Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

A table of contents for *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

A PROPER NAME FOR DIVES

(LEXICAL NOTES ON LUKE-ACTS VI[1])

The Bodmer Papyrus of Luke ($\mathfrak{P}^{75}$) lately published is undoubtedly the earliest Greek text now known of that gospel.[2] Therefore its inclusion of a proper name for the rich man in the parable of Luke 16 19–31 raises anew a problem but does not settle it. The problem was discussed half a century and more ago by Harnack, J. Rendel Harris, and Montague R. James, each in his characteristic way.[3] One regrets that none of them is alive to enjoy this recent discovery and to share with us their learned or ingenious insights in such matters.

The absence of any proper name for the rich man when the poor man was named Lazarus must have been noticed by many a reader. But the really noticeable feature was that a name was given to either figure. In the parables such an exception to anonymity is unique. Obviously this is the reason that some supposed that it was not a parable but history.[4] The synoptic tradition is very sparing of personal names even in narrative. It names the fathers of two of Jesus' patients, Jairus and Timaeus. Matthew omits the first and Luke omits the second. Indeed, Luke shows a characteristic aversion or apology for Semitic names of places as well as of persons.[5] Where personal names occur, one suspects they are to facilitate address in dialogue or easy distinction of pairs of persons in narrative. Thus in 10 38, 39 the introduction of a woman named Martha and her sister Mary prepares for the contrast both in the later narrative and in the words of Jesus. At Jericho, where Luke does omit the name of the blind man, he has another incident in which another rich man is named, the publican Zacchaeus. The name occurs in the later narrative, and he is so addressed by Jesus. In the narrative of this parable the characters are subsequently called the rich man and the poor man in connection with their respective deaths; but in the dialogue between Abraham and the rich man each has occasion to refer to the poor man, and each does so by using his proper name Lazarus.

How unnatural or inconvenient it seemed to readers to have only one of the characters named is shown in the Middle Ages when readers of the Latin Bible came to treat

---

[1] The last (No. V) of the preceding installments in this series was published in 1933 (Vol. 52, pp. 55–65)!

[2] *Papyrus Bodmer XIV–XV Evangiles de Luc et Jean*, Tome 1, Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1961. The date is conjectured to be between A.D. 175 and 225 (Introduction, p. 13). The text is relatively complete for 6 10–18 18 and 22 4–24 53. The Chester Beatty Papyrus I ($\mathfrak{P}^{45}$) is somewhat later, and in Luke chs. 6–14 alone are represented.

[3] A. von Harnack, "Der Name des reichen Mannes in Luc. 16.19" in *TU* 13, 1 (1895), pp. 75–78; "Miscelle" in *ThLZ*, 20 (1895), col. 428. J. Rendel Harris, "On Certain Obscure Names in the New Testament," *Expositor*, Sixth Series, 1 (1900), pp. 175–77. M. R. James, *JThS*, 4 (1903), pp. 242–43; *ibid.*, 7 (1906), p. 565.

[4] Tertullian, *de Anima*, 7; Ambrose, *Expositio Evangelii secundum Lucam, ad loc*: *Narratio magis quam parabola videtur, quando etiam nomen exprimitur* (Migne, *P.L.* xv, 1768).

[5] Cf. Cadbury, *Style and Literary Method of Luke*, pp. 154–58.

the Latin adjective *dives* for the rich man as a proper name. In English at least this use of "Dives" can be traced back as far as Chaucer and Langland's *Piers the Plowman* before A. D. 1400.[6]

Just as proper names were dropped in the synoptic tradition, so they were later added to it. The Gospel of John (18 10), in the scuffle at Gethsemane, identifies the aggressive one of Jesus' companions as Simon Peter, the high priest's slave as named Malchus. At the crucifixion the soldier who pierced Jesus' side is named Longinus in the Acts of Pilate; the centurion at the sepulcher in the Gospel of Peter is Petronius. The two "thieves" later receive names,[7] as do Pilate's wife in an earlier scene and the companion of Cleopas in the journey to Emmaus. Here again, but in narrative, it is Luke who names only one of two. Such identifications do not become constant, nor do we find unanimity among those who name the rich man of the parable.

In the Bodmer papyrus the name is Neues. The Greek text is clear ἄνθρωπος δέ τις ἦν πλούσιος ὀνόματι Νευης.[8] The last two words are not found in other MSS but they conform to Luke's characteristic use of ὀνόματι and are exactly symmetrical to the following undisputed parallel πτωχὸς δέ τις ὀνόματι Λάζαρος ἐβέβλητο κτλ. Plainly *νευης* stands for a proper name. But what name is it?

We may review now the alternative designations found in Christian tradition.[9] Nearly as early evidence is a scholion reported in certain codices[10] which reads εὗρον δέ τινες καὶ τοῦ πλουσίου ἔν τισιν ἀντιγράφοις τοὔνομα νινεύης λεγόμενον.

In the Sahidic version of the NT,[11] usually assigned a second-century date, the MSS pretty generally agree on a reading translated "But there was a rich man, his name being Nineve, who was wont to be clothed," etc. As in the Greek papyrus, the wording in the Coptic is symmetrical to the phraseology naming the poor man, translated: "But there was a poor man, his name being Lazarus, lying," etc. As late as the twelfth century the currency of the tradition of this name is attested by Euthymius Zigabenus in the form *Ninevis*.[12]

Another name is reported in a Latin writing of the third century. It is in the works of Cyprian, and, though not written by him, it can be dated in the year A.D. 242/243.[13]

---

[6] *New English Dictionary*, s. v. "Dives." Cf. Albert Bonus, Hastings *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, I, p. 467, s. v. "Dives."

[7] Cf. J. R. Harris, *Expositor, loc. cit.*, pp. 161–75, 304–08.

[8] P. 119. See also on the accompanying facsimile. In the next occurrence of the adjective (vs. 21) this papyrus has πλουσιου written over an erasure, but the original writing here cannot be deciphered.

[9] The evidence collected in the articles mentioned in note 3 is reviewed in a long note in Zahn, *Kommentar zum N. T.*, III,[3, 4] pp. 582–83; cf. Gressmann's article (cited below in n. 18), pp. 1–8.

[10] "Codices 36, 37, etc." (J. R. Harris, *loc. cit.*, p. 175).

[11] *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Southern Dialect, otherwise called Sahidic and Thebaic*, II, pp. 315 f.; cf. L. Th. Lefort, *ZNTW*, 37 (1938), pp. 65–72.

[12] Bonus, *loc. cit.* in n. 6.

[13] *De Pasch. comp.* 17 (ed. Hartel, III, p. 265). Cf. Harnack, *TU, loc. cit.*, p. 76, who notes, however, that the work has come down to us in two MSS of which one, Codex Remensis (9th cent.), has been burnt or otherwise disappeared, the other omits the word Phineas.

Its title is *de Pascha Computus* and it reads: *Omnibus peccatoribus a deo ignis est prae-paratus, in cuius flamma uri ille Finaeus dives ab ipso dei filio est demonstratus.* There is also Latin evidence for the same name a century and a half later. Priscillian in one of his tractates[14] wrote: *requietio Abrahae sinus dicitur, et Phinees immisericordis divitis gehennae ignis habitaculum repperitur.*

M. R. James added evidence for two other names for Dives. Their attestation is later, and one of them cannot be deciphered in full though it is evidently different from any so far considered. There are two or three MSS of a Latin work of unknown date but not dependent on Jerome's Vulgate, entitled *Inventiones Nominum* (i. e., the location of identical names in the Bible). One of these is an eighth-century MS in the town library of Albi, and it contains some additional notes about the names of persons unnamed in scripture. One of these reads: *Dives ad cuius ianuam Eleazar iacebat nomine Do - - - re* (?) *hoc invenies in Iosypo.*[15] Further in a MS of the *Aurora* of Petrus de Riga, bequeathed to the Fitzwilliam Museum, is a note in a thirteenth-century hand to the parable of Dives and Lazarus (f. 158^b): *Amonofis dicitur esse nomen divitis, et nota historiam esse non parabolam.*[16]

My first thought was that the Bodmer papyrus name $\nu\epsilon\upsilon\eta s$ was miswritten, a *vox nihili.* There is no word like it in Pape's dictionary of proper names.[17] Yet its likeness to the spelling $N\iota\nu\epsilon\upsilon\eta s$ in the scholion with a nominative ending in s (so the Latin *Ninevis*) unlike the name of the city ($N\iota\nu\epsilon\upsilon\eta$, $N\iota\nu\epsilon\upsilon\iota$) may show some relation. The editor of the papyrus suggested that the first syllable of $N\iota\nu\epsilon\upsilon\eta s$ had been added by dittography or omitted by haplography. Earlier discussion had suggested that $N\iota\nu\epsilon\upsilon\eta s$ and Finaeus (=Greek $\Phi\iota\nu\epsilon\acute{e}s$ of the LXX) were similar enough to represent variants of one original. And the latter, used in Num 25 7 as the son of an Eleazar (=Lazarus), could be explained as due to that connection.

Hugo Gressmann in a significant article in 1918[18] showed reasons for thinking that the story in Luke goes back to a similar story in Egyptian literature which in modified form occurs more than once in the rabbinic literature too. This suggests that the names found in Christian tradition were retained or later added from the version of the story current in Jewish or Egyptian parallels. *Amonophis*, perhaps to be corrected to *Amenophis*, certainly looks Egyptian, just as *Phinehas*, as it is spelled in English, looks Semitic or Jewish. Certainly *Lazarus* is Greek translation for the Semitic *Eleazar*, and may have entered the gospel text at an earlier stage. Since it is common, there is no special reason to identify the Lazarus of the parable with Lazarus of the Gospel of John,

---

[14] Tract. 9, ed. Schepps, p. 91. Harnack had this brought to his attention simul-taneously by two scholars.

[15] *JThS*, 4 (1903), p. 237; cf. pp. 218, 242–43, from Albi MSS 29, *f.* 71a. The name occurs at the mutilated end of the line, and defied repeated attempts at decipherment. Who is meant by Josypus is not evident.

[16] *JThS*, 7 (1906), p. 565.

[17] W. Pape-G. Benseler, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen*³.

[18] "Vom reichen Mann und armen Lazarus, eine literargeschichtliche Studie," *Abh. d. Preuss. Akad. d. Wissensch.*, Phil.-hist. Kl., 7. A good summary of the article is in J. M. Creed, *The Gospel According to St. Luke*, pp. 210–12.

even though both in John and in Luke 16 30, 31 his rising from the dead is contemplated, and though the mention in both gospels of the sisters Mary and Martha is hardly independent. At any rate, Lazarus need not suffer the sobriquet beggar, nor, in spite of the modern words *lazar, lazaretto,* be regarded as a leper.

So the question rested up until now. We wait to see whether Semitists or Egyptologists can throw some light on νευης, the oldest but most newly discovered among the proper names for Dives.

HENRY J. CADBURY

HARVARD DIVINITY SCHOOL, *emeritus*