

with its goods. Even then indeed there are many faithful ones in her midst. As in the Jewish Church there was a "remnant according to the election of grace," so in her there are never wanting those who listen to the Saviour's voice and follow Him. But they are not the Church as a whole; and, as in the days of the Saviour's flesh, they must eventually come out of her that they may follow Him whithersoever He goeth. It is the same sad story indeed which has marked all the previous Dispensations of the Almighty with his people in this world, and which will continue to be acted out until the Second Coming of the Lord. It is the same picture which is afterwards presented to us in this Book of Revelation, when the bride allying herself with the world becomes a harlot, and the Seer hears "another voice out of heaven saying, Come forth, my people, out of her, that ye may have no fellowship with her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues" (Chap. xviii. 4).

W. MILLIGAN.

WAS BARNABAS IGNORANT OF JEWISH
RITUAL?

IF the authorship of the Epistle of Barnabas were to be decided by external evidence alone, it must be assigned to Joseph of Cyprus, to whom the Apostles gave the name of Barnabas.

Clement of Alexandria, writing towards the close of the second century, more than once unhesitatingly attributes it to him; and this testimony is unanimously confirmed by later Fathers.¹

¹ It is true that Tertullian throws a *primâ facie* doubt on the identity of the Epistle by his passing allusion to the Epistle to the Hebrews as "The Epistle

The internal evidence, on the other hand, is commonly considered to be adverse to the external, and to outweigh it. But Dr. Milligan, in his able essay upon the Epistle in Dr. Smith's Dictionary of Christian Biography, has disposed of all the stock objections to the authenticity, except that he allows serious weight to the argument founded upon "the numerous mistakes committed by the writer in Chapters vii. viii. with regard to the rites and ceremonies of Judaism; mistakes (he says) to all appearance inconsistent with the idea that he could be a Jew, a Levite, who had lived long in Jerusalem, and must have been acquainted with the ceremonial institutions of the Jews."

Now, if all that has been urged against the Epistle on this score were true, no one could well be justified in persisting in ascribing its authorship to Barnabas; but seeing that some of the weightiest of the allegations made are contrary to the facts, it appears to the present writer to be worth reconsidering whether the author was ignorant of the Jewish ritual of the first century; and, if he was, whether his ignorance was greater than would have been probable with Barnabas.

Barnabas' knowledge of the Jewish rites must have been derived from three sources; from personal observation, from the Holy Scriptures, and from Tradition; and we know nothing of him which should lead us to expect that the knowledge so derived would be complete or infallible.

He was a native of Cyprus, and on some five occasions only do we find him at Jerusalem. We do not read of

of Barnabas," but as there are traces in his writings of an acquaintance with the latter epistle, his confusion of names must be taken as a mere slip of memory, and one for which the many points of resemblance between the two epistles readily account. The opinion of "most people," mentioned by Jerome (Epist. ad Dardanum), was, so far as it depended on external authority, only an echo of what Origen had said (Eus. H. E. vi. 25) combined with this slip of Tertullian's.

him, as of Apollos, that he was mighty in the Scriptures; nor are we told that, like his great coadjutor, he had ever sat at the feet of one of the learned Rabbis. The confident assumption of the Jews (John vii. 15), that our Lord had had no means of learning letters, shews that schools where the traditions of the Elders might be learnt could not have been common even in Palestine, much less are they likely to have existed in Cyprus.¹

To test the accuracy of Barnabas we have the Bible and the Mishna. But the Law was only the skeleton, as it were, overlaid with the flesh and blood of customs and traditions; and though the Mishna is probably identical, as far as it goes, with the traditions of the first Christian century, it does not profess to exhaust them. According to Maimonides,² Moses brought down from Mount Sinai, not only the written Law, but also its explanation, the oral Law, which he had equally learnt from the mouth of God. This oral law, Deuterosis or Mishna, was handed down orally from Prophet to Prophet, and from Rabbi to Rabbi, until about the end of the second Christian century, when it was first committed to writing by Rabbi Judah.

By this time, a century and a quarter after the destruction of the Temple, many details of the rites connected with that Temple must have fallen out of mind, and as, according to the Rabbis, the Deuterosis was given orally in order that it might not fall into the hands of the Gentiles, so it is probable that Rabbi Judah in the same spirit would intentionally refrain from committing to writing anything which he might think would afford a handle to the Christians in their controversies with the Jews.

Thus it is fair to conclude that an eyewitness of the

¹ According to Joseph Simon, "L'Instruction des Enfants chez les anciens Juifs d'après le Bible et le Talmud," p. 29, schools were not general in Palestine before the destruction of Jerusalem.

² See "Le Talmud," by L'Abbé L. Chiarini, p. 3 and seq.

Jewish rites must have seen much that is neither in the Scriptures nor the Mishna; and, accordingly, the statements of the author of the Epistle must not be deemed inaccurate whenever unsupported by existing authorities, but only where irreconcilable with them.

With this understanding let us proceed to put Barnabas to the question.

In the seventh chapter of his Epistle, after saying that the Son of God when fixed to the cross had gall and vinegar given to him, he continues:—

“Hear how the priests of the temple had given a visible representation of this. The commandment having been written, the Lord commanded, ‘Whosoever shall not fast the fast shall be destroyed with death,’

[Lev. xxiii. 29, 30,]

since even He Himself was about to offer the vessel of the Spirit as an offering for our sins, in order that the type which was made when Isaac was offered upon the altar might be fulfilled.

What then says He in the prophet?

[Sc. the prophet Moses, *i.e.* in the Law and the Deuteronomy. It is absurd to postulate, as is commonly done, an apocryphal prophet whose book has disappeared, when all that Barnabas says may be traced to the written and oral Law of the Jewish prophet.]

Does He say, ‘And let them eat of the goat which is offered in the fast for all sins’? No, on the contrary, mark carefully, He says, ‘And let all the priests alone eat the unwashed inwards with vinegar.’¹ Why? Seeing

¹ As in order to make the meaning clear, I have here added some words which are not in the original, I subjoin the Greek. *Τί οὖν λέγει ἐν τῷ προφήτῃ; ‘Καὶ φαγέτωσαν ἀπὸ τοῦ τράγου τοῦ προσφερομένου τῇ νηστείᾳ ὑπὲρ πασῶν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν; Προσέχετε ἀκριβῶς. Καὶ φαγέτωσαν οἱ ἱερεῖς μόνοι πάντες τὸ ἔντερον ἀπλυτον μετὰ ὄξους.* The punctuation is that of Hilgenfeld, which is undoubtedly correct, as the context requires it; though strange to say, in a note on the passage, he understands the words, “And let them eat of the goat which is offered in the fast for all sins,” as an erroneous assertion, instead of, as it really is, an inter-

that to me who am to offer the sacrifice of my flesh for the sins of my new people, ye will give gall with vinegar to drink, eat ye

[who now offer sacrifices for the sins of the people]

alone while the people fast and mourn in sackcloth and ashes.

Dr. Donaldson¹ treats all that is here said as a mistake on the part of Barnabas. He says that no one was allowed to eat on the Day of Atonement, neither priests nor people, and that in Leviticus xvi. 27 we are told that every part of the goat was burned; no portions were excepted. He takes no note, and I incline to think rightly, of the explanation first, I believe, offered by Dr. Fell in 1685, that Barnabas here had in view neither of the pair of goats of Leviticus xvi. 5, but the third goat of Numbers xxix. 11, mentioned also by Josephus (*Ant.* iii. 10, 3), where he says: "On the tenth day of the same lunar month (the seventh) they fast till the evening; and this day they sacrifice a bull, and two rams and seven lambs, and a kid of the goats for sin. And besides these they bring two kids of the goats, the one of which is sent alive out of the limits of the camp into the wilderness," etc. That this third goat was invariably eaten is undeniable; for the Mishna (*Menach.* xi. 7) provides that, even when the Atonement Day fell on a Friday, the goat offered for sin was eaten in the evening. And that the priests alone ate follows from Numbers xviii. 9, 10 (*comp.* Lev. x. 16, 17). This explanation (if the true one) rescues Barnabas from inaccuracy, rogatory suggestion only made for the sake of emphasizing the contradiction of it contained in the next sentence, a very common oratorical artifice. Barnabas' antitype, as will be seen by what follows, is Jesus offering as a priest the sacrifice of his flesh on the cross, and tasting gall and vinegar, while his new people for whom the offering was made still fasted, their salvation being not yet fully earned. Clearly, therefore, he cannot mean to say that the type of this was that the Jewish people were ordered to eat the goat, while their priests ate its inwards.

¹ "Hist. of Christian Lit. and Dogm.," vol. i. p. 206.

except that thus he makes the priests eat this goat, *while* the people fast; whereas, in reality, they did not eat it until the coming of the evening closed the fast for both priests and people. So slight an inaccuracy, for the sake of bringing the type and antitype into closer correspondence, might well have been intentional, and would almost be justifiable, seeing that in the eye of the writer, who is taking the goat as the type of Christ's body, the people, who never partook of the goat, never ended their fast at all.

The only, but to my mind fatal, objection to the explanation is that what struck Barnabas was the fact that as Christ tasted gall and vinegar, so before his time the priests on the Day of Atonement used to eat gall and vinegar. Taking, as he did, the gall to be animal-gall, if he found an ordinance, or a custom for which he would of course postulate an ordinance, that the priests were to partake of the inwards of an animal with vinegar, the resemblance is striking enough. But Dr. Fell's explanation reduces the point to this, that the priests were to eat a goat, which must include its inwards, which must include its gall.

The true explanation probably is that Barnabas meant the companion of the scape-goat. Of this goat, Leviticus xvi. 25, orders the burning of the fat, and (Verse 27) the burning of the skin, the flesh and the dung. The inwards are omitted. Elsewhere, where burnt offerings are mentioned (see Lev. iii. 14-16 and iv. 8-11), in addition to fat, skin, flesh, and dung, certain inwards are particularized. I will not say that the omission was intentional on the part of the writer of Leviticus, but no one who has read a word of the Talmud could doubt that the Rabbis would hold it to be so, and lay down the law accordingly. If, then, the inwards were not to be burned,¹ they must have been eaten

¹ To prevent misconception, I ought perhaps to notice that Yoma vi. 7 does provide for the burning of (according to the German translation) "what must be burnt upon the altar," where M. Schwab in his French translation of the Talmud substitutes "les entrailles" for the indefinite expression of the German.

by the priests in accordance with Numbers xviii. 9, 10. It is true that as the blood of this goat was brought into the Tabernacle of the Congregation to reconcile the holy place, to eat it was contrary to Leviticus vi. 30 (comp. x. 18); but the Rabbis continually allowed general rules to be overridden on the authority of special inferences; for instance, the Law enacted that no layman should eat of the offerings, and if one did so unwittingly he should pay a certain forfeit (Lev. xxii. 10, 14), but the Rabbis held that the layman who ate the grains of corn raw was not liable to the penalty, because that was not the usual way of eating them.¹ Adopting the same principle, we may assume that in the case of the forbidden goat, the priests might eat "unwashed" the inwards which were usually washed. (Comp. Lev. i. 9, 13; viii. 21; ix. 14.)

Thus we find that there is no disagreement between what Barnabas says, and what we know of the ceremonies of the Atonement-Day; for the inwards of the goat shared amongst several thousand priests (Barnabas says "all") could be eaten during the fast by virtue of the exception implied in Yoma viii. 2²: "Whoever eats as much as is equal in quantity to a full-sized date together with its stone, or who drinks so much as would fill a small measure, is guilty."

For the vinegar I know of no authority outside Barnabas. The rule just quoted would, however, allow any drink to be taken during the fast in a minute quantity; and some things might be drunk in any quantity, for Yoma viii. 3 says: "If any one has eaten food which is not usually (sonst) proper

אימוריהן the reading of my copy of the Talmud I take to be a misprint for איבוריהן literally "their pieces," *i. e.* the extremities, the kidneys, the fat, and the lobe of the liver (Josephus, l. c.). It is plain that the part which Barnabas' antitype shews him to have had in his mind when he used the term *ἔντροπον*, is not included.

¹ Talmud Hieros. Gemara to Troumoth vi. 1.

² My quotations from the Mishna are taken from Rabe's German translation.

for food, or drunk what one does not usually (sonst) drink, for example, fish-broth, or fish-brine, he is free." Many of the traditional rules were mere evasory mitigations of the inconvenient strictness of the Law; and it is more than probable that the priests¹ rendered the fast endurable by the use of some unusual potion to which Barnabas could give the name of vinegar.² Assuming that the existence of such a custom was known to Rabbi Judah in 190 A.D., at which time we know that the Epistle of Barnabas was in high repute among Christians, and may be sure that it was well-known to the Jews with whom they disputed, is it likely that the Rabbi would record a tradition otherwise of little interest, if he thereby furnished the adversaries of his religion with a weapon to be used against it?

Barnabas then continues :

"Mark the things which He commanded, in order that he might shew that it behoved Him to suffer for them. 'Take two goats beautiful and similar, and bring them forward, and let the priest take the one for the whole burnt offering for sins.' And what shall they do with the other? 'Accursed'

[ἐπικατάρατος, Barnabas' translation of לעזאזל for Azazel]

says He 'is the other?'

Mark how the type of Jesus is visibly represented. 'And spit on it all of you, and prick, and lay the purple wool around its head, and thus let it be cast out into the desert.'

And when this has been done, the man who takes away the goat brings it into the desert, and takes off the wool and places it upon a shrub which is called Rachia.

For the ceremonies connected with the two goats on the Day of Atonement, see generally Leviticus xvi. Dr.

¹ In this connexion it is perhaps worthy of notice, that in certain other fasts there were relaxations in favour of priests. See Taanith ii. 6.

² Possibly the "vinegar of the oblation," to drink which was held in an analogous case not to incur a penalty, because it was not usually drunk. See Talmud Hieros. Gemara to Troumoth vi. 1.

Donaldson asserts that nothing is said in the Bible, or the Talmud, about the similarity of the goats, or of the spitting upon and pricking of the scape-goat. In reality their likeness is expressly required by Yoma vi. 1: "Of the two goats at the Atonement Festival it is commanded that they should be like one another in appearance, in height, in value, and in time of buying."

Their beauty may be inferred from the law of Leviticus xxii. 20: "But whatsoever hath a blemish that shall ye not offer," etc.

Although too the Mishna does not specify spitting or pricking, in Yoma vi. 4, we read: "They had made a raised way for it (the scape-goat) to go, on account of the Babylonians who else would pluck it by the hairs," etc. The Gemarists explain "Babylonians" as equivalent to "Alexandrians": it was no doubt used contemptuously of the non-Palestinian Jews generally. Barnabas assumes that the practice of his brother-Hellenists, although forbidden by the Palestinian Jews, was enjoined by tradition; and he was led to specify the particular forms of violence and insult which he names by a recollection of the incidents recorded in Matthew xxvi. 67, xxvii. 30; John xix. 34, and perhaps Matthew xxvii. 29. The purple wool we find in Yoma iv. 2: "Next bound he the purple wool on the head of the goat which they were sending forth."

Now we come to the shrub called "Rachia." According to the Mishna,¹ when the man who led the goat came to the crag over which he meant to thrust it, he divided the purple wool, placed part of it on the crag, and tied the rest to the horns of the goat. Of the half tied to the goat Barnabas makes no use, but speaks only of the wool laid on the Rachia. Here we have the only certain discrepancy between Barnabas and the Tradition, the former mentioning a shrub, the latter a crag.

¹ Yoma vi. 6.

The explanation is simple. The name of the shrub varies in the different MSS. $\rho\alpha\chi\eta\lambda$ is the reading of Cod. Sinaiticus (4th century); $\rho\alpha\chi\iota\lambda$ of Vaticanus (11th century), Ottobonianus (14th century), Casanatensis (15th century), and MS. Barberinum copied about 1650 from a MS. in the Library of St. Silvester in the Quirinal. Codex Hierosolymitanus (11th century) reads $\rho\alpha\chi\eta$; and the Latin interpreter preserved in the Cod. Corbiensis of the 9th century has *rubus*. These readings are in truth only two, $\rho\alpha\chi\eta$ and $\rho\alpha\chi\eta\lambda$ or $\rho\alpha\chi\iota\lambda$; the two last, differing only by an itacism, are really the same. Consequently the weight of evidence is altogether in favour of $\rho\alpha\chi\eta\lambda$ or $\rho\alpha\chi\iota\lambda$, or written in uncial PAXHA or PAXIA: besides the omission of Λ to make sense is more probable than its insertion which makes nonsense. As there is no Hebrew or Aramaic word at all like Rachel or Rachil which could have been meant here by Barnabas, we must find it in Greek. And as the Greek word could not have ended with the letter Λ , this letter must be a clerical error for the almost identical Λ . We thus get PAXHA¹ or PAXIA, the latter of which is evidently the word required, being a literal translation of the $\rho\alpha\chi$ (crag) of the Mishna. Barnabas, then, it appears, uses the very word $\rho\alpha\chi\iota\alpha$ which some brother-Hellenist had used in telling him what was done with the purple wool; but, in his desire to use the thorn as a type, he either intentionally, or by accident, erroneously took it for the name of some kind of thorn-plant akin to $\rho\acute{\alpha}\chi\omicron\varsigma$ and $\rho\acute{\alpha}\chi\eta$.²

¹ Codex \aleph is full of itacisms, and not least so in the Epistle of Barnabas, and although I believe this $\rho\alpha\chi\eta\alpha$ supplies the only instance in this part of the MS. of the change of ι into η , I may point to $\chi\rho\eta\sigma\tau\iota\alpha\omicron\varsigma$ in Acts xi. 26, xxvi. 28, and 1 Peter iv. 16. See Scrivener's Collation, p. lii.

² The final Λ of PAXIA may have had a mark over it standing for final \aleph . If not, Barnabas' solecism in writing $\rho\alpha\chi\iota\alpha$ for $\rho\alpha\chi\iota\alpha\upsilon$ goes some way towards accounting for the clerical error of the scribe of \aleph or to be more accurate of the person dictating to him, for the middle stroke of the Λ having become indistinct [there is more than one instance of this in the twenty-five lines of \aleph of which Scrivener gives a facsimile] PAXIA would not remind him of PAXIAN and he probably took it for a Hebrew word. The reading of Hierosolymitanus is

That Barnabas should not have been preserved by personal knowledge from this slip is not wonderful, since from Yoma vi. 4, 5. it appears that the man who took the goat reached the fatal precipice alone, and that his last companion stopped short at a distance explained by Rabe to be about a mile. The chances would be literally a million to one against Barnabas' having ever been the man selected to lead off the goat, and no one else would have been near enough to distinguish whether the wool was laid on the ground or on a bush.

We have now examined all that Barnabas says about the Day of Atonement. About the red heifer of Numbers xix. he writes thus :

“Of what now do ye think it was a type that it was commanded to Israel that the men in whom sins were complete should bring a heifer and slay and burn her, and that then children should take the ash and cast it into vessels, and put the purple wool round upon wood— behold again the type of the cross and the purple wool— and the hyssop, and that thus the children should sprinkle the people one at a time that they might be purified from their sins ? ”

Then a little further on he adds :

“And why are there three children who sprinkle ? ”

The Mishna says nothing about the persons who brought the heifer to the priest. Numbers xix. 2 says that “the children of Israel” were to bring the red heifer, nothing being said about cleanness ; and, comparing this with Verses 9 and 18, where cleanness is expressly required, an inference arises that at least cleanness was not *essential* in those who brought the heifer. In the quotations from the Rabbis in

derived from the reading of \aleph by simply dropping the Λ in order to obtain a Greek word which like the rubus of the Latin translation correctly represented the meaning which Barnabas' context shews him to have attached to *Rachia*. In the next line Barnabas uses $\beta\alpha\chi\omicron\varsigma$, instead of $\beta\alpha\chi\iota\alpha$, dropping what he had treated as the specific name of a particular kind of $\beta\acute{\alpha}\chi\omicron\varsigma$ for its generic name.

the Siphri on Numbers xix. 2, the heifer is called "the heifer which is offered in uncleanness," and "the heifer whose offerers are unclean." This is all which we now find for or against what Barnabas says about them, unless the enigmatical statement of Parah iii. 7, that the Elders of Israel defile the priest who is about to burn the heifer, by, as Rabe explains, laying their hands upon him, is to the point.

What Barnabas says about the children is in thorough accordance with the Mishna.

Numbers xix. 18, 19 enjoins that the sprinkling must be done by a clean person.

To secure the required cleanness, most singular precautions were taken. Children were set apart literally from their mothers' wombs.¹ Under the Forecourts of the Temple, between them and the rock, a space was hollowed to prevent the contamination of any dead body which might lie buried there being communicated from the ground to the Courts. Into these Courts pregnant women were brought, who there bore their sons and reared them, until, as Rabe explains, they were eight years old.² After they were old enough, they were seated on doors laid on the backs of oxen; and, riding thus, they went to the brook Siloah, drew water, and returned to the Temple-hill, where, at the door of the Forecourt, were placed vessels containing the ashes of the red heifers. Then a goat was brought, a stick was tied between its horns, and a branch with twigs was attached to the stick. The stick was dipped into the ashes, the goat was made to spring backwards, and so draw out the stick and the branch, which the first child then took, and shook off the ash into the water, until

¹ Parah iii. 2 et seq.

² Dr. Donaldson accurately states that the Talmud excepts from taking part in the sprinkling boys who have not reached the age of intelligence. See Parah xii. 10, "Children who have no understanding," *i.e.* under eight years.

a film of ash lay on the top of the water when it was considered ready for use. After this the children sprinkled one another.

Here the Mishna turns away to say how, as far as possible, on the seven days of the priest's separation previous to the sacrifice of a red heifer, he should on each day be sprinkled with the ashes of a different heifer, a part of the ashes of each of those previously offered having been kept, and it makes the strange statement that this offering had only taken place on nine occasions inclusive of an offering made by Moses.

The description of what the children do is not again resumed, so that we do not come to where, according to Barnabas, they sprinkle the people. But there can be no reasonable doubt that they did it. If a man who had touched a dead body failed to purify himself, he was to die. (Num. xix. 13). The sprinkling, if done by an unclean person, was inoperative. No one could tell whether he was himself clean, much less could he answer for his neighbour; since we see that even if a man walked over a bridge and the ground on which the piers stood held a dead body, he became unclean. It is impossible to suppose that many would be willing to run the risk of death by receiving the sprinkling at the hands of a doubtfully clean neighbour, when there were these children, whose whole lives were devoted to avoiding possible pollution through any indirect contact with a dead body, the hollow under their dwelling protecting them when at home, and the doors on which they sat shutting off any risk when they went abroad.¹

¹ Another reason for preferring the services of persons whose special duty it was, would be the likelihood that any one else would through ignorance or forgetfulness infringe one of the many minute rules laid down for obtaining and preparing the sprinkling-water, and the non-observance of any one of which would render the whole thing futile. The assumption of the seventh-century Targum on the Pentateuch commonly named after Jonathan Ben Uzziel that the person by whom the sprinkling was done was to be a priest, is opposed to

Barnabas mentions wood, red wool, and hyssop. The passage which I have quoted from the Mishna names a stick and a branch with twigs. That the branch was hyssop follows from Numbers xix. 18 (comp. Exod. xii. 22; Lev. xiv. 4, 51, and Ps. li. 7). That the wool was also present appears from Parah iii. 11, where we find that the red wool was used to tie the hyssop to the wood.

The number of the children is now alone left. As the children's preparation for their office lasted eight years, it follows from the chances of mortality that the number must have varied from time to time. All we need say, therefore, is that, in Barnabas' time, the number happened to be three.

Another objection of a somewhat similar kind urged against the authenticity of the Epistle is, that "the writer allegorizes on the number of Abraham's servants, as if the Old Testament had been written in Greek. The Greek letters being used for numbers, he finds in 318 the name of Jesus and an intimation of the Cross, a piece of gnosis which he could scarcely have perpetrated had he not been so much accustomed to the Scriptures in Greek as to have forgotten that Hebrew letters had been originally used in indicating the number." But Barnabas was a Hellenist; and, if he did ignore the original language of the Scriptures, he did no more than Philo, who, commenting on Genesis i. 8, says: *Εἰτ' αὐτὸν εὐθέως οὐρανὸν εὐθυβόλως καὶ πάνυ κυρίως προσεῖπεν, ἥτοι διότι πάντων ὄρος ἦν ἤδη ἢ ὅτι πρῶτος τῶν ὀρατῶν ἐγένετο*. Barnabas, however, need not have meant more than that there was a latent reference in the numbers to Jesus and his cross, which was made manifest

the indefinite expression of the Bible and of the Targum of Onkelos, and is contradicted by the Siphri, while the Mishna says more than once that any one (*i.e.*, any one who was clean) could do it except a woman, an infant, and one other exception. And even women could and did take part in the ceremony so far as to bring forward the vessels containing the ashes for mixing with the water.

when, according to the predestination of God, the Scriptures were translated into Greek.¹

The result of our enquiry is that the writer's use of Tradition, attributing it to Moses, and making no distinction between its authority and that of the written Law, proves him to have been a Jew.

His so-called blunder, through the use of the Greek Scriptures, proves him to have been a Hellenist, as does his adoption, as we have seen, of the Hellenist tradition against that of the Palestinian Jews in regard to their treatment of the scape-goat. The minuteness of his acquaintance with Jewish ritual, coupled with the error about the meaning of *πάχια*, which could not have been made by any one whose knowledge had been acquired in the schools, proves him to have been one who, before the destruction of the Temple, must have been an eyewitness of its ceremonies and picked up his information on the spot.

Accordingly, this branch of the internal evidence distinctly corroborates the external testimony, that the writer of the Epistle was Barnabas of Cyprus, the companion of Paul.

JAMES C. MARSHALL.

BRIEF NOTICES.

THE PROPHETS OF ISRAEL, by *Dr. W. Robertson Smith* (Edinburgh: A. & C. Black), is a sequel to the volume of Lectures he published last year under the title *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, and carries down his review of the history of Israel to the close of the eighth century B.C. It is a singularly valuable contribution to popular Biblical literature, and even scholars will read it with

¹ Any one acquainted with Philo, Justin Martyr, and Origen, will understand that even by men of keen intellect, such a piece of gnosis would be deemed deep striking and true, and will be disposed to pardon the exultation with which Barnabas proclaims it.