

# 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 *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_bib-sacra\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php)

## ARTICLE IV.

AUTHORSHIP AND CANONICITY OF THE EPISTLE TO  
THE HEBREWS.

BY REV. J. HENRY THAYER, PROFESSOR AT ANDOVER.

[The following Article consists of extracts from lectures, introductory to the study of the Epistle to the Hebrews, which were delivered to the Junior Class in Andover Theological Seminary during the past term. They are published by request, and without material alteration. In them the author has attempted little more than to collect the scattered evidence in the case, and to present it fairly].

In investigating the authorship of this Epistle, we must remember that as the writer has not told us his name, nor afforded us any means of ascertaining it beyond a doubt, and as there is no uniform and unbroken tradition on the subject, we must content ourselves with the balance of *probabilities*. Our conclusion must of necessity be built up of indirect and incidental evidence.

A. Among the general and admitted characteristics of the author are the following :

1. He does not study to *conceal* his name ; he assumes that he is known to his readers : cf. xiii. 18, " Pray for us," etc. 19, " That I may the sooner be restored to you." 22, sq. " Timothy has been set at liberty ; with whom, if he come shortly, I will see you," etc.

2. He was one of the *distinguished* teachers of apostolic times. This is proved by the fact that he writes to an *entire church* (apparently) — indeed by the general *tone* of the Epistle.

3. He was a *born Jew* ; — the whole tenor of the Epistle puts this past question.

4. He was not one of those who heard the Lord in person ; but, in common with his readers, received the gospel *mediately*, from those who *were* ear-witnesses ; cf. ii. 3.

5. He was intimate with Timothy, the faithful friend and companion of Paul (xiii. 23).

B. The last-mentioned characteristic of the author (namely, intimacy with Timothy), is one of the signs which the Epistle is thought to afford that it was written by Paul. This opinion let us examine, considering first the *internal* and then the *external* arguments in reference to it.

*Internal* arguments in favor of Paul as its author: These may be comprised under three heads:

1. Facts or allusions contained in the Epistle:

a. In x. 34 the text. recept. runs τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου συνεπαθήσατε, "ye sympathized with" (Eng. vers. "had compassion on me in") "my bonds." This is naturally taken as an allusion to "*Paul* the prisoner." But the reading of the text. recept. is hardly sustained. A (B ends with ix. 14, and the passage is wanting also in C) — D, 47, etc.; Syr., Arab. Erp., Copt., Arm., Vulg.; Chrys., etc., support the reading τοῖς δεσμῶν — "ye sympathized with *those in bonds*" — which has been adopted by Griesbach, Lachmann, Scholz, Reiche, Tischendorf, Bleek, Delitzsch, Lünemann, Alford, etc.

b. In xiii. 19 the writer says: "I beseech you to *pray* for me . . . . that I may be *restored* to you the sooner:" ἵνα τάχιον ἀποκατασταθῶ ὑμῖν. This language, it is said, implies that the writer is a *prisoner*, and so favors the theory that he is Paul.

But we reply:

(1) It is true that the solicitation of their *prayers* for his restoration implies *hinderances* which those prayers might have some effect in removing (τάχιον); but

(2) ἀποκατασταθῶ does not of itself mean restored *from imprisonment*, while the subjoined ὑμῖν shows that here it *does* mean restored "*to you*," i.e. merely *from* absence; and

(3) v. 23 ("with whom [Timothy], if he come shortly, I will see you") shows that the writer was *personally* at liberty.

c. In xiii. 23 we read "Know ye that our brother Timothy has been set at liberty" (ἀπολελυμένου). Timothy was the companion of Paul; was with him during his confinement

at Rome; and if we render ἀπολελυμένον "sent away" on business, we may find a probable coincidence with Phil. ii. 19, "I trust . . . . to send Timotheus shortly unto you." 23, "Him therefore I hope to send presently." Our Epistle was written (it is said) by Paul during this absence of Timothy.

But the more natural and obvious meaning of ἀπολελυμένον is not "sent away," but "liberated"; see the lexicons.

d. In xiii. 24, the writer sends salutations from "those of Italy," οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας. This, it is alleged, corroborates the above indications, by showing that the Epistle was written from Rome, and therefore probably by Paul.

This argument turns upon the meaning of the debated phrase οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας. The possible interpretations may be classified under the two generic senses of ἀπὸ; namely, *local separation* and *origin*.

Taken in its primary sense of *local separation*, it may have reference,

Either (a) to the *persons*; in which case it denotes that the persons referred to are (together with the writer) "*away from*" Italy, although belonging to it. This, as it is the more obvious, seems also in the New Test. to be the more usual meaning of the phrase; cf. Matt. xv. 1 with Mark vii. 1; see also Acts vi. 9; (x. 23?); xxi. 27. Contrast, too, 2 Tim. i. 15, οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ.

If we adopt this interpretation in the present instance, we are met by the question: How comes the writer to send a salutation from the *Italians* alone, and not also from the *native* Christians of the place where he is writing? To this question it is hard to find a satisfactory answer.<sup>1</sup>

Or (b) it may refer to the *salutation*; as if two local prepositions had been blended into one, so that the full expression would run οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰταλίᾳ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας ἀσπάζονται ὑμᾶς. For other instances of this attraction, or rather pregnant con-

<sup>1</sup> Bleek, Lünemann, et al. regard the party as fugitives from the Neronian persecution, and as temporarily sojourning where there are no native Christians.

struction, cf. Matt. xxiv. 17; Luke xi. 13; Col. iv. 16. See Win. § 66. 6; Jelf, § 647; Kühn. ii. § 623, p. 318.

This interpretation is favored in the present case by the usage of the Greek epistolary style, which, as is well known, often employs those forms of expression (tenses, etc.), which are correct in reference to the reader of the letter, rather than to the writer. Buttmann, however (*Grammatik des neutest. Sprachgebrauchs*, pp. 323, 324, cf. p. 83), adopts the construction which follows.

If *ἀπό* be taken to denote *origin*, the phrase is very like "the men of Italy," i.e. "the Italians." Cf. Matt. xxi. 11; Mark xv. 43, etc. (Cf. the use of Art. with *ἀπό* to denote a genus in such phrases as *οἱ ἀπὸ σοφίας*, i.e. *docti*, Lob. Phryn. p. 164.)

In this case the *present* locality of the persons in question is, strictly speaking, left undecided. It must be determined, if at all, upon other grounds. If in the present instance we suppose (a) that the persons referred to were (with the writer) in some place *out* of Italy, we encounter again the same difficulty which lay in the way of interpretation (a) of the former class, namely, Why is no mention made of native Christians?

If, then, we allow the circumstances of the case to decide that the phrase here means (b) Italians *in* Italy, we are still pursued by the question of locality, and asked, Italians *outside* of Rome? or, *including* the Christians of Rome?

Many have thought themselves compelled to reply "*the former*, viz. Italians *outside* of Rome." Otherwise it is supposed the Roman Christians would have been mentioned also; hence they say the Epistle was probably written *outside* of Rome. But this conclusion is as doubtful as the assumption upon which it rests. Even supposing the author to be writing from Rome, why need he in the greeting make separate mention of the Roman Christians? The generic term includes the specific — the Romans were also Italians. And just because it is the more comprehensive term, it is the more weighty and eligible. So in Acts xviii. 2 Aquila is spoken

of as ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας, and then just afterwards comes the more specific ἐκ τῆς Ῥώμης.<sup>1</sup>

We conclude, therefore, that the phrase in question does not furnish with certainty a definite indication of locality. It may have been used by one writing from Rome; on the other hand, it may not have been. Hence (so Winer as above) no solid argument for the place where the Epistle was written can be found in the words; nor for the opinion that Paul was its author, so far as that opinion depends on their proof of the place.

2. The Epistle exhibits *doctrinal* resemblances to the epistles of Paul. Here we touch one of those points upon which discussion has been most ample. We have not space to consider all the arguments which have been advanced. Many of them need no consideration. Certainly we may quietly assume that an epistle written, as all must confess the Hebrews to have been, in the apostolic age by a leading Christian teacher to primitive Christians, harmonizes with the teachings of Paul relative to the preferableness of Christianity over Judaism, — its superiority as respects knowledge, motives, efficiency, permanence. The Christian system, with its characteristic doctrines, precepts, promises, sanctions, is indubitably taught in it. But we are concerned only with doctrinal *peculiarities*. The New Test. exhibits several well-marked types of doctrine. All have much in common, yet each has its distinctive characteristics. Accordingly biblical theologians speak of the Pauline type of doctrine, the Petrine, the Johannean, the Jacobic. We recognize the general appropriateness of such distinctions, however theologians may disagree when they come to define them minutely. Now the precise point of inquiry is: To which of these different patterns of doctrine does our Epistle belong? Do the views of truth presented in it accord with — *coincide* with, rather, for there is always harmony among inspired writers, even where there

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. xvi. 8 sq., where Paul, in writing from Ephesus, says (v. 19) "the churches of Asia salute you," is not a parallel case, for in v. 20 he appends an additional salutation from the Ephesian brethren distinctively.

is not unison — does its distinctive cast of doctrine coincide with Paul's? This question many writers answer in the affirmative. That answer, as we shall see subsequently, cannot be accepted without qualifications. And yet it is true that in many particulars the doctrinal views of the author, and his mode of presenting them, are Pauline :

a. God is spoken of as the final cause and the efficient cause of all things ii. 10, *δι' ὧν . . . . δι' ὧν τὰ πάντα.*

So (substantially) Paul in Rom. xi. 36, *ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα.*

b. Christ is represented

(1) As the "impress" (*χαρακτήρ*) of God's substance, i. 3.

So (again only substantially) Paul in Col. i. 15, *ὃς ἐστὶν εἰκὼν ("image") τοῦ θεοῦ;* so 2 Cor. iv. 4.

(2) As the instrumental agent (*δι' οὗ*) in creation, i. 2.

So (precisely, Jno. i. 3 ; substantially) Paul in Col. i. 16, *ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα.*

(3) As exalted on account of his sufferings, ii. 9, *διὰ τὸ πάθημα . . . . ἐστεφανωμένον.*

So Paul in Phil. ii. 9, *διὲ καὶ ὁ θεὸς αὐτὸν ὑπερέψωκε.*

(4) As having suffered once for all, *ἅπαξ ἐπὶ συνουσίᾳ τῶν αἰώνων,* etc., ix. 26 (cf. x. 12).

So Paul in Rom. vi. 10, *οἷ ἁμαρτίας ἀπέθανον ἐφάπαξ.*

(5) As having vanquished death, ii. 14.

So Paul in 1 Cor. xv. 54, 55, 57 ; 2 Tim. i. 10

(6) As exercising a constant intercessory agency vii. 25, *πάντοτε ζῶν εἰς τὸ ἐντυγχάνειν,* etc.

So (and substantially in 1 Jno. ii. 2 also) Paul in Rom. viii. 34, *ὃς καὶ ἐντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν.*

(7) As awaiting supreme dominion, x. 12, 13 "from henceforth expecting," *ἕως τεθῶσι οἱ ἐχθροὶ αὐτοῦ ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ.*

So Paul in 1 Cor. xv. 25, *ἄχρις οὗ ἂν θῆ ἅπασας τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ.*

c. The Mosaic law is represented as given through the instrumentality of angels ii. 2, *ὃ δι' ἀγγέλων λαληθεὶς λόγος.*

So Paul in Gal. iii. 19 *ὁ νόμος . . . . διαταγῆς δι' ἀγγέλων ;* yet so also Stephen in Acts vii. 53, *ἐλάβετε τὸν νόμον εἰς διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων.* From Joseph. Ant. xv. 5, 3 this appears to have been a current Jewish opinion.

3. Passing to the characteristics of *form* which favor the opinion that the Epistle was written by Paul, we notice

a. The general distribution of topics. Most of Paul's epistles divide themselves into two parts: a didactic or doctrinal portion, followed by a hortatory or practical. The same arrangement of materials—a little obscured by incidental exhortations in the former part—is traceable in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and is wanting in the epistles of John, Peter, James, and Jude.

b. In chap. x. 30, we find Deut. xxxii. 35 freely quoted *ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις, ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω, λέγει κύριος*, "To me belongs vengeance, I will recompense, saith the Lord." This quotation corresponds exactly neither with the Hebr. (עָפָרָה לִּי; "to me vengeance and recompense") nor with the Sept. (ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐκδικήσεως ἀνταποδώσω, "in the day of vengeance I will recompense"), but does agree word for word with the language of Paul in Romans xii. 19.<sup>1</sup>

c. Some of its *imagery* resembles Paul's:

(1) The "word of God" is compared to a "sword," iv. 12.

So Paul in Eph. vi. 17, *τὴν μάχαιραν τοῦ πνεύματος, ἧ ἔστι ῥῆμα θεοῦ* (yet this may have been a current figure; see the references to Philo in the Comm. on Hebr. l.c.).

(2) Inexperienced Christians are called "babes," have need of "milk," v. 13.

So Paul in Rom. ii. 20 *διδάσκαλον νηπίων*, Eph. iv. 14; Gal. iv. 3; 1 Cor. iii. 1; (yet this, too, seems to have been a current designation, cf. Thol. in Rom. l.c., and Wetst. in Matt. xv. 14).

Experienced Christians are styled "full-grown" persons, adults, and are said to use "solid food," v. 14.

So Paul in 1 Cor. xiv. 20.

(3) The Mosaic dispensation, in comparison with the Christian, is as a "shadow" to the substance; x. 1, *σκιά γὰρ ἔχων ὁ νόμος τῶν μελλόντων*, cf. viii. 5.

So Paul in Col. ii. 17, *ἧ ἔστι σκιά τῶν μελλόντων*.

<sup>1</sup> This coincidence has been explained by supposing either that our author derived his language from the lips or the writings of Paul, or that both employed a form of the passage familiarly current, or that both drew from some common source (e.g. the paraphrase of Origenes, so Mey. after Fritz. on Rom. i. c.; per contra Tholuck, Comm. p. 23 sq.).

(4) Christians are said to be "made a spectacle (*θεατριζόμενοι*)" by reproaches, etc., x. 33.

So Paul in 1 Cor. iv. 9, *θέατρον ἐγενήθημεν τῷ κόσμῳ*, etc.

(5.) Christians are exhorted "to run the race" set before them, etc., xii. 1.

So Paul in 1 Cor. ix. 24, *οὕτω τρέχετε ἵνα καταλάβητε*. Cf. Phil. iii. 14.

(6) Abraham, before Isaac's birth, is described in relation to offspring as "having become dead," *νεκρωμένου*, xi. 12.

So Paul in Rom. iv. 19, *οὐ κατενόησε τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα ἦδη νεκρωμένον . . . . καὶ τὴν νέκρωσιν τῆς μητρὸς Σάρρας* (cf. the language of Porphyrius in *Κυρκε*, *Observat. Sacr.* ii. 164).

*d. Single expressions coincide with Paul's:*<sup>1</sup>

(1) The use of a neuter adj. with the article instead of a substantive of quality. See vi. 17; xii. 13, 21. Cf. Rom. i. 19, ii. 4, iii. 1, etc.

(2) "The God of peace," xiii. 20.

So Paul in Rom. xv. 33, *ὁ δὲ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης*, and five times more.

(3) Christ is called (viii. 6, ix. 15, xii. 24) *κρείττονος διαθήκης μεσίτης*.

So Paul in Gal. iii. 19 (of Moses) 20; 1 Tim. ii. 5. (Yet so Philo of Moses, *Vit. Mos.* ii. 678, line 14. *Mangey*; *Fabric. Cod. Pseudepig. Vet. Test.* i. 845; *Wetst. N. T.* ii. 224. Cf. *Grimm's N. T. Lex. sub verb.*).

(4.) The language of the 5th Ps., "Thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet," is applied to Christ, ii. 8.

So Paul in Eph. i. 22; 1 Cor. xv. 27.

(5.) The words *παβήσῖα* and *καύχημα* are used to describe the Christian's state of mind, iii. 6, etc.

So (John also and) Paul in Eph. iii. 12, etc.; and (substantially) Rom. v. 2.

<sup>1</sup> Here, as under the preceding head, the lists of examples are greatly extended by several writers. But it is better to confine ourselves to those which are obvious. Even from these we should perhaps be compelled to deduct a considerable number were we thoroughly acquainted with the current and common forms of speech when the Epistle was written — at least among Hebrew Christians. Only what is distinctive and peculiar furnishes a solid basis of comparison, and what is so we can judge but imperfectly at the best.

- (6) The phrase *ἀπάτη τῆς ἀμαρτίας* (iii. 13) resembles Paul's *ἀπάτη ἀδικίας* in 2 Thess. ii. 10, yet cf. Win. § 30. 2. b. β., 7th. ed. p. 178.
- (7) The expression *ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς* (iv. 2), is used (without art.) by Paul in 1 Thess. ii. 13.
- (8) The writer is "persuaded he has a good conscience," xiii. 18; Allusions to his "conscience" are characteristic of Paul; Acts xxiii. 1; xxiv. 16; Rom. ix. 1; 2 Cor. i. 12; 2 Tim. i. 3.

Remark: Respecting the argument made to rest upon such resemblances both of thought and of expression as have been specified, it must be confessed there is danger of forming an incorrect estimate. The significance of such resemblances is not always so great as it at first appears to be. At this distant day it is often impossible for us to distinguish with certainty between what is peculiar to individual writers, and what was common to them and their age. And in any age a collation of contemporary writers of similar station and training upon the same general subject, would no doubt exhibit coincidences of thought, of expression even, surprising to those who have never made such an experiment. We have already noticed several resemblances between our present Epistle and that to the Romans, one of which amounted to verbal identity. This single case has constrained some of those even who deny that our Epistle was written by Paul (e.g. Bleek, deWette), to confess that its author was probably familiar with the Epistle to the Romans. But marked resemblances—amounting sometimes almost to verbal coincidence—can be detected between the Epistles of Paul and the first Epistle of Peter (deWette cites seventeen parallels, Einl., 6 te. Ausg. p. 382sq., Froth.'s Trans. p. 342; see also Hug ii. § 166, Fosdick's Trans. p. 629; cf. also 2 Pet. and Jude); and again between this same Epistle of Peter and the Epistle of James (deWette and Hug, as above). Yet the independent authorship, the genuineness of these several epistles, is not questioned on this account. Resemblances far more numerous and more striking—coincidences of language as well as of thought—exist between our Epistle and the writings of Philo. Bleek (i. 398sq.) has selected (cf. J. B. Carpzov, *Sacr. Exercitt.*

in S. Paul. Epist. ad Hebr. ex Philone Alexandrino, etc.) a list of twenty-two. And, strange to say, among them is an instance corresponding precisely to the case of verbal identity just alluded to between our Epistle and that to the Romans. In Heb. xiii. 5 we read the quotation "I will never leave thee nor forsake thee." These exact words are not to be found in the Old Test. (cf. Josh. i. 5; Gen. xxviii. 15; Isa. xli. 17, and Deut. xxxi. 6, 8; 1 Chron. xxviii. 20), yet they are given identically in Philo (de confus. linguar. ed. Mang. i. 480, 26). But such agreements do not make us entertain the supposition, that the works of Philo and our Epistle had the same author.<sup>1</sup> They are far outweighed by the probabilities on the other side. To such probabilities we must have regard in judging of the evidence that Paul wrote our Epistle.

We turn then to the internal evidence on the other side, i.e. conflicting with the opinion that the Epistle was written by Paul :

For convenience' sake it may be arranged under the same three classes (viz. personal, doctrinal, formal); which we will notice in inverse order :

1. Indications of a *formal* nature, conflicting with the opinion that Paul was the author :

*a.* Not without significance is the absence of an opening salutation; the omission of all mention of the name of author or readers; and in general the meagreness of the personal references and the treatise-like nature of the Epistle. In these respects the Epistle differs confessedly from the acknowledged productions of the apostle.

Of these differences three explanations have been offered (Hug, Einl. ii. 420 sq., Fosdick's Trans. p. 599 sq.) :

(1) (Pantaenus urges) that Paul omitted the introductory formula "Paul the apostle," etc., out of modesty, because he knew himself to be distinctively an apostle to the Gentiles, and regarded the Lord himself as the "apostle" to the Hebrews (iii. 1).

<sup>1</sup> Here, again, some (Bleek, de Wette, Lünemann) account for the coincidence by the supposition that the inspired author quotes from Philo; Delitzsch (Com. p. 669) supposes that Deut. xxxi. 6 assumed that form in the liturgic or homiletic use of the Hellenists.

But we reply, the explanation is inadequate. It merely gives us a plausible reason why Paul may have avoided calling himself "an apostle." It does not tell us why he avoided all mention of himself. It explains the omission of the office; but it leaves unexplained the omission of the man — the chief difficulty. Had he chosen, he could have dropped "apostle," and called himself "Paul the servant of Jesus Christ," or "Paul the prisoner of Christ Jesus," or simply "Paul;" as he did, for obvious reasons, in writing to the Philippians, to Philemon, to the Thessalonians. (In reference to Paul's modes of salutation see Rückert on Gal. i. 1 or Ellicott on Phil. i. 1.)

(2) The second explanation is (that of Clement of Alexandria) that Paul concealed his authorship, at least in the first part of the Epistle, from motives of policy, in order that the readers might come to its perusal without prejudice.

But we reply :

(a) The Epistle, as we have seen, does not warrant the supposition that the writer wished to conceal himself.

(b) (In the absence of public carriers) concealment in such a case — at least from those into whose hands the messenger delivered the letter — seems hardly possible.

(c) If practised by the apostle under such circumstances, it would when detected have reacted to the disadvantage of him and his epistle.

(3) A third explanation is, that a personal salutation would have been incongruous with the rhetorical character of the composition.

This is true. And this admitted, the difficulty in the case swings back upon us with all its weight. Is it probable that Paul would write in such an exceptional way? and write so to the Hebrews? Would he not have been likely to begin in this case, as in others (witness Ep. to Gal. and Cor. and his speech at Athens), by an endeavor to secure the good-will of his readers?

Now it is said, because Paul prefixed his name to other letters it was not necessary for him to do so in every case.

The explanations of the omission which have been given are unsatisfactory it must be confessed, but it does not follow that there is not some satisfactory explanation, though lying quite beyond our present knowledge or conjecture (Davidson's *Introd. to N. T.* iii. 210).

Very true. But we are concerned in this discussion not with possibilities, but with probabilities. And how stands the case? Here is a writing whose authorship is in dispute. It differs in its general form as well as in distinct particulars — differs undeniably — from every other known composition (and there are thirteen such) of a certain author to whom it has been ascribed. And all attempts to account for the admitted differences fail. Now the question is, on which side does the probability of his being the author lie? so far as these differences go.

*b.* The way in which the Old Test. is employed in our Epistle differs from the mode in which it is employed by Paul; and that in three particulars.

(1) As respects the *quotations themselves*:

Paul quotes freely, very often from memory, apparently; but the author of our Epistle hardly allows himself, at least in the larger and more important quotations, to depart in the slightest from the sacred text. His punctilious accuracy leaves the impression that he must have verified his quotations by turning to the letter of the text.

(2) As respects the *source* from which the passages are taken:

Paul very often gives evidence of having had the Hebrew in mind; indeed frequently follows it, discarding the Sept. version and translating for himself. Our author, on the contrary, quotes uniformly from the Septuagint. The Epistle apparently does not contain more than a single exception to this remark (x. 30). The Sept. is followed even where its renderings depart from the Hebrew, e.g. xi. 21 (*ἐπὶ τὸ ἄκρον τῆς ῥάβδου*), xiii. 15 (*καρπὸς χειλέων*); it is not only followed, but employed sometimes as the foundation of the argument (e.g. x. 5; ii. 7). This variation from Pauline usage in

quotation occurs in an epistle written to Jews, and, as is commonly supposed, to Palestinian Jews.<sup>1</sup>

(3) As respects the phraseology with which they are introduced:

Paul in quoting from the Old Test. frequently gives the name of the author, as "David says," "Moses says," "Isaiah cries," etc., even though the passage quoted introduce God as speaking in the first person (e.g. Rom. x. 19, 20). Still more frequently he designates the quotation as "scripture," by the formula *γέγραπται, καθὼς (ὡς) γέγραπται, κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον, κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον, λέγει ἡ γραφή*.

These formulas *never* occur in the Epistle to the Hebrews. The quotations are referred *directly to God*; either by using the formula "God says," and the like (and this even in passages where God is spoken of in the third person, e.g. i. 6, 7, 8; iv. 4; vii. 21; x. 30), or "the Holy Spirit says," etc. (iii. 7; x. 15), or by regarding Christ the Son as the speaker (ii. 11-13; x. 5, 8 sq.). There is but a single exception, ii. 6 (*διεμαρτύρατο δὲ πού τις λέγων κ.τ.λ.*).<sup>2</sup>

c. The Epistle exhibits characteristics of *expression*, characteristics both negative and positive, which indicate that it was not written by Paul.

Preliminary Remark 1. It must be remembered here, as in fact throughout, that the reasoning is cumulative; single particulars in themselves light, when taken together may constitute a weighty argument.

Preliminary Remark 2. As respects the question of authorship, the number of coincidences or of differences in expression is of far less significance than their nature.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It has been noticed that the quotations of Paul from the Sept. coincide for the most part with the readings of the Vatican codex, while those of the Epistle to the Hebrews agree still more predominantly with the Alexandrian codex; this circumstance seems to indicate that its author was accustomed to a somewhat different form of the text from that used by the apostle.

<sup>2</sup> xii. 21 from Deut. ix. 19 cannot correctly be reckoned as an exception.

<sup>3</sup> The last edition of Webster's Dictionary comprises upwards of one hundred and fourteen thousand words. Yet "few writers or speakers use as many as ten thousand words, ordinary persons of fair intelligence not above three or four

To begin with the *negative* characteristics alluded to (see *Christian Examiner* for 1827, p. 509) :

(1) There are certain forms of expression which are favorite with Paul, but which do not occur in this Epistle. The expressions referred to are of a general nature, such as would be pertinent in any epistle, such as disclose to us a writer's habits of expression.

(a) The phrase *ἐν Χριστῷ* occurs seventy-eight times in the Epistles of Paul, but not once in the Epistle to the Hebrews, although the length of this epistle (exclusive of quotations) bears to the total length of the thirteen Pauline Epistles "somewhat more than the proportion of one to seven."

(b) The phrase *ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός* (with various modifications as respects arrangement and pronouns) occurs in Paul's epistles more than eighty times (according to Thol., *Com.* p. 52, it is found eighty-six times in the Epistle to the Romans, and twenty-six times in 1 Cor.). But it does not occur in the Epistle to the Hebrews; we find instead *ὁ κύριος* two (or three xii. 14?) times; *Ἰησοῦς* nine times; *Χριστός* (with or without the art.) nine times; *Ἰησοῦς Χριστός* three times; and *ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς* once.

(c) The word *εὐαγγέλιον*, "the gospel," occurs sixty-one times in the other epistles; it is not met with in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

(d) The appellation *πατήρ* is used of God forty-four times by Paul. The only instance in which it is used by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews is in the phrase "Father of Spirits" (by way of antithesis to "fathers of our flesh," xii. 9).

Passing to *positive* characteristics, there are

(2) Certain forms of expression which the author of our Epistle substitutes for synonymous expressions employed by Paul.

thousand" (*Marsh's Lects. on the Eng. Lang.* p. 182). Our current translation of the Bible contains fewer than six thousand. The vocabulary of the Greek New Test. numbers about five thousand words, exclusive of proper names; and it is believed that the number of different words employed in our Epistle (quotations and proper names not included) is about seven hundred.

(a) In the phrase *καθίζω ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ*, etc., where Paul (twice Eph. i. 20; Col. iii. 1) uses the verb transitively, the writer to the Hebrews substitutes (four times) the intransitive use.

(b) The word *μισθαποδοσία* is used in our Epistle (three times) where Paul employs in the same sense (and connection. cf. 1 Cor. iii. 8, 14 with Heb. ii, 2; and 1 Cor. ix. 17 with Heb. x. 35) the simple *μισθός*.

(c) The phrases *εἰς τὸ διηκεῖς* (three times and peculiar to our Epistle) *εἰς τὸ παντελές* (once) and *διαπαντός* (twice; in Rom. xi. 10 it stands in a quotation from the Old Test.) are substituted for Paul's (less elegant, cf. Sturz, de Dialect. Maced. et Alex. p. 187) *πάντοτε*.

(d) *μέτοχου εἶναι, γίνεσθαι* is (four times) used where Paul employs *κοινωνὸν (συγκοινωνὸν) εἶναι, κοινωνεῖν*, etc.

(3) Other expressions are peculiar to this Epistle: such are

(a) The use of *παρά* and *ὑπέρ* (with acc.) after a comparative, five times in our Epistle, never in Paul's; and comparison by means of the formal *ὅσον . . . . τοσοῦτο* (four times).

(b) *ἄνπερ* (three times); never used by Paul.

(c) *ὅθεν*, "wherefore," six times in our Epistle; never in Paul's. Connectives have been styled "the physiognomy of speech." In addition to the characteristic conjunctions just mentioned the Epistle to the Hebrews exhibits, generally, greater variety and delicacy than Paul in the use of connectives.

Other characteristic expressions might be adduced, such as the phrase *οἰκουμένη μέλλουσα* ii. 5 (to denote the "consummate Christian dispensation"); *κρείττων* frequently used in a peculiar sense, the employment of feminine verbal nouns in *σις* which nearly all belong to literary Greek (Winer, Grammatik, 7th ed., p. 89, middle); but

More convincing in its bearing on the question of authorship than particular coincidences or differences of phraseology is

(4) The general difference of its style and diction from that of the Pauline Epistles. This difference is marked. Paul as a writer is rugged, abrupt, impassioned, digressive, unequal.

He writes like a man with a full heart, bent on uttering himself, and not very solicitous about the mode, provided he makes himself understood. With all this the Epistle to the Hebrews is in contrast.

(a) The language used in it is more pure, idiomatic, ample; not classic of course. Classic Greek had disappeared. Nor is the composition as pure in language and correct in construction as the writings of its author's native Greek contemporaries. Even Philo and Josephus, educated Jews, could not rid their style of national peculiarities.<sup>1</sup> Hebraisms, both lexical and grammatical, are to be found in our Epistle (Thol. as above), though by no means so many as some writers have alleged (cf. Davidson, *Introd.* iii. 242 sq., after Tholuck, *Com.* p. 26 sq.). But the statement, notice, is a *comparative* one. The language of our Epistle is less Hebraistic; its constructions are more idiomatic than those of the Epistles of Paul; of this assertion from the nature of the case no direct proof can here be attempted; yet its truth might be illustrated by the frequent and varied use of participles, particles, etc.

(b) The *style* is less impassioned than Paul's; more regular and periodic in structure; more rhythmical and euphonious. In short, the careful selection of the words, the delicate poise of the sentences, the musical flow of the periods, accord far better with the supposition that our Epistle was the leisurely composition of a man of scholastic training, than the product of the apostle Paul.

These statements cannot be adequately illustrated by the quotation of single passages. Still, one or two particulars may be specified, in which this rhetorical elaborateness of style becomes apparent.

a. Although many of its sentences are long and complex, in some cases even including parenthesis within parenthesis

<sup>1</sup> Josephus tells us (*contr. Apion.* i. 9; *Opera ed. Hav.* ii. 442) that in the composition of his History he employed assistance in reference to the Greek, and even amid his boasting he is constrained to confess his deficiencies (*Antiq.* xx. 11, 2; *ed. Hav.* i. p. 982). For critical judgments respecting Philo's Greek see Tholuck's *Com.* p. 48, note.

(xii. 18 sq.; vii. 20 sq.), yet their termination is adjusted to the beginning with careful accuracy. It is doubtful whether there is a single instance of anacoluthon in the Epistle. A marked contrast this to the grammatical inaccuracies of structure characteristic of almost all of Paul's longer periods.

β. The selection of stately words and full-sounding phrases: e.g. *πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως* etc., with which the Epistle begins; *μισθαποδοσία, μεγαλωσύνη, ὀρκωμοσία, αἱματεκχυσία*, and the like, cf. the employment of *ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως τοῦ θεοῦ* (i. 3) for Paul's simple *εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ*. So, again, Paul's expression *ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ καθήμενος* (Col. iii. 1) is expanded in the Hebrews even into *ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θρόνου τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν ταῖς οὐρανοῖς* (viii. 1).

(5) *Testimony* on this head. The difference as respects language and style between the Epistle to the Hebrews and the thirteen acknowledged Epistles of Paul has been conceded from the first.

Clement of Alexandria (towards close of second century) virtually admitted this by adopting the supposition that the Epistle had been translated by Luke, and on that account resembled in style the book of the Acts (see Kirchhofer, *Quellensammlung* u. s. w. p. 241; Euseb. H. E. vi. 14).

Origen († 254) is very explicit: "The style of the Epistle entitled 'To the Hebrews' has not the rudeness of the language of the apostle who confessed himself to be rude in speech, that is in diction; but the epistle is better Greek in the texture of its style, as every one able to judge of differences in style would confess," etc. (Kirch. p. 4; Euseb. H. E. vi. 25). This is the testimony of men to whom Greek was vernacular.

Jerome, the great biblical scholar of the West, testifies that "the Epistle to the Hebrews is believed not to be Paul's, because its style and diction differ from his" (Kirch. p. 178).

The same opinion finds fresh utterance with the revival of letters and the Reformation.

For the Roman Catholics speaks Erasmus, asserting that

“its style has no affinity with Paul’s,” but “differs in every respect” (in his annotation on xiii. 24; Opera vi. 1023-24. the passage is given in full by Alford, Proleg. to the Epistle p. 33 sq.).

For the Reformers, Luther; who says “it is not St. Paul’s because it employs a more ornate diction than St. Paul is accustomed to” (cf. Bleek, Com. i., note 388).

Calvin; who declares (in the Preface to his Commentary on the Epistle, Tholuck’s ed. p. 380) that “its mode of discourse and style testify plainly enough that its author was another than Paul.”

A similar judgment has been given by Grotius, Valckenær, and others; and at the present day this opinion is almost unquestioned.

Those who, notwithstanding the difference of style, hold to the opinion that Paul was the author, offer three suggestions in explanation of this difference:

First, That it is to be accounted for by assuming a considerable interval of time to have elapsed between the composition of the other thirteen epistles and that to the Hebrews. In that interval the apostle’s style (it is said) may have undergone a change; similar to that which John’s seems to have undergone between the composition of the Apocalypse and his Gospel.

But this explanation (to mention no other objection to it) is overthrown by the fact that the Epistle, if the work of Paul, must have been written (as all our knowledge of the apostle’s history compels us to believe) at the farthest only a year or two after the latest of his other epistles. And such an interval is too short for such transformation in a style which during ten or fifteen years preceding showed no tendency towards such a change (Davidson, iii. 295, dates the earliest of Paul’s epistles, 1 Thess., at A.D. 52, while according to him the Epistle to the Heb. and 2 Tim. were written A.D. 63).

Secondly, Others have conjectured that its studied style is owing to its being addressed to Jewish readers; readers to whom the apostle to the Gentiles has addressed no other epistle.

But this explanation is unsatisfactory. For, Hebrew or Hellenistic readers would have been among the last duly to appreciate this unusual purity and finish of Greek style. In writing to the cultivated Corinthians he does not bestow any special care upon his style. And yet that this matter had engaged his attention he shows by the half-apologetic confession he makes that he is “*rude* in speech” (*ιδιότης τῶ λόγῳ*, 2 Cor. xi. 6). Finished Greek, therefore, we should not expect that *he* would have attempted to write, who “to the Jews *became as a Jew*”; nor would they (probably) have been especially gratified with it, accustomed, as they were, to speak and to write a more Hebraistic idiom.

Thirdly, It has been assumed that the style of the Epistle may have taken its cast from the amanuensis to whom it was dictated, and who may have been a scholarly Greek.

But we reply, there is no evidence from the other epistles that the style of the amanuensis sensibly affected the style of the apostle. They were dictated to different persons; yet possess indisputable marks of a common author. Tertius, to whom the Epistle to the Romans was dictated (xvi. 22), was not, to judge him from his name, a Jew; yet the style of that epistle does not differ appreciably from that of the Epistle to the Galatians, which the apostle *seems* to have written with “his own hand” (Gal. vi. 11).

2. We pass to internal evidence of the second class tending to show that our Epistle was not the composition of Paul, viz. evidence of a *doctrinal* nature:

And here it may not be superfluous to repeat the remark, that it is not to be supposed that the doctrine of this Epistle is in any particular irreconcilable with the doctrine of Paul. This, indeed, has been asserted both in ancient and modern times. But the assertion has been rejected by Christendom as unsustainable by the facts. The Epistle does differ somewhat in doctrine from the Pauline Epistles. But the differences are not discrepancies. There is one glory of the sun and another glory of the moon; but the radiance of both is light from heaven. The differences resemble those which

are acknowledged to exist between the aspects of truth disclosed to us in other biblical books. John, for example, presents Christianity to our view as spiritual and eternal life in light and love. In James it reveals itself as perfect obedience to perfect law. So we remark :

a. Paul presents Christianity distinctively, as justification before God through faith in the Crucified One. Hence the current terms in his epistles are *δικαιοσύνη ἐκ πίστεως*, or *διὰ πίστεως*, *δικαιούσθαι*, *δικαίωσις*, *ἔργα πίστεως* and *ἔργα νόμου*, *ὀργή* and *χάρις θεοῦ*, *ἀπολύτρωσις*, *καταλλαγή*, *πνεῦμα* and *σάραξ*.

The fundamental view taken of Christianity in our Epistle is consummated Judaism. Accordingly its characteristic terms are *τελειοῦν*, *καθαρίζω*, *ἀγιάζω*, etc.

It results from this fundamental peculiarity of the Epistle that in it

(1) Faith is defined and illustrated (ch. xi.) in its generic, Jewish sense of trust in God's assurances. With Paul, on the other hand, it is generally specific—a sinner's trust in Christ. In the Epistle to the Hebrews it is antithetic to sight; in Paul antithetic (generally, yet cf. 2 Cor. v. 7) to works.

(2) The eternal high priesthood of Christ in heaven is presented as the consummation of the Messiah's career; whereas in Paul's epistles his triumphant resurrection is made prominent. *That* set the divine seal to his earthly work, and declared him to be the Son of God with power.

(3) The "people of God" (ii. 17; xiii. 12), the "seed of Abraham" (ii. 16, contrast Gal. iii. 28, 29) are faithful Jews; at least, little or nothing is said of the truth which Paul makes so prominent, that Gentiles are joint-heirs with Jews of the grace of life.

(4) The Old Test. is interpreted in a spiritualizing, symbolic way; a mode of interpretation indeed, of which traces are here and there to be found in Paul's writings (e.g. Gal. iv. 21 sq.; 1 Cor. x. 1 sq.), but which is so marked in this Epistle as to give it a half-mystical and speculative cast (cf.

Westcott, *History of the Canon*, 1st ed., p. 51; Riehm, *Lehrbegriff des Hebr.-br.* p. 188 sq.).

Now it must be admitted, ( $\alpha$ ) that these peculiarities do not by any means constitute so wide a divergence from the Pauline type of doctrine as is to be found in other apostolic epistles; ( $\beta$ ) that they relate rather to the development and proportion of doctrines than to their substance, — consist of omissions rather than positive statements; and ( $\gamma$ ) that it is possible to explain them all as owing to what is peculiar in the theme, the aim of the writer, and the character and circumstances of the original readers. Taken by themselves, they can hardly be considered as evidence that Paul was not the author. They would still seem strange to us. It would strike us as remarkable that the apostle's characteristic opinions, which crop out in the other epistles even where neither the readers nor the theme seem to suggest them (e.g. Phil. iii.), should fail to find expression in this, although tempting opportunities present themselves on every page. In the language of Delitzsch (*Com.* p. 703), "It is, and must remain, surprising that as we dissect the Epistle we nowhere meet with those ideas which are, so to speak, the very arteries of Paul's spiritual system. The apostle to the Gentiles, who through the law became dead to the law, lives in the antagonism between righteousness of faith and of works; he whom the Lord had called to the apostleship, not in the days of his flesh, but from his life of heavenly glory, lives and moves in Christ's resurrection; he who was sent unto the Gentiles, and who was predestined to effect the separation of synagogue and church, lives and moves in the call of the Gentiles to fellowship in salvation. But of these three fundamental doctrines there is to be found only a passing allusion (xiii. 20) to the resurrection." Still it is not so much as independent arguments, but rather as corroboratory indications of authorship, that the doctrinal characteristics mentioned have much weight. These indications are strengthened, further, by the fact that

b. Our Epistle differs somewhat from Paul's in the grounds on which its presentation of truth is made in general to rest:

Paul speaks as the authoritative messenger of God. He often makes reference, indeed, to the Old Testament, but oftener still he quietly assumes plenary authority to declare what had not been revealed to holy men of old.

The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, on the other hand, rests his teaching upon biblical statements almost exclusively. It is from the ancient scriptures that he demonstrates the dignity of the Messiah; his superiority to angels, to Moses, to Aaron. It is by the Old Testament that he proves the typical and temporary nature of the former economy and the superiority and permanence of the new. In short, he speaks, "not so much as an inspired messenger, delivering himself of that with which God had entrusted him, but as an enlightened believer in Moses and the prophets, both learning and teaching by a diligent comparison of what the ancient servants of Jehovah had uttered under the inspiration of the Divine Spirit" (An amended Trans. of the Ep. to the Hebrews, b. p. vi., 1847, London: Bagster and Sons; cf. Stanley's Sermons and Essays on the Apostolic Age, 2d ed., p. 366 sq.).

3. Facts, and allusions of a personal nature, inconsistent, apparently, with the supposition that the Epistle is Paul's :

*a.* There is a presumption against Paul's being the author in the circumstance that the Epistle addresses itself to Jewish Christians. If Paul wrote it, he departed in doing so from his ordinary province of labor (the Gentiles, and where Christ had not been preached, Gal. ii. 9; Rom. xv. 20).

*b.* If Paul had written to Jewish converts, particularly those at Jerusalem, he could hardly have abstained from justifying his apostolic course, which had brought down upon him their displeasure at his very last visit among them (Acts xxi. 17 sq.). It is difficult to understand, too, how Paul could have given utterance to language implying affectionate intimacy (e.g. xiii. 19).

Should it be conjectured that he adopted this course for the purpose of propitiating his readers, how shall we reconcile with such a supposition the plain terms in which (e.g. v. 11 sq.) he reproaches them with dullness and ignorance?

c. If Paul had written the Epistle to Christians at Jerusalem, he could hardly have alluded in cool historic style, as he does, to the early persecutions and martyrs of that church: "Remember those who have been your leaders, who spoke to you the word of God; whose faith follow, considering the end of their manner of life" (Heb. xiii. 7); "Ye have not yet resisted unto blood, striving against sin" (xii. 4).

Paul had been forward in inflicting these very persecutions. At the death of the proto-martyr, the witnesses laid off their clothes at the feet of Saul, who "was consenting unto his death" (Acts vii. 58; viii. 1, cf 3; ix. 1). How Paul was accustomed to allude to these things, even in writing to third parties, we see in 1 Cor. xv. 9, "I am the least of the apostles, that am not meet to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the church of God"; and in 1 Tim. i. 12 sq., "I thank Christ Jesus our Lord . . . . for that he counted me faithful, putting me into the ministry, who was before a blasphemer and a persecuter and injurious," etc.

d. Inconsistent with the supposition that Paul is the author, is the passage (ii. 3): "How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation, which began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard," etc. In this passage the author classes himself and his hearers together, and distinguishes them from those who had received the gospel immediately from Christ. This is in marked opposition to Paul's uniform style of speech on this subject. He constantly insists that he did not receive the gospel through any human channel, but by direct revelation from Christ, and accordingly claims to rank as the co-equal of the other apostles. See Gal. i. 1, 11, 12, 15, 16; ii. 6; 1 Cor. ix. 1; xi. 23; Eph. iii. 2, 3; 2 Cor. xi. 5. This is Paul's style of speech on the subject upon all (other) occasions.

But it is objected, the plural pronoun here may be used "communicatively," i.e. by that rhetorical usage according to which a person employs the term "we," although, strictly speaking, he does not mean to include himself.

We reply, This communicative use of the pronoun is allow-

able in two cases (cf. *Christian Examiner* for 1829, p. 335),

(1) When employed in a *collective* sense, i.e. when the writer views himself as belonging to a community, and asserts something of the community as a whole, although it may not be true of him considered as an individual. Here belongs the instance quoted from Cicero: "nos perdimus rempublicam."

(2) When used out of *courtesy*, i.e. when a writer in order to avoid immodesty, or to diminish the unpleasantness of the truth he is uttering, speaks as though he referred, in part at least, to himself, although really he has reference solely to others. This use is illustrated by every skilful preacher in almost every sermon.

Now in both these cases, notice, the writer merely keeps a distinction out of view. But in the present passage the distinction is clearly expressed, and the writer (on the interpretation proposed) assumes a false position in reference to it. He designates three separate classes of persons, viz. "the Lord," "them that heard him," and "we"; and in the face of this explicit distinction he puts himself in with the third class. The laws of rhetoric sometimes allow a writer to conceal truth, never to contradict it.

The improbability of Paul's making this false classification of himself in the present case is heightened, by the circumstance that the very weight of the writer's argument here rests upon the pre-eminently direct and trustworthy way in which his readers had come by the gospel. Hence the reference to the "Lord himself." Undeniably his argument would have been strengthened had he been able to appeal to a revelation of truth made to himself direct from heaven. As Paul could have made such an appeal, it is hardly possible to believe that he would not have made it. This passage, then, as Calvin (*Com.*, Tholuck's ed., p. 393; see also the *Arg.* p. 380) and others have said, is proof that the Epistle was not written by Paul.

It may be added that there seem to be indications that the Epistle was composed after the death of the apostle. Chief among them is the mention (xiii. 23) of Timothy's

release from imprisonment ("know that the brother Timothy has been set at liberty"). This assumption that the fact of his imprisonment is known to the readers, seems to imply that the imprisonment itself can have been neither unimportant nor of short duration. And yet nowhere else in the New Testament—not even in the latest of Paul's epistles (2 Tim.), written as is supposed very shortly before the apostle's death—is there any mention of this imprisonment. At the close of that epistle (iv. 9) the apostle summons Timothy from Ephesus to Rome; and it is not an unnatural supposition that there, as one who had been the apostle's friend and helper, he underwent the incarceration alluded to (Bleek, Einl. in d. N. T. p. 501, 502, cf. Tholuck, p. 22).

It appears, then, that while there are indications in the Epistle itself—indications personal, doctrinal, formal—which suggest the apostle Paul as its author, there is on the other hand much stronger evidence, of all three kinds, against the supposition that he composed it.

Let us turn now to the *external* or *historical* evidence.

1. Pantaenus is the first, so far as we know, who connected the name of Paul with the epistle. Pantaenus was at the head of the catechetical school in Alexandria about A.D. 150. His testimony comes to us at third hand in Eusebius (H. E. vi. 14; Kirch. p. 242). Eusebius quotes Clement of Alexandria as saying: "But now" as the blessed presbyter [probably Pantaenus, Clement's teacher] used to say, "since the Lord, being the Apostle of the Almighty, was sent to the Hebrews, Paul out of modesty, as if sent to the Gentiles, did not subscribe himself an apostle of the Hebrews; both out of reverence for the Lord, and because he, the herald and apostle of the Gentiles, wrote also to the Hebrews *ex abundantia*."

Note. Even this earliest testimony indicates that the Epistle is felt to possess characteristics at variance with Pauline authorship.

2. Clement of Alexandria (†220?) the pupil and successor of Pantaenus, is the next witness. He repeatedly cites the Epistle as Paul's. His most explicit testimony, given in his *ἰστορικῶσις* or "outlines"—a summary of the contents of

the thoughts (*νοήματα*) are those of the apostle, but the language and the composition (*ἡ δὲ φράσις καὶ ἡ σύνθεσις*) those of some one who recorded the apostle's views, who wrote out notes (*σχολιογραφήσαντος*; cf. note in Kirch.), as it were, of what had been said by his master. If any church, then, receives this Epistle as Paul's, let it have credit on that very account, for not without reason have the ancients handed it down as Paul's. But as to who wrote the Epistle, the truth is known to God. The account which has reached us [is various], some saying that Clement, who became bishop of the Romans, wrote the Epistle; some that Luke, who wrote the Gospel and the Acts.'"

In this testimony

Note a. That Origen professes to be giving his own opinion — the opinion of the best biblical scholar of his age.

Note b. That he cannot acknowledge the Epistle to be Pauline in the fullest sense; the thoughts are Pauline, the composition is not.

Note c. That the tradition that it was Paul's was ancient, yet not decisive of the question. The indefinite phrase, "the ancients have handed it down to us as Paul's," seems most naturally to mean that the belief in its Pauline authorship had in former times been the prevalent belief.

Note d. This opinion it is implied that some churches still hold (and are to be commended for holding), and that other churches reject; to say, as even Davidson does, p. 189, that the words "If any church receives this Epistle as Paul's let it have credit on that very account," do not sustain the inference that any church rejected it as his, is unwarranted. The language is hypothetical, it is true; but the phrase "let it have credit" (*εὐδοκμεῖτω*) conveys an indubitable implication as to the fact. We do not commend persons for doing what every body does without exception. If a person should say to-day: "If any church holds to the Boston Confession of 1680 let it be commended for doing so," should we think the inference that some churches do not hold to that platform unwarranted?

Note e. That in his judgment the proper author of the Epistle is unknown. Many contend that *ὁ γράψας* in the phrase "who it was wrote the Epistle only God knows," means merely acted as scribe (e.g. Rom. xvi. 22, *ἐγὼ Τίτριος ὁ γράψας τὴν ἐπιστολήν*. But

the phrase has naturally the same sense here as in the sentence immediately following: "Luke, who wrote (*ὁ γράψας*) the Gospel," etc. Though Origen thinks that the thoughts of the Epistle are Paul's, yet in the composition of the Epistle Paul was passive (cf. reply to the third explanation of the difference of style, p. 699).

From the time of Origen the Epistle to the Hebrews was currently accepted as Pauline by the Alexandrian and other Oriental churches. By the Synod of Antioch (A.D. 264 sq.) passages from it (chap. xi.) and from the Epistles to the Corinthians are linked together, and ascribed to "the apostle" (Mansi, i. 1038).

But the unqualified assertion that the Oriental writers do not exhibit a single trace of dissent from the opinion that Paul was its author (Olsh. Opusc. p. 95) is not quite true. Eusebius (bishop of Caesarea, in first half of the fourth century, † about 340) often quotes the Epistle as Paul's (Kirch. pp. 247, 248), yet he elsewhere says (iii. 3; Kirch. p. 170) "It ought not to be denied that some have set aside the Epistle to the Hebrews, saying that it is rejected by the church at Rome as not being Paul's." In another passage (H. E. vi. 18; Kirch. p. 240) he even seems himself to reckon it among the "antilegomena": he is speaking of Clement's *Stromata*, and says: "He has made use in them also of testimonies from the disputed writings (antilegomena), both from the so-called Wisdom of Solomon, and of Jesus the son of Sirach, also from the Epistle to the Hebrews, and from that of Barnabas and Clement and Jude" (cf. Thol. p. 13 sq.; Credner on the Canon, ed. Volkmar, p. 201 sq.).

It appears, then, that the apostle Paul was generally regarded as the author of the Epistle — mediate or immediate — by the Alexandrian and other Oriental Christians, from the middle of the second century downwards. But this opinion cannot be said to have been held with absolute unanimity, nor are there wanting (at least at first) indications, more or less marked, that the character of the Epistle was felt to conflict with it.

The testimony from the West is of a different nature.

Half a century before the Epistle is mentioned in the East, and hardly thirty years after it was written, we find it known and prized at Rome (see below, on the Canonicity), by a man who is believed to have been a fellow-laborer with the apostle Paul (see Phil. iv. 3; yet cf. Ellicott in loc.).

It seems hardly possible that, had the apostle been its author, Clement should have remained ignorant of the fact; or that, the fact once known, knowledge of it should have died out, while the Epistle itself survived. And yet in all parts of the West—in Gaul, Italy, Africa—the Epistle was regarded as un-Pauline.

1. Irenaeus (bishop at Lyons from A.D. 178 on) although making abundant use of all the other epistles of Paul, except Philemon, never quotes the Epistle to the Hebrews. This is negative testimony, indeed; but not without weight, for

(a) There are many passages in the Epistle which would have been very serviceable to Irenaeus in his controversies, had he and his opponents acknowledged the work as Pauline.

(b) Eusebius (v. 26 p. 212; Kirch. 239) in referring to a work of Irenaeus, no longer extant, speaks of the fact as though something remarkable, that “in it he mentions the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the so-called Wisdom of Solomon, subjoining certain sayings from them.”

(c) Photius (Patriarch of Constantinople and historian, † about 890, cf. Kirch. p. 240) quotes Stephen Gobar, of the sixth century, as recording “that Irenaeus says that Paul’s Epistle to the Hebrews is not his.”

2. Hippolytus, who describes himself as a pupil of Irenaeus and friend of Origen, and who lived at the beginning of the third century, would not admit that Paul wrote it: “The Epistle to the Hebrews is not the apostle Paul’s” (Church History, as preserved in Photius; Kirch. p. 240).

3. The Roman presbyter Caius, also of the first part of the third century, “mentions (according to Euseb. vi. 20; Kirch. p. 243) only the thirteen epistles of St. Paul, not reckoning that to the Hebrews with the rest.” Here again Photius endorses the statement.

4. Tertullian († between 220 and 240) makes but a single express reference to it, in a passage soon to be quoted at length (see on Canonicity, p. 720). He apparently has never heard of its being attributed to Paul; but quotes it unhesitatingly as the work of Barnabas.

5. Cyprian († 258), also of North Africa, nowhere mentions the Epistle, and in two passages (Kirch. p. 247) he speaks of Paul as having addressed seven churches, as our Lord did in the Apocalypse; a comparison found also in other ancient writers who refuse to recognize Hebrews as Paul's work (cf. Muratori's Fragment, and Victorinus).

More than a century later writers in the West, (Hilary, † 368 et al., cf. Credner, p. 267) following the Greek church Fathers, begin to ascribe the Epistle to Paul, and this opinion finally becomes general, largely through the influence of Jerome († 420) and Augustine († 430). Even these last two writers, however, exhibit traces of the earlier opinion:

Jerome vacillates (cf. Kirch. pp. 253, 254). His references to the Ep. are numerous. At times he quotes from it unequivocally, as "Paul," or "the Apostle"; at others, as "the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, whoever he may be," or "the apostle Paul, or whoever else wrote the Epistle," and says explicitly "the Epistle to the Hebrews, which Latin usage does not receive"; and again, "by most it is excluded from the number of Paul's epistles"; so too, "many Latins doubt about it." His fullest and latest (A.D. 414) utterance is as follows: After quoting from the Epistle (xi. 8 sq.) he adds, "the Jews of course do not receive these proofs." "We must tell Christians ('nostris'; perhaps 'our Latin Christians') that this Epistle entitled 'to the Hebrews' is received not only by the churches of the East, but by the whole succession of ecclesiastical Greek writers, as if it were the apostle Paul's, although very many ascribe it either to Barnabas or to Clement. And it is of no importance whose it is, as it is the work of an ecclesiastical man (i.e. not a heretic; cf. Bleek, Com. i. note <sup>281</sup>), and is daily read in the churches. But if Latin usage does not receive it among canonical writings, neither

do the Greek churches, using the same liberty, accept the Apocalypse of John ; yet *we* accept both ; by no means following present usage, but the authority of ancient writers, who for the most part constantly quote proof-texts from both, not as they are in the habit of doing sometimes from apocryphal writings (just as they occasionally use instances even from heathen literature), but as if canonical.”<sup>1</sup>

Augustine's bearing toward the Epistle is similar. Occasionally he quotes from it as “the apostle's,” but he evidently prefers some indefinite circumlocution : “the Epistle to the Hebrews” ; “the Epistle written to the Hebrews” ; “the Epistle entitled to the Hebrews,” etc., and says expressly “some have feared to receive it into the canon.” “Many say that Paul is its author, but some deny it,” etc. In one of his controversial writings (cf. Bleek, p. 220), after having gone through with proofs from Paul's epistles, he comes to the Hebrews, and then, as though in justification of his use of it, says, that “although it is uncertain to some, yet as he has read that certain of his opponents have chosen to employ it as a witness for their views, and is influenced more by the authority of the Oriental churches that reckon it too among the canonical books, he will take note of its testimony,” etc. (cf. too, Davidson, *Introd.* iii. p. 183 sq.).

The historical testimony concerning its author, then, exhibits a very remarkable contradiction : The Eastern churches almost unanimously regarded it as directly or indirectly the work of Paul, while among the Western no trace of any such opinion is to be found till after the lapse of two centuries.

An attempt has been made (Spanheim, *Wetst.*, especially Hug, *Einl.* ii. 412 sq.) to account for this contradiction by a reference to the views of the Montanists and subsequently of the Novatians. Heb. vi. 4 sq. it is said, sustains the views of these heretics concerning the non-restoration of the lapsi, and consequently the Epistle fell into disfavor with the Orthodox.

<sup>1</sup> Here we see Jerome is inclined to merge the question of authorship in the broader and more important question of canonicity ; see below.

But the explanation is not satisfactory ; for (1) If this had been the reason for the denial of the apostolic origin of the Epistle, numerous and unmistakable indications, not to say avowals of it, would probably be discoverable in the early writers ; but such is not the case. (2) These heretics themselves deny that Paul wrote the Epistle ! Tertullian's language is very explicit (see below p. 720) ; and Novatian himself does not so much as mention the Epistle (cf. *Thol.* p. 17 sq.).

It is said, the denial of its Pauline origin in the West should be disregarded, and the tradition of the Eastern churches credited ; for two reasons : (1) The testimony of the East is positive ; that of the West negative. (2) The truth of the matter is more likely to have been preserved in the East, where the Epistle was first read and put in circulation.

But (a) Even in the East it was not *known* who wrote it. This is evident from the differences in the views held there.

(b) The testimony of the West is not wholly negative. Tertullian, e.g. gives testimony as positive as any given in the East, that Barnabas wrote it (yet that testimony the majority of subsequent writers have not hesitated to set aside).

(c) The testimony of the West, although negative in the sense that it does not assign the Epistle to Paul as its author, is nevertheless positive in relation to the question : Did Paul write it ? When we consider that the Epistle was known at Rome more than half a century before any traces of it in the East have been preserved to us (some thirty years only after its composition), that though treated with respect at the West from that time on, it was never acknowledged or treated as Paul's, while had it ever been ascribed to him on trustworthy testimony, the opinion would not have been likely to become extinct,<sup>1</sup> — the ancient and wide-spread and uniform disbelief in its Pauline origin which existed among Western Christians cannot fairly be set aside as of little

<sup>1</sup> The drift of Christian opinion in such a case is in just the contrary direction, as is well illustrated by the history of this very Epistle.

weight (see Bleek, p. 388 sq. ; Riehm, p. 880 ; cf. Thol. p. 65). We must acknowledge at the least that the testimony of antiquity is far from authenticating it as the work of Paul.

Ancient testimony, then, being what it is — radically conflicting and, when affirmative, perhaps conjectural — we are left exposed to the full force of the internal evidence against the Pauline authorship. That evidence is so various, abundant, strong, as quite to justify the emphatic language of Calvin : “ I cannot be brought to acknowledge Paul as its author ” (as above, p. 380).

C. The opinion that Paul was indirectly its author : Here, if we would escape confusion, we must distinguish between suppositions which are often blended :

1. We may suppose Paul to have dictated the Epistle, and Luke or some other amanuensis to have penned it.

But on this supposition Paul remains the sole author of it. This was his usual mode of composing. This method does not produce any perceptible diversity in his style. For this reason (and others) this supposition is a useless supposition for our present purpose.

2. We may suppose the Epistle to be the joint production of Paul and some friend ; whether we assume that Paul merely appended the conclusion (so, e.g. H. Thiersch, de Epist. ad Hebr. comment. historic. Marburg, 1848, p. 1, bot.), or participated throughout in its composition.

But this supposition, in either form of it, is unnatural and without evidence. We have no reason to believe it to have been any more common anciently to compose letters in such a way than it is to-day. We have no evidence that any other New Testament epistle originated in this way. In reference to the present Epistle the opinion is a mere assumption ; an assumption which does not remove the difficulties in the case (cf. Bleek, Einl. in d. N. T. p. 515).

3. We may suppose the ideas to be in the main Paul's, but the composition to be the work of some one else.

Then, according to the ordinary use of language, Paul was not, and “ some one else ” was, the “ author ” of the Epistle.

According to common speech, Paul cannot be called the author of the Epistle unless he participated in the work of its composition. He is the author of a work (in the ordinary and obvious sense of the phrase), not who furnishes merely the ideas it contains, but the ideas in the form and expression they bear in that work. We call Luke the "author" of the third Gospel, although not only the facts, but in part the phraseology even, may have come from other sources. The author of our Epistle may have derived many of his thoughts from the apostle; but Paul cannot in the ordinary sense of the term be called its author, unless he were present and active during the work of its composition.

Since Paul, then, cannot be regarded as the author of the Epistle, we proceed to mention

D. The conjectures which have been ventured concerning the author :

Prominent among those to whom it has been attributed are Luke, Clement of Rome, Barnabas; and in modern times Apollos and Silas. [An examination of the arguments urged in support of their respective claims would show that in no case, not even that of Apollos, do they amount to much more than plausibility.]

Such are the indications which the Epistle gives of its author, and such the opinions respecting him which have found currency in ancient and modern times. An impartial consideration of them constrains us reverently to echo the words of Origen, *τίς δὲ ὁ γράψας τὴν ἐπιστολὴν, τὸ μὲν ἀληθὲς θεὸς οἶδεν.*<sup>1</sup>

#### ITS CANONICITY :

By the canonicity of a book is meant its claim to be numbered among those writings which constitute the final au-

<sup>1</sup> The use of the term "apostle" in reference to the author, both in former and recent times, by those who have hesitated to admit the Pauline origin of the book (e.g. Calvin, Luther, Beza, Delitzsch, etc.) finds its explanation, doubtless, in the fact that the Epistle confessedly breathes an apostolic spirit, and is thought to find warrant in the application of the term to Barnabas, Acts xiv. 14 (cf. Delitzsch, Com. p. 707).

thority in matters of Christian faith. This claim has been extensively supposed, both in ancient and modern times, to be dependent upon the authorship of a writing in question. It has been assumed that only those New Testament writings are authoritative which are apostolic. This is the view of the matter which even Origen († 254) appears to accept in arguing from this very Epistle. He is speaking of the tradition concerning the death of the prophet Isaiah, “that he was sawn asunder,” and says that “this is attested by the Epistle to the Hebrews, although recorded in none of the acknowledged (*φανερώων*) books,” and proceeds: “But perhaps some one, pressed by this demonstration, has recourse to the opinion of those who set aside the Epistle as not written by Paul; with this man we need other and separate arguments to prove that the *Epistle is Paul's*” (Epist. ad Afric., see Kirchhofer, pp. 244, 245). For Tertullian, too (see below), and in fact the majority of the early Fathers (cf. Bleek, Com. i. p. 437 sq.), uncertainty respecting the Pauline origin of the Epistle is enough to impair, if not annul, its canonical authority. To the Lutheran theologians, also, this has seemed a warrant for relegating the Epistle into the class of “deutero-canonical” books. In some printed editions of the New Testament (in low-German, Swedish, etc., Bleek, as above, p. 462 sq.; cf. Heppe, Dogm. des Deutsch. Prot. Bd. ii. 229 sq.) this book, together with the Epistles of James and Jude, and the Revelation, have not only been placed together at the end, but have even received the heading “Apocrypha<sup>1</sup> of the New Testament.”

But more correct and consistent views on this subject—views of which isolated traces are to be discovered in the early Fathers, and which were explicitly advocated by the Reformed or Calvinistic theologians, as opposed to the Lutherans—are now very generally accepted. According to these views the canonicity of a book is not dependent solely upon its authorship, but upon its general reception as authoritative. Its “*general* reception” notice; for this view does not, like certain false theories of inspiration, make the canonicity of

<sup>1</sup> “*Quorum origo non claruit patribus.*”—Augustine.

a book ultimately nothing but a matter of private judgment, so that every man is left free to accept what books he pleases, according to his private estimate of their contents; but the decision turns upon a question of historic fact. Have the great majority of early Christians recognized the book as belonging to the rule of faith? The testimonies of individuals are of value chiefly as aiding us in answering this question. We attach weight to what was said by Tertullian and Eusebius, Origen and Jerome, not because these men were either more learned or less fallible than biblical scholars at the present day, but because their language is a fair expression of current opinion on the subject. Only so far as it is a truthful exponent of the generally received views of the time, is it of much value to us. As the private judgment of individuals, it stands or falls on its intrinsic merits.

And this view of the grounds of a book's canonicity is more consistent than that which makes it depend upon apostolic origin. For the Gospels of Mark and of Luke on the face of things were *not* written by apostles, and yet not even those scholars who make canonicity dependent upon authorship abate their deference to these books on that account (cf. Bleek, p. 476 sq.). Indeed, the authority of these Gospels would hardly have been diminished had the name of their authors remained uncertain. Who among those scholars that adhere to the uniform tradition that Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew, withholds allegiance in the least from our Greek text, because utterly ignorant when, where, how, it was prepared and passed into currency?

It is this fact of authoritative currency which is decisive; and this in the case of the Epistle to the Hebrews can be pretty well established.

Towards the end of the first century (under Domitian, i.e. before A.D. 96, cf. Uhlhorn in Herzog, Real-Encyk. ii. 726) Clement of Rome wrote an epistle in the name of "The church of God which sojourneth at Rome to the church of God which sojourneth at Corinth." This epistle is found appended to codex A, and is admitted to be genuine. Into

it the author has incorporated numerous ideas and expressions manifestly derived from the Epistle to the Hebrews. Dressel, in his index, refers to as many as twenty-five such instances (*Patr. Apostol. opera*, 2d ed., p. 669). It is doubtful whether Clement has anywhere unequivocally quoted the Epistle (cf. *Thol.* p. 2; *Euseb.* iii. 38; *Kirch.* p. 248), but he has quietly appropriated its thoughts and language, and woven them into his composition. This circumstance does not warrant the inference (of Eichhorn et al.) that he held the Epistle to be inferior in worth to the other sacred books; for, amid the paucity of Christian books, he and other church Fathers often interweave biblical extracts into their writings without any formula of quotation (*Thol.* pp. 2, 3). It does show us that he had no occasion to mention its author's name, even if he knew it. His use of the Epistle, it has been said, (*Bleek, Com.* i. 93 sq.; *Eint.* in d. N. T. p. 509) does not prove anything more than that he was acquainted with the Epistle, esteemed it, and found it serviceable as he wrote, without making it indubitable that the Epistle was esteemed, or even known, either by the church at Rome or that at Corinth. But when we consider in general, that a writer by employing the words of another implies that he considers them, and that they will be considered by his readers, to be more impressive than his own; and that neither Clement nor the other early writers were in the habit of quoting writings whose authority was not recognized (cf. the language of *Euseb. H. E.* ii. 23 sub fin.); we must acknowledge that, in the absence of any conflicting evidence, the authoritative reception of the Epistle to the Hebrews at the close of the first century is presumptively established.

In judging of early testimony relative to the authority of the sacred books, we must take pains to conform our views to the facts of history. As a matter of fact, the distribution of Christian writings into two radically distinct classes, canonical and uncanonical, was a gradual process—a process which required centuries for its completion. The successors of the apostles had an indistinct sense, indeed, of a difference

between themselves and their predecessors, which they showed by recognizing practically a distinction between apostolic compositions and their own,<sup>1</sup> but it was only through the lapse of generations that the inspired authority of the sacred books attained to full and explicit recognition.

Letting Clement of Rome, then, speak for the Western churches, we turn to the East. There unequivocal evidence of the authoritative reception of the book in the middle of the second century is afforded us by the fact that it forms part of the Peschito<sup>2</sup> version. The significance of this fact is strengthened by three considerations (cf. Westcott on the Canon, 1st ed. pp. 292, 267 sq.) :

(1) This, like the other early versions, was made, not for private Christians, but for churches. It affords proof, therefore, of the wide-spread authority of the books it contains. This wide-spread authority it must have required time for any book to secure ; consequently when possessed, it implies that the book is recognized as a heritage from an earlier period, which in this case cannot have been long after the days of the apostles.

<sup>1</sup> The distinction is illustrated in such passages as the following : Clement, in the same Epistle to the Corinthians already referred to, says (§ 47) : " Take up the epistle of the blessed Paul, the apostle. What did he write you first in the beginning of his gospel ? Of a truth under inspiration he wrote you concerning himself, and Cephas, and Apollos, because even then there had been factions among you. But that faction brought less sin upon you, for ye were partisans of apostles of good report, and of a man approved by them," etc. Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, who was condemned by Trajan sent to Rome and thrown to wild beasts (c. A.D. 107), in an epistle to the Romans written on his journey says (§ 4) : " I do not give you injunctions, as did Peter and Paul. They are apostles ; I am a condemned man. They are freemen ; I am a slave until this present. But if I suffer I shall be the freedman of Jesus, and shall rise free in him," etc. Polycarp, the disciple of John, in a letter to the Philippian, written it is supposed c. A.D. 120, expresses himself as follows (§ 3) : " I do not write to you thus, brethren, concerning righteousness in a spirit of self-confidence, but because ye have summoned me to write. For neither I nor another like me is able to approximate to the wisdom of the blessed and glorious Paul ; who, when among you, taught accurately and surely before the men of that time the word of truth ; who, even when absent, wrote you letters, into which if ye look closely ye will be able to be built up into the faith given you," etc.

<sup>2</sup> Or " Peschitto," for according to Arnold, in Herzog, *Real-Encycl.* xv. 398, this latter spelling is more correct than the common, Peschito or Peschitho.

(2) This version does not contain a single uncanonical book ; but

(3) According to the subsequent views of Christendom the list of books contained in it is incomplete ; yet the Syrian churches in succeeding times scrupulously excluded (2 Pet., 2 and 3 Jno., Jude, and the Apocalypse) books which gained recognition in the West. Hence we may presume that the canon was originally selected with care.<sup>1</sup>

Equally unequivocal is the evidence for the canonical acceptance of our Epistle at the middle of the second century which is afforded by the writings of Justin Martyr († c. 167<sup>2</sup>). In his dialogue with Trypho the Jew he expresses himself as follows (Kirchhofer, p. 289) : “ This is he who after the order of Melchizedek is king of Salem and everlasting priest of the Most High ” (evidently borrowed from Heb. v. 9, 10 ; vi. 20 ; vii. 12) ; and again : “ About to become both everlasting priest of God and King and Christ ” ; once more in his First Apol. (c. A.D. 139, under Antoninus Pius), “ And he is called both angel and apostle ” ; which latter term is applied to Christ only in Heb. iii. 1.

In the canon of the North African churches the Epistle appears to have been originally wanting. The canon of the old Latin version seems to have coincided exactly with that of the Muratorian fragment<sup>3</sup> (Westcott on the Canon, p. 282, 1st ed.). The Epistle to the Hebrews was added subsequently,

<sup>1</sup> The version of our Epistle is thought to bear marks of proceeding from a separate translator (Wichelhaus de N. T. versione Syr. etc., Halis. 1850, p. 86 sq. as cited in Westcott, as above, p. 258) ; but that does not destroy the significance of its reception (yet cf. Thol. note pp. 9, 10).

<sup>2</sup> So commonly ; yet the date of his death is uncertain (cf. Semisch in Herzog, vii. 182), and has been fixed by some scholars a score of years earlier ; see Mr. Abbot's note on p. 369 of Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, American edition.

<sup>3</sup> This relic, discovered by Muratori in the Ambrosian Library at Milan, contains a list of the sacred books, and gives internal evidence of having been drawn up about A.D. 170. After enumerating the thirteen epistles of Paul, it makes mention of an epistle “ to the Alexandrians,” under which title some scholars (e.g. Köstlin, Theol. Jahrb., 1854, p. 366 ; Wieseler, Stud. und Krit. 1847 p. 841 ; Credner (ed. Volkmar) on the Canon, p. 161 ; Bunsen, Hippol. i. 365 ; Tischendorf, Proleg. to ed. vii. p. lxxiii, etc.) suppose our Epistle to the Hebrews is referred to.

and without the author's name. Its Latin text in the oldest forms in which it has come down to us is peculiar and remarkable. It is thought to represent the simplest extant form of the Old Latin. Its peculiarities indicate that it occupied a peculiar position, which probably exempted it from that revision to which books used in public worship seem to have been subjected. The testimony of Tertullian early in the third century confirms the belief that, though known to the North African Christians, it was not accepted as fully canonical. In arguing upon a matter of Christian discipline, after bringing forward proofs from most of the epistles of Paul, and from other books, he continues: "I wish, however, though it is superfluous, to bring forward also the testimony of a companion of the apostles, fitted, as it is, to confirm the discipline of his teachers on the point before us. For there is extant an Epistle to the Hebrews, which bears the name of Barnabas. The writer has consequently adequate authority, as being one whom Paul placed beside himself in the point of continence (1 Cor. ix. 6). And certainly the Epistle of Barnabas is more commonly received among the churches than that apocryphal shepherd of adulterers" (i.e. Hermas). He then quotes Heb. vi. 4-8 and continues: "One who had learnt from the apostles, and had taught with the apostles, knew this, that a second repentance was never promised by the apostles to an adulterer or fornicator. For he expounded the law admirably, and preserved its features to the very life" (De Pudicit. c. 20; see Kirch., p. 242 sq.; translation mostly borrowed from Westcott, pp. 285, 286). From this testimony it appears that in North Africa at the beginning of the third century the Epistle to the Hebrews, though held in respect by many churches, was not put upon a level with the canonical books; and that because it was not considered as the work of an apostle.

From this time, on its canonicity was regarded as dependent upon its authorship. And as Paul was generally believed in the West not to have been its author, it had there a subordinate place assigned it, and was classed among "eccle-

siastical" or "deutero-canonical" books. But broader views of the grounds of canonicity, explicitly advanced by Origen (†254, see Credner, as above p. 183 sq.), banished every doubt of its canonical authority from the orthodox churches of the East. This judgment, endorsed as it was by Augustine, (*de peccat. merit. et remiss.* i. 27, see above, p. 711; Kirch. p. 253, note<sup>1</sup>; cf. Credner, pp. 184, 397), ultimately secured for it a place in the canon of the West, although as late as A.D. 392 Jerome says (*de viris illustribus*, c. 59; Credner, p. 267), "it is not regarded as Paul's by the Romans, even at the present day" (cf. too, his letter to Paulinus, A.D. 394; Kirch. p. 15, "a plerisque extra numerum ponitur"; later, A.D. 414, in his *Epist. ad Dardanum*, Kirch. p. 253, he says: "he himself received it, influenced not by the custom of his time, but by the authority of ancient writers, cf. above, p. 711).

This tardy recognition in the West of the Epistle's claim to canonical rank is not to be overlooked. Still, its influence upon our judgment is neutralized, when we take note that it resulted from the one-sided view that indubitable apostolic authorship is indispensable to canonical authority.<sup>1</sup>

On some accounts our conviction of the validity of the Epistle's canonical claims should be all the deeper because of the opposition which the Epistle has encountered. Its triumph over wide-spread and long-continued opposition demonstrates its intrinsic worth. It is crowned as one that has overcome. It has made good the rightfulness of its hold upon the heart of Christendom by having silenced the hostile utterances of a misguided understanding. And when we hear persons declare at the present day that any doubt respecting its authorship abates their estimate of its authority, when we see men contending fiercely, one for Paul as its author,

<sup>1</sup> Thiersch says, with equal truth and beauty: "It is as with a picture of consummate loveliness which has been held to be Raphael's. Should it be proved not to have been painted by Raphael, but by some one else, we have not by this means lost a classic work of art, but have discovered another master of the first rank." *Die Kirche im Apost. Zeitalter*, p. 197; cf. Twisten, *Dogmatik 3te Aufl.* i. 436, note.

another for Apollos, another for Luke, we may well repeat to them the words of the Apostle himself: "While one saith I am of Paul, and another I am of Apollos, are ye not carnal? Who then is Paul? and who is Apollos? . . . . it is God that giveth the increase."

©

---

## ARTICLE V.

### THE NATURAL THEOLOGY OF SOCIAL SCIENCE<sup>1</sup>

BY REV. JOHN BASCOM, PROFESSOR IN WILLIAMS COLLEGE.

THE argument for the existence of God is exceedingly simple. It involves but one premise, magnificent as this is; but one inference, great as this is. The mind passes from that broad array of facts—that power, skill, and beauty which the universe presents—up to the Creator, the Former of all. This leap of the mind is performed, like all its reasoning, by its own native strength, under the guidance and impulse of ideas inherent in it. As force, design, adaptation, are universal, discoverable by every one everywhere, this conclusion of the existence of a spiritual, supernatural agency has entered every rational mind; robbed, indeed, among the lower races, of its true breadth and import,—passing through Polytheism into mere Fetichism; and among the higher races, sometimes partially expelled again by the tricks of philosophy and of science. Nevertheless the universality and stubbornness of the conclusion show the inherent and necessary character of the ideas which lead to it, and so far prove its justness.

The chief and most conspicuous of these are, cause and effect, and the infinite. Attention has usually been directed to the first to the oversight of the second, and thus the argument has been inadequately grounded and wrongly presented.

<sup>1</sup> This is the first Article of a series on the same subject.