

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

5-1-1944

Who Wrote Hebrews

Roland Thies

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_thiesr@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv>



Part of the [History of Christianity Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Thies, Roland, "Who Wrote Hebrews" (1944). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 103.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/103>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

WHO WROTE HEBREWS ?

A Thesis Presented to
the Faculty of Concordia Seminary
Department of New Testament Interpretation

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Bachelor of Divinity

By
Roland H.W. Thies
May, 1944

Approved by:

W. G. Arnold
Theod. Fritsch

CONTENTS

Introduction..... 1

CHAPT.

PAGE

I...Was it Paul.....2

Part I...Pro and Con According to External
Evidence.....2

Eastern Church.....5

Western Church.....14

Part II...Pro and Con According to Internal
Evidence.....23

Style.....23

Contents.....34

Time.....38

Paul's Imprisonment.....39

Timothy Argument.....41

2 Peter 3, 15 Argument.....42

Temple Argument.....43

Introduction and Signature Argument.....44

Alexandrianism Argument.....46

Nationality Argument.....47

Generation Argument.....48

Transition.....50

II...Divergent Theories.....53

St. Luke.....53

Clement of Rome.....59

Silas.....61

Aquila and Priscilla.....62

Peter.....64

Ariston.....65

Philip the Deacon.....65

Pseudonymous Theories.....66

III...Was It Barnabas or Apollos?.....70

Barnabas.....70

Apollos.....85

Bibliography.....88

INTRODUCTION

Our Problem, as the title informs one, is to discover, if possible, who is responsible for the New Testament Letter to the Hebrews; and if we are not able to arrive at any definite and conclusive conclusion, to set forth such theories as we find and to give as many of their arguments as we are able.

To accomplish our task we have divided our work into three parts. The first takes up the Pauline theory of authorship and is, therefore, the lengthiest of the three. The second treats all other proposed authors save Barnabas and Apollos who later become the topic of discussion in the third and last chapter.

It is with deep appreciation for the aid rendered us by our adviser, Dr. Arndt, and our reader, Dr. Laetch, and especially for the divine assistance granted in answer to our prayers, that we commend our efforts to the reader.

CHAPTER I

WAS IT PAUL ?

The critics of the Early Church, East and West, after three centuries, finally arrived at the conclusion that Paul was the author of this Epistle. And for many years it was so accepted, but then, in the days of the Reformation, scepticism broke loose once more until today there are few who will unconditionally accept the Pauline theory of authorship.

The pro and con arguments for this Pauline theory may well be divided into two sections according to their source: Pro and Con According to External Data and Pro and Con According to Internal Data.

PART I

Pro and Con According to External Data.

The testimony of the Church Fathers seems entirely confusing and nonconclusive. Much of it can be taken for either
(2)
side.

(2) Kendrick, A.C., Com. on the Ep. to the Heb. (Hovey, Alvah, Editor, An Am. Com. on the N. T., Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, Vol. VI) Introduction.

Eastern Church

(3)

Pantaenus: According to Eusebius, Clement writes thus:

"But now, as the elder used to say, since the Lord, X being the Apostle of the Almighty, was sent to the Hebrews, Paul, through modesty, since he had been sent to the Gentiles, does not inscribe himself as the apostle to the Hebrews, both to give due deference to the Lord and because he wrote to the Hebrews also out of his abundance, being a preacher and apostle to the Gentiles."

As to whether Pantaenus is here giving his personal observation, or the consensus of the Alexandrian School is difficult to ascertain. The words, "as the elder used to say" seem to lean towards a singular and individual opinion as existing alone in the mind of Pantaenus. (4)

But whosever's opinion it expresses, its contents raise many questions in our mind. Pantaenus here makes Paul responsible for the letter and yet he, at the same time, gives us an intimation that there was a doubt existing, if not in his own mind, then in the minds of others. We draw this from the apologetical character of the quotation and

(3) Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History, Vol. VI, 14.

(4) "The blessed presbyter referred to (...) may be concluded to have been Pantaenus (Cfr. Eusebius, H. E., Vol. V, 11; VI, 13) (Stromates. 1. Par. 11)" Farrar, F.W., Int. to the Ep. of Paul to the Heb. (Spence, H.D.M., Exell, J.S., Editors, The Pulpit Commentary. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co.), pp. 11-xiii.

"Bleek thinks that the Pantaenus reference gives merely a view in the Church of that day as against his own view." Moll, C.B., The Ep. to the Heb. (Lange, J.P., Schaff, P., translators and editors, A. Com. on the Holy Scriptures, Vol. VIII. New York: Charles Scribner and Co., 1868), Kendrick, A.C., trans., Int., pp. 2-10.

we feel safe in saying that there was a genuine doubt in the Alexandrian Church or he would not have spoken thus.

One must not, however, lean too far to one side, since it is also true that Pantaenus does state that Paul wrote Hebrews. He lived near Palestine and must, therefore, have been acquainted with the prevailing opinion on the subject and his testimony may be regarded as a fairly good proof that the Epistle was generally accepted as Paul's in that region. But still, one can see that a fog still hangs over this testimony which is difficult to lift in favor of one side or the other.

Clement: "And as for the Epistle to the Hebrews, he says indeed that it is Paul's, but that it was written for the Hebrews in the Hebrew tongue and that Luke, having carefully translated it, published it for the Greeks; hence, as a result of this translation, the same complexion of style is found in this Epistle and in the Acts but that the (words) 'Paul, an apostle' were naturally not prefixed. For, says he, 'in writing to the Hebrews who had conceived a prejudice against him and were suspicious of him, he very wisely did not repel them at the beginning by putting his name.'" (7)

Here again it is impossible to determine whether Clement gives his own conclusions, drawn from personal comparison of the Letter to the Hebrews with the other Pauline Letters, or whether in his circles he found evidence which spoke against Paul.

(5) Barnes, Al., Notes on the N.T. (London: Blackie and Son), Vol. IX, Int., pp. vii-xi.

(6) The question of the lack of Pauline greeting will be dealt with later; suffice to say that the explanation of Pantaenus is not generally accepted.

(7) Eusebius, E.H., VI, 14.

(8) For appreciation of this difficulty, cfr. Bleek, Fr., Einl. in das N.T. (Berlin: George Reimer, 1886), pp.252-280.

Once again we have the unrestricted statement that Paul is the ultimate author, but once again there is a hint of doubt in Clement's mind, forcing him to make a clarifying statement. The fog still hangs between us and the past.

That Luke was the translator of the Hebrew original has been ruled out by nearly all the better critics. This theory, however, will be dealt with again in the next chapter.

Origen: He gives us the most information concerning our problem but he also does not offer sufficient to form a definite conclusion.

"That the character of the diction of the Epistle entitled to the Hebrews has not the apostle's rudeness of speech, who confessed himself rude in speech, that is, in style; but that the Epistle is better Greek in the framing of its diction, will be admitted by everyone who is able to discern differences of style. But again, on the other hand, that the thoughts of the Epistle are admirable, and not inferior to the acknowledged writings of the apostle, to this also everyone will consent as true who has given attention to reading the apostle.

"But as for myself, if I were to state my own opinion, I should say that the thoughts are the apostle's, but that the style and the composition belongs to one who called to mind the apostle's teachings and, as it were, made short notes of what his master said. If any church, therefore, holds this Epistle as Paul's, let it be commended for this also. For not without reason have the men of old time handed it down as Paul's. But who wrote the Epistle, in truth God knows. Yet the account which has reached us (is twofold), some saying that Clement, who was bishop of the Romans, wrote the Epistle, others, (9) that it was Luke, he who wrote the Gospel and the Acts..."

"This opinion of Origen's, thus expressed, is of peculiar value; not only on account of the early age in which he lived, with all the facts that could then be known before him, but also because of his competence to form a sound

(9) Eusebius, E. H., VI, 25.

judgment on such a subject; and the fact of his having been an original and somewhat free thinker adds to, rather than detracts from, the value of his verdict." (10)

For the third time we find that also Origen, although he proclaims the Letter to the Hebrews as being Pauline, knows of definite doubts and opinions against such a conclusion and therefore is compelled to give up the idea of a personal writing by Paul and, instead, ascribes merely the contents to him. (11) For the first time, however, we have an intimation as to how great and influential these doubts of the Early Church were.

"Hardly does one dare derive from the statement of οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες οὐκ εἶκον ὡς Παύλου αὐτὴν παραδεδείχεν that the Fathers as one voice accepted Paul as the author; because such a conclusion would be for Origen especially with reference to the East, impossible; without a doubt Origen had only a few earlier scholars in mind, who accepted the Letter as Paul's and passed it on as such, as, for instance, Pantaeus and Clement. (12) The expression οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες does not necessarily, as Hug would have it, refer to men of the Apostolic age or as Tholuck would have it, at the beginning of the second century. If there had been other writers who had emphatically pointed to Paul as the writer, Eusebius, who gathered much of such material, would not have omitted it, but he gives no indication of such writers.

"Without a doubt, Origen found next to the tradition of Paul as the author another which went back to Luke, both out of early times and both out of his locality because he is writing to the African Church. Now he tries to unite the two traditions as Clement did before him." (13)

(10) Farrar, F.W., op. cit., pp. ii-xiii.

(11) Derived from a free translation of Wette, W.M.L.D., Lehrbuch der hist.-krit. Einl. in die kanonische Bücher des N.T. (Berlin: George Reimer, 1860), 344.

(12) Weiss / Weiss, D.B., Lehrbuch der Einl. in das N.T. (Berlin: Wm. Hertz, 1889), p. 523. / believes this refers to Pantaeus and Clement as do practically all others.

(13) Bleek, op. cit., 664.

"Origen repeatedly cites the Epistle as Paul's (De Orat. P27, where it is coupled to the Epistle to the Ephesians, in Poann, t.2, three times citing as Paul's the passages: Heb. 1,2; 2,9; P.6 and vi. 16, P.11; in Numer., Hom. iii. 3; in Ep. ad Rom. vii. P.1, ix P.36). In one place he refers to the fact that some denied the Epistle to be Paul's, and promises to give elsewhere a confutation of their opinion (Ep. ad Africanum, 9). But in his homilies on the Epistle, of which extants have been preserved by Eusebius (vi., 25), he shows himself to have become deeply impressed by the differences of style and he starts a theory as though the thoughts were Paul's, etc...." (14)

In relation to the previous testimonies of Pantaenus and Clement, Origen's is not nearly as sure (in respect to Paul's authorship) and therefore as restricted and limited. He does not, it is true, dispute the original Pauline origin of the Letter. His theory is compatible with many other theories of the time: translatorial, secretarial, etc. His words, "But who wrote the Epistle, in truth God knows" show us unmistakably that the Alexandrian School came no where near unanimously accepting the authorship of Paul, and we must leave it at that.

However, "on Origen's testimony have been based the defense of Paul's authorship by Semler, Meyer, Cramer, Starr, Gelpke, Paulus in Heidelberg (1833), Catholic Klee, Stein, (15) Gaussen, Wordsworth." Their footing, to say the least, is

(14) Salmon, George, A Hist. Int. to the Study of the Books of the N.T. (London: John Murray, 1894), p. 416.

(15) Moll, op. cit., p. 6.

precarious. No, the reader must agree, there is no dominating, conclusive proof here pro or con Paul's having been the writer.

The Early Eastern Church in General: "The ancient Alexandrian church leaders were favorably inclined towards their church's declaration, but they still felt a difficulty in ascribing this Epistle to Paul, and they appear not to be able to stand upon any definite and sure (16) ground." That fairly well sums up the situation. At least we (17) may not say, as Hug does, "I cannot see how the late critics can attach the authorship to an Alexandrian when right in the Alexandrian circles the view was for Paul already at the end of the first century. Who should know if they don't?"

But the reader might be more interested in a few verbatim opinions of the better critics than in an analytic synopsis of them.

"This belief in Paul's authorship was natural, as Paul was the supreme letter writer of the early church; but it was far from being unanimous even in Alexandria, where the beginning of the third century revealed divergent opinions (traditions) attributing it to Paul, Clement of Rome, or Luke; while Origen refuses to connect it with Paul except by medium of a Greek edition or (Rom. 16,22) amanuensis.

"The scholars of the Alexandrian Church, where it first gained a canonical position, felt obvious difficulties in the Pauline authorship which was bound up with its claims of canonicity. Origen also felt the discrepancies between the style of Paul and the style of Hebrews." (18)

(16) A free translation of Wette, op. cit., p. 344.

(17) Hug, L.J., Einl. in die Schriften des N.T. (Stuttgart and Tübingen: J.G. Cotta'schen Buchhandlung, 1821), p. 432. Also a free translation.

(18) Moffat, James, op. cit., pp. 420ff.

"The testimony of the Church at Alexandria was uniform after the time of Origen, that it was the production of Paul. Indeed there seems never to have been any doubt about it there, and from the commencement it was admitted as his production. The testimony of the Church and the school is particularly valuable because (a) it was near Palastine where the Epistle was probably sent (19); (b) Clement particularly had travelled much and would be likely to understand the prevailing sentiments of the East; (c) Alexandria was the seat of the most celebrated theological school of the early Christian ages, and those who were at the head of this school would be likely to have correct information on a point like this; and (d) Origen is admitted to have been the most learned of the Greek Fathers, and his testimony that the sentiments were those of Paul may be regarded of peculiar value." (20)

"The weighty authority of the Alexandrian Fathers, Pantaenus, Clement, and Origen, turns, from our point of view, rather against the Pauline authorship, when we reflect that it was probably because the stamp of Apostolic authority was deemed necessary by them to its canonical validity, and they could give it this authority only by assuming that Paul was, at least indirectly, its author. Their reasons for denying to the apostle its immediate, and so to speak, literary authorship, are weightier than those which lead them to bring it within the apostolic circle. Within that circle no name but that of Paul could be connected with the Epistle to the Hebrews, and they had the discernment to see the wide difference of style and manner between this work and the acknowledged writings of the apostle." (21)

Origen's and Clement's "testimony on this point is rather strengthened than weakened by the fact that each of them had a theory of his own about the composition of the Epistle." (22)

"There appears to be one, and only one, way of accounting for so general an agreement as to the authorship of an anonymous letter. It is this. When the Christians, who had escaped to Pella before the siege of Jerusalem found themselves precluded from returning to the captured city, they would be likely to go and settle, some of them

-
- (19) Two destination theories: 1. Rome (Our view); 2. Jerusalem.
(20) Barnes, Al., op. cit., p. vii ff.
(21) Kendrick, loc. cit.
(22) Kay, Int. to Heb. (Cook, F.C., editor, The Holy Bible with Com. London: John Murray, 1881, Vol. IV), p.4f.

in Palestine and Egypt, others in Syria, and Asia Minor (cfr. Acts 6,5.9; 8, 19, 19-20), carrying with them their copies of the Epistle, -Now, after the overthrow of the temple, more precious to them than ever. Their statements as to the authorship would of course be accepted everywhere." (23)

"...the testimony of the Alexandrians may not (with Michhorn, Schmidt, David Schulz) be referred back to purely hypothetical assumptions; compare Stenlein's Hist. Testimonies of the first four centuries regarding the author." (24)

"Es ist hierhach klar, dass die Paulinische Abfassung des HB auch in der Alexandrinischen Kirche keine Gemeindegemeinschaft, sondern nur eine Schulmeinung war, welche einzelne Gemeinden in guten Glauben angenommen hatten." (25)

The reader may readily see, from these few arguments, that it is an impossible thing to be sure either that Paul wrote the Epistle or that he did not. Critics are still guessing on this evidence with the majority of their guesses against Paul. As long as they are not sure as to what the Fathers knew, we shall be forced to remain in doubt and merely add our guess.

Later Eastern Church: "That the same view (Pauline origin) prevailed in the Church of Palestine, Syria, (26) and Asia Minor, is not questioned (Eusebius)." Yes, it is true, from Origen on we find in the Eastern Church a strange but definite unity of agreement on the Pauline authorship. Gradually even there sinks into obscurity the translation theory. It is almost necessary to name here the most important personages and bodies who testify to this consensus.

(23) Moffat, James, op. cit., p. 420 ff.

(24) Noll, op. cit., p. 6.

(25) Weiss, op. cit., p. 328.

(26) Kay, Wm., op. cit., p. 40 f.

(27) (28) (29)
 Justin Martyr, Polycarp and Dionysius (250) give
 evidence in their writings that they believe Paul to be the
 author and the Letter to be genuine. Fourteen years later the
 Synod of Antioch (264) coupled passages from Hebrews with
 passages from Corinthians as though they came from the same
 (29) (29) (29)
 author. Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem (286), Alexander (312) and
 Jacob, Bishop of Nisibis (325?), followed the trend, the last
 (29)
 citing it as from an apostle, presumably from Paul.

Eusebius of Caesarea, the historian of the era,
 ascribes fourteen epistles to Paul (E.H. iii, 3,5).

"Eusebius repeatedly refers to it as his. Yet
 he speaks of those in the Roman Church who denied its
 Pauline origin and he himself, like Clement of Alexandria,
 regards it as a translation from a Hebrew original (H.E.
 iii, 38,23) and he elsewhere classifies it among the
 disputed works" (30)

"He had heard the objection, had weighed the ob-
 jection and found it wanting...the fact which he mentions
 that its genuineness had been disputed by the Church of
 Rome, and that he specifies no other Church, proves that
 it had not been called in question in the East. The writers
 here referred to lived in the very country to which the
 Epistle was evidently sent (31) and their testimony is
 uniform and should settle the question." (32)

(33) (34)
 The Council of Laodicea (365), Titus of Bostra
 (371), and Athanasius (375) ascribe it to Paul, Athanasius
 counting it among fourteen epistles of Paul and placing it
 (35)
 after 2 Thessalonians. Ephraem Syrus (378), "a disciple of

(27) Salmon, George, op. cit., p. 415. Also Barnes, Al., op.
cit., p. vii f.
 (28) Salmon, loc. cit.
 (29) Kendrick, loc. cit.
 (30) Ibid.
 (31) Barnes altogether too dogmatic as to destination. He
 cannot prove his theory.
 (32) Barnes, op. cit., p. vii f.
 (33) Kendrick, loc. cit.
 (34) Ibid.
 (35) Kay, op. cit., p. 4 f.

Jacob of Nisibis, unhesitatingly refers to it as Paul's,"
(36)
(38)
(Opp. Syriac T. I.), and of him Barnes remarks:

"Ephraem Syrus, or the Syrian, abundantly ascribes the Epistle to Paul. He was the disciple of Nisibis, and no man was better qualified to inform himself on this point than Ephraem. No man stands deservedly higher in the memory of the Eastern Churches. After him all the Syrian Churches acknowledged the canonical authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews." (37)

The list of the Pauline adherents continues with
(39)
Basil the Great and his brother, Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory Nazeanizen (387), Didymus (395), Epiphany (402) in his
(40-41)
Haeres. LXIX, Par. 27, 39; opp. and III, p. 543 ed. Noesselt,
(42)
Chrysostom (407), and Theodoret of Massuestia (407) in his
(43-44)
Prolog. in Epist. ad Hebr.

The Arians: Arius put Paul as the author, but many of the Arians rejected this opinion; clearly, however, on controversial grounds only, as can be seen from the declaration of Epiphany (Haeres. 69) and Theodoret who writes in the introduction to his commentary, "It is no wonder that those affected with the Arian malady should rage against the apostolic writings, separating the Letter to the Hebrews from the rest and calling
(45)
it spurious."

(36) Moffatt, op. cit., p. 420 f.

(37) Barnes, op. cit., p. vii f.

(38) Hug, op. cit., p. 400. Also Sampson, F.S., A Crit. Com. on the Ep. to the Heb. (New York: Robert Carter and Bros., 1857), Intro.

(39) Kendrick, loc. cit., contains following four names.

(40) Delitzsch, R., Com. zum Briefe an die Hebr. (Leipzig: Aeserffling and Franke, 1857), Intr. Cfr. also Hug, op. cit., p. 438.

(41) Farrar, op. cit., p. v.

(42) Kendrick, loc. cit.

(43) Hug, Op. Cit., p. 438.

(44) Farrar, loc. cit.

(45) Farrar, op. cit., p. v.

Peshito: The Peshito held the Epistle but did not indicate it as being Pauline except for the superscription. It put the Letter where our edition has it. This translation must have been made very early since 2 Epistle of Peter and the 2 and 3 Epistles of John are not included. Salmon has mentioned the criticism that the antiquity of this portion has been doubted, namely that of the Letter to the Hebrews. He does, however, admit that he does not know whether there is any good authority for such doubts.

One must confess, as he glances over the list, that the evidence, at such a first glance, seems somewhat in favor of the Pauline origin. But one must still not let himself go off the deep end, for several other considerations come into play here. First of all, the reader must consider that all these opinions flowed from the early Church Fathers, Pantaenus, Clement, and Origen. We have seen how uncertain is their testimony. It seems that merely for want of better, the East gradually accepted the Pauline theory and forgot about objections to it. Leaders would be inclined to do this in order not to disturb the faith of their flocks. When one remembers the unstable source, then this later evidence shrinks in immensity.

Then there is also the consideration that outside of this area, even in the area to which we believe this Letter was sent (Rome), it is either not known as Pauline, or renounced as non-Pauline.

Add to this the need of the Fathers for an author to lend authority to the letter. This writer, must, therefore, be an apostle, and under such conditions we can appreciate the eagerness with which they grasped at Paul.

(46) Kendrick, loc. cit.

(47) Barnes, op. cit., p. v.

(48) Kendrick, loc. cit.

WESTERN CHURCH

Clement of Rome (92-102): During the lifetime of John and under the rule of Domitian (87-96), Clement wrote his Epistle to the Corinthians. In it, as Eusebius says, he either makes verbatim use of passages from the Letter to the Hebrews or he alludes to them. Stuart has arranged in parallel columns the original Greek of Clement's Epistle and the Letter to the Hebrews in the case of seven direct quotations (49) and eleven indirect.

"Clement uses Hebrews (for example) thus: 'Who, being the brightness of His majesty, is so much greater than the angels, as he has by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they. For it is written, Who maketh His angels spirits, and His ministers a flame of fire. But of His Son, thus saith the Lord: this day have I begotten Thee. Ask of me and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. And again he saith to him, Sit on my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool' (Clement, c. 36; Heb. 1,3,4,7,13)" (50)

(51) Clement uses the Epistle and seems to value it highly but beyond that we dare not go, for nowhere does he make mention of the author. Especially do we dare not suppose that he took it to be Paul's handiwork, for the whole subsequent evidence of the Western Church is against this. Of course, there are no authorities whom we could cite until we get to the end of the second century or the beginning of the third, but at that time none of the Western writers whose opinion we know regarded the Epistle as Paul's. (52)

(49) Samson, G.W., Homiletic Magazine, Feb., 1884, p. 280 f.

(50) Salmon, op. cit., p. 416.

(51) Bleek, op. cit., p. 662, a free translation gives this idea in full.

(52) Salmon, op. cit., p. 416.

In this connection Kendrick writes: "Later evidence renders it improbable that Clement (100) attributed it to Paul, as the canon of Muratori, belonging to the end of the second century, reckons thirteen epistles as attributed by the Roman Church to Paul, the Epistle to the Hebrews being entirely un-
(53)
mentioned."

Of what value, then, is Clement's use of the Epistle? For one thing, Clement wrote very early, which fact shows us that the Letter to the Hebrews also came from a very early date.

But here also lies, if we accept the theory of the Roman destination, a tremendous bit of evidence against Paul's authorship. If the Letter to the Hebrews was written by Paul to a congregation near or in Rome, would it not be natural that Clement and the Western Church would know about it? The fact that nowhere is there a hint of the Pauline origin in the vicinity to which the Epistle was sent is significant and must not be lightly shoved aside. Its weight is increased, moreover, by the fact that Clement must have worked contemporaneously with Paul and become intimately acquainted with him.

If the reader disagrees with our destination theory, however, he still must admit that the absence of a Pauline substantiation at the very least casts strong doubt on his being the author. But let us move on with some discussions of later Church history figures.

(53) Kendrick, loc. cit.

Murator: Close to the end of the second century, the canon of
of Muratori ignores the Letter in its list although

"he has the Pauline letters and also two others; ad Laodicenses and ad Alexandrinus; but the HB which ca(as Semler, Eichhorn, Hug, Schleiermacher, Guericke, Wieseler, Gredner, Volkmar, Koestlin, Hilgenfeld) dare look for in ad Alexandrinus (55) is not mentioned. This shows that it was not considered Pauline at the time." (56)

Marcion: "In the year 140, there came to Rome two marked young men. One was the brilliant Marcion, whose father, a disciple of Polycarp, a pupil of John, was obliged to exclude his son from his church near Smyrna, because of youthful improprieties; who, exiling himself, sought at Rome admission into the Christian church, but failing, resolved on opposition to its faith. The same year there came to Rome from Alexandria a speculative young man named Valentine; and the two found kindred congenialities of mind and heart. Marcion declared that of the fourteen epistles of St. Paul, found as authentic in the Greek original and in the Syriac translation, used in the Christian churches at that era, he accepted only ten. The objections to the HB, as Hug has shown, were from the first substantially the same: that Paul had not, as in other epistles, prefixed his name to it; that in 2,1-5, the term 'us' is in conflict with his declaration that he personally did not receive his view of Gospel truth from the apostles; that in 13,18, he seems to have been in affiliation with the Palestine Jews; and that the style of thought differs from Paul's in his other epistles." (57)

Hippolytus (200): "Photius (Bibl. Cod., 121) quotes Hip. as denying it." (58)

Irenaeus: "Photius (Bibl. Cod., 232) has preserved a statement of Stephen Gobar, a writer of the sixth century, that Irenaeus and Hippolytus asserted that the Epistle was not Paul's. In point of fact we find very little use of the Epistle made in the great work of Irenaeus against heresies. There are few coincidences, but we cannot positively

(54) Delitzsch, op. cit., int.

(55) Our opinion also.

(56) Bleek, op. cit., p. 665. A free translation.

(57) Samson, op. cit., p. 280.

(58) Farrar, op. cit., p. vii. Cfr. also Dods, Marcus, Epistle to the Hebrews (Nicoll, W.R., editor, The Expositor's Greek Testament. New York: Hodder and Staughten; Vol. IV, p. 221 ff.), Introduction, p. 223. And Salmon, op. cit., p. 417.

pronounce them to be quotations, and certainly the Epistle is never referred to as Paul's. Eusebius says he quoted the Epistle in a last work but he still does not say it was Paul's (59) "Irenaeus "could have used it because it offered much against gnostics and valentinians." (60)

Caius, Presbyter at Rome (211-217):..."he mentions only thirteen Epistles of the holy apostle, not numbering the Epistle to the Hebrews with the rest." (61) "Jerome confirms this and gives the date of Zephyrinus under whom Caius wrote (De Vir Illustr., c. 56)." (62)

Novatian (250): Delitzsch and Bleek declare that "Novatian, who could have used it to good advantage in his battle against the reacceptance of the lapsi, does not use it." (63)

"However, Sampson advances this argument: "Its rejection during this period is ascribed to the use which the Montanists and Novatians made of Chapter 6, 4-8 and chapter 10, 26-31 to justify their severe and unpopular rules as to the perpetual exclusion of certain classes of backsliders from the church. This revelation was rejected by some through opposition to the Chiliasts, who perverted its concluding chapters to their support." (64)

Tertullian: "But we have in Tertullian a decisive witness to Western opinion. The controversy as to the possibility of forgiveness of post-baptismal sin was one which much disturbed the Church at the beginning of the third century. The suspicion then arises that the opposition to this Epistle may have been prompted solely by the support afforded to the rigorest side on this question by the well known passage in the sixth chapter, which seems to deny in some cases, the possibility of repentance and forgiveness. But what is remarkable is that Tertullian quotes this passage in support of his Montanist views; yet though his interest would be to set the authority of the Epistle as Paul's, he quotes it as Barnabas' and not as canonical, but only as above the level of the 'Shepherd of Hermas' 'There is extant,' he says, 'in the epistle of Barnabas addressed to the Hebrews written by a man of such authority that Paul has ranked him with himself: 'I only and Barnabas, have we not power to forbear working?' And certainly this Epistle of Barnabas is more received than that apocryphal Shepherd of the adulterers' (De Pudic. 20). This is the language of

(59) Salmon, loc. cit. Also Farrar, op. cit., p. 417; and Delitzsch and Kendrick.

(60) Bleek, op. cit., p. 664.

(61) Eusebius, E.H., VI, 20.

(62) Farrar, loc. cit.

(63) Bleek, op. cit., p. 666. Also Delitzsch.

(64) Sampson, loc. cit.

a man to whom the idea that the Epistle was Paul's does not seem to have occurred; and the proof appears to have been conclusive that in Tertullian's time the Pauline authorship was not acknowledged in the Western Church." (65)

Cyprian (258): "Also from Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, does it appear that the HB at the middle of the third century in the proconsulate of Africa was not accepted as apostolic," (66) "for he leaves it unmentioned." (67) He and V. Peta-
bionensis seem to know only the letters to the seven churches. (68)

Methodius: (290) "Whether or not Methodius refers to the writings as Paul's is uncertain." (69)

In the fourth century the non-Pauline opinion con-
(70)
tinues in the writings and expressions of Hilary (354), Lucifer
(354), Victorinus (360), Zeno (360), Optatus Milevit, Ambrosiaster
(366-384), Phoebadius (392), Council of Hippo (393), Council of
(72) (74)
Carthage (398), and Leo the Great (440-461). The only contrary
(73)
voice heard up until Jerome and Augustine is that of Ambrosius
(397).

With Jerome and Augustine there comes a rev-
olution in the opinion of the Western Church. Both were well
versed in the Greek literature, Jerome having resided for a time
in the East. As a consequence neither could ignore the fact that
the Eastern Church wrote of Hebrews as being the Epistle of Paul.

(65) Salmon, op. cit., p. 418.

(66) Bleek, op. cit., p. 418.

(67) Kendrick, loc. cit.

(68) Delitzsch, loc. cit.

(69) Wetze, op. cit., p. 346.

(70) For the next three names cfr. Barnes, op. cit., p. vii f.

(71) Wetze, op. cit., p. 346. Also for the next trio of names.

(72) Dods, op. cit., p. 223.

(73) Delitzsch, op. cit., int.

(74) Wetze, loc. cit.

Jerome quotes it more often than not as an Epistle of Paul without any doubt showing in his designation, but at times he uses such phrases as "Paul, or whoever wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews." In his Ep. ad Dardanum (Ep. 129, vol. 1, p. 965) he says that the Epistle is received as Paul's, not only by the churches of the East, but also by all previous church writers in the Greek language, though he adds that many thought it to be the work of Clement and Barnabas.

(75)
Delitzsch tells us how Augustine was influenced by his Greek learning to accept the Pauline theory but it is noteworthy how often he quotes the Epistle merely as that to the Hebrews, apparently studiously avoiding to call it Paul's.

(76)
Thus we see that the acceptance of the Letter as Pauline by the Eastern Church swayed the Western opinion through its two great leaders, Jerome and Augustine, also to accept it thus. When one, therefore, analyzes the historical data, he must take this fact into very serious consideration, for, as Kay states:

"There can be little doubt that the final settlement of the question was largely due to the wisdom and candor of the two great church teachers, Jerome and Augustine,"

(77)

(75) Jerome: "This is to be maintained, that this epistle, which is inscribed to the Hebrews is not only received by the churches of the East as the Apostle Paul's but has been in past times by all Occident writers in the Greek language, although most Latins think that Barnabas or Clement was the author. Still it was not rejected by all the Latins. Some received it as the product of Paul." --cited by Barnes, op. cit., p. vii f.

(76) Re St. Augustine, op. cit., also De Doctrina Christiana, ii, 8; De Peccatorum Meritis et Remissione? i, 27; De Civitate Dei, xvi, 22.

(77) Salmon, op. cit., p. 418-419.

(78) Farrer, op. cit., p. ix. Bleek, op. cit., p. 666.

(79) Kay, op. cit., p. 4 f.

(80)

In spite of the decisions of the Councils of Hippo and Carthage that the Letter was canonical, the use of it declined in the next century. Cassidorus states that in the sixth century there was as yet no commentary on it.

(81)

Later the Council of Trent decreed that Hebrews was an Epistle of Paul's and this decree has bound many critics to defend the decree of their religion, the Pauline theory. Some, it is true, have gone against the decree of the Catholic Church and hold their own views. Among these are Bellarmine, Este, Ludorus Vives, Cardinal Cajetan, and others.

(82)

From the eleventh century to the Reformation few doubted Paul's authorship, but then came the reformation of opinion along this line also and the old arguments flared anew. The result was the arising of statements like that of Erasmus:

"If the Church certainly defines it to be Paul's, I willingly render my intellect captive to the obedience of faith; but, as far as my own judgments are concerned, it does not seem to me to be his." (83)

It seems, from the way the source material runs, that the more modern the critic, the more he favors another view than that for Paul. We think, perhaps, of James Moffat, Goodspeed, etc. Looking back and surveying all the arguments made behind them, these modern scholars decide against Paul.

(80) One might mention others of lesser importance who held the Pauline theory, such as Orosius, Pictoriensis, Lucifer Calortanus, V. Afr., and then too one might mention some of the catalogues and ancient MSS which have the Letter to the Hebrews in its place immediately after 2 Thess.: Codex Alex., Vatican, Sinaiticus, Coislinian, Beatty (P46), six minuscules, Syrian canon of 400 A.D., Egypt (5. cent.), Sahidic Versina (Coptic translation) and the Morgan MS (M. 570-571) (9. cent.). Cfr. "The Position of Hebrews in the Canon of the N.T.", the Harvard Theological Review, Vol. 29, April 1936. Sampson, op. cit., int.

(81) Lenski, op. cit., p. 8 f.

(82) Ibid.

(83) Farrar, op. cit., p. x.

We will first of all again give the reader some excerpts of verbatim opinions expressed on the historical data just presented as they flow from the pens of better critics and then we shall look into some of the causes for which scholars through the ages have rejected Paul.

"It is therefore, clear as the sun, that in the Western Church the HB was not passed on as being Pauline." (84)

"There is a connection between Italy and the Letter and therefore we are disposed to consider the Italian tradition as to the authorship with more respect than we should do if the Epistle had been dispatched from one Eastern city to another." (85)

"The Pauline authorship was denied also by many in the Roman Church till ecclesiastical considerations during the fourth century brought it into line with the Eastern Church where the Epistle had been widely received as Pauline." (86)

"The Epistle had not the name of the author. All the Epistles of Paul had. As the Epistle was addressed to the Hebrews in Palestine, it may not have been known to the Western Church." (87)

"Such was the state of opinion regarding the Epistle in the Latin Church as late as the time of Eusebius of Caesarea. After the middle of the fourth century the tide turned, probably under influence of the Eastern Church. Three African synods put the stamp of approval on it as being Pauline. It was approved by the pope as such. Down to the Reformation no doubt arose." (88)

"There are indeed distinguished scholars who, with Spanheim (de autore ep. ad Hebr.), Heidelberg, 1659) and Wetstein, suppose that the Western Church was actuated by hostility towards Montanists and Novatians (89) who appealed to chapter 6,4 against the readmission of the lapsi into the Church; but even Tertullian mentions indeed this Epistle during his Montanist period, but knows nothing, apparently, of its authorship by Paul." (90)

-
- (84) Free translation of Delitzsch, op. cit., int.
(85) Salmon, op. cit., p. 420.
(86) Moffat, op. cit., p. 420 f.
(87) Barnes, op. cit., p. vii f.
(88) Kendrick, op. cit., int.
(89) Kay believes this.
(90) Holl, op. cit., p. 3.

"Christ v. Hofmann thinks (deutra canonical? in Zeitschrift fuer Prot. und Kirche, Ell. 1857) that the Gentile Church of the West regarded the three Epistles to the Jewish Christians (Peter, James, and Hebrews) which, in the fragm. de canone, published by Muratori, do not appear among those which the Church has stamped with her approval, as in no way concerning them. But, on the other hand, the Epistle of James was even in the East an antilegomenon; and, on the other, First Peter is cited by Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Cyprian as apostolic composition." (91)

"We saw that the Epistle, which had been recognized as authoritative at Rome in the first century, came at a later period to be treated by many as of only secondary value. The reason which they alleged for this was that the Epistle was 'not St. Paul's'. The question then is: Shall the positive testimony of men, who, knowing St. Paul intimately, were qualified to give witness on such a point, be outweighed by the doubts of those who lived some hundred years later, and therefore, were not qualified? To allow this would be to violate a fundamental rule of evidence." (92)

This concludes the arguments derived from the external evidence and a summary may be in place. In the Eastern Church the earliest Fathers doubted the Pauline theory while in the Western it was not accepted at all. In the former it later was unquestionably accepted, while in the latter it did not become so until the time of Jerome and Augustine. On this evidence we are inclined to stick with the earliest opinion on the belief that they should know better than anyone. We say we are inclined thus, not dogmatically set, because the evidence does not permit this. There is perhaps only one statement we can make with any certainty - the question is still an open matter and no positive proof for either side has been uncovered. We look then elsewhere - into the internal parts of the Letter, seeking there a proof pro or con.

(91) Ibid.

(92) Kay, op. cit., int. p. 4 f.

P A R T I I

Fro and Con According to Internal Evidence.

In entering upon the question of similarities and dissimilarities of the style and contents of Paul's letters with the style and contents of the Epistle to the Hebrews, we fully realize that we tread on fiercely controversial ground. The opinions of the various critics may run in the same groove or they may be so far apart, one questions whether they deal with the same topic. It seems best to us, therefore, that we give as many opinions as possible so that the reader may compare our conclusions, if any, and evaluate them.

Style: To strike immediately into the very heart of the style, a quotation is presented which tells the essence of the conclusion reached in our study far better than we could hope to portray it:

"The style bears almost no similarity to that of Paul. - Nothing of the impetuosity and abruptness, none of his favorite expressions and forms of transitions; but moves on in an equable and uniform flow of quiet majesty. In his utmost intensity of emotion the writer is never insensible to, and never sacrifices the grace of diction. He is a rhetorician, trained in the culture of the schools and always writing, as Paul never writes, under the habitual sway of that culture. Paul is never a rhetorician; our author is always a rhetorician. Not, indeed that Paul does not, in the grandeur of his thought, and the native majesty and grandeur of his diction, often snatch spontaneously some of the highest graces of art. And not that our author, with his soul profoundly penetrated with Christian truth, does not uniformly rise above the sphere of the mere rhetorician. Yet in his noblest flights he neither can, nor would shake off his habits of rhetorical expression and habits which are utterly alien to the mind of the Apostle. Nor, while certainly inferior in finish and grace

of style, can we deny to the Apostle on the whole, the superior place as a writer. His largeness and depth of view, his burning energy, his confident and majestic tread amidst the Alpine heights of divine truth give him a Demosthenian pre-eminence in sacred oratory; and his principal epistles stand as perpetual proofs that if he often fed infantile Christians with the milk of sacred doctrine, he was able to utter among the full grown and mature a wisdom which the wisdom of this world has never transcended nor approached. The question between him and the writer to the Hebrews is not one of relative excellence, but of likeness or unlikeness. And unlike in their native endowments and style of culture, they certainly are. The one writer would certainly never have written the opening verses of the Epistle to the Romans; still less would the other have written the sonorous and rolling periods of the opening of the Hebrews." (1)

Already the early Church Fathers felt the difficulty of ascribing the language and style to Paul. On this basis also many other critics have hesitantly held to the Pauline theory or unhesitantly dropped it.

"No other work of the New Testament can be compared to it in the majestical stride and swing of language, the rhetorical march in precise rhythm. The style is more oratorical and rhetorical than dialectic, not as spontaneous and impulsive as the Letter to the Galatians; not as crude and imperialistic as that of Romans; not as impetuous and flowing as Ephesians; its flow of style is calm, of higher freedom, and of quiet majesty. We appear to have a treatise before us, but the permeating admonition portrays a sermon preached to a well known audience, and at the close, the sermon wanders

(1) Kendrick, op. cit., int.

through parenthetical lanes (13-22) into the form of a letter. This Letter bears no apostle's name and yet its contents compel one to think of an apostolic spirit."⁽²⁾

We have, then, on the one hand, the carefully constructed, errorless, rhetorical style of the Hebrews; and, on the other, the often incorrect, anakolutha-filled, powerful but yet rough and tempestuous (according to the mood of the apostle)⁽³⁾ style of Paul.

(2) Very free translation of Delitzsch, *op. cit.*, int.

(3) Barth, D.F., *Einkl. in das N.T.* (Guertersloh: c. Bertelmann, 1908), pp. 113 ff.

"Before all else is the manner of speech, the style, the temperament altogether otherwise than in the Pauline Letters...Above all is this letter written in the best Greek, most rhythmical classical prose, more so than any other N.T. Letter; while Paul's Hebrew always shines through in his writings." - Free translation of Juslicher, Adolf, *Einkl. in das N.T.* (Tuebingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1921), p. 134.

"The bare reading of the Epistle suffices to convince us that the Pauline authorship may be set aside as incredible. The style is not Paul's and this apostle, although using an amanuensis, undoubtedly dictated all his letters. The Epistle to the Hebrews reveals a literary felicity not found elsewhere in the N.T. The writer is master of his words and understands perfectly how to arrange each clause so that every word shall play its full part in conveying with precision the meaning intended. He knows how to build up his sentences into precise paragraphs, each of which carries the argument one step nearer to its conclusion. In all this he markedly and widely differs from the tempestuousness of Paul. Farrar: 'The writer cites differently from Paul; he writes differently, he argues differently; he thinks differently; he declaims differently; he constructs and connects his sentences differently; he builds up his paragraphs on a wholly different model. St. Paul is constantly bungling two constructions, leaving sentences unfinished, breaking into personal allusions, substituting the syllogism of passion for the syllogism of logic. This writer is never

"There still remains an argument of the most conclusive kind, the style and character of its diction, which has no affinity with Paul's...The divergence is not only in words or figures of speech, it differs in all features." -
(4)
Erasmus. "Furthermore, the vocabulary and style are alike decisive. The careful syntax, purged of anakoluths, the careful succession of periods, and the elaborate rhetorical construction of the whole writing, show no trace of rugged, broken style. We might contrast the auctor ad Hebraeos and Paul, in fact, as
(5)
Johnson contrasted Dryden and Pope."

ungrammatical, he is never irregular, he is never personal, he never struggles for expression, he never loses himself in a parenthesis; he is never hurried into an anakoluthon. His style is the style of a man who thinks as well as writes in Greek; whereas Paul wrote in Greek but thought in Syriac." -- Dods, op. cit., p. 224.

"The author is in remarkable command of the Greek language. He loves comparisons and parallels. He likes to go from the unimportant to the greatest; to use much allegory...The language is clearer than Paul's; that was seen already by Origen. The writer to the Hebrews observed a much more exact word order and he builds his periods much more regularly than Paul. All in all he uses more dialectics and more rhetoric than Paul" - Gregory, C.K., Einl. in das N.T. (Leipzig: Hinrichs' sehe Buchhandlung, 1909), p. 745. A very free translation.

"That Paul did not write this letter, the comparison of it with his other letters also shows, in point of the whole character, content, style, and language...I lay, thereby, less emphasis on differences of single expressions, manner of speaking, or constructions, as on the construction of the language as a whole." - Bleek, op. cit., p. 655. A free translation.

"The language, in contrast to Paul's, is pure Greek rhetorically and grammatically (Origen already decided thus. Most surely does Schulz, S. 136 f., show it. Seyffarth: de epistola quae dicitur ad Hebraeos, indole maxime peculiari. But they consider too much individual words and phrases. Better are Bleek, 327 f., Credner, Par. 200, Schott, and Tholuck.)" - Wette, loc. cit., a free translation.

(4) Kay, op. cit., p. 4 f.

(5) Morfat, op. cit., p. 420 f.

But we must, at the same time, be careful in analyzing the opinions of the critics along the lines of language and style. There is a problem here, or, rather, a temptation to go astray which Farrar states well:

(6)

"The internal evidence of some other actual writer than St. Paul does not rest solely and principally on the number of words and expressions in the Epistle which are not found in St. Paul's acknowledged writings. Differences of this kind may be made too much of as proof of different authorship; there are a considerable number of hapax legomena in some of St. Paul's undoubted epistles, and especially in the Pastorals, which are the latest. The same writer may greatly vary his phrases and words in different works and different times, in accordance with his train of thought, surrounding influence and associating books later read on the subjects treated. Hence the lists that have been made of words and phrases common to this Epistle and St. Luke alone, or to the Epistle and St. Paul alone, or found in this Epistle and St. Paul's own speeches as recorded by Luke, are not, whatever their value, important for the main argument, the essential part of which is that the whole Greek style of the Epistle is different from that of St. Paul's acknowledged writings - more classical in its ideas, as well as more finished and rhetorical; and also that the studied arrangement of the thoughts and arguments, the systematic plan of the whole work, is unlike the way of writing so characteristic of the great apostle."

One might, perhaps, present here a few concrete examples of the peculiarities of the Letter which critics have found definitely to speak against Paul.

The parentheses, for one, stand as evidence against the apostle. The parentheses in Hebrews are not separate but rhythmically connected, which is not the case with Paul.

(7)

(6) Farrar, op. cit., p. x-xl. Cfr. also Moll, op. cit., p. 8: "But it is not merely individual terms, expressions, and references which exhibit a deviation from those familiar to Paul; there yet (even with similarities of doctrine) runs through it a thorough independence in the modes of conception, in the style of the argumentation and the diction."

(7) Weiss, op. cit., p. 326.

"Especially is the Letter distinguished for actual and careful, involved constructions and for a grammatically correct use of parentheses; it contains connected parentheses with apodosis and protosis and with long interpolated parentheses, which are, however, carefully formed, without once permitting an anacoluthon to creep in, e.g., 2, 2-4, 4, 14, 15; 9, 13, 14; and especially 7, 20-22, and 12, 18-24. In contrast, Paul does not always follow through on his thoughts correctly and grammatically and often has to return. Paul seldom uses real parentheses, let alone long ones; rather he sets into the main sentences minor ones and often does not return to the construction with which he began. Cfr. Rom. 5, 12 ff." (8)

Another point on which the author to the Hebrews differs with Paul is the introduction of quotations from the Old Testament.

"In Hebrews they are mainly set down as quotations from God: ὁ θεὸς λέγει ἐπιτελέσει, ἐπιτελέσει, ἀδελφοί, μνηστέον and the like, whether ὁ θεὸς ὁ θεὸς λέγει; ὁ θεὸς αἶψα is expressly set forth or whether it is implied by the context. Thus are such passages introduced, in which the speech of God is in the third person, so that he cannot be directly seen as the speaker (1, 6.7.8.; 4, 4; 7, 21; 10, 50); next to this we find twice: τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον λέγει καταλείπει (3, 7; 10, 15), and a few times are passages introduced as direct statements of Christ, the Son of God (2, 11.13; 10, 5.8 ff). Otherwise with Paul. He cites the O. T. passages mainly as speeches of God: λέγει ὁ θεὸς and the like; but yet only in such passages in which the O. T. has God speaking in the first person (Rom. 9, 9.15.25; 2 Cor. 6, 2.16.17; Gal. 3, 16), and not otherwise. More often Paul mentions the mortal writer or speaker: so, e.g., in Romans David λέγει, Μωϋσῆς λέγει - ἰσχυρῶς, Μωϋσῆς λέγει - καταλείπει and this also in passages where God seems to speak in the first person (Rom. 10, 5.20.21). But still more frequently does Paul designate the citation as a quotation from the Scriptures: λέγει γὰρ ὁ κύριος (ὡς) λέγει ὁ κύριος, κατὰ τὸ κεραμένον, κατὰ τὸ εἰρημέριον, λέγει ὁ κύριος, and often with the place designated: λέγει ὁ κύριος ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἢ ἐκ τῆς Μωϋσῆος γῆς, λέγει ὁ κύριος ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἢ ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἢ ἐκ τῆς γῆς and the like." (9)

(8) Bleek, op. cit., p. 652 f.
 (9) Bleek, op. cit., p. 659.

On the other hand Salmon states: "His formulae of the O.T. citations are also different from those generally used by Paul (introductions--legei, etc.)...but there are exceptions which prevent us from pressing this argument confidently (Eph. 4,8; 5,14; Rom. 15,10; 2 Cor. 6,2; Gal. 3,16)."

The quotations themselves offer much better evidence against the Pauline theory, as Bleek witnesses:

"More clearly does the difference between Paul and the author of HB show in the quoting of O.T. passages: in relation to the reference to the words of the original and LXX. In Hebrews the O.T. passages are regularly, with one exception (10,31: Deut. 32,35) quoted from the LXX, and mostly verbatim, especially in the longer passages, so that the author probably had his LXX before him; the words of the LXX are also kept and are partly the foundation of the argument, even when they deviate more or less from the original. Also where, without actual citation, the author brings to mind the content of O.T. writings, he uses the expressions of the LXX. The author seems, therefore, to have all his knowledge of the O.T. from the LXX, since no trace of the original is found. (11)

(10) Salmon, op. cit., p. 423.

"Various forms of citations and their localities are: λέγει μετ' υμῶν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ὁ θεὸς ἢ only λέγει ἑπινοῶν μετ' υμῶν ὁ θεός 1,5.6f. 13; 3,7,15; 4,3.4ff.7; 5,5ff.; 6,14; 7,14.17.21; 8,5.8.13; 10,5.8.9.15f.30; 11,18; 12,5.20.26. (Paul, on the contrary: λέγουσιν καθὼς ἐκράτηται ἢ κρατῶν λέγει κατὰ τὸ κειρόμενον ὁ λόγος ὁ ἐπισημασμένος Rom. 1,17, 2,24; 13,4.10; 4,3.17.23; 8,36; 9,13.14.18; 10,11.15; 11,2.8.26; 14,11; 15,3.9.21; 1 Cor. 1, 19. 31; 2,9; 9,9; 10,7; 14,21; 15,45; 2 Cor. 4,13; 8,15; 9,9; Gal. 3,8.10.13; 4,22; 27,30, or ἠνωσῆς ἀπάδει Δαυὶδ λέγει, ὁ νόμος λέγει and likewise Rom. 4,6; 7,7; 9,25.27; 10,5.19.20; 11,9; 15,12; 1 Cor. 9,8; 14,21.34. Only Ephesians 4,8; 5,14, as in HB; Rom. 15,10; 2 Cor. 6,2; Gal. 3,16 likewise."-Wette, op. cit., p. 348. Free translation.

(11) Examples of the evidence which points to the LXX original for the quotations in Hebrews is given by Hug, op. cit., p. 442, one of which may be presented: "The sacrifice of the body, τὸ σῶμα ὅσα τὰ σῶματα this one sacrifice instead of all, μία τῶ σῶμα refers to the words of the Psalmist: you gave me a body. The Hebrew text treats, however, not of a body, but says: Ears have you borrowed to me, and so all his argument concerning an all-sufficient sacrifice was not based on the original. It was the Greek text alone that the writer had in mind." - p. 423.

Otherwise with Paul. He also cites the O.T. according to the LXX, but not infrequently did he use the Hebrew text, or at least, he bettered the LXX translation, or himself translated it into Greek without reference to the LXX, especially where the translation was uncertain. Besides this, Paul cites more freely and often from memory.

"(...From the letters of Paul we can see that Paul knew the O.T. passages at least as well in the Hebrew as in the LXX; in the most cases he holds himself only to the latter, for in this language he could set the Gospel more plainly before the Hellenes and Hellenists. But in HB which is written to the Jews, the author could not, in respect to his hearers, allow his use of the Hebrew to be slighted as in the other Pauline letters. This evidence is explainable rather through the acceptance of another author outside of Paul, who is not so learned as Paul in the Hebrew original of the O.T." (12)

Also to be noted here is the fact that the writer to the Hebrews uses the type of text represented in the Alexandrian Codex of the LXX and Paul usually uses that found in the Vatican. (13)

As has been said before, besides these particular peculiarities, long lists of words and phrases have been prepared by various critics pro and con Paul. Let it suffice to say that the burden of the proof, in our opinion, lies against Paul. The similarities which are presented by the critics seem, rather, merely to shout that another, an intimate acquaintance of Paul who was not only versed in the Pauline teachings, but also acquainted with his writings, has written this Epistle. For the sake of the more critical reader, a few parts of such lists are presented below. (15)

(12) Bleek, op. cit., p. 658. So also Kendrick, loc. cit., Barth, op. cit., p. 113; Weiss, op. cit., p. 327; Gregory, op. cit., p. 741.

(13) Weiss, op. cit., p. 327. Also Bleek.

(14) Kay, op. cit., p. 4 f.

(15) "Anstatt der Formeln: ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς χριστός.

Ἰησοῦς Χρ. ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν, δε. Ἰ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν, ὁ κύριος Ἰ. Χρισ.
HIER NUR ὁ κύριος 2, 3; 7, 14. Ἰησοῦς 2, 9; 3, 1; 4, 14;

It would hardly be fair if we left off here without giving some of the theories set forth to explain this difference of style. Salmon urges "that this is a treatise, rather

6,20; 7,22; 10,19; 12,2.24; 13,12, oder (δ) κοιτός 3,6.14; 5,5; 7,1; 9,11.14.24; 11,26; nur 10,10; 13,8.21: Ἰησοῦς Χρ. und 13,20: ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς - Ἰησοῦς von Christus 3,1; μικθαρδοσία 2,2; 10,35; 11,26. (bei Paulus μίσθος); ἐρημωσία 7,20.21; ψυλλεκχυσία 9,22. - zusammenge- setzte woerter mit εὐ und αἰ, wie ἐναρταίει, εὐποιεί, εὐπερίστατος ἐναδεύσει ἐναδεύσθαι - οἰκ. μελ. 2,5; τὸ κελόντα εἶναι 9,11; 10,1; μέτοχος εἶναι, κίεσθαι 3,1.14; 6,4; 12,8. (bei Paulus κοινωνία, συκοινωνία εἶναι κοινωνεῖ, συκοινωνεῖ); ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεκλιωμένης 1,8, ἐκ ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θρόνου τῆς μεκλιωμένης ἐν τοῖς ἀστροῖς 8,1 ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ θεοῦ 12,2. ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ 10,12. (Eph. 1,20: ἐκάθισεν (αὐτὸς θεός) ἐν δεξιᾷ, αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς Col. 3,1: ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ καθήμενος, ἦσαν); etc." - Wetts, op. cit., p. 349.

"Language: Jesus is described in the Second Epistle to Timothy (1,10) as καταρχήτατος μετ τῶν δέσποτων the use of καταρχήτατος in this sense being peculiar to Paul; and again in 1 Cor. 15,26 (καταρχήται): Hebrews 2,14 (καταρχήται). Paley has noticed a habit of Paul's to ring changes on a word, or to use in the same sentence several times the same word or different forms of it. I.e. 1 Cor. 15,27, υποτάσσω six times in five lines. Compare with Hebrews 2,8 on the same verse. Further, examples are adduced of similarity of construction from the third singular to the nominative plural in the sentence (Heb. 8,5) (ἰδοὺ λέγειν ὁ τρόπος ἢ καὶ κλημένοι τοῖς ἀγγέλοις). Chapt. 10,20 does not agree with the LXX but is in verbal agreement with the citation of the same verse in Rom. 12,14. These and other coincidents with Paul, are more than can be attributed to accident: if the writer is not Paul, he must have read some of Paul's Epistles - in particular those to the Romans and Corinthians....etc." - Salmon, op. cit., p. 422.

Ofr. also Fausset, A.R., Int. to the Epistles (Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown, A Commentary on the Old Testament and New Testament. Phil.: J.B. Lippincott and Company), p. 36. Also Moffat and Sampson.

(16)
than a letter, and that the polish is therefore natural," but
Romans is also a treatise. "The tone of every letter is dif-
ferent from the others. So here Paul was on more or less formal

(17)
terms with Palestine and he speaks thus," argues Hug. Fausset
believes Paul wrote to the Hebrews as a Hebrew and that is why
(18)
the Letter was accepted as Pauline in the Eastern Church.

"...so in quoting Old Testament Scripture, the writer quotes
it as a Jew writing to Jews, 'God spoke to our Fathers,' not
'it is written.' So ch. 13,8, 'we trust we have a good con-
(19)
science,' is altogether Pauline, etc."

"Hofmann wollte diese Stilverschiedenheit daraus
erklären, dass Paulus den griechischen gebildeten Juden
Antiochiens das Beste bieten wollte, was er bei grösster
sprachlicher Sorgfalt leisten konnte, und dass er bei dem
Worten auf Tim. grössere Ruhe zur Abfassung des Briefes
hatte. Als ob er nicht nach Röm. 1,14 ff. den Römern
gegenüber dazu ungleich mehr Anlass und bei seinem
Winteraufenthalt in Hellas noch mehr gehabt hätte." (20)

"In der That ist diese Abweichung so gross, dass
die Annahme einer Identität der beiderseitigen Vf.
geradezu als eine Unmöglichkeit erscheinen muss. Aller-
dings zeigt der Stil des HB die Eigenschaften schulmaes-
siger Beredsamkeit, ist also nicht bloss das Product
natuerlicher Begabung, sondern auch des Unterrichts, er
ist etwas Angelerntes, nicht etwas angebornes, und man
konnte somit geneigt sein, zu behaupten, dass, was
vermochte und dass er somit in der Stilart, die der HB
zeigt, vielleicht ebenso gewandt war wie in der, welche
in seinen Briefen findet." (21)

In answer to these arguments, we state again

that the similarities and dissimilarities in Hebrews with Paul's

(16) Salmon, op. cit., p. 425.

(17) Hug, op. cit., p. 447.

(18) Fausset, op. cit., p. 37 int.

(19) Fausset, loc. cit.

(20) Weiss, op. cit., p. 326.

(21) Aberle, H. v., Einl. in das N.T. (Freiberg in Breisgau:
Herder'sche Verlagshandlung, 1877), p. 237.

letters point not to Paul as the common author, but to a companion
(22)
and student of Paul's. Then, too, we could add with Bleek:

"The fire of Paul does not permit him to dwell on grammar and syntax. It is altogether otherwise in HB, which is, anyway, a far more skillful work and which portrays a far greater reflection and care cast on the style from beginning to end than we find in the Pauline letters or than we could expect from Paul's character.

"The difference also does not let itself be explained by a difference in time or a difference in the type of reader, as many have said. For the HB, if it is a work of Paul's, must have been written within a range of a few years after the last of his other letters; this would not suffice to explain the change in the apostle's style and consequently his character. The changing of a style like that of Paul's letters, to such as is contained in HB is hard to grasp, as it would be in the converse. Impossible also is it to explain the difference through consideration of the type of reader. So different are the views as to the first readers of HB that an argument cannot be held over whether the author had born Jews in mind or Hellenists. But why should Paul in just this particular letter to such readers use such care and polish, a much greater polish than he used, e.g., in the letters to the native Greek-speaking Corinthians? These letters do not come near HB and contain no concealment, as Paul's ἰδιώτους τῶ δόξῳ (2 Cor. 11,6). Finally, this difference does not permit explanation by way of accepting the opinion of the Fathers: Paul should have dictated this Letter to a more Greek writer, than his other letters. Romans was dictated and Galatians was written by himself, yet there is no difference." (23)

"It may, indeed, be said that, when St. Paul set himself to the careful composition of a work which, though in epistolary form, was meant as a lasting treatise on a great subject, he would be likely to depart from his usual epistolary form, and that a man of his learning and versatile powers would, even humanly speaking, be capable of adopting both the language and the arrangements suitable to his purpose. This consideration would have decided weight in the way of explanation if there were any real valid external evidence of his actually being the writer. In the absence of such the internal evidence

(22) Bleek, op. cit., p. 660.

(23) Bleek, op. cit., p. 657.

retains its force, to be felt by the appreciative students rather than explained. If any at the present day are insensible to this, they may at any rate, be reminded of the impression it has made upon the great scholars and theologians of antiquity, as well as of most recent times. On the whole, the right conclusion seems to be that the view of St. Paul having written the Epistle, as it stands in the Greek, is decidedly improbable, though still not untenable." (24)

This re-echoes our sentiments exactly. No one reading the Epistles of St. Paul and then reading Hebrews, no matter how lightly, can fail to see the gulf between them and nobody knowing human capabilities and incapacities can picture a writer with the one style being able to change to another so naturally and smoothly without any forcedness apparent.

Contents: The next great arena of conflict between the Paulists and the con-Paulists is the arena of the thought contained in the Letter. Once again we find similarities as well as dissimilarities running side by side or in opposite directions.

The Letter to the Hebrews seeks to show a superiority of the New Testament over the Old in that the Old Covenant is but a foreshadow of the real, perfect, and eternal of the New. One must keep this in mind as he studies the following arguments; then the various peculiarities and elements will fit into a connected scheme for the reader; for out of this concept grow the shoots which are foreign to Paul.

(24) Farrar, op. cit., p. x-xi.

(25) "There is the same preference for Christianity over Jud-

a) The Concept of Christ and His Redemption: The
(26)

Letter stresses the priestly function of Christ, which is absent
(27)
from the Pauline Letters. As the New Testament is superior to
the Old, so is Christ set forth as "above all the mediators of
salvation" and all the servants and organs of divine revelation.
Paul links the death of Christ with the sacrificial victim, but
here it is linked with the fact of priestly intercession. "Paul
lays stress on what was accomplished on the cross; here it is laid
on what is accomplished in the heavenly sanctuary of the perfected
High Priest, who is exhibited before us in His entire personality
as a sacrifice which 'through an eternal Spirit' in perfect manner
(28)
has been offered to God." The closest we can come to such a concept
in Paul's writings is the germ of the idea in Ephesians 4, 10
where Christ is exalted above the heavens, and Romans 8,34,
where He is pictured as the intercessor. Nowhere does Paul

aim in this Epistle as is shown by Paul in his other
Epistles, and exhibited in the same form: The Gospel
imparts superior light (Gal. 4,3-9; 1 Cor. 14,20...
with Hebr. 1,1-2; 2,2-4...The Gospel holds up superior
motives and encouragements to piety. Gal. 2,23; 4,2-3;
Rom. 8, 15-17; Gal. 4,4; 5,13;...with Heb. 9,9.14; 12,
18-24; 8,6-13; The Gospel is superior in promoting real
AND PERMANENT HAPPINESS TO MANKIND. Gal. 3,13; 2 Cor.
3, 7.9; Rom. 3,20; 4, 24-25; Eph. 1, 17; Heb. 12, 18-21;
9,9; 10,4.11;...The Jewish dispensation was a type and
shadow of the Christian. Col. 2, 16-17; 1 Cor. 10, 1-6;
Rom. 5,14; 1 Cor. 15, 45-47; 2 Cor. 3, 13-18;...with
Heb. 9, 9-14; 10,1; 8, 1-9; 9, 22-24. The Christian
religion is designated to be perpetual, while the Jewish
TO BE ABOLISHED. 2 Cor. 3, 10-13.18; 4, 14-16; Rom. 7,
4-6; Gal. 3, 21-25;...with Heb. 8, 6-8.13; 7,17-19;
10, 1-14."- Barnes, op. cit., p. vii f.

(26) Name "High Priest" occurs 17 times.

(27) Moffat, op. cit., p. 420 f. Also Dods, op. cit., p. 226.

(28) Moll, op. cit., p. 7.

(29) One more bit of evidence that a student of Paul's wrote
this letter.

expressly call Him our High Priest; rather, he makes much of Christ's kingly state.

b) The conception of the Law and the Gospel

are also widely different.

"There is nothing in the Epistle discordant with Pauline doctrine, but its argument moves on different lines and in a different atmosphere from those with which the Apostle to the Gentiles makes us familiar. This is most readily discerned when we consider the attitude held by the two authors respectively to the fundamental idea of Jewish religion, the Law. Paul views the Mosaic economy mainly as a law commanding and threatening. The writer to the Hebrews views it rather as a vast congeries of institutions, observances and promises. To the one writer the Law is merely judicial, to the other it is ceremonial. To the ardent spirit of Paul athirst for righteousness, the Law with its impracticable precepts had become a nightmare, the embodiment of all that barred access to God and life. The grace of Christianity throwing open the gates of righteousness was the antithesis and abolition of the Law. But to this writer, brought up in a more latitudinarian school and of a quieter temperament, the Law was not this inexorable taskmaster, but rather a system of type and symbol foreshadowing the perfect fellowship with God secured by Christianity and revealed in Him. This writer, unlike Paul, adopts a method and a view more likely to conciliate the Jew, aiming at exhibiting the work of Christianity as that towards which the Law strove, that without Christianity Judaism remains imperfect. Pfeleiderer also holds this view." (30)

c) In close harmony are the concepts of faith

and justification portrayed by the two authors. "The δικαιοῦν of Paul became in Hebrews δικαιοσύνη or καθαρσις or ΤΕΛΕΙΟῦν and the leading religious terms, 'faith', 'grace' (32)

(30) Moll, loc. cit.

(32) "It does not lie within the scope of the Epistle to dwell on the universality of the plan of grace, and on the calling of the Gentiles. So also the resurrection of Christ is but once mentioned, ch. 13,20; and Paul's doctrine of sin and grace is but lightly touched by the mention of 'deceitfulness of sin', 3,13, 11,25; 12,4; in like manner his doctrine of γὰρ, 4,6; and of deliverance (ἀπαλλαγῆ) in contrast to 'bondage' (δουλεία)." - Moll, op. cit., p.8.

and so forth have one meaning in Paul and another in the
(33)
Epistle."

"The author's interest, e.g., in Leviticalism as a poor and temporary proviso for the religious τελειώσις of Christianity, leads him to view the result of Christ's redeeming death as sanctifying (ἁγιασμοῦ), not as justifying (δικαιοῦν)."⁽³⁴⁾ Paul thinks of Christ as the end of the Law and lays all emphasis on faith. Naturally, therefore, the two also treat "the works of the law" with two different views, and yet, views which are congruous. (35).

(33) Dods, op. cit., p. 226.

(34) "This Letter lacks the personal polemical conceptions and views of Paul. It has, however, corruptions of its own. (Schulz s. 102 ff.) It lacks the real difference between πίστις and νόμος and ἔργα νόμου; πίστις in HB and with Paul are two different things; nothing of the justifying faith (only a clinging to, 11,7); nothing of βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ or τῶν ἁγίων; nothing of the kingdom of Satan; nothing of the Gospel of Christ; no authority, acceptance of the subject of resurrection." Free translation of Wette, op. cit., int. Cfr. Also Moffat. Wette goes a bit too far in this diagnosis.

(35) "man wird auch die typischen Deutungen an die Heb., wo das Tabernacle ein Sinnbild des Eintritts Jesu ins Allerheiligste des Himmels ist, Heb. 7, 5-6; 9,24, nicht fremde finden, wenn man 1 Cor. 10, den Durchdrang durchs arabische Meer also Vorbild der Tauf, u.s.w. als τύπος wie jenes dort als ἑπιτύπος τῶν ἀληθειῶν behandelt sieht.

"Dieser Grundsatz und die aus ihm abgewickelten Auslegungen sind in den früheren Briefen des Apostle's nur verlohrene Zusage, die mehr angezeigt als ausgeführt sind, die es aber dennoch erweisen, dass die Anschauungen und denen der Brief an die Heb. so reichhaltig ist, schon früher sich in seinem Gemueth gebildet haben, darin vorhanden waren, und gerade so aus ihm hervorgegangen sein wuerden, haetten ihm der Endzweck zu einer weitschichtigern Behandlung aufgefordert.

"Paulus war, da er die alten Ceremonial-Einrichtungen nur also Schattenbilder betrachtete, deren keiner eine begnadigend Wuerksamkeit zukommt, nun

Time: The majority of the critics advance the conclusion that the Epistle was written during the period immediately following Paul's death. This, of course, would deal a

Antwort auf die Frage schuldig, woher die Vergebung und Goettliche Huld erworben werde, und von wuerdigen Menschen der Vorzeit erworben worden sei, wenn im Gesetze kein Mittel dazu vorhanden gewesen ist. Ohne hierueber genug zu thun, war das vorige inconsistent, und die auflösung davon gehoert zu einem Gedankensystem, ohne welche keines sein wuerde.

"Sie ist ihm eigen und von ihm oefters vorgetragen worden. Er behauptet nemlich, dass dieses nicht ein Erfolg juedischer Religionshandlungen sei, sondern des Glaubens, της πιστεως... πιστις bezog sich auf ἐπιχαλκία auf goettliche Ankuendigung beschlossener Anstalten zur menschlichen Beglueckung, und ist die Zuversicht und unerschuetterliche Hoffnung, dass sie in Erfuellung gehen werden. Roem. 4, 16-18.20; Gal. 3,5 f.

"Diese Vorstellung des Apostles ist eine Grundidee der Schrift an die Heb., welche eine ansehnlichen Theil ihres Inhalts ausmacht. K. 10,38-12,4, und sonst an vielen Stellen. Wie sie der Apostel anderswo ausgebildet, durch Nebenvorstellungen erlaeutert und mit Beweisen ausgeschmueckt hat, tritt sie in dem Briefe an die Heb. auf. Paulus zeichnete sie Roem, 8,24-26, in einer Umschreibung also Hoffnung im Gegensatz auf das, was man sieht, und fuehlt, ἐλπίς βλέπομεν ἢ ἐκ ὅτι ἐλπίς ὁ βλέπομεν ἐλπίς u. s. w. Im Briefe an die Heb. ist diese Schilderung in eine Definition zusammengefasst. 11,1.

ἐλπίσμενων ὑποστάσις ἢ βλέπομενων
Dieser ziehert uns nach Paulus einen Vorzug ueber die Genossen jeder Religion zu, καὶ κούχημεν ἐπ' ἐλπίδι, Roem. 5,2. An die Heb. 3,6, gewuehrt sie uns ebenfalls ein κούχημα, welches er κούχημα τῆς ἐλπίδος nennt.

"Von diesem Hoffnungsvollen Vertrauen verstand er und der Vf. unseres Briefes die Schriftstelle: der Gerechte lebt von Glauben, Gal. 3,2; Heb. 10,38. Denselben zu folge geschah es nach beiden, dass Abraham u. Sarah, fuer die Zuegung erstorbene Menschen, einen Sohn erhielten. Roem. 4,19; Gal. 3,7; Heb. 11,12. Sie, diese πιστις, welche sich auf die ἐπιχαλκία baute, war es, die zum Freunde Gottes vor dem Gesetze geworden ist, u. s. w.

"So begagnen sie sich in eben dem Begriff von Glauben, seiner Beziehung auf ἐπιχαλκία, seinem rechtfertigenden Erfolge, in den Beweisen und Mustern zur Bestaetigung der behaupteten Unwuerksamkeit des Gesetzes und der gesetzlichen Handlungen, und scheiden

powerful blow to the Pauline hypothesis, but somehow one gets the impression that it is not pressed to such an extent that it merits. Naturally, it is as yet a mere theory, but a theory with solid ground underneath. There are critics who seek to fit the letter into the sequence of Paul's life, but their foundations have been strenuously attacked.

Paul's Imprisonment: From ch. 10, 34 some critics have vainly sought an indication of Paul, but, as Salmon states: "there is one passage which used to be quoted in confirmation of the Pauline authorship - words which agree with references made by Paul to his imprisonment in uncontested Ephesians. But the best critics now are agreed that the reading

sich darin, dass der Brief an die Heb. durch eine Menge Beispiele, ἔφερος κερτυρω kampf, das πίστις an die Rom. u. Gal. mit dünnen Worten dem Gesetze entgegengestellt ist, und den ἔφερος νόμος, in Briefe an die Heb. aber dieser harte Gegensatz vermieden und mit Schonung eingewickelt, dass in den anderen Briefen πίστις ἐστὶν ἡμῶν κερτυρῶν als das einzige Mittel zur Rechtfertigung geradezu vertheidigt; in diesem aber ohne deutlich abzuschliessen, hingelgt, und um Leser als Schlussfolge erwartet wird. Origenes hat darum sehr richtig gesehen, wenn er behauptet, τὸ νόμισμα ἔφερος πίστεως; denn es liegen wirklich diesem Aufsätze die Ansichten des Apostels, seine Vorstellungen, und nicht etwa einzelne Vorstellungen, sondern ein ganze Reihe derselben über einen Gegenstand, zum Grunde." - Hug, op. cit., p. 427.

(36) Cfr. Lenski for the best arguments. Also Bleek, op. cit., p. 672; and Zahn, T., Einl. in das N.T., (Leipzig: Werner School, 1924), Int. to Hebrews.

(37) Bleek, op. cit., p. 672.

"(a) author was companion and friend of Timothy (13, 23). Cp. Phil. 2, 19. What is more natural than to suppose that he had now sent Timothy to Philippi; that during his absence he wrote this Epistle; that he was waiting his return. And who would more naturally say this than the apostle Paul? - the companion and friend of Timothy?... (b) ch. 13, 18, he asks their prayers that he might be restored to them; and in v. 23 he expresses a confident expectation of being able soon to come and

is Ἰταλίας, which has been adopted by the revisers of the received version. This reading makes better sense with the context. The writer is referring to a time of persecution not extending to taking of life, but reaching to fines and imprisonments." (39)

"Especially does one think of Paul as a prisoner in Rome on account of 13,24b: ἔρχεται γὰρ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας. According to the ἔρχεται alone, the writer was probably outside of Italy. (According to Hofmann (a.a. O.V., S. 519) this ἔρχεται does not designate the origin but the destination; but his examples are not convincing. Apg. 10,23: ἔδεδόθη ἑμὶν ἵνα πορευθῶμεν εἰς Καίσαρα; the brethren were not in Jappa, but on the way to Caesarea; Herodot VIII, 114 does not handle ἔρχεται as Hofmann would, as belonging to Sparta, but here Ἡρακλεΐδαι ἀπὸ Σπάρτης are indicated, i.e., Ἡρακλεΐδαι, which originated from Sparta; these are the Spartans whose presence is in opposition to the immigrant Doric Heraklides, the ancestors of the Spartans; the Jews ἐκ Θεσσαλονίκης (Acts 17,11) were called (17,13) ἔρχονται ἀπὸ Θεσσαλονίκης; while it was thought that they were going from Thessalonika to Beroea as messengers; likewise τινὲς τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας do not simply designate relationship to the Church, but there are members of the ἐκκλησία who have wandered away from the Church and have come into the power of Herod (12,1).

"The ἄνθρωποι ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας are, therefore, Italians from Italy who are abroad. The letter, therefore, cannot be written in Italy. The one example of the use of ἔρχεται in opposition to this, which Zahn (Realencyklopaedia (2), Art. Heb.) produces from Pseudoignatius, ep. ad Heb. c. 8: ἔρχεται γὰρ ἡμεῖς καὶ πάντες ἀπὸ φιλίππων cannot knock over these examples, even if the Christians settled in Philippi are meant; but here the choice of the preposition ἔρχεται instead of ἐκ is influenced already by the connection: ὁ θεὸς καὶ ἐπέτειθέ σοι); I: 10,34 the

see them. From this it was evident that he was then imprisoned but had hopes of speedy release - a state of things in exact accordance with what occurred at Rome, etc." - Barnes, op. cit., p. vii f. These arguments will be answered in the next pages.

(38) Cfr. next pages for refutation of the arguments on which they stand, namely those derived from ch. 13,23; 10,34.

(39) Salmon, op. cit., p. 420.

correct reading is Τοῖς; and 13,18 f. may, it is true, refer to the captivity of the writer, but not necessarily so. Much rather was the writer not in captivity, as Paul was in Rome, because he writes, 13,23, that when Timothy comes to him, he will visit the readers; he must, therefore, have had freedom of movement." (40)

Timothy Argument: From ch. 13,23, one may derive the information that the author was a friend of Timothy's. In fact, he thought very highly of Timothy for he was willing to wait for him before making the trip to the readers. Some critics, as has been mentioned, grasp at this verse with delight, thinking that here they have an indication of Paul; but unfortunately for them, the passage has been turned against them.

We find no evidence of an imprisonment of Timothy during the lifetime of Paul, a deliverance from which the author here implies. In fact, it is out of harmony also with the life of Paul. The nearest that we can come to it is that Timothy was with Paul in his last imprisonment, and was released after Paul's death. This conjecture would put the time of the writing then after Paul's death.

Bleek brings forth arguments and a conjecture which seems to fit better into this passage than does the Pauline theory:

"Indeed, already during the lifetime of Paul, but much more if the writing of the Epistle took place after his death, could another Christian teacher, out of

(40) Bleek, op. cit., p. 652: a free translation.

(41) Dods, op. cit., p. 239. Also Bleek, op. cit., p. 672.

(42) Salmon, op. cit., p. 416 f.

only by special writers in the later ages, peculiar to Paul, and apparently borrowed from him by Peter. This subject is especially the theme of the Epistle to the Hebrews (2,1-4; 4,11; 6,9-12; 9,14; 11, 3-38). Third, this Epistle with others was copied and distributed apparently in this age of the apostles themselves.

"The Apostle Peter makes it clear that, during the life of Paul, his several epistles were copied and distributed generally; so that they were even in the hands of the unlearned..." (45)

We, however, are more inclined to agree with Bleek in this matter since it seems to voice the major opinion:

"Many advance 2 Pet. 3,15 as proof of Paul's authorship. But the source and time of 2 Pet. is very uncertain and the unity of the questioned passage with the subject of Hebrews is hardly passable. Far more likely is it that Peter refers to a lost apocryphal letter of Paul's (46)

Temple Argument: Discrepancies found in the description of the Jewish temple, 9,1 ff., are said to testify against Paul because he was well aware of the attributes of Herod's temple. But this is not entirely conclusive since the writer is here, rather, describing the Old Testament temple. It can be readily noticed, however, that the writer has obtained all his knowledge concerning the temple-cultus from the LXX and not through personal contact as Paul did. The latter might be

(45) Samson, op. cit., p. 280 f. Also Fausset.

(46) Bleek, op. cit., p. 662.

(47) "The writer uses the LXX to get his information and holds forth that Herod's temple is the same; this was, however, in no way, the case. Paul had studied in Jerusalem and therefore would not be as uncertain as the writer." - Bleek, op. cit., p. 661: free translation.

"The author, who was well-versed in the LXX, but who only knew the temple-cultus from the O.T. (Buschel, S.K., 1906, 548). His knowledge of Judaism is apparently derived not from actual contact with it as a living religion; it is book knowledge, like that of Clement of Rome." - Moffat, op. cit., p. 420 f.

(48)

held against the Pauline theory but not too much weight should be attached to it because Paul also might have used the LXX.

Introduction and Signature Argument: Already the early Church fathers were troubled with

lack of a Pauline introduction and signature and sought in many ways to explain it. Later many other theories sprang up to account for it:

a)"To explain the absence of a signature the author says: "St. Paul has just reached the end of an imprisonment which had lasted four years. The cause of this detention had been a charge, brought against him by the Jews of Jerusalem, that 'he taught men everywhere against the people, and the Law, and this place' (Acts 21,28). Was it not a plain duty in him to abstain, as far as possible, from everything that might furnish his opponents with grounds for bringing a fresh charge against him?" (49)

b)"The sustained concentration of the mental gaze on the 'faithful witness' in heaven may well be held to explain, what it abundantly justifies, the withdrawal of the writer's personality into the background." (50)

c)"The HB does not begin with an address in which the writer announces himself as do all the other Pauline letters. That it is a work to a congregation which he did not found, and that this motivated the omitting of the address, is testified against by Colossians and Romans." (51)

d)"Barth believes the beginning was lost as the beginning of Clement Alexander's Stromata and the end of Mark's Gospel." (52)

e)"Another reason for Paul's letting out his name in the greeting is that he was producing a literary piece and putting his name in it would not fit." (53)

(48) Footnote above.

(49) Kay, op. cit., p. 4 f.

(50) Ibid.

(51) Weiss, op. cit., p. 323 f.

(52) Barth, op. cit., p. 107.

(53) Hug, op. cit., p. 415 ff.

If we consider these several explanations and then think of the courage and audacity of St. Paul, we can see at once that the two don't harmonize at all and we are inclined to agree with Salmon when he says:"We cannot attribute much value to the reasons suggested for the omission of Paul's
(54)
name..."

Can one imagine Paul backing down because someone disliked him? No, as in the case of the Galatians and Corinthians, it would seem far more in harmony with this courageous character to cast a challenge into their teeth with a bold statement of identification and circumstance. At least we would
(55)
not find Paul neglecting completely a constant habit of his, even though we admit, for reasons of tact, he might have toned it down. But allow us to let better critics criticize these explanations:

a)"As to the other objections (to the correctness of Pantaenus' theory) they are purely speculative, and suggestive of individual fancy; and have been replied to fully, as Hug states, in every age when doubt has been revived. Paul was constantly visiting Jerusalem, comparing views with his fellow apostles; he declares that in common they were inspired for their respective work, but he always, as a preacher, sought out the Jews first; and the reasoning of the HB is just what might be expected from him, as men like Grotius and Webster, masters in address to different classes and varied nationalities, have specially observed." (56)

b)"Clement's mode of accounting for this peculiarity is not satisfactory." (57)

(54) Salmon, op. cit., p. 415.

(55) Farrar, op. cit., p. 11.

(56) Samson, op. cit., p. 280.

(57) Salmon, op. cit., p. 420.

c)"Paul was an apostle to the Gentiles. His whole course of life kept his mind open to the world-wide scope and purpose of the Gospel. Granting then that he might write an apostolic letter to his Jewish brethren (whom he loved, we know, with most intense and tenderest affection), it is scarcely conceivable that his discussion should not have occasionally broken over its bounds, and regarded the relations of the Gospel to the world outside of Judaism. There are, indeed, abundant indications of our author's recognition of this universal character of the Gospel...In no single instance does the author depart from the O.T. representation of Israel as the 'people of God,' and declare directly its widening out to the breaking down of the separating wall, and the admission of the Gentiles to an equal standing with the Jews... wholly inconceivable in the case of the world-embracing irrepressible spirit of the great apostle of the Gentiles."(58)

d)"Paul was accustomed to attach his greeting and votum." (59)

Alexandrian Argument: There seems to be no doubt in the minds (60)

of the critics that the Letter to the

Hebrews contains many elements found in Alexandrianism as (61)

portrayed by Solomon and Philo. The writer seems to have been

(58) Kendrick, op. cit., int.

(59) Moffat, op. cit., p. 420 f.

(60) Ibid. Also Gregory, op. cit., p. 742; Barth, op. cit., p. 113; Feine, P., Einl. in das N.T. (Leipzig: Quelle and Meyer, 1923). p. 182.

(61) "(This peculiarity, while Philo also sets up such a base: τὸ μὲν οὖν τῶν κρητύων σκιάς τῆς ὡς ἔρει σωματίων εἶναι de conf. ling., is the ground on which for some time it was explained that HB is a creation of Alex. as though Paul does not have the same view in Col.: τῶν μελλόντων τὸ εἶ σμῦμα τοῦ ἁγίου. Secondly, as Alexandrians attach an obscure conception to the history of the Jewish antiquity and as they place the events higher, so does the HB proceed. Yet not it alone, as we see from 1 Cor. 10,16,11, and Rom. 5,14, cfr. 1 Pet. 3,20-21. The two views are therefore not conclusively and exclusively Alex.; they are also Pauline, and we see therein the high culture and thought of the time, which Paul uses among and against his contemporaries. What could be more Philonish than the ἐλλογιστοῦμεθα Gal. 4, 21-31 compared with Philo, de Cherubim, int. Finally, the critic also refers to passages where HB comes near to Philo. This is the case, not only with HB

personally acquainted with, or well-tutored in this particular philosophy; in fact, there are so many coincidences with Solomon's "Book of Wisdom" that Dean Plumptre defended a theory that the two books were written by the same author.

In relation to our main argument, this Alexandrianism cannot be taken as evidence against the Pauline theory (62) as Salmon declares it to have been taken, for Paul also knows well the Philonian philosophy. Rather, it would testify for Paul since similarities do occur. But one must also remember that if Paul and the writer to the Hebrews knew Philonism, there were, because of the spread of culture at that time, also many, many others who did, so this peculiarity cannot be pressed too strenuously in favor of Paul.

This seems also to be the opinion of good critics, for "Baur believed the Letter to the Hebrews to be a product of the Jewish Christianity, spiritualized and intellectualized through Alexandrianism, neither Judaistic nor Pauline but in between. Hilgenfeld leans towards the opinion that it is a union of Alexandrianism and Paulism. So too Pfeleiderer and (63) Hausrath."

Nationality: Paul was a Jew; the Letter to the Hebrews contains many elements which seem to indicate a

but also with all the other letters of Paul - to a degree that could not be expected among contemporaries.)" Free translation of Hug, op. cit., p. 425.

(62) Salmon, op. cit., p. 423.

(63) Bleek, op. cit., p. 671. Free translation.

native Jew being the writer. Naturally, therefore, the two have been connected.

It is true that the writer to the Hebrews knows, to an uncommon degree, of the customs and beliefs of the Jewish people and it is also true that this would be natural to Paul since he had studied in Jerusalem; but the reader is asked to remember that the writer to the Hebrews uses the Greek for his quotations and not the Jewish language. He is also asked to keep in mind that "opportunities of familiarizing himself with Judaism abounded in the first century. The influx of Jews with the Christian Church, the wide-spread diffusion of the synagogues, and the knowledge of the LXX, opened ample channels of information to the interested inquirer."⁽⁶⁴⁾

To complete the picture we can add that many critics do class the writer to the Hebrews as a Jewish-Christian follower of Christ.⁽⁶⁵⁾

The Generation Argument: Unlike Paul, who boldly states his apostleship whenever he can, the writer to the Hebrews does not call himself an apostle and nowhere claims apostolic authority. This, coupled with ch. 2,3,⁽⁶⁶⁾ which seems definitely to deny apostleship to the writer, has⁽⁶⁷⁾ led many critics to look to the student-circle of Paul rather than to Paul himself.

"The testimony of 2,3, is 'thoroughly against the custom of Paul, who with all energy testifies that

(64) Moffat, op. cit., p. 420 f.

(65) Bleek, loc. cit. Also Barnes, op. cit., p. vii f.; Barth, op. cit., p. 112.

his Gospel was received not from other apostles or from other men, but from direct revelation from the Lord; cfr. Gal. 1,1.11 f.; 15 f.; 2,6; 1 Cor. 9,1; 11,23; Eph. 3,2 f. So would he not have expressed himself as in our Letter in other passages, for according to the analogy of these passages, the author unmistakably describes the way in which the second generation received the Gospel. Without a doubt, Paul, at this opportunity, would have witnessed to his direct revelation. Rightly, therefore, do already Luther, Calvin, Cajetan and others see in this passage an unmisakeable evidence against the authorship of Paul or against its having been written by any of the 'Voice', and just as wrong are they who, as Ebrard, S. 446 f., suppose that Paul could say nothing else but what he said."

"This passage shows plainly that the author can not be taken as Paul or any other 'direct' disciple, as do also the other passages." (68)

(66) "Yet even the passage, 2,3, taken in its connection, speaks strongly against Pauline authorship, as is commonly conceded. No less certainly does the author classify himself with his readers as belonging to a generation to which the salvation - originally uttered by the Lord - has been confirmed by the testimony of immediate witnesses." - Holl, op. cit., p. 6.

"The author of our Epistle classes himself (2,3) among those who received the Gospel at second hand, - This position the Apostle Paul could never have assumed for a moment. He replies almost indignantly to any lowering of himself to the second rank, and maintains that equally with the greatest of the Apostles, he stood in immediate communication with the Fountain Head of truth and authority. He stands on the highest level of apostolic prerogative, having seen the Lord Jesus, and received from Him directly his commission." - Kendrick, op. cit., int.

(67) Weiss, op. cit., p. 655.

(68) Bleek, op. cit., p. 655.

T R A N S I T I O N

We have now presented the chief arguments surrounding our question, "Did Paul Write Hebrews?" One may have noticed that we have been slightly hostile to the Pauline theory and perhaps, in a few instances, prejudiced; but we have sought to give full arguments on both sides so that the reader need not accept our opinion, but may draw his own conclusions.

When entering upon the question, our first task, naturally, was to read the Letter carefully and the conclusion we drew then is the same we hold now after examining all the criticisms, namely, that Paul was definitely not the author of Hebrews. As a consequence, in particularly the last sections we have now and then planted the seed of the thought that this is an Epistle written after his death by a companion of his. This companion would naturally have to be an intimate student of Paul's doctrine, who, perhaps, even took notes on his teacher's sermons.

This theory would explain how the Eastern Church could accept Paul as the originator of the thoughts; it would explain why the Western Church did not accept it as Paul's; it would explain the major dissimilarities and minor similarities of style and language; it would explain the connection of doctrine; it fits with the time; it fits into the circle of Timothy's close friends; etc. Yea, so well does this theory fit that critics throughout the ages have advanced such men as Barnabas, Apollos, Luke, Clement, Silas, Priscilla, etc., as possible authors.

To show that we are not alone in this opinion we present in conclusion to this chapter and in transition to the next, quotations from various commentators:

a) "I see nothing in the letter which Paul or a disciple of his could not have written; and it certainly has strong traces of Paul's influence." (69)

b) "The writer could not have been on the 'Voice' of Christ, but according to many signs, he must have been in close relation with Paul. (Originality, mode of argumentation, the way of writing, ideas, etc., point to this). Also in the whole outlook as well as in the individual thoughts, pictures, etc., does a dependency upon Paul appear. The writer was also probably acquainted with Paul's writings and has assimilated the same to his use.

"(Planck, Ritschle, Koestlin, Weiss, Riehm, claim that the author in his teachings does not depend upon Paul, but they include the Letter into the ancient Jewish-Christian circle. David Schulz had the same opinion, but leaned a little over much on the Judaistic elements in the Christianity of the writer: in the Letter, as Alex. Jewish-Christian speaks to a commoner; so also writes Hase.)" (70)

c) "The Letter tells us that the author was of no little note in at least one part of the Church; since the Letter was written after Paul's death, the writer, during the lifetime of the Apostle, must have been an important Christian teacher, in fact, one of the co-laborers of Paul. Of these, three have had the emphasis - Lucas, Clemens Romanus, Barnabas." (71)

d) "Daher stamme der Brief wahrscheinlich von einem Apostelschueler, der sich Notizen aus dem Predigten des Paulus gemacht und sie dann mit Erlaeuterungen voroeffentlicht habe." (72)

e) "...bezeichnet sich der Vf. ausdruecklich als einen Schueler der ersten Zuhoerer (2,3)." (73)

f) "Character would point only to some man who stood allied with Paul in apostolic dignity." (74)

(69) Salmon, op. cit., p. 422.

(70) Bleek, op. cit., p. 671.

(71) Bleek, op. cit., p. 672.

(72) Gregory, loc. cit.

(73) Barth, op. cit., p. 109.

(74) Moll, op. cit., p. 3.

C H A P T E R I I

DIVERGENT THEORIES

The co-existence of marked similarities of language and style with equally marked similarities of thought has led many critics, as far back as Clement and Origen, to form certain theories in vain attempts to explain this peculiarity. One of the most popular explanations advanced is that in which Paul is placed as the original Aramaic writer and one of his pupils as the Greek translator - preferably Luke or Clement of Rome. Some go a little farther and suggest Luke as the sole author. However, despite Guericks, Thiersch, Bisping, Stier, Ebrard, Davidson, and Delitzsch, modern critics, as we, have been obliged, in the face of contrary evidence, to disregard the hypothesis of a Lucan translation or Lucan authorship.

The origin of this theory, as has been stated earlier, lies with Clement of Alexandria and Origen. A mere reading of the citation in which their statements are found will show us, however, that "we may dismiss as a mere guess the suggestion thrown out in the Alexandrian School that Paul might have employed the pen of Luke or of Clement; and (that) guess not even a probable one."⁽¹⁾

Against the translation theory we find:

1) that the language is Greek throughout and only colored in Aramaic.

"We need not scruple to reject the notion that the document is a translation from the Hebrew, which has the strongest possible marks of being an original Greek composition; and we cannot contribute much value to the reasons suggested for the omission of Paul's name..."(2)

"Clement's view, in any case, is untenable, since the Epistle has distinct internal evidence of being an original composition in Greek." (3)

"Die alten meinen, der Brief sei von seinem Verfasser in Hebraischer (d.i. Aramaischer) Sprache geschrieben und erst durch einen anderen Schriftsteller ins Griechische uebertragen. (Jos. Hallet der Juengere, 1727, und J.D. Michaelis, Einl. ins. N.T., Augs. 4 P. 224-230). Allein wie die Annahme eines aramaischen Originals fuer das Math.-Evangelium unbegrundet ist, so noch mehr, was gegenwaertig allgemein anerkannt ist, fuer unsern Brief." (4)

2) that there are in the Epistle essentially pure Greek phrases and expressions such as could not well have the equivalents of any Hebrew ones.

"For the Greek original stand as testimony a line of words and expressions which are very hard to express in Hebrew, or, to turn it about, they invite thought formations which one would never ascribe to a Hebrew author. Such are 1,1 πολυμέρους και πολυτρόπος - 1,3 ἰπταυλοῦσι - 5,2 μετριοπαθεῖν - 8,11 δυναστεύουσας - 12,1 εὐοίστερος - and the play of words: 2,8 υπογραψαί... ἀρνητοκτεν - 5,8 ἕκαστος ἰδίῳ ὡς ἔπαθεν, 8,7.8 ἐλεεινός... μετρίωνες - and 10,38 ἐπιστεύεται... ἰστέονες. For the Greek also: ἑτάρας (Testament, Bund) instead of תַּיָּרָא (Bund)." (6)

(1) Salmon, op. cit., p. 415.

"Guericks, Ebrard, and Delitzsch follow Origen in referring the substance of it to Paul and the form to Luke. But the hypothesis of such dictation is an unwarranted conjecture, made, apparently, only to save the apostolic dignity of the Epistle." - Kendrick, op. cit., int.

"The hypothesis (J. Hallet in Wolf's Curae Philologicae, IV, 806-837; J.D. Michaelis, Biesenthal) that the Epistle represents 'the translation by Luke or some other disciple of Paul's original Hebrew arose from discrepancies of style which were early felt between it and the Pauline epistles (so from Clement of Alex. to

"According to its grounds the original was certainly Hebrew. In chap. 2,7.8. the writer uses the passages out of Psalm 8: What is man? - and yet you lay everything at his feet - πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑπὸ τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ. About this ὑπέταξας there are built from here on a series of sentences, v. 5 καὶ τοῖς ἁγγέλοις ὑπέταξεν τὴν οἰκουμένην v. 8, ἐν γὰρ τῷ ὑπέταξι αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα αὐτῷ ὑπέταξεν αὐτῷ - καὶ τῶν ἀγγέλων καὶ αὐτῶν τὰ πάντα καὶ αἰεταχμερα. Now in Hebrew this ὑπέταξεν is not evident but is brought out in paraphrase: You place or lay everything under his feet, שָׂתַח בְּיָדָיו כָּל־מַעֲשֵׂהוֹ. Would a Greek translator have translated the phrase thus?" (7)

"...the special Greek sense of ὑπέταξεν - testament (9,15-20) (This interpretation of ὑπέταξεν which, as Calvin saw, was itself fatal to the translation theory, is preferable on many counts to the more usual one of covenant.' In the papyri, from the end of century four B.C. down to the Byzantine period, the word denotes testament and that alone, in many scores of documents...' - Moulton, in Cambridge Bib. Essays, 1909, p. 497) was unknown in the Greek usage; and it would be difficult in a version to account, not only for the rhetorical finish, but also for the paronomasia and verbal assonances like those of 1,1; 5,8.14; 8,7; 10,29.39; 13,14 etc." (8)

3) that the Epistle uses the LXX alone for the lone source of its O.T. quotations, a peculiarity which many critics believe sounds the death knell for anything but a Greek original.

Thomas Aquinas), but it never had any basis in the internal evidence of the Epistle, and may be dismissed as a curiosity of criticism. No Hebrew (Aramaic) original has ever been heard of in connection with the Epistle." - Moffat, loc. cit., Cfr. also Moll, op. cit., p.9.

- (2) Salmon, op. cit., p. 415 f.
- (3) Farrar, op. cit., p. iv.
- (4) Bleek, op. cit., p. 650.
- (5) Farrar, op. cit., p. xi.
- (6) Gregory, op. cit., p. 745.
- (7) Hug, op. cit., p. 422.
- (8) Moffat, loc. cit.
- (9) Guericke, op. cit., p. 442; Kendrick, op. cit., int.; Cfr. also J. Langen, Grundriss der Einl. in das N.T. (Freiburg in Breisgau: Herder'sche Verlagshandlung, 1877), p. 128.

"With isolated exceptions from Chap. 10,30, all quotations from the O.T. point plainly and expressly to the LXX, also in their deviation from the original. Cfr. especially Heb. 10,5-7 (Ps. 40, 7.8) and 2,6-8 (Ps. 8,5-7) also ch. 1,6 (Ps. 97.7) and 10,38 (Hab. 2,4). Also where the Letter merely refers to the O.T. passage, the conveyance of the ideas and the conceptions themselves point to the LXX. Cfr. ch. 11,21 with Gen. 47-31; 12,15 with Deut. 29,18; 3,2 with Num. 12,7, etc." (10)

"Fuer die griechischen Originalitaet des Briefes spricht der ganze Charakter der Sprache und des Stils desselben, der ausgezeichnet sorgfaeltige und zum Theil verschlungene Periodenbau, der sich gerade im Hebraischen oder Aramaischen am wenigstens darstellen laesst, das verhaeltnismaessig reine, Gewaehlte und Elegante des griechischen Ausdrucks namentlich die Anwendung mancher einzelnen Ausdruecke, deren Sinn gar nicht durch einfache hebraische oder aramaische Woerter ausgedrueckt werden kann, sondern nur durch Umschreibungen, so dass sie nicht aus einem heb-ar. Original, sondern nur aus schon urspruenglich griechischen Conception stammen koennen... endlich die Art der Benutzung alttestamentlicher Stellen sowol bei foermalichen Citationen als bei blossen Anwendungen und Auspielungen, wo herrschend die Uebersetzung der LXX benutzt wird, selbst wo sie von den Worten und sogar von dem Sinne des hebraischen Textes so wesentlich abweicht, dass die Stelle nach dem letzteren eigentlich gar nicht, wie hier geschehen ist, haette benutzt werden koennen." (11)

4) certain peculiarities in Paul's having written Hebrew when also in Palestine, if that is where the Letter is headed (?), the Greek was the common language, especially in religious affairs.

"Yet Hebrews cannot possibly be regarded as a translation from the Aramaic. The difference in style is decisive against Paul's authorship. This includes far more than formal style; it refers to the whole manner of thought and to its mode of presentation. An appeal to the great versatility of Paul's is not a satisfactory answer, Paul is as versatile in Greek as he is in Aramaic, and he would write a Greek Letter without a thought of employing a translator. But it is inexplicable that he should use the most perfect Greek when writing to readers, all of whom were former Jews and inclined to return to Judaism, and never once write such Greek in any other of his letters when addressing readers who are mostly Gentiles. As for Luke, who is indeed skilled in Greek,

whenever he reproduces Aramaic originals, he allows it to remain evident that his sources are Aramaic." (12)

"Even if our Letter was written to Jewish Christians in Palestine, one still has no reason to believe that it was written in Hebrew (Aramaic); because also the Greek was universally understood, if not spoken." (13)

Origen and later, Grotius, knew of some who laid the entire work at the feet of St. Luke. Although there are minor similarities of language and although Luke and Paul were close friends, the difference between the third Gospel and Acts and the Letter to the Hebrews leaves no doubt in one's mind that Luke could never have written the last.

1) The language and style is not that of Luke.

Moffat, when speaking of this, writes:

"In Acts 7,20 and Heb. 11,23 καρτεῖος is a reminiscence of Ex. 2,2, which may have been independent in each case, while εὐτρομος (Ac. 7,32; 16,29; Heb. 12,21) is probably (The variant in Ac. 21,25 also lowers the force of the use of ἐπισηλλεῖν here and in Heb. 13,22, while the construction in Ac. 15,20 is different) in Heb. an emendation of εὐτρομος. Similarly ἐκλείρω does not count, for in Heb. 1,12 it occurs in the O.T. citation; and the same fact rules out κατρω (11,12) εὐχλεω (12,15), εὐωτερον (6,19), εἶκος (12,19) μετρίους (The solitary Lucan use, 5,7, 15, moreover, quite different in sense) (1,9), εὐθως (12,13), περὶ-λυομαι (12,12), παρινημι (12,12) ποδότης (8,11), εὐεργετώ, (7,1), and δύω (12,15); while παλαίου νοθω, which in 1;11 is also part of a citation, is differently applied in 8,13 and Lk. 12,33, καταπύνομαι in Ac. 7,49 occurs in an O.T. quotation, καταπύνω in Ac. 14,18 has a different sense and construction from those of Hebrews, and παροοικέω (11,29: Ac. 7,36), or use πατριάρχης (Ac. 2,29 etc.: Heb. 7,4). Thus, an examination of the language reveals only (Hebrews has only about four words peculiar to itself and Matthew, and the same number in common with Mark) about (a) six words peculiar in the N.T. to Heb. and the Gospel of Luke, with (b) six peculiar to Acts and Hebrews,

(10) Weiss, op. cit., p. 326.

(11) Bleek, op. cit., p. 652.

(12) Weiss, loc. cit.

(13) Guericke, op. cit., p. 442. Cfr. also Gregory, op. cit., p. 745.

and two (διαβαίω and διατεθῆμαι) which occur in all three. Of (a) three (ἐλάττειν, ἀνταρῶναι, and τελευτῶναι) are plainly due, as is the special frequent use of ἀλλοῦ to a common use of the LXX by writers who treat of the same or similar topics, while εἰς τὸ παρτελεῖν is too frequent in Hellenistic literature to make its preservation in Hebrews and Luke's Gospel more than accidental coincidence. This leaves merely πορεύεσθαι and εὐδαιμόνιος in this class, while ἐλεγχος (with 'salvation' in the context of Ac. 5, 31 and Heb. 2, 10) and ἐπιεῖμαι in (b) with καίτοι and ἀλλοῦ and ὑποδοχῆς, cannot be said to denote any special or striking affinities between Ac. and Hebrews (ἐπιεῖμαι being employed in quite a different sense) in point of vocabulary. (The same holds true of such phrases as καὶ αὐτὸς κυκλοῦναι (of cities), καί τις literally Heb. 11, 36: Ac. 22, 24) ἐν τῷ with infinitive, περικεῖσθαι with accusative, and the use in Hebrews of ἰδὲν by itself for the sufferings of Jesus. On the other hand, Hebrews avoids οὐκ, except in compounds, and omits several distinctly Lucan phrases and expressions like προσεύχωνται while a passage like Heb. 2, 12 shows affinities rather with Matthew (28, 10, cp. Jn. 20, 17). Hebrews once uses (6, 5) λέγονται with the accusative (cp. Jn. 2, 10); Luke never does.). The verdict is corroborated by the absence from Hebrews of several characteristically Lucan words and phrases, e.g., ἄν or ἴς with the optative, ἔτι τὸ τὸ ὕψος καὶ ὁρῶν καὶ ἔφερετο in its various constructions, ἐπὶ, ἐν with the infinitive ὄρματι, παρρηγήμα πρόσσω and ὡς (:when). An examination of the vocabulary and style of Hebrews and Luke hardly tends to indicate even a special amount of material common to both; it certainly discourages any attempt to ascribe the Epistle to the author of the third Gospel and of Acts. Luke could report a speech after the manner of a Hebrew rabbi or of a Greek rhetorician; and it may be rash to say that he could not have written a hortatory work in the style of Hebrews but when we compare Ac. 13, 38-41; 28, 17-28 with Heb. 3, 12-4, 13, not to say with 6, 4-12, we see that Luke did not, in fact, write like Hebrews, even in hortatory passages! (W.H. Simcox, Writers of the N.T., 1890; Gardiner, JBL., 1887, pp. 1-27). Community of atmosphere is all that can fairly be postulated."

"(Grotius fuerht an: ἐὺμαβείσθαι, εὐμαβεία AG. XXIII, 10. Hebr. V, 7. XI, 7; εἰς τὸ παρτελεῖν, Luc. XIII, 11. Heb. VII, 25; μαρτυροῦμεν μαρτυροῦσθαι A.G. VI, 3. XVI, 2. Hebr. VII, 8. XI, 2. 5. 39; χαρηματισμοῦ Luc. II, 26. A.G. X, 22. Hebr. VIII, 5; ἡχοῦμεν Luc. XXII,

26. Hebr. XIII, 7. 17; דְּרַמָּה A.G. III, 15. V, 31. Hebr. II, 10. XII, 2; πρόσ fuer ἑβ. Luc. XVIII, 1. XIX, 42. XX, 19. A.G. XXVIII, 25. Hebr. I, 7. 8. etc.)." (14)

"Aber die Alten taten dies wohl nur um den Brief welchen man dem Apostel Paulus absprechen musste, wenigstens von dessen Gehuehlfen abzuleiten. Es findet sich zwischen den Schriften des Lucas und diesem Briefe einige Aehnlichkeit in der Sprache." (15)

"(Dass such Lucas, wo er nicht von seinen Quellen abhaenig ist, ein reines, mehr periodisches griechisch schreibt, wie der Vf. des HB, ist der einfache Grund dieser Verwandtschaft, soweit sie wirklich besteht; darueber hinaus ist es doch nur ein sehr enger Kreis von Ausdruecken, die thatsaehtlich bei beiden etwas haeufiger, wenn auch nur theilweise ausschleisslich, vorkommen, (...). Alle uebrigen, die man dafuer anfuehrt, kommen zu selten bei einem von beiden oder zu haeufig auch sonst im N.T. vor, um irgend etwas beweisen zu koennen.)." (16)

"In uebrigen zeigt sich bei Lucas keine Spur von der oratorischen Begabung, die der Vf. des HB hat, oder von alexandrinischer Bildung; soweit eine eigenthuemliche Lehrweise bei Lucas hervortritt, ist es ja nur ein abgeblasster Paulinismus, und Beruehrung mit dem HB treten nur da hervor, wo er aus urapolischen Quellen schoepft." (17)

"St. Luke's style is much more Hebraic and less rhetoric than Hebrews." (18)

2) The writer of Hebrews is, according to his whole world of thought and method of expressing himself, a Jewish Christian; whereas Luke was a Gentile (Col. 4, 10). (19)

"...Luke could never have belonged to the Jewish people either through birth or through proselytism. (Kol. 4, 11. 14)." (20)

(14) Wette, op. cit., p. 355..

(15) Wette, op. cit., p. 354. Cfr. also Gregory, op. cit., p. 746.

For similarities of language with Luke, cfr. Gardiner in Journal of Soc. of Bibl. Lit. and Exegesis; June, 1887.

(16) Weiss, op. cit., p. 332.

(17) Ibid.

(18) Gregory, op. cit., p. 746 and Cook, op. cit., int.

(19) Barth, op. cit., p. 112.

(20) Bleek, op. cit., p. 673. Also Gregory, op. cit., p. 746.

"And an independent authorship by Luke is certainly out of the question. He was indeed one of those who received the Gospel at second hand; but his position in the Church lacked the almost apostolic dignity which clearly belongs to our author; and he was not a Jew, which the author of the Epistle certainly was." (21)

"Was Hebrews then written by Paul conjointly with some assistant? The affirmative answer to this question takes two forms. According to the first, the Apostle dictated the treatise to someone in Hebrew, and it was translated by this person to its present Greek form. This view was propounded by Clement of Alexandria in order to account for the difference in style between the Epistle to the Hebrews and Paul's other Letters. But though it has been and is held by some, yet it has against it the facts that it is not in style alone that Hebrews differs from Paul's writings, but in form and content also. Furthermore, Hebrews was evidently written in Greek and is no translation.

"According to the second variety of the theory of composite authorship, Paul is supposed to have delivered the substance of the writing to some one of his followers, who then worked it over in his own way, supplying form and diction. To the further question who this follower was, some adherents to this general view answer Luke and some Clement of Rome. That Luke took and restated Paul's message to the Hebrews, is argued by Delitzsch, upon the ground of the alleged similarity of language between this treatise and the third Gospel and the Book of Acts. But this similarity is very general, and extends no further than the use of certain words and expressions which were probably common to all Hellenistic writers. Differences between Luke and the author of Hebrews have also been pointed out, and upon the whole, they overbalance the similarities referred to." (22)

Clement of Rome.

Another person supposed by some to have had a connection with either the translating of the Epistle or with its direct authorship is Clement of Rome. His name also

(21) Kendrick, *op. cit.*, int.

(22) The Popular and Critical Bible Encyclopedia (Samuel Fallows, editor. Chicago: the Howard-Severance Company, 1902), p. 780-781.

arose out of the supposition that it must have been a disciple of Paul who wrote this letter - a disciple close enough to think the way Paul thought and yet to have had his own peculiar language and style. Clement's Letter to the Corinthians often touches our letter, and, although a coworker of Paul (Phil. 4,3), "yet must have been in so close contact with the Jewish Christians that some have sought to connect him with the starting point of gnostic Judaism." Erasmus, Calvin, Reithmayr, Risping (the latter two are Catholic writers), Aberle, and Cornely are some of the later critics to favor Clement.

Here again we meet up with the obstacles of utter difference in language and style, which has led such critics as Moffet (a well known language scholar), Bleek, Wetze, Weiss unhesitatingly to strike his name from the list. The fact that Clement uses Hebrews in his Epistle shows that it was already extant at his time, a situation which led also Kendrick to disregard this theory. But what seems to be the strongest of the arguments, including the fact that he also is a Gentile, against his having anything to do with it, is the ignorance of the Western Church of such authorship or translation. Surely his having translated or written it would have been known to them.

-
- (23) Longon, op. cit., p. 128. A free translation.
(24) Bleek, op. cit., p. 673.
(25) Aberle, op. cit., p. 240.
(26) Bleek, loc. cit.
(27) Wetze, op. cit., p. 355.
(28) Weiss, op. cit., p. 372.
(29) Farrar, op. cit., Int. Gregory, op. cit., p. 746.

"Clement of Rome was first suggested by Origen as the mediator between Paul and the audience to which Hebrews is addressed, and has been accepted as such by some on the ground of the numerous citations of the Epistle to the Hebrews in the first Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians. But a careful study of the two writings leaves no room for doubt that Clement is using Hebrews as the work of some other man, and that, aside from this, there is no other relationship between the two productions. The author of Hebrews is undoubtedly a more forceful and original thinker than Clement. Moreover the argument from style is fatally against the identification of the two." (30)

Silas.

Another student of Paul's who has been picked as the author of Hebrews is Silas or Sylvanus, as he is often called. Mynster, Boehme, Riehm, Godet, and Wohlenberg liked him because of his membership in the Pauline circle and his association with Timothy. However, Silas lived in Jerusalem (Acts 15,22) and therefore we would expect of him a much more thorough knowledge of the Jewish customs than is shown in the Letter to the Hebrews. There is no tradition or any other peg of evidence to hang him on save for the fact that he was Paul's disciple and therefore he has been rejected as being but a poor hypothesis by such scholars as Moffat, Wette, Barth, Bleek, and Gregory.

(30) Critical Encyclopedia, p. 781.

(31) Opinion of Bleek and others.

(32) "Silas was no doubt a member of the Pauline circle who was also associated with Timothy, and connected somehow with the composition of 1 Peter (a writing allied to Hebrews); but these data are too slight to support the weight of any hypothesis (Mynster, Boehme, Riehm, Godet doubtfully, Wohlenberg in NKZ, 1913, 752 f.) which would contribute Hebrews to a man of whom so little is known."

(33) Wette, op. cit., p. 354-357.

(34) Barth, op. cit., p. 112.

(35) Bleek, loc. cit.

(36) Gregory, op. cit., p. 747.

The Popular and Critical Bible Encyclopedia

sums up the data on the Silas theory:

"Silas was a popular member of the Christian community of Jerusalem, a Jewish Christian prophet and a Roman citizen. He was a companion of Paul on second missionary journey (Acts xv:40; xviii-xxii), and associated with the apostle in his letters (1 Thess. 1,1; 2 Thess. 1,1; 2 Cor. 11,19) under the name of Silvanus. The fact that he was acquainted with Timothy, taken with the mention of Timothy in Heb. xiii:23 has led some to think that he wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews. But, on the other hand, no trace of an external tradition ascribing the Epistle to him has been found, and, as he left us no other writings, and we cannot thus reach a conclusion regarding his style and type of thought, and as we are not informed that he had an Alexandrian education, it is not possible to test the value of the hypothesis that ascribes one Epistle to him."

Aquila and Priscilla

"Did Lady Pembroke collaborate with her brother in the composition of Arcadia? The problem which arises for the student of English literature has been raised in connection with the New Testament by those who conjecture that Priscilla and Aquila, Paul's devoted and intelligent συγγεγοι, composed the Epistle to the Hebrews. Their claims are urged tentatively by Harnack (Essay in SBBA, 1900, 'ueber die beiden Recension d. Gesch. der Priscilla u. des Aquila in Ac. Ap. 18, 1-27'), Schiele, Peake, and Rendel Harris (Sidelights on N.T. Research, pp. 148-176). Aquila has been more than once suggested (e.g. Bleek and Alford), but Priscilla is supposed, on this theory, to have been mainly responsible for the Epistle, and traces of the wife rather than the husband are sought for. The hypothesis certainly might account for the loss of the name, as canonical authority could hardly be claimed for a woman's writing. But the positive arguments are not substantial. (37) Paul had forbidden a woman

-
- (37) "In their favor: 1) letter proceeds from a highly cultured teacher, answering to the description given in Acts 18,26 of Aquila and Priscilla; that it was written by one who belonged to the Pauline circle, as there is no doubt that this couple did (Rom. 16,3, συγγεγοι); that the writer was associated with Timothy, as Aquila and Priscilla were for 18 months in Corinth and Ephesus (2 Tim. 4,19); that he belonged to one of the house churches in Rome, (to which the Epistle was presumably addressed)

even to teach in the Church (1 Cor. 14,34 f.), and the action described in Acts 18,26 does not prove that any exception would be made in favor of a gifted lady like Priscilla, for the instruction of Apollo was private, not public. The supposed signs of femininity in Hebrews are extremely dubious; as a matter of fact, one would have expected a reference to Deborah instead of Berek in 11,32, if a woman had written the Epistle. The stylistic argument, that now a single, now a plural authorship is implied, can hardly be maintained; our brother (in 13,23) means not our colleague, but the brother known to you and to me (the writer, op., I will see you); phrases like those in 11,32 and 13,19 imply a single author, and the we which elsewhere occurs is either editorial or due to the figure of οὐκ ἴσθαις. The association of Priscilla and Aquila with a home church in Rome depends on a view of Rom 16 which is not tenable. Finally, the masculine (ἄνδρες in 11,32) (cp. Deissmann, T.R. v. 64) rather tells against the feminine hypothesis than otherwise; and had any exception been taken to Priscilla, the deletion of her name from the address (leaving that of Aquila) would have been simpler than the excision of the address en bloc (cp. Wrede, 82-83). One has, therefore (cp. Heigh. 149 f.) reluctantly to forego the romance which this hypothesis would introduce into the primitive Christian literature." - Moffat.

and that he had taught there - which corresponds to what we know of Aquila and Priscilla (Acts 18,12, Rom. 16,3); that behind the writer of the Epistle there is someone or more with whom he associates himself in a common "we" which includes writer and readers, but a third use of the pronoun embracing some unknown person or persons as uniting with the writer in what he says. Paul and Luke witnessed as to the predominate position of the woman. She is favored as the author. The prologue is left off because of Paul's prohibition of female teaching.

"But there are grave difficulties in this theory. A single authorship is demanded by certain expressions as τι ἐγὼ λέγω, 11,32; ἰνα τάχιστα ἀποκηρῶ στὸ θεῶν ἴμην, 13,19; and the singular in 13,22-23. It is not possible to construe these singulars as referring to the single writer, to the writer and hearers. And that this one writer would have been Priscilla is certainly improbable, both on account of Paul's prohibition which Priscilla would have observed and because the writer appears to be one of the ἄνδρες which Priscilla could not have been. The Epistle gives the impression of proceeding from a masculine mind; and if the Epistle was due to either, Aquila would be the more likely to undertake the task. Their connection with Apollos might be support to account for the Alexandrian coloring of the Epistle." - Dods, op. cit., p. 228.

It might be well, before closing this chapter, to briefly mention also some of the other less popular supposed authors that have been mentioned from time to time in connection with the Epistle.

Peter: In speaking of Peter as the author of Hebrews, a suggestion arising out of marked similarities of thought and style, we could do nothing better than to bring the findings of Rendall before the reader as they are put forth by

Moffat:

"The resemblances (Rendall, Theology of Heb. Christians, 42-45), between Hebrews and 1 Peter, which cover the thought no less than the style of both epistles, are not insignificant. Both describe Christ as the Shepherd (Heb. 13,20; 1 Pet. 2,25; 5,3), and use the phrase the blood of the sprinkling (12,24; 1 Pet. 1,2) (ἁλοῦντος is common in Heb. 2,10; 12,2) and Peter's speech in Heb. 3,15; 5,31, cfr. above); both conceive faith as steadfast reliance on the unseen God under stress of trial, hold up Christ's example under suffering, and attach the same disciplinary value to human suffering; both use ἀίμα ἁγιασμοῦ, ἀρτίτυπος, χέρι καὶ προσέτιονμα, etc. and there are further parallels in 1 Pet. 2,25: He. 5,2, 1 Pet. 3,9: He. 12,17, 1 Pet. 3,11: He. 12,14, 1 Pet. 3,16: Heb. 7,27, 1 Pet. 4,14: Heb. 11,26, 1 Pet. 5, 10-11: Heb. 13, 20-22, etc. But such correspondences cannot be mixed up with a supposed allusion in 2,3 to the incidents of Jn. 1, 35-42, in order to support the hypothesis that Peter actually wrote Hebrews (A. Welch, The authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews, 1899, pp. 1-33). At most they suggest a dependence of one writing upon another, possibly no more than a common milieu of Christian feeling. 'The natural inference from them is that the writer was either a personal disciple of St. Peter or a diligent student of his Epistle' (Rendall)."

"Diversity of style is more easily felt by the reader than expressed by the critic, without at least a tedious analysis of language; one simple and tangible

test suggests itself, however, in the use of connecting particles, in as much as these determine the structure of the sentences. A minute comparison of these possesses, therefore, real importance in the differentiation of language. Now in the Epistle of St. Peter εἰ τι occurs fifty times, εἰτε sixty-three, ποτε nineteen, εἰτε (in enumerations) six, εἰ δε κη four, εἰτε five, εἰς εἰ three, εἰτε four, ποτε twelve, κακει ten, κεν three, εἰ eighty-eight times while none of them are found in the Epistle except εἰ and that only once (or twice), except in quotations. On the other hand, ο δε which occurs six times and εἰτε three, in the Epistle are never used by Peter. (Kendall's Theo. of Heb. Christianity, p. 27)." (38)

Ariston: The supposed author of Mk. 16, 9-20 has been recently advanced by J. Chapman (Revue Benedictina, 1905, 50-62) and argued by R. Perdelivity on the ground that "the sharp tone of He. 6, 4-6 and 10, 26-27 agrees with the trend of the teaching quoted by Irenaeus from the presbyter circles (adv. haer, IV. 28. 1, IV. 40), and also with that of the newly discovered fragment of Mk. 16, 9-20, where εἰ δε εἰτε are supposed to refer to the fate of the apostates. Hence all these converge on the same author. But even if Ariston were the author of the Mark ending, these conceptions are far too general and incidental to be made the basis of any such arguments." (Moffat) Gregory also states that the similarity with the Mark ending is nil.

Philip the Deacon: "(Cp. W.M. Ramsay, Exp. 5, IX. 407-422, Luke the Physician and other Studies, 1908, pp. 301-308) is also conjectured to have written

(38) Dods, op. cit., p. 225.

the Epistle from the Church of Caesarea (spring of A.C. 59) after discussions with Paul on topics raised by the local readers, to reconcile the Jewish party in the Jerusalem Church to Paulinism (Paul added the last verse or two). E.L. Hicks (The Interpreter, 1909, pp. 245 f.), denying the Pauline postscript, argues for the same origin, mainly upon the ground of linguistic analogy between Hebrews and Colossians-Ephesians." (40)

This view has never met with much favor and can be regarded as a mere conjecture.

Finally, there have arisen a number of pseudonymous theories which may be added here also in order to give completeness. None of them has ever been taken seriously by a consensus of the chief critics.

1) An Alexandrian author tries to remold Ephesians and Colossians - interpolated writing - for Jewish Christians. This theory, advanced by Baumgartner and Crusius (On the Origin and Internal Character of the Hebrew Epistle, Jena, 1828), has, in the Epistle, no shadow of support.

2) Schwegler (Post-Apostolic Age, II, p. 312) and Zeller (Theo. Jahr., 1842, 1) think it is a treatise of the Pseudo-Johannean School (form in harmony with such treatises) together with such personal references as would allow it to refer to Paul.

3) The older view (cp. Schwegler, NZ. ii, 304 f.), that Hebrews was written by a Paulinist who wished to pass off his work as Pauline, has been revived in a modified form by Wrede (so Wendland). He argues that the anonymous author, on coming towards the end of his treatise, suddenly determined to throw it into the shape of an Epistle written by Paul in prison; hence the allusions in 13,22b which are a cento of Pauline phrases (especially

(40) Moffat, loc. cit.

from Philippians). But, apart from other reasons (cp. Knopf in TLZ., 1906, 168 f.; Burggeller, pp. 111 f), it is difficult to see why he didn't insert more allusions in the body of the writing; the bare references at the close are too ambiguous and incidental to serve the purpose of putting the Epistle under Paul's aegis. Had a Paulinist desired to create a situation for the Epistle in Paul's lifetime (like that, e.g., of 1 Cor. 16,10, Philemon 22, Ph. 2,19.23 f.) he would have written more simply, as e.g., the author of 1 Tim. (1,3)" (41)

4) "If someone wrote this Letter and falsely ascribed it to Paul, he would better have chosen Peter or James. The theory that the personal ending was attached to make it Pauline was advanced by De Wette (retracted) and Baumgartner, Grosius, Schwegler, Zeller. Baur's theory was that it was the first of a series of ironical Pauline letters which sought to unite the Paulinism with the Jewish Christians, that Christianity should only be another form of Judaism, but that this Judaistic Christianity should be much more spiritual and freer from the formality of the Judaism. But we would expect that the 'Palsarius' personal indications which directly refer to the apostle, would have appeared more and more prominently. The whole character of the Letter makes this improbable. The time (after Paul's death) does not
(42)
permit it."

Having now gathered up the loose ends, we can go into the next chapter, discussing two other men who have

(41) Ibid.

(42) Bleek, op. cit., p. 669.

been seriously advanced as the author, namely, Barnabas and Apollos. We have saved them until the last because these two have some good arguments and many good critics supporting them.

Before tackling the problem of whether or not Barnabas or Apollos wrote the Letter, it might perhaps make it easier for the reader to evaluate the arguments for and against them if we first of all review the qualifications which the author of the letter must have.

Making our deductions from what has already been said, we find that the author was:

- 1) probably a highly trained Hellenistic Jewish Christian;
- 2) a teacher of repute, with apostolical gifts and literary culture;
- 3) someone who has not left any other literature to posterity;
- 4) a close disciple of Paul's - taught in the doctrinal and doctrinal language of Paul;
- 5) a close friend of Timothy, although this is not altogether necessary;
- 6) not a personality of Paul's secondary order;
- 7) well-versed in Jewish Christianity as well as in Hellenistic;
- 8) probably a man of the Eastern Church;
- 9) a writer who wrote this Epistle after Paul's death;

CHAPTER III

Was it Barnabas or Apollos?

Before tackling the problem of whether or not Barnabas or Apollos wrote the Letter, it might perhaps make it easier for the reader to evaluate the arguments for and against them if we first of all review the qualifications which the author of the Letter must have.

Making our deductions from what has already been said, we find that the author was:

- 1) probably a highly trained Hellenistic Jewish Christian;
- 2) a teacher of repute, with speculative gifts and literary culture;
- 3) someone who has not left any other literature to posterity;
- 4) a close disciple of Paul's - taught in the doctrines and doctrinal language of Paul;
- 5) a close friend of Timothy, although this is not altogether necessary;
- 6) not a personality of Paul's commanding genius;
- 7) well-versed in Jewish Christianity as well as in Alexandrianism;
- 8) probably a man of the Eastern Church;
- 9) a writer who wrote this Epistle after Paul's death;

10) probably one who did not found the church to which he was writing this Epistle;

11) one who would explain the mysterious absence of any clue pointing to the author.

With this checking chart in view we can proceed to discuss the popular theory that Barnabas wrote the Letter in question. Advanced already by Tertullian ⁽¹⁾ (de pudicitia, c. 20), he has been defended in later years by Wieseler, Schmidt, Twesten, Ullmann, Thiersch, Conybeare, Howson, Riggerbach, Hefele, Maier, Grau, Volkmor, Ritschle, Renan, Kuebel, Salmon, Weiss, Gardiner, Ayles, Blass, Walker, Edmundson, Barth, Gregory, Heinrici, Dibelius, and Edelmann, Camero, H. Schulz, ⁽²⁾ de Lagarde, Zahn, Ovenbeck - a list which so impresses one that he pauses a good while to carefully examine the evidence.

What does Tertullian's Statement tell us? "...what Tertullian says cannot be passed by without serious examination." Tertullian was one of the leaders of the African Church and a scholar of no mean repute:

(3)

(1) Kendrick states that "Tertullian bases his claim of Barnabas on Hebr. 6,4 f.; and 13,15."

(2) Cfr. Bleek, op. cit., p. 675 for names.

Moffat, loc. cit.; "The claims of Barnabas which have been advocated, e.g., by Schmidt (Einl. 289 f.), Hefele (Apostolic Fathers, pp. XI-XIV), Ullmann (SK., 1828, 377 f.), Wieseler (Chronologie, 478 f.; SK, 1866 pp. 665 f.), Maier, Twesten, Grau, Volkmor, Thiersch (joint-authorship of Paul), Ritschle (SK., 1866, 89 f.), Renan (IV. pp. 210 f.), Kuebel, Salmon (Int., 424 f.), B. Weiss, Gardiner, Ayles, Blass, Walker (Et. XV. 142-144), Edmundson, Riggerbach, Prat (Theologie de S. Paul 3, 502), Barth, Gregory (Canon and Text of the N.T., 1908, 223-224), Heinrici (Der Litt. Charakter d. neutest. Schriften, 1908 71-73), Dibelius and Endemann have the support of an early tradition (Op. Tertullian de pudicitia, 20: exstat enim et Barnabae titulus ad Hebraeos.)...

For some time he had also resided in Rome, so that he was not unfamiliar with most of the Western tradition. It is therefore necessary to admit that this was no mere guess on his part. Although we cannot go as far as Salmon when he states: "...I do not see how to avoid the conclusion that at the beginning of the third century, the received opinion in the Roman and African Church was that Barnabas was the author"; yet, possibly we must admit with Lange: "...Still it is undeniable that the statement of Tertullian must rest upon a fact existing within a certain circle."

How large this circle was we can only guess. Perhaps, as Moffat states, the tradition reflected "not only the North African Church's view or a Montanist's opinion, but some Roman tradition." Or, perhaps, as Dods declares: "This solution cannot be said to have ever been prevalent in the early church." One is inclined to ask here why there is no evidence of such a theory in other writings of the age? Prof. Bartlet and Mr. Ayles have sought for such evidence and have produced references that are too meagre and indefinite to be of much value - Philastrius, haer. 89, Jerome, Ep. 129 ad Dardanum, Isidorus, Etymol. 6,2.

(3) Salmon, op. cit., p. 425.

(4) Ibid.

(5) Lange-Schaff, op. cit., p. 4-5.

(6) Moffat, loc. cit.

(7) "In the Tractatus Origensis de libris ss. Scripturarum (ed. Batiffol, Paris, 1900, p. 108), as by Philastrius, He. 13,15 is quoted as a word of 'sanctissimus Barnabas.' - Moffat, loc. cit.

(8) Jerome designates this ascription of authorship as 'juxta Tertullianum', apparently implying that in all his vast store of information he had found no one else holding this opinion. Origen knows nothing of such an opinion." - Dods, op. cit., p. 227.

"This (proof) would be considerably lengthened if in the stichometrical list of the sacred writings of the New Testament in the Codex Claramontanus, the Epistle to the Hebrews were actually and simply designated as Epistola Barnabae. But in the list, this Epistle of Barnabas is separated from the Epistles of Paul by the Catholic Epistle, while in the Codex itself the Epistle to the Hebrews is separated only by this list from those of Paul, and a separated 'Epistle of Barnabas' is found also in
(9)
Codex Alpha."

Some believe that perhaps Tertullian mixed this Letter with Barnabas' other letter. This is unlikely because of the dissimilarity of style, the gravity of the work in which the allusion is made, and because he explicitly quotes Hebrews 6, 1-8.

"But in language, style, and the whole character, the two letters are too far apart to be the work of one man. But, one might argue, it is not certain if Barnabas wrote
(10)
the other letter and therefore he yet might be the writer of

(9) Lange-Schaff, op. cit., p. 4-5.

"The tradition that Mark, his nephew, introduced the Gospel into Alexandria, might be pressed to indicate some connection with that center of thought. This, however, tells also against his authorship, for it is unaccountable that Barnabas' name should have been lost in the church where his nephew presided. His association with the Church at Jerusalem speaks in his favor. Dods, op. cit., p. 227.

"On the other hand, his relation to the original gospel was probably closer than that implied in 2,3, and the rise of the Pauline tradition is inexplicable if Barnabas (or indeed any other name) had been attached to the epistle from the first. His reputed connection with the temple (Ac. 4,36), the existence of the epistle of Barnabas with its similar Judaistic themes, and perhaps the coincidence of Ac. 4,36 (A similar instance is pointed out in the attribution of Ps. 127 to Solomon on the score

(11)
the Letter to the Hebrews."

"If the Letter is Barnabas', then it is understandable how the "Barnabas-Letter" was accepted among the apostolic Fathers; it was mistaken for the real "Barnabas-Letter" the Letter to the Hebrews. Both treat of the relationship of Christianity to the Old Testament, although the "Barnabas-Letter" does so in a crude anti-Jewish manner, in that it connects the history of Israel with a misunderstanding of the literal sense of the law."
(12)

We may say then, to sum up, that Barnabas has a certain amount of tradition behind him. How strong that tradition is, only Tertullian can say; we can only guess and remain conservative, remembering also that no negative evidence is in existence.

Was Barnabas a highly trained Hellenistic Jewish Christian with speculative gifts and literary culture? Was he the learned man and the gifted linguist that wrote Hebrews? Wette says: "----furthermore Barnabas has no gifts for such a style." Bleek adds: "But Barnabas was never the eloquent orator as was Paul. (Apg. 14,12)," and Lenski chimes in with: "It is not credible that Barnabas wrote Greek that is finer than Luke's."
(13)
(14)
(15)

of 127,2: 2 Sam. 12,24f) and He. 13,22, may quite well have led to the guess that he was the author of this anonymous scripture." Moffat, loc. cit.

(10) It is our opinion that he did not write the other letter assigned to him.

(11) Bleek, op. cit., p. 675.

(12) Barth, op. cit., p. 116.

(13) Wette, op. cit., p. 356.

(14) Bleek, op. cit., p. 675.

(15) Lenski, loc. cit.

But lined up against these opinions we have the voice of Kendrick: "...and his title, Son of Exhortation - not Son of Consolation - might answer to some feature, both of sentiment and style of our Epistle;" Dods states: "...and was a man of character and capacity...he was a native of Cyprus where good Greek was spoken;" Barth adds: "...a hellenistic Jewish Christian, a student of the apostles, a gifted man who had the means for a literary perfection (4,37), a man full of faith and spirit, who was used by Paul in Jerusalem and Antioch (9,27; 11, 22f). The tradition that attributed to him the authorship has nothing decisive against it."

We know that Barnabas was once called Zeus, and the New Testament evidence of him intimates a powerful orator. Paul is at first subservient to him. He was a man of repute, well-known, and esteemed. Put the whole picture together and one must say that it could possibly be that he has the qualifications for writing the Epistle. At least there still is no decisive evidence against him.

Was he a close disciple of Paul's? Anyone who reads of Paul's first missionary journey will know just how close Barnabas was to Paul. "He belongs to the circle of Paul" and as such must have imbibed much of Paul's teachings. He was at an advantageous position to learn of the freedom of the New Testament and the symbolism of the Old. It is certain that he must have known Timothy, Paul's young disciple, and had many dealings with him.

(16) Kendrick, loc. cit.

(17) Dods, op. cit., p. 227.

"As a Levite, Barnabas might be specially interested in those priestly aspects of the Gospel, which in

If one refuses him the authorship of the "Barnabas-Letter", "we have," as Farrar says, "no knowledge of this, nor of St. Barnabas' style and natural powers as a writer, none of his genuine utterances, written or spoken, being on record."
(20)

Was he well-versed in Jewish Christianity and in Alexandrianism? We are told that Barnabas was a native of Cyprus and therefore was so near Alexandrianism that it would be hard to believe that he was not influenced by it. Also, Barnabas was one of the earliest leaders of the Church in Palestine and therefore in constant touch with the Jewish religion. He was so qualified that he could be sent on the first missionary journey with the comparatively novice Paul.

Weiss restates this when he says: "...Because he came from Cyprus he was near the Alexandrian philosophy and would have been influenced. He was a student of the original

our epistle are so prominent; as a Cypriote, he might have stood in some special relations to Alexandria."

Kendrick, loc. cit.

(18) Barth, loc. cit.

(19) Dods, op. cit., p. 227.

(20) Farrar, op. cit., p. xii.

"Again, the missionary work of Barnabas has been so overshadowed by that of his companion, Paul, (cfr. reverting of order of Barnabas and Paul to Paul and Barnabas in Acts), that it is natural to us to think of Barnabas as, though a very good man, not so able a man as the writer of Hebrews must have been. But we have no proof of this. No Luke to record the work of Barnabas so he was inferior. Further, it is pointed out that this Epistle is very unlike that which goes by the name of Barnabas. But if it be admitted that only one of the two epistles can be the work of Barnabas, we have a better right to claim for him that which Tertullian ascribes to him, than that which almost all critics reject as spurious." Salmon, op. cit., p. 427.

ancient Church and a "Urapostel". He had for many years worked with Paul in Antioch and on the first missionary journey without giving up his individuality to him (Acts 15,39)."⁽²¹⁾

Salmon answers the charge that he was not a Hellenist because he is commonly attached to Jerusalem:

"But the important question is: Was he a Hellenist or did he reside habitually in Jerusalem? The early part of Acts would dispose us to form the latter opinion. It is certain that the early gained consideration in the Church at Jerusalem by the gift of the price of his estate; but it is not stated that Jerusalem had been his ordinary dwelling place. He certainly had a near relation, Mary, mother of Mark, resident at Jerusalem (Acts 12,12) Col. 4,10). But he himself is described as a native of Cyprus, and as keeping up his relations with that island; for it is Cyprus which he first visits when starting on with Paul on a missionary journey, and again Cyprus to which he turns when separating from Paul and traveling with Mark. When men of Cyprus made converts among the Hellenists of Antioch, Barnabas was judged by the apostle the most suitable person to take charge of the newly-formed church. How long he had previously been residing at Jerusalem we cannot tell, but from that time forth we never hear of him as resident in Jerusalem again. And it must be remembered that even if it were proved that Barnabas had resided for a long time in Jerusalem, it would not follow that he was not a Hellenist, since we know from Acts 6 that there were Hellenists in Jerusalem."⁽²²⁾

He then goes on to say: "That Barnabas was acquainted with Alexandrian speculation is a thing which we should not have been justified in asserting without evidence; but we have little ground for contradicting good evidence that he was. And that Alexandrian philosophy should be taught in the schools of Cyprus is in itself probable."

Much has been written on the subject of the temple description as it has been given in the letter to the Hebrews, and in connection with Barnabas the debating has arisen

(21) Weiss, op. cit., p. 334.

(22) Salmon, op. cit., p. 427.

anew. The objections to Barnabas having written the letter are voiced by Salmon: "Once more it is said that the Levite Barnabas would be sure to have a first-hand knowledge of the temple worship, and would not speak, as this writer does, like one who had derived his knowledge from books; he would have been familiar with Hebrews and would not have used his LXX as his Bible." Bleek thinks "He was also a Levite and therefore would know more about the Jewish religious set-up than we have indicated in our letter."

Lanski answers: "Stress is laid on the fact that Barnabas was a Levite and was thus fully acquainted with the entire temple ritual, but only to the tabernacle and to its ritual as these are recorded in the Pentateuch, because he has divine Scripture for his material. No Levite...was needed to write this letter or to read it with perfect understanding."

"It is to be admitted that Barnabas, as a Levite of the Levant, with the gifts of edification (...Ac 4,36), would suit several characteristics of the Epistle. As the inaccuracies with regard to the worship refer not to the temple but to the tabernacle, it is hardly fair to press them against the likelihood of his authorship on the ground that he would be well-informed about the temple cultus at Jerusalem." (25)

(23) Ibid.

(24) Bleek, op. cit., p. 675.

"An Barnabas lässt sich wohl weniger denken, da der vorhandene Brief des Barnabas zu verschieden in ansicht u. Darstellung von dem HB ist (er spricht eine andere Ansicht aus ueber das juedische Ceremonialgesetz, und verraeth keineswegs die schriftstellerische Geschicklichkeit und Tiefe des HB). (19-441) Guericke, etc.

(25) Moffat, loc. cit.

(26) Moffat, loc. cit.

(27) Gregory, op. cit., p. 748.

(28) Wells, op. cit., p. 234. Cfr. Also Well, op. cit., p. 4.

(29) Moffat, loc. cit.

"But the inaccuracies are due to the later Jewish traditions which the author used for his description of the Levitical cultus. The daily sin-offering of the high priest (7,27) is a fusion of their yearly sin-offering on the day of atonement and of the daily sacrifice which, according to Philo (de Special. Legibus, iii, 23. οὗτος καὶ τοῦ εὐχάριστες ἱεράων οὐκ ἔστιν καὶ ἡ θυσία καὶ ἡ ἀγορεύς ἐστὶν... ἐκείνη δὲ καὶ ἐν ἁγίᾳ τῆς καὶ ἐν ἁγίᾳ) rabbinical evidence collected by Delitzsch in Zeitschrift fuer die Luther. Theol. und Kirche, 1860, 593 f., cp. also Schuerer, GJV. 4, 11, 347 f.), they offered. The golden altar of incense (9,4) is placed inside the holy of holies, instead of the holy place, by a similar reliance upon later tradition (e.g. Apoc. Bor 6,7), just as the author turns the pot of mammon into gold after the precedent of the LXX (Ex. 16,23), which Philo had already followed (De Congressu eruditionis gratia, 23: ἐργασίῳ χροῦ). The two passages bring out (a) the dependence of the author on the LXX and on rabbinical traditions mediated by Josephus (Thus 9,21 echoes the tradition preserved in Josephus, Ant. iii. 8.6). Dibelius argues that NK (cp. 15,38; Zahn, NKZ., 1902, 729-756) could only have derived the symbolic trait of the rent veil from Hebrews (cp. 6, 19-20; 9,8; 10, 19-20), i.e., from his relative and teacher, Barnabas (Col. 4, 10), the author. But it is not certain that this conception was peculiar to Hebrews) and Philo, with (b) his total indifference to the second temple of Judaism." (26)

"As a Levite, the rites of the Old Testament would be all-important to him. Some have seen mistakes in the service and the temple descriptions. But if one looks closer they become of no consequence, - or that they refer to the tabernacle and not to the temple, or that they are general passages which we dare not attach to the specific. It appears correct to me to hold Barnabas as the writer, but it is not sure." (27)

"...Arguments against Barnabas are based on errors in the description of the temple due to a misunderstanding of the writer's purpose..." (28)

"Unkenntnis der Kultuseinrichtungen des Tempels von Jerusalem, welche man an mehreren Stellen des HB hat entdecken wollen, wuerde bei Barnabas nicht mehr und nicht weniger verwunderlich sein, als bei Pl. Doch kann davon schon darum nicht ernstlich geredet werden; weil der Vf ueberall nicht von einem zu seiner Zeit bestehenden Kultus zu Jerusalem, sondern vom dem in Gesetz vorgeschriebenen Kultus der Stifthuette handelt." (29)

(26) Moffat, loc. cit.

(27) Gregory, op. cit., p. 748.

(28) Weiss, op. cit., p. 334. Cfr. Also Moll, op. cit., p. 4.

(29) Zahn, loc. cit.

"Our Epistle connects the Jewish ritual services rather with the Mosaic tabernacle than with the temple, which is not, I think, once expressly named in the Epistle." (30)

Some commentators have found an argument against Barnabas in the destination and type of audience the Letter seems to demand. They naturally think of the destination being the congregation at Cyprus and then they argue thus:

"In the ancient Church Barnabas was also regarded as the author of this Epistle. Riggenbach, in Zahn's commentary, advocates this possibility, and locates the readers of Hebrews in Cyprus, where Paul and Barnabas began their missionary labors...where also there were multitudes of Jews...Yet, if these congregations were mixed (reader is asked to remember the first convert and the fact that Paul was missionary to the Gentiles) as they must have been, it would be impossible for Barnabas to write a letter to the Jewish membership." (31)

"But the writer of Hebrews never speaks as though he were the founder of the congregation to which he writes; on the contrary, he speaks of their leaders as already dead (13,7) and distinguished these from their present leaders (13,17). Even if we accept the view that this letter was addressed to Christians living in Cyprus, Barnabas could not very well have been the author of Hebrews, for Barnabas was the founder of these congregations." (32)

One must admit that the destination of the Letter casts a strong doubt on Barnabas. We believe it was written to a congregation at Rome. But when did Barnabas have contact with this locality? Those who send it to Jerusalem have this objection to overcome:

"...the readers have been located in Jerusalem or in Palestine in general. Thus some hope to retain either Paul or Barnabas as the author; Delitzsch decides for Paul. Barnabas, however, rose to real prominence only after he left Jerusalem, only in Antioch (Acts 11, 22.25;

(30) Kendrick, loc. cit.

(31) Lenski, loc. cit.

(32) Ibid.

11,30; 12,25; 13,11), not in connection with the Jewish but with the Gentile missions right in Antioch. It is quite impossible to assume that many years later Barnabas was again connected with Jerusalem and with the Jewish work in Palestine, so that he could have written Hebrews to the Jewish Christians in Jerusalem or in Palestine. The limited tradition regarding Barnabas is too slender to support itself." (32)

Another difficulty that the proponents of Barnabas have to overcome is the argument that the Letter was written by a disciple of the second generation. This would leave Barnabas out of the picture since he wrote contemporaneously with Paul.

"The Letter to the Hebrews must have been written after Paul's death; and we should not expect Barnabas to have survived Paul as the active worker; for he is not only the older Christian but apparently the older man, seeming to be of some standing (Acts 9,27; Acts 4,36), when Paul is described as a young man (Acts 8, 58). In any case, if Barnabas was the older, he might still have survived Paul who did not die of old age but of martyrdom." (33)

To sum up the Barnabas theory we can use the words of the Popular and Critical Bible Encyclopedia:

"The view which makes Barnabas the author of Hebrews is perhaps the most widely accepted at the present day (Ullman, Wieseler, Volkmar, B. Weiss, Keil, Salmon, Renan, Zahn, and Harnack). The reasons that lead to this conclusion are, first of all, the ancient tradition attested by Tertullian that Barnabas wrote Hebrews (de Pudicitia, 20); then Barnabas was from Cyprus, and thus in close touch with Alexandria. He was also a companion of Paul, a fact that may explain the Pauline elements of the thought, in Hebrews, and a Levite possessing an intimate acquaintance with the ceremonial law. All these characteristics undoubtedly belong to the author of Hebrews also. But it may be asked, could Barnabas have classified himself with the second generation of Christian believers? And further, as a Levite, was he not better acquainted with the Hebrews than appears to be the author of Hebrews? Finally, an epistle bearing the name

(33) Salmon, op. cit., p. 427.

of Barnabas is extant. Antiquity admitted this, whether correctly or not, it is of no consequence. But having admitted one letter, why should it have scruples about conceding him also the Epistle to the Hebrews? (34) These questions make the claim in behalf of Barnabas a difficult one to establish." (35)

Apollos.

There is then no definite proof that Barnabas was not the author. With now and then a bit of pressure exerted around the edges, we can squeeze him in to fit into the jig-saw of facts. But we come now to a man who, we think, has still greater possibilities, Apollos, the pupil of Paul and of Priscilla and Aquila.

Luther was the first to advocate Apollos and he was followed by such critics as Bleek, Tholuck, Hilgenfeld, Lueneemann, Reuss, Pfleiderer, Alford, Farrar, and Plumtree.

What do we know about the man? "In Acts 18,24 Apollos is described as an Alexandrian Jew, a learned man, mighty in the Scriptures, who had been instructed in the way of the Lord and who spoke and taught with accuracy the things concerning Jesus. Passing from Ephesus where he first appears in Christian history, to Achaia, 'he helped them much who believed through grace and powerfully confuted the Jews and that

(34) "We may add that if Barnabas was the author of the writings which have come down to us under his name, then the Epistle to the Hebrews cannot be from his pen, and if it is from him, it is certainly an extraordinary ordering of Providence that the name of this great leader in the Church should be transmitted to later ages in connection with an almost worthless forgery, and almost wholly discovered from the work which would have placed him among the noblest instructors of the Church, and in the very first rank of Biblical authors." - Kendrick, loc. cit.

(35) P. 781.

publicly, showing from the Scriptures that Jesus was the Christ.' Paul also testifies to his influence as a teacher and probably indicates that his special function was that of carrying to maturity those who had already received the truth. The words: 'Paul planted, Apollos watered' bear this interpretation and agree with what is said in Acts of his peculiar work. Fits the author of the Hebrews and gives plausibility to the hypothesis. Evidently he was a man who moved about (Titus 3,13) and it is not improbable that he reached Rome." (36)

As to his origin Lenski confirms: "His first appearance, recorded in Acts 18, 24-28, presents him as an Alexandrian scholar, a Jew, an ἑρμῆς λογίος trained in one of the great universities of Alexandria."

"A born Jew and a Paulinian Christian, most likely a Palestinian and probably Apollo of Alexandria." (38)

"This Apollo...has the noble distinction of being the first to lead Alexandria to Bethlehem." (39)

"Ac. so ego - sagt Osiander (Epist. ad Hebr., Jac., l. et 2 retri cet. Illustrata. Tusb. 1585. p. 1 ff) - de autore huius ep. divinare deberem, tribuerem eam B. Pauli fidelissimo socia, aut Apollo, de quo scriptura dicit, quod fuerit Judaeus (sed ad Christum conversus) Alexandrinus genere, vir eloquens et potens in scripturis, et quod vehementer Judaeos convicerit publice." (40)

There is, then, no existing doubt that Apollos was a Jew, preferably an extra-Palestinian Jew, who has been trained in Alexandria and was therefore acquainted with the Philonian philosophy.

(36) Dods, op. cit., p. 229-230.

(37) Lenski, loc. cit.

(38) Reuss, op. cit., p. 140.

(39) Hug, loc. cit.

(40) Guericke, op. cit., p. 437.

Acts puts him in close connection with Paul, thus fulfilling another requisite of the author.

"We next note Apollos' connection with Paul and Paul's work. In Corinth he strongly aids the congregation established by Paul. We next see him with Paul in Ephesus. The Corinthians wanted Apollos back in their midst, so did Paul himself. Apollos agrees to go at a somewhat later date (1 Cor. 16,12). Timothy was already on his way to Corinth (1 Cor. 16,10). We note that Apollos continues to support Paul's work, and here already Apollos and Timothy are found in connection with this work. This agrees with Hebrews 13,23 where Apollos waits for Timothy so that the two can go to Rome together.

"As late as Titus 3,13 we meet Apollos in connection with the work of Paul. The apostle writes from Macedonia. He expects to winter in Nicopolis (Titus 3,12), so as to go to Spain as early as possible the following spring (in 64). He is sending Apollos and Zenas on a mission which takes them through Crete and asks Titus to help expediate them on their way. Thus all the data we possess regarding Apollos connect him with Paul and do so for years." (41)

"He is not a true student of Paul's but worked along side of him and, as it appears, with a preference towards the Jews." (42)

From what Scriptures says of him there also can be no doubt as to his literary and oratorical abilities. Paul gave the milk of the Word, the fundamentals; Apollos gave the meat. "Paul laid the foundation; the author of Hebrews built on it, not with wood or hay or stubble, but with gold, silver, precious stones. Should it have been Apollos to whom we owe this Epistle, then would that saying be true: Paul
(43)
planted, Apollos watered."

(41) Lanski, loc. cit.

(42) Hug, op. cit., p. 28.

(43) Moffat, loc. cit. Quoted from Resch, Palilinizismus, p. 506, echoing the remarks of Luther and Tyndale.

"He was a person of elegant culture and trained in the arts of rhetoric for the Epistle is full of fine rhetorical points. He was apparently acquainted with the writings of the Alexandrian Philo (though untinged by Philo's allegorizing and mystical tendencies); for the verbal coincidences are too numerous and striking to be the result of an accident. He was, therefore, in all probability, one of those who had received the Gospel at first hand. He differed widely from Paul in his mode of presenting the Gospel; was a far more finished writer and commanded a more eloquent style, and yet is actuated by the same spirit, and is in all fundamental points in full harmony with him. He was profoundly versed in the Old Testament and had that power of fathoming and drawing out its hidden meanings which would enable him with greater power to convince the Jews from the Old Testament Scriptures that Jesus is the Christ, 'as witness his treatment of Ps. 8, 5-7; of Ps. 109:4; 39:40, and of the Lord's Melchisedecian priesthood. All these requirements to the authorship of this Epistle are fulfilled in Apollos and we could scarcely find them more sufficiently summed up than in the words of Acts 18: 24-25: 'Apollos, a Jew from Alexandria, an eloquent (or lettered) man, mighty in the Scriptures, with great power convincing the Jews from the Old Testament that Jesus is the Christ.' Add to this his further training by Aquila and Priscilla, disciples of Paul, his companionship with the apostle himself, and the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and I doubt if we have much farther to seek for the man through whom the Spirit enriched the Church with this precious book of sacred truth." (44)

"The Biblical learning of Apollos, his Alexandrian training, his relation to Paul and the Pauline circle (Heb. 13, 19--1 Cor. 16, 10-12), are all adduced as arguments why this teacher might have written Hebrews." (45)

"Hebrews shows the fine Greek scholar, mighty in the Old Testament Scriptures, just as in Corinth supporting the work of Paul, just as in Corinth mighty to convince Jewish minds 'that Jesus is the Christ.' If we should make an inventory of the qualifications of the writer of Hebrews and did not have Acts 18, 24-28, our inventory would carry the features which Luke records about Apollos." (46)

"Here are characteristics which appear also in the author of Hebrews: i.e., first of all, independence, talent in disputation, precision in thought, fervor, gift of graceful and persuasive use of language, knowledge of Scripture." (47)

(44) Kendrick, loc. cit.

(45) Moffat, loc. cit.

(46) Lenski, loc. cit.

(47) The Popular and Critical Bible Encyclopedia, loc. cit.

Thus far we have seen how perfectly Apollos would fit the demands of the author. But now we come to one of several obstacles in the way, the same obstacle that the Barnabas theory stumbled on: namely, the destination of the Letter.

If this Letter was written to Rome, then we must have some connection between Apollos and Rome, some connection between Apollos and a congregation founded by Paul.

"...In Heb. 13, 19 and 24 a previous connection of the writer of Hebrews with his readers is implied. The writer has been in Rome, his readers know him well, he is able to deal with them as he deals in his Letter. What we lack in regard to Apollos is a direct statement in the New Testament that he has been with Paul in Rome. Did Apollos rejoin Paul at Nicopolis and with Paul go to Rome, when Paul advanced to Spain?"
(48)

We feel that we cannot go as far as some critics such as Lenski when he writes: "The evidence we possess fully warrants the conclusion that Apollos wrote Hebrews to a body of Jewish-Christians at Rome after the martyrdom of Paul and before the destruction of Jerusalem, between the year 67 and 70."
(49)
(50)
Schuetze also holds this view.

If the reader holds the opinion that the Letter was not written to Rome but to Palestine, then this difficulty is swept aside since Apollos did travel about in Jerusalem, Palestine, and over much of Asia Minor and Greece.

(48) Loc. cit.

(49) Ibid.

(50) Moffat, loc. cit.

Because of this tendency to travel, one might also have his critical spirit calmed by the resulting possibility that Apollos did go to Rome at some time or other. It is not in line with such an educated personality not to visit such an important place in history and culture as Rome. We, therefore, admit that here we lack positive evidence for Apollos but we also deny the opposition the right to forbid the possibility of Apollos having reached Rome.

An interesting theory is brought up by Klostermann when he conjectures πρὸς Βερενίους to have been the original heading and supposes the Letter to have been written by Apollos to the Jewish Christian community of Berea. Such a theory also is not altogether impossible.

Was Apollos a young enough man to have written the Letter after Paul's death? Here again we have no direct evidence one way or the other. But from the enthusiasm of the man as portrayed in the New Testament account, we have a feeling that he was a younger man. Since Paul died by unnatural causes, there is a strong likelihood that Apollos outlived him by a good many years.

But there is a problem which is a bit harder to solve than these two and which perplexes us no end. Why is there no mention of Apollos before Luther raised his name? Here the critics have been balked at every turn. Apollos fits the scheme of things well but he has no foundation of tradition behind him and therefore floats in the middle of the ages suspended on the threads of mere theory.

(51) Cfr. Moffat, loc. cit.

Luther stated: "Dieser Apollos ist ein hoch-
verstaendiger Mann gewesen, die Epistel Hebraeorum ist frielich
(52)
sein." We can agree with Zahn when he avers: "Luther's hypoth-
esis has a twofold advantage over all others: 1) among the
teachers of the apostolic times, so far as we are able to form
a conception of them, there is no one whom our impression of
the author of Hebrews fits better than Apollos; 2) in the lit-
tle we know of his history, there is nothing directly opposed
(53)
to the hypothesis."

Kendrick can conclude the discussion of Apol-
los with the words: "The grounds for a certain conclusion are
doubtless wanting, but all the evidence tends in this direc-
(54)
tion."

If the reader is altogether conservative and
hesitates at accepting our theory of Apollos and would rather
leave the answer to the question in abeyance, then Moffat's
conclusion might meet with his approval: "In the absence of
better evidence we must resign ourselves to the fact that the
author cannot be identified with any figure already known to
us from tradition. He was probably a highly trained Hellenistic
Jewish Christian, a teacher of repute, with speculative gifts
and literary culture; but to us he is a voice and no more. He
left great prose to some little clan of early Christians, but
who he was and who they were, it is not possible, with such
materials as are at our disposal, to determine. No conjecture
rises above the level of plausibility."

(52) As quoted by Lenski from Erlangen Edition, 18, 38.

(53) Lenski, loc. cit.

(54) Kendrick, loc. cit.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

Specialized Material

- Sampson, F.S., A Critical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews (New York: Robert Carter and Bros., 1857), Introduction.
- Delitzsch, R., Commentar zum Briefe an die Hebraeer (Leipzig: Auerfiling und Franke, 1857), Introduction.
- Moffat, James, An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament (New York: Charles Scribner & Sons, 1918), pp. 420 ff.
- Zahn, Theodor, Einleitung in das Neue Testament (Leipzig: Werner Scholl, 1924), Introduction to Hebrews.
- Bleek, Fr., Einleitung in das Neue Testament (Berlin: George Reimer, 1886), pp. 652-680.
- Wette, W.M.L.d., Lehrbuch der hist.-krit. Einleitung in die kanonischen Buecher des Neuen Testaments (Berlin: George Reimer, 1860), Hebraeerbrief.
- Barth, D.F., Einleitung in das Neue Testaments (Guetersloh: c. Bertelmann, 1908), pp. 107-116.
- Gregory, C.R., Einleitung in das Neue Testament (Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1909), pp. 741-748.
- Juelicher, Adolf, Einleitung in das Neue Testament (Tuebingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1921), p. 134 ff.
- Weiss, D.B., Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das Neue Testament (Berling: WilliamHertz, 1889), pp. 323 ff.
- Hug, J.L., Einleitung in die Schriften des Neuen Testaments (Stuttgart u. Tuebingen: J.G. Cotta'schen Buchhandlung, 1821), pp. 415 ff.
- Guericke, H.E.F., Hist.-krit. Einleitung in das Neue Testament (Leipzig: K.F. Koehler, 1843, pp. 431 ff.
- Langen, J., Grundriss der Einleitung in das Neue Testament (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder'sche Verlagshandlung, 1868).

- Aberle, M.v., Einleitung in das Neue Testament (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder'sche Verlagshandlung, 1877), pp.237 ff.
- Reuss, E., Die Geschichte der Heiligen Schriften des Neuen Testament (Braunschweig: Schwetschke u. Sohn, 1887), p. 140 ff.
- Feine, P., Einleitung in das Neue Testament (Leipzig: Quelle u. Meyer, 1923).
- Salmon, George, A Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the New Testament (London: John Murray, 1894), pp. 415 ff.

General Commentaries.

- Kendrick, A.C., Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews (Hovey, Alvah, Editor: An American Commentary on the New Testament. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, Vol. 6), Introduction.
- Lenski, R.C.H., The Interpretation of the Epistle to the Hebrews and of the Epistle of James (Columbus, Ohio: Lutheran Book Concern, 1938), Introduction, pp. 8 ff.
- Kay, William, Introduction to Hebrews (Cook, F.C., The Holy Bible with Commentary. London: John Murray, 1881. Vol. IV), pp. 4 ff.
- Barnes, Albert, Notes on the New Testament (London: Blackie and Son), Vol. IX, Introduction, p. vii ff.
- Moll, C.B., The Epistle to the Hebrews (Lange, J.P., Schaff, P., Translators and Editors: A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures, Vol. VIII. New York: Charles Scribner & Company, 1868), Kendrick, A.C., translator, Introduction, pp. 2 ff.
- Dods, Marcus, Epistle to the Hebrews (Nicoll, W.R., Editor: The Expositors' Greek Testament. New York: Hodder and Stoughten, Vol. IV, p. 221 ff.), Introduction, p. 221 ff.
- Farrar, F.W., Introduction to the Epistle of Paul to the Hebrews (Spence, H.D.M., Exell, J.S., Editors: The Pulpit Commentary. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company), pp. 11 ff.
- Fausset, A.R., Introduction to the Epistles (Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown, A Commentary on the Old and New Testaments. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott and Company), pp. 34 ff.

Periodicals.

Samson, G.W., Homilotic Magazine, p. 280 ff., February, 1884.

_____, The Position of Hebrews in the Canon of the New Testament, The Harvard Theological Review, Vol. 29, April, 1936.

Dictionaries.

Fallows, Samuel, Editor, The Popular and Critical Bible Encyclopedia and Scriptural Dictionary, Vol. II (Chicago: Howard-Severance Company, 1902), P. 779.

N.B. Reader is asked to remember that Catholic writers are influenced by the Council of Trent.

###