

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

*THE DATE AND AUTHORSHIP OF THE EPISTLE
TO THE HEBREWS.*

THE problem treated in the present paper is not soluble in the sense of demonstrating absolutely that one view is true and all other views are false. There is too little available evidence, internal or external.

But there is a strong probability—almost amounting to certainty—that the true view will be found to be widely illuminative, will make clear much that is obscure, and will show the Epistle not merely as a marvellous picture of “the spiritual character of the readers,”¹ but also as an important passage in the history of the first century.

Tried by this test, all the common theories of date and manner of origin fail. The Barnabas theory, the Apollos theory, throw light on nothing, not even on the Epistle itself. A date under Domitian, a date about A.D. 64–66,² make the document more enigmatical and isolated than it is when one has no theory on the subject.

It is not a matter of mere idle curiosity to reason as to the time and place at which the Epistle was written. It is true that the work is independent of those external circumstances, and can be understood and valued as a great book without a thought about them. But the history of the Apostolic Age is a subject of serious importance; and while that great blank remains in it, while the doubt continues as to whether the work belongs to Domitian's or Nero's time, whether it was addressed to a Jewish or Gentile

¹ Westcott, p. xli.

² The latter view formerly commended itself to me (*Church in Rom. Emp.*, p. 307). Longer study shows it to be untenable.

Church, there must be a doubt as to the security of the foundations upon which that history rests. So closely related to one another are all the other phenomena of early Christianity, that while this wonderful book stands apart in such isolation, we cannot (or ought not to) feel the same confidence in our ideas of the rest of the history.

The historical questions relating to the date and circumstances of the composition of the Epistle to the Hebrews have been brought nearer to an answer in a series of noteworthy papers by the Rev. W. M. Lewis. While in some respects the view stated in the following remarks differs from that advocated by Mr. Lewis, it agrees with his theory as regards all the main circumstances of the time and place and (to a considerable extent) the manner of composition of the Epistle; and it would certainly not have been attained so soon, possibly not at all, had I not been guided and stimulated by his earlier series of papers.¹ While writing the present article, I have also had before me his more recent articles,² which only confirm my general agreement and my occasional dissent from his opinion.

It will also be clear to any reader how much the writer has been indebted to the Bishop of Durham's great edition of the Epistle. Very often the turn of a sentence or the expression of an opinion is borrowed from him, with only the slight modification that a great man's words always require when they are seized and thought anew by even a humble disciple. I have also made frequent use of the Rev. G. Milligan's judicious and scholarly book;³ but he is further removed than the Bishop of Durham from the opinion which I hold. Their arguments are tested against those of Prof. McGiffert, as the best representative of the opposed point of view.

¹ In the *Thinker*, Oct. and Nov., 1893.

² In the *Biblical World*, Aug., 1898, April, 1899.

³ *Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, 1899.

Deliberately and intentionally, here and elsewhere, I prefer to use the words of others as much as possible, and preferably of those who do not hold the opinion which I advocate. This procedure is the best preventive against overstatement of the reasons on which my opinion is founded.

The theory advanced by Mr. Lewis is that the Epistle to the Hebrews was written from Cæsarea during Paul's imprisonment in the palace of Herod (Acts xxiii. 35).¹ He considers that Luke, in a series of interviews (Acts xxiv. 23), was instructed as to Paul's views, and directed to embody these in the form of a letter. The latter part of the theory can hardly be accepted without considerable modification. But as regards the important matters of the place and time and situation in which the letter originated, this theory seems to be remarkably illuminative, and therefore probably true.

The intention of the following remarks is not to recapitulate Mr. Lewis's arguments, which ought to be studied in his own statement; but to state my own reasons for thinking that he has come near the truth.

Stated briefly and dogmatically, the view to which this paper leads up is—

that the Epistle to the Hebrews was finished in the month of April or May, A.D. 59,² towards the end of the government of Felix;

that it treats certain topics which had been frequently discussed between Paul and the leading men of the Church at Cæsarea during his imprisonment, and

¹ Mr. Lewis usually states the date in this wide way. In one passage, however, he places the Epistle at the end of the imprisonment, after Festus had succeeded Felix. That seems to me a little too late, and inconsistent with xiii. 23, as will be shown in the sequel.

² The chronology advocated in *St. Paul the Traveller* is assumed throughout; those who follow another system can readily modify the dates to suit.

embodies the general impression and outcome of those discussions ;

that it was the Epistle of the Church in Cæsarea to the Jewish party of the Church in Jerusalem : this implies that the writer, practically speaking, was Philip the Deacon (Acts xxi. 8) ;

that its intention was to place the Jewish readers on a new plane of thought, on which they might better comprehend Paul's views and work, and to reconcile the dispute between the extreme Judaic party and the Pauline party in the Church, not by arguing for or explaining Paul's views, but by leading the Judaists into a different line of thought which would conduct them to a higher point of view ;

that the plan of composing such a letter had been discussed beforehand with Paul, and the letter, when written, was submitted to him, and the last few verses were actually appended by him ;

and finally, that the letter, as not embodying the thoughts of any single individual, was not completed by adding at the beginning the usual introductory clause of all ordinary letters, "So-and-so to So-and-so" : presumably the bearer of the letter would explain the circumstances.

That there is at this period an opening for a letter in which Paul was interested will at once be conceded. That is proved by the fact that many excellent scholars have placed, and some still place, during the Cæsarean captivity three letters which Lightfoot, supported by the almost universal opinion of British scholars, places in the Roman captivity.¹

No progress is possible until a definite and unhesitating

¹ Harnack, in the table appended to his *Chronologie der altchr. Literatur*, p. 717, gives both possibilities, but leans to the Roman date.

opinion is formed whether the ancient title "Epistle to the Hebrews," is correct or not. Some recent scholars have argued that the letter was written "to a Church or group of Churches whose membership was largely Gentile, where the Jews, as far as there were any, had become amalgamated with their Gentile brethren so that all race distinctions were lost sight of."¹ With all due respect to the distinguished scholars who have argued in favour of that view, I must express what I think—that it would be difficult to find an opinion so clearly paradoxical, so obviously opposed to the whole weight of evidence, so entirely founded on strained misinterpretation of a few passages and on the ignoring of the general character of the document. "The argument . . . cannot be regarded as more than an ingenious paradox by any one who regards the general teaching of the Epistle in connection with the forms of thought in the Apostolic Age."²

For example, it is argued that Hebrews ix. 14—"How much more shall the blood of Christ cleanse your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?"—could not be addressed to Jewish disciples, but only to persons who had been heathen. One would have thought that "dead works" was precisely what the Jew as Jew trusted to for salvation, and that Hebrews vi. 1, 2—"repentance from dead works, and faith toward God, the teaching of baptism, and the laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead and of eternal judgment,"—is clearly a summary of the first steps³ made by the Jew towards Christianity, and a most improbable and uncharacteristic way of describing the first steps of a pagan towards the truth. Obviously there is

¹ McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, p. 468, who gives a clear *résumé* of the arguments of Pfeiderer, Van Soden, etc., on this side.

² Westcott, p. xxxv.

³ What the writer calls "the foundation": he exhorts his readers not to confine their attention to this, but to proceed onwards to the more complete knowledge of what Christianity is.

an irreconcilable difference in the fundamental ideas about history and early Christianity, when two sets of scholars can look at words like these and pronounce such diametrically opposite opinions on them.

Contrast with one another such judgments as the following: "There is no trace of any admixture of heathen converts; nor does the letter touch on any of the topics of heathen controversy (not xiii. 9)":² Westcott, p. xxxvi.

"Not simply is there no sign that the author was addressing Jewish Christians . . . there are some passages which make it evident that he was addressing Gentiles" (McGiffert, p. 467).

"The widening breach between the Church and the Synagogue rendered it necessary at last to make choice between them, and 'the Hebrews' were in danger of apostasy: ii. 1, 3; iii. 6, 12 ff.; iv. 1, 3, 11; vi. 6; x. 25, 29, 39" (Westcott, *loc. cit.*).

"Nothing whatever is said about apostasy to Judaism . . . There is no sign that the author thinks of such apostasy as due to the influence of Judaism, or as connected with it in any way" (McGiffert, pp. 466 f.).

To put the matter in brief, Pfeiderer and his supporters neglect the obvious fact that the Epistle is addressed to persons who believed in the Jewish Scriptures, and were half-hearted in proceeding therefrom to Christianity; whereas Gentile Christians were persons who accepted the authority of the Old Testament Scriptures because they first had become Christians. "The Old Testament belonged to the Gentile as truly as to the Jewish wing of the Church, and an argument drawn from it had just as much weight with the former as with the latter."¹ That is perfectly true; but how different is the spirit in which the Old Testament is appealed to in the two cases. In addressing a Jew the preacher began his first approach by showing

¹ McGiffert, p. 46 f.

that the Old Testament pointed him forward to Christ. In addressing a pagan audience, the preacher would complete his approach by appealing to that prophetic preparation for Christ. Dr. McGiffert compares Hebrews with Clement, and finds that the latter "makes even larger use of" the Old Testament than the former. But how utterly different is the spirit! We also rest our case on the same comparison.

But it is not the intention of this paper to argue that point. Those who agree with Pfeiderer will not care to read any further, as we look from incompatible points of historical view. They may be referred to the arguments of Westcott and Milligan; and if they do not listen to those scholars, they would not listen to me.

But one more specimen of the arguments that are used to prove that the Epistle could not have been addressed to the Jews of Palestine, and specially of Jerusalem, must be given, because important inferences depend on it: "The reference to the great generosity of those addressed, and to their continued ministrations to the necessities of the saints, does not accord with what we know of the long-continued poverty of the Church of Jerusalem."¹ When reduced to a syllogism, this argument may be thus stated:

No poor man can be generous.

The members of the Church at Jerusalem were poor.

They therefore were not generous.

If the major premise is correct, the syllogism is perfect. But who will accept the major premise, when it is put plainly before him?

The argument is a glaring fallacy, and a libel on human nature.

Moreover, the Greek word which is rendered "generosity" is *ἀγάπη*. Surely the writers who employ that argument were writing, not with the eye on the Greek text, but with

¹ McGiffert, p. 464. Heb. vi. 10.

a modern commentator before them. Not even Pfeleiderer himself, who of all moderns is the least trammelled by the actual facts of nature and of history, could assert that a poor Church cannot show ἀγάπη.

Let any one who is interested in probing the matter travel in the East for some months or years, and travel not as a Cook's tourist, with tents, and beds, and cooks, and stores of food, and "a' the comforts o' the Sautmarket" (which Baillie Nicol Jarvie could not take with him into the Highlands), but travel in dependence on the inhabitants, and come into actual relations with them. He will learn how true it is that generosity and hospitality may be practised by very poor people even towards travellers with plenty of money, and may be lacking in the rich.

Or, if he cannot travel in the East, he may learn at home, if he does not keep himself shut up in his study, but comes close to real life, to appreciate Matthew Arnold's sonnet about the tramp who begged only from labouring men, while

She will not ask of aliens, but of friends,
Of sharers in a common human fate.
She turns from that cold succour, which attends
The unknown little from the unknowing great,
And points us to a better time than ours.

The truth is that Jerusalem was pre-eminently the city in which there was most opportunity for even the poorest Christians to show the virtues of generosity and hospitality, because it was crowded at frequent and regular intervals with strangers, many of them poor. Corinth and similar "wayside" stations on the great through route of traffic had many similar opportunities;¹ but even Corinth in that respect could not be compared to Jerusalem. These opportunities afforded admirable opening for the Christians to come into friendly relations with the Jews of distant lands;

¹ *Church in Rom. Empire*, pp. 10, 318 f.

and there cannot reasonably be any doubt that they used these opportunities. It was certainly in this way that the gospel spread so early to Rome and Italy; and it is the reason for the friendly relations that evidently existed between the Roman Jews and the Christians, as we shall see in the following remarks.

It may be regarded as incontrovertible that the Epistle was not written by Paul. Origen's opinion "that every one competent to judge of language must admit that the style is not that of St. Paul"¹ will not be seriously disputed, and is echoed almost unanimously by good scholars. The few exceptions in modern times, such as Wordsworth and Lewin, may be taken as examples of the remarkable truth that there is no view about the books of the Bible so paradoxical as not to find some good scholar for its champion.

But are we therefore to disconnect it absolutely from the Apostle Paul?

If that were so, it is difficult to see how such a strong body of early opinion should have regarded it as originating indirectly from Paul, and as conveying his views about a great crisis in the development of the Church. Clement of Alexandria and Origen, while both recognising that the language is not that of Paul, suggest different theories to account for what they recognise as assured fact—that the views and ideas are those of Paul.

Now how did Clement and Origen come to consider the connexion of Paul with the Epistle as an assured fact? It was not because the views and ideas are those which Paul elsewhere expresses. On the contrary, they present a different aspect of the subject from the ideas expressed in Paul's Epistles. It obviously was because an old tradition asserted the connexion.

Further, this belief and tradition is most unlikely to have arisen without some real ground. Mere desire to secure

¹ Westcott, p. lxxv.

canonical authority for this Epistle is not sufficient reason, for the Epistle differs so much from Paul's writings that general opinion, in seeking for an apostolic author, would have been more likely to hit upon one of the apostles separated for a time from the community addressed, and hoping soon to revisit it (xiii. 19). "The true position of the Epistle . . . is that of a final development of the teaching of 'the three,' and not of a special application of the teaching of St. Paul. It is, so to speak, most truly intelligible as the last voice of the Apostles of the Circumcision, and not as a peculiar utterance of the Apostle of the Gentiles" (Westcott, p. 41).

This tradition of a Pauline connexion was so strong as to persist even though there was prevalent a clear perception already in the 2nd century that the style was not that of Paul.¹ It was common in early manuscripts to place *Hebrews* in the midst of Paul's Epistles, even between *Galatians* and *Ephesians* (as was the case in an authority on which our greatest Manuscript, B, was dependent). Origen mentions that "the primitive writers" were positive as to the connexion of Paul with the Epistle.²

A very ancient tradition, therefore, of the strongest character guaranteed that there existed some relation of Paul to the Epistle. While it evidently did not assert that Paul was the author in the same sense as of *Romans* or *Corinthians*, it did assert that the thoughts in the Epistle

¹ Origen mentions theories already current in his time that Clement of Rome or Luke had written the thoughts of Paul in their own words. Clement of Alexandria thought that Paul had written in Hebrew, and Luke translated. These prove that speculation was already active when they wrote.

² Οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες: compare Wordsworth, p. 356, on the meaning of this phrase. How Dr. McGiffert can say, "the idea that Hebrews was Paul's work appears first in Alexandria in the latter part of the second century, and seems to have no tradition back of it" (p. 480 note) is to me unintelligible: and equally so his words, "the only really ancient tradition that we have links the Epistle with the name of Barnabas (Tertullian, *de Pud.* 20)." That is a 3rd century statement, and Dr. McGiffert himself concedes that the Pauline connexion has 2nd century authority.

either emanated from him, or were approved of by him when written, or in some way were stamped with his authority, and that the Epistle must be treated as standing in the closest relation to the work of the Apostle.

The persons addressed had been Christians for a considerable time, "when by reason of the time—because they had been Christians so long—they ought to have been teachers, they were themselves in need of elementary teaching": such is the implication of v. 12.¹

They had not heard the gospel from Jesus Himself, but only from those who had listened to Jesus. "(Salvation), which, having at the first been spoken through the Lord, was confirmed unto us by them that heard," ii. 3. It is, however, a mistake to infer from this that the writer and the readers were Christians "of the second generation," and therefore the Epistle must be as late as Domitian. All the 3,000 who were converted on the fiftieth day after the Crucifixion might be addressed in the words used ii. 3.

But, indubitably, the writer and the readers were all alike persons that had not hearkened to the preaching of Jesus, but had only heard the gospel at second hand from men who knew the Lord.² This indication of their position must be combined with another.

"They were addressed separately from their leaders."³ This remarkable fact has not as a rule been sufficiently studied, though almost every commentator from the earliest times notes it. The words—salute all them that have the rule over you—in xiii 24, imply "that the letter was not addressed officially to the Church, but to some section of it."⁴ The inference is correctly drawn by Theodoret: "they that had the rule did not stand in need of such teaching" as it is the object of the Epistle to convey.

¹ Westcott, p. 132.

² It is evident that Paul would never have classed himself in the category so described, ii. 3.

³ Westcott, p. xxxvi.

⁴ *Id.*, p. 451, quoting Theodoret.

There is implied in these words (1) a marking off and separating of a body holding rule in the community (of which those addressed formed part): there was a distinct class of persons recognised generally as "the leaders"; (2) a certain distinction between the views entertained by the leaders and the views entertained by the persons addressed.

In what relation does this peculiar and remarkable fact stand to the history of the period, so far as we know it?

There was one community in which the leaders were a distinct and well-marked body. At Jerusalem James and the Twelve were a clearly defined body with a peculiar standing and authority. That is implied throughout the narrative, and is formally and explicitly recognised in various passages in *Acts* and in the Epistles. But along with them must be classed the original disciples that had listened to the words of Jesus. Wherever they were, clearly those who had followed the Lord Himself were recognised as possessing dignity and character which none converted by men ever attained. In Jerusalem this class must have constituted a certain considerable body even as late as A.D. 59. In no other Church is there likely to have been more than a very few, if any, resident and settled members of this class.

The writer, himself a convert at second hand, does not presume to address his "word of exhortation" to any one who had followed Jesus personally.

Further, these leaders are conceived both by Paul and by the author of *Acts* as differing in opinion from at least a certain considerable section of the Christian community in Jerusalem. It is beyond doubt that Paul claimed (and Luke confirmed the claim) to be in essential agreement with the leading apostles. It is an equally indisputable fact that Paul was at variance with a large section of the Jewish Christians in Jerusalem, who regarded him as an

enemy of Jewish feeling and as bent on destroying Jewish ritual.

There was no other community in which such marked divergence of view between the leaders and the congregation existed, so far as our records show. There was no other community in which it is at all probable that such a division existed. We learn of divisions and differences of opinion existing in several other congregations; but there is not the slightest appearance or probability that in any of them a body of leaders took one side and the congregation as a mass took the other side, while in some cases it is clear that the lines of division were quite different in character. In fact, there is no allusion to anything like a body possessing higher position in any congregation except that of Antioch (*Acts* xiii. 1); and that isolated case hardly seems to be a case of a class of *ἡγούμενοι*.

Further, the subject on which the Epistle dilates is the subject on which divergence existed between the leaders and the general body of the congregation in Jerusalem—the relation of Judaism and the Law to Christianity and Faith. It is precisely on that subject that it would be least easy to address the leaders and the mass at Jerusalem in the same terms.

Moreover, in *Acts* xxi. 20–24, James, speaking evidently on behalf of the leaders, recognises that many myriads of the Christian Jews entertained different views from what he himself entertained about Paul's views on the Jewish ritual. They thought Paul was an enemy bent on destroying that ritual: James and the leaders knew that Paul practised that ritual personally, and James urged Paul to show publicly his adhesion to and belief in the value of the ritual.¹ The writer of the Epistle, similarly, is bent on

¹ It must, of course, be assumed that Paul regarded the ritual as having a distinct value for Jewish Christians. It would have been hypocritical to practise it if it were valueless in a religious point of view.

bringing out the true character and value of the Jewish ritual, on proving that Christianity does not destroy but perfects that ritual, and on showing that the Christian principle of Faith was already a powerful factor in the life of the ancient Jews.

It is therefore certain that the situation implied in the Epistle existed in Palestine during Paul's last stay in the country; and there is no evidence that it existed anywhere else.

In xv. 24 the writer conveys to the readers the salutation of "those from Italy." It is grammatically quite possible to understand this Greek phrase as meaning simply "those who belong to Italy"; and this might imply that the writer conveys from some place in Italy, where he composes the letter, "the salutations of the Italian congregations generally" to his readers. But, as the Bishop of Durham (from whom I quote) goes on to say, "it is difficult to understand how any one could give the salutations of the Italian Christians generally"; the writer would more naturally give the greeting of the Church of the city in which he was writing (*οἱ ἀπὸ Ῥώμης* or the like);¹ hence "it appears more natural . . . to suppose that the writer is speaking of a small group of friends from Italy who were with him at the time."

The conclusion which the Bishop considers more natural is, of course, imperative on our theory of Cæsarean origin. There must have existed near the writer, and in communi-

¹ Westcott, p. xlv. It is not inconceivable either that the writer was on a circular mission to the Italian Churches, or that he wrote from a city, Rome or Puteoli, where representatives of several Italian cities had met. Both suppositions, however, are improbable, and difficult to harmonize either with the Epistle or with what we know about the history of the time. A circular mission through Italy was not the experience which would naturally suggest a letter of this kind; and a meeting of representatives is also unlikely in itself, and would probably be explained by the writer, so that the readers might understand who saluted them.

cation with him, a company of persons belonging to various towns of Italy.

Now, are there any circumstances in which a company of persons from Italy are likely to have been at Cæsarea? Obviously this was quite a natural thing. A company of Jews on pilgrimage would be pretty certain to use a ship from Puteoli to Syria (joining it either at Puteoli or at some of the harbours in Southern Italy, as it coasted along). There were undoubtedly such pilgrim ships sailing every spring. It was on board one of them that Paul dreaded a conspiracy against his life (*Acts* xx. 2, 3).¹ The Roman Government had often guaranteed the right of safe passage of Jewish pilgrims to Jerusalem. In 49 B.C. Fannius, the Governor of Asia, wrote to the Coan magistrates on the subject: the pilgrim ships naturally passed by Cos, which had been a great Jewish centre of trade and banking as early as B.C. 138 (1 *Macc.* xv. 23). Compare the letter of Augustus (Josephus, *Ant. Jud.* xvi. 6, 2).

Every spring, then, a company of Italian Jews passed twice through Cæsarea on their way to and from Jerusalem. Now it is obvious that such a company is most unlikely to have consisted wholly of Christian Jews: it may be regarded as certain that there would be a majority of non-Christian Jews.

But is it not improbable that such a company of Jews would come into relations with Paul and Paul's friends, considering the relations in which Paul stood to the Jewish authorities of Jerusalem? Surely not at the period in which our theory places the letter. A body of Italian Jewish pilgrims would be received hospitably by Cæsarean Jews, and it is exceedingly improbable that the Christian Jews of Cæsarea would fall short of their non-Christian brethren.

Certainly, so far as Paul had any influence with the

¹ *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 287, compare p. 264.

Cæsarean Church, the Italian Jews would be welcomed and generously entertained.

But presumably there must have been some Christians among the company of the Italian pilgrims. Is not this improbable?

Certainly not! If Paul went on pilgrimage, why not the Italian Jewish Christians?

Further, the friendly spirit which we suppose to have existed between the Italian pilgrims and the Cæsarean Christians harmonizes excellently with the facts recorded in *Acts* xxviii. 17 ff. The friendly tone of the Roman Jewish leaders towards Paul, their ignorance (or rather diplomatic ignoring)¹ of any hostility between him and the Jews, their perfect readiness to hear what he has to say, is precisely the tone which we suppose in Cæsarea. The one throws light on the other. The narrative in *Acts* xxviii. 17-28 has always been regarded as a serious difficulty: it is mentioned by Dr. Sanday² as one of the four striking "real difficulties" of the book. It has been counted a difficulty, because it was thought inconsistent with the presumption from other recorded facts. It ceases to be a difficulty when we find it in perfect harmony with the situation revealed in this *Epistle*. Moreover, as Dr. Sanday proceeds: "the indications which we get in *Romans* xvi. as to the way in which Christianity first established itself in Rome would be consistent with a considerable degree of ignorance on the part of official Judaism." The "difficulty" solves itself when the evidence is fairly looked at as a whole.

It is clear that, if we are correct in this, a common in-

¹ It is noteworthy that they do not deny having heard of the proceedings against Paul. They have no official report by letter, and no one has reported to them any actual crime of which he had been guilty. They are aware that there was general bad feeling against Paul among Jews.

² *Bampton Lectures*, 1893, p. 329, note.

terpretation of Suetonius, *Claud.* 25, must be abandoned. The Latin historian's words, *Judæos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes*, cannot be taken as an allusion of Roman ignorance to quarrels between Christian and non-Christian Jews.

The salutation of the Italians would naturally be sent to Jerusalem on their homeward journey. On the way up to Jerusalem they were, doubtless, for the most part strangers to that city; and, moreover, they would carry their salutations in person. On the return journey they would naturally send greetings to their late hosts.

The message in itself contributes to the effect which the Epistle aims at. The writer desired, while establishing the true relation between Judaism and Christianity as the less and more perfect stages of one faith, to facilitate and preserve harmony between the Jews and the Jewish Christians; and the salutation exemplifies and confirms the harmony.

Incidentally the passage shows the exact date when the Epistle was composed. The final words were written in April-May, A.D. 58 or 59. The latter year is preferable, as the analogies of Hebrews are to Paul's last defence before Agrippa and Festus (*Acts xxvi.*), not to his earlier speeches in Jerusalem and Rome. Moreover the Epistle represents the outcome of a long period of thought and quiet discussion after the stormy period at the beginning of the Cæsarean captivity was ended.

The relation of the writer to the persons addressed is shown most clearly in the conclusion. He was in some way prevented at the moment from being with them (xiii. 19); he does not state what cause is detaining him against his will. Yet immediately afterwards he says confidently that he expects to see them shortly. He therefore regards it as practically fixed that he is shortly to be in the place where the persons addressed are. Accepting Delitzsch's

view¹ that the last few verses were appended by Paul himself, we make the following inferences.

When Paul was at Cæsarea, it is clear from xxv. 9 and from the general circumstances of the case, that if the formal trial of the prisoner occurred, it was almost certain to be held at Jerusalem, where the evidence was most readily accessible, and where the Jews wished it to be held. Every historical student knows how much influence the general wish of the provincials exercised on every Roman governor. It is therefore not at all improbable that at some time during his long imprisonment Paul expected that the trial would not be longer delayed, and that he would shortly be in Jerusalem. This was, of course, written before the plot to assassinate Paul on the way up to be tried had been discovered (when, in despair of a fair trial in Palestine, he was driven to appeal to the Emperor), in the summer of 59 A.D.

The reference to *Timothy* xiii. 23 is obscure on every theory. It touches facts of which we are wholly ignorant. But the intention is clear that, if Timothy be not detained too long by possible hindrances, he will accompany the writer to the city where the persons addressed live. Timothy, moreover, is an intimate and dear friend of the writer, and he expects this dear friend to accompany him. Timothy at the moment is away at a distance, and there may be impediments to his speedy arrival; but if he comes in time, it is a matter of course that he will accompany the writer.

Timothy, it is certain, accompanied Paul to Jerusalem in 57 A.D. (*Acts* xx. 4). We need not doubt that he and the other delegates soon followed Paul to Cæsarea. It is, however, in the last degree improbable that the delegates all remained in Cæsarea throughout the two years' imprison-

¹ The change of author was marked, not merely by change of handwriting, but probably also by a break, or some other device, which was lost in the later manuscripts.

ment. It may be taken as certain that Paul carried out his usual policy of sending his coadjutors on missions both to his churches and to new cities, and that mission work went on actively during that period. Paul then says: "Know that Timothy has been sent away on a mission,¹ with whom, if he returns quickly, I will see you."

In the Epistle "we" generally denotes the body of Christians not immediate hearers of the Lord, in particular the writers in Cæsarea and the readers in Jerusalem (though, of course, in various places what is said would apply to all Christians). Sometimes, however, "we" and "you" are distinguished and pointedly contrasted as the writers and the readers, as in v. 11, vi. 9, 11. Moreover, "we" sometimes (as ii. 5), and "you" often, denote the single body of writers or of readers respectively. The writers express themselves always as a group, for the first person singular in xi. 32² is an instance of literary and impersonal usage, not an indication of personality; and the last few verses we take with Delitzsch as added by Paul with his own hand.

The personality of the writer and his relation to Paul are the points in which Mr. Lewis's theory seems to require modification.

(1) The Jewish nationality of the writer seems as certain as that of the readers: Mr. Milligan, on p. 36 of the work quoted above, says "the writer, who was clearly himself a Jew." Probably this will be disputed by no one, and least of all by Mr. Lewis himself. He, as we may gather, would explain that, when Luke writes as a Jew, he does so because he is expressing the thoughts of Paul. This brings us to the second point.

¹ This interpretation, advocated by Lewin, seems more probable than "set free from prison": cp. *Acts* xiii. 3. But it seems self-contradictory to suppose that the mission is to carry the letter to Jerusalem, as has been suggested.

² The first person singular is used in the English translation in ix. 22, but not in the Greek text: it also is a mere literary form.

(2) Mr. Lewis seems to attribute too little independent action to the writer. He hears only Paul speaking through the words of Luke. He holds that Luke was, if not the amanuensis, yet the mere redactor of Paul's thoughts. That appears a somewhat anomalous and improbable position. One can understand that Luke might act as secretary, and reproduce as faithfully as he could the words and thoughts of Paul; but one sees no reason why Paul should instruct him as to his ideas in a series of short interviews,¹ and tell him to express them in his (Luke's) own words and style. Moreover the Epistle is clearly not an attempt by another to express Paul's ideas, but an independent thinking out of the same topics that Paul was meditating on and conversing about at Cæsarea. The person who wrote the Epistle was not trying unsuccessfully to express Paul's ideas as to "Faith" and "the Law," for example: his own individuality and character are expressed in the use which he makes of those terms—not contradictory, but complementary to, and yet absolutely different in nature from, Paul's ideas.

It has just been said that Paul was thinking at Cæsarea about the same topics that the Epistle discusses. Mr. Lewis has treated this subject excellently, and it should be studied in his own words. I give only a few examples.

In the first place, he quotes from the address to Agrippa and Festus expressions which show that Paul had recently been dwelling on the topics of the Epistle. The idea—"The hope of the promise made of God to the fathers, unto which promise our twelve tribes, instantly serving God night and day, hope to come" (*Acts* xxvi. 6, 7)—moves in the same sphere as *Hebrews*. The insistence upon the ceaselessness of the ritual, the conception that the Law may be regarded as a system of ritual, and "a scheme of

¹ One can hardly accept Mr. Lewis's interpretation of *διὰ βραχέων* (*Heb.* xiii.) as "in snatches" during brief interviews.

typical provisions for atonement,"¹ are noteworthy in Paul's words, and are characteristic of the Epistle. Again, "the sufferings of Christ, as distinguished from His death," are a characteristic feature of *Hebrews*, but not of any of Paul's Epistles. In *Acts* xxvi. 22 f., "I continue unto this day witnessing to both small and great," . . . that Christ should suffer."

These are quoted as examples of Mr. Lewis's striking demonstration of the parallelism between Paul's defence before Agrippa and the Epistle, especially in respect of points which are not characteristic of Paul's Epistles.

Secondly, Mr. Lewis gives some important arguments to show that topics and ideas and expressions used in *Hebrews* must have been in Paul's mind at that period, in order to effect the transition from his earlier to his later Epistles. These topics lead on from *Corinthians* and *Romans*, and are presupposed in *Ephesians*, *Philippians*, *Colossians*.

An interesting little point of expression lies in Paul's use of the Song of Moses, *Deuteronomy* xxxii. 1-43: he makes the following quotations or references to it:

<i>Deut.</i> xxxii. 4	in	1 <i>Cor.</i> x. 4;
„ „ 17	„	1 <i>Cor.</i> x. 20;
„ „ 25	„	2 <i>Cor.</i> vii. 5;
„ „ 35	„	<i>Rom.</i> xii. 19, and <i>Heb.</i> x. 30; ³
„ „ 36	„	<i>Heb.</i> x. 30;
„ „ 43	„	<i>Rom.</i> xv. 10;
„ „ 43	„	<i>Heb.</i> i. 6.

On the other hand, among ideas which are characteristic of the later Epistles, but not of the earlier, Mr. Lewis

¹ Westcott, p. lii.

² *Hebrews* viii. 11, "from the least to the greatest." Mr. Lewis says that no similar expression occurs in the Epistles of Paul.

³ The two quotations are in identical words, yet differing both from the Septuagint and the Hebrew text.

quotes the headship of Christ over the Church, the use of ἄφεσις, "forgiveness of sins" in *Hebrews* ix. 22, x. 18, *Ephesians* i. 7, *Colossians* i. 14, and in the defence, *Acts* xxvi. 18, etc.;¹ also Lightfoot's note on the analogy between the context of *Colossians* i. 12, and *Acts* xxvi. 18, "where all the ideas and most of the expressions occur," points us to the fact that both "are echoes of an argument entered into at length previously in *Hebrews*."

The preceding notes are not intended as an adequate treatment of the subject. That would require a detailed examination of many passages read in the Cæsarean light, and a discussion of several well-known arguments.

In conclusion, it may be added that probably the most important result of the Cæsarean view is the light it sheds on the relation of the Cæsarean Church to Paul on the one hand and to the Jewish-Christian party on the other. The reconciliation between the two parties in the Church was making good progress. It is an argument of my chapters on Christian Antiquities in *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia* that the reconciliation was very complete in Asia Minor.

W. M. RAMSAY.

¹ It must, however, be noticed that the word is used by Paul also in *Acts* xiii. 38, and thrice by Peter (*Acts* ii. 38, v. 31, x. 43).