

VERBAL USES OF THE PERFECT PARTICIPLE IN LUKE-ACTS

by

David B. Sloan

B.S., The Ohio State University, 1999
M.Div., Ashland Theological Seminary, 2004

A RESEARCH PAPER

Submitted to Professor D. A. Carson
in partial fulfillment of the requirements of
NT 8721 Advanced Greek Grammar
toward the degree of
Ph.D. in Theological Studies – New Testament
at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School

Deerfield, IL
April 2009

Introduction

The Greek perfect participle plays an important role in the New Testament and yet there are many questions surrounding it that have yet to be settled by NT scholarship. Some questions revolve around the meaning of the perfect tense itself: Is there inherent to the perfect tense a reference to a past action?¹ Is the contribution made by the perfect tense over against the aorist the concept of continuing effect of that past action?² Is the ongoing state that is expressed by the perfect that of the subject or of the object of the verb?³ Are there perfect verbs such as οἶδα that function as present verbs?⁴ And finally, what in general do Greek tenses grammaticalize – temporality? the kind of action? the author’s subjective portrayal of the action?⁵ These questions are compounded when we look at the perfect participle. Does the use of the perfect tense indicate that the

¹ According to McKay this is generally true, though there are exceptions, such as οἶδα (K. L. McKay, “On the Perfect and Other Aspects in New Testament Greek,” *Novum Testamentum* 23 [1981]: 289-329). Porter, on the other hand, argues that “whether a previous event is alluded to or exists at all is a matter of lexis in context and not part of aspectual semantics” (Stanley E. Porter, *Verbal Aspect in the Greek New Testament, with Reference to Tense and Mood* (Studies in Biblical Greek 1; New York: Peter Lang, 1989), 259).

² So Blass and Debrunner say that “the perfect tense combines in itself, so to speak, the present and the aorist in that it denotes the *continuance of completed action*” (F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, trans. Robert W. Funk [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961], 175 [§340]).

³ Blass and Debrunner argue that the perfect sometimes denotes the continuing effect on the subject and sometimes on the object (176 [§342]). McKay, on the other hand, says, “My researches have convinced me that the state signalled by the perfect aspect is properly and always that of the subject” (310).

⁴ So A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, 4th ed. (New York: Hodder & Stoughton, 1923), 881, and N. Turner, *Syntax*, vol. 3 of *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, ed. J. H. Moulton (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963), 82. McKay, however, argues that οἶδα is rightly seen as functioning as a perfect tense verb (298-303, cf. Porter, 282-287).

action described by the participle is antecedent in time to the main verb?⁶ Or does the placement of the participle before or after the main verb in a sentence indicate the temporal relationship between the two actions? To address these questions and contribute to the discussion of the perfect participle, we will investigate the verbal uses of the perfect participle in Luke-Acts. Limiting our investigation to the Lukan corpus has its drawbacks, but it allows us to form an understanding of the verbal perfect participle that can be tested by further studies of other NT books.

Sixty-eight (65%) of the 103 perfect participles in Luke and 49 (50%) of the 98 perfect participles in Acts are functioning adjectivally. These will not be dealt with in this paper. Of the 84 remaining participles, 48% are periphrastic (18 in Luke and 22 in Acts), 28% are adverbial (8 in Luke, 15 in Acts), 21% are indirect discourse (8 in Luke, 10 in Acts), and 2% are attendant circumstance (2 in Acts). While Luke⁷ sometimes uses a participle in a complementary sense (e.g., Luke 5:4; Acts 5:42; 6:13; 12:16; 13:10; 20:31; 21:32), he never uses a perfect participle this way. Similarly there are no examples of pleonastic perfect participles in Luke-Acts, though pleonastic participles can be found in other tenses (e.g., Luke 5:22; 7:22; 12:17; 13:2; 19:40). The fact that there are no *independent* verbal perfect participles in Luke-Acts is insignificant because nowhere in the Lukan corpus do we find an independent verbal participle in any tense. This paper will look first at perfect participles functioning adverbially or as

⁵ Zerwick argues “that the choice between aorist and perfect is not determined by the objective facts, but by the writer’s wish to connote the special nuance of the perfect; if this be not required, the aorist will be used” (Maximilian Zerwick, *Biblical Greek Illustrated by Examples*, trans. Joseph Smith [Rome: Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici, 1963], 97).

⁶ This is the argument of Robertson, 909, but it is challenged by Porter, 394-401.

⁷ Throughout this paper I will refer to the author of Luke-Acts as “Luke.” It is beyond the scope of this paper to address authorship of Luke-Acts and the decision made regarding authorship has no effect on our discussion of perfect participles.

attendant circumstances, then at perfect participles functioning in indirect discourse, and finally at perfect participles in periphrastic constructions, but before commencing this study a discussion of the word οἶδα is necessary.

Οἶδα and Γινώσκω in Luke-Acts

A number of scholars have argued that though οἶδα is perfect in form, it functions as a present tense verb.⁸ This view is largely rooted in a poor understanding of the perfect tense. If the perfect tense refers to a past action with present effects, then οἶδα does not function like a perfect, because as McKay has observed, “as a perfect, οἶδα is remarkable in that although it is one of the most commonly used perfects it rarely, if ever, conveys any clear implication of the action by which its state (of knowledge) was established.”⁹ If, as it is argued in this paper, the perfect tense grammaticalizes stativity with no necessary reference to a past action, then it is not surprising that οἶδα would regularly occur in the perfect tense. A comparison of the 44 occurrences of οἶδα and the 44 occurrences of γινώσκω in Luke-Acts will demonstrate the differences between these two words and reveal one reason why οἶδα always occurs in the perfect or pluperfect tense in Luke-Acts¹⁰ while γινώσκω never occurs in these tenses.¹¹

The perfect participle of οἶδα occurs eight times in Luke-Acts and the aorist participle of γινώσκω four times. In the eight former cases, there is no thought of

⁸ E.g., see Robertson, 881, and Turner, 82.

⁹ McKay, 299.

¹⁰ Outside of Luke-Acts οἶδα occurs in the future tense in Heb 8:11, which is taken from Jer 38:34 LXX (=31:34 MT/EVV). In the Septuagint, 259 of the 273 occurrences of οἶδα (95%) are in the perfect or pluperfect tenses (compared to 7 aorist, 6 present, and 1 future tense occurrences).

¹¹ Outside of Luke-Acts γινώσκω occurs in the perfect tense in 1 Cor 8:2-3 and 2 John 1 and in the pluperfect tense in Matt 12:7 (quoting Hos 6:6). These three occurrences account for slightly more than 1% of the occurrences of γινώσκω in the NT.

the acquisition of the knowledge. In Luke 8:53 the people were merely in the state of knowing that the little girl was dead. In Luke 9:33 Peter was in the state of not understanding what he was saying when he spoke at the transfiguration. In Luke 9:47 and 11:17, Jesus knew people's thoughts – his acquiring of this knowledge is of no concern. In Acts 2:30 the idea is David's being in the state of knowing about the promise of a descendent to sit on the throne, not his acquisition of that knowledge. Acts 5:7 and 20:22 both express someone being in a state of not knowing something, and again there is no thought of the acquisition of knowledge itself. In Acts 24:22, what is important is that Felix had a knowledge of the Way, not the obtaining of the knowledge itself.

In the four occurrences of participial forms of γινώσκω, however, the idea of acquisition of knowledge is often present. So in Luke 9:11 there is a temporal idea that *when* the crowds *learned* that Jesus had gone to Bethsaida, they followed him. Similarly in Acts 23:6, it is *when* Paul *realizes* that the council was one part Sadducees and the other part Pharisees that he gets the idea of bringing up his belief in the resurrection of the dead. Luke could have used the perfect participle of οἶδα here if he merely wanted to communicate that Paul's prior knowledge led him to speak, but perhaps the implication is that this knowledge (and its application) suddenly struck Paul and led him to change his tactic. The exception that shows that this is not a hard-and-fast rule is Luke 12:47-48. Here the aorist participial form of γινώσκω is used where there is seemingly little or no thought of the acquisition of knowledge. Notably Luke 12:46 is identical to Matthew 24:50-51a with the exception of one word and uses the present indicative of γινώσκω. Whether Luke 12:47-48 is original to Luke or comes from a different source is uncertain. But the uses of γινώσκω and οἶδα in other moods will

further demonstrate that in general when Luke uses οἶδα his desire is to communicate the state of knowledge and when he uses γινώσκω his desire is to communicate the acquisition of knowledge.

The perfect infinitive of οἶδα occurs twice in Luke-Acts, whereas the aorist infinitive of γινώσκω occurs seven times. In Luke 20:7, οἶδα is used because the Pharisees are saying that they are in the *state* of not knowing where John came from, not that they have not had a learning experience of this. Similarly, in Luke 22:34 the expectation is that Peter would deny that he is in the *state* of knowing Jesus, not that he has not had an experience of coming to know him. It would not have been as helpful for Luke to use the perfect infinitive of οἶδα in Luke 8:10, however, because the disciples were *not* in a state of knowing the meaning of the parables, but it was “given to them to *come to know* the secrets of the kingdom of God.” In Acts 1:7, it was not for the disciples to *come to know* the times or seasons that the Father has fixed. In Acts 17:19-20, the philosophers at Athens wanted to *come to know* Paul’s new teaching. In Acts 21:34, the Roman soldier could not *figure out* the facts about Paul and the rioting of the Jews in Jerusalem. In Acts 22:14, Paul recounts how Ananias had told him that God had appointed him to *come to know* God’s will. In Acts 22:30, the commander wanted to *come to know* the real reason Paul was being accused by the Jews. In all of these cases Luke uses the aorist infinitive of γινώσκω because he is communicating the obtaining of knowledge rather than the state of having knowledge, as in Luke 20:7 and 22:34.

Luke never uses an imperatival form of οἶδα in Luke-Acts, but he uses the aorist imperative of γινώσκω once (Luke 21:10) and the present imperative of γινώσκω

four times (Luke 10:11; 12:39; 21:31¹²; and Acts 2:36). In all of these cases the idea of obtaining knowledge is communicated. So Luke 21:10 gives the occasion on which they are expected to learn that Jerusalem's destruction has come near. In the other four passages something is being taught and the imperative that is given by the speaker is that they would learn a lesson. So again the idea of acquiring knowledge tends to lead Luke to use γινώσκω, whereas the idea of having knowledge tends to lead him to use οἶδα.

A comparison of the subjunctive uses of γινώσκω and οἶδα shows that Luke uses the former twice and the latter once. In Luke 5:24, the perfect subjunctive of οἶδα occurs when Jesus heals the paralytic, ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας (“so that you may know that the Son of Man has authority on earth to forgive sins”). Here the idea of acquiring knowledge is clearly communicated, so the distinction between γινώσκω and οἶδα cannot be pressed too hard, but it should be noted that this verse is identical to Matt 9:6 and Mark 2:10 with the exception of word order, so the choice of οἶδα over γινώσκω likely did not originate with Luke. The fact that Luke does not change the word (though he is free to change word order) shows that Luke is free to use οἶδα in contexts where obtaining knowledge is clearly communicated, but it seems that his natural tendency is to choose γινώσκω in such contexts. In Luke 8:17 and 19:15, which have no direct parallels in Matthew and Luke, Luke uses the aorist subjunctive forms (once passive, once active) of γινώσκω, and again the idea of obtaining knowledge is clearly communicated.

¹² Some scholars take γινώσκετε in Luke 21:31 to be a present indicative rather than a present imperative (see e.g., J. Reiling and J. L. Swellengrebel, *A Handbook on the Gospel of Luke* [UBS Handbook Series; New York: United Bible Societies, 1971], 675). Fitzmyer is probably correct to take it as a present imperative (Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, vol. 2 [The Anchor Bible 28A; Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, 1985], 1351).

Conclusion. Luke’s tendency is to use a perfect form of οἶδα when communicating the state of having knowledge and to use a non-stative form of γινώσκω when considering the acquisition of knowledge. While this distinction does not hold up in every use of the two words (especially when Luke uses external literary sources), it is so prevalent that it is clearly intentional at least at a subconscious level. Therefore to consider οἶδα to act as a present tense verb is to miss the distinction between the perfect tense of οἶδα and the non-perfect tenses of γινώσκω. Οἶδα is a stative idea, and Luke will use this word when he wants to communicate the state of knowing something. Therefore uses of the perfect participial form of οἶδα will be considered along with other perfect participles, under the assumption that Luke could have chosen a form of γινώσκω if he did not want to communicate the same idea that the stative aspect communicates.

Adverbial/Circumstantial Perfect Participles

The first category of verbal perfect participles we will investigate is those that function adverbially or circumstantially. The first among these of these is Luke 1:3: ἔδοξε κάμοι **παρηκολουθηκότι** ἄνωθεν πᾶσιν ἀκριβῶς καθεξῆς σοι γράψαι (“it seems good for me also, **having followed** everything **closely** from the beginning, to write to you in an orderly manner”). Here we have a participle giving the cause of the finite verb it *follows* – ἔδοξε (Luke’s having followed everything closely is not the cause of his writing but the cause of his perception that writing an orderly account would be a good exercise). Luke does not seem to be intent on expressing temporality in this participle, but contextually we can discern that Luke’s following everything closely happened *prior* to his realization that it would be good to write about it (one strike against the theory that placing a participle after the main verb tends to imply subsequent action). Regarding

aspect, the perfect participle expresses Luke’s condition – he is in the state of having followed everything closely. Had Luke wanted to discuss the event or the process of following things he could have used an aorist or present participle, but the perfect participle looks at the state Luke is in rather than the action that put him in that state.

In Luke 6:40, Jesus says, οὐκ ἔστιν μαθητὴς ὑπὲρ τὸν διδάσκαλον· **κατηρτισμένος** δὲ πᾶς ἔσται ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος αὐτοῦ (“A disciple is not above his teacher, but everyone, **being fully trained**, will be like his teacher”). Here the verb that the participle modifies is a future tense verb and the idea is perhaps one of means (“*by* being fully trained”) or temporality (“*when* he is fully trained”). Temporally the state of being fully trained is concurrent with the future tense verb – while the disciple is in the process of being trained, he is still not like his teacher, but once he is in the state of being fully trained, he will be like his teacher. The activity of being trained is not in view or Luke could have used the present or aorist tenses. Instead he is speaking of being in the state of “full-trainedness,” so he uses the perfect participle. Here the participle precedes the main verb.

The next four adverbial perfect participles in Luke are all forms of οἶδα. In Luke 8:53 it says, καὶ κατεγέλων αὐτοῦ **εἰδότες** ὅτι ἀπέθανεν (“And they laughed at him, **knowing** that she was dead.”) Here again a causal participle *follows* the verb it modifies, and it gives the state out of which the laughter of the people arose. In Luke 9:33, εἰδὼς is a participle of concession, also following the main verb: εἶπεν ὁ Πέτρος . . . , μὴ **εἰδὼς** ὃ λέγει (“Peter spoke, not **realizing** what he was saying”). Whereas Peter’s speaking is viewed as a complete action (aorist indicative), his lack of knowledge is viewed as the state from which he spoke, rather than as an event. In Luke 9:47 it says, ὁ

δὲ Ἰησοῦς **εἰδὼς** τὸν διαλογισμὸν τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν, ἐπιλαβόμενος παιδίον ἔστησεν αὐτὸ παρ’ ἑαυτοῦ καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς . . . (“but Jesus, **knowing** the reasoning of their hearts, took a child and placed him beside him and said to them . . .”). Similarly, Luke 11:17 says, αὐτὸς δὲ **εἰδὼς** αὐτῶν τὰ διανοήματα εἶπεν αὐτοῖς . . . (“but he, **knowing** their thoughts, said to them . . .”). In both cases εἰδὼς is a causal participle that *precedes* the finite verb. In all four examples the perfect tense grammaticalizes stativity, so the acquisition of knowledge is not in view (i.e., it is not “when Jesus discerned their thoughts he said to them . . .”). The state of knowledge is an ongoing state that was the condition before, during, and after the action of the finite verb. Word order has no bearing in any of these examples on the time of the participle’s “action”¹³ relative to the time of the action of the finite verb.

In Luke 11:21, Jesus says, ὅταν ὁ ἰσχυρὸς **καθωπλισμένος** φυλάσσει τὴν ἑαυτοῦ αὐλήν, ἐν εἰρήνῃ ἐστὶν τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ (“when the strong man, **fully armed**, guards his palace, his possessions are at peace”). Here we have a participle of means that precedes the verb it modifies. The stative aspect does not highlight the activity of the strong man fully arming himself, but the state of being fully armed.¹⁴

In Luke 18:13-14 we find two perfect participles. The first is an attendant circumstance: ὁ δὲ τελώνης μακρόθεν **ἑστῶς** οὐκ ἤθελεν οὐδὲ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐπᾶραι εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν (“the tax collector **stood** far off and did not want to even lift up his eyes to heaven”). This is not to say, however, that the participle has equal weight with the

¹³ I put “action” in quotes because throughout this study the picture that emerges is that the perfect participle not expressing *actions*, but *states*. Therefore it is really out of place to discuss temporality – the states are ongoing, at least beginning before and ending after the actions of the verbs that the participles modify.

¹⁴ This participle almost has the feel of an adjective, but without the article it should be seen as modifying the verb φυλάσσει.

verb ἤθελεν, much less that the perfect participle is more emphasized because it is more heavily marked.¹⁵ On the contrary, ἤθελεν is the main verb of the sentence with ἐστὼς modifying it by expressing the state of the speaker while he was not wanting to lift up his eyes to heaven.

The second participle in this passage would perhaps best be labeled a participle of manner: κατέβη οὗτος **δεδικαιωμένος** εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ (“this man went down to his house **justified**”). While this participle could be seen as adjectival, describing the man himself, it clearly, at least in some sense, defines the manner in which the man returns to his house. This time the participle follows the finite verb. The stative aspect is not surprising, as Jesus was describing the man’s state in going down to his house rather than the justifying action itself.

The next adverbial perfect participle is found in Acts 2:30: προφήτης οὖν ὑπάρχων καὶ **εἰδὼς** ὅτι ὄρκῳ ὤμοσεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς ἐκ καρποῦ τῆς ὀσφύος αὐτοῦ καθίσει ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ, προῖδὼν ἐλάλησεν περὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ Χριστοῦ (“therefore, being a prophet and **knowing** that on oath God had promised him that one from the fruit of his loins would sit on his throne, he foresaw and spoke about the resurrection of the Christ”). Εἰδὼς here is used in much the same way as in Luke 9:47 and 11:17 discussed above, but one additional element of this example is the string of participles. There is a present participle (ὑπάρχων), followed by the perfect participle (εἰδὼς), followed by an aorist participle (προῖδὼν). The first participle is present because ὑπάρχω is aspectually vague and never occurs in the aorist or perfect tenses in the New Testament. It may, however, pick up the aspect of the participle that follows it, as it expresses the state from which David spoke. The final participle is aorist because it is viewing the action of

¹⁵ For a defense of the stative aspect as the most heavily marked, see Porter, 245-251.

foreseeing as a whole and there is no need to use a more heavily marked form. One may observe that the “actions” are listed in the order in which they occur temporally, but this is likely not Luke’s intention in placing them in this order. Luke’s point seems to be that David’s state was 1) being a prophet and 2) knowing the promise, and from this state he foresaw (attendant circumstance) and spoke (perhaps concurrently – when he foresaw the resurrection of the Christ he immediately spoke it). The participles may be in the order in which we find them because the reader can follow the logic more easily when placed in that order, and it may be a coincidence that they seem to line up in the proper temporal order (an observation that only holds if actions and not states are in view).

In Acts 3:12, Peter asks his audience, ἡμῖν τί ἀτενίζετε ὡς ἰδίᾳ δυνάμει ἢ εὐσεβείᾳ **πεποιηκόσιν** τοῦ περιπατεῖν αὐτόν; (“why do you stare at us, as if by our own power or piety we **have made** him walk?”). Here the participle is part of a ὡς clause, but it expresses the possible cause for the main verb ἀτενίζετε, so it could be considered a causal participle that follows the main verb in the sentence, even though if it were considered an “action” one would argue that it temporally precedes the action of the main verb. Instead it is a state. Perhaps Luke chose to use a perfect tense form here to add emphasis by using a more marked form and to consider the *condition* of the apostles that would warrant such stares.

In Acts 5:2 there is a genitive absolute with a perfect participle: Ἀνανίας . . . ἐνοσφίσατο ἀπὸ τῆς τιμῆς, **συνειδυίης** καὶ τῆς γυναικός, καὶ ἐνέγκας μέρος τι παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τῶν ἀποστόλων ἔθηκεν (“Ananias kept some of the value for himself, with his wife also **knowing** about it, and bringing a certain portion, he laid it at the feet of the apostles”). The participle here gives the state of Ananias’ wife as a circumstance

surrounding the keeping back of some of the money, so the participle follows the verb it modifies and describes a concurrent state. The perfect is not used to add emphasis by using a more marked form; rather it is used because it is a stative aspect that Luke wants to communicate. The verbs of this sentence are not in the order they are in because of temporal relationships (the wife likely knew what he was doing before he kept some of it or at least during that process), but because of logical flow – the reader grasps the full weight of what is happening as each successive verb is laid out.

The next adverbial perfect participle is in Acts 9:2: *ἠτήσατο παρ’ αὐτοῦ ἐπιστολὰς εἰς Δαμασκὸν πρὸς τὰς συναγωγάς, ὅπως εἴαν τινὰς εὕρη τῆς ὁδοῦ ὄντας, ἄνδρας τε καὶ γυναῖκας, δεδεμένους ἀγάγῃ εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ* (“he asked him for letters to the synagogue in Damascus, so that if he found some belonging to the Way – men or women – he might bring them **bound** into Jerusalem”). This would probably be best understood as a participle of manner, expressing the manner in which the disciples (the object of the participle) would come to Jerusalem. Because Luke wants to depict the state of being bound rather than the action itself, he uses the perfect tense.

The same perfect passive participle – *δεδεμένος* (“the state of being bound”) – occurs five other times in Acts (Acts 9:21; 12:6; 20:22; 22:5; 24:27).¹⁶ In Acts 9:21 and 24:27 it is used in the same way as in 9:2. The only major difference is that in Acts 24:27 the main verb is *κατέλιπε* (“he left”) instead of *ἀγάγη* (“he might bring”) and in Acts 24:27, the participle *succeeds* the main verb. In Acts 12:6 and 20:22 the word occurs in the nominative case instead of the accusative case, and one time it comes before the main verb (20:22), whereas the other time it comes after the main verb (12:6). The other occurrence of this participle in Acts (22:5) is periphrastic, but it functions almost

¹⁶ It also occurs in Luke 19:30, but it is functioning adjectivally there.

identically to the occurrences in 9:2 and 21. Notably the periphrasis follows the main verb. From this we see a freedom to move the participle to where it fits best rhetorically rather than to place it somewhere that communicates its temporal relationship to the main verb. This is what we would expect if the perfect participle expresses a state with no concern for the action itself.

In Acts 9:8 there is a genitive absolute that functions concessively and precedes the main verb: **ἀνεφωγμένων** δὲ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτοῦ οὐδὲν ἔβλεπεν (“although his eyes **were open**, he saw nothing”). The stative aspect is expected because Luke is speaking not about the action of Paul opening his eyes, but about the state of openness that the eyes are in.

In Acts 11:11, Peter says, referring to when he was at the house of Simon the tanner, τρεῖς ἄνδρες ἐπέστησαν . . . **ἀπεσταλμένοι** ἀπὸ Καισαρείας πρὸς με (“three men approached, **sent** from Caesarea to me”). Here the participle could be considered adjectival, because it gives a fuller picture of who the men are (their status). But it could also be modifying the verb ἐπέστησαν, as if to say “they came because they were sent to me.” This advances the thought that their coming was no coincidence (a thought introduced by the word ἐξαυτῆς [“instantly”] earlier in the sentence). The perfect tense allows Luke to speak to their “sentness” without speaking of the specific act of sending that occurred.

In Acts 16:34, the Philippian jailer ἠγαλλίασατο πανοικεῖ **πεπιστευκῶς** τῷ θεῷ (“rejoiced with his family, **having believed** in God”). The participle here is causal and therefore the action behind it is antecedent in time, and yet the participle follows the main verb. Luke uses the perfect participle because it describes the jailer’s

state from which he was led to rejoice. In other words, Luke is not so concerned with the action of believing as he is with the state of being a believer.

In Acts 20:7, Luke says, Ἐν δὲ τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων **συνηγμένων** ἡμῶν κλάσαι ἄρτον, ὁ Παῦλος διελέγετο αὐτοῖς (“On the first day of the week, as we **were gathered together** to break bread, Paul reasoned with them”). This perfect participle would often be labeled a temporal adverbial participle, but the basic idea is that the context for Paul’s discussion was the regular gathering on the first day of the week. The activity of gathering is not in view, just the state of gatheredness, therefore the perfect tense is the best one for communicating this idea. The gatheredness is concurrent with Paul’s reasoning with them (likely it spans the entire time of Paul’s instruction plus additional time), and yet a perfect participle precedes an imperfect indicative verb.

Acts 20:22 has already been mentioned in the discussion of οἶδα and in the discussion of δεδεμένος (on 9:22 above). Is there significance to the word order, though? Καὶ νῦν ἰδοὺ **δεδεμένος** ἐγὼ τῷ πνεύματι πορεύομαι εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ συναντήσοντά μοι μὴ **εἰδώς** (“And now, behold, I, being **bound** by the Spirit, am going to Jerusalem, not **knowing** the things that will happen to me there”). Both δεδεμένος and εἰδώς communicate the circumstances under which he goes (present indicative) to Jerusalem. Viewing each verb as separate events, we could say the order of events is: 1) Paul is bound by the Spirit, 2) Paul cannot figure out what will happen to him there, and 3) Paul goes to Jerusalem. Clearly #2 as an event *precedes* #3 because once Paul accomplishes #3, #2 is no longer true. One could argue that δεδεμένος precedes εἰδώς in the sentence because the event described by the former precedes the event described by the latter. But if the past action is not necessarily conceived of in the use of a perfect

participle, then this argumentation is faulty. Instead Paul describes the condition in which he goes to Jerusalem. Word order does not establish temporality in this sentence any more than in any other sentence. Rather word order gives Paul a way to communicate his message in a rhetorical way. First he gives the fact that he is δεδεμένος . . . τῷ πνεύματι, because this expression sets the stage for the indicative verb in such a way that everyone knows they cannot prevent Paul from doing what he says he is going to do. It is out of a state of boundedness to the Spirit that Paul is going. Then Paul actually says what he is doing – πορεύομαι εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ – and finally he climaxes with an expression that communicates the full weight of this decision – τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ συναντήσοντά μοι μὴ εἰδώς. Perhaps the word order does not establish relative temporality so much as rhetorical effect.

In Acts 21:40, it says ἐπιτρέψαντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ὁ Παῦλος ἐστῶς ἐπὶ τῶν ἀναβαθμῶν κατέσεισεν τῇ χειρὶ τῷ λαῷ (“when [the commander] gave him permission, Paul, **standing** on the steps, motioned to the crowd with his hand”). Here we have an adverbial aorist participle followed by an adverbial perfect participle followed by an aorist indicative. Rather than viewing the standing as being antecedent to the motioning to the crowd, it is best to see standing as the state Paul was in when he began his speech. The action itself is not in view. Whether that state began before or after the commander giving permission is irrelevant and cannot be deduced from this sentence.

In Acts 24:21, Paul says he ἐκέκραξα ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐστῶς (“cried out while standing among them”). Here again the perfect participle describes Paul’s state while he was crying out. He happened to be in that state both preceding and following the action

of the aorist indicative verb. If temporality is a concern at all in this expression, it is merely to say that this was his state concurrent with the action of the main verb.

In the following verse (24:22), Luke says, Ἀνεβάλετο δὲ αὐτοὺς ὁ Φῆλιξ, ἀκριβέστερον εἰδὼς τὰ περὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ (“But Felix adjourned them, accurately knowing the things concerning the Way”). As in 24:21, the perfect participle follows the aorist indicative verb and it describes the state Felix was in when the action of the main verb transpired. There is no interest in the past action (how Felix obtained this knowledge); Luke merely wants to make it known that Felix was familiar with the Way when he responded to Paul in Acts 24:22. Notably, this verse is one of many that presents evidence against the argument that οἶδα is functionally a present tense verb, because under that model a present participle following an aorist indicative is typically understood to give concurrent action, but Felix accurately knew about the Way before this began. Verses like this make better sense when the meaning of the perfect participle is properly understood.

Conclusion. By way of summary of the twenty-five instances in Luke-Acts where the perfect participle functions adverbially, we can make a number of significant observations. First, Daniel Wallace’s claim that adverbial perfect participles are “almost always” causal¹⁷ does not hold for Luke-Acts. Of the twenty-five adverbial perfect participles, eight (32%) function causally, six (24%) communicate manner, three (12%) communicate means, two (8%) give concessions, two give attendant circumstances

¹⁷ Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 631.

(8%), one (4%) gives the reason, and three (12%) function more generally in giving circumstances surrounding the action of the main verb.¹⁸

Second, viewing the perfect tense as a means for grammaticalizing stativity gives a better model for understanding adverbial perfect participles. In each case the state expressed by the participle is an ongoing state that began before the action of the main verb and continues on beyond the action of the main verb. This calls into question temporal models, which cannot be sustained by this data. Any attempt to argue for temporal relationships to be expressed by word order cannot stand. The following chart demonstrates the flexibility with which Luke orders adverbial participles.

<i>Function of Participle</i>	<i>Participle Precedes Main Verb</i>	<i>Participle Follows Main Verb</i>
Causal	3	5
Manner	1	1
Means	2	1
Concession	1	1
Attendant Circumstance	1	1
Reason	0	1
General	2	1
Total	12	13

This leads to the third observation, that word order is a rhetorical tool that may or may not coincide with temporal relationships.

The final observation to be made is that the action that brought about the state is often not in view when the perfect participle is used in Luke-Acts. This in itself is evidence that Porter's argument that the perfect tense grammaticalizes stativity is a

¹⁸ While some would categorize these last three "temporal," it is better to view them as giving more general circumstances surrounding the main verb, because they do not express temporality any more than any of the other adverbial perfect participles. To be sure, the state is coincidental with the action (and therefore the action that brought about the state is antecedent) in each of these three cases, but that can be said to be true of all twenty-five adverbially perfect participles in Luke-Acts.

stronger argument than Campbell's, which holds that stativity is more a matter of lexis and that the perfect tense grammaticalizes imperfective aspect with heightened proximity, intensity, or prominence.¹⁹ Campbell's model does not work if the action that brings about the state is not considered in perfect participles. These four observations will be further confirmed as we look at other verbal uses of the perfect participle in Luke-Acts.

Perfect Participles in Indirect Discourse

The perfect participle is used in indirect discourse eight times in Luke and ten times in Acts. In each occurrence the participle follows the main verb and is in the accusative case, with the exception of Luke 1:11, which puts the participle in the nominative case because it uses a passive main verb. Of the fifteen clauses that contain these participles, eight have εὐρίσκω, two θεωρέω, two εἶδον, one ὁράω, one βλέπω, and one γινώσκω as the main verb. Luke 1:11 is the first example of indirect discourse in Luke that uses a perfect participle: ὤφθη δὲ αὐτῷ ἄγγελος κυρίου **ἑστῶς** ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου τοῦ θυμιάματος (“And there appeared to him an angel of the Lord **standing** at the right side of the altar of incense”). The perfect participle ἑστῶς is the most common perfect participle in indirect discourse in Luke-Acts (five out of eighteen occurrences [28%]). In fact, the present and aorist participles of ἵστημι never occur in indirect discourse in Luke-Acts, because in all five texts where this word occurs in indirect discourse it is speaking to the state of the person who is seen or found. In none of the cases is there evidence that a specific past action is in mind.

¹⁹ Constantine R. Campbell, *Verbal Aspect, the Indicative Mood, and Narrative: Soundings in the Greek of the New Testament* (Studies in Biblical Greek 13; New York: Peter Lang, 2007), 172-4, 185-187, 207.

In Luke 2:12, the angel says to the shepherds, εὐρήσετε βρέφος **ἐσπαργανωμένον** καὶ κείμενον ἐν φάτνῃ (“you will find a baby **swaddled** and lain in a manger”). Here the first participle is perfect and the second is present. While it is strange that the second participle is not in the perfect tense, even though it clearly communicates a stative idea in the context, it should be noted that nowhere in the New Testament or in the LXX does κείμαι occur outside of the present and imperfect tenses. Perhaps the stative aspect of ἐσπαργανωμένον carries over, then, to κείμενον. Also noteworthy in this verse is that the actions behind these states would chronologically have occurred in the order that the participles are presented, but again it is context rather than syntax that reveals this, although statistically it seems to be more likely for the first participle to be antecedent to the second because this is the normal order of presentation when telling a story or making a logical argument.

In Luke 8:35, it says of the Gerasenes, εὗρον καθήμενον τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἀφ’ οὗ τὰ δαιμόνια ἐξῆλθεν **ἱματισμένον** καὶ σωφρονοῦντα παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ (“they found the man from whom the demons had gone out sitting, **dressed**, and sane by the feet of Jesus”). Here the first and third participles are present, while the middle one is perfect. If one were to consider the actions involved – sitting, dressing, and becoming sane – they likely would have occurred in the opposite order from which they are presented. This is further evidence that word order in participles communicates rhetoric rather than temporality. One would expect all three participles to be in the perfect tense, but neither κάθημαι nor σωφρονέω ever occurs in the perfect tense in any mood in the New Testament or in the Septuagint, so it may be that it is standard for these words to occur in the present tense. It cannot be held that the perfect tense denotes antecedent

time and the present tense denotes contemporaneous time. All three participles – if viewed as states – are contemporaneous (as well as at least slightly antecedent and subsequent) to the discovery by the Gerasenes. If viewed as actions that bring about the states, all three are antecedent.

Luke 8:46 is an interesting example because the subject of the participle is the word δύναμις: ἐγὼ γὰρ ἔγνων δύναμιν ἐξεληλυθυῖαν ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ (“for I know that power **has gone out** from me”). One way of understanding this syntactically would be to suggest that Jesus is in the state of having had power leave him, but Jesus is not the subject of the participle, δύναμις is. How could δύναμις be in a state or condition? Perhaps the idea is that the power Jesus had in him is now in the state of having gone out. The use of the perfect instead of the aorist could also add emphasis, since the perfect is the more heavily marked form.

In Luke 11:25 we find two perfect participles in indirect discourse: καὶ ἔλθὼν εὕρισκει **σεσαρωμένον** καὶ **κεκοσμημένον** (“and when [the unclean spirit] comes, it finds [the house] **swept** and **put in order**”). Because the emphasis is on the state of the house when the unclean spirit returns and not on the actions themselves of sweeping and ordering, it is not surprising for Luke to use perfect participles. Similarly, in Luke 24:2, being “rolled away” is the state of the stone by the tomb. Because the rolling away itself is not what the women saw, it makes sense for Luke to use a perfect participle to depict the “rolled-awayness” of the stone. In Luke 24:33, the two men who went to find the disciples did not see that they were gathering together, but found them in the state of already having gathered together, so again Luke uses the perfect participle.

Acts 4:14 is similar to Luke 1:11 with the use of ἴστημι and so it does not need to be dealt with again. Acts 5:23 also uses the perfect participle of ἴστημι but has a second perfect participle in the construction: τὸ δεσμοκτήριον εὗρομεν **κεκλεισμένον** ἐν πάσῃ ἀσφαλείᾳ καὶ τοὺς φύλακας **ἐστῶτας** ἐπὶ τῶν θυρῶν (“we found the prison securely **locked** and the guards **standing** at the doors”). Both of these participles make sense as perfect tenses since they describe the state things were found in. In Acts 7:55, Stephen saw Jesus “standing at the right hand of God.” Again, standing was his state, not an action that Stephen was watching. Then in the following verse Stephen says, ἰδοὺ θεωρῶ τοὺς οὐρανοὺς **διηνοιγμένους** καὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκ δεξιῶν **ἐστῶτα** τοῦ θεοῦ (“behold, I see the heavens **opened** and the Son of Man **standing** at the right hand of God”). He does not see the event in which the heavens open up or Jesus first comes to stand at the right hand of God, but he is seeing this state of affairs.

In Acts 10:11 Peter θεωρεῖ τὸν οὐρανὸν **ἀνεωγμένον** καὶ καταβαῖνον σκευὸς τι ὡς ὀθόνην μεγάλην τέσσαρσιν ἀρχαῖς καθιέμενον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (“sees heaven **opened** and something like a great sheet descending, by its four corners being lowered to the earth”). This verse is very similar to Acts 7:56, but the participles in the second part of the verse are in the present tense because he is witnessing the process unfolding, whereas heaven itself he is just seeing in the state of openness. In Acts 10:27, Peter went into Cornelius’ house and εὕρισκει **συνεληλυθότας** πολλοὺς (“found many **gathered**”). As in Luke 24:33, the gathering was not an action witnessed by Peter; rather it is the state of gatheredness that Luke is depicting. Similarly in Acts 16:27, the jailer saw that the prison doors were opened, and in Acts 24:18, Paul was found **ἡγνισμένον** (“**purified**”) in the temple – the actions of opening and purifying are not in view, but the resultant state.

Conclusion. In this survey of perfect participles functioning in indirect discourse, we see further confirmation of the thesis that the perfect tense grammaticalizes stativity without regard for the initial action that brought about the state. We also see that in the Lukan corpus the participle always follows the verb of perception in indirect discourse and that it is always in the accusative case, except when the verb of perception is passive. And finally we have seen more evidence that word order is a rhetorical device, not a method of communicating temporality.

Periphrastic Perfect Participles

We will not be able to deal with periphrastic perfect participles as rigorously in this paper, but a few observations should be made. It can be difficult to distinguish between a periphrasis and an εἶμι verb with a participle functioning as a predicate adjective, and perhaps lines should not be so neatly drawn, but Boyer gives some guidelines that are helpful:

First, those places where the verbal sense seemed to be primarily in the participle, where the connecting verb was “semantically empty,” were classified as periphrastic. Those in which the copulative verb seemed to be predicating to the subject some quality, act or state expressed by the participle were classified as predicate adjectives. This factor also explains why the periphrastic construction is made a part of the “verbal” uses of the participle, for in such instances the participle does in fact express “the verb” of the clause. Second, where the participle appears in a list of predications along with predicate adjectives or predicate complements, its parallelism with the other predicates was taken to indicate its own predicate nature, even when it could well have been taken as periphrastic if it had stood alone.²⁰

²⁰ James L. Boyer, “The Classification of Participles: A Statistical Study,” *Grace Theological Journal* 5 (1984): 163-179, quotation from 167-168.

According to this model, one can find forty periphrastic perfect participles in Luke-Acts, but again, it is difficult to distinguish a periphrastic from an εἰμί verb with a participle functioning as a predicate adjective. This is especially complex with the perfect participle since it expresses the state of the subject rather than an action that the subject is performing. So in Luke 5:18 and Acts 9:33, is ἦν παραλελυμένος (“was paralyzed”) functioning more verbally or adjectivally? If it is merely an adjective with no verbal idea, why not use παραλυτικός? Then again, Luke never uses παραλυτικός, but twice uses παραλελυμένος substantivally. At the same time, Porter has argued convincingly that adjectival participles retain their aspectuality,²¹ so we would expect even adjectival participles to carry verbal connotations. But if this were merely functioning adjectivally, why place it in a ὅς clause at all? In Luke 8:2 there is a similar construction: καὶ γυναῖκές τινες αἱ ἦσαν **τεθεραπευμένοι** ἀπὸ πνευμάτων πονηρῶν καὶ ἀσθενειῶν, Μαρία ἢ καλουμένη Μαγδαληνή, ἀφ’ ἧς δαιμόνια ἑπτὰ ἐξεληλύθει . . . (“and some women who were **healed** from evil spirits and diseases: Mary who is called Magdalene, from whom seven demons had gone out, . . .”). The parallelism between the αἱ clause and the ἀφ’ ἧς clause here suggests that the perfect participle is functioning similar to the perfect indicative ἐξεληλύθει. So there seems to be more of a verbal feel to this kind of ὅς-ἦν clause. But even here the distinctions cannot be pressed hard, for really the participle functions like a verb in many ways and also like an adjective in many ways.

In the forty periphrastic perfect participles it is easy to see stativity as the idea that is communicated. So in Luke 5:1 the point is not that Jesus stood up by the lake of Gennesaret, but that he was in a state of standing by the lake. In Luke 5:17 the point is not that the Pharisees were in the process of coming, but that they were in the state of

²¹ Porter, 454.

having come from every town. In Luke 5:18 there is no thought of the act of becoming paralyzed, but what is in view is the state of being paralyzed. In Luke 8:2 it is not the coming out of the evil spirits and the diseases that is in view, but the state that the women were in of having been delivered. In Luke 9:32 Peter was in the state of sleepiness. In Luke 9:45 it is not an action of concealing the meaning of the saying that is in view, but the state of its concealedness. And most of the other periphrastic perfect participles in Luke-Acts are just as clearly stative.

The few examples where this is a little less certain are Luke 2:26; 4:16, 17; 23:15; Acts 20:13; and 21:29. Luke 2:26 is perhaps stative in that the emphasis is not on the revelation to Simeon itself, but on the fact that the state of this knowledge was that it had been revealed. Luke 4:16 (. . . Ναζαρά, οὗ ἦν τεθραμμένος, . . . [“. . . Nazareth, where he was brought up, . . .”]) is more difficult to understand statively, but perhaps the idea is that when Jesus is in Nazareth he is in the state of being in the place where he was brought up. In Luke 4:17 Jesus finds the place in Isaiah where the prophecy is written. Because what is important is the current state of the prophecy (its writtenness) rather than the writing itself, he uses the perfect participle.

Luke 23:15 (ἰδοὺ οὐδὲν ἄξιον θανάτου ἐστὶν πεπραγμένον αὐτῷ, “behold, nothing warranting death has been done by him”) is difficult because the ongoing state seems to apply to the object rather than the subject, but perhaps Luke uses the perfect participle because he is not looking at specific events, but a condition which involves both the subject (οὐδὲν) and the indirect object (αὐτῷ). When Luke wants to address the action itself, he uses the aorist participle, such as in Acts 19:19 (τῶν τὰ περίεργα πραξάντων, “those who practiced witchcraft”). Acts 20:13 is also difficult because the

ongoing state seems to apply more to the object than to the subject: ἐκεῖθεν μέλλοντες ἀναλαμβάνειν τὸν Παῦλον· οὕτως γὰρ διατεταγμένος ἦν (“we had intended to take Paul aboard there, for thus he had arranged”); but again the act of Paul’s arranging things is not in view so much as the state of the arrangedness, and this state applies to the subject as well as to the object – not only was this plan in the state of having been arranged, but Paul was in the state of having arranged this plan.

Finally, in Acts 21:29 Luke could have used an aorist participle to speak of the people having previously seen Trophimus with Paul in Jerusalem, but Luke is not highlighting the event, but the state the people were in of having seen this and how that state affected them in their present actions. So while a few examples are not as easily explained by the idea of stativity it can still account for all of them.

A few other periphrastic constructions are noteworthy. In Acts 5:25 the periphrasis also contains both a perfect participle and a present participle: ἰδοὺ οἱ ἄνδρες οὓς ἔθεσθε ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ εἰσὶν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ **ἑστῶτες** καὶ διδάσκοντες τὸν λαόν (“behold, the men whom you put in prison are **standing** in the temple and *teaching* the people”). Here ἴστημι occurs as a perfect participle because the activity of standing up is not in view, but the state of standing is. On the contrary, the teaching is an unfolding process that warrants the present tense. It is difficult to determine which is to be more emphasized – is it more significant that the men who were locked up are now standing somewhere else or that they are doing the very thing the chief priests did not want to happen, teaching? Both are likely emphatic here, which is probably why they are both placed in this periphrastic construction, and neither tense form highlights one over the other in this case.

Acts 12:12 is very similar with a perfect participle and a present participle standing together in a periphrastic construction. Again it is difficult to establish which is more emphatic. It is clearly significant that the people were praying for Peter, as this was emphasized already in verse 5. So when Luke says that the house of Mary is οὗ ἦσαν ἱκανοὶ συνηθροισμένοι καὶ προσευχόμενοι (“where many were gathered together and were praying”), he wants to communicate why Peter went there, what was going on there, and that it happened to be in a moment of earnest prayer. Whether the perfect participle or the present participle receives more weight is unclear.

In Acts 16:9 it says a man from Macedonia ἦν ἐστὼς καὶ παρακαλῶν αὐτὸν καὶ λέγων . . . (“was **standing** and urging him and saying, . . .”). Again the perfect participle establishes the state of the man while the present participles express his activities. And similarly in Acts 22:20, Paul says, αὐτὸς ἤμην ἐφεστὼς καὶ συνευδοκῶν καὶ φυλάσσων τὰ ἱμάτια τῶν ἀναιρούντων αὐτόν (“I myself was **standing** and approving and guarding the clothes of the men who were killing him”). Here again the perfect participle highlights the state of Paul, while the present participles show the actions that were unfolding from that state – Paul was there, and this is how he responded to their conduct.

One last observation to be made regarding periphrastics in Luke-Acts is that the participle typically follows the auxiliary verb (33/40=83%). It may be that the exceptions to this are ordered as they are to emphasize the participle. So in Luke 20:6, the chief priests and scribes say of the people, **πεπεισμένος** . . . ἐστὶν Ἰωάννην προφήτην εἶναι (“they are **convinced** that John was a prophet”), and in Luke 24:38, Jesus asks, τί **τεταραγμένοι** ἐστέ καὶ διὰ τί διαλογισμοὶ ἀναβαίνουσιν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν; (“Why are

you **troubled**, and why do doubts arise in your hearts?’). But Luke may have other reasons for placing the participle first.

Conclusion. In these examples we again see the stative aspect communicated by the perfect participle, often with no regard for the action that brought about the state. Sometimes periphrasis is used to add emphasis to the idea of the participle, but sometimes it is not. For example, in Luke 5:1 there does not seem to be a reason to emphasize ἐστώς, whereas in Acts 25:10 Paul’s state of standing before the Caesar’s tribunal is something to be highlighted.²² More work needs to be done on periphrastic perfect participles in Luke-Acts, but this brief study lays a foundation with some preliminary observations.

Conclusion

Having considered all of the verbal perfect participles in Luke-Acts, we see evidence that Porter’s conception of the perfect tense as grammaticalizing stativity and as having no temporal meaning is correct. We also see that perfect participles describe a state that is usually, if not always, concurrent with the action of the main verb. That state may have been initiated by a past action, but the past action itself is not in view when the perfect participle is used. We see that word order does not indicate a temporal relationship, nor does it suggest how the participle is functioning in relation to the main verb (what type of adverbial use is being employed). Rather, word order is a rhetorical device, which often coincides with temporal relationships only because an author is more likely to present things in the order in which they occurred. We have challenged the thesis that adverbial perfect participles are usually causal. And finally it should be noted

²² So Turner, 88, and C. K. Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, vol. 2 (New York: T. & T. Clark, 1998), 1128-1129.

that there were places where an aorist participle would have described an event just as accurately as the perfect participle, which suggests that the difference between the two is not *Aktionsart*, but the author's subjective portrayal of the action (aspect).

More work needs to be done on the perfect participle. A survey of the adjectival uses would further the discussion. Do adjectival participles maintain the aspectuality of their tenses? A comparison of the results of this study with studies of other corpora would also illuminate how standard these principles are and how much of this is related to idiolect.²³ A deeper exploration of the periphrastic participles may produce rich results as well. The perfect participle has a wide range of functions in Luke-Acts, as it does throughout the New Testament, and it has been commonly misunderstood by scholars and translators. Therefore it is imperative for scholars to continue to explore this grammatical form to understand its significance and assist in unlocking the depths of the message of Scripture.

²³ For one such study of the book of Galatians with similar conclusions, see T. R. Hatina, "The Perfect Tense-Form in Recent Debate: Galatians as a Case Study," *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 8 (1995): 3-22.

Bibliography

- Barrett, C. K. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. Volume 2. New York: T. & T. Clark, 1998.
- Blass, F., and A. Debrunner. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Translated by Robert W. Funk. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Boyer, James L. "The Classification of Participles: A Statistical Study." *Grace Theological Journal* 5 (1984): 163-179.
- Campbell, Constantine R. *Verbal Aspect, the Indicative Mood, and Narrative: Soundings in the Greek of the New Testament*. Studies in Biblical Greek 13. New York: Peter Lang, 2007.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Gospel According to Luke*. Volume 2. The Anchor Bible 28A. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, 1985.
- Hatina, T. R. "The Perfect Tense-Form in Recent Debate: Galatians as a Case Study." *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 8 (1995): 3-22.
- McKay, K. L. "On the Perfect and Other Aspects in New Testament Greek." *Novum Testamentum* 23 (1981): 289-329.
- Porter, Stanley E. *Verbal Aspect in the Greek New Testament, with Reference to Tense and Mood*. Studies in Biblical Greek 1. New York: Peter Lang, 1989.
- Reiling, J., and J. L. Swellengrebel. *A Handbook on the Gospel of Luke*. UBS Handbook Series. New York: United Bible Societies, 1971.
- Robertson, A. T. *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*. Fourth edition. New York: Hodder & Stoughton, 1923.
- Turner, N. *Syntax*. Volume 3 of *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*. Edited by J. H. Moulton. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963.
- Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.
- Zerwick, Maximilian. *Biblical Greek Illustrated by Examples*. Translated by Joseph Smith. Rome: Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici, 1963.