§ 1] ITS AUTHORSHIP. \_ [aytrovucrioy.   
   
 were St. Paul that author, and any conceivable liebrew church those   
 readers, no more notices should be found, not perhaps of his Apostle-   
 ship, but of the revelations of the Lord to him, of his pure intent and   
 love towards them? Any one who can suppose this, appears to me, I   
 own,—however it may savour of presumption to say so,—deficient in   
 appreciation of tho phenomena of our Epistle, and still more of the   
 character of the great Apostle himself.   
 139. In Bleck’s Introduction to his Commentary, on which, in the   
 main features, this part of my Introduction is founded, several interest-   
 ing considerations are here adduced as bearing on the question of the   
 authorship, arising out of the manner in which various points which   
 arise are dealt with, as compared with the manner usual with St. Paul.   
 Such considerations are valuable, and come powerfully in aid of a con-   
 clusion otherwise foreed upon us: but when that conclusion is not   
 acquiesced in, they are easily diluted away by its opponents. They are   
 rather confirmatory than conclusive : and have certainly not had justice   
 done them by the supporters of the Pauline hypothesis ; who, as they   
 seem to themselves to have answered one after another of them, repre-   
 sent each in succession as the main ground on which the anti-pauline   
 view is rested.   
 140. I would refer my English readers for the discussion of these   
 points to Dr. Davidson’s Introduction to the New Test., vol. iii, where   
 they are for the most part treated fairly, though hardly with due appre-   
 ciation of their necessarily subordinate place in the argument. The   
 idea which a reader, otherwise uninformed, would derive from Dr.   
 Davidson’s paragraphs, is that those who allege these considerations   
 make them at least co-ordinate with others, of which they in reality only   
 come in aid.   
 141. The same may be said of the whole mass of evidence resting on   
 modes of citation, words only once found, style of periods, and the like.   
 It abounds on the one hand with striking coincidences, on the other with   
 striking discrepancies : each of these has been made much of by the   
 ardent fautors of each side,—while the more impartial Commentators   
 have weighed both together. The general conclusion in my own mind   
 derived from these is, that the author of this Epistle cannot have been   
 the same with the author of the Pauline Epistles. The coincidences are   
 for the most part those which belong to men of the same general cast   
 of thought on the great matters in hand: the discrepancies are in turns   
 of expression, use of different particles, different rhythm, different com-   
 pounds of cognate words, a mode of citation not independent but rather   
 divergent,—and a thousand minor matters which it is easy for those to   
 laugh to scorn who are incapable of estimating their combined evidence,   
 but which when combined render the hypothesis of one and the samo   
 author entirely untenable,   
 val