

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

of the two Simons. If, in fact, we identify them, it must remain an open question whether the family was predominantly Galilean or Judæan.

We have now taken a fairly complete survey of the evidence, and the reader may draw his own conclusions. To the present writer it appears fairly safe to identify Martha's sister with the Magdalene, and, if anything, slightly more probable that this Mary was the "sinner."

CUTHBERT LATTEY.

A FURTHER NOTE ON TESTIMONIES IN BARNABAS.

IN a recent discussion of certain obscure words in 1 Peter ii. 8, according to which it seemed at first sight as if those who stumbled at the Corner Stone and Rock of Offence did so by necessity and of Divine appointment, I tried to show from a parallel passage in the Epistle of Barnabas that there was a slight error in the text of Peter, and that it was the stone which was appointed of God, and not, in Peter's view, those who stumbled at it: and I do not doubt that there will be not a few reverent students of the New Testament who will say something of this emendation, which corresponds in theological language to the Shakesperean terms "for this relief, much thanks!"

In the course of the argument to which I refer it was shown that Barnabas was under the influence of one of those early collections of proof-texts from the Prophets which I call "Books of Testimonies," more exactly described in early times as *Testimonies* (or Quotations) *against the Jews*. This observation was quite independent of the question whether the text of 1 Peter ii. 8 ought to be emended or not. It was deduced from a coincidence (or at least an overlapping) between the argument of Barnabas and that which is

involved in Cyprian's *Testimonies against the Jews*. And if the argument is a valid one, it must clearly be carried further. The detection of the source employed by the Epistle of Barnabas, or of the method which he follows, must lead to results in the exegesis of that perplexing document, and in one case at least, as we shall show, to the rectification of its text.

Let us then, in the first instance, confirm the correctness of our observation, made by the juxtaposition of a passage in Barnabas with a sequence in Cyprian's *Testimonies*, by trying for parallels and coincidences in another quarter.

Suppose we turn to Hilgenfeld's edition of the Epistle of Barnabas, and examine the cases which he has collected of the employment of Barnabas by later writers. We shall find that he recognizes a number of loans from Barnabas in a book which is ascribed to Gregory of Nyssa, as follows ! "Gregorius Nyssenus in libello *ἐκλογαὶ πρὸς Ἰουδαίους* 7, 11, 12 tacite reddidit Barnabae ep. c. 12, p. 31, 1, 2, c. 9, p. 22, 13 sq., c. 2, p. 6, 14 sq. ; cf. quae adnotavi, pp. 74, 79, 113."

To the three cases here specified as instances of borrowing from Barnabas on the part of Nyssen, he adds in a note that Nyssen has also borrowed from Clement of Rome :

"Addo, Gregorium Nyssenum (l. l. c. 16, p. 322) etiam Clementis Rom. ep. 1, c. 53, p. 59, 1-3 usum scripsisse : *Μωϋσῆς· Εασόν με ἐξαλείψαι τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον, καὶ δώσω σοι ἔθνος μέγα καὶ πολὺ μᾶλλον τούτου.* Cf. Exod. xxxii. 31, 33."

Now concerning these supposed loans on the part of Nyssen from Barnabas and from Clement of Rome, it is sufficient to remark that the book is expressly called "Selections of Testimonies against the Jews" : with the single exception that Nyssen says he has added somewhat in regard to the doctrine of the Trinity ; and this statement is borne out by the structure of the book : thus in the passage where

the influence of Clement of Rome has been suggested, the sequence is as follows :

“ Of the Jews he says : ¹ You have profaned it.

“ *David* : Ask of me, and I will give thee the Gentiles for thy inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession.

“ *Moses* : Suffer me to wipe out this people, and I will give thee a nation, great, and much more than these.

“ *Esaias concerning the Jews* : Hear the word of the Lord, ye children of Sodom, etc.”

Evidently there is not the least reason to suppose that in making an argument of this kind against the Jews, the Epistle of Clement of Rome has any place. If any priority is to be claimed, it is for the document used by Nyssen, which must have been public property and a storehouse of quotations beyond any single writing of an apostolic father. Hilgenfeld is, then, wrong in his reference to Clement. If Clement varies from the current text of the LXX, and combines separate scriptures together, this would be only one more argument for the use of a Testimony book by him, and not conversely.

But if Hilgenfeld is wrong in his note on Clement, he is equally wrong in his three references to Barnabas on the part of Gregory of Nyssa. In order that the argument may be clear and decisive we will examine the passages in debate with some care.

Barnabas denounces the Jewish sacrifices as follows :²

“ To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices ? . . . for who hath required these things at your hands ? . . . your new moons and your sabbaths I cannot away with.”

Then he adds *de suo* : “ These things, then, he has done away (*κατήργησεν*) in order that the new law of our Lord

¹ Greg. Nyss., l.c., p. 322.

² Isa. i. 11-13.

Jesus Christ, which is without any yoke of necessity, might not have its offering a man-made thing."

Then he quotes again:¹ "Did I ever command your fathers when they came out of Egypt to offer to me? etc."

Now in this connexion observe that the quotation with which Barnabas begins is in Cyprian, *Test.* i. 16, and that the heading of the section in Cyprian is

Quod sacrificium vetus evacuaretur et novum celebraretur,
and that another section near by has the heading

Quod jugum vetus evacuaretur et jugum novum daretur.

Here, then, in the Cyprianic titles we have the motive for Barnabas's reference to *new law*, and *new yoke*, and to the *abolition* (*κατήργησεν*) of [the old law and yoke. Clearly Barnabas is using the Testimony book.

The passage which he quotes from Jeremiah appears in Nyssen in the following form :

"*Esaias.* Did I ever command your fathers? etc.," and again, "To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices? etc."

Here the false reference to Isaiah in the first quotation is an anticipation of the quotation which is to follow : and the displacement of the title is one more proof that Nyssen is working, as he affirms, from a book of Testimonies. There is, therefore, no reason whatever for the supposition that Nyssen is quoting from Barnabas, when both he and Barnabas are seen to be quoting independently from collections of prophecies.

Now let us turn to the passage from Barnabas (c. 9) in which the writer denounces circumcision. Barnabas begins by saying :

"But the very circumcision on which they trust has been done away (*κατήργηται*) : for he said that there should be

¹ Jer. vii, 22, 23.

brought about a circumcision which is not of the flesh . . . and he says to them : Thus saith the Lord your God (so I find it commanded), do not sow among thorns, be circumcised to your Lord ”¹ : and what is it that he says ? “ Be circumcised in your hard hearts, and do not any more stiffen your neck.”² Take another passage : “ Behold ! thus saith the Lord, all the Gentiles are uncircumcised in their bodies, but this people are uncircumcised in heart.”³ But you will say, “ Yes, but the people of God was circumcised for a seal.” “ Truly : but so is every Syrian and Arab and all the idol priests, but they do not on that account come within the covenant, etc.”

Now does that look like the use of a Testimony book ? First, we notice that Cyprian (*Testim.* i. 7) has a special section to show that circumcision is abolished. The title of the section is

Quod circumcisio prima carnalis evacuata est et secunda spiritalis repromissa est.

Compare this with Barnabas’s introductory remarks, and the priority of the Cyprianic matter is evident. Cyprian begins his bunch of quotations as follows :

“ *In the prophet Jeremiah* : Thus saith the Lord to the men of Judah and to those who inhabit Jerusalem : *renovate inter vos novitatem*, and sow not amongst thorns : circumcise ye to the Lord your God, and circumcise the foreskin of your heart, etc.”

That is, Cyprian begins with the very same quotation as Barnabas.

But what of Nyssen ? He, too, has a section on circumcision. After some preliminary matter on the new covenant, he says :

“ In reproof of the Jews he says : All the Gentiles are uncircumcised in flesh, but this people in heart. And again :

¹ Jer. iv. 3.

² Deut. x 16.

³ Jer. ix. 25.

Be circumcised in your heart and not in your flesh. And again : *Νεώσατε ἑαυτοῖς νεώματα*, and do not sow among thorns, but circumcise the hard part of your heart.”

Then follows an argument as in Cyprian and Justin and elsewhere about the just men who were never circumcised, etc.

Now, why should we say here that Nyssen is quoting Barnabas ? he is nearer to Cyprian than to Barnabas in some points : he is ostensibly quoting testimonies, and what he is doing, ostensibly, we have shown that Barnabas is also doing, obscurely. There is not the least need to forge a link between Barnabas and Nyssen in order to explain the phenomena.

Our third instance is a curious passage in which Barnabas maintains that the Christ is not the son of David, but his Lord. It runs as follows :

“ Since they are for saying that the Christ is son of David, David himself prophesies, in fear and knowing well the error of the sinful men : ¹ The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit on my right hand, till I make thy foes thy footstool.” And again Esaias speaks on this wise : ² “ The Lord [said to the Christ my Lord, whose right hand I have taken hold of, for the nations to obey before thee, and I will break up the power of kings. See how David calls him Lord, and he does not call him son.”

If we examine the sequence here, we see that the argument of the first quotation is broken by the second one. Barnabas has copied too far from his book of extracts and has to turn back to pick up the thread of his argument. But that the passage from Isaiah was before him may be seen by referring to Cyprian on the one hand, and to Gregory of Nyssa on the other. For the passage from Isaiah is one of Cyprian's proof texts that the Jews are to be dis-

¹ Ps. cix. 1.

² Isa. xlv. 1.

placed by the Gentiles (*Testim.* i. 21—*Sic dicit Dominus Deus Christo meo domino : cujus tenui dextram, ut exaudiant eum gentes : fortitudinem regum dirumpam, etc.*), and the two passages from the Psalms and Isaiah occur together in Nyssen in the following intimate nexus (p. 324) :

“Whereas David says : The Lord said unto my lord, Sit on my right hand, etc., Esaias puts it more clearly, The Lord said unto my Christ Cyrus. But they affirm this to be spoken of Cyrus, king of the Persians : ridiculous ! how can that agree with the rest of the passage, I have holden thy right hand, etc. ?”

We now see how Barnabas was carried too far in his quotation : the two passages were closely linked in the Testimony book. Nyssen does not take his extracts from Barnabas, but from an earlier and more archaic source.

These instances, then, will suffice to show that Barnabas is constantly running on the lines of the old anti-Judaic propaganda. His anti-Judaism is not original with him : it is only accentuated. Almost all the fathers are trained on the same model : but we shall not rightly understand either them or him, either their texts or the interpretations of them, unless we are thoroughly familiar with the making and propagation of these little books of early Christian doctrine.

Now let us apply the foregoing investigation to a special passage.

The thirteenth chapter of Barnabas is taken up with the doctrine of the Two Peoples : it corresponds to a section in Cyprian (*Testim.* i. 19), whose heading is as follows :

Quod duo populi prædicti sint, major et minor, id est, vetus Judæorum et novus qui esset ex nobis futurus.

Cyprian begins with the story of Rebecca and her approaching twin-birth, and the doctrine that the elder shall serve the younger. So does Barnabas, who expands the

theme. When Barnabas has satisfactorily shown that the Gentiles are the heirs of the covenant and its promises, he concludes the section with the following obscure passage : which we must give in the Greek :

εἰ οὖν ἔτι καὶ διὰ τοῦ Ἀβραάμ ἐμνήσθη, ἀπέχομεν τὸ τέλειον τῆς γνώσεως ἡμῶν. τί οὖν λέγει τῷ Ἀβραάμ, ὅτε μόνος πιστεύσας ἐτέθη εἰς δικαιοσύνην ; Ἰδοὺ τέθεικά σε, Ἀβραάμ, πατέρα ἔθνῶν τῶν πιστευόντων δι' ἀκροβυστίας τῷ θεῷ.

As we have said, there is something obscure about this : it runs as follows, " Our argument and our teaching will be complete if we can show that by Abraham mention was made." Clearly something has dropped here, and a reference to what follows shows that the Gentiles have disappeared, the new people about whom he is arguing, for Abraham is the father of the faithful Gentiles. Suppose, then, we restore *ἔθνη* before *ἐμνήσθη*. Now let us look at the critical apparatus. *Three MSS. of secondary rank read ἔθνήσθη!* The genesis of the error is now obvious : the eye of an early scribe wandered from **ΕΘΝΗ** to **ΕΜΝΗ**, and thus an impossible reading arose. This has been corrected by the first-rank MSS. and versions by removing a faulty letter, but without restoring the dropped letters. Amongst these first-rank MSS. is the Codex Sinaiticus. The later MSS. are actually nearer to the truth, at all events ; by this time we have got the right text if we get it out of secondary MSS. on the one hand, and, on the other hand, out of a consideration of what the early book of Testimonies was trying to prove. The argument now is that " our doctrine will be complete [as regards the supremacy of the Gentiles], if we can show that Gentiles are mentioned by Abraham. Does not the Scripture say, ' I have made thee a father to Gentiles ' who believe, even though they lack the outward sign of the covenant of promise ? "

J. RENDEL HARRIS.