

NOTES AND STUDIES

EMPHASIS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

THE following are notes of an attempt to find an accurate definition of emphasis in the New Testament.

To some, looking at the weakness of English in this regard, it may seem, at first sight, a form of expression too intangible for accuracy. Indeed, the investigation is based on certain assumptions.

(i) For instance: that there is a great deal more in language than can be reproduced in written words and sentences. The delicate aromas of thought are expressed in speaking, not so much by the *machinery* of language, which is always more or less stiff and awkward, as by the audible music of *tone*, and by the visible drama of *gesture*.

(ii) And again: that these subtle refinements were always in the mind of every writer originally. He wrote with fire, with passion, with pity, with sarcasm, with humour, with antithesis, with emphasis. But these more delicate odours passed away—always to a large extent, yet not always to the same extent—under the hand of the writer. It rests with literary appreciation to recall them by some subtle sympathy with the writer's trend of thought; by closer study of his manner of expression; by getting back, so far as may be, mentally into the physical and intellectual circumstances in which he wrote; or by a minute criticism of his vehicle of expression; which last, being the only basis for accuracy, is what is under discussion here.

(iii) English, the vehicle through which the New Testament is presented to us, is much like other analytic languages. We have one or two lame devices for expressing emphasis. *By phrase*, 'It is', 'It was'; *by typography*, underlines or italics. But, beyond this, almost all is guess-work. The third assumption here made is that far less is left to guess-work in the Greek of the New Testament. This is, perhaps, not entirely assumption. We are dealing with the language of precision *par excellence*, which shews, by its use of particles, what fine and accurate shades of expression it can define: and we are taking it, where it is the vehicle for a subject-matter, above all others didactic and impassioned; which sounds the gamut of all human emotions, and is the voice of men whose hearts, above all others, were filled with a divine enthusiasm, and also, as has been suggested to the writer, in a form which was purposely constructed, in almost every case, for oral delivery. In this language, on these subjects, if anywhere, we may expect to find emphasis expressed.

Thus, perhaps, the search is justified. There is *this* justification further, that students in the course of general reading have detected some sure traces of emphasis in the Greek Testament. It is common and tantalizing in reading Alford's notes to find emphasis claimed, now and again, by an *ipse dixit*; and though, generally, as it seems, accurately, yet without any reference to any proof, or any critical apparatus by which it was estimated.

With this preliminary justification, then, it will be well, without further preamble, to give in outline the system which has been arrived at: not going through the inductive process, by which it was gradually formulated, but yet supplying crucial instances by which the several points may be tested in passing.

There is, of course, in the apparatus of every language, one part of the vocabulary which is there on purpose to supply emphasis. There are *particles*. In these Greek is peculiarly rich. Such are, in every form of Greek, *καί* with *οὐδέ* and *καὶ γάρ*, *γε*, *οὐ μή*, *μέν* and *δέ*, *νή* and, in New Testament Greek especially, *ἰδοὺ*, and the rising scale of asseveration, by which the Great Preacher was wont to mark the graduated importance of His utterances, *λέγω ὑμῖν—ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν—ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν*. Again, there are intensifying *pronouns* and *adverbs*: *αὐτός*, for the former; and for the latter we may take as our example the emphatic adverb forms, beloved especially by St Paul, *περισσῶς*, *ἐκ περισσοῦ*, *περισσότερον*, *λίαν ἐκ περισσοῦ*, *ἐκ περισσοῦ μᾶλλον*, *ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ*, *περισσότερον μᾶλλον*. Or one may instance the rising force of the phrases used to express eternity, which take as many as ten different forms, all of them apparently with very nearly the same meaning.

εἰς αἰῶνα Jude 13, &c., &c.

ἕως αἰῶνος Luke i 55.

εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα Mark iii 29, &c., &c.

εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος 2 Pet. iii 18.

εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας Rom. i 25, &c., &c.; Rev. *passim*.

εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας Jude 25.

εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος Heb. i 8.

εἰς αἰῶνας αἰῶνων Rev. xiv 11, &c.

εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰῶνων Gal. i 5, &c.

[*ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος* Matt. xxviii 20.]

εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεὰς τοῦ αἰῶνος τῶν αἰῶνων Eph. iii 21.

There are also *adjectives* and *substantives* in which an emphatic sense seems so naturally inherent that they almost always stand out in a prominent position, such as *πᾶς*, *μόνος*, *ὄλος*, *οὐδεὶς*, *μακάριος*; and from natural dignity, *Θεός*, *Χριστός*, *Κύριος*.

These, however, are words, on the surface, visible. Is there any other device available in this synthetic language, which is not in the

nature of things at the disposal of our modern analytic type of speech? It is believed that such a device is found in the *Order*.

One way of testing it is by examining sentences which, from the nature of their meaning, almost certainly are wholly free from emphasis. Compare these—

(a) Matt. xiii 53 ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὰς παραβολὰς ταύτας.

John v 10 ἔλεγον οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι τῷ τετραπευμένῳ.

Matt. xii 38 ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ τινές.

John vi 11 ἔλαβεν τοὺς ἄρτους ὁ Ἰησοῦς.

Matt. xiii 41 ἀποστελεῖ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ.

Matt. xiv 6 ὠρχήσατο ἡ θυγάτηρ τῆς Ἡρωδιάδος ἐν τῷ μέσῳ.

Matt. xiv 29 καταβὰς ἀπὸ τοῦ πλοίου Πέτρος: so xv 29.

Another test is applied by going to the opposite extreme, and taking passages by which a *maximum* of emotion seems clearly expressed. For example—

(b) Acts xix 2 ἀλλ' οὐδ' εἰ Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον ἔστιν ἀκηκόαμεν.

Acts xv 21 Μωυσῆς ἐκ γενεῶν ἀρχαίων κατὰ πόλιν τοὺς κηρύσσοντας αὐτὸν ἔχει, ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς κατὰ πᾶν σάββατον ἀναγνωσκόμενος.

It is clear, by the sense, that (a) are ordinary sentences, while (b) are almost wholly emphatic. It will be noticed that the order of words in (a), presumably the common order, is entirely reversed in (b).

Let it be remembered, further, that we are dealing with the most *logical* of languages. From both these considerations it seems plain that the ordinary order of words will be that of their importance. That, *in ordinary*, the verb,—the word, τὸ ῥῆμα,—is the most important, and therefore stands first, and following it—in order, just as they do in importance—the subject and object, each along with its qualifying words, and then after these adverbial adjuncts.

The inspiring principle in Greek being vivid representation (πρὸ ὁμμάτων ποιεῖν), and the order such as will serve this purpose most clearly, it follows that if any word calls for exceptional emphasis it must, on the same principle, be thrown into marked prominence, *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*, by breaking the order. This seems to be done by two chief methods. The commonest, by which most of the 'order-emphasis' is expressed, consists in throwing the word in question *before the verb*. There is, at the same time, another, much less common, which consists in setting a word at a distance from that with which it is in agreement. The *further* it is separated the more effective the emphasis becomes. Practically, it frequently amounts to putting the word *late*,—say, right at the end of the sentence, where it comes in as by a surprise. This latter device it will be convenient to refer to under the term *Dislocation*.

These two methods though on the surface they have a contradictory appearance—one throwing the emphatic word early in the sentence, and the other late—have yet really a common principle underlying them, as was suggested above; and in practice—with some further limitation, which will be given later on—they do not seem to clash with one another, nor to cause any confusion. It is obvious, at the same time, that neither is available in a non-inflectional language such as ours. We cannot, to begin with, have a *logical* order, for the subject must come before the verb to distinguish it from the object. We cannot, at will, put the object before the verb, for a like reason. Nor can we dislocate words, since it is proximity alone, in most cases, which indicates concord.

At this stage, before proceeding to examine these two principles in greater detail, and in the light of exceptions, it may be well to illustrate the whole subject by giving as a luminous instance a case in which, most of all, Greek shews its versatility in the expression of emphasis.

It is well known that the pronoun in the nominative, being already present in the verb inflexion, is not expressed separately, unless it calls for special prominence. Hence the canon: the nominative case of a pronoun is always emphatic. One may note, as a useful example, 1 Cor. xv 36 ἀφρων, σὺ δὲ σπείρεις, 'that which thou sowest,' &c., an emphasis, usually ignored, which gives admirable prominence to the parallel St Paul is drawing between the husbandry of God's acre and that of the acres of earth.

Suppose, then, we combine this with the other devices of emphasis, (a) emphatic *particle*, (b) emphatic *adjective*, (c) *order*, (d) *dislocation*, and tabulate, by instances selected from the actual text, all the degrees of diverse emphasis, which, in the case of the personal pronoun, are found in actual use.

How many different shades of emphasis are herein implied may be considered open to question, but that there are a good many, seven at the least, is hardly matter of doubt.

	I am &c.	
No emphasis	εἰμι	
Very slight emphasis	εἰμι <u>ἐγώ</u>	Acts xiii 25
From this point emphasis } increases	λέγει <u>αὐτός</u>	Acts ii 34
	ἐρωτήσω <u>καὶ ἐγώ</u>	St Luke xx 3
	στοιχεῖς <u>καὶ αὐτός</u>	Acts xxi 24
	δεῦτε <u>ὑμεῖς αὐτοὶ</u>	St Mark vi 31
(ἀνάθεμα)	εἶναι <u>αὐτὸς ἐγώ</u>	Romans ix 3
	πέπεισμαι <u>καὶ αὐτὸς ἐγώ</u>	Romans xv 14
	<u>ἐγώ</u> εἰμι	St John xiv 6

{	(ὁποῖος) <u>καὶ ἐγὼ</u> εἰμι	Acts xxvi 29
	<u>ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ</u> εἰμι	Acts x 21
	<u>ἐγὼ</u> εἰμι <u>αὐτός</u>	St Luke xxiv 39
	<u>αὐτός</u> ἐστι	St Matt. xi 14
	<u>καὶ αὐτὸς</u> ἤμην	Acts xxii 20
	<u>αὐτὸς ἐγὼ</u> δουλεύω	Romans vii 25
	<u>καὶ ἐγὼ αὐτὸς</u> εἰμί	Acts x 26
	<u>καὶ αὐτοὶ οὗτοι</u> προσδέχονται	Acts xxiv 15

Very strong emphasis—

{	<u>ὕμεις</u> τίνες <u>ἐστέ</u> ;	Acts xix 15
	<u>ἐγὼ</u> ὅτι τὴν ἀλήθειαν λέγω	John viii 45
	cf. <u>σὺ δὲ σπείρεις</u> (above)	1 Cor. xv 36
	<u>καὶ αὐτοὶ</u> . . . ἔχοντες, <u>ἡμεῖς καὶ αὐτοὶ</u> στεναίζομεν	Romans viii 23

N.B. Such orders as αὐτός εἰμι ἐγὼ
and ἐγὼ αὐτός εἰμι

are not found.

If now it may be assumed that the main principles are clear, it will be well, even in a brief outline such as this must necessarily be, to consider these two divisions of the general principle rather more in detail, to give examples of them, and most of all to try and elucidate the method underlying the numerous *exceptions*, which make the interpretation of the emphasis the rather baffling investigation which, at first sight, it appears to be.

I. Order.

Examples of emphatic word before the verb.

Pronoun and adverb. Matt. xv 33 Πόθεν ἡμῖν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ (verb supplied) ἄρτοι τοσοῦτοι ὥστε, &c.

Subject and object. Luke ix 58 αἱ ἀλώπεκες φωλεοὺς ἔχουσι
ὁ δὲ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἔχει ποῦ, &c.

Adjective. John xv 13 μείζονα ταύτης ἀγάπην οὐδεὶς ἔχει.

Genitive and participle. Gal. iii 15 ὁμως ἀνθρώπου κεκυρωμένην
διαθήκην οὐδεὶς ἀθετεῖ.

Almost every word emphatic. Mark xiv 30 Σὺ σήμερον ταύτη τῇ
νυκτὶ πρὶν ἢ δις ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι τρίς με ἀπαρνήσῃ. So too Acts xv 21,
quoted above.

2 Peter ii 8 βλέμματι καὶ ἀκοῇ δίκαιος ἐγκατοικῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἡμέραν ἐξ
ἡμέρας ψυχὴν δικαίαν ἀνόμοις ἔργοις ἐβασάνιζεν.

Antithesis. One well-known group of examples of this, very common in Greek, is *antithesis*. Never marked, of course, with chiasmus, as in Latin, but with μὲν . . . δέ, οὐ μόνον . . . ἀλλὰ καί, and the like, the antithetical words, by rule of order, standing first.

So far the general rule of order, case after case, makes it clear that words before the verb are emphatic. But what of the exceptions, which are many? It quickly becomes obvious that by no means *all* the words before the verb, in *all* cases, are set there to convey emphasis. How then did they get there?

These variants seem clearly explicable in almost every case as one manifestation or another of a common principle, which may be called **Attraction**. This is due, in the main, to considerations either (a) of *Sense* or (b) of *Artistic Effect*.

(a) *Sense*, and the desire to make the sentence compact and easy of apprehension.

(i) By taking a word out of its place to stand close beside one with which it is intimately connected in meaning. Acts xix 34 *φωνή ἐγένετο μία ἐκ πάντων*; where *μία* is drawn away from *φωνή* to *ἐκ πάντων* to contrast the 'one' with the 'many'. Gal. ii 9 *δεξιὰς ἔδωκεν ἐμοὶ καὶ Βαρνάβᾳ κοινωνίας, ἵνα ἡμεῖς . . . αὐτοὶ δὲ . . . : κοινωνίας* being put last, to stand next the following clause, which explains it.

(ii) By putting a word next that to which it is bound by the construction. *Genitives of relatives* present frequent instances; e.g. Acts xviii 7 *οὗ ἡ οἰκία ἦν συνομοροῦσα*. So too a word is put between two, both of which, to some extent, govern it. 2 Pet. iii 1 *διεγείρω ὑμῶν ἐν ὑπομνήσει τὴν εἰλικρινῆ διάνοιαν*, where *ὑμῶν* is not emphatic but belongs to the sense partly of the verb and partly of each of the two nouns. So Acts xxi 31 *ζητούντων αὐτὸν ἀποκτείνειν*.

(b) *Artistic effect*.

(i) To *weld a clause together*, enveloping between two words in agreement all those other words which closely qualify them: this being a more extended example of the common case of genitive between article and noun.

Col. ii 3 *ἐν ᾧ εἰσὶ πάντες οἱ θησαυροὶ τῆς σοφίας καὶ τῆς γνώσεως ἀπόκρυφοί*.

This is especially used with periphrastic verbs.

Col. iii 1 *ὁ Χριστὸς ἔστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ καθημένος*.

(ii) To set a *weak word*, especially one of the pronominal forms, next a strong one, or an emphatic one. A common case is pronoun next to pronoun.

Acts xviii 15 *κριτὴς ἐγὼ τούτων οὐ βούλομαι εἶναι*, where though *ἐγὼ* is emphatic *τούτων* need not be.

1 Tim. iv 12 *μηδεὶς σου τῆς νεότητος καταφρονεῖτω*.

1 Thess. v 3 *αἰφνίδιος αὐτοῖς ἐφίσταται ὀλεθρος*.

Mark xiv 30 (already quoted) *τρίς με ἀπαρήση*.

Here there is no emphasis on *σου, αὐτοῖς, με*, although before the verb. Two points should be noted here about enclitic pronominal forms.

(a) σου and other similar forms, ordinarily enclitic, may bear emphasis, and are then accentuated. (b) The monosyllabic cases of ἐγώ are, of course, always unemphatic. When, therefore, in spite of this they are placed in such cases before *the verb*, the evidence for this method of attraction seems complete.

Possessive Genitive.

A note ought to be made here, in passing, as to the possessive genitive of pronouns. The old idea that the pronoun takes emphasis by being placed before its noun appears to be quite untenable. There are numbers of cases to the contrary.

2 Thess. ii 17 παρακαλέσαι ὑμῶν τὰς καρδίας.

John iv 34 τελειώσω αὐτοῦ τὸ ἔργον.

Commonly, though by no means always, these are cases of attraction.

Phil. i 7 συγκοινωνούς μου τῆς χάριτος.

Luke vii 48 ἀφέωνται σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι (ἀφέωνται αἱ ἁμαρτίαι αὐτῆς αἱ πολλαί, in ver. 47), and frequently with σοι as a variant.

To claim emphasis it must be thrown into a still more prominent position.

Eph. ii 10 αὐτοῦ γάρ ἐσμεν ποίημα.

Matt. xiii 16 ὑμῶν δὲ μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ὅτι βλέπουσι.

An interesting case is John xiii 6 σύ μου νίπτεις τοὺς πόδας ;

One would be much inclined to translate 'Dost THOU wash *my* feet?', though μου would then require an accent, and it may well take its earlier order by attraction to the emphatic pronoun; and this is borne out by a similar order in Mark v 30 τίς μου ἤψατο τῶν ἱματίων; where 'my' can hardly bear any emphasis (see also note (b) above).

II. Dislocation.

(a) Notable examples are :—

Heb. vii 4 θεωρεῖτε πῆλικος οὗτος ᾧ δεκάτην Ἀβραὰμ ἔδωκεν ἐκ τῶν ἀεροθαίων ὁ πατριάρχης.

Heb. xiii 8 Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐχθὲς καὶ σήμερον ὁ αὐτός, καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

1 Pet. ii 12 τὴν ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἔχοντες καλὴν (for some force of emphasis seems to lie regularly in the tertiary predicate).

1 John i 5 ὁ Θεὸς φῶς ἐστὶ, καὶ σκοτία οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐν αὐτῷ οὐδεμία.

And so with the particles καὶ τοῦτο.

Phil. i 28 ἦτις ἐστὶν αὐτοῖς ἐνδειξίς ἀπωλείας, ὑμῶν δὲ σωτηρίας, καὶ τοῦτο ἐπὶ Θεοῦ.

On the other hand, it must be carefully noted that there are plenty of cases to be found of spurious dislocation, due to nothing more than the need of separating two agreeing words, in order to put emphasis on *the former only*. It is not enough for the later word to stand separate; it

must also be thrown into a marked position. If, though after the verb, it is in its ordinary order, we may be certain that only its fellow word *before the verb* has a stress on it. Such cases are :—

Hebrews ii 3 τηλικαύτης ἀμελήσαντες σωτηρίας.

Acts xvi 23 (&c.) πολλὰς ἐπιθέντες αὐτοῖς πληγὰς.

Titus ii 10 πᾶσαν πίστιν ἐνδεικνυμένους ἀγαθὴν: where σωτηρίας, πληγὰς, ἀγαθὴν are without emphasis.

Real dislocation is a very different matter, involving wider separation of the words; those to bear the stress being thrown very late in the sentence, in a way that disturbs the even flow of sense and thought, and is obviously without any other adequate explanation.

(δ) *Abruptness.* This is similar in effect to dislocation.

Acts xviii 6 τὸ αἷμα ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν ὑμῶν καθαρὸς ἐγώ.

John viii 55 ἔσομαι ὁμοῖος ὑμῶν, ψεύστης.

This effect is most commonly produced by the omission of the copulative verb, as in Luke xxii 21 ἰδοὺ ἡ χεὶρ τοῦ παραδιδόντος με μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης: or by putting a word right out of its place, even before an interrogative, as the demoniac in his frenzy: Acts xix 15 ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνας ἐστέ; or by *Asyndeton*, Luke xii 19 ἀναπαύου, φάγε, πίε, εὐφραίνου.

(ε) *Iteration.* Finally there is a method, which is a survival of the simplicity of early human speech, commonly called Hebraism in the New Testament, which lays stress on an idea by repeating it, and may be called *Iteration*.

Mark v 42 ἐξέστησαν εὐθὺς ἐκστάσει μεγάλῃ = very greatly.

Rev. xiv 2 καθαρωδῶν καθαριζόντων ἐν ταῖς κιθάραις.

Luke xxii 15 ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθύμησα.

Especially οὐδεὶς. Mark xvi 8 οὐδενὶ οὐδὲν εἶπαν.

Iteration is a notable device for adding force to extended passages, as 1 Cor. xii 4–12, where ὁ αὐτός and ἐν echo and re-echo in assertion of Christian unity in diversity; and the magnificent panegyric of *faith* in the eleventh chapter of Hebrews.

This, then, in brief outline, is the suggested apparatus of emphasis, critically considered.

(i) *Words* which speak it :—particles, adverbs, pronouns, adjectives, nouns.

(ii) *Order*, the main principle, the emphatic word being thrown into marked prominence, usually *before the verb*, exceptions being due to *Attraction*.

(iii) Then the more occasional subsidiary methods: expression of *pronouns in the nominative*; *dislocation*, along with *abruptness*, *brevity* and *asyndeton*; and last of all, *iteration*.

Sometimes these methods are used singly; often two or even more

are combined, to add weight to the same passage, of which it would be easy to quote instances, and indeed many have occurred incidentally among the examples already quoted.

One thing only remains in order to complete the outline of the subject. A word or two ought to be added about what may be called *tone-emphasis*. In putting passages to the test of reading, it quickly becomes apparent that it is not enough merely to lay *voice-stress* on an emphatic word; but that the true sense often depends on the *tone* in which this is done.

Emphasis, properly used, is a vehicle of *emotional* expression. There is a single interjection, a monosyllable, in our language, which by varied voice inflexion is used from time to time to cover a whole vocabulary of emotions. *Oh!* is not so simple a word as it looks. It can be made to express surprise, indignation, pain, pleasure, merriment, incredulity, admiration, vexation, interrogation, as well as simple address. The *toning* of the word will be found on consideration to vary in the different cases.

So it is with emphasis in general; we find it take colour with varieties of tone, as follows:—

Admiration. Rev. xxi 21, 22 'The twelve gates were twelve pearls; each one of the several gates was', &c. 'The *Lord God* the Almighty, and the *Lamb*, are the temple.'

Contempt. Acts xix 26 ὁ Παῦλος οὗτος, '*This Paul*'.

Anger and excitement. Luke xv 29, 30 'Lo, *these many years* do I serve thee, and I *never* transgressed a *commandment* of thine'.

Impulsiveness and enthusiasm. Acts x 28 ὑμεῖς ἐπίστασθε, &c. '*Ye yourselves* know how that it is an *unlawful thing* for a man (that is a Jew)', &c.

Determination. Acts xxvi 14 '*Saul, Saul*, why persecutest thou me? it is *hard* for thee to kick against the *goads*'.

Vehement sorrow. Acts xx 25 καὶ νῦν ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ οἶδα ὅτι οὐκέτι ὄψεσθε τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ὑμεῖς πάντες, ἐν οἷς. 'And *now, behold*, I *know* that *ye all* shall see my face *no longer*, among whom'.

Indignant reproof. Gal. ii 14 'If *thou*, being a *Jew*, livest as do the *Gentiles*', &c.

Despair and anguish. Rev. xviii 10 '*Woe, woe*, the *great city*, *Babylon*, the *strong city*!'

Grief and lamentation. Matt. xxiii 37 'O *Jerusalem, Jerusalem*, which *kildest the prophets*', &c.

Condemnation. Mark xi 14 Μηκέτι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ἐκ σοῦ μηδεὶς καρπὸν φάγοι, '*No man* eat fruit from thee *henceforward for ever*'.

Frenzy. Acts xix 15 τὸν Ἰησοῦν γινώσκω καὶ τὸν Παῦλον ἐπίσταμαι, ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνας ἐστέ; '*Jesus* I recognize, and *Paul* I know; but who are *ye*?'

The following are a few typical examples of special interest or difficulty:—

(i) Gen. i 7 (LXX) καὶ ἐγένετο οὕτως, 'And it **was** so'. It cannot assume the emphasis some have adopted: 'and it **was so**.'

(ii) In the same chapter we cannot read, 'after **their** kind', but 'after their **kind**', κατὰ γένη αὐτῶν; and so, still more markedly in the succeeding verses, κατὰ γένος,—no pronoun expressed at all—'after his **kind**'.

(iii) St Luke ii 7 οὐκ ἦν αὐτοῖς τόπος ἐν τῷ καταλύματι. Some have read, 'there was no room for **them** in the inn'; implying that the khan proprietor made a difference between rich and poor. The Greek gives no justification for accusing him of any such meanness.

(iv) Rom. ii 21 ὁ κηρύσσων μὴ κλέπτειν, κλέπτεις; 'Thou that preachest a man should not *steal*, dost thou *steal*?' The usual emphasis on the second '*thou*' is impossible.

(v) St John iv 18 νῦν ὃν ἔχεις, οὐκ ἔστι σου ἀνὴρ. 'He whom thou **now** hast is *not* thy husband.' 'Not *thy* husband' has been suggested; but (a) for this the order required would be σοῦ οὐκ ἔστιν, or οὐ σοῦ ἔστιν or οὐ σός ἔστιν or οὐκ ἔστιν ἀνὴρ ὁ σός. (b) We have no ground for supposing that her present husband was a divorcee.

(vi) St Luke xv 29 ἐμοὶ οὐδέποτε ἔδωκας ἔριφον, ἵνα μετὰ τῶν φίλων μου εὐφρανθῶ. The writer once heard Dean Burgon, whilst still Fellow of Oriel and Vicar of St Mary's, claim that the force of this passage was usually lost for want of emphasis. 'And yet, thou never gavest *me* a *kid*, that **I** might make merry with **my** friends.' But the Greek emphasis is not so simple, 'And yet, thou never gavest **me** a kid, that I might make merry with my **friends**'. A contrast is reasonably marked between φίλων and πορνῶν. The other contrast, which one would have expected between the 'kid' and the 'fatted calf', can hardly be found in the Greek, except so far as emphasis may be marked by *parallelism* between words in corresponding positions in two clauses.

(vii) 1 Cor. xiv 36 ἢ ἀφ' ὑμῶν ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐξῆλθεν, ἢ εἰς ὑμᾶς μόνους κατήνησεν; 'What? came the Word of God out **from** you? or came it **unto** you only?' Logically it is very tempting here to make a direct antithesis—'came it **unto** you only?' But the Greek, with μόνους rather than μόνον, seems certainly to require the emphasis given above, and makes one realize that St Paul, as his manner was, has here packed the sense with two antitheses instead of only one.

(a) 'It came **unto** you, not out **from** you.'

(b) 'It came to others as well as you.'

(viii) The climax of self-humiliation of the Incarnate, Phil. ii 6–8, so often missed in reading and slurred in our version, is elaborated carefully in the Greek, if not very clearly, each downward step being successively emphasized. 'Who, being *in the form of God*, thought it

not a *prize* to be equal with God, but *emptied* Himself and took upon Him the form of a *bondservant*, being made in the *likeness of men*; and being found in *fashion* as a *man*, He *abased* Himself, by becoming *obedient* even unto *death*, yea, death upon the *cross*.'

AMBROSE J. WILSON.

THE HOMILIES OF ST MACARIUS OF EGYPT.

A FRIEND, who is also a Friend, recently advised me to read, on account of their spiritual excellence, the fifty homilies ascribed to St Macarius of Egypt (*Patrol. Graeca* tom. xxxiv). Certainly, from the spiritual point of view, they are, as one of their editors has described them, *plenae succi spiritualis*. But as their ascription to the famous 'disciple of Antony' (who died A. D. 389) has been matter of doubt, it seemed to me worth while to note down, as I read, such indications of date and authorship as appeared to me: and as I should be glad, on many grounds, to draw the attention of scholars to these admirable homilies, I am venturing to offer these notes to readers of the JOURNAL.

1. The homilies are written in simple Greek, which presents few difficulties. Such obscurities as there are sometimes suggest corruption in the text. They are plainly by one author, and without apparent interpolations. Sometimes to a very short homily are appended a number of questions, with answers, as if the 'preacher' were anticipating the habit of some modern missionaries. Each homily ends with a doxology. I suppose they were not delivered, but written to be read.

2. The author has known those who were 'confessors' in persecution (*Hom. xxvii*, 14, *P. G.* xxxiv 704 B C D ἐγὼ δὲ σοὶ¹ λέγω ὡς εἶδον ἀθρόωτους κ.τ.λ.; then he gives instances). And he himself lives among those who have abandoned home and possessions for Christ's sake²: who in some cases possess gifts of healing (685 A, 704 D, 706 C) 'through the laying on of hands'. A normal experience with which he deals is that of a spiritual 'athlete' who has made the great renunciation, as far as externals go, and come into the desert, only to find that his struggle is beginning and not ended: and that the inward victory has still to be

¹ The passage (note the singular σοὶ) occurs not in the homily, but in one of the answers to questions which follow.

² Harnack complains of the lack of 'authentic illustrations' from early days of the freeing of slaves being looked upon as praiseworthy (*Expansion of Christianity* vol. i p. 210, Eng. trans.). In the passage cited above, however, it is mentioned as a normal and meritorious part of the renunciation of the world. 'A nobleman renounced and sold his property, freed his slaves', &c.