

THE GRAMMATICAL INTERNAL EVIDENCE FOR ὣΣΧΟΜΕΝ IN ROMANS 5:1

VERLYN D. VERBRUGGE*

Textual critics have long puzzled over the ἔχουμεν/ἔχομεν variant in Rom 5:1—that is, whether the text should read as the indicative or the subjunctive. According to Metzger’s *Textual Commentary*, the external manuscript evidence for the subjunctive is strong indeed—“far better external support than the indicative.” Nevertheless, both the UBS4 and NA27 Greek New Testaments have the indicative. Thus the choice for the indicative rests on “internal evidence [which] must here take precedence.”¹ Those textual critics who choose the indicative (and the majority do) do so on the basis of the sense of Paul’s message in this part of Romans.²

But more can be said about internal evidence than simply the sense of Paul’s message. The seedbed for this article was an observation made in a class on textual criticism taught more than forty years ago by the late Bastiaan Van Elderen of Calvin Theological Seminary. He noted that Rom 5:3 begins with οὐ μόνον δέ, not μή μόνον δέ, which suggests that Paul is working with the indicative here, not with the subjunctive. At the time, I figured his observation was commonly acknowledged in commentaries on Romans that deal with textual-critical issues. But as I began to do research in the critical commentaries, I discovered such is not the case.³ Moreover, while a few commentators do

* Verlyn Verbrugge is senior editor at large at Zondervan, 5300 Patterson Ave SE, Grand Rapids, MI 49530 and adjunct professor of biblical studies, Kuyper College, 3333 East Beltline Avenue NE, Grand Rapids, MI 49525.

¹ Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (2d ed.; New York: American Bible Society, 2002) 452.

² Most commentators who take up this textual-critical issue maintain that the source of the problem is that the omicron and omega were presumably pronounced virtually the same during the Hellenistic period, so that if Paul orally dictated his letters, confusion could easily occur; see J. H. Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1906) 1:35; Ian A. Moir, “Orthography and Theology: the Omicron-Omega Interchange in Romans 5:1 and Elsewhere,” in *New Testament Textual Criticism: Its Significance for Exegesis; Festschrift for Bruce M. Metzger* (ed. Eldon Epp and Gordon Fee; Oxford: Clarendon, 1981) 179–83 (Moir makes no reference to the issue of οὐ μόνον δέ in Rom 5:3, which is the focal point of this article).

³ My first awareness of a lack of attention to the οὐ μόνον δέ came in an email exchange with one of today’s top text critics, Daniel B. Wallace. Somehow we got on the topic of the text-critical issue in Rom 5:1, and I made a casual comment something like this: “Well, you always have Romans 5:3 to help with internal evidence.” “What do you mean?” Dan asked. I replied with the above-mentioned observation on οὐ μόνον δέ rather than μή μόνον δέ. To which Dan wrote back, “I never noticed that.” Upon further investigation, therefore, I discovered that even those commentaries that deal significantly with text-critical issues make no mention of οὐ μόνον δέ as an interpretive element of their analysis and decision regarding ἔχουμεν/ἔχομεν or even regarding the mood of καυχόμεθα in 5:2b, 3; see C. K. Barrett, *The Epistle to the Romans* (2nd ed.; BNTC; London: A & C Black, 1991)

acknowledge that the two occurrences of *καυχόμεθα* in 5:2b, 3 can be either indicative or subjunctive, no one works back from deciding this issue to see what effect it might have on the *ἔχομεν/ἔχομεν* issue in 5:1.⁴

Interestingly, in his 1978 dissertation on Rom 5:1–11, Michael Wolter deals extensively with the *ἔχομεν/ἔχομεν* debate and offers a new argument of internal evidence for the likelihood of *ἔχομεν*, based on his analysis on Paul's use of *διά* expressions (cf. *διά τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* in 5:1) elsewhere in his letters as being linked with assertions (i.e. indicatives), not exhortations (i.e. hortatory subjunctives). But when Wolter discusses 5:2b–3, he nowhere acknowledges the fact that *καυχόμεθα*, according to form, can be either indicative or subjunctive, nor does he examine the role that *οὐ μόνον δέ* might play in this entire discussion.⁵

It is appropriate, therefore, to examine the use of *οὐ μόνον* and *μὴ μόνον* in the NT and in the LXX, as well as the use of the hortatory subjunctive (which Paul would be using if *ἔχομεν* were the correct reading) in the NT, and see what impact these grammatical issues might have in making a textual-critical decision for Rom 5:1.

Initially I thought this would be an easy issue to settle; after all, *οὐ* is used with the indicative and *μὴ* with any other mood. In other words, Paul is dealing with the indicative here: not only do we have peace with God but we also rejoice—in the hope of the glory of God (5:2) and also in our sufferings (5:3). It makes sense. But the grammatical issues involved here are more complex than I had anticipated. Moreover, the intervening words of verse 2 create an element of doubt as to whether the *οὐ μόνον δέ* relates back to the beginning of verse 1 or just to the second half of verse 2.

95; Brendon Bryne, *Romans* (SacPag; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 1996) 169–70; C. E. B. Cranfield, *Romans* (ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1975) 1:257–59; James D. G. Dunn, *Romans* (WBC 38; Dallas: Word, 1988) 245; Joseph Fitzmyer, *Romans* (AB 33; New York: Doubleday, 1993) 395; Everett F. Harrison and Donald A. Hagner, "Romans" in *Expositor's Bible Commentary: Romans – Galatians* (ed. Tremper Longman III and David E. Garland; 2d ed.; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2008) 93; Ernst Käsemann, *An die Römer* (HNT; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1974) 123; Leander E. Keck, *Romans* (ANTC; Nashville: Abingdon, 2005) 135; Douglas J. Moo, *Romans* (NIVAC; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000) 170; idem, *Romans* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996) 295–96; John Murray, *Romans* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959) 159; Anders Nygren, *Commentary on Romans* (trans. Carl C. Rasmussen; Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1949) 193–94; W. Sandy and A. C. Headlam, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (ICC; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1911) 120; Thomas Schreiner, *Romans* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998) 258; John Zeisler, *Paul's Letter to the Romans* (Trinity Press International New Testament Commentaries; Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1989) 136–37.

⁴ Fitzmyer, for example (*Romans* 397), acknowledges the double possibility, but merely states it is difficult to say which is preferred. Cranfield likewise notes (*Romans* 259–60) that the *καυχόμεθα* in 5:2 can be either indicative or subjunctive (and he seems to choose the indicative based on the *ἐσχήκαμεν* in the subordinate clause earlier in v. 2); he also notes that the *οὐ μόνον δέ* in verse 3 "has to be understood [with] that which immediate precedes." But Cranfield does not connect the dots, as I hope to show can be done, that these two comments demand that the *καυχόμεθα* in verses 2b, 3 must both be viewed as indicatives.

⁵ See Michael Wolter, *Rechtfertigung und zukünftiges Heil: Untersuchungen zu Röm 5, 1–11* (BZNW 43; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1978) 89–95, 135–38.

I. ΚΑΥΧΩΜΕΘΑ IN ROMANS 5:2-3

I will begin my discussion with Rom 5:2b-3, both of which use *καυχώμεθα*. *καυχώμεθα* is the first person plural of *καυχάομαι*, which is an alpha-contract verb. Since an alpha next to either an omicron or an omega contracts into an omega,⁶ *καυχώμεθα* according to its form can be either indicative or subjunctive. The vast majority of English translations render both verbs in verses 2b and 3 as an indicative: “we rejoice”; “we exult”; “we boast”; “we glory”; or something similar. The latest version of the NIV (2010) to some extent obscures the relationship between these two identical verbs by translating the occurrence in verse 2 as “we boast” and the one in verse 3 as “we glory.” Moreover, each of these has a text note that suggests “let us” (i.e. reading *καυχώμεθα* as a subjunctive) as an alternative.

Two standard translations translate *καυχώμεθα* (either one or both) with a hortatory subjunctive as the preferred translation. The New Jerusalem Bible (1998) divides these two identical forms between indicative and subjunctive: “we . . . look forward exultantly to God’s glory. Not only that; let us exult, too, in our hardships.” Interestingly, its predecessor, the Jerusalem Bible (1966), had translated both occurrences of *καυχώμεθα* as indicatives: “. . . we can boast about looking forward to God’s glory. But that is not all we can boast about, we can boast about our sufferings.”

The New English Bible does not split the uses of *καυχώμεθα* between indicative and subjunctive (as the NJB has done), but it is interesting that the Revised English Bible translators have reversed their decision as to which mood Paul intends in Rom 5:2b-3. The original NEB (1961, 1970) translates each *καυχώμεθα* in Rom 5:2-3 as a subjunctive: “Let us exult in the hope of the divine splendour that is to be ours. More than this: let us even exult in our present sufferings.” The REB (1989), by contrast, reads this way: “We exult in the hope of the divine glory that is to be ours. More than this: we even exult in our present sufferings.” Both the NEB and the REB give the alternate possibility (indicative or subjunctive) in a footnote. In other words, while the NJB translators moved from translating *καυχώμεθα* as indicative in Rom 5:3 to translating it as a hortatory subjunctive, the REB translators went from regarding it as a hortatory subjunctive to regarding it as an indicative.

Of all the standard English translations, therefore, only the original NEB gives as a preference for *καυχώμεθα* in Rom 5:2b the hortatory subjunctive: “Let us exult.” Is such a translation even possible in the light of the οὐ μόνον δέ followed by ἀλλὰ καί in 5:3? It is mandatory that we examine οὐ μόνον . . . ἀλλὰ καί, along with the parallel expression μὴ μόνον . . . [ἀλλὰ καί], in the Greek NT in order to see whether these expressions help the case for internal evidence of the above-mentioned textual-critical problem.

⁶ Cf. William D. Mounce, *Basics of Biblical Greek Grammar* (3d ed.; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009) 141, 143.

II. μὴ μόνον IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

Let me begin with the statistics. The expression οὐ μόνον occurs 36 times in the NT (the δέ is not necessarily a part of this expression, since the conjunction δέ merely connects with the preceding material). In all 36 occurrences, οὐ μόνον is followed explicitly either by ἀλλὰ καί (33 times) or simply by ἀλλά (only 3 times). This pattern is not unusual, as we can see from the analogy of English: the expression “not only” begs for a subsequent “but also”—“not only A, but also B.” In English grammar, this is called a correlative conjunction, similar to “both . . . and,” “either . . . or,” and “neither . . . nor.” Good English style mandates that the expression on both sides of the correlative conjunctions is identical: nouns, prepositional phrases, clauses, and the like.

By contrast, μὴ μόνον occurs only four times in the NT. Surprisingly, in its four uses, only one is followed up with ἀλλὰ καί, a second one has ἀλλά alone, and the remaining two have nothing stated explicitly to complete the correlative phrase. Here are the four uses, with some explanatory comments:

- John 13:9: In this passage Jesus is washing the feet of the disciples, and he comes to Peter, who objects. Jesus replies with, “Unless I wash you, you have no part with me.” Peter responds to Jesus (with an implied imperative), “Then, Lord . . . [wash] not just [μὴ . . . μόνον] my feet but [ἀλλὰ καί] [wash] my hands and my head as well” (NIV). Here μὴ μόνον is used with an imperative implied from the previous verse.⁷

- Phil 2:12: This verse translates: “So then, my beloved, just as you have always obeyed [ὑπηκούσατε], not [μὴ] as in my presence only [μόνον], but [ἀλλά] now much more in my absence, work out [κατεργάζεσθε] your salvation with fear and trembling” (NASB). This verse uses ἀλλά alone to complete the μὴ μόνον, but it may seem puzzling from the NASB (and almost all other modern translations) why μὴ μόνον is used rather than οὐ μόνον. English versions link Paul’s μὴ μόνον to the indicative ὑπηκούσατε (“obeyed”—as if the apostle said, “You have obeyed my exhortations not only when I was present but also when I was absent”). Yet I have not found any other μὴ negatives linked with indicatives in this type of sentence; it therefore seems much better to me to link this expression to the imperative κατεργάζεσθε, which according to the pattern exhibited in NT Greek, normally takes μὴ as its negative:⁸ “As a result, my beloved, as you have always obeyed, work out your own salvation with fear and trembling, not as in my presence only, but now much more in my absence.”⁹

⁷ Note that in this case the μὴ and the μόνον are separated by τοὺς πόδας.

⁸ See BDF 427 (4); Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996) 724–25. This appears to be the way the ESV translators understood the construction: “Therefore, my beloved, as you have always obeyed, so now, not only as in my presence but much more in my absence, work out your own salvation with fear and trembling.”

⁹ The discussion of this verse warrants an article all on its own, so I will only make a few preliminary observations here. Already in 1897 Marvin R. Vincent (*Epistle to the Philippians and to Philemon* [ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1897] 64–65), followed by J. B. Lightfoot (*Saint Paul’s Epistle to the Philippians* [London: Macmillan, 1913] 116, clearly linked μὴ . . . μόνον with κατεργάζεσθε; Vincent states specifically that to link the correlative conjunction with ὑπηκούσατε “would require οὐ instead of μὴ.” Peter T. O’Brien (*Philippians* [NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991], 280–81)

• Gal 4:18: The $\mu\eta\ \mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\nu\nu$ in this verse is linked with the infinitive $\zeta\eta\lambda\omicron\upsilon\theta\sigma\alpha\iota$; in this case $\mu\eta\ \mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\nu\nu$ is not completed with either $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ or $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\ \kappa\alpha\iota$. Here Paul, in the context of his opponents who are trying to win the hearts and minds of the Galatians, says (lit. trans.), “It is good to be zealous for a good thing always and not only during my being with you.” Probably the expanded phrase could read, “it is always good not only to be zealous for a good thing in my being with you, but also to be zealous for a good thing in my being absent”—that is, it is always good to be zealous for doing good regardless of where I am.

• Jas 1:22: “Be doers of the word and not hearers only, deceiving yourselves.” Like John 13:9, the $\mu\eta\ \mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\nu\nu$ here is linked with the imperative, and like Gal 4:18 there is no corresponding $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ or $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\ \kappa\alpha\iota$. Once again, though, the correlative construction is implied: “Do not only be hearers of the word but also be doers.”¹⁰

What can we conclude for the use of $\mu\eta\ \mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\nu\nu$ in the NT? First, it occurs much less frequently than $\omicron\upsilon\ \mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\nu\nu$. Second, there tends to be more ellipsis in its uses. Third, it is linked with non-indicative verbs: imperatives and infinitives.

Before we move on to $\omicron\upsilon\ \mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\nu\nu$ in the NT, it is appropriate to examine whether the Greek negative $\mu\eta$ is ever used with verbs in the indicative mood. The answer is yes; $\mu\eta$ does occur in a number of such uses, either in special constructions or in idiomatic phrases.

(1) For example, $\mu\eta$ is used with questions that expect a “No” answer.¹¹

likewise argues strongly for $\mu\eta\ .\ .\ .\ \mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\nu\nu$ being linked with $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\gamma\acute{\alpha}\zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$. He points to three issues, however, that are problematic in this verse: (1) the fact that the correlative phrase “not only . . . but also” precedes $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\gamma\acute{\alpha}\zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$ rather than follows it (which is unusual); (2) the word $\pi\alpha\rho\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha$, which he, following Hawthorne (*Philippians* [WBC 43; Waco, TX: Word, 1983] 99), regards as relating to a planned future visit rather than to a past visit (cf. 1:26); and (3) the word $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$, which he regards as expressing “inner motivation” or possibly means “in light of, in view of” (cf. Rom 9:32; 2 Cor 2:17; Phlm 14); keep working out your salvation “not only *in view of* my return [$\pi\alpha\rho\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha$] but even more from this very moment, although I am absent” (281). According to O’Brien, “Paul’s thought keeps racing ahead to the principal verb $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\gamma\acute{\alpha}\zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$ (‘complete’), which dominates the sentence” (ibid.). Gordon Fee (*Philippians* [NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995] 232) acknowledges that $\mu\eta$ goes with the imperative, but because of Paul’s “untidy” sentence structure, Fee still links it more closely with the $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\eta\kappa\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha\tau\epsilon$, which he claims is the main idea (obedience to the gospel that is spelled out in their common salvation). “That concern is interrupted by the reminder that this is how they ‘obeyed’ when he was present and by ‘how much more’ he wants them to obey in his absence. Thus the $\mu\eta$ negates the imperative only *indirectly*: In working out their salvation they are *not* to do so as though such obedience were only forthcoming when he was among them.” I must admit I am puzzled about the grammatical category of “indirect negation” relative to an imperative.

¹⁰ John Kohlenberger III, Edward W. Goodrick, and James A. Swanson, in their *Exhaustive Concordance to the Greek New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997) 649, also list Acts 11:19 as an occurrence of $\mu\eta\ \mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\nu\nu$. But this use is questionable as a correlative expression. True, $\mu\eta$ stands next to $\mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\nu\nu$, but $\mu\eta$ is part of an $\epsilon\iota\ \mu\eta$ construction (“except”): “Those who had scattered as a result of the persecution after Stephen traveled through Phoenicia and Cyprus and Antioch, speaking the word to no one except [$\epsilon\iota\ \mu\eta$] only [$\mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\nu\nu$] to Jews.” This usage is, in other words, an accidental example of $\mu\eta$ and $\mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\nu\nu$ side by side; there is no implied “but also.” The next verse, which reads, “But there were some of the men from Cyprus and Cyrene who came to Antioch and spoke the word to Greeks, spreading the good news that Jesus is the Lord,” refers to a new group of people, not those of verse 19.

¹¹ See BDF, sec. 427 (2); Mounce, *Basics of Biblical Greek* 295.

(2) μή is used with second-class (contrary-to-fact) conditional sentences (such conditions use the indicative in both protasis and apodosis). If a negative occurs in the protasis, the appropriate term to use is μή. For example, in John 15:22 Jesus says: “If I had not come [μή ἦλθον] and spoken to them, they would not have [οὐ εἴχοσαν] sin” (NASB).¹²

(3) Another idiomatic use of μή is εἰ μή, which means “except” (if it is followed by a phrase) and “unless” (if it is followed by a clause).¹³ If εἰ μή introduces a clause, it usually takes an indicative verb (e.g. Rom 7:7b; 1 Cor 15:2; note, however, 1 Cor 14:5, where εἰ μή is followed by a subjunctive).

(4) Still another idiomatic use is οὐ μή for emphatic negation; it is usually followed by the aorist subjunctive (cf., e.g., John 13:8), but occasionally by the future indicative (e.g. Matt 26:35; John 4:14).¹⁴

(5) There are a couple of anomalous uses of μή with the indicative in relative clauses (Titus 1:11; 2 Pet 1:9).¹⁵ I think the first of these can be accounted for if we supply the infinitive διδάσκειν; the second one is indeed atypical (one would expect the subjunctive of πάρειμι rather than the indicative). The use of μή with the perfect indicative in a ὅτι-clause in John 3:18 is also difficult to explain; perhaps μή occurs on the analogy of ὁ δὲ μή πιστεύων in the previous (main) clause of this verse.

III. Οὐ μόνον IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

The reason for the above analysis of μή μόνον is to demonstrate that had Paul wanted to indicate clearly the *καυχώμεθα* in Rom 5:2b and 3 as being hortatory subjunctive, he could—indeed, I believe would—have used μή μόνον. To say, however, that μή almost never goes with an indicative does *not* answer the question of whether οὐ ever goes with a subjunctive (recall: Rom 5:3 has οὐ μόνον δέ). Thus, we need to examine briefly the 36 uses of οὐ μόνον . . . ἀλλὰ [καί] in the NT. Here the issue does seem, at least initially, a bit more cloudy.

I must state here one important assumption, namely, that in general, whatever occurs in the Greek NT is to be considered acceptable in Koine Greek, broadly speaking. As an editor I normally try to make sure that correlative conjunctions in English are linking like parts of speech (e.g. nouns, verbs, prepositional phrases). The very fact that I sometimes have to rewrite sentences submitted by fine scholars in order to accomplish this indicates that not all experienced writers who send in their manuscripts are sensitive to this “appropriate style.” To the best of our knowledge, the writings of the NT did not go through an extensive process of copy-editing, and thus it is possible to discover

¹² See BDF, sec. 428; Wallace, *Greek Grammar* 689.

¹³ See BDF, secs. 376, 428. Note that there is no idiom εἰ οὐ that means “except” in the NT; there are three occurrences of εἰ οὐ as the first words of a clause (Matt 26:42; Mark 14:21; John 10:37); only John 10:37 can be translated with the nuance of “unless” (cf. *NIV*). As for the statistics of εἰ μή, this idiom occurs 85 times in the NT. While opinions might vary about some of the places where it is used, it appears to me as if εἰ μή is used 72 times to introduce a phrase and 13 times to introduce a clause.

¹⁴ See Wallace, *Greek Grammar* 468.

¹⁵ See BDF, sec. 428 (4, 5).

things in the Greek NT that a polished Greek writer would perhaps not have written. Chief among these, of course, are the anacoloutha (of which there are a number of examples in the NT, e.g. Rom 2:17–21; 2 Cor 5:7; Gal 2:6).¹⁶ Yet I am going to assume that what we find in the NT is considered, for the most part, acceptable Koine Greek (even if it is not grammatically precise).

In general, the οὐ μόνον . . . ἀλλὰ [καί] construction does place in parallel like parts of speech. Here is a listing of passages where these constructions occur and what elements of speech are parallel:

- two indicative verbs: Matt 21:21; John 5:18; Rom 1:32; 5:3 (probably); 8:23;
- two participles in a periphrastic construction (hence, equivalent to two indicative verbs): 2 Cor 9:12;
- two nouns or pronouns (including different forms of substantives, such as adjectives or even articular infinitives): nominative case (Rom 9:10; 2 Cor 8:19; Phil 1:29; 1 Tim 5:13; 2 Tim 2:20); genitive case (Acts 19:26; 27:10); dative case (Rom 4:12, 16; 2 Tim 4:8; 1 Pet 2:18); accusative case (Acts 26:29; 2 Cor 8:10; Phil 2:27; 1 Thess 2:8; Heb 12:26);
- two prepositional phrases: ἐκ plus genitive (Rom 9:24); ἐνώπιον plus genitive (2 Cor 8:21); περί plus genitive (1 John 2:2); ἐν plus dative (2 Cor 7:7; Eph 1:21; 1 Thess 1:5, 8; 1 John 5:6); δία plus accusative (Rom 13:5);
- Acts 19:27, where it would appear that οὐ μόνον . . . ἀλλὰ καί goes with κινδυνεύει in the first half of the sentence, and then an understood repetition of this verb in the second half: “Not only is this a danger for us, that our line of business will go [ἐλθεῖν] into disrepute, but [it is] also [a danger] that the temple of the great goddess Artemis will be reckoned [λογισθῆναι] for nothing” (own trans.);
- Acts 21:13, where it initially appears as if οὐ μόνον . . . ἀλλὰ καί goes with two infinitives, δεθῆναι and ἀποθανεῖν (if so, one might expect μὴ μόνον). I would suggest a similar pattern, however, to the previous example, where the οὐ μόνον relates to the indicative verb, which should be understood as repeated: “For not only [οὐ μόνον] am I ready [ἑτοιμῶς ἔχω] to be bound [δεθῆναι], but [I am] also [ready] to die [ἀποθανεῖν] in Jerusalem on behalf of the name of the Lord Jesus” (own trans.).

These examples involve a total of 33 occurrences of the οὐ μόνον . . . ἀλλὰ [καί] phrases, where the correlative conjunction is placed in parallel with like parts of speech. That leaves three occurrences where there is clearly not a parallel construction.

- John 12:9: A large crowd of the Jews have come to a dinner at the home of Lazarus, “not for Jesus’ sake only, but that they might also see Lazarus, whom he raised from the dead” (NASB). Here we have οὐ μόνον introducing a prepositional phrase and the ἀλλὰ καί leading into a ἵνα clause. In this case, the οὐ μόνον is linked with the indicative ἦλθον. The Jewish crowd has not only come for the purpose of (seeing) Jesus, but they have also come in order that they might see Lazarus.

¹⁶ See BDF, secs. 466–70.

• Rom 5:10–11: Here Paul asserts that “we will be saved by [Christ’s] life. And not only this, but we also exult in God through our Lord Jesus Christ” (NASB). While every English translation makes it appear as if we have two parallel indicatives here, in the Greek “we will be saved” (σωθησόμεθα) is a future indicative, but “we exult” is actually the participle *καυχόμενοι* (a few minor variants give a present indicative, presumably an editorial attempt at standardizing the phrases associated with the correlative conjunction). Once again, the *οὐ μόνον* is justified because the introductory verb to which it relates is the indicative *σωθησόμεθα*. Moreover, the participle *καυχόμενοι* could be viewed as a participle in an understood periphrastic construction, *καυχόμενοι ἕσμεν* or *καυχόμενοι ἐσόμεθα*.

• John 11:52 is the only verse in the NT that clearly violates the pattern of *οὐ μόνον* with the indicative and *μη μόνον* with non-indicatives; it also does not offer parallel constructions on either side of the “not only . . . but also.” This passage reports what the high priest Caiaphas said, that Jesus was about to die for the nation, “and not for the nation only, but in order that he might also gather together into one the children of God who are scattered abroad” (NASB). In this passage, the *οὐ μόνον . . . ἀλλὰ καί* links together a prepositional phrase with a *ἵνα*-clause. It is legitimate to question here why the phrase is not *μη μόνον*, for the prepositional phrase is introduced by an infinitive (*ἀποθνήσκειν*), which would normally take *μή*, and the *ἀλλὰ καί* leads into a subjunctive verb in the *ἵνα* clause, which would also take *μή*. But it may be appropriate to emphasize here that this verse records the words of Caiaphas in a meeting of the Sanhedrin. Almost certainly this meeting was conducted in Aramaic or perhaps even Hebrew, so that these words as written in John’s gospel are a translation into Greek. Might this possibly account for the roughness of the Greek here?¹⁷

But the above few paragraphs do not present the entire picture, because several of those units where like parts of speech are paralleled (i.e. the first 33 occurrences noted above) have been placed in sentences where we would expect, at least if the negative were connected directly to the verbal element in the sentence, *μη μόνον* rather than *οὐ μόνον*. The clearest is Acts 26:29, in which the correlative conjunction joins together an accusative pronoun (*σέ*) with an accusative substantive phrase (*πάντας τοὺς ἀκούσαντες*). But the two verbals in this verse are an optative of wish and an infinitive: “I would wish [*εὐξαίμην ἄν*] to God that whether in a short time or long time, not only you, but also all who hear me this day might become [*γένεσθαι*] such as I am, except for these chains” (NASB). These two accusatives function as subject(s) of an infinitive. It is probably best to see such examples in light of the general rule outlined in BDF:

The distinction between the two negatives, objective *οὐ* and subjective *μη*, is in part fairly complicated in classical Greek. On the other hand, essentially everything can be subsumed under one rule for the Koine of the NT: *οὐ* negates the

¹⁷ I owe this observation to my good friend Miles Van Pelt. I can only raise that question here; the complexity of the issue of the nature of direct speech in the Bible and its relationship to the nature of translated speech does not allow for a thorough examination in this article.

indicative, μή the remaining moods including the infinitive and the participle. *Individual words and phrases are always negated by οὐ*.¹⁸

Since in Acts 26:29 what is correlated are not two verbs but the word σέ with the substantive πάντας τοὺς ἀκούσαντες, it is appropriate to expect the pattern of the negative οὐ rather than μή.

A similar comment might be made about 1 Pet 2:18, where a participle is used as an imperative: “Slaves, be submissive to your masters.” The following correlative conjunction parallels two different types of masters: “not only to those who are good and considerate, but also those who are harsh.” Once again, if we follow the above-mentioned rule from BDF, οὐ is more appropriate here rather than μή (cf. Acts 19:27 and 1 Thess 2:8, where similar arguments can be made).

The upshot of this analysis is that while we do indeed find οὐ μόνον linked with verb constructions that normally would take μή, the appropriateness of οὐ μόνον is seen because what is being correlated are phrases (e.g. nouns or prepositional phrases), not verbs. Verb forms that are linked directly with οὐ μόνον . . . ἀλλὰ [καί] are almost invariably indicative. Where verb forms themselves that normally take μή are correlated by the “not only . . . but also” expression (such as imperatives or infinitives), we find μή μόνον.

If we apply the above analysis to Rom 5:2b–3, it is important to note that the verb form καυχώμεθα occurs twice, so that what is being correlated by “not only . . . but also” are two forms of rejoicing: we rejoice in the hope of the glory of God and we rejoice in our sufferings.¹⁹ As a result, I feel confident in saying we have little choice but to see the two καυχώμεθα verb forms as indicatives rather than subjunctives.²⁰

IV. Οὐ μόνον AND μή μόνον IN THE SEPTUAGINT

Before moving to the specific issue of whether Rom 5:1 could be a hortatory subjunctive, I would like to take a brief tour through the Septuagint as another example of biblical/Hellenistic Greek, to see how οὐ μόνον and μή μόνον . . . ἀλλὰ [καί] are used in that body of literature and to examine whether the Septuagint follows the same patterns as the NT.

This expression occurs only 34 times in the Septuagint, even though this body of literature is approximately four times the size of the NT. Of these, only three occurrences are μή μόνον, and in each case they are followed by ἀλλὰ καί. In 3 Macc 1:29, the correlative is used in an accusative and the infinitive construction; in 4 Macc 4:20, the expression links two infinitives after ὥστε, and in 4 Macc 14:1, it links together two infinitives after ὡς.

¹⁸ See BDF, sec. 220 (italics added).

¹⁹ If there were not a second καυχώμεθα in 5:3, we would undoubtedly have a situation where the οὐ μόνον . . . ἀλλὰ [καί] would be joining two prepositional phrases, ἐπ' ἐλπίδι τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ (“in the hope of the glory of God”) and ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσιν (“in our sufferings”). In such a case (cf. BDF 220 again), it would be impossible to tell from the grammar of the passage whether καυχώμεθα was indicative or subjunctive.

²⁰ I must admit, therefore, that what Fitzmyer writes puzzles me: “The vb. καυχώμεθα is either subjunc. or indic. in form; it is difficult to say which is to be preferred in this case” (*Romans* 397).

The other 31 occurrences have οὐ μόνον. One thing that surprised me was that in the entire portion of the Septuagint translated from the canonical Hebrew Scriptures, there is only one instance of this correlative: Esth 1:16, where οὐ μόνον . . . ἀλλὰ καὶ links two nouns in the accusative after an indicative verb. All the rest of the usages are in the Apocrypha.

Of the 30 occurrences in the Apocrypha, most of them are completed by ἀλλὰ καὶ or sometimes ἀλλά, though one is completed by δέ (2 Macc 11:9) and another one by τε (Esth 8:12^c).²¹ Here is a listing of the 30 passages and what elements of speech are parallel:

- two indicative verbs (expressed or implied): Jdth 11:7; Esth 8:12^c; Wisd 10:8; 19:4–5; Sir 1:1 (line 4); 1 Macc 11:42; 2 Macc 7:24; 3 Macc 2:26; 3:23; 4 Macc 6:35; 8:5, 15; 9:10; 16:2; 18:3;
- two nouns or pronouns (including different forms of substantives, such as adjectives): nominative case (Wisd 11:19; Sir 1:1 [line 23]; 2 Macc 4:35); genitive case (2:4; 18:2); dative case (Esth 8:12^x; 2 Macc 6:31; 3 Macc 3:1; 4 Macc 17:20); accusative case (2 Macc 11:9);
- two prepositional phrases: ὑπό plus genitive (4 Macc 1:11); ἐπί plus accusative (1 Macc 6:25);

As with the NT, some of these are in constructions (such as with infinitives) where we might expect μὴ μόνον, and in at least one case (4 Macc 6:35) there is a μή negative linked directly with an infinitive; however, the rule expressed in BDF 220 (quoted above) adequately explains the use of οὐ μόνον.

Three verses have been left unaccounted for, and they require special attention. In 4 Macc 5:27, the οὐ μόνον . . . ἀλλὰ καὶ links two complementary infinitives after [ἔστιν] τυραννικόν. This clearly does not follow the pattern we have been observing. But there might be a plausible explanation for this verse, similar to the explanation given in our discussion of John 11:52, where the Jewish high priest's presumably Aramaic or Hebrew speech was translated into Greek with an unusual construction. Fourth Maccabees 5:27 records a portion either of the translated speech of the faithful Jewish priest Eleazar, or perhaps of an attempt he is making to speak in Hellenistic Greek but without using the finer grammatical elements of the language.

Esther 8:12^d has a participle (ἀνταναροῦντες) with the οὐ μόνον and an indicative (ὑπολαμβάνουσιν) with the ἀλλὰ καὶ, which violates the usual pattern. But analogous to the previous example, this verse is part of a letter written by Artaxerxes to the 127 provinces in his empire, presumably in Persian, and the version in the Apocrypha's Additions to Esther is a rough Greek translation. Moreover, the ἀνταναροῦντες is linked as part of the sentence started in 8:12^c, which, as I pointed out above, has an οὐ μόνον completed by τε, a highly unusual combination.

Finally, 4 Macc 14:9 is difficult to explain along the lines of traditional Greek grammar (either classical or Hellenistic). The sentence begins with an indicative φρίττομεν, and it then continues with οὐ μόνον . . . ἀλλὰ καὶ linked with three participles. It would be tempting to consider these participles either independent participles functioning as indicatives or perhaps incomplete peri-

²¹ In all quotations from the LXX, I am using the Rahlfs edition and Rahlfs versification system.

phrastics, but arguing in that manner can only be viewed as letting preconceived grammatical rules determine our conclusions. Of all the 64 occurrences in the Septuagint and NT of the correlative “not only . . . but also” that I have examined, this is the only one that does not fit the pattern and is truly an exception to the rule. But for the purposes of this paper, we can take note that οὐ μόνον is linked with a participle, not with a subjunctive.

V. HORTATORY SUBJUNCTIVES AND ROMANS 5:1

Let us now relate the above analysis of the Greek use of the “not only . . . but also” phrase to the ἔχομεν/ἔχομεν dispute of Rom 5:1. We can make two grammatical arguments that drive us in the direction of choosing the indicative rather than the subjunctive. The first and more obvious one is that in this section of Romans, Paul appears to be dealing in indicatives rather than in exhortation.²² He is not saying, “Let us have peace with God . . . and let us rejoice in the hope of the glory of God” (cf. above, a translation for 5:2b that we have already ruled out). Rather, he is saying, “We have peace with God . . . and we do rejoice in the hope of the glory of God.”

In fact, if one starts reading in Rom 3:21 and examines all the verbs Paul uses in the independent clauses (either expressed or implied), there is only one non-indicative verb from 3:21 to 5:21. This verb is the idiomatic μὴ γένοιτο in 3:31. In Romans 6, by contrast, we start getting other moods as the verbs of independent clauses, such as the deliberative subjunctive ἐπιμένωμεν in 6:1,²³ followed up by another μὴ γένοιτο in 6:2. Then, starting in 6:11, Paul begins writing a number of imperatives.

A second, and perhaps even stronger grammatical argument, comes through analyzing all hortatory subjunctives in the NT. In Rom 5:1–2, one thing is obvious: whatever the verb form is in 5:1, it is linked by καὶ in 5:2 with καυχώμεθα. I take all of the words from δι’ οὗ to ἐστήκαμεν in 5:1b–2a as being in a clause subordinate to the ἔχομεν/ἔχομεν in 5:1, with Paul picking up his main clause again with καὶ καυχώμεθα in 5:2b. An appropriate question to ask is this one: Are there any examples in the NT where a hortatory subjunctive is linked by καὶ to a subsequent indicative?

I have made a complete examination of the 60 hortatory subjunctives in the NT. In the majority of cases, the verses have a single hortatory subjunctive. Sometimes there are two or more hortatory subjunctives either in rapid succession or joined by καὶ (e.g. Matt 21:38; Luke 2:15; Rom 13:12–13; 1 Cor 15:32; 1 Thess 5:6; Heb 10:22–24; Rev 19:7). When a negative is used, it is invariably some form of the negative particle μή (e.g. John 19:24; Rom 14:13; 1 Cor 10:8–9; 1 Thess 5:6; 1 John 3:18).

²² A number of commentators make this point as part of the reason for their choice of ἔχομεν instead of ἔχομεν. See, e.g., Cranfield, *Romans* 257; Bryne, *Romans* 169; Keck, *Romans* 135; Käsemann, *An die Römer* 123; Fitzmyer, *Romans* 395.

²³ One could argue that this verb is a hortatory subjunctive in direct discourse after the τί οὖν ἐποῦμεν of 6:1, but even so, it is not a true Pauline exhortation, since Paul rejects this as a valid statement for believers to make (similarly the subjunctive in 6:15).

But are there any cases in the NT where a hortatory subjunctive is linked with a verb in a different mood, either with *καί* or simply standing in close proximity to it? The answer to that question is, “Yes.”

- In some places in the NT a verse begins with an imperative and is followed up quickly with a hortatory subjunctive. For example, in Matt 26:46, Jesus says to his disciples in the upper room, “Arise [ἐγείρεσθε], let us be going [ἄγωμεν]” (see also Matt 27:49; Mark 12:7 [if δεῦτε is regarded as equivalent to an imperative]; 14:42; 15:36; John 14:31; note that all of these are in narrative passages).

- In Rom 14:13, Paul begins with a hortatory subjunctive and follows it up with an imperative: “Let us no longer judge [κρίνομεν] one another; but rather make this decision [κρίνατε], not to put an obstacle or a stumbling block before a fellow believer” (own trans.).

- In Heb 12:28, the author gives a hortatory subjunctive and follows it up with a subjunctive in a subordinate clause: “Therefore, since we receive [παραλαμβάνοντες, a participle] a kingdom that cannot be shaken, let us show [ἔχωμεν] gratitude, by which [δι’ ἧς] we may offer to God [λατρεύομεν, a first person plural subjunctive] an acceptable service with reverence and awe” (NASB).

- In Luke 9:33 the first verb is an indicative and the next verb a hortatory subjunctive. Peter says to the Lord Jesus on the Mount of Transfiguration, “Master, good it is [ἔστιν] for us to be here, and [καί] let us make [ποιήσωμεν] three tents, one for you and one for Moses and one for Elijah.”

But regarding the 60 hortatory subjunctives used in the NT, I could find no passage that *begins* with a hortatory subjunctive and then switches, using the conjunction *καί*, to an indicative—as if Rom 5:1–2 said, “Therefore being justified by faith, let us have peace with God . . . and we rejoice in the hope of the glory of God.” The observation of this grammatical pattern, then, suggests the use of ἔχωμεν rather than ἔχωμεν in Rom 5:1.²⁴

VI. *LECTIO DIFFICILIOR*

Before I draw this article to a conclusion, there is a textual-critical caveat that needs to be taken into account briefly. I have thus far argued that the use of ἔχωμεν is more consistent with the grammar of biblical and Hellenistic Greek. But that means that the use of ἔχωμεν would be the “more difficult” reading (what is called in textual criticism the *lectio difficilior*). And the *lectio difficilior* is often considered to be the preferred original reading,²⁵ because the tendency of copyists was to go from a more difficult reading to a reading

²⁴ I should note that the NT sometimes does have a first-person plural subjunctive in a deliberative question followed by an indicative (e.g. Rom 6:1–2). But a deliberative subjunctive is a different construction grammatically from a hortatory subjunctive; moreover, there is no *καί* linking them together.

²⁵ See Bruce M. Metzger and Bart D. Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration* (4th ed.; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), who cite as the best overall textual critical principle, “choose the reading that best explains the origin of the others” (p. 300).

that is more usual and grammatically correct. This would definitely argue for ἔχωμεν as the original reading.²⁶

On this issue of using internal evidence to decide a textual issue, as I have been attempting to do here, Metzger and Ehrman note the following: “In general, the more difficult reading is to be preferred, particularly when the sense, on the surface, appears to be erroneous but, on more mature consideration, proves to be correct. (Here, ‘more difficult’ means ‘more difficult to the scribe,’ who would be tempted to make an emendation).”²⁷ Nevertheless, as Metzger and Ehrman go on to assert, the more difficult reading must always be seen as “relative, and a point is sometimes reached when a reading must be judged to be so difficult that it can have arisen only by accident in transcription.” Indeed, manuscripts are filled with idiosyncrasies that never enter a textual-critical apparatus since these variants appear to be slips of the pen rather than conscious decisions on the part of the copyist.

So, is the *lectio difficilior* principle applicable here? John Zeisler, for example, writes that the usual procedure of the “*lectio difficilior* . . . does not work well in this case, because the difference in sound was probably minimal between ἔχομεν and ἔχωμεν. . . . In these circumstances it is impossible to reconstruct how one reading was changed into the other, and scholars tend to choose that reading which fits best the theological argument.”²⁸ Moreover, as Nygren pointed out, even if it could be proved that ἔχωμεν was in the autograph of Romans, “that would not prove that Paul meant it that way,” since he was presumably dictating the letter to Tertius, the scribe (Rom 16:22), who may have misheard what Paul intended as he spoke the word in question.²⁹ Thus, we are left with the conclusion that we must indeed listen to the internal evidence of this portion of the book of Romans as well as the “grammatical rules” of Koine and Hellenistic Greek.³⁰

²⁶ Noted by Moo, *Romans* (NIVAC) 170, though he argues, as do many others, that “context finally decides the issue in favor of the usual rendering.”

²⁷ Metzger and Ehrman, *Text of the New Testament* 302–3.

²⁸ See Zeisler, *Romans* 137.

²⁹ Nygren, *Romans* 194. Wolter (*Rechtfertigung* 94) finds that the limits of the use of the *lectio difficilior* are pushed too far if one tries to argue that a later scribe was so sensitive to Paul’s use of δία with “Jesus” or “Christ” that he rewrote a subjunctive as an indicative, for such an exact recognition of the parameters of Paul’s “δία-Christ” pattern is recognizable only by using a concordance (obviously not available in the early centuries of the Christian era).

³⁰ It would take us too far afield and enter us into the world of speculation to probe whether the equal textual-critical evidence of ἔχομεν and ἔχωμεν in Rom 5:1 might perhaps go back to Paul himself. I dealt with this issue in a general way in a paper presented at 2005 SBL Convention in Philadelphia, entitled “Rethinking 2 Corinthians: The Literary Relationship between Chapters 10–13 and the Rest of the Letter.” There I suggested that Paul may have spent time rereading, and perhaps even editing, some of his earlier letters while he was in prison. Note, for example, what the imprisoned Paul asks Timothy in 2 Tim 4:13: “When you come, bring the cloak that I left with Carpus at Troas, also the books, and above all the parchments [μεμβράνας]” (NRSV); these μεμβράνα are probably parchment notebooks (the term is transliterated from the Latin word *membranae*) that most likely contained, among other things, rough drafts of Paul’s letters (for evidence, see Colin Roberts and Theodore Skeat, *The Birth of the Codex* [London: Oxford University Press, 1987] 22, 30; cf. also Theodore Skeat, “Especially the Parchments: A Note on 2 Timothy IV.13, *JTS* NS 30 [1979] 172–77); E. Randolph Richards, *The Secretary in the Letters of Paul* [WUNT 42; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1991] 57). Paul hopes to reread these while in prison. While we will never know

VII. CONCLUSION

The above grammatical evidence has not proven conclusively, of course, that Paul could not have written the subjunctive ἔχομεν in Rom 5:1. After all, Paul was sometimes given to doing unconventional things with his arguments and grammatical constructions. He writes as the Spirit leads him, not as Greek grammar dictates to him. As a result, neither reading can be conclusively ruled out.

Moreover, regardless of whether Paul makes a statement (“we have peace with God”), or “a sort of light exhortation, ‘we should have [peace with God],’”³¹ or an outright exhortation (“let us enjoy the peace we have with God”),³² the truth remains that through the saving work of Christ, who is our peace (Eph 2:14), we do have peace with God. This message shines through regardless of what textual-critical decision we make for Rom 5:1.

Nevertheless, we do want our published Greek New Testaments to reflect as accurately as possible the actual words that Paul wrote. And it is fair to say that the correct use of grammar is something internal to a native speaker and writer, so it is appropriate to examine the evidence to see what is most likely. The data presented here, I believe, strengthens the argument for internal evidence that what Paul wrote in Rom 5:1 was ἔχομεν rather than ἔχωμεν, and that regardless of what Tertius may have heard or written down, Paul intended the indicative ἔχομεν. It is not just the sense of Paul’s argument in Romans that leads us in the direction of the indicative, but also the parameters of Greek syntax.

for sure whether Paul himself began the process of collecting and perhaps even publishing some of his letters (as people like Cicero did), it is entirely reasonable to think that Paul did reread copies of his letters; moreover, if Paul saw something in the final draft that he did not intend, would he not have corrected it? If so, then there could be two copies of Romans that came from the hand of Paul, one with ἔχομεν and the other with ἔχωμεν.

³¹ Sandy and Headlam, *Romans* 120.

³² Barrett, *Romans* 95, allows for this possibility. In any case, from what we know about Paul’s theology, he would not have intended “let us obtain [ἔχομεν in the sense of ‘let us grab hold of’] peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ,” as if our salvation and peace with God are not a gift but something we must achieve by our own effort.