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This study examines the treatment of the Future tense among the major contributions in the discussion of verbal aspect in the Greek of the New Testament. It provides a brief comparative summary of the major works in the past fifty years, focusing on the distinction between aspect and *Aktionsart* on the one hand, and the kind of logical reasoning used by each proposal on the other. It shows that the neutrality of the method is best expressed in an abductive approach and points out the need of clarifying the nature and the role of *Aktionsart* in aspect studies.
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**1. Introduction**

The world of scholarship concerning the Greek verbal system experienced a paradigm shift in the late 1980s. Since the publication of Porter’s *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament* in 1989[[1]](#footnote-1)1 and Fanning’s *Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek* a year later[[2]](#footnote-2)2, there has been a change of direction in the discussion of the function of the Greek tense-forms from time and *Aktionsart* to aspect[[3]](#footnote-3)3. Since then, many have followed with their contributions of a new model of verbal system[[4]](#footnote-4)4 and meanwhile the discussion of aspect has grown in biblical studies[[5]](#footnote-5)5. Although not all of the contributors agree in every detail, these works signal an increase of awareness in this important category.

Whereas most of the contributions after the work of Porter and Fanning focus on construction of new theories, much is needed in terms of testing and applying the existing models using data from the New Testament[[6]](#footnote-6)6. Although quite obviously the debate among grammarians on the issue of the Greek verbal system is less likely to end soon, the work to be done for the practitioners is also pertinent if not more urgent. Questions such as how idiolect and style affect aspectual choice and how genre and register affect the use of particular aspect are particularly helpful for the refinement of individual theory[[7]](#footnote-7)7. However, there is some necessary groundwork that needs to be done so that a comparative analysis of various models becomes meaningful and feasible. It is necessary to present various proposals in a comparable and systematic manner in order to facilitate such a comparison. This study is an attempt to bring the discussion of the Future in the Greek verbal network up-to-date by summarizing the views of the major contributors, defining terms and possibly untangling the misunderstandings among various contributors[[8]](#footnote-8)8.

This study starts with a brief review of the history of research in Greek verbal aspect. The major views of the debate will be identified and terms will be defined. Particular attention is given to how different proposals distinguish aspect and *Aktionsart*. It will then focus on how the Future tense-form is evaluated in various models. This section begins with a brief summary of the current proposals of the possible origin and development of the Greek Future tense-form. It is followed by a discussion of how various parties describe the nature of the Future, particularly their view on how it encodes aspect. A distinction is made between three kinds of logical reasoning: induction, deduction, and abduction. It is argued that the abductive approach is the preferred method for determining the aspect of the Future tense. The paper concludes with a summary of findings and suggestion for further research.

**2. Verbal Aspect Theory: Definition, History and Development**

Discussions about the debate of Greek verbal aspect are ample[[9]](#footnote-9)9. It is thus necessary for this study neither to recount a detailed history of the Porter/Fanning debate nor to rehearse the arguments from all parties. Instead, what must to be done is a comparative summary of the development of various models, singling out the things that are relevant to the discussion of the function of the Future. But before going into the discussion of aspect in various proposals, definition of several terms is necessary.

Aspect can be loosely defined as a viewpoint feature1[[10]](#footnote-10)0, expressing a speaker’s subjective portrayal of an action. In order to engage in meaningful discussion about verbal aspect, one must distinguish between semantics and pragmatics. Semantics refers to the meaning expressed by the form alone as part of a language system, that is, meaning apart from context. Pragmatics refers to the meaning in a specific context, which has to do with “linguistic performance and implicature, which will vary depending on lexical, stylistic, grammatical and deictic interactions”1[[11]](#footnote-11)1. Aspect is encoded in and expressed by the tense-form alone and thus is a matter of semantics. To borrow Porter’s wordings, aspect can be formally defined as:

[A] synthetic semantic category (realized in the forms of verbs) used of meaningful oppositions in a network of tense systems to grammaticalize the author’s reasoned subjective choice of conception of a process1[[12]](#footnote-12)2.

Before this semantic category became the key focus in the discussion of the Greek verbal system, temporal reference and *Aktionsart* used to dominate the discussion1[[13]](#footnote-13)3. For the past century, the prevailing view was that the primary meaning of the tense-forms was *Aktionsart* with secondary implications for time1[[14]](#footnote-14)4. This traditional understanding of the function of tense-forms often became an obstacle and a point of contention in the discussion of Greek verbal aspect theory. To make matters worse, *Aktionsart*, literally the kind of action, is a term long confused with aspect and has sometimes been used interchangeably in some grammars1[[15]](#footnote-15)5. Bache’s work is credited as the first to make a semantic distinction between aspect and *Aktionsart*1[[16]](#footnote-16)6. Some grammarians see *Aktionsart* as a lexically expressed feature and prefer to use a different label. Olsen prefers to use the term ‘lexical aspect’ to describe the nature of aspect while Fanning uses ‘procedural characteristics’ to refer to the ways in which verbs behave in different settings. However, no matter what terminology is used, *Aktionsart* concerns the type or quality of an action, the nature of the internal temporal constituency1[[17]](#footnote-17)7. It is a theory that attempts to characterize actions as they objectively took place1[[18]](#footnote-18)8. In other words, whereas aspect indicates the speaker’s subjective viewpoint of an action, *Aktionsart* concerns its objective nature. Unlike aspect, which is a semantic category, *Aktionsart* is generally regarded as a pragmatic category1[[19]](#footnote-19)9. Although the aspect and *Aktionsart* of a word sometimes may have complementary or even overlapping descriptions, they are expressed differently: aspect is expressed grammatically whereas *Aktionsart* is expressed lexically and contextually2[[20]](#footnote-20)0. Thus when considering linguistics it is most helpful to discuss the meaning of a Greek verb in terms of both semantics and pragmatics categories.

Notice that, in Porter’s definition of aspect, two features are stressed: (1) Aspectuality is treated as a semantic category; and (2) the Greek verbal structure is described as systemic. Following Hallidayan systemic linguistics, Porter understands language as system-based and thus takes a systemic approach to aspect2[[21]](#footnote-21)1. All meaningful components within a language are part of a system of various systemic choices. These systems of choices are then arranged into a network2[[22]](#footnote-22)2. Since aspectuality is one of the systems in the Greek verbal network, it is essential to describe the relationship between the aspectual oppositions. There are two kinds of oppositions, privative and equipollent oppositions. A privative opposition consists of a pair of marked and unmarked members2[[23]](#footnote-23)3. The unmarked member lacks the semantic feature that is present in the marked member. However, the unmarked member can be marked with the same feature as the marked member at the level of pragmatics2[[24]](#footnote-24)4. In contrast, in an equipollent opposition, both members are marked with some specific semantic features2[[25]](#footnote-25)5. Both Porter and Fanning regard the Greek aspect system as consisting of equipollent oppositions2[[26]](#footnote-26)6, whereas Olsen endorses privative analysis of both the lexical (*Aktionsart*) and grammatical aspect2[[27]](#footnote-27)7.

With the various definitions now in place, the following is a brief summary of the five major contributions to the discussion of Greek verbal aspect2[[28]](#footnote-28)8:

*2.1 Kenneth L. McKay (1965)*

Although his monograph length work was published after the works of Porter and Fanning, McKay’s contribution on the Greek verbal system to the discussion of the N[[29]](#footnote-29)T Greek aspect goes back to the early 1960s2[[30]](#footnote-30)9. His definition of aspect is very similar to what we have described in this paper. He takes it as the category in the Greek verb system in which the speaker regards the action in relation to its context3[[31]](#footnote-31)0. He identifies three easily distinguishable aspects (imperfective, aorist and perfect) with the future aspect as some kind of anomaly3[[32]](#footnote-32)1.

Aspect is distinguished from *Aktionsart* in McKay’s works. Traditional categories of the *Aktionsarten* are not used in his work. He relates the kind of action to the lexical distinction in verb types, which he argues is analogous to aspect3[[33]](#footnote-33)2. He distinguishes two kinds of verbs in terms of lexical factor: action verbs (activities that are relatively definitive) and stative verbs (activities that refer to state of being) but stresses the importance of context in determining the translation of an aspectual form (which he calls realizations)3[[34]](#footnote-34)3. McKay also boldly moves away from the popular notion of morphological time-indication, blaming that on the assumption of Western culture and the influence of Latin grammar3[[35]](#footnote-35)4. This notion of avoiding mixture of aspect and temporality in tense terminology and equating tense-forms with aspectual categories is considered by some later aspect theorists as foundational3[[36]](#footnote-36)5. Thus McKay’s model can be described as:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Aspect | imperfective | aorist | perfect | future |
| Primary | Present | Aorist | Perfect | Future[+intention] |
| Secondary | Imperfect |  | Pluperfect |  |
|  |  |  | Future-Perfect |  |

*2.2 Stanley E. Porter (1989)*

Porter shares many methodological assumptions with McKay; he also stresses the distinction among aspect, *Aktionsart*, and temporal reference. To him, tense-form only reflects the speaker’s conception of the action (aspect), it is not used to grammaticalize time or *Aktionsart*. However, aspect may relate to other contextual factors (deictic indicators) to express temporal reference at the level of pragmatics3[[37]](#footnote-37)6.

As mentioned above, Porter builds his aspectual theory on a systemic functional linguistic paradigm3[[38]](#footnote-38)7. Three points are stressed in his model: (1) Aspect is a matter of semantics; (2) the Greek verbal structure is viewed as system-based and (3) Aspectuality is treated as one of the two major systems in the Greek verbal network. Within this aspectual system, there are three individual aspect-systems: perfective (Aorist), imperfective (Present/Imperfect) and stative (Perfect/Pluperfect). In Porter’s system, the Future form is considered an anomaly due to its odd formal paradigm and limited distribution3[[39]](#footnote-39)8. It is treated as partially aspectual with the choice of [±expectation] and grammaticalizes a speaker’s expectation toward a process3[[40]](#footnote-40)9.

The semantic value of each of these aspect-systems can be described in terms of verbal opposition. Marked pairs are used to describe these alternatives on the basis of equipollent binary opposition. Within the aspectual system4[[41]](#footnote-41)0, at the least delicate level, the system requires choice of [+expectation] or [+aspectual] to distinguish the partial aspectual choice (Future) with the full aspectual choices. Further to the right with choices of greater delicacy are the two sub-systems ASPECT 1 and ASPECT 2, both full aspectual choices which cover the Aorist, Present and Perfect4[[42]](#footnote-42)1. The aspect of the Pluperfect and Imperfect is realized by combining the ASPECT 2 with the REMOTENESS [±remoteness] system under [+assertion].

The following is part of the systemic display of the Greek verbal network4[[43]](#footnote-43)2:

*2.3 Buist M. Fanning (1990)*

Similar to the understanding of McKay and Porter, Fanning defines aspect as a grammatical category that “reflects the focus or viewpoint of the speaker in regard to the action or condition which the verb describes”4[[44]](#footnote-44)3. However, Fanning defines only two aspects: the internal/imperfective and external/perfective aspects. The aspectual distinction rests upon the reference point from which the action is viewed. If the action is viewed from a reference point within the action, without reference to the beginning or the end of the action then it is said to be internal (imperfective). On the other hand, if an action is viewed from a reference point outside the action, from beginning to end, then it is said to have external (perfective) aspect4[[45]](#footnote-45)4.

Following the work of Bache, Fanning prefers to use ‘procedural characteristic’ to refer to what others considered as *Aktionsart*4[[46]](#footnote-46)5. Procedural characteristic involves:

how the action actually occurs; reflects the external, objective facts of the occurrence; … usually expressed lexically, either in the inherent meaning of the lexical form or in the derivational morphology (i.e. by means of prefixes or suffixes which affect the meaning of the verb4[[47]](#footnote-47)6.

Aspect is clearly distinguished from procedural character. Fanning argues that a correct understanding of aspect requires the user to understand both the basic meaning of the aspects and their function in combination with other linguistic features, which include procedural characteristics of verbs and actions4[[48]](#footnote-48)7. Fanning uses the Vendler-Kenny taxonomy as the framework for the procedural characters4[[49]](#footnote-49)8. Aspect and *Aktionsart*, although distinct, are closely related systems4[[50]](#footnote-50)9.

Unlike Porter and to a less extent McKay, Fanning argues that temporal indications are grammaticalized on the basis of the combination of tense-forms and other features of lexical and contextual meaning. He also asserts a temporal relationship between these contextual features and the indicative verb5[[51]](#footnote-51)0. Thus for example, even though both the Present and the Imperfect take “the aspect-value of internal viewpoint concerning an occurrence”, the Imperfect indicates past time and the Present indicate present time5[[52]](#footnote-52)1. The insistence of the time-based perspective on verbs and the emphasis of the inter-relationship between aspect and *Aktionsart* allow Fanning to define the Perfect form as a product of the stative *Aktionsart*, past time and external aspect. The following figure summarizes Fanning’s model:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| AspectTense | external(perfective) | internal(imperfective) | Non-Aspectual |
| Past | AoristPluperfect[+stative *Aktionsart*] | Imperfect |  |
| Present | Perfect[+stative *Aktionsart*] | Present |  |
| Future |  |  | Future |

*2.4 Mari B. Olsen (1997)*

Olsen’s model resembles Fanning’s in quite a lot of ways. As mentioned above, she divides aspect into two categories: grammatical aspect is what comes close to Fanning’s definition of aspect; and lexical aspect, which in essence is what others generally consider as *Aktionsart*5[[53]](#footnote-53)2 According to Olsen, aspectual meaning is related to the understanding of the “internal temporal constituency” of an action. While grammatical aspect expresses a view of the internal temporal constituency of an action, lexical aspect expresses the nature of the internal temporal constituency of the action through Vendler’s taxonomy on temporal properties of the verbs5[[54]](#footnote-54)3. Grammatical aspect is explained in terms of how an action related to the event time (ET) and the reference time (RT)5[[55]](#footnote-55)4. Likewise, tense is represented by the relationship between the R[[56]](#footnote-56)T to a deictic center5[[57]](#footnote-57)5.

Olsen argues for a compositional aspectual interpretation, i.e. full aspectual meaning derives from both “the various constituents that encode lexical aspect (verbs, their arguments, temporal adverbials, etc.),” and the “grammatical aspect morphemes”5[[58]](#footnote-58)6.

The novel contribution of Olsen to the discussion of aspect is the principle of cancelability. As mentioned above, Olsen’s aspect model is evaluated in terms of a privative opposition. Lexical aspect is represented by three features: dynamicity, durativity, and telicity whereas grammatical aspect is marked by imperfective or perfective aspect. She argues that in a privative analysis of lexical aspect, only the positive member (those marked with the features) has a consistent, uncancelable semantic meaning, whereas verbs not marked may be interpreted as with or without the features depending on other lexical constituents and the pragmatic context5[[59]](#footnote-59)7.

Thus, meaning that comes from marked categories may not be canceled by contextual factors; unspecified features may be marked and unmarked by contextual elements (implicature). The following figure summarizes Olsen’s model:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| AspectTense | Imperfective | Perfective | Unmarked |
| Past | Imperfect | Pluperfect |  |
| Present |  | Perfect |  |
| Future |  |  | Future |
| Unmarked | Present | Aorist |  |

*2.5 Constantine R. Campbell (2007)*

The latest contribution to the discussion of Greek verbal aspect is the recent work of Constantine Campbell. His definition of aspect, much like the others, focuses on the opposition between the internal and external portrayal of an action5[[60]](#footnote-60)8. Aspect and *Aktionsart* is carefully distinct in Campbell’s work. Following Bache, several distinctions are made: whereas aspect is regarded as primarily (not entirely) subjective, *Aktionsart* is regarded as primarily (not entirely) objective; whereas aspect is a semantic category, *Aktionsart* a pragmatic category; whereas aspect concerns the perspective of the speaker on an action, *Aktionsart* concerns how the nature of an action can be objectively determined5[[61]](#footnote-61)9. Campbell also adopts the principle of cancelability to distinguish semantic values (aspect) from pragmatic implicature (*Aktionsart*)6[[62]](#footnote-62)0.

Like Porter and Fanning, Campbell regards Greek grammatical aspect as equipollent aspectual opposition rather than privative opposition. He did not describe his aspectual system at the outset, claiming that it is rather difficult to choose whether there are two aspects (Fanning, Olsen) or three (Porter and Decker). He contends that the key to the decision is to figure out the aspect of the Perfect and Pluperfect forms. He argues that an inductive/bottom-up approach is preferable, from which the aspect of the Perfect “may be recognized from the patterns evident within text rather than imposed upon it deductively”6[[63]](#footnote-63)1.

Campbell points out that those who reject a temporal understanding of the verb *may* prefer the concept of remoteness to distinguish the two imperfective tense-forms (Present and Imperfect)6[[64]](#footnote-64)2. Remoteness is a spatial category used to express distance or lack of proximity temporally, logically or contextually6[[65]](#footnote-65)3. He argues that the Perfect form, as demonstrated to be a “discourse tense-form”6[[66]](#footnote-66)4, overlaps with the Present Indicative, which itself is the dominant tense-form within discourse. As such, Campbell argues that the Perfect shares the imperfective aspect (like Present)6[[67]](#footnote-67)5. The expanded remoteness category with more level of proximity is used to accommodate the expansion of aspect category. Campbell’s model looks like the following:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| AspectSpatial | Perfective | Imperfective |
| HeightenedProximity |  | Perfect |
| Proximity |  | Present |
| Remoteness | Aorist | Imperfect |
| Heightened Remoteness |  | Pluperfect |
| Non-Spatial | Future[+ future tense] |  |

To summarize the discussion so far, the following table describes the major views under different grouping:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| View | Number of Aspects | Semantics of Tense-Forms | *Aktionsart* |
| McKay | 4 | Aspect + Time? | *Aktionsart* |
| Porter | 3 | Aspect | *Aktionsart* |
| Fanning | 2 | Aspect + Time | Procedural Character |
| Olsen | 2 | Grammatical Aspect + Time | Lexical Aspect |
| Campbell | 2 | Aspect + Remoteness | *Aktionsart* |

**3. Aspectuality and the Future form**

If the debate on verbal aspect is like a tempest, the discussion of the aspectuality of the Future form is one of the centers of the storm6[[68]](#footnote-68)6. The place of the Future form in the Greek verbal system is always a matter of contention among scholars. Some argue that the Future form is purely perfective; others claim that it is capable of expressing both perfective and imperfective aspects. This aspectual ambiguity prompted some scholars to conclude that the form is non-aspectual or aspectually unmarked. The lack of an obvious aspectual choice for an author to establish the constituency of a process prompted others to conclude that it is not fully aspectual. The following is an attempt to synthesize the current debate on the aspectuality of the Future. The goal is to provide a summary of various approaches and critique their various assumptions and methodology. We will first examine the validity of the models that champion a perfective aspect (Wallace, O’Brien and Campbell) and then move on to the non-aspectual approaches (Olsen and Fanning) and finally investigate the approaches that treat the Future with unique semantic feature (McKay and Porter).

*3.1 Perfective Aspect and Abductive Reasoning*

Wallace considers a perfective aspect for the Future form solely on a morphological basis. He argues that the Future is morphologically linked with the Aorist Indicative. The shared sigma tense formative is then taken as an indication that the Aorist Indicative is a “morphological ancestor” to the Future. Thus the Future is likely to be aspectual and expresses the same aspectual choice. In other words, the Future, like the Aorist, grammaticalizes perfective aspect6[[69]](#footnote-69)7. However, grammarians usually posit that the forms of the Aorist Subjunctive came together with the Future Indicative during the Hellenistic period6[[70]](#footnote-70)8. Even purely arguing on a morphological level, without the augment and using the same tense formative, the form of the Aorist Subjunctive is closer to the Future Indicative. Although in the works of some ancient writers the Aorist Indicative and Future Indicative seem to share the property of being indeterminate, the exact meaning of the ancient writers in this case is difficult to judge6[[71]](#footnote-71)9. Campbell, who comes to the same conclusion with another line of argument, articulates well when he adds, “arguments from morphology and diachrony can only perform a confirmatory role”7[[72]](#footnote-72)0.

In his opening discussion on methodological considerations, Campbell argues explicitly the uniqueness of his approach from a methodological point of view. Calling some other approaches deductive and theory-driven7[[73]](#footnote-73)1, he seeks to demonstrate that the aspect of the Greek verbal system should be determined by an inductive approach7[[74]](#footnote-74)2. In contrast to the deductive method of reasoning, where a theory or a rule is hypothesized and then tested and confirmed with a selective set of available data7[[75]](#footnote-75)3, he proposes a bottom-up approach, where the result is “recognized from the patterns evident within text rather than imposed upon it deductively”7[[76]](#footnote-76)4. His approach is two-fold in practice: the selected text corpora are first investigated for discernable patterns of usage of every Indicative tense-forms in various strands of discourses7[[77]](#footnote-77)5, and then these patterns are examined to uncover the aspectual value of each form. However, in dealing with the Future form, Campbell’s argument largely follows an unproven premise proposed by Mark O’Brien7[[78]](#footnote-78)6.

O’Brien’s work is mainly derived from a premise of Fanning. Fanning’s assertion is that the relationship and interaction between the aspect and procedural characteristic (i.e. *Aktionsart*) produces patterns that are predictable7[[79]](#footnote-79)7. O’Brien relies on this hypothesis in his work, seeking to “isolate any consistency in the verbal aspect of future forms”7[[80]](#footnote-80)8. His logic is that from the known patterns between certain aspects and other contextual and lexical factors, one could examine the pattern of certain tense-form and work backward to determine its aspect7[[81]](#footnote-81)9. Based on this premise, he argues that if he is able to demonstrate that the Future and the Aorist behave similarly when combined with certain lexical and contextual factors, then it is reasonable to conclude that the Future, like the Aorist, grammaticalize the same aspect, the perfective aspect8[[82]](#footnote-82)0. To prove his thesis, O’Brien suggests that verbs that are claimed to be lexically stative when used to express perfective aspect (grammaticalized by a tense-form) will create an ingressive *Aktionsart*8[[83]](#footnote-83)1. After examining certain stative verbs in the Future Indicative, he concludes that they behave in a manner similar to its Aorist counterpart. The stative verbs in the Future Indicative form imply the beginning or the inception of a state to be within view. Likewise, when verbs of accomplishment (i.e. verbs that express a sense of accomplishment in the lexical level) are used in the Future form, they will behave similarly to its Aorist use and demonstrate a stress on the consummation of the process8[[84]](#footnote-84)2.

One caveat regarding the above argument is worth mentioning before moving on to the discussion of Campbell’s method. First, although O’Brien points to ample instances in the N[[85]](#footnote-85)T to demonstrate the alleged ingressive expression in the use of the Future Indicative of selective class of verbs, not all of these examples are convincing8[[86]](#footnote-86)3. He admits that for those examples that demonstrate non-ingressive uses, it can be explained on the basis of contextual intrusions8[[87]](#footnote-87)4. This brings home the major weakness of his thesis, concerning the unanswered question of what constitutes the ingressive expression in these examples. If the non-ingressive uses of Future can be attributed to contextual intrusions, why is it then the ingressive readings are due to the lexical meaning of the verb but not the same contextual factors? More work has to be done to clearly explicate what these contextual intrusions are and in what circumstances it will contribute to the expression of ingression8[[88]](#footnote-88)5. Although Campbell also notices the complexity of identifying ingression in the Future form8[[89]](#footnote-89)6, he considers this lack of uniformity and consistency as irrelevant to the discussion, claiming that what needs to be proven is not certainty of an ingressive interpretation, but a possibility that these examples may be read as ingressive, “even if they do not necessarily demand such a reading”8[[90]](#footnote-90)7. The analysis of the verbs of accomplishment falls along the same line of argument and thus is vulnerable to the same problem of inconsistency. O’Brien tries to downplay this by pointing out that the Aorist also demonstrates this same inconsistency, that consummation is not evident in all instances8[[91]](#footnote-91)8. However, one has to demonstrate that these verbs of accomplishment exercise the same pattern of inconsistency in both the Future and Aorist in order to call this a valid comparison.

Campbell admits that although he considers O’Brien’s method as novel and holding promise8[[92]](#footnote-92)9, he also sees the selective and qualified nature of O’Brien’s work as a potential pitfall. He points out that the lack of formal criteria for the inclusion of the class of verbs in question is a major weakness in O’Brien’s work9[[93]](#footnote-93)0. Instead of formulating a formal criterion for the inclusion of the classes of verbs or better explaining why certain verbs are not considered, he includes more verbs that are “quite significant in New Testament usage” in his analysis9[[94]](#footnote-94)1. Similar to the method proposed by O’Brien, he develops his method according to the premise of Fanning, with an expanded list of verbs, seeking to “observe the *Aktionsart* created in each usage and comment as to whether such *Aktionsarten* may be regarded as legitimate expressions of perfective aspect”9[[95]](#footnote-95)2. After going through several of these “neglected verbs” as found in the selected corpora, barring a few apparent contradictions, he concludes that most of the Future instances of the selected verbs create an ingressive *Aktionsart,* “focusing on the beginning of an action or the entrance into a state”, and concludes that the Future form semantically encodes perfective aspect9[[96]](#footnote-96)3.

However, Campbell’s handling of exceptions merits particular attention. Although most instances of the verbs he chooses are shown to be without any serious problem, i.e. most examples he cites are *possible* to read as perfective, his handling of the Future of γίνομαι in John 10:16 seems to go against his own inductive assumption. As mentioned above, he explicitly argues that his method is inductive in nature and particularly guards against the practice of using particular translations to argue for certain assumed theory9[[97]](#footnote-97)4. However, in dealing with the phrase καὶ γενήσονται μία ποίμνη, εἷς ποιμήν from John 10:16, although he admits that this phrase clearly expresses a stative *Aktionsart* instead of ingressive, he attributes this problem to be a matter of translation, citing his own ingressive reading against the NASB translation he used throughout his work9[[98]](#footnote-98)5. Thus he apparently violates his own methodological assumption.

Therefore, at first glance O’Brien and Campbell’s works seem to be exercising a bottom-up approach in a manner similar to what is called a reverse engineering procedure, reconstructing the thematic schema from mining the pattern of the data. However, as demonstrated above, their approach relies heavily on the premise that there is a discernable and reliable pattern between aspect and *Aktionsart,* which itself is nothing more than an unproven assertion. Viewing it under these lights, Campbell’s method is more to the deductive end of the spectrum than being inductive as he wanted it to be. However, it is equally unfair to conclude that Campbell’s approach is deductive in nature. Instead of the exact opposite of what he claims to be, the essence of his methodology is closer to what is called abductive logical reasoning. While he is not as theory-neutral as he wanted to be, and in fact it is doubtful that there exists a pure theory-neutral method, his approach seems to slightly reflect a process of refinement between the data and the hypothesis.

Formally, the notion of abduction or abductive reasoning originated from American philosopher Charles S. Peirce9[[99]](#footnote-99)6. He defined abduction in terms of “explanation and hypothesis,” “the process of forming an explanatory hypothesis”9[[100]](#footnote-100)7. It differs from deductive and inductive reasoning as it is looking for a hypothesis as a best explanation, an intelligent or reasonable guess, given what is known and what is not known in the case9[[101]](#footnote-101)8. An abductive analysis draws conclusions by working from the given data and then tries to explain these facts or evidences by suggesting an explanation9[[102]](#footnote-102)9. Formally, a plausible hypothesis is formed with the available data. It is then “tested by further investigations, providing more data that could support or refute the hypothesis”10[[103]](#footnote-103)0. It is a process of refinement of the hypothesis. The data and the hypothesis are in a reciprocal relationship shaping the other. It is thus fair to conclude that apart from some extreme cases where true deductive method is assumed, aspect theorists try to make the most intelligent guess (i.e. hypothesize) from the available data in constructing and proving their theory.

Before moving on, a few remarks regarding the relationship between verb classes and aspect. First, aspect is arguably not a function of the lexical root but rather a function of the morphological form10[[104]](#footnote-104)1. It is also yet to be shown how a certain class of verbs is classified. It is apparent that quite often when a certain set of verbs is said to be inherent with a certain kind of linguistic feature, *Aktionsart* in this case, the formal criteria to classify this set of verbs is not provided. In Campbell’s case, although he notices these various problems10[[105]](#footnote-105)2, Campbell accepts O’Brien’s logic and argues for the perfective understanding of the Future by connecting the ingressive *Aktionsart* with the perfective aspect. However, as mentioned above and even well articulated in his own work10[[106]](#footnote-106)3, Campbell considers *Aktionsart* to be a pragmatic category whereas aspect a semantic category. If *Aktionsart* is not grammaticalized by tense-form but by pragmatic implicature, the usage of a Future verb that expresses certain *Aktionsart* which reflects perfective understanding of the verb does not mean that the tense-form *itself* grammaticalizes such aspect. Thus the seemingly definite correlation between certain aspect and *Aktionsart*, the basis of many of these models, is coincidental rather than axiomatic. All that can be said is that there are some instances when a certain verb is used with *other contextual factors* that express certain *Aktionsart,* the verbal complex in its entirety, not the tense-form *per se,* will also expresses such *Aktionsart*.

Thus, failure to maintain a clear distinction between the function and the nature of aspect and *Aktionsart* inevitably leads to a misreading of the aspect of the Future. However, Campbell is not the only scholar who tries to determine the semantic feature of the Future by examining the relationship and interaction between aspect and Aktionsart. Using different terminologies, Mari Olsen talks about how *Aktionsart* contributes to the understanding of the aspect of the Future in her works. However, her model, which is to some extent also based on Fanning’s premise, came up with contrasting conclusions even following what is apparently the same line of argument.

*3.2 Non-Aspectual or Aspectual Unmarked*

Olsen ties grammatical aspect with *Aktionsart* but instead of reading ingressive expression from the Future instances, like Fanning, her analysis focuses on the lexical telicity10[[107]](#footnote-107)4. Recall that Olsen endorses a privative opposition of lexical aspect (*Aktionsart*) in her model, i.e. a verb that is unspecified in lexical aspect may be marked with semantic features but the opposite is not possible. In another words, the positive member of the lexical aspect is an uncancelable semantic feature, whereas its opposite is not part of the semantic representation of lexical aspect10[[108]](#footnote-108)5. Thus for example, the lexical aspect of the verbs that are not marked with [+telic] may be interpreted as either telic or atelic depending on context10[[109]](#footnote-109)6. Under this line of argument, Olsen argues the Future is an aspectually unmarked form since it has “the range of interpretations associated with unmarked members of privative oppositions”10[[110]](#footnote-110)7. The grammatical aspect of the Future may be interpreted as either imperfective or perfective, depending on context and lexical telicity. Verbs that are unmarked for telicity may be made telic by adding a telic prefix or combining with other contextual factors10[[111]](#footnote-111)8. Thus the verbal complexes that are unmarked for telicity may be interpreted as either imperfective or perfective10[[112]](#footnote-112)9, whereas those that are marked for positive telicity are interpreted as perfective. The aspect of the Future thus varies from situation to situation; some situations assert that the action will be taking place in the future, thus imperfective, while some other situations stress the coda of the action, hence perfective11[[113]](#footnote-113)0.

However, this interpretive flexibility of the Future has long been noticed by others11[[114]](#footnote-114)1. Grammarians in the last century have long articulated similar observations11[[115]](#footnote-115)2. For instance, Moulton, among others, notices the mixture of usage in the Future and claims that a distinction can be made between, what is called today, durative and punctiliar *Aktionsarten* in those verbs that a double form exists (e.g. ἔχω)11[[116]](#footnote-116)3. Similarly, Burton also contends that the Future may be interpreted as aoristic or progressive not “from the point of view of pure grammar” but on the basis of lexis in context11[[117]](#footnote-117)4. Olsen’s approach to the Future is also indebted to Fanning, who articulates succinctly:

[The] mixture of usage in the future (punctual *or* durative sense) appears to indicate not the *flexible* aspectual meaning of the future but its *non-aspectual* character. The variation between punctiliar and durative seems to be dependent upon the lexical sense and contextual features, totally apart from an aspectual value for the future11[[118]](#footnote-118)5.

In this Olsen, and Fanning to a lesser extent, indirectly categorizes aspect into pragmatics instead of semantics by making aspect a function of *Aktionsart*. However, similar to the methodological shortcomings of the model proposed by Campbell and O’Brien, nowhere is the classification criteria of the telic verbs clearly spelled out in her approach. Although Olsen does include a definition of the telic verbs as those that “always denote situation with an inherent end” (such as the verbs of accomplishments, verbs of achievements and verbs of stages-level states), she does not provide the detailed and formal criteria of inclusion and exclusion of the verbs11[[119]](#footnote-119)6.

Thus as shown above, even when a similar approach is employed, Olsen’s analysis produces contrary result when compared to O’Brien and Campbell. Thus conflating aspect and *Aktionsart* categories in the analysis add little to the understanding of the aspect of the Future. It is also worth pointing out that even though most of the scholars insist on articulating a clear distinction between semantics and pragmatics categories and a clear distinction between aspect and *Aktionsart,* such insistences break down when the tense-form under investigation lacks a clear expression of aspect.

A brief summary statement is vital before moving on in the discussion. The uniqueness of the Future in the discussion of the Greek verbal system is apparent. As mentioned above, some have tried to explicate the aspect of the Future using the alleged underlying relationship with *Aktionsart*. Others have treated it as an absolute tense-form that primarily expresses time but resulted with a category that “must be qualified so radically, with such labels as the gnomic future and relative future, that the category becomes vacuous”11[[120]](#footnote-120)7. However, the result of those scholars who seek to frame the discussion with already-established categories are usually not wholly satisfactory. Whether one regards the Future purely as a tense, a mood or an aspect, one has to confront a long list of exceptions11[[121]](#footnote-121)8.

3.3 The Fourth Aspect

The present study places the models of McKay and Porter in the same group not because their conclusion is the same, but because both analyses seek to explicate the aspect of the Future using non-traditional categories; both of them deviate from the aforementioned *Aktionsart*-driven approaches and define aspect on different criteria than used elsewhere; and both propose a similar semantic feature of the Future. McKay regards the Future as expressing a unique fourth aspect. He contends that the Future is partly anomalous, even defective, in the sense that it is used mainly to grammaticalize the semantic feature of intention but also to express simple futurity11[[122]](#footnote-122)9. He stresses that the relationship between the aspectual and temporal expression is subtle. To handle the exceptions, he argues that certain statements of futurity that do not appear to express intentionality are a consequence of the intentional idea12[[123]](#footnote-123)0. Being alone in proposing four aspects, he acknowledges the difficulties but defends the future aspect by saying that it is “an explanation which recognizes that the range of future forms approximates most closely to those of the three obvious aspects [imperfective, aorist and perfect]”12[[124]](#footnote-124)1. This is where Porter’s approach is different from McKay’s. Porter rejects both the notions that the Future constitutes a verbal aspect in its own right and that the tense form *by itself* grammaticalizes temporal reference. Although he acknowledges McKay’s contribution as commendable, Porter criticizes his attempt as it failed to cover the idea of internal constituency or paradigmatic choice, calling his definition a “hotchpotch of intentional and external temporal features, and hence fails to be fully convincing”12[[125]](#footnote-125)2. In addition, by attributing both the function of temporal and modal reference to the future aspect, McKay’s definition is close to committing a category mistake, i.e. speaking of a tense-form in terms of *both* temporal relation and attitude12[[126]](#footnote-126)3.

Porter’s model is arguably the most systematic, comprehensive and technical work to date. It attracts most discussions and criticisms on methodological issues, while at the same time, being misunderstood and misrepresented by some of his critics. His approach is often criticized as being difficult to read12[[127]](#footnote-127)4, and theory-driven12[[128]](#footnote-128)5. His treatment of the Future is criticized for its radical direction in denying the relevance of time12[[129]](#footnote-129)6, but at the same time most critics see his approach to the aspect of the Future being the same as those proposed by Fanning and Olsen, that the Future is non-aspectual. However, before we move on to talk about his approach, a word in response to the last criticism is essential. In contrary to Fanning and Olsen, Porter’s conclusion of the aspect of the Future has nothing to do with *Aktionsart* or the alleged interpretive flexibility (durative or punctiliar) of the Future. In fact, not one time does he label the Future non-aspectual in his work, but he rather uses phrases like “not fully aspectual” or aspectually vague12[[130]](#footnote-130)7.

*3.4 Non-Aspectual vs. Not Fully Aspectual*

It is important for the discussion at this point to turn to explicate the nuance of the notion of aspectual vagueness or partial aspectuality. Claiming the Future as aspectually vague or more accurately not fully aspectual is not the same as saying that it carries no aspectual value. The distinction is subtle but essential. In Porter’s model, the reason for the Future being regarded as aspectually vague is not, as alleged by his critics, due to the dictation of his systemic framework. The point of departure of his study is not the lack of binary opposition but rather the lack of a complete paradigmatic edifice and the functional overlapping of the Future with the non-Indicative Mood.

The fact that the Future does not have a complete paradigm like the other tense-forms in and of itself warrants close scrutiny, not only for the sake of determining its aspect, but also for the purpose of getting a better understanding of the form and its place in the verbal system. The Future has only one set of forms, apart from the Indicative; it has Participle and a very rare Infinitive form12[[131]](#footnote-131)8. The lack of a complete paradigm that covers the set of Moods means that it is impossible to enter into a meaningful comparison with the other tense-forms. This paradigmatic deficiency also made it difficult to categorize the Future in the verbal network. It lacks a contrast with the non-indicative (Subjunctive, Imperative, Optative) forms if it is treated as Indicative. At the same time, although the usage of the Future has an apparent overlapping in function with the non-Indicative Moods, if treated as a non-Indicative form, there is no Indicative choice to complete the paradigm12[[132]](#footnote-132)9.

In addition to the problem of an odd formal paradigm, grammarians are also confronted with instances of the Future used in non-temporal (non-future) and non-Indicative contexts. Porter articulates this phenomenon meticulously saying that, “[t]here are functions and constructions that the Future shares with Indicative verbs and there are functions and constructions that the Future shares with non-Indicative Moods”13[[133]](#footnote-133)0. However, this does not mean Porter considers that the Future is used to express time in the N[[134]](#footnote-134)T. In fact, scholars that insist on an exclusive temporal usage or modal usage of the Future must confront all kinds of exceptions and qualifications that make the category become meaningless. Virtually all treatments of the Future have to deal with the fact that the form itself is used in distinctly non-future and non-Indicative contexts, such as timeless expression (Matt 6:14–15; 15:14; etc.), command (Matt 5:21; 6:5; 7:7; etc.), or parallel with the Subjunctive (Matt 18:6)13[[135]](#footnote-135)1.

Scholars have agreed on the late development of the Future in the history of the Greek language13[[136]](#footnote-136)2. The fact that its origin is possibly a non-Indicative form partly explains its usage in non-Indicative contexts and non-Indicative expressions13[[137]](#footnote-137)3. This late emergence of the form also helps to explain the paradigmatic peculiarities13[[138]](#footnote-138)4.

To summarize, the Future is intrinsically handicapped with regard to being on par with the other tense-form due to the virtual independence of its form in relation to the Greek verbal network. The Future does not offer a clear and meaningful paradigmatic choice in opposition to other tense-forms. Thus one way of explicating the aspectual vagueness of the form is in terms of its unique position in the Greek verbal network. Since form and function goes hand-in-hand within a verbal system, the paradigmatic peculiarities or the underdevelopment of the Future form resulted in its peculiar position in the aspectual system13[[139]](#footnote-139)5. Therefore, although the Future has “distinctive yet tense-related morphological features” and is related to a way of viewing the action, it is not fully aspectual or aspectually vague since no paradigmatic choice is offered13[[140]](#footnote-140)6. Thus on the one hand it shares the environment of other fully aspectual tense-forms but on the other hand it lacks formally a meaningful opposition within the verbal network, thus the Future is explained under the aspectuality system but not fully aspectual. Thus to summarize, Porter’s approach to the aspect of Future tense is truly abductive. He tries to come up with an intelligent explanation, a hypothesis, regarding the place of the Future in the Greek verbal system from the available data, i.e. its paradigm.

Before moving on to the discussion of the semantic feature of the Future, a brief note concerning the theory-driven criticism towards Porter’s model is necessary. Campbell argues that Porter should consider the future periphrasis as a possible opposition to the Future Indicative. He criticizes Porter’s approach as circular, arguing that since both the aspect of the Future and its opposition are unknown, Porter should not use one to advance his argument for another13[[141]](#footnote-141)7. This is where the theory-driven argument is used once again to go against Porter’s model. Campbell concludes that Porter’s model “may be regarded as an instance in which adherence to a linguistic model becomes overbearing”13[[142]](#footnote-142)8. Campbell’s suggestion of using the future periphrasis as an opposition is perhaps possible on the theoretical level, but practically impossible to apply and verify since the Future Periphrasis is too rare in the N[[143]](#footnote-143)T13[[144]](#footnote-144)9. The theory-driven criticism has already been touched on in the above section. One has to remember that practically there is hardly a pure theory-neutral method. If Porter’s insistence on finding a meaningful opposition is accused of being theory-driven, the same can be said about Campbell’s own theory, that his argument of a perfective Future is made to fit this rather peculiar tense-form (the Future) to “the accepted two aspect system”14[[145]](#footnote-145)0, even to a point of conflating aspect and *Aktionsart*. In fact, one can argue that Porter’s treatment shows the exact opposite of being theory-driven. One would think that if one has to strictly follow Porter’s system and include all tense-forms, instead of calling the Future as not fully aspectual, one would have to impose an opposition to the Future to create a more balanced system.

*3.5 Semantic Feature of the Future*

As mentioned above, due to its rather odd formal paradigm, any attempt to place the Future within established categories, whether treating it strictly as a tense, a non-Indicative Mood, or an aspect, will confront countless qualifications and exceptions. In Porter’s verbal network, the Future is under the aspectuality system since it has tense-related morphological features. It is “compatible with environments where full aspectual choice is made, but it does not grammaticalize such choice itself”14[[146]](#footnote-146)1. It has been noted that the Future is used parallel to or in place of the non-Indicative Moods, this apparent functional overlapping provides the direction of the discussion of semantic features of the Future. The Future thus expresses “a volition, a desire, an aim toward a goal, a prediction, an intention, an expectation”14[[147]](#footnote-147)2. Porter argues that the Future grammaticalizes [+expectation]. He summarizes it as:

The Future is a unique form in Greek, similar both to the aspects and to the attitudes, but fully neither, and realizing not a temporal conception but a marked and emphatic expectation toward a process14[[148]](#footnote-148)3.

As one can easily notice, Porter’s [+expectation] is very similar to McKay’s proposal of intention. The main distinction is that Porter does not regard the Future as grammaticalizing time, but only the semantic feature of expectation. This is where his treatment attracts most heated criticisms.

*3.6 Temporality*

Unlike the debate surrounding the aspect of the Future, the state of the discussion of Future temporality is rather simple. The diversity of aspect proposals is replaced by a dichotomy between Porter (and Decker) on one side and all other interpreters mentioned in this study on the other side. Even McKay, who forcefully dismisses the temporal reference in other tense-forms, contends that the Future is used to express futurity14[[149]](#footnote-149)4.

A word on the diachronic development of the Future is worth repeating here. As mentioned above, the historical development of the form in the evolution of the Greek language is not a determinative factor of the aspect of a tense-form in a particular period. However, it is treated as a supporting factor and used to elucidate other findings14[[150]](#footnote-150)5.

The scholars who argue for a temporal interpretation of the Future usually point to the passages in the N[[151]](#footnote-151)T that shows a clear future reference. Campbell argues since most of the Future instances are found within direct discourse, “this broad pattern should not surprise us if a temporal approach to the future form is adopted, …”14[[152]](#footnote-152)6. However, as mentioned above, the scholars who argue for a temporal interpretation have to come up with an explanation of the various non-future, non-Indicative uses of the Future in the N[[153]](#footnote-153)T. Although making the claim that the historical development of a tense-form can only act as a supportive role, Campbell points to the diachronic development of the form to explain the non-Indicative use14[[154]](#footnote-154)7. His main argument is from Evans’ assertion that the historical development demonstrates that the Future is “simply from expression of future action or situation as a qualified observation to its more confident prediction as a fact”14[[155]](#footnote-155)8. Evan’s explanation for the non-temporal usage of the Future is worth recounting here.

In response to Porter’s proposal of a non-temporal Future form, Evans attributes three motivating factors for this interpretation14[[156]](#footnote-156)9: (1) The Future was growing out of the Subjunctive; (2) the functional overlap with the non-Indicative Moods and; (3) Intrusion into the sphere of linguistics of philosophical questions on the concept of futurity.

In response to the first two points, one should also take note that Evans argues for an origin of the Future quite different from others. He argues that the special case of ἔχω described above demonstrates a mixed history of the Future rather than a regular development like the other tense-forms. He claims that the Future “arises from aspectually marked forms and to that extent has an aspectual origin”15[[157]](#footnote-157)0. However, the two uses of ἔχω do not signify two possible aspectual origins, but rather two uses under *Aktionsart* categories (ingressive and durative). As mentioned above, *Aktionsart* is not grammaticalized by form but rather indicated by context. The mixed origin suggested by Moulton is not due to mixed usage, but rather to whether the form comes from the confusion with the Aorist Subjunctive or something similar to the Future of other Indo-European languages like Sanskrit15[[158]](#footnote-158)1.

Regarding the possible modal origin of the Future, Evans agrees with others that the Future is a late development, formed mainly from desideratives and Subjunctives. However, his view of desideratives is different from the others. He argues that linguists have mistaken the form as a Mood. Based on comparative grammar, he argues that this form expresses a verbal occurrence as an assertion. Therefore, he concludes that the seemingly functional overlap of the Future and the oblique mood is not a witness to functional equivalence in reality. The oblique usage of the Future is an expression of added certainty and factual quality of a future action. He asserts that the Greek verbal system has undergone a development from a more purely aspectual structure to express the temporal distinctions in the verb15[[159]](#footnote-159)2. Thus although originally in the pre-historic period of Greek language development, the Future seems to be a member of the oblique Mood, “once the indicative mood begins to convey time values, a future tense becomes a possibility”15[[160]](#footnote-160)3. However, if the Future Indicative went through a historical development from non-Indicative to Indicative (temporal), then what about the argument of the non-oblique desiderative as the origin of the Future? If this is the case, then the development of Future has gone through a process of Indicative (+Subjunctive) to Indicative (+Temporal). More work has to be done to make this argument convincing.

Evans is quite negative and unsympathetic to the use of philosophical conceptions in the discussion of grammar. He contends that it is categorically different when we talk about the Future versus other tenses, saying that:

Such observations are sensible in terms of logic, and indeed general interpretation of futurity as a mental construct. Yet they are not especially helpful for analysis of grammatical categories, manifesting a confusion of what we think of as absolute time with the grammatical category of tense15[[161]](#footnote-161)4.

He champions an approach to the problem of the Future from “a strictly linguistic viewpoint”15[[162]](#footnote-162)5. However, he did not elaborate how this strictly linguistic approach is used. It should also be noted that the scholars that he argues against are linguists themselves and the discussion of linguistics, as in many other social sciences, is inevitably connected with philosophical concepts.

Finally, Evans argues that Porter’s view of non-temporal Future is theory-driven, i.e. *all* tense-forms are non-temporal so the Future cannot be an exception. However, it is an oversimplification of Porter’s argument. The fact that there exists usages of Future form in non-future context is overwhelming and begs for an explanation15[[163]](#footnote-163)6. Porter’s explanation is thus driven not by his system but by the data. The fact that there are so many exceptions to the temporal interpretation shapes his hypothesis of a non-temporal Future. Abductive reasoning is once again at work here.

Thus, to summarize the discussion on the nature of the Future:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model | Tense | Aspect | Interpretive |
| McKay | Future | [+intention] |  |
| Porter | None | [+expectation] |  |
| Fanning | Future | None | [punctiliar/durative] |
| Olsen | Future | None | [±telic] |
| Campbell | Future | Perfective | [±ingressive] |

**4. Conclusion**

As demonstrated above, the debate over the aspect of the Future generally circles around three points: the role of *Aktionsart*, the neutrality of the method and the historical development of the form. Whereas the model of Olsen and Campbell sometimes conflates *Aktionsart* and aspect and as a result produces conflicting conclusions. Porter’s systemic functional model seems to have a more rigorous method, even though his take on non-temporality will continue to face heated criticism.

The goal of the present study is to lay out the groundwork for a practitioner to test the validity of various aspect theories. Using one of the criteria suggested by Porter for evaluation of a linguistic model, the possible next step of this study is to test the inclusiveness of each model15[[164]](#footnote-164)7. The same data should be used to apply to all models. The objective is to determine which model incorporates “the largest number of pertinent pieces of data with the fewest items excluded”15[[165]](#footnote-165)8. However, this is out of the scope of this paper.
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78. 76 From his unpublished Th.M thesis from Dallas Theological Seminary. M. O’Brien, “Verbal Aspect in the Future Tense of the Greek New Testament” (Th.M. Diss., Dallas Theological Seminary; Dallas 1997) 1–58, particularly 23–5. See also Campbell, *Verbal Aspect,* 140–51. [↑](#footnote-ref-78)
79. 77 Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 49–50, 126–96. [↑](#footnote-ref-79)
80. 78 O’Brien, “Future Tense”, 23. [↑](#footnote-ref-80)
81. 79 O’Brien, “Future Tense”, 23–5. [↑](#footnote-ref-81)
82. 80 However, he admits that this hypothesis is heavily depends on the premise suggested by Fanning. O’Brien, “Future Tense”, 25. [↑](#footnote-ref-82)
83. 81 O’Brien, “Future Tense”, 24. [↑](#footnote-ref-83)
84. 82 In his words, when verbs of accomplishment are used to express perfective aspect, they will stress “the sense of the action progressing and accomplishing its fulfillment, at which point the action ceases”. O’Brien, “Future Tense”, 41. [↑](#footnote-ref-84)
85. NT New Testament [↑](#footnote-ref-85)
86. 83 See also, Campbell, *Verbal Aspect,* 142. [↑](#footnote-ref-86)
87. 84 As noted by Campbell, O’Brien does not indicate what these contextual intrusions might be. O’Brien, “Future Tense”, 40 and Campbell, *Verbal Aspect,* 142, n33. [↑](#footnote-ref-87)
88. 85 There is obviously another explanation to it, that the ingression is totally a product of context. See below discussion on semantics and pragmatics. [↑](#footnote-ref-88)
89. 86 He agrees with Huovila, another unpublished thesis on aspect, that it is intrinsically difficulty to identify ingression but considers it irrelevant to the discussion. Campbell, *Verbal Aspect,* 142, and Kimmo Huovila, “Towards a Theory of Aspectual Nesting for New Testament Greek”, (M.A. Thesis, University of Helsinki; Helsinki 1999) 62. [↑](#footnote-ref-89)
90. 87 Campbell, *Verbal Aspect,* 142. [↑](#footnote-ref-90)
91. 88 Campbell considers this as a fair explanation. Campbell, *Verbal Aspect,* 143 and O’Brien, “Future Tense”, 48–9. [↑](#footnote-ref-91)
92. 89 Campbell, *Verbal Aspect,* 141–2. [↑](#footnote-ref-92)
93. 90 Campbell points out that the verbs chosen by O’Brien are taken from lists of Aorist verbs in Fanning and Zerwick’s works. O’Brien, “Future Tense,” 27 and Campbell, *Verbal Aspect,* 143–4. [↑](#footnote-ref-93)
94. 91 He lists εἰμί, γίνομαι, ἀκούω, ὁράω, βλέπω, θεωρέω, κεῖμαι, καθέξομαι and μένω as examples. See Campbell, *Verbal Aspect,* 144–51 for examples. [↑](#footnote-ref-94)
95. 92 Although he claims that the *Aktionsart*-aspect method of O’Brien is abandon in his study for this point on, but it is hard to determine how his method is different from O’Brien’s. Campbell, *Verbal Aspect,* 144. [↑](#footnote-ref-95)
96. 93 See his analysis, Campbell, *Verbal Aspect,* 144–51, here 145. [↑](#footnote-ref-96)
97. 94 He uses the aspect of the Perfect as an example, claiming that when stative aspect is assumed instead of proved to be expressed by the Perfect form, if one “cite[s] several examples of how to translate the perfect statively, and while this may or may not be accurate, it amounts to little more than eisegesis”. Campbell, *Verbal Aspect,* 29–30. [↑](#footnote-ref-97)
98. 95 Campbell, *Verbal Aspect,* 145–6. [↑](#footnote-ref-98)
99. 96 Charles S. Peirce, “Pragmatism and Pragmaticism”, *Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce*, Vol.5. (eds. C. Hartshorne—P. Weiss) (Cambridge, MA 1965) 99–107. Walton shows his doubt on this and suggests that an article by Harman is also possibly responsible for introducing the notion of abduction to philosophy. D. Walton, *Abductive Reasoning* (Tuscaloosa, AL 2004) 3. [↑](#footnote-ref-99)
100. 97 Walton, *Abductive Reasoning,* 8. [↑](#footnote-ref-100)
101. 98 Walton, *Abductive Reasoning,* 11. [↑](#footnote-ref-101)
102. 99 Walton, *Abductive Reasoning,* 17. [↑](#footnote-ref-102)
103. 100 Walton, *Abductive Reasoning,* 5. [↑](#footnote-ref-103)
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115. 112 See the discussion in Porter, *Verbal Aspect,* 408–9. [↑](#footnote-ref-115)
116. 113 J.H. Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek: Prolegomena* (Edinburgh 1908) 148–50, see also Robertson, *Grammar,* 870–2. [↑](#footnote-ref-116)
117. 114 E. Burton, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek* (Edinburgh 1973) 31–3. [↑](#footnote-ref-117)
118. 115 Fanning, *Verbal Aspect,* 120. [↑](#footnote-ref-118)
119. 116 Olsen, *Lexical and Grammatical Aspect,* 206. [↑](#footnote-ref-119)
120. 117 Like the BDF for example, more will be said regarding the temporality of the Future in the next section. Porter, *Idioms,* 43. See also BDF, 348. [↑](#footnote-ref-120)
121. 118 Wallace has labels like predictive future, imperatival future, deliberative future, gnomic future and other miscellaneous subjunctive equivalents. Wallace, *Greek Grammar,* 568–71. [↑](#footnote-ref-121)
122. 119 McKay, “Time and Aspect”, 225; McKay, “Syntax in Exegesis”, 46; McKay, “Perfect and other Aspects”, 290 and McKay, *New Syntax,* 52. [↑](#footnote-ref-122)
123. 120 McKay, *Greek Grammar,* 147. [↑](#footnote-ref-123)
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