

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

## Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

---

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

---

6-1-1957

### Methods of Expressing Purpose in Romans, First Corinthians, Second Corinthians, Galatians, and Hebrews

Charles D. Froehlich

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir\_froehlichc@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Froehlich, Charles D., "Methods of Expressing Purpose in Romans, First Corinthians, Second Corinthians, Galatians, and Hebrews" (1957). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 525.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/525>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact [seitzw@csl.edu](mailto:seitzw@csl.edu).

METHODS OF EXPRESSING PURPOSE IN ROMANS, FIRST  
CORINTHIANS, SECOND CORINTHIANS, GALATIANS, AND HEBREWS

---

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty  
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,  
Department of Exegetical Theology  
in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of  
Bachelor of Divinity

---

by

Charles D. Froehlich

June 1957

Approved by: Martin H. Franzmann  
Advisor

Paul W. Spierck  
Reader

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	111
Chapter	
I. NATURE AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDY . . . . .	1
II. DESCRIPTION AND LIST OF ALL EXPRESSIONS OF PURPOSE . . . . .	3
"	
ὅτι Clauses . . . . .	3
ὅπως Clauses . . . . .	6
μή Clauses . . . . .	7
Infinitives . . . . .	9
τοῦ with Infinitive . . . . .	10
πρὸς τὸ with Infinitive . . . . .	12
εἰς τὸ with Infinitive . . . . .	13
τεῖς with Accusative . . . . .	14
εἰς with Accusative . . . . .	16
Relative Clauses, Participles . . . . .	18
III. EXAMINATION OF THE STATISTICAL METHOD . . . . .	20
IV. GRAMMATICAL PURPOSE AND RESULT . . . . .	24
V. ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS . . . . .	30
VI. SUMMARY . . . . .	35
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	37

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. All Expressions of Purpose . . . . .	27
2. Number of Constructions per page . . . . .	28
3. The percentage of all expressions of purpose that each construction represents . . . . .	29

stated in the use of the Hebrew, both letters in the description, and the use of the Galilean. It is hoped that some light might be shed on the probability or improbability of the genuine authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

It is, of course, admitted at the outset that evidence of tracing can be considered regarding the traditional question of the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews. This study only includes some of Paul's letters, not all of them. Also, this paper is concerned only with a grammatical, or stylistic, consideration. The contents of the letters, historical allusion to the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and all the other factors which were to be considered in a problem of authorship have been omitted. Furthermore, even the grammatical, or stylistic, study is partial.

It is the aim of this paper merely to draw some conclusions about and make some comparisons between the style of St. Paul, as it is represented in four of his letters, and the style of Hebrews, as well as to make some suggestions and draw some conclusions about the style of St. Paul, in so far as they are represented in the four letters studied. This tentative conclusion regarding the genuine authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews

## CHAPTER I

### NATURE AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this paper is to investigate and compare the methods of expressing purpose in four letters written by the Apostle Paul and in the Epistle to the Hebrews. The four epistles of St. Paul which have been studied are the one to the Romans, both letters to the Corinthians, and the one to the Galatians. It is hoped that some light might be shed on the probability or improbability of the Pauline authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

It is, of course, admitted at the outset that nothing of finality can be concluded regarding the traditional question of the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews. This study only includes some of Paul's letters, not all of them. Also, this paper is concerned only with a grammatical, or stylistic, consideration. The contents of the letters, historical attestation to the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and all the other factors which must be considered in a problem of authorship have been omitted. Furthermore, even the grammatical, or stylistic, study is partial.

It is the aim of this paper merely to draw some conclusions about and make some comparisons between the style of St. Paul, as it is represented in four of his letters, and the style of Hebrews, as well as to make some comparisons and draw some conclusions about the styles of St. Paul, in so far as they are represented in the four letters studied. Some tentative conclusions regarding the Pauline authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews

have been drawn on the basis of the professedly slight and incomplete evidence.<sup>1</sup>

The method was to find all expressions of purpose in the letters studied, assemble all examples under appropriate headings, and then draw conclusions on the basis of the use each letter makes of the various methods of expressing purpose.

To avoid repetition of the cumbersome circumlocutions Epistle to the Romans, First Epistle to the Corinthians, Second Epistle to the Corinthians, the Epistle to the Galatians, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, the five letters have been designated throughout merely as Romans, I Corinthians, II Corinthians, Galatians, and Hebrews. The text of the Greek New Testament used was that of E. Nestle. The edition was the sixteenth.

---

<sup>1</sup>The study may have more value as an illustration of the possibilities and limitations of a carefully controlled Wortstatistik than as affording a means of testing the Pauline authorship of Hebrews.

## CHAPTER II

### DESCRIPTION AND LIST OF ALL EXPRESSIONS OF PURPOSE

#### " (Vα Clauses

The most frequent method of constructing final clauses, both in classical Greek and Hellenistic Greek, was the use of the conjunction (Vα followed by a verb, most often in the subjunctive mood. A future indicative would occasionally be used instead of the subjunctive, especially in Hellenistic Greek.

In classical Greek, final clauses take the Subjunctive after primary tenses; after secondary tenses either the optative or the Subjunctive.

In the New Testament, the Optative does not occur.<sup>1</sup>

In Hellenistic Greek a tendency prevailed to employ (Vα clauses for a number of constructions which in classical Greek usually employed the infinitive or a οπως clause. The non-classical uses of (Vα in the New Testament include noun clauses, result clauses, explanatory clauses, and some other rarer and less important uses. In this paper, the non-final uses of (Vα which appear in the five letters studied have been excluded from consideration although they have been enumerated and illustrated.

That (Vα normally meant "in order that" is beyond question. It is perpetually used in the full final sense in the papyri, having gained greatly on the Attic οπως. But it has come to be the ordinary construction in many phrases where a simple infinitive was used

---

<sup>1</sup>Ernest DeWitt Burton, Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek (Third edition; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1898), pp. 85-86.

in earlier Greek, just as in Latin ut clauses, or in English those with that, usurp the prerogative of the verbal noun.<sup>2</sup>

The twenty-eight instances of (*va*) introducing purpose clauses in

Romans are: 1:11; 1:13; 3:8; 3:19; 4:16; 5:20; 5:21;  
6:1; 6:4; 6:6; 7:4; 7:13; 7:13; 8:4; 8:11; 8:17;  
11:19; 11:25; 11:31; 11:32; 14:9; 15:4; 15:6; 15:16; 15:20;  
15:31; 15:32; 16:12.

The forty-three instances in I Corinthians are: 1:17; 1:27;

1:27; 1:28; 1:31; 2:5; 2:12; 3:18; 4:6; 4:6; 4:8;  
5:2; 5:5; 5:7; 7:5; 7:5; 7:34; 7:35; 8:13; 9:12;  
9:15; 9:19; 9:20(2); 9:21; 9:22; 9:22; 9:23; 9:24; 9:25;  
10:33; 11:19; 11:32; 11:34; 12:25; 13:3; 14:5b; 14:19; 14:31;  
15:28; 16:2; 16:6; 16:11.

The thirty-eight instances in II Corinthians are: 1:9; 1:11;

1:15; 2:3; 2:4; 2:4; 2:5; 2:9; 2:11; 4:7; 4:10;  
4:11; 4:15; 5:4; 5:10; 5:12; 5:15; 5:21; 6:4; 7:9;  
8:9; 8:13; 8:14; 9:3; 9:3; 9:8; 10:9; 11:7; 11:12;  
11:12; 11:16; 12:7; 12:7; 12:7; 12:9; 13:7; 13:7; 13:10.

The fifteen examples in Galatians are: 1:16; 2:4; 2:5;

2:16; 2:19; 3:14(2); 3:22; 3:24; 4:5; 4:5; 4:17; 5:17;  
6:12; 6:17.

The twenty examples in Hebrews are: 2:14; 2:17; 3:13;

4:11; 4:16; 5:1; 6:12; 6:18; 9:25; 10:9; 10:36; 11:28;  
11:35; 11:40; 12:3; 12:13; 12:27; 13:12; 13:17; 13:19.

Two examples of the final (*va*) clause are in II Corinthians 1:15

<sup>2</sup>James Hope Moulton, A Grammar of New Testament Greek (Third edition with corrections and additions; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1919), I, 206.



and Galatians 6:12. II Corinthians 1:15 ἐβουλόμην πρότερον πρὸς ὑμᾶς εἰσεῖν ἵνα δεύτηραν χάριν σχῆτε "I wished to come to you before

in order that you might get a second gift of grace." Galatians 6:12

οὗτοι ἀναγκάζουσιν ὑμᾶς περιτέμνεσθαι, μόνον ἵνα τῷ

σταυρῷ τοῦ Χριστοῦ μὴ διωκῶνται "These compel you to be

circumcized only in order that they might not be persecuted for the cross of Christ."

In addition to the ἵνα clauses with telic force listed above, the following twenty-four non-final ἵνα clauses also occur in the books studied: Romans 11:11; 15:31; I Corinthians 1:10; 1:15; 4:2; 4:3; 7:29; 9:18; 14:1; 14:5a; 14:12; 14:13; 16:10; 16:12a; 16:12b; 16:16; II Corinthians 1:17; 8:6; 8:7; 9:4; 9:5; 12:8; Galatians 2:9; 2:10.

Twelve of these twenty-four non-final ἵνα clauses are employed as objects of a verb, especially verbs of two classes. Verbs of exhorting, commanding, entreating, persuading, and also those of striving for, taking care, planning, effecting are followed by a ἵνα clause. In classical Greek such verbs were usually followed by a ὅπως clause, or, in the case of the former class of verbs, more frequently by an infinitive.<sup>3</sup>

The twelve ἵνα clauses used in this way are those in Romans 15:31; I Corinthians 1:10; 14:5a; 14:13; 16:12a; 16:16; II Corinthians 8:6; 9:5; 12:8; and I Corinthians 14:1; 14:12; 16:10. The latter three follow verbs

of the second class while those verbs of the first class are followed by

ἵνα clauses in the nine passages which are listed first. I Corinthians 1:10: παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς . . . ἵνα τὸ αὐτὸ λέγητε πάντες

<sup>3</sup>Burton, op. cit., pp. 87-88.

"I beseech you all to say the same thing." I Corinthians 14:1 *ἵνα ὁμοῦτε*

... *ἵνα προφητεύητε* "Strive to prophesy."

The four *ἵνα* clauses which are of a substantive nature in the nominative case are in I Corinthians 4:2; 4:3; 9:18; 16:12b. I Corinthians

16:12b *πάντως οὐκ ἦν θέλημα ἵνα νῦν ἔλθῃ*

"It was not at all his will to come now."

The two *ἵνα* clauses which limit another expression are in Galatians 2:9; 2:10. The three *ἵνα* clauses of result are in Romans 11:11;

I Corinthians 1:15; II Corinthians 1:17. The two *ἵνα* clauses with an imperative force are in I Corinthians 7:29 and II Corinthians 8:7. The

remaining non-final clause, II Corinthians 9:4, is in a rare construction which A. T. Robertson terms *paraleipsis*.<sup>4</sup>

#### *ὅπως* Clauses

Although clauses introduced by *ἵνα* continued to be used frequently in Hellenistic Greek to introduce purpose clauses, the frequency of the conjunction *ὅπως* decreased appreciably from the classical standard.

"So then, though *ὅπως* as a pure final conjunction is disappearing in the New Testament, it yet occurs with the same concept on the whole."<sup>5</sup> "It is interesting to note that in the New Testament *ὅπως* is almost confined to Matthew and Luke's writings."<sup>6</sup> "Scott counts *ἵνα* 746 times

<sup>4</sup>A. T. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research (Fourth edition; Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman Press, 1934), p. 1199.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 987.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 986.

in the text of W. H. . . . and fifty-eight of "ὅπως."<sup>7</sup> It is true that all 746 of these "ὅπως" clauses do not express purpose. Still, the use of "ὅπως" to express purpose in the New Testament is far in excess of the use of "ὅπως". While Burton does not agree exactly with Scott in his figures, he also attests to the decline of "ὅπως". "In the New Testament "ὅπως" αὐτὸς occurs four times ( "ὅπως" alone forty-nine times), always in a final clause proper."<sup>8</sup>

In the five letters studied there are only nine final clauses introduced by "ὅπως". The three instances in Romans are 3:4 and 9:17(2). I Corinthians has only one, 1:29. The two in II Corinthians are 8:11 and 8:14. Galatians has one, 1:4. Hebrews has two, 2:9 and 9:15. Galatians 1:4 τοῦ δόντος ἑαυτοῦ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, ὅπως ἐφέληται ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστώτος "who gave himself on behalf of our sins, in order that he might deliver us from this present evil world."

### μή Clauses

The mere presence of μή or one of its compounds, μήπως or μήποτε, at the head of a clause is no proof that the clause is a negative final clause. The word μή can also introduce an object clause.

When the object clause after a verb meaning to care for, to take heed, is negative, classical Greek sometimes uses μή (instead of οὐκ μή) with the Subjunctive, or less frequently with the Future Indicative. . . . This is the common New Testament usage.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 985.

<sup>8</sup>Burton, op. cit., p. 85.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 88.

Examples of such clauses are in I Corinthians 8:9; 10:12; Hebrews 3:12; 12:25 where clauses introduced by μή or a compound of it are the object of the verb βλέπω and in Galatians 6:1 and Hebrews 12:14, 15, 16 where such clauses are the objects of επισκοπέω. In I Corinthians 16:16 a ἵνα clause is the object of the verb βλέπω. Here the clause ἵνα ἀφόβως γένηται after βλέπω probably has the same effect as the clause μή φόβως γένηται would have had.

A clause introduced by μή or one of its compounds may also occur as the object of a verb of fear or danger, as in II Corinthians 12:20; 11:3; Galatians 4:11; Hebrews 4:1. It is not even necessary for the verb of fearing (φοβούμαι in the four examples above) to be present. It may be implied. In this way Burton explains Galatians 2:2.

(3) As an object clause after a verb of fearing implied, "fearing lest I should run or had run in vain." . . . The third interpretation is consistent both with general Greek usage and with Paul's use of μή πως, and is the only probable one.<sup>10</sup>

Also Lightfoot is of the opinion that in this passage the μή πως indicates lurking anxiety.<sup>11</sup>

I Corinthians 9:27 ὑπωπιάζω μου τὸ σῶμα . . . μή πως ἄλλοις κηρύξας αὐτὸς ἄδοκιμος γένημαι can mean either "I beat my body (because I fear) that after I have preached to others I might myself become castaway" or "I beat my body in order that I might not become castaway." Probably the same alternative applies in II Corinthians 8:30;

<sup>10</sup> Ernest DeWitt Burton, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians in The International Critical Commentary (First edition, reprinted; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1948), XXIV, 74.

<sup>11</sup> J. B. Lightfoot, The Epistle of St. Paul to the Galatians (First edition, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, n.d.), p. 104.

9:4; 12:6. Much could be said for either explanation of the construction.

It seems to me that the only passages in the letters studied in which a strictly telic explanation can be applied to a clause introduced by  $\mu\eta'$  or one of its compounds are I Corinthians 9:27; II Corinthians 2:7; 8:20; 9:4; 12:6; Hebrews 2:1.

The paucity of negative final clauses introduced by the conjunction  $\mu\eta'$  or one of its compounds is not surprising because the conjunction  $\iota\upsilon\alpha$  followed by the negative word  $\mu\eta'$  and, to a much lesser extent,  $\omicron\pi\omega\varsigma \mu\eta'$  have to a considerable extent taken over this work of the negative final expressions. "In the New Testament  $\iota\upsilon\alpha \mu\eta'$  . . . and  $\omicron\pi\omega\varsigma \mu\eta'$  . . . have the run over the conjunction  $\mu\eta'$ ."<sup>12</sup> "In early Greek  $\mu\eta'$  was by far the commonest way of introducing negative clauses of purpose, but in the New Testament, it is almost crowded out by  $\iota\upsilon\alpha \mu\eta'$  and  $\omicron\pi\omega\varsigma \mu\eta'$ ."<sup>13</sup> The results of this study confirm Chamberlain's statement. The word  $\mu\eta'$  occurs with  $\omicron\pi\omega\varsigma$  only in I Corinthians 1:29. However, the combination  $\iota\upsilon\alpha \mu\eta'$  introduces negative final clauses in Romans 11:25; 15:20; I Corinthians 1:17; 2:5; 4:6b; 7:5b; 8:13; 9:12; 11:32; 11:34; 16:2; II Corinthians 1:9; 2:3; 2:5; 2:11; 4:7; 6:4; 9:3; 10:9; 12:7a; 12:7c; 13:10; Galatians 5:17; 6:12; Hebrews 3:13; 4:11; 6:12; 11:28; 11:40; 12:3; 12:13.

#### Infinitives

The following statements regarding the frequency of the simple

<sup>12</sup>Robertson, op. cit., p. 987.

<sup>13</sup>William Douglas Chamberlain, An Exegetical Grammar of the Greek New Testament (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927), p. 187.

infinitive (if it is the simple infinitive to which they refer rather than to the uses of the infinitive with  $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ ,  $\pi\rho\acute{o}s\ \tau\acute{o}$ ,  $\sigma\acute{i}s\ \tau\acute{o}$ ) as a method of expressing purpose in the New Testament seem not to be borne out by the letters studied. "This infinitive which is equal to a final sentence has again become widely prevalent in the New Testament."<sup>14</sup>

. . . the infinitive is exceedingly common in the New Testament for the notion of pure purpose. Votaw counts some 1,285 such instances of the simple infinitive of purpose in "biblical Greek." He gives the figure for the New Testament alone as 211. . . . Moulton . . . notes that the inf. of purpose is more common in the New Testament than in Attic.<sup>15</sup>

The simple infinitive to express purpose occurs only two times in Romans: 1:11; 15:9; seven times in I Corinthians: 1:17(2); 10:7a(2); 10:7b; 11:20; 16:3; II Corinthians, three times: 9:5; 11:2; 11:32; Galatians, two times: 1:13; 2:4; Hebrews, two times: 8:9; 9:24.

I Corinthians 1:17  $\acute{o}\upsilon\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \mu\epsilon\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma\ \beta\alpha\pi\tau\acute{\iota}\sigma\iota\nu$   
 $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\ \epsilon\upsilon\acute{\alpha}\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon\iota$  "For Christ did not send me to baptize, but to preach the Gospel."

### $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ with the Infinitive

The genitive of the articular infinitive can express purpose. It can also express result. It can have an exegetical force. It can be used with a full ablative force. "The normal use of  $\tau\omicron\upsilon$  with the inf. was undoubtedly final, . . . and in the New Testament that is still

<sup>14</sup>Friedrich Blass, Grammar of New Testament Greek, translated by Henry St. John Thackeray (Second, revised and enlarged edition; London: Macmillan and Company, Limited, 1911), p. 223.

<sup>15</sup>Robertson, op. cit., p. 989.

its chief use. But many of the examples are not final or consecutive."<sup>16</sup> Robertson's statement that in the New Testament the chief use for this construction is final is not confirmed by this study. Chamberlain's explanation seems better.

Not all of the instances of this idiom express purpose. The majority are explanatory. . . . Most of the examples expressing purpose are in the writings of Luke and Matthew. Paul used it, in this sense, twice: Romans 6:6; Philippians 3:10.<sup>17</sup>

In another place Robertson says: "Votaw notes but thirty-four such examples of direct purpose in the New Testament."<sup>18</sup> Of these thirty-four, but three are present in the five letters studied, one in Romans and two in Hebrews. They are Romans 6:6 ἵνα καταργηθῇ τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἀμαρτίας, τοῦ μηκέτι δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ ; Hebrews 10:7 ἰδοὺ ἤκω . . . τοῦ ποιῆσαι ὃ θεὸς τὸ θέλημα σου Hebrews 10:9 ἰδοὺ ἤκω τοῦ ποιῆσαι τὸ θέλημα σου .

An example of the explanatory, or exegetical, use of τοῦ with the infinitive is in Romans 11:8 ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν καὶ ὠτα τοῦ μὴ ἀκούειν "unseeing eyes, unhearing ears . . . a spirit which produces a condition of insensibility."<sup>19</sup> Cf. also Romans 1:24; 8:12; and Galatians 3:10. In Galatians 3:10 the phrase τοῦ ποιῆσαι explains wherein "remaining in all the things which are written in the book of the law" consists.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., p. 1067.

<sup>17</sup>Chamberlain, op. cit., pp. 190-191.

<sup>18</sup>Robertson, op. cit., p. 990.

<sup>19</sup>James Denney, "St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans," The Expositor's Greek Testament, edited by W. Robertson Nicoll (Grand Rapids, Michigan: W. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1951), II, 677.

In Romans 7:3, τοῦ μὴ εἶναι αὐτὴν μοιχαλίδά can be construed either as the result of the woman's being free after her husband's death, or as an explanation of wherein her freedom consists. The same duality of explanation applies to Hebrews 11:5 τοῦ μὴ ἰδεῖν θάνατον which can mean either "Enoch was transferred with the result that he did not see death," or "Enoch experienced a transfer, which consisted in this that he did not see death."

The genitive τοῦ has its full ablative force in Romans 15:22 ἐνεκοπτόμην τὰ πολλὰ τοῦ εἰδέναι πρὸς ὑμᾶς  
 "I was hindered many times from coming to you." Cf. also II Corinthians 1:8.

### πρὸς τό' with Infinitive

The infinitive can express purpose not only when it occurs alone or when it is preceded by τοῦ, but also when it is preceded by πρὸς τό' or εἰς τό'. With regard to the construction πρὸς τό' with the infinitive, A. T. Robertson notes that "there are only twelve of these in the New Testament."<sup>20</sup> "Paul has it four times, and always to express the 'subjective purpose' in the agent's mind."<sup>21</sup>

Paul's four uses of this construction, all with final force, are: II Corinthians 3:13; Ephesians 6:11; I Thessalonians 2:9; II Thessalonians 3:8. Since this construction does not occur in Hebrews, the only passage containing it in the books studied is II Corinthians 3:13: Μωϋσῆς

<sup>20</sup>Robertson, op. cit., p. 1075.

<sup>21</sup>Moulton, op. cit., p. 218.



ΕΤΙ ΔΕΙ ΚΑΛΥΜΜΑ ΕΠΙ ΤΟ ΠΡΟΣΩΠΟΝ ΑΥΤΟΥ, ΠΡΟΣ ΤΟ ΜΗ  
 ΔΕΙΝΟΜΕΝ ΤΟΥΣ ΥΙΟΥΣ . . . . "Moses put a veil upon his face in

order that the sons of Israel might not gaze upon. . . ."

ΕΙΣ ΤΟ with Infinitive

It has been true of many of the constructions considered above that the expression of purpose is only one of several uses to which a particular construction can be put. The same is true of the construction ΕΙΣ ΤΟ with the infinitive. "There is no doubt that in the New Testament ΕΙΣ ΤΟ has broken away to some extent from the classic notion of purpose."<sup>22</sup> Robertson admits, however, that the idea of purpose still occurs and quotes some examples. In the letters studied there are twenty-three examples of ΕΙΣ ΤΟ with the infinitive expressing purpose, but there are also a number of other uses for this construction in the letters studied.

Romans has this construction eleven times: 1:11; 3:26; 4:11; 4:16; 7:4; 8:29; 11:11; 12:2; 15:8; 15:13; 15:16.

There is but one example in I Corinthians: 11:33.

II Corinthians has four: 1:4; 4:4; 7:3; 10:16.

There are no examples of this construction in Galatians.

Hebrews contains seven examples of this construction: 2:17; 7:25; 8:3; 9:14; 9:28; 12:10; 13:21.

Several examples are now quoted along with the translations of the Revised Standard Version which bring out the telic force of each construction clearly. Romans 4:11 ΕΙΣ ΤΟ ΕΙΝΑΙ ΑΥΤΟΝ ΠΑΤΕΡΑ ΠΑΝΤΩΝ ΤΩΝ ΠΙΣΤΕΥΟΝΤΩΝ "The purpose was to make him the father of all who believe."

<sup>22</sup>Robertson, op. cit., p. 1071.

Romans 4:16 ἵνα κατὰ χάριν, εἰς τὸ εἶναι βεβαίαν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν  
 παντὶ τῷ σπέρματι "in order that the promise may rest on grace  
 and be guaranteed to all his descendants." Romans 8:29 ὅτι οὓς προέγνω  
 καὶ προώρισεν συμμέρφους τῆς εἰκόνας τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, εἰς τὸ εἶναι  
 αὐτοῦ πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς "For those whom he fore-  
 knew he also predestined to be conformed to the image of his son, in order  
 that he might be the first born among many brethren." II Corinthians 1:4  
 ὁ παρακαλῶν ὑμᾶς . . . εἰς τὸ δύνασθαι ἡμᾶς παρακαλεῖν τοὺς  
 . . . "Who comforts us in all our affliction so that we may be able to  
 comfort those who are in any affliction." II Corinthians 4:4 ὁ θεὸς  
 . . . ἐτύφλωσεν . . . εἰς τὸ μὴ ἀύχασαι . . . "the god of this  
 world has blinded the minds of the unbelievers to keep them from seeing  
 the light."

The construction εἰς τὸ with the infinitive can also be used with  
 other than telic force. It expresses result in Romans 1:20 εἰς τὸ εἶναι  
 αὐτοὺς ἀναπολογητοὺς "so that they are without excuse" and in  
 Hebrews 11:3 εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐκ φαινομένων τὸ βλεπόμενον γεγονέναι  
 "so that what is seen was made out of things which do not appear." Cf.  
 also Romans 4:11b; 6:12; 7:5.

This construction is used in apposition with a noun or pronoun in  
 I Corinthians 9:18 and 10:6. In I Corinthians 11:23 it has the dative  
 idea . . . εἰς τὸ εἶδέναι καὶ πίνειν "Do you not have houses to  
 eat and drink in?"

πρὸς with the Accusative

The article in Kittel's Wörterbuch on the word εἰς informs us that

εἰς with the accusative of a substantive or adjective can express purpose.<sup>23</sup> Unfortunately Kittel's article on πρὸς has not yet appeared.

When it does appear, we may expect the same statement to be made about this preposition and the substantive accusative. Thayer indicates that πρὸς can be used this way:

. . . of an intended end or purpose: πρὸς νοουθεσίᾳ τινος, 1 Co. x.11; as other exx. add, Ro.iii.26; xv.2; 1 Co. vi.5; vii.35; xii.7; xiv.12,26; xv.34; 2 Co. iv.6; vii.3; xi.8; . . . Heb. vi.11; ix.13;  
 . . .<sup>24</sup>

I have followed Thayer in regarding all these prepositional phrases as expressions of purpose and in addition have included several others.

A. T. Robertson supports the article in Thayer: "The notion of aim or end naturally develops also as in ἐγγράφῳ πρὸς νοουθεσίαν ἡμῶν (1 Cor. 10:11)."<sup>25</sup>

The complete list of prepositional phrases with πρὸς to express purpose includes Romans 3:26; 15:2; I Corinthians 6:5; 7:35(2); 10:11; 12:7; 14:12; 14:26; 15:34; II Corinthians 1:20; 4:6; 7:3; 8:19; 11:8; Hebrews 5:14; 9:13.

The translation of a large number of these prepositional phrases in the Revised Standard Version illustrates that they are used in a telic sense. Especially good Revised Standard Version translations to illustrate this are II Corinthians 7:3 πρὸς κατάκρισιν οὐ λέγω "I do not say this to condemn you," and II Corinthians 11:8 ἀλλὰς σκελετοῦ ἐσθλῶν λαβῶν

<sup>23</sup>Oepke, Albrecht, "eis," Delta - Eta of Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, edited by Gerhard Kittel (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1935), II, 427.

<sup>24</sup>Joseph Henry Thayer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament (Corrected edition, Chicago: American Book Company, 1889), p. 542.

<sup>25</sup>Robertson, op. cit., p. 626.

ἄλλων ἑκκλησιῶν πρὸς τὴν ὑμῶν διακονίαν "I robbed other churches  
by accepting support from them in order to serve you."

εἰς with the Accusative

In the article on εἰς in Kittel we find "εἰς mit substantivischen  
oder pronominalen Akkusativ hat in der Mehrzahl der Fälle finalen Sinn."<sup>26</sup>

Sometimes indeed εἰς appears in an atmosphere where aim or purpose  
is manifestly the resultant idea. Thus we may note εἰδὼν δὲ  
εἰς τὴν, Ἰωάννης εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον (2 Cor. 2:12). Here the  
second εἰς suggests the purpose of his coming. . . . Cf. again . . .  
εἰς φόβον in Ro. 8:15 εἰς ἐνδοξίαν in Ro. 3:25 . . .<sup>27</sup>

This construction occurs in: Romans 1:1; 1:5; 1:16; 1:17; 3:25; 5:21;  
6:16; 6:19(2); 7:10a; 8:15; 8:28; 9:21(2); 9:22; 9:23; 10:1; 10:4; 13:6;  
14:1; 15:2; 15:4; 15:7; 15:13; 16:26.

The instances of the occurrence of εἰς with the accusative to  
express purpose in I Corinthians are: 2:7; 5:5; 10:31; 11:24; 11:25;  
16:15.

This construction occurs in II Corinthians 2:12; 4:15; 5:5; 10:5;  
10:8(2); 13:10(2).

Of the former of the two constructions in Galatians, 2:8 and 4:24,  
Burton says: "The preposition εἰς expresses not mere reference but  
purpose or result, 'for or unto the creation of,' i.e. 'so as to make  
him an apostle.'"<sup>28</sup>

The examples in Hebrews are 1:14; 3:5; 4:16; 6:16; 9:26; 9:28; 11:7;  
12:7.

<sup>26</sup>Oepke, loc. cit.

<sup>27</sup>Robertson, op. cit., pp. 594-595.

<sup>28</sup>Burton, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, p. 94.

In the four following examples, the accompanying Revised Standard Version quotations illustrate the telic force of the prepositional phrases. Romans 1:5 δι' οὗ ἐλάβομεν χάριν καὶ ἀποστολήν εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως "thru whom we have received grace and apostleship to bring about obedience to the faith." Romans 3:25 εἰς ἐνδειξίν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ "this was to show God's righteousness." II Corinthians 2:12 ἐλθὼν δεῖ εἰς τὴν Τρωάδα εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον "when I came to Troas to preach the Gospel." Hebrews 1:14 οὐχὶ πάντες εἰσὶν λειτουργηκὰ πνεύματα εἰς διακονίαν ἀποσπλῆόμενα "are they not all ministering spirits sent forth to serve?" Cf. also together with Revised Standard Version Romans 10:4; 15:18; 16:26; Hebrews 4:16; 9:26, 28.

The phrase εἰς τοῦτο or εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο expressing the direction or purpose of some activity occurs in some passages, usually followed by a more complete expression of purpose. Romans 14:9 εἰς τοῦτο Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν καὶ ἔζησεν ἵνα . . . κυριεύσῃ. Cf. also II Corinthians 2:9 and 13:10. Romans 9:17 εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἐξήγειρά σε, ὅπως ἐνδείξωμαι ἐν σοὶ τὴν δύναμιν μου. Notice also Romans 13:6 λειτουργοὶ γὰρ θεοῦ εἰσὶν εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο προσκτερεύοντες and II Corinthians 5:5 ὁ δὲ κατεργασάμενος ἡμᾶς εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο θεός.

Not only does εἰς with the accusative express purpose. It can also express result. "Daneben steht aber ebenso unzweifelhaft konsekutiver Gebrauch."<sup>29</sup> Cf. Romans 5:16(2); 5:18(2); I Corinthians 11:17; 11:34; II Corinthians 8:2; 7:9; Romans 3:7; 7:10b; 10:10; 13:4; Hebrews 10:39(2). The Revised Standard Version Translators regard εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν,

<sup>29</sup> Oepke, loc. cit.

Hebrews 4:16, as consecutive. "A death has occurred which redeems them from the transgressions under the first covenant."

An especially instructive passage is Romans 7:10 where a final and a consecutive expression occur side by side:  $\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\delta\omicron\gamma \mu\omicron\iota \eta' \epsilon\upsilon\tau\omicron\lambda\eta' \eta'$   
 $\epsilon\iota\varsigma \gamma\omega\eta\upsilon \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta \epsilon\iota\varsigma \theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\upsilon$  . Cf. also 6:16a for purpose and 6:16b,c for result.

As is to be expected, since both final and consecutive meanings are possible there are many instances where it is extremely difficult to decide between them. "In manchen Fällen geht das eine so in das andere über, dass eine genaue Entscheidung unmöglich ist."<sup>30</sup>

#### Relative Clauses, Participles

The only example of a relative clause of purpose is in I Corinthians 4:17. That the almost total absence of this method of expressing purpose is not peculiar to the five letters studied is shown by A. T. Robertson: "The New Testament hardly uses the relative clause of purpose as fully as the Attic Greek."<sup>31</sup> In I Corinthians 4:17 the relative clause  $\delta\omicron\varsigma \dots \delta\upsilon\alpha\mu\upsilon\gamma\omicron\sigma\iota$  expresses the purpose of  $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\mu\lambda\lambda\omicron$  . Dana and Mantey also regard this relative clause as one of purpose.<sup>32</sup>

It is a bit difficult to distinguish between the relative clause of purpose in I Corinthians 4:17 and the relative clause of future prediction in I Corinthians 4:5. The phrase at the beginning of 4:17  $\Delta\iota\kappa\acute{\alpha} \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$  gives the key to identifying the relative clause as a final one. It is

<sup>30</sup>Ibid.

<sup>31</sup>Robertson, op. cit., p. 989.

<sup>32</sup>H. E. Dana and Julius R. Mantey, A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927), p. 272.

interesting that the Revised Standard Version illustrates neatly the difference between the interpretations of the two clauses. I Corinthians 4:5 ". . . before the Lord comes, who will bring light. . . ." I Corinthians 4:17 "I sent to you Timothy . . . to remind you of my ways. . . ."

There seem to be no instances of either the present or future participle to express purpose in the books studied. A. T. Robertson notes that there was a marked decline in the frequency of this construction from the classical norm to that of the Koine: "The future participle, so common in this construction in the Attic Greek, has nearly vanished from the New Testament as from the rest of the *Koine*."<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup>Robertson, *op. cit.*, p. 991.

### CHAPTER III

#### EXAMINATION OF THE STATISTICAL METHOD

This chapter is a summary of an article by Wilhelm Michaelis.<sup>1</sup>

Michaelis warns that the statistical examination of language should not be overvalued. He says that the champions of the spuriousness of the Pastorals have always pointed out that the character of the language is not Pauline. Above all else they ascribe decisive weight to the Wortstatistik. F. Torn in an essay in this same periodical, 1917-18, had brought forth a noteworthy critique of the statistical method and called attention to its potential failings. This raises the question: To what extent has the Wortstatistik any merit for reaching a decision about the genuineness of the Pastorals? By the same token, the validity of the methodology employed in this paper for making any conclusions about the Pauline authorship of Hebrews on the basis of statistics, although not word-statistics, can be challenged.

Michaelis seems perturbed that Torn's objections to the statistical method made no impression on P. N. Harrison, whose book The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles appeared in 1921. Michaelis concedes that in this work Harrison exploited the statistical method to its ultimate possibilities. Harrison's undertaking stands or falls with the opinion that by the Wortstatistik effective arguments for or against the genuineness of the Pastorals can be accumulated.

---

<sup>1</sup>Wilhelm Michaelis, "Pastoralbriefe und Wortstatistik," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche, XVIII (1929), 69-76.



With regard to the compass and care of the test and the vivid graphic delineation of his findings, Harrison's work easily outstrips all previous computations, as well as all subsequent ones, at least up until 1929, when Michaelis' article appeared.

On the basis of hapax legomena, particles, prepositions and compound words with the alpha privative, Harrison produces an intolerable tension between the use of the language of the Pastorals and the other letters of Paul. The diagrams are especially impressive. The curves of proportionate figures ascend among the other letters of Paul moderately, albeit steadily, thereby demonstrating that also within these tests definite differences are observable. However, with disproportionate steepness, the lines climb every time the proportionate figures of the Pastorals are adduced. Although within the Pastorals themselves fluctuations are observable, the striking impression is of a great difference between the Pastorals and the other letters. In all the diagrams the same picture presents itself, The different character of the Pastorals, their un-Pauline character, appears evident.

A careful check reveals that Harrison's results must be considerably revised because the linguistic difference between the Pastorals and the other letters of Paul is really quite different from what appears on the basis of Harrison's diagrams. Consider the matter of hapax legomena, for example. In Westcott and Hort's edition, Harrison finds that of 993 words, exclusive of proper names, in Romans, 261 words not in Paul's other nine letters occur on twenty-six pages, i.e. ten such words per page. Colossians, on six pages, has 409 words, of which fifty-eight are not in the other letters, i.e. 9.7 per page. These two figures, ten and 9.7, are plotted on a diagram and do not show much disparity. For II Timothy the figure

is 30.4 hapax legomena per page; for Titus, 27.3; for I Timothy, 22.4. Thus, the curves for the Pastorals range from two to three times as high as those for Romans and Colossians.

However, if one uses the total supply of words as the basis, then, for Romans, 0.263 of all the words in the book are hapax legomena for Paul; 0.142 for Colossians. Romans contains, on the basis of the total number of words, more than twice the linguistic Sondergut of Colossians. The corresponding figures for the Pastorals are: for II Timothy, 0.276; for Titus, 0.276; for I Timothy, 0.327. Therefore, the difference between Romans and Colossians is disproportionately greater than that between II Timothy, Titus, I Timothy, and Romans. The diagrams of Harrison would appear quite different if Harrison had based his computation of relative figures not on Seitenumfang but on the total number of words in each book.

It is hoped that errors of just this nature have been avoided in this study by the preparation of two different tables, each of which might serve to rectify a distortion in the other. One table gives the number of each construction per page for each book. The other table gives the percentage of each construction in a particular letter, relative to the other constructions in the same letter.

Michaëlis concludes that Harrison's statistical procedure, although done with an air of great superiority is inaccurate and misleading, and that the resulting claims made with such mathematical certainty break down. The genuineness of the Pastorals does not admit of statistical computation. The idea of demonstrating their spuriousness in such a way is a delusive hope.

The limitations of the statistical method must be imposed upon this present study also. From the outset, the fragmentary and indefinite



## CHAPTER IV

### GRAMMATICAL PURPOSE AND RESULT

Some constructions have undoubtedly been omitted in this paper which some persons would consider telic. The distinction between expressions of purpose and those of result — and even purport or epexegetical force — can be fine and difficult. Probably no two persons would agree entirely on which constructions in even one of the five letters studied are final and which are not. The difficulty in making such distinctions is admitted by many, in fact, by most — except for a few dogmatic grammarians and commentators who see difficulty only for others, but not for themselves, in discerning accurately the difference between a final and a non-final expression.

What is said of the weakening of final force in  $\iota\upsilon\chi$  applies also to other final constructions, such as  $\tau\omicron\upsilon$  c. infin. . . . The burden of making purpose clear is in all these cases thrown on the context.<sup>1</sup>

The author of the article on  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  in Kittel's Wörterbuch makes three points with regard to the use of  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  with a substantive or adjective.

$\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  mit substantivischem oder pronominalem Akkusativ hat in der Mehrzahl der Fälle finalen Sinn . . . Daneben steht aber ebenso unzweifelhaft konsekutiver Gebrauch. . . . In manchen Fällen geht das eine so in das andere über, dass eine genaue Entscheidung unmöglich ist.<sup>2</sup>

It is also true that a study of final clauses has theological implications. Throughout the New Testament, do final clauses sometimes

---

<sup>1</sup>James Hope Moulton, A Grammar of New Testament Greek (Third edition with corrections and additions; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1919), I, 207.

<sup>2</sup>Oepke, Albrecht, " $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ ," Delta - Eta of Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1935), II, 427.

represent the ultimate purpose of God or merely the purpose or result of the action in the verb which the final or result clause limits? Consider the following example. "I drove the car so recklessly that I had a costly accident." Does the clause "so that I had a costly accident" represent the purpose or the result of my driving so recklessly? Result is the obvious answer. Is perhaps the reason for my reckless driving that God had the ultimate purpose in mind that I have a costly accident?

If we press the teleology of God into service on all such constructions in the New Testament perhaps we must concede something to men like Meyer who in the nineteenth century inevitably demanded a telic explanation for every  $\epsilon\upsilon\alpha$  clause in the New Testament. Linguistically, however, such an inordinate demand for a universally telic force has been discredited.

Result is expressed by the  $\epsilon\upsilon\alpha$  clause in a few instances:

(Jn. 9:2), 'Who sinned, this man or his parents, so that he should be born blind?' It is hardly conceivable that the parents or the unborn child should have committed some heinous sin with the intent that the child should be born sightless. But it is quite in keeping with the theology of the time to raise the question as to whose sin resulted in the child's blindness.

Sanday and Headlam, without the aid of the new knowledge of koine Greek as exhibited in the papyri, argue on exegetical (not grammatical) grounds for the consecutive use of  $\epsilon\upsilon\alpha$  in  $\mu\eta$   $\epsilon\pi\tau\alpha\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\upsilon$   $\epsilon\upsilon\alpha$   $\pi\epsilon\sigma\omega\sigma\epsilon\upsilon$  (Rom. 11:11), 'Did they stumble so that they fell?' It is hardly conceivable that Israel stumbled in order to fall, but it is quite in keeping with Israel's history to say that she stumbled (so seriously) that she fell.<sup>3</sup>

It must be allowed that either a purpose or result, or some other, interpretation of most of the constructions discussed in this paper is linguistically tenable. This creates rather than eliminates a number of exegetical problems. These become more numerous and more difficult since

<sup>3</sup>William Douglas Chamberlain, An Exegetical Grammar of the Greek New Testament (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927), p. 187.

the linguistic possibilities are various enough to accommodate several interpretations.

In Romans 14:1 . . . προσλαμβάνετε μὴ εἰς διακρίσεις διαλογισμῶν is the meaning "Welcome him, but not with the purpose or intention of disputing about opinions?" Or does it mean "Welcome him, but not in such a way that disputes over opinions occur?" Something previously cited bears repetition here: "In manchen Fällen geht das eine so in das andere über dass eine genaue Entscheidung unmöglich ist."<sup>4</sup>

In a paper of this nature the decisions arrived at and expressed will not coincide with many of those of a reader. This is the way it must be. What is more, in many cases the writer was far from certain about his own choice between a final or consecutive, or other, explanation for a particular construction.

---

<sup>4</sup>Albrecht, loc. cit.

Table 1: All Expressions of Purpose

	Romans	I Corinthians	II Corinthians	Galatians	Hebrews
"(ν)α Clauses	28	43	38	15	20
"οπως Clauses	3	1	2	1	2
μη' Clauses		1	4		1
Infinitive	2	7	3	2	2
τοο' with Infinitive	1				2
περὸς το' with Infinitive			1		
εἰς το' with Infinitive	11	1	4		7
περὸς with Accusative	2	8	5		2
εἰς with Accusative	25	6	8	2	8
Relative Clauses		1			
Total	72	68	65	20	44

Table 2: Number of Constructions Per Page

	Romans	I Corinthians	II Corinthians	Galatians	Hebrews
"(VX) Clauses	0.82	1.38	1.80	1.46	0.81
"(OTWS) Clauses	0.09	0.03	0.09	0.10	0.08
μν' Clauses		0.03	0.19		0.04
Infinitive	0.06	0.23	0.14	0.20	0.08
τοῦ with Infinitive	0.03				0.08
πεὸς τὸ with Infinitive			0.05		
εἰς τὸ with Infinitive	0.32	0.03	0.19		0.28
περὶ with Accusative	0.06	0.26	0.24		0.08
εἰς with Accusative	0.73	0.19	0.38	0.20	0.32
Relative Clauses		0.03			
Total	2.09	2.19	3.03	1.84	1.78



Table 3: The Percentage of All Expressions of Purpose That Each Construction Represents

	" with Clauses	" with Clauses	" with Clauses	Infinitive	with Infinitive	with Infinitive	with Infinitive	with Infinitive	with Accusative	with Accusative	Relative Clauses
Romans	38.89	4.17	4.17	2.78	1.39	15.28	2.78	34.72			
I Corinthians	63.2	1.5	1.5	11.00		1.5	12.50	10.00			1.5
II Corinthians	58.49	3.08	6.15	4.61		6.15	7.69	12.31			
Galatians	75.00	5.00		10.00				10.00			
Hebrews	45.45	4.54	2.27	4.54	4.54	15.9	4.54	18.18			

## CHAPTER V

### ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

To follow the arguments of this chapter, the reader is asked to consult the Tables, especially Tables 2 and 3. On the basis of the use of " (Vα clauses, Paul shows some consistency in I Corinthians, II Corinthians, and Galatians, employing " (Vα clauses 1.38, 1.80, and 1.46 times per page, respectively. He uses " (Vα clauses in Romans only about half as often as he does in each of the other three books. The frequency of the use of " (Vα clauses in Hebrews, 0.81 per page, is almost identical with that of Paul in Romans, 0.82 per page, but much less than the other three letters of Paul, about half as much.

Both Romans and Hebrews use " (Vα clauses for less than half of the expressions of purpose. In Romans 38.89 per cent and in Hebrews 45.45 per cent of the expressions of purpose are " (Vα clauses. The other three letters use " (Vα clauses for more than half of their final constructions. The figures for I Corinthians, 63.2, and II Corinthians, 58.49, show only a slight difference. Hence, on the basis of both Tables 2 and 3 it is more probable that the man who wrote Romans also wrote Hebrews than it is that the man who wrote Romans wrote any of the other three letters.

Any conclusions made on the basis of the few " (στωσ clauses are almost meaningless. It is interesting that at least one " (στωσ clause of purpose occurs in each letter, but in no letter do more than three occur. There is not a pattern of the use of " (στωσ in any of Paul's letters markedly different from another of his letters, nor from Hebrews.

There are even fewer negative clauses of purpose introduced by  $\mu\eta'$  than there are purpose clauses introduced by  $\sigma\tau\omega\varsigma$ . Neither Romans nor Galatians has an example of this construction. Both I Corinthians and Hebrews have one example of each. II Corinthians has four. A reference to Table 3 indicates that II Corinthians, in which letter 6.15 per cent of the expressions of purpose are introduced by  $\mu\eta'$ , stands apart from all the other letters, both those of Paul and Hebrews.

Romans and Hebrews are the two letters which employ the simple infinitive of purpose most rarely, by the standards of both Tables 2 and 3. Romans has this construction only 0.06 times per page and Hebrews, only 0.08. The percentages for I Corinthians and Galatians are very nearly equal for this construction since I Corinthians expresses eleven per cent of its purpose clauses this way and Galatians, ten per cent. Tables 2 and 3 present a somewhat different picture for the status of II Corinthians. According to Table 2, II Corinthians occupies a position almost midway between I Corinthians and Galatians, on the one hand, and Romans and Hebrews, on the other. Judged by Table 3, however, II Corinthians, 4.61 per cent, resembles both Romans, 2.78 per cent, and Hebrews, 4.54 per cent, so closely that it could easily be included with them at one extreme while the other extreme is represented by I Corinthians, eleven per cent, and Galatians, ten per cent. This construction affords a similar alignment to that of the  $\nu\delta$  clauses. Romans and Hebrews again show the same tendency to a sparing use of this construction while two of the other letters use the construction quite frequently. The fifth letter stands about midway between the two extremes, at least when judged by Table 2.

Of all constructions discussed so far,  $\tau\omicron\upsilon$  with the infinitive is

represented by the fewest examples. Only three occur. It is perhaps significant that these all occur in either Romans, one time, or Hebrews, the other two. This is a confirmation, albeit a weak one, of the pattern which has been gradually forming, and which continues to do so, of the similarity between Romans and Hebrews.

The one example of  $\pi\rho\acute{o}\varsigma\ \tau\acute{o}$  with the infinitive to express purpose, in II Corinthians, is totally meaningless for purposes of comparison. While Paul uses it in one letter and Hebrews does not, neither does Paul in his other three letters. Exactly the same estimate must be made of the one relative clause of purpose, in I Corinthians.

Notice the impressive similarity between Romans and Hebrews in the use of  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \tau\acute{o}$  with the infinitive and the dissimilarity between the figures for the other letters and those for Romans and Hebrews. Romans has 0.32 instances of this construction per page and Hebrews has 0.28 per page. By contrast, this construction is much rarer in I Corinthians, only 0.03 per page. It is totally absent from Galatians. As so often before, here again there are two extreme positions and a middle one. The intermediary spot this time is controlled by II Corinthians, 0.19 per page. Table 3 does not alter, but rather corroborates, the impression gained from Table 2. Romans, 15.28 per cent, and Hebrews, 15.9 per cent, are separate and in a class by themselves because for I and II Corinthians, the figures are merely 1.5 per cent and 6.15 per cent.

For the  $\pi\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$  with a substantive construction, looking at Table 3, we arrive at the same conclusions. Of all expressions of purpose in Romans, only 2.78 per cent are  $\pi\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$  with the substantive. For Hebrews the figure is only 4.54 per cent. I and II Corinthians each employ this construction more frequently, the former 12.50 per cent and the latter

7.69 per cent. A consideration of Table 2 confirms the results obtained from Table 3, although somewhat less strikingly. Again, except for Galatians, which does not have this construction, Romans, 0.06 per page, and Hebrews, 0.08 per page, use this construction least. I and II Corinthians use it with almost the same frequency, 0.26 and 0.24 per page, respectively.

The greater similarity between Romans and Hebrews than between Romans and the other letters from Paul's hand is not so convincing with regard to the last construction,  $\frac{2}{15}$  with the substantive, as it has been in most of the previous constructions. In fact, on the basis of this one construction alone, the conclusion would be that it appears more probable that one man wrote I and II Corinthians, Galatians, and Hebrews, but a different man, Romans. The accumulating impression has been that one hand most likely produced Romans and Hebrews but a second hand, the other three letters. However, although Romans uses the present construction with singular frequency and thus stands apart from the other four letters, even in this construction Romans does resemble Hebrews more than it does any of the other three letters. Also, it is again evident that I and II Corinthians and Galatians are more like each other than they are like either Romans or Hebrews. These conclusions are based on Table 3 where the percentages are: for Romans, 34.72; for Hebrews, 18.18; for I Corinthians, 10.00; for II Corinthians, 12.31; and for Galatians, 10.00.

On the basis of Table 2 it must be conceded that for the first time in this study, another of Paul's own letters resembles Romans more than Hebrews does. II Corinthians has 0.38 per page which is nearer to the average for Romans, 0.73 per page, than Hebrews, 0.32 per page, is. However, this single, and that only slight, deviation from the pattern which

has been developing throughout the previous constructions certainly will not vitiate and invalidate the conclusion that it is more likely that the same man who wrote Romans also wrote Hebrews than that he also wrote one of the other three letters. Also, the author of Hebrews is more probably the author of Romans than of any of the other three letters.

## CHAPTER VI

### SUMMARY

The foregoing analysis has been a detailed one, each construction having been examined separately. The general impression derived from a summary glance at Tables 2 and 3 leads to a similar conclusion about the similarity of Romans and Hebrews with one another and their difference from the other three letters. By permitting the eyes to range from the top of Tables 2 and 3 to the bottom, one realizes that the near identity of the figures in the Romans row with those on the Hebrews row is remarkable. The three intervening rows show figures of different quantities from those on the top and bottom lines. Frequently two or all three of the middle lines, those of I Corinthians, II Corinthians, and Galatians, are nearly identical. Admittedly, on occasion, even one of these three lines will contain a figure which approaches either the top line or bottom line figure. However, the inescapable conclusion is that Romans and Hebrews are more like each other than they are like any of the other three letters.

Hence, the only conclusion at which we can safely arrive on the basis of this study is that to impugn Pauline authorship of Hebrews is dangerous, and even scientifically impossible, unless one also is ready to impugn his authorship of Romans. To deny the Pauline authorship of Hebrews on the basis of a Pauline standard derived from I and II Corinthians and Galatians might be justifiable on the basis of this study, but it also requires the repudiation of Pauline authorship of Romans. Lest any one fear that the preceding sentences of this paragraph are presented as a dogma, he is reminded of the admission of the incompleteness of this study which was

made, cf. p. 1, and even its potential weaknesses and invalidity, cf. pp. 19-22.<sup>1</sup> All that is affirmed — and that, it seems, with the complete justification of the statistics — is that on the basis of this partial and incomplete investigation it must be recognized that the outstanding conclusion is the similarity of Romans and Hebrews, the much greater similarity of Romans to Hebrews than to I or II Corinthians or Galatians.

---

<sup>1</sup>The results, the similarity between Romans and Hebrews, indicate that a conclusion reached by Wortstatistik alone, or primarily by such a method, must be received with great reserve in view of the strength of other evidence against the Pauline authorship of Hebrews.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### A. Primary Sources

Bible, Holy. Revised Standard Version.

Nestle, E. Novum Testamentum Graece. Sixteenth edition. Stuttgart, 1936.

### B. Secondary Sources

Blass, Friedrich. Grammar of New Testament Greek. Translated by Henry St. John Thackeray. Second, revised and enlarged edition. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1911.

Burton, Ernest DeWitt. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians. Vol. XXXIV of The International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1948.

----- . Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1898.

Chamberlain, William Douglas. An Exegetical Grammar of the Greek New Testament. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1941.

Dana, H. E., and Julius R. Mantey. A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927.

Lightfoot, J. B. The Epistle of St. Paul to the Galatians. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, n.d.

Michaelis, Wilhelm. "Pastoralbriefe und Wortstatistik." Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche, XXVIII (1929). Pp. 69-76.

Moulton, James Hope. Prolegomena. Vol. I in A Grammar of New Testament Greek. Third edition with corrections and additions. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1919.

Oepke, Albrecht. "εἰς." Delta-Eta of Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1935.

Robertson, A. T. A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research. Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman Press, 1934.

Thayer, Joseph Henry. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament. Chicago: American Book Company, 1889.