

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

“unction from the Holy One,” the Spirit that dwelleth in them, and shall be in them. Every qualification, in short, of the ancient priesthood, although in its fulfilled and accomplished form, is spoken of in the New Testament as marking, not only the Saviour Himself, but also the members of His body. Whether they have a priestly work to do as well as a priestly character to bear we shall see hereafter. In the meantime it is enough to say that, as we cannot separate the idea of priesthood from the Vine, so neither can we separate from the branches the privilege, the responsibility, and the duty which the term implies.

W. MILLIGAN.

THE PAULINE ANTILEGOMENA.

It is not proposed here to dispute what may be considered the opinion now general in England, that the so-called Epistle to the Hebrews on the one hand is not the actual work of the Apostle Paul, on the other that it was written by some one who had felt his influence strongly. In all this there is nothing arbitrary, nothing that is not supported by something in either the internal or the external evidence. But when it is attempted—sometimes when the attempt is abandoned—to determine who the actual author was, certain tacit assumptions are usually made, which do appear to be arbitrary, and which, as we shall find, certain minute phenomena appear to contradict. If we can eliminate these arbitrary assumptions, it will bring us a step nearer to right views about the Epistle, even though the result, as to its authorship, be no more than negative. These arbitrary assumptions, indeed, are not required by those who keep closest to the traditional belief. Those who regard the Epistle as written under St. Paul’s actual direction have real evidence in their favour—external evidence, in the fact

that the Church of Alexandria, and perhaps others, very early accepted it without question as his, and internal evidence in the similarity of the last chapter in its arrangement to the conclusion of St. Paul's acknowledged Epistles—especially to his habit of adding an autograph postscript to what was "written," in at least the mechanical sense, by some one else. Again, while the tradition of the Egyptian Church ascribed the Epistle to St. Paul, there was a Western tradition, probably as old, ascribing it to St. Barnabas. The fact that learning and biblical criticism were earlier developed in Alexandria than in the West, does not make the tradition received by Clement more trustworthy than that received by Tertullian; and criticism, when it came, if it did not support the Western tradition, did more to refute the Alexandrian than it.

We have therefore nothing to say against any one who, refusing to admit that the Epistle is virtually anonymous, regards it either as composed by St. Barnabas, or as proceeding from St. Paul, though he allowed more freedom in composition than usual to the secretary employed for the actual writing. But we desire to point out, that it is only on one or other of these two hypotheses, that we have any conclusive reason to believe that the author was a personal associate of the Apostle; and that it is only on the former hypothesis, that we have any reason at all to believe that he was one of his associates known to us by name, or by more than name. It is possible that the Pauline impress on the thoughts of the writer had come to him only at second hand, or only through the study of written works; or, even admitting that he knew the Apostle personally, he may have only known him towards the close of his life, after the period covered by the Acts of the Apostles.

And there is one fact that seems to give probability to one or other of these possibilities; opinions will differ which. The vocabulary of the Epistle has not much in

common with that of St. Paul generally; there is hardly anything but the comp. adv. *περισσοτέρως*, and the use of *νῦν* or *νυνὶ* in the sense of "actually," "as things are." But it has a quite appreciable amount in common with that group of the writings bearing St. Paul's name which is undoubtedly the latest in date, and of which the genuineness is most fairly open to question—the three Pastoral Epistles.

In the first place, we have the following words common to Hebrews and the Pastoral Epistles, but found nowhere else in the N.T.

<i>Ἀπόλαυσις</i> : 1 Tim. vi. 17 ;	Heb. xi. 25.
<i>ἀφιλάργυρος</i> : 1 Tim. iii. 3 ;	Heb. xiii. 5.
<i>βέβηλος</i> : 1 Tim. i. 9, iv. 7, vi. 20 ; 2 Tim. ii. 16 ;	Heb. xii. 16.
<i>ἐκτρέπεσθαι</i> : 1 Tim. i. 6, v. 15, vi. 20 ; ¹ 2 Tim. iv. 4 ;	Heb. xii. 13.
<i>ὄνειδισμός</i> : ² 1 Tim. iii. 7 ;	Heb. x. 33, xi. 26, xiii. 13.
<i>ἠρέγεσθαι</i> : ³ 1 Tim. iii. 1, vi. 10 ;	Heb. xi. 16.
<i>πρόδηλος</i> : ⁴ 1 Tim. v. 24 ;	Heb. vii. 14.

Γυμνάζειν is found in 1 Timothy iv. 7 ; Hebrews v. 14, xii. 11 ; but this is also found in 2 Peter ii. 14, and so is not *absolutely* peculiar to these two among N.T. authors. It is however worth remembering, that whensoever or by whomsoever that Epistle was written, it was written by one who had studied St. Paul's Epistles. The same writer has four times the otherwise exclusively Pauline word *ἐπίγνωσις* : but the fuller phrase *ἐπίγνωσις (τῆς) ἀληθείας* is found only in 1 Timothy ii. 4 ; 2 Timothy ii. 25, iii. 7 ; Titus i. 1, and Hebrews x. 26. Again, *ἐμπροσθεῖν* is not a very rare word in the N.T. ; but it is always used either in a physical or in a consciously parabolic sense, except in 1 Timothy iii. 6, 7, vi. 9, and Hebrews x. 31.

¹ Here only c. acc.

² Also in Rom. xv. 4 ; but that, being a quotation from the LXX., cannot be cited as another Pauline instance.

³ We have however *δρεξις* in Rom. i. 27.

⁴ It may be doubted if the word has exactly the same meaning in the two places ; the prep. has a distinctive force in 1 Timothy which it is hard to recognise in Hebrews.

But the evidence of vocabulary does not end here. Another phrase peculiar, at least in its exact shade of meaning, to these two groups of writings is found, with slight modification, in another. We have *δι' ἣν αἰτίαν* used as virtually equivalent to *διὸ* in 2 Timothy i. 6; Titus i. 13, and in Hebrews ii. 11. The same words occur in Luke viii. 47; Acts xxii. 24; but there the sense is what we should express in English by "for *what* cause," not "for *which* cause." In Acts x. 21, xxiii. 28, we have *ἡ αἰτία* (*τὴν αἰτίαν*) *δι' ἣν*, and in xxviii. 20 *διὰ ταύτην τὴν αἰτίαν*: and these phrases are virtually equivalent to the one under discussion, except as far as in xxiii. 28 (as perhaps in xxii. 24) the sense of "charge" mingles with that of "cause."

Here then we find an affinity in the language of Hebrews not only with the Pastorals, but with the writings commonly ascribed to St. Paul's companion St. Luke. We cannot trace further the likeness in the use of *αἰτία*. Where SS. Matthew, Mark, and John have the word in their accounts of the "charge" against our Lord, St. Luke has thrice the neuter form *αἴτιον* (xxiii. 4, 14, 22); in Acts he once again (xix. 40) uses that form; and once (xxv. 7) *αἰτίωμα*; and he never, like Hebrews (v. 9) has the personal form *αἴτιος*. But we shall find that words or phrases common to Hebrews with St. Luke are somewhat more numerous than those common with the Pastorals; while some few are common to all three. Of the last we have—

<i>μεταλαμβάνειν</i> ; Acts ii. 46 (xxiv. 25 c. acc.), xxvii. 33-4.	2 Tim. ii. 6.	Heb. vi. 7, xii. 10.
<i>παρατείσθαι</i> : Luke xiv. 18 <i>bis</i> -19; Acts xxv. 11.	1 Tim. iv. 7, v. 11; 2 Tim. ii. 23; Tit. iii. 10.	Heb. xii. 19, 25, <i>bis</i> .
<i>τυγχάνειν</i> c. gen.; Luke xx. 35; Acts xxiv. 3, xxvi. 22, xxvii. 3.	2 Tim. ii. 10.	Heb. viii. 6, xi. 35.
<i>χάριον ἔχειν</i> ; Luke xvii. 9.	1 Tim. i. 12; 2 Tim. i. 3.	Heb. xii. 28.

There is no sufficient reason for doubting the meaning in the last passage to be the same as in the others.

But if we now leave the Pastoral Epistles out of sight, and note the words or phrases which Hebrews has in common with St. Luke only, we find that while some of them are purely verbal—while some seem almost too plainly accidental to be worth noticing—others on the contrary have some theological significance. Of purely verbal coincidences we have—

<i>ἀναδέχσθαι</i> : Acts xxviii. 7 ;	Heb. xi. 17.
<i>ἀναθεωρεῖν</i> : Acts xvii. 23 ;	Heb. xiii. 7.
<i>ἀπογράφσθαι</i> : Luke ii. 1, 3, 5 (<i>ἀπογραφή</i> , <i>ibid.</i> 2, Acts v. 37) ;	Heb. xii. 23.
<i>ἀσάλευτος</i> : Acts xxvii. 41 ;	Heb. xii. 28.
<i>διαβαίνειν</i> : Luke xvi. 26 ; Acts xvi. 9 ;	Heb. xi. 29.
<i>ἔντρομος</i> : Acts vii. 32 ; xvi. 29 ;	Heb. xii. 21.
<i>ἦχος</i> : Luke iv. 37, xxi. 25 ¹ (true text) ; Acts ii. 2 ;	Heb. xii. 19. ¹
<i>καταφεύγειν</i> : Acts xiv. 6 ;	Heb. vi. 18.
<i>παροικεῖν</i> : ² Luke xxiv. 18 ;	Heb. xi. 9.
<i>παροξυσμός</i> : Acts xv. 39 ; ³	Heb. x. 24. ³
<i>ὑπαρξίς</i> ; Acts ii. 45 ;	Heb. x. 34.

We may add *προσφάτως* in Acts xviii. 2 and *πρόσφατος* in Hebrews x. 20, and perhaps *εἰσάγειν*, which is found once in John xviii. 16, but three times in Luke, six in Acts, and nowhere else in the N.T. but Hebrews i. 6 ; also *κυκλοῦσθαι* of cities in Luke xxi. 20 ; Hebrews xi. 30 (the act. in Acts xiv. 20, and in John x. 24, has a person for object ; in Revelation xx. 9 read *ἐκύκλευσαν*) ; *προσδέχσθαι*, with abstract obj. in the sense of "accept," perhaps in Acts xxiv. 15, and certainly in Hebrews x. 34. Clearer cases than these last are *ἀποθνήσκειν*, "to be dying," in Luke viii. 42 ; Hebrews xi. 21 (cf. vii. 8) ; contrast John iv. 47, *ἡμελλεν*

¹ The word is differently declined in these two places.

² But *πάροικος* in Eph. ii. 19 ; 1 Pet. ii. 11, and *παροικία*, 1 Pet. i. 17, as well as Acts vii. 6, 29 and xiii. 17.

³ The word has not really different senses in these places ; its use in the latter is a conscious oxymoron.

ἀποθνήσκειν; *λαμβάνειν*, of "receiving" an *office* in Luke xix. 12, 15; Acts i. 20 (from LXX.), xx. 24; Hebrews vii. 5; perhaps also Acts xxvi. 10; Hebrews v. 4. *Μάστιξ*, common in the sense of "plague," is used literally only in Acts xxii. 24; Hebrews xi. 36; *περικεῖσθαι*, with an acc. only in Acts xxviii. 20; Hebrews v. 2. For the common *ἐν εἰρήνῃ* or *εἰς εἰρήνῃν*, we have *μετ' εἰρήνης* in Acts xv. 33; Hebrews xi. 31, and *εἰς τὸ παντελές* in Luke xiii. 11; Hebrews vii. 25.

Last of all purely verbal coincidences, we may notice three that seem to refute an otherwise tempting theory. The arrangement of the last chapter is so like St. Paul's manner of concluding an Epistle, that it must have occurred to almost every one to ask if this may possibly be his in a fuller sense than the rest; and an attentive reader, if not a minute critic, might fancy that *vv.* 22–25 were from the Apostle's own hand. But just in these few verses we get two or three words or phrases which are not Pauline, but are Lucan: *τὸν λόγον τῆς παρακλήσεως* (cf. Acts xiii. 15), *ἐπέστειλα* (Acts xv. 20, xxi. 25 ?); we may add *ἀπολευμένον* as non-Pauline, though all the Gospels have it in common with St. Luke in the sense of "releasing" a prisoner, and all but St. John in the more general sense of "dismissal."

This gives a warning to those who need it, how necessary it is not to be content with vague impressions of likeness or unlikeness of style, but to supplement them by minute analysis of language. And yet it is not less necessary to remember that the words actually found in a short writing do not exhaust the vocabulary that its author had available for use, that *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα* are to a great extent a matter of accident, and especially in so small a body of literature as the N.T. The significance of the above lists cannot be estimated without weighing as well as counting the words contained in them; it may prove something of community of thought or language if two writers use a word like

ἀπόλαυσις or *βέβηλος*, but hardly if they use so simple a word as *διαβαίνειν*. Still, it is hard to say what coincidences may not be significant. Thus in the use of *ἔντρομος* in Acts vii. 32; Hebrews xii. 21, certainly is so; and it has the same significance that "the Red Sea" is only mentioned in the N.T. in Acts vii. 36; Hebrews xi. 29. The O.T. is treated on the same method in St. Stephen's speech and in Hebrews, whether we say that Paul had learnt from Stephen and the author of Hebrews from Paul, or are content to say only that the authors of Acts and of Hebrews belong to the same school. The same significance attaches to the use of *πατριάρχης* in Acts ii. 29, vii. 8, 9; Hebrews vii. 4. Thus the most instructive coincidences will be those which on the one hand are definitely formal or verbal, but which on the other are plainly traceable to some mental habit or theological tendency. Now there are many things of this kind to connect Hebrews with St. Luke; but we may begin with a word connecting it rather with St. Paul, which will serve to illustrate the range both of accident and of really significant coincidence in the use of words.

The use of *μετέχειν* and *μέτοχος* in Hebrews ii. 14, iii. 1, 14, v. 13, vi. 4, vii. 13, xii. 8, is certainly characteristic of that Epistle. We ought indeed to include i. 9; for that, though derived from the LXX., gives an instance of the way that the author takes a keynote from an O.T. passage, and pursues the theme at length with original variations. Now *μετέχειν* is found in no other N.T. writer except St. Paul; he has it five times, but *all in two successive chapters of one Epistle* (1 Cor. ix. 10, 12, x. 17, 21, 30). He has once (2 Cor. vi. 14) the abstract subst. *μετοχή*, and *συμμέτοχος* twice in Ephesians: but *μέτοχος* is found nowhere in the N.T. out of Hebrews, except in Luke v. 7, where it has only a secular sense. But the almost synonymous words, *κοινωνός*, *-νεῖν*, *-νία*, run through nearly all the N.T. writers. We get them thrice in Hebrews (ii. 14, x. 33, xiii. 16);

the relatively greater frequency of $\mu\epsilon\tau$. in that Epistle is really the only result of our analysis.

Thus cautioned against attaching undue importance to mere coincidences of phrase, we proceed to examine the theological language of St. Luke and of Hebrews. We find that $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\chi\epsilon\iota\nu$ is used absolutely (*i.e.* without an acc.) eleven times in the first Epistle of St. Peter. Of these passages three (ii. 21, 23, iv. 1a;—in iii. 18 read $\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\theta\alpha\nu\epsilon\nu$, but the T.R. shows what scribes or editors felt to be St. Peter's manner) refer to the sufferings of Christ, and six (ii. 19, 20, iii. 14, 17, iv. 19, v. 10) to those of Christians; one (iv. 1b) indirectly to the former, and one (iv. 15) to the latter. St. Paul has the use three times only (1 Cor. xii. 26; Phil. i. 29; 2 Thess. i. 5); in two places, and perhaps by implication in the third, it refers to the sufferings of Christians, but never of Christ. But in Luke xxii. 15, xxiv. 46 (here $\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega\varsigma$ is joined with the verb; cf. Matt. xvii. 12), Acts i. 3, xvii. 3, it is always of "the Passion"; and so Hebrews ii. 18, ix. 26, xiii. 12, not to count v. 8, where the phrase is proverbial and the object in some sort expressed.

The phrase with which the Epistle to the Hebrews opens, in which Divine revelations are described as "God speaking," occurs again in v. 5, xii. 25. We have it twice in the Evangelical Canticles (Luke i. 55, 70), four times in Acts (iii. 21, vii. 6, 44,¹ xxviii. 25), and only once (John ix. 29) in the whole N.T. besides.

$\text{\textit{Ἀρχηγός}}$ is used twice in Acts, twice in Hebrews, always of Christ: three times *c. gen.* (Acts iii. 15; Heb. ii. 10, xii. 2), once (Acts v. 31) absolutely, but coupled with $\sigma\omega\tau\eta\rho\alpha$, making the parallel to Hebrews ii. 10 ($\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\eta\gamma\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \sigma\omega\tau\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$) almost closer than if it had been formal.

¹ It may be questioned whether here $\acute{\omicron}\ \lambda\alpha\lambda\acute{\omega}\nu\ \tau\acute{\omicron}\ \text{\textit{Μωυση}}$ is conceived as $\acute{\omicron}\ \Theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ or as $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\ \text{\textit{Κυρίου}}$. If we extend our view to cases where $\lambda\alpha\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ is similarly used, but without "God" being directly the subject, the use will still appear characteristic of Hebrews and St. Luke, though St. John will furnish more parallels to $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu\ \eta\mu\acute{\iota}\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \text{\textit{Τίφ}}$.

Αύτρωσις is found only in Luke i. 68, ii. 38; Hebrews ix. 12. Both writers have *ἀπολύτρωσις* (Luke xxi. 28; Heb. ix. 15, xi. 35) in common with St. Paul: but it seems that in St. Luke, not in Hebrews, the distinction holds good between the words which St. Chrysostom sees (*In Rom. Hom.* xiv. [xv.], *ad* viii. 23); the first applying to what Christ has done, the second to what He yet has to do for His people.

The interest in the Jewish priesthood, and insistence in the sacrifice of Christ, common to St. Luke and Hebrews, might explain their being the only N.T. writings where we meet with *ἱερατεία*, the common biblical word for "priesthood" (Luke i. 9; Heb. vii. 5). Here there is, indeed, an element of accident: for Hebrews prefers the (more classical) *ἱερωσύνη* (vii. 11, 12, [14?] 24), and St. Peter, who has the cognate *ἱεράτευμα* (1. ii. 5, 9), might have used *ἱερατεία*: still the fact is worth notice. *Ἀνάμνησις* has a sacrificial meaning in Hebrews x. 3; some would say that it has in Luke xxii. 19 and the parallel 1 Corinthians xi. 24-5. If not, it would no doubt be a mere accident that these three are the only instances of the word in the N.T. *Ἡγούμενος* is used substantivally of "a ruler," almost always of *spiritual* office, in Luke xxii. 26; Acts vii. 10, perhaps xiv. 12, xv. 22, and in Hebrews xiii. 7, 17, 24. These however can hardly be said to be the *only* N.T. instances; for Matthew ii. 6, though a quotation, is not from the LXX.

In view of these resemblances of thought and language, the suggestion has found favour since Origen's time, that St. Luke may have written the Epistle to the Hebrews, whether under St. Paul's direction or otherwise. And as he, in view of 2 Timothy iv. 11, is the only person who can have been associated with St. Paul in the composition of the three Pastoral Epistles, it may be said that the coincidences with these strengthen the probability of this conjecture. And so it might, were it possible to believe that,

in personal utterances such as these Epistles appear to be, the Apostle should leave to a secretary anything beyond the mere mechanical act of writing. But apart from subjective prejudices like these, we can hardly believe that the Third Gospel, the Acts, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, all proceeded from one author. Every one knows that they are the most classical in style, the ablest as mere literary compositions, of the New Testament writings. On the other hand, both authors have too good taste, or too sound spiritual judgment, to allow themselves that affectation of classicalism which in Josephus, perhaps even in Philo, is felt constantly as a *tour de force* unworthy of a serious thinker or writer, sometimes as a sacrifice of religious sincerity to literary elegance. And we have seen that they agree in some more subtle or less obvious peculiarities, both of language and of thought. Yet the similarity between either the thought or the language of the two stops very far short of identity. In mere vocabulary, the difference is immense. The words, not merely *de facto* peculiar to Hebrews, but characteristic of its manner and method, outnumber those common to it with St. Luke; and St. Luke has words peculiar to himself, more numerous absolutely, though less so in proportion to the length of his writings, than those in Hebrews.¹

¹ Statistics are inadequate to measure the truth of a statement like this, but in a rough way they correspond with it. It may therefore be worth while to say, that Dr. Thayer's lists, in his appendix to Grimm's Lexicon of the N.T., give from 750 to 851 words as peculiar to St. Luke, from 158 to 168 as peculiar to Hebrews; the Third Gospel and Acts together being about 7 or 8 times the length of the Epistle. Of the words peculiar to Hebrews, about 45 may be considered as really characteristic of the writer's style and vocabulary, in comparison with perhaps 25 words, or *senses or groups of words*, which we have noticed as characteristic of both Luke and Hebrews. It is hardly possible to say how many of St. Luke's individualisms are really characteristic; it is of course no mere accident that he is the only N.T. writer who talks of Proconsuls and Politarchs, or of ships' bows or foresails, but this is the peculiarity of his subject not of his style. Allowing for this, we may say roughly that his characteristic words are about three times as many absolutely, or hardly half as many relatively, as those of Hebrews.

And if the number of their individualisms in vocabulary proves nothing, their quality does. St. Luke, like the author of Hebrews, uses classical or literary words which other N.T. authors do not; but he does not, like him, delight in sonorous compounds, whether culled, like ὀρκωμοσία, from the resources of the classical language, or coined after the classical model by the writer himself or some fellow-member of the Alexandrian school, as we cannot doubt was the case with αἵματεκχυσία, μισθαποδοσία.

If we pass from the minutiae of vocabulary to the broader qualities of style, we shall find the distinction between the two at least equally marked. It is indeed hard to say that St. Luke *could* not have written a work like Hebrews; we see him to have been an eminently versatile writer, able to vary his style according to his subject. But we can say that he *did* not write like Hebrews, even when he was writing in a similar hortatory tone and on a very similar subject; compare Acts xiii. 38-41, xxviii. 17-28¹ with Hebrews iii. 12-iv. 13, not to say vi. 4-12.

If then we set aside the theory that St. Luke was the writer, as more than a mere scribe, of the Pastoral Epistles, and the author (with or without suggestions and direction from St. Paul) of that to the Hebrews, what result have we from our inquiry? Much less than we may have hoped; but perhaps as much as this. The Pastoral Epistles, that to the Hebrews, and the two books ascribed to St. Luke proceeded from three different writers, but writers who all belonged to the same circle. In this circle the name of Paul was held in high honour; his doctrine of the calling of the Gentiles, and of salvation by faith, was heartily accepted and insisted on. But the influence of Paul was felt through some other channel than the study of his public Epistles: and there was a disposition to deal

¹ It may be thought that in the former passage the language is really in part St. Paul's own, not St. Luke's; but can it in the latter?

more tenderly with Judaism than he had done when he wrote them—to insist less than he there had done on the contrast between the Law and the Gospel, and more on the Divine purpose of the former as preparatory for the latter.

Now is it likelier that this state of things arose in the last year or two of St. Paul's own life, or not till the last two decades of the first century? In St. Clement's time (A.D. 96-7) Hebrews held an honourable, perhaps we may say an authoritative position, comparable with that of St. Paul's own writings; and it *was* from writings, not from any other channel, that the freshest and purest supplies of the apostolic spirit and teaching were to be derived. Plainly a great change—a change implying a considerable interval of time—had passed over the Church since Hebrews was written. On the other hand, if it was written after the fall of Jerusalem,¹ it cannot have been written very soon after it; there must have been time for the Jewish spirit to rally from the blow, and to resume an aggressive attitude towards the Church, if not yet towards the Empire.

The alternative dates then of this group of writings are fixed within tolerably narrow limits: they either fall within the years 63-70 or (approximately) 80-85. It seems on the whole easier to refer them to the earlier period. If so, it will be almost certain that the Pastoral Epistles are in the fullest sense genuine; it will be certain, at the very least, that they were written by some one who knew the facts of the close of the Apostle's life, so that the references to

¹ The strongest argument from the mere language of the Epistle for its priority to that event is x. 2. Not much can be made of the argument, that the *Temple* services must have been going on, because the *Tabernacle* services are spoken of in the present tense. But can we fancy a Christian arguing after midsummer A.D. 70, "The Jewish sacrifices are ineffectual because they *do not* cease," instead of the equally relevant argument, "The Jewish sacrifices *have ceased*, which they could not, until superseded by a more effectual sacrifice"? Here again the argument in the text would apply: if written after the fall of the Temple, the passage cannot have been written *soon* after it.

these, and the reproduction of his sentiments, would be at least as authentic as the account of the death of Socrates in the *Phædo*. The Acts, too, will gain in historical value, if we regard it not only as in its actual state the work of a companion of the Apostle, but as written by him while his memory of the events was yet fresh. But as to Hebrews alone we learn nothing—except to remember that, at the time when the Pastoral Epistles were written, St. Paul had several associates whom we never hear of before. It is true he was then (Tit. iii. 13) in communication with Apollos; but who shall say that Zenas the lawyer was not, equally with him, “mighty in the Scriptures”?—he *may* have been, like him, “an eloquent man, an Alexandrian by birth” or education. Or, if the Apostles committed to Linus the government of the Church of Rome, he *may* have been a man whose intellectual and spiritual gifts were equal to the composition of this Epistle. If our inquiry has given us a true glimpse into the sub-Apostolic circle, the glimpse is one tantalising rather than satisfying. We not only say with Origen, “As to who was the writer of this Epistle, God only knows the truth,” but with the Son of Sirach, “All these were honoured in their generations, and were the glory of their times. There be of them, that have left a name behind them, that their praises might be reported. And some there be, which have no memorial; who are perished, as though they had never been.” Only of those whose writings have reached us, even without their names, we may add, “These were merciful men, whose righteousness hath not been forgotten. With their seed shall continually remain a good inheritance, and their children are within the covenant. . . . Their bodies are buried in peace; but their name liveth for evermore. The people will tell of their wisdom, and the congregation will show forth their praise” (Ecclus. xliv. 8-15).

WILLIAM HENRY SIMCOX.