CHAPTER 1

Introduction

The rationale for this book is dissatisfaction with the treatment of particles in Koine Greek, and in particular with the lack of a reasonable theoretical framework by which their use might be described. This may seem to be esoteric and irrelevant for biblical studies, focusing as it does on small parts of the Greek language, but I argue that the conclusions reached have serious implications for exegesis and translation, leading the way to a clearer understanding of the position of Koine in the history of Greek as well as the way in which it functioned in the first century CE. The particular particle which is the focus of this study is ἵνα, but ὅτι, whose development parallels ἵνα in the Koine, is also dealt with in one chapter.

1.1 Background to Study

The background to this study is the change in use of particles in Koine Greek and in particular the increase in the frequency and variation in the use of the particle ἵνα. From being used exclusively as a particle which introduced purpose clauses in Classical Greek, it came to be used to introduce both dependent and independent clauses, as well as a wide range of the former. Its frequency especially in the writers of the New Testament and Epictetus is surprising. It occurs 663 times in the New Testament, but only 63 times in the first five books of the *Histories* of Polybius. Particles are often said to be a reliable indicator of language change in general and grammatical change in particular.[1] This is especially true of the change in both use and frequency not only of ἵνα but also of ὅτι.[2] Although this change was gradual and may be seen incipiently even in Aristotle and Demosthenes, the pace of that change gained momentum in the centuries after the conquest of Alexander and the concomitant spread of the Greek language geographically. This change marks a new direction for the ancient language, but probably reflects the situation in the spoken rather than the literary language even before Koine became widespread. This is a question of register which will be dealt with in Chapter 8.

---

[1] *ATR,* p. 1144 '…the particles mark the history of the effort to relate words with each other, clause with clause, sentence with sentence, paragraph with paragraph'.

[2] The significance in the increase of these two particles is the development of the subordinate clauses which they introduce in place of the previously dominant infinitival construction.

Grammarians differ as to which words are particles,[3] but I use the word in its wider sense, since 'conjunction', although usually an adequate term to describe ἵνα, does not fit every context.[4] In recent years, many scholars have focused on the intersentential particles in the Koine, both inferential[5] and conjunctive,[6] but very little study has been carried out specifically, as far as I am aware, on those particles which relate clauses, introduce subordination and seem to direct much of the logical argument of the sentence.[7]

In the Koine, ἵνα followed by a clause in the subjunctive mood seems to be increasing the scope of its operations in the works of certain authors such as Polybius, Dionysius, Epictetus[8] and the writers of the New Testament, while ὅπως is steadily retreating. Further, ἵνα may introduce clauses which would be described in traditional grammar as purpose, result, cause,[9] indirect command, imperatival, nominal. This increase is frequently at the expense of the infinitive, but there are many verbs which may have their arguments explicated either by a ἵνα clause or by the infinitive. It is often assumed that the choice between these two constructions is based on authorial style, but I argue that while this may be true to a certain extent, it deals neither with the reason for that particular style[10] nor with the inferences which the writer, perhaps not completely consciously, expects a reader to draw from such a choice.

1.2 Problem to be Addressed

The question raised in this book is: what inference does the use of ἵνα with the subjunctive invite the reader to draw in her[11] interpretation of the clause it introduces and its relationship to the rest of the sentence? This question arises because it seems to be a general assumption, based on an earlier stage of the

---

[3] *ATR* is inclusive in his treatment of this subject, but Denniston (1953) limits his study to those particles which connect clauses and sentences, leaving aside subordinating conjunctions.

[4] Chapter 3 deals with the independent use of this particle, which therefore cannot be conjunctive.

[5] R. Blass (1993), Levinsohn (1999) and (2000).

[6] S. Black (2002), Poythress (1984), Winedt (2000).

[7] Jannaris (1897), Mandilaras (1976) and Caragounis (2004) have examined these in much wider grammars of the language from a historical perspective. Levinsohn (2003) has an unpublished paper on ὅτι which is discussed in 7.2.1.

[8] Epictetus did not write but his lectures were recorded by Arrian as *Discourses*.

[9] I am not convinced of this category, but it will be dealt with at 9.3.1.4.

[10] I will show that 'style' is based on authorial choice which in turn is guided by relevance. The author intends the reader to draw inferences from the construction chosen.

[11] The masculine pronoun 'he' is used in this book to refer to a speaker or writer, while the female pronoun 'she' is used for the hearer or reader. This, or the reverse usage, has become a convention in the literature of relevance theory. Note further points at footnote 80.

language, that the 'meaning', or dictionary entry for ἵνα is 'in order that'. A study of the NT texts alone, however, shows that for Luke and John this is true for only 40% and 62% of such uses[12] respectively. The remaining instances show a wide range of clause types, in terms of traditional grammar, as noted above, together with contexts in which a telic interpretation of this particle is simply impossible.[13]

Consider the following example (1) from 1 John 1:9:

Example (1) [14] ἐὰν ὁμολογῶμεν τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν, πιστός ἐστιν καὶ δίκαιος, ἵνα ἀφῇ ἡμῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας καὶ καθαρίσῃ ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἀδικίας.
If we confess our sins, he (God) is faithful and just that he should forgive our sins and cleanse us from all wrongdoing.

The content of the clause introduced by ἵνα 'that he should forgive our sins…' cannot be the purpose of the righteous and faithful nature of God. It is rather the reverse: the author is claiming that the faithfulness and righteous nature of God is the basis on which such forgiveness might be predicated.[15]

A further example (2) from Luke 1:43 also shows the difficulty of insisting on a telic interpretation for a clause introduced by this particle:

Example (2) καὶ πόθεν μοι τοῦτο ἵνα ἔλθῃ ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ κυρίου μου πρὸς ἐμέ;
So what is this to me/ why did this happen to me that the mother of my lord should come to me?

Again, the clause introduced by ἵνα may explain the preceding τοῦτο or may introduce a prophetic insight,[16] but it cannot indicate a relationship of purpose with the preceding clause. I do not deny that this particle may introduce a purpose clause, but it does not follow from this that the particle itself has a lexical meaning of 'in order that'. If the clause it introduces is telic, then the reader has been able to infer this from the context. Consider Example (3):[17]

Example (3) ἔδοξε κἀμοὶ …καθεξῆς σοι γράψαι, κράτιστε Θεόφιλε, ἵνα ἐπιγνῷς περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης λόγων τὴν ἀσφάλειαν.
It seemed good to me also…to write for you in an orderly fashion, excellent

---

[12] This figure is arrived at by counting all instances of ἵνα which might be analysed as indicating purpose. This might not be the only or even the most relevant analysis.
[13] Consider John 5:7; 12:7.
[14] Since this study involves two disciplines: biblical studies and linguistics, the usual linguistic practice of introducing examples by bracketed numbers has been modified. The word 'example' prefaces each bracketed number, in order that there may be no confusion with the numbering of biblical text.
[15] This example is dealt with in detail at 6.2.1.
[16] This analysis is dealt with at 5.3 and 5.4.
[17] Luke 1:3-4, which is also dealt with at 6.1 Example (1).

Theophilus, in order that you might know the certainty of the accounts you have heard.

It is the context in the above example which alerts the reader to expect the ἵνα clause to give the purpose of the 'writing'. The desired outcome of this writing is that the reader, Theophilus, should be assured concerning reports which he has heard. We do not infer this from the particle ἵνα alone, but from the context also.

We cannot claim that one clause is in a relationship of purpose to the other *solely* on the basis of the lexical meaning of ἵνα and in defiance of the context. In other words, we cannot insist that someone did something in order to achieve a certain purpose if the *context*, and not merely the introductory particle, does not support this. I argue that ἵνα does not have a fixed meaning of 'in order that', but rather that its function is to alert the reader to expect a thought, desire or intention of the speaker, and the fact that the verb of that clause is in the subjunctive mood signals that this represents a potential rather than an actual state of affairs. [18]

1.3 Review of Scholarly Opinion

Since particles such as ἵνα have been dealt with traditionally as part of a wider grammatical framework, my review will outline briefly the views of the standard grammatical works of Blass Debrunner, J.H. Moulton, C.F.D. Moule, A.T. Robertson and Winer, together with the historical approaches of Horrocks, Jannaris and Mandilaras, the latter two in addition contributing their intuitive knowledge of their own language. Caragounis' comprehensive volume on the development of Greek in relation to the NT[19] is also relevant to this topic and its significance will also be noted at this point.

Since wider scholarly comment on ἵνα in the NT relates to its use in particular sentences, this will be adduced throughout the book when each example is discussed. This appears to be the simplest way of dealing with comment which is pertinent, but also disparate. In this section only the contribution of the major grammatical works listed above will be noted.

1.3.1 Classical Greek - Grammars

Grammarians concerned with Classical Greek, such as Goodwin and Smyth, understood the particle ἵνα to be used exclusively to introduce final clauses. This was in contrast to the particle ὅπως which together with a verb in indicative mood, could introduce a wider range of clauses than ἵνα, particularly after verbs of striving, asking or commanding. Consider the following example which has a future tense after ὅπως:

---

[18] This is dealt with under 'Theoretical basis' at 1.3 as well as in Chapter 2.

[19] Caragounis (2004).

Example (4) Χρὴ ὁρᾶν τοὺς Ἀργείους ὅπως σωθήσεται ἡ Πελοπόννησος.
The people of Argos must see that the Peloponnese is saved. (MGS)[20]

These uses of ὅπως were in addition to its function, when accompanied by a subjunctive verb, as a particle introducing final clauses. Goodwin points out that very rarely the particle ἵνα might introduce an object (i.e. noun) clause in Classical Greek, but 'it reappears in the later language, as in the New Testament'.[21] He also gives a useful chart[22] which shows the shift in the use of both these particles, with ἵνα gradually becoming the particle of choice for introducing final clauses, even in the classical language. It was also the case in the classical language that if a purpose was *not* fulfilled, because the action on which it was predicated did not take place, then the clause introduced by ἵνα would have a verb in the indicative mood.[23] This is noted because I shall argue that the function of this particle in Koine is also related to the mood in which its accompanying verb appears.

Of course there were other ways in which purpose might be expressed, such as the infinitive - with or without ὥστε or ὡς - and indeed this construction seems to have been more frequently used than a clause with ἵνα. The future participle was also a potentially telic construction, as was the relative with a future indicative.[24] This fact leads one to ask what the factors were which were involved in the choice of a particular construction. This study does not focus on Classical Greek and so I have not pursued this, but those Greeks who have written grammars of their own language suggest that ἵνα clauses were more popular in spoken language in classical times than they were in the literary register of that period.[25] The subject of register will be dealt with in Chapter 8.

1.3.2 Koine Greek

The limiting of ἵνα to a telic function noted for Classical Greek seems to be the criterion by which the later use in Koine is judged, in spite of the fact that before the time of the NT the use of this particle was extending in that it introduced 'object' clauses after verbs of commanding and striving, much as the particle ὅπως had in an earlier form of the language. This can be clearly seen in the formal documents and inscriptions from the Ptolemaic period[26] as well as the contemporary papyri. In the former ὅπως is used as much as, if not

---

[20] Thucydides 5.27, example given in Goodwin (1965 reprint) §339.

[21] Goodwin §357. He gives several examples from Homer (hence the use of the term 'reappear') but only one example from Demosthenes.

[22] Goodwin p. 398. This is adapted from the work of Dr Philip Weber (no publication date given), and is given in this book at 8.2.

[23] Goodwin §333. Smyth (1920), Example (1) at 8.2.

[24] Goodwin §338.

[25] Jannaris (1897) §05,022, Appendix VI §5. Caragounis (2004) more generally p. 40.

[26] Bradford Welles (1974).

more than ἵνα, but the latter appears after verbs and verbal phrases such as φροντίζω, πρόνοιαν ποιούμενος, παρακαλέω and γράφω. [27]

Polybius and Dionysius of Halicarnassus also use ἵνα after verbs of commanding and striving, as well as to introduce a noun clause.[28] Only one example[29] is given at this point:

> Example (5) καταπαυσάντων δὲ τὸν λόγον, κοινῇ μὲν ἔφη πειρᾶσθαι φροντίζειν ἵνα μηδὲν ἀδίκημα γίνηται Ῥωμαίοις ἐξ Ἰλλυριῶν· ἰδίᾳ γε μὴν οὐ νόμιμον εἶναι τοῖς βασιλεῦσι κωλύειν Ἰλλυριοις τὰς κατὰ θάλατταν ὠφελείας.
>
> When they had finished their speech, she said that in the public realm she would try to see to it that the Romans would suffer no wrong from the Illyrians, but in the private realm it was not the custom for the kings to hinder the booty from the sea to the Illyrians/ to stop the Illyrians from gains from the sea. (MGS)

Here the clause introduced by ἵνα explicates what Teuta (she) will attempt to pay attention to (following φροντίζειν). The use of literary features such as accusative and infinitive for indirect speech may be seen here: πειρᾶσθαι, εἶναι as well as the Attic -ττ- for the Koine -σσ-, but together with these there is the use of the particle ἵνα to indicate what the subject (Teuta) would strive for: *there should be no wrong done to the Romans*.

Several perceptive grammarians such as A.T. Robertson and J.H. Moulton, as well as the Greek grammarians Jannaris, Mandilaras and Caragounis appreciated the way in which the language had been developing in that the literary use of the infinitival constructions was giving way to a simpler, more perspicacious grammatical form, not only in the writings of the NT but in writers of literary Koine also.

1.3.2.1 TRADITIONAL GRAMMARS

The position of the most notable grammarians with reference to the use and function of ἵνα can be distinguished as follows:

1. those who insist on a telic meaning, based on the classical language, for most of the uses of this particle, and
2. those who see the particle as broadening the scope of its use in the language generally and not only in the biblical text.

---

[27] Bradford Welles (1980) p. 19, 34, 119, 163, 180.

[28] Note Examples (16) and (17) at 4.3.2.1 and Examples (18) and (19) at 4.3.2.2 for clauses of indirect command following this particle in Dionysius and Polybius respectively.

[29] Polybius *Histories* Book II.4.8. Although Polybius is regularly quoted to exemplify literary Koine, he wrote in the period which Jannaris describes as 'Hellenistic', that is 208-126 BCE.

The grammarians Burton and Winer take the first position. Although they *note* the different clauses which the particle seems to introduce, they are able to suggest 'purpose' as being behind many of these uses. Their particular concern is the question of an ecbatic use for ἵνα which they view as being appealed to in order to avoid a theological difficulty. 'There is no certain, scarcely a probable, instance in the New Testament of a clause introduced by ἵνα denoting actual result as such.'[30]

Also they view some epexegetic clauses as expressing 'conceived' but not actual result. It has to be said that these grammarians,[31] familiar as they were with the classical language,[32] held certain presuppositions which coloured their analysis of ἵνα. The most salient of these was the conviction that, since 'purpose' was behind the use of this particle, the notion that 'result' might also be included in its meaning was viewed as weakening the sense of the particle to accommodate theological considerations. This seems ironic, since it was a theological presupposition, the 'divine will', which caused Winer at least to refuse all but a telic interpretation for a ἵνα clause. He explained the difficult uses of this particle as having 'divine government'[33] behind them, a position which seems to be supported by *BAGD*,[34] albeit on a slightly different platform of 'Jewish thought'. Moule more reasonably widens this to be a reference to the 'Semitic mind' being 'notoriously unwilling to draw a sharp dividing line between purpose and consequence.'[35] This may be true in terms of a different world view, without necessarily invoking the nebulous concept of 'divine government.'[36] Moule's comments also are related particularly to the vexed question of purpose versus result clauses. His approach fits better in the second group of scholars.

Those clauses introduced by ἵνα which older grammarians describe as 'object clauses',[37] 'complementary and epexegetic clauses' are viewed as

---

[30] Burton (1894) §222. Note comments at 3.1.

[31] In particular Burton (1894) and Winer (1882).

[32] The comparisons made are always with the classical language, while there are no references to papyri evidence in support of language change, unlike the grammar of A.T. Robertson.

[33] Winer p. 573-4.

[34] *BAGD* p. 377-8.

[35] Moule (1982 reprint) p. 142.

[36] In many Afro Asiatic languages today (Hebrew falls within this grouping) there is no distinction made between a particle which introduces a final clause and one which introduces a consecutive clause. I suggest that for these speakers the notions of intended result and actual result do not require to be distinguished. Note that Classical Greek *did* distinguish, by means of mood, those purpose clauses which were not actualised from those which were, but Koine did not.

[37] *ATR* pp. 991-4; Goodwin (1965 reprint) §303A, 304, 339, 340.

'taking the place of the infinitive'.[38] This is true diachronically, but it does not explain the process by which speakers and then writers preferred to use such constructions instead of the infinitive. Again, since the classical language was the criterion against which the NT usage was judged, there was a strong predisposition to view 'purpose' as the primary indication in this particle's use. The wider use of ἵνα in pagan Greek was not considered at all. It is possible that even in the classical language the use of the particle ἵνα may have indicated a thought, desire or intention of the speaker or subject rather than having a fixed dictionary meaning of 'in order that'. Since this is not the focus of this book, I do not offer evidence for this.

The grammarians who take the second view accept that the language was changing and particle use with it. Some, like Turner, see it as a change for the worse, a deterioration deriving from Semitic influence,[39] while others such as Blass,[40] J.H. Moulton, Moule and Robertson accept it as an historical fact, making no value judgement on it. I will briefly summarise the comments of these scholars regarding the use of ἵνα in the NT and the reasons for the extension of its use in comparison to the classical language.

Blass, Debrunner and Funk see certain uses of the infinitive retreating in the face of 'analytical constructions with ἵνα and ὅτι'.[41] They acknowledge that this trend could be seen in 'early Hellenistic' but point out that even in the NT 'the infinitive is still used abundantly by all authors and the choice between the inf. and ἵνα appears to be a matter of preference in each case'.[42] I agree that this is the case, but argue that this is motivated by the communicative desire to make the thought of the speaker or subject clear for the reader. The comments on ἵνα clauses come within the general section on 'Mood' in *BDF*, that is in the units which deal with the infinitive.[43] The section which deals with final clauses[44] is concerned mainly with mood (optative, indicative) and only briefly with the use of ἵνα in place of the Attic ὅπως or ὅπως μή after verbs of striving. By contrast it is in the lengthy section on the infinitive that the varied uses of ἵνα are dealt with. These are described as 'analytical constructions' but no rationale is given for this construction and its prominence, nor for the fact that authors seem to use both constructions even after the same main verb. The use of this particle then is viewed predominantly from the perspective of the

---

[38] *BDF* '..analytical constructions with ἵνα and ὅτι have developed into serious rivals of the infinitive' §388.

[39] Turner (1988 reprint): 'If one cannot claim that its (ἵνα) even greater flexibility of use was entirely due to Semitic influence, one must at least underline the difficulty of finding anywhere but in biblical books such a wide variety in the use of ἵνα, imperatival, causal, consecutive, epexegetical, within so small a space' p. 8-9.

[40] Friedrich Blass, noted in Blass, Debrunner and Funk below.

[41] *BDF* §388.

[42] *BDF* §388; 'early Hellenistic' seems to refer to the period 300-100BCE.

[43] *BDF* §388-394.

[44] *BDF* §369.

earlier infinitival use, and the decline of the infinitive in both final and complement clauses.

J.H. Moulton's lucid and open minded discussion of the wider use of ἵνα in his *Prolegomena* is a great contrast to the comments of Turner in volume three of that series. After noting that the reluctance of the earlier commentators to yield to a wider understanding of the particle was 'driven by the supposed demands of grammar' he summarises his own view:

> That ἵνα normally meant "in order that" is beyond question. It is perpetually used in the full final sense in the papyri, having gained greatly on the Attic ὅπως. But it has come to be the ordinary construction in many phrases where a simple infinitive was used in earlier Greek ...the burden of making purpose clear is in all cases thrown on the context.[45]

I would add to his comment that if it is *context* which determines the use of this particle then it cannot be said to have a lexical meaning of 'in order that'. We should instead examine the function of the particle, the syntactic contexts in which it appears as well as the pragmatic inferences which a reader is invited to draw from its use in order to determine its role in post Classical Greek. Moulton does discuss the demise of the infinitive in later Greek together with the regional variations in this process. He is open minded about the flexibility of this particle but does not discuss reasons for this change and for the increase in its use.

C.F.D. Moule is likewise very open in his examination of this particle: 'Biblical Greek must not be laid upon the Procrustean bed of Classical grammar.'[46] He rejects a purely final meaning for ἵνα, citing the 'Semitic mind' as the reason for the lack of clear definition between ecbatic and telic uses. He also notes the Septuagintal translation of Genesis 22:14 which cannot surely be a telic use of this particle:

> Example (6) καὶ ἐκάλεσεν Αβρααμ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ τόπου ἐκείνου Κύριος εἶδεν, ἵνα εἴπωσιν σήμερον Ἐν τῷ ὄρει κύριος ὤφθη.
> So Abraham called the name of that place 'The Lord saw' so that they say today 'In the mountain the Lord was seen.'

He approves of Cadoux's suggestion, noted below, of an imperatival sense for ἵνα, although disagreeing with some of the latter's examples on the ground that they are deontic rather than imperatival. Still other examples he sees as 'denoting content'.[47] This description seems to refer to clauses which follow

---

[45] Moulton (1998 reprint) p. 206 and 207.
[46] Moule (1982 reprint) p. 142.
[47] Cadoux (1941) pp. 144-5.

such verbs as εὐχαριστῶ[48] and συνίστημι.[49] I will argue that his analysis may be extended to see the function of this particle as giving procedural instructions to the reader to expect an expression of the wish, command, intention or understanding of the author or speaker.

A.T. Robertson has references to the extension in the use of ἵνα together with the retreat of the infinitive in Koine throughout his comprehensive grammar of 1454 pages. He sees this as part of a natural process of language change:

> The infinitive as a whole disappears before ὅτι and ἵνα (modern Greek νά)...It was always a matter of discretion with a Greek writer whether in certain clauses he would use the infinitive or an object-clause (ὅτι, ὅπως, ἵνα).[50]

Robertson has been described as having a grasp of developments in Greek which is 'masterly, not to say magisterial.'[51] I would concur with that assessment since my own understanding of the particle is based on authorial choice which attempts to make salient the thought and attitude of a speaker. If it is acknowledged that a writer makes a choice, then the basis on which such a choice is made has to be considered. My argument is that this basis is relevance. I do not claim that this was a conscious process of selection, although with writers such as Dionysius and Polybius it may have been.

Again, because of the breadth of his treatment of the topic, I will refer to Robertson's opinion on various texts as they are in focus throughout the book. Here I note only his concluding comments on this particle's use:

> So, then, we conclude that ἵνα has in the N.T. all three uses (final, sub-final,[52] consecutive), and thus runs a close parallel with the infinitive which it finally displaced. [53]

The Greeks themselves, from Apollonius Dyscolos to Jannaris, Mandilaras and Caragounis,[54] see the advancement of ἵνα as a natural part of language development and reject the notion of Semitic influence. This is the position which I will defend in this book: that ἵνα had extended its role in Hellenistic[55]

---

[48] Ephesians 1:16-17.

[49] Romans 16:1, 2.

[50] *ATR* p. 371.

[51] Horsley (1989) p. 59.

[52] *ATR* uses the term 'sub-final' for imperatival, indirect command, noun clauses, in short every use of the particle which is neither ecbatic nor telic.

[53] *ATR* p. 999.

[54] See under 2.2.3.

[55] As noted in Chapter 8, I use the term Hellenistic to refer to the period 300 to 150BCE, thus distinguishing it from the more general term 'Koine' which I use to describe the language from 150 BCE to 300 CE.

Greek, certainly from 300 BCE, to take over some of the functions of the particle ὅπως and to introduce a wide range of clauses, thereby no longer having a fixed lexical meaning of 'in order that'.

1.3.2.2 PARTICULAR PROPOSALS FOR THE USE OF ἵνα

Other scholars have proposed explanations for both the extension in the use of this particle and its frequency, particularly in the Gospel of John. Cadoux[56] suggested that one particular use could be viewed as 'imperatival', a notion which has found favour with many scholars who have followed him, and which may account for some instances of independent clauses which are introduced by ἵνα. Cadoux based his argument on the post classical use of θέλω followed by a ἵνα clause with the subjunctive. He claimed that it then became common to omit the main verb 'so that the ἵνα-clause virtually became as much a main sentence as if the plain imperative had been used'[57] and gave evidence both from the papyri and Epictetus. For the NT he gave 'at least four unmistakeable cases' from Mark 5:23, 2 Corinthians 8:7, Ephesians 5:33 and Galatians 2:9.[58] Later commentators have accepted Cadoux's suggestion fairly uncritically as being a reasonable alternative to ellipsis, but Moule insightfully suggests[59] that 'it would be better in some cases to describe the ἵνα as "denoting content" rather than as imperatival', a point which is particularly relevant not only to clauses which might be classed as 'imperatival' but also to those coming under the description of 'indirect command'.[60] I argue that a ἵνα clause does 'denote content' but that the function of the particle is to alert the reader to expect that content and to read it as indicating speaker or subject attitude.

The term 'imperatival', however, was not clearly defined which led others to contest this description of such clauses. It seems that Cadoux may have been conflating the notions of 'command' and 'necessity', that is: instead of giving a command a speaker may, in the use of a ἵνα clause, have intended to give a representation of what he thought someone 'should' do. This is a weaker communication than a command. Certainly Cadoux's translation of some of the Johannine examples which he used leads one to view them as deontic rather than imperatival.[61] This does not invalidate Cadoux's hypothesis, but it should be expanded to include the notion of what one 'should' do. I argue that by analysing this particle as alerting the reader to expect the thought or attitude of the speaker or subject, I allow for this to encompass both the thought of what

---

[56] Cadoux (1941).
[57] Cadoux p. 166.
[58] These examples are discussed in Chapters 3 and 4.
[59] Moule p. 145.
[60] These examples will be dealt with in Chapter 4.
[61] For example his translation of ἀλλ᾽ ἵνα μαρτυρήσῃ as 'he had to bear witness' John 1:8.

the subject wants someone to do and what he thinks that someone should do. In English we distinguish between the communicatory effect of the following expressions:

   a. Do this.
   b. Please do this.
   c. I want (would like) you to do this.
   d. I think you should do this.

At this point, it should be noted that the *meaning* of ἵνα rather than its *function* has been a point of confusion in the discussion. It is more accurate to see any lexical meaning, reflected in the English translation, as being derived from its function in the clause it introduces as well as from its logical relation to the main clause, or even the rest of the sentence. Even modern grammars of NT Greek[62] give a translation of this particle as 'in order that', in spite of the fact that this is only true for 40% of the occurrences in Luke and 62% in John. This is of course still a substantial use, but in the 46 examples of this particle in Luke, only 21 introduce a purpose clause, while the remaining 25 introduce noun clauses or indirect commands as well as independent clauses. It certainly cannot be said to have a meaning of 'in order that' in those cases.[63]

Burney and to a lesser extent Zerwick have suggested that the varied uses of ἵνα, that is in comparison to the classical language, arose as 'mistranslations' of the Aramaic particle *di*.[64] This suggestion, which is proposed particularly for the uses of this particle in the fourth gospel, has to be based on a proposed Aramaic original for the gospels, as well as first language interference on the part of authors or editors who were presumed to be speakers of Aramaic. The Aramaic particle in question introduces clauses with a much wider range of meaning than ἵνα and it might be considered then to be more likely that a less restrictive particle would be used in translation. Colwell[65] and Torrey[66] deal firmly with Burney's arguments and only Zerwick has revived them, and that for a very limited number of texts.

A further point is the use made of the particle by Epictetus in his *Discourses*, as presented by Arrian. In this work, many types of clause may be introduced by ἵνα: noun, independent, indirect command, consecutive, the particle being found with a frequency which approaches that of John's Gospel. There can be no question of Aramaic interference in the case of either Arrian or

---

[62] Duff (2005), Jay (1958), Wallace (1996) is more cautious.

[63] The difficulty for those teaching Greek via the medium of English is that there is no single word which captures the multiple functions of this particle. The particle 'that' fits many contexts, but is not always a particularly natural translation.

[64] Burney (1922).

[65] Colwell (1931).

[66] Torrey (1933).

Epictetus, nor in the case of Polybius and Dionysius of Halicarnassus who use the particle less frequently but nevertheless in ways which differ from the classical usage. This makes the suggestion of interference either from a Semitic mindset or Aramaic less than credible.

1.3.2.3 ANALYSIS PRESENTED BY GREEK GRAMMARIANS

The diachronic development of ἵνα will be dealt with in Chapter 8, but at this point it should be noted again that all the Greek[67] grammarians, as well as scholars such as Horsley and Horrocks, view the development in use as a natural part of language change. The reason given for this development is the decline and eventual disappearance of the infinitive. The accusative and infinitive, for example, was a literary construction which was oblique and occasionally ambiguous, rather than being as perspicacious as the later language demanded. This leads to the suggestion that infinitival constructions would have been particularly challenging for the many who spoke Greek as a second or third language in the koine period. On this analysis, the clauses introduced by ἵνα, or ὅτι, could be all those which would have been expressed by the infinitive, or accusative and infinitive, in the classical language. While accepting that ἵνα clauses do seem to have been used in the place of infinitival constructions from the Hellenistic period onwards, I argue that an explanation for this shift in language use, in terms of the communicatory effect which it made, has not yet been given.

Jannaris points out the disadvantages for popular speech of the infinitive, in that it did not mark person which led to occasional ambiguity in distinguishing subject and object.

> A Greek, then, who aimed particularly either at precision, or emphasis, or both, was often compelled to resolve the infinitive into a finite mood with the appropriate particle, and thus obtain the desired effect with regard to the precise meaning, person, number, time.[68]

He saw this as the predominant factor which led to the disappearance of the infinitive from the language in post Byzantine times. Apart from carefully crafted literary works, it was also difficult to keep up an infinitival construction after speech verbs. Consider the following example from the book of Acts, which is considered to exemplify good Koine,[69] in which there are mixed

---

[67] That is, grammarians working on their own language: Greek.

[68] Jannaris (1897) p. 569 who uses the term 'analysis' to describe the use of clauses introduced by either ἵνα or ὅτι with the subjunctive or indicative mood respectively.

[69] That is from the perspective of the NT. Note Mealand (1996) for a comparison with Dionysius of Halicarnassus.

constructions after a verb of implied speech:[70]

> Example (7) παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ ῾Ιεροσολύμων μὴ χωρίζεσθαι ἀλλὰ περιμένειν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρὸς ἣν ἠκούσατέ μου, ὅτι…..
> He instructed them not to leave Jerusalem but to wait for the promise of the father which you heard from me that…

This mixed construction is found in other parts of both Acts and Luke,[71] which suggests that a prolonged passage which encapsulated information using accusative and infinitive was difficult to maintain. The more natural, I infer, often took over.[72]

Jannaris' comments are supported by the use of the Modern Greek particle *νά* with the subjunctive, and the demise of the infinitive. I concur with this analysis, but argue that it does not go far enough in giving a theoretical basis for such change, given that in the NT and pagan Greek authors or editors used *both* ἵνα clauses *and* infinitival constructions after the same main verbs.

Caragounis[73] then takes the argument a step further. He makes excellent use of pagan materials in composing his arguments for the natural development of ἵνα by Greeks rather than attributing it to either Semitic or illiterate influence. While I appreciate his use of examples from Classical Greek onwards right up to Modern Greek[74] in support of the role of language change in the development of the use of this particle, I shall contest the validity of reading back into the Koine the uses of *νά* in *MGreek*. *MGreek* usage may *support* an analysis of earlier usage, but it seems to be methodologically unsound, linguistically, to read present day usage into an earlier stage of the language. Rouchota[75] and Horrocks,[76] for example, consider the particle *νά* in *MGreek* to be a marker of the subjunctive,[77] which means that it may introduce almost *any* clause which has a subjunctive verb. Since this was certainly not the case in Koine, it would seem to be an invalid step to assume that types of *νά* clauses which are found in *MGreek* may occur *for the same reason* in the earlier language. As with earlier grammarians who saw the changes in their diachronic perspective, Caragounis acknowledges the changing use of ἵνα, ὅπως and ὅτι but does not give a reason for such change which takes account of the use of

---

[70] Acts 1:4. Compare this with the lengthy constructions maintained for example by Polybius in his *Histories* at Book IV.26.4.

[71] Note Acts 25:4-5 and Luke 5:14, as well as *BDF* §470.

[72] That is not to say that the author did not use the construction in shorter passages: see Luke 24:46.

[73] Caragounis (2004).

[74] Hereafter *MGreek*.

[75] Rouchota (1994) p. 1 and 2, also Mackridge (1985) §1.3.2.

[76] Horrocks (1997) p. 76.

[77] In Chapter 8 the question of grammaticalisation of this particle, which has led to its use in Modern Greek, is discussed.

both constructions, that is infinitival and ἵνα clauses.

1.4 Corpus

The data base used for this study has been the gospels of Luke and John, together with the first five books of the *Histories* of Polybius, the first four books of the *Roman Antiquities* of Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Arrian's account of the *Discourses* of Epictetus. The choice of Luke and John was made on the basis of their use of ἵνα, with Luke having the fewest examples (45) and John the most (145) among the gospel writers. Polybius is widely regarded as presenting a good example of literary Koine, while Dionysius as a teacher of rhetoric and a writer on style and composition must be considered as an exponent of 'good' Greek. The *Discourses* of Epictetus were recorded by Arrian, who himself wrote in Attic, while the teachings of Epictetus are clearly Koine. Since these teachings are close to both the style and vocabulary of the NT they have provided valuable insights into the use of ἵνα.

In addition I have taken examples from the other gospel writers, Acts, the Pauline epistles, the Septuagint, inscriptions and letters from the royal correspondence of the Ptolomaic period as well as examples from the non-literary papyri. I examined several books of the *Jewish War* of Josephus, but do not adduce examples from these as evidence since the Semitic influence of these might be said to militate against their value as literary, but non-biblical Greek. Since the wider use of ἵνα in the NT has been explained in the past in terms of interference from Aramaic or the Semitic mindset, I have selected authors who could not be accused of such bias.

1.5 Theoretical Basis for Book

Studies which cross disciplines present particular challenges, but the insights of a discipline external to the one with which the main body of the material is concerned have considerable potential for throwing fresh light on a topic. Biblical studies has benefitted from both social science approaches and also from linguistics. It is from the latter that I propose to draw principles to guide the study of particles in Koine Greek.

The theoretical basis for my analysis of ἵνα is that of Relevance Theory,[78] a cognitive approach to language first proposed by Dan Sperber and Deirdre Wilson.[79] This theory, which will be explained in greater detail in Chapter 2, claims to articulate the principles behind the cognitive processes by which the mind selects the interpretation of an utterance. In other words it attempts to determine the principles by which speakers and writers of a language communicate with one another, both verbally and non-verbally. The argument developed in this book is that by using the particle ἵνα and a verb in the subjunctive mood the writer is not only selecting a particular grammatical form,

---

[78] Hereafter *RT*.
[79] Sperber and Wilson (1986/1995).

but is doing this having in mind the cognitive effects which his readers may expect to receive from such use. This particle leads the reader to expect a particular type of information which might be informally described as a representation of the subject, or speaker's, attitude.

By examining some of the principles of cognition involved in human communication, I hope to offer a unified analysis of this particle which will contribute to a better understanding of the text of the New Testament. Rather than stating that this particle has a fixed dictionary meaning or that it introduces a variety of clause types which could have been infinitival in the earlier language, I argue that its function is to give the reader directions, inviting her to expect a representation of a thought of the speaker or subject. This has led to the expansion of its function in Koine and later in Modern Greek.

This theoretical basis will be examined in more detail, with examples, in Chapter 2, but at this point it is sufficient to note that the theory deals with communication between implied author and reader, and between speaker and hearer. It asserts that humans speak and listen to one another because they believe, instinctively, that what they are communicating has relevance for the reader or hearer. 'Relevance' indicates that what is being communicated gives information which a hearer or reader wants or needs to hear, in that it confirms what she[80] knows already, or causes her to reassess her existing assumptions. Of course a communicator may be mistaken in thinking that what he has to say is relevant, but it is this belief which causes him to make the attempt anyway.

A further prominent claim of *RT* is that language is underdetermined: speakers do not say all that they 'mean' but rely on inference to communicate. Inferencing relies on knowledge which is common to both parties, both contextually and in terms of shared world view. This is known in *RT* as the speaker and hearer's cognitive environment. The parables of the NT rely heavily on such a shared cognitive environment, without which many of them are less than fully understood.[81] Certainly individual words have content, but that content has to be developed by inferences which are drawn from the context as noted above. It is true nevertheless that in spite of a shared cognitive environment a hearer may fail to make the inferences which a speaker intended, or even may make inferences which he did *not* intend.[82] In such cases, the communication may fail. *RT* does, I argue, offer a powerful explanatory model for the success and also the failure of oral and written communication.

---

[80] In this book the speaker or writer is referred to as 'he' and the hearer or reader as 'she'. Blakemore (1987) and R. Blass (1990) use this scheme, while Carston (2002) reverses it. I have selected the former since there is a general assumption that the authors and editors of both the NT books and the pagan Greek literature used were male.

[81] This point is made strongly by Bailey (1976) with reference to the Lucan parables; while there might be many possible readings, complete ignorance of the context will yield less than satisfactory meaning.

[82] Consider John 21:22-23 in which the author claims to show a mistaken inference.

1.6 Arrangement of Chapters

The arrangement of chapters followed in this book is: a discussion of relevance theory, followed by the presentation of various uses of ἵνα in terms of traditional grammar. These have been grouped as independent clauses, indirect commands, noun clauses and purpose clauses. The use of ὅτι is also dealt with, followed by a brief diachronic study of the change in use of ἵνα.

1.6.1 Summary of Chapter 2

This chapter gives a basic introduction to Relevance Theory, focusing on those aspects which are pertinent to the interpretation of ἵνα in Koine Greek. It discusses the principle of relevance on which the theory claims that communication, whether oral or written, is based. Underdeterminacy as a feature of language is then investigated followed by its inevitable concomitant: inferencing. Examples of underdeterminacy and inferencing are given both from modern English and Koine Greek. Procedural markers, which guide a reader in her interpretation, are then introduced as well as the application of this to the present study. Ostensive communication, both verbal and physical, is explained, again with examples from Koine. Finally the concept of metarepresentation which is a crucial part of the analysis presented in this book is demystified and supported by modern examples from English as well as Koine Greek.

1.6.2 Summary of Chapter 3

The discussion of the function of the particle ἵνα begins in this chapter. This is introduced by an investigation of those ἵνα clauses which cannot indicate purpose because they are not preceded, or followed, by a main clause. Since the notion of purpose logically depends on some action which was carried out with a particular end in view, if there is no indication of such action, then the rationale for the clause's identification as telic is not present. Purpose is not the same as intention. Examples from Koine are given, both from the NT and pagan Greek. Scholarly opinion regarding a suitable analysis of these clauses is also adduced, this frequently involving an hypothetical ellipsis of the main clause, although 'imperatival' ἵνα is also dealt with here. In contrast, an analysis of such clauses in terms of the wish, intention or desire of the speaker or author, or the representation of what he thinks *should* be done is presented. The distinction between purpose and intention is discussed, together with the notion of desirable or potential states of affairs.

1.6.3 Summary of Chapter 4

Many ἵνα clauses in the NT follow verbs of praying, asking, commanding or instructing. These verbs, however, are not always followed by this construction. A comparison of parallel passages in the Synoptic Gospels is made to show the inferences which a reader might be expected to draw from the use of a ἵνα clause rather than, for example, direct speech or an infinitival construction.

Although a notion of 'purpose' may be said to lie behind the giving of a command or prayer, this might be better analysed as a 'desirable outcome' since there is no *action* from which 'purpose' could be derived. The subject is rather expressing his will in an utterance which indicates a potential, rather than actual, state of affairs. An *RT* analysis which presents ἵνα as introducing a desirable state of affairs, from the perspective of the subject, is a more satisfactory interpretation of such clauses. Although indirect commands or requests were formerly introduced by the particle ὅπως followed by the indicative mood, or else an infinitival construction, examples of ἵνα clauses following verbs of asking or instructing may be found from the third century BCE onwards. Examples from this period are given, as well as from the NT.

1.6.4 Summary of Chapter 5

Many of the uses of ἵνα in the NT are described as 'noun clauses'. These are frequently epexegetic in that they explicate a noun, adjective or demonstrative in the main clause. Such clauses are particularly frequent in the Gospel of John (x18) but also occur in pagan Greek in the writings of Polybius, Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Epictetus. It is almost impossible to consider these clauses as telic. They did occur in the earlier language, but were rare.[83] Examples of such clauses from the writers mentioned above are given, together with NT examples from the Johannine and Pauline corpus. As with other clause types introduced by this particle, I argue that such noun clauses indicate the thought or wish of the subject, with the particle ἵνα prompting the reader to expect such a representation.

1.6.5 Summary of Chapter 6

The clauses dealt with in this chapter are those which may be considered as truly indicating 'purpose'. They refer to a desired outcome which was the motivation for the action of the main clause. The point is made, however, that many of such clauses refer to attributed purpose, that is: the writer or speaker attributes such a desired outcome as being the motivation for action which he or others have observed. I argue that the writer or speaker is presenting his view of the motivation of another. In many cases we may believe that the subject would refute such an attribution, but humans seem incapable of desisting from attributing such intentions to others, frequently on the basis of very slender evidence. In those cases where the subject is stating his own intention, he is representing his own thought in an utterance and ἵνα, as before, is alerting the reader to read the following clause as such a representation. Again, examples are given from Polybius and Dionysius as well as the NT.

1.6.6 Summary of Chapter 7

It is claimed in earlier chapters that ἵνα is introducing the subject's thought

---

[83] Goodwin (1965 reprint) §357, referencing Demosthenes xvi.28.

concerning a desirable rather than an actual state of affairs, and the use of the subjunctive mood has been said to support such an analysis. A concomitant development in Hellenistic Greek was the great increase in the use of ὅτι with a following indicative verb, rather than the infinitival construction of the classical language. It is of course reasonably likely that the former construction was more frequent in spoken rather than written Greek, even in the fifth century BCE, but it is difficult to find evidence to support this. By the time of Koine ὅτι could be used to introduce direct or indirect speech, as well as causal clauses. Now direct or indirect speech is obviously a representation of the thought of the speaker or another. It reports either directly[84] or by interpretation what someone has said or thought. This particle then gives the reader a signal of such a representation which follows in the clause it introduces.

I argue that in terms of the causal use of this particle someone is also being represented as believing a certain proposition which is presented as a 'state of affairs' by the use of ὅτι with an indicative verb. The speaker might be mistaken or telling lies, but he is presenting as fact a reason for someone's action.[85] Note the difference here between the two particles ἵνα and ὅτι: the former introduces a thought about a state of affairs which is potential and may not in fact be realised, while the latter introduces a clause which claims to be a representation of an actual situation, a real 'state of affairs'. The respective moods used with each particle are claimed to support this analysis.

1.6.7 Summary of Chapter 8

This chapter gives a brief diachronic overview of the relevant developments in the Greek language from the time of Classical Greek through Koine to Modern Greek. The purpose of this is to show that the wider use of ἵνα which is such a prominent feature of NT writings is not a Semitic aberration nor an indication of the supposed semi-literate nature of the language of the NT corpus, but should be seen as a natural development of the language which has continued up to the present day in the use of the particle νά. Greek grammarians themselves do not see this development as alien to the spirit of their language but rather part of the 'genius' of Greek.

Further, the increase in the use of the particle ὅτι (Chapter 7) also fits this pattern which takes into account the general trend in the language from the use of accusative and infinitive to clauses introduced by ἵνα and ὅτι. Explanations are given for this change from linguistic and communicatory perspectives.

---

[84] Said to be 'metalinguistic representation' at footnote 55 of 2.2.2.5. Note examples (8a,b,c) there also.

[85] John 12:5-6 is a good example of this, where the author is rejecting the ostensive reason given by the speaker and giving his own reason for the speaker's utterance, presenting this as an actual state of affairs.

1.6.8 Summary of Chapter 9

The conclusion brings together the evidence for the use of ἵνα with the relevance theoretic approach which claims a unitary analysis for the particle which has been presented in the earlier chapters. It also answers the question: how does this analysis affect the exegesis of biblical text? Several examples of 'difficult' uses of ἵνα are noted here, together with an explanation for such uses in terms of this particle's function as a procedural marker. Such an analysis allows for more than one interpretation of the logical relationship between the dependent clause and the main clause of the sentence, but the reader is guided by the principles of *RT* to take the most relevant of these. In addition, I address the question as to whether or not this conclusion should make any difference to the way in which Koine Greek is taught, and relate the work of earlier scholars to the solution proposed in this book. Finally, suggestions for future work are laid out using *RT* as a basis for such analysis.

1.7 Summary

This book addresses the question of what inferences the implied authors of the New Testament expected their readers and hearers to draw from their use of the particle ἵνα with the subjunctive mood. It refutes the notion that this particle has a fixed meaning in lexical terms, but claims that its function is that of a procedural marker alerting the reader to expect an indication of the speaker or subject's thought, often his desire or intention. It is the responsibility of the reader to draw from the text the most relevant logical relation between the clause introduced by ἵνα and the rest of the sentence. This claim is based on the assumption that a communicator presents information which is relevant to his hearers or readers, and that by using a clause introduced by this particle and in the subjunctive mood, he is inviting the recipients of his communication to draw inferences which would not have been as easily recovered if he had used other grammatical constructions. The use of ἵνα enables the reader or hearer to access the communicative intention of the implied author in a more perspicacious manner than if she was presented with an infinitival construction.

Although the burden of the book is concerned with the use of ἵνα, the use of ὅτι is also relevant here, since it displays a parallel function in signalling a speaker's thought or speech. Its use is therefore noted briefly as confirming the analysis of ἵνα presented in this study.

Throughout the book examples are given not only from the text of the New Testament, but also from the Septuagint and from pagan writers such as Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Polybius and Epictetus, in order to illustrate the wide-ranging nature of the proposed analysis. For the Septuagint and NT examples, I give my own translation into English, but for non biblical material I note the translator after each passage, whether my own (MGS) or that of another (*LCL*:Paton).