MISREADINGS AND MISRENDERINGS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

II.

B. ERRORS OF INTERPRETATION.*

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

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

* By inadvertence, which I regret, the passage quoted in my previous article (EXPOSITOR, p. 426) from Soph. Ant. 443, appears misread. The whole should run thus: καὶ φημί δράσαι κοικὶ ἀπαφοροῦμαι. (Cf. O.C. 317 καὶ φημί κάτῳ φημὶ, Ant. 442; Pl. Theact. 165b φάναι τε καὶ ἀπαφεξάμας.) Jos. Ant. 6, 7, 4, Σαούλος δὲ ἀδικῶν ὡμολόγει καὶ τὴν ὁμοριάν οὐκ ἑρείτο—which passages restore the force of my argument that John i. 19 ὡμολόγησε καὶ οὐκ ἑρείτο is a sort of Græcism.
affect very materially not only its grammar but its very essence.

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

In its current version the text referred to runs thus:

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

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

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

We know from our classical Greek grammar that one of
the functions of the infinitive was—as still is in some modern languages—to do duty for the imperative, in that it expressed a demand, exhortation, or wish, as: ἔξειναι, μὴ ἔξειναι for ἔξεστο, μὴ ἔξεστο; χαίρειν for χαίρε; εὖ πράττειν for εὖ πράττων. That this usage, which was common in classical Greek—it occurs some 500 times in the leading representatives of classical literature—survived down to Graeco-Roman times, appears abundantly from the contemporary inscriptions recording public decrees and law provisions; even the New Testament writings supply some examples, e.g.: Rom. 12, 15 χαίρειν μετὰ χαιρόντων, κλαίειν μετὰ κλαιόντων. Acts 15, 23. James 1, 1. Col. 4, 6 εἰδέναι πῶς δεῖ υμᾶς ἐν ἐκάστῳ ἀποκρίνεσθαι. Phil. 3, 16 εἰς ὅ ἐφθαίσαμεν τῷ αὐτῷ στοιχείῳ. Luke 9, 3 μηδὲν αἴρετε εἰς τὴν ὀδὸν μήτε ρᾶβδον μήτε πῆραν . . . μήτε ἀνὰ δύο χυτῶν αὐτῶν ἔχειν. Eph. 4, 22. Similarly we must read in 1 Tim. 1, 3 καθὼς παρεκάλεσά σε, προσμεῖναι ἐν Εφέσῳ, "as I requested thee, do stop at Ephesus."

We further know that the above jussive or hortative and desiderative function of the infinitive was concurrently and pre-eminently performed first by the imperative, either simple (as λέγε, εἰπατε), or periphrastic (by means of φέρε, ἀγε, δεῦρα, ἀγε ὅταν, as: Ar. Eq. 1011; Nub. 439; Ecol. 149; Pl. Gorg. 495D. Rep. 336D); next by the independent subjunctive (λέγωμεν, μὴ εἴπης, μηδεὶς εἴπῃ), then by the independent future indicative simple (ἔρεις, πάντως τοῦτο ἀράσεις. Matt. 5, 43 ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου. 6, 5 οὐκ ἔσεσθε ὡς οἱ ὑποκρίται. 20, 26. 5, 48. 5, 21; 27, 33 οὐ φονεύσεις, etc.; 21 ἔρειτε. Luke 4, 12. Acts 23, 5. Rom. 7, 7. 1 Cor. 9, 9, etc.); and lastly, in a milder form, by the independent optative (ὁνα, λέγοις ἂν, ἀλλὰ βουληθεῖς).

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

2 This computation is based upon Richard Wagner's pamphlet, Der Gebrauch des Imperativischen Infinitivs im Griechischen, Schwerin, 1891.
We finally learn from the post-classical and Graeco-Roman history of the language that, long before the Christian era, the infinitive had begun to shift its position. That is to say, on the one hand it gradually receded before Ἰνα + subjunctive, even after such verbs as θέλω—(in the New Testament we find θέλω Ἰνα in Matt. 7, 12. Mark 6, 25. 9, 30. Luke 6, 31. John 17, 24);—and, on the other, it steadily spread at the expense of finite dependent clauses of the type: ὅτε ἔλεγεν, ὅπως ὁ Ἰνα λέγη or εἴπη, εἶπένε, etc., and particularly at the expense of the kindred participle: λέγων, λέξων or ἐρών, εἴπον, εἰρηκός). Thus the above variety of dependent verbal and participial constructions was now largely exchanged for the infinitive of the type: εἰπένε, τοῦ εἰπένε, εἰς τὸ εἰπένε, ἐν τῷ λέγεν, μετὰ τὸ εἰπένε, etc. And as the ground conquered was wider than the ground lost, the infinitive during the Graeco-Roman period became unduly common, especially with the article.

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

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

1 Students interested in the particulars of the infinitive in this period will find ample information in my Hist. Gr. Grammar, §§ 2062-2098, and especially in Appendix vi., pp. 568-580.
ther explained that the *gains* or conquests were made at the expense of dependent finite and participial clauses, but omitted to indicate the particular kind and nature of the *losses* sustained. Well, these were chiefly in the direction of the independent, *i.e.* jussive or hortative and desiderative function of the infinitive. For this function was now transferred to *ίνα* + subjunctive, except in the set phraseology of decrees and laws mentioned above, a mode of prescription imitated even in the Christian decrees, namely the canons of the Church Councils.

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

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

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

A. "Ἣνα as a conjunction very often takes the place of the dependent infinitive. Here ἵνα governs regularly the subjunctive and stands in particular:

(a) For almost any infinitive, except that depending on verbs or expressions of "saying, thinking, perceiving, expecting, swearing," when otherwise it would have been resolved by ὅτι, ὅτε ὅτι (ὡστο ὅτι), and πῶς, as we shall see in our next paper.
that every page of the unlearned compositions of the time can testify to the fact.¹

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

LXX. Job 7, 16 οὐ γὰρ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ζήσομαι ἵνα μακροθυμήσω (=ὁστε μακροθυμησαι). So too Tobit 3, 15; Sap. 13, 9; 2 Macc. 6, 24; Philo i. 181, 43 πιστὸς ἐστιν ἵνα τοὺς λόγους αὐτοῦ μηδὲν τῶν ὀρκῶν διαφέρειν. So 294, 3, 408, 23, etc. Jos. B.J. 4, 3, 10 πρὸς τοσοῦτον ἥκομεν συμφορῶν ἵνα ἡμᾶς ἔλεησον καὶ πολέμοι; so ib. 6, 2, 1 μὴ γενοῦμην ζῶν αὖτως αἰχμαλώτως ἵνα παύσωμαι κτλ. (=ὁστε παύσασθαι). Epict. Diss. 1, 19, 13, 1, 27, 8 ἐστώ ἐμὲ (μὴ) εἶναι Σαρπηδόνα τὸν τοῦ Διὸς ύιὸν ἵν’ ὀντω γενναίως εἰπώ (⇓ὁστε μὲ εἰπεῖν). So too 1, 29, 23; then 2, 2, 16 ὀντω μορὸς ἵνα μὴ ἰδῇ. So further: 2, 3, 3, 2, 16, 45, 2, 18, 22, 22, 9; and so on passim. Plut. ii. 67 f; Inst. Orat. 1 οὐ γὰρ τοιαύτῃς ἄρετής ἐπιδικάζομαι ἵνα τοῖς Ὀμηροῦ μῦθοις πείθωμαι. Lucian, Amores 50 (ii. 455); De Lectu 19 (=ii. 931); Galen. viii. 45 ε; Hermas Sim. 9, 1, 10 ὅτα δένδρα ἐκεῖνα κατάκαρπα ἵν, ἀλλοις καὶ ἀλλοις καρποίς κεκοσμημένα, ἵνα ἰδῶν τις αὕτη ἔπιθυμήσῃ φαγεῖν ἐκ τῶν καρπῶν αὐτῶν. Ignat. 680 Α τολλά ἥμιν λείπει

¹ For such examples of all periods see my Hist. Gr. Grammar, pp. 570, 572, and 574 ff.
² The reappearance in later times of ὅστε with the Subjunctive points to fastidiousness and misplaced reaction against ἵνα, now disdained as a too common word. Basil. iii. 1081c ὅστε ἐπάναγκες Ἔ. Acta Tho. 61, 73 (ed. Bonnet), ὅστε μὴ κατεξουσίαν μου (=ἵνα μὴ -ση). Theoph. 270, 23, etc. See my Hist. Gr. Grammar, §§ 1760 f. and 1764 f.
So then in the New Testament also, as: Luke 9, 45 τὸ ῥῆμα ἦν παρακεκαλυμμένον ἀπ’ αὐτόν ἵνα μὴ αἰσθωνται αὐτό, "so that they could not perceive it" (not "that they should not" perceive it, since there was no intention of concealing it from them). John 9, 2 τίς ἡμαρτεν, οὖν ἵνα γνονις αὐτοῦ, ἵνα τυφλὸς γεννηθῇ; "so that he should be born." 9, 36 καὶ τίς ἐστι, κύριε, ἵνα πιστεύσω εἰς αὐτόν; "so that I may believe in him." So further: Rev. 13, 13; 1 John 3, 1; 1 Thess. 5, 4; 1 John 1, 9 πιστὸς ἐστι καὶ δίκαιος ἵνα ἀφῇ τὰς ἁμαρτίας, "He is trusting and just so as to overlook our sins"; —and so on frequently.

B. "Ἣνα AS A HORTATIVE ADVERB stands for the independent Infinitive, then for any verbal form expressing command, exhortation, or wish. Here, therefore, ἵνα, which again governs the Subjunctive, represents the jussive Infinitive, the Imperative, the imperatival Future, the hortative Subjunctive, and the independent or desiderative Optative. This construction goes back to classical antiquity 1 with the mere difference that ὅπως here is far commoner than ἵνα, obviously because ἵνα then was a feeble rival of ὅπως. At all events, here both ὅπως and ἵνα are hortative adverbs, acting much like ἅγε, εἰθῇ, λέτ, do; may! would that!


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

Epicrt. Diss. 2, 11, 18 ἦν λοιπὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ἡγορίμων καὶ διευκρινυμένων ὁμώμενοι χρώμεθα ἐπὶ τῶν ἐπὶ μέρους διηρθημένως ταῖς προλήψεως, "let us use or apply." 3, 4, 9 ἄγε ἦν Σώφρων στεφανωθῇ; "let Sophron be crowned" (mark here the collocation of the two synonyms, ἄγε ἦν!). So ib. ἄγε ἦν τηρήσω τὴν ἐμαυτοῦ προαιρέσων, "let me keep." 4, 1, 41 ἦν μὴ μωρὸς ἦ ἀλλ' ἦν μάθη ἐλέγεν ὁ Σωκράτης (=μὴ ἐστώ μωρὸς ἀλλὰ μαθέω). Ench. 17 (23) ἰὰ τῶν υποκρίνεται σε θέλη (ὁ διδάσκαλος), ἦν καὶ τοῦτον εὐφυῶς ὑποκρίνη (=ὑποκρίνου, "do play his part properly!").

Canon. Concil. Sard. (about 343-4 A.D.) 3 καὶ τοῦτο προστεθῆναι ἀναγκαῖον ἦν μηδεις ἑπισκόπων εἰς ἑτέραν ἑπαρχιάν διαβαίνῃ, ut episcopi non transeant. ib. ἦν καὶ ἀδικε ἡ κρίσις ἀνανεωθῇ (=ἀνανεωθήτω), ut iterum cons.-
cilium renovetur; then 10; and so on through the Middle

1 For many other classical examples of ὅπως in this sense, see W. Goodwin, Greek Moods and Tenses (1889), §§ 271 ff.
Ages down to modern Greek speech, where ἵνα, in its shortened form νά, is very common.¹

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

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

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

"If I am not doing the works of my Father, believe me not; but if I am doing (them), even should ye not believe me, do believe in these works. Do recognise and do know (ἵνα γνώτε καὶ γινώσκετε, Rec. καὶ πιστεύσητε: and do believe) that the Father is in me and I in the Father."

That this is the true meaning of the passage, appears

¹ For examples from all periods see my Hist. Gr. Grammar, Greek Index under ἵνα.
also from the repetition of the same exhortation further below (14, 11), where Jesus employs the simple or direct Imperative: πιστεύετέ μοι ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί. "Do believe."

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

The passage should be read as follows:—

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

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

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

Thus read, St. Paul's words are not only obscure and incoherent; they are virtually perverted in more senses than one. I say incoherent, because I fail to see any logical connection among these three sentences: "I wished to come to you to have some fruit among you—I am debtor to the Greeks and the barbarians—so I must preach the gospel to you also that are in Rome." Again, the break caused by the alleged parenthetic clause ("I was hindered
hitherto”) and the severance, through a full stop, of “Gentiles” from “alike Greeks and barbarians,” which manifestly belong together (Gentiles, namely Greeks and barbarians), ought to arouse the suspicion of editors against the current way of reading the passage. For my part, I believe the text is grievously mispunctuated and misunderstood, the mischief being of course due to the troublesome ἵνα. There is little doubt but that St. Paul wrote and read the passage as follows:—

Οὐ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, ὑπὲρ πολλάκις προεθέμην ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ ἐκκολύθην ἄχρι τοῦ δεώρα. “Ἰνα τινὰ καρπὸν σχῶ καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν καθὼς καὶ ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς ἔθνεσιν, Ἑλλησί τε καὶ βαρβάροις, σοφοί τε καὶ ἀνυότοις! Ὁφειλέτης εἰμὶ ὁ ὑμῶν τὸ κατ’ ἐμὲ πρόθυμον καὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς ἐν Ῥώμη εὐαγγελίσασθαι.

Which is to be interpreted in English:—

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

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

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

We should of course read: καὶ ὅταν ἀναγνωσθῇ παρ’ ὑμῖν ἡ ἐπιστολή, ποιήσατε ἵνα ἐν τῇ Λαοδικείᾳ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀναγνωσθῇ. Καὶ τὴν ἐκ Λαοδικείας ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀναγνωτέ.

And translate: “And when this epistle hath been read amongst you, cause it to be read also in the church of the Laodiceans. Moreover do ye also read the epistle from Laodicea.”
But I must now return to the long passage of St. John (17, 18 ff.) with which I have opened this paper. As the foregoing illustrations fully apply to it, we can now read it without special comment. I shall only, for the sake of convenience, give, in parallel columns, both the Greek original and a fresh English version of it, so as to bring out more clearly the changes involved both in the punctuation and translation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Καθὼς ἐμὲ ἀπέστειλα εἰς τὸν κόσμον κἀγὼ ἀπέστειλα αὐτούς εἰς τὸν κόσμον, καὶ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν (ἐγὼ) ἁγιάζω ἐμαυτόν. Ἰνα δῶσιν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἑγαμαμένοι εἰς ἀληθεία! οὐ περὶ τούτων δὲ ἐρωτῶ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τῶν πιστεύοντων διὰ τοῦ λόγου αὐτῶν εἰς ἐμὲ. Ἰνα πάντες ἐν δῶσιν! Καθὼς σὺ, πατήρ, ἐν ἐμοὶ κἀγὼ ἐν σοί, Ἰνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν (Rec. adds ἐν) δῶσιν! Ἰνα δὲ κόσμος πιστεύῃ ὅτι σὺ με ἀπέστειλας, κἀγὼ τὴν δόξαν ἐν δεδωκάς μοι δεδωκα αὐτοῖς! Ἰνα δῶσιν ἐν καθὼς ἡμεῖς ἐν, ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ σὺ ἐν ἐμοί! Ἰνα δοσιν τετελεσμένοι εἰς ἐν! Ἰνα γνῶσεις ὅ κόσμος ὅτι σὺ με ἀπέστειλας, καὶ ἡγάπησας αὐτούς, καθὼς ἐμὲ ἡγάπησας! Πάτερ, δὲ (Rec. οὗ) δεδωκάς μοι θέλω Ἰνα ὅποιο εἰμὶ ἐγὼ κἀκεῖνοι δῶσιν, μετ' ἐμοῦ! Ἰνα θεωρῶσιν τὴν δόξαν τὴν ἐμὴν ἐν δεδωκάς μοι! ὅτι ἡγάπησας με πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, πατήρ δίκαιε.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

A. N. JANNARIS.