

Sayings of the Lord; many of them, naturally, in St John: where the emphatic possessive seems to express either a claim to authority on the part of the Speaker, or such a contrast as that between Himself as antitype and the type which He is superseding. Similar cases will be noticed when we come to deal with the nominative case of *ἐγώ*.

Matt. xviii 20 οὐ γὰρ εἰσι δύο ἢ τρεῖς συνηγμένοι εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα.

Luke xxii 19, 1 Cor. xi 24, 25 εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.

John viii 31 ἐὰν ὑμεῖς μείνητε ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῷ ἐμῷ and eight similar passages in St John.

1 Cor. xi 25 τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι.

The general conclusions as to the possessive pronoun, therefore, seem to be these:—

(a) The whole question is best tested through *ἐμός*. Some emphatic form of possessive was needed: *μου* was never emphatic. *ἐμοῦ* was not used as an ordinary possessive. Therefore *ἐμός* filled the necessary place, and *σός*, &c., naturally followed suit.

(b) They can be used wherever *ἐγώ* (*σύ*, &c.) can be used in the nominative, or where 'own' and the like can be expressed in the English rendering.

(c) The repetition of the article with the possessive is in no sense specially emphatic. It is a Johannine use only, though St John does not use it invariably. Beyond this there is no difference between his use of the possessive and that of the rest of the Greek Testament writers.

AMBROSÈ J. WILSON.

ST MATTHEW VI 1-6 AND OTHER ALLIED PASSAGES.

JEWISH sources describing the actual life under Pharisaic conditions have not verified the current explanation of the reproaches brought against the hypocrites who give alms in the presence of others and while doing so sound a trumpet before them in the synagogues and in the streets, and pray in the synagogues and in the corners of the streets that they may be seen of men (Matt. vi 1-6). Certainly, then as now, there were men who paraded their generosity to have glory of their fellows. But I can recall no reference in early Rabbinical literature to people who prayed in the streets, unless it be inferred,

from the express legal prohibition of the practice, that it occurred. But as to sounding the trumpet while giving alms; the commentators take the phrase metaphorically; while yet the rest of the passage must be explained literally, unless it is to lose all force. The clue to the real meaning of the whole section may be found, I believe, in the very phrase which, so far from being a metaphor, directs us to the only circumstances under which the reproaches would have been relevant.

It must first be observed that the three reproaches are continued by a fourth in verse 16: 'Moreover when ye fast be not, as the hypocrites, of a sad countenance: for they disfigure their faces, that they may be seen of men to fast.' This disfigurement on fast-days is interpreted by the command that the disciples should anoint their heads and wash their faces when fasting, so as to keep secret their act of asceticism. But how often did these fasts occur that there should be ground for so general a charge against the hypocrites?

All these difficulties disappear, and the whole passage becomes intelligible, when the verses are referred to the procedure on *public fasts*. The Mishnah tells us that on these days of public fasting on occasion of a drought, the scene of the service was the street or market-place (*Taanith* II § 1 seq.); the leaders of the community gathered there round the Ark containing the Law; and after an address by one of the Rabbis, who reminded the assemblage of the example of Nineveh and called his hearers to genuine repentance, the prayers for rain commenced. Here, then, we have the only prayers recorded as being recited in the streets, and of the many present it may well be that some joined with no true humiliation in their hearts but to be seen of men in the assembly, and some stood at the street corners praying with questionable sincerity. The people as a whole are not, it is true, represented as praying at these public fasts; they merely respond Amen. But we read how they broke into tears when Rabbi Eliezer addressed them and recited the prayer composed by himself (T. B. *Taanith* 25 b). But it is especially to be noticed that on such occasions the ram's horn (shofar) was blown after each of the six additional benedictions at the end of the prayers. The overseer (*hazan*) of the congregation gave the direction, 'Blow, ye priests, blow (the horn),' and again, 'Sound, ye sons of Aaron, sound.' We have, at all events, the precise statement that this was the mode of procedure in Sepphoris in the age of Halafta and Hananja ben Teradon. Now it was well understood that on such days, when God's mercy was besought, men must themselves exercise mercy practically in the form of almsgiving. Thus we read (T. B. *Synhedrin* 35 a): 'R. Eliezer says, Whoever postpones over night the distribution of the alms in con-

nexion with the fast is as though he¹ shed blood.' This implies that on fast-days alms were promised, but not always given on the spot. The same teacher deduces from Isa. lviii 5 sq. that almsgiving is the primary condition of the acceptance of the worshipper's prayer on fast-days (T. J. *Taanith* II vi 65 b line 14 sq.). And a characteristic story is told (in Genesis Rabba xxxiii 3; Leviticus Rabba xxxiv 14), how that Rabbi Tanhuma once decreed a public fast during a calamitous drought. When the rain still failed to descend, though the fast was thrice repeated, the Rabbi rose and said, 'My children, be full of mercy towards one another, then will God have mercy on you.' The people thereupon distributed alms. This practice seems to me to underlie the reproach against the public distribution of alms in Matt. vi 2.

In the light of this theory as to the circumstances referred to in the passage from Matthew, we can now consider some other allusions to fasting in the Gospels. It has already been suggested above that Matt. vi 16 which is a continuation of verse 6—after the digression on the Lord's Prayer—deals also with the same public fasts on occasion of drought or exceptional calamity. We are elsewhere informed that the disciples of John the Baptist and of the Pharisees 'were fasting' (Mk. ii 18; cp. Matt. ix 14; Lk. v 33). This also can only refer to an occasional fast in time of drought, as Schürer points out (II¹ 572; Eng. Tr. Vol. II div. ii p. 119). It has been inferred from Lk. xviii 12 that the stricter Pharisees already at this early period practised the custom of fasting twice every week throughout the year, though for this usage (well known of course in the later Judaism) only one Rabbinic confirmation is quoted, the passage (T. B. *Taanith* 12 a) cited by Lightfoot. This passage, however, by no means shews that the regular Monday and Thursday fasts were so ancient. The simplest view seems to be that Luke xviii 12, as well as the other passages, refers to the exceptional fasts during October–November, when severe pietists fasted on Mondays and Thursdays if the rain failed. At the close of this period every one was required to fast, but the Pharisee of Luke puts himself forward as a specially strict observer of the rite, and such pietists (yehidim) fasted several Mondays and Thursdays during the drought (T. B. *Taanith* 10 a and b). *Didache* viii 1 has these same Autumn fasts in mind, for the context shews that the author is basing his statement on Matt. vi, which we have before seen reason to assign to the same special series of fasts during drought. In short, the whole argument tends to the conclusion that these discourses regarding fasting were all spoken during the month October–November when, as we might put it, fasting was in the air.

In this connexion I venture to offer an explanation of the difficulty

presented by the first clause in the second of the Oxyrhynchus *Sayings*. The Greek runs: *ἐὰν μὴ νηστεύσητε τὸν κόσμον, οὐ μὴ εἴρητε τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ κτλ.*, 'Except ye fast the world ye shall in no wise find the kingdom of God, and except ye make the Sabbath a real Sabbath ye shall not see the Father.' Here the phrase *τὸν κόσμον* seems to be the translation of the Hebrew *עַמּוּל* or the Aramaic *עַמּוּלָא*. Both these words mean simply 'the people', and the same usage occurs in Syriac. Hence the meaning is 'Except ye fast with the world' i. e. with the rest of the people in distress. This is very closely paralleled by the following passage, from the second century at latest, to be found in T. B. Tractate *Taanith* fol. 11 a: 'If any one separates from Israel when it is in trouble, the two angels which accompany a man come and place their hands on his head and say, This man who separated from the community shall not behold the consolation of the community.' That this 'separation' refers to dissociation from a common fast in some time of distress is shewn by the next passage. 'When the community is plunged in distress one shall not say, I will go to my house, I will eat and drink, and thou, my soul, wilt be in peace; if he does this, concerning him is written Isa. xxii 13. But a man shall share the pain of the community, and whoever pains himself with the congregation shares the privilege of beholding the consolation of the community.' Thus the *Saying* seems directed against those who failed to observe the Sabbath and the public fasts with the community. Here again, then, we have the fact that the reference to fasting applies specifically to the fasting period, for it was only then that public fasts were prevalent.

It also seems to me probable that the Beatitudes in the previous chapter of Matthew are to be referred for their immediate application, to a period of drought when the poor were starving and required a message of comfort. Commentators have pointed out that Matt. v 3 should read 'Blessed are the poor' as in Lk. vi 20, the words 'in spirit' being an interpretation. Luke has only two other beatitudes, of those who hunger and those who weep. Matthew not only adds the meek but makes of those who hunger and thirst, people who hunger and thirst after righteousness (or because of righteousness). The two following beatitudes in Matt. (v 7 and 8) no longer refer to the poor but to the rich. It is their duty to have mercy on the poor and thus shew themselves 'pure in heart'. But they failed to perform this duty in times of drought when it was most specially incumbent on them. Hence 'Woe unto you that are rich . . . Woe unto you that are full' (Lk. vi 24 sq.).

Thus the consideration of these passages confirms the suggestion that the discourses and exhortations here brought together may have

been uttered in the month October–November. That they afterwards received and were capable of receiving a wider application does not invalidate their original restriction to a particular period and special circumstances.

ADOLF BÜCHLER.

NOTES ON THE TEXT OF ORIGEN'S COMMENTARY ON I CORINTHIANS.

I DO not think that the *Journal of Theological Studies*, in the nine years of its existence, has published any contribution to theological learning more solid and more valuable than the edition of the fragments of Origen on St Paul's epistles to Ephesus and Corinth. We owe, indeed, to Cramer's *Catena* our first introduction to the greater part of these fragments: but the copyists whom Cramer employed were capable of quite phenomenal blunders, and to Mr Gregg and Mr Jenkins belonged in effect, in each case, both the labour and the merit of an *editio princeps*.

Certain it is that these commentaries contain many interesting things which appear so far to have escaped the notice of Church historians. A reference to the inconsistencies between the duty of a Christian and the duty of a soldier (on I Cor. v 11) has escaped even Harnack's encyclopaedic knowledge of early Christian literature. The summary of the Eucharistic service as the 'invocation of the name of God and of Christ and of the Holy Spirit' over the elements (on I Cor. vii 5) is absent from Mr Brightman's collection of liturgical passages from the Egyptian fathers. And I myself, when writing on Patristic commentaries on St Paul (in the supplementary volume to Hastings's *Dictionary of the Bible* p. 489), ought to have cited Origen's distinct allusions to a predecessor or predecessors in the exegesis of the same epistle: *οἱ λοιποὶ ἐρμηνευταὶ . . . φασὶν* (on I Cor. vii 24), *τινὲς ἐξήγησαν τίς ἡ διαφορὰ τῶν ὑπὸ τὸν νόμον παρὰ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους* (on I Cor. ix 20). Note further the information about Ophites (on xii 3), about Montanists (on xiv 34), about heretics who used the Creed (on xv 20), about parts of the Old Testament unsuitable for Church lessons (on xiv 7, 8), about a Pauline citation found in Aquila and the other interpreters but not in the LXX text (on xiv 21), about Apollos being bishop of Corinth (on xvi 12).

Any fragments of the original Greek of Origen's work on the New Testament are worth all that we can devote to them of loving and