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 κενοτάφια, 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 δύλων (which is also a rendering of ὅσα, *Thummim*, in Deut. xxxiii 8), and in Zech. x 2 οἱ ἀποφθεγματίζοντες, *the oracle givers*. In Judges xvii 5, xviii 14–20 *teraphim* is transliterated with the singular article τὸ 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 δωδεκαπρόφητον, 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 follows 1:

RECTO. VERSO.
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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 Εξεκιλβοακαιλεγεικαι. 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 Clement 3 Paed. ii 10. 95 (227 ρ) we find: δυσωπεῖτω δε ἡμᾶς

1 I have numbered the lines for convenience.
2 p. 9 (printed edition).
3 I quote throughout from Dindorf's text.
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Similarly we have ἐκβοᾷ (ἡ γραφή) Strom. ii 8. 39 (449 P); ἐμβοᾷ Ἠβ. i 16 (325 P) paraβητέον . . . φωνᾶς τὰς ἐμβούσιας παρ’ ἕκαστα; ἐπιβοᾷ (the Apostle Paul) Ἠβ. iii 11. 77 (545 P); τὸ ἄγιον πνεῦμα διὰ τοῦ Ἀμώς ἐκφώνησεν Paed. ii 2. 30 (185 P); and frequently κέκραγεν : Paed. i 9. 85, Strom. ii 6. 26, ii 13. 59, iii 6. 53 (v. i. 5 ὁ Ἀισχύλος), v 3. 18, v 14. 119, vi 10. 81, Quis dives salv. 39.

Justin Martyr has similar phrases. Thus Ἡσαίας βοᾷ in Ῥυθμός 12 (229 A), 14 (231 C), 17 (235 A); βοᾷ διὰ Ἡσαίου (ὁ θεὸς οὐ τὸ ἄγιον πνεῦμα) Ἠβ. 24 and 25 (242 B); ἐμβοᾷ ὁ θεὸς διὰ τοῦ Ἡσαίου Ἠβ. 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, οὗ παύεται προτρέπων, νοεθέων, παιδεύων, φιλοῦν οὐδὲ γὰρ σῶσιν παύεται, συμβουλεύει δὲ τὰ ἁριστά. Δίκαιοι γένεσθε, λέγει κύριος, οἱ διψώντες πορεύεσθε ἐφ’ ὕδωρ . . . ἄνευ ἀργυρίου (a free quotation of Is. liv 17, lv 1). ἐπὶ τὸ λοιπὸν, ἐπὶ τὴν σωτηρίαν, ἐπὶ τῶν φωτισμῶν παρακαλεῖ μονονοχὺ βοῶν καὶ λέγων, γῆν σοι δίδωμι καὶ βάλλαταν, παιδίων, οὐρανῶν τε καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς πάντα ἐδα σοι χαρίζομαι μόνον, ὁ παιδίων, Δίψηκον τοῦ πατρὸς 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 11) to which Clement is here alluding.

For a similar combination of verbs we may compare also Paed. i 9. 76 (143 P) παρακαλεῖ καὶ φησιν διὰ τοῦ Ἡσεκηφη and Strom. vii 9. 53 (863 P) ὁ γενναῖος . . . ἀπόστολος κεκράγω καὶ γράφων (‘proclaimed aloud and in writing’, Mayor) περιτομήν τῆν χειροποιητὸν οὐδὲν ὀφελέειν.

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: Ῥυθμὸς 16 (234 C) ἐμβοᾷ ὡμῶν ὁ θεὸς διὰ τοῦ Ἡσαίου λέγων, 16 (233 D) διὰ Μωνωτῶν κέκραγεν ὁ θεὸς αὐτοῦ οὗτος λέγων.

I am not Patristic scholar enough to know whether this use of βοῶν occurs elsewhere.1 I have failed to find it, and if our fragment is coeval

1 Also Strom. v 14. 113 (717 P) Σωφροκλῆς . . . ἐπὶ τῆς σηχνῆς ἐκβοᾷ. Similarly of another tragedian Ἠβ. vi 2. 7 (739 P) Εὐριπίδου ἐπὶ τῆς σηχνῆς βοῶντος; and of actors in tragedies Ἠβ. ii 15. 63 (462 P) ἡ Μηδεία ἐπὶ τῆς σηχνῆς βοᾷ and Αἰας . . . 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 **oυv**, so the verso breaks off with an **ουκ ἄρ(α)**, where again Mr Sanders has failed to divide the words correctly. The two opening lines might conceivably run ['Ἰησοῦς ὁ ἐστιν [..... ὁ] μαρτυρῶν[σω ...]

**Line 2.** **μαρτυροῦν[σι]**. The whole passage is clearly a collection, as Clement would say a **σῶταγές**, or more pungently a veritable **σμῆνος** 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 καὶ ἔτερος μαρ[πυρεί].

The following lines are very obscure in the facsimile.

**Line 3** (Sanders. *Ich*). The letters look like **κσαί**, possibly **κκαί**; can an abbreviation of 'Ησαίας be intended?

**Line 4.** **σκεί** (Sanders), if correctly read, suggests σκε(ε)γραφία, 'adumbration', which occurs in Clement *Paed.* i 7. 60 (134 p) σκιαγραφία γὰρ ἥν τοῦ κυρίου τὸ ὄνομα τὸ Ἰησοῦ (Joshua) προκηρυσσόμενον ἐν νόμῳ, and *Strom.* i 11 (322 p) where the writer says that his work is not a γραφή εἰς ἐπιθετήν τεστησαμένη, but notes treasured for old age, an εἴδωλον ἀτεχνὸς καί σκιαγραφία of the clear and living doctrines which he had been privileged to hear from blessed men of old. There is a contrast here between τέχνη and σκιαγραφία, which is significant in view of the occurrence of (?) τέχνητων[ν] and τέχνην in the next two lines of the papyrus. τεχνίτης is frequent in various senses in Clement.

**Line 7.** **τερσίν άνθρωπο** (Sanders). The first fragmentary letter is, I think, not τ but ρ : the word is probably [ε]γερσων. The only use of this noun that I have found in Clement is *Strom.* v 14. 105 (712 p) ὁ γὰρ τὴν ἀνάστασιν μὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐξ ὑπνοῦ ἐγερσών, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν εἰς σάρκα κάθοδον τοῦ κυρίου ὑπνον ἄλληγορεί (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 τεχνη σοῦ) suggests rather the alternative meaning of 'building up', 'erection'.

---

1 *Strom.* iv 9. 70 (595 p) περὶ δὲ τοῦ μαρτυρίου διαρρήθην ὁ κύριος εἰρήκεν καὶ τὰ διαφόρα γεγραμμένα σωτάξων.

2 *ib.* iv 16. 102 (609 p) σμῆνος ὑποδηγμάτων θείων.
NOTES AND STUDIES

Line 9. άγατα διαδοτ (Sanders). The facsimile is almost illegible; I doubtfully read γ ή διαδοτ and suggest that the last words are γ (in the sense of 'as') διαδοτ[σαρ], 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 διαδοτ analogous to that of βοη, ἐκβοη, and ἐμβοη mentioned above.

Line 10 possibly contains an allusion to παρήχ, but again the facsimile is practically illegible.

Line 11. τείχης οὖν ταύτα (Sanders). τείχη οὖν suggests Biblical language, ταύτ(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 οὖν in Ezekiel seem incongruous. It is more likely that there is an allusion to Isaiah lx 18 κληθῆσεται Σωτήριον τὰ τείχη οὖν (ο ο ὥσχομήρωσιν ἀλλογενεῖς τὰ τείχη οὖν).

Line 12. The torn papyrus unfortunately conceals the nature of Ezekiel's 'cry'. The καὶ 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. καὶ εἰπ άγιο... θο ταλ (Sanders). I read καὶ μαρτ[γρε]c οι καλο[γμενοι] ἰωάκεκα ?]; the letters μαρτ seem fairly clear.

Line 14. λοε εκεί ἵλογ (Sanders). I confidently suggest τὰδε λέγει! ἱλογ; I cannot say that I read the first three words, but the letters that are visible, δέ-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 δωδικαπρόφητον has no exact instance of it, since in Zech. viii 7 the word παντοκράτωρ is interposed between Κύριος and ἦνοι.

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:—
Line 1. **φίκτων** 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 o is doubtful. The **κακοδαίμονεσ** **σοφισταί** who spend their lives in hair-splitting (*Strom.* i 3. 22 (328 p)) and **η σοφιστική 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 **[οίκο]δομού εργῶ** finds an illuminating parallel in Clement: *Strom.* vii 5. 28 (845 p) τί δ’ ἀν καὶ οἰκοδόμων καὶ λιθοδόμων καὶ βανάνος τέχνης ἄγιον εἴη ἔργον; Clement 1 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 **ἐκκάθισκαί** and line 3 **[οίκο]δομού εργῶ πο[λλῶ]** suggests

1 Or **ἀποκαλ[υφθησεται]**.
2 The three letters look like **εἰν** : one expects **των** [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.
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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 φῶς]ν τὴν νῦν ὑπὸ [ἄρχουσαν, τὴν]... 1 καλ[ουμένην, but of the genuine] λίθος ἄνθρακς, [with its remarkable] fiery nature [as it is writ]en, “Behold I pre[pare for thee thy stone a carbuncle”].'

Line 5. ΧΑΩΝΙΑΝ ΚΑΛ[ΟΥΜΕΝΗ]. 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 Μ; 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 Seville 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, will suit the ΑΩΝΙΑΝ of our text, in which the Ο, though small, is unmistakeable. Moreover, this gem from Alabanda in Asia was, according to Isidore, 'rarus' and ranked high, bequeathing its name to the modern 'almandine'; 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, quanquam multo vilior praedictis. Nascitur apud Nasamonas imbre, ut ferunt, divino.' The true ἄνθρακς, 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, Etymologiae lib. xvi cap. xiv 'De ignitis'.
3 N.H. xxxvii 96.
4 C. W. King Antique Gems p. 21.
Clement can admire such a thing as the magnet (ἡ μαγνητικὴ λίθος Ecl. Prophet. 27 (996 P), ἡ λίθος ἡ θρηλωμένη Strom. ii 6. 26 (443 P)) or the Lydian touch-stone (ἡ βάσανος λίθος Strom. i 9. 44 (342 P)); but for the φιλόλωβοι (Paed. iii 2. 10 (257 P)) and their λίθους 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 χρή περὶ τῶν λίθων καὶ τῶν χρυσῶν ἐποιήσαι κόσμον (Paed. ii 12). He there enumerates some of the gems most beloved of women —ἀμέθυστου, κεραυνίτας, ιάστιδες, τοσάξιον, ἡ Μιλθεία σμάραγδος, ὁ πολυτίμητος μαργαρίτης—but omits to mention the ἄνθραξ. Those shameless κακοδαίμονες ought ἀγὼ κοσμεῦσαι λίθων, τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ θεοῦ, ὃν μαργαρίτην ἡ γραφή κέκληκέν που, τῶν διανύει καὶ καθαρῶν Ἰθσούν, and to recognize that such unnecessary things as jewels were purposely concealed by God from men's sight. It is only their colours (αἱ χρώσεις) that are precious: otherwise they are but ἓλα γεώδης. When the Apostle likens the walls and gates of the heavenly Jerusalem to precious stones, his language is clearly symbolic; but those foolish women μὴ συνεῖχαν τὸ συμβολικὸν τῶν γραφῶν ὁμοίως και περικεχώραν τῶν λίθων.

The ἄνθραξ, so far as I can find, is mentioned once only in the extant works of Clement, 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 text 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, symbolic of sun and moon: οἱ δύο ἄνθρακες διὰ τε τοῦ Κρόνου καὶ τῆς Σελήνης ὅ μὲν γὰρ μεσημβρινός καὶ νυχτός καὶ γεώδης καὶ βαρύς, ἡ δὲ ἀέρωδης.

The carbuncle being symbolic of the sun, it is natural that its fiery property (τὸ πυρώδιος) should be emphasized. And this fiery nature connotes destructiveness, for a little lower down Clement tells us that with the Egyptians the hawk also symbolizes the sun, πυρώδης γὰρ καὶ ἀναωρετικὸς.

And now follows a Biblical quotation which we can fortunately identify. Mr Sanders reads ιαογ θω εἰπ, but the initial letters of the unfinished word are certainly ετοι: ετοι is unmistakeable and the

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 σαρδώνυχες (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. 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 ἵδιν ἐγὼ ἔτοιμάζω σοι ἄνθρακα τὸν λίθον σου καὶ τὰ θεμέλιά σου σάφειρον κτλ. The writer can have quoted but a few words, perhaps no more than ἵδιν ἐγὼ ἔτοιμάζω σοι 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 γίνομεν πατρί. 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 Apocalypse: ἀναβληθὼς τοῦ τι βεβηλωτος τελεῖται τῶν ἄγγεων ἡ πόλις πνευματικὸς οἰκοδομομένη πρὸς τὸ ἄνθος οὖν τῶν λίθων τὸ ἄμφιμητον τὸ ἄνθος τοῦ πνεύματος τὸ ἀκήρατον καὶ ἄγιον τῆς ὁσίας νεονήκασιν. 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 γίνομεν πατρί, rather than ἀποκαλύφθη, καλυφθήσεται or καλυφθησόμενος, but there can be no mistake about the verb; the connexion with the next line τῶν μεν κρίνει is obvious.

Here then we pass, a little abruptly, from the fiery carbuncle to a mention of the Father, ὁ θεός πατέρας 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 κρίνας ζωντας καὶ νεκρῶν, or rather of the earlier Creed of Jerusalem, 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 αὐτος, but [Μ]αζωρος is not impossible, if the ω was cramped.

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.
But that would be to neglect the significant little word **men**. It is not a case of a coordination of classes such as 'quick and dead', but of a contrast. **Των μέν κριθήκ** must have been balanced by a clause like τῶν δὲ μισθιππότης.

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. **"Όταν δὲ ἐλθή ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ... τότε καθίσει ἐπὶ θρόνων 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, 'Ιδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐτοιμάζω σου ἀνθρακα. He understood well enough that ἀνθρακα 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. 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 ἀνθρακα 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'.

The passage might therefore conceivably have run somewhat as follows:

καθὼς εἶπεν Ἰσαὰκ ἐν οἴκῳ ἐτοιμασμένον ἐν τῷ πατρός τῷ διαβόλῳ καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ ἦν τὸν κριθήκ... γεννατὸς ἢ παλαιτῆς... τῶν μέν κριθήκ... τῶν δὲ μισθιππότης...

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 ἐρχεσθαι ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ πατρός 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, ἠδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐκτίσα σε, οὕς ὁ χαλέκεις φυσιῶν ἀνθρακα... ἐγὼ δὲ ἐκτίσα σε οὕς εἰς ἀπώλειαν φθείραι.

3 Matt. xxv 41 τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰῶνιον δὲ ἡτοιμασμένον δὶ 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 προποκείται ὁ ἡτοιμασμένον ὁ κύριος τῷ διαβόλῳ καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ (Protrept. ix 83, 69 P); but it cannot be inferred from this solitary quotation that he was ignorant of the other text.

4 For δὸ μισθιππότης (θεός) see Clem. Alex. Strom. vi 9. 75 (777 P).
the exegesis of other ecclesiastical writers who interpreted the passage of the Church of the Gentiles, and finds no support in Clement himself.

Lines 13, 14. The letters ἦθς 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 ὦκ καρνίτων, again fails to divide the words correctly: read οὐκ ἄρα ἥν τινι ἦ. For οὐκ ἄρα opening a sentence in Clement cf. Paed. i 7. 59 (133 P) οὐκ ἄρα ἣ νεότης τοῦ λόγου ὑπειδιστέα, ib. ii 10. 101 (230 P) οὐκ ἄρα ποτὲ θνητῶς βιωτέων, parallels which suggest οὐκ ἄρα ἥν ἔθεσεν, but the letters ἥν 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: καγ/ταρ/τεκν/ειν../λατοι/οντα/καιαρ/καιίνη/[κ]λαγη/ειανη. But the pieces of the jigsaw 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 (Ὑποτοπώσεις) 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 (609 P) he similarly promises to deal with the subject of the Holy Spirit ἐν τοῖς περὶ προφητείας κἂν τοῖς περὶ ψυχῆς. Bishop Westcott 2 '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—[μαλακίας ἠβ—there appears 'in a larger hand... a second note of approximately the same date', which Mr Sanders 3 has acutely discovered can only be read as προφ κηρυκεί[α]

ε ὅλοκ

1 Eusebius in loc. and Dem. ev. iii 2. 72.
2 Diet. Christ. Biog. i 1561 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: οἱ ἐπόμενοι ἄν εἰς μετὰ τὴν ἐπιθρομὴν τῆς θεολογίας τὰ περὶ προφητείας παραδεδομένα διαλα-βεῖν κτλ. (564 P).
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'; 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 [έχειν βλα καὶ λέγει]. 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 δωδεκάπρόφητον. I venture, therefore, to think that προφ[ητική] 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.

H. St. J. Thackeray.

PS.—VERSO (14). ητεις] Thanks to the enlarged photo I now read [δίσ] καὶ τρίσ. 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 right 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 (νυνί δὲ).

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 τῦτων διδαχθησθαι means,

1 p. 19.  2 p. 21.
3 I have not found κηρυκεία in Clement, but we have the phrase ἡ κηρυκική ἰπστήμη, 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 vv. 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 (vv. 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 ἔλευθερωθέντος δὲ κ.τ.λ. in ver. 18 refers to the time before conversion. I should like further to compare εἰς δὲ παρεδόθητε with Gal. iii 23 ὑπὸ νόμον ἐφροισμῆνε ὑπὸ μ.θ.α. 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. Burdett.

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