# Theology on the Web.org.uk

## Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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 *Journal of Theological Studies (old series)* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[1st page of article]

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 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 ἐ φ ρ ο υ ρ ο ύ μ ε 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. 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

should say, nickname, of the third son of Mattathias—Ἰούδας ὁ καλούμενος Μακκαβαῖος (chap. ii 4). No explanation of the word is offered by the writer, nor are we told whether the name was given to Judas at his birth or whether he acquired it in later life. Since the original Hebrew (or Aramaic) text of First Maccabees is lost, we have no positive evidence as to the Hebrew form of the word which the translator had before him. Nor can any further information on this point be obtained from later sources. The spelling Μακκαβαῖος reappears in the Second Book of Maccabees and in Josephus, but it is doubtful whether either of these writers had seen the name in Hebrew script ; in any case their testimony adds nothing to what we learn from First Maccabees. In the Talmud, so far as I have been able to ascertain, the name Maccabee never occurs, and when it appears in mediaeval Jewish writings there is reason to believe that it was ultimately derived from Greek sources.

Curtiss has endeavoured to prove that the spelling *Machabaeus*, which occurs in the ordinary text of the Latin Vulgate, is a transliteration made by Jerome from the original Hebrew text of First Maccabees ; but this is highly improbable, for, as Schürer has pointed out, there is evidence that Jerome used the form *Maccabaeus* in accordance with the Greek spelling.

It is also important to notice that in ancient times neither Jews nor Christians had any tradition as to the meaning of the name Maccabee. I believe that the earliest attempt to attach a sense to it is to be found in a Jewish work, of about the eighth century, which is known either as ' The Scroll of Antiochus' or as ' The Scroll of the Hasmonaeans'. Here the name Maccabee appears, strangely enough, not as belonging to Judas but in connexion with his brother Yohanan—' He built a pillar and called it מקבי (variant מכבי) *Slayer of mighty men*'. Two manuscripts add על שמיה ' after his own name '. (See the *Transactions of the Ninth International Congress of Orientalists*, London, 1893, vol. ii page 21.) This interpretation of the name has all the appearance of a guess on the part of the author, and we have no reason whatever to regard it as derived from any ancient tradition. Thus in the present case, as in many others, it is not a question of setting aside tradition in favour of a modern theory but of explaining something which tradition leaves unexplained.

In endeavouring to solve the problem we must, I think, start from the assumption that the Greek spelling Μακκαβαῖος presupposes a Hebrew original מַקְבִּי, with doubling of the ק. There is, so far as I can see, only one way in which this form can be justified from a linguistic point of view, namely by supposing that the name was deliberately coined on the basis of Isaiah lxii 2—וְקֹרָא לָךְ שֵׁם חָדָשׁ אֲשֶׁר פִּי יהוה יִקֳּבֶנּוּ ' Thou

shalt be called by a new name which the mouth of the Lord will name'. It seems to me probable that this passage suggested—either to the priest Mattathias or to some one else—the idea of forming a name מַתַּבְיָהוּ 'the naming of the Lord', in imitation of such well-known names as מַתַּנְיָהוּ 'the gift of the Lord', מַעֲשֵׂיָהוּ 'the work of the Lord', and others. The name מַתַּבְיָהוּ, when once it was formed, might easily be shortened into מַקְבֵּי, just as מַתַּנְיָהוּ is shortened into מַתְּנֵי (Ezra x 33 37, Neh. xii 19), and מַעֲשֵׂיָהוּ into מַעְשַׂי (1 Chron. ix 12).

<div align="right">A. A. BEVAN.</div>

## A RECTIFICATION

In the review of Mr Coleman-Norton's edition of the *Dialogus de Vita Chrysostomi*, published in the last number of the JOURNAL (vol. xxx p. 71), a doubt was expressed as to whether the Medicean MS had been collated afresh for the edition. Mr Norton writes that he had procured photographs of the MS from which a new collation was made. I am pleased to make this rectification and to express regret at the mistake.

<div align="right">E. C. BUTLER.</div>