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Causal ἵνα – Sound Greek

By INEKE SLUITER, Amsterdam

Summary: Apollonius Dyscolus (s. II A.D.) has always given philologists a hard time by his description of the so-called “causal” use of the conjunction ἵνα. To all appearances causal ἵνα was a ghost-construction, unknown from any extant Greek text. Grammars of New-Testament Greek every now and then revived the concept in order to explain some problematic instances of the conjunction. However, their alleged examples of causal ἵνα did not conform to the conditions that Apollonius had set for its use. This article reports 11 instances of causal ἵνα from the 4th and 5th cent. A.D., all in accordance with Apollonian precepts, and showing a very regular semantic pattern. Attention is paid to the stylistic level where the construction is found. The “causal” use of ἵνα is thus definitively established as “sound Greek.”

1. The problem

Scholarly grammars are not in the habit of devoting much attention to the problem of the so-called “causal use” of the Greek conjunction ἵνα. Kühner-Gerth does not even mention the phenomenon and in Schweyzer-Debrunner it is only briefly referred to in an Anmerkung (II 674). Grammars of later Greek, especially those concerned with the New Testament, have more to offer. They discuss a number of passages where a causal interpretation of the conjunction might have its theological attractions (cf. AGC 157 ff.). However, in none of these passages does a causal interpretation of ἵνα impose itself.

Now, the reason why the possibility of such an interpretation is entertained at all, is the authority of the famous Greek grammarian Apollonius Dyscolus (s. II A.D.), who mentions the existence of “causal ἵνα”. I studied his and other ancient theories on the topic on an earlier occasion. Apart from these theories and a discussion of the origin of

1) I wish to thank Prof. Dr. D.M. Schenkeveld for his critical remarks on an earlier draft of this paper.
2) Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 456 Anm. 2 (discussing Apocal. 22:14; 16:15; Marc. 4:12; 1 Petr. 4:6); Moulton-Turner III 102. Cf. further Jannaris § 1741; Leumann-Hofmann-Szantyr II 647 (causal ut).
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the grammatical terminology for the σύνδεσμοι αιτιολογικοί, I also presented as a kind of πάρεγγον a few instances of an actual causal use of ἵνα and I gave a tentative explanation of the semantic development leading to this use. Since then, I have found several new instances shedding new light on the material available so far. They justify the conclusion that a “causal” use of ἵνα may be considered good Greek (no need for emendation) and they prove Apollonius Dyscolus to have been an acute observer of linguistic fact once again. The presentation of this new material is the objective of this paper.

2. Status quaestionis

The results of AGC were the following: Apollonius Dyscolus discussed the causal use of ἵνα at several points in his work (coni. 243, 11 ff., esp. 244, 24 ff.; synt. 381, 10 ff. and 388, 9 ff.). The upshot of his remarks is that ἵνα functions either as an adverb of place, or as a conjunction. When it is a conjunction, it either has final or causal meaning. In accordance with Apollonius' view on other causal conjunctions, ἵνα allegedly has a preference for past-tense constructions, probably on the ground that it is easiest to call something the cause of something else, when both cause and effect have already taken place. However, there is a slight complication in that, unlike other causal conjunctions, ἵνα takes the subjunctive instead of the indicative mood. This is said to be caused by analogy from the homophonous final conjunction, which is likewise construed with that mood. Although all examples provided by Apollonius feature a subjunctive of the aorist, ἵνα is an exception not only with regard to the following mood, but also because of the tense: An aorist subjunctive does not have past-tense value.\(^4\)

Apollonius' examples of causal ἵνα are somewhat disappointing: He does not quote any literary examples at all, but only gives some phrases coined for schoolroom use, such as: ἵνα ἀναγνω, ἐτυμῆθην, ἵνα λαυρόφησο ἐπελήξην (coni. 243, 21) (‘because I had read, I was honoured; because I had used foul language, I was rebuked.’).

To sum up the characteristics of Apollonian causal ἵνα: that conjunction is always followed by an aorist subjunctive, the main sentence has a past tense, and, finally, in all examples the ἵνα-clause precedes the main clause.

\(^4\) Apollonius himself gets quite confused over this point, cf. coni. 244, 24 ff.; AGC 145 ff.; 151 f.
One of the questions I tackled in my thesis was: Where did the theory about causal ἵνα originate? I argued that the whole concept of causal ἵνα rested mainly on a terminological confusion. From the Peripatos the grammarians had taken over some ideas about causation in general, including the distinction between final and effective causes. However, in this respect as in others they were terminologically dependent on the Stoics, who held a more monolithic view on causation. The consequence was that the one term αἰτιολογικός covered both final and effective causes. Thus, ἵνα would be classified as αἰτιολογικός, in its normal, final interpretation.

Some grammarians, however, began to distinguish the σύνδεσμοι ἀποτέλεσµατος (final conjunctions) as a separate group within the category of the αἰτιολογικοί. Remarks on a causal use of ἵνα are found only in these grammarians, maybe because they took the term ἵνα αἰτιολογικός not in its wide, but in its strict sense, i.e. as truly “causal” ἵνα.

I found some evidence that ἵνα was sometimes taken as a causal conjunction by ancient interpreters (examples from Andreas of Caesarea\(^5\)) and the Lexicon Vindobonense, AGC 158 ff.) and I suspected that there could also have been a real, if rare and marginal, use of ἵνα in a causal sense to support the grammarians’ interpretations. I tentatively suggested several examples of such a use. These, however, laboured from various problems, the most conspicuous being that they did not all of them concur with Apollonian criteria for the causal use of ἵνα, as I remarked at the time (AGC 164). In this respect, I did no better than the New Testament Grammars, which never bother about the Apollonian conditions for the use of causal ἵνα (cf. AGC 157 ff.).

In AGC, I tentatively regarded this use of ἵνα as an Alexandrian colloquialism.

3. Method; anticipation of conclusions

As I said, I have found several more instances since then. The problem with looking for a specific use of ἵνα is, that the word is so frequent. Even when one has the benefit of access to the Ibycus computer and the TLG material (as I do), a random search for ἵνα is

\(^5\) PG 106, 449. Andreas paraphrases ἵνα (Apocal. 22:14) by means of γάρ. At the time I checked ancient commentaries on the Bible-passages which were considered likely candidates for causal ἵνα by the New Testament Grammars. A posteriori that was not the most likely way to find “truly” causal ἵνα.
useless and frustrating. I was very glad therefore, when I found that a pattern emerged with the first new cases to crop up. However, a hermeneutic circle immediately was imminent: I could look for more examples by making use of the once-discovered pattern (and, indeed, not without success), but this was bound to be a self-confirmatory search. All new cases necessarily conformed to the established pattern, otherwise they would have gone undetected. Therefore, I cannot claim to have found the type of context in which a causal use of ἵνα may feel at home par excellence. I trust that others will supply my material with Lesefrüchte of their own.

In anticipation of my results the pattern which established itself may be described as follows: Causal ἵνα is mostly followed by an aorist subjunctive, the ἵνα-clause preceding the main clause. The main verb is in the past tense. All this is in accordance with Apollonian theory. The ἵνα-clause contains a condition (which in my examples is virtually always explicitly marked as a slight one). It is clear that the condition must have been fulfilled, because its consequent is presented as having taken place already (hence the past tense). It is this past tense which forces us to interpret ἵνα causally.

I shall now first present my material, starting with a brief mention of the examples from my thesis which fit the new pattern, then presenting the new material in full. Then, I shall give a brief general discussion, summing up what results from my material. After a note on the semantic development which led to our construction (more specifically the relationship with ἐὰν), I shall end with some remarks on the stylistic level on which causal ἵνα seems to occur.

---

6) I owe many thanks to dr. J. M. Tevel, who has showed himself an almost more fervent hunter for examples than myself. He found the pseudo-Chrysostomic text (ex. [4]) which proved the key to at least one set of problems.

7) The one possible exception is Anth. Pal. IX 169, 5 (Palladas) which I had (accidentally) found already; see, however, section 5. The rest of the new examples was found precisely by looking for a combination of ἵνα plus a disparaging word like βραχίονος, μόνον, εἶς, αὕτη, ἕν, μηψασθενος, τοσούτος, etc. Alternatively, I looked up the names of either very good people who were severely punished for one small (?) error (e.g. Moses, Miriam, the boys who laughed at Elisa), or of very “bad” people who were saved by one small (?) good deed (like Mary Magdalene, the robber on the cross, Paul). In all these cases, a phrase like “only because” is apt. I searched in all Christian writers available in the TLG material and further in Anon. Med.; Anth. Graec.; Chariton; Diog. Laertius; Dioscurides; Epict.; Eratosthenes; Euclides; Galenus; Heliodorus; Liban.; Porph.; Sextus Empiricus; Themist.; Vettius Valens; Xenophon Eph.
4. The material

(1) *Anth. Pal.* IX 169 (discussed in *AGC* 161 f.):

Μήνις Ἀχιλλῆς καὶ ἔμοι πρόφασις γεγένηται ὀυλομένης πενίς γραμματικοσαμένω.

εἴδε δὲ σὺν Δαναοῖς μὲ κατέχανε μῆνις ἐκείνη, πρὶν χαλεπὸς λιμὸς γραμματικῆς ὀλέσει.

ἀλλ᾽ ἵνα ἀφοσάξῃ Βροσίθα πρὶν Ἀγαμέμνονοι τὴν Ἐλένην ἔμοι ὡς ἁρπαζόμενον.

"The wrath of Achilles was the cause of pernicious poverty to me too, since I adopted the profession of a grammarian. Would that the 'wrath' had killed me with all the Greeks, before the bitter hunger of grammar had put an end to me. But all because in former times Agamemnon raped Briseis, and Paris Helen, I have become a beggar." 8)

The ἵνα-clause precedes the main clause, ἵνα is followed by an aorist subjunctive and the main verb is an imperfect. A final use of ἵνα seems excluded here.


Segue δὲ εἰςιν ἀφειδέστηκα τῶν αἰτιωμένων ταῦτα τῇ ἡμῖν ἀμφότερα ἐγκαλοῦσιν ὅμως καὶ προστιθέασι την εἰς τοὺς τετμηκότας ὄβριν, δίκαια πεπονθέναι λέγοντες αὐτοὺς καὶ εἰ μείζων τούτων ἀτυμασθέντες έτυχον παρ᾽ ἡμῶν ὅτι τοσοῦτος καὶ τηλικοῦτος ἀφέντες ἀνδρας, μειράκια χθές καὶ πρόθυν ἐτι ταῖς τοῦ βίου μερίμναις ἐγκαλινδούμενα, ἵνα χρόνον

8) Transl. adapted from Paton (Loeb), see *AGC* 161 note 55: Paton translates: "But all to let A. run away with B., and P. with H., I have become poor." Notice that he is obliged to ignore πρίν in his translation in order to give ἵνα its ordinary final interpretation. Soury (Budé) translates: "Mais pour qu'Agamemnon enlevât autrefois Briseis, et Pâris Hélène, je suis devenu mendiant" - this is incomprehensible. Beckby (Tusculum) notices the difficulty and comes up with: "Nein, da mußte zuvor Agamemnon Briseis und Paris/Helena rauben, damit ich als ein Bettler erstand." The drift of the epigram is that "there is a chain of causation which runs from the rape of Helen and that of Briseis via the μῆνις of Achilles to the poverty of the grammarian. The first two distichs call attention to the link between μῆνις and poverty, the last between the raped ladies and poverty – it does not make sense to take ἵνα as final in this connection. Moreover, ... πρίν (vs.5) would put an unpleasant and unnecessary emphasis on the inversion of cause and effect in the case of a final interpretation of ἵνα, whereas in a causal interpretation πρίν has the function of stressing the anteriority of ἀφαρσάξῃ to 'γενόμην' (AGC 161).
And all those detractors who are even less sparing in their accusations, accuse us of both these things at the same time and they add our insolent behaviour towards those who have honoured us, saying that they suffered what they deserved, even if they had received a still more ignominious treatment on our hands, because they had dismissed such formidable men and of such an honourable age, in order all of a sudden to promote youths who only a short time ago were completely involved in all the antics of the worldly life, because they frowned for a short time and dressed in grey and feigned a sombre and serious attitude, to such an honour as they would not even in their dreams have expected to receive.” (See AGC 159 f.)

The ἕνα-clause precedes the main clause, ἕνα is followed by an aorist subjunctive and two subjunctives of the present stem (or should we read περιβάλλονται, as does PG? Υποκρίνονται is ambiguous, of course). The main verb is an aorist indicative. The point is that in the eyes of his detractors a brief exertion on the part of the "youths" had sufficed to promote them to their present high position. The connection is clearly causal in nature.

(3) Basilius of Caesarea, Regulae brevius tractatae, PG 31, 1237-40: Question 233:

"Ex πάντων τῶν κατορθωμάτων ἔαν ἐν λείπῃ τινί, εἰ διὰ τοῦτο οὐ σφέται". ΑΠΟΚΡΙΣΙΣ Πολλῶν ὄντων ἐν τῇ τι Παλαιᾷ καὶ ἐν τῇ Καινῇ Διαθήκῃ τῶν δυναμένων περὶ τούτου πληροφορήσαι ἡμᾶς, ἀρχεῖν ἠγούμαι τῷ πίστῳ καὶ μόνον τὸ ἐπὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ κρίμα· δές ἐπὶ τοιούτους καὶ τηλικούτους κατορθώμασι, καὶ τοιούτους τοῖς παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου μακαρισμοῖς καὶ ἑπαίνοις, ἑνα ἐν ἐνί μόνῳ δῶξῃ παρακολούθων, καὶ τούτῳ οὕτε διὰ σκονν, οὕτε διὰ καταφρόνησιν, ἀλλὰ δὲ εὐλάβειαν καὶ τιμή τὴν περὶ τὸν Κύριον, ἐπὶ τούτῳ μόνῳ ἀκούει· Ἐὰν μὴ νῖγω σε, οὐκ ἔχεις μέρος μετ' ἐμοῦ [Joh. 13:8].

"If from all virtuous deeds one is lacking, whether for that reason a person will not be saved.’ ANSWER Although there are many examples from both the Old and the New Testament that can inform us on this point, I think it will be sufficient for the believer to look only at the decision taken in the case of Peter. After all his great and

9) Malingrey translates “pourvu que ceux-ci froncent les sourcils depuis quelque temps . . .”, instinctively noticing the relationship with ἔαν (see below, section 6).
wonderful virtuous deeds, after so many blessings and praise from the Lord, he heard, because he seemed to be disobedient in one instance only, and that not even on account of laziness or arrogance, but out of respectful honour for the Lord – for that reason only he heard: ‘If I do not wash you, you have no part in me.’”

The ἵνα-clause precedes the main clause. It contains an aorist subjunctive. The main verb is in the present indicative, which may be interpreted as a praesens historicum. A causal interpretation is supported by the fact that the ἵνα-clause is taken up by the phrase ἐπὶ τούτῳ μόνῳ.

(4) Pseudo-Johannes Chrysostomus, Oratio catechetica in dictum evangelii : simile est regnum caelorum homini patrifamilias, qui exit primo mane conducere operarios in vineam suam [Math. 20: 1], PG 59, 582:

“Because a prostitute has cried but for one hour next to you and because she untied her hair ... and kissed your immaculate feet with demure lips, and because she has offered to you, the heavenly one, earthly unguents, you gave her the privilege (or: the dignity) of a daughter and virgin. Because a robber, crucified on the cross, fled but for one hour for refuge to you and cried out ‘Remember me when you come in your high power’ [Luke 23: 42], you opened paradise to him on account of that word only. Because Paul the persecutor, the enemy, repented but for one hour, he was made a preacher of the gospel.”

In each of these three examples of causal ἵνα, the ἵνα-clause precedes the main clause. Each ἵνα-clause contains an aorist subjunctive. The main clause twice features an aorist indicative and once a perfect indicative (ἀναδέδεικται). A causal interpretation is explicitly supported by the words ὑπὲρ μόνης τῆς φωνῆς ταύτης. The context

10) PG translates “ubi ... visus est”.
11) PG translates ut + present subjunctive.
excludes a final interpretation. This is a sermon on “the workers in the vineyard” and in this section examples are presented of “last who will be first.” Like the “last” from the gospel, who worked μίαν ἠδραν, each of the persons here quoted (Mary Magdalen, the robber on the cross, Paul) were saved, after having functioned “properly” (in whichever way) μίαν ἠδραν. The rhetorical repetition of this phrase is significant.

(5) Pseudo-Johannes Chrysostomus, de Sacerdotio I. VII, PG 48, 1069 f.: 

Γνώθι τούν ὁ πεπόνθασιν οἱ τάλαντες ἐκεῖνοι, οἱ τῷ Μωσεί καὶ Ἀαρών ἀντιστάντες ποτὲ καὶ προπετευσάμενοι ἀναιδῶς καὶ αὐθαδῶς θυμιάσας τῷ Θεῷ· οὐχὶ πῦρ κατέφαγεν ἀπαντας ἄνθ᾽ ὁν κατετόλμησαν εἰς βαθμόν οὐδ᾽ ὡς ἦσαν ἄξιοι; Πάλιν δὲ καὶ Μαριάμ ἡ προφήτης τοῦ Θεοῦ, ίνα βραχύν τινα λόγον τῷ Μωσῇ ὑνειδία περὶ ιεροσύνης, τοιοῦτον αὐτῇ μῶμον ὄρισεν ὁ Ὑψιστος, ἵνα λεπρωθείσα ἐπτὰ ἡμέρας ἀφορισθῇ ἐξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς.

“Think of what those wretched men suffered, who once opposed Moses and Aaron and had the rashness to burn incense for God in a shameless and wilful way. Did not fire consume them all for their rash pretention to the rank of which they were unworthy? And, again, Miriam the prophetess of God: because she made Moses some brief reproach over the priesthood, the Highest brought such disgrace down on her that she was banned from the camp for seven days, suffering from an attack of leprosy.”

The ἵνα-clause precedes the main clause and it has an aorist subjunctive. The main clause contains an aorist indicative. An explicit indication for a causal interpretation is the use of ἄνθ᾽ ὁν in the preceding sentence (cf. SD 661). In both sentences the topic is divine retribution, in the first this is caused by the rashness of the pretenders to the priesthood (ἄνθ᾽ ὁν κατετόλμησαν), in the second, it is the behaviour of Miriam.

(6) Johannes Chrysostomus, de poenitentia hom. VIII, PG 49, 339: (God does not only refrain from punishment in the case of a penitent person, he even justifies). ... “Δίκαιον αὐτὸν ποιῶ.” Καὶ ποῦ τούτο ἐποίησαν; Ἐπὶ τοῦ ληστοῦ, ἰνα εἶπῃ μῶνον ἐκάινο, “Οὐδὲ φοβῆ σὺ τὸν Θεόν;”, τῷ ἑταῖρῳ αὐτοῦ. “Καὶ ἡμᾶς μὲν δικαίως· ἄξια γὰρ ὁν ἐπράξαμεν ἀπολαμβάνομεν.” Λέγει πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Σωτήρ. “Σήμερον μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ

---

12) PG translates “quod ... exprobrasset”!
“I justify him.’ And in which case did he do that? In the case of the robber, because he had said only this: ‘Do you not fear God?’; to his companion, ‘And we indeed justly; for we are receiving the due reward of our deeds’. The Saviour says to him: ‘Today you will be with me in Paradise’. [Luc. 23:40-3] He did not say: ‘I deliver you from punishment and retribution’, but he leads him into Paradise as a just man.”

In this case the main clause lacks a verb and we have to supply ἐποίησεν τοῦτο. The rhetorical structure of the passage accounts for the differences with the preceding passages. Theoretically, it seems possible to regard λέγει as the main verb (by change of punctuation), but this is not attractive. However the sentence is construed, I find the asyndeton rather harsh. The ἵνα-clause contains an aorist subjunctive. The main verb (to be supplied) is an aorist indicative (ἐποίησεν) (alternatively, it is a present indicative (λέγει)). A causal Interpretation seems inevitable and it is supported by the parallel passage from Johannes Chrysostomus, de Cruce et Latrone homil. II, PG 49, 410. There the causal relationship between the penitence of the robber and his reward is unmistakable. The words of the robber are there called τὰ βραχέα ἐκεῖνα ὁμήματα, which stresses the fact that his is a simple accomplishment that leads to a disproportionate remuneration.

(7) Johannes Chrysostomus, de Virginitate, SC 125 (ed. Musurillo), 22, 1:

Καὶ τί λέγω Μαριάμ; Οἱ γὰρ παῖδες ἐκεῖνοι οἱ περὶ τὴν Βηθλεέμ παῖζοντες ἵνα πρὸς τὸν Ἑλίσααίον τοῦτο μόνον εἰπώσαν· “Ἀνάβαινε, φαλάκρε,” οὐτῶν παρόξυναν τὸν Θεόν ὡς ἁμα τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ ἄρκους αὐτῶν ἐπαρεῖναι τῷ πλῆθει.

“And why am I talking about Miriam? For those children who were playing near Beth-el – because they said to Elisa only this: ‘Go up, you baldhead!’; they so angered God that as soon as they had spoken these words, he sent bears to attack their group” (cf. 2 Kings 2:23-4).15)

13) This text is also found as Johannes Chrysostomus, Ecloga de poenit. homil. xxxv, PG 63, 836 (which in fact contains excerpts from our passage). The text there runs thus: Δίκαιον αὐτὸν ποιεῖ. Καὶ ποῦ τοῦτο ἐποίησεν; Ἐπὶ τοῦ λῃστοῦ ἤνα εἶποι μόνον ἐκεῖνος· κτλ.

14) PG translates “ut ... diceret”, ignoring the problem.

15) Grillet (SC) rightly translates “pour avoir dit”.

The ἓνα-clause precedes the main clause. It contains an aorist subjunctive. The main verb is in the aorist indicative. Again the topic is severe retribution for (seemingly) small offences. This brings about a causal interpretation.


Ἐννόησαν, ὅσα ὑπέμεινεν, ὅσα ἐφιλοσοφήσεν ὁ Μωυσῆς, ὅσα ἐπεδείξατο ἁγαθὰ· καὶ ἓνα ἐν ἁμάρτῃ ἁμάρτημα μόνον, ἐκολάζετο πικρὸς.

"Think how much Moses endured, how much he taught, how many good deeds he did. And just because he committed one single sin, he was punished relentlessly."16)

The ἓνα-clause precedes the main clause, it contains an aorist subjunctive and the main verb is an imperfect. This text should be connected with the next one, which I discussed in AGC 162. There, the context is virtually identical and, moreover, it contains (like ex. (5) above) an explicit support for a causal interpretation, namely the phrase ἀνθ’ ὅν:

(9) Severianus of Gabala, homil. In qua potestate, PG 56, 419 (cf. CPG 4193) (discussed in AGC 162):

Μωυσῆς ο τοσούτος καὶ τηλικούτος ἀνήρ ..., ὁ δημόδηθα δάλασσα ... ὦτος, ὅν ἐν τι τῶν ὑπὸ Θεοῦ κελευσθέντων τολμήσῃ (Μ; τολμήσας cet. Migne) ἀνδροπίνω λογισμῷ μετρήσαι, καὶ μὴ τῇ θείᾳ δυνάμει παρα-χωρήσαι, ἀπαραίτητον ὑπέχει τὴν δίκην. ὡς γὰρ ἐφόσον ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν, λέγει πρὸς τὸν λαόν: "ὁ λαὸς σκληρὸς καὶ ὑπειθής, μὴ ἐκ τῆς πέτρας ταύτης δυνήσομαι υἱὸν δοῦναι θανάτῳ," καὶ τὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Θεὸς; "ἀνθ’ ὅν οὐκ ἐδόξασας με ἐνώπιον τῆς συναγωγῆς οὐκ εἰσέλευσε εἰς τὴν γῆν ἡν οἴμοισα."

"Moses, that great and honourable man ... for whom the sea parted ... he inescapably underwent his punishment because he had ventured to measure one of God’s commandments with human reason. For when he came at the rock he said to the people: 'Hard and disobedient people, shall I not be able to give you water from this rock?' And what did God say to him? ‘Because you have not glorified me in front of the assembly, you shall not enter the land that I promised.’” (cf. Num. 20:2-13).17)

The parallels with the passage from Chrysostom leap to the eye. Again the ἓνα-clause precedes the main clause. It contains an aorist subjunctive, the main verb is an aorist indicative.

---

16) PG translates “et tamen quod unum peccatum admiserit”.

17) PG (reading τολμήσας, which cannot be construed) translates: “hic ubi unum ex Dei jussis ausus est humana ratione metiri”.
5. Discussion

The nine passages quoted above contain eleven instances of ἵνα eliciting a causal interpretation. In all examples ἵνα is followed by an aorist subjunctive. In one instance (ex. [2]) ἵνα is followed by an aorist subjunctive which is coordinated with a present subjunctive and then another aorist subjunctive. However, the coordination is suspect (maybe a simple typesetting error?). I propose to read an aorist subjunctive in this case, too.

In ten out of eleven cases, the ἵνα-clause precedes the main clause. The one exception is ex. (6), where the structure of the sentence is to blame, there being no main verb explicitly present. The verb has to be supplied from the preceding question. Alternatively, the punctuation could be changed so as to make λέγει the principal verb, but on balance this is not attractive.

In eight out of eleven instances the main verb is in the past tense, either an aorist indicative (six cases) or an imperfect (two cases). The three remaining ones have either a present indicative (ex. [3], praesens historicum; possibly (see above) ex. (6), in that case another praesens historicum) or a perfect indicative (ex. [4]). The latter is the third of a series of three instances of causal ἵνα in one context. Since the preceding two have an aorist indicative as main verb, it is likely that the perfect was also felt as a past tense here.

The Apollonian conditions for a causal interpretation of ἵνα seem, therefore, to be generally valid. Several times there are overt signs in the context leading to a causal interpretation. In all contexts a final interpretation is excluded by the temporal sequence of the actions described in the ἵνα-clause and the main clause respectively. It is virtually impossible to read a teleological innuendo into any of these passages.\(^{18}\)

All examples share the characteristic that the action expressed by the main verb is presented as resulting from the fulfilment of a certain condition. The causal interpretation is due to the fact that evidently both the fulfilment of the condition and the result are already effec-
tuated. Mostly, stress is put on the discrepancy between the slightness of the condition and the seriousness of the ensuing results. In practice, this is done by underscoring the discrepancy lexically:

\(^{18}\) As may easily be done in the New Testament passages mentioned e.g. in note 2.
However, as I explained above, such a disproportionate relationship between cause and effect cannot be posited as a prerequisite for the causal interpretation of ἵνα: The preponderance of this type would in any case result from my methods of research. Typically, an example which I had already found accidentally, does not seem to conform to this pattern (ex. [1]). On the other hand, it must be remarked that this case, too, could be interpreted accordingly if one be prepared to consider the rape of Helen of minor importance in confrontation with the poverty of the complaining grammarian - one might even argue that the epigram gains additional force from such a supposition, ludicrous as it may be, but made by the persona of the grammarian! Nevertheless, I do not think that we can as yet posit the discrepancy of cause and effect as one of the semantic factors inducing the causal interpretation of ἵνα. For in that case, all the examples quoted by Apollonius Dyscolus would fall outside the general semantic environment of our construction. It is hardly conceivable that a schoolteacher would find a compliment an excessive reward for proper reading, or a rebuke an excessive punishment for using foul language. From a didactic point of view Apollonius’ examples would in that case be an extremely bad choice. Since Apollonius thus far proved a reliable witness, I hesitate to introduce elements which not only are not mentioned by him, but even seem to clash with his evidence.

6. Semantic development – relationship with ἐάν

In AGC 164 ff. I discussed the semantic developments which may have led to the possibility of a causal interpretation of ἵνα. I refer to that passage for a full discussion, but would like to add one detail
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The fact that our ἵνα-clauses may be described in terms of “conditions”, inevitably calls to mind the relationship between ἐὰν and ἵνα, which was established in ancient grammatical sources (AGC 155, n.37). Such a link is also suggested by the formulation of ex. (3): The question there is “ἐκ πάντων τῶν κατορθωμάτων ἐὰν ἐν λειτυ τινι, εἰ διὰ τοῦτο οὐ σώζεται”. The expression that comes nearest to a direct answer to this question is the phrase: “ἵνα ἐν ἑνὶ μόνῳ δόξῃ παρακούειν ... ἀκούει”.

Now, I do not for a moment mean to suggest that ἵνα is in any straightforward sense equivalent to ἐὰν. For one thing, it is impossible to replace the “causal” instances of ἵνα by ἐὰν, if only precisely because the whole period is generally past tense. But one wonders whether ἐὰν may not have had a kind of intermediary function, if one calls to mind that ἐὰν-sentences can state the “cause” with many verbs of emotion. The “cause” is in those cases presented as a mere supposition rather than as a matter of fact. An example is Isocr. ep. 6.7: μή θαυμάζετε δ’ ἐάν τι φειάνωμα λέγων. The point is, of course, that ἵνα comes to be used in very much the same contexts in later Greeks (i.e. replacing ὅτι-clauses), cf. AGC 166f.

7. Stylistic level

In AGC (e.g. 143) I suggested that the so-called causal use of ἵνα may have been either colloquial, or typical of the dialect of Alexandria, or both. In view of the authors who use ἵνα with a causal connotation, it is no longer necessary to regard it as a typically Alexandrian phenomenon. However, the likelihood of a “colloquial” flavour seems confirmed by the new material.

In general the following may be remarked on the “social environment” of causal ἵνα: Apart from the testimony of Apollonius Dys-

---

19) For “ἵνα ἄντι τοῦ ἐὰν” add Sch.Hom. H 353 (according to Aristonicus [see also Friedländer 133] this substitution is not done ‘Ὀμηρικῶς – this evokes the question where it is usual. Cf. Eustath. a. l.). Another instance is provided by the Scholiast on Epictetus I 29.16. For a final ἵνα-clause that comes very close to a statement of a proviso or condition, see e.g. Joh. Chrysost. Fragm. in Job, PG 64, 596 πάς ἀνθρώπως ἔοικεν αὐθημερινῷ μιαστῷ, δός δ’ ἀληθείς ἡμέρας κάμνει ἵνα μικρὸν τι κοιμήσῃ. In this case, too, the presence of μικρόν τι induces semantic overtones that are not quite straightforwardly final: it rarely is anyone’s professed purpose to earn “a little”.

colus, all “literary” instances of the causal use of ἵνα date from the fourth and fifth centuries. The stylistic level of Anth. Pal. IX 169 (ex. [1]) is discussed in AGC 161 ff. Several other examples stem from homilies, which are characterized in general by frequent colloquialisms (exx. [4], [6], [8], [9]). Note that I do not use “colloquialism” in any pejorative sense, i.e. as a “vulgar” element. All authors are educated persons, and there is no reason whatsoever for disparaging their Greek, but they do apply elements of a sub-literary level of style in the texts under discussion here. Such a sub-literary level of style may also be posited for the remainder of the passages containing causal ἵνα: De Sacerdotio (ex. [2]; cf. ex. [7]) is a dialogue, containing many elements of (educated) spoken Greek (cf. Malingrey, introd. 22 ff.).20) Basilius’ Regulae (ex. [3]) are “based on notes of pastoral conversations between Basil and members of his monasteries, as they were written down by tachygraphs”.21) – Incidentally, most homilies have come down to us by a like procedure. And, finally, Chrysostom’s de Virginitate (ex. [7]), although it is a treatise and not a homily, is very similar in stylistic level to the homiletic genre, and shows many affinities with the diatribe in this respect (cf. Musurillo, introd. 38 ff.).

I have entertained the possibility that causal ἵνα might belong to the stylistic level of the “Fachprosaschriftsteller”22) This would imply that it belongs to the stylistic level of sub-literary, written, educated Greek. However, there are two considerations that make me look upon causal ἵνα as a phenomenon that primarily belongs in (educated) spoken language. In the first place, the more technical writers I investigated (e.g. Vettius Valens, various medical writers, Euclides, Diogenes Laertius, Porphyry etc.) simply did not yield any instances of causal ἵνα. And secondly, the specific group of examples that I did find, struck me by the rhetorical impact of the construction, which seemed to fit a context of direct contact between speaker and addressee. The fact that Apollonius Dyscolus does not quote any literary examples (as he is wont to do) is also telling. The reason to regard “causal ἵνα” as “correct” Greek (instead of a vulgarism), is the character of the au-

20) I have not been able to consult W. A. Maat, A Rhetorical Study of J. Chrysostom’s De Sacerdotio, Washington 1944 (= Patr. Studies vol. LXXI).
21) J. Quasten, Patrology III 212.
thors involved, and especially the fact that at least Apollonius Dyscolus cannot have considered the construction to be vulgar, or he would have excluded it from his teaching.

8. Conclusion

The causal interpretation of the conjunction ἵνα is now definitively vindicated as sound Greek, and as such it deserves a place in the scholarly grammars.

It occurs under the circumstances that were described by Apollonius Dyscolus. The ἵνα-clause precedes the main clause, ἵνα is construed with an aorist subjunctive and the main verb is past tense.

This usage of ἵνα belongs to the sub-literary, colloquial language of the educated Greek, at least from the second century A.D. onwards. All literary attestations date from the fourth and early fifth centuries A.D.