

# 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](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

applies to the physical or animal substance of the human body. No surprise need be felt at finding a fresh "hapax legomenon" in the Hebrew of the old Testament, considering that many other such are known to exist in it; and the fact of their occurrence is sufficiently accounted for by the comparatively small number of documents that have come down to us from the times of the ancient Hebrews.

I will, in conclusion, point out that the ancient versions and early commentators, though apparently mistaken in their analysis of the word "bēshaggām," nevertheless gave the general sense of the phrase correctly enough. For it can be seen at once that the rendering "for that he also is flesh" practically amounts to the same as "inasmuch as his substance is but flesh." This is indeed one of the, perhaps, not inconsiderable number of cases in which tradition was guided by common sense to perpetuate the right meaning of a phrase, notwithstanding the obscurity which had settled down on some form or forms of which the collateral analogies of cognate languages had been either lost or forgotten.

G. MARGOLIOUTH.

*WERE MATTHEW AND ZACCHÆUS THE SAME  
PERSON?*

THIS may seem a startling question, but the reader must judge of the evidence for himself. It has generally been assumed that Matthew and Levi are two names of one and the same person, but considerable doubt is thrown on this identification by the alternative reading "Lebbæus" for "Thaddæus" in S. Matthew x. 3, and S. Mark iii. 18. In their "Notes on Select Readings" Westcott and Hort, commenting on this reading, observe: "This name is apparently due to an early attempt to bring Levi (*Λευεῖς*) the publican (Luke v. 27) within the Twelve, it being assumed

that his call was to apostleship; just as in Mark ii. 14 *Λευίς* is changed in western texts to *Ἰάκωβος* because τὸν τοῦ Ἀλφαίου follows, and it was assumed that the son of Halphæus, elsewhere named as one of the Twelve, must be meant. The difference between the two forms of the name would be inconsiderable in Aramaic, *Lewi* and *Levi* or *Lebi* or *Lebbi*; and *Λεββαῖος* might as easily represent *Lebbi* as *Θαδδαῖος* Thaddi. Indeed the identity of Levi and Lebbæus, evidently resting on the presumed identity of the names in Greek, is implied in a remark of Origen. . . . In reply to a taunt of Celsus that Christ chose for His Apostles "publicans and sailors," Origen (Cels. 376) first allows no publican but Matthew, and then refers concessively to "Lebes [*Λεβῆς* but ? *Λευεῖς*], a publican who followed Jesus," "but," he adds, "he was in no wise of the number of the apostles except according to some copies of the Gospel according to Mark." WH point out that Origen was here so far at fault that he failed to observe that in S. Matthew as well as in S. Mark *Θαδδαῖον* was not the only reading.

We have learned to attach a greater value of late to Western readings than WH do; and it is the object of this paper to show some reason for believing that the Western text here preserves the right reading, and that Matthew and Levi are not to be identified, but rather Matthew and Zacchæus.

We may first note that it is natural to bring two sons of Alphæus together, as would in this case be done if we read Mark iii. 18, "James the son of Alphæus, and Levi." It was necessary to distinguish this James from the son of Zebedee; hence the patronymic is placed after his name only.

But what seems to me to supply the missing link in the evidence is the fact that Clement of Alexandria informs us that, according to some authorities, the name of the

publican in Luke xix. 1-10 was "Matthias" (*Strom.* iv. 35). In another passage he says "Matthew" (*Quis Dives*, 13). Here he couples together "Zacchæus and Matthew, who were rich men and publicans." Zahn remarks that, in this passage, Clement refers only to Luke xix. 5-7, or its apocryphal parallels, and not to Matthew ix. 9 ff. For the passage runs, "The Lord Himself bids Zacchæus and Matthew . . . entertain Him." I think Zahn is right, and that Clement means that his readers must decide for themselves whether Zacchæus or Matthew is the right name in the pericope alluded to. "The Lord," he says in effect, "bids rich men and publicans entertain Him, as in the story about Zacchæus and Matthew"—the story, that is, as told, on the one hand in the canonical Gospel of S. Luke, and, on the other hand, in the Apocryphal Gospel, which read Matthew for Zacchæus. Clement does not attempt to reconcile this inconsistency, but it seems natural to suppose that Matthew and Zacchæus are really two separate names of one and the same person. By the time of Clement this fact may have been forgotten. At any rate he is content to note the divergence of his authorities on the point without accounting for it. Thus we have in this passage of Clement a presumption that Matthew and Zacchæus were, respectively, the nomen and prænomen of one rich publican. The reading of Matthew x. 3, which appears in our A.V., "Lebbæus, whose surname was Thaddæus" (ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς Θαδδαῖος) may likewise owe its origin to the fact that Thaddæus was Levi's "nomen gentilicium." WH regard this as a case of conflation, but it is found not only in the Peschito, but also in the Æthiopic and Armenian versions, and one Latin version. It is clear, at any rate, that one of the apostles was known by the name "Thaddæus" c. 250 A.D., for it was about this time that the legend of "Addai" or "Thaddæus" originated at Edessa, and it is possible that Levi Thaddæus

did preach the gospel in Eastern Syria, though doubtless it was not until the conversion of the King Abgar Bar Manu, in the latter half of the second century, that the gospel began to make any real progress in this region.

But what was the Apocryphal Gospel in which Clement found Matthew substituted for Zacchæus? Zahn thinks that it must have been the "Gospel of Matthias," which is referred to occasionally in the lists of apocryphal gospels which have come down to us, and he therefore regards Matthew as a slip for Matthias. He supposes that the earlier gnostics pretended to have access to a secret tradition of Matthias, and deliberately assigned certain episodes of the gospel story to him, and published their own garbled version of the gospel under the title of the "Gospel of Matthias," or the "Traditions of Matthias."

If, however, we examine the evidence for the existence of this supposed extra-canonical Gospel of Matthias, I think we shall find that it all resolves itself into the simple fact that the "Gospel according to the Egyptians" was, in the main, based on the original Gospel of S. Matthew, and was therefore known as "the Gospel according to S. Matthew," or "the Traditions of S. Matthew." I will endeavour briefly to substantiate this statement.

In the fragments which Zahn has collected of Origen's scholia on Luke i. 1, we read: "Matthew did not merely take in hand to write a gospel, but actually wrote one, being moved by the Holy Ghost; likewise both Mark and John, as also Luke . . . Many indeed 'took in hand' both the Gospel according to Matthias, and many others: but the Church of God prefers the four (canonical) Gospels alone." If we suppose that Matthias is a misreading for Matthew, what Origen here says is that there had been many recensions of the Gospel of S. Matthew, "written up" by those who "took it in hand." This is exactly what the Gospel according to the Egyptians appears to

have been. It is perfectly natural that, as an Apocryphal Gospel seemed to be referred to, and it was assumed that no such gospel could be entitled "according to Matthew," copyists should have substituted Matthias. Similarly, in other supposed references to a Gospel of Matthias, it is highly probable that Matthias should be corrected into Matthew.

A similar result is suggested by the position of this Apocryphal "Gospel of Matthias" in the three lists of apocryphal books in which it occurs. These are (1) the so-called "Decretum Gelasii," (2) the rescript of Pope Innocent I., (3) the Appendix to the list of "Sixty Canonical Books." In the first case, under the "Notitia librorum apocryphorum qui non recipiuntur," the list of Apocryphal Gospels is headed with those of Matthias and Peter. In the rescript of Pope Innocent, after the list of canonical books, we read, "But the rest, whether under the name of Matthias or James the Less, or under the name of Peter . . . are not only to be repudiated, but also to be condemned." The Appendix to the "Sixty Canonical Books" only mentions two Gospels, those according to "Barnabas," and "Matthias." A variant reading is "Matthew." The close association of the Gospels of Matthias and Peter in the two older lists, and their position at the head of the list in the "Decretum Gelasii," suggest that we have here to do with the two great Apocryphal Gospels, which we know to have been current together in Egypt—the Gospel according to the Egyptians and the Gospel of Peter. I cannot here go into the further reasons which lead me to believe that Basilides was the author of the "Gospel according to the Egyptians," but may perhaps be permitted to refer the reader to my *Lectures on the Early History of the Gospels*, in which I have tried to justify this position.

It is true that no absolute proof of the identity of

Matthew and Zacchæus has been, or, to my knowledge, can be, adduced, but I think we may fairly say that there is a very strong presumption in favour of such a theory. Clement was not a Jew, but an Athenian; else he might have sifted the matter further, and have suggested the identity of Matthew and Zacchæus. But he seems to have been indifferent to such a detail: what he cared about was the fact that our Lord taught rich publicans, whatever their name might have been, to use their money for good purposes.

It may be worth while, in conclusion, to refer to the tradition, which we find in the Clementine Homilies, that Zacchæus was the first bishop of Cæsarea. If, at the date when the original Clementine romance was written, Matthew and Zacchæus were convertible names, we have a natural explanation of the undoubted prominence of Zacchæus in the early Church of Western Palestine here referred to, and of the fact that the author of the Clementine Homilies assigns to Zacchæus a position of equal rank with Clement of Rome, asserting that they succeeded, respectively, in the West and the East, to the original primacy of S. James, Bishop of Jerusalem.

It is not improbable that Zacchæus was S. Matthew's tribal name. In Ezra ii. 9 we read of the "children of Zaccai," who are mentioned as one of the families who returned from the Captivity. There is a striking similarity of form between "Addai" and "Zaccai," suggesting that both Zacchæus and Thaddæus were "*nomina gentilitia*." Zacchæus may thus very well have been a sort of surname, and it would be by this name, rather than by the more homely name of Matthew, that the great Apostle would be known to the outside world in the early days of Christianity.

J. H. WILKINSON.