

Rodney J. Decker  
February 27, 1995

“Middleton in Miniature”  
A Synopsis of Part 1, Chapters 1–3 of:

Middleton, Thomas Fanshaw, *The Doctrine of the Greek Article Applied to the Criticism and Illustration of the New Testament*. Edited by H. J. Rose. New edition. London: Rivington, 1833.

Originally published in 1808, this work defends the thesis of Granville Sharp’s “rule”<sup>1</sup> against the (Socinian) criticism of that rule by Winstanley.<sup>2</sup> Middleton’s work, though now over 150 years old, remains “the most thorough treatment of the Greek article to date.”<sup>3</sup> It has, however, remained hard to find and relatively obscure. Few have even heard of it, let alone read it.<sup>4</sup> This paper summarizes the first three chapters of Middleton’s work. To provide an overview of the entire contents, the chapter titles for all of part one are given below with page numbers in parentheses. (Part 2, pp. 123–470, consists of notes on the New Testament in which Middleton comments on the use of the article, chapter by chapter through the New Testament.) The discussion and all the examples in part one are limited to classical texts. One of the reasons for this is the intended purpose of answering Winstanley’s criticisms of Sharp from extra-biblical Greek. The chief value of these initial chapters is to be found in chapter three where Middleton presents a detailed classification of the use of the article with common nouns.

1. Opinions of Grammarians respecting the Greek Article (1–5)
2. The Article Defined (6–31)
3. Appellatives (32–70)
  - 3.1. Insertions in Reference
  - 3.2. Insertions in Hypothesis
  - 3.3. Omissions
  - 3.4. Insertions and Omissions combined

---

<sup>1</sup>Granville Sharp, *Remarks on the Uses of the Definite Article in the Greek Text of the New Testament: Containing Many New Proofs of the Divinity of Christ, from Passages Which Are Wrongly Translated in the Common English Version* (Durham: Pennington, 1798; 2d ed., 1802; 3d ed., London: Vernor and Hood, 1803 = 1st American ed., Philadelphia: Hopkins, 1807).

<sup>2</sup>Calvin Winstanley, *A Vindication of Certain Passages in the Common English Version of the New Testament: Addressed to Granville Sharp, Esq.* (Cambridge: Univ. Press, 1819).

<sup>3</sup>Stanley E. Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1992), 103 n. 1.

<sup>4</sup>In addition to the reference by Porter (see previous note), see also (listed chronologically): A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, 4th ed. (Nashville, Broadman, 1923), 780, 795; C. F. D. Moule, *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek*, 2d ed. (Cambridge: Univ. Press, 1959), 94, 109, et. al.; Nigel Turner, *Syntax*, vol. 3 of *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* by J. H. Moulton (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963), 165; C. Kuehne, “The Greek Article,” *Journal of Theology* 13.3–15.1 (1973–75), et passim; and especially, Daniel B. Wallace, “The Article with Multiple Substantives Connected by KAI in the New Testament: Semantics and Significance” (Ph.D. diss., Dallas Theological Seminary, 1995), chapt. 2. Interestingly, BDF does not list Middleton’s work in the bibliography, and I found no reference to him in the section on the article—but neither is Granville Sharp mentioned, nor even the important essay on the article by Colwell.

4. Proper Names (71–90)
5. Abstract Nouns (91–97)
6. Anomalies (98–101)
7. With certain words (102–109)
8. Position in Concord (110–14)
9. How far the Classical Rules respecting the Article apply to the N. T. (115–20)

## Chapter 1: Opinions of Grammarians respecting the Greek Article

In his first chapter, Middleton surveys the comments of several grammarians on the article, including Apollonius Dyscolus (2d C.), Theodore Gaza (15th C.), a “Mr. Harris” (author of *Hermes*), Lord Monboddo, and Horne Tooke. He is generally dissatisfied with all of their treatments of the article.

## Chapter 2: The Article Defined

Middleton defines the article as follows: “The Greek Prepositive Article is the Pronoun Relative ‘O, so employed that its relation is supposed to be more or less obscure; which relation, therefore, is explained in some Adjunct annexed to the Article by the Participle of Existence expressed or understood” (6).

Translated into more familiar dress, that says that the article is actually a relative pronoun used when ambiguity would otherwise result. It is a “shorthand” notation for a more explicit statement. For example,<sup>5</sup> ὁ υἱός (*the son*) is short for ὁ ὢν υἱός (*he being the son*). This is different from αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός as “*Assumption* differs from *Assertion*” (6). In other words, the article with υἱός does not make a statement (assertion), but assumes the relationship involved. “Relation,” in the definition above, refers to the article/pronoun’s antecedent (or referent?).

The five sections of the chapter address various aspects of or objections to this proposed definition.

### 2.1: On the Article in Homer

Middleton next discusses the use of the article in Homer. This has apparently been a subject of considerable dispute in classical scholarship,<sup>6</sup> for Middleton refers to the position that the article is an invention of later times—Homer’s use of the same form is the equivalent of αὐτός or ἐκεῖνος (7). Middleton rejects the first part of this statement, but agrees with the second. He asks, however, if that use has ever really changed? In his quest for an answer he illustrates Homer’s use of the article with numerous examples, of which only two will be included here.

---

<sup>5</sup>The example is mine, not Middleton’s. I think this is what he intends to say.

<sup>6</sup>See the “Internet Notes” later in this regard.

Iliad 1.9–10.<sup>7</sup> ὁ γὰρ βασιλῆϊ χολωθείς νοῦσον ἀνὰ στρατὸν ὦρσε κακὴν<sup>8</sup> (for he, being embittered against the king, let loose a bad plague upon the army). Homer’s use of ὁ in this example would normally be αὐτὸς or ἐκεῖνος in later writers.

Iliad 4.399–400. ἀλλὰ τὸν υἱὸν γείνατο εἶο χερεῖα μάχῃ (but his son he begat is worse than he in battle). It would seem that τὸν υἱὸν could be translated simply “the son,” but Middleton prefers “his son.”

He then asks how these uses are any different from later writers, arguing that the difference between article and pronoun in the examples he cites is negligible. If this is so, he suggests that the article should be considered a pronoun in both Homer and later writers (8). “The pronominal nature of ὁ is, therefore, in *some* instances, established beyond contradiction; and we have only to ascertain whether this pronominal nature be ever lost” (9). He proceeds to argue that Homer did not entertain any idea of a difference between the use of ὁ as an article or as a pronoun, concluding that “the difference between the Article and the Pronoun is not *essential*, but *accidental*; and consequently, when we are speaking of the *nature* of the Article, that there is no difference at all... Homer’s Article, it is admitted, is a Pronoun: but so is the Article universally” (10–11).

Since the article is a pronoun, then why use different names to describe them? The answer is *functional*. Although they are “essentially the same thing,” the pronoun never has a nominal adjunct (i.e., a noun that it governs), whereas the article may. “ὁ is always a Pronoun, though it usually retains that name, only when it is a *defined Article*, i.e. when the object of its relation is so plainly marked, that no mistake can arise, and when, consequently, no Adjunct is requisite; they called it an *undefined Article*, when such addition became necessary to the perspicuity of its meaning” (13–14).

<b>Pronouns</b>			
Article:	undefined article	antecedent unclear	adjunct needed for clarity
Pronoun:	defined article	antecedent is clear	no adjunct needed

## 2.2. Object of its relation

This section considers the antecedent of the article/pronoun, developing the point that the undefined article is used rather than the defined article (= pronoun proper) for purposes of clarity in identifying the proper antecedent (which may also, of course, be a postcedent; i.e., the article may be either retrospective or anticipative—looking backward or forward, see 2.4.). The gender is a key in proper identification because the article will always agree with its antecedent in gender. Instances where this is not true usually require the reader to supply a noun that refers to the proper object. One example he cites of this is the phrase ἡ σήμερον—in which instance the article is FSN, but it modifies an adverb (which does not decline). In this instance ἡμερα is to be supplied:<sup>9</sup> ἡ ἡμερα ὧν σήμερον. This exact combination is not found in the NT, but a genitive

<sup>7</sup>Middleton’s classical references do not use the standard method of citation currently employed. His references appear, e.g., as Iliad A. v. 6. Translated, this reads: Iliad, book one, line six. He uses Greek uncial characters to refer to the book number in which A = 1, B = 2, Γ = 3, etc. The v. stands for *line* (*versus*).

<sup>8</sup>χολωθείς = aor. pass. ptcp. > χολόω; ὦρσε = aor. > ὄρνυμι.

<sup>9</sup>Liddell & Scott, ab. ed., 633; Middleton, 15. Another example cited is τὸ Ἀριστάρχου (neut. art. with masc. noun). The full sense is probably τὸ ὄνομα ἐστίν ὧν Ἀριστάρχου (= his name being Ἀ.).

is found in Matt. 27:8, διὸ ἐκλήθη ὁ ἀγρὸς ἐκεῖνος ἀγρὸς αἵματος ἕως τῆς σήμερον. That ἡμέρας is intended is evident from the *v.l.* in the parallel passage, Matt. 28:15, οἱ δὲ λαβόντες τὰ ἀργύρια ἐποίησαν ὡς ἐδιδάχθησαν. καὶ διεφημίσθη ὁ λόγος οὗτος παρὰ Ἰουδαίους μέχρι τῆς σήμερον [ἡμέρας].<sup>10</sup>

This principle explains why the article “is placed immediately, or almost immediately before its *Predicate*; for the reference being anticipative, the mind of the hearer will not bear long suspense; till the object of reference be known, every thing intervening will be disregarded” (17). (The *predicate* of an article is the noun that it governs.)

### 2.3. Obscure reference

The referent of the article may be obscure if the adjunct is omitted, but this is not unexpected or problematic to an explanation of the article as a pronoun. The pronoun itself often has an obscure referent. Apollonius pointed out that,

pronouns are of no use, when deprived of the person indicating and the person indicated: for when written, they are of all things the most indefinite, because then they are detached from their proper subject-matter. Hence we see the reason, why perfect writing requires the addition of the Nouns themselves. (18)

It is the nature of the article and/or pronoun that creates the obscurity. The inclusion of the article’s adjunct is only the speaker’s/writer’s effort to achieve maximum clarity (19).

A key statement in this section, and one on which Middleton will build in the next section, is that the article frequently is used as a *symbol* of what is primary in the speaker’s mind (and is usually assumed to be uppermost in the hearer’s mind also) (20).

### 2.4. Anticipative reference vindicated

The thrust of this section is to demonstrate that the article (particularly viewed as a pronoun) may refer not only to an antecedent referent, but also to an anticipative referent, that is, one that he is about to introduce in the discussion but which has not previously been identified. The article is thus a symbol for what is uppermost in the speaker’s mind in regard to previous statements (see previous section) and may also serve as a symbol for what is about to become the subject of a statement (25). He summarizes,

On the whole, it appears that the Article may be used, either when conjointly with its Predicate it recalls some former idea, or when it is intended to serve as the subject of an hypothesis. All the various uses of the Article will come under one of these two divisions. (25)

### 2.5. Participle of existence understood

The final section in chapter two returns to the last phrase of his proposed definition that refers to the participle of existence that is understood by the article. He explains that the article appears to indicate an ellipsis of ὄν and thus makes the same statement as if ὄν had been written (“the subintellection of the participle becomes a necessary consequence,” 26). Middleton’s example is

---

<sup>10</sup>The bracketed ἡμέρας is omitted by  $\aleph$  A W 0148<sup>vid</sup>  $f^1$ , 13 33 n e ff<sup>2</sup>. It is included by B D L  $\Theta$  *pc* lat. It is interesting in this case that the Majority Text *omits* the word that makes the text smoother by explicitly identifying the grammatical antecedent.

of ὁ ἀνὴρ (the man), which is the same as ὁ ὢν ἀνὴρ (he being a man). The difference between assertion and assumption (referred to above) is expanded on the basis that “every Proposition contains a *Subject* and a *Predicate* connected by a *Copula*; and that where this *Copula* is not marked by a distinct word, it is implied in the Verb” (26–27).

### Chapter 3: Appellatives

This chapter applies the definition of the article set out in chapter two to actual usage and catalogs the various rules that reflect when the article is either used or omitted. Middleton gives numerous examples in this section—all from classical writers. Examples cited below (where given) have been supplied from the NT.<sup>11</sup>

#### 3.1. Insertions in Reference

This section enumerates nine instances where the article is used (“inserted”). In most cases the article recalls some familiar idea, whether the technical anaphoric use or a more general relationship (ctr. with 3.2. below).

##### 1. Renewed mention

This category is known in contemporary terminology as the article of previous reference (or more technically, *anaphoric*) and is used “when a person or thing recently mentioned is spoken of again ... the Article ... is inserted when the mention is renewed.” This may be the same noun or a synonymous one may be substituted. It may also occur when there has not been a specific noun used, “but the existence of such person or thing may be inferred from what has been said.” (32)

John 4:7, γυνή ... 4:9, ἡ γυνή ἡ Σαμαρίτις

John 4:10, ὕδωρ ζῶν ... 4:11, τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ζῶν

##### 2. Well-known person or thing ( κατ' ἐξοχὴν )<sup>12</sup>

The article may indicate an object that is preeminent in the mind of the hearer. This is not necessarily “the best” of something (though it may be), but only what is uppermost in the mind at the time. (It could also indicate the worst of something.) It is pressing the rule too far, however, to argue just from the presence of the article that the object referred to is the ultimate in its category. (This is frequently done with the reference to Nicodemus in John 3:10, σὺ εἶ ὁ διδάσκαλος τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ταῦτα οὐ γινώσκεις;)

John 1:21, ὁ προφήτης εἶ σύ; (As the religious leaders attempt to figure out who John is, the possibility that he is the well-known prophet of Deut. 18 forms the basis of their query.)

<sup>11</sup>These examples have been drawn from Wallace, *Exegetical Syntax*; Young, *Intermediate NT Greek*; Porter, *Idioms*; or from acCordance searches (there are some from all four).

<sup>12</sup>ἡ ἐξοχή = a standing out, prominence: metaphorically, *eminence* (L&S, ab. ed., 238); cp. Acts 25:23, ἀνδράσιν τοῖς κατ' ἐξοχὴν τῆς πόλεως (the prominent men of the city)—a NT *hapax*.

Gal. 4:22, τῆς παιδίσκης ... τῆς ἐλευθέρᾱς (the slave woman ... the free woman)

### 3. Monadic nouns

A monadic noun identifies a class of one: a unique, one-of-a-kind object of which there are no other instances. [Although Middleton classifies them separately, it would seem that objects of nature (#5) and proper names would fit here as well.]

Matt. 5:18, ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ

Matt. 4:1 Τότε ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνήχθη εἰς τὴν ἔρημον ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος πειρασθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου.

### 4. Possessive pronoun

The article frequently functions as a possessive pronoun. The context makes this clear; if it does not, it is probably not legitimate to base an exegetical point on such a use.

Matt. 8:3, ἐκτείνᾱς τὴν χεῖρα ἥψατο αὐτοῦ (stretching out his hand, he touched him)  
Note that *his* is not the translation of αὐτοῦ but of the article; αὐτοῦ (= *him*) is genitive because ἄπτω takes its object in that case.

Matt. 13:28–29, ὁ δὲ ἔφη αὐτοῖς ... οἱ δὲ δοῦλοι λέγουσιν αὐτῷ ... ὁ δὲ φησιν (And he said to them ... but the slaves said to him ... and he replied) [This example also illustrates the use of ὁ δὲ to change subjects in dialog.]

### 5. With objects of nature

[See under monadic nouns (#3).]

### 6. General or abstract qualities expressed by neuter adjectives

Matt. 5:39, ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν μὴ ἀντιστῆναι τῷ πονηρῷ· (English would probably not use the definite article here, but translate simply *an evildoer*.)

Matt. 7:6 Μὴ δώτε τὸ ἅγιον τοῖς κυσὶν (Do not give *what is holy* to dogs.)

### 7. Correlatives in regimen having a mutual reference (genitive construction)

*Correlatives* are words in *regimen*, having a *mutual* reference; and consequently so circumstanced, that if the first relate to the second, the second must relate to the first. The Greek writers, it is observed, mark the relation in the *second* wherever it is necessary to mark it in the first: in other words, where the first has the Article, the second has it likewise. (36)

This is Apollonius' canon that states that when a noun is modified by a genitive noun, either both will have the article or both will lack it.<sup>13</sup> Middleton's classical example is:

Plato, *Theaetetus* 2.126, ἡ τοῦ γεωργοῦ δόξα (the opinion of the farmer)

Middleton notes a number of exceptions to this rule, including proper names in the genitive, βασιλεύς (both noted by Apollonius), enumeration, γένος, and abstract nouns. The only Greek writer who seems to disregard this use is Philo. NT examples where the rule is followed are numerous; one contrasting pair will suffice:

2 Cor. 6:7, ἐν λόγῳ ἀληθείας, ἐν δυνάμει θεοῦ

Col. 1:5, ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῆς ἀληθείας τοῦ εὐαγγελίου

## 8. Partitives and wholes

This is a specialized instance of the preceding rule (having similar exceptions). In this case the noun in regimen is the partitive genitive<sup>14</sup> and the governing noun is the part. Middleton illustrates from:

Aristotle, *Metaphysics* lib. 10.100.1. αἱ μαθηματικαὶ τῶν ἐπιστημῶν (the mathematicians among the learned; = part > whole)

NT examples include:

Rom. 15:26, τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῶν ἀγίων (the poor among the saints; πτωχοὺς is the part, ἀγίων is the whole; both have the article)

Jude 13, κύματα ἄγρια θαλάσσης (wild waves of the sea; κύματα [waves] is the part, θαλάσσης is the whole; neither have the article)

## 9. Pronominal sense (a mutual relation expressed with μέν and δέ)

When two things are contrasted with each other by the use of μέν ... δέ, the same pattern of article use is observed as with partitives: either both have it, or neither do.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>13</sup>This generally holds true, though there are numerous exceptions. For a concise summary see Young, *Intermediate NT Greek*, 67. Young suggests that the exceptions may be explained one of two ways: "(1) the head noun may be anarthrous while the genitive qualifier is articular, especially if the head noun is the object of a preposition, a predicate nominative, or vocative; (2) either may be anarthrous if it is a proper name (including κύριος) even though the other may be articular" (67). For more detailed discussion, see Wallace, *Exegetical Syntax*, 181–84; and Hull, *TJ* 7 (1986): 3–16.

<sup>14</sup>Partitive genitive denotes the whole of which the head noun is a part. Wallace suggests that *wholative* is a less confusing term (*ES*, 68 n. 32), though the name is not likely to change.

<sup>15</sup>For additional examples with the article, see: Matt. 25:33 καὶ στήσει τὰ μὲν πρόβατα ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ, τὰ δὲ ἐρίφια ἐξ εὐωνύμων; Matt. 26:41 γρηγορεῖτε καὶ προσεύχεσθε, ἵνα μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς πειρασμόν· τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα πρόθυμον ἢ δὲ σὰρξ ἀσθενής; Mark 14:38 γρηγορεῖτε καὶ προσεύχεσθε, ἵνα μὴ ἔλθητε εἰς πειρασμόν· τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα πρόθυμον ἢ δὲ σὰρξ ἀσθενής; Acts 22:9 οἱ δὲ σὺν ἐμοὶ ὄντες τὸ μὲν φῶς

Rom. 7:25, ἐγὼ τῷ μὲν νοῦ δουλεύω νόμῳ θεοῦ τῇ δὲ σαρκὶ νόμῳ ἁμαρτίας (I, on the one hand, with my mind serve the law of God, but on the other hand, with my flesh I serve the law of sin.)

1 Cor. 1:23, ἡμεῖς δὲ κηρύσσομεν Χριστὸν ἐσταυρωμένον, Ἰουδαίους μὲν σκάνδαλον, ἔθνεσιν δὲ μωρίαν

### 3.2. Insertions in hypothesis

#### 1. Representative of something of which an assumption is to be made

In contrast to the previous section (3.1), these uses are instances in which the article is used as a symbol or representation of something of which an assumption (hypothesis) is to be made in the subsequent statement (39).

Demosthenes, *de Cor.* § 71, πονηρὸν ὁ συκοφάντης ἀεί. (A slanderer is always evil.)<sup>16</sup>

Middleton's point seems to be that the article points to an assertion about a specific instance of a class. This is usually referred to today as the generic article, though the singular and plural are not differentiated (i.e., both this category and the next are combined). The definite article is usually *not used* in English translation. NT examples of the singular include:

1 Cor. 7:28, ἐὰν γήμη ἡ παρθένος, οὐχ ἥμαρτεν (If a virgin marry, she has not sinned.)

1 Tim. 3:2, δεῖ οὖν τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἀνεπίλημπτον εἶναι (Therefore a bishop must be blameless.)

#### 2. Inclusive sense: classes and descriptions of persons or things (plural)

As in the previous category, the article may also be used in the plural “to denote whole *classes* and *descriptions* of *persons* or *things*” (40). Middleton gives an example from:

---

ἐθεάσαντο τὴν δὲ φωνὴν οὐκ ἤκουσαν τοῦ λαλοῦντός μοι; Acts 27:41 περιπεσόντες δὲ εἰς τόπον διθάλασσον ἐπέκειλαν τὴν ναῦν καὶ ἡ μὲν πρῶρα ἐρείσασα ἔμεινεν ἀσάλευτος, ἡ δὲ πρύμνα ἐλύετο ὑπὸ τῆς βίας [τῶν κυμάτων]; Rom. 7:25 χάρις δὲ τῷ θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν. Ἔρα οὖν αὐτὸς ἐγὼ τῷ μὲν νοῦ δουλεύω νόμῳ θεοῦ τῇ δὲ σαρκὶ νόμῳ ἁμαρτίας; Rom. 8:10 εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, τὸ μὲν σῶμα νεκρὸν διὰ ἁμαρτίαν τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωὴ διὰ δικαιοσύνην; Eph. 4:11, Καὶ αὐτὸς ἔδωκεν τοὺς μὲν ἀποστόλους, τοὺς δὲ προφήτας, τοὺς δὲ εὐαγγελιστάς, τοὺς δὲ ποιμένας καὶ διδασκάλους.

For additional examples without the article, see: Rom. 8:17 εἰ δὲ τέκνα, καὶ κληρονόμοι· κληρονόμοι μὲν θεοῦ, συγκληρονόμοι δὲ Χριστοῦ, εἶπερ συμπάσχομεν ἵνα καὶ συνδοξασθῶμεν; 1 Cor. 12:20 νῦν δὲ πολλὰ μὲν μέλη, ἐν δὲ σῶμα; 1 Cor. 15:39 Οὐ πᾶσα σὰρξ ἡ αὐτὴ σὰρξ ἀλλὰ ἄλλη μὲν ἀνθρώπων, ἄλλη δὲ σὰρξ κτηνῶν, ἄλλη δὲ σὰρξ πτηνῶν, ἄλλη δὲ ἰχθύων; 1 Pet. 3:18 ὅτι καὶ Χριστὸς ἅπαξ περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἔπαθεν, δίκαιος ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων, ἵνα ὑμᾶς προσαγάγῃ τῷ θεῷ θανατωθεῖς μὲν σαρκὶ ζωοποιηθεῖς δὲ πνεύματι·

<sup>16</sup>The diachronic word sleuth could make a lot of mileage with the word συκοφάντης. Its historical roots refer to a “one who brings figs to light by shaking the tree,” (> σῦκον, fig + φαίνω, show) thus “a fig-shower,” or “fig-informer,” i.e., one who informed against persons exporting figs from Attica. It came to be used of any informer. (L&S, ab. ed., 661.) Thankfully the word is not used in the NT and so its etymology will not likely be subjected to pulpit abuse!

Demosthenes, *de Cor.* § 58, τα ῥήγματα καὶ τα σπάσματα, ὅταν τι κακὸν τὸ σῶμα λάβῃ, τότε κινεῖται (When the body receives some injury, then fractures and spasms are stirred up.)

Matt. 8:20, αἱ ἀλώπεκες φωλεοὺς ἔχουσιν καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατασκηνώσει (Foxes have holes and birds of the air have nests.)

Eph. 5:25, Οἱ ἄνδρες, ἀγαπᾶτε τὰς γυναῖκας (Husbands, love your wives.)

### 3.3. Omissions

#### 1. Propositions affirming or denying existence

Matt. 4:18, ἦσαν γὰρ ἀλιεῖς (for they were fishermen)

#### 2. Nouns preceding substantive or nuncupative verbs (or participles)

Middleton's statement of this principle is as follows:

Another *omission*, which arises out of the nature of the *Copula*, is that which is observable in all Nouns preceded by *Verbs* or *Participles*, *Substantive* or *Nuncupative*. In such cases the Noun is always *anarthrous*...

...In general they express some attribute or dignity possessed exclusively, and might therefore be expected to take the Article κατ' ἐξοχήν: but this is forbidden by the Verb or Participle preceding; which is used to indicate, as hitherto unknown, the very truth which the presence of the Article would imply to be known or supposed already: for such, as we have seen, is the force of the assumptive Copula understood. (43)

[I must admit perplexity at this point. *Nuncupative* means *oral* as opposed to written. The only possibility that I can conjure here is that it refers to an elided verb or participle that must be assumed/supplied by the reader. Beyond that, the statement appears to relate to the syntactical pattern *verb* > *noun*. But all but one of the examples cited (6 classical and 2 LXX) contain the pattern *noun* > *verb*. The best I can do here is to offer the examples with (very) rough translations.<sup>17</sup>]

Demosthenes, *de Cor.* § 23, αἴτιος εἰμί τοῦ πολέμου (I am the cause of the war.)

Aesch. [= Aeschines or Aeschylus?], *cont. Ctes.* §20, τοὺς κονδύλους, οὓς ἔλαβεν ἐν τῇ ὀρχήστρᾳ χόρηγος ὢν. (...the knuckles [?], which he received in the orchestra being the chorus leader.)

Ibid. §43, ὁ πολμῶν ἐν ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς γράφειν ὅτι δεσποτης ἐστίν ἀπάντων ἀνθρώπων (the one who is bold to write in the message [command? declaration?] to write that he is lord of all men.)

---

<sup>17</sup>Lack of any context renders this endeavor precarious. Underlining in these examples was represented by uncial characters in the original. Please note also that I had only the abridged edition of L&S to work with, and no access to the full texts.

Ibid. §61, Ἀριστείδης ὁ δίκαιος ἐπικαλούμενος (A. is the one called righteous.)

Demosthenes, *de Cor.* §52, ὃν οὐκ ἂν ὀκνήσαιμι ἔγωγε κοινωνῶν ἀλιτηριον εἶπειν (???)  
ὀκνήσαιμι ? > ὀκνέω, to shrink, hesitate, aor. μι form? ??? ἔγωγε ??? κοινωνος, common;  
ἀλιτηριον, sinful)

Aesh., *cont. Ctes.* §47, προδοτας τῶν Ἑλλήνων τοὺς Βοιωτάρχας ἐκαλεσε (He called the  
Boeotarchs [magistrates of Boeotia] of the Greeks traitors.)

Psalms 46:[7], ὅτι βασιλευς (scil. ἐστι\*) πάσης τῆς γῆς ὁ θεός (... that God is king of all  
the earth.) [\*i.e., ἐστι is to be supplied.]

Isa. 9:6, καὶ καλεῖται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ μεγάλης βουλήs ἄγγελος, θαυμαστος,  
συμβουλος, ἰσχυρος,... (His name will be called Messenger of Great Counsel,  
Wonderful, Advisor, Strong One,...)<sup>18</sup>

### 3. After verbs of appointing, choosing, creating, etc.

With verbs of appointing, choosing, or creating, the noun that indicates the nature of the appointment, choice, etc. is always anarthrous. (Nouns given in the examples include αἰρέω, ποιέω, τίθημι, and καθίστημι.)<sup>19</sup>

Demosthenes, *de Cor.* §59, ἡγεμων καὶ κυριος ἡρεθη<sup>20</sup> Φιλιππος ἀπάντων (Philip was  
appointed leader and lord of all.)

Acts 20:28, προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς καὶ παντὶ τῷ ποιμνίῳ, ἐν ᾧ ὑμᾶς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον  
ἔθετο ἐπισκόπους (Watch yourselves and all the flock over which the Holy Spirit has  
appointed you overseers.)

Rom. 4:17, καθὼς γέγραπται ὅτι πατέρα πολλῶν ἐθνῶν τέθεικά σε (Just as it stands  
written, “I have appointed you father of many nations.”) [Note that this is a double  
accusative, which appears to follow the same rule.]

<sup>18</sup>Note that there are textual variants in this text; the transl. given is of the text cited by Middleton; both the LXX and MT differ.

<sup>19</sup>An exception appears in 1Cor. 12:18, νυνὶ δὲ ὁ θεὸς ἔθετο τὰ μέλη, ἐν ἑκάστῳ αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ σώματι καθὼς ἠθέλησεν (God appointed the members...).

Other positive examples include 1Cor. 12:28 Καὶ οὓς μὲν ἔθετο ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ πρῶτον ἀποστόλους, δεύτερον προφήτας, τρίτον διδασκάλους, ἔπειτα δυνάμεις, ἔπειτα χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων, ἀντιλήψεις, κυβερνήσεις, γένη γλωσσῶν; 1Tim. 2:7 εἰς ὃ ἔτεθην ἐγὼ κῆρυξ καὶ ἀπόστολος, ἀλήθειαν λέγω οὐ ψεύδομαι, διδάσκαλος ἐθνῶν ἐν πίστει καὶ ἀληθείᾳ; 2Tim. 1:11 εἰς ὃ ἔτεθην ἐγὼ κῆρυξ καὶ ἀπόστολος καὶ διδάσκαλος; and Heb. 1:2, ἐπ’ ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων ἐλάλησεν ἡμῖν ἐν υἱῷ, ὃν ἔθηκεν κληρονόμον πάντων, δι’ οὗ καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς αἰῶνας. (This is a complete list for τίθημι; no examples were found using αἰρέω; other words were not checked.)

<sup>20</sup>ἡρεθη = 3SAPI > αἰρέω.

#### 4. Nouns in apposition that express the end or object

“Nouns in *apposition*, not explanatory of the essence of the preceding Noun, but of the end or object, to which the person or thing implied in it is affirmed to be subservient, are always anarthrous” (45).

Demosthenes, *de Cor.* §69, δυναμιν εἶχεν ἡ πόλις τοὺς νησιώτας (The city has power over the islanders.)

#### 5. Exclusive propositions

In “exclusive propositions ... the negation is meant to extend to every individual or to the whole species in question, so as to *exclude universally*” (46).

The force of the negation will not be duly estimated, unless it be taken to *exclude universally* the several objects spoken of.... In all of them the word *any* may in English be supplied before the several Nouns, or (which is the same thing) the negative must be rendered by *no*, in order adequately to give the sense. (47)

Demosthenes, *de Cor.* §28, οὐ ναυς, οὐ τειχη τῆς πόλεως τότε κεκτημένης (not [any] ship, not [any] walls of the city at that time had been acquired)

Heb. 8:2, τῶν ἁγίων λειτουργῶς καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς, ἣν ἔπηξεν ὁ κύριος, οὐκ ἄνθρωπος (a minister of the temple [holy things] and of the true tent that the Lord set up, not [any] man.)

#### 6. Nouns in regimen

This is the converse of 3.1.7. above; in this instance Middleton gives examples of the omission of the article. (An example of each was included above.)

#### 7. Indefinite governing noun

If the governing noun is both anarthrous *and* indefinite the governed noun will also be anarthrous.

Plutarch, *Conviv.* p. 99, ψυχῆς γὰρ ὄργανον τὸ σῶμα (For the body is an instrument of the soul.) Here the governing noun is ὄργανον which is both anarthrous *and* indefinite (*an* instrument), thus the governed noun (ψυχῆς) is also anarthrous.

The editor (Rose) notes that there are a number of exceptions to this rule, particularly when the governing noun is the *anarthrous* object of a preposition, but the governed noun that follows in the genitive is *arthrous*.

### 3.4. Insertions and Omissions Combined

#### 1. Subject and predicates of propositions

The general rule is that the subject usually has the article and the predicate does not (51). This may be seen in Mark 2:28, κύριός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (The Son of Man is Lord). The article in copulative sentences therefore often serves as the indicator of the subject. There are, however, other options involving *convertible* or *reciprocating* propositions “which are such, that of either term taken as the Subject the other may be affirmed as a Predicate” (54). These may take one of three forms.<sup>21</sup>

1. Both nominatives in a copulative sentence have the article.

John 15:1, ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ γεωργός ἐστιν (My Father is the vinedresser.)

2. Neither nominative in a copulative sentence has the article.<sup>22</sup>

Eph. 5:23, ἀνὴρ ἐστιν κεφαλὴ τῆς γυναικὸς (The husband is the head of the wife.)

3. Two nominatives in a copulative sentence are joined by a coordinating conjunction and linked by the copulative to ταυτό.<sup>23</sup>

Aristotle, *Top. lib.* 1.c.5. ταυτόν ἐστιν αἴσθησις καὶ ἐπιστημη (This is sensation and knowledge.)

The fact that two nominatives do both have the article does not necessarily mean, even in a copulative sentence, that it is a convertible proposition, for one of the articles may serve a different purpose (e.g., article of previous reference) (55 n. 1 [Rose].)

#### 2. Two+ attributives joined by a copulative assumed of the same person or thing

“When two or more Attributives joined by a Copulative or Copulatives are *assumed* of the *same* person or thing, before the first Attributive the Article is *inserted*; before the remaining ones it is *omitted*” (57). This is the Granville Sharp rule. Where two distinct people are intended, the article is repeated. Middleton pursues an extensive theoretical explanation of the reason why this is true (59–60) and also notes several limitations necessary to this rule (60ff). The rule applies only to “assumible Attributives”—i.e., nouns of which attributes can be assumed

<sup>21</sup>Discussion of this subject may be explored further in Lane McGaughey, “Toward a Descriptive Analysis of ἔσθαι as a Linking Verb in NT Greek;” Wallace, *Exegetical Syntax*, 33–39; Porter, *Idioms*, 109–10; and Young, *Intermediate NT Greek*, 64–66.

<sup>22</sup>This would be a profitable research topic; few discussions spend any time on this pattern. It needs to be asked, do all such statements form convertible propositions? (Pronouns and proper names should be excluded, of course.) Middleton cites Aristotle, *de Interp.* c. 6. καταφασίς ἐστιν ἀπαφασίς τινος κατὰ τινος as an example (55).

<sup>23</sup>ταυτό is an Attic crasis form for τὸ αὐτό. It does not occur in the NT. (ταῦτα does appear in 4 v.l.) Using αὐτός instead, I did not find any instances of similar constructions in the NT, but my search was not exhaustive.



ascribes it to Ionian culture. There ought to be some bibliographic refs. in his notes. Certainly it is evident that the normal use of HO, HE, TO in Homeric epic is as a weak demonstrative. You might want to look at the classic Homeric grammar (which I haven't looked at for ages): Chantraine, I think.

Carl W. Conrad

Department of Classics, Washington University  
One Brookings Drive, St. Louis, MO 63130, USA