

was confirmed unto *us* by *them* that heard."

Surely there should be no hesitation in classing this writer as being post-apostolic. Nothing but the wish to give undue authority to his writings could have given birth to the contrary thought, in the face of such clear internal evidence against such claim.

Again, the style of the composition is so radically different that every law of the human mind known to us must be violated to make it possible for Romans and Hebrews to be the production of one and the same individual.

Plainly, then, in considering the book of Hebrews we have to do with a writer who is telling forth his views from the vantage ground of an after generation. That this generation was one of the first which succeeded apostolic times is extremely likely, but which, we think, is not accurately known.

But, having broken through the superstition which insists upon the authority of every verse of the epistle as being on a par with that of Jesus, we can now examine it with healthy mind and learn the lessons connected therewith.

And first, it is no small boon to have this legacy of one of the early thinkers handed down to us as a possession, if for no other reason than to gratify our legitimate curiosity.

We look upon it as a decided link between Paul and the writings of the *Fathers*—those whose writings and names are known to be rightly connected.

It is evident, from a cursory reading of the whole epistle, that the *schemê* of *redemption*, as brought out and elaborated by Augustine and others, was brought forward a stage as compared with Paul's vague hints, and shaped somewhat more definitely; and yet not so definitely and elaborately as found in the writings of the after centuries.

The chief object of this writer seems to be to draw parallelisms between Judaism and Christianity, and make the one explain the other. As Christianity had already become hopelessly legalistic, this fact, of course, made the task an easier one, but at the same time easily and naturally introduced foundational errors into the comparisons instituted.

It is very difficult, however, to get at the real views of this writer, especially concerning the atonement. And this is tantamount to saying, concerning his most important beliefs, for the epistle principally revolves about this subject. In the bulk of his allusions to Christ he almost invariably makes all his dignities, whether in the past, present or future, to be the distinct gift of the Father.

If then he held the now orthodox opinion that Christ was almighty in himself, and so, equal to the Father in power and all other attributes, he does not undertake to solve the difficulty as to how these things could be a gift and apparently given as a reward for his sufferings for man. Therefore, what his real, definite opinions were, is not such an easy matter to determine, except, of course, to those who hold certain views about Christ, and go to the Epistle to the Hebrews to have them confirmed.

Take a few instances of his connecting the dignity of Christ with the gift of the Father:

"And when he again *bringeth* in the first-born into the world he saith: "And let all the angels of God worship him."

"Therefore God, *thy* God, *hath* anointed thee."

"For it became him to *make* the author of their salvation perfect through sufferings."

"Who was faithful to him that *appointed* him as also was Moses."

"And having been *made* perfect."

"And *made* higher than the heavens."