intropvcTion.] THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS. [em xv   
   
 14, Again, the historical notices in our Epistle do not fit the hypo-   
 thesis in question. ‘The great notice of ch. ii. 3, would be strictly true   
 of any church rather than that of Jerusalem, or those in Palestine   
 generally. At any date that can reasonably be assigned for our Epistle   
 (see below, § iii.), must have beon many living in those churches,   
 who had heard the Lord for themselves. And though it may be said that   
 they had, properly speaking, received the tidings of salvation from those   
 that heard Him, yet such a body, among whom Jesus Himself had lived   
 and moved in the flesh, would surely not be one of which to predicate   
 the words in the text so simply and directly. Rather should we look for   
 one of which they might be from the first and without controversy true.   
 15. Another historical notice is found ch. vi. 10, who have ministered   
 to the saints, and do minister, which would be less applicable to the   
 churches of Jerusalem and Palestine, than to any others. For it was   
 they who were the objects, not the subjects of this ministration, through-   
 out the ministry of St. Paul: and certainly from what we know of   
 their history, their situation did not improve after that Apostle’s death.   
 This “ministration for the saints” was a duty enjoined by him on the   
 churches of Galatia (1 Cor. xvi. 1; Rom. xv. 26), Macedonia, and   
 Achaia, and doubtless by implication on other churches also (see Rom.   
 xii. 13): the saints being the poor believers at Jerusalem. And though,   
 as has been replied to this, some of the Jerusalem Christians may have   
 been wealthy, and able to assist their poorer brethren, yet we must   
 notice that the ministration here is predicated not of some among them,   
 but of the church, as such, in general : which could not be said of the   
 ehureh in Jerusalem,   
 16. There are some notices, on which no stress can be laid either way,   
 as for, or as against, the claim of the Jerusalem church. Such are, that   
 found ch. xii, 4, which in the note there we have seen reason to apply   
 rather 10 the figure there made use of, than to any concrete fact assign-   
 able in history: and that in ch. v. 12, which manifestly must not be   
 taken to imply that no teachers had at that time proceeded from the   
 particular church addressed, but that its members in general were behind   
 what might have been expected of them in spiritual knowledge.   
 17. It may again be urged, that the absence, no less than the presence   
 of historical allusions, makes against the hypothesis. If the Epistle   
 were addressed to the church at Jerusalem, it seems strange that no   
 allusion should be made in it to the fact that our Lord Himself had lived   
 and taught among them in the flesh, had before their eyes suffered death   
 on the Cross, had found among them the first witnesses of His Resur-   
 rection and Ascension.   
 18. If then we cannot fit our Epistle to the very widely spread   
 assumption that it was addressed to the Jewish Christians of Jerusalem   
 and Palestine, we must obviously put to the test, in search of its original   
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