



"Meditate  
upon these things;  
give thyself  
wholly to them;  
that thy profiting  
may appear unto all"

I Timothy 4:15

---

Journal  
of  
Theology

**Church of the Lutheran Confession**

---

# CONTENTS

VOLUME 14

SEPTEMBER 1974

NUMBER 3

THE IMPORTANCE OF PROFESSIONAL IMPROVEMENT IN OUR CALLING .....	1
C. Kuehne	
LAMENTATIONS 3:24a -- A WORD STUDY .....	11
Garrett B. Frank	
THE GREEK ARTICLE AND THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST'S DEITY (Part V) .....	21
C. Kuehne	
SERMON: IN MEMORIAM .....	34
Paul F. Nolting	
OPENING ADDRESS AT ILC .....	39
C. M. Gullerud	
THE WISDOM OF GOD AND THE PRESENCE OF EVIL IN THE WORLD .....	42
John Lau	

---

The JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY is published at Eau Claire, Wisconsin, by authorization of the Church of the Lutheran Confession.

Subscriptions: \$3.00 per year, \$5.50 for 2 years, payable in advance. The month of subscription expiration is indicated on the address label.

Issues are dated: March, June, September, December.

Editor-in-chief: Prof. C. M. Gullerud  
Immanuel Lutheran College  
Eau Claire, Wisconsin 54701

Managing Editor: Prof. John Lau  
Immanuel Lutheran College  
Eau Claire, Wisconsin 54701

Staff Contributors: A. Schulz, C. Kuehne,  
D. Redlin, P. Nolting.

All correspondence regarding subscriptions, renewals, and changes of address should be directed to the Managing Editor. Correspondence regarding material printed in the JOURNAL should be addressed to the Editor-in-chief.

---

---

THE GREEK ARTICLE  
AND THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST'S DEITY

(Part V)

With this issue we carry forward our consideration of the Rule of Granville Sharp and of those four passages which according to Sharp ascribe the title of "God" to Jesus Christ. The previous four issues have dealt with the subject as follows: 1) the presentation of the rule and exegetical conclusions of this English philanthropist and philologist, Granville Sharp; 2) an evaluation of his findings in the light of the grammatical usage of the Greek New Testament -- leading to the tentative conclusion that the rule is a valid principle of syntax, and that the four passages do constitute proof passages for Christ's deity; 3) a summary of the detailed findings of Christopher Wordsworth, who in six letters to Sharp presented copious evidence from the Greek fathers in support of the rule in general and also of Sharp's exegesis in several of the passages in question; and 4) a presentation and refutation of the negative findings of a contemporary opponent of Sharp, Calvin Winstanley. Sharp published his monograph in 1798, and the responses of Wordsworth and Winstanley appeared in 1802 and 1805, respectively. It remains now to present and evaluate the views of a number of grammarians and commentators who have published their works since that time.

It will surely help in following the discussion below if the rule and passages are again repeated. First, Sharp's Rule in its simplified wording:

*When two personal nouns of the same case are connected by the copulative καί (and), if the former has the definite article, and the latter has not, they both relate to the same person.*

By "personal nouns" Sharp means nouns which are descriptive of personal relations, qualities, offices, ranks, and such like -- common nouns of personal description as opposed to proper names. Sharp specifically excluded proper names from the application of his rule. It will be noted, also, that the rule as worded excludes personal nouns when they are found in the plural number.

The four passages which are part of our study are the following:

Ephesians 5:5 ... οὐκ ἔχει κληρονομίαν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ (does not have an inheritance in the kingdom of the Christ and God).

2 Thessalonians 1:12 ... κατὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (according to the grace of our God and Lord, Jesus Christ).

Titus 2:13 ... προσδεχόμενοι τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ (waiting for the blessed hope and appearance of our great God and Savior, Christ Jesus). of the glory

2 Peter 1:1 ... ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (by the righteousness of our God and Savior, Jesus Christ).

### The Grammarians

MIDDLETON. One of Sharp's most eminent supporters, surely, is Thomas Fanshaw Middleton (1769-1822), an English cleric who in 1814 became the first Anglican bishop of Calcutta. Middleton attained distinction by his work *The Doctrine of the Greek Article Applied to the Criticism and Illustration of the New Testament*, a significant treatise which passed through a series of editions between 1808 and 1858.<sup>1</sup> In a real sense, Middleton's work was the forerunner of all subsequent scientific studies of the Greek article. While some of his observations are no longer part of current grammatical theory, his volume has been cited with approval repeatedly by such modern scholars as A. T. Robertson, C. F. D. Moule, and Nigel Turner.

Middleton enters upon a discussion of Sharp's Rule with the following generalization concerning the usage of the article in classical and Koine Greek: "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*." (p. 56f.) Middleton defends this principle on the basis of numerous citations from Greek literature and by means of his own theory concerning the fundamental nature and force of the article. He concludes this section with the observation that Sharp's Rule "accords with the usage of the best

Greek writers." (p. 60)

Several pages are then devoted to a discussion of the *limitations* of the rule. Middleton finds that the following types of nouns must be excluded: 1) names of substances *considered as substances* (cf. ὁ λίθος καὶ χρυσός, stone and gold, 2) proper names (cf. τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον καὶ Φίλιππον, Alexander and Philip), and 3) names of abstract ideas (cf. τὴν ἀπειρίαν καὶ ἀπαιδευσίαν, inexperience and ignorance).

Middleton then asks a very necessary question.

While it is true that when attributives referring to the same person are coupled together by a writer of Greek he prefixes the article to only the first, will it be true *conversely* that when we find the article prefixed to only the first of such attributives they are always to be taken as referring to the same person? Sharp's Rule is, of course, expressed in terms of this converse. Middleton finds that Sharp was correct in excluding *plural* attributives from the application of his rule, for numerous exceptions involving such plurals can be found in both the New Testament and in classical literature. Moreover, while Sharp was unable to locate in the New Testament any exceptions involving *singular* attributives, Middleton does recognize their occasional occurrence in the classics, such as this phrase from Plato: τοῦ δικαίου καὶ ἀδίκου (the just man and unjust man). But in all such occurrences, Middleton notes, the attributives thus coupled together "are in their nature plainly incompatible; and we cannot wonder, if, in such instances, the principle of the rule has been sacrificed to negligence, or even to studied brevity, where misconception was impossible. The second Article should, in strictness, have been expressed: but in such cases the writers knew that it might safely be understood." (p.69)

Middleton concludes, therefore, that Sharp's Rule is a valid principle of Greek grammar, and he continues: "Having thus investigated the canon, and having explained the ground of its limitations and exceptions, I may be permitted to add, that *Mr. Sharp's* application of it to the New Testament, is in strict conformity with the usage of Greek writers, and with the Syntax of the Greek tongue; and that few of the passages which he has corrected in our common version, can be defended without doing violence to the obvious and undisputed meaning of the plainest sentences which profane writers supply. ...

That the Fathers understood such passages (as Ephesians 5:5 and Titus 2:13) in the manner in which Mr. Sharp would translate them, and as, without doubt, they will be translated at some future period, has been fully ascertained by the researches of Mr. Wordsworth: and whatever may be thought of the Fathers in some other respects, it may surely be presumed that they knew the use of one of the commonest forms of expression in their native tongue." (p. 69f.)

In the second part of his book, Middleton examines in detail Sharp's exegesis of the passages that we are considering. With one exception, he concurs completely with Sharp. First, in regard to Ephesians 5:5: "The principle of the rule was sufficiently demonstrated in Part i . . . ; and it cannot be pretended that the present instance in any respect deviates from the conditions there prescribed, since both Χριστός and θεός, the former retaining its more usual sense, and not being taken as a Proper Name, are as plainly what I have denominated Attributives, as are any of the words which appear in illustration of the rule: θεός, indeed, is itself adduced in one or two of the examples." (p. 362) Middleton recognizes that some people might think that Paul's phrase, in a literal English translation, is somewhat harsh: "the kingdom of the Christ and God." To ease their concern he points out that "the Article of our language [English] not being a pronoun, has little resemblance to that of the Greeks; and the proper rendering of τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ is not 'of the anointed and God,' but 'of Him (being, or) who is the Christ and God.'" (p. 363)

Middleton continues: "But not only the principle of the rule . . . and the invariable practice in the N. T. with respect to θεός and all other Attributives, compel us to acquiesce in the identity of Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ, but the same truth is evinced by the examination of the Greek Fathers so ably executed by Mr. Wordsworth; who affirms, 'we shall have the consolation to find, that no other interpretation than yours (Mr. Sharp's) was ever heard in all the Greek churches.'" (p. 363f.) In conclusion, Middleton states concerning Ephesians 5:5: "On the whole, I regard the present text, as it stands in the Greek, to be among the least questionable of the authorities collected by Mr. Sharp, and as being, when weighed

impartially, a decisive proof, that in the judgment of St. Paul, Christ is entitled to the appellation of God." (p. 367)

It is in regard to Sharp's exegesis of 2 Thessalonians 1:12 that Middleton feels compelled to express several objections. The passage reads: κατὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. The problem, Middleton believes, lies in the fact that the phrase κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (Lord Jesus Christ) is used in the epistles quite frequently as a compound proper name, and that if it is so used here, the verse would not be subject to Sharp's Rule. A second concern of Middleton is that there is no clear evidence from the writings of the church fathers, on either side of the question, respecting the interpretation of this text. If the verse could in fact be understood as a proof text for Christ's deity, Middleton asks, why was it not more frequently cited as such during the patristic period?

To the present writer it indeed seems that Middleton has raised some valid questions concerning Sharp's exegesis. That κύριος when used *alone* is commonly subject to the rule must be admitted, if one examines the evidence from the writings of the Greek fathers.<sup>2</sup> But it is perhaps impossible to demonstrate that in our verse we *must* detach κυρίου from Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ -- which we would indeed have to do if we were to insist upon the application of Sharp's Rule. For again, if κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ be taken together, it would constitute a proper name, and Sharp's Rule would not apply.

Yet, in support of Sharp's exegesis, it should be pointed out -- as Middleton himself does -- that in at least two passages of the New Testament it is possible to divide the κύριος from the Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, namely, 1 Cor. 8:6 (εἷς κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, one Lord, Jesus Christ), and Phil. 2:11 (ὅτι κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, that Jesus Christ [is] Lord). It is true, of course, that in these verses the division, if made, would be suggested by the context -- which is not necessarily so in our verse. But it may be pointed out, as even weightier evidence in favor of Sharp, that if Paul had indeed intended to refer to *two* persons in our verse, he could easily have added a second article, thus: τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.<sup>3</sup> That the phrase κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός can have an article is clearly seen from Romans

13:14 (ἀλλὰ ἐνδύσαθε τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, but put on the Lord Jesus Christ). Compare also the well-attested variant readings at 2 Cor. 16:23 (ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μεθ' ὑμῶν, the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ [be] with you) and at 2 Tim. 4:22 (ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματός σου, the Lord Jesus Christ [be] with your spirit). While it is true that κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός generally occurs in the epistles without the article, most of the cases of such absence of the article probably result from the fact that the phrase is an object of a preposition.<sup>4</sup> Paul, now, was obviously well acquainted with that principle of syntax which we have come to call Sharp's Rule. If he had wished to refer to two persons in our passage, he could have readily avoided ambiguity by inserting a second article. Why did he not do so? May it not be that he was in fact thinking of only a *single* person, thus: "The grace of our God and Lord, Jesus Christ"?

But for Middleton an even stronger reason for doubting the correctness of Sharp's exegesis was the fact that 2 Thessalonians 1:12 was so seldom cited by the fathers in defense of Christ's deity. There may, however, be a reason for this silence. The chief opponents of the orthodox Christians were the Arians, and the Arians were quite ready to admit that the New Testament does refer to Christ as θεός and κύριος (God and Lord).<sup>5</sup> They argued that Christ's deity was of a *secondary* kind, and our verse would not have furnished the fathers with any effective defense against this assertion. May this not explain why it was not used more frequently in the early church? It is clear why such verses as Ephesians 5:5 and Titus 2:13 were more commonly cited against the Arians, for in the first "the kingdom" is ascribed to Christ, and in the second He is called "the great God."

Middleton concludes: "On the whole, then, I am disposed to think, that the present text affords no certain evidence in favour of Mr. Sharp. We have seen that the words Κύριος Ἰησ. Χριστός are usually taken together; and the acquiescence of antiquity induces a strong suspicion, that in this instance such was the received construction." (p. 382) The present writer feels that this appraisal of Sharp's exegesis here may be somewhat low.

With respect to Titus 2:13, Middleton concurs completely with Sharp's interpretation, namely, that the



words τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ should be understood: "of our great God and Savior, Christ Jesus." He says: "According to the principles already laid down, it is impossible to understand θεοῦ and σωτῆρος otherwise than of one person ... the word σωτῆρ not being exempted from the operation of the rule: nor is there a single instance in the whole N.T. in which σωτῆρος ἡμῶν occurs without the Article, except in cases like the present, and in 1 Tim. i. 1. κατ' ἐπιταγὴν θεοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν, where σωτῆρος wants the Article, on account of the preceding omission before θεοῦ, exactly as in the common forms; ὡς θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν, ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ ἡμῶν, etc. ... Accordingly, we learn from Mr. Wordsworth, that all antiquity agreed in the proposed interpretation; and many of the passages which he has produced from the Fathers, could not have been more direct and explicit, if they had been forged with a view to the dispute." (p. 394)

Earlier in his book, Middleton makes this significant observation: "Almost every chapter of the N.T. contains some exemplification of the rule in question [Sharp's Rule], with which, therefore, the Sacred Writers were well acquainted, and must have supposed their Readers to have been acquainted also; and if in Titus ii. 13. they did not mean to identify the Great God and the Saviour, they expressed themselves in a manner which they well knew would mislead their Readers ..." (p. 364)

Finally, 2 Peter 1:1: τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (of our God and Savior, Jesus Christ). Middleton says: "As this instance differs not in any point of importance from Titus ii. 13. I can have little new to advance with respect to its interpretation. The passage is plainly and unequivocally to be understood as an assumption, that 'Jesus Christ is our God and Saviour.' The only difference between the present text and Titus ii. 13. is, that ἡμῶν is here placed after the first Noun, not after the second: but for a plain reason, the position of the Pronoun does not affect the sense: in all such cases, strictly speaking, the Pronoun ought to be repeated after each and every Noun, (supposing more than two,) τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ, κ.τ.λ. and if it be only once inserted, for the repetition is unnecessary, it is wholly unimportant,

whether it be after the first or after the last Noun; if after the first, then it is understood after the remaining ones; if after the last, it comprehends those which precede: the only mode, in the present instance, of limiting the effect of ἡμῶν to τοῦ θεοῦ, would have been to prefix an Article to σωτήρος; and why that second Article, on the supposition that two persons were intended, was not employed, as (among a multitude of examples) in 1 John ii. 22. τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱόν, it might be difficult to show: in that instance, indeed, it may be said, that the very sense makes the distinction, and yet no MS. has ventured to read τὸν πατέρα καὶ υἱόν." (p. 433)

Middleton points also to the great similarity between verses 1 and 11 -- they differ only in one word: θεοῦ in the former, κυρίου in the latter. Even the position of the pronoun ἡμῶν is the same! Surely no one would doubt that in verse 11 "our Lord and Savior" are meant of the same person. Grammatical consistency would seem to require that "our God and Savior" in verse 1 likewise be taken of one person, namely Jesus Christ!

WINER. The first comprehensive grammar of New Testament Greek to achieve widespread use was surely that of George Benedict Winer, which appeared in a long series of editions beginning in the year 1822.<sup>6</sup> While Winer does not refer directly to the rule of Sharp, there can be no doubt that he came close to it in his own investigation of the article. He says in a footnote: "For a repetition of the Article is not admissible before connected nouns which, for instance, are merely predicates of one and the same person, as in Col. iii. 17 τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ [to the God and Father], 2 Pet. i. 11 τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτήρος Ἰ. Χρ. [of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ]. Eph. vi. 21; Mark vi. 3; Acts iii. 14." (p. 126)

It is indeed strange, then, when Winer later refuses to accept Titus 2:13 and 2 Peter 1:1 as proof texts for Christ's deity. The reason for this inconsistency is his own theological bias. In regard to Titus 2:13 he says: "... for reasons which lie in the doctrinal system of Paul, I do not regard σωτήρος [Savior] as a second predicate by the side of θεοῦ [God], as if Christ were first styled ὁ μέγας θεός [the great God] and then σωτήρ [Savior]. ... In the above remarks I did not mean to de-

ny that  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\sigma\varsigma \eta\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$  can *grammatically* be regarded as a second predicate dependent on the Article  $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ ; only, doctrinal conviction, deduced from Paul's teaching, that this apostle could not have called Christ *the great God*, induced me to show that there is also no grammatical obstacle to taking  $\kappa\alpha\iota \alpha\upsilon\tau.$  ...  $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$  by itself as a second subject." (p. 130)

The attempt by Winer to show that one can take "Savior Jesus Christ" as a second person separate from "the great God" is indeed weak. He says: "The Article is omitted before  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\sigma\varsigma$ , because the word is made definite by the Genitive  $\eta\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$  [our], and the apposition *precedes* the proper name [Jesus Christ]." (p. 130) Middleton discusses the matter of the  $\eta\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$  above, and shows that its placement in Titus 2:13 does not invalidate the application of Sharp's Rule to this verse. Let it be added that Winer might have done well to compare other passages in the New Testament which are similar in form to Titus 2:13. He would have found that the presence of a genitive or other adjunct with either of the nouns in no instance excludes a passage from the application of the rule -- so long as the basic pattern remains: definite article + personal noun +  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  + personal noun.<sup>7</sup> Whenever the holy writers wished to speak of two distinct persons, they either omitted the article before both nouns or inserted it before both.<sup>8</sup> Compare 1 Thess. 3: 11, which is similar in form to Titus 2:13 except for the addition of a second article:  $\delta \theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma \kappa\alpha\iota \pi\alpha\tau\eta\rho \eta\mu\acute{\omega}\nu \kappa\alpha\iota \delta \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma \eta\mu\acute{\omega}\nu \text{ } \dot{\iota}\eta\sigma\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$  (our God and Father and our Lord Jesus). Here Paul inserted an article before  $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$  -- *even though no ambiguity could have resulted from its omission*. Such passages show well how sensitive the apostle was to the force of the article and to the effect of its use or nonuse.

Winer's attempt to avoid the clear meaning of 2 Peter 1:1 is even weaker: "Similar is 2 Pet. i. 1, where there is not even a pronoun with  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\sigma\varsigma$ ." (p. 130) But this lack of  $\eta\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$  after  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\sigma\varsigma$  does not seem to bother him in verse 11, which reads exactly the same as verse 1, except for the substitution of  $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\upsilon$  for  $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ . Note his words on verse 11, quoted three paragraphs above, and see how he is not at all reluctant to apply Sharp's Rule to this latter verse.

In Winer's treatment of Titus 2:13 and 2 Peter 1:1 we see the sad result when doctrinal considerations are

permitted to have a bearing on grammatical theory. The following comments by A. T. Robertson indicate that Winer may well be responsible for much of the confusion that has surrounded the exegesis of these passages during the generations since his time: "The simple truth is that Winer's anti-Trinitarian prejudice overruled his grammatical rectitude in his remark about 2 Peter i. 1. The name of Winer was supreme in New Testament grammar for three generations, and his lapse from the plain path on this point is responsible for the confusion of the scholars in the English Versions on 2 Peter i. 1. But Schmiedel, in his revision of Winer (p. 158) frankly admitted Winer's error as to 2 Peter i. 1: 'Grammar demands that one person is meant.'<sup>9</sup> After pointing to Winer's admitted doctrinal bias, Robertson adds: "The grammarian has nothing to do *per se* with the theology of the New Testament, as I have insisted in my grammar. Wendland challenged Winer on Titus ii. 13, and considers it 'an exegetical mistake' to find two persons in Paul's sentence. ... It is plain, therefore, that Winer has exerted a pernicious influence, from the grammatical standpoint, on the interpretation of 2 Peter i. 1, and Titus ii. 13. Scholars who believed in the Deity of Christ have not wished to claim too much and to fly in the face of Winer, the great grammarian, for three generations. But Winer did not make out a sound case against Sharp's principle as applied to 2 Peter i. 1 and Titus ii. 13. Sharp stands vindicated after all the dust has settled. We must let these passages mean what they want to mean, regardless of our theories about the theology of the writers."<sup>10</sup> In his *Short Grammar*, Robertson rightly questions the correctness of Winer's anti-Trinitarian "doctrinal conviction": "... Paul's doctrinal system in Phil. 2:9 and Col. 1:15-19; 2:9, not to mention Rom. 9: 5 and Acts 20:28, does not forbid the natural import of the one article here [namely, in 2 Pet. 1:1 and Titus 2: 13]."<sup>11</sup>

Winer's comments on Ephesians 5:5 and 2 Thessalonians 1:12 are much briefer. He finds two persons in the words τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ (of the Christ and God), and assumes that the reason for the single use of the article is to mark the two nouns as "parts of one whole, or members of one community." (p. 127f.) Similarly, he finds two persons in the phrase τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (of our God and Lord, Jesus Christ), and

assumes an ellipsis of a second article before  $\kappa\upsilon\acute{\rho}\iota\omicron\upsilon$ . (p. 130) It is clear that Winer has little appreciation for Sharp's Rule when it comes to the passages involving Christ's deity.

JONES. In 1827, a Unitarian minister by the name of John Jones presented to the academic world of England *An Explanation of the Greek Article*,<sup>12</sup> containing among other things an "analysis and refutation of Dr. Middleton's theory" and "an application of the article to obscure passages in the New Testament." We need not spend much time in discussing Jones' work, for it is marred by a number of questionable statements and conclusions, the result probably of a rather obvious anti-Trinitarian bias.

In discussing Middleton's defense of Sharp's Rule, Jones proceeds on the unlikely assumption that the Greek article is in its nature an adjective, and that if it qualifies one noun it must, as an adjective, be extended by the reader to qualify other nouns, if any such succeed it. (p. 25f., p. 140) He does admit that when the copulative  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  connects nouns which are names of two different persons, the article is more likely to be repeated, "because being in themselves distinct subjects, the writer must have felt desirous to convey that impression to his readers." (p. 26) Jones, of course, assumes that two persons, the Father and the Son, are spoken of in each of the four verses which we are studying. How does he explain the fact that the article is not repeated in any of them? In each case he assumes ellipsis, and asks the reader to supply an additional article. (p. 142) And how is the reader to know when to add an article in this fashion? Jones' remarkable answer: "In every instance of words thus conjoined, whether they mean the same or two different persons or things, the reader must depend not on the use of the article, but upon the exercise of common sense, which he is supposed to possess." (p. 27) Thus, for Jones, "common sense" must be used to direct the course of exegesis -- which is, as we know, a basic hermeneutical principle for Unitarians!

Jones regards Sharp's Rule as "mere rubbish, without any foundation in truth." (p. 140) But he is not really fair in his attack upon the rule, for he repeatedly points to examples which Sharp and Middleton specifically exclude from its application, such as those

which involve proper names. Let Jones consider only those passages in the New Testament which contain nouns of personal description in the singular number and in the form: article + noun + *καί* + noun. He would find use for his "ellipsis" argument only in our four passages, for in each of the remaining passages it would be abundantly clear, even to him, that only *one* person is being designated by the holy writer. The fact that he must insist on ellipsis in the four indicates, not linguistic acumen or even common sense, but simple dogmatic bias!

(to be continued)

C. Kuehne

#### FOOTNOTES

1. The citations made in this article are from the new edition, with prefatory observations and notes by Hugh James Rose, published by J. & J. Deighton, Cambridge, and J. G. & F. Rivington, London, 1833.
2. For such evidence, cf. *Journal of Theology*, March, 1974, p. 16f.
3. For the effect of a repeated article, cf. *Journal of Theology*, December, 1973, p. 27f.
4. According to a list of the appellations of Christ compiled by Rose and printed in Appendix II, p. 9f., of the volume by Middleton (cf. footnote 1), the phrase κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, without article or modifier ἡμῶν, occurs a total of 17 times in the epistles of Paul. In 11 of these instances it occurs after a preposition in the familiar phrase ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ), and in two further instances it follows the preposition ἐν. The absence of the articles in such prepositional phrases is to be expected, as many grammars of the New Testament will attest. (Cf. Blass-Debrunner, edition of 1961, p. 133: "... the article appears when the specific Jewish or Christian God or Lord is meant ..., but it is sometimes missing, especially after prepositions ... and with a genitive which depends on an anarthrous noun.") The remaining occur-

rences of the phrase κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός located by Rose in the Pauline epistles are found in Phil. 3:20, in 1 Tim. 1:1 and 5:21 (cf. the readings of the Textus Receptus), and in our passage. In 1 Tim. 1:1, the article is lacking because the phrase is a genitive dependent on an anarthrous noun. (Cf. the quotation from Blass-Debrunner above.) 1 Tim. 5:21, in the reading of the Textus Receptus, is like our passage. This leaves only Phil. 3:20: ἔξ ὧ καὶ σωτῆρα ἀπεκδεχόμεθα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν (from which also we expect as a Savior the Lord Jesus Christ). Thus there is very little pertinent evidence to support any assertion that the phrase κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός normally occurs in the New Testament without an article.

5. Cf. *Journal of Theology*, March, 1974, p. 16f.
6. The citations from Winer made in this article appear in the seventh edition, enlarged and improved by Gottlieb Lünemann (Andover: Warren F. Draper & Co., 1904).
7. Cf. *Journal of Theology*, Dec., 1973, p. 25f.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 27f.
9. A. T. Robertson, "The Greek Article and the Deity of Christ," *Expositor* (London), series VIII, no. 21 (1921), p. 185. (This brief, but excellent, article by Robertson provided the present writer with much of the initial incentive to research Sharp's Rule and exegetical conclusions at greater length.)
10. *Ibid.*, p. 186f. Robertson makes similar comments concerning Winer in his *Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (Nashville: Broadman Press, c1934), p. 785f.
11. A. T. Robertson, *A Short Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, 3rd ed. (New York: Hodder & Stoughton, c1908), p. 75.
12. John Jones, *An Explanation of the Greek Article* (London: Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown, and Green, 1827.)