Bachelor of Divinity   Concordia Seminary Scholarship

3-28-1939

Purpose Clauses in the Pauline Epistles

Herbert Mueller
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_MuellerH@csl.edu

PURPOSE CLAUSES IN THE PAULINE EPISTLES

A Thesis presented to the

Faculty of Concordia Theological Seminary

in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Bachelor of Divinity

by

Herbert Christian Mueller

Concordia Seminary
March 28, 1959

Approved by

_____

W. Arndt.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Corrigenda

P. 16, fourth line from the bottom should read "Bachmann" instead of "Zahn"; also p. 17, first line, and p. 32 first line.

P. 19, note 68, first line read "a" in place of "the".

P. 24, first line, read "has taken", not "has been taken".

PURPOSE CLAUSES IN THE
PAULINE EPISTLES

A working knowledge of the Greek language is a very valuable
asset to the minister of the Gospel, and has a rightful place in
his professional equipment. It belongs to his tools. The better
the tool, the more efficient will the workman be. The better
acquainted the minister is with the Bible, his One Tool, the more
effective will his service be.

How can a minister become more firmly and deeply rooted in the
Bible than through its study on the basis of the original? In this
task his knowledge of Greek stands him in good stead, for in this
language the Holy Ghost inspired the books of the New Testament.
The translations into the vernacular are inspired only in so far as
they are reproductions of the original inspired text.

The translator's task is not always an easy one. The vernacular
will frequently not lend itself to reproducing the full meaning of
the original exactly. The result is that fine shades of meaning
may be lost in the process of translating. Any student of the
New Testament who works with the Greek will readily admit this fact.
If the minister is able to prepare his message on the basis of the
original Greek (we are not speaking of the delivery, of course),
he will be more likely to present a more exact meaning for the
particular text than if he were not acquainted with the original.

It makes for originality in his preaching. Thoughts and suggestions for his sermon often lie hidden in certain grammatical forms. A preacher may, for instance, find pictures in prepositions which will help to make his discourse more perceptible (cf. German "anschaulich") to the human mind.

A knowledge of the Greek language is indispensable for exactness in exegesis, and it serves in this way the cause of preserving purity of doctrine. Here comes to mind Luther's exegetical dictum: _grammatica est regina_, "grammar is the queen". Any exposition of a certain passage which is not grammatically correct must be rejected at the outset. Here Luther's renowned words on the importance of retaining the study of the original languages of the Bible also apply (St. Louis Edition, vol. X, p. 470): "Lasset uns das gesagt sein, dass wir das Evangelium nicht wohl werden erhalten ohne die Sprachen. Die Sprachen sind die Scheide, darin dies Messer des Geistes steckt; sie sind der Schrein, darin man dies Kleinod traegt; sie sind das Gefaesz, darin man diesen Trank fasset; sie sind die Kemnot, darin diese Speise liegt; und, wie das Evangelium selbst zeigt, sie sind die Koerbe, darin man dies Brod (sic) und Fische und Brocken behaelt."

From these introductory remarks the choice of subject for this thesis clearly vindicates itself.

I. CLAUSES WITH ἵνα

The most common particle introducing purpose clauses, in Classical as well as in Koine Greek, is ἵνα.[1] The Pauline Epistles are no exception. Our research places the number of instances at about 250, though these are not all purely final, as will be pointed out later.

The particle itself has an interesting history. Its etymology cannot be ascertained with certainty.[2] The first two characters, the Iota and Nu, occur as a word in a fragment of Hesiod, whose approximate date is 776 B. C.[3]. It has local meaning with the poets beginning with Homer in the sense of "where", "in what place".

How this particle with local meaning evolved into one of purpose, is not clear. Parallels may be found in other Indo-Germanic languages. The Latin ut, the English that, and the German dasz underwent similar transitions in the course of time.

That a living language develops, is well illustrated by the development and extension in the uses of the particle ἵνα. It is, in fact, a characteristic of Western Hellenistic that ἵνα is widely extended in usage.[4] It goes over into the territory of ὅπως to introduce purpose – and object clauses and of the infinitive in similar functions, but more of that literary expansion will be discussed later.

---

1. A. T. Robertson, "A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research", p. 981.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.
4. A. T. Robertson, op. cit., p. 992. Cf. Also Blass-Debrunner, Neutestamentliche Grammatick, p. 204. (Fifth Edition)

Its chief function remains final, also with Paul. It introduces
a subordinate clause which expresses the purpose of the action of the
main clause. This connection also is an evolution, for telic clauses,
were originally independent clauses, their origin begin traceable to
parataxis."[6] This view is held by Robertson,[6] and Gildersleeve supports him
in his contention: "Nihil est in hypotaxi quod non prius fuerit in parataxi."
The subjunctive then was originally the volitive Subjunctive of parataxis.
This origin is accepted by J. H. Moulton[7]; "Out of the Volitive (scil.
subjunctive) arousethe great class of dependent Clauses of Purpose, also
paratactic in origin. The closeness of relation between future and
subjunctive is seen in the fact that final clauses with ὅπως c. fut.
were negatived with μή: the future did not by any means restrict itself
to the futuristic use of the mood which it pillaged." Passing through
the various stages of development it became hypotatic. To illustrate,
Robertson uses the short sentence ἐλή λυαλα ἵνα μάλω, "veni ut
discam". The   he regards as a demonstrative in the accusative case of
reference. The μάλω is in apposition to ἵνα , "I came as to this",
viz. "I may learn".[8]

The predominate mood with Paul, as throughout the New Testament, is
the subjunctive, as in Col. 3, 21: "Fathers, provoke not your children to
anger, ἵνα μή αλυμωῶσιν." This instance also shows which
particle of negation was employed. Winer remarks that

5. Op. cit., p. 980 f.
6. Ibid., for quotation.
7. A Grammar of New Testament Greek, Vol. 1, Prolegomena, p. 185.
8. Op. cit.,p. 982. The paratactic origin may be shown by comparing,
"Pray lest (ἵνα μή) ye enter into temptation." (Mk. 14,38) and
"Take care and beware", (Luke 12,15). Moulton, op. cit., p. 178.

that[9] the subjunctive was used because purpose is always directed
to something future. Only the indicative future could possibly have
been used, if the writer thought correctly. As to the force of the
subjunctive, he continues[10]: "Der Konjunktive bezeichnet hier das,was
als wirklich eintreten sollende Folge gedacht, was in der Tat und
unmittelbar beabsichtigt wurde, mithin das objektiv Moegliche".

Pauline Greek, in accordance with the Koine, has deviated from
the Classical also in this respect that the optative mood does not
occur in purpose-clauses even after secondary tenses.[11] In Eph. 1, 17,
"Making mention of you in my prayers, that the God of our Lord
Jesus Christ .... may give .... the spirit of wisdom etc.", we find
$\dot{\iota}\nu\alpha \; \delta\acute{\psi}\eta$ with $\delta\widetilde{\psi}$, or $\delta\acute{\omega}\eta$ in the margin. This reading $\delta\widetilde{\psi}$,
the subjunctive, is found in the Codex Vaticanus and is adopted
as correct by the British scholars Westcott and Hort. Robertson
labels this case a volitive optative with $\overset{c\prime}{\iota\nu\alpha}$ only introductory.[12]
Winer is of the same opinion[13]: "The sentence at the head of which.
stands $\overset{c\prime}{\iota\nu\alpha}$ expresses the content (Gegenstand) of the wish and
prayer. Optative is chosen as modus optandi." Blass has a different
solution, though equally plausible. He calls $\delta\acute{\psi}\eta$ "der vermeintliche
Optativ"[14]. On p. 53 of his Grammar he comments: " $\Delta\acute{\psi}\eta$ fast nur bei
Paulus, bei dem die Abschreiber den ihnen nicht gelaeufigen Opt.

9. Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms, p. 269 f.
10. Ibid.
11. E. Burton, Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek,
p. 84: "Clauses introduced by a final particle usually employ the
Subjunctive after both primary and secondary tenses, less frequently
the Future Indicative."
12. Op. cit., p. 940
13. Op. cit., p. 273
14. Op. cit., p. 204

$\delta\acute{\psi}\eta$ oefter antrafen und also Konjunktiv betrachteten (also eher $\delta\acute{\psi}\eta=$ Opt. zu schreiben; allerdings ist $\delta\acute{\omega}\eta$ und $\delta\acute{\psi}\eta$ fuer die nachchristliche Aussprache dasselbe." He clearly regards $\delta\acute{\psi}\eta$ a scribal error for $\delta\acute{\omega}\eta$. Similar is Burton's view. Preferring the reading $\delta\acute{\omega}\eta$, he looks upon the $\H{\iota}\nu\alpha$ - clauses as object-clauses after $\mu\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu\ \pi o\iota o\acute{\upsilon}\mu\epsilon\nu o\varsigma.$[15]

Another disputed verse is II Tim. 2, 25: "Instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance," $\mu\acute{\eta}\pi o\tau\epsilon\ \delta\acute{\psi}\eta$. Here again later codices have the variant reading of the subjunctive, but the evidence from the MSS. is in favor of the optative. Robertson[16] agrees with Moulton that $\delta\acute{\psi}\eta$ (subj.) is to be read. The reason which they give is that it occurs with a parallel subjuntive, $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\nu\acute{\eta}\psi\omega\sigma\iota\nu$. Evenso, they do violence to the text, not adhering to the important rule of Textual Criticism, ^that^ the more difficult reading is to be preferred. Blasz applies his theory of a scribal error according to which the copyist confused $\delta\acute{\psi}\eta$ and $\delta\acute{\omega}\eta$, as he does sub Eph. 1, 17[17]. Granted that the optative is correct, since it is the more difficult reading, the clause is really a kind of indirect question and not purely a clause of purpose.[18]

The indicative future occurs a few times with Paul in this construction. In several passages the reading is uncertain[19], but there is no doubt as to the mood and tense in passages like

---

15. Op. cit., p. 87
16. Op. cit., p. 988 f.
17. Op. cit., p. 205 f.
18. Robertson, loc. cit.
19. E. g., I Cor. 15, 5; Gal. 2,4; I Thess. 9, 15.

Eph. 6, 5 ($\H{\epsilon}\xi\eta$), I Cor. 9, 18 ($\lambda\eta\sigma\omega$), 15 ($\kappa\epsilon\nu\omega\sigma\epsilon\iota$).
On the employment of the future indicative S. G. Green[20] has this
statement: "The Future, where admitted, must be taken as conveying
the idea of duration more vividly than the Aorist Subjunctive."

A rara avis in the New Testament is the present indicative in
final clauses. This solecism, namely, does not become frequent until
the Byzantine Age. There is no indisputable example in Pauline
Literature. True, some codices have indicatives in Gal. 6, 12 (A C
and later ones) I Thess. 4, 15 (A D and later) and Titus 2, 4 ($\aleph$ A),
but these examples would not be admitted from the viewpoint of Textual
Criticism. Two doubtful forms are $\phi\upsilon\sigma\iota o\tilde{\upsilon}\sigma\delta\epsilon$ and $\zeta\eta\lambda o\tilde{\upsilon}\tau\epsilon$
in I Cor. 4, 6 and Gal. 4, 17 respectively. The subjunctives normally
would be $\phi\upsilon\sigma\iota\tilde{\omega}\sigma\delta\epsilon$ and $\zeta\eta\lambda\tilde{\omega}\tau\epsilon$. However, in certain
dialects, e. g. in the Thessalian and later in the Aeolic, the ω is
changed to $o\upsilon$[21]. Robertson leaves the question as to whether they
are subjunctives or indicatives undecided.[22] Blass labels both as "die
wie Indikative aussehenden Konjunktive mit $o\upsilon$ statt attisches ω."[23]
Hort and Schmiedel also believe that they are subjunctives[24]. Winer,
on the other hand, regards both as indicatives and considers the
whole construction of $\H{\iota}\nu\alpha$ with present indicative as a "Missbrauch
der spaeteren Zeit"[25]. He comes to this conclusion in view of the fact

---

20. Handbook to the Grammar of the Greek Testament, p. 323.
21. Robertson, op. cit., p. 202 f.
22. "One is slow to credit this form to a mere vowel-change." Ibid.
23. Op. cit., p. 50 f.
24. V. Burton, op. cit., p. 84, for references.
25. Op. cit., p. 272. He mentions that the Exegete Mayer regards $\H{\iota}\nu\alpha$
in both places as "Ortspartikel".

that there is a similar usage in extra - New Testament literature
and that some codices have the present indicative in parallel
constructions.[26] The view that both are subjunctives deserves the
preference.

The aorist tense is most frequently chosen by Paul, as in
I Cor. 1, 14.15: "I thank God that I baptized none of you but Crispus
and Gaius; lest any should say ($\ddot{\iota}\nu\alpha \mu\acute{\eta} \tau\iota s \epsilon\ddot{\iota}\pi\eta$) that I had
baptized in my own name." Less frequently he uses the present, and
then to express continuous action, as in Gal. 1, 16: " God ......
called me by His grace to reveal His Son in me that I might preach
($\ddot{\iota}\nu\alpha \epsilon\dot{\upsilon}\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega\mu\alpha\iota$) him among the heathen." The perfect
subjunctive forms of certain verbs occur as $\epsilon\dot{\iota}\delta\tilde{\omega}\mu\epsilon\nu$ (I Cor.2, 12),
$\pi\epsilon\pi\sigma\iota\eta\acute{\sigma}\tau\epsilon s \tilde{\omega}\mu\epsilon\nu$ (II Cor. 1, 9) $\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\sigma\kappa\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\sigma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\sigma\iota \tilde{\eta}\tau\epsilon,$
and $\tilde{\eta}\tau\epsilon \kappa\alpha\tau\eta\rho\tau\iota\sigma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\sigma\iota$ (I Cor. 1, 10). For the use of the
future compare what was said above.

The present imperative in I Cor. 1, 31: "That (scil. of him are
ye in Christ), according as it is written, he that glorieth, let him
glory in the Lord, $\ddot{\iota}\nu\alpha$ .... $\kappa\alpha\upsilon\chi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\partial\omega$," is due to
the quotation from the LXX, Jer. 9, 22 - 24.

As already mentioned, the use of $\ddot{\iota}\nu\alpha$ is widely extended; it takes
over functions of other particles and invades the territory of the
infinitive,[27] although the infinitive is still quite frequent in

_____

26. V. footnote #19.
27. Burton, op. cit., p. 84; Moulton, op. cit., p. 207; Blass,
op. cit., p. 204.

in Paul's Letters.[28] Some wish to explain the weakening of the telic
force as a Latinism. Moulton disagrees because, as he observes, the
use of ἵνα in object-clauses in the vernacular was deeply rooted,
and the influence of the Latin did not reach this field.[29] In the
same connection he says: "From such sentences, in which the object-
clause, from the nature of the governing verb, had a jussive sense
in it which made the subjunctive natural, there was an early
transition to object-clauses in which the jussive idea was absent."

One type of clause in which ἵνα has been extended beyond
Classical usage is the so-called sub-final use of ἵνα . This
construction occupies an intermediate position between the telic and
ecbatic usage. It appears in various functions, most commonly as
object-clause. ἵνα seldom introduces such a clause in Classical Greek,
where ὅπως is the usual particle used in that capacity.[30]
Conversely, in the New Testament, including the Pauline Epistles, ἵνα
occurs much oftener in this type of clause than ὅπως ; in fact,
there is no instance of a ὅπως -object-clause with Paul. Another
shift in construction is that while Classical Greek used the future
indicative, sometimes the subjunctive in such clauses, Paul, yes, the
whole New Testament employs "the subjunctive to the exclusion of the
future indicative."[31] Such clauses follow verbs of exhorting, beseeching,
commanding, fearing, et al.[32] An example is I Cor. 16, 10: "If Timotheus
come, see that he may be (βλέπετε ἵνα γένηται) with
you without fear."

---

28. Cf. Blass, op. cit., p. 215.
29. Op. cit., p. 208.
30. Burton, op. cit., p. 87
31. Ibid.
32. Moulton, op. cit., p. 178. "An innovation in Hellenistic is ἵνα
cum Subjunctivo in commands, which takes the place of the classic

Sometimes this kind of clause is the subject of the sentence,

I Cor. 4, 2: "It is required in stewards, that a man be found faithful,

$\zeta\eta\tau\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\tau\alpha\iota$ $\H{\iota}\nu\alpha$ .... $\epsilon\H{\upsilon}\rho\epsilon\rtimes\tilde{\eta}$." Or, it may be in

apposition to a noun as in I Cor. 9, 18: "What is my reward then?

Verily that, when I preach the Gospel, I may make the Gospel of Christ

without charge ($\H{\iota}\nu\alpha$ ...... $\rtimes\H{\eta}\,6\omega$)." Even to a pronoun, Phil.1, 9:

"And this I pray that your love may abound yet more and more ($\tau o\tilde{\upsilon}\tau o$

$\H{\iota}\nu\alpha$ .... $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota 66\epsilon\H{\upsilon}\eta$)." In all these clauses the

purport, rather than the purpose is expressed.

Paul uses an idiom with $\H{\iota}\nu\alpha$ which is termed an "elliptical

imperative."[33] The peculiarity of this clause is that there is no

verb in the independent clause on which the subordinate depends. A

few examples will suffice. I Cor. 7, 29: "It remaineth ($\tau\H{o}\,\lambda o\iota\pi\H{o}\nu$)

that both they that have wives be as though they had none

($\H{\iota}\nu\alpha$ ...... $\tilde{\omega}6\iota\nu$)." Or, Eph. 5, 33: "Let every one of you in

particular so love his wife even as himself, and the wife see that

she reverence her husband ($\H{\eta}\,\delta\H{\epsilon}\,\gamma\upsilon\nu\H{\eta}\,\H{\iota}\nu\alpha\,\phi o\beta\tilde{\eta}\tau\alpha\iota$)."

It is a debatable question among the grammarians whether $\H{\iota}\nu\alpha$

ever introduces a purely ecbatic clause in the N.T., for scholars

are widely divided in their opinions. Moulton, op. cit., p. 209,

suggests that a commentator interpret $\H{\iota}\nu\alpha$ as the context demands,

telic, subfinal, ecbatic. Ellicot, Lightfight, and Evans believe

that $\H{\iota}\nu\alpha$ was used rather loosely.[34] Blasz is a little more

---

(continued from #32 p. 9) $\overset{u}{o}\pi\omega\varsigma$ c. fut. ind." E.g., after $\mu\epsilon\rho\iota\mu\nu\tilde{\alpha}\nu$,
$\epsilon\H{\upsilon}\chi o\mu\alpha\iota,\,\rtimes\H{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota\nu,\,\zeta\eta\tau\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu,\,\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\alpha\lambda\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu.$

33. Robertson, op. cit., p. 994.
34. V. Robertson, op. cit., p. 998; also "International Critical Commentary," vol. 52, p. 321.

conservative in his view: "Fuer den Inf. der Folge kann wie auch sonst wohl bei Spaetern $\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$ eintreten, aber schwerlich bei eigentlich tatsaechlicher Folge."[35]

Burton follows Blasz in his discussion on ecbatic $\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$. He designates these clauses as clauses of conceived result.[36] The relation between the principal and subordinate clauses is that of cause and effect. The speaker recognizes this relation in theory. Or, the action of the principal clause is the **conditio sine qua non** for the action of the subordinate clause. Conversely, the action of the independent clause may be conceived of as the result of that of the main clause. This use of $\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$ is very similar to $\acute{\omega}\sigma\tau\epsilon$ **cum infinitivo**. Yet Burton admits: "There is no certain, scarcely a probable, instance in the New Testament of a clause introduced by $\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$ denoting actual result conceived of as such."[37]

On the other hand, some scholars are not so ready to yield on this question. S. G. Green is of the opinion that the final significance is always discernible.[38] Thayer, the renowned lexicographer, agrees[39] with Winer and C. A. Fritzsche that "in all passages adduced from the New Testament to prove this usage (i.e. ecbatic) the telic (or final) force prevails." The commentator Meyer maintains emphatically that $\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$ always has telic force.[40] We shall be better able to come to a conclusion after we have examined a number of passages.

---

35. **Op. cit.**, p. 217.
36. **Op. cit.**, p. 94.
37. **Ibid.**   58. **Op. cit.**, p. 320.
39. **Greek - English Lexicon of the New Testament**, p. 304 (sub $\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$ II,3).

A striking example is Gal. 5, 17: "These (i.e. flesh and spirit) are contrary the one to the other so that ye cannot do the things that ye would, $\grave{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\iota}\kappa\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha\iota$ $\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$ $\mu\eta$ $\pi o\iota\tilde{\eta}\tau\epsilon$." The I.C.C. says, it is purely telic.[41] Burton follows suit with this comment: "Gal. 5, 17,best explained as expressing purpose of the hostility of the flesh and the spirit."[42] Meyer, who, as usual, sticks to the idea of a final clause, explains the sentence as expressing "die Tendenz jener miteinander kaempfenden Potenzen bei diesem Kampfe in ihrem wechselseitigen Verhaeltnis zur sittlichen Willenstellung des Menschen, welche auch beim Wieder-gebornen zwiefach bestimmbar ist."[43] Robertson, however, follows Lightfoot in accepting the clause as consecutive.[44] The relation is quite evidently that of cause and of effect; therefore, the translation of the Authorized Version and of Luther, which is the ecbatic, is doubtlessly correct.

Then there is I Thess. 5, 4: "Ye, brethren, are not in darkness that that day should overtake you as a thief ($o\grave{v}\kappa$ $\grave{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\epsilon\_\_$ $\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\_\_$ $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\beta\eta$)." This passage very aptly illustrates Burton's "clauses of conceived result."[45] To be overtaken by that day is conceived of in Paul's mind as the result of being in darkness. Paul has, of course, negatived the whole clause. Surely it cannot be a clause of purpose. This use of $\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$ approximates the use of $\acute{\omega}\sigma\tau\epsilon$ cum infinitivo.[46]

---

40. Vide his remarks on R. 5, 20, IV, p. 290; on 11, 11, p. 536; On I Cor. 1, 10, V, p. 24; on I Cor. 16, 10, vol. V, p. 508.

41. Vol. 34, p. 301 f. Author: Ernest De Witt Burton.

42. Op. cit., p. 94.

43. Vol. VII, p. 335ff.

44. Robertson, op. cit., p. 998.

45. Loc. cit. V. also Blass, op.cit., p. 217.

46. Ibid. 47. "$\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$ not $\grave{\epsilon}\kappa\beta\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\tilde{\omega}s$, so that, but $\tau\epsilon\lambda\iota\kappa\tilde{\omega}s$, in order that, eo consilio ut. As a rule, the consecutive sense of

We append our findings on certain passages in which the meaning is directly or indirectly affected by either the telic or the ecbatic construction. Rom. 5, 20: "The Law entered that the offence might abound ($\tilde{\iota}\nu\alpha$ $\pi\lambda\varepsilon o\nu\acute{\alpha}\zeta\eta$)." Philippi, who leans towards Meyer's position on the question of the ecbatic $\tilde{\iota}\nu\alpha$ in the New Testament[47], aptly remarks that what appears to us to be a consequence, is described as a purpose of God's Word, yes of God Himself. It all depends on the point of view. So $\tilde{\iota}\nu\alpha$ may under circumstances be equivalent to $\tilde{\omega}\sigma\tau\varepsilon$, as already observed. Adopting the telic sense, then the purpose of the giving of the Law was to increase sin. In what sense? It was the mediate purpose, eventually to work the knowledge of sin. For a similar thought compare Rom. 3, 20; 7, 7; and Gal. 3, 19. This view is also shared by Stoeckhardt.[48] The theology of this passage is well summed up by Augustine.[49] "Hoc est in lege magnum mysterium, ideo eam datam, ut, crescente peccato, humiliarentur superbi, humiliati confiterentur confessi sanarentur. -- Non crudeliter hoc fecit Deus, sed consilio medicinae. Aliquando enim videtur sibi homo sanus et aegrotat: et in eo aegrotat et non sentit, medicum non quaerit: augetur morbus, crescit molestia, quaeritur medicus, et totum sanatur."

(#48 concluded) the particle $\tilde{\iota}\nu\alpha$ is not demonstrable in the New Testament with certainty." Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, vol. I, p. 125.
48. Roemerbrief, p. 269.
49. Quoted by Philippi, op. cit., p. 284, Augustine's Ennartio in Psalm CII, ch. 15.

Headlam and Sanday do not regard this clause as purely telic.
They believe that it is a laxer use of $\tilde{\iota}\nu\alpha$ that is thought of
here.[50] They look upon it as conceived result. In support of the
ecbatic tinge they quote Chrysostom to show that the ancients were
aware of the ecbatic sense: $\tau\grave{o}\ \delta\grave{\epsilon}\ \tilde{\iota}\nu\alpha\ \grave{\epsilon}\nu\tau\alpha\tilde{\upsilon}\vartheta\alpha\ o\grave{\upsilon}\kappa\ \alpha\grave{\iota}\tau\iota o\lambda o\gamma\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$
$\pi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\nu\ \grave{\alpha}\lambda\lambda'\ \grave{\epsilon}\kappa\ \beta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma\ \grave{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu.$[51] Theodor Zahn[52] and the
Expositor's Greek New Testament[53] call it divine purpose.

Another passage in question from Romans is in the section that
treats of election, Rom. 11, 11: "Have they stumbled that they should
fall? $\mu\grave{\eta}\ \grave{\epsilon}\pi\tau\alpha\iota\sigma\alpha\nu\ \tilde{\iota}\nu\alpha\ \pi\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\omega\sigma\iota\nu$ .." Calvinists
find their doctrine of divine reprobation taught here. Shedd states
that the Apostle here gives a reason for the reprobation of the Jews:
viz., salvation of the heathen. He defends this theory by regarding
$\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\pi\tau\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha\tau\iota$ as occasional cause of their fall, since it is
culpable and punishable. "Therefore, reprobation is consistent with
the doctrine of personal responsibility and guilt."[53a] Headlam and
Sanday say here also, "conceived result" following the British
grammarians, Lightfoot, Ellicott, and Evans.[54] Robertson falls in
line with them.[55] He does not grant that the opinion of some that
where $\tilde{\iota}\nu\alpha$ seems to express the consequence, divine purpose is meant,
can be applied here. Stoeckhardt, Philippi, and Godet translate
$\tau\epsilon\lambda\iota\kappa\tilde{\omega}\varsigma$. The $\mu\grave{\eta}\ \gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu o\iota\tau o$ strongly supports this
explanation. Paul wishes to show that the purpose (i.e. with God)

50. International Critical Commentary, Vol. 32, p. 143.
51. Ibid.
52. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, Vol. VI, p. 286 ff.
53. Vol. 2, p. 631.
53a. Commentary upon the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans, p. 335.
54. Op. cit., p. 321.
55. Loc. cit.

15

of their stumbling was not their fall. Says Calov:[56] "De intentione
Dei loquitur, non de eventu. ----- Intentio autem Dei, nec ut cederent,
fuit, nec ut in casu et ruina maneant: multo minus ut impingant."
Philippi warns:[56a] "The stone of offence at which they stumbled was
not laid in their path by God for the end that ($\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$ - particle of
intention) they should fall prostrate." Lange discusses this passage
at length and says that the Jews surely fell, but the purpose of
their fall was not that they should fall into ruin of $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omega\lambda\epsilon\iota\acute{\alpha}$.
"The $\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$ denotes the final purpose of the Divine judicial
government, and is not merely $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\beta\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\tilde{\omega}s$, as Chrysostom, Augustine
and others would have it," and in a footnote on the same page:

> "Although $\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$ is telic, ... the emphasis does not rest
> upon it, as though only the purpose were denied, and the fact
> admitted. Taking $o\acute{\iota}$ $\lambda o\iota\pi o\acute{\iota}$ as representatives of the
> whole nation, the apostle admits the stumbling, and denies
> the final fall, intimating by his use of $\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$, that another
> purpose was involved, viz., the salvation of the gentiles."[56b]

Taking this view, one avoids even the most remote possibility of
allowing the doctrine of a reprobate election to slip into this
passage.

It is not amiss to examine several other passages to establish
the laxer use of $\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$. Gal. 2, 9: "They (scil. James, Cephas,
and John) gave me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship that
($\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$) we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision."
Robertson[57] takes $\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$ in the force of "on condition that", and
Burton[57] explains the clause as giving the content of the agreement.[57]

56. *Biblia Novi Testamenti Illustrata*, vol. II, p. 185.
56a. *Op. cit.* II, p. 191.
56b. *A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures*, vol. V, (N.T.), p. 564.
57. *Op. cit.*, p. 1000
58. *Op. cit.*, p. 92
59.-*Op. cit.*, There is an ellipsis within the clause. Calov,

. Similar is I Cor. 7, 5: "Defraud ye not one the other, except it be with consent for a time, that ye may give yourselves to fasting and prayer, $\H{\iota}\nu\alpha$ $\epsilon\chi o\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\eta\tau\epsilon$." The old interpretation is that it is a pure final clause: husband and wife agree upon abstinence for the sake of prayer. Bachmann says that it is strange (es befremdet sachlich) to Paul's position to take it as purpose.[60] He could easily have given other reasons for abstinence: viz., practice in self-control (Selbstbeherrschung), in making the somatic life serviceable (Dienstbarmachung des somatischen Lebens). Paul extols married life. Should he then consider it a hindrance to prayer-life?

The verb, $\epsilon\chi o\lambda\acute{\alpha}\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu$, is a hapaxlegemenon with Paul. Its meaning is not "to dedicate oneself to a thing in general", but "to have leisure-time for something". Compare Luther, "dasz ihr ...... Musze habet". The clause cannot be the purpose of $\alpha\pi o\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\tau\epsilon$ since there would then be a certain illogicality in Paul's discussion of the marriage-question. Furthermore, bearing in mind the meaning of the verb one would accuse Paul of using the most unusual argument in the world: They abstain to have leisure-time for prayer. Zahn, who in his conclusion gives up the idea of purpose, summarizes thus: "Entweder spricht er dann den Inhalt der Verabredung unter den Ehegatten aus oder den Wunsch, von dessen Erfuellung fuer Paulus die Zustimmung zu jener Trennung abhaengig ist." Since "with

---

(#59 concluded) op. cit., p. 546: "Est autem hic $\H{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\psi\iota s$, quae optime supplebitur: Apostolatu fuggeremur, nempe ex illo $\alpha\pi o\sigma\tauo\lambda\H{\eta}\nu$, quod jam praecesserat."
60. V. Zahn, op. cit. vol. VII, p. 256.

consent" comes in between, Zahn prefers the latter meaning. He refers to passages such as Gal. 2, 9 and Phil. 2, 2 where the classical distinction between $\iota\nu\alpha$ and $\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon$ is not observed as strictly as by Classical Writers.

Similarly II Cor. I, 17 furnishes evidence that $\iota\nu\alpha$ has gone over to the ecbatic sense. "The Things that I purpose, do I purpose according to the flesh that with me there should be yea yea, and nay nay $\iota\nu\alpha$ $\mathring{\eta}$ $\kappa\tau\lambda$." Blasz takes $\iota\nu\alpha$ as expressing result.[61] Bachmann believes that here also $\iota\nu\alpha$ has invaded the function of $\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon$[62]. We find the same explanation given by Plummer.[63] Moulton differs[64] with this view.

We found no difference in the 33 $\iota\nu\alpha$ - clauses of the Pastoral Epistles from the examples in Paul's other letters. They are all, with one exception, purely purpose-clauses. In Titus 2, 12: "Teaching us that ..... we should live soberly," $\iota\nu\alpha$ ....$\zeta\eta\sigma\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$, the clause gives the purport rather than the purpose of the teaching ($\pi\alpha\iota\delta\epsilon\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$). We add this observation to show that the linguistic evidence, though never conclusive, favors the Pauline authorship of the Pastorals, a question that has often been discussed by critics.

---

61. Op. cit. p. 217
62. Zahn, op. cit., Vol. VIII, p. 61 f.
63. International Critical Commentary, vol. XXXIIIa, p. 33f.
64. Op. cit., p. 210.

What about the Epistle to the Hebrews? There are fifteen examples of $\overset{c}{\iota} \nu \alpha$, all strictly telic. Again, this fact proves nothing, either for or against the Pauline authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

So, Robertson then, is justified in concluding that $\overset{c}{\iota} \nu \alpha$ has final, subfinal, and consecutive meaning in the New Testament,[65] and that holds good for Pauline Literature.

---

65. Op. cit., p. 999.

II. CLAUSES WITH ὅπως

In the expansion of its uses ἵνα largely invaded the territories belonging to the infinitive and to ὅπως , as already observed.[66] Many constructions of ὅπως have surrendered to ἵνα . This conclusion is borne out by the fact that ὅπως is found only eight times with Paul, and three of these passages are quotations from the LXX.[67]

ὅπως is compounded from the neuter accusative relative ὅ and πως , the indefinite adverb. It occurs also in the sense of "how". As to the difference between ἵνα and ὅπως , S. G. Green says, op. cit., p. 320, that with ἵνα the emphasis is on the result aimed at and with ὅπως on the method.

The construction as to tense and mood is the same as with ἵνα except that Paul never uses the present subjunctive in ὅπως clauses but only the aorist subjunctive. Once the future indicative occurs, νικήσεις in Rom. 3, 4. Even here the variant reading νικήσῃς has led some scholars to find the aorist subjunctive. It should be noted that the form occurs together with an aorist, δικαιωθῆς and that the LXX reading in Ps. 51, 6, is νικήσῃς .[68]

---

66. A.T.Robertson, op. cit., p. 992. Cf. also Blass – Debrunner, Neutestamentliche Grammatik, p. 204. (Fifth Edition)
67. Rom, 4; 9, 17 (bis); II Thess. 1, 12.
68. This may be the case of difference in orthography. In old Attic dialect ηι was not written, but ει was. ηι was written with iota subscript. η and ει were used interchangeably, e.g. κλῆω = κλείω. The New Testament universally has η , except βούλει in Luke 22, 42. The Koine generally has η . Scholars are divided on this question. Winer – Schmiedel accept this vowel confusion as possible in several instances, also in R. 3, 40. V. Robertson, op. cit., p. 193 f.

This passage is interesting also for another reason. It is the only instance in which ἄν occurs in a final clause with Paul. The presence of this particle is due to the quotation from the LXX. The ἄν gives the clause a relative or conditional force.[69]

Where ὅπως is not part of a quotation from the LXX, it is often used for the sake of variety. So in II Cor. 8, 14 and I Cor. 1, 28-29, where it occurs alongside of ἵνα . It stands alone in II Cor. 8, 11; Gal. 1, 4; and Philemon 6.

Paul does not use ὅπως in subfinal and consecutive clauses. The classical idiom of ὅπως with the fut. indicative after verbs of striving et al. is not found with him; all eight instances are purely telic.

---

69. Burton, op. cit., p. 85.

III. NEGATIVE CLAUSES OF PURPOSE

The usual method of expressing a negative clause of purpose is
by means of $\H{\iota}\nu\alpha\ \mu\H{\eta}$ or $\H{o}\pi\omega\varsigma\ \mu\H{\eta}$. Besides, the simple $\mu\H{\eta}$,
sometimes joined to $\pi o\tau\epsilon$ or $\pi\omega\varsigma$, is so used. The construction
is the same. One example will suffice: I Cor. 9, 27: "I keep under
my body and bring it into subjection: lest that by any means ....
I myself should be a castaway, $\mu\H{\eta}\ \pi\omega\varsigma$ ....$\gamma\H{\epsilon}\nu\omega\mu\alpha\iota$."

In Gal. 2, 2 and I Thess. 3, 5 we have a very unusual
phenomenon in Greek grammar ------ an indicative of a secondary tense
after $\mu\H{\eta}\ \pi\omega\varsigma$. "I ...... communicated unto them that gospel which
I preach ..... lest by any chance I ...... had run in vain, $\mu\H{\eta}\ \pi\omega\varsigma$
......$\H{\epsilon}\delta\rho\alpha\mu o\nu$ ", and "I sent to know your faith lest .... the
tempter have tempted you, $\mu\H{\eta}\ \pi\omega\varsigma\ \H{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\H{\iota}\rho\alpha\sigma\epsilon\nu$." The
phenomenon has been variously explained. One explanation is that it is
an indirect question. Robertson[70] regards this explanation as
possible in the passage from Galatians but not in I Thess. 3, 5.
An ellipsis of a verb of inquiry must be adopted. Moulton suggests
"an afterthought" in "had run" in Gal. 2, 2.[71] In reference to
Gal. 2, 2 Blass says[72]: "Ueblicher sind solche abhaengige Saetze mit
$\mu\H{\eta}\pi o\tau\epsilon$ ($\mu\H{\eta}\pi\omega\varsigma$), die sich an irgendein Verbum anhaengen,
um das begleitende und bestimmende Gefuehl der Besorgnis
auszudruecken." He does not admit any telic force in either of the
two passages. He designates I Thess. 3, 5 "befuerchtete Folge".[73]

---

70. Op. cit., p. 988.
71. Op. cit., p. 201.
72. Op. cit., p. 205 f.
73. Ibid.

Following Goodwin, "Moods and Tenses", p. 120 f., Robertson concludes that both are purpose-clauses. There was an ancient idiom according to which an indicative of an historical tense was used if it was distinctly implied that the purpose was not attained. So it was in both passages. Paul did not run in vain, neither did the tempter succeed with the Thessalonians. In both passages the indicatives occur with parallel subjunctives.[74] Robertson's view is doubtlessly correct.[75]

The function of $\pi o \tau \varepsilon$ and $\pi \omega s$ in this connection, according to Radermacher (Neutestamentliche Grammatik, p. 158), is to distinguish dubitative from final $\mu \acute{\eta}$. $\pi o \tau \varepsilon$ has lost the idea of time and expresses contingency, "lest perchance", in preference to "lest at any time."[76]

The particle $\mu \acute{\eta}$, simple or compound, has a very narrow range of use in sub-final clauses, usually after verbs of "taking heed", "caring for", and "fearing". The subjunctive is used as a rule with the exception of Col. 2, 8 where we find the future $\check{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \alpha \iota$. The indicative is employed after $\phi o \beta \varepsilon \tilde{\iota} \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$, if the object about which one fears is present or past, e.g., Gal. 4, 11: "I am afraid of you lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain, $\phi o \beta o \tilde{\nu} \mu \alpha \iota \mu \acute{\eta}$ --- $\kappa \varepsilon \kappa o \pi \acute{\iota} \alpha \kappa \alpha$."

74. $\tau \rho \acute{\varepsilon} \chi \omega$ in Gal. 2, 2, and $\gamma \acute{\varepsilon} \nu \eta \tau \alpha \iota$ in I Thess. 3, 5.
75. Loc. cit.
76. Ibid.

IV. RELATIVE CLAUSES OF PURPOSE

There is one instance of the classic relative clause with the future indicative to express purpose in Pauline Literature. I Cor. 4, 1 "For this cause have I sent unto you Timotheus ,....... who shall bring you into remembrance ($\acute{o}s$ $\mathring{\alpha}\nu\alpha\mu\mathring{\eta}\acute{o}\epsilon\iota$) of my ways $\kappa\tau\lambda$." Paul does not make use of the subjunctive in this capacity as do other New Testament writers. This subjunctive Blass[77] calls a result of "anlehnung an die gleichwertigen Saetze mit $\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$."

No example of the future participle with verbs of motion to express purpose is found with Paul.

---

77. Op. cit., p. 210.

V. THE INFINITIVE OF PURPOSE

Although ἵνα has been taken over many of its functions, the infinitive of purpose is still quite frequent with Paul,[78] and in various constructions.

The infinitive of purpose is old. It was more frequent with Homer than with the Attic writers. The latter used it chiefly with verbs of "giving, ordaining, offering, and sending."[79a] In the New Testament it is frequent with verbs of motion. On the substitution of ἵνα – clauses Blass remarks[79b]: "Fuer diesen Infinitiv (scil. des Zwecks) kann wieder ἵνα eintreten, ...; besonders bei loser Verbindung und groeszeren Inhalt des Nebensatzes ist ἵνα das Natuerliche, waehrend in besonders enger Verbindung bestimmter Redensarten der Infinitiv sich nicht verdraengen laeszt." Paul as well as Luke does not so readily substitute ἵνα for the infinitive as, for instance, John.

A. WITH PREPOSITIONS

We begin with εἰς τό and the infinitive, because it is especially frequent with Paul. He uses it most frequently in Romans, First and Second Corinthians, and in his First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians; occasionally in the Epistle to the Galatians, Ephesians, and Philippians; never in Colossians, the Pastoral Epistles, and in Philemon.[79c]

---

78. Paul has 50 of the 72 examples in the New Testament, Robertson, op. cit., p. 1071, εἰς τό.

79a. Blass, op. cit., p. 216.

79b. Ibid.

79c. Just on the side, there are eight instances in Hebrews. This fact, again, is not proof for Pauline authorship.

$\varepsilon \acute{\iota} s \ t\acute{o}$ is in this capacity equal to the English "with a view to" in accordance with the original notion of "motion toward or into" expressed by $\varepsilon \acute{\iota} s$. In his Lexicon Thayer[80] says ad rem: " $\varepsilon \acute{\iota} s \ t\grave{o}$ followed by an infinitive ......is like the Latin ad with gerundive." In this point he follows Harmsen in Zeitschrift fuer wissenschaftliche Theologie, 1874, (pp. 345 - 360). He distinguishes two kinds of infinitival expressions with $\varepsilon \acute{\iota} s \ t\acute{o}$. In the first type " $\varepsilon \acute{\iota} s \ t\acute{o}$ combines with the verb on which it depends into a single sentence".[81] Examples are I Cor. 8, 10, "If any man see thee which hast knowledge sit at meat in the idol's temple, shall not the conscience of him which is weak be emboldened to eat those things which are offered to idols? οἰκοδομηθήσεται εἰς τὸ -- ἐσθίειν ," or I Cor. 11, 22: "Have ye not houses to eat and to drink in? εἰς τὸ ἐσθίειν κ. πίνειν ."[82]

The second genus is that which expresses a separate telic clause. Paul usually uses $\varepsilon \acute{\iota} s \ t\acute{o}$ in this function as in Rom. 1, 11: "I long to see you ..... to the end ye may be established, εἰς τὸ στηριχ-θῆναι ὑμᾶς[83]." Notice how the translators have brought out the force of εἰστὸwith "to the end". When the subject of the infinitive is the same as that of the leading clause, it is sometimes not repeated as in Gal. 3, 17: "The covenant ...... the law ..... cannot disannul that it should make the promise of none effect εἰς τὸ καταργῆσαι τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν." The subject is even omitted

---

80. Sub $\varepsilon \acute{\iota} s \ t\acute{o}$, p. 185
81. Ibid.
82. Other examples are I Thess. 2, 16; 4, 9; Phil. 1, 23.
83. Other purely final instances are Rom. 3, 26; 7, 4; 8, 29 etal.

occasionally when it is not the same as that of the principal clause
and can be easily appplied, e.g. in Rom. 6, 12, "Let not sin reign
in your mortal body that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof,
$\varepsilon \acute{i} s \ \tau \grave{o} \ \acute{v} \pi \alpha \kappa o \acute{v} \varepsilon \iota \nu \ \kappa \tau \lambda$." Paul uses the present or the aorist
infinitive, once the perfect, viz. in Eph. 1, 18: "The eyes of your
understanding being enlightened that ye may know the hope of his
calling $\varepsilon \acute{i} s \ \tau \grave{o} \ \varepsilon \acute{i} \delta \acute{\varepsilon} \nu \alpha \iota \cdot \acute{v} \mu \tilde{\alpha} s$." Moulton[84] notes that the
difference between $\acute{i} \nu \alpha$ -clauses and clauses of $\varepsilon \acute{i} s \ \tau o \acute{}$ cum
infinitivo is that $\acute{i} \nu \alpha$ indicates the immediate, $\varepsilon \acute{i} s \ \tau o \acute{}$ the more
remote result aimed at.

The functions of $\varepsilon \acute{i} s \ \tau o \acute{}$ with infinitive are summarized by
Burton as expressing "tendency, measure of effect, or result, conceived
or actual",[85] besides purpose, the most common. The distinction
between these various tinges of meaning will best become clear through
examining passages that come into consideration.

Rom. 1, 20: "The invisible things of him from the creation of the
world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made,
even His eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse,
$\varepsilon \acute{i} s \ \tau \grave{o} \ \varepsilon \tilde{i} \nu \alpha \iota \ \alpha \acute{v} \tau o \acute{v} s \ \acute{\alpha} \nu \alpha \pi o \lambda o \gamma \acute{\eta} \tau o v s$." A little reflection will
reveal that the correct syntactical explanation is important, as far
as the meaning, yes doctrine, is concerned. If this passage is a
clause of purpose, one might use it, as has been done,[86] in support of

---

84. Op. cit., p. 218.
85. Op. cit., p. 161.
86. V. Calov, op. cit., p. 32, for quotations from Calvinists.

Calvin's doctrine of double election. Grammarians and exegetes line
up in this wise. Headlam and Sanday say, "secondary, conditional,
purpose";[87] Zahn, "beabsichtigte Folge"[88]; Meyer,[89] purpose; Stoeckhardt,
"divine purpose".[90] Over against these literati others believe, it is a
clause of result. Burton says, op. cit., p. 161: "This clause could be
joined to an expression of purpose only by supposing an ellipsis of
some such expression as καὶ οὕτως εἰσίν and seems therefore
to require that εἰς τὸ εἶναι be interpreted as expressing
reult." He adds that the following causal clause forbids the final
interpretation. Expositor's Greek New Testament believes that it is
ecbatic.[91] So Philippi, I, p. 48 f. He adds, however, that the telic
acceptation does not necessarily mean that an unconditional
predestination is taught here. Robertson, op. cit., p. 1002, does not
give a definite answer: "Divine purpose may be the idea, though result
is the probable conception." Similarly Moulton.[92] Forceful is Calov's
discussion.[93] "Illud autem εἰς τὸ εἶναι hic accipiendum est
non τελικῶς, sed ἐκβατικῶς." He follows this syntax against
the Calvinistic who believed that God gave the

---

87. *International Critical Commentary*, vol. 32, p. 44.
88. Vol. VI, p. 91 f.
89. "Εἰς τὸ mit dem artikulirten (sic) Infin. wird namentlich auch
im Roemerbriefe an keiner einzigen Stelle anders also telisch gebraucht",
IV, p. 85.
90. Op. cit., p. 54.
91. Vol. 2, p. 592
92. "This belongs to the category of passages dealing with divine
action, in which contemplated and actual results, final and consecutive
clauses, necessarily lose their difference."
93. Loc. cit.

heathen knowledge of Himself in order to deprive them of any pretext of excuse, <u>ut postea nihil haberent, quod praetexerunt.</u>[94] Calov shows that the purpose of giving them a natural knowledge of God was that there might be a "manuductio (a leading by the hand) quaedam ad ulteriorem DEI agnitionem in verbo propositam et ecclesiae patefactam quae dicitur finis paedagogicus". That the heathen are rendered $\grave{\alpha}\nu\alpha\pi o\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\eta\tau\alpha\iota$ because they neglected to seek the "ulteriorem Dei cognitionem", did not happen "ex Dei ordinatione vel intentione" but "praeter eandem". Calov's conclusion ... "ideo $\varepsilon\grave{\iota}s\ \tau\grave{o}\ \varepsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota$ hoc loco est $\acute{\omega}\varepsilon\tau\varepsilon\ \varepsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota$ " is correct.

The Fourth Chapter of the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans has four instances of $\varepsilon\grave{\iota}s\ \tau\acute{o}$ <u>cum infinitivo</u>, showing the frequency with which Paul uses this mode of expression. All four, two in v. 11 and one each in vv. 16 and 18, express purpose. V. 11, "And he (sibl. Abraham) received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith, which he had yet being uncircumcised: that he might be the father of all them that believe." This passage ($\varepsilon\grave{\iota}s\ \tau\grave{o}\ \varepsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota\ \alpha\grave{v}\tau\acute{o}\nu$) is now quite universally regarded as telic.[95] Meyer says, it was God's purpose that Abraham receive circumcision as a seal of the righteousness of faith. He regards the telic acceptation as necessary when looking at it from the viewpoint of the Biblical outlook (Anschauung) of

---

94. Ibid.
95. International Critical Commentary, vol.2, p. 107; Expositor's II, p. 617; Philippi I, p. 178.

the matter and of its importance. Therefore the ecbatic explanation
of making the clause equal to $\kappa\alpha\grave{\iota}$ $o\acute{u}tws$ $\acute{\varepsilon}\gamma\acute{\varepsilon}\nu\varepsilon\tau o$ $\pi\alpha\tau\acute{\eta}\rho$ was
rightly given up.[96]

A difference of opinion is held in regard to v. 18: "Who (scil.
Abraham) against hope believed in hope that he might become the father
of many nations, $\varepsilon\acute{\iota}s$ $\tau\grave{o}$ $\gamma\varepsilon\nu\acute{\varepsilon}\varepsilon\vartheta\alpha\iota$." Headlam and Sanday say,[97]
it is equivalent to $\H{\omega}\varepsilon\tau\varepsilon$ $\gamma\varepsilon\nu\acute{\varepsilon}\varepsilon\vartheta\alpha\iota.$ "His faith enabled
him to become the father, but with the underlying idea that his faith
in this was but carrying out the great Divine purpose which ordered
all these events." Philippi says, it is parallel to v. 11, namely
Divine intention. Some have thought that the infinitival clause
was the object of his faith. Philippi rejects that view. The direct
reflexive would then be used for $\alpha\grave{\upsilon}\tau\acute{o}\nu$. The verb $\pi\iota\varsigma\tau\varepsilon\acute{\upsilon}\varepsilon\iota\nu$
is not used with $\varepsilon\acute{\iota}s$ and the substantival infinitive as object.
Furthermore, such a view would weaken the phrase "against hope in hope".[98]

Romans 6, 12: "Let not sin reign in your mortal body that ye
should obey it in the lusts thereof, $\varepsilon\acute{\iota}s$ $\tau\grave{o}$ $\upsilon\pi\alpha\kappa\acute{o}\upsilon\varepsilon\iota\nu$ "
is clearly the result. If they let sin rule over their body, the
inevitable result is that they obey their lusts. This verse illustrates
well what Burton means by "tendency, measure of effect, or result,
conceived or actual". In Rom. 7, 4: "Ye also are become dead to the
law by the body of Christ that ($\varepsilon\acute{\iota}s$ $\tau\acute{o}$) ye should be married
to another" is taken as purpose. The purpose of the abolition of
the Law is that they should belong to Christ.[99]

---

96. Op. cit., p. 211.
97. Op. cit., p. 114.
98. Philippi, op. cit. I, p. 178.
99. Philippi, op. cit. I, p. 526 f.

In the very next verse we have a case of result being expressed by $\varepsilon i_s \, t o'$. "When we were in the flesh, the notions of sins which were by the Law, did work in our members to ($\varepsilon i_s \, t o'$) bring forth fruit unto death." It is parallel to $\overset{\shortmid\shortmid}{\omega}\varepsilon t \varepsilon$, as it is to be taken $\varepsilon' \kappa \beta \alpha \tau \iota \kappa \tilde{\omega} s$ and not $t \varepsilon \lambda \iota \kappa \tilde{\omega} s$. The result of the working of the fleshly notions is that they bring forth fruit unto death.[100]

This construction occurs in the <u>locus classicus</u> and one of the important <u>sedes doctrinae</u> on election, Rom. 8, 29: "Whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son that ($\varepsilon i_s \, t o'$) He might be the first-born among many brethren." The final aim of the $\pi \rho o o \rho \iota \epsilon \mu o' s$ was to glorify His Son, the mediate purpose the salvation of man.[101]

Still in the section on election (Romans 11, 11) we find another example: "Through their (scil. Jews') fall salvation is come unto the Gentiles, for to ($\varepsilon i_s \, t o'$) provoke them to jealousy."[102] How is this clause to be understood? The first part of the verse has shown that God did not intend the fall of the Jews.[103] The meaning is well given by Calov.[104]

---

100. Philippi, <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 550.
101. Philippi, <u>op. cit.</u>, vol. II, p. 35 f.
102. Luther's translation "nacheifern" is not the equivalent of the original, which is "eifersüchtig machen."
103. V. p. 20 f.
104. <u>Op. cit.</u>, p. 185

"Intelligenda haec sunt non τελικῶς , sed ἐκβατικῶς:
nam hoc eventus et directionis divinae fuit, non quod
voluerit DEUS, ut caderent Israelitae, sed, quia casuri
erant propria culpa, hunc eorum casum in bonum direxerit,
partim quoad gentiles in salutem eorum, partim quoad
Israelitas, ut eos per aemulationem gentium exitio eriperet.
Intentio itaque DEI fuit, ut ad aemulationem exstimularet
Judaeos per fidem et salutem gentium. Assumptio novi
populi directa fuit ad veteris provocationem ad aemulationem:
ut nempe Israelitae cernentes confertam gentilium ad Deum
conversionem seria aemulatione irritati et ipsi doctrinae
Evangelii animos suos submitterent."

The laxer use of this construction is further exemplified by
this passage (Rom. 12, 3): "I say .... to every man ... to (εἰς τό)
think soberly." Robertson (op. cit., p. 1072) lists this passage
as expressing conceived result, "to think so that he thinks soberly".[105]
He should think so of himself that the self-estimate is moderate.
Cf. Stoeckhardt's translation, "bedacht sein auf eine besonnene
Denkweise". In this usage we have a parallel in ὥστε , which is
used for aim and result.[106]

We observe the same wider use in other of his epistles.
II Cor.8, 5 - 6: "And .... they ..... first gave their own selves
to the Lord .... insomuch that (εἰς τό) we desired Titus."
Meyer, Hofmann, et al. insist on the "rein telische Fassung".[107] He
admits that the εἰς τό - clause was indeed a result of the matter
in Macedonia, but it was a result intended by God. He finds proof in
the phrase in v. 5, "by the will of God". Expositor's (III, p. 85),

---

105. Thayer, op. cit., p. 613.
106. Blasz, op. cit., p. 216: "Es wird aber mit ὥστε im
NeuenTestament wie attisch keineswegs blosz die wirkliche oder die
moegliche Folge eingefuehrt, sondern auch (was sogar das Aeltere ist)
die beabsichtigte, so dasz eine Grenze gegen die Absichtssaetze
kaum mehr sichtbar ist."
107. "Damit wir den Titus ermahnten". Remember that Meyer says,
εἰς τό is always "auf dasz", never "so dasz". (VII, p. 239)

I C C (XXXIIIa, p. 257), and Zahn (VIII, p. 312) take it in the ecbatic sense. The connecting thought is that he was so encouraged by the generosity of the Macedonians that he thought to send Titus.[108]

Again, this construction has broadened out so that it is used, like $\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$ -clauses, as objects of certain verbs. This use corresponds to the sub-final clause, as it is used after similar verbs: of commanding, of entreating, of asking for. Illustrations are to be found in I Thess. 2, 12; I Thess. 3, 10; and II Thess. 2, 2.[109]

Sometimes it is merely epexegetic. For instance, it is merely explanatory in Phil. 1, 23, "I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to ($\varepsilon\acute{\iota}s\ \tau\acute{o}$) depart and to be with Christ." Also epexegetic to a verbal adjective as in I Thess. 4, 9: "Ye are taught of God to ($\nu\varepsilon o\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\alpha\kappa\tau o\iota\ \varepsilon\acute{\iota}s\ \tau\acute{o}$) love one another."

---

108. Another instance of the Consecutive Infinitive is Gal. 3, 17. On II Cor. 1, 4: "Who comforteth us in all our tribulation that ($\varepsilon\acute{\iota}s\ \tau\acute{o}$) we may be able to comfort them which are in any trouble," Bachmann says: "Solche Zusprache (comforteth) fuehrt aber Gottbhis dahin fort, dasz die von ihm gewaehrte Troestung uebergeht auf die anderen in aehnlicher Lage befindlichen." He says it expresses result and purpose. Zahn, op. cit., VIII, p. 28. On p. 294 he discusses II Cor. 7, 3: "I have said before that ye are in our hearts to ($\varepsilon\acute{\iota}s\ \tau\acute{o}$) die and live with you." " bezeichnet die Wirkung, an deren Intensitaet man die Energie des $\varepsilon\nu\ \kappa\alpha\rho\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha\ \varepsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota$ abzumessen vermag.
109. After $\mu\alpha\rho\tau\upsilon\rho\varepsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota,\ \delta\varepsilon\tilde{\iota}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, and $\grave{\varepsilon}\rho\omega\tau\tilde{\alpha}\nu$ respectively.

Very similar is $\pi\rho\acute{o}s$ $\tau\acute{o}$ cum infinitivo. It has the force of "looking to" "with a view to". Of the twelve examples in the New Testament Paul has four - II Cor. 3, 13; Eph. 6, 11; I Thess. 2, 9; and in II Thess. 3, 8. In Eph. 6, 11, he has the present and in other passages the aorist infinitive. All four express "the subjective purpose"[110] as in II Cor. 3, 13, "And not as Moses, which put a veil over his face, that ($\pi\rho\acute{o}s$ $\tau\acute{o}$) the children of Israel could not steadfastly look ($\mu\grave{\eta}$ $\mathring{a}\tau\epsilon\nu\acute{\iota}\sigma\alpha\iota$) to the end which is abolished."

B. THE ARTICULAR INFINITIVE

A construction belonging to the higher stratum of Koine Greek, especially with Luke and Paul,[111] is the infinitive after the genitive article $\tau o\widehat{\upsilon}$. Luke has it oftener than Paul. In its development it started as a purely adnominal genitive.[112] Moulton maintains that it is generally incidental that $\tau o\widehat{\upsilon}$ corresponds to the ordinary genitive. It retains its genitive force after nouns and verbs which otherwise also govern the genitive.[113] In the extension of its uses, however, it retains its genitive force as little as the genitive absolute. Developed by Thucydides, it came to express purpose.[114] In fact, it

---

110. Robertson, op. cit., p. 1075.
111. Blass, op. cit., p. 226. Five-sixths of the examples with Luke and Paul.
112. It still is in I Cor. 16, 4: "If it be meet that I go also ($\tau o\widehat{\upsilon}$ $\kappa\alpha\mu\grave{\epsilon}$ $\pi o\rho\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\sigma\vartheta\alpha\iota$), they shall go with me."
113. E.g. after verbs of lacking, depriving, et al.
114. "In Beziehung auf ganze Saetze, um die Absicht auszudruecken, wo die aeltern Philologen $\breve{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\kappa\alpha$ oder $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\nu$ supplirten", Winer, op. cit., p. 304. Also Blass, loc. cit.

developed beyond the telic meaning over into the ecbatic. "The
general blurring of the expressions, which were once appropriated
for purpose, has infected two varieties of the articular infinitive."[115]
So also Blasz, "Starke Lockerung der Verbindung mit dem Substantiv
und Uebergang zu konsekutivem Sinn zeigen Stellen wie I Cor. 10, 13."

Moulton counts thirteen examples with Paul, and these are in
Romans, Galatians, I and II Corinthians, and Philippians. Of these
purpose is never unmistakable.[116] In fact, Robertson doubts whether
Paul ever uses $\tau o \tilde{v}$ cum infinitivo for purpose. In this respect
Paul's use differs frombhat of ~~of~~ Luke, viz., in the absence of
telic force.

Two probable cases are Rom. 6, 6, and Phil. 3, 10. Rom. 6, 6:
"Our old man is crucified with him that (ἵνα) the body of sin might
be destroyed, that ($\tau o \tilde{v}$) henceforth we should not serve sin." On
this passage Moulton remarks that the infinitival clause expounds
the purpose contained in the ἵνα-clause"[117]. Very similar is Phil.
3, 8 - 10: "I count all things but loss .... that (ἵνα) I may win
Christ and be found in Him ...... that ($\tau o \tilde{v}$) I may know Him."

This construction is generally epexegetic with Paul. Rom. 1, 24:
"God gave them (scil. the heathen) up to uncleanness through the lusts
of their own hearts, to ($\tau o \tilde{v}$) dishonor their own bodies." Yet, some

_____

115. Moulton, op. cit., p. 216; also Blasz, loc. cit.
116. V. Moulton, loc. cit.
117. Moulton, op. cit., p. 218.

take this infinitive as one of purpose. So Philippi (I, p. 54.).
In proof he refers to πάλη ἀτιμίας in v. 26, which resumes
the thought of ἀτι μάζεσθαι. Stoeckhardt also takes it as
a purpose clause and finds the <u>voluntas Dei consequens</u> expressed here.[118]
The grammarians, however, are of a different opinion. Blass says,
"Uebergang zu konsekutiven Sinn."[119] Robertson (<u>op</u>. <u>cit</u>., p. 1002)
says that τοῦ with infinitive is usually equivalent to "so as to"
in Pauline Literature and so here. Shedd,[120] Burton,[121] Winer,[122] all take
it as epexegetic. "Der Genitiv sagt an, worin jene ἀκαθαρσία
bestanden habe."[123] Warding off any possible Calvinistic teaching,
Calov, (<u>op</u>. <u>cit</u>., p. 84) concludes : "<u>Traditi</u> ergo a Deo sunt non
<u>effective</u>, quasi Deus autor sit illius impuritatis, ut <u>Calviniani</u>
blasphemant; nec solum <u>permissive</u> ac tantum ἐκβατικῶς sed
δικαστικῶς et <u>judicaliter</u>."

Here belongs a passage like Rom. 7, 3, "If her husband be dead,
she is free from that law, so that (τοῦ) she is no adulteress."
Moulton calls it epexegetic, while Philippi (I, p. 325), Robertson
(<u>op</u>. <u>cit</u>., p. 1002), and Burton label it a clause of result.
Philippi is without a doubt correct in equating τοῦ μή with
ὥστε μή.

Summing up, Moulton lists the thirteen examples as follows:

---

118. <u>Op</u>. <u>cit</u>., p. 61.
119. <u>Loc</u>. <u>cit</u>.
120. <u>Op</u>. <u>cit</u>., p. 26.
121. <u>Op</u>. <u>cit</u>., p. 158.
122. <u>Op</u>. <u>cit</u>., p. 305f.
123. <u>Ibid</u>.

three are either final or consecutive (Rom. 6, 6; 7, 3; Phil. 3, 10),
two are ablative (Rom. 15, 22; II Cor. 1, 8), five occur with
substantives (Rom. 15, 23; I Cor. 9, 10; 16, 4; II Cor. 8, 11; Phil. 3,
21), four are epexegetic (Rom. 1, 24; 7, 3; 8, 12; I Cor. 10, 13).[124]

C. WITH ὥστε

What about ὥστε with the infinitive? Reference was made to
this construction in note 106. It is usually used for result as in
the Classical[125], e.g. II Cor. 1, 8: "We would not have you ignorant of
our trouble .... that we were pressed out of measure, above
strength insomuch that (ὥστε) we despaired even of life."
Another example is II Thess. II, 4: "Who (scil. that man of sin)
opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that
is worshiped; so that (ὥστε) he as God sitteth in the temple
of God" etc. These examples express, according to Burton,[126]
"tendency, by implication realized in actual result".

Slightly different is the construction in I Cor. 13, 2: "Though
I have all faith so that (ὥστε) I could remove mountains and
have not charity, I am nothing." This case denotes "tendency or
conceived result thought of as such".[127] This shade of meaning is
better illustrated by Luther's translation: "also dass ich Berge
versetzte." Compare also II Cor. 2, 7. Robertson further observes
that the idea of pure purpose is rare with the N.T. writers when
they employ ὥστε cum infinitivo. Only probable examples should
be claimed[128].

---

124. There are really 14. Moulten apparently overlooked Gal. 3, 10,
where it occurs after a noun.
125. Blass, op. cit., p. 216.

VI. DOUBLE PURPOSE-CLAUSES

Paul expresses double purpose-clauses in various ways. We glean a few illustrations from his Epistle to the Romans which show his linguistic resource-fulness in this respect. Sometimes he introduces both with the same particle e.g. Rom. 7, 13: "But sin that ($\tilde{\iota}\nu\alpha$) it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good; that ($\tilde{\iota}\nu\alpha$) sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful."[129] Or, he begins the second clause with $\varepsilon\tilde{\iota}s\,\tau\acute{o}$ as in Rom. 4, 16: "It is of faith that ($\tilde{\iota}\nu\alpha$) it might be by grace; to the end ($\varepsilon\tilde{\iota}s\,\tau\acute{o}$) the promise might be sure to all the seed." Or vice versa as in Rom. 7, 4: "Ye are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ($\varepsilon\tilde{\iota}s\,\tau\acute{o}$) ye should be married to another ...... that ($\tilde{\iota}\nu\alpha$) we should bring forth fruit unto God." In Rom. 6,6, the order is $\tilde{\iota}\nu\alpha$ .... $\tauο\tilde{\upsilon}$ cum infinitivo. A double purpose-clause is usually placed in a long period.[130]

---

126. Op. cit., p. 149 f.
127. Ibid.
128. Op. cit., p. 990, p. 1089.
129. For double $\varepsilon\tilde{\iota}s\,\tau\acute{o}$ see Rom. 4, 11; double $\acute{o}\pi\omega s$ Rom. 9, 17.
130. "Gewoehnlich an entscheidender Stelle, am Satzende oder so, dass sie eine ganze Periode bestimmen," Zeitschrift fuer die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der aelteren Kirche, XXXIII, Heft I, p. 57.

$$\tau\grave{o}\ \tau\acute{\varepsilon}\lambda o s$$

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BACHMANN, PHILIPP, "Der Erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther,"
Zahn's Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, 3te Auflage, Leipzig,
Erlangen, A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung Dr. Werner Scholl,
VII, 1921, p. 256 ff.

"Der Zweite Brief des Paulus an die Korinther," Zahn's
Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, 1ste u. 2te Auflage, Leipzig,
A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung Nachf. (Georg Boehme),
1909, VIII, p. 28, 61 f.

BLASZ, FRIEDRICH, and DEBRUNNER, ALBERT, Neutestamentliche Grammatik,
fifth edition, Goettingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1921,
p. 50 f., pp. 204 - 206, pp. 215 - 222, pp. 226 - 229.

BURTON, ERNEST DE WITT, Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New
Testament Greek, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press,
1900, pp. 86 - 96, 161 - 162, 149f, 151f.

"A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the
Galatians," International Critical Commentary, New York,
Charles Scribner's Sons, 1980, XXXIV, passim.

CALOVIUS, ABRAHAM, Biblica Novi Testamenti Illustrata, Dresdae et
Lipsiae, sumptibus Johannis Christophori Zimmermanni,
Rudolstadii, imprimebat Heinricus Urban, 1719, Tomus II, pp. 32,
185, 546.

DENNEY, Rev. JAMES, D.D., "St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans," The
Expositors Greek Testament, London, New York, Toronto, n.d., II,
p. 592, 617, 631.

DOBSCHUETS, E. von, "Zum Wortschatz und Stil des Roemerbriefs,"
Zeitschrift fuer die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die
Kunde der aelteren Kirche, XXXIII, 1934, Heft I, Gieszen, Verlag
von Alfred Toepelmann, p. 56 f.

GREEN, SAMUEL G., Handbook to the Grammar of the Greek Testament,
London, The Religious Tract Society, 4 Bouverie and 65 St. Paul's
Church-yard, pp. 320 - 323, 326 - 328.

HEADLAM, ARTHUR C., and SANDAY, WILLIAM, "A Critical and Exegetical
Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans," International
Critical Commentary, 11th edition, New York, Charles Scribner's
Sons, 1906, XXXII, pp. 44, 107, 114, 143, 521.

LANGE, J. P., and FAY, F. R., "The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans," Lange-Schaff: A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures, V (N.T.), New York, Charles Scribner and Co., 654 Broadway, 1869, p. 364.

LUTHER, MARTIN, "An die Ratsherrn aller Staedte Deutschlands, dasz sie christliche Schulen aufrichten und halten," Saemmtliche Schriften, St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1892, X, pp. 458 - 485.

MEYER, HEINRICH A. G., Kritisch-Exegetischer Kommentar ueber das Neue Testament, Goettingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprechts, Verlag, 1866, IV, pp. 85, 211; VII, p. 533ff., 259.

MOULTON, JAMES HOPE, A Grammar of New Testament Greek, Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark, 38 George Street, I, "Prolegomena", 3rd Edition with Corrections and editions, pp. 205 - 210, 216 - 220.

PHILIPPI, FRIEDRICH ADOLPH, Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, translated by J. S. Banks, Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark, 38 George Street, 1878 & 1879, I, p. 54, 125, 178, 284, 326, 330; II, p. 35f., p. 191.

PLUMMER, ALFRED, "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians," International Critical Commentary, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905, XXXIIIa, p. 33f.

ROBERTSON, A. T., A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research, fifth Edition, New York, Richard R. Smith, Inc., Hodder & Stoughton, n.d., passim.

"The Minister and his Greek New Testament, New York, George H. Doran Company, 1923, passim.

SHEDD, WILLIAM G. T., A Critical and Doctrinal Commentary upon the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 743 and 745 Broadway, 1879, p. 26, 335.

STOECKHARDT, GEORGE, Commentar ueber den Brief Pauli an die Roemer, St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1907, pp. 61, 54, 269.

THAYER, JOSEPH HENRY, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, corrected edition, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago, American Book Company, 1889, passim.

ZAHN, THEODOR, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, Leipzig, A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung Nachf. (Georg Boehme), 1ste & 2te Auflage, 1910, VI, p. 91f., p. 286ff.