

Globethics Repository

The logo for Globethics, featuring the word "Globethics" in white, sans-serif font centered within a solid blue rectangular background.

An Essay on Middle Issues of Ancient Greek

This page was generated automatically upon download from the Globethics Repository. More information on Globethics see <https://www.globethics.net>. Data and content policy of Globethics Repository see <https://repository.globethics.net/pages/policy>.

Item Type	Article
Authors	Yoshihara, Hirokatsu
Publisher	Asia Pacific Theological Seminary (APTS)
Rights	All rights reserved.
Download date	2026-07-11 11:30:10
Link to Item	http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12424/164201

**An Essay on Middle Issues of Ancient Greek
Some Answers to Constantine Campbell in Defense
of Carl W. Conrad¹**

Part II

by Hirokatsu Yoshihara

**Semantic Relations Among Active/Middle/Passive and
Transitive/Intransitive**

In his emphasis on the inherent nature of the middle semantic in the Greek voice system and rationale for the integration of the traditional “middle/passive” and “passive” into a common “middle/passive” or “subject-focused,” Conrad argues that even Aorist/Future Passive, bearing the distinctly “passive” /-θη-/ morphology (*2a/b above), often renders the middle semantic:

The simple fact is that the $\theta\eta$ endings were never essentially passive, even if they were often used and understood as indicating a passive sense to the verb in question; rather the $\theta\eta$ endings are forms developed in the course of the history of ancient Greek (“relatively late”²) to function for the middle-passive in the aorist and future tenses.³

¹This 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.

²Carl W. Conrad, “New Observations on Voice in the Ancient Greek Verb,” unpublished paper, 2000.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.) 6. According to Klaiman, “while in earlier Homeric Greek, the passive is confined to the aorist alone.” M. H. Klaiman, *Grammatical Voice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1991), 84.

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>

³Conrad, “New Observations on Voice in the Ancient Greek Verb,” 6. He continues even with a stronger tone: “So what is commonly taught - that passive sense is distinguished by verb forms different from those indicating middle sense in only two

Conrad's view is independently shared by Klaiman and Fortson, their taking similar positions on the secondary nature of the passive in Greek, Sanskrit and PIE.⁴ Conrad also charts out a possible process of historical development of /-θη-/: "We need to grasp that the -θη- forms originated as intransitive aorists coordinated with "first" -σα aorists, that they increasingly assumed a function identical with that of the aorist middle-passives in -μην/σο/το and gradually supplanted the older forms."⁵ He thus contends that there was not much difference between /-θη-/ (intransitive > middle > middle/passive) and /-μην/ (traditionally middle) because /-θη-/ was indeed grammaticalizing the passive function through the semantic property of subject's affectedness, shared with the passive ("subject-focused" in Conrad's terms). Though both seem to have coexisted for some time, the former was driving out the latter "in a process of change."⁶

Conrad points out above that the aorist and future passive forms often render active meaning. He argues that such "active" usage can be attributed to the intransitive origin of /-θη-/, which he contends was originally intransitive aorist.⁷ For this point, Klaiman provides interesting insights: she has come up with prototypes of the active-only verbs, the middle-only, and verbs that alternate between the two in ancient IE languages.⁸

voices - is not really true after all; while the θη forms do indeed quite frequently indicate a passive sense, it cannot be assumed by any means that this was their regular and invariable function."

⁴The middle does not directly express passive meaning; rather, the semantic function or functions it encodes happen to be compatible with the meaning of the passive." Klaiman, *Grammatical Voice*, 85. In fact, Klaiman repeatedly makes similar remarks: "The IE middle has an affinity with various semantic functions consistently with affectedness, or denoting situations the principal effects of which devolve upon the referent of the logical subject." *Ibid.*, 105. "Indo-Europeanists concur that a formal passive did not exist in the proto-language. Rather, in the protolanguage there occurred one nonactive voice; its meanings or values included the expression of the passive semantic function." *Ibid.*, 84.

"A tradition of scholarship rejects positing a passive voice for PIE because there was no separate set of passive endings. But all the daughter languages that have a separate passive conjugation have developed it in whole or in part from the PIE middle endings, and it seems best to regard the middle as having been, in fact, a mediopassive or middle-passive - capable of expressing either voice depending on the context." Benjamin W. Fortson, IV, *Indo-European Language and Culture: An Introduction* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2004), 82.

⁵Conrad, "New Observations on Voice in the Ancient Greek Verb," 5.

⁶*Ibid.*

⁷*Ibid.*, 6.

⁸Klaiman, *Grammatical Voice*, 139, Fig. 3.7 "Prototype functions of basic voice categories."

She also points out an important contrast: "Active-only verbs more often express physical or bodily actions that tend to be performed reflexively, such as defecating,

Active-only

Non-control predicates

(a) Presupposed subject: animate/intentional (nondeponent semantic function) (#1) Typical instances: *sneeze, be fat*

(b) Presupposed subject: inanimate/nonintentional (#2)
Typical instances: *bloom, thunder, creak*

Middle-only

Control predicates

Presupposed subject: animate/intentional (deponent semantic function) (#3) Typical instances: *speak, think, sit*

Active/Middle

Agentive predicates (#4)

Typical instances: *increase* (Transitive), *bend* (Trans.)

Undergoing predicates (neuters) (#5)

Typical instances: *increase* (Intransitive), *bend* (Intrans.)

This prototypical chart provides at least three intriguing insights: 1) the active-only verbs that are intransitives are prototypically “non-control predicates”⁹ on the contrary to our assumption from the nomenclature of “active”: 2) in fact, it is the middle-only verbs (also intransitives by definition) that are prototypically with “control predicates”: 3) on the other hand, the “agentive predicates” (transitives), with which we would also quickly come up from the label “active,” are in the active as assumed, while their intransitive counterparts are prototypically in the middle as the “undergoing predicates,” which Klaiman also identifies as “inchoative.”¹⁰

Descriptively speaking, the relations among the intransitive, the middle and the passive are indiscreet, for a systematic description has

urinating, vomiting and the like. By contrast, the middle-only verbs of physical or bodily action more often express actions which are ascribable to animate participants and presuppose their control.” Ibid., 100. These morphological distinctions remind me of a similar opposition of Intransitive prefixes/infixes of Ilocano, a Philippine language: /ag-/ for more controlled verbs like *agadal*, ‘study’, *agsubli*, ‘go back’, *agdigos*, ‘take a bath, swim’, and /ma-/ or /(-)um-/ for more reflexive like *mapan*, ‘go’, *mangan*, ‘eat,’ *umay*, ‘come’, *umisbo*, ‘urinate’, etc.

⁹The subject is construed to have no control over the event in an unmarked linguistic environment. This non-control nature can be pragmatically canceled, for example, by saying, “Mary *intentionally* sneezed,” with an assumption that she has an ability of control to hold her sneezing *as far as she can* as an animate/intentional subject.

¹⁰Inchoative is “characteristic of uncontrolled events, or of verbally encoded situations presupposing no participant’s control.” Klaiman, *Grammatical Voice*, 318. Its subject is a PATIENT. Or, those are ones “denoting events which occur spontaneously, or without the specific intervention of a semantic Agent or instigator.” Ibid., 74.

to wait for a thorough investigation of concrete lexical items. However, if we experimentally work on Klaiman's prototypes above, we can say:

- 1) If the verb is **transitive**, the subject is an AGENT, and the subject is *semantically neutral* concerning affectedness. (#4 above; Transitive: 0 affectedness)
- 2) If the verb is **intransitive** and if the intransitive is **inchoative (neuter)**, the subject is a PATIENT because it is the would-be object of the morphologically corresponding transitive: the subject *semantically* bears affectedness from the verb. (#5 above; Intransitive: +affectedness)
- 3) If the verb is **intransitive**, if the intransitive is not inchoative (neuter), if the subject is animate/intentional, and if the verb is a control verb, then the intransitive is **middle-only**: the subject is a PATIENT and *semantically* bears affectedness from the verb. (#3 above; Intransitive: +affectedness)
- 4) If the verb is **intransitive**, if the intransitive is not inchoative (neuter), if the subject is animate/intentional, if the verb is a non-control verb, then the verb is **active-only**: the subject is an AGENT but can *pragmatically* bear affectedness from the non-control verb (#1 above; Intransitive: (+) affectedness).
- 5) If the verb is **intransitive**, if the intransitive is not inchoative (neuter), if the subject is inanimate/nonintentional, then the verb is a non-control verb and **active-only**: the subject is a PATIENT and *semantically* bears affectedness by itself (inanimate/nonintentional) and from the non-control verb. (#2 above; Intransitive: +affectedness)

Theoretically and prototypically speaking, therefore, all types of intransitive subjects are semantically (#2, 3, 5) and pragmatically (#1) with affectedness. This implies that they have affinity with the middle and passive subjects and thus their semantics. Although, descriptively speaking, concrete lexical items have to at least go through scrutiny in different linguistic contexts (practically impossible to diagnose them in all innumerable extralinguistic contexts), this affinity shows that Conrad's theory that /-θη-/ originally occurred as an intransitive marker and then developed into a middle/passive marker is highly plausible in a theoretical perspective.

An implication from what has been seen above is how we should treat the concept of “active.” In the educational settings for Greek “deponents,” it is usually said, “middle or passive in form but meaning in active.”¹¹ As far as the intransitives are concerned, however, it will be naïve to use the term “active” uncritically because the active includes both intransitives and transitives, and because intransitives, as just seen above, mostly bear subject affectedness in parallel to the middle/passive. When the notion of the middle is introduced, it is typically Direct Middle, in the formula that the subject acts upon or for himself/herself.¹² Thus, when “active” is used in the statement of “not middle but active,” it is implied that the subject acts NOT upon or for himself/herself but upon others (typically, transitive) or nothing (non-control intransitive with the animate/intentional subject).

However, here is a misleading point between Ancient Greek, and contemporary English as a dominant language of Greek education. When such neutrality is implied, the teacher may presuppose English verbs such as “go” or “eat,” as prototypical English intransitives. This is misleading because these verbs (“controlled” verbs with an “animate/intentional” subject in Klaiman’s terms) are prototypically categorized as middles in Ancient Greek and other IE languages (readily exemplified by ἔρχομαι/ποροῦμαι and φάγομαι, if not ἐσθίω).

In fact, Conrad can be critiqued or appreciated in his treatment of the concept of “active.” In some places, he clearly distinguishes the intransitive from the active, which is linguistically wrong; else, he includes the intransitive in the active. Such ambivalence of his conception is seen in some of his remarks: “We have already noted that the so called (*sic*) “Active” morphoparadigm is *by no means* bound up with transitive active meaning, that intransitive verbs may appear in the “Active” morphoparadigm.”¹³ “These verbs are intransitive - it is *absurd* to say that they carry an “active” sense”;¹⁴ “what is true of the verb ἐγείρω, which can be either *transitive and active* or passive or intransitive, is certainly true also . . .”;¹⁵ and “although it is true that

¹¹William D. Mounce, *Basics of Biblical Greek*, 2d ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2003), 150.

¹²It is interesting that, apart from the writers just cited [including Smyth], a number of Greek and Sanskrit grammarians are either silent about the middle’s expressing reflexive meaning . . . , or deny outright that it has any meaning corresponding to the semantic reflexive.” Klaiman, *Grammatical Voice*, 88, brackets mine.

¹³Ibid., 8, italics mine.

¹⁴Conrad, “New Observations on Voice in the Ancient Greek Verb,” 4, italics mine.

¹⁵Ibid., 3. The italics mine.

most ancient Greek verbs with “active” morphoparadigms are *transitive and active* in meaning, quite a few of them are intransitive . . .”¹⁶

Conrad can be critiqued that his understanding of the active (as a grammatical subcategory of Voice) and the intransitive (as a grammatical subcategory independent of, though related to, Voice) are confused. Yet, he can be appreciated in clearly recognizing the difference between the transitive (prototypically more “active” for him) and intransitive (prototypically more “middle” for him) semantics, as we have seen above, for when he uses the term “active” in his paper, it often goes with “*transitive and active*.” As to what Conrad probably means with many of his references to Greek examples, Klaiman elegantly verbalizes it: “The action notionally devolves from the standpoint of the most dynamic (or Agent-like) participant in the depicted situation.”¹⁷ It is perhaps recommended not to use the “active” anymore when one teaches the middle semantic: the middle is middle, and there is no point of describing it in light of the active semantic. This is especially true in the NT, as Wallace has been quoted,¹⁸ and even truer now that “deponents” have been confirmed just as middle in light of Miller and Kemmer.

Finally, Conrad quotes Guy Cooper and lists some active examples construed as passive:

Some verbs with “active” morphoparadigms may even bear an authentic passive sense; for example, aor. ἐάλων - “I was captured,” pf. ἐάλωκα of ἀλίσκομαι; πίπτω with ὑπό + gen. may mean “be felled in battle” and under the same circumstances ἀποθνήσκω may mean “be executed”; the usage of πάσχω is almost uncanny in that it can take a direct object and an agent construction and bear passive sense, so that δεινὰ ὑπὸ τῶν ἐχθρῶν μου ἔπαθον = “I was made to suffer terrible things by my enemies;” οἰκέω “sometimes seems to mean *be inhabited* . . . , certainly passive conceptions from our point of view.”¹⁹

¹⁶Ibid. The italics mine.

¹⁷Klaiman, *Grammatical Voice*, 3. This is mirrored by her statement about one view that “the middle signals lower transitivity.” Ibid., 45.

¹⁸Indirect Middle, not Reflexive Middle, “is a common use of the middle in the NT; apart from the deponent middle, it is the most common.” Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996), 419.

¹⁹K. W. Krüger, *Attic Greek Prose Syntax: Revised and Expanded in English*, vol. 1, trans. and ed. Guy L. Cooper III (n.p., Michigan: University of Michigan, 1998), 560; quoted by Conrad, “New Observations on Voice in the Ancient Greek Verb,” 3. Note that Conrad recognizes Cooper as virtually responsible for the work.

Although these examples might be extreme ones and could be evaluated along with what Conrad himself states about the passive sense found in some middle forms, namely not semantically inherent but *pragmatically construed*, he contends that the traditional “active” should be relabeled as “basic” or “simple” in the following sense that “they are unmarked - that is, they are the “regular” or “standard” or ‘basic’ forms for verbs which Greek-speakers/writers did not choose to specify as being “subject-focused.””²⁰

There are some possible interpretations to what Conrad presents in his quote of Cooper above: 1) as Fortson states in the previous note, the active voice of the earlier Greek system was not established well yet so that it could function flexibly with a passive semantic in such a certain linguistic environment with “ὕπό + genitive” especially because Cooper’s given verbs are all non-control verbs: ‘fall’, ‘die’, and ‘suffer’ (‘capture’ does not sound like one in the English sense, yet it is a middle/passive in the present “ἀλίσκομαι”); but 2) it is still difficult to explain the active alternation of “ἀλίσκομαι” to “ἔαλων” in the aorist and “ἔαλωκα” in the perfect: was it more idiomatic or simply errors in transmission of the text? Or, was it as Conrad himself says on the middle/passive alternation:

The Greek mind and the Greek language didn't distinguish the middle and passive meanings as a student who is not a Greek-speaker may think they ought to be distinguished; the simple fact is they didn't consider that distinction very important. . . . This distinction perhaps is more significant to the translator than it was to the ancient Greek.²¹

What is clearer is that this flexibility of the verbal system in earlier Classical Greek with the ὑπό construction - no matter what the internal linguistic motivation was - kept possible the development of the passive function of /-θη-/ , or even of /-μαι/ and /-μην/ much earlier.

One potentially parallel phenomenon is now going on in Modern Greek. That is a phenomenon called “inversion,” proposed by Katy Roland. According to T. Givón, the inversion is where “the patient (the object in the accusative in the active/transitive) is more topical than the agent (the subject in the nominative in the active/transitive, or what is marked by ὑπό + genitive in the ancient counterpart²²), but the agent

²⁰Conrad, *Ibid.*, 11. Fortson’s word may assist Conrad’s position: “The difference in meaning between these two voices [active and middle] in PIE is not fully clear.” Fortson, *Indo-European Language and Culture*, 82, brackets mine.

²¹Conrad, “New Observations on Voice in the Ancient Greek Verb,” 13.

²²In Modern Greek, the corresponding prepositional phrase is από + accusative.

retains considerable topicality,”²³ while the passive is where “the patient [the subject in the passive in the nominative] is more topical than the agent [marked by ὑπό + genitive in the ancient counterpart].”²⁴ If the existence of the ὑπό construction is necessary for the Ancient Greek middle to be construed as passive, the original motivation of the development of the passive from the middle or even the active may have been through a construction like the inverse construction. As has been discussed above, the voice system of Modern Greek is active/passive, but this kind of inverse construction is developing in the language today according to Roland.²⁵ Her research is intriguing and even supported by some statistical surveys to show the on-going development of the new construction in the language in the space where the existent grammatical constructions cannot fully function for people’s pragmatic need for certain types of information packaging and presentation in communication. It is possible to imagine that this kind of development was one of the possibilities of how the ancient passive was born from the existent active/middle.

In this section, I have discussed the relations among the active/middle/passive and transitivity/intransitivity in Greek in response to Conrad’s suggestions as his rationale for relabeling the active, and the middle/passive and the passive, as “active” and “middle/passive,” or more radically, “basic” or “simple” and “subject-focused,” respectively. If one emphasizes the more prototypical transitive nature of the active, the current nomenclature “active” looks fit. If one emphasizes the rather chaotic situation especially in light of the passive in the active, the new label “basic” or “simple” may avoid the potential confusion to be brought about by “active.” As to the integration of “middle/passive” and “passive,” it looks more plausible to adopt the new “subject-focused” because of the semantic property and the pragmatic effect, namely subject affectedness, commonly observed in the subject of these constructions. Now, let us turn all the way back to Campbell’s two questions on the “mixed deponents” and

David Holton, Peter Mackridge and Irene Philippaki-Warburton, *Greek: A Comprehensive Grammar of the Modern Language* (London: Routledge, 1997), 214, 380 and 381-2.

²³T. Givón, “The Pragmatics of De-transitive Voice” in *Voice and Inversion*, ed. T. Givón (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1994), 9, brackets mine.

²⁴Ibid, brackets mine.

²⁵The example below is from Katy Roland, “The Pragmatics of Modern Greek Voice” in *Voice and Inversion*, ed. T. Givón (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1994), 245. I supplemented the literal transcription, bold, black mine:

Ton ksipnise to telefono.

(ton=him/Acc, ksipnise=wake-Past-Act-3Sg, to=the, telefono=telephone/Nom)

(Lit., Him, woke up, the telephone = He was awakened by the telephone.)

the “passive deponents” based on the assumption that Conrad’s thesis is valid.

Answers to Campbell

To the “Mixed Deponents”

Reiterated, the question was “why some verbs have middle future forms.”²⁶ Campbell points out: “People often *do* speak of the future as certain, even if it is not,”²⁷ responding to Pennington and Bakker’s “linking the future tense with volitionality and intention.”²⁸

I would argue that language expressions are not flexible enough to reflect what the speaker perceives moment by moment because they are in the constraint of conventionalization. Yes, as a linguistic student subscribing to the Cognitive/Functional approaches, I admit and appreciate that language reflects human cognition flexibly. Oftentimes, however, the speaker/writer has to make the most use of the language in the limitation of the repertoire of its grammar and lexicon. In addition, the written language, which is the only available stock to us today concerning Ancient Greek, is conservative. Even if the spoken language was flexible enough to reflect such subtle differences that Campbell wonders about with regards to one’s perception of the future at the time of speaking, the written language that could record it would be functioning with much limited repertoire: if the written language had been flexible enough, we would attest to a more variety of future forms!²⁹

Rather, Conrad suggests the semantic property of the middle in the future - “a notion of *self-projection* or *self-propulsion*,”³⁰ which he considers are highly cognitive/mental so that the middle was one of the best choices for some verbs. Conrad also quotes Krüger (Cooper) to appeal to the volitionality, which is also highly self-involving: “The future was originally a *volitive* mood which only subsequently became

²⁶Constantine R. Campbell, *Advances in the Study of Greek: New Insights for Reading the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2015), 100.

²⁷Ibid.

²⁸Ibid.

²⁹Although the papyri that are said to carry far more spoken variation do not attest such flexibility, as examined by G. Adolf Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East: The New Testament Illustrated by Recently Discovered Texts of the Graeco-Roman World*, trans. Lionel R. M. Strachan (New York: Hodder and Stoughton, 1910), from which and others modern Greek grammars have been written, one may well wish to listen to Greek conversations with an MP3 recorder so as to collect a lot of linguistic variations that could be heard, reflecting different construal of assumptions and perceptions of the age!

³⁰Conrad, “New Observations on Voice in the Ancient Greek Verb,” 8.

a strictly temporal expression (tense form) as it is usually <sic> observed in both <sic> Archaic and Classical Attic usage.”³¹

Klaiman approaches this issue from the aspectual perspective: “In Greek, moreover, a large number of verbs (many of which express bodily actions) are invariably middle-inflecting in one tense category, the future . . . This is further evidence for the affinity of the middle with the temporomodal semantics of *noneventuality*.”³² She elaborates: “The middle, in contrast with the active, cross-linguistically displays an association with various kinds of *noneventuality*, e.g. with *atelic*,³³ *nonpunctual*, and/or *irrealis* temporomodal categories of the verb.”³⁴ *Noneventuality* is, according to Klaiman’s own definition, “characteristic of a verbally encoded situation or event which is *irrealis* and/or *nonpunctual*”: namely the potentiality of the event is lower; and/or the event will be durative, to be occurring over some period of time.

Paul Hopper and Sandra Thompson provide lists of prototypically higher transitivity and prototypically lower transitivity.³⁵ If Conrad’s assumption that the active was typically transitive is correct, that can be supported by Hopper and Thompson’s typological and universal observation on transitivity: lower transitivity is prototypically obtained by 1) one participant, 2) nonaction in “Kinesis,” 3) atelic in “Aspect,” 4) nonpunctual in “Punctuality,” 5) nonvolitional in “Volitionality,” 6) negative in “Affirmation,” 7) irrealis in “Mode,” 8) low potency in Agent in “Agency,” 9) Object not affected in “Affectedness of the Object,” and Object nonindividuated in “Individuation of the Object.” Klaiman’s point above at least echoes with 3), 4) and 7). In addition, the semantic nature of the future tense even echoes with 8) (contra Campbell’s counter-argument with speaker’s certain construal toward

³¹Krüger (Cooper), *Attic Greek Prose Syntax: Revised and Expanded in English*, vol. 1, 594; quoted by Conrad, “New Observations on Voice in the Ancient Greek Verb,” 8.

³²Klaiman, *The Grammatical Voice*, 96, italics mine.

³³Atelic (from Greek α- ‘not’ and τέλος, ‘end’) means that the whole event does not imply the completion of the event like the English sentence, “John is singing.” The example is from Bernard Comrie, *Aspect* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1976), 44.

Comrie provides a test to determine atelic and telic: “If a sentence referring to this situation in a form with imperfective meaning (such as the English Progressive) implies the sentence referring to the same situation in a form with perfect meaning (such as the English Perfect), then the situation is atelic; otherwise it is telic. Thus from *John is singing* one can deduce *John has sung*, but from *John is making a chair* one cannot deduce *John has made a chair*. Thus a telic situation is one that involves a process that leads up to a well-defined terminal point, beyond which the process cannot continue.” *Ibid.*, 44-5.

³⁴Klaiman, *The Grammatical Voice*, 105.

³⁵Paul J. Hopper and Sandra A. Thompson, “Introduction” in *Studies in Transitivity* ed. idem, *Syntax and Semantics* 15 (New York: Academic, 1982), 3.

the future event,³⁶ to which I have already provided my counter-argument above with regards to the relation between the flexibility of human cognition and the linguistic constraint of conventionalization, especially in written language) and 9) because the event has not taken place yet and because the Object has not been affected by the action yet. The future tense thus has quite an affinity with the middle voice.

The remaining problem, however, is Conrad's connection with the future tense with speaker's volitionality as seen above. While the volitive semantic was surely there and survived or even prevailed in the historical development of the future tense of Greek, with a result of which all the future forms in Modern Greek³⁷ are with the auxiliary verb $\theta\alpha$ that was derived from the Ancient $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega$ 'I will,' I believe what matters with the middle is not necessarily speaker's volitionality but speaker's mental projection in imagining the future. Speaker's high volitionality especially with a higher transitivity in fact contradicts with Hopper and Thompson's prototype of low transitivity. What is to be remembered, however, is the middle voiced future forms in Greek mostly maintain its transitivity (taking a direct object) like in $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ of $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\acute{\iota}\omega$ 'eat' and $\lambda\acute{\eta}\mu\psi\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ of $\lambda\alpha\mu\beta\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$ 'take'.

Klaiman points out that the middle of Fula (Fulani) in West Africa (non-IE) functions as detransitivizer, namely changing active transitives to middle intransitives. As seen above, Conrad's assumption is similar to such an understanding though he recognizes there are many intransitives in Greek *in spite* that they are active. In fact, Klaiman quotes Smyth and states:

Similarly, while offering various instances of reflexive-like middles (including a small number of genuine semantic reflexive middles, such as *paraskeuaze-sthai* 'prepare oneself'), Smyth 1974: 390 issues the qualification, "The direct reflexive idea is far more frequently conveyed by the active and a reflexive pronoun."³⁸

³⁶Campbell, "Deponency and the Middle Voice," 100.

³⁷Modern Greek has developed three future systems and two related conditional systems: Imperfective future (ex. $\theta\alpha$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega$ ($\theta\alpha$ + Present) 'I shall tie [more than once]'), Perfective future (ex. $\theta\alpha$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\theta\omega$ ($\theta\alpha$ + Dependent) 'I shall tie'), Future Perfect (ex. $\theta\alpha$ $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omega$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\theta\epsilon\iota$ ($\theta\alpha$ + Perfect) 'I shall have tied'); and Conditional (ex. $\theta\alpha$ $\acute{\epsilon}\delta\epsilon\nu\alpha$ ($\theta\alpha$ + Imperfect) 'I would tie') and Perfective Conditional (ex. $\theta\alpha$ $\acute{\epsilon}\iota\chi\alpha$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\epsilon\iota$ ($\theta\alpha$ + Pluperfect) 'I would have tied'). Holton, Mackridge and Philippaki-Warbuton, *Greek*, 122.

³⁸Klaiman, *The Grammatical Voice*, 88, quoting H. W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, rev. by G. M. Messing (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1974), 390.

This is evidence that the middle had a much stronger affinity with the intransitive as Conrad and Fortson³⁹ assume, and Klaiman more evidently proves as seen above, so that the transitive syntax with a reflexive pronoun and the transitive semantic of Direct Middle had been pushed out to alternate to the active. This echoes with our quotation of Wallace, saying the middle in NT is mostly Indirect Middle (plus Deponents), as has been quoted above.

The process of grammaticalization is also a blend of different semantic properties. Here, some Greek future forms have grammaticalized the middle semantics of “subject-focused” in Conrad’s terms and thus the middle (and secondarily passive in Conrad) morphology but have grammaticalized the higher volitionality to maintain their transitive behavior with a direct object although Greek shows some tendency like Fula that the middle can function as a detransitivizer.

In this section, Campbell’s first question about “Mixed Deponents” has been answered in two perspectives: 1) Campbell’s appeal to the speaker’s moment by moment construal of the event is cognitively and linguistically possible but is not attested to by the manuscripts probably due to the constraints of conventionalization and conservatism of written language; 2) arguments of the semantics of the middle voice and the future tense assisted by the prototype theory of transitivity (and intransitivity) strongly suggest the close affinity between the two though the degree of actual grammaticalization is not totally comprehensive but depends on each lexical item. Further examination of the semantic properties of, say, *φάγομαι*, *λήμψομαι* and many others will reveal more details of the motivation of grammaticalization of the middle morphology/semantic in concerned lexical items, where the future forms alternate to the middle.

To the “Passive Deponents”

While Campbell appreciates Conrad’s contention, summarizing it as “the “passive” forms are really an alternate set of middle-passive forms, so that both sets of middle-passive forms can express either middle or passive meanings, depending on lexeme and context,”⁴⁰ Campbell raises two further questions: 1) “What do we make of verbs that have middle and passive forms (traditionally understood)? Does

³⁹Fortson, *Indo-European Language and Culture*, 82. He quotes Hittite examples as typical, implying that the active is for the transitive, and the middle is for the intransitive. This is like Klaiman’s active-transitive/middle (neuter)-intransitive alternation like “break a glass” vs. “a glass broke” in English.

⁴⁰Campbell, “Deponency and the Middle Voice,” 101.

not the existence of both forms for the same lexeme suggest a meaningful semantic difference between them?”⁴¹ (2) “Is it true that some middle forms are actually passive in meaning?”⁴² To the first question, Conrad has already provided an answer: “In fact, however, there are really *very few* verbs in the Greek New Testament (GNT) database that are to be found in both the “MP” and the “Passive” morphoparadigms.”⁴³ He also contends that “the process of linguistic change has gradually shifted expression of the middle-passive sense in the aorist and future tenses from the older -μαι/σαι/ται; -μην/σο/το to the newer -θη- morphoparadigms.”⁴⁴

To the second question, Conrad lists “30 verbs in the GNT with forms in both aorist morphoparadigms”⁴⁵ of the μην and θη families and provides detailed discussions on three verbs, namely ἀγαλλιῶ, ἀποκρίνομαι and γίνομαι.⁴⁶ Especially as to γίνομαι, he states:

Although I can discern in some instances of ἐγενήθην more of a passive sense [namely, typically translated ‘was done’ in the given context], I find the same sense exemplified in forms of ἐγενόμην. I believe that we should recognize in these two verbs <sic> concurrent and competing forms of this verb with the same meanings and semantic functions in both the ἐγενόμην and the ἐγενήθην morphoparadigms.⁴⁷

Conrad also lists up 10 of its semantic functions with different syntactic structures and presents three sets of cases:⁴⁸ 1) “Aorist -θη- forms of γίνομαι where sense is passive” with 25 NT examples;⁴⁹ 2) “Aorist -θη- forms of γίνομαι where sense is middle” with 11 NT examples;⁵⁰ and 3) “Aorist -θη- forms of γίνομαι where sense is ambiguous: “too close to call”” with 9 NT examples.⁵¹ This makes a counter-argument to Campbell’s question to Pennington that “Pennington’s solution may also create another type of deponency, in which the middle form has been laid aside and the passive form has

⁴¹Ibid.

⁴²Ibid.

⁴³Conrad, “New Observations on Voice in the Ancient Greek Verb,” 15.

⁴⁴Ibid.

⁴⁵Ibid.

⁴⁶Ibid., 15-21.

⁴⁷Ibid., 16.

⁴⁸Ibid., 16-8.

⁴⁹Ibid., 18-9.

⁵⁰Ibid., 19-20.

⁵¹Ibid., 20-1.

taken its place, thus getting us back on to that merry-go-round.”⁵² As Conrad’s thesis insists, it seems more plausible that the middle and passive semantics were existent in both of his MP1 and MP2, in the two different sets of morphology, which he also insists of integrating into one label of “Subject-focused.”

In this section, we have discussed Campbell’s second question of “Passive Deponents.” Although we have to admit that Conrad’s extensive discussion of γινόμεαι is not totally a counter-argument to Campbell’s question because γινόμεαι is not a good example of the passive deponent but of the middle and passive coexisting and while it is absolutely true that such surveys as Conrad’s on other Greek verbs are urgently demanded, his argument to prove that γινόμεαι was rendering both the middle/passive semantics both in the middle/passive morphoparadigms provides a good proof that both the semantics were rendered both in MP1 and MP2, with a result of which it is plausible to integrate the two sets of morphology under one semantic “middle/passive” or the more radical “Subject-focused” by Conrad, not remaining in confusion between the two traditional labels of “middle/passive” and “passive.”

Conclusion

In this paper, I have tried to answer two of Campbell’s questions of “Mixed Deponents” and “Passive Deponents” with a critical summary and evaluation of Conrad’s thesis that the Greek “middle/passive” should be relabeled as “MP1” and “passive” as “MP2,” or rather more radically integrating the two under new nomenclature of “Subject-focused” while “active” to remain “active” or, more radically to be relabeled as “basic” or “simple.” I have to admit that my argumentation was heavily dependent upon literature studies of theoretical linguistics, especially on the Cognitive/Functional/Typological orientations. If some theoretical directions have been made clearer, further descriptive work on each Tense/Voice subcategory has to be conducted to enhance or modify them so that the argument may be more persuasive. Conrad carries many NT examples with several classical ones. The concerned reader is strongly recommended to refer to his easily downloadable paper for further investigation.

Finally, I could not incorporate a discussion over *unergativity* and *unaccusativity*, an up-to-date distinction of the grammatical behaviors and semantics of intransitive verbs though Klaiman provides some space in terms of her discussion of active-only verbs, middle-only verbs

⁵²Campbell, “Deponency and the Middle Voice,” 101.

and the active-middle alternation.⁵³ Also left behind is providing a similarly critical evaluation to Rutger Allen's dissertation at the University of Amsterdam. This is a task that is necessary for the next step of research of this kind. This paper mainly focused on findings from theoretical linguistics, but revisiting classic works from biblical studies will bring new lights and challenges.⁵⁴ May this kind of study in "basic science" advance NT exegesis even further.

Bibliography

Note: "Libronix" is the integrated literature management software produced and provided from Logos Bible Software (Bellingham, Washington, 2000-14). Its most updated version at the writing of this article is: Version 6.7 SR-1 (6.7.0.0044) (accessed November 25, 2015).

Browning, Robert. *Medieval and Modern Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.

Campbell, Constantine R. *Advances in the Study of Greek: New Insights for Reading the New Testament*. A foreword by D. A. Carson. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 2015.

_____. "Deponency and the Middle Voice." In Campbell, *Advances in the Study of Greek*: 91-104.

Carl W. Conrad. "New Observations on Voice in the Ancient Greek Verb." Unpublished paper, 2000.
<https://pages.wustl.edu/files/pages/imce/cwconrad/newobsancgrkv.c.pdf> (accessed November 16, 2015).

⁵³Klaiman, *Grammatical Voice*, 121-4. Though not from a Cognitive but Generative perspective, see Beth Levin and Malka Rappaport Hovav, *Unaccusativity* (Cambridge, MA: MIT, 1995). Yoshihara states: "It has been pointed out that the former is related to intransitive verbs with more agent-hood (e.g. 'run', 'study'), and the latter to those with more patient-hood (e.g. 'break', 'become'). The latter has been argued, also, in its relation to middle semantics. Incorporating these semantic categories in middle studies is a future task, too." Yoshihara, "Should the Concept of Deponency Be Abolished?" 30, n.4. However, since the morphological/syntactic realization of unergativity and unaccusativity may vary language by language in light of Klaiman, and its study seems to require a lot of native speaker's intuition according to Levin and Rappaport Hovav. How successful it will be to try to incorporate them in the middle studies of Ancient Greek will have no guarantee but be worth doing as well.

⁵⁴Rutger 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.).

Comrie, Bernard. *Aspect*. Cambridge Textbooks of Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

Fortson, Benjamin W., IV. *Indo-European Language and Culture: An Introduction*. Blackwell Textbooks in Linguistics 19. Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell, 2004.

Givón, T. "The Pragmatics of De-transitive Voice: Functional and Typological Aspects of Inversion." In *Voice and Inversion*, ed. T. Givón. Typological Studies in Language 28. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1994: 3-44.

Henle, Robert J., Sr. *Latin: Grammar*. Chicago: Loyola Press, 1958.

Holton, David, Peter Mackridge and Irene Philippaki-Warbuton. *Greek: A Comprehensive Grammar of the Modern Language*. Comprehensive Grammars. London: Routledge, 1997.

Hopper, Paul J., and Sandra A. Thompson. "Introduction." In *Studies in Transitivity*. Edited by Hopper and Thompson. New York: Academic Press, 1982: 1-5.

_____, ed. *Studies in Transitivity*. Syntax and Semantics 15. New York: Academic Press, 1982.

Kemmer, Suzanne. *The Middle Voice*. Typological Studies in Language 23. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1993.

Klaiman, M. H. *Grammatical Voice*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 59. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Krüger, K. W. *Attic Greek Prose Syntax: Revised and Expanded in English*, vol. 1. Translated and edited by Guy L. Cooper, III. N.p., Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1998. Quoted by Conrad, "New Observations on Voice in the Ancient Greek Verb."

Miller, Neva F. "A Theory of Deponent Verbs." Appendix 2. In *Analytical Lexicon of the Greek New Testament*. Edited by Timothy Friberg, Barbara Friberg, and Neva F. Miller. Baker's Greek New Testament Library. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker, 2000: 423-30; Libronix.

- Mounce, William D. *Basics of Biblical Greek: Grammar*, 2d ed. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 2003.
- Porter, Stanley E. *Linguistic Analysis of the Greek New Testament: Studies in Tools, Methods, and Practice*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker, 2015.
- Roland, Katy. “The Pragmatics of Modern Greek Voice: Active, Inverse and Passive.” In *Voice and Inversion*, ed. T. Givón. Typological Studies in Language 28. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1994: 233-60.
- Smyth, H. W. *Greek Grammar*. Revised by G. M. Messing. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1974). Quoted by Klaiman, *The Grammatical Voice*.
- Trenchard, Warren C. *A Concise Dictionary of New Testament Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament, with Scripture, Subject, and Greek Word Indexes*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 1996.
- Yoshihara, Hirokatsu. “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). Available at: <https://goo.gl/MZ18I5> (Reads, Em-Zee-one-eight-Ai-five) (accessed Nov. 24, 2015).