An Essay on Middle Issues of Ancient Greek
Some Answers to Constantine Campbell in Defense of Carl W. Conrad[1]

Part I

by Hirokatsu Yoshihara

Introduction

Prompted by the recent advancement of Functional/Cognitive approaches in linguistics,[2] more and more lively linguistic analyses have been submitted in the area of Biblical Greek.[3] The year 2015 alone testified to the publication of some enterprising works in this area using those approache.[4] On the validity of linguistic analysis of Biblical Greek, Stanley Porter states: "I firmly believe that matters of Greek language and linguistics are essential to understanding the Greek New Testament; in that sense, knowledge of Greek linguistics is a fundamental hermeneutical stance that should be pursued by every serious student of the New Testament."[5]

---

[1]This paper was presented during the William Menzies Annual Lectureship in January, 2016. Although the text has not been modified since then, I deeply appreciate those who offered their questions and critiques, including Prof. Donald Hagner, the lectureship speaker, and Adrian Rosen and Marlene Yap, my colleagues at the seminary.

[2]Some recent representative works are: Ronald W. Langacker, *Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University, 2004); William Croft and D. Alan Cruse, *Cognitive Linguistics*, Cambridge Textbooks of Linguistics (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2004); M. A. K. Halliday, *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 4th ed., revised by Christian Matthiessen (London: Routledge, 2013).

[3]For the definitions of the term Biblical Greek and other related terms, see Hirokatsu Yoshihara, "Should the Concept of Deponency Be Abolished? With an Exegesis of a Sample Verb from 1 Peter." Unpublished MTh (Master of Theology) tutorial paper submitted to Asia Pacific Theological Seminary (2014), 1, n.1. This is downloadable at: https://goo.gl/MZ18I5 (Reads, Em-Zee-one-eight-Ai-five) (accessed Nov. 24, 2015).

[4]Constantine R. Campbell, *Advances in the Study of Greek: New Insights for Reading the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2015); Stanley E. Porter, *Linguistic Analysis of the Greek New Testament: Studies in Tools, Methods, and Practice* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2015).

[5]Porter, *Linguistic Analysis of the Greek New Testament*, 1.

Porter further elaborates on the background of his statement above with a careful expression of the efforts and methodologies that have been adopted in NT studies and exegesis:

> I am troubled by exegetes that show no apparent awareness of the complex issues involved in the study of the Greek of the New Testament. I do not in any way wish to minimize the complexity of such interpretive problems or pretend that all of them are easily solved simply by invoking a vague notion of linguistics. However, I believe that much more can and should be done in this field - we can never know its usefulness [until] we make the effort.[6]

In a similar agenda, Constantine Campbell, in his most recent work, provides an excellent survey of some areas of Biblical Greek studies to which findings from linguistics have contributed, such as "lexical semantics and lexicography," "deponency and the middle voice," "verbal aspect and Aktionsart," "idiolect, genre, and register," "discourse analysis," "pronunciation" and "teaching and learning Greek."[7] As a preliminary to this endeavor, Campbell includes one chapter on "linguistic theories" as well as another on "a short history of Greek studies: the nineteenth century to the present day."[8]

As a linguistics major at undergraduate and graduate levels, applying findings from theoretical linguistics and contributing to Greek studies for a better NT exegesis has been one of my academic interests and desires. This has prompted me to engage in the debates in so-called deponency of Greek verbs.[9] My thesis was that Greek deponency should be abolished (or "abandoned," in Campbell's term), while 1) arguing the necessity of describing the middle not in the measure of the active but in its own right, 2) coining a temporary term 'DMP verb' (deponent/middle/passive verb) in order to avoid unnecessary confusion in the process of totally abandoning deponency out of publications and pedagogy, and 3) presenting a sample analysis of a 'DMP verb' - ἀπογίνομαι, 'to die,' which is found in 1 Peter 2:24.

In consultation with the literature,[10] Campbell also sorts out three positions,[11] among them 1) "terminological reservations" (by Moulton,

---

[6]Ibid., 14.

[7]Campbell, *Advances in the Study of Greek,* 9-14.

[8]Ibid., 7-9.

[9]Yoshihara, "Should the Concept of Deponency Be Abolished?"

[10]The literature with which Campbell has consulted is as follows: James Hope Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek: Prolegomena*, vol. 1 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1906); A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, 4th ed. (Nashville: Broadman, 1934); K. L. McKay, *A New Syntax*

Robertson and McKay), 2) "reconstituting the middle voice" (by Miller) and 3) "categorical rejection" (by Taylor, Conrad, Allan and Pennington). Campbell recommends "categorical rejection"; namely, deponency is to be totally abandoned. His suggestion is supported by the unanimous agreement of the four leading scholars of the concerned field (Porter, Taylor, Pennington and himself) at the 2010 Society for Biblical Literature (SBL) Conference. In his words, "the session seemed to have historic importance,"[12] for "it is rare at SBL to find four presenters who completely agree on a controversial topic."[13]

Campbell's conclusion agrees with mine, which was obtained through my dialogues with some sources shared with him[14] as well as other literature, mostly in linguistics, that I have accessed independently, [15] However, not every problem has been solved concerning

---

of the Verbs in New Testament Greek: An Aspectual Approach, Studies of Biblical Greek 5 (New York: Peter Lang, 1994); Neva F. Miller, "A Theory of Deponent Verb," in *Analytical Lexicon of the Greek New Testament*, ed. by Barbara Friberg, Timothy Friberg and Neva F. Miller (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2000): 423-30; Bernard A. Taylor, "Deponency and Greek Lexicography," in *Biblical Greek Language and Lexicography: Essays in Honor of Frederick W. Danker*, ed. Bernard A. Taylor, John A. L. Lee, Peter R. Burton and Richard E. Whitaker (Grand Rapids: MI: Eerdmans, 2004): 167-76; Carl W. Conrad, "New Observations on Voice in the Ancient Greek Verb," unpublished paper, 2000 (http://www.artsci.wustl.edu/~cwconrad/docs/NewObsAncGrkVc.pdf: accessed n.d.); Rutger J. Allen, "The Middle Voice in Ancient Greek: A Study in Polysemy," dissertation presented to the University of Amsterdam, 2002 (http://dare.uva.nl/record/108528: accessed n.d.); Jonathan T. Pennington, "Deponency in Koine Greek: The Grammatical Questions and the Lexicographical Dilemma," *Trinity Journal* 24 (2003): 55-76; idem, "Setting Aside 'Deponency': Rediscovering the Greek Middle Voice in New Testament Studies," in *The Linguist as Pedagogue: Trends in the Teaching and Linguistic Analysis of the Greek New Testament*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Matthew Brook O'Donnell, New Testament Monographs 11 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2009): 181-203; Stratton L. Ladewig, "Defining Deponency: An Investigation into Greek Deponency of the Middle and Passive Voices in the Koine Period," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 2010; Egbert Bakker, "Voice, Aspect and Aktionsart: Middle and Passive in Ancient Greek" in *Voice: Form and Function*, ed. by Barbara Fox and Paul J. Hopper, Typological Studies in Language 27 (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1993): 23-47.

Note, however, that Conrad's paper is not available at the URL cited above. As of November 16, 2015, see https://pages.wustl.edu/files/pages/imce/cwconrad/newobsancgrkvc.pdf

[11]All three positions are summarized in Campbell, "Deponency and the Middle Voice," in Campbell, *Advances in the Study of Greek*, 99.

[12]Campbell, "Deponency and the Middle Voice," 98.

[13]Ibid.

[14]Namely, those by Miller, Taylor, Pennington (2003), and Bakker.

[15]Namely, Benjamin W. Fortson, IV, *Indo-European Language and Culture: An Introduction* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2004); T. Givón, *Functionalism and Grammar* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1995); Paul J. Hopper and Sandra A. Thompson, "Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse," *Language* 56 (1980): 251-99; Paul J. Hopper and Elizabeth Closs Traugott, *Grammaticalization*, Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics

deponency and the middle voice of Koine Greek. Campbell points out further problems: "The questions that remain . . . will be how to assimilate the problems of so-called "mixed deponents" and "passive deponents," and how to make responsible assertions about voice, given that the matter appears to be more complex than simply recognizing morphology."[16] As described in his introductory section, Campbell's problem with "mixed deponents" is how to explain the existence of the "deponent" forms adopted by some verbs in the future tense. Similarly, his problem with "passive deponents" is how to explain the existence of "passive deponents," in which the passive-only forms render middle meanings. Furthermore, Campbell elaborates his final and remaining problem, namely the problem of "lexical complexity"[17] in his term: "A more positive challenge remains in which the relationship between lexeme and voice requires further investigation. As Bakker and Conrad have acknowledged, there is a complex interweaving between lexeme and voice, perhaps parallel to that between lexeme and verbal aspect."[18]

In this paper, I will answer Campbell's first two questions from the Functional/Cognitive point of view of general linguistics while critically summarizing and evaluating Carl Conrad's position[19] for the future tense and his position that the Ancient Greek did not fully grammaticalize the passive semantic.[20] I have chosen Conrad because, although his thesis seems quite radical, his contention is the most convincing to me since it includes a wide scope of coverage in his discussions, including suggestions for education, a deep knowledge of

---

(Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1993); Suzanne Kemmer, *The Middle Voice* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1993); M. H. Klaiman, *Grammatical Voice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1991); John Saeed, *Semantics* (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1997); Dan Slobin, "The Origins of Grammatical Encoding of Events," in *Studies in Transitivity*, ed. by Paul J. Hopper and Sandra A. Thompson, Syntax and Semantics 15 (New York: Academic, 1982): 409-22; Albert Rijksbaron, *The Syntax and Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek: An Introduction*, 3d ed. (Chicago: The University of Chicago, 2002); Friedrich Ungerer, and Hans-Jörg Schmid, *An Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics* (London: Longman, 1996); and Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996).

[16]Campbell, "Deponency and the Middle Voice," 99.

[17]Ibid., 101.

[18]Ibid.

[19]Carl Conrad, "New Observations on Voice in the Ancient Greek Verb," unpublished paper, 2000 (https://pages.wustl.edu/files/pages/imce/cwconrad/newobsancgrkvc.pdf: accessed November 16, 2015).

[20]Carl Conrad is a retired classicist at the University of Washington, an expert in the Classical, Koine (including the LXX/NT) and Modern, and is familiar with linguistics. He is also well-known as the moderator of an Internet discussion group called "b-greek" (http://www.ibiblio.org/bgreek/forum/: accessed November 17, 2015). I would strongly recommend any of serious students of Biblical Greek to subscribe to this ever active venue of discussions of a wide range of related topics.

the history of the language and well-grounded insights from theoretical linguistics and other languages including Latin and modern Indo-European (IE) descendants such as German, French and Spanish.

On the other hand, Campbell's final question of "lexical complexity" is to be left untouched in this paper. Answering it requires a lot more preparation with intricate and detailed studies of each word's grammatical and pragmatic behaviors, which goes beyond the space allowed here.

This article is divided into two Parts. Part I contains a critical summary and evaluation of Carl W. Conrad's thesis after introducing some basic but important linguistic concepts. I will first elaborate his thesis and develop my discussions of its validity on the following three topics: 1) the middle in its own right, 2) the ancient Indo-European voice systems and 3) the semantic relations among the active, the middle, and the passive and transitivity and intransitivity. Part II will open with the third aforementioned topic. Discussions include dialogues with other linguists and classists, extending to discussions of other languages and the history of Greek, including the language today. This is followed by my answers to Constantine Campbell's two questions, after which I will present some conclusive remarks.

Key Linguistic Concepts

Levels of Linguistic Analysis and Basic Concepts

As linguistics is a well-established academic field with many methodological and conceptual assumptions, it will be beneficial to mention some of the important ones for the purpose of this study.[21] First, there are different levels of linguistic analysis, namely *phonetics*, *phonology*, *morphology*, *syntax*, *semantics* and *pragmatics*. This paper is primarily concerned with the latter four levels. Briefly explained, morphology is concerned with word formation with morphemes such as

---

[21]For a concise introduction to linguistics from the perspective of biblical studies, see David Alan Black, *Linguistics for Students of New Testament Greek: A Survey of Basic Concepts and Applications* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2000). For more detailed discussions in a similar kind, see Peter Cotterell and Max Turner, *Linguistics and Biblical Interpretation* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1989); and Moisès Silva, *God, Language and Scripture: Reading the Bible in the Light of General Linguistics*, Foundations of Contemporary Interpretation, vol. 4 (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1991). For some well-reputed and widely-used introductory books of linguistics in general, see George Yule, *The Study of Language*, 3d ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2006); and Victoria Fromkin, Robert Rodman and Nina Hyams, *An Introduction to Language*, 9th ed. (Boston: Wadsmith, 2011). In addition, see Yoshihara, 6-7 with his notes for more detailed discussions of the linguistic concepts presented in this paragraph. The following note just below will be also beneficial.

roots, stems and suffixes; syntax is word arrangement to build up phrases, clauses and sentences; semantics involves inherent meaning with the given linguistic units; and pragmatics is meaning in context.[22,23] These levels of analysis are closely interconnected through what is technically called *interfaces*. It is often difficult to make their distinctions discreetly, especially between morphology and syntax, and semantics and pragmatics.

Some other basic linguistic concepts for studying the Ancient Greek voice system are *grammatical relations* of the verb and nouns (like *subject*, *object*, etc.), *thematic/semantic roles* (like *Agent*, *Patient*, etc.),[24] *thematic hierarchy*,[25] *prototype*,[26] *agency*,[27] *affectedness*,[28] and

---

[22]In an example, "λούομαι τὰς χειράς," morphology is concerned with the formation of each word (λου–, –ο–, –μαι, etc); syntax is with the arrangement, order and relations of the three words (τὰς χειράς makes one unit as an article and a noun to work with a verb λούομαι at a different level as a verb and its object); semantics is with the verbal meaning of "λούομαι," the nominal meaning of "τὰς χειράς" and the composite meaning of the two units with several possibilities ("I wash "the" hands for myself / I wash "my" hands / I am washed with reference to "the" hands = I have "my/the" hands washed, etc."); and pragmatics is with the best contextual choice of construal. I have borrowed the example and some of the semantic possibilities from Conrad, "New Observations on Voice in the Ancient Greek Verb," 7.

[23]Since pragmatics is concerned with meaning in context, it is also indiscreetly related to society, culture, history and human cognition in general, which are studied in the labels of sociolinguistics, linguistic anthropology (anthropological linguistics), historical linguistics, cognitive linguistics and discourse analysis. Thus, for such a field as linguistic studies of Biblical Greek, these interdisciplinary areas have been more and more recognized as significant. Porter spares one chapter on sociolinguistics in his 2015 book: Stanley E. Porter, "Sociolinguistics and New Testament Study" in *Linguistic Analysis of the Greek New Testament*: 113-31. Also highly recommended are Campbell's two chapters, "Discourse Analysis I: Hallidayan Approaches" and "Discourse Analysis II: Levinsohn and Runge" in *Advances in the Study of Greek*: 148-162, 163-192, respectively. For some recent introductions to historical linguistics and linguistic anthropology, see Lyle Campbell, *Historical Linguistics: An Introduction*, 3d. ed. (Cambridge, MA: MIT, 2013); and Alessandro Duranti, *Linguistic Anthropology*, Cambridge Textbook of Linguistics (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1997).

[24]"That which the arguments assigned by a predicate individually contribute to the interpretation of a structural configuration in which that predicate appears; or alternatively, the contents of nominal positions specified in a predicate-argument structure." Klaiman, *The Grammatical Voice*, 322.

[25]Nouns of what kind of semantic properties are more preferred for the arguments, i.e. subject, object, etc., of a construction.

[26]What kind of members are construed as the most typical in a category.

[27] The degree of subject's control to the given action denoted by the verb.

[28]"Characteristic of a participant in a verbally encoded situation which is typically sentient, is outranked for potential control by no other participant, and upon which devolve the principal effects of the denoted event or situation." Klaiman, *The Grammatical Voice*, 315.

transitivity.[29] In the next section, I would like to introduce the concepts of *marked/unmarked*, *control* and *grammaticalization*.

Marked/Unmarked, Control and Grammaticalization

First, *marked*, in opposition to *unmarked*, is where a certain linguistic form carries a semantic or pragmatic function that is not recognized in its *unmarked* counterpart(s). In contrast to the unmarked sentence, for example, (1) "John loves Mary," its marked counterparts such as (2) "John, he loves Mary," (3) "Mary, John loves her," and (4) "Mary is loved (by John)" respectively carry a certain semantic or pragmatic function. Thus, in sentence (2), John is topicalized; in (3), Mary is topicalized; in (4), Mary is at the pivot of description (subject), or John is backgrounded (not mentioned or unknown).

Control is a complex concept. According to M. H. Klaiman, control has been investigated to a greater degree in philosophy, social sciences, psychology and social learning theory.[30] Having developed some fundamental and preliminary discussions, Klaiman states:

> For purposes of the discussion to follow, it is assumed, on the basis of the preceding, that attribution of control is a fundamental and universal behavior in certain natural species, including human. Given this, there seems no reason in principle to discount the possibility that attribution of control may be reflected in the mental structures which underlie grammatical behavior.[31]

Based on this theoretical assumption, Klaiman defines control as follows:

> Capacity of an individual to engage or, alternatively, to refrain from engaging in a particular action . . . ; characteristic of a participant in a given situation such that (a) the situation's realization depends on the participant role . . . in question and (b) the situation is compatible with that participant's intentional involvement therein.[32]

---

[29]The degree of the dynamics typically transferred from the subject to the object in the event. See Yoshihara's text and notes, 7-11.

[30]Klaiman, *The Grammatical Voice*, 112.

[31]Ibid., 117.

[32]Ibid., 317.

Grammaticalization with the verb *grammaticalize* is a process of language change in history, where a linguistic unit with a referential meaning becomes one with a grammatical function. A cliché example in English is the verb "go": it refers to one's motion to another place but also has acquired a function of referring to the future in the construction of "be going to," with a phonologically-reduced form "gonna," as in "John *is going to* stay home tonight." In this sentence, the sense of the original "go" is nearly *bleached*, although one could associate the physical "going" with the cognitive "going" toward the future as a semantic extension, and that a more abstract future function as a grammatical marker has been acquired.[33]

In the extension of this technical concept of grammaticalization, the verb *grammaticalize* is also used in its past participle / adjectival form *grammaticalized* to mean that a linguistic unit bears a grammatical function, whether or not it was developed from what is traceable in the past. This is a usage focusing on the result of a certain process, assuming that all linguistic items change. Thus, the Greek ending /-μαι/ is traditionally said to have grammaticalized the middle and passive semantics and /-σα/ the aorist semantic.[34]

Now we are ready to turn to a critical summary and evaluation of Conrad's argument.

A Summary and Evaluation of Conrad's Argument

Conrad's Thesis

Carl Conrad's basic sentiment in writing his 2002 paper is stated as follows:

> Terminology and assumptions either implicit in the teaching or openly taught to students learning Greek seem to me to make understanding voice in the ancient Greek verb more difficult than it need be. In particular I believe that the meanings conveyed by the morphoparadigms for voice depend to a great extent upon understanding the distinctive force of

---

[33]The auxiliary verb "will" can also be similarly traced back to the medieval verb "will."

[34]A well-accepted introduction on grammaticalization is: Hopper and Closs Traugott, *Grammaticalization*. Also see Elizabeth Closs Traugott and Bernard Heine, ed., *Approaches to Grammaticalization*, 2 vols., Typological Studies in Language 19 (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1991), where is T. Givón, "The Evolution of Dependent Clause Morpho-Syntax in Biblical Hebrew" in ibid., vol. 2: 257-310.

the middle voice, that the passive sense is not inherent in the verb form.[35]

In linguistic terms, Conrad states that the passive sense in Greek is NOT *semantically inherent* to the concerned morphemes and thus not always their primary sense even if they are traditionally labeled as "passive," especially in aorist/future exclusively. He then implies that the passive sense is *pragmatically construed* through the linguistic[36] contexts. Conrad contends:

> I would urge that the designation of **both** the conventionally-termed "**middle-passive**" morphoparadigms [–μαι/σαι/ται/–μεθα/σθε/νται; –μην/σο/το/–μεθα/σθε/ντο] (*1: *traditionally for Present/Imperfect/Perfect/Pluperfect + Middle/Passive; and Future/Aorist + Middle*) **and** the conventionally-termed "**passive**" morphoparadigms [–θην/θης/θη/θημεν/θητε/θησαν; –ην/ης/η/–ημεν/ητε/ησαν and –θήσομαι/θήσῃ/θήσεται/ θησόμεθα/θήσεσθε/θήσονται; –ήσομαι/ήσῃ/ήσεται/–ησόμεθα /ήσεσθε/ήσονται] (*2: *traditionally for Aorist/Future + Passive*) **should bear the same designation**. I personally believe that "**subject-focused**" would be the most useful term to designate both of the morphoparadigms in terms of their marked distinction in function from the unmarked "**basic**" or "**active**" morphoparadigms [–ω/εις/ει/–ομεν/ετε/ουσι; –ν/ς/_/–μεν/τε/ντ; –μι/σι/τι/–μεν/τε/ντι] (*3: *traditionally for Present/Imperfect/Aorist/Perfect/Pluperfect + Active*).[37]

In other words, Conrad contends that the traditional "active" (*3 above) should be relabeled as "basic" or "simple" and that the traditional "middle-passive" (*1 above) and "passive" (*2 above) should be integrated as "subject-focused." He is flexible enough, however, to suggest to maintain "active" (*3) as it is and to replace "middle-passive" (*1) with "MP1" and "passive" (*2) with "MP2," or integrate them to "middle/passive," if his preference is not accepted.[38]

---

[35]Conrad, "New Observations on Voice in the Ancient Greek Verb," 1-2.

[36]So it is even extralinguistically: for the contemporary speaker and writer of Ancient Greek, their extralinguistic contexts may have influenced on their language use, which is not available to us today's readers because what we have at hand is only what is written and textually transmitted and reconstructed. This is a serious restriction in classics studies, needless to say. We will come back to this discussion later.

[37]Ibid., 11. The verbal endings have been completed in reference to Conrad's Sections 2.1.1 - 2.1.3 on page 2 for the purpose of the reader's convenience. The notes in the parentheses and editorial emphases all mine.

[38]Ibid., 12.

They can be briefly diagrammed as follows:

Conrad's Suggestion 1

	[TRADITIONAL]:	[SUGGESTED TO BE]:
[–ω/ομεν; –ν/μεν; –μι/μεν] (*3)	Act.	> Basic / Simple
[–μαι/μεθα; –μην/μεθα] (*1)	Mid./Pass.	> Subject-Focused
[–θην/θημεν; –ην/ημεν] (*2a)	Pass.	> Subject-Focused
[–θήσομαι/θησόμεθα; –ήσομαι/ησόμεθα] (*2b)	Pass.	> Subject-Focused

Conrad's Suggestion 2

	[TRADITIONAL]:	[SUGGESTED TO BE]:
[–ω/ομεν; –ν/μεν; –μι /μεν] (*3)	Act.	> Active
[–μαι/μεθα; –μην/μεθα] (*1)	Mid./Pass.	> Middle/Passive (MP1)
[–θην/θημεν; –ην/ημεν] (*2a)	Pass.	> Middle/Passive (MP2)
[–θήσομαι/θησόμεθα; –ήσομαι/ησόμεθα] (*2b)	Pass.	> Middle/Passive (MP2)

The rationale of Conrad's suggestions, as already quoted above, is that the voice oppositions in Ancient Greek (both Classical and Koine) are not *semantically* stable but *pragmatically* flexible. With his vast and deep knowledge of Greek and others, his argument is well grounded with essential examples. Let us now examine three points of his contentions critically, especially in light of findings in theoretical linguistics, namely, 1) treating the middle in its own right; 2) the voice system of the Indo-European languages; and, more concretely, 3) the semantic relations among active/middle/passive and transitivity/ intransitivity in Greek.

The Middle to Be Treated in Its Own Right

First, Conrad emphasizes on the importance of treating the middle in its own right:

> The middle voice needs to be understood in its own status and function as indicating that the *subject* of a verb is the focus of the verb's action or state; many Greek verbs in the middle voice are in fact intransitive, but whether intransitive or not, they indicate the deep involvement of the subject as the one experiencing, suffering, enduring, or undergoing an action or a change of state.[39]

Conrad makes this contention with two recent crucial works along the same line of thought: 1) Suzanne Kemmer's universal and

---

[39]Conrad, "New Observations on Voice in the Ancient Greek Verb," 3.

typological studies[40] from a Cognitive/Functional approach with more than 30 languages including Classical Greek, which are mostly not related and recognized to have certain middle-type grammatical devices and 2) Neva Miller's sketchy but influential essay on deponents in the NT.[41] Quoting Kemmer is one of Conrad's contributions to biblical studies because Campbell is somehow silent about her epoch-making work.[42]

Following is Miller's list of so-called "deponent verbs," borrowing Conrad's format with some editorial that I did:[43]

Class 1: Reciprocity
A. <u>Positive [i.e. friendly] Interaction</u>
δέχομαι 'welcome', δωρέομαι 'bestow on', εἰσκαλέομαι 'invite in', ἐναγκαλίζομαι 'embrace', ἐπιμελέομαι 'take care of', ἐπισκέπτομαι 'visit, look after', ἰάομαι 'heal, cure', ἱλάσκομαι 'bring about reconciliation', συναντιλαμβάνομαι 'help', χαρίζομαι 'forgive'

B. <u>Negative [i.e. hostile] Interaction</u>
διαμάχομαι 'contend with', δράσσομαι 'catch, seize', ἐάλλομαι 'leap on', ἐπαγνωνίζομαι 'struggle against', ἐπιλαμβάνομαι 'grasp, seize hold of', μάχομαι 'fight', μέμφομαι 'blame, find fault with'

---

[40]Kemmer, *The Middle Voice*.

[41]Miller, "A Theory of Deponent Verb."

[42]A possible reason is Kemmer's strong typological and technical nature. This is probably not because Kemmer's studies does not deal with Koine but only the Classical, for Campbell highly appreciates Allen's doctoral dissertation, saying: "For deeper reflection and research, Rutger Allen's dissertation provides substantial grounds for understanding the middle voice in the absence of deponency. Future dissertation on the topic will necessary engage his work as the most important treatment of the Greek middle voice we have seen for some time." Campbell, "Deponency and the Middle Voice," 102. A similar praise can be offered to Kemmer, in my opinion.

[43]Miller, "A Theory of Deponent Verb," 427-9. The format is found in Conrad, "New Observations on Voice in the Ancient Greek Verb," 10.

For the reader's reference, Kemmer's list of middle verbs universally attested to is as follows:

1) Grooming or body care; 2) Nontranslational motion; 3) Change in body posture; 4) Indirect middle (self-benefactive middle); 5) Naturally reciprocal events; 6) Translational motion; 7) Emotional middle / Emotive speech actions / Other speech actions; 8) Cognitive middle; 9) Spontaneous events; and 10) Logophoric middle. Kemmer, *The Middle Voice*, 16-20.

C. Positive and Negative Communication
αἰτιάομαι 'accuse', ἀνατάσσομαι 'narrate', ἀποκρίνομαι 'answer', ἀποφθέγγομαι 'declare', ἀρνέομαι 'deny', ἀσπάζομαι 'greet', διαβεβαιόομαι 'speak confidently', διακατελέγχομαι 'refute', διαμαρτύρομαι 'warn', ἐξηγέομαι 'tell, relate', ἐξηγενομαι 'interpret, describe', μαρτύρομαι 'affirm, witness to', παρατιέομαι 'request', ψεύδομαι 'lie to"

Class 2: Reflexivity

ἀπολογέομαι 'make a defense', ἐγκαυχάομαι 'boast (pride oneself in)', ἐγκρατεύομαι 'abstain (control oneself)', ἀπαναπαύομαι 'rest (support oneself on)', μασάομαι 'bite one's lips or tongue', μιμέομαι 'imitate (pattern oneself after)', πειράομαι 'try (exert oneself)' / directional: ἀφικνέομαι 'arrive', διαπορεύομαι 'go through', διεξέρχομαι 'come out', ἐξάλλομαι 'leap up', ἐπανέρχομαι 'return', ἐπεκτείνομαι 'stretch toward', ἔρχομαι 'come, go', ὀρχέομαι 'dance', πορεύομαι 'journey'

Class 3: Self-Involvement

A. Intellectual Activities
αἰσθάνομαι 'perceive', διαλογίζομαι 'ponder', ἐνυπνιάζομαι 'dream', ἐπιλανθάνομαι 'forget', ἐπίσταμαι 'understand', ἡγέομαι 'consider', λογίζομαι 'reckon', οἴομαι 'suppose', πυνθάνομαι 'learn'

B. Emotional States
βδελύσσομαι 'abhor, strongly hate', διαπονέομαι 'be annoyed', ἐμβριμάομαι 'be indignant', ἐμμαίνομαι 'be enraged against', εὐλαβέομαι 'feel reverence for', μετεωρίζομαι 'be worried', ὀμείρομαι 'long for'

C. Volitional activities
βούλομαι 'will, wish', ἐναντιόομαι 'oppose, set oneself against'

Class 4: Self-Interest

διαδέχομαι 'succeed to', διαπραγματεύομαι 'earn by trading', ἐμπορεύομαι 'buy and sell', ἐργάζομαι 'perform, accomplish', κτάομαι 'get, acquire'

Class 5: Receptivity
γεύομαι 'taste', ἐπακροάομαι 'listen to',
θεάομαι 'see, behold (through visual impression)'

Class 6: Passivity
γίνομαι 'be born, come into being', ἐπιγίνομαι 'come on, approach (of the night)', κοιμάομαι 'fall asleep, die', μαίνομαι 'be mad (lunatic)', μαντεύομαι 'divine, prophesy (by demon possession)'

Class 7: State, Condition
δύναμαι 'be able, be powerful enough to', ἐπίκειμαι 'lie on', καθέζομαι 'sit down', κάθημαι 'sit', κεῖμαι 'lie (down)', παράκειμαι 'be at hand, be ready'

Miller concludes her discussion as follows, concerning these traditional "deponents" or "deponent verbs," while admitting that the list is "not exhaustive:"[44]

If we accept the theory that so-called deponent verbs express personal interest, self-involvement, or interaction of the subject with himself or with others in some way, we will be better able to accept that the nonactive form of the verb is **valid** for communicating **a meaning on its own**, and we will be challenged to look for that meaning.[45]

To this position, Kemmer gives an impression of accepting deponency, *at a first look*:

These exceptions [middle-marking (MM) only verbs] are notable because they are quite widespread: in fact, I would venture to suggest, universal in middle-marking languages. Rather idiosyncratically from the point of view of individual languages, MM-only verbs in middle verb classes often lack unmarked counterparts. I will term such MM-only verbs deponents.[46]

However, Kemmer's affirmation is not for the assumption that those MM-only verbs originally had active counterparts and have laid

---

[44]Miller, "A Theory of Deponent Verb," 426.
[45]Ibid. The bolds mine.
[46]Kemmer, *The Middle Voice*, 22. The brackets are mine.

them aside, as has been traditionally thought concerning deponency in Greek grammar. She affirms the existence of such MM-only verbs as a universal phenomenon among her research languages that are mostly, mutually unrelated. She affirms the grammatical category like middle-only verbs are universal with a lot of lexical stock in each.

Kemmer's position echoes Klaiman's list of active-only verbs and middle-only verbs. Klaiman provides lists of those both from Classical Greek and Sanskrit and concludes that middle-only verbs show some distinctive semantics, namely "physical actions" and "mental/emotive actions," while the active-only category is vague with several kinds of verbs put together.[47] These middle-only semantics obviously overlap with those found in the lists by Miller and Kemmer[48] and support the distinctive contour of them as they are.

In this section, we have discussed the significance of treating the middle in its own right. Now we will turn to Conrad's rationale for integration of the middle and the passive as "subject-focused" or "middle/passive": the voice system of the ancient Indo-European languages.

The Ancient Indo-European (IE) Voice Systems

Conrad also contends "that the fundamental polarity in the Greek voice system is not *active-passive* but *active-middle*"[49] and elaborates that the active-middle voice opposition is a common feature among IE languages.[50]

Independently of Conrad, Klaiman describes the voice systems that are found in the IE languages predominantly, as "basic voice systems."[51] She states that "in the classical literary Indo-European languages described in traditional grammars . . . ," the major voice system is active/middle, not active/passive.[52] Interestingly, however, she also states in the same context that, "Only in two Indo-European stocks does a specific formal passive occur (Indo-Iranian and

---

[47]Ibid., 98-9.

[48]Fortson also joins here: "As a group these verbs do tend to express various "internal" or intransitive notions like spatial movement, position of rest, emotions, sensory perception, speaking, giving off sound or light, and changes of state." Fortson, *Indo-European Language and Culture*, 82.

[49]Conrad, "New Observations on Voice in the Ancient Greek Verb," 3.

[50]Ibid. Conrad further states: "Greek inherited from its PIE ancestor only two voice morphoparadigms, those described in section I above as "Active" and "Middle-Passive." But the term "Middle-Passive" is itself questionable: although the "Middle-Passive" forms can be and were used to express the passive sense, there was no distinct passive-voice morphology in the parent language . . ." Ibid., 6.

[51]Klaiman, *Grammatical Voice*, 24.

[52]Ibid., 23-4.

Hellenic)."[53] Since Greek belongs to the Hellenic branch, this statement may sound like a counter-argument to Conrad and a self-contradiction to Klaiman herself. Three things can be pointed out in her defense: 1) The passive in Greek was still grammatically developing in the aorist/future with the /-θη-/ endings and was far from a systematic completion, and, in addition, the passive semantic not in the two but all the tenses was still secondary to the middle, if Conrad is correct; 2) Klaiman consistently identifies the Classical Greek system as "basic," as introduced above, throughout her book and uses it as a good sample with a rich literary tradition with Sanskrit;[54] and 3) when Conrad makes the similar contention, he sees not only the morphological system ("morphoparadigms" in his term), traditionally labeled as "active," "middle" and "passive," but also their semantic and pragmatic functions. We can therefore identify the Classical Greek with Klaiman's basic (active/middle) voice without much reservation.

However, it is also important to note that the Greek voice system was gradually shifting to the active/passive system in the Koine period with the weakened middle. Robert Browning points out "a drastic reorganization of the verb system"[55] of Greek in the later period of antiquity and "the reduction of the three voices of classical Greek to two."[56] Daniel Wallace suggests that the prototypical Direct Middle had given its way to periphrastic reflexives and that Indirect Middle "is a common use of the middle in the NT; apart from the deponent middle, it is the most common."[57] It is also the reality that most middle-only verbs in Miller's list appear only a few times, and many, only once in the NT.[58] The Koine middle was not like the more established Classical Greek's middle although the Atticists were trying to revive the Attic language by making "the literature of this period . . . full of middle voices where Attic uses in fact the active."[59]

---

[53]Ibid., 23.

[54]Interestingly, the voice system of Latin was not active/middle but active/passive already at the classical period (which is actually at the same time as the first half of the Koine period, several hundred years after the Greek classical period); e.g., see Robert J. Henle, S.J., *Latin: Grammar* (Chicago: Loyola, 1958), 43-67.

[55]Robert Browning, *Medieval and Modern Greek* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1969), 30.

[56]Ibid.

[57]Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond Basics*, 419.

[58]This is according to my survey of the verbs with Warren C. Trenchard, *A Concise Dictionary of New Testament Greek* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2003).

[59]Browning, *Medieval and Modern Greek*, 47. On the other hand, he states about the NT: "The New Testament, we have seen, was written substantially in the spoken Greek of the time though with varying degrees of literary pretension - Luke often 'corrects' what he finds in Mark, the Pauline epistles are more literary than the Gospels, the Apocalypse has so many linguistic anomalies and oddities that it seems likely that its

In fact, after further changes in the medieval and modern period, Greek today has an active/passive system.[60] One thing that supports Conrad's thesis is that the Modern Greek passive bears some of the middle functions of its ancient counterpart such as reflexive and reciprocal. [61] Modern Greek also has some passive-only verbs (traditionally called "deponents") as transitives, intransitives, or transitives and their neuter intransitives.[62] This historical shift suggests that we see Conrad's thesis carefully in favor and to summarize that 1) Ancient Greek began to develop a grammatical category by /-θη-/, which is traditionally and distinctively called the "passive," from its parental active/middle Proto-Indo-European (PIE); 2) in Koine, the middle in general (especially in syntax and semantics) weakened, but the passive semantic survived together with the middle semantic to develop the newer grammatical category of "passive"; 3) in Modern Greek, the so-called "passive" bears some of the middle semantics. In other words, while the morphology and thus syntax developed from the PIE middle to the modern passive, the passive semantic has successfully developed and the middle semantic has been more or less carried over, with the different semantics in traditional nomenclature, namely from "middle/passive" to "passive."

For sure, there is evidence to call the modern "passive" as "passive" because the /-θη-/ endings have prevailed in Simple Past, a new category called Dependent, Perfect and Pluperfect, while the /-μαι/ endings are surviving in Present and Imperfect. There still are passive-only verbs.[63] Do these verbs remain passive-only verbs today

---

author's knowledge of Greek was imperfect." Ibid., 49.

[60]David Holton, Peter Mackridge and Irene Philippaki-Warburton, *Greek: A Comprehensive Grammar of the Modern Language* (London: Routledge, 1997), 113-4, 213-9.

[61]Examples are from Holton, Mackridge and Philippaki-Warburton, *Greek*, 216, emphases mine.

Κοίταξε **τον εαυτό της** στον καθρέφτη.(She looked at **herself** in the mirror.)
Κοιτάχτηκε στον καθρέφτη. (She looked at herself [lit. *is looked at*] in the mirror.)
Ο Τάκης και η Όλγα αγαπούν πολύ **ο ένας τον άλλο**.
(Takis and Olga love **each other** very much)
Ο Τάκης και η Όλγα αγαπιούνται πολύ.
(Takis and Olga love each other [lit. *are loved*] very much).

[62]The following examples are from ibid., 217.

Transitives: θυμάμαι 'remember', δέχομαι 'receive, accept', περιποιούμαι 'take care of'.

Intransitives: έρχομαι 'I come', κοιμάμαι 'sleep', κουράζομαι 'get tired', ξεκουράζομαι 'rest', γίνομαι 'become'.

Transitives/(Neuter) Intransitives: λυπάμαι 'pity (+O), be sad', φοβάμαι 'fear (+O). be fearful'

[63]The following examples are from ibid., 119.

just because they have been fossilized in the history of grammaticalization? Or, does Modern Greek Passive still productively maintain the semantic of what Conrad calls "subject-focused"? If the latter should be the case, should it be still called "passive," just following the tradition, or could it be relabeled as "subject-focused" even in Modern Greek, in the extension of what Conrad suggests for Ancient Greek? Conrad's thesis is throwing a radical stone to the Greek voice systems of over thousands of years, and perhaps to the voice systems of many other languages, too.

In this section, we have discussed the nature of the Greek voice system briefly tracing from the Classic (active/middle) to the Modern (active/passive), to emphasize the original predominance of the middle in the former, through the transitional period of Koine, and the affinity between the Classical middle and the Modern passive to seek the nature of Greek voice. We have seen that the Classical MIDDLE/passive semantics have been somehow carried over to the Modern middle/PASSIVE and challenged ourselves to evaluate the potential extension of Conrad's contention of the opposition of "Simple" or "Basic" and the "Subject-focused."[64]

αισθάνομαι, 'feel', απολογούμαι, 'defend myself', αρνούμαι, 'deny', αφηγούμαι, 'narrate',εργάζομαι, 'work', μιμούμαι, 'imitate', φαίνομαι, 'appear/seem', φοβάμαι, 'fear', etc.

[64]The passive is prototypically defined as 1) the PATIENT promoted to the subject, and further the topic, discourse-salient position; 2) the verb derived from the base form; 3) the AGENT demoted and backgrounded to be implicit or explicit with a prepositional phrase, as in "John was attacked (by the rubber/X)" in English. Thus the passivity of Modern Greek requires more independent work of evaluation. For a prototypical description of passive typology, see Edward L. Keenan, "Passive in the World's Language" in *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, vol. 1, *Clause Structure* ed. by Timothy Shopen (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1985), 243-81.