

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/robbadshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE IX.

CRITICAL NOTES.

I.

RECENT WORKS ON THE ATONEMENT.¹

BY THE REV. GEORGE F. MAGOUN, D. D., GRINNELL, IOWA.

IN an account of the Baptist work in Sweden by P. A. Nordell, D. D., (New York Examiner) it is stated, that the Baptist churches there are one in doctrine, and that "a constant struggle has been maintained against the numerous and influential Free Church, which, in point of doctrine, corresponds very closely with the Andover wing of American Congregationalism, but is marked by a far more enthusiastic religious activity." A vague American echo of Waldenstroem appears in a late number of the *Andover Review*,— "The Blood of Jesus Christ: the New Testament Doctrine," by Lyman Abbott, D. D. He makes three points *vs.* the evangelical view: (1) The blood of Jesus Christ in the New Testament is the life of Christ. His character,—*not* the drops that fell on Calvary, but "his individuality, his personality." The world is saved, not by a "plan of salvation," but "by Christ himself." This leaves out any propitiating *work* of Christ for men, and substitutes therefor a mere exhibition of himself, producing a mere subjective effect in us. It goes farther from the New Testament than Waldenstroem's theory of blood-contact with spirit, and in the direction of Jamieson. (2) His character as "*transmittible* [?]" is represented by Christ's blood, like heredity in physical life, a character received by men "almost unconsciously," the "blood of God, as it were [?]" (like qualities inherited along the lines of pedigree), by which we are "adopted into the very generation of Divinity." (3) But this "transmitted life is poured out for us,"

and John give to it, we have the indefinite speculative theory referred to above, with its perversion of Scripture terms, and nullification of their legitimate signification. But no one has directly and successfully emptied Scripture of the idea of divine propitiation for human sin. It is the stem and trunk of the whole doctrine of substitutionary, vicarious, expiatory atonement, and refuses to surrender its dominant place in the gospel.

II.

PAULINE AUTHORSHIP OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

BY THE REV. GEORGE W. GILMORE, BROOKLYN, N. Y., LATE OF KOREAN ROYAL COLLEGE, SEOUL, KOREA.

THE writer of this article has lately been engaged in a study of the "hypothetical period" of the New Testament. In the course of his investigations excursions into fields other than the one immediately under study were suggested. One inquiry thus opened was, What light would be afforded on the question of the Pauline authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews by a comparison of the conditional sentence as found therein and in some writing generally conceded to be by St. Paul? This might prove somewhat new, as not a great deal of stress has been laid on a purely grammatical argument. Of course the results would not be decisive. But if they proved to be in the direction indicated by other arguments, the evidence would be cumulative, and thus contribute something towards a final settlement; while if opposed, some reason why usage should differ might be found, or else the indication would be that conclusions already reached might have to be modified. It was gratifying to find that though the differences were not always great, yet all pointed in one direction, and that one corroborative of the general consensus against Pauline authorship.

It is, of course, understood that the argument based on this study is purely grammatical, and entirely distinct from the *lexical* argument usually employed in the discussion of this question. It depends on the forms of sentences, not on the words employed.

Seven forms of conditions are found, temporal conditions and indefinite relatives with *ἀντίθετος* in the protasis being considered apart from the "vivid future" and "present general" conditions, for greater clearness, although they can be classed under those forms. The book chosen for comparison was the Epistle to the Romans, because the character of the contents more nearly coincides with that of the Epistle to the Hebrews, while the extent of the text is not much greater. The text used was that of Westcott and Hort, in which Romans occupies about twenty-six pages, and Hebrews twenty-one.

Professor Goodwin's classification of the hypothetical period, and, in the main, his terminology, will be used.

Of temporal conditions having *διν* joined to some temporal particle (*διτε*, *διως*, etc.) and the subjunctive mood in the protasis, there were found in Romans three, one of which is a quotation—and therefore not to be taken into account; while in Hebrews only two were noted, of which one was a quotation. The ratio of occurrence in Romans, then, is one to every thirteen pages; in Hebrews, one to twenty-one pages.

Of indefinite relatives joined to *διν* and the subjunctive, in Romans four exist, of which three are quotations, while in Hebrews no example was noted. The indications thus far, it will be seen, are exceedingly slight, and alone can form no basis for argument.

Of the "vivid future" form of condition. Romans contains eleven instances, three of which are quotations; Hebrews affords only six instances, four of them quotations. Here the evidence is more decisive, since Romans contains one such condition properly chargeable to the author for every three pages, while Hebrews has only one to each ten pages.

Romans contains seven cases of the "present general supposition," none of which are quoted; Hebrews has only three, one a quotation. The ratio here is, for Romans one to every four pages; for Hebrews, one for every ten. It is therefore noticeable that St. Paul has a fondness for the subjunctive which is displayed in a much less marked degree by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

The next form to come under examination is the "particular supposition," as Professor Goodwin has termed it, or the "logical," as others have named it. It is a form especially frequent in Pauline writings, occurring more often than all others put together. Romans contains thirty-three cases, while only eight are found in Hebrews. This seems to the writer to be a very marked difference, especially in view of the fact mentioned above, that this form of condition is so frequently used by St. Paul. None of the above are quotations, and so are indicative of a real difference in style of argumentation.

It seemed worth while to note also the occurrence of *εἰ μὴ* (verb omitted) with the meaning "but." Romans has this five times and Hebrews once, the ratio of frequency being about four to one.

The last form to call for attention is the "impliedly unfulfilled." Romans has of this only two examples, one of which is a quotation; while Hebrews has four, none quoted. Ratio: Romans, one to twenty-six pages; Hebrews, one to every five pages.

But the difference in frequency of occurrence is not the most significant feature in connection with this form of condition in the two writings. An examination of Romans vii. 7 will show that the *διν* which should appear in an apodosis of this form is missing. In all the Pauline Epistles this kind of condition occurs only six times, once as a quotation, and in two of the five chargeable to St. Paul, *διν* of the apodosis is missing. This omission is striking and unusual, as it is the classic mark of this particular form of hypothesis. It will be noted that, in contrast to this departure by St. Paul from classic models, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews always writes

the full form of the conclusion. This is in accord with what has been noted by the commentators of the carefulness of construction shown by the writer to the Hebrews.

The general result may be presented to the eye thus:—

KIND OF CONDITION.	ROMANS.		HEBREWS.		RATIO OF OCCURRENCE TO PAGES.	
	Quotations	Total Occurrence	Quotations		Romans	Hebrews
			Total	Occurrence		
Temporal conditions, with <i>av</i> + subj...	3	I	I	I	I—13	I—21
Indefinite relatives, " " " "	4	3	—	—	I—26	—
Vivid future suppositions.....	II	3	6	4	I—3	I—10 ¹
Present general "	7	—	3	I	I—4	I—10 ²
Particular suppositions.....	33	—	8	—	I—8	I—2 ²
<i>ei μή</i> , verb omitted.....	5	—	I	—	I—5	I—21
Impliedly unfulfilled.....	2	I	4	—	I—26	I—5

It will thus be seen that there is a difference in style, sometimes very slight, but still existing, all along the line. In some of the forms of condition the divergence is so slight that from them alone no case could be made out. But when a difference in the forms is seen to exist, each case adds its weight to the rest, and the whole makes what seems to the writer strong testimony corroborative of the general opinion reached on other grounds of a non-Pauline authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

III.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

BY THE REV. GEORGE W. GILMORE.

ALTHOUGH the authorship of the Acts of the Apostles is now generally conceded to the author of the third Gospel, it may not be amiss to note one or two confirmatory indications gathered in the course of grammatical studies of the New Testament, which peculiarities I have not seen remarked on. These are connected with the use of *εἰς*, and are noteworthy as occurring only in these two books.

In two passages (Luke iv. 42 and Acts ix. 38) we find *ἐώς* employed with the genitive of *person* after verbs of motion, where in classic Greek we should have *ὡς* with the accusative. So far as I can discover, these are the only instances of such a use in the New Testament, and the occurrence of such a construction once in each book and nowhere else seems to me strong evidence of sameness of origin.

Another finger pointing in the same direction is the employment in Luke and Acts of *ἐώς* before and in conjunction with a preposition. The passages in question are Luke xxiv. 50 (*τρόπῳ*); Acts xxvi. 11 (*εἰς*); and xvii. 14 (*ἐπὶ*). It is remarkable that peculiarities of style so marked should be found in these books and no others of the New Testament, if they are not the work of the same author.

One other singular usage going with the above is the employment of *ἐώς* as a preposition before indeclinable nouns. See Luke ii. 15 and Acts xiii. 20. Matthew (chap. xviii. 21-22) uses *ἐώς* before indeclinable numerals, but no other writer of the New Testament employs it with indeclinable nouns.