§1] ITS AUTHORSIIP. [intropuctioy.   
   
   
 written by one and the same. There is nothing in St. Luke of the rheto-   
 rical balaneo, nothing of the accumulated and stately period \*, nothing of   
 the deep tinge which would be visible even in narrative, of the threaten-   
 ing of judgment. Within the limits of the same heavenly inspiration   
 prompting both, St. Luke is rather the careful and kindly depicter of the   
 blessings of the covenant, our Writer rather the messenger from God to   
 the wavering, giving them the blessing and the enrse to choose between:   
 St. Luke is rather the polished Christian civilian, our Writer the fervid   
 and prophetic rhetorician. The places of the two are different : and it   
 would shake our confidence in the consistency of human characteristics   
 under the influence of the Holy Spirit, were we to believe Luke, the   
 beloved physician and Evangelist, to have become so changed, in the   
 foundations and essentials of personal identity, as to have written this   
 Epistle to the Hebrews.   
 165. If the preceding considerations have any weight, we must regard   
 the coincidences above mentioned as the result of common education and   
 manner of speech, and of common derivation of doctrine from the same   
 personal source. St, Luke had derived his style from the same Alexan-   
 drine scholastic training, his doctrine from the same father in the faith,   
 as the Writer of our Epistle.   
 166. It appears never to have been advanced as a serious hypothesis,   
 that St. Mark is the Writer of our Epistle. There are no points of   
 coincidence between it and his Gospel, which would lead us to think so.   
 He does not appear, after St. Paul’s second missionary journey, ever to   
 have been closely joined for any considerable time in travel or in mission-   
 ary work with that Apostle : and again, he scems to have been a born   
 Jerusalem Jew (Acts xii. 12: see Introd. to Vol. I. ch, iii. § 1), which,   
 by what has been before said, would exelude him.   
 167. The fact that Srtvanus, or Silas, belonged to the churel   
 salem (Acts xv. 22), would scem to exclude him also. In other points,   
 our tests are satisfied by him. He was the constant companion of St.   
 Paul: was imprisoned with him at Philippi (Acts xvi. 19 ff), while   
 Timotheus remained at large : is ever named by the Apostle before Timo-   
 theus (Acts xvii. 14, 15, xviii. 5 ; 2 Cor. i. 19; 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess.   
 i. 1): and afterwards is found in close connexion with St. Peter Jeru-   
 (1 Pet. v. 12). It must be acknowledged, that as far as mere negative   
 reasons are concerned, with only the one exception above named, there   
 seems no cause why Silvanus may not have written our Epistle. But   
 every thing approaching to a positive reason is altogether wanting. We   
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 2 This remark especially applies to that portion of St. Luke’s   
 be sure by the merely superficial observer to be cited as furn ing an answer to it;   
 viz. the prologue to his Gospel. No two styles can be more distinct, than that of this   
 preface, and of any equally elaborated passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews.   
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