§1] ITS AUTHORSHIP. [inrropuction.   
   
 it is probable that he recognized the notion as Tertullian’s only. And   
 we may fairly assume that Philastrins (par. 65) and others refer to tho   
 same source, and that this view is destitute of any other external support   
 than that which it gets from the passage of Tertullian \*,   
 172. It must then, in common with the rest, stand or fall on internal   
 grounds. And in thus judging of it, we have two alternatives before   
 us. Either the extant Epistle of Barnabas is genuine, or it is not.   
 In the former case, the question is soon decided. So different are the   
 styles and characters of the two Epistles, so different also the view which   
 they take of the Jewish rites and ordinances, that it is quite impossible   
 to imagine them the work of the same writer. The Epistle of Barnabas   
 maintains that the ecremonial commands were even at first uttered not   
 in a literal but in a spiritual sense : finds childish allusions, e. ¢., in   
 Greek numerals, to spiritual truths : is in its whole diction and character   
 spiritless, and flat, and pointless. If any one imagines that the same   
 writer could have indited both, then we are clearly out of the limits of   
 ordinary reasoning and considerations of probability.   
 173. But we may take the other and more probable alternative ; that   
 the so-called Epistle of Barnabas is apocryphal. Judging then of Bar-   
 nabas from what we know in the Acts, many particulars certainly seem   
 to combine in favour of him. He was a Levite, not of Judea, but of   
 Cyprus (Acts iv. 36): he was intimately connected with St. Paul   
 during the early part of the missionary journeys of that Apostle (Acts   
 ix. 27, xy. 41), and in common with him was entrusted with the first   
 ministry to the Gentiles (Acts xi, 22 ffl, xv. 12, &e.; Gal. ii. 9, &e.):   
 he was called by the Apostles (Acts iv. 86) by a name which we have   
 scen reason to interpret ‘son of exhortation.’   
 174, These particulars are made the most of by Wiescler, as support-   
 ing what he considers the only certain tradition on the subject. But   
 as we have seen this tradition itself fail, so neither will these stand under   
 stricter examination, For Barnabas, though by birth a Cyprian, yet   
 dwelt apparently at Jerusalem (Acts ix. 27, xi, 22): and there, by the   
 context of the narrative, must the field have been situated, which he sold   
 to put its price into the common stock. Asa Levite, he must have been   
 thoronghly acquainted with the usages of the Jerusalem temple, which,   
 as before obseryed, our Writer does not appear to have been. It is quite   
 out of the question to suppose, as Wieseler does, that Barnabas, a Levite   
 who had dwelt at Jerusalem, would, during a subsequent ministration   
 in Egypt, have cited the usages of the temple at Leontopolis rather than   
 those at Jerusalem. If such usages have been cited, it must be by an   
 Egyptian Jew to whom Jerusalem was not familiar.   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
 4 It has been upheld in modern times by J. E. Chr.-Schmidt, Tx esten, Ullmann,   
 Thiersch, Wiescler. On the last of these, see below, var. 174.   
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