

*THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE EPISTLE TO THE
HEBREWS.¹*

[In this article the contractions ἀλ. and ἀλλ. are used to save space, and, unless otherwise stated, are to be taken as meaning that the word or words thus marked are limited, not absolutely to the books in which they are found, but to these books within the New Testament, and without considering the question of their occurrence once or more than once within these limits.]

WE are now in a fair position for examining the Epistle itself. First of all, let us look at its matter, comparing it with the Third Gospel and *Acts*.

S. Luke's Gospel occupies a curious position. It is classed as Synoptic; but its peculiarities outnumber its coincidences with the Synoptic narrative. Again, in S. Luke's use of the Synoptic narrative, his "economy" has often been noticed; and it is considered sufficient explanation of this "economy" to say that he reproduces none but "representative" facts. There is, however, another element present in his selection of incidents, namely, the bearing of the facts concerned on the relation of Judaism to Christianity and on the "calling of the Gentiles." His peculiar portions, seem especially selected and arranged with reference to this idea. He gives us the Gospel of the Childhood. In it we have the only description of a Temple-service that occurs in the New Testament, and this service is definitely associated with the births of the last of the Prophets and of the Founder of Christianity. In the picture of the aged priest, Zacharias, ministering at the altar, stricken into silence through his failing faith, and roused at last from his dumbness to raise his great song of deliverance—in the meeting of Mary and Elizabeth—in Simeon, weary of the world, but waiting for the redemption of Israel—in the

¹ ERRATA.—Page 77, line 27, for "an" l. "our"; page 79, line 16, for "Peter" l. "Peter."

widowed Hannah—in the Christ-child seated in the House of God, more learned than the doctors of Judaism in the lore of God—in the deep poetic thought of the three great Gospel canticles—we see the figuring forth of S. Luke's full purpose. Behind this great group of pictures, the poet and artist of the Evangelists shows dying Judaism, shorn of its prophetic power, widowed and forlorn; he tells us how, at the Advent of Him whose coming was told "afore-time to the Fathers by the forth-tellers," the dumb religion broke out into its *Te Deum* of joy; he, and he alone, has saved for us the story of how the surroundings of Christ at His birth summed up the meaning of all Revelation that had been and foretold all Revelation that was to be. He, and he only, tells how, when the Father brought the Only-begotten into the world, all the angels of God worshipped Him. And he sets his theme in a few words of supreme poesy. "As He spake by the mouth of His holy prophets, which have been since the world began"; "To perform the mercy promised to our fathers, and to remember His holy covenant: to perform the oath which He sware to our forefather Abraham"; "A light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of Thy people Israel." The Gospel of the Childhood, at least, rings with the same music that sounds through the whole Epistle to the Hebrews.

From this we naturally pass to the more marked peculiarities of S. Luke's historical works as a whole. In his Gospel he tells us very little of our Lord's ministry between His temptation and the going up to His last Passover and His death; but at that point he takes up the tale with special fulness. Two characteristics are thus strongly brought out: (1) The Ox is his emblem, because he most clearly shows our Lord as Priest and Victim. This element comes out most strongly in the special incidents that fall between the beginning of that last journey and the Ascension. (2) Through this whole section there is evidently

a deliberate intention of selecting such incidents as lead up to the thought of the calling of the Gentiles. Thus—not to multiply examples—the “Great Three Days’ Teaching” springs out of the hostility of the Pharisees to this very doctrine; and the Seven Parables that mainly occupy the succeeding Sabbath and the following day have a very evident bearing on the relation, not only of the Pharisees to “publicans and sinners,” but of Judaism to the whole Gentile world.

Thus the lines on which the Third Gospel is laid are directly linked with those of the *Acts*; and there is no difficulty in showing that this is done of set purpose. The earlier portion of the latter book is, not a history of the early Church, but a selection of such incidents in that history as lead up to the preaching of S. Paul; and S. Stephen’s speech, in particular, is a formal *Apologia* for the calling of the Gentiles.

The Epistle to the Hebrews comes naturally as a third book in the same series. In word and thought the author treads in S. Stephen’s footsteps. He follows, logically, the work and teaching of S. Paul. In this only book of the New Testament are unfolded in theory the relation between Judaism and Christianity, the doctrine of Christ’s Priesthood and Sacrifice, the necessary merging of Judaism in a universal Church. The texts already cited from the Gospel canticles might fully form its all-sufficient motto.

So, too, *Hebrews* contains, in its matter, the minor characteristics of S. Luke. His Gospel is the Evangel of the Angels—of the weak and suffering touched by the Divine Compassion of the Christ—of tolerance—of grace.¹ Precisely the same characteristics are to be found in our Epistle.

¹ The word *χαρις* occurs 7 times in S. Luke’s Gospel, 16 times in *Acts*, abundantly in S. Paul’s Epistles—including those which I have marked as “Secondary Lucan,”—10 times in 1 *Peter*, twice in 2 *Peter*, 8 times in *Hebrews*. Outside these limits it is extremely rare.

Again, it is worth noticing the connexion between particular passages in *Hebrews* and parallel passages in S. Luke's acknowledged works. The first quotation in *Hebrews* i. 5 occurs also in *Acts* xiii. 7. The expression "κρείττων γενόμενος τῶν ἀγγέλων" (*Heb.* i. 4) distinctly recalls S. Luke's "ἰσάγγελοι" (*Luke* xx. 36). The opening verses, in their matter, distinctly suggest the Gospel canticles, and the first three words remind us of our Lord's hermeneutic teaching in *Luke* xxiv. 27. The heirship of Christ (*Heb.* i. 2) may be compared with *Luke* xx. 14. The title of Christ as πρωτότοκος suggests *Luke* ii. 7.¹ The oath, the covenant, the εὐλαβεία (εὐλαβής and its related words are, otherwise, exclusively Lucan) are all in *Hebrews*; and there are other quotations in common—such as that found in *Hebrews* viii. 5, and *Acts* vii. 44—which can hardly be due to accident. These are a few of the cases in which we find casual coincidences of thought coming in to strengthen the conclusion one would naturally draw from general coincidence of purpose.

From matter we pass, naturally, to style. S. Luke's style has several well marked peculiarities, which we may take in order:—

(1) The first is perhaps not very important, but it gives us a definite point from which to start. He is particularly fond of alliteration and assonance. So are most writers—partly because alliteration and assonance please the ear, and partly because both bear a large part in the work of association, by which our choice of words is largely guided. Besides, both were reckoned important elements of style in the Hebrew of the Old Testament (as they were also in the Arabic of the Q'ran); and this fact helps to account for their frequent presence in the New Testament. But S. Luke uses both to a larger extent than other New Testament writers; and there seems distinct evidence that he uses

¹ See also *Col.* i. 18.

them with due deliberation and careful choice. Moreover, in both of his books, he paid particular attention to the perfecting of style in his prologues. Set them side by side. In each, the words are carefully chosen, with reference to sound as well as sense. In the Gospel, the opening *ἐπειδήπερ* suggests a series of words beginning with *ἐπ-* and *π*, that runs on into the next verse. Moreover, *ἐπειδήπερ* suggests *ἐπεχείρησαν*, and this, in its turn, suggests the assonance of *διήγησιν* (*ἀ. λ.* in New Testament). So, too, in the prologue to the *Acts*, the alliterative *π*'s echo the opening words of the *Evangel*, and powerfully suggest the authorship.

But the likeness between these prologues does not end here; they have a common *rhetorical* character. Both are formal antitheses. In the first, we have a definite contrast between the more or less unsatisfactory "treatises" of less well-informed writers and the orderly plan of the Evangelist himself. In the second, we have a sure and sharp severance between the purpose of the Gospel, as embodying the personal earth-work of Christ, and the author's plan of completing this by an account of the Apostolic development of the Church. Thus the two prologues have the same verbal scheme and the same rhetorical character.

The opening of our Epistle has exactly the same literary form—accurately, one would say that it was intermediate in style between the two prologues. Verbally, the alliterative *π*'s extend into the third verse, and (as with *ἐπ-* in the Gospel) so here the sound-system brings in *ἀπ-* in *ἀπαύγασμα*. Then follow a series of *κ*'s, among which we may also notice the vocal relation between *καθαρισμόν* and *ἐκάθισεν*. This vocal system runs through the whole Epistle, and is one of its most marked points of style.

So, too, these verses are strongly antithetical, and the antithesis powerfully resembles that in the prologue to the Gospel. The fragmentary sketches made by the *Evange-*

list's predecessors are replaced by revelation "πολυμερῶς καὶ πολύτροπος πάλαι" in the Prophets. Great is the power of what we call "accident." It led Whewell, most unpoetic of men, to embody a mechanical law in a Tennysonian stanza, perfect in metre and rhymes.¹ It cast a well-known advertisement into a perfect hexameter, complete even to the cæsura. It grouped the numbers and numerical values of the first verse in *Genesis* (Hebrews and LXX.), the first verse of *S. Matthew*, the names and titles of our Lord, the two Greek names of the Cross, and the number of the Beast, into a most curiously complete arithmetical system. But the first words of *Hebrews* did not fall together by chance—if there be any such thing in a world teeming with coincidences. The orderly biography, again, is replaced by the complete revelation in the Son. For the rest, the plan of the two prologues is exactly the same. Would not any man with an ear and a judgment for style say that they seemed like the work of the same writer?

(2) It has been mentioned that *S. Luke's* and *S. Paul's* acknowledged writings both abound in active verbals; but reasons have been given for believing that this idiosyncrasy originated with *S. Luke* rather than with *S. Paul*. We may therefore reckon the great redundancy of active verbals in this *Epistle* as a point in favour of its *Lucan* origin.²

(3) In my *City of the Living God* I have noticed both the remarkable prevalence of anarthrous substantives in

¹ "So that no force, however great, can stretch a cord, however fine, into a horizontal line that shall be accurately straight."

² There are altogether 147 active verbals used in the New Testament. Of these, 39 occur in the *Epistle to the Hebrews*. Out of these 39, 10 are ἀλλ. Our *Epistle* shares 25 with *S. Luke* and 18 with *S. Paul*, 3 with the *Petrine Epistles*, and 5, not being ἀλλ. in *Hebrews*, are shared by *Hebrews* with portions of Scripture outside these limits. (In this note and all other passages bearing on vocabulary I have been obliged to exclude the *Apocalypse*. Its verbal elements are so peculiar as to make its inclusion not only useless but positively misleading.)

Hebrews, and the extraordinary number of definite articles that have crept into the *Textus Receptus*. Passing by less important passages, two places call for special notice: (a) The famous passage cap. xii. v. 22–24 incl. contains no definite article, except one (where it would least be expected) before the proper name “Abel.” The T.R. of the surrounding verses is full of definite articles rejected by every competent critic. (β) In cap. ix. v. 14, Bishop Westcott was led, through the absence of an article, to deny that the words “Eternal Spirit” signified the Third Person of the Trinity. Now in Westcott and Hort’s text—and in all good texts—of the *Acts* the words *πνεῦμα ἄγιον* are constantly anarthrous. This is all the more remarkable because critics have been inclined to believe that the presence or absence of the article is a crucial test as to the meaning of these words.

From matter and style we naturally pass to vocabulary. Ignoring words too unimportant to appear in a concordance, the total vocabulary of our Epistle consists of 908 words. Of these 154 are ἀλλ. in the New Testament. Of the remaining 754 words, 612 appear in *S. Luke* or *Acts*, and 50 are altogether, and 43 almost altogether, confined to the Third Gospel, *Acts*, and *Hebrews*. To this we may add the facts that ἀλλ. abound also in the Third Gospel and *Acts*, and that the words peculiar to these writings, peculiar to *Hebrews*, and shared by *Hebrews* with *S. Luke*’s two recognized works, seem traceable to the same sources. In fact, there is a remarkably strong verbal relationship between our Epistle, on the one hand, and the acknowledged writings of *S. Luke* on the other.¹

¹ I may mention that the first point which suggested to me, many years ago, the probability of the Lucan authorship of our Epistle, was the observance of a strongly marked common character in the vocabularies of *Hebrews*, the opening chapters of *S. Luke*, and *1 Peter*. The following points may be helpful:—

If the total length of *S. Luke*’s Gospel and *Acts* be taken as 14, the

A few words call for special notice: ἀπαύγασμα is undoubtedly a Sophian word from the Apocrypha. The influence of the Sophia-literature in S. Luke's Gospel is distinctly marked. διατίθεμαι is absolutely confined, and ἔθος is limited—save for one passage in S. John's Gospel—to the Third Gospel, *Acts*, and our Epistle. Ἐπαγγελία is prevalently Lucan: in *Hebrews* 14 times. εὐαγγελίζομαι occurs 10 times in the Third Gospel, 15 times in *Acts*, 22 times in S. Paul's Epistles [once in *S. Matt.* and 3 times in 1 *Peter*]. A Lucan and Pauline word, obviously: 3 times in *Hebrews*. Εὐαγγέλιον occurs 61 times in S. Paul's Epistles, 4 times in the First, and 7 times in the Second Gospel, once only in the Apocalypse, once only in 1 *Peter*, twice in *Acts*, never in the Third Gospel, and never in our Epistle. It is hardly possible to over-rate the importance of this argument, resting as it does on the presence and absence of two closely-related words. The case of εὐλαβής¹

Pauline Epistles may be represented by 11, and the Petrine by 1. Now, while the number of words peculiar to a writer will not increase proportionately to the length of his writings, yet, very obviously, length has some influence on their number.

In proportion to length, the Petrine Epistles have a remarkable number of ἀλλ.—128. *Hebrews* has, as we have seen, 154. Of words found only in S. Luke's Gospel and *Acts*, there are 725. S. Paul (excluding *Hebrews*) has 787. For what seems to me to be the true bearing of the last point, see note near end.

In addition to the words noticed in the text, the following are somewhat interesting:

Our Lord is rarely called Ἰησοῦς, without the addition of some title, outside the Gospels. In our Epistle, the name occurs 13 times, and in 7 of these cases it is used without any added title. This looks like the habit of an Evangelist. The titles used for Deity form a striking group: "The Living God," "The Most High God," "The God of Peace," all suggest S. Luke. So do the phrases: "The people of God," "In the presence (ἐνώπιον) of God." In no other book outside the first three Gospels do we find παραβολή. Our author shares with S. Luke's works a decided liking for compounds of προς. Σκηνή is a favourite word with our author—who never uses ναός. Curiously enough, the σκηνοποιός of Tarsus never mentions the σκηνή. The absence of δικαίω is also remarkable, and a distinctly un-Pauline characteristic.

¹ εὐλαβής: *S. Luke* once, *Acts* twice. εὐλαβεία: *Heb.* twice. εὐλαβέομαι, *Acts, Heb.* once each.

and its congeners has already been considered. A few other examples must suffice. S. Luke alone alludes to the sword-edge as *στόμα μαχαίρης*—where not only the phrase but the Ionic genitive is to be noticed. The same phrase occurs in our Epistle (xi. 37); and, though the T.R. reads *μαχαίρας*, the T.R. is undoubtedly wrong. Again, *κόσμος* occurs 186 times in the New Testament—there being 3 occurrences only in S. Luke's Gospel and 1 in *Acts*: *οίκουμένη* 15 times in all—of which 3 are in the Third Gospel and 5 in *Acts*. *Hebrews* has both words: *κόσμος* 5 times and *οίκουμένη* twice. *Hebrews* shares with the Third Gospel and *Acts* a peculiar fondness for the word *λαός*. Again both S. Luke and S. Paul would naturally be familiar with the technical military term *παρεμβολή*. But it never occurs in S. Paul's writings; we find it 9 times in the New Testament, i.e., once in the Apocalypse, 5 times in *Acts*, and 3 times in *Hebrews*. Finally, it is not a little curious that three words, on whose meaning the chief questions as to the nature of the Eucharist depend, are found together only in the accounts given by S. Luke and by S. Paul of the institution of that Sacrament, and that these three words—*διαθήκη*, *ποιεῖν*, and *ἀνάμνησις*—are all found in their special technical senses in our Epistle.

Naturally, however, one turns from the consideration of special words to a portion of S. Luke's vocabulary that is universally admitted to be markedly his own—his medical and surgical phraseology. His acknowledged works abound in words used by Greek medical authors, more especially by the master of ancient medicine—Hippocrates. Some of this technical vocabulary, so far as it bears on our Epistle, I have relegated to a note;¹ but for our present purpose

¹ Taking only the words beginning with α and β, and marking the αλλ. of *Hebrews* with †, the following medical or semi-medical words are worth noticing: †ἀγνόημα (Theophrastus), ἀγρυπνέω (H. and L.), †αἰσθητήριον, †ἀλλουσιτελής, ἀντίτυπος, †άρμός, ἀφίστημι (all Hippocratean words). To these we may add ἀναθεωρέω (H. and L.), apparently taken from Theo-

we may find a further examination of a few passages more profitable.

Passing by the Hippocratean words in the first three chapters, we come to the *locus crucialis* in cap. iv. v. 5. Whether the true reading be *συνκεκερασμένους* or *συνκεκερασμένος*, and whether (as Westcott and Hort think probable) *ἀκούσασιν* be, or be not, a primitive error for *ἀκούσασιν*, the best sense of this passage seems to be found by translating the first of these words in its medical sense, "compounded." In the next verse, too, we have the technical term *καταβολή*, which—in the form *κατηβολή*—is cited by Galen from Hippocrates. In cap. xi. v. 11 the same word is found in its strictly technical sense. In vv. 12–14 incl. the whole passage has a medical "flavour," and is replete with medical and physiological terms: *νήπιος*, *στερεὰ τροφή*, *ἕξις*, *αἰσθητήριον*, *γεγυμναζόμενος*, and *διάκρισις*, all fall under this head, and *τελειότης* has a double medical meaning. In cap. xi. v. 11 *καταβολή* is associated with *ἡλικία*, which also has a technical medical sense. *ἀσθενεία* (a favourite Lucan word) and its companion term *ἀσθενής* are the regular Greek medical names for "sickness" and "sick"; and *τέλειος*, with its derivatives, is used by Hippocrates to signify "healthy," etc. The terms are contrasted in cap. vii. v. 28, where they certainly seem to bear their medical meaning.

I shall quote only one more passage in this connexion, and that simply because it is peculiarly interesting, "The Word of God is living and powerful (*ἐνεργής*), and sharper than any two-edged sword," etc. (cap. iv. vv. 12–14). As this is usually interpreted, no one seems to have tried to show what was the exact image in the mind of the writer

phrastus the Physician; *ἀπὸ λανσις*, taken probably from either Hippocrates or Aristotle, and possibly *ἀστρον* (L. and H.). Medical words are plentiful in *S. Luke* and *Acts*, and many may be reckoned in our Epistle; but the fact of their occurring in groups, as in the examples cited in the text, is more important than their mere numbers.

in speaking of the action of the two-edged sword (*μάχαιρα δίστομος*). The simile is, from any point of view, somewhat mixed; but the mixture is slight, if the thought is derived from surgery. *μάχαιρα* was the technical name for a surgeon's knife. In the Iliad, the surgeon Machaon (whose name is supposed to be derived from this very word) extracts an arrow with the *μάχαιρα*. S. Chrysostom thinks (erroneously, I believe) that the two *μαχαίραι* owned by the Apostles were knives. Adopting this translation we have a consistent picture, "The Word of God is living and active, sharper than any two-edged knife, and piercing to the severing of soul and of spirit [as the knife pierces to the sundering], of joints and of marrow" (physiological words again). "And [as the parts operated on are visible, bared, and displayed before the surgeon, so] there is no created thing that is not manifest before the face of Christ" (notice the strongly Lucan preposition *ἐνώπιον*, and the essentially Lucan use of *αὐτός* as a synonym for "Christ"), "and all things are bared and exposed before the eyes of Him with whom we have dealings." If *μάχαιρα* be here the surgeon's knife, the other words fall into their places naturally, and the picture is complete.

The case from a comparison of our Epistle with the Third Gospel and *Acts* seems to me extremely strong. It is worth mentioning that it becomes even stronger when we compare the Epistle to the Hebrews with the secondary Lucan works. This, however, must be left to a note.¹

¹ The evidence for a group of "Secondary Lucan documents" rests mainly on the following considerations:—

(1) The historical evidence, as noted in the text, of his presence with S. Paul at the times when the Pastoral Epistles, *Colossians*, and 2 *Corinthians* were written.

(2) The evidence for a common style and common vocabulary in these books.

(3) The marks of a similar style in 1 *Peter*, and of a curious approach to this style in 2 *Peter*.

(4) The evidence of community of style in these documents and in S. Luke's acknowledged works.

The consideration of this question raises and throws light on many side issues, such as the relation between S. Paul

Of (1) no more need be said.

Under (2) we may note the following facts: (a) In most of these Epistles the introductions bear a strong resemblance to S. Luke's habits, already noticed, of alliteration and assonance. (b) There is a clear line of demarcation between the vocabulary of this group, as a whole, and that of the other Pauline Epistles. It will be remembered that the total length of the Pauline Epistles has been reckoned as 11. Taking this for the whole, the "Secondary Lucan group" is represented by 3 and the non-Lucan by 8. Now there are 32 active verbals used in the latter group against 30 in the former. Again, we have seen that the total number of ἀλλ. in the Pauline Epistles is 787. On examining these closely we find three remarkable facts: (i.) They fall for the most part into two definite divisions, corresponding to the two groups in question; (ii.) though the Paulo-Lucan section represents less than $\frac{2}{11}$ of the whole, it has a greater number of ἀλλ. than the other section; (iii.) only a very small proportion of the words peculiar to the Pauline Epistles occurs in both groups. The following table shows the proportions as nearly as I can find them:—

Pauline ἀλλ. (prop. length, 11) . . .	787
Confined to Sec. Lucan group (3) . .	371, over 47 per cent.
" " non-Lucan group (8) . .	368, under 47 " "
Common to both groups	48, about 6 " "

(3) It is impossible to enter fully, within my limits, into the Petrine problem: but it can be seen, by examination of the text of the Epistles, that they are marked by the presence of a very large proportion of active verbals (23), and of ἀλλ. (128). The vocabulary of 1 *Peter* has a curious affinity with that of the first two chapters of the Third Gospel. A curious point is the fact that of the Petrine ἀλλ. one only (*ἀπὸθεοῦ*) is found in both Epistles. This, together with the general nature of the two Epistles, distinctly suggests that 1 *Peter*—which, on other grounds, has been believed by Dr. Salmon, Dr. Lias and others to be a translation—is, so far as its Greek goes, the work of S. Luke. I cannot here enter fully into the grounds on which I believe this to be highly probable, or into the reasons why 2 *Peter*, with a vocabulary undoubtedly related to that of *S. Luke*, and drawn in the main from the same sources, appears to me to be an imitation of his style. But they seem sufficient for the inclusion of both Epistles in the Lucan cycle. The proportionate length of the two Petrine Epistles may, roughly, be represented as "1." Adding them to the Lucan group, we get the following figures:—

	ἀλλ.
Pauline Non-Lucan group (8)	368
Secondary Lucan group (4)	499

There are many other facts that point to the unity of the group as a whole and to its very distinctive character.

(4) Taking no account of the Epistle to the Hebrews, I find 130 words in the "Secondary Lucan group" that distinctly point to the influence of

and his secretaries, and the probable history of the Petrine Epistles, on which I cannot now dwell; and I have been

S. Luke's vocabulary. The group, as a whole, abounds in philosophical, physiological and medical terms, and in words drawn from the authors mentioned in the text as sources of the peculiar parts of S. Luke's vocabulary. A few are worth mentioning. The occurrence of *παγίς* and *ζωργέω* together in 2 *Timothy* ii. 26 distinctly suggests S. Luke; so do the technical word *στόμαχος* and *ἀσθενεία* in 1 *Timothy* v. 23. Besides these, every Epistle that I have marked as "Secondary Lucan" has ethical and metaphysical words that mark its vocabulary as akin to that of the Evangelist.

If we compare the Epistle to the Hebrews with these books as well as with the Third Gospel and *Acts*, we find the evidence for its Lucan origin greatly strengthened. The text shows that it is akin to the acknowledged works of S. Luke; further examination shows that, where it resembles the Pauline Epistles, it resembles the group in which S. Luke's influence can be traced more than the purely Pauline section. It shares 28 active verbals with the Lucan writings and 18 only with the others. Passing by all points except those that entirely rest on vocabulary, I find that the following table gives a rough view of the facts:—

Words entirely confined to S. Luke (<i>Gosp.</i> and <i>Acts</i>) and <i>Hebrews</i>	50
Words predominantly confined to S. Luke (<i>Gosp.</i> and <i>Acts</i>) and <i>Hebrews</i>	43
Words predominantly confined to Lucan Cycle and <i>Hebrews</i>	47
Words entirely confined to S. Luke, L.C. and <i>Hebrews</i>	19
Words predominantly confined to S. Luke, L.C. and <i>Hebrews</i>	43
Total	202

Thus, out of the 908 words in the vocabulary of *Hebrews*, we have 154 ἀλλ., and 202 that show a distinct connexion with S. Luke, leaving what may be called the "general vocabulary" of the Epistle to be represented by 552 words, about $\frac{1}{3}$ of the whole.

It is worth mentioning (α) that the ἀλλ. common to the pure Pauline and the Secondary Lucan Epistles are largely due to the connexion between *Ephesians* and *Colossians* and between 1 and 2 *Corinthians*; and (β) that *Hebrews* resembles *Colossians* much more than *Ephesians*. There are 25 distinct (and sound) references from the A.V. margin of *Hebrews* to *Colossians*. The weight of this fact can best be appreciated by remembering that the latter Epistle is very short, containing only 95 verses. Winer has no theory as to the authorship of *Hebrews*: but his "New Testament Greek Grammar" contains many suggestive analogies. The following points are worth observing:—Cf. H. i. 2 with 2 Cor. xii. 2, as to use of *αἰῶνες*. Lucan use of *αἰῶς*, 2 P. iii. 4. S. Luke and our Epistle are especially fond of the use of the Infinitive in oblique cases: A. viii. 11, H. xi. 3, and 1 P. iv. 2, form a unique group in inserting of several words between

obliged, through pressure of space, to give in the text none but the most important points of evidence. But I think I may now fairly summarise the results. (1) The Epistle cannot well be referred to S. Paul. (2) What seems Pauline in it can be accounted for, if S. Luke be the author. (3) Its matter, style, and vocabulary resemble those of S. Luke; and there is a mass of cumulative evidence pointing in the same direction. (4) There seem fair grounds for tracing S. Luke's influence in other books, and these resemble the Third Gospel and *Acts* on the one hand, and *Hebrews* on the other.

A close study of S. Luke's Gospel and the *Acts* cannot fail to impress any reasonably intelligent student with the marvellous power and breadth of culture possessed by its writer, and also with the modesty that led him to keep himself absolutely in the background of his history. The contents of this great anonymous Epistle complete the picture that he drew, and its manner is markedly that of the great poet, philosopher, historian, artist, of the New Testament, who has left of his own life hardly a trace, though he has limned with surest strokes the lineaments of his Master and his fellow-labourers—Lucas, the physician of Antioch.

ALEX. R. EAGAR.

the article and the infinitive. The use of *τε* is most frequent in *Luke*, *Acts*, and *Hebrews*. For assonance cf. L. xxi. 11, A. xvii. 25, and H. v. 8. The following passages are also worth examining: H. i. 2, with 2 P. i. 9; 1 P. iv. 6, with structure of Lucan hymns: H. i. 3, with A. ii. 33. Many other passages show a grammatical character peculiar to the 3rd Gospel, *Acts*, the L.C. and *Hebrews*.