

**μάρτυς, μαρτυρέω, μαρτυρία, μαρτύριον, ἐπιμαρτυρέω,  
 συμμαρτυρέω, συνεπιμαρτυρέω, καταμαρτυρέω, μαρτύρομαι,  
 διαμαρτύρομαι, προμαρτύρομαι, ψευδόμαρτυς,  
 ψευδομαρτυρέω, ψευδομαρτυρία**

## † μάρτυς, † μαρτυρέω, † μαρτυρία † μαρτύριον.

Contents: A. Form of the Word, Etymology and Formation. B. Use of μάρτυς, μαρτυρέω, μαρτυρία, μαρτύριον in non-biblical Greek: 1. **Witness to Facts in the Legal Sphere; 2. Witness to Facts generally, and also to Truths or Views;** 4. Applications of the Use in the Sense of Witness to Truths or Views; the Special Use in Epictetus. C. μάρτυς, μαρτυρέω, μαρτυρία, μαρτύριον in the LXX: 1. The Heb. Words: a. for μαρτυρέω, μαρτυρία; b. for μαρτύριον; 2. The Use of μάρτυς, μαρτυρέω, μαρτυρία: a. In the Legal Sphere; b. In the Religious Sense in Dt. Is.; 3. The Use of μαρτύριον. D. The Idea of the Martyr in Later Judaism; the Usage in Josephus and Philo. E. μάρτυς, μαρτυρέω, μαρτυρία, μαρτύριον, in the New Testament: 1. Occurrence; 2. The Use of μάρτυς: a. General Use (Witness to Facts); b. The Special Lukan Use (Combination of Witness to Facts and Witness in the Sense of Evangelistic Confession); c. The Incipient Separation of the Two Elements in Luke; d. μάρτυς τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθημάτων in 1 Pt. 5:1; e. μάρτυς in the Johannine Writings; 3. The Use of μαρτυρέω: a. Of the Human Declaration of Facts; b. Of the Good Report; c. Of the Witness of God, the Spirit, or Scripture; d. Of Religious Witness; e. The Special Use in the Johannine Writings; f. 1 Tm. 6:13; 4. The Use of μαρτυρία: a. Outside the Johannine Writings; b. In the Johannine Writings; 5. The Use of μαρτύριον: a. Occurrence; b. The Use in the Sense of Witness for the Prosecution; c. Witness to Something; d. Witness in the Active Sense. F. The Development and Establishment of the Specific Martyrological Use in the Early Church: 1. Review; 2. Usage; 3. Understanding.

### A. Form of the Word, Etymology and Formation.

1. Form of the Word. ὁ, ἡ μάρτυς, gen. μάρτυρος, acc. μάρτυρα and occasionally μάρτυν, dat. plur. μάρτυσι. The ancient epic form is ὁ μάρτυρος, nom. plur. μάρτυροι, dat. plur. μαρτύροις in Hom., also some inscr., esp. Delphic (CIG. I, 1699, 1702–1707), once in P. Gen., 54, 6 (4th cent. A.D.): μάρτυρός ἐστιν ὁ θεός, ὅτι κτλ. The form repeatedly called Aeolian by Herodianus Technicus, i.e., μάρτυρ, is also found in the inscr. of Cnidos, GDI, 3591, 23 == Ditt. Syll.<sup>3</sup>, 953, 22. It becomes quite common later in ecclesiastical usage.

2. Etymology and Formation. μάρτυς would seem to come from the root *smer*, “to bear in mind,” “to remember,” “to be careful,” cf. the Gk. μέμμερος, “that which demands much care or deliberation; he who considers or deliberates much,” then μερμαίρω, μερμηρίζω, “consider, deliberate, hesitate,” μερμινάω, μέρμιννα, the Lat. *memor*, *memoria*, Gothic *maúrnan*, Anglo-Saxon *murnan*, Old High German *morneun*, “to be anxiously concerned.” Hence μάρτυς was probably “one who remembers, who has knowledge of something by recollection, and who can thus tell about it,” i.e., the witness. To the verb μαρτυρεῖν applies something which is true of verbs in -έω formed from nouns and adj. of all declensions, namely, that they denote a state or habitual activity, but can often take on trans. significance.<sup>6</sup> μαρτυρεῖν thus means “**to be a witness,**” “**to come forward as a witness,**” “**to bear witness to something.**” The secondary noun μαρτυρία, whether referred to μάρτυς or μαρτυρεῖν, has in the first instance, like most such nouns, an abstract significance: the bearing of witness. But it can then mean the witness thus borne. On the other hand, μαρτύριον, like other nouns in -ιον, is more concrete and denotes witness from the more objective standpoint as the proof of something. Any μαρτυρία can become a μαρτύριον, but not conversely. μαρτυρία and μαρτύριον are related like

ναυαγία (“shipwreck”) and τὰ ναυάγια (“the remains of the ship”) or γυμνασία (“bodily exercise”) and γυμνάσιον (“the place of exercise”).

## B. Use of μάρτυς, μαρτυρέω, μαρτυρία, μαρτύριον in non-biblical Greek.

1. **Witness to Facts in the Legal Sphere.** The proper sphere of μάρτυς is the legal, where it denotes one who can and does speak from personal experience about actions in which he took part and which happened to him, or about persons and relations known to him. He may be a witness at a trial, or, in legal transactions of different kinds, a solemn witness in the most varied connections. The witness at a trial and his μαρτυρία are dealt with fully by Aristot. in his Rhet. and also by Anaximenes of Lampsacos in his Ars Rhetorica ad Alexandrum, which is found among the works of Aristot.<sup>10</sup> The inscr. and esp. the pap. offer an almost inexhaustible number of examples of the solemn witness in every possible kind of written agreement and record, including official records.

The function of the witness is normally denoted by the verb μαρτυρεῖν. This can be used in the abs., “to come forward as a witness,” but also commonly with the dat. to denote the one for whom one testifies or the agreement to which one is a witness, then the acc., or περί and the gen., or an ὅτι clause, for the content of the statement in so far as the witness is testifying to anything specific. Similarly, the noun μαρτυρία, in acc. with its basic meaning as a *nomen actionis*, is used for the coming forward of a witness, or the giving of the witness. But it can then denote the witness itself. Often it is hard to differentiate. A fine example of the legal use of μαρτυρεῖν, μαρτυρία is to be found in P. Hal., 1, lines 222–233 (3rd cent. B.C.), a passage which concerns the summoning and examining of witnesses: line 222: εἰς μαρτυρίαν κλησῖς. Ε[ἰς] μαρτυρίαν καλείσθω ἐναντίον (223) δύο κλ[η]τόρων παρόντα ἀγορεύοντα καθ’ ἐν ἑκαστον ὅτι ἄ[ν] (224) δέημι μ[αρ]τυρεῖν. ὁ δὲ καλεσάμενος γραφέτω τὴν μαρ (225) τυρίαν εἰς π[ι]ν[ά]κι[ον], ὁ δὲ κληθεὶς μαρτυρεῖτω ἐ[π]ὶ [τῆ]ι (226) ἀρχῆι καὶ ἐπὶ τ[ῶ]ι δικαστηρίω ἐφ’ οἷς παρῆν ἢ εἶδε[ν] ὀμώσας (227) τὸν ν[ό]μιμον ὄρκ[ο]ν ἀληθῆ μαρτυρεῖν τὰ ἐν τῶι π[ι]νακίωι (228) γεγρα[μμέν]α, ἄλλην δὲ μὴ μαρτυρεῖτω. Ἐ[ὰν] <δὲ> μὴ φῆι [[παρα]] (229) παρεῖναι μὴδὲ ἰδεῖν περὶ ὧν ἂν κελεύη μαρτυρεῖν (230), ἐξομοσάσθω τὸν νόμιμον ὄρκον παραχρημα μῆτε εἰδέ[ν]αι μῆτε (231) παρεῖναι περὶ ὧν ἂν κληθῆι εἰς μαρτυρίαν. ἐὰν δ[ε] (232) τῆς μαρτυρίας τὰ μὲν φῆι εἰδέναι, τὰ δὲ μὴ, ἃ μὲν ἂν φῆ[ι] (233) συνειδέναι, μαρτυρεῖτω, ἃ δ’ ἂν φῆι μὴ συνειδέναι, ἐξομο[ς]άσθ[ω].

In the case of μαρτύριον, on the other hand, there is no special affinity to the sphere of the courts or the law generally. This denotes the objective, witness, the proof, which can be adduced to confirm a statement or fact, whether this be the saying of a third person (e.g., a poet—a very common use), or a series of facts, or something which serves as proof. In the latter case one sees clearly the objective character of the term: The olive wreath with which bravery is crowned is laid up in the temple of the gods of war—μαρτύριον εἰς τὴν τῶν ἀριστείων κρίσιν παντὸς τοῦ βίου κτλ., Plat. Leg., XII, 943c. Every man becomes a poet when *eros* lays hold of him: ὃ δὲ πρέπει ἡμᾶς μαρτυρίῳ χρῆσθαι, ὅτι ποιητῆς ὁ Ἔρως ἀγαθός, Plat. Symp., 196e. The saying of Plato confirms this fact of experience. A writing may be handed to the authorities πρὸς μαρτύριον (Preisigke Sammelbuch, IV, 7363, 15 [168 A.D.]). For the assertion that many foods cause bad dreams, μαρτυροῖς ἐχρῶντο τοῖς τε κυάμοις καὶ τῇ κεφαλῇ τοῦ πολύποδος, Plut. Quaest. Conv., 8, 10 (II, 734 f.). μαρτύρια δὲ τούτων τρόπαια ἐστήσαντο τῶν πολεμίων, Gorg. Fr., 6 (II, 286, 8 f., Diels5). μαρτύριον δὲ τῶν εἰρημένων καὶ τὸ πᾶσι ὑπάρχειν ... αὐτήν, Aristot. Part. An., III, 4, p. 666a, 22. μαρτύρια τὰ ἡμερινὰ ἔργα τῶν νυκτερινῶν ποιούμενος, ... Dio C., 38, 22, 3. In support of the view that Caesar often showed clemency out of sheer generosity of soul, μέγιστον μὲν καὶ ἐκεῖνο μαρτύριον ἐστίν ..., Dio C., 44, 47, 1. The Carian graves on Delos are μαρτύριον to the settlements which the Carian pirates once established there, Thuc., I, 8, 1. Any recollection that the stem word originally belonged to the legal sphere, esp. trials, has now completely faded. The ref. is always to the proving of facts.

2. Witness to Facts generally, and also to Truths or Views. But the stem words μάρτυς, μαρτυρεῖν and μαρτυρία also find a very general use outside the legal sphere. In so doing they undergo a broadening of meaning and thus come to be used in two senses. The group now refers not merely to the establishment of events or actual relations or facts of experience on the basis of direct personal knowledge. It signifies also the proclamation of views or truths of which the speaker is convinced. It thus relates to things which by their very nature cannot be submitted to empirical investigation. This distinction is plainly developed by Aristot. in *Rhet.*, I, 15. Aristot. first compares πίστεις ἄτεχνοι and ἔτεχνοι, i.e., natural means of proof and those fashioned by methodical art (I, 2, p. 1355b, 35 f.). He cites five πίστεις ἄτεχνοι: νόμοι, μάρτυρες, συνθήκαι, βάσανοι (statements under torture), ὄρκοι, which he discusses in detail (I, 15, p. 1375a, 24 f.). Among witnesses he distinguishes between those who belong to the past and those who belong to the present (παλαιοί and πρόσφατοι). Among the past witnesses are those who testify to past events and those who testify to the future. To the latter group belong χρησμολόγοι (those who expound oracles), but also αἱ παροιμίαι μαρτυρία ἐστίν. In relation to πρόσφατοι μάρτυρες we have the judgments of worthy persons which are made without respect to the immediate point at issue, but on the other hand we may also have μάρτυρες μετέχοντες τοῦ κινδύνου. Of these it is then said (p. 1376a, 12 ff.): οἱ μὲν οὖν τοιοῦτοι τῶν τοιούτων μόνον μάρτυρες εἰσιν, εἰ γέγονεν ἢ μή, εἰ ἔστιν ἢ μή, περὶ δὲ τοῦ ποῖον οὐ μάρτυρες οἶον εἰ δίκαιον ἢ ἄδικον, εἰ συμφέρον ἢ ἀσύμφορον. Hence a distinction is made between μαρτυρία περὶ τοῦ πράγματος and those περὶ τοῦ ἠθους. Only in the former case do we have legal witnesses in the sense of Anaximenes (→ n. 10). Though the terms μάρτυς, μαρτυρεῖν, μαρτυρία are used on both sides, the sense is obviously quite different. In the former case the reference is to the examination of facts observable from without, whether these be events or states. In the latter case the reference is to ethical judgments, to expressions of moral convictions, or more generally to views. On the one hand, statements are made about objective events, on the other personal convictions are made known. On the one hand the point at issue is whether a thing is or was really so, on the other whether it is true and valid from the standpoint of the one who states it.

Yet the distinction does not arise merely at this point. It is to be noted already when μάρτυρες is used with reference to the future. For in this case witness can be borne only by the faith that this or that will happen, no matter what may be the basis of this faith. The fact that the terms μάρτυς, μαρτυρεῖν, μαρτυρία can embrace both meanings is of decisive importance for their further history.

3. Applications of the General Use in the Sense of Witness to Facts. In this sense there was from very early times a use with ref. to the gods. Appeal was made to the gods as witnesses in treaties, solemn agreements or declarations, assurances and oaths. Even if no other witness was present, they, the omniscient, could confirm the truth of a statement or the fact of an agreement. Those who appealed to them as witnesses did so in the belief that should they be lying, or should they break the agreement, they would fall victim to divine punishment. The word is also used for men as witnesses by eye or ear to all kinds of things. It would be superfluous to give examples of this everyday use. Finally, there is a figur. use for impersonal witnesses.<sup>17</sup> In the same way μαρτυρεῖν is used in the sense of to confirm or prove, and similarly μαρτυρία. These words even have the weaker sense of “making a statement about someone or something,” or a “statement thus made,” esp. in a favourable sense, i.e., a good witness, or the confirmation of, e.g., a fact of experience.<sup>18</sup>

4. Applications of the Use in the Sense of Witness to Truths or Views; the Special Use in Epictetus. The sense of testifying to a view held, or a truth of which one is convinced, may first be illustrated by some examples from Plato. The χορός of young men up to 30 yrs. of age is first devoted to the task of convincing youth that the best life is also the happiest—τὸν ... Παιᾶνα ἐπικαλούμενος

μάρτυρα τῶν λεγομένων ἀληθείας πέρι, Leg., II, 664c. The Athenian rejects the homosexuality of the Spartans—μάρτυρα παραγόμενος τὴν τῶν θηρίων φύσιν, Leg., VIII, 836c. For the view that the brave conduct of citizens in revolution is to be more highly estimated than bravery in battle against external foes, the Athenian appeals to the poet Theognis of Megara—ποιητὴν δὲ καὶ ἡμεῖς μάρτυρ' ἔχομεν, Θεόγνιν κτλ., Leg., I, 630a. τὸν ἀδικοῦντα οὐκ εὐδαίμονα εἶναι is a basic conception of Socrates. Polos can easily adduce a swarm of witnesses to contest the truth of this teaching: ἐὰν βούλη κατ' ἐμοῦ μάρτυρας παρασχέσθαι ὡς οὐκ ἀληθῆ λέγω· μαρτυρήσουσί σοι, ἐὰν μὲν Βούλη, Νικίας κτλ., Gorg., 472a. In the opposite evaluations of ecstasy μάρτυσι καὶ ἐπαινέταις χρώμενοι ἐπαινοῦμεν ἑκάτεροι—both parties support their views by witnesses and panegyrists, Leg., I, 638d. Here it is particularly worth noting that μάρτυρες and ἐπαινέταις are obviously felt to be synonymous.

In all these examples the ref. is not to facts which are to be established by the witness but to views or convictions which he approves, expresses and emphatically champions as right, to truths which he accepts and espouses. This takes place in the form of the judgments which he makes. But the trial of Socrates, and the way it is handled in Plato's Apol., show that men are more effectively convinced by conduct than by word. If the terms μάρτυς, μαρτυρεῖν, μαρτυρία are not used in this sense here, materially the whole Apol. is one long glorification of Socrates from the standpoint that he invincibly demonstrated the truth of what he taught by his conduct both in life and esp. in death. Socrates is a model of loyalty to conviction irrespective of the consequences, and he is extolled as such, as a moral hero.

When centuries later Epictet. magnifies the πεπαιδευμένος as the divinely called witness to practical philosophical wisdom, apart from the Stoic garb he simply reduces to a formula a view which is already present in Plato's Apol. and which had considerable influence. In fact the theme of the philosopher as a witness plays a considerable role in Epictet., and he gives us the most important examples of the use of the terms μάρτυς, μαρτυρεῖν, μαρτυρία in this sense.<sup>21</sup> The philosopher, the true Cynic, is or ought to be a witness to the truth of Stoic-Cynic wisdom with its doctrine of the unimportance of everything external, of everything which one cannot control. The πεπαιδευμένος shows himself to be a witness when he maintains a cheerful equanimity of soul in face of disgrace, exile, or whatever else may befall him. He comes forward as a divinely summoned witness to testify to God in face of accusers who question the divine government of the world: ὡς μάρτυς ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ κεκλημένος. “ἔργου σὺ καὶ μαρτύρησόν μοι· σὺ γὰρ ἄξιός εἰ προαχθῆναι μάρτυς ὑπ' ἐμοῦ. μή τι τῶν ἐκτὸς τῆς προαιρέσεως ἀγαθὸν ἐστὶν ἢ κακόν; μή τινα βλάβη; ...” (God does not ordain ill to any man when the external blows of fate smite him?) God has based the true profit of each on his own decision. τίνα μαρτυρίαν δίδως τῷ θεῷ; The man struck by misfortune begins to complain. Epictet. writes: ταῦτα μέλλεις “μαρτυρεῖν” καὶ καταισχύνειν τὴν κλῆσιν ἣν κέκληκεν, ὅτι σε ἐτίμησεν ταῦτη τὴν τιμὴν καὶ ἄξιον ἡγήστο προσαγαγεῖν εἰς μαρτυρίαν τηλικαύτην; Diss., I, 29, 44–49. On the philosopher's view of temporal evils, Zeus willed τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀνθρώποις προάγειν με μάρτυρα τῶν ἀπροαιρέτων, namely, as witnesses to the unimportance of ἀπροαίρετα. Zeus sends evils, not out of ill-will or indifference, ἀλλὰ γυμνάζων καὶ μάρτυρι πρὸς τοὺς ἄλλους χρώμενος (III, 24, 110–114). The philosophically educated are μάρτυρες, οἷς μόνους χρῆται [ὁ θεὸς] παραδείγμασιν πρὸς τοὺς ἀπαιδεύτους, ὅτι καὶ ἔστι καὶ καλῶς διοικεῖ τὰ ὅλα ... καὶ ὅτι ἀνδρὶ ἀγαθῷ οὐδέν ἐστι κακὸν οὔτε ζῶντι οὔτε ἀποθανόντι ... (III, 26, 28). Practical Stoic-Cynic wisdom is thus the truth which the true philosopher in the sense of Epictet. attests by the steadfast equanimity with which he accepts all the blows of fate. Thereby he is also a witness for God against those who accuse Him. Thereby he proves himself a μάρτυς, with the sense of being called and brought to this position by Zeus. In this consists his μαρτυρία. In some cases this may involve suffering death. But this is not essential to the concept of the witness in Epictet. Naturally, he attests the truth of this view of life by words too. But Epictet. applies the terms μάρτυς, μαρτυρεῖν, μαρτυρία, not to this, but to practical demonstration in a crisis, to the οὐ λόγῳ, ἀλλ' ἔργῳ τὰ τοῦ καλοῦ καὶ ἀγαθοῦ ἐκτελεῖν, III, 24, 110. Nor is it the point to prove the factuality of external events. The point is to express conviction as to the truth of a doctrine by one's conduct in adverse circumstances.

Yet there can be no question of a technical use of the words. How little this is so may be seen from Diss., III, 22, 87 f., where Epictet. uses μάρτυς of the body of the philosopher: The health of the body is a proof, a witness to the correctness of the Cynic ideal of a simple and natural mode of life which despises luxury. The term is sometimes used in Epictet. for an act which confesses a truth. In the last resort this would be death, though it does not have to be. Neither Socrates, nor Musonius, nor any other of the lauded models of a genuine philosophical attitude are described as μάρτυρες. The relation between Christian usage and that of Epictet. (if one may speak of such) is only external.

## C. μάρτυς, μαρτυρέω, μαρτυρία, μαρτύριον in the LXX.

### 1. The Hebrew Words.

When we consider μάρτυς κτλ. in the LXX attention is directed primarily to μαρτύριον. In respect of μάρτυς, μαρτυρεῖν, μαρτυρία the LXX remains by and large within the confines of popular usage and its various possibilities. The only exception is 4 Macc. 12:16 (A): οὐκ ἀπαυτομολῶ τῆς τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου μαρτυρίας, if we are to follow A with Swete and not to read ἀριστείας (X) with Rahlfs. But a few passages in Dt. Is. also have a bearing. The main interest, however, centres on μαρτύριον.

a: μάρτυς occurs some 60 times, always for Heb. מַרְטָא with the single exception of Gn. 31:47, unless we are to follow Rahlfs there in reading τῆς μαρτυρίας (D). In this verse the original is מַרְטָאֵי לָבָן, used by the Aramean Laban. The cairn erected on the occasion of his covenant with Jacob is called by him מַרְטָאֵי לָבָן and by Jacob מַרְטָאֵי לָבָן. On the other side, מַרְטָא is some 8 or 9 times rendered μαρτύριον some 6 times μαρτυρεῖν, and a few times, inexactly, by other terms, though without any particular significance. μαρτυρεῖν (some 15 times), when there is a Heb. original, is used once each for מַרְטָא and מַרְטָא q, and twice for מַרְטָא hi, which is usually translated → διαμαρτύρεσθαι. μαρτυρία (some 10 times, 6 times with Heb. equivalent) is found in Gn. 31:47 for מַרְטָאֵי לָבָן, in the verses mentioned in → n. 25 for מַרְטָא, in ψ 18:7 for מַרְטָא (usually μαρτύριον), and in 1 Βασ. 9:24 for מַרְטָא, unless (with Rahlfs) we read μαρτύριον here, as usually in the LXX.

b. In the case of μαρτύριον things are rather complicated. Used some 250 times, it is first the rendering of מַרְטָא, almost always (over 100 times) in the expression מַרְטָא אֶל־אֱהִי (ή) σκηνη (του) μαρτυρίου. Some 40 times it is used for מַרְטָא and מַרְטָא, 8 or 9 times for מַרְטָא, once for מַרְטָא. In many cases the use of μαρτύριον is very mechanical, and is to be explained by the view of the translator that the Heb. term to be translated was in some way connected with מַרְטָא, מַרְטָא. which is not always true, and which can make it hard to make sense of the rendering. This is very generally true of the rendering of מַרְטָא by μαρτύριον. מַרְטָא means the agreement or appointment (Ju. 20:38), or the content of the agreement, or the place or time agreed upon or appointed. The expression מַרְטָא אֶל־אֱהִי means the appointed place where Yahweh will meet with Moses by agreement to impart His demands for Israel (Ex. 25:22). When the expression is rendered ή σκηνη του μαρτυρίου, it is obviously because the translator in some way perceived מַרְטָא, מַרְטָא as a constituent part in מַרְטָא. The rendering is linguistically incorrect, but materially not unsuitable, and certainly not without point (→ 485). But when μαρτύριον is used in translation of מַרְטָא (שָׁמַר) (1 S. 13:8), of מַרְטָא הַמַּרְטָא (1 S. 13:11), or of מַרְטָא (1 S. 20:35), the Greek makes no sense. For מַרְטָא here means the

appointed time, and is elsewhere properly rendered καιρός (e.g., 2 Βασ. 20:5) or ὄρος (e.g., Ex. 9:5). Equally mechanical and meaningless is the use of μαρτύριον in Mi. 7:18 (God does not hold His wrath  $\text{לְעֵלִי}$ ) and Prv. 29:14 (the throne of the king who deals justly with the lowly will stand  $\text{לְעֵלִי}$ ), where the rendering εἰς μαρτύριον can be explained only in terms of a false reading of  $\text{לְעֵלִי}$ , cf. also Am. 1:11 and Hos. 2:14: καὶ θήσομαι αὐτὰ εἰς μαρτύριον, HT:  $\text{לְעֵלִי הִתְקַדְּשִׁי}$ . On the other hand, in Zeph. 3:8 the LXX is right in reading  $\text{לְעֵלִי}$  = εἰς μαρτύριον instead of the Mas.  $\text{לְעֵלִי}$ . In Ier. 37:20 (30:20 HT): τὰ μαρτύρια αὐτῶν =  $\text{לְעֵלִי}$  or  $\text{לְעֵלִי}$ , and in Job 15:34:  $\text{לְעֵלִי הִתְקַדְּשִׁי}$  = μαρτύριον ἀσεβοῦς,  $\text{לְעֵלִי}$  (“congregation”) is confused by LXX with  $\text{לְעֵלִי}$ \*,  $\text{לְעֵלִי}$  (“commandments”). Literally, but by reason of the corruption of the text quite obscurely, μαρτύριον is put for  $\text{לְעֵלִי}$  in 4 Βασ. 11:12. Nor can the Gk. reader make much of μαρτύριον τῷ Ἀσάφ =  $\text{לְעֵלִי הִתְקַדְּשִׁי}$  in the title of ψ 79.

## 2. The Use of μάρτυς, μαρτυρέω, μαρτυρία.

a. In the Legal Sphere. In the LXX, too, μάρτυς belongs to the legal world and denotes the witness before the judgment, in the first instance the witness for the prosecution, cf. Nu. 5:13; 35:30; Dt. 17:6, 7; 19:15. False witness stands under the severe threat of the *lex talionis*, Dt. 19:16 ff. The μάρτυς ἄδικος, δόλοισι or ψευδής, also the overhasty witness (μάρτυς ταχύς) is particularly worthy of contempt, Ex. 23:1; ψ 26:12; 34:11; Prv. 6:19; 12:17, 19; 19:5, 9; 21:28, whereas the μάρτυς πιστός is praised, Prv. 14:25, 5. μαρτυρεῖν is used for judicial witness in Nu. 35:30; Dt. 19:15, 18; Sus. 41; μαρτυρία in Prv. 25:18. The witness to an agreement is found in Ier. 39(32):10, 25, 44 and Rt. 4:9, 10, the eye- or ear-witness to an event in Lv. 5:1; Nu. 23:18; Is. 8:2. For an appeal to Yahweh as witness cf. the agreement between Laban and Jacob in Gn. 31:44, and the pact between David and Jonathan in 1 S. 20:23, 42; also the agreement of the Jews who wish to go down to Egypt and Jeremiah in Ier. 49(42):5. Yahweh can also be a witness in judgment in Mal. 3:5; Ier. 36(29):23. He is a witness to the integrity of Samuel in 1 S. 12:5 f. (along with the king), to the innocence of Job (16:19): ἰδοὺ ἐν οὐρανοῖς ὁ μάρτυς μου; to the innocence of those who die rather than fight on the Sabbath in 1 Macc. 2:37, to what goes on in the inner part of man in Wis. 1:6; ψ 88:37 (ὁ μάρτυς ἐν οὐρανῷ πιστός). In the judgment of Yahweh the people are witnesses against themselves (Jos. 24:22), the song of Moses bears witness (μαρτυρεῖν) against Israel (Dt. 31:19, 21), and illegitimately begotten children are μάρτυρες πονηρίας κατὰ γονέων (Wis. 4:6). μαρτυρία is used generally and weakly for the proof or confirmation of something in Sir. 31:23 f. and 4 Macc. 6:32 (the death of Eleazar is a proof that λογισμὸς rules over the πάθη; otherwise I would have given them τὴν τῆς ἐπικρατείας μαρτυρίαν, and confirmed their superiority). Similarly in Lam. 2:13 μαρτυρεῖν simply means to declare. In a few verses not mentioned here the bearing is obscure (cf. Ex. 21:36; 1 S. 9:24; 1 K. 17:20; 2 Ch. 28:10; Wis. 17:10).

b. In the Religious Sense. Along with all these passages in which there is nothing distinctive as compared with non-biblical popular use, a few verses from Dt. Is. deserve special attention.<sup>27</sup> We refer to the sections Is. 43:9–13 and 44:7–11. Here Yahweh arranges before the nations a kind of trial in which it will be shown who is truly God, Yahweh or the gods of the Gentiles. The nations seem to be here both spectators and also judges who will decide (v. Rad). But they are also interested parties as advocates and witnesses on behalf of their gods. They are interested witnesses who must come forward to demonstrate the deity of their gods from their experiences (43:9; 44:9). To this extent they are also accusers of Yahweh, though vanquished by Him, 44:11. For these witnesses or deities have nothing whereof to testify. They see nothing and hear

nothing. The makers of idols are impotent. Their favoured gods are of no use to them. In this trial they will be put to shame (44:9–11). In contrast, Israel is told three times: “You are my witnesses,” 43:10, 12; 44:8. “Ye are my witnesses, saith the Lord, and my servant whom I have chosen, that ye may know, and believe me, and understand that I am he: before me there was no god formed, neither shall there be after me. I, even I, am the Lord; and beside me there is no saviour. I have declared, and have saved, and I have shewed, and there was no strange god among you: therefore ye are my witnesses, saith the Lord. I am God. Yea, from eternity I am he; and there is none that can deliver out of my hand,” 43:10–13. “Who is like unto me? Let him come forth, and call, and declare it to me, and set in order for me ... and the things that are coming, and shall come, let them shew unto them. Fear not, neither be afraid, Have not I told thee long before, and declared it? Yea, ye are my witnesses. Is there a God beside me? Yea, there is no rock; I know not any,” 44:7–9. In this trial between God and the nations and their gods, Israel, on the basis of the guidance, deliverance and revelation which is grounded in its election and which it has experienced, will declare to the nations of the world the uniqueness, reality, and deity of God. Hence they are His witnesses. For the prophets the deity of God is a fact, His particular saving action in the history of Israel is a fact. But it is not the kind of fact which can be observed and attested like any other externally demonstrable fact. It is a fact which is certain only to faith, which only the man who is not blind and deaf can see and attest, 43:8. The content of the witness is thus a religious truth of which the witness is convinced on the basis of his experience. It is a religious certainty whose content he emphatically represents, for whose acknowledgment he strives, but for the correctness of which he cannot give any rational proof or present any empirical demonstration. It is grounded, then, on the prophetic experience of revelation which is original, and which by nature is not subject to rational control. This is certainty to the prophet. It is also certainty to Israel in so far as it follows the spiritual leadership of prophecy. The witness to this reality of God which is believed and experienced in faith bears the character of a religious confession advanced with the claim to recognition.

If one compares the statements of Dt. Is. with those of Epictet., too much stress should not be laid on the fact that in Epictet. we have the witness of conduct whereas in Dt. Is. we have witness of mouth. The decisive point is the difference in content. The view of the witness in Dt. Is. is superior to that in Epictet. to the same degree that the prophetic historical view of God in the OT is superior to the rational Enlightenment philosophy of Epictet. The witness of Epictet. retreats into the capsule of apathy. The witness of Dt. Is. proclaims with holy passion the living God, whether by his conduct or by his existence (v. Rad). On the one hand we have philosophy or religion, on the other revelation. The word draws its life from its content.

Significant though this is, however, it is to be noted that one cannot speak of a witness concept in Dt. Is., though the great goal of evangelising the nations shines before him, 42:4; 49:6; 62:10; → *λαός*, 37. In him the term is a figurative one which he uses from time to time without in any way developing a technical use. In particular, there is no more precise connection between the function of witness discharged by the servant of Yahweh, Israel, and the suffering of the *'ebed Yahweh*, especially if we are to see in this *'ebed* a figure like the suffering king. It is thus straining things exegetically to press the metaphor, to pour all that the book says about the servant of the Lord into the figure of the witness of Yahweh, to speak of the prophetic martyr theology of Dt. Is., or even to work this up into a formal theological system. There is certainly no direct connection with the early Christian concept of the witness, let alone with the concept of the martyr in the 2nd century Church.

### 3. The Use of μαρτύριον.

In respect of μαρτύριον one may first see traces of the popular use, though this quickly takes on a religious flavour. The total picture is thus controlled by a distinctively religious use.

In the sense of an objective witness or means of demonstration or the confirmation of the factuality of events or the correctness of an assertion, we find μαρτύριον in connection with the drawing off of the shoe in Rt. 4:7 in testimony of the renunciation of the right of redemption to Boaz. The 7 lambs which Abimelech receives from Abraham serve as a μαρτύριον that Abraham has dug the well of Beersheba, or as an acknowledgment of this fact by Abimelech, Gn. 21:30. The cairn in Gn. 31:44 serves as a μαρτύριον to the fact of the agreement between Jacob and Laban. In the same sense the altar erected by the Jordan in Jos. 22 is a μαρτύριον to the compact made there. In Is. 55:4 we read with ref. to David: μαρτύριον ἐν ἔθνεσιν ἔδωκα αὐτόν, which means that David, in virtue of all that Yahweh has granted him, is a factual proof of Yahweh's grace and power—in Sir. 36:14 there seems to be prayer for a similar proof of the authenticity of faith in Yahweh. But the witness to facts can also be accusation. The stone of Shechem serves as a μαρτύριον to the fact of the covenant made with Yahweh, and this is a threat when Israel breaks the covenant, Jos. 24:27. Thus the Law laid up in the ark can be ἐν ὑμῖν εἰς μαρτύριον in the sense of accusing witness, like the song of Moses extolling the acts of Yahweh towards Israel, Dt. 31:19, 26. On the other side Yahweh Himself can become εἰς μαρτύριον, not in leveling accusations, but in executing judgment, Mi. 1:2; Zeph. 3:8. Through the judgment which He executes He establishes beyond cavil the fact of the guilt of those on whom it falls. This is how Hos. 2:14 LXX is to be understood. God will make the devastated plantings of Israel εἰς μαρτύριον, namely, a proof of the reality of their sin and also of His judgments on them: cf. the expression μαρτύριον τῆς μονηρίας (Wis. 10:7) with ref. to the wasted and smoking fields of Sodom etc. Thus the witness against men becomes an attestation of God Himself. It is this thought which controls the expressions σκηνη τοῦ μαρτυρίου, κιβωτὸς τοῦ μαρτυρίου. This does not really correspond to Gk. usage, according to which there is something objective about the word μαρτύριον. For the tent or ark cannot be described as μαρτύριον. Nor can it be said that there is in them an objective μαρτύριον or demonstration. One can think only in terms of the tables of the Law which acc. to Ex. 25:15 (16), 20 (21) are laid up in the ark. But these are τὰ μαρτύρια. Hence the phrase σκηνη τοῦ μαρτυρίου neither could nor did suggest these to the Gk. reader—the phrase is σκηνη τοῦ μαρτυρίου, never σκηνη τῶν μαρτυρίων—but it pointed him to the fact that here the attestation of God takes place through the directions there imparted to Moses for Israel (Ex. 25:22). μαρτύριον always takes on here the sense of revelation, the revelation of divine commandments. If the rendering of מוֹעֵד לְהָאֱלֹהִים by σκηνη τοῦ μαρτυρίου is linguistically inexact, it is materially appropriate. But the term μαρτύριον is also materially appropriate in the admittedly not very many cases where the phrases תְּעֹדוּת לְהָאֱלֹהִים (Nu. 9:15; 17:22, 23; 18:2; 2 Ch. 24:6) or תְּעֹדוּת מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם (Nu. 1:50, 53; 10:11) or תְּעֹדוּת יְיָ (== κιβωτὸς τοῦ μαρτυρίου, e.g., Ex. 25:10, 22; 26:33 f.; 40:5 A, 21; Nu. 4:5; 7:89) were being translated.

In all these combinations μαρτύριον is always in the sing. The only exception is ἡ κιβωτὸς τῶν μαρτυρίων in Ex. 30:6. This reminds us that acc. to Ex. 25:15 ff. τὰ μαρτύρια, the Mosaic Law (תְּעֹדוּת), lay in the ark; cf. τὸ ἱλαστήριον τὸ ἐπὶ τῶν μαρτυρίων, Lv. 16:13; ἀπέναντι τῶν μαρτυρίων, Ex. 30:36; 40:20. To be sure, in Ex. 31:18; 32:15 we find πλάκες τοῦ μαρτυρίου. But elsewhere the plur. τὰ μαρτύρια is used for the concrete statutes of the divine attestation from which the Mosaic Law proceeded. This corresponds in some instances to תְּעֹדוּת, but usually to the plur. of תְּעֹדוּת. This plur. is formally a par. for δικαιώματα, κρίματα, προστάγματα, ἐντολαί, διαθήκη, νόμος (cf. Dt. 4:45; 6:17; 3 Βασ. 2:3; 4 Βασ. 17:13—15; 1 Ch. 29:19; Ιερ. 51:23; ψ 77:5; 80:5 f.; 98:7; 118 *passim*; 131:12).

Hence a distinctive point in the LXX use in so far as it goes beyond the popular is the fact that Yahweh Himself is the subject of the μαρτυρεῖν contained in μαρτύριον. But this μαρτυρεῖν is worked out in the revelation imparted to Moses. The commandments are its content. The full appropriation of the word μαρτύριον and its plural μαρτύρια for the self-witness of God in the Mosaic legislation is a highly significant process for the development of OT nomism.

#### **D. The Idea of the Martyr in Later Judaism; the Usage in Josephus and Philo.**

“The Jewish religion is a religion of martyrdom. It is born out of martyrdom and the sufferings of the righteous in the Maccabean age. At the end of our epoch stands the figure of the martyr Akiba, who rejoices because in his martyrdom he first fulfils in truth the saying: Thou shalt love God with thy whole soul.” Already in the early Church, cf. Orig. Exhort. → n. 24, it became the custom to bring the events to which we refer into close connection with the development of the early Christian μάρτυρ concept. Now it may well be that one can discern this kind of influence in the further history of the idea, so that in the Church’s tradition the Maccabean martyrs could even be enrolled among the Christian martyrs.<sup>34</sup> Nevertheless, this approach is not correct so far as the origin of the early Christian concept is concerned, and it hampers a clear understanding of the uniqueness of this concept.

The figure of the prophet who for the sake of his mission, or the righteous man who for the sake of his piety, suffers calumny, persecution and even death, was known to Israel prior to the time of the Maccabees. One has only to remember Elijah, or the prophets put to death by Jezebel, or the martyrdom of the prophet Uriah (1 K. 19:10; Jer. 26:20 ff.). The true prophet says nothing to tickle the fancy of people. He is irrevocably committed to preach repentance. The echo which he finds is in all ages לֹא יִשְׁרָאֵל עֲבָרָה (1 K. 18:17), and sometimes he must suffer the consequences. Alongside the prophet with his special mission is the righteous man (cf. Ps. 69:8–10), and indeed the whole people, which is forced to complain: “For thy sake are we killed” (Ps. 44:22). This experience did, of course, reach its climax in the atrocities of the Syrian persecution, and it is only natural that now and later, when the newly kindled zeal found itself exposed to new pressures, attention should be directed to the figures who had defied the demand for apostasy, and crowned their faithfulness and obedience to the Law with steadfast endurance even to death. 1 Macc. tells their story with simple objectivity (chapters 1 and 2). 2 Macc. glories in the παρρησία with which the victims went to their execution, and in the obedience to the Law which triumphed over every pain. To 4 Macc., which in a Hellenistic spirit causes the depiction of the Maccabean martyrdoms to serve the message of the triumph of reason over sufferings, the whole of the OT from the murder of Abel onwards is a collection of illustrations of the true martyr spirit (18:11ff.). Josephus describes with quiet admiration the Essenes, who defy all threats, ἵν’ ἢ βλασφημησωσιν τὸν νομοθέτην ἢ φάγωσιν τι τῶν ἀσυνήθων, and who without any sign of pain, and even smiling (μειδιῶντες ἐν ταῖς ἀλγηδόσιν), suffer the most exquisite tortures even to death (Bell., 2, 151–153; cf. also 1,648–655 on the σοφισταί, i.e., the rabbis Judas and Matthias and their 40 pupils, who died ὑπὲρ τοῦ πατρῖου νόμου). We may also recall the martyrdom of Isaiah (who did not cry out when he was sawn asunder, for his mouth conversed with the Holy Ghost, Mart. Is. 5:14), En. 47:2; Hb. 11:35–38, and the adornment of the graves of the prophets (Mt. 23:29), whose violent death seems to have come to be taken for granted in the days of Jesus (Mt. 23:37; Lk. 13:33; Mt. 5:11 f.; Ac. 7:52). All this gives us some idea how vital for the people

was the ideal of the righteous man who proves his loyalty to the faith and the Law by suffering persecution and death. That this ideal lived on may be seen in the Rabbinic tradition concerning the end of various pious teachers of the Law in older and more recent times, especially R. Akiba in the Barcochba revolt.

But though this much is clear, and though the general regard for heroes of faith and obedience may be seen in the adornment of the stories and the legendary poetry (cf. Da. 3), nevertheless it is surprising that nowhere are the terms μάρτυς, μαρτυρεῖν, μαρτυρία used in this context.. This is no accident. In the case of the Christian martyr it is always recalled that witness is borne to someone (as in Is. 43 and 44), that he turns with a message to others. This is not so with the martyrs of Judaism. The high estimation of martyrs is wholly within the framework of the Pharisaic ideal of piety. Suffering and death for the Law is a work of piety *par excellence*. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the statement of R. Akiba already mentioned. Only if we take the word martyr in the very general sense to denote one who suffers for his convictions can it be used of the Maccabean heroes of faith and obedience. But this does not contribute to an understanding of the early Christian concept.

In keeping with this is the fact that there is nothing distinctive about the use of the terms μάρτυς κτλ. in the writings here in question. In Joseph. it is worth noting that in spite of the fixed usage of the LXX he simply says σκηνή or κιβωτός rather than σκηνή (or κιβωτός) τοῦ μαρτυρίου. He also avoids the plural μαρτυρία = ἐντολαί = νόμος Ant., 3, 6). Perhaps his *graeculi* had a hand in this. It is understandable that they should not take kindly to this use of the word μαρτύριον.

Nor does Philo's usage offer any deviation from the normal use. μάρτυς, μαρτυρεῖν, μαρτυρία belong to the legal sphere (witness at trials or to agreements), to the attestation of individual facts or events, or to facts of general experience,<sup>43</sup> or to the confirmation of certain views expressed or truths maintained, etc. Here, too, μαρτύριον usually has an objective nuance, e.g., as applied to quotations which show this or that statement to be correct, or to facts which serve as proof. There is in Philo not even the first impulse towards a specific use along the lines of that found in primitive Christianity.

## **E. μάρτυς, μαρτυρέω, μαρτυρία, μαρτύριον in the New Testament.**

### 1. Occurrence.

The distribution in the various writings is worth noting: μάρτυς 34 times (with Lk. 11:48 35 times), 4 (5) times in the Synoptics, 0 in Jn., 13 in Ac., 9 in Paul (incl. Past.); 2 in Hb., 1 in 1 Pt., 5 in Rev.; μαρτυρεῖν 76 times (with Lk. 11:48 77), 2 (3) in the Synoptics, 33 in Jn., 11 in Ac., 8 in Pl., 8 in Hb., 10 in 1 and 3 Jn., 4 in Rev.; μαρτυρία 37 times, 4 in the Synoptics, 14 in Jn., 1 in Ac., 2 in Pl. (Past.), 7 in 1 and 3 Jn., 9 in Rev.; μαρτύριον 20 times, 9 in the Synoptics, 0 in Jn., 2 in Ac., 6 in Pl., 1 in Hb., 1 in Jm., 1 in Rev. A striking feature is that we find μαρτυρεῖν 47 times in the Johannine writings, μαρτυρία 30 times, and μάρτυς and μαρτύριον not at all in the Gospel. A strong proportion of the instances of μάρτυς and μαρτυρεῖν is in Ac. This statistical finding seems to be external, but it is not, since it is connected with the development of the distinctively Christian use of the terms.

### 2. The Use of μάρτυς.

To understand the NT use it is basic to remember that non-biblical Gk. already uses the concept of witness both in the sense of witness to ascertainable facts and also in that of witness to truths, i.e., the making known and confessing of convictions (→ B.). Both uses are also found

in the NT, and the development of the distinctive Christian use is the result of their application to the content of Gospel proclamation and to the circumstances in which this took place.

a. General Use; Witness to Facts.

The original sense of witness to facts, i.e., the man who can speak about them from his own direct knowledge, especially in legal proceedings, is to be found in Mk. 14:63 == Mt. 26:65. When Jesus, in answer to the high-priest's question whether he was the Christ, confessed that He was the Son of Man of Daniel, the high-priest cried out in relief, for this blasphemy in the very ears of his fellow-members on the council made it unnecessary to proceed by the method of proof by witness, hitherto attempted in vain: τὶ ἔτι χρεῖαν ἔχομεν μαρτύρων. A trial witness, again in proceedings against blasphemy, is also meant in Ac. 6:13; 7:58. False witnesses (μάρτυρες ψευδεῖς) are set up to bring about the condemnation of Stephen, and though there seems to be no orderly sentence he is then stoned according to the statute in Dt. 17:7. In this connection we might also mention Hb. 10:28, where in the second warning against irremediable apostasy there is a reminder of the decree of Dt. 17:6 that if a man is guilty of an impious breach of the OT covenant by worshipping other gods, then he must be put to death by stoning if his act is proved by at least two or three witnesses.<sup>48</sup> The legal principle that one witness is not enough for condemnation is stated very generally in Dt. 19:15, and the regulation of Mt. 18:16 borrows from this verse. If in the brotherhood of the Christian community a disciple has offended against another, and the wounded party cannot turn him from his wrongdoing between themselves, then he must repeat the attempt before one or two others, ἵνα ἐπὶ στόματος δύο μαρτύρων ἢ τριῶν σταθῇ πᾶν ῥῆμα. If this attempt also fails, the statements of these witnesses about what has occurred will serve as a basis for the decision which must then be made by the community. According to 1 Tm. 5:19 the Deuteronomic principle that there must be more than one witness also applies when accusation is made against one of the elders of the Christian congregation. Again, in 2 C. 13:1 Paul appeals to the same principle to establish the seriousness of his intention of purifying the congregation on his approaching third visit: Τρίτον τοῦτο ἔρχομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς· ἐπὶ στόματος δύο μαρτύρων καὶ τριῶν σταθήσεται πᾶν ῥῆμα.

Paul seems to compare his different visits to Corinth to two different but agreed witnesses in a trial who dispose of all doubts concerning the facts. The point at issue is his firm resolve to purify the congregation. On the very first visit his goal was a congregation which would separate itself from sin (cf. 1 C. 6:9). The second aimed to deal with flagrant abuses. It failed. The firmer, then, is Paul's resolve to create pure relations on his imminent new visit. In this case, the relation between the original saying in Dt. 19:15 and Paul's use of it is, of course, very loose. For there is no judicial process, nor are there two or three distinct witnesses, only the repeated assertion of the same witness. The point of comparison is merely that in virtue of repetition on the one side, different witnesses on the other, there can be no doubt as to specific facts in the one case, and a fixed purpose in the other. The seriousness of the statement is in both instances beyond all question. The passage is thus an example of the freedom with which the apostle makes use of OT sayings without concern as to their exact meaning. It is also an example of the freedom which he permits himself in the formal movement of thought.

The idea of a witness to facts takes on a more general sense beyond the judicial when Paul frequently calls upon God as a witness to processes and motives in his inner life, no other factual witnesses being available to prove the veracity and authenticity of what he affirms (R. 1:9; 2 C. 1:23; Phil. 1:8; 1 Th. 2:5), or when he invokes the Thessalonians, and with them God, who in the last resort is alone able to judge as He who knows the heart, as witnesses "how holily and justly and unblameably we behaved ourselves among you that believe" (1 Th. 2:10). The observation in

2 C. 1:23 is rather different from these verses in the sense that here Paul appeals directly to God as witness (whereas elsewhere he is simply content to assert that God is his witness), and by adding *μάρτυρα τὸν θεὸν ἐπικαλοῦμαι “ἐπὶ τὴν ἐμὴν ψυχὴν”* he invokes a formal curse against his own soul if his statement does not correspond to the truth. The saying thus takes on the formal character of an oath, though in this capacity it expresses an element which lends particular weight to the appeal to God as witness only where there is faith in Him, or at least no decided lack of faith.

*μάρτυς* is used for the human witness to facts in Lk. 11:48, where to the Jews who build the graves of the prophets whom their fathers killed Jesus proclaims: *ἄρα μάρτυρές ἐστε καὶ συνευδοκεῖτε τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν*. If the meaning of *συνευδοκεῖτε* is not very clear, it is obvious enough that the present generation with its cult of the graves bears witness to the fact that the fathers murdered the prophets. *μάρτυς* is used in the same sense, not only in 1 Th. 2:10, but also in 1 Tm. 6:12: Timothy has made the good confession (his baptismal confession) *ἐνώπιον πολλῶν μαρτύρων* (cf. Did., 7, 4; Just. Apol., I, 61). In the phrase *ἃ ἤκουσας ... διὰ πολλῶν μαρτύρων, ταῦτα παράθου* in 2 Tm. 2:2 there is again a reference to the fact that Timothy has received baptism (or possibly ordination) in the presence of many witnesses, and that the tradition, the *παραθήκη*, has been committed to him thereby. The *μάρτυς* is also a witness to an externally perceptible event in Hb. 12:1. After the long list of examples of faith in c. 11, the author proceeds in 12:1: *τοιγαροῦν καὶ ἡμεῖς, τοσοῦτον ἔχοντες περικείμενον ἡμῖν νέφος μαρτύρων, ὄγκον ἀποθέμενοι πάντα καὶ τὴν εὐπερίστατον ἁμαρτίαν, δι’ ὑπομονῆς τρέχουμεν τὸν προκείμενον ἡμῖν ἀγῶνα κτλ.* The readers are represented as runners who have entered the arena. They make ready to run by laying aside everything that would impede them. Around them on the stands are the packed ranks of spectators, the *νέφος μαρτύρων*, who with avid interest follow the course of the runners as eye-witnesses. The distinctive thing here is, of course, that this *νέφος μαρτύρων* consists of those who according to c. 11 have received witness (acknowledgment) from God because of their faith (*ἐμαρτυρήθησαν*, 11:2; cf. 11:4, 5, 39). As such, they bear witness by the very fact of their existence to the authenticity of faith. It thus seems that the factual witness is also implicitly a confessing witness. But the witness which a man receives is different from that which he gives. The movement from a passive “attested by reason of faith” to an active “witness to the validity of faith” is not intimated by the text itself. Without exact analysis one might easily presuppose here a technical use of *μάρτυς* which is certainly not present in Hb. One is forced to concede, however, that in 12:1 the term has a certain ambivalence in the light of c. 11.

b. The Special Lukan Use (Combination of Witness to Facts and Witness in the Sense of Evangelistic Confession).

In all the instances thus far adduced the use of *μάρτυς* remains within the framework of popular usage.

It is Luke’s usage in Lk. 24:48 and Ac. which takes us beyond this, but in such a way that here, too, the term first denotes one who declares facts directly known to himself. The facts in question, however, are the facts of the history of Jesus, especially His resurrection, which is treated by Luke as no less an objective fact than the passion. But witness cannot be borne to these facts unless their significance is also indicated and an emphatic appeal is made for their recognition in faith. This, too, is from God’s standpoint a fact. But it is a fact on a different level from that of the facts in the story of Jesus. It cannot be confirmed by witnesses; it can only be believed and then attested by proclamation. The distinctiveness of the object referred to in this witness implies also that the declaration of specific facts and the believing, confessing,

evangelising confession of their significance are indissolubly united in the concept of the witness. The witness to facts and the witness to truth are one and the same—the unavoidable result of the fact that the Gospel presents a historical revelation. But the fact that Luke applies the concept of the witness to the content of the Gospel is grounded in his marked concern to expound clearly the historical foundations of the evangelical message. At issue are, not doctrines, myths, or speculations, but facts which took place in the clear light of history at a specific time and place, facts which can be established and on which one can rely.<sup>53</sup> Hence one must speak of witnesses. Nor are these witnesses in general. They are those who are qualified to be witnesses because they themselves lived through the events. They were indeed specifically called to be such (Lk. 24:47; Ac. 1:8, 22–26). They were given the necessary equipment for their task (Lk. 24:48; Ac. 5:32). Herein may be seen Luke’s concept of, and interest in, the witness. This concept coincides with that of the apostle in the narrower sense, and, unless it undergoes reconstruction, it is equally bound to disappear as historical development proceeds.

All the essential elements are present already in the first and only instance in Lk., i.e., in the missionary command of the risen Lord to the eleven in Jerusalem (24:48). Jesus first shows that according to the statements of Scripture Christ had thus (i.e., as He did) to suffer and on the third day to rise again. He then says that on the basis of His name repentance for the remission of sins is to be proclaimed to all nations beginning at Jerusalem. In the last phrase the reference to scriptural statements becomes the missionary charge to the disciples. The addition ὑμεῖς μάρτυρες τούτων shows why the disciples are fitted for this task, and how they will discharge it. They are fitted because from experience they can bear witness to the factuality of the suffering and resurrection of Jesus, and also because they have grasped in faith the significance of Jesus, and can thus attest it. They discharge the task by proclaiming both the facts and their significance as they have grasped this in faith. Only thus does the *kerygma* become the *kerygma*. As special equipment they have the prospect of the Spirit whom the Father has promised and whom Jesus will send (v. 49).

What is intimated in Lk. is developed in Ac. The missionary charge to the apostolic band is repeated with the phrase ἔσεσθέ μου μάρτυρες (1:8). The primary thought is that they can and will proclaim from first-hand knowledge the story of Jesus (1:22; 10:39) and especially the fact of His resurrection (2:32; 3:15; 5:31 f.; 10:41). But in so doing they will always emphasise its saving significance (cf. esp. 10:42). It is at once apparent that this condition can be met only by a select circle whose members had the honour of personal encounter with the risen Lord (10:41; 1:22). These are μάρτυρες αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸν λαόν (13:31).

The latter quotation from Paul’s address in the synagogue at Pisidian Antioch is worth noting because here only the older apostles “who came up with him from Galilee to Jerusalem,” and by whom “he was seen many days,” are called μάρτυρες αὐτοῦ, whereas Paul uses of himself and Barnabas the word εὐαγγελίζεσθαι. The emphasis is, of course, that these are μάρτυρες αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸν λαόν (i.e., Israel in Palestine), whereas ἡμεῖς ὑμᾶς εὐαγγελιζόμεθα (in the Hellenistic world outside Palestine, though first in the Synagogue). Nevertheless, the choice of terms is no accident. It is controlled by the fact that μάρτυς could not be used of Paul (or Barnabas) in the sense in which it had thus far been used in Ac.

### c. The Incipient Separation of the Two Elements in Luke.

The more surprising it is, then, that the term is used of Paul in Ac. 22:15 and 26:16, and that Stephen, too, is called μάρτυς σου (of Jesus) in 22:20.

When Paul receives his sight back, Ananias tells him in 22:14 that God has foreordained him to know His will καὶ ἰδεῖν τὸν δίκαιον καὶ ἀκοῦσαι φωνὴν ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἔση

μάρτυς αὐτῷ πρὸς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὧν ἑώρακας καὶ ἤκουσας. In 26:16 Jesus Himself says to Paul on the Damascus road: εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ὄφθην σοι, προχειρίσασθαί σε ὑπηρέτην καὶ μάρτυρα ὧν τε εἶδές [με] ὧν τε ὀφθήσομαί σοι κτλ. In both passages the concept of the witness is applied to Paul's missionary work in the sense of the witness to facts, as in the case of the older apostles in the passages previously mentioned. But in this sense, in the sense of Ac. 1:22, he is not really a witness to facts. At best, he is this only with reference to the Damascus vision, and in both instances the concept is limited to this and to the visions which followed. But limited, or totally reorientated in this way, the concept is not very well adapted to characterise the content of Paul's missionary work. For the heart of this is the crucifixion, not the Damascus vision. Hence both passages must be regarded as an artificial and not wholly successful attempt to make applicable to Paul the concept of the factual witness which was so decisive for Luke in respect of the older apostles. Apart from the Damascus appearance, Paul could be described as a witness only in respect of the implied element of witness to the significance of the person and story of Jesus, i.e., in the sense of the confessing witness. That this is so may be seen in Ac. 22:15, for here (and here alone) we read ἔση μάρτυς αὐτῷ (for Christ) where one might have expected the genitive. Paul will bear witness for Him by expounding His significance and summoning to faith in Him. Naturally, an assertion of the factuality of the story of Jesus is contained in this witness. But the witness can no longer be called such because he can tell the story from his own experience. Paul is not a factual witness in the same sense as the older apostles. For he cannot guarantee the story of Christ from first-hand knowledge. He is, however, a witness to truth who seeks to propagate the Christian faith by confession. The result is that, when the term μάρτυς is applied to Paul, the second aspect begins to predominate over the first, whereas the reverse is true when the term is used of the older apostles. The two elements begin to separate, and this enables the term to survive when by the very nature of the case there are no more apostolic witnesses to the facts in the original sense.

A further step is taken when Stephen is called "thy witness" in Ac. 22:20. It is true that the phrase ἐξεχύννεται τὸ αἷμα Στεφάνου τοῦ μάρτυρός σου does not mean that here already we have the later ecclesiastical martyr concept. The genitive σου shows that we are still wholly in the sphere of the original sense. Stephen is not called a witness because he dies; he dies because he is a witness of Christ and because of his evangelistic activity. Nevertheless, there is no sense any more of the man who from first-hand knowledge can bear witness to the facts of Jesus' history. He is simply the confessional witness. All the apostles were, of course, confessional witnesses. But Stephen is called this in an emphatic and distinctive way because by suffering death he gave final proof of the seriousness of his confessional witness. His martyrdom underlies the fact, not that he is called μάρτυς, but that he is so in this emphatic way. To this degree the usage here prepares the ground for the later technical use in the Church. The fact of persecution rather than special ecstatic experiences of the martyrs led to the development of this specialised usage.

d. 1 Pt. 5:1.

A distinctive and equivocal use is to be found in the phrase μάρτυς τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθημάτων with which Peter in 1 Pt. 5:1 establishes the authority of his admonition to the elders of the community concerning the way in which they should discharge their office: πρεσβυτέρους ... παρακαλῶ ὁ συμπρεσβύτερος καὶ μάρτυς τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθημάτων. He can give the admonitions of 2f. because he has the same task as the presbyters, though in a wider circle, and yet at the same time he is μάρτυς τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθημάτων. At a first glance it might seem that Peter is here calling himself an eye-witness of the passion of Jesus in order to remind the presbyters of His exemplary attitude to suffering. But the continuation ὁ καὶ τῆς μελλούσης

ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι δόξης κοινωνός shows that the reference is to personal participation, including participation in Christ's sufferings, and not just to being there as an eye-witness (cf. the description of the sufferings of Christians in persecution as κοινωνεῖν τοῖς τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθήμασιν in 4:13). That the sufferings endured in persecution or in fulfilment of the missionary call should be thought of in this way is a common notion in the NT.<sup>59</sup> The expression also implies that Peter knew persecution, to whose patient and even joyful endurance he repeatedly summoned (1:6f.; 2:20; 3:14; 4:1, 12f.), from his own experience, so that he was well able to speak of it and of its meaning and blessing. He does not speak as a blind man speaks of colour when he gives directions as to the right attitude under pressure. He speaks as one who from his own life can say what is meant by the παθήματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ. There can here be no question of a technical martyrological sense, for Peter is still alive.

e. μάρτυς in the Johannine Writings.

Of the Johannine writings, only Rev. uses μάρτυς. In 2 of the 5 references Jesus Christ Himself is thus designated (1:5; 3:14). Of the others 11:3 refers to the two prophets who bear witness for 1260 days in Jerusalem, now doomed to be destroyed by the Gentiles, and who are then put to death by the beast. They are not witnesses because they are put to death, but by reason of their prophetic activity. Similarly Antipas in 2:13 is not a witness because he is put to death; he is put to death because he is a witness, i.e., in the sense of proclamation of the Gospel. Yet he is a faithful witness (emphatic) because he cannot be deflected from his witness by death. This gives us the clue to 17:6 where it is said that the woman is drunk ἐκ τοῦ αἵματος τῶν ἁγίων καὶ ἐκ τοῦ αἵματος τῶν μαρτύρων Ἰησοῦ. The term μάρτυρες cannot be taken here in the later martyrological sense because there is reference also to "martyred" saints. To note this is decisive for a true grasp of the concept of witness in Rev. Those who suffer death for their evangelistic witness are mentioned as well as those who are killed simply because of their faith. Not every committed Christian who dies for his faith is called μάρτυς. The name is reserved for those who are at work as evangelistic witnesses. There is no further place here for the idea of the witness to historical facts. The witness is now the one who persuasively declares the truth of the Gospel. But again not every one who does this is μάρτυς. The term is reserved for those who prove the final seriousness of their witness by suffering death. These are faithful witnesses, and only faithful witnesses are witnesses in the full sense, true witnesses. The concept of the witness in Rev. is the same as that of Ac. 22:20.

In this light one can truly see why Jesus Christ Himself is called ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστός in Rev. 1:5 and ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστός καὶ ἀληθινός in 3:14. The phrase is taken from ψ 88:37: ὁ μάρτυς ἐν οὐρανῷ πιστός. In the psalm it applies to God; here it has a Messianic reference. The sense may be seen from 1:1, 2. The revelation is the revelation of Jesus Christ, who simply passes on what He has received from God. Hence it is called μαρτυρία Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (1:2). This task He reliably fulfils. This is emphasised in the salutation (1:5) and at the beginning of the last letter (3:15), where it brings out the seriousness of the warning therein contained. But this does not exhaust the meaning of the term. Jesus Christ bears the title, not merely with reference to the revelation, but also more generally: I am born and have come into the world ἵνα μαρτυρήσω τῇ ἀληθείᾳ (Jn. 18:37). He showed Himself faithful to this calling by dying. In evaluating His designation as μάρτυς πιστός one cannot overlook the fact that the martyr Antipas bears the same title. The crucified Lord is the model of the Christian witness.

### 3. The Use of μαρτυρέω.

a. Of the Human Declaration of Facts.

μαρτυρεῖν denotes the activity of a μάρτυς. It is first used in the NT for the declaration or confirmation, on the basis of first-hand knowledge, of individual acts or general facts of experience, though it so happens that there is no special use for testifying in court. Cf. Mt. 23:31 (of the Pharisees, with reference to the cult of the graves of the prophets): μαρτυρεῖτε ἑαυτοῖς ὅτι υἱοὶ ἐστε τῶν φονευσάντων τοὺς προφῆτας. R. 10:2 (with reference to the Jews): μαρτυρῶ ... αὐτοῖς ὅτι ζῆλον θεοῦ ἔχουσιν. Gl. 4:15: μαρτυρῶ ... ὑμῖν, ὅτι εἰ δυνατόν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ὑμῶν ἐξορύξαντες ἐδώκατέ μοι. Cf. Col. 4:13 (of Eraphras): μαρτυρῶ ... αὐτῷ ὅτι ἔχει πολὺν πόνον ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν. 2 C. 8:3 (of the contributions of the Macedonian churches to the collection): γνωρίζομεν ... ὅτι κατὰ δύναμιν, μαρτυρῶ, καὶ παρὰ δύναμιν ... ἔδωκαν. 1 C. 15:15: ἐμαρτυρήσαμεν κατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ὅτι ἤγειρεν τὸν Χριστόν (i.e., if there is no resurrection of the dead, as some maintain in Corinth, and hence if Christ is not raised). Ac. 22:5: ὡς καὶ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς μαρτυρεῖ μοι καὶ πᾶν τὸ πρεσβυτέριον (that Paul has persecuted the Christian movement). Ac. 26:5: The Jews are προγινώσκοντές με ἄνωθεν, ἐὰν θέλωσι μαρτυρεῖν, ὅτι κατὰ τὴν ἀκριβεστάτην αἴρεσιν τῆς ἡμετέρας θρησκείας ἔζησα Φαρισαῖος. Jn. 2:25: Jesus did not need ἵνα τις μαρτυρήσῃ περὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου· αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐγίνωσκεν τί ἦν ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ. Jn. 3:28 (the Baptist): αὐτοὶ ὑμεῖς μοι μαρτυρεῖτε ὅτι εἶπον· οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγὼ ὁ χριστός. Jn. 18:23: The servant of the high-priest should say what is the κακόν in what Jesus said. Jn. 19:35: ὁ ἑωρακὼς μεμαρτύρηκεν (concerning the spear wound in the side of Jesus). Cf. also Jn. 4:39; 12:17. With reference to the future Jn. 13:21 (intimation of the treachery of Judas) and Rev. 22:18 (with reference to the threat which protects the book). As concerns a general fact of experience Jn. 4:44: Ἰησοῦς ἐμαρτύρησεν ὅτι προφήτης ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ πατρίδι τιμὴν οὐκ ἔχει.

b. Of the Good Report.

To this section belong all the verses in which μαρτυρεῖν is used in the abs. for “to give a good report,” whether actively with the dat. of the person to whom it applies (so Lk. 4:22; cf. also Ac. 13:22 and Hb. 11:4) or passively in the sense of receiving a good report (the seven in Ac. 6:3; Cornelius, 10:22; Timotheus, 16:2; Ananias, 22:12; with special grounds, the widow, who must be ἐν ἔργοις καλοῖς μαρτυρουμένη, 1 Tm. 5:10; cf. also 3 Jn. 3, 6, 12). For the meaning is always that on the basis of direct observation the nature or conduct of those concerned is said to be satisfactory and the one who judges is ready in some sense to vouch for it.

c. Of the Witness of God, the Spirit, or Scripture.

A special group is formed by passages in which God, the Spirit, or Scripture is the subject of such judgments (Ac. 13:22; 15:8; Hb. 11:2, 4, 5, 39) or guarantees the correctness of specific statements. Thus the term can often mean “to declare emphatically, on the guarantee of an existing authority”; cf. Hb. 7:8: μαρτυρούμενος ὅτι ζῆ (of Melchisedec); Hb. 7:17: μαρτυρεῖται ... ὅτι σὺ ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισέδεκ (of Christ in ψ 109:4); Hb. 10:15: μαρτυρεῖ δὲ ἡμῖν καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον (with reference to Jer. 31:33); R. 3:21: μαρτυρουμένη ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν (of the righteousness of God which is revealed without Law); Ac. 10:43 (τούτῳ πάντες οἱ προφῆται μαρτυροῦσιν, ἄφεςιν ἁμαρτιῶν λαβεῖν διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ πάντα τὸν πιστεύοντα εἰς αὐτόν). On the other hand, in Ac. 14:3 (παρρησιαζόμενοι ἐπὶ τῷ κυρίῳ τῷ μαρτυροῦντι τῷ λόγῳ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, διδόντι δημεῖα καὶ τέρατα γίνεσθαι ...) the thought is that the apostolic proclamation is supported by the factual divine witness of miracles, which confirm the truth of the Gospel (cf. Hb. 2:4).

d. Of Religious Witness.

The three last passages are distinguished from those which precede by the fact that here μαρτυρεῖν refers to the central content of the Gospel as such. Seen from the standpoint of faith this content is a fact. God has established it. But it is a fact of higher order which cannot be observed and attested like other facts of earthly occurrence. If the witness refers to this, it becomes the witness to revealed and believed truth. The factual witness in the popular sense becomes evangelistic confession. But where the whole life revolves around this centre, and the proclamation of this truth is the task which takes precedence of all else, the word becomes—almost, one might say, unavoidably—a technical term for this activity. It has this character in Ac. 23:11, where Paul in a night vision is given the direction: ὡς ... διεμαρτύρω τὰ περι ἑμοῦ εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, οὕτω δε δεῖ καὶ εἰς Ῥώμην μαρτυρῆσαι. Here we see how language is shaped by the actual forces of historical development.

e. The Special Use in the Johannine Writings.

The final sense leads us close to the Johannine use in the Gospel and the First Epistle, except that here the reference is solely to the figure of Jesus as such, to His person and significance. To be sure, the verb sometime occurs with no specific reference (cf. 2:25; 3:28; 4:39, 44; 12:17; 13:21; 18:23). The Johannine usage is given its distinctive colouring by the numerous passages which speak of witness to Jesus. This is not witness to the factuality of His history, though this is presupposed and even emphasised (1 Jn. 1:2; 4:14; Jn. 15:27; 21:24; also 3:11, in so far as the address of Jesus here actually becomes the preaching of the Evangelist). Nor is it witness to certain significant events in the story, whether His birth, death or resurrection, with the sole exception of 19:35. The witness is simply to the nature and significance of His person. Hence μαρτυρεῖν περὶ αὐτοῦ, 1:15; in the addresses of Jesus περὶ ἑμοῦ or περὶ ἑμαντοῦ, 5:31–39; 8:13–18; 10:25; 15:26; but 3:26 ᾧ σὺ μεμαρτύρηκας (of the Baptist). The content of this witness is ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, 1:34; hence His eternity, 1:15, or ὅτι ὁ πατήρ με ἀπέσταλκεν, 5:36f.; or ὅτι ὁ πατήρ ἀπέσταλκεν τὸν υἱὸν σωτήρα τοῦ κόσμου, 1 Jn. 4:14; or ὅτι ζωὴν αἰώνιον ἔδωκεν ὁ θεὸς ἡμῖν καὶ αὕτη ἡ ζωὴ ἐν τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ ἐστίν, 1 Jn. 5:10 f. If it is emphatically said of the Baptist that he himself is not the light, but has simply come ἵνα μαρτυρήσῃ περὶ τοῦ φωτός, the content of the witness is that Jesus, the incarnate Logos, is this light, the light of the world which Jesus attests Himself to be in 8:12, the light which is the light of life for those who believe in Him (1:7) or who follow Him (8:12). Because He is the incarnate Word, because He has come from heaven, when He speaks of God He bears witness to what He has seen and heard (cf. 3:32; cf. also 3:11). He is the truth (14:6) and thus to bear witness to it (5:33; 18:37) is to bear witness to Him (3:26) or about Him (5:32). For this is always to declare Him as the σωτήρ τοῦ κόσμου sent by God (4:42). This took place, and does take place, through the Scriptures (5:39), through the Baptist (1:7f., 15, 32, 34; 3:26; 5:33), through God (5:32, 37; 8:18), through the works which the Father causes Him to do (5:36; 10:25), through Jesus Himself, since in His divine mission He is in the Fourth Gospel the only theme of His addresses (5:31; 8:13 f., 18). It is only the reverse side of His self-witness that He testifies to the world which hates Him that its works are evil (7:7). When Jesus Himself no longer stays on earth, there follows the witness of the Spirit who is the Spirit of truth or simply the truth (15:26; 1 Jn. 5:6), and who especially in baptism and the Lord's Supper bears His witness to the Son of God as the One who gives eternal life (1 Jn. 5:5–11). For believers constantly have fresh experience of Him as such in the sacraments. Finally, the witness is given by the disciples themselves (15:27; 1 Jn. 4:14). Their witness is confession. μαρτυρεῖν and ὁμολογεῖν merge into one another (1 Jn. 4:14 f.).

The ref. in 1 Jn. 5:7 is to three who bear witness now (μαρτυροῦντες). Hence the water and blood of v. 8 can hardly be the baptism and death of Jesus (the latter is given a specific anti-gnostic

emphasis). They must surely refer to the sacraments observed by the community. Basically there is only one witness of the Spirit who gives inward assurance to believers. Only recollection of the legal rule (Dt. 17:6; 19:15; cf. Mt. 18:16; also Jn. 8:17) leads to the mention of three witnesses in v. 8. If the concepts of water and blood here undergo a change without any specific note to this effect, this corresponds to the Johannine love of an interrelated wealth of elastic terms. It is not impossible that there is even a ref. to the happening in Jn. 19:34 f., and that here, too, the two sacraments are in view. For the emphasis here on the witness to the truth of what took place shows how decisively important the event was for the Evangelist. Nor is there any wholly satisfying explanation of it apart from the relation suggested.

The author of Jn. and 1 Jn. certainly claims to have been a witness in the historical sense, i.e., an eye-witness to the historical Jesus. But in his view of the witness this is not so important as it is for Lk., namely, to prove the historicity of certain events. It is important in the much deeper sense of endowment with the possibility of receiving a direct impression of the δόξα of Jesus ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρὸς πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας, to which he is inescapably bound to testify. The man who is simply an eye-witness in the historical sense sees nothing of this δόξα. It is disclosed only to the believer (1 Jn. 5:9 f.). Nor is it disclosed merely to believers who were eye-witnesses in the historical sense, but to all believers. For ὁ πιστεύων εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ ἔχει τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἐν αὐτῷ, 1 Jn. 5:10. Hence new witnesses can arise, i.e., those who confess evangelistically who Jesus was and what He signified. With this clear and decisive development of the concept of the religious witness, and its separation from that of the historical witness, we are on the same line as that noted in respect of μάρτυς in Ac. 22:20 (Stephen) and Rev. 2:13; 11:3; 17:6. The only difference is that with the verb there is no discernible movement towards reserving the term for those witnesses who have suffered martyrdom as such.

Nor is there any such movement in Rev. Here μαρτυρεῖν occurs only 4 times, and it refers always to the contents of the book in so far as these are attested to the recipients by Jesus Christ (22:20) or by the divine (1:2; 22:16), apart from 22:18, where the divine, addressing “every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book,” bears witness to the threat by which it is protected.

f. 1 Tm. 6:13.

There is perhaps an intimation of the later use in the one verse not yet discussed, namely, 1 Tm. 6:13, where Timothy is admonished ἐνώπιον ... Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ μαρτυρήσαντος ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου τὴν καλὴν ὁμολογίαν. The good confession, an expression which seems to be chosen as a parallel to the preceding (baptismal?) profession of Timothy, is Jesus' acknowledgment of His Messianic mission which He made expressly, or by patiently suffering death as the Messiah, or by both. The fact that the verb μαρτυρεῖν is used for this confession of the passion (rather than the ὁμολογεῖν used for Timothy's profession in v. 12), is worth noting, and reminds us of what was said at the end of a.

#### 4. The Use of μαρτυρία.

##### a. μαρτυρία outside the Johannine Writings.

μαρτυρία occurs in the NT only 7 times outside the Johannine writings, where it is found 30 times. Of the 7, 6 are religiously neutral. In 4 instances the term is court witness to facts, i.e., the witness for the prosecution in the trial of Jesus (Mk. 14:55, 56, 59; Lk. 22:71), cf. → 489. Once it is a good report; in 1 Tm. 3:7 it is said of the bishop that he must μαρτυρίαν καλὴν ἔχειν ἀπὸ τῶν ἑξῶθεν; cf. → 496. Once it refers to a quotation from the poets: Tt. 1:13: ἡ μαρτυρία αὐτῆ

ἐστὶν ἀληθής, with ref. to a verse of Epimenides concerning the moral worthlessness of the Cretans, cf. → 479. The term has a specific religious and Christian reference only at Ac. 22:18. Praying in the temple, Paul sees in an ἔκστασις the heavenly Christ who commands him to leave Jerusalem quickly διότι οὐ παραδέξονται σου μαρτυρίαν περι ἑμοῦ, cf. → 493. μαρτυρία here is evangelistic witness for the faith, and Christ is its content.

b. μαρτυρία in the Johannine Writings.

It is the more surprising, then, that the specific religious and Christian ref. completely dominates the usage in the Johannine writings. It is true that in Jn. 8:17 μαρτυρία means human witness on the basis of Dt. 17:6; 19:15. In 3 Jn. 12 it means the witness of a good Christian report in the case of Demetrius. The first μαρτυρία in 1 Jn. 5:9: εἰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων λαμβάνομεν, possibly carries with it a reminiscence of the Dt. passages, which is certainly present in v. 8. This would forge a link with the second μαρτυρία, the witness which men give one another.

The other passages (27) are dominated by the specific sense of the evangelistic witness to Christ's nature and significance which aims at faith. This is in keeping with the Johannine use of → μαρτυρεῖν. Corresponding to the fundamental meaning in accordance with the formation of the word (→ A.), μαρτυρία is twice used in the active sense of bearing witness (Jn. 1:7: John ἦλθεν εἰς μαρτυρίαν, ἵνα μαρτυρήσῃ, and Rev. 11:7 of the two prophetic witnesses: ὅταν τελέσωσιν τὴν μαρτυρίαν αὐτῶν). Elsewhere it has the passive sense of the witness given. It is given by the Baptist (1:19), by Jesus Himself (3:11, 32, 33; 8:13f., which is not in contradiction to 5:31, since here only autonomous self-witness is repudiated), by God through the works which He causes Jesus to do (5:32, 36), by the Evangelist, whose whole book is called a μαρτυρία (21:24), not merely or primarily in the sense of external historical attestation but in the sense of witness to what faith has come to know of Jesus. In 19:35, with its reference to the thrust of the spear in Jesus' side and, the blood and water which flow from it, it is stated with solemn emphasis: ὁ ἑωρακὼς μεμαρτύρηκεν, καὶ ἀληθινὴ αὐτοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία. The obvious point at issue here is not the historical attestation of a remarkable event but the witness to an event which intimates the saving efficacy of the death of Jesus and which is attested by a believer "that ye might believe."

In 1 Jn. 5:9–11, too, the reference is to God's witness to His Son. The content of this witness is ὅτι ζωὴν αἰώνιον ἔδωκεν ὁ θεὸς ἡμῖν καὶ αὕτη ἡ ζωὴ ἐν τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ ἐστὶν. According to the context this witness of God is identical with the witness of the Spirit referred to just before in v. 6f. The distinctive phrase in v. 10a (ὁ πιστεύων εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ ἔχει τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἐν αὐτῷ) shows that this witness of the Spirit is the *testimonium spiritus sancti internum* in virtue of which man may be sure of the content of the divine μαρτυρία.

The expression "to have the witness" leads to Rev., where it occurs more than once (6:9; 12:17; 19:10). But the most striking feature in Rev. is the phrase ἡ μαρτυρία Ἰησοῦ or Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, which is found in 6 of the 9 occurrences (1:2, 9; 12:17; 19:10 twice; 20:4), cf. also 6:9. The gen. is a subj. gen. Only twice is there reference to human witness (11:7; 12:11). In many cases the λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ (1:2, 9; 6:9; 20:4) or ἐντολαὶ τοῦ θεοῦ (12:17) are closely related to the μαρτυρία Ἰησοῦ, so that we have a twofold expression. The combination is not to be construed as referring to the OT on the one hand and the Christian message on the other. We have rather a "plerophoric expression for the Christian revelation in general."<sup>68</sup> The Word of God and the witness of Jesus Christ are inseparably interwoven.

In 1:2 there is a special reference to the contents of the book. God has given these to Jesus Christ, who has then showed them as His witness to John. The difficult 19:10c is perhaps to be

taken in the same way. Here the angel of revelation forbids the self-prostration of the seer because he is only a fellow-servant with him and with his brothers who have the μαρτυρία Ἰησοῦ. The angel or the author—we need not go into this question here—then adds: ἡ γὰρ μαρτυρία Ἰησοῦ ἐστὶν τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς προφητείας (v. 10c). According to the parallel 22:9 the brothers referred to are not believers in general but the prophets. Here, too, they are characterised as such. This is the point of v. 10c. If they have the μαρτυρία Ἰησοῦ, they have the spirit of prophecy, i.e., they are prophets, and as such they stand alongside the divine, who is himself a prophet, like the angel, who simply stands in the service of the μαρτυρία Ἰησοῦ (cf. 1:1). This is why the angel is their σύνδουλος. For as the mediators of what God seeks to impart the prophets are His δοῦλοι in a special sense, cf. 1:1; 10:7; 11:18; 22:3; also 19:2 and perhaps 2:20. The μαρτυρία Ἰησοῦ is the witness which they have, not as Christians, but as Christian prophets. They have it, not as a secure possession, but as a task, i.e., in order that they may pass it on, as John himself attests the witness of Jesus. This is why they are prophets. This is also what is indicated by the phrase ἔχειν τὴν μαρτυρίαν. The reference is to a special obligation resting on them. The idea of martyrdom does not arise.

In the other verses, however, μαρτυρία Ἰησοῦ refers to the Christian revelation in general. This is particularly true of 1:9. For the reference can be only to the banishment of John to Patmos, which took place “for the word of God and the witness of Jesus,” i.e., to prevent their further proclamation. This is also the meaning in 12:17 and 20:4, also in 6:9, where we do not have the genitive Ἰησοῦ (Χριστοῦ). Because of this witness the martyrs are slain (6:9) or beheaded (20:4), and according to 12:17 the dragon fights against them because they have this witness. One might think that this phrase, which occurs in 6:9, would simply denote Christians. But this does not seem to be so. In 6:9 the cry for vengeance is uttered by the souls of those who are slain διὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ διὰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν (sc. Ἰησοῦ). They are comforted “until their fellow-servants also and their brethren, that should be killed as they were, should be fulfilled.” There is a distinction between the fellow-servants and the brethren. The latter are Christians in general. The former are servants in the same special sense as those who cry. They thus have a special task, which is naturally to proclaim the μαρτυρία Ἰησοῦ. The phrase ἔχειν τὴν μαρτυρίαν again seems to be designed to express this. Things are much the same in 20:4, where those who are beheaded for the witness of Jesus and the Word of God are accompanied by those who have not worshipped the beast or his image nor accepted his mark on their foreheads and hands. Only in 12:17 does ἔχειν τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ seem to refer to Christians in general. For the formula οἱ τηροῦντες τὰς ἐντολὰς τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἔχοντες τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ is comprised under one article and relates to the total remnant of the seed of the woman.

In view of the statements of John’s Gospel about the self-witness of Jesus, it is not surprising that occasionally in Rev. the Christian message of salvation should be called μαρτυρία Ἰησοῦ, perhaps in combination with λόγος or ἐντολαὶ τοῦ θεοῦ. Nevertheless the phrase is a remarkable one. For it involves the isolation of one expression which in the Gospel occurs with others (witness of the Baptist, of God). This expression alone is made a formula for the Gospel. This is possibly linked with the fact that the divine reserves the term → μάρτυς for those who have confirmed their witness by their death. It is also linked with the fact that Jesus, like Antipas, is from this standpoint given the title “faithful witness.” In the expression μαρτυρία Ἰησοῦ there is a reminiscence of the passion of Jesus, cf. 1 Tm. 6:13. Under the impress of the current experience of the Church, μαρτυρία, like μάρτυς, takes on an affinity to the instances where death proved the final seriousness of the witness and his witness. The term begins to acquire a martyrological nuance. This may be seen in the phrase ἔχειν τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ. For this is

used always of those who have suffered death or are in the total situation of martyrdom. Even in 11:7, which speaks of the μαρτυρία of the two prophets in Jerusalem, the term naturally means oral witness. But it is used of those who seal their witness with their death. In 12:11 the martyrological orientation of the word seems to be even plainer. After the victory of Michael and his angelic hosts over the dragon there is heavenly jubilation that “the accuser of our brethren is cast down.” “And they overcame him διὰ τὸ αἷμα τοῦ ἀρνίου καὶ διὰ τὸν λόγον τῆς μαρτυρίας αὐτῶν, by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony,”<sup>72</sup> i.e., the word which they attest, or rather, since they have given their lives, attested. Now here, too, the term means evangelistic confession of Jesus rather than the testimony of blood. Nevertheless, it is used of a confession which culminates in the sacrifice of life.

The results of this investigation of the terms μάρτυς, μαρτυρεῖν, μαρτυρία overlap and support one another. What we find in the Johannine writings, especially Rev., but also in some verses in Ac., forms a preliminary step towards the martyrological concept of the witness (μάρτυς == martyr) which emerged at once in the early Church.

## 5. The Use of μαρτύριον.

### a. Occurrence.

This word (used 20 times) is less common than μάρτυς, μαρτυρεῖν and μαρτυρία. It is not found at all in the Johannine writings except at Rev. 15:5, where the OT ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ μαρτυρίου is adopted with ref. to the heavenly temple, cf. Ac. 7:44. Of the other 18 instances half are in the Synoptists (Mk. 1:44 par. Mt. 8:4; Lk. 5:14; Mk. 6:11 par. Lk. 9:5; Mt. 10:18 and 24:14 par. Mk. 13:9; Lk. 21:13; in fact there are thus only three references).

### b. Use in the Sense of Witness for the Prosecution.

In respect of the use and meaning, our starting-point must be the fact that, unlike μαρτυρία, μαρτύριον does not mean the process of giving testimony. Even in witness we are to think less of the content than of the fact that the objective testimony, whether it be an object, act or utterance, is primarily a means of proof. This is everywhere apparent in the NT, where the phrase εἰς μαρτύριον is used with the dat. of the person for whom the witness is significant, usually as witness against him. This sense is apparent already in the OT use, cf. Gn. 31:44; Dt. 31:26; Jos. 24:27. In the NT it is plainly the meaning in Jm. 5:3: the rust on the gold and silver of the rich εἰς μαρτύριον ὑμῶν ἔσται καὶ φάγεται τὰς σάρκας ὑμῶν ὡς πῦρ. They would rather let their possessions rot than use them in works of mercy. Thus the rust on their gold will be a witness for the prosecution against them on the day of judgment. Mk. 6:11 is to be construed in the same way. Where the disciples are not accepted with their message, they are to leave the place and to shake off the dust from their feet εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς (correctly expounded in Lk. 9:5 as εἰς μαρτύριον ἐπ’ αὐτούς). The fact that they leave their hearers with this gesture will be a witness against their resistance and unbelief on the day of judgment. The direction which Jesus gives the cleansed leper that he should show himself to the priest and bring the prescribed offerings εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς (Mk. 1:44 par.) could be taken in the same way.<sup>75</sup> If the cleansing is confirmed by the priest, this will be a severe indictment of the unbelief in which the people (αὐτοῖς) lingers still. The passage is to be expounded in terms of Mt. 11:20–24. Also to be taken in this sense are Mk. 13:9 and the par. Mt. 10:18, also 24:14, though Lk. 21:13 stands apart. In Mk. 13:9; Mt. 10:18 it is envisaged that for Jesus’ sake the disciples will be brought before the local Jewish courts, whipped in the synagogues, and arraigned before rulers and kings εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς

(Mk.) or αὐτοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν (Mt.). The αὐτοί here seem to be the Jews in contrast to the Gentiles represented by the rulers and kings. According to the context the μαρτύριον cannot be the evangelistic witness of missionary preaching, which offers the chance of conversion. The goal of this witness is to make opponents guilty. In Mt. 24:14: “This gospel of the kingdom must be preached in all the world εἰς μαρτύριον πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, it is apparent from v. 9 (ἔσεσθε μισούμενοι ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου) that the reference is to the witness which makes the Gentiles guilty. Hence we cannot translate: “That they may be given a chance to believe.” Only Lk. gives a different turn to the saying with his ἀποβήσεται ὑμῖν εἰς μαρτύριον (21:13). This means, not martyrdom in the later sense, but the opportunity which the disciples are given of making their witness. As always in Lk., the alteration is a thoughtful one, and is designed to form a transition to the ensuing promise that Jesus will help them at the trials. Their witness will thus be of irresistible power (v. 15), so that they will emerge unscathed from the most dangerous situations (v. 18f.).

#### c. Witness to Something.

The small alteration here made by Lk. is important because it introduces us to another circle in which μαρτύριον is not witness as a means of proof but witness to something, occasionally in an active sense. The genitive used with it denotes either the subject (τὸ μαρτύριον τῆς συνειδήσεως ἡμῶν, 2 C. 1:12; τὸ μαρτύριον ἡμῶν, 2 Th. 1:10) or the object to which the statement relates (τὸ μαρτύριον ... τῆς ἀναστάσεως, Ac. 4:33; τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ, 1 C. 1:6; τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ θεοῦ, 1 C. 2:1, unless we are to read τὸ μυστήριον here; τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ κυρίου, 2 Tm. 1:8). μαρτύριον is here synonymous with εὐαγγέλιον, κήρυγμα, or διδασκαλία. The same is true of the designation of the Christian message as τὸ μαρτύριον καιροῖς ἰδίους 1 Tm. 2:6.

#### d. Witness in the Active Sense.

μαρτύριον takes on the active sense of attestation in Hb. 3:5. Moses was faithful in all his house as a servant εἰς μαρτύριον τῶν λαληθησομένων, i.e., the directions, especially the legal statutes, which he receives from God in the tabernacle and is then to attest to the people. This active use is contrary to Greek sensibility and is to be explained by the σκηνὴ τοῦ μαρτυρίου of the LXX, → 485.

In clear distinction from μάρτυς, μαρτυρεῖν, μαρτυρία, there is in the NT no trace of any inclination to develop the use of μαρτύριον in the direction of the Church's martyrological usage in the 2nd century (cf. Mart. Pol., 1, 1; 2, 1; 18, 2; 19, 1).

## **F. The Development and Establishment of the Specific Martyrological Use in the Early Church.**

### 1. Review.

In the 2nd century the impulses found in the NT, especially in the Johannine writings, are carried a stage further. Like the beginnings, the development was due to the persecutions which fell on the Christian community. As is only natural, the popular use with its various meanings lived on.<sup>82</sup> So, too, did the older specifically Christian use for verbal evangelistic witness to the truth of the Gospel. The only thing to fade was recollection that the reference was originally to those who were specifically charged to give this witness, or who did in fact give it. The terms are now applied to those who, even if only on occasion, bear witness under threat, for only this is regarded as full witness. Hence the distinction between ὁμολογεῖν and μαρτυρεῖν disappears, as

may be seen especially in the accounts of the South Gaul martyrdoms in Eus. Hist. Eccl., V, 1, where the two terms are fully interchangeable. But they also draw apart, for the term witness is reserved for those who seal the seriousness of their witness or confession by death, and it becomes a *tt.* in this sense.

## 2. The Usage.

Whether μαρτυρεῖν is used in this martyrological sense in 1 Cl., 5, 4 and 7 is open to debate. As an example of a ἕως θανάτου ἀθλεῖν (5, 2) Peter is first mentioned, ὃς ... οὐχ ἓνα οὐδὲ δύο ἀλλὰ πλείονας ὑπήνεγκε πόνους καὶ οὕτω μαρτυρήσας ἐπορεύθη εἰς τὸν ὀφειλόμενον τόπον τῆς δόξης (5, 4). It is said of Paul that he δικαιοσύνην διδάξας ὅλον τὸν κόσμον, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ τέλος τῆς δύσεως ἐλθὼν καὶ μαρτυρήσας ἐπὶ τῶν ἡγουμένων, οὕτως ἀπηλλάγη τοῦ κόσμου (5, 7). In the first verse there has been no mention of Peter's preaching, only of his sufferings. Hence it seems to be said that he suffered a martyr's death. But in what is said about Paul the μαρτυρεῖν seems to refer to his preaching, though this is, of course, the preaching of one who died for the sake of his ministry. The usage is thus fluid. To reserve judgment on this epistle, which comes from the Roman church, is particularly appropriate when one recalls that the Shepherd of Hermas, which also comes from Rome, obviously does not show acquaintance with the technical use of μάρτυς etc. Hermas mentions martyrs, and is vitally concerned about their ecclesiastical rank and heavenly reward, cf. esp. s., 9, 28; v., 3, 1, 9; 2, 1; 5, 2. But his regular term for them is οἱ παθόντες διὰ τὸ ὄνομα or εἵνεκα τοῦ ὀνόματος. No less surprising is the complete lack of any martyrological use of the word group in Ignatius. Ignatius is full of the idea of martyrdom. The content associated with the idea is richly developed by him. He is an imitator, a bearer of Christ. As one who goes to martyrdom, he is on the point of becoming a true disciple of Christ. But nowhere do we find μάρτυς, μαρτυρεῖν etc. He shows no acquaintance whatever with the later use. The same is also true of Justin, who does not use the terms either.

The first work to have all four words μάρτυς κτλ. in the fixed martyrological sense is the Martyrdom of Polycarp written just after Polycarp's death (Feb. 23, 155) by the church of Smyrna to tell the church of Philomelium about it, cf. Mart. Pol., 19, 1: ... Πολύκαρπον, ὃς σὺν τοῖς ἀπὸ φιλαδελφίας δωδέκατος ἐν Σμύρνη μαρτυρήσας ... οὐ μόνον διδάσκαλος γενόμενος ἐπίσημος, ἀλλὰ καὶ μάρτυς ἕξοχος, οὗ τὸ μαρτύριον πάντες ἐπιθυμοῦσιν μιμεῖσθαι κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον Χριστοῦ γενόμενον, and 13, 2: παντὶ ... καλῶ πρὸς τῆς μαρτυρίας ἐκεκόσμητο. Cf. also μάρτυς in 2, 2; 14, 2; 15, 2; 16, 2; 17, 3; μαρτυρεῖν in 1, 1; 21, 1; 22, 1; epil. 3; μαρτυρία in 1, 1; μαρτύριον in 1, 1; 2, 1; 18, 3. It may also be noted that a little later Melito of Sardis in his work Περὶ τοῦ πάσχα uses the simple ἐμαρτύρησεν when telling of the martyrdom of Bishop Sagaris (Eus. Hist. Eccl., IV, 26, 3), and that a little later still Polycrates of Ephesus, in his letter to Victor of Rome about the paschal question, uses what is almost the fixed double formula ἐπίσκοπος καὶ μάρτυς for the bishops Polycarp of Smyrna, Thraseas of Eumencia and the above Sagaris.

Thus in the church at Smyrna, and, one might say, in the church throughout Asia Minor, we find a fixed and technical martyrological use of the terms by the middle of the second century. We find this use, then, in the area which was the home of Rev., in which the first clear steps are taken towards such a development. Elsewhere at this time no traces of the later concept are to be found. One may conclude that the sphere in which the martyr concept developed was the church in Asia Minor.

We also find the beginnings of a use of the term witness for those who confess at the risk of their lives but without suffering death. Thus acc. to Hegesippus the descendants of Jude, the brother of Jesus, who were haled before Domitian but escaped free and later played a leading role in the Palestinian church, are called μάρτυρες (Eus. Hist. Eccl., III, 20, 6; 32, 6). Hippolytus also uses the

word for those who had to do forced labour in the Sardinian mines and who were later liberated (Philos., IX, 12, 10 and 11). He also speaks of the μαρτυρεῖν and μαρτυρία of that dubious Christian the later Pope Calixtus, who had temporarily done forced labour in Sardinia (§ 4). In a letter of Serapion of Antioch there is ref. to a bishop who signed himself Ἀὐρήλιος Κυρίνιος μάρτυς (Eus. Hist. Eccl., V, 19, 3). In Eus. Hist. Eccl., V, 18, 5 f. there is a Montanist leader Themison, ὁ μὴ βαστάσας τῆς ὁμολογίας τὸ σημεῖον, who purchased his freedom by a big money payment, and also an Alexander, both of whom called themselves witnesses and were honoured as such by their followers.

The usage is only occasional. But it spread rapidly. It is found in the Acts of Justin (c. 6: οἱ ἅγιοι μάρτυρες ... ἐτελείωσαν τὸ μαρτύριον ἐν τῇ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ὁμολογίᾳ). Dionysius of Corinth in his letter to Rome wrote that Peter and Paul εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν ὁμόσε διδάξαντες ἐμαρτύρησαν κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρὸν (Eus. Hist. Eccl., II, 25, 8). He obviously took the μαρτυρεῖν of 1 Cl., 5, 4 and 7 in the sense of martyrdom. Hegesippus uses μαρτυρεῖν in this sense of the martyrdom of Simon, son of Cleopas, in the time of Trajan (Eus. Hist. Eccl., III, 32, 3), and esp. of the death of the Lord's brother, James. After being thrown from the top of the temple and stoned, James received a blow on the head from a fuller: καὶ οὕτως ἐμαρτύρησεν, Eus. Hist. Eccl., II, 23, 18; cf. also μετὰ τὸ μαρτυρῆσαι Ἰάκωβον τὸν δίκαιον, ὡς καὶ ὁ κύριος, IV, 22, 4. But μαρτυρεῖν is also used by Hegesippus in the ordinary sense (μαρτυροῦμέν σοι καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ὅτι δίκαιος εἶ, II, 23, 10), and μαρτυρία can mean oral witness to the faith, II, 23, 14, cf. 23, 2. Both ideas are combined at the end of the account: μάρτυς οὗτος ἀληθῆς Ἰουδαίους τε καὶ Ἑλλησιν γεγένηται ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς ἐστίν (23, 18). His oral witness is consummated in his death. Both are one act. He is thus a μάρτυς in the full sense. But the ὅτι clause shows that μάρτυς needed to be filled out in content.

Particularly instructive is the account of the persecution in S. Gaul at the time of Marcus Aurelius (Eus. Hist. Eccl., V, 1 f.), esp. because here for the first time we find the distinction between ὁμολογοῦντες and μάρτυρες which later carried the field, and the title μάρτυς or ἡ τῆς μαρτυρίας προσήγορία is reserved for Christ Himself and for those οὓς ἐν τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ Χριστὸς ἠξίωσεν ἀναληφθῆναι, ἐπισφραγισάμενος αὐτῶν διὰ τῆς ἐξόδου τὴν μαρτυρίαν (V, 2, 3). The Christians there, for all the terrible tortures they have already had to suffer—οὐχ ἅπαξ οὐδὲ δις ἀλλὰ πολλάκις μαρτυρήσαντες, says the account (V, 2, 2)—refused to be called martyrs by their fellow-believers until they were perfected; they were only ὁμολογοῦντες μέτριοι καὶ ταπεινοί. The account itself, of course, is not so strict in its usage. If it says of those condemned to death προσετίθεντο τῷ τῶν μαρτύρων κλήρῳ etc. (V, 1, 26 and 48), it can already call the living μάρτυρες in so far as they have had to suffer torments for their confession. What is usually ὁμολογία can also be called τὴν καλὴν μαρτυρίαν (V, 1, 30). It speaks of the repeated μαρτυρεῖν of the same persons (V, 2, 2). It even says of Attalos that he αἰεὶ μάρτυς ἐγγένοι παρ' ἡμῶν ἀληθείας (V, 1, 43), using the term in the older sense of evangelistic witness. But these are echoes of a less developed and earlier use. Such echoes never die away altogether. We also find spiritualisations, esp. in Cl. Al., cf. Strom., IV. But in the strict sense martyrs are now only those put to death for their faith: κύριως μόνους μάρτυρας ὠνόμασαν τοὺς τῇ ἐκχύσει τοῦ ἑαυτῶν αἵματος μαρτυρήσαντας τῷ τῆς θεοσεβείας μυστηρίῳ (Orig. Comm. in Joh., 2, 210). For as the prophets are perfect (τέλειοι) in prophecy, so οἱ μάρτυρες ἐν ὁμολογίᾳ (Cl. Al. Strom., IV, 21, 133, 1). The content and the current relation of μαρτυρεῖν and ὁμολογεῖν are correctly stated in this observation. Those not yet condemned are, in Tertullian's phrase (Mart., 1), *martyres designati*. The strict sense of witness is only a distant echo in this technical Christian use. The word has acquired a new sense. This is why the Latin speaking church took over the Greek term instead of translating it (by *testis*).

It remains only to note that μαρτύριον, in accordance with its objective trend, was often used later for the place where a martyr was buried or his remains were to be found, cf. P. Oxy., VI, 941, 4 (6th cent. A.D.): ἀντίς τοῦ μαρτυρίου, over against the altar of the martyr.

### 3. Understanding.

The new concept which arose in this way naturally associated itself at once with ideas which had been long in preparation. The Christian who goes forward to martyrdom does not wrestle with flesh and blood. Those who torture him or try to make him recant are agents of the devil. He stands in an ἀγών with this great foe. The conflict with the Egyptian (Egypt is the land of devilish magic) finds particularly graphic description in a vision in the Martyrdom of Perpetua and her companions, c. 10.<sup>88</sup> In this struggle Christians imitate Christ. They also continue His sufferings. Indeed, He Himself fights in them and stands at their side. They are supported by Him and by the Spirit. They are thus enabled to endure without a murmur, and even with a smile, the most terrible torments. In not a few cases they have the privilege of seeing the δόξα κυρίου. They are prepared, encouraged and strengthened by visions and heavenly voices. As they suffer, they are in transition to the heavenly state, μηκέτι ἄνθρωποι, ἀλλ' ἤδη ἄγγελοι (Mart. Pol., 2, 3). It is little wonder that when their bodies are consumed by the flames there comes from them a divine savour. If they are perfected, they go directly to heavenly glory.

These ideas are found very clearly in the older martyrdoms, e.g., of Polycarp, Justin, Perpetua, and the S. Gaul martyrs, though not every trait is present in all of them. The basic elements, namely, the conflict with Satan, the imitation and extension of the sufferings of Christ, His mysterious support, the infilling of power and joy, are fully developed in the epistles of Ignatius. All the decisive points go back to ideas found in the NT itself.<sup>90</sup> Thus disciples who are persecuted for the sake of Christ are called blessed in Mt. 5:11 f. The support of the Spirit is promised to those brought before courts in Mt. 10:17 ff. The promise of life is given to those who offer up their lives in Mt. 16:24 ff. Here and in the eschatological discourses the Gospel tradition offers a wealth of motifs which come together at this point. The note in Ac. 5:41 (they rejoiced because they κατηξιώθησαν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος ἀτιμασθῆναι) breathes the whole mood of martyrdom, not to mention the death of Stephen. To Paul the sufferings which he endures in his missionary work seem to be an ἀνταναπληροῦν of the ὑστερήματα τῶν θλίψεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ (Col. 1:24). This thought determines his whole view of his missionary sufferings. As such, they are sufferings in the service of Christ. The joyous mood of martyrdom is also expressed in Rom. 5:3 and 8:17. In 1 Pt. those who are persecuted are summoned to joy at κοινωνεῖν τοῖς τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθήμασιν (4:13) and exhorted to ἐπακολουθεῖν τοῖς ἴχνεσιν αὐτοῦ, namely, those of the Christ who suffered for others (2:21ff.). Before the eyes of the seer in Rev. stands Christ, the Lamb slain, the original martyr, the faithful witness κατ' ἐξοχήν. In the NT, however, these elements are not yet firmly associated with the concept of the martyr. They cannot be, for the development of the martyrological sense is only a consequence of the martyrdom experienced by the Church. When it arose, this sense necessarily assimilated all the other ideas, and it thus had new implications (e.g., in respect of merits) which it is beyond the scope of this dictionary to pursue.

### † ἐπιμαρτυρέω, † συμμαρτυρέω, † συνεπιμαρτυρέω, † καταμαρτυρέω.

The meaning of these compounds is closely related to the popular sense of μαρτυρεῖν (→ μάρτυς B. 2 and 3).

ἐπιμαρτυρεῖν (Plat., Plut., Lucian, Joseph., very occasionally pap.) is not found in the LXX at all.

ἐπιμαρτυρεῖν occurs in the NT only at 1 Pt. 5:12. It mean "to attest (a preceding assertion)," not just "to attest emphatically" (cf. P. Lond., 1692a, 19 [6th cent. A.D.]: τῶν δεῖνα ἐπιμαρτυροῦντων). The ἐπι- simply strengthens an element in the μαρτυρεῖν. But ἐπιμαρτυρεῖν

can also mean “to affirm,” “to agree,” and it can be used of the protestation, not of a fact, but of a view or opinion, so that the basic sense of μαρτυρεῖν is lost, cf. Ep. Ar., 197: ἐπιμαρτυρήσας δὲ τούτοις, where ἐπιμαρτυρεῖν means the same as the preceding ἐπιφωνεῖν, ἐπαινεῖν, ἀποδέχεσθαι. There can be no question here of a witness or proof in the strict sense. This may be explained in terms of what was said in → μάρτυς B. 2. In 1 Pt. 5:12 what is attested is stated in the ensuing acc. c. inf.

συμμαρτυρεῖν is a common compound (Soph., Eur., Isocr., Xenoph., Plut., pap.) which does not occur in the LXX and is used in the NT only at R. 2:15; 8:16; 9:1. It first means “to bear witness with,” “to attest or confirm something as one witness along with another or several others.” It has this sense in, e.g., BGU, I, 86, 40 ff. (2nd cent. A.D.), where a list of witnesses is linked with the first witness by a συμμαρτιρῶ (or συμμαρτυρῶ) καὶ συνσφραγιῶ (*sic*); cf. also Plut. Comparatio Thesei c. Romulo, 6, 5 and 7 (I, 39b) ὁ χρόνος ἐστὶ μάρτυς ... τῷ δὲ τοσοῦτῳ χρόνῳ συμμαρτυρεῖ καὶ τὰ ἔργα. But then recollection of the basic meaning fades, and συμμαρτυρεῖν simply means “to confirm” (i.e., the statement of another of any kind, whether about a fact or an opinion), or, with the dat., “to agree.” Cf. Plat. Hi., I, 282b: συμμαρτυρήσαι δέ σοι ἔχω ὅτι ἀληθῆ λέγεις, “I must agree with you that you are right” (i.e., with the view expressed). Xenoph. Hist. Graec., VII, 1, 35: ἔλεγε δὲ ὁ Πελοπίδας ὅτι ... συνεμαρτύρει δ’ αὐτῷ ταῦτα πάντα ὡς ἀληθῆ λέγοι ὁ Ἀθηναῖος Τιμαγόρας, Timagoras confirms the account of Pelopidas. With ref. only to a belief, without mentioning who held it, Plut. Quaest. Conv., VIII, 4, 4 (II, 724c/d): σκύλων δὲ Πυθοῖ καὶ ἀκροθινίων καὶ τροπαίων ἀναθέσεις ἄρα οὐ συμμαρτυροῦσιν ὅτι τῆς εἰς τὸ νικᾶν καὶ κρατεῖν δυνάμεως τῷ θεῷ τούτῳ πλεῖστον μέτεστιν, the votive offerings confirm the opinion of faith that God will help to victory. “Distinction between the two meanings to testify with and to confirm alone does justice to the usage; συμμαρτυρεῖν never denotes, like μαρτυρεῖν, purely authoritative assertion, but always confirmation.”

Our starting-point now must be the three passages in Romans. 2:15: οἵτινες ἐνδεικνύονται τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου γραπτὸν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν (by their actual conduct, v. 14), συμμαρτυροῦσης αὐτῶν τῆς συνειδήσεως. Conscience confirms the ἐνδειξις of the actual conduct of the Gentiles (that they ἑαυτοῖς εἰσιν νόμος, or that the works demanded by the Law are written on their hearts). The constant impulses of the living moral consciousness have independent significance along with the individual acts performed. Similarly, R. 9:1: ἀλήθειαν λέγω ἐν Χριστῷ, οὐ ψεύδομαι, συμμαρτυροῦσης μοι τῆς συνειδήσεώς μου ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ. The judgment of Paul’s conscience as directed by the Holy Spirit accompanies and confirms the statement which he has made or begun to make. It is really true that the unbelief of Israel is a great burden to the apostle. In R. 8:16: αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα συμμαρτυρεῖ τῷ πνεύματι ἡμῶν ὅτι ἐσμὲν τέκνα θεοῦ, the divine → πνεῦμα confirms what τὸ πνεῦμα ἡμῶν already says, namely, that we Christians are the children of God. The first πνεῦμα is the πνεῦμα υἰοθεσίας by which the sons of God are impelled and which enables them to call upon God as Father (v. 14f.). The πνεῦμα ἡμῶν can only be the spiritual ego of man, the νοῦς, or, as we would say, the soul. πνεῦμα is also used for soul in R. 1:9; 8:10; 1 C. 5:3–5; 7:34; 16:18:2 C. 2:13; 7:1, 13; Gl. 6:18; Phil. 4:23; Col. 2:5; Phlm. 25. If we take συμμαρτυρεῖν strictly, it is implicitly said that the spiritual ego of the man in Christ already declares him to be a child of God. But it is hard to think that Paul could say this. Hence we are forced to give to συμμαρτυρεῖν here the simple sense of “bear witness.” If, on the other hand, we think that when Paul relates the πνεῦμα to man he always, or here at least, means the personal life of the Christian as this is shaped by the Spirit of God, then we can take συμμαρτυρεῖν strictly. The statement of faith made by this Christian ego which is aware of being a child of God is confirmed by the Spirit. “Here Paul sets alongside the act of faith the inspirative process. He assigns this to the second place; the first is occupied by

the faith based on the message of Jesus.” But could the Roman Christians read this from τῷ πνεύματι ἡμῶν? Does it not finally amount to the fact that the Spirit of God confirms Himself?

συνεπιμαρτυρεῖν, which is common in non-biblical Gk. (Aristot., Polyb., Plut.), does not occur in the LXX and is found in the NT only at Hb. 2:4. The salvation first preached by the Lord Himself is confirmed in us by the hearers, συνεπιμαρτυροῦντος τοῦ θεοῦ σημείοις κτλ. On the meaning cf. Ep. Ar., 191: συνεπιμαρτυρήσας δὲ τούτῳ τὸν ἐχόμενον ἠρώτα, “(the king) agreed with this one and asked the next.” Cf. also 1 Cl., 23, 5: συνεπιμαρτυρούσης καὶ τῆς γραφῆς. The saying does not imply the presence of another witness who confirms what has been said and with whom there is then a second. It simply means that something seen by another, whether a fact, opinion, or conviction, is accepted by a second as true.

Thus Hb. 2:4 does not carry a reference to yet other μάρτυρες, so that the preachers (ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκουσάντων ... ἐβεβαιώθη) are indirectly described as such. They have given assurance and made an impression thereby. But God Himself has confirmed the truth of the preaching by the witness of the σημεῖα. In the case of συνεπιμαρτυρεῖν the situation is much the same as in that of συμμαρτυρεῖν.

καταμαρτυρεῖν (Lys., Demosth., Isaeus, Epict., Dio C., occasionally the pap.) is used with the gen. of person for “making a statement in witness against someone.” It occurs a few times in the LXX (for הַעֲדוּ hi, הַעֲדוּ or פ' הַעֲדוּ לְכֹחֲךָ). mostly of false witnesses for the prosecution. It does not have to mean false witnesses; this either emerges from the context (3 Βασ. 20:10 [not B], 13; Sus. 21 Θ) or is expressly indicated by the addition (μαρτυρίαν) ψευδοῦ (Prv. 25:18; Sus. 43;49 Θ). The term does not have this implication in Job 15:6: τὰ δὲ χεῖλη σου καταμαρτυρήσουσίν σου, or Da. 6:25: οἱ καταμαρτυρήσαντες τοῦ Δανιήλ. Cf. also Epict. Diss., IV, 8, 32, of the witness of the genuine Cynic who by his conduct τῇ ἀρετῇ μαρτυρεῖ καὶ τῶν ἐκτὸς καταμαρτυρεῖ (bears witness against the value of everything external).

In the NT the word occurs only at Mk. 14:60 == Mt. 26:62, where the highpriest asks Jesus: οὐκ ἀποκρίη οὐδὲν τί οὗτοί σου καταμαρτυροῦσιν; and Mt. 27:13, where Pilate puts to Him the question: οὐκ ἀκούεις πόσα σου καταμαρτυροῦσιν; (Mk.: ἴδε πόσα σου κατηγοροῦσιν). The context shows that there is no basis for the statements.

### † μαρτύρομαι, † διαμαρτύρομαι, † προμαρτύρομαι.

μαρτύρεσθαι originally, “to invoke someone as a witness about something,” esp. the gods (Plat. Phileb., 12b: μαρτύρομαι νῦν αὐτήν τὴν θεόν, Eur. Med., 1410: δαίμονας, Eur. Phoen., 626: γαῖαν καὶ θεοῦς), but also men, Aesch. Eum., 643: ὑμᾶς δ' ἀκούειν ταῦτ' ἐγὼ μαρτύρομαι, Plat. Resp., II, 364d: οἱ δὲ τῆς τῶν θεῶν ὑπ' ἀνθρώπων παραγωγῆς τὸν Ὀμηρον μαρτύρονται, Aristoph. Pl., 932: ὄραξ ἄ ποιεῖ; ταῦτ' ἐγὼ μαρτύρομαι, namely, the witness who is addressed (σε to be supplied), cf. Ra., 528; Vesp., 1436; Nu., 1222 and 1297; Plut. Alcibiades, 12 (I, 196d): τὸν Διομήδη ... μαρτυρόμενον θεοῦς καὶ ἀνθρώπους, Plut. Aristid., 18 (I, 330a): Ἀριστείδης ... μαρτυρόμενος Ἕλληνίους θεοῦς ἀπέχεσθαι μάχης, Marcellus, 7 (I, 301d): Ζεῦ, μαρτύρομαί σε ... σοὶ καθιεροῦν, P. Oxy., VIII, 1114, 23 ff. (3rd cent. A.D.): ἐμαρτύρατο τοὺς τότε τὸ μαρτυροποίημα σφραγίζειν μέλλοντας ... Αὐρηλίαν Ἀπολλωνίαν ... ἀδιάθετον τελευτήσαι. It thus passes into general use. Strictly, we should be told what the occasion is. If we are told only to what the witness refers, μαρτύρεσθαι comes to mean “to make a solemn declaration about.” This can then have the sense of an emphatic affirmation that something is so, cf. Plat. Phileb., 47d: ταῦτα δὲ τότε μὲν οὐκ ἐμαρτυράμεθα, νῦν δὲ λέγομεν; Dio C., 41, 3, 2: εἰπόν τε πολλὰ καὶ ἐμαρτύραντο, or simply “to attest”: P. Oxy., VIII, 1121, 8 (3rd cent. A.D.): μαρτυρομένη τὰ εἰς με ἐπιχειρηθέντα, cf. line 23 f.: ἐπιδίδωμι τάδε τὰ βιβλία μαρτυρομένη μὲν

τὸ ἐπιχείρημα ἀξιούσα δὲ ..., also 1120, 11; 1114, 23 (→ *supra*), or an emphatic demand, requirement or admonition, cf. P. Lips., 37, 25 (4th cent. A.D.): διὰ τοῦτο ἐπιδίδωμι τούσδε τοὺς λιβέλλους μαρτυρόμενος καὶ ἀξιῶν τούτους ἐν ἀσφαλεῖ εἶναι μέχρις τῆς ἐπιδημίας τοῦ ἄρχοντος.

In the LXX it occurs (along with the rather more common ἐπιμαρτύρεσθαι, 9 times) only twice, at Jdt. 7:28: μαρτυρόμεθα ὑμῖν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὸν θεὸν ἡμῶν, to support a demand previously expressed; and 1 Macc. 2:56, where Caleb receives an inheritance ἐν τῷ μαρτύρασθαι τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, because he bore witness to the community in the sense of a summons not to be discouraged by the report of the spies, but to begin the conquest of Canaan trusting in God. Σ has it in ψ 49:7 (for 717 hi) in the sense “to declare solemnly.”

In the NT μαρτύρεσθαι is found twice in Ac. and three times in Pl. It has the meaning of emphatic demand in 1 Th. 2:11 f.: παρακαλοῦντες ὑμᾶς ... καὶ μαρτυρόμενοι εἰς τὸ περιπατεῖν ὑμᾶς ἀξίως τοῦ θεοῦ κτλ., and Eph. 4:17: τοῦτο οὖν λέγω καὶ μαρτύρομαι ἐν κυρίῳ, μηκέτι ὑμᾶς περιπατεῖν καθὼς καὶ τὰ ἔθνη περιπατεῖ. The translation “I adjure you” strikes a false note, since there is no thought of calling on God to give force to the admonition. In the other three passages it has the sense of emphatic affirmation, each time with the dat. of person. It may be a factual assertion, as in Ac. 20:26: διότι μαρτύρομαι ὑμῖν ... ὅτι καθαρὸς εἰμι ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος πάντων. Paul assures the Ephesian elders that he bears no responsibility if anyone perishes. It may refer to a truth to be observed, as in Gl. 5:3: μαρτύρομαι δὲ πάλιν παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ περιτεμνομένῳ ὅτι ὀφειλέτης ἐστὶν ὅλον τὸν νόμον ποιῆσαι. In particular, it refers to the message of the Gospel which Paul attests both to small and great (Ac. 26:22).

There is hardly any difference in meaning between διαμαρτύρεσθαι and μαρτύρεσθαι. The first meaning is “to invoke someone (gods or men) as witness with reference to something,” “to declare with an appeal to witnesses,” and then secondly “to declare emphatically,” whether with ref. to facts or truths (so esp. Demosth.) or in the sense of a summons, admonition, or warning.

It occurs a few times in the LXX, almost always for 717 hi, but once each for 717i hi, 717 hoph, and twice for 777 hi. It has its basic sense at Dt. 4:26: διαμαρτύρομαι ὑμῖν (against you) σήμερον τὸν τε οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν, ὅτι ἀπολεία ἀπολεισθε κτλ., cf. 30:19; 31:28; in Ier. 39:10, 44 (διαμαρτύρεσθαι μάρτυρας) the ref. is to the part of witnesses at the signing of agreements. Elsewhere it means “to declare emphatically,” whether with ref. to statutes to be followed (Ex. 18:20; 19:10, 21; 1 Βασ. 8:9), to representations made to someone (Ex. 21:29; 2 Εσδρ. 23:21), occasionally to a promise given (Zech. 3:6), or commonly to prophetic warnings to repent (4 Βασ. 17:13; 2 Παρ. 24:19; 2 Εσδρ. 19:26, 34; ψ 49:7; 80:8; Ier. 6:10; Ez. 16:2; 20:4 in these two passages with the obj. τὰς ἀνομίας). With these meanings we often find the dat. of person, e.g., Dt. 32:46; Ex. 19:21. There is a special use in Mal. 2:14: ὅτι Κύριος διεμαρτύρατο ἀνὰ μέσον σου καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον γυναικὸς νεότητός σου, “He was present as a witness.”

Of the 15 NT occurrences, 10 are in the Lucan writings (9 in Ac.), 3 in the Past., one each in 1 Th. and Hb. The meaning is never “to invoke as witness.” “To declare emphatically” in the sense of a warning is the meaning in Lk. 16:28: ὅπως διαμαρτύρηται αὐτοῖς, ἵνα μὴ καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔλθωσιν εἰς τὸν τόπον τοῦτον τῆς βασάνου, and 2 Tm. 2:14: διαμαρτυρόμενος ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ μὴ λογομαχεῖν. Here the ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ reminds us of the original sphere of the term. This is also true in 1 Tm. 5:21 and esp. 2 Tm. 4:1, where the meaning is “to declare emphatically” by way of admonition. In the latter passage: Διαμαρτύρομαι ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ ... καὶ τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ· κήρυξον τὸν λόγον, διαμαρτύρεσθαι is similar to ὀρκίζω τινά τι in Mk. 5:7; Ac. 19:13; cf. 1 Th. 5:27, and it obviously has the sense “to adjure.” To avoid this we should have to take τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν κτλ. as the object of

διαμαρτύρομαι, which is against the context. In all other instances the meaning is (emphatic) “affirmation” that a thing is or will be so, cf. the intimation of Paul’s imprisonment in Ac. 20:23, the adducing of a truth attested in the OT in Hb. 2:6, Paul’s preaching of future judgment in 1 Th. 4:6, and in Ac. (up to 20:23) the apostolic preaching of the Gospel with the object τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ (20:24), τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ (28:23), τὸν λόγον τοῦ κυρίου (8:25), τὰ περὶ ἐμοῦ (Christ, 23:11), τὴν εἰς θεὸν μετάνοιαν καὶ πίστιν εἰς τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν (20:21). In 18:5 the content is given by the phrase εἶναι τὸν χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν and in 10:42 by a ὅτι clause. In 2:40 it is made clear by the context.

προμαρτύρεσθαι occurs for the first time outside the Bible in an 8th cent. pap. in the sense “to summon to something in advance” (P. Lond., IV, 1356. 32: προμαρτυρόμενος [αὐτοὺς εἰς] τὸ σχεῖν τὸν φόβον τοῦ θεοῦ πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν).

It does not occur in the LXX and the only NT instance is at 1 Pt. 1:11 in the sense “to attest or declare in advance as a fact (which will come to pass).” The πνεῦμα (of Christ) dwelling in the prophets was προμαρτυρόμενον τὰ εἰς Χριστὸν παθήματα (the sufferings ordained for Christ) καὶ τὰς μετὰ ταῦτα δόξας.

### † ψευδόμαρτυς, † ψευδομαρτυρέω, † ψευδομαρτυρία

ψευδόμαρτυς, “the false witness.” Like ψευδομαρτυρεῖα and ψευδομαρτυρία it occurs already in class Gk., cf. esp., Anaxim. in Ps.-Aristot. Rhet. Al., 16, p. 1431b, 20 ff., esp. 41 f., where there is an express discussion *de testimoniis et testibus*, and all three words are found. On the other hand, they do not occur at all in the pap., though we find ψευδομαρτύριον (→ 514). The construction is not to be explained in the same way as ψευδοφίλιππος (Luc.), ψευδηρακλῆς (Menand.), ψευδόχριστος (Mt. 24:24), ψευδοπάρθενος (Hdt.), ψευδόχρυσος (Plut.), ψευδόδειπνον (Aesch.) etc., where the ψευδο-implies that what the main word denotes is claimed only ψευδῶς or falsely. On the contrary, the main word is taken verbally as in ψευδάγγελος (declaring lies, false messenger, Hom., Aristot.), ψευδοκῆρυξ (Soph.), ψευδόμαντις (Aesch., Soph.). The word thus means one who attests something which is false. It is not contested that the person concerned is a witness, as though he had no direct knowledge of the persons, relations or events at issue. What is disputed is the correctness of what he says; τὰ ψευδῆ μαρτυρεῖν, ψευδομαρτυρία, ψευδόμαρτυς correspond (cf. Anaxim. Rhet. Al., 16). When in Plat. Gorg. (472b), in the discussion of the thesis of Socrates τὸν ἀδικοῦντα οὐκ εὐδαίμονα εἶναι, Polos brings against Socrates the whole host of the Athenians as witnesses, and Socrates calls all these ψευδομάρτυρας with whose help ἐπιχειρεῖς ἐκβάλλειν με ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας καὶ τοῦ ἀληθοῦς, he is not saying that they cannot be regarded as witnesses, but simply that οὗτος ὁ ἔλεγχος οὐδενὸς ἄξιός ἐστι πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν (471e) because they testify to what is false. Whether a man is μάρτυς or ψευδόμαρτυς depends on whether or not he tells the truth.

The biblical usage is similar. In the LXX ψευδόμαρτυς occurs only in Sus. 60 (cf. Θ v. 61), where it is said of Daniel and the two elders who laid traps for Susannah: αὐτοὺς κατέστησεν ἀμφοτέρους ψευδομάρτυρας, “he convicted them both as false witnesses.”

In the NT the word is used at Mt. 26:60 for those who bore witness against Jesus at His trial. The high-priest and the whole council sought ψευδομαρτυρίαν κατὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ὅπως αὐτὸν θανατώσωσιν, καὶ οὐχ εὔρον πολλῶν προσελθόντων ψευδομαρτύρων. Here the standpoint of the narrator merges into that of the assembly inasmuch as his judgment of the quality of the witnesses becomes a description of the purpose of the Sanhedrin

The only other instance of ψευδόμαρτυς is at 1 C. 15:15. If Christ is not risen, our preaching is in vain and so is your faith. εὐρισκόμεθα δὲ καὶ ψευδομάρτυρες τοῦ θεοῦ, ὅτι ἐμαρτυρήσαμεν

κατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ὅτι ἤγειρεν τὸν Χριστόν, ὃν οὐκ ἤγειρεν εἴπερ ἄρα νεκροὶ οὐκ ἐγείρονται. Here, too, the starting-point is that ψευδόμαρτυς denotes the one who as a witness, i.e., claiming to be a witness, says something untrue. Paul has done this if, as he says in v. 8, he proclaims from his own experience that Christ is risen and yet all the time it is established *a priori* that resurrection from the dead is not possible. The reference of the observation is to the content of the witness, not to the fact that the character of Paul is set in a bad light because he falsely claims the title of μάρτυς. Quite apart from contradicting the sense of ψευδόμαρτυς, this would also, in defiance of the context, entail a diverting of attention from the material question to a personal consideration. The genitive ψευδομάρτυρες τοῦ θεοῦ makes no difference in this respect. If this is taken as a subj. gen. (witnesses whom God has appointed and who obey Him),<sup>3</sup> this would mean that the incidental note echoes a title (μάρτυς τοῦ θεοῦ) not found elsewhere in Paul. This compels a wresting of the sense of ψευδόμαρτυς and a deflection from material considerations to personal. The point is also missed that the ὅτι clause which follows is a comment on the phrase. This is the correct explanation. Though it is linguistically difficult to take the gen. as an obj. gen., the usual exegesis is right here. Paul would be a ψευδόμαρτυς τοῦ θεοῦ because, to use Plato's words, καταψευδομαρτυρηθεῖη ἂν ὁ θεὸς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, that He has done something which in reality He has not done, i.e., raise up Christ (cf. Plat. Gorg., 472a).

Apart from a vl. in Sus. 61 Θ, ψευδομαρτυρεῖν occurs in the LXX only at Ex. 20:16 = Dt. 5:20 (17): רָקַשׁ עַד בְּרַעַב הַעֲנֵה אֵל, of false witness in court.

There is reference to this statute of the Law in Mt. 9:18 = Mk. 10:19 = Lk. 18:20. At R. 13:9 it has made its way—from this source—into Ν and some other MSS as a secondary reading. The only other instance is in Mk. 14:56 f. of the witnesses at the trial of Jesus.

ψευδομαρτυρία does not occur in the LXX.

It is found in the NT at Mt. 26:59 with reference to the trial of Jesus (→ ψευδόμαρτυς) and in the plural in the list of vices, based on the second table of the Decalogue, in Mt. 15:19: ἐκ γὰρ τῆς καρδίας ἐξέρχονται διαλογισμοὶ πονηροί, φόνοι, μοιχεῖαι, πορνεῖαι, κλοπαί, ψευδομαρτυρίαι. In P. Hal., 1 (→ mavrtu~ n. 14) we have express accounts of the proceedings at trials for false witness (ἡ τοῦ ψευδομαρτυρίου δίκη). The normal expression here is ψευδομαρτύριον.

*Strathmann*

---

<sup>1</sup> Kittel, G., Bromiley, G. W., & Friedrich, G. (Eds.). (1964–). *Theological dictionary of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.