Emphasis of the Personal Pronoun.

Art. II.—Emphasis of the Personal Pronoun in the Greek Testament.

The particular character of the emphasis created by the presence of the personal pronoun appears to have been somewhat overlooked by readers of the Greek Testament.

Not being aware of any work on the subject, I offer the following as a contribution thereto. The importance of anything tending to a more exact understanding of the sacred writings is an excuse for doing so, which will readily be admitted by readers of The Churchman.

The emphasis arising from the personal pronoun, standing either in agreement or in regimen, may be classed under three heads:

A. Where the emphasis is concentrated in the pronoun.
B. Where the emphasis partly resides in the pronoun, and partly flows over into the rest of the sentence.
C. Where the whole emphasis of the pronoun is distributed throughout the sentence; in other words, where the pronoun is only expressed in order to make the sentence in which it stands emphatic.

A.

This is the ordinary case, concerning which we were taught in our boyhood; and probably so taught, as to make us think that the presence of the pronoun was always thus sufficiently accounted for; or, at any events, the pronoun in agreement. Examples of this use of the pronoun it is unnecessary to give; and it is to be understood that in the following pages, except by oversight, all the omitted passages in which the pronoun is for the sake of emphasis expressed are considered to come under this head. The following sentences are given for the sake of showing sub-divisions under this head:

(a) Where the whole emphasis is concentrated in the pronoun in agreement: 1 Cor. i. 12. Ἔγώ μὲν εἰμι Παύλου, ἐγώ δὲ Ἀπολλών, κ.τ.λ.
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(b) Where two pronouns in agreement have the emphasis of contrast: 1 Cor. iv. 10. 'Ἡμῖν δὲ οἱ δύο Χριστὸς, ὑμῖν δὲ φρονίμων ἐν Χριστῷ'—ἡμῖν ἀδύνατον, ὑμῖν δὲ ἰσχυρόν ὑμῖν ἐνδεχόμεθα, ὑμῖν δὲ ἀτόμοι.

(c) Where the pronoun in agreement is contrasted with the pronoun in regimen: 2 Cor. x. 1. Αὕτη δὲ ἐγὼ Πάππους παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς: ὁ δὲ ἁγιόν ὑμᾶς.

(d) Where two pronouns in regimen have the emphasis of contrast: 2 Cor. iv. 12. "εἰσε ὁ διάνοιας ἐν ἡμῖν ἴσος θεία, ὁ δὲ ζωὴ ἐν ὑμῖν.

Before proceeding to B and C, let us note

1st. That there are some passages in which the pronoun is expressed, in which it is not easy to discover any special emphasis accompanying it. This is especially the case in some sentences in St. John’s Gospel.

2ndly. That there are cases in which the pronoun is not expressed, though apparently called for; as in John vi. 68, last clause. An English reader would be sure to read, "Thou hast," etc., giving emphasis to the pronoun, which is missing in the Greek. Also 1 Thess. iii. 8: ὑμῖν ἐδόθη ἡ πρόκλησις.

3rdly. That with the formula ἁμὴν, ἀμὴν, the pronoun in agreement is never expressed.

B.

(1.) Matt. xi. 28. Αὕτη πρὸς με πάντες οἱ κοσμίωτες καὶ περιφερισμένων, κάγω ἀναπαύσω ὑμᾶς. There is, doubtless, some emphasis in the pronoun itself, but it also gives weight and force to its verb.

(2.) Matt. xxviii. 20. Ἐγὼ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι. The whole sentence shares to some extent the emphasis of the expressed pronoun.

(3.) Mark ix. 2-15. Τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἄλαλον καὶ καρφῷ, ἐγὼ σοὶ ἐπιτάσσω, ἐξέλθη. "We may observe, in His address to the foul spirit, the majestic 'I charge thee;' no longer one whom thou mayest dare to disobey," etc. (Trench.) This is very questionable; is there not more real majesty in the sentence, if we take the expressed pronoun as giving weight, deliberation, and dignity to the whole of it; or, at the least, recognise an overflow of emphasis from the pronoun? Except for deference to Dr. Trench, this would have been placed under C, without any direct emphasis being attributed to the pronoun.

(4.) Luke i. 19. Ἐγὼ εἰμι Γαβριήλ. The emphasis overflows, and adds solemnity to the announcement.

(5.) Luke viii. 46. Ἐγὼ γὰρ ἐγὼν δύναμιν ἐξέλθουσαν ἀπ' ἐμοὶ. The peculiar subject-matter requires this redoubled expression of personality. There may be an emphasis special to ἐγὼ, q. d. "I know, what you do not," but it is not thus exhausted, but partially carried through the whole sentence.
(6.) John iii. 10. ὡς ἐὰν διδάσκαλος; "Art thou the teacher?" Though the personal pronoun could not be dispensed with, and retains a considerable emphasis, yet the emphasis also passes on into the remainder of the sentence, and contributes point and force to it.

(7.) John viii. 12. ἐγώ εἰμι τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου. Some emphasis on the pronoun, but overflowing into the rest of the sentence, and giving weight to it.

(8.) John xiii. 7. ὁ ἐγώ ποιῶ, σὺ εἰς αὐτὸς ἁρτί. No doubt there is an emphasis of contrast between these pronouns, but not very strongly marked. Much of the emphasis overflows and gives a sense of deliberateness to the whole sentence.

(9.) John xv. 14. ἠμῖν φίλοι μου ἵστε, ἵνα σοι ὑμεῖς ἐγώ εἰς ἐκκλησίαν ἐλθητε ὑμῖν. A sentence of nearly the same character as the last.

(10.) Acts xv. 19. τέτικεν εἰς σοῦ; The pronoun retains its emphasis, but at the same time contributes to the solemn weight of the momentous question, as a whole.

(11.) Acts xv. 19. Διὸ ἐγώ κρίνω. Of course, there is a very distinct emphasis in the pronoun, but it is not less obvious that some of it passes on, and contributes to the weight and deliberation of the whole "sentence." "Quare ego ita censeo."

(12.) Phil. iii. 13. ἐγώ ἐμαυτῷ οὐ λογίζομαι κατιστρέφειναι. "Others might well think this of Paul," i.e., that he had apprehended; so Bengel remarks, and in that case this would come under A. But Lightfoot truly says, "This seems hardly to be the point of the expression." St. Paul is not contrasting his own estimate of himself with other people's estimate of him, but his estimate of himself with others' estimate of themselves." This being so, if we allow some emphasis to remain on the pronoun, we must see some of it overflowing into the sentence; it expresses the deliberateness of his judgment.

(13.) Phil. iv. 11. ἐγώ γὰρ ἐμαυτόν, ἐν ὑμῖν, αὐτάκες εἰμι. Perhaps some emphasis is lodged in the ἐγώ (he may be contrasting his real independence with the vaunted independence of the Stoics; comp. μεμίσθημαι in the next verse), but it mainly overflows, and gives an air of settled deliberateness to the whole utterance.

(14.) James ii. 19. Σὺ πιστεύεις ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς εἰς ἵστε. "Thou believest that God is one." R. V. Some emphasis resides in the pronoun, but some is spread over the sentence, and contributes to a slowly-delivered irony.

(15.) 1 John iv. 14. ἦμεις τεθναμέθα καὶ ματαιώμεθα. The emphasis of the pronoun runs over, and gives solemnity to the sentence. So also v. 16.

It may here be observed that on Acts xv. 7 (ὑμεῖς ἰσιστασάθε), VOL. II.—NEW SERIES, NO. VII. 2 D
Alford remarks, "In Peter's speeches in ch. x. this phrase occurs twice at the beginning of a sentence: vv. 28 and 37: and we have traces of the same way of expressing the personal pronoun in his speeches, ch. ii. 15; iii. 14, 25." The value of the pronoun seems to come under this head; but see C (30).

C.

(1.) Matt. x. 16. Ἰδοὺ, ἵνα ἀποστίλλω ὑμᾶς ὡς πρόβατα ἐν μίσῳ Ἡλια. The personal pronoun is not used for emphasis in itself, but for the sake of giving weight and solemnity to the whole sentence. And it is worthy of observation in how many passages this is the case, where either the conferring, or the receiving, of a divine commission is spoken of.

(2.) Matt. xi. 10; Mark i. 2. Ἰδοὺ, ἵνα ἀποστίλλω τὸν ἀγγέλον μου. See above.

(3.) Matt. xvi. 16; Mark viii. 29. Σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός. The pronoun gives weight and force to the whole sentence.

(4.) Matt. xxiii. 34. Διὰ τούτο, Ἰδοὺ, ἵνα ἀποστίλλω τὸς ὑμᾶς προσφύγας. See (1). In passing it may be suggested that διὰ τούτο would be better translated "therefore" (not "wherefore"), looking forward to an apodosis in ὦ τις. It is so translated in R.V.

(5.) Matt. xxvi. 64. Σὺ ἔσται. The distribution of emphasis is manifest in this solemn reply.

(6.) Matt. xxvii. 11. Σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς; Σὺ λέγεις. As in the last quotation.

(7.) Mark i. 11. Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός. The presence of the pronoun contributes to the solemnity of the whole sentence. So also

(8.) Mark xii. 26; Matt. xxvii. 32. Ἐγώ ὁ Θεὸς Ἄβραάμ: except that here the pronoun includes the verb.

(9.) Luke ix. 9. Ἰδὼν ἵνα ἀποκαλέσῃ τὸν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ τετυλίθη ἵνα ἀκούσῃ. The presence of the personal pronoun twice is best accounted for by viewing the sentence as the slow, deliberate utterance of a man greatly perplexed, not knowing what to think, and pausing between each word.

(10.) Luke xxiii. 14. Καὶ ἰδοὺ, ἥνων ἐνώπιον ὑμῶν ἀπεκρίνατε αὐτὸν εὐρός. No special emphasis in ἵνα; its use is to give weight and judicial character to the whole sentence.

(11.) John i. 19. Σὺ τίς εἶ; "As for thyself, who art thou?" So Westcott; but this seems forced. The real reason for the pronoun seems to be that the inquiry is put in the most formal manner.

1 Compare John v. 16; viii. 47; and Isa. liii. 12, LXX.
(12.) John iv. 38. 'Εγώ ἀκτίστηλα ὑμᾶς. See (1).
(13.) John v. 36. Τὰ ἐγένα ἐὰν ἰδουκέ μοι ὁ Πατὴρ ἵνα τελειωσάω αὐτῷ, αὐτὰ τὰ ἐγένα ἐὰν ἐγὼ ποιῶ, μαρτυρεῖ τῷ ἢμῖν. The redundance of the sentence gives it weight and solemnity; and the ἐγώ, if genuine, is in keeping with this; but Westcott rejects it.¹
(14.) John vi. 40, 44. 'Αναστήσω αὐτὸν ἐγώ... ἐγὼ ἀναστήσω αὐτόν. “In v. 40 the believer and Christ are placed in remarkable juxtaposition; here the ‘I’ stands first with a reference to the preceding clause” (Westcott). This may be so; but in v. 39 the personal pronoun is not expressed; and it may be that it has no special emphasis of its own in either of these two verses, and is introduced only for the sake of giving weight to a very important statement.
(15.) John vi. 70. ὁ ἐγώ ἐξέληξάμην; similar to (1).
(16.) John x. 34. 'Εγώ εἶπα, θεῖον ἐστε. The pronoun gives solemnity to the whole sentence.
(17.) John xi. 27. 'Εγὼ ἐξέληξάμην; similar to (1).
(18.) John xvi. 7. 'Εγώ thrice. The first comes under this head; the others under A.
(19.) John xvi. 27. 'Εγὼ παρὰ τοῦ θεου ἐξέληξάμην. If, as we have seen, the solemnity of any divine mission is marked by the introduction of the personal pronoun, much more this, the highest of all. (See also xvii. 8, 21, 23, 25.)
(20.) John xviii. 4, 9, 14, 19. It is confirmatory of the view here put forth to find that in this solemn prayer the personal pronoun comes in so frequently where it might otherwise have been omitted, as is proved by comparing v. 9 with v. 15. In the first, ἐγώ ἐξέληξάμην giving solemnity to a prefatory sentence, as it were. In the second, simply ἐρωτά.
(21.) John xviii. 37. Οὐκ ἐστι βασιλεὺς ἢ σῦ; ... σῦ λόγως, ἢ τι βασιλεὺς ἐσμεν ἐγώ. ἐγώ εἰς τὸ τούτου γεγένηται, καὶ εἰς τὸ τούτο ἐγείρων εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἵνα μαρτυρήσω τῷ ἄλλῳ. “A king then art thou?” ... “Thou sayest that a king am I.” The collocation is noteworthy, the answer following the order of the question, and showing at least a partial distribution of emphasis, more properly to be classed under B. But the solemn words that follow seem to belong to this head, the pronoun simply spreading emphasis over the whole sentence. See (19) and (1).

¹ The text used in this paper is that of Scholz, published by Bagster.
(22.) John xviii. 20. 'Εγώ σας είπα θαυμάσας τον κόσμον εγώ σάντοτε είδα εν συναγωγῇ. The pronouns seem meant to invest the whole reply with deliberateness and weight.

(23.) Acts iv. 7. 'Εν ουδὲν υπάρχει επιστήμη τούτου άματε; v. 9. Εί ήμείς σήμερον ἀνακεισόμεθα, κ.τ.λ. A solemn judicial question, and a solemn preface to the reply; the pronoun being introduced to give deliberateness to each.

(24.) Acts ix. 16. 'Εγώ γὰρ ὑποδείξα τοῦρα. The pronoun expressed to give solemnity to the whole declaration.

(25.) Acts xi. 5. 'Εγώ ἡμῖν ἐν πολεί ἱσόπτρε, A remarkable instance in point. We can imagine the very deliberate manner in which the Apostle records the circumstances which explain the conduct that had been impugned. Hence the pronoun.

(26.) Acts xiii. 32. Ημείς ὑμᾶς ἐναγγελίζωμεθα. The pronoun expressed to give weight and importance to the announcement; the juxtaposition of the two pronouns contributing to this effect.

(27.) Acts xiii. 41. Ἡμείς ἐγώ ἐργάζομαι. As (16) from the LXX.

(28.) Acts xvii. 3. Ὄν ἐγώ καταγγέλλω ὑμῖν. Pronoun expressed to give importance to the announcement; partly too, perhaps, on account of the sudden transition from the oratio obliqua.

(29.) Acts xvii. 23. Τούτον (rather, perhaps, τότῳ) ἐγώ καταγγέλλω ὑμῖν. No emphasis of contrast, since the pronoun is omitted in the other clause. Emphasis distributed, as in the last example.

(30.) Acts xx. 18, 25, 29. Ἡμείς ἰσίστασθε, and ἐγὼ ὤδα, twice. The pronouns are plainly used to give weight to the assertion; their use with these particular verbs is noteworthy; and their occurrence here in a Pauline speech tends to qualify Alford's remark quoted above.

(31.) Acts xxiii. 1, 6; xxviii. 17. Ἀνθέσαι ἀδελφοί, ἐγώ κ.τ.λ. See (25). After the address, ἀδελφοί ὀδελφοί, it perhaps sounded more respectful to insert the personal pronoun, as well as more consonant with the weight of the subject-matter; just as we should avoid familiar abbreviations on similar occasions.

1 It might have been ἡμῖν ἐν ἱσόπτρῳ. The same reason which caused the insertion of πόλει would cause the insertion of ἐγώ—to give deliberateness to a sentence. Let an illustration be given from our own language in support of the theory advanced in these pages. The verb "to thank" is one of the very few the pronoun to which is generally understood. "No, thank you" conveys a simple negative. "No, I thank you" makes it more formal and deliberate, without any sort of emphasis on the pronoun itself. There is the same difference between "Pray, don't" and "I pray you, do not."

2 Compare the use of ἐγώ without special emphasis in the set speech of
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(32.) 1 Cor. v. 3. ἔγνω μεῖν γὰρ ... ἂδη κἀκεῖνα. Solemn judicial sentence, requiring the fullest expression.

(33.) 1 Cor. ix. 3. ἡ ἕκαστος ἀπολογία ταῖς ἑαυτοῖς ἀνακρίνομαι. This throws much light on the principle here contended for. It is a solemn preface to what follows, uttered with the utmost deliberation. The translators seem to have caught the spirit of it, and to have sought an equivalent in English by using the auxiliary verb, “do examine.” (Not so, however, the R.V.)

(34.) 1 Cor. x. 30. Εἰ ἐγὼ χάριτι μετέχω, τί βλασφημοῦμαι ὑπὲρ οὗ εἰμι ἐν πλειστοτέρῳ; Emphasis wholly distributed; none on the pronoun, as such, which is used simply to avoid making the sentence abstract, and to give it force and life.

(35.) 1 Cor. xii. 13. Ἐπὶ εἰς Πνεύματι ἡμῶς πάντες εἰς ἑν σῶμα ἐκατοπτίσθημεν. The pronoun seems thrown in only to give importance to the whole sentence. So also 2 Cor. v. 16. Ἡμῶς ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν οὐδένα ὅμοιον κατὰ σάρκα.

(36.) 2 Cor. i. 23. Ἐγὼ δὲ μάρτυρα τὸν Θεὸν ἵππωκαλοῦμαι ἐπὶ τὴν ἣμαν ὡρὰν. A very remarkable and strong instance in point.

(37.) Col. i. 25. Ἡς εὐαγγελίας ἐγὼ διάκονος. Similar, or rather correlative, to (1).

(38.) Col. i. 28. ὅν ἡμῶς καταγγέλλωμεν. On the same principle as the last.

(39.) 1 Tim. i. 11. ὁ ἐπιστρέφων ἐγώ. Cognate to the above.

(40.) 1 Tim. ii. 7. Εἰς ὃ ἐστίν ἐγὼ κηρύξατο καὶ ἀπόστολος. Another correlative to (1). So also 2 Tim. i. 11.

We may here observe that Westcott says on John ix. 34, ὅ ἐποιήσας ἤμας; (“dost thou teach us?”) “the emphasis is on ‘teach.’” Yes; on the supposition that there must be “the emphasis.” But it would rather appear that the whole question is charged with emphasis, and that each word in it, the verb, the pronoun in agreement, and the pronoun in regimen, contributes to what may be called a sustained emphasis. Westcott’s remark, however, may be claimed as denying special emphasis to the nominative pronoun, even when there is a primâ facie case for it.

The above instances, especially those under the last head, are submitted to students of the Greek Testament with due deference, but with a conviction that a case has been made out for, at any rate, a ventilation of the subject.

GEORGE RENAUD.

Cleisthenes, Herod. vi.130: Ἀνθρωπος, παιδὸς τῆς ἴμης μνησθῆνες, ἐγὼ ἴμας κ.τ.λ [see (26).]