

D. Mason

# Concordia Theological Monthly

Continuing

LEHRE UND WEHRE

MAGAZIN FUER EV.-LUTH. HOMILETIK

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY-THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

---

---

Vol. XVII

July, 1946

No. 7

---

---

## CONTENTS

	Page
Dr. Walther's Foreword for Volume XIV of "Lehre und Wehre," 1868 Tr. by Alex Wm. C. Guebert .....	481
The Author of Hebrews — A Fresh Approach E. L. Lueker .....	499
Outlines on the Standard Epistle Lessons .....	514
Miscellanea .....	524
Theological Observer .....	532
Book Review .....	550

---

---

Ein Prediger muss nicht allein *weiden*, also dass er die Schafe unterweise, wie sie rechte Christen sollen sein, sondern auch daneben den Woelfen *wehren*, dass sie die Schafe nicht angreifen und mit falscher Lehre verfuehren und Irrtum einfuehren.

*Luther*

Es ist kein Ding, das die Leute mehr bei der Kirche behaelt denn die gute Predigt. — *Apologie, Art. 24*

If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle? — *1 Cor. 14:8*

---

---

Published by the

Ev. Luth. Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, St. Louis 18, Mo.

This is the material which we felt we ought to present to our readers in the foreword of our periodical for the current year. In these closing words we bear testimony to the fact that nothing in the most recent theological writings, discussions, and events has changed our position. We still uphold the principle that whatever God has clearly and definitely decided in His holy Word dare not be accepted as an open question in the sense of modern theology. We vow that in the future too, in the editing of this journal, we shall let ourselves be guided by this principle.

In a special article\* in the next issue we shall show how untenable those reasons are by which men try to justify themselves in declaring those portions of divine revelation which have been presented to be open questions.

\* This article is found in translation in several numbers of this journal for 1939 under the heading: "The False Arguments for the Modern Theory of Open Questions." — ED. NOTE.

St. Louis, Mo.

---

## The Author of Hebrews A Fresh Approach

By E. L. LUEKER

The mystery surrounding the origin of the Letter to the Hebrews has led to endless speculation.<sup>1</sup> The addresses have been sought in Jewish congregations in Italy, in Jerusalem, in Palestine as a whole, in Antioch, in Asia Minor, in Alexandria, or even in some unknown hamlet between the Pillars of Hercules and Damascus. Scholars have also maintained that the congregation was not a Jewish congregation at all, but a Gentile-Jewish congregation probably located in Rome. Farthest from the traditions of the fathers are those who hold that the Letter was sent to a Gentile church.

Theories regarding the author are equally numerous and can be divided into three classes: 1) those which follow the

---

<sup>1</sup> It is unnecessary to repeat the voluminous bibliography for the various theories. If the reader is interested in the full presentation of any particular theory, he can find the bibliography in James Moffatt: *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*. The theories regarding the author have also been analyzed in a Concordia Seminary B. D. dissertation by R. H. Thies, 1944.

view which prevailed in the Church of the fourth and fifth centuries, namely, that Paul was the author; 2) those which agree with opinions held at the end of the second and at the beginning of the third centuries (Barnabas, Clement of Rome, Luke); 3) those which were developed on the basis of internal evidence alone. By far the majority in the last group champion Apollon. The authorship has been ascribed to Silas, Peter, Aristion, Philip, and Priscilla. Moffatt sounds a note of retreat when he says:<sup>2</sup>

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 διδάσκαλος of repute, with speculative gifts and literary culture; but to us he is a voice, and no more.

The purpose of this study is not to survey the opinions of other scholars, although they will be referred to when necessary.

Farrar and Weiss already noted that the quotations from the Old Testament in Hebrews followed Codex Alexandrinus (A) rather than Vaticanus (B).<sup>3</sup> Weiss used this evidence to oppose the Pauline authorship. It seems that Weiss and Farrar touched on a bit of evidence which warrants further study. This study was based upon Rahlfs' *Septuaginta* and Swete's *The Old Testament in Greek*. Rahlfs' *Genesis*, Sanders' *Old Testament Manuscripts* and editions of the Chester Beatty Papyri and Oxyrhynchus Papyri were also consulted.

Seventy-three instances in which variants were found either in the manuscripts of the Old Testament passages quoted in Hebrews or between the quotations in Hebrews and leading Old Testament manuscripts were studied. In sixteen instances the New Testament reading found no support in the leading Septuagint majuscules. The following table shows the agreement of Hebrews with the Old Testament manuscripts in the fifty-seven remaining instances:<sup>4</sup>

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, 442.

<sup>3</sup> Weiss, Bernhard, *Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 1886.

<sup>4</sup> Codex "A" is the well-known *Alexandrinus*, an uncial of the fifth century which contains the Old Testament and most of the New. "B" is the fourth century codex called *Vaticanus*. Most of Genesis is missing in this uncial. "S" is the manuscript discovered by Tischendorf and called *Sinaiticus*. It dates from the late fourth or early fifth century.

Heb. with A (Alexandrinus)	45
Heb. with B (Vaticanus)	23
Heb. with S (Sinaiticus)	28

The reader sees that in a number of instances the O. T. text, as quoted in HB, agrees not merely with one, but with several of the leading LXX witnesses. The following table shows the number of variants:

HB against A	12
HB against B	32
HB against S	29

A study of individual variants indicates even more clearly the agreement of the readings in the quotations of Hebrews with Manuscript A. Of the twelve disagreements with A, three at least were due to scribal errors in A, two of which were corrected by a later hand. In two other instances there is important manuscript support for the A reading in the New Testament manuscripts. Thus the number of variants would be reduced to seven. Two of these seven variants have F, the closest relative of A among the majuscules, as the only supporting manuscript in the Old Testament. Even without these explanations it is still apparent that the writer of Hebrews followed a text tradition which is remarkably well preserved in manuscripts AF.<sup>5</sup>

The tables are subject to slight error, since all the manuscripts supporting a reading and the variants are not always listed by Rahlfs and Swete. In order to remove the subjective element all variants of the O. T. passages quoted in the New were considered. Thus in Ps. 2:7, quoted in Heb. 1:5, MS. A has the scribal error γεγεννηκα. At other times the variants were due to a change in the word order (thus Heb. 10:37-38 follows the word order of A—μου εκ πιστεως, the rest have εκ πιστεως μου). Often the variant was due to the insertion of a word (διδους νομους, with A against the rest in Heb. 8:10) or to the fact that the words themselves were different (λεγει with A, whereas the rest have φησιν in Heb. 8:8). From this study it appeared that manuscript F, somewhat later than A, was often nearer the Palestinian text than A. Perhaps the most interesting variant in the passages quoted in Hebrews is found in Deut. 32:43. In this passage F and Theta (an early papyrus manuscript edited by Sanders) have the reading αγγελιοι, whereas all the other manuscripts have υιοι. The fact that the early Egyptian papyrus supports F indicates that we have in αγγελιοι the original reading, which was changed at an early date to υιοι to conform to the Hebrew. The writer of Hebrews followed the reading of F. The quotations in Hebrews in most instances also agree with Lambda (another early papyrus recently edited by Sanders).

<sup>5</sup> The possibility of a later corrector's changing the readings of Hebrews to agree with Manuscript A is very slight. Unless such changes were made on the original manuscript, they would have become apparent

Sanders describes AF as containing a Palestinian text.<sup>6</sup> This view is supported by the fact that Matthew, when quoting the LXX, tends to agree with the tradition preserved in AF.<sup>7</sup> Furthermore, the text tradition followed by Hebrews varies from the manuscript used by Philo in Egypt and by the Western writers, as we shall see later.<sup>8</sup>

After these preliminary observations we can approach the study of the individual theories, beginning with the one which holds that Paul is the author. The earliest external evidence

---

in the later manuscripts. Even if originally addressed to Jews in Palestine, the manuscript was at Rome at a very early date. Clement of Rome (chap. XXXVI of the First Epistle to the Corinthians) evidently quotes Ps. 104:4 from Hebrews. His quotation shows that his manuscript already had the characteristic A reading (*πυρος φλογα*). The letter was in Egypt at least by the beginning of the second century. Although here and there an attempt to change the reading to agree with the Egyptian tradition can be detected, the Egyptian manuscripts usually give the Palestinian text in quotations from the Old Testament. That, on the other hand, manuscripts AF were occasionally corrected to agree with New Testament readings has been observed by Sanders (*op. cit.*, 48). Such changes, however, seem to have been made at random, since there are many instances in which we should have expected a change if made by a conscientious redactor. Furthermore, there is no reason why more changes should have been made to conform with Hebrews and Mark (the latter being definitely addressed to the Gentile world and, according to Streeter, being somewhat neglected in the early Church and least handled by critics) than with other books of the New Testament. The fact that MSS. AF are usually supported by manuscripts of different families also opposes the thought that the A tradition was corrected to agree with the N. T. Sanders holds that the reading in Heb. 1:6 is the original LXX reading.

<sup>6</sup> *Op. cit.*, 48.

<sup>7</sup> Thus in 35 instances in which O. T. manuscripts varied, the author of Matthew followed A 27 times. Perhaps the most interesting is the quotation of the Commandments (Matt. 19:18). Matthew and Mark give the Commandments in the order found in A (*ου φονευσεις, ου μοιχευσεις, ου κλειψεις*), whereas Paul and Luke follow the order of B (*μη μοιχευσης, μη φονευσης, etc.*). In numerous instances Matthew has readings supported by A alone (Matt. 4:10: *προσκυνησεις*; Matt. 26:31: *προβατα της ποιμνης και διασκορπισθησονται*; etc.).

<sup>8</sup> The question has been much debated as to whether the author of Hebrews quoted from memory or copied from a manuscript. In the case of Matthew it is almost certain that the author quoted from memory, for in that way alone we can explain the mixed sources on which the author drew. The author of the Gospel of Mark also seems to have quoted from memory. For a Jew who began to study and memorize Sacred Scripture at the age of six it would certainly not be an unusual feat to quote the passages of Hebrews from memory. There are sufficient variations from our ancient manuscripts to justify the assumption that the author was quoting from memory. Furthermore, passages are not always quoted in the same way (Cf. 8:10 with 10:15). Nor is it unusual to find verses of a quotation transposed (Heb. 10:38) — which would not easily happen if the author were copying his quotations.

supporting this theory comes from Clement of Alexandria as quoted by Eusebius:

And now, as the blessed Presbyter used to say, since the Lord, as the Apostle of the Almighty, was sent to the Hebrews, Paul, as having been sent to the Gentiles, did not subscribe himself Apostle to the Hebrews, out of modesty and reverence for the Lord and because, being the herald and Apostle of the Gentiles, his writing to the Hebrews was something over and above.<sup>9</sup>

It has generally been assumed that the phrase "the blessed Presbyter" referred to Pantaenus, although there is no definite evidence for this. Nor do we know to what extent the "Presbyter" had investigated the problem. If Pantaenus had been definite in his statements that Paul was the author, it is doubtful whether Clement, his pupil, would have evolved the following theory:

In the Hypotyposes, in a word, he has made abbreviated narratives of the whole testamentary Scripture; and has not passed over the disputed books — I mean Jude and the rest of the Catholic Epistles and Barnabas and what is called the Revelation of Peter. And he says that the Epistle to the Hebrews is Paul's and was written to the Hebrews in the Hebrew language; but that Luke, having carefully translated it, gave it to the Greeks and hence the same coloring in the expression is discoverable in this Epistle and the Acts; and that the name "Paul, an Apostle" was very properly not prefixed, for, he says, that writing to the Hebrews, who were prejudiced against him and suspected, he with great wisdom did not repel them in the beginning by putting down his name.<sup>10</sup>

That this theory was not generally accepted in the East at the time of Clement is shown by the following statement of Origen, who lived approximately a half century later:

That the verbal style of the epistle entitled "To the Hebrews" is not rude like the language of the Apostle who acknowledged himself "rude in speech," that is, in expression, but that its diction is purer Greek, anyone who has the power to discern differences of phraseology will acknowledge. Moreover, that the thoughts of the epistle are admirable and not inferior to the acknowledged apostolic writings, anyone who carefully examines the apostolic text will admit. . . . If I gave my opinion, I should say that the thoughts are those of the apostle, but the diction and phraseology are those of some-

<sup>9</sup> Quoted in Eusebius, *Ch. Hist.*, VI, 14.

<sup>10</sup> *Loc. cit.*

one who remembered the apostolic teachings and wrote down at his leisure what had been said by his teacher. Therefore if any church holds that this epistle is by Paul, let it be commended for this. For not without reason have the ancients handed it down as Paul's. But who wrote the epistle in truth God knows. The statement of some who have gone before us is that Clement, bishop of the Romans, wrote the epistle, and of others, that Luke, the author of the Gospel and the Acts, wrote it.<sup>11</sup>

The statement "For not without reason have the ancients handed it down as Paul's"<sup>12</sup> evidently does not refer to statements by the ancients to the effect that Paul was the writer, for the succeeding sentences give the opinions of Origen's predecessors. Furthermore, there is no early manuscript evidence for a subscription ascribing the Epistle to Paul. Origen's words probably imply that the Epistle was handed down in the collection of Paul's writings.<sup>13</sup>

Although Clement of Alexandria and Origen felt that Hebrews could only indirectly be attributed to Paul, they, in their writings, often loosely referred to the Epistle as Paul's.<sup>14</sup> This practice was continued in the Eastern Church, until finally the Epistle was generally accepted as Paul's.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>11</sup> Quoted in Eusebius, *op. cit.*, VI, 25, 11.

<sup>12</sup> Οὐ γὰρ εἰκῆ οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες ὡς παύλου αὐτὴν παραδεδώκασιν.

<sup>13</sup> The Chester Beatty Papyrus (P<sup>46</sup>) has Hebrews after Romans. Codices Sinaiticus and Alexandrinus insert it between Thessalonians and Timothy. The Eastern Church usually put Hebrews between Paul's ecclesiastical and private Epistles. The West placed Hebrews after Paul's Letters.

<sup>14</sup> Clement of Alexandria: *Strom.* I, 5; *Frag.* (preserved by Casiodorus) I; *et multi*. Origen: *De Prin.*, I, II, 7; I, V, 1; III, II, 4; *et multi*.

<sup>15</sup> Eusebius was of the opinion that Clement was the translator of the Epistle (*Ecc. Hist.*, iii, 28, 2). He knew that the Pauline authorship was denied in the West (*op. cit.*, iii, 3, 5; VI, 2, 3). Once he places Hebrews in a class with the wisdom of Solomon (*op. cit.*, V, 26, 1). In spite of these statements, however, he classifies the Epistle as Paul's (*op. cit.*, III, 3, 4; II, 17, 12; VI, 14). After the time of Eusebius the view generally prevailed in the East that Paul was the author. In addition to the authors mentioned, the following early Alexandrian writers refer to Hebrews as Paul's: Dionysius (*Frag. Ante-Nicene Fathers*, VI, 98); Peter Can. *Ep.*, ix; Alexander (*Ep. on Arian Heresy*, ii, 3); Theognostus (*Frag.* 3 from Athanasius, *Ep.* 4). Later Alexandrian authors (Athanasius, Didymus, Cyril, Euthalius) continue the tradition established at Alexandria. In the early church at Antioch, Theophilus probably refers to the Epistle (*Autolycus*, ii, 31) but does not ascribe it to Paul. The later church at Antioch (Council of Antioch of 264, Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret) was probably influenced by the Alexandrian tradition. Origen and Eusebius brought the Alexandrian tradition to Palestine, where it was followed by later writers (Cyril, Epiphanius, John of Damascus). In the ancient Syriac Document, *Teaching*

A survey of the evidence of the East during the end of the second and the beginning of the third century reveals the following facts: 1) The Epistle was referred to as Paul's, even by those who state that he was not the actual writer, probably because the real author was unknown and because it was handed down together with the writings of Paul; 2) Paul could only indirectly be considered the author; 3) Although the writer was unknown, the names of Luke and Clement were frequently suggested.

When we turn our attention to the West, we are sure at least of one thing from Hebrews: some Italians knew who the author of Hebrews was.<sup>16</sup> Clement of Rome is the first writer to quote the Epistle, but he does not ascribe it to Paul.<sup>17</sup> From Apostolic days to the time of Jerome and Augustine, Western authors either say nothing concerning the Pauline origin of Hebrews or deny it. The Muratorian Canon omits it;<sup>18</sup> Marcion<sup>19</sup> denied its genuineness, so did Hippolytus,<sup>20</sup> Irenaeus,<sup>21</sup> Gaius,<sup>22</sup> Tertullian.<sup>23</sup> Jerome and Augustine brought about its acceptance in the West, chiefly because it was regarded as Paul's Epistle in the East. The testimony of the East (with the possible exception of Pantaenus) and the

---

*of the Apostles*, Heb. 10:33 may be quoted. In Syria, at a later date, we find the Epistle ascribed to Paul (Aphraates, Ephraem, Peshitto). Polycarp is often quoted as indicating that the Pauline authorship was accepted at a very early date in Asia Minor. Polycarp may refer to Hebrews (*Phil.* xii; vi), but he does not ascribe the Epistle to Paul. According to a *fragment* (9), Melito of Sardis ascribed Hebrews to an Apostle. Methodius (*Banquet of the Virgins*, iv, i; v, 7; x, 1; vi, 5; *Disc. on Res.*, 1, 5) quotes the Epistle. Later writers in Asia Minor (Basil, the Gregorys, Council of Laodicea) support the Pauline authorship.

<sup>16</sup> Heb. 13:24.

<sup>17</sup> 1 Clement XXXVI. Cf. Hermas, *Vis.* iii, vii, 2; iv, ii, 4.

<sup>18</sup> Some have conjectured a reference to Hebrews in the phrase *ad Alexandrinus*.

<sup>19</sup> Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* IV, 5.

<sup>20</sup> Photius, *Bibl. Cod.* 121. This is supported by the fact that Hippolytus, although a pupil of Irenaeus, does not quote Hebrews while at Rome.

<sup>21</sup> Photius, *op. cit.*, 232. Eusebius mentions that Irenaeus in a treatise entitled *The Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching* quotes Hebrews and the Wisdom of Solomon (v. 26, 1). Irenaeus quotes Hebrews (*Against Heresies*, III, 6, 5), and according to a *fragment* (37) he quotes the Epistle as Pauline.

<sup>22</sup> Eusebius, *E. H.*, VI, XX.

<sup>23</sup> Tertullian advanced the Barnabas theory, as we shall note below. Novatian (*Trin.* 31) may have a reference to Heb. 5:7. I have found no quotation in Hippolytus or many lesser Roman writers (Minucius Felix, Dionysius, etc.).



West during the second and third centuries does not point to Paul as the actual writer. Later the Pauline tradition prevailed in both East and West.

The internal evidence has been thoroughly studied and the conclusion has been repeatedly reached from the time of Origen to modern times that the Epistle was not written by Paul. "It is superfluous to labor this point . . . one need not take sledge hammers to doors that are open."

We have already pointed out that Weiss used the argument of LXX manuscripts against Paul where O. T. quotations come into consideration. Paul follows Manuscript B more than the other O. T. manuscripts. Thus, whereas the author of Hebrews followed A most closely, S next, and B least, the author of Romans followed B the most, A next, and S least. The manuscript evidence therefore weighs heavily against the authorship of Paul.<sup>24</sup>

Thus the external and internal evidence is against the Pauline authorship.

The combination theories evolved by Clement of Alexandria and Origen are also unsatisfactory. The Paul-Luke combination has attracted such scholars as Calvin, Hug, Ebrard, Delitzsch, Field, Zill, Huyghe, Grotius, and Lewis. Although there are some similarities of style between the Epistle to the Hebrews and Luke's writings, the argument based on style is unsatisfactory.<sup>25</sup> Furthermore, the evidence of the quotations is also against the Lukan authorship. The quotations of Acts are not so exact as those of Hebrews, and the text tradition followed by Luke resembles that followed by Paul.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> A study based on 49 variants showed that Romans agrees with A 29 times, with B 32 times, and with S 16 times. Romans varied from A 20 times, from B 17 times, and from S 33 times.

<sup>25</sup> Moffatt, *op. cit.*, 435 f.

<sup>26</sup> The fact that Luke followed B when quoting the Commandments (footnote 7) in itself indicates that Luke inclined to the Egyptian tradition, at least more than the author of Matthew. A count based on 55 readings shows that the author of Acts agrees with A and B 34 times and with S 28 times. When Luke followed a tradition preserved in A, it is usually supported by a tradition preserved either in S or Q (Q represents a tradition current in Egypt especially at the time of the Hesychian recension). Acts seldom follows F when this manuscript is unsupported by other manuscripts but often opposes F. The readings followed by Luke and Paul are almost equidistant from A and B.

Nor can we look to Clement as the translator. The fact that in his first epistle Clement had many thoughts similar to those in Hebrews naturally led to the consideration of him as author.<sup>27</sup> But the differences in style are too great to warrant his authorship, and the manuscript evidence also opposes this hypothesis.<sup>28</sup>

The theories which hold that Silas or Peter or Aristion or Philip or Priscilla is the author of Hebrews are too hypothetical, and the evidence supporting them is still too meager to receive detailed treatment.

There is a theory, however, based on internal evidence alone, which has received serious consideration, namely, the conjecture which was first voiced by Luther, although not without precedent, to the effect that Apollos was the author of Hebrews.<sup>29</sup> It was only natural that the search among the followers of Paul for a writer capable of writing the fine style of Hebrews would fix upon Apollos. According to the Book of Acts he was born at Alexandria, and this fact would make it easy to account for the Alexandrian influences in Hebrews. Furthermore, according to Acts, he was "an eloquent man and mighty in the Scriptures. . . . This man was instructed in the way of the Lord; and being fervent in the spirit, he spake and taught diligently the things of the Lord, knowing only the Baptism of John." After his conversion "he mightily convinced the Jews, and that publicly, showing by the Scriptures that Jesus was the Christ."<sup>30</sup> Paul in his Letter to the Corinthians speaks of Apollos in terms of respect.

<sup>27</sup> Eusebius, iii, 28, 2.

<sup>28</sup> Much dependence cannot be placed on manuscript studies of the Fathers, because the manuscripts are late and the evidence has not been compiled as completely as is the case in New Testament readings. An examination of twenty-four readings in which there were variants in O. T. majuscules quoted showed that Clement followed B 10 out of 13, A 15 out of 24, and S 14 out of 24 times.

<sup>29</sup> It is not known to what extent Luther had investigated the problem. He mentions Apollos' authorship incidentally in a sermon on 1 Cor. 3. Speaking of the author in another connection, Luther indicated that he was not the first to advance the Apollos theory: "etliche meinen, sie sei St. Lucas, etliche Apollos". Cf. Leipoldt, *Geschichte des N. T. Kanons*, ii, 77. The theory has been defended by Semler, Osiander, Ziegler, Bleek, Reuss, de Wette, Kurtz, Schott, Luetterbeck, Luenemann, Tholuck, Credner, Riehm, Feilmoser, Alford, Moulton, Meyer, Hilgenfeld, Plumtre, Bartlet, Pfeiderer, Albano, Buechsel, Farrar, Selwyn, von Soden, Belser, Klostermann, Schuetze, and most Lutheran scholars, the most recent being Lenski.

<sup>30</sup> Acts 18: 24 ff.

Taking into consideration these facts, scholars have pointed to the Apollos theory as the most plausible of those based on internal evidence alone.

We must be careful, however, not to stretch the measuring line too tightly.<sup>31</sup> The author of the speech in Acts 7 was certainly also ἀνήρ λόγιος, δυνατὸς ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς, ζέων τῷ πνεύματι.<sup>32</sup>

Although some facts may be urged in support of the Apollos authorship, there are also weighty considerations against it. We would expect Apollos, if he had a strong Alexandrian background, to use manuscript traditions of Egypt<sup>33</sup> or, failing that, to use the tradition of Paul or Luke. There is no evidence indicating that he was trained in Palestine or had ever been there.

<sup>31</sup> The New Testament tells us only that Apollos was an Alexandrian "by birth" (τῷ γένει). There is no reason for assuming that he spent the greater part of his life there or was trained in the Alexandrian university rather than in some other school (that of Tyrannus in Ephesus). The fact that he "knew only the Baptism of John" does not necessarily prove that he had been in Palestine, since a sect which professed to carry on the teachings of John the Baptist existed far into the Christian era. That he had "the noble distinction of having been the first to lead Alexandria to Bethlehem" is a myth, contradicted by the evidence of early Christianity. An "elucidation" in Roberts-Donaldson, *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, attempts to defend the view that Apollos influenced the rise of the great Christian school at Alexandria (vi, 236). The chief evidence given is that Apollos was born at Alexandria and that Acts 18:24 is quoted in such a way in Alexandria as to lead one to believe that Apollos was known and loved at Alexandria. But Acts 18:24 is not quoted in the *Ante-Nicene Fathers*. Early Alexandrian writers do not even mention Apollos (Clement *et al.*).

<sup>32</sup> Stephen was also a speaker who was full of the Holy Ghost. The word λογίος may mean "learned" (Democritus, 30; Aristotle, *Pol.*, 1267 b), but that does not seem to have been the usual meaning during the Alexandrian period. The word originally had the meaning "versed in tales" (Pindar, *Pyth.*, I, 94; *Nem.* VI, 45; Herodotus, I, 1; Polybius VI, 45, 1). The word is often used during the Alexandrian period for "skill in words." Aristotle is said to have called Theophrastus τὸν λογιώτατον (*Str.* xiii, 2, 4). Plutarch (*Pomp.*, 51) uses the word simply for the ability to talk. It was an epithet of Hermes as god of eloquence (Lucian, *Apol.*, 2). Technically it was a synonym for the elevated style (Demetrius, *On Style*, 38). It also had the meaning "oracular." The style of Hebrews, strictly speaking, is not "elevated." All we can deduce from v. 24 is that Apollos was a forceful speaker who ably marshaled Scriptural evidence.

<sup>33</sup> An examination of variants in the first eighty paragraphs of Philo, *On Drunkenness* (this work was selected rather than a section in which the Old Testament is quoted in sequence, since the chances for correction would be less), shows that Philo followed the reading preserved in B and its correctors 15 out of 17 times; S (Sinaiticus), 20 out of 27; A, 16 out of 33; F, 6 out of 21 times when quoting the LXX.

The early church fathers say nothing of the Apollos authorship. Clement of Rome, who mentioned Apollos,<sup>34</sup> in no way indicated that he considered him the author of Hebrews. The silence of Clement and Origen, who were from Alexandria and who undoubtedly surveyed the list of Paul's followers for possible authors, speaks against the theory.

Although Hebrews follows the thought patterns of Egypt, it also shows rabbinic influence.<sup>35</sup> This fact points to an author who was trained not only at Alexandria, but also at Jerusalem. Furthermore, the West was ready to accept the writings of Luke and Mark because of their relationship to the Apostles. Would it have hesitated to accept a work written by Apollos, whom Clement of Rome (1 Cl. XLVII) already called a man approved by the Apostles?

The theme of Apollos was the Messiahship of Jesus. That of the author of the Hebrews was the superiority of the priesthood of Christ to that of the Old Testament dispensation. Finally, if Hebrews was addressed to Jews in Palestine, as antiquity maintains, the authorship of Apollos would become still less probable.

There is a definite tradition handed down from antiquity regarding the author of Hebrews. Tertullian does not conjecture that Barnabas is the author of Hebrews; it is the only view known to him. He would gladly have assigned the Epistle to an Apostle if that had been possible, for he quotes the Epistle in support of his view on repentance:<sup>36</sup>

<sup>34</sup> 1 Clement, xlvii, 3.

<sup>35</sup> Weiss (*op. cit.*, 328 ff.) shows that many characteristics of the Letter attributed to the influence of Philo and Alexandria really were of Palestinian origin and adds: "Riehm (*Der Lehrbegr. des Hebraerbriefs*. Ludwigsburg, 1858) hat ueberzeugend nachgewiesen, wie die Vorstellungen des Verf. von den beiden Weltaltern, von der Vermittlung des Gesetzes durch die Engel, von dem Satan als Gewalthaber des Todes, von den Engeln, von der Sabbathruhe des Volkes Gottes, von dem himmlischen Heiligthum und dem himmlischen Jerusalem palaestinisischen Ursprungs sind, weshalb man auch ganz mit Unrecht in den letzteren die metaphysische Unterscheidung Philos zwischen der unsichtbaren, unvergaenglichen, urbildlichen Welt und der sichtbaren, vergaenglichen Erscheinungswelt gesucht hat."

<sup>36</sup> *De Pud.*, 20. That Tertullian has Hebrews in mind here is proved by the fact that he quotes Heb. 6:1 ff. Tertullian is not the only ancient writer who held this view. "In the *Tractatus Origenis de Libris ss. Scripturarum* (ed. Batiffol, Paris, 1900, p. 108), as by Philastrius, Heb. 13:15 is quoted as a word of 'sanctissimus Barnabas'" (quoted from Moffatt, *op. cit.*). Also Jerome was acquainted with the view of Tertullian. Codex Claromontanus (D), whose stichometry, according to Weiss, Tertullian follows, places Hebrews after all the Apostolic letters.

I wish, however, redundantly to superadd the testimony likewise of one particular comrade of the Apostles — (a testimony) aptly suited for confirming, by most proximate right, the discipline of his masters. For there is extant withal an Epistle to the Hebrews, under the name of Barnabas — a man sufficiently accredited by God, as being one whom Paul has stationed next to himself in the uninterrupted observance of abstinence: "Or else, I alone and Barnabas, have we not the power of working?" And, of course, the Epistle of Barnabas is more generally received among the churches than that apocryphal "Shepherd" of adulterers.

We wish to emphasize in this article that the manuscript tradition followed by Hebrews supports the Barnabas theory. Barnabas spent some time at Jerusalem and also at Antioch and thus could be expected to use a Palestinian text tradition. As a Levite he would undoubtedly have access to manuscripts in his own country and elsewhere. But even stronger evidence for the Barnabas theory is the fact that his cousin Mark, when quoting the LXX, used the same text tradition which was used by the author of Hebrews.<sup>37</sup>

The fact that Clement of Rome made much use of Hebrews and seems to have preferred it even to some writings of Paul is easily explained if Barnabas was the author of Hebrews. For according to the *Constitution of the Holy Apostles*,<sup>38</sup> the *Recognitions of Clement*,<sup>39</sup> and the *Clementine Homilies*,<sup>40</sup> Clement was acquainted with Christianity by Barnabas. Although these documents contain some things which are evidently spurious, still the statement that Clement was converted by Barnabas is probably true, for it would be difficult to explain the origin of the theory if it were not true. Writers at Rome would have been inclined to assign Clement's conversion to Peter, Paul, Luke, Mark, Timothy.

---

That Tertullian and his followers were well acquainted with the Letter to the Hebrews is shown by his numerous quotations from the Letter. The African letter *Against the Heretic Novatian*, written 254—256, quotes Heb. 10:30 (ch. ix). Cyprian also knew it. Heb. 6:4 ff. was quoted by Montanists in North Africa against the acceptance of those who had lapsed from the faith.

<sup>37</sup> Mark, like Matthew, often follows the Hebrew and Aramaic and at times a translation unknown to us. Where he follows the LXX, he agrees with A 13 out of 15 times; where the O. T. manuscripts differ, he agrees with B 4 out of 15 and with S 3 out of 15 times.

<sup>38</sup> vi, 2, 8.

<sup>39</sup> vii-viii. That the *Recognitions* are of great antiquity is shown by the fact that they are quoted by Origen in his Commentary on Genesis.

<sup>40</sup> i, 8 ff.

Since Barnabas' home was on the island of Cyprus, he was in close contact with Alexandrian ideas from his youth. Furthermore, according to a well-established tradition, Mark brought the Gospel to Alexandria.<sup>41</sup> The early writings which mention the fact that Barnabas converted Clement also describe Barnabas' preaching at Alexandria. It is probable that Barnabas and Mark went to Alexandria after their separation from Paul at Antioch. Mark, within a few years after that separation, redeemed himself completely in the eyes of Paul, a thing which would hardly have happened if Barnabas and Mark had confined their activity to the island of Cyprus.

Scholars have objected to the Barnabas theory because of the excellent style in Hebrews. "It is inconceivable that Barnabas should have written better Greek than Luke." This is a guess and no more. The evidence of the New Testament indicates that Barnabas was highly trained. When Paul returned to Jerusalem after his conversion, it was Barnabas who led him to the other disciples. This indicates that Barnabas knew Paul, perhaps having made his acquaintance in some school of higher learning. Barnabas' home, as stated before, was in Cyprus, where the Jews shared the liberal attitudes of Western Jews rather than those of Jews in Jerusalem and the East (Acts 11:20). When Grecians were converted at Antioch, Barnabas was selected as the man most capable of caring for them (Acts 11:22. Some manuscripts have the variant reading "Hellenes"). Barnabas' seeking out Paul as his co-worker indicates a kinship of spirit; and his recognizing the qualifications of the Apostle, who was still distrusted by the rest, is one of the greatest tributes to his deep wisdom. Barnabas labored alongside the Apostle Paul without yielding his individuality to him. At Lystra, Barnabas was regarded as Zeus, a thing which certainly indicates the dignity of his character.

The internal evidence of Hebrews also favors the Bar-

---

<sup>41</sup> The liturgy early used in the patriarchate of Alexandria has the sentence: "Especially remember those whose memory we celebrate this day, and our holy father Mark, the Apostle and Evangelist, who has shown us the way of salvation." — *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vii, 568. At the end of the *Acts of Barnabas*, Mark is described as taking up his abode at Alexandria after his cousin's death. Eusebius records the year in which Mark gave up the leadership in Alexandria: "In the eighth year of the reign of Nero, Annianus was the first after Mark the Evangelist to receive charge of the diocese of Alexandria" (*E. H.*, ii, xxiv).

nabas theory. Thinking of the emphasis placed by the sacred writers on leading ideas, one may say that to James, Christ was a lawgiver, the Giver of the perfect law of liberty; to Paul, Christ was the Messiah, the second Adam, who redeemed the human race, and the great teacher of the mystery of the righteousness of God; to the writer of Hebrews, Christ is the great High Priest, who has brought the perfect sacrifice for mankind and acts as intermediary between man and God. Moses is mentioned, not as a great lawgiver, but as a man who was faithful in his house. At a time when rabbis had displaced priests in popular esteem and outstanding writers dwelt little on the priesthood, the Letter to the Hebrews sounds like a voice from within the sanctuary.

Heb. 2:3 supports the theory that the author was a person who was very close to the original disciples and those that heard Jesus. Whereas Apollos received his Gospel from Aquila and Priscilla and later from Paul, the writer of Hebrews speaks as though he were acquainted with the original disciples.<sup>42</sup>

Even those who reject the Barnabas theory regard it as unfair to press the so-called inaccuracies regarding the Temple worship against the likelihood of the Levite's authorship, inasmuch as Hebrews refers, not to the Temple, but to the tabernacle. Would it be unlikely that a Levite, barred from the service in the Temple because of his adherence to the new "sect," should abandon the worship of his day and turn to the Old Testament? Also the fact that the author of Hebrews follows the Septuagint when it differs from the Massoretic text cannot be urged against Barnabas' authorship, because Paul, a Hebrew of the Hebrews, at times did the same.<sup>43</sup>

Some have urged the reference to Timothy as being in opposition to the Barnabas theory. But Mark, the cousin of Barnabas, undoubtedly associated with Timothy in Ephesus and Rome; and it should not appear strange to us if Barnabas

---

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Eusebius, *E. H.*, vii, ii, 1. Eusebius quotes Clement of Alexandria as writing: "To James the Just and John and Peter, the Lord after His resurrection imparted knowledge. These imparted it to the rest of the Apostles, and the rest of the Apostles to the Seventy, of whom Barnabas was one" (cf. i, xii; ii, i.). Heb. 2:3 does not remove the possibility of the author's having seen or heard Jesus. The disciples "confirmed" (ἐβεβαιώθη) the teachings of the Lord. The evidence of the New Testament does not indicate that Barnabas was one of the Seventy.

<sup>43</sup> Rom. 9:25 (Toy, *Quotations in the N. T.*, 141); 9:27; 9:33; et al.

also was a close friend of Timothy, especially if he had contacts in Rome. The criticism that Barnabas was older than Paul and therefore could not have survived him is not substantiated. It was based on the false view which made Mark Barnabas' nephew and on the fact that Barnabas was regarded as Zeus at Lystra.

The *Epistle of Barnabas* existed in Egypt at a very early date and was regarded by the ancients as a work of Barnabas.<sup>44</sup> The internal evidence shows that it was written after the fall of Jerusalem.<sup>45</sup> Modern scholars are generally agreed that this Barnabas letter is a forgery. Its spuriousness is also attested by the tradition followed in its quotations.<sup>46</sup> The publication, however, of this letter under Barnabas' name indicates two things: 1) Barnabas was connected with Alexandria; 2) Barnabas was regarded as having written one or more Epistles. The fact that this *Pseudo-Barnabas* was attributed to him could have prevented Alexandrian scholars from discovering their mistaken view in regard to the author of Hebrews.

If Barnabas wrote the Letter to the Hebrews, it is not difficult to explain the differences between the East and West regarding its canonicity. Since Antioch and Jerusalem considered Paul and Barnabas as fellow missionaries, they would associate them in their thoughts. Therefore a letter of Barnabas might easily be placed alongside one of Paul. In the West, however, Paul and his immediate co-workers overshadowed Barnabas. A personal friend of Barnabas, like Clement of Rome, might regard his letter highly; but others, who knew him only from Acts, would value his Epistle much less than one written by Paul's later co-workers.

The Pauline thoughts in Hebrews can also be accounted for if the Barnabas theory is adopted. For Barnabas was a co-worker of Paul at a time when the Apostle was much interested in Jews and probably often heard the Apostle speak on themes pertaining to the relationship between the old and the new dispensation.

Concordia, Mo.

---

<sup>44</sup> Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.*, ii, vi.

<sup>45</sup> Chap. xvi. There may be a reference to Rev. 1:7, 13 in chap. vii, 9, which would place it beyond the time of the early disciples.

<sup>46</sup> The quotations incline more to the Egyptian MSS. SBQ, although A was followed much more than was the case with Philo, especially in the group SAQ.