

early death by violence. It is probable that, when writing his comment on Mk: x 39, Chrysostom (like others) was misled by his failing to perceive that the doctrine of a martyr's 'baptism' by blood was the product of a later age.

J. H. BERNARD.

I TIM. vi 12, 13: ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πειλάτου.

ἀγωνίζου τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα τῆς πίστεως, ἐπιλαβοῦ τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς, εἰς ἣν ἐκλήθης καὶ ὡμολόγησας τὴν καλὴν ὁμολογίαν ἐνώπιον πολλῶν μαρτύρων. παραγγέλλω σοι ἐνώπιον θεοῦ τοῦ ζωογονοῦντος τὰ πάντα καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ [υ.λ. Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ] τοῦ μαρτυρήσαντος ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πειλάτου τὴν καλὴν ὁμολογίαν . . .

I believe that we have here a more or less intentional echo of the primitive nucleus of the Creed: and that therefore (1) *ζωογονοῦντος τὰ πάντα* means 'creator of all things'; (2) *ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πειλάτου* means 'under Pontius Pilate'; (3) 'witnessing the good confession' is the equivalent of 'crucified'. I should paraphrase verse 13a 'I charge thee before God the Creator and Christ Jesus the Martyr and Confessor under Pontius Pilate'.

Let us see how far usage in early Christian literature bears out this interpretation of the phrases.

1. *ζωογονοῦντος*. So A D₂ etc. : *ζωοποιῶντος* & etc. There is perhaps no difference in the original meaning of the two words: L-S. *ζωοποιέω* = *ζωογονέω*: and, so far as that remained the case, the question of reading may of course be put aside. The only real parallel in the LXX is Neh. ix 6 (= 2 Esdras xix 6) *Σὺ ἐποίησας τὸν οὐρανὸν . . . τὴν γῆν καὶ πάντα ὅσα ἐστὶν ἐν αὐτῇ, τὰς θαλάσσας . . . καὶ σὺ ζωοποιεῖς τὰ πάντα*, where obviously *ποιεῖν* is used of God as creator of inanimate things, *ζωοποιεῖν* of animate, though also the difference in tense indicates that the giving of life is not a single act in the past, but a continuous process: possibly because living things are continually being brought into existence, more probably because the continuance in life of each living thing depends on the continual imparting of life from the Source of life. *ζωοποιέω* is used in Barnabas of the new life acquired through the Redemption (xii 5, 7), and in Hermas of the new life imparted in Baptism (*Sim.* ix 16 §§ 2, 7) and regained in repentance (*Mand.* iv 3 § 7). *τὸ ζωοποιόν* in the Constantinopolitan Creed, 'The Giver of life', presumably should be taken in a similar sense. *ζωογονεῖν* is much rarer in Christian writers: it is used some few times in the LXX, practically always with the meaning to 'save alive' (but not of God, except in one

case, in the Song of Hannah, 1 Reg. ii 6), and it is hardly possible to give it that sense here. Whether in fact we read *ζωογονοῦντος* or *ζωοποιοῦντος*, I suspect that the word does in effect mean here 'creator', and is nearly equivalent to Tertullian *praeser.* 36 (quoted by Dr Lock in his *Commentary*) 'unum deum novit, creatorem universitatis'.

2. ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου. Hort (on Apoc. i 2) translates 'before Pontius Pilate'; so too does Dr Lock, who says ἐπὶ Π. Π. corresponds to ἐνώπιον πολλῶν μαρτύρων. But the double use of ἐνώπιον suggests that ἐνώπιον πολλῶν μαρτύρων corresponds rather to ἐνώπιον θεοῦ . . . καὶ Χριστοῦ, and if so it cannot correspond to ἐπὶ Π. Π. To translate 'before Christ Jesus who before Pontius Pilate . . .' would imply what is on the face of it an extraordinarily improbable collocation. Even to put Pilate in a parallel position to the 'many witnesses' is a thing which I cannot bring myself to believe any Christian writer would have done. I can only give a meaning tolerable for a Christian writing if we are allowed to use ἐπί of Pilate in some quite different sense from that in which ἐνώπιον is used of God and Christ and the Christian people. Treat ἐπὶ Π. Π. as a historical reference, and this difficulty vanishes. Moreover we are then taking ἐπὶ Π. Π. in the sense in which the whole tradition of Christian language has used the phrase, beginning at least from Ignatius (*Trall.* 9 ὅς . . . ἀληθῶς ἐδιώχθη ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, ἀληθῶς ἐσταυρώθη καὶ ἀπέθανεν: *Smyrn.* 1 ἀληθῶς ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου καὶ Ἡρώδου τετράρχου καθηλωμένον ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐν σαρκί: cf. *Magh.* 11 τῇ ἀναστάσει τῇ γενομένη ἐν καιρῷ τῆς ἡγεμονίας Ποντίου Πιλάτου) and Justin *Apol.* i 13 τὸν σταυρωθέντα ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, *Dial.* 30 τὰ δαιμόνια . . . ἐξορκιζόμενα κατὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ σταυρωθέντος ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου.

3. μαρτυρήσαντος . . . τὴν καλὴν ὁμολογίαν. To some extent the interpretation of these words hangs together with the interpretation of ἐπί. If with Dr Lock we take the καλὴ ὁμολογία to mean the 'noble profession of His Messiahship and the nature of His Kingdom', then no doubt we must understand ἐπί as 'in presence of Pontius Pilate': or perhaps we ought rather to put it conversely—if ἐπί is taken in a local, not a temporal, sense, we are driven to explain the ὁμολογία as limited to the nature of the Messianic kingdom.¹ But this seems to me to give an extraordinarily inadequate content to μάρτυς and ὁμολογία in connexion with the name of Christ. I cannot put any lesser meaning to St Paul's solemn charge than 'before God our Creator and Christ Jesus our Redeemer'. The appeal must be to the Crucifixion: μαρτυρέω and

¹ And for that the Fourth Gospel is our only authority. I do not at all doubt the truthfulness of the interview as recorded in St John: I do doubt whether the author of 1 Tim. vi 13, even if he were not St Paul, can have had the information at his disposal.

ὁμολογία belong to the technical language of the Church from the beginning, and they meant in substance the same thing. Later on a distinction grew up between the two groups of words: *μάρτυς* came to be limited to 'martyrs', *ὁμολογητής* to those who had confessed the Name in persecutions, but had not been actually put to death. That distinction certainly does not go back to the date of the Pastoral Epistles: but the association of both words, 'martyr' and 'confession', with suffering and death is, I should suppose, unquestionably early. Origen (ap. Eus. *H. E.* iii 1) speaks of St Paul as *ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐπὶ Νέρωνος μεμαρτυρηκόςτος*, where the rendering 'was martyred' is inevitable. Clement of Alexandria says that some heretics taught *φονέα εἶναι ἑαυτοῦ καὶ αὐθέντην τὸν διὰ θανάτου ὁμολογήσαντα*.¹ Still earlier is the passage in the wonderful Letter of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons, ap. Eus. *H. E.* v 2 §§ 2, 3 *εἴ ποτέ τις ἡμῶν δι' ἐπιστολῆς ἢ διὰ λόγου μάρτυρας αὐτοὺς προσεῖπεν, ἐπέπλησσον πικρῶς. ἡδέως γὰρ παρεχώρουν τὴν τῆς μαρτυρίας προσηγορίαν τῷ Χριστῷ, τῷ πιστῷ καὶ ἀληθινῷ μάρτυρι*² . . . καὶ ἐπεμμνήσκοντο τῶν ἐξεληλυθότων ἤδη μαρτύρων καὶ ἔλεγον "Ἐκεῖνοί ἤδη μάρτυρες οὓς ἐν τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ Χριστοῦς ἠξίωσεν ἀναληφθῆναι, ἐπισφραγισάμενος αὐτῶν διὰ τῆς ἐξόδου τὴν μαρτυρίαν, ἡμεῖς δὲ ὁμολογοὶ μέτριοι καὶ ταπεινοί . . ." καὶ τὴν μὲν δύναμιν τῆς μαρτυρίας ἔργῳ ἐπεδείκνυντο . . . τὴν δὲ πρὸς τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς τῶν μαρτύρων προσηγορίαν παρητοῦντο. Christ was the martyr of martyrs: among his followers the name should only be given to those whose 'confession' was ratified by death for His sake. But obviously the distinction between 'martyrdom' and 'confession' was then still only in the making: and the writers of the Letter, like the writer of 1 Timothy, combine both words in the phrase (1 Tim. i § 11) *τὴν ὁμολογίαν τῆς μαρτυρίας*. And in § 30 *ἀπεδίδον τὴν καλὴν μαρτυρίαν* is (I think) a clear echo of the phrase *τὴν καλὴν ὁμολογίαν* in 1 Tim. vi 13. Hegesippus too, their contemporary, says that the grandsons of St Jude presided over the churches as being at once 'martyrs' and of the family of the Lord (ap. Eus. *H. E.* iii 20 § 6).

Not till the third century was the distinction well established that a martyr had confessed the faith and died for it, a confessor had confessed and survived: the distinction is presumably drawn by Hippolytus, when he speaks (ap. Eus. *H. E.* v 28. 8) of 'a certain Natalius a confessor', and by pope Cornelius (*ib.* vi 43. 5) 'Novatian had with him at the first the confessors', and certainly by Dionysius of Alexandria (*ib.*

¹ I take the reference from Suicer, who gives '*Strom.* iv p. 401', which does not enable one to verify it in Stählin's edition.

² Apoc. iii 14. I cannot doubt that the authors of the Letter are right in supposing that *μάρτυς* in this passage means 'Witness faithful to death', 'Martyr'. Do let us rid ourselves of the presupposition that the writers of N.T. and the writers of the rest of early Christian literature used two different languages.

vii 11. 24) 'Eusebius ministered to the confessors in prison and saw to the burial of the blessed martyrs'. Yet in the middle of the century Cyprian, though he drew like the others a definite line between confessors and martyrs, drew it at a different point: to him any one who endured torture for the name of Christ was a martyr, even though he survived. And this was apparently the established usage at that time of the African Church, see *Cypr. epp.* x, xv, xviii, lxxvi.

One word in conclusion as to the meaning, under the hypothesis of this interpretation of verse 13, which should be put on verse 12. The 'good confession before many witnesses' I take to be the Renunciations and Profession of faith in the face of the congregation which preceded Baptism. But the 'good' confession cannot be separated from the 'good' fight earlier in the same verse: both are forms which the 'witness' takes. Only we must not suppose that the 'good fight', either there or in 2 Tim. iv 7, has necessarily anything to do with martyrdom. The Christian's whole life is a contest: and I see no reason to suppose that the apostle, though he was clearly expecting death when he wrote 2 Tim. iv 6-8, was expecting any other than a natural death.

C. H. TURNER.

'LEVI SON OF ALPHEAUS'.

THERE is a well-known various reading in Mk. ii 14, where instead of Levi (or Levis) son of Alphaeus the Western texts have 'James son of Alphaeus'. The attestation is

D ⊕ 565 69 & c *abceffgr* § 10 Ephr. *Diat.* 58 *Diat. arab.* vii 9
The Sinai Palimpsest has lost a leaf here. Both readings were known to Origen when he wrote the *Contra Celsum* (c. 249). In the above list § denotes De Bruyne's African *Capitula*.

The special object of this Note is to point out that both MSS of the Arabic Diatessaron actually read 'James' (يعقوب), as is duly recorded in Ciasca's Arabic apparatus, though he regarded it as a scribe's blunder and put *Levi* in his text and in his Latin translation. From Ciasca it passed to the English editions of Hamlyn Hill and H. W. Hogg, and also to the recently published German translation by Preuschen and Pott (Heidelberg, 1926)!

It may be added by way of confirmation on Syriac ground that Barsalibi in his Commentary on the Gospels, commenting on the List of the Twelve in Matt. x, says that two Apostles were Publicans, *viz.* Matthew and James son of Alphaeus. It is therefore certain that the