

The Syntax of the Correlative οὕτως . . . ὥστε in John 3.16 in the Light of Parallel Constructions in the Ancient Greek Corpus

AARON MICHAEL JENSEN

Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary, 11831 N Seminary Dr., Mequon, WI 53092, USA.

Email: aaron.michael.jensen@gmail.com

While it has recently become a common assumption that the traditional understanding of the grammar of John 3.16 ('For God so loved the world that ...') is misleading or simply inaccurate, this article demonstrates on the basis of parallel constructions from the ancient Greek corpus that οὕτως ... ὥστε, when used with ἀγαπάω, functions as a correlative intensifier–result pair, exactly as it is presented in the traditional understanding.

Keywords: John 3.16, οὕτως, ὥστε, ἀγαπάω, correlatives, gradability

1. Introduction

Perhaps no words of the New Testament are so familiar to people as the traditional translation of John 3.16: 'For God so loved the world'. However, despite their familiarity, this traditional rendering is now frequently maligned as misleading or inaccurate. Translating οὕτως as 'so' treats the adverb as an intensifier, indicating the degree to which God loved the world that resulted in him giving his son. And while there still are those who follow this interpretation,¹ many in recent years have come to reject the idea that οὕτως functions in this way

¹ See, for example, D. A. Carson, *The Gospel according to John* (PNTC; Leicester: InterVarsity/Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991) 204; L. Morris, *The Gospel according to John* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995) 201–4; U. Wilckens, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (NTD 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000) 71; A. Köstenberger, *John* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004) 129; R. Brown, *The Gospel according to John (1–xii): Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (AYB; New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 2008) 133–4; J. R. Michaels, *The Gospel of John* (NICNT; Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2010) 201; M. Harris, *John 3:16: What's It All about?* (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2015) 10–11.

here as an intensifier ('so much'), instead interpreting the adverb as pointing to the manner ('thus') in which God loved the world.²

This article will demonstrate that judgement has been passed far too hastily in rejecting the traditional understanding of 'God so loved' as designating the intensive degree of God's love. A wider survey of the ancient Greek corpus that we have at our disposal will show that taking οὕτως as an intensifier is an interpretation which is not only possible, but even likely, when the other elements in the context are considered.

2. The Intensive οὕτως in BDAG

Those who reject the intensive meaning ('so much') in favour of one expressing manner ('thus') often do so on the grounds that the adverb οὕτως more frequently depicts manner than intensity, a fact which is certainly true. Starting with the article of Gundry and Howell twenty years ago, which is often appealed to by those who reject an intensive use for οὕτως, it is even said that an intensive interpretation is impossible because, as they state, οὕτως simply is not used that way with verbs.³ And that is certainly the impression one might get if all one does is examine the evidence presented as supporting the intensive meaning in BDAG. BDAG does allow for the intensive meaning even with verbs, but does so with little evidence. The third definition which BDAG lists for οὕτως is 'marker of a relatively high degree, so'.⁴ After chronicling such a use for οὕτως when it precedes adjectives and adverbs, it notes specifically its use preceding verbs: 'Before a verb *so intensely* (X., Cyr. 1, 3, 11; TestAbr B 4 p. 108, 11 [Stone p. 64]; Tat. 19, 1) 1J 4:11'.⁵ An examination of these four citations by BDAG, however, provides less reason to be confident about the possibility of an intensive οὕτως with verbs:

Xenophon, *Cyropaedia* 1.3.11: καὶ ἡ μήτηρ εἶπεν· ἀλλὰ τί ποτε σύ, ὦ παῖ, τῷ Σάκκῳ οὕτω πολέμείς; "But why in the world, my son", said his mother, "are

2 See, for example, B. Newman and E. Nida, *A Handbook on the Gospel of John* (UBSHS; New York: United Bible Societies, 1993) 89; G. Keil, *Das Johannesevangelium: Ein philosophischer und theologischer Kommentar* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997) 62; R. Gundry and R. Howell, 'The Sense and Syntax of John 3:14-17 with Special Reference to the Use of οὕτως... ὥστε in John 3:16', *NovT* 41 (1999): 24-39; K. Wengst, *Das Johannesevangelium, 1. Teilband: Kapitel 1-10* (TKNT 4/1; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2000) 145; C. Keener, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*, vol. II (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003) 566; C. Kruse, *John: An Introduction and Commentary* (TNTC; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2003) 115-16; H. Thyen, *Das Johannesevangelium* (HNT 6; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005) 211; J. Kanagaraj, *John* (NCC; Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2013) 34; W. Weinrich, *John 1:1-7:1* (CC; St. Louis: Concordia, 2015) 371-2; NET; ISV; NLT; HCSB; CSB.

3 Gundry and Howell, 'John 3:16'.

4 BDAG s.v. 3.

5 BDAG s.v. 3.

you **so** set against Sacas?”⁶ While οὕτω could perhaps be understood as intensive here, it can also be understood as referring to the manner of opposition which Cyrus has already displayed towards Sacas in the preceding dialogue, meaning that this citation is by itself inconclusive as to the intensive meaning.

Testament of Abraham B4: ὡς δὲ ἤκουσεν ἡ Σάρρα τοῦ κλαυθμοῦ αὐτῶν ἔσω οὐσα ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτῆς, ἐξεληθούσα εἶπεν τῷ Ἀβραάμ· Κύριε, τί ἐστὶν ὅτι οὕτως κλαίετε; ‘When Sarah heard their crying (for she was inside her house), she came out and said to Abraham, “My lord, why is it that you cry **thus**?”⁷ Again, while an intensive interpretation is perhaps possible, it is hardly necessary. The adverb here is probably best understood as being exophoric (pointing to something outside the text), referring to Abraham’s manner of weeping which Sarah observed.

1 John 4.11: Ἀγαπητοί, εἰ οὕτως ὁ θεὸς ἠγάπησεν ἡμᾶς, καὶ ἡμεῖς ὀφείλομεν ἀλλήλους ἀγαπᾶν. ‘Beloved, if God **so** loved us, we too should love each other.’ Here οὕτως could be anaphoric,⁸ referring back to the manner in which God’s love was demonstrated, which was articulated in the previous verse (καὶ ἀπέστειλεν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἰλασμὸν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν). It does not necessarily have to indicate an intensive degree.

Tatian, Oratio ad Graecos 19.1: θανάτου δὲ ὁ καταφρονῶν οὕτως αὐτὸς ἐδεδίει τὸν θάνατον ὡς καὶ Ἰουστίνον καθάπερ καὶ ἐμὲ ὡς κακῶ τῷ θανάτῳ περιβαλεῖν πραγματεύσασθαι. ‘He who advised contempt of death was himself **so** afraid of death **that** he set about involving Justin – as he did me too – in the death penalty as if it were an evil.’⁹ Here, used correlatively¹⁰ with ὡς, οὕτως does seem to function intensively. It would be hard to give οὕτως an antecedent to which it could anaphorically refer back in order to describe the manner of Crescens’ fear here. Likewise, the content of the ὡς-clause would struggle to serve as a sensible postcedent for οὕτως to point ahead to cataphorically¹¹ if the adverb communicated manner and not degree.

So of BDAG’s four examples of an intensive οὕτως with verbs, we see that three make for rather poor evidence of the meaning, and the fourth, from Tatian, is

6 Translation from W. Miller, LCL.

7 Translation from J. H. Charlesworth, ed., *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol. 1: *Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1983).

8 A pronoun/proadverb functions anaphorically when it points to something said above (cf. ἀνά), as opposed to when it functions cataphorically pointing to something which will be said below (cf. κατό).

9 Translation from Tatian, *Oratio ad Graecos and Fragments* (ed. and trans. Molly Whitaker; OECT; Oxford: Clarendon, 1982).

10 ‘Correlative’ refers to cases where a pair of words combine to form a conjunction. Examples in English would be *both ... and* and *not only ... but also*.

11 A pronoun/proadverb functions cataphorically when it points to something which will be said below (cf. κατό), as opposed to when it functions anaphorically pointing to something said above (cf. ἀνά).

found not absolutely but as part of a correlative phrase with ὡς. Judging purely from this presentation, one could come to the conclusion that the support for an intensive meaning for the οὕτως is rather scant when the adverb is used in isolation. However, this also suggests to us that a stronger direction would be to consider the adverb as it functions correlatively, specifically when paired with ὥστε, as it is found in John 3.16.

3. The Grammar of the Correlative οὕτως ... ὥστε

BDAG actually lists John 3.16 not under its third heading of ‘marker of a relatively high degree’ but under its second heading of ‘pert. to what follows in discourse material’. If one does not read through the entry closely, though, one might mistakenly draw from this that the lexicon is interpreting the use of οὕτως in John 3.16 to be merely cataphoric, as in, pointing ahead to an object clause which will serve as its postcedent. A closer reading, however, reveals that this is not what it intends when the word is used with ὥστε. John 3.16, with Acts 14.1, is included as an example of οὕτως being used correlatively with ὥστε. It is important to recognise that BDAG does not mean by this that the ὥστε-clause is the postcedent of οὕτως. The way BDAG renders its example from *Sylloge inscriptionum Graecarum* (‘he was suffering to such an extent from a suppurating wound, that ... he was filled with matter’) demonstrates that the οὕτως ... ὥστε functions not as cataphor-postcedent but as a correlative intensifier-result pair.

If this distinction between cataphor-postcedent and correlative intensifier-result pair seems overly subtle, perhaps examples will better illustrate the distinction. First, an example of οὕτως being used with ὡς¹² as a cataphor-postcedent combination, **Mark 4.26:** καὶ ἔλεγεν, **Οὕτως** ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ὡς ἄνθρωπος βάλη τὸν σπόρον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ‘And he said, “**Like this** is the kingdom of God: **like** a man throwing seed on the ground.”’ Here οὕτως serves as a cataphor, pointing ahead to the clause introduced by ὡς, which is the postcedent. The ὡς-clause fills in the content of the cataphoric οὕτως, and the cataphoric οὕτως serves to highlight the yet-unnamed content it points ahead to.¹³ Interpreters and translators who understand John 3.16 along the lines of ‘This is how God loved the world: ...’ are taking οὕτως ... ὥστε as a cataphor-postcedent combination.

Now second, an example of οὕτως being used with ὥστε as a correlative intensifier-result pair, **Xenophon, Anabasis 7.4.3:** καὶ ψύχος οὕτως ὥστε τὸ ὕδωρ ὀ

12 ὡς is also able to function similarly to ὥστε to signal a result-clause, but does not do so in this example. See LSJ s.v. B.iii; GE s.v. II.C.a.

13 See S. Runge, *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis* (Bellingham, WA: Lexham, 2010) 61–71.

ἐφέροντο ἐπὶ δεῖπνον ἐπήγγυτο καὶ ὁ οἶνος ὁ ἐν τοῖς ἀγγείοις, ‘And it was **so** cold **that** the water which they carried in for dinner and the wine in the jars would freeze.’¹⁴ As with the previous example, one could here label the usage of οὕτως as being broadly cataphoric, because it does orient the sentence towards the following clause. However, such a label, if applied indiscriminately, might obscure the fact that here οὕτως is pointing the sentence forward in a significantly different way than in the previous case where it pointed to a postcedent. That is because the ὥστε-clause is not a postcedent – an exclusively adverbial conjunction like ὥστε cannot even introduce a substantival clause such as would be needed to serve as a postcedent.¹⁵ Instead of serving as a postcedent, the ὥστε-clause indicates the result or consequence of what proceeds, as it usually does. Unlike the ὡς-clause in the previous example, the ὥστε-clause here does not directly fill in the content of οὕτως but instead shows its result. In the example given, the result-clause does not directly describe how cold it was. It only indirectly describes how cold it was by saying what happened as a result of it being so cold.¹⁶

This specialised correlative intensifier–result usage would probably have developed by analogy with the cataphor–postcedent use, because if we take this concise correlative construction and expand it, we do end up with something of a cataphor–postcedent combination: *And it was cold in this way: [in such a way] that the water and the wine would freeze.* But note still that even in expanded form the ὥστε-clause describes the result of this kind of cold and fills in the content of the kind of cold not directly but only indirectly. Note also that *cold in this way* is clearly going to be a reference to the degree or intensity of the cold, not the manner in which the cold came to be or happened. This is because *cold* is a gradable adjective,¹⁷ and so it is naturally modified with respect to degree or intensity. It is not only adjectives and adverbs that can be gradable, however. Many verbs are gradable as well, including verbs of emotion.¹⁸ So when οὕτως ...

14 Translation from C. L. Browson, LCL.

15 Wallace lists ἵνα, ὅπως, ὅτι and ὡς as the conjunctions which can indicate a substantival clause. D. Wallace, *Greek Grammar beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996) 677–8. Postcedents such as this can also be introduced via asyndeton.

16 Note the phrasing of this sentence. The ὥστε-clause indirectly describes not *how it was cold* (manner), but *how cold it was* (degree of intensity).

17 A gradable adjective is an adjective which can be readily used in a comparative way or modified with respect to degree. For example, *hot*, *big* and *fast* are gradable adjectives, as something can easily be *hotter*, *bigger* and *faster*, and *very hot*, *very big* and *very fast*. Non-gradable adjectives, which tend to be binary in nature, are less readily used in such ways. For example, *married*, *dead* and *perfect* are non-gradable adjectives, as something cannot easily be *more married*, *more dead* or *more perfect*, or *very married*, *very dead* or *very perfect*, at least not without pressing the language for effect.

18 J. Fleischhauer, *Degree Gradation of Verbs* (Dissertations in Language and Cognition 2; Düsseldorf: Düsseldorf University Press, 2016), esp. 277–80.

ὥστε is found in combination with a gradable adjective, adverb or verb, such as ἀγαπάω is, we should expect οὕτως to indicate the degree or intensity of that word.¹⁹ ὥστε, as the second part of the correlative pair, will indicate the result of that gradable adjective, adverb or verb being that intense.

4. The Correlative οὕτως ... ὥστε in the Corpus

Gundry and Howell argue against the existence of such a correlative usage of οὕτως ... ὥστε primarily on two grounds. The first is the words' respective etymologies, but since etymologies are not determinative of lexical meaning such evidence does not itself prove anything, as Gundry and Howell seem to admit,²⁰ and we have also above proposed a plausible scenario for how such a correlative usage of οὕτως ... ὥστε could have developed. The second argument comes from their going one by one through instances in Demosthenes, Josephus, Philo and Epictetus where the Loeb Classical Library takes οὕτως and ὥστε as a correlative pair in a systematic attempt to eradicate possible examples of such a correlative usage.²¹ In every case their strategy requires locating an acceptable antecedent for οὕτως. As thorough as their efforts may be, many of their proposed antecedents strain credibility,²² and a number of the others would seem to make the sentence rather inane, as their own renderings pieced together would demonstrate.²³ Even on the few occasions when their interpretation could potentially make decent sense, the LCL reading which they reject makes at least as much sense,²⁴ especially since in every case the word modified by οὕτως is a gradable

19 For this reason, despite their formal similarities, Acts 14.1 is not really an exact parallel with John 3.16. ἀγαπάω in John 3.16 is a gradable verb. λαλέω in Acts 14.1 is not, meaning it could not easily admit an intensive meaning anyway. So the fact that in Acts 14.1 οὕτως must indicate manner and not intensity does nothing to rule out the intensive meaning in John 3.16.

20 Gundry and Howell, 'John 3:16', 26–7.

21 Gundry and Howell, 'John 3:16', 27–32.

22 Namely, those proposed for Josephus, *Ant.* 9.12.3; Philo, *Det.* 87; *Congr.* 168; *Somn.* 1.203; *Abr.* 31; *Legat.* 157, 163; Epictetus 1.11.4, 4.11.19.

23 Namely, those proposed for Demosthenes 2.26; Josephus, *Ant.* 8.7.7; 9.5.1; 9.12.3; Philo, *Agr.* 41, 50; *Her.* 83; *Mos.* 1.234; *Spec.* 2.87; *Prob.* 131.

24 When Gundry and Howell's identification of an antecedent does effect a somewhat coherent reading, this seems to be attributable not to a sound interpretation of οὕτως and ὥστε but to the fact that the passages they are interpreting are coherent, with the other elements of the οὕτως-clause containing anaphoric ties to the preceding sentence, and with the sentence with οὕτως ... ὥστε being intended to develop and advance the previous sentence. This does not, however, mean that the οὕτως is necessarily anaphoric. Instead, as the other material points back, the οὕτως points ahead to move the discussion forward.

word,²⁵ easily admitting an intensive modifier. In the end, the frequency with which οὕτως and ὥστε co-occur, all of which instances make very good sense with a correlative intensifier–result understanding, suggests that far simpler than Gundry and Howell’s proposal, and more in line with the data, is to retain the correlative usage, a usage which the lexica do advocate and document.²⁶

Moreover, not only is this correlative usage of οὕτως ... ὥστε clearly outlined in the lexica; Spicq documented it even further and applied it to the question of John 3.16 already back in 1958.²⁷ Unfortunately, however, the French scholar’s work on this question seems to have gone largely unnoticed by English commentators.²⁸ Spicq provides examples where οὕτως ... ὥστε is used as a correlative intensifier–result pair with a number of different verbs, including several occurrences where the verb is ἀγαπάω.²⁹

And no stronger proof can really be given for οὕτως ... ὥστε in John 3.16 being a correlative intensifier–result pair than examples where these words clearly function this way when used with ἀγαπάω. In addition to those observed already sixty years ago by Spicq, a significant number of other such examples can be found throughout the ancient Greek corpus.³⁰ In each of the parallel constructions I give below, we will see that the two proposed alternatives to understanding οὕτως ... ὥστε as a correlative intensifier–result pair (either by taking οὕτως anaphorically or by taking οὕτως ... ὥστε as a cataphoric–postcedent construction) are not realistically viable. On the other hand, interpreting οὕτως ... ὥστε as a correlative intensifier–result pair consistently gives the most coherent understanding of the passage.³¹

25 In several cases Gundry and Howell’s renderings tend to obscure the gradability of the Greek original, but examination of the underlying text reveals verbs whose meanings clearly lend themselves to being gradable.

26 LSJ s.vv. οὕτως III, ὥστε B.ii; BDAG s.vv. οὕτως 2, ὥστε 2α, β; GE s.vv. οὕτως 2b, ὥστε II.

27 C. Spicq, ‘Notes d’exégèse Johannique. La charité est amour manifeste’, *RB* 65 (1958) 358–70, esp. 359–60.

28 Spicq is, however, cited favourably by Carson, *John*, 204 n. 16.

29 Spicq, ‘Notes’, 360. The examples given where the verb is ἀγαπάω are Isocrates, *De pace* 8.45; *Antidosis* 15.88; Theopompus fr. 124. These examples which include ἀγαπάω, along with other similar examples, will be provided and discussed below.

30 The Greek examples given here were located using the *TLG* database. In an effort to focus on examples which more closely parallel John 3.16 I am omitting here those cases where οὕτως ... ὥστε is found with ἀγαπάω but where οὕτως does not directly modify ἀγαπάω but rather an adverb which itself modifies ἀγαπάω.

31 In a number of the examples given below ὥστε is followed not by the indicative but by an infinitive, in keeping with the fact that the use of the infinitive had long been supplanting the use of the indicative with ὥστε in subordinate clauses; on that trend, see A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (Nashville, TN: Broadman, 1934) 1000. This does not diminish but instead perhaps enhances their usefulness as parallels for John 3.16, which does retain the indicative after ὥστε. That is because following ὥστε with the infinitive makes clear that the clause is both a result-clause

Isocrates, *De pace* 8.45: ἀλλ' ὅμως οὕτως αὐτοὺς ἀγαπῶμεν ὥσθ' ὑπὲρ μὲν τῶν παίδων τῶν ἡμετέρων, εἰ περὶ τινὰς ἐξαμάρτοιν, οὐκ ἂν ἐθελήσαιμεν δικὰς ὑποσχεῖν, ὑπὲρ δὲ τῆς ἐκείνων ἀρπαγῆς καὶ βίας καὶ παρανομίας μελλόντων τῶν ἐγκλημάτων ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ἦξειν οὐχ ὅπως ἀγανακτοῦμεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ χαίρομεν ὅταν ἀκούσωμεν αὐτοὺς τοιοῦτόν τι διαπεπραγμένους. 'But, for all that, we **are so enamored** of these mercenaries **that** while we would not willingly assume the responsibility for the acts of our own children if they offended against anyone, yet for the brigandage, the violence, and the lawlessness of these men, the blame for which is bound to be laid at our door, not only do we feel no regret, but we actually rejoice whenever we hear that they have perpetrated any such atrocity.'³²

Isocrates, *Antidosis* 15.88: ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τελευτῆς, ὅτ' ἤδη μέλλοιεν ἀποπλεῖν ὡς τοὺς γονέας καὶ τοὺς φίλους τοὺς ἑαυτῶν, οὕτως ἠγάπων τὴν διατριβὴν ὥστε μετὰ πόθου καὶ δακρύων ποιεῖσθαι τὴν ἀπαλλαγὴν. 'On the contrary, when at the last the time would come for them to sail away to their parents or their friends at home, **so happy did they feel** in their life with me, **that** they would always take their leave with regret and tears.'³³

Significantly, these two quotations from Isocrates which employ the combination οὕτως ἀγαπάω ... ὥστε begin with the adversative conjunction ἀλλά. The contrast that ἀλλά marks between these sentences and those that precede them in context makes it highly unlikely that οὕτως is meant to refer back anaphorically to the material being contrasted. οὕτως in some way looks forward to the ὥστε-clause. And in both of these statements from Isocrates it would not make much sense if the ὥστε-clause described how the love happened. ('We loved these mercenaries in this way: we do not regret their violence but rejoice when they commit atrocities.' 'They love their life with me in this way: they take their leave with regret and tears.') It makes good sense, however, that excusing atrocities and being sad to leave would be results of love.

Plato, *Phaedrus* 257e: καὶ πρὸς τῷ ἀγκῶνι λανθάνει σε ὅτι οἱ μέγιστον φρονούντες τῶν πολιτικῶν μάλιστα ἐρῶσι λογογραφίας τε καὶ καταλείψεως συγγραμμάτων, οἳ γε καὶ ἐπειδάν τινα γράφωσι λόγον, οὕτως ἀγαπῶσι τοὺς ἐπαινέτας, ὥστε προσπαραγράφουσι πρώτους οἱ ἂν ἐκασταχοῦ ἐπαινώσιν αὐτούς. 'You seem not to know that the proudest of

and a dependent clause, the former of which speaks against the cataphor-postcedent interpretation of οὕτως, the latter against Gundry and Howell's anaphoric-dependent clause interpretation of οὕτως. The rarer use of the indicative in a dependent ὥστε-clause in John 3.16, found elsewhere in the New Testament only in Gal 2.13, emphasises that God not only had such love as *would* give his son, but also as *did* give his son.

³² Translation from G. Norlin, LCL.

³³ Translation from G. Norlin, LCL.

the statesmen are most fond of writing and of leaving writings behind them, since they **care so much** for praise **that** when they write a speech they add at the beginning the names of those who praise them in each instance.³⁴ No realistic antecedent can be found for οὕτως here were it to be anaphoric, and the listing of the people who have praised them shows not how the proud politicians have a love for praise but the result of the proud politicians loving praise. Here too οὕτως ... ὥστε is used with ἀγαπάω as a correlative intensifier-result pair.

Theopompus fr. 124: πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ οὕτως ἠγάπησε τὴν παρὰ τοῦ βαρβάρου τιμὴν ὥστε βουλόμενος ἀρέσκειν καὶ πιστεύεσθαι μᾶλλον ἀνεκόμισε πρὸς βασιλέα τὸν υἱόν, ὃ τῶν ἄλλων οὐδεὶς πώποτε φανήσεται ποιήσας. 'He was, first of all, **so enamoured** of being honoured by the barbarian **that**, in his eagerness to please the King and gain more of his confidence, he took his son to him, something no one else will ever be found to have done.'³⁵ πρῶτον here corresponds to ἔπειτα, which immediately follows this quotation, and which lays out a second over-the-top action by Nicostratus in his efforts to win the king's favour. This makes clear that the whole first clause is intended to set up the ὥστε-clause, which presents the first over-the-top action by Nicostratus, meaning that οὕτως cannot be anaphoric. Nor will the ὥστε-clause be a postcedent, since bringing his son to the king to get more honour is not how Nicostratus loved honour but what he did as a result of his loving honour.

Plutarch, Publicola 9.7: καὶ λόγον ἐπ' αὐτῷ διεξῆλθεν ἐπιτάφιον, ὃς οὕτως ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων ἠγαπήθη καὶ τοσαύτην ἔσχε χάριν ὥστε πᾶσι τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς καὶ μεγάλοις ὑπάρχειν ἐξ ἐκείνου τελευτήσασιν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρίστων ἐγκωμιάζεσθαι. 'He even delivered a funeral oration in his honour, which **was so admired** by the Romans and won **such** favour **that** from that time on, when their great and good men died, encomiums were pronounced upon them by the most distinguished citizens.'³⁶ Note that in this case Plutarch coordinates οὕτως with the correlative intensive adjective τοσαύτην. In modifying the noun χάριν he uses a correlative intensive adjective, but in modifying the verb ἠγαπήθη he uses οὕτως, evidently as a correlative intensive adverb. The ὥστε-clause, describing the encomiums that were made from then on because of Valerius' speech, indicates not the way in which the Romans loved and favoured his oration but the result of their loving and favouring it.

Plutarch, Sulla 22.2: καὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα Σύλλας οὕτως ἠγάπησεν ὥστε αὐτὸς εἰς λόγους σπεῦσαι τῷ Ἀρχελάῳ συνελθεῖν. 'The matter **was so welcome** to Sulla **that** he was eager to have a personal conference with Archelaus.'³⁷

34 Translation from R. G. Bury, LCL.

35 *Apud* Athenaeus, *Deipn.* 6.252b. Translation from S. D. Olson, LCL.

36 Translation from B. Perrin, LCL.

37 Translation from B. Perrin, LCL.

Plutarch, *Sertorius* 22.2: ἔτι δὲ νικήσας ποτὲ μάχη τὸν Σερτώριον οὕτως ἐπήρθη καὶ τὴν εὐτυχίαν ἠγάπησεν ὥστε αὐτοκράτωρ ἀναγορευθῆναι, θυσίαις δ' αὐτὸν αἱ πόλεις ἐπιφοιτῶντα καὶ βωμοῖς ἐδέχοντο. 'Moreover, after a victory which he once won over Sertorius he **was so** elated and **delighted** with his success **that** his soldiers saluted him as Emperor and the cities celebrated his visits to them with altars and sacrifices.'³⁸

Plutarch, *Artaxerxes* 23.4: τὴν δ' Ἄτοσσαν οὕτως ἠγάπησεν ὁ πατὴρ συνοικοῦσαν ὥστε ἀλφοῦ κατανεμηθέντος αὐτῆς τὸ σῶμα δυσχερᾶναι μὲν ἐπὶ τούτῳ μηδ' ὀτιοῦν. 'Atossa, however, **was so beloved** by her father as his consort, **that** when her body was covered with leprosy he was not offended at this in the least.'³⁹

Again in the last three examples from Plutarch above, the ὥστε-clause shows the results of the love (wanting to meet with someone, celebrating success, being comfortable with a woman's leprosy) and is not a postcedent explicating the manner of the love. Likewise, in none of these cases is there a viable antecedent in the previous context were οὕτως to be taken as anaphoric.

Themistius, Ὑπὲρ τοῦ λέγειν ἢ πῶς τῷ φιλοσόφῳ λεκτέον 311b: οὐ δῆπου με τὰ θεάτρα οὕτως ἀγαπᾶν ἠγείσθε ὥστε ἀγνοεῖν ὅτι ὀλίγοι ἔμφορες πολλῶν ἀφρόνων τῷ λέγοντι φοβερώτεροι. 'Surely you do not think that I **love** theaters **so much that** I am unaware that a few discriminating men are more formidable to a speaker than the uninformed masses.'⁴⁰ As this is the opening line of the oration, οὕτως could not possibly be anaphoric here. And given the content of the ὥστε-clause, as would be expected, it makes much better sense to take it as a result-clause rather than as a postcedent.

Themistius, *In Aristoteles physica paraphrasis* 3.8: καίτοι τὸν λόγον τοῦτον ἠγάπησεν οὕτως Ἐπίκουρος, ὥστε παλαιότερον ὄντα εἰσποιήσασθαι καὶ ὑποβάλλεσθαι μικραῖς τισι καὶ φαύλαις προσθήκαις, καθάπερ οἱ τὰ φώρια μετασχηματίζοντες ὑπὲρ τοῦ λανθάνειν. 'Yet Epicurus **so cherished** this argument **that** he adopted it despite its being rather old-hat and supported it with some minor and trivial additions in the manner of thieves who to escape notice change the look of stolen goods.'⁴¹ This sentence, beginning with an adversative, is unlikely to feature an anaphoric use of οὕτως. And the ὥστε-clause shows what Epicurus did as a result of his love of the argument, not the manner in which he loved the argument.

Julian the Apostate, *Misopogon* 32: Κελτοὶ μὲν γὰρ οὕτω με δι' ὁμοιότητα τρόπων ἠγάπησαν, ὥστε ἐτόλμησαν οὐχ ὄπλα μόνον ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ λαβεῖν,

38 Translation from B. Perrin, LCL.

39 Translation from B. Perrin, LCL.

40 Translation from Themistius, *The Private Orations of Themistius* (ed. and trans. R. J. Penella; Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2000).

41 Translation from Themistius, *On Aristotle: Physics 1–3* (trans. R. B. Todd; London/New Delhi/New York/Sydney: Bloomsbury, 2012).

ἀλλὰ καὶ χρήματα ἔδωκαν πολλά, καὶ παραιτούμενον ὀλίγου καὶ ἐβιάσαντο λαβεῖν, καὶ πρὸς πάντα ἐτοίμως ὑπήκουσαν. 'For they **loved** me **so much**, on account of the similarity of our dispositions, **that** not only did they venture to take up arms on my behalf, but they gave me large sums of money besides; and when I would have declined it, they almost forced me to take it, and in all things readily obeyed me.'⁴²

Damascius, *Vita Isidori* 23: ὁ δὲ πρὸς τῇ ἀφελείᾳ οὕτω καὶ τὴν ἀψεύδειαν ἠγάπα, ὥστε καὶ εὐθύγλωττος εἶναι πέρα τοῦ δέοντος ἐδοξάζετο, καὶ οὐδ' ὀτιοῦν ἔχειν ἐν ἑαυτῷ προσποιούμενον. 'In addition to simplicity, he **loved** also truthfulness **so much that** he was thought to be more straight-tongued than necessary and to have nothing whatsoever in him that was pretended.'⁴³

While Julian the Apostate and the Neoplatonist philosopher Damascius are certainly not known for their contributions to Christianity, here they still do show us, as the other non-Christian writers do, examples very similar in form to John 3.16 of this correlative pairing of οὕτως as intensifier and ὥστε as result.

In addition to these twelve examples from non-Christian writers, we observe the same correlative use with ἀγαπάω also in Christian writers as well:

Gregory of Nyssa, *In Canticum canticorum* 2: πῶς γάρ σε μὴ ἀγαπήσω τὸν οὕτω με ἀγαπήσαντα καὶ ταῦτα μέλαιναν οὖσαν, ὥστε τὴν ψυχὴν σου ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων θεῖναι, ἃ σὺ ποιμαίνεις; 'For how shall I not love you, who **so loved** me – even when I was dark – **as to** lay down your life for the sheep that you shepherd?'⁴⁴

Ps.-Macarius, *Sermones* 64 (*collectio B*) 28.2.4: οὕτω γὰρ ἠγάπησεν ὁ θεὸς τὴν ψυχὴν τὴν κατ' εἰκόνα αὐτοῦ κτισθεῖσαν, ὥστε ἑαυτὸν χαρίσασθαι αὐτῇ ποικίλως ἐν αὐτῇ κοσμούμενον καὶ τῆς ἰδίας φύσεως κοινωνὸν αὐτὴν καθιστῶντα. 'For God **so loved** the soul created in his image **as to** give himself to it, intricately clothed in it and making it share in his own nature.'⁴⁵

Chrysostom, *In Joannem* 80.2: ὡς ὅταν λέγη Παῦλος, ὅτι Οὕτως ἠγάπησεν ἡμᾶς, ὥστε παραδοῦναι ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν. 'For example, when Paul said: "He **loved** us **so much that** he delivered Himself up for us."⁴⁶

Chrysostom, *In epistulam ad Ephesios* 7.1: ὅτι οὕτως αὐτοὺς ἠγάπησεν ὁ Θεὸς, ὥστε καὶ τὸν Υἱὸν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν δοῦναι, καὶ τοὺς δούλους κακοῦν. 'It is because God **so loved** them, **as to** give even the Son for them, and to afflict His servants for them.'⁴⁷

42 Translation from W. C. Wright, LCL.

43 Translation mine.

44 Translation from Gregory of Nyssa, *Homilies on the Song of Songs* (trans. R. A. Norris Jr.; Atlanta: SBL, 2012).

45 Translation mine.

46 Translation from John Chrysostom, *Commentary on Saint John the Apostle and Evangelist, Homilies 48–88* (trans. Sister Thomas Aquinas Goggin; FCPS 41; Washington, DC: CUA, 1959).

47 Translation from *NPNF* series 1, vol. XIII.

Chrysostom, *In epistulam ad Philippenses 3.1*: εἰρηνεύετε, εἶπεν, οὐ τοῦτο δηλῶν, ὅτι Οὐχ οὕτως ἀγαπᾶτε, ὥστε ὑπὸ τῆς φιλίας βλάπτεσθαι. “*Live in peace,*” he said. “*Don’t love in such a way that you are harmed by love.*”⁴⁸ This occurrence seems to be the only instance where manner of love and not degree of love is indicated, as the translation reflects. This rarer reading of οὕτως easily arises from the preceding context, which has included a number of adverbials to depict the way in which love can be well or poorly exercised.⁴⁹ Yet while this example is something of an exception, it still can be seen here that the ὥστε-clause is again clearly a result-clause, and the οὕτως, neither anaphoric nor cataphoric, points ahead to it correlatively.

Chrysostom, *In epistulam ad Hebraeos 7.3*: εἶτα ἐλπίδας αὐτοῖς ἐντίθησι, λέγων, Μέτοχοι γεγόναμεν τοῦ Χριστοῦ· μονονουχὶ λέγων, ὁ οὕτως ἡμᾶς ἀγαπήσας, ὁ τοσοῦτων ἡμᾶς καταξιώσας, ὥστε ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα ποιῆσαι, οὐ περιόψεται ἀπολλυμένους. ‘Then he suggests hopes to them, saying (v. 14), “We are made partakers of Christ”; All but saying, He that **so loved** us, He that counted us worthy of so great things, **as to** make us His Body, will not suffer us to perish.’⁵⁰ Here again we find οὕτως as a correlative intensive adverb paired with a correlative intensive adjective (τοσοῦτων).

Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarius in Isaiam prophetam 4.1*: ἡγάπησα δὲ οὕτως, ὥστε καὶ εἰ γένοιτο καιρὸς ἢ χρεῖα τοῦ πολλοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ ἄρχοντας ὑπὲρ τῆς σῆς δοθῆναι κεφαλῆς, δοίην ἅν. ‘I **so loved** you **that** even if time or need required many people and rulers be given for your head, I would give them.’⁵¹

Marcus Eremita, *Consultatio intellectus cum sua ipsius anima 2*: ἡμεῖς δὲ οὕτως αὐτὰς ἀγαπῶμεν, ὥστε οὐ μόνον τὴν ἀρετὴν ἀντ’ αὐτῶν προδιδόαμεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὰς ἐκείνας ἐτέραν τῇ ἐτέρῃ ἐν καιρῷ καταλλάσσομεν. ‘But we **so love** them **that** we would not only forsake virtue for them but also, when there is the opportunity, replace one of them with another.’⁵²

Justinian I, *Novella 22.48*: εἰ μὲν γάρ τινα ἐκ τῶν δευτέρων ἔχοιεν γάμων, ἢ καὶ τῶν πρώτων τυχόν, οὕτω περισπούδαστον, οὕτως ἀγαπώμενον, ὥστε βούλεσθαι ὑπερφέρειν αὐτὸν τοὺς ἄλλους ἐν τῇ κτήσει, δίδομεν ἄδειαν τοῦτο πράττειν. ‘If he should have any child from the second marriage, or

48 Translation from John Chrysostom, *Homilies on Paul’s Letter to the Philippians* (trans. P. Allen; WGRW 16; Atlanta: SBL, 2013).

49 μετὰ κρίσεως ‘with judgement’, μετὰ λογισμοῦ ‘with reasoning’, μετὰ τοῦ αἰσθάνεσθαι ‘with perception’, ἀλόγως ‘stupidly’, ἀπλῶς ‘simply’ and ὡς ἔτυχεν ‘anyhow’.

50 Translation from *NPNF* series 1, vol. xiv.

51 Translation from Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentary on Isaiah*, vol. III: *Chapters 40–50* (trans. R. C. Hill; Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2008).

52 Translation mine.

even perhaps from the first marriage, who is so desired, **so loved that** he plans for him to surpass the others in possessions, we give him license to do this.’⁵³

Adding these nine examples from early Christian writers, as well as four more that can be found from Christian writers later in the first millennium,⁵⁴ to those from non-Christian writers, we have twenty-five parallel examples of οὕτως ... ὥστε with ἀγαπάω in total.⁵⁵ With only one exception among these parallels, we consistently find οὕτως ... ὥστε being used as a correlative intensifier–result pair with ἀγαπάω, demonstrating that the same construction not only can but also probably does function in the same way in John 3.16.

In light of such strong evidence for this correlative pairing, we need to be very careful in our application of arguments concerning οὕτως on the basis of the overall frequency of a given meaning. For example, the fact that the adverb typically indicates manner (‘thus’) and not degree (‘so much’) is far less significant when it comes to this specific usage than is its typical intensifying meaning when found with ὥστε and a gradable verb such as ἀγαπάω. Furthermore, the argument that οὕτως is typically anaphoric is a good one to make against a cataphor–postcedent interpretation. In fact, the argument can be made even more pointedly than that, as John 3.16a clearly lacks the requisite qualifications to establish the cohesion necessary for οὕτως even potentially to function cataphorically here.⁵⁶ But as a correlative intensifier–result pair the οὕτως ... ὥστε construction does not employ a cataphoric οὕτως in a strict sense, and so arguing

53 Translation mine.

54 *Martyrium Juliani et Basilissae* 2.36; Photius I, *Epistula* 216; *Fragmenta in epistulam ad Romanos* p. 514 Staab; *Commentarii in Joannem* 83.

55 If we include also examples where ὡς is used in place of ὥστε in the correlative intensifier–result pair with the same meaning (see LSJ s.v. Β.iii; GE, s.v. II.c.a), we have an additional twenty-five examples: Aristophanes of Byzantium, *Historiae animalium epitome* 2.118; Pappus, *Synagoge* 8; Themistius, *Φιλιάδελφοι ἢ περὶ φιλονθρωπίας* 81d; Chrysostom, *De sacerdotio* 2.5; *In sanctum Julianum martyrem* 1; *Quales ducendae sint uxores* 2; *In Joannem* 27.2; *In epistulam ad Romanos* 32.2; *In epistulam ad Galatas commentarius* 2.8; 6.3; *In epistulam ad Ephesios* 20.6; *In epistulam ad Philippenses* 14.2; Theodoret, *Epistulae: Collectio Sirmondiana* 76; *Explanatio in Canticum canticorum* 2; *Interpretatio in XII prophetas minores* on Zeph 3.16–18; Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarii in Joannem* vol. II p. 389 Pusey; *Commentarii in Isaiam prophetam* 2.5; 5.3; Gerontius, *Vita S. Melaniae Junioris* 30; Marcus Eremita, *De baptismo* 14; John of Damascus, *Commentarii in epistulas Pauli* on 6.14; *Oratio in Sabbatum sanctum* 2; *Oratio in nativitatē sanctae dei genitricis Mariae* 5; Photius I, *Fragmenta in epistulam II ad Corinthios* p. 592 Staab; Symeon Neotheologus, *Orationes ethicae* 7.1.

56 See A. M. Jensen, ‘Information Structure as a More Objective Criterion for Distinguishing between Cataphoric and Kinds of Anaphoric Demonstratives’, *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 32 (2019, forthcoming). Here in John 3.16a ‘God loved the world’ communicates informational content which has not been brought up in the immediately preceding context, which would prevent οὕτως from being cataphoric in the strict sense without severing the cohesion between this verse and the preceding context.

against a cataphoric usage on the basis of frequency really does nothing to undermine this well-documented specialised correlative usage of οὕτως ... ὥστε. The frequency with which οὕτως elsewhere indicates manner or is anaphoric is in the end irrelevant when it comes to its use in John 3.16. Sound exegesis does not force the most common meaning of a word into a given sentence when there are clear indications in that sentence that a different (but still rather common) meaning is being used.

5. Greek Reception History of οὕτως ... ὥστε in John 3.16

Not only do we find parallel passages for the grammar of John 3.16 in the ancient Greek corpus handed down to us, we also have evidence of how the grammar of John 3.16 was received by the Greek-speaking church. Gundry and Howell's own proposal for John 3.16 takes 16a (οὕτως γὰρ ἠγάπησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν κόσμον) as more properly part of the sentence found in 3.14–15, with 16b (ὥστε τὸν υἱὸν τὸν μονογενῆ ἔδωκεν, ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν μὴ ἀπόληται ἀλλ' ἔχη ζωὴν αἰώνιον) providing an additional independent statement parallel to it.⁵⁷ This seems unlikely, however, not just because of how convoluted it is, but also because of the fact that when the Greek Church Fathers cite 16a they consistently do so in conjunction with 16b and not with 14–15.⁵⁸

⁵⁷ Gundry and Howell, 'John 3:16', 35–9.

⁵⁸ See, for example, Eusebius, *De ecclesiastica theologia* 1.9.5; 1.12.6; 1.20.18; Athanasius, *Epistulae quattuor ad Serapionem* 1.20.5; Ps.-Athanasius, *Contra Sabellianos* 3; *Oratio quarta contra Arianos* 18; Basil, *Regulae morales* 5.1; Didymus the Blind, *Commentarii in Zacchariam* 4.236; *Commentarii in Psalmos* 22–26.10 p. 86 Gronewald; *Commentarii in Psalmos* 29–34 p. 221 Gronewald; Ps.-Macarius, *Sermones* 64 (collectio B) 4.29.2; Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catecheses ad illuminandos* 1–18 11.6; Chrysostom, *Adversus Judaeos (orations 1–8)* 3.4; *In illud: Pater, si possibile est, transeat* 2; *Ad eos qui scandalizati sunt* 17.4; *In Genesim* 27.1; *Expositiones in Psalmos* on Ps 41.4; *In Joannem* 27.2; *De perfecta caritate* 1; *De regressu* 14; Ps.-Chrysostom, *In Samaritanam* 2; *De caritate*; *In adorationem venerandae crucis*; *In annuntiationem deiparae*; Theodore, *Eranistes* p. 197 Ettliger; *Commentaria in Isaïam* 2, 3; *De incarnatione domini* 34; *Interpretatio in Psalmos* on Ps 29.11–13; 144.8; *Interpretatio in XII prophetas minores* on Zeph 3.16–18; *Haereticarum fabularum compendium* 5.2; *De providentia orationes decem* 10; Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarius in XII prophetas minores* vol. II, pp. 133, 310 Pusey; *Commentarii in Joannem* vol. I, pp. 226, 227, vol. II, p. 565 Pusey; *Fragmenta in sancti Pauli epistolam ad Romanos* vol. III, pp. 181, 247 Pusey; *De sancta trinitate dialogi I–VII* p. 507 de Durand; *Quod unus sit Christus* p. 768 de Durand; *Epistulae paschales sive Homiliae paschales (epist. 1–30)* 5.6; 13.4; *Glaphyra in Pentateuchum* 3, on Abraham and Isaac 2; *Expositio in Psalmos* on Ps 21.23; 91.5; *Fragmenta in Canticum canticorum* on 3.10; *Commentarius in Isaïam prophetam* 5.1; *Thesaurus de sancta consubstantiali trinitate*; *Concilium universale Ephesenum anno 431* 1.1.6, pp. 72, 92 Schwartz; Proclus, *Homilia de caede innocentium et de vidua* 8.33; Procopius, *Catena in Canticum canticorum* PG 87/2.1633; *Commentarii in Isaïam* PG 87/2.2524; *Commentarii in Genesim* 22.1; Justinian I, *Edictum rectae fidei* p. 168 Albertella,

Additionally, we have statements from Church Fathers which make explicit that they understand οὕτως as an intensifier. First, Origen says: 'In saying, "so loved (οὕτως ἠγάπησεν)", he shows the great intensity (πολλὴν δείκνυσι τὴν ἐπίτασιν), and in saying, "God the world", he shows the great difference between the Creator and the Creation.'⁵⁹ Second, Chrysostom says:

And the son of thunder, amazed at this and considering the exceeding nature of the love of God which he has shown to the human race, cried out and said, 'For God so (οὕτω) loved the world'. See how much wonder fills the statement. 'So (οὕτω)', he says, considering the magnitude (τὸ μέγεθος) of which he was about to speak. That is why he begins like that. So tell us, St John. 'So (οὕτω).' How? Tell us the measure (τὸ μέτρον). Tell us the magnitude (τὸ μέγεθος). Teach us the exceeding nature (τὴν ὑπερβολὴν). 'For God so (οὕτω) loved the world that he gave his only son so that everyone who believes in him will not perish but have eternal life.'⁶⁰

So the way in which John 3.16 was received by the Greek-speaking church too is in line with the traditional way in which it has been received by the English-speaking church, as featuring a correlative intensifier-result pair.

6. Conclusion

In the end, after all our discussion of conjunctions, cataphors, correlatives and corpora, we are left with – and left confident with – the traditional understanding of the Bible's best-known verse: 'For God so loved the world that he gave his only son that whoever believes in him shall not perish but have eternal life.'

Amelotti and Migliardi; *Chronicon Paschale* p. 683 Dindorf; Germanus I, περὶ ὁρων ζωῆς p. 64 Garton and Westerink; John of Damascus, *Contra Nestorianos* 31, 37; *Sacra parallela*; *Oratio in ficum arefactam et in parabolam vineae* 2; Theodorus Studites, *Parva Catechesis* 40; Photius I, *Bibliotheca* pp. 88, 184 Henry; Constantius VII Porphyrogenitus, *De contionibus militaribus* 1; Symeon Neotheologus, *Epistula de confessione* 3.

59 J. A. Cramer, *Catena Graecorum patrum in Novum Testamentum*, vol. II (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1841) 206.

60 *In Genesis* 27.3. Translation mine.