

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

ON CERTAIN OBSCURE NAMES IN THE NEW
TESTAMENT :

A PROBLEM IN PALÆOGRAPHY.

AMONGST the many tendencies which can be traced in the various readings of the New Testament, one of the most curious is the tendency to furnish anonymous characters with proper names, so as, for example, to identify more clearly such shadowy persons as the two crucified thieves, or the rich man at whose gate Lazarus lay, or the centurion at the cross, whom the Peter Gospel calls Petronius, but other legends by the name of Longinus. The existence of such a tendency may, perhaps, be challenged at the outset of our inquiry, and we may be asked how we know that the names have been added to persons who are rightly anonymous, and whether it may not be the case that the tradition of the name is original and primitive, and that it has merely been lost sight of in those texts which appear to be anonymous. Certainly we must not, at the very outset of our inquiry, make the assumption that gives priority to the canonically anonymous person over the uncanonical nomenclature which we may find in stray lines of tradition outside the New Testament and in occasional copies of the New Testament itself. We will simply state the case, as it actually occurs. There is a divergence of tradition with regard to certain characters of the New Testament, one line of tradition leaving them nameless, and the other supplying them with names; and it is required that we estimate the relative value of the divergent traditions. Is

there more weight to be attached to St. Luke's anonymous statement that there was "a certain rich man, clothed in purple and fine linen," or to the statement found in certain authorities that the name of the rich man was—what we shall presently find it affirmed to have been. Or shall we combine the traditions harmonistically, since the man, in any case, was not really anonymous, and make an expanded text of St. Luke, so as to cover the whole of the information.

We have a case somewhat like those to which we have alluded in the statement of St. John that the servant whose ear Peter cut off was named Malchus. This is an expansion which John makes to the account in Mark, whose text is implied to underlie the fourth Gospel; but no one is justified in making severe criticisms on the addition, as though it were merely editorial; for why should it not also be correct? And if we allow for the possible correctness in such a case as the addition of the name of Malchus by St. John, why should we *a priori* discredit those later copyists and historians who have added precisely similar information with regard to other nameless persons in the New Testament? Clearly the inquiry should be an open one, and we should not hastily predict where it is likely to lead us, but collect the facts of the tradition patiently, and then see how far they can be reconciled with the belief that they contain a historical element.

In the first of the cases to which we have alluded in our opening sentence, that, viz., of the two thieves who were crucified with our Lord, we find them anonymous in most of the copies and versions of the Gospel, but at the same time there is no slight body of evidence as to the names which they respectively bore. And this evidence we must endeavour to tabulate.

Beginning with the Gospels, a glance at the critical apparatus of Tischendorf will show under Matthew 27³⁸

(τότε σταυροῦνται σὺν αὐτῷ δύο λησταί, εἰς ἐκ δεξιῶν καὶ εἰς ἐξ ἐωνύμων) the following note :

ἐκ δεξιῶν : *c.* add *nomine zoatham*, item post ἐωνύμων *nomine camma*.
Alia nomina (*Dismas* vel *Dimas* et *Gestas*) praebent act¹: cf. in ed.
mea pp. 231 et 286 :

from which we learn that a famous Old Latin codex (known as Colbertinus) has names for the two thieves respectively ; but that these names are found in quite a different form in the body of legends which go under the name of the Acts of Pilate or Gospel of Nicodemus.

In the Gospel of Mark 15²⁷, we again find in the same Old Latin codex (*c*) the additions *nomine zoathan* and *nomine chammatha* after *a dextris* and *a sinistris* respectively.

Tischendorf again refers to the names as given in the *Acta Pilati* in the forms Γεστᾶς and Δυσμᾶς (Δημᾶς).

In the Gospel of Luke 23³², we find a similar addition of the names in the text of the Old Latin codex *l* (known as Rhedigerianus), where the words *ioathas et maggattras* follow the statement *ducebantur autem et alii duo latrones cum eo*. It will be observed that the names differ slightly in Luke in cod. *l* from the forms given in Matthew and Mark from cod. *c*: nor is the attempt made to distinguish between the thief on the right hand and the thief on the left. But inasmuch as one of the names in question *ioathas* is evidently the same as *zoatham* (*zoathan*) we can hardly have fallen upon a completely independent tradition.¹

When we turn to the Old Latin codex *r* (Codex Usserianus), we find the deciphered portion of the MS. in Luke 23²² to be as follows :

[du
ceba]ntur autem et alii duo m[a
ligni] cum illo ut crucifigere[ntur
. . .] et capnatas . . . et postquam :

¹ Probably it is the same tradition that turns up in the *Collectanea* attached to the works of the Venerable Bede : " Dic mihi nomina duorum latronum qui

from which it appears that in this MS. also there stood the names of the robbers, but at a later place than in cod. *l*, which has the words added after *cum illo*. One of these names is illegible; the other varies strikingly from cod. *l*. From these three Old Latin MSS. we deduce, then, the following traditions as to the names:

		Right-hand.	Left-hand.
Cod. <i>c</i> . . .	Matt. . .	<i>zoatham</i> and	<i>camma</i> .
	Mark . . .	<i>zoathan</i> „	<i>cammatha</i> .
		(?) Right-hand.	(?) Left-hand.
Cod. <i>l</i> . . .	Luke . . .	<i>ioathas</i> „	<i>maggatras</i> .
Cod. <i>r</i> . . .	Luke	„	<i>capnatas</i> .

Now let us turn to the nomenclature, as given in the *Acta Pilati*. As is well known, these Acts were published by Tischendorf in two separate recensions, which he calls A and B. We are not concerned at this point with the criticism or with the editing of the *Acta*; it is probable that Tischendorf's distinction between the recensions is not final, and the criticism of the texts is far from being satisfactory: what we are concerned with, however, is the evidence for the tradition of the names. Accordingly we note that in what is called recension A of the *Acta* we are told in c. ix. that Pilate directed that Jesus should be fixed to the cross in the garden where He was apprehended, and that Dysmas and Gestas, the two malefactors, should be crucified along with him. The variation in the texts at this point is not very great: we have in the Greek *Δυσμᾶς* and *Γέστας* with a variant *Γρέγας*, in the Coptic *Demas* and

Cystas, and in the Latin $\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{Dismas} \\ \text{Dimas} \\ \text{Dymas} \end{array} \right\}$ and Gestas.

In the next chapter (c. x.), after the statement that “they hanged likewise the two malefactors,” the critical apparatus

cum Jesu crucifixi sunt. Matha et Joca. Matha credidit, Joca negavit vitam, mortem elegit.”

shows the following expansions to the text (which expansions have not met with editorial approval):

B add τον μεν ένα εκ δεξιων, τον δε ετερον εξ ευωνυμων, item A Copt. Latt. Δυσμαν εκ δεξιων και Τρεγαν (Latt. Copt. *Gestam*) εξ ευωνυμων.

A little further on in the same chapter, we are told that "one of the malefactors who were hanged with Him said, Save Thyself and us. But Dysmas answered him and said, Dost thou not fear God?" etc.

Here the critical apparatus betrays the addition of the words "whose name was Gestas" to the description of the first robber, while the same variation between *Δυσμας* and *Δημας* occurs. The Coptic version also makes the good robber to be Dysmas (Demas) and relates that

Demas quum finem fecisset increpandi Gestam, clamavit: Memento mei, etc.

So far as these authorities go, we have then the statement that the two robbers were named Dysmas and Gestas (possibly Demas and Gestas), and it is suggested that Dysmas was the good robber.

In the second group of authorities from whom Tischendorf edits we find in c. ix. 3 for the words

μετὰ ταῦτα ἔφερον καὶ δύο λησταί, τὸν μὲν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ, τὸν δὲ ἀριστερᾷ

a variation in one MS. to the following effect:

Cod C. τότε σταυροῦνται σὺν αὐτῷ δύο λησταί, εἰς ἐκ δεξιῶν ὀνόματι Δυσμᾶς, καὶ εἰς ἐξ ευωνύμων ὀνόματι Γίστας,

where the spelling should be carefully noted.

In c. x. 6 we find the statement that *Dysmas* was the good robber, on the right hand (of Christ), and that *Gestas* or *Gistas* was the bad robber.

ὡσαύτως καὶ ὁ ἐν τῷ ἀριστερῷ μέρει ἐσταυρωμένος ληστής πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔλεγεν· ἐὰν τοῦ Θεοῦ υἱὸς εἶ, κατὰβηθι καὶ σῶσον καὶ ἐαυτὸν καὶ ἡμᾶς· ὄνομα αὐτῷ ἦν Γιστᾶς· ὁ δὲ ἐκ δεξιῶν ἐσταυρωμένος ὀνόματι Δυσμᾶς ὠνείδιξε τὸν αὐτὸν ληστήν λέγων·

Here Tischendorf notes *Γίστας* cum A, B *Γήστας* . . . C om. *ὄνομα* usq. *Γίστ*. The Cod. C has, however, added at an earlier point the statement that the second robber was named Gistas, and is in evidence for the spelling edited by Tischendorf.

Thus both recensions agree that the names of the two robbers were

Dysmas and Gestas,
[Demas] [Gistas]

and it is suggested on either hand that the former robber was the good one, and was crucified on the right hand.¹

The Armenian version of the Acts, which has been studied by Mr. Conybeare, gives the names as *Demas* and *Gestas*, and makes Demas occupy the right hand and Gestas the left.²

It will be observed, then, that we have what appear to be widely divergent traditions with regard to the names of the two robbers; nor does it seem at all easy to reconcile the traditions one with the other.

We will, therefore, go further afield, and collect some

¹ Probably the *Acta* are the source of the names as they appear in late representations of the crucifixion: e.g. in the Gospel of Bishop Egbert of Trier the names over the heads are Desmas and Cesmas. Desmas is the penitent.

² This is almost the same thing as saying that Dysmas (Demas) is the good robber; for he is named first, and has the place of honour; moreover the traditions of the early Church are in favour of the belief that the penitent thief occupied the place on the right hand. Mr. Conybeare points out allusions to the Acts, which may be quoted in support of this statement. For example, in the Homily of Ps.-Aristides de Iatrone (Venice, 1878) we have, "And now I pray you all, friends of the Christian race, to be instructed by the faith of the right-hand thief and to agree with him. Despise the left-hand one and his associates. . . . for he has withdrawn himself to the left hand and stationed himself there," etc.

And in the Acts of Polyuctes (*Polyeucte dans l'histoire*, par B. Aubé, Paris, 1882), Nearchus, the friend of the martyr, says: "Yes, and thou mayest remember yet another incident . . . and this is from the history of the Lord. Bethink thee of the thief who was crucified on the right-hand side: what did he say to the thief who was crucified on the left, and who reviled the Lord?"

To these references, which I owe to Mr. Conybeare, many more might, no doubt, be added.

fresh material for the solution of this very interesting problem.

So far we have not examined any Syriac tradition bearing on the question; the Armenian texts are declared by Mr. Conybeare to be derived from the Greek, and we need not, therefore, regard them as adding anything fresh to the materials for the solution of our problem. They follow, at all events, the Greek spelling and order of the names.

Let us now turn to the Syriac literature, and see whether there is any knowledge of a tradition concerning the names of the two robbers.

If we examine Bar Hebraeus' commentary on Matthew, we find the following note on the words "And there were crucified with Him two robbers":¹

The one on his right hand, named Titus, ܬܝܬܘܫ, and the one on his left hand, Dumachus, ܕܡܚܘܫ, for thus it is found in the book of the holy Hierotheus, the disciple of the great Paul.

It will be observed that Bar Hebraeus does not cite as his authority any codex of the New Testament, but only the book of Hierotheus. This book is supposed to be the work of the pantheist Bar Şudaili,² and is closely connected with all those fictions which pass under the name of Dionysius the Areopagite. From a copy in my possession I am able to verify the reference of Bar Hebraeus.

In the twenty-first chapter of the book of Hierotheus, we find as follows:

"But he beholds also the soul that is on his right hand, which is crucified like Titus; but the body, like Dumachus, on his left hand."

This somewhat obscure passage, with regard to the crucifixion of soul and body with Christ, is explained in a marginal comment of Bar Hebraeus, who has carefully annotated the whole text of Hierotheus, as follows:

¹ Ed. Spanuth. p. 65.

² See Frothingham: *Stephen Bar Şudaili*.

“Namely, between the soul and the body, even as Christ also between the two thieves.”

Here, then, we find in the Syriac literature what appears to be a third pair of names for the two thieves, viz., Titus and Dumachus, of whom Titus stands for the soul in the mysticism of Hierotheus, and Dumachus for the body; *i.e.* the good robber is Titus, and occupies the place on the right hand. And it should be observed that Hierotheus uses the names freely, and without any explanation, as if they would readily be understood by his readers. So that we may assume that the tradition of the names was well established when he wrote, perhaps at the end of the fifth century.

Now the tradition that the two names were Titus and Dumachus is not confined to Hierotheus and Bar Hebraeus.

In the twenty-third chapter of the Arabic Gospel of the Infancy,¹ we find a story that when our Lord was taken into Egypt, Joseph and Mary designed to pass over a part of the desert by night, because it was infested by robbers. But as they went on their way, they lighted on two robbers, sleeping, and a multitude of other robbers with them, who were asleep and snoring. The two robbers whom they came across were Titus and Dumachus, and Titus begged of Dumachus to let the party pass, and not to call the attention of the gang to them. He gave him forty drachmas, and pledged his purse with him, if only he would let them alone. Now when the lady Mary saw the kindly disposition of the robber, she besought for him piously the support of the Lord and the remission of his sins. At this the child Jesus intervened with a prophecy: “After thirty years,” said he, “the Jews will crucify me in Jerusalem, and these two robbers shall be crucified at the same time, Titus at my right hand, and Dumachus on my

¹ Thilo, *Codex Apocryphus novi Testamenti*, p. 65. Tischendorf, *Evangelia Apocrypha*, p. 181.

left; and Titus shall go before me on that day into Paradise." This story, which seems to be invented in order to establish merit for the penitent robber in his past history, finds its way also into some copies of the Acts of Pilate, but with a change of the names to Dysmas and Gestas, so as to agree with the tradition of the *Acta*.¹

The same tradition turns up in the Book of the Bee (ed. Budge, p. 87). "When they were journeying along the road to Egypt, two robbers met them; the name of the one was Titus, the name of the other Dumachus. Dumachus wished to harm them, and to treat them ill, but Titus would not let him, and delivered them from the hands of his companion."

It seems, however, that Titus and Dumachus are the proper form for the Syriac and for the Arabic derived from it. And here we may very well make a pause, and ask whether it is possible that these three lines of tradition can be variants of a primitive form, and whether that form can be recovered. Is there any palæographical connection between

Zoatham and Cammatha.

Dysmas and Gestas.

Titus and Dumachus.

At first sight, the supposition appears to be an impossible one: certainly if these be the data of a problem in palæography, it is nothing like the palæography which we are accustomed to in MSS. of the LXX. and of the New Testament, where the variations occur between narrow and well-defined limits.

As far as I know, there have been no successful attempts to explain these names. It has been suggested, if I remember rightly, that Dysmas might mean the man to the west (*δυσμὰς*) of Christ, the west being the region of darkness. But no corresponding explanation is forthcoming for

¹ See Tischendorf: *Acta Pilati* B. p. 308.

Gestas, who ought, on this showing, to have something to do with the east, which is the region of light, and so to stand for the good robber.

Another suggestion which I have seen somewhere, but where I cannot remember, is that Dumachus is a transliteration of Theomachus (*θεομάχος*), the one who fights against God, so that Dumachus would be the impenitent robber, and Titus the penitent one. Let us see whether this solution is capable of corroboration. It implies, of course, that the names are artificial, and that Titus must be an adjective describing the good robber. Some time since there came into my possession a fragment of a Greek service-book, which contained the following sentences :

δὴ ἀποστόλων συσταυρωθέντων αὐτῶ, ὁ μὲν, τὴν τῶν Ἰουδαίων θεομάχων
δηλῶν γνώμην, ἐβλασφημεί αὐτῶ. ὁ δὲ ἕτερος καὶ ἡμέτερος, τὴν τῶν ἐθνῶν
εἰσαγωγὴν καὶ πίστιν ἀπεικονίζων ἔλεγε·

Here the liturgy or hymn has actually conserved for us, in its description of the impenitent thief, the adjective that we are in search of: the impenitent robber is, in fact, a figure of the Jewish people that *wars against God*; the penitent robber adumbrates the calling and the faith of the Gentiles.

The confirmation is so striking that we are disposed to accept the explanation of Dumachus by Theomachus. We then ask whether there is, in the same fragment, any suggestion that will explain Titus. The answer is in the word *πίστιν*, which suggests that we name the penitent robber *ὁ πιστός*.

But now, having gone so far, palæography comes to our aid. Replacing Titus and Dumachus by Pistos and Theomachus, we begin to see that Gestas must be a variant of Pistos; for we find in recension B of the *Acta* that the form **ΓICTAC** is established, and between this form and **ΠICTOC** the bridge is not, palæographically, a long one. We must now reverse the order of the names, as given in the *Acta*, and read

Gistas (*i.e.* Pistos) and Dysmas [Demas].

The second name has, at least, so much similarity with Dumachus, that we cannot avoid admitting that there is some connection between them. Perhaps there is an intermediate form Dumas which connects Dumachus with Dysmas and Demas.

Having now solved the riddle, so far as these two pairs of names are concerned, we have some important conclusions to draw.

In the first place, it appears that the names are not names at all; they can never have originated in a historical text. No one professing to write history would have introduced such names, and no ordinary transcriber of documents could have perverted the names into the forms which we have to deal with.

In the second place, if the names do not belong to an historical or semi-historical document, then they must be taken from some other form of tradition, and it seems clear that this must have been a picture, perhaps a mosaic, of the crucifixion, or an illumination in a volume of the Gospels, in which, in Greek letters, were written names over the heads of the chief figures, so as to assist the imagination of the pious person. Nothing is easier than the misinterpretation of such names in a mosaic or partly effaced painting.

In the third place, it should be noticed that the investigation does not altogether provoke confidence in the criticism which has been, of late years, occupied in finding traces of primitive readings in the Acts of Pilate. If the foregoing explanations are correct, the names of the robbers in the Acts of Pilate are a misunderstanding of an illumination or design, not belonging to a very early period. And it looks as though the deciphered names had gone a pilgrimage through the Syriac. Their form in the Greek of the Acts is not the first form in which they were deciphered. Add to this the fact that the Acts have transposed the penitent and impenitent thieves, which are given rightly in the

Syriac of Hierotheus. So the evidence is against finding a primitive reading in this feature of the *Acta*.¹

Returning, now, to the Latin readings, we have to ask whether there is any prospect of explaining

zoatham and cammatha,

ioathas and maggattras,

or

— and capnatas.

It has been already pointed out that the coincidence of *zoatham* with *ioathas* carries with it a belief that the same pair is intended in the first two cases, so that *cammatha* must be connected palæographically with *maggattras*. But how shall the equation be made? It is further suspicious that a number of the letters in *capnatas* can be paralleled in *cammatha*; but can *pn* be linked in any way with *mm*, so as to derive one of the forms from the other? And, last of all, can we see how to connect these peculiar forms with the root-forms

ΠΙCΤΟC and ΘΕΟΜΑΧΟC

that we have unearthed? These questions are not easy to answer. Perhaps the form *cammatha* may be a misreading in a cursively written Latin, where *t* and *c* are almost identical, of *thammacha*, which would bring us very near, indeed, to the ground form *theomachos*. There is, however, something still wanting to the explanation. Why should the "m" be doubled, for instance? Moreover, the companion names do not seem to yield to investigation.

Shall we, then, abandon the investigation and say that the part of the problem of the names which has to do with their Latin tradition is still an unsolved problem? I confess that I am reluctant to do so, after having made so much progress with the matter.

¹ Mr. Lake has informed me that in an Athos MS. of the Acts of Pilate (Cod. Laura, λ, 117) the names are in the right order. So that perhaps this point, the reversal of the names, ought not to be urged in depreciation of the Greek Acts.

Let us see how far we have really got. We have traced to the original forms $\acute{\omicron}$ πιστός and $\acute{\omicron}$ θεομάχος the group of names *Πιστας*, *Γεστας*, and *Τιτος* along with *Dumachus*, *Dusmas*, and *Demas*.

Now the *a priori* impression, which is made upon us by the successful bringing together of such an apparently unconnected group of names, is that the explanation of the remaining group ought to be found on the same line. For why should we multiply hypotheses? Let us then look again at the group

Zoatham and Cammatha,
 Zoathan and Chammatha.
 Ioathas and Maggattras.
 Capnatas.

The left-hand group is clearly from a simple ground form. But is it not clear also that the same is true of the right-hand group? *Capnatas* is a connecting link between *Cammatha* and *Maggattras*. And in a Latin script, the letters C and G are so nearly equivalent that we may trace nearly all the letters of *Cammatha* in *Maggattras*.

Replace the G by C, and it is little more than a chance transposition which takes us from one form to the other. Assuming that one of these forms is the primitive of the other, which of them comes the nearer to the group,

Πιστός and *Θεόμαχος*

and to which member does it approximate?

The answer can only be that *cammatha* is much nearer to the second member than the first. In a cursive Latin the two words in question are certainly capable of *rapprochement*. It seems, then, after all, the residual difficulty is that of determining how to identify the forms.

}	Zoatham	}	with the forms	{	Pistos.
}	Joathas				Gistas.
}					Titus.

But here I confess that my craft fails me, and that there seems at present no hope of a reconciliation of the forms.

The theory that the names of the two thieves are derived from some representation of the crucifixion, finds its confirmation in the case of Longinus the centurion (or soldier), who pierced the Lord's side with a spear. Here it is almost certain that Longinus is derived from the Greek *λόγχη*; ¹ and though one would more naturally expect some such a form as *λογχίτης* to be used to describe the person who holds the spear, it is quite within the bounds of the expected that a Latin writer should turn this into Longinus, or that a Greek writer acquainted with Latin should coin the name in that form.

Longinus, then, is a pictorial fiction, an artist's unreality, an inscription to help the imagination. We actually do find such an inscription in the famous Syriac MS. containing a picture of the Crucifixion, which is one of the chief ornaments of the Medicean Library at Florence. A representation of this picture will be found in Assemani's catalogue of the Florence MSS., and a rude reproduction of the upper half of it is in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*.²

In this picture, however, the names of the thieves are not given, and the name of the spearman is written in Greek. Probably, at the early date of this MS., the names were not widely known. It is, however, clear from the text of the Acts of Pilate that the names of all three were known at the time of the composition of the *Acta* (unless we assume an earlier and simpler form of the work to have disappeared).

Even if we had not the suggestion derived from the peculiar character of the names *πιστός* and *θεόμαχος*, that

¹ e.g. *Acta Pilati*, A. x., where some copies read *καὶ λαβὼν Λογγίνος ὁ στρατιώτης λόγχην ἐνυξεν αὐτοῦ τὴν πλευράν*, and B. x. 2, *εἰς στρατιώτης ἐλόγησεν αὐτόν*.

² Art. *Crucifixion*.

they were pictorial and descriptive, we should have been tempted to look for a solution in the direction that we have intimated by the striking analogy of the case of Longinus, which has been shown to be an artificial creation and to be connected with the pictorial representation of the Crucifixion.¹

There is one other character in the crucifixion scene to whom legend has assigned a name, and whose name is yet unexplained. The man who puts vinegar on a sponge with the object of allaying our Lord's thirst is represented in one famous Crucifixion picture as *Stephaton*. This name I also suspect to be artificial.

I pass on now to a somewhat similar case, viz., the name of the rich man at whose gate Lazarus was laid. In the critical apparatus to Luke 16¹⁹ we find it stated that the Sahidic version adds the words, "whose name was *Nineue*," and that a scholiast, whose annotations are found in the minuscule Codices 36, 37, etc., εὖρον δέ τινες καὶ τοῦ πλουσίου ἐν τισιν ἀντιγράφοις τοῦνομα νινεύης λεγόμενον.

Thus from two quarters comes the suggestion that the rich man was called *Ninive*[s].

When we turn to the tract on the Passover, which is bound up with the works of Cyprian (ps.-Cyprian *de Pascha computus*), which can be dated from its internal evidence 242-243 A.D., we find a curious variant of this name. In c. 17 we have—

Ab initio non tantum diabolo et angelis eius sed et omnibus peccatoribus a deo ignis est praeeparatus, in cuius flamma uri ille *Finæus* diues ab ipso Dei filio est demonstratus.

Are these two forms *Niniues* and *Finæus* variants of the same tradition, and what is the original base from which they are derived?

On this subject Harnack has written a learned note in

¹ In the *Collectanea* bound up with the works of Bede he is called *Legorrius*, but this is probably only a corruption of *Longinus*.

Texte und Untersuchungen, xiii. Heft i. S. 75. He thinks that *Niniues*, which certainly goes back to the third century, is a corruption of an original *Φινεες*, which survives in the Latin. And he points out to me in a private communication that the actual form *Finees* is given in Priscillian, tract 9, p. 91. Harnack's opinion is, that, since in Numbers 25. 7 Phinehas is said to be the son of Eleazar, that an attempt has been made to suggest that the poor man who lay neglected at the rich man's gate was the rich man's own father. The suggestion is ingenious, and almost convincing. If I make a counter suggestion, it is due to the measure of success arrived at in the previous investigation as to the names of the two robbers. I propose to try and explain the variants and their origin by the combined use of palæography and pictures.

It will be agreed that there is a connection between
Niniues and Finaeus.

The actual coincidences in the letters are sufficiently striking; and if the spelling of the second name be *Finees*, as in the Old Latin of Numbers 25⁷, the case is not much different.

Suppose, however, we write down the word

diues

we find the last four letters to be in exact coincidence with the last four letters of *Niniues*, and this agreement makes us stop and think whether a further agreement may not be possible; the word, however, is too short, and the suggestion occurs that a word of two or three letters has dropped out before *diues*. I can only think of (a) the equivalent of the article (ὁ πλούσιος) which would be

hic diues,

or (b) an interjection, suitable to pictorial representations, such as

en diues.¹

¹ The difficulty is to find parallels to such an assumed pictorial representa-

From one of these two forms, probably the second, the name of the rich man may have been evolved. The advantage of such a solution is that it lies in the nature of things ; if the Gospel simply calls him "the rich man," then an illustration of the Gospel is likely to give the same description, rather than to invent a name or to borrow one out of the Old Testament. The most serious objection to such a solution would, perhaps, be that we do not know anything of the existence of such pictorial illustrations of the parables of the New Testament, at the early time required by the patristic and textual evidence.¹

J. RENDEL HARRIS.

THE FIRST MIRACLE AND THE EXALTATION OF CHRIST'S HUMAN NATURE.

"And the third day there was a marriage."—*St. John* ii. 1.

THOSE who have written in defence of Christianity have been for the most part wont to lay great stress on what they have described as the simple and inartificial character of the Gospels. Of recent years, however, the minute analysis to which they have been subjected by sceptic and Christian commentator alike, has revealed to us that the Gospels should rather be regarded as works of consummate art. Nor does it seem easy to understand why any Chris-

tion with accompanying legends. The famous Diptych of Rambona, which is one of the oldest of extant crucifixions, has *mulier en* over the head of the Virgin, and *dissipule ecce* over the head of St. John, accompanied by *Ego sum* *Ths nasaraeus* over the head of the Lord ; but here the legends seem to be borrowed from the Gospel of John ("Behold thy mother," etc.), and are not designed especially for the assistance of the person studying the carving, where the figures did not, in fact, need any elucidation.

¹ In the *Collectanea* of Ps.-Bede, we have the name of the rich man given as Tantalus, but this is an obvious loan from the Pagan mythology, due to the fact that the rich man desired a drop of water to drink, and could not obtain it.