

the first time L may be put upon the same level as Mark and Q as a primary source for the life of Jesus.

But this is to say at once too much and too little. It is to say too little, for the fact that L is based, at any rate to a very large extent, upon genuine dominical reminiscences, has long been granted by the great majority of scholars—of British scholars at least.

On the other hand, it has been widely recognized that Mark stands by itself for *naïveté* and for closeness to primitive historical reminiscence. Q might perhaps have stood with it if we had Q in its original form. But we have not, and so Mark still stands by itself. For if the material from Q has been to some extent worked over by its editors in the First and the Third Gospels, so also has the Third Evangelist remoulded—and perhaps more freely remoulded—the material which he collected in L and L<sup>1</sup>.

Thus a suggestion like Dr Taylor's seems to go too far as well as not far enough. Whatever L and L<sup>1</sup> are, they are certainly not naïve or primitive in the sense of being unrevised. The material they contain is good material, but not raw material. It is material which has been so skilfully woven into a patterned fabric that the original constituents of it can now be distinguished with difficulty and recovered only in part.

J. W. HUNKIN.

### A STUDY OF ST MARK x 38, 39.

THE purpose of this article is to examine the meaning, in their original context, of the words addressed by Jesus to the sons of Zebedee on the occasion when they asked for seats by His side in His expected kingdom. The episode is contained in Mk. x 35-45, which is reproduced with important alterations in Mt. xx 20-28. It does not appear in St Luke.

ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Οὐκ οἶδατε τί αἰτεῖσθε· δύνασθε πιεῖν τὸ ποτήριον ὃ ἐγὼ πίνω, ἢ τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι βαπτισθῆναι; οἱ δὲ εἶπαν αὐτῷ Δυνάμεθα. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Τὸ ποτήριον ὃ ἐγὼ πίνω πῖεσθε καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι βαπτισθήσεσθε, τὸ δὲ καθίσαι κτλ. (St Mark x 38, 39).

Was this meant by St Mark to be a prediction by Jesus of the death by martyrdom of both James and John? Some of those who take this view hold that when the Gospel according to St Mark was written, it was believed that John (as well as James, Acts xii 2) had already died

<sup>1</sup> As one small indication of such remoulding note the use of *κύριε* in the sections from L and Q + L: see Streeter *op. cit.* pp. 213, 214.

a violent death. The further inference is drawn that this represents the early belief of the Church, which was superseded in the second century by a later tradition to the effect that John lived to be an old man (cf. Jn. xxi 22) and died a natural death at Ephesus. I am here concerned only with the exegesis of the Markan passage.

## I

The first thing to be noticed is the absence of any hint in Mk. x 35 f that James and John, to whom the words were addressed, understood them as predictive of a violent death either for them or for their Master. Jesus had spoken clearly to the Twelve of His impending death for the first time after the Confession of Peter (Mk. viii 31, Mt. xvi 21, Lk. ix 22). None of them believed this sombre forecast (Mk. viii 32, Mt. xvi 22). He spoke again in Galilee of His death in similar terms (Mk. ix 31, Mt. xvii 22; cf. Lk. ix 44); but, again, they did not understand, being indeed afraid to question Him as to what such incredible words could mean (Mk. ix 32, Lk. ix 45; cf. Mt. xvii 23). Once more, as they were going up to Jerusalem for the last scenes, He told them explicitly that He would be mocked and scourged and killed, and the third day rise again (Mk. x 34, Lk. xviii 32, 33, Mt. xx 19). Lk. xviii 34 adds the comment 'They understood none of these things and this saying was hid from them and they perceived not the things that were said'. Instead of this comment Mark, followed by Matt., gives the story of the sons of Zebedee and their claim (Mk. x 35 f, Mt. xx 20 f).

It appears from Mk. x 35 f that the preceding words of Jesus about His Resurrection (Mk. x 34) were misinterpreted by James and John. They thought that Jesus had been speaking of an approaching assumption of Messianic sovereignty, and so they asked that they should be given special dignities as His viziers. Something similar had happened on the last occasion when Jesus had predicted His Resurrection (Mk. ix 31 f); for, this being misunderstood, a dispute began among the Twelve about precedence (Mk. ix 34).

But not only did the Twelve fail to understand what Jesus meant by 'rising again'. They, one and all, failed to understand that He was going to die. This was the mental attitude of all the apostles before the Crucifixion; they did not believe that their Master was to die a martyr's death. Nothing is clearer in the Synoptic Gospels than this. Accordingly, when Jesus asked James and John 'Are ye able to drink the Cup that I am drinking, or to be baptized with the Baptism that I am baptized with?' neither of them supposed for a moment that He meant to ask them 'Are you ready to die?' for they did not believe

that He was going to die at all. Whatever the sharing of His Cup or His Baptism meant for *them*, it did not mean red martyrdom, for they did not think of Jesus as moving to death. They were ready, or thought they were, to face tribulation and persecution with Him. 'We are able', they said, beginning perhaps to understand that danger and suffering might come upon them as His followers. But death was not in their minds, either *their* death or His. And Jesus does not again repeat the explicit warning, so often misunderstood, that He was on His way to death. But He takes His eager disciples at their word, accepting the best that they knew how to offer, their promise that they would experience sorrows and tribulations such as were His. So it will be, He said, repeating the words which He had used before. The same warning was given to James and John with others, a little later; 'they shall deliver you up to councils, and in synagogues shall ye be beaten . . . ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake' (Mk. xiii 9, 13).

The Ministry of Jesus was, throughout its course, in many ways a ministry of pain and hardship. 'The Son of Man hath not where to lay His head' (Lk. ix 58). He had reminded the Twelve already that it had been written of Him that 'He should suffer many things and be set at nought' (Mk. ix 12, cf. Isa. liii 3). The whole story of the Ministry confirms this, and the warning to James and John 'The Cup that I am drinking ye shall drink, and with the Baptism that I am being baptized withal shall ye be baptized', was certainly fulfilled in the sense that they must have understood it: viz. that they would have to endure tribulation and hardship similar to that which, as they knew, He was experiencing every day. If the words 'Cup' and 'Baptism' were used here by Jesus as explicitly pointing to His Death and theirs, then they must have been used *ironice*, for none of His listeners understood them in that sense, and He knew this.

## II

Before proceeding with the exposition of the Markan passage, the Matthaean version of it claims a word or two. In Mt. xx 20 it is the mother of the sons of Zebedee who makes the bold claim for their future precedence, not James and John in person. That is a characteristic toning down of the story, so as to save James and John from the charge of undue forwardness, although Mt. xx 24 (from Mk. x 41) notes the indignation of the other disciples.

More important is the change of the Markan τὸ ποτήριον ὃ ἐγὼ πίνω to τὸ ποτήριον ὃ ἐγὼ μέλλω πίνειν. Here Matthew alters the words before him, so as to make the reference to the future Passion of Jesus

unambiguous.<sup>1</sup> Mark's 'the Cup which I am drinking', sc. at the time of speaking, is changed to 'the Cup which I am about to drink', sc. in the future. Thus, according to Mt. xx 23, Jesus made the explicit prediction that James and John would share the Cup of Death with Him, i. e. would suffer a violent death. But this is not in the Markan narrative, which is the original.

Further, Matthew does not reproduce at all the second clause of the words of Jesus as given by Mark. There is nothing in Mt. xx 21, 22 corresponding to 'the Baptism with which I am being baptized' of Mk. x 38, 39. Salmon suggested that Matthew did not understand these words and omitted them on that account.<sup>2</sup> It may be so, but in any case the words have an important bearing on the interpretation of the original Markan story, as we shall see.

### III

We have next to enquire if the metaphors of 'Cup' and 'Baptism' in Mk. x 38, 39 necessarily or naturally signify a violent death. The words must be examined separately.

(a) In the O.T. the 'Cup' which God gives men and nations to drink is a familiar metaphor. It may be a cup of happiness (Ps. xvi 5, 6, xxiii 5), but more frequently it is a cup of pain, administered by God because of human sin (Ps. xi 6, lxxv 8, Isa. li 17, Jer. xxv 15, xlix 12). So in the Apocalypse ποτήριον is the Cup of the Divine Wrath (Rev. xiv 10, xvi 19). It is not necessarily the Cup of Death (cf. Lam. ii 13 ἐμεγαλύνθη ποτήριον συντριβῆς σου), while it may involve death. The image of a Cup of Suffering, it must be remembered, is *always* applied in the O.T. to suffering ordained of God. So in the story of Gethsemane, the Cup which Jesus was to drink, and from which He shrank, was the Cup given to Him by His Father (Mk. xiv 36, Lk. xxii 42, Mt. xxvi 39, 42, Jn. xviii 11). It is clear from these passages that Jesus knew that this ποτήριον would involve His death; but the use of the O.T. designation 'Cup' implies that it is the Cup appointed by God because of human sin, predetermined in the Divine Wisdom. And the emphasis is the same at Mk. x 38, 39. The ποτήριον which Jesus told His disciples that He was drinking was the Cup of Suffering ordained for Him by God. He added that this, too, would be given them to drink. It may be the Cup of Death, as in His

<sup>1</sup> This is pointed out by Spitta in Preuschen's *Zeitschr. für die neutest. Wissenschaft* 1910. He holds that Mk. x 39, 40 does *not* refer to the death of the apostles. I have treated the subject somewhat differently, while I agree with Spitta's exegesis in the main.

<sup>2</sup> *Human Element in the Gospels* p. 419.

own case, and as in the case of James ; or the Cup of Tribulation, as in the case of John. They are asked if they can drink it, without refusal. They say that they can, and so it came to pass. For James suffered by Herod's sword (Acts xii 2), and John accepted His share in the common tribulation which came upon the Church *διὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ* (Rev. i 9).

Hence *ποτήριον*, the word used in Mk. x 38, 39, suggested the Cup of Suffering ordained by God, and so the Twelve would have understood it. But it did not necessarily connote or suggest a violent death.

(b) We have now to consider the sentence *καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι βαπτισθήσεθε*. This is not reproduced in Mt. xx 23, and the only N.T. parallel is Lk. xii 50 *βάπτισμα δὲ ἔχω βαπτισθῆναι*.

In the N.T. *βαπτίζειν* is generally used to signify the Jewish or Christian initiatory rite of baptism, a meaning which it cannot have in Mk. x 38, 39 or Lk. xii 50. Jesus had, indeed, been 'baptized' in the Jordan, but in these passages there can be no allusion to that.

The primary meaning of *βαπτίζειν* is 'to dip' or 'to wash' (as in 2 Kings v 14, Judith xii 7). This appears also in Mk. vii 4 *βαπτισμοὶ ποτηρίων κτλ.* ; a close parallel to which is found in a Greek rendering of Lev. vi 28 'shall be scoured and *rinsed in water*', viz. *σμηχθήσεται καὶ βαπτισθήσεται*.<sup>1</sup> Cf. Lk. xi 38.

There is, however, a frequent secondary use of *βαπτίζεσθαι* which must be noted. The word is used of the submerging of a ship (Polybius i 51, 6). Moulton-Milligan s.v. *βαπτίζειν* give a similar usage from a fourth-century papyrus ; and this passes into metaphor. In a papyrus of 153 B. C. *βαπτίζεσθαι* means 'to be overwhelmed', sc. with the floods of misfortune. So Plato (*Euthyd.* 277 D) has *βαπτιζόμενον τὸ μεράκιον* of a youth 'overwhelmed' with questions. Plutarch (*Galba* 21) has *ὀφλήμασι βεβαπτισμένος* 'overwhelmed' with debts. Josephus has *ἐβάπτισαν τὴν πόλιν* of the crowds who flocked into Jerusalem at the siege and so 'overwhelmed' it (*Bell. Jud.* iv 3, 3).

Now this metaphorical use of *βαπτίζειν*, *βαπτίζεσθαι* is found in the Greek versions of the O.T. The mention of the 'deep waters' of tribulation or danger is frequent in the O.T. (Pss. xxxii 6, lxix 14, cxxiv 4, cxlvi 7, Isa. xliiii 2, Lam. iii 54), and the image has found its way into English speech. Sometimes these waves and storms of distress are expressly described as sent by God (Ps. xlii 7, lxxxviii 7, Ezek. xxvi 19). In at least three passages the overwhelming force of these waters of calamity is described by the verb *βαπτίζεσθαι*, *βαπτίζειν*. Thus the LXX of Isa. xxi 4 has *ἡ ἀνομία με βαπτίζει* 'lawlessness overwhelms me'. Again, the cry of Ps. lxix 2 'I sink in deep mire where there is no standing : I am come into deep waters where the floods overflow me'

<sup>1</sup> See Field's *Hexapla* in Lev. vi 28.

was rendered by Symmachus in his flowing Greek, *ἐβαπτίσθην εἰς ἀπεράντους καταδύσεις καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν στάσις· εἰσηλθὼν εἰς τὰ βάθη τῶν ὑδάτων καὶ ρεῖθρον ἐπέκλυσέν με*. And in Ps. ix 15 'the nations are *συνκῆ δῶν* in the pit that they made' is rendered *ἐβαπτίσθησαν* by another Greek translator of the O.T.<sup>1</sup>

For *βάπτισμα* 'an overwhelming' there seems to be no parallel in Greek literature, although *βαπτίζεσθαι* 'to be overwhelmed' is amply justified by examples. But our Lord spoke in Aramaic, not in Greek; and although *βάπτισμα βαπτίζομαι* might be a Greek idiom, it more naturally recalls an Aramaic way of speech which has been literally rendered into Greek. I understand, then, τὸ *βάπτισμα ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι βαπτισθήσεσθε* to mean 'You shall be overwhelmed by the same flood of tribulation by which I am being overwhelmed'. So Lk. xii 50 *βάπτισμα ἔχω βαπτισθῆναι* signifies 'I am being overwhelmed by a flood of tribulation'. The present tenses *βαπτίζομαι* (Mk. x 39) and *ἔχω* (Lk. xii 50) must be given their natural meaning. In neither case does Jesus say 'I shall be overwhelmed', i. e. in the moment of His impending death, but 'I *am being* overwhelmed'. The words which follow in Lk. xii 50 *πῶς συνέχομαι ἕως ὅτου τελεσθῆ* express the weariness of endurance which would be His until the end of His Passion.

That our Lord should speak of Himself as being 'overwhelmed' by the waters of God's appointment is entirely in accordance with the language already cited from the Psalms of the afflictions of the righteous. 'Thy wrath lieth hard upon me, and thou hast afflicted me with all thy waves' (Ps. lxxxviii 7) is the experience of the saint, whose long drawn out suffering elicits at last the cry 'Lord, why castest thou off my soul? Why hidest thou thy face from me?' (Ps. lxxxviii 14).<sup>2</sup> Such a *βάπτισμα* or overwhelming flood of tribulation may issue in death, as in the case of Jesus; but it may also be that the afflicted saint survives the deep waters of calamity or persecution. Just as the *Cup* of tribulation which is God's appointment for His witnesses is to be accepted voluntarily, so must the *Baptism* of tribulation, whether it end in a violent death (as in the case of James the son of Zebedee), or whether it is survived (as in the case of John). But *Baptism* does not connote *Death* by violence, although a flood of persecution or misfortune which overwhelms a man may, in some cases, bring him to death.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See for these citations Field *Hexapla* in loc.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Ps. xxii 1, Mk. xv 34.

<sup>3</sup> St Paul's doctrine of baptism being 'into the death of Christ' (Rom. vi 3; Col. ii 12) is not related at all to the later doctrine of a 'baptism of blood', and is not apposite in the examination of Mk. x 39, 40. I have discussed the Pauline doctrine of baptism in *Studia Sacra* pp. 57 ff.

## IV

Attempts have often been made, both in ancient and modern times, to interpret *βάπτισμα* in Mk. x 39, Lk. xii 50, as if it meant a martyr's death; and it is suggested that our Lord referred in these sayings to His approaching 'baptism of blood'. To expose this curious anachronism, the growth of the later Christian conception of martyrdom as a 'baptism' must be briefly indicated.

It is fundamental in Christian literature from the earliest times that baptism is 'for the remission of sins', *εις ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν*. Can then sins be remitted in any case *without* baptism? Origen, commenting on Mk. x 39,<sup>1</sup> raises this question, as it must doubtless often have been raised in days of persecution. He argues that a *martyr* (whether he meets death for his faith or is only what was afterwards called a *confessor*<sup>2</sup>) may claim the promise of Christ in Mt. x 32. If he confesses Christ before men, he may be assured that Christ will confess (or recognize) him before the Father. But that is to say that he will receive the remission of his sins, which is the baptismal gift. Hence martyrdom may be called a *βάπτισμα*, and have its efficacy. Here is the origin of the conception that martyrdom in death was a 'baptism of blood', and this conception affected Christian doctrine throughout the third and fourth centuries.

But no such reasoning is found in the N.T., and Origen vainly struggles to connect the idea of 'baptism of blood' with Mk. x 39. He notes that the baptism of John to which Christ submitted in His own person was for the remission of sins (Mk. i 4), i. e. of *our* sins, which was completely accomplished on the Cross. But, while this is true, it does not justify the exegesis of *βάπτισμα* in Mk. x 39 as the Atoning Death of Christ for sin, or its connexion with Rom. vi 10 which Origen suggests. In like manner when Tertullian speaks of a *lauacrum sanguinis* (*de bapt.* 16), and interprets the *βάπτισμα* of Lk. xii 50 in this way, he is using the later conception of a 'baptism of blood' which had become familiar in days of persecution, as if it were included in the connotation of *βάπτισμα* in the time of Christ. The Fathers were much better theologians than exegetes; and in this matter, as in others,<sup>3</sup> their

<sup>1</sup> *Comm. in Mt.* tom. xvi 6.

<sup>2</sup> That *μάρτυς* has this double meaning is abundantly established. See Lommatzsch *Origen* xx p. 316; Lightfoot *Clement* i 86 f; and my *Studia Sacra* p. 266.

<sup>3</sup> Thus Origen (*l. c.*) commenting on the 'drinking of the Cup' in Mk. x 39 cites not only Mk. xiv 36 but also Ps. cxvi 13-15. The 'cup of salvation' of which the Psalmist sings must be, he says, the cup of martyrdom, as is shewn by the Psalmist's comment 'Precious in the sight of the Lord is the Death of His saints'. This is very perverse; but Theodoret (*in Ps. cxvi*) has the same comment.

exegesis was coloured by the beliefs of their own day. Another illustration of the same inaccuracy of interpretation is provided by Cyril of Jerusalem who says (*Cat.* iii 10) that Jesus called *martyrdom* a *baptism* citing Mk. x 39 in proof.

It is worth noticing that Clement of Alexandria does not fall into this trap. He discusses martyrdom at great length (*Strom.* iv cc. 4 to 17), recognizing (quite in the manner of Heb. xi 32-39) that a *martyr* may be such by the witness of his life, no less than by a violent death. Chap. ix professes to bring together the sayings of Christ *περὶ τοῦ μαρτυρίου*, citing Lk. xii 8, Mt. x 32; but neither here nor elsewhere does he make any allusion to Mk. x 39, 40 or Mt. xx 22, 23.

## V

It is not the purpose of this article, which is purely exegetical, to discuss the statement ascribed (erroneously, as I believe) to Papias, that John the son of Zebedee died a martyr's death.<sup>1</sup> But it may be added to what has been said of the treatment of martyrdom by Clement of Alexandria, that he has nothing anywhere which suggests that John died by violence, and that he has preserved traditions about this apostle's ministry in Asia Minor in his old age.<sup>2</sup>

To Origen's comments on Mk. x 39, 40 reference has already been made. It must be borne in mind, when they are considered, that he follows them up by the following summary: 'The sons of Zebedee drank the cup and were baptized with the baptism; for Herod slew James the brother of John with the sword, and the King of the Romans, as tradition teaches, condemned John, bearing witness (*μαρτυροῦντα*) for the word of truth, to the island of Patmos'.<sup>3</sup> Whatever be thought of Origen's exegesis, he did not believe that Mk. x 39, 40 implied a prediction of the death by violence of John the son of Zebedee.

Chrysostom seems, at first sight, to deduce the martyrdom of John from Mk. x 39, for he says<sup>4</sup>: 'His meaning is that you shall be counted worthy of martyrdom, and shall suffer those things which I suffer; you shall end your life by a violent death, and in these things you shall be partakers with me'. This has been thought to be explicit and to represent Chrysostom's considered belief. But (1) on Acts xii 2 he cites Mk. x 39 as fulfilled in the case of James, not mentioning John at all; and (2) on Mt. xxii he notes that John lived 'for a long time' after the Fall of Jerusalem, which proves that he did not hold that John died an

<sup>1</sup> I have examined this in *Studia Sacra* ch. xi.

<sup>2</sup> *Quis diues saluetur* § 42.

<sup>3</sup> *Comm. in Mt.* tom. xvi 7.

<sup>4</sup> *In Mt.* xx 23, which he quotes as if it were Mk. x 39.



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 D<sub>2</sub> etc. : *ζωοποιῶντος* N 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