

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

4-24-1930

The Alexandrian Back-ground of the Letter to the Hebrews

Paul A. Boriack

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

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



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

Recommended Citation

Boriack, Paul A., "The Alexandrian Back-ground of the Letter to the Hebrews" (1930). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 715.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/715>

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.

**The Alexandrian Back-ground
of the Letter
to
The Hebrews.**

**A Dissertation submitted to the Fa-
culty of Concordia Seminary in Candidacy
for the Degree of Bachelor of Divinity.**

By

Paul A. Boriack.

St. Louis, Mo. April 24, 1930.

The purpose of this treatise is to present mainly those facts which are generally adduced to prove the Alexandrian ~~Back~~-ground of the Letter to the Hebrews. Since some scholars, however, deny this ~~Back~~-ground, their evidence, as far as available from sources at hand, shall also be considered.

Hellenism, the result of the amalgamation of Grecian and Oriental ideas since the days of Alexander the Great, became the culture of the world. Jewish Hellenism is one of the phases of this general movement. That Alexandria in Egypt should become the main confluence of these various streams of learning is due mostly to its unique historical and geographical position. Under the patronage, first of the Egyptian princes and afterward of the Roman emperors, Alexandria long remained one of the most important commercial centers and of learning for the whole world of the time. A few centuries before the Christian Era the Jews began to come to Egypt in great numbers and most of them settled in Alexandria, the home of all learning. (In the Introduction to "Selections from the Septuagint" by Conybeare and Stock.). Thus Alexandria became the seat not only of Grecian, but of Jewish, and subsequently of Christian learning. (Am. Bib. Repos. 1834, p.1-21; 190; 617, from M'Clintock and Strong under the article, Alexandria). There was a "classicalism of style, a symptom and a cause of classicalism of thought". (Alexandrian Schools-M'Clintock and Strong). "The philosophy which seems to have obtained most at Alexandria was an eclectic teaching aiming at bringing together the best features of every school and combining them into one harmonious aggregate."(ibid.). This indirect influence of Greek learning and philosophy produced great effects upon the Alexandrian Jews. Due to this the chief object of Jewish speculation was to trace out the subtle analogies which were to exist between the writings of Moses and the teaching of the various schools. Consequently we find the profoundly learned Philo, of the Jews, and the erudite Origen and Clement, of the Christians, remarkably intimate with the heathen philosophy and literature and steeped in the Alexandrian style of language and me-

thod of thought. The celebrated Philo borrows from the works of Plato a great number of ideas and views and endeavors to amalgamate them with the truth contained in the O.T.. The literature of this stream of culture is quite numerous. For the present discussion we mention particularly the Wisdom of Solomon and Philo. The general influence of this Alexandrian learning was far reaching on later literary work. To ascertain its importance as the back-ground of the Letter to the Hebrews we shall follow two lines of argument, according to language and according to thought. (Hollman-Der Hebräerbrief, p. 160f.; McClintock and Strong-Alexandria and Alexandrian Schools.).

Traces of Greek rhetorical prose are found in the arrangement of the Letter upon the lines of a *προσπεριον προς συστασιν* 1, 1-4, 13; a *προθεσια*, followed by a *διηγησις προς κισανσηρα* 4, 14-5, 20; an *εποδισις προς κτισιν*, 7, 1-10, 18; and an *επισλογος*, 10, 19-13, 21. (Hoffat-Introduction to the N.T., p. 424). A similar analysis of its contents with a more exhaustive explanation according to this arrangement is found in the International Critical Commentary, Introduction to Hebrews, p. 23ff. 27.

This structure of the Letter persuades Georg Hollman to say, "Der Hebräerbrief macht den Eindruck einer schriftgelehrten Abhandlung die bis ins Kleinste hinein genau durchdacht worden ist. Er steht auch formell den Trakten Philos nahe". (Der Hebräerbrief, s. 157) ...He continues, "enige Briefe zeigen einen so genauen wohldurchdachten Aufbau". (ibid. s. 160).

In reference to the Greek terms employed Hildebrand says p. 37 that none of these exactly correspond to the relative sections of the Epistle. (Hoffat-Introduction to the N.T., p. 424). This criticism, however, bears no influence on the issue of the argu-

ment.

Siegfried makes a similar assertion in respect to the form, "Manche Eigenthuemlichkeit der Form, welche der Hebraeerbrief mit Philo gemein hat--dahin gehoert die Manier, lehrhafte und parasetische Stellen mit einander abwechseln zu lassen". (Philo von Alexandrian, s. 321.). To carry his point he would have us compare de poster. Cain. 40 (I, 251.), quod deus immut. 24 (I, 289), de agricult. 25 (I, 317), de migr. Abr. 24 (I, 457), and similar with Hebr. 2, 1ff., 3, 1ff.. (ibid. 321).

The deft adjustment of the argumentation to the hortatory sections especially shows the Greek skill of the author, ("ibellius-Verfasser des Hebraeerbriefes, cf. Moffat-Introduction to the N.T., p. 424f.). Section 2, 1-4 contrasted with 1, 2 and 2, 2 show that there the superiority of Jesus Christ to all angels first suggests the danger of neglecting the revelation of God in His Son. With c. 2, 3 the author opens up with the $\sigma\omega\tau\eta\rho\epsilon\iota\alpha$ for men, not for angels, he resumes various ideas, presents various thoughts in his argumentation by pursuing his theme, with hortatory sections interspersed, c. 6, 4-8. 10, 26-31. 12, 16f., and finally in c. 10, 19f. the gathered momentum of the argument breaks into the long appeal with which the writing ends, and appeal directly addressed to the situation of the readers. (Moffat-Introduction to the N.T., p. 225ff.; Hollman-der Hebraeerbrief, s. 160). Other examples of hortatory sections are c. 2, 1-4; 3, 1f.; 3, 6-4, 2; 4, 11-16; 5, 11-6, 12; 10, 19-39; 12, 1-13, 25.

The words of the International Critical Commentary present a summary, "The writing, therefore, for all its elaborate structure, has a spontaneous aim... The argumentative sections bear directly and definitely upon the situation of the readers, whom the writer has in view thruout even when he seems to be far from their

situation". (Introduction to Hebrews, p. 27f.).

Corresponding to the former phenomena the style of the Letter is literary and even classical in parts.

Edmund Gosse, in "Father and Son", p. 89, describes in telling how his father read aloud to him the Epistle, "The extraordinary beauty of the language, for instance the matchless cadences and images of the first chapter, made certain impressions upon my imagination, and were... my earliest initiation into the magic literature... The melodious language, the divine forensic audacities, the magnificent ebb and flow of argument which make the Epistle to the Hebrews such a miracle were far beyond my reach, and they only bewildered me". (International Crit. Comm. p. 30).

Although the Letter is not entirely free from the peculiarities of the N.T. Greek yet the literary and classical tinge in comparison is predominant. Fr. Bleek writes, "Ist unser Brief auch nicht frei von den Eigentümlichkeiten des neutestamentlichen Hellenistischen, so ist seine Sprache im Vergleich mit den meisten anderen neutestamentlichen Schriften und namentlich der Paulinischen Briefe doch bei weitem besser Griechisch, reiner und correcter". (Einleitung in das N.T., s. 655). Schon Origen sagte mit Recht: "οτι ο χαρακτηρ της λεξης της προς Ιβραϊους επιστολης ουκ εστι εν λογω ιδιαιτικον του αποστολου (2 cor. 11, 6)...αλλα εστιν η επιστολη συνθεσαι της λεξης ελληνικωτερα, και ο επισταμενος κρινειν φρασεων διαφανος ομολογησαι εν (Eusebius, H.E. VI. 25; translated in Expositor, p. 225).

Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown thus pays tribute to the author, "Of all N.T. writers he is nearest to perfection..... The eloquence of style and rhetoric is characteristic of Apollo's at Corinth. (In-

roduction to Hebrews). Likewise Lange-Schaff comments as to the culture of the writer, "He was a person of elegant culture and trained in the arts of rhetoric; for this epistle is full of delicate rhetorical points". (Hebrews, p., 10). Farrar takes note of the writers style, " He is never 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 anacoluthon. His style is the style of a man who thinks as well as writes in Greek." (Expositor, p. 225). Barth remarks similarly, "Der Hebraeerbrief ist in einem vortrefflichen, wohl lautenden, sorgfaeltig ausgearbeiteten, fehlerfreien griechischen Stil geschrieben, nach F. Blass geradezu in rhythmischen Kunstprosa, welche eine laengere rhetorische Ausbildung des Schreibenden erforderte". (Der Hebraeerbrief, s. 113).

Discussing the probable home of the author Barth comments, "Die Heimat (des Verfassers) ist Alexandria, an welche die schriftstellerische Haltung des Hebraeerbriefes erinnert". (Der Hebraeerbrief, s. 112). Similarly Lange-Schaff, ascribing the authorship to Barnabas, argues, "The purer Greek and the Alexandrian tinge of the Epistle would be in his case....explicable from the fact that he sprang from Cyprus, which stood in intimate relations of commerce and intercourse with Alexandria". (Hebrews, p. 4).

Because of the Alexandrian coloring the authorship is today generally ascribed to Apollos. (Expositor, p. 229; Bleek-Einleitung, p. 675ff.: Dissertation on the authorship of Hebrews, Post-Graduate Class Report, 1930).

The facts which lead to these general observations we weigh in detail.

The accumulation of short syllables, a characteristic of later prose and particularly of Wisdom is frequent in *τῶν ἐπεδίων* e.g. 2,1.2., *καὶ τὸ πλεονεχὲς λόγος ἐγένετο σεβασίως,*

6, 9. 10, και εχομενα ... ου γαρ εστινος ο θεος , 10, 25: 11, 12. 19: 12, 8. 9: 13, 4 etc.. (Int. Nat. Crit. Comm. p. 57, Introduction to Hebrews).

The author delights to play on similarly sounding words in the Greek, and alliterations, and has rhythmically constructed periods. (Jamieson, Faussset and Brown-Introduction to Hebrews). The assonances and composite phrases dignify his style. ("offat-Introduction to the N.T.). Thus by the frequency of paranomasia the letter receives very strong Greek coloring. And the claim of Lange-Schaff is evidently correct, "we find no inconsiderable number of paranomasia such as belong exclusively to the Greek". (Introduction to Hebrews, p. 48: "offat-Introduction to the N.T.).

That the author loves to play on words or assonances is obvious from c. 3, 12. 13: 5, 8. 14: 9, 28: 12, 1.5: 13, 14. Occasionally he also likes to use a term in two senses, e.g. 4, 12. 13: 9, 15f.. From first to last he is addicted to the gentle practice of alliteration, 1, 1; 2, 28; 3, 1; 4, 3. 12; 7, 3; 7, 18. 25. 9, 15. 24. 26. 27; 10, 3; 10, 4. 33; 11, 15; 12, 11; 13, 19. (Int. Crit. Comm.-Introduction to Hebrews, p. 60f.). Bleek finds the following examples of paranomasia, "c. 2, 8; εκσταζει - ανυκτακτον , 5, 8; εμθεν ηρ εν εμθεν , v. 14; καλυ τε και κικου , 7, 3; εκταρ, εμηταρ , v. 19, 22; εγγιζομεν - εγγουζ (s. Carphov l.l. p. 83), v. 23. 24; παρεμενειν - μενειν , 8, 7. 8; εμεμετισσ - μεμτομενσ , 9, 10; επι βραχασιν και πορασιν v. 28; προσενεχθαισ - ανενεγχειν , 10, 29; ηγησμενος, εν ε ηγησθη , v. 34; την αρχην των υπαρχοντων - προσεδεξατο, γινωσκοντες εχειν αυτοις κραιττονα υπαρειν , - 10, 38.

39; και εν υποστειληται - ημεις δε ουκ εομεν υποστειλησ , -11, 27; τον γαρ πορατον εσ οραν , v. 37; επισθησαν, εκαιρασθησαν ,

13, 14; ου γαρ εχομεν δε μ εινουσαν πωλις, ελλατ τας μ ελλουσαν ? ? ? ητητητη. (Comm. on Hebrews, vol. I-Introduction, p.15, f.n. 30)

Meyer asserts that this figure cannot ~~ST. JOHN'S. CH. 10~~ be a work of chance but indicates a thorough education in Greek learning. (Comm. p. 388). Fr. Bleek similarly remarks, "Die zahlreichen Paronomasien, wie z.B., K. 5, 8; $\sigma\mu\alpha\theta\epsilon\nu$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau$ $\sigma\upsilon$ $\sigma\mu\alpha\theta\epsilon\nu$, 13, 14; $\mu\epsilon\nu\theta\upsilon\sigma\alpha\nu$.. $\mu\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\alpha\nu$, und viele andere, welche offenbar wenigstens zum Teil mit absichtlicher Kunst hervorgebracht sind und deshalb auf Griechische Conception schliessen lassen". (Einleitung in das N.T. p. 650f.).

A predilection for sonorous compounds, a fondness for nouns ending in $\iota\sigma$, c. 2, 4, and the extensive use of periphrases, c. 4, 11, is prevalent. (Int. Crit. Comm.-Introduction to Hebrews, p. 60f.). We note a few of the many compounds, the equivalent of which could have been expressed in Aramaic only by means of periphrases, $\kappa\omicron\lambda\upsilon\mu\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\kappa\omicron\lambda\upsilon\tau\omicron\mu\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha$, 1, 1; $\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha\nu\alpha\sigma\mu\epsilon$, 1, 3; $\mu\epsilon\tau\omicron\kappa\alpha\theta\epsilon\iota\nu$, 5, 2; $\sigma\upsilon\pi\epsilon\tau\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\tau\epsilon\sigma$, 12, 1, etc.. (Meyer-Comm. p. 388). There is an obvious endeavor to avoid harsh hiatus... and a distinct fondness for compound verbs. (Int. Crit. Comm. p. 61).

The use and position of words bears out the literary style of the Letter. A quotation from Fr. Bleek corroborates this assertion, "Der Brief zeichnet sich durch genaue und oft sehr sorgfältig gewählte Wortstellung aus". (Einleitung in das N.T. s. 636). The Expositor says, "The writer is master of his words, and perfectly understands 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 concise paragraphs, each of which carries the argument one stage nearer to its conclusion. He avoids all irrelevant digressions. His earnestness of purpose never betrays him into carelessness of language, but only serves to give edge and point to its exact use." (Expositor-Introduction to Hebrews, p. 225).

By throwing a word forward or to the very end of the sentence the writer generally brings out the emphasis of the main thought. (Int. Crit. Comm. p. 51).

Many of the words point to an original Greek conception. Fr. Bleek brings the evidence, "Das verhaeltnismaessig Reine, Geweichte und Elegante des Griechischen Ausdrucks, namentlich die Anwendung mancher einzelner Ausdruecke, die nur aus schon urspruenglich Griechischer Conception stammen koennen, wie z. B. 1,1; πολυπραπος και πολυτροπος , 1, 3; ακουγασμα , 5, 2; μετρηκαθειν 5, 11; δυσερμηνεντος , 12, 1; ανκρισιατος , u. a." (Einleitung in das N.T. p. 650). Lange-Schaff claims that εκδειξις e. 5, 17, is a Greek rhetorical term for display, exhibition. (Hebrews, p. 122).

Other examples of fine Greek which our author uses frequently are εαντες , καθ οσον , οθεν , ου ακοζ ειπειν , and εαν only once or twice. He avoids such terms as ερα ουν , ει τις ειπε ειτε, μη γενοιτο, μηκος , μηκει , παντοτε , τι ουν , ποτε ειτε ειπερ, μενουυς, ει δε και, εκτος ει μη. Some phrases of the better Greek are common to the writer of Hebrews and Philo, but are unknown to St. Paul, e. g., τοσουτα , ουυ δηκου ... αμητωρ . (Farrar-The Early Days of Christianity, p. 306).

The use of special grammatical constructions and other characteristics evince a learned Greek.

Oratorical imperatives are used with effect, e.g., 3, 1. 12; 7, 4; 10, 32, etc., also double, 1, 5; 1, 13; 1, 14; 12, 5-7, and even triple, 3, 16.18, dramatic questions as well as single ones, 2, 3. 4; 7, 11; 9, 13..14; 10, 29; 11, 52; 12, 9. (Int. Crit. Comm. p. 59f.). The Expositor would have us compare the oratorical imperative of c: 7, 4, εσπεριτε with 4 Macc. 4, 13. (P. 225). The

same point is emphasized by Moffat in his Introduction into the H.T..

The Int. Crit. Comm. makes a point of the author's treatment of transitions, "The style is persuasive, neither diffuse nor concise. The writer shows real skill in managing his transition, suggesting an idea before he develops it, e.g. 'in 2, 17; 5, 8'". (Hebrews-Introduction p. 59f.).

One of the outstanding characteristics of the writer is the employment of parenthesis. There are instances of fluent use of parenthesis, 7, 20-22; one parenthesis bound up in another and yet the author uses correct grammatical structure, 12, 18-24. (Moffat-Introduction to the H.T.). Jamieson, Fausset and Brown likewise is aware of this practice, "Harmonious symmetry of the sentence is preserved uninterrupted, even where parenthesis of considerable extent are considered, 7, 20-22; parenthesis enclosed within parenthesis and yet the writer steadily returns to complete the construction begun, e. 12, 18-24. (Introduction to Hebrews). The Int. Crit. Comm. says that the artistical parenthesis and asides are sometimes of considerable length, e.g. $\alpha\beta\alpha\gamma \dots \alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha$, 3, 7-11; 5, 13. 14; 7, 20-22; 8, 5; 11, 13. 16, now and then slightly irrelevant, e.g., 3, 4, but occasionally as in Plato, of real weight, e.g., e. 2, 16; 7, 12. 19; 10, 4. 23; 11, 38; 13, 14. (Introduction to Hebrews, p. 59f.).

Another feature of the style "is the number of long, carefully constructed sentences, e.g., 1, 1-4; 2, 2-4; 2, 14.15; 3, 12. 15; 4, 12. 13; 5, 1-3; 5, 7-10; 6, 4-8; 6, 13-20; 7, 1-3; 8, 4-6; 9, 2-5; 9, 6-10; 9, 24-26; 10, 11-13; 10, 19-25; 11, 24-26; 12, 1. 2; 12, 18.24. Yet his short sentences are most effective, e.g., 2, 18; 4, 3; 10, 18, and once at least, 3, 16-18 there is a touch of the rapid staccato distributive style". (Int. Crit. Comm. p. 60f.).

There is an extensive use of the infinitive and the preposition for beauty of style, cf. c. 3, 12. (Int. Crit. Comm.p. 60). For effect the second personal pronoun is more frequently used, e.g., 10, 32f.; 12, 3f.; 13, 1f.; cp., 3, 1. 12. 13; 5, 12f. (Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown-Introduction to Hebrews).

The purer Greek in the Letter to the Hebrews is more perfectly rounded off into periods and consequently is more rhetorical. It always flows on in smooth facility. (Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown-Introduction to Hebrews). Fr. Bleek comments more fully, "Der Brief zeichnet sich besonders.... durch einen sehr regelmässigen 'eriodenbau aus; er enthält selbst sehr zusammengesetzte 'erioden mit Vordersatz und Nachsatz und mit längeren zum Teil sogar zusammengesetzte Perioden, die ueberall auf ganz regelmässige Weise ausgeführt sind, ohne dass jemals ein Anacoluthon stattfindet, z.B. 2, 2-4; 2, 14. 15; 9, 13. 14; besonders 7, 20-22: und 12, 13-24". (Einleitung in das N.T. s. 650).

Traces of Greek culture are evident in the rare use of the aorist participle. In general the participles and particles betray throughout an acquaintance with the art of composition and learned rhetoric. (Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown-Introduction to Hebrews). Likewise Moffat suggests, "The use of particles and participles point to a thorough stylistic and learned 'reek". (Introduction to the N.T.).

Discussing the beauty of the language Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown even points to the strophic character of the Letter and for proof brings the following passages, c. 1, 4-14; 2, 1-3, 2; 3, 3-4, 13; 4, 14-5, 10; 5, 11-6, 8; 6, 9-20; 7, 1-8, 2; 8, 3-13; 9, 1-12; 9, 13-22; 9, 23-10, 7; 10, 8-25; 10, 26-39. (Introduction to Hebrews).

Barth compares the Epistle with other N.T. writings and says, "Die Sprache des Hebräerbriefes ist kunstvoller und volltörender als

die der anderen Briefe". (Der "ebraerbrief, s. 112). Without question great care is placed upon euphony and musical cadence, cp. 1, 1-4; 7, 1-3. The endeavor after euphony and adornment of style extends even to the details of expression and the turns of discourse.

(Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown-Introduction to "ebrews). Meyer notices, "Das Streben nach Wohlklang und musikalischer Tonfall, 1, 1-4; 7, 1-3, und Redeschmuck bis auf die Einzelheiten der Ausdrucksweise und der Wendungen hin". (Introduction to "ebrews in the Comm.).

In place of the common $\mu\iota\sigma\theta\epsilon\gamma$, we have the full sounding $\mu\iota\sigma\theta\alpha\kappa\epsilon\sigma\tau\alpha$, 2, 2; 10, 35; 11, 26. The use of such terms as $\alpha\sigma\epsilon\pi\mu\kappa\alpha$ - $\sigma\tau\alpha$, 7, 20. 21. 28; $\alpha\iota\pi\alpha\tau\alpha\chi\upsilon\sigma\tau\alpha$, 9, 22. We notice particularly the majestic form for Christ's sitting at the right Hand of God, 1, 3; 8, 1; 12, 2.

A minor point of good style is the author's predilection for the perfect tense to emphasize the permanent and contemporary value of some remote action, 7, 6-4, 8. 13. Sometimes it is used simply for literary variety, to break a line of aorists, 11, 17. 28; or in c. 1, 13, cp. 1, 5, as a result of the movement which afterwards, in Byzantine Greek, substituted the perfect often for the aorist. (Burton-Codes and Tenses, 88; Januarius, Hist. of Gr. Grammar, 439). Throughout, however, the aorist is preferred to the clumsier and less euphonic perfect. -K. (Lange-Schaff: Introduction to Hebrews, p. 87) [Int. Crit. Comm. p. 59: Loffat-Introduction to the N. T. p. 27f.).

The comparison of Hellenistic Jewish writings, particularly of the Book of Wisdom and Philo, with "ebrews in reference to words and phrases used brings some interesting facts to light.

We find a great employment of Hellenistic Jewish categories, e.g. c. 2, 5-Sir. 17, 17 (4 Es. 8, 21f.); 2, 14-Sir. 14, 18, (17, 31);

2, 16-Sir. 4, 11 (ἐπιλαμβάνουσαι-οὐρα); 4, 13-Sir. 17, 19f.; 11, 5-Sir. 44, 16, (49, 14); 11, 17-Sir. 44, 20 (1 Mac. 2, 52); 12, 12-Sir. 25, 23; and 13, 16-Sir. 52, 4. (Loffat-Introduction to the N.T. p. 423).

So many coincidences of parallels with the Book of Wisdom are found that Dean Plumptre defended a theory that the two books have the same author, e.g., κολυμβήσας 1, 1; cp. Wisdom 7, 22; ἀναγορεύει, 1, 3; cp. Wisdom 7, 26; ὑπερταταίς , 1, 3; cp. Wisdom 16, 21; τοκοῦ μετὰ νεύου , 12, 17; cp. Wisdom 12, 10; ἐκβραχίαις , 13, 7; cp. Wisdom 2, 17. (Salmon-Introduction to the N.T. p. 425f.).

There are echoes of the idea of predestination, the nature of idolatry and heathenism, e.g., ἡβρ. 1, 3-ἡβρ. 7, 25f.; 33f.-ἡβρ. 13, 3f.; 4, 12-ἡβρ. 7, 23f. etc.. The quotation in ἡβρ. 13, 5 occurs only, in this form, in de Conf. Ling. 32. (Loffat-Introduction to N.T. p. 27).

Loffat similarly finds coincidences, e. 5, 9-Wisdom 4, 13; 6, 6-Wisdom 6, 9; 8, 2f. -Wisdom 9, 8, Apoc. Bar. 4, 5; 11, 3-Wisdom 9, 1; 13, 7; 11, 5-Wisdom 4, 10f. 13f.; 11, 6-Wisdom 1, 1-2; 11, 28-Wisdom 13, 9; 11, 29-Wisdom 10, 18f., and 19, 4-8; 12, 14-Wisdom 8, 19; 12, 17-Wisdom 12, 10. 20; 15, 7-Wisdom 2, 17. (Introduction, p. 428).

The greatest number of parallels are, however, found in Philo. Loffat finds verbal echoes in the following: e. 3, 1-de Somnis, I. 38; ο μὲν δὲ μέγα ἀρχισπέρυγ , 3, 2-de plant., 16 ad finem; 3, 5-leg. alleg. III. 61, ἕκαστος μαρτυρούμενος ὅτι σοὶ πιστοῦ ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ αἵματι , 5, 8-de Somnis, II, 15, ο καθὲν ἀριβασ ἐμάθεν , 5, 9-de agric. 22, ἀπειροὶ ἀκτιοὶ οὐρητῶν γαυόμενοι , 7, 1-2-leg. alleg. III, 25; and 10, 3, ἀναγνώσις ἀμαρτιῶν . (Introduction to the N.T., p. 27). Even Riggensbach admits that οὐκ ἐστὶν ἡμῶν , e. 8, 5 and similarly e. 9, 23f., and 10, 1 are close to Philo's expressions. He would also have us compare e. 11, 32 with Philo III Somn. II. 63 (4). (Einleitung zur Kommentar,

s. 17, f.n.). Lange-Schaff finds a number of comparisons. The formula $\tau\epsilon\rho\epsilon\upsilon\tau\epsilon$ $\kappa\omega\epsilon$ occurs in Philo and in Hebrews, c. 1, 4; 7, 20-22; 8, 6; 10, 25 and is never used by Paul. (Comm. of Hebrews, p. 28). The indefiniteness of the form of citation, Hebr. 2, 6, $\kappa\omega\upsilon$, somewhere, occurs also with Philo. (ibid. 48). The $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\kappa\theta\epsilon\rho\iota\sigma\alpha\tau\epsilon$, in c. 11, 19 is used by Philo, II, 74, 4, to designate the recovery of Joseph by his father. (ibid. p. 188). In c. 13, 5 precisely the same terms are used as in Philo, Ed. Mang., I. 430. (ibid. p. 212). Hebrews shows a liking for technical philosophical terms or words and phrases which were especially employed by earlier philosophical writers from Plato and Aristotle to Philo, e.g. $\epsilon\iota\sigma\delta\eta\tau\eta\rho\iota\alpha\upsilon$, $\delta\eta\mu\iota\omega\rho\gamma\omega\varsigma$, (of God), $\delta\epsilon\lambda\eta\mu\iota\omega$, $\mu\epsilon\tau\rho\iota\omega\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\upsilon$, $\tau\iota\mu\epsilon\rho\iota\alpha$, $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\delta\epsilon\iota\gamma\mu\epsilon\varsigma$, and others. $\epsilon\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ is applied to God the speaker, 13, 6, as in the Pythagorean school the phrase $\epsilon\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ $\epsilon\pi\alpha$ (thus spake the Master). The following list of parallels has been gleaned from the commentaries of Bleek and Farrar.

1. Hebr. 1, 5b. ($\sigma\kappa\epsilon\mu\epsilon\rho\omega\upsilon$)—Philo, de Prof. par. p. 458 E. ep. leg. allegr. 1. III. 8. p. 65. E. (Bleek, vol. 1. p. 118f.).
2. Ch. 1, 7: $\epsilon\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota$ $\lambda\epsilon\iota\tau\omega\rho\gamma\epsilon\iota$, ep. Philo, de charitat. p. r. 3. p. 700, D. (Bl. I. p. 147).
3. Ch. 2, 10: $\epsilon\pi\alpha\tau\alpha\iota$ $\tau\omega$ $\delta\epsilon\omega$, the same term and synonyms often in Philo, leg. allegr. 1. I. par. 15. p. 48 E. (Bl. I. p. 309).
4. Ch. 2, 11a: $\Delta\iota$ $\eta\upsilon$ $\epsilon\iota\pi\iota\omega\upsilon$, in Philo—de opif. mund. par. 36. p. 17. D. par. 33. p. 22. (Bl. I. 309).
5. Ch. 2, 13: ep. Philo, quis rer. divin. haer. par. 1. p. 481 A. (Bl. I. 316).
6. Ch. 2, 14: Philo, quis rer. divin. haer. par. 30. p. 501, E.; and de Abraham. par. 31. p. 372, E. (Bl. I. p. 332).
7. Ch. 2, 15: $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\kappa\theta\epsilon\rho\iota\sigma\alpha\tau\epsilon$, ep. Philo, quod omnis prob. lib.

- par. 17. p. 382. (Bl. I. p. 343).
8. Ch. 2, 16: $\epsilon\upsilon \delta\eta\lambda\omega\varsigma$ -often in Philo, op. leg. alleg. 1, 1, 3. p. 41. E. de resip. Mos, par. 5. p. 276 G. (Bl. I. p. 347).
9. Ch. 2, 17b.: $\alpha\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\sigma$, op. Philo, quis rer. divin. h-er. par. 18 p. 493. E; id. de sacrif. Ab. et Cain. par. 28. p. 146. (Bl. I. 364).
10. Ch. 3, 1: $\alpha\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\varsigma$, Philo quod deter. potior insid. par. 4. p. 157 G; id. legat. ad Caj. par. 45. p. 104. E. (Bl. I. p. 376)
11. Ch. 3, 3: Anknuepfung-Philo, de vit. Mos. 1. par. 5. p. 605 D. par. 59. p. 652. G.; de decal. par. 21. p. 759. B. (Bl. I. p. 394).
12. Ch. 4, 5b.-Philo, de plantat. Mos par. 16. p. 223. D. (Bl. I. p. 517).
13. Ch. 4, 11: $\sigma\kappa\epsilon\tau\delta\alpha\lambda\epsilon\iota\upsilon$ -Philo, legat. ad Caj. par. 11. p. 1002. E. (Bl. I. 554).
14. Ch. 4, 12f.: marrow, used by Philo. (Farrar-The Early Days of Christianity, p. 388.).
15. Ch. 4, 15: $\tau\epsilon\alpha\chi\eta\lambda\iota\zeta\epsilon$ -Philo, de nom. mutat. par. 12. p. 1057. A. (Bl. I. p. 596).
16. Ch. 4, 15: high-priestly character- de Profugis. (Bl. II. 16).
17. Ch. 5, 2: $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\iota\omega\tau\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\upsilon$ -Philo, de Abrah. 44. p. 385. G.; id. de Josepho. 5. p. 530. G. (Bl. II. p. 40).
18. Ch. 5, 7: $\sigma\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\theta\epsilon\iota\zeta$ -Philo, de Opif. 55. p. 36. A.; vit. Mos. 1. 1. 14. p. 615. (Bl. II. p. 82); de. fortitud. 5. p. 739. E. (Bl. II. p. 83).
19. Ch. 5, 8: cf. de legg. spec. 6.; de somn. 1. II. 15. p. 1123. A.; de profug. 25. p. 470. A.; vit. Mos. 1. III. 38. p. 695. G. (Bl. II. p. 89).
20. Ch. 5, 10: after the order of Melch.-Philo, opp. 1. 653.

- (Farrar, p. 375f., f.n. 5).
21. Ch. 5, 12: cf. de migrat. Abrah. 36. p. 418. K. (Bl. II. p. 115).
 22. Ch. 5, 1: καταβαλεσθαι -de spetenar. 13. p. 1187. B.; gig. 7. p. 233. A. (Bl. II. 149).
 23. Ch. 6, 16: βαβαιοτω -somm. 1. 1. 3. p. 587. C.; id. alleg. 1. III. (Bl. II. p. 257).
 24. Ch. 6, 18: προκαισθαι -de mitat. nom. 6. p. 1051. E. par. 14. p. 1053. D. (Bl. II. 239).
 25. Ch. 6, 19: κατακτασθαι -vit. Mos. 1. III. 9. p. 669. B. par. 5. p. 667. C. (Bl. II. 273).
 26. Ch. 7, 9: ut scis alicui -quod deter. pot. insid. 21. p. 168. E.; de Cherub. 31. p. 126. E. (Bl. II. p. 344; Farrar, p. 360. f.n.1).
 27. Ch. 6, 15: swore by himself -de legg. alleg. III. 72. (Farrar, p. 323. f.n. 7).
 28. Ch. 7, 1: blessed him -de Abrah. par. 40. (Farrar, f.n. 4. p. 392).
 29. Ch. 7, 1f.: king of Jerusalem -leg. alleg. III. 25. (Farrar, p. 394f. f.n. 5).
 30. Ch. 7, 1f.: the Highest -Bybl. ap. Euseb. praep. Ev. 1, 10. (Farrar, p. 395. f.n. 1).
 31. Ch. 7, 13: none-priestly tribe of Judah -Philo uses the expression αρχισπετω ψευδωνυμοσ , opp. II. 246. (Farrar, p. 405. f. n. 1).
 32. Ch. 7, 19: cp. passage in Philo on the mediation of the Eldest Word, quis rer. div. haer. opp. 1. 501. (Farrar, p. 408. f. n.1).
 33. Ch. 8, 5: in the Hebrew and the LXX it is simply, "make it", not "all things"; but this remarkable variation is due to Philo, de leg. alleg. III. 33. (Farrar, p. 411. f. n. 9).
 34. Ch. 8, 6: mediator -Philo applies the same term to Moses. (Farrar, p. 412f. f. n. 2.).
 35. Ch. 9, 3: Philo also in one place, vit. Mos. III. 9, calls the outer veil, Καλυμμα. (Farrar, p. 415. f.n. 2).
 36. Ch. 9, 4: pot of manna, also used by Philo. (Farrar, p. 417f. f.n.

37. Ch. 9:8:126727 -Philo alludes to two sense of the word, de non. mutat. par. 6. (Farrar 427. f. n. 1).
38. Ch. 10, 3: striking semblance in Philo, de vict. off.; and de vit. Mos. III.; and de plant. Mos. (Farrar, p. 441. f. n.1).
39. Ch. 10, 5: Philo, de plant. Mos. (Farrar, p. 441. f. n. 2).
40. Ch. 11, 1: faith-St. Jerome says that this clause, "breathes somewhat of Philo". (Farrar, p. 452, f.n. 1).
41. Ch. 11, 3: ages-de monarch. II. p. 823; leg. allegg. III. p. 79; de Cherub. I. p. 162. (Farrar, p. 434. f.n. 2).
42. Ch. 11, 3: utterance of God- de Saor. Abel and Cain. par. 18. (Farrar, p. 455. f. n. 1).
43. Ch. 11, 10: foundations-God; the same thought and expression occurs in Philo. He speaks of God as the Architect, of the world; and this is one of the semblances of the Epistle to the Book of Wisdom. (Farrar, p. 457. f.n. 3. 4.).
44. Ch. 11, 32: time will fail me- this is found in de somn. (Farrar, p. 460. f.n. 4).
45. Ch. 11, 34f.: op. Philo in Flacc. 20. (Farrar, p. 461. f.n.7).
46. Ch. 12, 6: Philo comments on the same passage, Prov. 1, 11. 12, in much the same strain, opp. 1, 544. (Farrar, p. 463. f. n. 1).
47. Ch. 12, 16: the writer here follows Jewish tradition as Philo also does. (Farrar, p. 464, f.n. 5).
48. Ch. 13, 3! similar sufferings in de spec. legg. pat. 30. (Farrar, p. 464, f.n. 5).
49. Ch. 13, 5! leave nor forsake them-de corpus. ling. par. 32. (Farrar, p. 470. f.n. 3. 6.).

Siegfried mentions another similarity, "Ferner die Wendung, dass eine Sache als zu schwierig oder zu weitfuehrend fuer jetzt uebergangen werden soll; so vgl. de nigr. Abr. 13 (I, 452) τα μεν αλλα μακροτερον η κατα τον παροντα καιρον δειται λεγειν και υπερβατον u.a. mit Hebr. 5, 11; 6, 1.--Sodann gewisse Aehnlichkeit in rednerischen Vergleichen. Wie Hebr. 3, 3 es heisst καθ' οσον κλειονα τιμην εχει του εικου ε κατασκευαστου εσθεν, so aehnlich de plantat. 13 (I, 340), οσα γαρ ε πιπρωμενα το κτημα του κτηματος αμεινων και το κεραιηκευτου γεγονοτος Aehn aehnliche rednerische Steigerungen finden sich. Man vergleiche de profug. 16, (I, 452), ει γαρ ει τουσ θνητουσ κληρονομησαντες γοναισ επιγονουσ την επι θανατου τινοσ εβιουσ χρηνομιζαιν τιμαριασ των ολων πατερα και ποιητην βλασφημειν υπομενοντασ , mit Hebr. 2, 2ff. - Auch gewisse Nachl. ossigkeiten in der Wortstellung sind uebereinstimmend. So hat das logisch versetzte καλιν in Hebr. 1, 3, was dem Sinne nach jedenfalls zu λεγει zu stehen ist, (El. bd. II, s.131), sein Vorbild in leg. alleg. III, 9, ο δε καλιν αποδιδρασκων θεου φησι, wo ebenfalls καλιν zu φησι gehoert." (Philo von Alexandrian, s. 321f.). To this must be added that the Rabbinical form of disputation is entirely absent. This would be difficult to explain if the writer had been instructed in the strict Jewish methods.

These facts warrant the following conclusion, " We notice particularly the purity of the language, the flowing character of the diction, the rhetorical beauty and smoothness of the style, the delicate arrangement of the words and the skillful construction of the entire period. The whole form of thought is Greek." (Langeschaff-Introduction to Hebrews).

The influence that Alexandrian thought exerted upon Hebrews is generally traced to two main sources, the LXX and Philo.

Almost all of the 28 O.T. quotations (H.B. Swete-Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek) in Hebrews follow the LXX very closely, indeed so closely that Bleek thinks he had the LXX before him as he wrote this Epistle. Sometimes he uses a free paraphrase or apparently cites from memory but Bleek finds only one exception to the use of the LXX, in the citation of Hebr. 10, 30 where Deut. 32, 35 is quoted. (Einführung in das N.T., s. 553). The author is so dependent upon the LXX that critics believe he was not at all or only slightly acquainted with Hebrew. (Meyer-Commentary, p. 377). It is true that St. Paul and the other N.T. writers also used the LXX but many of their citations are taken directly from the Hebrew original. This is evidently not the case with the writer of Hebrews.

Hebrews is based on the LXX, "auch wo dieselbe erheblich vom Grundtext abweichen, z.B., c. 1, 6: $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\ \alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\alpha\iota\ \theta\epsilon\sigma\upsilon$; 10, 5: $\sigma\upsilon\mu\alpha\ \delta\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\pi\tau\iota\omega\mu\alpha\iota$; 12, 28: $\sigma\tau\iota\ \sigma\upsilon\kappa\epsilon\delta$." (Bleek-Einführung in das N.T. p. 553, ^{similarly} Hebrews even accepts an argument from the LXX inaccurate readings; thus in Ps. 8, 6, the Hebrew $\text{וְיָשָׁן אֱלֹהִים וְלֹא יִשְׁכָּח וְלֹא יִשְׁכָּח}$, "Thou shalt make him to be without God for a while" is translated by the LXX $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\ \alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\omega\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\nu\ \beta\epsilon\alpha\ \chi\iota\ \tau\iota\ \kappa\alpha\tau\ \alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\omega\varsigma$. And this translation is quoted Hebr. 2, 7. Both the Hebrew and Greek however stress the humiliation of Christ. In Hebr. 10, 5: $\sigma\upsilon\mu\alpha\ \delta\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\pi\tau\iota\omega\mu\alpha\iota$, is the LXX translation of $\text{וְיָשָׁן אֱלֹהִים וְלֹא יִשְׁכָּח וְלֹא יִשְׁכָּח}$, "ears you have dug for me". But again in both Hebrew and Greek the point is obedience. (Meyer-Commentary. p. 388).

Because of this Bleek says, "Der Verfasser scheint also seine Kenntniss des A.T. nur aus der LXX geschöpft zu haben, während sich bei ihm kaum eine Spur der Bekanntschaft mit dem Original-text der Alttestamentlichen Bücher findet.... Dieser Verfasser war in der Hebraeischen Sprache und dem Original-texte des A.T. nicht so bewandert, wie der in der Schule von Schriftgelehrten zu Jerusalem gebildete Paulus." (Einleitung, s. 659).

When we consider that the LXX originated in Alexandria and was held almost of equal importance as the O.T. Original at this place, the argument of Alexandrian influence upon the writer of Hebrews becomes quite weighty. This thought does not militate against the doctrine of Inspiration for none of the quotations are contrary to Scriptural doctrine and the Holy Ghost simply gave His approval upon the words from the LXX as He often does in the Bible on statements from other sources.

But this argument of the LXX usage is yet more closely related to Alexandria. Bleek indicates the point, "The author of Hebrews seems to have used a text similar to codex Alexandrinus." (Meyer-Commentary, p. 576). The same author says, "Die Citationen des Hebraeischen Briefes stimmen ueberwiegend mit denen des codex Alexandrinus in Gegensatz gegen dem des codex Vaticanus ueberein." (Einleitung, p. 660). Lange-Schaff quotes, "Bleek has discovered the important fact that the citations follow the special recension of the codex Alexandrinus... Only once, c. 10, 30, do we find a citation which accords neither with the Hebrew nor with the Alexandrian text, but agrees precisely with Rom. 12, 19." (Hebrews, p. 14.).

A few of the specific instances are the following.

1. Ch. 1, 6: the words here cited are found strictly after the codex Vaticanus and the collection of the O.T. Cantica appended to the Psalter in the codex Alexandrinus. (Langeschaff, p. 38).
2. Ch. 1, 7: (Ps. 104, 4): $\kappa\upsilon\pi\alpha\varsigma \ \phi\lambda\omicron\gamma\upsilon\zeta$; Vatic. $\kappa\upsilon\pi\ \phi\lambda\omicron\gamma\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon$. (Eloek-vol. I. p. 372).
3. Ch. 1, 8: who maketh his angels wings and his ministers a flame of fire; the citation is after the LXX according to the Alexandrian Mss. which indeed commonly agrees with the citations in this Epistle. (Alford-The Greek Testament, p. 19).
4. Ch. 1, 9: the codex Alex. reads $\delta\sigma\iota\kappa\iota\alpha\upsilon$. (Meyer-Comm. p. 350; Lange-Schaff).
5. Ch. 1, 12: $\epsilon\lambda\iota\epsilon\iota\sigma$ (A, D. read $\epsilon\lambda\lambda\iota\epsilon\iota\sigma$) as in Hebrew and in the Alexandrian Mss. of the LXX., which this Epistle generally follows. (Farrar-The Early Days of Christianity, p. 353, f. n. 5; Bl. vol. 1. s. 372).
6. Ch. 1, 8 (ps. 45, 6): $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\varsigma$. The same in the codex Alex. (Vat. $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon$ $\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\varsigma$). (Bl. vol. I. p. 373).
7. Ch. 3, 8 (Ps. 95, 8): $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\kappa\alpha\iota\pi\alpha\sigma\mu\omicron\upsilon$ (Vat. $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\kappa\alpha\iota\pi\alpha\sigma\mu\omicron\upsilon$).
8. Ch. 3, 9 (1. 1. v. 9): $\epsilon\delta\omicron\kappa\iota\mu\alpha\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon$ (Vat. $\epsilon\delta\omicron\kappa\iota\mu\alpha\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon$), (Bl. I. p. 373).
9. Ch. 3, 10 (1. 1. v. 10): $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\upsilon$ (Vat. $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\upsilon$), and $\epsilon\upsilon\tau\epsilon\iota$ $\delta\epsilon$ $\epsilon\upsilon\zeta$ (Vat. $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\epsilon\upsilon\tau\epsilon\iota$ $\epsilon\upsilon\zeta$). (Bl. I. p. 373).
10. Ch. 8, 8 (Jerem. 31, 31): $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\kappa\upsilon\pi\iota\alpha\varsigma$ (Vat. $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\kappa\upsilon\pi\iota\alpha\varsigma$). (Bl. I. p. 373).
11. Ch. 8, 9 (1. 1. v. 32): $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\epsilon\upsilon\zeta$ (Vat. $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\epsilon\upsilon\zeta$). (Bl. I. p. 373).
12. Ch. 8, 10 (1. 1. v. 33): $\epsilon\upsilon\tau\eta$ η $\delta\text{'}\epsilon\sigma\theta\eta\eta$ (Vat. add. $\mu\omicron\upsilon$).

13. Ch. 8, 10 (1.1.v. 33): $\delta\iota\delta\omicron\upsilon\tau\ \nu\omicron\mu\omicron\upsilon\tau$ (Vat. $\delta\iota\delta\omicron\upsilon\tau\ \delta\alpha\sigma\omicron\upsilon\ \nu\omicron\mu\omicron\upsilon\tau$).
(Bl. I. p. 373; Expositor, p. 325).
14. Ch. 8, 11 (1. 1. v. 34): $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\ \mu\iota\kappa\rho\omicron\upsilon$ (Vat. $\epsilon\alpha\delta\delta.\ \epsilon\upsilon\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau$).
(Bl. I. p. 373).
15. Ch. 10, 6 (ps. 40, 8): $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\kappa\upsilon\tau\alpha\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ (Vat. $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\kappa\upsilon\tau\alpha\mu\alpha$).
(Bl. I. 372).
16. Ch. 12, 6 (Prov. 3, 12): $\pi\alpha\iota\delta\upsilon\sigma\alpha\iota$ (Vat. $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma\chi\alpha\iota$). (Bl. I. p. 372).
17. Ch. 12, 15: the Alex. Mss. of the LXI has $\epsilon\upsilon\chi\lambda\eta$. (Far-
rar—Early Days of Christianity, p. 484). In reference to
this passage "Iford says, "Our author constantly used the
Alex. copy of the LXX. The construction is completed with
words from Deut. 29, 18 after the codex Alex. (Bl. Luen.
Del.)" (Lange-Schaff, p. 203f.).
18. Ch. 8, 10: $\delta\iota\delta\omicron\upsilon\tau\ \epsilon\tau\chi.$; the LXX (vat.) has $\delta\iota\delta\omicron\upsilon\tau\ \delta\alpha\sigma\omicron\upsilon$,
but this writer omits $\delta\alpha\sigma\omicron\upsilon$ in x. 13 as well as here. We
must therefore suppose that the writer was simply quoting
from the Alexandrian text which omits $\delta\alpha\sigma\omicron\upsilon$. (Expositor, p. 325). ^{of Vat.}

This similarity of citations has also been pointed out
by Boehme, p. 61. (Bl. I. in the Introduction, p. 372).

Riggenbach holds a qualifying attitude ever against the
examples of Bleek. He writes, "Der Nachweis von Bleek, I.
s. 369-375, dass die LXX-Citate des Hb mehr mit dem Text von A
als mit dem B uebereinstimmen, darf nicht so verstanden werden,
als sei der vom Hb zugrunde gelegte LXX-text mit dem in A er-
haltenen conform. Mit den Sonderlesarten von A trifft der Hb.
kaum zusammen". Riggenbach, however, does not refute the exam-
ples cited nor does he offer any counter-examples. But Bleek,
after giving a number of passages where the two agree, brings
a list of readings that differ from the codex Alex. and says

in respect to them, "Vergleichungsweise weniger und im Ganzen viel unbedeutender ist dasjenige, was unser Brief von einzelnen Lesarten mit dem codex Vaticanus gegen den codex "alexandrinus gemein hat. ...Auf jeden Fall, glaube ich, ergibt sich aus dieser Vergleichung aufs deutlichste, dass bei den Citationen im Hebraeerbrief eine Handschrift der LXX zum Grunde liegt, welche sehr ueberwiegend die Recension des ¹extes gehabt hat, die wir in unserm codex Alexandrinus finden." (Bl. I. p. 373f.).

Authors are also aware of a similar unique view of Philo and the writer of Hebrews in regard to Inspiration of Scriptures. According to Philo's doctrine of Inspiration the Spirit of God speaks in the Prophets so that they do not utter their own thoughts but that a Higher One employs them as His instrument to convey His message. Siegfried brings a number of examples, "an vergleiche Stellen wie *quæ rer. div. hæc. 52 (I. 5. 10)*, *προφητῶν γὰρ οὐδὲν ἀκροβαγγεῖται ἀλλοτρίᾳ δὲ πάντα ὑπάρχοντα* *στέρου* *praem. et poen. 9 (II, 417)* *ἐρμηνεύσθαι γὰρ εἶπεν ὁ προφητῶν εὐδοκῶν ὑπάρχοντος τὰ λεκτὰ τοῦ θεοῦ / de monarch.*

I, 9 (II, 22) *τίς ἐκίναται εὐαγγελιστῶν προφητῶν θεοκλήτων θεσπιαί και προφητεῖσαι λέγουσιν μὲν αἰεὶ οὐδὲν.....ὅσα δὲ ἐννοεῖται διαλεῖσθαι καθεκέρ υποβαλλόντος στερου. Ἐρμηνεύσθαι γὰρ εἶπεν οἱ προφηταὶ θεοῦ καταχρησμένου τοῖς ἐκείνων ὀργανοῖς πρὸς δὴλασιν*
εν αν εθεληση --mitHebr. 1, 1 ο θεος λαλησας τοις κτησιν εν τοις προφηταις, εκεκταν ημιν εν υις . (Philo von "alexandrien,

s. 322). And as Philo considers Scriptures the immediate word of God so likewise Hebrews, *op. c. 1, 5. 6. 7. 13; c. 4, 3.4.7; c. 5, 5. 6. u. a.. (Bl. I. s. 378)*. This manner of quotation is quite rare with St. Paul and other N.T. writers. (Siegfried-Philo von Alexandrien: Bl.-Introduction, bd. I. s. 375ff.). Barth observes, "Der strenge Inspirationsbegriff des Hebraeerbriefs, wel-

chem die Alttestamentlichen Worte als direkte Aeusserungen Gottes und des Heiligen Geistes gefasst werden, erinnert an Philo". (Der Abrabamerbrief, s. 113; El. Einleitung in das N.T., s. 659). This resemblance between Philo and Hebrews goes still farther. Siegfried says, "Auch darin ist eine Aehnlichkeit, dass, wie Philo die Schriftsprueche oeffter als Worte des Logos citiert, z.B. de somn. I, 19 und ibid. 20 ein Wort Jakob's Gen. 37, 10 als Ausspruch des $\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\omicron\lambda\omicron\gamma\epsilon\sigma$ anfuehrt, ganz so Hebr. 2, 11f. 13. c. 10, 5. Sff. mehrere Alttestamentliche Stellen als Worte Christi, des Sohnes Gottes, und Hebr. 3, 7 ein Wort des Psalmisten (Ps. 95, 7) als Ausspruch des Heiligen Geistes bezeichnet wird (vgl. auch Hebr. 10, 15 ff.). (Philo von Alex., s. 322).

To both Scriptures is pregnant with latent meaning. Its silence on certain matters is to them divinely significant and is to both important for instruction as are its utterances. Farrer says, "On two passing and isolated allusions to Melchizedek, allusions separated from each other by an interval of nine centuries, he builds a theological system of unequalled grandeur. That system receives strong support from the import and omen of names. It is partly built on the fact that certain circumstances are not mentioned in the Sacred narrative. Similarly, from the absence of any reference to the death of Cain, Philo infers the deathlessness of evil in mortal life. He calls Sarah 'without mother' because the name of her mother is not recorded. So, to the writer of this Epistle the mystic splendor of Melchizedek is enhanced by the circumstance that he is 'without father, without mother, without recorded genealogy'." (The Early Days of Christianity, p. 305f.: 404, f.n. 3). A quotation from Moffat pertains to the subject, "By a characteristically Philonic method the writer finds a religious significance in the very silence of the O.T.:

thru the absence of any allusion to the parents of Melchizedek, c. 7, 5, is as pregnant to him as the similar lack of any reference to Sarah's mother is to the Alex. thinker (quis rerum div. haer. 12; de christate, 14), and the titles of Melchizedek suggest religious truths to him no less than to Philo (leg. alleg. III. 25). (Introduction to the H.F., p. 27; Siegfried-Philo von Alex., p. 324). This argument from silence is further elucidated by Hebr. 1, 5. 13. Siegfried asserts, "Da niemals zu einem Engel gesagt wird in der Bibel, 'du bist mein Sohn' oder 'setze dich zu meiner Rechten', so folgt daraus, dass der Messias, an welchem beide Ausdrücke gerichtet werden, höher steht als die Engel. Aehnlich ist Hebr. 2, 16. Es kommen in der Bibel oft Stellen vor, in denen die göttliche Erwählung des Samens Abrahams gemeldet wird, nirgend aber wird etwas Gerartiges von den Engeln gesagt, so folgt daraus, dass in Christo die menschliche Natur noch ueber die Engel erhoehet wird". (Philo von Alex., s. 323).

The discussion of the Logos idea in Philo and its relation to Hebrews has caused much comment.

In the memorable opening passage of Hebrews the author "speaks of Christ as 'the effulgence of God's glory'. Philo had spoken of God as the 'archetypal brightness', and of the Logos as a 'sunlike brightness', and the Book of Wisdom had spoken of Wisdom as 'the effulgence of everlasting light'. --He calls the Son 'the stamp and impress of God's substance'. Philo speaks of the word of man as 'the stamp of divine power', and of the Logos as the 'stamp of the seal of God'". (Farrar--The Early Days of Christianity). But Weiss remarks on this passage, "Selbst die Christologie des Briefes hat mit der Philonischen Logosleh-

re garnichts zu tun, da: das *επινοημα της σοφης* seine bedeut-
samste Parallele bei Sap. 7, 25f. und in Verg. zu Jes. 6, 1
findet. Jedenfalls hat der Verfasser seinen Zusammenhang mit dem
A.F. treuer bewahrt, als der Alexandrinismus, und ist fuer die
in diesem so wirksamen Einflusse hellenischer Philosophie ganz
unzugänglich geblieben". (Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das N.T.,
s. 329). The words of Siegfried on the same phrase are enlight-
ning, "Wenn Hebr. 1, 3 der Sohn ein *επινοημα της σοφης* (του
κατος) genannt wird, so erkennt man unschwer, wie hier das,
was Philo de opif. n. 51 von der Seele des Menschen lehrt, in
hervorragendem Sinne auf Christum uebertragen ist. Philo sagt
n. n. O.: κατ' εθερακα κατα μεν την διανοιαν εκαιεται θειο λογος
της μακροτα γυωσσο επιμαγειον η αποκασμα η επινοημα γαγονα.
Ausserdem nennt ja Philo den Logos *επειν εσεν de confus. lingu.*
20". (Philo von Alex., s. 324).

The same is true of the expression *χαρακτηρ της υπεστασασιν*
Hebr. 1, 3, which is based on quod det. pot. insid. 23, where
Philo calls the higher *κνυση* in man *τυκον τινα και χαρακτηρα*
θεισο δυναμωσσο. Siegfried continues, " Der Hebraeerbrief ueber-
traegt diesen Ausdruck auf das Verhaeltniss des Sohnes zu Gott.
vgl. ausserdem de plantat. 5 *επειν αυτην (σε την ψυχην) τυκω-*
θεισαν σφραγιδι: εσεν η ο χαρακτηρ εστιν αιθιρο λογοσ ."(Phi-
lo von Alexandrien, s. 324).

The name of the Logos as the *πρωτογενεσ* Hebr. 1, 3 goes
back to Philo. He calls the Logos *πρωτογενεσ υιοσ*, de agricult.
12; de confus. lingu. 14; 23; leg. alleg. III, 51; de somn. I,
37;-- *αποσβυτατεσ υιοσ*, in de confus. lingu. 14. (Philo von Alex.,
s. 325).

Philo speaks of the Logos as "bearing all things that
are". Hebrews says, "By whom also He made the worlds"; c.1, 2.

Philo says that "the instrument (organon) of creation was the word, by whom it was set in order," and that "the word is the image (eikon) of God, by whom the whole universe was fashioned, cf. de monarchia, II, par. 5. (Farrar-The Early Days of Christianity-p. 303). Siegfried takes his proof for the Logos as the instrument of the creation from de migr. "br. 1; και οτι σκοπευλαται

χρησμεντα οργατα τουτα απο την ανυκατιον των αποτελευμενων
 στυαταιν , op. Hebr. 1, 2; δι ου και τουσ αιωνασ
 εκαιησαν ; de cherub. 35; οργατον (εμρησια) λογον
 θεου δι ου (ο κοσμοσ) κατασκευασθη ; de monarch. II, 5; δι
 ου ουμ κατω ο κοσμοσ εδημιουργατο : leg. alleg. III,
 32. He proceeds, "Daneben besteht bei Beiden die Anschauung, dass das goettliche Wort im buchstaeblichen Sinne schöpferisch ist. Man vgl. de sacrif. Ab. et Cain. 18; ο θεου
 λεγων εμα εκαια mit Hebr. 11, 3 πισται νοηουμεν κατ-
 ηρισται τουσ αιωνασ ρηματα θεου (Philo von Alex., s. 325).

Both writers ascribe even the maintenance of the creation to the Logos. Hebrews says that the Son "upholds all things by the utterance of His power". Philo speaks of the Logos as 'bearing all things that are'. (Farrar-The Early Days of Christianity. Compare also quis rer. div. haer. 7 ο τα μεν οντα φερον και τα πντα γενταν with Hebr. 1, 3 φερον τα τα παντα τα ρηματα της δυναμεισ αυτου ., and de somn. I, 41 το γεν υπεραιουσ .ετα στυαχθη βαβυλια τα κρηταισ και υπεραιουσ μεν λογα . (Philo von Alex., s. 325).

The thought of the λεγοσ τεμνω is found in both. Weiss remarks, "Die Ausfuehrung Philo's..wie ueber den Logos tomous, cf. 4, 12, erinnern an unseren Brief". (Lehrbuch zur Einleitung in das N.T., s. 326). Farrar says in reference to Hebr. 4, 12. 13, "The writer evidently has in mind the thoughts of Philo and of the Book of

Wisdom. Philo compares the Word to the flaming sword of Paradise; he speaks of the 'fire and knife' of Abraham as being used 'to cut off and consume his still adherent mortality.' He calls the Word 'the cutter of all things,' and says that 'when whetted to the utmost sharpness it is incessantly dividing all sensuous things'. He compares it to the midmost branch of the golden candlestick, as being the cutter or divider of the six faculties of the human soul. Similarly the author of Wisdom compares God's Almighty word to a sharp sword leaping down from earth to heaven!. Siegfried admits that the real meaning of this phrase in both writers has always been much discussed and is hard to determine but he too maintains, "Die Aehnlichkeit geht hierbei bis zur Ausdrucksweise, man vgl. nur das $\delta\iota\lambda\epsilon\gamma\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu\sigma$ mit der Wendung Philo's $\alpha.\alpha.O. \kappa\alpha\iota\delta\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma \delta\epsilon \mu\epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota \tau\epsilon\upsilon \sigma\tau\epsilon\mu\upsilon$... $\delta\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\theta\eta$."--

Nimmt man auch hierzu noch weiter, dass auch die Vergleichung der $\delta\upsilon\sigma\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma \tau\eta\mu\alpha\tau\omega\upsilon$ des Logos mit einem Schwerte sich bei Philo findet, (de cherub. 9. I, 144), dass ferner die Hebr. 4, 12 geschilderte, alles durchschneidende Kraft des Logos, $\delta\iota\sigma\chi\epsilon\iota \mu\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon\sigma \alpha\pi\alpha\upsilon \tau\epsilon \tau\epsilon \kappa\alpha\iota \mu\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\tau\epsilon\upsilon$ dringt, aehnlich *quis rer. div. haer. l. c.* beschrieben wird, vgl. *ibid.* 27, dass endlich die Wendung Hebr. 4, 13 $\kappa\alpha\iota \sigma\omega\tau\iota \sigma\tau\iota\omega\sigma \epsilon\pi\epsilon\upsilon\gamma\sigma \sigma\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\sigma\upsilon \kappa\upsilon\tau\epsilon\upsilon$ ihr deutliches Vorbild findet in *leg. alleg. III, 59*, wo es heisst: $\kappa\alpha\iota \epsilon \delta\epsilon\sigma\sigma \lambda\omicron\gamma\epsilon\sigma \epsilon\upsilon\beta\epsilon\pi\alpha\sigma\tau\alpha\tau\epsilon\sigma \sigma\omega\tau\iota\upsilon \sigma\sigma \kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\sigma \sigma\pi\omicron\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon \alpha\iota\upsilon\alpha\iota \lambda\epsilon\gamma\upsilon\sigma$ --so wird es das Naturlichste sein, wie auch schon von Grotius, Langey, Bleek, Delitzsch, Coestlin u.a. geschehen, die ganze Anschauung des Hebräerbriefes von der Wirkung des Wortes als eine auf Grundlage der Philonischen sich erhebende anzusehen". (Philo von Alex., s. 325f.).

Of great importance is the view that both take of the Logos as the High-priest. The main argument of Hebrews turns on the Priesthood of Christ and Philo too has called the Logos a High-

priest. (Farrar- The Early Days of Christianity, p. 306). The Expositor states that as in Philo, the priestly function, absent from Paul, dominates the thought of the "Epistle to the Hebrews. The idea of sacrifice charges strongly. And the priestly exaltation of the risen Christ is conspicuous. (Comm., p. 226f.). Hollman makes a clear statement, "Das Hohepriestertum Christi ist die leitende Idee unseres Briefes, die ihm sein eigentümliches Gepräge gibt. Der Verfasser hat diese Ideenverbindung mit dem A.T. nicht selbst erfunden, er hat sie uebernommen aus der Alex. Schriftgelehrtheit. Genau so hatte vor ihm Philo den unanfänglichen Logos als den wahren Hohenpriester beschrieben". (Der Hebräerbrief, s. 195).

A few particulars will prove these general statements.

This High-priest is called $\mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha\lambda\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma$ by both. Compare Hebr. 4, 14 with de somn. I, 38 (I, 354), $\epsilon\ \mu\epsilon\nu\ \delta\eta\ \mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha\lambda\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \alpha\rho\chi\iota\epsilon\rho\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$.

Hebrews dwells on the sinless Priesthood, c. 7, 26. Philo too has spoken of the Logos as having "no participation in sin". (Farrar, The Early Days of Christianity, p. 306). The evidence is found in de prof. 20 $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omicron\upsilon\mu\epsilon\nu\ \gamma\alpha\rho\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \alpha\rho\chi\iota\epsilon\rho\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma\ \alpha\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\nu\ \alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\ \lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\nu\ \theta\epsilon\lambda\omicron\nu\ \epsilon\iota\nu\alpha\iota\ \kappa\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu\ \epsilon\nu\chi\ \epsilon\kappa\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota\omicron\nu\ \mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu\ \alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\kappa\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota\omicron\nu\ \alpha\mu\alpha\rho\tau\eta\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\nu\ \alpha\mu\epsilon\tau\omicron\chi\omicron\nu$ (—ibid.), 21 $\alpha\mu\epsilon\tau\omicron\chi\omicron\varsigma\ \gamma\alpha\rho\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \alpha\kappa\alpha\rho\alpha\delta\epsilon\kappa\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \kappa\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\iota\nu\alpha\iota\ \kappa\epsilon\rho\epsilon\nu\alpha\nu\ \alpha\mu\alpha\rho\tau\eta\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$. " Also the term $\alpha\mu\epsilon\tau\omicron\chi\omicron\varsigma$ is used in the above quoted passages. (Philo von Alex. , p. 326).

Siegfried refers to the goodness of the High-priest thus, "Seine Milde und Guetigkeit wird hervorgehoben de profug. 18 $\epsilon\nu\chi\ \alpha\mu\alpha\rho\tau\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \alpha\lambda\lambda\ \sigma\upsilon\mu\alpha\upsilon\epsilon\sigma\ \delta\epsilon\ \eta\mu\epsilon\rho\epsilon\iota\tau\eta\tau\alpha\ \phi\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\sigma\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\ \tau\omicron\ \theta\epsilon\lambda\omicron\nu$. vgl. mit Hebr. 4, 15. 16. (Philo von Alex., s. 326).

One of the most fundamental conceptions in the Epistle and Philo is the Melchizedek 'riesthood of Christ. Farrar comments, "In his whole treatment of the subject, the writer adopts the method and the thoughts of Philo. Philo speaks of the 'Just King,' as holding 'a self-acquired, self-taught priest-hood,' which--- buildⁱⁿ solely on the silence of Scripture--he describes as having been bestowed on him without merit or work. "e directly compares him to the Logos in the words, 'The Logos, who is shadowed forth by Melchizedek, ' is priest of God the Most High.' Philo also speaks of the Logos as 'the great High Priest'". (The Early Days of Christianity, p. 309). The proof for this comparison is found in Hebr. 5, 10; 7, 1ff. and leg. alleg. II, 28. $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma\ \gamma\alpha\rho\ \sigma\omega\tau\iota\upsilon\ \lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma\ \chi\lambda\eta\rho\epsilon\iota\ \sigma\eta\upsilon\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\upsilon\tau\epsilon$; congr. erud. grat. 18; de somn. par. 33. Philo continues, "Die Bezeichnung des $\alpha\rho\chi\iota\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$ als $\epsilon\mu\eta\tau\epsilon\rho$ Hebr. 7, 3 findet sich ausdrucklich so nicht bei Philo, welcher $\epsilon\mu\eta\tau\epsilon\rho$ von der Sarah, de obrist. 14, und von der Siebensahl, de opif. n. 33, gebraucht, aber der Sache nach sagt er doch dasselbe, wenn es de profug. 20 heisst; $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omicron\mu\epsilon\upsilon\ \gamma\alpha\rho\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\rho\chi\iota\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\ \epsilon\upsilon\delta\epsilon\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\ \lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\alpha\iota\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\iota\upsilon\alpha\iota\ \dots \delta\iota\epsilon\tau\iota\ \epsilon\iota\mu\alpha\iota\ \gamma\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\alpha\upsilon\ \alpha\theta\epsilon\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\rho\tau\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \phi\lambda\alpha\chi\epsilon\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\ \mu\epsilon\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\ \dots\ \mu\eta\tau\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$ (Philo von Alex., 2. 326f.). Hollman says, "ausdrucklich hatte Philo Melchizedek als den Typus dieser Logos-Hohenpriesters hingestellt, und genau nachgewiesen, dass das im Gesetz von dem Hohenpriester Aaron's gesagte auf ihn zutreffe". (Der Hebraeerbrief, s. 195; Lange-Schaff-Comm. p. 139).

The mediatory characteristic is also a point of comparison. Farrar is certain, "If (the writer) speaks of Christ's sitting on the right hand of God to make intercession for us, Philo^{to} has spoken of the Logos as 'a Priest of the Father of the Universe,' as 'an advocate to obtain both forgiveness of sins and a supply of

all good; ' as 'the boundary between created things and the Creator; ' as 'an intercessor for mortality in its longings after the incorruptible, and an ambassador from the Lord of all to that which is His subject". Let us compare Hebr. 7, 25 with de migr. Abr. 21 τὸν θεὸν ἱερέως λόγον οὐκ ἐκστραπέτω σὺν θεῷ ἁγιασθέντι . and quia rer. div. haer. 42, where the Logos stops the plague, Num. 16, 49. (Philo von Alex., s. 327).

Philo calls Moses a High-priest, de vita Mos. II, 1. III, 1, "womit die Vergleichung Christi als Hoherpriester mit Mose in Hebr. 3, 2 zusammenstimmt. Bemerkenswert ist auch, dass wie Mose als ἱερέως ἱερέως ἔσεν bei Philo quod det. pot. insid. 44 sein Zelt ausserhalb des Lagers aufschlaegt, so auch im Hebraeerbrieff c. 13, 13 Christus sich ausserhalb des Lagers, εἰς τὴν παρεσβολὴν , der israelitischen Gemeinde findet".(Philo von Alex., s. 327).

Concerning this Highpriestly relationship of the Logos and Christ the International Critical Commentary writes thus, "In regard to the speculations of the Logos as High-priest, de migrat. Abrah. 102, de fug. 108ff., the priestly mediation there is mainly between man and upper world of ideas. The Logos or reason is not only the means of creating the material cosmos after the pattern of the first and real world, but inherent in it enabling human creatures to apprehend the invisible. This is Philo's primary use of the metaphor. It is philosophical rather than religious. Yet the increased prestige of the High-priest in the later Judaism prompted him to apply to the Logos functions which resemble intercession as well as interpretation. Vague as they are, they are familiar to the author of our Epistle, and it is probable that they helped to fashion his expression of the eternal significance of Jesus as the Mediator between man and God.

The Logos as High-priest, says Philo, de somn. II, 28, for example is not only, *αρχιερεως ομοιωμενος* but *μεσσηριος τις θεου - και ανθρωπου - φυσια, του μιν ελαττων, ανθρωπου δεκραττων*. With reference to the intercessory idea, 'in de somn. II, 34, Philo remarks that the Logos is a minister, *λατρουργος θεου*, of God, belonging to creation in his mortal nature and to the uncreated world in his immortal nature. Similarly he pleads, in the de sacerdot. 12, that the function of his high-priest was to mediate between God and man, *ως διαμεσσηριος τις εν μεση εναντιον του θεου, θεου δε των χαριτων ανθρωπου, ουκ ελαττων τιμι χρημενσα ερσηη και χορηγη*. Here we may feel vibrating a need of intercession, even although the idea is still somewhat theosophic". (Comm. p. 48). Again we read, "Philo had indeed, not only spoken of the Logos as a High-priest in a metaphorical sense, i.e. as mediating metaphysical and psychologically the relations between the worlds of thought and sense, but in a allegorical fashion...; de somn, I, 37". (Comm. p. 46). This statement bewilders one in respect to the true meaning and function of Philo's Logos. "And a thorough investigation of Philo's Logos will convince one of the vast superiority of the Christian High-priest, Christ. Farrar correctly concludes, "The Logos of Philo has to be removed from any direct contact with matter by an endless number of intervening powers; the forms in which he is represented are so self-contradictory, that we never know whether he is to be regarded as a Person or an Idea. And Philo is still so far entangled in Jewish particularism that he is unable to understand the universal prophecies of the Old Testament. His Logos is at the best a Jewish deliverer, and is infinitely far from being the Savior of the world". (The Early Days of Christianity, p. 307).

Some scholars claim that one of the most characteristically Philonic antithesis in the Epistle is the contrast between the *divine* ^{divine} and the

transitory shows or shadows of this world and the genuine, ideal realities of the heavenly sphere. The whole idea of these heavenly counterparts are supposed to be derived from the Alex. religious philosophy. The phenomenal is but an imperfect, shadowy transcript of what is eternal and real. The present world of sense and time stands over against the world of reality, the former being merely a shadow or copy of the latter. (Moffat-Introduction, 428ff.). Farrar presents a rather lengthy discussion of the matter, p. 310ff. and finally says, "The author found his fruitful thought of a pre-existent ideal in the Alexandrian philosophy. That philosophy had sprung up from seed which Plato had sown in the rich soil of Semitic monotheism. To the school of Philo, as to that of Plato, earth was---

'But the shadow of heaven, and things therein,

Each to the other like more than on earth is thought.'

To them (and they found sanction for their views in Holy writ) the world of phenomena was but the shadow of a world of noumena..... So the author of this Epistle identifies the ideal world with the kingdom of Heaven". (The Early Days of Christianity, p. 315ff.). The words of Hollman argue similarly, "Suchen wir uns noch in aller Kuerze die Grundzuge der philonischen Weltanschauung zu vergegenwaertigen, so ist von ausschlagender Bedeutung die Unterscheidung der sichtbaren Welt und der Ideen-Welt. Indem Philo platonische Gedanken verwertet, behauptet er, dass die Urbilder aller Dinge, die 'unkoerperlichen und nackten Dinge selbst' im Himmel sich befinden, waehrend die irdischen Dinge nur sozusagen die Schatten, die Gegenbilder der himmlischen sind, denen allein wahres Sein imwohnt. Genau das ist die grundlegende Anschauung des Hebraeerbriefs, der ganz in derselben

himself thus, "Owing to his philosophical category of the antithesis between the phenomenal and the archetypal realities in heaven, the Epistle seldom does more than hover 'on the verge of the deeper truth for which its theological scheme allows no room—that the world of the eternal is already ours, in so far as we have entered into the spirit of Christ'". (This conclusion is made by H.F. Scott—The Apologetic of the N.T., 1907. p. 306; Baur, Church History, I. 117 and A.S. Davidson, Biblical and Literary Essays, 317, quoted by Moffet—Introduction to the N.T., p. 427).

Weiss becomes even bolder in his judgement, "Dagegen hat Riehm, der Uebersetzer des Hebräerbriefs, Ludwigsburg, 1858, 1887, ueberzeugend nachgewiesen, wie die Vorstellung von dem himmlischen Heiligtum und dem himmlischen Jerusalem palaestinischem Ursprungs sind, weshalb man auch ganz mit Unrecht in den letzteren die metaphysische Unterscheidung Philo's zwischen der unsichtbaren, unvergaenglichen, urbildlichen Welt und der sichtbaren, vergaenglichen Erscheinungswelt gesucht hat". (Lehrbuch zur Einleitung in das N.T., s. 329).

The relation of the Contrast worlds between Philo and Hebrews is much discussed and if we compare the philosophy of Plato, from which Philo is supposed to have taken his ideas, we must admit that the two authors have entirely different conceptions.

A question closely related to the former is the allegorical-symbolical treatment of Scriptures and has caused a heated debate. The author of Hebrews is supposed to have used the Alexandrian allegorical method of interpreting Scriptures. In order to determine the facts the methods of both shall be presented.

The Alexandrian method of allegorizing is quite well summarized in a quotation from Lange-Schaff, "Allegory is there resorted to as a means of effecting an outward connection between rational truths and the letter of the Holy Scriptures, and of introducing entirely foreign ideas into the O.T. by means of accidental resemblances, and by an arbitrary and forced explanation of its institutions, relations, statements, and historical accounts, divesting them of their true historical character and value, and transforming them essentially into the mere veils and husks of ideas, and mere allusions to some fancied truths". (Uomo. p. 16). Although Farrar maintains a connection between Philo's mode and that of Hebrews yet he too admits that Philo does not remain within rational limits and pushes his interpretation into absurd details. He writes, "Philo says that Melchizedek brought forth the nourishment for the soul which Ammonites and Moabites would not do, because the Ammonites are the children only of perception and the Moabites of mind". (The Early Days of Christianity, p. 310). Consequently Jamieson Fausset and Brown are justified in drawing their conclusion, "The allegorical mode... is pushed to an unwarrantable excess in the Alexandrian school." (Introduction to Hebrews).

Scholars like Meyer, Farrar, Reuss and others are of the opinion that the symbolical treatment of Scriptures in Hebrews is closely related to the Philonian mode.

Reuss discusses both writers and concludes, "Der Brief verräth eine gewisse Verwandtschaft mit Philo... Die Methode des Briefes beruht wesentlich auf der allegorischen-typischen Erklärung des A.T.. Eine solche dient längst vorher der der jüdischen-Alexandrinischen Schulphilosophie." (Geschichte der Heiligen Schriften des N.T., s.139).

The International Critical Commentary comes to the same conclusion, "The symbolical method of exegesis... the author took over from the Alexandrian school". (p. 46). Barth is of a somewhat similar opinion, "There is a symbolism of a unique kind. Like Philo and the author of Wisdom, he interprets the past and the present alike in terms of the old theory". (p. 119). Moffat likewise argues, "The allegorical method of interpretation (in the Letter) received a powerful impetus from Alexandrian Judaism.

There is, however, a great difference between the two methods as is indicated by Lange-Schaff, "The following passages from Philo, cited by Lueneemann, are among the striking evidences that our author while totally free from the mystical and allegorizing fancies of Philo, could yet have hardly been unacquainted or unfamiliar with his writings; *qui rerum divinarum haeres*, p. 499, and *de cherubin*, p. 112f.". (Comm. p. 93.).

Fairbairn discusses the same interpretation of Hebrews which is entirely different from the extreme mode of Philo, cf. *Hebr.* 12, 23 (Typology of Scripture, vol. II. p. 53); *ev. 15*, 11 (vol. II. p. 309); and other passages (vol. I. and II.).

The following summary characterizes the author of Hebrews quite well, "He plants himself on the ground of historical fulfillment, of that which They (the O.T.) are constituted typically and symbolically to express and thus inspires the conviction that an abandonment of Christianity, and a retrogression to the O.T. level, is an unpardonable denial of the true revelation of the living God Himself. This stands in marked and fundamental contrast with that allegorical treatment of the language and economy of the O.T. which was especially employed at that time by the Alexandrian Jew Philo". (Comm. p. 16).

Although there may be some influence of the Alexandrian method, yet the relation of the two, the rational and the Biblical interpretation, is so remote that it has little bearing on the argument.

There still remain a few minor points of contact between Alexandria and Hebrews.

Siegfried shows that the two authors, Philo and he of Hebrews, have the same doctrine of sacrifice, that their presentation of the O.T. practise of sacrifices is in many instances the same, and that they have a similar typical conception of the Patriarchs. (Philo von Alex., s. 327ff.).

The sacrificial argument also involves the question of the Temple description. According to some Hebrews reproduces the Temple of Onias at Leontopolis in Egypt. Wieseler is of this assumption. (Lange-Schaff, Comm. p. 139. 151). Others think we have in the Letter a picture of the temple at Jerusalem. (Of. Barth, 114ff.). The correct view is without question that we have here a description of the O.T. Tabernacle. (Sufficient proof is presented by the following: Barth-Der Hebräerbrief, s. 113ff.; Lange-Schaff-Comm. p. 139. 151; Block-Einleitung, s. 661; Meyer-Comm. p. 373; Salmon, Introduction to the N.T., p. 424; Lange-Schaff-Comm. p. 11f.).

Although the evidence is in favor of the O.T. Tabernacle this would not militate against the idea of an Alex. Background, for the writer took his material from the LXX description.

Closely related to this point of comparison is the view of the Hebrew nation which both authors have. Farrar says, "The writer's (of Hebrews) thoughts are absorbed in the Hebrews. It is the same with Philo". (The Early Days of Christianity, p. 304f.).

Other similarities between Philo and Hebrews are the designa-

tion of the saints as the dwelling place of God, the discussion of the oath which God swears by Himself, and the comparison of the Word of God to a bodily food. (Siegfried-Philo von Alex., s. 329).

A few points of differences between the two writers are noteworthy. Siegfried, a strong advocate of the Alex. Background, admits, "Anderes beruehrt sich naeher mit den Vorstellungen des palaestnischen als des Alexandrinischen Judentums. So die Anschauung von himmlischen Jerusalem...Ebenso ist die Gottesruhe (sabbatismos) eine andere im Hebraeerbrief als bei Philo". (Philo von Alex. s. 329). Philo also makes use of love-language, "Hebrews not so much. (Int. Nat. Crit. Comm. p. 46). Riggensbach mentions a few doctrines that he finds in Hebrews and are missing in Philo, at least in the sense of Hebrews, "Many references to Palestinian Jews; the Messianic conception, esp. of Ps. 110; the differentiation of the present and future Aeon; the heavenly Jerusalem; the whole doctrine of angels; particularly the giving of the Law thru angels; and the conception of Satan as sovereign over death". (Einleitung in das N.T., s. 38). Riggensbach says that Hebrews never used the Logos idea in the sense of Philo. (Einleitung in das N.T., s. 37). And the Cook Commentary asserts that Philo's teaching is "opposed to the whole tenor of Divine Revelation. He nowhere recognized the need of an Atonement for sin. With him, the true High-priest is the Divine Reason (Logos) which he speaks of as the Son of God; in which the ideal Universe is contained; and which mediates between God and the material Universe. With him Melchisedek is a type of 'right reason' (orthos logos); and sacrifices have efficacy just so far as they are expressions of moral virtues in the offerers". (p. 20).

3. ανεκτιμωται, LXX. and Josephus.
4. εχομενα, LXX.
5. προαισθαι, LXX., Josephus, and classical writers.
6. αμαρτια, very frequent in LXX.
7. υπεσπελλομαι, LXX., Josephus, Classics, and St. Paul, Acts 20, 20.

The term *αιτιας σατραις* c. 5, 9, is found in Philo; but it also occurs twice in Josephus, and once in Diodorus Siculus. *κλυμαρ* and *κλυτρικωσ* are conjoined in Philo; but so are *κλυμαρην* and *κλυτρικωσιν* in two passages of Maximus Tyrius. If the contrast between *γαλακτα* and *τελακτα*, and the comparison of simple spiritual diet to milk, 5, 12; 6, 1, be found in Philo, so also are they in another Hellenistic writer, St. Paul, 1 Cor. 2, 6; 3, 1.2. (The Expositor, 1875, p. 336; Cook Commentary, p. 20).

We may summarise the view of the negative scholars thus, "Granting now, certain resemblances between our Epistle and the writings of Philo, ep. Carpz. Sacrae exercitt. in ep. ad Hebr. ex Philone Alex. Helms., 1750, not merely in many individual expressions, terms, and modes of speech, but also in the mode of employing Scriptures, e.g., the account of Melchizedek, yet this assuredly involves no dependence of our author upon Philo, Quinoid in his Comm., and Kestlin in Theol. Jahrbuch, but at most only implies the influence of similar elements of culture, Tholuck, Einleitung, p. 84ff.; Niehm, Lehrbegriff, I., p. 259". (Langeschaff, p. 16).

The possibility of Alexandrian influence was granted by Clericus and Mangey, followed by Bleek. (Weiss-Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das N.T.). Jamieson, Fausset and Brown strike a weak note, "Philo's mode of thought is not necessarily all derived from his (the author) Alexandrian, but also from his Jewish education." (Intro-

duction to Hebrews). Riggensbach writes concerning the author of Hebrews that as a cultured Hellenist he knows the language, is at home in the Greek Bible, and is well acquainted with the exegetical rules of his day. (Einleitung, s. 36). He admits that there is a resemblance and close relation but claims that the author knew and used the writings of Philo cannot be absolutely established. (ibid. s. 38). And finally he concludes that the Alexandrian influence is essentially of a formal nature. (ibid, s.38f.). Zahn strikes a very low comparison between Philo and Hebrews and writes, "Eine hier und da zu Tage tretende Aehnlichkeit des Ausdrucks und ein gewisser Modus rabbinischer und rhetorischer Bildung besteht zwischen Philo und dem Hebraeerbrief. Es bleibt aber unwahrscheinlich, dass der Verfasser an den, so entsetzlich langweiligen Schriften des Alexandrischen Juden ein Gefallen gefunden haben wird". (Einleitung in das N.T., B. II, s. 131).

Another word from Riggensbach proves that he does not deny the Alexandrian influence entirely, for he admits that Hebrews in thought and expression to a great extent is related to the Alexandrian religious philosopher, a fact, long acknowledged by J.E. Carpsov, Bleek, and Richt. (Der Hebraeerbrief, s. 38f.). Lange-Schaff remarks, "He (the writer of Hebrews) was, it seems almost certain, acquainted with Philo for the verbal coincidences are too numerous and striking to be the offspring of mere accident, though untinctured by his philosophizing and mystical tendencies; he therefore, in all probability, must have been from Alexandria". (Comm. p. 10). Reuss says, "Der Brief verräth eine grosse Verwandtschaft mit Philo". (Geschichte der Heiligen Schriften des N.T., s.139).

The Alexandrian background has been maintained by Koestlin and Delitzsch. Weiss mentions a few more, "Uebrigens haben besonders

Hilgenfeld, Fleiderer, Damer, Holtzmann und von Soden in dem Alexandrinismus die Eigentümlichkeit des Briefes gesehen". (Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das N.T., s. 329). Moffat calls the letter, "a unique specimen of Alexandrian thought", (Introduction to the N.T., p. 442) and says that it is characterized by the Alexandrian tone of argument. (ibid., p. 446). Gregory writes, "Gewiss kannte der Verfasser des Hebräerbriefs sowohl Philo wie auch Paulus, aber die Ähnlichkeit...geht aus ihrer gemeinsamen Alttestamentlichen klassischen und Alexandrinischen-hellenistischen Bildung hervor". (Einleitung in das N.T., s. 745).

Others are yet of a more positive opinion. Barth describes the author thus, "Unser Verfasser ist ein gebildeter Theologe, eigentümlicher Art, So sicher es ist, dass er nicht nur einzelne Paulinische Briefe, sondern die ganze Paulinische Theologie kennt und voraussetzt, der entscheidende Einschlag ist nicht von dorthen, sondern von Alexandria erfolgt. Unser Verfasser ist durchtränkt von den Anschauungen jenes jüdischen Hellenismus, der in Aegypten, vornehmlich in Alexandria seinen Sitz hatte. Er kennt die klassische Literatur dieser eigentümlichen Geistesrichtung, vor allem die 'Weisheit Salomos' und die Schriften Philo's". (Der Hebräerbrief, s. 119f.). Hollman is of the firm conviction, "Und nur von hier aus (Alexandrien) kann man die Gesamtanschauung des Briefes sowie die zahlreichen Einzelheiten verstehen. Dabei handelt es sich nicht durchaus etwa nur um formelle Bereicherung; nein, philonische Weltanschauung, Schriftbetrachtung, wissenschaftliche Methode ist deutlich erkennbar.... Der Verfasser ist 'aus seinem Alexandrinisch gebildeten Juden ein Christ geworden. Eine Quelle philonischer Gedankengaenge ist fuer ihn in Wegfall gekommen, weil Jesus Christus der beherrschender Mittelpunkt seines religiösen Denkens geworden ist. Wohl aber ist Philo fuer den

Bildungsgang des Verfassers so bedeutungsvoll gewesen, dass er auch als Christ wesentliche Bestandteile jener Anschauungen nicht fallen gelassen, sondern auf Christus uebertragen und mit seinem Christentum verschmolzen hat". (Der Hebraeerbrief, s. 160).

Bleek gives an estimate characterization of some of the more important representatives in the field as follows, "David Schulz (sagt) im Briefe rede ein Alexandrinisch gebildetes Judenchristentum. So hat auch Baur zuletzt den Hebraeerbrief als Produkt des Judenchristentums aufgefasst, aber eines durch den Alexandrinismus vergeistigten, welches dadurch, dass es weder Judaismus noch Paulinismus ist, indirekt zwischen beiden vermittelt. Auf Judenchristlichen Alexandrinismus fuhren denn auch Wieseler, Roush, Holtzmann, Lipsius, die Eigenthumlichkeit des Hebraeerbriefes zureuck.... Neander, Schwegler, Luenemann, Melitzsch, Ewald und andere, auch Kurtz, zwar nicht ausdrecklich, aber augenscheinlich und Hilgenfeld ganz ausdrecklich lassen den Lehrbegriff des Briefes aus der Verbindung des Paulinismus mit dem Alexandrinismus hervorgehen...Ebenso Pfeleiderer, Ausrath, Schonkel, Von Soden bezeichnen in von allen Judaismus freien Alexandrinismus als den Standpunkt des Verfassers". (Einleitung in das N.T., s. 670).

The evidence presented favors the view that Hebrews has an Alexandrian background. How far this influence exerted itself, indirectly as a culture of the world, or directly as the probable home of the author, is difficult to establish. Yet the points of similarity are so numerous and striking that one is inclined to conclude there is a connection between the two. Without question some of the contacts are somewhat

distant and perhaps even irrelevant, yet the argument in its entirety endorses the Alexandrian ~~back~~ background of Hebrews. And since this view does not interfere with the Biblical Doctrine of Inspiration, for other writers of the Bible, e.g. St. Paul, expressed their thoughts in Hellenistic phrases and the Holy Spirit employed the general education of the various writers to convey His message, the Alexandrian background of Hebrews is very probable.

OUTLINE.

THE ALEXANDRIAN BACK-GROUND OF HEBREWS.

A. According to Language.

1. The arrangement of the Letter.
2. The style.
 - a. In general of Hellenistic culture.
 - b. In particular identical with Philo and Book of Wisdom.

B. According to Thought.

1. The LXX. Influence.
2. The View of the Inspiration of Scriptures.
3. The Meaning of Scriptures.
4. The Logos Relation.
 - a. Various Terms.
 - b. The Logos as High-priest.
 - c. The Melchizedek Priesthood.
5. The Antithesis of the Transitory and Genuine Worlds.
6. The Allegorical-Symbolical relation.
7. Minor points of Contact.
8. Differences.

C. Criticism.

1. Negative.
2. Positive.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

1. Weiss-Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das N.T.
2. Salmon-Introduction to the N.T.
3. Moffat-Introduction to the N.T.
4. Zahn-Einleitung in das N.T., B.II.
5. Fr. Bleek-Einleitung in das N.T.
6. Gregory-Einleitung in das N.T.
7. Cook-Comm. on Hebrews.
8. Expositor-Comm.
9. International Critical Commentary.
10. Lange-Schaff-Comm.
11. Georg Hollman-Der Hebräerbrief.
12. Riggenbach-Einleitung und Commentar.
13. Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown Comm.
14. Meyer-Comm.
15. Farrar- The Early Days of Christianity.
16. Swete-Introduction to the O.T. in Greek.
17. Fairbairn-Typology of Scriptures, vol. I.II.
18. Alford-The Greek N.T.
19. Reuss-Geschichte der heiligen Schriften des N.T.
20. Rendall- Theology of Hebr. Christians.
21. Siegfried-Philo von Alexandrien.
22. BleekComm..vol. I.II.
23. M'Clintock and Strong Ency.
24. Selections from the LXX.-Conybeare and Stock..