

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 *vs.* 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