

Copyright © 2018 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.

THE DISCOURSE FUNCTION OF KOINE GREEK VERB  
FORMS IN NARRATIVE: TESTING CURRENT  
PROPOSALS IN THE BOOK OF JUDITH

---

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

---

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Doctor of Philosophy

---

by  
Michael Todd Graham Jr.

May 2018

**APPROVAL SHEET**

**THE DISCOURSE FUNCTION OF KOINE GREEK VERB  
FORMS IN NARRATIVE: TESTING CURRENT  
PROPOSALS IN THE BOOK OF JUDITH**

Michael Todd Graham Jr.

Read and Approved by:

---

Robert L. Plummer (Chair)

---

Peter J. Gentry

---

Duane A. Garrett

Date \_\_\_\_\_

To Lisa, my wife and gift from God, and Lydia, Michael Todd, Ethan, Peter  
Jeremiah, and Miriam, our precious children.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES .....	vi
PREFACE.....	vii
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION .....	1
Thesis .....	1
History of Research .....	2
Greek Grammar beginning with G. B. Winer .....	2
Greek Grammar in the First Half of the Twentieth Century.....	5
Greek Grammar and the Influence of Linguistics .....	6
Greek Grammar and the Impact of Verbal Aspect .....	11
Approaches to The Study of Greek Grammar in the Fourth Shift .....	15
Traditional Approach.....	16
Aspect Primary Approach.....	22
2. THE DISCOURSE PRIMARY APPROACH AND THE INDICATIVE VERB IN JUDITH .....	29
Discourse Primary Approach.....	29
Methodology .....	43
Scope of Study .....	43
Approach of Study .....	45
Corpus of Study.....	46

Chapter	Page
3. THE DISCOURSE FUNCTION OF THE IMPERFECT AND AORIST INDICATIVE WITHIN THE BOOK OF JUDITH.....	52
The Imperfect Indicative in Judith.....	59
The Aorist Indicative in Judith .....	70
Concluding Analysis.....	83
4. THE DISCOURSE FUNCTION OF THE PRESENT INDICATIVE WITHIN THE BOOK OF JUDITH.....	85
The Present Indicative in Judith .....	89
Concluding Analysis.....	100
5. THE DISCOURSE FUNCTION OF THE PERFECT INDICATIVE WITHIN THE BOOK OF JUDITH.....	102
The Perfect Indicative in Judith.....	109
Concluding Analysis.....	123
6. CONCLUSION.....	125
 Appendix	
1. SYNTHESIS OF POSITIONS .....	131
2. USE OF AORIST AND IMPERFECT INDICATIVE IN THE SEPTUAGINT .....	134
3. USE OF PRESENT INDICATIVE IN THE SEPTUAGINT .....	137
4. USE OF PERFECT INDICATIVE IN THE SEPTUAGINT.....	140
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	143

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
A1. Function of indicative verb-forms in narrative.....	131
A2. Use of aorist and imperfect indicative in the Septuagint.....	134
A3. Use of present indicative in the Septuagint .....	137
A4. Use of perfect indicative in the Septuagint .....	140

## PREFACE

The completion of this dissertation is a testimony to the grace of God manifested in a host of people in my life. While there is not enough space to mention each person by name, my heart is overwhelmed with gratitude as I reflect upon the kindness that God has displayed to me through so many people. Nonetheless, while I cannot thank everyone by name, some individuals and groups must be acknowledged. First, I want to express my appreciation to my committee—Professors Robert L. Plummer, Peter J. Gentry, and Duane A. Garrett—for the careful reading and keen insights they have provided. Thank you, Professor Gentry, for the many years of instruction in Greek and Hebrew. The discipline and tools that I acquired in your seminars have been fundamental in this project, particularly the instruction you provided in your Septuagint seminar. Further, I want to thank you for the careful reading, comments, and direction you provided on each chapter throughout the entirety of this process. The production of this dissertation is in large part a result of your expert guidance. Thanks is also due to Professor Garrett for his insistence on clarity and precision in the execution of my thesis. This has greatly enhanced the style and argumentation of this project.

I am especially grateful for Professor Plummer, my doctoral supervisor. Thank you for suggesting this project and for guiding me throughout this long process. Your helpful and keen insights have protected me from many costly errors. I would not be writing this preface to my dissertation if it were not for your kindness, wisdom, and support. For this, I am forever grateful. I also thank Dr. Steven Runge for the foundational comments and direction he provided at the beginning of this project. A note of thanks is also due to Marcus Leman and Joseph Habib for

generously helping me with the formatting of this dissertation.

Thanks and gratitude are due to The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary for its commitment to excellence in academics and insistence that all faculty model the gospel of Jesus Christ. I have been shaped in innumerable ways throughout my time at Southern Seminary. It is also necessary to give thanks to Clifton Baptist Church for the congregation's care and support during our time in Louisville. The friendships formed, the ethos of the congregation, and the leadership of Clifton will continue to impact me for years to come.

I would also like to thank my wife and our children. Lisa, you are a gift, a treasure, and a demonstration of the abundance of God's grace in my life. You have walked with me through this long journey, providing me with encouragement and support all along the way. Words cannot express my love for you. Lydia, Michael, Ethan, Peter, and Miriam, you have been a continuous source of joy in my life. I love you all.

This dissertation is a result of the immeasurable grace God has shown in my life, most notably through bringing me to faith in his promised messiah, Jesus. May the grace of God and power of his spirit radiate from my life and work, for his glory and for the furtherance of his gospel.

Michael T. Graham Jr.

Louisville, Kentucky

May 2018

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

The objective of this dissertation is to test major theories on the discourse function of the Greek indicative verb-forms in narrative. Since the publication of Stanley Porter and Buist Fanning's doctoral dissertations, verbal aspect has been a major area of research among scholars. Although there is still significant debate concerning the aspect of the perfect verb-forms, the function of the historical present, and whether or not the indicative Greek verb-forms semantically encode time, there is a growing consensus among scholars that discourse grammar can provide answers to questions such as these, questions that have been debated for the last 25 years.<sup>1</sup> Nonetheless, a major question still begs to be answered: whether their answers can satisfactorily account for the variety of verb-forms throughout historical narrative outside of the New Testament.<sup>2</sup> Therefore, this dissertation will seek to address this question, testing current proposals on the discourse function of Greek indicative verb-forms within the narrative of Judith.

#### **Thesis**

The thesis of this dissertation is that the recent proposals on the discourse function of the Greek indicative verb-forms within narrative help provide a rationale for the variety of verb-forms used within the book of Judith.

---

<sup>1</sup>Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch, eds., *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis* (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016).

<sup>2</sup>Peter Gentry, a Septuagint scholar *par excellence*, states that until modern theories concerning verbal aspect are tested outside of the New Testament, a balanced view will not be possible. Peter J. Gentry, "Aspect and the Greek Verb" (a course handout for Advanced Greek Grammar at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky, April 1, 2010).

## History of Research

The study of Greek grammar since the nineteenth century may be divided into four key shifts:<sup>3</sup> Greek grammar beginning with G. B. Winer, Greek grammar in the first half of the twentieth century, Greek grammar and the influence of linguistics, and Greek grammar and the impact of verbal aspect.<sup>4</sup> One point to note in this division is that each period testifies to the massive influence of Georg Winer on the study of Greek. That is, the fundamental principle—the Greek of the New Testament is a real language that must be studied within the boundaries of the laws of language—which led Georg Winer to write *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms* shapes the arguments and advancements made in each shift in the study of Greek grammar.<sup>5</sup>

### Greek Grammar Beginning with G. B. Winer

Constantine Campbell summarizes the study of Greek grammar prior to G. B. Winer's *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms* well in his remark that it was characterized by weak methodology, a faulty understanding of the nature of language, and self-contradiction.<sup>6</sup> In fact, Georg Winer describes it as unboundedly arbitrary.<sup>7</sup> Further, A. T. Robertson states that this period was marked by “inanities and sinuosities,” which both Robertson and Winer describe by the phrase *quid pro*

---

<sup>3</sup>A. T. Robertson's history of the study of Greek grammar since the nineteenth century also highlights G. B. Winer and the shift in the study of Greek grammar at the turn of twentieth century. A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, 4th ed. (Nashville: Broadman, 1934), 3-30.

<sup>4</sup>These divisions were significantly influenced by the following authors: Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, 3-30; Constantine R. Campbell, *Verbal Aspect, the Indicative Mood, and Narrative: Soundings in the Greek of the New Testament* (New York: Peter Lang, 2007), 30-49.

<sup>5</sup>Georg Benedict Winer, *A Treatise on the Grammar of New Testament Greek, Regarded as a Sure Basis for New Testament Exegesis*, 3rd ed., rev. (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1882), xxi.

<sup>6</sup>Constantine R. Campbell, *Advances in the Study of Greek: New Insights for Reading the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2015), 30.

<sup>7</sup>Winer, *Grammar*, xxi.

quo.<sup>8</sup> Namely, exegetes would deal with grammatical difficulties by “explaining one term as used for another, one preposition for another, one case for another, etc.”<sup>9</sup>

This type of explanation led Winer to remark that this makes scripture become like a “waxen nose, which a man may twist any way he pleases, in proportion to the scantiness of his knowledge of language.”<sup>10</sup> That is, such an approach can afford the exegete the ability to find any meaning he desires. Accordingly, Winer sought to provide a Greek grammar that presented a philological foundation which respected the “phraseology” of the New Testament authors, that analyzed the Greek of the New Testament as a “living language,” working within the boundaries of the laws of language, and that utilized a grammatically based methodology.<sup>11</sup>

The immediate impact of Winer is testified to by the work of such scholars as Franz Bopp, Georg Curtius, Friedrich Blass, and Ernest de Witt Burton. That is, Georg Winer’s emphasis on robust philology, studying the Greek of the New Testament within the boundaries of the laws of language, and a consistent grammatically based methodology is witnessed in the work of each of these men. For instance, Franz Bopp introduced comparative philology.<sup>12</sup> Georg Curtius introduced *Zeitart*, which was later re coined by the term *Aktionsart* and ultimately led to the development of verbal aspect.<sup>13</sup> It must be noted that although this term was used by

---

<sup>8</sup>Robertson, *Grammar*, 3; Winer, *Grammar*, xxiii.

<sup>9</sup>Robertson, *Grammar*, 3.

<sup>10</sup>Winer, *Grammar*, xxii.

<sup>11</sup>Winer, *Grammar*, xxi-xxiv.

<sup>12</sup>Franz Bopp, *Verleichende Grammatik des Sanskrit, Zend, Griechischen, Lateinischen, Litthauischen, Altslavischen, und Deutschen* (Berlin: Bei Ferdinand Dummler, 1833), 20-21. Berthold Delbrück adds that one of the features of Bopp’s impact on the study of New Testament Greek is seen in his laying aside traditional rules based upon Latin grammar. Berthold Delbrück, *Introduction to the Study of Language: A Critical Survey of the History and Methods of Comparative Philology of the Indo-European Languages*, trans. E. Channing (Leipzig: Breitkopf and Härtel, 1882), 25-26. See also Robertson, *Grammar*, 10.

<sup>13</sup>Georg Curtius, *Die Bildung der Tempora und Modi im Griechischen und Lateinischen*

Blass, Moulton, and Robertson among others, it was poorly defined and more akin to a poor version of *Aktionsart* than to the modern discussions of verbal aspect.<sup>14</sup> Friedrich Blass, being convinced of the folly of isolating the Greek of the New Testament, illustrated his monumental *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch* with examples from the contemporary or nearly contemporary Greek literature of the time period in which the New Testament was composed.<sup>15</sup> Further, Ernest de Witt Burton's *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek* is based upon the results of comparative and historical grammar, and it applies the principles of the laws of Greek speech to its interpretation of the Greek verb.<sup>16</sup>

The immensity of the shift that took place in the study of Greek grammar beginning with Georg Winer's *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms* can be captured in Winer's "fundamental" critique of the scholars of the Greek New Testament of his day; namely, their failure to treat the Greek of the New Testament as "a living idiom, designed for a medium of human intercourse."<sup>17</sup> For that matter, the significance of this critique by Winer is what some consider to be one of the most important contributions he made to the study of the Greek New Testament.<sup>18</sup> Thus, the first shift in the study of Greek grammar, a period which began with

---

*sprachvergleichend dargestellt* (Berlin: Wilhelm Besser, 1846), 148-53; George Curtius, *A Grammar of the Greek Language* (New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1872); Andrew David Naselli, "A Brief Introduction to Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek," *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* 12 (January 2007): 21; Campbell, *Verbal Aspect*, 2.

<sup>14</sup>Stanley E. Porter and Jeffrey T. Reed, "Greek Grammar since BDF: A Retrospective and Prospective Analysis," *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 4, no. 8 (1991): 152.

<sup>15</sup>Friedrich Blass, *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, trans. Henry St. John Thackeray (London: Macmillan, 1898), vi.

<sup>16</sup>Ernest De Witt Burton, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek* (1900; repr., Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1978), vi.

<sup>17</sup>Winer, *Grammar*, xxi.

<sup>18</sup>H. E. Dana and Julius R. Mantey, *A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927), iv-v.

Georg Winer, is marked by the principle that the Greek of the New Testament must be studied within the laws of language.

### **Greek Grammar in the First Half of the Twentieth Century**

Greek grammar in the first half of the twentieth century can also be unified around Winer's principle concerning the study of the Greek of the New Testament.<sup>19</sup> This period may be represented by the work of Adolf Deissman, James Hope Moulton, and A. T. Robertson.<sup>20</sup> One of the marks of this period is a focus on the study of the non-literary Greek papyri and their importance for the study of the Greek of the New Testament. Specifically, these works address issues such as the impact these new texts have on the methodology of Historical and Dogmatic Philology and the study of the Greek of the New Testament as a "living language."<sup>21</sup> Another characteristic of this period is a significant development of topics related to the Greek verbal system.<sup>22</sup> For instance, A. T. Robertson remarks that as significant as Winer was to the advancement of the scientific study of the Greek of the New Testament, he was inconsistent in the use of his own principles, he did not make consistent application of philosophical grammar, and the "great science of comparative philology had not revolutionized linguistic study" when he wrote his grammar.<sup>23</sup> Some of the reasons Robertson provides for the advancement of Greek grammar since the time of Winer are the development of comparative philology,

---

<sup>19</sup>Robertson, *Grammar*, 30; Antonius N. Jannaris, *An Historical Greek Grammar Chiefly of the Attic Dialect: As Written and Spoken from Classical Antiquity Down to the Present Time, Founded Upon the Ancient Texts, Inscriptions, Papyri and Present Popular Greek* (London: MacMillan and Co., 1897), ix-xiii.

<sup>20</sup>So Robertson, *Grammar*, 5; Campbell, *Advances*, 33-34.

<sup>21</sup>Adolf Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, trans. Lionel Strachan (New York: Hodder and Stoughton, 1910); J. H. Moulton, *Prolegomena*, vol. 1 of *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1906), ix; Robertson, *Grammar*, vii-viii.

<sup>22</sup>Porter and Reed, "Greek Grammar since BDF," 149.

<sup>23</sup>Robertson, *Grammar*, 4.

critical editions of Greek authors, advancement in the study of Greek dialects, and the discovery of Greek inscriptions, papyri and ostraca.<sup>24</sup> Thus, this period also witnesses to the impact of Georg Winer and the ongoing pursuit of the principles which guided him.<sup>25</sup>

### **Greek Grammar and the Influence of Linguistics**

Greek grammar and the influence of linguistics also bears witness to Winer's influence. Linguistics aptly fits within Winer's fundamental principle that the Greek of the New Testament must be studied within the laws of language, since it is based upon the belief that language cannot be studied atomistically, but it must "give way to the functional and structural conception of language."<sup>26</sup> For that matter, the areas of Greek grammar that have been most impacted by linguistics are verb and case structure, syntax, and discourse analysis.<sup>27</sup> The field of linguistics can be represented by Ferdinand Saussure, J. R. Firth, Noam Chomsky, James Barr, M. A. K. Halliday, Joseph H. Greenberg, John Lyons, Carl Bache, and Bernard Comrie.<sup>28</sup>

The impact of linguistics upon the study of the language of the New Testament became a significant topic after the publication of James Barr's *Semantics of Biblical Language*, at which time there was a reevaluation of the standard

---

<sup>24</sup>Robertson, *Grammar*, 8-30.

<sup>25</sup>A. T. Robertson remarks, "The N. T. Greek is now seen to be not an abnormal excrescence, but a natural development in the Greek language; to be, in fact, a not unworthy part of the great stream of the mighty tongue. It was not outside of the world-language, but in the very heart of it and influenced considerably the future of the Greek tongue." Robertson, *Grammar*, 30.

<sup>26</sup>Ferdinand De Saussure, *Course in General Linguistics* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1950), xii. So James Barr, who says that he does not view biblical language as distinct from other language. James Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (London: Oxford University Press, 1961), 2.

<sup>27</sup>Stanley E. Porter and Andrew W. Pitts, "New Testament Greek Language and Linguistics in Recent Research," *Currents in Biblical Research* 6, no. 2 (2008): 215.

<sup>28</sup>The following authors also note the significance of these linguists: Campbell, *Advances*, 35-45; Geoffrey Sampson, *Schools of Linguistics: Competition and Evolution* (London: Hutchison, 1980).

understanding of Greek grammar.<sup>29</sup> James Barr's *The Semantics of Biblical Language* picks up upon Chomsky's rejection of Saussure's divide between linguistics and classical language approaches and seeks to rightly integrate the fields of linguistics and Biblical studies.<sup>30</sup>

In Barr's *Semantics of Biblical Language*, he exposes methodological problems to the study of Biblical language within the field of Biblical studies.<sup>31</sup> That is, he addresses the failure of Biblical scholars, particularly Biblical theologians, "to relate what is said about either Hebrew or Greek to a general semantic method related to general linguistics."<sup>32</sup> Specifically, he critiques their method with respect to their argumentation regarding the verbal system, word formation and meaning, and lexically based theology.<sup>33</sup> Finally, as mentioned above, Barr's work, being congruent with Winer's principle that the Greek of the New Testament must be studied within the laws of language,<sup>34</sup> is monumental in the application of linguistic evidence to the study of Greek grammar within the New Testament.<sup>35</sup>

James Barr's *Semantics of Biblical Language* is pivotal to the proper application of general linguistics to Biblical studies and New Testament Greek grammar discussions. However, there are at least 8 scholars who were either instrumental for their roles in the rise of modern linguistics within the study of

---

<sup>29</sup>David Alan Black, "The Study of New Testament Greek in the Light of Ancient and Modern Linguistics," in *Interpreting the New Testament: Essays on Methods and Issues*, ed. David Alan Black and David S. Dockery (Nashville: Broadman and Holman Publishers, 2001), 249. See also Moisés Silva's foreword to David Alan Black's *Linguistics for Students of New Testament Greek: A Survey of Basic Concepts and Applications* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1988), ix.

<sup>30</sup>Barr, *Semantics*, 4, 263; Campbell, *Advances*, 41.

<sup>31</sup>Barr, *Semantics*, 1.

<sup>32</sup>Barr, *Semantics*, 24.

<sup>33</sup>Barr, *Semantics*, 46-88;107-60; 206-62.

<sup>34</sup>Winer, *Grammar*, xxi-xxiv.

<sup>35</sup>Andreas J. Köstenberger and Robert W. Yarbrough, eds., *Understanding the Times: New Testament Studies in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2011), 19.

Greek grammar or for their impact upon the scholars who have been most influential in the modern period of Greek grammar. The three linguists who led to the rise of modern linguistics in the study of Greek grammar are Ferdinand Saussure, J. R. Firth, and Noam Chomsky, and the five linguists who significantly impacted the most influential scholars in the modern period of Greek grammar are M. A. K. Halliday, Joseph H. Greenberg, John Lyons, Carl Bache, and Bernard Comrie.

Ferdinand Saussure is considered to be the paramount figure in the field of linguistics.<sup>36</sup> One of the most significant contributions Saussure made to the field of linguistics was the organization of principles and methods outlined in his system entitled “static linguistics.”<sup>37</sup> J. R. Firth is referred to by some as the grandfather of linguistics.<sup>38</sup> Further, he is credited with the founding of the London School of Linguistics, making linguistics an accepted academic discipline in Britain.<sup>39</sup> Firth’s greatest contributions to the field of linguistics are his work on phonology, meaning,<sup>40</sup> and syntax.<sup>41</sup> Moreover, Firth’s leadership within the London School of Linguistics led to the development of one of the most influential linguistic methods within linguistics, Functional Linguistics, and it gave rise to the work of M. A. K. Halliday and John Lyons, two of the most influential linguists in modern times.

---

<sup>36</sup>In the translator’s introduction to Ferdinand De Saussure, *Course in General Linguistics*, Wade Baskin discusses how significant Saussure is in the field of linguistics and references Leonard Bloomfield’s comment that Saussure has provided the modern field of linguistics with a needed theoretic foundation. Saussure, *Linguistics*, xi. See also Campbell, *Advances*, 40.

<sup>37</sup>Konrad Koerner, *Practicing Linguistic Historiography: Selected Essays* (Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1989), 32. See also Saussure, *Linguistics*, xiii-xvi.

<sup>38</sup>E. F. K. Koerner, *Essays in the History of Linguistics*, Studies in the History of the Language Sciences 104 (Berlin: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2004), 202.

<sup>39</sup>Sampson, *Schools of Linguistics*, 277.

<sup>40</sup>John Lyons, “Firth’s Theory of ‘Meaning,’” in *In Memory of J. R. Firth*, ed. C. E. Bazell et al. (London: Longmans, 1966), 290.

<sup>41</sup>Campbell, *Advances*, 39.

Noam Chomsky is also a very influential linguist. In fact, some consider his impact second only to Ferdinand de Saussure.<sup>42</sup> His most notable contribution to the field of linguistics is thought by some to be his monograph *Syntactic Structures*,<sup>43</sup> which is acclaimed to be the impetus for the modern cognitive linguistics movement.<sup>44</sup> Moreover, his body of work, which argued to a considerable degree that there are universal rules governing all languages,<sup>45</sup> led to what is now referred to as Generative Linguistics. Finally, Chomsky's attempt to unite Ferdinand Saussure's divide between linguistics and classical language approaches is particularly noteworthy in light of the influence linguistics has had on the study of Greek grammar in the modern period.<sup>46</sup>

Having looked at the linguists who led to the influence of linguistics in the study of Greek grammar, it is now imperative to survey the linguists who have significantly impacted the most influential scholars in the fourth shift of New Testament Greek grammar. M. A. K. Halliday, a student of the London School of Linguistics, is most known for the development of *Systemic Functional Linguistics*.<sup>47</sup> Further, his work is foundational to Stanley Porter's thesis, one of the most influential Greek scholars in the later half of the twentieth century. Joseph H. Greenberg is credited for developing linguistic typology,<sup>48</sup> a system that uses a

---

<sup>42</sup>Campbell, *Advances*, 40.

<sup>43</sup>Noam Chomsky, *Syntactic Structures* (The Hague: Mouton, 1957).

<sup>44</sup>David W. Lightfoot, preface to *Syntactic Structures*, by Noam Chomsky, 2nd ed. (New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2002), v.

<sup>45</sup>John Lyons, *Noam Chomsky* (Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1978), 11.

<sup>46</sup>Noam Chomsky, *Current Issues in Linguistic Theory* (1964; repr. London: Mouton & Co., 1967), 25; Chomsky, *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax* (Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1965), 118.

<sup>47</sup>M. A. K. Halliday, "Categories of the Theory of Grammar," *Word* 17 (1961): 241-92; M. A. K. Halliday and Ruqaiya Hasan, *Cohesion in English* (London: Routledge, 1976); M. A. K. Halliday and Christian M. I. M. Matthiessen, *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 4th rev. ed. (London: Routledge, 2014).

<sup>48</sup>Joseph H. Greenberg, ed., *Universals of Language: Report of a Conference Held at*

functional linguistic approach and proposes that there are linguistic universals.<sup>49</sup> Moreover, Greenberg's work influenced Stephen Levinsohn, who has greatly impacted Steven Runge, one of the leading voices in the modern period of Greek grammar.

The pervasiveness of the influence of John Lyons, Bernard Comrie, and Carl Bache on the fourth shift of New Testament Greek grammar is evidenced by the amount of interaction the most prominent New Testament Greek grammarians from this shift have with their work, regardless of their adherence to their particular linguistic approach.<sup>50</sup> John Lyons, like Halliday, is a student of the London School of Linguistics. However, unlike Halliday, he supports a Generative Linguistic approach.<sup>51</sup> Bernard Comrie published the first monograph on the topic of verbal aspect from a general linguistic theory.<sup>52</sup> One point to note is that he does not sever time from aspect,<sup>53</sup> a point highlighted in current critiques of Stanley Porter's position.<sup>54</sup> Carl Bache made significant contributions in the field of linguistics by

---

*Dobbs Ferry, New York, April 13-51, 1961* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1963).

<sup>49</sup>Greenberg, *Universals of Language*.

<sup>50</sup>For example, John Lyons, Bernard Comrie, and Carl Bache are consistently referenced by Stanley Porter and Buist Fanning. Stanley E. Porter, *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament with Reference to Tense and Mood* (New York: Peter Lang, 1989); Buist M. Fanning, *Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990).

<sup>51</sup>John Lyons, *Language and Linguistics: An Introduction* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981), xi; Lyons, *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1968), 135, 155.

<sup>52</sup>Bernard Comrie, *Aspect: An Introduction to the Study of Verbal Aspect and Related Problems* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1976), vii; Some authors who note this include Porter and Reed, "Greek Grammar Since BDF," 152; Porter and Pitts, "New Testament Greek Language," 215. Another significant work by Comrie is his monograph on tense. Bernard Comrie, *Tense* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985).

<sup>53</sup>Comrie, *Aspect*, 3.

<sup>54</sup>Christopher J. Thomson, "What Is Aspect? Contrasting Definitions in General Linguistics and New Testament Studies," in *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*, ed. Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016), 13-80.

providing needed clarification on the semantic differences between verbal aspect and *Aktionsart*, a point for which Bache critiques both Bernard Comrie and John Lyons.<sup>55</sup>

### **Greek Grammar and the Impact of Verbal Aspect**

Having surveyed the first three shifts in the study of Greek grammar since the nineteenth century, we now turn to the fourth shift—the study of Greek grammar and the impact of verbal aspect. As with the prior three shifts of Greek grammar, the study of Greek grammar and the impact of verbal aspect evidences the influence of Winer’s insistence that the Greek of the New Testament must be analyzed within the laws of language. This is most evidently displayed, whether correctly or not, in Stanley Porter’s dismissal of Chrys C. Caragounis’s *The Development of Greek and the New Testament* because it is not based upon an “established linguistic framework.”<sup>56</sup> The congruity of the fourth shift in the study of Greek grammar with Winer’s fundamental principle is further demonstrated by the appeal to linguistics by grammarians on both offensive and defensive fronts.<sup>57</sup> The study of Greek grammar and the impact of verbal aspect can be represented by three grammarians: Stanley Porter, Buist Fanning, and Steven Runge. Porter and Fanning brought the topic of verbal aspect to the forefront of Greek grammar within the New

---

<sup>55</sup>Bache, “Aspect and *Aktionsart*.” Other significant works by Carl Bache include the following: Bache, *Verbal Aspect: A General Theory and its Application to Present-Day English* (Odense, Denmark: Odense University Press, 1985); Bache, *The Study of Aspect, Tense and Action: Towards a Theory of the Semantics of Grammatical Categories* (New York: Peter Lang, 1995).

<sup>56</sup>Porter and Pitts, “New Testament Greek Language,” 215.

<sup>57</sup>Stanley E. Porter and D. A. Carson, eds., *Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics: Open Questions in Current Research* (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 26-45; Köstenberger and Yarbrough, *Understanding the Times*, 46-54; K. L. McKay, *A New Syntax of the Verb in New Testament Greek: An Aspectual Approach* (New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 1994), 187-89; Thomson, “What Is Aspect?,” 47-48; Buist M. Fanning, “Approaches to Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek: Issues in Definition and Method,” in *Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics: Open Questions in Current Research*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and D. A. Carson (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 58.

Testament.<sup>58</sup> Steven Runge challenges Porter's understanding of the linguistic sources he uses to support his thesis. In place of Porter's planes of discourse approach, which is based upon an aspect only verbal system,<sup>59</sup> utilizing discourse grammar, Runge offers an explanation for the variation of the verbal verb-forms within the same tense-context that does not require an aspect only Greek verbal system.<sup>60</sup>

As stated in the above survey, the topic of verbal aspect was first introduced at the beginning of the twentieth century; the issue of tense in relation to the verb has been raging for over a century.<sup>61</sup> However, concerning the study of verbal aspect in itself, this is a new debate. The reason it is new is because 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."<sup>62</sup> 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, for 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.

One of the major issues in this debate concerns 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. Until the late

---

<sup>58</sup>Fanning, "Approaches to Verbal Aspect," 46.

<sup>59</sup>Porter states that the planes of discourse model is one way of illustrating verbal aspect. Porter and Reed, "Greek Grammar Since BDF," 153-56.

<sup>60</sup>Steven E. Runge, "Contrastive Substitution and the Greek Verb: Reassessing Porter's Argument," *Novum Testamentum* 56 (2014), 154-73; Steven Runge, *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publisher, 2010); Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch, eds., *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis* (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016).

<sup>61</sup>Porter and Reed, "Greek Grammar Since BDF," 152.

<sup>62</sup>Fanning, "Approaches to Verbal Aspect," 46.

1800s the leading view regarding the entire verbal system was that it grammaticalized absolute time by its morphology.<sup>63</sup> However, at the end of the nineteenth century this view was overturned and replaced by a view that recognized the verb as semantically encoding *Aktionsart* in all verb-forms and only semantically marking absolute time in indicative verbs.<sup>64</sup> 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.<sup>65</sup> Thus, it is necessary to define verbal aspect and *Aktionsart* and 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, Gnostic, Epistolary, etc.

In recent decades, the issue of verbal aspect in relation to the verbal system has been much debated 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 syntax for about two decades."<sup>66</sup> Nevertheless, despite the immense amount of literature on the topic, the issue of tense and aspect in relation to Greek verbs lacks a consensus. This lack of consensus is most clearly seen in the work of Steven Runge, who in recent years has led a charge against Porter's thesis that the Greek verbal system only encodes aspect. Two of Runge's most significant works, which have directly argued against Porter, are his article critiquing Porter's position

---

<sup>63</sup>Naselli, "A Brief Introduction," 21.

<sup>64</sup>Naselli, "A Brief Introduction," 20-21.

<sup>65</sup>Naselli, "A Brief Introduction," 21.

<sup>66</sup>Naselli, "A Brief Introduction," 17.

on contrastive substitution and the Greek verb, and his co-edited work, *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*.<sup>67</sup> In these works, Porter's most fundamental supporting arguments to his thesis are addressed. Some of the topics addressed in these sources are contrastive substitution, defining aspect, the function of the augment, and discourse grammar. The fundamental difference between Porter's thesis and the discourse analysis approach represented by Runge, Fresch, Allan, and others is their insistence that Porter has wrongly applied the linguistic sources and consequently misinterpreted the data. Specifically, Porter wrongly assumed that the variation of verb-forms within a common temporal setting proved his thesis, and he sought to illustrate this thesis through an analogy referred to as planes of discourse.

After surveying these four shifts in the study of Greek grammar, three things become apparent: First, the influence of Georg Winer is pervasive. Second, each shift is marked by scholars applying new evidence to the study of Greek grammar within the New Testament. Third, the issue of verbal aspect in regard to its relation to the issue of tense is not essentially new, but it is an issue that has been brought to the forefront of the discussion within New Testament Greek grammar. Although there has been significant progress in the study of Greek grammar since Winer's ground-breaking declaration that the Greek of the New Testament is a real language that must be studied within the boundaries of the laws of language,<sup>68</sup> there are many questions that need to be answered—particularly in relation to the variation of verb-form within shared temporal context—which, as discussed above, is a question receiving significant attention in the fourth shift of the study of Greek

---

<sup>67</sup>Steven E. Runge, "Contrastive Substitution and the Greek Verb: Reassessing Porter's Argument," *Novum Testamentum* 56 (2014): 154-73; Runge and Fresch, *The Greek Verb Revisited*.

<sup>68</sup>Winer, *Grammar*, xxi.

grammar.<sup>69</sup> Thus, in the following section, I identify the three main approaches to the analysis of Biblical Greek within the fourth shift of the study of Greek grammar, and I discuss two of them, the Traditional Approach and the Aspect Primary Approach. However, the third approach will be identified and analyzed in chapter 2 with the scope and methodology of this dissertation, since it is this approach which will be tested.

### **Approaches to the Study of Greek Grammar in the Fourth Shift**

There are three approaches in the study of the Greek verbal system within the fourth shift: Traditional Approach, Aspect Primary Approach, and the Discourse Primary Approach.<sup>70</sup> It must be noted that these divisions are not intended to create a dichotomy between these groups. Rather, they are intended to highlight important points of distinction that impact how they utilize discourse grammar in formulating their proposals concerning the rationale for the variegated verb-forms within historical narrative. The Traditional Approach gives very little attention to discourse analysis.<sup>71</sup> The Aspect Primary Approach utilizes discourse analysis to a limited degree, giving priority to aspect.<sup>72</sup> The Discourse Primary approach utilizes the

---

<sup>69</sup>A few of the questions include the following: defining aspect, determining the aspect of the perfect and future tense verb-forms, determining if time is a semantic feature of the Greek verbal system, determining if aspect or *Aktionsart* is completely objective or subjective, determining the function of the augment, and determining the relationship between the varied usage of verb-forms within the same temporal setting. For more discussion on these issues, see the following: Runge and Fresch, *The Greek Verb Revisited*; Buist M. Fanning, "Approaches to Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek: Issues in Definition and Method," in *Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics: Open Questions in Current Research*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and D. A. Carson (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993); Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 1-6; Daryl D. Schmidt, "Verbal Aspect in Greek: Two Approaches," in *Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics: Open Questions in Current Research*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and D. A. Carson (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993).

<sup>70</sup>These approaches are fluid. There are instances in which a scholar may align more with the position represented by one of the other approaches on a particular issue.

<sup>71</sup>Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 72-85; McKay, *A New Syntax*, 39-52; T. V. Evans, *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch: Natural Greek Usage and Hebrew Interference* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 26-32, 145-74.

<sup>72</sup>Campbell, *Verbal Aspect*, 3; Porter and Pitts, "New Testament Greek Language," 235;

research concerning *Aktionsart* and aspect, but it places a significant emphasis upon discourse analysis.<sup>73</sup> Therefore, as scholars are analyzed, each one will be placed within the group best describing his or her approach to the study of the Greek verbal system. I will interact with scholars in the following order: those who adhere to a Traditional Approach, those who follow an Aspect Primary Approach, and those who utilize a Discourse Grammar Primary Approach. The analysis will focus on each scholar's conclusions concerning the function of the present, the aorist, the imperfect, the perfect, and the future within narrative.<sup>74</sup>

### Traditional Approach

The Traditional Approach within the modern period recognizes the important role of verbal aspect and linguistics. However, it does not abandon the semantic encoding of time within the Greek verbal system.

### Buist M. Fanning

**Present.** Fanning argues for what grammarians call the “Dramatic” use of the present tense.<sup>75</sup> That is, he maintains that when the historical present is used in narrative “the key feature which prompts the use of the present is the temporal transfer, not some sort of aspectual effect.”<sup>76</sup> In other words, Fanning sees the historical present as communicating time rather than aspect. For this reason, he sees

---

Porter, *Verbal Aspect*.

<sup>73</sup>Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, xvi-xvii; Stephen H. Levinsohn, *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek: A Coursebook on the Information Structure of New Testament Greek*, 2nd ed. (Dallas: SIL International, 2000), vii.

<sup>74</sup>It should be noted that not every scholar has written on the function of each verb-form within narrative.

<sup>75</sup>Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 226-29. The following discussion of Buist M. Fanning is adapted from my 2012 ThM thesis. Michael Todd Graham Jr., “An Analysis of Recent Research on Verbal Aspect in Hellenistic Greek” (ThM thesis, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2012).

<sup>76</sup>Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 227.

vivid or immediate effect being communicated, not by aspect, but by the time of the event communicated in the historical present.<sup>77</sup>

**Aorist.** Fanning states that the aspect of the aorist is an external viewpoint of an occurrence as a whole and that it almost without exception has past time reference.<sup>78</sup> Further, he argues that because the aorist gives a simple statement about the occurrence of an action without providing further description, it is the most common narrative tense.<sup>79</sup> Further, Fanning states that the perfective (aorist) verbs form the mainline of the narrative.<sup>80</sup>

**Imperfect.** Fanning argues that the imperfect communicates virtually the same aspect as the present indicative, “internal viewpoint on an occurrence.”<sup>81</sup> He maintains the primary difference is that “the imperfect moves this aspect-value into the past-time frame, since it indicates past tense.”<sup>82</sup> Further, Fanning states that in narrative the imperfect is distinct from the aorist in the following ways. First, he argues that the imperfect can be used to provide descriptive details whereas the aorist simply states the facts.<sup>83</sup> Second, he maintains that imperfects are regularly used to describe “generalized” and reoccurring events, while the aorist is often used when the event is specific and single.<sup>84</sup> However, he states there are times when the imperfect is used to communicate mainline information.<sup>85</sup>

---

<sup>77</sup>Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 228.

<sup>78</sup>Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 255-90.

<sup>79</sup>Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 256.

<sup>80</sup>Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 19.

<sup>81</sup>Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 240.

<sup>82</sup>Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 240-41.

<sup>83</sup>Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 243.

<sup>84</sup>Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 247.

<sup>85</sup>Buist Fanning, “Greek Presents, Imperfects, and Aorists in the Synoptic Gospels,” in

**Perfect.** Fanning argues that the perfect verb-form combines three elements of meaning: *Aktionsart*-feature of stativity, tense-feature of anteriority, and the perfective *aspect*.<sup>86</sup> Further, he notes that the perfect indicative verb-form occurs less in “straightforward narrative” and more commonly in “reflective and discursive style.”<sup>87</sup> Nonetheless, Fanning maintains that the general function of the perfect tense-form in the indicative is to convey the notion that the result of the occurrence of the action conveyed through the perfect tense-form is to be understood as “present” or “simultaneous” with the time of speaking.<sup>88</sup>

**Future.** Fanning purports that the future tense-form is non-aspectual and conveys the meaning of future occurrence.<sup>89</sup> Moreover Fanning says that the future tense-form contrasts with the other verb-forms not with respect to aspect but with respect to the time-value associated with the indicative tense-forms.<sup>90</sup>

#### T. V. Evans

**Present.** Evans asserts that when the present is used in narrative it is commonly used in direct speech.<sup>91</sup>

**Aorist.** Evans states that the aorist verb-form is the unmarked form used to move the narrative forward.<sup>92</sup>

---

*Discourse Studies and Biblical Interpretation: A Festschrift in Honor of Stephen H. Levinsohn*, ed. Steven E. Runge (Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2011), 179-81.

<sup>86</sup>Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 112-20, 290-91.

<sup>87</sup>Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 297.

<sup>88</sup>Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 291.

<sup>89</sup>Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 123.

<sup>90</sup>Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 123-24.

<sup>91</sup>Evans, *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch*, 161.

<sup>92</sup>Evans, *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch*, 200, 206, 214.

**Imperfect.** Evans maintains that by the time of the post-Classical period, the imperfect verb-form, in prose, is the marked form.<sup>93</sup> Further, Evans argues that the imperfect verb-form is used to focus on the progression of the event and to provide a rich description of it.<sup>94</sup>

**Perfect.** Evans claims that the perfect verb-form is a “special type” of imperfective aspect and that it communicates stativity.<sup>95</sup> Further, he states that within narrative,<sup>96</sup> the perfect verb-form is most often used in direct speech, and it functions in a way similar to the historical present.<sup>97</sup> In particular, Evans argues that the perfect verb-form is used in narrative settings in which the author is making a parenthetical comment.<sup>98</sup> Evans follows scholars such as Louw and Porter, who argue that the idea of prior occurrence in the perfect verb-form is a result of lexical semantics.<sup>99</sup> He states that the traditional position that the perfect verb-form expresses the ongoing effects of a previous action or occurrence is fundamentally flawed because it is based solely on pragmatics, and it does not adequately articulate the perfect verb-form at the grammatical level.<sup>100</sup> Further, he argues that the cause for the traditional view is that within action verbs, “tension” at the lexical/contextual and grammatical semantics level produces the traditional “dual focus.”<sup>101</sup> Evans says

---

<sup>93</sup>Evans, *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch*, 208-9.

<sup>94</sup>Evans, *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch*, 200, 206.

<sup>95</sup>Evans, *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch*, 32.

<sup>96</sup>It must be noted that Evans argues that the perfect verb-form does not occur in “pure narrative” and instead is found in direct discourse or parenthetical comments within narrative. Evans, *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch*, 165.

<sup>97</sup>Evans, *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch*, 152-53, 158-66.

<sup>98</sup>Evans, *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch*, 161-65.

<sup>99</sup>Evans, *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch*, 30.

<sup>100</sup>Evans, *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch*, 27-28.

<sup>101</sup>Evans, *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch*, 28.

that in order for scholars to move forward in the study of the perfect verb-form, distinction must be made between grammatical and lexical semantics in analyzing the form.<sup>102</sup>

**Future.** Evans supports the traditional interpretation of the future verb-form.<sup>103</sup> He defends this by arguing that in the late prehistoric period Greek verbs were more aspectual, being classified within the oblique mood during this time due to the “vagueness of the notion of futurity.”<sup>104</sup> Further, he says that the “factuality” of the future event is presupposed and can thus be “represented” as factual even though it is not really known.<sup>105</sup> Moreover, he states that the emergence of the future tense indicative verb-form is a result of the development, within the indicative, of “temporal distinctions.”<sup>106</sup> Finally, Evans states that scholars can move forward in the study of the future verb-form by studying it from a pure “linguistic viewpoint,” by which attention is given to the “essential functions of the moods.”<sup>107</sup>

### K. L. McKay

**Present.** McKay states that the present verb-form is most commonly found in contexts in which the time reference is present or timeless.<sup>108</sup> He further states that when a present verb-form is used to refer to past events instead of the imperfect or aorist, it is a stylistic choice by the author to “enliven the more significant parts of

---

<sup>102</sup>Evans, *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch*, 28.

<sup>103</sup>Evans, *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch*, 40.

<sup>104</sup>Evans, *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch*, 39.

<sup>105</sup>Evans, *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch*, 39.

<sup>106</sup>Evans, *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch*, 39. He bases this upon the work of J. Gonda, *The Character of the Indo-European Moods* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1980), 71.

<sup>107</sup>Evans, *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch*, 38.

<sup>108</sup>McKay, *A New Syntax*, 39.

their narrative.”<sup>109</sup> According to McKay, in the New Testament it occurs with verbs of saying and is used to introduce direct speech.<sup>110</sup>

**Aorist.** McKay argues that the aorist verb-form is almost universally found in narrative, and it is used to refer to a past action or event that is complete.<sup>111</sup>

**Imperfect.** McKay maintains that the imperfect verb-form is most often found in narrative and describes actions or events in process in past time.<sup>112</sup>

**Perfect.** McKay asserts that the perfect verb-form is most commonly found in present tense contexts as well as contexts in which no time reference is specified.<sup>113</sup> However, he does note that there are instances in which the perfect is used to reference a past event. McKay proposes that the perfect communicates a stative aspect to the present time, timeless situations, extensions from past to present, and the implication of future reference in the same way that the present verb-form implies on-going action.<sup>114</sup> Moreover, he argues that when the perfect verb-form is used in narrative contexts, it is used to add emphasis. That is, he argues that its use in narrative parallels the historic present.<sup>115</sup>

**Future.** McKay argues that the future verb-form commonly expresses statements of intention and simple future time reference.<sup>116</sup>

---

<sup>109</sup>McKay, *A New Syntax*, 42.

<sup>110</sup>McKay, *A New Syntax*, 42.

<sup>111</sup>McKay, *A New Syntax*, 46.

<sup>112</sup>McKay, *A New Syntax*, 46

<sup>113</sup>McKay, *A New Syntax*, 49.

<sup>114</sup>McKay, *A New Syntax*, 49.

<sup>115</sup>McKay, *A New Syntax*, 49.

<sup>116</sup>McKay, *A New Syntax*, 52.

## Aspect Primary Approach

The Aspect Primary Approach argues that the Greek verbal system semantically encodes aspect alone. However, it must be noted that this approach does not deny the importance of discourse grammar, for those who fall within this category utilize it to various degrees.

### Stanley E. Porter

**Present.** Porter describes the present as the foreground tense, used to introduce significant characters or highlight “climatic references” to “concrete situations.”<sup>117</sup> Further, he says that the present verb-form is used in contexts where the author desires to describe an action in progress without specification to time.<sup>118</sup> Nonetheless, in reference to the present tense-form in narrative, Porter argues that the present tense-form is used to draw more attention to the event.<sup>119</sup>

**Aorist.** Porter maintains that the aorist is the background verb-form, creating the base for the narrative or discourse.<sup>120</sup> That is, Porter purports that because “story-telling” requires a “sequential framework,” the aorist, as the background verb-form, is used and the other more important events are built upon this framework using other verb-forms.<sup>121</sup> In other words, Porter states that it is the primary tense-form used to move the narrative without drawing special attention to

---

<sup>117</sup>Stanley E. Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*, 2nd ed. (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 23. The following discussion of Stanley E. Porter is adapted from my 2012 ThM thesis. Graham, “An Analysis of Recent Research.”

<sup>118</sup>Porter, *Idioms*, 29.

<sup>119</sup>Porter, *Idioms*, 30-31; Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 189-98.

<sup>120</sup>Porter, *Idioms*, 29.

<sup>121</sup>Porter and Reed, “Greek Grammar since BDF,” 154.

the events being described.<sup>122</sup> Finally, Porter states that the aorist can be used to close a pericope when it is used in conjunction with an imperfect.<sup>123</sup>

**Imperfect.** According to Porter, the imperfect verb-form is used in contexts where the author desires to describe an action in progress without specification to time.<sup>124</sup> However, he maintains that because of the widespread restriction of the imperfect verb-form to past contexts, it is the closest verb-form to conveying time. Even still, he insists that it does not communicate absolute tense.<sup>125</sup> Porter clarifies that the imperfect verb-form is selected in place of the aorist verb-form when the author desires to dwell upon an action.<sup>126</sup> Further, he argues that when it is used in conjunction with the aorist (background tense), it can introduce a new “stage” (foreground) in the discourse.<sup>127</sup>

**Perfect.** The perfect verb-form, according to Porter, is used to bring information to the front-ground, in which case it presents content in a “discrete, defined, contoured, and complex way.”<sup>128</sup> Moreover, Porter states that the perfect verb-form conveys the stative aspect, and he purports that this aspect carries more semantic weight than any of the other verb-forms.<sup>129</sup> Furthermore, when the perfect tense-form is used in narrative, Porter argues that the common occurrence of the

---

<sup>122</sup>Porter, *Idioms*, 35.

<sup>123</sup>Porter and Reed, “Greek Grammar since BDF,” 155.

<sup>124</sup>Porter, *Idioms*, 29.

<sup>125</sup>Porter, *Idioms*, 33-34.

<sup>126</sup>Porter, *Idioms*, 34.

<sup>127</sup>Porter and Reed, “Greek Grammar since BDF,” 155.

<sup>128</sup>Porter, *Idioms*, 23; Fredrick J. Long similarly argues that the perfect is used to indicate important actions or states. Fredrick J. Long, *Koine Greek Grammar: A Beginning-Intermediate Exegetical and Pragmatic Handbook* (Wilmore, KY: GlossaHouse, 2015), 246.

<sup>129</sup>Porter, *Idioms*, 39-40.

orist and perfect verb-form being used together does not indicate that the two verb-forms are synonymous. Rather, he argues that in these instances the orist is being used to support the perfect.<sup>130</sup>

**Future.** Porter argues that the future verb-form grammaticalizes the semantic feature of expectation, and he maintains that while it is morphologically related to the non-indicative forms, particularly the subjunctive mood, it provides a greater sense of certainty.<sup>131</sup>

### Constantine R. Campbell

**Present.** Campbell maintains that the aspect of the present verb-form is imperfective or it is internal viewpoint.<sup>132</sup> 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.<sup>133</sup> Campbell states that the historical present is best explained when it is understood to semantically encode the value of "proximity."<sup>134</sup> In reference to the purpose of the historical present, Campbell argues that its use is a matter of stylistic preference.<sup>135</sup> Nonetheless, he identifies at least two implications of the historical present. First, Campbell argues that as a result of the imperfective-proximate nature of discourse "spilling-over" through the present tense-form, the historical presents can introduce discourse.<sup>136</sup> Second, he argues that as the author sees fit, the

---

<sup>130</sup>Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 248-51.

<sup>131</sup>Porter, *Idioms*, 43-44.

<sup>132</sup>The following discussion of Constantine R. Campbell is adapted from my 2012 ThM thesis. Graham, "An Analysis of Recent Research."

<sup>133</sup>Campbell, *Verbal Aspect*, 36-37.

<sup>134</sup>Campbell, *Verbal Aspect*, 65.

<sup>135</sup>Campbell, *Verbal Aspect*, 75.

<sup>136</sup>Campbell, *Verbal Aspect*, 75.

historical present may be used with verbs of propulsion to "heighten the sense of transition" that the verb denotes.<sup>137</sup> It is important to note that according to Campbell, the historical present is not always of special significance. However, he emphasizes that he does not deny that it does at times have "special significance." For example, when Mark uses them to begin certain *pericopae* or when John uses the historical presents in significant clusters.<sup>138</sup>

**Aorist.** Campbell maintains that the aorist semantically encodes perfective aspect and a spatial, rather than temporal, description of perfectivity.<sup>139</sup> Moreover, Campbell states that the aorist is most often used in narrative proper and that it conveys the mainline of the narrative.<sup>140</sup> However, it can occur in direct and indirect discourse as well.<sup>141</sup>

**Imperfect.** Campbell purports that the imperfect is primarily a narrative proper tense-form, and he maintains that 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.<sup>142</sup> He says that the imperfect is the default form used for offline or inside view material in narrative. He describes offline or this inside view as giving explanation, personal thoughts, editorial comment, and so forth.<sup>143</sup> Also, he states that the aspect of the aorist is in opposition to the

---

<sup>137</sup>Campbell, *Verbal Aspect*, 75.

<sup>138</sup>Campbell, *Verbal Aspect*, 75.

<sup>139</sup>Campbell, *Verbal Aspect*, 103-26.

<sup>140</sup>Campbell, *Verbal Aspect*, 108, 115.

<sup>141</sup>Campbell, *Verbal Aspect*, 109-11.

<sup>142</sup>Campbell, *Verbal Aspect*, 83.

<sup>143</sup>Campbell, *Verbal Aspect*, 116.

imperfect, but both forms are narrative proper forms.<sup>144</sup> Furthermore, he writes 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.<sup>145</sup> Finally, Campbell argues that the imperfect form is used in narrative proper alongside the aorist to provide background information for the mainline of the story, which is most often communicated through the aorist verb-forms.<sup>146</sup> However, he acknowledges that while the imperfect is principally a form that is used in offline narrative proper, it can and does occur in other contexts such as mainline narrative proper, conditional sentences, and discourse.<sup>147</sup>

**Perfect.** Campbell maintains that the perfect tense-form encodes imperfective aspect, and he denies the view that the perfect verb-form encodes stative aspect, which is suggested by such scholars as McKay, Porter, J. P. Louw, and Comrie.<sup>148</sup> There are two main factors for his position. First, those who view the perfect as encoding stative aspect are not able to account for all of the uses of the perfect tense-form in the literature, particularly transitive verb.<sup>149</sup> Second, stativity is considered by most linguists to be a lexical quality and thus restricted to the category of *Aktionsart*.<sup>150</sup> Furthermore, he rejects the proposal that the aorist encroached upon the perfect due to the increased usage of transitive verbs, and he argues that

---

<sup>144</sup>Campbell, *Verbal Aspect*, 78.

<sup>145</sup>Campbell, *Verbal Aspect*, 77-78.

<sup>146</sup>Campbell, *Verbal Aspect*, 91-96.

<sup>147</sup>Campbell, *Verbal Aspect*, 96-101.

<sup>148</sup>Campbell, *Verbal Aspect*, 166-89.

<sup>149</sup>Campbell, *Verbal Aspect*, 166-67.

<sup>150</sup>Campbell, *Verbal Aspect*, 172-75.

the perfect tense-form resembles the present indicative.<sup>151</sup> Campbell states that in the literature he reviewed, the perfect tense-form overwhelmingly occurs in discourse. However, he says that when it does occur in narrative it almost always functions like the present indicative in narrative. Namely, it is used for narrational comment or in verbs of propulsion.<sup>152</sup> More specifically, he states that the perfect simply heightens the spatial value of the present and imperfect. Whereas the present has the spatial value of proximity, the perfect has the spatial value of heightened proximity.<sup>153</sup> 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.<sup>154</sup>

**Future.** Campbell states that the future tense-form most commonly occurs in direct discourse and that it semantically encodes perfective aspect.<sup>155</sup> Moreover, Campbell addresses the issue of the perfective aspect being used in an imperfective context by stating that this is expected since the future verb-form is not spatial but temporal.<sup>156</sup> That is, discourse would be the appropriate context since narrative mainline does not usually permit such communication.<sup>157</sup> Thus, in summary, Campbell maintains that the future verb-form is predominantly found in discourse, and it semantically encodes perfective aspect and future temporal reference.<sup>158</sup>

---

<sup>151</sup>Campbell, *Verbal Aspect*, 184-85.

<sup>152</sup>Campbell, *Verbal Aspect*, 175-89.

<sup>153</sup>Campbell, *Verbal Aspect*, 193-210.

<sup>154</sup>Campbell, *Verbal Aspect*, 210-11.

<sup>155</sup>Campbell, *Verbal Aspect*, 134, 151, 159.

<sup>156</sup>Campbell, *Verbal Aspect*, 159.

<sup>157</sup>Campbell, *Verbal Aspect*, 159.

<sup>158</sup>Campbell, *Verbal Aspect*, 159-60.

In summary, what this survey demonstrates is that a central issue in the study of Greek grammar during the fourth shift is tense variation within historical narrative. In other words, does the variation of verb-forms within the same temporal context indicate that the Greek verbal system only encodes aspect? Moreover, is this variation best explained through discourse planes, which is a representative view within the Aspect Primary group, or is this simply a device used to make the narrative more vivid—a leading view within the proposed Traditional Approach group?<sup>159</sup>

Steven Runge, Christopher Fresch, and other representatives of the Discourse Primary approach—scholars who embrace a discourse grammar approach to the Greek verbal system—reject such claims.<sup>160</sup> Instead, these scholars provide answers to such questions through the use of discourse grammar and accordingly point to data supporting their proposal that both tense and aspect are semantically encoded—a proposal which would account for the variation in verb-forms within a common temporal context. Hence, in light of the potential impact upon current developments within the study of Greek grammar, in the following chapter I will survey the leading scholars within the Discourse Primary approach, cataloging their positions on the function of the indicative verb within narrative and articulating how this approach will be evaluated within the scope and methodology of this dissertation.

---

<sup>159</sup>Porter, *Idioms*, 23; Campbell, *Verbal Aspect*, 36; Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 228; McKay, *A New Syntax*, 42.

<sup>160</sup>Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 125-33; Runge, “Verbal Aspect of the Historical Present,” 191-221; Stephen H. Levinsohn, “Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative,” in *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*, ed. Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016), 170-72; John C. Callow, “The Historic Present in Mark” (a seminar handout at SIL, Horsely Green, England, 1996), 1-8.

## CHAPTER 2

### THE DISCOURSE PRIMARY APPROACH AND THE INDICATIVE VERB IN JUDITH

In this chapter I will examine the leading scholars within the Discourse Primary approach. The primary goal of this survey will be to catalog their positions on the function of the indicative verb within narrative. Moreover, I will delineate how this approach will be evaluated within the scope and methodology of this dissertation.

#### **Discourse Primary Approach**

The Discourse Primary approach recognizes the importance of verbal aspect and linguistics, without abandoning the traditional understanding that the Greek verbal system semantically encodes time. Further, it is distinct from the Traditional Approach in that in addition to the above, it addresses the question of the variegated use of verb-forms within historical narrative through discourse grammar.<sup>1</sup>

#### **Steven E. Runge**

**Present.** The use of the present verb-form in narrative communicates that the author is choosing, through the mismatched use of grammaticalized time and

---

<sup>1</sup>Fredrick J. Long helpfully adds—with respect to the general function of discourse in communication—that “when one looks at a book as a whole, one is observing a discourse. Discourses are written to address the situation that exists between authors and their audiences. Authors conceive of the purposes of the discourse with arguments and themes in mind that will run throughout the discourse.” Fredrick J. Long, *Koine Greek Grammar: A Beginning-Intermediate Exegetical and Pragmatic Handbook* (Wilmore, KY: GlossaHouse, 2015), 1. In other words, what Long’s comments helpfully highlight is that discourse grammar considers the part in light of the whole. Discourse grammar is built upon the principle that choice implies meaning. Steven E. Runge, *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publisher, 2010), 5-7.

aspect, to highlight a speech or event that follows.<sup>2</sup> Specifically, Runge argues that the present verb-form is used to mark the pragmatic feature of discontinuity whether or not the verb is a verb of propulsion or speech.<sup>3</sup>

**Aorist.** The aorist is the default verb-form used in the mainline of the narrative and marks no special feature.<sup>4</sup>

**Imperfect.** The imperfect is the default verb-form used in narrative for offline, or nonevent information.<sup>5</sup>

**Perfect.** The perfect verb-form most commonly occurs in the offline of the narrative; however, the perfect verb-form can occur in the mainline of the argument. The most common function of the perfect verb-form is to show the relevance of that material to what was said in the mainline. Nonetheless, Runge argues that even in the instances in which the perfect verb-form is used in the mainline, it is used to show its relevance to the current event. Runge maintains that the perfect verb-forms do not mark prominence in narrative,<sup>6</sup> but rather mark the relevance of the information contained in the perfect verb-form as particularly relevant to the current material.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 128-30.

<sup>3</sup>Steven E. Runge, "The Verbal Aspect of the Historical Present Indicative in Narrative," in *Discourse Studies and Biblical Interpretation: A Festschrift in Honor of Stephen H. Levinsohn* (Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2011), 214.

<sup>4</sup>Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 129. See also Kathleen Callow, *Discourse Considerations in Translating the Word of God* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974), 52-54.

<sup>5</sup>Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 129-30. See also Callow, *Discourse Considerations*, 52-54.

<sup>6</sup>Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 129.

<sup>7</sup>Steven E. Runge, "Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect," in *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*, ed. Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016), 458-85.

## Stephen H. Levinsohn

**Present.** Levinsohn argues that because the present verb-form is not the default form used to portray an event in narrative, it “must have added implicatures.”<sup>8</sup> He states that the added implicature when the present verb-form is used in narrative is to point forward and highlight what follows.<sup>9</sup>

**Aorist.** Levinsohn supports the consensus view that the aorist verb-form is the default verb used to carry the narrative when the author desires to portray the action as a whole.<sup>10</sup> Moreover, Levinsohn states that since narratives are composed of events, unless it is marked in some way, a verb-form that is used to describe the event is expected to be expressing foreground information.<sup>11</sup> According to Levinsohn, then, the aorist verb-form is the default verb used to move the events of the narrative, and he also insists that unless it is preceded by *γάρ* it is the default foreground in narrative.<sup>12</sup>

**Imperfect.** Levinsohn maintains that the imperfect verb-form is the default form to convey that the action or event is ongoing in narrative.<sup>13</sup> According to Levinsohn, the imperfect verb-form is usually used to convey background information, a position he supports by correlating aspect and grounding as opposed

---

<sup>8</sup>Stephen H. Levinsohn, “Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative,” in *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*, ed. Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016), 170.

<sup>9</sup>Levinsohn, “Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative,” 170-72. Levinsohn’s view, that the historical present “brings attention to what follows,” argues against Porter’s position that the historical present “brings prominence to itself.” See also John C. Callow, “The Historic Present in Mark” (a seminar handout at SIL, Horsleys Green, England, 1996), 1-8.

<sup>10</sup>Levinsohn, “Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative,” 163-69, 172, 179.

<sup>11</sup>Levinsohn, “Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative,” 164. See also Callow, *Discourse Considerations*, 52-54.

<sup>12</sup>Levinsohn, “Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative,” 169-71. See also Callow, *Discourse Considerations*, 52-54.

<sup>13</sup>Levinsohn, “Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative,” 168, 172, 179; Stephen H. Levinsohn, *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek: A Coursebook on the Information Structure of New Testament Greek*, 2nd ed. (Dallas: SIL International, 2000), 174.

to equating them.<sup>14</sup> Levinsohn states that the non-events communicate background information, implying, based on his position concerning the imperfect verb-form, that the imperfect is also the expected form to be used to describe non-events in narrative.<sup>15</sup> However, he states that it can communicate foreground information when the imperfect is used to describe the event instead of the aorist. He emphasizes, though, that this is based on the context, that there are times when the imperfect is used to describe an event, and that the added implicature is that the event is backgrounded.<sup>16</sup>

**Perfect.** Levinsohn argues that due to the “stative nature” of the perfect verb-form, it is used to communicate background information.

### **Randall Buth**

**Present.** Buth argues that the present verb-form is used in narrative to “contravene tense” by which a present time verb-form is used in a past time context in order to create a rhetorical effect.<sup>17</sup> He bases his thesis upon his study of the relationship between participles with historical presents.

**Perfect.** Randall Buth states that any generalized theory about the aspect of the perfect cannot accurately account for the complexity of the perfect verb-form.<sup>18</sup> That is, he argues that suggestions by scholars that the perfect verb-form

---

<sup>14</sup>Levinsohn, “Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative,” 167-68.

<sup>15</sup>Levinsohn, “Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative,” 164.

<sup>16</sup>Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 169-70, 172, 179.

<sup>17</sup>Randall Buth, “Participles as a Pragmatic Choice: Where Semantics Meets Pragmatics,” in *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*, ed. Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016), 304-5.

<sup>18</sup>Randall Buth, “Perfect Greek Morphology and Pedagogy,” in *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*, ed. Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016), 416-29.

semantically encodes only stativity, imperfective, or perfective aspect all over-simplify the issue and do not accurately account for the usage of the perfect in the literature.<sup>19</sup> One of the fundamental arguments Buth makes is that the complexity of the morphology of the perfect verb-form demands a more complex theory of aspect.<sup>20</sup> That is, Buth points out that unlike most verb-forms, the perfect verb-form has a separate active and middle stem, and it has two distinct morphological markers to distinguish these stems. Namely, it uses the *kappa* and reduplication to mark the active and only reduplication to mark the middle stem.<sup>21</sup> Furthermore, Buth argues that the *kappa* perfect did not develop from Proto-Indo-European but is rather an “early-Greek innovation within Indo-European.”<sup>22</sup>

Buth identifies three “morphological layers” which contribute to the development of the perfect verb-form: the vowel-shift perfect, the reduplication perfect, and the *kappa* perfect.<sup>23</sup> Buth clarifies that the first perfects were stative and intransitive at the semantic level. However, he states that the perfect began to mark frequentative etymology through reduplication and perfective aspect through the *kappa*.<sup>24</sup> That is, Buth contends that the reduplicated prefix can be traced back to Eastern Indo-European and, as with many languages, marks a frequentative idea or imperfectivity.<sup>25</sup> Moreover, he argues that when the perfect verb-form began to mark

---

<sup>19</sup>Buth, “Perfect Morphology and Pedagogy,” 425.

<sup>20</sup>Buth, “Perfect Morphology and Pedagogy,” 416.

<sup>21</sup>Buth, “Perfect Morphology and Pedagogy,” 417-18.

<sup>22</sup>Buth, “Perfect Morphology and Pedagogy,” 418.

<sup>23</sup>Buth, “Perfect Morphology and Pedagogy,” 419-20.

<sup>24</sup>Buth, “Perfect Morphology and Pedagogy,” 418-22.

<sup>25</sup>Buth, “Perfect Morphology and Pedagogy,” 419-20.

active transitivity with the *kappa* perfect, it was paralleled with the normativity of the *kappa* perfect actives.<sup>26</sup>

Finally, Buth purports that the *kappa* perfect is related to an old aorist known as the *kappa* aorist, supporting this by pointing out that both the *kappa* aorist and the *kappa* perfect only occur in the active and arguing that the perfect verb-form assumes the perfective aspect from the *kappa* aorist to which it is related.<sup>27</sup> However, Buth does not suggest that the perfect verb-form encodes perfective aspect only. Rather, he maintains that due to the morphological marker of reduplication and the *kappa* in the active, the perfect verb-form contains both perfective and imperfective aspect.<sup>28</sup> Thus, for Buth, the morphological complexity of the perfect verb-form points to aspectual complexity, a complexity that Buth says can only be properly understood through a cognitive linguistics perspective and the internalization of Greek to the point of second-language fluency.<sup>29</sup>

### Rutger J. Allan

**Perfect.** Rutger J. Allan argues that the perfect tense-form is best understood as a polysemous chain of semantic extensions.<sup>30</sup> That is, he argues that questions concerning the aspect and tense of the perfect tense-form can best be accounted for by understanding that the usage of the perfect tense-form, in texts such as the Greek New Testament, reflect the impact of the historical development of this particular tense-form. The perfect tense-form then reflects all of these

---

<sup>26</sup>Buth, "Perfect Morphology and Pedagogy," 420.

<sup>27</sup>Buth, "Perfect Morphology and Pedagogy," 422.

<sup>28</sup>Buth, "Perfect Morphology and Pedagogy," 421-22.

<sup>29</sup>Buth, "Perfect Morphology and Pedagogy," 425-28.

<sup>30</sup>Rutger J. Allan, "Tense and Aspect in Classical Greek: Two Historical Developments; Augment and Perfect," in *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*, ed. Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016), 83, 114.

developments. He develops this thesis by considering the development of the perfect tense-form from the PIE and Homeric literature up to the literature found in the first few centuries AD.<sup>31</sup>

Allan contends that there are three stages in the development of the Greek perfect tense-form.<sup>32</sup> In the first stage, using the PIE and Homeric literature, he purports that there were at least two types of perfects, resultative and experiential.<sup>33</sup> Further, he acknowledges the possibility of three other types of perfects: iterative, intensive, and totalizing-iterative.<sup>34</sup> He states that the resultative perfect was the default meaning of the perfect.<sup>35</sup> He defines it as follows: “The perfect designated that the subject was in a physical or mental state resulting from a prior event.”<sup>36</sup> However, Allan notes that the focus of the perfect is on the present event, the past event is “only evoked in the background of the conceptualization.”<sup>37</sup> Moreover, he rejects the proposal, by Stanley Porter and Andrew Sihler, that the perfect in PIE literature was pure stative and the resultative meaning developed later.<sup>38</sup>

He grounds this rejection on two facts. First, he argues that the thesis that within most Indo-European languages the perfect tense has past reference, indicates that the perfect originally referred to the state which resulted from a past action, and

---

<sup>31</sup>It must be noted that the section which discusses the third stage of the development of the perfect does not provide sufficient interaction with the primary literature. Allan, “Tense and Aspect in Classical Greek,” 112-13.

<sup>32</sup>Allan, “Tense and Aspect,” 102-14.

<sup>33</sup>Allan, “Tense and Aspect,” 102-3.

<sup>34</sup>Allan, “Tense and Aspect,” 106-7.

<sup>35</sup>Allan, “Tense and Aspect,” 102.

<sup>36</sup>Allan, “Tense and Aspect,” 102.

<sup>37</sup>Allan, “Tense and Aspect,” 102.

<sup>38</sup>Allan, “Tense and Aspect,” 103.

thus was not simply stative.<sup>39</sup> Second, Allan maintains that his position is supported by the existence of a “distinctive stative category in PIE.”<sup>40</sup>

Next Allan discusses the experiential perfect, and he suggests that the evidence indicates that it was already developed in PIE.<sup>41</sup> That is, he says that the resultative perfect had developed an experiential perfect in which the perfect is used to “express that a past event has had a persistent effect on the present in the form of the subject’s knowledge or experience.”<sup>42</sup> One example he provides of the experiential perfect is the PIE verb \**yoid-h<sub>2</sub>e* which means “I have seen,” and he comments that it later becomes “I know” which indicates the action that was previously acquired has become a lasting piece of knowledge.<sup>43</sup>

The second stage begins with Homer, according to Allan. In the second stage he identifies three certain developments in the perfect tense-form—current relevance (anterior), continuative, and existential—and one category that he views as a possible development, namely, recent past.<sup>44</sup> He purports that arguably the most significant semantic change in this stage is the production of a transitive perfect tense-form in which the subject focus and resultative-stative meaning of the first stage is still present.<sup>45</sup> Further, throughout this section the subject focus which characterized the first stage carries over into the second stage.<sup>46</sup> Moreover, he states

---

<sup>39</sup>Allan, “Tense and Aspect,” 103.

<sup>40</sup>Allan, “Tense and Aspect,” 104-5.

<sup>41</sup>Allan, “Tense and Aspect,” 105-6.

<sup>42</sup>Allan, “Tense and Aspect,” 105.

<sup>43</sup>Allan, “Tense and Aspect,” 105.

<sup>44</sup>Allan, “Tense and Aspect,” 108-12.

<sup>45</sup>Allan, “Tense and Aspect,” 108.

<sup>46</sup>Allan, “Tense and Aspect,” 108-12.

that the semantic expansion of the perfect is a result of speakers using the form “ad hoc in a new context of use.”<sup>47</sup>

The time period of the third stage is contested according to Allan, and as a result he does not specify when this development of the perfect tense-form occurred. However, some scholars he cites suggest that it began as early as the first century CE and as late as the fourth or fifth century CE.<sup>48</sup> The biggest development of this stage is the use of the perfect tense-form as a past tense indicator. That is, it began to function much like the aorist indicative. Allan concludes this section with a discussion concerning whether or not it is possible to identify one overarching semantic core meaning. Although he identifies the current relevance feature of the perfect tense-form as possibly having the ability to subsume the most semantic variants found throughout all three stages of the development of the perfect tense-form, he concludes that the historical data suggests that the perfect tense-form has a chain of related meanings rather than one core meaning.<sup>49</sup> This point is particularly relevant to the Discourse Primary proposal since it is proposing that the perfect does not have one semantic meaning.<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup>Allan, “Tense and Aspect,” 109.

<sup>48</sup>K. L. McKay and Stanley Porter both argue on a fourth or fifth century C.E. date for this stage of development of the perfect; Robert Crellin argues for a first century C.E. date. Kenneth L. McKay, “On the Perfect and Other Aspects in the Greek Non-literary Papyri,” *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 27 (1980): 23-49; McKay, “The Use of the Perfect Down to the Second Century A.D.,” *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 12 (1965): 1-21; Stanley E. Porter, *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament with Reference to Tense and Mood* (New York: Peter Lang, 1989); Robert Crellin, “The Greek Perfect Active System: 200 BC-AD 150” (PhD diss., University of Cambridge, 2012).

<sup>49</sup>Allan, “Tense and Aspect,” 113.

<sup>50</sup>This is a very significant point in the discussion. Since the time of Stanley Porter and Buist Fanning’s dissertations, no major argument has been proposed for a dual semantic meaning of the perfect tense-form. For instance, Stanley Porter argues that the perfect verb-form semantically encodes stative aspect, Buist Fanning argues that it encodes perfective aspect, and Constantine Campbell argues that it encodes imperfective aspect.

## Patrick James

**Present.** Patrick James states that when the present verb-form is used in narrative it is highlighting statements or actions which follow.<sup>51</sup> He argues that it accomplishes this by drawing attention to either a new speaker or discontinuities with respect to the current topic, location, or actor.<sup>52</sup> Moreover, James comments that when there is an unusual number of present verb-forms used together the author is creating a “crescendo effect.”<sup>53</sup>

**Aorist.** James argues that in the New Testament and Greek Pentateuch the aorist verb-form is the default form.<sup>54</sup> That is, he maintains that the aorist is the most common verb-form used in narrative. Furthermore, in narrative James purports that the aorist and the imperfect are contrasting binary options.<sup>55</sup> Namely, in narrative the author can select the aorist if desiring to present an event in summary or the imperfect if intending to showcase a process in detail.

## Elizabeth Robar

**Present.** Elizabeth Robar argues that the present verb-form is used in narrative as an “editorial device to indicate thematic prominence.”<sup>56</sup> Further, she states that the scope of the present verb-form in narrative is the entire discourse unit

---

<sup>51</sup>Patrick James, “Imperfects, Aorists, Historic Presents, and Perfects in John 11: A Narrative Test Case,” in *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*, ed. Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016), 212-16.

<sup>52</sup>James, “Imperfects, Aorists, Historic Presents, and Perfects in John 11,” 212-16.

<sup>53</sup>James, “Imperfects, Aorists, Historic Presents, and Perfects in John 11,” 212-16.

<sup>54</sup>James, “Imperfects, Aorists, Historic Presents, and Perfects in John 11,” 204.

<sup>55</sup>James, “Imperfects, Aorists, Historic Presents, and Perfects in John 11,” 188. Contrasting binary option refers to the function of the aorist and the imperfect in narrative.

<sup>56</sup>Elizabeth Robar, “The Historical Present in NT Greek: An Exercise in Interpreting Matthew,” in *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*, ed. Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016), 341-46, 350.

in which it opens.<sup>57</sup> For this reason, she holds that one has to understand the broader discourse episode in order to determine the units in which the historic presents are located.<sup>58</sup> She maintains that identifying discourse units is based upon two discourse features, lexical choice and developmental markers.<sup>59</sup>

Robar identifies with Steve Runge, stating her thesis is very similar to his processing hierarchy.<sup>60</sup> Moreover, she comments that the traditional view that the historic present is used to communicate vividness, bringing an event from the past into the present, should not be completely dismissed but should simply be linguistically nuanced.<sup>61</sup> She replaces the traditional concept of vividness with prominence, in which the present verb-form requires more processing time than the expected verb-forms. What is more, in support of tense being a semantically encoded feature of the Greek indicative verb-form, Robar traces the history of the historic present cross-linguistically and seeks to show that the historic present is far more prevalent in languages which have a more developed tense system, particularly the present and future tense.<sup>62</sup>

### Robert Crellin

**Perfect.** Robert Crellin argues for a “unified semantic description of the perfect” in order to account for the majority of its uses.<sup>63</sup> Further, he states that his

---

<sup>57</sup>Robar, “The Historical Present,” 349-50.

<sup>58</sup>Robar, “The Historical Present,” 350.

<sup>59</sup>Robar, “The Historical Present,” 349-50. She argues the following: end section—the unit is the clause itself; middle section—the unit may be either a single speech unit or encompass multiple speech units; beginning section—its scope is the entire narrative episode itself.

<sup>60</sup>Robar, “The Historical Present,” 332.

<sup>61</sup>Robar, “The Historical Present,” 332-33.

<sup>62</sup>Robar, “The Historical Present,” 333-35.

<sup>63</sup>Robert Crellin, “The Semantics of the Perfect in the Greek of the New Testament,” in *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*, ed. Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016), 435.

primary concern in his study of the perfect tense-form is with the “truth conditions associated with the perfect.”<sup>64</sup> He also purports that the issue of the perfect verb-form semantically encoding anterior, resultative, and pure state in one form is best addressed through Wolfgang Klein’s semantic aspectual framework found in Klein’s “The Present Perfect Puzzle” and in Klein’s *Time in Language*.<sup>65</sup> He supports this in three ways. First, he connects tense and aspect with event (i.e., the activity “make a cake”) and situation structure (i.e., the time of the event).<sup>66</sup> Second, he discusses how tense and aspect function within languages, such as Greek and English, marking these features with the verb. Third, he identifies the apparent problems the perfect verb-form has in relationship to tense and aspect, and he offers a proposal for the semantics of the Greek perfect verb-form.

Crellin begins his discussion of event and situation structure by pointing out that although many have erroneously identified tense and aspect as belonging to the verb, in recent times scholars have come to understand that these are “properties of propositions realized as predicates.”<sup>67</sup> Crellin adds that propositions contain an event or situation which has its own time structure with a beginning, middle, and end.<sup>68</sup> Further, he says that each kind of event or situation can be distinguished in accordance with its time structure.<sup>69</sup> He identifies three distinguishing bases: telicity, durativity, and homogeneity.<sup>70</sup> According to Crellin, homogeneity can be divided

---

<sup>64</sup>Crellin, “Semantics of the Perfect,” 435.

<sup>65</sup>Crellin, “Semantics of the Perfect,” 430-35.

<sup>66</sup>Crellin refers to the “time of the event” as the “time of the situation.” Crellin, “Semantics of the Perfect,” 430-35.

<sup>67</sup>Crellin, “Semantics of the Perfect,” 435. Crellin forms his position based upon the work of Carol Tenny and Maes Pustejovsky. Carol Tenny and James Pustejovsky, “A History of Events in Linguistic Theory,” in *Events as Grammatical Objects: The Converging Perspectives of Lexical Semantics and Syntax* (Stanford, CA: Center for the Study of Language and Information, 2000).

<sup>68</sup>Crellin, “Semantics of the Perfect,” 435.

<sup>69</sup>Crellin, “Semantics of the Perfect,” 436.

<sup>70</sup>Crellin, “Semantics of the Perfect,” 436. Crellin defines his terms—Telicity: the

into two sub groups, strong and weak.<sup>71</sup> Nonetheless, for his purposes, he only focuses on strong homogeneity, which he defines as the ability to infinitely subdivide an eventuality into events of the same character, distinguishing five kinds of eventuality: activity, accomplishment, achievement, state, complex events.<sup>72</sup>

Next, Crellin discusses tense and aspect, bringing attention to the role of the verb in communicating these features in Greek.<sup>73</sup> He states that one element that is crucial to Klein's semantic definition of tense and aspect is topic time.<sup>74</sup> In this framework, tense refers to the relationship between the topic time and the utterance time, and aspect refers to the relationship between the time of the topic to the time of the situation.<sup>75</sup> Furthermore, he articulates how the Greek verbal system marks both tense and aspect, adding that tense is only marked by the Greek verbal forms in the indicative mood.<sup>76</sup>

Lastly, Crellin articulates the issues surrounding the perfect verb-form with respect to tense and aspect, surveying and interacting with various suggestions,

---

existence of a determined endpoint; Durativity: duration beyond one "conceptual moment"; Homogeneity: the capacity to divide an event into multiple smaller occasions of the same event type. Crellin, "Semantics of the Perfect," 436.

<sup>71</sup>Crellin points the reader to the following resources for more discussion on these distinctions: Tenny and Pustejovsky, "History of Events," 5; Gillian Catriona Ramchand, *Aspect and Predication: The Semantics of Argument Structure* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997); David R. Dowty, *Word Meaning and Montague Grammar: The Semantics of Verbs and Times in Generative Semantics and in Montague's PTQ*, *Synthese Language Library* 7 (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1979).

<sup>72</sup>Crellin, "Semantics of the Perfect," 436-37.

<sup>73</sup>Crellin, "Semantics of the Perfect," 437-38.

<sup>74</sup>Crellin, "Semantics of the Perfect," 438. Crellin follows Klein's definition of topic time which he defines as "the time for which, on some occasion, a claim is made." Wolfgang Klein, "The Present Perfect Puzzle," *Language* 68, no. 3 (September 1992): 535; Crellin, "Semantics of the Perfect," 438.

<sup>75</sup>Crellin, "Semantics of the Perfect," 438. In this framework the tenses work as follows: Present tense—the time of the situation is concurrent with the time of the utterance; Past tense—the time of the situation precedes the time of the utterance; Future Tense—the time of the utterance precedes the time of situation. Furthermore, Crellin states that there are two aspects perfective and imperfective. He states that with perfective aspect the time of the topic includes the time of the situation, whereas with imperfective aspect the time of the situation includes the time of the topic.

<sup>76</sup>Crellin, "Semantics of the Perfect," 439-40.

and he offers a proposal for the semantics of the Greek perfect.<sup>77</sup> In summary, Crellin states that the heart of the problem is that the perfect has three types of relationships to the time of the utterance: First, the time of the situation may include the time of the utterance when the perfect is formed to a state predicate.<sup>78</sup> Second, the time of the poststate includes the time of the utterance when the predicate describes a change of state. Third, the time of the situation precedes the time of the utterance when the predicate describes neither a state nor a change of state with respect to the subject.<sup>79</sup> However, in addition to the issue of the three relationships of the perfect verb-form to the time of the utterance, the perfect also has issues related to how the time of the topic relates to the time of the situation.<sup>80</sup>

Crellin argues that Klein's definition of the perfective aspect<sup>81</sup> accounts well for most of the various ways the perfect relates the time of the topic to the time of situation. However, Crellin states that Klein's proposal does not account for the instances in which the time of the situation includes the time of the topic and the time of the utterance.<sup>82</sup> He suggests that the perfect semantically encodes a derived homogeneous atelic eventuality for the subject, and it includes topic time in the situation time. Further, he asserts that this proposal accounts for the four different relationships the perfect verb-form can have with the time of the utterance.<sup>83</sup>

---

<sup>77</sup>Crellin, "Semantics of the Perfect," 440-53.

<sup>78</sup>Crellin states that a "state predicate" almost always concerns the subject, and he lists two types of verbs that fall within this category. (1) In verbs of action: A state usually arising from a prior action or series of actions. This state may be that of responsibility for having performed the action(s) or of a characteristic established by the action(s). (2) In verbs whose present denotes a state: A state usually arising from the aoristic operation of that verb, resulting either in a continuing state or a subsequent state. Crellin, "Semantics of the Perfect," 433.

<sup>79</sup>Crellin, "Semantics of the Perfect," 440-42.

<sup>80</sup>Crellin, "Semantics of the Perfect," 440-42.

<sup>81</sup>Perfective aspect: the time of the topic includes the time of situation.

<sup>82</sup>Crellin, "Semantics of the Perfect," 444.

<sup>83</sup>Crellin, "Semantics of the Perfect," 440-53. For example, (1) Where the perfect is formed to a state predicate, the time of the situation may include the time of the utterance; (2) where the

Crellin's article on the semantic components of the perfect tense-form highlights the importance of understanding its complexity. The discourse function of the perfect tense-form is impacted by semantic constraints. It is not accurate simply to say that the perfect tense-form is used to fulfill a particular discourse function, since it may have merely been selected because of semantic constraints. That is, it may have been utilized because it best communicates the idea of resultant state, anterior action, or a pure state.

## Methodology

### Scope of Study

The questions surrounding verbal aspect within the Koine Greek verbal system are varied and numerous.<sup>84</sup> Therefore, as stated above, it is imperative to narrow the focus. This dissertation will narrow the scope to the recent proposals within the Discourse Primary Approach on the discourse function of the Greek indicative verb-forms within narrative.<sup>85</sup> Specifically, it will test these proposals

---

perfect describes a change of state, the temporal duration of the poststate includes the time of the utterance; (3) where the perfect describes neither a state nor a change of state on the part of the subject, the time of the situation precedes the time of the utterance; (4) where the perfect describes an event that continues after the speech time or at least continues up to the speech time.

<sup>84</sup>A few of the questions involve the following: defining aspect, determining the aspect of the perfect and future tense verb-forms, determining if time is a semantic feature of the Greek verbal system, determining if aspect or *Aktionsart* is completely objective or subjective, determining the function of the augment, and determining the relationship between the varied usage of verb-forms within the same temporal setting. For more discussion on these issues, see the following: Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch, eds., *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis* (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016); Buist M. Fanning, "Approaches to Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek: Issues in Definition and Method," in *Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics: Open Questions in Current Research*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and D. A. Carson (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993); Fanning, *Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 1-6; Daryl D. Schmidt, "Verbal Aspect in Greek: Two Approaches," in *Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics: Open Questions in Current Research*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and D. A. Carson (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993).

<sup>85</sup>In this dissertation "narrative" is used in its broadest sense. That is, it is recognized that within a narrative there can be a number of genres represented. The most common genre is narrative proper—mainline and offline information which communicates the main storyline as well as the background information to the story. However, reported speech and general discourse are also found within a narrative. Thus, when various tense-forms are used outside of narrative proper, it will be noted. For more discussion on the topic of genre and narrative see the following sources: Constantine R. Campbell, *Verbal Aspect, the Indicative Mood, and Narrative: Soundings in the Greek of the New Testament* (New York: Peter Lang, 2007), 3-4; Marie-Laure Ryan, "Toward a Definition of Narrative," in *Cambridge Companion to Narrative*, Cambridge Companions to Literature, ed. David Herman

within the narrative of Judith.<sup>86</sup> Furthermore, it must be noted that the contribution of this dissertation will primarily be within the field of Greek grammar and linguistics.

There are at least three reasons for focusing upon the recent proposals concerning the discourse function of the indicative verb within narrative. First, prior to the work of Steven Runge, it was not seriously considered with respect to the issue of verbal aspect.<sup>87</sup> Second, before the rise of discourse grammar, the debate between Fanning and Porter, with respect to the questions surrounding verbal aspect, were at a stalemate at best and Stanley Porter's view had prevailed at worst. Third, these proposals are some of the first to provide a response to Porter's discourse planes analogy. In light of these reasons, the need for an evaluation of the recent proposals concerning the discourse function of the variegated Greek indicative verb-forms within historical narrative becomes more apparent. Therefore, this dissertation will test the leading theories—within the Discourse Primary group—on the discourse function of the Greek indicative verb-forms within the narrative of Judith in order to bring some clarity within the field of Greek grammar and linguistics concerning the legitimacy of these recent proposals.

---

(Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 22-35; Anna De Fina and Barbara Johnstone, "Discourse Analysis and Narrative," in *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, 2nd ed., Blackwell Handbooks in Linguistics, ed. Deborah Tannen, Heidi Ehernberger Hamilton, and Deborah Schiffrin (Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell, 2015), 152-88.

<sup>86</sup>The book of Judith was chosen because it provides an adequate sampling of representative texts to test current proposals. For further discussion on this, see Stanley Porter, *Linguistic Analysis of the Greek New Testament: Studies in Tools, Methods, and Practice* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015), 143; M. B. O'Donnell, "Designing and Compiling a Register-Balanced Corpus of Hellenistic Greek for the Purpose of Linguistic Description and Investigation," in *Diglossia and Other Topics in New Testament Linguistics*, ed. Stanley E. Porter (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 255-97; M. B. O'Donnell, *Corpus Linguistics and the Greek of the New Testament*, New Testament Monographs 6 (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2005).

<sup>87</sup>Stanley E. Porter and Andrew W. Pitts, "New Testament Greek Language and Linguistics in Recent Research," *Currents in Biblical Research* 6, no. 2 (2008): 235; Campbell, *Verbal Aspect*, 3.

## Approach of Study

The objective of this thesis limits the approach of this study in the following ways. First, since this study is testing the theses of others and not arguing for a new theory regarding verbal aspect and the discourse function of the indicative verb in narrative, it will be largely descriptive in nature. Second, because this study requires a corpus that is large enough to provide a sufficient sampling of the various verb-forms within a shared temporal context, it will utilize statistical analysis to communicate the breadth of the research—while still providing many illustrative examples to demonstrate the statistical findings—since every instance cannot be individually analyzed within the body of the dissertation.<sup>88</sup>

Third, the Discourse Primary proposals will be evaluated in light of the literary context of Judith, the segmentation of texts within the critical translations of the Septuagint, and the analysis of critical commentaries on Judith.<sup>89</sup> Critical translations and commentaries will be consulted, compared, and interacted with as the analysis of the results from this research are evaluated. For instance, the results from testing the proposal that the historical present marks what follows by transitioning to a new character or scene (i.e., new topic, location, or actor) will be compared and evaluated in light of the context of each occurrence of the present, the

---

<sup>88</sup>See the following for further discussion on use of statistical analysis for corpus research: Andrew Hardie, *Corpus Linguistics: Method, Theory and Practice* (New York: Cambridge, 2012), 48-53.

<sup>89</sup>The following critical translations and commentaries will be utilized: (1) Critical Translations: Albert Pietersma, and Benjamin G. Wright, *A New English Translation of the Septuagint: And the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007); Michael D. Coogan, *The New Oxford Annotated Apocrypha* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010); Eberhard Bons, Wolfgang Kraus, and Martin Karrer, *Septuaginta Deutsch: das griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2009); Natalio Marcos Fernández and María Victoria Spottorno Díaz-Caro, *La Biblia griega septuaginta 2* (Salamanca: Sígueme, 2011); (2) Critical Commentaries: Carey A. Moore, *Judith: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985); Morton Scott Enslin and Solomon Zeitlin, *The Book of Judith, Greek Text with an English Translation* (Leiden: Brill, 1973); Gerald West, "Judith," in *Eerdmans Commentary on the Bible*, ed. James D. G. Dunn, and J. W. Rogerson (Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 2003); Dichk M. Kanonge, "Reading Narratives in the Septuagint: A Discourse on Method," in *Septuagint and Reception: Essays Prepared for the Association for the Study of the Septuagint in South Africa*, ed. Johann Cook (Boston: Brill, 2009), 361-82.

way the critical translations segment the text, as well as whether or not the commentators' remarks align with this proposal. Fourth, in each chapter the Discourse Primary proposal will be compared and contrasted with the Aspect Primary Approach and the Traditional Approach in order to evaluate whether or not the other approaches are viable.

### Corpus of Study

The corpus of this study will be the book of Judith. The Greek text which will be utilized for the analysis of the recent proposals is Alfred Rahlfs's *Septuaginta: Judith*.<sup>90</sup> Further, the translation that will be utilized within the body of this dissertation is Albert Pietersma, and Benjamin G. Wright's *A New English Translation of the Septuagint: And the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title* (NETS). Moreover, except for the name, Judith, the spelling of names and places will follow the NETS translation.<sup>91</sup> The research conducted on the book of Judith has primarily focused on literary studies and general commentaries with limited grammatical discussions, a point which, at the research level, gives grounds for the selection of Judith as the corpus of this study.<sup>92</sup>

---

<sup>90</sup> Alfred Rahlfs and Robert Hanhart, *Septuaginta: id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006).

<sup>91</sup>The spelling "Judith" will be followed, as opposed to the NETS spelling "Judith," because "Judith" is the common English spelling among commentators and scholars.

<sup>92</sup>Moore, *Judith*; Enslin and Zeitlin, *The Book of Judith*; Robert Hanhart, *Judith* (Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979); Hanhart, *Text und Textgeschichte des Buches Judith*, *Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens* 14 (Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979); Benedikt Otzen, *Tobit and Judith*, *Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha* (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002); Pierre Johan Jordaan, "Reading *Judith* as Therapeutic Narrative," in *Septuagint and Reception: Essays prepared for the Association for the Study of the Septuagint in South Africa*, ed. Johann Cook (Boston: Brill, 2009), 335-46; Alonso Schökel Luis, and Wilhelm H. Wuellner, *Narrative Structures in the Book of Judith: Protocol of the Eleventh Colloquy, January 1974*, *Protocol Series of the Colloquies of the Center for Hermeneutical Studies in Hellenistic and Modern Culture* 11 (Berkeley, CA: Center, 1975); Margarita Stocker, *Judith: Sexual Warrior, Women and Power in Western Culture* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998); James C. VanderKam, *No One Spoke Ill of Her: Essays on Judith*, *Early Judaism and Its Literature* 2 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992); Toni Craven, *Artistry and Faith in the Book of Judith* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983); Craven, "The Book of Judith in the Context of Twentieth-Century Studies of the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books," *Currents in Biblical Research* 1, no. 2 (2003): 187-229; Helen Efthimiadis-Keith, *The Enemy Is Within: A Jungian Psychoanalytic Approach to the Book of*

Although this type of work has not been conducted within the book of Judith, the suitability of the quality of the Greek style and grammar must be addressed. The question of the types of Greek in the Septuagint has been a central facet of Septuagint studies since the early 1980s.<sup>93</sup> This question, as it relates to the type of Greek in the book of Judith, is an important factor in determining Judith's suitability for this project. That is, determining the quality of the Greek of Judith, specifically whether or not it is translation or composition Greek is an important factor to consider, since the purpose of this dissertation is to evaluate current Greek grammar proposals. The answer to this question has traditionally been that the Hebraic features within the book of Judith indicate that it is translation Greek.<sup>94</sup>

Some of the Hebraic features that scholars note are its consistent use of Hebraic expressions, idioms, and syntactical features.<sup>95</sup> However, despite these apparent Hebraic features, there are Septuagint scholars, particularly in recent years, who reject the previous arguments that Judith is translation Greek and argue that Judith is an example of composition Greek which has been influenced by the wording from Septuagint books which predate the composition of Judith.<sup>96</sup> Thus,

---

*Judith*, Biblical Interpretation Series 67 (Boston: Brill Academic, 2004).

<sup>93</sup>Staffan Olofsson, *The LXX Version: A Guide to the Translation Technique of the Septuagint*, Coniectanea Biblica, Old Testament Series 30 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1990), 33-36; G. H. R. Horsely, "Divergent Views on the Nature of the Greek of the Bible," *Biblica* 65, no. 3 (January 1984): 393-403; Moisés Silva, "Bilingualism and the Character of Palestinian Greek," *Biblica* 61, no. 2 (January 1980): 198-219; J. Lust, Erik Eynikel, and Katrin Hauspie, *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, rev. ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2003.), xvii; Hauspie, "The Idiolect of the Target Language in the Translation Process: A Study of the *Calques* in the LXX of Ezekiel," in *Septuaginta Deutsch: Erläuterungen und Kommentare*, ed. Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2012), 205-13.

<sup>94</sup>Jerome mentions a "Chaldean" version that he used as the basis of his Latin translation. Moore, *Judith*, 66-67, 95; Hanhart, *Text und Textgeschichte*, 137; Otzen, *Tobit and Judith*, 140.

<sup>95</sup>The following is a sampling of these features in Judith: Hebrew expressions: υἱοὶ Ἰσραηλ, ἰδοῦ; Hebrew idioms: ἀπὸ προσώπου, κατὰ πρόσωπον, and πρὸ προσώπου; Hebrew Syntactical Features: parataxis, resumptive pronouns, and periphrastic tenses.

<sup>96</sup>J. Joosten, "The Original Language and Historical Milieu of the Book of Judith," in *Meghillot: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls V-VI: A Festschrift for Devorah Dimant*, ed. Moshe Bar-Asher and Emanuel Tov (Haifa, Israel: University of Haifa Press, 2008), 159-76; Jeremy Corley, "Imitation of Septuagintal Narrative and Greek Historiography in the Portrait of Holofernes," in *A Pious Seductress: Studies in the Book of Judith*, ed. G. G. Xeravits (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 2012), 22-

although it may not be able to be definitively answer whether Judith is translation or composition Greek, the quality of the Greek style of Judith is certainly comparable to books within the Septuagint that are composition Greek, a point which highlights the author's competent use of the Greek language. For instance, the author of Judith employs features that mark composition Greek texts. Some of these features include a comparable distribution of the present and perfect indicative tense-form with undisputed composition Greek books within the Septuagint and the use of composition Greek grammatical features such as  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  as a structuring device.<sup>97</sup>

The rationale for selecting the book of Judith is two-fold. The first reason Judith has been selected is because the text is an extended historical narrative, containing enough text to provide a sufficient sampling to test the various theories concerning the variegated verb-forms within historical narrative.<sup>98</sup> In the book of Judith there are 649 aorist, 88 imperfect, 86 present, and 12 perfect indicative tense-forms.<sup>99</sup> The disparity between the use of the aorist and the imperfect indicative

---

54; Enslin and Zeitlin, *The Book of Judith*, 45; Corley, "Judith," in *The T & T Clark Companion to the Septuagint*, ed. J. K. Aitken (London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2015), 227; Claudia Rakel, *Judit—über Schönheit, Macht und Widerstand im Krieg: eine feministisch-intertextuelle Lektüre*, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 334 (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 2003), 36-40; Barbara Schmitz and Helmut Engel, *Judit*, Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament (Freiburg, Germany: Herder, 2014), 40-43. Nigel Turner makes a similar argument about the influence of the Septuagint on the New Testament Gospels. J. H. Moulton and Nigel Turner, *Style*, vol. 4 of *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1976), 15-19, 33, 36, 46-50, 56-60, 67-68. It must be noted that there are instances of older Septuagint scholars who argue that Judith is composition Greek. For example, Craven, *Artistry and Faith*, 5. Further there are more recent Septuagint scholars who argue that it is translation Greek. Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright, *A New English Translation of the Septuagint: And the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 443.).

<sup>97</sup>Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 31-36; Levinsohn, *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek*, 71-93; Herbert Weir Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, rev. ed. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1956), 644-45; Eleanor Dickey, *An Introduction to the Composition and Analysis of Greek Prose* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 64; The proper use of verb-forms has been used by Greek scholars as an indicator of composition Greek skill. That is, Nigel Turner argues that Mark's proper use of the tenses is an indication of a certain level of Greek composition skill. Moulton and Turner, *Style*, 27-28. Thus, in an analogous way the distribution of these verb-forms in Judith suggests Greek compositional competence (see appendices 3-4). See the following examples of the use of  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  in Jdt 2:10-13; 7:1, 4, 6.

<sup>98</sup>The book of Judith is 16 chapters long.

<sup>99</sup>See appendices 2-4.

tense-forms, as well as the limited occurrences of the perfect indicative tense-form, may appear to raise concern about the reliability of any analysis of the Greek text of Judith to evaluate largescale Greek grammar and syntax issues. While this is a fair concern, there are at least two reasons it is unfounded.

First, although the distribution of the aorist is more than 50 percent higher and the use of the imperfect is 50 percent lower than compositional books such as 2, 3, and 4 Maccabees,<sup>100</sup> this is not an indication of the disparity between translation Greek versus composition Greek. The distribution of the aorist and the imperfect indicative verb-forms are varied in both composition and translation Greek texts in the Septuagint.<sup>101</sup> For instance, composition Greek books like *Bel and the Dragon*, *Susanna*, *Sirach*, and *Wisdom of Solomon*<sup>102</sup> also use either the aorist indicative verb-form over 50 percent more and/or the imperfect indicative verb-form over 50 percent fewer times than 2, 3, and 4 Maccabees.<sup>103</sup> Furthermore, the distribution of the aorist and/or imperfect indicative verb-forms in translation Greek texts from the Septuagint such as *Zechariah*, *Ezra*, *2 Samuel*, *Numbers*, *Zephaniah*, and *Deuteronomy*<sup>104</sup> are comparable to 2, 3, and 4 Maccabees as well as other composition Greek texts.<sup>105</sup> Thus, although the proportion of the use of the aorist indicative tense-form in comparison to the imperfect indicative tense-form may be significant when compared to books like 2, 3, and 4 Maccabees, it is comparable to the use of these tense-forms within other composition Greek texts in the Septuagint.

---

<sup>100</sup>See appendix 2.

<sup>101</sup>Moulton and Turner, *Style*, 27-28.

<sup>102</sup>J. K. Aitken, ed., *The T & T Clark Companion to the Septuagint* (London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2015), 401-25; 555-67.

<sup>103</sup>See appendix 2.

<sup>104</sup>Aitken, *Companion to the Septuagint*, 58-85; 127-46; 195-202; 438-55.

<sup>105</sup>See appendix 2.

Second, the limited number of occurrences of the perfect indicative tense-form in Judith may appear to suggest that an analysis of these forms would be insufficient. However, this is not as it appears since the perfect is used very little throughout the Septuagint. For instance, the perfect indicative tense-form is used 1.31 times per 1,000 words in Judith, 1.11 in 1 Chronicles, 1.93 in 2 Maccabees and 1.87 times per 1,000 words in Wisdom of Solomon.<sup>106</sup> Thus, in light of the above data, the distribution of the indicative tense-forms in Judith is comparable to both composition and translation Greek books in the Septuagint.<sup>107</sup> This, in conjunction with the fact that Judith is an extended narrative, make this book a suitable text to analyze current proposals on the discourse function of the indicative tense-forms in narrative.

The second reason Judith has been selected is based upon the similarity between the Greek style in Judith and the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, texts which have been used to test verbal aspect theories.<sup>108</sup> In other words, in Judith as well as in Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, the following characteristics are noted among others: parataxis, resumptive pronouns, and periphrastic tenses.<sup>109</sup> This shared Greek style is also supported by Albert Pietersma and Benjamin Wright's description of Judith as "profoundly Hebraic prose style: terse, direct, measured, stately," and Nigel Turner's pervasive discussion of the Hebraic style of Matthew,

---

<sup>106</sup>See appendix 4.

<sup>107</sup>This is further supported by recent Septuagint scholars who have argued, in contrast to previous scholarship, that Judith is translation Greek.

<sup>108</sup>Wally V. Cirafesi, *Verbal Aspect in Synoptic Parallels: On the Method and Meaning of Divergent Tense-Form Usage in the Synoptic Passion Narratives*, Linguistic Biblical Studies 7 (Leiden: Brill, 2013); Rodney J. Decker, *Temporal Deixis of the Greek Verb in the Gospel of Mark with Reference to Verbal Aspect*, Studies in Biblical Greek 10 (New York: P. Lang, 2001).

<sup>109</sup>Moulton and Turner, *Style*, 11-79; Craven, *Artistry and Judith*, 5-6; Moore, *Judith*, 66-67. The following are examples from Judith and the Gospels: (1) Parataxis: e.g., Jdt 1:1-7, 6:14-21; Mark 1:6, 4:27, 8:34. (2) Resumptive pronouns: Jdt 1:16, 3:6; Matthew 3:12, 10:11. (3) Periphrastic tenses: Jdt 3:8 (ἦν δεδομένον), 4:3 (ἦσαν ἀναβεβηκότες), 10:7 (ἦν ἡλλοιωμένον); Luke 1:7 (προβεβηκότες . . ἦσαν), 2:51 (ἦν ὑποτασσόμενος), 9:45 (ἦν παρακεκαλυμμένον).

Mark, Luke, and John.<sup>110</sup>

Despite the shared Hebraic style between the Gospels and Judith, it must be noted that these features do not indicate lack of compositional skill on the part of these authors; rather, it is in an indication of the influence of the Septuagint.<sup>111</sup> Thus, the book of Judith is an ideal corpus to test the various proposals on the variegated Greek indicative verb-forms within historical narrative, since the style is similar to the New Testament texts in which much of recent research has been conducted, while distinct enough to avoid the impact from familiarity with the text upon the analysis of the data.<sup>112</sup> Nonetheless, despite the author's capable facility in the Greek language, since the corpus is limited in scope and there is debate concerning whether or not the book of Judith is translation Greek,<sup>113</sup> the findings of this research will be tempered in light of current discussions concerning idiolect, genre, and register.<sup>114</sup>

---

<sup>110</sup>Pietersma and Wright, *New English Translation of the Septuagint*, 443; Moulton and Turner, *Style*, 11-79.

<sup>111</sup>Moulton and Turner, *Style*, 15, 26-29; 39-43; 57-60; 67-68; Joosten, "The Original Language," 159-76; Corley, "Imitation of Septuagintal Narrative," 22-54; Corley, "Judith," 227; Morton Scott Enslin and Solomon Zeitlin, *The Book of Judith: Greek Text with an English Translation*, Jewish Apocryphal Literature 7 (Leiden: Brill, 1973), 45; Rakel, *Judit*, 36-40; Schmitz and Engel, *Judit*, 40-43.

<sup>112</sup>Familiarity with the texts is one of the reasons Peter Gentry insists that recent proposals must be tested outside of the New Testament corpus. Peter J. Gentry, "Aspect and the Greek Verb" (a course handout for Advanced Greek Grammar at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky, April 1, 2010), 5-6.

<sup>113</sup>Scholars who argue that Judith is translation Greek cite that Jerome mentions a "Chaldean" version that he used as the basis of his Latin translation. Moore, *Judith*, 66-67, 95; Hanhart, *Text und Textgeschichte*, 137; Benedikt Otzen, *Tobit and Judith: Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha* (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 140; Pietersma, and Wright, *New English Translation of the Septuagint*, 441. Scholars who argue that Judith is composition Greek include Joosten, "The Original Language," 159-76; Corley, "Imitation of Septuagintal Narrative," 22-54; Corley, "Judith," 227; Rakel, *Judit*, 36-40; Enslin and Zeitlin, *The Book of Judith*, 45; Schmitz and Engel, *Judit*, 40-43.

<sup>114</sup>For further discussion on idiolect and register see the following: Constantine R. Campbell, *Advances in the Study of Greek: New Insights for Reading the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2015), 134-47; Hauspie, "Idiolect," 205-13.

## CHAPTER 3

### THE DISCOURSE FUNCTION OF THE IMPERFECT AND AORIST INDICATIVE WITHIN THE BOOK OF JUDITH

The function of the aorist and the imperfect within narrative is generally agreed upon among all three approaches within the field of Greek grammar (Traditional Approach, Aspect Primary Approach, and Discourse Primary Approach). Each approach maintains that in narrative the aorist indicative tense-form primarily functions as the foundational verb-form which moves the narrative forward, while the imperfect indicative verb-form is largely used to add descriptive detail rather than move the narrative forward.<sup>1</sup> In other words, what these grammarians agree upon is also what literary scholars agree upon: “All stories move only in one direction, forward through time. If there is a knowable beginning, that’s where they

---

<sup>1</sup>Buist M. Fanning, *Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 247, 256; Fanning, “Greek Presents, Imperfects, and Aorists in the Synoptic Gospels,” in *Discourse Studies and Biblical Interpretation: A Festschrift in Honor of Stephen H. Levinsohn*, ed. Steven E. Runge (Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2011), 179-81; T. V. Evans, *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch: Natural Greek Usage and Hebrew Interference* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 200, 206, 214; K. L. McKay, *A New Syntax of the Verb in New Testament Greek: An Aspectual Approach* (New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 1994), 46; Stanley E. Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*, 2nd ed. (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 29, 34-35; Constantine R. Campbell, *Verbal Aspect, the Indicative Mood, and Narrative: Soundings in the Greek of the New Testament* (New York: Peter Lang, 2007), 78, 108, 115; Steven Runge, *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publisher, 2010), 129-30; Stephen H. Levinsohn, “Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative,” in *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*, ed. Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016), 167-71; Levinsohn, *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek: A Coursebook on the Information Structure of New Testament Greek*, 2nd ed. (Dallas: SIL International, 2000), 174; Kathleen Callow, *Discourse Considerations in Translating the Word of God* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974), 55-59; Patrick James, “Imperfects, Aorists, Historic Presents, and Perfects in John 11: A Narrative Test Case,” in *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*, ed. Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016), 204. For a helpful linguistic definition of Foreground and Background, see Robert A. Dooley and Levinsohn, *Analyzing Discourse: A Manual of Basic Concepts* (Dallas: SIL International, 2001), 79.

begin. If there is a knowable end, that's where they end."<sup>2</sup> While the presence of the aorist indicative verb-form in narrative does generally indicate the theme-line, it is important to note that scholars within the Discourse Primary group acknowledge there are exceptions to this. For instance, Stephen Levinsohn argues that when the aorist indicative verb-form is not moving the narrative, it will be marked.<sup>3</sup> That is, Levinsohn asserts that unless intentionally marked, the aorist describes mainline events, provides the foundation for the narrative, and thus moves it forward. Further, he argues that the imperfect—unless it is marked as functioning in another way—is used with non-events, giving descriptive or background information rather than moving it forward.<sup>4</sup>

The book of Judith is an ideal corpus to test the Discourse Primary theses on the discourse function of the aorist indicative and the imperfect indicative verbs, particularly that when marked, the aorist will not be communicating mainline information. The reason it is a helpful text is because there are 649 aorist indicative verbs and only 88 imperfect indicative verbs in Judith. This disparity in the distribution of the aorist and the imperfect indicative tense-forms suggests that the aorist is being used where the imperfect would be expected. The sheer number of aorists, according to the Discourse Primary proposal, indicates that the aorist in

---

<sup>2</sup>H. Porter Abbot, "Story, Plot, and Narration," in *The Cambridge Companion to Narrative*, ed. David Herman (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 39.

<sup>3</sup>Levinsohn, "Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative," 164-72; The following monographs and articles also acknowledge that there are primary and secondary events. Namely, there are mainline aorists and offline aorists. See Stephen H. Levinsohn, *Self-Instruction Materials on Narrative Discourse Analysis* (Dallas: SIL International, 2015), 66-83; Dooley and Levinsohn, *Analyzing Discourse*, 81; Roberta D. Huisman, "Angaataha Narrative Discourse," *Linguistics* 11, no. 110 (1973): 29-42; Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 131; Callow, *Discourse Considerations*, 55-59.

<sup>4</sup>Levinsohn, "Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative," 163-83. So Patrick James who states that in his study of Lysias 1 the imperfect verb-form was the "basic narrative tense," and the aorist was only used to "denote a single completed action." He goes on to argue that findings such as these suggest that the "tense" that predominates in any given passage is "basic." In other words, the "basic" or theme-line tense form is the form which the author chooses to use most often. James, "Imperfects, Aorists, Historic Presents, and Perfects in John 11," 203-4.

many of these instances is not functioning to mark the mainline of the narrative.<sup>5</sup> Thus, in light of the disparity between the distribution of the aorist and the imperfect indicative verb-forms, Stephen Levinsohn's work will be tested within the book of Judith since his essay addresses when aorist and imperfect indicative verb-forms do not perform the expected discourse function and also because it is a featured article in the representative work produced by the Discourse Primary group—Runge and Fresch's *The Greek Verb Revisited*.<sup>6</sup>

In Stephen Levinsohn's article "Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative," he addresses the topic of grounding, or the issue of what content is foreground/mainline and what is background/offline in narrative.<sup>7</sup> Levinsohn maintains that the imperfect verb-form is regularly used to convey background information. He purports that a default feature of the imperfect is to show that the action or event is ongoing as well as describe non-events in narrative, a position he arrives at based upon correlating aspect and grounding as opposed to equating them.<sup>8</sup> In other words, the correlation of these features in place of their equation allows the imperfect indicative tense-form to be classified as the default background

---

<sup>5</sup>Levinsohn, "Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative," 167-69, 172.

<sup>6</sup>Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch, eds., *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis* (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016), 184-220.

<sup>7</sup>Levinsohn, "Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative," 163-66; For a helpful discussion on the topic of foreground/mainline and background/offline, see Dooley and Levinsohn, *Analyzing Discourse*, 79-85. Dooley and Levinsohn state that the tendency within scholarship is to either define foreground in narrative based upon a "strict temporal sequence of telling" or to determine foreground based upon "notions of importance and salience." Dooley and Levinsohn, *Analyzing Discourse*, 81. For further discussion on the above two poles of interpretation concerning foreground in narrative, see Helen Aristar Dry, *Foregrounding: An Assessment. In Language in Context: Essays for Robert E. Longacre*, ed. Shin Ja J. Hwang and William R. Merrifield (Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics and the University of Texas at Arlington, 1992), 435-50; Sandra A. Thompson, "'Subordination' and Narrative Event Structure, in Coherence and Grounding in Discourse," in *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse*, ed. Russell S. Tomlin (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1987), 435-54. For a helpful introduction to Discourse Analysis, see James Paul Gee, *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*, 4th ed. (New York: Routledge, 2014).

<sup>8</sup>Levinsohn, "Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative," 164-68, 172, 179. See also Levinsohn, *Self-Instruction Materials*, 75-77; Fanning, "Greek Presents, Imperfects, and Aorists," 172-81.

verb-form in narrative without forcing every event described by the imperfect to be classified as background information.

Levinsohn emphasizes this point with his statement that in addition to communicating non-events, the imperfect can describe either a backgrounded or a foregrounded event.<sup>9</sup> He discusses at least two uses of the imperfect to communicate foreground information, considered in more detail below.<sup>10</sup> Further, although he does not discuss this in the current article, in his book *Self-Instruction Materials on Narrative Discourse Analysis* he comments that one common backgrounding feature is the use of a stative verb.<sup>11</sup> Thus, in summary, for Levinsohn and the Discourse Primary group, the most common function of the imperfect indicative verb-form is usually to provide background information. However, they carefully nuance this, suggesting instances in which it is used to communicate foreground information.

### Foregrounding Uses of the Imperfect

Below is a list of the instances which, according to Levinsohn, the imperfect will not be backgrounding information.

---

<sup>9</sup>Levinsohn, "Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative," 169-70, 172, 179; Stephen Levinsohn develops this proposal based upon the work of Vladimir Žegarac, who suggests that it is necessary to distinguish between "markedness" and "more relevant" when discussing how authors chose to portray an event. In other words, Žegarac states that a particular verb-form may be chosen based upon the need to express its relevance to the reader. That is, depending on the context, particular verb-forms are selected based upon their ability to convey the action in a way that maximizes its relevance to the reader. Vladimir Žegarac, "Relevance Theory and the Meaning of the English Progressive," *University College London Working Papers in Linguistics* 1 (1989): 27-29. For other scholars who hold this position, see Gustavo Martin-Ascencio, *Transitivity-Based Foregrounding in the Acts of the Apostles: A Functional-Grammatical Approach to the Lukan Perspective* (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 62-63; Shin Ja J. Hwang, "Foreground Information in Narrative," *Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 9 (1990): 78-82; and James, "Imperfects, Aorists, Historic Presents, and Perfects," 203-4.

<sup>10</sup>Levinsohn, "Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative," 168-70. See also Levinsohn, *Self-Instruction Materials*, 75-77. As discussed in the history of research, Buist Fanning also states that the imperfect can convey mainline events, and he offers some helpful criteria for determining when an imperfect is used this way. Fanning, "Greek Presents, Imperfects, and Aorists," 173-74.

<sup>11</sup>Levinsohn, *Self-Instruction Materials*, 75; Fanning also suggests this in his comment that verbs which convey broad, characteristic actions or traits provide background information. Fanning, "Greek Presents, Imperfects, and Aorists," 180. See also Dooley and Levinsohn, *Analyzing Discourse*, 81.

1. To Incite or Provoke Conversational Exchange: The imperfect is used in a context in which the imperfect is not perceived as “ongoing at the point of reference,” rather the imperfect is used to cause the dialogue exchange of the that particular section.<sup>12</sup>
2. To Communicate Imperfective Aspect: The imperfect is used because the author desires to communicate that the event is ongoing, and the imperfect is the best form to communicate this type of action.<sup>13</sup> This point is further corroborated in Teresa Bridgeman’s article “Time and Space,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Narrative*, where she states, “The treatment of duration is an important way of foregrounding certain events and reducing the status of others.”<sup>14</sup>

Stephen Levinsohn’s discussion of the aorist indicative is largely based on the acknowledgment that foreground information largely consists of events, and background information is generally composed of non-events.<sup>15</sup> Moreover, he argues that on account of narratives consisting of events, any verb-form that depicts an event is expected to communicate foreground (thematic) information, unless it is marked with a backgrounding device.<sup>16</sup> In other words, according to this schema, since the aorist indicative verb-form is the verb most commonly used to describe events, when occurring in narrative the expectation is that it will communicate the foreground information unless marked otherwise.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup>Levinsohn, “Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative,” 169-70.

<sup>13</sup>Levinsohn, “Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative,” 168. Fanning helpfully adds the following criteria for determining if an imperfect is communicating mainline or offline information: (1) If an imperfect is used to convey broad, characteristic actions or traits it is offline. (2) If an imperfect is used to reference a specific, narrow situation in context, it slows the story down and gives a more immediate, vivid description of a mainline event. Fanning, “Greek Presents, Imperfects, and Aorists,” 180.

<sup>14</sup>Teresa Bridgeman, “Time and Space,” in *Cambridge Companion to Narrative*, Cambridge Companions to Literature, ed. David Herman (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 58.

<sup>15</sup>Levinsohn, “Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative,” 164. The following scholars also suggest this: Callow, *Discourse Considerations*, 52-54; Paul J. Hopper, “Aspect and Foregrounding in Discourse,” in *Syntax and Semantics*, ed. Talmy Givón (New York: Academic Press, 1979), 213.

<sup>16</sup>Levinsohn, “Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative,” 164. See also Callow, *Discourse Considerations*, 52-53.

<sup>17</sup>My analysis of the function of the aorists indicative verbs in Judith was based upon Levinsohn’s assertion that unless marked otherwise, the aorist indicative verb-forms should be categorized as mainline. In other words, I categorized all of the aorists indicative verbs as mainline, and I did not change the category of the aorist from mainline to offline unless it matched one of the offline indicators identified by Levinsohn. For sake of reference I have provided the backgrounding events and markers. Backgrounding Events: (1) Preliminary events that occur prior to the theme-line events (often marked as past or perfect), (2) Resulting events that occur after the theme-line events (often marked as perfect or as future), (3) Reported speeches that lead to theme-line events

As stated above, Levinsohn does not discuss the markers indicating that an aorist is not communicating foreground information, but he does cite his work on narrative discourse in which these markers are identified.<sup>18</sup> This aspect of Levinsohn's thesis is particularly relevant in light of the use of the aorist in the book of Judith. In his book *Self-Instruction Materials on Narrative Discourse Analysis* Levinsohn states that although non-events are automatically considered background information, events are not always conveying one type of information. That is, he contends that events can be either foreground events or secondary events; they can communicate either foreground (theme-line) information or backgrounded information.<sup>19</sup> Further, he argues that an event is a foreground event unless it is

---

Backgrounding Markers: Particular Verbal Forms—(1) A past tense which implies 'prior to the point of reference' (e.g., it is similar to the function of an English pluperfect, and it can be accompanied with particles such as "already"), (2) A past tense which implies a state, (3) Spacers: the insertion of a spacer (particle) to separate background and foreground information (Levinsohn lists the following circumstances where a spacer regularly occurs: (a) Topic—spacer—comment, (b) Point of departure—spacer—Rest of the sentence, (c) Less important information—spacer—more important information, (d) Focus/more important information—spacer—presuppositions/less important information), (4) Specific Semantic/Lexical Verb Types: (a) state (e.g., was, know, have), (b) achievement (e.g., recognize, find, die), (c) accomplishment (e.g., make something, paint a picture), (d) activity (e.g., run, drive a car).

<sup>18</sup>Levinsohn, *Self-Instruction Materials*, 66-83. For a helpful discussion on the various views on discourse markers and the theory behind them, see Deborah Schiffrin, "Discourse Markers: Language, Meaning, and Context," in *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, ed. Deborah Schiffrin, Deborah Tannen, and Heidi E. Hamilton (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2003), 54-75; M. A. K. Halliday and Ruqaiya Hasan's work on Cohesion in English provides a helpful corollary to the discussion on discourse markers by Levinsohn, Schiffrin, and others. M. A. K. Halliday and Ruqaiya Hasan, *Cohesion in English* (New York: Routledge, 2013), 7-9. That is, Halliday and Ruqaiya's study of the "non-structural text-forming relations" further support the notion of discourse markers which are not based solely upon particular verb-forms but rather through particles, semantics, lexical indicators, etc. The following authors also discuss the distinguishing factors between mainline information and offline information: Robert E. Longacre, *The Grammar of Discourse*, 2nd ed. (New York: Plenum Press, 1996), 21; Hopper, "Aspect and Foregrounding in Discourse," 214-41; H. A. Gleason Jr., "Contrastive Analysis in Discourse Structure," in *Report of the Nineteenth Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies*, ed. James E. Alatis (Georgetown, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1968), 39-64; Joseph E. Grimes, *The Thread of Discourse*, Technical Report No. 1, National Science Foundation Grant GS-3180 (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, 1972).

<sup>19</sup>Levinsohn, "Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative," 163-83. See Levinsohn, *Self-Instruction Materials* for a detailed discussion of how one determines if an event is foreground or background. Levinsohn, *Self-Instruction Materials*, 70. The following sources also support Levinsohn's statement that there are mainline and offline events. Kathleen Callow argues events are only mainline if they are within the "event series" of the narrative. Callow, *Discourse Considerations*, 55-59. Robert Longacre argues for what he terms "an etic salience scheme for narrative discourse." In this scheme, he identifies as many as three story lines which he distinguishes based upon morphosyntactic and discourse structure concerns. Longacre, *The Grammar of Discourse*, 27. For further discussion on the various ways scholars have identified foreground and background in narrative, see Dry, *Foregrounding*, 435-50.

marked as a backgrounded (or not theme-line) event. In his discussion of secondary events he identifies three types of backgrounding events and three types of backgrounding devices which are used to create these events. In other words, there are three types of events which are secondary events and at least three devices which mark these events as secondary.<sup>20</sup> For the sake of reference, the above backgrounding events and markers are outlined below:

### **Backgrounding Events**

1. Preliminary events that occur prior to the theme-line events (often marked as past or perfect)
2. Resulting events that occur after the theme-line events (often marked as perfect or as future)
3. Reported speeches that lead to theme-line events<sup>21</sup>

### **Backgrounding Markers**

1. Particular Verbal Forms: (1) A past tense which implies ‘prior to the point of reference’ (e.g., it is similar to the function of an English pluperfect, and it can be accompanied with particles—e.g., “already”); (2) A past tense which implies a state
2. Spacers: the insertion of a spacer (particle) to separate background and foreground information.<sup>22</sup> Levinsohn lists the following circumstances where a spacer regularly occurs: (1) Topic—spacer—comment; (2) Point of departure—spacer—Rest of the sentence; (3) Less important information—spacer—more important information; (4) Focus/more important information—spacer—presuppositions/less important information
3. Specific Semantic/Lexical Verb Types: (1) State (e.g., was, know, have); (2) Achievement (e.g., recognize, find, die); (3) Accomplishment (e.g., make something, paint a picture); (4) Activity (e.g., run, drive a car)

---

<sup>20</sup>Levinsohn, *Self-Instruction Materials*, 70-74.

<sup>21</sup>Levinsohn states that “the most overt way of recognizing when reported speeches are intermediate steps en route to later speeches or non-speech events is when perfective aspect is used to present the theme-line events, whereas the aspect of the verb of the speech orienters is imperfective.” Levinsohn, *Self-Instruction Materials*, 110-11. See also Malcolm Coulthard, *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*, Applied Linguistics and Language Study (London: Longman, 1985), 70.

<sup>22</sup>In his article “Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative” Levinsohn states that when an aorist indicative verb-form is preceded by γάρ it will not be presenting foreground information in narrative. Levinsohn, “Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative,” 169-71.

In the following section, the Discourse Primary proposal on the function of the imperfect and aorist indicative verb-forms as set forth in Stephen Levinsohn's article will be tested within the book of Judith. Namely, his thesis—the aorist is used to describe mainline events (unless intentionally marked), provides the foundation for the narrative, and moves it forward, while the imperfect is used with non-events, giving descriptive or background information, rather than moving it forward (unless intentionally marked)—will be evaluated in light of the usage of these verb tense-forms within the book of Judith. A particular focus will be given to the three types of backgrounding markers Levinsohn identifies.

### **The Imperfect Indicative in Judith**

The imperfect, as discussed above, is regularly used to convey background information. Put another way, the function of the imperfect is used to show that the action or event is a non-mainline event.<sup>23</sup> Further, on account of Levinsohn correlating aspect and grounding, he argues that an imperfect indicative verb can describe either a backgrounded or a foregrounded event in addition to non-events.<sup>24</sup> He discusses at least two uses of the imperfect indicative verb-form to communicate foreground information: (1) To incite or provoke conversational exchange: The imperfect is used in a context in which the imperfect is not perceived as “ongoing at the point of reference,” but rather the imperfect is used to introduce the dialogue exchange of the that particular section.<sup>25</sup> (2) To communicate imperfective aspect: The imperfect is used because the author desires to communicate that the event is ongoing, and the imperfect is the best form to communicate this.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup>Levinsohn, “Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative,” 168, 172, 179.

<sup>24</sup>Levinsohn, “Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative,” 164-70, 172, 179.

<sup>25</sup>Levinsohn, “Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative,” 169-70. See also Levinsohn, *Self-Instruction Materials*, 75-77.

<sup>26</sup>Levinsohn, “Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative,” 168. See also Levinsohn, *Self-*

The imperfect occurs 88 times in Judith, and of these 88 instances, 27 appear to convey mainline information. That is, in 30 percent of the instances in which the imperfect indicative verb-form is used in Judith, it may be communicating mainline information as opposed to the expected background information.<sup>27</sup> Further, within the book of Judith of those 27 instances in which the imperfect is communicating theme-line information, all of them support the second category suggested by Levinsohn—to communicate imperfective aspect. That is, these imperfects appear to be chosen not because the author desires to communicate background information, but because he desires this mainline event to have imperfective aspect, and the imperfect verb-form is the choice form for this aspect in narrative. Thus, in the following section, since the default function of the imperfect is to convey offline actions or events, only the instances in which the imperfect is being used to describe mainline actions or events will be analyzed.

### To Communicate Imperfective Aspect

The imperfect is used because the author desires to communicate that the event is ongoing, and the imperfect is the best form to communicate this.<sup>28</sup>

#### Judith 4:14-15

καὶ Ἰωακὶμ ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ μέγας καὶ πάντες οἱ παρεστηκότες ἐνώπιον κυρίου ἱερεῖς καὶ οἱ

---

*Instruction Materials*, 75-77.

<sup>27</sup>The following verses contain at least one imperfect verb-form in which a mainline action or event is communicated: Jdt 4:14-15; 6:12-13; 7:5, 21-22; 10:10-11, 19; 12:7-9, 16; 14:8; 15:2, 13-14; 16:12.

<sup>28</sup>Levinsohn, “Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative,” 168. See also Levinsohn, *Self-Instruction Materials*, 75-77. Stephen Levinsohn develops this proposal based upon the work of Vladimir Žegarac, who suggests that it is necessary to distinguish between “markedness” and “more relevant” when discussing how authors chose to portray an event. In other words, Žegarac states that a particular verb-form may be chosen based upon the need to express its relevance to the reader. That is, depending on the context, particular verb-forms are selected based upon their ability to convey the action in a way that maximizes its relevance to the reader. Žegarac, “Relevance Theory,” 27-29. In this section, only a sample of the instances in which the imperfect indicative verb-forms which support this category will be analyzed. I have listed all of the instances which support this category for further reference: Jdt 4:14-15; 6:12-13; 7:5, 21-22; 10:10-11, 19; 12:7-9, 16; 14:8; 15:2, 13-14; 16:12.

λειτουργοῦντες κυρίῳ σάκκους περιεζωσμένοι τὰς ὀσφύας αὐτῶν προσέφερον\* τὴν ὀλοκαύτωσιν τοῦ ἐνδελειχισμοῦ καὶ τὰς εὐχὰς καὶ τὰ ἐκούσια δόματα τοῦ λαοῦ, καὶ ἦν σποδὸς ἐπὶ τὰς κιθάραις αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐβόων\* πρὸς κύριον ἐκ πάσης δυνάμεως εἰς ἀγαθὸν ἐπισκέψασθαι πᾶν οἶκον Ἰσραηλ.

And Ioakeim the great priest and all those who attend the Lord, priests and ministers of the Lord, their waists girt with sackcloth, offered\* the perpetual whole burnt offering and the vows and the voluntary gifts of the people. And there were ashes upon their turbans, and with all their might they were calling upon\* the Lord to look after the entire house of Israel for good.

In Judith 4:14-15 the author uses two imperfect forms—*προσέφερον*, *ἐβόων*—as he describes priests making sacrifices and praying to the Lord after hearing about all that Olophernes had done to the nations.<sup>29</sup> As noted above, the expected function when the verb moves from the aorist indicative to the imperfect indicative—among all three approaches within the field of Greek grammar<sup>30</sup>—is that the narrative will move from mainline information to offline information. The reason is that in narrative, the aorist indicative verb-form primarily functions as the foundational verb-form which moves the narrative forward, whereas the imperfect indicative verb-form is largely used to add descriptive detail rather than move the narrative forward.<sup>31</sup> However, as delimited above in Levinsohn’s article, “Verb, Grounding, and Narrative,” he suggests that there are uses of the imperfect in which the information it conveys is not intended to be offline or backgrounded, rather the author intends for this information to be mainline information.<sup>32</sup>

In Judith 4:14-15 the author appears to be using the imperfect not to convey background information, but rather mainline content. Specifically, these

---

<sup>29</sup>See Jdt 4:1.

<sup>30</sup>Traditional Approach, Aspect Primary Approach, Discourse Primary Approach.

<sup>31</sup>Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 247, 256; Fanning, “Greek Presents, Imperfects, and Aorists,” 179-81; Evans, *Verbal Syntax*, 200, 206, 214; McKay, *A New Syntax*, 46; Porter, *Idioms*, 29, 34, 35; Campbell, *Verbal Aspect*, 78, 108, 115; Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 129-30; Levinsohn, “Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative,” 167-71; Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 174; Callow, *Discourse Considerations*, 55-59; James, “Imperfects, Aorists, Historic Presents, Perfects,” 204. For a helpful linguistic definition of foreground and background, see Dooley and Levinsohn, *Analyzing Discourse*, 79.

<sup>32</sup>Levinsohn, “Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative,” 168. See also Levinsohn, *Self-Instruction Materials*, 75-77; Žegarac, “Relevance Theory,” 27-29.

forms appear to support Levinsohn’s second category—to communicate imperfective aspect. In this category, the imperfect is used because the author desires to communicate that the event is ongoing, and the imperfect is the best form to communicate this.<sup>33</sup>

The first reason is because both *προσέφερον* and *ἐβόων* are part of the mainline events which describe the response of the sons of Israel to the news of Olophernes’s destruction of the cities around them, a response that is starkly different than that of their neighbors inhabiting the coast—Sidon and Tyre—and Sour, Okina, and Lemnaan.<sup>34</sup> That is, in Judith 2:28-3:4 the response of these people to the news of Olophernes is recorded. The difference between their response and the sons of Israel to this news illustrates the disparity between these nations and the sons of Israel. Namely, this group immediately surrenders to the army of Nabouchodnosor, handing-over all their possessions and people and placing their trust in the mercy of Nabouchodnosor. On the other hand, the people of Israel turn to the Lord for mercy and prepare for battle on account of their concern for the temple and city of God. Thus, unlike the nations around them, they do not turn to Nabouchodnosor, but they turn to God. The use of the imperfect to describe the activity of the priests in the temple fits well with the emphasis of this section, since it allows the author to bring emphasis upon the ongoing nature of these actions.

The second reason *προσέφερον* and *ἐβόων* in Judith 4:14-15 fit with Levinsohn’s second category of imperfects communicating mainline information—to communicate imperfect aspect—is because in verse 13 this event lasted for many

---

<sup>33</sup>Levinsohn, “Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative,” 168. See also Levinsohn, *Self-Instruction Materials*, 75-77.

<sup>34</sup>The following authors refer to the difference in the response of the sons of Israel to the threat of Olophernes in comparison to their neighbors: Morton S. Enslin and Solomon Zeitlin, *The Book of Judith, Greek Text with an English Translation* (Leiden: Brill, 1973), 79; Carey A. Moore, *Judith: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, The Anchor Bible 40 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985), 149.

days. In Judith 4:13 the author states that throughout all of Judea and Jerusalem the people were fasting and praying. Further, the author's use of ἐνδελεχισμοῦ to modify δλοκαύτωσιν, the object of προσέφερον, also supports the suggestion that the author desires for the reader to see this as an ongoing activity, since ἐνδελεχισμοῦ is used in the Septuagint to describe perpetual or continual sacrifices.<sup>35</sup> The importance of the continuation of these actions is also noted by Toni Craven, who remarks, “the explosion of acts of religious supplication . . . parallels the explosion of military acts of aggression (by the Assyrians) . . . they fast; they offer burnt offerings and vows as freewill gifts; they put ashes on their heads and cry continually to God. In short, they hope by these acts to escape Assyrian domination.”<sup>36</sup> In other words, the use of the imperfect in order to carry these mainline events with imperfective aspect fits very well with the importance of these religious acts. Therefore, since the thematic importance of these events suggest that these verbs are not intended to provide background information, and since the context suggest that the author is emphasizing the ongoing nature of these events, it appears as though Levinsohn's second category of mainline imperfects is supported in Judith 4:14-15.<sup>37</sup>

### Judith 7:21-22

καὶ οἱ λάκκοι ἐξεκενοῦντο,\* καὶ οὐκ εἶχον\* πιεῖν εἰς πλησμονὴν ὕδωρ ἡμέραν μίαν, ὅτι ἐν μέτρῳ ἐδίδοσαν\* αὐτοῖς πιεῖν. καὶ ἠθύμησεν τὰ νήπια αὐτῶν, καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες καὶ οἱ νεανίσκοι ἐξέλιπον ἀπὸ τῆς δίψης καὶ ἔπιπτον\* ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις τῆς πόλεως καὶ ἐν ταῖς διόδοις τῶν πυλῶν, καὶ οὐκ ἦν κραταίωσις ἔτι ἐν αὐτοῖς.

<sup>35</sup>Henry George Liddell et al., *A Greek-English Lexicon*. rev. and augm. ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 558; Frederick W. Danker et al., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 3rd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 332. See Exod 29:38; 30:8; Num 28:3.

<sup>36</sup>Toni Craven, *Artistry and Faith in the Book of Judith*: Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983), 81-82. See also Helen Efthimiadis-Keith, *The Enemy Is Within: A Jungian Psychoanalytic Approach to the Book of Judith*, Biblical Interpretation Series 67 (Boston: Brill Academic, 2004), 182-83.

<sup>37</sup>Second Category: To communicate imperfective aspect, the imperfect is used because the author desires to communicate that the event is ongoing and the imperfect is the best form to communicate this. Levinsohn, “Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative,” 168. See also Levinsohn, *Self-Instruction Materials*, 75-77.

and the cisterns were emptied out,\* and they were unable\* to drink their fill of water for a single day, for they were giving\* them to drink in measure. And their infants lost heart, and the women and the young men failed from thirst, and they were falling\* in the streets of the city and in the passages of the gates, and there was no longer strength in them.

In Judith 7:21-22 the author uses four imperfect forms—ἐξεκενοῦντο, εἶχον, ἐδίδοσαν, ἐπιπτον—to describe the situation after Olophernes sieges the city.<sup>38</sup> In Judith 7:21-22 the author shifts from the default verb-form for mainline events in narrative—using the aorist to narrate how Olophernes and his mercenary soldiers had sieged Baityloua for over 34 days—to the use of the imperfect to describe the situation in Baityloua.<sup>39</sup> This shift from the aorist to the imperfect, while typically an indicator of moving from mainline information to offline information,<sup>40</sup> is not indicating offline information in this text because it is pivotal to the development of the narrative.<sup>41</sup> As Carey A. Moore states in the Anchor Bible Commentary on Judith, “The situation in Bethulia (Baityloua) was desperate. The town that had started out so bravely in its opposition to Holofernes has seen its courage, along with its water, dry up. The hopelessness of the people . . . will be a perfect foil for Judith’s radiant hope and faith. . . .”<sup>42</sup> In other words, this scene marks the climax of the crecendo in the story: will the people of Baityloua remain committed to their faith in the one true God, or will they surrender as the nations around them have done?

---

<sup>38</sup>See Jdt 7:8-18.

<sup>39</sup>Levinsohn, “Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative,” 164. See also Callow, *Translating the Word of God*, 52-53.

<sup>40</sup>Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 247, 256; Fanning, “Greek Presents, Imperfects, and Aorists,” 179-81; Evans, *Verbal Syntax*, 200, 206, 214; McKay, *A New Syntax*, 46; Porter, *Idioms*, 29, 34, 35; Campbell, *Verbal Aspect*, 78, 108, 115; Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 129-30; Levinsohn, “Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative,” 167-71; Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 174; Callow, *Discourse Considerations*, 55-59; James, “Imperfects, Aorists, Historic Presents, Perfects,” 204. For a helpful linguistic definition of foreground and background, see Dooley and Levinsohn, *Analyzing Discourse*, 79.

<sup>41</sup>Moore, *Judith*, 175. See also Craven, *Artistry and Judith*, 83.

<sup>42</sup>Moore, *Judith*, 175.

There are at least two instances in which the situation described in Judith 7:21-22 is referenced at crucial points in the narrative. For example, in Judith 8:9 it is because Judith hears about the malicious words of the people of Baityloua that she enters the narrative. Further in Judith 11:12, Judith references this situation as the reason she came to him, again highlighting the importance of the events in Judith 7:21-22 to the development of the narrative. In other words, this scene in the narrative in which the people of Baityloua are completely desperate is not dispensable information, rather it is critical for the development of the narrative. Thus, the imperfects in Judith 7:21-22 appear to be communicating mainline information.

Levinsohn's first of two suggested scenarios in which an imperfect may be used to communicate mainline information—to incite or provoke conversational exchange<sup>43</sup>—does not appear to be a possibility in this text. That is, it does not fit within the context of Judith 7:21-22, since the imperfect verb-forms do not lead to a dialogue. Rather, the significance of these imperfects appears to fit best with Levinsohn's second category—to communicate imperfective aspect<sup>44</sup>—since these events appear to describe an ongoing situation that is approaching the point of complete ruin. For instance, in verse 21 the author modulates the statement that the “cisterns were emptied (ἐξέκενοῦντο)” with two more imperfects—εἶχον, ἐδίδοσαν—stating that as a result of this the leaders ration the water and consequently they do not have enough to drink.

This suggests that the imperfect form ἐξέκενοῦντο is communicating more of the idea of becoming empty, particularly in light of the imperfect nature of the

---

<sup>43</sup>Levinsohn, “Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative,” 169-70. See also Levinsohn, *Self-Instruction Materials*, 75-77.

<sup>44</sup>Levinsohn, “Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative,” 168. See also Levinsohn, *Self-Instruction Materials*, 75-77.

verbs—εἶχον, ἐδίδοσαν—with which the author qualifies this statement.<sup>45</sup> Moreover, the fact that there is still enough water to ration to an entire city indicates that the cistern is not completely empty since any quantity of water large enough to be rationed to an entire city would have been kept in a cistern.<sup>46</sup> Moreover, the imperfect in 7:22 (ἐπιπτον) further suggests that the author intended to describe these events in such a way that the ongoing nature of their suffering would be emphasized. The significance of this event being portrayed with imperfective aspect is supported by Helen Efthimiadis-Keith’s observation that although the people of Baityloua begin fervent in their faith and trust in God through the process of the siege by Olophernes, they move from pious faith (6:16-20) to betrayal and idolatry (7:23-28).<sup>47</sup> Thus, because this event is pivotal to the development of the narrative, the author appears to be using the imperfects in Judith 7:21-22 not to convey background information, but rather mainline content. Specifically, these forms appear to support Levinsohn’s second category.<sup>48</sup>

### Judith 10:10-11

καὶ ἐποίησαν οὕτως. καὶ ἐξῆλθεν Ιουδιθ, αὐτὴ καὶ ἡ παιδίσκη αὐτῆς μετ’ αὐτῆς· ἀπεσκοπέουον\* δὲ αὐτὴν οἱ ἄνδρες τῆς πόλεως ἕως οὗ κατέβη τὸ ὄρος, ἕως διῆλθεν τὸν αὐλώνα καὶ οὐκέτι ἐθεώρουον\* αὐτὴν. καὶ ἐπορεύοντο\* ἐν τῷ αὐλώνι εἰς εὐθείαν, καὶ συνήντησεν αὐτῇ προφυλακὴ τῶν Ἀσσυρίων.

And so they did. And Ioudith set forth, she and her slave girl with her. The men

<sup>45</sup>Morton Enslin and Solomon Zeitlin also emphasize that the water was not completely empty but was limited. Enslin and Zeitlin, *The Book of Judith*, 107.

<sup>46</sup>Philip J. King and Lawrence E Stager, *Life in Biblical Israel* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 210-23; Shimon Gibson and David M. Jacobson, *Below the Temple Mount in Jerusalem: A Sourcebook on the Cisterns, Subterranean Chambers and Conduits of the Ḥaram Al-Sharif*, Bar International Series 637 (Oxford: Tempus Reparatum, 1996), 1-7.

<sup>47</sup>Efthimiadis-Keith, *The Enemy Is Within*, 193-97; Moore, *Judith*, 175; Craven, *Artistry and Judith*, 83; Benedikt Otzen, *Tobit and Judith*, Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 101-2.

<sup>48</sup>Second Category: To communicate imperfective aspect, the imperfect is used because the author desires to express that the event is ongoing and the imperfect is the best form to communicate this. Levinsohn, “Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative,” 168. See also Levinsohn, *Self-Instruction Materials*, 75-77.

of the city continued watching\* her until she went down the mountain, until she passed through the ravine and they no longer saw\* her. And they continued going\* straight ahead in the ravine, and the advance guard of the Assyrians met her.

In Judith 10:10-11 the author uses the following imperfect verb-forms—ἀπεσκόπευον, ἐθεώρουν, ἐπορεύοντο—to describe the scene in which Judith and her slave girl depart from Baityloua to the camp of Olophernes.<sup>49</sup> In Judith 10:1 the author begins a new scene. She shifts from the report of her prayer to God—a prayer which recounts her request that God deliver his people through her cunning and deceitful plan—to the account of Judith’s preparation to leave Baityloua and journey down to the camp of Olophernes.<sup>50</sup>

In this section, the default verb-form is almost exclusively utilized until Judith 10:10-11, at which point the author employs three imperfect verb-forms to describe Judith’s departure from the gates of Baityloua through the valley to the guards of the Assyrians—even using the imperfect to describe how the men of Baityloua were watching Judith until they could no longer see her. The author’s choice to move from the aorist to the imperfect forces one to consider its intent. That is, is this shift in tense form selected to indicate movement from mainline information to offline information—the default function of the imperfect?<sup>51</sup> While this shift is most commonly a result of the author moving from mainline information to background information, in this instance the significance of the content once again seems to indicate that the above imperfects in Judith 10:10-11 support Stephen

---

<sup>49</sup>See Jdt 10:1-11.

<sup>50</sup>See Jdt 9:1-14. Efthimiadis-Keith remarks concerning this deception that it is similar to the deception that Simeon used with Schechemites, who in a similar fashion to Judith’s charge against the Assyrians, were liable for their sexual misconduct with virgin women. Efthimiadis-Keith, *The Enemy Is Within*, 228-29.

<sup>51</sup>Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 247, 256; Fanning, “Greek Presents, Imperfects, and Aorists,” 179-81; Evans, *Verbal Syntax*, 200, 206, 214; McKay, *A New Syntax*, 46; Porter, *Idioms*, 29, 34, 35; Campbell, *Verbal Aspect*, 78, 108, 115; Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 129-30; Levinsohn, “Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative,” 167-71; Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 174; Callow, *Discourse Considerations*, 55-59; James, “Imperfects, Aorists, Historic Presents, Perfects,” 204. For a helpful linguistic definition of foreground and background, see Dooley and Levinsohn, *Analyzing Discourse*, 79.

Levinsohn's thesis concerning imperfects which communicate mainline information. More specifically, these imperfects can be placed within Levinsohn's second category—to communicate imperfective aspect.<sup>52</sup> In other words, the author selects the imperfect verb-form because he wants to emphasize the ongoing nature of the action.

Before seeking to suggest a rationale for the author's choice to express this mainline event as ongoing, it is necessary to demonstrate the importance of this event to the narrative of Judith. One possible indicator of the importance of this scene is suggested by the fact that this location is highlighted both when Judith leaves to face Olophernes and when she returns in victory in Judith 13:10. That is, this mountain and ravine appear to represent the bridge between life and death—Judith leaves a widow and returns a heroine. Thus, Judith's faith and God's faithfulness are symbolized in Judith's walk through this terrain. This is also supported by Toni Craven's structural analysis of Judith, in which she places Judith 10:11 at the beginning of the section which she identifies as the "heart of the story"—the section (10:11-13:10) which recounts Judith's departure from Baityloua with a bag of provisions, and her return with a bag containing the head of Olophernes.<sup>53</sup>

Another indicator of the importance of this scene is the role it plays in highlighting the distinction between the sons of Israel and the nations "inhabiting the coast."<sup>54</sup> That is, in Judith 2:28-3:4 the narrator recounts the response of the inhabitants of the coast who out of fear send an envoy to plead with Olophernes for

---

<sup>52</sup>Levinsohn, "Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative," 168. See also Levinsohn, *Self-Instruction Materials*, 75-77. Levinsohn states that the imperfect in this instance is used because the author desires to communicate that the event is ongoing, rather than to communicate offline information. In other words, the imperfect is chosen because it is the best form to communicate this aspect in narrative.

<sup>53</sup>Craven, *Artistry and Faith*, 94.

<sup>54</sup>Jdt 2:28-3:4.

peace, surrendering both their people and possessions. However, in this text the envoy of the sons of Israel, Judith and her maid servant, come not in fear but in faith, and this envoy does not come for peace but for victory over the enemy of God's people. This is also supported by Morton Enslin's and Solomon Zeitlin's comment concerning the use of εὐθείαν to modify ἐπορεύοντο: it is used to emphasize Judith's unwaivering intention to face Olophernes. That is, they state that Judith and her maid servant "were not trying to avoid the enemy but rather to meet them; so, they took the regular path through the valley."<sup>55</sup> Thus, in light of the significance of this event to the narrative of Judith, it is unlikely that the author selected imperfect indicative verb-forms in order to background this event. Rather, as stated above, this text appears to support Levinsohn's second category of imperfects which communicate mainline information—imperfects are chosen because the author wishes to communicate the theme-line events or actions with imperfective aspect.

The evidence to support this use of the imperfect is that the context surrounding ἀπεσκόπευον, ἐθεώρουν, and ἐπορεύοντο suggests that describing these events with verb-forms which describe the event as ongoing highlights the significance of Judith's decision to willingly go into the camp of Olophernes.<sup>56</sup> That is, the fact that the author moves from the aorist to the imperfect to describe the way the men watched (ἀπεσκόπευον) and marveled (ἐθεώρουν) at Judith as she left Baityloua further highlights the significance of this event. This point is highlighted by Enslin's and Zeitlin's observation that the "imperfect tense heightens the picture."<sup>57</sup> Further, this is also noted by Carey Moore, who states that the

---

<sup>55</sup>Enslin and Zeitlin, *The Book of Judith*, 130.

<sup>56</sup>It is interesting to note that when Judith returns with the head of Olophernes the men are once again described as marveling at the sight of Judith (Jdt 13:1-20).

<sup>57</sup>Enslin and Zeitlin, *The Book of Judith*, 130; Moore, *Judith*, 202; Craven, *Artistry and Faith*, 94.

description of Judith's journey from Baiytloua to the camp of Olophernes is reminiscent of cinematic techniques in which the author makes a "very skillfull transition of scenes."<sup>58</sup> In other words, what Carey Moore, Morton Enslin, Solomon Zeitlin, and Toni Craven seem to be noticing from a literary standpoint is similar to what Levinsohn is suggesting a grammatical standpoint. In Judith 10:10-11 the author once again appears to be using the imperfect in order to convey mainline information with imperfective aspect, rather than using the imperfect to introduce background information to the preceding events.<sup>59</sup>

### The Aorist Indicative in Judith

Having tested Stephen Levinsohn's thesis concerning the function of the imperfect in narrative, it is now appropriate to examine his thesis on the function of the aorist in narrative. As detailed above, according to Stephen Levinsohn, mainline information in Greek narratives is made up largely of events, and background information is generally composed of non-events.<sup>60</sup> He contends that in narrative all verb-forms which depict an event are expected to be presenting mainline (thematic/foreground) information, unless they are marked for background information. Since the aorist indicative verb-form is the verb most commonly used to describe events in Greek, when it occurs in narrative the expectation is that it will communicate foreground information unless marked otherwise.<sup>61</sup> As discussed at the

---

<sup>58</sup>Moore, *Judith*, 202. Toni Craven hints at the importance of these verses stating that this section serves as a bridge between the "longer and more complicated" sections preceding and following it. Craven, *Artistry and Faith*, 94.

<sup>59</sup>Levinsohn, "Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative," 168. See also Levinsohn, *Self-Instruction Materials*, 75-77.

<sup>60</sup>Levinsohn, "Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative," 164. The following scholars also suggest this: Callow, *Discourse Considerations*, 52-54; Hopper, "Aspect and Foregrounding in Discourse," 213.

<sup>61</sup>Levinsohn, "Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative," 164. See the following for further discussion on the use of "markers" in discourse: Callow, *Discourse Considerations*, 52-53; Timo Eskola, *A Narrative Theology of the New Testament: Exploring the Metanarrative of Exile and Restoration*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 350 (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 5-8; For an introduction to semiotics or the investigation of linguistic signs in

beginning of the chapter, Levinsohn does not provide these backgrounding markers in his article in *The Greek Verb Revisited*. However, he does identify these backgrounding markers in his work on narrative discourse.<sup>62</sup>

In *Self-Instruction Materials on Narrative Discourse Analysis*, Levinsohn states that an event is a foreground event unless it is marked as a backgrounded (or not theme-line) event. He identifies three types of background events and three types of background devices which are used to create background events. In other words, there are three types of events which are secondary events and at least three devices which mark these events as secondary.<sup>63</sup> That is, these aorists appear to function not as mainline events moving the narrative forward, but as secondary events providing offline/background information.

The aorist verb-form occurs 649 times in Judith, and of these instances, 254 convey offline/background information. That is, in 40 percent of the instances in which the aorist indicative verb-form is used in Judith, it is communicating offline/background information as opposed to the expected mainline information.<sup>64</sup>

---

narrative, see John N. Deely, *Basics of Semiotics*, Advances in Semiotics (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990).

<sup>62</sup>Levinsohn, *Self-Instruction Materials*, 66-83. For a helpful discussion on the various views on discourse markers and the theory behind them, see Schiffrin, "Discourse Markers," 54-75. M. A. K. Halliday and Ruqaiya Hasan's work on cohesion in English provides a helpful corollary to the discussion on discourse markers by Levinsohn, Schiffrin, and others. M. A. K. Halliday and Ruqaiya Hasan, *Cohesion in English* (New York: Routledge, 2013), 7-9. That is, Halliday and Ruqaiya's study of the "non-structural text-forming relations" further support the notion of discourse markers which are not based solely upon particular verb-forms but rather through particles, semantics, lexical indicators, etc. The following authors also discuss the distinguishing factors between mainline information and offline information: Longacre, *The Grammar of Discourse*, 21; Hopper, "Aspect and Foregrounding in Discourse," 214-41; Gleason, "Contrastive Analysis in Discourse Structure," 39-64; Grimes, *The Thread of Discourse*.

<sup>63</sup>Levinsohn, *Self-Instruction Materials*, 70-74. The three background events are as follows: (1) events that occur before the theme-line events—often marked as past or perfect. (2) events that occur after the theme-line—often marked as perfect or as future. (3) reported speeches that lead to theme-line events; the three background devices are as follows: (1) particular verb forms (2) spacers (3) specific semantic/lexical verb types.

<sup>64</sup>These offline/backgrounded aorists can be found in the following texts: Jdt 1:1-16; 2:28; 4:1-2; 5:1, 7-19, 22; 8:2-8; 10:20-22; 12:16; 13:3; Jdt 16:21-24; 8:11-27, 28-31, 32-35; 9:2-9,13; 10:9; 11:1-3, 7-19, 22-23; 12:18; 13:15-16,18, 20; 14:8,13,18; 15:10; 16:2-12,14.

Further, within the book of Judith, the breakdown of these 254 instances in which the aorist indicative verb-form is communicating offline/background information is as follows:

1. Preliminary events that occur prior to the theme-line events (often marked as past or perfect): 109 occurrences
2. Resulting events that occur after the theme-line events (often marked as perfect or as future): 14 occurrences
3. Reported speeches that lead to theme-line events:<sup>65</sup> 131 occurrences

In summary, since the default function of the aorist is to convey mainline actions or events, in the following section only the instances in which the aorist is being used to describe offline actions or events will be evaluated.

### Events Prior to Theme-Line

The aorist indicative verb-forms in this category occur prior to the theme-line events, and they are often marked as past in reference to the narrative.<sup>66</sup>

#### Judith 1:1-16

Ἔτους δωδεκάτου τῆς βασιλείας Ναβουχοδοноσορ, ὃς ἐβασίλευσεν\* Ἀσσυρίων ἐν Νινευη τῇ πόλει τῇ μεγάλῃ, ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἀρφαξάδ, ὃς ἐβασίλευσεν\* Μήδων ἐν Ἐκβατάνοις, καὶ ᾠκοδόμησεν\* ἐπ’ Ἐκβατάνων κύκλῳ τείχη ἐκ λίθων λελαξευμένων εἰς πλάτος πηχῶν τριῶν καὶ εἰς μῆκος πηχῶν ἕξ καὶ ἐποίησεν\* τὸ ὕψος τοῦ τείχους πηχῶν ἑβδομήκοντα καὶ τὸ πλάτος αὐτοῦ πηχῶν πενήκοντα καὶ τοὺς πύργους αὐτοῦ ἔστησεν\* ἐπὶ ταῖς πύλαις αὐτῆς πηχῶν ἑκατὸν καὶ τὸ πλάτος αὐτῆς ἑθεμελίωσεν\* εἰς πήχεις ἑξήκοντα καὶ ἐποίησεν\* τὰς πύλας αὐτῆς πύλας διεγειρομένας εἰς ὕψος πηχῶν ἑβδομήκοντα καὶ τὸ πλάτος αὐτῆς πήχεις τεσσαράκοντα εἰς ἐξόδους δυνάμεως δυνατῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ διατάξεις τῶν πεζῶν αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἐποίησεν\* πόλεμον ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις ὁ βασιλεὺς Ναβουχοδοноσορ πρὸς βασιλέα Ἀρφαξάδ ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ τῷ μεγάλῳ, τοῦτό ἐστιν πεδίον ἐν τοῖς ὄρειοις Ραγαυ. καὶ συνήνησαν\* πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντες οἱ κατοικοῦντες τὴν ὀρεινὴν καὶ πάντες οἱ κατοικοῦντες τὸν Εὐφράτην καὶ τὸν Τίγριν καὶ τὸν Ὑδάσπην

---

<sup>65</sup>Levinsohn states that “the most overt way of recognizing when reported speeches are intermediate steps en route to later speeches or non-speech events is when perfective aspect is used to present the theme-line events, whereas the aspect of the verb of the speech orienteers is imperfective.” Levinsohn, *Self-Instruction Materials*, 110.

<sup>66</sup>Levinsohn, *Self-Instruction Materials*, 70; In this section, the aorists indicative verb-forms are analyzed within the body of the text. As discussed above, there are many other instances in which the aorist indicative verb-form is used to communicate offline events. The following are all of the instances in Judith in which the aorist indicative verb-forms support this particular backgrounding event: 1:1-7, 11-16; 2:28; 4:1-2; 5:1,22; 8:2-8; 10:20, 22; 12:16b; 13:3.

καὶ πεδία Ἀριωχ βασιλέως Ἑλυμαίων, καὶ συνῆλθον\* ἔθνη πολλὰ εἰς παράταξιν υἱῶν Χελεουδ. καὶ ἀπέστειλεν\* Ναβουχοδοноσορ βασιλεὺς Ἀσσυρίων ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς κατοικοῦντας τὴν Περσίδα καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς κατοικοῦντας πρὸς δυσμαῖς, τοὺς κατοικοῦντας τὴν Κιλικίαν καὶ Δαμασκὸν καὶ τὸν Λίβανον καὶ Ἀντιλίβανον, καὶ πάντας τοὺς κατοικοῦντας κατὰ πρόσωπον τῆς παραλίας καὶ τοὺς ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι τοῦ Καρμήλου καὶ Γαλααδ καὶ τὴν ἄνω Γαλιλαίαν καὶ τὸ μέγα πεδῖον Εσδρηλων καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἐν Σαμαρείᾳ καὶ ταῖς πόλεσιν αὐτῆς καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου ἕως Ἱερουσαλημ καὶ Βατανη καὶ Χελους καὶ Καδης καὶ τοῦ ποταμοῦ Αἰγύπτου καὶ Ταφνας καὶ Ραμεσση καὶ πᾶσαν γῆν Γεσεμ ἕως τοῦ ἐλθεῖν ἐπάνω Τάνεως καὶ Μέμφεως καὶ πάντας τοὺς κατοικοῦντας τὴν Αἴγυπτον ἕως τοῦ ἐλθεῖν ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρια τῆς Αἰθιοπίας. καὶ ἐφάυλισαν\* πάντες οἱ κατοικοῦντες πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν τὸ ῥῆμα Ναβουχοδοноσορ βασιλέως Ἀσσυρίων καὶ οὐ συνῆλθον\* αὐτῷ εἰς τὸν πόλεμον, ὅτι οὐκ ἐφοβήθησαν\* αὐτόν, ἀλλ' ἦν ἐναντίον αὐτῶν ὡς ἀνὴρ εἷς, καὶ ἀνέστρεψαν\* τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ κενοὺς ἐν ἀτιμῖᾳ προσώπου αὐτῶν. καὶ ἐθυμώθη\* Ναβουχοδοноσορ ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ταύτην σφόδρα καὶ ὤμοσε\* κατὰ τοῦ θρόνου καὶ τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ εἰ μὴν ἐκδικήσῃν πάντα τὰ ὄρια τῆς Κιλικίας καὶ Δαμασκηνῆς καὶ Συρίας ἀνελεῖν τῇ ῥομφαίᾳ αὐτοῦ καὶ πάντας τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἐν γῆ Μωαβ καὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἀμμων καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν Ἰουδαίαν καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ ἕως τοῦ ἐλθεῖν ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρια τῶν δύο θαλασσῶν. καὶ παρετάξατο\* ἐν τῇ δυνάμει αὐτοῦ πρὸς Ἀρφαξαδ βασιλέα ἐν τῷ ἔτει τῷ ἑπτακαιδεκάτῳ καὶ ἐκραταιώθη\* ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀνέστρεψεν\* πᾶσαν τὴν δύναμιν Ἀρφαξαδ καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν ἵππον αὐτοῦ καὶ πάντα τὰ ἄρματα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκυρίευσεν\* τῶν πόλεων αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀφίκετο\* ἕως Ἐκβατάνων καὶ ἐκράτησεν\* τῶν πύργων καὶ ἐπρονόμεισεν\* τὰς πλατείας αὐτῆς καὶ τὸν κόσμον αὐτῆς ἔθηκεν\* εἰς ὄνειδος αὐτῆς καὶ ἔλαβε\* τὸν Ἀρφαξαδ ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσι Ραγαυ καὶ κατηκόντισεν\* αὐτὸν ἐν ταῖς σιβύναις αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐξωλέθρευσεν\* αὐτὸν ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης. καὶ ἀνέστρεψεν\* μετ' αὐτῶν αὐτὸς καὶ πᾶς ὁ σύμμικτος αὐτοῦ, πλῆθος ἀνδρῶν πολεμιστῶν πολὺ σφόδρα, καὶ ἦν ἐκεῖ ῥαθυμῶν καὶ εὐωχούμενος αὐτὸς καὶ ἡ δύναμις αὐτοῦ ἐφ' ἡμέρας ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι.

It was the twelfth year of the reign of Nabouchodonosor, who ruled over\* the Assyrians from Nineue, the great city. It was in the days of Arphaxad, who ruled over\* the Medes from Ecbatana and who had built\* walls around Ecbatana from stones hewn to a breadth of three cubits and to a length of six cubits and made\* the height of the wall seventy cubits and its breadth fifty cubits and raised up\* its towers at its gates one hundred cubits and laid out\* their foundations to a breadth of sixty cubits and made\* its gates, gates rising to a height of seventy cubits and their width being forty cubits for the passage of his army of chief men and the ranks of his foot-soldiers. And it was in those days that King Nabouchodonosor made\* war against King Arphaxad in the Great Plain, that is, the plain on the frontier of Rhagau. And there rallied\* against him all the inhabitants of the highlands and all who dwelt by the Euphrates and the Tigris and the Hydaspes and in the plain of Arioch, king of the Elymeans. And a great many nations gathered\* for the battle of the sons of Cheleoud. And Nabouchodonosor, king of the Assyrians, had sent\* to all those who inhabit Persia and to all the inhabitants of the west, the inhabitants of Cilicia and Damascus and Lebanon and AntiLebanon and all the inhabitants facing the coast and those among the nations of Carmel and Galaad and Upper Galilee and the great plain of Esdrelom and all those in Samaria and its cities and beyond the Jordan as far as Ierousalem and Batane and Chelous and Kades and the wadi of Egypt and Taphnas and Ramesse and all the land of Gesem, until one comes above Tanis and Memphis, and all the inhabitants of Egypt, until one comes to the frontier of Ethiopia. And all the inhabitants throughout all the land had contempt\* for the word of Nabouchodonosor, king of the Assyrians, and did not join with him for the war, for they did not fear\* him; rather, in

their eyes he was but one man, and they sent back\* his messengers empty-handed and shamefaced. And Nabouchodonosor became violently angry\* at all this land and swore\* by his throne and by his kingdom that he would punish the entire region of Cilicia and the Damascene and Syria and that he would dispatch with his sword all the inhabitants of the land of Moab and the sons of Ammon and all Judea and all those in Egypt, until one comes to the region of the two seas. And in the seventeenth year, he took\* the field of battle before his army against King Arphaxad and prevailed\* in his war. And he turned back\* the entire army of Arphaxad, all his cavalry and all his chariots, and he seized\* his cities. And he came as far as\* Ecbatana and gained possession\* of the towers and looted\* its streets, and its honor he turned\* to its shame. And he overtook\* Arphaxad in the mountains of Rhagau and struck\* him down with his spears and destroyed\* him unto that day. And he returned\* with them, he and all his mongrel force, an enormously large body of warriors, and he spent one hundred and twenty days there, he and his army, in idleness and merriment.

The book of Judith begins by providing the reader with an account of an event that took place in the twelfth year of the reign of Nabouchodonosor. In this event, the narrator begins in Judith 1:1b-4 by briefly describing how Arphaxad, the ruler of the Medes in Ecbatana, had strengthened and fortified Ecbatana with thick/high walls made of hewn stones. He also erected exceedingly high towers and gates which were not only tall but were also wide enough to allow his infantry to form ranks on them. However, beginning in verse 5 and continuing through the remainder of chapter 1, the author describes Nabouchodonosor's response to the fortification efforts of Arphaxad.

In these verses, the author describes how Nabouchodonosor made war against King Arphaxad, how the surrounding nations support Nabouchodonosor, and how Nabouchodonosor sent messengers to all the countries to the west of Persia requesting support in his war against King Arphaxad. Further, the author recounts how Nabouchodonosor vows to destroy these countries as a result of their unwillingness to assist him in this war. Finally, in this section the author narrates how in the seventeenth year of Nabouchodonosor's reign he defeated King Arphaxad, plundered all his possessions, returned to Nineveh with all of his combined forces, and rested and feasted for 120 days.

While it may initially appear that the mainline of the narrative begins in

Judith 1:13 (during the seventeenth year of Nabouchodonosor’s reign . . . ), the statement in Judith 2:1—that in the eighteenth year of Nabouchodonosor’s reign it was brought to his attention—indicates that the events which occur in chapter 1 precede those which begin in chapter 2 and continue throughout the remainder of the narrative. In summary, it appears that the events in Judith 1 are not part of the mainline of the narrative, but they do provide background details for the mainline of the narrative which begins in Judith 2:1.

Beyond the temporal indicators mentioned by the author in Judith 1:1, 13 and 2:1, there are many other examples of aorist verb-forms which support Levinsohn’s first backgrounding marker, namely Particular Verbal Forms, a marker he proposes in *Self-Instruction Materials on Narrative Discourse Analysis*.<sup>67</sup> Throughout chapter 1, there are verb-forms used either implying action prior to the point of reference in the narrative or to an action which implies a state. For instance, in Judith 1:1b-4 the author prefaces his discussion of King Arphaxad’s fortification efforts with “It was in the days of Arphaxad,” a temporal device that Levinsohn also mentions in his discussion of this backgrounding marker.<sup>68</sup> Further, in Judith 1:5 the author again uses a temporal device to indicate the past time of these events with reference to the narrative when he states, “it was in those days that Nabouchodonosor made war against King Arphaxad.” Finally, an example of a past

---

<sup>67</sup>For the sake of reference, Levinsohn’s backgrounding markers are provided:

1. Particular Verbal Forms: (1) a past tense which implies ‘prior to the point of reference’ (e.g., it is similar to the function of an English pluperfect, and it can be accompanied with particles—e.g., “already”), (2) a past tense which implies a state.
2. Spacers: the insertion of a spacer (particle) to separate background and foreground information; a spacer regularly occurs in these situations: (1) topic—spacer—comment, (2) point of departure—spacer—rest of the sentence, (3) less important information—spacer—more important information, (4) focus/more important information—spacer—presuppositions/less important information.
3. Specific Semantic/Lexical Verb Types: (1) state (e.g., was, know, have), (2) achievement (e.g., recognize, find, die), (3) accomplishment (e.g., make something, paint a picture), (4) activity (e.g., run, drive a car). Levinsohn, *Self-Instruction Materials*, 70-74.

<sup>68</sup>Levinsohn, *Self-Instruction Materials*, 70.

tense which implies a state is in Judith 1:13 when the author recounts, “in the seventeenth year, he took the field of battle before his army against King Arphaxad and prevailed in his war.”

Toni Craven hints at the offline nature of chapter 1, identifying the first chapter of Judith as an “introduction to Nebuchadnezzar and his campaign against Arphaxad.”<sup>69</sup> In other words, she suggests that the purpose of chapter 1 is to provide needed background information. Furthermore, Teresa Bridgeman comments, “Many narrative texts employ flashback as a matter of course, in order to fill in the past history of protagonists while avoiding a lengthy introduction or in order to reveal new facts.”<sup>70</sup> In other words, the notion that Judith chapter 1 would have been written to provide needed past history fits very well not only with the proposals of grammarians such as Stephen Levinsohn but also with literary theorists like Teresa Bridgeman who suggests that “our sense of climax and resolution, of complications and resolutions, the metaphors we use for the paths taken by plots are constructed on spatio-temporal patterns.”<sup>71</sup> Thus, it appears that Levinsohn’s first of three backgrounding events is supported in the book of Judith.

### Events after Theme-Line

The aorist indicative verb-forms in this category occur after the theme-line events, and they are often marked by events which describe states or future events in reference to the mainline of the narrative.

### Judith 16:21-24

Μετὰ δὲ τὰς ἡμέρας ταύτας ἀνέζευξεν\* ἕκαστος εἰς τὴν κληρονομίαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ Ἰουδιθ ἀπῆλθεν\* εἰς Βαιτυλοῦσα καὶ κατέμεινεν\* ἐπὶ τῆς ὑπάρξεως αὐτῆς· καὶ ἐγένετο\* κατὰ

---

<sup>69</sup>Craven, *Artistry and Faith*, 60.

<sup>70</sup>Bridgeman, “Time and space,” 57.

<sup>71</sup>Bridgeman, “Time and space,” 64.

τὸν καιρὸν αὐτῆς ἔνδοξος ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῆ. καὶ πολλοὶ ἐπεθύμησαν\* αὐτήν, καὶ οὐκ ἔγνω\* ἀνὴρ αὐτήν πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ζωῆς αὐτῆς, ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας ἀπέθανεν\* Μανασσης ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς καὶ προσετέθη\* πρὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἦν προβαίνουσα μεγάλη σφόδρα καὶ ἐγήρασεν\* ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς αὐτῆς ἔτη ἑκατὸν πέντε· καὶ ἀφῆκεν\* τὴν ἄβραν αὐτῆς ἐλευθέραν. καὶ ἀπέθανεν\* εἰς Βαιτυλουα, καὶ ἔθαψαν\* αὐτήν ἐν τῷ σπηλαίῳ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς αὐτῆς Μανασση, καὶ ἐπένησεν\* αὐτὴν οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ ἡμέρας ἑπτὰ. καὶ διεΐλεν\* τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτῆς πρὸ τοῦ ἀποθανεῖν αὐτὴν πᾶσι τοῖς ἔγγιστα Μανασση τοῦ ἀνδρὸς αὐτῆς καὶ τοῖς ἔγγιστα τοῦ γένους αὐτῆς.

After these days each returned\* to his inheritance, and Ioudith departed\* for Baityloua and remained\* there on her property, and in her time she was\* renowned in all the land. And many desired\* her, and no man knew\* her in all the days of her life since the day Manasses her husband had died\* and was\* added to his people. And she kept increasing in stature, and she grew\* old in the house of her husband, one hundred and five years. And she set free\* her favorite slave. And she died\* in Baityloua, and they buried\* her in the cave of her husband Manasses, and the house of Israel mourned\* her for seven days. And before she died she divided\* her possessions among all the nearest of Manasses her husband and the nearest of her race.

The aorist indicative verb-forms found in Judith 16:21-24 occur at the very end of the book of Judith and serve as a concluding statement.<sup>72</sup> In Judith 16:1 an extended offline section begins in which Judith's extended psalm of praise is reported as she poetically retells how God delivered his people through her. Next is the recounting of Judith's song of praise to God, describing the glory, might, and mercy of God, the importance of fearing God, and the power of God over his enemies.<sup>73</sup>

In Judith 16:18-21a the author returns to theme-line content and describes the arrival of Judith and those with her in Jerusalem to offer sacrifices and to praise God. However, in Judith 16:21b the content appears to go offline again as the author provides some closing comments for the book of Judith. He offers descriptive details about the remainder of Judith's life, discussing her reputation, marital status, length of life, and how she bequeathed her estate. The reason this appears to shift from mainline to offline information is because, beginning in verse 21b, the narrative consists of both stative and future events, two of the markers which Levinsohn

---

<sup>72</sup>Toni Craven states that this text serves as the book end to what he identifies as part 2 of Judith (Jdt 8-16). Further, she states that "Part 2 of the book of Judith ends as it began with a description of the woman called Judith." Craven, *Artistry and Faith*, 112.

<sup>73</sup>Jdt 16:1-17.

provides for his second category for offline aorist indicative verbs in narrative: events after theme-line.<sup>74</sup>

For instance, in Judith 16:21b Judith is described as renowned throughout her life (ἐγένετο κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν αὐτῆς ἔνδοξος ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῆ), and in 16:22 it is said that many desired her but no man knew her since the day Manasses her husband died (πολλοὶ ἐπεθύμησαν αὐτήν, καὶ οὐκ ἔγνω ἀνὴρ αὐτήν πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ζωῆς αὐτῆς, ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας ἀπέθανεν Μανασσης ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς). Moreover, the future element of these events from the standpoint of the mainline of the narrative is quite clearly seen in the author's statement that Judith grew old in the house of her husband, she lived to be 100, she died in Baityloua, they buried her in the cave of her husband Manasses, and the house of Israel mourned for seven days (ἐγήρασεν ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς αὐτῆς ἔτη ἑκατὸν πέντε· καὶ ἀφῆκεν τὴν ἄβραν αὐτῆς ἐλευθέραν. καὶ ἀπέθανεν εἰς Βαιτυλουα, καὶ ἔθαψαν αὐτήν ἐν τῷ σπηλαίῳ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς αὐτῆς Μανασση, καὶ ἐπένησεν αὐτὴν οἶκος Ἰσραηλ ἡμέρας ἑπτὰ). The author's use of descriptive events to describe the state of Judith's character from the time of her victory over Olopherenes until her death is supported by Carey A. Moore's comment that in Judith 16:21-25 the author "reassures [the] readers on several important points. For her services to God and country, Judith was well rewarded with fame and long life."<sup>75</sup> Thus, it appears that the aorist verb-forms in Judith 4:21b-24 are conveying offline information. Moreover, these forms appear to occur after the theme-line events and thus support Levinsohn's second category, events after the theme-line.

### Reported Speeches to Theme-Line Events

The aorist indicative verb-forms in this category occur in reported

---

<sup>74</sup>Levinsohn, *Self-Instruction Materials*, 70. Levinsohn states that aorist indicative verb-forms which occur after the theme-line often are marked as perfect/state, or as future with respect to the mainline of the narrative.

<sup>75</sup>Moore, *Judith*, 261.

speeches and lead to theme-line events.<sup>76</sup>

### Judith 9:2-14

Κύριε ὁ θεὸς τοῦ πατρὸς μου Συμεων, ᾧ ἔδωκας\* ἐν χειρὶ ῥομφαίαν εἰς ἐκδίκησιν ἀλλογενῶν, οἱ ἔλυσαν\* μήτραν παρθένου εἰς μίασμα καὶ ἐγύμνωσαν\* μηρὸν εἰς αἰσχύνην καὶ ἐβεβήλωσαν\* μήτραν εἰς ὄνειδος· εἶπας\* γὰρ Οὐχ οὕτως ἔσται, καὶ ἐποίησαν\*· ἀνθ' ὧν ἔδωκας\* ἄρχοντας αὐτῶν εἰς φόνον καὶ τὴν στρωμνὴν αὐτῶν, ἢ ἠδέσαστο\* τὴν ἀπάτην αὐτῶν, ἀπατηθεῖσαν εἰς αἶμα καὶ ἐπάταξας\* δούλους ἐπὶ δυνάσταις καὶ δυνάστας ἐπὶ θρόνους αὐτῶν καὶ ἔδωκας\* γυναῖκας αὐτῶν εἰς προνομήν καὶ θυγατέρας αὐτῶν εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν καὶ πάντα τὰ σκῦλα αὐτῶν εἰς διαίρεσιν υἱῶν ἠγαπημένων ὑπὸ σοῦ, οἱ καὶ ἐζήλωσαν\* τὸν ζῆλόν σου καὶ ἐβδελύξαντο\* μίασμα αἵματος αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπεκαλέσαντό\* σε εἰς βοηθόν· ὁ θεὸς ὁ θεὸς ὁ ἐμός, καὶ εἰσάκουσον ἐμοῦ τῆς χήρας. σὺ γὰρ ἐποίησας\* τὰ πρότερα ἐκείνων καὶ ἐκεῖνα καὶ τὰ μετέπειτα καὶ τὰ νῦν καὶ τὰ ἐπερχόμενα διενόηθης,\* καὶ ἐγενήθησαν\* ἃ ἐνενοήθης,\* καὶ παρέστησαν\* ἃ ἐβουλεύσω\* καὶ εἶπαν\* Ἴδου ἀρέσμεν· πᾶσαι γὰρ αἱ ὁδοὶ σου ἔτοιμοι, καὶ ἡ κρίσις σου ἐν προγνώσει. Ἴδου γὰρ Ἀσσύριοι ἐπληθύνθησαν\* ἐν δυνάμει αὐτῶν, ὑψώθησαν\* ἐφ' ἵππων καὶ ἀναβάτη, ἐγαυρίασαν\* ἐν βραχίονι πεζῶν, ἤλπισαν\* ἐν ἀσπίδι καὶ ἐν γαίσῳ καὶ τόξῳ καὶ σφενδόνη καὶ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν\* ὅτι σὺ εἶ κύριος συντρίβων πολέμων. κύριος ὄνομά σοι· σὺ ῥάξον αὐτῶν τὴν ἰσχὺν ἐν δυνάμει σου καὶ κατάξον τὸ κράτος αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ θυμῷ σου· ἐβουλεύσαντο\* γὰρ βεβηλῶσαι τὰ ἅγια σου, μιᾶναι τὸ σκῆνωμα τῆς καταπαύσεως τοῦ ὀνόματος τῆς δόξης σου, καταβαλεῖν σιδήρῳ κέρας θυσιαστηρίου σου. βλέψον εἰς ὑπερηφανίαν αὐτῶν, ἀπόστειλον τὴν ὀργὴν σου εἰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν, δὸς ἐν χειρὶ μου τῆς χήρας ὁ διενόηθην\* κράτος. πάταξον δοῦλον ἐκ χειλέων ἀπάτης μου ἐπὶ ἄρχοντι καὶ ἄρχοντα ἐπὶ θεράποντι αὐτοῦ, θραῦσον αὐτῶν τὸ ἀνάστημα ἐν χειρὶ θηλείας. οὐ γὰρ ἐν πλήθει τὸ κράτος σου, οὐδὲ ἡ δυναστεία σου ἐν ἰσχύουσιν, ἀλλὰ ταπεινῶν εἶ θεός, ἐλαττόνων εἶ βοηθός, ἀντιλήμπτωρ ἀσθενούντων, ἀπεγνωσμένων σκεπαστής, ἀπηλπισμένων σωτήρ. ναι ναι ὁ θεὸς τοῦ πατρὸς μου καὶ θεὸς κληρονομίας Ἰσραηλ, δέσποτα τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ τῆς γῆς, κτίστα τῶν ὑδάτων, βασιλεὺ πάσης κτίσεώς σου, σὺ εἰσάκουσον τῆς δεήσεώς μου καὶ δὸς λόγον μου καὶ ἀπάτην εἰς τραῦμα καὶ μάλωπα αὐτῶν, οἱ κατὰ τῆς διαθήκης σου καὶ οἴκου ἠγιασμένου σου καὶ κορυφῆς Σιών καὶ οἴκου κατασχέσεως υἱῶν σου ἐβουλεύσαντο\* σκληρά. καὶ ποιήσον ἐπὶ παντὸς ἔθνους σου καὶ πάσης φυλῆς ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ εἰδῆσαι ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ θεὸς θεὸς πάσης δυνάμεως καὶ κράτους καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος ὑπερασπίζων τοῦ γένους Ἰσραηλ εἰ μὴ σὺ.

O Lord, God of my father Symeon, to whom you gave\* a sword in hand for vengeance on aliens, the ones who ravaged\* the virgin's vulva for defilement and stripped\* naked the thigh for shame and polluted\* the vulva for disgrace, for you said:\* 'It shall not be thus,' and they did;\* therefore you handed\* over their rulers for slaughter, and their bed which, deceived, felt ashamed\* at their deceit, for blood, and you struck\* down slaves with lords and lords upon their thrones, and you handed over\* their wives for pillage and their daughters for

<sup>76</sup>Levinsohn, *Self-Instruction Materials*, 70, 110. Levinsohn states that “the most overt way of recognizing when reported speeches are intermediate steps en route to later speeches or non-speech events is when perfective aspect is used to present the theme-line events, whereas the aspect of the verb of the speech orienteers is imperfective.” Levinsohn, *Self-Instruction Materials*, 110. In this section only a select portion of the examples is analyzed within the body of the text. However, the following is a list of all the examples which after analyzing every instance of the Aorist indicative verb-form in Judith fit within this category: 8:11-27, 28b-31, 32b-34, 35b; 9:2-9, 13; 10:9b-c; 11:1b-3, 7-19, 22b-23; 12:18b; 13:15b-16, 18b, 20b; 14:8a, 13b, 18; 15:10; 16:2-17.

captivity and all their spoils for division among the sons loved by you, who also were zealous\* in zeal for you and detested\* the defilement of their blood and called upon\* you as helper. O God, my God, also listen to me, the widow. “For you accomplished\* the things previous and those at hand and those thereafter and at present, and those of the future you contemplated,\* and what you conceived\* of came to pass,\* and what you had resolved stood\* by and said:\* ‘Behold, we are here.’ For all your ways are prepared, and your judgment is with foreknowledge. “For behold, the Assyrians were increased\* in their power; they were exalted\* by horse and rider; they took pride\* in the arm of infantry; they put their hope\* in shield and javelin and bow and sling and did not realize\* that you are the Lord who crushes wars; the Lord is your name. Dash down their might with your power, and bring down their strength with your fury, for they have resolved\* to pollute your holy precincts, to defile the covert of the resting place of the name of your glory, to strike down with the blade the horn of your altar. Look upon their arrogance; dispatch your anger for their heads; place in the hand of me, the widow, the strength that I have contemplated.\* By the lips of my deceit<sup>b</sup> strike down the slave with the ruler and the ruler with his attendant; shatter their stature by the hand of a female. “For your strength is not in numbers, nor is your dominance in those who are fit, but you are a God of the lowly; you are the helper of the inferior, the supporter of the weak, the shelterer of the desperate, the savior of the hopeless. Yes, yes, God of my father and God of the inheritance of Israel, master of the heavens and earth, creator of the waters, king of all your creation, hear you my entreaty, and grant ‘my word and deceit<sup>c</sup> for their wound and welt, who have resolved\* hard things against your covenant and your hallowed house and the summit of Sion and the house of your sons’ possession. And among every nation and every tribe bring about the knowledge to realize that you are God, God of all power and strength, and that there is no one other than you shielding the race of Israel.

The aorist indicative verb-forms in Judith 9:2-14 are located within a reported speech. In Judith 9:1 the scene transitions from Judith discussing with the elders of Baityloua how she intends to deliver Israel from the hand of Olophernes, to her prayer to God for his blessing. That is, in Judith 8 the heroine of the narrative is introduced, and after briefly providing her background, the focus moves to the leaders’ recent decision to follow the desires of the people and surrender to the Assyrians if God does not act within five days (7:29-8:11). Once Judith hears of this situation, she rebukes the leaders for this decision to surrender and exhorts them to call upon God (8:17), to convince the people of the importance of their submission to their leaders (8:24), to give thanks to God for this trial (8:25), and to remember that just as God has tested their fathers before them, so he is testing them now (8:26-27). Finally, in Judith 8:28-9:1 the elders of Baityloua respond positively to Judith, and once they leave she immediately turns to God in prayer.

In Judith 9:2-14 aorist indicative verb-forms are used 26 times within this reported speech (Judith's prayer). As discussed above, in Stephen Levinsohn's "Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative," he argues that narratives are made up of events and non-events. Further, he claims that the mainline of a narrative consists of events, and the offline/background is made up of non-events. However, he maintains that in narrative not all events should automatically be viewed as mainline information, and he lists three events in narrative in which the aorist indicative verb-form, or the verb-form which most commonly carries the mainline of the narrative, is being used to communicate background information.<sup>77</sup>

The Discourse Primary thesis (specifically Levinsohn's third backgrounding event—reported speeches that lead to theme-line events<sup>78</sup>) fits well with the use of the aorists in this text. According to Levinsohn and other scholars, most reported speeches are not an "end in themselves," but they are pointing forward to later speeches or non-speech events that form the theme-line of the narrative.<sup>79</sup> Further, Levinsohn states there are three ways of indicating that a reported speech is being used to point forward to another speech or a theme-line event:<sup>80</sup> (1) The use of perfective aspect (aorist verb-forms) to carry the theme-line within the reported speech, (2) the reported speech is not treated as a new

---

<sup>77</sup>Levinsohn, "Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative," 164; Levinsohn, *Self-Instruction Materials*, 70. For a helpful discussion on the topic of foreground/mainline and background/offline see Dooley and Levinsohn, *Analyzing Discourse*, 79-85. Dooley and Levinsohn state that the tendency within scholarship is to either define foreground in narrative based upon a "strict temporal sequence of telling" or to determine foreground based upon "notions of importance and salience." Dooley and Levinsohn, *Analyzing Discourse*, 81. For further discussion on the above two poles of interpretation concerning foreground in narrative see Dry, *Foregrounding*, 435-50; Thompson, "Subordination," 435-54.

<sup>78</sup>Levinsohn, *Self-Instruction Materials*, 70. Levinsohn states that "the most overt way of recognizing when reported speeches are intermediate steps en route to later speeches or non-speech events is when perfective aspect is used to present the theme-line events, whereas the aspect of the verb of the speech orienteers is imperfective." Levinsohn, *Self-Instruction Materials*, 110.

<sup>79</sup>Levinsohn, *Self-Instruction Materials*, 110. See also Levinsohn, *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek*, 218.

<sup>80</sup>Levinsohn, *Self-Instruction Materials*, 110-11.

development in the narrative,<sup>81</sup> and (3) the reported speeches are grouped into couplets.<sup>82</sup> Accordingly, the aorists in Judith 9:2-14 correspond very well with the first two ways Levinsohn suggests that a reported speech is being used to point forward to another speech or a theme-line event.

First, the use of the aorist indicative verb-form to carry the mainline of the reported speech in Judith 9:2-14 corresponds with Levinsohn's first way of indicating that a reported speech is pointing forward: the use of perfective aspect (aorist verb-forms) to carry the theme-line within the reported speech. That is, Levinsohn's first way of determining if a reported speech is pointing forward matches perfectly with Judith 9:2-14, since the aorist indicative verb-form is used in 84 percent of the instances in which the indicative verb-form occurs in this section of Judith. Second, since the reported speech in Judith 9:2-14 is not treated as a new development in the narrative, it also correlates with Levinsohn's second way of indicating that the reported speech is pointing forward. In other words, because the author does not introduce this speech with some type of conjunction or phrase which marks development, the function of this reported speech is likely to point forward to another speech or a theme-line event.<sup>83</sup> Thus, in summary, Judith 9:2-14 appears to support Levinsohn's third backgrounding event very well. Since the use of the aorist indicatives in Judith 9:2-14 all occur in direct discourse, they carry the theme-line of the discourse, and the speech is not treated as a new development in the narrative, the third backgrounding event proposed by Levinsohn and the Discourse Primary

---

<sup>81</sup>For more discussion concerning the use of development features in narrative, see Eskola, *A Narrative Theology of the New Testament*, 5-8.

<sup>82</sup>Levinsohn, *Self-Instruction Materials*, 111. See also Coulthard, *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*, 70.

<sup>83</sup>Dooley and Levinsohn state that this conjunction or phrase is commonly  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  or particles associated with the verb phrase: a change of spatiotemporal setting, circumstance, or the underlying subject. Dooley and Levinsohn, *Analyzing Discourse*, 93-94. See also Levinsohn, *Self-Instruction Materials*, 95; Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 72.

group appears to match very well with the aorist indicative verb-forms which occur within reported speech in the book of Judith.<sup>84</sup>

### Concluding Analysis

As stated above, the imperfect occurs 88 times in Judith, and of these instances, 27 appear to convey mainline information. That is, in 30 percent of these occurrences in which the imperfect indicative verb-form is used in Judith, it seems to be communicating mainline information as opposed to the expected background information. Further, within the book of Judith, of those 27 instances in which the imperfect is communicating theme-line information, all of them appear to support the second category suggested by Levinsohn—to communicate imperfective aspect. These imperfects appear to be chosen not because the author desires to communicate background information, but because he desires this mainline event to have imperfective aspect, and the imperfect verb-form is the choice form for this aspect in narrative. However, it must be recognized that this analysis is not definitive, and it could be argued that each of these apparent “mainline imperfects” are not carrying the mainline but are simply providing descriptive details. Nevertheless, Levinsohn’s proposal is compelling and the above analysis does suggest its plausibility.

Moreover, as discussed in the section on the aorist indicative verb-form in Judith, the aorist verb-form occurs 649 times in Judith, and of these 649 instances 254 convey offline/background information. That is, in 40 percent of the instances in which the aorist indicative verb-form is used in Judith, it is communicating offline/background information as opposed to the expected mainline information. Further, within the book of Judith, the breakdown of these 254 instances in which

---

<sup>84</sup>Levinsohn, *Self-Instruction Materials*, 110.

the aorist indicative verb-form is communicating offline/background information, 109 occur prior to theme-line events, 14 occur after theme-line events, and 131 are found within reported speeches which lead to theme-line events.

Thus, after analyzing each instance of the imperfect and aorist indicative verb-form within the book of Judith, the data fits within the scope of the Discourse Primary proposal: the aorist, unless intentionally marked, is used to describe mainline events, it provides the foundation for the narrative, and moves it forward. On the other hand, the imperfect, unless it is marked as functioning in another way, is used with non-events, giving descriptive or background information, rather than moving it forward.<sup>85</sup> In other words, Levinsohn's and the Discourse Primary group's very nuanced understanding of the discourse function of the imperfect and aorist indicative verb-form fits very well with the use of these forms in Judith.

---

<sup>85</sup>Levinsohn, "Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative," 163-83; James, "Imperfects, Aorists, Historic Presents, Perfects," 203-4.

## CHAPTER 4

### THE DISCOURSE FUNCTION OF THE PRESENT INDICATIVE WITHIN THE BOOK OF JUDITH

The function of the present indicative verb-form within historical narrative has been discussed among both classical and biblical Greek grammarians since the end of the nineteenth century.<sup>1</sup> In *Idioms of the Greek New Testament* Stanley Porter summarizes the various positions on the function of the historical present well: dramatic use, tense reduction, change of setting or character, and verbal

---

<sup>1</sup>Georg Benedict Winer, *A Treatise on the Grammar of New Testament Greek, Regarded as a Sure Basis for New Testament Exegesis*, 3rd ed., rev. (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1882), 333; Karl Brugmann, *A Comparative Grammar of the Indo-Germanic Languages: A Concise Exposition of the History of Sanskrit, Old Iranian, Old Armenian, Greek, Latin, Old Irish, Gothic, Old High German, Lithuanian, and Church Slavonic*, trans. R. Seymour Conway and W. H. D. Rouse (New York: Westermann & Co., 1895); Antonius N. Jannaris, *An Historical Greek Grammar Chiefly of the Attic Dialect: As Written and Spoken from Classical Antiquity Down to the Present Time; Founded Upon the Ancient Texts, Inscriptions, Papyri, and Present Popular Greek* (London: MacMillan and Co., 1897), 434; Friedrich Blass, *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, trans. Henry St. John Thackeray (London: Macmillan, 1898), 188; John C. Hawkins, *Horae Syntopicae: Contributions to the Study of the Synoptic Problem* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1899), 113-14; Basil Lanneau Gildersleeve, *Syntax of Classical Greek: From Homer to Demosthenes* (New York: American Book Company, 1904); Edwin A. Abbott, *Johannine Grammar* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1906), 1:350; J. H. Moulton, *Prolegomena*, vol. 1 of *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1906), 120ff; Herbert Weir Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, rev. ed. (1920; repr., Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984), 422; Henry St. John Thackeray, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship: A Study in Origins* (London: Oxford University Press, 1921), 21; A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934), 866-69; S. M. Reynolds, "The Zero Tense in Greek: A Critical Note," *Westminster Theological Journal* 32 (1965): 68-72; Paul Kiparsky, "Tense and Mood in Indo-European Syntax," *Foundations of Language* 4 (1968): 30-57; Kenneth L. McKay, "Further Remarks on the 'Historical' Present and Other Phenomena," *Foundations of Language* 11 (1974): 247-51; John J. O'Rourke, "The Historic Present in the Gospel of John," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 93 (1974): 585-90; John A. Battle, "The Present Indicative in New Testament Exegesis" (PhD diss., Grace Theological Seminary, 1975); R. Buth, "Mark's Use of the Historical Present," *Notes* 65 (1977): 7-13; Stephen H. Levinsohn, "Preliminary Observations on the Use of the Historical Present in Mark," *Notes* 65 (1977): 13-28; Ralph Enos, "The Use of the Historical Present in the Gospel according to St. Mark," *Journal of the Linguistic Association of the Southwest* 3 (1981): 281-98; Ronald L. Shive, "The Use of the Historical Present and Its Theological Significance" (ThM thesis, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1982); Carroll D. Osburn, "The Historical Present in Mark as a Text Critical Criterion," *Biblica* 64 (1983): 486-500; David Boos, "The Historical Present in John's Gospel," *Start* 11 (1984): 17-24; Levinsohn, "The Historic Present and Speech Margins in Matthew," in *Language in Context: Essays for Robert E. Longacre*, ed. Shin Ja J. Hwang and William R. Merrifield (Arlington: Summer Institute of Linguistics and the University of Texas at Arlington, 1992), 451-73.

aspect.<sup>2</sup> The debate became more widely known after the publication of Porter's and Buist Fanning's dissertations.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, despite the increase in discussion and research concerning the historical present, it was not until the work of Steven E. Runge, building upon the research of Stephen Levinsohn among others, that

---

<sup>2</sup>Stanley E. Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*, 2nd ed. (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 30-31. (1) Dramatic use: the present propels an event from the past into the present for vividness. Author(s) who hold this position: Buist M. Fanning, *Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 226-29; Karl Brugmann, *Griechische Grammatik* (Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1900), 555-56; Blass, *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, 188; J. H. Moulton and Nigel Turner, *Syntax*, vol. 3 of *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* (1963; repr., London: T & T Clark, 2005), 61; Robertson, *Grammar*, 866-67. (2) Tense reduction: the present occurs after a number of repeated sequences of tenses as the "reduced" form of a past verb. Author(s) who hold this position: Kiparsky, "Tense and Mood," 30-57; Reynolds, "The Zero Tense in Greek," 68-72; Battle, "The Present Indicative," 111-17. (3) Change of setting or character: the present is used to mark important changes in the narrative. Author(s) who hold this position: Buth, "Mark's Use of the Historical Present," 7-13. (4.) Verbal aspect: the present (imperfective aspect) is used to give added attention to the event. Author(s) who hold this position: Laurel J. Brinton, "Historical Discourse Analysis," in *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, ed. Deborah Schriffrin, Deborah Tannen, and Heidi Ehernberger Hamilton (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2001), 143; Porter, *Idioms*, 31; Porter, *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament with Reference to Tense and Mood* (New York: Peter Lang, 1989), 189-98. Fredrick J. Long also provides a helpful overview of the various positions on the function of the historical present among Greek grammarians. Fredrick J. Long, *Koine Greek Grammar: A Beginning-Intermediate Exegetical and Pragmatic Handbook* (Wilmore, KY: GlossaHouse, 2015), 125.

<sup>3</sup>The influence of Stanley Porter and Buist Fanning on the debate surrounding the Historical Present and more broadly the issue of verbal aspect is demonstrated in the number of articles and monographs on the topic of verbal aspect with a focus on New Testament studies: Moises Silva, "A Response to Fanning and Porter on Verbal Aspect," in *Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics: Open Questions in Current Research*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and D. A. Carson (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993); D. A. Carson, "An Introduction to the Porter/Fanning Debate," in *Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics: Open Questions in Current Research*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and D. A. Carson (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993); Daryl D. Schmidt, "Verbal Aspect in Greek: Two Approaches," in *Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics: Open Questions in Current Research*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and D. A. Carson (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993); Stanley E. Porter, "In Defense of Verbal Aspect," in *Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics: Open Questions in Current Research*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and D. A. Carson (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993); Stephanie L. Black, "The Historic Present in Matthew: Beyond Speech Margins," in *Discourse Analysis and the New Testament: Approaches and Results*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Jeffrey T. Reed, Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 170 (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999); Rodney J. Decker, *Temporal deixis of the Greek Verb in the Gospel of Mark with Reference to Verbal Aspect*, Studies in Biblical Greek 10 (New York: P. Lang, 2001); Jody Bernard, "Is Verbal Aspect a Prominence Indicator? An Evaluation of Stanley Porter's Proposal with Special Reference to the Gospel of Luke," *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 19 (2006); Constantine R. Campbell, *Verbal Aspect, the Indicative Mood, and Narrative: Soundings in the Greek of the New Testament*, Studies in Biblical Greek 13 (New York: Peter Lang, 2007); Campbell, *Verbal Aspect and Non-Indicative Verbs: Further Soundings in the Greek of the New Testament*, Studies in Biblical Greek 15 (New York: Peter Lang, 2008); Toshikazu S. Foley, *Biblical Translation in Chinese and Greek: Verbal Aspect in Theory and Practice*, Linguistic Biblical Studies 1 (Leiden: Brill, 2009); David Mathewson, *Verbal Aspect in the Book of Revelation: The Function of Greek Verb Tenses in John's Apocalypse*, Linguistic Biblical Studies 4 (Leiden: Brill, 2010); Wally V. Cirafesi, *Verbal Aspect in Synoptic Parallels: On the Method and Meaning of Divergent Tense-Form Usage in the Synoptic Passion Narratives*, Linguistic Biblical Studies 7 (Leiden: Brill, 2013); Douglas S. Huffman, *Verbal Aspect Theory and the Prohibitions in the Greek New Testament*, Studies in Biblical Greek 16 (New York: Peter Lang, 2014).

significant attention was given to the importance of discourse grammar. As a result of the focused emphasis on discourse grammar, particular interest in this topic increased among New Testament Greek grammarians and exegetes. Consequently, the aspect-only position which argues that Greek verbs do not semantically encode time began to be seriously undermined.<sup>4</sup>

Steven E. Runge and other scholars, who also emphasize the importance of discourse grammar in analyzing the Greek verbal system, generally hold that the function of the present indicative verb-form in narrative is to mark what follows.<sup>5</sup> For the purpose of this dissertation, the work of Steven E. Runge will be tested within the book of Judith since his proposal also looks at the function of the present

---

<sup>4</sup>Runge sets out a clear critique of Porter at this point. Steven E. Runge, “Contrastive Substitution and the Greek Verb: Reassessing Porter’s Argument,” *Novum Testamentum* 56 (2014): 154-73. The following are some of the articles/monographs which provide alternative arguments to the Aspect Primary thesis: Runge, *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publisher, 2010); Runge, “The Verbal Aspect of the Historical Present Indicative in Narrative,” in *Discourse Studies and Biblical Interpretation: A Festschrift in Honor of Stephen H. Levinsohn* (Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2011), 191-224; Buist Fanning, “Greek Presents, Imperfects, and Aorists in the Synoptic Gospels: Their Contribution to Narrative Structuring,” in *Discourse Studies and Biblical Interpretation: A Festschrift in Honor of Stephen H. Levinsohn* (Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2011), 191-224; Levinsohn, “The Historic Present and Speech Margins,” 451-73; Elizabeth Robar, “The Historical Present in NT Greek: An Exercise in Interpreting Matthew,” in *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*, ed. Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016), 329-52; Patrick James, “Imperfects, Aorists, Historic Presents, and Perfects in John 11: A Narrative Test Case,” in *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*, ed. Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016), 184-220.

<sup>5</sup> Runge, *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, 125-44; Stephen H. Levinsohn, “Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative,” in *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*, ed. Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016), 163-83; Levinsohn, *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek: A Coursebook on the Information Structure of New Testament Greek*, 2nd ed. (Dallas: SIL International, 2000), 200-213; James, “Imperfects, Aorists, Historic Presents, and Perfects,” 184-220; Robar, “The Historical Present in NT Greek,” 329-52; Long, *Koine Greek Grammar*, 125, 245. It must be noted that the point put forth concerning the function of the historical present by Runge and the Discourse Primary group is not that different than Porter’s. Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 189-98. The main differences are that the Discourse Primary group would suggest that shifts such as these demonstrate that some discourse feature is being marked—since the author chose to step away from the default verb for narrative—as opposed to suggesting that this shift is a testimony to the prominence of the present verb-form as well as the absence of time at the semantic level. See Runge, “Verbal Aspect of the Historical Present,” 219; Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 129. Runge also points to Bernard Comrie’s discussion of a “tenseless” language to suggest that Stanley Porter’s arguments are not “typologically” consistent with a tense-less language. Bernard Comrie, *Tense* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 50-53.

indicative verb in narrative.<sup>6</sup> In his article “The Verbal Aspect of the Historical Present Indicative in Narrative,” he states that his primary objective is to challenge the position that Koine Greek does not grammaticalize tense.<sup>7</sup> Particularly, he resists Stanley Porter’s claim that the present indicative verb form has “inherent prominence value,” which is morphologically marked.<sup>8</sup> Further, he contends that the approach he is proposing is a “functional and typologically-based” approach to language.

After surveying the various functions attributed to the historical present by scholars including vividness, paragraph-marking, and prominence-marking, Runge argues for a discourse processing hierarchy. He contends it will provide a framework for determining the discourse function of a present indicative verb-form in a particular context.<sup>9</sup> Runge states that the meaning assigned to a verb is created by the reader’s “understanding of what is prototypical through their use of the language.”<sup>10</sup> Thus, according to Runge when a verb fits within the expected norm, the reader moves forward. However, if the verb-form falls outside the expected range, then the reader moves up the processing hierarchy in order to determine an alternative explanation.<sup>11</sup> Runge provides the following hierarchy.<sup>12</sup>

1. Level 1: Expected Semantic Function: The semantic meaning of the present indicative verb is imperfective aspect and proximate temporal deixis.
2. Level 2: Processing Function: The mismatch of expected usage leads the reader to add prominence to a discontinuity that is already present in the context

---

<sup>6</sup>Runge, “Verbal Aspect of the Historical Present,” 191-223.

<sup>7</sup>Runge, “Verbal Aspect of the Historical Present,” 191.

<sup>8</sup>Runge, “Verbal Aspect of the Historical Present,” 191; Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 198-207; Porter, *Idioms*, 302-3.

<sup>9</sup>Runge, “Verbal Aspect of the Historical Present,” 203.

<sup>10</sup>Runge, “Verbal Aspect of the Historical Present,” 203.

<sup>11</sup>Runge, “Verbal Aspect of the Historical Present,” 203-4.

<sup>12</sup>Runge, “Verbal Aspect of the Historical Present,” 203-5.

such as segmenting the text, signaling the beginning or end of a paragraph, or opening a new sequence.

3. Level 3: Discourse-Pragmatic Function: This function creates a type of crescendo or climax and occurs when the device (historical present) is overused in a particular series of clauses.

In summary, Runge maintains it is not the core semantic meaning of the verb that changes, but rather the reader's understanding of the purpose of the verb-form in this particular context.<sup>13</sup> This is in contrast to those who propose a zero-tense and zero-aspect function of the historical present. Further, according to Runge, if a present verb-form's usage is within the expected norm of reported speech or non-narrative texts, then there is no rationale for asserting marked meaning for the verb-form.<sup>14</sup> The marked discourse features of the present indicative verb-form in narrative are a pragmatic feature.

### The Present Indicative in Judith

Having examined Runge's article, his thesis will be now evaluated within the book of Judith. The present indicative form occurs 86 times in the book of Judith, and in all but 5 instances,<sup>15</sup> it is located within reported/direct speech.<sup>16</sup> In other words, 94 percent of the present indicative forms are in reported speech.<sup>17</sup> As a result of this distribution of the present indicative verb-form in reported/direct

---

<sup>13</sup>Runge, "Verbal Aspect of the Historical Present," 203-4.

<sup>14</sup>Runge, "Verbal Aspect of the Historical Present," 205-6.

<sup>15</sup>The following are the instances in which the present indicative form is used outside of reported speech: Jdt 1:5; 2:16; 3:9; 4:6; 7:3. In all of these instances the verb form is used to provide explanatory details that are relevant to the reader. This analysis is very similar to Constantine Campbell's analysis of present indicative verb forms which were outside of direct/reported discourse in the Oxyrhynchus Papyri texts which he analyzed. Campbell, *Verbal Aspect*, 45.

<sup>16</sup>This use of the present indicative occurs in the following instances: Jdt 2:5; 3:2; 5:3; 5:5; 5:20-21; 5:23; 6:2; 6:4; 6:9; 7:10a-13; 7:25; 7:28; 8:12-13; 8:15; 8:18; 8:20; 8:24-25; 8:27-29; 8:31; 8:34; 9:6-7; 9:11; 9:14; 10:12-13; 10:19; 11:3-4; 11:7; 11:10; 11:17-19; 11:21-23; 12:3-4; 12:11; 12:13; 13:16-17; 14:18; 16:13-14.

<sup>17</sup>Levinsohn states that when analyzing the discourse function of verbs in narrative one must ignore those which occur in reported/direct speech. Stephen H. Levinsohn, *Self-Instruction Materials on Narrative Discourse Analysis* (Dallas: SIL International, 2015), 68.

speech, there are no instances of the historical present in Judith.

While this may seem surprising since the present indicative verb-form occurs 86 times in Judith, this distribution is consistent with the use of the present indicative form within the following narrative texts from the Septuagint, both composition and translation Greek texts: Ruth and Susanna.<sup>18</sup> For instance, in Ruth and Susanna the number of present indicative forms is similar to Judith,<sup>19</sup> and the utilization of these forms in direct discourse or reported speech is proportionate to Judith.<sup>20</sup> Furthermore, in his research on the Greek verbal system in the Pentateuch, T. V. Evans states that the present most often occurs in direct discourse.<sup>21</sup> This point is further substantiated in Constantine Campbell's research in which he examines Luke, John, *Vita Aesopi G*, Chariton, Oxyrhynchus Papyri III 486.8-9, XLVI 3304.13-15, L 3561.7-8, Thucydides, and Lysias. Campbell states that after examining all of the present indicative verb-forms in these books, one common feature emerges: the primary function of the present indicative verb-form is within discourse.<sup>22</sup> That is, in all of these books an average of 85 percent of the present indicative verb-forms are

---

<sup>18</sup>Susanna is an example of composition Greek, and Ezra and Ruth are examples of translation Greek. Lawrence Lahey, "The Additions to Daniel," in *The T & T Clark Companion to the Septuagint*, ed. J. K. Aitken (London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2015), 557; Cameron Boyd-Taylor, "Esther and Additions to Esther," in *The T & T Clark Companion to the Septuagint*, ed. J. K. Aitken (London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2015), 203-4; Eberhard Bons, "Ruth," in *The T & T Clark Companion to the Septuagint*, ed. J. K. Aitken (London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2015), 118.

<sup>19</sup>The present indicative form occurs 9.37 times per 1,000 words in Judith, 15.90 times per 1,000 words in Ruth, it occurs 15.05 times per 1,000 words in Esther, and it occurs 8.84 times per 1,000 words in Susanna (see appendix 3).

<sup>20</sup>In the book of Ruth 94 percent of the present indicative verb-forms occur in direct discourse/reported speech. The instances in the book of Ruth where the present indicative verb-form does not occur in direct discourse/reported speech are Ruth 1:18 and Ruth 3:8. Similarly, in the book of Susanna 100 percent of the present indicative verb-forms occur in direct discourse/reported speech.

<sup>21</sup>T. V. Evans, *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch: Natural Greek Usage and Hebrew Interference* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 161; K. L. McKay's comment that past narrative only "has room for present . . . reference only in speeches and in parenthetical comment . . ." also appears to coincide with Evans's research. K. L. McKay, "Time and Aspect in New Testament Greek," *Novum Testamentum* 34, no. 3 (1992): 226.

<sup>22</sup>Campbell, *Verbal Aspect*, 56, 76.

connected to discourse, either in direct/indirect discourse or introducing discourse.<sup>23</sup> Further, he goes so far as to say that in the Gospel of Luke, the present indicative verb-form is almost exclusively used as a discourse verb-form.<sup>24</sup>

In light of the absence of the historical present within the book of Judith, the following analysis will be limited to an evaluation of Runge's statement that the present indicative verb is only marked when it occurs in narrative proper.<sup>25</sup> A debate that is particularly relevant, as Gustavo Martín-Ascensio aptly states, "The need of writers to mark varying degrees of saliency in narrative seems to be a universal one."<sup>26</sup> This evaluation will consider the use of the present indicative verb-form in Judith utilizing Porter's theory,<sup>27</sup> since this proposal has not gained the attention the other aspects of his theory has received.<sup>28</sup> An evaluation of the literary context of Judith, the critical commentaries on Judith, and emphases indicated within the critical translations of Judith will be used to test Porter's theory.<sup>29</sup> In other words, the present indicative verb-forms of Judith will be evaluated based on Porter's thesis in order to test the accuracy of Runge's proposal. The evaluation will take place in

---

<sup>23</sup>Campbell, *Verbal Aspect*, 35-57.

<sup>24</sup>Campbell, *Verbal Aspect*, 39.

<sup>25</sup>Runge, "Verbal Aspect of the Historical Present," 219.

<sup>26</sup>Gustavo Martin-Ascensio, *Transitivity-Based Foregrounding in the Acts of the Apostles: A Functional-Grammatical Approach to the Lukan Perspective* (Sheffield, England: Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 43.

<sup>27</sup>Stanley Porter refers to the present as the "foreground tense." In other words, he maintains that at the semantic level the present verb form marks the foreground within a given text. Porter, *Idioms*, 23. Further, the influence of this position is exemplified in the work of Wally V. Cirafesi, who, utilizing Porter's theory concerning the semantic marking of prominence in the Greek verbal system, argues for the markedness of the present indicative verb ποιέω in direct discourse. Cirafesi, *Verbal Aspect in Synoptic Parallels*, 89-101.

<sup>28</sup>Jody A. Barnard, "Is Verbal Aspect a Prominence Indicator? An Evaluation of Stanley Porter's Proposal with Special Reference to the Gospel of Luke," *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 19 (2006): 3.

<sup>29</sup>Both Rodney Decker and Jody Barnard utilize a similar methodology to test Porter's theory. Decker, *Temporal Deixis of the Greek Verb*; Barnard, "Is Verbal Aspect A Prominence Indicator?," 8.

light of the literary context of Judith, the segmentation of texts within the critical translations of the Septuagint, and the analysis of critical commentaries on Judith.<sup>30</sup> In summary, this chapter will evaluate within the book of Judith Runge's rejection of Stanley Porter's claim that the present indicative verb-form is semantically marked for prominence.<sup>31</sup>

### Present Indicative within Reported/Direct Speech

The discourse function of the present indicative within direct/reported speech is disputed.<sup>32</sup> That is, is the form marked as a result of its morphology<sup>33</sup> or is

---

<sup>30</sup>As discussed in chap. 2, among other sources and resources the following critical translations, commentaries, and essays are utilized in this dissertation: (1) Critical Translations: Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright, *A New English Translation of the Septuagint: And the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007); Michael D. Coogan, *The New Oxford Annotated Apocrypha* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010); Eberhard Bons, Wolfgang Kraus, and Martin Karrer, *Septuaginta Deutsch: das griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2009); Natalio Marcos Fernández and María Victoria Spottorno Díaz-Caro, *La Biblia griega septuaginta 2* (Salamanca: Sígueme, 2011); (2) Critical Commentaries: Carey A. Moore, *Judith: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985); Morton Scott Enslin and Solomon Zeitlin, *The Book of Judith, Greek Text with an English Translation* (Leiden: Brill, 1973); Gerald West, "Judith," in *Eerdmans Commentary on the Bible*, ed. James D. G. Dunn and J. W. Rogerson (Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 2003); Dichk M. Kanonge, "Reading Narratives in the Septuagint: A Discourse on Method," in *Septuagint and Reception: Essays Prepared for the Association for the Study of the Septuagint in South Africa*, ed. Johann Cook (Boston: Brill, 2009), 361-82.

<sup>31</sup>Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 198-207; Porter, *Idioms*, 302-3; Steven Runge references William Foley and Robert Van Valin's *Functional Syntax and Universal Grammar* as support for his position concerning the relationship between verb prominence, aspect, and genre. William A. Foley and Robert D. Van Valin, *Functional Syntax and Universal Grammar*, Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 38 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984).

<sup>32</sup>The following is a list of some important works on the topic of discourse analysis and prominence: P. J. Hopper, "Aspect and Foregrounding in Discourse," in *Discourse and Syntax*, ed. T. Givón (New York: Academic, 1979), 213-41; Robert E. Longacre, "Discourse Peak as a Zone of Turbulence," in *Beyond the Sentence: Discourse and Sentential Form*, ed. J. R. Worth (Ann Arbor, MI: Karoma, 1985), 81-98; Stanley E. Porter and D. A. Carson, *Discourse Analysis and Other Topics in Biblical Greek*, Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 113 (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995); Kathleen Callow, *Discourse Considerations in Translating the Word of God* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974); David A. Black, Katharine Barnwell, and Stephen H. Levinsohn, *Linguistics and New Testament Interpretation: Essays in Discourse Analysis* (Nashville: Broadman, 1992); Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*; Runge, *Discourse Grammar*.

<sup>33</sup>Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 198-207; Porter, *Idioms*, 302-3. The following works follow Porter's thesis: Cirafesi, *Verbal Aspect in Synoptic Parallels*; Mathewson, *Verbal Aspect in the Book of Revelation*; J. T. Reed, and R. A. Reese, "Verbal Aspect, Discourse Prominence, and the Letter of Jude," *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 9, no. 18 (1996): 181-99; Reed, *Discourse Analysis of Philipians: Method and Rhetoric in the Debate over Literary Integrity*, Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 136 (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997); Martin-Ascensio, *Foregrounding in the Acts of the Apostles*; Vinh Nguyen, "Prominence and Markedness in Galatians 3: A Linguistic Analysis with Reference to Verbal Aspect Theory" (MA thesis, New Orleans

markedness a pragmatic feature?<sup>34</sup> As stated above, Stanley Porter's thesis that the present verb-form in both narrative and expository material is used to mark prominent features in the text will be applied to the book of Judith in order to evaluate Steven Runge's position.<sup>35</sup>

### Judith 2:4-5

καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς συνετέλεσεν τὴν βουλὴν αὐτοῦ, ἐκάλεσεν Ναβουχοδονοσορ βασιλεὺς Ἀσσυρίων τὸν Ολοφέρνην ἀρχιστράτηγον τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ δεύτερον ὄντα μετ' αὐτὸν καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν· Ἰδοὺ λέγει ὁ βασιλεὺς ὁ μέγας, ὁ κύριος πάσης τῆς γῆς Ἰδοὺ σὺ ἐξελεύσῃ ἐκ τοῦ προσώπου μου καὶ λήμψῃ μετὰ σεαυτοῦ ἄνδρας πεποιθότας ἐν ἰσχύι αὐτῶν, πεζῶν εἰς χιλιάδας ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι καὶ πλῆθος ἵππων σὺν ἀναβάταις χιλιάδας δέκα δύο,

And it came to pass, when he had completed his counsel, Nabouchodonosor, king of the Assyrians, called for Olophernes, the field marshal of his army, being second in command after him, and said to him: "This is what the Great King, Lord of all the earth, *says*: Behold, you shall go forth from my presence, and you shall take with you men who rely on their strength, as many as one hundred and twenty thousand infantry and a troop of horse with twelve thousand riders.

In Judith 2:4-5 there is one present indicative form, λέγει. In Judith 2:1 the narrative shifts from background material to the beginning of the mainline of the narrative. In Judith 2:4 the editor states that first thing Nabouchodonosor did was summon Olophernes to give him orders for his campaign against the nations to the west who did not support his war efforts. In verse 5 the content of these orders is introduced. However, although λέγει introduces direct speech, it occurs in reported speech. As such, the present indicative verb-form is not a historical present, and it is not marked at the pragmatic level.<sup>36</sup>

---

Baptist Theological Seminary, 2016).

<sup>34</sup>Runge, "Verbal Aspect of the Historical Present," 219. The following works similarly contend that the present verb form has no discourse function within direct/reported speech: Levinsohn states that when analyzing the discourse function of verbs in narrative one must ignore those which occur in reported/direct speech. Levinsohn, *Self-Instruction Materials*, 68; Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 125-33; Callow, "The Historic Present in Mark," 1.

<sup>35</sup>Runge, "Verbal Aspect of the Historical Present," 191-221. Bernard, "Is Verbal Aspect a Prominence Indicator?," 3-29.

<sup>36</sup>It is commonly accepted among scholars, including both Runge and Porter, that when

At the semantic level it is challenging to locate any type of marked prominence since the function of λέγει is to introduce Nabuchodonosor's speech. As stated above, because λέγει occurs in direct discourse, there is not the pragmatic function of the present indicative in narrative proper. Consequently, within the context of Judith 2:4-5, λέγει seemingly has no significant function within the text. What is more, commentators do not even mention this verb-form, and no critical translations mark this by segmenting the text—a common feature of the present indicative verb-form when it is used in narrative proper.<sup>37</sup> Thus, in Judith 2:4-5 it is problematic to attempt to conclude that λέγει is marked for prominence.

### Judith 5:20-21

καὶ νῦν, δέσποτα κύριε, εἰ μὲν ἔστιν\* ἀγνόημα ἐν τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ καὶ ἁμαρτάνουσιν\* εἰς τὸν θεὸν αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπισκεψόμεθα ὅτι ἔστιν\* ἐν αὐτοῖς σκάνδαλον τοῦτο, καὶ ἀναβησόμεθα καὶ ἐκπολεμήσομεν αὐτούς· εἰ δ' οὐκ ἔστιν\* ἀνομία ἐν τῷ ἔθνει αὐτῶν, παρελθέτω δὴ ὁ κύριός μου, μήποτε ὑπερασπίσῃ ὁ κύριος αὐτῶν καὶ ὁ θεὸς αὐτῶν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐσόμεθα εἰς ὀνειδισμόν ἐναντίον πάσης τῆς γῆς.

“And now, O lord and master, if there is\* in fact negligence amongst this people, and they are sinning\* against their God, we will also mark this offense which is\* amongst them, and we will go up and make war on them. But if there is\* no lawlessness in their nation, then let my lord pass them by, rather than have their Lord and their God shield them. And we shall be disgraced before all the earth!”

In Judith 5:20-21, the author employs four present indicative verb-forms in this instance of direct speech. In the immediate context which begins in Judith 5:1, in response to the report that the sons of Israel had prepared for war and had

---

the present is used in narrative proper it is pragmatically marked in some way. However, where Porter and Runge disagree is concerning whether the verb forms are semantically marked to convey particular discourse functions.

<sup>37</sup>Moore, *Judith*, 131-34; Enslin and Zeitlin, *The Book of Judith*, 65-67; Toni Craven, *Artistry and Faith in the Book of Judith*: Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983), 77; Efthimiadis-Keith, *The Enemy Is Within*, 160-63,72; West, “Judith,” 749-50; Stanley Porter, as well as a host of other grammarians, state that one of the common functions of the historical present is to introduce new characters, scenes, discourse units, etc. Porter, *Idioms*, 30-31; Runge, “Verbal Aspect,” 191-200. Pietersma, and Wright, *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*; Coogan, *The New Oxford Annotated Apocrypha*; Bons, Kraus, and Karrer, *Septuaginta Deutsch*; Fernández and Díaz-Caro, *La Biblia griega septuaginta 2*.

blocked the highland passages, Olophernes summons the rulers of Moab and the generals of Ammon to receive a report about the sons of Israel. Achior, the leader of the sons of Ammon, provides a lengthy history of the people of Israel, beginning with their ancestry from the Chaldeans, walking Olophernes through their time in Egypt and God's deliverance, moving to God's provision of the land of Chanaan, discussing their exile and return, and then providing Olophernes with the summarizing analysis in Judith 5:20-21. Ammon states that unless the sons of Israel have sinned in some way against their God, Olophernes has no chance of defeating them.

In these concluding verses, the author shifts from using the aorist to the present, a point which according to Porter's theory is intended to show prominence.<sup>38</sup> However, the difficulty with such a claim is that beginning in verse 20 Ammon shifts from recounting the history of the people of Israel to a discourse in which he analyzes the current situation. This sudden shift from the aorist indicative to the present indicative would be expected as a result of the genre change.<sup>39</sup> Further, commentators do not discuss these verbs.<sup>40</sup> For instance, in her article entitled "Speech in the Book of Judith," Deborah Levine Gera does not bring attention to the use of the present form of these verbs in her analysis of Judith 5:20-

---

<sup>38</sup>Porter, *Idioms*, 302; Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 198-207.

<sup>39</sup>Wally V. Cirafesi, an author who follows Porter's thesis in order to argue that the author's choice of a particular instance of the present indicative verb form in direct speech has discourse prominence, acknowledges that the present indicative verb form is the default verb for the mainline of the discourse. Cirafesi, *Verbal Aspect in Synoptic Parallels*, 92. Jody Barnard similarly critiques Porter for not providing a rationale for instances in which a verb-form is used because of pragmatic reason (i.e., default verb form). That is, in his examination of Luke he argues that contrary to Porter's position there are times when Luke chooses a particular verb form merely for pragmatic reasons and not for discourse reasons. That is, he chooses a verb form not because of a desire to communicate prominence, but because that form best communicates the desired content, which may or may not be prominent. Barnard, "Is Verbal Aspect A Prominence Indicator?," 14-15.

<sup>40</sup>Moore, *Judith*, 160-2; Enslin, *Judith*, 91-92; Craven, *Artistry and Faith*, 82; Keith, *Judith*, 331-33; West, "Judith," 751; Deborah Levine Gera, "Speech in the Book of Judith," in *XIV Congress of the IOSCS, Helsinki, 2010*, ed. Melvin K. H. Peters (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010), 413-24.

21. This is surprising if they are semantically marked for prominence.<sup>41</sup> Thus, it is difficult to demonstrate a semantic level prominence for the present indicative verbs in this text.

### Judith 7:10-13

ὁ γὰρ λαὸς οὗτος τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ οὐ πέποιθαν ἐπὶ τοῖς δόρασιν αὐτῶν, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τοῖς ὕψεσι τῶν ὄρέων, ἐν οἷς αὐτοὶ ἐνοικοῦσιν\* ἐν αὐτοῖς· οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν\* εὐχερὲς προσβῆναι ταῖς κορυφαῖς τῶν ὄρέων αὐτῶν. καὶ νῦν, δέσποτα, μὴ πολέμει πρὸς αὐτοὺς καθὼς γίνεται\* πόλεμος παρατάξεως, καὶ οὐ πεσεῖται ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ σου ἀνὴρ εἷς. ἀνάμεινον ἐπὶ τῆς παρεμβολῆς σου διαφυλάσσω πάντα ἄνδρα ἐκ τῆς δυνάμεώς σου, καὶ ἐπικρατησάτωσαν οἱ παῖδες σου τῆς πηγῆς τοῦ ὕδατος, ἣ ἐκπορεύεται\* ἐκ τῆς ρίζης τοῦ ὄρους, διότι ἐκεῖθεν ὑδρεύονται\* πάντες οἱ κατοικοῦντες Βαιτυλουα, καὶ ἀνελεῖ αὐτοὺς ἡ δίψα, καὶ ἐκδώσουσι τὴν πόλιν αὐτῶν· καὶ ἡμεῖς καὶ ὁ λαὸς ἡμῶν ἀναβησόμεθα ἐπὶ τὰς πλησίον κορυφὰς τῶν ὄρέων καὶ παρεμβαλοῦμεν ἐπ' αὐταῖς εἰς προφυλακὴν τοῦ μὴ ἐξελεθεῖν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ἄνδρα ἓνα.

for this people of the sons of Israel do not rely upon their spears but upon the heights of the mountains, wherein they themselves dwell,\* for it is\* not easy to ascend the summits of their mountains. And now, O Master, do not wage\* war against them as a military force is wont to do in regular battle, and not a single man of your people will fall. Remain at your camp, preserving every man of your army, and let your servants hold the spring of water, which issues forth\* from the foot of the mountain, for all those who inhabit Baityloua draw\* their water from there, and the thirst will kill them, and they will surrender their city. And we and our people shall climb up to the neighboring summits of the mountains and encamp upon them for an advanced guard, that not a single man set out from the city.

In Judith 7:10-13, five present indicative verb-forms occur in the address from the leaders of the sons of Esau and Moab to Olophernes. The preceding context immediately follows the decision by Olophernes to take Achoir to Baityloua on account of his speech in Judith 5:5-20—a speech in which Achoir says that unless the sons of Israel have sinned against their God it is impossible to defeat them. In Judith 7:1, the day after taking Achoir to Baityloua, Olophernes gathers his army and begins his march to make war against the sons of Israel. However, before he arrives at Baityloua the rulers of the sons of Esau and Moab approach him, and in Judith

---

<sup>41</sup>Gera, “Speech in the Book of Judith,” 421.

7:9-15 their speech to Olophernes is recounted. The speaker highlights the discontinuities between the sons of Israel and the other peoples, and he provides a strategy that is contrary to what the people and nobles around Olophernes demanded in Judith 5:22-24. According to Stanley Porter's position the presents within this speech are semantically marked for prominence.

A significant problem with this position in this particular text is that each of these verbs are fulfilling their expected function. They are describing the current situation, and an attempt to see the author's choice of the present indicative verb-form to communicate foreground information or "the most important information" is difficult at best.<sup>42</sup> For instance, in verse 12 *ἐκπορεύεται* is used to describe the spring that the leaders of sons of Esau and Moab advise Olophernes to guard. However, it could be argued that the most important information in this verse is not communicated by *ἐκπορεύεται*, but rather *ἐπικρατησάτωσαν* is communicating more important information since it instructs Olophernes about what to do with the spring as opposed to simply describing where the spring is located. One final reason it is problematic to suggest that *ἐκπορεύεται* is communicating the most important information is the fact that the spring flows forth from the foot of the mountain is not highlighted by any of the critical commentaries on Judith, but instead *ἐπικρατησάτωσαν*—the verb form which according to Porter's schema is the least marked for prominence—is highlighted.<sup>43</sup> Thus, the present indicative verb-forms in Judith 7:10-13 do not appear to be communicating the most important information in this text making Porter's position on semantic marking difficult to support.

---

<sup>42</sup>Porter, *Idioms*, 302-3; Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 198-207.

<sup>43</sup>Moore, *Judith*, 173; Enslin, *Judith*, 104; Craven, *Artistry and Faith*, 83; West, "Judith," 752; Jody Barnard makes a similar critique of Porter's position in his study of Luke. Barnard, "Is Verbal Aspect A Prominence Indicator?," 9-11.

## Judith 11:1-10

Και εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτὴν Ολοφέρνης Θάρσησον, γύναι, μὴ φοβηθῆς τῇ καρδίᾳ σου, ὅτι ἐγὼ οὐκ ἐκάκωσα ἄνθρωπον ὅστις ἠρέτικεν δουλεύειν βασιλεῖ Ναβουχοδοноσορ πάσης τῆς γῆς. καὶ νῦν ὁ λαὸς σου ὁ κατοικῶν τὴν ὄρεινὴν εἰ μὴ ἐφάυλισάν με, οὐκ ἂν ἦρα τὸ δόρυ μου ἐπ' αὐτούς· ἀλλὰ αὐτοὶ ἑαυτοῖς ἐποίησαν ταῦτα. καὶ νῦν λέγε μοι τίνος ἔνεκεν ἀπέδρας ἀπ' αὐτῶν καὶ ἦλθες πρὸς ἡμᾶς· ἦκεις\* γὰρ εἰς σωτηρίαν· θάρσει, ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ ζήσῃ καὶ εἰς τὸ λοιπὸν· οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν\* ὃς ἀδικήσῃ σε, ἀλλ' εὖ σε ποιήσῃ, καθὰ γίνεται\* τοῖς δούλοις τοῦ κυρίου μου βασιλέως Ναβουχοδοноσορ. καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτὸν Ιουδιθ Δέξαι τὰ ῥήματα τῆς δούλης σου, καὶ λαλησάτω ἡ παιδίσκη σου κατὰ πρόσωπόν σου, καὶ οὐκ ἀναγγελῶ ψεῦδος τῷ κυρίῳ μου ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ. καὶ ἐὰν κατακολουθήσῃς τοῖς λόγοις τῆς παιδίσκης σου, τελείως πρᾶγμα ποιήσῃ μετὰ σοῦ ὁ θεός, καὶ οὐκ ἀποπεσεῖται ὁ κύριός μου τῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων αὐτοῦ. ζῆ\* γὰρ βασιλεὺς Ναβουχοδοноσορ πάσης τῆς γῆς καὶ ζῆ\* τὸ κράτος αὐτοῦ, ὃς ἀπέστειλén σε εἰς κατόρθωσιν πάσης ψυχῆς, ὅτι οὐ μόνον ἄνθρωποι διὰ σέ δουλεύουσιν\* αὐτῷ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ θηρία τοῦ ἀγροῦ καὶ τὰ κτήνη καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ διὰ τῆς ἰσχύος σου ζήσονται ἐπὶ Ναβουχοδοноσορ καὶ πάντα τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ. ἠκούσαμεν γὰρ τὴν σοφίαν σου καὶ τὰ πανουργεύματα τῆς ψυχῆς σου, καὶ ἀνηγγέλη πάσῃ τῇ γῇ ὅτι σὺ μόνος ἀγαθὸς ἐν πάσῃ βασιλείᾳ καὶ δυνατὸς ἐν ἐπιστήμῃ καὶ θαυμαστὸς ἐν στρατεύμασιν πολέμου. καὶ νῦν ὁ λόγος, ὃν ἐλάλησεν Αχιωρ ἐν τῇ συνεδρίᾳ σου, ἠκούσαμεν τὰ ῥήματα αὐτοῦ, ὅτι περιεποίησαντο αὐτὸν οἱ ἄνδρες Βαιτυλουα, καὶ ἀνήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς πάντα, ὅσα ἐξελάλησεν παρὰ σοί. διό, δέσποτα κύριε, μὴ παρέλθῃς τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ κατάθου αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου, ὅτι ἔστιν\* ἀληθής· οὐ γὰρ ἐκδικᾶται τὸ γένος ἡμῶν, οὐ κατισχύει\* ῥομφαία ἐπ' αὐτούς, ἐὰν μὴ ἀμάρτωσιν εἰς τὸν θεὸν αὐτῶν.

And Olophernes said to her: "Take courage woman; do not be afraid in your heart, for I have not hurt any person who has chosen to be subject to the king of all the earth, Nabouchodonosor. And now, as for your people who inhabit the highlands, if they had not shown me contempt, I would not have taken up my spear against them, but they have done these things to themselves. And now, tell me why you ran away from them and came to us, for you have come\* to safety. Be of courage; you shall live in this night and the future; for there is\* no one who will harm you, but rather will treat you well, as is\* done with the slaves of my lord, King Nabouchodonosor." And Ioudith said to him: "Accept the words of your slave, and let your girl speak to your face, and I will not report falsehood to my lord in this night. And should you follow the words of your girl, God will see the matter through with you entirely, and my lord will not fail in his mission. For Nabouchodonosor, king of all the earth, lives,\* and his might lives,\* he who sent you for the correction of every soul; not only will<sup>b</sup> people be subject\* to him on account of you, but also through your strength the beasts of the field and the cattle and the birds of the sky will live for Nabouchodonosor and all his house. For we have heard tell of your wisdom and of the cunning ways of your spirit, and it has been reported before all the land that in all the kingdom you alone are noble and pre-eminent in experience and prodigious in the campaigns of war. "And now, as for the word which Achior spoke in your council, we have heard his words, for the men of Baityloua saved him, and he reported to them everything that he had said before you. For which reason, O lord and master, do not disregard his word but rather lay it up in your heart, for it is\* true, for he does not punish our race, nor does a sword prevail\* against them, unless they sin against their God.

In Judith 11:1-10 Olophernes's words to Judith upon their meeting and Judith's rationale for her arrival are recorded. There are 8 present indicative verbs in this pericope. In the events leading up to this exchange between Olophernes and Judith, Judith has just recently arrived in the camp of the Assyrians and after being seized by the guards of the camp of the Assyrians, she explains who she is and why she has come. On account of her rationale for her visit and the beauty of her face, the guards arranged for her to be escorted to the tent of Olophernes by 100 choice men (Jdt 10:11-23). The present indicative verbs in this pericope all appear to fit within Porter's framework.

For instance, in verse 3 the present indicative verb ἦκεις is used to describe the outcome of Judith's decision to leave Baityloua and journey to the camp of Olophernes. The leaders tell her, "you have come to salvation." What is communicated by the verb ἦκεις in verse 3 is thematically important in this discourse. Throughout this pericope, the author uses present indicative verbs to weave this theme into the tapestry of Judith 11:1-10.<sup>44</sup> The thematic climax is in verse 10 when Judith repeats Achoir's analysis, using the present verb κατασχύει to declare to Olophernes that salvation ultimately is determined by the God of Israel, since no sword can overcome the sons of Israel unless they have sinned against God.

The importance of the information communicated by these present indicative verbs in this section is also suggested by the emphasis placed on these verbs within the critical commentaries.<sup>45</sup> For instance, Morton S. Enslin and Carey A. Moore both highlight the irony of this interchange between Olophernes and

---

<sup>44</sup>Jdt 11:4—there is (ἐστίν) no one who will harm you; you will be treated well, as is done (γίνεται) with the slaves of my lord, King Nabouchodonosor; Jdt 11:7—for Nabouchodonosor, king of all the earth, lives (ζῆ), and his might lives (ζῆ); not only will people be subject (δουλεύουσιν) to him on account of you; Jdt 11:10—for it is (ἐστίν) true, for he does not punish our race; nor does a sword prevail (κατασχύει) against them.

<sup>45</sup>Moore, *Judith*, 208-10; Enslin, *Judith*, 134-38; Craven, *Artistry and Faith*, 97-98; West, "Judith," 754.

Judith, and they point to Judith's statement "nor does a sword prevail against them, unless they sin against their God" as central to this book.<sup>46</sup> In other words, this notion of the safety of the sons of Israel begins in verse 3 with Olopherens's statement to Judith and culminates in verse 10 with Judith setting the record straight. Safety or destruction for the people of Israel is dependent upon their God, a point that these commentators recognize as significant in the book of Judith. In support of Stanley Porter's schema, the present indicative verbs in Judith 11:1-10 do appear to be communicating the most important information. However, it must be noted that a correlation between the present verb-form and the importance of this information is not apparent. That is, this information would be just as important if the author chose to use another verb-form.<sup>47</sup>

### Concluding Analysis

In summary, the present indicative verb-form occurs 86 times in the book of Judith, and in all but 5 instances, the present indicative form is located within reported speech/direct speech.<sup>48</sup> That is, 94 percent of the present indicative forms are in reported speech.<sup>49</sup> Further, having worked through the occurrences of the present indicative verb-forms within direct/reported speech, in 2 of the 20 direct/reported speech units in Judith, the present indicative verb-forms convincingly convey the most important information.<sup>50</sup> In the 12 other direct/reported speech

---

<sup>46</sup>Moore, *Judith*, 210; Enslin, *Judith*, 138.

<sup>47</sup>Jody Barnard similarly argues that even in the instances in which Stanley Porter's theory matched the data, it may simply be "more to a coincidence than to an intentional marking of prominence." Barnard, "Is Verbal Aspect A Prominence Indicator?," 29.

<sup>48</sup>The following are the instances in which the present indicative form is used outside of reported speech: Jdt 1:5; 2:16; 3:9; 4:6; 7:3.

<sup>49</sup>Levinsohn states that when analyzing the discourse function of verbs in narrative one must ignore those which occur in reported/direct speech. Stephen H. Levinsohn, *Self-Instruction Materials on Narrative Discourse Analysis* (Dallas: SIL International, 2015), 68.

<sup>50</sup>Direct/Reported Speech units in which the present appears to convey the most important information: Jdt 8:12-27; 11:1-10. Direct/Reported Speech units in which the present does not appear to convey the most important information: Jdt 2:1-13; 3:2-4; 5:1-21; 6:2-9; 7:10-13; 7:24-

units—of which 4 are closely analyzed above—the present indicative verb-forms are not clearly conveying the most important information. Rather, in some instances the aorist indicative verb-forms appear to be conveying the most important information. In others, the present verb-forms appear to be chosen not for discourse reasons but for pragmatic reasons. Finally, in other occurrences the correspondence between the present verb-form and the most salient information may be coincidental. After examining the present indicative verb-forms occurring within the direct/reported speeches in the narrative, it appears as though Steven Runge’s thesis that prominence/markedness is a pragmatic feature and not a semantic feature of the verb is supported in the book of Judith.

---

28; 8:28-35; 9:5-14; 10:12-13; 10:19; 11:16-19; 11:21-23; 12:3-4; 12:11-14; 13:15-17; 14:17-18; 16:13-14.

## CHAPTER 5

### THE DISCOURSE FUNCTION OF THE PERFECT INDICATIVE WITHIN THE BOOK OF JUDITH

The function of the perfect indicative verb within historical narrative has been a topic of debate since the publication of Stanley Porter's and Buist Fanning's dissertations in the late 1980s. The longevity of this debate is attested by the recent annual Society of Biblical Literature meeting in which there was an entire session dedicated to the perfect tense-form.<sup>1</sup> Nonetheless, there has not been anyone or any group that has been able to account fully for the complex functions of perfect tense-forms, and scholars within the discourse-primary approach have sought to address this by asking different questions. As previously stated, the discourse-primary proposal does not seek to provide another view on the debates surrounding the Greek verb. Rather, the scholars within this group seek to provide proposals to these questions within a shared linguistic framework.<sup>2</sup>

In other words, the discourse-primary approach seeks to offer a coherent account of insights across disciplinary lines, and as such it provides a very nuanced proposal.<sup>3</sup> Because every scholar or idea from this group cannot be tested, Steven Runge's article "Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect" in *The Greek Verb Revisited* will serve as the representative proposal for this group.<sup>4</sup> This proposal,

---

<sup>1</sup>2013 Society of Biblical Literature Annual Meeting, Baltimore, MD, Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics section.

<sup>2</sup>Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch, eds., *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis* (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016), 3.

<sup>3</sup>Runge and Fresch, *The Greek Verb Revisited*, 3.

<sup>4</sup>Steven E. Runge, "Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect," in *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*, ed. Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch

which will be evaluated in light of the usage of the perfect tense-forms within the book of Judith, argues that the perfect tense-form shows the relevance of the information contained in this form to the current discourse or situation. This is in contrast to the aspect-primary approach which argues that the perfect tense-form is prominent in narrative.<sup>5</sup>

It is imperative to understand that this proposal is based upon a constellation of morphological and historical/linguistic data.<sup>6</sup> That is, the discourse-primary proposal concerning the function of the perfect tense-form in narrative is built upon two presuppositions. First, the historical, morphological, and linguistic data demonstrates that the perfect tense-form semantically encodes both perfective and imperfective aspect.<sup>7</sup> Second, its function is a result of both semantic and discourse reasons.<sup>8</sup> Thus, the Discourse Primary group recognizes that the perfect verb-form is not only used for discourse reasons; rather, they understand that at the semantic level the perfect is simply the verb-form used in Greek to communicate anterior, resultative, and pure state information.<sup>9</sup> However, as stated above, at the discourse level—the focus of this dissertation—the discourse-primary group argues

---

(Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016), 459-62.

<sup>5</sup>Runge, “Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect,” 459-62. See also Steven E. Runge, *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publisher, 2010), 129; Stanley E. Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*, 2nd ed. (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 39-40; Porter, *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament with Reference to Tense and Mood* (New York: Peter Lang, 1989), 248-51.

<sup>6</sup>Runge, “Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect,” 462.

<sup>7</sup>Runge, “Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect.” Runge states that the “perfective aspect captures the state of affairs, whereas the imperfective component implicates an ongoing connection to the present discourse context.” For a detailed discussion of the morphological support for the perfect encoding both imperfective and perfective aspect, see Randall Buth, “Perfect Greek Morphology and Pedagogy,” in *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*, ed. Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016), 416-29.

<sup>8</sup>Runge, “Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect,” 461-63, 483. Runge maintains that the perfect, unlike the aorist, semantically encodes logical or temporal connection between an anterior action to the current discourse.

<sup>9</sup>Runge, “Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect,” 461-62, 483.

that the perfect verb-form is used to show the relevance of the information contained in the perfect verb-form to the current discourse or situation.<sup>10</sup> Before testing the Discourse Primary proposal within the book of Judith, it is necessary to look more closely at Steven Runge's arguments in "Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect."

The discourse-primary proposal concerning the function of the perfect verb-form is represented by Steven E. Runge. He seeks to address the issues surrounding the perfect verb-form by asking discourse questions, as opposed to simply focusing on questions about the perfect verb-form's semantic meaning or translation value.<sup>11</sup> He contends that at the discourse level, the perfect verb-form is used to show the relevance of the information it contains to the current discourse or situation.<sup>12</sup>

It must be noted that Runge's attempt to ask discourse questions about the perfect verb-form does not devalue the work of scholars who have focused on the semantic and translation value of the perfect verb-form. Instead, it builds upon this work by using their conclusions as he articulates his proposal.<sup>13</sup> In other words, his discourse argument complements the proposals of scholars concerning the aspect, semantic value, and function of the perfect indicative verb-form. Some of the scholars upon which he bases his conclusions concerning the aspectual and semantic value of the perfect verb-form are D. N. Shankara Bhat, Fredrich Blass, Daniel B. Wallace, Sander Orriens, Christopher J. Thomson, Robert Crellin, and Nicholas J.

---

<sup>10</sup>Runge, "Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect," 463-79. Runge argues that whether the perfect tense-form precedes, follows, or occurs in embedded speech, its discourse function is to show the relevance of the action described in the perfect-verb-form to the current discourse or situation.

<sup>11</sup>Runge, "Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect," 458.

<sup>12</sup>Runge, "Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect," 459-62. See also Steven E. Runge, *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publisher, 2010), 129.

<sup>13</sup>Runge, "Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect," 462.

Ellis.<sup>14</sup> Thus, Runge's argument is based upon a constellation of morphological and historical/linguistic data.

In light of the importance of the morphological and historical/linguistic data to Runge's argument, some of the scholars whom Runge references in each of these areas will be examined. First, two scholars whose work on the morphology of the perfect verb-form influenced Runge's argument are Nicholas Ellis and Randall Buth. These grammarians both argue that based upon morphology, the perfect verb-form has a combination of perfective and imperfective aspect, in which the imperfective aspect is marked through reduplication and the perfective aspect is marked through the *kappa* suffix.<sup>15</sup> In other words, the perfect verb-form will consist of an action or an event in which the perfective aspect describes the action or event with reference to its historicity, and the imperfective aspect conveys its ongoing relevance.<sup>16</sup> It should be noted that this combinative aspect proposal is not new, as Runge indicates in his reference to grammarians such as Friedrich Blass and Daniel Wallace who also hold this position.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup>Runge, "Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect," 459-63; Bernard Comrie, *Aspect: An Introduction to the Study of Verbal Aspect and Related Problems* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976); D. N. Shankara Bhat, *The Prominence of Tense, Aspect, and Mood* (Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1999); Friedrich Blass, *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, trans. Henry St. John Thackeray (London: Macmillan, 1898); Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996); Sander Orriens, "The Greek Perfect as a Situating Cohesion Device," in *Discourse Cohesion in Ancient Greek*, ed. Stephanie J. Bakker and G. C. Wakker, Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology 16 (Leiden: Brill, 2009); Christopher J. Thompson, "What Is Aspect? Contrasting Definitions in General Linguistics and New Testament Studies," in *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*, ed. Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016), 13-80; Robert Crellin, "The Semantics of the Perfect in the Greek of the New Testament," in *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*, ed. Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016), 430-57; Nicholas J. Ellis, "Aspect-Prominence, Morpho-Syntax, and a Cognitive-Linguistic Framework for the Greek Verb," in *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*, ed. Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016), 122-62.

<sup>15</sup>Ellis, "Aspect-Prominence," 122-62; Buth, "Perfect Greek Morphology," 416-29.

<sup>16</sup>Buth, "Perfect Greek Morphology," 418-23; Ellis, "Aspect-Prominence," 141-3.

<sup>17</sup>Runge, "Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect," 459; Blass, *Grammar*, 198; Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 573.

Second, some of the scholars whose historical and linguistic work helped to shape Runge's argument are Geoffrey Horrocks, Bernard Comrie, D. N. Shankara Bhat, Sander Orriens, and Robert Crellin. Horrocks's historical research and Comrie, Bhat, Orriens, and Crellin's linguistic work serve as a foundation for Runge's position that the perfect verb-form's distinctiveness lies in marking relevance. The binary opposition, therefore, is between the aorist and the perfect and not the present and the perfect.<sup>18</sup> Thus, Runge's work does not negate the work of scholars who have focused on the semantic and translation value of the perfect verb-form but rather affirms their views.

Turning from Runge's infrastructure, his own arguments furnish the "brick and mortar" of his thesis. The perfect indicative verb-form shows the relevance of the information contained in the perfect verb-form to the current discourse or situation.<sup>19</sup> Runge states that he desires to answer the question, "What does the Greek perfect do in discourse?" Or, "What is the discourse function of the Greek perfect?"<sup>20</sup> His fundamental point is that although most linguists and New Testament scholars recognize that a significant characteristic of the perfect is "relevance," they fail to capitalize upon this essential feature of the perfect.<sup>21</sup> That is, he argues that the perfect verb-form is commonly described as showing the present relevance of a past action or situation, but this does not receive enough consideration.<sup>22</sup> Runge supports this by pointing to the work of linguists like

---

<sup>18</sup>Runge, "Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect," 460-61, 478, 482; Comrie, *Aspect*, 12, 52-65; Bhat, *Prominence*, 170; Geoffrey Horrocks, *Greek: A History of the Language and Its Speakers*, 2nd ed. (Chichester, England: Wiley, 2014), 177; Crellin, "The Semantics of the Perfect," 430-57.

<sup>19</sup>Runge, "Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect," 459-62; Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 129.

<sup>20</sup>Runge, "Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect," 458.

<sup>21</sup>Runge, "Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect," 458.

<sup>22</sup>Runge, "Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect," 458-59.

Bernard Comrie, D. N. Shankara Bhat, and Sander Orriens. Specifically, he points to the conclusions of the following scholars concerning the perfect verb-form:

1. Bernard Comrie states, “The term ‘perfect’ refers to a past situation which has present relevance, for instance the present result of a past event (his arm has been broken).”<sup>23</sup>
2. D. N. Shankara Bhat argues that the Greek perfect verb-form connects some logically previous situation or state to the current discourse.<sup>24</sup>
3. For Sander Orriens, the perfect marks “a reciprocal relationship between a completed past state of affairs and the moment of speech.”<sup>25</sup>

Each of these scholars recognize the relevance-characterization of the perfect verb-form. However, Runge’s argument is that no one has sufficiently tested this thesis on extensive discourse units. Thus, his proposal seeks to show how this characteristic of the perfect verb-form serves to provide an explanation to its discourse function as well as a possible way forward in the debates surrounding the perfect verb-form.

Runge tests his thesis by looking at the function of the perfect in Luke, Romans, and Hebrews.<sup>26</sup> In his research he finds that whether the perfect precedes, follows, or occurs on the mainline its discourse function in nearly every instance clearly supported his thesis.<sup>27</sup> He states that when the perfect verb-form precedes that to which it is relevant, it constrains the reader to understand that the information presented by the perfect verb-form is relevant to what follows.<sup>28</sup> Further, he purports that the perfects which follow that to which they are relevant are usually in a dependent relationship, which aids the reader in properly identifying the information contained within the perfect verb-form as relevant to what precedes

---

<sup>23</sup>Comrie, *Aspect*, 12-14.

<sup>24</sup>Bhat, *Prominence*, 170.

<sup>25</sup>Orriens, “The Greek Perfect,” 225.

<sup>26</sup>Runge, “Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect,” 463.

<sup>27</sup>Runge, “Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect,” 463-73.

<sup>28</sup>Runge, “Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect,” 463-66.

it.<sup>29</sup> Finally, Runge argues that when the perfect verb-forms occur on the theme-line it will be in an embedded speech in which the perfect is adding relevant information to a preceding speech or situation.<sup>30</sup> For Runge, the distinction between the perfect verb-form and the aorist verb-form in this context is that in contrast to what is discussed above, the aorist is simply descriptive and is not used to indicate the relevance of the information it provides with what precedes or follows it.<sup>31</sup> Thus, Runge argues that the perfect verb-form is used to show the relevance of the information contained in the perfect verb-form to the current discourse or situation.<sup>32</sup>

In summary, the Discourse Primary Approach, as represented by Steven Runge in his article “Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect” proposes that the historical and linguistic data demonstrates that the perfect verb-form first semantically encodes both perfective and imperfective aspect, and second, its function is based upon both semantic and discourse features. Namely, the discourse-primary group purports that the historical as well as the linguistic data indicates that the aspect of the perfect verb-form is a combination of both perfective and imperfective aspect, and its function is to establish a connection between a prior action or state of affairs to the reference time of discourse, whether the prior action or state be logical or temporal, and whether the perfect occurs on the mainline of the narrative or before or after the verb it is related.<sup>33</sup> Furthermore, the discourse-primary proposal argues that the perfect verb-form is used in place of the aorist in

---

<sup>29</sup>Runge, “Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect,” 466-72.

<sup>30</sup>Runge, “Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect,” 472-76.

<sup>31</sup>Runge, “Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect,” 465, 478.

<sup>32</sup>Runge, “Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect,” 459-62; Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 129.

<sup>33</sup>Runge, “Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect,” 462, 465.

order to show the relevance of the information contained in the perfect verb-form to the current discourse or situation.<sup>34</sup> Thus, this thesis suggests that in the book of Judith both the usage and placement of the perfect indicative verb-form should be for the purpose of showing the relevance of a prior state or action to the current discourse.<sup>35</sup> In other words, the perfect indicative verb-form should be used in contexts in which the aorist would be appropriate, and its placement within the discourse—whether it occurs on the mainline of the narrative or before or after the verb—should not impact its relevancy constraint.

Having closely examined the arguments put forth concerning the perfect verb-form by the discourse-primary approach, this discourse-primary proposal will now be tested within the book of Judith. In the following section, I will provide a summary of the data, an analysis of each instance of the perfect verb-form, and a final analysis concerning the viability of the Discourse Primary proposal.<sup>36</sup>

### **The Perfect Indicative in Judith**

The perfect verb-form occurs 12 times in the book of Judith, and each occurrence is found within direct discourse. There are 1,660 perfect indicative verb-forms in the Septuagint. The book with the highest number of perfect indicative verb-forms is Job with 145, and the book with the lowest number is Song of Solomon with one occurrence. The number of instances of the perfect indicative verb-form in Judith is consistent with the range of usage of the perfect indicative verb-form within Septuagint books that are composition Greek as well as books

---

<sup>34</sup>Runge, “Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect,” 462-67, 472, 476, 478.

<sup>35</sup>This point stands in direct contrast with Stanley Porter’s thesis concerning the function of the perfect tense-form. Porter argues that the perfect is used to bring the action or state conveyed through the perfect tense-form to the foreground. Porter, *Idioms*, 23.

<sup>36</sup>As stated in chap. 1, I preface my analysis with the recognition that Judith is a very limited corpus and the idiolect and register is likely affected by the reality that Judith is translation Greek.

which are translation Greek.<sup>37</sup> For instance, the perfect occurs 1.93 times per 1,000 words in the book of Second Maccabees, 1.87 times per 1,000 words in the book of Wisdom, 1.26 times per 1,000 words in Leviticus, and 1.31 times per 1,000 words in the book of Judith.<sup>38</sup> Thus, although the data sample for the perfect indicative verb-form is small within the book of Judith and the idiolect and register limits the results, the distribution is consistent with other books within the Septuagint. More specifically, within the book of Judith the usage of the perfect is represented by the following percentages with respect to the Discourse Primary proposal: pre-relevant marker perfects: 17 percent; post-relevant marker perfects: 66 percent; theme-line perfects: 17 percent.<sup>39</sup>

### Perfect Verb-Form: Marker of Relevance

#### Judith 2:12-13

*ὅτι ζῶν ἐγὼ καὶ τὸ κράτος τῆς βασιλείας μου, λελάληκα\* καὶ ποιήσω ταῦτα ἐν χειρὶ μου. καὶ σὺ δὲ οὐ παραβήσῃ ἐν τι τῶν ῥημάτων τοῦ κυρίου σου, ἀλλὰ ἐπιτελῶν ἐπιτελέσεις καθότι προστέταχά\* σοι, καὶ οὐ μακρυνεῖς τοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτά.*

For as I live, and on the might of my kingdom, I have spoken,\* and I will accomplish these things by my hand. You too shall not transgress even one of the words of your lord; rather, when you carry them out, you are to carry them out just as I have ordered\* you and not put off their doing.

---

<sup>37</sup>See appendix 2.

<sup>38</sup>See appendix 2.

<sup>39</sup>Runge tests his thesis by looking at the function of the perfect in Luke, Romans and Hebrews. In his research, he finds that whether the perfects precede, follow, or occur on the mainline their discourse function in nearly every instance they clearly supported his thesis. He provides three categories of usage within his thesis. First, he states that the first category accounts for when the perfect tense-form precedes that to which it is relevant, it constrains the reader to understand that the information presented by the perfect tense-form is relevant to what follows. Second, he purports that the second category consists of perfects which follow that to which they are relevant, and which are usually in a dependency relationship which aids the reader in properly identifying the information contained within the perfect tense-form as relevant to what precedes it. Third, Runge argues that the third category describes those perfect tense-forms which occur on the theme-line, and which are in an embedded speech in which the perfect is adding relevant information to a preceding speech or situation. Thus, Runge argues that the perfect tense-form is used to show the relevance of the information contained in the perfect tense-form to the current discourse or situation. Runge, "Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect," 463-73.

There are two perfect indicative verb-forms in Judith 2:12-13. In the book of Judith, each one of these forms occurs in direct discourse. In the context leading up to the use of these two perfect verb-forms, upon defeating Arphaxad, the king of the Medes, Nabouchodonosor has just chosen Olophernes to serve as the leader of his army for the purpose of judging the nations to the west for not heeding his order to join in the war against Arphaxad. In verse 12, the perfect indicative verb-form *λελάληκα* is used with *ὅτι*, and it is providing the grounds for his order that Olophernes destroy all the nations who ignored his command.<sup>40</sup> Further, in verse 13 the perfect indicative verb-form *προστέταχά* is used with *καθότι*, and it serves to explain the manner in which Olophernes will carry out Nabouchodonosor's orders.<sup>41</sup>

As discussed in the summary of Steven Runge's article "Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect" the "meaningful choice" for the author in narrative was the aorist versus perfect, not the present versus perfect.<sup>42</sup> In this case, the aorist would simply look back on a situation or event, whereas the perfect constrains the reader to see the link between the past state or event and the present discourse.<sup>43</sup> In both of these examples, the function of the perfects support the second category of the Discourse Primary thesis. The perfects which follow that to which they are relevant are usually in a dependent relationship, aiding the reader in properly identifying the information contained within the perfect verb-form as relevant to

---

<sup>40</sup>F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), 238; Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 674.

<sup>41</sup>Henry George Liddell, et al., *A Greek-English Lexicon*. rev. ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 856.

<sup>42</sup>Runge, "Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect," 483. Steven Runge basis this upon the work of Orriens, "The Greek Perfect," 225, and Arjan Amor Nijk, "The Rhetorical Function of the Perfect in Classical Greek," *Philologus* 157 (2013): 237-62.

<sup>43</sup>Runge, "Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect," 460; Orriens, "The Greek Perfect," 225.

what precedes it.<sup>44</sup> That is, it does appear to highlight the relevance of the action or state communicated in the perfect indicative verb-form to the current discourse. In both instances the author is referencing instruction given in the past, and the emphasis is on its current relevance. This is reinforced by the use of the future to describe what Olophernes is to do with this instruction.<sup>45</sup>

### Judith 5:3-4

καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Ἀναγγείλατε δὴ μοι, υἱοὶ Χανααν, τίς ὁ λαὸς οὗτος ὁ καθήμενος ἐν τῇ ὄρεινῃ, καὶ τίνες αἱ κατοικοῦσιν πόλεις, καὶ τὸ πλῆθος τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐν τίνι τὸ κράτος αὐτῶν καὶ ἡ ἰσχὺς αὐτῶν, καὶ τίς ἀνέστηκεν\* ἐπ' αὐτῶν βασιλεὺς ἡγούμενος στρατιᾶς αὐτῶν, καὶ διὰ τί κατενωτίσαντο τοῦ μὴ ἐλθεῖν εἰς ἀπάντησίν μοι παρὰ πάντας τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἐν δυσμαῖς.

and said to them: “Now tell me, sons of Chanaan, who is this people seated in the highlands, and what cities do they inhabit, and what is the number of their army, and in what does their power and strength lie, and who has arisen\* over them as king, leading their army, and why have they, of all the inhabitants of the west, disdained to come and meet me?”

The perfect indicative verb-form in Judith 5:3 is located within a reported event. In Judith 5:1 Olophernes is told that the sons of Israel had prepared for war, and in his anger, he summons the leaders of Moab and the generals of Ammon to inquire about this people who were resisting him. The perfect indicative verb-form ἀνέστηκεν in Judith 5:3 is located within a series of questions from Olophernes in which the aorist is used for the narrative.<sup>46</sup> The Discourse Primary thesis fits well with this use of the perfect, specifically with Runge’s third category concerning “Theme-Line Perfects in Embedded Speeches” in which he argues that these perfect indicative verb-forms show the relevance of the action conveyed in the perfect to the preceding context on the theme-line of the discourse, rather than providing relevant

<sup>44</sup>Runge, “Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect,” 466-72.

<sup>45</sup>In v. 12 the author uses the future of ποιέω and in v. 13 he uses the future of μακρύνω to describe how Olophernes is to respond to this past instruction.

<sup>46</sup>Jdt 5:1—It was reported (ἀνηγγέλη) to Olophernes that the sons of Israel prepared (παρεσκευάσαντο) for war; Jdt 5:2—he was extremely angered (ὠργίσθη) by this and he summoned (ἐκάλεσεν) all the rulers of Moab and Ammon.

subordinate information.<sup>47</sup>

While this example still marks the content as relevant to the current discourse, this instance of the perfect in Judith does not precede or follow in a dependency relationship that to which it is relevant. Rather, in this example the perfect is used in reported speech and is not being used to support what precedes or follows, but is instead providing theme-line information that is marked for relevance to the current situation.<sup>48</sup> In other words, the perfect is selected because, unlike the aorist, it is marked to indicate that the king is still reigning, a particularly salient point to the current discourse.<sup>49</sup>

### Judith 7:10

ὁ γὰρ λαὸς οὗτος τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ οὐ πέποιθαν\* ἐπὶ τοῖς δόρασιν αὐτῶν, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τοῖς ὕψει τῶν ὀρέων, ἐν οἷς αὐτοὶ ἐνοικοῦσιν ἐν αὐτοῖς· οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν εὐχερὲς προσβῆναι ταῖς κορυφαῖς τῶν ὀρέων αὐτῶν.

for this people of the sons of Israel do not rely\* upon their spears but upon the heights of the mountains, wherein they themselves dwell, for it is not easy to ascend the summits of their mountains.

The function of the perfect in 7:10 fits within the thesis proposed by the Discourse Primary approach. More specifically, it supports the second category of the Discourse Primary proposal: the perfects which follow that to which they are relevant are usually in a dependency relationship, which aids the reader in properly identifying the information contained within the perfect verb-form as relevant to what precedes it.<sup>50</sup> In other words, it indicates that the state of not trusting in their spears (οὐ πέποιθαν ἐπὶ τοῖς δόρασιν αὐτῶν) is a relevant point in the current discourse. Unlike the aorist, which is not marked to indicate whether or not an action is still a

---

<sup>47</sup>Runge, "Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect," 472-77.

<sup>48</sup>Runge, "Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect," 472-73.

<sup>49</sup>Runge, "Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect," 461; Orriens, "The Greek Perfect," 225.

<sup>50</sup>Runge, "Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect," 466-72.

reality, the perfect is able to communicate the ongoing nature of the action. This understanding of the perfect is further supported by the use of *γάρ* before *πέποιθαν*, since it indicates that *πέποιθαν* has an explanatory function, providing the cause or grounds which support the mainline in this discourse (*Ακουσάτω δὴ λόγον ὁ δεσπότης ἡμῶν*).<sup>51</sup> Since the request for Olophernes to listen is supported by the reality that the people of the sons of Israel are trusting in the heights of the mountains, it is essential that the verbal form indicates the action is currently relevant.

### Judith 7:25

καὶ νῦν οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ βοηθὸς ἡμῶν, ἀλλὰ πέπρακεν\* ἡμᾶς ὁ θεὸς εἰς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν τοῦ καταστρωθῆναι ἐναντίον αὐτῶν ἐν δίψῃ καὶ ἀπωλείᾳ μεγάλῃ.

And now there is no helper for us, but God has sold\* us into their hands, to be laid low before them with thirst and great destruction.

The perfect indicative verb-form in Judith 7:25 occurs at a critical point in the narrative. Beginning in verse 24, the narrative intensifies with the shift from historical narrative to direct discourse.<sup>52</sup> The discourse begins by using an aorist indicative (*ἐποιήσατε*) to describe how they ended up in their situation. The people state that because the elders did not treat the Assyrians properly they are now suffering. However, when the writer describes the current situation he switches from the aorist indicative verb-form to the perfect indicative verb-form *πέπρακεν*. The context seems to demand that this act of being “exported as captives for sale”<sup>53</sup> to the Assyrians—which began months prior when the Assyrians, the Ammonites, and the Edomites surrounded them and took away all of their food and water supply—is still

---

<sup>51</sup>Herbert Weir Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, rev. ed. (1920; repr., Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984), 637-38; Blass, Debrunner, and Funk, *Greek Grammar*, 235-36; Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 658; Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 54; Stephen Levinsohn, *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek: A Coursebook on the Information Structure of New Testament Greek*. 2nd ed. (Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 2000), 91.

<sup>52</sup>Carey A. Moore, *Judith: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, The Anchor Bible 40 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985), 175.

<sup>53</sup>Liddell, et al., *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 1395.

a present reality.<sup>54</sup> If the author had used the aorist indicative verb-form, the present relevance of the action would have been less clear.

The perfect in Judith 7:25 appears to fit within the thesis proposed by the Discourse Primary group. Specifically, it supports the second category of the Discourse Primary thesis. The perfects which follow that to which they are relevant are usually in a dependency relationship, aiding the reader in properly identifying the information contained within the perfect verb-form as relevant to what precedes it.<sup>55</sup> Namely, it obligates the reader to understand that the action conveyed in *πέπρακεν* is directly connected to the statement that they were left without a helper. This connection between the lack of a helper and their current situation is particularly noteworthy since in just a few verses the helper, Judith, will be introduced in the narrative.<sup>56</sup>

### **Judith 8:24**

καὶ νῦν, ἀδελφοί, ἐπιδειξώμεθα τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ἡμῶν, ὅτι ἐξ ἡμῶν κρέματα ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτῶν, καὶ τὰ ἅγια καὶ ὁ οἶκος καὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον ἐπεστήρισται\* ἐφ' ἡμῖν.

And now, brothers, let us prove to our brothers that their life hangs upon us and that the holy precincts and the house and the altar rest\* upon us . . . .

In Judith 8:24 the perfect indicative verb-form once again appears to be used to show the relevance of the action to the current discourse. More specifically, it appears to be functioning within Runge's third category; it is occurring on the theme-line of the narrative, and as such it is highlighting the relevance of the information contained in the perfect indicative verb-form to the mainline of the narrative.<sup>57</sup> Further, the perfect in Judith 8:24 fits within the criteria set-forth within

---

<sup>54</sup>Jdt 7:16-22.

<sup>55</sup>Runge, "Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect," 466-72.

<sup>56</sup>Jdt 8:1.

<sup>57</sup>Runge, "Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect," 472-76.

Runge's article. Namely, it occurs within an embedded speech, and it is adding relevant information to the preceding speech or situation.<sup>58</sup> In Judith 8 the scene in the narrative shifts to Judith, and the focus quickly narrows in upon her response to the leaders' decision to follow the desires of the people and surrender to the Assyrians. Judith rebukes the leaders for this decision to surrender and gives three exhortations: call upon God (8:17), convince the people of the importance of their submission to their leaders (8:24), and give thanks to God for this trial (8:25). In Judith 8:24, unlike the other two exhortations, the author uses the perfect indicative verb-form, as opposed to the aorist to explain her exhortation.

In verses 17 and 25 the aorist indicative appears to be used because the continuing present reality of the actions described by those verbs (in verse 18 the author supports the exhortation in verse 17 by describing, with the aorist, their blameless past, and in verse 25 the aorist forms are used to remind the reader of God's past actions) are not relevant to the current discourse. In other words, the actions described by those aorist verbs are completed, and the author is referencing them as past events. Conversely, in verse 24 the author uses the perfect indicative verb-form of *ἐπιστήριζω*, and the context suggests that its present reality is very important for current discourse. Namely, *ἐπιστήριζω* is used in place of the aorist to emphasize to the people that they need to trust their leaders because not only is their well-being placed upon their leaders (*κρέματα*), but the holy precincts, the temple, and the altar have also been placed upon them. Thus, the choice of the perfect as opposed to the aorist seems to be based on the importance of the current relevance of the action in the verb.

Moreover, this data seems to suggest that the aorist indicative verb-form would have been the expected form if the author merely wanted to state the fact that

---

<sup>58</sup>Runge, "Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect," 472-76.

they were charged with the protection of the holy precincts, the temple, and the altar. However, since this reality is particularly relevant to the current discourse, the author uses the perfect indicative verb-form.<sup>59</sup> This point is aptly demonstrated in the use of ἐπιστήριζω in Judges 16:23-31, the account of the final event of Sampson's life. In this story Sampson pushes down the foundation pillars of a house full of Philistines and sacrifices himself in order to destroy the enemies of Israel. In Judges 16:26 the perfect of ἐπιστήριζω is used to describe the pillars which held up the building, and the aorist form of ἐπιστήριζω is used to describe what Samson did to them in Judges 16:29.

The key points to notice are that when the author wants to emphasize the current relevance of a past action the perfect is employed, and when he wants to simply state that an action occurred he uses the aorist. That is, in Judges 16:26 the perfect is used because in the direct speech Samson is describing a past action—the construction of the house upon particular pillars—that has continuing relevance in the current discourse. The pillars were still holding up the building. In 16:29 the aorist is used because the author is now simply reporting a past event—Samson leaning his hands against the two pillars. Thus, these examples seem to be functioning in a similar fashion to Judith 8:24, and the author's choice of the perfect form of ἐπιστήριζω therefore appears to support Runge's thesis.

### **Judith 8:30**

ἀλλὰ ὁ λαὸς δεδίψηκεν\* σφόδρα καὶ ἠνάγκασαν ἡμᾶς ποιῆσαι καθὰ ἐλαλήσαμεν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐπαγαγεῖν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ὄρκον, ὃν οὐ παραβησόμεθα.

But the people thirst\* exceedingly, and they have compelled us to act in accordance with what we said to them and have urged an oath upon us, which we will not transgress.

In Judith 8:30 the perfect indicative verb-form is used to describe the leaders'

---

<sup>59</sup>Buth, "Perfect Greek Morphology," 422.

initial response to Judith. The context surrounding the use of the perfect verb-form, *δεδίψηκεν*, again appears to support the Discourse Primary thesis that the discourse purpose of the perfect verb-form is to show the relevance of the action to the current discourse. Particularly, in this instance the perfect verb-form fits within the first category of the Discourse Primary proposal—the perfect indicative verb-form precedes that to which it is relevant.<sup>60</sup> Moreover, he states that when the perfect verb-form precedes that to which it is relevant, it constrains the reader to understand that the information presented by the perfect verb-form is relevant to what follows.<sup>61</sup> The perfect is used because the fact that the people are thirsty has placed the leaders in a position in which they cannot listen to Judith and ignore the people’s wish to surrender to the Assyrians. Thus, the perfect, unlike the aorist which would simply mark that the people were thirsty in the past, is able to mark the present relevance of this past event to the current discourse in which the leaders are constrained by the people’s situation to surrender to the Assyrians.<sup>62</sup> In other words, the perfect is being used to mark the relevance of the people being thirsty to the current discourse.

### Judith 10:15

Σέσωκας\* τὴν ψυχὴν σου σπεύσασα καταβῆναι εἰς πρόσωπον τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν· καὶ νῦν πρόσελθε ἐπὶ τὴν σκηνὴν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀφ’ ἡμῶν προπέμψουσίν σε, ἕως παραδώσουσίν σε εἰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ·

Hastening to come down to face our lord, you have saved\* your life. And now, approach his tent, and some of us will escort you until they pass you into his hands.

The perfect form of *σώζω* (*Σέσωκας*) in Judith 10:15 is set within the account

---

<sup>60</sup>Runge, “Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect,” 463-66.

<sup>61</sup>Runge, “Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect,” 463.

<sup>62</sup>Morton Enslin’s suggestion that the perfect verb *δεδίψηκεν* should be translated “have or had become thirsty,” supports the idea of the present reality of their situation. This suggests that he also sees the present relevance of *δεδίψηκεν*, a point which would support Steven Runge and the Discourse Primary thesis. Morton Scott Enslin and Solomon Zeitlin, *The Book of Judith, Greek Text with an English Translation* (Leiden: Brill, 1973), 119.

of Judith’s departure from the safety of Baityloua, her city, to the camp of Olophernes. Moreover, the placement of the perfect indicative verb-form supports the Discourse Primary proposal as represented by Runge. Namely, Runge’s first category, when the perfect verb-form precedes that to which it is relevant, constrains the reader to understand that the information presented by the perfect verb-form is relevant to what follows.<sup>63</sup> In other words, the function of σέσωκας appears to highlight the current relevance the action conveyed in this verb. Namely, her salvation is being marked as important to the current discourse.

The relevance of σέσωκας is suggested by the remainder of the discourse, describing how she will be saved.<sup>64</sup> Carey Moore’s comments on the irony of this verse may support the Discourse Primary proposal. According to Moore, there is irony in the soldier’s declaration that Judith had saved her life “by being delivered into Holofernes’s hands,” when in reality her life had been saved “by taking Holofernes into her hands.”<sup>65</sup> In other words, Moore sees the comment about Judith’s salvation (σέσωκας) as significant to the current narrative discourse, the very point the Discourse Primary proposal is arguing. Therefore, σέσωκας as a perfect verb-form is not only marked as an anterior action, but it is also marked as relevant in the current discourse.

### **Judith 11:1**

Καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτὴν Ολοφέρνης Θάρσησον, γύναι, μὴ φοβηθῆς τῇ καρδίᾳ σου, ὅτι ἐγὼ οὐκ ἐκάκωσα ἄνθρωπον ὅστις ἠρέτικεν\* δουλεύειν βασιλεῖ Ναβουχοδονοσορ πάσης τῆς γῆς.

And Olophernes said to her: “Take courage woman; do not be afraid in your heart, for I have not hurt any person who has chosen\* to be subject to the king of all the earth, Nabouchodonosor.

---

<sup>63</sup>Runge, “Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect,” 463-66.

<sup>64</sup>Jdt 10:14-16.

<sup>65</sup>Moore, *Judith*, 203.

The perfect verb ἤρῆτικεν in Judith 11:1 is placed in the midst of a series of aorist indicative verb-forms which recount when Judith was presented to Olophernes.<sup>66</sup> The author uses a perfect indicative verb-form to describe those who willfully surrender to Nabouchodonosor. The Discourse-Primary thesis fits very well in this context.<sup>67</sup> Specifically, the second category of this thesis stresses that perfects which follow the content to which they are relevant are usually in a dependency relationship. This relationship helps the reader to properly identify the information contained within the perfect verb-form as relevant to what precedes it.<sup>68</sup>

ἤρῆτικεν is indeed in a dependency relationship with that which precedes it, a relative clause, and it is describing the one whom Olophernes does not harm. The perfect indicative verb-form is significant for the following reasons. First, the author could have used the aorist form of αἰρετίζω to simply convey a past event in the narrative. The very fact that the author selects another verb-form suggests that he intends something more than a simple account of an historical event to be communicated.<sup>69</sup> Second, the action conveyed in αἰρετίζω is important for the remainder of this section of the narrative.<sup>70</sup> That is, in Judith 11:2-4 Olophernes states that he is attacking Judith's people because, in contrast to Judith's choice (ἤρῆτικεν) to submit to Nabouchodonosor, her people chose to resist. Further, in Judith 11:5-19 an emphasis is placed upon the need for Olophernes to wait to attack Judith's people until they chose to disobey God's commands; the perfect indicative

---

<sup>66</sup>Jdt 10:20-11:1.

<sup>67</sup>Discourse Primary thesis: The perfect verb-form is used to convey the relevance of its action to the current discourse.

<sup>68</sup>Runge, "Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect," 466-72.

<sup>69</sup>Steven Runge and Steven Levinsohn both argue that when the author has a choice, this implies meaning. Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 5; Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, viii.

<sup>70</sup>Jdt 11:1-19.

verb-forms are used when the author discusses the specific acts of disobedience.<sup>71</sup>

Thus, the context which follows the use of perfect form, ἡρέτικεν, supports the thesis that the perfect is used to highlight the relevance of this verb in the current discourse.

### Judith 11:13-14

καὶ τὰς ἀπαρχὰς τοῦ σίτου καὶ τὰς δεκάτας τοῦ οἴνου καὶ τοῦ ἐλαίου, ἃ διεφύλαξαν ἀγιάσαντες τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν τοῖς παρεστηκόσιν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἀπέναντι τοῦ προσώπου τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν, κεκρίκασιν\* ἐξαναλώσαι, ὧν οὐδὲ ταῖς χερσὶν καθῆκεν ἄψασθαι οὐδένα τῶν ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ. καὶ ἀπεστάλκασιν\* εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ, ὅτι καὶ οἱ ἐκεῖ κατοικοῦντες ἐποίησαν ταῦτα, τοὺς μετακομίσοντας αὐτοῖς τὴν ἄφεσιν παρὰ τῆς γερουσίας.

And the first fruits of grain and the tithes of wine and of oil, which they preserved, consecrating them for the priests who stand in the presence of our God in Ierousalem, which it is not proper for any of the common people to touch with their hands, they have decided\* to consume entirely. And to Ierousalem, for there too the inhabitants did these things, they have sent\* envoys to convey dispensation to them from the senate.

Two perfect indicative verb-forms occur in Judith 11:13-14: *κεκρίκασιν* and *ἀπεστάλκασιν*.<sup>72</sup> These perfects occur in the midst of aorist indicative verb-forms. They are functioning to highlight the relevance of the content of the things Judith mentioned in verse 12 to the preceding discussion. Specifically, these perfects highlight the relevance of these actions to Judith's point that once they do these things God will hand them over to destruction.<sup>73</sup> Thus, the context seems to support the Discourse-Primary proposal that the perfect verb-forms are used instead of aorists because the aorist would simply indicate that a past action occurred, whereas the perfect shows both the reality of the past action as well as the current relevance.<sup>74</sup> More specifically, the use of these perfects support Runge's second

---

<sup>71</sup>See discussion of the use of the perfect indicative tense-forms in Jdt 11:13-14.

<sup>72</sup>As stated above in the summary of the data, every occurrence of the perfect tense-form in Jdt occurs in direct discourse.

<sup>73</sup>Jdt 11:15.

<sup>74</sup>Runge, "Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect," 465.

category.<sup>75</sup> These perfects are in a dependency relationship that is marked by the use of *ἐπεὶ* in verse 12.<sup>76</sup> That is, they are providing the explanation for Judith's statement in verse 11 that her people will transgress against God, thereby providing the opportunity for Olophernes to defeat them. This dependency relationship indeed appears to further highlight the relevance of the perfect verb-forms to the current discourse.

### Judith 12:13

καὶ ἐξῆλθεν Βαγώας ἀπὸ προσώπου Ολοφέρνηου καὶ εἰσῆλθεν πρὸς αὐτὴν καὶ εἶπεν Μὴ ὀκνησάτω δὴ ἡ παιδίσκη ἡ καλὴ αὕτη ἐλθοῦσα πρὸς τὸν κύριόν μου δοξασθῆναι κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ καὶ πίεσαι μεθ' ἡμῶν εἰς εὐφροσύνην οἶνον καὶ γενηθῆναι ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ ὡς θυγάτηρ μίᾳ τῶν υἱῶν Ἀσσοῦρ, αἱ παρεστήκασιν\* ἐν οἴκῳ Ναβουχοδονοσορ.

And Bagoas set forth from the presence of Olophernes, and he went in to her and said: "Do not let this beautiful girl hesitate now to come to my lord and be honored before his presence and to drink wine with us for merriment and to become in this day like a daughter of the sons of Assour, who attend\* in the house of Nabouchodonosor."

The perfect indicative verb-form, *παρεστήκασιν*, found in Judith 12:13, is used once again in the midst of a discourse that primarily consists of aorist indicative verb-forms. Its occurrence seemingly supports the discourse-primary proposal that the perfect verb-form is used to mark the relevance of the action conveyed in the verb-form to the current discourse. More specifically, the function of *παρεστήκασιν* in Judith 12:13 supports Runge's second category.<sup>77</sup>

The dependency relationship is marked by the use of the relative pronoun, *αἱ*, to introduce *παρεστήκασιν*, which occurs at the end of an extended dialogue about

---

<sup>75</sup>Runge's second category is as follows: When the perfect verb-form follows that to which it is relevant it is usually in a dependency relationship which aids the reader in properly identifying the information contained within the perfect verb-form as relevant to what precedes it. Runge, "Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect," 466-72.

<sup>76</sup>Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, 503; Blass, Debrunner, and Funk, *Greek Grammar*, 238; Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 674, 761.

<sup>77</sup>Runge, "Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect," 466-72.

how to convince Judith to join Olophernes at the party.<sup>78</sup> Further, the shift to the perfect indicative-verb-form and the focus of the narrative after this shift both support the discourse-primary thesis. First, the author's shift in verb-forms highlights *παρεστήκασιν* since he moves from the aorist to the perfect to describe how Judith is to act in the presence of Olophernes, and then back to the aorist to continue the narrative. Second, the extended description of how Judith is clothed with the adornments of those who attend the king also supports the Discourse primary thesis, since it once again highlights *παρεστήκασιν*, giving more detail about those who stand before Nabouchodonosor. The importance of Judith looking like one who stands before Nabouchodonosor is also emphasized by Carey Moore, who highlights how this discussion concerning Judith's attire served two purposes. For Bogas it was a polite way of asking Judith to act like one of the Assyrian women in Nabouchodonosor's courts, and for Judith it was a part of her plan to be sexually appealing to Olophernes.<sup>79</sup> Thus, the context also supports the discourse-primary thesis.

### Concluding Analysis

As stated above, the perfect verb-form occurs 12 times in the book of Judith, and each occurrence is found within direct discourse. The function of the perfect verb-forms within Judith can all be placed within the three categories proposed within the Discourse Primary proposal. Within the book of Judith, the usage of the perfect is as follows with respect to the Discourse Primary proposal: Pre-Relevant Marker Perfects: 17 percent; Post-Relevant Marker Perfects: 66 percent; Theme-line Perfects: 17 percent.<sup>80</sup> Thus, after analyzing each instance of the perfect

---

<sup>78</sup>Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, 573; Blass, Debrunner, and Funk, *Greek Grammar*, 251; Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 659.

<sup>79</sup>Moore, *Judith*, 224.

<sup>80</sup>Runge tests his thesis by looking at the function of the perfect in Luke, Romans, and

verb-form within the book of Judith, the data fits within the scope of the Discourse Primary proposal that the perfect verb-form highlights the relevance of the action, event, or situation which it contains to the current discourse. In other words, the perfect indicative takes a completed state of affairs and connects it to the present reference time of the discourse.<sup>81</sup> Thus, the perfective aspect communicates the “state of affairs,” and the imperfective aspect indicates that there is “an ongoing connection to the present discourse context.”<sup>82</sup>

---

Hebrews. In his research, he finds that whether the perfects precede, follow, or occur on the mainline their discourse function in nearly every instance they clearly supported his thesis. He provides three categories of usage within his thesis. First, he states that the first category accounts for when the perfect tense-form precedes that to which it is relevant, it constrains the reader to understand that the information presented by the perfect tense-form is relevant to what follows. Second, he purports that the second category consists of perfects which follow that to which they are relevant, and which are usually in a dependency relationship which aids the reader in properly identifying the information contained within the perfect tense-form as relevant to what precedes it. Third, Runge argues that the third category describes those perfect tense-forms which occur on the theme-line, and which are in an embedded speech in which the perfect is adding relevant information to a preceding speech or situation. Thus, Runge argues that the perfect tense-form is used to show the relevance of the information contained in the perfect tense-form to the current discourse or situation. Runge, “Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect,” 463-73.

<sup>81</sup>Runge, “Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect,” 462.

<sup>82</sup>Runge, “Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect,” 462.

## CHAPTER 6

### CONCLUSION

The goal of this dissertation has been to evaluate and test the most recent proposals on the discourse function of the indicative verb within narrative. Accordingly, since the focus of this dissertation has been to consider the discourse function of the indicative verb-forms, the scope of the proposals to be tested was narrowed to those scholars who have approached their study of the indicative verb in light of discourse grammar.

As discussed in chapter 2, the book of Judith was selected because of its length, genre, and style. Since Judith is 16 chapters in length, it provides a sufficient sampling to test the various theories concerning the variegated verb-forms within historical narrative. Furthermore, Judith was selected because the style is similar to that of the gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, texts which have been used to test verbal aspect theories.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>The following authors have written entire monographs on verbal aspect theory within the Gospels: Wally V. Cirafesi, *Verbal Aspect in Synoptic Parallels: On the Method and Meaning of Divergent Tense-Form Usage in the Synoptic Passion Narratives*, Linguistic Biblical Studies 7 (Leiden: Brill, 2013); Rodney J. Decker, *Temporal Deixis of the Greek Verb in the Gospel of Mark with Reference to Verbal Aspect*, Studies in Biblical Greek 10 (New York: P. Lang, 2001). Some of the shared stylistic features are the following: parataxis, resumptive pronouns, and periphrastic tenses. J. H. Moulton and Nigel Turner, *Style*, vol. 4 of *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1976), 11-79; Toni Craven, *Artistry and Faith in the Book of Judith* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983), 5-6; Carey A. Moore, *Judith: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985), 66-67. The following are examples from Judith and the Gospels: (1) Parataxis: e.g., Jdt 1:1-7, 6:14-21; Mark 1:6, 4:27, 8:34. (2) Resumptive pronouns: Jdt 1:16, 3:6; Matthew 3:12, 10:11. (3) Periphrastic tenses: Jdt 3:8 (ἦν δεδομένον), 4:3 (ἦσαν ἀναβεβηκότες), 10:7 (ἦν ἠλλοιωμένον); Luke 1:7 (προβεβηκότες . . . ἦσαν), 2:51 (ἦν ὑποτασσόμενος), 9:45 (ἦν παρακεκαλυμμένον).

## Chapter Reviews

The organizational structure of this dissertation is centered around the indicative verbal forms. Each chapter focuses on either one indicative verbal form or, as is the case in chapter 3, two indicative verbal forms as a result of their complementary discourse function. Chapter 1 introduces the thesis of this dissertation, surveys the literature related to Greek grammar, and discusses the need to focus on discourse grammar. Chapter 2 surveys the literature related to discourse grammar, provides a methodology, and discusses the rationale for the selection of the book of Judith.

Chapter 3 tests the function of the aorist and the imperfect within the book of Judith. Specifically, it tests the proposal that unless intentionally marked, the aorist is used to describe mainline events, providing the foundation for the narrative and therefore moving it forward. The imperfect is used with non-events, giving descriptive or background information rather than moving it forward.<sup>2</sup> After examining every occurrence of the imperfect and aorist indicative verb-forms in Judith, of the 88 occurrences of the imperfect indicative verb-forms, 27 (or 30 percent) are used to communicate mainline information. Further, the aorist occurs 649 times in Judith, and 254 (40 percent) of these instances convey offline/background information. Thus, after analyzing each instance of the imperfect and aorist indicative verb-forms within the book of Judith, Levinsohn's and the Discourse Primary group's nuanced understanding of the discourse function of the imperfect and aorist indicative verb-forms fits very well with the use of these forms in Judith.

Chapter 4 examines the function of the present within the narrative of Judith. More specifically, it tests whether the present indicative is semantically

---

<sup>2</sup>Stephen H. Levinsohn, "Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative," in *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*, ed. Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016), 163-83.

marked for prominence as Stanley Porter suggests or if this is a pragmatic feature as Steven Runge argues. In other words, the present indicative verb-forms of Judith will be examined based on Porter's thesis in order to test the accuracy of Runge's proposal. The evaluation will take place in light of the literary context of Judith, the segmentation of texts within the critical translations of the Septuagint, and the analysis of critical commentaries on Judith.<sup>3</sup> In summary, this chapter evaluates within the book of Judith Runge's rejection of Stanley Porter's claim that the present indicative verb-form is semantically marked for prominence.<sup>4</sup>

There are 86 present indicative verb-forms in Judith, and 81 occur in direct/reported speech. In other words, 94 percent of the present indicative forms are in reported speech.<sup>5</sup> Further, having worked through the occurrences of the present indicative verb-forms within direct/reported speech, in all but two instances the present indicatives do not appear to convey the most important information.<sup>6</sup> Thus,

---

<sup>3</sup>As discussed in chap. 2, among other sources and resources the following critical translations, commentaries and essays are utilized in this dissertation: (1) Critical Translations: Albert Pietersma, and Benjamin G. Wright, *A New English Translation of the Septuagint: And the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007); Michael D. Coogan, *The New Oxford Annotated Apocrypha* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010); Eberhard Bons, Wolfgang Kraus, and Martin Karrer, *Septuaginta Deutsch: das griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2009); Natalio Marcos Fernández and María Victoria Spottorno Díaz-Caro, *La Biblia griega septuaginta 2* (Salamanca: Sígueme, 2011); (2) Critical Commentaries: Carey A. Moore, *Judith: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985); Morton Scott Enslin and Solomon Zeitlin, *The Book of Judith, Greek Text with an English Translation* (Leiden: Brill, 1973); Gerald West, "Judith," in *Eerdmans Commentary on the Bible*, ed. James D. G. Dunn and J. W. Rogerson (Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 2003); Dichk M. Kanonge, "Reading Narratives in the Septuagint: A Discourse on Method," in *Septuagint and Reception: Essays Prepared for the Association for the Study of the Septuagint in South Africa*, ed. Johann Cook (Boston: Brill, 2009), 361-82.

<sup>4</sup>Stanley E. Porter, *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament with Reference to Tense and Mood* (New York: Peter Lang, 1989), 198-207; Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*, 2nd ed. (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 302-3; Steven Runge references William Foley and Robert Van Valin's *Functional Syntax and Universal Grammar* as support for his position concerning the relationship between verb prominence, aspect, and genre. William A. Foley and Robert D. Van Valin, *Functional Syntax and Universal Grammar*, Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 38 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984).

<sup>5</sup>Levinsohn states that when analyzing the discourse function of verbs in narrative one must ignore those which occur in reported/direct speech. Stephen H. Levinsohn, *Self-Instruction Materials on Narrative Discourse Analysis* (Dallas: SIL International, 2015), 68.

<sup>6</sup>Direct/reported speech units in which the present appears to convey the most important information: Jdt 8:12-27; 11:1-10. Direct/reported speech units in which the present does not appear

after examining the present indicative verb-forms occurring within the direct/reported speeches in Judith, in accordance with Steven Runge's thesis, they do not appear to be semantically marked for prominence/markedness.

Chapter 5 observes the function of the perfect verb-forms within the narrative of Judith. Specifically, it evaluates the thesis that the perfect verb-forms are used to show the relevance of the action, idea, or situation which they contain to the current discourse.<sup>7</sup> Runge suggests that whether the perfects precede, follow, or occur on the mainline, their discourse function is to show the relevance of the perfect verb-forms to what precedes or follows them.<sup>8</sup> The perfect verb-form occurs 12 times in the book of Judith, and each occurrence is found within direct discourse. Furthermore, after analyzing these verbs in light of Runge's categories, each perfect verb-form fits within his thesis.

### Areas for Future Study

At least two areas would further the research conducted in this study, providing fruitful data for the advancement of the discussion among Greek grammarians from all three approaches to the study of Greek grammar identified in chapter 1.<sup>9</sup> These two areas are the use of present indicative verbs within the

---

to convey the most important information: Jdt 2:1-13; 3:2-4; 5:1-21; 6:2-9; 7:10-13; 7:24-28; 8:28-35; 9:5-14; 10:12-13; 10:19; 11:16-19; 11:21-23; 12:3-4; 12:11-14; 13:15-17; 14:17-18; 16:13-14.

<sup>7</sup>Steven E. Runge, "Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect," in *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*, ed. Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016), 459-62.

<sup>8</sup>Runge, "Discourse Function of the Greek Perfects," 466-72.

<sup>9</sup>As stated in chap. 1, the purpose of these divisions is not to create a dichotomy between these groups. The purpose is to highlight important points of distinction in reference to discourse grammar when developing their explanations for the variegated verb-forms within historical narrative. The Traditional Approach gives very little attention to discourse analysis: Buist M. Fanning, *Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 72-85; K. L. McKay, *A New Syntax of the Verb in New Testament Greek: An Aspectual Approach* (New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 1994), 39-52; T. V. Evans, *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch: Natural Greek Usage and Hebrew Interference* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 26-32, 145-74. The Aspect Primary approach utilizes discourse analysis to a limited degree, giving priority to aspect: Constantine R. Campbell, *Verbal Aspect, the Indicative Mood, and Narrative: Soundings in the Greek of the New Testament* (New York: Peter Lang, 2007), 3; Stanley E. Porter and Andrew W. Pitts, "New Testament Greek Language and Linguistics in Recent Research," *Currents in Biblical Research* 6, no. 2 (2008):

narrative books of the Septuagint and the function of the perfect indicative verbs within the entirety of the Septuagint. In the book of Judith, I found that the use of the perfect indicative verb-form matched Steven Runge's proposal very well. However, because the perfect verb-form is not used often throughout the Septuagint, in order to more fully evaluate his proposal, a comprehensive study throughout the Septuagint would be profitable.<sup>10</sup>

Further, in my study of the present indicative verb-form, 94 percent of these forms occur in direct speech, and the remaining 6 percent do not appear to have a discourse function. Further, there are only two clear instances in which the present indicative within direct/reported speech is marked for prominence in Judith. Accordingly, this data within Judith seemingly supports Steven Runge's thesis. Although these findings are intriguing, in light of the limited corpus of my research, I believe a more comprehensive study would be profitable, particularly since this data raises questions concerning the viability of Stanley Porter's thesis.

### Closing Statements

The driving motive which has given life to this dissertation is the desire to more accurately interpret the word of God. Since God has chosen to reveal himself

---

235; Porter, *Verbal Aspect*. The Discourse Primary approach utilizes the research concerning *Aktionsart* and aspect, but it places a significant emphasis upon discourse analysis: Steven E. Runge, *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publisher, 2010), xvi-xvii; Levinsohn, *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek*, vii. The following is a list of some of the scholars from each group: Traditional Approach: Buist M. Fanning, K. L. McKay, T. V. Evans; Aspect Primary Approach: Constantine R. Campbell, Stanley E. Porter, Wally V. Cirafesi, Matthew Brook O'Donnell, Andrew W. Pitts, David Mathewson, Mari Broman Olsen, John C. Poirier, Jeffrey T. Reed, R. A. Reese, Daryl Schmidt; Discourse Primary Approach: Steven E. Runge, Stephen H. Levinsohn, Randall Buth, Rutger J. Allan, Patrick James, Robert Crellin, Elizabeth Robar, Peter J. Gentry, Nicholas J. Ellis, Michael Aubrey, Rachel Aubrey, Robert E. Longacre, Christopher J. Fresch, Kathleen Callow, John C. Callow

<sup>10</sup>Another helpful option, given that the size of the Septuagint, would be to study either the historical books or the epistolary books of the Septuagint—since Runge tested his proposal in both narrative and epistolary literature from the New Testament. Since one does not often consider epistolary genre within the Septuagint, here are two examples of this genre within the Septuagint: 2 Maccabees and the Letter of Jeremiah (e.g., Baruch chap. 6). These two books are both examples of composition Greek and were composed between the second and first centuries B.C.E.

through written words, understanding how these words work together to communicate and convey information is a fundamental task for proper interpretation of the scriptures. Moreover, what this dissertation has sought to do is test the proposals of a group of Greek grammarians whose fundamental driving principle is aptly summed up in Steven E. Runge's remark, "choice implies meaning."<sup>11</sup>

After examining the proposals concerning the discourse function of the indicative verb within narrative and of those who adhere to this approach, my final analysis is that their proposals are seemingly accurate. That is, their theses concerning the aorist, imperfect, present and perfect indicative verb-forms fit very well with the usage of these forms within the book of Judith. Thus, in light of the correspondence between the usage of the aorist, imperfect, present and perfect indicative verb-forms and the Discourse Primary group's proposals concerning the function of these forms within narrative, I am convinced of the value of their proposals. I believe that further examination in other corpora of texts would produce similar demonstrations of the accuracy of these proposals.

---

<sup>11</sup>Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 5-7. For sake of reference, I have listed once more some of the scholars within this group: Steven E. Runge, Stephen H. Levinsohn, Randall Buth, Rutger J. Allan, Patrick James, Robert Crellin, Elizabeth Robar, Peter J. Gentry, Nicholas J. Ellis, Michael Aubrey, Rachel Aubrey, Robert E. Longacre, Christopher J. Fresch, Kathleen Callow, John C. Callow.

APPENDIX 1  
SYNTHESIS OF POSITIONS

In order to aid comprehension of the various positions, it is imperative to identify where there is unity and where there is disagreement among these approaches. As stated in the introduction, there are three approaches<sup>1</sup> to the study of the Greek verbal system: Traditional Approach,<sup>2</sup> Aspect Primary Approach,<sup>3</sup> and Discourse Primary Approach.<sup>4</sup> While there are many points of agreement between these three approaches, there are important differences. The various positions on the function of the indicative verb are summarized in the following table.

Table A1. Function of indicative verb-forms in narrative

<i>Verb Forms</i>	<i>Agreement</i>	<i>Disagreement</i>
Present	The present verb-form occurs in narrative as a marking device which is used to capture the attention of the reader.	There is a lack of consensus over what is being marked.  Traditional Approach: The historic present marks the action of the verb for vividness.

---

<sup>1</sup>As stated above, these approaches are fluid. There are instances in which a scholar may align more with the position represented by one of the other approaches on a particular issue.

<sup>2</sup>Traditional Approach: The Traditional Approach recognizes the importance of verbal aspect and linguistics. However, it does not abandon the semantic encoding of time within the Greek verbal system.

<sup>3</sup>The Aspect Primary Approach argues that the Greek verbal system semantically encodes aspect alone. However, it must be noted that this approach does not deny the importance of discourse grammar, for those who fall within this category utilize it to various degrees.

<sup>4</sup>The Discourse Primary approach recognizes the importance of verbal aspect and linguistics, without abandoning the traditional understanding that the Greek verbal system semantically encodes time. Further, it is distinct from the Traditional Approach in that in addition to the above, it addresses the question of the variegated use of verb-forms within historical narrative through discourse grammar.

Table A1. continued

<i>(Present cont.)</i>		<p>Aspect Primary Approach: The transition is marked.</p> <p>Discourse Primary Approach: The historic present marks what follows.</p>
Aorist	<p>The aorist verb-form, forming the foundation of the narrative, moves it forward.</p>	<p>There is no significant disagreement.<sup>5</sup> However, the Discourse Primary group adds that while the aorist usually moves the narrative forward, there are instances in which the aorist indicative can provide offline/background information.</p>
Imperfect	<p>The imperfect verb-form is used to add descriptive detail, rather than to move the narrative forward.</p>	<p>There is no significant disagreement.<sup>6</sup> However, the Discourse Primary group argues that while the imperfect most commonly provides offline/background information, and does not move the narrative forward, there are instances in which the imperfect can provide mainline/foreground information; thus, moving the narrative forward.</p>
Perfect	<p>The perfect verb-form is most often used to add something to the narrative, rather than to move the narrative forward.</p>	<p>There is disagreement over what the perfect verb-form is adding to the narrative.</p> <p>Traditional Approach: The perfect verb-form adds emphasis.</p>

<sup>5</sup>Porter argues that the aorist verb-form can be used to close a pericope when it is used in conjunction with an imperfect. Stanley E. Porter and Jeffrey T. Reed, "Greek Grammar since BDF: A Retrospective and Prospective Analysis," *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 4, no. 8 (1991): 155.

<sup>6</sup>Porter argues that the imperfect verb-form can be used to introduce a new "stage" (foreground) in the discourse. Porter and Reed, "Greek Grammar Since BDF," 155.

Table A1. continued

(Perfect cont.)		<p>Aspect Primary Approach: The perfect focuses the attention upon the subject of the perfect verb; being supported by the aorist.<sup>7</sup></p> <p>Discourse Primary Approach: The perfect adds supporting information for the mainline of the narrative.<sup>8</sup></p>
Future	The future verb-form is used to express expectation.	<p>There is disagreement over whether the future verb-form conveys future time reference and whether or not it has aspect.</p> <p>Traditional Approach: The future verb-form is non-aspectual and conveys future time reference.</p> <p>Aspect Primary Approach: Stanley Porter asserts that the future verb-form conveys expectation only.</p> <p>Constantine Campbell argues that it conveys perfective aspect and future time reference.</p> <p>Discourse Primary Approach: N/A</p>

---

<sup>7</sup>Although Campbell is distinct from Fanning and those who follow the traditional view in most instances, in this instance he aligns with the Traditional Approach.

<sup>8</sup>Steven Runge, *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publisher, 2010), 129; Runge, “Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect,” in *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*, ed. Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016), 458-485

APPENDIX 2

USE OF AORIST AND IMPERFECT INDICATIVE IN  
THE SEPTUAGINT

Table A2. Use of aorist and imperfect indicative in the Septuagint

<i>Book</i>	<i>Total Occurrences</i>	<i>Total Occurrences per 1000 Words</i>	<i>Total Occurrences</i>	<i>Total Occurrences per 1000 Words</i>
	<i>Aorist</i>		<i>Imperfect</i>	
Genesis	2595	79.67	295	9.06
Exodus	1090	43.92	131	5.28
Leviticus	332	17.40	4	0.21
Numbers	1002	39.99	65	2.59
Deuteronomy	678	29.48	52	2.26
Joshua	886	59.48	73	4.90
Judges	1550	97.20	113	7.09
Ruth	191	92.05	8	3.86
1 Samuel	1465	72.75	199	9.88
2 Samuel	1469	81.93	123	6.86
1 Kings	1518	72.95	179	8.60
2 Kings	1792	95.05	118	6.26
1 Chronicles	768	47.27	88	5.42
2 Chronicles	1587	74.32	149	6.98
1 Esdras	366	40.68	45	5.00
Ezra	247	44.22	19	3.40

*Table A2. continued*

Nehemiah	482	62.79	48	6.25
Esther	353	60.37	59	10.09
Judith	649	70.74	88	9.59
Tobit	362	65.75	64	11.62
1 Maccabees	1721	94.07	203	11.10
2 Maccabees	428	35.90	208	17.45
3 Maccabees	128	25.04	81	15.85
4 Maccabees	198	25.16	129	16.39
Psalms	1943	55.57	120	3.43
Odes	221	52.73	5	1.19
Proverbs	118	10.57	24	2.15
Ecclesiastes	169	37.18	3	0.66
Canticum	101	49.58	1	0.49
Job	686	50.56	84	6.19
Wisdom	309	44.47	89	12.81
Sirach	628	33.64	7	0.37
Wisdom of Solomon	193	39.18	17	3.45
Hosea	224	56.91	26	6.61
Amos	98	30.53	16	4.98
Micah	67	28.29	12	5.07
Joel	52	32.91	3	1.90
Obadiah	20	42.37	1	2.12
Jonah	111	101.83	15	13.76
Nahum	30	32.02	10	10.67

*Table A2. continued*

Habakkuk	46	41.63	0	0.00
Zephaniah	23	18.81	2	1.64
Haggai	37	39.07	5	5.28
Zechariah	163	32.83	23	4.63
Malachi	54	38.11	10	7.06
Isaiah	1031	38.06	59	2.18
Jeremiah	1541	53.23	133	4.59
Baruch	153	58.67	8	3.07
Lamentations	297	124.22	7	2.93
Letter of Jeremiah	4	3.11	133	4.59
Ezekiel	981	33.07	188	6.34
Daniel	538	49.90	116	10.76
Susanna	55	69.44	18	22.73
Bel	72	79.91	21	23.31

APPENDIX 3

USE OF PRESENT INDICATIVE IN THE SEPTUAGINT

Table A3. Use of present indicative in the Septuagint

<i>Book</i>	<i>Total Occurrences</i>	<i>Total Occurrences per 1000 Words</i>
Genesis	386	11.85
Exodus	228	9.19
Leviticus	244	12.78
Numbers	199	7.94
Deuteronomy	279	12.13
Joshua	137	9.20
Judges	121	7.59
Ruth	33	15.90
1 Samuel	340	16.88
2 Samuel	170	9.48
1 Kings	186	8.94
2 Kings	143	7.58
1 Chronicles	46	2.83
2 Chronicles	96	4.50
1 Esdras	158	17.56
Ezra	40	7.16
Nehemiah	62	8.08
Esther	88	15.05
Judith	86	9.37

*Table A3. continued*

Tobit	123	22.34
1 Maccabees	129	7.05
2 Maccabees	80	6.71
3 Maccabees	29	5.67
4 Maccabees	198	25.16
Psalms	453	12.96
Odes	75	17.90
Proverbs	678	60.72
Ecclesiastes	131	28.82
Canticum	35	17.28
Job	399	29.41
Wisdom	207	29.79
Sirach	351	18.80
Wisdom of Solomon	41	8.32
Hosea	32	8.13
Amos	73	22.74
Micah	25	10.56
Joel	13	8.23
Obadiah	5	10.59
Jonah	10	9.17
Nahum	8	8.54
Habakkuk	15	13.57
Zephaniah	15	12.26
Haggai	29	30.62
Zechariah	101	20.34

*Table A3. continued*

Malachi	62	43.75
Isaiah	471	17.39
Jeremiah	539	18.62
Baruch	24	9.20
Lamentations	18	7.53
Letter of Jeremiah	76	59.14
Ezekiel	478	16.11
Daniel	116	10.76
Susanna	7	8.84
Bel	28	31.08

APPENDIX 4

USE OF PERFECT INDICATIVE IN THE SEPTUAGINT

Table A4. Use of perfect indicative in the Septuagint

<i>Book</i>	<i>Total Occurrences</i>	<i>Total Occurrences per 1000 Words</i>
Job	145	10.69
1 Samuel	143	7.10
Ezekiel	121	4.08
Genesis	105	3.22
Exodus	95	3.83
Isaiah	91	3.36
1 Kings	77	3.70
Deuteronomy	71	3.09
Numbers	67	2.67
Jeremiah	60	2.07
2 Samuel	53	2.96
Joshua	47	3.16
1 Maccabees	42	2.30
Sirach	37	1.98
Daniel	33	3.06
Proverbs	32	2.87
2 Kings	30	1.59
2 Chronicles	28	1.31

*Table A4. continued*

Judges	28	1.31
Zechariah	27	5.44
Psalms	24	0.69
Leviticus	24	1.26
2 Maccabees	23	1.93
Tobit	22	4.00
4 Maccabees	20	2.54
1 Esdras	20	2.22
1 Chronicles	18	1.11
Esther	14	2.39
Joel	13	8.23
Wisdom	13	1.87
Hosea	12	3.05
3 Maccabees	12	2.35
Ecclesiastes	12	2.64
Odes	12	2.86
Judith	12	1.31
Malachi	8	5.65
Jonah	7	6.42
Ruth	7	3.37
Susanna	6	7.58
Zephaniah	6	4.91
Amos	6	1.87
Bel	5	5.55
Habakkuk	5	4.52

*Table A4. continued*

Micah	4	1.69
Ezra	4	0.72
Nahum	3	3.20
Jeremiah	3	2.33
Nehemiah	3	0.39
Baruch	2	0.77
Lamentations	2	0.84
Haggai	2	2.11
Canticum	2	0.99
Obadiah	1	2.12
Wisdom of Solomon	1	0.20

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbott, Edwin A. *Johannine Grammar*. 2 vols. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1906.
- Abbot, H. Porter. "Story, Plot, and Narration." In *The Cambridge Companion to Narrative*, edited by David Herman, 39-51. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Aitken, J. K., ed. *The T & T Clark Companion to the Septuagint*. London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2015.
- Allan, Rutger J. "The Imperfect Unbound. A Cognitive Linguistic Approach to Greek Aspect." In *Variation and Change in Ancient Greek Tense, Aspect and Modality*, edited by Klaas Bentein, Mark Janse, and Jorie Soltic, 100-130. Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology 23. Leiden: Brill, 2017.
- Bache, Carl. "Aspect and Aktionsart: Towards a Semantic Distinction." *Journal of Linguistics* 18, no. 1 (March 1982): 57-72.
- Barnard, Jody. "Is Verbal Aspect a Prominence Indicator? An Evaluation of Stanley Porter's Proposal with Special Reference to the Gospel of Luke." *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 19 (2006): 3-29.
- Battle, John A. "The Present Indicative in New Testament Exegesis." PhD diss., Grace Theological Seminary, 1975.
- Black, David Alan. *Linguistics and New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Discourse Analysis*. Nashville: Broadman & Holman Academic, 1993.
- Black, Stephanie L. "The Historic Present in Matthew: Beyond Speech Margins." In *Discourse Analysis and the New Testament: Approaches and Results*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and Jeffrey T. Reed, 120-39. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 170. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- 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.
- Bons, Eberhard, Wolfgang Kraus, and Martin Karrer. *Septuaginta Deutsch: das griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2009.
- Boos, David. "The Historical Present in John's Gospel." *Start* 11 (1984): 17-24.

- Bridgeman, Teresa. "Time and Space." In *The Cambridge Companion to Narrative*, edited by David Herman, 58-65. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Brooks, James A., and Carlton L. Winbery. *Syntax of New Testament Greek*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1979.
- Brugmann, Karl. *A Comparative Grammar of the Indo-Germanic Languages: A Concise Exposition of the History of Sanskrit, Old Iranian, Old Armenian, Greek, Latin, Old Irish, Gothic, Old High German, Lithuanian, and Church Slavonic*. Translated by R. Seymour Conway and W. H. D. Rouse. New York: Westermann & Co., 1895.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Griechische Grammatik*. Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1900.
- Buth, Randall. "Participles as a Pragmatic Choice: Where Semantics Meets Pragmatics." In *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*, edited by Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch, 273-306. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Perfect Greek Morphology and Pedagogy." In *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*, edited by Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch, 416-29. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016.
- Buth, Randy. "Mark's Use of the Historical Present." *Notes* 65 (1977): 7-13.
- Callow, John C. "The Function of the Historic Present in Mark 1:16-3:6; 4:1-41; 7:1-23; 12:13-34." *Selected Technical Articles Related to Translation*, no. 11 (1984): 9-16.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Historic Present in Mark." A paper presented at a seminar at SIL, Horsleys Green, England, 1996.
- Callow, Kathleen. *Discourse Considerations in Translating the Word of God*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974.
- Campbell, Constantine. *Advances in the Study of Greek: New Insights for Reading the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2015.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Basics of Verbal Aspect in Biblical Greek*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2008.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Finished the Race? 2 Timothy 4:6-7 and Verbal Aspect." In *Robinson Selected Works: Preaching God's Word, Appreciation*, edited by Peter G. Bolt and Mark D. Thompson, 169-75. Camperdown, Australia: Australian Church Record/Moore College, 2008.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Verbal Aspect and Non-Indicative Verbs: Further Soundings in the Greek of the New Testament*. Studies in Biblical Greek 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 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
- \_\_\_\_\_. "An Introduction to the Porter/Fanning Debate." In *Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics*, 18-25. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- Cirafesi, Wally V. *Verbal Aspect in Synoptic Parallels: On the Method and Meaning of Divergent Tense-Form Usage in the Synoptic Passion Narratives*. Linguistic Biblical Studies 7. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- 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.
- Corley, Jeremy. "Imitation of Septuagintal Narrative and Greek Historiography in the Portrait of Holofernes." In *A Pious Seductress: Studies in the Book of Judith*, edited by G. G. Xeravits, 22-54. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Judith." In *The T & T Clark Companion to the Septuagint*, edited by J. K. Aitken, 222-36. London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2015.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Semitic Interference, and the Original Language of the Book of Judith." In *Studies in the Greek Bible: Essays in Honor of Francis T. Gignac*, edited by Jeremy Corley and Vincent T. M. Skemp, 22-54. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 44. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2008.
- Coulthard, Malcolm. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. Applied Linguistics and Language Study. London: Longman, 1985.
- Craven, Toni. *Artistry and Faith in the Book of Judith*. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Book of Judith in the Context of Twentieth-Century Studies of the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books." *Currents in Biblical Research* 1, no. 2 (2003): 187-229.
- 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.
- De Fina, Anna, and Barbara Johnstone. "Discourse Analysis and Narrative." In *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, 2nd ed., edited by Deborah Tannen, Heidi Ehernberger Hamilton, and Deborah Schiffrin, 152-67. Blackwell Handbooks in Linguistics. Chichester, MA: Wiley Blackwell, 2015.

- Decker, Rodney J. *Temporal Deixis of the Greek Verb in the Gospel of Mark with Reference to Verbal Aspect*. Studies in Biblical Greek 10. New York: Peter Lang, 2001.
- Deely, John N. *Basics of Semiotics*. Advances in Semiotics. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990.
- Dry, Helen Aristar. "Foregrounding: An Assessment." In *Language in Context: Essays for Robert E. Longacre*, edited by Shin Ja J. Hwang and William R. Merrifield, 435-50. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics and the University of Texas at Arlington, 1992.
- Efthimiadis-Keith, Helen. *The Enemy Is Within: A Jungian Psychoanalytic Approach to the Book of Judith*. Biblical Interpretation Series 67. Boston: Brill Academic, 2004.
- Enos, Ralph. "The Use of the Historical Present in the Gospel according to St. Mark." *Journal of the Linguistic Association of the Southwest* 3 (1981): 281-98.
- Enslin, Morton Scott, and Solomon Zeitlin. *The Book of Judith: Greek Text with an English Translation*. Jewish Apocryphal Literature 7. Leiden: Brill, 1973.
- Erickson, Richard J. "Oida and Ginōskō and Verbal Aspect in Pauline Usage." *Westminster Theological Journal* 44, no. 1 (March 1982): 110-22.
- Eskola, Timo. *A Narrative Theology of the New Testament: Exploring the Metanarrative of Exile and Restoration*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 350. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2015.
- Evans, T. V. "Future Directions for Aspect Studies in Ancient Greek." In *Biblical Greek Language and Lexicography: Essays in Honor of Fredrich W. Danker*, edited by B. A. Taylor, J. A. L. Lee, P. R. Burton, and R. E. Whitaker, 199-206. Grand Rapid: Eerdmans, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch: Natural Greek Usage and Hebrew Interference*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- 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, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Greek Presents, Imperfects, and Aorists in the Synoptic Gospels." In *Discourse Studies and Biblical Interpretation: A Festschrift in Honor of Stephen H. Levinsohn*, edited by Steven E. Runge, 157-90. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2011.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "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.

- Fernández Marcos, Natalio, and María Victoria Spottorno Díaz-Caro. *La Biblia griega septuaginta*. 2 vols. Salamanca: Sígueme, 2011.
- Foley, Toshikazu S. *Biblical Translation in Chinese and Greek: Verbal Aspect in Theory and Practice*. Linguistic Biblical Studies 1. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Foley, William A., and Robert D. Van Valin. *Functional Syntax and Universal Grammar*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 38. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- Gee, James Paul. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. 4th ed. New York: Routledge, 2014.
- Gentry, Peter J. "Aspect and the Greek Verb." A course handout for Advanced Greek Grammar, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky, April 1, 2010.
- Gibson, Shimon, and David M. Jacobson. *Below the Temple Mount in Jerusalem: A Sourcebook on the Cisterns, Subterranean Chambers and Conduits of the Haram Al-Sharif*. Bar International Series 637. Oxford: Tempus Reparatum, 1996.
- Gildersleeve, Basil Lanneau. *Syntax of Classical Greek: From Homer to Demosthenes*. New York: American Book Company, 1904.
- Gleason, H. A., Jr. "Contrastive Analysis in Discourse Structure." In *Report of the Nineteenth Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies*, edited by James E. Alatis, 39-64. Monograph Series on Language and Linguistics. Georgetown, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1968.
- Gonda, J. *The Character of the Indo-European Moods, with Special Regard to Greek and Sanskrit*. Wiesbaden, Germany: Harrassowitz, 1956.
- 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.
- Grimes, Joseph E. *The Thread of Discourse*. Technical Report No. 1, National Science Foundation Grant GS-3180. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, 1972.
- Halliday, M. A. K., and Ruqaiya Hasan. *Cohesion in English*. New York: Routledge, 2013.
- Hanhart, Robert. *Judith*. Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Text und Textgeschichte des Buches Judith*. Mitteilungen Des Septuaginta-Unternehmens 14. Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979.
- Hardie, Andrew. *Corpus Linguistics: Method, Theory and Practice*. New York: Cambridge, 2012.

- Hauspie, Katrin. "The Idiolect of the Target Language in the Translation Process: A Study of the *Calques* in the LXX of Ezekiel." In *Septuaginta Deutsch Erläuterungen und Kommentare*, edited by Martin Karrer, and Wolfgang Kraus, 205-13. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2012.
- Hawkins, John C. *Horae Syntopicae: Contributions to the Study of the Synoptic Problem*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1899.
- Hopper, Paul J. "Aspect and Foregrounding in Discourse." In *Syntax and Semantics*, edited by Talmy Givón, 213-41. New York: Academic Press, 1979.
- Horsely, G. H. R. "Divergent Views on the Nature of the Greek of the Bible." *Biblica* 65, no. 3 (January 1984): 393-403.
- Huffman, Douglas S. *Verbal Aspect Theory and the Prohibitions in the Greek New Testament*. Studies in Biblical Greek 16. New York: Peter Lang, 2014.
- Huisman, Roberta D. "Angaataha Narrative Discourse." *Linguistics* 11, no. 110 (1973): 29-42.
- Hwang, Shin Ja j. "Foreground Information in Narrative." *Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 9 (1990): 78-82.
- Iverson, Kelly R. "Orality and the Gospels: A Survey of Recent Research." *Currents in Biblical Research* 8, no. 1 (October 2009): 71-106.
- James, Patrick. "Imperfects, Aorists, Historic Presents, and Perfects in John 11: A Narrative Test Case." In *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*, edited by Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch, 184-220. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016.
- Joosten, Jan. "The Original Language and Historical Milieu of the Book of Judith." In *Meghillot: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls V-VI: A Festschrift for Devorah Dimant*, edited by Moshe Bar-Asher and Emanuel Tov, 159-76. Haifa, Israel: University of Haifa Press, 2007.
- Jordaan, Pierre Johan. "Reading *Judith* as Therapeutic Narrative." In *Septuagint and Reception: Essays Prepared for the Association for the Study of the Septuagint in South Africa*, edited by Johann Cook, 335-46. Boston: Brill, 2009.
- Kanonge, Dichk M. "Reading Narratives in the Septuagint: A Discourse on Method." In *Septuagint and Reception: Essays Prepared for the Association for the Study of the Septuagint in South Africa*, edited by Johann Cook, 361-82. Boston: Brill, 2009.
- Karrer, Martin, and Wolfgang Kraus, eds. *Septuaginta Deutsch Erläuterungen und Kommentare*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2012.
- King, Philip J., and Lawrence E. Stager. *Life in Biblical Israel*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.
- Kiparsky, Paul. "Tense and Mood in Indo-European Syntax." *Foundations of Language* 4 (1968): 30-57.

- Klein, Wolfgang. "The Present Perfect Puzzle." *Language* 68, no. 3 (September 1992): 525-52.
- Köstenberger, Andreas J., and Robert W. Yarbrough, eds. *Understanding the Times: New Testament Studies in the 21st Century*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2011.
- Lee, Jae Hyunn. *Paul's Gospel in Romans: A Discourse Analysis of Rom 1:16-8:39*. Linguistic Biblical Studies 3. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Leung, Marvis M. "The Narrative Function and Verbal Aspect of the Historical Present in the Historical Present." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 51, no. 4 (2008): 703-20.
- 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.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Historic Present and Speech Margins in Matthew." In *Language in Context: Essays for Robert E. Longacre*, edited by Shin Ja J. Hwang and William R. Merrifield, 451-73. Arlington, TX: Summer Institute of Linguistics and the University of Texas at Arlington, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Preliminary Observations on the Use of the Historical Present in Mark." *Notes* 65 (1977): 13-28.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative." In *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*, edited by Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch, 163-83. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016.
- Lightfoot, David W. Preface to *Syntactic Structures*, by Noam Chomsky. 2nd ed. New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2002.
- Long, Fredrick J. *Koine Greek Grammar: A Beginning-Intermediate Exegetical and Pragmatic Handbook*. Wilmore, KY: GlossaHouse, 2015.
- Longacre, Robert E. "Discourse Peak as a Zone of Turbulence" In *Beyond the Sentence: Discourse and Sentential Form*, edited by J. R. Worth, 81-98. Ann Arbor, MI: Karoma, 1985.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Grammar of Discourse*. 2nd ed. New York: Plenum Press, 1996.
- Luis, Alonso Schökel, and Wilhelm H. Wuellner. *Narrative Structures in the Book of Judith: Protocol of the Eleventh Colloquy, January 1974*. Protocol Series of the Colloquies of the Center for Hermeneutical Studies in Hellenistic and Modern Culture 11. Berkeley, CA: Center, 1975.
- Lust, J. Erik Eynikel, and K. Hauspie. *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Rev. ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2003.
- Lyons, John. *Linguistic Semantics: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Maddox, Randy L. "The Use of the Aorist Tense in Holiness Exegesis." *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 16, no. 2 (Fall 1981): 168-79.

- Mandilaras, B. G. *The Verb in the Greek Non-Literary Papyri*. Athens: Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sciences, 1973.
- Martin-Ascensio, Gustavo. *Transitivity-Based Foregrounding in the Acts of the Apostles: A Functional-Grammatical Approach to the Lukan Perspective*. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- 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.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Verbal Aspect in the Book of Revelation: The Function of Greek Verb Tenses in John's Apocalypse*. Linguistic Biblical Studies 4. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- McKay, K. L. "Aspect in Imperative Constructions in New Testament Greek." *Novum Testamentum* 27, no. 3 (July 1985): 201-26.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Further Remarks on the 'Historical' Present and Other Phenomena." *Foundations of Language* 11 (1974): 247-51.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A New Syntax of the Verb in New Testament Greek: An Aspectual Approach*. Studies in Biblical Greek 5. New York: Peter Lang, 1994.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "On the Perfect and Other Aspects in the Greek Non-literary Papyri." *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 27 (1980): 23-49.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "On the Perfect and Other Aspects in New Testament Greek." *Novum Testamentum* 23, no. 4 (October 1981): 289-329.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Time and Aspect in New Testament Greek." *Novum Testamentum* 34, no. 3 (1992): 209-28.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "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.
- Moore, Carey A. *Judith: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985.
- Moule, C. F. D. *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959.
- Moulton, J. H. *Prolegomena*. Vol. 1 of *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1906.
- 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.

- 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.
- Nguyen, Vinh. "Prominence and Markedness in Galatians 3: A Linguistic Analysis with Reference to Verbal Aspect Theory." MA thesis, New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 2016.
- O'Donnell, M. B. *Corpus Linguistics and the Greek of the New Testament*, New Testament Monographs 6. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2005.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Designing and Compiling a Register-Balanced Corpus of Hellenistic Greek for the Purpose of Linguistic Description and Investigation." In *Diglossia and Other Topics in New Testament Linguistics*, edited by Stanley E. Porter, 255-97. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Olofsson, Staffan. *The LXX Version: A Guide to the Translation Technique of the Septuagint*. Coniectanea Biblica Old Testament Series 30. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1990.
- Olsen, Mari Broman. *A Semantic and Pragmatic Model of Lexical and Grammatical Aspect*. Outstanding Dissertations in Linguistics. New York: Garland, 1997.
- O'Rourke, John J. "The Historic Present in the Gospel of John." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 93 (1974): 585-90.
- Osburn, Carroll D. "The Historical Present in Mark as a Text Critical Criterion." *Biblica* 64 (1983): 486-500.
- Otzen, Benedikt. *Tobit and Judith*. Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- Palmer, F. R. *Mood and Modality*. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- 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.
- Pietersma, Albert, and Benjamin G. Wright. *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- 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. *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*. 2nd ed. London: Continuum, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "In Defense of Verbal Aspect." In *Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics: Open Questions in Current Research*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and D. A. Carson, 26-45. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Keeping Up with Recent Studies 17: Greek Language and Linguistics." *The Expository Times* 103, no. 7 (April 1992): 202-8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Linguistic Analysis of the Greek New Testament: Studies in Tools, Methods, and Practice*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Studies in the Greek New Testament: Theory and Practice*. New York: Peter Lang, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "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.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament, with Reference to Tense and Mood*. Studies in Biblical Greek 1. New York: Peter Lang, 1989.
- Porter, Stanley E., and D. A. Carson. *Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics: Open Questions in Current Research*. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Discourse Analysis and Other Topics in Biblical Greek*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 113. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Porter, Stanley E., and M. B. O'Donnell. "The Greek Verbal Network Viewed from a Probabilistic Standpoint: An Exercise in Hallidayan Linguistics." *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 14, no. 27 (2001): 3-41.
- Porter, Stanley E., 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 E., and Jeffrey T. Reed. "Greek Grammar Since BDF: A Retrospective and Prospective Analysis." *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 4, no. 8 (1991): 143-62.
- Rakel, Claudia. *Judit—über Schönheit, Macht und Widerstand im Krieg: eine feministisch-intertextuelle Lektüre*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 334. Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 2003.
- Reed, J. T., and R. A. Reese. "Verbal Aspect, Discourse Prominence, and the Letter of Jude." *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 9, no. 18 (1996): 181-99.
- Reed, Jeffrey T. *Discourse Analysis of Philippians: Method and Rhetoric in the Debate over Literary Integrity*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 136. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Identifying Theme in the New Testament: Insights from Discourse Analysis." In *Discourse Analysis and Other Topics in Biblical Greek*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and D. A. Carson, 75-101. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 113. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Reynolds, S. M. "The Zero Tense in Greek: A Critical Note." *Westminster Theological Journal* 32 (1965): 68-72.

- Robar, Elizabeth. "The Historical Present in NT Greek: An Exercise in Interpreting Matthew." In *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*, edited by Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch, 329-52. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016.
- Robertson, A. T. *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934.
- Runge, Steven E. "Contrastive Substitution and the Greek Verb: Reassessing Porter's Argument." *Novum Testamentum* 56 (2014): 154-73.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Discourse Function of the Greek Perfect." In *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*, edited by Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch, 458-85. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2010.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Verbal Aspect of the Historical Present Indicative in Narrative." In *Discourse Studies and Biblical Interpretation: A Festschrift in Honor of Stephen H. Levinsohn*, edited by Steven E. Runge, 191-223. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2011.
- Runge, Steven E., and Christopher J. Fresch, eds. *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016.
- Ryan, Marie-Laure. "Toward a Definition of Narrative." In *Cambridge Companion to Narrative*, edited by David Herman, 22-36. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- 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*, edited by Charles H. Talbert, 27-38. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1985.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Verbal Aspect in Greek: Two Approaches." In *Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics: Open Questions in Current Research*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and D. A. Carson, 63-73. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- Schmitz, Barbara, and Helmut Engel. *Judit*. Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament. Freiburg, Germany: Herder, 2014.
- Shive, Ronald L. "The Use of the Historical Present and Its Theological Significance." ThM thesis, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1982.
- Sicking, C. M. J., and P. Stork. "The Grammar of the So-Called Historical Present in Ancient Greek." In *Grammar as Interpretation: Greek Literature in Its Linguistic Contexts*, edited by Egbert J. Bakker, 131-68. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Silva, Moisés. "Bilingualism and the Character of Palestinian Greek." *Biblica* 61, no. 2 (January 1980): 198-219.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Response to Fanning and Porter on Verbal Aspect." In *Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics: Open Questions in Current Research*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and D. A. Carson, 74-83. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- Stocker, Margarita. *Judith: Sexual Warrior, Women and Power in Western Culture*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998.
- Swart, G. J. "Non-Past Referring Imperfects in the New Testament: A Test Case for an Anti-Anti-Anti-Porter Position." *Harvard Theological Studies* 61, no. 4 (2005): 1085-99.
- Thackeray, Henry St. John. *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship: A Study in Origins*. London: Oxford University Press, 1921.
- Thompson, Sandra A. "'Subordination' and Narrative Event Structure." In *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse*, edited by Russell S. Tomlin, 435-54. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1987.
- VanderKam, James C. *No One Spoke Ill of Her: Essays on Judith*. Early Judaism and Its Literature 2. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Voelz, J. W. "Present and Aorist Verbal Aspect: A New Proposal." *Neotestamentica* 27, no. 1 (1993): 153-64.
- Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.
- West, Gerald. "Judith." In *Eerdmans Commentary on the Bible*, edited by James D. G. Dunn, and J. W. Rogerson, 748-57. Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 2003.
- Wills, Lawrence M. *Judith*. In *The New Oxford Annotated Apocrypha*, edited by Michael D. Coogan, 31-52. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Winer, Georg Benedict. *A Treatise on the Grammar of New Testament Greek, Regarded as a Sure Basis for New Testament Exegesis*. 3rd rev. ed. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1882.
- Wuellner, Wilhelm H. *Narrative Structures in the Book of Judith: Protocol of the Eleventh Colloquy, January 1974*. Protocol Series of the Colloquies of the Center for Hermeneutical Studies in Hellenistic and Modern Culture 11. Berkeley, CA: Center, 1975.
- Young, Richard A. *Intermediate New Testament Greek: A Linguistic and Exegetical Approach*. Nashville: Broadman and Holman Publishers, 1994.
- Žegarac, Vladimir. "Relevance Theory and the Meaning of the English Progressive." *University College London Working Papers in Linguistics* 1 (1989): 19-30.

## ABSTRACT

### THE DISCOURSE FUNCTION OF KOINE GREEK VERB FORMS IN NARRATIVE: TESTING CURRENT PROPOSALS IN THE BOOK OF JUDITH

Michael Todd Graham Jr., PhD  
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2018  
Chair: Dr. Robert L. Plummer

The objective of this dissertation is to test some major theories on the discourse function of the Greek indicative verb-forms in narrative. Since the publication of Stanley Porter and Buist Fanning's doctoral dissertations, verbal aspect has been a major area of research among scholars. Although the debate and research concerning the aspect of Greek verbs continues to be at the forefront of Greek grammatical studies, the question that begs to be answered is whether their answers can satisfactorily account for the varied verb-forms throughout the entirety of a historical narrative. This dissertation seeks to answer this question by testing current proposals on the discourse function of Greek indicative verb-forms within the narrative of Judith.

Chapter 1 introduces the thesis of the dissertation, surveys the literature related to Greek grammar, and discusses the need to focus on discourse grammar. Chapter 2 surveys the literature related to discourse grammar, provides a methodology, and discusses the rationale for the selection of the book of Judith. Chapter 3 tests the function of the aorist and the imperfect within the book of Judith. Specifically, it tests the proposal—unless intentionally marked, the aorist is used to describe mainline events, it provides the foundation for the narrative, and thus moves it forward. Whereas the

imperfect is used with non-events, giving descriptive or background information, rather than moving it forward. Chapter 4 examines the function of the present within the narrative of Judith. Namely, it evaluates Runge's rejection of Stanley Porter's claim that the present indicative verb-form is semantically marked for prominence. Chapter 5 observes the function of the perfect within the narrative of Judith. Specifically, it evaluates the thesis—the perfect is used to show the relevance of the action, idea, or situation to the current discourse. Chapter 6 provides a concluding summary of each chapter in this dissertation and suggests areas for fruitful future research.

## VITA

Michael Todd Graham Jr.

### EDUCATION

B.S., Liberty University, 2006

M.Div., Liberty University, 2008

Th.M., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2012

### ACADEMIC EMPLOYMENT

Adjunct Faculty, Baptist College of Florida, Graceville, Florida, 2009-2010

Adjunct Faculty, Mid-Continent University, Mayfield, Kentucky, 2011-2013

Online Instructor, Liberty University Online, Lynchburg, Virginia, 2010-

### PUBLICATIONS

“Rabbinic Literature and the New Testament.” In *Lexham Bible Dictionary*, edited by John D. Barry. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2015.

“Suffering and the Love of God: A Look at Psalm 44:22 in Romans 8:36.” *Journal of Discipleship and Family Ministry* 6, no. 1 (Spring 2018): 175-80.

### ORGANIZATIONS

Society of Biblical Literature

The Evangelical Theological Society