NOTES AND STUDIES

EMPHASIS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

I

It may be within the recollection of readers of the *Journal* that a paper under this heading appeared in the October number, 1906.

This took the form necessarily of an initial, and, in some degree, a tentative statement, a summary of the general conclusions which I had arrived at, in the course of a preliminary study of the subject.

The comments on it which reached me, while they contained some illuminating and valuable criticisms of detail, yet left the main principles which had been formulated untouched; and they were, further, of a nature to encourage a deeper and more exhaustive study of the subject on the same lines.

The principles so formulated were based upon an induction from observed instances; but it is obvious that an induction, when dealing with literary questions, differs from regular scientific induction in two respects. It admits, on the one hand, of less accuracy, as being concerned with such fluctuating matters as style and idiomatic expression, and, on the other, of more accuracy, since the induction may be tested by a comparison of all existing instances.

At this distance of time it may be well, by way of clearness, to recapitulate the different ways of expressing emphasis which were then suggested; namely,

(i) *Words* which indicate it by their sense—particles, adverbs, pronouns, adjectives, nouns.

(ii) More occasional, subsidiary methods, such as expression of pronouns in the nominative, iteration, and dislocation, which includes abruptness and asyndeton.

(iii) *Order* of the words, which is the main principle, the emphatic word being thrown into marked prominence, usually *before the verb*—exceptions being due to attraction.

It is considered that the first two classes, except that of the separate expression of pronouns in the nominative, which demands some further study, may be taken, in general, as proved, depending as they do partly
on the nature of the case and partly on usages which are common to
many languages.

But it is emphasis by ORDER which has seemed to need most careful
handling, because of its many very obvious exceptions.

The main principle stated was, that words in a sentence of New
Testament Greek stand in the order of their importance; and that the
verb in any ordinary sentence stands first as being the most important:
and from this it follows that, with the exception of those particles
which, of their nature, always stand first—relatives, interrogatives, con­
junctions, and the like—any word put before the verb will bear
emphasis (and still more if it stands before the interrogative also); but
that this has many exceptions, all of which fall under one general head
of Attraction.

And then, further, in dealing with Attraction itself, there are several
classes of cases which seem not to require elaborate investigation,
since they are logical and arise out of the nature of the case. As, for
instance, when a word is taken out of its place (a) in order to stand
close to one with which it is closely connected in the sense, or (b) to
one to which it is bound by construction, or (c) so as to enclose, between
two words in agreement, all those others which directly qualify them.

But the one unobvious, and not, in the nature of things, necessarily
reasonable case of attraction, is that in which a weak word, wholly un­
emphatic, is put, apparently on artistic grounds, before the verb, in order
to stand next to a strong word.

The words so displaced are entirely, or almost entirely, pronouns,
and because generalities, however probable, appear to afford an in­
sufficient basis in such a case for final decision, I have felt com­
pelled to elaborate a complete conspectus of all the instances that bear
upon the general induction. It is now proposed to give the results
which follow upon an exhaustive study of the oblique cases of the per­
sonal pronouns ἐγὼ and σὺ.

And it may be suggested, in passing, that there is a special value in
such an investigation for the matter in hand, because, in colloquial and
epistolary style, it is on the pronoun that emphasis is most frequently
laid.

Following the method which was actually employed in this investiga­
tion, it will be well to take, as a first test, two clear instances of attrac­tion
which were cited in the original paper.

St Mark xiv 30 τρίς μὲ ἄπαριστον.

1 Tim. iv 12 μωθὺς σοι τῆς νεότητος καταφρονεῖτο.

It is obvious, from the sense, that μὲ and σοι, though before the verb,
cannot bear emphasis.

The question then arises, are such cases due to accident, to occa-
sional variations in the same author, or to a difference of usage as between one author and another; and it is obvious that such questions cannot be answered except by a careful comparison of all the instances.

And here, on the threshold of the statement, it is to be explained that, apart from the consideration of the different uses of these pronouns on their merits, in the course of which there seems to be a complete corroboration of the theory of Attraction given above, the Greek language provides the student, in one of its pronominal forms, with a luminous test of a most convincing kind. The singular of ἔγῳ is possessed of duplicate forms in its oblique cases. Any short study of these forms is sufficient to shew that ὡ, ὡ, ὡ are never accentuated and always unemphatic, while ἐ, ἐ, ἐ are always accentuated, and—with one notable class of exceptions, namely, when they are governed by prepositions—are always emphatic.

It is possible, therefore, as a side light on the investigation, to arrive at an accurate definition of the emphasis on the oblique cases of ἔγῳ, and by this means to put to a conclusive test the general results arrived at in the oblique cases of στὶ, ἡμεῖς, and ἐμεῖς.

This was, in fact, the actual course along which the investigation travelled.

Beginning with these three last-named pronouns, taking crucial instances in which the sense seemed to settle the question of emphasis beyond dispute, and passing from these to the consideration of more uncertain instances, the conclusion was forced upon me more and more clearly, that oblique cases of these, when standing next to a strong word before the verb, are never in any case emphatic.

Now whether or no this kind of inductive reasoning should be accepted by itself as conclusive, it was found to be supported by two considerations, which—together, at least, if not singly—seemed to establish the principle in an impregnable position.

The first was the test case of ἔγῳ. It appears, on complete investigation, that the form of its oblique cases, which stands next a strong word before the verb, is always the enclitic and unemphatic ἦ, ἦ, ἦ, and never the emphatic ἐ, ἐ, ἐ.

And the second consideration is the evidence of accents. It is true that στὶ, στὶ, στὶ are treated usually as enclitics and not accentuated; but wherever they are meant to be emphasized they at once assume accents, στὶ, στὶ, στὶ. And it is found that the accentuated form is never, according to the best MS authority, put next the strong word before the verb.

What the historical value of these accents may be—in itself a question of no little interest—must be left for consideration later. But this, at least, is worthy of notice, that they are completely in accord with the
results stated above; so that there results a mutual corroboration, the accents guaranteeing the accuracy of this theory of emphasis, and the general conclusions as to emphasis guaranteeing the accentual usage.

The nature of the original evidence and its corroborations having been thus explained, it now becomes necessary to give leading examples first of the emphatic usage of the pronouns, and next, of the various sorts of attraction under which these pronominal forms, though standing before the verb, are entirely free from emphasis. It should be premised that only a few cases out of many have been selected, with the purpose of presenting, as far as possible, a similar example of all three cases of each of these two pronouns in both numbers taken from different writers. But yet there are, in most cases, a great number of other examples of a similar kind, which might equally well be quoted. This may be the more easily credited when it is stated that the total number of passages collated—being in each case, it is believed, all in the Greek Testament which bear upon the question—are over 650, in all of which it becomes clear that, with few exceptions, not only in the same author but in the different authors, the general method of order remains in the main the same.

I. Typical examples of **Emphatic Usage.**

A. Emphasis used to distinguish between persons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John iii 30</td>
<td>ἐκείνων δὲ αὐτάνας, ἔμε δὲ ἐλαττοῦσαν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke x 16</td>
<td>ὁ ἀκούν ὑμῶν, ἔμοι ἀκούει.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil. iii 1</td>
<td>ἔμοι μὲν οὐκ ἀκύρων, ὑμῖν δὲ ἀσφαλές.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor. vi 14</td>
<td>καὶ τὸν Κύριον ἤγειρεν καὶ ἤμας ἤξεγειρε.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Emphasis General.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John xvi 32</td>
<td>καμὲ μόνον ἀφήτε.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor. iv 3</td>
<td>ἔμοι δὲ εἰς ἐλάχιστον ἐστίν.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Eph. iii 8 | τὸς δοθείσης μοι ... ἔμοι τῷ ἐλάχιστοτέρῳ. |
| Luke x 45 | ταῦτα λέγων καὶ ἤμας ῥῆξας. |
Mark xii 7, Luke xx 14 δεῦτε ἀποκτείνωμεν αὐτὸν, καὶ ἡμῶν ἐσται κληρονομία.

Acts iii 12 ἡμῖν τί ἀγένετε;
Matt. xxvi 18 πρὸς σε τοιῷ τῷ πάσχα.
Rom. xi 21 οἶδε σοῦ φείστεται.
Acts v 4 οὐχὶ μένον, σοι ἐμενεν.
1 Pet. iii 21 καὶ ὅμας ἀντίτυπον νῦν σώζει βάπτισμα.
Matt. xiii 16 ὅμων δὲ μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοί.
Rev. ii 24 ὅμων δὲ λέγω τοὺς λοιποὺς.

II. Unemphatic: the pronominal forms standing before the verb by attraction.

It should be explained that, besides the passages here given and many similar ones collated, there are a great number of others which have the forms unemphatic, in their usual order after the verb, and being always wholly unemphatic, all serve in this negative way as a corroborate of the main theory.

Attraction (a) To Pronouns.
(i) τίς Acts ix 4 τι με διώκεις;
1 Thess. ii 19 τίς γὰρ ἡμῶν ἔλτεις;
Mark x 51 τί σου θέλεις ποιήσω;
1 Cor. xiv 6 τι ύμας ὀψελήσω;
2 Cor. xi 16 μήτε με δόξη αφρονα.
Heb. xii 5 ἢτις ὑμῖν ὡς νίκος διαλέγεται.
Acts ix 6 οί τι σε δει ποιεῖν.

(ii) Attraction to other pronouns, when emphatic.
John xiii 6 σὺ μου νύπτες τοὺς πόδας;
Acts xvi 37 αὕτοι ἡμᾶς ἐξαγαγέτωσαν.
John viii 11 οἶδε ἡγώ σε κατακρίνω.
Acts xiii 32 καὶ ἡμεῖς ύμᾶς εὐαγγελιζόμεθα.
John vii 29 κακεῖνος με ἀπέστειλεν.
Matt. xxvi 62 οὕτως σου καταμαρτυροῦσι;

(iii) Attraction to particles.
2 Cor. xii 7 ὑπὸ με κολαφίζῃ.
Acts xvi 37 λάβρα ἡμᾶς ἐκβάλλουσιν;
Philem. 11 τὸν ποτὲ σου ἀχρηστὸν.
1 Thess. iv 11 καθὼς ὑμῖν παρηγείλαμεν.
Mark xv 4 πόσα σου κατηγοροῦσιν.

(iv) To words emphatic (a) by nature.
Acts xxv 11 οἴδεις με δύναται.
1 John iv 12 ὁ θεὸς ἐν ἡμῖν μένει.
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Further similar examples will be given when the possessive is treated.

It should be repeated that the above are, in reality, only a few instances out of very many; and that they have been selected as specimens to cover, as far as space will allow, the writings of each author, and all variations of the pronouns.

Among such numbers of passages a certain amount of variation of order will naturally be found, and these, it is hoped, will be dealt with separately later. There is not mathematical precision. Indeed, in matters literary such precision will hardly be looked for. Yet the exceptions will be found by no means weighty or numerous enough to disturb the general theory, or to counterbalance the mass of normal testimony. Indeed, what will probably strike the student most is the singular unity of style, and that especially in a language which, through its inflectional forms of concord would seem likely, in the nature of things, to admit of considerably greater flexibility in the Order.

II

PRONOUNS GOVERNED BY PREPOSITIONS.

In order to complete the study of the pronouns of the first and second persons, in the matter of order and emphasis, we must now
pass on to the special uses of the pronoun, when governed by a preposition.

As instances are collated, it soon becomes abundantly clear, although it may not be easy of explanation, that after prepositions the emphatic form of these personal pronouns is, with few exceptions, always used, even when no emphasis is intended. That this is not due to any whim of the accentuator is made clear by applying once again the crucial test of the oblique cases of ἐγώ, when it is found that, after prepositions, the emphatic form alone is used.

With the exceptions yet to be mentioned, the enclitic forms με, μου, μοι never follow prepositions, but ἐμε, ἐμοι, ἐμοί; and this is borne out by the use after prepositions of none but the accentuated forms σε, σοι, σοί.

This is true of all the ordinary prepositions except πρός, and of the adverbial prepositions ἐνεκεν, χωρίς, ἐχρισ, ἐγγος, μεταξύ.

On the other hand the unemphatic forms μον and σον always follow ὀπίσω, ἐνώπιον, and ἐμπροσθεν.

The variations of πρός are distinctly strange and apparently quite inexplicable.

πρός ἐμε is found in St John’s alone of all the Gospels. Yet he has πρός με in three passages: and in one same verse, vi 37, both forms occur. The synoptic Gospels use πρός με only, and so do the Pauline Epistles. In the Acts it is three times each way. Compare Acts xxii 8 εἰπέν τε πρός ἐμε, with εἰπέν πρός με, vv. 10, 21, xxvi 14.

πρός σε, on the other hand, is used in the other Gospels as well as in St John; and throughout the New Testament πρός σε occurs once only, Matt. xxv 39.

Since, then, form and accent are no guides to emphasis in such combinations of preposition and pronoun, how is emphasis expressed? By the general method of order. The prepositional phrase, to be emphatic, must come before the verb.

Of this the following examples, few out of very many, will perhaps suffice.

I. Emphatic.

A. Emphasis used to distinguish between persons.

John xiv 1 πιστεύετε εἰς τὸν Θεόν, καὶ εἰς ἐμε πιστεύετε.
2 Cor. iv 12 ὁ χάνατος ἐν ἡμῖν ἐνεργεῖται, ἡ δὲ καὶ ἐν ἡμῖν.
2 Tim. i 5 τέσσεραν σε δι' ὅτι καὶ ἐν σοί.


Matt. xii 30 ὁ μῆ σὺν μετ' ἐμοι, κατ' ἐμοι ἐστίν.
1 Tim. i 16 ἢνα ἐν ἐμοί πρός ἐνδείξηται Χριστός.
Luke xxii 33 μετὰ σοῦ ἔτοιμός εἰμι ... πορεύεσθαι.
Mark i 11 ἐν σοὶ εἴδοκενσα.
1 Cor. ix 10 ἢ δι’ ἡμᾶς πάντως λέγει; δι’ ἡμᾶς γὰρ ἐγράφη.
1 Pet. iv 17 εἰ δὲ πρῶτον ἄφεν ἡμῶν, τί τὸ τέλος τῶν ἅπαθευόντων ;
John vi 70 καὶ εἴς ὑμῶν εἰς διάβολος ἐστίν. Contrast the unemphatic xiii 21 εἰς εἴς ὑμῶν παραδώσει με.
2 Cor. xiii 3 ὥς εἰς ὑμᾶς αὐξάνει, ἀλλὰ διότι εἰς ὑμῖν.

II. A. Of the unemphatic use, following the verb there are many examples, e. g. ἐλθέων πρὸς ὑμᾶς passim.
B. The unemphatic before the verb by attraction
(a) to pronouns.
James v 19 εὰν τις ἐν ὑμῖν πλανηθῇ.
(b) to particles.
(c) to other emphatic words.
John xiii 37 τὴν ψυχὴν μου ὑπὲρ σοῦ χῇσω.
38 τὴν ψυχὴν σου ὑπὲρ ἑμοῦ θήσεις ;
1 John iv 12 ὁ θεὸς ἐν ὑμῖν μένει.
John vii 33 Cf. xii 35, xiii 33, xiv 9 ἐπὶ χρόνων μικρὸν μεθ’ ὑμῶν εἰμὶ.
Col. ii 5 ἀλλὰ τοῦ πνεύματι σὺν ὑμῖν εἰμὶ.
1 Pet. iv 14 τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ Πνεῦμα ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς ἀναπαύεται.

THE POSSESSIVE PRONOUN.

There is one use of the genitive of pronouns, of very frequent occurrence, to express possession. Although, in the main, it follows the same rules of order as pronouns in general, yet it must be considered separately, partly on its own account, and partly because of the existence of the adjectival possessives ἡμῶς, σοῦ, ἡμέτερος, ὑμέτερος.

I. A. The genitive of the personal pronoun is almost always unemphatic. Perhaps the only cases to the contrary are the following:—μοι, of course, can never bear emphasis.

Rom. i 12 διὰ τῆς ἐν ἀλλήλων πίστεως ὑμῶν τε καὶ ὑμοὶ.
xvi 13 τὴν μυρτέα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἑμοῦ.
2 Cor. i 14 καίχξεα ὑμῶν ἐσμέν, καθάπερ καὶ ὑμεῖς ἡμῶν.
viii 24 ἡμῶν κανενωτεως ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν.
Mark xii 7, Luke xx 14 ἡμῶν ἐσται ἡ κληρονομία.
Matt. vii 4 ἰδοὺ ὡ δοκεῖ ἐν τῷ ὄφθαλμῷ σοῦ.
2 Cor. vii 14 τὸ ὑμῶν περίσσευμα εἰς τὸ ἐκεῖνων ὑπότημα.
Eph. vi 9 καὶ αὐτῶν καὶ ὑμῶν ὁ Κύριός ἐστιν, ...
B. The crude notion that every possessive case before its noun is emphatic, is, I believe, by this time discredited among scholars. But careful investigation leads us to go a step further and to claim that there is, in reality, no such order of words, apart from the exigencies of attraction, as given above.

It will be noticed that in all such cases the possessive genitive is invariably placed next to one of the words which would have attracted the enclitic pronoun in other cases.

A luminous example will be found in

John xiii 6 σοῦ μοῦ νίπτεις τοὺς πόδας;

However attractive the sense may appear with the double emphasis, 'Dost Thou wash my feet?' it is obvious that this is quite out of the question, the form μοῦ being necessarily unemphatic; but its position is due to the attractive force of the strong and doubly emphatic pronoun σοῦ.

It remains in this case, as before, to give examples—few selected from many—of this unemphatic position of the possessive before the verb or noun. The instances of its ordinary place, after both verb and noun, are very numerous.

(a) Attraction to pronoun.

Matt. xii 50 αὐτός μου ἀδελφός.
Mark v 31 τίς μου ὄψατο;
1 Thess. ii 19 τίς γὰρ ἡμῶν ἐλπίς;
1 Cor. ix 11 μέγα εἰ ἡμεῖς ἡμῶν τὰ σαρκικὰ θερίσομεν;

(b) to particles.

John xi 32 οὐκ ἂν μου ἀπέθανεν ὁ ἀδελφός.
1 Tim. iv 15 ἦν σοῦ ἡ προκοπὴ φανερὰ ἡ πάσην.

(c) to other emphatic words.

Phil. i 7 συνκοινωνοὺς μου τῆς χάριτος.
Acts xvi 20 ἐκπαράσσουσιν ἡμῶν τὴν πόλιν.
Matt. xv 28 μεγάλη σου ἡ πίστις.

(d) There is one set of cases of special interest in which it immediately follows or precedes a verb which, in strict grammar governing its noun, yet in the general sense governs partly the pronoun also.
II. The Possessive Pronoun.

In the course of the foregoing detailed investigation it has become apparent that, although not invariably, yet in the vast majority of cases the possessive genitive is unemphatic. ἤμων, for instance, except for the purpose of coupling with another pronoun, is never possessive. It is natural, therefore, to presuppose the specialization of ἡμός, σός, and the other possessives, to supply the requirements of emphatic expression.

And yet, when the attempt is made to verify this in detail, the matter seems hardly so simple as it is sometimes assumed to be.

The investigation falls naturally under heads.

A. Without the article. In this use the possessive is always emphatic.

Matt. xx 23, Mark x 40 οὐκ ἔστιν ἤμων δόναι.
John iv 34 ἤμων βρῶμα ἔστιν . . .
Phil. iii 9 μὴ ἔχων ἐμὴν δικαιοσύνην.
John xvii 6 σοὶ ἦσαν κάμοι αὐτοῖς ἔκδοκα.
Luke vi 20 ὁμητέρα ἔστιν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ.

B. With the article.

(a) When used substantively it bears a natural emphasis.

Matt. xx 15 οὐκ ἔστιν μοι ὃ δὲθλω ποιήσατε ἐν τοῖς ἐμοῖς;
John xvi 15 ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήψεται.

N.B. 1 John ii 2 ὕλαθιμος ἔστιν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἤμων, οὐ περὶ τῶν ἁμετέρων δὲ μόνον. A test passage, where the distinction is clear between ἤμων unemphatic and ἁμετέρων emphatic.

John xv 20 εἰ τῶν λόγων μου ἐπήρησαν, καὶ τῶν ὁμήτερων τηρήσατεν.

(b) When used adjectivally, with substantive as well as with article.

Clear cases of emphasis.

(i) To distinguish between persons.

John vii 6 δὲ καιρὸς δ ἐμὸς οὐπω πάρεστιν, δὲ δὲ καιρὸς ὁ ὁμήτερος . . .
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Rom. iii 7 ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ ψεύσματι ἐπερίσσευσεν.
2 Cor. ii 3 ἡ ἐμὴ χαρὰ πάντων ὑμῶν ἐστιν.
Matt. vii 3 τίνι δὲ ἐν τῷ σῷ ὀφθαλμῷ δοκῶν οὐ κατανοεῖς.
1 Cor. xiv 16 ὁ ἀναπληρῶν...πώς ἐρεῖ τῷ Ἁμὴν ἐπὶ τῇ σῇ εὐχαριστίᾳ.

There are twenty-six such instances in all.

(ii) Emphasis general.

1 Cor. xvi 21, Col. iv 18, 2 Thess. iii 17 τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ Παῦλου.
John xv 9 μείνατε ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ τῇ ἐμῇ, and note the omission of emphasis when the phrase is repeated in 10 ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ μου.
    Cf. v. 30, viii 16, 31.
John x 26 οὐκ ἐστε ἐκ τῶν προβάτων τῶν ἐμῶν. Cf. 27.
1 Cor. vii 40 μακαριωτέρα δὲ ἐστιν...κατὰ τὴν ἐμὴν γνώμην.
Acts v 4 οἴχει μένον σοὶ ἐμενεν καὶ πραθὲν ἐν τῇ σῇ ἐξουσίᾳ ὑπῆρχεν:
Philem. 14 χωρὶς δὲ τῆς σῆς γνώμης οὐδὲν ἡθέλησα ποιήσαι.

Besides these there are a number of other passages in which the emphasis is not so immediately obvious. Taking the emphatic use of the possessive as proved by the previous examples, these afford interesting exercises in the interpretation of emphasis.

(a) John iii 29 αὐτή σὺν ἡ χαρὰ ἡ ἐμὴ πεπλήρωται (like that of other bridegroom's friends).
    1 Cor. i 15 ἦνα μη τις εἴτε ὅτι εἰς τὸ ἐμών ὄνομα ἐβαπτίσθη (rather than in Christ's Name).
Matt. vii 22 οὔ τῷ σῷ ὄνοματ ἐπροφητεύσαμεν, καὶ τῷ σῷ ὄνοματ...; (was it not in Thy Name?).
John xviii 35 τὸ ἔθνος τὸ σῶν...παρεδωκὼν σε ἐμοὶ (not Romans or Greeks).
Rom. xv 4 ὅσα γὰρ προεγράφη, εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν διδασκαλίαν ἐγράφη (rather than for the instruction of contemporaries).
Acts xxvii 34 τούτῳ γὰρ πρὸς τῆς ἡμετέρας σωτηρίας ὑπάρχει (not merely for mine).

(b) Where it has the force of own.
    τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ, &c. See under (ii) and Acts ii 11.

(c) Or of well-known.
    Acts xxiv 4 παρακαλῶ ἀκούσαι...τῇ σῇ ἐπιεικείᾳ. Cf. 2, xxvi 5.

(d) Or to express contempt.
    1 Cor. viii 11 ἀπόλλυται ὁ ἄσθενῶν ἐν τῇ σῇ γνώσει.

(e) There is lastly a considerable group of passages which occur in
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 οὖ γὰρ εἰς δύο ἢ τρεῖς συνηγμένοι εἶς τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα.
Luke xxii 19, 1 Cor. xi 24, 25 εἶς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.
John viii 31 ἐὰν ἐμεῖς μείνῃτε ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῷ ἐμῷ and eight similar passages in St John.
1 Cor. xi 25 τούτο τῷ ποτήριον ἡ καυνή διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἰματι.

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

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

(b) They can be used wherever ἐγὼ (σὺ, &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.

Ambrose 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,