

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

MISREADINGS AND MISRENDERINGS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

II.

B. ERRORS OF INTERPRETATION.*

WHILE discussing in last December EXPOSITOR the subject of mispunctuation in the New Testament text, I had occasion to refer also, though incidentally, to some cases of misinterpretation, such as (τὸ) λοιπόν, “well then,” “therefore,” and καὶ—καί, “both—and.” I now propose to devote some pages to this special subject of *misinterpretation* by discussing a certain class of words generally misunderstood and in many cases giving rise to serious errors. In so doing I shall endeavour to account for the origin of the evil, and at the same time to indicate the general method of rectifying many of these errors.

The class of words I mean to discuss are such as ἵνα, ὅπως, ὅτι, διότι, ὡς ὅτι, πῶς, ὅ, τι, εἰ, ἦ, etc., which, as is well known, have not yet received due attention on the part of Biblical critics and commentators. It will be shown that these particles, which may appear insignificant in themselves, have a very important bearing upon the New Testament language and its interpretation. Most of them recur almost times without number, and so they, along with some other little words (as καί, οὖν, etc.), lend to the sacred text its peculiar colour and style, and at the same time

* By inadvertence, which I regret, the passage quoted in my previous article (EXPOSITOR, p. 426) from Soph. Ant. 443, appears misread. The whole should run thus: καὶ φημι δρᾶσαι κοῦκ ἀπαρνοῦμαι. (Cf. O.C. 317 καίφημι κάπό φημι, Ant. 442; Pl. Theact. 165A φᾶναι τε καὶ ἀπαρνεῖσθαι.) Jos. Ant. 6, 7, 4, Σαούλος δὲ ἀδικεῖν ὠμολόγει καὶ τὴν ἀμαρτίαν οὐκ ἤρνεῖτο—which passages restore the force of my argument that John i. 19 ὠμολόγησε καὶ οὐκ ἤρνήσατο is a sort of Græcism.

affect very materially not only its grammar but its very essence.

A good case to the point is afforded by the closing verses of Jesus' "Prayer of Consecration," as it stands in St. John's Gospel 17, 18-26. In these nine verses the particle *ἵνα* occurs no less than *ten* times, and each time the English versions render it by *that . . . may*, a turn which is of course an alternative expression for "to the intent that," "in order that."

In its current version the text referred to runs thus :—

"As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world. And for their sakes I sanctify myself, *that* they also *may* be sanctified in (A.V. through the) truth. Neither pray I for these alone: but for them also which shall believe (R.V. that believe) on me through their word; *that* they all *may* be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, *that* they also *may* be one in us: *that* the world *may* believe that thou hast sent me. And the glory which thou hast given me, I have given them: *that* they *may* be one, even as we are one: I in them and thou in me, *that* they *may* be perfected (A.V. perfect) in one, and *that* the world *may* know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me. Father, that which (A.V. they whom) thou hast given me, I will *that*, where I am, they also *may* be with me; *that* they *may* behold my glory which thou hast given me: for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world. O righteous Father, the world hath not known me, but I have known thee, and these have known that thou hast sent me. And I have declared (R.V. made known) unto them thy Name and will declare it (R.V. make it known): *that* the love wherewith thou hast loved me *may* be in them, and I in them."

Now in perusing the original of this text with care, we find that, while its vocabulary is quite plain, its gram-

matical construction is too dragging, and at the same time yields a very obscure sense. In fact, were it not for the occurrence twice of the vocative case (Father!), we might take the whole for a calm and deliberate request for certain things with a special long explanation of their object (*That—may-clauses*). As a matter of fact, we have here a long series of sentences succeeding one another in the relation of request and purpose of the thing requested, sentences, however, which show no clear connection with, or dependence upon, one another. It is true that in the first verse quoted (v. 19, “for their sakes I sanctify myself, *that* they also *may* be sanctified,” (ὕπερ αὐτῶν ἐγὼ ἀγιάζω ἑμαυτὸν ἵνα ᾧσι καὶ αὐτοὶ ἡγιασμένοι) the ἵνα-clause looks final “in order to,” and so could—though not logically—depend upon ἀγιάζω. But, despite the introductory “for their sakes,” can we well argue that Jesus was sanctifying (or consecrating) Himself *to the intent that* the apostles might also be sanctified? Again, what is the logical connection, in the succeeding several sentences, between the leading clauses and their subordinate *That—may-clauses*?

That here the particle ἵνα (*that—may*) is the source of the difficulty, is manifest. And as neither our classical lexicon nor our classical grammar can help us out of the dilemma, we must turn to post-classical Greek for an explanation; that is, we must consider the post-classical usages of the particle ἵνα. Now as the history of ἵνα is inseparable from the history of the infinitive, we have to say a few words about the latter. Such remarks, moreover, will, I hope, prove interesting and useful to Biblical students unfamiliar with the post-classical and subsequent history of Greek, and, what is more to our present purpose, will enable such readers to account for a whole series of vexed questions in the New Testament language.

We know from our classical Greek grammar that one of

the functions of the infinitive was—as still is in some modern languages¹—to do duty for the imperative, in that it expressed a *demand*, *exhortation*, or *wish*, as: ἐξεῖναι, μὴ ἐξεῖναι for ἐξέστω, μὴ ἐξέστω; χαίρειν for χαίρε; εὖ πράττειν for εὖ πράττοις. That this usage, which was common in classical Greek—it occurs some 500 times in the leading representatives of classical literature²—survived down to Græco-Roman times, appears abundantly from the contemporary inscriptions recording public decrees and law provisions; even the New Testament writings supply some examples, *e.g.*: Rom. 12, 15 χαίρειν μετὰ χαιρόντων, κλαίειν μετὰ κλαιόντων. Acts 15, 23. James 1, 1. Col. 4, 6 εἰδέναι πῶς δεῖ ὑμᾶς ἐνὶ ἐκάστῳ ἀποκρίνεσθαι. Phil. 3, 16 εἰς ὃ ἐφθάσαμεν τὸ αὐτὸ στοιχεῖν. Luke 9, 3 μηδὲν αἴρετε εἰς τὴν ὁδὸν μήτε ράβδον μήτε πήραν . . . μήτε ἀνὰ δύο χιτῶνας ἔχειν. Eph. 4, 22. Similarly we must read in 1 Tim. 1, 3 καθὼς παρεκάλεσά σε, προσμῆναι ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, “as I requested thee, do stop at Ephesos.”

We further know that the above jussive or hortative and desiderative function of the infinitive was concurrently and pre-eminently performed first by the imperative, either simple (as λέγε, εἴπατε), or periphrastic (by means of φέρε, ἄγε, δεῦρο, ἄγε ὅπως, as: Ar. Eq. 1011; Nub. 489; Eccl. 149; Pl. Gorg. 495D. Rep. 336D); next by the independent subjunctive (λέγωμεν; μὴ εἴπῃς, μηδεὶς εἴπῃ), then by the independent future indicative simple (ἐρεῖς, πάντως τοῦτο δράσεις. Matt. 5, 43 ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου. 6, 5 οὐκ ἔσεσθε ὡς οἱ ὑποκριταί. 20, 26. 5, 48. 5, 21; 27, 33 οὐ φονεύσεις, etc.; 21 ἐρεῖτε. Luke 4, 12. Acts 23, 5. Rom. 7, 7. 1 Cor. 9, 9, etc.); and lastly, in a milder form, by the independent optative (ὄναίω, λέγοις ἄν, ἀλλὰ βουληθείης).

¹ For instance, in French, as: *voir* for *voyez*, like *lδεῖν* and *lδέ*,—not to speak of English, which has only one form for both the infinitive and imperative, as: see for *lδεῖν* and *lδέ*.

² This computation is based upon Richard Wagner's pamphlet, *Der Gebrauch des Imperativischen Infinitivs im Griechischen*, Schwerin, 1891.

We finally learn from the post-classical and Græco-Roman history of the language that, long before the Christian era, the infinitive had begun to shift its position.¹ That is to say, on the one hand it gradually receded before *ἵνα* + subjunctive, even after such verbs as *θέλω*—(in the New Testament we find *θέλω ἵνα* in Matt. 7, 12. Mark 6, 25. 9, 30. Luke 6, 31. John 17, 24);—and, on the other, it steadily spread at the expense of finite dependent clauses of the type: *ὅτε ἔλεγεν, ὅπως* or *ἵνα λέγῃ* or *εἶπῃ, ἐπεὶ εἶπεν*, etc., and particularly at the expense of the kindred participle: *λέγων, λέξων* or *ἐρῶν, εἰπῶν, εἰρηκῶς*). Thus the above variety of dependent verbal and participial constructions was now largely exchanged for the infinitive of the type: *εἰπεῖν, τοῦ εἰπεῖν, εἰς τὸ εἰπεῖν, ἐν τῷ λέγειν, μετὰ τὸ εἰπεῖν*, etc. And as the ground conquered was wider than the ground lost, the infinitive during the Græco-Roman period became unduly common, especially with the article.

It may be added here by the way that this changed position and function of the infinitive remained more or less undisturbed through the succeeding transitional period (300–600 A.D.). However, soon hereafter the old rival of the infinitive, the particle *ἵνα* (now, owing to its great frequency, shortened to *νά*), gained absolute supremacy and eventually dislodged the infinitive altogether. It is in this way that the Greek language has lost the infinitive since the Middle Ages, its place having been taken chiefly by *ἵνα* or rather *νά* with the subjunctive.

But as we are concerned here mainly with the Greek of the Græco-Roman times, let us return for one more moment to the infinitive of that period. We have already said that on the one hand it gained largely and on the other it lost in favour of *ἵνα* + subjunctive. We have fur-

¹ Students interested in the particulars of the infinitive in this period will find ample information in my *Hist. Gr. Grammar*, §§ 2062–2098, and especially in Appendix vi., pp. 568–580.

ther explained that the *gains* or conquests were made at the expense of dependent finite and participial clauses, but omitted to indicate the particular kind and nature of the *losses* sustained. Well, these were chiefly in the direction of the independent, *i.e.* jussive or hortative and desiderative function of the infinitive. For this function was now transferred to *ἵνα* + subjunctive, except in the set phraseology of decrees and laws mentioned above, a mode of prescription imitated even in the Christian decrees, namely the canons of the Church Councils.

Here, then, we see that *ἵνα* + subj. begins in post-classical antiquity to act as a substitute for the jussive and desiderative infinitive, that is, in the sense of classical *ἄγε* or *φέρε* and *εἶθε* or *εἰ γάρ*, which are absent from New Testament Greek. And not only did *ἵνα* dislodge the infinitive from its imperatival domain: it soon attacked also the other kindred exponents, that is, the imperatival Future indicative, the hortative Subjunctive, the (desiderative) Optative, and the third person Imperative, and eventually succeeded in ousting them, one after another, from the living language; nay, it did not even spare its old associate and synonym *ὅπως*, but forced it to take refuge in the domain of artificial or literary style. In other words, apart from its other multifarious usages, the particle *ἵνα* came to be, as early as Græco-Roman antiquity, and probably under the influence of Latin *ut* and *utinam* (as if *ut-ina-m*), the chief exponent of (indirect) command, exhortation, and wish (besides purpose), thus acting much like classical *ἄγε*, *εἶα*—*εἰ γάρ* or *εἶθε*, *let, do—may! would that!* etc. Now that *ἵνα* here is no longer a conjunction, but an *adverb*, is too obvious to be dwelt upon. What we may add profitably here is that, as time went on this hortative particle or adverb spread in the lines indicated above, and ended, during the Middle Ages, by becoming, in the shortened form *νά*, the ordinary exponent of in-

direct command and wish, as well as the regular means of forming the Future tense, as we now witness it in modern Greek.

That the foregoing historical survey of the infinitive and its rival and successor *iva* has a direct and important bearing upon the language of the New Testament is manifest. For we are now in a position to account for the peculiar character, function, and relative frequency of both the infinitive and *iva* in the sacred compositions. Keeping this important fact well impressed upon our mind, that is, reading the infinitive and the particle *iva* in the light of their new or post-classical function, when we study the Greek Testament, we shall have no difficulty in grasping the true meaning of all the numerous passages containing an abnormal infinitive or *iva*-clause. Regarding the latter, with which we are particularly concerned here, we shall find that, alike in the New Testament and in the non-Atticistic or unlearned secular compositions of this period, this particle performs a double function, in that it acts on the one hand as a final conjunction, and on the other as a hortative adverb, serving to form or strengthen an imperatival, hortative, or optatival clause.

The following classified data may now illustrate the process and nature of the whole case.

A. "*Iva* AS A CONJUNCTION very often takes the place of the *dependent* Infinitive. Here *iva* governs regularly the subjunctive and stands in particular:—

(a) For almost any Infinitive, except that depending on verbs or expressions of "saying, thinking, perceiving, expecting, swearing," when otherwise it would have been resolved by $\delta\tau\iota$ ¹ with the indicative. To adduce here illustrations of *iva* for the infinitive is quite needless, seeing

¹ Since early Græco-Roman times also by $\delta\iota\delta\tau\iota$, $\omega\varsigma \delta\tau\iota$ ($\omega\sigma\beta\tau\iota$), and $\pi\omega\varsigma$, as we shall see in our next paper.

that every page of the unlearned compositions of the time can testify to the fact.¹

(b) For the *inferential* Infinitive, that is, for the Infinitive preceded by *ὥστε* (which *ὥστε* is scarce in New Testament Greek, and absent from John, except 3, 16): so as to, so that. Thus the sentence: *ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν ὥστε ἐκβάλλειν τὰ πνεύματα*, "so as to cast out," now assumes the form: *ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν ἵνα ἐκβάλλωσι τὰ πνεύματα*, "to cast out." Here the analysis of the Infinitive to an *ἵνα*-clause involved the collocation *ὥστε ἵνα*, which collocation naturally led to the dropping of *ὥστε*.²

LXX. Job 7, 16 *οὐ γὰρ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ζήσομαι ἵνα μακροθυμήσω* (= *ὥστε μακροθυμήσαι*). So too Tobit 3, 15; Sap. 13, 9; 2 Macc. 6, 24; Philo i. 181, 43 *πιστός ἐστιν ἵνα τοὺς λόγους αὐτοῦ μηδὲν τῶν ὄρκων διαφέρειν*. So 294, 3. 408, 23, etc. Jos. B.J. 4, 3, 10 *πρὸς τοσοῦτον ἤκομεν συμφορῶν ἵνα ἡμᾶς ἐλεήσωσι καὶ πολέμιοι*; so *ib.* 6, 2, 1 *μη γενοίμην ζῶν οὕτως αἰχμάλωτος ἵνα παύσωμαι κτλ.* (= *ὥστε παύσασθαι*). Epict. Diss. 1, 19, 13. 1, 27, 8 *ἔστω ἐμὲ <μη> εἶναι Σαρπηδόνα τὸν τοῦ Διὸς υἱὸν ἵν' οὕτω γενναίως εἶπω* (= *ὥστε με εἰπεῖν*). So too 1, 29, 23; then 2, 2, 16 *οὕτω μωρὸς ἵνα μὴ ἴδῃ*. So further: 2, 3, 3. 2, 16, 45. 2, 18, 22. 2, 22, 9; and so on *passim*. Plut. ii. 67 F; Inst. Orat. 1 *οὐ γὰρ τοιαύτης ἀρετῆς ἐπιδικάζομαι ἵνα τοῖς Ὀμήρου μύθοις πείθωμαι*. Lucian, Amores 50 (ii. 455); De Lectu 19 (= ii. 931); Galen. viii. 45 E; Hermas Sim. 9, 1, 10 *τὰ δένδρα ἐκεῖνα κατάκαρπα ἦν, ἄλλοις καὶ ἄλλοις καρποῖς κεκοσμημένα, ἵνα ἰδῶν τις αὐτὰ ἐπιθυμήσῃ φαγεῖν ἐκ τῶν καρπῶν αὐτῶν*. Ignat. 680 A *πολλὰ ἡμῖν λείπει*

¹ For such examples of all periods see my *Hist. Gr. Grammar*, pp. 570, 572, and 574 ff.

² The reappearance in later times of *ὥστε* with the *Subjunctive* points to fastidiousness and misplaced reaction against *ἵνα*, now disdained as a too common word. Basil. iii. 1081c *ὥστε ἐπάναγκες ᾗ*. Acta Tho. 61, 73 (ed. Bonnet), *ὥστε μὴ κατεξουσίασθαι μου* (= *ἵνα μὴ -σθαι*). Theoph. 270, 23, etc. See my *Hist. Gr. Grammar*, §§ 1760 f. and 1764 f.

ἵνα Θεοῦ μὴ λειπώμεθα. Clement. 2, 29, οὕτω νήπιοι ἵνα κτλ. 2, 30; etc.

So then in the New Testament also, as: Luke 9, 45 τὸ ῥῆμα ἦν παρακακαλυμμένον ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἵνα μὴ αἰσθωνται αὐτό, "so that they could not perceive it" (not "that they should not" perceive it, since there was no intention of concealing it from them). John 9, 2 τίς ἤμαρτεν, οὗτος ἦ οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ, ἵνα τυφλὸς γεννηθῆ; "so that he should be born." 9, 36 καὶ τίς ἐστι, κύριε, ἵνα πιστεύσω εἰς αὐτόν; "so that I may believe in him." So further: Rev. 13, 13; 1 John 3, 1; 1 Thess. 5, 4; 1 John 1, 9 πιστός ἐστι καὶ δίκαιος ἵνα ἀφῆ τὰς ἀμαρτίας, "He is trusting and just so as to overlook our sins";—and so on frequently.

B. *Ἰνα* AS A HORTATIVE ADVERB stands for the *independent* Infinitive, then for any verbal form expressing command, exhortation, or wish. Here, therefore, *ἵνα*, which again governs the Subjunctive, represents the jussive Infinitive, the Imperative, the imperatival Future, the hortative Subjunctive, and the independent or desiderative Optative. This construction goes back to classical antiquity¹ with the mere difference that ὅπως here is far commoner than *ἵνα*, obviously because *ἵνα* then was a feeble rival of ὅπως. At all events, here both ὅπως and *ἵνα* are hortative *adverbs*, acting much like *äγε, εἶθε, let, do; may! would that!*

Aesch. Prom. 68 ὅπως μὴ σαυτὸν οἰκτιεῖς. Agam. 600. Soph. Ant. 776. 1332 ὅπως μηκέτ' εἰσίδω. Ai. 697. 1221 ὅπως προσείποιμεν, "may we greet!" Phil. 238. O.T. 1518. Tr. 618. 955. El. 637 (cf. El. 1134. Tr. 602). O.T. 1389 ἵν' ἦ τυφλός = εἶθε ἦν. O.T. 621 ἵνα πίεται, "he

¹ The supposed omission in this case of *δρα* or *σκόπει* is untenable. If we are to assume an ellipsis, the only word to be supplied would be *äγε*, the frequent companion preceding the imperative and hortative subjunctive; that is to say: (*äγε*) ὅπως (μὴ) + fut. indic. (or aor. subj.) = simple imperative, subjunctive, or optative.

will drink," 1377. Soph. Phil. 987 Ζεὺς ἐσθ' ἴν' εἰδῆς, Ζεὺς ὁ τῆσδε γῆς κρατῶν, "it is Zeus, do know it." O.C. ἀλλ' ἴνα μὴ προσπέσης (= μὴ προσπέσης). Eur. Cycl. 595. 630. Or. 1060. H.F. 504. I.T. 321. Ar. Aves 131 ὅπως παρέσει μοι (= πάρισθι). So Pl. 326 ὅπως δέ μοι καὶ τὰλλα συμπαραστάται ἔσσεσθε (= γένεσθέ μοι). Eq. 222 ὅπως ἀμυνεῖ τὸν ἄνδρα. Nub. 824 ὅπως δὲ τοῦτο μὴ διδάξεις μηδένα. So too 1177. 1464 ff.; Eccl. 297 ff.; Pax 1017; Vesp. 1222; Ran. 7 μόνον ἐκεῖν' ὅπως μὴ 'ρεῖς, "but be sure not to say that." Xen. An. 1, 7, 3 ὅπως οὖν ἔσσεσθε ἄνδρες ἄξιοι τῆς ἐλευθερίας. Cyr. 1, 3, 18 ὅπως οὖν μὴ ἀπολλῆ. 4, 2, 39. 4, 1, 16 ὅπως μὴ ἀναγκάσωμεν. Plat. Crat. 430 D ἀλλ' ὅπως μὴ ἦ τοῦτο. Prot. 313 C ὅπως γε μὴ ὁ σοφιστῆς ἐξαπατήσῃ ἡμᾶς. Cf. Meno 77 A. (Cf. also Rep. 445 δεῦρο ἴνα καὶ ἴδῃς.) Aeschin. 3, 21 ἴνα γε μὴ δρασμῶ χρήσῃ.¹ LXX. Macc. 2, 1, 9 ἴνα ἄγῃτε τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς σκηνοπηγίας τοῦ χασελεῦ μηνός.

Epict. Diss. 2, 11, 18 ἴνα λοιπὸν ἀπὸ τινων γνωρίμων καὶ διευκρινημένων ὀρμώμενοι χρώμεθα ἐπὶ τῶν ἐπὶ μέρους διηρθρωμέναις ταῖς προλήψεσιν, "let us use or apply." 3, 4, 9 ἄγε ἴνα Σώφρων στεφανωθῆ, "let Sophron be crowned" (mark here the collocation of the two synonyms, ἄγε ἴνα!). So *ib.* ἄγε ἴνα τηρήσω τὴν ἔμαντοῦ προαίρεσιν, "let me keep." 4, 1, 41 ἴνα μὴ μωρὸς ἦ ἀλλ' ἴνα μάθῃ ἃ ἔλεγεν ὁ Σωκράτης (= μὴ ἔστω μωρὸς ἀλλὰ μαθέτω). Ench. 17 (23) ἂν πτωχὸν ὑποκρίνασθαι σε θέλῃ (ὁ διδάσκαλος), ἴνα καὶ τοῦτον εὐφυῶς ὑποκρίνῃ (= ὑποκρίνου, "do play his part properly!").

Canon. Concil. Sard. (about 343-4 A.D.) 3 καὶ τοῦτο προστεθῆναι ἀναγκαῖον ἴνα μηδεὶς ἐπισκόπων εἰς ἑτέραν ἐπαρχίαν διαβαίῃ, *ut episcopi non transeant*. *ib.* ἴνα καὶ αὐθις ἢ κρίσις ἀνανεωθῆ (= ἀνανεωθῆτω), *ut iterum concilium renovetur*; then 10; and so on through the Middle

¹ For many other classical examples of *ὅπως* in this sense, see W. Goodwin, *Greek Moods and Tenses* (1889), §§ 271 ff.

Ages down to modern Greek speech, where *ίνα*, in its shortened form *νά*, is very common.¹

It is in the light of these data, then, that we must read a great many passages in the New Testament. Thus Mark 5, 23 *ίνα* ἐλθὼν ἐπιθῆς αὐτῇ τὰς χεῖρας *ίνα* σωθῆ καὶ ζήσῃ = “do come and lay thy hands on her, so that she may be saved and live” (not “I pray thee that,” etc. There is no ellipsis here).

In John 10, 37 f. Jesus is represented as saying to the Jews: “If I do not the works of my father, believe me not; but if I do (them), though ye believe not me, believe the works: *that* ye *may* know and understand (γινῶτε, Rec. πιστεύσητε, believe) that the Father is in me and I in the Father.”

Surely the construction, “believe the works of my Father *that ye may* know that He is in me,” etc., has no logical connection. It is true that commentators here explain away the difficulty by freely paraphrasing “that ye may perceive once for all and then go on advancing in ever fuller perception” (Westcott); but this is theorizing and speculating, possibly suggested by the English verb “may,” which is absent from the Greek text. Here Jesus is obviously referring to His previous remarks to the Jews (5, 35 ff.): Ye believe not in me whom the Father has sent. If we remember those remarks, the reading of the present passage regains its intrinsic simplicity; that is to say:

“If I am not doing the works of my Father, believe me not; but if I am doing (them), even should ye not believe me, do believe in these works. Do recognise and do know (*ίνα* γινῶτε καὶ γινώσκητε, Rec. καὶ πιστεύσητε: and do believe) that the Father is in me and I in the Father.”

That this is the true meaning of the passage, appears

¹ For examples from all periods see my *Hist. Gr. Grammar*, Greek Index under *ίνα*.

also from the repetition of the same exhortation further below (14, 11), where Jesus employs the simple or direct Imperative: πιστεύετε μοι ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί. "Do believe."

In the same way John 15, 11 f.: "These things have I spoken unto you, *that* my joy *may* be (Rec. remain) in you and *that* your joy *may* be fulfilled (A.V. *might* be full). This is my commandment, *that* ye love one another, as I have loved you. Greater love hath no man than this, *that* a man lay down his life for his friends." The passage should be read as follows:—

"These things have I been preaching unto you. *May* my joy be (Rec. abide) in you and your joy be consummated! This is my commandment: *do* love one another, as I have loved you. Greater love than this no man has. Would that (or, If only) every one lay down his life for his friends!"

In Romans 1, 13 ff. the English versions read:—

"And (R.V. Now) I would not have you ignorant, brethren, that oftentimes I purposed to come unto you (and was hindered [A.V. but was let] hitherto), that I might have some fruit among (R.V. in) you also, even as among other (R.V. as in the rest of the) Gentiles. I am debtor both to the Greeks and to the barbarians, both to the wise and the foolish (A.V. unwise). So, as much as in me is, I am ready to preach the gospel to you also that are in Rome."

Thus read, St. Paul's words are not only obscure and incoherent; they are virtually perverted in more senses than one. I say incoherent, because I fail to see any logical connection among these three sentences: "I wished to come to you to have some fruit among you—I am debtor to the Greeks and the barbarians—so I must preach the gospel to you also that are in Rome." Again, the break caused by the alleged parenthetical clause ("I was hindered

hitherto") and the severance, through a full stop, of "Gentiles" from "alike Greeks and barbarians," which manifestly belong together (Gentiles, namely Greeks and barbarians), ought to arouse the suspicion of editors against the current way of reading the passage. For my part, I believe the text is grievously mispunctuated and misunderstood, the mischief being of course due to the troublesome *ἴνα*. There is little doubt but that St. Paul wrote and read the passage as follows:—

Οὐ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι πολλάκις προεθέμην ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ ἐκωλύθην ἄχρι τοῦ δεῦρο. Ἴνα τινὰ καρπὸν σχῶ καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν καθὼς καὶ ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς ἔθνεσιν, Ἑλλησὶ τε καὶ βαρβάροις, σοφοῖς τε καὶ ἀνοήτοις! Ὅφειλέτης εἰμι οὕτω τὸ κατ' ἐμὲ πρόθυμον καὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς ἐν Ῥώμῃ εὐαγγελίσασθαι.

Which is to be interpreted in English:—

"And I wish you not to ignore, brethren, that I oftentimes planned to come to you, and that I have been prevented hitherto. May I bear some fruit among you also, as among the rest of the Gentiles, alike Greeks and barbarians, alike wise and foolish!

"It is my duty, then, as willingly as I can, to preach the gospel to you also that are in Rome."

It is the mischievous *ἴνα*, further, that has led to the mispunctuation and mistranslation of Colossians 4, 16: "And when this epistle hath been read amongst you, cause that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans, and that ye likewise read the epistle from Laodicea."

We should of course read: καὶ ὅταν ἀναγνωσθῆ παρ' ὑμῖν ἡ ἐπιστολή, ποιήσατε ἴνα ἐν τῇ Λαοδικέων ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀναγνωσθῆ. Καὶ τὴν ἐκ Λαοδικείας ἴνα καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀναγνώτε.

And translate: "And when this epistle hath been read amongst you, cause it to be read also in the church of the Laodiceans. Moreover do ye also read the epistle from Laodicea."

But I must now return to the long passage of St. John (17, 18 ff.) with which I have opened this paper. As the foregoing illustrations fully apply to it, we can now read it without special comment. I shall only, for the sake of convenience, give, in parallel columns, both the Greek original and a fresh English version of it, so as to bring out more clearly the changes involved both in the punctuation and translation.

Καθὼς ἐμέ ἀπέστειλας εἰς τὸν κόσμον καὶ γὰρ ἀπέστειλα αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν κόσμον, καὶ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν (ἐγὼ) ἀγιάζω ἑμαυτόν. Ἵνα ᾧσιν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἡγιασμένοι ἐν ἀληθείᾳ! Οὐ περὶ τούτων δὲ ἐρωτῶ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τῶν πιστευόντων διὰ τοῦ λόγου αὐτῶν εἰς ἐμέ. Ἵνα πάντες ἐν ᾧσιν! Καθὼς σύ, πατήρ, ἐν ἐμοὶ καὶ γὰρ ἐν σοί, ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν (Rec. adds ἐν) ᾧσιν! Ἵνα ὁ κόσμος πιστεύσῃ ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας, καὶ γὰρ τὴν δόξαν ἣν δέδωκάς μοι δέδωκα αὐτοῖς! Ἵνα ᾧσιν ἐν καθὼς ἡμεῖς ἐν, ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ σὺ ἐν ἐμοί! Ἵνα ᾧσιν τετελειωμένοι εἰς ἓν! Ἵνα γινώσκῃ ὁ κόσμος ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας, καὶ ἡγάπησας αὐτούς, καθὼς ἐμὲ ἡγάπησας! Πάτερ, ὃ (Rec. οὗς) δέδωκάς μοι θέλω ἵνα ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ κακείνοι ᾧσιν, μετ' ἐμοῦ! Ἵνα θεωρῶσιν τὴν δόξαν τὴν ἐμὴν ἣν δέδωκάς μοι! ὅτι ἡγάπησάς με πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, πατήρ δίκαιε.

“As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I sent them into the world, and in their behalf am sanctifying myself. May they also be sanctified in truth! Now I am not praying in behalf of these alone, but in behalf of them also that believe in me by their word. May all be one! As thou, Father, art in me and I in thee, may they also be in us! (Rec. one through us!). May the world come to believe that it is thou who hast sent me, and that the glory which thou hast given me I have given to them! May they be one, as we are one: I in them and thou in me! May they be consummated into one!¹ May the world know that thou hast sent me, and that thou hast loved them, even as thou hast loved me! Father, that which (Rec. those whom) thou hast given me, I do love: where I am, may they also be: with me! May they behold my glory which thou hast given me! for thou didst love me before the foundation of the world, righteous Father!

¹ That is: “May they become a perfect unity!”

Καὶ ὁ κόσμος σε οὐκ ἔγνω, ἐγὼ δέ
σε ἔγνω. Καὶ οὗτοι ἔγνωσαν ὅτι
σύ με ἀπέστειλας. Καὶ ἐγνώρισα
αὐτοῖς τὸ ὄνομά σου καὶ γνωρίσω.
Ἴνα ἡ ἀγάπη ἣν ἠγάπησάς με ἐν
αὐτοῖς ᾗ, καὶ ἐν αὐτοῖς!

Now the world has not recog-
nised thee, but I have recognised
thee. These too have recognised
that thou hast sent me. I have
both declared unto them thy
name and will be declaring it.
May the love wherewith thou
hast loved me be among them!
I also among them!"

As will be seen, there is a substantial difference between the current versions (either English or foreign) and the one now given above. As to the relative merits of either, the reader who has followed the preceding historical exposition with an unbiassed eye can form an opinion for himself. But whatever his choice may be, one thing is certain. As already pointed out, the current versions represent Jesus as petitioning the Father in behalf of Himself, then of His apostles and believers in a rather argumentative manner; that is to say, He appears to be strongly emphasizing the various purposes of His petition by means of a long string of final *That*-clauses, thus appealing to the *mind*. Now a petition of this nature and form would be surely too narrow and unbecoming for Jesus; too inappropriate and unnatural for the solemnity and pathos of the occasion; too calm to be reconciled with the *agony* of Gethsemane; in short, too speculative and argumentative for the character of a prayer, and the text is certainly a valedictory *prayer*. On the other hand, as now read above, Jesus' words regain, I hope, their original form, meaning, and tone. Here Jesus, with His eyes raised up to heaven (*v. 1 ἐπάρας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν*), is addressing from His *heart*, in *plain* and *direct* language, a fervent, pathetic, and sublime prayer to the Father: a farewell prayer directly for Himself, directly for His apostles, directly for the world.

A. N. JANNARIS.