§1] ITS AUTHORSHIP. (intropuction.   
   
 (who inclines to Apollos as the author, but sees an improbability in   
 his ever having been in so close a relation to the Jewish Christians of   
 Palestine), Tholuck (whose very valuable and candid enquiry in his   
 last edition results in a leaning towards Apollos as the Writer), Bleck   
 (whose view is mainly the same), Wieseler (who supports Barnabas as   
 the probable Writer), Liinemann (who strongly upholds Apollos), Ebrard   
 (who holds St. Paul to have been the Author, St. Luke the Writer),   
 Delitzsch (who holds St. Luke to have been the Writer).   
 109, The principal modern upholders of the purely Pauline author-   
 ship in Germany have been Bengel (died 1752), Storr (1789), and   
 recently Hofmann.   
 110, In our own country, the belief of the direct Pauline origin,   
 though much shaken at the Reformation’, has recovered its ground far   
 more extensively. The unwillingness to disturb settled opinion on the   
 one hand, and it may be the disposition of our countrymen to take up   
 opinions in furtherance of strong party bias, and their consequent inapti-   
 tude for candid critical research on the other, have mainly contributed to   
 this result. Most of our reeent Theologians and Commentators are to   
 be found on this side. Among these may be mentioned Whitby, Mack-   
 night, Doddridge, Lardner, Stuart (American), Forster (Apostolical   
 Authority of the Epistle to the Ilebrews), Conybeare and Ilowson (Life   
 of St. Paul), Davidson (Introd. to New Test.), and Dr. Wordsworth, in   
 the reeently published third vol. of his Greek Testament.   
 111. Iam obliged, before passing to the internal grounds on which   
 the question is to be treated, to lay down again the position in which we   
 are left by the preceding sketch of the history of opinion.   
 112. It is manifest that with testimony so divided, antiquity cannot   
 claim to close up the enquiry: nor can cither side allege its voice as   
 decisive. In the very carliest times, we find the Epistle received by   
 some as St. Panl’s: in the same times, we find it ascribed by others,   
 and those men of full as much weight, to various other authors.   
 113. I briefly thus restate what has already been insisted on in para-   
 graphs 35—40, because the time has not yet entirely passed by, when   
 writers on the subject regard our speculations concerning the probable   
 author of the Epistle as limited by these broken fragments of the rumours   
 of antiquity : when a zealous and diligent writer among ourselves allows   
 himself to treat with levity and contempt the opinion that Apollos   
 wrote it, simply on the ground that he is a claimant “altogether un-   
 noticed by Christian antiquity®.” What we require is this: that we of   
 ihis age should be allowed to do just that which the “ancient men” did   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
 1 Sce the opinions of several of the Reformers below, § vi. par. 17 ff.   
 2 See Forster’s Apostolieal Authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews, Dedication,   
 prix   
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