

Sticks brought Mr Verrill and his companion to a halt. *Teraphim*, like Devil Sticks, warn the would-be intruder that there is sickness about. It would be a mistake I think to argue from 1 Sam. xix 13 that *teraphim* were usually of the exact shape and size of the human form. I would rather believe that many of the quite small conventionalized figures of Astarte and Bes and other deities or demons which are dug up in largish numbers during excavations in Palestine would have been called *teraphim* by the writers of the Old Testament.

It is worthy of note that LXX gives a plural form, whenever it allows itself to render this objectionable word. The rendering is generally scornful: τὰ εἰδωλα in Gen. xxxi 19; τὰ κεντάφια, 1 Sam. xix 13; τοῖς γλυπτοῖς, Ezek. xxi 21 (26, Heb.); but an approximation to the meaning of the word is given in Hos. iii 4 δῆλων (which is also a rendering of תַּמִּים, *Thummim*, in Deut. xxxiii 8), and in Zech. x 2 οἱ ἀποφθεγγόμενοι, 'the oracle givers'. In Judges xvii 5, xviii 14-20 *teraphim* is transliterated with the singular article τό prefixed in two cases, while in 2 Kings xxiii 24 the transliteration is preceded by τὰ. Surely we need not attribute to the singular article the significance that the translator supposed that *teraphim* signified a single image! Such authority as LXX has is surely in favour of the view that the *teraphim* are plural.

W. EMERY BARNES.

A PAPYRUS SCRAP OF PATRISTIC WRITING

THE third-century Washington MS of the δωδεκαπρόφητων, of which a notice appears elsewhere in this JOURNAL, contains in addition fragments of an unknown work. These scraps, 38 in all, are reproduced by Mr Sanders on pp. 69 and 70 of the Facsimile volume 'in order that scholars may have a chance to help in identifying them'. He adds that 'the reading is in all cases so doubtful that I have not ventured to print the text of the fragments, but as an assistance towards identifying the work' he gives his 'tentative reading of the largest fragment'.¹ The object of this note is to supplement and correct Mr Sanders's reading of this largest fragment in a few particulars which his facsimiles have, I think, enabled me to decipher, and, secondly, to venture a suggestion as to the author. I have failed to identify the passage, which probably comes from a lost work. The fragment consists of the middle portions of fourteen consecutive lines, recto and verso, each line containing no

¹ p. 228 f. of the printed edition.

more than two or three words except at the bottom, where the width of the fragment slightly expands.

Mr Sanders prints his tentative reading as follows¹:—

RECTO.	VERSO.
[1] σουν εστιν	τουτων α [1]
[2] ν μαρτυρου	εκκλησιας δ [2]
[3] .ισηι την πολ	μου συνπ [3]
[4] . . . θελην σκει	ν την νυν υπ [4]
[5] των τεχνιτω	. . . ιδου ειμι . . . [5]
[6] ην τεχνην το	λιθος ανθραξ . [6]
[7] τερσιν ανθρωπο	το πυρωδες ν . [7]
[8] ην εκκλησιαν	ιδου εγω ειπ [8]
[9] αυται ανηβοτ	το του πατρος [9]
[10] . του παθ . . λετε	ενυστερον [10]
[11] τειχη σου ταυτ	. . . βηιμηκαλ [11]
[12] ξεκιηλ βοα και λεγει και	των μεν κριτης . εν [12]
[13] και επ αυτω . . σοι καλο	και ετερος μαρ [13]
[14] λοε εκει ιδου ου καρνιτων [14]

This printing does not shew the ragged edges which appear in the facsimiles. On the right of the recto there is an indentation at lines 9 and 10, and the papyrus in the last three lines expands to the left.

RECTO. Here I have little to suggest, since the facsimile is so obscure as to be almost illegible. The faint indications of lettering on a dark background, in which the markings of the papyrus are the prominent feature, offer little hope of restoration.

Line 12 contains one arresting phrase which, 'aided by a suggestion of Dr Rendel Harris',² Mr Sanders doubtless correctly deciphers as [E]ξεκιηλ βοα και λεγει. This use of βοα, or a synonym such as κέκραγεν, to introduce a scriptural quotation or paraphrase, is characteristic of two early Christian apologists, Clement of Alexandria and Justin Martyr. Such a verb seemed more forcible than the λέγει which suffices the writers of the New Testament in citing Scripture. To the Apologist the old Hebrew prophet, or the Christian Apostle, not merely 'being dead yet speaketh': he *declaims*, as it were, from the pulpit or from the stage. Or, perhaps more often, it is God or the Holy Spirit who declaim through the mouth of the prophet.

Thus in Clement³ *Paed.* ii 10. 95 (227 P) we find: *δυσωπείτω δὲ ἡμῶς*

¹ I have numbered the lines for convenience.

² p. 9 (printed edition).

³ I quote throughout from Dindorf's text.

ὁ παιδαγωγὸς δι' Ἐξεκλήλ βοῶν "περιτέμενσθε τὴν πορνείαν ὑμῶν" (a paraphrase of Ez. xliii 9). Similarly we have ἐκβοᾷ¹ (ἢ γραφή) *Strom.* ii 8. 39 (449 P); ἐμβοᾷν *ib.* i 1. 16 (325 P) παραθετόν . . . φωνὰς τὰς ἐμβοῶσας παρ' ἕκαστα; ἐπιβοᾷ (the Apostle Paul) *ib.* iii 11. 77 (545 P); τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα διὰ τοῦ Ἀμῶς ἐκφωνήσαν *Paed.* ii 2. 30 (185 P); and frequently κέκραγεν: *Paed.* i 9. 85, *Strom.* ii 6. 26, ii 13. 59, iii 6. 53 (v 1. 5 ὁ Αἰσχυλος), v 3. 18, v 14. 119, vi 10. 81, *Quis dives salu.* 39.

Justin Martyr has similar phrases. Thus Ἡσαίας βοᾷ in *Trypho* 12 (229 A), 14 (231 C), 17 (235 A); βοᾷ διὰ Ἡσαίου (ὁ θεὸς οἱ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα) *ib.* 24 and 25 (242 B); ἐμβοᾷ ὁ θεὸς διὰ τοῦ Ἡσαίου *ib.* 16 (234 C); and κέκραγεν is frequent.

But the phrase in the papyrus fragment is not merely βοᾷ, but βοᾷ καὶ λέγει; and to illustrate this combination of verbs we must turn not to Justin, but to Clement. In the *Protrepticus* 94 (75-6 P) we read: ὁ δὲ φιλόστοργος οὗτος ἡμῶν πατήρ, ὁ ὄντως πατήρ, οὐ πάυεται προτρέπων, νοουθεῶν, παιδεύων, φιλῶν· οὐδὲ γὰρ σώζων πάυεται, συμβουλεύει δὲ τὰ ἄριστα· δίκαιοι γένεσθε, λέγει κύριος, οἱ διψῶντες πορεύεσθε ἐφ' ἕδωρ . . . ἀνεγ ἄργυρίου (a free quotation of Is. liv 17, lv 1). ἐπὶ τὸ λουτρόν, ἐπὶ τὴν σωτηρίαν, ἐπὶ τὸν φωτισμὸν παρακαλεῖ μονονουχὶ βοῶν καὶ λέγων, γῆν σοι δίδωμι καὶ θάλατταν, παιδίον, οὐρανόν τε καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς πάντα ζῶά σοι χαρίζομαι· μόνον, ὦ παιδίον, δίψησον τοῦ πατρός κτλ. (a very free paraphrase of the meaning of Scripture). The passage is for two reasons significant. It suggests that βοᾷ καὶ λέγει in our fragment may introduce not a literal quotation, but a paraphrase of the prophet's language. Again, as will appear later, the fragment contains a quotation from the very section of Isaiah (liv 17) to which Clement is here alluding.

For a similar combination of verbs we may compare also *Paed.* i 9. 76 (143 P) παρακαλεῖ καὶ φησὶν διὰ τοῦ Ἰεζεκιήλ and *Strom.* vii 9. 53 (863 P) ὁ γενναῖος . . . ἀπόστολος κεκραγὼς καὶ γράφων ('proclaimed aloud and in writing', Mayor) περιτομήν τὴν χειροποίητον οὐδὲν ὠφέλειν.

Justin, on the other hand, so far as I have observed, never has this collocation of present tenses united by καὶ (βοᾷ καὶ λέγει or βοῶν καὶ λέγων); though he may employ a combination of indicative and participle: *Trypho* 16 (234 C) ἐμβοᾷ ὑμῖν ὁ θεὸς διὰ τοῦ Ἡσαίου λέγων, 16 (233 D) διὰ Μωυσέως κέκραγεν ὁ θεὸς αὐτὸς οὕτως λέγων.

I am not Patristic scholar enough to know whether this use of βοᾷν occurs elsewhere.² I have failed to find it, and if our fragment is coeval

¹ Also *Strom.* v 14. 113 (717 P) Σοφοκλῆς . . . ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς ἐκβοᾷ. Similarly of another tragedian *ib.* vi 2. 7 (739 P) Εὐριπίδου ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς βοῶντος; and of actors in tragedies *ib.* ii 15. 63 (462 P) ἡ Μηδεία ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς βοᾷ and Αἴας . . . κέκραγεν.

² Since this was written Dr Darwell Stone has kindly supplied me with several instances from fourth-century writers.

with or only slightly later than the third-century text of the Minor Prophets with which it was bound up, the range of possible authors is rather narrowly limited. At any rate this phrase raises a presumption of Clementine authorship, which is borne out by other details.

I now revert to the remainder of the Recto, taking the lines in order.

Line 1. For COYN I should read C OYN . The writer is arguing. As the recto begins with an $\text{o}\dot{\iota}\nu$, so the verso breaks off with an $\text{o}\dot{\iota}\kappa \alpha\rho(\alpha)$, where again Mr Sanders has failed to divide the words correctly. The two opening lines might conceivably run [Ἰησοῦ] $\text{s o}\dot{\iota}\nu \dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ [. δ] ν $\mu\alpha\rho\tau\upsilon\rho\acute{\omicron}\nu[\sigma\iota\nu . . .$

Line 2. $\text{M}\alpha\rho\tau\upsilon\rho\acute{\omicron}\nu[\text{CIN}]$. The whole passage is clearly a collection, as Clement would say a $\text{s}\dot{\iota}\nu\tau\alpha\acute{\xi}\iota\varsigma$,¹ or more pungently a veritable $\text{s}\mu\eta\eta\nu\text{o}\varsigma$,² of *testimonia*. In line 12 of the recto we have Ezekiel 'shouting' and in the next line probably another occurrence of the word 'witness'. In the verso we find a quotation from Isaiah and perhaps an allusion to Matthew, and we end with $\text{k}\alpha\iota \dot{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\rho\text{o}\varsigma \mu\alpha\rho[\tau\upsilon\rho\acute{\omicron}\nu]$.

The following lines are very obscure in the facsimile.

Line 3 (Sanders . ICH). The letters look like MCAI , possibly HCAI ; can an abbreviation of Ἡσαίας be intended?

Line 4. $\text{σ}\kappa\epsilon\iota$ (Sanders), if correctly read, suggests $\text{σ}\kappa(\epsilon)\iota\alpha\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\acute{\iota}\alpha$, 'adumbration', which occurs in Clement *Paed.* i 7. 60 (134 P) $\text{σ}\kappa\iota\alpha\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\acute{\iota}\alpha \gamma\alpha\rho \eta\nu \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\upsilon \tau\omicron \delta\omicron\nu\omicron\mu\alpha \tau\omicron \text{Ἰησοῦ}$ (Joshua) $\text{π}\rho\omicron\kappa\eta\rho\text{o}\sigma\acute{\omicron}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu \dot{\epsilon}\nu \nu\acute{\omicron}\mu\omega$, and *Strom.* i 1. 11 (322 P) where the writer says that his work is not a $\text{γ}\rho\alpha\phi\acute{\eta} \dot{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma \dot{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}\delta\epsilon\iota\chi\epsilon\iota\nu \tau\epsilon\tau\epsilon\chi\nu\alpha\sigma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$, but notes treasured for old age, an $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\iota}\delta\omega\lambda\omicron\nu \dot{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\chi\nu\acute{\omega}\varsigma \kappa\alpha\iota \sigma\kappa\iota\alpha\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\acute{\iota}\alpha$ of the clear and living doctrines which he had been privileged to hear from blessed men of old. There is a contrast here between $\text{t}\acute{\epsilon}\chi\nu\eta$ and $\text{σ}\kappa\iota\alpha\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\acute{\iota}\alpha$, which is significant in view of the occurrence of (?) $\text{t}\epsilon\chi\nu\acute{\iota}\tau\omega[\nu]$ and $\text{t}\acute{\epsilon}\chi\nu\eta\nu$ in the next two lines of the papyrus. $\text{t}\epsilon\chi\nu\acute{\iota}\tau\eta\varsigma$ is frequent in various senses in Clement.

Line 7. $\text{t}\epsilon\rho\text{c}\iota\nu \dot{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron}$ (Sanders). The first fragmentary letter is, I think, not τ but ρ : the word is probably [$\dot{\epsilon}$] $\gamma\epsilon\rho\sigma\iota\nu$. The only use of this noun that I have found in Clement is *Strom.* v 14. 105 (712 P) $\text{o}\dot{\upsilon} \gamma\alpha\rho \tau\eta\nu \dot{\alpha}\nu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\iota\nu \mu\acute{\omicron}\nu\eta\nu \tau\omicron\upsilon \text{Χριστοῦ} \dot{\epsilon}\xi \text{ὑπνου} \xi\gamma\epsilon\rho\sigma\iota\nu$, $\dot{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha} \kappa\alpha\iota \tau\eta\nu \dot{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma \sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\kappa\alpha \kappa\acute{\alpha}\theta\omicron\delta\omicron\nu \tau\omicron\upsilon \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\upsilon \text{ὑπνον} \dot{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\eta\gamma\omicron\rho\acute{\epsilon}\iota$ (sc. David in Ps. iii 5 'I laid me down', &c.). In the papyrus, as in the foregoing passage, there may be an allusion to the 'resurrection'; but the building metaphor in the context (l. 11 $\text{t}\epsilon\iota\chi\eta \sigma\omicron\upsilon$) suggests rather the alternative meaning of 'building up', 'erection'.

¹ *Strom.* iv 9. 70 (595 P) $\text{π}\epsilon\rho\iota \delta\acute{\epsilon} \tau\omicron\upsilon \mu\alpha\rho\tau\upsilon\rho\acute{\omicron}\nu \delta\iota\alpha\r\rho\eta\delta\eta\nu \delta \kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma \dot{\epsilon}\rho\eta\kappa\epsilon\nu \kappa\alpha\iota \tau\acute{\alpha} \delta\iota\alpha\phi\acute{\omicron}\rho\omega\varsigma \gamma\epsilon\gamma\rho\alpha\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha \sigma\upsilon\nu\tau\acute{\alpha}\xi\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$.

² *ib.* iv 16. 102 (609 P) $\text{s}\mu\eta\eta\nu\text{o}\varsigma \text{ὑποδειγμάτων} \theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$.

Line 9. ΑΥΤΑΙ ΔΗΗΒΟΥΤ (Sanders). The facsimile is almost illegible ; I doubtfully read γ ΗΙ ΔΝΕΒΟ and suggest that the last words are ἦ (in the sense of 'as') ἀνεβόη[σαν], and that we have the 'cry' of another witness or witnesses like that of Ezekiel below. But I can quote no instance of a use of ἀναβοᾶν analogous to that of βοᾶν, ἐκβοᾶν, and ἐμβοᾶν mentioned above.

Line 10 possibly contains an allusion to παθῆ $\bar{\chi}\bar{\gamma}$, but again the facsimile is practically illegible.

Line 11. ΤΕΙΧΗ ΣΟΥ ΤΑΥΤ (Sanders). *τείχη σου* suggests Biblical language, *ταῦτ(a)* that it is a case of interpretation of Scripture, rather than direct quotation. 'These are "thy walls"' is a form of sentence for which parallels can be found in Clement, though I have omitted to note references. Ezekiel is mentioned in the next line, but the only occurrences of the phrase τὰ *τείχη σου* in Ezekiel seem incongruous. It is more likely that there is an allusion to Isaiah lx 18 κληθήσεται Σωτήριον τὰ *τείχη σου* (or *το οἰκοδομήσουσιν ἀλλογενεῖς τὰ *τείχη σου**).

Line 12. The torn papyrus unfortunately conceals the nature of Ezekiel's 'cry'. The *καί* at the end of the line rather suggests that the quotation did not immediately follow *λέγει*, but was preceded by a parenthesis, e. g. 'and others agree with him'.

Line 13. ΚΑΙ ΕΠ ΑΥΤΩ . . ΣΟΙ ΚΑΛΟ (Sanders). I read *καί μαρτ[γρε]c οἱ καλο[γμενοί] δωδεκα ?* ; the letters *μαρτ* seem fairly clear.

Line 14. ΛΟΞ ΕΚΕΙ ΙΔΟΥ (Sanders). I confidently suggest *ταδε λεξε!* $\bar{\kappa}\bar{\zeta}$ *ιδου* ; I cannot say that I read the first three words, but the letters that are visible, *δε-ε-κ*, fall into place. Here apparently begins the quotation from Ezekiel, but we are unfortunately not much nearer identifying it ; for this exordium of four words occurs some twenty times in Ezekiel, twice in Isaiah, and sixteen times in Jeremiah. The *δωδεκαπρόφητον* has no exact instance of it, since in Zech. viii 7 the word *παντοκράτωρ* is interposed between *Κύριος* and *ιδού*.

VERSO. Here I am on firmer ground, since Mr Sanders has considerably published a second facsimile in his printed edition (Plate II 'Papyrus fragments at bottom of first box'), slightly smaller, but far clearer, than that contained in his volume of facsimiles. Except for a few letters, I have succeeded, I think, in deciphering the whole. The difficulty of tracing the connexion between the fragmentary lines remains ; there is also, of course, a lacuna of a considerable part of a page between Recto and Verso. My reading of the text is as follows, variation from Mr Sanders's reading being indicated by thicker type :—

VERSO.

- (1) **ϞΦΙϞΤΩΝ Κ**
 (2) **ΕΚΚΛΗϞΙΑϞ Δ**
 (3) [**οικο**]ΔΟΜΟΥ ΕΡΓΩ ΠΟ[λλω]
 (4) **ΙΝ ΤΗΝ ΝΥΝ ΥΠ[αρχουσαν]**
 (5) **ΧΗΔΟΝΙΑΝ ΚΑΛ[ουμενην]**
 (6) **ΛΙΘΟϞ ΑΝΘΡΑΞ**
 (7) **ΤΟ ΠΥΡΩΔΕϞ**
 (8) [**ειπ**]ΕΝ ΙΔΟΥ ΕΓΩ ΕΤΟΙ[μαζω σοι ανθρακα..]
 (9) [**υ**]ΠΟ ΤΟΥ ΠΑΤΡΟϞ
 (10) **ΤΟ ΕΝ ΥϞΤΕΡΟΝ**
 (11) **ΕΝ ΔΟΞΗ ΑΠΟΚΑΛ[υφθη]**¹
 (12) **ΤΩΝ ΜΕΝ ΚΡΙΤΗϞ . ΕΝ**²
 (13) **³ ΚΑΙ ΕΤΕΡΟϞ ΜΑΡ[τυρει]**
 (14) **ΗΤΗϞ ΟΥΚ ΑΡΑ ΗΝ ΤΙΝΙ Η**

Line 1. ΦΙϞΤΩΝ is clear, and the first letter in the line may well be c, the apparently angular form being probably due to lines in the papyrus: the ο is doubtful. The *κακοδαίμονες σοφισταί* who spend their lives in hair-splitting (*Strom.* i 3. 22 (328 P)) and *ἡ σοφιστικὴ τέχνη* (*ib.* i 8. 39 (339 P), i 10. 47 (344 P)) come in for much abuse in Clement of Alexandria.

Line 3. The reading is clear, and the phrase [**οικο**]ΔΟΜΟΥ ΕΡΓΩ finds an illuminating parallel in Clement: *Strom.* vii 5. 28 (845 P) *τί δ' ἂν καὶ οἰκοδόμων καὶ λιθοξόων καὶ βαναύσων τέχνης ἅγιον εἶη ἔργον*; Clement⁴ is arguing that the infinite God cannot be circumscribed in a given locality, and in the next section he proceeds to say that the true temple of God is the assembly of the elect, *the Church*: *ib.* (846 P) 'And if the word "holy" is taken in two senses, as applied to God Himself and also to the building raised in His honour, surely we should be right in giving to the Church . . . the name of a holy temple of God, that precious temple built by no mechanic art. . . I use the name *Church* now not of the place, but of the congregation of saints'. The juxtaposition of line 2 ΕΚΚΛΗϞΙΑϞΔ and line 3 [**οικο**]ΔΟΜΟΥ ΕΡΓΩ ΠΟ[λλω] suggests

¹ Οἱ ἀποκαλ[υφθησεται].

² The three letters look like εεν: one expects τωv [δε. .].

³ Space of 4 letters, possibly blank: the faint indications of letters suggest the writing on the recto shewing through.

⁴ I avail myself of the analysis and translation in the edition of Hort and Mayor.



A PAPYRUS SCRAP OF PATRISTIC WRITING
(slightly enlarged)

Reproduced, by kind permission of Messrs. Macmillan, from
Plate II in *The Minor Prophets in the Freer Collection*

that the argument of the author of the fragment is to the same effect. 'These are thy walls' (ro., l. 11) also seems to gain new meaning.

Lines 4-8 appear to hang together. Except for some letters in line 5 they are all legible; the difficulty is to fill in the blanks and reconstruct the train of thought. The dominant idea is that of the 'carbuncle stone' (6), the source of which is revealed by the O.T. quotation two lines lower down (8); that quotation indicates that the metaphor of building, which has appeared more than once already, is still maintained. I imagine the connexion to be something like this: '[I am not speaking of any ordinary gem such as that with which we are familiar, τὴν φύσιν τὴν νῦν ἰπ[άρχουσαν, τὴν] . . .¹ καλ[ομένην, but of the genuine] λίθος ἀνθραξ, [with its remarkable] fiery nature [as it is writt]en, "Behold I pre[pare for thee thy stone a carbuncle]"']

Line 5. ΧΗΔΟΝΙΑΝ ΚΑΛ[ομένην]. The first word can only be an adjectival termination in the accusative case, but the two first and the two penultimate letters are uncertain. The two NS are clear, but between these we have what appears to be an M; in this position a vowel is essential, and we must read either ΙΑ (cramped) or possibly Η. The first two letters are obscure, but I am confident in reading them as printed. The half obliterated initial letter of the following word can only be a Κ. Judging by the 'carbuncle' in the next line I assume that there is an allusion to some species of gem. Among the various species of carbuncle and other 'fiery' stones enumerated by S. Isidore of Seville² there are two only which here come into consideration—*Carchedonia* and *Alabandina*. The latter seems to be excluded on two grounds. Neither form of the adjective, *Alabandina* of Isidore or *Alabandicus* of Pliny,³ will suit the -ΔΟΝΙΑΝ of our text, in which the ο, though small, is unmistakable. Moreover, this gem from Alabanda in Asia was, according to Isidore, 'rarus' and ranked high, bequeathing its name to the modern 'almandine'⁴; and I infer that our author is contrasting an inferior gem with the true *anthrax*. If that is so, Isidore's description of the other stone is significant: '*Carchedonia* hoc quod et Lychnites facere dicitur, quamquam multo vilior praedictis. Nasctur apud Nasamonas imbre, ut ferunt, divino.' The true ἀνθραξ, according to Isidore, 'gignitur in Libya apud Troglodytas'. The 'viler' Carthaginian stone and the genuine Libyan article would both be familiar to a writer in Alexandria and to his readers.

¹ Here follows an adjective, probably of place.

² Migne *P. L.* lxxxii, *Etymologiarum* lib. xvi cap. xiv 'De ignitis'.

³ *N.H.* xxxvii 96.

⁴ C. W. King *Antique Gems* p. 21.

Line 6. Clement can admire such a thing as the magnet (ἡ μαγνήτις λίθος *Eclog. Prophet.* 27 (996 P), ἡ λίθος ἡ θρυλουμένη *Strom.* ii 6. 26 (443 P)) or the Lydian touch-stone (ἡ βάσανος λίθος *Strom.* i 9. 44 (342 P)); but for the φιλόλιθοι (*Paed.* iii 2. 10 (257 P)) and their λίθων περιεργία (*ib.* ii 10. 104 (232 P)) he has an even profounder contempt than for the 'banausic art' of the builder. He has devoted a whole chapter to the theme *ὅτι οὐ χρὴ περὶ τοὺς λίθους καὶ τὸν χρυσοῦν ἐπιτοῆσθαι κόσμον* (*Paed.* ii 12). He there enumerates some of the gems most beloved of women—ἀμέθυστοι, κεραυνῖται, ἰάσπιδες, τοπάζιον, ἡ Μιλησία σμάραγδος, ὁ πολυτίμητος μαργαρίτης—but omits to mention the ἄνθραξ. Those shameless κακοδαίμονες ought ἀγίψ κοσμεῖσθαι λίθῳ, τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ θεοῦ, ὃν μαργαρίτην ἢ γραφὴν κέκληκέν που, τὸν διαυγῆ καὶ καθαρὸν Ἰησοῦν, and to recognize that such unnecessary things as jewels were purposely concealed by God from men's sight. It is only their colours (αἱ χροαί) that are precious: otherwise they are but ἕλη γεώδης. When the Apostle likens the walls and gates of the heavenly Jerusalem to precious stones, his language is clearly symbolical; but those foolish women μὴ συνιεῖσαι τὸ συμβολικὸν τῶν γραφῶν ὅλαι περιεκεχίνασιν τοῖς λίθοις.

The ἄνθραξ, so far as I can find, is mentioned once only in the extant works of Clement,¹ as forming part of the ornaments worn by the priest; and here he differs from the Biblical texts as to the nature of the gem. While the Hebrew text² calls the two stones on the shoulder-piece of the ephod 'onyx' or 'beryl' (*shōham*), and the LXX speaks of 'emeralds' (*σμάραγδοι*), Clement mentions a pair of carbuncles, symbolical of sun and moon³: οἱ δύο ἄνθρακες διὰ τε τὸν Κρόνον καὶ τὴν Σελήνην· ὁ μὲν γὰρ μεσημβρινὸς καὶ ὑγρὸς καὶ γεώδης⁴ καὶ βαρὺς, ἡ δὲ ἀερώδης.

Line 7. The carbuncle being symbolical of the sun, it is natural that its fiery property (τὸ πυρῶδες) should be emphasized. And this fiery nature connotes destructiveness, for a little lower down⁵ Clement tells us that with the Egyptians the hawk also symbolizes the sun, πυρῶδης γὰρ καὶ ἀνααιρετικός.

Line 8. And now follows a Biblical quotation which we can fortunately identify. Mr Sanders reads *ιδου εγω ειπ*, but the initial letters of the unfinished word are certainly *ετο*: *ετο* is unmistakable and the *ι*

¹ *Strom.* v 6. 37 (668 P).

² *Exod.* xxviii 9.

³ The same symbolism, as applied to the *σμάραγδοι*, is mentioned by Philo, though he prefers another explanation, partly on the ground of colour (*Vita Mos.* ii § 122, 153 M); also by Josephus who calls the stones *σαρδόνυχες* (*Ant.* iii 7. 7 § 185).

⁴ Note the depreciatory word applied to all jewels in a passage previously quoted.

⁵ *Strom.* v 7 43 (671 P).

has merely lost its top.¹ Only one O.T. passage runs thus, and its content, with the mention of the carbuncle, confirms this reference beyond a doubt. It is the glowing picture of the new Jerusalem in Isaiah liv 11, beginning ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐτοιμάζω σοὶ ἄνθρακα τὸν λίθον σου καὶ τὰ θεμέλιά σου σάπφειρον κτλ. The writer can have quoted but a few words, perhaps no more than ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐτοιμάζω σοὶ ἄνθρακα, because there is room for no more; in the next line he has passed from quotation to exposition, and we must allow space for some introductory words before [γ]πο τοῦ πατρος. Possibly he has already given a fuller quotation higher up: that would account for the mention of the ἄνθραξ in line 6 preceding the Biblical quotation in line 8. Clement has nowhere quoted these actual verses of Isaiah in his extant works, and, if he is the author of our fragment, we are left to conjecture what symbolical meaning he put upon them. All we have to guide us is his short statement concerning the heavenly Jerusalem depicted in the Apocalypse²: συμβολικῶς τοῖτοις εἰκότως τειχίζεται τῶν ἁγίων ἡ πόλις πνευματικῶς οἰκοδομουμένη πρὸς τὸ ἄνθος οὖν τῶν λίθων τὸ ἀμίμητον τὸ ἄνθος τοῦ πνεύματος τὸ ἀκήρατον καὶ ἅγιον τῆς οὐσίας νενοήκασιν. Perhaps the sequel may bring further light.

Lines 9-12 doubtless hang together. In line 9 the first letter is a broken π, not τ as Mr Sanders read, and the phrase was probably [γ]πο τοῦ πατρος, rather than [Δ]πο τοῦ πατρος. In line 10 read τὸ ἐν ὑστερον; the ἐνὑστερον of Mr Sanders must clearly be broken in two. But ἐν ὑστερον is puzzling; Clement writes ἐν ὑστέρω,³ εἰς ὑστερον,⁴ τὸ ὑστερον.⁵ Possibly we should read τὸ ἐν ὑστερον. Line 11 baffled Mr Sanders: read undoubtedly ἐν δοξῆ ἀποκαλ. The last word may be completed as ἀποκαλύφθη, -καλυφθήσεται or -καλυφθησόμενος, but there can be no mistake about the verb; the connexion with the next line τῶν μὲν κριτικῆς is obvious.

Here then we pass, a little abruptly, from the fiery carbuncle to a mention of the Father, ὁ ὄντως πατήρ as Clement often calls Him, and of a future revelation in glory of One as judge. It is natural to think of the Nicene Creed καὶ πάλιν ἐρχόμενον μετὰ δόξης κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς, or rather of the earlier Creed of Jerusalem,⁶ which in place of

¹ It is even possible that the end of the word is preserved on one of the scraps reproduced in Mr Sanders's facsimiles (p. 70). There is a line there which I first read as ἀζαρω, but [μ]αζωφοῖ is not impossible, if the ω was cramped.

² *Paed.* ii 12. 119 (242 P).

³ *Strom.* iv 13. 89 (603 P).

⁴ *ib.* iii 5. 42 (530 P); vi 12. 99 (789 P); vii 17. 108 (900 P).

⁵ *ib.* vi 17. 150 (818 P).

⁶ Burn *The Nicene Creed* 1909 p. 110.

μετὰ δόξης had ἐν δόξῃ. But that would be to neglect the significant little word ΜΕΝ. It is not a case of a coordination of classes such as 'quick and dead', but of a contrast. ΤΩΝ ΜΕΝ ΚΡΙΤΗΣ must have been balanced by a clause like τῶν δὲ μισθοποδότης.¹ And, if we are to look not to the Creeds but to the New Testament for the source of our author's language, nowhere is that contrast more sharply drawn than in the parable of the sheep and the goats. I strongly suspect that the passage in his mind is Matt. xxv 31 ff Ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ . . . τότε καθίσει ἐπὶ θρόνον δόξης αὐτοῦ κτλ.

And here, with much hesitation, I venture to suggest a possible link between the Old and New Testament passages—a train of thought which may have led to this transition from the 'carbuncle' of the prophet to the parable of the evangelist. The writer has quoted but a few words of Isaiah, detached from their context, Ἴδου ἐγὼ ἐτοιμάζω σοι ἄνθρακα. He understood well enough that ἄνθραξ meant the gem, but a writer of the allegorical school was quite capable of interpreting it in its original sense, not as *carbunculus*, but as *carbo*, especially when he found it so used a few verses later.² He has at any rate laid stress on its 'fiery nature', and, if he is indeed Clement, we know that he regarded it as symbolical of the fiery and destructive sun. The 'preparing' of the ἄνθραξ was a striking phrase and called up the thought of 'the eternal fire', which, as he read in his 'Western' text of the parable in Matthew, 'the Father has prepared for the devil and his angels'.³ The passage might therefore conceivably have run somewhat as follows: [καθὼς εἶπ]ΕΝ ΙΔΟΥ ΕΓΩ ΕΤΟΙ[μάζω σοι ἄνθρακα, τούτεστιν τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἡτοιμασμένον ὑ]ΠΟ ΤΟΥ ΠΑΤΡΟΣ [τῷ διαβόλῳ καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ ὅταν] . . . ΥΣΤΕΡΟΝ [ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου] ΕΝ ΔΟΞῆΙ ΔΠΟΚΑΛ[ύφθη . . .] ΤΩΝ ΜΕΝ ΚΡΙΤΗΣ [τῶν δὲ μισθοποδότης].⁴ But I am fully conscious of the various objections to this restoration, which attaches an artificial meaning to an isolated phrase of Isaiah without regard to the context, runs counter to

¹ Cf. Matt. xvi 27 μέλλει γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχεσθαι ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ . . . καὶ τότε ἀποδώσει ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὴν πράξιν αὐτοῦ.

² Is. liv 16 'Behold I have created the smith that bloweth the fire of coals . . . I have created the waster to destroy'; where the Greek translator, understanding that the coals and the destruction are for Jerusalem, thinks fit to insert two negatives, ἰδὸν ἐγὼ ἐκτίσά σε, οὐχ ὡς χαλκεὺς φυσῶν ἀνθρακας . . . ἐγὼ δὲ ἐκτίσά σε οὐκ εἰς ἀπάλειαν φθεῖραι.

³ Matt. xxv 41 τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον ὃ ἡτοίμασεν ὁ πατήρ (μου) τῷ διαβόλῳ καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ (Western text). Clement, in his extant quotation of the passage, diverges from other 'Western' authorities in writing 'the Lord' for 'the Father': τὸ πῦρ δὲ προσκοπεῖτε ὃ ἡτοίμασεν ὁ κύριος τῷ διαβόλῳ καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ (*Protrept.* ix 83, 69 f); but it cannot be inferred from this solitary quotation that he was ignorant of the other text.

⁴ For ὁ μισθοποδότης (θεός) see Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vi 9. 75 (777 f).

the exegesis of other ecclesiastical writers¹ who interpreted the passage of the Church of the Gentiles, and finds no support in Clement himself.

Lines 13, 14. The letters ΗΤΗΣ at the beginning of line 14 are unfortunately insufficient to enable us to identify this 'other witness'. Mr Sanders, reading the rest of the line as ΘΥ ΚΑΡΝΙΤΩΝ, again fails to divide the words correctly: read ΟΥΚ ΑΡΑ ΗΝ ΤΙΝΙ Η. For οὐκ ἄρα opening a sentence in Clement cf. *Paed.* i 7. 59 (133 P) οὐκ ἄρα ἡ νεότης τοῦ λόγου ὀνειδιστέα, *ib.* ii 10. 101 (230 P) οὐκ ἄρα ποτὲ θνητῶς βιωτέον, parallels which suggest ΟΥΚ ΑΡΑ ΗΓΗΤΕΟΝ, but the letters ΗΝ ΤΙΝΙ seem plain.

I had hoped to obtain further light from the minor scraps, several of which are legible. The longest of these is a strip of 10 lines, each line containing no more than from 4 to 6 letters; I read the verso as follows: ΚΑΥ / ΤΑΡΤ / ΤΕΚΝ / ΣΙΝ . . / ΛΥΤΟΙ / ΟΝΤΑ / ΚΑΙΣΑΡ / ΚΑΙΝΗ / [Κ]ΑΛΥΨΗ / ΕΙΔΗΗ. But the pieces of the jig-saw puzzle, a few stray relics of what were once perhaps several pages, not unnaturally do not fit together.

I have suggested that the author was Clement of Alexandria. The fragment is not to be found in his extant works, but much of his work is lost. Fragments only of the *Outlines* (*Ἐπιτομώσεις*) have been preserved; and the author refers to works which have not come down to us. In particular there are two allusions to a projected work on prophecy: in *Strom.* iv 13. 93 (605 P), he proposes to deal with the 'Phrygians' and 'the new prophecy' (the Montanists) ἐν τοῖς περὶ προφητείας; *ib.* v 13. 88 (699 P) he similarly promises to deal with the subject of the Holy Spirit ἐν τοῖς περὶ προφητείας κἀν τοῖς περὶ ψυχῆς. Bishop Westcott² 'questioned whether the[se and other] references may not be partly to sections of his greater works, and partly to designs which he never carried out'. The extant *Eclogae Propheticae* were, in his opinion, taken from the *Outlines*. Whether derived from one of these major works or from a separate treatise on prophecy, the papyrus fragment, I have little doubt, comes from a lost work of Clement.

The fragment may even have preserved for us the title of the work. For beneath the subscription to the δωδεκάπροφητον—[μαλ]αχίας ἰβ—there appears 'in a larger hand . . . a second note of approximately the same date', which Mr Sanders³ has acutely discovered can only be read as

προφ κηρυκει[α]
ε̅ ολοκ^ο

¹ e. g. Eusebius *in loc.* and *Dem. ev.* iii 2. 72.

² *Dict. Christ. Biog.* i 561 a. He refers to *Strom.* iv 1-3, where the author appears to contemplate dealing with O.T. prophecy in the course of his *Miscellanies*: οὗς ἐπόμενον ἀν εἶη μετὰ τὴν ἐπιδρομὴν τῆς θεολογίας τὰ περὶ προφητείας παραδεδομένα διαλαβεῖν κτλ. (564 P).

³ Printed edition, p. 19 ff.

The second line, adopting a suggestion of Professor Rahlfs, he interprets to mean '5 *holocottinoi*', being either the cost of writing or the sale price of the said 'Prophetical Preaching'. His interpretation of the meaning of *holocottinoi*, as he shews, 'practically forces us to date the MS before 270 A. D., if not before 260, a dating well supported by the writing and the character of the text'. The title itself, however, he regards as belonging not to the unknown work, but to the Minor Prophets. 'As the work contains the Minor Prophets it seems reasonable to expect here a general designation or title for the whole work'¹; 'whatever the meaning, this seems a designation of what preceded in the MS and not of what followed, though in one of the unplaced fragments in a related hand I have read [ε]ζεκηνλ βοα και λεγει'.² The grounds for the hesitation, which the writer betrays in these last words, are, I venture to think, greatly strengthened by the contents of the present article. Moreover, had the scribe wished to append a second subscription, he would surely have employed the familiar δωδεκαπρόφητον. I venture, therefore, to think that προφ[ητικῆ] κηρυκεία is not a subscription, but a superscription to the lost work. And, if the title is to be dated not later than 260-270 A. D., we have in these precious scraps a fragment of a MS of a lost work of Clement written within half a century of the lifetime of its author, and the title may well be his own.³

H. ST. J. THACKERAY.

PS.—VERSO (14). ΗΤΗC] Thanks to the enlarged photo I now read [δεις] Η ΤΡΙC. Sir. xiii. 7, the only Biblical parallel, seems irrelevant; the words are therefore probably the author's.—H. St. J. T.

ON ROMANS vi 17-18

I THINK that Fr Lattey is right⁴ in rejecting the idea, accepted by the Revised Version and almost all expositors, that 'ye became obedient from the heart,' &c., refers to the time *after* conversion. The state after conversion only begins to be considered in *ver.* 22 (νυνὶ δε).

The question is, for what is St Paul giving thanks? Not that others were δοῦλοι—that, according to his language we must all be in any case: we are slaves to that which we obey, to sin or to righteousness or to God (*ver.* 22). I agree with Fr Lattey that τύπον διδαχῆς means,

¹ p. 19.

² p. 21.

³ I have not found κηρυκεία in Clement, but we have the phrase ἡ κηρυκικὴ ἐπιστήμη, *Strom.* i 1. 4 (318 P).

⁴ See *J. T. S.* July 1928 (vol. xxix p. 381).

practically, the Mosaic Law, but I do not think St Paul teaches that zeal for it could in itself make a man the slave of sin: the Law is holy and just and good, but (says St Paul) I did not always want to obey it! The Law produced sin by inducing *disobedience*.

But the matter in hand for St Paul in this whole paragraph vi 15-23 is not to establish that all have sinned, but to controvert the thesis 'let us sin, for we are not under law but under grace'. He tells the objector not to regret but to be thankful for sins avoided before conversion. St Paul seems to me to recognize three conceivable states, immorality, morality caused by obedience to law, evangelical freedom (in which a man produces 'the fruit of the Spirit'). In *vs.* 17 and 18 he rejoices for the (hypothetical) case that some of those he was writing to, whether Jews or Greeks, may have been kept from sin by obeying the demands of Law. He is concerned to say that immorality is bad in itself, though it is best to be freed from it by the good motive, not merely by obedience to commands. So he says (*vs.* 17-18):

'Thank God that while you were in your former bondage to sin you should have whole-heartedly obeyed Divine Law, and so have been free of sin while slaves of morality.'

The important thing is that *ἐλευθερωθέντες δὲ κ.τ.λ.* in *ver.* 18 refers to the time before conversion. I should like further to compare *εἰς ὃν παρεδόθητε* with Gal. iii 23 *ὑπὸ νόμον ἐφρορούμεθα*. The passive *παρεδόθητε* does not seem to me to be a natural turn of expression for St Paul to use of the 'freedom' of the Gospel.

F. C. BURKITT.

THE ORIGIN OF THE NAME MACCABEE

It is scarcely necessary to say that with regard to the origin and meaning of the name Maccabee many theories have been put forward in modern times, but nevertheless the question still remains unsettled. Perhaps the fullest discussion on the subject is to be found in a pamphlet entitled *The Name Machabee* by Dr Samuel Ives Curtiss, junior, published at Leipzig in 1876. So far as I am aware, no fresh theory worth mentioning has been propounded during the fifty-two years which have since elapsed. It would therefore be a waste of time to enumerate all the rival hypotheses, since not one of them has met with general acceptance. My object is simply to make a suggestion of my own. But before stating it I may be allowed to describe briefly the chief facts which we have to explain.

The earliest authority for the name Maccabee is the First Book of Maccabees, where it appears repeatedly as the second name, or, as we