

Updated 26 September 2008

## Reviews

This file contains excerpts of Reviews on *The Development of Greek and the New Testament: Morphology, Syntax, Phonology, and Textual Transmission* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 167), Tübingen: Mohr, 1004, xx + 732 pp. Hard covers: € 129.00. Corrected Reprint in Paperback: Baker Academic, January 1, 2007, US \$69.00.

Here are the more substantial reviews as they appear:

- Prof Peter van der Horst (Utrecht) in *Nederlands Theologische Tijdschrift* 59, 1 (2005), pp. 21-30

*Here follow a few brief excerpts from Prof van der Horst's review:*

Het hier te bespreken werk is het *magnum opus* van de Griekse geleerde Chrys Caragounis, hoogleraar Nieuwe Testament aan de universiteit van Lund. Wat hij in dit omvangrijke werk duidelijk wil maken is dat nieuwtestamentici bij de bestudering van de Griekse tekst van het NT ten onrechte en tot hun schade geen aandacht besteden aan het latere Grieks, d.w.z. het Byzantijns en Nieuwgrieks. Hij wordt niet moe te betogen dat het onderscheid tussen het oude klassieke Grieks en het Byzantijnse en moderne Grieks een kunstmatig onderscheid is omdat er in feite een veel grotere mate van continuïteit en eenheid en een veel geringere mate van verandering in de geschiedenis van deze taal te constateren valt dan in vrijwel alle andere talen.

...

Wie nu echter modern Grieks hoort spreken zal met zijn of haar kennis van het oude Grieks er weinig van verstaan, maar, zo zegt Caragounis, dat is de schuld van Erasmus die in 1528 de uitspraak van het (klassieke) Grieks vastlegde op een wijze die voor alle latere geslachten volkomen verduisterde dat de huidige uitspraak van het Grieks in feite al gebruikelijk was in de tijd van het NT, zelfs al eerder. Ook in dat opzicht is er dus een veel grotere continuïteit dan men op grond van de door ons aangeleerde uitspraak geneigd is aan te nemen. In het algemeen kan men constateren, aldus terecht Caragounis, dat het NT in taalhistorisch opzicht dichterbij het moderne Grieks dan bij dat van Homerus staat.<sup>4</sup>

...

Er zijn talloze bewijzen dat 'the present Greek pronunciation was in all essentials establishing itself already in the Vth and IVth c. B.C.' (391). Alle reden dus om de Erasmiaanse uitspraak definitief overboord te zetten. Dat ben ik hartgrondig met Caragounis eens.<sup>15</sup> Maar wat is nu de relevantie van dit alles voor de studie van het Nieuwe Testament? Aan deze vraag zijn de laatste twee hoofdstukken van het boek (samen ca. 175 pagina's) gewijd.

...

Een mooi voorbeeld daarvan is 1 Kor. 13:3, waar de thans meest gangbare edities lezen 'al zou ik mijn lichaam overleveren *hina kauchêsômai* (om te roemen) maar had de liefde niet, dan baat het mij niets'. De variant is *hina kauthêsômai* of *kauthêsomai* (om me te laten verbranden). Caragounis toont eerst aan dat *kauthêsômai* niet de 'grammatical monstrosity' is waarvoor text-critici als Bruce Metzger het houden (het is een uit taalhistorisch oogpunt acceptabele vorm) maar een door gelijklopende uitspraak ontstane variëteit schrijfwijze van *kauthêsomai*. Dat impliceert dat de lezing *kauthêsomai* een veel bredere handschriftensteun heeft dan wanneer men alleen naar die manuscripten kijkt die het woord met een *omikron* spellen en dat *kauthêsomai* daarmee veel sterker dan *kauchêsomai* komt te staan. Daarbij komt nog dat de apostel in de doordachte structuur van deze hele passage (1 Kor. 13:1-3) toewerkt naar een climax waarbij 'het lichaam overleveren' alleen maar het ultieme offer kan aanduiden als het wordt gevolgd door een noodzakelijk complement, namelijk 'Om verbrand te worden'. Hier zou 'om op te roemen' alleen maar misstaan. Kortom: niet *kauchêsomai* maar *kauthêsomai* is de juiste lezing hier (anders dan Nestle-Aland en The Greek New Testament). Dat het bij Paulus verder niet voorkomende werkwoord voor 'verbranden' werd vervangen door het bij hem veel voorkomende 'roemen' - zeker bij vrijwel gelijklopende uitspraak - laat zich gemakkelijk denken.

Tot zover een beknopte en daardoor vaak sterk vereenvoudigende weergave van de visie van Chrys Caragounis. Het boek wordt besloten met 150 pagina's bibliografie en uitputtende indices.

Dit boeiende boek, dat ik in veler handen wens ... De lezer zal hebben gemerkt dat de recensent grote sympathie voor het Anliegen van Caragounis heeft en bewondering voor zijn enorme belezenheid in de Griekse literatuur aller eeuwen en zijn daarop gebaseerde standpunten.

...

we hier te maken hebben met een indrukwekkend werk waarvan gehoopt mag worden dat het nieuwtestamentici de ogen opent voor belangrijke maar verwaarloosde aspecten van de taal van het NT en dat het hun linguïstische horizon zal verbreden.

*For the sake of those not acquainted with Dutch, I translate the first and last two paragraphs:*

“The work that is being reviewed here is the *magnum opus* of the Greek scholar Chrys Caragounis, professor of New Testament at the University of Lund. What he wants to make clear in this massive work is that New Testament scholars in studying the Greek text of the NT mistakenly and to their own detriment have failed to take account of the later Greek, that is to say, Byzantine and Neohellenic. He is never tired to emphasize that the difference between the old, classical Greek and Byzantine and Neohellenic is an artificial distinction since, in fact, it can be shown that there is a much greater measure of continuity and unity between them and a much smaller measure of change in the history of this language than in perhaps all other languages.

...

This fascinating book, that I wish came to many hands ... The reader will have noticed that the reviewer has great sympathy with the concerns of Caragounis and admiration for his enormously wide reading in the Greek literature of all ages and his thereon based standpoints.

...

Here we have to do with an impressive work, whereby it is hoped that New Testament scholars will open their eyes to important but neglected aspects of the language of the New Testament and that this will broaden their linguistic horizon”.

• Prof J. Keith Elliott (Leeds) in *Novum Testamentum* 47, 4 (2005) 394-96

*Excerpts from Prof Keith Elliott's review:*

Chrys Caragounis is Professor of New Testament at Lund and is in an enviably unique position to write a book on the history of the Greek language and the New Testament's place in that story because he is an expert linguist and grammarian highly competent in and familiar with contemporary Biblical scholarship as well as having Greek as his mother tongue. He thus not only has an easy familiarity with classical and Biblical Greek but a ready awareness of modern usage.

...This book ... aims to demonstrate the unity of the language — its vocabulary, morphology and syntax from its earliest times right up to the present. ... Caragounis claims that this is merely a first attempt at such a history and he regularly expresses the wish to coax others to follow his significant leads.

I hope they do, for he writes with erudition, perceptiveness — and passion.

... He shows how Neohellenic and New Testament (Koine) Greek are inheritors of and contributors to the continuing legacy of the Greek language ...

Part II plots developments of morphology and syntax. This well- researched section on grammar has the effect of demonstrating, with numerous examples, how New Testament Greek and modern Greek stand closely together. He then gives a number of well-chosen and telling examples of how an awareness of the development of Greek from New Testament times onwards can assist in exegesis. ... There is much meat in all these (and other such) discussions and they show clearly that Caragounis' thesis is no 'mere' history but has innumerable applications for exegesis.

Part III is headed 'Pronunciation, Communication and Textual Transmission', in other words it deals with sound, style, rhetoric and diatribe. He shows how an awareness of such matters can help resolve textual variants. Again, he gives us good, telling examples. ...

One recurrent complaint by Caragounis throughout the book is that because Western scholarship has adopted the artificial pronunciation, promoted originally by Erasmus, it has not been aware of or alert to the syntax, vocabulary and use of the spoken language. Had it done so, it may have avoided the many howlers and erroneous exegesis Caragounis mercilessly —and wisely— exposes. By looking only to Koine or LXX usage many modern scholars ignore the latter examples that Caragounis himself utilises to illuminate much in New Testament usage. Because of his own privileged position, Caragounis is able to criticise alleged misdirections

and misinformation purveyed by modern commentators and exegetes, and thereby he provides a welcome antidote and often a refreshingly new line of inquiry and explanation.

...

There are important discussions about Atticism. ...

The Indexes cover some 150 pages and are impressive in their comprehensiveness and detail. ... These, together with the very full and detailed footnotes throughout in which we have splendidly full examples from a range of literature, not least modern Greek, are further testimony to Caragounis' scholarship, industry and mastery of the material ...

This highly readable survey is a veritable mine of information and detailed scholarship and is to be highly recommended to all scholars of the Greek New Testament.

• Dr Evangelia Dafni (Essen, Germany) in *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 131, 11 (2006), Cols. 1146-1150

*A shortened version of Dr E. Dafni's review:*

Der Hellene, Chrys C. Caragounis, Inhaber einer Professur für Neutestamentliche Exegese an der Universität Lund in Schweden, der bereits namhafte neutestamentliche Abhandlungen veröffentlicht hat, bietet uns in diesem umfangreichen Band, der m.E. die schöpferische Leistung seines bisherigen wissenschaftlichen Lebens katexochen darstellt, einen holistischen und historisch wohl begründeten Zugang zu der *Sprache der Hellenen*. Er hebt ihre Einheit und ununterbrochene, mündliche und schriftliche Tradierung von der Mykenischen *Linear B* bis zur Neuhellenischen Koine (Katharevousa and Demotiki) hervor, mit dem Ziel, ihre ausgesprochen große Wichtigkeit für die Neutestamentliche Exegese und Hermeneutik für Nicht-Muttersprachler plausibel zu machen. Im Mittelpunkt seiner Betrachtung steht die Tatsache, dass die Hellenische (Griechische) Sprache als ein lebendiger Organismus, der quantitativ aufwächst und sich qualitativ entwickelt, eine der drei ältesten schriftlich überlieferten Indoeuropäischen Sprachen (Sanskrit, Hellenisch und Hettitisch) ist und die älteste heute noch gesprochene europäische Sprache darstellt. Obwohl sie keine Töchtersprachen geboren hat, kann sie eine lückenlose schriftliche Dokumentierung von über 3.500 Jahren nachweisen ...

Seine Untersuchung verläuft entlang zweierlei Fäden, d.i. Diachronie und Akustik (bzw. Phonetik) und will der Rehabilitation der Sprache der Hellenen

dienen, die seit ihrer von Desiderius Erasmus 1528 eingeführten künstlichen Aussprache, die weder epigraphisch noch papyrologisch eine Stütze findet und dabei das hellenische, erlesene Sprachgefühl tief verletzt, geplagt wird. Denn die Einführung dieser künstlichen Aussprache geht von einem logischen Fehlschluss aus, nämlich dass die Sprache der Hellenen, die zugleich die Sprache des Neuen Testaments ist, eine tote Sprache sei. Man glaubt seither, dass zwischen ihr und dem Neugriechischen die allertiefste Kluft bestehe, die weder die Nachklassische, noch die Byzantinische, noch die Metabyzantinische und Neuhellenische Literatur zu überbrücken vermögen. Daher wurde die Sprache des Neuen Testaments - und der Meinung der Rz. nach ebenso die Sprache der Septuaginta - isoliert betrachtet, als ob sie zwei Fremdkörper im gesamten lebendigen Organismus der Sprache der Hellenen wären. Und da es angeblich keine kompetenten Muttersprachler (*native speaker*) gäbe, um sie zu befragen, dürfte man in der Abgeschiedenheit dieser von Erasmus künstlich gefertigten Idylle Phantasiegebilde auch in Bezug auf die Aussprache durchsetzen. Wie Caragounis in seinem ganzen Werk zeigt, die Aussprache des Griechischen bzw. der Sprache der Hellenen, ist nicht bloß eine Sache der variierenden Betonung eines Wortes und der Sprachmelodie, sondern sie beeinflusst entscheidend die Wortbedeutung, die Einzelformulierungen und die Textkommunikation. Auf sie gehen sowohl unzählige Textvarianten in der handschriftlichen Überlieferung als auch Miss- und Fehldeutungen des Neuen Testaments vom größten Ausmaß zurück.

Das hier zu besprechende Werk von C. gliedert sich in drei Teile: Der erste Teil [Kap. 1-2 (17-92): *Evolution and relevance*], der zweite Teil [Kap. 3-5 (93-336): *Developments in Morphology and Syntax*], der dritte Teil (Kap. 6-8 (337-564): *Pronunciation, Communication and Textual Transmission*]. Abgerundet wird es mit einer Zusammenfassung der wichtigsten Forschungsergebnisse, eingeteilt nach Einzelkapiteln (565-582). Daran schließt sich ein ausführlicher bibliographischer Katalog (583-732) mit Abkürzungsverzeichnis (583-587) an. Der sekundären Literatur (618-642) vorangestellt werden Namen und Werken von hellenischen Autoren aus allen Sprachperioden (590-641), auf die der Vf. in sinnvoller Weise Bezug genommen hat. Es folgen Indizes von Autoren (643-650), Bibelstellen (651-669), Editionen und Übersetzungen des Neuen Testaments (670f.), hellenischen Texten (672-709), Namen und Themen (710-732).

Kapitel 1 wendet sich der Einheit der Hellenischen Sprache in all ihren Entwicklungsphasen zu, von der Mykenischen Zeit bis heute, und betont ihre Relevanz für die Neutestamentlichen Studien. Eine tiefgreifende, wertende Darstellung der wichtigsten Momente in der Geschichte der Sprache der Hellenen wird vorgenommen, aus der auch die Stimmen der größten Hellenen Sprachwissenschaftler und Philologen Hatzidakis und Giannaris [Jannaris] herauszuhören sind, denen das Werk auch gewidmet ist - sowohl im Original als

auch in der vom Vf. erstellten englischen Übersetzung ... Die betreffenden Beispiele ... für Nicht-Muttersprachler dürften sie eine angenehme Überraschung von unschätzbarem wissenschaftlichem Wert sein. Aufgrund des Zeugnisses, das die modernen Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaften ablegen, wird hier darauf aufmerksam gemacht, dass das Attische und im allgemeinen das Hellenische ihren Höhepunkt in der Entwicklung der Morphologie und Syntax in der Zeit zwischen Alexander dem Grossen und Justinian (335 v. Chr. – 565 n. Chr.) erreicht hat. Die wichtigsten Merkmale des Neuhellenischen wurden in dieser Zeit herausgebildet. Das Neue Testament wurde ebenso in dieser Periode schriftlich fixiert. Daher teilt es die gleichen Grundmerkmale mit dem Neuhellenischen.

Kapitel 2: In kritischer Auseinandersetzung mit dem von Karl Krumbacher (1903) erhobenen Skeptizismus ... Daher stellt C. aufgrund von unzähligen Beispielen folgendes klar: a) Das Hellenische kann und muss nicht auf der Basis der Entwicklungen in der Deutschen und Englischen Sprache verstanden und gewürdigt werden. b) Das Neuhellenische ist der Schatzmeister des alten Spracherbes. Um sein komplexes Verhältnis zum Althellenischen zu verstehen, darf man über die Byzantinische Literarische Produktion und die Klassische Bildung der Byzantinischen Autoren nicht hinwegsehen und die unleugbare Tatsache unterschätzen, dass im Neuhellenischen antikes Gedankengut sowie antike Denkweise weiterleben und sich frei entfalten können ...

Kapitel 3 behandelt den Übergang vom Attischen zum Hellenischen im Hinblick auf die Morphologie mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Neuen Testaments... Vorgenommen wird hierbei eine Revision der bisherigen Würdigung der so genannten Attizistischen Bewegung und deren Verhältnis zum Neuen Testament aufgrund vergleichender Wortstatistik von attizistischen (v.a. Phrynichos und Moiris), neutestamentlichen und neuhellenischen Schriften.

Kapitel 4 handelt von den grammatischen und syntaktischen Wandlungen des Hellenischen in der Übergangsphase zwischen Alexander dem Grossen und Justinian, die im Neuen Testament u.zw. in einer beträchtlichen Anzahl von umstrittenen Texten wieder zu erkennen sind. Dreizehn Bereiche der grammatischen und syntaktischen Abwandlungen ... werden hier unter exemplarischer Heranziehung textlicher Evidenz in adäquater Ausführlichkeit behandelt. Es wird betont, dass nachneutestamentliche Texte das Vorhandensein von lexikalischen und syntaktischen Neologismen bezeugen ... Ihre wiederholte Aufnahme in der Byzantinischen und Neuhellenischen Literatur zeigt, wie embryonale syntaktische Phänomene im Neuen Testament von den späteren Generationen verstanden und erklärt werden können.

Im 5. Kapitel wird die Diskussion fortgesetzt und die Bedeutung der grammatischen und syntaktischen Entwicklungen für die Neutestamentliche Exegese hervorgehoben. Herangezogen werden nun konkrete, theologisch strittige

Beispielsfälle aus dem Neuen Testament ... Damit soll aufgezeigt werden, wie strittige neutestamentliche Topoi mithilfe der späteren sprachlichen Evidenz eine logische und einleuchtende Erklärung finden können.

Die eigentliche Kritik an der von Erasmus eingeführten und weiterhin propagierten Aussprache wird in den drei Kapiteln des dritten Teils der Untersuchung geübt. Im 6. Kapitel wird erläutert: a) worin genau Erasmus einen Fehlgriff begangen hat, b) welche historischen Zusammenhänge zur Durchsetzung und Konservierung seiner künstlichen Aussprache des Althellenischen geführt haben und c) welche Kriterien bereits vom Beginn des 6. Jh.s v. Chr. bis zum heutigen Tage die hellenische Aussprache bestimmen. Aufgrund von papyrologischem und epigraphischem Vergleichsmaterial wird gezeigt, dass keinerlei wissenschaftlichen Gründe zur Aufrechterhaltung dieser Aussprache beigetragen haben, sondern eigentlich nur die Tatsache, dass *„Hellas was no longer a sovereign state, able to uphold the interests of its language and its literary and artistic treasures. The various states of Europe were of the opinion that Hellas had ceased to exist, and thus looked upon themselves as the legitimate heirs to the legacy of Greece ... European neo-classicists declared Greek a dead language, and proceeded to sever it altogether from those who still used it as their mother tongue“* (S. 575).

Kapitel 7 widmet sich der Akustik im Verhältnis zur Textkommunikation. Hier werden Probleme des Übergangs von der Mündlichkeit zur Schriftlichkeit und des Verhältnisses zwischen literarischen Kompositionen und Akustik besprochen, u.zw. auf der Basis des in der Antike wohl bezeugten Laut-Vorlesens (Rezitation) von geschriebenen Texten und der stilistischen Grundvoraussetzungen und Regeln, die nach Dionysios Halikarnasseus (1. Jh. v. Chr.-1. Jh. n. Chr.) literarische Kompositionen charakterisieren sollen.

Kapitel 8 handelt von den Auswirkungen der Historischen Griechischen Aussprache in der handschriftlichen Überlieferung des Textes des Neuen Testaments. Prinzipien und Kriterien in der jüngsten Methodendiskussion in Bezug auf die 26. und 27. kritische Ausgabe von Kurt Aland werden unter die Lupe genommen und aus der Sicht der bisher nicht ernst genommenen papyrologischen und epigraphischen Evidenz kritisch geprüft ... Das Kapitel wird mit einer exemplarischen textkritischen, grammatischen und strukturalen Analyse von 1Kor 13,3 abgeschlossen, aus der klar und deutlich ergibt, dass dem Textverständnis weder semiotische noch andere Konzepte der Textauslegung behilflich sein können, wenn der Exeget die Sprache des Textes nicht bzw. nicht richtig beherrscht. So betont C. mit unmissverständlicher Deutlichkeit: *„Whether we like it or not, this is the way in which the language functions. It is rather a question of whether we are willing to take the way in which the language functions seriously*



*and allow it to guide our exegesis, or are determined to bend the language and make it say what we want it to say“ (S. 264).*

Nicht nur deswegen, weil im wirklich hellenischen<sup>1</sup> Herzen sich berechtigter Stolz auf überragende Forschungsleistungen regt, sondern weil diese Leistungen nur aus Liebe zur wissenschaftlichen Wahrheit erfolgt sind und Rückbesinnung auf altbewährtes wissenschaftliches Ethos bewirken können, wäre es sehr wünschenswert, dass das hier besprochene Werk von Chrys C. Caragounis auch in deutscher Sprache als Studienausgabe bald erscheint.

Evangelia G. Dafni  
Pretoria, RSA

- Dr J.-M. Auwers (Louvain-la-Neuve), *Revue de Louvain* 4 (2006) 566

*The conclusion of this Review is:*

On l’a compris: l’ouvrage est un plaidoyer, très argumenté, très enraciné, aussi bien dans l’histoire de la langue que dans celle de la recherche exégétique, en faveur d’une approche moins cloisonnée et moins livresque du Nouveau Testament. Qu’ il soit entendu!”

*A translation of the above might look like this:*

“We’ve got it: this work is a plea, very well-argued and very well-founded, as well within the history of the language as in exegetical research, favoring an approach to the New Testament that is less compartmentalized and less bookish. May he be heard!”

---

<sup>1</sup> Im Sinne von Isokrates!

- Prof Michael Holmes, *Religious Studies Review* 32 (2006), p. 43

The author's "working title"—"A Diachronic and Acoustic Approach" to the NT—reveals the primary concerns of this deeply learned ... volume ... The volume is erudite, passionate, and wide-ranging. ... Agree or disagree with the author, the volume will become a standard reference

- Ass. Professor Mark Alterman in *Stone-Campbell Journal* 9 (2006), pp. 307-310

Greek is not a dead language to Chrys **Caragounis**. The central thesis of *The Development of Greek and the New Testament* is that the Greek language is an organic, living unity from the time of the linear B tablets to the present day, *and* that this fact has been neglected to the detriment of New Testament scholarship.

To understand the language of the New Testament properly, he insists, one must be familiar with the language as a whole, a facility he demonstrates throughout the book. C. is uniquely qualified to undertake this study. He is a ... an internationally recognized NT scholar. He is professor of NT in Lund, Sweden, and has contributed to evangelical works such as *The Dictionary of New Testament Backgrounds* (IVP), as well as writing for international journals and publishing houses. ... A central underlying theme of *DVGNT* is that the study of Greek took a false turn when Erasmus introduced an artificial "un Greek" pronunciation.

The logical point of departure is the year 1528, when Desiderius Erasmus introduced the pronunciation that bears his name. This unfortunate event led to the division of the Greek language into ancient and later Greek. In this way the unity of the language was lost and scholarship became unaware of the continuity that exists between ancient and modern Greek.

A whole chapter (chapter 6) is devoted to explaining and refuting "the error of Erasmus." C. presents ample evidence from inscriptions supporting his conviction

that many of the phonetic values found in "Modern Greek" were present from the fifth through third centuries B.C. on.

Although the emphasis throughout the book is more on continuity (especially with reference to pronunciation) than change, he does acknowledge natural, gradual changes in the language. By the second century A.D., such changes in morphology and syntax had become prominent enough that Phrynichos of Bithynia called for a revival of Attic forms. In one of the many helpful charts and tables in the book, C. compares Attic forms with forms rejected by Phrynichos and with forms actually found in the NT. Sometimes the NT agrees with Phrynichos and the Attic forms, but often the forms rejected by the grammarian reflect the true spoken language, and thus are reflected in the NT. In general, the changes from Classical to Koine in morphology and syntax reveal a simplifying and regularizing of complex forms. For example, distinctions between the aorist and perfect, and likewise distinctions between middle and active forms, came to be softened.

An interesting section of the book is a series of exegetical studies illustrating the value of a historical approach. For example, marshalling evidence from pre and post NT usage, C. argues that ἡ παρθένος in 1 Cor 7 means neither "virgin daughter" nor "fiancée" but "virginal status," i.e. male virginity. Appealing to the usage of modern Greek waiters, he explains that ἔφθασεν in Matt 12:28 (=Luke 11:20), referring to the Kingdom of God, means "will be right here," rather than "has arrived." The text supports immanent rather than realized eschatology. In a study of John 15:1-7 he argues that Jesus is the vineyard and his followers are the vines (rather than vine and branches).

C. is vigorous in challenging many cherished assumptions of NT scholarship, but is generally not mean spirited. He begins the section on "Time and Aspect" gently enough but becomes relentless in his opposition to Stanley Porter's bizarre thesis that Greek verb tenses do not indicate time, but only aspect.

C. argues that from Homer to the present all Greeks have recognized both time and aspect in Greek verbs, and that Porter can only evade this fact by ignoring both living users of the language and ancient grammarians as well. ...

One assumption challenged by C. is the value of the nonliterary papyri for understanding the language of the NT. He regards these documents as mostly the product of illiterate barbarians; far more valuable is the living history of the language as used by native speakers, including Byzantine authors and modern speakers.

He also questions the value of the earliest NT papyri, contending that they

were written by "semiiterate barbarians," as indicated by the frequent spelling errors. C. illustrates these in meticulous tables, including "A Conspectus of P <sup>66</sup>." In the Gospel of John, this manuscript contains 155 instances of I for EI and 139 cases of the reverse. Iota is in fact frequently confused with Y, OI, and H, as well. These represent what Metzger and others call "itacism," but what C. calls "the historic pronunciation." C. laments the fact that standard critical editions (including the current project *Novum Testamentum* <sup>2</sup> *Graecum: editio critica maior*) omit readings of a purely orthographic nature, thereby giving a false impression of the nature of the manuscripts. In most cases these orthographic errors represent simple and obvious misspellings, but the confusion of ὙΜΕΙΣ and ἩΜΕΙΣ (both of which are pronounced "imis" according to the "historic Greek pronunciation") represents a genuine variant in meaning. Similarly interesting is the confusion of ΑΙ and Ε (both pronounced as epsilon in "historic Greek pronunciation") which does result in alternative grammatical forms; for example ΑΕΓΕΤΕ vs. ΑΕΓΕΤΑΙ or ΟΨΕΣΘΑΙ vs. ΟΨΕΣΘΕ. C. has presented enough evidence to convince me that readings of this type are usually best decided on internal evidence alone.

The chapter on "The Acoustic Dimension in Communication" presents a valuable contribution to the appreciation of rhetorical features in the New Testament. He compares Paul's writings with the advice of Dionysios of Halicarnasus, and concludes that Paul often does measure up to the canons of pleasing style. C. further argues that the pleasing sounds of good Greek composition can better be appreciated when the language is heard in the softer, more soothing "historic Greek pronunciation." For example pronouncing beta as 'v' rather than 'b' (and likewise delta as a continuant sound) results in a smoother flow of sound.

*The Development of Greek and the New Testament* is an important resource for the questions and challenges it raises, and for the abundant resources it provides (in the form of tables and texts quoted in full from all phases of the language) ...

C. has presented enough evidence on the pronunciation of Greek to convince me that that pronunciation of the language had changed between fifth century Athens and the time of Christ, probably under the influence of Alexander's spreading of the language to non native speakers. Paul's pronunciation of Greek was likely much closer to that used by native Greeks today than to that used in textbooks of NT Greek. C. testifies that he taught the "Erasmian pronunciation" for twenty years before switching to the "historic Greek pronunciation," and that the transition was easy for him and beneficial to his students. ...Whether his

campaign will be successful remains to be seen. As a minimum, it would be helpful to introduce students to the importance of the spoken word in the composition of NT texts and to the influence of pronunciation on textual criticism.

His insistence that NT scholars would benefit from reading scholarly literature written by Greeks is also worth consideration. The book is dedicated to Hatzidakis, whom C. considers the greatest historian of the Greek language and possibly the greatest linguist of all times. Tributes to his works are found on nearly every page.

The bibliography includes twenty eight items published in Greek (under the Greek spelling of his name Χατζιδάκι), and, for those who do not read Greek, one in German and one in French.

Professors of Greek or NT will find *The Development of Greek and the New Testament* a valuable and stimulating resource. The book would also provide a good framework for a graduate seminar in advanced Greek.

[Caragounis' comment: «The few criticisms by M. Alterman in the above review are actually uninformed, being based on misunderstandings. A careful reading of my text will show them to be un-called for»]

- Prof Dr Eckhard Schnabel in *Trinity Journal*, Vol. 29, 1 April 2008, pp. 151-53

Not many scholars dare write substantial monographs about the Greek language, apart from Greek grammars which generally copy most of their material from their predecessors. Thus, the appearance of Caragounis's magisterial *opus magnum* is a welcome addition to the literature about the Greek language. Since Caragounis is not only a scholar of Greek but also a Greek scholar who speaks contemporary (Neohellenic) Greek, he is uniquely qualified to explore and explain the Greek language of a bygone era.

Anyone who is bilingual and who has had to read what people who have only secondary knowledge of his primary (or "mother") language say about their language has been surprised, mystified, or irritated by various pronouncements. ... [Caragounis] argues that the Greek language cannot be broken up into distinct phases that are completely independent of each

other and that therefore can be investigated in isolation. The goal of this book is “to approach the Greek language holistically and historically, as a living organism evolving and developing” (p. 4), focusing on diachrony and acoustics. ... Caragounis identifies Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam as the main culprit for what has gone wrong in the study of the Greek language ... [Erasmus’ teaching on pronunciation] established an artificial division in the history of Greek literature, distinguishing ancient Greek literature from modern Greek literature and scholarship, with the result that few if any NT (and classical) scholars are able to read and interact with the scholarship of Greek experts, let alone speak modern Greek.

... Caragounis’s survey of the history of the Greek language from its beginnings to the present day demonstrates the unity of the Greek language.

... Caragounis uses the evidence of the full range of ancient and modern Greek to clarify numerous NT passages ...

... Caragounis demands that scholars “abandon the Erasmian pronunciation” and “return to the Greek pronunciation” (p. 393). The relevance of acoustics for NT studies is demonstrated by the application of Dionysios’s [Halikarnasseus] principles, e.g. on rhythm, to Pauline texts and other rhetorical effects of oral delivery such as parallelism and paronomasia. ...

Caragounis ends his “Summary and Conclusions” with “the hope that this book will become an eye-opener, a precursor, and a source of inspiration for other, younger scholars to follow” (582). **It goes without saying that Caragounis’s *The Development of Greek and the New Testament* underlines the demand for a new reference grammar of Koine Greek which NT scholars can use with confidence.**

## • Randall L. Vinson, Amazon Books’ Buyer’s Review

\*\*\*\*\* I Thought So!, February 18, 2007

This book is an extremely valuable discovery. It does have plenty of material that cannot be rushed through, though my temptation is to fly through it to see what's next. One should already have some sort of background in Greek (as well as Latin, German, and French) to get

through it. That being said, my thoughts as I scanned through the book were, "Aha! Just as I thought!" And then, "I wish I had picked up more on this 20 years ago." If you are studying any period of Greek literature, especially the New Testament, get this information and run with it. Learn Greek the proper way and throw out the Erasmian pronunciation and the ancient versus modern dichotomy that have been forced on us.

- [Hugh Donohoe, Amazon Books' Buyer's Review](#)

\*\*\*\*\* **An Important Work**, December 10, 2007

By

**Hugh Donohoe** (Houston, TX) - [See all my reviews](#)

The scope of this work is breathtaking. The seminal point of the book follows that the Greek language is unique in human history. It has remained fairly similar throughout its 3500 years of written documentation. It was splintered into dialects and coalesced three different times into a prominent dialect. Because of this unique aspect, the study of Modern Greek (Middle Ages/Byzantine-Modern) can shed light on the Ancient/Koine. Because of a false Ancient/Modern dichotomy it has not been studied in the West, who became the keepers of the tradition after the fall of Byzantium. This willfull ignorance of Modern Greek by Continental Scholarship has led to errors in pronunciation, syntactical understanding, textual criticism and exegesis. He deals with each at length. Particularly amusing is Caragounis' dismantling of Stanley Porter's view of verbal aspect. The book is also meant to serve as a reference work. It contains much valuable information which is difficult to come by. If you are a student of New Testament Greek this book is worth every penny just for the reference material. The book also references much scholarship from Greece which is lacking in most Western scholarship. The author possesses expertise in areas which are lacking

in much of New Testament scholarship, which particularly qualifies him to write such a work as this. Much of the book is a shot across the bow to the status quo, so aspects of the material will continue to be debated. Although I must say, the scholarly reviews I have read of this work, several seemed to be very negative, yet they did not attack the main points of the book. The reason for this is probably that most scholars are not knowledgeable enough to weigh the evidence from such a diachronic approach. As you have gathered by now this is a technical scholarly work. However, if the above information piques your curiosity this tome is worth owning.

- **Wieland Willker** (published on B-Greek 13 November 2004):

Caragounis, Chrys C.

*The Development of Greek and the New Testament Morphology, Syntax, Phonology, and Textual Transmission*, Mohr Siebeck, 2004. XX,732 pages

I found this one of the most interesting books I have read over the last years. Very knowledgeable. Really a must-have.

Best wishes  
Wieland

- **Carl W. Conrad**, Department of Classics,  
Washington University (published on B-Greek 24 Nov  
2004)

Eric Weiss had written:

«The error of Erasmus and Un-Greek Pronunciations of Greek» *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 8 (1995) 151-85



This lengthy and detailed article may give some idea of Caragounis, style and what his book may have to say in its chapters on the pronunciation of the language.

### On this Carl Conrad commented:

This is a very important article and one that not a few serious Greek scholars have found pretty persuasive. Despite my scepticism about his pushing «itacism» as far back as 5th and 4th centuries BC, I am inclined to think that he's closer to the truth than is Sidney Allen's still dominant view expressed in his *Vox Graeca*.

- The Following Note was found on the Internet

After Greek Resources:

### JBC Course and Distance Learning Material

*The Development of Greek and the New Testament: Morphology, Syntax, Phonology, and Textual Transmission* (Paperback). This is a must read if you have any interest in how the Greek language developed, was preserved, and propagated. There is a lot of discussion about the proper pronunciation of certain letters and letter combinations. I've found it fascinating.

- **Randall Buth (B-Greek 10th Jan 2008):**

Caragounis is a philologist and a good one. ...  
Caragounis controls the ancient Greek and points out where Porter's view does not do justice to the Greek verb. While I would agree that <aspect only> is untenable, nor is it required by «linguistics», this is an area where Caragounis is writing as a philologist ...

I highly recommend Caragounis' book. He discusses an impressive collection of data and has many engaging observations ... Caragounis' view of the Greek verb is sound and his control of the whole history of the language is reassuring. He also affirms Dionysios Thrax' grouping of aorist and future together in terms of aspect. I like that.



*Of the many personal communications that I have received from various countries, in which their authors express their appreciation, I quote a number of examples (in abbreviated form). This is to let appreciative readers of my Book know that they are not alone in finding it important for the proper understanding of the New Testament.*

• Theodoros Mavropoulos, Professor, Classicist (Platonist)  
Thessaloniki, Hellas (9th February 2006)

Ἀγαπητὲ Ἀριστείδη,

Εὐχαριστῶ γιὰ τὰ ἀποσταλέντα, καὶ ὅσα ἔστειλα στὴ  
Λαμία καὶ ὅσα σοῦ ἐπιστρέφω.

Μὲ ἔχει ἐντυπωσιάσει ἡ ἐμπεριστατωμένη ἐργασία  
τοῦ Χρυσ. Κ. Καραγκούνη. Ὁ τόμος *The Development of  
Greek and the New Testament: Morphology, Syntax, Phonology, and  
Textual Transmission* εἶναι μία ὀλοκληρωμένη σύνθεση  
γιὰ τὸν ἐλληνικὸ λόγον· τὰ ἐπὶ μέρους κεφάλαιά του  
θίγουν τὸ σύνολο σχεδὸν τῶν συναφῶν θεμάτων, ποὺ  
ἐνδιαφέρουν κάθε ἐραστὴ τοῦ ἐλληνικοῦ λόγου, τοὺς  
ὁμοτέχνους (ᾧς χρησιμοποίησω αὐτάρεσκα τὸ ὄρο  
αὐτὸ) τοῦ συγγραφέα. Μία ἔκδοση τοῦ ἔργου αὐτοῦ  
μεταφρασμένου στὰ ἐλληνικὰ θὰ εἶχε, νομίζω, καλὴ

τύχη καὶ ὅπωςδήποτε θὰ ὠφελοῦσε πολύ. Ξέρω ὅτι αὐτὸ δὲν εἶναι εὐκόλο νὰ γίνεῖ. Ἴσως μὲ τὴν συγκατάθεση τοῦ συγγραφέα θὰ μπορούσαμε νὰ δημοσιεύσουμε σὲ φιλολογικὰ ἢ σὲ ποικίλης ὕλης περιοδικὰ τμήματα τοῦ τόμου αὐτοῦ· τὸ κεφάλαιο «The Unity and Evolution of the Greek Language» (σελ. 17-63) ἢ τὸ κεφάλαιο «The Historical Pronunciation and the Dichotomy of the Language» (pp. 339-96). Ἄς τὸ ἀντιμετωπίσουμε ὡς καθήκον μας γιὰ τὸ προσεχὲς μέλλον, ὅταν καὶ ἂν μᾶς μείνει κάποιος ἐλεύθερος ἀπὸ αὐτοδεσμεύσεις χρόνος.

Ἑρρωσο σὺν γυναικὶ καὶ τέκνοις  
Θ.

The following is a translation of the above text:

Dear Aristeides,

Thanks for ...

I have been impressed by Chrys C. Caragounis's detailed work. *The Development of Greek and the New Testament: Morphology, Syntax, Phonology, and Textual Transmission* is a complete synthesis about Greek discourse: its several chapters touch on almost every relevant issue that forms the interest of the lovers of Greek discourse and especially of us, philologists, fellow craftsmen (if I may use the term self-complacently) of the Author. An edition of this work translated into Greek, I think, would fare well and at all events would do a lot of good. I know that this is not easy. Perhaps with the Author's consent we might publish in philological or other journals parts of this volume: the chapter «The Unity and Evolution of the Greek Language» (pp. 17-63) or the chapter on «The Historical Pronunciation and the Dichotomy of the Language» (pp. 339-96). Let us consider it our duty for the

near future, when and if we have some free time from other engagements.

Errôso etc.

Th. M.

- J. C., A Student of Ancient Greek, Austin, Texas, USA, 3rd Oct 2006

Dear Dr. Caragounis,

I am a student of ancient Greek, and over the past year I have begun using the historical Greek pronunciation--or I should say that I have begun trying to use this pronunciation. My knowledge of it is limited almost entirely to written descriptions of the sounds, and for obvious reasons, I want and need an audio resource from a native Greek speaker. This evening I found your website and learned that you created a course on CD to teach the historical Greek pronunciation. ...

Best Regards,

J. C.

Austin, Texas, USA

- K. G., Trinity Episcopal School for Ministry, Ambridge, Pennsylvania, USA, 15 March 2007

Dr. Caragounis,

I am a seminary student in the U.S. trying to learn NT Greek. Your studies are fascinating and I have just ordered your book (Baker, 06). I have two questions if you have a moment, please, concerning learning NT Greek:

1. Do you think the "immersion" method of learning a

language would be helpful to learning NT Greek? (By immersion I mean reading, writing, speaking and listening to the language with the hopes of learning how to "think" in the language, as opposed to just learning the grammar and how to read it.)

2. If so, would you recommend Rosetta Stone's immersion method of Modern Greek (<http://www.rosettastone.com/en/offer/googlepage/grk>) to be helpful for the NT Greek student? How about Dr. Buth's immersion method of Koine (<http://www.biblicalulpan.org>)?

Thank you *so much* for your work and scholarship into Greek and the NT!

Sincerely yours,  
K. G.

My answer, later in the correspondence, may have some interest for others of my readers:

17th May 2007

Dear Mr G.,

1. So far it has been almost unheard of that a non-Greek student learns the entire Greek language. They choose either Neohellenic or one of the older forms.

It should make not much difference whether one starts with Neohellenic or with ancient Greek. Both approaches have been used—though, as I indicated, extremely seldom.

The exigencies of your education, would no doubt commend that you start with ancient Greek and/or New Testament Greek. This will give you the grammatical basis, which is a *sine qua non*. While learning the grammar, the inflections and the conjugations, and

enlarging on one's vocabulary, one should try to construct sentences (beginning with simple and going towards more complex ones). In this way, learning will not be simply a passive experience, but an active one as well.

My argument for the unity of Greek at first may be experienced as misleading. What I mean is that it may be concluded from this that learning ancient Greek will automatically render one able to converse in Neohellenic. It will not! And yet the language is one! It takes time and experience to see the underlying similarities in meanings, constructions, thought patterns, etc. However, from ancient / NT Greek it will not be as long a step to Byzantine and Neohellenic as it may be thought at first. I can illustrate this by the example of an American doctoral student. He wanted to put to practice my holistic approach (the entire language) in the matter of NT lexicography. He visited me a year ago and stayed with me for one week. He had with him the latest edition of the standard NT Lexicon by Danker-Baur-Arnd-Gingrich (2000) as well as a Neohellenic lexicon, which I had advised him earlier to buy. He actually surprised me when he went through Danker's interpretation of various passages and criticized him in the light of the meanings given in the Neohellenic lexicon! What surprised me most was that he had understood correctly the explanations in the Neohellenic lexicon (only occasionally had he misunderstood some), and was able to compare them with Danker's explanations and make some very apposite critical remarks on Danker. In this way he proved that had Neohellenic been taken into consideration while preparing this fine lexicon (a fact that I bemoaned to Danker himself in Tel Aviv in 2000), Danker's lexicon would have been much better and more correct than it is! (I have invited this doctoral student to give a paper [entitled "A Full Diachronic Approach to New Testament Lexicography"] this August at the seminar I lead on the Greek of the NT in our "Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas", the most

prestigious NT society there is).

At the same time I should emphasize that having learned the elements of grammar and the basics in how Greek works, one could proceed to study the accommodations that need be made for Neohellenic. Having come over that, one should seek to have contact with Greek persons, preferably visit Hellas, in order to listen to and try to converse with them.

2. If I am not mistaken, Dr Buth likes to call his pronunciation “the ‘Reconstructed’ Pronunciation of Greek”. I have written on that under “Greek Pronunciation” > “Erasmianism in New Garb: The Chimera of the ‘Reconstructed’ Pronunciation of Greek”.

3. There is no sample of my CD on my web page. Only the information that a CD exists.

Errôso,  
Chrys C. Caragounis  
(Professor)

• E. W., Highland Village, Texas, USA, 16th May 2007

Dr. Caragounis:

I received the CD this weekend, and have installed it on my PC. I am very pleased with it. ...

• C. M., Associate Professor, Marshall University, USA.  
(Personal communication 21 March 2007)

Just finished your 700+ page book on Greek and the NT. I found it quite remarkable - one of the best I have read anywhere! I must say that I have been a bit disappointed in some of the recent reviews (Decker, Silva, etc). It seems they either have not really read the whole book or they, a priori, have decided that they



disagree with what you are going to say. I think your expertise in Greek literature and especially your status as a native Greek-speaker bring invaluable insight into NT studies. I look forward to reading more from you in the future.

• G. G., Dep't of Bible and Theology  
Shasta Bible College (10 August 2007)

Chrys,

We have not met before, but a colleague of mine here at Shasta Bible College recommended your book, *The Development of Greek and the New Testament*, to me. I have been teaching New Testament Greek at the college level for over 20 years. I must say I found your book to be very enlightening, and, for the most part, your arguments to be quite compelling. Thank you for bringing this volume to the world of Biblical scholarship. I wonder if you would be willing to answer a few questions for me. As one who was taught Erasmian pronunciation, and who has now taught that system of pronunciation for over 20 years, I find the prospect of changing to HGP a bit daunting. However, I think I am just about ready to take the plunge and change the way I, myself, pronounce Greek, in preparation for teaching HGP to my students in the coming years. For now, I have purchased some courses in modern conversational Greek, just so I can get a feel for the pronunciation.

However, I'm wondering if you can recommend some good resources for teaching HGP that use New Testament vocabulary. ...

- D. L. Dallas, Texas, USA, 6th March 2008

Dear Dr. Caragounis,

Greetings. I am reading your book *The Development of Greek and the New Testament* and I am enjoying it. I found in your website about the pronunciation. Is there any way I can get a hold of it? Also, do you have any suggestions to practice the modern pronunciation? Thank you taking your time to read this email.  
yours.

- F. St.I. P., Pastor, Reading, Pennsylvania Ephrata, 7th June 2007

*Dear Dr. Caragounis:*

*I am student in a PhD program in Hebrew Bible. It has been my interest to master Modern Greek before I go unto Greek NT studies. Your book has been very helpful.*

*Can you recommend other scholars who have written in Modern Greek, French, Spanish, German, English, Italian or Portuguese about NT Greek or on the NT in general? I am looking for writers who do master both Ancient and Modern Greek.*

*I noticed that if I follow Modern Greek pronunciation while reading the kini Greek NT, many of the Hebrew and/or Aramaic words or names quoted sound closer to the original Hebrew or Aramaic, than when the text is pronounced with the artificial Erasmian pronunciation.*

*Shalom*

*Thank you.*

*• J. K., Cardiff, United Kingdom, 10th August 2007*

*Dear Professor Caragounis,*

*The CD arrived safely yesterday. The software has been installed and I am very pleased with it.*

*• E. R., Concordia Seminary, St Louis, 16 August 2007*

*Dr. Caragounis,*

*My name is E. R., and I am a student of Dr. James W. Voelz in the Masters of Divinity program at Concordia Seminary in St. Louis, Missouri. Dr. Voelz recently gave*

me a copy of your book «The Development of Greek and the New Testament», which I have enjoyed tremendously. While much of the content concerning the evolution of Greek morphology is a bit over my head, I do appreciate seeing that the New Testament authors -- especially Paul -- were not only proficient in the rudiments of Greek grammar, but also in the oral delivery style of their day.

...

In Christ

E. R.

• E. Th., ThD. Professor, Capital Bible Seminary,  
Lanham, MD, 11 September 2007

Professor, Dr. Caragounis:

I appreciated your book, *The Development of Greek and the NT Text*. Although I need to spend more time thinking on your basic thesis, I am not only surprised but glad that we agree on several areas. I was just thinking recently that while it is not particularly disturbing that some scholar like Porter could come up with such a theory on the Greek verb, it is very depressing that so many (Decker, Young, etc.) would not only blindly follow this thinking but even put in out in books. I noticed that you said something to that effect. I also planned years ago, but did not do so, to write on this issue, pointing out that Porter's arguments are weak or illogical; that he eliminates the future tense in order to derive his view, and that he uses exceptional or unusual uses of the aorist in order to derive a

meaning for the aorist but does not even allow for the fact that exceptions are exceptions. Thus, he seems to be following the same error as involved in the etymological fallacy in looking for one “pure meaning” that covers all uses. There is of course the improbability that an advanced language such as Greek would not indicate time with the verb, and the fact that everything makes such good sense taking it the traditional way. I think, and I hope that your remarks on Porter’s view will be a great help to NT interpreters in this day, even if they do not agree with your main thesis. I have always felt that linguistics by its nature is well suited to be a science but that the linguists tend to more philosophers than objective, analytical researchers.

One other item. I had just decided to emphasize in my classes that Koine Greek is an actual language. (I had always assumed that this was obvious) and thus it is not even probable that it was open to so many interpretations as scholars come up with. In most cases, only one is reasonable, sometimes a few due to the fact that the time is 2000 years removed and we do not know all the details of the situation. No one could have communicated if it was as uncertain as interpreters make it out to be. I noticed that you said the same thing, only in a better way. We try to teach our students to actually read the NT text with understanding, and that exegesis is not dissecting the text into fragments and making endless word studies but mainly is understanding the flow of thought and the immediate context as well as the more remote context.

I have been teaching NT, especially exegesis for 38 years and I have not read too many books that really were that profitable; so, let me thank you again. I think this is the first time I have contacted an author I did not personally know. I have one question in view of your basic thesis. If I want to know the English meaning of a term or idiom in Modern Greek, is there a dictionary or resource you can recommend for someone beginning to study this approach? For example, I was just using the *TLG* to study an expression and in line with your approach I checked examples as far as they go (15<sup>th</sup>

century). I noticed a consistency from 800 BC-1500 AD. Now, I would like to see if this is true in present Greek. This would start one NT professor on the road to using your recommended inclusion of present Greek; to a diachronic approach. I am interested in the meaning of the biblical text and would consider myself an exegete primarily rather than an academician (interested in the “latest thing” as those in Athens, Acts 17).

Sincerely, and with apology for this long message. I was originally going to write a letter.

Th. E., ThD  
(Professor of NT)

My answer to Prof Th. E.:

Dear Professor E.,

I use Greek fonts from Linguist's Software, Edmonds, WA, both in my main computer (a Mac) and in a secondary computer (PC). I have no problem with final sigma, but in my PC I have some difficulties locating some accentual signs.

For the unity of the entire Greek language and the relevance of Neohellenic, we have to consider the following (it is discussed in the earlier chs. of “Development”): In broad periods divided, we may say that ancient Greek covers the period down to 335 B.C. (Alexander) and that Neohellenic covers the period from c. 600 A.D. (Justinian) to the present day. Between Alexander and Justinian (335 B.C. - A.D. 565) we have the period of transition from ancient Hellenic to Neohellenic (Many features of Neohellenic are introduced at the time of Alexander). During this time not only the vocabulary is enriched, but also morphology and syntax become more modern and neologisms are created. The NT, which occurs in the middle of this period, has, in fact, sometimes words and syntax occurring for the first time. Such features cannot be explained by reference to earlier Greek, since they are not found there, but by reference to later Greek up to Neohellenic (I have given many examples of this throughout, but esp. in chs. 4 and 5). My book, therefore, does not merely theorize; it also and especially produces evidence

for each one of my claims.

Now while this is the first book of its kind (i.e. relating to the NT), my thesis of the oneness of the language has been a commonplace among Greek scholars of Hellenic descent, who are acquainted with the entire history of the language. But because the error of Erasmus divided Greek into several periods, scholars in the West remained in the dark about the close unity of the language and the relevance of the later periods for the earlier periods. Those non Greeks who have learned Modern Greek agree with the above claims (for example, I have referred to the London or Cambridge professor, R. Browning). Naturally, then, my book has nonplused some NT scholars and they are faced with the prospect of having to become acquainted with all periods of the language. This is a formidable challenge, so some of them try to turn a deaf ear to the facts I present. It is sometimes a case of Aisop's fox with the grapes (as I pointed out in my answer to R. Decker, under "Debate").

So, it is not really a case of looking up some words in a Dictionary of Modern Greek, but rather one of becoming acquainted with at least some of the main facts and features of Neohellenic. I have given "countless applications" as Prof J. K. Elliott expressed it, while in ch. Five, I have shown how such knowledge has deep-going significance in a number of highly important texts and the teaching that flow from them: for example on Mat 12:28 (the central issue of realized eschatology); John 15:1-7 on the Vine or Vineyard, and on John 21:5 on "paidia". The relevance of later Greek is, of course, readily seen in the "Great Lexicon of the Entire Greek Language", 9 folio Volumes (in Greek), Athens 1933-56. This is the only dictionary of its kind, giving examples from Homeros to the present. However, it requires that one can read more than NT Greek. Perhaps Mr D. Hasselbrook can be of some assistance here.

With regards to Rm 1:16f., I had once read a fine article on this by Hans C. Cavallin, "'The Righteous Shall Live By Faith': A Decisive Argument for the Traditional Interpretation", *Studia Theologica* 32 (1978), pp. 33-43.

With best regards,

Chrys C. Caragounis

His reply:

Dr. Caragounis:

Thank you for your quick and gracious reply to my previous letter. I am thankful for the information therein. Also, I am glad to know that you have a web site with more information. I am working on the phrase in Romans 1:17, *ek pistews eis pistin* (I cannot find the Greek final sigma on this computer). The *TLG* indicates both frequent and consistent usage up through AD 1500. Relying on your diachronic approach, I hope to get some help from modern Greek. The usage as given by the *TLG* seems to support your concept.

Thank you again.

Th. E. ThD (Professor)

• R. L., Student of NT at Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, Boston, 22 Nov 2007

Dr. Caragounis,

Greetings! My name is R. L., and I am a student of New Testament at Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary in Boston, Massachusetts. I am writing to inquire about the CD on Historical Greek pronunciation. How do I obtain the CD, and how much does it cost? I am very interested in learning the correct way to pronounce the Greek text of the New Testament (I hope also to learn Neohellenic).

Many thanks.

R. L.

On receiving the CD 3rd December 2007:



Dr. Caragounis,

I have received the CD and it works perfectly. I look forward to engaging with the lessons as soon as I finish final exams here at Gordon-Conwell next week.

Thanks again for the CD and for writing to me concerning John 20.30-31. My professor and classmates were very interested in hearing what you had to say.

Sincerely,  
R. L.

• M. W. , Guelph Ontario, Canada, dated 29 Dec.  
2007

Dear Dr. Caragounis

I am an adult learning Greek on my own. ( right now Koine Greek but I hope to expand to Homeric in the future. I realize this is very ambitious) I have come across your comments/papers on the issue of pronunciation and I am unhappy using the Erasmian approach. The text I am working from and especially the aids to vocabulary memorization are keyed to an Erasmian approach. I was actually excited when I read in your paper "The Pronunciation of Greek" that the the Historical pronunciation would in fact make it easier to read the texts.

This is a long winded way of asking How I can purchase a copy of your CD?

I am also interested in asking about Homeric Greek and it's pronunciation. The language would have been in a process of

change at that time and in that case how would we pronounce the Homeric words? Would we still use the Historical pronunciation?

Any information you can give concerning the CD and the answer to my question would be appreciated

yours truly

M. W.

Again, on receiving the CD:

Dear Dr. Caragounis

Thank you very much. What nice way to begin the New Year!  
regards

M. W.

• R. M. Instructor of Greek at Northwestern Baptist Seminary in Tacoma Washington, (19 March 2008)

Dear Dr Caragounis,

I am currently ... I am also currently the instructor of first year Greek at the Seminary and I have been convinced by you that I need to abandon the Erasmian pronunciation for the proper Historical Greek Pronunciation. I would greatly appreciate having a copy of your CD to assist me in this process.

I have also recently received a copy of your book *The Development of Greek and the New Testament*. I have not yet read through all of it but I am very interested in it. I have read with great interest your response to Stanley Porter's nontemporal view of the indicative mood tenses. Frankly, I cannot understand why any English-speaking Greek scholar

would discount the views of those for whom the Greek language is both their native tongue, passion, and expertise. Who better than scholars like you to know your own language?

Thanks for your significant contribution to our understanding of New Testament Greek which I also believe can become a significant contribution to the Kingdom of God.

- C. G. A Student of Greek and Theology, Mexico City, Mexico,

Hello Chris [This is Chris Tilling of the Chrisendom Blog, who forwarded the letter to me]

I am a Greek and Theology student in Mexico City. And I am struggling with academic Erasmian Greek pronunciation..... Help! (personally I don't like it) Luckily found an article navigating on the net. It was Professor Chrys Caragounis' article on Historical Greek Pronunciation ! So, after finding it, I went to his webpage and found his e mail address. Sadly I haven't been able to make contact with him. My mails keep returning. I wonder if you could help me? Perhaps I got Professor Caragounis wrong... I don' know.

I 'm desperate to get his CD from him. I think that the only way I could finally learn Greek is with a living language course not from the dead letter... .I send you my e mail; perhaps you could give me Professor's e mail or perhaps you could send him mine? Please.

Thank you very much

Yours,

C. G.

On the 25th June 2008, C. G. writes:

Dear Professor Caragounis,

I'm so very glad I had finally made contact with you!! I read your article on the error of Erasmus Greek pronunciation and let me tell you that I loved it! I totally agree with you. I have decided to reject Erasmian phonetics from now on! and to embrace modern Greek pronunciation. Thank you Professor! You are the answer to my prayers!

I would like to ask you something, Is there any written material included with the CD ROM? or Do you send the written Greek texts recorded in the CD?

I'd want a PC version of the CD.

With profound respect and admiration

Your mexican pupil,

C. G.

**T.B. Professor of New Testament, Moody Bible Institute, Chicago,  
11 August 2008**

Dear Chrys (if I may),

Thank you for your recent volume "The Development of Greek" which (if I may say) is a masterpiece of learning. In reading through parts of the book, I came upon your article "1 Thess. 2:7" which I have just read. Again, the discussion demonstrates a mastery of the sources in which you present a cogent argument for upholding 'gentle' as the desired reading.

I would agree with your conclusion and have written a monograph (with John Barclay as my supervisor) entitled *Family Matters: A Socio-historical Study of Kinship Metaphors in 1 Thessalonians* (T & T Clark, 2003) in which I look at Paul as parent, i.e. nursing mother (2:7), and father (2:11-12). Even if 'infants' is a possibility, of which I am not convinced, this does not deconstruct Paul's parental role because he is the founder of this community and situates himself above his converts as father and nursing mother. Throughout the letter Paul relates to his converts as a parent not as a child!

I also look at the intra familial relations between the Thessalonians as

siblings (4:3-8; 9-12; 5:12-15.

Many thanks for these scholarly contributions.

Yours,

T. J. B., PhD  
Professor in New Testament  
Department of Bible  
Moody Bible Institute  
Chicago il 60610  
USA

**Mr R. L. a Theological Student at University of Baltimore, USA,  
19 September 2008**

*Dear Dr. Caragounis:*

*I want to thank you for your work; you have built your case logically and backed it with solid research. I have read many of your articles and have passed them around to other students. I have also ordered a copy of your book from Amazon and look forward to reading it.*

*I am amazed at the prejudice displayed among academics in the U.S. when they find out that I use the "modern" Greek pronunciation and not the so called Erasmian. The latest example of this just occurred in the Readings in Biblical Greek class; the Instructor, Dr. C., said that I had to use the Erasmian scheme as he thought it was closer to the ancient pronunciation. My reading skill comes from listening to the New Testament recordings of Dr. Zodhiates.*

*I am arming myself with your articles and will take my case to the Dean, Dr. G., who has an open mind on the subject. I think that I would rather drop the class then be forced to use a non-Greek pronunciation scheme.*

*I am a Theological student at the University in Baltimore, Maryland. Thank you for your kind attention.*

*Sincerely,  
R. L.*

My answer:

Dear Mr L.,

Thank you so kindly for your thoughtful email. I am sorry to hear of the opposition you experience at reading Greek in the Greek way! Evidently, your instructor is not well informed.

Within New Testament Studies, we have a Society, Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas. This Society is the most qualified body of New Testament Scholars in the world (including the Society of Biblical Literature, etc.). In this Society I have been for the past seven years one of the two Chairmen of the Seminar on the Language of the New Testament. Not only have my views on the Greek language been discussed in this Seminar with respect and appreciation, but they are being more and more followed by other colleagues.

You may also read a number of reviews of my book by important international scholars who applaud it, as well as letters of appreciation received from many readers in my web site under "Reviews". There is also important material on my criticism of Erasmianism in my web site under "Greek Pronunciation".

The Erasmians have been non-plused. To give up the error they learnt, will necessitate that they learn the correct pronunciation. But having taught the wrong thing for a number of years, they are not enthused by the prospect of having to relearn how to pronounce Greek. Thus, they think, that their only option is to close their ears and eyes to the evidence for the Historical Greek Pronunciation, hoping to survive the storm that rages against them. It is a pity that so many 'scholars' lack the basic presupposition of scholarship: Honesty!

I hope your Dean will be understanding to your problem and free you from this unreasonable demand. You have every right to demand respectful consideration, since you follow the results of the latest research (whereas they are bound to a 500 year old tradition).

With every good wish for your future studies,  
Errôso ( = may you be strong, healthy and successful)

Chrys C. Caragounis