

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

fineness and strength of character, and that where love exists there you may expect heroism and self-sacrifice, justice and truth. And the distinction of the morality introduced by Christ consists in this, that He took this mother-virtue and gave it its true and dominating place, and by disclosing the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of men, and identifying both these doctrines with His own person and revelation, He at once gave an extension to the realm of love, and furnished it with a root in reality such as it had never before known.

MARCUS DODS.

ON THE PROPER NAMES IN S. MARK'S GOSPEL.

A STUDY IN THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM.

I PROPOSE in this article to take the proper names of persons and places which occur in S. Mark's Gospel, and to examine what becomes of them in the parallel sections (as far as there are such) of SS. Matthew and Luke. My object in doing this is to draw attention to what I believe to be a new and interesting argument in favour of the oral theory of the origin of the Synoptic Gospels.

To save the reader's time I assume at the outset that the oral theory is true. The arguments in support of it will be given as the article proceeds. I assume also that S. Mark i. 2-xvi. 8 is practically conterminous with what we may call, after Papias, "S. Peter's Memoirs of the Lord," or "Petrine Tradition," which I believe to constitute the first cycle of Oral Gospel.

In deciding which passages of SS. Matthew and Luke are to be considered parallel to S. Mark, I have generally followed Mr. Rushbrooke's *Synopticon*. Even in the history of the Passion, where many of S. Luke's narratives appear to me to come from independent sources, I have

nevertheless for the purposes of this paper accepted Mr. Rushbrooke's parallels.

I have however excluded SS. Matthew's and Luke's "editorial notes," by which term I designate those parts of the Gospels which are personal additions of the author and not based on his authorities. Such additions to the first cycle have no claim to be considered S. Peter's work. I should like to have excluded S. Mark's "editorial notes" also, if it were possible to sever them with any certainty from his text. But though it is easy to see that such words as "The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ" (i. 1); "In the high priesthood of Abiathar" (ii. 26); "For the Pharisees and all the Jews, unless they wash their hands with the fist, eat not," etc. (vii. 3, 4); and "the father of Alexander and Rufus" (xv. 21), are probably editorial notes, it is impossible to feel sure on this point; and in cases where S. Mark repeats a proper name several times in the same narrative when he might have used a pronoun, we cannot decide whether he is reproducing S. Peter's style or indulging in his own. The fact that the other Evangelists agree with him or differ from him in doing so is not decisive. If they agree, they may be following him and not S. Peter; if they differ, they may be departing equally from both. For believing, as I do, that the authors of the first and third Gospels obtained their knowledge of S. Peter's memoirs indirectly through S. Mark's translation of them, I can attach but little weight to their testimony in my endeavour to recover S. Peter's words. Only when they agree together against S. Mark, is it probable that they are reproducing his original language, which in the course of years of catechising he must to some degree have altered from the form which it held when the other Evangelists received it from him.

It is better therefore, in such a discussion as this, to refrain as a rule from any attempt to get behind S. Mark.

We accept him as S. Peter's authorised translator; but we do so with a caution, knowing that allowance must be made for the unconscious working of his own mind and memory during many years.

I have not reckoned as proper names *God, Lord, Son of Man, Son of God, or Holy Spirit*. Neither have I admitted *Satan, the devil or Beelzebul*. The name *Jesus* occurs so frequently, and its repetition in many passages is so much a matter of literary feeling, that I have given the numbers first with, then without it.

I find that in the first cycle eighty-six¹ proper names occur, many of which are repeatedly given until the sum total of proper names in S. Mark amounts to 341, in the Petrine portions of S. Matthew to 270, and in the Petrine portions of S. Luke to 175.

Excluding the name *Jesus*, we find in S. Mark 261 proper names, in S. Matthew's parallel passages 194, and in S. Luke's 128.

Further details are shown in the following tables:—

	S. MARK.	S. MATTHEW.	S. LUKE.
Common to all three Gospels	105	105	105
Common to SS. Mark and Matthew	111	111	
Common to SS. Mark and Luke	35		35
In one Gospel only	90	54	35
	341	270	175

Omitting the name *Jesus*:—

	S. MARK.	S. MATTHEW.	S. LUKE.
Common to all three Gospels	85	85	85
Common to SS. Mark and Matthew	82	82	
Common to SS. Mark and Luke	21		21
In one Gospel only	73	27	22
	261	194	128

¹ I reckon Jacob and Israel, Simon and Peter, Levi and Matthew, James, John and Boanerges as distinct names. I allow three Maries, four Jameses, and two each of Joses and Judas.

It must, however, be remembered that S. Matthew omits five of S. Mark's sections containing in all 7 proper names, and S. Luke omits 14 sections containing 36 proper names. The corrected proportion, therefore, will be for S. Mark, 341; for S. Matthew, 275; and for S. Luke, 196.

It is evident, however, on examination that, as we should have expected, the 54 names peculiar to S. Matthew, and the 35 peculiar to St. Luke are, except in one instance, "editorial notes" possessing no claim to be considered part of the Petrine memoirs. We may deduct them all but one, and the result will then be, S. Mark, 341; S. Matthew, 222; S. Luke, 162.¹

The first thing that strikes us on inspecting these figures is the large proportion of proper names (105 out of 341) which have resisted all the attrition of years of catechising, and all the changes of widely diverging literary styles, and still keep their place in three Gospels. Secondly, we notice that more than double the number (216, *i.e.* 105 + 111) are found in the two Gospels, SS. Mark and Matthew; but when we come to the other pair, SS. Mark and Luke, there is a great falling off. Only 140 (105 + 35) are common to these.

As with the proper names, so fared it with the other words generally. The catechists of Jerusalem, who were responsible for the safe keeping of the Petrine portions of S. Matthew's Gospel, were, as their Oriental training and sympathies inclined them to be, very jealous for the precise wording of the narratives which they taught. They abbreviated them, sometimes considerably; but they did not often change them. The Gentile catechists, inheriting a Greek love of liberty, were not so closely tied to their

¹ In verifying these figures no dependence must be placed on Bruder's concordance. The fourth edition of that work professes to give the readings of Tregelles, and Westcott and Hort. It really prints the *textus receptus*, and seldom notices various readings. A concordance based on a good text is much wanted.

original. As long as the general sense was retained, the words were altered with no little freedom. S. Luke supports S. Mark in only 35 cases beyond those which are common to three Evangelists, and several of these are where S. Matthew has omitted the section.

Lastly, in only one case—exclusive of “editorial notes”—does S. Matthew support S. Luke against S. Mark. For in Mark i. 5, the word *Jordan*, according to the united testimony of SS. Matthew and Luke, ought to have been written twice instead of once. In all other cases in which SS. Matthew and Luke agree, S. Mark agrees with them. Even in this case the meaning is not affected. Whether the word should be given once or twice is a question of literary propriety.

It is of course theoretically possible, if the documentary hypothesis be true, that S. Mark wrote later than SS. Matthew and Luke, and diligently incorporated into his work the whole of the proper names which he found in them, adding many more from external sources. But it seems to us very much simpler and more probable to hold that S. Mark gives us S. Peter’s teaching in its fullest form, the other Gospels in a curtailed form. The priority of S. Mark is generally admitted by all classes of critics, and the facts which we have just stated most strongly confirm it.¹

Professors Sanday² and Marshall³ have recently been calling upon us in *THE EXPOSITOR* to abandon the oral theory of the origin of the Gospels, and to recur to the hypothesis of written documents (which have unaccountably perished and left no trace behind) as the foundation of the com-

¹ In Matthew xxvi. 50-52=Luke xxii. 48-51, the word *Jesus* is twice inserted on the united authority of SS. Matthew and Luke only. But the clauses in which it occurs, though they have Petrine words embedded in them, are, both of them, “editorial notes.” They have no real resemblance with each other, nor is there anything corresponding to them in S. Mark. They come from other sources.

² *EXPOSITOR*, vol. iii. p. 180.

³ *EXPOSITOR*, vol. iii. p. 17.

mon matter in the synoptic Gospels. Professor Sanday's reasons for urging this are different from Professor Marshall's. Professor Sanday holds fast to the unity of S. Mark and accepts his Gospel as the historical framework of the other two. He believes, as I do, that S. Matthew's *Logia*, or "utterances of the Lord," were unknown to S. Mark, or, at least, not used by him.

Professor Marshall, on the other hand, requires us to believe that S. Mark had before him, and deliberately rejected from his Gospel, the Lord's Prayer, the Sermon on the Mount, the longer parables and discourses. In fact, on Professor Marshall's showing, S. Mark becomes a mere editor of other people's work, and one who had so decided a preference for what I had almost called the chaff to the wheat, that the comparative neglect into which his Gospel has fallen is excusable.

Professor Marshall also asks us to believe that with Aramæan scribes writing was so uncertain an art that one letter was constantly misread for another. In a single line of three words he would have us maintain that six letters were confused and one dropped altogether! ¹ Now I admit that the square "Hebrew" characters in which Aramaic was written in the time of our Lord, being without vowel points and having no spaces between the words, did often, in spite of final letters, lead to misreading. But writing would have been of little use in trade if it had not been tolerably trustworthy. The scribes knew which letters were liable to be mistaken, and shaped them with corresponding care. A modern teacher has no difficulty in writing Hebrew letters distinctly. It is one thing for mistakes to have been made in deciphering a manuscript of the Old Testament, which might be centuries old with many letters frayed or rubbed away; it is quite another thing to

¹ EXPOSITION, vol. iii. 387.

blunder in reading a manuscript which, according to Professor Marshall, can hardly have been ten years old.

Moreover if it be true—as it surely must be—that S. Peter's Memoirs as well as S. Matthew's *Logia* were originally composed in Aramaic, and continued to circulate in that language amongst the "Hebrews" of the Church at Jerusalem; if also both the Memoirs and the *Logia* were translated into Greek (as Professor Marshall allows the *Logia* to have been), and freely circulated amongst the "Hellenists," how can his linguistic test distinguish between them? The most that it can do is to discover the places where the oral Greek of either the one or the other has been revised through changes in the oral Aramaic. And thus Professor Marshall's main contention falls to the ground.

Professor Marshall himself is obliged at last to admit¹ the fact of a Greek oral version existing side by side with his supposed Aramaic documents. And this amounts practically to a surrender of his position. For the existence of such a version would inevitably prevent the numerous corruptions and mistakes which his theory requires. And if the version was oral, why should not the original have been oral also? And why should not S. Peter's memoirs have been current in both languages, as well as S. Matthew's *Logia*? S. Peter spoke Aramaic: his knowledge of at least literary Greek was small: else why did he use S. Mark or Silvanus to translate his words into Greek? But if both cycles existed in both languages, what becomes of the linguistic test?

Professor Stanton appears to agree with me in holding that the documentary hypothesis entirely fails to account for the multitude of minute discrepancies in the identical portions of the synoptic gospels. Nothing but years of oral teaching can have produced them. Oral teaching also

¹ EXPOSITOR, vol. vi. p. 93.

alone can account for the present state of the *Logia*. He has done excellent service in insisting on these important points. Nevertheless, certain minute resemblances in language and in order seem to him to make it probable that the authors of the First and Third Gospels had a copy of S. Mark before them when they wrote, though pressure of local opinion in the Churches for which they wrote prevented them from using it except in unimportant details. This assumes that *two* men treated an almost Apostolic document with equal timidity, and that S. Mark's Gospel had a wider circulation in early times than the loss of the last verses indicates. But I venture to point out what I consider a more serious difficulty.

If SS. Matthew and Luke had had before them, as Professor Stanton supposes, a written copy of S. Mark's Gospel or of its prototype, is it credible that they would have treated the proper names in it as they have done?

S. Luke, in his Gospel and in the Acts of the Apostles, writes as an historian. In his "editorial notes" he masses proper names as an historian would. He knows the importance of giving dates, places and persons. Is it conceivable that with S. Mark's 341 proper names in front of him he should have omitted all but 175? Or if he had only a mutilated copy of S. Mark, from which passages containing 36 proper names were absent, still the reduction of even 305 to 175 is impossible to account for, and, as we have seen, the reduction really is to 140.

Grant, however, that S. Luke was a catechist, engaged for many years in teaching "the facts concerning Jesus" to the Christians at Philippi, and is it not certain that with ordinary prudence and kindness he would avoid burdening the memory of his pupils with obscure and unfamiliar foreign names? Such places as Jerusalem, Nazareth, Capernaum; such persons as S. Peter, Mary of Magdala, Judas Iscariot, were essential to his narrative, and must be

learned : but Cæsarea Philippi, Magadan, Decapolis, Bartimæus, Herod Philip, and the Herodians, had either disappeared from the oral teaching before S. Luke received it, or slipped out of his lessons at an early date. When, therefore, he came to write his Gospel, he did not produce them, because he was no longer able to do so, though, if I understand his aims aright, he would have given almost anything for the recovery of just such proper names as these.

Our belief in the oral theory is greatly strengthened when we find that new investigations so decidedly confirm it. It has enabled me lately¹ in the simplest way, to account for S. Luke's omissions, which had puzzled me for twenty years; it has forced upon me an easy answer to the question about the day of the Crucifixion² which was becoming a difficulty of the first magnitude. And while supporters of the documentary hypothesis sooner or later speak of disappointment, despair, and insoluble problems, those who adopt the oral hypothesis are full of hope.

Professor Sanday, for example, confesses³ his inability to account for the extraordinary discrepancies which exist between S. Luke's preface to the Sermon on the Mount and S. Matthew's (Luke vi. 17-26 = Matt. v. 1-12), when compared with the close resemblance between them in the later sections of the same sermon. To me the explanation is easy. S. Luke was a diligent collector of evangelical facts and sayings. During his long residence at Philippi, his wanderings over S. Paul's churches, or his visit to Palestine, he received by word of mouth or by letter—in Greek or Aramaic⁴—not merely the important contributions which make up the third cycle, but an abun-

¹ Letter to the *Guardian*, March 11, 1891.

² *The Biblical World*, Chicago, September, 1893.

³ *EXPOSITOR*, vol. iii. p. 311 ff.

⁴ This will account for some of the traces of translation which Professor Marshall observes.

dance of words or works of Christ collected by many private Christians. Some of these were parts of the second cycle, which was being slowly compiled at Jerusalem; more were sent by independent witnesses. Most of them reached S. Luke without note of time or place. He found room for them in his oral lessons one by one as they came, to the best of his ability. Often he arranged them according to subject-matter rather than by their true chronology. The present state of his Gospel confirms what I say. Only thus can we account for the many boulders in it, deposited in places which are certainly not their own.

Now some of these private contributions S. Luke actually preferred to S. Peter's memoirs. In chapters xxii. and xxiii. he has substituted several of them for S. Peter's records. What more natural than that one of the spectators should have furnished him with an independent account of the opening words of the Sermon on the Mount? His edition of these opening words, besides showing signs of literary polish, differs from S. Matthew's account, as S. John's feeding of the five thousand, or SS. John's and Luke's version of S. Peter's denials differs from S. Mark's. There are some additions and much change, but the same scene is plainly described. It is possible of course that S. Luke never received S. Matthew's narrative: it is more probable that he set it aside in favour of his private information.

The argument from the order of the narratives in the three Gospels, which Mr. F. H. Woods¹ has worked out in detail, so far from being fatal to the oral hypothesis, as Professor Stanton and many others suppose, appears to me to be a strong support of it. For experience shows that if you are to learn by heart a large quantity of loosely connected matter with a view to daily repetition, you must be as careful in preserving the order as in preserving the words.

¹ *Studia Biblica*, series ii. pp. 59-104.

You must even resort to artificial means to assist you in doing this. For memory is so constituted that a variation in order would lead to the loss of matter. Every system of mnemonics is based on association and order. The catechists could only perform their duty by dividing their subject into lessons, and taking each lesson in its proper sequence. The addition from time to time of new matter would not disturb the order of the old sections. A few minor changes would be made, as they have been, in the several churches on first starting: for each considerable church must have had its own Oral Gospel; but when once the order was fixed in any church, it would remain.

Lastly, the contention that the first cycle, if published in Jerusalem, must have contained a Judæan ministry,¹ does not appear to me decisive. In the first place more than a third—three-eighths—of S. Mark's Gospel is taken up with events which happened and discourses which were delivered in Jerusalem. Several of these, I maintain, though placed in Holy Week by S. Mark, belong really to the earlier years of our Lord's ministry. And if, as becomes increasingly probable, a Johannine course of oral teaching was extant in comparatively early times, it is not strange that, as S. John dealt chiefly with the Judæan ministry, S. Peter should have refused to intrude into his brother Apostle's domain. They may have agreed at the outset to divide the work thus between them.

"Mr. Wright," Professor Sanday writes,² "knows the ins and outs of his friends the catechists' proceedings more intimately than most of us." I admit that I have collected for the first time and put together the obscure hints scattered over the New Testament, which indicate the existence and work of a noble band of men who have been hitherto strangely neglected but to whom the Church is under infinite obligation. And in filling up the picture I

¹ EXPOSITOR, vol. iii. p. 187.

² EXPOSITOR, vol. iii. p. 83.

have no doubt made some use of the historical imagination, as every one must do who would present a vivid picture of bygone ages. And to a certain extent at least I have been successful. The existence of the catechists is no longer denied. An effort is sometimes made to belittle them and minimise their work. Not so did the learned author of the Clementine homilies estimate them when he called the catechist of the Apostolic age the officer in command at the prow of the ecclesiastical ship. That was a post of dignity and responsibility second only to the position of the Bishop in the poop. And the catechists, if I mistake not, are regaining it. We have seen how Professor Marshall flies for refuge to them from a serious difficulty. Even Professor Sanday is forced to admit¹ that the catechists lived and laboured in all parts of the Christian world: the contention between us is reduced to this, whether they taught (as Apollos, who was one of them, taught) "the facts concerning Jesus,"² which facts alone their pupils would be willing to learn, or only moral precepts and "the two ways," which belong, I contend, to the less earnest times of the second century, when the Gospels were a written possession. Theophilus, at any rate, had been catechised in the very facts about which S. Luke wrote³ in his Gospel.

But, to return to the proper names, the first cycle speaks of the exercise of miraculous power on twenty-eight occasions. Four times it tells us generally that many were healed, twice definite numbers—5,000 and 4,000—were fed. Eight miracles concerned our Lord Himself. The recipients of the remaining fourteen were individuals. Now it is very remarkable that only one of these individuals is mentioned by name—Bartimæus, the son of Timæus. S. Peter's mother-in-law and Jairus's daughter are designated by the name of a relative. Eleven are anonymous.

¹ EXPOSITION, vol. iii. p. 84.

² Acts xviii. 25.

³ Luke i. 4.

If S. Peter had been writing history for the refutation of adversaries, he would have taken pains to discover (if he had forgotten or never known) the names of these eleven persons, and he would have appealed to them as witnesses in his support. But S. Peter was teaching Christians who accepted his testimony. They wanted information, not proof. They were little disposed to burden their memory with proper names of persons whom they did not know. They expected the end of the dispensation very shortly, and knew nothing of the claims of posterity.

On the other hand S. Peter's knowledge of places might be expected to be fuller. And we find that he fixes the locality of fourteen miracles. Four others are said to have been wrought "in the desert," "in a desert spot," "on a lofty mountain," or at its foot. The remaining ten have no local clue.

Seven Old Testament saints are mentioned—Abraham, Isaac, Jacob or Israel, Moses, David, Elijah, Isaiah. S. Mark adds Abiathar, and S. Matthew Jeremiah and Daniel in what are probably "editorial notes." It is noteworthy that the seven are mentioned in all the three Gospels. The common idea that Gentile Christians took little interest in the Old Testament is not supported. S. Luke's quotations from the Old Testament in the Acts of the Apostles completely refute it.

The name of Jesus is mentioned 80 times in S. Mark, John the Baptist 16 times, the Boanerges and Pilate 10 times, Peter and Herod (Antipas) 8 times. So truly is the first cycle described as "the facts concerning Jesus."¹

Something is told concerning nine faithful men of that age, John the Baptist, Simon Peter, the sons of Zebedee, Matthew (if indeed he is identical with Levi, which is more than doubtful), Jairus, Bartimæus, Joseph of Arimathæa, Simon the Cyrenian; and of three holy women, the Virgin

¹ Acts xviii. 25.

Mary, Mary of Magdala, Salome. Then come four unbelieving men—Herod, Pilate, Barabbas, Judas Iscariot, and one unbelieving woman, Herodias.

Very little is recorded of the above persons. If it were not for the dramatic vividness of S. John's Gospel, we should be singularly in the dark about the Apostles and leaders of the Church. Except in the one tragic scene of the Baptist's murder, our Lord is the central figure in every section of the first cycle. Other characters are entirely subordinate to Him.

Names and nothing more are given of twenty-three other persons, of whom seven were Apostles and four "brethren of the Lord." The rest are Alphæus, Zebedee, James the Little and his brother Joses, Simon the leper, Timæus, Alexander and Rufus (these two I regard as an editorial addition of S. Mark's), Mary (who is once described as the mother of James the Little and Joses, on another as the mother of Joses, and on a third as the mother of James), (Tiberius) Cæsar, Herod Philip (in Cæsarea Philippi) and apparently another Herod Philip in the narrative of the Baptist's murder.

Geographical details are scanty. Five countries are mentioned—Judæa, Galilee, Gennesaret, Beyond Jordan, and Decapolis. Eleven cities or villages—Jerusalem, Capernaum, Nazareth, Bethsaida, Cæsarea Philippi, Jericho, Bethphage, Bethany, Magadan, Tyre and Sidon. I might have given Dalmanutha instead of Magadan, but, as Professor Rendel Harris has shown,¹ it is probably a "primitive error," in which S. Matthew has preserved the true Petrine word. If, as I have long suspected, Bethphage and Bethany are two names of the same village, all difficulty about them disappears. Lieutenant Conder does not admit the existence of two Bethsaidas on the shore of the same lake. And such a thing is hardly credible in itself. Either, therefore,

¹ On the *Codex Beza*, p. 178.

S. Luke¹ has unwittingly transposed the name from the end of the narrative to the beginning, or some private informant has told him the locality of the feeding of the four thousand—for which Bethsaida is singularly well suited—and he, knowing nothing of that event, has transferred the word to the feeding of the five thousand. S. Mark only knows of a “desert spot” as the scene of the miracle, and S. John’s narrative does not at all suit the North end of the lake. It is true that S. John in another place² speaks of a “Bethsaida in Galilee,” whereas the only Bethsaida of which we know was on the east shore of the Jordan, and therefore just out of Galilee in Gaulanitis. But S. Luke has once interchanged Gaulanitis³ with Galilee, and it may well be that the word Galilee had a wider application in addition to its strict geographical use.

S. Mark tells us that Nazareth was in Galilee,⁴ S. Matthew that Capernaum was by the ‘sea-side,’⁵ and S. Luke that Tyre was on the shores of the Mediterranean,⁶ and that Capernaum was a city in Galilee.⁷ But all these additions seem to be “editorial notes.” Knowledge on the part of the reader is generally assumed.

Five other places are mentioned—the river Jordan, the sea of Galilee, the Mount of Olives, the Garden of Gethsemane, Golgotha. S. Luke omits Gethsemane, and translates Golgotha “a skull.”⁸ So he translates Cananæan “Zealot.”⁹ To prevent mistake he calls the sea of Galilee the lake of Gennesaret. He defines the “two disciples” (Mark xi. 1 = Matt. xxi. 1) to be Peter and John. He describes John as “the son of Zechariah” (iii. 2). For Thaddæus he puts “Judas the (son) of James” (Luke vi. 16; cf. Acts i. 13). He adds Joanna (xxiv. 10) to the list of women who visited the sepulchre.

¹ Luke ix. 10; cf. Mark vi. 45.

² xii. 21.

³ Acts v. 37.

⁴ i. 9.

⁵ iv. 13.

⁶ iv. 17.

⁷ iv. 31.

⁸ xxiii. 33.

⁹ vi. 15.

Again, twelve adjectives derived from proper names are found—Jews, Pharisees, Sadducees, Galilæans, Jerusalemites, Herodians, Gerasenes, Idumæans, Nazarene, Cyrenian, Greek, Syrophœnician. S. Matthew, at least in the present text, changes Gerasenes into Gadarenes.

Finally we may observe that of the eighty-six proper names which occur in the first cycle, the following twenty-five are absent from S. Luke's parallels: Abiathar, Thaddæus, Boanerges, the names of the four Brethren of the Lord, James the Little, Joses, Bartimæus, Timæus, Alexander, Rufus, Salome, both the Herods Philip (if indeed there were two), the Herodians, Jerusalemites, Greek woman, Syrophœnician, Gennesaret, Beyond Jordan, Decapolis, Cæsarea Philippi, Magadan. These names, I submit, are exactly the kind of names which we should expect to be riddled out of the tradition in forty years of catechetical teaching amongst persons who were not resident in Palestine. But if we look at the proper names in the non-Petrine portions of S. Luke's Gospel, or at the remarkably rich array of famous and obscure persons and places mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles, they will be seen to be just the kind of names which S. Luke would have wished to record in a written Gospel.

ARTHUR WRIGHT.