THE APODOSIS AT I TIMOTHY 1:3 AND II PETER 1:4

by Frederic E. Blume

Since the days of Jerome and his revision of the Latin translation of the New Testament, the men who have been putting the apostolic word into the language of their own time have quite obviously been struggling with the problem as to just where to look for the main clause at the opening of the letter proper in both I Timothy and II Peter. The makers of the King James Version evidently felt that the Apostle Paul in writing his first letter to his disciple and co-worker Timothy had left the opening sentence (v. 3) of the letter proper incomplete, for they supplied a grammatical structure for verses 3 and 4 by supplying the words *so do* at the end of verse 4. The King James translators can have meant only one thing: that as they saw it the apostle had left the very first sentence of this weighty and extremely serious epistle hanging grammatically in the air; had, as we say in language study, permitted himself an *anacoluthon*, an *ellipsis*, or even an *aposiopesis*. It is not contended here that the use of these three or any other rhetorical figures detracts from the clarity of a piece of writing in which they appear. Nor would their appearance argue against the verbal inspiration of the writing. Something quite different is the case: because of the temperament of the respective writer or the nature of the subject matter, or both, also the writers of the Biblical books have at times left their sentences grammatically incomplete. And yet, just because of this mechanical incompleteness, the thought that the writer wishes to convey has become all the more clear. We may compare Mark 2:10 as usually read and Galatians 2:4-6. In the former instance the nature of the subject-matter makes it very clear just what Mark has to tell us. In the latter—well, who could expect this slave of Jesus Christ to express himself in any other way when the very core of the Gospel message was being put in jeopardy?

However, it would seem to be only fair to observe that in the opening sentence of an important communication the Apostles Paul and Peter might well have been expected to write (or dictate) complete sentences so that their readers would have no trouble knowing just what direction the argument was about to take.

Jerome opens his translation of I Timothy 1:3 with a subordinating conjunctive adverb, continues with a series of conjunctions and relative pronouns, and finishes the sentence at the close of verse 4 without translating anything by means of a finite verb that would serve as the main clause of the complex sentence that began at verse 3.[1]

The second great missionary version of the New Testament made in the first centuries was the Syriac. The Syriac-speaking church centered at, or near, Antioch on the Orontes. This Christian community, so intimately connected with the name of Paul of Tarsus during the first part of his missionary labors (Acts 13:1ff; 14:26-28; 15:22, 30, 35), apparently looked in two directions during the course of its days as a leader in the Christian mission movement: first, it had served as a home-base for Paul and his coworkers (Acts 13-14), who carried the Gospel message to the Greek-speaking lands to the west. Later, its interests included the work among the Syriac-speaking natives within its own territory. As a leading commercial center, it served as a gateway between the west and the Syriac-speaking east. Though Antioch remained Greek-speaking for some time, the influence of its leadership also among the native-tongued Syrian Christians was understandably very great. Somewhere in this northeastern corner of the Mediterranean there came then some very early attempts to render the New Testament, or parts of it, into the language of the people. Apparently, as was the case with the Latin translations in the west, there was considerable lack of uniformity in those earliest Syriac Bibles; so at just about the time when Jerome was directed to bring into being a uniform version of the Latin, attempts were made to create a single generally-accepted Syriac "vulgate." The results are what we know as the Peshitto Version.

The Syriac translators solved the grammatical problem at I Timothy 1:3 in their own way. With a fine feeling for the Apostle's true intent, they translated the passage in a way that in English becomes:

---

1 *Novum Testamentum Latine secundum editionem sancti Hieronymi*, rec. Johannes Wordsworth et Henricure White. Ed. Minor. (Oxford: The University Press, 1950), p. 495.

> When I was going into Macedonia, I requested thee to remain at Ephesus, and to charge certain persons not to teach different doctrines.…[2]

In this translation the clauses are shuffled about so that the verb of a dependent clause becomes the main verb (*verbum regens*) of the sentence.

These examples of the Latin Vulgate and the Syriac Peshitto aptly illustrate how, in addition to simply supplying a main verb in the KJV manner, the problem of the grammar at I Timothy 1:3 has commonly been handled: some allow a number of dependent clauses to stand; others translate the obvious sense and render a dependent element as though it were a *verbum regens;* others supply in the text or in a supplementary note what was felt to be the missing main clause.

To the first group belongs the German *Lutherbibel* that was the *textus receptus* for seminary students of the writer's generation in the course on isagogics.[3] This translation of verses 3ff renders the text by means of a number of clauses, each of them introduced by a subordinating conjunction or relative pronoun. It should however be pointed out that for anyone with something of a German *Sprachgefühl* left in his bones, the *dass*-clause of verse 3[4] dependent on *ermahnet habe* would not sound so irreconcilably dependent at all but would rather have some of the overtones of the common German imperative that began with a *dass*, like the oft-repeated morning admonition to the schoolboy whose deportment on the previous day had been somewhat short of ideal: "*Dass du dich heute aber besser schickst*!"[5]

The much-used *Menge-Bibel* translates in the manner of the Peshitto and makes of the first subordinate clause a main clause: *Ich habe dich bei meiner Abreise nach Mazedonien aufgefordert, in Ephesus noch länger zu bleiben, um gewissen Leuten zu gebieten, keine abweichenden Lehren vorzutragen.…*[6]

The King James Version finds its German counterpart in the popular Schlachter *Miniaturbibel*,[7] which refers to a note on the passage in the appendix. This reads: *zu ergänzen: darum schreibe ich*.[8] The English Revised Version of 1881–85 followed the lead of the KJV by supplying the main clause: "so do I now."[9] The English versions that appeared in the half-century after 1885 refrained, however, from supplying the main verb. In the much-read and heatedly-discussed English and American modern-speech translations with which the twentieth century opened, the solution of the Peshitto and of Menge was adopted, namely that of rearranging the clauses so as to translate the verb in one of them as the predicate of an independent clause. These renderings were the Twentieth Century, and those of Weymouth, Moffatt, and Goodspeed. The Twentieth Century[10] renders the word that KJV translated as "besought" as though it were the main verb. Weymouth[11] does likewise. The Americans Moffatt[12] and Goodspeed[13] make the verb that KJV has as "to abide still" into the *verbum regens* at verse 3. In his translation of the epistles of Paul, Arthur S. Way, then just fifty years after the appearance of the RV, made of the word rendered by KJV as "besought" the main verb and in addition, in the

---

2 *The New Testament. A Literal Translation from the Syriac Peshito [sic] Version*, by James Mudrock (New York: Stanford and Swords, 1855), p. 379.

3 *Die Bibel oder die ganze Heilige Schrift nach der deutschen Uebersetzung Dr. Martin Luthers* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, –), p. 249 (NT).

4 The rendering of vv. 3, 4 reads: *Wie ich dich ermahnet habe, dass du zu Ephesus bliebest, da ich in Macedonien zog, und geboetest etlichen, dass sie nicht anders lehreten, auch nicht Acht haetten auf die Fabeln und der Geschlechte Register, die kein Ende haben.…*

5 "See to it that you behave yourself better today!"

6 *Die Heilige Schrift Alten und Neuen Testaments*, uebersetzt von D.Dr. Hermann Menge (Stuttgart: Privileg. Wuerttemb. Bibelanstalt, –), p. 287 (NT).

7 *Die Heilige Schrift. Miniaturbibel ... herausgegeben von Franz Eugen Schlachter, 17. Auflage bearbeitet von H. Linder und E. Kappeler (Stuttgart: Privileg. Wuert. Bibelanstalt*, 1923), pp. 692 and 732.

8 "supply: 'For this reason I am writing!' "

9 F. F. Bruce, *The Letters of Paul. An Expanded Paraphrase* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1965), p. 296.

10 *The Twentieth Century New Testament* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1901), p. 385.

11 Richard Francis Weymouth, *The Modern Speech New Testament* (New York: The Baker and Taylor Co., 1902), p. 513.

12 James Moffat, *The New Testament. A New Translation* (New York: Harper & Brothers, rev. ed., 1934), p. 309.

13 Edgar J. Goodspeed, *The Bible. An American Translation* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1923), p. 196 (NT).

manner of KJV, Schlachter, and RV, now added a second main verb: "I now repeat that request."[14] It should be added that Way does not hesitate to paraphrase when he feels that such a rendering would the better express the apostle's meaning. The Williams[15] translation does a similar doubling-up: the word rendered "besought" in the KJV in this translation "in the language of the people" appears twice as "begged": once in a subordinate clause, then as: "I still beg you." The RSV[16] is more economical of words, rendering the KJV "to abide still" as though it were the principal clause. Phillips clears the construction by adding the independent expressions: "I am repeating in this letter…" and "I wanted you …,"[17] and the NEB in what is really quite an effective translation, makes of the KJV "besought" one independent clause and of "that thou mightest charge" another independent clause.[18] The New American Standard version renders the KJV "to abide still" as though it were a main verb in the imperative,[19] while in Beck[20] the KJV "besought" becomes the main verb: "I urged," and the construction is salvaged by adding "I wanted you" before "to order." Bruce's paraphrase[21] adds the smooth, "You know how …" and "My intention was … .,"

The new TEV[22] renders I Timothy 1:3 by means of two complete sentences, the first complex, and the second compound; it begins the first by adding, "I want you …" and introduces into the second the words, "you must order." The Jerusalem Bible[23] adds the word "please" to Paul's request that Timothy stay on at Ephesus instead of accompanying him on his further missionary travels.

The preceding brief review of almost a score of translations of I Timothy 1:3 is not only interesting as a study in translation techniques; it also reveals that all along there has been a basic difficulty with the grammar of the Greek text: how are the several clauses to be construed? Translators have a rather easy time of it in that they do not have to explain how their rendering was arrived at: they merely give us what they claim is a fair modern-language equivalent without being bound to the precise wording and construction of the Greek text they are translating. With the commentator it is different: by definition he is expected to tell us precisely how he sees the relation between the several words, phrases, and clauses that make up his text. Perhaps, therefore, a look at a few representative commentators on I Timothy 1:3 will help us on our way to an answer to the question: Where in this sentence does the main clause lie?

We shall find that commentators fall into the same general classes as did the translators. Conybeare and Howson, for instance, see the sentence as an anacoluthon: "This sentence is left incomplete," they declare.[24] Others, like many translators, believe that the main verb is to be found in one of the apparently subordinate verb forms. Hendricksen[25] translates: "do stay on at Ephesus." In a footnote he allows for the possibilities: 1) of an *anacoluthon;* 2) that the infinitive προσμεῖναι is to be read as an imperative; or 3) that the act of writing is to be considered a substitute for "omitted words." He concludes his note with the remark that for whichever one of the possibilities the reader may opt, he will find "no substantial difference in sense." With that remark we wholeheartedly agree. It is the precise and detailed construction of this Greek sentence that we are trying to pin down, not the substance of the matter.

---

14 Arthur W. Way, *The Letters of St. Paul* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1935), p. 194.
15 Charles B. Williams, *The New Testament. A Translation in the Language of the People* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1950), p. 461.
16 *The Holy Bible. Revised Standard Version* (New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1946), p. 1238.
17 J. B. Phillips, *The New Testament in Modern English* (London: William Collins Sons & Co., Ltd., 1958, rev. ed., 1960), p. 411.
18 *The New English Bible* (Oxford University Press, Cambridge University Press, 1961), p. 356.
19 *New American Standard Bible. New Testament* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1960), p. 353.
20 William F. Beck, *The New Testament in the Language of Today* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1963), p. 366.
21 Op. cit., p. 297.
22 *Good News for Modern Man. The New Testament in Today's English Version* (New York: American Bible Society, 1966), p. 466.
23 *The Jerusalem Bible* (Garden City: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1966), p. 358 (NT).
24 W. J. Conybeare and J. S. Howson, *The Life and Epistles of St. Paul*. New Edition. (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1951), p. 748.
25 William Hendriksen, *Exposition of the Pastoral Epistles* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1967), p. 56, and ibid. footnote 25.

In the Zahn *Kommentar*, Wohlenberg[26] wants to take verse 3 as subordinate to verse 2, while Hervey[27] finds in the long-way-off verse 18 the apodosis and sees "the intermediate verses as a digression caused by St. Paul's desire to show how exactly the charge was in agreement with the true spirit of the Law of God."

There are commentators then who like some translators would shuffle the dependent verb forms and in some way make one of them the *verbum regens*. There are others who believe that the main verb in the sentence has been omitted by Paul and is to be supplied. So Kretzmann[28] would add *so tue nun auch*, "conduct yourself accordingly," while Lenski[29] translates: "As I urged thee to remain on in Ephesus when proceeding to Macedonia, *so I still do*." He adds the note: "With R. 439 we find no anacoluthon here; this is a simple ellipsis."

Another possible solution goes back to Theodore of Mopsuestia (*floruit* about 400 A.D.). It will be remembered that Greek was this Biblical scholar's mother tongue. He thought[30] that the ἵνα παραγγείλῃς should be read as an imperative (παράγγελλε). Lock[31] believes the *apodosis* (main clause) is "probably" to be found in the ἵνα παραγγείλῃς, as Grotius already had suggested, and, as we have seen, Theodore of Mopsuestia had taught. He believes the ἵνα to be "elliptical," but does not spell out his understanding of the construction in full. But, as we shall try to set forth, Lock's suggestion points out a new path of approach to the problem that it will be worthwhile to follow out for a bit.[32]

In his exhaustive study of figures of speech used in the Bible, Bullinger[33] cites I Timothy 1:3, 4 under *Anacoluthon* and says: "Here, the AV supplies the sense by adding '*so do*.' The RV adds, '*so do I now*.'" In the same book, however, on page 55, the passage is listed under *Ellipsis*, and the words omitted are given as: [*so I repeat my charge, that thou remain at Ephesus*, etc.]

The English translation of John Calvin's commentary[34] illustrates perhaps best of all the cavalier manner in which commentators have been treating the grammar of the passage. On *As I besought thee* Calvin writes: "Either the syntax is elliptical, or the particle ἵνα is redundant; and in both cases the meaning will be obvious." A footnote (loc. cit.) quotes a certain Bloomfield as having cut the Gordian knot thus: "The construction here is tortuous and elliptical.… The simplest and most natural method is to understand οὕτω καὶ νῦν παρακαλῶ." Apparently Bloomfield is quoted as a corrective over against Calvin, and the translator wants the passage understood as an *anacoluthon*.

At II Peter 1:4 the problem again is precisely where the *apodosis*, or main clause, midst a welter of apparently dependent clauses, is to be found. Here however the solution to the question has centered around the point of just how to punctuate the first seven or eight verses of the epistle. The concern has been whether to make a full stop after the first, the second, or the third verse. Each solution has found its advocates among the translators, editors of the original text, and the commentators on it.

The Vulgate[35] and the Peshitto[36] put a stop after verse 1, but then read the verses immediately following it in close connection with verse 2. The Greek text of Westcott and Hort[37] and the KJV do likewise. The

26 W. Wohlenberg,*Die Pastoralbriefe* (Leipzig: A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1923), p. 82.

27 A. C. Hervey, *I Timothy* (New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1950 republication), p. 1.

28 P. E. Kretzmann, *Die Pastoralbriefe* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1918), p. 24.

29 R. C. H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians, to Timothy, to Titus, and to Philemon* (Columbus: Lutheran Book Concern, 1937), p. 505f..

30 Quoted in Wohlenberg, op. cit., p. 82.

31 Walter Lock, *The Pastoral Epistles* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1924), p. 7.

32 The commentary by Gealy and Boyes in Vol. XI of *The Interpreter's Bible* is of no real help (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1955, p. 381). This work on the RSV merely accepts what is also the Moffatt translation for the infinitive προσμεῖναι *remain* (at Ephesus) and does not comment further.

33 E. W. Bullinger, *Figures of Speech Used in the Bible* (London: Eyre and Spotteswoode, 1898. Reprinted 1968 by Baker Book House), p. 723.

34 John Calvin, *Commentaries on the Epistles to Timothy, Titus and Philemon*, translated by Wm. Pringle (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1948), p. 21.

35 Op. cit., p. 559.

36 Op. cit., p. 427.

37 Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek* (Cambridge: Macmillan and Co., 1881), p. 331.

commonly-used modern *Lutherbibel*[38] has a period after verse 1 and no other period till the end of verse 7. There are semicolons after verses 2 and 3 and a colon after verse 4. This is a variation from the way the text was printed in Luther's *Das Newe Testament Deutzsch* of 1522 and in his German Bible of 1546. In each of these there is a full stop after verses 1, 2, 4, and 8.[39]

The stop after verse i also has commentator support. Caffin[40] holds that verse 3 is to be "closely connected with verse 2." However, Windisch[41] in the Lietzmann *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*, where reference is generally made to critical opinion of every shade, may be looked upon as fairly representative of most recent translators and commentators in the way he solves the problem: he seems to give to verse 3 a dual function, first, as continuing verse 2, and secondly, as being quite an independent element. In short, without putting it into so many words, Windisch recognizes the problem.

Recent translators have in the main followed the punctuation of the two most recent printings of the Greek text, a late edition of Nestle[42] and the 1966 *The Greek New Testament* of the Bible societies,[43] in this that they take verses 1 and 2 as a salutation and the verses 3 to 7 as constituting a unit, though for purposes of editing and translation each may go his own way. To illustrate:

Menge[44] makes of verses 3 and 4 complete sentences. Schlachter[45] makes of verses 3-7 one sentence, with a dash at the end of verse 4. The Greek text of Tasker,[46] which is the text found translated in the NEB, makes separate paragraphs of verse 1, verse 2, verses 3 and 4, and verses 5-7. The *Twentieth Century New Testament*[47] anticipated Tasker and his NEB in their approach by making complete sentences of verse 1, verse 2, verse 3, verse 4, and verses 5 and 6. Moffat[48] solved the problem by making one sentence of verses 3-7, within which verse 4 is set off by dashes. Goodspeed[49] makes of each, verse 3 and verse 4, an independent sentence, while the RSV[50] makes of the two verses a single sentence. Phillips[51] separates verse 3 from verse 4 and has this interesting rendering of verse 4 following the ἵνα: "… making it possible for you to escape the inevitable disintegration that lust produces in the world and to share God's essential nature."

In his recent excellent commentary in the Tyndale series Michael Green[52] would seem to prefer to put a full stop after verse 2 and consider the following an *anacoluthon*. However, his statement is cautious and stimulating: "Unless … the *that* (4) represents an old use of the imperative 'see that you become,' we should regard the sentence as an anacoluthon."

In his unfortunate, magisterial manner Lenski[53] would solve the whole problem in one fell swoop. He writes: "The whole of verses 3-11 is a unit. Our versions connect ὡς with verse 2, as though verses 3-4 were appended to the greeting, and as though verse 5 begins a new sentence. No greeting known to us has such a peculiar extension.… The main verb is an imperative." Obviously he thinks he finds the apodosis in the

---

38 Op. cit., p. 264 (NT).
39 WA DB pp. 316f..
40 B.C. Caffin, *II Peter* (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1950 republication), p. 1.
41 Hans Windisch, *Die Katholischen Briefe* (Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 3. stark umgearbeitete Auflage, 1951), p. 84.
42 *Novum Testamentum Graece, novis curis elaboraverunt Erwin Nestle et Kurt Aland* (Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 23. Auflage, 1957), p. 592.
43 *The Greek New Testament*, edited by Kurt Aland, Matthew Black, Bruce M. Metzger, Allen Wikgren (Stuttgart, West Germany: Wuerttemberg Bible Society, 1966), p. 805.
44 Op. cit., 325.
45 Op. cit., 707.
46 R. V. G. Tasker, *The Greek New Testament* (Oxford University Press, Cambridge University Press, 1964), p. 364.
47 Op. cit., p. 473.
48 Op. cit., p. 352.
49 Op. cit., p. 223.
50 Op. cit., p. 1268.
51 Op. cit., p. 468.
52 Michael Green, *The Second Epistle General of Peter and the General Epistle of Jude* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1968), p. 62.
53 R. C. H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of the Epistles of St. Peter, St. John, and St. Jude* (Columbus: Lutheran Book Concern, 1938), p. 260.

imperative ἐπιχοπηγήσατε of verse 5. On the ἵνα clause of verse 4 he writes (p. 265): "We regard the ἵνα as appositional, and not as introducing a purpose clause; …in the Koine this particle…often introduces a substantive clause, as is the case here…. This is what the things promised actually are; we are not left to surmise their contents."

So far as we have been able to check them, only the commentary of Bigg[54] in the *International Critical* puts the stop after verse 3. Unfortunately there is no discussion of the sentence structure, though he does bring much by way of valuable word-study. Since just after the turn of the century, there have however been English and American versions that have put the stop after verse 3 and have shown an awareness of the problem of the ἵνα clause of verse 4, as the words of Lenski have recognized. Weymouth[55] reads verses 2 and 3 together and thus makes of verse 3 the "peculiar extension" of the salutation Lenski is talking about. Weymouth sees the ἵνα clause as one of purpose, while Williams,[56] who also puts the stop after verse 3, sees the ἵνα as indicating result.

The NEB like the Greek text published under the name of Tasker puts stops after each of verses 1-4 and renders the ἵνα clause of verse 4 thus: "through them you may…come to share in the very being of God."[57] The New American Standard[58] and the TEV[59] put the stop after verse 3 and render the ἵνα of verse 4 with an "in order that." The *Jerusalem Bible*[60] makes the same sentence-division but renders the ἵνα of verse 4 as introducing an independent clause: "through them you will be able to share the divine nature and to escape corruption in a world that is sunk in vice."

The just-concluded canvass of commentaries, versions, and critical New Testament texts should, we hope, have convinced the reader that it is still fair to ask the question: "Where are we to look for the apodosis at I Timothy 1:3 and II Peter 1:4?" Surely no one could come away with the impression that there is a great deal of unanimity in the way the opening verses of these two New Testament epistles are handled. It is to be admitted readily that no great historical or theological point is at stake. On any rendering or grammatical analysis the situation between Paul and Timothy and between Peter and the readers for whom he bears such a profound yet loving concern will remain pretty much what it would be on any other rendering or analysis. However, for us to whom the words of Scripture are the very life-blood of our theological being, the relation of these words, one to another, in phrases, clauses, and sentences, must be of profound interest and importance. What we have considered in the passages studied is the precise relation of one clause to another, or to put it more concretely: "Among a number of apparently dependent clauses in each passage, where are we to find the independent clause, the apodosis?" It is, therefore, not only a matter of grammar and literature and theology, but also and fundamental to these, a matter of *scholarly method*.

The writer vividly recalls how the late Robert J. Bonner, at one time chairman of the department of classical Greek at the University of Chicago, would in his seminars on the histories of Thucydides and the comedies of Aristophanes discuss the problem of method. Professor Bonner would urge his students to consider seriously adopting an approach that he, Bonner, had found extremely fruitful in a lifetime of research in Greek history and literature and especially in Greek law.

When generations of scholars, the professor would explain, have been working at a certain point and yet have not arrived at anything like unanimity of result, then there is little likelihood that any more gold will be mined in the old diggings; so he advised his students to go off to one side and try some new approach. With a new perspective on the problem, Professor Bonner would illustrate out of a large array of personal experiences, he had repeatedly been able to come up with a solution that had been lying at everyone's feet all the while but had escaped them. He had hit pay-dirt when he had moved his diggings to a new locale.

54 Charles Bigg, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902), p. 255.
55 Op. cit., p. 597.
56 Op. cit., p. 522.
57 Op. cit., p. 403.
58 Op. cit., p. 401.
59 Op. cit., p. 525.
60 Op. cit., p. 406 (NT).

The writer will claim no originality in finding the answer to the question raised by this study. The answer was apparently given long ago by one of the great Cappadocian fathers of the church, was resurrected at the beginning of the modern era by Grotius, and has been in modern times with a great deal of hesitancy suggested by Walter Lock and Michael Green. Bluntly, the solution here suggested is that, in each passage, it is the ἵνα clause that is the apodosis or main-clause of the sentence, and that this ἵνα is but another example of its recognized usage as introducing an *imperative*. This interpretation was suggested long ago, but apparently, as Mark Twain said about the discovery of America by the Norsemen, it "didn't stay discovered."

The primal difficulty we have, who have been brought up in the classical tradition, is to convince ourselves that ἵνα can be rendered in any other way than by means of "in order that," as we came to know it in our first and second years of Greek study. We swallow hard but have to admit that it can mean "so that." We feel sometimes that we are being unfaithful to our grammatical antecedents when we treat ἵνα as introducing a substantive clause and as the equivalent of an infinitive. But Lenski has reminded us that the Koine admits of such a construction, and in this usage the word could be translated with a simple "that." In these three translation methods we can trace a certain family resemblance: "in order *that*," "so *that*," "*that*." But to render ἵνα plus the subjunctive as an independent clause in the imperative—?

This is not the place to examine the probable historical development of the construction of ἵνα-imperative that clearly appears in the New Testament at Ephesians 5:33 ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ἵνα φοβῆται τὸν ἄνδρα, "and let the wife reverence her husband," and at Mark 5:23 ἵνα ἐλθὼν ἐπιθῇς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῇ, "come and lay your hands upon her." Let it suffice here to quote the words of James Hope Moulton, a scholar to whom students of the New Testament owe an immeasurable debt of gratitude for his studies in both the vocabulary and the syntax of the New Testament. Moulton writes: "An innovation in Hellenistic is ἵνα c. subj. in commands, which takes the place of the classical ὅπως c. fut. indic. Whether it was independently developed, or merely came in as an obvious equivalent, we need not stop to enquire. In any case it fell into line with other tendencies which weakened the telic force of ἵνα; and from a very restricted activity in the vernacular of the NT period it advanced to a prominent position in Modern Greek syntax."[61] An example of the construction in Modern Greek quoted by Moulton[62] is να' πῇς, say! (for ἵνα εἴπῃς). Illuminating is the example Moulton quotes from the Roman Cicero, who in his private letters frequently breaks into Greek. The passage (*Att.* vi. 5) reads: ταῦτα οὖν, πρῶτον μέν, ἵνα πάντα σῷζηται δεύτερον δέ, ἵνα μηδὲ τῶν τόκων ὀλιγωρήσῃς.[63] "First of all, let all these things be kept in mind; secondly, do not neglect collecting the interest." This example from Cicero should help us recognize the idiom as perhaps nothing else could. It is surely not "low-brow" Greek, coming from a literary stylist like Cicero. It is used by a man who, like Paul and Peter, used the Greek as a *second* language. And finally, in the two parts of this sentence, ἵνα with the subjunctive is used as imperative of the third person in the first clause, as in Ephesians 5:33, and as imperative of the second person in the second, as in Mark 5:23.

Though he had collected many of the materials, Dr. Moulton was lost at sea before he could complete his second volume. It was issued by his student. The third volume passed through the hands of a number of successors and finally appeared in 1963.[64] This volume deals exclusively with the syntax of New Testament Greek and has a lengthy statement on Imperatival ἵνα. It quotes the passages we have cited plus a number of others, among them Matthew 20:33; John 13:18; Colossians 4:16. I Timothy 1:3 is given as an example, with the note: "or depends on παρεκάλεσα."[65] In view of the last, a further statement is startling (or amusing, as our mood may be). It reads: "None in Ac, Past [*sic*], Heb, Jas, 1, 2 Pt [*sic*], Rev…" But then if Alexander Pope was right, even Homer allowed himself an occasional nod!

Our contention then is that the apodosis at I Timothy 1:3 and at II Peter 1:4 is to be found in the ἵνα clause in each. Such a solution would seem to solve the linguistic and textual difficulties with which the translators have been tussling. It would comfort those commentators whose *Sprachgefuehl* would seem to be

---

61 James Hope Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek.* Vol. I *Prolegomena* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 3rd ed., 1908), p. 178.
62 Op. cit., p. 176
63 Op. cit., p. 178.
64 Idem., Vol. III *Syntax*, by Nigel Turner (Edinburgh: T. &. T. Clark, 1963).
65 Op. cit., p. 94f..

telling them that there must be an imperative hidden away here somewhere but who could not bring themselves to be quite as unfaithful to Xenophon as to translate an *in-order-that* clause as an independent clause imperative. As far as historians and theologians are concerned, the writer fails to see how this solution would create more problems than it solves. Admittedly, Peter's word to "become partakers of the divine nature" is a strong statement. But then, in his Second Epistle Peter consistently uses very strong language!—We would then render: I Timothy 1:3 *Just as when I was on my way to Macedonia I encouraged you to stay on at Ephesus, do you direct certain Messrs. Somebody to cut out their heterodoxizing.…* (The writer believes that not an anacoluthon but *brachylogy* is present here. For Timothy Paul does not need to spell out in full pedestrian logic the complete sequence of thought, which would be: "As I when I was on my way to Macedonia encouraged you to do when I encouraged you to stay on at Ephesus, do you, etc." The writer's understanding is this: Both Timothy's continued service at Ephesus and his effective handling of the problem of heterodoxizing teachers in the congregation there had been parts of the discussion between the Apostle and his favorite pupil and personal representative at Ephesus when they met for the conference here alluded to: πορευόμενος εἰς Μακεδονίαν. To say something once that needs to be thought twice (*brachylogy*) would not be too foreign to Paul's way of handling such things, especially when he is in a hurry to get to his main thought: "Timothy, you must meet head on the peril posed by those who under the guise of a superior wisdom are eviscerating the Gospel of that Christ who appeared to me and in whose service I as His slave must now stand." This statement would be shorthand for what passed between the two *on the road to Macedonia*.)

II Peter 1:3–4: Since His divine power has, through the knowledge of Him who called us, made us a gift of all that pertains to true life and Christianity, and has done so by a majesty and effectiveness entirely His own, by which also the greatest and most glorious promises have been given to us, do you by means of all these become partakers of the divine nature and flee the destruction that in its lust is this world's lot.