

LINGUISTIC  
ANALYSIS  
*of the*  
GREEK  
NEW  
TESTAMENT

Studies in Tools, Methods, and Practice

STANLEY E. PORTER



**Baker Academic**

*a division of Baker Publishing Group*  
Grand Rapids, Michigan

Stanley E. Porter, *Linguistic Analysis of the Greek New Testament*  
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

(Unpublished manuscript—copyright protected Baker Publishing Group)

© 2015 by Stanley E. Porter

Published by Baker Academic  
a division of Baker Publishing Group  
P.O. Box 6287, Grand Rapids, MI 49516-6287  
www.bakeracademic.com

Printed in the United States of America

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means—for example, electronic, photocopy, recording—without the prior written permission of the publisher. The only exception is brief quotations in printed reviews.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Porter, Stanley E., 1956– author.

Linguistic analysis of the Greek New Testament : studies in tools, methods, and practice /

Stanley E. Porter.

pages cm

Includes bibliographical references and indexes.

ISBN 978-0-8010-4998-9 (pbk.)

1. Greek language, Biblical. 2. Bible. New Testament—Language,

style. I. Title.

PA810.P56 2015

487.4—dc23

2014046440

Unless otherwise indicated, Scripture quotations are the author's translation.

15 16 17 18 19 20 21      7 6 5 4 3 2 1



Stanley E. Porter, *Linguistic Analysis of the Greek New Testament*  
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

(Unpublished manuscript—copyright protected Baker Publishing Group)

Dedicated to  
Lorraine DeHaan Porter  
and  
Wendy J. Porter  
Two Extraordinary Women of God



# Contents

Preface vii  
Abbreviations ix

Introduction 1

## Part 1 Texts and Tools for Analysis

1. Who Owns the Greek Text of the New Testament?  
Issues That Promote and Hinder Further Study 17
2. Analyzing the Computer Needs of New Testament  
Greek Exegetes 29
3. “On the Shoulders of Giants”: The Expansion and  
Application of the Louw-Nida Lexicon 47
4. The Blessings and Curses of Producing a Lexicon 61

## Part 2 Approaching Analysis

5. Linguistics and Biblical Interpretation 83
6. A Multidisciplinary Approach to Exegesis 93
7. Sociolinguistics and New Testament Study 113
8. Discourse Analysis: Introduction and Core  
Concepts 133

9. The Ideational Metafunction and Register 145
10. Time and Aspect in New Testament Greek: A Response to K. L. McKay 159
11. Three Arguments regarding Aspect and Temporality: A Response to Buist Fanning, with an Excursus on Aspectually Vague Verbs 175
12. The Perfect Tense-Form and Stative Aspect: The Meaning of the Greek Perfect Tense-Form in the Greek Verbal System 195

### Part 3 Doing Analysis

13. A Register Analysis of Mark 13: Toward a Context of Situation 219
14. The Grammar of Obedience: Matthew 28:19–20 237
15. Verbal Aspect and Synoptic Relations 255
16. Study of John's Gospel: New Directions or the Same Old Paths? 277
17. Method and Means of Analysis of the Opponents in the Pauline Letters 307
18. 1 Timothy 2:8: Holy Hands or Holy Raising? 339
19. Greek Word Order: Still an Unexplored Area in New Testament Studies? 347
20. Proper Nouns in the New Testament 363
21. Hyponymy and the Trinity 377

Bibliography 385

Index of Ancient Sources 422

Index of Modern Authors 427

## Preface

All of the essays in this volume address matters of the Greek New Testament, especially in its linguistic dimensions, variously conceived and defined. There are some theoretical essays, but most of them are applied to particular problems and texts within the Greek New Testament.

None of the essays in this volume has been published before, although one of them draws on a paper published previously. However, the essays were written for a variety of original purposes. Most of them—somewhere around seventeen of them, if I have remembered and counted correctly—were originally delivered at conferences such as the Society of Biblical Literature or Society for New Testament Studies or as invited papers (sometimes both). I appreciated the responses that I received from those who attended, heard, and discussed the papers further. I am especially appreciative of one student at Westminster Seminary in Korea who took the time to go through one paper in detail and provide written comments. These were very helpful, and I am sure that if I read Korean, I would have benefited even further from additional comments he made. In any case, thank you to all who took these papers seriously and responded to them. I also am thankful for the fervent and continuous debate with my former colleague Professor Arthur Gibson about one of the papers. I deeply miss these discussions, and I wish we had been able to continue them over the years. I am sure I have not convinced you, Arthur, about proper nouns, but I have done my best. I am also thankful for comments made on various papers by several of my students, former students, friends, and colleagues, including (but not inclusively) Gus Konkel, Matthew Brook O'Donnell, Hughson Ong, Francis Pang, Andrew Pitts, Steven Studebaker, Randall Tan, and Cynthia Long Westfall, who have even gone so far as to suggest terms and wordings that I have adopted. I also thank Bryan Fletcher for compiling the indexes.

Getting these papers into publishable shape has required the work of two people in particular. I thank my former student and now colleague Christopher Land for initially editing and setting up most of these files for publication. He offered much editorial help and many useful comments on the various essays, from which I have greatly benefited. I also thank my former student Gregory Fewster for his similar help, especially with a couple of essays that were far from being in the complete form that they needed to be. Both of these colleagues have taken on this project with fervor and made the final product much better than it would have been. They not only paid attention to the many small things but also offered global comments and criticism, to the point of suggesting other words and adding words and sentences (and sometimes more!) here and there (many, if not most, of which I have gladly accepted and incorporated), along with rewriting numerous sections. I am very grateful to both for their excellent work.

These papers were mostly written during my time at two different institutions. The University of Surrey Roehampton (now Roehampton University) and McMaster Divinity College both provided the opportunity to complete the research and writing of these papers. Even though I am president of the latter institution, and that is truly my full-time day (and sometimes also night) job, I have been supported in my off-hours research pursuits.

I also thank my friends at Baker Academic for their help in making this project possible, especially James Ernest.

I conclude with thanks once again to my tremendous wife, Wendy, both for being an academic colleague extraordinaire and, far more importantly, for being the soul and spirit of our lives together.



# Abbreviations

## General

chap(s).	chapter(s)	SIL	Summer Institute of Linguistics
col(s).	column(s)		
esp.	especially	SFL	systemic functional linguistics
ibid.	in the same source		
p(p).	page(s)	v(v).	verse(s)
rev.	revised		

## Ancient Texts, Text Types, and Versions

LXX	Septuagint		<i>Literature</i> . University of California, Irvine, 1972–.
MT	Masoretic Text		
TLG	<i>Thesaurus linguae Graecae: A Digital Library of Greek</i>		<a href="http://www.tlg.uci.edu/">http://www.tlg.uci.edu/</a>

## Modern Versions

AV	Authorized Version	LB	The Living Bible
BBE	The Bible in Basic English	NASB	New American Standard Bible
CEB	Common English Bible		
CEV	Contemporary English Version	NEB	New English Bible
		NET	New English Translation (The NET Bible)
ESV	English Standard Version		
GNB	Good News Bible	NIV	New International Version
HCSB	Holman Christian Standard Bible	NJB	New Jerusalem Bible
		NKJV	New King James Version
JB	Jerusalem Bible	NLT	New Living Translation

REB	Revised English Bible	TNIV	Today's New International
RSV	Revised Standard Version		Version

### Hebrew Bible / Old Testament

Gen.	Genesis	Song	Song of Songs
Exod.	Exodus	Isa.	Isaiah
Lev.	Leviticus	Jer.	Jeremiah
Num.	Numbers	Lam.	Lamentations
Deut.	Deuteronomy	Ezek.	Ezekiel
Josh.	Joshua	Dan.	Daniel
Judg.	Judges	Hos.	Hosea
Ruth	Ruth	Joel	Joel
1–2 Sam.	1–2 Samuel	Amos	Amos
1–2 Kings	1–2 Kings	Obad.	Obadiah
1–2 Chron.	1–2 Chronicles	Jon.	Jonah
Ezra	Ezra	Mic.	Micah
Neh.	Nehemiah	Nah.	Nahum
Esther	Esther	Hab.	Habakkuk
Job	Job	Zeph.	Zephaniah
Ps./Pss.	Psalms	Hag.	Haggai
Prov.	Proverbs	Zech.	Zechariah
Eccles.	Ecclesiastes	Mal.	Malachi

### New Testament

Matt.	Matthew	1–2 Thess.	1–2 Thessalonians
Mark	Mark	1–2 Tim.	1–2 Timothy
Luke	Luke	Titus	Titus
John	John	Philem.	Philemon
Acts	Acts	Heb.	Hebrews
Rom.	Romans	James	James
1–2 Cor.	1–2 Corinthians	1–2 Pet.	1–2 Peter
Gal.	Galatians	1–3 John	1–3 John
Eph.	Ephesians	Jude	Jude
Phil.	Philippians	Rev.	Revelation
Col.	Colossians		

### Apocrypha and Septuagint

1–4 Macc. 1–4 Maccabees

### Dead Sea Scrolls

4QMMT 4QHalakhic Letter

## Greek and Latin Works

*Aristotle*

*Rhet.*      *Rhetorica (Rhetoric)*

*Dionysius of Halicarnassus*

*Or.*      *Oration*

*Josephus*

*Ant.*      *Jewish Antiquities*

*Longinus*

*Subl.*      *De sublimitate (On the Sublime)*

## Secondary Sources

- |        |  |       |  |
|--------|--|-------|--|
| AAAH   | <i>Acta academiae aboensis: Humaniora</i>  | BASP  | <i>Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists</i>   |
| AARAS  | American Academy of Religion Academy Series  | BBR   | <i>Bulletin for Biblical Research</i>  |
| AB     | Anchor Bible   | BCAW  | Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World  |
| AC     | <i>Acta classica</i>   | BCILL | Bibliothèque des Cahiers de l'Institut de Linguistique de Louvain  |
| ADP    | Advances in Discourse Processes  | BDAG  | Bauer, W., F. W. Danker, W. F. Arndt, and F. W. Gingrich. <i>Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> . 3rd ed. Chicago, 2000             |
| AJP    | <i>American Journal of Philology</i>   | BDB   | Brown, F., S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs. <i>A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> . Oxford, 1907   |
| AL     | <i>Archivum linguisticum</i>   | BDF   | Blass, F., and A. Debrunner. <i>A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> . Translated by R. W. Funk. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961 |
| ALLS   | Applied Linguistics and Language Study   | BECNT | Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament   |
| AnBib  | Analecta biblica   | BETL  | Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium   |
| ASCP   | Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology   |       |  |
| ATANT  | Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments  |       |  |
| AUSSGS | Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis: Studia Graeca Stockholmiensia  |       |  |
| AUSTR  | American University Studies: Theology and Religion   |       |  |
| BAGD   | Bauer, W., W. F. Arndt, F. W. Gingrich, and F. W. Danker. <i>Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> . 2nd ed. Chicago, 1979 |       |  |
| BAGL   | <i>Biblical and Ancient Greek Linguistics</i>  |       |  |

<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>	DPLSMi	De proprietatibus litterarum, Series minor
BibSem	Biblical Seminar		
<i>BICS</i>	<i>Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies</i>	DS	Discourse Studies
BILS	Berkeley Insights in Linguistics and Semiotics	ÉBib	Études bibliques
BIS	Biblical Interpretation Series	ECC	Eerdmans Critical Commentary
BLG	Biblical Languages: Greek	ECHC	Early Christianity in Its Hellenistic Context
BLH	Biblical Languages: Hebrew	EFN	Estudios de filología neotestamentaria
BNTC	Black's New Testament Commentaries	EKK	Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
<i>BSLP</i>	<i>Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris</i>	ELS	English Language Series
<i>BT</i>	<i>The Bible Translator</i>	ENT	Estudios de Nuevo Testamento
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft	<i>ETL</i>	<i>Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses</i>
CAL	Cambridge Approaches to Linguistics	<i>EvQ</i>	<i>Evangelical Quarterly</i>
CBC	Cambridge Bible Commentary	<i>ExpTim</i>	<i>Expository Times</i>
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series	FGS	Functional Grammar Series
<i>CBR</i>	<i>Currents in Research: Biblical Studies</i>	<i>FL</i>	<i>Foundations of Language</i>
CIP	Cambridge Introductions to Philosophy	<i>FN</i>	<i>Filología neotestamentaria</i>
CL	Collection linguistique	GBSNT	Guides to Biblical Scholarship: New Testament
ConBNT	Coniectanea biblica: New Testament Series	GNC	Good News Commentary
CPC	Collection de philologie classique	GP	Gospel Perspectives
<i>CQ</i>	<i>Classical Quarterly</i>	GSE	Gothenburg Studies in English
CSCC	Comparative Studies in Cultures and Civilizations	<i>GTJ</i>	<i>Grace Theological Journal</i>
CSL	Cambridge Studies in Linguistics	HA	Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft
CTL	Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics	<i>HS</i>	<i>Historische Sprachforschung</i>
DEL	Describing English Language	<i>HSCP</i>	<i>Harvard Studies in Classical Philology</i>
		HTB	Histoire du texte biblique
		HUT	Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie
		<i>HvTSt</i>	<i>Hervormde theologiese studies</i>

IBC	Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching	<i>JPrag</i> <i>JQL</i>	<i>Journal of Pragmatics</i> <i>Journal of Quantitative Linguistics</i>
ICC	International Critical Commentary	<i>JSHJ</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus</i>
<i>IF</i>	<i>Indogermanische Forschungen</i>	JSJSup	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
<i>IJAL</i>	<i>International Journal of American Linguistics</i>	<i>JCNT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
<i>Int</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>	JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supple- ment Series
ISBL	Indiana Studies in Biblical Literature	JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supple- ment Series
<i>JAAR</i>	<i>Journal of the American Academy of Religion</i>	<i>JSPL</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of Paul and His Letters</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>	JSPSup	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supple- ment Series
JBLMS	Journal of Biblical Litera- ture Monograph Series	JOST	Johannine Studies Series
<i>JCP</i>	<i>Jahrbücher für classische Philologie</i>	<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
<i>JD</i>	<i>Jian Dao</i>	KEK	Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament (Meyer-Kommentar)
<i>JETS</i>	<i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>	KNT	Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
<i>JGRChJ</i>	<i>Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism</i>	LA	Linguistische Arbeiten
<i>JIS</i>	<i>Journal of Indo-European Studies</i>	LAL	Library of Arabic Linguistics
JISM	Journal of Indo-European Studies Monographs	LBS	Linguistic Biblical Studies
JLSMa	Janua linguarum, Series maior	LE	Linguistics Edition
JLSMi	Janua linguarum, Series minor	LHBOTS	Library of Hebrew Bible and Old Testament Studies
JLSP	Janua linguarum, Series practica	<i>LHS</i>	<i>Linguistics and the Human Sciences</i>
<i>JMALS</i>	<i>Journal of the Midland Association for Linguistic Studies</i>	<i>LI</i>	<i>Linguistic Inquiry</i>
<i>JÖB</i>	<i>Jahrbuch der österreichi- schen Byzantinistik</i>	<i>LLC</i>	<i>Literary and Linguistic Computing</i>
<i>JPhil</i>	<i>Journal of Philology</i>	LLL	Longman Linguistics Library

LN	Linguistique nouvelle	NTS	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
LNTS	Library of New Testament Studies	NTTS	New Testament Tools and Studies
LPS	Library of Pauline Studies	OLS	Open Linguistics Series
LSJ	Liddell, H. G., R. Scott, and H. S. Jones. <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> . 9th ed. with rev. supplement. Oxford, 1996	OPTT	<i>Occasional Papers in Translation and Textlinguistics</i>
LSL	Lodz Studies in Language	ORP	Oxford Readings in Philosophy
LVC	<i>Language Variation and Change</i>	OSS	Oxford Studies in Sociolinguistics
LW	Language Workbooks	OTM	Oxford Theological Monographs
MJTM	<i>McMaster Journal of Theology and Ministry</i>	<i>PasJ</i>	<i>Pastoral Journal</i>
MNTC	Moffatt New Testament Commentary	PeINTC	Pelican New Testament Commentaries
MNTS	McMaster New Testament Studies	PFES	Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society
NCBC	New Cambridge Bible Commentary	PilNTC	Pillar New Testament Commentary
NCUC	Nouvelle collection à l'usage des classes	PLB	Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava
NET	Neutestamentliche Entwürfe zur Theologie	<i>PR</i>	<i>Philosophical Review</i>
NGS	New Gospel Studies	PAST	Pauline Studies
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament	PV	Papyrologica vindobonensia
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary	QULPM	Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters
NLLT	<i>Natural Language and Linguistic Theory</i>	<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue biblique</i>
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>	RILP	Roehampton Institute London Papers
NovTSup	Novum Testamentum Supplements	<i>RJ</i>	<i>Reformed Journal</i>
NTD	Das Neue Testament Deutsch	RNT	Regensburger Neues Testament
NTG	New Testament Guides	RSL	Research Surveys in Linguistics
NTL	New Testament Library	RSGL	Routledge Studies in Germanic Linguistics
NTM	New Testament Monographs	RTT	Research in Text Theory
NTT	New Testament Theology	SBFA	Studium Biblicum Franciscanum Analecta
		SBG	Studies in Biblical Greek

SBLCP	Society of Biblical Literature Centennial Publications	SubBi	Subsidia biblica
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series	SWPLL	<i>Sheffield Working Papers in Language and Linguistics</i>
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series	TAPA	<i>Transactions of the American Philological Association</i>
SBLRBS	Society of Biblical Literature Resources for Biblical Study	TDNT	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> . Edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. Translated by G. W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids, 1964–76
SBL SBS	Society of Biblical Literature Sources for Biblical Study	TENT	Texts and Editions for New Testament Study
SBLSymS	Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series	THNT	Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament
SCL	Studies in Christianity and Literature	TJ	<i>Trinity Journal</i>
SEL	Studies in English Language	TLZ	<i>Theologische Literaturzeitung</i>
SemSt	Semeia Studies	TMEA	Travaux et mémoires: Études anciennes
SIS	Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics	TMO	Travaux de la Maison de l'Orient
<i>SJT</i>	<i>Scottish Journal of Theology</i>	TNTC	Tyndale New Testament Commentaries
SNTG	Studies in New Testament Greek	TPS	<i>Transactions of the Philological Society</i>
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series	TSK	<i>Theologische Studien und Kritiken</i>
SNTW	Studies of the New Testament and Its World	TUGAL	Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur
SP	Sacra pagina	TWNT	<i>Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament</i> . Edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. 10 vols. Stuttgart, 1932–79
<i>SPap</i>	<i>Studia papyrologica</i>	<i>TynBul</i>	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
SPIB	Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici	TZT	<i>Tübingen Zeitschrift für Theologie</i>
SSCFL	Studies in the Social and Cultural Foundations of Language	UBSMS	United Bible Societies Monograph Series
SSEJC	Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity		
START	<i>Selected Technical Articles Related to Translation</i>		
StBL	Studies in Biblical Literature		

UISK	Untersuchungen zur indo-germanischen Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft	WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
USFISFCJ	University of South Florida International Studies in Formative Christianity and Judaism	ZB	Zürcher Bibelkommentare
VE	<i>Vox evangelica</i>	ZECNT	Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary	ZNW	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche</i>
WLQ	<i>Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly</i>		



# Introduction

This volume of essays continues work done on Greek language and linguistics that I have been fortunate to be able to engage in from the very beginning of my academic career. My first published academic article was in the area of Greek language and linguistics, and, although I did not realize it at the time, it helped to set the course for at least one major strand of my subsequent research, writing, and teaching career. In that first article I examined the adjectival attributive genitive in ancient Greek, especially those instances within the less frequent syntactical patterns in the New Testament.<sup>1</sup> Later, what began as a complicated attempt to find a PhD thesis topic, and led to completing a PhD in the fields of both biblical studies and linguistics (systemic functional linguistics in particular), has continued to be a productive area of ever-expanding research. I firmly believe that matters of Greek language and linguistics are essential to understanding the Greek New Testament; in that sense, knowledge of Greek linguistics is a fundamental hermeneutical stance that should be pursued by every serious student of the New Testament.<sup>2</sup> By

1. S. E. Porter, "The Adjectival Attributive Genitive in the New Testament: A Grammatical Study," *TJ* 4 (1983): 3–17.

2. Hermeneutics is a closely related area that I have also pursued in some depth, especially recently. See S. E. Porter, "Hermeneutics, Biblical Interpretation and Theology: Hunch, Holy Spirit or Hard Work?," in *Beyond the Bible: Moving from Scripture to Theology*, by I. H. Marshall, with essays by K. Vanhoozer and S. E. Porter (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic; Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2004), 97–127; Porter, "What Difference Does Hermeneutics Make? Hermeneutical Theory Applied," *JD* 34 // *Pas* 27 (July 2010): 1–50; S. E. Porter and J. C. Robinson, *Hermeneutics: An Introduction to Interpretive Theory* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011); Porter, "A Single Horizon Hermeneutics: A Proposal for Interpretive Identification," *MJTM* 13 (2011–12): 45–66; Porter, "What Exactly Is Theological Interpretation of Scripture, and Is It Hermeneutically Robust Enough for the Task to Which It Has Been Appointed?," in *Horizons in Hermeneutics: A Festschrift in Honor of Anthony C. Thiselton*, ed. S. E. Porter and

“knowledge of Greek,” I do not mean what some people claim is knowledge on the basis of finishing one or two years of Greek study (especially employing some of the widely used but inadequate pedagogical grammatical tools) or traditional grammar or the invocation of the work of outmoded and outdated reference tools. What I mean is a robust and insightful development of appropriate linguistically based methods for study of the Greek New Testament. Such work is the exception to most of what represents itself under the name of exegesis. It is disconcerting to see many of the latest commentaries and numerous journal articles make statements about the Greek New Testament and yet show absolutely no knowledge of any of the recent discussion of ancient Greek. They sometimes even use such naive and unfounded knowledge as the basis for what can only be called, as a result, highly tenuous exegetical conclusions. This volume is designed to help remedy this situation, at least in part, by providing some insights into various areas of Greek grammar and linguistics along with providing examples of application of linguistics to particular problems in Greek.

My first major work in Greek language and linguistics, a major monograph on verbal aspect theory and the Greek of the New Testament, led to linguistically related work in at least two major areas.<sup>3</sup> The first was in areas more particularly linguistic in nature. Several of my earliest scholarly articles addressed matters of general linguistics, even if they had direct application to the work that I was doing in study of the Greek of the New Testament. This resulted in publications on vagueness and ambiguity,<sup>4</sup> and on tense-form terminology.<sup>5</sup> Another area of general linguistic interest came about first through the basic corpus-based approach of my original research on verbal aspect, and then later in the collaborative work of my then-student and later colleague Matthew Brook O’Donnell on corpus linguistics. The study of ancient languages raises a unique set of corpus problems, some of which we have addressed in our research.<sup>6</sup> Since then, I have also contributed linguistic overviews of the

---

M. R. Malcolm (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013), 234–67; Porter, “Biblical Hermeneutics and Theological Responsibility,” in *The Future of Biblical Interpretation: Responsible Plurality in Biblical Hermeneutics*, ed. S. E. Porter and M. R. Malcolm (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2013), 29–50. See also S. E. Porter and B. M. Stovell, eds., *Biblical Hermeneutics: Five Views* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2012).

3. S. E. Porter, *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament, with Reference to Tense and Mood*, SBG 1 (New York: Peter Lang, 1989; 2nd ed., 1993).

4. S. E. Porter and N. J. C. Gotteri (my doctoral supervisor in linguistics), “Ambiguity, Vagueness and the Working Systemic Linguist,” *SWPLL* 2 (1985): 105–18.

5. S. E. Porter, “Tense Terminology and Greek Language Study: A Linguistic Re-Evaluation,” *SWPLL* 3 (1986): 77–86; revised and reprinted in *Studies in the Greek New Testament: Theory and Practice* by S. E. Porter, SBG 6 (New York: Peter Lang, 1996), 39–48.

6. M. B. O’Donnell, S. E. Porter, and J. T. Reed, “OpenText.org: The Problems and Prospects of Working with Ancient Discourse,” in *Proceedings of the Corpus Linguistics 2001 Conference*,

New Testament and Septuagint for a linguistic reference work.<sup>7</sup> I have also attempted to formulate what the distinctives of linguistically based Greek grammatical study look like in relation to more traditional areas of Greek scholarship, such as traditional grammar and classical philology.<sup>8</sup>

Within the field of New Testament Greek language and linguistic studies, my second major area, I have extended my initial studies on verbal aspect into five other major research areas. These lines are discussed in various ways within this fundamental research, though they have often been overlooked because they are overshadowed by the major topic of discussion, verbal aspect. The first area is continued discussion of verbal aspect,<sup>9</sup> as well as tense and mood (the three together often referred to as “TMA,” or tense-mood-aspect), and their relationships to things such as temporal reference and even syntax.<sup>10</sup> Verbal aspect is a topic to which I return in several of the chapters in this volume. One of the frequently heard though rarely supported responses to my theory of aspect is that choice of verbal aspect is influenced by the Greek verbal system itself or by lexical choice. In a corpus-based study of the Greek of the New

---

ed. P. Rayson et al. (Lancaster: Lancaster University, 2001), 413–22; printed also in *A Rainbow of Corpora: Corpus Linguistics and the Languages of the World*, ed. A. Wilson, P. Rayson, and T. McEnery, LE 40 (Munich: Lincom, 2003), 109–19; S. E. Porter and M. B. O’Donnell, “Theoretical Issues for Corpus Linguistics and the Study of Ancient Languages,” in *Corpus Linguistics by the Lune: A Festschrift for Geoffrey Leech*, ed. A. Wilson, P. Rayson, and T. McEnery, LSL 8 (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2003), 119–37.

7. S. E. Porter, “New Testament” and “Septuagint,” in *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*, ed. G. K. Giannakis (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 2:497–500, 3:287–90.

8. S. E. Porter, “Studying Ancient Languages from a Modern Linguistic Perspective: Essential Terms and Terminology,” *FN* 2 (1989): 147–72. See also Porter, “Problems in the Language of the Bible: Misunderstandings that Continue to Plague Biblical Interpretation,” in *The Nature of Religious Language: A Colloquium*, ed. S. E. Porter, RILP 1 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 20–46, where a number of topics are discussed.

9. S. E. Porter, “In Defence of Verbal Aspect,” in *Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics: Open Questions in Current Research*, ed. S. E. Porter and D. A. Carson, JSNTSup 80, SNTG 1 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 26–45; revised and reprinted in Porter, *Studies in the Greek New Testament*, 21–38.

10. S. E. Porter, “Vague Verbs, Periphrastics, and Matthew 16:19,” *FN* 1 (1988) 155–73; revised and reprinted in Porter, *Studies in the Greek New Testament*, 103–24; Porter, “Verbal Aspect in NT Greek and Bible Translation: A Review of Research,” *TIC Talk* 15 (Spring 1991): 1–3; Porter, “The Date of the Composition of Hebrews and Use of the Present Tense-Form,” in *Crossing the Boundaries: Essays on Biblical Interpretation in Honour of Michael D. Goulder*, ed. S. E. Porter, P. Joyce, and D. E. Orton, BIS 8 (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 313–32; Porter, “Time and Order in Participles in Mark and Luke: A Response to Robert Picirilli,” *BBR* 17 (2007): 261–67; Porter, “Verbal Aspect and Discourse Function in Mark 16:1–8: Three Significant Instances,” in *Studies in the Greek Bible: Essays in Honor of Francis T. Gignac, S.J.*, ed. J. Corley and V. Skemp, CBQMS 44 (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2008), 123–37; Porter, “What Can We Learn about Greek Grammar from a Mosaic?,” in *The Language of the New Testament: Context, History, and Development*, ed. S. E. Porter and A. W. Pitts, ECHC 3, LBS 6 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 29–41.

Testament, Matthew O'Donnell and I show, from a probabilistic standpoint, that the aspectual system within the Greek verbal system is for all intents and purposes completely independent.<sup>11</sup> In an article on lexical choice, I also show that lexical influence on verbal aspectual choice is also very limited.<sup>12</sup> Through this work, I (and others) demonstrate, I believe, that such counterclaims are simply not defensible, and that such arguments should be dropped, and with them theories (such as *Aktionsart* or lexical aspect), even of grammatical aspect, that are based upon them. Related to verbal aspect and other areas of Greek usage is the notion of prominence, the means by which language users indicate the salience of various linguistic elements. In an earlier work titled "Prominence: A Theoretical Overview," I attempt to provide a system for determining Greek prominence in relationship to markedness and foregrounding.<sup>13</sup>

The second major strand I have continued to develop is general work on the history and development of the Greek language, where I have attempted to show the appropriate position of the Hellenistic Greek of the New Testament in relation to the varieties of Greek that came before it, and how study of the Greek of the New Testament—widely ignored by students of Classical Greek—has made significant contributions to our understanding of Greek.<sup>14</sup> Related to this is my offering of extended critique of some of the

11. S. E. Porter and M. B. O'Donnell, "The Greek Verbal Network Viewed from a Probabilistic Standpoint: An Exercise in Hallidayan Linguistics," *FN* 14 (2001): 3–41.

12. S. E. Porter, "Aspect Theory and Lexicography," in *Biblical Greek Language and Lexicography: Essays in Honor of Frederick W. Danker*, ed. B. A. Taylor et al. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 207–22.

13. S. E. Porter, "Prominence: A Theoretical Overview," in *The Linguist as Pedagogue: Trends in the Teaching and Linguistic Analysis of the Greek New Testament*, ed. S. E. Porter and M. B. O'Donnell, *NTM* 11 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2009), 45–74; cf. also Porter, "Verbal Aspect as a Prominence Indicator: A Response to Jody Barnard," in *Greeks, Jews, and Christians: Historical, Religious, and Philological Studies in Honor of Jesús Peláez del Rosal*, ed. L. R. Lanzillotta and I. M. Gallarte (Córdoba: Ediciones el Almendro, 2013), 421–48.

14. S. E. Porter, "The Language of the Apocalypse in Recent Discussion," *NTS* 35 (1989): 582–603; Porter, "Introduction: The Greek of the New Testament as a Disputed Area of Research," in *The Language of the New Testament: Classic Essays*, ed. S. E. Porter, *JNTSup* 60 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 11–38; revised and reprinted in Porter, *Studies in the Greek New Testament*, 75–99; Porter, "Is  $\mu$  Really  $\mu$  (*P. Oxy XVII 2110.15*)?," *BASP* 27 (1990): 45–47; Porter, "The Greek Language of the New Testament," in *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament*, ed. S. E. Porter, *NTTS* 25 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 99–130; Porter, "Greek of the New Testament," in *Dictionary of New Testament Background*, ed. C. A. Evans and S. E. Porter (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2000), 426–35; Porter, "Greek Language," in vol. 2 of *The New Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. K. D. Sakenfeld (Nashville: Abingdon, 2007), 673–81; Porter, "Languages of the Bible," in *Dictionary of the Bible and Western Culture: A Handbook for Students*, ed. M. A. Beavis and M. J. Gilmour (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2012), 286–87. My historical interest comes through in A. Wifstrand, *Epochs and Styles: Selected Writings on the New Testament, Greek Language and Greek Culture in the Post-Classical Era*, ed. L. Rydbeck and S. E. Porter, trans. D. Searby, *WUNT* 179 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005).

tools and approaches used in contemporary Greek study, including grammars and commentaries.<sup>15</sup>

The third area is sociolinguistics, the specific topic of chapter 7 in this volume. Sociolinguistics is a major field of linguistic study, and the several intertwined subareas where I have made a contribution are diglossia, multilingualism, and historical sociolinguistics. Diglossia is related to the area of register study and is concerned with how various language users shift and adjust their linguistic choice within their potential repertoires for various socially and textually determined reasons.<sup>16</sup> The second subarea of sociolinguistics, multilingualism, is directly relevant to the milieu in which the New Testament was written, especially in relation to matters such as style, register, and prestige languages.<sup>17</sup> The Mediterranean world of the first century was multilingual, and this affects issues such as the language of Jesus and the use of language by a variety of New Testament writers, such as Paul, a Diaspora Jew who lived for a time in Palestine but traveled throughout the greater Mediterranean Greco-Roman world.<sup>18</sup> This sociolinguistic work has significance for Greek Egypt as well.<sup>19</sup> Historical sociolinguistics studies the sociolinguistic dynamics of the ancient world on the basis of historical evidence of the varieties of language used by various peoples.<sup>20</sup> Within an SFL (systemic functional linguistics)

15. S. E. Porter and J. T. Reed, "Greek Grammar since BDF: A Retrospective and Prospective Analysis," *FN* 4 (1991): 143–64; Porter, "A Modern Grammar of an Ancient Language: A Critique of the Schmidt Proposal," *Forum* 2 (1999): 201–13; Porter, "Linguistic Criticism," in *Dictionary of Biblical Criticism and Interpretation*, ed. S. E. Porter (London: Routledge, 2007), 199–202; Porter, "The Linguistic Competence of New Testament Commentaries," in *On the Writing of New Testament Commentaries: Festschrift for Grant R. Osborne on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*, ed. S. E. Porter and E. J. Schnabel, *TENT* 8 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 33–56; Porter, "Commentaries on the Book of Romans," in Porter and Schnabel, *New Testament Commentaries*, 365–404.

16. S. E. Porter, "The Functional Distribution of Koine Greek in First-Century Palestine," in *Diglossia and Other Topics in New Testament Linguistics*, ed. S. E. Porter, *JSNTSup* 193, *SNTG* 6 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 53–78.

17. S. E. Porter, "The Greek Papyri of the Judaean Desert and the World of the Roman East," in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After*, ed. S. E. Porter and C. A. Evans, *RILP* 3, *JSPSup* 26 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 293–316.

18. S. E. Porter, "The Languages That Paul Did Not Speak," in *Paul's World*, ed. S. E. Porter, *PAST* 4 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 131–49; Porter, "The Language(s) Jesus Spoke," in *Handbook for the Study of the Historical Jesus*, vol. 3, *The Historical Jesus*, ed. T. Holmén and S. E. Porter (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 2455–71.

19. S. E. Porter, "History of Scholarship on the Language of the Septuagint," in *Handbuch zur Septuaginta*, vol. 4, *Sprache*, ed. E. Bons and J. Joosten (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlag, forthcoming).

20. S. E. Porter, "The Greek of the Jews and Early Christians: The Language of the People from a Historical Sociolinguistic Perspective," in *Far from Minimal: Celebrating the Work and Influence of Philip R. Davies*, ed. D. Burns and J. W. Rogerson, *LHBOTS* 484 (London: T&T Clark, 2012), 350–64.

framework (itself a sociolinguistic theory), the notion of register is important since it provides a means for describing typical instances of language use within the context of situation of a discourse.<sup>21</sup> Register studies continue to be underdeveloped in New Testament research (see chap. 13 in this volume), even though there has been some work that has paved the way in this regard.

The fourth area of continued research is concerned with the language of Jesus (closely related to sociolinguistics above).<sup>22</sup> Within the context of Mediterranean multilingualism, I have examined the languages of Jesus and attempted to develop linguistically based criteria for determining the historical reliability of sayings of Jesus. To that end, I have developed three linguistically based criteria for authenticating the words of Jesus and applied them to various Gospel-recorded instances: Greek language and its context, Greek textual variance, and discourse features.<sup>23</sup>

The fifth and final strand of New Testament linguistic research is discourse analysis.<sup>24</sup> In some ways, discourse analysis has been an overriding concern of my work from the start, as I have tried to position my study of Greek within

21. S. E. Porter, "Dialect and Register in the Greek of the New Testament: Theory," in *Rethinking Contexts, Rereading Texts: Contributions from the Social Sciences to Biblical Interpretation*, ed. M. D. Carroll R., JSOTSup 299 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 190–208; Porter, "Register in the Greek of the New Testament: Application with Reference to Mark's Gospel," in Carroll R., *Rethinking Contexts, Rereading Texts*, 209–29.

22. S. E. Porter, "Did Jesus Ever Teach in Greek?," *TynBul* 44 (1993): 199–235; revised and reprinted in Porter, *Studies in the Greek New Testament*, 139–71; Porter, "Jesus and the Use of Greek in Galilee," in *Studying the Historical Jesus: Evaluations of the State of Current Research*, ed. B. Chilton and C. A. Evans, NTS 19 (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 123–54; Porter, "Jesus and the Use of Greek: A Response to Maurice Casey," *BBR* 10 (2000): 71–87; Porter, "Language Criticism," in *Encyclopedia of the Historical Jesus*, ed. C. A. Evans (London: Routledge, 2008), 361–65.

23. S. E. Porter, *The Criteria for Authenticity in Historical-Jesus Research: Previous Discussion and New Proposals*, JSNTSup 191 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 126–237; Porter, "Luke 17.11–19 and the Criteria for Authenticity Revisited," *JSHJ* 1 (2003): 201–24; Porter, "The Criterion of Greek Language and Its Context: A Further Response," *JSHJ* 4 (2006): 69–74; Porter, "The Role of Greek Language Criteria in Historical Jesus Research," in *Handbook for the Study of the Historical Jesus*, vol. 1, *How to Study the Historical Jesus*, ed. T. Holmén and S. E. Porter (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 361–404. These criteria were anticipated on the basis of S. E. Porter and M. B. O'Donnell, "The Implications of Textual Variants for Authenticating the Words of Jesus," in *Authenticating the Words of Jesus*, ed. B. Chilton and C. A. Evans, NTS 28.1 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 97–133; Porter and O'Donnell, "The Implications of Textual Variants for Authenticating the Activities of Jesus," in *Authenticating the Activities of Jesus*, ed. B. Chilton and C. A. Evans, NTS 28.2 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 121–51.

24. S. E. Porter, "Discourse Analysis and New Testament Studies: An Introductory Survey," in *Discourse Analysis and Other Topics in Biblical Greek*, ed. S. E. Porter and D. A. Carson, JSNTSup 113, SNTG 2 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 14–35; Porter, "Rhetorical Analysis and Discourse Analysis of the Pauline Corpus," in *The Rhetorical Analysis of Scripture: Essays from the 1995 London Conference*, ed. S. E. Porter and T. H. Olbricht, JSNTSup 146 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 249–74; Porter, "Is Critical Discourse Analysis Critical? An Evaluation Using Philemon as a Test Case," in *Discourse Analysis and the New Testament:*



larger discourse concerns. This has led to my writing the first grammar of New Testament Greek that utilized discourse principles within a strong linguistic framework,<sup>25</sup> and to my being one of only a few to write on the grammar of the *Gospel of Peter* and the first to write a discourse analysis of that noncanonical gospel.<sup>26</sup> With Jeffrey Reed and Matthew O'Donnell, I have also coauthored an elementary Greek grammar that incorporates a linguistic framework into its presentation and organization.<sup>27</sup>

Besides my work in New Testament Greek language and linguistics study, a second major field where I have undertaken serious research is the area of New Testament lexicography, including semantic-domain theory. My interests here have been both theoretical and practical. I have written one of the only full-scale studies of a Greek lexeme within all of ancient Greek usage, a study of  $\mu$  (“reconcile”) and its cognates from earliest usage to the sixth century AD.<sup>28</sup> This is a further example of corpus-based study, in which I examined all of the contexts in which the lexeme appears and analyzed its major syntactical patterns. I followed this up with several related studies on particular New Testament passages.<sup>29</sup> I also have been concerned with the more theoretical issues of lexicography, where I have become an overt proponent of lexical monosemy rather than the traditional polysemy,<sup>30</sup> and

---

*Approaches and Results*, ed. S. E. Porter and J. T. Reed, JSNTSup 170, SNTG 4 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 47–70.

25. S. E. Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*, BLG 2 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992; 2nd ed., 1994).

26. S. E. Porter, “The Greek of the Gospel of Peter: Implications for Syntax and Discourse Study,” in *Das Evangelium nach Petrus: Text, Kontexte, Intertexte*, ed. T. J. Kraus and T. Nicklas, TUGAL 158 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007), 77–90.

27. S. E. Porter, J. T. Reed, and M. B. O'Donnell, *Fundamentals of New Testament Greek* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010); S. E. Porter and J. T. Reed, *Fundamentals of New Testament Greek: Workbook* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010).

28. S. E. Porter, *in Ancient Greek Literature, with Reference to the Pauline Writings*, EFN 5 (Córdoba: Ediciones el Almendro, 1994).

29. S. E. Porter, “Reconciliation and 2 Cor 5,18–21,” in *The Corinthian Correspondence*, ed. R. Bieringer, BETL 125 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1996), 693–705; Porter, “ $\mu$  in Ancient Greek Literature and Romans 5: A Study of Pauline Usage,” in Porter, *Studies in the Greek New Testament*, 195–212. For other lexical studies, see Porter, “How Should  $\mu$  in 1 Corinthians 6:16, 17 Be Translated?,” *ETL* 67 (1991): 105–6; S. E. Porter and M. B. O'Donnell, “Semantics and Patterns of Argumentation in the Book of Romans: Definitions, Proposals, Data and Experiments,” in Porter, *Diglossia*, 154–204; S. E. Porter, “The Concept of Covenant in Paul,” in *The Concept of the Covenant in the Second Temple Period*, ed. S. E. Porter and J. C. R. de Roo, JSJSup 71 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 269–85; Porter, “Penitence and Repentance in the Epistles,” in *Repentance in Christian Theology*, ed. M. J. Boda and G. T. Smith (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2006), 127–50.

30. S. E. Porter, “Greek Linguistics and Lexicography,” in *Understanding the Times: New Testament Studies in the 21st Century; Essays in Honor of D. A. Carson on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, ed. A. J. Köstenberger and R. W. Yarbrough (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2011),

have opposed the insidious tendency of New Testament studies toward theological lexicography.<sup>31</sup> In this volume chapters 3 and 4 also figure into this discussion of lexicography by critiquing two standard lexicons and making some constructive proposals.<sup>32</sup>

A third area of research and writing not already mentioned above is my work in translation studies, a field often excluded from discussion of linguistics “proper” (or improper, I would say). Beginning with my study of the Contemporary English Version and Mark 1:4, an important verse in translation theorizing,<sup>33</sup> I have extended that research and developed a framework for examining various types of translations.<sup>34</sup> This framework attempts to move beyond the usual bifurcation between literal and dynamic equivalence and to explore a fuller range of interlingual translational options,<sup>35</sup> along with using discourse analysis as a means of translational analysis and evaluation.<sup>36</sup>

---

19–61, which also discusses verbal aspect in some detail; Porter, “Matthew and Mark: The Contribution of Recent Linguistic Thought,” in *Mark and Matthew: Comparative Readings*, part 1, *Understanding the Earliest Gospels in Their First-Century Settings*, ed. E.-M. Becker and A. Runesson, WUNT 271 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 97–119, which also offers a critique of the use of linguistics in such scholarship; Porter, “μ in Mark 6:6 and Luke 11:38: A Note on Monosemy,” *BAGL* 2 (2013): 75–79.

31. S. E. Porter, “Is *dipsuchos* (James 1:8; 4:8) a ‘Christian’ Word?,” *Bib* 71 (1990): 469–98; Porter, “Lexicons (Theological),” in Porter, *Dictionary of Biblical Criticism and Interpretation*, 195–96.

32. See also S. E. Porter, “Romans 13:1–7 as Pauline Political Rhetoric,” *FN* 3 (6; 1990): 115–39, where New Testament lexicography, though not central, is crucial to my argument.

33. S. E. Porter, “The Contemporary English Version and the Ideology of Translation,” in *Translating the Bible: Problems and Prospects*, ed. S. E. Porter and R. S. Hess, JSNTSup 173 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 18–45.

34. S. E. Porter, “Mark 1.4, Baptism and Translation,” in *Baptism, the New Testament and the Church: Historical and Contemporary Studies in Honour of R. E. O. White*, ed. S. E. Porter and A. R. Cross, JSNTSup 171 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 81–98; Porter, “Some Issues in Modern Translation Theory and Study of the Greek New Testament,” *CBR* 9 (2001): 350–82; Porter, “Modern Translations,” in *The Oxford Illustrated History of the Bible*, ed. J. Rogerson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 134–61; Porter, “Translations of the Bible (since the KJV),” in Porter, *Dictionary of Biblical Criticism and Interpretation*, 362–69; Porter, “Eugene Nida and Translation,” *BT* 56 (2005): 8–19; Porter, “Language and Translation of the New Testament,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Biblical Studies*, ed. J. W. Rogerson and J. M. Lieu (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 184–210; Porter, “Translation, Exegesis, and 1 Thessalonians 2:14–15: Could a Comma Have Changed the Course of History?,” *BT* 64 (2013): 82–98; S. E. Porter and H. T. Ong, “‘Standard of Faith’ or ‘Measure of a Trusteeship’? A Study in Romans 12:3—A Response,” *JGRChJ* 9 (2013): 97–103.

35. S. E. Porter, “Assessing Translation Theory: Beyond Literal and Dynamic Equivalence,” in *Translating the New Testament: Text, Translation, Theology*, ed. S. E. Porter and M. J. Boda, MNTS (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 117–45; Porter, *How We Got the New Testament: Text, Transmission, Translation* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2013), esp. 147–210.

36. S. E. Porter and M. B. O’Donnell, “Comparative Discourse Analysis as a Tool in Assessing Translations Using Luke 16:19–31 as a Test Case,” in Porter and Boda, *Translating the New Testament*, 185–99.



Along the way, I have also written a number of linguistically framed articles on a variety of other topics in study of the Greek New Testament. This is actually the second volume I have published that includes a variety of my linguistic papers. The first one, however, contained mostly (though not only) previously published papers.<sup>37</sup> These papers included an introduction to Greek language and linguistics,<sup>38</sup> a treatment of the Greek verb  $\mu$  (“become”) as a verb of location,<sup>39</sup> an article on Romans 5 that discusses a number of linguistic matters,<sup>40</sup> and a treatment of Wittgenstein’s classes of utterances in Paul with special reference to Galatians 3:28–29,<sup>41</sup> among others that are less linguistic in orientation or that are mentioned elsewhere in this introduction. In individual studies, I have also continued to explore a range of topics in Greek language and linguistics. One of these is the area of linguistic determinism or relativity, what is sometimes known as the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, in which I critically examine the question of how one’s language influences one’s thought.<sup>42</sup> Another of these areas is word and constituent order, also a topic that I take up in one of the chapters in this book.<sup>43</sup> I am gratified to see that there has been some recent work on this topic: it remains an understudied area, full of unjustified suppositions. Another topic is the Greek case system, where I have responded to some research differentiating grammatical and semantic case by arguing for the need for a formally based approach.<sup>44</sup> Andrew Pitts and I have also applied case grammar to the issue of (“faith of Christ”) and the genitive, and we believe, contrary to much theologizing, that a linguistic analysis can actually solve this enduring linguistic and hence theological problem.<sup>45</sup> I believe that there is too much

37. Porter, *Studies in the Greek New Testament*.

38. S. E. Porter, “Greek Language and Linguistics (Keeping Up with Recent Studies 17),” *ExpTim* 103 (1991–92): 202–8; revised and reprinted in Porter, *Studies in the Greek New Testament*, 7–20.

39. S. E. Porter, “In the Vicinity of Jericho’: Luke 18:35 in the Light of Its Synoptic Parallels,” *BBR* 2 (1992): 91–104; revised and reprinted in Porter, *Studies in the Greek New Testament*, 125–38.

40. S. E. Porter, “The Argument of Romans 5: Can a Rhetorical Question Make a Difference?,” *JBL* 110 (1991): 655–77; revised and reprinted in Porter, *Studies in the Greek New Testament*, 213–38.

41. S. E. Porter, “Wittgenstein’s Classes of Utterances and Pauline Ethical Texts,” *JETS* 32 (1989): 85–97; revised and reprinted in Porter, *Studies in the Greek New Testament*, 239–54.

42. S. E. Porter, “Two Myths: Corporate Personality and Language/Mentality Determinism,” *SJT* 43 (1990): 289–307; Porter, “An Assessment of Some New Testament-Related Assumptions for Open Theism in the Writings of Clark Pinnock,” in *Semper Reformandum: Studies in Honour of Clark H. Pinnock*, ed. S. E. Porter and A. R. Cross (Carlisle: Paternoster, 2003), 160–82.

43. S. E. Porter, “Word Order and Clause Structure in New Testament Greek: An Unexplored Area of Greek Linguistics Using Philipians as a Test Case,” *FN* 6 (1993): 177–205.

44. S. E. Porter, “The Case for Case Revisited,” *Jian Dao* 6 (1996): 13–28.

45. S. E. Porter and A. W. Pitts, “\_\_\_\_\_ with a Preposition and Genitive Modifier: Lexical, Semantic, and Syntactic Considerations in the \_\_\_\_\_ Discussion,” in *The Faith of Jesus*

invested in the theological issues for some to concede that such a solution is not only available, but also quite possibly correct. I have also written an essay that tackles some of the issues surrounding the notorious problem of the Greek middle voice.<sup>46</sup> Along with Matthew O'Donnell, I have also written on the so-called vocative case, attempting to bring some clarity to a case that stands out in a variety of linguistically definable ways.<sup>47</sup> We have also written on conjunctions, an area that has not been well discussed from a linguistic standpoint because of the failure to see the conjunctive system as just that—a linguistic system, and not comprising a mixed set of discrete elements.<sup>48</sup> A major advancement of discourse-based study of language—Greek included—is examination of units above the clause. One of these units is the paragraph, which I have endeavored to define linguistically.<sup>49</sup> Nevertheless, study of the paragraph (or equivalent) remains woefully underdeveloped. Future research in linguistics, whether ancient or modern, will need, I believe, to move to formalizing analysis of the paragraph. I, along with Matthew O'Donnell, have also applied the kind of linguistically oriented work noted above to the Greek of the documentary papyri.<sup>50</sup> Even though I continue to work within the SFL

---

*Christ: Exegetical, Biblical, and Theological Studies*, ed. M. F. Bird and P. M. Sprinkle (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson; Carlisle: Paternoster, 2009), 33–53.

46. S. E. Porter, “Did Paul Baptize Himself? A Problem of the Greek Voice System,” in *Dimensions of Baptism*, ed. S. E. Porter and A. R. Cross, JSNTSup 234 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 91–109.

47. S. E. Porter and M. B. O'Donnell, “The Vocative Case in Greek: Addressing the Case at Hand,” in *Grammatica intellectio Scripturae: Saggi filologici di Greco biblico in onore di Lino Cignelli OFM*, ed. R. Pierri, SBFA 68 (Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 2006), 35–48.

48. S. E. Porter and M. B. O'Donnell, “Conjunctions, Clines and Levels of Discourse,” *FN* 20 (2007): 3–14.

49. S. E. Porter, “Pericope Markers and the Paragraph: Textual and Linguistic Considerations,” in *The Impact of Unit Delimitation on Exegesis*, ed. R. de Hoop, M. C. A. Korpel, and S. E. Porter, *Pericope* 7 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 175–95.

50. S. E. Porter, “New Testament Studies and Papyrology: What Can We Learn from Each Other?,” in *Akten des 23. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses, Wien, 22.–28. Juli 2001*, ed. B. Palme, PV 1 (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2007), 559–72; Porter, “Prolegomena to a Syntax of the Greek Papyri,” in *Proceedings of the 24th International Congress of Papyrology, Helsinki, 1st–7th of August 2004*, ed. J. Frösén, T. Purola and E. Salmenkivi (Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica, 2007), 921–33; S. E. Porter and M. B. O'Donnell, “Building and Examining Linguistic Phenomena in a Corpus of Representative Papyri,” in *The Language of the Papyri*, ed. T. V. Evans and D. D. Obbink (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 287–311; Porter, “Buried Linguistic Treasure in the Babatha Archive,” in *Proceedings of the 25th International Congress of Papyrology, Ann Arbor, July 29–August 4, 2007*, ed. T. Gagos, ASP Special Edition (Ann Arbor: Scholarly Publishing Office, The University of Michigan Library, 2010), 623–32; Porter, “The Babatha Archive, the Egyptian Papyri and Their Implications for Study of the Greek New Testament,” in *Early Christian Manuscripts: Examples of Applied Method and Approach*, ed. T. J. Kraus and T. Nicklas, TENT 5 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 213–37.

framework, I have also explored some other related topics in linguistics and utilized other approaches to linguistics than the SFL approach, for which I am perhaps best known.<sup>51</sup> In the course of my work, and at periodic intervals, I have also offered several critical summaries of some of the major issues or the state of play within Greek grammatical study,<sup>52</sup> as well as preparing the New Testament Greek bibliography for the Oxford On-Line Bibliographies.<sup>53</sup> I have also published a number of other studies that depend upon linguistics, even if linguistics does not figure as prominently as it does in most of the essays noted in this introduction.<sup>54</sup>

This volume continues several of the major lines of scholarly research that I have indicated above and includes a number of papers delivered at a variety of conferences over the years or written for other purposes. Even though some of

51. S. E. Porter, "A Functional Letter Perspective: Towards a Grammar of Epistolary Form," in *Paul and the Ancient Letter Form*, ed. S. E. Porter and S. A. Adams, PAST 6 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 9–31; Porter, "Why Hasn't Literary Stylistics Caught On in New Testament Studies?," in *Discourse Studies and Biblical Interpretation: A Festschrift in Honor of Stephen H. Levinsohn*, ed. S. E. Runge (Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2011), 35–57; Porter, "How Do We Know What We Think We Know? Methodological Reflections on Jesus Research," in *Jesus Research: New Methodologies and Perceptions*, ed. J. H. Charlesworth with B. Rhea in consultation with P. Pokorný (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014), 82–99.

52. S. E. Porter, "New Perspectives on the Exegesis of the New Testament: Anglo-American Insights," in *Herkunft und Zukunft der neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft*, ed. O. Wischmeyer, NET 6 (Tübingen: Francke, 2003), 63–84; Porter, "Linguistics and Biblical Interpretation," in *Methods of Biblical Interpretation: Excerpted from the Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation* (Nashville: Abingdon, 2004), 35–40; Porter, "Greek Grammar and Syntax," in *The Face of New Testament Studies: A Survey of Recent Research*, ed. S. McKnight and G. R. Osborne (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004), 76–103; S. E. Porter and A. W. Pitts, "New Testament Greek Language and Linguistics in Recent Research," *CBR* 6 (2008): 214–55; Porter, "Greek Grammar and Lexicography," in Porter, *Dictionary of Biblical Criticism and Interpretation*, 136–39.

53. S. E. Porter, "Greek Language," in *Oxford Bibliographies Online: Biblical Studies*, ed. C. Ferraro (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014).

54. S. E. Porter, "\_\_\_\_\_ in Ephesians 5:5: Does Chiasm Solve a Problem?," *ZNW* 81 (1990): 270–76; Porter, "P.Oxy. 744.4 and Colossians 3:9," *Bib* 73 (1992): 565–67; Porter, "Linguistics and Rhetorical Criticism," in *Linguistics and the New Testament: Critical Junctures*, ed. S. E. Porter and D. A. Carson, JSNTSup 168, SNTG 5 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 63–92; Porter, "Latin Language," in Evans and Porter, *Dictionary of New Testament Background*, 630–31; Porter, "The Ending of John's Gospel," in *From Biblical Criticism to Biblical Faith: Essays in Honor of Lee Martin McDonald*, ed. C. A. Evans and W. Brackney (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 2007), 55–73; Porter, "Allusions and Echoes," in *As It Is Written: Studying Paul's Use of Scripture*, ed. S. E. Porter and C. D. Stanley, SBLSymS 50 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2008), 29–40; Porter, "Did Paul Speak Latin?," in *Paul: Jew, Greek, and Roman*, ed. S. E. Porter, PAST 5 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 289–308; Porter, "Granville Sharp's Rule: A Response to Dan Wallace, or Why a Critical Book Review Should Be Left Alone," *JETS* 56 (2013): 93–100; S. E. Porter and W. V. Cirafesi, "\_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ in Romans 3:23: A Response to Steven Enderlein," *JSP* 3 (2013): 1–9; S. E. Porter, "Not Only That ( μ ), but It Has Been Said Before: A Response to Verlyn Verbrugge, or Why Reading Previous Scholarship Can Avoid Scholarly Misunderstandings," *JETS* 56 (2013) 577–83.

the papers were written and delivered some time ago, I have not attempted to bring them up to date in every regard (especially by adding bibliography) but have let them stand as statements addressing particular issues. The volume is structured around three major organizational groupings of the essays. The first group comprises the text and tools necessary for linguistic analysis of the Greek New Testament. In this section, I first raise the question of who owns the Greek New Testament. By this, I mean to ask the question of who owns the modern eclectic Greek New Testament that is promoted and widely sold by a number of different people—all apparently purporting it to be the original Greek, or as close as we can come to it (otherwise, why undertake this particular project?). I also tackle some of the computer-related needs of those interested in serious study of the Greek New Testament, finding that, even with the surrounding hyperbole regarding computer technology, we have still not progressed as far as we need to. I close this section with two essays on matters of lexicography, one reviewing the Louw-Nida semantic-domains lexicon and the other the fairly recently revised Bauer lexicon by Frederick Danker. I believe that the Louw-Nida lexicon is an underutilized resource in New Testament studies, while the Bauer type of lexicon is probably best seen as reflecting an earlier day and age in lexicography.

The second part of this volume is concerned with ways to approach analysis—in other words, linguistic orientations to the Greek of the New Testament. Most of these approaches overtly reflect the SFL method that I have found so productive in most of the studies that I have done—although I have not used this method exclusively, as noted above, or simply attempted to impose categories developed for the study of English, a configurational language, on ancient Greek, a nonconfigurational language. This second group of essays includes an introductory exploration of the value of linguistics for biblical interpretation that outlines some of my views on lexicographical study; a discussion of how linguistics within a multidisciplinary orientation can contribute to exegesis; an exploration of some of the topics in sociolinguistics that I have pursued in other venues and that merit further exploration; an overview of discourse analysis applied to the study of the Greek New Testament; and an explanation of the ideational metafunction within a register framework (both metafunctions and register being essential concepts in SFL). The close of this section includes three essays that address criticisms of my approach to verbal aspect. The first is a response to a much earlier essay by K. L. McKay. Some may wonder why I have taken so long to respond to him. I have been asked this on several occasions, and I have asked myself as well. One of the reasons is that in most respects McKay and I agree, and so his article did not seem to warrant a confrontative response. Nevertheless, after further

thought and seeing references to his article by others, I include a few words in response here. The next essay responds to comments first made by Buist Fanning at a conference and then in printed form regarding my approach to aspect, especially its relationship to temporality. I tackle his three objections (concerning the augment, the performative present, and the arguments of Daniel Wallace), as well as a further one regarding aspectually vague verbs, a notion that I introduced into Greek language study. I show that there is little to argue for on behalf of Fanning's proposals, and in fact quite a bit to argue against. The final essay tackles an area where I have followed and developed the research of several important grammarians before me, especially J. P. Louw and K. L. McKay, in defining the Greek perfect tense-form as grammaticalizing stative aspect. There are some other Greek grammarians who for various reasons—either a restricted view of binarism or a confused notion of aspect and *Aktionsart*—have hesitated to pursue a definition of the semantics of the perfect tense-form as having its own semantic function. In this essay, I defend my conception of stative aspect.

In the third and final section of this book, I include several essays that illustrate linguistically informed biblical analysis being undertaken. The first is a register analysis of Mark 13. I have previously used Mark 13 as an example text when I developed a discourse-features criterion for historical-Jesus study. In this volume, I use the notion of register as user-based variety of language to explicate Mark 13. I follow this essay on Mark with one on Matthew's Gospel, in particular the so-called Great Commission in Matthew 28:19–20. I examine the language of this important passage in order to determine through grammatical analysis the organization of its thought. The next essay explores alterations in verbal aspect in extrabiblical Greek and the Synoptic Gospels, as an attempt to bring aspectual study to bear on the study of Synoptic relations. The fourth essay surveys and critiques recent research in John's Gospel and suggests that a variety of linguistically based means of examining this Gospel might prove more productive in the future than has some previous literary-oriented research. Here I offer examples of three different types of linguistic analysis, including literary stylistics, discourse analysis, and register analysis (all admittedly influenced by SFL). In the next chapter I offer an examination of the opponents in three of Paul's letters—Philemon, Romans, and Colossians—by drawing upon the structuralist and functional model of Karl Bühler, a member of the Prague Linguistics Circle and predecessor of Hallidayan functionalism. This chapter is followed by a short study of the grammar of 1 Timothy 2:8. Then in the next chapter I revisit the state of play in word-order studies in New Testament scholarship, attempting to clear the ground and offer some ways forward in this still understudied and, unfortunately, underconceptualized area.

In the next chapter, going where previous philosophers of language have not dared to go, I explore the notion of a proper noun in Greek—what appears to be a straightforward topic made more difficult by the language itself. I close the volume with an essay that brings the linguistic category of hyponymy to bear on the question of the Trinity—at least on how God/Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are conceptualized lexically in the New Testament.

I realize that much more could be said at virtually every point in these essays. I have not written them to be definitive studies in any regard (certainly not regarding bibliography), but rather as steps forward in what I believe is an essential and developing discussion. As I mentioned above, I am troubled by exegesis that shows no apparent awareness of the complex issues involved in the study of the Greek of the New Testament. I do not in any way wish to minimize the complexity of such interpretive problems or pretend that all of them are easily solved simply by invoking a vague notion of linguistics. However, I believe that much more can and should be done in this field—we can never know its usefulness unless we make the effort. This volume is an attempt to establish some of the theory that might be usefully employed in such linguistic study, and to demonstrate its possibilities in some explorations of the Greek New Testament.