

readers any detailed discussion of the next verse, and quote the Revised Version text as a possible (or should I say impossible?) rendering: 'Yea, ye have borne Siccuth your king and Chiun your images, the star of your god, which ye made to yourselves.' The R.V. margin offers the alternatives, 'the tabernacle of your king and the shrine of your images'. For the past tense it also offers the future, 'ye shall take up'; but in view of the preceding verse I should prefer the past tense, referring to idolatry in the wilderness.

I note that Drs. Oesterley and Robinson admit this interpretation of Amos in their *Hebrew Religion* (p. 299). They write: 'That Amos contemplated the entire abrogation of the sacrificial system at the time at which he lived . . . is difficult to believe; for one thing, he must have known that during the nomadic period of the wanderings in the wilderness sacrifices were offered.' And shortly afterwards they add (p. 300): 'Not until there was some definite form of worship to take the place of the sacrificial system would its needlessness, and therefore its entire abolition, be contemplated; and this was not the case until the Exile had taught the possibility of a purely spiritual worship.'

These last words raise a larger issue than I can afford to discuss here, which belongs to the philosophy of religion rather than to the religion of the prophets. I merely ask, if once it be conceded that there was no question of reprobating sacrifice before the Exile, is it likely that the idea arose later? The most liturgical of the prophets was Malachi, whom nobody, I feel sure, will put before the Exile; nor is it necessary to do more than recall the liturgical character of the end of Ezekiel, or Haggai's zeal for the rebuilding of the Temple. Drs. Oesterley and Robinson themselves devote a section to the development of the sacrificial system after the Exile (pp. 296-301).

C. LATTEY

## THE IMPERATIVAL USE OF *iva* IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

It is a matter of common knowledge that in post-classical Greek the use of *iva* was largely extended for several different purposes. One of these was to provide an alternative to the imperative mood for the expression of requests, exhortations, and injunctions. *iva* with the subjunctive was made to serve this purpose. At first the *iva*-clause, in conformity with the normal character of the conjunction, was a dependent noun-clause following some main verb like *θέλω*. But while this subordinating construction remained in use, the custom

readers any detailed discussion of the next verse, and quote the Revised Version text as a possible (or should I say impossible?) rendering: 'Yea, ye have borne Siccuth your king and Chiun your images, the star of your god, which ye made to yourselves.' The R.V. margin offers the alternatives, 'the tabernacle of your king and the shrine of your images'. For the past tense it also offers the future, 'ye shall take up'; but in view of the preceding verse I should prefer the past tense, referring to idolatry in the wilderness.

I note that Drs. Oesterley and Robinson admit this interpretation of Amos in their *Hebrew Religion* (p. 299). They write: 'That Amos contemplated the entire abrogation of the sacrificial system at the time at which he lived . . . is difficult to believe; for one thing, he must have known that during the nomadic period of the wanderings in the wilderness sacrifices were offered.' And shortly afterwards they add (p. 300): 'Not until there was some definite form of worship to take the place of the sacrificial system would its needlessness, and therefore its entire abolition, be contemplated; and this was not the case until the Exile had taught the possibility of a purely spiritual worship.'

These last words raise a larger issue than I can afford to discuss here, which belongs to the philosophy of religion rather than to the religion of the prophets. I merely ask, if once it be conceded that there was no question of reprobating sacrifice before the Exile, is it likely that the idea arose later? The most liturgical of the prophets was Malachi, whom nobody, I feel sure, will put before the Exile; nor is it necessary to do more than recall the liturgical character of the end of Ezekiel, or Haggai's zeal for the rebuilding of the Temple. Drs. Oesterley and Robinson themselves devote a section to the development of the sacrificial system after the Exile (pp. 296-301).

C. LATTEY

## THE IMPERATIVAL USE OF *iva* IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

It is a matter of common knowledge that in post-classical Greek the use of *iva* was largely extended for several different purposes. One of these was to provide an alternative to the imperative mood for the expression of requests, exhortations, and injunctions. *iva* with the subjunctive was made to serve this purpose. At first the *iva*-clause, in conformity with the normal character of the conjunction, was a dependent noun-clause following some main verb like *θέλω*. But while this subordinating construction remained in use, the custom

grew up of dropping the main verb, so that the *ἵνα*-clause virtually became as much a main sentence as if the plain imperative had been used.

An early example of this imperatival use of *ἵνα* is often quoted from Sophokles, *Oidipous at Kolonos*, ll. 156-61, where the chorus warns Oidipous, ἀλλ' ἵνα τῷδ' ἐν ἀφθέγκτῳ μὴ προσπέσης νάπει ποιάεντι, . . . τῶν, ξένε πάμμορ', εὖ φύλαξαι. But in view of the extreme rarity of the usage at this early date, it would seem better to regard the *ἵνα*-clause here as dependent on φύλαξαι than to treat it as an independent prohibition. We could quite well translate: 'But lest thou stumble on in this silent grassy grove, . . . of this, thou woe-begone stranger, take good heed.'<sup>1</sup>

We must, I think, similarly discard another instance adduced by some from a somewhat early source. Cicero says to Atticus about a certain debtor (*Epist. ad Att.* VI. v. 2): Ταῦτα οὖν, πρῶτον μὲν, ἵνα πάντα σώζῃται: δεύτερον δέ, ἵνα μηδὲ τῶν τόκων ὀλιγορήσης τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς προεκκειμένης ἡμέρας. Here ταῦτα οὖν, though not referring to what precedes, is clearly an abbreviated main sentence, 'Look, then, to these two things . . .', thus rendering the *ἵνα*-clauses essentially subordinate.

The new Liddell and Scott, however, quotes two examples from papyri of the third century B.C., while from the first century B.C. onwards instances are numerous, in both vernacular and literary compositions. A few examples will suffice. For the second person, 2 Macc. i. 9 (124 B.C.?) has: καὶ νῦν ἵνα ἄγητε τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς σκηνοπηγίας τοῦ Χασελεῦ μηνός, 'And now, see that ye keep the days of the Feast of Booths, in the month Chislew'. A papyrus of A.D. 99 runs: ἐπέχον (i.e. ἐπέχων) τῷ δακτυλιστῇ Ζωίλωι καὶ εἶνα αὐτὸν μὴ δυσωπήσης, 'Give heed to the surveyor Zoilos, and do not look askance at him'. For the third person, Arrian reports Epiktetos as saying (IV. i. 41): Ἴνα μὴ μωρός ᾖ, ἀλλ' ἵνα μάθῃ ἃ ἔλεγεν ὁ Σωκράτης . . . καὶ μὴ εἰκῆ τὰς προλήψεις ἐφαρμόζη ταῖς ἐπὶ μέρους οὐσίαις, 'Let him not be a fool, but let him learn . . .'.<sup>2</sup> Marcus Aurelius says (xi. 4): τοῦτο (i.e. acting for the common good) ἵνα αἰεὶ πρόχειρον ἀπαντᾷ, 'Let this ever be ready to thine hand'. For the first person, a papyrus of the second or third century A.D. reads: εἰς ἀναβῆς τῆ

<sup>1</sup> Moulton, *Prolegomena*, 179 top. He remarks on the previous page that the imperatival use of *ἵνα* was a Hellenistic 'innovation', which took the place of the classical *ὅπως* with the future indicative. Cf. also id. 177, n. 1; Blass-Debrunner, *Gramm. des nt. Griech.* (1931), 215; and Rademacher, *Neutest. Grammatik* (1925), 170.

<sup>2</sup> In Sophocles' *Lexicon* (599 a [8]) μάθης is erroneously put for μάθη, and the sentence mistranslated: 'You must not be foolish.'

ἐορτῆ, ἵνα ὁμόσοι γενώμεθα, 'If thou goest up for the festival, let us get together'.

The number of instances collected by our authorities<sup>1</sup> suffices to show that by the first century A.D. the usage was well established; and it is interesting to note that it survives in modern Greek.<sup>2</sup>

When now we turn to the New Testament, we find at least four unmistakable cases of this imperatival use of ἵνα with the subjunctive. Two are in the second person, one in the third, and one in the first, as follows:

(1) Mark v. 23. Jairus besought Jesus much, saying: 'My little daughter is in desperate straits: do please come and lay thine hands on her (ἵνα ἔλθῶν ἐπιθῆς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῆ) that she may be saved and live.'<sup>3</sup>

(2) 2 Cor. viii. 7. Paul writes to the Corinthians about the collection for Jerusalem: 'But as ye abound in every (virtue)—faith and speech and knowledge and all zeal and your love for us—do please abound in this gracious (enterprise) also (ἵνα καὶ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ χάριτι περισσεύητε).'<sup>4</sup>

(3) Eph. v. 33. Paul concludes his paragraph about the duties of husbands and wives, after completing his digression on Christ and the Church, thus: 'But let each one of you also so love (ἀγαπάτω) his own wife as he loves himself; and let the wife revere her husband (ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ἵνα φοβῆται τὸν ἄνδρα).'<sup>4</sup>

(4) Gal. ii. 9 f. The pillar-apostles 'gave right hands of fellowship

<sup>1</sup> Several other examples are quoted verbatim or referred to in Sophocles' *Lexicon*, in the article by Jannaris (304 f.) mentioned below (p. 168, n. 2), in Moulton and Milligan's *Vocab.*, in W. Bauer's *Griech.-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments* (589), and in Radermacher, *Neutest. Grammatik* (1925), 170.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. A. Thumb, *Mod. Greek Vernac.* (1912), 126 f.; also H. Pernot in *Expos. Times*, xxxviii. 105 f. (Dec. 1926). I would take this opportunity of observing that M. Pernot is very much mistaken in supposing that Modern Greek has been largely ignored by New Testament scholars. Dr. A. T. Robertson, in *Studies in Early Christianity* (ed. S. J. Case, 1928), 52-4, also protests against this erroneous opinion unwarrantedly expressed by M. Pernot. I venture also to differ from his suggestion (103 b) that the Greek of the Gospels is nearer to the spoken Greek of to-day than the English of Shakespeare's comedies is to modern English.

<sup>3</sup> The insertion of the λέγων- clause and the use of the second person ἐπιθῆς forbid us to hang the ἵνα- clause directly on to παρακαλεῖ, as C. H. Turner, appealing to vii. 32, suggests in the *Journ. of Theol. Stud.* xxix. 356 (July 1928).

<sup>4</sup> Moulton (*Prolegomena*, 179) says this is the clearest example in the New Testament. Bauer (*Wörterbuch*) renders: 'd. Frau aber soll den Mann fürchten.' On this and the two previous examples, cf. Blass-Debrunner, *Gramm. des nt. Griech.* (1931), 214, and Radermacher, *Neutest. Grammatik* (1925), 178.

to me and Barnabas, on the understanding that we should go (*ἵνα ἡμεῖς*, no verb) to the Gentiles, but they to the circumcision. Only we were to remember the poor (*μόνον τῶν πτωχῶν ἵνα μνημονεύωμεν*), which very thing I was (already) eager to do.<sup>1</sup> It is the *second* of these two *ἵνα*-clauses which is relevant to our present inquiry.<sup>1</sup>

With this amount of clear evidence before us, we cannot doubt that *ἵνα* with the subjunctive was a method frequently used in the Greek of New Testament times for the purpose of expressing a wish, such as would in earlier days have been expressed by the use of the imperative or optative mood. The clauses are not subordinate in any real sense, but are to all intents and purposes main sentences; and only as such can they be rightly rendered into English. The certainty thus established cannot but suggest to our minds the question whether the usage is not really more frequent in the New Testament than we generally recognize, and whether several passages in regard to which we normally cling to some more familiar interpretation (usually the 'final' sense) are not really instances of this imperatival use of *ἵνα* in a main clause.<sup>2</sup>

Let me take first the group of passages, mostly Johannine, in which the use of *ἵνα* is commonly regarded as clearly elliptical,<sup>3</sup> and in which consequently the English Versions encourage us to supply for ourselves a main clause upon which the *ἵνα*-clause can depend. We shall notice that in every case, by availing ourselves of the analogy of Eph. v. 33, we can translate the *ἵνα*-clause as a main sentence, and obtain excellent sense without resorting to the questionable expedient of composing a main sentence out of our own heads. Thus:

(1) Mark xiv. 49. 'I was with you daily teaching in the Temple, and ye seized me not: but the Scriptures have to be fulfilled (*ἀλλ' ἵνα πληρωθῶσω αἱ γραφαί*).'<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It is true that *ἵνα* is here preceded by *μόνον*, without which the construction might not have been used. Sophocles (*Lexicon*, 599 a [13]) refers both to this passage and also to Gal. vi. 12 (where the *ἵνα*-clause is quite clearly final and subordinate), along with some patristic passages, as illustrating a special use of *ἵνα* with *μόνον* or *πλήν*, meaning 'provided that'. On the other hand, our sentence from Gal. ii. 10 is neither simply final, nor closely parallel to the *ἵνα* of the previous sentence.

<sup>2</sup> A useful article on the subject was contributed by A. N. Jannaris to *The Expositor*, V. ix. 296-310 (April 1899), in which he discussed the extended uses of *ἵνα* in late Greek, especially as a substitute for the infinitive, which was itself, of course, often used imperatively.

<sup>3</sup> So, e.g., Abbott, *Joh. Grammar*, 120-3 (but see below, n. 4 fin.); also Blass-Debrunner, *Gramm. des nt. Griech.* (1931), 256. Radermacher (*Neutest. Grammatik*, 1925) seems to pay very little attention to these passages.

<sup>4</sup> This is the one case in the whole group in which the A.V. renders the *ἵνα*-clause as a main sentence ('but the Scriptures must be fulfilled'). The R.V.

(2) John i. 8. 'He (John) was not the light; but he had to bear witness (*ἀλλ' ἵνα μαρτυρήσῃ*) concerning the light.'<sup>1</sup>

(3) John xiv. 30 f. 'I shall not speak many more things with you, for the ruler of the world is coming, and has nothing in me: but the world needs to learn (*ἀλλ' ἵνα γινῶ ὁ κόσμος*) that I love the Father, and that as the Father has given me commandment, so I act.'<sup>2</sup>

(4) John xv. 24 f. 'Now, however, they have both seen and hated both me and my Father: but the word which has been written in their Law, "They hated me causelessly", had to be fulfilled (*ἀλλ' ἵνα πληρωθῆ ὁ λόγος . . .*).'

(5) 1 John ii. 19. 'For if they had belonged to us, they would have remained with us: but they had to be shown up as not, any of them, belonging to us (*ἀλλ' ἵνα φανερωθῶσιν ὅτι οὐκ εἰσὶν πάντες ἐξ ἡμῶν*).'<sup>3</sup>

The Fourth Gospel contains five other *ἵνα*-passages in the third person, which, although a tolerable sense could no doubt be obtained from them by treating *ἵνα* as a subordinating conjunction, yield an equally good or even better sense if regarded as main sentences expressing fitness or necessity.

(1) John ix. 3. 'Jesus answered, "Neither did this man sin, nor his parents: but the works of God had to be made manifest (*ἀλλ' ἵνα φανερωθῆ . . .*) in his case."' To put a comma at the end of the verse, and subordinate the *ἵνα*-clause to the *ἡμας δεῖ* of verse 4 is grammatically possible, but gives a weaker sense.<sup>4</sup>

never does so. Bauer (*Wörterbuch*) says we must understand *κρατεῖτέ με* after *ἀλλά*. Abbott (*Joh. Grammar*, 122), however, regards this as 'an extremely weak interpretation', and prefers to expand, as suggested in Matthew (xxvi. 56), '[evil and strange] but yet, [ordained] in order that . . .'

<sup>1</sup> E. C. Colwell (*Gk. of the Fourth Gosp.* 96-9) points out that Burney's suggestion of a misunderstood Aramaism here is unnecessary.

<sup>2</sup> Here alone in this group, except as stated on p. 168, n. 4, do the English versions refrain from inserting in italics a main clause composed *ad hoc* by the translators. None the less, they retain the subordinating sense of *ἵνα*, thus rendering the English Version ungrammatical and unintelligible. Abbott (*Joh. Grammar*, 121) thinks that in John xiv. 31 the *ἵνα*-clause depends on the *οὕτως ποιῶ* at the end of the sentence.

<sup>3</sup> I am not at all clear why in Bauer's *Wörterbuch* Mark iv. 22 is quoted as belonging to this group of passages, and as needing to be expanded thus: *ἀλλ' (ἐγένετο ἀπόκρυφον) ἵνα ἔλθῃ εἰς φανερόν*. In the text of Mark the words *οὐδὲ ἐγένετο ἀπόκρυφον* immediately precede *ἀλλ' ἵνα*; and the parallelism of the verse proves that *ἀλλ' ἵνα* means exactly the same as *ἐὰν μὴ ἵνα* in the first half, and needs to be translated 'except in order that'. There is no need to suppose ellipsis.

<sup>4</sup> Bauer treats the sentence as needing (*ἐγένετο τυφλός*) between *ἀλλ'* and *ἵνα*. Cf. E. Abbott, *Joh. Gramm.* 117, 120-2.

(2) John xiii. 18. 'I do not speak concerning all of you. I know whom I have chosen. But the Scripture, "He who eats my bread has lifted up his heel against me", has to be fulfilled (*ἀλλ' ἵνα ἡ γραφή πληρωθῆ* . . .).' Here again it would be possible to treat the words quoted from Ps. xli. 9 as the main sentence on which the final *ἵνα*-clause depends. But the analogy of the other *ἵνα*-*πληρωθῆ* passages strongly suggests that *ἵνα* here introduces the main sentence (cf. John xvii. 12, where the subordinate character of *ἵνα πληρωθῆ* has a little more to be said for it).

(3) John xviii. 8 f. 'Jesus answered, "I told you that I am (he). So if ye seek *me*, let these men depart." The word he had said, "Of those whom thou hast given me I have lost none", had to be fulfilled (*ἵνα πληρωθῆ* . . .).'

(4) John xviii. 31 f. 'The Jews said to him, "It is not lawful for us to kill anyone". Jesus's word which he had spoken, indicating by what sort of death he was destined to die, had to be fulfilled (*ἵνα ὁ λόγος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ πληρωθῆ* . . .)'—a somewhat more ambiguous case than those just cited.

(5) Very similar is John xix. 24. 'So they' [the soldiers with Jesus's tunic] 'said to one another, "Let us not tear it, but let us cast lots for it (to decide) whose it shall be". The Scripture, "They divided my garments among themselves, and over my clothing did they cast lots", had to be fulfilled (*ἵνα ἡ γραφή πληρωθῆ* . . .).'<sup>1</sup>

Before we look for similar instances in the second or first person, let us put together a few more cases of the *third person* gathered from the other books of the New Testament.

(1) 1 Cor. vii. 5. 'Do not deny one another (sexual intercourse), except by mutual consent for a time, in order that ye may be free for prayer, and may (then) come together again. Satan must not tempt you (*ἵνα μὴ πειράξῃ ὑμᾶς ὁ Σατανᾶς*) on account of your incontinence.' Here the meaning certainly appears to require a break before the last *ἵνα*, as Dr. Moffatt's translation suggests.

(2) 1 Cor. vii. 29 f. 'This is what I mean, brothers. The time is limited: henceforth (therefore) even those who have wives should be (*ἵνα* . . . *ᾤσω*) as if they had none, and those who weep as if they wept not, . . .'

(3) 2 Cor. viii. 12 f. 'For if willingness is forthcoming, it is acceptable according to what a man has, not according to what he has not.

<sup>1</sup> W. F. Howard (*The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism*, 253) and Bauer (*Wörterbuch*) include John xi. 52 in their collections of passages illustrating the elliptical use of *ἵνα*: but the sense in that verse seems to me to demand the strictly final clause. A much more probable instance is John xii. 7: 'Let her alone. Let her keep it . . .'

For there ought not to be (simply) relief for others and suffering for you (οὐ γὰρ ἵνα ἄλλοις ἀνεσις, ὑμῖν θλίψις); but . . .'

(4) On the analogy of the Johannine ἵνα-πληρωθῆ- passages already quoted, the similar clauses in Matt. ii. 15, iv. 14, and xii. 17-21 (cf. xiii. 35) might also be considered as main sentences, expressing the inevitability of the fulfilment of Scripture.

(5) There is another ἵνα- passage regarded by some authorities as equivalent to a virtual third person imperative—Apoc. xiv. 13.<sup>1</sup> 'And I heard a voice saying from heaven: "Write, Happy henceforth are the dead who die in the Lord." Yes, the Spirit says (it), ἵνα ἀναπαύσονται from their labours, for their works follow after them.' It is not easy to see clearly who is meant, in the second half of the verse, to be saying (or writing) what. Presumably we ought to identify 'the Spirit' with the speaker from heaven, and to understand the resting from labours as the ground for the saints' happiness. That being so, it is perhaps simplest to regard the second half of the verse as the author's own comment on what he had heard from heaven, rather than as a continuation of the heavenly utterance itself. Now there is some evidence that ἵνα in late Greek sometimes means 'because',<sup>2</sup> a meaning which would exactly fit its context here, and which is perhaps supported by the fact that the verb is in the indicative mood, not (as elsewhere with the imperatival ἵνα) in the subjunctive. I should therefore venture to paraphrase the second half of the verse somewhat as follows: 'Yes, the heavenly Spirit instructs me so to put it on record that the departed saints are happy, because they will be resting from their painful earthly toils, and because their good deeds, with the joy and the rewards befitting them, follow them hence into the life beyond.'<sup>3</sup>

(6) The following passages are also worth studying in this connexion: Eph. i. 16 f. (see Westcott and Hort's marginal readings), iii. 15 f., iv. 29; Heb. ix. 24 f.; Titus ii. 4 f.

I will now enumerate the few tolerably clear cases of imperatival ἵνα used with the verb in the *first person*.

<sup>1</sup> Moulton (*Prolegomena*, 248) says: 'Dr. J. O. F. Murray suggests to me that this ἵνα may be seen in Rev. 14<sup>13</sup>. . . Its superior fitness in the grammatical structure of the verse is undeniable.' Bauer in the *Wörterbuch* also includes it; so does Radermacher (*Neutest. Grammatik* [1925], 178).

<sup>2</sup> Sophocles, *Lexicon*, 599 b (16); Pernot in *Expos. Times*, xxxviii. 104 f. (Dec. 1926). Cf., however, the sceptical discussion by A. T. Robertson in *Studies in Early Christianity* (ed. S. J. Case, 1928), 49-57.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. A. T. Robertson, as in last note, 54 f.: he mentions, as other possible instances of causal ἵνα, Apoc. xxii. 14, John viii. 56. On the latter of these two passages, cf. E. Abbott, *Joh. Grammar*, 116 f., and E. C. Colwell, *Gk. of the Fourth Gosp.* 113-15.

(1) John i. 22. 'So they said to him (John): "Who art thou? We have to give an answer (*ἵνα ἀποκρισὼν δώμεν*) to those who sent us. What sayest thou of thyself?"' John ix. 36 is very similar.<sup>1</sup>

(2) 2 Cor. x. 8 f. 'For even if I do boast somewhat more strongly about our authority . . ., I shall not be ashamed. I do not want (however) to seem to overawe you (*ἵνα μὴ δόξω ὡς ἂν ἐκφοβεῖν ὑμᾶς*) by means of my letters' (cf. Moffatt's rendering).

(3) Philem. 19. 'I, Paul, write it with my own hand: "I will repay it." I do not want (by the bye) to remind thee (*ἵνα μὴ λέγω σοι*) that thou owest me thine own self also.'<sup>2</sup>

I have not so far adduced any further possible instances of imperatival *ἵνα* used with the verb in the *second person*. This is because I am anxious not to 'overrun my scent'. But I append here a list of references to a number of passages in which *ἵνα* used with a verb in the second person, although capable of being construed as a subordinating conjunction, usually with a 'final' sense, may conceivably introduce a main sentence with imperatival force. I have marked with an asterisk the cases in which the *ἵνα*-clause is so rendered by Dr. Moffatt.

Mark xiv. 38; 1 Thess. iv. 11 f.; 1 Cor. i. 10, v. 2\*, xiv. 1, xvi. 6, 15 f.\*; Rom. xvi. 1 f.\*; Col. iv. 16 fin.\*,<sup>3</sup> 17\*; Eph. iii. 17 f.; Phil. i. 10, ii. 2, 14 f.; 1 Pet. ii. 21\*; Heb. vi. 11 f., xii. 3; 2 John 6 fin.\*; Apoc. xviii. 4, xix. 17 f.; John x. 37 f.<sup>4</sup>, xiii. 34 b\*;<sup>5</sup> Jas. i. 4; 1 Tim. i. 3\*, iii. 14 f., v. 21; 2 Pet. i. 4.

The reader who is at pains to turn up these passages in his Greek Testament may well wonder, in the case of some of them, why one cannot rest content with the customary interpretation. Were it not

<sup>1</sup> It is interesting to compare with these passages Sophokles, *Philoktetes*, l. 989: *Zeὺς ἔσθ', ἵν' εἰδῆς, Ζεὺς, ὁ τῆσδε γῆς κρατῶν, . . .* ('It is Zeus—I tell thee) that thou mayest know—Zeus who controls this earth, . . .'). The new Liddell and Scott has a number of such instances of the apparent omission of an explanatory main clause. Perhaps John i. 22 ought to be regarded as similar; but the frequent occurrence of what I have called the imperatival *ἵνα* lays this other possibility open.

<sup>2</sup> On Jesus's words in Mark xii. 15 (*φέρετέ μοι δηνάριον ἵνα ἴδω*), Dr. A. E. J. Rawlinson (note *ad loc*) says: 'Translate and punctuate "Bring me a *denarius*. Let me look at it."' Possibly we have here another instance of the independent *ἵνα*-clause. The reply of Bartimaeus to Jesus (*Ῥαββουὶ, ἵνα ἀναβλέψω*) in Mark x. 51 (cf. Luke xviii. 41, Matt. xx. 33) might conceivably be regarded as an independent sentence, but more probably it depends on the *θέλω* implied by *θέλεις* in Jesus's question (cf. Moulton, *Prolegomena*, 179, and Turner in *The Journ. of Theol. Stud.* xxix. 357 (July 1928)).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Jannaris in *Expos.* V. ix. 308 (April 1899).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Jannaris, in *op. cit.* 306 f. He adds other possible cases.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. E. Abbott, *Joh. Grammar*, 115, 124 f.

for the existence of a number of clear instances of *iva* introducing an independent imperatival sentence, it would be quite unjustifiable to depart from the usual rendering in these last-specified passages. But in the light of the evidence I have presented, one is justified in regarding as at least worth consideration a suggestion which would otherwise be without foundation. Critical study not infrequently exemplifies this principle of judgement.

In conclusion, I would just mention for the sake of completeness two important *iva*-passages in the Synoptic Gospels to which I have not yet referred. They are relevant to the present inquiry; but I do not propose to discuss them here because they both involve other difficult questions of literary and exegetical criticism, the consideration of which would take us too far afield. The passages I have in mind are—

Mark ii. 10 = Luke v. 24 = Matt. ix. 6, Jesus's words over the forgiven paralytic.

Mark iv. 12 = Luke viii. 10; cf. Matt. xiii. 13, the explanation why Jesus spoke in parables. C. J. CADOUX

### A SAYINGS-COLLECTION IN MARK'S GOSPEL?

IN this JOURNAL for July 1939 (vol. xl, p. 277), Dr. R. H. Lightfoot hinted that the irregular and unequal use of the name  $\delta$  'Ιησοῦς in Mark might be a sign of the diverse provenance of sections of the Gospel. Investigation upon these lines provides some useful and suggestive results.

The name occurs in the W.H. text of Mark eighty times. If we omit the occurrence in i. 1 and two occurrences after xv. 37 (the death of Jesus), and also two places (v. 7 and x. 47) where Jesus is addressed, the name being in the vocative, we have seventy-five places where the name is used in the narrative of the actual ministry. In eleven of these cases  $\delta$  'Ιησοῦς is the subject of a verb denoting action of some kind and twenty-one occurrences are in oblique cases. In the remaining forty-three instances  $\delta$  'Ιησοῦς is the subject of a verb of saying, and an utterance of Jesus follows.

Thus in more than half the occurrences of the name in Mark's account of the ministry (43 out of 75), 'Jesus says' or 'Jesus said' or an equivalent phrase is used. This proportion is the more remarkable in view of the comparatively small amount of space devoted to the teaching of Jesus in Mark. It would seem that the writer sought especially to emphasize the words of Jesus in this way. An analysis