

Copyright © 2012 Michael Todd Graham Jr.

All rights reserved. The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary has permission to reproduce and disseminate this document in any form by any means for purposes chosen by the Seminary, including, without limitation, preservation or instruction.

AN ANALYSIS OF RECENT RESEARCH ON VERBAL
ASPECT IN HELLENISTIC GREEK

A Thesis
Presented to
the Faculty of
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Theology

by
Michael Todd Graham Jr.

December 2012

APPROVAL SHEET

AN ANALYSIS OF RECENT RESEARCH ON VERBAL
ASPECT IN HELLENISTIC GREEK

Michael Todd Graham Jr.

Read and Approved by:

Thomas R. Schreiner (Chair)

Peter J. Gentry

Date _____

To Lisa,
my dear wife,
and to
Lydia, Todd, and Ethan,
our precious children.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	v
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
The State of the Issue of Verbal Aspect	1
Statement of the Purpose	3
Verbal Aspect and Its Contributors	5
2. THE MAJOR VIEWS ON THE ISSUE	7
Introduction	7
An Investigation of Porter's View	7
An Investigation of Decker's Support of Porter	34
An Investigation of Fanning's View	36
An Investigation of Campbell's View.....	58
3. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	83
The Importance of Reaching Some Conclusions Regarding This Issue ...	83
Areas Which Need Further Study and Analysis	84
BIBLIOGRAPHY	86

PREFACE

This thesis has been written to serve as an introduction to the topic of verbal aspect within Hellenistic Greek. The primary goal of this project was to survey the leading contributors to this field and to review and synthesize their work in this area of study. Further, this thesis sought to clarify the topic by exposing each author's views concerning the major matters of debate and by listing some subjects in verbal aspect that are in need of further study. Finally, this thesis was intended to demonstrate the importance of this topic for the study of Scripture, particularly, the study of the New Testament.

Michael T. Graham Jr.

Louisville, Kentucky

December 2012

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The State of the Issue of Verbal Aspect

The subject of verbal aspect is rooted in a debate that began among scholars in the latter part of the 1800s.¹ In fact, “since World War II one of the major topics of discussion on a wide linguistic front has been verbal systems.”² Hence, verbal aspect, in regard to its relation to the issue of tense, is not essentially a new issue. Rather, the issue of tense in relation to the verb has been raging for over a century. However, concerning the study of verbal aspect in itself, this is a new debate. The reason it is new is because up until the last two decades the “research on aspect in Hellenistic and New Testament Greek has been rare, usually limited in scope, and not widely known.”³ Nonetheless, because of its relation to the verbal system, it is rooted in a rather old debate. Yet, this is still an important area of research because the implications that verbal aspect brings to the understanding of the Greek verbal system challenge many widely held views concerning the function and scope of the verb forms.

¹Andrew David Naselli, "A Brief Introduction to Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek," *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* 12 (January 2007): 21.

²Stanley E. Porter and Jeffrey T. Reed, “Greek Grammar since BDF: A Retrospective and Prospective Analysis,” *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 4, no. 8 (1991): 149.

³Buist M. Fanning, "Approaches to Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek: Issues in Definition and Method," in *Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 46.

One of the major issues in this debate has to do with whether the verb can semantically encode time. In other words, does the verb inherently depict time as well as aspect, or does it only encode aspect at the semantic level? The issue of time in reference to the verb was at one point unquestionably affirmed, for until the late 1800s the leading view regarding the entire verbal system was that it grammaticalized absolute time by its morphology.⁴ However, at the end of the nineteenth century this view was overturned and replaced by a view that recognized the verb as grammaticalizing *Aktionsart* in all verb forms and only grammaticalizing absolute time in indicative verbs.⁵ For that matter, this view has continued to be the leading view held among the majority of authors of commentaries and Greek and Bible teachers in colleges and seminaries to this day.⁶ Thus, it is necessary to define verbal aspect and *Aktionsart* to distinguish between them. Verbal aspect is a semantic category that uses the verbal forms to grammaticalize the author's perspective of the action. *Aktionsart* is a pragmatic category that is a combination of various elements within the sentence to convey different syntactical ideas such as Ingressive, Constatative, Progressive, Instantaneous, Iterative, Gnomonic, Epistolary, etc.

In recent decades, the issue of verbal aspect in relation to the verbal system has caused much debate among scholars. According to Naselli, "Books and articles on verbal aspect in New Testament Greek have been part of the cutting edge of Greek grammar and

⁴Naselli, "A Brief Introduction," 21.

⁵Ibid., 20-21.

⁶Ibid., 21.

syntax for about two decades.”⁷ Nevertheless, despite the immense amount of literature on the topic, the issue of tense and aspect in relation to Greek verbs lacks a consensus. Moreover, the lack of consensus is so significant that even those who believe that tense is not a part of the Greek verb at the semantic level still have disagreements as to the relation of tense to the verb. For instance, concerning Porter, K. L. McKay states that it “seems . . . that in his enthusiasm to overthrow the old erroneous assumptions he sometimes goes too far, and either ignores or misapplies the contextual evidence.”⁸ The major issue between these two scholars is not whether tense is semantically encoded in the verb forms, for they both agree it is not. Rather, the issue concerns properly determining the correlation between Greek verb forms and tense.⁹ Therefore, as one can see this is a highly contested topic, for even those who agree on certain points of verbal aspect disagree on others.

Statement of the Purpose

The principle objective of this thesis is to investigate the major contributions to the study of verbal aspect; particularly addressing the issues of how verbal aspect and tense relate to Greek verbs, what aspect the perfect tense form has, and the function of the historical present. Specifically, this thesis will seek to analyze the major contributors to this topic: Stanley E. Porter, Buist M. Fanning, Constantine R. Campbell, and Rodney J. Decker, reviewing their contributions to this topic. Particularly, it will focus on their

⁷Ibid., 17.

⁸K. L. McKay, “Time and Aspect in New Testament Greek,” *Novum Testamentum* 34, no. 3 (1992): 210.

⁹Ibid., 212-13.

conclusions concerning whether tense is a semantic feature of the verb or a pragmatic function indicated by lexical, grammatical, and contextual factors. Further, it will concentrate on their views concerning the aspect of the perfect verb form and the historical present.

The subject of verbal aspect is inherently tied to the issue of tense in relation to the Greek verb. Since Stanley Porter and Buist Fanning completed their doctoral dissertations on this topic, verbal aspect has been a major area of research among Greek scholars. However, despite the substantial amount of literature written on the subject there is still no consensus on the temporality issue,¹⁰ as well as the aspect of the perfect and the function of the historical present. Although the view that the verb is timeless is growing amongst scholars, there are many who do not hold this view.¹¹ For that matter, there is no agreement regarding this issue, and a fresh investigation into the study of this topic is needed.

Therefore, this thesis will analyze the major contributors to this topic: Porter, Fanning, Campbell, and Decker. Specifically, it will examine their dissertations, surveying and interacting with their conclusions concerning aspect within the Greek verbal system. That is, it will focus on the issue of semantics and pragmatics with regard to the verb and the aspect of the perfect verb form as well as the function of the historical present.

¹⁰Constantine R. Campbell, *Basics of Verbal Aspect in Biblical Greek* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2008), 32.

¹¹Ibid.

Verbal Aspect and Its Contributors

The problem of how tense relates to the verb with respect to verbal aspect may be the most significant dilemma of the entire verbal aspect discussion. In addition to this, the identification of the aspect of the perfect verb form and the function of the historical present are major areas of debate. Further, the importance of these issues and their relation to the verb is displayed in the fact that, apart from these areas of debate, the two major verbal aspect theories come to many of the same views.

One model, which is predominately represented by Stanley E. Porter,¹² holds to the understanding that verbs do not indicate tense at the semantic level, but rather tense is indicated at the pragmatic level. In other words, verbs do not innately indicate tense through their forms, but tense is instead expressed through external features such as context, lexeme, etc. This view eliminates the possibility of tense being directly indicated by the verb.¹³ Further, this model holds that the aspect of the perfect is stative and that previous existence of the event is a matter of lexis.¹⁴ The other model, which is largely represented by Buist M. Fanning, embraces the understanding that verbs grammaticalize aspect, but tense is closely connected. That is, this view holds that while the verb form does not indicate tense, it is affected by lexis and context.¹⁵ In other words,

¹²K. L. McKay is also a major contributor to this debate; he was the first to make a significant impact on the modern discussion of verbal aspect. However, Porter and Fanning became the most dominant figures after writing their dissertations; nonetheless, McKay is still a very important contributor to this debate. He is similar to Porter in his view on the verb as non-temporal (Campbell, *Basics of Verbal Aspect*, 28). However, he is distinct in that he is more accepting of tense in relation to the verb (Naselli, "A Brief Introduction," 20).

¹³Naselli, "A Brief Introduction," 20.

¹⁴Stanley E. Porter, *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament, with Reference to Tense and Mood*, Studies in Biblical Greek, vol. 1 (New York: Peter Lang, 1989), 259.

¹⁵Naselli, "A Brief Introduction," 20.

while tense is not semantically encoded within the verb, as in the case of aspect, it is still closely related. In addition, this model holds that the aspect of the perfect involves “tense, *Aktionsart*, and aspect features working together.”¹⁶ Thus, although much scholarship has been focused on this topic, the study of verbal aspect in Hellenistic Greek is still important because of the great lack of consensus surrounding it.

¹⁶Buist M. Fanning, *Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 112.

CHAPTER 2

THE MAJOR VIEWS ON THE ISSUE

Introduction

The topic of verbal aspect is an area within the scholarly community that is highly debated. The reasons for this debate are varied, but one particular reason is that there is no real consensus on the topic. For instance, the scholarship concerning this subject has been far reaching, and the number of contributors is continuing to increase. However, there are a few prominent scholars who have written on this topic, and this chapter seeks to analyze each one. Thus, the author will seek to provide an overview of each of the author's contributions to this topic, devoting particular attention to the most debated areas within verbal aspect.

An Investigation of Porter's View

In his published dissertation, *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament, with Reference to Tense and Mood*, Stanley Porter begins by introducing his approach to the issue of verbal aspect. In the introduction Porter delineates his thesis stating, "The major assertion is that the category of synthetic verbal aspect—a morphologically-based semantic category which grammaticalizes the author/speaker's reasoned subjective choice of conception of a process—provides a suggestive, workable and powerful

linguistic model for explaining the range of uses of the tense-forms in Greek.”¹ In other words, he asserts that linguistics, particularly systemic linguistics, provides the best explanation for the array of uses of the forms in the Greek verbal system. Porter further develops this thesis throughout his introduction by giving a history of linguistics in recent discussion, by making an appeal for a linguistic model and a reevaluation of traditional linguistic systems, and finally, by surveying systemic linguistics.

In his section on the history of linguistics in recent discussion, Porter states that since the study of James Barr’s *Semantics of Biblical Language*, biblical scholars have recognized the importance of modern linguistics in interpreting Scripture (2). He further states in this chapter that the results of scholarship done in the area of structural linguistics by scholars such as Sawyer, Burres, and Silva were initially restricted to the study of lexis. However, he makes it clear that the study of structural linguistics in recent years has been recognized as important for the study of areas such as grammar, syntax, and semantics (2). Porter concludes this section of the chapter by pointing out that many biblical scholars have recognized that all interpretation, including that of grammar, occurs within some model or “interpretive context” (3-4).

In light of the recognition that even grammar is interpreted within some model, he makes an appeal for a linguistic model by referring to the theoretical nature of language systems. He then highlights the difference between how a native speaker uses his or her language and how a grammarian evaluates the use of a language (4). He points out that, in light of the “epigraphic nature” of the study of New Testament Greek and the

¹Stanley E. Porter, *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament, with Reference to Tense and Mood*, Studies in Biblical Greek, vol. 1 (New York: Peter Lang, 1989), 1. In the section discussing Porter’s view, parenthetical page numbers in the text refer to this source.

lack of native speakers, there is a great need to have some type of linguistic model to verify a particular scholar's grammar of a language. He concludes this appeal for a linguistic model by stating that "these factors, however, rather than causing despair should make more pressing the need to reevaluate constantly the interpretive models employed and to rely more heavily upon formal linguistic features of the extant corpus" (4).

Following this appeal to reevaluate interpretative models, he examines other such models and linguists, such as Kempson, Chomskian, Pike, and Hudson. He also lists three criteria for evaluating the legitimacy of a grammatical model, asserting that a model must be inclusive, it must result in rational discourse, and it must provide creative and provocative conclusions that offer potential for further analysis (4-5). Finally, he restates his claim that one must constantly reevaluate the current interpretative grammatical system, and he asserts that systemic linguistics solves some of the problems that the other systems are unable to explain (6).

Porter concludes the introduction by providing an overview of systemic linguistics. He begins by making a strong distinction between formal and functional features in the Greek verbal structure. He states that systemic linguistics is a functional linguistic model or a "functional paradigm" that "defines language in terms of its use as an instrument or tool for communication and social interaction" (7). Further, Porter uses the word "formal" as a synonym for morphologically based features (7). As a result, Porter views the endings that distinguish each tense to be formal, but the system in which the tenses are used to be functional. Porter highlights this by capitalizing all formal terms

(subjunctive, participle, aorist indicative, etc.) and putting all functional terms in lower case letters (perfective, attitude, stative, etc.) (12).

Porter mentions several linguists who have written on this linguistic model, and he makes special mention of Gotteri's definition, who states,

The term 'systemic linguistics' can be used of any variant of system-structure theory in which language is interpreted as essentially a vast network of interrelated sets of options. The structure of a language (wordings or other syntagmatic realisations) is regarded as manifesting choices made from interdependent paradigmatic options, which between them constitute the language's potential for conveying meaning (7-8).²

In other words, systemic linguistics views the Greek language as consisting of a limited amount of choices that the author may use to convey his thoughts (8). Finally, throughout the rest of this section Porter further explains systemic linguistics, demonstrating various aspects of this grammatical system (8-16).

In chapter 1, Porter interacts with the history of research concerning tense, *Aktionsart*, and aspect. He begins by claiming that discussion concerning aspect is only the "tentative result of a history of previous debate" and that there is a serious problem with tense terminology that is only augmented by many linguists (17-18). Porter first surveys the history of research on this topic by interacting with Hellenistic Greek Grammars. One such grammar he discusses is that attributed to Dionysius Thrax, dated from around 120 B.C. Porter makes several observations concerning this work, the first of which is that Dionysius "does not make clear whether his temporal categories correspond to particular verbal forms" (19). Specifically, he does not clearly indicate whether he views the forms as having particular temporal references. However, Porter

²N. J. C. Gotteri, "Towards a Comparison of Systemic Linguistics and Tagmemics: An Interim

states that Dionysius' system is "temporally oriented" (20).

The second group of Hellenistic Grammars that Porter evaluates is those produced by Stoic grammarians. He states, "Working with essentially the same terminology as the Alexandrians, the Stoics do not set out a purely temporal paradigm but work from tense-form oppositions, defining tenses according to both temporal distinctions and kind of action" (20). For instance, they see a connection between the present and the imperfect because they are both incomplete and possess the same sounds (20). However, Porter believes that the Stoics rely too heavily on temporally based categories. In fact, he states that the Greeks' description of their own language was rudimentary and in some instances misleading (22). Porter next does a cursory overview of the nineteenth-century and traditional grammars (22-26). One important statement that he makes in this section is that the era's grammarians resemble either Dionysius Thrax or the Stoics. However, Porter critiques these grammarians for basing their grammars on pragmatic usage (23).

In the next section of this chapter, Porter discusses Comparative Philology and *Aktionsart* (26-35). He brings attention to the fact that early nineteenth-century scholars began questioning traditional tense definitions (26). Further, he highlights various authors and their contributions to this development. The first author he mentions is Rost, who according to Porter is able to advance the study of Greek grammar by "paying particular attention to the verbal action of the individual tenses" (26). Another scholar Porter mentions is Curtius, to whom Porter gives credit for informing scholars of "verbal

Report and Bibliography," *Journal of the Midland Association for Linguistic Studies* 7 (1982): 31.

kind of action” (26). Porter also mentions Brugmann and Wackernagel, remarking that he considers Brugmann to be the most important contributor in his era, for he is the one who coined the term *Aktionsart* (29). Porter concludes this section by stating that although he does not desire to discount verbal *Aktionsart* altogether, he does seek to demonstrate that these categories are “neither strictly morphologically based . . . nor descriptively objective” (33). In light of this, he lists several helpful distinguishing points and critiques of *Aktionsart* (33-34).

In the last two sections of chapter 1 in his dissertation, Porter addresses some transitional approaches, and he thoroughly discusses the development of structural linguistics and aspect. In the section on transitional approaches, he analyzes the grammatical theories of grammarians such as Harrison, Jacobsohn of Wackernagel (35),³ and Schwyzer (37-38),⁴ among others. He then concludes chapter 1 by discussing structural linguistics and aspect. In these pages, Porter discusses various scholars’ contributions to this area of study, as well as a range of Hellenistic Greek Grammars from the nineteenth century to the present (39-65). One scholar with whom he interacts is Holt, noting that he published the first structural linguistic approach to aspect in 1943 (39). Holt’s main premise was that “previous attempts to adjudge aspectual values of the Greek verb suffered from lack of a systematic structural approach” (39). Moreover, Holt suggests that there is a distinction between a language’s expression (form) and content

³According to Porter, Jacobson concludes that “there are two ways of conceiving of action: subjective aspect . . . and objective *Aktionsart*.”

⁴One critique Porter gives of Schwyzer is that in his grammar “he asserts that the indicative has absolute temporal meaning, an assertion which causes unnecessary problems, since he acknowledges that the non-indicative moods are solely aspectual.” Another critique by Porter concerns Schwyzer’s view of the augment. He states that because the temporal view of the augment does not consistently hold true (he

(function) (39). Porter recognizes Holt's contribution to this topic, but he critiques him on several features of his analysis. Two particular critiques of Porter include Holt's lack of clear departure from a "strictly logical analysis" and his "desire to put all choices on the same level" (40-41).

Two other significant contributors to this topic with whom Porter interacts are Comrie and McKay. In his review of the former, he points out that Comrie posits two oppositions: one between the perfect and non-perfect forms and the other between the aorist and non-aorist forms, with the future being aspectless (46). Porter provides several criticisms, such as that Comrie does not devote enough attention to each language, he appears to be limited in his knowledge of Greek, and his theory of aspect seems to be a theory of *Aktionsart* (46).

In Porter's review of McKay, he has many positive statements about his work in this area. One supporting remark Porter makes is that "McKay stresses the importance of the 'subjective attitude of the speaker or writer' in selection of aspect in Greek, and his renaming of the present as 'imperfective' helps him to untangle confusing Greek tense terminology, though he retains the term 'future' despite his argument for it as an aspectual category" (49). Although Porter has many positive comments about McKay's contributions, he also gives several objections. One significant critique is that "McKay conflates *Aktionsart* and aspect when he notes that though the Aorist expresses an action simply as an event, pure and undefined, the action itself may be momentary, prolonged, etc. simply because it is the residual aspect" (49). In other words, Porter is pointing out

makes note of the non-past imperfect), it is not legitimate.

that McKay is contradicting the main point of his argument: that the aorist is to be classified as a specific aspect and not simply as unmarked (49). Finally, Porter concludes the first chapter by interacting with the major grammars in the last two hundred years, some of which include: Winer, Burton, Blass-Debrunner-Funk, Moulton, Robertson, Mayser, and several others that give an alternative to the traditional approach to analysis of language (50-65).

In chapter 2, Porter seeks to give a systemic analysis of Greek verbal aspect. That is to say, he seeks to delimit his particular view of the Greek verbal system. He brings clarity to his intentions for this chapter by referencing Lyons' book *Semantics*. He states, "The most persuasive explanation will delimit a defined number of specific, shared semantic features which describe the largest number of kinds of examples" (75). Porter's goal for this chapter is seemingly to crystallize the grammatical elements that are the hinge on which the language turns. In the chapter, he attempts to accomplish this by discussing four areas that are essential to this topic: grammaticalization of tense, an introduction to verbal aspect, deictic indicators and temporal reference, and standard patterns of verbal usage.

In the first section, which discusses grammaticalization of tense, Porter begins by interacting with Comrie and Lyons' discussions on the meaning of tense. Porter emphasizes the importance of proper terminology and consequently follows the definitions of Comrie and Lyons. Porter highlights Comrie's statement that "a more characteristic use of the present tense is in referring to situations which occupy a much larger period of time than the present moment, but which nonetheless include the present

moment with them” (77).⁵ Based on this definition Porter denies tense in the present verb form completely. He supports this because only one example in the New Testament meets the criteria of this definition and because there are many examples, in which the present verb form can be used with a variety of temporal and non-temporal references (77-78). However, he does not simply hold the view that the present verb form does not grammaticalize tense. Rather, because the other major tense categories are likewise used in temporal and non-temporal settings, Porter’s position is that, like the present verb form, all other verb forms do not grammaticalize tense (78-83).⁶

Following Porter’s discussion on grammaticalization of tense, he further defines his view of the Greek verbal system by introducing verbal aspect. He begins the second section by posing a question: is there a “unifying semantic category of Greek tense usage?” (83). Porter positively answers this question pointing out that aspect is able to do what *Aktionsart* is not (83-84).⁷ In other words, he argues that the Greek verbs should not be analyzed based on tense, but rather they “must be stringently reformulated on the basis of systemic application of the grammatical category of synthetic or formally-based verbal aspect” (84). For that reason, Porter holds that verbal aspect is the unifying semantic category on which Greek tense usage may be centered, for it is capable of demonstrating how the three major Greek verb forms (aorist, perfect, and present) can have “similar temporal reference” and yet semantically remain distinct (83). In this

⁵Bernard Comrie, *Tense* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 37.

⁶One critique that seems to be necessary is that Porter needs to spend more time developing and supporting his position since it denies a long-standing consensus opinion on the Greek verbal system.

⁷Porter lists two major criticisms. First, he asserts that *Aktionsart* fails to answer why Greek uses three different verb forms for the same basic function. Second, he claims that *Aktionsart* is not able to limit the number of tenses because of the infinite ways an event can be conceived.

chapter, he defines verbal aspect as “a synthetic semantic category (realized in the forms of verbs) used of meaningful oppositions in a network of tense systems to grammaticalize the author’s reasoned subjective choice of conception of a process” (88). In summary, Porter states that verbal aspect is the author’s view of the action based on a set grammatical structure. Each verbal form conveys a particular aspect, and the author’s choice is within these limits. Porter keeps the traditional categories, but he assigns new “functional” categories to each of the verb forms. The aorist is labeled perfective aspect, the present and imperfect are labeled imperfective aspect, and the perfect and pluperfect are labeled stative aspect (89).

In the remaining pages of this section, he seeks to demonstrate four qualities that semantically distinguish each verbal aspect (89-98). The first quality he mentions is verbal oppositions, or rather, marked pairs (89). By way of explanation, Porter claims that Greek verbal aspect “appears to function on the basis of equipollent binary oppositions, in which while each aspect is not identically weighted, at the least each contributes semantically in an identifiable way” (90). Consequently, Porter understands there to be two oppositions, the perfect tense, which is the most heavily formally marked (stative aspect) in opposition to the present/aorist, concerning which the imperfective aspect is slightly more formally marked (imperfective/perfective aspects). Further, Porter states that because the perfective aspect is the least heavily marked, it is the default aspect and that the first binary opposition is [+perfective or –perfective]. Finally, the second binary opposition is [+imperfective or +stative].

The second quality Porter discusses is visualization. He defines this as the picture each aspect creates in the author’s mind. After briefly summarizing the

traditional conception of each verb form, he describes the picture each aspect conveys through the analogy of a parade (91). The perfective aspect is what a television announcer would see from a helicopter high above the event. The imperfective aspect is what a person in the audience would see as the parade passes by him or her. The stative aspect is what the parade manager sees as he or she considers all that went into making the parade take place. Finally, he concludes this section by emphasizing that tense is not inherently communicated through these aspects, that each aspect adds a new perspective on the process, and that these aspects are not objective but rather are the subjective view of the speaker (91).

The third quality Porter mentions that distinguishes each verbal aspect is planes of discourse. That is to say, the author views the various aspects as communicating different views of information. The perfective aspect (aorist verb form) communicates background information. The imperfective aspect (present and imperfect verb forms) communicates foreground information, and the stative aspect (perfect verb form) communicates front ground information. Further, Porter distinguishes between the imperfective and stative aspects, classifying the former as defined and the latter as well-defined (92-93).⁸

The fourth quality Porter mentions is systemic display. In this section, Porter attempts to demonstrate a systemic display of the Greek verbal network so that he may graphically demonstrate it (93). He does this by using componential notation, which he claims “provides a succinct and useful means of noting the semantic features

⁸Porter’s conclusions in this section would be more convincing if he provided more than one example to support his claims.

accumulated in a trip through the systems within the network from broader to more delicate distinctions” (93). The two broadest choices in this system that Porter offers are aspectuality and finiteness. The finiteness system “distinguishes the semantic distinction between limitation on the verbal expression through person [+finite] and lack of limitation [-finite]” (94). The aspectuality system “requires choice of [+expectation] or [+aspectual]” (94). The other choices in this system include aspect 1 [+perfective/-perfective]; aspect 2 [+imperfective/+stative]; attitude [+assertion/-assertion] and remoteness (93-97). Interestingly, Porter states that [+remoteness] or [-remoteness] is the closest the Greek verb forms come to a temporal semantic feature (95).

In the third section of chapter 2, Porter discusses deictic indicators and temporal reference. He begins by claiming that the non-temporal nature of the verb categories in Greek is established (98).⁹ He next discusses two topics: the relationship of aspect, tense and attitude and the function of deixis (98). Porter asserts that aspect is not a temporal category; rather, it is “related to tense (and attitude) in the sense that all three of these categories are concerned with processes which occur in time and the realm of time is their semantic domain” (98). Porter lists three temporal points in this domain: the time of speaking or writing, the time at which the process occurs, and the time of all processes a writer or speaker may refer to at a given moment. Accordingly, for Porter, aspect grammaticalizes the view of the speaker on a specific process and not external time (98).

Next, Porter defines attitude as that which grammaticalizes the relationship between the speaker and reference time. Specifically, it grammaticalizes the speaker’s

⁹It seems as though this claim is premature and needs more development. For instance, one question that would aid in this discussion is why are there two verb forms with the same aspect if the verb forms do not indicate tense?

view on the point of reference (98-99). Concerning tense, Porter states that it is “a non-grammaticalized category of temporal reference established on the basis of deixis” (99). Nonetheless, Porter allows the traditional temporal categories of past, present, and future to be retained, although he introduces two additional categories: omnitemporal and timeless reference (99). A timeless proposition is one that does not even consider tense and an omnitemporal proposition is one that sees the eternality of something, or “one for which the question of time-reference . . . simply does not arise” (99). However, Porter clearly supports a timeless view and only concedes that an omnitemporal view is plausible (99).

Finally, Porter discusses deixis, which in quoting Lyons he says is “the location and identification of persons, objects, events, processes, and activities being talked about, or referred to, in relation to the spatiotemporal context created and sustained by the act of utterance and the participation in it, typically, of a single speaker and at least one addressee” (99).¹⁰ In other words, it is what communicates the spatial and temporal features of language. He lists four deictic categories (person, time, discourse, and social deixis) and discusses them for the remainder of this section (98-102).

In the fourth and final section of chapter 2, Porter discusses standard patterns of verbal usage (102-09) as he seeks to answer the question: “If tense forms are non-temporal in reference why does the Aorist refer to the past in the great majority of uses, and the Present to the present?” (102). He begins by listing four reasons, building a case

¹⁰See John Lyons, *Linguistic Semantics: An Introduction* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 637.

for the temporal view of the verb forms based on statistical data that is flawed (102-03). In response to the statistical argument, he claims, “The most convincing and adequate grammatical explanation must encompass the widest range of uses under a single explanatory head (intensional meaning), relegating the fewest number of times it is used (103). Thus, what Porter seeks to demonstrate in this section is that there is a distinction between semantics at the code level and pragmatics at the text level (103). For Porter, the implicatures can be cancelled but the essential meaning cannot (104). As a result, he asserts that based on contrastive verbal substitution, verb forms are aspect based and other cancelable indicators indicate tense (104-08).

In chapter 3, Porter interacts with the question of the influence of Semitic languages on verbal aspect in the New Testament. He addresses this question by looking at the languages used in Palestine and the nature of New Testament Greek, by examining possible examples of Semitic influence upon it, and by demonstrating that the Greek of the New Testament is Hellenistic Greek (111-56). In the first section of this chapter, he begins by noting the extensive amount of interest in this topic since the work of Wyss, Pasor, and Trom in the mid-seventeenth century (111). He synthesizes the issue, stating that there are two main areas of discussion in this study: the current languages of first century Palestine, and various theories regarding the nature of the Greek of the New Testament (111-17). Regarding the languages used in Palestine in the first century, he concludes that they were multilingual and that the main languages used included Aramaic, Greek, Hebrew (possibly vernacular but certainly written), and Latin (primarily used by Romans) (113). However, he states that the primary debate concerns the nature

of New Testament Greek, and he surveys the major views (113-17).¹¹

In the second section, in which he examines the possible instances of Semitic influence upon the Greek of the New Testament, Porter begins by listing eight key points that guide the discussion in this chapter. One particularly noteworthy point is the statement that there are two common approaches to determining Semitisms in the New Testament. The first approach gives priority to the Semitic source and puts the burden of proof on the New Testament. The second, which Porter prefers, gives precedence to the New Testament and puts the burden of proof on those who argue for a Semitic influence (117-18).¹² Throughout the remainder of this section, he interacts with common examples given by those who support Semitic influence, and in each case, he repudiates such claims, demonstrating that each can be explained in a way that is in keeping with a Greek background (119-41). For instance, he refutes the claim that the pleonastic use of λέγων is in place of the Hebrew infinitive construct, לֵאמֹר. In particular, he points out that “on the basis of secular Greek parallels, heavy usage of λέγων in the New Testament is at most a well-accepted Greek idiom enhanced by the LXX, especially since it appears in the ‘characteristically Greek material’ of Luke-Acts” (139).¹³

¹¹The major views range from the view that New Testament Greek is derived directly from Attic Greek to the view that it is a heavily semitized translation Greek.

¹²The reasons given for placing the burden of proof on those who argue for a Semitic influence are that the New Testament manuscripts were written in Greek within a Greek environment, and so there is the possibility of the authors, whose first language is Semitic, using ‘good Greek.’ Consequently, since Semitic influence is not simply “a matter of circumstances but of measurable alteration” the proof is on those who support a Semitic influence (118).

¹³J. H. Moulton and Nigel Turner, *Style*, vol. 4 of *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1976), 52. Porter’s point would be strengthened if he listed some examples to support his claim.

In the third section of chapter 3, Porter contends that the Greek of the New Testament is Hellenistic Greek. In this section, he “evaluates from a linguistic perspective the major findings, incorporating previous discussion in this chapter” (141). More specifically, Porter interacts with the research on this topic, illustrating the linguistic support for New Testament Greek being Hellenistic. Some of the areas he discusses include the lack of evidence for Semitic sources underlying Koine Greek, the deficiency of Semitic loan words in the New Testament, and the commonality between the Greek of the New Testament and Hellenistic Greek (141-56).

In chapter 4, Porter further develops selected topics discussed in chapter 2. Dividing the chapter into two parts, he first discusses the various moods (attitudes) in New Testament Greek. In the second part, after demonstrating the support of his proposed non-temporal view from recent research, he delineates the criteria for differentiating various pragmatic categories within the aorist and present/imperfect verb forms, and he gives examples of these in New Testament Greek (163-239). Porter begins the overview of the various moods (attitudes) in New Testament Greek by declaring that the indicative mood conveys assertive attitude (163). In other words, the mood conveys the author’s projected viewpoint of the action as actual or real. However, it must be understood that in reality the action may or may not be true or factual (164-65). Porter further defines this by discussing Palmer’s study of ‘mood and modality,’ and he points out that because modality simply conveys the author’s opinion and attitude, the indicative may be used to convey both factual and non-factual information.¹⁴ He states, in like manner, the non-indicative mood can convey both non-factual and factual information (165). He concludes the analysis of the indicative mood by positing that the frequency of the indicative mood in Greek literature, the most frequent mode used, is evidence of it

¹⁴F. R. Palmer, *Mood and Modality*, Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 16.

being the “normal mode to use when there is no special reason for employing another mode’ and hence it is less heavily marked in relation to the non-indicative Moods” (166).¹⁵ Therefore, for Porter the indicative mood is used for assertive or declarative speech, while the non-indicative verb forms are used for a variety of other related attitudes (166).

Porter claims that the non-indicative mood conveys non-assertive attitudes (167-68), and he spends a substantial amount of the remaining pages of part one of this chapter interacting with the various issues concerning this mood. In these pages, he substantiates the non-temporal nature of the imperative, subjunctive, and optative moods, as well as discusses their semantic features (168-78). Particularly, he proposes that the subjunctive mood conveys projection with no expectation of fulfillment (170-73),¹⁶ the optative expresses projection with contingent expectation of fulfillment (173-77),¹⁷ and the future verb form communicates expectation (177-78). That is, Porter proposes that the future verb form semantically communicates the speaker’s expectation of a future event (177).¹⁸

Porter concludes the first part of chapter 4 by discussing markedness and the assertive attitude. He proposes that the perfective and imperfective aspects in Greek

¹⁵See A. T. Roberston, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in Light of Historical Research* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934), 915. See also K. L. McKay, *A New Syntax of the Verb in New Testament Greek: An Aspectual Approach*, vol. 5 of *Studies in Biblical Greek* (New York: Peter Lang, 1994), 148.

¹⁶One critique of Porter’s categorization of the subjunctive is that he does not expound on the claim that the subjunctive indicates no expectation of fulfillment. Further, he states that Gonda’s formulation of the subjunctive is helpful and in it, Gonda states that the subjunctive conveys an idea that is not only capable of realization but may even be awaiting realization (172). This seems to contradict Porter’s categorization of the subjunctive. (See J. Gonda, *The Character of the Indo-European Moods, with Special Regard to Greek and Sanskrit* [Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1956], 69-70).

¹⁷It is worth noting that Porter sees plus or minus contingency as the main difference between the subjunctive and the optative (173). Further, he states that he believes contingency is the main element communicated by the optative (174).

¹⁸Porter discusses this in detail in chapter 9.

create an equipollent opposition and that morphological markedness¹⁹ indicates the historical development of the verb forms (178). In this section, then, he proposes that based on the material, implicational, distributional, and semantic markedness, the aorist and the present/imperfect make a bipolar opposition, in which the aorist is the less heavily marked (also the earlier form), and the present/imperfect are the more heavily marked verb forms (178-81).²⁰

The second part of chapter 4 commences with an analysis of recent research on the perfective aspect. In this section, Porter begins by summarizing the previous chapters in his dissertation and gives a list of five pragmatic usages of the verb forms: past, present, future, omnitemporal, and timeless reference (182). In the remaining portion of this section, Porter reviews several articles on the aorist, and he concludes that these articles demonstrate that his work is both in harmony with recent trends in Greek grammar and that he advances the discussion (182-88). Next, Porter discusses past-referring imperfective and perfective aspects, and he claims that verbal aspect provides the most convincing explanation of the alternation in verb form usage (188-208). He begins by discussing the past-referring present (historical present), and he lists the four major theories concerning the historical present, providing his view of an aspectual approach to the historical present (189-98).²¹

¹⁹Porter defines markedness as the morphemes that distinguish each verb form.

²⁰Material Markedness: Porter asserts that the present is more morphologically nuanced than the aorist (178-80). Therefore, the aorist is the oldest verb stem. Implicational Markedness: Porter believes that because the present/imperfect are more heavily marked and because they combine the endings of the middle/passive voice, this points to the aorist being the 'older' form. Further, he agrees with McKay that the augment was originally an adverbial particle and that it is non-temporal (180). Distributional Markedness: Porter states that fact that the aorist is used more than the present/imperfect verb forms points to it being older (181). Semantic Markedness: Porter argues that in each of the verbal analogies discussed in chapter 2 the aorist form is shown to be the least heavily marked and consequently the oldest form (181).

²¹Porter states, "To formulate a general theory of the past-referring Present, therefore, the 'historic' Present is used at those places where the author feels that he wishes to draw attention to an event or series of events" (196).

Porter explains that the imperfective/perfective opposition is a fundamental opposition in Greek. In addition, he states that the stative/non-stative opposition occurs in narrative contexts least often. Porter makes clear that the present and aorist verb forms comprise the majority of forms in narratives (198). He next clarifies the relationship between the aorist and the imperfect, and he addresses the relationship between the imperfect and the present (198-208).²² Moreover, in the second part of chapter 4 Porter discusses how the augment is not a past-referring morpheme. In this section, he argues that as early as the classical period the augment was simply a formal feature and did not indicate past time (208-09).²³ Finally, he interacts with examples in which the various verb forms do not align with the temporal view of the verb forms. He argues that this supports his proposal since these instances, are often treated as anomalies, “must be integrated by an adequate explanatory theory of verb tenses, and that verbal aspect provides such an explanatory semantic category” (239).

In chapter 5, Porter interacts with the stative aspect and perfect verb form. He begins this chapter by making clear his objective: this chapter “attempts a systemic explication of the opposition between the stative and non-stative aspectual systems in the Greek verbal network” (245). He attempts to accomplish this objective by first outlining his proposed system. That is to say, he claims that Greek has three aspectual choices in consequence of two primary binary oppositions: the [+perfective]/[-perfective], and the [+imperfective]/[+stative]. Further, he posits that the stative is the most heavily marked

²²Porter states that the “Aorist provides the backbone for narrative by describing a series of complete events. It is upon this framework that the narrative is built, with the Imperfect providing marked opposition” (206). Further, concerning the imperfect and present he remarks that “the Imperfect is best understood as the less heavily marked Imperfective form, grammaticalizing [+remoteness], i.e. it is used in contexts where the action is seen as more remote than the action described by the (non-remote) Present” (207).

²³See T. V. Evans, *Verbal Aspect in the Greek Pentateuch: Natural Greek Usage and Hebrew Interference* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 45-50 for a persuasive argument supporting the temporal view of the augment.

aspect (245). The author then distinguishes between four types of markedness. The first is distributional markedness, which he uses to distinguish the frequency of usage each verb form exhibits in the examined literature. He states that the perfect is the least used form in the New Testament (246). The second is material markedness, which concerns the amount of morphological tags of a given verb form. He states that the perfect/pluperfect forms have the morphological bulk of all the verb forms because of its athematic root, endings, and reduplication. However, he makes clear that although reduplication is not restricted to the perfect form, the perfect is the only stem in which reduplication is an integral part of the stem (246-47).

The third is implicational markedness, which Porter uses to point out the regularity or lack of regularity of the morphological tags within the verb forms. He asserts, “The Perfect maintains a morphological regularity unknown in the other tenses. Whereas the Aorist and Present forms contend with thematic and nonthematic roots, with various kinds of augmentation or reduplication and suffixes, the Perfect simply affixes its endings to the very regular verb stem” (247). The fourth is semantic markedness, which concerns the range of meaning each stem communicates. Porter states, “In a distinct way, therefore, the stative aspect is more complex than the other aspects, since it in effect subsumes either, or both, of the Present and Aorist, which again points to its markedness” (248).²⁴

Following the section on markedness and the stative aspect, Porter spends the

²⁴In light of this, many scholars have posited that the present and aorist can be used where the perfect is used. However, Porter denies this stating that “most scholars making such a claim, however, do so on the basis of *Aktionsart*, by which they interpret the lexical meaning of a given verb, especially one in the Present, as compatible with their idea of the Perfect meaning (248). He states, “This analysis neglects synthetic verbal aspect as a morphologically-based category, and provides no formal criteria for evaluation” (248). Further, Porter rejects the claim that the perfect and aorist are virtually synonymous. His rationale for rejecting this is that it is not uncommon for the combination of a perfect form (more heavily marked form) and an aorist (less heavily marked form) to be used together. He states that this does not neutralize the perfect; rather the aorist is used to support the perfect and the perfect (more heavily marked form) virtually always serves as the focal point (248-51).

remainder of the chapter demonstrating how the perfect verb form is stative aspect,²⁵ showing that the various pragmatic usages in the literature,²⁶ its viability during the Hellenistic period,²⁷ and the viability of the distinction between οἶδα and γινώσκω during the Hellenistic period²⁸ all support the perfect verb form having stative aspect (251-87). Finally, he demonstrates how the Pluperfect has stative aspect, distinguishing between the perfect and pluperfect by asserting that the pluperfect shows [+remoteness] in addition to stativity (287-89).

In chapter 6, Porter discusses conditional statements, interacting with the major views, new proposals, and the various views on the function of the apodosis. In the section on the major views, he interacts with the work of William Goodwin and Basil Gildersleeve. Porter asserts that each view inadequately describes conditionals (294). However, while Porter does praise Gildersleeve for contributing to a sizeable contribution in the study of conditionals (294), he still rejects both views for the temporal scheme each one promotes (291-94).

In his segment on new proposals, he discusses two major categories within

²⁵Porter states, “It is appropriate to reassert that the Perfect grammaticalizes the state or condition of the grammatical subject as conceived by the speaker. Whether a previous event is alluded to or exists at all is a matter of lexis in context and not part of aspectual semantics” (259). Fanning argues that Porter confuses aspect with *Aktionsart* in his claim that the aspect of the perfect is stative (see Buist M. Fanning, “Approaches to Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek: Issues in Definition and Method,” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series* 80 [1993]: 49-50).

²⁶Porter lists and interacts with the range of time references the perfect tense exhibits in the literature. Namely, he shows how the perfect has past, present, future, omnitemporal, and timeless temporal reference. He claims that this demonstrates that “not only does it show further evidence that the traditional conception lacks explanatory power, but it reinforces the definition of the Perfect tense as grammaticalizing the author’s stative conception of a process” (270).

²⁷Porter discusses the arguments against the viability of the perfect in the New Testament era and he argues, “Whether an Active or a Passive verb is used, the state of the grammatical subject is conceived of by the speaker” (281). In other words, Porter asserts that in all cases the aspect of the perfect is stative.

²⁸During the Hellenistic period, says Porter, the meaning of οἶδα developed into a similar class of meaning as the more superior term, γινώσκω (281-87).

scholarly analysis of conditionals, assertion and projection (294-316). The category of assertion includes all uses of the indicative excluding the future. He lists two major types of assertion within conditionals, assertion for the sake of argument (294)²⁹ and assertion to the contrary (304).³⁰ The major difference Porter purports in his analysis of conditionals in contrast to traditional analysis is that of verbal aspect as opposed to temporality (302, 310).³¹ In the section covering projection Porter lists three different forms that he places under this category: $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\nu$ + subjunctive (307), $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ + optative (311),³² and $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ + future (312-314).³³ Finally, in the last section of this chapter he discusses the apodosis of conditional statements in which he interacts with the two major views on its function (319-320).³⁴ He rejects the first view because it is temporally based, and he rejects the second view because it is not comprehensive enough. He concludes this section by stating, “The conditional establishes a relation between protasis and apodosis. Although this relationship is not specified on the basis of tense form as a temporal relationship, several different logical means of analysis may apply” (320).

²⁹Porter clarifies that “the general form of this conditional is $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ + Indicative.” He further explicates, “Goodwin’s categorical description is more accurate than Gildersleeve’s at this point, since Goodwin, followed by Gonda, specifies that this category implies nothing of completion.”

³⁰According to Porter, “Sometimes called the irrealis or unreal condition, scholars have debated whether this conditional in and of itself expresses a contrary to fact situation or whether outside information is required.” He also claims, “It is best to view this conditional as a non-factive put in the form of a contra-factive, i.e. the speaker posits the information as if it were unreal, whether in fact what he may say is true or false.”

³¹Throughout this section, Porter points to the insufficiency of a temporal view of the verb forms, and he demonstrates how an aspectual view better accounts for the examples in the literature.

³²Porter states that this is usually followed by $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ + optative in the apodosis.

³³Porter labels this “Expectation,” stating that grammarians agree on the fact that there is a connection between the future and subjunctive, and he cites Goodwin as actually placing them together. He also mentions that there are examples of $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\nu$ + future as well.

³⁴The first view holds that the verb forms indicate time and such scholars as Goodwin and Carson, among others (316-17), hold it. The second view is held by two scholars, Nutting and Kruger. This view sees different kinds of logical relations between the protases and apodoses of conditional sentences. Some of these relations include cause and effect, ground and inference, and relation and equivalence (319-20).

In chapter 7, Porter discusses the aorist, present, and perfect verb forms in the non-indicative moods. Particularly, he purports that it is “important to stress the relevance of verbal aspect, despite repeated insistence by some that the tenses are primarily future referring” (321). He seeks to accomplish this by treating the present and aorist subjunctive/optative, the imperative, and the perfect. He begins the section on the subjunctive and optative by distinguishing between the function of the indicative and non-indicative stating, “The indicative is used to grammaticalize assertive or declarative statements, while the non-indicative forms grammaticalize a variety of related attitudes, having in common that they make no assertion about reality but grammaticalize the volition of the speaker, and are therefore deontic” (322).

Next, Porter explains the aspectual usage of the subjunctive and optative, both asserting and demonstrating that they are non-temporal (322-35). He likewise distinguishes between the aorist and the present verb forms by stating the aorist is the least marked in comparison to the present, the latter being exegetically significant. As in the indicative, he similarly claims that the aorist is the default stem and, therefore, when the more heavily marked present verb form is used it is more exegetically significant (323-35).

After interacting with the subjunctive and optative moods, Porter discusses the imperative and the use of commands and prohibitions (335-61). He begins by asserting that the imperative grammaticalizes direction. He says, “The command attitudinally grammaticalizes the speaker’s desire to give direction to a process” (335). Porter begins with an unexpected confession that “the aspect theory does not adequately explain the use of tenses in the imperative” (336). However, Porter still holds that aspect of the imperative is still a subjective choice of the author “to grammaticalize a process as perfective or imperfective, and these categories may apply to action however it is objectively conceived and however it is depicted in relation to the time of commanding.”

(346-47). Thus, as in the previous section, Porter holds that within the imperative verb forms the present is the more heavily marked and the aorist is the less heavily marked. The present is used for emphasis, and the aorist is used for more general statements (357). Finally, Porter analyzes the use of the perfect in non-indicative moods, noting the rarity of this verb formative outside the indicative, and he concludes that aspectual view of these verb forms is superior to the traditional approach because the traditional approach results in faulty temporal categories (361-63).

In chapter 8, Porter discusses the aorist, present, and perfect verb forms in both the participles and infinitives. He begins by giving an analysis of the participle and infinitive, stating that the participle is “an element both in the class of verbal group . . . and in the class of noun group and at the rank of clause acts as an element in subjects, complements and adjuncts” (366).³⁵ He defines an infinitive as being in the rank of group and as being able to function as “a headterm or a modifier, of a completive, or of a verb” (369). Following this analysis of the participle and infinitive, he interacts with many functions of these verbal forms, elaborating on such uses as genitive, dative, and accusative absolute, the imperatival participle and the independent infinitive (366-77).

In this chapter, Porter also considers the temporal reference of the participle and infinitive in reference to syntax and aspect (377-90). He begins with the participle, and he argues that they do not indicate temporal reference but that temporal reference is indicated by other contextual factors (377-88). For instance, Porter claims that “when the Participle is placed before the main verb, there is a tendency for the action to be depicted as antecedent, and when the Participle is placed after the main verb, there is a tendency

³⁵Porter defines verbal group as something that grammaticalizes choice of verbal aspect and which fills the predicate structure, and he defines noun group as something that grammaticalizes case, gender, and number. He further states, “At the rank of group, the Participle may fill the slot of either a headterm or a modifier, of a completive, or of a verb.”

for the action to be seen as concurrent or subsequent” (381). Next, Porter interacts with the infinitive and concludes that temporal reference must be established by context even in indirect discourse. Further, he purports that the preposition is a “significant deictic indicator” (388). Porter concludes his analysis of the present and aorist participle and infinitive by delineating the semantic relation between the participle and infinitive (390-91). He contends that it is best “to characterize the difference between the Participle and the Infinitive as the Participle is grammaticalizing a factive presupposition . . . while the Infinitive does not grammaticalize such a presupposition” (391).³⁶

Lastly, Porter concludes the chapter with an analysis of the perfect infinitive and participle. He begins by interacting with the infinitive and notes the rare use of the perfect infinitive, the faultiness in the traditional temporal understanding of this form, and the emphasis that the author is making when this form is used (392-94). He concludes by evaluating the perfect forms of the participle and infers that it is temporally relative. He notes its various functions, and he states that generally in the present, aorist, and perfect forms of the participle, “When the Participle precedes the main verb the action is usually antecedent to that of the main verb, and when the Participle follows the main verb the action usually is coincidental or subsequent to that of the main verb” (400).³⁷

In chapter 9, Porter discusses the future verb form and confronts the question of whether the form is a tense, aspect, or mood. His thesis is that “the future form – an anomaly in the Greek verbal network – grammaticalizes the semantic feature of [+expectation], being neither fully aspectual nor an attitude” (403). He begins the

³⁶However, it should be noted that Porter asserts, “This makes no comment on whether one could make such a presupposition, thus the Infinitive is used in indirect discourse and as, e.g., the complement of volitional verbs.”

³⁷Nevertheless, he notes that because of the stative verbal aspect of the perfect verb form “this cannot be pressed in many instances, where the state grammaticalized by the Perfect overlaps with the process described by the finite verb.”

support of this thesis by giving a brief history of the future verb form, and he concludes, “The Greek future was, by common opinion, a later development within Greek itself, evident by the time of Homer though not without some risk of confusion with the Aorist Subjunctive” (404). Next, Porter interacts with the three positions held by various grammarians (404-07). The first is that held by such scholars as Blass, Debrunner and Funk, stating that it is an absolute future tense. The second is that held by such scholars as Mandilaras, McKay, and Wilkinson, who hold that the temporal function of the future form is a mixture of the functions of both the indicative and non-indicative moods (406).³⁸ The third position, held by a very small group of grammarians, holds that the future is only modal. In other words, scholars such as Humbert and Magnien posit that “the Future is not an objective (or absolute) tense but a ‘virtual’ tense which indicates that an event is trying to come to pass” (407).³⁹ Next, Porter lists some of the major views on the aspect of the future as well as discusses the semantic range of the future, and he concludes that the future is a bi-temporal language, or aspectually vague. In other words, “The future is compatible with environments where full aspectual choice is made, but it does not grammaticalize such choice itself” (413). He concludes the chapter with an analysis of the pragmatic implicatures (417-27)⁴⁰ of the future verb form and an argument for the benefits of the view that the future grammaticalizes [+expectation] (416-38).

³⁸Scholars who hold this view claim that the temporal function of the future is seen “when it refers to events or acts which, by natural sequence, will take place in future time, or when it states a piece of information the effect of which comes into force in the future.” (B. G. Mandilaras, *The Verb in the Greek Non-Literary Papyri* [Athens: Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sciences, 1973], 182).

³⁹While Porter likes this view, he critiques it on the grounds that it fails to account for the formal characteristics of the future in that it does not take note of the various forms (finite, participle, infinitive) of the future, neither does it distinguish the verb stems or give account for the “Indicative-like contexts in which the Future appears.”

⁴⁰He states, “The Future Participle conveys in a number of cases a sense of an expected or intended result, with relative temporal value, in line with the essential nature of the tense function and the function of Participles in general.” Porter points out that the future infinitive has all but disappeared in the New Testament. The temporal implicatures in the indicative forms of the future include: command, timeless, omnitemporal, deliberative, and prospective (419).

In chapter 10, Porter addresses the verbs in Greek that do not have paradigmatic opposition. He analyzes vague verbs and periphrastics, and he claims that these exceptions prove his thesis rather than weaken his theory. Porter next makes three arguments (441). The first argument is that few verbs in Greek that do not have formal choices do not differentiate aspect. The second is that the verb εἰμί, fills an important part in periphrastic constructions because of its aspectual vagueness and lexical meaning. The third argument is that formal criteria for periphrasis can be determined.

Porter begins his first argument by defining aspectual vagueness by distinguishing between ambiguity and vagueness. The distinction he makes is that “if an item realizes or is capable of realizing more than one set of meaning choices, i.e. more than one selection expression from a network, then it is ambiguous, if not, then any doubts about its interpretation may be put down to vagueness” (442). In other words, he differentiates between vagueness and ambiguity by pointing out that ambiguity allows for more than one set of choices in meaning whereas vagueness does not. In this section, Porter demonstrates that few verbs are aspectually vague by showing that only the oldest verbal forms in the Greek verbal system are (446).⁴¹ For example, verbs such as εἰμί, φημί, κέῖμαι, and other μι verbs which, although they are called present and imperfect for formal purposes, do not distinguish aspectual value.

Porter begins his second argument by giving a brief history of interpretation on the recognition and meaning of periphrastic constructions. In this section, he lists grammarians such as W. Alexander, Regard, Bjorck, Rosen and Gonda, Aerts, and Kahn (447-49). Next, he discusses the εἰμί form and its role in periphrastics (449-52). He posits that the periphrastic construction is made up of two elements, the auxiliary verb,

⁴¹Porter states, “It may be said that some of the oldest surviving Greek verb forms (including the μι verbs) may have been living relics of an earlier stage where certain aspectual or tense differentiations were not developed, or at least were not developed fully by speakers.”

which he claims is the verb εἰμί, and the participle. He spends a large portion of this chapter delineating why εἰμί is so important in periphrastic constructions and makes two conclusions, that “εἰμί is compatible with any aspectual context” (449) and that “the lexically vague semantic meaning of εἰμί, revolving around the central meaning of ‘being present,’ is apparently ideally suited to serving as an auxiliary in periphrastic constructions” (452).

He begins his third argument by giving a definition of periphrasis in Greek. He declares that a periphrastic construction must contain “an aspectually vague auxiliary verb and a Participle in agreement with its reference” (452). Next, he lists the various formal features that the Greek language uses to convey aspect (454-78), a few of which include: [-remoteness] form of εἰμί + present participle (455),⁴² [+expectation] form of εἰμί + present participle (463-64),⁴³ and [-remoteness] form of εἰμί + perfect participle (467-69).⁴⁴ Hence, Porter argues that the antiquity and rarity of the forms that do not distinguish aspect, the flexibility of εἰμί to fit in any aspectual context, and the formal abilities of periphrastic constructions support his thesis.

Investigation of Decker’s Support of Porter

In his dissertation, Rodney J. Decker seeks to support Porter’s position by examining the Gospel of Mark and demonstrating that Porter’s verbal aspect theory is buttressed within Mark’s Gospel. That is, Decker aspires to defend Porter’s thesis by

⁴²Porter asserts, “The use of εἰμί + Present Participle is acknowledged by virtually all grammarians as present in ancient Greek.”

⁴³According to Porter, “It must be admitted that the Future of εἰμί, with Present Participle is rare, but it is rare in all forms of Greek literature” (464). In other words, although this form is rare, nonetheless it is a form used to communicate expectation of a forthcoming event.

⁴⁴Porter states, “The present form of εἰμί, + Perfect Participle is fairly common in ancient Greek from Homer through to the Hellenistic period” (467).

examining the history of Verbal Aspect Theory, by explaining Porter's view on the temporality of the verb, and by evaluating the way Mark communicates time in his Gospel. Since Decker's objective is to support Porter's theory and not to propose a new theory on verbal aspect, his dissertation will only be briefly reviewed, highlighting how he seeks to support Porter's theory.

In Decker's review of the history of verbal aspect theory, he seeks to demonstrate how grammarians since the nineteenth century have attempted to account for the issue of time and the verb.⁴⁵ In particular, how grammarians' understanding of the verbal system, particularly concerning time and the verb, evolved, moving from an absolute view of the temporality of the verb, to a recognition of *Aktionsart* (8)⁴⁶ and finally to an aspectual view of the verbal system (17-28).⁴⁷

In Decker's analysis of Porter's view on the temporality of the verb, he seeks to demonstrate how his view fits the data best within the literature. That is, how Porter's view has the least amount of exceptions (29-59). In this chapter, he defines both time and tense theory, and he explains Porter's temporal thesis. Further, he defends Porter's theory against such critiques as Porter's methodology being too simplistic, ignoring the force of the augment, and redundancy of tenses, among others. Finally, Decker concludes by overviewing temporal deixis in relation to verbal aspect, listing its

⁴⁵Rodney J. Decker, *Temporal Deixis of the Greek Verb in the Gospel of Mark with Reference to Verbal Aspect* (New York, Peter Lang, 2011), 1-28. In the section discussing Decker's view, parenthetical page numbers in the text refer to this source.

⁴⁶Decker states that A.T. Robertson viewed time as subordinate in the verb and *Aktionsart* as primary (see A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in Light of Historical Research* [Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934], 343-44, 365, 825, 836-46, 866-69, 879-82, 892-98).

⁴⁷He mentions the work of scholars such as Comrie, Brinton, McKay, Fanning, and Porter, among others.

parameters and categories.

In Decker's evaluation of time in relation to the verb in Mark's Gospel, he seeks to demonstrate the timelessness of the verb. In this section, he attempts to accomplish this first by overviewing Mark's use of deictic indicators to convey time, specifically, his use of certain words and phrases. Some of the markers Decker lists include adverbial indicators, prepositional indicators, and conjunctive indicators (63-90). Second, Decker endeavors to show the timelessness of the verb by examining the various verb forms in Mark's Gospel, demonstrating how the traditional understanding of the verb does not adequately account for the way Mark uses the verb in his Gospel. A few of the verb form usages that do not fit within the traditional explanation of the verb, which Decker examines, include the historical present and the aorist with present time reference (91-125). Finally, the third way Decker sets out to illustrate the timelessness of the verb is by examining specific passages within Mark, illustrating how the author uses deictic indicators to communicate time (127-55).

An Investigation of Fanning's View

In his dissertation entitled *Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek*, Buist M. Fanning begins with a survey of the various definitions of aspect and *Aktionsart* by various scholars in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The scholars he lists include Blass, Burton, Moulton, Robertson, Moulton-Turner, and Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf.⁴⁸ Fanning states that these definitions are helpful as an introduction and can even be

⁴⁸Buist M. Fanning, *Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 1-4. In the section discussing Fanning's view, parenthetical page numbers in the text refer to this source. Fanning states that Blass and Burton emphasize the progress of the action, while Moulton, Robertson, Moulton-Turner, and Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf focus on the type of action.

beneficial in interpretation if used appropriately (3). Following his interaction with the history of scholarship in this area, he gives an analysis of standard grammars and claims that these are insufficient in the area of aspect studies. That is, he asserts that “the standard reference-grammars of NT Greek reflect the state of aspect studies as they stood in approximately 1920 (5). After illustrating the need for further study in this area of Greek grammar, he concludes his introduction by outlining his purpose and goals for this work. Specifically, he states, “The purpose of this book is to present a more detailed analysis of NT verbal aspect than is given by the standard grammars, using insights from contemporary research in linguistics and in NT studies” (5).

In chapter 1, Fanning defines verbal aspect (8-85). More specifically, he seeks to formulate a general theory of aspect and surveys aspectology to give a backdrop for later discussion concerning the challenges surrounding the use of aspect in the New Testament (8). He begins by discussing the modern contribution of the distinction between aspect and tense. He notes that early Greek works made an aspectual distinction but that it was distorted by a temporal view of the verbal system based on Latin and German. In particular, “Alexandrian grammarians had observed aspect-values in Greek, but their rudimentary descriptions were lost in the Latin grammatical tradition of the medieval and early modern eras” (9). It was not until Georg Curtius’ work in 1846 that this view of the verbal system was overturned and time was now restricted to the indicative mood (10). He concludes this section in listing the two arguments advanced by Curtius and others, discussing the distinctions between primary and secondary verb forms and by cataloging the views on aspect by such scholars as Koschmieder, Guillaume, Jacob, and Martin. Therefore, Fanning argues in this section that while there

is a non-deictic temporal meaning that can be involved in aspect-function, this is a secondary function (15-29).

In the next section of this chapter Fanning sets out by making note of the next major advancement in aspectual studies; aspect must be differentiated from not only tense but also “the procedural characteristics of actual occurrences and of other linguistic elements” (29). He further clarifies this by mentioning that this happened in three steps: the distinction of *Aktionsart* from lexical characteristics of verbs and from the meaning of words and phrases used in composition with the verb (29).⁴⁹ Throughout this section, he examines such topics as aspect and *Aktionsart*, aspect and lexical classes of verbs, and aspect and compositional elements (29-50). He begins the examination of aspect and *Aktionsart* by stating that from the time of Curtius until the 1920s, *Zeitart*, *Aktionsart*, and aspect were considered synonymous terms to define facets of verbal meaning, meaning which Curtius and others had distinguished from *Zeitstufe* or tense (30). However, Fanning points out that one exception to this was Sigurd Agrell, who in studying the Polish tenses brought out a distinction between aspect and *Aktionsart*. It was not until the mid-1920s that others followed Agrell, for at this time scholars such as Jacobsohn, Porzig, and Hermann made a distinction between aspect and *Aktionsart*. They defined *Aktionsart* as that which “involves how the action actually occurs; reflects the external, objective facts of the occurrence; focuses on something outside the speaker” (31). Further, they define aspect as that which “involves a way of viewing the action; reflects the subjective conception or portrayal by the speaker; focuses on the speaker’s

⁴⁹The words and phrases that Fanning is speaking of include adverbs, prepositional phrases and objects.

representation of the action” (30-31). He notes that the work of these scholars was so influential that these distinctions are not only followed by Fanning, but in some form are followed by practically all aspectologists (33). Some of the more modern scholars he interacts with in his examination of aspect and *Aktionsart* include Comrie and Lyons (36-37),⁵⁰ Bache (38-40),⁵¹ and Smith (40).⁵² He concludes this discussion of the distinction between aspect and *Aktionsart* by stating that he is in agreement with the views of Porzig, Hermann and more specifically, Bache and Smith. Fanning asserts, “In this approach the aspects are semantically different from the various *Aktionsarten* or procedural characteristics, although they interact with these in important and somewhat predictable ways which ought to be noted clearly” (41-42). Fanning explicates how to distinguish between aspect and *Aktionsart* or procedural characteristics (49),⁵³ stating one must differentiate between aspect and lexical classes of verbs (44-46),⁵⁴ and aspect and

⁵⁰Comrie and Lyons, like Jacobsohn, hold that aspect and *Aktionsart* operate on the same semantic plane, although they do note the need to distinguish what languages communicate grammatically and lexically. Nonetheless, Fanning points out that “both of them drop the term ‘*Aktionsart*’ after the initial mention, and use ‘aspect’ thereafter to refer to both “categories of meaning” (37).

⁵¹See Carl Bache, “Aspect and *Aktionsart*: Towards a Semantic Distinction,” *Journal of Linguistics* 18, no. 1 (March 1982): 59. Bache rejects Lyon’s and Comrie’s use of the terms aspect and *Aktionsart*, stating that they “have conflated two categories which ought to be kept separate, and he tries to show ‘that a strict distinction between aspect and *Aktionsart* must be insisted on . . . and that failure to recognize the necessity of this distinction is responsible for some confusion on the part of both Comrie and Lyons” (38). Further, Comrie and Lyons claim that aspect is subjective and *Aktionsart* is objective (38).

⁵²Smith follows the same semantic distinction as Bache. Nevertheless, she adds that “the interpretation of aspect must be done both by maintaining a distinction between the two categories and by examining the interaction between the two. However, she uses the term ‘aspect’ to describe both areas of meanings, with further qualification to indicate reference to one or the other” (40).

⁵³Fanning gives a helpful summary at the end of this section on the relationship of aspect and procedural characteristics.

⁵⁴In this section, he lists continuous and non-continuous verbs.

compositional elements (46-47).⁵⁵ Next, Fanning discusses how aspects interact within a language (50-72)⁵⁶ and how aspect interacts with discourse-functions (72-77).⁵⁷ He concludes the chapter by acknowledging the complexity and problems in defining aspect as a prelude to his proposed definition (78-85) which states, “Aspect is concerned with the speaker’s viewpoint concerning the action in the sense that it implicitly sets up a relationship between the action described and a reference-point from which the action is viewed” (85).⁵⁸

In chapter 2, Fanning seeks to illuminate the meaning of the verbal aspects in New Testament Greek. He begins by addressing the aorist aspect, stating that the meaning of the aorist verb forms has been more disputed than the other forms (86-98). However, since the time the aorist has been studied as an aspect rather than a pure tense there have been four general suggestions for the basic sense of the aorist: the instantaneous or momentary aspect, the completed or accomplished aspect, the constative or summary aspect, and the unmarked or undefined aspect (86-97). According to Fanning, the instantaneous or momentary aspect is not an accurate description of the aspect of the aorist verb form, for aspect in the aorist does not include momentary,

⁵⁵Fanning claims that this step in the process of distinguishing aspect from procedural characteristics involves “distinguishing them from other elements used ‘in composition with verbs’ which also interact in significant ways with the aspects” (46).

⁵⁶The major conclusion he makes in this section includes the need to define the aspects in terms of their mutual relationships. Some of the categories he lists are the purely privative opposition, the contradictory opposition, contrary opposition, and mixed opposition.

⁵⁷Some of the roles he lists include: To show the nature of the speech-situation, to show prominence in narrative, and to show temporal sequence in narrative.

⁵⁸Fanning also states, “Aspect has nothing inherently to do with temporal sequence, with procedural characteristics of actual situations or of verbs and verb-phrases, or with prominence in discourse. It is instead a rather subjective category, since a speaker may choose to view or portray certain occurrences by one aspect or another without regard to the nature of the occurrence itself” (85).

durative, or iterative sense. Rather, these come from outside forces. Further, he states, “The momentary or instantaneous meaning for the aorist must be regarded as an oversimplification of the linguistic usage” (89). The completed or accomplished aspect is a possibility according to Fanning when the verb implies it. For instance, he states, “with verbs denoting simply a homogenous activity without such a bounded sense, the aorist denotes not fulfillment or completion but mere ‘termination’” (91). Thus, Fanning concludes that completed or accomplished aspect is more accurate than an instantaneous aspect for the aorist verb form. However, he asserts that it still fails to describe the true aspect of the aorist because it is too restrictive “since it describes the effect of one particular lexical type on the aorist’s function but fails to do justice to others” (91).

Fanning notes that the final two views on the aspect of the aorist verb form are widely held among more recent grammarians. Concerning the constative or summary aspect, he remarks that grammarians began to realize the subjective portrayal of the action in distinction from the objective fact of the action. As a result, they began to explain its use as subjectively punctiliar. In other words, they began to present “the action in its totality, as a whole, without regard to its actual constituency. The action may be continued or repeated but this is left out of view and the aorist presents it ‘as a whole,’ in summary of all the parts which may be involved” (92). Further, of the unmarked or undefined aspect, Fanning states that it has some attractiveness (96). However, he remarks that this view has some weaknesses because it does not fit well with what would be expected of stative verbs (96).⁵⁹ He goes on to explain that the “aorist is not simply an

⁵⁹For instance, one would expect them to be in the aorist form if it denotes a state rather than a specific action.

aspectual blank without any positive aspect-meaning . . . [I]n contrast the evidence suggests that the aorist has a positive meaning and is not merely the contrastive foil for the other aspects” (97). He concludes the analysis of the aspectual meaning of the aorist verb form by stating that this book holds to the third view, the constative or summary aspect (97-98).

Next, Fanning interacts with the aspect of the present verb form, asserting that there are three main suggestions regarding its aspect, durative or extended aspect, incomplete or unaccomplished aspect, and cursive or progressive aspect. He begins this section by giving an assessment of the durative or extended aspect. Fanning states that this was one of the earliest aspectual descriptions of the present verb forms and has been held by almost all of the New Testament grammars for the past one hundred years (98). He continues by stating,

This definition of the present is phrased primarily in terms of actional character: the feature of temporal duration is made central to the present aspect. It is possible that the term ‘durative’ in these grammars is meant to serve as a more general description of progress, development, and so on, without emphasis on the temporal extension, but this is not made clear, and in fact temporal duration is often stressed (99).

Fanning’s view of this proposed understanding of the aspect of the present verb form is that “defining the Greek present in terms of an actional characteristic, such as duration, is an erroneous step from the start” (99). Fanning poses the question as to whether this durative sense is the product of an aspect-value that is created in combination with lexical or contextual features, which add to the durative sense (99). Next, he interacts with the incompleting or unaccomplished aspect of the present verb form, and he states that it “describes the present as action ‘in process’ as opposed to the ‘fulfilled’ meaning of the aorist” (100). Further, Fanning asserts that this is valid as a

secondary function of the present aspect but not as its basic sense (101). The last aspect of the present verb form discussed by Fanning is the cursive, or progressive aspect. He maintains that this view is taken by those who “describe it as progressive and avoid emphasizing duration or incompleteness” (101). Further, Fanning’s view of the aspect of the present form is that it should be seen “as a viewpoint aspect, concerned with the perspective of the speaker in regard to the occurrence and not directly with actional characteristics such as duration or incompleteness” (103).

Following his discussion of the present verb form, he addresses the aspect of the perfect (103-20). In this section, he asserts that for the last one hundred and fifty years New Testament grammars have presented a uniform view of the perfect form. In light of this, he begins this section by evaluating the traditional view, stating that it can be summarized as “an aspect . . . which denotes a state or condition resulting from a completed action” (103). Moreover, he states that most grammars portray both of these features and emphasize the dual significance. Yet, Fanning acknowledges that some propose this view generally but place more emphasis on one or the other of these features (104). Next, he interacts with some of the objections to the traditional view (106),⁶⁰ and lists some more recent views to the English perfect (107-11).⁶¹ Fanning concludes that the perfect verb form consists of tense, *Aktionsart*, and aspect features working together.

⁶⁰He states that those “who question this consensus object to the label ‘aspect’ being applied to the perfect but accept the basic sense for the perfect which it presents.”

⁶¹Fanning lists four views: current relevance, which “expresses a present state resulting from past action,” indefinite past, which “expresses a past event which is unidentified as to time,” extended now, which “expresses a past event within a time span which is continuous with the present, not differentiated into ‘then’ versus ‘now,’” and embedded past, which “is made up of a past-tense sentence embedded as sentential subject of a present-tense predicate.” He totally rejects the first three views, but he has a slightly more positive response to the current relevance view. He says it at least forces one to reevaluate the traditional understanding of the aspect of the perfect (107-08).

Further, he states that the perfect verb form, like the aorist and imperfect, has a temporal sense that is completely separate from the external time-value, which it picks up when used in the indicative mood. He also asserts that the perfect must in part be seen as indicating time and that secondarily it carries a stative sense. Lastly, Fanning states that in the perfect and aorist verb forms, verbs that are in the past voice are more likely to emphasize stative sense, and verbs with an active voice form are more likely to emphasize the occurrence and not the resulting condition (112-15). Consequently, Fanning holds that the aspect of the perfect verb form is summary viewpoint concerning the occurrence (perfective), the tense-feature is anteriority (past-time), and the *Aktionsart* feature is stative (119-20).

Lastly, Fanning analyzes the aspect of the future verb forms (120-24). He states that three aspects have been proposed for the future in New Testament Greek: dual significance: future tense and punctiliar aspect (120),⁶² an aspect expressing ‘intention,’ (121)⁶³ and a tense expressing future time (122).⁶⁴ Fanning concludes this section by stating that the future verb form is likely a late development from the subjunctive or some other earlier form, so it must be understood as a non-aspectual tense category, which points to something following an established point of reference (123). He closes the chapter by stating that the primary aspectual relationship is that which occurs between the

⁶²Fanning states, “A common interpretation of the future is that it possesses a dual significance of tense and aspect.”

⁶³This view sees the future as an aspect of ‘intention’ or ‘end of view.’ In other words, the future is seen “as primarily an aspect parallel with the present, aorist, and perfect, and only secondarily a tense-form.”

⁶⁴The view that the future form is simply a “tense-form,” without an aspectual meaning is the most widely held view in New Testament grammars.

present and aorist aspects. The perfect is secondary to these because it shares the same aspect as the aorist. Moreover, he makes clear that the invariant values for each aspect is best expressed in the viewpoint of the speaker. The present reflects an internal viewpoint, and the aorist reflects an external one. As a final point, he asserts that when the forms are “analyzed in this way, the aspects form an equipollent opposition rather than a privative one, since they are both marked with a distinctive meaning. Therefore, the use of one aspect rather than the other constitutes . . . the choice of a different meaning and not just a shift in a neutral value” (124-25).

In chapter 3, Fanning submits that the inherent meaning of a verb and other elements surrounding the verb can affect aspectual function. He begins by listing some primary features that affect aspect-function, including procedural character of verbs (inherent lexical meaning), compositional elements (other features occurring with the verb such as adverbial modifiers, subject and object phrases, and negatives), general versus specific reference, tense-reference (past, present, future), and discourse related factors (e.g. showing prominence and sequence in a narrative) (126). He points out that these categories make several clear distinctions, and some scholars identify these distinctions with the aspects themselves. However, in this chapter he seeks to demonstrate that these distinctions are rather the product of “the combinations of lexical meanings with the viewpoint-oriented values for the aspects themselves” (126). He begins by analyzing how procedural characteristics affect aspectual function (126-63). In this section, he presents a taxonomy that categorizes the lexical features that influence aspectual function, and he qualifies this section with three important remarks. First, he says these are characteristics of the entire proposition or sentence and not simply the

verb. Second, no verb is completely uniform in its actional behavior and thus this is simply a generality of the usual function of some verbs. Third, Fanning points out that these are mainly applicable to propositions describing specific situations (127-28). Throughout this section he defines, summarizes, and illustrates how his taxonomy effectively accounts for how the aspects interact with each of these categories (129-63). In his classification, he lists five categories and four distinctions. The first category is states, and the first distinction he makes is between states and actions. He defines states as that which involves no change in condition (130). For Fanning, the first distinction is that which “separates states from actions, based on whether a verb expresses no change or change in the condition, relation, or location of the subject or object” (133). The second category is activities, and the second distinction he makes is between activities and performances. He defines activities as being “‘unbounded’ in that they are verbs or expressions which do not involve a limit or terminus for the action” (143). He states that the second distinction is between two actions in that one must distinguish the activity, which is unbounded, from the other actions that are portrayed as limited in some way (148).

The third category is accomplishments, and the third distinction he makes is between accomplishments and achievements. He defines accomplishments as durative bounded actions (149). He also demonstrates that a distinction must be made between accomplishments, which are durative and unbounded, and achievements, which are non-durative bounded actions (149-54). He concludes this section by pointing out that the fourth and fifth categories that he lists, climaxes and punctuals, are not followed by many writers because they follow Vendler’s classification (154). He defines a climax as “an

action which occurs in a moment as the culmination of a separate process which is its preface” (155). He then defines punctuals as that which takes place “in a moment, but the event is not linked with another action as its preface” (156). He purports that “the primary criterion for distinguishing these two types of achievements is their different sense when used in progressive/imperfective form” (156).

In the next section of this chapter, Fanning sets forth his argument that other elements can affect aspectual function (163-79). He writes, “Meaning of the aspects can be greatly influenced by other elements used in composition with the verb” (163). Throughout this chapter, he mentions the most common elements that affect aspect when used in conjunction with them, some of which include noun –or pronoun– phrases used as subject or object (163-70),⁶⁵ adverbial phrases (170-78),⁶⁶ and aspectual verbs or ‘*Aktionsartlich*’ (178-79).⁶⁷ In the next section, he makes the assertion that the distinction between general and specific reference has an effect on aspectual function (179-85). He defines propositions with specific reference as those that occur on a particular occasion. Fanning claims that the specific reference in propositions affects aspectual function by giving an “opportunity for normal interaction between aspect and actional character, producing more transparent differences between the aspects than is

⁶⁵Within the subject or object element he lists the following areas that impact aspect: singular versus plural reference, effected versus affected object, ‘count’ – versus ‘mass’ – nouns, and specific versus non-specific reference.

⁶⁶Within this element, Fanning lists the following areas that impact aspect: directional and extent-phrases with movement-verbs, durational temporal phrases, phrases denoting repetition and habituality, negatives, and climaxes and punctuals.

⁶⁷In regard to the aspectual or *Aktionsartlich* element he states that “a final effect of compositional elements on aspectual function is the use of verbs which in their lexical sense duplicate some of the secondary functions of the aspects.”

possible in general utterances” (181). Further, he defines propositions with general reference as those that represent situations as occurring on various unspecified occasions (181). He asserts that the general reference in propositions impacts aspectual function in that “the demands of general reference obscure many of the major distinctions which, in specific utterances, the aspects are able to produce” (184).

He ends the chapter by discussing how tense-reference and discourse features can affect aspectual function (186-94). He argues that in Greek the aspects have a common association with certain relative time-values as a secondary effect of their aspectual meaning (186). Concerning discourse features, he argues that various features such as conjunctions, articles, personal-pronoun reference, verbal mood, as well as the larger context can influence the function of the aspects (190). Therefore, Fanning’s argument in this chapter and up to this point is that meanings like duration, completion, repetition, stative versus ingressive, repeated versus single occurrence, durative versus punctual, etc. “must not be given as definitions of the aspects themselves but should be clearly articulated as their secondary functions in combination with other elements” (195).

In chapter 4, Fanning describes how his theory of verbal aspect is used within the indicative mood in the Greek New Testament (198-324). He sets forth his view of the role of tense regarding aspect in his statement, “The distinctive feature of aspectual usage in the indicative is the intersection in the same forms of aspect-value with time –or tense– meanings. The deictic time-values of past, present, and future, though distinct from the meanings of the aspects themselves, do interact with the aspects in the indicative” (198). For Fanning, then, although tense is not communicated within the aspects themselves,

there is a close interaction between these two elements that affect the usage of aspect within the New Testament. He begins by analyzing the uses of the present indicative (198-240), stating that the aspect of the present indicative “combines the aspect-value of ‘internal viewpoint concerning an occurrence’ with the tense-meaning of ‘occurrence simultaneous with the time of speaking.’”(198-99). He breaks down the uses of the present indicative into three groups: those which describe a specific occurrence (progressive and instantaneous), those which describe a general occurrence (customary, gnomic, and ‘past action still in progress’), and special uses of the present (conative, futuristic, historical, and perfective) (199). Within his treatment of each type of use, he defines the range of meaning, explains how it acquires that meaning, and gives examples of its usage in Scripture. Further, he explains how the aspect is handled within each of these types of occurrences in the indicative.

One particularly significant use of the present that he explains is the historical present. In this section, he states that he does not agree with the traditional understanding of the historical present, in which it is “used to bring a past occurrence into immediate view, portraying the event as though it occurs before the reader’s eyes”(226). Rather, he states, “It is the argument of this book that, in both types of historical present, the key feature which prompts the use of the present is the temporal transfer, not some sort of aspectual effect” (227). In other words, Fanning sees the historical present as communicating time rather than aspect. For this reason, he sees vivid or immediate effect being communicated, not by aspect, but by the time of the event communicated in the historical present (228). Thus, while he acknowledges the various functions of the historical present (simple narrative, vivid or dramatic narration, and emphasis on an

important event or shift in the narrative), Fanning differs from the traditional view in that he does not attribute these to aspect, but instead attributes them to the temporal value communicated through the historical present (228-39).

Fanning next analyzes the uses of the imperfect indicative and the aorist indicative (240-90). He asserts that the imperfect communicates virtually the same aspect as the present indicative, internal viewpoint on an occurrence. The main difference he points out is that “the imperfect moves this aspect-value into the past-time frame, since it indicates past tense” (240-41). However, he emphasizes that the major uses of the imperfect are “virtually identical in aspect-value to the corresponding categories of the present” (241).⁶⁸ Concerning the aorist verb form, he maintains that the aspect value is external viewpoint of an occurrence as a whole, and he adds that, except for a few exceptions (265-80),⁶⁹ it also has “the temporal meaning of past occurrence” (255).⁷⁰

Fanning concludes the chapter by discussing the uses of the perfect indicative, the pluperfect indicative, and the periphrastic constructions. He states that the aspect of the perfect indicative is summary viewpoint, and he adds that the “temporal element which is added is the correlation of the condition or result with the time of speaking” (291).⁷¹ Further, he contends that the aspect of the pluperfect is the same as the perfect

⁶⁸A few of the uses he lists include the progressive or descriptive imperfect, the customary or iterative imperfect, and the conative imperfect.

⁶⁹Some of the exceptions that he lists include the gnomic aorist, the proleptic or futuristic aorist, and the dramatic aorist or aorist of present state.

⁷⁰Fanning states that the most common uses are the constative or complexive aorist, the ingressive aorist, and the consummative or effective aorist.

⁷¹The uses of the perfect that Fanning lists include the perfect of resulting state, perfect of

with the exception that it is removed one step into past time” (305-06).⁷² In other words, Fanning claims that “the ‘pastness’ of the condition is reckoned from the reference-point of the time of speaking, as is normal for the indicative” (306). Finally, Fanning interacts with periphrastic constructions (309-23), and he states that these can function as near-equivalents of indicative forms; they can substitute for subjunctives, for optatives, and for infinitives and participles. However, he emphasizes that their main use is to parallel indicatives (309).⁷³

In chapter 5, Fanning seeks to explain the meanings of the different aspects in commands and prohibitions in the New Testament (325-88). He begins with an emphasis on the agreement between scholars that the meaning of the present and aorist commands and prohibitions is aspectual as opposed to temporal. Further, he states that the perfect verb form occurs so infrequently in commands and prohibitions that it was not even an ‘idiomatic option.’ Finally, he explains that just as in the indicative, in commands and prohibitions the basic aspectual value coalesces with other linguistic features to make secondary functions (325-26). The distinctions he lists between the present and aorist verb forms are stative/ingressive, descriptive/simple, simultaneous/sequenced, durative/momentary, conative/consummative, multiple/single, and general/particular.

However, he emphasizes that the distinction general/particular is much more frequent in

completed action, and perfect with aoristic sense, among others (291-303).

⁷²Some of the uses Fanning lists include the pluperfect of resulting state, pluperfect of completed action, and the pluperfect with past stative meaning (306-09).

⁷³Some of the periphrastic constructions Fanning lists include the present periphrastic, the imperfect periphrastic, the future periphrastic, and the perfect periphrastic, among others (311-23). Fanning brings attention to the point that these parallel the aspectual meaning of the indicatives. For instance, concerning the present periphrastic, he comments that it has a progressive or customary sense that is essentially the same as the simple present (312).

the commands and prohibitions than in the indicative, and he spends a large portion of the chapter describing this secondary function (326).

In the next section of this chapter, Fanning interacts with the differences between general precepts and specific commands (327-40). He comments that Blass first suggested this function in 1896. The distinction Blass makes is that “in general precepts (also to an individual) concerning attitudes and conduct there is a preference for the present, in commands related to conduct in specific cases (much less frequent in the NT) for the aorist.”⁷⁴ Fanning further explains this important secondary function by defining general precept and specific command. He defines general precept as “a moral regulation which is broadly applicable; a rule for conduct to be applied in multiple situations; a command or prohibition to be followed by an individual or a group not only in the immediate situation in which it is given, but also in subsequent circumstances in which the precept is appropriate” (327-28). Further, he defines specific command as “an order or request for action to be done in a particular instance. The speaker commands or prohibits some attitude or action, but does so only in reference to the immediate circumstances and hearers involved: he does not intend to regulate conduct in broader terms” (328).

He prefaces this secondary usage by stating that these distinctions are not intended to answer every question about any passage within the New Testament. Rather, they are intended to serve as bookmarks at either end of an interpretive range (329). He also adds that this distinction is validated in the usage within the New Testament, for he

⁷⁴See Friedrich Blass and Albert Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament*, trans. and ed. W. Funk (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), 172.

claims that within primarily didactic sections there are mainly general precepts as opposed to specific commands. Likewise, in narrative text there is primarily the opposite precedent (329). Throughout the remainder of this section, he illustrates this pattern in positive commands, prohibitions, and prohibitory general precepts. He concludes this section by stating that while the basic distinction between the present and aorist in commands and prohibitions is aspectual, the primary secondary function is general versus specific (332-40).

In the following portion of this chapter, Fanning interacts with the various exceptions to the general versus specific distinction (340-79). He begins by explaining that most of the exceptions to this distinction fall into one of three categories: one marked by idiomatic usage, one that is superseded by the more basic aspectual distinction in another combinatory contrast, and one in which the specific New Testament book does not follow the general versus specific pattern (340). In the section in which he examines the exceptions to the general versus specific distinction, he begins with the idiomatic usages, asserting that the largest group of verbs which are used this way are verbs of motion and that this group of verbs occurs in the present stem in specific commands. Fanning purports, “The reason for this tense appears to be the continuing or extended nature of ‘coming,’ ‘going,’ and the like, even in a specific instance” (341). Other exceptions he discusses in this chapter include the imperative of πορεύομαι, περιπάτω, φέρω, verbs of speaking (351),⁷⁵

⁷⁵Fanning states, “These usually follow the general vs. specific guideline quite closely. However, there are puzzling exceptions, which make one wonder what other influences come to bear on these verbs.” In fact, Fanning questions whether or not in this group of verbs there is even any distinction except the basic aspect-difference in commands and prohibitions.

and γινώσκω (352).⁷⁶ Fanning confesses that although there are exceptions to the general versus specific guideline, “these departures appear to be due to idiosyncrasies of usage on the part of the particular verbs rather than to a lack of validity for the guideline itself” (352). He ends this section by examining the verbs that appear in the aorist verb form in general precepts (354-64),⁷⁷ by investigating the instances where the aspect distinction surpasses the general versus specific distinction (364-70),⁷⁸ and by considering the individual books that do not follow this distinction (370-79).⁷⁹

He concludes the chapter by elucidating other issues related to aspectual usage in commands and prohibitions, and in doing so he interacts with other pertinent issues related to aspect within command and prohibitions. Some of the topics he discusses include the forcefulness of the aspects in commands and the predominance of the aorist

⁷⁶Fanning points out that the verb γινώσκω does not follow the general versus specific distinction at all. Further, he comments that the “pattern for this verb is elusive.”

⁷⁷Some of the verbs he lists include: δίδωμι and its compounds, ἀσπάζομαι, ἀποτίθημι, and ἐνδύω, among others. Concerning δίδωμι, Fanning remarks that the two groups in which this verb and its compounds do not fit within the general versus specific distinction are (a) Commands giving a general principle for all, but in a distributive sense (b) Commands giving a general precept with an iterative sense. Further, in regard to the use of this verb with an aorist tense form giving a general precept, Fanning states, “It seems that the aorist came to be used with δίδωμι originally because of the sense of consummative or instantaneous action inherent in its lexical character: ‘to give’ was thought of not as ‘to offer’ or ‘to be presenting’ but as actually ‘to hand over.’ Thus, it seems, the aorist developed as the normal pattern of aspect usage” (352).

⁷⁸In this distinction, unlike the previous one, the usage has not become stereotyped but occurs in particular cases. Further, Fanning remarks that “In these, the speaker chooses one aspect over the other to highlight a desired aspectual value regardless of the general or specific nature of the command” (364). In this section, he gives examples of present forms in specific commands and aorist aspects in general precepts (365-70).

⁷⁹He lists five books that are exceptions: II Timothy, James, I Peter, II Peter, and Jude. However, he notes that because of the brevity of II Peter and Jude and the small number of imperatives, it is uncertain whether these can be counted as exceptions. He states that these epistles diverge “from the normal pattern primarily in regard to general precepts.” However, he clarifies that “with general precepts there is either a free variation between present and aorist or a preference for the aorist or a preference for the aorist rather than the present” (371).

verb form in prayers,⁸⁰ the use of the aspects in indirect commands (383),⁸¹ and the use of the aspects in imperatival infinitives and participles (380-88).

In chapter 6, Fanning explains the various meanings the aspects can display in the participle, infinitive, optative, and subjunctive (389-419). He argues in this chapter that the infinitive, optative, and subjunctive only communicate aspect, but that the participle communicates aspect and tense. That is to say, the aspectual usages of the participle display a “predictable pattern of temporal relations” (389). He begins by listing some general principles for the meanings of the aspects in the infinitive, subjunctive and optative. He prefaces this by asserting, “The primary aspect-distinction in these forms is the contrast between present and aorist, in which the basic significance is that of ‘viewpoint’ aspect” (390).

Fanning claims that the present verb form concentrates on the “internal make-up of the occurrence without regard for ends-points” (390). The aorist verb form pictures the “occurrence as a whole from beginning to end without regard for internal details” (310). Finally, he asserts that the perfect verb form has the same sense as presented in chapter 2 in that the perfect views the action as “a state produced by an anterior occurrence” (390). Consequently, for Fanning the general principles are that “in all three

⁸⁰Regarding the relative forcefulness of the aspects in commands, Fanning states, “It seems likely, in fact, that the present is more forceful in specific commands where it is unexpected and this assumes a more peremptory tone. On the other hand, in general precepts the aorist appears to carry greater urgency” (381). In other words, the unexpected use of the present and aorist verb forms causes them to be more forceful. Further, in reference to the predominance of the aorist in prayers Fanning states, “In NT usage most request in prayer are concerned with specific occurrence rather than customary or general action, and the aorist is the most natural in such requests” (381-82). What Fanning is saying, then, is that the reason for the predominance of the aorist in prayers is that prayers generally fit best within the aspectual range of the aorist verb form.

⁸¹Fanning points out that just as in direct commands, the primary distinction between the present and aorist is aspectual and the secondary distinction is general versus specific. It is likewise the

cases the general significance undergoes modification produced by its combination with other linguistic features, as shown in chapter 3” (390). Further, he makes clear that just as in the indicative, the other features that combine with the aspects of these tenses create similar meanings such as ingressive versus consummative sense, general versus specific reference, and single versus multiple occurrence (390).

Fanning spends the remainder of this section noting the normal and unusual functions of the aspects in the infinitive, subjunctive, and optative (390-406). He contends that the present verb form may signify a progressive, customary, gnomic, or conative sense. Further, he asserts that it is not uncommon to see a present aspect with stative verbs (391-93). The normal functions of the aorist aspect that Fanning lists include an ingressive, consummative, and constative sense (393-97). Further, Fanning maintains that the perfect is very infrequent in these non-indicative forms of the verb, and when it occurs it “preserves its basic sense of ‘aspect-Aktionsart-tense’ in denoting a state or condition resulting from an anterior occurrence” (396).

In Fanning’s discussion of the unusual functions of the aspects in these forms (397-406), he lists a table that details both the common and unusual aspect-frequency in some of the uses of the infinitive in the New Testament (398). One particular unusual function of aspect usage in the infinitive is the predominance of present infinitives in indirect discourse (401). In the author’s discussion of the subjunctive, he points out that typically the aorist verb form is used much more than the present or the perfect forms. However, he points out that one particularly noteworthy unusual aspectual function in the

case in indirect commands.

subjunctive is that in conditional and indefinite relative clauses the present verb form has an exceptionally high percentage of usage (402-03). Finally, concerning the unusual aspectual usages of the optative, Fanning comments that it is “quite rare in the NT, and many occurrences come in stereotyped phrases, which cannot be relied upon to reflect living idiom in regard to aspect-function” (404).

The author concludes this chapter with an analysis of the aspectual usage in the participle, and begins by giving the fundamental meanings of the different aspects (406-08). Fanning introduces this principle by stating that since the time of Curtius, the meaning of the aspects in the participle has perplexed grammarians for two seemingly irreconcilable features. First, outside the indicative “tense-meaning is not expected for the present and aorist,” and second, the actual usage demonstrates that “the present and aorist participles do reflect a consistent pattern of temporal meanings relative to the action of their main or leading verb” (406-07). Fanning further clarifies this consistent pattern by stating, “The action of a present participle is almost always simultaneous with the main verbal action and that of an aorist participle is almost always antecedent to it” (407). Fanning’s general principle, therefore, is that just as it has been demonstrated throughout the rest of this book that the indicative primarily encodes aspect and secondarily relative-time value, one should understand “both temporal and aspectual values for the aspects in the participle, but which regards the temporal meanings as secondary to the aspectual ones” (407).

The chapter concludes with a description of the normal functions of the aspects in the participle (408-19). Some of the common functions of the present aspect are progressive, customary, and conative (408-13). Likewise, some of the common functions

of the aorist aspect include ingressive, consummative, and constative (413-16). Finally, some of the common aspects of the perfect are result and, less commonly, actual result (416-18).

Fanning closes his dissertation by asserting that “the primary argument of this book has been that understanding verbal aspect requires a grasp of both the basic meanings of the aspects themselves and their function in combination with other linguistic and contextual features” (420). While Fanning recognizes the interrelatedness of aspect and other features such as *Aktionsart*, one should understand that “these meanings must not be given as definitions of the aspects themselves but should be clearly articulated as their secondary functions in combination with other elements” (421). Nonetheless, Fanning highly values these secondary meanings, for he states that “aspect interacts so closely with such features and is so significantly affected by them that no analysis of aspect can be comprehensive without taking into account these interactions” (421).

An Investigation of Campbell’s View

In his dissertation entitled *Verbal Aspect, the Indicative Mood, and Narrative: Soundings in the Greek of the New Testament*, Constantine R. Campbell introduces his work by addressing the problem of verbal aspect, discussing where scholarship is presently at, and introducing how his work will contribute to the study of verbal aspect.⁸² Campbell states that he seeks to locate his work within the context of previous

⁸²Constantine R. Campbell, *Verbal Aspect, The Indicative Mood, and Narrative: Soundings in the Greek of the New Testament*, (New York, Peter Lang, 2007), 1-5. In the section discussing Campbell’s view, parenthetical page numbers in the text refer to this source.

scholarship in two ways. The first way is to examine the function of verbal aspect in the indicative mood in narrative literature within the New Testament, particularly within the Gospels. The second way is to explain how one should describe and understand the narrative function of verbal aspect (3). He asserts that his work will contribute to current scholarship by exploring the importance of understanding the distinction between narrative proper and discourse proper and by developing a model of the verbal network of the indicative mood (5).

In chapter 1, Campbell seeks to give an account of the methodological issues involved in Greek aspect studies (7-34). He endeavors to accomplish this by defining important terminology, by exposing linguistic assumptions, by explaining pragmatics and semantics, by expounding on the absolute necessity to establish the number of aspects within Koine Greek, and by purporting the need to limit the sources used in the study of aspect. In his section on terminology, Campbell defines aspect, *Aktionsart*, discourse analysis, and remoteness. According to Campbell's definition, aspect is viewpoint. It is "the way in which the author/speaker chooses to depict an activity or state, the usual opposition being 'internal' (imperfective) and 'external' (perfective)" (8). Campbell further explains that he is in agreement with Porter and Decker's analysis of the semantic quality of aspect. In other words, Campbell agrees that aspect is communicated through the morphology of the verbal form and is consequently an intrinsic element of the verbal form. Ultimately, Campbell contends, "Aspect is built into the verbal forms of Greek" (9).

Next, Campbell defines *Aktionsart* by noting the differences between aspect and *Aktionsart*. For that matter, he prefaces this entire discussion by recognizing the

confusion that has been caused by this term (10). He states that the main reason for this confusion results from the interchanging use of the terms. However, he makes clear that in recent times there is some agreement on how to differentiate aspect from *Aktionsart*. One distinction he makes between these terms is that “the term ‘*Aktionsart*’ has been reserved for procedural characteristics, seen especially as lexically expressed, while the term ‘aspect’ has been restricted to grammatically expressed viewpoint features” (10). Another dissimilarity Campbell brings out is that aspect is a subjective category and *Aktionsart* is an objective category in that “an author/speaker chooses the aspect with which s/he portrays an action, while the *Aktionsart* qualities of an action refer to the way in which the action occurs in reality” (11). A final difference he makes between these two categories is that “[aspect] is generally regarded as a semantic category, while [*Aktionsart*] is a pragmatic category” (12). In light of these divergences, then, Campbell argues that one must reject the common misconception regarding aspect that asserts it “views action as completed or in-progress,” for this is “objectively determined, and thus properly belongs to the realm of *Aktionsart*” (11).

Subsequently, Campbell interacts with the category of discourse analysis. While he acknowledges the relative lack of agreement in terms of definition and method he nonetheless defines discourse analysis as “a discipline that moves beyond purely atomistic analyses of texts and reaches for a broader understanding of how texts function, are structured, and ultimately convey meaning” (12). Within the category of discourse analysis Campbell discusses background and foreground, first addressing the lack of consensus on the meaning of these terms, or what these terms convey. Whereas Porter places the mainline information as background, Paul J. Hopper places mainline

information as foreground (13-14). Campbell acknowledges the need for a consensus in vocabulary and commends the second scholar's use of this terminology, but he does not specify how he will use it in his work (14). Lastly, Campbell concludes this section by defining remoteness. After acknowledging the movement away from tense in aspectual studies, he offers an alternative to the tense category that he titles remoteness. He defines this as "a spatial rather than temporal category, to do with distance or lack of proximity, yet it may express itself temporally in particular contexts" (15).⁸³

In his section on linguistic assumptions, he discusses four linguistic options that have influenced aspectual studies to this point. The two main schools of thought that he lists are generative linguistics fathered by Chomsky and systemic linguistics fathered by J.R. Firth and Michael Alexander Kirkwood Halliday (17-18).⁸⁴ Regarding generative and systemic linguistics, Campbell mentions privative and equipollent oppositions. He begins by defining the former term, which fit within a generative linguistic schema and explains that a privative opposition is a binary opposition. He states that it is an opposition in which "one member is seen as marked by the presence of a feature, which its other member lacks" and is accordingly unmarked (19).⁸⁵ Next, he defines the latter,

⁸³Campbell lists three categories in which remoteness may be expressed: temporal remoteness, logical remoteness, or contextual remoteness."

⁸⁴Campbell points out that generative linguistics is "concerned with the behaviour of mental patterns underlying the use of language." In other words, what generative linguistics argues is that, although there is diversity between languages on the surface level, there is a uniformity between languages at the level of deep structure (17). Further, he states that systemic linguistics is "concerned with inductively formed descriptions of language phenomena. It is concerned to establish a network of systems of relationships, which will account for all the semantically relevant choices in the language as a whole" (17-18). Hence, those who support generative linguistics argue that systemic linguistics is limited because it primarily deals with the surface-level, while those who support systemic linguistics argue that generative linguistics is prescriptive rather than descriptive (18).

⁸⁵Campbell continues to describe this opposition stating, "Within a privative opposition, 'the two members can frequently be interchangeable in specific contexts, because the unmarked member may

as “one where the members are seen as logically equivalent to each other” (19-20). He further clarifies the meaning of this type of opposition by maintaining that both members are marked with uncancelable semantic features, which, instead of encoding opposite or symmetrical values, encode some specific value (20). In other words, the main difference between privative and equipollent oppositions is that “an equipollent opposition offers a choice of ‘this or that,’ whereas a privative opposition offers ‘this or something’” (20). He concludes this section by asserting that Ruiperez and Olsen adhere to a privative analysis. Further, he purports that his position is in accordance with Porter and Fanning, who adhere to a verbal aspectual network of equipollent oppositions (20-21).

A third option that Campbell briefly mentions is one that adopts no specific linguistic model at all, although he calls it a little naïve (19). The fourth option Campbell mentions is what he terms grammatical aspect (21). In this section, he mentions Orvokki Heinamaki and Ferenc Kiefer, who argue against aspect being grammaticalized in the verbal form and instead argue that it is grammaticalized in the whole sentence (21-22). While Campbell does not wholly accept this, he does acknowledge its value, and he proposes a modified form of it. In particular, he recognizes that “a clause may give expression to a particular aspect due to a dominance of a verb forms within the sentence that do encode that particular aspect” (22). For that matter, he asserts that when this takes place it will be referred to as aspectual context, which may refer to clauses, sentences or

substitute for the marked one without introducing an opposing sense. Indeed, the unmarked member may even adopt the characteristics of the marked member, only the marked member ‘has a consistent, uncancelable semantic meaning,’ whereas unmarked members may be interpreted in a variety of ways depending on the pragmatic context” (See Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 58 and Mari Broman Olsen, *A Semantic and Pragmatic Model of Lexical and Grammatical Aspect*, in *Outstanding Dissertations in Linguistics* [New York: Garland Publishing, 1997], 31).

larger discourse units (22-23). Finally, in his section on linguistic assumptions he discusses synchronic and diachronic approaches. Campbell defines synchronic linguistics as that which “examines languages as they exist at a particular point in time” (23).⁸⁶ Diachronic linguistics is defined as that which “examines languages from the point of view of their historical development, often utilizing the discoveries of synchronic analysis as a preliminary” (23). Campbell makes his stance on the type of analysis he uses clear in his statement “there is still much to be done on the synchronic plane before diachronic analysis of substantial value may continue” (23).

He concludes the chapter by discussing pragmatics and semantics, determining aspect, and limiting sources (24-33). Campbell defines semantics as that which “refers to the core grammatical values of a linguistic item; the values of verbal items being of primary interest” (24). He further clarifies that the semantic value is that the meaning cannot be canceled (24). He defines pragmatics as that which “refers to the way in which language is used in context. It has to do with linguistic performance and implicature, which will vary depending on lexical, stylistic, grammatical and deictic interactions” (24). Therefore, because it is dependent on changing elements, Campbell states that it expresses cancelable features (24). Within the discussion of pragmatics and semantics, Campbell also writes about “the principle of cancelability” (26). Campbell explains this by relating it to semantics, stating that it is similar to “semantics in that semantics is concerned with values that are inherent in grammatical forms, and are therefore not cancelable” (26). He points out that Olsen applies this principle to semantic meaning

⁸⁶Campbell also points out that synchronic analysis is “one of the hallmarks of modern linguistics” and that interestingly, McKay, the scholar who first contributed to this topic, began his study diachronically, but as he continued, he became more synchronic in his approach.

and pragmatic meaning. Campbell further states that this principle is most often applied to the debate about tense (26). In accordance with this, it is argued by means of this principle that if the verb forms communicate tense at the semantic level it must not be cancelable (26). Campbell therefore states, “A model will be deemed more successful than another on the basis that it more successfully demonstrates the non-cancelability of its semantic content; in other words, the model with the least ‘exceptions’ will win the day” (26).

Another important idea within the discussion of pragmatics and semantics is aspectual vagueness. Campbell states, “A commitment to the distinction between semantics and pragmatics is relevant to the discussion concerning the idea of aspectual vagueness” (27). The reason it is relevant is because some verbs do not exist in all the forms and consequently limit the choice of tense forms, which ultimately limits the choice of aspects. Thus, when “the choice between one aspect and another is eliminated, it is proposed that aspectual vagueness ensues” (27). Campbell recognizes that because aspect is regarded as a set of binary oppositions, this could cause one to hold the position that this lack of choice diminishes the significance of the usage of the particular aspect (27). However, Campbell rejects this for four reasons: A commitment to the semantic value of verbal aspect pushes one to recognize that the encoding of aspect exists whether or not aspectual choice is represented by a particular lexeme; The prospect of verbal suppletion⁸⁷ alleviates to some degree the lack of complete opposition; It may be that a commitment to aspectual vagueness is an over-commitment to a theoretical

⁸⁷Campbell comments that “verbal suppletion here refers to the use of another lexeme’s morphological forms in order to complete an aspectual opposition” (27).

presupposition at the expense of what can plainly be observed in language usage;⁸⁸ The stated definition for aspect protects against aspectual vagueness. More specifically, aspect is a subjective choice within certain bounds, one of the limitations being morphological choice. Hence, while such a lack may decrease choice, it does not diminish aspect (27-28).

In his section on determining aspect, Campbell brings to the reader's attention the fact that there is no consensus on the number of aspects in New Testament Greek. In fact, he says the number ranges from two to four aspects (28-29). The problem in bringing a consensus to this debate is that there is no clear method to determine aspect. For this reason, in this section Campbell seeks to overview a suggested methodology for determining the number of aspects. The first method he overviews is one suggested by Mark O'Brien, who sought to explore the interactions between aspect and *Aktionsart* in the future verb forms and, based on the predictable outcomes, isolate any consistency in the verbal aspect of future forms (29). Second, he overviews the inductive method and he comments on its superiority to the deductive method, which he states is "easier to conduct, but [it] can result in artificial and sometimes spurious conclusions" (29). Hence, he suggests one should determine aspects through the patterns within the text rather than artificially imposed deductive analyses. He suggests that one may be able to use the method of O'Brien to determine the aspect of the perfect verb form. He concludes this section by stating that the aspectual context may be useful and states that if certain verb forms commonly occur in certain aspectual contexts, it "may be reasonable to conclude

⁸⁸Can this same critique be applied to the principle of cancelability? In other words, just because something does not exist in every possible circumstance does that cancel it, or should one give weight to what is plainly observed through language use?

that they contribute to these contexts by sharing the aspectual value already expressed in the clause, sentence, or discourse strand” (30). He concludes the chapter by professing that a limited number of sources in the study of aspect is more beneficial than a study of a sampling of usage from Homer to the New Testament. Thus, Campbell limits his sources to The Gospel of Luke, The Gospel of John, *Vita Aesopi G*, *The Story of Callirhoe*, narrative sections from the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, a testing of over forty-one chapters from *The Peloponnesian War*, and a narrative section taken from *Against Eratosthenes* (30-33).

In chapter 2, Campbell analyzes the present verb form as he seeks to determine the aspect of the present through an investigation of its usage in narrative texts (35-76). However, he codifies this by stating that “the imperfective aspectual value of the present tense-form in the Greek of the New Testament is uncontested in recent literature; it is one of the few areas in which there is complete agreement (35). Thus, Campbell maintains that the aspect of the present verb form is imperfective, or it is internal viewpoint. Yet, he emphasizes that it is not temporal but spatial in nature. Specifically, he argues that the spatial category of proximity is the best explanation for the usage of the present verb form in the texts he examines (36-37).

In the next portion of chapter 2, Campbell examines source texts to demonstrate that the present form encodes imperfective aspect with the spatial value of proximity. In his examination of the texts, he found that in Luke, 97.8% of the present verb forms occur in discourse. In John, 82.8% of the present verb forms occur in discourse. In *Vita Aesopi G*, 97% are associated with discourse. In the *Oxyrhynchus*

Papyri, 88.7%⁸⁹ of presents are associated with discourse. In Thucydides, 63.1% of present indicatives are associated with discourse (48).⁹⁰ In Lysias, 53.3% are related to discourse, and Campbell states that the remaining presents that are found in narrative proper are verbs of propulsion (37-48). After examining the source texts, he proposes a theory to account for the usage of the present form in narrative (48-57). In this section, he proposes “the term *proximity* as the spatial opposition to *remoteness*” (49). He rejects the traditional temporal theories for two reasons. The first reason is that a tense-based understanding does not explain why the present occurs so regularly in discourse (48).⁹¹ The second reason is that a tense-based understanding does not explain verbs of propulsion (49). Thus, Campbell views a spatial understanding of the verb as opposed to a temporal explanation as a way forward, for he believes that his theory of spatial value covers the same things as traditional temporal distinctions, and it accounts for space (49). He states that his view stands where the traditional temporal view falls (50). In other words, instead of the distinction between the present and imperfect verb form being temporal, in Campbell’s view the distinction is one of space. The present form encodes the spatial value of proximity, and the imperfect form encodes the spatial value of remoteness (50). In the remainder of this section, he discusses the complexity of

⁸⁹It should be noted that this 88.7% may be strengthened by the fact that there were only a total of 89 present indicatives in this source text.

⁹⁰Campbell seeks to support his thesis by bringing attention to the fact that “since most of the present indicatives unrelated to discourse in Thucydides are verbs of propulsion, as is the case in the other texts, it is concluded that the usage of the present indicative in this work differs from the others only on the level of distribution; the percentages of discourse-presents and propulsion-presents are differently apportioned, but the actual usage remains the same: the present tense-form is used either in connection with discourse or to convey propulsion when outside the scope of discourse.”

⁹¹Campbell anticipates push-back, and he states that while a tense based understanding can account for direct discourse, it does not account for the present verb forms that introduce discourse and this

discourse within the Greek narrative genre and brings light to the imperfective-proximate character of discourse and the use of the present verb form within discourse (51-57).

Further, he focuses on the present form's grammaticalization of imperfectivity and proximity, suggesting that this is the reason for its prominent use in discourse. That is to say, he argues that the aspectual and spatial value encoded in the present form is "the core reason that the present tense-form occurs predominantly within discourse" (56).

In the last section of chapter 2, Campbell interacts with the issue of the historical present (57-76). He begins by listing and interacting with the four main views on the meaning of the historical present; the traditional view, the zero-tense theory, discourse-prominence theories, and the timeless aspectual theory (57-65). He states that the traditional view, which is supported by scholars such as Martin Ruiperez and Daniel Wallace, holds that the historical present is used to communicate vividness. However, Campbell argues that this theory does not fit well with the distribution of the historical present since most of the historical presents are "rarely clustered together, but often alternate with aorists . . . a fact that does not support the traditional view" (58). In Campbell's review of the zero-tense theory he points out that it was first proposed by Paul Kiparsky. He then states that this theory argues that the historical present is syntactically functioning like a past tense verb, semantically identical and thus interchanges with past tense verbs in joined structures (59). Campbell further points out that Kiparsky argued that the historical present "is governed by some kind of conjunction reduction, 'which optionally reduces repeated occurrences of the same tense

has led to the problem of the historical present.

to the present” (59-60).⁹² However, Campbell argues against this stating, “The problem here is that without the first verb being a past tense, Kiparsky’s theory fails” (60).

Campbell then interacts with discourse-prominence theories, supported by scholars including Randall Buth and H. Thackeray. He asserts that this view defines the historical present as that which “functions to introduce new scenes in a narrative text. It signals the arrival of a new character or a change of location or marks a turning-point in the sequence of events” (61). One major criticism Campbell lays against this theory is that it “fails to explain the purpose of mid-episodic, non-discourse-introducing, historical presents” (64). The fourth theory concerning the meaning of the historical present that Campbell reviews is the timeless aspectual theory, which is supported by Porter. He affirms that this theory views the verb forms as completely aspectually based, with no temporal element. Hence, those who hold this view hold that “the occurrence of the present tense-form within past-referring contexts ‘inherently poses no grammatical problems, merely potentially misleading problems of nomenclature’” (64).⁹³ Campbell states that Porter’s view that “the absence of remoteness is the feature that marks the present tense-form as a distinct choice as opposed to the imperfect” is very close to his position. However, he makes the distinction that “whereas Porter describes the present negatively, as non-remote, it is argued above that the present tense-form grammaticalizes a positive proximity value” (65). Thus, throughout the remainder of this chapter Campbell argues, “The value of proximity provides far yet greater explanatory power”

⁹²See Paul Kiparsky, “Tense and Mood in Indo-European Syntax,” *Foundations of Language*, 4 (1968), 33-34.

⁹³See Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 195.

for the historical present (65). He demonstrates through the source texts that the semantic qualities of the present verb form account best for the use of the historical present in the source text. That is, these qualities explain when the historical present is used to introduce discourse, and to heighten the sense of transition, when it is both insignificant and significant (65-76).⁹⁴

In chapter 3, Campbell examines the imperfect verb form (77-102). He begins by stating that he affirms imperfective aspect for the imperfect indicative and that it is chiefly a narrative proper verb form. Further, Campbell asserts that the imperfective aspect is grammaticalized in the imperfect indicative as a semantic value giving an internal viewpoint that does not reference the beginning or end of the action. Also, he states that the aspect of the aorist is in opposition to imperfect, but both forms are narrative proper forms (78). Thus, he argues in this chapter that the imperfect indicative grammaticalizes both imperfective aspect and spatial remoteness, asserting that this has more explanatory power than the traditional temporal understanding of this verb form (77-78).

Next, he seeks to demonstrate through the source material that the imperfect is a narrative-proper verb form. In his examination of the texts, he discovered that in Luke, 88.8% of the imperfect forms occur in narrative proper. In John, 81.6% of the imperfect forms occur in narrative proper. In *Vita Aesopi G*, 73.6% occur in narrative proper. In the Chariton, 93.1% occur in narrative proper. In the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, 80.9% of imperfections are found within narrative proper. In Thucydides, 97% of imperfect

⁹⁴An example of when it would be significant would be when “found at the beginning of certain pericope within Mark . . . to highlight that Jesus has moved to a new location, thus a new section has begun” (75).

indicatives occur in narrative proper. In Lysias, 100% of the imperfect indicatives occur in narrative proper (79-84). Thus, after examining the source texts Campbell concludes that “it is evident that the imperfect indicative is primarily a narrative proper tense-form, though it is capable of operating within discourse as well” (83). Next, Campbell interacts with the current research on the issue of whether or not time is a semantic value of the imperfect verb form. He acknowledges that it is very difficult to disprove the tense-based view of the imperfect since there are only about eighteen instances in the New Testament that may be non-past narrative imperfections. Nonetheless, he holds that viewing the imperfect as encoding imperfective aspect and the spatial value of remoteness provides a better explanation for its usage in the New Testament than a time-based view (84-87). He seeks to further support this through an examination of the augment. In this section, he surveys the research on this, noting how Porter and Decker argue that the augment never indicated past-time and he outlines Trevor Evan’s critique of Porter’s view.⁹⁵ Campbell acknowledges the strength of Evan’s argumentation but nonetheless does not completely agree with his conclusions. That is, he does not see the augment as encoding past-time. Rather, he sees it encoding remoteness, a view that McKay originally promoted (88-91).

In the remainder of the chapter, Campbell argues that the imperfect form is used in narrative proper alongside of the aorist to provide background information for the mainline of the story which is most often communicated through the aorist verb forms (91-96). However, he acknowledges that while the imperfect is principally a form that is

⁹⁵To read the entire critique see T. V. Evans, *Verbal Syntax*, 40-50.

used in offline narrative proper, it can and does occur in other contexts such as mainline narrative proper, conditional sentences, and discourse (96-101).

In chapter 4, Campbell examines the aorist verb form, arguing that the aorist semantically encodes perfective aspect and a spatial rather than temporal description of perfectivity (103-26). He begins by addressing what he refers to as the common misconception of what is termed “the ‘punctiliar’ aorist” (105-07). In this section, he points out that while the aorist can communicate a point in an action, this is not communicated through the semantic category of aspect, which is subjective, but rather is communicated through the pragmatic category of *Aktionsart*, which is objective (105). Thus, what Campbell makes clear in this section is that the aorist does not grammaticalize punctiliar action, for it “has to do with the way in which an action is stated, and not with the action itself” (106).

Next, Campbell considers the usage and function of the aorist verb form. He argues in this section that the aorist indicative is most often used in narrative proper communicating the narrative mainline (108). After examining the source texts, he finds that in Luke, 77.7% of aorist indicatives are in either narrative proper or embedded narratives (111).⁹⁶ In John, 68.3% of aorist indicatives are in narrative proper. In *Vita Aesopi G*, 68.9% of aorists are in narrative proper. In Chariton 77.5% of aorist indicatives occur in narrative proper. In the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 84.3% of aorist indicatives are within narrative proper. Finally, in Thucydides 94.1% of aorists occur in narrative proper (108-14). Following this examination of the source texts, Campbell

⁹⁶Embedded narratives are narratives that occur in discourse, either as a parable or otherwise.

argues that the aorist verb form is the “dominant narrative proper tense-form in Koine Greek” and that it conveys the mainline of the narrative (115). He claims that the aorist’s semantic value of perfectivity and spatial value of remoteness, which replaces the value of past tense, make it an appropriate choice for narrative mainline (115-21). In other words, the external viewpoint is “the ideal candidate for relaying sequential material, as it is precisely the beginning and endpoint of an action that are in view” (116).

Campbell closes this chapter by surveying Decker and Olsen’s shared view of the aorist verb form, detailing that they both view the form as not encoding tense at the semantic level. However, Campbell emphasizes that this does not take away from the fact that the aorist indicative is often past-referring. Further, he states that although he agrees with Decker and Olsen, he differs in that while they reject tense based on the principle of cancelability, he rejects tense at the semantic level of the aorist verb form because of the power of explanation (122-23). He concludes by examining the reasons for the aorist in discourse (123-25). He purports that all of the non-past aorist verb forms occur in direct discourse, and he uses this as evidence against a temporal view of the aorist. He proposes that in discourse the aorist is “subordinate; it is not dominant, and does not control the shape of discourse” and that “the primary reason for this is that the aorist is out of its natural habitat” (124-25). However, he recognizes that this explanation does not account for all of the uses of the aorist in discourse and suggests that “non-dependent uses are explained by the need of a perfective contrast” (125). He concludes by stating that the aorist is chiefly a narrative proper verb form, functioning as the primary form for mainline narrative. Nonetheless, he emphasizes that the aorist still

appears in non-narrative proper context, and in such examples the aorist is not used to communicate tense (125-26).

In chapter 5, Campbell analyzes the future verb form (127-60). He begins by stating that the opinion on the aspect of the future has no consensus. He states that the opinions range from the future verb form encoding perfective aspect or both perfective and imperfective aspect, to it being non-aspectual or aspectually vague (127). In light of this, Campbell asserts that this chapter seeks to bring “clarity in terms of the aspect of the future indicative and to examine the validity of its supposed future temporal reference, while keeping in view the usage of the future within text, and issues related to morphology and historical development” (127). He attempts to accomplish this objective by first examining the future usage and function in the source texts. He finds that in his research within the source texts, in Luke, 100% of the future indicatives are used in direct discourse. In John, 99% are found in direct discourse. In *Vita Aesopi G*, 96% of future indicatives are within direct discourse. In Chariton, 95% are used in direct discourse. In the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, 89% of future indicatives are found in direct discourse (133).⁹⁷ In Thucydides, 33% of the future indicatives are within direct discourse.⁹⁸ In Lysias there are only three future indicatives, and while none appear in direct discourse, two occur in indirect discourse and one occurs in authorial discourse (127-34). Thus, he concludes from this data that “in spite of the evidence of Thucydides and Lysias, it seems

⁹⁷While this percentage looks much lower than the rest, the frequency of the future indicative verb forms being used in direct discourse in this source text is very high. For, in the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* there are a total of nine future indicatives and eight of them are found in direct discourse.

⁹⁸While this percentage may appear low, Campbell demonstrates that it still fits well with the rest of his findings because there are a total of nine future indicatives used in Thucydides and three appear in direct discourse and five appear in indirect discourse. Oddly, Campbell does not state where the ninth

clear from the other sources that the dominant pattern of usage of the future form is that it is found within direct discourse” (134).

Campbell next interacts with the various views on the aspect of the future verb form (134-51). He begins by separating the views into two groups. The first group views the future as non-aspectual, seeing the future as pure future tense or as encoding some other non-aspectual and non-temporal value. The second group considers the future verb form as aspectual, assigning either perfective aspect or a combination of perfective and imperfective aspects (134-35). He begins with an evaluation of the non-aspectual views and points out that Fanning, Olsen, Porter, and Kimmo Huovila all agree that the future verb form does not encode aspect. However, Porter and Huovila are distinct from the others in that they reject aspect within the future indicative on the basis that it has no aspectual opposition. Campbell argues against this, stating that their argument seems circular and that “aspect may exist even where there is no clear choice between aspects, despite the theoretical presuppositions of systemic linguistics” (136). He closes this section by stating that he cannot address the views of Fanning and Olsen until he has reviewed the aspectual view of the future (136).

Campbell subsequently addresses the aspectual view of the future verb form. The first view he examines is the dual aspect view (137-38). He notes that this view is held by Ernest de Witt Burton. Campbell makes clear that Burton has conflated aspect and *Aktionsart* in his analysis, which regards “the aoristic expression as default, with progressive expression implicated only when context and lexical factors require it” (137).

future indicative appears.

Campbell concludes his analysis of the dual aspect view by stating, “The form must be either perfective or imperfective (or neither), but it cannot be both” (138). Moreover, Campbell examines the suggestion that the future verb form encodes perfective aspect. He claims that those who hold this position support it first and foremost through morphology. That is, he points to scholars like Wallace who say that “the future’s formal link to the aorist indicative (through the aoristic sigma) indicates perfective aspect” (139). Next, Campbell makes clear that those who support this view would call the perceived imperfective usages an example of *Aktionsart*, and he states that supporters of this view commonly point back to ancient scholars such as Dionysius Thrax, who points to the parallels between the aorist and future verb forms. However, Campbell rejects this by stating that arguments based on morphology and diachrony cannot prove a case but can only support an argument. Instead, he claims that a synchronic approach is a superior means of determining this type of issue (139-40).

Finally, Campbell interacts with O’Brien’s view of the aspect of the future indicative. He explains that O’Brien has adopted Fanning’s view of the predictable patterns that occur between aspect and *Aktionsart*, and O’Brien seeks to apply this to his study of the future verb forms (140-51). That is, O’Brien “posits that if the future behaves similarly when combined with similar lexical and contextual factors, then it is reasonable to conclude that the future shares the aspect of the aorist” (140). Campbell recognizes the value and potential in O’Brien’s method. However, after examining the texts he acknowledges some deficiencies, in particular O’Brien’s failure to include selected verbs due to “additional complexities that would detract from the purpose of the paper” (144). Nonetheless, Campbell admits that despite the shortcomings in O’Brien’s

work, it does not nullify his conclusions (149). Finally, he comments on the conclusions of Fanning and Olsen, stating that one must “disentangle some of the confusion between aspect and *Aktionsart*” (150). Further, he states that just as in the aorist verb form, “continuous *Aktionsarten* do not necessarily negate perfective aspect,” so likewise in the perfect form (150). Thus, Campbell holds that the future verb form encodes perfective aspect (151).

Campbell concludes the chapter by discussing future temporal reference and discourse analysis (151-59). He begins his analysis of the future temporal reference of the verb by mentioning the view purported in Blass-Debrunner-Funk, stating that “in meaning, time is practically the only significance of the future” (151). He then discusses the view of Porter and Decker, who deny the future reference of the future verb form (151-58). He rejects this claim on several grounds. The first is that Porter and Decker’s argument that an author is unable to make assertions about the future is flawed because “it must be recalled that language is subjectively driven according to the mind of the author or speaker” (153). In other words, Campbell is pointing out that whether or not the event actually occurs does not affect the fact that the author is certain the event will occur (152-53). The second is that Decker’s claim, that the future occurs in temporally unrestricted contexts, is faulty because his examples are taken from parables. That is, Campbell claims it has already been indicated that parables should “be regarded as legitimate narratives in their own right for the purposes of syntax, and the fact that they might not depict real events does not change the manner in which syntax functions” (156). The third is that Porter and Decker’s claim, which states that the development of

the future verb form from the subjunctive argues against the future reference of this form, is based on faulty conclusions. That is, Campbell states,

The point of the future, therefore, is not to function simply as a deliberative, but to move beyond qualified observation to future reference. Undoubtedly, the future can still function in parallel with the subjunctive . . . but in each of those examples the future reference is nevertheless inescapable even if the overall context produces some level of uncertainty (157).

Thus, Campbell concludes that he holds to a traditional view of the future verb form in which case he sees it “as a future-referring tense” (157). Lastly, Campbell highlights that the future verb form occurs almost exclusively in discourse, and he answers the question of how it can be perfective aspect and occur almost exclusively in discourse, which is an imperfective-proximate context. He points out that because the future verb form is not spatial but temporal, discourse is the appropriate context since narrative mainline does not usually permit such communication (159). Thus, Campbell ends by asserting that the future verb form semantically encodes perfective aspect and future temporal reference (159-60).

In chapter 6, Campbell investigates the perfect verb form (161-211). He begins by acknowledging the complexity and lack of consensus on the aspect and temporal reference of this verb form. He then reviews the traditional approach and stative aspect views of the perfect (161-75). In his analysis of the traditional approach, he reviews the view that the perfect expresses “the combination between past action and present result” (162). That is, he says that this view of the perfect verb form does not adequately account for the usage of the perfect verb form in the literature. Campbell highlights one particular usage that the traditional view has problems accounting for, the resultative perfect.

In this view, Campbell points out that this category was created in an attempt to account for the inability of the traditional understanding of the perfect verb form. Specifically, the resultative perfect is an example of how previous scholars attempted “to maintain the accepted definition of the perfect as a combination of the aorist and the present, while recognizing that it does not adequately describe the increasing phenomenon of transitive perfects” (164). For this reason, Campbell concludes this section by rejecting the resultative perfect, thus denying the traditional understanding of the perfect verb form (162-66). Next, he interacts with the view that the perfect verb form encodes stative aspect, which is suggested by such scholars as McKay, Porter, J.P. Louw, and Comrie. While he acknowledges the value in this proposal, he critiques it on many levels. First, he critiques McKay’s proposition that the perfect verb form creates stativity upon the subject, and he demonstrates that this does not fit the usage within the source text (166-69). Second, he comments on Porter’s suggestion that it views the entire affair as a state, delineating how this creates unsound and vague interpretations of texts (170-72). Third, he evaluates the notion of stative aspect in general, pointing out that most linguists view stativity as an *Aktionsart* and not an aspect (172-73). Finally, he rejects stativity because several contemporary Greek linguists understand imperfective aspect as offering better explanatory power than stative aspect (173-75).

After examining the traditional understanding of the perfect verb form and the stative aspect view, Campbell considers the perfect usage and functions in his source texts. He finds that in Luke, 96.6% of perfect verb forms occur in discourse. In John, he

states that 100% of perfects occur in discourse of some kind (177-78).⁹⁹ In *Vita Aesopi G*, 94.5% of perfects are found in discourse. In Chariton, Campbell states that 100% of perfect verb forms occur in discourse. In the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Campbell states that 38.9% of perfect occur in discourse. However, he notes that all but one of the perfect verb forms that occur in narrative resemble the present indicative for narrational comment or in verbs of propulsion. In Thucydides, 100% of perfect verb forms transpire in discourse, and in Lysias, 100% of perfects are found in discourse (175-83).

Next, he states that a stative aspect must be rejected for the perfect verb form, but that the perfect may have either perfective or imperfective aspect (184). Campbell begins by examining imperfective aspect, stating that the usage of this form in the source texts demonstrated that this is a discourse verb-form (184). Based on the texts examined, he rejects the notion that due to the increased use of transitive verbs, the aorist form increasingly encroached upon the perfect until the perfect form was replaced by the aorist (184-85). Instead, he declares that the usage of the perfect verb form aligns it with the present indicative, not the aorist indicative (184).

He supports this claim by pointing to the fact that just as the present verb form is primarily a discourse verb form, so the perfect form is likewise a primarily discourse verb form. He further points to the fact that although the aorist does occur in discourse, it is primarily a narrative proper verb form. Moreover, Campbell indicates that the perfect even resembles the present verb form's usage outside discourse, for just as the major usage of the present outside of discourse is to introduce discourse and verbs of

⁹⁹He states that the perfect verb form occurs in either direct discourse, indirect discourse, or authorial discourse.

propulsion, so likewise the perfect verb form is largely used in this way outside of discourse. Campbell concludes that based on the usage of the perfect, the aspect of this verb form is imperfective. He goes on to state that although the perfect verb form does in many instances express stativity, this is an expression of *Aktionsart* and not aspect. He explains that stativity is attracted to imperfective aspect and, as a result, fits well with the perfect verb form since they encode imperfective aspect. Thus, Campbell concludes by stating that imperfective aspect does not only explain why the perfect is a discourse verb form, but it also explains why certain lexically stative verbs are attracted to it (184-89).

Next, Campbell considers Fanning and Olsen's view that the perfect encodes perfective aspect, and he concludes that the weaknesses of such a view are that it admits too many exceptions and the way those who hold this position claim it interacts with certain lexical types. In particular, he comments on Fanning's claim that stative perfects imply the "act of entrance which led into that state" (191),¹⁰⁰ questioning whether this is helpful in understanding stative perfects. Therefore, Campbell's criticism of Fanning and Olsen's view of the aspect of the perfect verb form as stative is that this view lacks the explanation power that an imperfective aspect has (189-93). He ends the chapter by highlighting the exegetical implications of the perfect verb form having an imperfective aspect, and he marks out the difference between the perfect and the present and imperfect, which have imperfective aspect. That is, he states that the perfect simply heightens the spatial value of the present and imperfect. Specifically, whereas the present has the spatial value of proximity, the perfect has the spatial value of heightened

¹⁰⁰Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 138-39.

proximity (193-10). Therefore, according to Campbell the perfect indicative is a discourse verb form, which encodes imperfective aspect and coincides with the usage of the present verb form (210-11).

In chapter 7, Campbell examines the pluperfect verb form and its functions within narrative texts (213-37). In this chapter he argues that the pluperfect encodes imperfective aspect and functions to provide offline material that “supplements, describes, or explicates mainline action” (213). In his research he finds that in Luke, 93% of the pluperfects occur in some type of offline material. In John, 82% appear in offline material. In *Vita Aesopi G*, there are only four pluperfects and two are within offline material. In Chariton, 85.7% of pluperfects occur in offline material. In Thucydides, 91% of the pluperfects are found within offline material (213-23). Next, he interacts with the traditional view and the views of Porter and McKay on the aspect of the pluperfect, and he demonstrates the weaknesses of these views (224-28). Following this, he explains how imperfective aspect and heightened remoteness of the pluperfect best fit the data found in the source texts (228-33). Finally, Campbell examines Porter’s planes of discourse model. In this section, Campbell attempts to demonstrate how Porter’s theory, that the pluperfect shows prominence, does not fit within the source material reviewed (233-37). Campbell maintains that the pluperfect verb form “semantically encodes imperfective aspect and heightened remoteness, and it is these values that best explain the usage of the pluperfect” (237). Therefore, according to Campbell, while the pluperfect verb form does not grammaticalize past time, a spatial understanding of this verb form not only explains the examples of this form in a past time context, it also explains the non-temporal examples.

CHAPTER 3

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The Importance of Reaching Some Conclusions Regarding This Topic

The study of verbal aspect has received much scholarly attention in the last twenty years. Some of the most noteworthy contributors have been reviewed in this work, Stanley Porter, Rodney Decker, Buist Fanning, and Constantine Campbell. While there are other scholars who have made helpful contributions to this topic, including K.L. McKay, Trevor Evans, Mari Olsen, Bernard Comrie, and Steve Runge, their works were not reviewed because they do not fit within the scope of this study.

Through the study of the dissertations of Porter, Decker, Fanning, and Campbell, one will observe that there are several areas of agreement. Some of the topics that these scholars agree upon concerning verbal aspect are the aspect of the aorist, present, and imperfect verb forms. Moreover, these scholars agree that verbal aspect is the grammaticalization of the author's viewpoint of the action. Finally, these authors all view aspect as a subjective category that is separate from *Aktionsart*. However, although there is some agreement between these scholars, there are many matters of disagreement. A few of the major areas of disagreement involve the number of aspects within the Greek verbal system, the aspect of the perfect verb form, the question of whether the future verb form has aspect or if it simply conveys tense, and whether the indicative mood encodes tense at the semantic level.

The importance of reaching some conclusions in this area is that it impacts exegesis. In other words, it can affect the way one interprets Scripture. For instance, in Galatians 5:4 Paul uses the aorist passive verb *κατηργήθητε* to condemn those who are turning from his gospel to circumcision. The English Standard Version translates Paul as saying, “You are severed from Christ . . .” However, the New American Standard Bible, the New English Translation, the New International Version, and the Holman Christian Standard Bible translate this verse with a perfect sense, “You have been severed from Christ . . .” The problem is that the verb *κατηργήθητε* is an aorist passive verb form, and it typically would be translated, “You were severed from Christ . . .” Thus, the issue at hand is whether Paul is saying that the Galatians are in a state of being severed from Christ, were severed in the past and are still severed in the present, were previously severed from Christ, or is this verb simply communicating aspect? The answer to this question is greatly impacted by one’s view of verbal aspect.

Areas Which Need Further Study and Analysis

The importance of reaching some conclusions on this topic demands that further study be done on verbal aspect within Hellenistic Greek. Some of the areas that are in need of such study are the points of disagreement, such as the historical present, the aspect of the perfect verb form, and tense in the indicative mood. Regarding the disparity of views among grammarians, a Septuagint scholar, Peter Gentry remarks, “Balanced views on aspect and tense will probably start to be restored when a theorist following Porter has the courage to move beyond the comfort zone of the NT and actually seek to pinpoint when the grammatical category of tense becomes a factor in the history of

Greek.”¹ In other words, he is calling for scholars to investigate these issues outside of the New Testament so that one’s background within this corpus of literature does not influence one’s study of the topic.

Further, after studying this issue I am convinced that further research needs to be conducted on the impact of genre in the study of verbal aspect. That is, most of the verb forms occur within a certain genre; the aorist and imperfect most often occur within narrative proper and the present and perfect most often occur within discourse.

Moreover, when these verb forms occur within these genres, their temporal value is not in question. In other words, what may need to be examined is whether the indicative verb forms encode time at the semantic level within their appropriate genre. For these reasons, the study of verbal aspect is still in need of further research on a number of important fronts.

¹Peter J. Gentry, “Aspect and the Greek Verb,” A Course Handout for Advanced Greek Grammar at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary - 04/01/10, (5). <http://www.ntdiscourse.org/docs/Gentry-VerbalAspect.pdf> [accessed October 24, 2012].

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Black, David Alan. *It's Still Greek to Me: An Easy-to-Understand Guide to Intermediate Greek*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1998.

_____. *Linguistics and New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Discourse Analysis*. Nashville: Broadman & Holman Academic, 1993.

Blass, Friedrich, and Albert Debrunner. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament*. Translated and edited by Robert W. Funk. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Brooks, James A., and Carlton L. Winbery. *Syntax of New Testament Greek*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1979.

Campbell, Constantine. *Basics of Verbal Aspect in Biblical Greek*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2008.

_____. *Verbal Aspect and Non-Indicative Verbs: Further Soundings in the Greek of the New Testament*. Studies in Biblical Greek, Vol. 15. New York: Peter Lang, 2008.

_____. *Verbal Aspect, the Indicative Mood, and Narrative: Soundings in the Greek of the New Testament*. Studies in Biblical Greek, Vol. 13. New York: Peter Lang, 2007.

Caragounis, Chrys C. *The Development of Greek and the New Testament: Morphology, Syntax, Phonology, and Textual Transmission*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006.

Carson, D. A. *Exegetical Fallacies*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1996.

Comrie, Bernard. *Aspect: An Introduction to the Study of Verbal Aspect and Related Problems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

_____. *Tense*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Curtius, Georg. *The Greek Verb: Its Structure and Development*. Translated by Augustus S. Wilkins and Edwin B. England. London: John Murray, 1880.

- Dana, H. E. and Julius R. Mantey. *A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament*. New York: Macmillan, 1955.
- Decker, Rodney J. *Temporal Deixis of the Greek Verb in the Gospel of Mark with Reference to Verbal Aspect*. Studies in Biblical Greek, Vol. 10. New York: Peter Lang, 2001.
- Evans, T. V. *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch: Natural Greek Usage and Hebrew Interference*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Fanning, Buist M. *Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Gonda, J. *The Character of the Indo-European Moods, with Special Regard to Greek and Sanskrit*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1956.
- Levinsohn, Stephen H. *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek: A Coursebook on the Information Structure of New Testament Greek*. 2nd ed. Dallas: SIL International, 2000.
- Lyons, John. *Linguistic Semantics: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Mandilaras, B. G. *The Verb in the Greek Non-Literary Papyri*. Athens: Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sciences, 1973.
- McKay, K. L. *A New Syntax of the Verb in New Testament Greek: An Aspectual Approach*. Studies in Biblical Greek, Vol. 5. New York: Peter Lang, 1994.
- Moule, C. F. D. *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959.
- Moulton, J. H., and Nigel Turner. *Style*. Vol. 4 of *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1976.
- _____. *Syntax*. Vol. 3 of *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*. 1963. Reprint. London: T. & T. Clark, 2005.
- Mounce, William D. *The Morphology of Biblical Greek*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994.
- Olsen, Mari Broman. *A Semantic and Pragmatic Model of Lexical and Grammatical Aspect*. *Outstanding Dissertations in Linguistics*. New York: Garland, 1997.
- Palmer, F. R. *Mood and Modality*. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Porter, Stanley E. *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*. 2nd ed. London: Continuum, 1992.

_____. *Studies in the Greek New Testament: Theory and Practice*. New York: Peter Lang, 1996.

_____. *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament, with Reference to Tense and Mood*. Studies in Biblical Greek, Vol. 1. New York: Peter Lang, 1989.

Porter, Stanley, and D. A. Carson. *Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics: Open Questions in Current Research*. Sheffield, UK: JSOT Press, 1993.

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

Silva, Moises. *Interpreting Galatians: Explorations in Exegetical Method*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001.

Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.

Young, Richard A. *Intermediate New Testament Greek: A Linguistic and Exegetical Approach*. Nashville: Broadman and Holman Publishers, 1994.

Articles

Bache, Carl. "Aspect and Aktionsart: Towards a Semantic Distinction." *Journal of Linguistics* 18, no. 1 (March 1982): 57-72.

Campbell, Constantine. "Finished the Race? 2 Timothy 4:6-7 and Verbal Aspect." In *Robinson Selected Works: Preaching God's Word, Appreciation*, ed. Peter G. Bolt and Mark D. Thompson, 169-75. Camperdown, NSW: Australian Church Record/Moore College, 2008.

Carson, D. A. "An Introduction to the Porter/Fanning Debate." In *Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics*, 18-25. Sheffield, UK: JSOT Press, 1993.

Erickson, Richard J. "Oida and Ginōskō and Verbal Aspect in Pauline Usage." *Westminster Theological Journal* 44, no. 1 (March 1982): 110-22.

Evans, T. V. "Future Directions for Aspect Studies in Ancient Greek." In *Biblical Greek Language and Lexicography: Essays in Honor of Fredrich W. Danker*, ed. B. A. Taylor, J. A. L. Lee, P. R. Burton, and R. E. Whitaker. Grand Rapid: Eerdmans, 2004.

- Fanning, Buist M. "Approaches to Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek: Issues in Definition and Method." In *Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics*, 46-62. Sheffield, UK: JSOT Press, 1993.
- _____. "Verbal Aspect, The Indicative Mood, and Narrative: Soundings in the Greek of the New Testament." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 51, no. 2 (June 2008): 394-97.
- Gotteri, N. J. C. "Towards a Comparison of Systemic Linguistics and Tagmemics: An Interim Report and Bibliography." *Journal of the Midland Association for Linguistic Studies* 7 (1982): 31-42.
- Iverson, Kelly R. "Orality and the Gospels: A Survey of Recent Research." *Currents in Biblical Research* 8, no. 1 (October 2009): 71-106.
- Kiparsky, Paul. "Tense and Mood in Indo-European Syntax." *Foundations of Language*, 4 (1968), 30-57.
- Maddox, Randy L. "The Use of the Aorist Tense in Holiness Exegesis." *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 16, no. 2 (Fall 1981): 168-79.
- Mathewson, David. "Verbal Aspect in Imperative Constructions in Pauline Ethical Injunctions." *Filología Neotestamentaria* 9, no. 17 (1996): 21-35.
- _____. "Verbal Aspect in the Apocalypse of John: An Analysis of Revelation 5." *Novum Testamentum* 50, no. 1 (January 2008): 58-77.
- McKay, K. L. "Aspect in Imperative Constructions in New Testament Greek." *Novum Testamentum* 27, no. 3 (July 1985): 201-26.
- _____. "On The Perfect and Other Aspects in New Testament Greek." *Novum Testamentum* 23, no. 4 (October 1981): 289-329.
- _____. "The Use of the Ancient Greek Perfect Down to the Second Century A.D." *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 12 (1965): 1-21.
- _____. "Time and Aspect in New Testament Greek." *Novum Testamentum* 34, no. 3 (1992): 209-28.
- Naselli, Andrew David. "A Brief Introduction to Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek." *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* 12 (January 2007): 17-28.
- Newton, Brian. "Scenarios, Modality, and Verbal Aspect in Modern Greek." *Language* 55, no. 1 (March 1979): 139-67.

- Picirilli, R. E. "The Meaning of the Tenses in New Testament Greek: Where Are We?" *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 48, no. 3 (2005): 533-55.
- Poirier, John C. "Statistical Studies of the Verbal Agreements and their Impact on the Synoptic Problem." *Currents in Biblical Research* 7, no. 1 (October 2008): 68-123.
- Porter, Stanley E. "Keeping Up with Recent Studies 17: Greek Language and Linguistics." *The Expository Times* 103, no. 7 (April 1992): 202-08.
- _____. "Verbal Aspect and Discourse Function in Mark 16:1-8: Three Significant Instances." In *Studies in the Greek Bible*, 123-37. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2008.
- Porter, Stanley, and Andrew W. Pitts. "New Testament Greek Language and Linguistics in Recent Research." *Currents in Biblical Research* 6, no. 2 (February 2008): 214-55.
- Porter, Stanley, and Jeffrey T. Reed. "Greek Grammar Since BDF: A Retrospective and Prospective Analysis." *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 4, no. 8 (1991): 143-62.
- Porter, Stanley, and M. B. O'Donnell. "The Greek Verbal Network Viewed from a Probabilistic Standpoint: An Exercise in Hallidayan Linguistics." *Filología Neotestamentaria* 14, no. 27 (2001): 3-41.
- Reed, J. T., and R. A. Reese. "Verbal Aspect, Discourse Prominence, and the Letter of Jude." *Filología Neotestamentaria* 9, no. 18 (1996): 181-99.
- Schmidt, Daryl. "The Study of Hellenistic Greek Grammar in the Light of Contemporary Linguistics." In *Perspectives on the New Testament: Essays in Honor of Frank Stagg*, ed. Charles H. Talbert, 27-38. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1985.
- Swart, G. J. "Non-Past Referring Imperfects in the New Testament: A Test Case for an Anti-Anti-Anti-Porter Position." *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 61, no. 4 (2005): 1085-99.
- Thorley, John. "Aktionsart in New Testament Greek: Infinitive and Imperative." *Novum Testamentum* 31, no. 4 (October 1989): 290-315.
- Voelz, J. W. "Present and Aorist Verbal Aspect: A New Proposal." *Neotestamentica* 27, no. 1 (1993): 153-64.

Non-Published Source(s)

Gentry, Peter J. "Aspect and the Greek Verb." A Course Handout for Advanced Greek Grammar at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary - 04/01/10.
<http://www.ntdiscourse.org/docs/Gentry-VerbalAspect.pdf> [accessed October 24, 2012].

ABSTRACT

AN ANALYSIS OF RECENT RESEARCH ON VERBAL ASPECT IN HELLENISTIC GREEK

Michael Todd Graham Jr., Th.M.
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2012
Chair: Dr. Thomas R. Schreiner

This thesis surveys the major works on the topic of verbal aspect. Chapter 1 provides an introduction, giving the background to the issue and listing some of the major contributors to the topic, Stanley Porter, Rodney Decker, Buist Fanning, and Constantine Campbell. Chapter 2 reviews and analyzes the contributions of these authors in this area of study. Further, this thesis seeks to clarify the topic, by exposing each author's views concerning the major matters of debate and by listing some subjects in verbal aspect that are in need of further study; in particular, the issue of the aspect of the perfect verb form, the aspect of the future verb form, and the historical present. Finally, chapter 3 demonstrates the importance of this issue for the study of Scripture, specifically, the study of the New Testament, and it gives suggestions for further study in this area.

VITA

Michael Todd Graham Jr.

PERSONAL

Born: July 22, 1983, Jacksonville, Florida
Parents: Robert Eugene and Paula Denise Heck, and Michael T. Graham Sr.
Married: Lisa Janelle Bishop, January 7, 2005

EDUCATIONAL

Diploma, Bell High School, Bell, Florida, 2002
B.S., Liberty University, 2006
M.Div., Liberty Baptist Theological Seminary, 2008
S.T.M., Liberty Baptist Theological Seminary, 2011

MINISTERIAL

Pastor, Covenant Community Church, Martinsville, Virginia, 2007-2008
Assistant Pastor-Youth, First Baptist Church, Sanford, Florida, 2008-2010

ACADEMIC

Adjunct Faculty, Baptist College of Florida, Graceville, Florida, 2009-2010
Online Instructor, Liberty University Online, Lynchburg, Virginia, 2010-
Adjunct Faculty, Mid-Continent University, Mayfield, Kentucky, 2011-

ORGANIZATIONAL

The Evangelical Theological Society