

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

limits the operation and influence of the Divine Spirit, and sees nothing here but a world lying in wickedness by the side of a lukewarm Church and a little flock of the spiritual; while he looks forward to a future, lurid with the flames of Divine vengeance, to be for ever exacted from the unrepentant mass of humanity, Clement on the other hand beholds God, everywhere and at all times, as the all-loving Father and Teacher of mankind, training them, often by severe discipline carried on, both in this world and the next, for eventual perfection. Faith, hope, and love are alike conspicuous in Clement, but the two latter graces have small place in the gloomy soul of Tertullian.

JOSEPH B. MAYOR.

(To be concluded.)

BARNABAS AND HIS GENUINE EPISTLE.

THE last few years have seen excellent work on the Epistle to the Hebrews, the great anonymous hortatory letter of the New Testament. But we have hardly reached anything like agreement on the subject. It remains wrapped in much mystery, like the Apocalypse of John. And largely for a similar reason, our failure to imagine a completely convincing historical situation to which the argument may be seen to be truly relevant. But the materials for such a fresh interpretation have been steadily accumulating, though the first effect of a perception of some hitherto neglected aspects of the situation implied has been to send certain scholars off on a wrong scent and lead to reactionary theories. Such is the theory that the Epistle was not addressed to Jewish Christians, but to certain believers in danger of apostasy from religion altogether; also the view, springing largely from the same minimizing of the working of old Judaic influences upon

those addressed, that its destination is to be sought as far from Palestine as Rome itself.

The Roman destination of Hebrews has recently been set forth by Rev. G. Milligan in an able paper,¹ in which he nevertheless combats what Westcott rightly calls the "ingenious paradox" that its readers were Gentiles. In this position, both positive and negative, he has since received support from Professor A. S. Peake,² support the more valuable because of his fine insight into the genius of his author's theology and the fairness of his statement of the case as a whole. Yet I am more persuaded than ever that their historical setting of the Epistle is incorrect, and detracts seriously from its true use as a primary source for knowledge of the Apostolic age. Indeed, Mr. Peake's frank recognition of the difficulties in fitting the Epistle's references to persecution into the known conditions of the Roman Church, and his consequent vacillation as between a date just before A.D. 64 and one under Domitian, tend strongly to make his reader suspect that he is here off the line altogether. Nor can one think he does well in summing up, on the question of authorship, in favour of Harnack's suggestion that Priscilla and Aquila were its joint authors. But in any case its plausibility is bound up with the Roman destination, itself most doubtful.

Some have come to regard the problems just alluded to as insoluble, and to acquiesce in negative results. But under such conditions the exegesis of the Epistle cannot but suffer, for want of a clear historical setting. Yet the data supplied by the Epistle itself are not really few, or even as vague as is sometimes supposed. They cohere with a great deal of external evidence of one kind and another. Accordingly there seems room for a fresh discussion of the questions of Authorship, Destination, Date, Occasion,

¹ *The Expositor*, Dec., 1901.

² *Hebrews in The Century Bible* (1902).

by the aid of the greater variety of "historic points of view" which study of this Epistle and of the Apostolic age in general has of late brought to light.

It may tend to clearness, to state our conclusions beforehand. They are these. The author of our Epistle was Barnabas, to whom it is assigned by the earliest confident witness of antiquity. Its destination was a group of churches on the Palestinian seaboard, of which Caesarea may be taken as type; its date about A.D. 61-62; its occasion the culmination of a number of influences which had been, for longer or shorter periods, depressing the Christian zeal and loyalty of certain Jewish believers in those regions. In arguing to these points we shall take them as far as possible in the order just outlined.

A. BARNABAS THE HELLENIST APOSTLE.

1. The Barnabas of the New Testament was a far greater man than the Barnabas of modern tradition. It is essential, then, that we break down the current prejudice which would bar his authorship of an Epistle like Hebrews on the ground that a cause must be adequate to the effect¹ assigned to it. In the New Testament he appears in the Acts and three of Paul's Epistles: and no single passage can be cited to prove that he was other than a great man, large in mind as well as in heart. That he was finally overshadowed by the commanding genius of "the Apostle" (as the Church came in the second century to style St. Paul), simply gives a comparative measure of the man, and one which in no way warrants a belittling estimate. For, after all, it was he who "discovered" his greater colleague,²

¹ Origen remarks that "the thoughts of the Epistle are admirable and not second to the acknowledged apostolical writings" (ap. Euseb. *Eccl. Hist.* vi. 25).

² He and Saul were probably old acquaintances. Some suggest they had met in Tarsus (whither a Cypriot Jew might have been drawn for study); but it is more likely that it was in the Holy City that the young Levite and the young

and helped him to gain that footing with the older Apostles which his own powers confirmed and increased; and further it was probably as the colleague of Barnabas, not *vice versâ*, that Paul continued to be thought of in old-fashioned Christian circles.

This means a good deal, and it is fully borne out by other things. The man who was sent down from the Apostolic circle in Jerusalem to judge of the new departure created by the striking beginnings of Antiochene Christianity, was far more than a good-hearted person. He must have enjoyed a reputation for ability and inspired insight second only to the leading apostles; and next, a point of great interest in the present connexion, he must have been regarded as one peculiarly fitted to deal with problems touching the relations of the old and the new in Judæo-Christianity. That is, apart from Stephen, with whom he had probably much affinity (of which more in the sequel), he was the leading Hellenistic Christian in the primitive Church. And in the opinion of that Church itself he stood on a far higher level of authority¹ than Stephen. It is instructive to contrast the relative dependence of Philip the Evangelist in his work in Samaria. No such sanction at the hands of any of the Twelve was needed to authenticate the Christianity sanctioned by Barnabas. Indeed, does not this episode of itself justify the title "Apostle" in a sense only slightly inferior to that in which it was used of the Twelve? His function in relation to Christianity in Antioch was exactly analogous to that of Peter and John in Samaria; and there is no act more essentially apostolic, known to us, than that of authenticating and confirming the beginnings of the Gospel in a fresh field. This is how

Rabbi became friends—perhaps in connexion with the synagogue frequented by "Cilicians" and other such Hellenists (Acts vi. 9).

¹ It was probably for this reason that he, so eminent for his love of the poor, was not chosen one of the Seven.

Acts seems to regard the matter, in referring to "the Apostles Barnabas and Paul" in South Galatia (xiv. 4, 14).

Paul not only confirms this, but carries us a step farther, in hinting at the fact that Barnabas had seen the risen Lord. He first equates his own apostolic rights with those of "the rest of the apostles and the brethren of the Lord and Cephas," and then brackets Barnabas (reference to whom is not demanded by the context) with himself (1 Cor. ix. 5 f.). But he has just defined "an apostle" as one who had "seen Jesus our Lord." And this, to judge from what seems the ascending series—apostles, brethren of the Lord, Cephas—was the current notion of apostleship even according to Palestinian usage. So much is implied by the high place given to the Lord's brethren,¹ and by the use of "Cephas" rather than Peter. Accordingly it appears most probable that Barnabas, whose kinswoman Mary had a house in Jerusalem, and who seems to have owned property himself in the neighbourhood (Acts iv. 37), had shared the vision of the risen Lord, recorded in Acts i. 6 ff., upon which apostolic status was held to rest.²

But if so, he was also an earlier disciple in some degree, like the young man of Mark xiv. 51 f., who was present at Christ's arrest and in whom most see the evangelist Mark himself. As such, he may have been among the friends of Jesus who beheld the crucifixion from afar (Luke xxiii. 49), and indeed may even have been directly cognizant of his Master's ex-

¹ This estimate, which had no ground in Christ's own teaching, and which was only Palestinian and temporary in its range, prepares us for the other fact, viz., that there does not seem to have been any hard and fast line drawn in the first generation between the Twelve and other apostles as defined by St. Paul.

² The view put forward here and in the next paragraph on internal evidence, is also supported by the tradition of the Ancient Church. Besides the evidence adduced below, p. 419, one may cite Chrysostom, *Hom.* xxix. on Acts; the author of *Prædestinatus*, who calls Barnabas "Christ's disciple" (c. 7); and the *Encomium* by Alexander Monachus (sixth century), who regards him as the chief of the Seventy.

periences during the last visit to Jerusalem.¹ Such a view would help to explain the extraordinary realism of the language used of Christ's temptations, particularly such as we connect with the Garden of Gethsemane, found in Hebrews v. 7 f.²—supposing that we are led to see in Barnabas its author. How possible all this becomes, once we get rid of our conventional notion of the Twelve as alone about the person of the Saviour as disciples, may be realized by asking ourselves a simple question: "Why should not the unnamed disciple who accompanied Cleopas on his memorable walk to Emmaus, have been Barnabas? There is good reason to believe that this man was no ordinary member of the Master's circle, since to him so singular a privilege was vouchsafed. In any case it is hard to believe that, with numerous eyewitnesses of the risen Lord, like Cleopas, Joseph Barsabbas,³ and many another, living and working in the primitive community, so commanding a place was conceded to a Cypriot Hellenist who had never seen the Messiah for himself, and so did not fall even within the wider circle of the apostles (1 Cor. xv. 7). On this, the common view, there is no proportion between the position of Barnabas in the early years of the Jerusalem Church and his assumed antecedents. We must remember that this Church laid stress on a man's

¹ If one may hazard a guess as to the source of Luke's supplementary knowledge touching all connected with the Passion, no one is more likely than Barnabas. Indeed it is most tempting to connect the tradition that Barnabas was one of the Seventy, with the reference to their mission in Luke's Gospel alone (ch. x.); and to infer that he was the Evangelist's authority for the whole special cycle of Christ's words and deeds in which it occurs (ix. 51-xviii. 14).

² "Who in the days of his flesh, having offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto Him that was able to save him from death, and having been heard for his godly fear, though he was a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered."

³ I conjecture that the surname "Barnabas" was given to Joseph the Cypriot to distinguish him from this Joseph, and that the very similarity of the surnames chosen was due in part to this circumstance. No doubt the name was already a current one; but the Apostles seem to have given it a more spiritual sense than its original etymology (Bar-Nebo) warrants.

objective connexion with its Messiah, rather than on subjective insight into the meaning of His teaching, such as was possessed by a Stephen. Nor is there any hint given that Barnabas won his standing by sheer gifts: we simply find him enjoying high consideration whenever he comes before us. This is most easily explained by supposing that he had had the fullest privileges of personal connexion with the Master which could belong to a disciple outside the inner circle of the Twelve. And for this supposition there is the amplest room.

Let any one consider these passages in Luke xxiv. "They reported to the Eleven and to all the rest" (v. 9); "two from among them," viz. from the apostolic circle (v. 13); "they found assembled together the Eleven and those with them"—the company to which the risen Jesus appears and gives the last commission reported in Luke's Gospel, saying "ye (are) witnesses of these things" (see verses 33, 36, 44, 48 f., 50 ff.). Let him put alongside these Acts i. 21 f., which refers to a body of men who had been in Christ's company more or less throughout His ministry; and the inference is inevitable. The disciple-circle was far larger than we are apt to imagine; and the same is already implied by Luke's account of the mission of the Seventy. It is, therefore, in the highest degree improbable that a man who held his knowledge of Christ and the Gospel at second-hand,¹ would rise almost at once into the position of leadership and authority which Barnabas evidently enjoyed.

How commanding Barnabas' place in Palestinian and Syrian Christianity really was, most fail to perceive, because

¹ It is very doubtful also whether Paul, who so insisted upon his own competence as a witness to the risen Christ, would have been satisfied to undertake his great pioneer mission as the colleague of one who could not help to "establish out of the mouth of two witnesses" the truth of what would seem to many of their hearers incredible. In choosing Silas as his next colleague, Paul may have had the same qualification in view; see Acts xv. 22, compared with i. 23.

they view it in the light of Paul's more brilliant career, as seen first through the Gentile Christianity of other regions, and then through the experience of Christian history as a whole. So viewed Barnabas' rôle was far less impressive. But look at it in the other way suggested, from the standpoint of the primitive Palestinian Church; and all is changed. It was Barnabas who rendered possible the earlier stages of Paul's career, with its growing brilliance; and that not only by his generous belief in the ex-persecutor, but by the weight of his own authority. No ordinary man could have availed to remove the cloud of suspicion hanging over the young Saul. Further, there is good reason to believe that it was Barnabas' great reputation alone which prevented criticism of the Gentile mission, as conducted by himself and Paul, from emerging sooner and in a more effective form at Jerusalem. Observe the significant order of the two names in Acts xv. 12, 25, which here as elsewhere proves its value as reflecting current and local conditions. Speaking in his own person, and as representing the feeling for Paul's leadership already established in Antioch, our author has just before referred twice to "Paul and Barnabas" (xv. 2). When, however, their relative authority in Jerusalem comes to be in question, we learn that men "hearkened unto Barnabas and Paul rehearsing what signs and wonders God had wrought among the Gentiles by them" (xv. 12); and again mention is made of "our beloved Barnabas and Paul, men that have hazarded their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ" (v. 25).

We are so accustomed to speak of "the Apostle of the Gentiles," as to forget that the older apostles and the Palestinian Church thought of "the Apostles to the Gentiles," according to Paul's own witness in Galatians ii. 9; "that we (I and Barnabas) should go unto the Gentiles, and they unto the Circumcision." Nor is there any evidence that they ever ceased to think of the two as

at least co-ordinate, if many did not to the end regard Barnabas as superior. And this was probably the perspective in which Judaeo-Christianity saw the matter throughout the Apostolic age, and in certain circles for long after. Nay, most Judaeo-Christians throughout Palestine must have viewed Barnabas as the greater and wiser man, in that he was more sensitive to what was due to Jewish feeling and traditions. This is implied in the difference of opinion as to a matter of expediency which occurred at Antioch. There Barnabas followed Peter's lead in thinking that Jewish feeling, rather than Gentile, should be considered, when the two clashed on the secondary matter (as they esteemed it, though wrongly, as Paul shows) of social equality as between Jewish and Gentile brethren in Christ. This shows the spirit in which Barnabas carried out his ministry, leaning towards recognition of the value of the traditional forms of Israel's religion, wherever the spiritual reality did not seem to be sacrificed. To him personally, as to Paul, the latter had become all in all: but the external forms had a symbolic or suggestive function, not yet formally superseded by any Divine command. And so he held a relatively positive attitude to them, which admitted of a somewhat opportunist policy, as at Antioch. What is not clear, is how far he accepted the lesson which came to him on this occasion through Paul's relentless logic. But the way is quite open for supposing that if he saw adequate reason to sacrifice the outer form, he would not shrink from so doing.

It is natural to think of Barnabas, the Hellenist Levite, as coming to the Gospel by a line of approach analogous to that followed by Paul himself. That is, each found the institutions of Mosaism inadequate to the inner satisfaction of their religious needs. Only, while the young Rabbi, Paul, wrought vainly at the obtaining of merit by "Works of the Law," the Levite Barnabas tried to find cleansing of conscience from the sense of defiling sin through the sacri-

ficial rites of Judaism. But in his case also, innerness of experience forced him to feel the lack of reality in the results attained. Thus to Barnabas the ineffective media for atonement and true communion proved the *paedagogus* to bring him to Christ, by the negative method of shutting him up to Him as condition of access to God. For the Mosaic ritual system had made him acutely conscious of a defiled conscience, but had proved unequal to its purification. It is clear that the attitude of one who so approached the Gospel, might, after his need was met by the reality yearned for, be quite other in relation to the preparatory institutions from that of Paul to the legal system. Such rites had been helpful as far as they went, viz., as symbols and shadows of the spiritual reality: they had not stimulated the latent "sin in the flesh" to seek to establish a self-righteousness. Barnabas had escaped that kind of bondage. Hence his attitude to the old could be kindlier than was Paul's, though he no less had outgrown it by deepening experience of the reality symbolized.

For such an attitude we have ample analogy in the Clementine literature, which, whatever ideas may be peculiar to it, assumes very similar views of sacrifices, "the Holy Place," and even baptisms for purification from sins (e.g. *Recogn.* i. 36-39), as common among Jewish Christians after A.D. 70. That Barnabas should long before that date have reached like results, along the line of the "Alexandrine" symbolic theology widely diffused in Hellenist circles, may surely be granted as probable. And indeed the fact that his name is introduced into this literature in a position second only to Peter's, may well be due to the fact that such was the type of doctrine with which he was associated in Judaeo-Christian tradition. And this holds even if it be not conceded, that the influence of the Epistle to the Hebrews can be traced in the Clementines, which would thus contain proof presumptive that the

Epistle itself came to the authors of this literature as the work of Barnabas.

2. Tradition outside the New Testament, beginning with Clement of Alexandria, who here almost certainly depends on an early Judæo-Christian source, makes Barnabas one of the Seventy, and indeed their leading member. The Clementine legend, in both forms, assumes that Barnabas was a personal disciple of Jesus the Prophet, a disciple second only to Peter as an authoritative exponent of the truth.¹ Further witness to the repute attaching to Barnabas before the older memories of apostles other than the Twelve and Paul died out, is afforded by the Gospel attributed to him. It was probably akin to the "Traditions" (*Paradosis*) of the Saviour's teaching attributed to Matthias, which Clement of Alexandria cites with respect: and both he and Hippolytus imply that Matthias was already appealed to by Basilides and his followers as an authority for teaching not found in our Gospels. Accordingly we may suppose that the "Gospel according to Barnabas," which is placed in later lists² of apocryphal writings next to what is there called the "Gospel according to Matthias," goes back to the first half of the second century at latest. If we may gather anything as to its character from what seems a version of one form which this Gospel assumed, namely the work entitled *Vero Evangelio di Jessu chiamato Christo, novo profeta, mandato da Dio al mundo, secundo la descrizione di Barnaba Apostolo suo*, it would seem to have proceeded from much the same Jewish Christian circle as the original Clementine legend. Further it will be noted that Barnabas is here called one of Christ's apostles, as is also the case in the

¹ *Strom.* ii. 20; *Hypotyposes*, vii. ap. Euseb. *H.E.* ii. 1; Eusebius *H.E.* i. 12, and others cited in Lipsius, *Apokr. Apostelgesch.* II. ii. 270.

² In the List of the Sixty Books it comes before Matthias in a class of "Teachings" (*Didaskaliæ*), but after Matthias in the *Decretum Gelasii*, which also implies that they were current in more than one recension.

sole Greek fragment¹ which survives as from his mouth : “ Barnabas the apostle said, ‘ In conflicts that are evil, more to be pitied is he who wins ; because he comes off with the balance of sin.’ ”

The general result of our study of Barnabas, the Hellenist Levite, is to show that he was just such a man as might have written the Epistle to Hebrews, if only there were enough positive evidence to connect it historically with his name. That he was reputed to be the author of an important writing, may perhaps be inferred from the fact that by the middle of the second century at any rate he was credited with the composition of the so-called “ Epistle of Barnabas,” which was certainly not his work. That his authorship of the Epistle to Hebrews was the reality of which this false ascription is the *simulacrum*, we hope to make plain in the sequel. But meantime we must anticipate one objection on the threshold, derived from the very apostolic status which we have endeavoured to prove that he enjoyed. It is often assumed that Hebrews ii. 3 could not have been written by a personal disciple and “ apostle ” of Jesus. Thus Mr. Peake writes, “ It is possible, though perhaps not probable, that Barnabas was not a hearer of Jesus ” ; as if a hearer of Jesus could not have written such words. But this is to read the passage too much in the light of the use made of it to disprove Paul’s authorship. It is fatal to that hypothesis, but for reasons peculiar to Paul’s history. Were it not that he had had to vindicate his apostleship in the face of alleged dependence on apostles who had “ known Christ after the flesh,” the objection would hardly have been raised. The passage is simply one of many instances in the Epistle in which the writer identifies himself with his

¹ Probably from his *Didaskalia* : see Grabe, *Spicilegium*, i. 302, Βαρνάβας ὁ ἀπόστολος ἔφη· ἐν ἀμίλλαις πονηραῖς ἀθλιώτερος ὁ νικήσας, διότι ἀπέρχεται πλέον ἔχων τῆς ἁμαρτίας. Clement of Alexandria also, besides calling Barnabas “ an apostolic man,” and “ one of the Seventy,” twice calls him “ the apostle.”

readers. This is altogether fitting in one penning a serious warning. If he does not except himself from its scope, he only enhances its force with his readers and conciliates their feelings. Thus having begun with "How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation," he is practically bound to finish with "which . . . was certified unto us (*εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐβεβαιώθη*) by them that heard"—this being true of his readers as a whole, among whom he rhetorically includes himself.

B. BARNABAS AND THE EPISTLE TO HEBREWS IN EARLY TRADITION.

The more the external evidence is examined and cross-examined, the clearer becomes the superiority of Barnabas' claims. For the earlier traditions connecting Hebrews with the name of Paul, do not amount to theories of direct authorship at all; while those naming Clement of Rome and Luke, are for the most part scholarly guesses meant to supply the missing link between the Epistle and Paul. They rest upon literary phenomena, starting from a comparison of the Epistle with writings with which it has obvious points of contact. There is perhaps one exception. Origen, who was then living at Caesarea, refers¹ to an existing story (*ιστορία*) to the effect that Clement of Rome himself wrote it. Here the fact that Clement of Alexandria speaks only of Luke as the literary link between Paul and the Epistle, tends to show that the tradition was Caesarean,² and not Alexandrine, and so less likely to be mere learned inference.

However this may be, there is nothing of the sort at all

¹ Quoted by Euseb. *Eccl. Hist.* vi. 25: ἡ δὲ εἰς ἡμᾶς φθίσασα ἱστορία ὑπὸ τινῶν μὲν λεγόντων ὅτι Κλήμης ὁ γενόμενος ἐπίσκοπος Ῥωμαίων ἔγραψε τὴν ἐπιστολήν, ὑπὸ τινῶν δὲ ὅτι Λουκᾶς ὁ γράψας τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον.

² We shall see later how such a tradition may be harmonized with Barnabas' real authorship. Another reading of Origen's meaning is possible, viz. that the account reached him in a written form, say in Irenaeus and Hippolytus (see note to p. 424). But Eusebius would hardly have failed to note the fact.

equal in confidence to Tertullian's witness, when he writes: "There is extant also a work of Barnabas entitled *To Hebrews*." He then goes on to refer to "Barnabas' Epistle" as "more generally accepted among the Churches" than the *Shepherd* of Hermas.¹ It is now widely recognized that Tertullian here speaks not as one putting forward a doubtful inference, but as appealing to what would be admitted as common to himself and those with whom he is remonstrating. But the matter will repay further consideration in relation to the area which Tertullian's view may be held to represent.

Zahn has recently argued² that it could not have been widely shared in the African Church, since in that case "it would be inconceivable that the Roman Church, from which the African received its sacred Scriptures, should, so far as we know, have then and for long been content to reject both the Pauline origin and the canonical rank of Hebrews without indicating another author. Again one sees from Tertullian's whole argument, confirmed by the witness of Cyprian's writings, that Hebrews had in Carthage had from of old no sort of relation to the New Testament." Accordingly he concludes that a MS. must have reached Tertullian from one of the Churches in which (according to Zahn) Hebrews ranked as Scripture, entitled "Barnabas' Letter to Hebrews." It can, he thinks, have come only from Asia Minor, the home of that Montanism which had caused Tertullian to pen such a work as his pamphlet *On Modesty*, indignantly protesting against the lax disciplinary policy of the Roman Church in particular.

But plausible as this is, as far as Zahn states it, it needs only to be thought out a little further, to refute itself. For

¹ *De Pudicitia*, 20: "Extat enim et Barnabae titulus ad Hebraeos, a deo satis auctorati viri, ut quem Paulus juxta se constituerit in abstinentiae tenore (1 Cor. ix. 6); et utique receptor apud ecclesias epistola Barnabae illo apocrypho Pastore mœchorum."

² *Einleitung in das N.T.*, Bd. ii. 116 f.

the essence of the passage is twofold. (1) It descends in so many words from the level of "the apostles" (i.e. the New Testament Scriptures as then conceived), to add the superfluous witness of a comrade of apostles,¹ for the sake of setting it over against the authority of the *Shepherd*, already believed by many to be the work of an apostolic man,² the Hermas saluted in Romans xvi. 14. And for such a purpose a work by Barnabas, an apostolic man, was just the thing. But (2) it was so, only supposing the Roman Church, against the policy of whose bishop Tertullian is protesting, was known to admit the authorship here assumed: else his argument loses all cogency. Hence we find in the passage exactly what Zahn excludes from it, namely proof that there was a strong tradition in Rome connecting Barnabas with our Epistle. Nor is that all. For we get in this very reminder of the incompatibility of the tone of the two works here contrasted (in the matter of restoration from mortal sin) the probable explanation of the Roman attitude to Hebrews, both in what is said and what is left unsaid.

Zahn misstates the plain facts, when he writes as if Tertullian implied that Hebrews ranked in certain churches as Holy Scripture. The whole tenor of the passage in question is to the opposite effect. But in any case, whereas Tertullian's own tendency now was to magnify Hebrews at the expense of the *Shepherd*, the tendency of the Roman Church, owing to its special attitude on discipline, was the reverse. It wanted to make as much of Hermas as it could, while it had an equally good reason for not emphasizing its original tradition touching the actual author of Hebrews.

¹ *Volo tamen ex redundantia alicujus etiam comitis apostolorum testimonium superducere.*

² Tertullian had once shared the general estimate of this work; see his *De Oratione*, 16, where he cites Hermas' book as one from which authoritative precedents *might* be drawn.

The silence of the Roman Church is really eloquent. If it knew the Epistle to be by a man of little weight, it was policy to name him. On the other hand, it is improbable that Hermas would refer in his own work to Clement, if he was then held to be author of Hebrews, the very work which his doctrine of repentance seemed to traverse.

Hence Roman tradition simply dwelt on the negative fact that the Epistle lacked the highest authority,¹ viz. that of Paul "the Apostle"—which would have made any maxim in it fully binding. Such an attitude explains the practice of Irenaeus, who used Hebrews in a few instances,² but not as Scripture, and of Hippolytus, who went further and denied its Pauline authorship.³ Zahn believes he was led to speak explicitly (where his master Irenaeus had been content to take the thing for granted) owing to the appeal to it as Paul's, and so holy Scripture, made by the heretical Theodotians of the closing years of the second century. These followers of Theodotus, the Roman banker, held, that "there was a certain power of the highest order, Melchisedek, and that He was greater than Christ; so that Christ, as they said, was after His image."⁴ It is obvious how easily they could twist Hebrews to their purpose; and this well explains how Hippolytus, whose views on discipline would make him honour Hebrews rather than the *Shepherd*, should yet be at pains to reassert the negative Roman tradition touching its origin.

¹ This is the inner meaning of the fact recorded by Eusebius, that "some have disallowed the Epistle to Hebrews on the ground that its Pauline authorship was controverted by the Roman Church" (*Ecl. Hist.* iii. 3).

² E.g. *Adv. Haer.* ii. 30 (*verbo virtutis suae*, cf. Heb. i. 3), iv. 11, v. 5; see also note on p. 421.

³ So says Stephen Gobar (c. A.D. 600), as cited by Photius, bibl. 232, and Photius himself in bibl. 121. Batiffol (*Revue biblique*, viii. 278 ff.) thinks that an obscure reference to the Roman Clement in Photius' context perhaps means that Hippolytus at least held him the author.

⁴ Hippolytus, *Ref. omn. haer.* vii. 36: *δύναμιν τινὰ τὸν Μελχισεδέκ εἶναι μεγίστην, καὶ τοῦτον εἶναι μείζονα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, οὐ κατ' εἰκόνα φάσκουσι τὸν Χριστὸν τυγχάνειν.*

But further, this view of the situation explains the attitude of the Muratorian Canon to both writings, which seems similar to that of Hippolytus. This catalogue of canonical books earnestly deprecates the idea that the *Shepherd* of Hermas could rank with "the Prophets" proper or "the Apostles." Hence it is anxious to show how recent it was in origin, i.e. after the Apostolic age altogether. On the other hand it passes over our Epistle in silence, as if it were notorious in Rome that it had no claim to be considered Pauline; while he mentions to dismiss the claims of an Epistle to the Laodiceans and one to the Alexandrians, to which the name of Paul was falsely attached. Both of these, as it seems, but certainly the latter, he describes as "forged with a view to Marcion's heresy," i.e. to dissociate Old and New Testament religion. This corresponds closely enough to an element in the so-called "Epistle of Barnabas," and suggests that it was current in certain limited circles, at least in the West, under Paul's name—which is quite likely in a writing originally anonymous. But the description does not suit Hebrews at all. On the whole, then, this witness too favours a Barnabas tradition in Rome, especially as some explicit reference was to be expected, if it was connected with the revered name of Clement—an attribution therefore to be held peculiar to the eastern Mediterranean, e.g. Caesarea, where Origen was living when he referred to it as an account current with some (though unknown to Clement in Alexandria).

The status of Hebrews in Rome about the end of the second century, was just such as would be natural on the assumption that it was believed to be by Barnabas. It needed no apology; it made no claim to be canonical, either on the ground of authorship by Paul (or other of those regarded in the West as "apostles" in the fullest sense)¹

¹ Had Roman tradition taught that it had been addressed to Rome, it is quite likely that this might have changed matters.

or as a "prophetic" writing, such as the partisans of the *Shepherd* claimed that it was. Hebrews stood just outside the canon, on the ambiguous border-land which was suffered to exist for a long time in Church usage. So Irenaeus is said¹ to have used it in the same way as he used the *Wisdom of Solomon*, which the Muratorian Canon recognizes as a work accepted in some high sense.² Thus the constructive evidence of Rome agrees with the explicit witness of Tertullian for North Africa, a witness in which he has later support in the Stichometry contained in the Codex Claromontanus. This reckons *Barnabae epistola* as having 850 lines, which comparative reckoning³ proves clearly to correspond to the length, not of the "Epistle of Barnabas," but of the Epistle to Hebrews. Again we have the evidence of the *Tractatus de Libris*, which definitely names Barnabas as author of Hebrews,⁴ and therein expresses the opinion of some part of the Latin Church, perhaps in the fourth century. Finally Philastrius, bishop of Brescia, writing about A.D. 380, observes that some say it is by Barnabas the Apostle, or Clement the bishop of Rome, or Luke. Thus he places Barnabas' authorship first, as if best supported by tradition, and himself makes no objection to it (*Haer.* 89).

To sum up the broad effect of our discussion so far. Barnabas was one of the greatest personages of the Apostolic

¹ Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* v. 26.

² The sense is a little ambiguous. *Wisdom*, Jude's Epistle, and "the pair bearing the name John," in *catholica habentur*—which may represent more than one Greek phrase, e.g. ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ (ἐκκλησίᾳ), or simply ἐν καθολικοῖς, masculine or neuter: cf. Eusebius' expression (iii. 3), οὐδ' ἄλλως ἐν καθολικοῖς ἴσμεν παραδεδομένα.

³ See e.g. Westcott, *Epistle to the Hebrews*, xxviii. f. Zahn is driven to dire straits when he calls this "one-sided emphasis" on the figures involved (which are confirmed by Nicephorus). Its witness is far more objective than his own reasoning, which it upsets. It is borne out also by the position of Hebrews in the Stichometry, viz. after the Catholic Epistles, and before the Revelation, Acts, and the *Shepherd*.

⁴ Compare an article by Batiffol in the *Revue biblique*, vol. viii, 278 ff.

age. The only names we can place before his are those of Peter, James, Paul—John, from the nature of his genius, coming to the front only after A.D. 70. Thus he satisfies one main requirement in the author of Hebrews. For, as Renan¹ says, “the single fact of addressing an epistle to a great Church indicates an important man, one of those personages who figure in the apostolic history, and whose name is celebrated.” May we not add that some knowledge of the great name in question would be needful to float an anonymous epistle into currency outside its original circle of readers? Further, “it may be conceived on this hypothesis how the Epistle has been attributed to Paul. It was, in fact, the lot of Barnabas always to be lost in some sense in the rays of the glory of the great Apostle; and if Barnabas composed some writing, as appears very probable [e.g., from the spurious *Epistle of Barnabas*], it is among the works of Paul that it is natural to seek the pages really from his pen.” In a word, “not one of the special features which the Epistle presents is opposed to such an hypothesis.” To justify this estimate more fully will be the task of a future paper.

VERNON BARTLET.

¹ Preface to *L'Antichrist*. This argument is enhanced when we notice how firmly he speaks to his readers of their shortcomings; see v. 11—vi. 8, x. 25 ff., xiii. 7 ff.