰ μὴ ἢν οὗτος κακῶν ποιῶν οὐκ ἂν σοὶ παρεδόκαμεν αὐτὸν
63. Acts 1:10: καὶ ὡς ἀτενίζοντες ἢσαν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν πορευομένου αὐτοῦ, καὶ ιδοὺ ἀνδρὲς δύο παρεστίκεισαν αὐτοῖς ἐν εὐθήσεις λευκαίς,
64. Acts 1:13: καὶ οὗτος εἰσῆλθον, εἰς τὸ ὑπεράνων ἀνέβησαν οὐ ἢσαν καταμένοντες, ὃ τε Πέτρος καὶ Ἰωάννης καὶ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἀνδρέας, Φιλίππος καὶ Θωμᾶς, Βαρθολομαίος καὶ Μαθαῖος, Ἰάκωβος Ἀλφαίος καὶ Σίμων ο Ξεδωρίης καὶ Ἰούσας Ἰακώβου.
65. Acts 1:14: οὔτοι πάντες ἢσαν προσκαρτεροῦντες ὁμοθυμαδὸν τῇ προσευχῇ σὺν γνυαζόν καὶ Μαρία τῇ μητρί τοῦ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς αὐτοῦ
66. Acts 2:2: καὶ ἐγένετο ἄνων ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἦς ὅσπερ φερομένης πνοῆς βιαίας καὶ ἐπλήρωσεν ὅλον τὸν οὐκ oὐ ἢσαν καθήμενοι

131 BDF (§353[1]). This is possible, depending on how one exegetes this passage. Green lists it as a periphrastic (Understanding Eimi Periphrastics, 431).
67. Acts 2:5: ἡσαν δὲ εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ κατοικοῦντες Ἰουδαῖοι ἄνδρες εὐλαβεῖς ἀπὸ παντὸς ἐθνοῦς τὸν ὑπὸ τὸν υἱὸν τῶν
68. Acts 2:42: ἡσαν δὲ προσκαρτεροῦντες τῇ διάδαχῃ τῶν ἁπαστόλων καὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ ταῖς προσευχαῖς
69. Acts 8:1: Σαῦλος δὲ ἦν συνευδοκόν τῇ ἀναιρέσει αὐτοῦ
70. Acts 8:13\textsuperscript{132}: ὁ δὲ Ζήμων καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπίστευσεν καὶ βαπτισθεὶς ἦν προσκαρτερῶν τῷ Φιλίππῳ θεωροῦν τησ σημεία καὶ δυνάμεις μεγάλας γινομένας ἐξίστατο
71. Acts 8:28: ἦν τε ύποστρέφον καὶ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τοῦ ἁρματος αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀνεγίνωσκεν τὸν προφήτην Ησαϊαν
72. Acts 8:28: ἦν τε ύποστρέφον καὶ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τοῦ ἁρματος αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀνεγίνωσκεν τὸν προφήτην Ησαϊαν
73. Acts 9:9\textsuperscript{133}: καὶ ἦν ἡμέρας τρεῖς μὴ βλέπων καὶ οὐκ ἔφαγεν οὐδὲ ἔπιεν
74. Acts 6.28: καὶ ἦν μετ’ αὐτῶν εἰσπροευμένος καὶ ἐκπροευμένος εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ παρρησιαζόμενος ἐν τῷ ὄνοματο του κυρίου
75. Acts 9:28: καὶ ἦν μετ’ αὐτῶν εἰσπροευμένος καὶ ἐκπροευμένος εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ παρρησιαζόμενος ἐν τῷ ὄνοματο του κυρίου
76. Acts 10:24: τῇ δὲ ἐπαύριον εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν Καισάρειαν ὁ δὲ Κορνήλιος ἦν προσδοκόν αὐτοῦς συγκαλεσάμενος τοὺς συγγενείς αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἀναγκαίους φίλους
77. Acts 10:30: καὶ ὁ Κορνήλιος ἔρχεται ἐπὶ τετάρτης ἡμέρας μέχρι ταύτης τῆς ὥρας ἦν τὴν ἐνάτην προσευχόμενον ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ μου καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀνήρ ἔστη ἐνωπίων μου ἐν ἔσθητι λαμπρά
78. Acts 11:5: ἐγὼ ἦν ἐν πόλει Ἰόππη προσευχόμενος καὶ εἶδον ἐν ἐκότασεν ὡραμα καταβαίνον νακε δυῖος τι ως δούλην μεγάλην τέσσαριν ἁρχαῖς καθιμένην ἐκ τοῦ υἱον του καὶ ἤλθεν ἄρχε ν ἐγὼ
79. Acts 12:5: ὁ μὲν οὖν Πέτρος ἐτηρεῖτο ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ προσευχή ἤσαν ἐκτενῶς γινομένη ὑπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας πρὸς τὸν θεόν περὶ αὐτοῦ
80. Acts 12:6\textsuperscript{134}: ὅτε δὲ ἠμέλλεν προσαγαγεὶν αὐτὸν ὁ Ηρώδης τῇ νυκτὶ ἐκείνῃ ἦν ο Πέτρος κοιμώμενος μεταξὺ δύο στρατιωτῶν δεδεμένως ἀλύουσιν δοῦσιν φυλακές τε πρὸ τῆς θύρας ἐτίρωσαν τῇ φυλακήν
81. Acts 12:12: συνιδόν τε ἤλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν οἰκίαν τῆς Μαρίας τῆς μητρὸς Ἰοάννου τοῦ ἐπικαλουμένου Μάρκου οὗ ἦν ἰκανοὶ συνήθροισμένοι καὶ προσευχόμενοι
82. Acts 12:20: ἦν δὲ θυμοσθεὶς Ὀρίου καὶ Σιδωνίως
83. Acts 14:7: κακεὶ εὐαγγελιζόμενοι ἠσαν

\textsuperscript{132} It is possible that this βαπτισθείς is functioning periphrastically, a possibility that Porter raises (Idioms, 49). However, in light of the scarcity of aorist periphrastics, and the fact that ἦν προσκαρτερῶν is definitely periphrastic, it is probably better to take this as an adverbial use of the participle which is odifying the periphrastic construction.

\textsuperscript{133} BDF take this as adjectival and “only seemingly periphrastic” (§353[1]). Green lists it as a true periphrastic (Understanding Eimi Periphrastics, 432).

\textsuperscript{134} The second participle looks like it ought to be another periphrastic, but because there is no conjunction, it should be seen as adverbial.
86. Acts 16:12\footnote{135}: κάκειθεν εἰς Φιλίππους ἤτε ἐστὶν πρώτης μερίδος τῆς Μακεδονίας πόλις κολονία ἦμεν δὲ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ πόλει διατρίβοντες ἡμέρας τινὰς.
88. Acts 19:14\footnote{136}: ἡσαν δὲ τίνος Σκευή Ἰουδαίου ἀρχιερέως ἐπὶ τῷ τοῦτο ποιοῦντες.
89. Acts 21:3: ἀναφάναντες δὲ τῇ Κύπρον καὶ καταληψαντες αὐτὴν εὐώνυμον ἐπλεόμεν εἰς Συρίαν καὶ κατήλθομεν εἰς Τύρον ἐκείσε γὰρ τὸ πλοῖον ἦν ἀποφορτιζόμενον τὸν γόμον.
94. 1 Cor 12:2: οἴδατε ὅτι ὅτε ἔθην ἦτε πρὸς τὰ εἰδώλα τὰ ἄφωνα ὡς ἂν ἦγεσθε ἀπαγόμενοι.
95. 2 Cor 5:19\footnote{137}: ως ὅτι θεός ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμην καταλάςασσον ἐαυτῷ μὴ λογιζόμενοι αὐτοῖς τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν καὶ θέμενος ἐν ἡμῖν τὸν λόγον τῆς καταλλαγῆς.
96. 2 Cor 5:19\footnote{138}: ως ὅτι θεός ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμην καταλάςασσον ἐαυτῷ μὴ λογιζόμενοι αὐτοῖς τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν καὶ θέμενος ἐν ἡμῖν τὸν λόγον τῆς καταλλαγῆς.
100. Phil 2:26: ἐπειδὴ ἐπιποθῶν ἦν πάντας υμᾶς καὶ ἀδημονῶν, διότι ἦκούσατε ὅτι ἠθένησαν.

\footnote{135} This is slightly ambiguous, but is likely periphrastic.
\footnote{136} DBF say that this is not a true periphrastic (§353[2]). Green lists it as a true periphrastic (Understanding Eimi Periphrastics, 433).
\footnote{137} This is ambiguous.
\footnote{138} See above.
102. Rev 17:4\textsuperscript{139}: καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἤν περιβεβλημένη πορφυροῦν καὶ κόκκινον καὶ κεχρυσομένη χρυσίω καὶ λίθῳ τιμίῳ καὶ μαργαρίταις ἐξουσία ποτήριον χρυσοῦν ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτῆς γέμον βδέλυγμάτων καὶ τὰ ἀκάθαρτα τῆς πορνείας αὐτῆς

Indicative εἰμὶ: Future Periphrastic

1. Matt 10:22: καὶ ἔσεσθε μισούμενοι ὑπὸ πάντων διὰ τὸ ὅνομά μου ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος ούτος σωθῆσεται
2. Matt 24:9: τότε παραδώσουσιν ὑμᾶς εἰς θλίψιν καὶ ἀποκτενοῦσιν ὑμᾶς καὶ ἔσεσθε μισούμενοι ὑπὸ πάντων τὸν ἐθνὸν διὰ τὸ ὅνομά μου
4. Mark 13:25: καὶ οἱ ἀστέρες ἔσονται ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πίπτοντες καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς σαλευθῆσονται
5. Luke 1:20\textsuperscript{140}: καὶ ἰδοὺ ἔση σιωπῶν καὶ μὴ δυνάμενος λαλῆσαι ἄχρι ἧς ημέρας γένηται ταῦτα ἀνθ᾽ ὦν οὐκ ἐπίστευσας τοῖς λόγοις μου ὁτίνες πληροθῆσονται εἰς τὸν καιρὸν αὐτῶν
7. Luke 5:10: ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην υἱῶς Ζεβεδαίου, οἱ ήσαν κοινοὶ τῷ Σίμωνι, καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς τὸν Σίμωνα ὁ Ἰησοῦς· μὴ φοβοῦ· ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀνθρώπους ἔσῃ ἐξογρῶν.
11. 1 Cor 14:9: οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς διὰ τῆς γλώσσης ἐὰν μὴ εὐθυμοῦν λόγον δότε πᾶς γνωσθῆσατε τὸ λαλούμενον ἔσεθε γὰρ εἰς ἀέρα λαλοῦντες
12. Luke 17:35: ἔσονται δύο ἄληθουσαι ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἢ μία παραλημφθῆσεται ἢ δὲ ἐτέρα ἀφεθῆσεται

Indicative εἰμὶ: Perfect Periphrastic

1. Matt 10:30: ὑμῶν δὲ καὶ αἱ τρίχες τῆς κεφαλῆς πάσαι ἠριθμημέναι εἰσίν

\textsuperscript{139} Wallace notes that this might be a predicate adjective participle (Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics, 649). Green accepts it as a genuine periphrastic (Understanding Eimi Periphrastics, 419).

\textsuperscript{140} BDF take this as adjectival and “only seemingly periphrastic” (§353[1]). Wallace lists it as a periphrastic (Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics, 649), as does Green (Understanding Eimi Periphrastics, 439).
2. Matt 18:20\
   o\u03b9  
   γάρ εἰσίν δύο ἡ τρεῖς συνηγμένοι εἰς τὸ ἔμοι ὅνομα ἐκεῖ εἰμὶ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν
3. 1 Cor 15:19: εἰ ἐν τῇ ζωῇ ταύτῃ ἐν Χριστῷ ἡ λεπτότες ἐσμέν μόνοι, ἐλεεινότεροι πάντων ἀνθρώπων εὐμέν.
8. John 2:17: εὐνήσθησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι γεγραμμένον ἐστίν ὁ χήλος τοῦ οἴκου σου καταφάγεται με
12. John 6:45: ἐστίν γεγραμμένον ἐν τοῖς προφηταῖς καὶ ἐσονται πάντες διδακτοὶ θεοῦ πάς ὁ ἀκούσας παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ μαθών ἔρχεται πρὸς ἐμέ
13. John 10:34: ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἐστίν γεγραμμένον ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ὑμῶν ὅτι ἐγὼ εἶμαι θεοὶ ἔστε
15. John 20:30: πολλά μὲν οὖν καὶ ἄλλα σημεῖα ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐνώπιον τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ὁ οὐκ ἐστίν γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τούτῳ
17. Acts 5:25\
18. Acts 21:33: τότε ἐγγέσα τὸ χιλιάρχου ἐπελάβοντο αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκέλευσαν δεθῆναι ἀλώσας δυσι, καὶ ἐπυνάντεν τοῖς εἰς καὶ τί ἐστίν πεποιηκός
19. Acts 25:10: εἶπεν δὲ ὁ Παύλος ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος Καίσαρός ἐστός εἰμὶ οὕτως με δεῖ κρίνεσθαι Ἰουδαίοις οὐδὲν ἠδίκησα ὡς καὶ σὺ κάλλιον ἐπιγνώσκεις
20. Acts 25:14: ὡς δὲ πλείους ἡμέρας διέστησαν ἐκεῖ ὁ Φήστος τῷ βασιλεῖ ἀνέθετο τά κατά τόν Παύλον λέγοντα ἀνήρ τός ἐστίν καταλεξιμένος ὑπὸ Φήλικος δέσμιος

141 The sentences with “where” might be indicating location, and so might indicate the independent use of the verb (thus not a periphrastic).
142 This is debatable, but it is likely a periphrastic, because it is not likely that Luke wants us to think “they are in the temple, standing and teaching,” but rather “they are standing in the temple and teaching.” However, McKay reads it as an independent use of the finite verb (A New Syntax of the Verb, 9–10).
Indicative εἰμί: Pluperfect Periphrastic

1. Matt 9:36: ιδόν δὲ τούς ὀχλοὺς ἑπλαγχύνησθη περὶ αὐτῶν ὅτι ἦσαν ἐσκυλμένοι καὶ ἐρρημένοι ὡς πρὸβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα.

143 The second participle looks like a periphrastic, but because it is not linked by a conjunction coordinating it with the first participle, it is likely modifying the periphrastic construction.
2. Matt 9:36: ίδιον δὲ τούς ὄχλους ἐσπλαγχνίσθη περὶ αὐτῶν ὃτι ἦσαν ἐσκυλμένοι καὶ ἔρριμμένοι ὥσει πρόβατα μή ἔχοντα ποιμένα
3. Matt 26:43:

4. Mark 1:6: καὶ ἦν ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐνδεδυμένος τρίχας καμήλου καὶ ζώνην δερματίνην περὶ τὴν ἄσφον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐσθίων ἄκριδας καὶ μέλι ἄγριον
5. Mark 1:33: καὶ ἦν ὡλὴ ἡ πόλις ἐπισυνηγμένη πρὸς τὴν θύραν.
6. Mark 6:52: οὗ γὰρ συνήκαν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄρτοις ἀλλ’ ἦν αὐτῶν ἡ καρδία πεπορομένη
7. Mark 15:7: ἦν δὲ ὁ λεγόμενος Βαραββᾶς μετὰ τῶν στασιαστῶν δεδεμένος οὕτως ὅτι στάσει φόνον πεποίηκεισαν
8. Mark 15:26: καὶ ἦν ἡ ἐπιγραφή τῆς αἰτίας αὐτοῦ ἐπιγεγραμμένη ὁ βασιλέας τῶν Ἰουδαίων
9. Mark 15:46: καὶ ἀγοράσας συνόνα καθελὼν αὐτὸν ἐνείλησεν τῇ συνδόνι καὶ ἔθηκεν αὐτὸν ἐν μνημείῳ ὃ ἦλελατομημένον ἕκ πέτρας καὶ προσκεύλισεν λίθον ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν τοῦ μνημείου
10. Luke 2:26: καὶ ἦν αὐτῷ κεχρηματισμένον ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἄγιου μὴ ἴδειν θάνατον πρὶν ἢ ἢν ἢν τὸν Χριστὸν κυρίου
15. Luke 5:18: καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀνδρὲς φέροντες ἐπὶ κλίνης ἀνθρωπὸν ὃς ἦν παραλειμμένος καὶ ἐξῆτον αὐτὸν εἰσενεχείν καὶ θείναν αὐτὸν ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ
16. Luke 8:2: καὶ γυναῖκες τινες οἱ ἦσαν τεθραμμέναι ἀπὸ πνευμάτων πονηρῶν καὶ ἀσθενείων Μαρία ἡ καλουμένη Μαγδαληνή ὃς ἦς δαμώνια ἐπτα ἐξεληλύθη
18. Luke 9:45: οἱ δὲ ἤγνωσον τὸ ὦμα τούτο καὶ ἦν παρακεκαλμένον ἀπ’ αὐτῶν ἦν μὴ αἰσθοῦνται αὐτῷ καὶ ἐφοβοῦντο ἐρωτήσας αὐτῶν περὶ τοῦ ῥήματος τοῦτού

\[144\] This might be debatable because it might be simply predicating the participles about the subject rather than forming a unit. Green lists it as a true periphrastic (Understanding Eimi Periphrastics, 433).
Γαλιλαίας αὐτῶ ἐθεάσαντο τὸ μνημεῖον καὶ ὡς ἐτέθη τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ
23. John 13:5: εἶτα βάλλει ὅφει εἰς τὸν νυκτῆρα καὶ ἤρετο νύπτειν τοὺς πόδας τῶν μαθητῶν
καὶ ἐκμάθησαν τῷ λεντίῳ ὁ ἦν διεξωσμένος
25. John 12:16: ταῦτα ὅπερ ἔγνωσαν αὐτῶ οἱ μαθηταὶ τὸ πρόδοτον ἀλλ’ ὅτε ἐδοξάσθη Ἡσυχος
tοῦ εἶναι συνιδων τε ἦν ἐπ’ αὐτῷ γεγραμμένα καὶ ταῦτα ἔποιήσαν αὐτῷ
καὶ καὶ ἐθερμαίνοντο ἦν ἡμέρας Μετ’ αὐτῶν ἐστῶσι καὶ θερμαίνομένος
27. John 18:25: ἦν δὲ Σίμων Πέτρος ἔστωσι καὶ θερμαίνομένος εἰπὼν οὖν αὐτῷ μὴ καὶ σὺ ἐκ
τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτῶ οἱ ἐρνήσατο ἐκεῖνος καὶ εἶπεν οὖν εἰμὶ
28. John 19:11: ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ Ἡσυχος οὗ γέγονεν καὶ ἔξωσαν αὐτόν καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ τὸν
ἀνώθεν διὰ τοῦ ὁ παραδός μὲ σοι μείζονα αμαρτίαν ἔγινεν
29. John 19:19: ἔγραψαν δὲ καὶ τίτλον ὁ Πιλάτος καὶ ἐθηκέν ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ ἦν δὲ
γεγραμμένον Ἡσυχος ὁ Ναζωραῖος ὁ βασιλεύς τῶν Ἰουδαίων
30. John 19:20: τοῦτον οὖν τὸν τίτλον πολλοὶ ἀνέγραψαν τῶν Ἰουδαίων ὅτι ἐγγύς ἦν ὁ τόπος
τῆς πόλεως ὅπου ἐσταυρώθη ὁ Ἡσυχος καὶ ἦν γεγραμμένον Ἑβραϊστὶ Ῥωμαϊστὶ Ἐλληνιστὶ
31. John 19:41: ἦν δὲ ἐν τῷ τόπῳ ὅπου ἐσταυρώθη κῆπος, καὶ εἰ τὸν κήπῳ μνημεῖον καὶ τὸν
ἐν ψυχή Δικαίους ἦν τεθεμένος
33. Acts 4:31: καὶ διηθεότον αὐτῶν ἐσάλευθη ὁ τόπος ἐν ψυχήν καὶ ἔλαχεν ἄνθρωπος καὶ ἐσαλεύθη ἐν
τῆς πόλεως ὅπου ἐσταυρώθη ὁ Ἡσυχος καὶ ἦν γεγραμμένον Ἑβραϊστὶ Ῥωμαϊστὶ Ἐλληνιστὶ
34. Acts 8:16: οὐδέπω γὰρ ἦν ἐπ’ οὐδὲν αὐτῶν ἐπιπέπτουκός μονὸν δὲ βεβαπτισμένοι
ὑπήρχον εἰς τὸ σῶμα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ
35. Acts 9:33: εἶχεν δὲ ἐκεῖ ἀνθρωπισάν τινα οὖν μαθητᾶς Αινέαν δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν ὁ παρακάτω ὁ
ἡμικελλομένος
ἐφεστὸς καὶ συνειδοκόν καὶ φυλάσσον τὸ μνημείον τῶν ἀναφερόντων αὐτὸν
37. Gal 2:11: ὅτι ἦλθεν Κηφᾶς εἰς Αντιόχειαν κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτῷ ἀνέστην ὃ ὅτι
κατηριθμημένος ἦν
38. Gal 4:3: οὕτως καὶ ἡμεῖς, ὅτε ἦμεν νήπιοι, ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου ἠμεθα
δεδουλομένοι
39. Acts 12:12: συνιών τὸν ἤλθεν ὁ πρὸ τῆς Μαρίας τῆς κυρίου Ἰωάννου τὸν
ἐπικαλομένου Μάρκου ὁ ἦν ἡμών καὶ συνηθροισμένοι καὶ προσευχομένοι
ἐπίστευσαν ὅσοι ἦσαν τεταγμένοι εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον
41. Acts 14:26: καὶ γένεσθαι ἀπελπεύσαν εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν ἄθεαν ἦσαν παραδεδομένοι τῇ χάριτι
τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς τὸ ἔργον ὁ ἐπλήρωσαν
42. Acts 16:9: καὶ ὀραμα διὰ τῆς νυκτὸς τῷ Παύλῳ ὄψθη ἀνήρ Μακεδών τις ἦν ἔστος καὶ παρακάλος αὐτὸν καὶ λέγων διαβᾶς εἰς Μακεδονιάν βοήθησον ἡμῖν
43. Acts 18:25: οὗτος ἦν κατηχημένος τὴν ὅδον τοῦ κυρίου καὶ ξέων τῷ πνεύματι ἐλάλει καὶ εὐδαςκέν ἀκριβῶς τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἡσυχοῦ ἐπιστάμενος μόνον τὸ βάπτισμα Ἰωάννου
44. Acts 19:32: ἄλλοι μὲν οὖν ἄλλο τι ἐκραζόν ἦν γὰρ ἡ ἐκκλησία συγκεχυμένη καὶ οἱ πλείους οὐκ ἤδειαν τίνος ἔνεκα συνελημέναν
46. Acts 20:13: ἡμεῖς δὲ προελθόντες ἑπὶ τὸ πλοῖον ἀνήχηθημεν ἑπὶ τὴν Ἀσσον ἐκεῖθεν μέλλοντες ἀναλαμβάνειν τὸν Παύλον οὗτος γὰρ διατεσσαμένος ἦν μέλλων αὐτὸς πεζευν
47. Acts 21:29: ἦσαν γὰρ προσωράκότες Τρόφιμον τὸν Ἐφέσιον ἐν τῇ πόλει σὺν αὐτῶ ὅν εὐδύμοις ὅτι εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν εἰσήγαγεν ὁ Παύλος
49. 2 Pet 3:5: Λανθάνει γὰρ αὐτοῦ τούτῳ θέλοντας ὅτι οὐρανοὶ ἦσαν ἐκπαλαι καὶ γῆ εἰ ὡδατο καὶ δι’ ὥδατος συνεστώτα τῷ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγῳ.
50. Rev 17:4:145 καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἦν περιβεβλημένη πορφυροῦ καὶ κόκκινον καὶ κεχρυσομένη χρυσίῳ καὶ λίθῳ τιμίῳ καὶ μαργαρίταις ἔχουσα ποτήριον χρυσὸν ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτῆς γέμων βδολομάτων καὶ τὰ ἀκάθαρτα τῆς πορνείας αὐτῆς
51. Rev 17:4:146 καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἦν περιβεβλημένη πορφυροῦ καὶ κόκκινον καὶ κεχρυσομένη χρυσίῳ καὶ λίθῳ τιμίῳ καὶ μαργαρίταις ἔχουσα ποτήριον χρυσὸν ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτῆς γέμων βδολομάτων καὶ τὰ ἀκάθαρτα τῆς πορνείας αὐτῆς

Indicative εἰμί: Future Perfect Periphrastic

5. Matt 16:19: δώσω σοι τὰς κλειδὰς τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ ὅ ἐάν δήσῃς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔσται δεδεμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ὅ ἐάν λύσῃς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔσται λελυμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς
6. Matt 16:19: δώσω σοι τὰς κλειδὰς τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ ὅ ἐάν δήσῃς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔσται δεδεμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ὅ ἐάν λύσῃς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔσται λελυμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς
7. Matt 18:18: ἄμην λέγω ὡμίν ὅσα ἐάν δήσῃς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔσται δεδεμένα ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ὅσα ἐάν λύσῃς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔσται λελυμένα ἐν οὐρανῷ
8. Matt 18:18: ἄμην λέγω ὡμίν ὅσα ἐάν δήσῃς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔσται δεδεμένα ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ὅσα ἐάν λύσῃς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔσται λελυμένα ἐν οὐρανῷ

145 Wallace notes that this might be a predicate adjective participle (Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics, 649). Green accepts it as a genuine periphrastic (Understanding Eimi Periphrastics, 419).
146 See above.

Indicative εἰμί: Aorist Periphrastic

2. 2 Cor 5:19: ὡς ὁθεός ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλάβας σοι ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ θέμενος ἐν ἠμίν τὸν λόγον τῆς καταλαγῆς

Subjunctive εἰμί (All Constructed with Perfect Participles)

1. Luke 14:8: ὅταν κληθῆς ὑπὸ τινὸς εἰς γάμους μὴ κατακλιθῆς εἰς τὴν πρωτοκλίσιαν μήποτε ἐντιμὸτερός σου ἡ κεκλημένος ὑπ’ αὐτόν
2. John 3:27: ἀπεκρίθη Ἰωάννης καὶ εἶπεν οὖ ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἵνα ἐλθεῖν δύναται ἔλθειν πρὸς ἐνα καὶ ἡ δεδομένον αὐτῷ ἐν τοῦ πατρός
3. John 6:65: καὶ ἔλεγεν διὰ τοῦτο εἴρηκα ὅτι οὐδεὶς δύναται καὶ θεός ἐνα ἐνα καὶ ἡ δεδομένον αὐτῷ ἐκ τοῦ πατρός
4. John 16:24: έος ἀρτίς οὖ κινήσασεν οὐδὲν ἐν τῷ ὄνοματί μου αἰτεῖτε καὶ λήμψεσθε ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ὑμῶν ἡ πεπληρωμένη
5. John 17:19: καὶ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἔγω ἀγιαζω ἔμαυτόν ἵνα ὅσιν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἡγιασμένοι ἐν ἀληθείᾳ
6. John 17:23: ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτῶν καὶ σὺ ἐν ἐμοί ίνα ὅσιν τετελειομένοι εἰς ἵνα γινώσκῃ ὁ κόσμος ὅτι σὺ με ἀπεστείλας καὶ ἤγαπης καθὼς ἐμὲ ἤγαπης
7. 1 Cor 1:10: παρακαλῶ δὲ υμᾶς ἀδελφοὶ διὰ τοῦ ὄνοματος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἵνα τὸ αὐτὸ λέγητε πάντες καὶ μὴ ἡ ἐν υμῖν σχίσματα ἤτε δὲ κατηρτισμένοι ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ νοὴ καὶ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ γνώμῃ
8. 2 Cor 1:9: ἀλλὰ αὐτῶν ἐν αὐτῶν τὸ ἀπόκριμα τοῦ θανάτου ἐσχήκαμεν ἵνα μὴ πεποιθήσετε ὅμως ἐφ’ ἐαυτοῖς ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ τοῦ θεοῦ τῷ ἐγείροντι τοὺς νεκροὺς
9. 2 Cor 9:3: ἐπεμείσα ὑμᾶς δὲ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ἵνα μὴ τὸ καύχημα ἡμῶν τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κενοθῇ ἐν τῷ μέρει τοῦτο ἵν αὐτῶς ἔλευγεν παρεσκευασμένοι ἤτε

---

147 Acts 8:13 is another possibility, but it seems more likely that the aorist participle in that verse is functioning adverbially, modifying the imperfect periphrastic construction (see Acts 8:13, which is #70 under the section “imperfect periphrastics” above).

148 It is unusual to have an aorist periphrastic. BDF say that εἰμί with the aorist, “used to emphasize the verbal idea, was not unknown in classical [Greek]” (§354). They list a variant at John 18:30 which reads εἰ μὴ ἦν ὁ αὐτὸς κακὸν ποιήσας in S* (ibid.).

149 Porter says that this example is “highly debatable” (Porter, Idioms, 49).

150 BDF point this out (§353).
10. Jas 5:15: καὶ ἡ εὐχή τῆς πίστεως σώσει τὸν κάμινοντα καὶ ἐγερέθι αὐτὸν ὁ κύριος· κἂν ἀμαρτίας ὡς πεποιηκός, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ.

11. 1 John 1:4: καὶ ταῦτα γράφωμεν ἡμεῖς ἵνα ἢ χαρὰ ἢ μὴ ὡς πεπληρωμένη.

12. 2 John 12: καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς μήποτε σε παραδόθη ὁ κυρίος πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ κύριος ἐλπίζω γενέσθαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ στόμα πρὸς στόμα λαλῆσαι ἵνα ἢ χαρὰ ἢ μὴ πεπληρωμένη ὡς

**Imperative εἰμί**

1. Matt 5:25\(^{151}\): ἵσθι εὐνοῦν τῷ ἀντιδίκῳ σου ταχὺ ἐξαρξάτε ὅτου ἔχετε μετ’ αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ· μήποτέ σου παραδόθη οἱ αἰωνιοί κρίματα· ὁ κρίτης τῷ ὑπηρέτῃ καὶ ὁ κρίτης τῷ ἑαυτῷ εἰς φυλακὴν βλήθησιν.

2. Luke 12:35: ἔστωσαν ὑμῶν αἱ ὑποφέρειας περιεσχόμεναι καὶ οἱ λόγοι καὶ δοξεῖς·

3. Luke 12:35: ἔστωσαν ὑμῶν αἱ ὑποφέρειας περιεσχόμεναι καὶ οἱ λόγοι καὶ δοξεῖς·


**Infinitive εἰμί**\(^{152}\)


2. Luke 11:1: καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ καθὼς προσευχόμενον ὡς ἐπαύσατο εἰπεν τις τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ πρὸς αὐτόν κύριος δίδαξον ἡμᾶς προσευχόμενοι καθὼς καὶ Ἰωάννης ἐδιδάξεν τοὺς μαθητάς αὐτοῦ

**Participle εἰμί**

1. Eph 4:17–18\(^{153}\): Τοῦτο οὖν λέγω καὶ μαρτύρομαι ἐν κυρίῳ, μηκέτι ὑμᾶς περιπατεῖν, καθὼς καὶ τὰ ἔθνη περιπατεῖ ἐν ματαιότητι τοῦ νοὸς αὐτῶν, 18 ἐσκοτωμένοι τῇ διανοίᾳ ὄντες, ἀπελλοτριωμένοι τῆς ἥπειρος τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ τὴν ἀγνοίαν τὴν ὁμοίαν ἐν αὐτοῖς, διὰ τὴν πάθοσιν τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν.

\(^{151}\) BDF take this as adjectival and “only seemingly periphrastic” (§353[1]).

\(^{152}\) Green rejects both of these verses as non-periphrastic, but his arguments are not ultimately convincing (Understanding Eimi Periphrastics, 103–108). He rightly notes that “if the infinitive and the participle combine, the resulting combination would function as an infinitive rather than a finite verb form” (p. 107). In this case it may depend on whether periphrastic is defined narrowly (a construction that functions as a finite verb) or broadly (a construction that functions in place of another verbal construction). This might very well be stretching the definition, but if the phenomenon is the same, it seems best to try to recognize this with our terminology.

\(^{153}\) Col 1:21 might be a periphrastic, but the participle and the adjective are both parallel. Green is probably right that the participle is a predicate adjective (Understanding Eimi Periphrastics, 111). BDF list it as a periphrastic (§352).
2. Eph 4:17–18: Τούτο οὖν λέγω καὶ μαρτύρομαι ἐν κυρίῳ, μηκέτι ὡς περιπατεῖν, καθός καὶ τὰ ἐθνη περιπατεῖ ἐν ματαιότητι τοῦ νοὸς αὐτῶν, 18 ἐσκοτωμένοι τῇ διανοίᾳ δόντες, ἀπηλλοτριομένοι τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ τὴν ἁγιασμὸν τῆς οὐσίας ἐν αὐτοῖς, διὰ τὴν πάροσιν τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν

Implied εἰμί 154

2. 2 Cor 12:4: καὶ ἵκουσιν ἀρρήτα ῥήματα ἀ οὐκ ἔξον ἀνθρώπων λαλῆσαι
3. Heb 5:156: καὶ οὐχ ἐστώ τις λαμβάνει τὴν τιμήν ἄλλα καλούμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ καθώσπερ καὶ Ααρών.

γίνομαι 157

1. 2 Cor 6:14: Μὴ γίνεσθε ἐτερογεγονέντες ἀπίστως: τίς γὰρ μετοχὴ δικαιοσύνη καὶ ἄνομία, ἢ τίς κοινωνία φωτὶ πρὸς σκότος;
2. Col 1:18: καὶ αὐτὸς ἔστιν ἡ κεφαλή τοῦ σώματος τῆς ἐκκλησίας ὡς ἔστιν ἄρχη πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν ἵνα γένηται ἐν πάσιν αὐτῶς προτείουν
3. Heb 5:12: καὶ γὰρ ὁφειλομένα εἶναι διδάσκαλοι διὰ τὸν χρόνον πάλιν χρείαν ἔχετε τοῦ διδάσκειν ὡς τινά τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν λογίων τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ γεγόνατε χρείαν ἔχοντες γάλακτος καὶ ὁ στερεάς τροφῆς
4. Rev 3:2: γίνον γρηγορὸν καὶ στήρισον τὰ λοιπὰ ἑμὲν ἀποθανεῖν ὁ γὰρ εὐρηκά σου τὰ ἔργα πεπληρωμένα ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ μου
5. Rev 16:10: καὶ ὁ πέμπτος ἔξεχεσθε τὴν φύλαξιν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον τοῦ θερίου καὶ ἐγένετο ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ ἐσκοτωμένη καὶ ἔμασθεν τὰς γλώσσας αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ πόνου

---

154 Boyer comments that “In a few cases a participle has been identified as periphrastic when an auxiliary is not present but seems to be implied by the sense of the context or by parallels where the same construction has the auxiliary” (Boyer, “The Classification of Participles,” 172).
155 BDF suggest this example (§353[5]); see also Boyer, “The Classification of Participles,” 172.
157 These examples are possible, but it depends on the verb losing its sense of “become” and functioning simply as an auxiliary. Mark 9:3 seems to be an example that is tempting to read as a periphrastic, but is likely to be taken in the sense of “became” (καὶ τὰ ἰμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο στιβάνων λευκὰ λάιν). According to BDF, γίνομαι is sometimes used similarly to εἶμι in a periphrastic construction “to denote the beginning of a state or condition” (§354).
ὑπάρχω ("only with the perfect participle")\textsuperscript{158}

1. Acts 8:16\textsuperscript{159}: οὐδέπω γὰρ Ἰν ἐπ’ οὔδεν αὐτῶν ἐπιπεπτωκός μόνον δὲ βεβαπτισμένου ὑπάρχω εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ

2. Acts 19:36: ἀναντιρρήτων οὖν ὄντων τούτων δὲ οὐκ ἐστὶν ὑμᾶς κατεσταλέμενος ὑπάρχειν καὶ μηδὲν προπετές πρᾶσσειν

ἐχω

There do not appear to be any periphrastics using ἐχω + the participle in the NT. The following have been suggested: Luke 13:6; 14:18; 19:20.\textsuperscript{160} Each of these seem to have alternate explanations that make it unlikely that they are functioning periphrastically.\textsuperscript{161}

\textsuperscript{158} BDF §354.

\textsuperscript{159} McKay also sees this as a periphrastic (A New Syntax of the Verb, 10).

\textsuperscript{160} Dana-Mantey, quoted in Wallace, Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics, 647.

\textsuperscript{161} This agrees with Fanning, who states that "Periphrasis with ἐχω and the aorist participle occurs in classical Greek but not in the NT. Finally, expressions with ἐχω, an object, and a supplementary participle do occur in the NT, but these are not regarded as 'periphrasis' in the sense discussed here" (Fanning, Verbal Aspect, 310, n. 255).
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