

I used this grammar for an intensive Greek II course in Athens during the summer of 1995 with eight students. My primary impression is that the text is a conventional grammar with intrusive polemical grit. The book contains three extraneous chapters on linguistics (14, 17, 18) appended in hopes of creating a marketing niche.

Although the book commits to exegesis [vii], it frequently asserts one possible reading (typically, a 20th-century conservative Christian viewpoint) as the only appropriate one. Whether or not one agrees with a given position, the following are examples of statements which seem out of place in a grammar:

The N[ew] W[orld] T[ranslation] reads, "and the Word was a god," meaning one of many and in essence removing Christ as the supreme God (66).

The problem [in distinguishing between "purpose" and "result" clauses] is compounded when it involves divine action, for with the omnipotent and omniscient God who dwells beyond time, His purposes are always realized, and everything realized is either planned or permitted for some reason (170).

. . . (Friends, you haven't caught any fish, have you?). The disciples, as expected, replied, "No." This could be considered further evidence of Jesus' omniscience (202).

[O]ne cannot love both God and the anti-God world establishment (31).

[S]alvation is not bestowed corporately as the Jews had thought (56).

The problematic phrase in 1 Corinthians 15:29 . . . has been interpreted several dozen ways, four of the more common being: (1) substitution, a practice by pagans or misinformed Christians who are baptized *vicariously for the dead*" (102, italics are Young's).

Examples of resulting misinterpretations [of the aorist] abound in the literature, especially in holiness circles to support a 'crisis' nature of sanctification (121).

First Corinthians 7:15 is a first class condition: . . . (But if the unbelieving husband departs, let him depart). The verb . . . is often used in the papyri as a technical term for divorce in marriage contracts and divorce documents. Thus if an unbelieving partner initiates the divorce, the believer is to permit it (137).
“All do not have the power to perform miracles, heal diseases, speak in tongues, or interpret the tongues.” This makes it clear that Paul did not teach that tongues was a necessary gift to prove that one has the indwelling Spirit (224).

As to editorial matters, I noted only one typo (“voatives” for vocatives [12]), but a major difficulty is that the page numbers in the “Subject Index” are frequently incorrect and incomplete: “Adverb” not on 187-90, but 195-198; “Infinitive” not 159-70, but 165-77; “Epexegetical” correctly as 166, 169, but also 171 (2x), 172, 175 (2x).

Young’s work treats grammatical sections in rather conventional style. The chapters that allow it to be called a “linguistic” approach seem tangentially related to the grammar and of dubious helpfulness for the majority of second-year students. For example, chapter 14, “Sentence Structure,” introduces the student to a modified transformational grammar “appropriate for Greek and other inflected languages that do not follow English word order.” But the chapter is not well-integrated into the book, its abbreviations are abundant and normally undefined. As the chapter stands, the payback is paltry for the investment of energy required to understand the chapter. Young correctly assesses the chapter himself: “We must not be overly optimistic regarding the value of transformational grammar for exegesis” (205).

Chapters 17 and 18, “Discourse Analysis” and “Diagramming,” are helpful in conceptualizing the exegetical task. Chapter 17 examines seven interrelated features: genre, structure, cohesion, propositions, relations, prominence, and setting and provides some illustrative biblical references. Chapter 18 presents a “thought-flow” diagram of James 1:2-8 which reminds the student that not every word, phrase, or sentence carries primary meaning or importance. However, both chapters seem like foreign intrusions into a grammar which properly belong in an introductory course in exegesis.

Although my students passed the departmental Greek diagnostic exam with the same pass rate as students using other grammars, I will not use this text again for teaching Greek II.
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