

### THE MARTYR APOSTLES.

THE Gospel writers know of but three among the Twelve who suffered martyrdom, and even tradition, which busied itself in developing the later career of each apostle, long hesitated to award the martyr's crown to any save Peter and James and John. The last-named held a curiously vacillating position of both martyr and surviving "witness (*μάρτυς*) of Messiah." He drank the cup of Jesus (according to legend a cup of poison) and was baptized with his baptism of death (according to legend immersion in boiling oil), but emerged from the ordeal unharmed, to continue untouched of corruption in a sleep that only resembled death until the coming of the Lord. The legend is due to the harmonistic interweaving in later fancy of two antithetic prophecies of Jesus, one to the disciples at the Declaration of Messiah's Fate, "Some that stand by shall not taste of death till they see the Son of Man coming in His kingdom";<sup>1</sup> the other to James and John, as they ask the pre-eminent places in the Messianic kingdom, "Ye shall indeed drink of my cup, but to sit at my right and left hand is reserved for them that are worthy." Peter is the third, who offers to go with Jesus to prison and death; but breaks down in the attempt.

Regarding the actual fate of these apostolic volunteers

<sup>1</sup> Matt. xvi. 28=Mark ix. 1=Luke ix. 27. As an actual promise of Jesus the passage is not only supported by this strong array but by the kindred saying Matt. xxiv. 34=Mark xiii. 30=Luke xxi. 32, and by the conviction of the whole primitive Church, attested by Paul in numerous well-known passages, that the second advent was to come "quickly," while some of them "were alive and remained." The unique phrase "taste of death" is an indication that Jesus has in mind the expected "witnesses of Messiah," Moses (or Enoch) and Elias, who in Jewish apocalypse (2 Esdr. vi. 26) attend the coming of Messiah as "the men that were taken up, that have not *tasted death* from their birth." The meaning seems to be repeated in the Lucan assurance (Acts i. 8), "Ye are *my* witnesses."

to martyrdom only one is reported in positive, distinct terms by any New Testament writer. In Acts xii. 1 f. Luke informs us of the decapitation of James by Agrippa I early in the year 44 A.D. As to Peter's fate, while the tradition is early, and apparently trustworthy, that he perished at Rome by crucifixion in the Neronian persecution of 64 A.D., the only New Testament references to it are in the veiled language of symbolism. The appendix to the Fourth Gospel, balancing the respective claims of the apostle to whom leadership over the flock of Christ is committed, and the "other disciple" whose task it is to "witness" until He come, shows already the traces of the harmonization of the two antithetic prophecies already referred to, in application to John. Peter, who had been told when first he volunteered to lay down his life for Jesus, "Thou canst not follow me now, but thou shalt follow afterwards" (John xiii. 36), is told now, "When thou wast young thou girdedst thyself, and walkedst whither thou wouldest; but when thou shalt be old, thou shalt *stretch forth thy hands*, and another shall gird thee,<sup>1</sup> and carry thee whither thou wouldest not." The author adds that Jesus "spake this signifying by what manner of death Peter should glorify God," and then significantly adds that "when Jesus had spoken this He saith unto him, Follow me."

This account leaves little doubt in the mind of the reader accustomed to the symbolism of the Fourth Gospel, that an allusion is intended to the time, and even the manner, in which Peter's too self-confident offer, "Lord, why cannot I follow Thee even now? I will lay down my life for Thee" was to find at last its worthy fulfilment.

<sup>1</sup> In the Orient old men are girded by standing up, stretching out the hands and revolving the body, thus winding around the waist the long sash or girdle, whereof one end is held by an attendant. Young men gird themselves.

But while the symbolic veil is less transparent, there is one other Gospel fragment which seems to the present writer scarcely less certainly concerned with the same over-confident offer of Peter to "follow," redeemed, after a first humiliating failure, by an ultimately victorious faith. It forms an appendix in Matthew xiv. 28-32 to the Markan story of Jesus' Walking on the Sea. This narrative itself is suggestive of symbolism, from its connexion with the Feeding of the Multitude, wherein the Fourth Evangelist rightly finds a type of the Agape with its memorializing (in the appended eucharist) of the Lord's death (John vi. 52-58). Jesus by His death had been separated from the disciples, leaving them to battle alone against the elements of the world, yet left them not alone, but triumphing over all the waves and billows of death which had gone over Him, came to them, cheered them and piloted their craft to its desired haven. For those to whom triumph over the sea-monster was a favourite symbol for Jesus' victory over the power of death and the under-world,<sup>1</sup> and His rebuke of the storm which threatened the boat-load of disciples on Gennesaret one of the proofs of His Messianic power, such a combination in the symbolism of sacramental teaching is not difficult to conceive.<sup>2</sup>

Whether or not this be the case with Mark vi. 45-52, which the Evangelist declares to have been a sign misunderstood at the time by the disciples because "their heart was hardened," Matthew's addition to the story is highly suggestive of symbolic intent. When Peter saw Jesus treading the billows under foot he entreated :

"Lord, if it be Thou, bid me come unto Thee upon the waters. . . . But when he saw the wind he was afraid ; and beginning to sink, he cried out, saying, Lord, save me. And immediately Jesus

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Matt. xii. 40, and *Jona*, H Schmidt, 1907.

<sup>2</sup> For an instance of the kind very fully elaborated see the *Epistle of Clement to James* xiv.

stretched forth His hand and took hold of him, and saith unto him, O thou of little faith, wherefore didst thou doubt ?”

We have little difficulty in recognizing in the legend of Domine, quo vadis ? a variation on this same theme of Peter's denial and recovery. It is certainly conceivable that this representation of Peter's ultimately successful attempt to share in Jesus' triumph over the powers of the under-world should have been suggested by the fate by which Peter at last redeemed his promise to “ follow unto prison and death.”

To the practically certain allusion in John xiii. 36-38, xxi. 18 f. we may, therefore, join Matthew xiv. 28-32 as a possible second allusion within the limits of the Gospels, though only in their latest elements, to the martyrdom of Peter. It remains to be seen whether further traces may not be discoverable of other apostolic martyrdoms.

An increasing number of critics, beginning with the independent conclusions of Bousset and Wellhausen, are convinced that the “ prophecy ” to the two sons of Zebedee, “ Ye shall indeed drink of my cup,” could not have obtained its place in Mark x. 39=Matthew xx. 23, and then maintained it unaltered until the stereotyping of the tradition, unless the prophecy had actually met fulfilment. These critics are therefore, disposed to accept as genuine and historical the fragment of Papias recently published by de Boor <sup>1</sup> in which this writer of about 150 A.D. declares that “ John and James his brother were killed by the Jews,” to which an interpolator of the Codex Coislinianus adds, “ thus fulfilling the prophecy of Jesus concerning them.” Zahn <sup>2</sup> vainly endeavours to show why it is impossible that Papias—who undoubtedly regarded the Apostle John

<sup>1</sup> *Texte u. Untersuchungen*, v. 2, p. 170.

<sup>2</sup> *Forschungen*, vi. p. 147 ff.

as in some sense responsible for the Apocalypse<sup>1</sup>—should have endorsed this tradition. No reason exists why Papias may not have referred this somewhat indefinite literary activity of the apostle—or, for that matter the authorship of the whole “Johannine” canon—to a period antecedent to this martyrdom. The *Muratorianum*, if it does not actually rest upon Papias, is at least as open to all these objections of incompatibility with the later tradition of John’s survival to the times of Trajan, as Papias could be. And the *Muratorianum* represents John’s authorship of Revelation as antecedent to the Pauline Epistles! As for the argument that later readers of Papias could not then have accepted the tradition of the aged survivor of the apostolic band, it is enough to observe that the two writers who actually do quote the statement of Papias are able to reconcile it with the accepted belief, and that those who could not (such as Eusebius) have simply ignored it, doubtless classing it with the *μυθικώτερα* which Eusebius claims to find in his pages.

Until some valid reason is advanced, therefore, why this doubly attested statement of the martyrdom of James and John may not have stood on the pages of Papias, writing *circa* 150, it must be accepted as the simple historical fact, in perfect harmony with the “prophecy” it was adduced to confirm. What must be explained is its displacement by the subsequently dominant tradition of the survival of John, the earliest attestation of this tradition being found again in the appendix to the Fourth Gospel (John xxi. 23).

But it is not the whole truth to say that a tradition identifying the surviving “witness of Messiah” of Mark ix. 1 with John the son of Zebedee is attested by the apologetic

<sup>1</sup> Fragments x. and xi. in *The Apostolic Fathers*, Lightfoot-Harmer, 1891.

of John xxi. 23. The author does indeed undertake to vindicate for "the disciple whom Jesus loved" a "white martyrdom" in contrast to the "red martyrdom" of Peter. He goes further. He undertakes a vindication of this form of the tradition *against* the objection that the witness had died—or at least might be expected to die. Not merely that the word of Jesus had been conditionally spoken, but also that the disciple's "witness" does in fact continue in the same way as the witness of Moses and the prophets appealed to in v. 39. "This is the disciple that beareth witness to these things (ὁ μαρτυρῶν περὶ τούτων) and wrote these things." The paragraph, therefore, should be closed after verse 24, not after verse 23. This is part of the truth concerning this author's dealing with the tradition of the *μαρτυρία* of John. The other part, unfortunately ignored in current discussions of the appendix, is that it also deals (in the lightest touch of symbolism to be sure, but no less surely) with the other form of the tradition: *John a sharer of Jesus' cup of martyrdom*. The author does not lightly use the term "follow" in this connexion. All possible literary art is used in verse 19 to indicate its pregnancy of meaning. If, therefore, he tells us immediately after (v. 20) that "Peter, turning about, seeth the disciple whom Jesus loved following," and then that Peter asked the question when he saw John "following," *what then John's fate would be* (κύριε, οὗτος δὲ τί;),<sup>1</sup> the ambiguity of the answer which Jesus returns is deliberately designed to cover both forms of the tradition. The writer intends to meet the contention of both parties. Some think John's *μαρτυρία* was to be a "following" in the same sense in which Peter finally "followed" Jesus. Others think

<sup>1</sup> The rendering "What shall this man do?" does not convey the sense. The meaning is, By what manner of death shall *this* man (emphatic οὗτος) glorify God?

it was to be that of the survivor of "those that stood by" when Jesus declared that that generation should not pass till the judgment came, a tarrying "without tasting of death" until the Lord come, in the sense of "the witnesses of Messiah" of 2 Esdras vi. 26.<sup>1</sup> A "tarrying" or a "following" witness—which did Jesus predict for John? The Evangelist's answer to this question is: It cannot be known whether Jesus predicted one fate or the other for John. One thing is important. As Peter was given the function of administrative care (as moderns might say, the ruling eldership) John was given that of interpretation of the truth (the teaching eldership). Whatever the form of his visible *μαρτυρία*, whether by life or by death, his enduring "witness" to the Lord is that he "is a witness of these things and wrote these things." The pertinence of the appendix as a commendation of the evangelic writing which it accompanies resides, accordingly, in this paragraph John xxi. 15-24<sup>2</sup> treated as a whole. The writer takes account of *both* forms of the earlier tradition of the *μαρτυρία* of John, and substitutes for them his own, along with the book whose "truth" he guarantees. His interpretation is this: The *μαρτυρία* of John is rather the tarrying than the following witness, but not in the sense of *physical* survival. His *testimony* abides.

It is doubtful if the New Testament contains other allusions to the *μαρτυρία* of James and John, yet before we confront the problem why the tradition interpreting it in John's

<sup>1</sup> Whosoever remaineth . . . shall see my salvation and the end of my world. And they shall behold the men that have been taken up (Moses—according to other authorities Enoch—and Elijah), who have not tasted death from their birth."

On the current apocalyptic conception of the "witnesses of Messiah" the "sons of oil" that "stand in the presence of the Lord of the whole earth" as His "remembrancers" of the need of Zion, see Bousset, *Legend of Antichrist*, the chapter on this subject, and Rev. xi. 3-13.

<sup>2</sup> Verse 25 is not found in *N*\*, and may well be a later addition. Tischendorf's text rejects it.

case in the sense of the tarrying witness (Mark ix. 1) should have ultimately superseded that which interpreted it in the sense of the following witness (Mark x. 39), we must take into account two more possible traces. The former may be dismissed briefly, since its value is wholly dependent on our judgment regarding the difficult question of the composite structure of Revelation.

(1) In substantially its present form the Apocalypse of John is a product of "the end of the reign of Domitian," as even Irenaeus was already aware. It seems to have included the portions which claim Johannine authorship at least from before 155 A.D., when Justin already quotes it as the work of this apostle. Whether the imputation to John is older than the introductions and epilogues which seem to have been added "in the end of the reign of Domitian" would be difficult to say. For, as practically all recent critics admit, an older element borrowed from Jewish apocalypse has been incorporated at least in the section dealing with the two "witnesses of Messiah" in xi. 1-13. That these "witnesses" were originally Moses and Elias is quite apparent from the description of their miraculous endowments in verse 6.<sup>1</sup> Their prophecy follows upon the voice of the seven thunders (Rev. x.) which the seer is forbidden to write and commanded to "seal up." In a measure it takes the place of these thunders, the witnesses themselves having both of them the Elijan weapon of fire from heaven, so that "if any man shall desire to hurt them fire proceedeth out of their mouth and devoureth their enemies." Nevertheless, "when they shall have finished their testimony" the beast from the abyss puts them to

<sup>1</sup> "These have the power to shut the heaven that it rain not during the days of their prophecy (Elias); and they have power over the waters to turn them into blood, and to smite the earth with every plague, as often as they shall desire" (Moses).

death. This, too, as we learn from Mark ix. 13, is a genuine element of the old apocalyptic legend of Elias. A vivid trait is the fact that their dead bodies are suffered to lie exposed "in the street of the great city." Finally, after the symbolic period of the half of seven days,

The breath of life from God entered into them, and they stood upon their feet, and great fear fell upon them which beheld them. And they heard a great voice from heaven saying unto them, Come up hither. And they went up into heaven in the cloud, after the likeness of the ascension of Jesus.

The occidental reader would probably have some difficulty in guessing that "the great city" in whose streets the bodies of the two witnesses lie unburied is Jerusalem (!), were it not for the friendly editorial hand which inserts the explanation "that which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, where their Lord also was crucified." But whom does the incorporator of this bit of apocalypse mean by "the two witnesses"? For it is somewhat difficult to imagine him, as a Christian, thinking of Moses' and Elias' return otherwise than in some Christian embodiment, as John the Baptist in the Synoptic writers is treated as a reincarnation of Elias. Especially difficult is it when their martyrdom is brought into express relation with that of Jesus as "their Lord" (!), and their resurrection and ascension are depicted in obvious relation to that of Jesus.

If the question were asked of Justin Martyr, we could answer it at once. The "witness of Messiah," who comes again in the guise of Elias to effect the "great repentance" before the great and terrible day of the Lord (cf. Rev. xi. 13) is John the Baptist redivivus:—

Shall we not suppose that the word of God has proclaimed that Elijah shall be the precursor of the great and terrible day, that is, of his (Jesus') second advent? "Certainly," he (Trypho the Jew) answered. "Well, then, our Lord in his teaching," I continued, "proclaimed that this very thing would take place," saying that Elijah would also come. And we know that this shall take

place when our Lord Jesus Christ shall come in glory from heaven ; whose first manifestation the Spirit of God which was in Elijah preceded as herald in the person of John, a prophet among your nation.”<sup>1</sup>

But the Apocalyptist has not yet with Justin reduced the “two witnesses” to one ; and he gives no indication that he has in mind the Baptist. On the contrary he seems to be thinking of two martyrs of Jesus, whose fate provokes the bitterest resentment in his mind against “the great city which spiritually is called Sodom, and Egypt, where their Lord too was crucified.” For the stereotyped apocalyptic feature of the “great repentance” almost disappears from view in his elaboration of the vengeance inflicted on the guilty city through the earthquake, wherein a tenth part of the city is destroyed and seven thousand persons are killed (*v.* 13 ; cf. the earthquake of *Matt.* xxvii. 51-53). Where hot indignation flames out as here there must be something more than scholastic borrowing of dead material.

The pages of the Synoptic Gospels, which reflect the popular apocalyptic conceptions of the coming of Elias as witness of Messiah, as martyr, as raised from the dead, and perhaps (in Christian form) as avenger of Messiah’s wrongs, are those to which we must look for light on the question what personalities, if any, the incorporator of Revelation xi. 1-13 has in mind. In Matthew and Mark, John the Baptist appears as Elias, who anoints the Messiah and makes him known to himself and the people.<sup>2</sup> The idea that his martyrdom was in fulfilment of (apocryphal) prophecy is admitted,<sup>3</sup> and we have traces of its companion elements,<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See the instructive context in *Dial.* xlix.

<sup>2</sup> For the Jewish tradition on this point see Justin Martyr, *Dial.* viii. and xlix.

<sup>3</sup> *Mark* ix. 13. The only other trace of this in pre-Christian legend is in the Slavonic *Book of Biblical Antiquities* attributed to Philo, where Elias redivivus in the person of Phineas is put to death by the tyrant.

<sup>4</sup> The apocalyptic developments of the doctrine of the “witnesses”

the miracles which are supposed to "work in him" *because* he is risen from the dead (Mark vi. 14), and his coming again before the end (xv. 35 f.). But the last two conceptions are only alluded to, not admitted by, the Evangelist. The Baptist's function is complete, in Mark's idea, at his death. On the other hand Moses and Elias are certainly introduced as witnesses of Messiah in the remarkable scene of the Transfiguration; only their function is obscure. It is not clear whether their appearance in "the vision" witnessed by the three disciples is prophetic of the glory that is to be by-and-by, or whether it is an uncovering to their minds of the present hidden reality. Perhaps both.

In Luke the crudity of the Markan apocalyptic ideas is much modified. The Baptist was from his birth a fore-runner "in the spirit and power of Elijah" (i. 17, 76-79; vii. 27), but the direct identification with Elias (Matt. xi. 14), the statement that "scripture" had been fulfilled in his martyrdom, and the cry from the cross, are omitted. The allusions to popular expectations of the resurrection of Elias and his mighty works are also almost completely suppressed. "Moses and Elias" still appear in the Transfiguration *to predict the crucifixion* (ix. 31; cf. xxiv. 25-27); but instead of coming again from the dead to effect the great repentance, Israel is forewarned in a special appendix to the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus (xvi. 26-31) that if they do not accept the *written* witness of Moses and the prophets the return from the dead would be useless.

How radically the Fourth Gospel treats the identification are fond of introducing the trait of the duel of wonders in which the true witness(es) withstand and outdo the wonders of the false prophet(s) in the presence of the tyrant; as Moses and Aaron withstood Jannes and Jambres in the presence of Pharaoh. The great repentance ensues upon the final victory of the witnesses in raising the dead. Cf. Bousset, *Legend of Antichrist* and the Clementine duel of Peter (and Paul) against Simon Magus.

of the Baptist with Elias, his witness and his mighty works (John i. 19-28, x. 41) need here only be mentioned. To this Evangelist as well as to Luke it is only in their writings that Moses and Elias are the witnesses of Messiah (John v. 33-47).<sup>1</sup>

But in the deep-lying material incorporated by both Mark and Luke there are certain suggestions which cannot well be overlooked when the question is put, Whom, if any one, had the apocalyptist in mind when he incorporated the paragraph on the martyred "witnesses" ?

Aside from the prophecy to the sons of Zebedee, "Ye shall indeed drink my cup," significantly omitted by Luke (!), the Synoptic Gospels contain but two references to the brothers James and John taken by themselves. The first is Mark iii. 17, where we learn that they bore *together* the Aramaic surname Boanerges. What the real meaning of the epithet may have been is obscure ; even the meaning Mark attached to it is almost equally obscure, for while the words "sons of thunder" by which he renders the surname are plain enough, no feature of the life or character of the brothers is given to show in what sense the epithet was meant.

The only other New Testament passage where the pair are mentioned by themselves is Luke ix. 51-56 ; and here the textual variants, even if unauthentic, are of sufficient interpretative value to be worthy of incorporation (in [ ] ) with the text :

And it came to pass when the days were well-nigh come that he should be received up, he steadfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem, and sent messengers before his face ; and they went and entered into a village of the Samaritans to make ready for him. And they did not receive him because his face was (set as) going to Jerusalem. And when his disciples *James and John* saw (this), they said, Lord,

<sup>1</sup> The Baptist, however, was "the lamp" (ὁ λύχνος, John v. 35 ; cf. αἱ δύο λύχναι, Rev. xi. 4) granted as a concession to human weakness

wilt thou that we bid fire to come down from heaven and consume them [as Elijah did]? But he turned and rebuked them and said, Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. [For the Son of man came not to destroy men's lives but to save them]<sup>1</sup>. And they went to another village.

To the Evangelist at least the spirit rebuked is not so much that of the historical Elijah, which it would not have occurred to any of our Gospel writers to question ; but (unless we greatly err) he sees rebuked in it the vindictive spirit of Revelation xi. 1-13, a spirit which rejoices in the fire proceeding out of the mouth of the two witnesses and devouring their enemies "as Elijah did" (2 Kings i. 12), a spirit only too glad that "if any man desireth to hurt them, in this manner must he be killed." But if the narrative have really this aim in view, we have here a clue to the long- vexed problem of the epithet "Sons of Thunder." It was applied to James and John not so much for what they had done, as for what *they were expected to do*. Revelation xi. 1-13, with its lurid substitute for the unuttered "voice of the seven thunders," is a cry from the tortured spirit of the church, driven out in A.D. 64-67 from "the city which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt," after its chief "pillars" James the Just (and may we now conjecturally add, John the son of Zebedee?) had been stoned and beaten to death in its streets, "where their Lord too was crucified." Under the ancient apocalyptic figure the vision depicts the work of vengeance which is to be wrought by the *μάρτυρες* of Messiah in the day when He comes to judgment against the guilty city. As in Justin John the Baptist-Elias renews his work of preparing the way of the Lord at the second advent, so here the Sons of Thunder come before Him to judgment, with fire to destroy their enemies. A great earthquake destroys a tenth part of the blood-

<sup>1</sup> The clause in double [ ] is found in still fewer authorities than that which precedes it.

stained city, and seven thousand perish of those that had made merry over the dead bodies of the prophets.<sup>1</sup>

But in our Gospels another spirit has displaced the vindictive spirit of the earlier parts of Revelation. The cry from the cross is no longer an appeal to Elias to come and take Him down, but a wail over the departing presence of God. The last remnant of the spirit of Revelation xi. 1-13, if the title "sons of thunder" be really such, remains a meaningless survival in Mark. Thereafter it disappears. And in its place comes in the Lucan story of the rebuke to James and John, "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of."<sup>2</sup>

(2) One more trace seems to us to be distinguishable in the Synoptic Gospels of the period when James and John, together with Peter, Rome's "following" witness ("carried away whither he would not"), were the three martyr-apostles. Like the two sons of Zebedee, the trio, "Peter and James and John" are mentioned in but three fundamental passages by our Second Evangelist, from whose pages the group has generally been transferred intact to those of Matthew and Luke.<sup>3</sup> Mark represents Jesus in these three instances as admitting only "Peter and James

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the cry of the souls of the martyrs from under the altar, Rev. vi. 9 f., "How long, O Master, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood?" and its answer.

<sup>2</sup> If the *argumentum e silentio* is not to be excluded, we should take also into account the strange phenomenon that the Fourth Evangelist, who treats Synoptic eschatology so radically, in particular the doctrine of the coming of Elias, has stricken from his pages all mention whatever of either of the sons of Zebedee! In their place comes in the new and mysterious figure of "the disciple whom Jesus loved."

<sup>3</sup> Matthew disregards the selection of the three in the story of the raising of Jairus' daughter. Luke, after introducing the group in the Markan form at the beginning of the Transfiguration story, refers to them in the addition which he makes (Luke ix. 32) only as "Peter and they that were with him" (cf. xiii. 45). Hence the trio appears to be of primary significance to Mark only.

and John" to a peculiarly intimate relationship with Himself. Not even Andrew, who forms one of the group of four at the calling of the first followers (Mark i. 16-20), and the prediction of the doom of Jerusalem (Mark xiii. 3) is here admitted.

It is conceivable that the phenomenon might have its explanation in the subsequent importance to the Jerusalem church of "James and Cephas and John, those who were regarded as pillars" (Gal. ii. 9) anachronistically referred to the earlier time. To the present writer this explanation would seem more probable than the current one of some special predilection of Jesus for just these three. But one difficulty—perhaps not insuperable<sup>1</sup>—is the fact that the James who became the "pillar" is not the same as the intimate of the Gospel of Mark. A more serious objection to this theory is that it leaves unexplained the special nature of the three occasions in which only the trio are admitted. It cannot be mere accident that all are connected with the same supremely important theme: "Christ and the power of His resurrection." The three occasions are the Raising of Jairus' Daughter, the Transfiguration, and the Agony in Gethsemane. It may fairly be assumed that to our Evangelist, as to the writer of John xxi. 18 f., Peter was one who had "followed" Jesus in almost literal repetition of His sufferings. Mark x. 39 shows that He looked upon James and John as destined to fulfil, if not as having already fulfilled, the prophecy of the Lord that they should "drink of His cup." From this point of view it will no longer seem strange that in a Gospel wherein Jesus' pedagogic relation to the Twelve is more prominent than in any other,<sup>2</sup> Peter and James and John should be made the confidants of

<sup>1</sup> Confusion between "James the Just" and James the son of Zebedee is frequent in post-apostolic literature.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Mark iii. 14.

His wrestling with "him that had the power of death." They were the martyr apostles.

The facts we have presented are collected as indications that the New Testament itself contains confirmation of the strange new testimony that

Papias relates in his second book of the Oracles of the Lord, that John was slain by the Jews, fulfilling manifestly, together with his brother, the prediction of Christ concerning them, and their own confession and undertaking in the matter.<sup>1</sup>

Their cogency will doubtless be variously judged, and must depend largely on the value attached to the alleged witness of Papias. Were space allowed, it might be possible to supplement their force by an examination of the confused and self-contradictory fragments, mainly from Hegesippus, regarding the martyrdom of James the Just. For the victim appears to suffer a double fate, now by precipitation and stoning, now by a fuller's club; now in the year 62, again immediately before "Vespasian besieged the city." Certainly Hegesippus implies that the only surviving relatives of the Lord were the two grandsons of Jude when these were brought before Domitian shortly after his accession. He plainly states that this marked the end of persecution on the score of Davidic pretensions. We cannot but infer that the martyrdom of the successor of James, Symeon the Lord's cousin, on the same charge, a martyrdom which Hegesippus dates under Trajan, at the age of 120 years (!), has undergone displacement.<sup>2</sup> Thebuthis, who at the return of the Christians after the siege entertains hopes of the leadership, and whose disappointment

<sup>1</sup> The MS. Coisl. 305 (tenth or eleventh century) of Georgius Hamartolus, published by Muralt (Petersburg 1859, p. xvii. f.). Cf. the fragment from Cod. Baroccianus 142 in the Bodleian library quoted above from de Boor, *T. u. U.* v. 2, p. 170.

<sup>2</sup> The motive would be again the prophecy of the surviving witness. Symeon represents the generation that should not pass away. His age

is, according to Hegesippus, the origin of heresy,<sup>1</sup> cannot be aware of the survival of John the Apostle, the "pillar," the near relative of the Lord. For how could he cherish such ambitions when

those of the apostles and disciples of the Lord that were still living came together from all directions with those that were related to the Lord according to the flesh (for the majority of them also were still alive) to take counsel as to who was worthy to succeed James.<sup>2</sup>

The unanimous choice of Symeon the Lord's cousin under these circumstances, to Thebuthis' chagrin, indicates an equally inexplicable forgetfulness on the part of the church. But the question of the inconsistencies of Hegesippus is too wide for present consideration, certainly wide enough to leave room for a martyrdom of John as well as James the Just in the troublous times antecedent to the Christians' withdrawal from the spiritual Sodom and Egypt.<sup>3</sup>

The question remains, How could the church pitch upon the very same individual who at an earlier time had been widely held in reverence as fulfilling the prophecy "Ye shall drink my cup" as the individual in whom was fulfilled the almost contradictory prophecy, "Some of them that stand by shall not taste of death till they see the Son of Man coming in His kingdom" ?

Some bearing on this question must certainly be conceded to the coincidence that one of the Elders<sup>4</sup> of the Jerusalem

(120 years) is the Old Testament limit of human life (Gen. vi. 3; Deut. xxxiv. 7). Traditions of the survival of "witnesses" "until the times of Trajan" in the Jerusalem church parallel the later traditions of Ephesus.

<sup>1</sup> Another inconsistency. If heresy has its origin in the chagrin of Thebuthis in *circa* 70 the church cannot have remained, as claimed, virgin pure from heresy until the death of the last of the witnesses "in the times of Trajan."

<sup>2</sup> Eusebius *H.E.* III. xi., quoting apparently Hegesippus; also IV. xxii. 4-6.

<sup>3</sup> The reference is to Lot's withdrawal and Israel's exodus. Cf. Luke xvii. 28-32.

<sup>4</sup> In the Jerusalem church the links of the succession (*διαδοχη*) on which the second century laid such stress were reckoned as "Apostles

church, who survived, according to Epiphanius, until the year 117, bore this same name John. This Elder John (of Jerusalem), whom Papias still carefully distinguishes by the title from the apostle of the same name, is certainly confounded with him by Irenaeus in his quotations from Papias, and very probably also in his boyhood recollections of Polycarp's references to anecdotes of "John" about the Lord "concerning His miracles and His teaching." Since it is to Irenaeus and his contemporaries and fellow-defenders of the Johannine authorship of the Ephesian canon that we owe the tradition of John the Apostle as the long-surviving witness, this fact has certainly an important bearing. But by itself alone it cannot explain the well-nigh complete eclipse of the earlier tradition by the later. A more important factor is the interaction of the two conflicting "prophecies" of Jesus, facilitated by the ambiguity not of the mere Greek word *μάρτυς* but of the deeper-lying Semitic tradition of the "witnesses of Messiah," wherein both the martyrdom and the witness-bearing are original elements. Its Protean forms admit of adaptation to every contingency. Are there some still surviving of those who "stood by" when Jesus uttered His memorable assurance of vindication within the lifetime of the perverse generation which rejected Him? These may be the fulfilling counterparts of those apocalyptic "witnesses of Messiah" who were not to "taste of death" until they had seen and heralded the Lord's Christ.<sup>1</sup> Have two shared the Baptist's fate, and the rest departed before the coming of the Lord? Then these two may be ex-

and Elders" (Acts xi. 30, xv. 6, etc.), "the elders, the disciples of the Apostles" (Papias *ap. Iren. Haer. V. v. 1* and *passim*); not "bishops" as in the Greek churches. Under Hadrian this church still claimed as its leaders "the disciples of the disciples of the Apostles" (Epiph. *de mens. xv.*).

<sup>1</sup> The story of Simeon, Luke ii. 25 ff., as well as that of Zacharias, Luke 17, seems to have points of contact with the legend of the Forerunner.

pected to return with Him at His second advent, devouring their enemies with fire from heaven "as Elijah did." For this is precisely the rôle assigned by the church of Justin's day to its John the Baptist-Elias. The martyrdom also is a mark of the "witnesses." Surely in the long interval which intervened between the martyrdom of the two sons of Zebedee<sup>1</sup> there must have been some who began to ask whether the *μαρτυρία* of John might not be the tarrying witness.

Time is one great corrector of apocalypse. The spirit of Jesus was another. Rapidly after the seventies the course of events demonstrated the inadmissibility of both apocalyptic forms of the Christianized doctrine of "the witnesses of Messiah," the "tarrying" and the "following" *μαρτυρία*. The Pauline doctrine that the outpouring of the Spirit is the pledge of the *parousia* came to its predestined right. The very apocalypse which makes the martyr apostle its mouthpiece<sup>2</sup>—if indeed in the earlier Palestinian form of the book it be John and no other who is the seer that receives his revelation of "the things which must come to pass" in an anticipatory ascension in spirit to heaven<sup>3</sup>—even Revelation no longer holds to a literal fulfilment of the prophecy. Paulinism enters even here: "The *μαρτυρία* of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy."<sup>4</sup> With this interpretation it matters little whether the apostle-prophet "tarries" or "follows," the "witness" is given. Twenty years later the churches of Asia are passing through a new crisis. Persecution without is allied to heresy within. The prophet-witness of Jesus is invoked again. From

<sup>1</sup> To the present writer the theory of E. Schwartz (*Tod der Söhne Zebedaei*, 1904) of a simultaneous martyrdom of James and John in 44 A.D. seems to be excluded by Gal. ii. 9.

<sup>2</sup> With Rev. i. 9, "I John . . . partaker in the tribulation and kingdom . . . in Jesus," cf. Mark x. 37-40, Luke xxii. 28-30, 2 Tim. ii. 11 f.

<sup>3</sup> With Rev. xi. 12 cf. iv. 1.

<sup>4</sup> Rev. xix. 10.

Patmos, whither he is brought "for the word of God and the testimony of Jesus," he is made to deliver his message again in new and broader form to meet the double enemy on a wider field. This is not "forgery." Even if the pseudonymity be deliberate, this is simply the method of apocalypse, which has not one true representative among its multitude of productions that is not pseudonymous. Its strict parallel is found in the use of the authority of Peter against the same heretics in 2 Peter. The appendix to the Fourth Gospel furnishes the key to the history of the conflicting traditions of John the "following" and the "tarrying" witness, superseded as they could not fail to be by the Pauline-Johannine doctrine that the true prophet-witness of Messiah, refuting the false-prophecy of Antichrist-gnosis, abiding with the church until the coming of the Lord, is the "witness of the Spirit." But how inevitable it was that an age which took literally the symbolism of the prophet-apostle in Patmos, addressing "the churches of Asia," should cling to one form of the earlier "prophecy" of Jesus, and gradually build up for itself, first in Palestine, afterward, in Irenaeus' time, in Asia, the legend of the "tarrying Witness."

B. W. BACON.

### *THE GIFT OF TONGUES AT CORINTH.*

It is not likely that there ever will be complete unanimity on the vexed question of the nature of the Glossolalia. It is a question on which each one must endeavour to satisfy his own mind. Apart from the brief reference in the appendix to St. Mark's Gospel (Mark xvi. 17), our only sources of information are the accounts in Acts and 1 Corinthians.

Most recent writers on the subject start with the hypo-