



This material has been provided by Asbury Theological Seminary in good faith of following ethical procedures in its production and end use.

The Copyright law of the united States (title 17, United States code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyright material. Under certain condition specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to finish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specific conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be *“used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research.”* If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of “fair use,” that user may be liable for copyright infringement. This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

**By using this material, you are consenting to abide by this copyright policy. Any duplication, reproduction, or modification of this material without express written consent from Asbury Theological Seminary and/or the original publisher is prohibited.**

### **Contact**

B.L. Fisher Library  
Asbury Theological Seminary  
204 N. Lexington Ave.  
Wilmore, KY 40390

**B.L. Fisher Library’s Digital Content**  
[place.asburyseminary.edu](http://place.asburyseminary.edu)



**Asbury Theological Seminary**  
205 North Lexington Avenue  
Wilmore, Kentucky 40390

800.2ASBURY  
[asburyseminary.edu](http://asburyseminary.edu)

A DISSERTATION ON THE  
EPISTLE OF S. BARNABAS.

*By the same Author.*

## THE INFLUENCE OF DESCARTES ON METAPHYSICAL SPECULATION IN ENGLAND.

"AN excellent monograph which shows both powers of thought and a philosophical erudition very unusual in the English metaphysical literature of the present time. In an introduction the author elaborates the speculative principles which govern his work. His first chapter is devoted to discussing the 'Internal Connection of the various Systems.' Next he passes to Descartes and gives an exhaustive review of the Cartesian philosophy. The succeeding Chapters are: The Contemporaries of Descartes; John Locke and his school; George Berkeley; David Hume. These writers are discussed in their relation to Descartes mainly. The fundamental stand-point of the author can be seen when he states the central principle to be 'The Notion and its moment.' An acquaintance with the best German works which treat of his subject is a leading feature. D. J. S." From *Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, Jan. 1876.

"The analysis of Descartes' views is careful and clear, and the results of his teaching in England are treated with fulness and considerable research...Throughout accurate in statement...the essay as a whole deserves notice for many excellent qualities."—*Scotsman*.

"Mr Canningham's treatise on Descartes and English speculation is a model in its kind: it is clear, penetrating, succinct, and trustworthy." *Academy*.

"He has produced a readable account of Descartes and his bearings on English thought. The 'Introduction' contains a fair *résumé* of Hegel's views upon the history of philosophy."—*Westminster Review*.

A DISSERTATION  
ON THE  
EPISTLE OF S. BARNABAS,  
INCLUDING A DISCUSSION OF ITS DATE  
AND AUTHORSHIP.

BY THE  
REV. WILLIAM CUNNINGHAM.

TOGETHER WITH  
THE GREEK TEXT, THE LATIN VERSION, AND A NEW  
ENGLISH TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY.

Θεόσυτος ἡ βρότειος ἡ κεκραμένη;  
AESCH. *Pr.* 116.

London:  
MACMILLAN AND CO.  
1877.

[*All Rights reserved.*]

**Cambridge :**

**PRINTED BY C. J. CLAY, M.A.  
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.**

## PREFATORY NOTE.

THIS Dissertation, in a slightly different form, obtained a Hulsean prize in 1874, and is published in consequence of the conditions imposed by the trustees. I take this opportunity of acknowledging the constant assistance I have received, while recasting my Essay, from my friend Mr G. H. Rendall, Fellow of Trinity College. He has besides kindly enabled me to render the book more complete than it would otherwise have been, by editing the texts and furnishing an English translation and commentary, which will, I am sure, be found the most valuable part of the whole.

TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE,

*May, 1876.*

# CONTENTS.

	PAGE
DISSERTATION . . . . .	i—cxvii
 I. The Manuscripts, Editions, and Text. . . . .	 i
 II. Plan and Character of the Epistle.	
i. The Plan of the Epistle . . . . .	xiii
ii. The Integrity of the Epistle . . . . .	xviii
iii. The Characteristics of the Author and Readers . . . . .	xx
iv. Stylistic Peculiarities of the Epistle . . . . .	xxiv
v. Date of the Epistle . . . . .	xxix
 III. The Authorship of the Epistle.	
i. Testimony of the Epistle to its Author . . . . .	xli
ii. Facts and Legends of the Life of S. Barnabas . . . . .	xlvi
 IV. The Testimony of Antiquity in regard to the Epistle.	
i. Opinion of the Church on its Canonícity . . . . .	lxiii
ii. Opinions of the Fathers on its Authenticity . . . . .	lxxii
 V. The Epistle and Contemporary Influences.	
i. Its Relation to Judaism and Paulinism . . . . .	lxxv
ii. Influence of the Gospels and Epistles . . . . .	lxxxv
iii. Traces of Alexandrine doctrines . . . . .	xcvi

# CONTENTS.

	PAGE
VI. The Theology of the Epistle.	
i. The Divinity of Jesus . . . . .	cvii
ii. The Humanity of Christ , . . . .	cvii
iii. The Holy Spirit . . . . .	cviii
iv. The Work of Christ . . . . .	cx
v. The Holy Eucharist . . . . .	cxii
vi. Baptism . . . . .	cxiv
vii. The Church . . . . .	cxv
viii. The Sabbath . . . . .	cxvi
Note . . . . .	I
The Greek Text, Latin Version, and Commentary . . . . .	4
English Translation . . . . .	87



## I.

### THE MANUSCRIPTS, EDITIONS AND TEXT.

THERE have been three different periods of Christian thought when the writings of the sub-apostolical Fathers have been read with special interest. *The study of sub-apostolical writings in early* The early Church found in them additional sources of testimony as to historical facts and apostolical doctrines; the importance attached to these writings is shown by the number of quotations from them in later works, and still more, by the continued use of them for public reading. Again, in the hundred and fifty years of controversy which succeeded the Council of Trent, attention was once more turned to them, *and modern times.* but rather in this case as dogmatic authorities, than witnesses for Christian facts: this was the interest in which the texts were studied by Jesuits and Anglicans alike, and numerous printed editions are mementos of their labours. Now once more, when men have recognised that no true estimate of the divine revelation is possible, unless we understand the characteristics of the age in which it was given to the world, a new interest arises in these early writings, as reflecting the life of their time: hence the critical study of our own day. In

the recent editions we find that the attention is chiefly turned to the passages which may help us to determine the design of the writer, the class of readers he had in view, the resources at his command, and the various influences of time and place which seem to have affected his work.

*Questions  
which arise.*

Although the purpose with which these works have been read has been so varied, there are certain questions which have presented themselves to all students. What title has the book to be regarded as the work of the man whose name it bears? is it authentic, and if so, what claims had it to be acknowledged as canonical? Why and when was it written? And what, amid the conflicting testimony of various manuscripts, is the most accurate text? Some attempt at answers to these questions preceded both the evidential and dogmatic use of the epistle, meeting however with very partial success, until in our day they became the main object of investigation.

*The value of  
the labours  
of the  
Fathers.*

There are, on this account, comparatively few critical results to be gleaned from the writings of the Fathers, though there are two ways in which their evidence is important. The quotations which they make enable us, at times, to correct the text of the epistle, by giving us an additional source from which to draw. The Apostolical Constitutions, the works of the Alexandrian Clement and of Origen, are the principal aids of this kind which we have. Still more interesting is the evidence which may be adduced from their writings as to the value which was put upon the epistle by these men, as well as by Eusebius and S. Jerome, who explicitly discuss the question; while the mention of its name in stichometries appears to show a very general recognition of its worth. From the time of

the stichometry of Nicephorus (A.D. 810) a great silence occurs, which was at length broken when the revival of learning and the controversies of the Reformation had combined to render attractive the search for and study of the writings of the early Fathers.

There is some difficulty in arriving at a clear account of the re-discovery of the epistle and the sources from which the various editions were compiled. Amid the confused, not to say conflicting statements of various editors, the following would seem to be the facts of the case.

Among the papers of the Jesuit, François Turrien (or Torrès), was found what appeared to be an unusually long copy of the epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians. Sirmond however, who transcribed it, saw that a second work was conjoined with it, and this he identified as the oft-quoted epistle of S. Barnabas. Unfortunately, it was evidently imperfect, as it began in the middle of a sentence which had been mistaken by the copyist for the continuation of one of Polycarp. The missing portion was however substantially supplied with the help of an old Latin version which was discovered about the same time by Hugh Menard in the Monastery of Corbie, in Picardy. Before however anything was given to the world, a second Greek MS. was discovered by Andrew Schott. This was in a similarly mutilated condition, but was made the basis of Usher's Oxford Edition, with which it perished in the great fire which occurred while the copies were still passing through the press. A transcript of it however had been sent to Rome, and was collated with two other MSS.—the Vatican (V) and Ottobonian (O). From these materials Menard compiled a text; the publication was however delayed by his death, and

*Discovery of  
an imperfect  
Greek MS.,*

*of the Latin  
version,*

*of other  
Greek ones  
of the same  
family.*

was at length accomplished by L. D'Achery. A few years later a careful examination of the Italian MSS. was undertaken by Holstein at the instance of Isaac Voss: he took a copy, now preserved in the Barberine Library, of the Theatine MS., which belonged to the monastery of S. Silvester in the Quirinal, and has since been destroyed by fire: he also collated the Vatican MS. once more, and compared the Medicine (F) MS. at Florence.

*Printed  
editions.*

The following are the principal early printed editions which were made from these sources.

1. Usher. Oxford, 1643. Schottianus, Corbie.
2. Menard and D'Achery. Paris, 1645. 4to. Turrien's, O, V.
3. I. Voss. Amsterdam, 1646. 4to. F, B.
4. Mader. Helmstadt, 1655. 4to.
5. Cotelier (Opera Patrum). Paris, 1672. Fol.
6. Fell. Oxford. 12mo., 1685.<sup>1</sup>
7. Lemoyne (Varia Sacra). Leyden, 4to. 1685.  
Professedly from a newly discovered MS.

Our epistle also occurs<sup>2</sup> in all the numerous editions of Cotelier's collection of the Fathers, in Galland, Russel, &c. Of these the most interesting is Clerk's edition of Cotelier, published at Antwerp in 1700. It embodies a very full account of all the opinions and criticisms of previous editors. These ponderous tomes do not however contain much that is important for the study

<sup>1</sup> In this edition Fell reprinted a sheet of Usher's which had been saved from the fire, and contained his prefaces. He also attempted to reconstruct the missing Greek text by retranslating the Latin Version.

<sup>2</sup> There have been several English translations as follows:

Wake, Lond. 1690.

Hoole, Lond. 1872.

Donaldson, Edin. 1869.

The last has been made since the text was corrected with the help of the Sinaitic MS., but it is not in all respects a satisfactory rendering.

of the epistle now, and their texts have been superseded by more careful collations made in connection with the critical controversies of this century, as well as by the discovery of a complete Greek text in the Sinaitic MS. The judgments of those editors have neither the interest attaching to the opinions of the Fathers, nor the value which may be fairly claimed for modern investigations.

We may therefore proceed at once to consider the sources which are now at hand for the construction of an accurate text; the sole foundation of all exegetical criticism. One most important step in this direction was taken by Dressel, who was not contented with making conjectural corrections of the text of Voss, but in person or with the help of friends (Tischendorf, Heyse and others), collated the Roman and Florentine MSS. for his edition of the Apostolical Fathers. The epistle of S. Barnabas is found in five of the seventeen MSS. which he examined; their designations, value and date are thus assigned by Dressel<sup>1</sup>:

*The sources  
of the present  
text.*

*European  
MSS. col-  
lated by  
Dressel.*

Cod. Vaticanus (V.) XI cent., parchment, a good MS. and well written.

Cod. Ottobonianus (O.) XIV cent., paper, with marginal notes, corrections and conjectures: it is occasionally difficult to read on account of the contractions and abbreviations.

MS. Barberinus (B.) Holstein's transcript from the destroyed Theatine Cod.

Cod. Casanatensis (C.) XV cent., paper, and containing about half the epistle.

Cod. Mediceus or Florentinus (F.) XV cent., paper.

<sup>1</sup> A. R. M. Dressel, *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera*, 2nd Ed. Lips. 1863, p. LVI.

*The Sinaitic  
MS.*

These MSS. all belong to the same family, and it was not till 1863 that a complete Greek text was published with the help of the Sinaitic MS. The date of this MS. has given rise to a great deal of controversy; Schenkel placing it as early as the third century, Hilgenfeld arguing for the sixth as the probable date. The most competent critics however, including Tischendorf himself, agree to refer it to the beginning of the fourth century, on grounds which are familiar to all students of the Greek Testament, and which need only be very briefly summarised. 1. It does not contain the Euthalian verses, and is even without the Eusebian divisions which were commonly in use from the middle of the fourth century. 2. The text, like the Codex Bezae, harmonises in many passages with the Western group, and this is usually taken as a sign of antiquity. 3. The arrangement of the books, though in general the same as that adopted by the Western Fathers, differs from it in the position assigned to the Epistle to the Hebrews, which occurs after 2 Thessalonians. 4. Even the unusual spellings, the itacisms, and the Alexandrian barbarisms which are found, do not by any means show that the MS. was written at a time when Greek was much corrupted (though this occurred pretty early in country places), but rather that the text had not undergone the process of improvement, which was due to the labour of scholarly correctors.

*The second  
correction of  
the Sinaitic.*

One other point is worth mentioning in this connexion—namely the value to be attached to the second corrector of **N**, commonly designated by **N\*\*** (Hilgenfeld's **S\*\***), to which Müller<sup>1</sup> attributes so high an importance. Tischendorf<sup>2</sup>, on whose judgment we are practi-

<sup>1</sup> Müller, *Erkl. des Barnabas-briefs*, pp. 26—29.

<sup>2</sup> Tisch. *Cod. Sin.* Imperial Ed. 1862. Proleg. pp. 9, 10.

cally entirely dependent, decides that in all probability this hand is the same as that which he designates by C<sup>c</sup>; this designation he adopts to bring it into close connexion with hands C<sup>a</sup> and C<sup>b</sup>, supposing all the three to belong to the seventh century. Now to this hand, which runs through both the O. T. and the N. T. part of the MS., a special value is attached, owing to a curious note at the end of the book of Esther, to the effect that the corrections were made with the help of a holograph MS. of Pamphilos, who had compared his text with the Hexapla of Origen. Now on this we must observe, by way of modification to Müller's remarks on p. 28 of his Introduction: 1. That it is uncertain, though most probable, that the second corrector of our Epistle is identical with this C<sup>c</sup> of Tischendorf. 2. That we have no warrant for assuming that the Codex Pamphili to which he refers, contained any part of the New Testament, still less that it contained the Epistle of Barnabas. 3. That assuming the affirmative in both these cases, we yet have no clue to the precise value of the version of Ep. Barnabas contained in that codex.—Accordingly for determining the value of N<sup>\*\*</sup> we are thrown back, as indeed in these cases all sound criticism must inevitably be, on the internal evidence in their favour afforded by the readings themselves, grounded on a careful and detailed comparison of N<sup>\*\*</sup> with the other sources of MS. evidence. In the present case, depending on this stable comparative method, we need not hesitate to agree with<sup>1</sup> Müller, Gebhardt and in the main Hilgenfeld, in assigning a high and independent value to this branch of MS. authority.

<sup>1</sup> Müller, *Erkl. des Barn.* p. 29; Hilgenfeld, *Nov. Test. extr. Can.*  
Gebhardt, *Patr. Apost. Op.* p. xiv.; p. ix.

*Codex Petropolitannus or Corbetensis.*

While the discovery of the Sinaitic MS. has rendered us less dependent on the Latin version, it has led to a higher appreciation of the value of that translation. Menard thought so little of it that he substituted a new rendering of his own in his edition, while Hilgenfeld seems to regard it as almost the most trustworthy source we have. It contains the first four and a half chapters, which are absent from all the Greek MSS. except **8**, but omits the last four—a circumstance which has given rise to some discussions as to the integrity of the epistle. The codex itself belongs to the ninth, or, according to Tischendorf, the eighth century: the quotations are not brought into accordance with any known Latin version, from which it may be inferred that the translation was made before the Vulgate became the received text of the Church. The archaic spelling of some names, *e.g.* Moyses, is preserved, and we have thus reason to believe that the text which was used was older in form than that of the majority of the MSS., and perhaps even the Sinaitic itself. There are frequent lacunae, as for example where the translator has shortened his version by the omission of expressions that seemed to him redundant, and he has apparently been once or twice influenced by dogmatic considerations. The MS. is now in S. Petersburg, where it was recently collated by Muralt.

*Principles on which the text has been constructed.*

The text which I have printed here is that of De Gebhardt and Harnack; it seems to have been constructed with a very just appreciation of the relative value of the various sources of the text: to not a few instances however of somewhat arbitrary readings, attention has been called in the notes.

Like most recent editors, they have been guided by



very similar principles to those which were adopted, and are thus described, by Müller<sup>1</sup> :—

“The critical principles which I have followed in my attempt to reconstruct the original text are those which are universally adopted in recent New Testament criticism, and which have been generally followed by the latest editors of our epistle. Some of these *canones critici* are based on historical or external, others on exegetical or internal principles: the latter must depend on and proceed from the former, to prevent our criticism having a tinge of subjective prejudice: the oldest as well as the most current traditional opinion must be primarily kept in view.

I. *External, historical principles.*

“(a) *Consensus testium.* Where no variation occurs the traditional reading may be accepted as the oldest and most generally current.

“(b) Where divergences are found the preference must be given to **N**, **N\*\***, and Lat.

“(c) Usually the majority is to be preferred to the minority..

“(d) A consensus of the MSS. on which the Greek Vulgate is based, only supplies the evidence of a single family, since all are derived from one mutilated original.

“(e) When they do not agree, the preferable reading is that supported by an independent source, which in its turn receives additional confirmation from the agreement.

“(f) When the Sinaitic has no variants in important passages we may assume that the codex Pamphili agreed with it, and the authority for the reading is

<sup>1</sup> *Erklärung des Barnabasbriefs*, p. 29.

doubled," (*or rather, is strengthened by the agreement of an unknown authority*).

"(g) The less important authorities become most valuable when there are lacunae in the principal ones; though they must be allowed some weight even when the others are complete.

## 2. *Internal and exegetical Reasons.*

"The oldest reading which survives is not necessarily the best, for inaccurate readings were propagated in the earliest times through the carelessness and ignorance of transcribers. The author himself may have made slips of the pen which could be readily corrected by anyone: but we must not depart from the oldest reading unless it is positively necessary.

"(a) A difficult, harsh, and uncommon reading is to be preferred to one easier and more obvious, as the former is more likely to have been corrected into the latter than *vice versa*, more particularly through the medium of glosses.

"(b) Exceptions must be made to this rule in the case of evident slips, confusions, and itacisms: though not where late forms of colloquial Greek occur, *e.g.* Acc. Sing. 5th Decl. in *-av*, as in N. T. according to Lachmann, Tischendorf, Winer, &c.

"(c) The shorter reading is to be preferred, as additions are frequently inserted by way of explanation.

"(d) The old Latin version forms an exception, because abbreviation is particularly characteristic of it.

"(e) If one reading agrees with the LXX. and another does not, the latter is to be preferred because the former has probably been corrected into accordance with the LXX.

“(f) This holds good in regard to the Latin except where an agreement of the Greek MSS. with the LXX. is discountenanced by abbreviations in the Latin.

“(g) The reading has also sometimes been corrupted from doctrinal considerations: *e.g.* in cap. IV. 3, where Henoch has been changed into Daniel by the translator, or more probably by a copyist.

“(h) The analogy of Greek linguistic usage—especially within the epistle itself—must be taken into account, more particularly in doubtful cases.

### 3. *Conjectural criticism.*

“Conjecture is occasionally allowable even when it involves the correction of the traditional text; but the more closely that conjecture confines itself to readings actually preserved, the better. Where the copyist gives us tolerable sense we must not attempt to improve upon it, even with the skill of a Bentley: the only exception is where we have reason to suppose the copyist himself made a mistake,”

These facts and principles have not been clearly kept in view by the author of *Supernatural Religion*. It must of course always be difficult to give the general reader a short summary of the results of critical controversy. But it would indeed be unfortunate if we were driven to the conclusion that the MSS. are so corrupt that no satisfactory text can be constructed, and that therefore all argument founded upon internal evidence is valueless. But before a general charge of constant interpolation can be admitted, it is well to remember that this must have occurred at a very early date, as the sources of the text are so distinct. Besides, there is not much judgment displayed in the manner in which the

writer refers to particular authorities, as when he describes a variant of the second correction of the Sinaitic as the work of a "pious scribe" who "added words in the margin as a gloss." This may be true of the passage in question (XIX. 11), but we ask in vain for the "very many similar glosses which have crept into the text," and which have been most unaccountably left unmentioned by all recent editors. It is surely unscientific to found our criticisms on the unverified hypothesis of a purposeless corruption of the text at the hands of a possible pious scribe.

## II.

### THE PLAN AND CHARACTER OF THE EPISTLE.

#### I. *Plan of the Epistle.*

FOR a knowledge of the character of the Epistle, its aim and date, we must rely principally on the results that may be brought to light by a careful study of the book itself. The most important introduction to such an attempt is the delineation of the plan of the author's argument. This is sufficiently clear, though there is sometimes but little formal break in the train of reasoning when the author is really passing to a new point. The fundamental thought of the whole is that the external ritual of the Jews has passed away, while the true religious life, which the symbols prefigured to prophetic minds, is within the reach of those who are renewed through the death and suffering of the incarnate Christ. The parts may be thus arranged.

	<i>Chapter</i>
<i>Introduction.</i>	I.
<i>Part I.</i> External ritual is	
worthless,	II. whether sacrifices
	III. or fasts:
	IV. and is observed
	by evil-livers.

## Chapter

Part II. The true religious  
life is possible through

1. The work of Christ which is prefigured,
  - (a) in prophecies
    - v. as to His suffering
    - VI. in the flesh:
  - (b) in ritual observances,
    - VII. in regard to the goats
    - VIII. and heifer.
2. The religious ordinances
  - (a) of the old dispensation were *only* types,
    - IX. e.g. circumcision
    - X. and precepts as to food.
  - (b) while those of the new were prefigured by prophets,
    - XI. e.g. baptism,
    - XII. the cross.
3. These mark Christians as the true heirs of salvation,
  - (a) as was understood by
    - XIII. the patriarchs,
    - XIV. and by Moses and the prophets;
  - (b) and Christians possess
    - XV. the true Sabbath,
    - XVI. and the true temple.
    - XVII.

Conclusion.

Appendix. The fruits of true and false religion are contrasted as

- XIX. the way of light,
- XX. and the way of darkness.

Conclusion.

XXI.

This plan carries on the face of it a clear intimation of the object of the epistle. It is evidently directed against Judaising teachers who were sowing dissension in a Christian church, and who, while boasting of their election, were corrupt in life. It is against them that the attack is directed in so far as the epistle is at all polemical; but it has this character only in a minor degree, as its principal aim is to gladden and edify some Christian brethren by instructing them more fully in the knowledge of divine truth. It is not mainly hortatory, but the author desires to impart a deeper understanding of the divine ways. God's action in the past is the subject which he principally elucidates, by drawing out the spiritual meaning of ordinances which were intelligible only to the prophets of old. The purpose of his writing is most clearly brought out in the Introduction, where we find his conception of the Christian character, and have some hints of the place which this spiritual knowledge should hold in respect to it. It is a help to Christian progress rather than a step towards beginning the religious life; since it is to be added to faith, though for lack of it those, who lived before Christ came, failed to obtain the benefit of His work: but it seems to be the one means by which Christians may 'go on unto perfection:' its possession will increase their divine joy: while it may present occasions for the deepening of their faith, and be a help in the performance of duty. It is twice mentioned along with other intellectual graces, II. 3, and XXI. 5, and seems to the author to be specially worthy of cultivation. Perhaps it may be best distinguished from wisdom and knowledge as *Spiritual Insight*, which distinguishes the divine teaching conveyed in ordinary events and occurrences: such insight seems to be closely allied to the prophetic spirit. The expres-

*The Epistle  
opposed to  
Judaisers,  
but mainly  
directed to  
"edifying"  
the brethren*

*by increas-  
ing their  
Spiritual  
Insight.*

sion *ἐτέρα γνώσις* in the second part of the epistle is difficult to explain, but it may have seemed appropriate to an attempt to enforce the religious character of secular and social as well as of devotional duties.

*The opinion of the Old Testament prophets in regard to rites contrasted with that of the author;*

It is not hard for our author to find passages in the prophets which shew that the performance of perfunctory sacrifice and fasting (II. and III.) was not pleasing to God: and one who felt how mechanical the legal observances of his own age had become, had difficulty in believing that they had ever been anything else. Thus he does not contrast—as the prophets had done—the mechanical and devotional fulfilment of ritual obligations, but (as he imagined they did) the mere performance of ritual obligations and true religious life. The mass of the Jews, whose worship was merely false, are contrasted with the prophets whose words and deeds were of wholly spiritual import, and who, by the help of a divinely implanted insight, attained to true faith in Christ. Even though the intended readers had received a clear revelation of divine truth, it seemed to the author that a fuller measure of insight would guard them against the evil tendencies of their age (IV.).

*his view of the work of Christ,*

The four succeeding chapters are of very great interest, as bringing out clearly the meaning which primitive Christians put upon the work of Christ. We have here an epistle which professedly deals with the deeper aspects of that work—and the essential characteristics (XVII.) by an insight into which the fathers were saved: this is delineated in the words of the prophets (V., VI.) and in what may be described as the symbolical institutions of Moses (VII., VIII.). Christ's death and resurrection are a victory over Death; the sufferings which preceded them were undergone for the sake of sinners, and betoken the means of salvation: but there is no trace of the



doctrine of vicarious sacrifice, so common in a later theology.

Though the other chapters which deal with rites are closely connected with those immediately preceding, there is still a considerable change in the tone in which the author speaks of these usages. Where they dimly declare the true way of salvation through Christ they are valuable: where no such purpose is served the object of the command was not served by actual performance, but lay solely in the spiritual significance: the obvious answer to this, that the father of the faithful himself practised the rite of circumcision, can only be met by discovering that owing to the number of those circumcised the event foreshadowed the cross of Jesus (IX.). The validity of the ordinances as to food, when taken in the literal sense, is also denied (X.) and spiritual interpretations are assigned. This leads to the second part of the argument, for if the Old Testament fathers attained to salvation—spiritual insight declaring to them what Jesus manifested to the world—they must have been aware of Christian means of grace: and thus we have a discussion of Old Testament hints of Baptism (XI.) and of that Cross which was the symbol of victory over Death (XII.).

Having thus described the true way of salvation, and the real spiritual unity existing among those who lived under the two dispensations, the author proceeds to insist more strongly that only the spiritual Jew and the Christian are heirs of the Covenant, as was perceived by the patriarchs (XIII.), by Moses and the prophets (XIV.). So, too, the limitation of worship to set times (XV.) and to one set place (XVI.) was unspiritual and had never received divine sanction. The Appendix does not contain anything which need detain us in a preliminary sketch.

*and of the ceremonies which were not types of it.*

*The spiritual unity of the two dispensations.*

II. *The Integrity of the Epistle.*

*No extensive  
mutilations  
of the text.*

It is only necessary to refer to this question for the sake of clearing the way for the discussion of special difficulties and establishing our right to use the epistle as a whole. There is a general agreement that the work, as we have it, proceeded from the hands of one author and has not been either largely mutilated or interpolated in after times. This has not always been admitted, and the most wild and contradictory hypotheses as to the true form of the epistle have been started from time to time. Dodwell, Lemoyne and others<sup>1</sup>, refused to admit the genuineness of the second part of the epistle, but the grounds on which its integrity is maintained are very convincing, and will be found briefly stated in a note, cap. XVIII.

*Schenkel's  
theory.  
Stud. u.  
Kritik. 1837.*

Till quite recently the only careful interpolation hypothesis<sup>2</sup> which had been brought forward was that of Schenkel, who thought the original epistle consisted of §§ I.—VI. XIII. XIV. and XVII. These he supposes to be due to Barnabas himself, while the other sections were added by a Therapeutic Christian. The hypothesis has given rise to much suggestive criticism. In the chapters which he accepts, Schenkel finds a logical order of treatment; II. III. IV. assert that the authority of the Jewish Law does not extend to Christians: in V. VI. there is a testimony to the reconciling and sanctifying influence of Christ's death, but this is figured as a new creation and not as a new birth. In XIII. XIV. the idea of the covenant people is developed at some length. This is all said to be intensely Pauline, while the spirit which is

<sup>1</sup> Henke *de Epist.* p. 2. Rörðam *de Auth. Epist. Barnabas*, 9, 60.

<sup>2</sup> For a more recent but equally unconvincing attempt to establish a

theory of wide interpolations, cf. Heydecke, *Dissertatio qua Barnabae Epistola interpolata demonstratur.*

shown by the interpolated portions is very bitter. It is farther urged that in the genuine part Barnabas regards the old covenant as a preparation for the new, as being a real ordinance of God; and Moses as a real historic personage. But could the interpolator have taken this view? Does he not do away with the very conditions which are necessary for historical truth, and regard the Old Testament Fathers as mere conscious symbols of something that was to happen in the far future?—"There is no admission of a theocratic significance in circumcision, which expressed the covenant relation on the side of man; nor does he admit a mediating prophetic power which ratified the covenant on the side of God<sup>1</sup>." Again Barnabas represents the Christian Church as a moral and sanctifying influence established for the eternal salvation of man<sup>2</sup>. In the other chapters forgiveness of sins is ascribed to a magical power in the act of Baptism; and the cross is a mere symbol. "There is nothing that harmonises with the Gospel history or Pauline spirit. But an unhealthy mysticism is found in these chapters which is quite at variance with the child-like trust of the first century, and does not satisfy the longing of pious faith, but panders instead to the sickly desire of idle curiosity<sup>3</sup>."

Such is the difference of tone which Schenkel finds in the two parts of the epistle. It is worth while to notice that the hypothesis is utterly insufficient to explain the facts. It professes to be an attempt to reconcile the strong testimony of Origen and Clement in favour of an epistle of Barnabas with the fact that much of what occurs in the epistle before us cannot be decently attributed to him. But Clement and Origen

*Criticism  
of the theory.*

<sup>1</sup> *Stud. u. Kritik*. 1837, p. 663.

<sup>2</sup> p. 667.

<sup>3</sup> *Stud. u. Kritik*, p. 669.

quote partly from the chapters Schenkel accepts, partly from those he rejects<sup>1</sup>; their testimony is as decisive about the one as about the other. Nor can it be said that there is any greater logical unity in the plan which Schenkel suggests than in that which has been sketched above: the hypothesis is utterly devoid of any textual support, and it will be seen below that (apart from the appendix) the same stylistic peculiarities occur throughout the epistle, and give considerable confirmation to the view that it is throughout the work of a single author.

### III. *The Characteristics of the Author and Readers.*

*The evidence  
of Gentile  
authorship.*

The epistle is so much concerned with Mosaic institutions that some editors have almost taken for granted that it must have been written to Jewish Christians by one of their own race: but a closer examination renders this conclusion very improbable, and the grounds may now be stated which tell in favour of Gentile authorship. The evidence tells us rather what our author was not, than what he was. The members of most of the early churches were drawn both from Jewish and Gentile sections of the community, and we are led by the author's language to believe that he was neither a missionary who had come among them from a distance, nor a Jew who had tender associations with the ancient worship. The one possible exception to this rests on a doubtful reading in XVI. 7, and is discussed in a note on the verse. The references to his own individuality which we find, seem to betray a very close connection with his expected readers. He writes to them as "one of them<sup>2</sup>," and not

<sup>1</sup> e.g. Clement quotes XVI. XXI. XVIII. as well as v.  
x. as well as vi. Origen quotes

<sup>2</sup> § I. 8, and § IV. 6.

as a teacher. It seems hardly likely that he would have rested his appeal to them entirely on their intimate knowledge and connection, if he were a stranger coming among them for a time, one who was not of their race, and had no natural bond of union with them but such as arose from their being his sons in God. The pastoral epistles of S. Paul have often at least a passing reference to apostolic authority, and we do not find him resting his appeal entirely on his affectionate relations with them, as this author does. There is a total disclaiming of authority in our epistle, and though the phrase *περί-ψημα* is applied both by S. Paul<sup>1</sup> and our author to themselves, there is a vein of irony in S. Paul's use of it which is not present here. From examining these expressions we are led to conclude, that the constant appeal to intimate friendship and love is more accordant with the bearing of a Christian to fellow Christians, than with that of a missionary to his disciples. The most distinct of those passages which seem to preclude a Jewish authorship is that in XVI.<sup>2</sup> How could a Jewish author, appealing to fellow-countrymen whose feelings he shared and respected, tell them that the Jews worshipped God in their temple "almost as the heathen do"? How could he speak of the destruction of that temple and of the holy city with the sort of exultation that he shows? When we remember how Christ wept over the city at the mere thought of its coming sorrows, we cannot imagine a man of tender sympathy, such as our author seems to have been, writing in this heartless manner of the event itself, to other Jews who had but recently known the bitter grief of seeing the great centre of their national existence destroyed by their enemies.

*and contrast  
with the  
manner of  
S. Paul.*

*Arguments  
from refer-  
ences to the  
destruction  
of Jerusa-  
lem,*

<sup>1</sup> § VI. 5; cf. I Cor. iv. 13.

<sup>2</sup> § XVI. 1; cf. Hilg. *Apost. Vät.* p. 32. Schenkel, *Stud. u. K.* p. 668.

On the other hand, to Gentile Christians, who were being pressed by their Jewish brethren to conform to the Mosaic law, the destruction of the temple and abolition of the worship there, must have been a great practical relief. We can understand that some of them would feel little or no regret.

*and to the  
former con-  
dition of his  
readers ;*

Another remark (in XVI. 7) calls for some attention in this connection. Henke, Rördam, Hefele, and the other maintainers of a Jewish authorship, translate it as asserting that "before we believed in Christ we worshipped the true God so ignorantly that our hearts were full of idolatry," and apply it to Jewish Christians. But though granting that this may be the case, and even admitting that the idolatry alluded to was in the heart, we may more naturally refer it to Gentile Christians. Fell, in his edition, cites 1 Pet. iv. 3 as a parallel passage, but it is doubtful how far it is really so ; for S. Peter appears to be warning his readers against countenancing the Gentile customs in any way, and not to be referring to a time when their worship of the true God was so ignorant that it was a sort of idolatry. It certainly applies more naturally to Gentile than to Jewish Christians, as does the difficult clause about the rebuilding of the temple—in whatever way we interpret it.

Another passage which it is difficult to suppose that a Jew would have written to Jews is that which treats of circumcision (IX. 4). In what sense could a Jew have said that an evil angel had deluded his nation to the practice of circumcision ?

*from the use  
of pronouns.*

Nor is this all. The use of the personal pronouns ἡμῶν and ἐκείνων is occasionally confirmatory of and never contrary to the hypothesis of a considerable proportion of Gentile readers. Is it likely that a Jew would

explain to Jews how "we" received a share in the covenant, as the author does in XIV. 4? He might have told how they (the unbelieving Jews) consummated their iniquity, but he would hardly have gone on to say, as he does, that "we" thus become heirs of the covenant. If we compare the passage with that argument of S. Paul to which it corresponds<sup>1</sup>, we cannot help being struck by the fact that the reasoning before us is presented in the form which that argument would have taken, if it had been put in the mouth of a Gentile convert. The contrast which he points with these pronouns is between Christians and unspiritual Jews: between what S. Paul calls the election and those who were blinded: but he does not separate himself at all from the Gentiles who were grafted in when the branches were broken. On the whole, the balance of probability is in favour of the opinion that the author was not a Jew, and that at least a large proportion of those for whom he wrote were Gentile Christians.

Two objections are commonly urged against this opinion,—that the whole theme would only be suited to Jewish readers, and that the mode of treatment shows an acquaintance with Jewish veins of thought<sup>2</sup>. The latter remark has a considerable amount of truth in it, but the former is worthless as an argument. We must remember the immense struggle which was kept up during the first century between Jewish and Gentile Christians, and how important the question of the continued obligation of the Mosaic institutions was to those Gentiles who were accustomed to the rites. We cannot fail to see that an epistle like that before us would be a most suitable one to address to Gentile Christians, as far as its theme goes. Further evidence on this point,

*Objections  
from the  
general  
theme of the  
epistle*

<sup>1</sup> Romans xi. 11.

<sup>2</sup> Hef. *Das Send.* pp. 130, 131.

as also upon the knowledge of Jewish literature possessed by our author, will be adduced below.

and from  
the phrase  
"fathers."

One particular term employed is said to be inappropriate, if we suppose it used by a Gentile to Gentiles. It occurs in the beginning of XIV., where Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are referred to as the "fathers," a phrase which, it is contended, would only be used if the author was addressing their descendants. This argument shows clearly to what straits those who maintain a Jewish authorship are reduced. The whole point of the chapter is that those who are spiritually minded are the true inheritors of the covenant which the patriarchs received in faith: that in so far as "we" share their faith "we" are their heirs, and partake in the covenant which was made with "them." On these various grounds we feel that the supposition of a Gentile author and readers is perfectly accordant with the general theme of the epistle, while it is distinctly confirmed by several hints which can be gathered from different isolated passages.

#### IV. *Stylistic Peculiarities of the Epistle.*

General  
characteris-  
tics.

The principal difficulties which occur in reading the epistle are rather due to the character of the matter, than to any want of clearness in the sentences themselves: nineteenth century modes of thought are very different from those of our author's time, and we are apt to charge him with incoherence, when the confusion is really due to our inability to follow the train of his reasoning. These characteristics will be more fitly dwelt on in considering the theological position of the author, and it will be sufficient for the present to confine our attention to the peculiarities of his phraseology and the conclusions which may be thence derived.



The attention of the reader is constantly arrested by such monitions as *προσέχετε, μάθετε, νοεῖτε*, &c. ; and the flow of sentences is broken by *membra disjecta*, and explanatory clauses which sometimes interrupt the sense. These tricks of composition are common characteristics of the Alexandrian Fathers, but peculiar importance attaches to phrases which seem to show that the author had come under the influence of the Hebrew tongue. Rördam, like the other defenders of the apostolic authorship of the epistle, attaches great weight to the presence of these peculiarities, and has noted them with care<sup>1</sup>. There are several cases where ordinary words are used in unusual senses, e.g. *δικαίωμα, κατάρα, πρόσωπον, φόβος, ὄνομα*, &c. It may be sufficient to remark that even when these occur elsewhere than in direct quotations out of the Septuagint, as is sometimes the case, they may still be explained as distinct reminiscences of that translation, and no ground can be alleged for referring them to any more direct influence : several of the instances cited, e.g. *σκεῦος, δεκαδύο*, are rather Alexandrian than Hebraistic. The same is true of such constructions as *ἐλπίζειν ἐπὶ* or *εἰς, κολλᾶσθαι μετὰ* and the instrumental use of *ἐν*. The writer's mind was certainly deeply imbued with Old Testament phraseology, but there is nothing to show that he made use of it, because he had been accustomed to read and express himself in Hebrew. On the other hand, while the exaltation of *γνώσις* and the allegorising habit of mind are eminently characteristic of Alexandria and her schools, we have a few phrases which point distinctly to this quarter as the one from which the epistle emanated. The oft-recurring expression *δόγματα* was much used by the theologians of that place, and in a precisely similar sense.

*Alexan-  
drianisms.*

*Alleged  
Hebraisms.*

*Alexan-  
drian  
phrases.*

<sup>1</sup> *De Auth. Epist. Barn.* p. 47.

It had lost the sense of Theoretical Principles,—though even the Stoics who applied it thus, connected the word with deeply hidden mysteries,—and in Philo it stands for any Scripture teaching which possesses an esoteric as well as a plain historical interpretation; at a later date still, Basil distinguishes the *δόγμα*, which has a hidden spiritual sense, from the *κήρυγμα*, which contains the plain teaching of the Church<sup>1</sup>. The expression *γῆ πάσχουσα* in VI. 9, is another possible indication of the same vein of thought: it harmonises with Philo's theory that matter was something purely passive, on which God worked through the instrumentality of the *λόγος*. (X. II.)

So far then as the testimony of linguistic peculiarities goes we find that our author was indoctrinated with Alexandrian philosophy, and that his mind was deeply imbued with scriptural phraseology, but we have no reason to doubt that his acquaintance with it was derived from the LXX. version, which was so generally used by the Egyptian Jews.

*Quotations  
are from the  
LXX., but  
occasionally  
agree more  
closely with  
the Hebrew.*

Further light is thrown upon this question by the quotations which are made from the Old Testament. They are very numerous and very inexact, as the sense is frequently given rather than the actual words. Almost without exception the quotations are allied to the LXX. version rather than to the Hebrew, and in IX. 6 the author has fallen into a mistake from misunderstanding the confused LXX. rendering of Jer. IX. 25, 26. There are three passages, however, where it is alleged that he departs from the LXX. and approaches more closely to the original. One of these (VI. 2, 4) is so vague as hardly to be a citation at all; the other two (XI. 2, XV. 3) have been discussed in the notes. They do not appear to me to be so convincing as to compel the admission

<sup>1</sup> See note on cap. II. 6.

that the author was acquainted with Hebrew, or to drive us to the hypothesis that he used a LXX. text differing from ours. The mystic importance attached to the 318 servants of Abraham, has also been alleged as showing that the author was so habituated to the use of Greek, that he was unable to recal the fact, that Abraham could hardly be conscious of a spiritual meaning which was hidden in Greek numerals: this is certainly a strange oversight, which would be difficult to explain on the hypothesis that the author was an educated Levite who had sat at the feet of Gamaliel.

In connection with the subject of quotations, the formulæ of citation which he generally uses are worth discussing. These are very various. The commonest of all is the simple λέγει, sometimes amplified into λέγει κύριος, or λέγει ἡ γραφή, or λέγει ὁ προφήτης, or λέγει ἐν τῷ προφήτῃ. Often too the name of the Prophet is mentioned; thus Henoch, Daniel, Moses, and, constantly throughout the epistle, David and Isaiah are referred to in this way. There is one instance of a book (Deuteronomy) being cited by its name as distinct from that of its author. The formula γέγραπται is common, and is used of Moses, Henoch, Daniel, Isaiah, and probably of S. Matthew. It is I think impossible to find any reason for the use of a particular form in any case. There is no one form which is reserved for particular books, nor is there any difference made according as the quotation is verbally correct, or only a reference to the sense of the passage. Some of the least exact quotations have very exact references, as in IV. where Daniel and Henoch are referred to: but other passages are given very loosely, and only mentioned as occurring in the Scriptures, as in the case of the quotation from these same authors in XVI.

*Quotations  
from books  
of the Old  
Testament  
and Apocry-  
pha,*

The books of the Old Testament of which our author makes use are very numerous. Isaiah is very frequently quoted, and after it the Psalms are most often referred to. The five books of Moses, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Zechariah, Proverbs, Zephaniah, and possibly Haggai, are all cited. But by far the most striking fact in this connexion is the large use which our author made of Apocryphal books; especially of the book of Henoch, and IV. Esdras. The Wisdom of Sirach is also once quoted. The two former are cited by our author as scripture with precisely the same formulæ as he uses when quoting from the canonical books. In XVI. we find a passage from Henoch introduced by the phrase λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή: and IV. Esdras is possibly quoted in VI. with the words λέγει κύριος, and certainly as the work of a prophet in XII. The author uses all these books with little or no discrimination.

But much more interesting questions are opened, when we come to consider his use of the New Testament. The epistle is placed by some critics at A.D. 72 or so—a date which is earlier than that of the later writings which are included in the canon: and it is interesting to know in what way the Gospels were received by the Church on their first publication, or at any rate before they had acquired that authority which any venerable writing can claim.

*and from  
S. Matthew.*

There is one alleged quotation (IV. 14) with the usual formula (γέγραπται) which has given rise to much discussion: but I cannot help thinking with Tischendorf<sup>1</sup> that the more probable hypothesis is, that the Gospel of S. Matthew was appealed to by our author in the same way as other Scriptures were. No other instances of direct quotation from any Gospel or Epistle can be

<sup>1</sup> *When were our Gospels written?* pp. 87 f.

substantiated, though several have been alleged and have a certain air of likelihood, and this probable reference to S. Matthew's Gospel is important.

So far, then, as the evidence from idioms and quotations goes, we are confirmed in the belief that the epistle was most probably written by one who had been brought up in Alexandria (whether Jew or Gentile), but whose extensive, if inexact, knowledge of scripture was dependent on the LXX. rather than due to any acquaintance with the Hebrew itself.

#### V. *The Date of the Epistle.*

This can be determined within very wide limits by a mere consideration of the subject matter of the epistle: it is connected with the period when Jewish hopes were beginning to revive after the destruction of Jerusalem. The *terminus a quo* is given by the siege of Titus, the *terminus ad quem* by the war in the reign of Hadrian, and we may thus say with absolute certainty that it was written between 70 and 131 A.D. Christians were placed in very trying circumstances during this period: the conquerors oppressed them as if they had been Jewish rebels, while the Jews themselves disowned them. It was surely a time when comfort and support were sorely needed, and our author's main object is this work of consolation. But besides this, the destruction of the ancient forms of worship, to which Jesus had himself conformed, was a great stumbling-block to many of the Christians, and it was necessary for their teachers to insist that while the old surroundings of religion had passed away, the reality might still remain. The letter of Serapion, which is of the same period, discusses in a

*The period  
when it was  
written.*

*The special  
difficulties of  
Christians.*

semi-pagan manner the corresponding difficulty with regard to the kingdom of Jesus<sup>1</sup>, and proves that the destruction of the seat of Jewish monarchy did not affect the spiritual reign, of which Jesus had spoken : in the same way our author delineates the true religious life, and places it in contrast with the ordinances which had ceased for ever.

*The condition of the Jews,*

*and their hopes.*

The epistle describes the Jews in language which is certainly true of many of them at this time. Driven from their country, and in despair at its destruction, many had given themselves up to mere money-getting<sup>2</sup>, and engaged in the most vicious occupations in pursuance of this end. Some, like Josephus, rose to high positions in the courts of their conquerors, while others pandered to the vices of the luxurious rulers of the world. Still, the hope of a new temple began to spring in the hearts of the people from the very time when the old was destroyed : it was cherished by the more devout<sup>3</sup>, and gathered strength when men of the scattered nation were welcomed in high places. This feeling centred more especially round Agrippa<sup>4</sup> and his Queen Berenice, for it was hoped that through their instrumentality the Romans might be induced to restore Jerusalem and rebuild the Temple. The expectation of restoration culminated in the beginning of the reign of Hadrian, when Jews received greater encouragement than before : it is even said that they were successful in extracting temporary permission from the emperor for the reconstruction of the Temple, and numbers flocked to help in the work. The outbreak under Bar-cochba and the commencement of the Jewish war put an end to their

<sup>1</sup> Ewald, *Geschichte des Volks Israel*, VII. 29.

<sup>2</sup> *Juv. Sat.* VI. 546.

<sup>3</sup> Jost, *Geschichte des Judenthums*, II. 66.

<sup>4</sup> Ewald, VII. 22.

hopes, which were finally extinguished when Roman artizans were sent to found the city of Ælia, and to build a temple for the worship of Jupiter.

Such being the general character of the period, it remains for us to see what grounds there are for any nearer determination of the date of our epistle. Two passages are of the highest importance in this connection, IV. 3—5 and XVI. 4. We shall deal with the latter first: there are three different ways in which it has been interpreted, (*a*) in a spiritual sense, (*b*) as applying to one special event which can be identified with great accuracy, or (*c*) as referring to actual events, but only in a very vague and loose manner. There is no difficulty about the translation, but there is much difference of opinion as to the sense the words were meant to convey. "And again he says, 'Lo, they who destroyed this temple shall themselves rebuild it.' This is come to pass: it was destroyed by their enemies because of their wars; and now they themselves and the servants (*ὑπηρέται*) of their enemies are about to rebuild it."

*Various interpretations of the reference to the rebuilding of the temple.*

*a.* The simplest way out of the difficulty seems to be to take the last clause in a spiritual sense: this is the view of Menard, and it has the support of Hilgenfeld<sup>1</sup> and Hefele<sup>2</sup>. The passage then tells of the destruction of the marble temple and the rebuilding of a spiritual one by Jewish and Gentile Christians alike. The principal objection to this seems to be that the whole conception of the spiritual temple is different from that which the author works out below, where each Christian is described as himself a true temple (*v.* 9, 10); how then can it be said without confusion that the rebuilding of one spiritual temple is carried on by Jews and Gentiles alike? (*Vide notes in loc.*)

*(a) Spiritual interpretation*

*criticised.*

<sup>1</sup> *Apost. Vat.* p. 28 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Das Sendschreiben*, p. 115.

A still more fatal objection arises from the fact that the sense of every word has to be forced to enable the passage to bear this interpretation. Why should we call Gentile Christians *ὑπηρέται* of the conquerors? *δοῦλοι* they were for the most part, but not all *ὑπηρέται*. Again, the same Jews whose war had occasioned the destruction of the temple, continued to hope for another earthly temple, and did not by any means long for a spiritual one. The *αὐτόν*, too, must refer to an earthly temple: the spiritual temple may have been foreshadowed by the earthly, but cannot be said to be the earthly one. Lastly, the transition to the subject of the spiritual temple is marked below (v. 6), "Let us ask whether there *is* a temple of God." On all these grounds this view does not appear to me to be tenable.

(b) *Definite events,*

b. Those too who look for one particular event to which these words may apply, differ very widely from one another.

e.g. *Zerubbabel's Temple.*

Weizsäcker refers it to the rebuilding of the temple by Zerubbabel. He regards the passage as part of a brief summary of the history of the temple, while he thinks the tenses of the verbs have no relation to the order of the events, but are merely used in a way which gives greater vividness. The rebuilding was effected with the assistance of the Persians, who may be said to have been the servants of the Babylonians; the next clauses refer to the destruction by Titus, and then after this historical sketch we find the transition to the spiritual temple. I am not aware that this extremely forced interpretation has commended itself to any mind except that of its author. Volkmar, Müller, and Keim find a distinct reference to the time when the promise of Hadrian raised the reviving hopes of the Jews to their highest pitch. The *ὑπηρέται* are the craftsmen and

*Hadrian's encouragement of the Jews.*



labourers who accompanied many of the legions, and we seem to be able to date the work with the greatest accuracy at 119, when the promise to rebuild had been extracted. Weizsäcker<sup>1</sup> objects with much force, that it is hard to imagine any time when these precise words could have been written: not at the moment when they had received a mere permission to rebuild the temple themselves: still less at the time when that permission was revoked and the craftsmen had been sent to build that of a pagan god: how then can they have reference to this special event? only if the short-lived permission was so cordial that they hoped for help from the craftsmen and labourers who accompanied all the legions in the time of Hadrian<sup>2</sup>.

c. Under these circumstances it seems to me impossible to press for a very definite interpretation; all that we can say is, that the passage refers to the vague hope of a third temple which was general during the whole period. The epistle may of course have been written at the time when those hopes were highest, but I cannot find that the words themselves convey any definite indication that this was the case. This is the view of Ewald, who places the epistle in the time of Vespasian<sup>3</sup>.

The passage in the fourth chapter has given rise to a similar difference of opinion: the various editors have given many arrangements of the ten horns, the three horns and the little one; some count the three and the one as included in the ten, while others exclude them. Besides this, the fact that there is a good deal of diversity

*Passage  
might apply  
to the whole  
period.*

*The inter-  
pretation of  
Daniel's  
vision*

<sup>1</sup> *Barnabasbrief*, 24.

<sup>2</sup> It may be remarked that the clause *καὶ αὐτοὶ κ.τ.λ.* is omitted from the Latin Version, like the last four chapters. If we suppose with Müller that these chapters are a later

addition (vide XVIII. note), we must surely hold that these words are an interpolation which mark the date, not of the epistle, but of the appendix.

<sup>3</sup> *Geschichte des Volks Israel*, VII. 20.

of opinion as to the individuals who should be counted as emperors, accounts for a variety of conflicting interpretations.

*differs from  
the original.*

A few words may be said about the way in which our author uses the prophecy, for his explanation differs from the original passage in one important point. The little horn in Daniel is represented as a sort of incarnation of evil which wars against the Ancient of Days, and the similar vision in the Apocalypse is generally interpreted as a prediction of the coming of a very Nero. But in our epistle the coming of the little horn is only a sign that the Spirit of Evil would soon be specially active: but it is not itself a wicked or persecuting power. The wide difference which exists between these two conceptions, shows clearly that the Apocalypse had not influenced our author's writing in this particular passage.

*Volkmar's  
arrange-  
ment.*

Volkmar<sup>1</sup> has not observed this unusual interpretation of the vision, nor does his enumeration of the emperors agree with the description in our text. Counting from Augustus, and omitting Vitellius, he calls Domitian the tenth; Nerva, Trajan and Hadrian, who were, by adoption, of one family, are the three; and the little one, an incarnation of evil, was soon to be expected. This would corroborate his precise interpretation of the other crucial passage, and place the epistle in Hadrian's reign. But besides the objection urged above, exception must be taken to this interpretation on other grounds. The three kings are included by Daniel among the ten, and ought not to be counted in addition to them: nor does the fact that these successive monarchs were of one family, bear upon the assertion that they should be overthrown together by the last king. (ὅς ταπειν. κ.τ.λ.) Still further, this interpretation has less real affinity with

<sup>1</sup> *Monumentum vetustatis christianae ineditum*, p. 10.

that given by Volkmar of the passage in XVI. than seems at first sight to be the case: for the *τέλειον σκάνδαλον* (IV. 3) cannot be referred to the founding of the temple of Jupiter, if we assume that our author was unaware of the pagan character of the temple when he wrote chapter XVI. 4.

One of the above objections may also be urged against Hilgenfeld's<sup>1</sup> view. The ten emperors are counted just as they are by Volkmar, but the three Flavii who were the last of the ten, are regarded as the three kings who made way for that weakling Nerva. The date which we wish to determine would thus be about 97. But once more, the three are not according to our epistle united at first, but they come to share a common humiliation before the last and little, but not least powerful of the kings.

The only interpretation that seems at all satisfactory is that of Weizsäcker<sup>2</sup>. Starting, as in the Sybilline books, with Caesar, we take Nero as the sixth, Galba, Otho and Vitellius pass rapidly away before Vespasian, who restores the unity of the Empire. He is called little, not because he was unimportant, but because he was the first of a new and upstart imperial dynasty that had no blood of Caesar in its veins.

This seems to accord in all respects with the requirements of the text: and it is further to be noticed that the epistle regards the little horn as the last of the ten, while Daniel counts it in addition to them. The fact that the Sybilline books include both Caesar and Vitellius in a corresponding enumeration is also important, as it strongly corroborates this method of arrangement. The reign of Vespasian then was, according to our author, a

<sup>1</sup> *Barnabas*, note on passage.

<sup>2</sup> *Zur Kritik des Barnabasbriefs*, p. 20.

sign of warning that a time of special activity on the part of the Spirit of Evil was nigh at hand.

*Inferences  
from these  
two passages  
combined.*

Such is the information which may be gathered from the epistle, as to its probable date: in what way may the testimony of the two passages be best reconciled? Müller and Keim<sup>1</sup> insist on attaching great weight to the words about the temple, and maintain that the author, writing in 119, pointed back to the reign of Vespasian as a token that evil was to come to power shortly: and since half a century had already passed when he wrote, the time must then be thought to be very nigh. I cannot help feeling, however, that it is very unlikely that any writer would refer so slightly to a sign of that character, when writing so long after the event: the circumstances would hardly be clear in the minds of his readers, and if the warning had so long preceded the event it announced, there would be some doubt felt as to the reality of the sign. If chapter IV. is to be interpreted of Vespasian, we cannot date the epistle more than a very few years after his time: in other words, it must be placed in the earliest part of the period of reviving hopes, rather than at the moment when these hopes culminated and perished. The time of Vespasian, which Weizsäcker suggests, seems at first sight to be absurdly early; but the more I study the question, the more strongly do I feel that the epistle cannot have been written many years later.

*Argument  
from the re-  
lation of the  
epistle to  
Gnostic con-  
troversies.*

An additional verification of this view may be derived from a consideration of the matter of the epistle itself: it bears traces of having been composed in the earliest ages of our religion, when the disciples were filled with a sense of elevation into a spiritual region, and before the Christian Consciousness had uttered itself in express forms either of doctrine

<sup>1</sup> *Jesus of Nazara*, I. p. 191.

or worship. It goes back to a time when Christian teaching was indefinite, because it had not been rendered distinct by contrast with the heresies that had not yet arisen. Very similar as are the statements of our author to those of the Alexandrian Clement on the relation of *γνώσις* and *πίστις*, we yet notice that Clement has to attack aggressive Gnosticism, and to defend his own position from the prejudices of an ignorant orthodoxy which feared all teaching that had a semblance of philosophy. But neither had these attractive systems, nor the fear which they generated, appeared when our author wrote. He does not seem to apprehend any opposition on the part of other Christian brethren, or to be aware how closely he bordered on heresies which he would have strongly repudiated. On these grounds we are led to argue that the heresies had not yet appeared, or he would have been more careful to distinguish his own way of thinking from them.

Yet these tendencies had appeared and were distracting the Churches of Asia Minor<sup>1</sup> when S. Paul wrote his Epistle to the Colossians. He refuted the value some attributed to higher knowledge (II. 8), he denied the Demiurgus (I. 16), the angelology (II. 18), and the false asceticism which had been taught among them. Our author comes dangerously near to the first of these (in IX. 9), and to an unsound view of the God of the Old Testament (in IX. 4), when he speaks of an evil angel deluding the unspiritual Jews. Surely our author would have been more precise in his language if these heresies, which were current in other Churches in Apostolical times, had been disseminated in Alexandria when he wrote. It is only the teaching on the person of

<sup>1</sup> Mansel, *The Gnostic Heresies*, p. 53.

Christ that is very decided, and the Docetism of Simon Magus, and the views of the Ebionites, were certainly common from a very early time.

Again, we may remember the other Alexandrian systems, and the relation which they asserted between the religion of Israel and Christianity. Basilides<sup>1</sup> looked on the God of the Jews as by no means the highest Spiritual Being, and Judaism as preparatory to Christianity. Surely if such teaching had been current at the time of our epistle, the author would have referred to it: yet we find no hint of any doctrine on this subject but his own, that the religion of the spiritually-minded Jews and of the Christians was identical. Basilides flourished during the time of Hadrian, in all probability: I should be inclined to urge that our epistle must be earlier, because though writing on the same subjects to the same people, the author ignores the more celebrated teacher.

*Argument  
from the  
in-agre-  
ness  
of his teach-  
ing.*

To put it more generally, our author is separated from the Gnostics, because they made use of religious knowledge to solve metaphysical questions; he accepted it as the means of personal salvation. It is just because his problem is the practical one that he is kept from losing himself in the mazes of speculation, for there are tendencies in his mind to withdraw himself from the realm of actual life. The fathers seem to be divested of much of their historical reality; and his strong repudiation of the Jewish ritual as unnecessary for spiritual minds betokens a habit of mind that laid little stress on the Christian sacraments. This will be dwelt on more fully below (see ch. VI.), it may suffice to say for the present that Rothe has shown that the years immediately succeeding the fall of Jerusalem were times

<sup>1</sup> Mansel, p. 155.

of very great disorder in the Church. The old Christian right of every man to speak for the edification of the rest was subject to much abuse, and we can imagine that the other sides of Church life might also be neglected. It seems to me, both from the form of address as merely claiming this old right (εἰς ἐξ ὑμῶν), from the meagreness of his teaching, and from the want of reference to any recognised rulers, that our author addressed the Church at Alexandria, while it was in this unorganised condition. Yet we find evidence of Church government there in Hadrian's time<sup>1</sup>, and thus once more it appears to me that the epistle was written before the year 119, when most editors date it.

Nor in ascribing to this epistle a peculiarly early date would I for a moment pretend to claim for it any special authority. Its lessons were only written for our learning, inasmuch as they have an historical, not an authoritative value for us. It recalls us to a time of high enthusiasm, when from the new won heights of spiritual elevation, Religion felt no need of definite thought, ecclesiastical order, or even of ordinary morality. It was no corruption of primitive purity, but a mighty step in advance, when the Christian Conscience found external expression, and the Catholic Church arose with its orderly government, its recognised canon, and definite statements of the truth which had gladdened the hearts of its members. We can never return to the chaos of primitive Christianity, even if we are repelled by the mere submission to system which marred the religious life of a later day. Each age finds new problems before it, each must confront them for itself, and in each, as it comes and goes, the same Eternal Guide is present. With that help given to

*True value  
of the Epistle  
in relation  
to its early  
date.*

<sup>1</sup> Lightfoot *On the Philippians*, p. 223.

them that ask it, the Church may still advance to deeper knowledge and wider well-doing, and attain to phases of Christian Consciousness which were beyond the reach of those who lived and wrote in apostolical times.



### III.

#### THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE EPISTLE.

##### I.

THE remarks that have been made above as to the characteristics of the author and intended readers *Testimony of the epistle to its author.* have gone to show that the epistle was written for a united body of Jewish and Gentile Christians by a Gentile. Still there must have been some grounds for the wide-spread opinion that it came from the hand of S. Barnabas, and it is worth while to compare the indications of the personality of the author which are given in the epistle with the facts and legends which have come down to us regarding the great missionary.

These indications are by no means either numerous or distinct. The general opinion of commentators appears to be that the epistle is the work of a man far advanced in life. Any conclusion upon this point, where the data are so slight and delicate, must of necessity be put forward with deference, seeing that it must be based on indefinable impression rather than on adduced facts. The recurrence of such expressions as *υἱοὶ καὶ θυγατέρες* (I. 1), and the repeated *τέκνα* (VII. 1, IX. 7, XV. 4, XXI. 9), seems the main argument on which those who suppose the author to have been an old man rely. These, as titles of spiritual relationship (more particularly when *Opinion that he was an old man*

*discussed.*

we notice the common addition of ἀγάπης, εὐφροσύνης, εἰρήνης, or the like to the simple τέκνα) are but a slender reed on which to lean. On the other hand, the whole tone of the writing appears to be that of a younger man, one certainly not past middle age. There is a buoyancy and hopefulness of tone, a sanguine assurance as to the correctness of his own opinions and their ready acceptance by others, a bold self-reliance, an enthusiastic setting forth of that aspect of truth which has presented itself to him, a rash and almost thoughtless logic which, regardless of consequences, fearlessly pushes its conclusions to their legitimate end, a certain impatience of outward forms and unity, a frank belief in the self-sufficingness of the individual when guided by the Spirit, which are all characteristic of a younger man. Add to this his treatment of opponents: hopelessly and diametrically as he is opposed to Jews and Judaizing Christians alike, he yet displays little or nothing of bitterness or rancour in denunciation. He displays rather an entire absence of intellectual sympathy, a total incapacity to adopt for one instant their point of view, an inconsiderate blindness to the merits of their case or the arguments by which they would support it, which are hardly consonant with the character of a practised and hardened disputant. Further, his treatment of Old Testament texts and types is so arbitrary in selection and interpretation, as well as in the matter of suppression or omission, that we instinctively feel in the presence of a comparatively young man, earnest, loving, and unsophisticated, building up the faith of his Christian friends and followers by happy illustrations and citations from the Scriptures which they revere in common, rather than in that of an aged teacher whom long training has skilled in the use of demonstration and refutation. Some have seen in our

epistle the last charge of some venerable saint, anxious to give final and lasting utterance to the matured convictions of a life-time, and leave them as his last legacy to his beloved children in Christ. But this seems to me most unlikely, as there is no hint of weariness or approaching death; rather a joyful confidence of anticipation, a readiness, almost eagerness, to face obloquy and endure tribulation for Christ's sake, with a sure hope in the near approach of His kingdom, and of the passage of the writer himself from those 'last days' in which he writes, into immediate participation in the reign of Christ upon earth. Once more, the sins against which he reiterates special warnings and exhortation are specially sins of the flesh, sins of pride, and sins of rash speaking, such as his own spiritual experience would naturally suggest to the mind of a younger man. And lastly, while writing often didactically and dogmatically, he yet displays a modest candour and reserve (cf. I. 8, IV. 9, VI. 5, and especially XVII.), which accord well with the position of one comparatively young.

Much more important characteristics of the author can be discovered, not from the facts which he states or the opinions which he urges, but from the author's ignorance: and it is this which most conclusively proves that S. Barnabas could never have written the epistle. Comparatively little as we know about the companion of S. Paul, we find statements made which could never have come from his pen. Unless we suppose, with some editors, that our author was simply letting his imagination run riot, we are compelled to adopt Dressel's supposition of his trusting to some apocryphal book which is now lost. He does not confine himself to the Levitical account, and though the ceremonies of the Day of Atonement are described in the Mischna minutely, there

*The mistakes made by the author would have been impossible for S. Barnabas.*

*e.g. Day of Atonement;*

is not the least trace of the practice mentioned in VII. 4. There is a further objection: the Pentateuch ordains many washings and purificatory ceremonies on that day, and it seems most improbable that so great an infraction as is implied in this command should have been not only tolerated, but enjoined. Besides this, there were special injunctions that the whole of the goat as well as of the bullock which were sacrificed on the Day of Atonement should be burnt<sup>1</sup>, skin, flesh, and everything else: if this was carried out how could the eating of any part of it be possible? Though Justin and Tertullian, who were farther removed from Jewish times, were not quite correct in their description of the ceremonies on that day, they do not fall into such gross blunders as our author does. He has possibly been carried away by the attempt to find predictions of the facts of the crucifixion in the ceremonies of the Jews, and was not so well acquainted with the ceremonies as with the events which he thought were predicted. It is impossible to believe that S. Barnabas, a Levite, who had again and again witnessed these ceremonies, could have fallen into such errors: while we are not altogether at a loss to see the circumstances from which they might have arisen in the mind of one who had only an acquaintance with inaccurate written descriptions of the ritual, and who had never seen it performed: for in the case of many sin-offerings the victim fell to the share of the priest, and was eaten by him. After the Day of Atonement the high-priest had supper with his friends; while the priests who were actually engaged in the temple service were not compelled to observe the fast so strictly as the rest.

*the scape-goat;*

The account of the scape-goat and of the evil treatment it underwent (VII.) is curiously different from the

<sup>1</sup> Lev. xvi. 27.

simple direction of the Mosaic Law, nor can the variation be accounted for by supposing that the rites had been greatly modified by traditional usages. We find in the Mischna the prayer which the high-priest uttered before handing the goat over to the man who was to lead him away. But we have not to depend on mere negative testimony: special care was taken to prevent its being maltreated. The Babylonians had been in the habit of pursuing the man who conducted it, and the precautions which are laid down in the Talmud are due to this. Surely no educated Levite who had witnessed the rite would describe it thus. But, as in the former case, we can understand how it was that the mistake arose, at least to some extent. The maltreatment of the man who led it away has got confused with the maltreatment of the goat itself, and the temptation to describe the precise method of injury with more particularity than regard to truth was too great for our author to resist. Only one of the ceremonies, that of placing scarlet wool on the goat's head, is confirmed by the Talmud. The further description of what happened in the wilderness is equally inexact, for this tongue of scarlet wool—the change of whose colour typified, according to Maimonides, the forgiveness of sins—was divided into two parts, one of which was brought back, while the goat bearing the other was hurled over a crag. Nothing of all this is of any possible typical application, and our author passes it over, while the facts which he does give about the bramble-bush appear to be quite imaginary.

These are not the only errors in regard to the ceremonial law. In the next chapter the ceremony of the red heifer is detailed in a way which is very inaccurate. It rests on a total misunderstanding of the whole rite.

*the red  
heifer.*

To the mind of a man who saw no value in the external ritual, the idea that means for obtaining ceremonial purity were appointed by the command of God, would be quite inconceivable. He thus thinks that the purity which is intended must be sanctification of heart; and then, the means by which this is to be attained must be something that points forward to the death of Christ. This fundamental confusion is visible throughout the whole chapter, and is at the bottom of the subsequent distortions; all of which are easily accounted for when we remember that the aim of the author was to find in the type as many traits exhibiting the facts of the crucifixion as he possibly could. We may merely enumerate the points where he is mistaken. There was no necessity that those who slew and burnt the heifer should be "great sinners:" the impurity of the man who filled this office is almost excluded by the fact that the Mischna describes special precautions which were taken to prevent the priest who burnt it from being defiled; while the Bible asserts that those who execute this office shall be unclean till evening, plainly implying that they were not unclean before performing this rite. The burning is not, according to the Bible, a priestly function, though the sprinkling of blood is, while both are regarded as priestly by the Talmud; so that our author's statement is neither supported by the one nor by the other, and the blood sprinkling, which was a very important element in the rite, is totally ignored, as well as the casting of cedar-wood, hyssop, and wool into the fire (Num. xix. 4, 6). Again<sup>1</sup>, the statement that boys were to sprinkle the ashes is a singularly unhappy one, as young boys were one of the few classes who are specially mentioned as unfit to take a part in this: and there is certainly no

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Hef. *Das Sündschreiben*, § VII. n. 1 and 2.

trace of its being the peculiar task of youths. The whole exposition is evidently that of a man who was but slightly acquainted with what he describes, and who, probably with no dishonest intention, thought he was at liberty to fill in the details of his description according to the preconceived notions which he had formed of what the rite was intended to teach, and therefore must have resembled.

The defenders of the apostolic authorship of the epistle were contented to admit that the Bible gave no sanction for these ceremonies, but maintained that, for all that, they might be supported by practices which had crept in by tradition. But a further study of the Talmudic books has proved that this last subterfuge fails; that the traditions are quite contradictory to the assertions of our author. Under such circumstances, is it possible to attribute these chapters to an educated Levite like S. Barnabas?

## II.

We may now return and approach this question from the opposite side by reviewing the knowledge we possess of the reputed author from sacred histories and the legends which were retailed by tradition. As isolated traits of his character have been supposed to harmonise with certain features of the epistle, a somewhat lengthy discussion may be necessary, in order to demonstrate satisfactorily that the balance of evidence is against the existence of any such connection.

The account which we have of S. Barnabas in the Bible itself is very short, and he always occupies a subordinate place in S. Luke's account of his joint travels with S. Paul. There can be little doubt that

*Facts of the  
life of S.  
Barnabas*

S. Paul did take a decided lead in the joint work ; for the brief hint which we get in Acts XIV. of the popular impression which they created at Lystra shows us that, though S. Barnabas was probably the older and more distinguished looking man, S. Paul was the chief speaker and played the main part in the work of preaching to the people. While the facts which we find about S. Barnabas in the Bible are comparatively few, those few are entirely connected with the earlier part of his life, since his unfortunate difference with S. Paul cut him off entirely from those regions where the evangelistic work of the primitive Church is described.

He is introduced somewhat suddenly in the history of the Church, and appears as a person who must have been of great consequence in the Christian community in its earliest struggles. He was a man of some landed property, and disposed of it for the common good. He was a Levite, born in Cyprus. The legends enter into details as to the extent and position of his piece of land, and as to the circumstances of his parents : but these, whether true or not, have no bearing at all on the question before us. But there are other assertions in regard to which the testimony of antiquity is unanimous, and which would be of value if we could trust to their truth. It was the common belief that S. Barnabas had gone to Jerusalem while quite young, and had studied there at the feet of Gamaliel<sup>1</sup>, and the apparent readiness of his acceptance of the newly converted S. Paul has been alleged as confirming this report. The account of his own conversion on seeing some of the miracles of Jesus, and of his subsequently bringing<sup>2</sup> Mary, the mother of John Mark, to Christ, may or may not be mythical. But the

<sup>1</sup> *Acta Sanctorum*, June, II. 439.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* June, II. 440.



fact that the house of his aunt was a common resort of the disciples at an early period (Acts XII. 12), his own earnestness in the cause of the Church (Acts IV. 36), and the confidence which the Apostles placed in him (Acts IX. 27), would lead us to suppose that he was not a new convert, but had been for some time connected with the cause. Clement of Alexandria<sup>1</sup> says he was one of the Seventy. The assertion that he was a pupil of Gamaliel has especial interest for us with reference to this epistle, as the philosophy which was current in that school had a close relation to the Alexandrian teaching, of which there are so many traces in the writing before us.

Be this as it may, we have some trace of the character of the man in the name which the disciples gave him—the Son of Consolation. There may of course be some dispute as to the precise meaning of this term, but it seems probable that we may compare it with such a passage as I Cor. XIV. 3, and that he was remarkable for the power which he had of speaking to “edification and exhortation and comfort.” At another time (Acts XI. 23, 24) we find him described as “a good man, full of the Holy Ghost and of faith:” and the joy which he felt at seeing the grace of God is dwelt on; as if this was the predominating feature of his character.

Again, we must admit that this trait would agree with the character of the author of our epistle. Indeed so much is this the case, that some authors suspected that it was the predominance of these features which had led to its being attributed to S. Barnabas, and that being a consolatory epistle it was attributed to this Son of Consolation.

An attempt has been made by many critics, and

*Confusion  
with Joseph  
called Bar-  
sabus.*

<sup>1</sup> *Stromateis* II. p. 410 c. Ed. Paris, 1629.

most recently by Ullman<sup>1</sup>, to identify Joses called Barnabas with Joseph called Barsabas; owing principally to the fact that the one drops out of Apostolic history just as the other comes upon the scene, and that the description of Barsabas is very much what we should expect to find given as an account of S. Barnabas, from the inferences which we can draw from the various scattered hints that have been collected above. Besides this, there is an undoubted resemblance in their names: and the Codex Bezae and Aethiopic translation read Barnabas in Acts I., while other MSS. give Joses as the name of the new apostle. But it is not permissible to identify the two, though there is a great temptation to do so: for the description with which S. Barnabas is introduced in Acts IV. seems to show that he was appearing on the scene for the first time. The mention of a Judas Barsabas in Acts xv. 22 still farther complicates the question. Nor can any argument for the identity of these two be based on the fact that the companion of S. Paul is subsequently spoken of as an Apostle, for this term does not appear to have been so strictly confined<sup>2</sup> to the twelve as may at first be thought. In Romans XVI. 7 we have a reference to those "who are of note among the apostles," and the statement in 1 Cor. IV. 9 seems to be capable of a very general application. Besides this, Tertullian enumerates no less than seventy apostles; all of which seems to show that the term was not used with great definiteness. In one passage too, S. Barnabas appears to be rather separated from the Apostles. When S. Paul came to Jerusalem, we read "Barnabas took him and brought him to the Apostles." This is not the form

*Is he properly described as an Apostle?*

<sup>1</sup> *Stud. u. Kritik.* 1828, p. 77, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Henke, *De Epist.* pp. 25—29.

of expression which we should have expected to find had he been one of the Twelve. Still farther, though Clement of Alexandria sometimes calls him an Apostle, he more frequently uses the term, Apostolic man: and Tertullian uniformly describes him as an Apostolic man. A great proof of the high esteem in which he was held by his fellow Christians at Jerusalem, and an important point for us to notice, is the fact that he was sent by the Apostles to Antioch to report to them *His mission to Antioch.* upon the state of the Church, which had received a very large increase at that place. The teachers who had been preaching to the Gentiles were his own countrymen, and this may have had something to do with the matter, but we cannot doubt that he must have had the reputation of being a most discreet man to be chosen for such a mission. The contest between the Jews and the Gentiles was imminent, and a man would be required whom the Jews could trust, while he must at the same time be one likely to conciliate the Gentiles. No violent Judaist could have been sent, still less could a man strongly imbued with a dislike of Jewish customs and prejudices have performed the task so satisfactorily as S. Barnabas appears to have done. The difficulties of the situation were great, but his success seems to have been perfect. It was necessary for him to refrain from all attempts to subject the new converts to the yoke of the Mosaic law, and at the same time he could not dare to oppose those converts who loved and revered that law, and wished to see its injunctions enforced, unless he did it with the greatest gentleness and prudence.

For the next few years we have a pretty connected *His first missionary tour,* account of the events of his life. He was still engaged as a prophet and teacher at Antioch along with

S. Paul, when he was set apart for the missionary work: and it seems not unnatural to suppose that it was at his desire that they crossed to preach in his native island of Cyprus. The events which happened there, or in the other towns which they visited during that first missionary journey, have no bearing on the subject of our investigation, save that we learn how immediately and bitterly the contest and rivalry between Jews and Gentile converts sprang up.

*and return  
to Jerusalem.*

But a really important event followed. S. Paul and S. Barnabas were obliged to oppose the Judaizing teachers who came to Antioch; and to go to Jerusalem to consult the Apostles on the question of the subjection of the Gentiles to the Jewish Law. S. Barnabas and S. Paul gave an account of their success to the assembled Church at Jerusalem, carried their point, and obtained a decided repudiation of the doctrines of those who taught that the Gentile converts must be circumcised and keep the law.

*His dispute  
with S. Paul.*

Shortly after their return to Antioch a difference arose between S. Paul and S. Barnabas. Scripture gives as the only cause of the quarrel, a disagreement as to the advisability of taking S. Mark with them on a second missionary tour. But it is not impossible that there may have been a considerable divergence of opinion on doctrinal points as well. It is evident that S. Barnabas was not so decided as S. Paul in taking a stand against Judaism, and it is probable that he was a man of an easy disposition, who might be carried away by the "dissimulation" of S. Peter "and certain who came from James." At any rate, almost the last mention which we have of him in Scripture shows him in a less decided position than S. Paul with regard to the Jewish law.

These are the indications of his character which we can gather from Scripture, and it at once strikes us that to attribute our epistle to such a man is absurd, unless very good grounds can be given for showing that his opinions had greatly altered. We find a man full of the Holy Ghost and of faith; of a pre-eminently gentle disposition, and inclined to regard the opinions of the Jews with rather more favour than S. Paul, though agreed with him in the main. And to this man is attributed an epistle breathing a spirit of complete alienation from the Jews, and antagonism to their law—expressed much more strongly than anything in the Pauline Epistles. From what we know from the Bible of the character and position of the companion of S. Paul, it seems impossible to suppose that he could ever have been the author of some parts of our epistle.

*Impossibility that S. Barnabas was the author, from his character,*

If however the Bible account of his character renders it unlikely that he should have been the author, the truth of the legends which give an account of his death would make it simply impossible. Even from the very scattered hints which we find in the Epistles it has been concluded that S. Barnabas did not live very long. There is one mention of him as late as the year 57, in 1 Cor. ix. 5, 6, from which various inferences have been drawn; but the reference may be to the conduct of these Apostles on their first missionary journey, or to what was known of the way in which S. Barnabas behaved on a missionary tour in some other region when unaccompanied by S. Paul. For the third suggestion, that at this time S. Paul and S. Barnabas were again united in the work, there seems to be little or no ground. An argument from silence must not be pressed too far, but it seems difficult to believe that the historian would have failed to notice such an important event as the re-union of S. Barnabas

*and from the probability of his early death,*

and S. Paul, previous to his stay at Ephesus or during that time. Another passage is alleged as bearing in favour of their having met and worked together again, but it is really of no value. In 2 Cor. VIII. 18, we have mention of "the brother whose praise is in all the churches," and who was to be sent by S. Paul along with S. Titus to the Corinthian church, in all probability from Macedonia. Some have identified him with S. Barnabas, but on quite insufficient grounds. It is plain that this brother was subordinate to S. Titus, and that he was entirely under the direction of S. Paul. We shall see reason to suppose that it *might* possibly have been S. Mark, but we cannot imagine that a missionary of long standing like S. Barnabas would have been placed in this sort of position by S. Paul. It is far more likely that some man of lesser fame was the brother referred to. These are the only arguments that have been brought forward to support the hypothesis that S. Barnabas and S. Paul ever met and worked together again, after their separation at Antioch in the year 51 or 52. We know that S. Barnabas went to visit and edify the churches in Cyprus; and as this was the only district of all the places he had visited on which S. Paul bestowed no farther care, we may suppose that he felt it was well looked after by some one or other. The Bible quite confirms the supposition that S. Barnabas and S. Mark undertook the work in Cyprus, and perhaps in Africa, and that the two streams of evangelical work remained distinct.

*which is inferred from the conduct of S. Mark*

But not for very long. During the earlier years of S. Paul's imprisonment at Rome, we find that it was with him and not with S. Barnabas that S. Mark was now associated. Galland<sup>1</sup> indeed urges this as an additional proof that S. Barnabas too had returned

<sup>1</sup> Quoted by Hefele, *Das Send.* p. 29.

to companionship with S. Paul ; but this seems difficult to credit. While many other companions are mentioned again and again, and while a particular affection is expressed for S. Mark, no mention is made of S. Barnabas. S. Timothy has attained to such an honoured place that his name is coupled with S. Paul's at the head of the Epistle to the Philippian church ; and yet there is no mention of S. Barnabas, but the alleged anonymous designation—"the brother whose praise is in all the churches." The other hypothesis which has a greater probability, is that S. Barnabas having died, S. Mark determined to return to the company of S. Paul : perhaps feeling conscious that his conduct during the period that had elapsed since they parted, was such as to have established his character for persevering endurance. That his reception was warm is plainly evident. This then is the ground on which it has been concluded that S. Barnabas was already dead ; it may be insufficient ; other reasons of which we have no hint may have induced S. Mark to leave S. Barnabas and to return to S. Paul, and of the suppositions before us, we can only say that it is the more probable one. The verse in Acts XI. 24 has been alleged as a further proof of this : it is thought to sound like a tribute to his memory ; but a phrase like this cannot have much weight on either one side or the other.

*and the  
silence of the  
Bible :*

When what seems the more probable inference from the scattered hints in Scripture is found to harmonise exactly with the traditions that have come down to us, the weight of argument becomes much greater. There are three separate forms in which the legend of the martyrdom of S. Barnabas in Cyprus has come down to us, and though there are others which directly contradict

*as well as  
the state-  
ments of the  
legends,*

them, we shall find good reason for showing that these last are of absolutely no value. The testimony of these legends is examined carefully by Hefele<sup>1</sup>, and I shall content myself with summing up results.

*some of  
which are  
quite worth-  
less.*

We may first notice a legend which has gained considerable currency, but is not of any very great antiquity. The exact date of the Synopsis of Dorotheus is not known, but it is probably not earlier than the fifth century. It is in this that we come across the earliest statement that S. Barnabas, who was appointed an Evangelist along with S. Paul, was the first to preach the gospel in Rome, and subsequently became Bishop of Milan. But how much credit is to be given to any of the statements in this authority may be inferred from the fact that the writer makes both Titus and Timothy disciples of Christ himself, and gives definite episcopal sees to each of the 70 disciples, as well as to a few women, such as to Prisca and Junia, and still more extraordinary, to the Emperor Nero himself.

The next supporter of this tradition comes from the ninth or tenth century, and though the sources from which he drew his information were probably considerably older, it is not certain that they were of any great value. At any rate, his work contains some curious confusions, for according to his account S. Barnabas preached for a long time in Cyprus after he had separated from S. Paul, and then went to Rome, where he arrived eight years after the Ascension, or fourteen years before his disagreement with S. Paul. The two earliest supporters of this tradition are of no greater authority than this, and it is almost useless to examine their successors; for as might be expected, we find them very closely connected with the earlier statements whose value we have already

<sup>1</sup> Hef. *Das Send.* pp. 43—47.



examined. But besides the great difficulty of giving any weight to statements which are so baseless, there are several positive circumstances which tell strongly against the legend. Pope Innocent I. was evidently unacquainted with it, as well as S. Ambrose, the most celebrated Bishop of Milan; and there was no feast of S. Barnabas kept at Milan about the year 500. Besides, there is an ancient catalogue of the Milanese Bishops, in which the name of S. Barnabas has been added by a later hand. The fact too, that a discourse was addressed to the Milanese church in the eleventh century in which other men are mentioned as its first founders, seems to show that even at that time the Milanese tradition was not generally accepted even in that church itself.

To complete the demonstration of the worthlessness of this tradition, nothing is wanting but to show an adequate reason why it should have sprung up. And this is easily found. There was an impression abroad that Anatolon, the first Bishop of Milan (on our supposition) was a pupil of S. Barnabas, and thus a temptation was given to go one step farther back and claim a direct connection with the Apostle himself. And not only so, but when Milan was in the pride of her glory, the claim to a direct descent from an Apostolic founder would be likely to take the fancy of the populace, and to be received with readiness when it was once fairly proposed.

Having thus cleared the ground we may proceed to take up the second legend, for which we have some authorities of considerably earlier date. The first<sup>1</sup> is the *Acta et Passio Barnabae in Cypro*, which claims to come from the pen of S. Mark. This gives some account of the journey of S. Barnabas after he left S. Paul. How he went first to Laodicea<sup>2</sup>, and then, after touching at

*while pseudo-Mark gives a very circumstantial account*

<sup>1</sup> *Acta Sanctorum*, June, Vol. II. pp. 431—435.

<sup>2</sup> pp. 432—33.

various islands, finally made his way to Cyprus. There is next a description of his preaching there, and of his destroying some of the licentious people. A report also occurs of his meeting Elymas the sorcerer<sup>1</sup>, who again opposed him, and stirred up an immense number of Jews to follow his example; they did so, and opposed his entry into Curium. Subsequently S. Barnabas and S. Mark escaped and reached Salamis, where they went to the synagogue and S. Barnabas read and explained passages in the Gospel of S. Matthew; however, Elymas appeared a few days later and roused the enmity of the Jews, so that the Apostle was dragged out of the city with a cord round his neck to a neighbouring field, where he was burnt<sup>2</sup>. The Jews were anxious to destroy his very ashes by putting them into the sea, but S. Mark and some other disciples rescued them and buried them along with a copy of the Gospel of S. Matthew.

*which is confirmed from another source*

The testimony of the monk Alexander harmonises in its main points with the above, and he adds that S. Barnabas directed S. Mark to return to S. Paul after his death, and that having joined him at Ephesus, he proceeded later to Rome. There are however some considerable points of difference. According to the monk, S. Barnabas sailed direct to Cyprus and went about there preaching, when he was opposed by the Jews, stirred up, not by Elymas, but by some man who had followed him from Syria<sup>3</sup>. Seeing that his end was nigh he bade farewell to his friends, and after celebrating the Lord's Supper<sup>4</sup> with them, gave his parting directions to S. Mark. This done, he entered the synagogue and commenced preaching, but the Jews refused to hear him, laid hands on him,

<sup>1</sup> p. 434.

<sup>2</sup> *Laudatio S. Barn. Apos. in Acta Sanctorum*, pp. 436—453.

<sup>3</sup> p. 444.

<sup>4</sup> p. 445.

dragged him out and stoned him. They had intended to burn his corpse, but S. Mark had an opportunity of getting it, and carried it away and buried it along with a copy of S. Matthew: though the knowledge of the spot was lost owing to the bitter persecution which followed, and which utterly destroyed the church at Salamis. The differences between the two accounts are partly explained by the fact that at a subsequent time when there was a dispute between the Bishop of Salamis and the Emperor at Constantinople, his native church was cheered by the reappearance of S. Barnabas, who pointed out to the Bishop the spot where he had been buried, and which, when examined, turned out to contain a corpse and a copy of the Gospel of S. Matthew, which was carried to Constantinople and served to convince the Emperor of the authoritative position of a prelate, who occupied what had thus been proved to be an apostolic see. This event occurred about 488: and consequently it was impossible for the monk Alexander, who wrote after and recounts this event, to repeat the story in the form in which it is given by pseudo-Mark, and a Greek Church historian named Theodorus Lector, who lived previously to that time, and who say that the body of S. Barnabas had been reduced entirely to ashes.

But these legends, occurring as they do, comparatively early, and in forms which show that they were not closely copied from one another, are not to be too lightly cast aside. The description of the mode in which S. Barnabas proceeded, of the preaching in the synagogues, of the cause of his death in the enmity of the Jews, and of its taking place outside the city gates at Salamis, bear no improbability upon their face. There is another piece of testimony which is common to them all. It is that which connects a copy of S. Matthew's

*and has no  
inherent im-  
probability.*

Gospel with the event; Theodorus Lector adds that it was a copy transcribed by S. Barnabas with his own hands. This is a curious fact, and it is rather interesting to us in regard to the subject of our investigation, when we remember that most of the references to the life of our Lord which this epistle contains are to be referred to that Gospel. But though the fact is an interesting one, it cannot of course be adduced as giving the very faintest probability to the belief that S. Barnabas was the author of the work before us, when we remember how strong the adverse arguments are.

*Difficulty in  
regard to the  
date*

Real light might be thrown on the subject, if we knew the exact date which the legends assign to the event they record so circumstantially. Unfortunately it is difficult to fix it with any approach to certainty. It is only in the account which claims to be by S. Mark that a date is given: according to this the event occurred on Monday, the 11th of June, in the year 102; though even the reading on which the year depends is extremely doubtful<sup>1</sup>, and may be 12. Taking the year as 102 there is some difficulty in determining from what period the reckoning is made. If it was counted according to the Alexandrian method, the date would be 72. But there is an objection to this. In the year 72, the 11th of June would not fall on a Monday. This only occurs in those years whose Dominical letter is G—such as 53, 59, 64, 70, 80, &c. But if the reckoning be that which was current at Antioch, the year 102 would be the same as the year 53 of our era. Little weight can be placed on this argument however, depending as it does on a possible reading, and a probable interpretation. The comparatively general determination of the date which we get from the monk

<sup>1</sup> ρβ' or ϑβ', p. 435; cf. Hef. *Das Send.* pp. 34, 35.

Alexander is much more to be trusted. According to him, S. Mark left Cyprus and joined himself to S. Paul during the latter's long visit to Ephesus: which is variously placed at 54—56 or 55—57. In this case the death may have occurred at any time between 53 and 57, and the date which the correction of the account in pseudo-Mark's writings gives us may be exact. Be that as it may, we can at any rate be sure of S. Mark's having been with S. Paul at Rome in 62 or 63, and we may put these years as the extreme limit beyond which we cannot place the martyrdom of S. Barnabas, though it might have occurred very considerably earlier. This coincides with the date (A.D. 53) given by the Breviary, but on what ground is unknown. The attempt to discover a precise year is not so important for our object as it is to find a limit before which the event occurred, and this limit we have placed in A.D. 62. But the author of our epistle must, as we have seen above, have been living at least some years after that time—later than 70 at the very least, and therefore so far as the dates can be determined it seems impossible that S. Barnabas could have written this epistle.

*and probable  
limit before  
which it oc-  
curred.*

Nor are these traditions so utterly untrustworthy as Henke<sup>1</sup> seems to suppose. The contrary assertions of the Milanese historians have been shown to be valueless, and the statements on which our argument is based are not by any means mere tradition; but tradition interpreted by the testimony of Scripture.

The question whether the epistle was written by the man whose name it bears may be definitely settled in the negative. The testimony of the epistle itself shews that it is very improbable that any educated Jew could have penned it: the traces of the character

<sup>1</sup> *De Epist.* pp. 46—49, notes.

and opinions of the man which are given in the Bible make it still less probable, and the conclusions which may be fairly drawn after sifting the legends render it impossible, that he could have written our epistle even at the earliest date which can be assigned to it.

#### IV.

##### THE TESTIMONY OF ANTIQUITY AS TO THE CANONICITY AND AUTHENTICITY OF THE EPISTLE.

NOTWITHSTANDING the mass of proof from different quarters with which our general conclusions are supported, there would be some difficulty in running counter to the opinion of the early Fathers, especially when we may suppose that they had evidence before them which has since perished. It is therefore necessary to examine the amount and value of the testimony of antiquity on this subject.

There are two different questions which have sometimes been confused, but which ought to be kept entirely separate, and in regard to which we require very different kinds of evidence; 1st, the opinion of the Church as to the canonicity, and 2nd, the opinion of individual Fathers as to the authorship, of the epistle.

The evidence on the first and more important of these questions may be derived from very many different sources. In the earliest days of the Church, there were a large number of treatises which claimed to be authoritative and met with a certain amount of acceptance. It was only gradually that the Christian Consciousness came to recognise the deficiencies of some, and that a general agreement was reached as to the books which combined to satisfy the spiritual needs of the community. We can easily see how entirely apart

*Two different questions:*

*1st, Opinion of Church as to canonicity.*

*Gradual  
selection of  
books.*

this judgment of the Church on the spiritual value of the books and consequent canonicity is from any decision as to the personality of the probable author. The epistle before us was accepted in some quarters at first, but a truer judgment was afterwards formed, and the evidence of MSS., stichometries, quotations, and histories alike, shows that it gradually declined in Christian estimation.

Difficulties of communication made this process of selection a much slower one than it would have otherwise been. The books which one branch of the Church regarded as authoritative had not all come under the notice of other converts, so that they had not an early opportunity of passing an opinion upon them. The work of transcribing was so slow, that it took a long time for the writings of the Apostles to be circulated universally, and still longer for the Consciousness of the whole Church to issue its final judgment upon them.

Differences of opinion may be noticed in Africa, Syria, and Rome; and it was not until the three streams of Church teaching were gathered into one, that the Canon was finally decided upon. The characteristic of the Alexandrian church in this respect had been a certain readiness to admit many books as worthy of acceptance, which the other churches either did not notice at all, or regarded with distrust. The Canon of the Old Testament Scriptures which had sprung up there, contained many writings which the Jews could not recognize as inspired; and that train of thought which led Clement and Origen to christianize philosophy, prepared them to find traces of inspiration in writings which did not commend themselves to other Christians. Partly, too, the great literary activity at Alexandria, and the existence of the celebrated Cate-



chetical School there, would bring a greater number of books under the notice of the Alexandrian divines, among them some which were subsequently accepted by other churches. Still the fact remains that at Alexandria there was a tendency to receive books more readily than in other churches; and that testimony as to acceptance in Alexandria, does not prove a general recognition.

To take the evidence of MSS. first. There is only one MS. of the Greek Testament which contains this epistle. In the Sinaitic MS., discovered by Tischendorf at the Convent of S. Katharine, the Epistle of S. Barnabas follows the Apocalypse immediately: the Shepherd of Hermas was also contained, while it is probable that some other writing, such as the Revelation of S. Peter, occupied the missing pages between them. The fact that any work occurs in the MS. only proves that the transcriber considered it of sufficient value to wish to have it read in the churches; and that our epistle was so read cannot be doubted. A similar addition was made to what is now the recognised canon in the Alexandrine MS., which contains the epistles of S. Clement.

The "Epistle of Barnabas"<sup>1</sup> also occurs in the index to the Claromontane MS. of the old Latin version; so that it was evidently considered of sufficient value to be translated, but in spite of its being thus included, its position in these MSS. is such that we may suppose it was considered of less value than the other writings, for

(a) Evidence  
of Sinaitic  
MS.:

of Claromontane Index,

<sup>1</sup> Tischendorf *Nov. Test. Sinait.* Leipzig, 1863. Proleg. pp. xxxii, xxxiii. In a note he expressly denies that this can be the Epistle to the Hebrews, on what grounds I cannot discover. In Credner's *Geschichte des Kanons* (Volkmar's Edition), p. 106, 7, the other view is taken; and

the existence of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and not that of Barnabas, in the Codex Sangermanensis, where there is a copy of the Claromontane Stichometry, is important. But its occurring in Jerome's catalogue seems to prove the fact of its translation, even if this index does not.

it comes after the canonical books and in company with the Acts of S. Paul, the Revelation of S. Peter, and less generally known books which have since been rejected as uncanonical. The principle which guided the transcriber and translator was probably, not to reject anything unless there was a very general feeling against it.

*of Latin  
version, as  
to use in  
Church;*

From an examination of the old Latin version we may derive the conclusion that it was designed for public reading in church: such at least is the inference from the fact that a doxology founded on XII. 7 is added. This was frequently the case with works which were thus used, e.g. the four books of Psalms had similar additions, and the ἀμήν which occurs at the end of several epistles is not found in the earliest MSS. Little weight can be attached to this hint of the possible object of the translation, but it opens the question whether the high estimation of the value of the epistle may not have been more general than was at one time supposed.

The close connection with the epistle of S. Polycarp, in which it is found in the other Greek MSS., gives us no clue to the value which was assigned to it in the West in early times. For as the earliest of these MSS. (the Vatican) is of the eleventh century, the sources from which it and the others were copied may very easily have dated from a time long subsequent to the authoritative decision of the Church in regard to the canon: when it would of course come to be ranked among writings not of Apostles, but of Fathers. The truth is that it was probably little known, and consequently little thought of, in Asia Minor and Europe.

*of Stichome-  
try of Nicc-  
phorus,*

There is one other testimony which is particularly interesting. The epistle is mentioned among the disputed books of the New Testament in the Stichometry

of Nicephorus. This curious document has been carefully studied by Credner<sup>1</sup>, and he has come to most interesting conclusions as to its value and date. It was put forth by Nicephorus the Patriarch of Constantinople in the beginning of the ninth century, and was considered of value, as is shown by the fact of its republication in Latin by Anastasius, a Roman Librarian, in the same century, and from the number of MSS. which have come down to our day. But there are reasons for believing that it is of a much earlier date. While in the early times of the Church there were a considerable number of disputed writings (*ἀντιλεγόμενα*), the judgment of the Church became gradually decided, and long before the ninth century all the books had been included in one or other of the opposing classes of canonical (*ὁμολογούμενα*) or apocryphal (*νόθα*). The position given to the Apocalypse of S. John among the disputed books, and the fact that the catholic epistles cannot have been generally known in the district where the list was first formed, and were not divided into verses, point to a considerably earlier date. These circumstances also betoken a comparatively low state of literary activity, and taken in conjunction with the known estimate of particular books in the Syrian Church, there is reason to believe that this Stichometry had its origin there, and was probably not later than the fifth century. There are four disputed New Testament books mentioned. The Apocalypse of S. John, the Apocalypse of S. Peter, the epistle of S. Barnabas, and the Gospel according to the Hebrews; it is probable that they are enumerated in the order in which they were generally approved. If these conclusions be correct, we find from this a testimony to the fact that the controversy still continued in

<sup>1</sup> *Geschichte des Kanons*, 95—126. First Edition.

Syria till the fifth century, but that at that time our epistle was in less general favour than some other books whose authority was also under discussion.

*of Stichomet-  
try of Anastasius.* It is also contained<sup>1</sup> along with a large number of Apocryphal writings in the Stichometry of Anastasius Sinaiticus, who died in 599. There can be no doubt that the epistle before us is the one referred to in these two Stichometries, as the Epistle to the Hebrews is enumerated among the writings of S. Paul.

*(b) Evidence  
of quotations* Passing from the evidence of MSS. and of the Old Latin Version, we must consider the testimony of quotations, and the manner in which S. Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and S. Jerome treat the epistle. Clement refers to it again and again. In the Stromateis II. there are five quotations, and in Stromateis V. there are two. In Stromateis VI. there are a few words attributed to S. Barnabas, which really however come from an epistle of S. Clement of Rome. But it does not at all follow from the mere fact that he appealed to this ancient writing or quoted it with approval, that Clement regarded the epistle as inspired. Indeed in one passage he quotes a few words from it, and expresses a different opinion himself. It is hardly likely that he would have recorded a difference, however slight, from any book which he regarded as inspired and canonical. The passage in x., in regard to the hyaena, is referred to by him in the Paedagogica II. 10 (p. 188, B.C.D. Paris Ed. 1629), and criticised: and though he agrees with some of the remarks he cannot assent to all. This is worth noticing, I think, as it seems to show that he placed the book on a lower level than Scripture itself. Origen quotes the epistle twice, and there is, besides, a possible reference to it in his commentary on Rom. I. 24, where the

<sup>1</sup> Credner, *Geschichte des Kanons*. Volkmar's Edition, p. 240.

sense of XVIII. agrees with what is introduced by the words, "sicut in multis Scripturae locis invenimus." The one quotation (Princip. III. 2, 4) has the formula "Eadem quoque Barnabas in epistolâ suâ declarat," and in the other case (Cels. I. 63) he calls it the Catholic Epistle of Barnabas. This passage is indirectly a proof of a considerable circulation, as it shows that the epistle had probably come under the notice of the heathen author whom Origen answered.

Henke alleges that besides the quotations which were made from it, we have the direct testimony of the History of Eusebius as to the opinion of these Fathers. But in the passage referred to (Hist. Eccl. VI. 13, 14) I can only find an assertion that they used and studied this epistle as well as other apocryphal books, and not a proof that they valued it highly. From Eusebius' own writing we can distinctly gather that there was a controversy, but it is not certain what his opinion was. He divides all the books into *νόθα*, *ἀντιλεγόμενα* and *ὁμολογούμενα*, those which were received by none, by some, or by all. Now in Hist. III. 25, he places our epistle among the *νόθα*; and in VI. 13, 14 among the *ἀντιλεγόμενα*; from this it is plain that there was a dispute, but we can hardly infer from it that, during the writing of his history, Eusebius had come to form a higher opinion of the value of the epistle<sup>1</sup>. In the earlier passage he is discussing the canon, and the chances are that the word he uses in that connexion is exact, while the milder word *ἀντιλεγόμενα*, might be used in a general sense to include "disputed" books which had hardly anything to be said for them, especially as the contrast in the later passage is with profane, not inspired writings. It will not do to explain

*The two  
statements  
of Eusebius  
compared.*

<sup>1</sup> Henke *de Epist.* Cf. also Ullmann in *Stud. u. Kritik.* 1828, p. 384, 5.

away the stronger term, or to neglect the distinction between the two; and besides this, there are indications that Eusebius was not perfectly decided in his judgment on the epistle. He especially calls it *ἡ φερομένη*, and enumerates it along with the Revelation of S. Peter and books of that stamp. His witness in favour of the valuable nature of the book is anything but strong.

*S. Jerome's  
quotation,*

The next testimony comes from S. Jerome. There is one passage near the beginning of the Dialogue Adv. Pel. III. where he makes an opposite mistake to that of Clement, as he quotes words from the epistle which he attributes to Ignatius. This may be a small matter in itself, but it seems to me worthy of notice, as it surely indicates that these Fathers did not use the book with such frequency and care as they did the other writings of Apostles, when out of the small number of quotations occurring, there are two of these confusions. It is worth noticing too that the confusions occur with the books of the Apostolic Fathers, and not with canonical books; and it is surely a fair inference that they valued it very much as they did those writings with which the confusion occurred; that they were books of the same sort of authority.

*and testi-  
mony to the  
continued  
use of the  
epistle;*

In the commentary on Ezekiel XLIII. 19, and again in the Catal. Script. Ecclesi., S. Jerome states that S. Barnabas wrote an epistle which is read among the Apocrypha. Of the public reading in the African Church we can have no doubt, especially after the Claromontane Index, according to Tischendorf; but I fail to see that any very strong inference can be drawn from this. Galland and Henke<sup>1</sup> assert that the statement means, S. Barnabas wrote it although it is now counted apocryphal: their opponents interpret it, S. Barnabas is said to

<sup>1</sup> Henke, *Epist.* pp. 17—23.

have written it (but he did not) for it is counted apocryphal. From such a very meagre statement it is impossible to draw any strong argument, as to the author's individual opinion on this point.

There is another mention of the epistle in the writings of S. Jerome. He gives a dictionary of the meanings of the Hebrew names which occur in each of the books of the Bible, arranged according to the books. At the end of the list comes the epistle of S. Barnabas, and it is the only apocryphal New Testament book which occurs in this connexion. *his dictionary.*

Such is the testimony of antiquity on the subject of the value of the epistle. In Alexandria, where the Fathers were most prone to receive writings easily, and where the allegorising would be particularly pleasing to authors who indulged so much in this style of writing, it was placed among the disputed books. By Eusebius, it was regarded as distinctly apocryphal, as well as by S. Jerome, who may have followed his opinion; but in Syria and Africa it was read in the churches, and in the former country it was retained for some time after the limits of the canon had been settled by the Church. Clement did not scruple to express a difference from it, and both he and S. Jerome confused it with sub-apostolic writings.

There is one other fact that is worth noticing. The latter part of the epistle was incorporated by the author of the Apostolical Constitutions VII. without any acknowledgement. Had the epistle been well known and highly esteemed in the part of the world where he wrote, he would have claimed its authority to enforce his truths. As that work was probably compiled in the latter part of the third or the fourth century in some part of the Eastern Church, it shows that the *The Apostolical Constitutions.*

interest in the epistle, almost the knowledge of its existence, had died out in one great region of Christian literature; and in that part where we find it acknowledged most fully, to judge from its occurring in local Stichometries which had been formed at an early date.

2nd, Authenticity of the epistle,

Having determined the value which was placed on the epistle in early times, we may now proceed to discuss the opinions of the Fathers on its authenticity.

how far connected with the question of canonicity?

The impugnors of the apostolic authorship of the epistle have unanimously insisted on the fact that it is uncanonical, and that if it had been believed to be the work of an Apostle it would have been accounted canonical. The well-known passage of S. Augustine (*De civit. Dei*, XVIII. 38) is alleged as showing that he believed that apocryphal books were excluded from the canon, because they were not genuine<sup>1</sup>. This argument appears to me to rest on a very superficial view; those books were accounted canonical which satisfied the spiritual Consciousness of the Church; not those which the criticism of the day rejected as coming from unknown authors. The argument which Henke<sup>2</sup> and the defenders of the epistle bring forward is equally futile. It is urged that S. Barnabas was not an Apostle, but only an apostolic man; that he was not so widely known as some other Apostles, and so forth. It cannot be thought that it was by considerations of this kind that the canon was fixed. Surely that Spirit which guided the Fathers in defining its limits, bore witness to the internal unfitness which rendered this epistle unworthy of a place beside the writings of such an apostolic man as S. Luke.

<sup>1</sup> It must be remembered that this is spoken of the Old Testament Apocrypha; and a passage (*De doctr. Christ.* II. 12) which treats of

the New Testament Canon he refers to the truer test.

<sup>2</sup> *De Epist.* pp. 26—29.



At the same time it seems to me unfair to attempt to draw such fine distinctions as Galland and Henke do, in order to show that S. Jerome or Eusebius believed the epistle to be written by S. Barnabas himself, though they did not accept it as canonical. Their words were not intended to bear any such close interpretation, and it certainly seems unlikely that Eusebius at all events was clear as to its being rightly attributed to S. Barnabas; while those who spoke of it as written by him, did not probably mean more than that it was commonly alleged to be written by him.

We can imagine grounds which would lead to this epistle being assigned to S. Barnabas, just as in a later day the see of Milan claimed him as its first bishop. The epistle is just sufficiently Pauline in its tone, to be readily attributed to the companion of S. Paul. There may have been at one time a genuine epistle of S. Barnabas, and the tradition of its former existence have fastened round this work of an Alexandrine convert.

Nor is this the only epistle which has been attributed to S. Barnabas. Long ago Tertullian<sup>1</sup> expressed an opinion that he was the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and in the present century there have been several critics who have maintained the same view. The arguments given by Ullman<sup>2</sup> are principally these; that the allegorising is what we should expect from S. Barnabas' connection with Cyprus; that his being a Levite would make the dwelling on the ritual natural; that the Pauline modes of thought are such as we should expect in the companion of S. Paul; and that its language betokens a personal relation to Jesus. There are other arguments from minor details. Without going

*Why attributed to S. Barnabas,*

*as other epistles have been.*

<sup>1</sup> *De Pudicitia*, 20.

<sup>2</sup> *Stud. u. Kritik*, 1828, pp. 388—399.

into any consideration of the value of this opinion, we cannot but feel the vast differences between the two works; while the one breathes the spirit of "a good man full of the Holy Ghost and of faith," the other can scarcely be attributed to an author of such a character.

The testimony which is derived from various quarters in regard to the dispute in the early Church regarding the value of the epistle is of great interest, and our age would most certainly endorse the old decision, if the question were re-opened: though the argument for authenticity does not fall to the ground along with the unfavourable judgment on its canonicity, it is impossible to establish the theory that any of the early Fathers who quoted it by name, were strongly convinced that it was the genuine work of S. Barnabas.

## V.

### THE EPISTLE AND CONTEMPORARY INFLUENCES.

#### I. *Relation of the Epistle to Judaism and Paulinism.*

IN the foregoing pages there has been an attempt to investigate the evidence as to the authorship of the epistle and the time and place which gave it birth. *The character of Alexandrian Christianity* The indications on which our judgment has been formed are principally isolated phrases and minor peculiarities of diction. But the subject matter of the epistle, and the tone of treatment, are more particularly interesting, since they shed a great deal of light on the character of Alexandrian Christianity at the close of the first century, and on the influences to which it was exposed.

The epistle was according to its own statement intended to stimulate the readers to higher Christian attainments, and it is not hard to see how the difficulties which it endeavours to smooth would have arisen in the church to which it was probably addressed.

No centre of Christian life played a more prominent part in the first centuries than Alexandria, and yet of the founding of that church itself we know nothing. Tradition mentions the name of S. Mark in connection with the Catechetical School, but the church itself must have flourished for many years before it became a seminary of Christian teaching. *as probably founded among the Jews.* Lying so near as it did

to Jerusalem, it would be a natural refuge for some of those who escaped during the first persecution, and thus it is extremely likely that a church would spring up among the Jews at Alexandria, as one did at Antioch. As in most other churches, the Gospel would be preached first among the Jews, and would spread from them among the surrounding Gentiles. At Antioch this was not the course taken by events. Peculiar circumstances brought on the conflict at an early period, but in most of the other churches this was the case: the Gospel came to the Gentiles through Jewish influences<sup>1</sup>; they were entangled for long with Jewish practices, and even after they had succeeded in shaking these off, the Jewish ideas remained rooted in their minds. To the outside world Christianity was a kind of Judaism, and in many ways it really did adapt the older forms to the newer use. At first Gentile converts would conform much as ordinary proselytes did, and probably underwent circumcision. It was only when their numbers increased largely, so as to predominate over the brethren to whom they owed the knowledge of the truth, that the difficulty as to observing the ceremonial law would come into prominence. But when it did arise, a new question would spring up with it. The Jewish idea of righteousness had been that of conformity to this expressed law, that of conduct conformable to God's command. So that when the Gentiles murmured against the burdensome yoke of the law, the Jew would naturally retort, But where then do you find a rule of conduct if not in the law? where else is there a standard of righteousness, so that our lives may be ordered according to God's will? We can imagine that many a devout Jew who believed in Jesus as the Messiah, would yet feel there

*Subsequent difficulties with Gentiles, in regard to the standard of righteousness.*

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Jowett, *Epistles of S. Paul*, II. 15 f.

was a danger in cutting himself or his friends loose from that rule of life which he had been wont to keep, and in endeavouring to order his life by a spiritual principle. It was the same conflict which re-appears again and again in the history of the Church, in different forms, in different ages, and occurs in our day between those who can rest their faith on a Divine Spirit Who will teach them to use the sacred books, and those who cling to the letter of an infallible record. It is only when we see the analogy between their feelings and those of many earnest Christians in our day, that we can at all appreciate the strength of the position of the Judaizers.

The problem then, which developed itself in these originally Jewish churches, was not the same as that which was most frequently brought before the mind of S. Paul by his continual conflict with the heathen. Though he recognised all sides of the truth, the problem most constantly presented to him was—How shall a man be just before God? To the jailor asking, What must I do to be saved? he answers—Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ. It is the means of entering the covenant that he has to deal with,—the way by which the Gentile should enter into the privileges which had been given to the Jew. Our author's doctrine of the means of entering the covenant relation occurs incidentally, and will be noted below; his principal theme is continuance and progress. The Jew would not feel the converse difficulty; even the Gentile proselytes would see that they had been embraced in the covenant; and feeling as they did that to walk in the steps of their Master they must fulfil all righteousness, they must have been staggered at the thought of giving up the law which was a complete rule of righteousness. Besides this, when Jesus was on earth,

*Difference  
from the  
Pauline  
problem.*

the time was not ripe for any attempt to shake off these observances. His scathing words might expose the shallowness of those who prided themselves most on their complete performance of the law, and might inspire many to aim at infusing a more spiritual tone into their conduct, and thus to exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees.

*Righteousness regarded as the obeying a divine law,*

But this would be no help to the Jew or Gentile proselyte who desired to live according to God's will, and who yet felt that the ceremonial law was needlessly burdensome. In the life of Jesus the spiritual element had only manifested itself through the means prescribed by the law—it created no new forms for itself; and this was but little direct help to those who desired to see it acting immediately and by itself. So that the question which perturbed them was—What rule of life shall we follow in order to be righteous? It does not at all follow that, because these Jews and proselytes struggled after a rule of conduct, they placed no confidence in the sacrifice of Jesus as a victory over sin, or that they sought to effect their own salvation by their works. It was simply the impulse which springs in every truly Christian mind, to try to please God, which, from their conception of righteousness as the fulfilling of the law of Moses, took this shape. The Christian Jew would believe that he was a partaker in the newer form of the covenant, but he would be inclined to show his participation in it by the same means as he had used to show his participation in the old. This was the difficulty which arose within the Church itself, and which was quite different from that which disturbed those who did not see that they had any claim on God's covenant. It was this difficulty that was brought before the first Council at Jerusalem, and it was at that time that the

first authorised relief was given to Gentile converts. The subsequent steps by which full Christian liberty was attained by those who had been born Jews, are not of such importance to us; but it is necessary to see that the conception of righteousness as obeying a divine law still lingered in the Christian communities.

And along with this was another conception on which it closely depended: the Kingdom of the Messiah had been expected as a period of earthly monarchy and glory; this idea had not altogether passed away, even when a suffering Messiah was revealed. There was still the expectation that Christ would speedily return to set up the monarchy at Jerusalem, and His kingdom was still looked on as a theocracy—an institution existing in opposition to, but overpowering other monarchies, instead of a power which was to exercise its sway by claiming the hearts of those who were the subjects of different earthly monarchs. This idea is plainly exhibited in the Gospel according to S. Matthew, which was probably written at Jerusalem, or possibly Pella, shortly before the year 70. This conception of Christianity as an Instituted Society, a Theocracy, had taken deep root in the minds of Jewish Christians, and of the Gentiles who had been much subjected to Jewish influences.

And this had a still further effect. If the Kingdom of Christ was a theocracy, participation in which was shown by an acceptance of its laws, the knowledge of these laws must have been the main want; not the higher spiritual knowledge only, but the practical knowledge of the precepts as well. This was thought to be the principal means of grace in the newer dispensation, as it had been among the Pharisees who considered that "this people which knoweth not the law is accursed."

*and Christianity as an Instituted Theocracy;*

*hence knowledge of these laws becomes the chief means of participation in the covenant.*

*Contrast  
with S.  
Paul's teach-  
ing.*

These external representations which had grown up among the Jews still fettered the Christian life. In the Pauline Epistles we do not find them. The Apostle of the Gentiles had once and for ever shaken himself free from these "weak and beggarly" elements. To him "faith is the spiritual principle whereby we go out of ourselves to hold communion with God and Christ; not like the faith of the Epistle to the Hebrews, clothing itself in the shadows of the law, but opposed to the law, and of a nature purely moral and spiritual. It frees man from the flesh, the law, the world, and from himself also; that is from his sinful nature which is the meeting of these three elements in his spiritual consciousness<sup>1</sup>." And it is of these difficulties that our epistle is the outcome; these representations had taken firm hold of the mind of our author, and though he is rising above them, they have left definite traces in his writing. His object is to point out the way of righteousness, to answer that difficulty which had been felt by those who still clung to the observances of the Jewish law. His treatise is a purely practical one, and this is its bearing.

*Effect of the  
destruction  
of Jerusa-  
lem*

Up to the time of the destruction of Jerusalem the recognition of these truths was not of the first importance. It was a spiritual view to which many could not attain, and when the old ordinances passed away their weaker faith was sorely tried. Those who pin their faith to the form in which truth has been revealed, rather than to the truth itself, will be rudely shaken as God vouchsafes a deeper understanding of His ways. It was so with some at that time, who thought that since the divine ordinances had passed away, the truth of God had perished. Hence the despair and licentiousness

<sup>1</sup> Jowett, *Epistles of S. Paul*, II. p. 458.



of many Jews, and probably of some Judaizers. If the other converts were to be saved from the same misery, it must be by showing that Christianity was quite independent of all the ordinances that had been destroyed; and yet it would not have been a religion that they could have accepted, unless it was still presented in a Jewish dress and as involving the ideas of a covenant, and of obedience to a law. Besides this, the mystical and rationalising teaching of the Therapeutae<sup>1</sup> had already paved the way for the assertion, not only that the covenant in its deeper meaning still remained, but that it never had existed in any other sense.

It is this marked retention of Jewish ideas which separates the author by a long interval from S. Paul. There are many Pauline expressions, many fragments of Pauline teaching, but a careful consideration of the writing as a whole shows us that it is not written from the point of view which that apostle would have assumed: and that the real connexion is with the school of Christian thought represented by the Gospel according to S. Matthew, and the Epistle of S. James. It is later than one at least of these writings, and bears traces, as we have seen, of Gentile rather than Jewish authorship, and of bitter antagonism to much that is Jewish; but for all that, it appears to me to be the product of a mind that had been strongly imbued with certain essentially Jewish ideas, rather than of one that had grown up from the beginning in Christian liberty.

Taking this view, I was surprised to find one critic after another dwelling on its Paulinism, and almost omitting to notice the tendencies which seem to me to be most marked. I was glad therefore to find the opinion at which I arrived was that which had been

<sup>1</sup> Neander, *Ch. Hist.* (Torry), I. 79.

maintained by Weizsäcker, and to see it so strongly enforced as it is by him<sup>1</sup>, as well as in a modified manner by Keim. The mistake has arisen from persisting in looking at the epistle as a polemic, and not as it really is, a hortatory epistle. The repudiation of the literal interpretation of the Jewish law savours of Paulinism, and therefore the epistle is at once set down as a polemic written in this interest. But a very little examination shows that these writers had travelled by different roads to the ground which is common to both, and their habitual modes of expression bear witness to these divergences.

*S. Paul's  
consciousness  
of faith*

S. Paul had shaken off his former Jewish prejudices entirely. To his mind the close communion with God—the life of faith—is an active principle, which when it once finds its place in the soul, carries with it an assurance of its own reality, and develops itself naturally in the external life: so that no further rule of conduct is needed. Do we make void the law? By no means, we establish the law, on a firmer and surer basis than it had before as an external and positive enactment. It is only when this faith falls away so as to become a mere opinion, or intellectual belief, that the difficulties as to the relation of faith, and justification in the sight of God, and actual holiness of life, come into view. It was just because faith was so much a living reality to S. Paul that he declined to formulate his belief in definite dogmatic statements, and that his opinion on the mutual relation of faith and works has remained a *quaestio vexata*.

*and its con-  
nexion with  
knowledge*

Nor does he state distinctly his opinion on the relation of faith and knowledge. To one whose spiritual intuition was so perfect, to whom the truth presented

<sup>1</sup> Weizsäcker, *Zur Kritik des Barnabasbriefs*, p. 50.

itself with such overwhelming force, it was impossible to define the relation between the intellectual apprehension of religious truths and that spiritual acceptance of them as living realities, which constitutes true faith. The two sides had not fallen apart; he apprehended them simply, and as one.

One thing which shows how little our author was influenced by S. Paul, is the narrow rôle which faith plays. It is mentioned as a Christian virtue which his readers possessed, but it is not the active influence which is to pervade their lives. That is spoken of under an Alexandrine phrase—those who possess it are *πνευματικοί*. Ever and again we read of spirituality. It is this which corresponds to the “faith” of S. Paul. Spiritual-mindedness was what distinguished Moses and the prophets: and it is by ordering our lives after spiritually interpreted precepts, that we order them aright. So that “faith” appears to me to become in this epistle only the initial apprehension of the belief in an unseen God. It is not the active, pervading, religious influence, as it is with S. Paul, but this is denoted spirituality.

Comparing then these two, we find a great difference. Faith (as used by S. Paul) is a subjective principle of action, having its ground in the heart of the individual. “Spirituality” is a conformity with an externally imposed but divine law: there is not the same depth of thought here: not the same freedom from Judaistic conceptions of righteousness. The covenant people in the one case consists of all those individuals who have the faith of Jesus in their hearts, in the other of those who by conformity with the prescribed conditions of the covenant, claim their place within it.

It is not unnatural, however, that these two views of

*contrasted  
with our  
author's  
opinions.*

*Both are  
opposed to  
Judaism,*

the fundamental principle of Christianity should have the same opposition to what was distinctively Jewish, in spite of the wide difference between them; for both are spiritual modes of thought. Both, while claiming inheritance in the covenant, maintain a freedom from the law: but one by substituting subjection to a different and spiritual law; the other by asserting the existence of a spiritual principle. The Pauline principle is deeper, and gives a grander conception than the mere substitution of one law for another; though both of them would be equally opposed to the ordinary Jewish feeling. The sacrifices, fasts, sabbaths and rites are all done away with, from either point of view. The important distinction is in their opinions as to the law before the Christian era. To S. Paul it was a school-master to bring the people unto Christ; he looked on it as divine throughout; but our author regarded only the Christianity within the law (so to speak) as divine.

*but with  
different  
opinions as  
to the law  
before  
Christ.*

This then seems to be the relation in which our epistle, and presumably a considerable section of the Alexandrian church, stood to the two contrasted doctrines of religious life. All the ideas are Jewish, this is the tone throughout; the problem is one which would occur to the minds of Jewish rather than heathen converts, and the precise form of the answer is what was required after the fall of Jerusalem. Still the teaching is similar to that of S. Paul, though less noble in its conception of Christian faith; nor was our author removed sufficiently far above the old dispensation to be able to recognise its real value.

II. *Influence of the Gospels and Epistles.*

It is quite consistent with the above view, that the only Gospel with which our author seems to be acquainted should be that according to S. Matthew, which was written with especial reference to Jewish churches, and bears the strongest traces of Jewish modes of thought. We have already seen one quotation from this book, but there are several other close agreements with it, which can hardly be the effect of any mere coincidence, though different explanations are offered. The question, whether the Gospel which he used was in the shape in which we have it or not, is an extremely interesting one; and there is a great temptation to wrest the authority of our epistle for the support of one or other of the theories of the composition of that Gospel; but the evidence that can be adduced is so meagre, that almost each of these hypotheses is chiefly dependent on that very feeble defence, the argument from silence—at least as far as our epistle is concerned.

To consider first the alleged<sup>1</sup> references to sayings.

(a) In IV. 3, in the idea of God shortening the days out of love to His people, there is a marked similarity of thought with Matt. XXIV. 22, but the direct connexion is far too uncertain to be insisted upon.

(b) At the end of the same chapter there is another reference given by Hefele, which seems to me extremely doubtful, IV. 13. It is at best a summary of the lesson derived from the parable of the Wise and Foolish Virgins; and there is still less resemblance between the Sinaitic and Greek versions than between the Corbie

<sup>1</sup> Hefele, p. 231, also Lardner and Hilgenfeld.

and Vulgate, on which Hefele based his suggestion. The idea of watching and not sleeping in sin is common to both passages, but that is really all.

*Matt. ix. 13.* (c) The next passage is one about which there is hardly any doubt. The resemblance between the words about the choosing of the Apostles (v. 9) and *Matt. ix. 13* is extremely close, while their connexion in the Gospel with the account of the call of S. Matthew gives some excuse for our author's strange explanation.

*Matt. xxii. 14.* (d) We next have the important passage, in *IV. 14*, which is an alleged quotation from *Matt. xxii. 14*—for the insertion of the identical phrase in *Matt. xx. 16* can hardly stand. This differs from the other cases of coincidence inasmuch as it is professedly a quotation from some sacred writing: and the question really resolves itself into this, Is this a quotation from a resembling passage in *IV. Esdras*, from S. Matthew, or from a source which was common to the Gospel and epistle, but which is now lost? In *IV. Esdras*, a book which our author certainly used, we have similar sense, but expressed in totally different language, so that even acknowledging the great laxity of his quotations it is hardly possible to consider this one. In S. Matthew we have similar language, but there is difficulty in supposing that our author knew and valued that Gospel when he made so little use of it. The third supposition, that the phrase was a common proverb which was quoted from an unknown apocryphal writer both by S. Matthew and our author, is to be objected to inasmuch as it suggests a supposed instead of an actual source of the words. The most natural conclusion seems to be that it was derived from the Gospel, and that this book from its first appearance received the approval of Christians, so that one of them ventured to appeal to it as an authority.

If this is admitted a considerable amount of confirmatory evidence can be adduced ; as it will be seen below, that our author sympathised with the mode of thought which is presented in the Gospel of S. Matthew, and was acquainted with trivial facts that are not mentioned in any other canonical record ; these circumstances add to the probability that the writing which is thus quoted was our Gospel—the question remains whether it was our Gospel in its present form.

(e) In the next chapter (v. 12) there is a passage *Matt. xxvi. 13.* which has given rise to an immense deal of discussion. It is a quotation from Zechariah, which also occurs in the first Gospel (XXVI. 13). In the first place, it is used in a different connexion. Christ spoke of the scattering of the disciples, and this is of the dispersion of the Jewish nation. At the same time it does not seem to me impossible that our author should have used the words of the Gospel in another sense. The words are about equally near to S. Matthew and to the Alexandrine text of the Septuagint, which is said to be throughout more closely allied to the quotations in Matthew, than any other text ; and Hefele's supposition, that it was a fresh translation of the Hebrew text introduced into the Gospel, is unnecessary here.

(f) In VI. 13 there is a similar difficulty. The words *Matt. xx. 16.* are quoted with verbal accuracy from Matt. xx. 16, but the sense in which they are used is somewhat different, while there is a difficulty in supposing that the λέγει κύριος refers to any unknown apocryphal book.

(g) In VII. 11 there are a few words introduced, *Matt. xvi. 24.* which remind one very strongly of the teaching of Jesus in regard to the probable sufferings of His followers, which are recorded in Matt. XVI. 24. But in this case again it is extremely doubtful if there is a reference to

the passage, and it seems much more likely that the *Οὕτω φησίν* with which the words are introduced does not mean, He (Jesus) says, that thus,—but rather, By this type God teaches us; as the spiritual interpretation of part of the ceremonial follows the words, and the teaching seems to be quoted as given in this special application.

*Matt. xxii.*  
43.

(*h*) In XII. 10, there is a use made of Ps. CX. 1, which coincides exactly with that in Matt. XXII. 43, &c. In this case the language is not followed at all closely, but the sense is.

*Matt. v. 42.*

(*i*) The only remaining case is a somewhat doubtful reading in the second part of the epistle (XIX. 27), inculcating the duty of liberality; and here the words are more closely connected with Luke VI. 30, than with Matt. v. 42, as there is the word *παντί* in the quotation as well as in the third Gospel, and it is omitted in the simple precept as recorded in the first,—“Give to him that asketh thee.”

So far for the references to the sayings of Jesus; there was one (IV. 9) which was for a long time regarded as a saying unrecorded in the Gospels. The discovery of the Sinaitic MS. has set that difficulty at rest, and has taken away one support from those who would argue that at that early time there was a great reliance placed on tradition, as apart from the written Gospel.

*Knowledge of Gospel facts*

There are three facts in the life of Jesus which are referred to in a manner that throws light on the sources used—the choosing of the Apostles, the Crucifixion, and the Ascension. To take the Crucifixion first; we find in VII. several agreements with S. Matthew's account, but one fact is mentioned which is not given in it. Our author uses the word *κατακεντήσαντες*; a similar phrase occurs in the Fourth Gospel, and Tis-

*The Crucifixion.*



chendorf asserts that this is a reference to that Gospel at a very early period. At the same time, there is much that harmonises with S. Matthew's account and not with S. John's. The adjective *κοκκίνην* is found in the First Gospel alone, and the *χολή* is only mentioned by him. At the same time, the presence of the word *ἐξουθενήσαντες* would give as good grounds for asserting that S. Luke's Gospel had been used, as the reference to the piercing gives for maintaining the use of S. John's; but though the actual word is not used, the setting at nought is detailed so fully in the First Gospel, that there is every reason to suppose this was the account which our author followed. Besides this, S. Matthew puts forward the acknowledgement that He was the Son of God, again and again. It is made a considerable point of in the earlier Gospel, while it is only mentioned as a charge brought by the Jews in the Fourth. On every ground it seems to me that the account followed is that of the First Gospel in preference to any of the others. The two words *χολή* and *κοκκίνην* may well outweigh the single one *κατακεντήσαντες*, and the stress laid on the setting at nought and the claim to divinity seem to point to that source. Besides this, we can easily account for the prominence of the idea of piercing, from the fact of the prophecy which would be doubtless applied to Christ by all who knew of it. If we add that the Sinaitic text omits this word, the case against any mention of S. John's Gospel here, appears to be conclusive.

The Ascension of our Lord is referred to, and this is a difficulty to Weizsäcker, as no mention of the fact is made in S. Matthew's Gospel; but does his knowledge of this event render it impossible that the author relied frequently on that book? There is the further *The Ascension.*

difficulty about the day assigned to it. There are only trivial objections to the view that the words about the Ascension are intended to round off the sense and not to add another reason for keeping the Lord's day. The hypothesis has been broached that forty is used as a round number, and that forty-two is the correct one, so that our epistle is exactly right. This is so strongly opposed to the usage of the Church, that it seems impossible to accept it.

*The choice of  
the Apostles.*

The last alleged divergence from the account in S. Matthew is that in v. where the choice of the Apostles is referred to. They are here put forward as if they were chosen for the sake of an example, and ground of hope to "sinners," which is not the representation in the Gospel at all. Weizsäcker alleges that both in v. and VIII. the Apostles are distinctly regarded as appointed for preaching to the heathen, and Christ's manifestation as being from the first intended primarily for them. This, it is said, is not found in S. Matthew; it certainly is not, nor can I find it in our epistle. And even admitting that this idea is strongly present, the local colour is exactly that which we find in the first Gospel: the call of S. Matthew associated with the words "publicans and sinners." The alleged difference then is that a view of the work of Christ and of His Apostles is taken, which was not present to S. Matthew's mind, and that therefore, in spite of the strong resemblance, this Gospel could not have been used.

*The author's  
style of  
quotation.*

To estimate the exact value of these quotations and references to sayings and incidents, we must call to mind the extreme looseness of the mode of citation from the Old Testament; we shall not expect to find any greater exactness in quoting from the New; and we

may remember that in several passages the sense was given without any particular attempt to follow the words. Nor does the author always care strictly for the sense of the passage from which he quotes words that suit his purpose. Surely words could not be more completely dragged out of the sense in which they were first used than those quoted from Isaiah LXV. 2, "All day long have I stretched forth my hands to a rebellious and unrighteous people." And many other instances might be quoted where the sense of the passage from which a quotation is taken is by no means preserved.

Considering then the great laxness with which our author was wont to cite, and his carelessness in regard to facts contained in books which he certainly used, it is very difficult indeed to frame any exact argument on the subject. It is, however, perfectly fair to consider the matter in this way; there is one passage which is, if not universally, generally admitted to be a formal quotation from S. Matthew's Gospel, and which no one has succeeded in showing to be a quotation from anything else. To my mind it seems plain that this is a quotation, and proves that our author made use of that Gospel. In this case the alleged references which might otherwise, taken by themselves, be doubtful, rise to a much greater degree of probability; and the combined weight of cumulative evidence becomes so great that it is not easy to explain them all on any other supposition. We find some following the sense, rather than the letter; as *a*, *b*, and *g*. Others conversely follow the words more closely than the sense; such are *c*, *d*, and *e*. They must each be judged separately, and even all combined may fall short of complete certainty. But they distinctly prove that our author was conversant with the same habits of thought as occur in the Gospel,

*Summary of  
the argu-  
ment for the  
use of the  
Gospel,*

and when taken in connection with the one quotation, the case becomes really strong.

*and bearing  
on the ques-  
tion of its  
origin.*

The extreme looseness and generality is greatly to be regretted, as it prevents us from being able to make much use of the Epistle in regard to the very difficult problem as to the origin and formation of the Gospel of S. Matthew. Weizsäcker alleges that it was originally published as a collection of the sayings of Jesus, and that the account of His doings was added afterwards, and that our author had the earlier portion before him, but not the latter. I have endeavoured to state my reasons for believing that the references to the Crucifixion were distinctly more dependent on S. Matthew's account than on any other; and the mention of the calling of the Apostles along with the quoted saying which is used in the connexion, seems to me to turn the scale in favour of our author having this Gospel in his hands in this case also, even though he regarded the function of the Apostles as different from that which S. Matthew assigns them. If we remember the various mis-statements about facts of ritual and matters mentioned in the Old Testament, which were enumerated above, it will not seem strange that our author should have been as careless in his use of the New Testament writings as he was in regard to the Old. These differences are not sufficient to support the inference in defence of which they are alleged. There is nothing to give colour to the supposition that although the author used the sayings of Jesus as recorded in the First Gospel, he was unacquainted with that history of His doings. The hypothesis in regard to S. Matthew which is favoured by Schleiermacher, Weizsäcker and others, receives no support from our epistle; in fact, the evidence appears to me to be strongly on the other

*Schleier-  
macher.*

side. It is still more difficult to bring any argument bearing on the less mechanical theory of composition favoured by the Tübingen School, in particular by Schwegeler and Hilgenfeld. Where objections are urged *Schwegeler.* against particular passages, they could only be met by finding references to these passages; and this we can hardly hope to do in one short epistle. Out of the list of possible coincidences given above, there are two references to passages in the Gospel which are much disputed; but they are of such a character that it is impossible to base any inference on them. One is the exceedingly doubtful reference to the parable of the Ten Virgins; the other is the quotation, "Many are called and few chosen," which might come out of the parable of the Wedding Feast (Matt. XXII. 14, a disputed passage), but it has been alleged, as seen above, that the words are derived from Matt. XX. 16, or even from some uncanonical source. There is consequently no light obtainable from this epistle on the question of the integrity of this Gospel<sup>1</sup>. At the same time I am in candour bound to state that the argument from silence goes some way to show that the Gospel of S. Matthew was not in common use as a recognised authority among those to whom the epistle is addressed. To take one conspicuous instance. In the discussion upon the Sabbath in xv., we find not the most distant allusion to the narratives of Matt. XII., or the emphatic declarations in vv. 8, 12 of that chapter; while at the same time we cannot but feel how apposite and conclusive such a reference would have been, to support the main argument.

Tischendorf maintains that there are distinct traces *Alleged traces of the*

<sup>1</sup> No argument against it is at all supported however. Cf. Volkmar in his edition of Credner's *Geschichte des Kanons*, p. 16, note.

*Fourth Gos-  
pel,* of the use of the Fourth Gospel ; the attempt to establish this from the reference to the Crucifixion which it contains, has been already shown to be futile. The only other alleged coincidence, the mention of the brazen serpent as a type of Christ (XII. 7), seems almost to exclude the possibility of dependence. Keim<sup>1</sup> admits this, but still considers that there is such a close correspondence between the epistle and the Gospel in "the inmost sphere of thought," that either the latter is a development of the former, or the epistle a scholastic exposition of the Gospel. But if our account of the problem which gave rise to the epistle be correct, we shall have no difficulty in supposing that the connexion is due to the similar pressure of external circumstances, and we need not be forced to adopt the supposition that the epistle is an exposition of the Gospel from the pen of one who did not value it very highly and permitted himself very many divergences from it.

*and of vari-  
ous Epistles,* Hilgenfeld, who considers the epistle a development of Paulinism, has given up all the supposed references to the Pauline Epistles, and only regards the use of Gen. XVII. 5 in XIII. as possibly due to the perusal of the Apostle's argument in Rom. IV. 11<sup>2</sup>. But besides this there are several other passages where the sense of verses in the same Epistle is closely followed. They are for the most part cases of a strong similarity in the use of the Old Testament, and considering the immense amount of verbal discussion there must have been at that time, it is not impossible that the two Epistles should be connected by common oral teaching: an additional proof of this is the fact that some of these passages are quoted in more than one inspired Epistle,

*especially  
Romans*

<sup>1</sup> Keim, *Jesus of Nazara*, I. 189.

<sup>2</sup> *Apostol. Väter*, pp. 47, 48.

*e.g.* we may compare XIII. 7 with Romans IV. 3, or Gal. III. 6, or James II. 23. At the same time, as the sentence immediately following coincides with Rom. IV. 11, we should incline to refer both to that Epistle rather than to either of the others. Besides, the argument in XIII. 2, 3, about Isaac is found in Romans IX: 10—13, and not in any other epistle. Again, the passage in XIX. 7 may be compared with Romans VIII. 29 and 30, or with 1 Pet. II. 9.

Another passage which might be referred to either *and 1 Peter*; of these Epistles, is the mention of Christ as a cornerstone, elect and precious, in VI. 2. It is possible to compare it either with Romans IX. 33 or with 1 Pet. II. 6, 7, 8. In XII., at the end of the discussion of the brazen serpent, there is a doxology closely resembling Romans XI. 36. There is a close agreement with 1 Cor. III. 8, in IV., in speaking of the judgment; and the idea of a spiritual temple is also common to both these passages as well as to 1 Peter II. 6, 8. It is to the last of these that I should prefer to refer the quotation. A few other ideas are made prominent here which we also find in the Epistles, *e.g.* respect of persons is blamed by S. James; but these are the only coincidences which are at all worthy of notice. We can only say that it is within the bounds of possibility that the author had the Epistle to the Romans and 1 Peter before him, possibly 1 Corinthians, and some would say Galatians, but that there is no sufficient reason for alleging that he had any of them at all. The weak point about the argument is, that agreement is generally found in the use of Old Testament passages in an application which must have been of daily occurrence in the Church. Others, which are in regard to the last judgment, might almost be framed out of Matthew XXIV.; and the

*but no definite conclusion can be reached.*

doxology might surely have been of early origin, and adopted by both. The conclusion then to which we are led is a purely negative one; we are not in a position to assert that any Epistle was in the hands of our author. The argument for the use of any of the Epistles is much less convincing than that for the use of S. Matthew's Gospel, even independently of the apparent quotation.

### III. *Traces of Alexandrine doctrines, &c.*

*Relation of  
our author  
to Gnos-  
ticism,*

*which was  
quite unde-  
veloped,*

There is so much said about *γνῶσις* in the epistle, and there are so many allegorical interpretations, that we might expect to find it considerably marked with traces of Gnosticism: but this is not the case, and the mere fact, that our author was so clearly affected by this spirit, while he shows neither affinity with, nor antagonism to, the developed systems, has been already insisted upon as having a bearing on the question as to the date of the epistle. Whether we regard Gnosticism as fundamentally a revolution against the Pauline tendency to exalt faith at the expense of knowledge, or as an attempt to establish a philosophy of religion, or as an effort to escape from the comparative narrowness and positive nature of the Jewish religion by the introduction of Oriental Mysticism—and various forms of Gnosticism were really but different combinations of these elements—we shall find but little trace of any of these in the general tone of the epistle. The author had not advanced so far as the Pauline conception of faith, far less placed himself in antagonism to it. The questions of the origin of evil, or the possibility of the union of the infinite and finite or spiritual and material, do not



appear to come before him at all, nor does he seek to rise to any higher life than that of conduct. The man who followed his precepts and walked in the way of light would only be *ψυχικός* after all, and not *πνευματικός*, according to the distinctions which were drawn by others. Yet he is not altogether unaffected by the atmosphere around him. The germs of Gnosticism were *but still in the air.* part of the spirit of the age: it was in the air. We can see traces of it in his writings, partly in opposition to external forms, partly in phrases which show that he had imbibed the subtle influence. Yet from what we read we can see that he would have been distinctly opposed to all those elaborate theosophies, which are so alien and unnatural to our way of thinking, but which sprang up most naturally in days that were disturbed by the rival claims of Grecian philosophy, of Oriental religions, of Jewish, and later, of Christian Revelation, among men by whom all of these were regarded as various opinions to be sifted, and if possible reconciled. His doctrine of the person of Christ, shows that our author did not feel the same *Our author's position,* difficulties about the relation of spirit and matter as others did: and the advantages of *γνώσις* are never put forward as opposed to faith or righteousness. No formed conception of a higher and lower Divinity can be detected, nor of a Demiurgus opposed to the Deity, though there are traces of the feeling in accordance with which the latter conception was framed. For instance, in XVIII. 2 we may trace germs of the idea of a moral duality. How far this might have been the case had he proceeded with his task, and given us the *γνώσις* of the present and future, we cannot say; the *γνώσις* of the present would be a philosophy of redemption—the *γνώσις* of the future, an apocalypse. We

can sympathize with the author in his feeling that neither of these were necessary for salvation (XVII.), but we also feel how completely this simple statement shuts him off from the teachers who sprang up in such numbers in Alexandria and Syria.

*his view of  
γνώσις,*

He regarded γνώσις, then, as subordinate to the working out of salvation: spiritual insight would tend to his readers' advancement in good works; the simple precepts which occur in the second part are dignified with the name of a *ἐτέρα γνώσις* (XVIII.), but perhaps he uses the term as a concession to the popular culture of his day, rather than from a sense of the truth that those who do the divine Will attain to the highest spiritual knowledge. In particular the understanding of the spiritual meaning of the Jewish Law—the taking these precepts in a spiritual sense, would give them a rule of conduct. It would solve the difficulty which his epistle attempted to meet. He was accordingly tempted to go very far with those philosophical Jews who had been indoctrinated with Greek philosophy and spiritualised the greater part of the law. Among the people of the old dispensation he would find a distinction between spiritual and carnal (to use S. Paul's phrase). But he seems to have thought that with Christianity these difficulties were removed; that Christ had made all things plain to the world, and that the γνώσις would be intelligible to all his readers; nor does he seem to address any narrow section, rather, we would suppose, the whole church in Alexandria. It is true this spiritual knowledge is a grace which his hearers possessed above other Christians (IX. 9), but it does not seem that they were therefore raised to an entirely different class; they did not become a spiritual aristocracy. This knowledge is a grace to be cultivated and prized; but

to be prized principally because it conduces to the furtherance of spiritual life, and not for its own sake, apart from its bearing on salvation; and where it is difficult or obscure (dealing with the present and future) it loses its interest for him and for them.

We shall be able to find several particular agree-<sup>of the Old Testament commands,</sup>ments with writers of the Judæo-Alexandrine School; for instance, the distinction into two classes of the Jewish people. And we find that our author is behind Philo in a reverent appreciation of the Old Testament. For though Philo found a spiritual sense within the exoteric one, he did not dare to discard the latter altogether. In particular is this the case in his treatment of Circumcision. In our epistle we find that an evil angel deluded the Jews to obey the command literally; while Philo<sup>1</sup> would have condemned the disregard of it. The temptation to disparage the Old Testament in its literal sense arose from the fact of our author's living at the juncture he did. His firm faith in the completeness of the new divine revelation as it was given to all, prevented him from looking for any more refined knowledge of Christian truth. The earnestness of Christian life throughout the community, prevented him from drawing distinctions, or framing a spiritual aristocracy among the men around him; he and all Christians of his age were, like Moses and the prophets, spiritual men; and the whole of his indignation was concentrated on the Israelites who had been unable to perceive the higher truth. Philo, as a Jew whose countrymen were for the most part clinging to the exoteric sense, Origen, as a Christian who saw that many of his brethren could never rise to grasp the higher sense, would not have this feeling. To them the

<sup>1</sup> *De migratione Abraham.* Ueberweg, *Geschichte der Philos.* i. 266.

divine spiritual meaning was contained in a divine exoteric one. Whereas in the epistle we find that only the spiritual sense is regarded as divine, because this was a dim foreshadowing of what was afterwards fully revealed by God.

This attempt to separate the Jews into two classes and to identify the spiritually minded Jews with the Christians is manifest in the use made of Scripture<sup>1</sup>. The denunciations are applied to the Israelites generally; the promise to "us,"—the spiritually minded, whether Jews or Christians. In III. we have Isaiah LVIII. 4, 5 applied to the Israelites, and Isaiah LVIII. 6—10 applied to "us."

One of the most singular phenomena in regard to the view which he exhibits is the utter absence of that idea which exercises such a potent spell upon us now, and which appeared in so many Gnostic systems, the idea of development. To his mind the being of God is one; there is an identity between the former revelation and the new one. The old dispensation was not a preparation for the new, so much as an imperfect anticipation of the events in connexion with which certain truths were revealed under the new; from what he says we gather that he thought the same knowledge and same conduct were required under both; but because the Israelites did not recognise that the Mosaic ordinances were only types and symbols of Christ, they found it more difficult to attain to this faith and spiritual conduct. Finding that the Jewish ceremonial is not a necessary adjunct of spiritual life in his day, he at once concludes that it could not have been so at any time. He forgets that this despised ritual was a witness to an

*and of the  
relation be-  
tween the  
two dispen-  
sations.*

*Error in re-  
gard to the  
Jewish cere-  
monial*

<sup>1</sup> Hilg. *Apost. Väter*, p. 42.

ignorant and impulsive nation of a pure and righteous and spiritual God, and that the obeying of these positive commands involved a self-restraint, and obedience to an unseen and righteous Power, which really was a life of faith. The Israelite who conquered in himself the tendency to the sensual worship of Baal-peor or Jezreel, was really guided by a reverence for a holy and unseen God. This ceremonial had sunk into a mere dead observance ; as the most pure and elevated of creeds may sink into a mere formula, and become the watchword of a party. But our author is too much blinded by the state of the ceremonial worship which was present to his mind. It was for him a mere formalism, and he could not conceive that it had ever been anything else. His error is closely connected with a misapprehension of the work of Christ: this he regards as the actual accomplishment of deliverance from death by an event in time, not as a perfect revelation of the way by which the Eternal God saves men from sin. If saving efficacy is found through the events of the passion, then the story of its incidents must have been known to the fathers, or they could not partake in its benefit—and we find our author straining passages so as to force them to convey this knowledge. But when we know that men are delivered from evil by partaking of that spirit of utter submission in which Jesus suffered, that they are stimulated to goodness by the constraining love which was manifested in Him, we shall feel that those to whom God had given that spirit in earlier days, or drawn by dimmer revelations, have truly come to God through Him—though they knew it not. The patriarchs and prophets of old were *πνευματικοί*, not, as our author seems to say, because they guessed at the story of the passion, but because they lived a life of

*due to a  
misapprehension of  
the nature  
of the work  
of Christ,*

faith in Jehovah, and trod that way of sacrifice which Jesus revealed to the world: of this inward grace the fulfilment of the Mosaic ordinances was the outward sign: the actual ceremonies were by no means worthless, still less wicked, as our author seems to think.

*and marked  
in regard to  
circum-  
cision.*

The most curious case of this confusion occurs in his remarks about circumcision (IX. 8), which have been already discussed. Again, the same thing is obvious in his treatment of the commands about meats; all of them really had a spiritual value for the people who obeyed them; and some had in addition, as we now see, a sort of sanitary importance. But neither of these thoughts was present to our author. To him there is no goodness but ethical goodness; no ceremonial purity could be pleasing to God, who cared only for conduct.

*Demonology  
of the  
epistle.*

The semi-philosophic tendency exhibited in regard to Judaism no longer occurs when the author comes to treat of Christianity. In it, all the mysteries are solved. He does not feel the glaring contradiction between a spiritual and sensible world which must be mediated by a series of emanations; nor does he know of a number of divine functions which required separate existences to perform them. Spiritual existences are mentioned, but they are on a distinctly lower sphere; they are the angels of God set to watch over the way of light; or the angels of Satan (XVIII.). They have no connexion, so far as we can judge, with any doctrine of divine emanations. Satan, the chief of these evil angels, is the Prince of the present evil time; while God reigns from eternity to eternity; Satan is the lord of the sensible and passing world (II. and XVIII.), who tempts us to evil (IV.), who keeps us from our truest life (II.), and who deluded the Jews to turn to the mere literal sense of their law (IX.). There is just a passing hint in this of the Platonic tendency to place the

Divine Life in the world of Ideas, and to identify what is fleeting and false and wrong with the sensible world. We see too that it is rather from a philosophical side, (from the fact that he is unable to think of God as desiring ceremonial observances, but regards them as belonging to the present world and the kingdom of Satan) that there is the tendency to make the God of the (carnally minded) Jews a power opposing the true God. In later times the same idea sprung up, but from a moral revulsion against some of the deeds which the Israelites were commanded to do.

There was a common distinction, which appears as early as the second Book of Maccabees<sup>1</sup>, between the Eternal God who dwells in heaven, and the Divine Power which dwelt at the Temple in Jerusalem. This appears to me to be hinted at in XVI. 1, where the Jewish worship is described as idolatrous, the worship of a presence, rather than of the Eternal God.

Some phrases indicate a protest against different errors, but there is no special heresy against which the epistle is directed. We shall best enter into the spirit of the writing, if we regard it as intended to edify the less spiritually minded converts, and thus to guard them against each and every heresy—but especially against utter despair and consequent immorality. Thus while our author dwells on the necessity that Christ should come in the flesh, and asserts a real incarnation (though he is silent in regard to a miraculous birth) in opposition to the Docetae, he is not less positive as to the divinity of the Son of David, which the Ebionites denied. While there are strong traces of the Judaeo-Alexandrine mode of thought, both in the language and tone of the

*Current  
heresies.*

<sup>1</sup> Ueberweg, *Geschichte der Phil.* 1. 244.

epistle, there is no trace of the theosophy that appeared later, nor any hint of the metaphysical difficulties which called it forth: the answers which were given to these problems by different Gnostic systems are all at variance with the positive teaching of our epistle, though none of them are directly attacked.



## VI.

### THE THEOLOGY OF THE EPISTLE.

**B**UT little remains to be said. The result of the investigation has been to render it certain that this epistle could not have been written by the companion of S. Paul; but that its author was a Gentile, and probably connected with Alexandria, who had come under many Jewish influences, and who had not shaken off these ideas so thoroughly as S. Paul had done, and who accordingly regarded the old dispensation in a spirit of active opposition rather than of serene superiority. He was infected with Alexandrian philosophy to a slight extent, at least in so far as it had borne fruits in the allegorising of the Old Testament, and wrote about A. D. 79. He cannot be quoted as an independent witness of the truth of any facts of the Gospel history; for he made use of the Gospel of S. Matthew, and for anything that the epistle shows to the contrary, of that Gospel in its present form. His mode of quoting this book seems to show that he ranked it along with the Old Testament Scriptures and Apocrypha. There is no certain testimony to be drawn from his work in regard to any other books at present comprised in the canon of the New Testament.

Such was his date and intellectual position. The question naturally suggests itself, How did this work come to be attributed to S. Barnabas, if it was not really *Results.*  
*How did the work come to be attributed to S. Barnabas?*

his? The supposition of its being the work of another man of the same name, has met with some favour, but it is almost idle to speculate on a problem, where there is such infinite room for wild hypothesis. I may throw out as a possible suggestion, that the teaching in this epistle bore some relation to what was reported as that of S. Barnabas. We know that he did not rise so thoroughly above Jewish prejudices as S. Paul had done, and we can easily conceive that much of the doctrine in the epistle was his, but expressed with a decision which would have been foreign to his nature. It is not impossible that it may be a rechauffée of his oral teaching, made by one who unconsciously gave the production a colour which would have been most displeasing to the Apostle. This would explain to a great extent the coincidences with Pauline modes of arguing which we find.

*Its value for  
us is principally  
historical, as  
showing,*

Be this as it may, it can make no difference to the value which we assign to the epistle theologically. Whether it was ultimately due to Apostolic teaching or not, we find such a strong admixture of other elements that we cannot respect it very highly. The worth of the whole is to be estimated, as far as its authority goes, as no higher than the worth of the worst passages which it contains. It is not the work of one who had authority to preach bestowed on him directly by Jesus; but only a characteristic work of a Christian of the first century; and as such can lay no claim to special inspiration, beyond that common to every Christian. It is an interesting testimony to what Christian thought was at that time, but it cannot be set up as a great example of what Christian thought ought to be. Having thus considered what weight we may attach to the opinion of this author, it may not be an altogether useless addition to our investigation to consider what he thought

about various questions of grave importance, which are at present agitating theological circles.

1. The divinity of Jesus is strongly insisted on.—1. a recognition of the divinity of Jesus, Not to lay stress merely on the phrase, Son of God, bestowed on Him especially, though not on Him alone (cf. IV. 9), I may call attention to two or three other expressions which are even less ambiguous. In v. 5 He is spoken of as *παντὸς τοῦ κόσμου κύριος*; and God consults with Him about the creation of man. This implies existence before the world, and lordship over it: (cf. John I. 1—3). In VII. 2 it is said that He is “Lord, and is coming to judge the living and the dead.” Again in XV. 5 this sentence is important, “When the Son shall come, and put an end to the evil days, and judge the wicked, and change the sun and the moon and the stars,” &c. These passages do distinctly give a meaning to the phrase, Son of God, which it may not have in itself. There is a distinct ascription of purely divine attributes to Jesus—to Him who is generally spoken of as the Son of God.

Another passage (XII. 7) has been alleged in the same connexion, but as it is doubtful I shall not do more than mention it. After the reference to the brazen serpent he adds, “Hereby you perceive the glory of Jesus once more, that in Him are all things, and for Him.” This appears on the face of it to be a doxology which could be only applied to a divine being, but there is another possible meaning; “in Him” and to Him “all these types have their application.” In the same chapter (XII. 10) the conduct of Moses furnishes a type of Jesus, “not a Son of Man, but a Son of God;” and the application of the prophecies from the Psalms and Isaiah seems quite conclusive.

2. Equally distinct is the teaching upon the 2. of the humanity of Christ,

humanity of Christ ; this would be called forth by incipient, if not prevalent Docetism. The first line of v. speaks of the offering up of His flesh, and throughout the chapter we have His sufferings referred to again and again ; *e.g.* "How could sinful men bear to look upon Him and be saved if He had not come in the flesh ? for they cannot even look at the rays of the sun, which is the work of His hands." Other passages might be adduced, but these seem quite sufficient to show that the opinion of the author was clear on this point. The fact is so plain, that it has been mentioned by some critics as one of the main objects of the epistle to prove this ; nor could a single passage be found which would tend to throw any doubt on his maintaining the Catholic doctrine in regard to the great mystery of "God<sup>1</sup> manifest in the flesh."

3. of an un-  
formed and  
vague doc-  
trine of the  
Holy Ghost :

3. In regard to the personality of the Holy Ghost his teaching is not at all clear ; in fact, we cannot help remembering those Ephesians who consorted with the Church and yet had not "heard whether there be any Holy Ghost." There is a great deal of reference to that sort of spiritual action which we should ascribe to the Third Person of the Trinity, yet there is no distinct reference to Him as an active Existence. The whole teaching is of spiritual life and spiritual knowledge, and yet there is little definite assertion of the presence of a Spirit which bears witness with our spirits. One passage is highly important from being so exceptional. In XVI. 8—10, where the Christian is spoken of as a true temple, there is clear reference to the sanctifying work of the indwelling God. This one passage is very definite, but in general the language is vague. The truth is there, but not distinctly formed into a definite

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Schwegler, *Nachap. Zeit.* II. p. 242.

conception. The author comes very near to the Catholic doctrine in XIX., where he directs his readers "to love Him who made them, to glorify Him who redeemed them, and to be single-hearted and rich in your spirit." The third clause shows at least the feeling of the necessity of that divine action which we should ascribe to the Holy Ghost. There is indeed a temptation to force this out of it by translating τῷ πνεύματι instrumentally, "through the Spirit;" but even without the parallel phrase, ἀπλοῦς τῇ καρδίᾳ, this would be inadmissible.

This is still stronger where Moses is spoken of as writing ἐν πνεύματι; but this has also to be taken of his subjective state, rather than of an objective agent. There is another passage to which attention<sup>1</sup> has been called as showing not only an explicit recognition of the personality of the Holy Spirit, but possibly, if we compare the variant in the Latin version, a definite doctrine on His relation to the Father. In I. 3 we read, "because I truly perceive within you the spirit bestowed upon you from the abundance of the Lord's love," or following the Latin version, "from the abundant fountain of the Lord." But even here there is no decided personification, and the whole reads to me as if the author were thinking of subjective graces, without tracing them to the abiding presence of the Spirit of God. We must conclude on the whole that this doctrine was not explicitly held by our author, for treating so much of spiritual matters as he does, some more forcible statement would have been certain to escape him, had he done so. It is not difficult to account for his ignorance of this cardinal point of Catholic truth; the great incidents which served as the occasion for calling the atten-

<sup>1</sup> H. B. Swete, *Hist. of Doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit*, p. 13.

tion of the Church to the personality of the Holy Ghost were the facts of miraculous gifts of healing and language. At a church where there was no Apostolic founder, those gifts might be less generally known, and the necessity for personifying the divine Spirit Who works in man, would not be so strongly felt. The indefiniteness of doctrine on this point is a further proof that the epistle cannot be a development of Pauline teaching. But it is interesting to find the strong assertion of the need of this form of divine help and guidance, which shows how much the mind of the writer was prepared for accepting the Catholic doctrine, whenever it was presented to his mind.

4. *the view  
of the work  
of Christ*

4. The conception of sacrifice was so universal, that it is not surprising to find that much stress is laid on Christ's passion, and none on His life. It is repeated above all things that He died on account of our sins, V. 1, "For for this end the Lord suffered to give His flesh to corruption, that we might be sanctified by the remission of our sins, through the sprinkling of His blood;" again, "the Lord endured to suffer on account of (περι) our souls."—VII. 2—4, "If therefore the Son of God, who is Lord, and will judge the quick and the dead, suffered in order that His stripes might make us live; we ought to believe that the Son of God was not able to suffer except on our account" (δι' ἡμᾶς). "When He was about to offer the vessel of the spirit, on behalf of our sins" (ὑπὲρ τῶν ἡμετέρων ἀμαρτιῶν).—"When I am going to offer up My flesh for (ὑπὲρ) the sins of My new people." In XIV. 4, there is a further reference to His suffering—δι' ἡμᾶς—on our account.

*compared  
with other  
representa-  
tions:*

When we further come to consider wherein the special efficacy of the sufferings consisted, the teaching is equally clear. In XII. 2, when speaking of the battle

with Amalek, he tells us that it was death that the Israelites feared; and the events of the day served to show that "those who do not place their hope on Jesus would be eternally worsted." In the same chapter it was death that threatened them from the serpents; death which recalled to them the eternal death which entered the world through the sin of Eve, and again, the type of Jesus saves from this death. "He though dead is able to make alive." XII. 7. The passage quoted above from VII. tells the same thing. "He suffered in order that His stripes might make us live." And in v. 6, 7, "But because it was necessary for Him to appear in the flesh, He suffered in order that He might make death of no effect and reveal the resurrection from the dead, so as to give His promise to the fathers, and to show, while He was on earth, and preparing His new people, that He would bring the resurrection to pass, and be a judge."

From these passages<sup>1</sup> it is evident that according to our author, the suffering of Christ had its efficacy in overcoming death, and him who had the power over death. It is not put forward in the same imaginative form as in the narrative of Charinus and Lenthius in the Apocryphal Gospel of Nicodemus; but the conception is the same; that the object of Christ's passion was to deliver His people from death. Death had been brought into the world through sin; it was on account of their sins that they were subject to death and needed deliverance from it; but it was a sacrifice which was required to save us from the dominion of the Devil; who is the prince of death, moral and physical. The idea that Jesus suffered instead of us, that our sins necessitated a sacrifice in order that God might be

<sup>1</sup> A different opinion is expressed by de Bunsen, *The Hidden Wisdom of Christ*, Vol. I. pp. 346, 347, but not I think substantiated.

satisfied, had not found a place in that early theology. Still less was the work of Jesus thought of as a mere ethical example for us. It was a real overcoming of the Evil Principle, the advantages of which all His people might inherit.

The defect in his view of the work of Christ has been noticed below; his teaching on the subject need only be summarised. Jesus revealed the God whose ineffable brightness was too much for our gaze, and manifested the covenant of promise which had been given of old; He destroyed the death which men dread, so that those who, by suffering and receiving that baptism which is the sign of forsaken sin, enter into the true covenant, will receive fruits of His victory. It is by spiritual insight that we shall attain to a knowledge of the divine commands, and by keeping them that we become most truly the heirs of the covenant.

5. *the neglect of the Holy Communion:*

5. The thought of a covenant people from whom God requires obedience is thus at the root of his conception of the religious life, just as was the case with the Israelite of old. Yet with what a difference: of old all ties of country and family, and merest details of organisation, all minutest circumstances of actual life, were connected with the divine injunctions. On the other hand, according to our author, the true covenant people had been found among those who had attained to a spiritual elevation, where actual circumstances of race and place and time were things indifferent.

This was almost necessarily the first phase of Christian feeling. To men enraptured with the sense of spiritual elevation which was brought to them by the new revelation, all other things seemed but dross: to such an extent was this the case with some, that even ordinary moral duties seemed unworthy of their attention. Our



author's common sense saved him from this abyss of religious folly, but the injunctions which he adds in the appendix come as an afterthought. He concentrates his attention on the essentials of religion—the relation of the individual spirit to God, and moves wholly in this transcendant sphere: he has little thought of the human being as dwelling in a work-a-day world, and hemmed in by actual needs and greeds. And therefore while describing the highest spiritual attainment of the individual, he altogether forgets the means of grace by which frail human beings may be sustained in the effort after communion with God. There is no mention of the help which may be derived from common worship, or from fellowship in Christian duties, or, still more strange as it may seem, from the sacraments. He had painted the spiritually minded Jew as disregarding the older forms of service, and he seems to have felt himself and his readers on a height of individual religion where they could dispense with the Holy Eucharist, and had in consequence but little sense of union with a body of faithful men among whom the sacraments were duly ministered.

When we remember how strongly he condemns the actual performance of the divine injunctions among the Jews, we may feel sure that he would hardly sympathise with the institution of any rite in the Christian community: it could only be justified to his mind in as much as it seemed an instructive type of Christ, and even in this aspect it was a retrogression to times when the truth was not yet clearly revealed. This mode of thought has reappeared to some extent in the Society of Friends in modern days; and we can see from the whole tone of the epistle that the silence in regard to the Holy Communion is no accidental omission, but

is in strict accordance with the general vein of his thought.

6. *the language regarding Baptism:*

6. The case appears to be entirely different with regard to Baptism, as he seems to attribute an almost magical efficacy to this rite; but a little farther thought will show us that there is no real discrepancy in his views. We must remember that Baptism was a familiar practice among the Jews, and that even in pre-Christian times it was regarded as a sign of regeneration, and hence it was used by our author to denote the all-important step of entering into the covenant relation. "We go down into the water full of sin and uncleanness, and come up again bearing fruit in our hearts, and with faith and hope towards Jesus." Yet it seems to me very doubtful whether there is any reference here to the performance of an actual rite<sup>1</sup> as specially important. If it were necessary for partaking in the covenant relation, how could the Old Testament fathers have shared in it? He seems merely to use the well-known ceremony as a mere name for the grace of repentance, not to regard it as an "effectual sign whereby He doth work invisibly in us."

It is only in this way that we can understand the close connexion which there seems to be in his mind between Baptism and the Cross: the latter is the name he uses for Christ's triumph over death, the former is a name for the triumph over sin, whereby we become sharers in the covenant: it is only when Baptism is thus regarded that the fundamental thought of the whole epistle, that of the identity of the spiritual condition under the two dispensations, is preserved. He does not assert that we are regenerated by the act of Baptism, and that the actual performance of the rite

<sup>1</sup> Donaldson, *History of Christian Literature* 1. 240.

is a condition of entering the covenant, but he used this as a name for the spiritual change which was essential.

7. The religious life which he contemplated was hid <sup>7. the Church:</sup> in the recesses of the human heart, and found no expression in religious ordinances. It is *γυνῶσις* and *γυνῶσις* alone which edifies the Christian, nor does our author recognise any other channel by which God would communicate with the human soul. So too, the spiritual temple is the individual heart, not the "members fitly joined together." His one idea of Church life seems to be the meeting together for mutual advancement in knowledge, not for common worship but for individual edification. The over-estimation of preaching as part of the services of the Church has not been confined to our author and his times.

8. We have here a very striking, if mistaken, <sup>8. the omissions, and the positive teaching of the epistle;</sup> phase of thought; we can wonder at the "spirituality" of the man who could shake himself so entirely free from all external helps, who did not accept the Christian ritual as necessary, while he had freed himself from the bondage of the Jewish one. But we can hardly tell how far his frame of mind represents the general tone of the Alexandrine church, and how far it is individual; we cannot tell whether the epistle is to be accepted as an important contribution to Church history or not. One thing is to be noticed. It is by omissions that his teaching differs from Catholic orthodoxy; there is no positive assertion from which we can dissent in regard to the Holy Spirit, the Sacraments, or the Church; and the epistle might be very acceptable to a body of Christians who were perfectly orthodox on these subjects; so that it cannot be taken as proving anything about the general opinions. But where

*and the  
contrast of  
the Lord's  
day and  
Sabbath*

there is positive teaching it is very different; this has a much greater claim to be considered as commonly received; so that we may fairly conclude that the teaching on the person and work of Christ was generally acceptable. This is still more the case in regard to any institution; whatever had ceased for our author, may be regarded as having passed away for his readers; whatever he represents as being practised, was probably practised by the Church. And therefore it is that his testimony in xv. on the subject of the Sabbath, is of the highest interest. He shows that the Church was in the habit of keeping the Lord's day, and of keeping it as a memorial of His resurrection, and of the new creation which thereby was accomplished. The chiliasm is a little confused, but it is decisive; there was in the author's mind no attempt to prove that a Sabbath on the first day was to be substituted for a Sabbath on the seventh day. The Jewish Sabbath was a type of the great rest which remaineth for the people of God, which we can partake of by sanctifying our hearts, and which will come at last in power, when the new creation is completed, and God can again rest from His work. The Lord's day is no type of a day of rest to come; but a memorial of the first day of a new creation, and to be kept by us with joyfulness. This is a very early testimony to the keeping of the Lord's day; and the reasoning by which the practice is supported, and the care with which the hallowing of this first day is distinguished from the observance of the Jewish Sabbath, is not without interest.

Such were our author's opinions on these important subjects. It will be seen that they harmonise closely with the general position which has been ascribed to him;

and in particular his neglect (to call it no more) of much important Christian truth in a letter which claims to be complete, shows that our author's is no development of a definite system of Christian teaching; it is rather a struggling towards a Christian system. The Conscience of the Church has been guided to greater clearness in many directions; it has found reason to deny the inspiration of books which he accepted as divine; it has learned to value means of grace which he neglected, and above all to recognise more clearly a Holy Spirit watching over it and guiding it into all truth.

The greatest value of the epistle arises from the striking testimony which it bears to the development of Christian thought in many directions, though some of the particular phases of doctrine which it puts forward have more than a merely historical interest for us. We may do well to listen to the voice from a distant past, which tells us that the Lord's day never was a Sabbath, and that spirituality of heart and righteousness of life are the marks of the true heirs of the Covenant.

# THE GREEK AND LATIN TEXT

AND

## ENGLISH TRANSLATION.

THE text adopted both for the Greek and Latin Versions of the Epistle is that recently published by Gebhardt, Harnack and Zahn, in their edition of the *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera* (Leipsic, 1875). Not wishing to encumber the space at my disposal with lists of various readings, which are given very completely and compactly by Gebhardt, and almost more intelligibly (though not quite so exhaustively) by Hilgenfeld, I have thought it best to adopt *in toto* some published text provided with full *apparatus criticus*. I have selected Gebhardt's text as on the whole the soundest and best: it is based on the same critical principles as that of Müller, which is however very carelessly printed; if anything, Gebhardt defers more completely to the authority of **N**. It differs considerably from that of Hilgenfeld, who attaches far more weight than other editors to the Latin Version, and sometimes even reconstructs the Greek Text on that basis. From Gebhardt's text, except in slight occasional changes of punctuation, I have in no case departed, even following him in the acceptance or rejection of Hellenistic forms. Thus I print with him *συνχαίρω* i. 3, *συνγραφὴν* iii. 3,

ἐνκαταλελείφθαι iv. 14, συνκλάσω xi. 4 &c., and keep ἐγγισιάτω vi. 1 in preference to the ἐνγισιάτω of **N**, even though, from the omission to mention the various reading in the critical notes, the ἐγγισιάτω of the text may be due to an oversight. Similarly, I reject with Gebhardt the forms σάρκαν, ἔναν, κόρακαν, &c. (cf. vi. 3 note), which Müller admits into the text. At the same time, I have noticed in the Commentary the more important various readings, where there can be much doubt about the true text, and in a considerable number of places have expressed my approval of a reading different to that adopted in Gebhardt's text.

In the English Version appended my first aim has been exact and careful rendering of the Greek, according to the text here given. I have only aimed at such elegance as is compatible with a scrupulous adherence to the original Greek. Words not in the original, which the exigencies of English idiom required, are printed in italics.

G. H. R.

BARNABAE EPISTULA

GRAECE ET LATINE



## ΒΑΡΝΑΒΑ ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ.

I. Χαίρετε, υἱοὶ καὶ θυγατέρες, ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντος ἡμᾶς, ἐν εἰρήνῃ.

- 2 Μεγάλων μὲν ὄντων καὶ πλουσίων τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ δικαιομάτων εἰς ὑμᾶς, ὑπέρ τι καὶ καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ὑπερευφραίνομαι ἐπὶ τοῖς μακαρίοις καὶ ἐνδόξοις ὑμῶν πνεύμασιν· οὕτως ἔμφυτον τῆς δωρεᾶς πνευματικῆς χάριν εἰλήφατε.
- 3 διὸ καὶ μᾶλλον συνχαίρω ἐμαυτῷ ἐλπίζων σωθῆναι, ὅτι ἀληθῶς βλέπω ἐν ὑμῖν ἐκκεχυμένον ἀπὸ τοῦ πλουσίου τῆς ἀγάπης κυρίου πνεῦμα ἐφ' ὑμᾶς. οὕτω με ἐξέπληξεν ἐπὶ

### Title.

BARNABA ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ. This is the simple title given by **N** and adopted by Usher, Hilgenfeld. In the other MSS. the ep. is acephalous. At head of Lat. we find *incipit epistola barnabae*···*feliciter*···. The Edd. vary :

Epistola S. Barnabae. Cot. Menard.

Barnabae Apostoli Epistola. Dress.

Barnabae Apostoli Epistola Catholica. Is. Voss.

Sancti Barnabae Apostoli Epistola Catholica. Davis.

Sancti Barnabae Epistola Catholica. Hef.;

while Müller entirely omits any title. The words *epistola catholica* are taken from the subscription in

B, where they are introduced by a later hand, almost certainly on the authority of Origen ; no subscription is found in CFÖ. V. note on subscription.

### § I. Salutation and Introduction.

1. χαίρετε. Usual form of epistolary greeting. So in N. T. James i. 1. S. Paul invariably prefers the more distinctively Christian form, *χάρις ὑμῖν κ.τ.λ.* Rom. i. 7. Gal. i. 3. Eph. i. 2. Phil. i. 2 &c.

υἱοὶ καὶ θυγατέρες. Spiritually. So 1 Cor. iv. 14, and the tender *τέκνα* of Gal. iv. 19 and S. John's showing the intimate and affectionate relations of writer towards those addressed. Lat. seems to have found after *κυρίου* the words

## EPISTOLA BARNABAE.

- I. Havete, filii et filiae, in nomine domini nostri Iesu Christi, qui vos dilexit, in pace.
- 2 Magnarum et honestarum dei aequitatum abundantiam sciens esse in vobis, supra modum exhilarior beatiss et praeclaris spiritibus vestris, quod sic naturalem gratiam accepistis. propter quod plurimum gratulor mihi sperans liberari, quia vere video in vobis infusum spiri-

### I. 4 Exhilaror *al.*

ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, or the like, which Hilg. inserts in the text.

2. δικαιώματα. The word occurs thus eight times. Lat. transl. by aequitates (once aequitas). In every case a gen. (θεοῦ, κυρίου) is expressed or manifestly implied, and the meaning is 'the just requirements' of God, used as almost synonymous with ἐντολαί. Cf. Luke i. 6, and see Vaughan on Romans i. 32. Here Mül. would take it as 'just acts,' the fruit of Christian graces. Cf. Rev. xv. 4, xix. 8, but it is unnecessary thus to sever this from the other passages in Ep.

ὑπερεφραίνομαι. Volk. suspecting this compound would read ἐφραίνομαι; but cf. v. 8 note.

ἐμφυτον. So again ἐμφυτον δωρεάν τῆς διδαχῆς, ix. 9. 'Implanted' rather than 'inborn, natural.' Hence Lat. 'naturalem' is misleading. So Jas. i. 21, τὸν ἐμφυτον λόγον, 'the en-

grafted word.' The οὕτως before ἐμφυτον is restored from *sic* of the Lat., for the οὐ το of B.

3. ἀγάπης. Lat. by its *ab honesto fonte Dei* clearly read πηγῆς for ἀγάπης.

τοῦ πλουσίου. Neut. and equiv. to τοῦ πλούτου. Neut. adj. are often thus used in Ep., e.g. ἀγαθῶ, τὸ πονηρὸν in xx. 2. Many take τοῦ πλουσίου in agreement with κυρίου, but the ἀπὸ then becomes unnatural, particularly to any one familiar with our author's style.

κυρίου goes with ἀγάπης. Such is the regular collocation in this Ep.: an anarthrous κυρίου following the word on which it depends. κυρίον might be made dependent on πνεῦμα, and ἀγαπῆς on πλουσίου, but the usage of Ep. is against this. πνεῦμα κυρίου is the habitual order (cf. vi. 14, ix. 2, xiv. 9), nor does a gen. ever depend on an abstract neut. adjective.

- 4 ὑμῶν ἡ ἐπιποθήτη ὕψις ὑμῶν. πεπεισμένος οὖν τοῦτο καὶ  
 συνειδὼς ἐμαυτῷ—ὅτι ἐν ὑμῖν λαλήσας πολλὰ ἐπίσταμαι  
 ὅτι ἐμοὶ συνώδευσεν ἐν ὁδῷ δικαιοσύνης κύριος, καὶ πάντως  
 ἀναγκάζομαι καὶ γὰρ εἰς τοῦτο, ἀγαπᾶν ὑμᾶς ὑπὲρ τὴν ψυχὴν  
 μου ὅτι μεγάλη πίστις καὶ ἀγάπη ἐγκατοικεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν  
 5 ἐλπίδι ζωῆς αὐτοῦ—λογισάμενος οὖν τοῦτο, ὅτι ἐὰν μελήσῃ  
 μοι περὶ ὑμῶν τοῦ μέρους τι μεταδοῦναι ἀφ' οὗ ἔλαβον, ὅτι  
 ἔσται μοι τοιούτοις πνεύμασιν ὑπηρετήσαντι εἰς μισθόν,  
 ἐσπούδασα κατὰ μικρὸν ὑμῖν πέμπειν, ἵνα μετὰ τῆς πί-  
 6 στεως ὑμῶν τελείαν ἔχητε τὴν γνῶσιν. Τρία οὖν δόγματα  
 ἐστὶν κυρίου· ζωῆς ἐλπίς, ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος ἡμῶν καὶ δικαιο-  
 σύνη πίστεως ἀρχή, καὶ τέλος ἀγάπη, εὐφροσύνης καὶ  
 7 ἀγαλλιάσεως ἔργον ἐν δικαιοσύνης μαρτυρίᾳ. ἐγνώρισεν

4. *πεπεισμένος οὖν...* The style of this first chapter is curiously awkward and constrained. This passage is one of the most perplexing. Hilg. hopelessly confuses it, and Müller tampers with the text in addition. I have here ventured to change the punctuation of the text adopted in this edition. The true explanation seems to be that at the first *ὅτι* a parenthesis commences, which threatens to transform itself into a main sentence, and is continued down to *ζωῆς αὐτοῦ*. There however *λογισάμενος οὖν* resumes the main drift of the sentence, gathering up the initial words *πεπεισμένος οὖν τοῦτο καὶ συνειδὼς ἐμαυτῷ* and giving a new turn to the whole. The long parenthesis serves to give the ground of the confidence expressed in *πεπεισμένος* &c. V. Eng. transl. at end. *καὶ γὰρ*. Sc. the promptings of my own heart, no less than the conviction of the Lord's working with me, constrain me.

5. *ὅτι...ὅτι*. One of these is redundant.

*γνῶσιν*. The importance of this *γνῶσις*, as the complement of *πίστις*, is again and again insisted on in Ep., and forms almost the key-note

of the whole. It alone can teach the correct interpretation of Scripture, and bring home to the heart that esoteric teaching, which allegorizes and spiritualizes, and thereby Christianizes the forms and letter of the old dispensation. Cf. v. 3, 4, vi. 10, ix. 8, 9, &c. In its fuller and intellectual rather than spiritual development it becomes the Gnosticism of the early ages, to which however our Epistle is more antagonistic than akin. Dissert. pp. xv, xxxvi, xcvi.

*τελείαν*. 1 Cor. xiv. 20, *ταῖς φρεσὶ τέλει γένησθε*. Eph. iv. 13.

6. It is difficult to construct here a satisfactory text. After *κυρίου* N reads *ζωῆς πίστεως ἐλπίς ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος ἡμῶν καὶ δικαιοσύνη κρίσεως ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος ἀγάπη εὐφροσύνη καὶ ἀγαλλιάσεως ἔργον ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ μαρτυρία*. The initial words of our text (following Hilg.) reconstructs from the Latin, ignoring the sole Greek MS. Hilg. goes on to omit all the words after *ἡμῶν* as 'mera additamenta.' True the Lat. omits them, but in case of omissions the authority of Lat. is slight. The text by substituting *πίστεως* for *κρίσεως*, *εὐφροσύνης* for *εὐφροσύνη*, and *ἔργον* for *ἔργων*, and recognising in *δικαιοσύνῃς* the

4 tum ab honesto fonte dei. cum persuasum mihi sit hoc  
 et plenus sciam, quia dum ad vos adloquor multa mihi  
 bona successerunt in via aequitatis domini: ideo prorsus  
 et ego cogor diligere vos super animam meam, quia  
 magnitudo fidei et dilectio habitat in illo et spes vitae  
 5 illius. cogitans ergo hoc, quia si mihi curae fuerit ut  
 vobiscum partiar ex eo quod accepi, futurum mihi tali-  
 bus spiritibus servienti hoc in mercede, adpropiaui pauca  
 vobis mittere, ut fidem vestram consummatam habeatis  
 6 et scientiam. Tres sunt ergo constitutiones domini:  
 7 vitae spes, initium et consummatio. propalavit enim  
 dominus per prophetas quae praeterierunt, et futurorum  
 dedit nobis initia scire. sicut ergo locutus est, honestius

I. 3 Prorsus. *fors* cod.

common Itacism  $\alpha$ i for  $\eta$  gets a tolerable sense. Still the reconstruction is arbitrary, and the opening words especially are unsatisfactory.  $\tau\rho\iota\alpha$   $\delta\acute{o}\gamma\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$  is an expression which recurs in x. i. 9. 10 and cf. ix. 7. Some (e.g. Müller) have supposed that the author attached no definite meaning to the word  $\tau\rho\iota\alpha$ , but dwelt on it mystically; cf.  $\tau\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$   $\pi\alpha\acute{\iota}\delta\epsilon\varsigma$  in viii. 4. But this I believe to be unsound: v. x. 1 note. Hilg. explains the three  $\delta\acute{o}\gamma\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$  as  $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\pi\iota\varsigma$   $\zeta\omega\acute{\eta}\varsigma$ ,  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\acute{\eta}$  and  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ , and Heydecke accepting this explains  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\acute{\eta}$  (sc.  $\zeta\omega\acute{\eta}\varsigma$ ) to mean  $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ , and  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ ,  $\gamma\nu\omega\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ . The category is strangely incongruous, and the explanation far too forced and unnatural to be accepted as a reconstruction from the Lat., in defiance of MS. authority. As throughout closer to  $\aleph$  and in itself far more satisfactory I should propose to read— $\tau\rho\iota\alpha$   $\omicron\upsilon\upsilon$   $\delta\acute{o}\gamma\mu\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}$   $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$   $\kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon$   $\zeta\omega\acute{\eta}$   $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$   $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\pi\iota\varsigma$ ,  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\acute{\eta}$   $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$   $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$   $\eta\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$   $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$   $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta$   $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma$   $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\acute{\eta}$ ,  $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$   $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$   $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\alpha}\pi\eta$   $\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\phi\rho\omicron\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta$   $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$   $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\iota}\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma$   $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\omicron\nu$   $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$   $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta$   $\mu\alpha\rho\tau\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha$ . Transl. 'there are then three revelations of the Lord; life, faith and hope, our beginning and

I. 6 Quia si. *quasi* cod.

end—and righteousness is the beginning of faith, and the end thereof love, gladness and work of exultation in witness of righteousness.' This reading introduces no new departures from  $\aleph$ , but obviates two changes and one omission. It yields too, I believe, a more natural sense. The three  $\delta\acute{o}\gamma\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$  are (1) right life or conduct, so strenuously insisted on throughout Ep., (2) faith, (3) hope, which is the beginning and end of the Christian life. Faith is then parenthetically explained as an  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\epsilon\iota\alpha$  or active moral state, commencing with justice or righteousness, and culminating in an active charity or love that delights to bear witness to that righteousness.

Müller retains  $\aleph$  intact. His explanation of  $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta$  as 'justification' seems to me even more violent than Gebhardt's emendation  $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma$  for  $\kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ . In the latter part he sufficiently justifies  $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\alpha\iota\varsigma$  = 'righteous acts' from parallel uses in LXX., but the gens.  $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\iota}\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma$   $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\omicron\nu$  hang very awkwardly on  $\mu\alpha\rho\tau\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha$ , which itself seems hardly natural.

The passage remains at best un-

γὰρ ἡμῖν ὁ δεσπότης διὰ τῶν προφητῶν τὰ παρεληλυθότα  
καὶ τὰ ἐνεστώτα, καὶ τῶν μελλόντων δούς ἀπαρχὰς ἡμῖν  
γεύσεως. ὦν τὰ καθ' ἕκαστα βλέποντες ἐνεργούμενα, καθὼς  
ἐλάλησεν, ὁφείλομεν πλουσιώτερον καὶ ὑψηλότερον προσά-  
8 γειν τῷ βωμῷ αὐτοῦ. ἐγὼ δὲ οὐχ ὡς διδάσκαλος ἀλλ' ὡς  
εἰς ἐξ ἱμῶν ὑποδείξω ὀλίγα, δι' ὧν ἐν τοῖς παροῦσιν εὐ-  
φρανθήσεσθε.

II. Ἡμερῶν οὖν οὐσῶν ποιηρῶν καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἐνεργοῦν-  
τος ἔχοντος τὴν ἐξουσίαν, ὁφείλομεν ἑαυτοῖς προσέχειν καὶ  
2 ἐκζητεῖν τὰ δικαιώματα κυρίου. τῆς οὖν πίστεως ἡμῶν  
εἰσὶν βοηθοὶ φόβος καὶ ὑπομονή, τὰ δὲ συνμαχοῦντα ἡμῖν  
3 μακροθυμία καὶ ἐγκράτεια· τούτων μενόντων τὰ πρὸς κύ-  
ριον ἀγνῶς συνευφραίνονται αὐτοῖς σοφία, σύνεσις, ἐπι-  
4 στήμη, γνῶσις. πεφανέρωκεν γὰρ ἡμῖν διὰ πάντων τῶν  
προφητῶν ὅτι οὔτε θυσιῶν οὔτε ὀλοκαυτωμάτων οὔτε προσ-  
5 φωρῶν χρῆζει, λέγων ὅτε μὲν· Τί μοι πλῆθος τῶν θσιῶν

Is. i. 11-13. ἱμῶν; λέγει κύριος. πλήρης εἰμι ὀλοκαυτωμάτων, καὶ στέαρ

satisfactory, and probably must do so till new light is thrown on it by additional MS. authority. [Such there is every reason to hope will shortly be forthcoming. In the newly discovered MS. at Constantinople, from which the hitherto missing portion of the so-called second Ep. of Clement to the Corinthians has been brought to light, the Ep. of Barnabas is also found complete. This will in all probability prove an independent authority for the Greek Text, though it is impossible to estimate its value until the edition of Barnabas, which Bp. Bryennius the discoverer of the MS. promises shortly, is given to the world.] There is a curiously similar passage in Ignat. ad Eph. xiv. 1, which may prove to have somehow become mixed with the text.

δόγματα. First, that which seems true, 'opinions'; Lat. placita. Secondly, by a natural transition, 'ordinances,' authoritative decrees whether

of an individual or the state. Hence transl. in Lat. by the corresponding 'constitutiones.' We may see the change of meaning in the Epicurean 'δόγματα' (cf. the celebrated dying charge of Epicurus, τῶν δογμάτων μεμνησθαι), first 'the opinions,' then 'the authoritative utterances' or 'dogmas' of the master. The term (like λόγος) was so to say naturalised by the religious speculators of the Alexandrian school into the Christian vocabulary, and came to mean the authoritative ordinances delivered by inspiration from the Almighty (cf. further, Dissert. p. xxv). In this Ep. (cf. e.g. ix. 7) it is used of the higher teaching or revelations which a fuller γνῶσις supplies to the favoured few. It almost corresponds to the μυστήρια of the N. T. Gebhardt defines it as praecepta in quibus sensus aliquis gravis et arcanus inest.

ἀγάπη is commonly combined in Ep. with πίστις and ἐλπίς. So i. 4,

8 et altius accedere debemus ad aram illius. ego autem non tamquam doctor sed unus ex vobis demonstrabo pauca, per quae in plurimis laetiores sitis.

II. Cum sint ergo dies nequissimi et contrarius habeat huius saeculi potestatem, debemus adtendentes inquirere  
2 aequitates domini. fidei ergo nostrae adiutores timor et sustinentia, quae autem nobiscum pugnant, patientia est  
3 et continentia. haec cum apud dominum permanent  
4 casta, conlaetantur illis sapientia et intellectus. adaperuit enim nobis per omnes prophetas quia non utitur nostras neque hostias neque victimas neque oblationes,  
5 haec dicens: *Quo mihi multitudinem sacrificiorum vestrorum? dicit dominus. plenus sum holocaustomatibus* Is. i. 11-14.

l. 1 Debemus. Om. cod.

l. 6 Adiutores. adiutor est cod.

xi. 8. Cf. too iv. 8, where indeed Lat. *dilectio* seems to have read ἀγάπη for τοῦ ἡγαπημένου.

7. ὁ θεσπότης used again of God in iv. 3. So in N. T. but only as term of address. L. ii. 29, Acts iv. 24, Rev. vi. 10.

τὰ παρεληλυθότα. God is said to have revealed what is past by the mouth of the prophets, in the sense of having made clear by them the true significance and object of the old dispensation. This the major part of the Ep. is employed in unfolding. For a close parallel cf. v. 3.

γνώσεως. The Lat. from its *scire* clearly here read γνώσεως, which Hilg. somewhat uncritically adopts in text.

βωμῶ. A generally accepted correction supplied by *ad aram* of Lat. for the φόβω of N.

§ II. Here we enter on the main theme of the Epistle—viz. the abolition of the old ceremonial by virtue of the new covenant purchased by the sufferings and victory of Christ.

In this chapter the difference is pointed out between the Christian

and the Jewish sacrifices, which latter, it is shown from the prophets, have no value in God's eyes.

1. πονηρών. Ref. both to outward persecution and to moral depravity.

τοῦ ἐνεργούντος of Satan; and on the use of this verb cf. xix. 6 note, and cf. Eph. ii. 2. For similar refs. to Satan cf. ὁ πονηρὸς ἀρχὼν iv. 13—ὁ μέλας iv. 9, xx. 1—ὁ σατανᾶς xviii. 1, and in 2 ὁ ἀρχὼν καιροῦ τοῦ νῦν τῆς ἀνομίας, and cf. var. lect. ὁ ἀνομος in xv. 5.

προσέχειν καὶ N\*\*, προσέχοντες N\*. τὰ δικ. κυρίου, cf. i. 2.

κυρίου usually anarthrous throughout Ep.

2. This conception of the Christian virtues as aids to faith, which is elsewhere regarded as their source, is characteristic of our Ep.

καὶ ὑπομονή. Om. καὶ N, inserted from Lat.

3. τὰ πρὸς κύριον in things pertaining to the Lord—like τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν. Heb. ii. 17, v. 1.

αὐτοῖς, the same as τοῦτων, viz. φόβος, ὑπομονή, μακροθυμία, ἐγκράτεια.

ἀρνῶν καὶ αἶμα ταύρων καὶ τράγων οὐ βούλομαι, οὐδ' ἂν ἔρχησθε ὀφθῆναι μοι. τίς γάρ ἐξεζήτησεν ταῦτα ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν ὑμῶν; πατεῖν μοι τὴν ἀγλήν οὐ προσθήσεσθε· ἐπεὶ δέ· Ἐὰν φέρητε σεμίδαλιν, μάταιον θυμίαμα, βδέλγμᾳ μοι ἔστιν· τὰς νεομηνίας ὑμῶν καὶ τὰ κάββατα οὐκ ἀνέχομαι.

6 ταῦτα οὖν κατήργησεν, ἵνα ὁ καινὸς νόμος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἄνευ ζυγοῦ ἀνάγκης ὦν, μὴ ἀνθρωποποιήσῃ τοις ἔχοντες τὴν προσφοράν. λέγει δὲ πάλιν πρὸς αὐτούς·

Jer. vii. 22 sq. Μὴ ἐγὼ ἐνετειλάμην τοῖς πατέρεσσι ὑμῶν ἐκπορευομένοις ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου, προσενέγκαι μοι ὀλοκαυτώματα καὶ θυσίας;

8 ἀλλ' ἢ τοῦτο ἐνετειλάμην αὐτοῖς· Ἐκαστος ὑμῶν κατὰ τοῦ πλησίον ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ἑαυτοῦ κακίαν μὴ μνησικακεῖτω, καὶ

Zech. viii. 17. 9 ὅρκον περὶ αὐτῶν μὴ ἀγαπάτε. Αἰσθάνεσθαι οὖν ὀφείλομεν, μὴ ὄντες ἀσύνητοι, τὴν γνώμην τῆς ἀγαθωσύνης τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν· ὅτι ἡμῖν λέγει, θέλων ἡμᾶς μὴ ὁμοίως πλανωμένους

10 ἐκείνοις ζητεῖν πῶς προσάγωμεν αὐτῷ. ἡμῖν οὖν οὕτως

Ps. li. 17. λέγει· Θυσία τῷ θεῷ καρδία συντετριμμένη, ὁσμη εὐωδίας τῷ κυρίῳ καρδία δοξάζουσα τὸν πεπλακότα αὐτήν. ἀκριβεύεσθαι οὖν ὀφείλομεν, ἀδελφοί, περὶ τῆς σωτηρίας ἡμῶν, ἵνα μὴ ὁ πονηρὸς παρείσδυσιν πλάνης ποιήσας ἐν ἡμῖν ἐκσφενδονήσῃ ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τῆς ζωῆς ἡμῶν.

III. Λέγει οὖν πάλιν περὶ τούτων πρὸς αὐτούς. Ἰνατί

5. *σεμίδαλις*, the finest wheat flour. The orig. Hebrew *שֵׂמִידָה* is a general expression: so E. V. 'oblations'; but both in this passage and Lev. ix. 4, and Is. lxvi. 3, the LXX. turns it by *σεμίδαλιν*, as forming the principal element in the offering.

ὅτε δέ, an unnecessary emendation of text in place of οὐδέ of N.

6. ὁ καινὸς νόμος, note the striking expression.

Here only in Ep. we have Ἰησοῦς Χριστός. Χριστός alone appears (with ref. to O. T. quotations) only twice besides, viz. xii. 10, 11. Elsewhere always Ἰησοῦς.

7. Iren. Adv. Haer. iv. xvii. p. 248, commenting on same words says,

that the Israelites were led up out of Egypt, not that they might sacrifice, but that they might forget the idolatries of Egypt and be made ready to hear the words of the Lord. Thus the command was an injunction not so much to perform sacrificial rites as to obey and hearken to the will of God.

8. ἀλλ' ἢ 'but' or 'except,' again in xi. 7. The quotation is very inexact; indeed the first part is little more than a paraphrase.

9. ἐκείνοις, here as commonly of the Jews.

προσάγωμεν, v. i. 7 for similar intrans. use.

arietum et pinguaminibus agnorum, et sanguinem tauro-  
 rum et hircorum nolo, nec si veniat is videri mihi. quis  
 enim exquisivit haec de manibus vestris? calcare aulam  
 meam non adicietis. si attuleritis mihi similaginem, va-  
 num; supplicamentum exsecratio mihi est. numenias  
 vestras et sabbata et diem magnum non sustineo; ieiunium  
 6 et ferias et dies festos vestros odit anima mea. haec  
 ergo vacua fecit, ut nova lex domini nostri Iesu Christi,  
 quae sine iugo necessitatis est, humanam habeat obla-  
 7 tionem. dicit iterum dominus ad illos: Numquid ego Ier. vii. 22 sq.  
 praecepi parentibus vestris, cum exierunt de terra Aegypti,  
 8 ut offerrent mihi hostias et victimas? sed hoc praecepi  
 illis dicens: Unusquisque vestrum adversus proximum Zech. viii. 17.  
 suum non habeat malitiam, et iuramentum mendax non  
 9 amet. Intellegere ergo debemus, cum non simus sine  
 intellectu, consilium benignitatis patris nostri; quia  
 nobis dicit, nolens nos similiter errantes quaerere, quem-  
 10 admodum ad illum accedamus. nobis enim sic dicit:  
 Sacrificium domino cor contribulatum, et humiliatum deus Ps. li. 17.  
 non despicit. certius ergo inquirere debemus, fratres, de  
 salute nostra, ut ne nequam habeat introitum in nobis et  
 evertat nos a vita nostra.

III. Dicit ergo iterum de his ad illos: *Ut quid mihi* Is. lviii. 4 sq.

L. 14 Mendax. mendum cod.

L. 15 Amet. habet cod.

L. 21 Nequam. ne quando cod.

10. ὁσμή, κ.τ.λ. The preceding words are quoted from Ps. li. 17, but these do not occur in either Heb. or LXX. text. It is curious that Irenaeus, who does not otherwise appear to have known our Epistle, Adv. Haer. iv. xvii. 2, appends the same words to the same quotation, proving that both consulted a common source. 'Sacrificium Deo cor contribulatum; odor suavitatis Deo cor clarificans eum qui plasmavit.' The Lat. vers. here replaces the LXX. text.

ὁ πονηρὸς παρῆλθυσω, iv. 9 offers

a perfect parallel both in sense and expression. παρῆλθ. is used in both. For ὁ πονηρὸς the title chosen for the Evil One is ὁ μέλας, which might prps. be similarly explained in xx. 1, though there it seems neuter. For other appellations given to Σατανᾶς cf. v. 1. ὁ πονηρὸς recurs thus in xxi. 3, possibly xix. 11, and is similarly used in N. T., e.g. Matt. xiii. 19, 1 Joh. ii. 13, 14, v. 18, 19, and so prps. Matt. vi. 13.

§ III. Fast-days are done away, and true fasting consists in humbleness of heart and compassion.



- 1s. lviii. 4 sq. ΜΟΙ ΝΗΣΤΕΥΕΤΕ, ΛΕΓΕΙ ΚΥΡΙΟΣ, ὥς ΗΜΕΡΟΝ ΔΚΟΥΘΘΗΝΑΙ ἘΝ ΚΡΑΥΓῇ  
 ΤΗΝ ΦΩΝΗΝ ὙΜΩΝ; ΟΥ ΤΑΥΤΗΝ ΤΗΝ ΝΗΣΤΕΙΑΝ ἘΓΩ ἘΞΕΛΕΞΑΜΗΝ,  
 ΛΕΓΕΙ ΚΥΡΙΟΣ, ΟΥΚ ἈΝΘΡΩΠΟΝ ΤΑΠΕΙΝΟΨΝΤΑ ΤΗΝ ΨΥΧὴΝ ΑΥΤΟΥ,  
 2 ΟΥΔ' ἈΝ ΚΑΜΨΗΤΕ ὥς ΚΡΙΚΟΝ ΤὸΝ ΤΡΑΧΗΛΟΝ ὙΜΩΝ, καὶ ΣΑΚΚΟΝ  
 καὶ ΣΠΟΔὸν ὙΠΟΣΤΡΩΣΗΤΕ, ΟΥΔ' ΟΥΤΩΣ ΚΑΛΕΣΕΤΕ ΝΗΣΤΕΙΑΝ  
 3 ΔΕΚΤΗΝ. *πρὸς ἡμᾶς δὲ λέγει·* Ἰδοὺ ΑἴΤΗ ΝΗΣΤΕΙΑ ἦΝ ἘΓΩ  
 ἘΞΕΛΕΞΑΜΗΝ, ΛΕΓΕΙ ΚΥΡΙΟΣ, ΟΥΚ ἈΝΘΡΩΠΟΝ ΤΑΠΕΙΝΟΨΝΤΑ ΤΗΝ  
 ΨΥΧΗΝ ΑΥΤΟΥ· Ἀλλὰ ΛΥΕ ΠᾶΝ ΣΥΝΔΕΣΜΟΝ ἀΔΙΚΙΑΣ, ΔΙᾶΛΥΕ ΣΤΡΑΓ-  
 ΓΑΛΙΑΣ ΒΙΑΙΩΝ ΣΥΝΑΛΛΑΓΜΑΤΩΝ, ἀΠΟΪΣΤΕ ΤΕΘΡΑΥΣΜΕΝΟΥΣ ἘΝ  
 ἀΦῚΕΣΙ, καὶ Πᾶσαν ἀΔΙΚΟΝ ΣΥΝΓΡΑΦὴν ΔΙΑΪΠΑ. ΔΙΑΘΡΥΠΤΕ ΠΕΙ-  
 ΝΩΣΙΝ ΤὸΝ ἄΡΤΟΝ ΣΟΥ, καὶ ΓΥΜΝὸν Ἐὰν ἸΔῆς, ΠΕΡΙΒΑΛΕ' ἈΣΤΕ-  
 ΓΟΥΣ ΕἶΣΑΓΕ Εἰς ΤὸΝ ΟἶΚΟΝ ΣΟΥ, καὶ Ἐὰν ἸΔῆς ΤΑΠΕΙΝΟΝ, ΟΥΧ  
 ὙΠΕΡΟΨῃ ΑΥΤΟΝ, ΟΥΔὲ ἀπὸ ΤῶΝ ΟἰΚΕΙΩΝ ΤΟΥ ΣΠΕΡΜΑΤΟΣ ΣΟΥ.  
 4 ΤΟΤΕ ῤΑΓΗΣΕΤΑΙ ΠΡΩΪΜΟΝ Τὸ Φῶς ΣΟΥ, καὶ τὰ ἸΑΜΑΤΑ ΣΟΥ  
 ΤΑΧΕΩΣ ἀΝΑΤΕΛΕῖ, καὶ ΠΡΟΠΟΡΕΪΣΤΑΙ ἘΜΠΡΟΣΘΕΝ ΣΟΥ Ἡ ΔΙΚΑΙΟ-  
 5 ΣΥΝΗ, καὶ Ἡ ΔΟΞΑ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ ΠΕΡΙΣΤΕΛΕῖ ΣΕ. ΤΟΤΕ ΒΟΗΣΕΙΣ, καὶ ὁ  
 ΘΕὸς ἘΠΑΚΟΥΣΕΤΑΙ ΣΟΥ, ἔΤΙ ΛΑΛΟΨΗΤΟΣ ΣΟΥ ἙΡΕῖ· Ἰδοὺ ΠΑΡΕΙΜΙ  
 Ἐὰν ἀΦΕΛῆς ἀπὸ ΣΟΥ ΣΥΝΔΕΣΜΟΝ καὶ ΧΕΙΡΟΤΟΝΙΑΝ καὶ ῤῆΜΑ ΓΟΓ-  
 ΓΥΣΜΟΥ, καὶ Δῶς ΠΕΙΝΩΝΤΙ ΤὸΝ ἄΡΤΟΝ ΣΟΥ Ἐκ ΨΥΧῆς ΣΟΥ, καὶ  
 6 ΨΥΧὴν ΤΕΤΑΠΕΙΝΩΜΕΝΗΝ ἘΛΕΗΣῃς. *εἰς τοῦτο οὖν, ἀδελφοί, ὁ*  
*μακρόθυμος προβλέψας, ὡς ἐν ἀκραιοσύνῃ πιστεύσει ὁ*

1. The question of fasts, which forms the subject of this chapter, was one that gave rise to much controversy in the early Churches, the stricter party upholding the maintenance of the set Jewish fasts, and supporting their case by the example of Paul and Barnabas, as well as by the construction they put on Christ's injunctions, Matt. vi. 16, ix. 15, xvii. 21, while their opponents as here urged that the fixed fasts of the Jewish ritual were done away with the rest of the ceremonial law, and found their equivalent in the more spiritual exercises and discipline which the true Christian must substitute.

*αὐτοῖς*, sc. the Jews.

*ἰνατί.* A classical construction. Of the six instances of this usage in the N. T. three are as here quotations from the O. T.: always with a verb following.

*ὡς ἀκουσθῆναι τὴν φωνήν.* 'that your voice may be heard.' A Hebraism.

*ἐν κραυγῇ.* Om. *ἐν Ν.*

3. *πάν.* Hilg. corrects to *πάντα*; but it is better, considering the use of *δεσμός*, *σύνδεσμος*, to retain the neut.

*σύνδεσμον.* So Acts viii. 23 *σύνδεσμον ἀδικίας*, and a favourite word of S. Paul's of the 'bond' of peace (Eph. iv. 3), perfectness (Col. iii. 14), &c.

*στραγγαλίδ* means a tangled or knotted skein, a tightly-tied knot:

- ieiunatis, ut hodie audiat vox vestra in clamore? non tale ieiunium elegi, dicit dominus, ut quis humiliet animam*  
 2 *suam sine causa, neque si curvaveris quasi circulum col-  
 lum tuum et saccum te circumdederis et cinerem straveris:*  
 3 *nec sic celebrabis mihi ieiunium acceptum. ad nos autem  
 sic dicit: Cum ieiunaveritis, solve omnem nodum inius- Is.lviii.6—10.  
 titiae, et omnem consignationem iniquam dele, resolve suf-  
 focationes inpotentium commerciorum, dimitte quassatos  
 in remissionem, et omnem cautionem malignam dissipa.  
 frange esurienti panem tuum, et egenos sine tecto induc in  
 domum tuam; si videris nudum, vesti, et domesticos semi-  
 4 nis tui non despicias. tunc erumpet temporanum lumen  
 tuum, et vestimenta tua cito orientur. et praeibit ante te  
 5 iustitia, et claritas dei circumdabit te. tunc exclamas, et  
 deus exaudiet te; cum adhuc loqueris, dicit: Ecce adsum;  
 si abstuleris a te nodum et suadelam malorum et verbum  
 6 murmurationis, et dederis esurienti panem ex animo. in  
 hoc ergo, fratres, providens est et misericors deus, quia*

## I. 13 Oriuntur cod.

so 'to strangle' of that form of death; and Latin here translates by *suffocationes*.

*συναλλάγματα*, written contracts made in cases of sale, agreements: Lat. *consignationes*, sealed deeds of sale, &c.

*συγγραφή*, a merchant's bond or contract, much the same as *συνάλλαγμα*; the orig. Hebr. for both is the same.

*διάθρυπτε*, break in pieces or fragments—not unlike S. Paul's *ψαμίσω πάντα τὰ ὑπάρχοντά μου*. I Cor. xiii. 3.

4. *λάματα*, N reads *ιαματα*, evidently hesitating between reading of text and *λάττια*, which *vestimenta* of the Lat. clearly represents. Both variants are found in LXX. In quotations of the passage from Isaiah we find Aquila reading *λάματα*, but Just. Mart. and Lat. PP., e.g. Tert.

## I. 16 A te. ante te cod.

Ambr. Cyr. Aug. all read *vestimenta*. In either case, but even more with *λάττια* than *λάματα*, there is sad confusion of metaphor.

5. *χειροτονίαν*, a verbal translation of the Hebr. *נָשַׁף אֶת הַיָּד*, the stretching out of the finger; either, as is most prob., of pointing in token of scorn, or in way of direction to deceive. The Gk. word is never so used elsewhere.

*ἐλεήσεις*, N, the sole MS., has *ἐλαίσεις* by itacism for *ἐλεήσεις*, which Müller retains and no doubt rightly, careless as the grammar seems. Cf. notes on v. 6, xi. 11.

6. *ὁ μακρόθυμος*, sc. of course 'God,' which the Lat. actually supplies. These adjectival appellatives are characteristic of our author. Cf. *ὁ μέλας*, *ὁ πονηρός*, &c., and in this verse *ὁ ἡγαπημένος*.

λαὸς ὃν ἡτοίμασεν ἐν τῷ ἡγαπημένῳ αὐτοῦ, προεφάνέρωσεν ἡμῖν περὶ πάντων, ἵνα μὴ προσρησώμεθα ὡς ἐπήλυτοι τῷ ἐκείνων νόμῳ.

IV. Δεῖ οὖν ἡμᾶς περὶ τῶν ἐνεστώτων ἐπιπολὺν ἐραυνῶν-  
 τας ἐκζητεῖν τὰ δυνάμενα ἡμᾶς σῶζειν. φύγωμεν οὖν τελείως  
 ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων τῆς ἀνομίας, μήποτε καταλάβῃ  
 ἡμᾶς τὰ ἔργα τῆς ἀνομίας· καὶ μισήσωμεν τὴν πλάνην τοῦ  
 2 νῦν καιροῦ, ἵνα εἰς τὸν μέλλοντα ἀγαπηθῶμεν. μὴ δῶμεν  
 τῇ ἐαυτῶν ψυχῇ ἄνεσιν, ὥστε ἔχειν αὐτὴν ἐξουσίαν μετὰ  
 ἁμαρτωλῶν καὶ πονηρῶν συντρέχειν, μήποτε ὁμοιωθῶμεν  
 3 αὐτοῖς. Τὸ τέλειον σκάνδαλον ἡγγικεν, περὶ οὗ γέγραπται,  
 ὡς Ἐνὼχ λέγει. εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ὁ δεσπότης συντέτηκεν  
 τοὺς καιροὺς καὶ τὰς ἡμέρας, ἵνα ταχύνη ὁ ἡγαπημένος  
 4 αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν κληρονομίαν ἦξῃ. λέγει δὲ οὕτως καὶ ὁ  
 Dan. vii. 24. προφήτης· Βασιλεῖαι δέκα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς βασιλεύουσιν, καὶ ἐξα-  
 ναστήσεται ὀπισθεν αὐτῶν μικρὸς βασιλεῦς, ὃς ταπεινώσει  
 5 τρεῖς ἕφ' ἐν τῶν βασιλέων. ὁμοίως περὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ λέγει

λαὸς ὃν ἡτοίμασεν, phrase recurs  
 v. 7, xiv. 6.

προσρησώμεθα, Hilg., from Lat.  
*incurramus*, foists into the text a  
 tame and most improbable *προσερ-*  
*χώμεθα*.

ἐπήλυτοι. ἐπήλυτοι, Volk. Mül.  
 ἐπιλυτοί, N. ἐπιλύτῳ. Weiz. ἐπη-  
 λύται, Hilg. The Lat. interprets  
 rightly *proselyti*. Weiz. gives an  
 elaborate and very forced defence  
 of ἐπιλύτῳ, which in reality dif-  
 fers from the reading of N more  
 seriously than our text. The adj.  
 seems never to occur, though both  
 the verb and subst. are found in  
 N. T. and repeatedly in Herm. Past.  
 in sense of expounding, interpreting  
 parables or allegory. The form  
 ἐπήλυτοι is well supported. The  
 words form one among the abound-  
 ing evidences that Gentile Christians  
 formed at least a large part of the  
 body to whom the Epistle is address-  
 ed. Is it conceivable that a body of

Jewish Christians should be told  
 that the Scriptures were written to  
 prevent their being dashed ὡς ἐπή-  
 λυτοι like proselytes against *their*  
 (note the ἐκείνων) law?

§ IV. *Warning to hold fast in  
 these latter days; for, as prophecy  
 proves, the time is at hand. He only  
 that endures to the end shall be saved.*

1. ἐραυνῶντας. N keeps this form  
 Joh. v. 39, vii. 52, Rom. viii. 27,  
 1 Cor. ii. 10, 1 Pet. i. 10, 11.

ἐκζητεῖν, of earnest diligent seek-  
 ing with a view to find something.  
 ἐρευνᾶν, of careful thorough search-  
 ing examination of an object, e.g.  
 Joh. v. 39, 1 Cor. ii. 10. ἐκζητεῖν  
 is a common word in our Ep., and  
 recurs strikingly in xxi. 6.

τὴν πλάνην τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ. From  
 the habitual use of πλάνη, πλανᾶσθαι  
 in this Ep., we shall do right to  
 refer this, with Hefele, specially to  
 Judaizing, even if (cf. Dressel) it in-  
 cludes the godlessness and wicked-

in simplicitate crediturus esset populus quem comparavit dilecto suo: ante ostendit de omnibus nobis, ut non incurramus tamquam proselyti ad illorum legem.

IV. Oportet ergo nos de instantibus multum scrutantes scribere, quae nos possint sanare. fugiamus ergo ab omni opere iniquitatis, et odio habeamus errorem  
2 huius temporis, ut futuro diligamur. non demus animae nostrae spatium, ut possit habere potestatem discurrendi cum nequissimis et peccatoribus, ne quando similemus  
3 illis. Consummata enim temptatio, de qua scriptum est, sicut Daniel dicit, adpropinquavit. propter hoc enim dominus intercidit tempora et dies, ut adceleret dilectus  
4 illius ad hereditatem suam. dicit autem sic propheta: *Regna in terris decem regnabunt, et resurget retro pusillus* Dan. vii. 24.  
5 *rex, qui deponet tres in unum de regnis.* similiter de hoc

I. 2 De. Om. cod.

L. 12 Interdicit cod.

ness of the heathen world at large.

3. The apocalyptic teaching of our Ep. is as follows: These are the evil days (ii. 1, iv. 9), which precede the coming of the Lord (xvi. 5), for he is nigh to judge the earth (xxi. 3). The world will run its course of 6000 years from the beginning, 1000 years corresponding to each of the six days of creation; then will follow the millennium of rest, when sun, moon and stars shall be changed. The Son will reappear in majesty (vii. 9), uprooting evil (xii. 9), and making all things new (xv. 7), all living things being made subject unto Him (vi. 18).

ἦξει. Better ἦξει. Cf. v. 6 n.

Ἐνώχ. It is noticeable, as showing the character of the Lat. version, that it here substitutes Daniel for Enoch, partly from not recognising quotation, and partly from qualms about the recognition of so apocryphal a book (as that of Enoch) as an authority. The particular substitution of Daniel is not improbably due to some reflection, in the mind

of the translator, of the parallel passage in Matt. xxiv., in immediate connexion with which a similar passage of Daniel is quoted, cf. τὸ τέλειον σκάνδαλον with Matt. xxiv. 15. Some take the following, some (with more justice) the preceding words as the quotation: neither appear in the book of Enoch, so far as we know it through the surviving Aethiopic translation. On the book of Enoch v. Alford, Section v. of Prolegomena to Jude's Epistle.

συντέμνηκεν, κ.τ.λ. reminds us of Matt. xxiv. 22 with parallel Mk. xiii. 20, but the συντέμνηκεν for the ἐκολόβωσε of the Gospels proves that the passage was at any rate not prominently in the author's mind.

4. ὅφ' ἐν: the natural and obvious sense is 'under one.' It seems grammatically possible to take it of collecting 'into one,' or lastly, as meaning 'all at once.'

5. No passage in the Epistle has become more a *vexata quaestio* than this as to its interpretation, which

Dan. vii. 7 sq. Δανιήλ· Καὶ εἶδον τὸ τέταρτον θηρίον πονηρὸν καὶ ἰσχυρὸν καὶ χαλεπώτερον παρὰ πάντα τὰ θηρία τῆς γῆς, καὶ ὡς ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἀνέτειλεν δέκα κέρατα, καὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν μικρὸν κέρας παραφυᾶδιον, καὶ ὡς ἐταπείνωσεν ἕφ' ἐν τρία τῶν μεγάλων  
 6 κεράτων. *συνιέναι οὖν ὀφείλετε.* Ἔτι δὲ καὶ τοῦτο ἐρωτῶ ὑμᾶς ὡς εἰς ἐξ ὑμῶν ὢν, ἰδίως δὲ καὶ πάντας ἀγαπῶν ὑπὲρ τὴν ψυχὴν μου, προσέχειν νῦν ἑαυτοῖς καὶ μὴ ὁμοιοῦσθαί τισιν ἐπισωρεύοντας ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις ὑμῶν, λέγοντας ὅτι ἡ διαθήκη ἐκείνων καὶ ἡμῶν ἐστίν. ἡμῶν μὲν ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνοι οὕτως εἰς τέλος ἀπώλεσαν αὐτήν, λαβόντος ἤδη τοῦ Μωϋ-  
 7 σέως. λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή· Καὶ ἦν Μωϋσῆς ἐν τῷ ὄρει  
 Επ. xxxi. 18.  
 xxxiv. 28. ΝΗCΤΕΥΩΝ ἡμέρας τεσσαράκοντα καὶ νύκτας τεσσαράκοντα, καὶ ἔλαβεν τὴν διαθήκην ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, πλάκας λιθίνας γεγραμ-

becomes of the first importance in reference to the date of writing.

What is obvious is, that the author supposes ten kings to reign, with a *little* king at the end, apparently of a new order or dynasty, who shall humble, and succeed in producing unity out of the discords of three feeble predecessors.

That the βασιλεῖς are to be interpreted by the Roman Emperors is admitted on all hands. The questions arising are, Who is to be regarded as the first emperor? which of the emperors are to be counted? Is the one included in the ten (cf. ἐξ αὐτῶν in v. 5), or to be reckoned independently (δπισθεν αὐτῶν v. 4)? To these questions various answers have been given.

The Emperors are as follows. Jul. Caesar ob. 44 B.C., Augustus 29 B.C.—14 A.D., Tiberius 14—37 A.D., Caius 37—41 A.D., Claudius 41—54 A.D., Nero 54—68 A.D., Galba 68—69 A.D., Otho 69 A.D., Vitellius 69 A.D., Vespasian 69—79 A.D., Titus 79—81 A.D., Domitian 81—96 A.D., Nerva 96—98 A.D., Trajan 98—117 A.D., Hadrian 117—138 A.D., fifteen in all.

Volkmar begins (as is generally done) with Augustus, and omitting Vitellius as not usually reckoned by Alexandrines, makes Domitian close the ten: then follow Nerva, Trajan and Hadrian, *τρεις ὑφ' ἐν*, as forming one family by adoption, and after Hadrian (in whose time the Ep. was written) the little *κέρας παραφυᾶδιον* was to be looked for, possibly in the resurgent Nero. Plausible as the interpretation may seem, it cannot possibly be sound, for the *τρεις* are most distinctly included in the ten in v. 5, and the interpretation of the *τρεις ὑφ' ἐν* is very unsatisfactory.

Hilgenfeld, also commencing with Augustus and omitting Vitellius, makes Domitian the tenth, interprets the *τρεις ὑφ' ἐν* naturally as the three Flavians, and interprets the little horn to mean Nerva—supposing the Ep. to date from his time.

Weizsäcker, counting both Julius Caesar and Vitellius, makes Vespasian the tenth, regards Galba, Otho and Vitellius as the three who are humbled by Vespasian, who with ref. to his descent and as founder of a new dynasty is naturally called *μικρὸν παραφυᾶδιον κέρας*. The ἐξ

ipso dicit iterum Daniel: *Et vidi quartam bestiam, ne- quam et fortem et saeviore ceteris bestiis marinis. et apparuerunt illi decem cornua, et ascendit aliud cornu breve in medio illorum, et deiecit cornua tria de maioribus* 6 *cornibus.* intellegere ergo debemus. Adhuc et hoc rogo vos tamquam unus ex vobis, omnes amans super animam meam, ut adtendatis vobis et non similetis eis qui peccata sua congerunt et dicunt quia testamentum illorum et nostrum est. nostrum est autem, quia illi in 7 perpetuum perdidierunt illud, quod Moyses accepit. dicit enim scriptura: *Et fuit Moyses in monte ieiunans quadraginta diebus et quadraginta noctibus, et accepit testamentum a domino, tabulas lapideas scriptas manu dei,*

Dan. vii. 7 sq.

Ex. xxxi. 18.  
xxxiv. 28.

αὐτῶν of v. 5 justifies the little horn being *included* in the number of the ten, and indeed may be considered an evidence of some weight in favour of its truth; for ἐξ αὐτῶν, not being in Daniel, is the author's own interpretative commentary on the prophecy, and clearly a not undesignated one, for in the preceding verse he substitutes ἐξαναστήσεται δπισθεν αὐτῶν for Daniel's simple ὀπίσω αὐτῶν ἀναστήσεται. For further arguments in favour of this view, cf. Heydecke, Dissert. qua Barn. Ep. Interpolata demonstratur, p. 52 ff.

Of these theories Weizsäcker's seems as it stands least open to objection. The weakness of Hilgenfeld's lies in the interpretation of the little horn by Nerva, who was never a great potentate, humbling the preceding three. By a slight modification of the theory we may get rid of this difficulty: we may suppose the rise of the little horn to be imminent but not yet realised, waiting to be fulfilled either by the return of Nero or the rise of some other great Emperor, and thus date the epistle from some time in Domitian's reign. That it must belong either to that or Ves-

pasian's reign seems the legitimate inference from the text, while independent historical considerations (cf. xvi. 4 n.), and to some extent the text itself, are in favour of the latter of these two alternatives.

6. ἀγ. ὑπὲρ τὴν ψυχ. μου, for same expression cf. i. 4, xix. 5.

ἐπισωπείοντας. This absol. use is rare. We find after ἐπισωπείω (1) acc. of thing, (2) acc. of thing with dat. of pers., (3) acc. of person with dat. of thing. The idea here is that of making a heap with sins, and we may compare 2 Tim. iii. 6, γυναῖκες σεσωρευμένα ἁμαρτίαις, though by no means an exact parallel.

ἐκελῶν καὶ ἡμῶν ἐστίν. These words, which do not appear in **Σ**, are supplied by Edd. since Dressel from Lat. I cannot help thinking ἡμῶν καὶ ἐκελῶν ἐστίν is the true reading, for (1) it suits the context better, (2) it accounts readily for the omission of the words in **Σ**, the second ἡμῶν having attracted the eye of the copyist. This the received reading quite fails to do.

7. Μωϋσῆς. The MS. wavers between this the popular Hellenistic form, and the more classical orthography Μωϋσῆς.

- 8 ΜΕΝΑΣ Τῷ ΔΑΚΤΥΛῳ ΤΗΣ ΧΕΙΡὸς τοῦ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ. ἀλλὰ ἐπιστρα-  
φέντες ἐπὶ τὰ εἰδῶλα ἀπώλεσαν αὐτήν. λέγει γὰρ οὕτως  
 Fx., xxii. 7. κύριος· Μωϋσῆ Μωϋσῆ, κατὰβηθι τὸ τάχος, ὅτι ἠνόμησεν ὁ  
 Deut. ix. 12. λαός σου, οἷς ἐζήγαγες ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου. καὶ συνῆκεν Μωϋ-  
 Ελ. xxxii. 19. σῆς καὶ ἔριψεν τὰς δύο πλάκας ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν αὐτοῦ· καὶ  
 συνετρίβη αὐτῶν ἡ διαθήκη, ἵνα ἡ τοῦ ἡγαπημένου Ἰησοῦ  
 ἐνκατασφραγισθῇ εἰς τὴν καρδίαν ἡμῶν ἐν ἐλπίδι τῆς  
 9 πίστεως αὐτοῦ. Πολλὰ δὲ θέλων γράφειν, οὐχ ὡς διδά-  
 σκαλος ἀλλ' ὡς πρέπει ἀγαπῶντι ἀφ' ὧν ἔχομεν μὴ ἐλλι-  
 πεῖν, γράφειν ἐσπούδασα, περίψημα ὑμῶν. Διὸ προσέ-  
 χωμεν ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις. οὐδὲν γὰρ ὠφελήσει ὑμᾶς  
 ὁ πᾶς χρόνος τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν, ἐὰν μὴ νῦν ἐν τῷ ἀνόμῳ  
 καιρῷ καὶ τοῖς μέλλουσιν σκανδάλοις, ὡς πρέπει υἱοῖς θεοῦ,  
 10 ἀντιστῶμεν, ἵνα μὴ σχῇ παρείσδυσιν ὁ μέλας. φύγωμεν  
 ἀπὸ πάσης ματαιότητος, μισήσωμεν τελείως τὰ ἔργα τῆς  
 πονηρᾶς οδοῦ. μὴ καθ' ἑαυτοὺς ἐνδύνοντες μονάζετε ὡς ἡδη  
 δεδικαιωμένοι, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνερχόμενοι συνζητεῖτε  
 11 περὶ τοῦ κοινῇ συμφέροντος. λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή· Οὐαὶ οἱ  
 σῖνετοι ἐαγτοῖς καὶ ἐνώπιον ἐαγτῶν ἐπιστήμονες. Γενώμεθα  
 πνευματικοί, γενώμεθα ναὸς τέλειος τῷ θεῷ. ἐφ' ὅσον  
 ἐστὶν ἐν ἡμῖν, μελετῶμεν τὸν φόβον τοῦ θεοῦ, φυλάσσειν  
 ἀγωνιζώμεθα τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ, ἵνα ἐν τοῖς δικαίωμασιν  
 12 αὐτοῦ εὐφρανθῶμεν. Ὁ κύριος ἀπροσωπολήπτως κρινεῖ

8. Ἰησοῦ. The regular appella-  
 tion in this Ep., v. ii. 6 note.

ἐγκατασφραγισθῇ. This long com-  
 pound is prps. a *παῖς* λέγ. So too  
 ἐπικαθυπνώσωμεν in v. 13.

9. περίψημα ὑμῶν, sc. ἐγώ. So  
 S. Paul 1 Cor. iv. 13 speaks of him-  
 self as *περικαθάρματα τοῦ κόσμου*,  
*πάντων περίψημα*. Here the expres-  
 sion seems uncalled for, not to say  
 affected and unnatural. But we  
 learn from a passage of Dionysius  
 Alex. in Eus. H. E. vii. 22. 4, that  
 the word became almost a polite  
 epistolary commonplace in ecclesi-

astical writers, and so it would ap-  
 pear here and in Ign. ad Eph. viii.,  
 and cf. id. xviii. The expression is  
 repeated in vi. 5, which supports the  
 above view.

ἀνόμῳ καιρῷ: cf. the strictly pa-  
 rallel xviii. 2, and xv. 5 note.

παρείσδυσιν ὁ μέλας: cf. notes on  
 ii. 1, 10.

10. ἐνδύνοντες has sense of going  
 in privily; said of those who collect  
 together privately in small parties,  
 separating themselves from the main  
 body of worshippers, and so to say  
 forming a schism in the Church. Cf.

8 sed conversi in idola perdiderunt illud. dicit enim domi-  
 nus Moysi: *Moyses, descende celerius, quoniam praeteriit* Ex. xxxii. 7.  
Deut. ix. 12.  
Ex. xxxii. 9.  
*legem populus tuus; quem eduxisti de terra Aegypti.* et  
 proiecit Moyses tabulas lapideas de manibus suis, et  
 confractum est testamentum eorum, ut dilecti Iesu con-  
 9 signetur in praecordiis vestris in spem fidei illius. Prop-  
 ter quod attendamus novissimis diebus. nihil enim  
 proderit nobis omne tempus vitae nostrae et fidei, si non  
 modo inicum et futuras temptationes caveamus, sicut  
 10 decet filios dei. resistamus omni iniquitati et odio  
 habeamus eam. ergo considerate opera malae viae. non  
 separatim debetis seducere vos tamquam iustificati, sed  
 in unum convenientes inquirite quod communiter dilectis  
 11 conveniat et prosit. dicit enim scriptura: *Vae illis qui* Is. i. 21.  
*sibi soli intellegunt et apud se docti videntur.* Simus spi-  
 ritales, simus templum consummatum deo; in quantum  
 est in nobis, meditemur timorem dei et custodiamus  
 12 mandata illius. Dominus non accepta persona iudicat

l. 5 Dilecti. *dilectio* cod. and Edd.

l. 9 *Inicum* cod. iniquum Edd.

the warning against this in xix. 12.

μονάζειν we find used of the soli-  
 tary hermits, and the word in a  
 somewhat wider sense has obtained  
 a permanent existence in the form  
 monasterium. Schisms were already  
 threatening in S. Paul's day (cf. 1  
 Cor. i. 10, &c., also 2 Pet. ii. 1,  
 Apoc. ii. 15); and no doubt the ten-  
 dency increased, more particularly  
 among the Judaizing party, till it  
 culminated in the Ebionite secession.  
 In the present passage the ref. is  
 probably to them, though several  
 Edd. suppose that the Gnostics are  
 pointed at.

11. πνευματικοί, ναὸς τέλειος: cf.  
 xvi. 10.

μελ. τὸν φύβ. τοῦ θεοῦ, doubtless,  
 if we compare xi. 5, a ref. to Is.  
 xxxiii. 18. For μελετᾷν v. xix.  
 10 n.

12. ἀπροσωπολήπτως κρινεῖ reads  
 almost like a quotation from 1 Pet.  
 i. 17: indeed there are several re-  
 markable parallels in expression  
 with this ep.: cf. v. 1 ἵνα τῇ ἀφέσει  
 τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἀγνισθῶμεν, ὃ ἐστίν  
 ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ θαντίσματος  
 αὐτοῦ, with 1 Pet. i. 2, ἐν ἀγιασ-  
 μῷ πνεύματος, εἰς ὑπακοὴν καὶ θαν-  
 τισμὸν αἵματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ; while  
 the next verse introduces a quotation  
 used also in 1 Pet. ii. 24. Again,  
 vi. 2 quotes from Is. xxviii. 16 the  
 same verse as does 1 Pet. ii. 6, and  
 vi. 4 follows the quotation with a  
 second from Ps. cxviii., which S.  
 Peter also introduces in the succeed-  
 ing verse of his Epistle. This coin-  
 cidence becomes more striking when  
 we find S. Peter's οἶκος πνευματικός  
 of v. 5 reproduced in πνευματικός  
 ναὸς xvi. 10. Throughout the Epi-



τὸν κόσμον. ἕκαστος καθὼς ἐποίησεν κομιεῖται. ἐὰν ᾗ ἀγαθός, ἡ δικαιοσύνη αὐτοῦ προηγήσεται αὐτοῦ· ἐὰν ᾗ  
 13 πονηρός, ὁ μισθὸς τῆς πονηρίας ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ· ἵνα μήποτε ἐπαναπαυόμενοι ὡς κλητοὶ ἐπικαθυπνώσωμεν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἡμῶν, καὶ ὁ πονηρὸς ἄρχων λαβὼν τὴν καθ' ἡμῶν ἐξουσίαν ὑπώσῃται ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ  
 14 κυρίου. Ἔτι δὲ καὶ κεῖνο, ἀδελφοί μου, νοεῖτε· ὅταν βλέπετε μετὰ τηλικαῦτα σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα τὰ γεγονότα ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ οὕτως ἐνκαταλείφθαι αὐτοὺς· προσέχωμεν  
 Mt. xxii. 14. μήποτε, ὡς γέγραπται, πολλοὶ κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοὶ εὐρεθῶμεν.

V. Εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ὑπέμεινεν ὁ κύριος παραδοῦναι τὴν σάρκα εἰς καταφθοράν, ἵνα τῇ ἀφέσει τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἀγνισθῶ-  
 2 μεν, ὃ ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ θαντίσματος αὐτοῦ. γέγραπται γὰρ περὶ αὐτοῦ ἃ μὲν πρὸς τὸν Ἰσραὴλ, ἃ δὲ πρὸς ἡμᾶς.  
 Is. liii. 5, 7. λέγει δὲ οὕτως· Ἐτραυματίσθη διὰ τὰς ἀνομίας ἡμῶν καὶ μεμαλάκισται διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν, τῷ μῶλωπι αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς ἴαθμεν. ὡς πρόβατον ἐπὶ σφαγὴν ἤχθη καὶ ὡς ἄμνος  
 3 ἄφρωνος ἐναντίον τοῦ κείραντος αὐτόν. Οὐκοῦν ὑπερευχα-

stle we may trace constant minor resemblances of thought and language to 1 Pet., though the evidence of familiarity with that Ep. is not convincing.

ἡ δὲ κ. τ. λ., a reminiscence of Is. lviii. 8, quoted in iii. 4.

13. ἵνα. The Edd., following the Lat., needlessly insert a προσέχωμεν before ἵνα. In text the ἵνα is not, as Müller says, left suspended in air, but depends on the foregoing sentence. The Lord will judge every man according to his works, in order that, with the prospect of judgment before our eyes, we may not fall asleep in our sins, and forfeit our inheritance in the kingdom.

ὁ πονηρὸς ἄρχων, cf. note on ii. 1.

14. Before νοεῖτε K, prob. by a mere slip, inserts ὅταν, which is cor-

rected by both first and second hand. Take νοεῖτε as imper., and ὅταν βλέπετε. κ. τ. λ., exexegetic of καὶ κεῖνο.

βλέπετε. βλέπεται K, by common itacism for βλέπετε. For ὅταν with ind., but there fut. ind., cf. xv. 5; v. note on xi. 11.

σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα. The main reference is to the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus.

ὡς γέγραπται. The words quoted agree identically with Mat. xx. 16, or xxii. 14. The ὡς γέγραπται is observable, as thereby S. Matthew's Gospel is quoted at this early epoch with the authority of Scripture. Until the finding of N De Wette, Dressel, al. maintained that the *sicut scriptum est* was an interpolation of the Lat. translator. We may note, however, that the book of Enoch is

mundum. unusquisque secundum quae fecit accipiet: si fuerit bonus, bonitas eum antecedit, si nequam, merces  
 13 nequitiae eum sequitur. attendite, ne quando quiescentes iam vocati addormiamus in peccatis nostris, et nequam accipiens potestatem nostram suscitet et ex-  
 14 cludat a regno domini. Adhuc et illud intellegite: cum videritis tanta signa et monstra in populo Iudaeorum, et sic illos derelinquit dominus: attendamus ergo ne forte, sicut scriptum est, *multi vocati, pauci electi* inveni- Mt. xxii. 14.  
 amur.

V. Propter hoc dominus sustinuit tradere corpus suum in exterminium, ut remissione peccatorum sanctificemur,  
 2 quod est sparsione sanguinis illius. scriptum est enim de illo, quaedam ad populum Iudaeorum, quaedam ad nos. dicit autem sic: *Vulneratus est propter iniquitates* Is. liii. 5, 7.  
*nostras et vexatus est propter peccata nostra; sanguine illius sanati sumus. tamquam ovis ad victimam adductus est, et sicut agnus coram tondente se, sic non aperuit os*  
 3 *suum.* Supergratulari ergo debemus domino, quia et

L. I Fecit. facit cod.

cited with similar formula. In v. 9 too there is in all probability a direct reference to Matt. ix. 13, and also in vi. 13 to Matt. xx. 16. Ch. v. 12 offers another possible reminiscence of S. Matthew, and Tisch. would further refer xii. 10 to Matt. xxii. 43: cf. also notes on vii. 8, 9. Some Comm., impugning so early a recognition of S. Matthew's Gospel, have uncritically maintained that the reference is to 4 Ezra viii. 3, which runs in the Lat. *multi creati sunt, pauci autem salvabuntur*, or to the still more dissimilar 4 Ez. ix. 15. For a full discussion of passage on this side v. Sup. Religion I. 236 pp. Weizs. with more probability supposes the words to be a common proverbial saying, introduced independently in S. Matt. and

our Epistle. Assuming that the passages quoted here prove some acquaintance with S. Matthew's Gospel, we cannot determine whether or how far that Gospel bore the precise form in which we now have it. Cf. Westcott on Canon of the New Test. ch. i. § ii. esp. pp. 61, 62, and see Dissert. IV. § ii.

§ V. *The Incarnation, Sufferings and Crucifixion of Christ, as foretold by the prophets, were a necessary and voluntary atonement for our sins.*

1. The words remind us of Ps. xvi. 10, but *διαθορὰν* is there the LXX. word.

*ἀλατὶ τοῦ ἵαντ.*, cf. 1 Pet. i. 2 and v. note on iv. 12.

2. *μῶλωψ*, properly the weal or bloodmark caused by a stripe.

ριστεῖν ὁφείλομεν τῷ κυρίῳ, ὅτι καὶ τὰ παρεληλυθότα ἡμῖν ἐγνώρισεν, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐνεστώσιν ἡμᾶς ἐσόφισεν, καὶ εἰς

4 τὰ μέλλοντα οὐκ ἐσμὲν ἀσύνετοι. λέγει δὲ ἡ γραφή· Οὐκ  
Prov. i. 17. ἀδίκως ἐκτείνεται δίκτυα πτερωτοῖς. τοῦτο λέγει ὅτι δικαίως

ἀπολεῖται ἄνθρωπος, ὃς ἔχων ὁδοῦ δικαιοσύνης γινώσιν,  
5 ἑαυτὸν εἰς ὁδὸν σκότους ἀποσυνέχει. Ἔτι δὲ καὶ τοῦτο,

ἀδελφοί μου· εἰ ὁ κύριος ὑπέμεινεν παθεῖν περὶ τῆς ψυχῆς  
ἡμῶν, ὃν παντὸς τοῦ κόσμου κύριος, ᾧ εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς ἀπὸ

Gen. i. 26. καταβολῆς κόσμου· Ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα καὶ

καθ' ὁμοίωσιν ἡμετέραν· πῶς οὖν ὑπέμεινεν ὑπὸ χειρὸς ἁν-

6 θρώπων παθεῖν; μάθετε. Οἱ προφῆται, ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἔχοντες

τὴν χάριν, εἰς αὐτὸν ἐπροφήτευσαν. αὐτὸς δὲ ἵνα καταρ-

γήσῃ τὸν θάνατον καὶ τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν δείξῃ, ὅτι

3. τὰ παρεληλυθότα κ.τ.λ., cf. i. 7 n.

4. οὐκ ἀδίκως. The E. V. transl. the Heb. more truly, 'surely in vain the net is spread in the sight of any bird.' Menard would take the words as a question, 'Is the net spread in vain?' which brings us to a sense nearer that of the LXX.

ἀποσυνέχει, not found elsewhere.

The verse is a warning to the readers not to be caught like birds in the snares of Judaizing teachers.

5. ἀπὸ καταβ. κόσμου. The pre-mundane existence of the Son is asserted similarly in the book of Enoch, while the identification of the Son with the Father is very marked in the Test. of the Twelve Patriarchs. Cf. too John i. 1—4.

ποιήσωμεν. The plur. has been variously interpreted. (1) By Christian orthodoxy, as a forecast of the Trinity; (2) as a plural of majesty; (3) as a deliberative plural; (4) as a trace of a preexistent polytheism among Israelites. Here it is referred to the Father and Son alone. So again vi. 12, and so often among the Fathers. The dogma of the Trinity was as yet

not matured, and is not explicitly, if implicitly (cf. xvi. 9 and Dissert. c. vi.), recognized in this Ep.

Some editors, as Müller, destroy the mark of interrogation at παθεῖν.

6. ἀπ' αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ. Cf. 1 Pet. i. 10, 11.

αὐτός κ.τ.λ. Death could be abolished only by virtue of the resurrection of Christ from the dead, and for this end it was needful that He should be manifested in the flesh, and suffer and die. Here and throughout much of this chapter our author has in his mind the Docetics, and their subversion of the cardinal doctrine of the Resurrection by their dualistic theories.

καταργήσῃ, δείξῃ. So the Edd. generally, in preference to καταργήσει, δείξει, the reading of B. This raises a point, which merits a somewhat full discussion, as it has not been noticed by previous commentators. There are a number of passages in the Ep., in which MS. authority shows a fut. ind. after ἵνα in place of a subj. They depend mainly on the interchange of an -ει and -η and in every case the Edd.

praeterita nobis ostendit et sapientes fecit, et de futuris  
 4 non sumus sine intellectu. dicit autem: *Non iniuste* Prov. i. 17.  
*tenduntur retia avibus.* hoc dicit quia iuste periet homo  
 habens viae veritatis scientiam, et se a via tenebrosa non  
 5 continet. Adhuc et ad hoc dominus sustinuit pati pro  
 anima nostra, cum sit orbis terrarum dominus, cui dixit  
 deus ante constitutionem saeculi: *Faciamus hominem ad* Gen. i. 26.  
*imaginem et similitudinem nostram.* quomodo ergo sus-  
 6 tinuit, cum ab hominibus hoc pateretur? discite. Pro-  
 phetae ab ipso habentes donum in illum prophetaverunt.  
 ille autem, ut vacuam faceret mortem et de mortuis  
 resurrectionem ostenderet, quia in carne oportebat eum

l. 4 Viae. *viam* cod. and most Edd. l. 7 Deus. *diē* cod.

assume that the -ei has arisen by simple itacism from -η. The more conspicuous instances are as follows. In each case I give the MS. authority in full, premising that in c. i.—v. 6 N is our sole authority, and that in the remainder of the Ep. N or N\*\* may be regarded as a weightier authority than even a complete consensus of the other MSS., which are all derived from the same copy, O and V being the most accurate. In every instance the Edd. adopt the subjunctive.

iv. 3. *ἡξει* N.

v. 6. *καταργήσει* N. *δείξει* N.

v. 7. *επιδείξει* NBFOV. *επει-  
δείξει* C.

vi. 18. *κυριενσει* N. *κυριενση* BCFOV.

vii. 2. *ζωοποιήσει* N (i for ei is habitual in N, i for η quite exceptional; instances of each occur in the proportion of about 30 to 1). *ζωοποιήσει* V. *ζωοποιηση* BCFO.

vii. 5. *δείξη* NBCFO. *δείξει* V.

xii. 2. *υπομνησει* N. *υπομνηση* BCFOV.

xii. 6. *δείξει* N. *δείξη* BCov.

As analogous cases we may quote After *ὁς ἄν* xi. 11, *ἀκουση* NBC.

*ἀκουσει* OV—*πίστευσει* NBCOV, with other instances referred to in the note on that passage.

Now here we have a series of instances, where the use of the fut. after *ὅτι* is supported by all or the most respectable portion of the MSS. Such evidence of course becomes specially strong in cases like the present, where the motive for correction is so obvious. Can we then fairly account for these instances by itacism, to which the Edd. have without a misgiving attributed them? Of the other MSS. I cannot speak, but N I have examined carefully with a view to this special point. From a collation of the first five chapters, I gather the following statistics as to itacism. i for ei is extraordinarily common, ei for i far less so but by no means rare. ai for e and e for ai occur frequently and about an equal number of times. i for η is quite exceptional, η for ai still more so, and of the converse of either I find no instance. e and η are not interchanged, and the interchange of e and ei in *εἶπεν* for *επει* in vi. 3 is apparently a mere slip. Of the inter-

- 7 ἐν σαρκὶ ἔδει αὐτὸν φανερωθῆναι, ὑπέμεινεν, ἵνα καὶ τοῖς  
πατράσιν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν ἀποδῶ καὶ αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ τὸν λαὸν  
τὸν καινὸν ἐτοιμάζων ἐπιδείξῃ, ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ὧν, ὅτι τὴν  
8 ἀνάστασιν αὐτὸς ποιήσας κρινεῖ. πέρας γέ τοι διδάσκων  
τὸν Ἰσραὴλ καὶ τηλικαῦτα τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα ποιῶν  
9 ἐκήρυσσεν, καὶ ὑπερηγάπησεν αὐτόν. ὅτε δὲ τοὺς ἰδίους  
ἀποστόλους τοὺς μέλλοντας κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον αὐτοῦ  
ἐξελέξατο, ὄντας ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν ἁμαρτίαν ἀνομωτέρους, ἵνα  
Mt. ix. 13. δείξῃ ὅτι οὐκ ἦλθεν καλέσαι δικαίους ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλοῦς, τότε  
10 ἐφάνέρωσεν ἑαυτὸν εἶναι υἱὸν θεοῦ. εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἦλθεν ἐν  
σαρκί, πῶς ἂν ἐσώθησαν οἱ ἄνθρωποι βλέποντες αὐτόν,  
ὅτε τὸν μέλλοντα μὴ εἶναι ἥλιον, ἔργον τῶν χειρῶν αὐτοῦ  
ὑπάρχοντα, ἐμβλέποντες οὐκ ἰσχύουσιν εἰς τὰς ἀκτίας  
11 αὐτοῦ ἀνοφθαλμῆσαι; Οὐκοῦν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς τοῦτο  
ἐν σαρκὶ ἦλθεν, ἵνα τὸ τέλειον τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἀνακεφαλαι-  
12 ὴσῃ τοῖς διώξασιν ἐν θανάτῳ τοὺς προφῆτας αὐτοῦ. οὐκ-

change of η and ει there is not a single instance in the first five chapters. The only such instance I have noticed in the body of the Ep. (the particular class of cases discussed in this note being of course excepted) is a confused ἀφειρημένοι for ἀφρημένοι in xi. 3, which can hardly be a case of simple itacism. (σκληρυνεῖτε in ix. 5, κολληθήσεται in x. 8, no less than the numerous divergences between fut. and aor. subj. after οὐ μὴ in c. xix., must fairly be regarded as various readings.) These statistics, I take it, conclusively demonstrate that the constr. of ἵνα with the fut. should be admitted into the text, and that editors err in amending throughout. For the constr. cf. Winer § 41, p. 304. We need have less hesitation in admitting the occurrence, when we not only find a fut. ind. following ἐάν, ὅταν and ὅς ἂν, but actually a pres. ind. after ἵνα on the authority of the best MS. in vi. 5 (and cf. vii. 11).

ἐν σαρκί. Emphatic. So v. 11, which compare.

7. The large lacuna which in all the second class of MSS. has deprived us of the first four and a half chapters of the Epistle, ends with αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ.

αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ. So in xiv. 6 agreeably with Luke i. 17, while in iii. 6 it is the Father prepares a people for His Beloved.

ἐπιδείξῃ. Read ἐπιδείξει, v. 6 note.

αὐτὸς ποιήσας. The ordinary N.T. conception is that of Christ being raised by the power of the Father; that here expressed, viz. of Christ raising Himself by His own power, hardly occurs in the N.T., but cf. John x. 18. The question came prominently forward in the second century, and some of the heresiarchs insisted strongly on the latter of these views as correct.

Some make τὴν ἀνάστασιν refer to the general resurrection of the dead, rather than Christ's own resurrec-

- 7 adparere, sustinuit, ut promissum parentibus redderet.  
 et ipse sibi populum parans resurrectione facta in terris  
 8 iudicabit illos, ad finem docens populum Iudaeorum et  
 magna signa et monstra faciens; non crediderunt nec  
 9 dilexerunt illum. tunc apostolos suos, qui incipiebant  
 praedicare evangelium suum, elegit, qui erant super  
 omne peccatum peccatores, ut ostenderet quia *non venit* Mt. ix. 13,  
*vocare iustos sed peccatores*: tunc ostendit se esse filium  
 10 dei. si enim non venisset in carne, quomodo possent  
 homines sanari, cum respicientes solem, qui est opus  
 11 manus dei, non possint radios eius diutius intueri? Fi-  
 lius ergo dei ideo in carne venit, ut consummationem  
 peccatorum definiret eis qui persecuti sunt ad mortem  
 12 prophetas illius. dicit autem Esaias: *Plaga corporis* Is. liii. 5.

l. 3 Illos. *illis* cod. *ille* Cot. *ipse* Hilg.

Ad finem docens. *ad vitam ducens* cod.

tion, but the phrase would be rather strange thus used.

8. πέρας γέ τοι. Yes and further—a very favourite combination in Ep. Cf. λ. 2, xii. 6, xv. 6, 8, xvi. 3.

ὑπερηγάπησεν. υπερηγαπησαν N. Hilg. here from the Lat. *non crediderunt nec dilexerunt* reads οὐπερ ἡγάπησαν, but (apart from the want of good authority and the objectionable οὐπερ), the writer is here dwelling on the work and mission of Christ, not on His reception by the Jews. For these compounds in ὑπερ—our author has a special predilection. Cf. ὑπερευφραίνομαι i. 2, ὑπερευχαριστεῖν v. 3.

9. ὑπὲρ πᾶς. αὐ. ἀνομιτέρους. Origen (contra Cels. i. 62, 63) supposes Celsus to have based his attack on this passage, when he speaks of Jesus choosing out ten or eleven infamous scoundrels (ἐπιβή-τους ἀνθρώπους...καὶ...ναύτας πονηροτάτους) for his disciples. Jerome (adv. Pel. iii. § 2) attributes the words, doubtless by a slip of memory, to Ignatius. The passage is remarkable and may fairly be re-

garded as one of the decisive proofs against the authorship of Barnabas. The argument is that Christ, to prove His love for sinners and His mission to sinners, chose out sinners as His own apostles to preach the Gospel. We must read too this rhetorical exaggeration by the light of viii. 3, not by that of the malignity of Celsus.

ὅτι οὐκ ἦλθεν—a quotation almost beyond doubt from Matt. ix. 13. Cf. iv. 14, note. Here, as in the parallel passage in S. Matthew, εἰς μετάνοιαν has been inserted by the inferior group of MSS. after ἀμαρτώλους. N. omits the words.

υἱὸν θεοῦ. So again v. 11, and six or more times besides in the Epistle. υἱὸς θεοῦ iv. 9 is used of those whom he addresses.

11. Exactly the same thought, though differently expressed, is found in Matt. xxiii. 32, though there from the nature of the case the death of the Messiah is not distinctly brought forward as the crowning completion of the sum of their fathers' sins. Cf. too xiv. 5.

οὖν εἰς τοῦτο ἰπέμεινεν. λέγει γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τὴν πληγὴν τῆς

Zech. xiii. 7. σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ ὅτι ἐξ αὐτῶν. Ὅταν πατάζωσιν τὸν ποιμένα

13 ἐαγτῶν, τότε ἀπολείται τὰ πρόβατα τῆς ποιμνῆς. αὐτὸς δὲ ἠθέλησεν οὕτως παθεῖν. ἔδει γὰρ ἵνα ἐπὶ ξύλου πάθῃ.

Ps. cxii. 20. λέγει γὰρ ὁ προφητεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ. Φεῖσάι μοι τῆς ψυχῆς  
cxix. 120.  
xxii. 16. ἀπὸ ῥομφαίας, καὶ. Καθήλωσόν μοι τὰς σάρκας, ὅτι πονη-

14 ρεγομένων σὺναγωγῇ ἐπανέστησάν μοι. καὶ πάλιν λέγει.

Is. i. 6 sq. Ἰδοὺ τέθεικά μοι τὸν κῶτον εἰς μάστιγας καὶ τὰς σιαγῶνας  
μοι εἰς ῥαπίσματα, τὸ δὲ πρόσωπόν μοι ἔθηκαν ὡς στερεὰν  
πέτραν.

Is. i. 8 sq. VI. Ὅτε οὖν ἐποίησεν τὴν ἐντολὴν, τί λέγει; Τίς ὁ κρινό-  
μενός μοι; ἀνιστήτω μοι ἢ τίς ὁ δικαζόμενός μοι; ἐγγι-  
2 σάτω τῷ παιδί κυρίου. οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, ὅτι πάντες ὑμεῖς παλαιω-

διώξασιν τοὺς προφ. Matt. xxiii.  
34 and parallel Luke xi. 47 *vv.*

12. τὴν πληγὴν τῆς σαρκός. The Lat. refers these words to Is. liii. 4, 5, but the resemblance is slight, until altered and enlarged by Lat. into a literal quotation. Cf. however vii. 2 n. Zech. xiii. 6, 7 Müller believes is the passage referred to, but more because the following words refer thither, than from any very close resemblance.

πατάζωσιν τὸν ποιμένα. Zech. xiii. 7 is the passage referred to, but the quotation is so inexact, and at the same time so strikingly in accord with the rendering of that prophecy by Matt. xxvi. 31, Mark xiv. 27, that either our author again quotes from S. Matthew as *supr. v. 9*, or else both consulted a common source. Between these two explanations it may be difficult to decide, but there is no independent evidence for a various reading here in the LXX.

ἀπολείται. τότε ἀπολείπεται. N. τότε σκορπισθήσεται καὶ ἀπολείται. N\*\*. *scorpius* *scorpius* cet. MSS., and so the Lat. *dispergentur*. Still Gebhardt is prps. right in rejecting this strong MSS. evidence, as the word may

have been introduced from the parallel passage in Gospels or supposed variant in LXX.

13. ἔδει ἵνα. Constr. seems not to occur in N.T. or LXX. In N. T. we have ἵνα used after θέλει, θέλημα *est* *in* habitually. More like this is the use after συμφέρι (Matt. Joh.), λυσιτελεῖ (Luke), ἀρκεῖν (Joh. Matt.), ἀξιος (Joh.), ἱκανός (Matt. Luke), but a still closer parallel will be found in the οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχω ἵνα... of Joh. ii. 25, xvi. 30; 1 Joh. ii. 27 (Heb. x. 36 is different).

For ξύλον of the cross, cf. viii. 5, xii. 1, both times in connexion with O.T. prophecy. The κρεμάσαι ἐπὶ ξύλου (cf. Acts v. 30, x. 39; Gal. iii. 13) was a legal term derived from Deut. xxi. 23.

ῥομφαίας. The emphasis here is on this word, the author taking this passage as an intimation that the death of Christ would be by the cross not the sword. The word is used of the large broad Thracian sword; later of the carved Persian scimitar. It is specially a LXX. word, which we find also in the song of Simeon and repeatedly in the Apocalypse.

- illius omnes sanati sumus, et alius propheta: Feriam* Zech. xiii. 7.  
 13 *pastorem, et dispargentur oves gregis. ipse autem voluit*  
*sic pati. dicit enim qui prophetat de illo: Parce ani-* Ps. xxii. 20.  
*mae meae a gladio, et: Confige clavis carnes meas, quia* cxix. 120.  
 14 *nequissimorum conventus insurrexerunt in me. et iterum* Is. i. 6 sq.  
*dicit: Ecce posui dorsum meum ad flagella et maxillas*  
*meas ad palmas, faciem autem meam posui tamquam*  
*solidam petram.*

VI. Cum autem fecit dei praeceptum, quid dicit? *Quis* Is. i. 8 sq.  
*est qui contradicit? resistat mihi. quis aequalis futurus*  
 2 *est mihi? propinquet puero dei. vae vobis, quia vos omnes*

l. 5 *Insurrexit* cod.

καθήλωση. In the original passage the use of the word is purely metaphorical. The Hebrew has כִּסְמַר כִּפְתָּהָךְ בְּיָשָׁרִי: in the E. V. 'My flesh trembleth for fear of thee.' Ps. cxix. 120.

σιαγῶνας, 'jaw-bones.'

ῥαπίσματα. Not Attic, though ῥαπίζω occurs—strictly to beat with a rod, and so generally to strike, more particularly of boxing the ear or cuffing the face.

§ VI. *Man's salvation and the whole scheme of redemption is built upon the manifestation of Christ in the flesh. In Him is found the fulfilment of the good land promised by God to the fathers. Of that land we, God's new creation, are the inheritors, and the universal dominion promised at the Creation to man, will find its consummation when we have entered into the full fruition of that new inheritance.*

1. τὴν ἐντολήν. N alone inserts τὴν, which should probably be omitted—ἐντολή is one of the words used anarthrously in this Epistle. So even in plural in xix. 2.

δικαζόμενος. In the absence of decisive MS. authority, the sense seems to require δικαζόμενος, for

δικαιούμενος appears to be used uniformly in a good sense, while here the Hebrew parallelism points clearly to some word analogous in meaning to κρινόμενος. N has δικαιούμενος, BCOV δικαζόμενος, while the Lat. *aequalis futurus est* is conjectured to represent εἰκασόμενος.

τῷ παιδὶ κυρίου. These words are not in LXX. which has simply μοι, nor yet in the Heb.—though the context of original shows that this is the right interpretation of the μοι. In connexion with the words two questions arise: (1) As to their original reference—(2) Their meaning—(1) Schulz traces a gradual narrowing of the reference from the chosen people to the select and faithful portion of them, thence to the line of prophets, and so finally to a single prophet of the future. The pre-Christian Jews referred the expression to the people at large, though, even before the Christian era, we find them referred definitely to the coming Messias. In the N. T. we find the prophecies concerning the παῖς θεοῦ referred habitually to Christ: and this beyond any question is the reference in our present passage—cf. ix. 2. (2) Their meaning. In the original the Heb.



- θήσεσθε ὡς ἱμάτιον, καὶ χὴς καταφάγεται ἡμᾶς. καὶ πάλιν λέγει ὁ προφήτης, ἐπεὶ ὡς λίθος ἰσχυρὸς ἐτέθη εἰς συν-
- Is. xxviii. 16. **τριβὴν** Ἰδοὺ ἐμβαλῶ εἰς τὰ θεμέλια Σιών λίθον πολυτελεῖ, 3 ἐκλεκτόν, ἀκρογωνιαίον, ἔντιμον. εἶτα τί λέγει; Καὶ ὃς ἐλπίζει ἐπ' αὐτὸν ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. ἐπὶ λίθον οὖν ἡμῶν ἡ ἐλπίς; μὴ γένοιτο. ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ ἐν ἰσχύι τέθεικεν
- Is. l. 7. **τὴν σάρκα** αὐτοῦ κύριος. λέγει γάρ· Καὶ ἔθηκε με ὡς 4 στερεὰν πέτραν. λέγει δὲ πάλιν ὁ προφήτης· Λίθον ὃν
- Ps. cxviii. 22. ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν
- Ps. cxviii. 24. **γωνίας**. καὶ πάλιν λέγει· Αἴτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ μεγάλη καὶ 5 θαυμαστή, ἣν ἐποίησεν ὁ κύριος. ἀπλοῦστερον ὑμῖν γράφω, 6 ἵνα συνῆτε, ἐγὼ περιψήμα τῆς ἀγάπης ὑμῶν. τί οὖν
- Ps. xxi. 17. λέγει πάλιν ὁ προφήτης; Περιέσχεν με συναγωγὴ πονη-
- Ps. cxviii. 12. **ρεγομένων**, ἐκκλῶσαν με ὡσεὶ μέλισσαι κηρίον, καί· Ἐπὶ 7 τὸν ἱματισμὸν μοῦ ἔβαλον κλῆρον. Ἐν σαρκὶ οὖν αὐτοῦ μέλλοντος φανεροῦσθαι καὶ πάσχειν, προεφανέρωθη τὸ
- Is. lli. 9 sq. **πάθος**. λέγει γάρ ὁ προφήτης ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ· Οὐαὶ τῇ ψυχῇ αὐτῶν, ὅτι βεβοῦλενται βουλὴν πονηρὰν καθ' ἑαυτῶν, εἰπόντες· Δῆσωμεν τὸν δίκαιον ὅτι δύσχρηστος ἡμῖν ἐστίν.
- 8 **Τί λέγει ὁ ἄλλος προφήτης Μωϋσῆς αὐτοῖς**; Ἰδοὺ τάδε
- Ex. xxxiii. 1, 3. λέγει κύριος ὁ θεός· Εἰσέλθατε εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν ἀγαθὴν, ἣν ὤμοσεν κύριος τῷ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ, καὶ κατακλη- 9 ρονομήσατε αὐτήν, γῆν ῥέογσαν γάλα καὶ μέλι. τί δὲ λέγει

ⲓⲛⲓ means servant, and so doubtless did the LXX. *παῖς θεοῦ*. The best modern commentators (Bengel, De Wette, Olsh., Mey., Stier, Alf., Words.) would extend this meaning to the N. T. throughout. Cf. Alf. on Acts iii. 13, but here our author undoubtedly makes *παῖς* equivalent to *υἱός*, in accordance with the usage of patristic literature, e.g. Ep. ad Diog. viii.; Mart. Pol. xiv.; Sib. i. 331, &c.; Hipp. x. 33. 75.

2. *ⲛ* reads in a different order,

*ὕμεις πάντες ὡς ἱμάτιον παλαιωθήσεσθε*. Neither corresponds exactly to the LXX. arrangement.

*λίθος...συντριβὴν*. The writer has in his mind Isai. viii. 14, 15.

*Ἰδοὺ κ.τ.λ.* The same verse is quoted 1 Pet. ii. 6. Cf. iv. 12, note. *πολυτελεῖ. πολυτελεῖν* *ⲛ*, on which form see note on next verse.

3. *καὶ ὃς ἐλπίζει...κ.τ.λ.* The words do not occur in O. T.—Isai. xxviii. 16 seems still in his mind. For *ὃς ἐλπίζει* *ⲛ* reads *ὁ πιστεύων*, which the Lat. supports,

- veterescitis tamquam vestimentum, et tinea devorabit vos.*  
 iterum dicit propheta: *Tamquam lapis expositus est in*  
*afflictione. Ecce mittam in fundamenta Sion lapidem* Is. xxviii. 16.  
 3 *pretiosum, electum.* et quid dicit? *Et qui crediderit in*  
*illum non confundetur.* in lapide ergo fides nostra?  
 4 absit. sed quia in fortitudine posuit corpus illius. dicit  
 iterum propheta: *Lapidem quem reprobaverunt aedifi-* Ps. cxviii. 22.  
*cantes, hic factus est in caput anguli. Hic est dies quem* Ps. cxviii. 24.  
 6 *fecit dominus.* quid ergo dicit? *Circumvenerunt me* Ps. xxii. 17.  
*conventus nequissimorum, vallaverunt me tamquam apes.* cxviii. 12.  
 7 et iterum dixit: *Super vestem meam sortes miserunt.* In Ps. xxii. 19.  
 carne ergo incipiente illo venire, ante ostensa sunt quae  
 passurus erat. dicit ergo propheta ad Iudaeos: *Vae* Is. iii. 9 sq.  
*animae iniquorum, qui dicunt inter se: Circumveniamus*  
 8 *iustum, quia insuavis est nobis.* Et Moyses autem dicit  
 ad illos: *Haec dicit dominus deus: Intrate in terram* Ex. xxxiii. 1,  
*bonam, quam promisit dominus Abrahae, Isaac et Iacob, et* 3  
 9 *domini estote illius terrae, quae trahit lac et mel.* quid

l. 4 Quid. *qui* cod.

l. 14 Quia al. for *qui* of cod. and text.

but which seems borrowed from the LXX. as continuation of the previous quotation.

τέθεικεν Ν. ἔθηκε cet. MSS. Ν as differing from LXX reading is probably right. ἔθηκε too of cet. MSS. may be due to the ἔθηκε occurring next line.

σάρκα. Ν reads σάρκαν, as also in vii. 5. In various places Ν retains these genuine Hellenistic forms. So πολυτελήν in v. 2, ἔναυ vii. 6, κώραν x. 1; cf. Winer, Gk. Gr. § 9, note 3.

4. ἐγενήθη eis. Winer, Gk. Gr. § 29, note 3, where he denies that it is a Hebraism. It is a tendency in later stages of language to substitute the prepositional circumlocution for the simple predicate after εἶναι, γίγνεσθαι, &c.

ἐγενήθη for ἐγένετο. So ix. 4. For same use in N. T. cf. Winer, Gk. Gr. § 15.

ὁ κύριος. ὁ should be omitted with Ν.

5. περίφημα iv. 9 n. συνιῆτε. συνιετε Ν. συνείτε OV. The second hand of O corrects to the subj., which is read by BC. It would seem the soundest criticism boldly to read the indicative. Cf. end of note on use of ἵνα at v. 6.

7. δῆσωμεν τὸν δίκ. Here the writer follows LXX. verbatim, abandoning the Hebr. which gives as E. V. 'Say ye to the righteous that it shall be well with him.'

8. εἰσέλθατε ΝBOV. A genuine Hellenistic form. So v. 13.

9. τί δέ. Ν alone has δέ, which should be omitted.

- ἡ γυνῶσις, μάθετε. Ἐλπίσατε, φησίν, ἐπὶ τὸν ἐν σαρκὶ μέλλοντα φανεροῦσθαι ὑμῖν Ἰησοῦν. ἄνθρωπος γὰρ γῆ ἐστὶν πάσχουσα. ἀπὸ προσώπου γὰρ τῆς γῆς ἡ πλάσις  
 10 τοῦ Ἀδὰμ ἐγένετο. τί οὖν λέγει· Εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν ἀγαθὴν, γῆν ῥέουσαν γάλα καὶ μέλι; εὐλογητὸς ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν, ἀδελφοί, ὁ σοφίαν καὶ νοῦν θέμενος ἐν ἡμῖν τῶν κρυφίων αὐτοῦ. λέγει γὰρ ὁ προφήτης παραβολὴν κυρίου· τίς νοήσει, εἰ μὴ  
 11 σοφὸς καὶ ἐπιστήμων καὶ ἀγαπῶν τὸν κύριον αὐτοῦ; Ἐπεὶ οὖν ἀνακαινίσας ἡμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἀφέσει τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, ἐποίησεν ἡμᾶς ἄλλον τύπον, ὡς παιδίων ἔχειν τὴν ψυχὴν, ὡς ἂν δι᾽  
 12 ἀναπλασσόντος αὐτοῦ ἡμᾶς. λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφὴ περὶ  
 Gen. i. 26. ἡμῶν, ὡς λέγει τῷ υἱῷ· ΠΟΙΗΣΩΜΕΝ ΚΑΤ' Εἰκόνα καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν ἡμῶν τὸν ἄνθρωπον, καὶ ἀρχέτωσαν τῶν θηρίων τῆς γῆς καὶ τῶν πετεινῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῶν ἰχθύων τῆς θαλάσσης. καὶ εἶπεν κύριος ἰδὼν τὸ καλὸν πλάσμα ἡμῶν  
 Gen. i. 28. Αἰζάνεσθε καὶ πληθύνεσθε καὶ πληρώσατε τὴν γῆν. ταῦτα  
 13 πρὸς τὸν υἱόν. πάλιν σοι ἐπιδείξω πῶς πρὸς ἡμᾶς λέγει κύριος. δευτέραν πλάσιν ἐπ' ἐσχάτων ἐποίησεν. λέγει δὲ  
 ?[Mt. xx. 16]. κύριος· Ἰδοὺ ποιῶ τὰ ἔσχατα ὡς τὰ πρῶτα. εἰς τοῦτο οὖν

φησίν. Gebhardt rather strangely inserts this word supported only by N\*\* and Lat. Clem. Al. too inserts, but very probably only to make the sense clearer.

ἄνθρωπος γάρ. Here again the connecting particle which N has inserted should clearly be dropped. Gen. iii. 19, γῆ ἐστὶ καὶ εἰς γῆν ἀπειλεύσῃ, is in his mind—and we think naturally of 1 Cor. xv. 47. Philo allegorises similarly.

πάσχουσα is very difficult to explain. Some commentators think of the ὕλη πάσχουσα of the philosophers, others again of the 'suffering' functions of the mother.—Though both seem far-fetched and unnatural, the first is the most tolerable and less absurd than many that have been suggested.—Gebhardt understands πάσχουσα to be

simply πλάσιν πάσχουσα, the word πάσχουσα being thus introduced as pointing to Christ's πάθη.

προσώπου τῆς γῆς. Hebr. from Gen. ii. 6, 7.

πλάσις. Here we see the natural transition from πλάσις = 'the act of forming,' to πλάσις = πλάσμα 'the thing formed.' So Angl. *formation*.

10. γῆν ῥέουσαν. Authorities are evenly divided between τῇν, and the preferable γῆν.

σοφίαν καὶ νοῦν. For a similar note of thankfulness for a kind of esoteric wisdom vouchsafed, cf. ix. 9.

The text rightly adopts Hilg.'s punctuation. Most edd. place a stop at προφήτης, and see in following words a loose quotation from Prov. i. 6; but the correspondence is too inexact, though the phraseology employed may be possibly an uncon-

- dicat scientia, discite. Credite, inquit, in eum qui in carne apparebit, Iesum. homo enim terra est, cum ex  
 10 terra sit figmentum Adae. quid ergo dicit? *In terram bonam, fluentem lac et mel*, et: *Benedictus dominus, quia sapientiam et sensum posuit in nobis absconditorum suorum*. dicit autem et per prophetas parabolam dominus; quis intellet, nisi sapiens et diligens dominum suum?  
 11 Quia ergo, cum nos cognovit in remissionem peccatorum, fecit nos aliam figuram tamquam pueros habere, ut  
 12 spiritu figuraret nos. nos enim, sicut dicit scriptura: *Faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nos-* Gen. i. 26.  
*tram, et supersit bestiis terrae et avibus caeli et piscibus maris.* et dominus videns bonam figuram nostram  
 13 dixit: *Crescite et multiplicamini et replete terram.* ite- Gen. i. 28.  
 rum vobis ostendam quomodo nobis dicit. secundam figuram in novissimis fecit. dicit dominus: *Ecce facio* [Mt. xx. 16.]  
*novissima tamquam priora.* propter hoc ergo praedi-

l. 14 *Multiplicate et replemini* cod.

l. 15 Nobis. vobis cod.

l. 16 Fecit om. cod.

scious reminiscence of that passage.

παράβολον. So xvii. 2. This and more commonly τύπος we find in our Ep., but ἀλληγορία does not occur. A παράβολή Chrys. defines as that which 'shows forth something not immediately apparent from the words, but containing an inly hidden thought.'

11. We must retain the partic. ἀνακαίνισας after ἐπέλ, though Dressel goes wrong in quoting ἐπέλ of v. 2 as parallel. We must not however, as Edd., boldly and ungrammatically make ἀνακαίνισας = an indic., but rather regard the sentence as anacoluthic, the apodosis being omitted, owing to the long quotation which is inserted.—He breaks suddenly off to prove from Scripture the truth of his words ἀναπλασσοτος ἡμᾶς, and having done this resumes in v. 14, with ἡμεῖς ἀναπεπλάσμεθα. Cf. i. 4, for a some-

what similar parenthesis. ἀνακαίνι-ζειν is used Heb. vi. 6. S. Paul uses ἀνακαίνουιν, ἀνακαίνωσες similarly: cf. 2 Cor. iv. 16; Col. iii. 10; Rom. xii. 2; Tit. iii. 5.

The ἀφesis τῶν ἁμ. is similarly coupled with ἀγνίζειν in v. 1, and cf. viii. 3, xvi. 8.

τύπον. Here stamp, form, 'character,' as in xii. 10. Common use in Ep. is for a prophetic 'type,' e. g. vii. 3, 7, 11, viii. 1, xii. 2, 5, 6. In xix. 7, the sense is almost intermediate between the two.

παιδίων. Cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 20.—Müller explains it as meaning παιδίων θεοῦ, but the simple 'little children' gives a far more natural sense in connexion with the ἀναπλάσσοντος.

12. ὡς λέγει τῷ υἱῷ, v. 5.

13. λέγει δὲ κύριος. Om. δέ, against N only.

ποιῶ τὰ ἔσχατα ὡς τὰ πρῶτα.

ἐκήρυξεν ὁ προφήτης· Εἰσελθατε εἰς τὴν ῥέουσαν γάλα καὶ

14 μέλι, καὶ κατακριεῖσθε αὐτῆς. Ἴδε οὖν, ἡμεῖς ἀναπεπλά-

Ex. xli. 19.  
xxvi. 26.

σμεθα, καθὼς πάλιν ἐν ἑτέρῳ προφῆτῃ λέγει· Ἰδοὺ, λέγει

κύριος, ἐξελῶ τοῦτων, τουτέστιν ὧν προέβλεπεν τὸ πνεῦμα

κυρίου, τὰς λιθίνας καρδίας καὶ ἐμβαλῶ σαρκίνας. ὅτι αὐτὸς

15 ἐν σαρκὶ ἔμελλεν φανεροῦσθαι καὶ ἐν ἡμῖν κατοικεῖν. ναὸς

γὰρ ἅγιος, ἀδελφοί μου, τῷ κυρίῳ τὸ κατοικητήριον ἡμῶν τῆς

16 καρδίας. λέγει γὰρ κύριος πάλιν· Καὶ ἐν τίνι ὀφθῆσμαι

Ps. xlii. 3.  
Ps. xxii. 23.

τῷ κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ μου καὶ δοξασθῆσμαι; λέγει· Ἐξομολογή-

σμαι σοὶ ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀδελφῶν μου καὶ ψαλῷ σοὶ ἀναμέσον

ἐκκλησίας ἀγίων. οὐκοῦν ἡμεῖς ἐσμεν οὓς εἰσήγαγεν εἰς τὴν

17 γῆν τὴν ἀγαθὴν. Τί οὖν τὸ γάλα καὶ τὸ μέλι; ὅτι πρῶτον

τὸ παιδίον μέλιτι, εἶτα γάλακτι ζωοποιεῖται. οὕτως οὖν

καὶ ἡμεῖς τῇ πίστει τῆς ἐπαγγελίας καὶ τῷ λόγῳ ζωοποιού-

18 μενοι ζήσομεν κατακυριεύοντες τῆς γῆς. Προειρήκαμεν δὲ

Gen. i. 28.

ἐπάνω· Καὶ ἀζζανέσθωσαν καὶ πληθγνέσθωσαν καὶ ἀρχέτωσαν

τῶν ἰχθύων. τίς οὖν ὁ δυνάμενος νῦν ἄρχειν θηρίων ἢ

ἰχθύων ἢ πετεινῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ; αἰσθάνεσθαι γὰρ ὀφεί-

λομεν ὅτι τὸ ἄρχειν ἐξουσίας ἐστίν, ἵνα τις ἐπιτάξας κυ-

19 ριεύσῃ. εἰ οὖν οὐ γίνεται τοῦτο νῦν, ἄρα ἡμῖν εἴρηκεν πότε·

ὅταν καὶ αὐτοὶ τελειωθῶμεν κληρονόμοι τῆς διαθήκης κυρίου

γενέσθαι.

Commentators, seeking diligently, have found a number of passages in Old Testament or apocryphal books, which they suppose to be here cited: but in none is the correspondence even tolerably close.—We must either suppose the quotation to come from some vanished uncanonical source, against which the λέγει κύριος makes strongly—or we must refer the words to Matt. xx. 16, ἔσονται οἱ ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι, καὶ οἱ πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι. It is very noticeable that these occur in that place in juxtaposition with the πολλοὶ εἰσιν κλητοὶ, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί, which we found in iv. 14. That

the context here is quite different from that in Matt. will not weigh very strongly with any one who is familiar with our author's manner of quotation, and that the citation here is from Matt. seems the most reasonable hypothesis. On this point, cf. iv. 14 u.

14. ἡμεῖς emphatic, as below in v. 16.

σαρκίνας. Here we find the Pauline use maintained of σάρκινος as distinguished from σαρκικός—the latter being used in the bad sense.

ἐν σαρκὶ φανερ. Cf. xii. 10 n.

15. ναὸς. The same familiar figure (1 Cor. iii. 16, 17, vi. 19; 2 Cor.

cavit propheta: *Intrate in terram, quae trahit lac et mel,*  
 14 *et dominamini eius*, quia ipse incipiebat apparere et in  
 15 nobis habitare. templum enim domini inhabitatio cor-  
 16 dis nostri est. dicit ergo iterum: *Et quomodo apparebo* Ps. xlii. 3.  
*deo domino meo et magnificabor?* inquit: *Confitebor in* Ps. xxii. 23,  
*ecclesia fratrum meorum et decantabo tibi in ecclesia sanc-*  
*torum.* nos ergo sumus quos induxit in terram bonam.  
 17 Quid ergo lac et mel? quia ab initio infans melle et  
 lacte vivificatur, sic et per fidem promissionis, verbo  
 dum adnutrimur, sic vivificamur, dominatum agentes  
 18 terrae. Quis est qui possit modo esse super bestias aut  
 super aves aut super pisces? sentire debetis quia super-  
 esse potestatis est, ut quis inperans dominus sit.

l. 8 Mel. *melle* cod.

l. 9 Sic et. *sicut* cod.

l. 13 Dominus. *domino* cod.

vi. 16) recurs iv. 11, xvi. 7—10, where too we find τὸ κατοικητήριον τῆς καρδίας, ἐν τῷ κατοικητήριῳ ἡμῶν ὁ θεὸς κατοικεῖ, πνευματικὸς ναὸς, and the like. Cf. Eph. ii. 22.

16. Hefeles, who fancies that there is a constant metamorphosis of the type going on, supposes that the γῆ here becomes identified with the regenerate Church. The type appears to me carried out consistently throughout. The γῆ is represented by Christ, whose Incarnation (ἄνθρωπος ἐστὶ γῆ) was foretold under that figure. The regenerate Church enters into the promised land, sc. finds their promised inheritance in Christ. Thus the Church, God's new creation, enters into full possession of Christ, his covenant and kingdom, in fulfilment of the promise given at Creation that man should have dominion over the whole earth (γῆς).

16. ἐν τίνι. Transl. 'wherein?' not 'in whom?' as Müller, who condemns the more correct Lat. *quomodo*.

ἡμεῖς. Sc. the regenerate, the ἐκκλησία ἁγίων.

17. τὸ παιδίον μέλει. Cf. Isai.

vii. 15. By the Greeks, too, honey was administered to infants at a tender age. Cf. Pind. Ol. vi. 47, the birth of Janus. Among the early Christians honey and milk were commonly given to the newly-baptized; so also to deacons. They were also given to young children at celebrations of the Sacrament, in place of the bread and wine. Our passage is rather against these practices having been in vogue at the time when Ep. was written.

18. ἐπάνω v. 12. The dominion over beasts, fish and fowl is a type of a supreme lordship over the whole earth reserved for the new creation of Christ's Church. Rabbinical teaching regarded the creation of man on the sixth day, as typical of the appearance and complete triumph of the Messiah six thousand years after the Creation. To the realization of this, the writer now looks forward.

κυριεύσει. Read κυριεύσει, cf. v. 6, note.

19. Messias has come, and if His final and complete dominion is not yet realized (οὐ νῦν γίνεται), it

VII. Οὐκοῦν νοεῖτε, τέκνα εὐφροσύνης, ὅτι πάντα ὁ καλὸς κύριος προεφάνερωσεν ἡμῖν, ἵνα γινώμεν ὃ κατὰ πάντα 2 εὐχαριστοῦντες ὀφείλομεν αἰνεῖν. εἰ οὖν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, ὦν κύριος καὶ μέλλων κρίνειν ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς, ἔπαθεν ἵνα ἡ πληγὴ αὐτοῦ ζωποιοῖσῃ ἡμᾶς, πιστεύσωμεν ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς 3 τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἠδύνατο παθεῖν εἰ μὴ δι' ἡμᾶς. ἀλλὰ καὶ σταυρωθεὶς ἐποτίζετο ὄξει καὶ χολῇ. ἀκούσατε πῶς περὶ τούτου πεφάνερωκαν οἱ ἱερεῖς τοῦ ναοῦ. γεγραμμένης ἔντο- Mt. xxvii. 34, 48. Lev. xxiii. 29. λῆς· Ὡς ἂν μὴ νηστεύῃ τὴν νηστείαν, θανάτῳ ἐξολεθρευθήσεται, ἐντελείατο κύριος, ἐπεὶ καὶ αὐτὸς ὑπὲρ τῶν ἡμετέρων ἁμαρτιῶν ἔμελλεν τὸ σκεῦος τοῦ πνεύματος προσφέρειν θυσίαν, ἵνα καὶ ὁ τύπος ὁ γενόμενος ἐπὶ Ἰσαὰκ τοῦ 4 προσενεχθέντος ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον τελεσθῇ. Τί οὖν λέγει ἐν τῷ προφῆτῃ; Καὶ φαγέτωσαν ἐκ τοῦ τράγου τοῦ προσφερομένου τῇ νηστείᾳ ὑπὲρ πασῶν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν. προσέχετε ἀκριβῶς· Καὶ φαγέτωσαν οἱ ἱερεῖς μόνοι πάντες 5 τὸ ἔντερον ἀπλγτον μετὰ ὄζοις. πρὸς τί; Ἐπειδὴ ἐμέ,

awaits only the perfecting of His followers, that they may become inheritors of the Lord's covenant.

§ VII. *The O.T. covenant and ceremonial was throughout a foreshadowing of Christ. Explanation of the type of the two goats, the vinegar and the scarlet wool.*

1. νοεῖτε. indic. not imper.

ὁ καλὸς κύριος, not a N.T. expression; ὁ καλὸς ἀνταποδότης, xix. 11, furnishes a fair parallel—καλὸς and καλῶς are favourite words with our author.

ᾧ dat. after εὐχαριστ. rather than αἰνεῖν—though αἰνεῖν with dat. occurs, 1 Chron. xvi. 36.

2. κύριος. absol. and anarthrous as in i. 1, vi. 1, 3, vii. 3, and habitually—the Lord of all things from the beginning.

ἡ πληγὴ αὐτοῦ. Ref. apparently to Isai. liii. 5, though in v. 2 our author preserves τῷ μῶλῳ πι of the LXX.

ζωποιοῖσῃ. Read ζωποιοῖσῃ. Cf. v. 6 n, and so perhaps δείξει for δείξῃ in v. 5.

δι' ἡμᾶς. So xiv. 4, δι' ἡμᾶς ὑπομείνας. So we find in similar passage, v. 2, διὰ τὰς ἀνομίας, διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν as compared with ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν in 3, 4, 5 of this chapter. This Epistle nowhere seems to teach the strictly vicarious death of Christ. Müller appends a special excursus on the subject to this chapter. Cf. Dissert. cx. pp.

3. καὶ. Emphasizing σταυρωθεὶς as shewing the magnitude of the suffering. He suffered, yea, was even crucified, the climax of suffering.

Note ἐποτίζετο with dat. In v. 5, where the act. ποτίζειν is used, we have the constr. with double accus. Cf. Matt. x. 42; Mk. ix. 41; 1 Cor. iii. 2. Our author is in agreement with Joh. xix. 30, ἔλαβε τὸ ὄξος ὁ Ἰησοῦς. Mark xv. 23

VII. Intellegite ergo, filii dilecti, quia omnia bonus dominus ostendit nobis, ut sciremus cui per omnia gratias  
 2 agere debeamus. si ergo filius dei, cum sit dominus qui incipiet iudicare vivos et mortuos, passus est ut plaga illius vivificaret nos: credamus quia filius non poterat  
 3 pati nisi propter nos. sed et potatur aceto et felle. <sup>Mt. xxvii. 34, 48.</sup> audite quemadmodum de hoc significaverint sacerdotes templi. inscripta lege praecepti, ut si quis non ieiunaret <sup>Lev. xxiii. 29.</sup> ieiunium, morte moreretur, praecepit dominus, quia ipse pro peccatis nostris incipiebat vas spiritus sui offerre hostiam, ut et figuram quae fuerat sub Isaac, qui oblatus  
 4 est ad aram, consummaret. Quid dicit propheta? *Et manducent de hirco quem oblaturi sunt ad ieiunium pro omnibus peccatis.* attendite diligenter: *Et manducent*  
 5 *sacerdotes soli intestinum non lotum cum aceto.* ad quid?

l. 2 Cui. *cum* cod.

l. 12 Quid. *qui* cod.

says simply, ὁ δὲ οὐκ ἔλαβε. Matt. xxvii. 34. reconciles the two, saying Jesus tasted the vinegar, but refused to drink.

πεφανέρωκαν. NBCOV all agree in this form, which is found in N.T. Winer, § 13, 2 c.

ἐντολῆς. Lev. xxiii. 29, though the actual words differ.

κύριος, emphatic. It was the Lord that gave, inspired the commandment.

τὸ σκεῦος τοῦ πνεύματος. Not a mere paraphrase for the body (cf. 2 Cor. iv. 7; 1 Thess. iv. 4), but regarding the Incarnate Christ as specifically the Vessel of the Spirit. For σκεῦος v. xxi. 8, note.

4. λέγει, saith He. The ceremonial commandment is represented as coming from God.

καὶ φαγέτωσαν. The command is not found in the O.T. nor in any surviving apocryphal writer. That some definite writing is referred to, not mere oral Jewish tradition (the δευτέρωσις of which Aug. speaks,

contr. Adv. Leg. II. i.), is clear from the expression ἐν τῷ προφῆτῃ: further conjectures are valueless. N has φαγέτωσαν.

The general reference throughout is to Lev. xvi. 7 *vv.*, where we have the full account of the goat offered for the sins of the people, and the scapegoat. The great day of atonement was annual, on the tenth day of the seventh month *Tisri*.

τὰ ἑντερον. Not the intestines, which were not of course eaten by the priests, but the flesh. To translate Heb. בשר. The writer perhaps uses the word as dwelling on the disagreeable nature of the meal, ἀπλυστον—μετὰ ὄξους.

The injunction is contrary to the law, which ordains (Lev. xvi. 27) that the sacrificed goat should be burnt in the fire with the skin, flesh and dung. Irregularities must have begun to creep into the performance of the ceremonial; it hardly seems satisfactory to attribute a precise quotation of this kind to



ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν μέλλοντα τοῦ λαοῦ μου τοῦ καινοῦ προσ-  
 φέρειν τὴν σάρκα μου, μέλλετε ποτίζειν χολὴν μετὰ ὄξους,  
 φάγετε ὑμεῖς μόνοι, τοῦ λαοῦ νηστεύοντος καὶ κοπτομένου  
 ἐπὶ σάκκου καὶ σποδοῦ ἵνα δείξῃ ὅτι δεῖ αὐτὸν πολλὰ  
 6 παθεῖν ὑπ' αὐτῶν. Πῶς οὖν ἐνετείλατο, προσέχετε· λάβετε  
 7 δὲ ἱερεῖς τὸν ἓνα εἰς ὀλοκαῖτωμα ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν. τὸν δὲ ἓνα  
 τί ποιήσωσιν; ἐπικατάρατος, φησὶν, ὁ εἷς. προσέχετε πῶς  
 8 ὁ τύπος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ φανεροῦται· καὶ ἐμπύστε πάντες καὶ  
 κατακентήσατε, καὶ περὶθετε τὸ ἔριον τὸ κόκκινον περὶ τὴν

Lev. xvi. 7  
sq.

the ignorance of the writer. Donaldson, *Apost. Fathers*, cap. IV. 206 pp., and others do so apparently without misgiving. Cf. *Dissert.* p. xliii. On the subject of the author's apparent ignorance of ritual law, cf. O. Braunsberger's *Der Apostel Barnabas, Sein Leben und der ihm beigelegte Brief*. Sect. vi. §§ 1-3, p. 253 pp., where the writer attempts (not without plausibility) to show that these supposed errors ought really to be regarded as genuine additions to our knowledge of Jewish Antiquities.

5. Our author refers the distasteful character of the priest's meal, as also the fasting and sorrowing people, typically to the sufferings of Christ, the accompaniment of the vinegar finding its literal fulfilment at the Crucifixion. In tracing the significance of the type he dwells but lightly on the goat which was sacrificed—except as regards the *likeness* of the two goats, which he regards as typical of the likeness of the triumphant Christ at his second coming to the suffering Christ upon the Cross. The principal points he notices with regard to the second goat, the scapegoat, are (besides those mentioned above) the contumely of piercing and spitting heaped upon it, the scarlet wool bound round its head as the scarlet-

robe about Christ's body, and further the portion of wool put among the thorns, signifying that we must not shrink from the thorns of suffering if we would lay hold upon Christ. To the crown of thorns, we may note, he makes no reference. Cf. *Dissert.* p. xlv.

Tert. adv. Jud. XIV. gives a strikingly similar explanation of type. It will be well to quote his words: Sic enim et duorum hircorum, qui ieiunio offerebantur, faciam interpretationem. nonne et illi utrumque ordinem nominis Christi, qui iam venit, ostendunt? pares quidem atque consimiles propter eundem Domini conspectum, quia non in alia venturus est forma, ut qui agnosci habet a quibus et laesus est. unus autem eorum circumdatus coccino, maledictus et consputatus et convulsus et compunctus a populo extra civitatem abiciebatur in perditionem, manifestis notatus insignibus Christi passionis, qui coccinea circumdatus veste et consputatus et omnibus contumeliis afflictus extra civitatem crucifixus est. alter vero pro delictis oblat, et sacerdotibus tantum templi in pabulum datus, secundae representationis argumenta signabat, qua delictis omnibus expiatis sacerdotes templi spiritualis, id est ecclesiae, dominicae gratiae quasi visceratione

Quoniam me pro peccatis populi mei incipientem offerre corpus meum potabitis acetum cum felle: manducate vos soli, populo ieiunante, et plangite vos in cilicio et cinere. et ut ostenderet quia ab illis debet pati, sic praecepit: *Sumite hircos duos bonos similes et offerte, et accipiant sacerdotes unum holocaustum pro peccatis, alium autem in maledictione.* adtendite quomodo figura Iesu ostendebatur. *Expuite in illum, inquit, omnes et pungite, et inponite lanam coccineam circa caput illius, et sic in*

quadam fruerentur, ieiunantibus ceteris a salute. He repeats the same words adv. Marc. III. 7.

Just. Mart., Dial. 40, doubtless quite independently, regards the two similar goats as types of the first and second coming of Christ.

τοῦ λαοῦ τοῦ καινοῦ. Not of course necessarily *exclusive* of those under the Old covenant. The chosen people (λαός) might, no less than others, become a part of the new people, ὁ καινὸς λαός, of Christ.

ὁμαίς. Sc. οἱ ἱερεῖς, as supr.

6. καλοὺς καὶ ὁμοίους. There is no such direction in Lev. xvi., but the ὁμοιοτης is insisted on in the Mischna. So too Cyril, Just. Mart., Tert.

ὁ εἰς, ὁ εἰς... Winer, § 26, 2. It is repeated in v. 9. Cf. xii. 2.

7. τὸν δὲ ἕνα. Dismissing the goat of sacrifice, he considers more in detail the type of the scapegoat. v. note on v. 5.

ἐπικατάρατος. For the ἑπικατάρατος, which our author translates by ἐπικατάρατος, and Tert. by maledictus, the LXX. and Greek fathers have ἀποπομπαῖος, probably combining the notions of the *scape*-goat as banished into the wilderness, and also as averting evil. Cf. ἀποτροπαῖος. ἀποπομπαῖος is used of propitiatory offerings, as also of the *Dii averrunci*. Vulg. gives simply *emissarius*.

The word ἐπικατάρατος is used of the legal curse by S. Paul quoting from Deut. in Gal. iii. 10, 13 — with the first of which, cf. John vii. 49. The LXX. uses it of the snake and of the ground in Gen. iii. 14, 17.

8. ἐμπτύσατε. The imperatives are not parallel with the προσέχετε, but like preceding λάβετε and προσενέγκετε are part of the Commandment. There is no such command in the O.T., and the Talmud only sanctions that part of it relating to the red wool. Of its maltreatment there is no trace in Bible or Talmud; indeed special provisions necessarily excluded it. The High Priest merely pronounced the confession over it, and while the other priests and people prayed, the goat was handed over to the man appointed to lead it away.

κατακεντήσατε. Cf. ἐξεκέντησαν, Joh. xix. 37. Cf. Rev. i. 7 — with ref. to Zech. xii. 10.

κόκκινον. The actual word is used Matt. xxvii. 28, of the *scarlet* robe worn by Jesus, corresponding to the πορφύρα of Mk. xv. 17, 20; Joh. xix. 2. The author probably had S. Matthew in his mind.

ἐριον. So among the Romans a fillet of wool was bound upon the consecrated victim — probably in sign of cleansing, though wool itself

κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ, καὶ οὕτως εἰς ἔρημον βληθῆτω· καὶ ὅταν  
 γένηται οὕτως, ἄγει ὁ βαστάζων τὸν τράγον εἰς τὴν ἔρημον,  
 καὶ ἀφαιρεῖ τὸ ἔριον καὶ ἐπιτίθησιν αὐτὸ ἐπὶ φρύγανον τὸ  
 λεγόμενον *ράχια*, οὗ καὶ τοὺς βλαστοὺς εἰώθαμεν τρώγειν  
 ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ εὐρίσκοντες. οὕτως μόνῃς ταύτης τῆς *ράχους*  
 9 οἱ καρποὶ γλυκεῖς εἰσὶν. τί οὖν τοῦτό ἐστιν; προσέχετε·  
 Τὸν μὲν ἕνα ἐπὶ τὸ θγσιαστήριον, τὸν δὲ ἕνα ἐπικατάρaton,  
 καὶ ὅτι τὸν ἐπικατάρaton ἐστεφανωμένον· ἐπειδὴ ὄψονται  
 αὐτὸν τότε τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τὸν ποδῆρην ἔχοντα τὸν κόκκινον περὶ  
 τὴν σάρκα, καὶ ἐροῦσιν· Οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὃν ποτε ἡμεῖς  
 ἐσταυρώσαμεν ἐξουθενήσαντες καὶ ἐμπτύσαντες καὶ κατα-  
 κεντήσαντες; ἀληθῶς οὗτος ἦν ὁ τότε λέγων ἑαυτὸν υἱὸν  
 10 τοῦ θεοῦ εἶναι. πῶς γὰρ ὁμοῖος ἐκείνῳ; εἰς τοῦτο ὁμοίους  
 τοὺς τράγους καὶ ἴσους, ἵνα ὅταν ἴδωσιν αὐτὸν τότε ἐρχό-  
 μενον, ἐκπλαγῶσιν ἐπὶ τῇ ὁμοιότητι τοῦ τράγου. οὐκοῦν

in the religious service of the Jews was often regarded as the reverse of clean. Cf. Ezek. xlv. 17, 18. But we may compare Isai. i. 18.

*βαστάζων*. Not of literal carrying, but in wider sense of *ἄγων*.

*ράχια*. *ραχήλ* N. *ραχίλ* BCOV. *ραχίη* and *ραχίηλ*, and Gebhardt's *ραχία*, are read by various Edd., but without direct MS. support. *ραχίηλ* seems fairly probable. Müller reads *ραχίη* (sc. *ραχία*), which is used, Soph. Fr. 934, like *ράχis*, of a sharp, spiky mountain-ridge. It is closely akin to *ραχός*, which means a thorn-bush or branch. Müller supposes the term *ραχίη* to have been applied by Hellenists to the rock from which in the later ceremonial the goat was thrown down, and on which a portion of the wool was previously laid; and that our author transferred the term so used to the thorn-branch, which was strictly *ραχός* not *ραχίη*. The explanation seems far-fetched, and probably not right, but none better is suggested. Between Gebhardt's PAXIA and the MS. PAXIA,

the difference is of course very slight.

*τοὺς βλαστοὺς*. Prop. the shoots, here apparently used generally for the produce or fruit.

*ταύτης*. The Gk. MSS. agree one and all in reading *οὕτως*. The emendation *ταύτης* is a simple conjectural insertion first added by Voss, and even though supported by huius of the Lat. version seems violent. Nor, so far as I can see, does the sense absolutely require it, though somewhat benefited by its presence. I cannot help thinking that this sentence is an old marginal gloss of some copyist by way of note on the preceding words. To explain *τρώγειν τοὺς βλαστοὺς* and *ράχια*, he writes: with the *ραχός* alone is it the case that the berries are sweet in the way mentioned—and his remark has slipped into the text.

*ράχους*. So the MSS., but the Edd. rightly I think *ραχοῦ*. It is hard to see how *ράχους* can be fem.

9. *τὸν μὲν ἕνα*. Not really an

*aram ponatur*; et cum ita factum fuerit, adducat qui ferat hircum in eremum et auferat lanam et ponat illam in stirpem quae dicitur rubus, cuius et fructus in agris adsuevimus inuenientes manducare. huius stirpis dulces  
9 fructus inueniuntur. ad quid ergo hoc? attendite: *Unum ad aram, alium tamquam maledictum*; et quare is qui maledictus coronatus? quia videbunt illum tunc in illa die clamidem habentem coccineam circa corpus, et dicent: Nonne hic est quem nos crucifiximus fastidientes et conspuentes et compungentes? vere hic fuit  
10 qui tunc se dicebat esse filium dei. sicut ergo similis, sic *similes hircos et aequales*, ut cum viderint unum ex illis tunc pascentem, admirentur in similitudinem capri.

*l. 1* Adducat. *adducite* cod. *adducit* al. edd. *l. 2* Lanam om. cod.

*l. 4* Adsuevimus. *adsumus* cod.

accus. absolute, but the words of quotation are kept in their original case after *λάβετε* or like, cf. v. 6.

*βτι*. Mark of quotation, simply equivalent to inverted commas in English.

*ψονται*. For very similar passages, cf. Matt. xxiv. 30; Joh. xix. 37; Apoc. i. 7.

*ποδῆρη* is similarly used as subst. in the very parallel Apoc. i. 13. Strictly of course it is an adj., with *πέπλος* or *χιτών* understood.

*κόκκινον*. Doubtless this colour is ascribed with ref. to Matt. xxvii. 28; v. note on last verse. It was regarded of course as the sign of sovereignty—and is not rare in representations of the Last Judgment.

*ὁ τότε λέγων*. Cf. Matt. xxvi. 64; Mk. xiv. 62; Luke xxii. 70; though from the amount of verbal agreement I believe the passage really in the author's mind was the declaration of the centurion, Matt. xxviii. 54, *ἀληθῶς θεοῦ υἱὸς ἦν οὗτος*.

*ιο. πῶς*. Not equal to *ὡς*. The author is going to call attention to the true manner and significance of the likeness, and to show how it comes

about in correspondence with the type.

*ἐκείνῳ*. I believe the likeness insisted on is of Christ the sovereign Judge, to (*ἐκείνῳ*) Christ suffering the humiliation of the cross. In what fashion does Christ the Judge resemble that other Christ, Christ on the Cross? But *ἐκείνῳ* may be taken of (1) *τύπῳ*, the type, (2) more specially, *τράγῳ*, the goat: the correspondence between Christ and the type being insisted on.

*ὁμοίους τοὺς τράγ.*, accus. once more of direct quotation.

*εἰς τοῦτο*. Perhaps a stop should be put after *εἰς τοῦτο*, which would then be the answer to *πῶς*—and the explanatory quotation would begin at *ὁμοίους*, which would thus be thrown even more prominently at the forefront of the sentence. At present *εἰς τοῦτο* is awkward, for clearly the words would have no place in the original quotation.

*καὶ ἰσους. καλοὺς ἰσους* N. *καλοὺς καὶ ἰσους* rell. MSS. Gebhardt's emendation seems to me arbitrary, and to be certainly no improvement to the sense.

ἴδε τὸν τράγον τὸν τύπον τοῦ μέλλοντος πάσχειν Ἰησοῦ.

11 τί δὲ ὅτι τὸ ἔριον εἰς μέσον τῶν ἀκανθῶν τιθέασιν; τύπος ἐστὶν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ θέμενος, ὅτι ὃς ἐὰν θέλῃ τὸ ἔριον ἄραι τὸ κόκκινον, δεῖ αὐτὸν πολλὰ παθεῖν διὰ τὸ εἶναι φοβεράν τὴν ἀκανθαν, καὶ θλιβέντα κυριεύσαι αὐτοῦ. Οὕτως, φησὶν, οἱ θέλοντές με ἰδεῖν καὶ ἄψασθαί μου τῆς βασιλείας ὀφείλουσιν θλιβέντες καὶ παθόντες λαβεῖν με.

Num. xix. 2 sq. VIII. Τίνα δὲ δοκεῖτε τύπον εἶναι, ὅτι ἐντέταλται τῷ Ἰσραὴλ προσφέρειν δάμαλιν τοὺς ἄνδρας ἐν οἷς εἰσὶν ἁμαρτιαὶ τέλειαι, καὶ σφάζαντας κατακαίειν, καὶ αἶρειν τότε τὴν σποδὸν παιδία καὶ βάλλειν εἰς ἄγγῃ, καὶ περιτιθέναι τὸ ἔριον τὸ κόκκινον ἐπὶ ξύλον (ἴδε πάλιν ὁ τύπος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ καὶ τὸ ἔριον τὸ κόκκινον) καὶ τὸ ὕσσωπον, καὶ οὕτως ῥαντίζειν τὰ παιδία καθ' ἓνα τὸν λαόν, ἵνα ἀγνίζονται ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν; νοεῖτε πῶς ἐν ἀπλότῃ λέγεται ὑμῖν· ὁ μόσχος ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐστίν, οἱ προσφέροντες ἄνδρες ἁμαρτωλοὶ οἱ προσεσέγκαντες αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὴν σφαγὴν. ἔπειτα οὐκέτι ἄνδρες ἁμαρτωλοί, οὐκέτι ἁμαρτωλῶν ἡ δέξα.† 3 οἱ δὲ ῥαντίζοντες παῖδες οἱ εὐαγγελιστάμενοι ἡμῖν τὴν ἀφε-

11. ἀκανθῶν. The obvious fulfilment of the type in the crown of thorns is not suggested, as unsuitable to the triumphant Christ at His second coming.

ἔτι, as in v. 9, v. note.

πολλὰ παθεῖν. This Epistle seems clearly written out of the midst of persecution. Cf. ii. 1, viii. 6.

θλιβέντα of course after δεῖ, not διὰ τό.

αὐτοῦ, sc. ἐρίου.

οὕτως κ.τ.λ. This sentence is commonly quoted as one of the few apocryphal sayings of Christ that have been preserved independently of the Gospels. So Westcott, Introduction to Study of Gospels, App. c. Cf. too Westcott, On Canon, Part I. Cap. I. Note, p. 62. I cannot consider the passage intended as such, though Supernatural

Religion, I. p. 255, says bluntly that the expression is "directly attributed to Jesus." Now as a matter of fact φησὶν is habitually used in this Epistle simply for 'means,' 'implies,' in explaining a type (e.g. x. 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, xi. 11, and cf. vi. 9, xi. 8), more often so in fact than in introducing a direct quotation (e.g. vii. 7, x. 4, 5, 6, and cf. xii. 7), and as such, without much hesitation, I take it here. For the introduction of the first person in words manifestly not a quotation, cf. as one decisive instance v. 5 of the present chapter. xi. 8 gives an instance introduced by a φησὶν. The initial οὕτως I consider distinctly in favour of my view.

§ VIII. The heifer offered by sinners, the ashes of which were collected by boys and put into vessels

II ergo videtis figuram eius qui passurus erat, Iesu. quare et lanam in medio spinarum ponunt? figura Iesu ecclesiae posita; quia qui voluerit tollere lanam coccineam, oportet illum multa pati propter spinae nequitiam, et coartatum sic dominari illius. Sic, inquit, qui volunt me videre et adtingere regnum meum, debent compressi et multa passi accipere.

VIII. Quam autem figuram putatis esse, quia praeceptum est populo Iudaeorum offerre vaccam homines in quibus peccata consummata sint, et occisam comburere, et tollere tunc cinerem pueros et mittere in vasa fictilia, et suspendere in ligno lanam coccineam et hysopum, et sic spargere pueros circa singulas turbas populi, ut sanctificentur a peccatis? videte ergo quomodo in similitudine dicat vobis: vacca erat Iesus; qui offerebant homines peccatores, hi qui obtulerunt illum ad victimam. 3 qui sparserunt pueri, hi erant qui nuntiaverunt nobis

l. 2 *Ecclesia* cod.

l. 7 Passi. *pasi* cod.

l. 14 *Similitudine* cod. *simplitudine* al.

*bound with scarlet wool and hysop, is a type of Jesus.*

The purification-sacrifice alluded to is ordained in Numb. xix. and briefly alluded to Heb. ix. 13, 19. A red heifer without spot or blemish was killed, and burnt with all the parts entire in a fire fed with cedar wood and hysop and scarlet wool. The ashes, after being gathered, were kept in a place outside the camp or town, and used for purposes of purification.

1. τοὺς ἀνδρας ἐν οἷς... at entire variance with Numb., where the priest sacrifices the heifer, and a man who is clean (not τὰ παῖδια) gathers the ashes.

τῇ σποδῶν παῖδια. τα παῖδια σποδον N.

τὸ ἔριον. Not in Numb. but a correct addition. Cf. Heb. ix. 19.

ἴδε πάλιν... κόκκινον. Om. FOV and very probably correctly. The

words read rather like a gloss, and form an awkward parenthesis.

παῖδια. One commentator affirms that young boys, women and certain other persons were expressly excluded from taking part in the ceremony.

2. For ὁ μόσχος ὁ Ἰησοῦς, N strangely reads νομος χριστος ιησους, but N\*\* corrects to text.

μόσχος used for δάμαλις of v. 1, which is the LXX word. The change of gender ὁ μόσχος in which all MSS. agree is noticeable, but no doubt unintentional. Jos., Ant. iv. 4. 6, says expressly μόσχος θήλεια. Jer., in Ezek. xliii. 19, quotes approvingly this application of the type in our Epistle.

εἴτα... δόξα. These words give no sense — ἀμαρτωλοὶ was inserted by Usher, but the MSS. suggest no variant, and it should of course be rejected: nor does the Latin version,

Numb. xix. 2  
sq.

σιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ τὸν ἀγνισμὸν τῆς καρδίας, οἷς ἔδωκεν  
 τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τὴν ἐξουσίαν, οὖσιν δεκαδύο εἰς μαρτύριον  
 τῶν φυλῶν (ὅτι δεκαδύο φυλαὶ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ), εἰς τὸ κηρύσ-  
 4 σεν. διατί δὲ τρεῖς παῖδες οἱ ῥαντίζοντες; εἰς μαρτύριον  
 5 Ἀβραάμ, Ἰσαάκ, Ἰακώβ, ὅτι οὗτοι μεγάλοι τῷ θεῷ. ὅτι  
 δὲ τὸ ἔριον ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον· ὅτι ἡ βασιλεία Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ ξύλου,  
 καὶ ὅτι οἱ ἐλπίζοντες ἐπ' αὐτὸν ζήσονται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.  
 6 διατί δὲ ἡμα τὸ ἔριον καὶ τὸ ὕσσωπον; ὅτι ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ  
 αὐτοῦ ἡμέραι ἔσονται πονηραὶ καὶ ῥυπαραί, ἐν αἷς ἡμεῖς  
 σωθησόμεθα· ὅτι ὁ ἀλγὼν σάρκα διὰ τοῦ ῥύπου τοῦ ὕσσω-  
 7 που ἰᾶται. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο οὕτως γενόμενα ἡμῖν μὲν ἔστιν  
 φανερά, ἐκείνοις δὲ σκοτεινά, ὅτι οὐκ ἤκουσαν φωνῆς  
 κυρίου.

IX. Λέγει γὰρ πάλιν περὶ τῶν ὧτίων, πῶς περιέτεμεν

Ps. xviii. 45. ἡμῶν τὴν καρδίαν. λέγει κύριος ἐν τῷ προφήτῃ· Εἰς

Is. xxxiii. 13. ἀκοὴν ὧτίου ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου. καὶ πάλιν λέγει· Ἀκοῇ ἀκού-

Ier. iv. 4. σονται οἱ πόρρωθεν, ἃ ἐποίησα γνώσκονται καί· Περιτμήθητε,

2 λέγει κύριος, τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν. καὶ πάλιν λέγει· Ἀκογε,

Ier. vii. 2 sq. Ἰσραὴλ, ὅτι τάδε λέγει κύριος ὁ θεός σου. καὶ πάλιν τὸ

Ps. xxxiv. 13. πνεῦμα κυρίου προφητεύει· Τίς ἐστὶν ὁ θέλων ζῆσαι εἰς τὸν

Ex. xv. 26. 3 αἰῶνα; ἀκοῇ ἀκούσάτω τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ παιδός σου. καὶ

which altogether omits the words,  
 come to our rescue.

3. ὅτι δεκ. φυλ. τοῦ Ἰσ. From this (among other things), we may infer that the Epistle is not addressed to Jewish Christians alone.

4. τρεῖς. Neither the O. T. nor the Talmud recognise this number. Numb. speaks of one man through-

5. ξύλον. So xii. 1, 7, ξύλον is made typical of the cross: quite apart from the explanation of a type, our author uses the simple ξύλον for "the cross" in v. 13. So Acts v. 30, x. 39, xiii. 29.

ξύλον in meaning of "tree" is first found in LXX. and Alexan-

η βασ. ἐπὶ ξύλου. After the words ὁ κύριος ἐβασίλευσεν in Ps. xcvi. 10, many copies of the LXX. added ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου. The old Lat. and the Coptic version both inserted the words, and Just. M., Tert., Aug., and others, all recognise the addition. At what time it first found a place is doubtful, but clearly our author had it in his mind. Among the old Latin hymns we find:

Impleta sunt quae concinit  
 David fideli carmine,  
 Dicens in nationibus,  
 Regnavit a ligno Deus.

For ξύλου, vulg. reads ξύλω, and so some Edd. ξυλον Ν.

6. ὕσσωπον. Hyssop was used both externally for cleansing purposes,

remissionem peccatorum et castitatem praecordiae nostrae, quibus dedit evangelii potestatem, qui sunt duodecim in testimonium tribuum, quia duodecim sunt tribus Iudaeorum. quare ergo et lana in ligno est? quia qui crediderit in illum vivet in perpetuum. quare in unum lanam et hysopum? quia in regno illius dies erunt nequissimi et sordidi, quibus nos sanabimur. et propter hoc, dum sic fiunt, nobis lucida, illis autem obscura, quia non audierunt vocem domini.

IX. Dicit autem de auribus, quomodo circumcidat aures praecordiae nostrae. dixit per prophetam: *Audit* Ps. xviii. 45.  
*ditu auris exaudivit me.* et iterum dicit: *Auditione* Is. xxxiii. 13.  
*audient qui longe sunt, et quae feci scient.* *Circumcidite,* Ier. iv. 4.  
 2 *dicit dominus, aures vestras.* et iterum dicit: *Audi,* Ier. vii. 2 sq.  
*Israel, quia haec dicit dominus deus tuus.* et iterum  
 spiritus domini prophetat: *Quia qui vult vivere in per-* Ps. xxxiv. 13.  
 3 *petuum, auditione audiat vocem pueri mei.* et iterum Ex. xv. 26.  
 l. 3 Om. in cod. l. 5 Vivet. vivit cod. l. 12 Auditionem cod.  
 l. 13 Feci. faciet cod.

and internally as a purging medicine. In the ceremonial of the red heifer its use is enjoined, Numb. xix. 6, 18.

ἡμέραι πονηραί, ii. 1. For πονηραί καὶ ῥυπαραί of Vulg. and Lat. N has ρυπαραί καὶ πονηραί.

ῥύπον presents great difficulties. No good emendation to the passage has been proposed. Dressel in desperation connects ῥύπος with ῥύω, βέω, and would translate it juice or sap. The real explanation would seem to be that "the filth or foulness of the hyssop" is a condensed expression for "the removal of filth by means of the hyssop," which gathers to itself the filth of the object cleansed. Cf. use of ῥύμμα for (1) soap, (2) dirt remaining from washing — and cf. ῥύπτω, ῥυπτικός. The word recurs xi. 11, of the defilement of sin.

7. ἐκελευσ. Here clearly of the Jews.

§ IX. *Circumcision of the flesh was a sign (in its origin prophetic of Christ's crucifixion), which is now superseded by circumcision of the heart.*

The Chapter abruptly introduces the consideration of another type.

1. πάλιν marks the transition to a new division of the subject, a very favourite word with the author.

ἡμῶν and καρδίας, both emphatic.

ἐν τῷ προφῆτῃ, sc. per prophetam, God speaking in and by the mouth of the prophet, rather than merely apud prophetam, in the book of the prophet. προφήτης is used of the Psalms in vi. 6 and xi. 6.

ἀκοῆ, which is not in Heb. or LXX., is added for emphasis.

οἱ πόρρωθεν, orig. of Gentiles as contrasted with Jews: here of all who are not Christians, Jews and Gentiles alike.



- Is. i. 2. *πάλιν λέγει· Ἄκογε οὐρανέ, καὶ ἐνωτίζου γῆ, ὅτι κύριος*  
 Is. i. 10. *ἐλάλησεν ταῦτα εἰς μαρτύριον. καὶ πάλιν λέγει· Ἀκούσατε*  
*λόγον κυρίου, ἄρχοντες τοῦ λαοῦ τοῦτο. καὶ πάλιν λέγει·*  
 Is. xl. 3. *4 Ἀκούσατε, τέκνα, φωνῆς βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ. οὐκοῦν*  
*περιέτεμεν ἡμῶν τὰς ἀκοάς, ἵνα ἀκούσαντες λόγον πιστεύ-*  
*σωμεν. ἡ γὰρ περιτομὴ ἐφ' ἣ πεποίθασιν κατήργηται.*  
*περιτομὴν γὰρ εἴρηκεν οὐ σαρκὸς γεννηθῆναι. ἀλλὰ παρέ-*  
 5 *βησαν, ὅτι ἄγγελος πονηρὸς ἐσόφειζεν αὐτούς. λέγει πρὸς*  
 Jer. iv. 3 sq. *αὐτούς· Τάδε λέγει κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν (ὧδε εὐρίσκω ἐντο-*  
*λήν)· Μὴ σπείρῃτε ἐπ' ἀκάνθαις, περιτμήθητε τῷ κυρίῳ*  
 Deut. x. 16. *ἡμῶν. καὶ τί λέγει; Περιτμήθητε τὸ σκληρὸν τῆς καρδίας*  
*ἡμῶν, καὶ τὸν τράχηλον ἡμῶν οὐ μὴ σκληρύνετε. λάβε*  
 Jer. ix. 25 sq. *πάλιν· Ἰδοὺ, λέγει κύριος, πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἀπερίτμητα ἄκρο-*  
*βυστίαν, ὁ δὲ λαὸς οὗτος ἀπερίτμητος καρδίας. ἀλλ' ἐρεῖς·*  
*Καὶ μὴν περιτέμνεται ὁ λαὸς εἰς σφραγίδα. ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶς*  
*Σύρος καὶ Ἀραβὺ καὶ πάντες οἱ ἱερεῖς τῶν εἰδώλων. ἄρα*  
*οὖν κἀκένοι ἐκ τῆς διαθήκης αὐτῶν εἰσὶν; ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ*  
 7 *Αἰγύπτιοι ἐν περιτομῇ εἰσὶν. μάθετε οὖν, τέκνα ἀγάπης,*

2. ἀκοῇ ἀκουσ. κ.τ.λ. These words are not in the Ps., which to the question quoted replies, 'Keep thy tongue from evil, and thy lips from speaking guile.' They resemble Ex. xv. 26.

3. τοῦ παιδὸς μου, cf. vi. 1 n.

4. τὰς ἀκοάς and ἀκούω have been the words dwelt on throughout.

παρέβησαν. Such intrans. use is not found in N. T. In 2 Joh. 9 παραβαλῶν is a false reading.

ἄγγ. πονηρός, one of the ἄγγελοι τοῦ Σατανᾶ of xviii. 1. Commentators here see a germ of Gnostic angelology; but from the tone of the Ep., such Gnosticism as the author had come immediately in contact with appears in a stage of very early development. Cf. Dissert. pp. xxxvii. xcvi.

5. καὶ τὸν τράχ. These words

come from Deut. x. 16, though some Edd. refer them to Jer. vii. 26. For σκληρύνετε it would seem better to read σκληρυνεῖτε, for (1) it is the reading of N, (2) it is the word in the LXX. Deut. x. 16, (3) an imperative, not fut., is required, and with οὐ μὴ the fut. is employed to give such imperative force.

λάβε does not again occur like this. The reading is doubtful. ἰδου λαβε N, λαβε N\*, και BCF, while OV altogether omit.

6. περιτ. εἰς σφραγίδα. So, Rom. iv. 11, the sign of circumcision is spoken of as a σφραγίδα τῆς δικαιοσύνης τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐν τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ. The passages should be compared throughout, as also Rom. ii. 25 vv. Cf. Gal. v. 6, Col. ii. 11, &c.

πᾶς Σύρος, κ.τ.λ. This passage has given rise to much discussion

dicit: *Audi caelum, et percipe auribus terra, quia dominus* Is. i. 2.  
*locutus est.* et iterum dicit: *Audite verbum domini,* Is. i. 10.  
*principes populi huius.* et iterum: *Audite vocem clamoris* xl. 3.  
 4 *in eremo.* ergo circumcidit aures nostras, ut audito  
 verbo credamus. circumcisionem autem dixit non cor-  
 poris. sed praeterierunt, quia angelus nequam docebat  
 5 illos. dicit autem ad illos: *Haec dicit dominus deus* Jer. iv. 3 sq.  
*vester* (hic invenio novam legem): *Vae illis qui seminant*  
*in spinis.* *circumcidite vos domino vestro* (hoc est: au-  
 dite dominum vestrum) *et circumcidite nequitiam de prae-*  
*cordiis vestris.* dicit autem iterum: *Ecce, dicit dominus,* Jer. ix. 25 sq.  
*omnes nationes sine circumcisione corporis sunt, hic autem*  
 6 *populus sine circumcisione cordis est.* sed etiam cum  
 circumcisis est populus in signo. sed et Iudaeus et  
 Arabs et omnes sacerdotes idolorum et Aegyptii. ergo  
 7 et hi de testamento sunt, quos dicit filios Abrahae de

l. 4 *Circumcidite* cod. Nostras. *v* for *n* corr. in cod.

among the commentators. Some, with the Lat. vers., would arbitrarily omit the *πᾶς*, or violently interpret *πᾶς* to mean '*many*,' or again explain *Σύπος* by Judaeo-Syrian or the like. (The Lat. vers. actually substitutes *Iudaeus* for *Syrus*.) Though Herod., II. 104, speaks of circumcision existing among the Palestinian Syrians as a custom borrowed from the Egyptians, he seems (cf. Jos. Ap. I. 22, Antiq. VIII. 10. 3) to have meant simply the Jews. Certain tribes appear to have practised the rite in older times, but from 1 Macc. i. 15, 48, 60, 61 we learn that circumcision had become by that time a *distinctive* mark of Jews. Among the Arabians again, though there is evidence for some partial prevalence of the custom, it was certainly not universal. As a conspicuous instance of the circumcision of idol-priests we may notice the Egyptians. Indeed it was in Egypt probably that the rite originated.

Her. II. 104 says that the Colchians, Aethiopians, Phoenicians, Palestinians, Syrians (sc. prob. Jews), and others derived it thence. Abraham instituted the custom after his sojourn in Egypt, and it was perhaps expressly enjoined as marking out the Israelites as a *priestly* people, cf. Ex. xix. 6.

However, to argue at length on the historical accuracy of the statement of this verse is beside the mark; there can be no doubt that, whether true or untrue, as matter of fact, the writer derived it from a misunderstanding of Jer. ix. 25, 26, where the obscure rendering of the LXX. seemed to imply that the nations there mentioned, Egyptians, Jews, Edomites, Ammonites, and Moabites, all practised circumcision, whereas the prophet in reality asserts the contrary.

*ἐν περτ. εἰσιν.* Cf. *ἐν παρρησία* εἶναι Joh. vii. 4, *ἐν ποιήσει γενέσθαι* Her. II. 82.

περὶ πάντων πλουσίως, ὅτι Ἀβραὰμ πρῶτος περιτομὴν  
 δούς ἐν πνεύματι προβλέψας εἰς τὸν Ἰησοῦν περιέτεμεν,  
 8 λαβὼν τριῶν γραμμάτων δόγματα. λέγει γάρ· Καὶ περι-  
 Gen. xvii. 23  
 sqq.  
 cf. xiv. 14. ἔτεμεν Ἀβραὰμ ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ ἄνδρας δεκαοκτὼ καὶ  
 τριακοσίους. τίς οὖν ἡ δοθεῖσα τούτῳ γνώσις; μάθετε ὅτι  
 τοὺς δεκαοκτὼ πρώτους, καὶ διάστημα ποιήσας λέγει τρια-  
 κοσίους. τὸ δεκαοκτὼ ἡ· ἔχεις Ἰησοῦν. ὅτι δὲ ὁ σταυρὸς  
 ἐν τῷ τ' ἡμελλεν ἔχειν τὴν χάριν, λέγει καὶ τριακοσίους.  
 9 δηλοῖ οὖν τὸν μὲν Ἰησοῦν ἐν τοῖς δυσὶν γράμμασιν, καὶ ἐν  
 τῷ ἐνὶ τὸν σταυρόν. οἶδεν ὁ τὴν ἔμφυτον δωρεὰν τῆς  
 διδασκῆς αὐτοῦ θέμενος ἐν ἡμῖν. οὐδεὶς γνησιώτερον ἔμαθεν  
 ἀπ' ἐμοῦ λόγον· ἀλλὰ οἶδα ὅτι ἄξιόι ἐστε ὑμεῖς.

X. "Ὅτι δὲ Μωϋσῆς εἰρηκεν· Οἷ φάγεσθε χοῖρον οὐδέ  
 Lev. xi.  
 Deut. xiv. ἀετὸν οὐδέ ὀζύπτερον οὐδέ κόρακα, οὔτε πάντα ἰχθὺν ὅς οὐκ  
 ἔχει λεπίδα ἐν ἑαυτῷ, τρία ἔλαβεν ἐν τῇ συνέσει δόγματα.  
 2 πέρας γέ τοι λέγει αὐτοῖς ἐν τῷ Δευτερονομίῳ· Καὶ διαθή-  
 Deut. iv. 1sq. κομαὶ πρὸς τὸν λαόν τοῦτον τὰ δικαιώματά μοι. ἄρα οὖν

7. δόγματα. Cf. note on i. 6.

8. The misspent ingenuity of this explanation of the number 318 is remarkable. In Greek it is expressed by the letters T standing for 300, I for 10, H for 8. This elaborate allegorizing from numbers is a common vice both in patristic and rabbinical writing, especially in ref. to apocalyptic books, e.g. Daniel, and received as its scientific appellation *Gematría*. In this particular instance, as the Heb. Tau (Τ) does not signify 300 but 400, Jewish rabbis found in the 318, the name Elieser, the Hebrew letters of which indicate the number. Later Christians referred the number to the 318 Nicene Fathers.

καὶ περιέτεμεν. The direct statement does not occur, but Gen. xiv. 14 gives the number of his servants as 318, and Gen. xvii. 27 says that he circumcised all his house. Strictly the 318 of Gen. xiv. 14 were only a

band of fighting men selected from his household, so that the statistics on which this elaborate allegorizing is based are untrue.

τούτῳ should hardly be retained. τούτῳ BC, τούτο OV, αὐτῷ N.

The allegorical reference of T to the Cross is habitual. Cf. Tert. adv. Marc. III. 22, Jer. Comm. in Ez. III. 96 on Ez. ix. 4.

ἔχειν τὴν χάριν may be translated (1) to show forth its grace, sc. the grace whereby it procured our redemption, or (2) to find acknowledgment, though none of the Comm. suggest this rendering of the passage.

9. ὁ, Müller reads οἶδεν ὅτι, but this seems impossible to translate: the θέμενος is then left wholly unsupported. For ὅτι read ὁ, the reading of all the MSS. except N.

For διδασκῆς N has διαθήκης.

As in vi. 10 the writer exalts his power of mystical and allegorical interpretation into nothing short of

omnibus gentibus. quia Abraham primus circumcisio-  
 8 nem dedit in spiritu, quod prospiciebat in Iesum. cir- Gen. xvii. 23  
 cumcidit de domo sua homines trecentos XVIII, quia <sup>sq.</sup> cf. xiv. 14.  
 primo XVIII, tum trecenti sunt, et distinctione facta  
 dicit X et VIII. habes in duabus litteris Iesum, in  
 quibus incipiebat habere donum. tunc dicit et trecen-  
 9 tos: habes in una littera ·tau· crucem. scitote quia  
 naturale donum doctrinae suae posuit in nobis. nemo  
 aptius didicit a me verbum, sed scio quia digni estis.

X. Quare autem Moyses dicit: *Non manducabis* Lev. xi.  
*porcinam nec aquilam nec accipitrem nec corvum, nec om-* Deut. xiv.  
*nem piscem qui non habet in se squamam?* tres accepit  
 2 Moyses in conscientia sua constitutiones. ad summa  
 dicit illis in secunda lege: *Et disponam ad populum hunc* Deut. iv. 1 sq.  
*aequitates meas.* ergo non est mandatum dei ne man-

l. 4 Primo XVIII tum. *primatum* cod. l. 9 Aptius. *artius* cod.  
 l. 12 Qui. *quia* cod.

a spiritual gift, one of God's choicest favours.

§ X. *As in the case of circumcision, so with meats also the injunctions of the Law had a spiritual allegorical force, and in the bare letter were valueless.*

1. The law on clean and unclean meats is to be found in Lev. xi. and Deut. xiv., from which our author derives his quotations.

εἶρηκεν, & has εἶπεν, and so again v. 3.

χοῖρον, the Sept. word is ὄς, but in N. T. χοῖρος habitually takes its place. Lev. xi. 7, Deut. xiv. 8.

δξύπτερον, curiously enough the word is not used in the passages alluded to, though *lxrls* and *lépaξ* are both mentioned with a number of less kindred birds. Lev. xi. 13 ff., Deut. xiv. 11 ff.

Fish without fins or scales are forbidden, Lev. xi. 9 ff., Deut. xiv. 10.

τῖπλ δόγμ. The τῖπλ here at first

hardly seems to have a special application, but to be used rather as the perfect and sacred number. In i. 6 life, faith, hope appeared to be the τῖπλ δόγματα. In ix. 7 we had the τῖπλ γράμμάτων δόγματα with specific reference. So here we can discover a definite application for the τῖπλ in the threefold classification of animals as beasts, birds, fishes, dealt with in vv. 3, 4, 5 respectively. In vv. 9, 10, where the phrase recurs, the division is *clearly marked*, and it would become so here if in the confusion of MSS. we might read οὐδὲ ἀερὸν οὐτὲ βξ. οὐτὲ κορ., οὐδὲ πᾶντ. *lxθ.*, the οὐτὲ linking together the subordinate members of the second class. Doubtless the division strikes the reader as worthless and arbitrary, but viii. 4 gives another instance of a mystical significance attached to the number *three*.

2. ἐν τῷ Δευτ. The exact citation nowhere appears, but may be referred vaguely to Deut. iv. 1, 5.

οὐκ ἔστιν ἐντολὴ θεοῦ τὸ μὴ τρώγειν, Μωϋσῆς δὲ ἐν πνεύ-  
 3 ματι ἐλάλησεν. τὸ οὖν χοιρίον πρὸς τοῦτο εἴρηκεν· οὐ μὴ  
 κολληθήσῃ, φησίν, ἀνθρώποις τοιούτοις, οἵτινές εἰσιν ὅμοιοι  
 χοίρων· τουτέστιν ὅταν σπαταλῶσιν, ἐπιλανθάνονται τοῦ  
 κυρίου ἑαυτῶν, ὅταν δὲ ὑστερηθῶσιν, ἐπιγινώσκουσιν τὸν  
 4 κύριον, ὡς καὶ ὁ χοῖρος ὅταν τρώγῃ, τὸν κύριον οὐκ οἶδεν,  
 ὅταν δὲ πεινᾷ κραυγάζει, καὶ λαβὼν πάλιν σιωπᾷ. Οὐδὲ  
 μὴ φάγῃς, φησίν, τὸν λετόν οὐδὲ τὸν ὀζύπτερον οὐδὲ τὸν  
 ἰκτῖνα οὐδὲ τὸν κόρακα· οὐ μὴ, φησίν, κολληθήσῃ οὐδὲ  
 ὁμοιωθήσῃ ἀνθρώποις τοιούτοις, οἵτινες οὐκ οἶδασιν διὰ  
 κόπου καὶ ἰδρώτος πορίζειν ἑαυτοῖς τὴν τροφήν, ἀλλὰ ἀρ-  
 5 πάζουσιν τὰ ἀλλότρια ἐν ἀνομίᾳ αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπιτηροῦσιν ὡς  
 ἐν ἀκεραιουσύνῃ περιπατοῦντες, καὶ περιβλέπονται τίνα ἐκ-  
 δύσωσιν διὰ τὴν πλεονεξίαν, ὡς καὶ τὰ ὄρνεα ταῦτα μόνα  
 διὰ κίπου ἑαυτοῖς οὐ πορίζει τὴν τροφήν, ἀλλὰ ἀργὰ καθή-  
 6 μενα ἐκζητεῖ πῶς ἀλλοτρίας σάρκας καταφάγῃ, ὄντα λοιμὰ  
 τῇ πονηρίᾳ αὐτῶν. Καὶ οὐ μὴ φάγῃς, φησίν, σμῆραιναν  
 οὐδὲ πῶλγπα οὐδὲ σπιάν· οὐ μὴ, φησίν, ὁμοιωθήσῃ κολλώ-  
 7 μενος ἀνθρώποις τοιούτοις, οἵτινες εἰς τέλος εἰσὶν ἀσεβεῖς  
 καὶ κεκριμένοι ἤδη τῷ θανάτῳ, ὡς καὶ ταῦτα τὰ ἰχθυῖδια  
 μόνα ἐπικατάρата ἐν τῷ βυθῷ νήχεται, μὴ κολουμβῶντα ὡς  
 8 τὰ λοιπά, ἀλλὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ κάτω τοῦ βυθοῦ κατοικεῖ. ἀλλὰ  
 καὶ τὸν δασύποδα οὐ μὴ φάγῃ, φησίν. πρὸς τί; οὐ μὴ γένη  
 παιδοφθόρος, οὐδὲ ὁμοιωθήσῃ τοῖς τοιούτοις· ὅτι ὁ λαγῶδς  
 κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν πλεονεκτεῖ τὴν ἀφόδενσιν. Ἔσα γὰρ ἔτη ζῇ,  
 9 τοσαύτας ἔχει τρύπας. ἀλλὰ οὐδὲ τὴν γαῖαν φάγῃ· οὐ μὴ,

οὐκ ἐντ. θεοῦ, a bold declaration which means that the command *per se* had no vital or spiritual import, but was of value solely in the hidden spiritual significance.

3. χοίρων N. For the gen. cf. Winer § 30. 4, who quotes Joh. viii. 55, where however Lach., Treg. read the dative. The Vulg. MSS. read χοίροις.

ὑστερηθῶσιν. N has ὑστεροῦνται,

prob. rightly: for constr. see next note.

ὅταν τρώγῃ. NOV all support the Indic., which must clearly be kept in the text. For such construction cf. note on xi. 11.

4. ἐπιτηροῦσιν, which N alone reads for ἐπιτηρόνσω, though a possible compound, does not appear to occur elsewhere, and has prob. crept into the text from the neighbouring

- 3 ducent, sed Moyses in figura locutus est illis. porcinam ergo ad hoc dixit: non eris coniunctus hominibus talibus, qui cum luxuriant, obliviscuntur dominum suum. porcus enim cum manducat, dominum non novit; cum  
 4 esurit, tunc clamat, et cum accepit, iterum tacet. *Nec manducabis*, inquit, *aquilam aut accipitrem aut corvum*. hoc dicit: non adiunges te nec similabis talibus hominibus, qui nesciunt per laborem et sudorem sibi adquirere escam, sed rapiunt alienam per suam iniquitatem et observant quasi in simplicitate ambulantes quem dispo-  
 5 *Non manducabis*, inquit, *muraenam nec polypum nec sepiam*: non, inquit, similabis adhaerens talibus hominibus, qui in perpetuo impii et iudicati iam morti sunt. hi enim pisces soli maledicti sunt, non natantes sicut  
 6 reliqui, sed in ima altitudinis terra inhabitant. sed *nec leporem manducabis*. ut quid dicit? non eris, inquit, corruptor puerorum nec similabis talibus. quia lepus singulis annis facit ad adsellandum singula foramina, et  
 7 quotquot annis vivit, totidem foramina facit. sed *nec*

l. 12 *Pigre* cod.

περιπατούντες, περιβλέπονται.

καὶ περιβλέπονται...τροφήν. These words are asserted on authority of **N** alone, but the Lat. concurs in inserting a portion of them.

ἐκδύσωσιν, so used of the thieves in the parable of the Good Samaritan, Luke x. 30.

5. σμύραιναν, in **N** *συμρναν*, while for *πωλυπαν* of **N**, Vulg. MSS. read *πολυποδα*.

σμύραιναν. The lamprey is not specified in Lev. xi., but falls into the category of fish without scales. So too the polypus and the cuttle-fish.

εἰς τέλος, 'utterly,' rather than 'at the last.' So again xix. 11.

l. 16 *Morti. mortui* cod.

ἐπικατάρατα, see vii. 7 note.

κολυμβῶντα. The word properly means *to dive*, or simply *to swim*, the Hellenistic equivalent for Attic *νέειν*, but here it manifestly implies swimming near the surface. Not altogether dissimilar is the use in Acts xxvii. 43 of plunging into the water from the stranded ship.

6. δασύποδα, as in LXX., the *hare*, which is regarded as unclean by the Turks and Armenians no less than by the Jewish law, Lev. xi. 6, which condemned it as a ruminating animal, not dividing the hoof.

φησὶν, om. **N**.

7. ὕαιναν. The hyena, though

- φησίν, γένη μοιχὸς οὐδὲ φθορεὺς, οὐδὲ ὁμοιωθήσῃ τοῖς τοι-  
 οὔτοις. πρὸς τί; ὅτι τὸ ζῶον τοῦτο παρ' ἐναυτὸν ἀλλάσ-  
 σει τὴν φύσιν, καὶ ποτὲ μὲν ἄρρεν, ποτὲ δὲ θῆλυ γίνεται.  
 8 ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν γαλῆν ἐμίσησεν καλῶς. οὐ μὴ, φησίν, γενη-  
 θῆς τοιοῦτος, ὅλους ἀκούομεν ἀνομίαν ποιοῦντας ἐν τῷ στό-  
 ματι δι' ἀκαθαρσίαν, οὐδὲ κολληθήσῃ ταῖς ἀκαθάρτοις ταῖς  
 τὴν ἀνομίαν ποιούσαις ἐν τῷ στόματι. τὸ γὰρ ζῶον τοῦτο  
 9 τῷ στόματι κύει. Περὶ μὲν τῶν βρωμάτων λαβὼν Μωϋ-  
 σῆς τρία δόγματα οὕτως ἐν πνεύματι ἐλάλησεν, οἱ δὲ κατ'  
 ἐπιθυμίαν τῆς σαρκὸς ὡς περὶ βρώσεως προσεδέξαντο.  
 IO λαμβάνει δὲ τῶν αὐτῶν τριῶν δογμάτων γνώσιν Δαυίδ, καὶ  
 Ps. i. 1. λέγει ὁμοίως· Μακάριος ἀνὴρ ὃς οὔκ ἐπορεύθη ἐν βογλῆ  
 ἀσεβῶν, καθὼς οἱ ἰχθύες πορεύονται ἐν σκότει εἰς τὰ βάθη,  
 καὶ ἐν ὁδῷ ἁμαρτωλῶν οὔκ ἔστι, καθὼς οἱ δοκοῦντες φοβεῖ-  
 σθαι τὸν κύριον ἁμαρτάνουσιν ὡς ὁ χοῖρος, καὶ ἐπὶ καθέδραν  
 λοιμῶν οὔκ ἐκάθισεν, καθὼς τὰ πετεινὰ τὰ καθήμενα εἰς  
 II ἀρπαγὴν. ἔχετε τελείως καὶ περὶ τῆς βρώσεως. ἀλλ'  
 Lev. xi. 3. εἶπεν Μωϋσῆς· Φάγεσθε πᾶν διχηλοῖν καὶ μαργκώμενον. τί  
 Deut. xiv. 6. λέγει; ὁ τὴν τροφὴν λαμβάνων οἶδεν τὸν τρέφοντα αὐτόν,

not specified in Lev., falls into the class of unclean animals, who neither chew the cud, nor have the hoof split.

ἀλλάσσει τὴν φύσιν. This curious mistake in natural history was widespread. Not only Church allegorizers, but Ovid, Diod. Sic., Aelian, and Pliny endorse it in spite of Aristotle's express counterstatement, De Gen. An. III. 6; Hist. An. VI. 32. A similar error was current about the hare.

8. γαλῆν. As a creeping beast the weasel is held unclean, Lev. xi. 29.

οὐδὲ κολλ. κ.τ.λ. BCFOV, except the *εν*, which is added from *Σ*, which reads *οὐδε ταις τὴν ἀνομίαν ποιοῦσαι* (\*\* *ποιοῦσαις*) *εν τῷ στοματι* καὶ *ἀκαθαρσία κολληθήσῃ*.

ἀνομ. ποι. ἐν τῷ στόμ. Not of lewd conversation, but of *fellatores* and *fellatrices*.

τῷ στόμ. κύει. Ov., Met. IX. 323, and Aelian, Hist. An. II. 55, make the same egregious mistake in spite of Arist. De Gen. An. III. 6. Others for the mouth substituted the ears.

9. The writer clearly regards these and similar ordinances of the Law, not merely as finally superseded, but as valueless and meaningless from the beginning, except in their spiritual signification, which was grasped (so he declares) by Moses and David, though hidden from the Jews at large. Tert. and Orig. no less boldly reject and denounce any literal interpretation or acceptance of such Mosaic enactments. To do so is of course wholly uncritical, and belongs to that mechanical, allegorical, and unhistorical method of Biblical interpretation which this last century has so completely discredited.

*beluam*, inquit, *manducabis*. hoc est: non eris moecus aut adulter, nec corruptor, nec similabis talibus. quia haec bestia alternis annis mutat naturam et fit modo  
 8 masculus modo femina. sed et quod dicit: *Mustelam odibis*, non eris, inquit, talis, qui audit iniquitatem et loquitur inmunditiam. non, inquit, adhaerebis inmundis,  
 9 qui iniquitatem faciunt ore suo. De escis ergo Moyses, acceptis tribus constitutionibus, in spiritu sic locutus est. illi autem secundum concupiscentiam corporis, tamquam  
 10 de escis diceret, sic perceperunt. accepit autem earum trium constitutionum scientiam David et dicit: *Beatus* Ps. i. 1.  
*vir qui non abiit in consilio impiorum*, sicut pisces eunt in tenebras, *nec in via peccatorum stetit*, sicut qui videntur dominum timere et exerrant tamquam porcus, *nec in pestilentiae cathedra sedit*, sicut aves quae sedent ad  
 11 rapinam. habetis consummatam de escis. sed dixit Moyses: *Manducabis omne quod ruminat*, hoc est: qui  
 esca accepta scit eum qui se pascit in se refrigerari.

Lev. xi. 3.  
Deut. xiv. 6.

l. 7 *Qui*. quae Edd.

l. 14 Dominum om. cod.

l. 16 Consummatim Edd.

τρία δόγματα, v. 1 note.

10. Against the authority of Jewish tradition and the LXX. the first psalm, we may notice, is here attributed to David, as all anonymous psalms gradually came to be.

λοιμῶν subst.

τῆς βρώσεως, sc. that which may lawfully be eaten, that is, according to Lev. xi. 3, 'whatsoever parteth the hoof, and is cloven-footed and cheweth the cud.'

11. Turning from the unclean animals, he considers the clean and in their case too gives a symbolical interpretation, which agrees with that given by Clem. Al. and elsewhere. The animals that chew the cud typify those who meditate continually upon the law of the Lord in their hearts, while the divided hoof typifies the two worlds, this

world and the next, which are ever present to the mind of the true servant of God. It may be not uninteresting to quote a singularly close parallel in thought and language from a writer of a very different time and school. "This brings to my mind that of Moses, by which he describeth the beast that is clean. He is such an one that parteth the hoof, and cheweth the cud: not that parteth the hoof only, or that cheweth the cud only. The hare cheweth the cud, but yet is unclean, because he parteth not the hoof. And this truly resemblenth Talkative; he cheweth the cud, he seeketh knowledge, he cheweth upon the word (ἀναμαρτυκωμένων τὸν λόγον), but he divideth not the hoof, he parteth not with the way of sinners."—*The Pilgrim's Progress*.



καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἀναπαυόμενος εὐφραίνεσθαι δοκεῖ. καλῶς εἶπεν βλέπων τὴν ἐντολήν. τί οὖν λέγει; κολλᾶσθε μετὰ τῶν φοβουμένων τὸν κύριον, μετὰ τῶν μελετώντων ὃ ἔλαβον διάσταλμα ῥήματος ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ, μετὰ τῶν λαλούντων τὰ δικαιώματα κυρίου καὶ τηρούντων, μετὰ τῶν εἰδόντων ὅτι ἡ μελέτη ἐστὶν ἔργον εὐφροσύνης καὶ ἀναμαρτυκωμένων τὸν λόγον κυρίου. τί δὲ τὸ διχηλοῦν; ὅτι ὁ δίκαιος καὶ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ κόσμῳ περιπατεῖ καὶ τὸν ἅγιον αἰῶνα ἐκδέχεται.

12 βλέπετε πῶς ἐνομοθέτησεν Μωϋσῆς καλῶς. ἀλλὰ πόθεν ἐκείνοις ταῦτα νοῆσαι ἢ συνιέναι; ἡμεῖς δὲ δικαίως νοήσαντες τὰς ἐντολάς, λαλοῦμεν ὡς ἡθέλησεν κύριος. διὰ τοῦτο περιέτεμεν τὰς ἀκοάς ἡμῶν καὶ τὰς καρδίας, ἵνα συνιῶμεν ταῦτα.

XI. Ζητήσωμεν δὲ εἰ ἐμέλλησεν τῷ κυρίῳ προφανερῶσαι περὶ τοῦ ὕδατος καὶ περὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ. περὶ μὲν τοῦ ὕδατος γέγραπται ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ, πῶς τὸ βάπτισμα τὸ φέρον ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν οὐ μὴ προσδέξονται, ἀλλ' ἑαυ-

2 τοῖς οἰκοδομήσουσιν. λέγει οὖν ὁ προφήτης· Ἔκστηθι οὖν·

Ier. ii. 12 sq. ρανέ, καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦτῳ πλεῖον φριζάτω ἡ γῆ, ὅτι δῶ καὶ πονηρὰ ἐποίησεν ὁ λαὸς οὗτος· ἐμέ ἐγκατέλιπον πηγὴν ζωῆς, καὶ

3 ἑαυτοῖς ὥρξαν βόθρον θανάτου. Μὴ πέτρα ἔρημος ἐστίν

μελετώντων = Lat. *meditari*, to which it etymologically corresponds, rather than to '*practise*.' So again xi. 5.

διάσταλμα α ἅπαξ λεγόμενον: the meaning is clearly a *distinct precept* (Lat. *distinctus sermo*) or *command*, like ἐντολή; cf. διαστέλλεσθαι. In a passage of Pseudo-Aristeas, Hist. xxxiii.—xxxix., which Hilg. quotes *in extenso*, and which, owing to numerous correspondences of language and interpretation, he supposes to have been familiar to our author, the words διαστέλλειν, διαστολή, &c., recur a number of times. There 'separation' (physical, moral, or intellectual) is

the prevailing idea. But as διάσταλμα itself does not once occur, and as, further, the proof is not convincing that the passage was present to the mind of our author, I prefer the simpler explanation of the word given above.

§ XI. *Prophetic utterances of the O. T., connecting together the water of baptism and the blood of the cross, are examined.*

1. ὕδατος, sc. the water of baptism. It is important in considering the author's doctrine of Baptism, to notice the intimate connexion that he assumes between baptism and the death of Christ, the water and the cross. Baptism is a symbol

bene dicit, providens mandatum. quid ergo dicit? adhaerete eis qui tenent distinctum sermonem in corde suo, et cum eis qui locuntur aequitates domini; cum eis qui sciunt quia adsidua lectio utilis est. videte quomodo spiritaliter legem constituit Moyses. sed unde illis haec intellegere? nos autem intellegentes mandata loquimur sicut voluit dominus.

XI. Quaeramus si curae fuerit domino ostendere de aqua et de cruce. de aqua scriptum est ad populum Iudaeorum, quomodo tinctionem quae adfert remissionem peccatorum non recipiant, sed sibi instituant. dicit ergo propheta sic: *Horruit caelum, et in hoc plurimum expavit terra, quia duo mala fecit populus hic: me dereliquerunt fontem aquae vitae, et foderunt sibi lacus detritos, qui non possunt aquam portare. numquid petra* Icr. ii. 12 sq. Is. xvi. 1 sq.

implying the individual acceptance of Christ's atonement, a being baptized into his death (cf. Rom. vi. 3), and this we must carefully remember when we read of baptism which brings remission of sins (v. 1, cf. too v. 11), if we wish to understand rightly our author's view of the sacrament. Notice further that nowhere else in the Epistle in speaking of remission of sins and the like (cf. e.g. v. 1, vi. 11, xvi. 8) does he introduce any mention of baptism. It is noteworthy that throughout he makes not even a passing allusion to historical types of Baptism, e.g. the ark, the passage through the Red Sea, and still less to Jewish legal observances of baptisms and washings: he confines himself to quoting figurative prophetic utterances. Donaldson, *Apost. Fathers*, p. 240, makes the extreme statement 'that the word baptism, as used by the writer, has not the slightest reference to any Christian ceremony.' Credat Iudaeus.

προσδέχονται. The consensus of NOV is decisive in favour of reading the fut. in place of aor. subj., though it may possibly be due to the closely following οἰκοδομήσουσιν. For constr. in N. T. cf. Matt. xvi. 22, and see Winer § 56. 3.

2. ἐκστηθι οὐρανέ. Here, as perhaps in some other places (cf. xv. 3), the Hebrew text is followed in preference to the LXX., which reads ἀνέστη ὁ οὐρανός ἐπὶ τοῦτω.

βόθρον θανάτου, a striking variant, preserved by N alone, from the LXX. λάγκους συντετριμμένους, 'broken cisterns.' It appears that λάγκος was used not unfrequently of the grave and death. Suidas gives θάνατος as one of its acknowledged meanings.

3. ἐρημος, desert, in the sense of being without water, for in this alone lies the point of the quotation. The word is so used in Sept., 2 Kings ii. 8, Ez. xxx. 12.

- Is. xvi. 1, 2. τὸ ὄρος τὸ ἄγιόν μου Σινᾶ; ἔσεσθε γὰρ ὡς πετεινοῦ νοσσοί  
 4 ἀνιπτάμενοι νοσσιᾶς ἀφηρημένῃς. καὶ πάλιν λέγει ὁ προ-  
 Is. xlv. 2 sq. φήτης· Ἐγὼ πορεύσομαι ἔμπροσθέν σου, καὶ ὄρη ὀμαλῶ καὶ  
 πῆλας χαλκᾶς συντρίψω καὶ μοχλοῖς σιδηροῖς συνκλάσω, καὶ  
 δώσω σοι θησαυροὺς σκοτεινοῦς, ἀποκρύφους, ὁράτους, ἵνα  
 Is. xxxiii. 16. γινῶσιν ὅτι ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεός. καί· Κατοικήσεις ἐν ὑψηλῶ  
 5 σπηλαίῳ πέτρας ἰσχυράς. εἶτα τί λέγει ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ; Τὸ  
 Is. xxxiii. 16 sq. ἥδωρ αὐτοῦ πιστόν· βασιλέα μετὰ δόξης ὄψεσθε, καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ  
 6 ἡμῶν μελετήσκει φύβον κυρίου. καὶ πάλιν ἐν ἄλλῳ προ-  
 Ps. i. 3-6. φήτη λέγει· Ἔσται ὁ ταῦτα ποιῶν ὡς τὸ ζῆλον τὸ πεφυτευ-  
 μένον παρὰ τὰς διεζόδοις τῶν ἰδάτων, ὃ τὸν καρπὸν αὐτοῦ  
 δώσει ἐν καιρῷ αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸ φύλλον αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἀποργήσεται,  
 7 καὶ πάντα ὅσα ἂν ποιῇ κατεγοδωθήσεται. οἷον οὔτως οἱ ἄσε-  
 βεῖς, οἷον οὔτως, ἀλλ' ἢ ὡς ὁ χνοῦς ὃν ἐκρίπτει ὁ ἀνεμος  
 ἀπὸ προσώπου τῆς γῆς. διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἀναστήσονται οἱ ἄσε-  
 βεῖς ἐν κρίσει, οὔδ' ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἐν βογλῇ δικαίων· ὅτι γινώσκει  
 8 κύριος ὁδὸν δικαίων, καὶ ὁδὸς ἁσεβῶν ἀπολεῖται. αἰσθάνεσθε  
 πῶς τὸ ἕδωρ καὶ τὸν σταυρὸν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ὥρισεν. τοῦτο  
 γὰρ λέγει· Μακάριοι οἱ ἐπὶ τὸν σταυρὸν ἐλπίσαντες κατέ-  
 βησαν εἰς τὸ ἕδωρ· ὅτι τὸν μὲν μισθὸν λέγει ἐν καιρῷ αὐτοῦ  
 τότε, φησὶν, ἀποδώσω. νῦν δὲ ὁ λέγει· Τὰ φύλλα οὐκ  
 ἀποργήσεται, τοῦτο λέγει ὅτι πᾶν ῥῆμα ὃ ἐὰν ἐξέλθῃ ἐξ ὑμῶν  
 διὰ τοῦ στόματος ὑμῶν ἐν πίστει καὶ ἀγάπῃ, ἔσται εἰς ἐπι-  
 9 στροφὴν καὶ ἐλπίδα πολλοῖς. Καὶ πάλιν ἕτερος προφήτης  
 λέγει· Καὶ ἦν ἡ γῆ τοῦ ἱακώβ ἐπαινομένη παρὰ πάντων τῆν  
 γῆν. τοῦτο λέγει· τὸ σκεῦος τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ δοξάζει.

Σινᾶ. Many Edd. against all MS. evidence correct to the Σιών of the LXX. Sinai is possibly a mere slip of memory, but in so far as Mt. Sinai is (except at the summit) well watered, while Sion is barren and dry, the former suits better with the context.

4. θησαυροῦς. The secret and hidden treasures are perhaps the watersprings hidden in the rock, sc.

baptism. But the quotation does not appear very apposite.

5. εἶτα τί λέγει ἐν τῷ νήῳ BCFOV. These words, bracketed by Müller, are absent in N, and also in the Lat. which is however full of omissions. It is difficult to give any reasonable explanation of their later insertion, and they are prob. authentic. Müller places the stop after λέγει, but it is more natural to put the mark of in-

- eremosa est mons sanctus meus Sina? eritis enim tam-  
 4 quam alites pusillis ablatis. et iterum dicit Esaias: *Ego* Is. xlv. 2 sq.  
*antecedam te, et montes aequabo et ostia aerea contribulabo*  
*et seras ferreas confringam, et dabo tibi thesauros obscuros,*  
*invisos, ut sciant quia ego sum dominus deus, inhabitans*  
 5 *in altissima spelunca fortis petrae; et aqua illius fidelis.* Is. xxxiii. 16  
*regem cum magnitudine videbitis, et anima vestra medita-* sqq.  
 6 *bitur timorem.* et iterum David dicit: *Erit qui haec* Ps. i. 3—6.  
*facere coeperit tamquam lignum quod plantatum est iuxta*  
*tractus aquarum, quod fructum suum dabit tempore suo;*  
 7 *et folia eius non decident. non sic impii, non sic, sed tam-*  
*quam pulvis quem abiicit ventus a facie terrae. propterea*  
*non resurgunt impii in iudicio, neque peccatores in consilio*  
*iustorum, quoniam scit deus viam iustorum, et via im-*  
 8 *piorum peribit.* sentire autem debetis quomodo aquam  
 et crucem in uno dono constituit. hoc ergo dicit:  
 Felices qui speraverunt in aquam et in crucem; mercedem  
 in tempore suo: tunc, inquit, reddam. modo autem  
 quod dicit: *Folia illius non decident*, hoc est quia omnis  
 sermo qui exierit per os vestrum, erit in spem et resur-  
 9 rectionem multis. Et iterum alius propheta dicit: *Erit*  
*Iacob laudabilis super omnem terram.* vas spiritus illius

l. 1 Eremosa. *remiosa* or *renuosa* cod. renudosa, ruinoso, arenosa, rimosa,  
 Edd. l. 2 Alites. *aliis* cod. l. 19 Quod. *qui* cod.

terrogation after *υῖω*, which becomes otherwise confused with the quotation that immediately follows. It is astonishing to find Gebhardt admitting into text the purely conjectural *αὐτῷ* for *υῖω*.

*κρυπτον*. The word is added by our author to the original quotation, in which *φόβον* refers to the terror of the Assyrians.

6. Here the water and the wood are brought into connexion, and this and the passage from Ezek. thus form a transition to the consideration of the *ξύλον* or cross by itself.

*προφήτην*, ix. 1 note.

*διεξόδους*, *channels*, a common LXX. word.

7. ἀλλ' ἦ, as in ii. 8.

8. *κατέβησαν*. The same verb, repeated in v. 11, reminds us that complete immersion was regularly practised at time of baptism by the early Church.

9. *ἦν ἡ γῆ*, the quotation is referred to Zeph. iii. 19, but the correspondence is very slight. Clem. Al., Strom. iii. 12, 198, in citing our passage also attributes the words to a prophet.

*τὸ σκέυος τοῦ πνεύ.* Comparing the same phrase in vii. 3 we cannot

- 10 Εἶτα τί λέγει; Καὶ ἦν ποταμὸς ἔλκων ἐκ δεξιῶν, καὶ ἀνέ-  
 Ezek. xlvii. 1—12. ? βαίνειν ἐξ αὐτοῦ δένδρα ὠραία· καὶ ὃς ἄν φάγῃ ἐξ αὐτῶν  
 11 ΖΗΣΕΤΑΙ Εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. τοῦτο λέγει ὅτι ἡμεῖς μὲν καταβαί-  
 νομεν εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ γέμοντες ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ ῥύπου, καὶ ἀνα-  
 βαίνομεν καρποφοροῦντες ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ, καὶ τὸν φόβον καὶ  
 τὴν ἐλπίδα εἰς τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐν τῷ πνεύματι ἔχοντες. Καὶ ὃς  
 ἄν φάγῃ ἀπὸ τούτων ΖΗΣΕΤΑΙ Εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, τοῦτο λέγει· ὃς  
 ἂν, φησὶν, ἀκούσῃ τούτων λαλουμένων καὶ πιστεύσῃ, ζήσε-  
 ται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

- XII. Ὁμοίως πάλιν περὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ ὀρίζει ἐν  
 ἄλλῳ προφήτῃ λέγοντι. Καὶ πύτε ταῦτα συντελεσθήσεται;  
 4 Esr. v. 5. λέγει κύριος· "Ὅταν ζῆλον κλιθῇ καὶ ἀναστῇ, καὶ ὅταν ἐκ  
 ζήλου αἷμα στάξῃ· ἔχεις πάλιν περὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ καὶ τοῦ  
 2 σταυρουσθαι μέλλοντος. λέγει δὲ πάλιν ἐν τῷ Μωϋσῇ,  
 Ex. xvii. 8 sqq. πολεμουμένου τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀλλοφύλων, καὶ ἵνα  
 ὑπομνήσῃ αὐτοὺς πολεμουμένους ὅτι διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας  
 αὐτῶν παρεδόθησαν εἰς θάνατον· λέγει εἰς τὴν καρδίαν

doubt that the body of Christ is referred to, and specially the body of Christ as hanging on the Cross, to which the main thought is here directed. In the other passage where this strange expression occurs, it is used in a similar connexion. The typical transference of ἡ γῆ τοῦ Ἰακώβ to this is unusually violent. Ἰακώβ means Christ himself, cf. Iust. Dial. 36 p. 254 D, ὁ χριστὸς Ἰακώβ καλεῖται ἐν παραβολῇ, while γῆ is the body of Christ, or more generally Christ incarnate, as in vi. 8, 9 ff. *Hefele* gives a different interpretation. 'By the land of Jacob is meant the people of God, and in particular the *new* people, the Christians. But why is this new land beloved? Because of its streams (Baptism), and trees (the Cross).' This does not commend itself to me, after a careful consideration of the words employed in the text.

δοξάζει. Gebh. rather curiously

retains with **SB** the pres., against **SB\***CFOV, which read the fut. *δοξάσει*.

10. ἔλκων. So intrans. of a river in Dan. vii. 10.

The last words of the quotation are not found in the passage from Ezekiel, of which the general sense is paraphrased. Joh. vi. 51 *ἐάν τις φάγῃ ἐκ τούτου τοῦ ἄρτου ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* is a close verbal parallel.

11. The teaching is similar in Herm. Past. III., Sim. IX. xvi. *ἀνάγκην εἶχον δι' ὕδατος ἀναβῆναι ἵνα ζωοποιηθῶσι... ἡ σφραγὶς οὖν τὸ ὕδωρ ἐστίν· εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ οὖν καταβαίνουσι νεκροὶ καὶ ἀναβαίνουσι ζῶντες*—a passage quoted approvingly by Clem. Al.

*καρποφοροῦντες* may be absol., in accordance with the common N.T. usage; but the balance of the sentence suggests that τὸν φόβον should be taken with *καρποφ.*, rather than with the words that follow, if with

- 10 magnificat. Deinde quod dicit: *Erat flumen trahens a dextra, et ascendebant inde arbores speciosae; et quicumque* Ezek. xlvii. 1-12. ?
- 11 *ex illis manducaverit vivet in perpetuum*, hoc et quia nos descendimus in aquam pleni peccatis et sordibus, et ascendimus fructibus pleni, in praecordiis nostris timorem et spem habentes in deum. ideo dicit: *Et qui manducaverit vivet in perpetuum.*

XII. Similiter et crucem significat in alio propheta dicente: *Et quando haec consummabuntur? et dixit dominus: Cum lignum inclinatum fuerit et resurrexerit, et cum de ligno sanguis stillaverit.* ? 4 Esr. v. 5.

2 cruce et de eo qui incipit crucifigi. dicit autem iterum in Moyse, cum pugnaret populus Iudaeorum, et ceciderunt Iudaei ab alienigenis, ut illos commemoraret dum oppugnantur, quia propter peccata sua traduntur in Ex. xvii. 8 sqq.

L. 13 *Moysen* cod., but with mark against the *n*.

L. 15 Traduntur. *trahuntur* cod.

Vulg. we may omit the *καὶ* before *τὸν φόβον*. In any case connect *ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ* with *καρποφοροῦντες*.

*ἀκούσῃ*. Both O and V, which rank next in value after N, here read *ἀκούσει*, while *πιστεύσῃ* for *πιστεύσει* is supported by one inferior MS. only. There can be no doubt that the future was the original reading in both cases. That it is unsatisfactory to regard *-ει* as a mere itacism for *-η* I have shown on v. 6. Thus in this Ep. we find *ἐάν* with the fut. ind. iii. 5, and in xix. 1 MS. authority is evenly divided between *σπεύσει* and *σπεύσῃ* (cf. Winer § 41, p. 310); *ὅταν* with pres. ind. iv. 14 and x. 3, with fut. ind. in xv. 5; *ὅπότεν* with past ind. in xii. 2, the only instance that I have noticed of the occurrence of the word (Winer § 42, 5 a b); *ὅς ἂν* with fut. ind. here and xii. 5 (Winer § 42, 3 a).

§ XII. *The Cross, as set forth in historical type (viz. the lifting up of Moses' hands, the brazen ser-*

*pent, the commission of Joshua) and prophecy.*

Passing away from the water, as a type of Baptism, and from the connexion of the water and the wood, our author considers now the O. T. types and foreshadowings of the Cross itself.

I. *καὶ πότε*. Hilg. sees in these words a citation from 4 Es. iv. 30, but the resemblance is very distant. The words *ἐκ ξύλου αἷμα στάξῃ* come from that book, v. 5, but the rest from some unknown source. For *προφήτης* of apocryphal writings, cf. vii. 4. *συντελεσθήσεται*. So Mk. xiii. 4, &c., and cf. the repeated *συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος* of Matt. xiii. 39, 40, 49, xxiv. 3, xxviii. 20.

2. *πολεμουμένου* from *πολεμέω*, so used pass. in classical Greek. *ὑπομνήσῃ*. Read *ὑπομνήσει*. Cf. v. 6 note.

*εἰς τὴν καρδ.* *λέγειν εἰς* thus used is a Hebraism; the same constr. in Acts ii. 25 is verbally similar but not really parallel, and the other

Μωϋσέως τὸ πνεῦμα, ἵνα ποιήσῃ τύπον τοῦ σταυροῦ καὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος πάσχειν, ὅτι ἐὰν μή, φησὶν, ἐλπίσωσιν ἐπ' αὐτῷ, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα πολεμηθήσονται. τίθησιν οὖν Μωϋσῆς ἐν ἐφ' ἐν ὅπλον ἐν μέσῳ τῆς πυγμῆς, καὶ ὑψηλότερος σταθεὶς πάντων ἐξέτεινεν τὰς χεῖρας. καὶ οὕτως πάλιν ἐνίκα ὁ Ἰσραήλ. εἶτα, ὁπότεν καθεῖλεν, πάλιν ἐθανατοῦντο.

3 πρὸς τί; ἵνα γινώσιν ὅτι οὐ δύνανται σωθῆναι, ἐὰν μὴ ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἐλπίσωσιν. Καὶ πάλιν ἐν ἐτέρῳ προφήτῃ λέγει·

Is. lxx. 2. Ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν ἐξεπέτασα τὰς χεῖράς μοι πρὸς λαόν

5 ἀπειθῆ καὶ ἀντιλέγοντα ὁδῷ δικαίᾳ μοι. Πάλιν Μωϋσῆς ποιεῖ τύπον τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ὅτι δεῖ αὐτὸν παθεῖν καὶ αὐτὸς ζωοποιήσει ὃν δόξουσιν ἀπολωλέκεναι, ἐν σημείῳ, πίπτοντος τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. ἐποίησεν γὰρ κύριος πάντα ὅφιν δάκνει αὐτούς, καὶ ἀπέθνησκον (ἐπεὶ δὲ ἡ παράβασις διὰ τοῦ ὀφews ἐν Εὐᾶ ἐγένετο), ἵνα ἐλέγξῃ αὐτοὺς ὅτι διὰ τὴν παράβασιν αὐτῶν εἰς θλίψιν θανάτου παραδοθήσονται.

Num. xxi. 6  
sq.

6 πέρας γέ τοι αὐτὸς Μωϋσῆς ἐντειλάμενος· Οὐκ ἔσται ἡμῖν οὔτε χωνεγτόν οὔτε γλιπτόν εἰς θεὸν ἡμῖν, αὐτὸς ποιεῖ, ἵνα τύπον τοῦ Ἰησοῦ δείξῃ. ποιεῖ οὖν Μωϋσῆς χαλκοῦν 7 ὅφιν καὶ τίθησιν ἐνδόξως, καὶ κηρύγματι καλεῖ τὸν λαόν.

Deut. xxvii.  
15.

instances of constr. in N. T. are still less akin. Rev. xvii. 17 furnishes a truer parallel.

ἐν ἐφ' ἐν ὅπλον, for constr. cf. vii. 6, 7, 9. Of the incident itself Exod. xvii. knows nothing, but represents Moses sitting on a stone, placed on the brow of a hill (ἐπὶ τῆς κορυφῆς τοῦ βουνοῦ).

πυγμῆς. πηγμῆς is Müller's reading unsupported by any MS. N has πυγμῆς, OV ποιγμῆς, B πήγης. On the whole πυγμῆς would seem the best reading in the sense of 'melee' or 'battle,' though even in classical Greek (still less in Alexandrine) it does not appear to be used for πυγμαχία. Still πηγμή, which Müller supposes to be synonymous with πῆγμα a stage or scaf-

folding, is quite unsupported by MSS., never occurs as an existing word, and gives a forced and unnatural sense.

ὁπότεν. The MSS. agree in καθεῖλεν, though N evades the bad grammar by substituting πάλιν for ὁπότεν. v. note on xi. 11.

4. ἐξεπέτασα, the orig. has of course no ref. to the stretching out of the hands upon the cross, but rather in the attitude of entreaty or deprecation.

5. ὁν. The second hand of N, a quite first-rate authority, adds ἄν prob. rightly. Three inferior MSS. omitting ἄν write δόξωσιν. For ὁ δν with fut. ind. cf. xi. 11.

σημείῳ. The word is commonly enough used like τύπος. In Numb.

- mortem; dixit in praecordiis Moysi spiritus: Fac figuram crucis, quia si non crediderint in illum, in perpetuo oppugnabuntur. et iterum: Ascendit Moyses in aggerem et stans manus extendebat, et vincebant Iudaei. 3 deinde cum deposuerat, vincebat Amalech. hoc ad quid? ut scirent quia non possunt liberari, nisi in cruce 4 Christi speraverint. Et iterum dicit in alio propheta: *Expandi manus meas tota die ad populum inpersuadibilem* Is. lxxv. 2. 5 *et contradicentem viae iustae.* Item Moyses facit figuram Iesu, quia oportebat illum pati et quia ipse vivificabit quem illi putaverunt perdidisse. cadente enim populo Iudaeorum, quia iusserat dominus ut morsu colubrae morerentur (quia praeteritio Evae per colubram fuerat), voluit illos corripere, et ideo sic morti tradere, qui 6 mandata eius praeterierunt. ad summam ipse Moyses, qui praeceperat dicens: *Non erit vobis neque conflatile neque sculptile*, ipse fecit serpentem aereum, ut figuram Iesu ostenderet, et posuit in cruce, et per praecones 7 convocavit populum. et cum venissent, rogabant Moy-

Num. xxi. 6 sqq.

Deut. xxvii. 15.

l. 9 Item. iterum al. Edd.

l. 10 Vivificavit cod.

l. 15 Summam. summa ut cod.

xxi. 8, 9, it is the LXX. word for the sign or 'pole' on which the brazen serpent was set up. There is probably therefore in this passage a combination of the two senses. It seems best to take *ἐν σημείῳ* primarily with *ποιεῖ τύπον τοῦ Ἰησοῦ*, but it is placed ambiguously so as to be taken with both that and *ἀπολωλεκέναι*.

*πάντα* seems here to = *παντοδαπός*. So Just. Apol. I. 60 says that when Israel went out of Egypt, there met them *λοβόλα θηρία, ἐχιδναὶ τε καὶ ἀσπίδες καὶ ὄφεις πᾶν γένος*.

6. Read *δείξει* for *δείξη*. Cf. v. 6 note.

*ἐν δόξῃ*. The *in cruce* of the Lat. makes the reading of earlier edd. *ἐν δόξῃ* at first sight very tempting. But it has no MS. support, nor as a matter of fact does *δοκός* appear

to be ever used simply of the cross. Indirectly too *ἐν δόξῃ* finds support from the *τὴν δόξαν* of the next verse. The word occurs also in xvi. 6, 8 and i. 2.

7. From this handling of the type of the brazen serpent Tisch., *When were our Gospels written?* p. 93, has supposed our author to have been acquainted with S. John's Gospel. For such a supposition there is no sufficient foundation. The general application of the type is not unnaturally the same in both, for it again and again appears in the writings of Alexandrine Jews. Beyond that there are no special verbal resemblances, and this passage, even taken by itself, makes against rather than for the theory of acquaintance with the Fourth Gospel.





- sen ut pro sanitate eorum dominum rogaret. tunc dixit illis Moyses: Cum aliquis ex vobis morsus fuerit, veniat ad colubram et speret quoniam cum sit ipsa mortua potest alios sanare, et sine mora curabitur. et ita faciebant. Quid dicit iterum Moyses Ause filio Nave, ut ostenderet Iesum esse filium dei, audiente populo, quia omnia pater ostendit de filio suo? clamavit Moyses filium Nave et inposuit illi nomen Iesus, et dixit: *Accipe librum in manu tua et scribe quae dicit dominus, quia amputabit a radicibus omnem domum Amalech filius dei Iesus in novissimis diebus.* ecce iterum Iesus, non filius Nave sed filius dei, in carne apparuit. iterum dicit David: *Dixit dominus domino meo: Sede ad dexteram meam donec ponam inimicos tuos sub pedibus tuis.* et iterum dicit Esaias: *Sic dicit dominus Christo meo*

Num. xxi. 8 sq.

Num. xiii. 17.

Ex. xvii. 14.

Ps. cx. 1.

Is. xlv. 1.

l. 4 Alios. *alias* cod. l. 7 De om. cod. l. 10 *Amputavit* cod.

9. ἐπιθεὶς ὄνομα, ὅποτε. The change of Joshua's name (cf. Num. xiii. 16) is not recorded before this event, though it would seem to have taken place considerably earlier, from Joshua being called by this name when he fought with Amalek at Rephidim, Ex. xvii. 8 foll. The statement in Numbers is quite parenthetical, and does not imply any particular chronological order, but has clearly led to the loose inference in our Epistle.

10. οὐχὶ υἱὸς ἀνθ. Not a son of man, as Joshua was, but Son of God. For υἱὸς ἀνθ. in this its simplest sense, as contrasted with the ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθ. assumed as his title so frequently by Christ, cf. Dan. vii. 13; Rev. i. 13, xiv. 14.

τύπῳ, clearly not in contrast with ἐν σαρκί. (1) Jesus is regarded as the type or pattern of the ideal man, cf. Eph. iv. 13. Or (2) more simply, Joshua manifest in the flesh is regarded as a living type of Christ's manifestation in the flesh.

ἐν σαρκί φανερ. The frequent repetition of this conjunction of words (cf. vi. 7, 9, 14) is noticeable. In 1 Tim. iii. 16 they seem to form part of some early Christian liturgical office, a kind of rhythmical creed.

μέλλουσιν λέγειν, a definite ref. clearly to some sect or school of interpretation, aimed at in the τὴν πλάνην τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν; probably teachers of an Ebionite tendency are referred to, who maintained that Christ could not be at once son of David and son of God. The ref. may be extended also to the Jews at large, among whom this argument was common.

εἶπεν κύριος. This quotation from Ps. cx. 1 is applied to prove an exactly similar conclusion in Matt. xxii. 43 (cf. parallel Mk. xii. 35, Lk. xx. 41), and if we are right in supposing our author to have known S. Matthew's Gospel, was doubtless borrowed from thence. Cf. iv. 14 n.

Is. xlv. 1. τῷ Χριστῷ μοῦ κυρίῳ, οὗ ἐκράτησα τῆς δεξιᾶς αὐτοῦ ἐπακοῦσαι ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ ἔθνη, καὶ ἰσχύϊ βασιλέων διαρρήξω. ἴδε πῶς Δαυὶδ λέγει αὐτὸν κύριον καὶ υἱὸν θεοῦ.

XIII. Ἰδῶμεν δὲ εἰ οὗτος ὁ λαὸς κληρονομεῖ ἡ ὁ 2  
 2 πρῶτος, καὶ εἰ ἡ διαθήκη εἰς ἡμᾶς ἢ εἰς ἐκείνους. ἀκούσατε  
 Gen. xxv. 21 οὖν περὶ τοῦ λαοῦ τί λέγει ἡ γραφή· Ἐδεῖτο δὲ Ἰσαὰκ περὶ  
 599.  
 ῥεβέκκας τῆς γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ, ὅτι στεῖρα ἦν. καὶ συνέλαβεν.  
 εἶτα ἐξῆλθεν ῥεβέκκα πῦθῃ παρὰ κυρίου. καὶ εἶπεν  
 κύριος πρὸς αὐτήν· Δύο ἔθνη ἐν τῇ γαστρί σοι καὶ δύο  
 λαοὶ ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ σοι, καὶ ὑπερέξει λαὸς λαοῦ, καὶ ὁ μείζων  
 3 δοyleύσει τῷ ἐλάσσονι. αἰσθάνεσθαι ὀφείλετε τίς ὁ Ἰσαὰκ  
 καὶ τίς ἡ ῥεβέκκα, καὶ ἐπὶ τίνων δέδειχεν ὅτι μείζων  
 4 ὁ λαὸς οὗτος ἢ ἐκείνος. Καὶ ἐν ἄλλῃ προφητεῖᾳ λέγει  
 φανερώτερον ὁ Ἰακώβ πρὸς Ἰωσήφ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, λέγων  
 Gen. xlviii. 11, 9. Ἰδοῦ, οὐκ ἐστέρησέν με κύριος τοῦ προσώπου σοι· προσάγαγε  
 5 μοι τοὺς γιόους σοι, ἵνα εὐλογῶ αὐτούς. καὶ προσήγαγεν  
 Ἐφραὶμ καὶ Μανασσῆ, τὸν Μανασσῆ θέλων ἵνα εὐλογηθῇ,  
 ὅτι πρεσβύτερος ἦν· ὁ γὰρ Ἰωσήφ προσήγαγεν εἰς τὴν  
 δεξιὰν χεῖρα τοῦ πατρὸς Ἰακώβ. εἶδεν δὲ Ἰακώβ τίπον  
 Gen. xlviii. 14 sqq. τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ λαοῦ τοῦ μεταξὺ. καὶ τί λέγει; Καὶ  
 ἐποίησεν Ἰακώβ ἐναλλὰξ τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐπέθηκεν  
 τὴν δεξιὰν ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν Ἐφραὶμ τοῦ δευτέρου καὶ  
 νεωτέρου, καὶ ἐλόγησεν αὐτόν. καὶ εἶπεν Ἰωσήφ πρὸς  
 Ἰακώβ· Μετάθεο σοι τὴν δεξιὰν ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν Μανασσῆ  
 ὅτι πρωτότοκός μοι γιός ἐστιν. καὶ εἶπεν Ἰακώβ πρὸς  
 Ἰωσήφ. Οἶδα, τέκνον, οἶδα· ἀλλ' ὁ μείζων δοyleύσει τῷ  
 6 ἐλάσσονι. καὶ οὗτος δὲ εὐλογηθήσεται. βλέπετε ἐπὶ τίνων  
 τεθείκεν, τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον εἶναι πρῶτον καὶ τῆς διαθήκης

11. κυρίῳ. The MSS. (except a corr. in S) concur in κυρίῳ, against Κύριω of the LXX. and Heb. Doubtless the author citing from memory wrote κυρίῳ, which suits better the purpose of his quotation.

After θεοῦ S adds a second λέγει.

§ XIII. *By the analogy of the sons of Isaac and Joseph, it is shown that the younger people are the heirs of the promised blessing.*

1. οὗτος ὁ λαός, sc. the Christians.

2. S. Paul adduces the narrative (Rom. ix. 7-12) as an instance of

*domino, cuius tenui dexteram; exaudient illum gentes, et virtutem regum conrumpam.* videte quomodo illum prophetae dominum, non tantum filium dicunt.

- XIII. Quaeramus igitur si hic populus hereditatem  
 2 capit, et testamentum in illis est aut in nobis. de hoc  
 audite. sic scriptum est: *Rogabat Isaac pro Rebecca* Gen. xxv. 21  
*uxore sua, quia sterilis erat. et Rebecca quaerebat a* sq.  
*domino quid portaret. et dixit illi dominus: Duae na-*  
*tiones in utero tuo sunt, et duo populi ex utero tuo nas-*  
 3 *centur, et maior serviet minori.* intellegite qui sit Isaac  
 et quae Rebecca, et qui populus minor aut maior.  
 4 iterum dixit Iacob Ioseph filio suo: *Ecce dominus non* Gen. xlvii.  
*fraudavit me ex genere tuo. perduc ad me filios tuos,* 11, 9.  
 5 *ut benedicam illos.* et adduxit Manassem et Efrem.  
 volens autem Manassem benedici, quia maior erat, sta-  
 tuit illum ad dexteram patris sui. vidit autem Iacob  
 in spiritu figuram populi qui postea futurus erat, et  
 convertit manus et transtulit dexteram supra caput  
 Efrem minoris, et benedixit illum. *et dixit Ioseph patri* Gen. xlviii  
*suo: Transfer manum tuam dextram supra caput Ma-* 14 sqq.  
*nasse, quia primitivus filius meus est. et dixit Iacob:*  
*Scio, fili, scio, sed maior serviet minori. sed et hic bene-*  
 6 *dicetur.* videte quem voluerit esse primum, testamento

I. 14 Ut. et cod. I. 21 Manasse. Manassem cod. Manassae Edd.

God's election by predestination. Iren. iv. 38, Tert. adv. Marc. III. v., apply the type as here.

3. ἐπὶ τίνων, of or concerning whom, in whose case, a familiar use in the Epistle. The τίνων are of course the καὶνὸς λαὸς the people who believe, and the people of the circumcision. Esau serves as the type of the Jews, Jacob of the Christians. τίνων, some take less well of the sons themselves, but then ἐπὶ would not have been the preposition used. Cf. v. 6.

5. εὐλογηθῇ. εὐλογήσῃ N.

81 προσβ. Rules of primogeniture were strict among the Jews. Cf. Deut. xxi. 15—17.

After προσήγαγεν Hilg. and Müll. insert αὐτόν on authority of Lat. alone. In xvi. 6 there is a similar ellipse of αὐτόν.

τοῦ μεταξὺ. This use of word, for 'after' in succession, belongs to later Greek.

6. τίνων. Here again Ephraim, the younger son yet heir to the greater blessing, typifies the Christians, while Manasses, who also received his blessing though a subordi-

7 κληρονόμον. εἰ οὖν ἔτι καὶ διὰ τοῦ Ἀβραάμ ἐμνήσθη, ἀπέχομεν τὸ τέλειον τῆς γνώσεως ἡμῶν. τὸ οὖν λέγει τῷ Ἀβραάμ, ὅτε μόνος πιστεύσας ἐτέθη εἰς δικαιοσύνην;

Gen. xv. 6.  
xviii. 5;  
Rom. iv. 11  
sq.

Ἰδοὺ τέθεικά σε, Ἀβραάμ, πατέρα ἐθνῶν τῶν πιστεγόντων δι' ἄκροβυστίας τῷ κυρίῳ.

XIV. Ναί. ἀλλὰ τὴν διαθήκην ἣν ὥμοσεν τοῖς πατράσι δοῦναι τῷ λαῷ, εἰ δέδωκεν ζητῶμεν. δέδωκεν αὐτοὶ δὲ οὐκ ἐγένοντο ἄξιοι λαβεῖν διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν.

2 λέγει γὰρ ὁ προφήτης· Καὶ ἦν Μωϋσῆς νηστεύων ἐν ὄρει Σινᾷ, τοῦ λαβεῖν τὴν διαθήκην κυρίου πρὸς τὸν λαόν, ἡμέρας

Ex. xxiv. 18.

Ex. xxxi. 18. τεσσαράκοντα καὶ νύκτας τεσσαράκοντα. καὶ ἔλαβεν παρὰ κυρίου τὰς δύο πλάκας τὰς γεγραμμένας τῷ δακτύλῳ τῆς χειρὸς κυρίου ἐν πνεύματι. καὶ λαβὼν Μωϋσῆς κατέφερεν

3 πρὸς τὸν λαὸν δοῦναι. καὶ εἶπεν κύριος πρὸς Μωϋσῆν·

Ex. xxxii. 7  
sq.

Μωϋσᾶ Μωϋσᾶ, κατὰβηθι τὸ τάχος, ὅτι ὁ λαός σου ὃν ἐξήγαγες ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου ἠνόμησεν. καὶ συνῆκεν Μωϋσῆς ὅτι ἐποίησαν ἐαυτοῖς πάλιν χωνεύματα, καὶ ἔρριψεν ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν τὰς πλάκας, καὶ συνετριβήσαν αἱ πλάκες τῆς διαθήκης κυρίου. Μωϋσῆς μὲν ἔλαβεν, αὐτοὶ δὲ οὐκ ἐγένοντο ἄξιοι.

4 πῶς δὲ ἡμεῖς ἐλάβομεν, μάθετε. Μωϋσῆς θεράπων ὢν ἔλαβεν, αὐτὸς δὲ κύριος ἡμῖν ἔδωκεν εἰς λαὸν κληρονομίας,

5 δι' ἡμᾶς ὑπομείνας. ἐφανερώθη δὲ ἵνα κἀκεῖνοι τελειωθῶσιν τοῖς ἀμαρτήμασιν καὶ ἡμεῖς διὰ τοῦ κληρονομοῦντος διαθή-

nate one, is a type of the Jews. ἐπὶ τίνων as in v. 3 is of the people typified, not of the sons who were types.

7. ἐμνήσθη, ἀπέχομεν. The mode of expression is somewhat obscure: the meaning is, that if we find similar teaching conveyed by the history of Abraham as by that of Isaac and Jacob, then the revelation is complete; our knowledge (γνώσις) requires no further materials for its satisfaction, but is perfected. And Abraham, the O. T. itself records, was made father of *them that believe*, independently of circumcision or uncircumcision.

πιστεύσας ἐτέθη...τῷ κυρίῳ. The passage is a combination of Gen. xv. 6 and xviii. 5, and seems undeniably (so Sanday, *Gospels in the Second Century*, ii. p. 19) to have passed under the influence of Rom. iv. 11, cf. iv. 3.

§ XIV. It is shown by prophecy, as well as by historical type, how the Christians have become heirs of the covenant forfeited by the chosen people.

1. τοῖς πατράσι. Some have asserted that these words *prove* that both the author and the readers of the Epistle were *Jewish* Christians. Obviously they will not bear such a

7 heredem. si ergo et per Abraham commemoratus est, habemus consummationem scientiae nostrae. quid ergo dicit Abraham, cum solus credidisset et positus esset in iustitia? *Ecce posui te, Abraham, patrem nationum quae credunt domino non circumcisae.* Gen. xv. 6. xvii. 5. Rom. iv. 11 sq.

XIV. Sed testamentum quod iuravit parentibus ut daret populo, an dederit quaeramus. dedit, sed illi non  
2 fuerunt digni accipere propter peccata sua. dicit enim propheta: *Et erat Moyses ieiunans in monte Sina, ut acciperet testamentum a domino, quadraginta diebus et quadraginta noctibus. et accepit a deo tabulas scriptas manu dei,* et ut accepit deferebat ad populum, ut illis  
3 daret. et dixit dominus: *Moses Moses, descende celarius, quia populus tuus quem eduxisti de terra Aegypti praeteriit legem. et intellexit Moyses quia fecerunt sibi iterum conflatile, et proiecit de manibus tabulas, et con-*  
4 *fractae sunt.* Moyses accepit, sed illi non fuerunt digni. quomodo acceperimus nos, discite. ille, cui nos in  
5 hereditatem, propter nos omnia sustinens. apparuit, ut illi consummati sint in peccatis et nos per illum

L. 1 Si. sic cod.

L. 5 Circumcisi cod.

L. 18 Ille. illi cod.

strain, to the exclusion at any rate of Gentile Christians, more particularly when Abraham has in the preceding verse been emphatically called *πατέρα ἐθνῶν τῶν πιστευόντων δι' ἀκροβυστίας*.

2. τοῦ λαβεῖν. For this common N. T. constr. of gen. infin. to express the purpose, cf. Winer § 44, 4; xiv. 8 furnishes a parallel from our own Epistle. For similar inf. without art. cf. δοῦναι at the end of the verse.

πρὸς depends on the διαθήκην. For διατίθεμαι πρὸς cf. x. 2.

3. In connexion with our author's manner of citation it is worth noticing, that though in the Epistle we several times find the same passage quoted twice (cf. iv. 7 with

xiv. 2, v. 5 with vi. 12, v. 13, 14 with vi. 3, 6, vi. 12 with vi. 18, ix. 1 with ix. 5), in none of these is there an exact correspondence of quotation; ii. 5 however agrees with xv. 8; the only difference between the quotation in this place and in iv. 8 is a substitution of *ὅν* for *οὗς* and a change in the position of *ἠνόμωσεν*.

4. His complete silence concerning the new tables of stone, and the renewal of God's covenant with His people (cf. Ex. xxxii. 14, xxxiv. 1—10), is characteristic of our author. *θεράπων* is LXX. word in Ex. xiv. 31, Numb. xii. 8, Josh. i. 2. Cf. Heb. iii. 5.

For *ὕπομεινας* used absol. in similar way, cf. v. 1, 12.

5. τελειῶθ. τοῖς ἁμαρτ. Cf. v. 11.

κην κυρίου Ἰησοῦ λάβωμεν, ὃς εἰς τοῦτο ἡτοιμάσθη, ἵνα αὐτὸς φανεῖς τὰς ἤδη δεδαπανημένας ἡμῶν καρδίας τῷ θανάτῳ καὶ παραδεδομένας τῇ τῆς πλάνης ἀνομίᾳ λυτρωσάμενος ἐκ τοῦ σκότους, διαθήχῃ ἐν ἡμῖν διαθήκην λόγῳ.

6 γέγραπται γὰρ πῶς αὐτῷ ὁ πατὴρ ἐντέλλεται, λυτρωσάμενον ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ σκότους ἐτοιμάσαι ἑαυτῷ λαὸν ἅγιον.

Is. xlii. 6 sq. 7 λέγει οὖν ὁ προφήτης· Ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεὸς σοῦ ἐκάλεσά σε ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, καὶ κρατήσω τῆς χειρός σου καὶ ἐνισχύσω σε, καὶ ἔδωκά σε εἰς διαθήκην γένους, εἰς φῶς ἔθνων, ἀνοίξει ὀφθαλμοὺς τυφλῶν, καὶ ἐξαγαγεῖν ἐκ δεσμῶν πεπεδημένους καὶ ἐξ οἴκου φυλακῆς καθημένους

Is. xlix. 6 sq. 8 ἐν σκύτει. γινώσκετε οὖν πόθεν ἐλυτρώθημεν. πάλιν ὁ προφήτης λέγει· Ἰδοὺ τέθεικά σε εἰς φῶς ἔθνων, τοῦ εἶναί σε εἰς σωτηρίαν ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς· οὕτως λέγει κύριος

Is. lxi. 1 sq. 9 ὁ λυτρωσάμενός σε θεός. καὶ πάλιν ὁ προφήτης λέγει· Πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ' ἐμέ, οὗ εἵνεκεν ἔχρισέν με εὐαγγελίσασθαι ταπεινοῖς χάριν, ἀπέσταλκέν με ἰσάσθαι τοὺς συντετριμμένους τὴν καρδίαν, κηρῆσαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεςιν καὶ τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν, καλέσαι ἐνιαγτὸν κυρίου δεκτὸν καὶ ἡμέραν ἀνταποδόσεως, παρακαλέσαι πάντας τοὺς πενθοῦντας.

Ex. xx. 8 sqq. cf. Ps. xxiv. 4. XV. Ἔτι οὖν καὶ περὶ τοῦ σαββάτου γέγραπται ἐν τοῖς δέκα λόγοις, ἐν οἷς ἐλάλησεν ἐν τῷ ὄρει Σινᾶ πρὸς Μωϋσῆν κατὰ πρόσωπον· Καὶ ἀγιάσατε τὸ σάββατον κυρίου 2 χερσὶν καθααῖς καὶ καρδίᾳ καθαρά. καὶ ἐν ἐτέρῳ λέγει·

δαπανᾶν in N. T. is used always of literal or (cf. 2 Cor. xii. 15) metaphorical spending. Here it seems strictly parallel with παραδεδομένας, in the sense of the precious treasure of the heart being 'wastefully given over' to death. Herm. II. Mand. xii. 1, we read that a man δαπανᾷται ὑπ' ἐπιθυμίας, and again ἐπιθυμία δαπανᾷ τοὺς...καὶ...παραδίδωσιν εἰς θάνατον, a close parallel. In the Martyrdom of Polycarp, xi. 16, we have simply δαπανηθῆναι πυρὶ, 'to be given over to the fire.'

ἐκ τοῦ σκότους, cf. xviii. 1, and for

λυτρωσάμενος v. 6, 7, 8, and xix. 2.

λόγῳ. Müller here accepts Hilg.'s emendation λαοῦ, though it finds no support from the MSS., which agree in λόγῳ. λαοῦ was suggested by the strange Lat. *servorum suorum*, which would seem rather to be corrupted from *sermonum suorum*, the Lat. translator having read ΛΟΓΩΝ for ΛΟΓΩΙ. λόγῳ, though rather pointless, must undoubtedly be retained.

7. The quotations in these three verses, as indeed throughout the chapter, keep closer than usual to the original. As another instance

- hereditatem testamenti domini nostri Iesu accipiamus, qui in hoc paratus est, ut adventu ipsius praecordia nostra, quae iam absumpta erant a morte et tradita iniquitati, liberaret a tenebris, et testaretur in nobis  
 6 testamentum servorum suorum. scriptum est enim quomodo illi pater mandaverit ut nos liberaret a tene-  
 7 bris et pararet sibi populum sanctum. dicit ergo propheta sic: *Ego dominus deus tuus vocavi te in aequitatem; Is. xlii. 6 sq. tenebo manum tuam et fortem te faciam. dedi te in testimonium gentibus et in lumen nationum, ut aperias oculos caecorum et educas de vinculis alligatos. scitote*  
 8 ergo unde liberati sumus. et iterum propheta dicit: *Posui te in lucem nationum, ut sit sanctitas tua usque in Is. xlix. 6 sq. novissimum terrae, sicut dicit dominus qui te liberavit deus.*  
 9 iterum propheta dicit: *Spiritus domini super me, propter Is. lxi. 1 sq. quod unxit me bene nuntiare humilibus, misit me curare contribulatos corde, praedicare captivis remissionem et caecis visum, vocare annum domini acceptabilem.*

XV. Adhuc et de sabbato scriptum est in decem verbis quibus locutus est in monte Sina ad Moysen: *Sanctificate sabbatum domini manibus mundis et puro* Ex. xx. 8 sqq. cf. Ps. xxiv. 4.  
 2 *corde.* et alibi dicit: *Si custodierint filii mei sabbatum,* Ier. xvii. 24 sq.

1. 16 Humilibus. *hominibus* cod.

of comparatively exact quotation cf. ii. 5. And for a compact tabular classification, showing our author's manner in quotation, cf. Sanday, *Gospels in the Second Century*, ch. ii. p. 31 ff., the general result of which distributes the O. T. quotations in the Ep. as follows: 16 exact, 23 slightly variant, 47 variant.

8. οὐτως & Lat., om. Vulg.

At the beginning of both 8 and 9 the authorities waver between πάλιν and καὶ πάλιν.

9. ταπεινοῖς χάριν. So the Vulg. MSS., and the Lat. too *humilibus* (in the cod. *hominibus*). & has corrupted the words into the simple πτωχοῖς of the LXX.

§ XV. *The Jewish Sabbath was but a type of the true Sabbath which shall be ushered in when the new order begins, and is not to be observed.*

1. τοῖς δέκα λόγοις, so Ex. xxxiv. 28.

The addition of the words χερσ. καθ. κ. καρδ. καθ. to the familiar commandment, as though they formed a substantive part of it, is noteworthy in considering how far the laxity of quotation that prevails through the Ep. was conscious or even intentional. The Mosaic law makes no allusion to moral purity.

2. ἐν ἐτέρῳ sc. τόπῳ, or perhaps προφῆτῃ.



- Jer. xvii. 24 sq. Ἐὰν φηλάζωσιν οἱ γίοί μου τὸ σάββατον, τότε ἐπιθήσω τὸ  
 3 ἑλεός μου ἐπ' αὐτοῦς. τὸ σάββατον λέγει ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς  
 Gen. ii. 2. κτίσεως· Καὶ ἐπυῖνεν ὁ θεὸς ἐν ἑξ ἡμέραις τὰ ἔργα τῶν  
 χειρῶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ συνετέλεσεν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἐβδόμῃ καὶ  
 4 κατέπαυσεν ἐν αὐτῇ, καὶ ἡγίασεν αὐτήν. προσέχετε, τέκνα,  
 τί λέγει τό· Συντετέλεσεν ἐν ἑξ ἡμέραις. τοῦτο λέγει ὅτι  
 ἐν ἑξακισχιλίοις ἔτεσιν συντελέσει κύριος τὰ σύνπαντα.  
 ἡ γὰρ ἡμέρα παρ' αὐτῷ χίλια ἔτη. αὐτὸς δέ μοι μαρτυρεῖ  
 Ps. xc. 4. λέγων· Ἰδοὺ σήμερον ἡμέρα ἔσται ὡς χίλια ἔτη. οὐκοῦν,  
 τέκνα, ἐν ἑξ ἡμέραις, ἐν τοῖς ἑξακισχιλίοις ἔτεσιν συντε-  
 5 λεσθήσεται τὰ σύνπαντα. Καὶ κατέπαυσεν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ  
 ἐβδόμῃ. τοῦτο λέγει· ὅταν ἐλθὼν ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ καταργήσῃ  
 τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον καὶ κρινεῖ τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς καὶ ἀλλάξει τὸν  
 ἥλιον καὶ τὴν σελήνην καὶ τοὺς ἀστέρας, τότε καλῶς  
 6 καταπαύσεται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἐβδόμῃ. πέρασ γέ τοι λέγει.  
 cf. v. 1. Ἀγιάσεις αὐτήν χερσὶν καθαφαῖς καὶ καρδίᾳ καθαρά. εἰ οὖν ἦν  
 ὁ θεὸς ἡμέραν ἡγίασεν, νῦν τις δύναται ἀγιάσαι εἰ μὴ

3. ἐβδόμη. This is one of the instances, perhaps besides xi. 2 the only strong one, where the writer has followed the Hebrew text in preference to the LXX., which here gives ἔκτῃ. From some confusion in idea between the ceasing on the sixth day and the resting of the seventh day, he may have intentionally or unintentionally have departed from the LXX. text, and fallen into accidental coincidence with the Heb. : or again, there may have been, as in this particular passage there seems some ground for supposing, a var. l. in the LXX. : or lastly, he may have heard the passage so quoted by some one acquainted with the Heb. text. On the whole it is quite improbable (cf. Dissert. p. xxvi.) that our author was himself familiar with Hebrew.

4. ἑξακισχιλίοις. Jews and Christians alike dwelt much on this millennial computation. The world

was to last 6000 years; then followed 1000 years of rest, which should usher in the true Sabbath of the Lord. Some held that the Messiah would reign during the last thousand years of the 6000, others that his reign, or as the Christians said, his second coming would take place at the end of that time. The Christian era was most commonly supposed to be 5500 years from the era of Creation, or as some held 5000 years. In Apoc. xx. the thousand years is not brought into any temporal relations with the Creation. Cf. too Heb. iv. For further discussion of the subject, cf. Müller's Excursus to this chapter.

δι ... σύνπαντα. The reading adopted is that of N. Vulg. besides having a different order of words reads συντελεῖ for συντελέσει, and here, as again at end of verse, πάντα for σύνπαντα.

5. The true reading καταργήσῃ is

- 3 *tunc faciam misericordiam in illis.* sabbatum dicit initium constitutionis: *Et fecit deus dies sex opera sua*, Gen. ii. 2. *et consummavit in die septimo et requievit in illo die.*
- 4 *ad*tendite, filii, quid dicit: *Consummavit in sex dies.* hoc dicit quia consummabit deus omnia in sex milia annorum. dies enim apud illum mille anni sunt. ipse mihi testis est dicens: *Ecce hodiernus dies erit tanquam* Ps. xc. 4. *mille anni.* unde scire debetis quia in sex milia annorum
- 5 consummabuntur omnia. et quod dicit: *Requievit deus die septima*, hoc est: cum venerit filius illius et amputabit tempus iniquitatis et iudicabit impios et mutabit solem et lunam et stellas: tunc bene requiescet in
- 6 die septima. ad summa hoc dicit: *Sanctificabis illum* cf. v. 1. *diem manibus mundis et corde puro.* quem ergo diem sanctificavit deus, quis potest sanctificare modo nisi qui

I. 2 Dies sex. *die sexto* cod. Edd.

I. 5 *Consummavit* cod.

preserved by **NV** and second hand of O, while BC and O first hand have *καταργήση*. All concur in *κρινεῖ*, and **NBC** preserve *ἀλλάξει*. *ἀλλάξη* OV. For the constr. cf. iv. 14 and note on xi. 11. Cf. Winer § 42, 5 b.

*τὸν καιρὸν* is the time, season, order of things (cf. v. 8 n.) during which the evil one has his opportunity for antagonism to God.

*τοῦτον* of the text is a conjectural reading for *αὐτοῦ*, the reading of the Greek MSS. except **N**, which altogether omits. Fell and later Edd. from *αὐτοῦ* ingeniously supply *τοῦ ἀνόμου* by conj. from the 'iniquitatis' of Lat. It is better to interpret *ἀνόμου*, if that reading be adopted, as masc. than neut. (cf. the parallel xviii. 2, as also *ὁ πονηρός*, ii. 10), though the Lat. has understood it as neuter.

*τὸν ἥλιον*, cf. Matt. xxiv. 29, which the writer may have had in mind. There is much less correspondence to Is. xxx. 26 or Ps. cii. 26, 27, but the representation of such changes

is common in Jewish writings.

6. *χερσὶν καθ.* In this verse the writer actually proceeds to build an argument on words which are an arbitrary addition of his own to the Mosaic enactment, cf. v. 1.

*ἐλ οὖν ἦν κ.τ.λ.* The reading is doubtful. Müller has followed Hilg. in accepting *ἦν οὖν*, the Lat. Vers. reading against all the Greek MSS., which Gebhardt in text follows without change, except only that **N** omits *ἐλ μὴ*, and makes a clerical mistake of *πάντων* for *πάντων*. Müller depreciates the evidence of **N** by laying stress on the omission of the *ἐλ μὴ*, which however he fails to note is supplied by the excellent second hand of **N**: it may have slipped out owing to the preceding *ἐλ οὖν*. The MSS. reading then gives perfectly satisfactory sense, quite as much so as that constructed by Hilg., who, besides reading *ἦν οὖν*, makes *τίς* interrogative, and places a question after *καρδίᾳ*. The general sense thus is, purity of heart,

7 καθαρὸς ὢν τῇ καρδίᾳ, ἐν πᾶσιν πεπλανήμεθα. ἴδε οὖν  
 ἄρα τότε καλῶς καταπαυόμενος ἀγιάζει αὐτήν, ὅτε δυνη-  
 σόμεθα αὐτοὶ δικαιοθέντες καὶ ἀπολαβόντες τὴν ἐπαγγελ-  
 λίαν, οὐκέτι οὕσης τῆς ἀνομίας, καινῶν δὲ γεγονότων πάντων  
 ὑπὸ κυρίου· τότε δυνησόμεθα αὐτὴν ἀγιάσαι, αὐτοὶ ἀγία-  
 8 σθέντες πρῶτον. πέρας γέ τοι λέγει αὐτοῖς· Τὰς νεομηνίας  
 ἡμῶν καὶ τὰ σάββατα οὐκ ἀνέχομαι. ὁρᾶτε πῶς λέγει· Οὐ  
 τὰ νῦν σάββατα ἐμοὶ δεκτά, ἀλλὰ ὁ πεποίηκα, ἐν ᾧ  
 καταπαύσας τὰ πάντα ἀρχὴν ἡμέρας ὁγδόης ποιήσω, ὃ  
 9 ἐστὶν ἄλλου κόσμου ἀρχήν. διὸ καὶ ἄγομεν τὴν ἡμέραν  
 τὴν ὁγδόην εἰς εὐφροσύνην, ἐν ᾗ καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνίστη ἐκ  
 νεκρῶν καὶ φανερωθεὶς ἀνέβη εἰς οὐρανούς.

Is. i. 13.

unless my teaching is wholly false, is the one essential to the right observance of the Sabbath.

ἡγίακεν Vulg., ἡγίασεν R.

ἐν πᾶσιν seems to go more pointedly with πεπλανήμεθα than with the preceding words.

7. οὐκέτι. μηκέτι R.

καινῶν γεγ. πάντ. Rev. xxi. 1.

8. τὰς νεομ. The verse has been previously adduced in ii. 5 with a corresponding omission of ἡμῶν after σάββατα.

κόσμος is used of a cycle or order of things: in x. 11 of the present order of things (cf. "the old order changeth yielding place to new") as opposed to the new αἰών or era, which is looked for in the future, and is here spoken of as ἄλλος κόσμος. 2 Pet. iii. 6 is somewhat similar.

9. διὸ. The writer, notice, does *not* deduce the observance of the Sunday from the Jewish Sabbath; that he declares to be abolished, and to be abhorrent to God. The Christian Sunday is a festival of gladness, commemorating the Resurrection and Ascension, and an image or type of that spiritual Lord's Day, which will dawn upon us, when with the eight thousandth year the old world will be done away, and

God's new order will begin. Thus he agrees with S. Paul (Col. ii. 16, Gal. iv. 10, Rom. iv. 5), in rejecting the Sabbath as a Christian obligation. He goes beyond him in asserting that, like circumcision and the laws concerning meats, it never possessed binding external validity. The true Sabbath can be kept only by purity of heart and hand, such as we can attain to only when we have been justified and sanctified and made partakers of the new order, 'when all things are made new.'

ὁγδόην. For Sunday being called the eighth day, cf. Just. M. Dial. 41. It appears to have been observed (Acts xx. 7), and to have found a distinctive name (cf. ἐν τῇ κυριακῇ ἡμέρᾳ, Rev. i. 10) from the very first.

ἐν ᾗ ἀν. Just. M., Ath., Ign., Aug., similarly connect Sunday with the day of Resurrection. Cf. Matt. xxviii. 1.

ἀνέβη, not used of the Ascension in N. T., where ἀνεφέρετο, ἐπήρθη, ἀναλημφθεὶς, are the words used. With the whole expression cf. Collect for Ascension Day: 'to have ascended into the heavens.'

Many critics, Hilgenfeld, Volkmar, Weizsäcker, Gebhardt, &c.,

7 sit mundus corde? in omnibus nos erravimus. vide  
 ergo quia refrigerans sanctificabit illum, et nos tunc  
 8 poterimus sanctificare, ipsi sanctificati primum. ad  
 summa dicit illis: *Dies sollennes vestros et sabbata non* Is. i. 13.  
*sustineo.* videte quomodo dicit non haec sabbata sibi  
 nunc accepta, sed quae fecit. et in die quo consum-  
 mavit omnia, initium octavi diei faciet, qui est alterius  
 9 saeculi initium. propter quod agimus diem octavum  
 in laetationem, in quem et Iesus resurrexit a mortuis  
 et apparuit et ascendit in caelos.

*l. 1* Nos. *non* cod.      *l. 2* Sanctificavit cod.      *l. 6* Nunc. *non* cod.  
*l. 7* Oct. di. faciet.      *octava* (octavae al.) *diei* *facta* cod.  
*l. 9* Laetat. *legationem* cod.

insist that our author here states that the Resurrection and Ascension took place on the same actual day, and have thence, among other conclusions, deduced that he knew nothing of Matthew's account, nor of the other Gospels. It is unnecessary to consider the various conclusions and inferences thus attained, for the basis of the argument is unsound. There is no necessity (cf. Müller) to suppose that the author held any such erroneous views; the Greek, though admitting, does not require it, nay, the *φανερωθῆς* seems distinctly to point to some interval of time or sequence of events between the *ἀνέστη* and *ἀνέβη*. We find no trace of a supposed identity of day in early Christian literature (at least the commentators adduce none such), which makes it *prima facie* very improbable that our author should have had the idea. The author of *Supernatural Religion* indeed says (Vol. i. Pt. II. 2, p. 256), "In making the Resurrection, appearances to the disciples and the Ascension take place in one day, the author is in agreement with Justin Martyr, who made use of a Gospel different from ours." The statement so far as I know has not the smallest foundation in fact: of

the two passages referred to in its support (viz. Apol. i. 67 and 50), the first does not even mention the Ascension (that Jesus appeared to his disciples on or after the day of Resurrection is hardly disputed by the Synoptists, and this is all Justin declares), while the second has absolutely not a word about days or time, but simply states the fact of the Resurrection, subsequent appearance or appearances, and the Ascension, without the vestige of an implication that they happened on the same day. Indeed implication, so far as it goes, may point to intervals of time intervening between the events, for in precisely the same category with the Resurrection and Ascension are named the descent of the Holy Spirit and the preaching of the Gospel to all nations of men: the break, so far as there is one, in the participial construction, occurs between the Ascension and the Resurrection with its subsequent appearances.

It may be said that our author believed both the Resurrection and Ascension to have taken place on a (though not the same) Sunday; so Henke, placing a forty-two days' interval between them; but the truer view seems to be that

- XVI. Ἔτι δὲ καὶ περὶ τοῦ ναοῦ ἐρῶ ὑμῖν, πῶς  
 πλανώμενοι οἱ ταλαίπωροι εἰς τὴν οἰκοδομὴν ἤλπισαν,  
 καὶ οὐκ ἐπὶ τὸν θεὸν αὐτῶν τὸν ποιήσαντα αὐτούς, ὡς ὄντα  
 2 οἶκον θεοῦ. σχεδὸν γὰρ ὡς τὰ ἔθνη· ἀφίέρωσαν γὰρ αὐτὸν  
 ἐν τῷ ναῷ. ἀλλὰ πῶς λέγει κύριος καταργῶν αὐτόν, μάθετε·  
 Is xl. 12. Τίς ἐμέτρησεν τὸν οὐρανὸν σπιθαμῇ, ἢ τίς τὴν γῆν δρακί;  
 Is. lxvi. 1. οὐκ ἐγὼ; λέγει κύριος. Ὁ οὐρανός μοι θρόνος, ἡ δὲ γῆ  
 ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν μου· ποίον οἶκον οἰκοδομήσετε μοι;  
 ἢ τίς τόπος τῆς καταπαγέσεώς μου; ἐγνώκατε ὅτι ματαία  
 3 ἡ ἐλπίς αὐτῶν. πέρας γέ τοι πάλιν λέγει· Ἰδοὺ οἱ καθελόν-  
 Is. xlix. 17. 4 τεσ τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον, ἀγτοὶ ἀγτὸν οἰκοδομήσουσιν. γίνεται.  
 διὰ γὰρ τὸ πολεμεῖν αὐτοὺς καθήρεθῃ ὑπὸ τῶν ἐχθρῶν.  
 νῦν καὶ αὐτοὶ καὶ οἱ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ὑπηρέται ἀνοικοδομή-  
 5 σουσιν αὐτόν. πάλιν ὡς ἔμελλεν ἡ πέλις καὶ ὁ ναὸς καὶ

the Ascension is simply mentioned as a necessary corollary, so to say a component part of the Resurrection; so conversely ἀνάληψις is used, Luke ix. 51, of the whole train of events commencing with the journey to Jerusalem and culminating in the Ascension.

Finally this record of the Ascension is noticeable as one of the few facts, perhaps the only fact, of Gospel history unrecorded by S. Matthew, to which our author alludes. The main fact of the Ascension must of course have been a part of oral Christian teaching from the beginning.

§ XVI. *The temple at Jerusalem has been done away, and the prophecies concerning it are fulfilled. But the true temple of the Lord is not built with hands, but is the heart of man.*

1. δέ. Om. Vulg. rightly, and so also γὰρ after ἀφίέρωσαν in next verse. πῶς. N has ὡς, which is the less common particle in our Epistle.

οἱ ταλαίπωροι, sc. the Jews. The word has a similar tone Rev. iii. 17. οἰκοδομὴν, the certain reading of

N for the old ὁδόν. So Lat. *asdem*.

αὐτοὺς. For αὐτοὺς Heydecke, not without some probability I think, suggests αὐτόν (N? αὐτήν) sc. οἰκοδομὴν or ναόν. This would make the position of ὡς ὄντα οἶκον θεοῦ more natural.

2. σπιθαμή, a span. δράξ, a hand's breadth.

3. οἱ καθελόντες. The orig. ref. is to the Chaldeans.

4. γίνεται. Om. N.

νῦν. Gallandi, to favour the date of writing which he advocated, viz. 71—73, placed the stop after instead of before νῦν, but this seems unnatural; the νῦν becomes at once misplaced, and in its connexion with the aorist awkward. Westcott, however, *On Canon of N. T.* Part I. § 4, p. 41 n. prefers the punctuation, and thinks the ref. is to the *present* desolation of the temple. Hef., Dres., Hilg., Müller, &c., agree with text.

αὐτοὶ καὶ. It is prob. right to retain with N the second καὶ, which makes a somewhat marked difference in the sense, by including the Jews among the rebuilders of the temple. Not only is MS. authority

- XVI. Adhuc et de templo dicemus, quomodo errantes in aedem spem habuerunt tamquam in dominum  
 2 qui illos fecit, quasi sit domus deo. aut forsitan tamquam ethnici consecraverunt illum in templo. sed quomodo dicat dominus discite, vacuum faciens templum:  
*Quis mensus est caelum palmo, aut quis totam terram* Is. xl. 12.  
*pugno adprehendit? nonne mihi, dicit dominus, caelum* Is. lxvi. 1.  
*thronus est, terra autem scabellum pedum meorum est? qualem domum mihi aedificabitis, aut quis locus erit requietionis meae?* unde cognoscitis quia vana spes est  
 3 illorum. et iterum: *Qui deposuerunt templum hoc, ipsi* Is. xlix. 17.  
 4 *illud et aedificabunt.* et fiet. dum enim belligerarent depositum est ab inimicis. nunc et ipsi inimicorum  
 5 ministri ab initio aedificant illud. iterum sicut inci-

I. 3 Domus. *dns (dominus)* cod.

on the whole slightly in favour of this, but thus a proper parallelism is introduced, as required by the argument, and by the *αὐτοῖς* and *τῶν ἐχθρῶν* of the preceding sentence.

*ἀνοικοδομήσωσιν* N. The other MSS. have the more natural, and therefore prob. incorrect *ἀνοικοδομήσουσιν*, which Gebhardt retains. The subj. would mean, may rebuild it if they choose, not making therefore a material difference to the sense.

The interpretation of this verse has been much disputed.

I. Some comm. consider the words to refer to the rebuilding of the *spiritual* temple.

They interpret *οἱ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ὑπ.* to mean Gentile Christians: but the title is most inappropriate applied to them as builders of the spiritual temple. Nor again would our author make *αὐτοὶ* (the Jews) the main builders of the *spiritual* temple. Further, the abrupt and concealed transition from the earthly temple spoken of in *καθάρθη* to the spiritual intended by *αὐτῶν*, is unnatural in the extreme. The spiritual temple

is first discussed in v. 6, where quite a different interpretation of it is given.

II. The actual temple of stone is referred to throughout.

a. Weizsäcker's wild supposition that the temple of Zerubbabel is meant, needs no comment.

b. Ewald VII. 20 refers the passage to the hopes of Jews in Vespasian's time, and states, apparently on no authority but that of this passage, that rumours were current of the Emperor's intention to rebuild Jerusalem; still for Jewish expectations and hopes roused by the accession of Vespasian cf. Merivale, *Romans under the Empire*, ch. lxx. init., and cf. iv. 3—5 note.

c. Volkmar, followed by Müller, refers the passage to Hadrian's time (119 A.D.), when it appears that promises of the restoration of the temple were officially held out to the Jews. At any rate rumours to that effect were generally current at the commencement of his reign. Cf. e.g. Sib. Or. v. 48, 421, x. 163.

The only certain inferences to be

Henoch  
lxxxix. 56, 66  
sq. ?

ὁ λαὸς Ἰσραὴλ παραδίδοσθαι, ἐφανερώθη. λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή· Καὶ ἔσται ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν, καὶ παραδώσει κύριος τὰ πρόβατα τῆς νομῆς καὶ τὴν μάνδραν καὶ τὸν πύργον αὐτῶν εἰς καταφθοράν. καὶ ἐγένετο καθ' ἣ ἐλάλησεν κύριος.

6 ζητήσωμεν οὖν εἰ ἔστιν ναὸς θεοῦ. ἔστιν, ὅπου αὐτὸς λέγει

Dan. ix. 24 ?

ποιεῖν καὶ καταρτίζειν. γέγραπται γάρ· Καὶ ἔσται τῆς ἑβδομάδος σὺντελομένης, οἰκοδομηθήσεται ναὸς θεοῦ ἐν-

7 δόξῳ ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου. εὕρισκω οὖν ὅτι ἔστιν ναὸς. πῶς οὖν οἰκοδομηθήσεται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου, μάθετε. πρὸ τοῦ ἡμᾶς πιστεῦσαι τῷ θεῷ ἦν ἡμῶν τὸ κατοικητήριον

deduced from the passage are these :

1. The Epistle is subsequent to the destruction of the first temple, viz. 70 A.D.

2. It is previous to the great Jewish rebellion of 119 A.D. consummated by the building of Aelia on the site of Jerusalem, A.D. 133, and to the erection of the temple of Zeus on the site of the old temple. (The idea of ἀνοικοδομήσουσιν containing an ironical reference to this event is untenable).

3. At the time of writing (γίνεται νῦν) there were at any rate vague hopes, amounting prob. to some definite prospect (ἀνοικοδομήσωσιν), of the Jews being permitted under supervision of the Romans to rebuild their temple. This was the case at the commencement of Hadrian's reign, but may quite well have been so at various times from Vespasian onward, in whose own time some such hopes appear to have been roused. Hence this passage cannot weigh strongly if at all against the conclusions arrived at in note on iv. 3-5. For further discussion of the passage, and its bearing on the date of the Epistle, cf. Dissert. p. xxxi. pp. For the difficulty of assigning the passage to any one point in Hadrian's reign, see Hilgenfeld's Barnabas, Adnotationes in loc. p. 75 (1866 Ed.), who quotes Weizsäcker at

length. It may be worth while here to mention Heydecke's theory, contained in his recently published *Dissertatio qua Barnabae Epistola Interpolata demonstratur*. He supposes capp. i.—iv. and xiii.—xxi. to be the genuine work of the Apostle Barnabas, written 70-71 A.D. to cheer and encourage Jewish Christians at the great crisis of the demolition of the temple. Ch. v.—xii. are a later insertion, 119-122 A.D., by the hand of some Gentile Christian, who removed iv. from its original place between xvi. and xvii. to its present position, at the same time inserting in it vv. 6-9, and interpolating also xv. 8, 9, xvi. 3, 4.—The object of the genuine part of the Ep. he considers to be (cf. i. 5) to perfect the knowledge (γνώσις) of his readers as a fit adjunct of their faith, and the arrangement of the Ep. consisted (according to the promise of i. 7) in a consecutive treatment of things past, things at hand, and things to come. The whole tract is ingenious rather than convincing, and the obvious objections and weaknesses in the argument are succinctly stated in Dr O. Braunsberger's *Der Apostel Barnabas, sein Leben und der ihm beigelegte Brief*. Mainz. 1876. Heydecke considers iv. 3-5 to point decisively to Vespasian's reign as the date of the

piebat civitas et populus totus Iudaeorum tradi, pro-  
palavit. dicit enim scriptura: *In novissimis diebus tradet* Henoch  
lxxxix. 56, 66  
sq. ?  
*dominus oves pascui et cubile et turrem eorum in ex-  
terminium.* et factum est secundum quae dominus  
6 locutus est. quaeramus ergo si est templum deo. est,  
ubi ipse dicit facere et consummare. scriptum est: *Et* Dan. ix. 24  
*erit septimo die consummato, aedificabitur templum deo*  
7 *praeclare in nomine domini.* invenio quia est templum.  
quomodo ergo aedificabitur in nomine domini, discite.  
antequam crederemus deo erat habitatio nostra corrupta

Epistle, but very unsatisfactorily (p. 64) assumes that xvi. 3, 4 are an insertion by the presumed interpolator.

5. ἡ γραφή. The words are supposed to be from the book of Henoch, though the correspondence is not very exact. Still as Henoch survives only in the Aethiopic version, not much stress can be laid on this, and there is sufficient general similarity to identify the passage.

ἐπ' ἐσχ. τῶν ἡμ. For the rather strange order, cf. xii. 9, 1 Pet. i. 20, &c.

μάνδραν, 'sheepfold,' for which S. John x. i. 16 uses ἀνθή, in ecclesiastical Greek is used for 'monastery.' Here it is referred to Jerusalem, as πύργον to the temple.

6. The use of οὖν is peculiar. It might be taken for 'whereas,' 'inasmuch as,' cf. 2 Pet. ii. 11, or perhaps better quite literally, 'There is a temple, in the place (sc. the heart) in which He himself promises to build and perfect it.'

ποιεῖν κ. καταρτ. An αὐτόν is omitted as in xiii. 5.

7. ἡμᾶς. Considering the motives that, on the supposition of Barnabas being the author, would have naturally led a copyist to substitute ὑμᾶς for ἡμᾶς, we may perhaps consider the reading ἡμᾶς sufficiently

established: at the same time it is unfortunate that ἡμᾶς should read ὑμᾶς, for perhaps there is no passage, taken singly, in the Epistle which goes so far as this (cf. πλήρης ἐδωλολατρίας) to prove that the author as well as the readers were Gentile and not Jewish Christians. That a very large portion, indeed the main body of those addressed, were Gentiles admits of no reasonable doubt (cf. Dissert. p. xx. pp.); with the author the case is different; a ἡμᾶς here might be regarded as decisive, while a ὑμᾶς in contrast with ἡμῶν of v. 8 would point definitely in the other direction.

We may notice that there is no attempt here to regard the temple as a type of a wider and universal spiritual temple, extending over the whole world, as we find elsewhere, cf. 1 Cor. iii. 16 *ὡν*, 2 Cor. vi. 16, &c. The one central temple is wholly done away; the term is preserved only metaphorically: each man's heart became a temple. Here, as in his treatment of meats, circumcision, the Sabbath, &c., we have in our author a certain impatience of outward form and unity, that does not even seek to realize the conception of an outward visible Catholic Church.



- τῆς καρδίας φθαρτὸν καὶ ἀσθενές, ὡς ἀληθῶς οἰκοδομητὸς ναὸς διὰ χειρός· ὅτι ἦν πλήρης μὲν εἰδωλολατρείας καὶ ἦν οἶκος δαιμονίων διὰ τὸ ποιεῖν ὅσα ἦν ἐναντία τῷ θεῷ.
- 8 οἰκοδομηθήσεται δὲ ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου. προσέχετε, ἵνα ὁ ναὸς κυρίου ἐνδόξως οἰκοδομηθῇ. πῶς; μάθετε. λαβόντες τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ ἐλπίσαντες ἐπὶ τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου ἐγενόμεθα καινοί, πάλιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς κτιζόμενοι· διὸ ἐν τῷ κατοικητηρίῳ ἡμῶν ἀληθῶς ὁ θεὸς κατοικεῖ ἐν ἡμῖν.
- 9 πῶς; ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ τῆς πίστεως, ἡ κλῆσις αὐτοῦ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, ἡ σοφία τῶν δικαιωμάτων, αἱ ἐντολαὶ τῆς διδαχῆς, αὐτὸς ἐν ἡμῖν προφητεύων, αὐτὸς ἐν ἡμῖν κατοικῶν, τοῖς τῷ θανάτῳ δεδουλωμένοις ἀνοίγων ἡμῖν τὴν θύραν τοῦ ναοῦ, ὃ ἐστὶν στόμα, μετάνοιαν διδούς ἡμῖν εἰσάγει
- 10 εἰς τὸν ἀφθαρτον ναόν. ὁ γὰρ ποθὼν σωθῆναι βλέπει οὐκ εἰς τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἀλλὰ εἰς τὸν ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικοῦντα καὶ λαλοῦντα, ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἐκπλησσόμενος ἐπὶ τῷ μηδέποτε μῆτε τοῦ λέγοντος τὰ ῥήματα ἀκηκοέναι ἐκ τοῦ στόματος μῆτε αὐτός ποτε ἐπιτεθυμηκέναι ἀκούειν. τοῦτό ἐστιν πνευματικὸς ναὸς οἰκοδομούμενος τῷ κυρίῳ.

XVII. Ἐφ' ὅσον ἦν ἐν δυνατῷ καὶ ἀπλότῃ δηλᾶσαι ὑμῖν, ἐλπίζει μου ὁ νοῦς καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ τῇ ἐπιθυμίᾳ μου μὴ

2 παραλελοιπέναι τι τῶν ἀνηκόντων εἰς σωτηρίαν. ἐὰν γὰρ περὶ τῶν ἐνεστῶτων ἢ μελλόντων γράφω ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ νοήσητε διὰ τὸ ἐν παραβολαῖς κείσθαι. ταῦτα μὲν οὕτως.

οἶκος δαιμονίων, cf. Ps. xciv. 5 in LXX. πάντες οἱ θεοὶ τῶν ἔθνων δαιμόνια, and such was the prevalent idea running through the Sibylline books, and habitually recurring in Gnostic teaching.

8. ἐγεν. καινοί, cf. vi. 11, ἀνακαινίσκειν, phrases quite parallel to Pauline teaching, of which further the word κτιζόμενοι specially reminds us. Cf. καινὴ κτίσις, 2 Cor. v. 17, Gal. vi. 15.

9. κλῆσις, 'summons,' 'invitation,' not of course 'election.'

αὐτὸς προφ., not with ref. to the

special χάρισμα of prophesying, but a fearless appeal to the sense and conviction of God's inspiring power and presence in the heart.

αὐτὸς ἐν ἡμῖν προφητεύων, αὐτὸς ἐν ἡμῖν κατοικῶν. Commentators, e.g. very markedly Donaldson, *Apost. Fathers*, ch. iv. p. 236, seem most strangely to have ignored this passage in considering the question how far the author recognized the doctrine of the Trinity. Granting that in his time the doctrine was not definitely formulated as a part of Church Creed, yet here surely we

et infirma, sicut templum quod per manus aedificatur, quia pleni eramus adorationibus idolorum, et erat domus daemoniorum, propter quod faceremus quae deo essent  
 8 contraria. aedificabitur autem in nomine domini praeclare templum deo. attendite, et quomodo, discite: ut accipiatis remissionem peccatorum. cum crediderimus in nomine domini, nos sumus iam tales quales ab initio creati. propter quod in nobis vere deus in-  
 9 habitat. quomodo? sermo fidei illius, vocatio promissionis illius, sapientia aequitatis, praecepta testamenti illius, in nobis prophetans ipse et in nobis habitans; qui cum sub servitute mortis eramus, aperiens ostium templi nostri, quod est os sapientiae, fecit de nobis domum  
 10 incorruptam. qui enim concupiscit liberari vidit non in hominem sed in eo qui habitat in illo, miratur quod nunquam tales sermones audierit eum dicentem neque ipse concupierit audire. hic est spiritaliter aedificatus.

XVII. Quantum fuerit in simplicitate demonstrandi  
 2 vobis non intermisi quicquam. si enim de instantibus ac futuris scribam vobis, non intellegitis, quoniam in parabolis posita sunt multa. haec autem sic sunt. habes interim de maiestate Christi, quomodo omnia in illum et per illum facta sunt; cui sit honor, virtus, gloria nunc et in saecula saeculorum.

Explicit epistola Barnabae.

L. 7 Nos. non cod. Edd. 'L. 11 Qui. quia cod. L. 14 Vidit. vivit cod.

have the doctrine of the Third Person of the Trinity very plainly implied. The religious need of the doctrine was felt, though the intellectual conception of it was still undefined. Cf. Dissert. p. cviii.

ὁ ἐστὶν στόμα. The introduction of the phrase is unexpected and abrupt, but cf. xi. 8: possibly the *προφητεῶν* suggested the thought of the Christian's *προφητεία*. In the *λαλοῦντα, λέγοντος, ῥήματα, στόματος*,

of next verse, the thought comes very prominently forward. Cf. xix. 7 note.

10. ἐπ' αὐτῷ, neut.; the ἐπὶ τῷ κ.τ.λ. is exegetical of it. τοῦτο, emphatic.

πνευματικός ναός. Cf. οἶκος πνευματικός, 1 Pet. ii. 5.

§ XVII. *Brief retrospect on the general scope of the Epistle.*

1. The text on authority of N\*\* alone rather arbitrarily retains ὁ

XVIII. Μεταβώμεν δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ ἑτέραν γνώσιν καὶ διδαχὴν. Ὅδοι δύο εἰσὶν διδαχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας, ἥ τε τοῦ φωτός καὶ ἡ τοῦ σκότους. διαφορὰ δὲ πολλή τῶν δύο ὁδῶν. ἐφ' ἧς μὲν γάρ εἰσιν τεταγμένοι φωταγωγοὶ ἄγγελοι 2 τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐφ' ἧς δὲ ἄγγελοι τοῦ σατανᾶ. καὶ ὁ μὲν ἔστιν κύριος ἀπὸ αἰῶνων καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ὁ δὲ ἄρχων καιροῦ τοῦ νῦν τῆς ἀνομίας.

XIX. Ἡ οὖν ὁδὸς τοῦ φωτός ἔστιν αὕτη· ἐάν τις θέλων ὁδὸν ὁδεύειν ἐπὶ τὸν ὠρισμένον τόπον, σπεύσῃ τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ. ἔστιν οὖν ἡ δοθείσα ἡμῖν γνώσις τοῦ περι-

νοῦς καί, which **N** and Vulg. omit.

2. ἐάν γάρ, κ.τ.λ. A strange hesitation after c. iv.

The μὲν is noticeable with reference to the genuineness of the last four chapters. It certainly implies to some extent the δέ which commences ch. xviii. For the words ταῦτα μὲν οὕτως we have the Latin as witness, to shew that they are not merely a tag added by the compiler of xviii—xxi.

Of the doxology added in the Latin version, but entirely unrecognized by any Greek MS., we can only say that similar phenomena of appended doxologies frequently occur, and that there is no reason to suppose it an integral part of the Epistle.

#### *Genuineness of Chapters XVIII—XXI.*

Considerable doubts have been expressed as to the genuineness of these last four chapters.

Briefly it is urged against them that they are entirely absent from the old Latin version—and further differ from the main body of the Epistle in language, style and subject-matter.

The arguments in favour of their genuineness are far more weighty—(a) the Greek MSS. of both families recognize them: and so too does the Stichometry of Nicephorus.

(b) The Const. Apost. quote them throughout; and the *Duae Viae* or *Iudicium Petri* clearly refers to them; so too does Origen; while Clem. Alex. *Strom.* cites twice from the last chapter, which cannot be fairly separated from the rest.

(c) It is true that the Latin omits them, but at the same time by supplying an independent doxology at the end of xvii. seems almost to imply some omission. The difference of tone—the substitution of hortative maxims for doctrinal teaching and exposition—may have furnished a reason to the translator (of whose object we know nothing) for omitting them.

(d) The differences in style are certainly marked, but perhaps not more so than may reasonably be accounted for by the change in subject-matter.

(e) Both in language and matter there are marked links between the two parts of the Epistle. In language we have noticed one in xvii. 2 note: as another may be quoted the repeated use of ὁδός in the earlier part of the Epistle in a way closely corresponding to that in the latter, cf. i. 4, iv. 10, v. 4 *bis*, xi. 7 *bis*: or once again the mode of speaking of the Evil one, cf. τὸν πονηρὸν xix. 11 with ii. 10 (cf. iv. 13, ix. 4)—but it is useless to multiply these.

- 2 πατεῖν ἐν αὐτῇ τοιαύτῃ. Ἀγαπήσεις τὸν ποιήσαντά σε, φοβηθήσῃ τὸν σε πλάσαντα, δοξάσεις τὸν σε λυτρωσάμενον ἐκ θανάτου· ἔσῃ ἀπλοῦς τῇ καρδίᾳ καὶ πλούσιος τῷ πνεύματι· οὐ κολληθήσῃ μετὰ πορευομένων ἐν ὁδῷ θανάτου, μισήσεις πᾶν ὃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀρεστὸν τῷ θεῷ, μισήσεις πᾶσαν
- 3 ὑπόκρισιν· οὐ μὴ ἐγκαταλίπῃς ἐντολὰς κυρίου. οὐχ ὑψώσεις σεαυτὸν, ἔσῃ δὲ ταπεινώφρων κατὰ πάντα. οὐκ ἀρεῖς ἐπὶ σεαυτὸν δέξαν. οὐ λήμψῃ βουλὴν πονηρὰν κατὰ
- 4 τοῦ πλησίον σου· οὐ δώσεις τῇ ψυχῇ σου θράσος. οὐ πορνεύσεις, οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ παιδοφθορήσεις. οὐ μὴ

Müller invents an arbitrary theory that the last four chapters were added by the same author at a later date: but such an hypothesis, besides being quite unprovable, creates at least as many difficulties as it removes.

§ XVIII. *The Two Ways distinguished.*

1. καὶ ἐπὶ ἐν. Om. καὶ Ν. ὁδοὶ δύο. From Prodicus' Choice of Hercules, Xen. Mem. II. i. 21 onward, the metaphor both in sacred and profane literature is too common and natural to need illustration. We find the one way spoken of in our Epistle as ἡ τοῦ σκότους, v. 4, xviii. 1, ἡ τοῦ μέλανος, xx. 1, ὁδὸς θανάτου or αἰώνιον θάνατον, xix. 2, xx. 1, ὁδὸς ἀσεβῶν, xi. 7, πονηρὰ ὁδός, iv. 10; the other as ἡ τοῦ φωτός, xviii. 1, xix. 12, ὁδὸς δικαίων, xi. 7, ὁδὸς δικαίας, xii. 4.

ἄγγελοι. In the activity assigned to angels throughout the Epistle, and the belief in their constant interference with mundane affairs (cf. ix. 4), we trace the influence of incipient Gnosticism. Satan is an active agent for harm, at the head of an array of ἄγγελοι. Cf. ii. 1, 10 note, iv. 9, 13, ix. 4.

2. ἀρχ. καὶ ρ. τοῦ νῦν τῆς ἀνομ. Cf. the parallel xv. 5, and iv. 9.

§ XIX. *The way of light amplified into a code of moral injunctions enjoined upon the readers.*

The greater part of these chapters xix. xx. appears in altered form and arrangement in Const. Apost. vii. 2-18. Their chief characteristic is the insistence on certain rules of *conduct*, in relation to man. Of the inner spiritual life before God, prayer, devotion, &c., there is but slight mention, while of a corporate religious life, with its common worship, sacraments and means of grace, there is hardly a trace; but cf. xix. 4, 10.

1. εἰς θέλων. Most curiously, all the Commentators explain θέλων as an instance of the participle used for a finite verb, and explain it as ecclesiastical or Byzantine Greek, comparing vi. 11.—εἰς...σπεύσῃ τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ is of course simply exegetical of αὐτῇ.

σπεύσῃ Ν, while the other MSS. read the future, which as the most difficult reading is probably right. Cf. xi. 11 note.

2. τῷ πνεύματι. We must not be tempted by τὸν ποιήσαντα followed by τὸν λυτρωσάμενον in the previous clause to suppose that here there is direct reference to the Third Person of the Holy Trinity. On this see Dissert. p. cix.

4. παιδοφθορήσεις. From the connexion, as παιδοφθόρος in x. 6, clearly of παιδερσσία, to which it is explicitly referred by the Const. Apost. vii. 2.

σου ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξέλθῃ ἐν ἀκαθαρσίᾳ τινῶν. οὐ λήμψῃ  
 πρόσωπον ἐλέγξαι τινὰ ἐπὶ παραπτώματι. ἔση πραῦς, ἔση  
 ἡσύχιος, ἔση τρέμων τοὺς λόγους οὓς ἤκουσας. οὐ μνησι-  
 5 κακήσεις τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου. οὐ μὴ διψυχήσης πότερον  
 Ex. xx. 7. ἔσται ἢ οὐ. οὐ μὴ λάβῃς ἐπὶ ματαίῳ τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου.  
 ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὑπὲρ τὴν ψυχὴν σου.  
 οὐ φονεύσεις τέκνον ἐν φθορᾷ, οὐδὲ πάλιν γεννηθὲν  
 ἀποκτενεῖς. οὐ μὴ ἄρῃς τὴν χεῖρά σου ἀπὸ τοῦ υἱοῦ  
 σου ἢ ἀπὸ τῆς θυγατρὸς σου, ἀλλὰ ἀπὸ νεότητος διδάξεις  
 6 φόβον θεοῦ. οὐ μὴ γένη ἐπιθυμῶν τὰ τοῦ πλησίον σου,  
 οὐ μὴ γένη πλεονέκτης. οὐδὲ κολληθήσῃ ἐκ ψυχῆς σου  
 μετὰ ὑψηλῶν, ἀλλὰ μετὰ ταπεινῶν καὶ δικαίων ἀναστρα-  
 φήσῃ. τὰ συμβαίνοντά σοι ἐνεργήματα ὡς ἀγαθὰ πρόσ-  
 7 δεξαι, εἰδὼς ὅτι ἄνευ θεοῦ οὐδὲν γίνεται. οὐκ ἔση δύνωμος

τινῶν. Some explain as neut. gen. after ἀκαθαρσία, and equivalent in sense to τινί. This gives hopelessly harsh and unnatural Greek. It must clearly be taken masculine, and 'in the uncleanness of any' means 'in the presence of any infected with uncleanness': the injunction is practically that evil-livers or unclean persons shall not be suffered to form part of the congregation or circle of Christian hearers.

οὐ λήμψῃ πρόσωπον, cf. ἀπροσωπολήμπτως, iv. 12.

5. διψυχήσης. The main reference of this maxim is, as Const. Apost. vii. 11 understands it, to faith in prayer, though other forms of trust in God's working are no doubt covered by the expression. Cf. James i. 8, iv. 8.

ἀγαπήσεις. Cf. Lev. xix. 18, and for the whole expression, iv. 6.

οὐ φονεύσεις κ.τ.λ. Not of spiritual death, but rather a prohibition against wilful abortion, or infanticide. Müller wrongly makes the reference the same as in παιδοφθορήσεις above.

6. ἐπιθυμῶν. Cf. Ex. xx. 17; we

have the third, seventh, and tenth commandments repeated pretty closely in v. 5, 4 and 6 respectively. The other commandments are not explicitly referred to, and the fourth of course our author has already rejected, c. xv.

ἐνεργήματα. The Const. Apost. paraphrase the sentence by τὰ συμβαίνοντά σοι πάθη (sc. παθήματα) εὐμενῶς δέχου καὶ τὰς περιστάσεις ἀλύπτως—and this is doubtless the reference of ἐνεργήματα, 'occurrences' namely of sickness, anxieties and troubles of various kinds. ἐνεργεῖν was used specially of evil agencies and diabolic visitations, cf. ii. 1. In Const. Apost. a special chapter ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐνεργουμένων (viii. 7) contains a form of prayer for exorcism of the evil spirit. The reference in the present passage is not so explicit, as the ὡς ἀγαθὰ sufficiently proves.

7. παγίς θανάτου repeated next verse. Cf. παγίς διαβόλου not altogether dissimilarly used, 1 Tim. iii. 7, 2 Tim. ii. 26.

διγλωσσία. The importance attached throughout to watchfulness

- οὐδὲ δὶγλωσσος· παγὶς γὰρ θανάτου ἐστὶν ἡ διγλωσσία. ὑποταγήσῃ κυρίοις ὡς τύπῳ θεοῦ ἐν αἰσχύνη καὶ φόβῳ. οὐ μὴ ἐπιτάξῃς δούλῳ σου ἢ παιδίσκῃ ἐν πικρίᾳ, τοῖς ἐπὶ τὸν αὐτὸν θεὸν ἐλπίζουσι, μήποτε οὐ φοβηθήσῃ τὸν ἐπ' ἰμφοτέροις θεόν, ὅτι οὐκ ἦλθεν κατὰ πρόσωπον καλέσαι  
 8 ἀλλ' ἐφ' οὓς τὸ πνεῦμα ἡτοίμασεν. κοινωνήσεις ἐν πᾶσι τῷ πλησίον σου, καὶ οὐκ ἐρεῖς ἴδια εἶναι· εἰ γὰρ ἐν τῷ ἀφθάρτῳ κοινωνοὶ ἐστε, πόσῳ μᾶλλον ἐν τοῖς φθαρτοῖς. οὐκ ἔσῃ πρόγλωσσος· παγὶς γὰρ τὸ στόμα θανάτου. ὅσον  
 9 δύνασαι ὑπὲρ τῆς ψυχῆς σου ἀγνεύσεις. μὴ γίνου πρὸς μὲν τὸ λαβεῖν ἐκτείνων τὰς χεῖρας, πρὸς δὲ τὸ δοῦναι Ecclus. iv. 31. συσπῶν. ἀγαπήσεις ὡς κόρην τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου πάντα  
 10 τὸν λαλοῦντά σοι τὸν λόγον κυρίου. μνησθήσῃ ἡμέραν κρίσεως νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας, καὶ ἐκζητήσεις καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν τὰ πρόσωπα τῶν ἀγίων, ἣ διὰ λόγου κοπιῶν καὶ πορευόμενος εἰς τὸ παρακαλέσαι καὶ μελετῶν εἰς τὸ σῶσαι

over *words* is noticeable. Cf. xvi. 9, xix. 4, 8, 9, 10, xx. 2.

Before *κυρίοις* the MSS. except **N** insert *κυρίῳ*, which should probably be read, as it may have been so easily dropped out in **N** through carelessness. The sense will then be, Be subject to the Lord, and to masters, as the image or representative of God—*τύπῳ θεοῦ* thus gains fresh force.

*κυρίοις*. For the injunction, cf. Eph. vi. 5 ff.; Col. iii. 22; 1 Tim. vi. 1; Tit. ii. 9; and 1 Pet. ii. 18, 13, where the thought contained in *δεῖ αὐτοῦ πεμπομένοις* is analogous to that expressed here by *ὡς τύπῳ θεοῦ*.

*τὸν ἐπ' ἀμφ. θεόν*. The thought is the same Eph. vi. 9. *ἦλθεν οὐ* Vulg., for *οὐκ ἦλθεν* of **N**.

*τὸ πνεῦμα* is clearly accus., not nom. as some strangely take it—*ἐτοιμάζω* is followed by accus. invariably in Ep. Cf. iii. 6, v. 7, xiv. 6. In xiv. 5 passive.

8. *εἰ γάρ, κ.τ.λ.* 1 Cor. ix. 11

has the same thought. The significant singular *τῷ ἀφθάρτῳ* as contrasted with *τοῖς φθαρτοῖς* has been preserved by **N** only.

*πρόγλωσσος* would be specially of angry, boastful, rash or violent talking.

9. *συσπῶν*. Equivalent to *συστέλλων*, which is the word adopted in the parallel passage of Const. Apost. vii. 11.

*ὡς κόρην τοῦ ὀφ.* An Old Testament expression, Deut. xxxii. 10; Ps. xvii. 8; Prov. vii. 2; Zech. ii. 8.

10. *ἣ διὰ λόγου*. There is some difference in the MSS. here. The text follows **N**, and may be considered quite satisfactory. *ἣ...*, *ἣ...* mark the contrasted clauses. In the second clause quite strictly *ἐργάσῃ* should be a participle, but such a change to the finite verb is common and natural enough.

*μελετῶν*. Here obviously, as throughout the Epistle (cf. xxi. 7), the thought is of inward heart meditation, not of outward practice.

- ψυχὴν τῷ λόγῳ, ἣ διὰ τῶν χειρῶν σου ἐργάσῃ εἰς λύτρωσιν  
 11 ἁμαρτιῶν σου. οὐ διστάσεις δοῦναι οὐδὲ διδοὺς γογγύσεις,  
 γνώσῃ δὲ τίς ὁ τοῦ μισθοῦ καλὸς ἀνταποδότης. φυλάξεις  
 αἱ παρέλαβες, μήτε προσθεῖς μήτε ἀφαιρῶν. εἰς τέλος  
 12 μισήσεις τὸν πονηρόν. κρινεῖς δικαίως. οὐ ποιήσεις  
 σχίσμα, εἰρηνεύσεις δὲ μαχομένους συναγαγών. ἐξομο-  
 λογήσῃ ἐπὶ ἁμαρτίαις σου. οὐ προσήξεις ἐπὶ προσευχῇν  
 ἐν συνειδήσει πονηρᾷ. Αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ὁδὸς τοῦ φωτός.

XX. Ἡ δὲ τοῦ μέλανος ὁδὸς ἐστὶν σκολιὰ καὶ κατάρas  
 μεστή. ἰδὸς γάρ ἐστιν θανάτου αἰωνίου μετὰ τιμωρίας, ἐν  
 ᾗ ἐστὶν τὰ ἀπολλύντα τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτῶν· εἰδωλολατρεία,

λύτρωσιν ἁμ. The very close connexion introduced between good works and redemption of sin, so close that the latter is actually, in part at any rate, a result of the former, has staggered many commentators, who have vainly tried to wrest some other meaning from the words. Really they are but the most exaggerated expression of the thought that in great measure pervades these chapters. At the same time the words must not be unjustly pressed. Donaldson, *Apost. Fathers*, p. 222, says: "By thy hands thou shalt work for the redemption of sins"—Such an exhortation can be paralleled from no contemporary writer;" and proceeds to suggest that they are a precept of the second century or later. In such a statement the words are unfairly divorced from their context. They occur in the text as an alternative. The writer presses that the Christian life must be practical: it is the bounden duty, he would say, of every Christian, either to preach and teach, or to undertake personal practical work, for this tends towards, makes for (εἰς λύτρωσιν), remission of sins.

11. Before γνώσῃ the Greek MSS. except N insert πάντι τῷ αἰτούντι σέ

δίδου. These the most recent Edd. omit on authority of N and suppose them to be inserted from Luke vi. 30. This may be so, but we must bear in mind that similar interpolations do not occur (but cf. v. 9) in the rest of the Epistle. The MS. authority decidedly favours their insertion. Had we simply to balance N against the other MSS. we should unhesitatingly under the circumstances accept its authority—but N\*\* inserts the words, and this second corrector of N is an authority hardly second to N itself. The author of *Supernatural Religion*, whose whole chapter on the Epistle of Barnabas is extraordinarily and perversely uncritical, regards the words as the interpolation of a pious scribe, but we have two independent sources of testimony for the words—viz. the vulg. MSS., and N\*\* which represents not 'piety' but alternative readings gathered from the so-called Codex Pampili, of very old though uncertain date.—The most recent Ed., Gebhardt (*Proleg.* p. xiv. n.), says that Müller has failed to observe that the second corrector is not the same hand in Ep. Barnabas as in the remainder of the MS. In that case the value of N\*\* becomes indeterminate; but Tisch. (so far as I understand) thinks

θρασύτης, ὕψος δυνάμεως, ὑπόκρισις, διπλοκαρδία, μοιχεία, φόνος, ἄρπαγή, ὑπερηφανία, παράβασις, δόλος, κακία, 2 αὐθάδεια, φαρμακεία, μαγεία, πλεονεξία, ἀφοβία. διώκεται τῶν ἀγαθῶν, μισοῦντες ἀλήθειαν, ἀγαπῶντες ψεῦδη, οὐ γινώσκοντες μισθὸν δικαιοσύνης, οὐ κολλῶμενοι ἀγαθῷ, οὐ κρίσει δικάῃ, χήρα καὶ ὀρφανῷ οὐ προσέχοντες, ἀγρυπνοῦντες οὐκ εἰς φόβον θεοῦ ἀλλὰ ἐπὶ τὸ ποιηρὸν, ὧν μακρὰν καὶ πόρρω πραύτης καὶ ὑπομονῆς, ἀγαπῶντες μάταια, διώκοντες ἀνταπόδομα, οὐκ ἐλεοῦντες πτωχόν, οὐ ποιοῦντες ἐπὶ καταπονουμένῳ, εὐχερεῖς ἐν καταλαλίᾳ, οὐ γινώσκοντες

§ XX. *The way of darkness is described.*

§ XX. *The way of darkness is described.* 1. τοῦ μέλανος. The Commentators generally regard this as masc., supporting their view by ὁ μέλας of the Evil one in iv. 9. It seems preferable to make it neut. and synonymous with τοῦ σκότους, xviii. 1. The nature of the ὁδός (cf. note on xviii. 1) is habitually described by some abstract word, or by the character of those who walk in it. θανάτου αἰωνίου. A collocation not found in N.T. ἦ, sc. ὁδός.

ἡ, sc. ὁδός.

παράβασις. παραβάσεις N. Where a reading depends as here on this commonest form of itacism, context and taste must decide. ἀφοβία. N\*\*BCOFV insert after this θεοῦ—N omits. The word is correct as an explanation, even if it is not to be read in text. 2. N alone inserts οὐ before προσέχοντες. It seems much better to omit and take the awkward οὐ κρίσει δικάῃ with προσέχοντες, which gives a perfectly good sense, corresponding to πενήτων ἀνομοὶ κριταὶ at the end of the verse. In the text the absence of a participle with κρίσει δικάῃ quite breaks the parallelism of clauses. ὧν masc. καταπονουμένῳ. Masc. and pass., the man who is overdone with

αἰς τέλος, 'utterly,' as in x. 5. Donaldson, *Apost. Fathers*, cap. iv. p. 222, translates 'to the last,' and proceeding to render the doubtful τὸν ποιηρὸν by 'the wicked man,' remarks that it is a maxim unworthy even of the second century of Christianity, and with a ring that betokens a still later date—*progeniem vitiosioremi*. It is impossible with Müller to make εἰς τέλος = 'finally,' for admonitions both precede and follow without the slightest visible break. τὸν ποιηρὸν. Here probably generic=τοὺς ποιηρούς—though ὁ ποιηρός is used of the Evil one, ii. 10, where see note, and so Men., Gebh. take it here.

12. σχίσμα. Cf. iv. 10.



τὸν ποιήσαντα αὐτοὺς, φονεῖς τέκνων, φθορεῖς πλάσματος θεοῦ, ἀποστρεφόμενοι τὸν ἐνδεόμενον καὶ καταπονοῦντες τὸν θλιβόμενον, πλουσίων παράκλητοι, πενήτων ἄνομοι κριταί, πανταμάρητοι.

- XXI. Καλὸν οὖν ἐστὶν μαθόντα τὰ δικαιώματα κυρίου, ὅσα προγέγραπται, ἐν τούτοις περιπατεῖν. ὁ γὰρ ταῦτα ποιῶν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ δοξασθήσεται· ὁ ἐκεῖνα ἐκλεγόμενος μετὰ τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ συναπολείται. διὰ τοῦτο
- 2 ἀνάστασις, διὰ τοῦτο ἀνταπόδομα. Ἐρωτῶ τοὺς ὑπερέχοντας, εἴ τινά μου γνώμης ἀγαθῆς λαμβάνετε συμβουλίαν· ἔχετε μεθ' ἑαυτῶν εἰς οὓς ἐργάσσηθε· τὸ καλὸν μὴ ἐγκαταλείπητε.
  - 3 ἐγγὺς γὰρ ἡ ἡμέρα ἐν ᾗ συναπολείται πάντα τῷ πονηρῷ.
  - 4 ἐγγὺς ὁ κύριος καὶ ὁ μισθὸς αὐτοῦ. Ἔτι καὶ ἔτι ἐρωτῶ ὑμᾶς· ἑαυτῶν γίνεσθε νομοθέται ἀγαθοί, ἑαυτῶν μένετε
  - 5 σύμβουλοι πιστοί, ἄρατε ἐξ ὑμῶν πᾶσαν ὑπόκρισιν. ὁ δὲ

toil. Used trans. in act. two lines further on.

πενήτων. The honest self-supporting poor—πτωχὸς the needy, or beggar. The distinction is here preserved.

πανταμάρητοι, α ἅπαξ λεγόμενον. Hilg. and Müll. correct to πανθαμάρητοι.

§ XXI. *Final words of exhortation to readers to live so that they may be prepared for the Day of Judgment, which is near at hand. Farewell benediction.*

1. οὖν should not be inserted, as  $\aleph$  omits.

προγέγραπται,  $\aleph$  has simply γέγραπται.

ἐκεῖνα, sc. all those things which are in opposition to ταῦτα, the just requirements of God.

2. ἐργάσσηθε, both with alms, and with active labour of hand and tongue.

ἐγκαταλείπητε. It would be much better to observe good grammar, and read with C ἐγκαταλίπητε. The

ἐλιπῆται (itacism for ἐλιπητε) of  $\aleph$  is in favour of it, while the ἐγκαταλείπητε of BFOV is very probably a mere case of the commonest form of itacism.

3. ἐγγὺς. The proximity of the Day of Judgment is a common thought in N. T. and throughout the early ages of Christianity.

τῷ πονηρῷ. Here we can hardly doubt masc., cf. ii. 10 note. Hefele takes it neut. as τὸ πονηρὸν in xx. 2. καὶ ὁ μισθός. Cf. Rev. xxii. 12. The idea of 'the reward' is much dwelt on, specially in these closing chapters. So xix. 11, xx. 2; cf. iv. 12, xi. 8.

5. σοφ., σύν., ἐπιστ., γν. τῶν δικ. αὐτ., ὑπομονήν—the ref. is marked to the opening of the Ep. ii. 1—3, where every one of these words occurs.

6. ποιῆτε ἵνα is apparently a Latinism, but is said to occur in Hellenistic Greek even earlier than this. ἔτι καὶ ἔτι in v. 4, and σώζεσθε v. 9, are other instances of Latinisms in this chapter, which with other

θεός, ὁ τοῦ παντὸς κόσμου κυριεύων, δόξη ὑμῖν σοφίαν, σύνεσιν, ἐπιστήμην, γνώσιν τῶν δικαιωμάτων αὐτοῦ, 6 ὑπομονήν. γίνεσθε δὲ θεοδίδακτοι, ἐκζητοῦντες τί ζητεῖ κύριος ἀφ' ὑμῶν, καὶ ποιεῖτε ἵνα εὐρεθῇτε ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως. 7 εἰ δὲ τίς ἐστιν ἀγαθοῦ μνεία, μνημονεύετε μου μελετῶντες ταῦτα, ἵνα καὶ ἡ ἐπιθυμία καὶ ἡ ἀγρυπνία εἰς τι ἀγαθὸν 8 χωρήσῃ. ἐρωτῶ ὑμᾶς, χάριν αἰτούμενος. Ἔως ἔτι τὸ καλὸν σκευὸς ἐστιν μεθ' ὑμῶν, μὴ ἐλλείπητε μηδενὶ αὐτῶν, ἀλλὰ συνεχῶς ἐκζητεῖτε ταῦτα καὶ ἀναπληροῦτε πᾶσαν 9 ἐντολήν· ἔστιν γὰρ ἄξια. διὸ μᾶλλον ἐσπούδασα γράψαι ἀφ' ὧν ἡδυνήθην, εἰς τὸ εὐφρᾶναι ὑμᾶς. Σώζεσθε, ἀγάπης τέκνα καὶ εἰρήνης. ὁ κύριος τῆς δόξης καὶ πάσης χάριτος μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν.

## Ἐπιστολὴ Βαρνάβα.

reasons have led some to attribute this portion of the Ep. to a different writer.

εὐρεθῇτε. For this absolute use of the word, cf. Rev. xviii. 21.

7. μελετῶντες. Here, as elsewhere in Ep. (iv. 11, x. 11, xi. 5, xix. 10)=Lat. *meditari*.

ἀγρυπνία. So ἀγρυπνοῦντες, xx. 2. 8. τὸ καλὸν σκευός. A strangely affected phrase for 'the body,' but σκευός is used elsewhere in Ep. in this connexion. Cf. vii. 3, xi. 9, and 2 Cor. iv. 7, &c.—Nothing more seems meant than 'so long as ye remain in the body.'

ἐλλείπητε. Here, as in v. 2, it would seem sounder to accept the ἐλλιπῆται of N, and read the aorist.

αὐτῶν, neut. identical with immediately following ταῦτα.

9. σώζεσθε *salvete*—ἔβρωσθε *valete* is a commoner form, but perhaps σώζεσθε is purposely chosen, in view of the Christian application of the word.

ἀγάπης τέκν. κ. εἰρ. Cf. vii. 1, ix. 7, xv. 4, and on the significance of this mode of address, see Dissert. p. xli.

The simple subscription *ἐπιστολὴ Βαρνάβα* is found in N which BV expand into *ἐπιστολὴ Βαρνάβα τοῦ ἀποστόλου συνεκδημοῦ Παύλου τοῦ ἁγίου ἀποστόλου*. There is not the slightest reason to suppose either genuine, though it is possible enough that the general attribution of the Epistle to the Apostle Barnabas was due to its having been composed by some namesake—CFO have no subscription.

## THE EPISTLE OF BARNABAS.

### I.

<sup>1</sup> JOY be with you, sons and daughters, in the name  
<sup>2</sup> of the Lord who loved us in peace. Seeing that  
God's just requirements are great and abounding to  
youward, I rejoice exceedingly and beyond measure in  
your blessed and glorious spirits; in such manner have  
ye received the engrafted grace of the free gift of the  
<sup>3</sup> Spirit. Wherefore also I the more rejoice in mine own  
*heart*, hoping to be saved, because that I truly perceive  
within you the Spirit of the Lord's love poured forth  
from his riches upon you<sup>1</sup>. With so great *joy* con-  
cerning you hath the desired sight of you moved me.  
<sup>4</sup> Being persuaded therefore of this, and convinced in my  
own *mind*—for having spoken many things among you,  
I know that the Lord hath been my companion in the  
way of righteousness, and am utterly constrained also my-  
self to this, namely, to love you above my own soul, for  
great faith and love dwell within you in hope of His  
<sup>5</sup> life<sup>2</sup>—accounting this therefore, that if I am at pains  
concerning you to impart some portion of that whereof  
I have received, that to minister to such spirits will be to  
me *not without* reward, I made haste shortly to send

<sup>1</sup> Or, 'the Spirit of the Lord  
poured forth from the riches of his  
love upon you.'

<sup>2</sup> The life, which He (sc. God)  
has promised.

unto you, that ye might have your knowledge perfected  
 6 with your faith. There are then three revelations of the  
 Lord ; our<sup>1</sup> hope of life, its beginning, its end—and the  
 beginning of faith is righteousness, and the end *thereof*  
 love, the work of gladness and exultation in witness of  
 7 righteousness.—For the master hath revealed to us by  
 the prophets that which is past and that which is at  
 hand, and hath given us also the first-fruits of the taste  
 of that which shall be. Of which things we behold  
 the gradual accomplishment, according as He hath said,  
 and ought with the more abundance and uplifting of  
 8 heart to draw near to his altar. I then, not as a teacher,  
 but as one of your own selves, will show forth a few  
 things, by the which in the present *time of trial* ye shall  
 be made glad.

## II.

1 Seeing then the days are evil, and that He himself  
 that worketh in us hath power, we ought to take heed  
 unto ourselves and to search out the just requirements  
 2 of the Lord. So then fear and patience are the helpers  
 of our faith, and that which fighteth with us is long-  
 3 suffering and continence. While these abide in things  
 pertaining unto the Lord, wisdom, understanding, science,  
 and knowledge rejoice with them in pure fellowship.  
 4 For He hath shewed plainly to us by *the mouth of* all  
 the prophets, that He requireth not sacrifices nor burnt-  
 5 offerings, nor oblations, saying at one time : “ What is  
 the multitude of your sacrifices unto me ? saith the Lord.

<sup>1</sup> Taking the ἡμῶν with the whole sentence, which undoubtedly seems forced, I have given the best rendering that the text seems to admit. The parenthesis is an explanation

of what is meant by the beginning and end respectively. For what appears to me a better arrangement of the text, see commentary in loc.

I am full of burnt offerings, and the fat of lambs and the blood of bulls and goats I desire not, not though ye come to be seen of me. For who hath required these things of your hands? Ye shall not add *this thing*, to tread my court." And at another time, "Though ye bring fine flour of wheat, it is a vain sacrifice, an abomination unto me; your new moons and your sabbaths  
6 I cannot away with." These things then He hath done away, that the new law of our Lord Jesus Christ, being free from the yoke of compulsion, might have an  
7 oblation not made of man's *hands*. And again He saith unto them, "Did I charge your fathers when they went forth out of the land of Egypt, to offer unto me burnt-offerings and sacrifices? nay, but I charged this *charge*  
8 upon them. Let every man of you bear no grudge of malice in his heart against his neighbour, and love not  
9 the false oath." We ought, then, not being unwise, to perceive the counsel of the goodness of our Father; for He, being willing to seek us, if we fall not into like error with them, telleth us how we may draw nigh  
10 unto Him. Therefore He saith thus unto us, "The sacrifice unto God is a broken heart, the savour of a sweet smell unto the Lord is a heart glorifying Him that hath formed it." We ought then to be careful, brethren, concerning our salvation, that the Evil one make no loophole of error in us to cast us away suddenly from our life.

### III.

1. Therefore, touching these things, He saith again unto them, "To what purpose do ye make fasts unto me, saith the Lord, to make your voice this day to be heard on high? This is not the fast that I have chosen,  
2 saith the Lord, for a man to humble his soul; not though

ye bend your neck as a hoop, and spread sackcloth and ashes under *your feet*, not even so shall ye call an acceptable fast." But unto us He saith, "Behold, this is the fast that I have chosen, saith the Lord, not *of* a man humbling his own soul; but loose every band of wickedness, unloose the knots of bonds made by violence, set them that are broken at liberty, and tear in sunder every unrighteous compact: deal thy bread unto the hungry, and if thou seest any naked, cover *him*; bring them that have no shelter into thine own house, and if thou seest any abject, thou shalt not despise him, not though *he be* of thy kinsmen of thine own seed. Then shall thy light break forth in the morning, and thy healing shall rise up speedily, and thy righteousness shall go before thee, and the glory of the Lord shall encompass thee. Then shalt thou cry, and thy God shall hear thee; while thou art yet speaking He shall say, 'Behold, here I am.' If thou take away from thee the band, and the stretching forth of the finger, and the word of murmuring, and give to him that hungereth thy bread from thine own soul, and wilt have pity on the afflicted soul." Unto this then, brethren, the Long-suffering one looking before, that his people whom He prepared may with *all* sincerity believe in his Beloved, hath foreshewed unto us concerning all things, that we be not as proselytes dashed in pieces against their law.

## IV.

1 We ought then concerning those things which are at hand, to inquire diligently, and search out that which is able to save us. Let us then fly utterly from all the works of unlawfulness, lest perchance the works of unlawfulness lay hold on us; and let us hate the error of

this present time, that we may be loved in that which  
 2 is to come. Let us give no indulgence to our soul, so  
 that it have power to run together with sinners and  
 3 wicked men, lest we be made like unto them. The final  
 offence is at hand, concerning which it is written, as  
 Enoch saith. For to this end hath the Master shortened  
 the times and the days, that his Beloved might hasten  
 4 and come unto the inheritance. And the prophet too  
 saith thus, "Ten kingdoms shall reign upon the earth,  
 and there shall rise up after them a little king, who shall  
 5 bring low three of the kings under one." Likewise con-  
 cerning the same thing, Daniel saith, "And I saw the  
 fourth beast, evil and strong and fiercer than all the  
 beasts of the earth, and that out of it arose ten horns,  
 and out of them a little horn growing beside them,  
 and that it brought low under one three of the great  
 6 horns." Ye ought then to understand. Furthermore  
 I beseech of you this also, as being one of your  
 own selves, and loving you all in particular more than  
 my own soul, that ye take heed now unto your-  
 selves, and be not made like unto some, heaping  
 up *sins* upon your sins, saying that the covenant  
 belongs to them and us *also*. To us *it belongeth*: but  
 they lost it thus utterly, though Moses once received it.  
 7 For the Scripture saith: "And Moses was in the mount  
 fasting forty days and forty nights, and received the  
 covenant from the Lord, tables of stone, written with  
 8 the finger of the hand of the Lord." But they turned  
 aside after idols and lost it. For thus saith the Lord;  
 "Moses, Moses, come down quickly, for thy people doeth  
 lawlessly, whom thou broughtest out of the land of  
 Egypt." And Moses perceived, and cast the two tables  
 out of his hands; and their covenant was broken in  
 pieces, that the *covenant* of the beloved Jesus might be

- sealed upon our hearts in hope of the faith *that is* in him.
- 9 Now wishing to write many things, not as a master, but as beseemeth one that loveth, I, your off-scouring, was zealous to write *those things* of which we must not come short. Wherefore let us take heed in the last days; for the whole time of your faith will profit you nothing, unless now in the iniquitous time, and in the offences that are coming, we resist as becomes sons of God, that the Black one gain no loophole of entrance.
- 10 Let us flee from all vainness; let us hate perfectly the works of the evil way. Go ye not privily one with another, separating yourselves, as though *ye were* already justified, but coming together to the same place, seek ye together concerning that which profiteth the whole *body*.
- 11 For the Scripture saith, "Woe *unto them* that are wise unto themselves, and understanding in their own eyes." Let us become spiritual, let us become a perfect temple unto God. In so far as is in us, let us meditate upon the fear of God; let us strive to keep his commandments.
- 12 that we may rejoice in his just requirements. The Lord without respect of persons shall judge the world; each man shall get, according as he hath done: if he be good, his righteousness shall go before him; if he be wicked
- 13 the reward of his wickedness before him: that we may not, taking our ease as called *already*, fall asleep in our sins, and the Evil Prince take his authority against us, and thrust us out from the kingdom of the Lord.
- 14 Furthermore, my brethren, take note of this, when that after so great signs and wonders ye behold what hath come to pass in Israel, and that they are thus utterly forsaken: let us take heed lest so be that we be found, as it is written, "many called, but few chosen."



## V.

- 1 For to this end the Lord endured to deliver up his  
flesh to destruction, that we might be cleansed by the  
remission of sins, which is in the blood of his sprinkling.
- 2 For *there* are written concerning Him some things  
unto Israel, and some unto us. Now *Scripture* saith  
thus: "He was wounded for our transgressions and hath  
been bruised for our sins, with his stripes we were healed.  
He was brought as a sheep to the slaughter, and as a  
3 lamb dumb before him that sheareth it." Therefore  
ought we to be exceeding thankful unto the Lord, be-  
cause He hath both made known unto us that which is  
past, and made us wise in that which is at hand, and for  
that which shall be we are not without understanding.
- 4 Now the *Scripture* saith, "Not unjustly is the net spread  
for birds." This it saith because *that* man shall justly be  
destroyed, who, having knowledge of the way of righte-  
ousness, straitly confineth himself to the way of darkness.
- 5 And yet furthermore, my brethren, if the Lord endured  
to suffer for our soul, though He was Lord of all the  
world, to whom God said from the foundation of the  
world, "Let us make man after our image and after our  
likeness," how hath He endured to suffer at men's hands?
- 6 Understand ye. The prophets having grace from Him pro-  
phesied concerning Him. And He himself, that He might  
abolish death and show forth the resurrection from the  
dead, since it behoved Him to be manifested in the flesh,  
7 endured *suffering*, that He might restore the promise to  
the fathers, and might himself prepare his new people for  
himself, and by being upon the earth show forth that  
when He hath himself accomplished the resurrection, He  
8 will judge *mankind*. Yea and further He preached unto

Israel teaching him and doing so great signs and wonders, and loved him exceedingly. And when He chose out his own apostles who should preach his gospel, who, that He might show that "He came not to call the righteous but sinners," were transgressors beyond all sin, then did He manifest himself to be the Son of God.

9 For if He had not come in the flesh, how could men have looked on Him and been saved, *seeing that* when they look stedfastly upon the sun, which is the work of his hands, and shall *one day* cease to be, their eyes are

10 not able to meet his rays? Therefore did the Son of God come in the flesh to this end, that He might sum up the full measure of their sins to them that persecuted

11 his prophets to death. To this end therefore He endured: for God saith of the stroke of his flesh that *it is* from them: "when they smite their own shepherd, then

12 shall the sheep of the flock perish." And of his own will He consented so to suffer. For it behoved that He should suffer upon the tree: for he that prophesieth concerning Him saith, "Spare my soul from the sword;" and, "Pierce my flesh with nails, for the assemblies of wicked

13 doers have risen up against me." And again he saith, "Behold I have given my back for scourges and my cheeks for smitings, and my face have I set as a hard rock,"

## VI.

1 So when He made the commandment, what saith He? "Who *is* he that contendeth with me? let him stand up against me: or who is he that disputeth with me? let him come near to the child<sup>1</sup> of the Lord.

<sup>1</sup> Or 'servant.' The Greek is *παῖδ*. Cf. notes *in loc.*

2 Woe unto you, for ye all shall wax old as a garment,  
and the moth shall eat you up." And again the pro-  
phet saith, seeing that He was set as a strong stone  
for bruising, "Behold I will lay for the foundations of  
Sion a stone precious, elect, a corner-stone, honour-  
3 able." Then what saith he? "And whoso shall hope  
upon Him shall live for ever." Is our hope then upon a  
stone? God forbid. But because the Lord hath laid  
in strength *the foundation of* his flesh. For he saith:  
4 "And He set me as a strong rock." And the prophet  
saith again: "The stone which the builders rejected, this  
*same* hath become the head of the corner." And again  
he saith, "This is that great and wonderful day, which  
5 the Lord made." I, *even I*, the offscouring of your love,  
write unto you the more simply, that ye may understand.  
6 What then saith the prophet again? "The assembly of  
wicked doers inclosed me, they compassed me about as  
bees around wax," and "Upon my vesture they cast  
7 lots." Seeing then that He should be manifested in the  
flesh and should suffer, his suffering was beforehand  
made manifest. For the prophet saith concerning Israel,  
"Woe unto their soul, for they have counselled evil  
counsel against themselves, saying, Let us bind the just  
8 man, for he is ill-pleasing to us." What saith the other  
prophet Moses unto them? "Behold, thus saith the  
Lord God: Enter ye in into the good land, which the  
Lord sware to Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, and in-  
9 herit it, a land flowing with milk and honey." Under-  
stand then what knowledge saith. Hope ye, it saith,  
upon Him that shall be manifested to you in the flesh,  
*even Jesus*. For man is *but* earth<sup>1</sup> having conditions—  
for from the face of the earth<sup>1</sup> came the formation of

<sup>1</sup> γῆ. The word just used for the good 'land.'

- 10 Adam. Why then saith he, "Into the land, *even* the good land flowing with milk and honey"? Blessed be our Lord, brethren, who hath put in us wisdom and understanding of his hidden *things*. For the prophet speaketh a parable of the Lord. Who shall understand except the wise and prudent and he that loveth his
- 11 Lord? Seeing then that He hath renewed us in the remission of sins, and hath made us *after* another pattern, *that we should* have the soul as of little children, inas-
- 12 much as He hath truly new created us—for the Scripture saith concerning us, as He saith to the Son, "Let us make man after our image and after our likeness, and let them rule over the beasts of the earth, and the fowls of the heaven, and the fish of the sea." And the Lord saw us his good creation and said, "Increase ye and multiply and replenish the earth." These things *have*
- 13 *reference* to the Son. Again I will show thee after what manner the Lord speaketh concerning us. He hath made a second creation in *these* last days: and the Lord saith, "Behold I make the last as the first." To this end then the prophet proclaimed, "Enter ye into the land flowing with milk and honey, and have
- 14 dominion over it." Behold then we have been new created, as again He saith in another prophet, "Behold, saith the Lord, I will take away from them," that is *to say from those* whom the Spirit of the Lord foresaw, "their stony hearts and will put in *hearts* of flesh." For He was himself about to be
- 15 manifested in the flesh and to inhabit among us. For the habitation of our heart, my brethren, is a temple
- 16 holy unto the Lord. For the Lord saith again: "And wherewith shall I appear before the Lord my God and be glorified?" He saith: "I will make confession to thee in the congregation of my brethren,

and will sing psalms to thee in the midst of the congregation of the saints." Therefore we are they, whom  
 17 He brought into that good land. What then is the milk and the honey? Because the little child is kept alive first with honey, afterward with milk. In like manner we also, being kept alive by faith in the promise and by the word, shall live and have dominion over the  
 18 earth. And above we have said before, "And let them increase and multiply and rule over the fishes." Who then *is* he that is able now to rule over beasts or fishes or fowls of the heaven? For we ought to perceive that rule is of authority, that a man may order and have  
 19 dominion. So then though this cometh not to pass now, surely He hath told us when *it shall be; even* when we ourselves also are made perfect, *so as* to be made inheritors of the Lord's covenant.

## VII.

1 Ye perceive then, children of gladness, that the good Lord foreshowed all things to us, that we may know to whom we ought in all things to give thanks and praise.  
 2 If then the Son of God, who is Lord and who shall judge the quick and dead, suffered in order that his stripes may make us alive, let us believe that the Son  
 3 of God could not suffer but for our sakes. But He was even crucified, and was given vinegar and gall to drink. Give ear how the priests of the temple have showed of this *matter*. In the writing of the commandment, "Who-soever keepeth not the fast shall be utterly destroyed with death," the Lord gave commandment, because He was in his own person about to offer the vessel of the Spirit *as* a sacrifice for our sins, that the type which was set forth in Isaac who was offered upon the altar might  
 4 be fulfilled. What then saith He in the prophet? "And

let them eat of the goat which is offered at the fast for all sins." Give heed carefully. "And let the priests alone all eat of the inwards unwashen with vinegar." Where-  
5 unto? Because unto Me, who shall offer my flesh for the sins of my new people, ye shall give gall to drink with vinegar, *therefore* eat ye alone, while the people fast and mourn in sackcloth and ashes: *this He commandeth*, that He might show that He must needs suffer many  
6 things at their hands. Give heed then how He made commandment. "Take two fine goats like *to each other*, and offer them, and let the priest take the one for a whole  
7 burnt-offering for sins." But to the *other* one what shall they do? "Accursed," it saith, is that one. Give heed  
8 how the type of Jesus is made manifest. "And spit ye all upon it, and pierce it, and put the scarlet wool about its head; and so let it be cast into the wilderness." And when it is so done, he that beareth the goat leadeth it into the wilderness, and taketh away the wool, and putteth it upon the branch which is called Rachia, whereof also we are used to eat the shoots when we find them in the land. Of this briar alone is the fruit thus  
9 sweet. What then is this? Give heed. "The one," *saith He*, "upon the altar, and the other accursed." And again, "the accursed one crowned." Inasmuch as they shall see Him at that day having the long scarlet robe about his flesh, and they shall say, Is not this He whom we set at nought, and spat upon, and pierced, and crucified? Of a truth this was He who then said that  
10 He was himself the Son of God. For how is He (*the latter Christ*) like unto the former? To this end *he commandeth that* "the goats *should be* like, and equal *in size*," in order that when they behold Him coming in that day, they may be astonished at the likeness of the goat. See ye then *in* the goat the type of Jesus who should

11 suffer. But why *doth He command* that they put the wool into the midst of the thorns? It is a type of Jesus set forth to the church, because that whosoever will take up the scarlet wool must needs suffer many things, for that the thorn is terrible, and must through tribulation have power over it. Thus, He saith, they who would see me, and lay hold of my kingdom, must through tribulation and suffering obtain me.

## VIII.

1 But what type think ye is it, that it hath been commanded to Israel, that those men, in whom sins are at the full, should offer an heifer, and slay and burn it, and that children should then take up the ash, and cast it into vessels, and bind the scarlet wool upon wood (behold again the type of the cross and the scarlet wool), and hyssop *therewith*, and that after this manner the children should sprinkle the people one by one, that  
 2 they may be purified from their sins? Consider how in *all* simplicity it is said unto you; the calf is Jesus, the men who make offering, *being* sinners, *are they* who offered Him for the slaughter. [*So then no longer are men sinners, no longer doth the glory belong unto sinners*].  
 3 But the boys who sprinkle are they who preached unto us the gospel of the remission of sins and the purification of the heart, unto whom, being twelve *in number* for a witness of the tribes—for there are twelve tribes in Israel—he gave authority over the gospel, that they  
 4 should preach it. But wherefore are the boys that sprinkle three *in number*? For a testimony unto Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, because these are mighty before  
 5 God. And why the wool upon the wood? Because the

kingdom of Jesus is upon wood, and they that hope  
6 upon Him shall live for ever. But wherefore the wool  
withal and the hyssop? Because in his kingdom  
there shall be days evil and polluted, in the which we  
shall be saved. For he that is sick in the flesh is healed  
7 by the pollution of the hyssop. And therefore are the  
things which were so done clear unto us, but unto them  
dark, because they have not heard the voice of the  
Lord.

## IX.

1 Furthermore He saith concerning the ears, how that  
our circumcision is of the heart. The Lord saith in the  
prophet, "To the hearing of the ear they did obey me."  
And again He saith, "With hearing shall they that are  
afar off hear, they shall know what things I have done."  
And, "Be ye circumcised," saith the Lord, "in your  
2 hearts." And again He saith, "Hear, O Israel, that the  
Lord thy God saith these things." And again the Spirit  
of the Lord prophesieth, "Who is he that will live for  
ever? With hearing let him hear the voice of my Son."  
3 And again He saith, "Hear, O heaven, and give ear, O  
earth, for the Lord hath spoken these things for a  
testimony." And again He saith, "Hear the word of  
the Lord, ye rulers of this people." And again He saith,  
"Hear, ye children, the voice of one crying in the  
4 wilderness." So then He circumcised our hearings that  
we might hear the word and believe. For the circum-  
cision on which they have trusted hath been done away:  
for He hath declared that circumcision was made not of  
the flesh. But they went out of the way; for an evil  
5 angel beguiled them. He saith unto them, "These  
things saith the Lord your God" (so do I find the com-  
mandment); "sow not upon thorns, be ye circumcised



unto your Lord." And why saith He, "Be ye circumcised in the hardness of your hearts, and ye shall not be stiffnecked"? Take again, "Behold, saith the Lord, all the nations are uncircumcised with uncircumcision *of the flesh*, but this people is uncircumcised in their hearts."

6 But thou wilt say, Yea, verily, the people hath been circumcised for a seal. But likewise is every Syrian and Arabian, and all the priests of idols. Think ye they too are of their covenant? Moreover, the

7 Egyptians also are in circumcision. Understand then, children of love, concerning all things richly, that Abraham, who first gave circumcision, circumcised looking forward in the spirit unto Jesus, having received the

8 ordinances of three letters. For He saith, "And Abraham circumcised of his household eighteen males and three hundred." What then was the knowledge that was given unto him? Understand ye that He saith the eighteen first, and then, after an interval, three hundred. In the eighteen IH, thou hast Jesus. And inasmuch as the cross was destined to show forth grace in the *sign* T, he adds three hundred. So then he showeth forth Jesus in the two letters, and in the single one the

9 cross. He knoweth it who hath put within us the engrafted gift of his doctrine; no man hath learned of me a truer instruction, but I know that ye are worthy.

## X.

1 Now in that Moses hath said, "Ye shall not eat swine, nor eagle, nor falcon, nor raven, nor any fish that hath not scales upon him," he received in his

2 understanding a triple ordinance. Yea, and further he saith unto them in Deuteronomy, "And I will make a covenant with this people *of* my righteous require-

ments." So then there is no commandment of God to  
3 abstain from eating, but Moses spake in the spirit. To  
this end then hath he mentioned the swine : thou shalt  
not be joined, he saith, unto such men as are like unto  
swine ; for when they wax fat they forget their Lord,  
but when they lack they acknowledge the Lord, like as  
the swine also when it feedeth knoweth not his lord,  
but when it is hungry crieth out, and so soon as it has  
4 received is quiet again. "Thou shalt not eat," he saith,  
"of the eagle, nor the falcon, nor the kite, nor the  
raven : " thou shalt not, saith he, be joined nor made  
like unto such men as know not how by labour and  
sweat to provide for themselves sustenance, but in their  
lawlessness make prey of other men's *goods*, and as  
though walking in all simplicity observe them, and are on  
the watch whom they may despoil for their greed's sake,  
like as these fowls only *of all fowls* do not by labour  
provide for themselves sustenance, but sit idle, seeking  
how they may devour the flesh of others, and are full  
5 of mischief in their evil-doing. "And thou shalt not  
eat," he saith, "lamprey, nor polypus, nor cuttle-fish : "  
thou shalt not, saith he, be made like nor joined unto  
such men as are utterly ungodly and are condemned  
already unto death, like as these fishes only *of all fish*  
are accursed and swim in the deep waters, and swim  
not on the surface as do all other kinds, but have their  
6 habitation in the earth under the deeps. Moreover,  
"thou shalt not eat of the hare," he saith. Wherefore?  
Thou shalt not become a defiler of boys, nor be made  
like to such ; for the hare every year multiplies the  
channels for excretion, for as many years as it lives,  
7 so many of these it has. "Neither shalt thou eat at all  
of the hyena." Thou shalt not, saith he, become a  
fornicator or corrupt person, neither be likened to such.

Wherefore? because this animal year by year changes its nature, and becomes one year male and the next  
8 female. Moreover, he hath rightly abominated the weasel. Thou shalt not, saith he, become such as those of whom we hear that they practise lawlessness with their mouth for uncleanness' sake, neither shalt thou be joined to the unclean women, who practise lawlessness with their mouth. For this animal conceives with  
9 the mouth. Concerning meats then Moses received a triple ordinance and spake thus in the Spirit; but they after the desire of the flesh received *his words* as though  
10 they concerned meats. But David receives knowledge of the same triple revelation and saith in like manner, "Blessed is the man who hath not gone in the counsel of the ungodly"—even as the fishes go in darkness into the depths; "and hath not stood in the way of sinners"—even as they who make a pretence to fear the Lord sin like the swine; "and hath not sat upon the seat of the scorers"—even as the fowls that sit in wait for prey. Get ye a perfect *knowledge* also concerning  
11 that which may be eaten. But Moses said, "Ye shall eat every *animal* that divideth the hoof and cheweth the cud. What doth he mean? He that receiveth food knoweth him that feedeth him, and being refreshed showeth his delight in him. He spake well, looking at the commandment. What then does he mean? Be ye joined with them that fear the Lord, with them that meditate upon the precept of the word which they have received in their heart, with them that tell of the righteous ordinances of the Lord and observe them, with them that know that this meditation is a work of gladness, and that chew the cud of the word of the Lord. But wherefore that which divideth the hoof? Because the righteous man while he walketh in this

present world looketh also for the holy world *which is to come*. Behold how Moses delivered the law well.  
12 But whence should they discern or understand these things? but we discern rightly the commandments and tell of them, as the Lord wills. For this cause hath He circumcised our hearings and our hearts, that we may understand these things.

## XI.

1 Let us enquire whether it pleased the Lord to show beforehand of the water and of the cross. Concerning the water it is written of Israel, how that they shall not receive baptism which bringeth remission of sins, but  
2 shall build *foundations* for themselves. Therefore saith the prophet: "Be astonished, O heaven, and let earth be horribly afraid at this, for this people hath committed two great evils; they have forsaken me the fountain of life, and have digged for themselves a ditch of death.  
3 Is my holy mount of Sinai a desert rock? For ye shall be as fledglings of a bird fluttering abroad when the  
4 nest is taken away." And again the prophet saith, "I will go before thee and make the mountains level, and break in pieces the gates of brass and bruise unto breaking the bars of iron, and I will give thee treasures dark and hidden and unrevealed, that they may know that I am the Lord their God." And, "Thou shalt dwell in  
5 the high cave of a strong rock." Then what saith it in the same *prophet*? "His water *shall be* sure; ye shall see the King with his glory, and your heart shall  
6 meditate terror of the Lord." And again in another prophet it saith, "He that doeth these things shall be like the tree that is planted by the rivers of waters, that shall yield his fruit in his season, and his leaf shall not

wither, and all things whatsoever he doeth shall prosper.  
7 Not so *are* the ungodly, not so, but *are* like the chaff,  
which the wind catcheth away from the face of the  
earth: therefore the ungodly shall not stand up in the  
judgment, nor sinners in the counsel of the righteous;  
for the Lord knoweth the way of the righteous, and  
8 the way of the ungodly shall perish." Ye perceive, how  
he hath referred the water and the cross to the same  
*end*. For this *is what* he saith: Blessed are ye who  
have hoped upon the cross and gone down into the  
water. For he speaketh of the reward "in his season;"  
at that time, saith he, will I give recompense. But  
now in that he saith, "his leaf shall not wither," he  
saith that every word which goeth forth from you out  
of your mouth in faith and love, shall be for conversion  
9 and hope unto many. And again another prophet  
saith, "And there was the land of Jacob highly ex-  
toll'd above every land," meaning thereby, He glorifieth  
10 the vessel of his Spirit. Then why saith he, "And  
there was a river flowing on the right, and there went  
up out of it goodly trees, and whosoever eateth of them  
11 shall live for ever"? Herein he saith, that we go down  
into the water laden with sins and filthiness, and come  
up bearing fruit in our heart, and having fear and hope  
toward Jesus in our spirit. "And whosoever eateth of  
these shall live for ever": herein he saith, *that* whoso-  
ever shall hear these things preached and shall believe,  
shall live for ever.

## XII.

1 Likewise again He giveth intimation concerning the  
cross in another prophet saying: "And when shall  
these things be accomplished? saith the Lord. When

a tree is bent down and rises again, and when blood shall drop out of wood." Again thou hast *a testimony* of  
2 the cross and of Him that should be crucified. And He speaketh again in Moses, when the strange nations made war upon Israel, and that he might call to their remembrance in *the midst of* war that for their sins they were delivered unto death, the Spirit speaketh in the heart of Moses that he should make a type of the cross and of Him that should suffer, *showing*, saith He, that except they hope upon Him they shall be at war for ever. So Moses put one shield upon another in the midst of the battle, and he stood above them all and stretched forth his hands; and so Israel again prevailed; then, as soon as he let down his hands, they were again smitten to death.  
3 To what end? that they might know, that they cannot  
4 be saved except they hope upon Him. And again in another prophet He saith: "The whole day long have I spread out my hands to a people disobedient and  
5 gainsaying my righteous way." Again Moses setteth forth a type of Jesus, that He must suffer and that He shall make alive whom they shall think to have slain, by the sign of a pole when Israel was falling. For the Lord made all manner of serpents to bite them, and they died (for through the serpent was transgression found in Eve), that He might convince them, that for their transgression's sake they should be delivered into  
6 the affliction of death. Yea furthermore though Moses himself gave commandment, "Ye shall have no molten nor graven image for your God," *yet* he himself made *it*, that he might show forth a type of Jesus. Moses therefore made a serpent of brass, and put it up conspicuously, and called the people *together* by a proclamation.  
7 When they were come together therefore to the same *place*, they entreated Moses, that he should offer

for them supplication for their being made whole. But Moses spake unto them and said : When any man of you is bitten, let him come to the serpent that is set upon the wood, and let him hope *thereon*, believing that it is able even though dead to restore to life, and immediately he shall be saved. And they did so. In these things too thou findest again the glory of Jesus, 8 that in Him and unto Him are all things. Again what saith Moses to Jesus, the son of Nave, to whom he gave this name as being a prophet, that all the people might give ear *to him* only, because *in him* the Father makes 9 all things manifest concerning his Son Jesus? Moses then saith unto Jesus son of Nave, when he gave him this name and sent him forth to spy out the land ; " Take a book into thy hands, and write what the Lord saith, that the Son of God shall cut off by the roots all 10 the house of Amalek at the last days." Behold again Jesus, not a son of man, but Son of God, by type manifested in the flesh. Now since *some* will say, that Christ is David's son, David himself prophesieth, fearing and understanding the error of sinful men : " The Lord said unto my Lord, ' Sit thou at my right hand until 11 I make thy enemies thy footstool.' " And again Esaias likewise saith : " The Lord said unto Christ my Lord, whose right hand I have holden, that nations should give ear before Him, and the strength of kings will I break in pieces." Behold how David calleth Him Lord, and Son of God.

## XIII.

1 Now let us see whether this people is the heir or the first *people*, and whether the covenant *is* to usward or 2 unto them. Hear ye then, what the Scripture saith

concerning the people: "And Isaac intreated for Rebecca his wife, because she was barren; and she conceived. Then Rebecca went out to enquire of the Lord: and the Lord said unto her, 'Two nations *are* in thy womb, and two people in thy belly, and *one* people shall rule *another* 3 people, and the greater shall serve the less.'" Ye ought to perceive who *is* Isaac and who Rebecca, and of whom it hath declared that this people *should be* greater 4 than that. And in another prophecy Jacob speaketh more openly to Joseph his son, saying, "Behold, the Lord hath not deprived me of thy face; bring me hither 5 thy sons, that I may bless them." And he brought Ephraim and Manasseh, desiring that Manasseh should be blessed, because he was the elder: for Joseph brought *him* to the right hand of his father Jacob. But Jacob saw in the spirit a type of the people that should come after. And what saith *Scripture*? "And Jacob put his hands crosswise, and laid his right hand on the head of Ephraim, the second and younger, and blessed him. And Joseph said to Jacob, Change thy right hand on to the head of Manasseh, for he is my firstborn son. And Jacob said to Joseph, I know, my son, I know, but the greater shall serve the less, yea, and this one shall be 6 blessed." See ye of whom He hath set forth, that this 7 people is first and heir of the covenant? If then through Abraham also *like* record is made, we attain to the fulness of our knowledge. What then saith He to Abraham, when he alone believed, and it was counted to him for righteousness? "Behold, Abraham, I have made thee the father of nations which believe in the Lord in uncircumcision."



## XIV.

1 Yea, verily, but let us enquire of the covenant which  
He sware to the fathers to give to his people, whether  
He hath given it. He hath given it: but they were  
found not worthy to receive it because of their sins.  
2 For the prophet saith, "And Moses was in Mount Sinai  
fasting forty days and forty nights, that he might receive  
the covenant of the Lord with the people; and he received  
from the Lord the two tables which were written with  
the finger of the hand of the Lord in the Spirit." And  
Moses received them and brought them down to the  
3 people to give *them*. And the Lord said unto Moses,  
"Moses, Moses, get thee down quickly; for thy people,  
whom thou broughtest out of the land of Egypt, hath  
done wickedly. And Moses perceived that they had  
made for themselves again molten images, and he cast  
the tables out of his hands, and the tables of the Lord's  
4 covenant were broken in pieces." Moses, indeed, re-  
ceived it, but they were not found worthy. Now in  
what manner we have received *the covenant*, understand  
ye. Moses received it, being a servant, but the Lord  
himself gave it unto us to be the people of the inheri-  
5 tance, having for our sakes endured patiently. And He  
was made manifest that they indeed might come to the  
full measure of their sins, and that we might receive the  
covenant through the Lord Jesus who was the heir  
thereof, who was prepared for this end, that He might  
himself be manifested, and might redeem out of dark-  
ness our hearts which were already given unto death,  
and handed over to the iniquity of error, and might  
6 establish in us the covenant by his word. For it is  
written how the Father giveth Him commandment to

redeem us out of darkness, and prepare for himself a holy  
 7 people. Therefore saith the prophet, "I, the Lord thy  
 God, have called thee in righteousness, and will hold  
 thine hand, and strengthen thee, and I have given thee  
 for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles,  
 to open the eyes of the blind, and to bring out from  
 fetters them that are bound, and them that sit in dark-  
 ness out of the prison-house." Ye perceive then whence  
 8 we were redeemed. Again the prophet saith, "Behold,  
 I have set thee for a light of the Gentiles, that thou  
 mayest be for salvation unto the end of the earth; thus  
 9 saith the Lord, *even* God who hath redeemed thee."  
 And again the prophet saith, "The Spirit of the Lord  
*is* upon me; wherefore He hath anointed me to preach  
 the gospel of grace to the lowly; He hath sent me to  
 heal the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the  
 captives, and recovery of sight to the blind, to announce  
 the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of recom-  
 pense, to comfort all that mourn."

## XV.

1 Further, it hath been written concerning the Sabbath  
 also in the Ten Words<sup>1</sup>, wherein *the Lord* spake to Moses  
 on Mount Sinai face to face: "And keep ye the Sabbath  
 of the Lord holy with pure hands and a pure heart."  
 2 And in another *place* he saith, "If my sons observe my  
 Sabbath, then will I cause my mercy to rest upon them."  
 3 He speaks of the Sabbath at the beginning of the  
 creation, "And God made the works of his hands in  
 six days, and made an end on the seventh day, and  
 4 rested on it and sanctified it." Give heed, *my* children,  
 why he saith thus, "He made an end in six days."

<sup>1</sup> Or 'the Decalogue.'

This he saith, signifying that in six thousand years the Lord will make an end of all things; for one day is with Him a thousand years. And He himself beareth me witness, saying, "Behold, to-day shall be as a thousand years." Therefore, *my* children, in six days, *that is to say*, in six thousand years shall an end be made of all things. "And He rested on the seventh day." This signifieth, *that* when his Son shall come and utterly destroy this *present* time, and shall judge the ungodly, and change the sun, and the moon, and the stars, then He shall truly rest on the seventh day. Yea, and He saith furthermore, "Thou shalt keep it holy with pure hands and a pure heart." If, then, a man is now able to keep holy the day which God hath made holy, except he be pure in heart, we have gone utterly astray. Behold then He doth *not* truly rest and keep it holy *until* that day, when we shall ourselves be able *so to do*, having been justified and having received the promise, when ungodliness is no more, but all things are made new by the Lord; then shall we be able to keep it holy, having been ourselves first made holy. Furthermore He saith unto them, "Your new moons and sabbaths I cannot away with." Look ye how He saith, "Your present Sabbaths *are* not acceptable unto me, but *the Sabbath* which I have made, in the which, when I have finished all things, I will make the beginning of the eighth day, which is the beginning of a new world. Wherefore also we keep the eighth day unto gladness, in the which Jesus also rose from the dead, and after that He had been manifested, ascended into the heavens.

## XVI.

1 Moreover, I will tell you concerning the temple also, how these wretched men have gone astray,

and have hoped not upon their God who made them, but upon the building as being the house  
2 of God. For they are almost as the Gentiles; for they have done Him worship in the temple. But learn ye how the Lord speaketh, making void the temple, "Who hath meted out the heaven with a span, or who the earth with a hand's-breadth? *is it* not I, saith the Lord? The heaven is my throne, and the earth the footstool of my feet; what manner of house will ye build me? or what shall be the place of my rest?" Ye have learned  
3 that their hope is vain. Furthermore He saith again, "Behold, they that cast down this temple, themselves  
4 shall build it." So it comes to pass: for because they went to war it was cast down by their enemies; now both they, and the servants of their enemies, shall build  
5 it up. Again, it was showed plainly how the city, and the temple, and the people of Israel, should be given up. For the Scripture saith, "And it shall be at the last days, and the Lord shall give up the sheep of his pasture, and the fold, and the tower thereof to destruction." And  
6 it came to pass according as the Lord spake. Let us enquire therefore, whether there is a temple of God. There is, *even in the place* where He himself promises to make and finish it. For it is written, "And it shall be when the week is finished, the temple of God shall be  
7 builded gloriously upon the name of the Lord." I find then that there is a temple; learn ye therefore how it shall be built upon the name of the Lord. Before that we believed on God, the habitation of our heart was corrupt and without strength, truly a temple built with hands; for it was full of idolatry, and a house of devils,  
8 in that we did all things contrary unto God. "But it shall be built upon the name of the Lord." Take heed, that the temple of the Lord be builded gloriously,

How? Learn ye. Having received the remission of sins, and having hoped upon the name of the Lord, we were made new *creatures*, created again from the beginning; wherefore in the habitation of our *heart* God truly hath  
 9 his habitation within us. How? The word of his faith, the calling of his promise, the wisdom of his just requirements, the commandments of his doctrine, Himself prophesying within us, Himself having his habitation within us, opening unto us who were in bondage unto death the door of the temple, which is the mouth, and giving us repentance, leadeth *us* into his incorruptible  
 10 temple. For he that longeth to be saved looketh not unto the man, but unto Him that dwelleth and speaketh within him; and is herein amazed, in that he hath never heard him that speaketh the words of his mouth, neither hath himself ever desired to hear. This is a spiritual temple builded to the Lord.

## XVII.

1 As far as it was possible in all simpleness to speak plainly unto you, my heart and soul hope with desire that I have omitted none of those things that profit for  
 2 salvation. For if I write unto you concerning those things which are at hand, or which shall be, ye will not understand, for *these things* are hid in parables. Thus much *then* on this wise.

## XVIII.

1 But let us pass also to another *form of* knowledge and doctrine. There are two ways of doctrine and authority, the *way* of light and the *way* of darkness. And between these two ways there is a wide difference.

For over the one are stationed light-bearing angels of  
2 God, but over the other angels of Satan. And *God* is  
the Lord from everlasting to everlasting, but *Satan* the  
prince of the time which now is of unrighteousness.

## XIX.

- 1 This then is the way of light, if a man desire to walk  
in the way towards the appointed place, and is zealous  
in his works. The knowledge then that hath been given  
2 us *whereby we may* walk therein is on this wise. Thou  
shalt love Him that made thee, thou shalt fear Him that  
formed thee, thou shalt glorify Him that redeemed thee  
from death ; thou shalt be single in heart and rich in  
spirit ; thou shalt not be joined with them that walk in  
the way of death, thou shalt hate everything that is  
not pleasing unto God, thou shalt hate all hypocrisy ;  
thou shalt not forsake the commandments of the Lord.  
3 Thou shalt not exalt thyself, but shalt be lowly-minded  
in all things ; thou shalt not take glory to thyself.  
Thou shalt not take evil counsel against thy neighbour.  
4 Thou shalt not give insolence to thy soul. Thou shalt  
not commit fornication, thou shalt not commit adultery,  
thou shalt not defile youths. The word of God shall  
not go forth from thee where any are defiled. Thou  
shalt have no respect of person in rebuking any for  
transgression. Thou shalt be meek, thou shalt be peace-  
able, thou shalt fear the words which thou hearest.  
5 Thou shalt not bear malice against thy brother. Thou  
shalt not be of doubtful mind, whether or no *the thing*  
shall be. Thou shalt not take in vain the name of the  
Lord. Thou shalt love thy neighbour above thy life.  
Thou shalt not by abortion murder a child, neither again  
shalt thou put to death that that is born. Thou shalt

not remove thine hand from thy son or from thy daughter, but from *their* youth *up* shalt teach the fear  
6 of the Lord. Thou shalt not be covetous of thy neighbour's goods, thou shalt not be an extortioner. Neither shalt thou be joined in thy heart with the high-minded, but shalt have thy conversation with the lowly and righteous. Accept as good *gifts* the visitations which come upon thee, knowing that without God nothing  
7 comes to pass. Thou shalt not be double-minded nor double-tongued; for the double tongue is a snare of death. Thou shalt be subject to thy masters, as the image of God, with modesty and fear. Thou shalt lay no command with bitterness upon thy slave or maid-servant, who hope upon the same God, lest thou fear not God who is over both *thee and them*; for He came not to call *men* after the outward appearance, but those  
8 for whom He prepared his Spirit. Thou shalt communicate in all things unto thy neighbour, and shalt not call *anything* thine own: for if ye are partakers in that which is incorruptible, how much more in the corruptible things? Thou shalt not be forward in speech; for the mouth is a snare of death. To the uttermost of thy powers thou shalt be pure for thy  
9 soul's sake. Stretch not forth thy hands continually to receive, whilst thou closest them against giving. Thou shalt love as the apple of thine eye every one  
10 that speaketh to thee the word of the Lord. Thou shalt remember the day of judgment night and day, and shalt seek out daily the presence of the saints, either labouring by word *of mouth*, and going forth to exhortation and meditating how thou mayest save souls by thy word, or by thy hands shalt thou work for the  
11 redemption of thy sins. Thou shalt not be chary to give, neither when thou givest shalt thou murmur, but

shalt understand who is the good recompenser of the reward. Thou shalt keep what things thou hast received, neither adding thereto nor taking therefrom. Thou shalt utterly hate the wicked. Thou shalt judge  
 12 justly. Thou shalt make no schism, but shalt bring together them that contend and set them at peace. Thou shalt make confession over thy sins. Thou shalt not draw nigh unto prayer<sup>1</sup> with an evil conscience. This is the way of light.

## XX.

1 But the way of blackness<sup>2</sup> is crooked and full of cursing. For it is a way of eternal death with punishment, wherein are those things which destroy men's souls—idolatry, insolence, haughtiness of power, hypocrisy, doubleness of heart, adultery, murder, extortion, pride, transgression, guile, malice, self-will, sorcery,  
 2 witchcraft, covetousness, no fear *of God*. Persecutors *are they* of the good, hating truth, loving lies, knowing not the reward of righteousness, cleaving not to good, *cleaving* not to just judgment, heeding not the widow and orphan, watching not unto the fear of God but to evil, from whom meekness and patience *stand* afar off, loving vain things, pursuing after recompense, having no compassion on the poor, labouring not for him that is spent with labour, prone to evil-speaking, knowing not Him that made them, slayers of children, defilers of God's workmanship, turning away from him that is in need and oppressing him that is afflicted, advocates of the rich, lawless judges of the poor, filled with all manner of sin.

<sup>1</sup> Or 'to the place of prayer.'

<sup>2</sup> Or 'the Black One.'



## XXI.

- 1 So then it is good for a man to learn the just requirements of the Lord, as many as are above written, and to walk therein. For he that doeth these things shall be glorified in the kingdom of God : he that chooseth the other shall perish together with his works. For this cause is the resurrection, for this the recompense.
- 2 I beseech you that are superior, if ye take of me any advice of good counsel, keep in your midst *some* for whom ye may work : forsake not that which is good.
- 3 For the day is at hand, in the which all things shall be destroyed along with the Evil one. The Lord is at
- 4 hand and his reward. Again and again I beseech you, be good lawgivers one to another, continue faithful fellow-counsellors together, take away from you all
- 5 hypocrisy. And may God, who is Lord of the whole world, grant unto you wisdom, understanding, science,
- 6 knowledge of his just requirements, patience. And be ye taught of God, seeking diligently what the Lord requireth of you, and *so* do that ye may be found in the
- 7 day of judgment. Now if there is any mindfulness of good *among you*, remember me and think on these things, that my desire and my watchfulness may issue in some advantage ; I beseech you, entreating favour.
- 8 So long as your fair vessel is yet with you, fail not in any of these things, but without ceasing seek diligently these things and fulfil every commandment ; for *these*
- 9 *things* are worthy. Wherefore the more I was zealous to write from what *store* I was able, that I might make you glad. Fare ye well, children of love and peace. The Lord of glory and all grace be with your spirit.

# INDEX I.

- ABRAHAM, xxiv, xxvii, 46 *n.*, 64 *n.*,  
95, 99, 101, 108  
Accusative, 39  
Acta et passio Barnabae, lvii  
Acts of Apostles, xlviii, 1, 9 *n.*, 12 *n.*,  
26 *n.*, 42 *n.*, 49 *n.*, 57 *n.*  
Acts of S. Paul, lxvi  
Adam, 96  
Adjectives, 5 *n.*, 13 *n.*, 69 *n.*  
Aelia, xxxi, 74  
Aethiopic versions, I, 15 *n.*  
African Church, lxx  
Agrippa, xxx  
Alexander the Monk, lviii  
Alexandrian Church, xxxix, lxiv,  
lxxxiv, cxv; doctrines, xxxviii, xcvi,  
8 *n.*, 59 *n.*; school, lxv, lxxv;  
reckoning, lx  
Alexandrianisms, vi, xxv, lxxxiii,  
42 *n.*, 58 *n.*  
Amalek, cxi, 61 *n.*, 107  
Ambrose, lvii  
Anastasius of Rome, lxvii  
Anastasius Sinaiticus, lxviii  
Anatolion of Milan, lvii  
Ancient of days, xxxiii  
Angel, Evil, xxii, cii, 100  
Antioch, Church at, li, liv, lxxvi;  
reckoning at, lx  
Antwerp, iv  
Apocalypse, xxxiv, lxv, lxvii, 5 *n.*,  
9 *n.*, 26 *n.*, 37 *n.*, 39 *n.*, 58 *n.*,  
61 *n.*, 69 *n.*, 84 *n.*; of S. Peter,  
lxv, lxvii  
Apocrypha, xxviii, xliii, lxxii, 32 *n.*,  
57 *n.*  
Apostles, lxii, xc, 25 *n.*, 94, 99  
Apostolical Constitutions, ii, lxxi, 78 *n.*  
Arabian, 45 *n.*, 101  
Ascension, lxxxix, 70 *n.*, 115  
Augustine, lxxii, 70 *n.*  
Augustus, xxxiv, 16 *n.*  
Author of the Epistle, 85 *n.*, 88, 91,  
95; his nationality, xx, xliii, 36 *n.*;  
probable age, xli  
Baal Peor, ci  
Babylonian Jews, xxxii, xlv  
Baptism, xiv, xix, cxiv, 53 *n.*, 55 *n.*,  
104  
Barberine MS., iv, v, 23 *n.*, 27 *n.*,  
29 *n.*, 35 *n.*, 44 *n.*, 46 *n.*, 50 *n.*,  
56 *n.*, 58 *n.*, 69 *n.*, 83 *n.*, 84 *n.*,  
85 *n.*  
Barcochba, xxx  
Barnabas, facts of his life, xlvii;  
legends, lv; question of authorship,  
xviii, xliii, 75 *n.*, 85 *n.*; and S.  
Paul, xlvii, l, cvi, 12 *n.*  
Barsabas, l  
Basil, xxvi  
Basilides, xxxviii  
Berenice, xxx  
Braunsberger, 36 *n.*, 74 *n.*  
Breviary, lxi  
Bryennius, 8 *n.*  
Bunsen, cxi *n.*  
Bunyan, John, 51 *n.*  
Caesar, xxxv, 16  
Canonicity of Epistle, lxiii; how de-  
termined, lxxii  
Casanatensis codex, v, 4 *n.*, 23 *n.*,  
27 *n.*, 29 *n.*, 35 *n.*, 44 *n.*, 46 *n.*,  
50 *n.*, 56 *n.*, 69 *n.*, 83 *n.*, 84 *n.*,  
85 *n.*

- Celsus, lxix, 25 *n.*  
 Charinus, cxi  
 Christ as Judge, cvii, 39 *n.*, 110; person of, ci, cx, 24 *n.*, 35 *n.*, 55 *n.*, 61 *n.*, 93, 95, 98; resurrection of, xvi, 22 *n.*, 24 *n.*, 93, 114; sayings of, 40 *n.*; work of, xvi, ci, cx, 34 *n.*, 53 *n.*, 93, 110; see also, Type  
 Chronicles, 34 *n.*  
 Church, difficulties in Early, lxxvii, 19 *n.*; doctrine of, cxv, 33 *n.*, 75 *n.*; government of, xxxviii; judgment of, xxviii, lxiii, lxxii; and Lord's Day, xc, cxvi  
 Chrysostom, 31 *n.*  
 Circumcision, xiv, xvii, xxii, cii, 43 *n.*, 100  
 Claromontane MS., lxx, lxx  
 Claudius, 16  
 Clement of Alexandria, ii, xix, xxxvii, xlix, li, lxiv, lxxiii, lxx, 30 *n.*, 51 *n.*, 55 *n.*  
 Clement of Rome, lxx, lxxiii, 8 *n.*  
 Clerk, iv  
 Codices, of Epistle, v; Bezae, vi, 1; Claromontanus, lxx, lxx; Corbeienensis, viii, lxxxv; Sangermanensis, lxx *n.*; see also, Sinaiticus  
 Colossians, Epistle to, xxxvii, 12 *n.*, 31 *n.*, 44 *n.*, 70 *n.*, 81 *n.*  
 Consciousness, Christian, xxxvi, xxxix, lxiii, lxxii, cxvii  
 Constantinople, lix, lxxvii, 8 *n.*  
 Corbie, iii, lxxxv  
 Corinth, Church at, liv  
 Corinthians, S. Paul's Epistles to, xc, 4 *n.*, 6 *n.*, 12 *n.*, 14 *n.*, 18 *n.*, 19 *n.*, 31 *n.*, 32 *n.*, 34 *n.*, 67 *n.*, 75 *n.*, 76 *n.*, 81 *n.*, 85 *n.*  
 Cotelier, iv  
 Covenants, true heirs of, xiv, xvii, cxii, cxvii, 63 *n.*, 65 *n.*, 107, 109; old and new, lxxviii, lxxxiii, 9 *n.*, 37 *n.*; entering it, cxiv  
 Credner, lxx *n.*, lxxii, lxxviii *n.*, xciii *n.*  
 Cross, xiv, xvii, cxiv, 26 *n.*, 46 *n.*, 53 *n.*, 55 *n.*, 57 *n.*, 101, 105  
 Crucifixion, lxxxviii, 25 *n.*, 26 *n.*, 36 *n.*, 95  
 Curium, lviii  
 Cyprus, xlvi, li, lviii, lxi, lxiii  
 D'Achery, iv  
 Daniel, xi, xxvii, xxviii, xxxiii, 15 *n.*, 17 *n.*, 56 *n.*, 61 *n.*, 91  
 Date of Epistle, xxix, 16 *n.*, 73 *n.*  
 Dative, 34 *n.*, 48 *n.*  
 David, xxvii, 50 *n.*, 51 *n.*, 103, 107  
 Death, xvi, cxi, 22 *n.*, 93, 106  
 Demonology, xxxvii, cii, 44 *n.*, 79 *n.*, 80 *n.*, 100, 112  
 Demiurgus, xxxvii, xcvi  
 Deuteronomy, xxvii, 37 *n.*, 44 *n.*, 47 *n.*, 63 *n.*, 81 *n.*, 101  
 Dionysius Alexandrinus, 18 *n.*  
 Docetism, xxxviii, ciii, cviii, 22 *n.*  
 Dodwell, xviii  
 Domitian, xxxiv, 16  
 Donaldson, iv, cxiv *n.*, 36 *n.*, 53 *n.*, 76 *n.*, 83 *n.*  
 Dorotheus, Synopsis of, lvi  
 Dressel, v, xliii, 14 *n.*, 17 *n.*, 73 *n.*  
 Ebionites, xxxviii, ciii, 19 *n.*, 61 *n.*  
 Editions, iv, 4 *n.*  
 Egypt, 10 *n.*, 45 *n.*, 89, 109  
 Egyptians, 45 *n.*, 101  
 Elymas, lviii  
 Ephesians, Epistle to, 4 *n.*, 6 *n.*, 9 *n.*, 12 *n.*, 33 *n.*, 61 *n.*, 81 *n.*  
 Ephesus, liv, lviii, cviii  
 Ephraim, 63 *n.*, 108  
 Epicurus, 8 *n.*  
 Epistle of S. Barnabas, author and readers, xx, xli, 14 *n.*, 36 *n.*, 75 *n.*, 85 *n.*, 88, 91, 95, 109; canonicity, lxiii; date, xxix, 16 *n.*, 73 *n.*; editions, iv, 4 *n.*; integrity, xviii, 74 *n.*, 78 *n.*; manuscripts, iii; plan and divisions, xiii; quotations, xxvi, lxxxv, 20 *n.*, 32 *n.*, 35 *n.*, 40 *n.*, 57 *n.*, 65 *n.*, 67 *n.*; relation to Judaism, lxxxv; stylistic peculiarities, xxiv, 17 *n.*, 23 *n.*, 27 *n.*, 29 *n.*, 49 *n.*, 57 *n.*, 79 *n.*, 84 *n.*; theological value, xxxix, cvi; title, 4 *n.*; traces of Paulinism, xviii, lxxxii, xciv, cvi, 32 *n.*, 76 *n.*  
 Esaias, 107  
 Esau, 63 *n.*  
 Esdras, xxviii, lxxxvi, 21 *n.*, 57 *n.*  
 Esther, Book of, vii  
 Eucharist, lviii, cxiii, 33 *n.*  
 Eusebian divisions, vi  
 Eusebius, ii, lxix, lxxiii  
 Euthalian verses, vi  
 Evil, Spirit of, xxxiv, xxxvi, cxi, 9 *n.*,

- 11 *n.*, 69 *n.*, 78 *n.*, 79 *n.*, 83 *n.*, 88,  
 92, 114, 116, 117  
 Ewald, xxx, xxxiii, 73 *n.*  
 Exodus, 44 *n.*, 45 *n.*, 65 *n.*, 67 *n.*  
 Ezekiel, xxviii, 37 *n.*, 53 *n.*, 56 *n.*  
  
 Faith, lxxx, lxxxii, 7 *n.*, 9 *n.*, 88, 92,  
 97, 105, 113  
 Fast, xiii, 12 *n.*, 89, 97  
 Fathers, Early, ii, lxxii  
 Fell, iv, xxii, 69 *n.*  
 Flavii, xxxv, 17  
 Florentine MSS., iv, v, 4 *n.*, 23 *n.*,  
 27 *n.*, 29 *n.*, 35 *n.*, 41 *n.*, 44 *n.*,  
 50 *n.*, 56 *n.*, 83 *n.*, 85 *n.*  
 Fourth Gospel, lxxxix, xciv, 59 *n.*  
 Friends, Society of, cxiii  
  
 Galatians, xciv, 4 *n.*, 26 *n.*, 37 *n.*,  
 44 *n.*, 70 *n.*  
 Galba, xxxv, 16 *n.*  
 Galland, iv, liv, lxx, lxxiii, 72 *n.*  
 Gamaliel, xxvii, xlvi  
 Gebhart, vii *n.*, viii, 1, 6 *n.*, 8 *n.*,  
 30 *n.*, 38 *n.*, 60 *n.*, 71 *n.*, 73 *n.*,  
 82 *n.*  
 Genesis, 30 *n.*, 37 *n.*, 45 *n.*, 64 *n.*  
 Gentile Christians, xx, xxiii, xxxi, xli,  
 lxxviii, 14 *n.*, 75 *n.*  
 Goats, as types, xiv, 34 *n.*  
 God of the Jews, xxxviii, 112  
 Gnosticism, xcvi, 19 *n.*, 76 *n.*, 78 *n.*;  
 and date of Epistle, xxxvii, 6 *n.*,  
 44 *n.*  
  
 Hadrian, xxix, xxxiii, xxxviii, 16 *n.*,  
 73 *n.*  
 Haggai, xxviii  
 Harnack, viii, 2  
 Hebraisms, xxv, 12 *n.*, 29 *n.*, 57 *n.*  
 Hebrews, Epistle to, vi, lxxv, lxxviii,  
 lxxiii, lxxx, 9 *n.*, 26 *n.*, 31 *n.*, 41 *n.*,  
 65 *n.*  
 Hebrew Text, 10 *n.*, 11 *n.*, 12 *n.*,  
 27 *n.*, 43 *n.*, 53 *n.*, 62 *n.*, 68 *n.*  
 Hefele, xxii, xxxi, lvi, lxxxv *n.*, lxxxvi,  
 14 *n.*, 73 *n.*  
 Heifer, the red, xiv, xlv, 41 *n.*, 99  
 Henke, xviii, xxii, l, lxi, lxix, lxx,  
 lxxii, 71 *n.*  
 Henoch, Book of, xi, xxvii, xxviii,  
 15 *n.*, 20 *n.*, 75 *n.*, 91  
 Hermas, Shepherd of, lxxv, lxxvii, 14 *n.*,  
 56 *n.*  
  
 Herodotus, 45 *n.*  
 Heydecke, 7 *n.*, 17 *n.*, 74 *n.*  
 Heyse, v  
 Hilgenfeld, vi, xxi *n.*, xxxi, xxxv,  
 lxxxv *n.*, xciii, xciv, 2, 16 *n.*, 70 *n.*  
 Holstein, iv  
 Holy Spirit, liii, cviii, cxv, cxvii,  
 22 *n.*, 79 *n.*, 87, 112, 115  
 Hoole, iv  
  
 Ignatius, 25 *n.*  
 Indicative, 20 *n.*, 22 *n.*, 31 *n.*, 48 *n.*,  
 73 *n.*  
 Innocent I., lvii  
 Interpolations, Schenkel's theory, xviii;  
 Heydecke's, 74 *n.*  
 Intransitive verbs, 44 *n.*, 56 *n.*  
 Irenaeus, 10 *n.*, 11 *n.*  
 Isaac, xxiv, xxv, 63 *n.*, 64 *n.*, 95, 97,  
 99, 107  
 Isaiah, xxvii, xxviii, 10 *n.*, 19 *n.*, 26 *n.*,  
 28 *n.*, 34 *n.*, 37 *n.*, 69 *n.*  
 Itacisms, vi, 13 *n.*, 20 *n.*, 23 *n.*, 57 *n.*,  
 83 *n.*, 84 *n.*  
  
 Jacob, xxiv, 63 *n.*, 64 *n.*, 95, 99  
 James, S., lii; Epistle of, lxxxi, xciv,  
 4 *n.*, 80 *n.*  
 Jeremiah, xxviii, 44 *n.*, 45 *n.*  
 Jerusalem, lxxvi, lxxix; destruction  
 of, xxi, xxix, lxxx, 73 *n.*  
 Jerome, ii, lxxv *n.*, lxx, 25 *n.*, 41 *n.*  
 Jesus, and the law, lxxvii; divinity  
 of, cvii  
 Jewish Christians, xx, xxxi, li, lxxvi,  
 lxxxv, 14 *n.*  
 Jews, carnal and spiritual, xvi, xxiii,  
 c, cxiii, 50 *n.*, 63 *n.*; ritual of, xiii,  
 xvii, xliii, ci, 35 *n.*, 37 *n.*; under  
 Hadrian, xxx, xxxii, 73 *n.*  
 Jezreel, ci  
 John, S., Gospel of, lxxxix, xciv, 4 *n.*,  
 14 *n.*, 24 *n.*, 37 *n.*, 39 *n.*, 45 *n.*,  
 59 *n.*, 75 *n.*; Epistle of, 11 *n.*  
 Joseph, 62 *n.*  
 Josephus, xxx  
 Joshua, 59 *n.*, 107; Book of, 65 *n.*  
 Jost, xxx  
 Jowett, lxxvi, lxxx  
 Judaizers, xv, xlii, lxxvi, lxxxiii, 19 *n.*,  
 22 *n.*  
 Judgment, Final, 15 *n.*, 20 *n.*, 84, 92,  
 110, 115  
 June, lx

- Junia, lvi  
 Jupiter, xxxi, xxxv, 74 n.  
 Justin Martyr, xlv, 37 n., 59 n., 70 n.  
 Juvenal, xxx  
  
 Keim, xxxii, xxxvi, lxxxii, xciv  
 Knowledge and faith, lxxxiii  
  
 Lachmann, ix  
 Laodicea, lvii  
 Lardner, lxxxv  
 Latinism, 84 n.  
 Latin version, discovery of, iii; value of, viii, x; omissions in, xxxiii, 6 n., 41 n., 45 n., 49 n., 54 n., 67 n.; use of, lxvi; variants of, cix, 4 n., 5 n., 8 n., 9 n., 11 n., 12 n., 14 n., 20 n., 25 n., 26 n., 27 n., 33 n., 43 n., 52 n., 59 n., 63 n., 66 n., 69 n., 78 n., 80 n.  
 Law, Jewish, xviii, xxii, lxxviii, 67 n.; Spiritualised, xcvi  
 Legends of S. Barnabas, lv  
 Lemoine, iv, xviii  
 Levites, xliii, xlvi, lxxiii  
 Leviticus, ion., 35 n., 37 n., 47 n., 49 n., 51 n., 80 n.  
 Life, the Christian, xiv, lxxviii, cxii, 7 n., 79 n., 82 n.  
 Lightfoot, xxxix n.  
 Liturgy, 61 n.  
 Lord's day, xc, cxvi, 70 n., 111  
 Luke, S., xlvii, lxxii; Gospel of, lxxxviii, lxxxix, 5 n., 9 n., 24 n., 26 n., 49 n., 61 n., 72 n., 82 n.  
 Lystra, xlviii  
  
 Maccabees, ciii  
 Macedonia, liv  
 Mader, iv  
 Maimonides, xlv  
 Manasses, 63 n., 108  
 Mansel, xxxvi, xxxviii  
 Manuscripts, iii  
 Mark, S. John, xlviii, lii, liv, lviii, lxxv; Gospel of, 15 n., 26 n., 34 n., 37 n., 57 n.  
 Matthew, S., Gospel of, lviii, lxxix, lxxxi, 11 n., 14 n.; use of, xxvii, lxxxv, 20 n., 25 n., 26 n., 32 n., 34 n., 37 n., 57 n., 61 n., 70 n., 71 n., 82 n.; composition of, xcii  
 Medicine MSS., iv, v  
 Menard, iii, iv, viii, xxxi, 22 n.  
 Messiah, lxxix, 25 n., 27 n., 33 n.  
 Milan, bishops of, lvi, lvii, lxxiii  
 Mischna, xliii, xlv, 37 n.  
 Moses, xiv, xxvii, xxviii, xcix, cvii, 50 n., 58 n., 91, 101, 103, 106, 108  
 Müller, vi, vii, xxxii, xxxvi, 4 n., 31 n., 38 n., 46 n., 71 n., 79 n., 82 n.; critical principles, ix, i  
 Muralt, viii  
 Mysticism, xix, xcvi  
  
 Neander, lxxxi  
 Nero, xxxiv, lvi, 16 n.  
 Nerva, xxxiv, 16 n.  
 Neuter adjectives, 5 n.  
 Nicephorus, Stichometry of, iii, lxvi, 78 n.  
 Nicodemus, Gospel of, cxi  
 Numbers, 41 n., 42 n., 59 n., 61 n., 65 n.  
 Old Testament, Fathers, cii, cxiv, 64 n.; quotations from, xxvi, xc, xciv, 12 n., 27 n., 67 n.; value of, xcix  
 Origen, ii, xix, xx n., lxiv, lxviii, xcix, 4 n., 25 n., 50 n.  
 Otho, xxxv, 16 n.  
 Ottobonian MS., iii, v, 4 n., 23 n., 27 n., 29 n., 34 n., 44 n., 46 n., 48 n., 50 n., 56 n., 69 n., 83 n., 85 n.  
 Oxford Editions, iii, iv  
  
 Paedagogica, lxviii  
 Pamphili Codex, viii, x, 82 n.  
 Paul, S., Acts of, lxvi; companions of, liv; differences with Barnabas, lii, cvi, 12 n.; journeys with Barnabas, xlvii; and the epistle, xxi, xxiii, lxxii, 62 n.  
 Paulinism, and Judaism, lxxvii; of the epistle, xviii, lxxxi, xciv, cvi, 32 n., 76 n.  
 Pella, lxxix  
 Peter, S., lii; Epistles of, xcv, 14 n., 19 n., 21 n., 22 n., 28 n., 69 n., 75 n., 77 n.; Revelation of, lxxv, lxvi, lxx  
 Petropolitanus Codex, viii  
 Persiacus, xxxii  
 Pharisees, lxxviii  
 Philippians, Epistle to, lv, 4 n.; of Polycarp, iii, lxvi  
 Philo, xxvi, xcix

- Platonic doctrines, cii  
 Polycarp, Epistle of, iii, lxvi  
 Principles of criticism, ix  
 Prisca, lvi  
 Prophets, xiv, xvi, 9 n., 27 n., 43 n.  
 Proverbs, 30 n., 81 n.  
 Psalms, 11 n., 19 n., 21 n., 27 n.,  
 43 n., 51 n., 61 n., 69 n., 76 n.,  
 81 n.  
 Pseudo-Aristeas, 52 n.  
 Pseudo-Mark, lvii, lxi  
  
 Quotations, formula of, xxvi; laxity  
 of, xc, 10 n., 55 n., 65 n., 66 n.,  
 67 n., 69 n.; from Old Testament,  
 xxvi, 10 n., 12 n., 67 n.; from New  
 Testament, lxxxv, 20 n., 32 n.; from  
 unknown sources, 35 n., 40 n.,  
 57 n.  
  
 Rebecca, 108  
 Resurrection, xvi, cxi, 22 n., 24 n.,  
 70 n., 93, 114, 117  
 Ritual, Jewish, xiii, xvii, xliii, ci,  
 35 n., 37 n.  
 Roman MSS., iv, v  
 Romans, Epistle to, xciv, 4 n., 14 n.,  
 31 n., 44 n., 62 n., 64 n., 70 n.  
 Rome, lxi, lxiv  
 Rordam, xviii, xxv  
 Rothe, xxxviii  
 Russel, iv  
  
 Sabbath, xiv, xciii, cxvi, 69 n., 110  
 Salamis, lviii, lxi  
 Sanday, 60 n., 64 n., 67 n.  
 Sangermanensis, lxxv n.  
 Satan, cii, 9 n., 79 n., 114  
 Scapegoat, xliv, 34 n., 36 n., 97  
 Schott, iii  
 Schenkl, vi, xviii, xxi  
 Schism, sin of, 18 n.  
 Schleiermacher, xci  
 Schulz, 27 n.  
 Schwegler, xciii, cviii  
 Septuagint, x, xxvi, lxxxvii, 10 n.,  
 11 n., 13 n., 21 n., 22 n., 26 n.,  
 27 n., 28 n., 29 n., 34 n., 37 n.,  
 42 n., 44 n., 47 n., 53 n., 62 n.,  
 68 n., 76 n.  
 Serapion, xxix  
 Simon Magus, xxxviii  
 Sinai, 104, 110  
 Sinaitic MS., iv, v, lxxv, lxxxv, 4 n.,  
 7 n., 10 n., 13 n., 14 n., 19 n.,  
 23 n., 26 n., 27 n., 28 n., 34 n.,  
 44 n., 46 n., 48 n., 50 n., 53 n.,  
 54 n., 58 n., 67 n., 68 n., 69 n.,  
 72 n., 81 n., 83 n., 85 n.; date of,  
 vi; corrections of, vi, xi, 9 n.,  
 26 n., 41 n., 44 n., 50 n., 56 n.,  
 58 n., 62 n., 77 n., 82 n., 83 n.  
 Sion, 95  
 Spiritual insight, xv, xcvi, 6 n.,  
 30 n., 47 n.; ordinances, xvi, ci,  
 43 n., 47 n., 102; gifts, 87  
 Spirituality, lxxxiii  
 Stichometries of Nicephorus, iii, lxvi,  
 78 n.; of Anastasius Sinaiticus,  
 lxviii  
 Stoics, xxvi  
 Stromateis, lxviii  
 Subjunctive, 22 n., 52 n., 73 n.  
 Suidas, 53 n.  
 Supernatural Religion, xi, 20 n.,  
 40 n., 71 n., 82  
 Swete, cix  
 Sybilline Books, xxxv, 76 n.  
 Syria, lviii, lxiv, lxvii, xcvi  
 Syrians, 45 n., 101  
  
 Talmud, xlv, 37 n., 42 n.  
 Temple, true, xiv, xxxi, 75 n., 112;  
 at Jerusalem, xxi, xxxii, ciii, 72 n.  
 Tertullian, xlv, l, lxxiii, 36 n., 50 n.  
 Theatine MS., iv, v  
 Theodorus Lector, lix, lx  
 Therapeutae, xviii, lxxx  
 Thessalonians, Epistle to, vi, 34 n.  
 Tischendorf, vi, ix, xxviii, lxxv, lxx,  
 xciii, 20 n., 59 n., 82 n.  
 Titus, xxix, xxxii, 16 n.  
 Titus of Crete, liv, lvi; Epistle of,  
 31 n., 81 n.  
 Timothy, lv, lvi; Epistle of, 61 n.,  
 80 n.  
 Torres, iii  
 Trajan, xxxv, 16 n.  
 Translations, English, iv, 2  
 Turrien, iii  
 Types of Christ, xiv, xviii, cxiii;  
 good land, 27 n., 33 n., 95; goats,  
 xliv, 34 n., 36 n., 97; heifer, xlv,  
 41 n., 99; Moses, 57 n., 106; Isaac,  
 64 n., 97; Joshua, 59 n., 107  
  
 Ueberweg, xcix n., ciii n.  
 Ullman, lxxix n., lxxiii

- Ussher, iii, 4 *n.*, 41 *n.*  
 Vatican MS., iii, v, lxvi, 23 *n.*, 27 *n.*,  
     29 *n.*, 41 *n.*, 44 *n.*, 46 *n.*, 48 *n.*,  
     50 *n.*, 56 *n.*, 69 *n.*, 83 *n.*, 85 *n.*  
 Varia Sacra, iv  
 Version, Latin, iii, viii, lxxxv  
 Vespasian, xxxiii, 16 *n.*, 73 *n.*  
 Vitellius, xxxiv, 16 *n.*  
 Volkmar, xxxii, xxxiv, xciii, 16 *n.*,  
     71 *n.*, 72 *n.*  
 Voss, iv, 4 *n.*  
 Vulgate, viii, lxxxvi  
 Wake, iv *n.*  
 Way of light and darkness, xiv, 79 *n.*,  
     113; of righteousness, 87  
 Weizsäcker, xxxii, xxxvi, lxxxii,  
     lxxxix, xc, 16 *n.*, 71 *n.*, 73 *n.*  
 Westcott, 72 *n.*  
 Winer, x  
 Work of Christ, prefigured in O. T.,  
     xiv, xvi; as a new creation, xviii;  
     doctrine of, ci, cx, 34 *n.*  
 Zahn, 2  
 Zechariah, xxviii, lxxxvii, 26, 37 *n.*,  
     81 *n.*  
 Zephaniah, xxviii, 55 *n.*  
 Zerubbabel, xxxii, 73 *n.*

## INDEX II.

Ἀβραάμ, VI 8, VIII 4, IX 7, 8 n., XIII 7 n.  
 ἀγαλλίασις, I 6 n.  
 ἀγαπάω, I 1, 4, II 8, IV 1, 6 n., 9, VI 10, XIX 5 n., XX 2, ὁ ἡγαπημένος, III 6 n., IV 3, 8  
 ἀγάπη, xlii, I 5 n., VI 5 n., XI 8, XXI 9 n.  
 ἄγγελος, IX 4 n., XVIII 1 n.  
 ἀγρυπνία, XIX 7 n.  
 ἀδελφός, XIX 4, ἀδελφοί, II 10, III 6, IV 14, V 5, VI 10, 15  
 ἀδίκως, V 4 n.  
 αἰετός, X 1 n., 4  
 Αἰγύπτιοι, IX 6  
 Αἰγυπτος, II 7 n., XIV 3  
 αἶμα, V 1 n., XII 1 n.  
 αἰτέω, XIX 11 n., XXI 7  
 αἰών, X 11; εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, VI 3, VIII 5, IX 2, XI 10, 11, XII 2  
 αἰώνιος, XXI 1 n.  
 ἄκανθα, VII 11 n., IX 5  
 ἀκοή, IX 1, 2 n., 4 n., X 12  
 ἀκούω, III 1 n., VII 3, VIII 7, IX 1, 2 n., 3, 4 n., X 8, XI 11 n., XII 8, XIII 2, XIX 4  
 ἀκροβυστία, XIII 7 n.  
 ἄλλ' ἤ, II 8 n., XI 7  
 Ἀμαλήκ, XII 9 n.  
 ἀμάρτημα, XIV 5 n.  
 ἁμαρτία, cx, IV 6, 13, V 1, 2, 9 n., 11 n., VII 5, VIII 1, 3, XI 1, 11, XII 2, XVI 8, XIX 10, 11  
 ἁμαρτωλός, IV 2, V 9 n., VIII 2 n., X 10, XI 7, XII 10  
 ἀμήν, lxvi, XXI 9  
 ἀμφοτέρος, XIX 7 n.  
 ἀναβαίνω, XI 10, 11, XV 9 n.

ἀνακαινίζω, VI 11 n.  
 ἀνακεφαλαίω, V 11 n.  
 ἀναμαρτυρόμαι, X 11 n.  
 ἀνάστασις, V 6, 7 n., XXI 1  
 ἀνήρ, VIII 1 n., 2, IX 8, X 10  
 ἄνθρωπος, III 1, 3, V 4, 5, 6, 10, VI 9 n., 12, X 3, 4, 5, XII 10 n., XVI 10  
 ἀνίστημι, XI 7, XII 1, XV 9 n.  
 ἀνοικοδομέω, XVI 4  
 ἀνομία, IV 1, V 2, X 4, 8 n., XIV 5, XV 7, XVIII 2 n.  
 ἄνομος, IV 9 n., V 9 n., XV 5 n., XX 2  
 ἀντιλεγόμενος, lxxvii  
 ἀπέχω, XIII 7 n.  
 ἀπλοῦς, cix, XIX 2  
 ἀπόλλυμι, IV 6, V 12 n., XI 7, XII 5, XX 1  
 ἀπόστολος, V 9 n.  
 ἀπροσωπολήμπτως, IV 12 n.  
 ἄπτομαι, VII 11 n.  
 Ἄρα ψ, IX 6  
 ἀρχή, I 6 n., XV 3, 8, XVI 8  
 ἀρχων, IV 13 n., IX 3, XVIII 2 n.  
 ἄφesis, V 1, VI 11 n., VIII 3, XI 1, XIV. 9, XVI 8  
 ἄφθαρτος, XVI 9, XIX 8 n.  
 ἀφοβία, XX 1 n.  
 Βάπτισμα, XI 1  
 βασιλεία, IV 4, 13, VII 11 n., VIII 5 n., 6, XXI 1  
 βασιλεὺς, IV 4, 5 n., XI 5, XII 11  
 βαστάζω, VII 8 n.  
 βλάστος, VII 8 n.  
 βλέπω, I 7, IV 14 n., V 10, X 11, XIII 6, XVI 10  
 βοηθός, II 2 n.



βόθρον, XI 2 n.  
βρώσις, X 10 n.  
βωμός, I 7 n.

Γαλή, X 8 n.

γεῦσις, I 7 n.

γῆ, xxvi, IV 4, 5, V 7, VI 8, 9 n., IO, 12, 13, 16 n., 17, IX 3, X 5, XI 2, 7, 9 n., XII 9, XIV 3, 8, XVI 2

γίνομαι, IV II, VI 3, 4 n., 19, VII 3, VIII 7, IX 4, X 6, 7, XIV I, 4, XV 7, XVI 4 n., 5, 8 n., XXI 6

γνώσις, xxv, xxxvii, xcvi, cxv, I 5 n., 6 n., II 3, V 4, VI 9, IX 8, X IO, XIII 7 n., XVIII I, XIX I, XXI 5 n.

γραφή, xxvii, IV 7, II, V 4, VI I 2, XIII I, XVI 5 n.

γράφω, xxvii, IV 9, VI 5, VII 3, XII 9, XIV 2, XVII 3, XXI 9; γέγραπται, IV 3, 14 n., V 2, XI I, XIV 6, XV I, XVI 6, XXI I

Δαιμόνιον, XVI 7 n.

δάμαλις, VIII I n.

Δανιήλ, IV 5

δαπανάω, XIV 5 n.

δασύπους, X 6 n.

Δαυίδ, X IO, XII IO, II

δεῖ, V 6, 13 n., XII 5

δείκνυμι, V 6 n., 9, VII 5, XII 6 n., XIII 3 δέκα, IV 4; βασιλείαι, IV 4 n.; λόγοι, XV I n.

δεσπότης, I 7 n., IV 3 n.

Δευτερονόμιον, X 2 n.

διαθήκη, IV 6, 7, 8, VI 19, IX 6, XIII I, 6, XIV I n., 2, 3, 5, 7

διαθρύπτω, III 3 n.

διάσταλμα, X II n.

διάστημα, IX 8 n.

δευλωσία, XIX 7 n.

διδαχή, IX 9 n.

διδωμι, IV 2, VIII 3, IX 7, 8, XI 4, 6, XIV I, 2, 4, 7, XVI 9, XIX I, 3, II n., XXI 5

διέξοδος, XI 6 n.

δικάζομαι, VI I n.

δικαίος, X II, XI 7, XII 4 n., XIX 6, XX 2

δικαιοσύνη, I 4, 6 n., IV 12 n., V. 4, XIII 7, XX 2

δικαίωμα, xxv, I 2 n., II I n., IV II, X 2, II, XVI 9, XXI I, 5 n.

διψυχέω, XIX 5 n.

διώκω, V II n., XX 2

δόγμα, xxv, I 6 n., IX 7 n., X I n., 9, IO

δόξα, VIII 2 n.

δοξάζω, VI IO, XI 9 n., XIX 2, XXI I

δράξ, XVI 2 n.

δυό, IX 8, XI 2, XIII 2, XIV 2, XVIII 2

Ἐγγύς, XXI 3 n.

ἐγκαταλείπω, IV I 4, XI 2, XIX 2, XXI 2 n.

ἐγκατασφραγίζω, IV 8 n.

ἐγκράτεια, II 2 n.

εἰδωλολατρεία, XVI 7 n., XX I

εἰρήνη, xlii, I I, XXI 9 n.

εἰς, xxxix, ἐξ ὑμῶν, I 8, IV 6; ὑφ' ἑν, IV 4 n., 5; ὁ εἰς—ὁ εἰς, VII 6, 9; καθ' ἑνα, VIII I; ἐν γράμμα, IX 8

εἰσέρχομαι, VI 8 n., 13

εἶτα, VI 3, XI 5 n., IO, XII 2, XIII 2

ἐκδύω, X 4 n.

ἐκείνος, xxii, II 9 n., III 6 n., IV 6 n., VIII 7 n., IX 6, X 12, XIII I, 3, XIV 5, XXI I ἐκζητέω, II 5, IV I n., X 4, XIX IO, XXI 6, 8

ἐκκλησία, VI IO, VII II

ἐλεέω, III 5 n., XX 2

ἐλκω, XI IO n.

ἐλλείπω, IV 9, XXI 8 n.

ἐλπίζω, I 3, XII 7, XVII I; ἐπί τινα, VI 3 n., 9, VIII 5, XVI I, XIX 7; ἐπί τινι, XII 2, 3, XVI 8; ἐπί τι, XI 8; εἰς, XVI I

ἐλπις, I 4 n., 6 n., IV 8, VI 3, XI II, XVI 2

ἐμπτύω, VII 8 n., 9

ἐμφυτος, I 2 n., IX 9

ἐνδόξως, XII 6 n.

ἐνδύνω, IV IO n.

ἐνεργέω, I 7, II I n.

ἐνέργημα, XIX 6 n.

ἐνίστημι, τὰ ἐνεστῶτα, I 7, V 3, XVII 2 ἔντερον, VII 4 n.

ἐντολή, IV II, VI I n., VII 3 n., IX 5, X 2 n., II, I 2, XVI 9, XIX 2

Ἐνώχ, IV 3 n.

ἐξακισχίλιοι, XV 4 n.

ἐξάνιστημι, IV 4 n.

ἐξουθενέω, lxxix, VII 9

ἐξουσία, II I, IV 2, 13, VI 18, VIII 3, XVIII I

ἐπάνω, VI I 8 n.

ἐπήλυτος, III 6 n.

ἐπιδείκνυμι, V 7 n., VI 13

ἐπιθυμέω, XVI IO, XIX 6 n.

- ἐπικαθυπνῶ, IV 13 n.  
ἐπικατάρατος, VII 7 n., 9, X 5  
ἐπιστήμη, II 13, XXI 5 n.  
ἐπιτηρέω, X 4  
ἐπιτίθημι, VII 8, XII 8, 9 n.; XIII 5, XV 2  
ἐραυνάω, IV 1 n.  
ἐργάζομαι, XIX 10 n., XXI 2 n.  
ἐργον, IV 10, XIX 1, XXI 1; ἀγαλλιασέως, I 6 n.; τῆς ἀνομίας, IV 1; τῶν χειρῶν, V 10, XV 3; εὐφροσύνης, X 11  
ἐρρημος, VII 8, IX 3, XI 3 n.  
ἐριον, VII 8 n., 11, VIII 1 n., 5, 6  
ἐρχομαι, V 9 n., 10, 11, VII 10, XII 7, XV 5  
ἐσχάτος, IV 9, VI 13 n., XII 9, XVI 5 n.  
ἐτοιμάζω, III 6 n., V 7, XIV 5, 6, XIX 7 n.  
Ἐσα, XII 5  
εὐαγγέλιον, V 9, VIII 3  
εὐλογέω, XIII 4 n., 5  
εὐρίσκω, VII 8, XVI 7, XXI 6 n.  
εὐφροσύνη, XII 1, I 6 n., VII 1, XV 9  
ἐχαραστῶ, VII 1 n.  
Ἐφραίμ, XIII 5 n.  
ἐχθρός, XII 10, XVI 4 n.  
Ζωή, I 4 n., 6 n., II 10  
Ἦκω, IV 3 n., XIX 12  
ἥλιος, V 10, XV 5 n.  
ἡμεῖς, XXII, CX, I 6, II 2, 4, 6, 9, 10, III 3, 6, IV 6 n., XI, V 2, VI 14 n., 16 n., VII 2 n., XVI 7 n.  
ἡμέρα, VI 4, VII 9, XII 4, XIV 2, 9, XV 3; ἐβδόμη, XV 5; ὀγδόη, XV 8, 9; κρισέως, XIX 10, XXI 6; ἡμέραι, πονηραί, II 1 n.  
Ἡσαΐας, XII 11  
Θάνατος, V 11, VII 3, XII 2, 5, XIX 2, 7 n., 8, XX 1; ὁ θάν., V 6 n., X 5, XIV 5, XVI 9, XX 1 n.  
θέλω, II 9, IV 9, VII 11, IX 2, XIII 5, XIX 1 n.  
θεός, II 10, V 5, 13, VI 8, 16, VIII 4, IX 2, 5, X 2 n., XII 6, XIV 7, 8, XVI 1, 7, 8, XVIII 1, XIX 2, 4, 7 n., XX 2; θεοῦ υἱός, IV 9, V 9 n., VII 9, XII 9, 11; θ. ναός, IV 11, XVI 6; θ. φόβος, IV 11  
θεράπων, XIV 4 n.  
θησαυρός, XI 4 n.  
θλίβω, VII 11 n., XX 2  
θυγάτηρ, XII, I n., XIX 5  
θυσία, II 4, 7 n., 10, VII 3, 9 n.  
Ἰακώβ, VI 8, VIII 4, XI 9 n., XIII 4, 5  
λάμα, III 4 n.  
ἱερεὺς, VII 3, 4, 6, IX 6  
Ἰησοῦς, IV 8 n., VI 9, VII 7, 10, 11, VIII 2, 5, IX 7, 8, XII 5, 6, 7, 10, XIV 5, XV 9; Ἰη. Χριστός, II 6 n.  
Ἰησοῦς ὁ τοῦ Ναυῆ, XII 8, 9  
Ἰνα, IV 13 n., V 6 n., 13 n., VI 18, VII 5, 11; with indicative, VI 5 n., XII 6 n.  
Ἰνατί, III 1 n.  
Ἰσαάκ, VI 8, VII 3, VIII 4, XIII 2 n., 3  
Ἰσος, VII 10 n.  
Ἰσραήλ, IV 14, V 2, 8, VI 7, VIII 1, 3 n., IX 2, XII 2, 5, XVI 5  
ἰχθύς, VI 12, 18, X 1 n., 10  
Ἰωσήφ, XIII 4, 5  
Καθαίρω, XII 2, XVI 3, 4 n.  
καθαρός, XV 2 n., 6 n.  
καθῆλδω, V 13 n.  
καινός, II 6 n., V 7 n., VII 5 n., XV 7 n., XVI 8 n.  
καιρός, IV 3, XI 6, 8, XV 5 n.; ὁ νῦν, IV 1 n., XVIII 2 n.; ὁ ἀνομος, IV 9 n.  
καλός, VI 12, VII 1 n., 6 n., XIX 11, XXI 1, 2, 8 n.  
καρδία, CIX, II 10, IV 8, VI 14, 15, VIII 3, IX 1 n., 5, X 11, 12, XI 11, XII 2 n., XV 1 n., 6, XVI 7, XIX 2  
καρποφορέω, XI 11 n.  
καταβαίνω, XI 8 n., 11, XIV 3  
κατακεντέω, LXXVIII, VII 8 n., 9  
καταπονέω, XX 2 n.  
κατάρα, XXV, XX 1  
καταργέω, II 6, V 6 n., IX 4, XV 5 n., XVI 2  
καταρτίζω, XVI 6 n.  
καταφθορά, V 1 n., XVI 5  
κατοικέω, XVI 9 n.  
κέρας, IV 5 n.  
κηρύγμα, XXVI, XII 6  
κλήσις, XVI 9 n.  
κόκκινος, LXXVIII, VII 8 n., 9 n., VIII 1  
κολλάσθαι, XXV, X 3, 4, 5, 8 n., 11, XIX 2, 6, XX 2  
κολυμβάω, X 5  
κόραξ, X 1 n., 4  
κόρη, XIX 9  
κόσμος, CVII, IV 12, V 5, X 11, XV 8 n., XXI 5  
κραυγή, III 1 n.  
κρίνω, IV 12 n., V 7, VI 1, VII 2, X 5, XV 5, XIX 11

κρίσις, I 6 n., XI 7, XIX 10, XX 2 n.,  
XXI 6

κρίζω, XVI 8 n.

κυριεύω, VI 18 n., VII 11, XXI 5

κύριος (of God), xxvii, lxxxvii, cvii,

I 1, 3 n., 6, II 1 n., 3 n., III 1, IV  
12, V 3, VI 1 n., 4 n., 8, 10, 12, 13,  
14, 15, 16, 19, VII 1 n., 3 n., VIII  
7, IX 1, 2, 3, 5, X 10, 11, 12,  
XI 4, 5 n., 7, XII 1, 9, 10 n., 11,  
XIII 2, 4, XIV 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, XV 2,  
4, XVI 2, 5, 7, 8, XVII 2, XIX 2, 5,  
7 n., 9, XXI 1, 3, 6, 9; ὁ κύριος, IX  
5, X 11, XI 1, XIII 7, XVI 10; of  
Christ, V 1, VI 3, VII 2, XII 11,  
XIV 5, XV 7; ὁ κ., V 5, XII 10  
κύω, X 8 n.

Λαγώς, X 6 n.

λαλέω, I 4, 7, IX 3, X 2, 9, 11, 12,  
XI 11, XV 1, XVI 10 n., XIX 9

λαμβάνω, IV 6, 7, 13, VII 6, 11, IX 5,  
7, X 1, 3, 9, 11, XII 9, XIV 1, 2 n.,

4, 5, XVI 8, XIX 4 n., 5, 9, XXI 2

λάος, III 6 n., V 7, VII 5 n., VIII 1,  
IX 3, 6, X 2, XII 4, 8, XIII 1 n.,

2, 3, 5, 6, XIV 1, 2, 3, 4 n., 5, 6,  
XVI 5

λέγω, xxvii, lxxxvii, II 4, 7, 9, III 1, 3,  
IV 3, 4, 5, 6, 11, V 2, 4, 12, 13, 14,

VI 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12 n.,  
14, 16, VII 4 n., 8, 9 n., VIII 2,

IX 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 11, X 2, 10, XI 2,  
4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, XII 1, 2, 4, 8,

9, 10 n., 11, XIII 1, 4, 5, 7, XIV  
2, 7, 8, 9, XV 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, XVI

3, 5, 6, 10

λέπις, X 1 n.

λίθος, VI 2 n., 3, 4

λόγος, xxvi, VI 17, IX 3, 9, X 11, XIV  
5 n., XV 1 n., XVI 9, XIX 4, 9, 10 n.

λοιμός, X 10 n.

λυτρώω, XIV 5, 6 n., 7, 8, XIX 2

λύτρωσις, XIX 10 n.

Μακροθυμία, II 2 n.

μακρόθυμος, III 6 n.

Μανασσής, XIII 5 n.

μάνδρα, XVI 5 n.

μανθάνω, xxv, V 6 n., VI 9, IX 7, 8, 9,  
XIV 4, XVI 2, 7, 8, XXI 1

μαρτυρία, I 6 n.

μέλας, IV 9 n., XX 1 n.

μελετώ, IV 11 n., X 11 n., XI 5 n.,  
XIX 10 n., XXI 7 n.

μέλι, VI 8, 10, 13, 17 n.

μεταξύ, XIII 5 n.

μικρός, IV 4, 5 n.

μισθός, I 5, IV 12, XI 8, XIX 11, XX 2,  
XXI 3

μονάζω, IV 10 n.

μόσχος, VIII 2 n.

μώλωψ, V 2 n.

Μωϋσής, IV 6 n., 8, VI 8, X 1, 2, 9, 11,  
XII 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, XIV 2, 3, 4, XV 1

Ναός, IV 11 n., VI 15 n., VII 3 n.,  
XVI 1 n., 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 n.

Ναυῆς, XII 8 n.

νηστεία, III 2 n., 3, VII 3, 4

νοέω, xxv, IV 14 n., VI 10, VII 1 n.,  
VIII 2, X 12, XVII 2

νόθος, lxvii

νόμος, II 6 n., III 6

νοῦς, VI 10 n.

νῦν, xxxiii n., IV 1 n., 9, VI 18, XI 8,  
XV 6, XVI 4 n.

Ὀγδοός, xv 8 n., 9

ὀδός, IV 10, XI 7, XII 4 n., XIX 1, 2,  
XX 1; δικαιοσύνης, I 4, V 4; τοῦ

φωτός, xviii 1, XIX 1, 12; σκοτούς,  
V 4, xvi 1 n.

οικοδομή, xvi 1 n.

οἶκος, IX 8, XII 9, XIV 7, XVI 1, 2,  
7 n.

ὅμοιος, VII 6 n., 9 n., 10, X 3

ὁμολογέω, lxvii

ὄνομα, xxv, I 1, XII 8, 9 n., XVI 6, 7,  
8, XIX 5

ὄξος, VII 3 n., 4, 5

ὀξυπερος, X 1 n., 4

ὀπισθεν, IV 4 n.

ὄπλον, XII 2 n.

ὅποτε, XII 9 n.

ὀπότε, XII 2 n.

ὀπου, XVI 6 n.

ὀρώω, II 5, VI 16, VII 9 n., xv 8

ὀσμή, II 10 n.

ὅταν, IV 14 n., X 3 n.

ὅτε, II 5 n., V 9, VI 1

ὅτι, I 2, 4 n., 5 n., II 9, IV 6, V 4, 7,  
12, VII 9 n., 11, IX 8, X 1, XI 2

οὐρανός, VI 12, 18, IX 3, XI 2 n., XV 9,  
XVI 2

ὀφθαλμός, XIV 7, XIX 9 n.

οφίς, XII 5, 6, 7 n.

Πάγίς, XIX 7 n., 8

παιδίον, VI 11 n., 17 n., VIII 1 n.

παιδοφθορέω, XIX 4 n.

παῖς, VIII 3, κυρίου, VI 1 n., IX 2 n.

πάλιν, VI 4, 6, 13, 14, 16, IX 1 n., 2, 3, 5, X 3, XI 4, 6, 9, XII 1, 2, 5, 10, 11, XIV 8, 9, XVI 3, 5, 8, XIX 5

πανταμάρτητος, XX 2 n.

παραβαλῶν, IX 4 n.

παράβασις, XII 5, XX 1 n.

παραβολή, VI 10 n., XVII 2

παραδίδωμι τινι, XIV 5 n., εἰς, V 1, XII 2, 5, XVI 5

παραλαμβάνω, XIX 11 n.

παραφνάδιος, IV 5 n.

παρεϊσδυσίς, II 10 n., IV 5 n.

παρέρχομαι, τὰ παρεληλυθότα, I 7 n., V 3 n.

πᾶς, Ixxviii, cvii, III 3 n., IV 6, VI 2, IX 7, XII 5 n., 7, XV 4, 6, 7, 8, XXI 5

πάσχω, xxvi, V 5, 6 n., 13, VI 9 n., VII 2, 5, 11, XII 2, 5

πατάσσω, V 12 n.

πατήρ, II 7, V 7, XIII 5, 7, XIV 1 n.; of God, XII 8, XIV 6

πέιθω, I 4 n., IX 4

πένης, XX 2 n.

πέρας γέ τοι, V 8 n., X 2, XV 6, 8, XII 6, XVI 3

περιτέμνω, IX 1 n., 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, X 12

περιτομή, IX 4, 6 n., 7

περίψημα, xxi, IV 9 n., VI 5 n.

πιστεύω, VII 2, IX 4, XI 11, XII 7, XIII 7 n., XVI 7

πίστις, xxxvii, I 6 n., II 2, IV 8, 9, VI 17, XI 8, XVI 9

πλανάω, II 9, XV 6 n., XVI 1

πλάνη, II 10, IV 1 n., XII 10, XIV 5

πλάσις, VI 9 n., 13

πλεονεξία, X 4 n., XX 1

πληγή, V 12 n., VII 2

πληρης, II 5, XVI 7 n.

πλούσιος, I 2, 3 n., 7, XIX 2, XX 2

πνεῦμα, cix, I 2, 5, XII 2, XIX 7 n., XXI 9, τῷ πνεύματι, XIII 5, XIX 2 n.; ἐν πν., IX 7, X 2, 9, XI 11, XIV 2; πνεῦμα κυρίου, VI 14, IX 2, XIV 9; ἐκκεχυμένον, I 3; τὸ σκεῦος τοῦ πν., VII 3 n., XI 9 n.

πνευματικός, xcvi, IV 11 n., XVI 10 n.

ποδήρης, VII 9 n.

ποιέω, II 10, V 7 n., VI 1, VI 4, 11, 13, VII 7, IX 1, X 8, XI 2, XII 2, 5, 6, 7, XIII 5, XIV 3, XV 3, 8, XVI 1, 6 n., 7, XIX 12, XXI 1, 6 n.; ὁ ποι. ἀνθρώπων, V 5 n., VI 12, XVI 1, XIX 2, XX 2

ποιμήν, V 12 n.

πολεμέω, XII 2 n., XVI 4

πολυτελής, VI 2 n.

πονηρός, IV 2, 10, 12, VI 7, XIX 3, 11 n., XX 2 n.; ὁ πον. ἄγγ. π. ἀρχ. π., II 10 n., IV 13 n.; πον. ἡμέραι, II 1 n., VIII 6

πότε, VI 19, X 7, XII 1 n.

ποτίζω, VII 3 n., 5

πρεσβύτερος, XIII 5 n.

πρόγλωσσος, XIX 8 n.

προγράφω, XXI 1

προσάγω, I 7, II 9 n., XIII 4, 5

προσδέχομαι, X 9 n., XI 1 n., XIX 6

προσέχω, xxv, II 1 n., IV 6, 9, 14, VII 4, 6, 7, 9, XV 4, XVI 8, XX 2 n.

προσρήσω, III 6 n.

πρόσωπον, xxv, V 14, VI 9 n., XI 7,

XIII 4, XV 1, XIX 4 n., 7, 10

προφητεύω, V 6, IX 2, XVI 9 n.

προφήτης, xxvii, IV 4, VI 4, 6, 8, 10, 13, VII 4, IX 1, XI 2, 4, 6, 9, XII 1, 8, XIV 2, 7, 8, 9; ἐν τῷ π., VII 4, IX 1 n., XI 6 n., XII 1, 4; οἱ π., II 4, V 6, 11

πρώτος, VI 13 n., XIII 1

πυγμή, XII 2 n.

πύργος, XVI 5 n.

πῶς, V 10, VII 6, 7, 9 n., IX 1, XI 8, XII 11, XIV 4, 6, XV 8, XVI 1, 2, 8

ῥάντισμα, V 1 n.

ῥάπισμα, V 14 n.

ραχία, VII 8 n.

ράχος, VII 8 n.

ῤεβέκκα, XIII 2, 3

ῥέω, fluo, VI 10 n., 13

ῥέω, dico, VI 19, VII 9, IX 4, 6, X 1 n., XVI 1, XIX 8

ῥῆμα, III 5, X 11, XI 8, XVI 10 n.

ῥομφαία, V 13 n.

ῥύπος, VIII 6 n., XI 11

Σάββατον, II 5, XV 2, 3, 8 n.

σάρκινος, VI 14 n.

σάμψ, V 1, 6 n., 10, 11 n., 12 n., 13,

VI 3 *n.*, 7, 9, 15 *n.*, VII 5, 9, VIII 6,  
 IX 4, X 9, XII 10  
 Σατανᾶς, II 10 *n.*, XVIII 1  
 σεμίδαλις, II 5 *n.*  
 σημείον, IV 14 *n.*, V 8, XII 5 *n.*  
 Σινᾶ, XI 3 *n.*, XIV 2, XV 1  
 Σιών, VI 2  
 σκάνδαλον, XXXV, IV 3 *n.*, 9  
 σκεῦος, XXV, VII 3 *n.*, XI 9 *n.*, XXI 8 *n.*  
 σκληρός, IX 5 *n.*  
 σκληρύνω, IX 5 *n.*  
 σκότος, V 4, X 10, XIV 5 *n.*, 6, 7,  
 XVIII 1  
 σμύρανα, X 5 *n.*  
 σοφία, VI 10 *n.*, XVI 9, XXI 5  
 σπεύδω, XIX 1 *n.*  
 σπιθαμή, XVI 2 *n.*  
 σποδός, VII 5, VIII 1 *n.*  
 σταυρός, IX 8 *n.*, XI 1, 8, XII 1 *n.*, 2  
 σταυρύω, VII 3 *n.*, XII 1  
 στόμα, X 8 *n.*, XI 8, XVI 9 *n.*, 10,  
 XIX 8  
 στραγγαλιά, III 3 *n.*  
 συναλλάγμα, III 3 *n.*  
 συγγραφή, III 3 *n.*  
 σύνδεσμος, III 3 *n.*, 5  
 σύνεσις, II 3, X 1, XXI 5 *n.*  
 συνήμι, IV 6, 8, VI 5 *n.*, X 12, XII 10,  
 XIV 3  
 συντελέω, XII 1 *n.*, XV 3, 4, XVI 6  
 συντέμνω, IV 3 *n.*  
 συντριβή, VI 2 *n.*  
 Σύρος, IX 6 *n.*  
 συσπάω, XIX 9 *n.*  
 σφραγίς, IX 6 *n.*  
 σχίσμα, XIX 12 *n.*  
 σώζω, I 3, IV 1, V 10, VIII 6, XII 3,  
 XVI 10, XIX 10, XXI 9 *n.*  
 Ταλαίπωρος, XVI 1 *n.*  
 ταπεινός, XXXIV, III 1, 3, 5, IV 4, 5  
 ταπεινός, XIV 9 *n.*, XIX 6  
 τέκνα, xli, xliv, VII 1, IX 3, 7, XV 4,  
 XX 2, XXI 9 *n.*  
 τέλειος, XXXV, I 5 *n.*, IV 3 *n.*, II 1 *n.*,  
 V 11 *n.*, VIII 1, XIII 7  
 τελειώω, VI 19, XIV 5 *n.*  
 τέλος, I 6 *n.*, IV 6, X 5 *n.*, XIX 10  
 τέρας, IV 14 *n.*, V 8  
 τιθῆναι, V 14, VI 2, 3 *n.*, 10, VII 11,  
 IX 9, XII 2, 6, XIII 6, 7 *n.*, XIV 8  
 τράγος, VII 4, 6 *n.*, 10  
 τράχηλος, III 2, IX 5 *n.*

τρεῖς, I 6, IV 4, 5, VIII 4 *n.*, IX 7, X 1,  
 9, 10  
 τριακόσιοι, IX 8 *n.*  
 τρώγω, VII 8 *n.*, X 2, 3  
 τύπος, VI 11 *n.*, VII 3, 7, 11, VIII 1,  
 XII 2, 5 *n.*, 6, 10 *n.*, XIX 7 *n.*  
 "Ταῖνα, X 7 *n.*  
 ὕδωρ, XI 1 *n.*, 5, 6, 7, 8  
 υἱός, xli, I 1 *n.*, VI 12 *n.*, XII 8, 10 *n.*,  
 XIII 4, 5, XIX 5; υἱ. θεοῦ, IV 9, V  
 9 *n.*, VII 2, 9, XII 8, 9, 10, 11, XV  
 2, 5  
 ὑπεραγαπάω, V 8 *n.*  
 ὑπερευφραίνομαι, I 2 *n.*  
 ὑπέρτης, XXXI, XVI 4 *n.*  
 ὑπό, IV 4 *n.*, 5  
 ὑπομένω, V 1, 5, 6, 12, XIV 4 *n.*  
 ὑπομονή, II 2 *n.*, XX 2  
 ὕσσωπον, VIII 6 *n.*  
 ὕστερέω, X 3 *n.*  
 Φαγεῖν, VII 4 *n.*, X 1 *n.*, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11,  
 XI 10, 11  
 φανερώω, II 4, V 6, 9, VI 7, 9, 14, VII  
 3 *n.*, 7, XII 8, 10 *n.*, XIV 5, XV 9 *n.*,  
 XVI 5  
 φέρω, lxx, II 5, XII 1  
 φησίν, lxxxviii, VI 9 *n.*, VII 7, 11 *n.*,  
 X 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, XI 8, 11, XII 7  
 φθαρτός, XVI 7, XIX 8 *n.*  
 φόβος, XXV, II 2 *n.*, XI 11 *n.*, XIX 5, 7;  
 φ. τοῦ θεοῦ, IV 11 *n.*, XI 5 *n.*, XX 2  
 φονεύω, XIX 5 *n.*  
 φυλή, VIII 3 *n.*  
 φύσις, X 7 *n.*  
 Χαίρω, I 1 *n.*  
 χάρις, V 6, IX 8, XIV 9 *n.*, XXI 7, 9  
 χεῖρ, IV 7, 8, V 10, XII 2, 4, 9, XIII 5,  
 XIV 2, 3, 7, XV 3, 6 *n.*, XVI 7, XIX  
 5, 9, 10  
 χειροτονία, III 5 *n.*  
 χοῖρος, X 1 *n.*, 3, 10  
 χολή, lxxxix, VII 3 *n.*, 5  
 Χριστός, II 6, XII 10, 11  
 Ψυχή, I 4, III 1, 3, 5, IV 2, 6 *n.*, V 5,  
 13, VI 7, 11, XVII 1, XIX 5, 6, 8,  
 10, XX 1  
 ψυχικός, xcvi  
 ὦπτιον, IX 1