

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

5-1-1948

The Expression of Purpose in the Johannie Writings

William John Hassold

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_hassoldw@csl.edu

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



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hassold, William John, "The Expression of Purpose in the Johannie Writings" (1948). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 267.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/267>

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

**THE EXPRESSION OF PURPOSE
IN THE JOHANNINE WRITINGS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. The Reason for This Study 1
II. The Classes . . . A Thesis Presented to 3
III. Subsidiary . . . The Faculty of Concordia Seminary 23
Conclusion . . . Department of New Testament Theology 24
Bibliography 27

**In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Bachelor of Divinity**

**by
William John Hassold**

May 1948

Approved by:

W. Arndt.
Otto E. John

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE EXPRESSION OF PURPOSE IN THE JOHANNINE WRITINGS

I. The Reason for This Study 1

II. *ἵνα* Clauses 3

III. Subsidiary Johannine Methods of Expressing Purpose 30

Conclusion 34

Bibliography 35

... a change which is often levelled against the grammarian is that he does not lay down the rules to which the language is to conform, but to study the language as it is used and attempts to analyze and record the workings of the language.

No language has ever received such careful and recent study as the language of the New Testament. And with good reason. In this language the message of the Gospel was given to men. In it the "oracles of God" were issued. And yet, in spite of all the careful and penetrating studies which have been made of the New Testament idiom, many vexing problems still remain. One by one these are being investigated and solutions are being reached.

One of the most vexing problems connected with the language of the New Testament is found in the language of St. John, the writer of the Fourth Gospel and of the three epistles which bear his name. There

seems to be a certain amount of grammar in them. St. John had certain peculiarities of style which have intrigued investigators for many years. One of the major problems which confronts a person as he attempts to study the Johannine writings from a grammatical point of view is the question, How does St. John express purpose? He uses a *ὅτι* clause

THE EXPRESSION OF PURPOSE IN THE JOHANNINE WRITINGS

I. The Reason for This Study

A charge which is often leveled against the grammarian is that he sits above a language and attempts to lay down rules and regulations to which the language must conform. A moment's reflection is enough to convince anyone that this is a caricature of the office and work of the grammarian. He does not lay down the rules to which the language is to conform, but he studies the language as it is used and attempts to analyze and record the workings of the language.

No language has ever received such careful and earnest study as the language of the New Testament. And with good reason! In this language the message of the Gospel was given to men. In it the "oracles of God" were issued. And yet, in spite of all the careful and penetrating studies which have been made of the New Testament idiom, many vexing problems still remain. One by one these are being investigated and solutions are being reached.

One of the most vexing problems connected with the language of the New Testament is found in the language of St. John, the writer of the Fourth Gospel and of the three epistles which bear his name. There

1

seems to be a certain sameness of grammar in them. St. John had certain peculiarities of style which have intrigued investigators for many years. One of the major problems which confronts a person as he attempts to study the Johannine writings from a grammatical point of view is the question, How does St. John express purpose? He uses a $\overset{\circ}{\iota}\nu\delta$ clause often; does he use other modes of expression? Are all $\overset{\circ}{\iota}\nu\delta$ clauses purposive in force? If not, what functions do they have? In this paper we shall attempt to analyze the various ways in which St. John expresses purpose and attempt to clarify the difficulties connected with them.

1. We shall not include the study of the grammar of the Apocalypse in this study, not because we deny the Johannine authorship of the book, but because it presents so many peculiar and distinctive problems.

II. "Iva Clauses

The most common method of expressing purpose in the Johannine writings is by means of a $\dot{\iota}\nu\alpha$ clause. The ordinary New Testament usage is the same. In St. John's writings, however, there are a number of difficult problems connected with the use of $\dot{\iota}\nu\alpha$. Is every $\dot{\iota}\nu\alpha$ clause intended to express purpose? Does St. John's use of $\dot{\iota}\nu\alpha$ betray an Aramaic background? Is there any foundation for the idea that St. John's use of $\dot{\iota}\nu\alpha$ may have been influenced by the uses of the Latin particle ut? Do the papyri shed any light on these matters? These are some of the more pressing problems which must be faced by anyone who wishes to discuss St. John's use of $\dot{\iota}\nu\alpha$.

The Arrangement of Material

A word of warning is in place at the beginning of this discussion. At times it is extremely difficult to distinguish between final and consecutive clauses. Purpose may be viewed as desired or contemplated result, and result as achieved purpose. It is for this reason that eminent exegetes such as H. A. W. Meyer and Bishop Lightfoot strove so valiently and with such a show of right against the idea that the final conjunctions ever introduce anything but purpose clauses.

Robertson points out the difficulties encountered by grammarians in organizing the material on the point under discussion.

Goodwin, therefore, treats "final and object-clauses" together as pure final clauses, object-clauses with verbs of care and effort, clauses with verbs of fearing. He gives a separate discussion of consecutive clauses. Burton

practically follows Goodwin. Viteau blends them all into one. Winer practically ignores consecutive clauses. Jan-naris pointedly says that the popular speech "avoids the consecutive construction" and uses *ὡς* with the infinitive for either final or consecutive (cf. Latin *ut* and English *that*) "thus confounding consecutive with final clauses." It was not quite that. As a matter of fact the various points of view shade off into one another very easily and sometimes quite imperceptibly. It is not always easy to distinguish purpose and result in the mind of the speaker or writer. The very word *finis* may be the end aimed at (purpose) or attained (result). My colleague, Prof. W. O. Carver, D.D., has suggested grouping these ideas all under result, either contemplated, feared, or attained. Some such idea is near the true analysis and synthesis.¹

One sentence in this quotation deserves to be underscored: "As a matter of fact the various points of view shade off into one another very easily and sometimes quite imperceptibly." In order to arrange this discussion of St. John's use of *ὡς* in a somewhat logical order we have elected to follow (with certain variations) the organization of material proposed by the Rev. H. P. V. Nunn in his admirable little volume on the syntax of the New Testament.²

In the discussion of St. John's use of *ὡς* we shall be guided by the following arrangement of material:

- (1) Adverbial Clauses.
 - (a) Final Clauses.
 - (b) Consecutive Clauses.
- (2) Noun Clauses.
 - (a) As Object.
 - (b) As Subject.
 - (c) In Apposition.
- (3) Explanatory Clauses.
- (4) Principal Clauses.

There are two important variations from the Rev. Mr. Nunn's line-up of material in the above outline. Both were made in the interest

1. Archibald T. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research, p. 980.
 2. H. P. V. Nunn, A Short Syntax of New Testament Greek, # 182.

of showing the historical development in the use of $\dot{\iota}\nu\alpha$. The discussion of principal clauses was moved from first into last place, and the discussions of subject and object clauses were transposed.

Origin of $\dot{\iota}\nu\alpha$ Clauses

In order to assess final clauses in the Johannine writings correctly cognizance must be taken of their origin. According to Robertson ³ final clauses had their origin in parataxis rather than in hypotaxis. To make his point, Robertson appeals to Gildersleeve, the eminent classicist, who said: "Nihil est in hypotaxi quod non prius fuerit in parataxi."

For a better understanding of this construction, consider the lone example in the Johannine writings, John 18:39, $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\epsilon\delta\epsilon\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\lambda\upsilon\sigma\omega$; A literal translation ("Do you wish? should I release him?") would indicate that the subjunctive mood is used in its volitive capacity. Examples of this construction may be found in the Homeric epics, although, already at the time of their composition, this idiom was on the decline.

This idiom was felt to be very harsh, and a conjunction was interposed between the two clauses. In New Testament Greek the most common particle is $\dot{\iota}\nu\alpha$, with $\acute{\omicron}\pi\omega\varsigma$ also being commonly found, although in the Johannine writings there is only one instance of the latter. The etymology of $\dot{\iota}\nu\alpha$ ⁴ is uncertain.

This much, however, can be asserted, that the particle is a demonstrative of some sort and is in the accusative case, expressing general

3. Robertson, op. cit., p. 981.

4. On the etymology of $\dot{\iota}\nu\alpha$ Robertson, loc. cit., says: "The etymology of $\dot{\iota}\nu\alpha$ is not certain. A fragment of Hesiod has $\dot{\iota}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\beta\epsilon\phi$. Perhaps $\dot{\iota}\nu\alpha$ is derived from this form. But at any rate in Homer, $\dot{\iota}\nu\alpha = \acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\acute{\epsilon}$ in Iliad 10, 127. After Homer, especially in the poets, it has the meaning 'where', 'in what place', 'whither.' The exact connection between this local demonstrative and relative sense and the final 'that' is not clear."

reference. This is brought out clearly when the sentence *ἔληλυθα ἵνα μαθῶ*, is translated literally, "I am come as to this," viz., "I may learn." The conjunction is used, as mentioned above, to avoid asyndeton and to show the connection between the clauses.

Adverbial Clauses

In the Johannine writings the majority of *ἵνα* clauses express purpose. The verb is generally in the subjunctive mood, rarely in the future indicative. As an example of the first kind we might mention the first *ἵνα* clause in the Gospel, 1:7, *οὗτος ἦλθεν εἰς μαρτυρίαν, ἵνα μαρτυρήσῃ περὶ τοῦ φωτός, ἵνα πάντες πιστεύσωσιν δι' αὐτοῦ.*

"He came for testimony to bear witness to the light, that all might believe through him."

A final clause with the future indicative is found in John 7:3, *μετάβηθι ἐντεῦθεν καὶ ὕπαγε εἰς Ἰουδαίαν, ἵνα καὶ οἱ μαθηταί σου θεωρήσουσιν τὰ ἔργα σου ἃ ποιεῖς.*

"Leave here and go to Judea, that your disciples may see the works you are doing."

As has already been stated the verb is generally in the subjunctive mood. At times, however, the future indicative is used. Is there any discernible difference between them in meaning?

Abbott is treading softly when he says: "The instances of *ἵνα* with the fut. in John are so few that no safe inference is possible as to any difference in meaning." He does, however, suggest reasons why the future indicative may have been used rather than the aorist subjunctive. In the case of John 7:3 he suggests that there may be an intention to

5. Ibid.

6. All translations in this paper, unless specially noted, are taken from the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament.

7. Edwin Abbott, Johannine Grammar, # 2690.

show the certainty of the result which the clause is aiming at. In reference to John 17:2 he says:

It is possible that the use of the future may have been facilitated by the tendency to substitute for forms of the 2nd aorist active forms of the 1st aorist active in -σα which resembled forms of the future. It would be an anachronism to suppose in the N. T. late Grk aorists εδωκα and εδωκα: but long before these forms came into use there might be a tendency to avoid the 2nd aorist of verbs in -μι because of their irregularity and erroneous use. . . . It is probable that ἴνα with particular futures that had an aorist subjunctive sound would come into use long before ἴνα had become customary with the future in general. But the future after ἴνα would also displace, at a comparatively early date, irregular and rare forms of the subjunctive.⁸

There may be one instance of a final clause with the present indicative in the Johannine writings. But this is far from certain.

Burton holds that the ἴνα clause in 1 John 5:20 is a final clause and suggests that the present indicative there "γινώσκουσιν is probably pregnant in force, 'that we may know, and whereby we do know'."⁹

There are two things to be noted about this passage: 1) The reading is far from certain. Nestle (17th edition) no longer follows the consensus of the 19th century editors in this passage, but has adopted the present subjunctive as the correct reading.¹⁰ 2) This ἴνα clause may also be construed as an explanatory clause modifying δαυοίαν.

The Johannine writings abound in examples of this mode of expressing purpose. To list all of the instances would be a well nigh interminable task; a few instances will suffice: John 3:15, 16, 17; 5:34; 6:30; 9:36; 12:47; 17:1, 11, 13, 19; 18:36; 19:35; 1 John 1:3; 3:5; 4:9; 5:13; 2 John 12; 3 John 8.

8. Ibid.

9. Edgar Dewitt Burton, Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek, # 189.

10. Eberhard Nestle and Erwin Nestle, Novum Testamentum Graece, in loc.

It is to be noted that an infinitive may also be used to express purpose. This will be discussed at greater length in the next chapter, but it is mentioned here because of the bearing which this fact has on explaining the peculiar uses of ἵνα in the Johannine writings.

The other type of adverbial clause introduced by ἵνα is a clause of consequence or result. It expresses the result achieved by the action indicated by the verb in the principal clause. Until recent years it was fervently maintained by many grammarians and commentators that a ἵνα clause could never, under any circumstances, express result, but now, as J. H. Moulton says,

the long debated question of " ἵνα ἑρμηνεύον " may be regarded as settled by the new light which has come in since H. A. W. Meyer waged heroic warfare against the idea that ἵνα could ever denote anything but purpose. All motive for straining the obvious meaning of words is taken away when we see that in the latest stage of Greek language-history the infinitive has yielded all its functions to the locution thus jealously kept apart from it.

One of the clearest examples of this in the Gospel is 9:2 where it is obvious that the ἵνα clause is intended to express actual result.

Ραββί, τίς ἥμαρτεν, οὗτος ἢ οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ, ἵνα τυφλὸς γεννηθῆι;

"Rabbi, who sinned, this man or his parents, that he was born blind?"

In the epistles of John one of the clearest examples is in 1 John 1:9,

πιστὸς, ἔστιν καὶ δίκαιος, ἵνα ἄφθ' ἡμῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας.

which the Revised Standard Version translates freely by, "He is faithful and just and will forgive our sins." Another very clear passage is

1 John 3:1 where the clause καὶ ἕσθ' ἵνα accents the ecbatic force of ἵνα.

12

How is this construction to be explained. Blass-Debrunner

11. J. H. Moulton, A Grammar of New Testament Greek, Vol. I, p. 206.

12. A. Debrunner, Friedrich Blass' Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch, # 391, 4.

13
 J. H. Moulton look upon the infinitive (ἀφικος ἐπιλαθέεσθαι) in Heb. 6:10 as a parallel to the use of the ἵνα clause of result. Robertson goes his own way to show that from the idiom of conceived result expressed by ἵνα , as in John 6:7, issued the idiom of actual result expressed by ἵνα .¹⁴

In this connection, one other problem confronts us. Is the formula ἵνα πληρωθῆ , occurring in John 12:39; 13:18; 15:25; 17:12; 18:9, 32; 19:24, 28, 36, intended to express purpose or result? In form, of course, it might express either.

Some scholars hold that the correct interpretation of these formulas is as follows: the writer viewed the action as a divine purpose which inevitably issued in result.¹⁵

The fact that St. Matthew employs the same formula has value in explaining St. John's usage. He employs exactly the same phrase, ἵνα πληρωθῆ , interchangeably with ὅπως πληρωθῆ , and the latter phrase never expresses result, but only purpose. From this we may incline to the view that in St. John's use, the formula ἵνα πληρωθῆ expressed the thought that God purposed to fulfill the Scriptures.

Noun Clauses

We now pass to the second portion of the discussion of ἵνα clauses: Noun clauses introduced by ἵνα . The line between object clauses and final clauses is extremely tenuous, and it would be dangerous to attempt to draw the line too firmly. However, for the sake of clarity of organization, we shall attempt it.

13. Moulton, op. cit., p. 204.

14. Robertson, op. cit., p. 998.

15. Burton, op. cit., § 222.

In the first place, St. John employs object clauses with $\dot{\iota}\nu$ after verbs which mean to entreat, to exhort, to command. The verb is once again in the subjunctive, and "the naturalness of the development is obvious from the simple fact that the purpose clause with $\dot{\iota}\nu$ is merely a use of the jussive subjunctive which makes its appearance after a verb of commanding or wishing entirely reasonable."¹⁶

Examples of the construction are quite common in the Johannine writings. See John 11:53, 57; 13:34; 15:17; 17:24, and other passages in the Gospel. In the epistles see 2 John 5.

As in the case of final and consecutive clauses, this use of the $\dot{\iota}\nu$ clause can be paralleled with an infinitive used in the same way. For examples of this see Acts 1:4 and Luke 9:39.

From object clauses it is but a short step to subject clauses. Heretical as it would have seemed to grammarians several decades ago to say that a $\dot{\iota}\nu$ clause might serve as the subject of a verb without some trace of purposive force being connected with it, today such a statement would be grammatical orthodoxy.

Following Nunn once more, we shall subdivide subject clauses into two groups: those which stand as the subject of the verb, and those which are used as subjects of predicates meaning it is profitable, it is sufficient, and the like.¹⁷ The verb is in the subjunctive, although in these clauses it has lost its volitive flavor entirely.

As a very clear example of the first type we may refer to the Savior's words to His disciples after they returned with food for Him

16. Moulton, op. cit., p. 208.

17. Nunn, op. cit., # 186 f.

after He had His conversation with the woman of Samaria, John 4:34, ἐμὸν βρώμα ἐστὶν ἵνα ποιῶ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψάντος με καὶ τελειώσω αὐτοῦ τὸ ἔργον.¹⁸ "My food is to do the will of him who sent me, and to accomplish his work." Another clear example of this is found in John 18:39, ἐστὶν δὲ ἑσθλήθειά ὑμῶν ἵνα ἐνα ἀπολύσω ὑμῶν ἐν τῷ πάσχα. "But you have a custom that I should release one man for you at the Passover."

Examples of the second use of a ἵνα clause as a subject are also very easy to find. Take John 11:50 as an example, συμφέρει ὑμῶν ἵνα εἷς ἄνθρωπος ἀποθάνῃ ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ. "It is expedient for you that one man die for the people."

Examples of infinitives serving as subjects of verbs may be found in Mark 2:15, Luke 18:25; 20:22.

The use of ἵνα in a subject clause made it very easily possible for the common people to go another step beyond classical usage. They now began to employ it in appositional clauses. These clauses, outside of the Johannine writings, are none too common; but in St. John's writings they are a sign that he was a man of the people and wrote and spoke in the way in which the people about him spoke. Therefore he employed a ἵνα clause in apposition to a noun or pronoun, thereby explaining or expanding its meaning. The verb is always found in the subjunctive mood. Examples of the construction are to be found in all the Johannine writings. As a model we may mention 1 John 5:3, αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ ἵνα τὰς ἐντολάς αὐτοῦ τηρῶμεν. "For this is the love of

18. The variation in texts between the present subjunctive and the aorist subjunctive need not detain us, since we are interested here especially in the mood of the verb. However, most editors prefer the present subjunctive.

God, that we keep his commandments." It may be noted that the clauses in apposition may follow a noun or pronoun in any case.

Examples in the First Epistle of John are 3:1, 11, 23; 4:21; 5:3. In the Second Epistle, 6; and in the Third Epistle, 4. In the Gospel we may mention 6:29, 39, 40; 13:15; 15:8, 12, 13; 17:3; 19:39.

Parallel passages employing the infinitive are James 1:27; Acts 15:28, 29; 1 Thess. 4:3.

Explanatory Clauses

Closely connected with the use of $\dot{\nu}\epsilon$ in a clause in apposition is the next use of $\dot{\nu}\alpha$. It is used in an explanatory clause which is used "to explain or limit the meaning of a noun or adjective, or even
19 of a verb." In such cases, they are similar to exepogetic infinitives.

Examples of this use of the infinitive are found in Matt. 3:11; Luke 8:8; Rom. 13:11; 11:15; Acts 15:10.

If we wish to join the "splitters" among the grammarians (who are analogous to the "splitters" among the biologists, i. e., they wish to subdivide into as many separate species as possible), we might follow Burton who separates these clauses into two classes: clauses expressing complementary limitation of nouns and adjectives signifying authority, power, fitness, need, set time, etc.; and clauses which define the con-
20 tent, ground, or method of the action denoted by the verb.

A good example of the first class is found in John 12:23, $\epsilon\lambda\eta\lambda\upsilon\theta\epsilon\nu$ $\eta\ \omega\pi\alpha\ \dot{\nu}\alpha\ \delta\omicron\zeta\alpha\epsilon\theta\eta$; $\delta\ \nu\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \dot{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\upsilon$. "The hour has come for the Son of man to be glorified." This passage is especially important

19. Nunn, op. cit., # 195.

20. Burton, op. cit., # 216 f.

because it figures in the discussion of the possible Aramaic background of the Johannine writings. When this subject is considered further evidence for the correctness of placing it here will be given.

The second class of epexegetical ἵνα clauses may take as its model John 9:22, ἡ δὲ γὰρ εὐσεβείντο· οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἵνα ἐάν τις ἀδελφὸν ὁμολογήσῃ Χριστόν, ἀποσυνάγωγος γίνηται. "For the Jews had agreed that if anyone should confess him to be Christ, he was to be put out of the synagogue." Here the clause introduced by ἵνα gives the content of the agreement. In John 8:56, which is in dispute, Burton holds that the ἵνα clause gives the cause of the rejoicing.²¹ Bauer, on the other hand, would place this passage under the classification of object clauses after verbs of striving.²²

Principal Clauses

In New Testament Greek it is possible for a ἵνα clause to stand independent of any other verb to express a command, just as an infinitive may do. Moulton says:

An innovation in Hellenistic is ἵνα c. subj. in commands, which takes the place of classical ὅπως c. fut. indic. Whether it was independently developed, or merely came in as an obvious equivalent, we need not stop to enquire. In any case it fell into line with other tendencies which weakened the telic force of ἵνα; and from a very restricted activity in the vernacular of the NT period it advanced to a predominant position in Hellenistic syntax. In the papyri we have a moderate number of exx.²³

The question quite naturally arises, Are there any examples of this use in St. John's writings? We would answer: there may be. The two

21. Ibid., #217.

22. Walter Bauer, Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur, sub ἵνα.

23. Moulton, op. cit., p. 178.

passages which we shall discuss under this heading may (not necessarily do) fall into this category.

The first of these is John 13:34, which is translated in the Revised Standard Version as follows: "A new commandment I give unto you, that you love one another; even as I loved you, that you also love one another." From this it is apparent that the translators did not regard this as an imperative. They looked upon the second *ἵνα* clause as merely expanding and reinforcing the first *ἵνα* clause. This is very possible. However, another way to construe this sentence would be to place a period after the first *ἀλλ' ἵνα*. The sentence would then be translated: "A new commandment I give unto you, that you love one another. Even as I have loved you, love one another!" Such a rendering has much to commend it, because it would emphasize the Savior's command to love much more than does the first rendering. But there is nothing to cast the deciding vote, as to which is the correct translation. Moffatt's rendering ("I give you a new command, to love one another—as I have loved you, you are to love one another")²⁴ would certainly countenance the second construction.

The second passage in which a *ἵνα* clause may be used as an imperative is John 12:7, *ἀφες αὐτῆν, ἵνα εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ ἔγγραφου αἰματός μου τηρήσῃ*.

In Hellenistic Greek the imperative 1st person is beginning to be differentiated from other subjunctives by the addition of *ἀφες, ἀφεστε*, a use which has recently appeared in a papyrus of the Roman period and has become normal in MGr.²⁵

24. James Moffatt, A New Translation of the New Testament, in loc.
25. Moulton, op. cit., p. 175.

It is just possible, according to Moulton, that this construction has shifted to the 3rd person, thus making the $\overset{\iota}{\nu}\lambda$ clause an object clause.²⁶

But there is another construction which is preferred by both Moulton²⁷ and Robertson.²⁸ The alternative is, "Let her alone: let her keep it," which would agree with Mark 14:6. The accusative $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\iota$, when compared with the $\epsilon\gamma\omega$ seen in the papyrus which Moulton quotes discourages treating $\delta\varphi\epsilon\varsigma$ as a mere auxiliary. "The word had not yet by any means developed as far as our English let or its own MGr derivative $\lambda\epsilon\omicron$."³⁰

There is another possible way to construe this sentence. The clause may be regarded as a final clause expressing the purpose of the anointing. However, we should be inclined to see in this passage the use of a $\overset{\iota}{\nu}\lambda$ clause as an independent imperative.

One final possibility for the use of an independent $\overset{\iota}{\nu}\lambda$ clause³¹ deserves mention. Moffatt translates John 17:21 ff. as follows: "Nor do I pray for them alone, but for all who believe in me by their spoken word; may they all be one! As thou, father, art in me and I in thee; so may they be in us—that the world may believe thou hast sent me." Moffatt would then regard the $\overset{\iota}{\nu}\lambda$ clauses in these verses as equivalent to optatives. J. Rendall Harris says: "These new renderings are a great improvement, even if for the present grammarians are ignorant of

26. Ibid.

27. Ibid.

28. Robertson, op. cit., p. 932.

29. Moulton, loc. cit.

30. Ibid.

31. Moffatt, op. cit., in loc.

32
 them and the classical scholars acknowledge them not."

"Great improvement" though they may be, as far as we are able to ascertain, such a rendering is simply impossible. There is no instance where a $\dot{\iota}\nu\alpha$ clause—or an infinitive, for that matter—is used as an optative. Yes, "grammarians are ignorant of them and the classical scholars acknowledge them not"—because they are not.

"Infinitivssurrogat"

As we have attempted to show, each use of a $\dot{\iota}\nu\alpha$ clause may be paralleled with an infinitive used in a similar way. The conclusion which we might very easily draw from this is that the $\dot{\iota}\nu\alpha$ clause is an equivalent to the infinitive. For years grammarians were loath to accept this inference, because they held that the final conjunctions always retained some purposive force. However, since the epochal discovery of Deissmann and the studies of Moulton, it is apparent that we are not deceived in equating the two constructions. The papyri parallels are quoted at some length in Moulton's Prolegomena, to which we refer the reader for the extensive verification of this thesis. 33

Negation

Before we can leave the purely descriptive portion of this paper, there are a number of items which call for consideration.

In all $\dot{\iota}\nu\alpha$ clauses the negative is $\mu\text{ } \dot{\nu}$. This perfectly agrees with the origin of $\dot{\iota}\nu\alpha$ clauses as clauses of purpose. The $\mu\text{ } \dot{\nu}$ expresses a more subjective, less definite, form of negation than does $\alpha\dot{\nu}$.

32. J. Rendall Harris, in a book review of Moffatt's translation of the New Testament in The Expositor (January 1914) quoted in Robertson, op. cit., p. 1382.

33. Moulton, op. cit., p. 205 ff.

As the clauses accepted a larger field, the use of $\mu\eta\acute{\iota}$ as the negative continued, even though there was no definite reason for continuing it outside of analogy. In many respects it is similar to the leveling process which $\mu\eta$ underwent with the participle.

Robertson has an interesting note on this point in which he discusses New Testament usage in general with regard to negation with

There are 117 instances of $\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$ with $\mu\eta\acute{\iota}$ in N.T. (indic. 4, subj. pres. 37, aor. 75, perf. 1 (2 Cor. 1:10)). When the construction with $\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$ is continued in a further clause by $\mu\eta\acute{\iota}$, $\mu\eta\acute{\iota}$ alone is repeated, Mk. 4:12 LXX, Jo. 6:50, 11:50, 1 Jo. 2:28, Jo. 4:15, Rev. 7:11. . . . When the construction is continued with $\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ 'but on the contrary,' $\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$ is not repeated, Jo. 3:16, 6:39, 18:28, 2 Jo. 8, 1 Cor. 12:25.³⁴

Ellipsis

Another matter in this connection merits consideration: ellipses in the Johannine writings. In considering ellipses in John's writings where they concern $\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$ clauses, we may follow Abbott³⁵ who divides them into two classes: contextual and idiomatic. The first group is so called from the fact that the words which must be supplied are found in the immediate context of the statement. The second kind is an ellipsis which consists in "the customary omission of words (apart from contextual influence) in certain condensed phrases."³⁶

A contextual ellipsis is found in such passages as John 1:8, 3:17; 11:52; 12:47; 17:15, etc., where a word—or words—to be supplied are taken from the preceding clause.³⁷

34. Robertson, op. cit., p. 1413.

35. Abbott, op. cit., # 2204.

36. Ibid.

37. There are instances in the Gospel, which, on first glance, might appear to be contextual ellipses, but which, when correctly construed, are not. Two of these deserve attention: 1:31 and 14:30 f. In both cases the verb upon which the $\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$ clause is dependent follows

Instances of idiomatic ellipsis are found in 1:22 and 9:36 of the Gospel, where the words to be supplied are not found in the immediate context in which the $\dot{\nu}\alpha$ clause stands. In both cases some form of "tell" must be supplied.³⁸

Abbott's Theory of Purpose

Dr. Edwin Abbott, whose Johannine Grammar is a monument to his scholarship, holds that there are two reasons for St. John's fondness for $\dot{\nu}\alpha$ in his writings. He maintains that "the frequency of $\dot{\nu}\alpha$ in John illustrates in part his preference for colloquial as distinct from literary Greek, but in part also the tendency of his Gospel to lay stress on purpose."³⁹ With the first part of this statement we may concur; but one's scepticism with regard to the latter part is hard to down.

However, before condemning Abbott, let us look into the case which he builds up a bit more closely. His basic premise is that "in John— whatever may be the case in other writers— $\dot{\nu}\alpha$ seems always to retain some notion, or suggestion, of purpose or motive, as being the essence of the action."⁴⁰

As we have seen in a previous section, St. John frequently does use $\dot{\nu}\alpha$ to express purpose, in full accord with classical usage. Abbott wishes to find some idea of purpose in each and every instance of

rather than precedes. In 1:31 this is clearly brought out by the appositional phrase $\delta\iota\delta\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$. In 14:30 f. it is best to connect the clause with $\omicron\sigma\tau\omega\varsigma\ \pi\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omega$ as the Revised Standard Version does, when it translates: "He has no power over me; but I do as the Father has commanded me, so that the world may know that I love the Father."

38. Abbott's view that "It came to pass" after $\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ in the phrase $\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\ \dot{\nu}\alpha$ is to be supplied is a direct result of his view that all $\dot{\nu}\alpha$ clauses express purpose. In the light of Koine usage, this view is not tenable. For Abbott's argumentation see op. cit., ## 2105-2112.

39. Ibid. # 2093.

40. Ibid.

the occurrence of $\overset{\nu}{\iota}$ in John's Gospel.

In his argumentation he first submits that $\overset{\nu}{\iota}$ in John is never merely appositional. He holds that if $\overset{\nu}{\iota}$ were merely appositional like our English to, New Testament writers would be able to employ like to irrespective of good or evil, of positive or negative—in such sentences as, "It is good, or evil, for thee to do this," "I command, or forbid, thee to do this."

But $\overset{\nu}{\iota}$ can only be used with "good" and "command," not with "evil" and "forbid." The reason is that "goodness" and "command" suggest a positive object to be attained or a positive object in commanding; and object suggests purpose. "Evil" and "forbid" do not—or at least not to the same extent.⁴¹

To give cogency to his contention, Abbott discusses a number of passages, which, he holds, have some suggestion of purpose in them. The first of these passages is John 13:34. He takes issue with the Revised Version of 1881 which translates: "A new commandment I give unto you, that you love one another; even as I have loved you, that you may also love one another," taking the first $\overset{\nu}{\iota}$ as introducing the substance of the command and the second as introducing the purpose. Abbott says, "It seems better to give the same rendering in both cases, the second being an emphatic and much more definite repetition of the first. . . . The meaning is in both cases, 'My command is, and my purpose is, that ye love one another'.⁴²"

The second passage which comes into consideration is John 15:13, "Greater love has no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." Abbott construes the $\overset{\nu}{\iota}$ clause in apposition to $\tau\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$

41. Ibid. # 2094.

42. Ibid. For another view of this passage see p. 14 of this paper.

and then states " *πρὸ δεῖναι*, is not the same as *ἵνα τις δοῦ* ." ⁴³ The love, he holds, is not "the laying down of the life, but the spirit which prompts the laying down or stimulates one man that he may lay down his life for another." ⁴⁴ Abbott maintains that the suggestion of motive or purpose is latent in *ἵνα*. Among the other passages which he adduces to show that *ἵνα* never introduces a purely appositive clause ⁴⁵ are 4:35 and 17:3.

One more passage calls for comment in this connection. It is 6:29. In answer to the question, "What are we to do in order that we may work the works of God?" Jesus replies, *τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ ἔργον τοῦ θεοῦ ἵνα πιστεύετε εἰς ὃν ὑπέστειλεν ἑκεῖνος*. Abbott would make this mean

"This is the work of God (namely) in order that you may believe" which appears to mean that the 'works' are not of the nature assumed by the questioners (e.g. sabbath-keeping, alms-giving, etc.), but of the nature of motive or purpose: and if they are to do the works of God it will be because they have taken into their hearts God's purpose and will, which is an effort to make them believe, literally an effort "in order that ye may believe." ⁴⁶

On these passages Abbott erects his structure with regard to apposition, denying that it ever occurs without the idea of purpose being in some way connected with it. To clinch his argument he submits a number of passages which call for some exegetical ingenuity.

The first of these is John 8:56. "Abraham, your father, rejoiced that he might see (*ἵνα ἴδῃ*) my day," is the way in which Abbott would render this passage. The meaning, according to Abbott's understanding of the passage is that Abraham helped by God performed a work of God,

43. Ibid. # 2095.

44. Ibid.

45. Ibid.

46. Ibid. # 2096.

namely, believing and rejoicing in order that he might fulfill a purpose of God, namely that he might see the day of the Messiah.⁴⁷

The second passage which demands consideration is John 9:2. Abbott says:

"Rabbi, who sinned, this man or his parents in order that he might be born blind?" is answered by Jesus in language that does not deny purpose, but calls attention to ulterior purpose: "Neither did this man sin, nor his parents; but it came to pass in order that the works of God might be manifested in him."⁴⁶

The last of the special passages which Abbott offers for special discussion is John 11:14-15. The important question in this passage is, Upon which verb, expressed or implied, does the *ivα* clause depend? The only verb which is to be found in the passage is *χαίρω*. Taken by themselves the words might mean that Jesus forced Himself to rejoice over the death of Lazarus in order that His disciples might believe on Him. However, Abbott casts his vote against this construction. He employs a much more subtle explanation. He notes that the verb and the *ivα* clause do not follow upon one another immediately, but "for your sakes" intervenes.

Now "for your sakes" implies that the speaker desires something for the sake of those spoken to. And in answer to the question "desiring what?" *τι δέλω* the reply would be *δέλω ivα πιστεύητε* "desiring that you may believe." Hence *ivα* may depend upon *δέλω* implied in *δε' υμεις*: "I rejoice for your sakes, desiring that ye may believe."⁴⁹

One more instance of Abbott's efforts to find purpose in *ivα* may be mentioned. This is in John 11:50. He says:

47. Ibid., # 2097.

46. Ibid., # 2098. Note that Abbott does not even discuss the possibility of an ebativ use of *ivα*.

In xi. 50 "It is profitable for you (lit.) in order that one man should die for the people," and in xvi. 7 "It is profitable for you (lit) in order that I may depart," follows a word that suggests a profitable object to be pursued. But owing to the context in each case, there is probably a notion of preordnance. For this reason, perhaps, $\nu\alpha$ and the subjunctive are put into the mouth of the High Priest when he utters the words under influence higher than his own ('not of himself') as being a divine decree: but afterwards the evangelist, when referring to these very words, uses the infinitive, xvii. 4.⁵⁰

This then is Abbott's presentation of the use of $\nu\alpha$. It would offer a tremendous field for exegetical ingenuity if it were true; but the light which the study of modern Greek and of the papyri has shed on this subject shows that it cannot be true.

In the first place, the people who read John's letters and his Gospel would never have been conscious of such subtleties of expression as those which Abbott attributes to him. They simply did not speak that way. The evangelist was using the common language of his day, and the parallels from the papyri show that by the time the New Testament was written $\nu\alpha$ had lost all of its overtones of purpose.

Another very significant item on the linguistic side is this, that all of the uses of $\nu\alpha$ can be paralleled with examples which employ the infinitive. This Infinitivssurrogat, as we have shown in a previous section, is a much more valid explanation of the Johannine usage.

The parallels from the papyri, referred to in a previous section, forbid our finding any lurking notion of purpose behind the $\nu\alpha$ clauses in apposition as we have them in John.

The special passages which Abbott submits for consideration are admittedly difficult, but the interpretation which he offers for them

50. Ibid., # 2104.

is more difficult and cannot be paralleled in any author. There is only Abbott's dictum against the parallels which have been discovered in the papyri.

Abbott inadvertently punctures holes in his own argument. In the light of the parallels in usage between the ἰν̄ε clause and the infinitive is very significant that Abbott notes that ἀγαλλιάσθαι and a ἰν̄ε clause (John 8:56) can be paralleled with ἀγαλλιάσθαι and the infinitive in Ps. 19:5 (LXX).⁵¹

Abbott's argument that there is a difference between the two reports which St. John gives of the high priest's prophecy can be turned around and made to show that the two usages are parallel. Therefore this argument is not conclusive. In the light of the papyri discoveries, however, it may be made to bolster the view espoused by Moulton, Robertson, and other modern grammarians that these two modes of expression are equivalent.

Aramaic Influence Theory

Another theory which has been advanced to explain the peculiar uses of ἰν̄ε clauses in the Johannine writings is the theory that St. John's use of ἰν̄ε has been influenced by the use in Aramaic of the particle ܐܢܝܢ. In his preface to the fourth edition of his Short Syntax of New Testament Greek, the Rev. H. P. V. Nunn says:

It should be noted that since this book was written Dr. Burney in his Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel has explained many of the peculiar uses of ἰν̄ε in the N.T. and especially in the Fourth Gospel by the supposition that it has been used to translate the Aramaic relative pronoun.⁵²

51. Ibid., # 2097, note.

52. Nunn, op. cit., p. vii.

Burney holds that the evidence for this view is found in mistranslations from the Aramaic original into Greek which will become evident from a restoration of the original text. He says:

The most weighty form of evidence in proof that a document is a translation from another language is the existence of difficulties or peculiarities of language which can be shown to find their solution in the theory of mistranslation from the assumed original language.⁵³

The first mistranslation which Burney offers is that $\overset{\text{c}}{\text{v}}\text{a}$, by mistranslating the Aramaic relative particle $\overline{\text{r}}$, serves in the Johannine writings as a relative pronoun. The passages which Burney mentions as showing this peculiarity are 1:8; 5:7; 6:30; 9:36; 14:16. He offers as proof of this assumption merely a translation into Aramaic or Syriac in which languages the particle could bear the relative meaning. To substantiate his argument he notes that re-translation into Aramaic makes the ellipsis unnecessary in 1:8. He also points out that if $\overset{\text{c}}{\text{v}}\text{a}$ is translated as "who" in 9:36 the quality of the man's faith will be raised. He regards as the clinching evidence for this theory of mistranslation the fact that the $\overset{\text{c}}{\text{v}}\text{a}$ of Mark 4:22 is reproduced in Matt. 10:26 and Luke 8:17 by $\overset{\text{c}}{\text{v}}$. He admits that the final sense of $\overset{\text{c}}{\text{v}}\text{a}$ in John 6:30 is as natural in Aramaic as in Greek.⁵⁴

The second series of mistranslations which Burney finds are in those passages in which he finds $\overset{\text{c}}{\text{v}}\text{a}$ is equivalent to "when". The passages in which he finds this are 12:23; 13:1; 16:2; 32. In passing it may be well to note that each of these instances occurs after $\overset{\text{c}}{\text{v}}\text{a}$.

53. C. F. Burney, The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel, p. 101, quoted in Ernest Cadman Colwell, The Greek of the Fourth Gospel: A Study of its Aramaisms in the Light of Hellenistic Greek, p. 96.

54. Cf. Colwell, op. cit., p. 96 f.

55. Ibid., p. 99.

As we have mentioned previously, the passage John 8:56 is quite important in the discussion of the influence of Aramaic upon the Greek of the Fourth Gospel. Colwell says:

No extension of the use of $\dot{\nu}\alpha$ seemed to Burney (p. 111) adequate to explain $\dot{\nu}\alpha \lambda\lambda\dot{\iota}\delta\epsilon\sigma\tau\omicron \dot{\nu}\alpha \dot{\iota}\delta\eta$, and he felt that the similarity of the following clause demanded some such meaning as 'longed' for $\dot{\nu}\alpha \lambda\lambda\dot{\iota}\delta\epsilon\sigma\tau\omicron$. This he found in a Syriac verb, not known to occur in Western Aramaic, which carried both the meaning 'longed' and 'exulted'.⁵⁶

Besides these mistranslations, Burney has other arguments to offer in favor of his theory that St. John's use of $\dot{\nu}\alpha$ is based upon a mistranslation of the Aramaic. He gives figures, quoted by Colwell, which will represent the frequency of $\dot{\nu}\alpha$ in each Gospel. He does not give the actual count, but figures out what the total would be if each Gospel were as long as St. Matthew. The figures at which he arrives are as follows: Matthew, 33; Mark, 88; Luke, 44; John, 163. The frequency in John points, he alleges, to the influence of the Aramaic particle

$\dot{\nu}$.⁵⁷

In similar vein Burney also finds indications of the Aramaic background of John's Gospel in the frequency of $\dot{\nu}\alpha \mu\dot{\iota}$ in it, as compared with the other Gospels. His figures are as follows: Matthew, 8; Mark, 5; Luke, 8; John, 18. These figures have not been computed as in the case of $\dot{\nu}\alpha$,⁵⁸ but indicate the actual number of occurrences.

Burney offers one other fact which he regards as significant when he notes that John regularly uses $\dot{\nu}\alpha \mu\dot{\iota}$ rather than $\mu\dot{\iota} \pi\omicron\tau\epsilon$ or $\mu\dot{\iota} \tau\epsilon$ to express "lest". And he does this even in a quotation taken from the

56. Ibid., p. 113.

57. Ibid., p. 92.

58. Ibid., p. 93.

LXX where $\mu\eta\prime\ \pi\omicron\tau\epsilon$ translates the Hebrew $\int\ \text{D}$, while in quoting it (John 12:40) he substitutes $\text{iv}\ \mu\eta\prime$ for the $\mu\eta\prime\ \pi\omicron\tau\epsilon$.⁵⁹

These then are the arguments advanced by Burney in favor of the theory that the present Gospel of John is a translation from an Aramaic original. How much validity do they have? We cannot dogmatically rule them out of court because of preconceived notions. It must be frankly admitted that they do have a measure of plausibility or they would never have been advanced.

To be able, at least in some measure, to evaluate this theory we must know something about the use of the particle v in Aramaic. Marti says:

Zum Ausdruck, dass irgendwelche Beziehung des neuen Satzes mit dem vorhergehenden resp. mit dem folgenden bestehe, wird die allgemeine nota relationis v gebraucht. In welcher Beziehung der durch v eingeleitete Satz zu der ganzen Periode oder einem Teile derselben steht, muss der Zusammenhang lehren.⁶⁰

However, though v may be used in the ways suggested by Prof. Burney, this does not necessarily prove his point. Will St. John's usage stand up in the light of what we know about Koine Greek? The majority of modern scholars maintain that it will; this matter has been discussed at some length in a previous section of this paper.

The first question is, Is iv ever used in such a way as to be translated into English by a relative pronoun. Colwell offers examples from Epictetus i. 24. 3 and iv. 1. 108 to prove that it is.⁶¹

With regard to individual passages where iv might appear to be correctly translated by a relative pronoun, Matthew Black says:

59. Ibid., p. 94.

60. E. Marti, Biblisches Aramäisches Grammatik, # 96, b.

61. Colwell, op. cit., p. 97.

In Jn. i. 8 . . . there are linguistic objections to Burney's conjecture. Burney would have rendered 'He was not the light, but one who (/iva , d-) was to bear witness of the light.' It is doubtful if d- in the sense of 'one who' could stand alone in this emphatic position without being reinforced by the indefinite man as antecedent.

In other instances it is not always clear that the d- would really have been relative and not telic even in the Aramaic. The /iva in most of these cases is employed in a common Koine use; in v. 7 it is used much as we use 'to,' 'I do not have anyone to put me into the water.' In Jn. vi. 30 the purpose clause is important; it is not 'What sign doest thou which we may see?' as Burney suggests, but 'What sign does thou in order that we may see?'; the emphasis is on the last word; proof by sight was the purpose of the sign. ⁶²

The second misuse of /iva according to Burney is as a temporal conjunction, mistranslating the particle T. "Strictly speaking d- is not a temporal conjunction but, as a relative or relating particle after such antecedents as 'time,' 'day,' 'hour,' or adverbs of time, it becomes the equivalent of 'when.'" ⁶³

That this is not a strict Semitism is brought out very clearly by Howard when he says:

Mr. G. R. Driver cites several instances from late Greek of καιρος ερχεται (estiv) /iva ; whilst KGr. ειναι καιρος να ελθης is the regular idiom for "it is time for you to come." To this we may add, ηλθεν η ώρα να πεθαι, "the hour came to die." (Thumb, Hdb. 187). This usages is therefore at most a secondary Semitism, and can quite easily be explained by the writer's strong partiality for this particle, which had already gained great flexibility in the /τοις. ⁶⁴

Torrey, who would be very happy to see Burney's thesis proved, says quite correctly:

It does not seem to me, however, that defenders of the theory of an originally Greek gospel are likely to be convinced by any of these examples. The Greek conjunctions

62. Matthew Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, p. 59.

63. Ibid.

64. Moulton-Howard, Grammar of New Testament Greek, Vol. II, p. 470.

in question, especially $\dot{\iota}\nu\alpha$, are used so loosely in the later language that every variety of use in John—including such cases as 16:2, 32—could be defended by anyone who felt defense to be necessary.⁶⁵

Colwell cites Bauer with regard to John 8:56. He holds that after verbs of striving is sufficient to explain the passage. He translates it by "jubilnd streben nach."⁶⁶ An additional proof that the $\dot{\iota}\nu\alpha$ clause is tolerable as Greek is the fact that an infinitive is used after $\delta\gamma\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\iota}\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$ in Ps. 19:5.

As additional support for his contention that there is an Aramaic influence on the use of $\dot{\iota}\nu\alpha$ in the Johannine writings, Burney argues that the frequency of $\dot{\iota}\nu\alpha$ betrays a Semitic background. Colwell says:

The history of the use of $\dot{\iota}\nu\alpha$ is a record of rapid expansion in use after 300 B.C., at the expense of $\delta\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota$ and $\delta\sigma$. Jannaris speaks of it as having become 'very common—perhaps the most common word next to $\kappa\alpha\iota$ and the article.' There was, however, from 150 B.C. to 300 A.D. some reaction against $\dot{\iota}\nu\alpha$ on the part of the literati. Thus its common use or avoidance could occur on other grounds than Semitic influence.⁶⁷

The same explanation basically will suffice for the frequency of $\dot{\iota}\nu\alpha \mu\eta$ in John. $M\eta$ as the final negative particle was losing ground,⁶⁸ and therefore it is only natural that $\dot{\iota}\nu\alpha \mu\eta$ would supersede it.

Burney sees in the use of $\dot{\iota}\nu\alpha \mu\eta$ in John 12:40 rather than $\mu\eta\pi\omicron\tau\epsilon$ proof of Aramaic influence. However, this is not at all conclusive since $\dot{\iota}\nu\alpha \mu\eta$ was the common and $\mu\eta\pi\omicron\tau\epsilon$ the infrequent way of expressing "lest." Colwell summarizes this argument's validity by saying: "The

65. C. G. Torrey, "The Aramaic Origin of the Gospel of John", Harvard Theological Review, XVI (October, 1923), p. 328.

66. Walter Bauer, Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des neuen Testaments, s. v., quoted in Colwell, op. cit., p. 114. The Third edition of Bauer translates: "er freute sich laut darauf, zu sehen."

67. Colwell, op. cit., p. 92.

68. Ibid., p. 93.

cogeneity of the proof that John's Greek translates not only a Semitic but an Aramaic original becomes almost a minus quantity," in the light of this fact.

69

69. Colwell, op. cit., p. 95.

While it is true that the most common Johannine method of expressing purpose is by means of a clause introduced by $\epsilon\upsilon\omicron$, St. John does not confine himself to this idiom, but he uses other modes of expression besides this one. In this chapter we shall take these other ways up somewhat briefly, since they do not present as many trying problems as the $\epsilon\upsilon\omicron$ clause.

The Infinitive

We have already mentioned, and attempted to show, that the clause $\epsilon\upsilon\omicron$ is used in exactly the same constructions where an infinitive is used. Accordingly, we might expect that an infinitive is used to express purpose, and we would be correct.

Ordinarily we are inclined to think of the infinitive as a verbal form which lacks person and number. Really it is not that at all. It is a noun which retains some of its verbal characteristics. The Greek Infinitive is historically either a locative (as $\lambda\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$) or a dative (as $\lambda\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\iota$, $\lambda\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\iota\sigma\iota$, etc.) from a noun base directly connected with a verb. Since this base is closely connected with a verb, it still retains some of the characteristics of a verb, such as governing an object, etc.

Colwell is very correct when he says:

1. Motson, op. cit., p. 203.

2. ibid.

III. Subsidiary Johannine Methods of Expressing Purpose

While it is true that the most common Johannine method of expressing purpose is by means of a clause introduced by $\dot{\nu}\alpha$, St. John does not confine himself to this idiom, but he uses other modes of expression besides this one. In this chapter we shall take these other ways up somewhat briefly, since they do not present as many trying problems as the $\dot{\nu}\alpha$ clause.

The Infinitive

We have already mentioned, and attempted to show, that the clause is used in exactly the same constructions where an infinitive is used. Accordingly, we might expect that an infinitive is used to express purpose, and we would be correct.

Ordinarily we are inclined to think of the infinitive as a verbal form which lacks person and number. Really it is not that at all. It is a noun which retains some of its verbal characteristics. "The Greek Infinitive is historically either a locative (as $\lambda\upsilon\epsilon\iota\nu$) or a dative (as $\lambda\upsilon\epsilon\iota\sigma\iota$, $\alpha\dot{\nu}\epsilon\iota\sigma\iota$, etc.) from a noun base closely connected with a verb." Since this base is closely connected with a verb, it still retains some of the characteristics of a verb, such as governing an object, etc.

2

Moulton is very correct when he says:

1. Moulton, op. cit., p. 203.

2. loc. cit.

There are comparatively few uses of the Greek Infinitive in which we cannot still trace the construction by restoring the dative or locative case from whence it started. Indeed, the very fact that when the form had become petrified the genius of the language took it up afresh and declined it by prefixing the article, shows us how persistent was the noun idea. The imperative use . . . is instructive if we are right in interpreting it in close connection with the origins of the infinitive. A dative of purpose used as an exclamation conveys at once the imperatival idea. The frequent identity of noun and verb forms in English enables us to cite in illustration two lines of a popular hymn:--

"So now to watch, to work, to war,

And then to rest for ever!"

A schoolmaster entering his classroom might say either "Now then, to work!" or "at work!"—dative or locative, expressing imperative 2nd person, as the hymn lines express 1st person. . . . The noun-case is equally traceable in many other uses of the infinitive. Thus the infinitive of purpose as in Jn 21:3 ἄλιεόν ἐστιν a fishing, or Mt. 2:2 προσκυνῆσαι for worshipping. . . . The force of such infinitives is always best reached by thus going back to the original dative or locative noun.

By far the clearest example of the infinitive of purpose in the Johannine writings has been mentioned already by Moulton in the passage which we have just quoted. Another clear example is found in John 4:7 where the woman of Samaria came to Jacob's well to draw water.

Nowhere in the Johannine writings is the articular infinitive used to express purpose. The four instances in the Johannine writings where an articular infinitive is found are not final.³ Another New Testament idiom for expressing purpose with the infinitive is the infinitive preceded by ἵνα; this likewise is not used in the Johannine writings. Blass is correct when he says: "Joh. kennt überhaupt zum Ausdruck des Zwecks fast nur ἵνα und liebt auch den finalen Inf. nicht."⁴

The ὅτι Clause

In origin the ὅτι clause is similar to the ὅτι clause. As we

3. John 1:48; 2:24; 13:19; 17:5.

4. Blass-Debrunner, op. cit., # 369, 4.

have pointed out in the last chapter both started in parataxis, and in the course of time a conjunction was inserted to do away with the asyndeton. The three most common conjunctions during the classical age were $\dot{\iota}\nu\alpha$, $\delta\acute{\omicron}\pi\omega\varsigma$, and $\dot{\iota}\omega$; but in the centuries which followed, $\dot{\iota}\nu\alpha$ gained the ascendancy and far out-stripped $\delta\acute{\omicron}\pi\omega\varsigma$ in frequency of use, while $\dot{\omega}\varsigma$ fell into almost complete disuse.⁵ At the time when the New Testament was written $\dot{\iota}\nu\alpha$ was very common, although $\delta\acute{\omicron}\pi\omega\varsigma$ had not yet completely fallen into disuse as a final particle in the common speech.

In the Johannine writings there is only one instance of a $\delta\acute{\omicron}\pi\omega\varsigma$ clause of purpose, although the frequency for the whole New Testament is about eight $\dot{\iota}\nu\alpha$ clauses to one $\delta\acute{\omicron}\pi\omega\varsigma$ clause.⁶ The one instance of a $\delta\acute{\omicron}\pi\omega\varsigma$ clause in the Johannine writings is 11:57 of the Gospel, $\delta\epsilon\delta\acute{\omega}\kappa\epsilon\iota\sigma\alpha\iota\ \delta\epsilon\ \omicron\iota\ \epsilon\pi\chi\eta\epsilon\rho\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \omicron\iota\ \Phi\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\alpha\iota\omicron\iota\ \epsilon\upsilon\tau\omicron\lambda\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \dot{\iota}\nu\alpha\ \epsilon\grave{\alpha}\nu\tau\iota\varsigma\ \gamma\eta\rho\acute{\upsilon}\ \pi\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu\ \mu\eta\gamma\iota\nu\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\ \delta\acute{\omicron}\pi\omega\varsigma\ \pi\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\sigma\iota\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota$. "Now the chief priests and Pharisees had given orders that if any one knew where he was, he should let them know, so that they might arrest him."

The only explanation which is offered for this one instance of a $\delta\acute{\omicron}\pi\omega\varsigma$ clause of purpose introduced by $\delta\acute{\omicron}\pi\omega\varsigma$ in the Johannine writings is that St. John uses $\delta\acute{\omicron}\pi\omega\varsigma$ rather than $\dot{\iota}\nu\alpha$ for the sake of variation. Blass says: "Die Stelle bei Joh. ist 11:56, wo $\delta\acute{\omicron}\pi\omega\varsigma$ offenbar der Abwechslung wegen gebraucht ist, indem schon ein $\dot{\iota}\nu\alpha$ unmittelbar vorherging."⁷ In this he is seconded by Bernard in his volume on St. John in the International Critical Commentary.⁸

5. Cf. A. T. Robertson and W. H. Davis, A New Short Grammar of the Greek Testament, p. 341.

6. loc. cit.

7. Blass-Debrunner, loc. cit.

8. J. H. Bernard, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John, in loc.

The Participle

The future participle was common in the classical period as another means of expressing purpose. During the course of the years, it lost in popularity, although it is still found in New Testament Koine. In the classical period the participle was ordinarily in the future tense, although rarely a present participle was employed. In the Koine the same general rule applies. In the Johannine writings, the one example employs a present participle. The Revised Standard Version translates John 6:6a as follows: "This he said to test him," *τοῦτο δὲ ἔλεγεν περὶ ζῶν αὐτοῦ*. This is probably the correct translation, although
 9, 10
 other constructions may be found for it.

9. Cf. Robertson, op. cit., p. 991.

10. There are certain modes of expressing purpose which are not used in the Johannine writings, and it may be well to note them here. St. John never uses a relative clause with the future indicative to express purpose, as is sometimes done in the New Testament, although, it must be admitted, this construction is none too common. He also avoids the articular infinitive, as has been noted earlier in this chapter. Negative purpose clauses employ *ἵνα μή*, never *μή*, *μηπῶς* or *μήποτε*. The importance of this fact on the use of *ἵνα μή* in the Johannine writings has been discussed in the previous chapter.

Conclusion

The study of the expression of purpose in the Johannine writings confirms that statement which was made in the introductory remarks to this paper, that there is a grammatical unity between the epistles and Gospel of St. John. A careful study shows that *ἵνα* which is frequent in both epistles and Gospel is used in exactly the same way in both groups of writings, and this fact argues—not conclusively, to be sure—for identity of authorship. The infrequent use of other means of expressing purpose in the Gospel and the absolute lack of use in the epistles tend in the same direction.

Another point which has been brought out by a study of the expression of purpose in the Johannine writings is that the cramping and forced exegesis of the last century must be avoided. No longer must every *ἵνα* clause be forced into the mold of purpose. It may express other ideas too. And what about the Aramaic background for the use of *ἵνα* ? This too is ruled out by the study of the Koine dialect in which the New Testament was written. The language of the Gospel and of the epistles is Greek—not the cultured literary Greek of the day, but the vernacular which the recipients of the Gospel and epistles did understand.

With grammar as a means to an end, not as an end in itself, we can study the Johannine writings and gain a deeper insight into the Gospel message which the Lord has given to men through the instrumentality of St. John the Apostle and Evangelist.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ABBOTT, EDWIN, Johannine Grammar, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1905.
- BAUER, WALTER, Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur, 3d. ed., Berlin, Tüpelmann, 1937.
- BLACK, MATTHEW, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1946.
- BURTON, EDGAR DEWITT, Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1903.
- COLWELL, ERNEST CADMAN, The Greek of the Fourth Gospel: A Study of its Aramaisms in the Light of Hellenistic Greek, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1931.
- DEBRUNNER, A., Friedrich Blass' Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch, 5th ed., Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1921.
- MARTI, KARL, Kurzgefasste Grammatik der Biblisch-Aramäischen Sprache, Literatur, Paradigmen, Texte und Glossar, 2nd ed., Berlin, Reuther & Reichard, 1911.
- MOFFATT, JAMES, A New Translation of the New Testament, New York, Doran, 1913.
- MOULTON, J. H., A Grammar of New Testament Greek: Vol. I, Prolegomena, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1908. Vol. II, Accidence and Word Formation, edited by W. F. Howard.
- NESTLE, EBERHARD, Novum Testamentum Graece cum apparatu critico curavit, 17th ed., revised by Erwin Nestle, Stuttgart, Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1921.
- NUNN, H. P. V., A Short Syntax of New Testament Greek, 4th ed., Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1924.
- ROBERTSON, A. T., A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research, 4th ed., New York, Doran, 1923.
- ROBERTSON, A. T. and DAVIS, W. H. A New Short Grammar of the Greek Testament, New York, Harpers, 1933.

The New Covenant Commonly Called the New Testament of Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, Revised Standard Version, New York, Nelson, 1946.

TORREY, C. C., "The Aramaic Origin of the Gospel of John," Harvard Theological Review, XVI (October, 1923), 305-344.