The Bulletin
2019/20

The Canadian Society of Biblical Studies
La société canadienne des études bibliques

Volume 79
Andrew B. Perrin, Editor

Editor:
Andrew B. Perrin
Trinity Western University

The Bulletin is an annual publication of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies / La société canadienne des études bibliques.

Membership Information: The annual fees for membership in the CSBS/SCÉB are:

	Regular	Dual
Full	$103.20	$67.20
Student, Contractual	$51.75	$20.90
Unemployed, Retired	$51.75	$20.90

Membership includes a subscription to the *Bulletin* and to *Studies in Religion / Sciences religieuses*. Dual membership is available to individuals who already receive SR through membership in another scholarly society. All inquiries concerning membership should be directed to the Membership Secretary:

Laura Hare
laura.hare@mail.utoronto.ca

A limited number of individual issues of the *Bulletin* may be purchased for a handling charge of $10.00 each, payable to the CSBS/SCÉB. Requests should be sent to the editor at the address above.

The CSBS/SCÉB website address is http://www.csbs-secb.ca

CN ISSN 0068-970-X

Contents / Matières

Canadian Society of Biblical Studies
Executive Committee 2019-20 Comité executif de
La Société canadienne des études bibliques

PRESIDENT:	**J. Richard Middleton** Northeastern Seminary
VICE-PRESIDENT:	**Colleen Shantz** University of St. Michael's College
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY:	**Mark Leuchter** Temple University
TREASURER & MEMBERSHIP SECRETARY:	**Laura Hare** United Church of Canada
PROGRAMME COORDINATOR:	**Agnes Choi** Pacific Lutheran University
COMMUNICATIONS OFFICER:	**Andrew Perrin** Trinity Western University
STUDENT LIASON OFFICER:	**Morgyn Babins** University of Toronto

2019 CSBS Presidential Address
University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC

Where Have All the Greek Grammarians Gone? And Why Should Anyone Care?[1]

Stanley Porter
McMaster Divinity College

Abstract

Academic and intellectual communities are known for various areas of subject expertise. When one thinks of Greek grammar, including that of the New Testament, one thinks of Germany, and possibly Great Britain, but rarely Canada. An examination of recent trends regarding the study of ancient languages, especially Greek, in various institutions within Canada serves in this paper as an analogy for the study of other, related subjects, indicating some possible reasons why our field of biblical studies is increasingly an embattled subject and what we can do to address some of the issues involved.

[1] I delivered this as the Presidential address at the annual meeting of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies (CSBS) in Vancouver, BC, Canada, 1–3 June 2019. I appreciate the very positive response that I received from my fellow CSBS members and the conversations afterward.

Introduction

I am honored to have been President of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies and before that the Vice President over the course of the last two years. It has been a privilege to work alongside the dedicated members of the Executive Committee, who do most of the work of organizing the activities of our society, including the annual meeting.

I must confess that, in some sense, I have been trying to deliver my presidential address for nearly twenty years. In August of 2001, I was scheduled to be the plenary speaker at a conference in Britain, with my title "Where Have All the Greek Grammarians Gone?" I, however, had moved in July from London, England, to Hamilton, Ontario, to take up my new position at McMaster Divinity College, and so regrettably had to cancel the talk.

The person who was to introduce me to give the lecture, I was told later, said on the occasion words to the effect that, the paper topic was "Where Have All the Greek Grammarians Gone? Apparently they have gone to Canada."

This was not only a clever way of addressing the immediate situation of my cancelled lecture, but it also pointed out the situation that, with the departure of a single individual, the field of New Testament Greek grammatical study could be significantly altered. In other words, the number of New Testament Greek grammarians is not large in the UK—or in Canada, for that matter. My move did not suddenly swell the ranks.

When I returned to Canada in 2001, I was under no illusion that the number of grammarians in Canada was any larger than it was in the UK. As I contemplated my topic for this paper, I looked at the list of past-Presidents of CSBS to see if there were any other recognizable New Testament Greek scholars. I could find only one. G. B. Caird, who taught at McGill University and was President from 1957–58 before his return to the UK, wrote a book on the *Language and Imagery of the Bible*,[2] which arguably treats some linguistic issues, but he is not otherwise known for his Greek language study. One Greek scholar who arguably falls into the category is the second President of the society, the Reverend Canon George Abbott-Smith, who was President from 1934–35. Abbott-Smith wrote *A Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament*[3] while being sometime Principal of the Montreal Diocesan Theological College and Professor of Hellenistic Greek in McGill University. His lexicon, originally published in 1922, went through three editions, the last in 1937 just after his presidency. Abbott-Smith thanks a number of different scholars for their work, including especially James Hope Moulton, but also A. T. Robertson and Friedrich Blass, thus placing his lexicon within a distinct linguistic tradition that I will speak more about in a moment. The lexicon is known for its frequent reference to usage

[2] G. B. Caird, *The Language and Imagery of the Bible* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1980).

[3] G. Abbott-Smith, *A Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament*, 3rd ed. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1937).

in the Septuagint. So far as I can determine, the lexicon was Abbott-Smith's only published book in Greek, although he authored a short book on Charles Bancroft and edited one on soul care. Nevertheless, he was recognized in 1939 by McGill with an award of the honorary LL.D. I realize that there have been some others interested in New Testament Greek, but most of these have written first year Greek grammars, a topic I will also address in a moment. I do not attempt to mention individuals for fear that I will overlook someone.

I have dedicated a significant amount of my scholarly career over the last thirty years to the study of the ancient Greek language, in particular the Greek of the New Testament. I was fortunate to approach this study from a strong foundation in linguistics, having had the opportunity to do my PhD in both biblical studies and linguistics, as the first interdisciplinary PhD in the faculty of arts at the University of Sheffield, along with having a strong background in the reading and later teaching of extra-biblical Greek texts from Homer to the fourth century AD. Besides being a biblical scholar, I consider myself a modern linguist who studies New Testament Greek—that is my definition of being a Greek grammarian, at least for this paper—and strongly believe that we should bring the latest thought on language to bear on our understanding even of an ancient language. Just because a language is ancient does not mean that its methods of study must also be. I will address this issue further below as well.

The situation regarding the study of Greek has changed significantly over the course of my career. It is very difficult to gather precise information regarding the study of ancient Greek in Canada or elsewhere, and so I must rely upon haphazard evidence and my own intuitions. When I was teaching in the UK, less than a handful of the university theology programs required the study of Greek, roughly about five of nearly forty. Since then it has no doubt declined, if such a thing is possible, as has the number of theology departments. In 2013 in the UK, there were only 260 secondary schools in the entire nation that offered advanced Greek language study, including all types of Greek in the survey.[4] I could not find any relevant statistics solely for Canada, but according to the Modern Language Association in the United States, the number of students studying ancient Greek (including New Testament and other Biblical Greek) has fallen by an astronomical 42% in the decade from 2006 to 2016, the last year for which I could find statistics.[5] I imagine that these haphazard statistics are confirmed by all of our own experiences. The study of ancient languages, and

[4] Josephine Quinn, "The Tragedy of Classical Languages Being for the Privileged Few," *The Guardian*, 16 March 2015 (online).

[5] Dennis Looney and Natalia Lusin, *Enrollments in Languages Other than English in United Sates Institutions of Higher Education Summer 2016 and fall 2016: Preliminary Report* (New York: Modern Language Association of America, 2018), 13. The number of students in 2006 was 22,842 and in 2016 was 13,264. The total drop was 42%, but from 2013–2016 alone the drop was nearly 22%.

in particular Greek and including New Testament Greek, is declining, whether one is teaching at the undergraduate, seminary, or graduate level. And we are all very much concerned about this—especially those of us who make our livings in this area. As a result, there is much handwringing in various circles about what to do. There are, of course, many proposals that have been made, including holding the line uncompromisingly (probably a way of losing further students), adjusting our curriculum in various ways to attempt to address the issue of student interest (whether we can address an entire cultural change to rampant pragmatism is a matter of debate), or simply accepting defeat and proceeding as if all is fine but without languages (the notion of an expert in a literature without knowledge of its language will always strike some as odd).

In this paper, I do not intend to try to solve all of the difficulties regarding the study of ancient Greek and especially of how we might revive interest in the study of Greek. I do not intend actually to determine where all the Greek grammarians have actually gone, as I realize that there are a few here and there wherever the Greek New Testament is studied. I have a more modest goal. I wish to examine some of the possible reasons why we are where we are, on the basis of the history of the study of New Testament Greek, using this history of discussion as a possible analogue to the study of other sub-areas within our discipline of biblical studies. I will recount the narrative of the

history of Greek grammatical discussion, and I will leave you to draw the strong correlations to other areas of our discipline.

A History of the Discussion of Greek Grammar; or How We Got Where We Are

Many of us will no doubt know the contours of the development of the western intellectual tradition. I wish to recount some of this history since the Enlightenment to trace the development of Greek grammatical study. This should provide a framework for thinking about other dimensions of our discipline. In broad terms, there are three major periods in the study of language from the Enlightenment to the present.[6]

Rationalist Period

Rationalism, growing out of the Enlightenment, was characterized by focus upon rational thought, a shift from dogmatic to empiricist epistemology, an emphasis upon naturalism (as opposed to supernaturalism), and dissolution of the divide between the secular and the sacred. This desacralization included the Bible. The movement is perhaps captured best in the work of Baruch Spinoza

[6] See R. H. Robins, *A Short History of Linguistics*, 3rd ed. (London: Longman, 1990), passim, for the basic facts recounted here.

(1632–1677), a rationalist (though not empiricist) who believed in deduction from common knowledge to arrive at generalizations.

The rationalist period of language study went hand in hand with the Enlightenment. This period extends from roughly the middle of the seventeenth to the turn of the nineteenth centuries (1650 to 1800), with the rise of Romanticism (more precisely some would say in 1798, with the publication of the "Preface" to *Lyrical Ballads* by Wordsworth and Coleridge). Language study during the Rationalist period was dominated by philosophers and linguists who approached language rationalistically, along with its historical concerns. For example, Étienne Bonnot de Condillac (1714–1780) believed that "abstract vocabulary and grammatical complexity developed from an earlier individual concrete vocabulary," and Johann Gottfied Herder (1744–1803) believed in the "inseparability of language and thought."[7] William Jones (1746–1794), the British judge in India, thought that Sanskrit was "more perfect than the Greek, more copious than the Latin, and more exquisitely refined than either,"[8] and James Harris (1758–1835) thought one could derive "grammar from ontology, since the verb, to him, denotes nothing less than existence itself."[9] The rationalist period was characterized by a philosophical orientation that logically deduced the nature of language from prior understandings

[7] Robins, *Short History*, 165, 166.

[8] Robins, *Short History*, 149.

[9] Hye-Joon Yoon, *The Rhetoric of Tenses in Adam Smith's The Wealth of Nations* (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 47.

and beliefs, usually grounded in understandings of reality. Hence there was the notion of better and worse formed languages, thought and language were inseparable (and eventually led to German historicism), tense-forms indicated reality grounded in time, and more complex forms were developed from simpler ones.

Georg Benedikt Winer's (1789–1858) *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms* (published from 1822 to 1855 during his lifetime),[10] though not the first Greek grammar, fully represented the rationalist period. Winer was on the forefront of a new phase of Greek language study, even if he was not up to date with wider language study, as he wrote in the rationalist mode even though the period was coming to an end in the advent of comparative historicism. Prior to Winer, study of Greek was dominated by the categories of Latin grammar with a basic descriptivism verging on prescriptivism. Winer was the first to apply systematically the rationalist framework to understanding New Testament Greek, in which Greek was seen as a logically-based set of categories.

Winer sees Greek as the "sure basis" for exegesis. He sees the Jewish writers of the Greek New Testament writing in a mixed Greek and Semitic language that represents a unified type of

[10] Georg Benedikt Winer, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms* (Leipzig: Vogel, 1822; 1828; 1830; 1836; 1844; 1855); Georg Benedikt Winer, *A Treatise on the Grammar of New Testament Greek, Regarded as A Sure Basis for New Testament Exegesis*, 3rd ed., trans. W. F. Moulton (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1882).

grammar, what he calls a "single syntax."[11] Winer specifically speaks of the "rational method" of Greek language study, equated with empiricism. He follows these rationalistic principles throughout, including consistency and regularity based upon empirical evidence (or at least his perception of empirical evidence). This approach is specifically seen in Winer's grammar when he confines the meanings of the Greek tense-forms to temporal categories (he was a German after all). He states: "Strictly and properly speaking no one of these tenses [of Greek] can ever stand for another," with the present tense-form being "used for the future in appearance only," because the label indicates that it must only be a present tense-form.[12]

Winer's grammar would otherwise simply be a curiosity of linguistic history were it not for the fact that the rationalistic approach is still widely found in New Testament Greek language teaching and study. The rationalistic approach is in evidence in most beginning New Testament Greek grammars, where tense-forms and temporality are equated as if there is an inherent logic in their meanings and names (one that usually matches our metalanguage), reference is made to the "definite" article (Greek has no definite article), and other similar highly questionable comments. I surveyed over thirty such elementary grammars, and the vast majority fall within this category, from that of J. Gresham

[11] Winer, *Grammar*, 3.
[12] Winer, *Grammar*, 331.

Machen (1923) to Daniel Zacharias (2018) with William Mounce (1993; 5th ed. 2018) in between, and many others besides.

More disturbing, perhaps, is the fact that several intermediate-level Greek grammars continue to reflect the rationalistic period as well. The most obvious examples of the rationalistic approach are Daniel Wallace's *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics* and the more recent Andreas Köstenberger, Benjamin Merkle, and Robert Plummer's *Going Deeper with New Testament Greek*.[13] These grammars may not at first appear to be rationalistic grammars, as they seem to be familiar with the latest developments in Greek language study. Wallace, for example, accepts such apparently linguistic notions as "semantics and semantic situation," "synchronic priority," and "structural priority." However, he also relies upon the notion of "undisputed examples," reintroduces diachrony, has a non-systemic view of structure, and maintains the strange belief in the "cryptic nature of language."[14] Köstenberger, Merkle, and Plummer don't even include as much linguistic information as does Wallace—and that

[13] Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996); Andreas Köstenberger, Benjamin Merkle, and Robert Plummer, *Going Deeper with New Testament Greek: An Intermediate Study of the Grammar and Syntax of the New Testament* (Nashville: B&H, 2016).

[14] Wallace, *Grammar*, x-xvii. He also is concerned to create rationalist, inclusive frameworks, seen in his treatment of cases and his combining aspect and *Aktionsart*.

is pretty minimal. They, too, define the meanings of the tense-forms in rationalistic terms, such as the "combinative aspect" of the aorist and present, utilize a traditional lexical-incremental morphology, and attempt to explain both the five- and eight-case systems.

I admit that the ability to write a beginning Greek grammar is not a suitable test of one being a Greek linguist, but that may well be the problem. Most of our elementary language teaching, as well as several textbooks used for intermediate or exegesis courses, clearly reflect the rationalist language perspective. This is analogous to the use of F. C. Baur's (1880–1960) *Tendenz* criticism as the basis of contemporary historical critical methodology (Baur and Winer were almost exact contemporaries), or his reconstruction of early Christianity as the basis of our studying Christian origins. We no doubt wish to appreciate the foundational earlier research that underlies our discipline, but we probably wish to think that we have progressed to new levels of analysis and understanding within the discipline. Why we don't think the same about language remains one of the great mysteries of contemporary biblical scholarship. We may well be sealing our own fate by asking our students to learn by means of language models that are not just out of date, but completely outmoded.

Comparative Historicism

Comparative-historical language study emerged in the early nineteenth century as languages were discovered and then studied in relation to each other under the influence of the developmental hypothesis that came to dominate the period until Saussure, the Prague School of Linguistics, and the American descriptivists. The comparative-historical approach was also influenced by philosophy, but mostly the rise of Romanticism, with its emphasis upon the self, subjectivity, and experience. The German poet and philosopher Friedrich Schlegel (1772–1829) formulated the term "comparative philology" (1808) to describe the comparisons of both derivational and inflectional morphology.

The Danish linguist Rasmus Rask (1787–1832) and the German linguist Jacob Grimm (1785–1863) were major figures in the emergence of the comparative historical school. Rask wrote grammars for Old Norse and Old English, and Grimm wrote the first Germanic grammar, developing terminology still used in linguistics (strong/weak verbs, ablaut, and umlaut). Grimm's law of consonantal change is considered one of the major breakthroughs of comparative philology. The highpoint in this period was the work of Franz Bopp (1791–1867), who wrote a major work on the conjugation system of Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, Persian, and German, and then an important comparative grammar in three volumes, thereby developing the principles and practices of comparative philology. Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767–1835)

defined the inner forms of languages as agglutinative, isolating, and flexional, and August Schleicher (1821–1868) developed the comparative philological tree diagram to describe the relations among the languages in a family. The comparative historical period reached its culmination in the New Grammarians, including Karl Brugmann (1849–1919) and Berthold Delbrück (1842–1922). The New Grammarians were an informal group of younger German linguists who took a scientistic approach to language and believed that all sound changes followed exceptionless rules, thereby creating dialectology and principles of language conservatism as means of explaining exceptions.[15]

Contemporary New Testament studies currently relies upon a small handful of reference grammars as the basis of its advanced level research. The three major reference grammars of New Testament Greek all reflect the comparative historical perspective and were written during this time period. These grammars are by Friedrich Blass, James Hope Moulton, and A. T. Robertson. Friedrich Blass (1843–1907) was not a comparative philologian, but a classical philologian, as he acknowledges in the preface to the first edition of his Greek grammar, which appeared in 1896.[16] Nevertheless, he follows many of its principles as he describes New Testament Greek in relationship to Attic Greek and Latin. In the fourth edition of 1913 the Swiss comparative philologian

[15] Robins, *Short History*, 187–210.

[16] Friedrich Blass, *Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Griechisch* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1896).

Albert Debrunner (1884–1958) became the author. A number of further editions were made, and after Debrunner's passing, Friedrich Rehkopf took up the editorship in 1976 and continued to 2001. Robert Funk translated the ninth and tenth editions in 1961. The most important feature to note about the grammar, however, is that, no matter how many editions, the grammar is in its essentials the same, with its comparative-historical dimension gaining in explicitness especially through the work of Debrunner.

James Hope Moulton (1863–1917) was educated as a comparative philologian at Cambridge and acknowledges that he writes from this standpoint in his "Preface" to the second edition of his Prolegomena, the first volume of his projected three volume grammar.[17] Whereas Adolf Deissmann made the discovery of the common vocabulary of the Greek New Testament and the Greek documentary papyri, Moulton emphasized the common grammar. His *Prolegomena* of 1906 went through two editions in 1906 and 1908, and then he began work on his accidence and word-formation. He wrote over two-thirds or more of this volume before being killed crossing the Mediterranean in 1917. This work was completed by his student Wilbert Francis Howard (1880–1952), who finished the last section and the introduction, as well as writing an appendix planned by Moulton on Semitisms in the New

[17] James Hope Moulton, *Prolegomena*, vol. 1 of *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* by James Hope Moulton (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1906).

Testament.[18] The third and an additional fourth volume in the series, on *Syntax* and *Style*, were written by Nigel Turner, but he does not follow the same language theory and reverts to a style of thought that *precedes* the rationalistic period in his belief in a special, almost Holy Ghost, Greek. This fact is often overlooked by those who simply pick up the similarly presented blue volumes and use them without recognizing the major differences among them. It is not only graduate students who confuse their references to the various volumes in MHT.

The culmination of the comparative historical method of study of the Greek New Testament occurred in the work of A. T. Robertson (1863–1934). Robertson's grammar, first published in 1914, began as an attempt to revise Winer's grammar. In insightful statements that bear further contemplation, Robertson realized that such a plan would not work because (I note) "[s]o much progress had been made in comparative philology and historical grammar since Winer wrote his great book."[19] Therefore, he took the, for him, contemporary approach. Robertson provides a 24-page list of works most often cited, including two additional pages for the third edition, and the list is full of comparative philologians. Robertson

---

[18] James Hope Moulton and W. F. Howard, *Accidence and Word-Formation*, vol. 2 of *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* by James Hope Moulton (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1929).

[19] A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (Nashville: Broadman, 1914, 1915, 1919, 1923), vii.

places his grammar in relation to both his predecessors and the current thought on language. He notes the pre-Winer and then Winer periods, before referring to the, for him, "modern period," with its new tools such as comparative philology. Robertson clearly recognizes that his grammar is an example of comparative philology.

The comparative-historical perspective has continued in New Testament Greek grammatical study, in large part because of reliance—one might even say, over-reliance—upon these reference grammars. Chrys Caragounis's *The Development of Greek and the New Testament* (an admittedly odd title) is consciously diachronic in orientation and concerned with "the historical development of the language morphologically and especially syntactically."[20] Caragounis also dismisses many, if not most, of the categories of modern linguistics. David Hasselbrook, in his *Studies in New Testament Lexicography*, describes this as "Advancing toward a Full Diachronic Approach with the Greek Language" (again an admittedly odd title).[21]

The analogy for continued reliance upon the comparative-historical reference grammars—sometimes without any reference

[20] Chrys C. Caragounis, *The Development of Greek and the New Testament: Morphology, Syntax, Phonology, and Textual Transmission*, WUNT 167 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004).

[21] David S. Hasselbrook, *Studies in New Testament Lexicography: Advancing toward a Full Diachronic Approach with the Greek Language*, WUNT 2.303 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011).

to anything more recent, including articles or monographs—is use of the history of religion work of Wilhelm Bousset or Richard Reitzenstein. Bousset and Reitzenstein, like the comparative-historical grammarians, rely upon the developmental model (developed by Herbert Spencer) and are more concerned to diachronically compare data across boundaries—whether religious or language boundaries—than they are to synchronically examine the data as comprising their own system of thought. The advent of the New History of Religion movement is an admission that research has moved beyond the previous categories, yet for many, similar movement has not occurred in Greek language study.

The principles of language study found in the rationalist and comparative-historical frameworks are now often referred to as "traditional grammar." I use the term "traditional grammar" to refer to an approach to language that is what might be called pre-linguistic. David Crystal defines the major features of traditional grammar as these: the failure to recognize the difference between spoken and written language, emphasis upon restricted forms of written language, a failure to recognize various forms of language and how they are used, the tendency to describe language in terms of another language, often Latin, the appeal to logic as a means of describing and even assessing language, the tendency to evaluate language as more or less logical or complex or primitive or

beautiful or the like.[22] These kinds of traditional criteria grew out of a long history of discussion of language that dates back to the ancients and continued until the advent of modern linguistics. They are found in the two major periods of language study just discussed, the rationalist and comparative historical.

We need to note two important concluding factors regarding both the rationalist and comparative historical language schools. The first is that, no matter what developments may have occurred within linguistic thought (and some of those who persist in their rationalism and comparative historicism are aware of such developments), there continue to be those that model these traditional forms of grammar in their work. Most do so unknowingly because they are simply unaware of the history of the development of language thought, which is an argument for better knowledge of the history of language discussion and, more particularly, for knowledge of the current state of language discussion. One readily sees their citations of BDF in even their scholarly papers. But some of those who persist in their rationalism and comparative historicism are aware of such developments and continue nevertheless. Their persistence is less understandable, as they recognize that there are alternatives, ones that directly address the language issues that they are confronting. The second factor is that these models of language, which arguably have been

[22] David Crystal, *What Is Linguistics?*, 3rd ed. (London: Edward Arnold, 1974), 9–17.

superseded in subsequent linguistic thought (or the new models would not have persisted and replaced them in linguistics), remain, inexplicably, foundational within New Testament studies, providing most examples of beginning New Testament Greek grammars, several of the intermediate Greek grammars, virtually all of the advanced reference grammars, and even monographs that continue to be produced.

Modern Linguistics

A romanticized story is often told of the beginnings of modern linguistics, but the story is, in fact, much more complex. In many ways, the paradigm shift from the comparative-historical period to the modern linguistic period resembles the kind of movement that Thomas Kuhn envisions in his *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*.[23] In that important book, he notes how normal science—in this case, comparative-historical linguistics—despite its ascendancy, must address anomalies observed by other scholars. The number of anomalies increases until the point where the anomalies are too many to ignore and can no longer be viewed simply as anomalies. At this point, a paradigm shift occurs, in which the governing paradigm is displayed by a new hypothesis that does not have the same readily apparent explanatory

[23] Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962).

difficulties. The same is the case with the comparative-historical method. As it progressed, its categories of explanation became further hardened, especially in the thought of the New Grammarians. The New Grammarians not only observed sound changes but formulated ineluctable laws regarding such changes. However, there were always exceptions, to the point where the exceptions grew significantly in number. The environment was ripe for a new theory to displace the old.

This new theory emerged in several different ways at different places and, when the dust had settled—and it took some time for the dust to settle—we had entered the modern linguistic period. There are at least three foci of the emergence of this New Linguistics. These revolve around the research and writing of the Geneva language scholar Ferdinand de Saussure, the early and later developments of the Prague School of Linguistics, and the studies in Native American language in North America.

Ferdinand de Saussure (1857–1913) is by far the best known of these three strands lying behind the development of modern linguistics and is often cited as the founder of modern linguistics, even if I wish to question that assumption. More to the point is that Saussure was a member of the New Grammarians and so perfectly at home within the linguistics of his time. He wrote an important article entitled “Mémoire on the Primitive System of

Vowels in the Indo-European Languages," published in 1878.[24] This article was concerned with the lengthening of internal vowels in Indo-European languages. However, by the early years of the twentieth century, Saussure was lecturing on the topic of general linguistics along far different lines. From 1906–1911 on three different occasions, Saussure offered his general linguistics course at the University of Geneva. Saussure himself never lived to read the published form, as he died in 1913. The work of publishing the volume fell to two of his students who had heard his lectures, Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye, to assemble a book from the notes. This volume appeared in 1916 in French, but not in English until 1959, and established the basis of what is sometimes referred to as general linguistics.[25]

At the same time as Saussure was doing his speaking, there were other linguists who were shifting their perspective on the fundamental ways in which language is viewed. Some of those linguists later began to congregate around a core group of scholars in Prague. In 1911, Vilém Mathesius (1882–1945), a young

[24] Ferdinand De Saussure, "Mémoire on the Primitive System of Vowels in the Indo-European Languages," in *A Reader in Nineteenth-Century Historical Indo-European Linguistics*, ed. and trans. Winfred P. Lehmann (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1967), 417–24.

[25] Ferdinand de Saussure, *Course in General Linguistics*, ed. Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye with Albert Riedlinger, trans. Wade Baskin (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959) (trans. of *Cours de linguistique générale* [Paris: Payot & Rivages, 1916]). The Geneva School of linguistics formed around Saussure and his students.

linguist from Prague, presented a paper in which he argued for the synchronic study of languages. In 1926, Mathesius and a small group of scholars, including Jan Mukarovsky (1891–1975) (who extended the school's work to the arts, especially literature), Roman Jakobson (1896–1982) (who had been a member of the Russian Formalists, and later would have a huge influence upon North American linguistics, literary criticism, and Claude Lévi-Strauss), and Nikolai Trubetzkoy (1890–1938) (the Russian phonetician, who developed markedness theory), among others, held the first meeting of what was to become the Prague Linguistics Circle, a group that would last at least until 1948, when the changed circumstances of the communist government of Czechoslovakia would lead to the group's oppression and disbandment.[26]

The third group focused upon study of American Indian languages in North America. Wilhelm von Humboldt's (1767–1835) study of the Kawi language from Java,[27] a major study of a non-Indo European language, was a significant factor in the

[26] See Josef Vachek, *The Linguistic School of Prague* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1966); and F. W. Galen, *Historic Structures: The Prague School Project, 1928–1948* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1985). For their manifesto, see Marta K. Johnson, ed. and trans., *Recycling the Prague Linguistic Circle* (Ann Arbor, MI: Karoma, 1978), 1–31, the manifesto apparently having been drafted by Jakobson.

[27] See Wilhelm von Humboldt, *On Language*, ed. Michael Losonsky, trans. Peter Heath (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

development of his thoughts regarding his philosophy of mind, his views of language and culture, and the importance of comparative linguistics. Humboldt's theories encouraged a number of linguists to come to North America to study Native American languages. Franz Boas (1858–1942), a German refugee, came to North America because of its immense promise for the recording and classifying of a wide range of phenomena.[28] He noted that there were varieties of classification systems of language that could be used to describe its structures—including American Indian languages being analyzed along different lines than those traditionally used for European languages—and that there was a relationship between language and thought patterns, an idea extended to the notion that speakers might be forced to think according to the strictures of linguistic categories. Some of his ideas were taken much further by Boas's student, Edward Sapir (1884–1939), who worked in both Canada and the USA, and whose student Benjamin Lee Whorf (1897–1941) was outspoken in his differentiation of language and behavior.[29] Out of this work arose the so-called Sapir-Whorf hypothesis of language

[28] Franz Boas, *Race, Language, and Culture* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1940).

[29] Edward Sapir, *Selected Writings in Language, Culture, and Personality*, ed. David G. Mandelbaum (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1949); and Benjamin Lee Whorf, *Language, Thought, and Reality*, 2nd ed., eds. John B. Carroll, Stephen C. Levinson, and Penny Lee (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2012).

determinism. A strong form of this hypothesis—which has been rightly criticized by other linguists—was one of the major problems with the Biblical Theology Movement so roundly criticized by James Barr, although this and similar abuses persist in biblical scholarship.

In distinction from the rationalist or comparative historical study of language, the principles of modern linguistics were noteworthy: (1) the arbitrary nature of the sign, and the relationship between the signified and the signifier; (2) langue versus parole, or the language sign system versus a user's personal use of that language (treated differently by various linguistic theories); (3) synchrony versus diachrony, with synchrony taking priority over diachrony; (4) language as difference; (5) language as system; (6) syntagmatic versus paradigmatic relations; (7) language as social entity, with language as conventional among various semiotic systems; (8) marked versus unmarked members, a distinct contribution of Trubetzskoy and the Prague linguists; (9) form versus function, encouraged by the distinction by Karl Bühler (1879–1963) the psychologist and linguist among the representative, expressive, and appellative functions of language; and (10) syntax versus semantics, and later semantics versus pragmatics, along with information structure at the level of the sentence (especially in the Prague Functional Sentence Perspective).

Modern linguistics was instrumental in the development of structuralism, which came to dominate western intellectual

discourse in the first two thirds of the twentieth century. Linguistic structuralism spread far and wide, with various forms coming to be represented in various places. These include the Copenhagen school of Louis Hjelmslev (1899–1965), the American structuralism of Leonard Bloomfield (1887–1949) whose book *Language* had a dominating influence upon American linguistics,[30] French structuralism that was dependent upon both literary and philosophical influences from the Russian Formalists and resulted in French narratology as found in A. J. Greimas (1917–1992), and British structuralism mediated through the anthropologist Bronislaw Malinowski (1884–1942) to John R. Firth (1890–1960), the first professor of general linguistics in the UK, and then to Michael Halliday, from whence it spread to Australia and beyond.[31]

In most ways, linguistics as defined above survived the poststructural rebellion, often identified with the conference entitled "The Languages of Criticism and the Sciences of Man" held in October, 1966 in Baltimore, Maryland, where Jacques Derrida presented his paper, entitled "Structure, Sign, and Play in

[30] Leonard Bloomfield, *Language* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston, 1933).

[31] See David Robey, ed., *Structuralism* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1973), with essays on linguistics, anthropology, semiology, literature, philosophy, and mathematics.

the Discourse of the Human Sciences."[32] He questioned the notion of structure, attempted to sever the relationship of sign and signified or at least to destabilize it, endorsed notions of play and freedom in sign systems, and deconstructed the structuralism of one of its major figures, the anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss (1908–2009). This is not to say that there were no effects of poststructuralism. They are seen in the traditional notion of language as product becoming language as process (as in Julia Kristeva), the recognition of language as intertextual, the move from univocal to dialogical and heteroglossic meaning (based upon the work of Mikhael Bakhtin [1895–1975]),[33] the move from linguistic systemic stability to fluidity and unboundedness (with Roland Barthes [1915–1980]), and recognition of structures of power being exercised through language (as in Michel Foucault [1926–1984]).

Most linguistics, however, has retained its fundamental structuralist agenda, even if it has been forced to recognize that language, rather than simply being a mirror or reflector of the world is a partial maker of its own world, a part of the social or

---

[32] Jacques Derrida, "Structure, Sign, and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences," in *The Structuralist Controversy: The Languages of Criticism and the Sciences of Man*, ed. Richard Macksey and Eugenio Donato (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972), 247–65.

[33] E.g. M. M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, ed. Michael Holquist, trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981).

individual construction or at least interpretation of reality. This destabilization may well be one of the reasons that linguistic study has not become more robust within biblical studies, an academic discipline that, despite its protestations otherwise, actively seeks definitive meanings, even if they are negative ones.

There are various ways of categorizing linguistics after World War II. One of the ways is to distinguish between two major approaches to linguistic theory, the approach of Noam Chomsky and the others who do not follow Chomsky. This is developed by Robert Van Valin and Randy LaPolla as the difference between the "syntactocentric" and the "communication-and-cognition" perspectives.[34] The syntactocentric perspective attributed to Chomsky[35] and his many followers is characterized by language

[34] The following is dependent upon Van Valin and LaPolla, *Syntax: Structure, Meaning and Function*, Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 8–15, but with reference to other works interposed as appropriate. I do not include speech-act theory, for which there are works in both Greek and Hebrew, because here I am concentrating on syntactical/semantic theories as per Van Valin and LaPolla, rather than pragmatic theories that are more a philosophy of language than linguistic (apart from mentioning Relevance Theory below).

[35] Noam Chomsky, *Syntactic Structures* (The Hague: Mouton, 1957); Noam Chomsky, *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1965); Noam Chomsky, *Lectures on Government and Binding* (Dordrecht: Foris, 1981); Noam Chomsky, *The Minimalist Program* (Cambridge: MA: MIT Press, 1995), among many other works.

being an "autonomous cognitive faculty"[36] (Universal Grammar) that results in human internal grammar that follows linguistic universals. Such linguistics investigates not language use (performance) but the speaker's competence, and especially the psychological dimensions of language such as its acquisition. Such an approach to language has spawned a number of further theories.[37] One of the characteristics of such language study, however, based in part upon the work of Bloomfield, is the minimization of meaning and the emphasis upon form, hence often being called formal grammars.

The communication-and-cognition perspective, according to Van Valin and LaPolla, essentially includes everything else, unified around the view that linguistics focuses upon use of language either for communicative purposes or as a reflection of cognitive processing in relation to other cognitive systems, with grammar or syntax as relatively less significant to these greater concerns and meaning or function being more important. The linguistic theories that this perspective subsumes are numerous and diverse.[38] Whereas Chomsky dominates the first group, there is no

---

[36] William Croft and D. Alan Cruse, *Cognitive Linguistics*, Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 1.

[37] Such as Generalized Phrase Structure Grammar, Relational Grammar, and Categorial Grammar.

[38] They include Functional Grammar or grammars in their various types (including Continental, St. Petersburg, and West Coast or Oregon forms), Role and Reference Grammar, Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG), Tagmemics,

single dominant figure in the second group, only a relatively unified yet widespread rejection of the syntactocentric perspective.

The broadness of this communication-and-cognition category has led others to differentiate between formalist, cognitive, and functionalist perspectives on language. This is especially pertinent since cognitive theories grew out of formalist theories, rather than sharing origins with the functionalists.[39]

The linguistic world that I have just depicted may sound very strange, especially to New Testament scholars—and indeed it is. This is a world in which the study of language has departed significantly from the kinds of common sense or Latin-based categories typically used in other disciplines that are textually

---

Lexical-Functional Grammar, Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar, Construction Grammar, Autolexical Syntax, Word Grammar, Meaning-text theory, Cognitive Grammar, Prague School Dependency Grammar, and French functionalism, to list only what must be an incomplete list (and it is, as one can also think of Stratificational Grammar or Columbia School Linguistics, both functionalist models), along with a number of what they call independent linguists. Van Valin and LaPolla, *Syntax*, 12, list as independent linguists Michael Silverstein, Ray Jackendoff, Ellen Prince, Talmy Givón, Susumu Kuno, Leonard Talmy, Sandra Thompson, and Anna Wierzbicka. Not all might fit as conveniently as others, and one might also think of others to place in this category. I would have thought that most of these were classifiable, some of them even in the syntactocentric and others in the communication-and-cognition perspective. However, see below on these categories.

[39] David Banks, *A Systemic Functional Grammar of English: A Simple Introduction* (London: Routledge, 2019).

based. Even if we might say that structural linguistics is foundationalist in orientation, as opposed to the anti-foundationalism of poststructuralism, the categories used to express these foundations are not those of previous schools of thought. They include complex relationships between signifier and signified, an emphasis upon signs, the importance of systems, clear preference for synchrony over diachrony even if diachrony is recognized, and the individual and, arguably more important, social dimension of language for its use and function.

The pronounced recognition of the importance of general, and in particular Saussurean, linguistics for biblical studies occurred in James Barr's (1924–2006) *The Semantics of Biblical Language* published as far back as 1961.[40] In this justly well-known yet still widely neglected work, Barr states that he is going to use linguistic semantics, and he applies it to a number of well-known elements of the Biblical Theology Movement. That it took over forty years for modern linguistics to penetrate biblical studies is not surprising. The same kind of delay is found in the field of linguistics itself.[41] Despite the work of Saussure (and others) in the early days of the century, it was not until the post-World War II period that linguistics practitioners caught up with their own discipline's history. In that sense, Barr entering the affray in 1961

[40] James Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961).

[41] Geoffrey W. Sampson, *The Linguistics Delusion* (Sheffield: Equinox, 2017), 1–3.

was at the outset of the discipline of biblical linguistics. He has been followed by a few who have attempted to continue and enhance the course of his work.[42]

Despite this early adoption of the strong Saussurean perspective, it is nevertheless nearly sixty years since Barr published his book, and I would have thought that such an arguably convincing case cannot be long ignored. However, the history of New Testament Greek language study adopting a modern linguistic framework is disappointingly sparse, even if it occurred relatively soon after Barr's pronouncements. In the area of beginning New Testament grammars, there are arguably only a very small number that reflect the principles of modern linguistics. These include (this is not a complete list, but a complete list would not be much larger): Eugene Van Ness Goetchius, *The Language of the New Testament*,[43] indebted to the American structuralist Bloomfieldian approach of scholars such as Charles Hockett (a fierce opponent of Chomsky), Henry Gleason, Eugene Nida, and Charles Fries;[44] B. Ward Powers, *Learn to Read the Greek New*

[42] D. A. Carson, *Exegetical Fallacies* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984); David Alan Black, *Linguistics for Students of New Testament Greek* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1988); Peter Cotterell and Max Turner, *Linguistics and Biblical Interpretation* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1989); and Moisés Silva, *God, Language, and Scripture: Reading the Bible in the Light of General Linguistics* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1990).

[43] Eugene Van Ness Goetchius, *The Language of the New Testament* (New York: Scribner, 1965).

[44] See Robins, *Short History*, 232–36.

Testament,[45] also dependent upon American structuralism, as well as more recent modern language teaching methods that emphasize meaning over translation; Stanley Porter, Jeffrey T. Reed, and Matthew Brook O'Donnell, *Fundamentals of New Testament Greek*, which takes a Systemic-Functional Linguistic approach Greek;[46] Rodney J. Decker's *Reading Koine Greek: An Introduction and Integrated Workbook*, which acknowledges being influenced by Silva, Carson, Goetchius, and Porter, among others;[47] and Frederick Long's *Koine Greek Grammar: A Beginning-Intermediate Exegetical and Pragmatic Handbook*, which incorporates matters related to tense/aspect, prominence, and discourse analysis.[48]

Intermediate grammars do not prove much more productive than do beginning grammars (again, the list is probably not complete, but my point is made well enough). The first

---

[45] B. Ward Powers, *Learn to Read the Greek New Testament: An Approach to New Testament Greek Based upon Linguistic Principles* (Adelaide: SPCK Australia, 1979; 5th ed., 1995), esp. Appendix B (pp. 192–212) and notes.

[46] Stanley E. Porter, Jeffrey T. Reed, and Matthew Brook O'Donnell, *Fundamentals of New Testament Greek* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010).

[47] Rodney J. Decker, *Reading Koine Greek: An Introduction and Integrated Workbook* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2014). See also Christophe Rico, *Speaking Ancient Greek as a Living Language*, 2 vols. (Jerusalem: Polis Institute Press, 2015), for a linguistic approach to ancient Greek of the Hellenistic period especially the first century, but one that uses immersion.

[48] Fredrick J. Long, *Koine Greek Grammar: A Beginning-Intermediate Exegetical and Pragmatic Handbook* (Wilmore, KY: Glossa House, 2015).

intermediate book to note is the volume already mentioned by Powers, whose beginning book also contained an intermediate section as well. The second work is by Stanley Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*.[49] This volume was one of the first to make an explicit attempt to create an intermediate-level grammar that was based upon modern linguistic principles, in this case functional linguistics such as Systemic Functional Linguistics, as well as some elements from other functionalists, such as the slot and filler notion from Tagmemics. Porter was followed fairly quickly by Richard Young, *Intermediate New Testament Greek: A Linguistic and Exegetical Approach*, who takes what he calls a "descriptive" approach with an emphasis upon "usage in context" as determining meaning,[50] while also offering thanks to John Callow of the Summer Institute of Linguistics. Decker also includes some intermediate level material in his *Reading Koine Greek*. Finally, the most recent intermediate grammar that reflects principles of modern linguistics is David Mathewson and Elodie Ballantine Emig, *Intermediate Greek Grammar: Syntax for*

[49] Stanley E. Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1992).

[50] Richard A. Young, *Intermediate New Testament Greek: A Linguistic and Exegetical Approach* (Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 1994), viii. Cf. the Introduction, where he makes further linguistic distinctions (e.g. communication act, implicit and explicit information, form and meaning, surface structure and deep structure, and semantics and pragmatics) very much in the binary structuralist mode.

Students of the New Testament, which follows, as it states, most closely the intermediate grammar by Porter.[51] Most of these works may well be unknown to the majority of biblical scholars, even those engaged in the teaching of New Testament Greek.

When we are required to make a choice regarding elementary or intermediate Greek books, it is not enough to judge the book simply by its cover or the online resources or the cute pictures or clever sidebars—when there are substantive issues that distinguish these books from the others.

One of the greatest disappointments is that there have been no major reference grammars of New Testament Greek produced from any modern linguistic perspective—certainly in English. There have definitely been a number of monographs that approach various questions of Greek from linguistic perspectives—especially some of those in the series Studies in Biblical Greek by Peter Lang and Linguistic Biblical Studies by Brill, and the now defunct Studies in New Testament Greek series by Sheffield Academic Press (now Bloomsbury)—but these are the kinds of technical monographs one might expect in a discipline and are generally not used apart from specialists, even if we might wish otherwise. Both series continue to thrive, and other volumes are being published. Nevertheless, they are not Greek grammars as we

[51] David L. Mathewson and Elodie Ballantine Emig, *Intermediate Greek Grammar: Syntax for Students of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2016), xv.

are discussing here. Scholars should make use of these monographs, although they are admittedly technical and often far too complex even for biblical scholars to fully understand.

Thus, even though there are a few beginning and intermediate level Greek grammatical volumes available, there has not yet been a sustained, advanced level modern linguistic grammar of the entire system of the Greek found in the New Testament corpus. This is a major lacuna in New Testament studies, and probably has a direct correlation with the state of affairs in New Testament Greek teaching and learning, and quite possibly the wider field of biblical studies. Modern linguistics by any reckoning is now around one-hundred years old, or at least sixty if we allow for some understandable slippage. Even if we recognize that the major progress in development of modern linguistics occurred in the post-World War II era, this means that modern linguistics in its many and varied forms has been the dominant intellectual paradigm for discussion of language for over fifty years, and for over fifty years such thought has been explicitly known to biblical scholars, including New Testament scholars. Yet in that time, only eight distinct volumes, by my estimate, have been published in English that explicitly acknowledge and reflect such a modern linguistic perspective, interpreting the term broadly. I, of course, am not talking about monographs, but even there, the two viable series that I mention above have only published about 35 volumes in total over the last thirty years.

Where Do We Go from Here?

If one were to listen to some of the more vociferous debate regarding the study of New Testament Greek, one might form the impression that the major issue revolves around whether one uses modern or Erasmian pronunciation. There are advocates on both sides, and arguments for each. However, this is not the central issue in the study of the Greek of the New Testament, and it is not the major issue that contributes to the state of the discipline at this juncture. It is but one that mostly grows out of a more fundamental discussion regarding how we teach our first-year languages. There are, at least so far as I know, five approaches to the teaching of elementary Greek. I doubt that most who are involved in teaching New Testament Greek are aware of these different approaches and have weighed their strengths and weaknesses in evaluating textbooks or determining the goals of or their own approaches to language instruction. These approaches also do not necessarily indicate that the description of the language is linguistically sound, as some of these pedagogical approaches pre-date developments in modern linguistics. Nor do these approaches have any inherent relationship to the number of students who may study Greek, as there are both micro- and macro-patterns involved in why students study Greek. The micro-patterns are often whether the individual teacher sufficiently arouses the attention of students so that they want to take the language. The macro-patterns are related to the general cultural shift away from cultural knowledge and toward

scientism, so that students become more and more concerned with instrumentalism rather than understanding.

The five pedagogical approaches are the immersion method, the inductive method, the linguistic analysis method, the morphological method, and the usage-based method. The morphological method, also known as the grammar-translation approach, is the one most often reflected in traditional beginning Greek grammars, although it need not be the case. There are a variety of approaches to the study of morphology, with the lexical-incremental approach being found in most New Testament Greek study and the closest to traditional grammatical study.[52] This morphological model posits that each morpheme is roughly equivalent to a lexeme in that each is a unit of meaning, and the meaning of a word is the composite of its morphemes. By contrast, one might better argue for the inferential-realizational approach, in which the properties of any morpheme are determined by its paradigmatic function.[53] In the current climate, where there is a discussion of approaches to teaching Greek, the immersion method has probably garnered more discussion than most others. There are a number of strong advocates of a "living language" approach to the study of Greek. The major problem with such an approach is

[52] William D. Mounce, *The Morphology of Biblical Greek* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994); Gregory T. Stump, *Inflectional Morphology: A Theory of Paradigm Structure* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

[53] Gregory Stump, *Inflectional Paradigms: Content and Form at the Syntax-Morphology Interface* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016).

that one cannot produce the kind of full immersion environment necessary with an epigraphic language, which will never be and never can be a living language. Further, the goal of living language instruction is significantly different from the kind of exegetical analysis desired in biblical studies. Although immersion approaches are to be commended for arousing interest in pedagogical approaches to Greek study, their ability to achieve the necessary goals of language instruction for New Testament Greek purposes has failed. The inductive method has been used by various elementary grammars in the past, from William Rainey Harper in the late nineteenth century to William Sanford Lasor to the present.[54] In many ways, the inductive approach is the predecessor of the immersion approach, as they both rely upon direct confrontation with the language. The fact that such volumes have been around for so long and produced so little indicates that the inductive approach has limitations. The linguistic analysis method is less concerned with learning a language than learning how to analyze and describe a language so that one might productively use it. Finally, the usage-based method introduces the elements of the language on the basis of their frequency of usage. This approach follows some cognitive linguistic findings that show that reinforcing the most commonly occurring elements enhances

[54] William Rainey Harper and Revere Franklin Weidner, *An Introductory New Testament Greek Method* (New York: Scribner, 1893); William Sanford Lasor, *Handbook of New Testament Greek*, 2 vols. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980); and others.

learning and retention. One thing that is certain is that beginning Greek instruction should not be left to the low person on the departmental totem pole or consigned to a graduate student. The stakes are far too high. The teaching of Greek, especially if one is interested in linguistic understanding, should be handled by those with specialist knowledge or expertise, or at least by those interested in Greek from a linguistic standpoint and willing to learn and do more than simply read from the assigned textbook. Providing a sufficient linguistic foundation in the language, so that we have educated students, some of whom may even go on for further study, demands this at the least.

These approaches to pedagogy, as I mentioned above, are not necessarily directly tied to the linguistic orientation of the individual presentation. These may be important for the introduction of the language, but they do not address the much more important issue of not just whether students are studying Greek but what we are understanding when we refer to Greek.

I realize that not all those who study and utilize Greek in their scholarship can be linguists, by that meaning those educated in the principles of linguistic thought. The field of linguistics is an intellectual discipline of its own and it requires the same kind of dedication and study as any other. However, the discipline of biblical studies is, by definition, a synthetic and eclectic field that has been more than willing to incorporate models of thought from a variety of disciplines, including the social sciences and literary studies, among many others. As a result, biblical studies is full of

literary studies, social-scientific studies, various types of ideological studies, and the like. I suspect, however, that linguistics, especially as I understand linguistics, demands much more of its practitioners than do some of these other fields, where their language and methods are more readily amendable to traditional ways of doing biblical studies. This may be why certain relatively low-grade and easily graspable linguistic treatments of Greek have become more popular than some more rigorous ones, such as cognitive-discourse analysis becoming more popular than Construction Grammar.

This makes it all the more important that we are aware of and actively seeking to utilize language works that utilize modern linguistics. I would argue that we should rethink this from the ground up. That means that we should re-orient our teaching of Greek so that the foundation of linguistic understanding is laid in the initial treatment of the language, and then that the intermediate grammars that are used in exegesis courses are linguistically-oriented treatments of the language, including introductions to such things as discourse analysis. There is already a limited number, and even at that an entirely sufficient number, of these works available. To this point, as I have indicated, we lack reference grammars of New Testament Greek from a linguistic perspective of any sort. This is a difficult task to accomplish, as is witnessed by the recent publication of *The Cambridge Grammar of*

Classical Greek.[55] On the one hand, I am very glad to see this work in print as it makes a strong case for a linguistic description of the Greek language. On the other hand, the linguistic model displayed is underdeveloped and undertheorized—there is no discussion of its linguistic approach, and hence no reference to the linguistic theoreticians on which it relies. The result is a work that is uneven and piecemeal in many respects, with it unclear the basis for making some of the judgments that it does (notorious instances are the treatment of the article, where there is contradictory information; and the lack of rigor in describing the Greek verbal system). This illustrates the need not to abandon the task but to engage in the task all the more, with more people involved and more research being undertaken.

I am not optimistic that the field of biblical studies is willing or even able to realize that it is unnecessarily limited in its linguistic perspective. If a change were to be effected, there would no doubt need to be major developments made in such areas as graduate education, faculty hiring, selection of textbooks, and publications where the resources of Greek linguistics are brought to our interpretive task. This would require a major investment of time and energy in becoming at least minimally knowledgeable in the linguistics of ancient Greek. There are no shortcuts to such knowledge. One of the responses to such a challenge that I have

[55] Evert van Emde Boas, Albert Rijksbaron, Luuk Huitink, and Mathieu de Bakker, *The Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019).

occasionally heard is what I call the damned if you do and damned if you don't syndrome. Those who advocate a linguistic approach to the Greek language are often challenged to present the new findings from their approach, but if they do propose such findings they are often questioned because traditional grammatical study had not previously uncovered such interpretations. I am not saying that, if a thoroughly rigorous linguistic approach is adopted, we will need to rethink all of our previous exegetical conclusions, especially as modern linguistics is itself the latest in a stage of continued thought regarding language and has profitably built upon its predecessors even if it has chosen to emphasize different orientations to language. However, I do not think that we are in a position to describe the limits of what can be discovered by rigorous linguistic study of Greek unless such study is undertaken on a more widespread basis than has previously been done and that such studies are utilized across the range of our interpretive work. We must not only study Greek in our language courses, but we must utilize the best in linguistic research in our research articles and monographs. It is only then that we will be able to judge whether the effort has been worth it. Until then, it will be an untried experiment, with conclusions drawn on the basis of insufficient evidence.

Conclusion

I have had the privilege of being able to offer some comments on the topic of the question of where have all the Greek grammarians gone. In one sense, many of them have passed on with their predecessors as either rationalist or comparative-historical grammarians—even if we continue to resurrect them by using them even though there are better approaches available. In this lecture, I hope to have opened up some areas of knowledge that perhaps have not been previously understood regarding the history of Greek language discussion, some developments in Greek linguistic study, and some of the potential areas where such study might proceed in the future. There are, thankfully, a few pockets of serious linguistic study of the Greek of the New Testament, and I am honored to be able to work with three other colleagues in New Testament who are all expert in various areas of Greek linguistic study. They provide a constant challenge and stimulus to further work.

I apologize if you were perhaps thinking that I would provide the solution to the problem of the loss of students in the study of Greek in our institutions. I do not have a solution to that problem, except to say that the only way that we will be able to address such a situation is from one of greater knowledge of where we have come from, where we are, and where we should be going in the study of Greek. I think that all of us, in whatever area of biblical studies we may find ourselves, should be made aware of

the history and development of this particular area of our discipline. The lines of interconnection and coincidence are too great to ignore. It is only through gaining such knowledge that we will be able to address the challenges of our discipline in the future.

Minutes of the 2019 CSBS
Annual General Meeting

University of British Columbia
Vancouver, BC
Saturday, June 1, 2019
3:30 – 5:00 PM

Attendees: : Stanley Porter, J. Richard Middleton, Keith Bodner, Jonathan Vroom, Andrew Perrin, Agnes Choi, Anna Cwikla, Ryan Schroeder, Gary Yamasaki, Alan Kirk, Morgyn Babins, Laura Hare, Robert Revington, Mark Leuchter, Christine Mitchell, John Marshall, Colleen Shantz, Anne Letourneau, Ehud Ben Zvi, John F. Horman, Andrew Brockman, Francis Landy, Melody Everest, David Sigrist, Arthur Walker-Jones, John Leo McLaughlin, Heather Macumber, Jordash Kiffiak, Ryan Schellenberg, Steven Muir, Daniel Sarlo, Andrew Kransc, Hanna Tervanotko, Nicholas Meisl, John Martens, Michelle Yu, Jennifer Otto, Brandon Diggens, Matthew Hama, Terry Donaldson, Bill Morrow, Tony Cummins, Paul Spilsbury, Duncan Reid, Carmen Imes, James Magee, Shannon Stange, and Matt Thiessen.

1. Welcome: Andrew Perrin began with the statement, “I would like to acknowledge that we are gathered today on the traditional, ancestral, and unceded territory of the Musqueam people.”

2. Approval of agenda

   Motion: J. Richard Middleton Second: Francis Landy **CARRIED**

3. Approval of minutes of 2018 Annual General Meeting

   Motion: John Leo McLaughlin Second: Agnes Choi **CARRIED**

4. Business arising from the minutes

   None arising.

5. President's report (Stanley Porter)

   Numerous people should be thanked, not least the members of Executive, who invest countless hours in the interests of CSBS. Several will be moving on, and others who continue to serve. The Society faces challenges in the days, and therefore all members of CSBS are encouraged to continue promoting involvement in our common task.

6. Vice-President's report (Richard Middleton)

   Nominations for Executive vacancies

   Vice-President (and President Elect): Colleen Shantz
   Executive Secretary: Mark Leuchter

Programme Coordinator: Agnes Choi
Student Liaison: Morgyn Babins

Motion to approve the nominees:
Moved: J. Richard Middleton Second: Francis Landy **CARRIED**

- R.B.Y. Scott and Falconer awards
  The awards for this year will be presented during the reception.

7. Programme Coordinator's report (Agnes Choi)

50 papers will be presented this year, and of these, 35 will be presented by full members alongside 15 students. 26 of the papers are in the area of Hebrew Bible/Dead Sea Scrolls, while 24 are in the field of New Testament/ Apocryphal literature. In terms of geographical distribution, 24 presenters are from Ontario, 4 from Alberta, 8 from BC, 1 from Manitoba, 1 from Nova Scotia, 2 from Quebec, 1 from Saskatchewan, and 9 international presenters. Each of these deserve a word of thanks for supporting the work of CSBS.

Due to rising costs associated with the Annual Banquet, a pilot project was tested last year, with a reception immediately following the presidential address. Members subsequently were canvassed

with a survey, and the results were positive for the reception to continue, and those canvassed also supported a modest fee increase to cover the cost. Moreover, an initiative has been created for "small-group dinners" after the reception.

Members are also reminded about the Craigie Lecture with Dr Marvin Sweeney on Sunday evening at 7 pm.

Robert Cousland also deserves a word of thanks as this year's Local Area Co-ordinator.

8. Membership Secretary's report and approval of new members (Jonathan Vroom)

   Motion to approve the new members:
   Moved: Jonathan Vroom Second: Christine Mitchell **CARRIED**

9. Treasurer's Report (Jonathan Vroom)

   - See Appendix for full report (including the list of new members).
   - Congress fee increase for reception
     Motion to increase Association Conference fee by 5 dollars for students and 12 for full members starting next year:
     Moved: Jonathan Vroom Second: J. Richard Middleton **CARRIED**

10. Executive Secretary's report (Keith Bodner)

Nothing to report at this time.

11. Communication Officer's report (Andrew Perrin)

1) Efforts are being made to improve and centralize CSBS communication. Email is a primary means, but so is social media (including a YouTube channel). It is hoped that such initiatives will help serve our membership and encourage timely renewals.
2) It might be time for an overhaul of the CSBS website, not least to streamline donations, memberships, and to provide updates. Costs have been calculated for this redesign (estimated at this point to be ~2500-3500 dollars), along with the annual fee for ongoing server hosting and maintenance. Members are encouraged to send feedback or respond to a survey as proposals are drafted for a redesign, and ideas for enhancing traffic and content (e.g., job boards, announcements, publications, or upcoming conferences).

12. Student Liaison report (Anna Cwikla)

The *Special Student Session* this year was entitled "It'll Look Great on your CV!": Prioritizing Professionalization Opportunities, featuring panelists: Mark Leuchter (Temple), Hanna

Tervanotko (McMaster), Heidi Wendt (McGill), Ian Wilson (Alberta). Both the lunch and the session were well attended, and a special word of thanks is extended to the presenters.

13. Endowment Committee report (Jonathan Vroom)

    See Appendix Below

14. Publications Report: SCJ and Advancing Studies in Religion (Terry Donaldson and Christine Mitchell)

    An update was provided on these two book series, and members are encouraged to inform colleagues to consider or promote this publishing venue. Books will be on display at the reception following the Craigie Lecture.

15. Other business

    The point was raised about approving the accountant's report, and that matter will be pursued over the course of the year. Furthermore, a question was raised about a national database for graduate students in biblical studies, and a suggestion was forwarded about checking with CCSR.

16. Adjournment

    Moved: John Leo McLaughlin **CARRIED**

APPENDIX

Membership Secretary and Treasurer's Report 2019

CANADIAN SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL STUDIES
SOCIETÉ CANADIENNE DES ÉTUDES BIBLIQUES
Prepared by Jonathan Vroom, June 1, 2019
jonathan.vroom@utoronto.ca

1. MEMBERSHIP

1.1. *Obituary*

In 2018-2019, three members/former members of CSBS passed away:

- Sean McEvenue (President in 1989-1990)
- Gary N. Knoppers (President 2003-2004)
- William Klassen (President 1982-1983)

1.2. New Members

Name	**Membership Type**
Nominator	
Richard S. DeMaris	Contract
Steven Muir	
Melody Guest	Student
Ehud Ben Zvi	

Ko Woon Lee	Student
Colleen Shantz	
Nicholas Meisl	Full
Shawn Flynn	
Jennifer Otto	Full
Ian Henderson	
Amanda Rosini	Student
Patricia Kirkpatrick	
Martin Sanfridson	Student
Matthew Thiessen	
Patrick Stange	Student
Ian Brown	
Roy Tanenbaum	Contract
Jonathan Vroom	
Rebecca Sanfridson	Student
John Kloppenborg	
Greg Gardner	Full
Jonathan Vroom	
Irene Quach Soquier	Student
Matthew Thiessen	
John Cook	Full
Robert Holmstedt	
Brenton Dickieson	Student
Jonathan Vroom	
Brian Felushko	Student
Matthew Hama	
Arthur Walker-Jones	Full
Jonathan Vroom	
Brandon Diggens	Student
Andrew Perrin	

George Guthrie Paul Spilsbury	Full
Brandon Diggins Andrew Perrin	Full

1.3 *Notes*

This year 127 members from our 328-member database paid their dues. Of those, 108 were renewals (the other 19 were new members). This is a substantial decrease in membership. In 2018 there were 170 renewals and 22 new members and in 2017 there were 177 renewals and 34 new members.

2. FINANCES: GENERAL AND RESTRICTED FUNDS

2.1. *Explanation of the General and Restricted Funds*

The General Fund covers all of the Society's annual operating costs, while the Restricted Funds cover specifically designated expenses, such as book awards and student prizes. The Society pays for all of its annual operating costs and Restricted Funds expenses from an account with Royal Bank, which, as of May 30th, has a balance of $39,522.07. An approximate explanation of the society's 2018-2019 General Funds and Restricted Funds thus far is laid out in the two charts below: Statement of Income (Fig. 1); and Statement of Expenses (Fig. 2).

According to the charts, excess of revenue over expenses is significantly less than the 2017-2018 fiscal year; there is a shortfall of over $5192.04, which is much higher than the $727 loss last year. There are at least five factors that contribute toward this

projected loss. First, our renewal rate is much lower this year (see 1.3 above). This decline resulted in $5161.60 less in revenue, though lower membership also reduces operating costs, such as the *SR* subscription ($5940 in 2018 versus $3670 this year). Second, we have not (yet) drawn from the Endowment. Typically, the Endowment Committee sends between $2500 and $3000 to the Treasurer each year to help cover costs with the Society's operations. This remains an option for this year (more on this below). Third, this year we are hosting a Craigie Lecture, which will put an additional $1500 (appox.) strain on the Operating Budget. These three factors alone explain the entirety of the $6000 difference between this year and last year.

But there are a couple more factors to consider. Fourth, this year we have paid every shortfall from the restricted funds' costs with money from the General Fund. For example, because we only raised $2050 for the Craigie Lecture this year, the remaining $1531.22 of the projected costs will be covered by the General Fund. Similarly, the entire cost of the book award and student essay prize, which received no donations, will be covered by the General Fund. In all there was a shortfall of $2881.22 (approx.) in these Restricted Funds' costs, which were covered by the General Fund. In previous years, Robert Bishop's (our account's) financial statements indicate that these shortfalls were covered by the various lines in the Endowment Fund. For example, last year $500 from the Beare Award Line from the Endowment was spent to cover that Award. It should be noted that it is still possible to cover these shortfalls with a transfer from the Endowment Fund, perhaps more clearly specifying which line from the Endowment is contributing toward each Restricted Fund expense so as to avoid interfund transfers (see below).

Finally, a fifth factor to consider with this year's budgetary shortfall concerns something called interfund transfers. According to Robert Bishop's (our accountant's) previous financial statements, each year money from the Restricted Funds ended up being transferred into the General Fund. For example, in the 2017-2018 statement (which will be available soon), $3815 of restricted funds were transferred to the General Fund. Although the Society committed to cease this practice in 2016, these transfers have continued, though it must be noted that they were automatically and unintentionally made to optimize investments. Although these interfund transfers certainly help to reduce losses in the annual operating budget, it is part of the Society's fiduciary responsibility to ensure restricted funds are used exclusively for their designated purposes. Perhaps a means of avoiding these interfund transfers, while still helping reduce losses in the Society's General Fund, would be to align transfers from the Endowment Fund's Restricted Lines to the corresponding annual Restricted Funds' expenses. For this year, that would entail a transfer of $2881.22 (approx.) that corresponds to each of the Restricted Funds' shortfalls (see Fig. 2 below).

2.2. Charts

Figure 1: Statement of Income

Income: Sept 2018 to June 2019					**2017-2018**	
General Fund:						
Membership Dues	**#**	**$/pp**	**$$$**	**Total:**	**Total:**	
-Full members	69	$ 103.20	$ 7,120.80			
-Full without *SR*	5	$ 67.20	$ 336.00			
-Student, contract, retired	43	$ 51.75	$ 2,225.25			
-Student/contract/retired no *SR*	10	$ 20.90	$ 209.00			
-(subtract early payments)			$ (361.65)			
-Total:	127		$ 9,529.40	$ 9,529.40	$ 14,691.00	
Undesignated Donation				$ 148.75	n/a	
Congress Registration (approx)				$ 5,670.00	$ 5,670.00	
Conress Dinner				n/a	$ 1,477.00	
Congress Refund:				$ 1,615.91	n/a	
Total Income General Fund:				**$ 16,964.06**	**$ 21,838.00**	
Restricted Funds:						
Deitmar Neufeld Travel Fund				$ 1,700.00	$ 2,470.00	
Falconer				$ 18,500.00	$ 20,323.00	
Craigie Lecture Sponsors						
-The Federation			$ 800.00			
-CSPS			$ 250.00			
-CCSR			$ 1,000.00			
-Craigie Total:			$ 2,050.00	$ 2,050.00	n/a	
Congress Dinner			$ 300.00	$ 300.00		
**General Endowment				$ -	$ 1,148.00	**
**Beare Award				$ -	$ 500.00	**
**Founders' Prize				$ -	$ 250.00	**
**Jeremias Prize				$ -	$ 250.00	**
**R.B.Y. Scott Award				$ -	$ 500.00	**
Total Income Restricted Funds:				**$ 22,250.00**	**$ 25,441.00**	

Figure 2: Statement of Expenses

Expenses Sept 2018 to June 2019			**2018-17**
General Fund	**Total:**		**Total:**
Accounting	$ 2,940.00		$ 3,415.00
Bank Charges (including new cheques)	$ 252.70		$ 118.00
PayPal Fees	$ 226.92		n/a
Canadahelps.org Fee	$ 128.00		n/a
Congress Expenses (approx.)	$ 3,200.00		$ 4,639.00
CSBS Dinner	$ 568.78		$ 599.00
Congress Dues	$ 2,084.55	*	$ 1,998.00
Executive Travel and Dinner (approx.)	$ 5,000.00		$ 5,072.00
Office, Printing, Postage (approx.)	$ 1,203.93		$ 784.00
CSR Subscription	$ 3,670.00		$ 5,940.00
*Student Awards shortfall	$ 850.00		n/a
*Craigie Lecture shortfall	$ 1,531.22		n/a
*Book Awards shortfall	$ 500.00		n/a
Total Expenses:	**$ 22,156.10**		**$ 22,565.00**
Restricted Funds:			
	Cost	**Spent**	**Spent**

Craigie Lecture				
-Travel and Accommodation (approx.)	$ 1,500.00			
-Honorarium	$ 1,000.00			
-Post lecture reception	$ 1,081.22			
-Craigie total (restricted)	$ 3,581.22	$ 2,050.00	n/a	
Student Awards				
-Prize money	$ 250.00			
-Travel (approx)	$ 600.00			
-Student Awards Total:	$ 850.00	$ -	$ 500.00	*
Book Awards	$ 500.00	$ -	$ 1,000.00	*
Neufeld Travel Award	$ 1,700.00	$ 1,700.00	$ 2,803.00	*
				*
Restricted Funds Total Expenses		**$ 3,750.00**	**$ 4,303.00**	
Total Income over revenue:		**- $5192.04**	**- $727**	

3. ENDOWMENT FUND (adapted from Robert Derrenbacker's Endowment Report)

3.1. *Introduction*

In 1996, the CSBS solicited funds to assist having solid financial foundations for Society projects, and also to provide funds for Society initiatives. The long-term targeted goal for the endowment is $250,000. The endowment started in August 1998 at $56,425 and was administered by Merrill Lynch Canada Inc. The CSBS

endowment portfolio was transferred to Jennings Capital Inc. in July 2001. On December 31, 2014 Jennings Capital merged with Mackie Research Capital Corporation. The endowment for the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies (CSBS) is divided into two different funds: The "Main" Endowment Fund (established in 1998) and the newly created Falconer Fund (established in 2018).

As reported to the AGM in May 2018 – as of May 3, 2018, the portfolio market evaluation by Mackie Research Capital Corporation was $172,950. That evaluation included $701 cash on deposit, and $651 in a money market fund (Altamira High Interest Cash Performer) for a total of $1,352 in cash/cash equivalents. This year, the May 14, 2019 CSBS portfolio market evaluation by Mackie Research Capital Corporation was $184,504. The evaluation includes $2,950 cash on deposit, and $4,580 in a money market fund (Altamira High Interest Cash Performer) for a total of $7,530 in cash/cash equivalents. As per the usual practice and when requested, $2,500 from cash will be forwarded to the Treasurer to assist with 2019 Society expenses.

3.2. *Investment Strategy*

The portfolio is broken into three primary categories as follows (not including cash/cash equivalents, about 4% of the total portfolio at the moment [$7,530]). The Endowment committee typically holds approximately $5,000 in the money market account for Society emergencies that is 3% of the total portfolio (funds in the "Altamira High-Interest CashPerformer" account at the National Bank – is a daily interest savings account with no fees or

service charges. Funds are available to the Society within 24 hours notice):

Category A:
Approximately 27% ($48,559) in a long-term government bond investment (a province of British Columbia strip bond purchased in 1998 for $9,676 will return the Society's initial investment funds of $56,425 by yielding approximately $60,000 in 2027 that results from compound interest associated with the strip bond).

Category B:
Approximately 59% ($107,168) invested in dividend stocks (ARC Resources Ltd.; Bank of Montreal; BCE Inc.; Brookfield Infrastructure Partners; Canwel Building Materials Group; Emera Inc.; Northwest Healthcare REIT; and Rogers Sugar Inc.) that currently generate an annual income of $5,804 to help meet expenses associated with Society projects, and to provide reinvestment options.

Category C:
Approximately 11% ($21,250) in long term growth investments (Fidelity Investments Canada Ltd with specific sub-categories of investment − Consumer Fund, Financial Services, Health Care, and Global Equity Fund) that provide long term growth and investment flexibility.

3.3. *Society Projects (Restricted Funds Expenses)*

- Peter Craigie Lecture Fund (Bi-Annual Lecture)
- Founders Prize Fund (Graduate Student Essay Competition)
- Joachim Jeremias Prize Fund (Graduate Student Essay Competition)
- Publication Fund
- Studies in Christianity and Judaism Publication Fund
- R.B.Y. Scott Book Award Fund (for books published on the Hebrew Bible and ancient Israel)
- Francis W. Beare Book Award Fund (for books published on Christian Origins, Post-Biblical Judaism and Greco-Roman Religion)
- Norman E. Wagner Award for Creative Use of Technology in Biblical Studies
- Student Research Fund

3.4. *Explanation of the Endowment*

The global economy still faces a challenging environment in 2019. Economic expansion is entering its tenth year that included an era of ultra-low interest rates that will soon come to an end. The global political background to the economy is unsettled. The US economy is expected to continue growing in 2019, the Euro area economies are expected to be moderate and the UK is in a period of economic uncertainty because of Brexit. Although the Chinese economy is forecast to grow at more than 6%, it will not have global stimulus of recent years. In Canada, the combination of tight financial

conditions in combination with lower commodity prices suggests moderate to weak growth for 2019. While policy uncertainty remains high for 2019, the passage agreement of the USMCA has removed a cloud from the export outlook that is crucial for Canada. In addition, weaker quarterly returns likely have already been factored into stocks and bonds values for 2019 so annual growth may exceed expectations.

A summary comparison between May 3, 2018 (the date of last year's Endowment Report) and May 14, 2019 is as follows:

	03/05/2018	14/05/2019
Category A		
BC Government Bond	$ 44,385	$48,559
Category B		
ARC Resources	$ 14,470	$7,980
Atlantic Power	$ 301	(sold 2018)
Bank of Montreal	$ 23,951	$25,286
BCE Inc.	$ 16,176	$18,060
Emera Inc.	$ 13,182	$16,461
Brookfield Infrastructure	$ 10,194	$11,300

Northwest Healthcare	$ 16,815	
$17,730		
Canwel Bldg Materials	$ 6,480	$4,570
Rogers Sugar Inc.	$ 5,530	$5,780
Category C		
Fidelity, Global	$ 7,792	$7,969
Fidelity, Financial	$ 2,824	$2,743
Fidelity, Health	$ 4,479	$5,102
Fidelity, Consumer	$ 5,016	$5,434
Cash/cash equivalent	$ 1,352	$7,530
Total	$172,950	
$184,504		

From 1998 to May 14, 2019 the market value of the portfolio increased by approximately 225% from the original investment of $56,425 for an annual growth of approximately 11% over 20 years. In addition, approximately $80,000 has been earned during that period through investment income to meet Society expenses or to be re-invested. Over the last 20 years, the Society's endowment investments experienced two bear markets: one in 1998 and the second in 2002. During the "great recession" of 2008-2009, the portfolio valuation dropped by 39.25% between June 2008 and July 2010, before fully recovering to the 2008 valuation amount in December of 2010.

It is the Endowment Committee's belief that the Society's endowment portfolio is well-balanced and it will not be unduly

impacted by current market fluctuations over the long-term. However, endowment funds will continue to be monitored closely during the rest of 2019.

3.5. *The Falconer Fund (established 2018)*

During this past year, there was the commencement of an exciting new endowment project. A few past presidents have, for some years, discussed establishing a new "presidents' fund" in the CSBS as a recognition both of their gratitude for the role the Society has played in their careers and in the development of biblical studies in Canada.

In 2018, the CSBS Executive approved the creation of the "Sir Robert Falconer Endowment Fund" in honour of CSBS's first president, and formally announced this endowment at the 2018 AGM. From the earned investment income of this fund, an annual award (the "Sir Robert Falconer Award") will be made to a member of the Society. While the Main Endowment fund helps to support two student essay prizes, a technology prize, prizes for monographs in Hebrew Bible and in Christian origins, and an annual lectureship, the "Sir Robert Falconer Award" will fill a gap by providing support for a short-term research project. Preference will be given to scholars in the early stages of their career; initially an award of $1500 will be given annually to help with the costs of visiting a study centre or library or museum or archaeological excavation appropriate to biblical studies and relevant to their research. The goal of the Falconer Fund is $100,000.

The Falconer Endowment is divided into three segments: mutual funds (19%), common stocks (35%), and cash on deposit (46%), to be invested in equities/securities in the near future. Projected income for 2019 from the common stocks is $672. As of May 14, 2019, the market value of this endowment was $38,627 as indicated below:

Long-term Bonds/Mutual Funds ("Auto-Callable Notes")

- BMO and NBI ACN in Canadian banks $2,069
- CIBC ACN in Amazon $5,164

Common Stocks

- Bank of Nova Scotia $7,208
- BCE $6,080

Cash on Deposit (to be invested)
$18,106

TOTAL
$38,627

It is the Endowment Committee's goal for the Falconer Endowment to reflect the balance of investments and investment strategy of the Main Endowment in the long term.

3.6. *Endowment Committee Members*

Robert Derrenbacker (Chair), Richard Ascough, Keith Bodner, Jonathan Vroom, Wayne McCready (Past Chair, non-voting).

CANADIAN SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL STUDIES

FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

August 31, 2019

(Unaudited -- See Notice to Reader)

ROBERT W. R. BISHOP
Chartered Professional Accountant

13308 Crescent Road, South Surrey, BC V4P 1K4 **Tel 604-538-1288 Fax 604-538-1248**

NOTICE TO READER

On the basis of information provided by management, I have compiled the statement of financial position of Canadian Society of Biblical Studies as at August 31, 2019 and the statements of operations, changes in fund balances and cash flows for the year then ended. I have not performed an audit or a review engagement in respect of these financial statements and, accordingly, I express no assurance thereon. Readers are cautioned that these statements may not be appropriate for their purposes.

"Robert W.R. Bishop"

June 26, 2019 CHARTERED PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTANT

CANADIAN SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL STUDIES
STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL POSITION
As at August 31, 2019
(Unaudited – See Notice to Reader)

	General Fund	Restricted Funds	2019 Total	2018 Total
ASSETS				
Cash	$ 90	$ 29,797	$ 29,887	$ 35,280
Accounts receivable	782	-	782	1,616
Investments	-	225,934	225,934	196,256
	$ 872	$ 255,731	$ 256,603	$ 233,152
LIABILITIES				
Deferred revenue	$ 782	$ -	$ 782	$ 1,865
	782	-	782	1,865
FUND BALANCES				
Unrestricted	90	-	90	1,938
Restricted	-	255,731	255,731	229,349
	90	255,731	255,821	231,287
	$ 872	$ 255,731	$ 256,603	$ 233,152

APPROVED BY THE BOARD:

J. Richard Middleton Director

Director

CANADIAN SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL STUDIES
STATEMENT OF OPERATIONS
For the Year Ended August 31, 2019
(Unaudited -- See Notice to Reader)

	General Fund		Restricted Funds	
	2019	2018	2019	2018
REVENUE				
Membership dues	$ 9,351	$ 14,691	$ -	$ -
CSBS dinner	300	1,477	-	-
Congress registration	3,000	5,670	-	-
Donations	-	-	25,408	25,441
Investment income (Note 3)	-	-	9,555	5,926
	12,651	21,838	34,964	31,367
EXPENSES				
Accounting	2,940	3,415	1,000	-
Bank charges	510	118	-	-
Congress expenses	1,384	4,639	-	-
Craigie Lecture	-	-	2,419	-
CSBS dinner	-	599	-	-
Dues and memberships	2,085	1,998	-	-
Executive travel	5,566	5,072	-	-
Office, printing and postage	414	783	-	-
Student awards	-	-	750	1,500
Student travel	-	-	2,412	2,803
Subscriptions	3,600	5,940	-	-
	16,499	22,564	6,580	4,303
EXCESS OF REVENUE OVER EXPENSES	$ (3,848)	$ (726)	$ 28,383	$ 27,064

CANADIAN SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL STUDIES
STATEMENT OF CHANGES IN FUND BALANCES
For the Year Ended August 31, 2019
(Unaudited -- See Notice to Reader)

	General Fund		Restricted Funds	
	2019	2018	2019	2018
BALANCE, OPENING (Note 5)	$ 1,937	$ 2,664	$ 229,348	$ 202,285
EXCESS OF REVENUE OVER EXPENSES	(3,848)	(726)	28,383	27,064
TRANSFER FROM ENDOWMENT (Note 4)	2,000	-	(2,000)	-
BALANCE, CLOSING	$ 90	$ 1,938	$ 255,731	$ 229,349

CANADIAN SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL STUDIES
STATEMENT OF CASH FLOWS
For the Year Ended August 31, 2019
(Unaudited -- See Notice to Reader)

	General Fund		Restricted Funds	
	2019	2018	2019	2018
CASH PROVIDED BY (USED FOR)				
OPERATIONS				
Excess of revenue over expenses	$ (3,848)	$ (726)	$ 28,383	$ 27,064
Unrealized change in market value (Note 3)	-	-	(3,829)	(264)
Changes in non-cash working capital:				
Accounts receivable	834	(585)	-	-
Investments	-	-	(25,849)	(20,251)
Deferred revenue	(1,083)	466	-	-
Transfer from Endowment (Note 4)	2,000	-	(2,000)	-
CHANGE IN CASH	(2,097)	(845)	(3,295)	6,549
CASH, OPENING	2,187	3,032	33,092	26,543
CASH, CLOSING	$ 90	$ 2,187	$ 29,797	$ 33,092

CANADIAN SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL STUDIES
NOTES TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
August 31, 2019
(Unaudited -- See Notice to Reader)

1. PURPOSE OF THE ORGANIZATION

Canadian Society of Biblical Studies is an unincorporated non-profit organization, the purpose of which is to stimulate the critical investigation of the classical biblical literatures, together with other related literature, by the exchange of scholarly research both in published form and in public forum.

The Society is a registered charity and is income tax exempt.

2. SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES

(a) Investments

Investments in marketable securities are carried at market value. Changes in market value are recognized in net income in the period incurred.

(b) Capital Assets

Capital assets are expensed in the year of acquisition.

3. INVESTMENT INCOME

	2019	2018
Realized investment income	$ 5,726	$ 5,662
Unrealized change in market value of investments	3,829	264
Investment income (loss)	$ 9,555	$ 5,926

4. TRANSFER FROM ENDOWMENT

During the year, the amount of $2,000 was transferred from General Endowment to the General Fund to cover a cash shortfall.

5. RESTATEMENT OF PRIOR YEARS

The opening balances of the General Fund and various restricted funds have been restated to correct the recording of transfers between those funds in prior years.

CANADIAN SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL STUDIES
SCHEDULE OF RESTRICTED FUNDS
For the Year Ended August 31, 2019
(Unaudited -- See Notice to Reader)

	General Endowment	Beare Award	Craigie Lectureship	D Neufeld Travel	ESCJ Fund	Falconer Fund
CAPITAL						
Balance, opening	$ 41,626	$ 13,697	$ 21,502	$ 8,988	$ 11,753	$ 20,323
Donations	1,158	-	2,050	1,700	-	20,500
Expenditures	-	-	-	(1,932)	-	-
Balance, closing	42,785	13,697	23,552	8,757	11,753	40,823
INCOME ON HAND						
Balance, opening	19,446	4,441	1,202	-	5,382	(73)
Investment income	2,286	742	1,220	480	907	837
Expenditures	(1,000)	-	(2,419)	(480)	-	-
Interfund transfers	(2,000)	-	-	-	-	-
Balance, closing	18,732	5,183	4	-	6,289	763
FUND BALANCE, CLOSING	$ 61,516	$ 18,880	$ 23,556	$ 8,757	$ 18,042	$ 41,586

	Founders' Prize	Jeremias Prize	N Wagner Award	Publication Fund	RBY Scott Award	Total
CAPITAL						
Balance, opening	$ 10,316	$ 11,114	$ 10,321	$ 3,846	$ 21,343	$ 174,830
Donations	-	-	-	-	-	25,408
Balance, closing	10,316	11,114	10,321	3,846	21,343	198,306
INCOME ON HAND						
Balance, opening	2,895	4,555	5,362	2,451	8,857	54,519
Investment income	559	602	559	208	1,156	9,555
Expenditures	(250)	-	-	-	(500)	(4,649)
Interfund transfers	-	-	-	-	-	(2,000)
Balance, closing	3,204	5,157	5,921	2,659	9,513	57,425
FUND BALANCE, CLOSING	$ 13,520	$ 16,271	$ 16,242	$ 6,505	$ 30,856	$ 255,731

Membership News

While members of CSBS remained active in publishing during the 2019-2020 year, too few members of the Society submitted reports to publish in this year's *Bulletin*. The CSBS Communications Officer plans on including a broader range of published items in next year's *Bulletin* to account for this gap in our records.

Membership Directory

Surname	First Name	Affiliation
Alcorn	David	University of St. Michael's College
Alexander	William E.	
Ascough	Richard S.	Queen's School of Religion
Ashby	Jason	
Babins	Morgyn	University of Toronto
Baker	Murray	Wycliffe College
Batten	Alicia	Conrad Grebel University
Bazzana	Giovanni	
Beckman	Peter	
Bell	Brigidda	University of Toronto
Bell	Ron	
Ben Zvi	Ehud	University of Alberta
Bennett	Shelby	
Bernier	Jonathan	
Beverly	Larry W.	Presbyterian Church of Canada
Boda	Mark	McMaster Divinity College
Brownridge	Amelia	
Burke	Tony	York University
Burrell	Kevin	
Callon	Callie	University of Toronto
Campbell	Warren C.	
Carson	Donald A.	Trinity Evangelical Divinity School
Charles	Ronald	St. Francis Xavier University
Clancy	Frank	
Conway	Mary	McMaster Divinity College

Cotter CSJ	Wendy	Loyola University of Chicago
Cousland	Robert	University of British Columbia
Cox	Claude	McMaster Divinity College
Crook	Zeba	Carleton University
Cummins	Tony	Trinity Western University
Cwikla	Anna	University of Alberta
Dallaire	Hélène	Denver Seminary
Damm	Alexander	Wilfrid Laurier University
Di Giovanni	Andrea	
Donaldson	Terence L.	Wycliffe College
Dyck	Andrew	McMaster Divinity College
Dykes	Julie	
Eberhart	Christian A.	University of Houston
Ehrlich	Carl S.	York University
Evans	Paul	McMaster Divinity College
Everest	Melody	University of Alberta
Felushko	Brian	Trinity Western University
Fewster	Gregory P.	University of Toronto
Fitzgerald	Katharine	McMaster University
Fletcher	Bryan	
Fonseca-Quezada	Channah	McMaster University
Fuller	David J.	McMaster Divinity College
Glanville	Mark R.	
Guillen	Esther	
Hare	Laura	University of Toronto
Horman	John F.	
Idestrom	Rebecca G. S.	Tyndale Seminary
Imes	Carmen	Prairie College
Jeal	Roy R.	Booth College
Kampen	John	Methodist Theological School in Ohio
Keesmat	Sylvia	

Kirkpatrick	Patricia G.	McGill University
Kloppenborg	John S.	Trinity College
Knight-Messenger	Andrew	McMaster University
Krogevoll	Alexander	TST/University of Toronto
Krohn	Rachel	Wycliffe College
Lam	Tat-Yu	
MacDonald	Margaret Y.	St. Francis Xavier University
MacKenzie	Robert K.	
Magee	James	Trinity Western University
Maier	Harry O.	Vancouver School of Theology
Marshall	John	University of Toronto
Matson	Joshua	
Maurais	Jean	McGill University
McCready	Wayne O.	University of Calgary
McLaughlin	John L.	University of St. Michael's College
Middleton	J. Richard	Roberts Wesleyan College
Miller	David	
Mitchell	Matthew	Canisius College
Mitchell	Christine	St. Andrew's College
Morrow	William	Queen's Theological College
Mui	Daisy	
Murray	Michele	Bishop's University
Newman	Judith H.	Emmanuel College (University of Toronto)
Oeste	Gordon	Heritage Theological Seminary
Palmer	Carmen	Emmanuel College
Parks	Sara	McGill University
Parsons	Kyle	Trinity Western University
Penner	Ken	St. Francis Xavier University
Perrin	Andrew	Trinity Wester University
Pettem	Michael	
Porter	Stanley E.	McMaster Divinity College

Porter	Amelia Marie	University of Toronto
Quach	Irene	McMaster University
Reid	Duncan	Tyndale Seminary
Revington	Robert Crispin	McMaster University
Reynolds	Benjamin	Tyndale University College
Rilett	Wood	
Runesson	Anders	University of Oslo
Sabo	Peter	University of Alberta
Sanfridson	Martin	McMaster University
Sanfridson	Rebecca	University of Toronto
Sarlo	Daniel	University of Toronto
Schuller	Eileen	McMaster University
Scollo	Giuseppe	St. Augustine's Seminary
Shantz	Colleen	University of St. Michael's College
Shepherd	Harold Edwin	
Shute	Daniel	Presbyterian College
Sigrist	David	Trinity Western University
Smith	Tyler	McMaster University
Spilsbury	Paul	Regent College
Spinney	Joyce-Ann	Acadia Divinity College
Stratton	Kimberly	Carleton University
Suderman	Derek	Conrad Grebel University
Tapio	Jarkko Vikman	
Taylor	Marion	Wycliffe College
Tervanotko	Hanna	University of Helsinki
Thiessen	Matthew	McMaster University
Thomson	Ambrose	McMaster Divinity College
Tobolowsky	Andrew	
Vaillancourt	Ian	Wycliffe College
Van Dam	Cornelis	Canadian Reformed Theological Seminary
Van Maaren	John	McMaster University

Vayntrub	Jacqueline	
Walsh	Matthew	McGill University
Warren	Meredith	University of Sheffield
Weir	Alistair	University of Western Ontario
Wilson	Ian	University of Alberta
Wisse	Frederik	
Wray Beal	Lissa	Providence Theological Seminary
Yapp	Neil Andre	Concordia University
Youngberg	Brendan	McMaster Divinity College
Yu	Michelle	University of Toronto
Zeichmann	Christopher	
Zivkovic	Goran	McMaster Divinity College