

Paul's Authorship of The Epistle to the Hebrews

By S H Lim

The Epistle to the Hebrews was widely accepted as the Apostle Paul's from the earliest times and included in the canon of the New Testament as such.

In the Eastern Church, Pantaenus, the leading teacher of Alexandria, affirmed this as early as AD 150. Eusebius (AD 263 – 340) referred to “fourteen epistles of Paul” and to Clement of Alexandria (AD 150 – 215)'s view that Paul wrote Hebrews in Hebrew, which Luke translated into Greek. Jerome of Jerusalem (AD 347 – 420) and Augustine of North Africa (AD 354 – 430) considered Hebrews to be Paul's. In several early Greek manuscripts, all the Pauline epistles are grouped together with Hebrews. Only Origen¹ (AD 185 – 254) questioned Paul's authorship while however acknowledging that “The men of old handed it down as Paul's.”

In the Western Church, Tertullian (AD 160 – 230) was regarded to “actually accept Hebrews because it derived from the apostles, specifically Paul” albeit his writings was hard to decipher leading some to think that he regarded Barnabas as the author.

By the 4th Century AD, the canon of the Bible was settled; being accepted by the African Synod in Hippo, the Councils of Carthage and the Western Church. As we travel down church history, the view that Paul wrote Hebrews remained preponderant. Thomas Aquinas taught this. The Council of Trent (1545 - 1563) declared fourteen Pauline epistles. The Belgic Confession (1561), the Second Helvetic Confession (1562) and the King James Version of the Bible (1611), John Owen, the Matthew Henry Commentary, Matthew Poole, Louis Gaussen and Jonathan Edwards all ascribed Hebrews to Paul, a view held through successive generations.

During the flux of the Reformation, Martin Luther suggested Apollos as the author but then struggled to remove Hebrews with James, Jude and Revelations from his German Luther Bible, finally placing these four last therein. Dean Alford, Franz Delitzsch and others later followed down the novel trail, throwing up various suggestions such as Clement of Rome, Luke and Priscilla. Today with our greater knowledge, all these alternate suggestions are now known to be fully implausible, leaving us in a current resigned state: the dismal, sad and wrong “*author unknown, unknowable or unimportant to know*” consensus.

In preparing this paper, I am most indebted to the late Dr J Sidlow Baxter², who answered the key objections against Paul's authorship of Hebrews, and who saw incisively that “*to settle the human authorship of Hebrews is as necessary to our edifying study of its contents as to the recognition of its supernatural inspiration.*” He acknowledged difficulties of the subject but observing that all the eminent scholars were quite inconsistent, averred, “Still, we will bravely hazard our considered opinion, because the scholars greatly disagree.” If more had carefully read Dr Baxter's cogent treatise on the subject, perhaps this paper may not be necessary.

We now put forward the clear observations in proof of Paul's authorship of Hebrews: -

¹ Origen Adamantius was a prolific writer, who taught at the Catechetical School at Alexandria where Clement had taught until he was expelled by the patriarch of Alexandria. He produced the Hexapla, a revised Septuagint and various Bible commentaries. He articulated an allegorical interpretation of scripture and taught that the soul passes through stages of incarnation before reaching God and even demons were reunited with God; and God was the First Principle, and Christ, the Logos, was subordinate to him - views later declared anathema by the Church.

² See “Explore the Book”, Zondervan Press (6 volumes in 1) 1966, ‘Who Wrote Hebrews?’ p 274-280

1. **The Apostolic basis of the New Testament Canon** underscores Paul's authorship.

The church is built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself the chief cornerstone. (Eph 2:20). This foundation is the *Old Testament* penned by the Prophets beginning with Moses from Genesis to Malachi, and the *New Testament* penned by the Apostles or those very close to them from Matthew to Revelations.

Mark's Gospel is based on Peter's first-hand account (1 Pet 5:13). Luke, Paul's missionary companion to the Graeco-Roman world unto the end, prepared his Gospel and Acts for those they were evangelising, after obtaining a perfect understanding from first-hand eye witnesses including the Apostles, probably during the two years of Paul's Caesarea imprisonment (Lk 1:1-4, Act 1:1-3, 21-22, 16:10, 24:27, 2 Tim 4:11). James and Jude were our Lord's brothers, who grew up with Him and witnessed His miracles; James counting among the Apostles as the pillars of the Jerusalem Church. (Act 15:13-19, Gal 1:18-19, 2:9-12).

The empiric historic test of canonicity was authorship by the Apostles and Prophets of old, being the "holy men of God who spake, as they were moved by the Holy Ghost" (2 Pet 1:21). Hebrews was included in the canon because it was recognised as authored by Paul.

2. The **date of writing** supports Pauline authorship of Hebrews.

Hebrews was written well before AD 70 as verses 10:11 and 13:11-13 indicate that the Temple at Jerusalem was still well standing. Paul would be alive and who more prominent than he could be its author while remaining without mention on the face of the document?

Paul's first Roman imprisonment occurred from c. AD 60 to 62. From there, he wrote to the Philippians telling them that with their prayers, he would abide and visit them again for their further joy of faith. He also wrote to Timothy expecting to come again to him shortly. (Phil 1:25-26, 1 Tim 3:14-15). Early church tradition held that Paul was released, which accords with biblical expectations. Paul's appeal to Caesar was of the Lord for Festus had, with King Agrippa's concurrence, written that Paul could be released; and in all likelihood, Paul's accusers did not turn up in Rome for the trial. (Act 23:11, 25:16, 25-27, 26:32 and 28:21).

Paul was re-imprisoned and executed c. AD 67 or no later than the Spring of AD 68 by Nero, who himself committed suicide in June AD 68. During his second imprisonment under different conditions in a cold cell, Paul wrote to Timothy to tell him that he had finished his course and his departure was at hand (2 Tim 4:6-8, 13).

3. **The Apostle Peter** attests that Paul wrote to the Jews (i.e. the Hebrews).

Peter wrote two epistles to the Jewish Christians "dispersed throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia" who "have obtained like precious faith with us". The second, when he knew he would soon depart (c. AD 64) stirred them one final time to remember their precious calling in Christ, and he mentions at its close, "And account that the longsuffering of our Lord is salvation; even as our beloved brother Paul also according to the wisdom given unto him hath written unto you." (1 Pet 1:1, 2 Pet 1:1, 13-14 and 3:15)

Dr Baxter poignantly points out regarding that which Paul had written, "If this epistle is not Hebrews, which was it? Where was it? What trace of any other?"

We would add that "God's longsuffering" is the theme of Hebrews. 1:1 introduces God's patience, "*speaking in sundry times past and in various manners to the fathers by the prophets, and now in these last days, by His Son*". 10:35-39 calls the hearers not to cast away confidence with its great recompense of reward, "*For ye have need of patience, that, after ye have done the will of God, ye might receive the promise. For ... he that shall come will come, and will not tarry.*" Chap 11 lists men and women of faith who, "*having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise: God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect.*" Chap 12 exhorts them with so great a cloud of witness, to endure to the end, resisting sin to the shedding of blood, despising not the chastening of the Lord, to receive a kingdom that cannot be moved.

Furthermore, the wisdom by which this epistle was written was given peculiarly only to one man, Paul, "*Circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew of the Hebrews; as touching the law, a Pharisee*", "*brought up in Jerusalem at the feet of Gamaliel.*" His other epistles are divinely inspired pieces but which but only Hebrews intimately treats the meatier Jewish subjects of angels, prophets, priesthoods, the Temple, covenants, ceremonial laws and the sacrifices of the Mosaic economy, and magnificently then demonstrates that the Person and Office of Jesus Christ far transcends them all?

Paul very likely grappled with these very issues while he kicked against the pricks; in stoning Stephen, arresting the early believers and marching on to Damascus to arrest more, out of his zeal for the law and its righteousness. When he saw the risen Jesus in dazzling brightness which blinded him physically, and heard the words, "Saul, Saul, why persecutes me?", he did not eat or drink for three days and nights while these truths finally dawned upon him. Thereafter, he immediately proclaimed that Christ was the Son of God! Who then has fuller wisdom to write this treatise to the Hebrews? (Phil 3:5-6, Act 9:1-9, 22:3-11).

4. The **cast of the message and its transcendence** consistent with Paul's authorship.

Dr Baxter: "It is remarkable, sometimes even amusing, how even those who most sharply repudiate Paul's authorship admit the presence of Pauline characteristics in it. Origen admitted "*the thoughts are the apostle's.*" Dean Alford had to agree that "*the general cast of thought is Pauline.*" Franz Delitzsch who prefers Luke, nevertheless says, "*It produces throughout the impression of the presence of the original and creative force of apostolic spirit. And if written by an apostle, who could have been its author but St. Paul? Its form is not Pauline, and the thoughts, though not un-Pauline, yet often go beyond the Pauline type of doctrine as made known to us in the other epistles; but towards the close, when the epistle takes the epistolary form, we seem to hear St. Paul himself, and no one else.*"

Every chapter of Hebrews uses expressions of thought corresponding with expressions in Paul's other epistles, except that Hebrews goes further, beyond the Gentiles' outer court into the inner holy court of the Jews: the priesthoods of Levi, Aaron, the Order of Melchizedek, the Temple sacrifices, the Mosaic Law and the Faith of the Jewish Fathers. 30 Old Testament verses are cited to point out the superiority of Jesus, the promised Messiah come, ushering in a "better covenant", "established on better promises" (Heb 8:6) for Christ was superior above all that came before Him - the former means of revelation (1:1-3), angels (1:4-2:18), Moses and Joshua (3:1-4:13), the Aaronic priesthood (4:14-10:18), and the entire Old Covenant (10:19-12:29). Jesus is Prophet, High Priest and King, "the author and perfecter of our faith" (12:2), whom all the Old Testament types prefigured.

5. **Paul's unceasing burden for the Jews** constrains Paul to write to them.

"I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost, That I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart. For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh." (Rom 9:1-3)

Paul prayed incessantly to God for Israel's salvation (Rom 10:1). At Cenchrea, he took a vow as he set out to keep a feast at Jerusalem (Act 18:18-22). When Jerusalem suffered a severe famine, he organised a collection from the churches and determined to deliver this by Pentecost AD 57; although bound in the spirit, he knew that bonds and afflictions awaited him there, so he told the Ephesian elders at Miletus that they would see his face no more. (Act 20:2-4, 16-25, 1 Cor 16:1-4, 2 Cor 9:1-5). At Caesarea, Agabus prophesied that Paul would be bound and delivered to the Gentiles at Jerusalem, but his resolve to witness and even die there for the name of the Lord Jesus remained unshaken. (Act 21:8-40).

At Jerusalem, to show to the Jewish brethren that he did not teach Jews to forsake the laws and customs of Moses, Paul performed temple purification rites with four of them whose rites he paid for. The Jews however mistook these four for Gentiles and beat Paul nearly to death, had not the Romans rescued him. He was held a prisoner in Caesarea for two years until a new Governor, Festus, reopened his case. When the high priests laid a trap for him to be purportedly tried in Jerusalem, Paul appealed to Caesar.

On arriving in Rome, c. AD 60, Paul immediately called the chief Jews together to explain that his appeal to Caesar was not an accusation against his nation. Thereafter to them, *"he expounded and testified the kingdom of God, persuading them concerning Jesus, both out of the Law of Moses and out of the prophets from morning till evening."* (Act 24:1-25:10, 28:17-23). Is not Hebrews a written version of this persuasion of Paul to the Jews at Rome?

A man as Paul, a Hebrew of Hebrews, zealous for Israel's salvation – how can such an one be restrained from writing an epistle to the Hebrews for the sake of the Hope of Israel?

6. The **absence of salutation** fits perfectly and naturally with Paul's authorship.

Detractors point out that Paul's customary salutation is missing unlike in Paul's other 13 epistles, where he always identifies himself, "Paul, an Apostle of Jesus Christ". They forget that Paul was divinely appointed an Apostle to the Gentiles, and not to the Jews. His other 13 epistles were written to the Gentiles churches and pastors, and it was right for Paul to salute them as "an Apostle of Christ" for he was their Apostle! In contrast, for a document such as Hebrews, it would be quite inappropriate. Paul would not usurp Peter, who was entrusted with the Gospel to the circumcision while he to the uncircumcision. Conversely had Hebrews been written by Peter or James, it would have been evidenced with a salutation from "Peter an Apostle of Jesus Christ" or "James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ." (Act 22:18, 21, Gal 2:7-8 and cf., also Rom 11:13, 1 Cor 9:2, 2 Tit 1:11)

A further possible but secondary reason that there was no salutation was that Paul started writing this document while awaiting his appeal trial before Caesar. If his Jewish accusers had gotten hold of this document, they would have tried to distort and use this against Paul at the hearing. Paul's targeted recipients in contrast did not need a salutation to know who wrote to them for he was well known and much beloved to them.

The absence of salutation harmonizes very well with Paul's authorship of Hebrews!

7. The **epistolary ending** contains Paul's complete imprints.

Not being an Apostle to the Jews, Paul wrote the first twelve chapters as a treatise, to which he attaches his epistolary ending. Dr Baxter wrote, "Although the epistle is always said to be "anonymous," it is only superficially so, for, plainly as can be, the last chapter shows that the writer was well known to his readers and that he was not in the least degree attempting anonymity. Who, then, is it who freely "gives away" his identity in that last chapter? Well, even Delitzsch agrees that here, at least, we "seem to hear Paul himself, and no one else." Who is it but Paul who writes (in verses 18, 19): "Pray for us; for we are persuaded that we have a good conscience, desiring to live honestly in all things: and I exhort you the more exceedingly to do this, that I may be restored to you the sooner"? Who is it but Paul who adds: Know ye that our brother Timothy has been set at liberty, with whom, if he come shortly, I will see you"? – And then ends with the characteristic: "Grace be with you all"? Why, as we come to these parting verses, we suddenly seem to realise that they must surely have been added in the very *handwriting* of Paul himself, for verse 22 says, "I have written you in a *few words*," which simply cannot refer to the whole epistle, with its *eight thousand* words! Nay, we begin to see that the last chapter, or part of it, is really a covering note to the treatise – which at the same time explains what so many have noticed, namely that the book is a *treatise* rather than a letter, yet becomes quite epistolary just at the end. And if the covering note is so clearly Pauline, then the formal *treatise* (which by its very form and style and idiom as such has caused its Pauline authorship to be doubted) must also be by Paul."

If any is still unconvinced, examine the following details: -

"Pray for us" (13:18) is Paul's consistent request to all the churches, as seen also in Rom 15:30, 2 Cor 1:11, Eph 6:19, Phil 1:19, Col 4:3, 1 Thess 5:25, 2 Thess 3:1 and Phm 22.

"Grace be with you all" (13:25) is the way Paul invariably closes all his epistles as seen in the other thirteen endings - Rom 16:20, 1 Cor 16:23, 2 Cor 13:14, Gal 6:18, Eph 6:24, Phil 4:23, Col 4:18, 1 Thess 5:28, 2 Thess 3:18, 1 Tim 6:21, 2 Tim 4:22, Tit 3:15 and Phm 25.

"And I beseech you, brethren, suffer the word of exhortation: for I have written a letter unto you in few words" (13:22) indicates Paul, who unlike Peter had no prerogative to exhort the Jews, and hence the courteous plea, beseeching them to suffer his few words of exhortation.

The phrase "our brother Timothy" (13:23) is the same way that Paul mentions Timothy in 2 Cor 1:1, Col 1:1, 1 Thess 3:2 and Phm 1:1.

The phrase "with whom, if he comes shortly, I will see you." revealingly confirms Paul, for with whom else would Timothy travel in this fashion, coming to him and then escorting him? (cf. Act 16:3). It couldn't be Barnabas, Apollos, Luke or Priscilla or Clement of Rome.

We see in the ending that Paul's appeal had succeeded and he also receives news of Timothy's release, who likely was arrested during his visits to Paul closer to the trial date. A final proof is the greetings in 13:24, "They of Italy salute you." for they were in Italy from whence they were released (Act 27:1, 6). Does this not resonate with Phil 4:22, "All the saints salute you, chiefly they that are of Caesar's household." written from prison in Rome?

The time of writing of Hebrews can now also be accurately dated c., AD 62 or early 63, towards the end of Paul's imprisonment or shortly after Caesar had granted his appeal.

8. The **objection based on Heb 2:3** actually consistent with Pauline authorship

Baxter: "Dean Alford is certain also that 2:3 excludes Paul. He says, "The writer speaks of himself as among those who had received the Gospel from the apostles and those who heard the Lord." This stands "directly against" Paul's authorship, for Paul "always upholds his independence of man's teaching."... For to us the very verse (2:3) which he says refutes Paul's authorship *confirms* it! He is quite inaccurate when he says: "The writer speaks of himself as among those who had 'received' the 'Gospel' from the 'apostles' ..." The writer neither mentions the "apostles" nor the "Gospel"; nor does he use the word "received"! Read the verse: "How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation? which having at first been spoken through the Lord was confirmed unto us by them that had heard." Now without needing to make capital out of the dean's inaccuracies, we would simply ask: Does that not indicate Paul? So far as we have any knowledge, he never heard one of the Lord's parables, never saw one of the miracles; never once met, and never even saw the Lord, during His days on earth. Did the ascended Lord, whom Paul first met on the Damascus road, supernaturally re-enact the whole of his earthly ministry for Paul, or was it "confirmed" to Paul by "them that had heard"? ... Surely then, chapter 2:3 other than excluding Paul, *indicates* him!"

Further notes: "was confirmed" is ἐβεβαιώθη (*ebebaiôthê*), verb indicative aorist passive 3rd person singular from βεβαίωω (*bebaioô*). Cf. 1 Cor 1:6, 8, 2 Cor 15:8, Col 2:7, Rom 15:8.

Paul in Gal 1:11-19 certified that he received the Gospel directly from the Lord Jesus, and it was only three years later that he went up to Jerusalem to see Peter and James, the Lord's brother - his first opportunity to have his received revelation confirmed by those who had heard directly from the Lord. In Gal 2:1-9, Paul by revelation went to Jerusalem again fourteen years later, accompanied by Barnabas and Titus, to deal with a serious perversion to the doctrine of salvation in Jesus Christ alone, by those who insist that Gentile converts must also keep the Law of Moses and be circumcised. There, at the council also recorded in Act 15:1-29, the Apostles and elders concurred with Paul, and altered not a whit of his Gospel to the Gentiles. "*But contrariwise, when they saw that the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me, as the gospel of the circumcision was unto Peter; (For he that wrought effectually in Peter to the apostleship of the circumcision, the same was mighty in me toward the Gentiles). And when James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship; that we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision.*" (Gal 2:7-9)

The Apostles, elders and brethren at Jerusalem then *confirmed* Paul's Gospel in a circular letter to all the Gentile churches (Act 15:23-29). Paul in turn thus may plead with his fellow Hebrews everywhere, "How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard *him*?"

9. The **objection based on a higher grammar and literary style** actually supports Paul's authorship during the leisure afforded to him of his first Roman imprisonment (Act 28:16).

Baxter: "But of course the chief objection is that "the whole Greek style of the epistle is

different from that of St. Paul's acknowledged writings – more classical in its idiom, as well as more finished and rhetorical; and also that the studied arrangements of the thoughts and arguments, the systematic plan of the whole work, is so unlike the way of writing so characteristic of the great apostle." Against this, the late Sir Robert Anderson asks: "Will any student of literature maintain that so great a master of the literary art as the apostle Paul might not, in penning a treatise such as Hebrews, display peculiarities and elegancies of style which do not appear in his epistolary writings?"

... Remember, too, most of Paul's epistles to the "churches" were written *earlier*; were written in the thick of busy, adventurous ministry, movement and travel; were provoked by sudden emergencies of false doctrine or other peril; were written with that emotion which a spiritual father felt for his own children in the faith, and churches which he himself had founded; and, moreover, were written to *Gentiles*: whereas Hebrews as one of the latest, written perhaps during imprisonment, amid quiet, unhurried broodings, with ample leisure for meditative planning and well-chosen sentences; was a set treatise to his countrymen, not a letter to his own children in the faith; was not to Gentiles, but to Jews.

To me, such considerations, especially in relation to a versatile genius like Paul, adequately cover the literary objection to his authorship of Hebrews. I am the more persuaded of this because of an admission by Dr Barmby in his *Pulpit Commentary* article on Hebrews. He himself is one of those who reject the Pauline authorship on literary grounds, yet he says: "This consideration [i.e. that Paul could have written it under such circumstances as we have mentioned] would have decided weight in the way of explanation if there were any really valid *external* evidence of his having been the actual writer." But then there *is* most definitely "external evidence" of Pauline authorship in the *tradition* handed down right from Paul's own time!

If still further answer is required to the literary difficulty, we ourselves are not at all averse to believing that probably all over the Hebrews epistle there are welcomed touches of Greek "finish" and right to the end (2 Tim 4:11). This must not be taken as suggesting that we have Paul's thoughts in Luke's words. Both the thoughts and their expressions are Paul's, but given a literary finish by the concurrent grammatical collaboration of companion Luke."

10. The **Unconvincing Alternatives** eliminated leaves only Paul.

Baxter correctly surmises that of all the alternatives actually suggested, only four could be taken seriously, which are Luke, Barnabas, Clement of Rome and Apollos.

Luke was a Gentile (Loukas is a Greek name). In Col 4:10-14, Paul groups Aristarchus, Marcus and Justus who were Jews (v11) and places Luke with Epaphras and Demas, who were not. Both his Gospel and the Acts begin with a formal dedication in Greek and Roman style, whereas the author of Hebrews was a Hebrew of the Hebrews as clearly as can be.

Barnabas was a Hebrew, a Levite but there is no real support from antiquity. The "Epistle of Barnabas" supposedly written by him is not canonical and its genuineness is doubtful. If Barnabas did write it, then he certainly did *not* write Hebrews, for the two are *utterly* unlike both in style and sentiment. But if the supposed Barnabas epistle is spurious, then we have no knowledge that Barnabas ever wrote an epistle: why then attribute *Hebrews* to him?

Clement was one of the earliest bishops of Rome but there was never the slightest tradition

in Rome of his authoring an epistle to the Jews! He wrote an epistle to the Corinthians (not regarded as canonical) and which was completely unlike the Hebrews epistle.

Apollos was never thought of until Martin Luther suggested him! He is a most tempting candidate and Dean Alford makes out a strong case for him but there are two strong objections: 1) *None* of the ancients (who must have known more of the probabilities than moderns do) ever even suggested him; 2) Apollos was an *Alexandrian Jew*; but does not the Hebrews epistle require a Jew of long and intimate acquaintance with *Jerusalem* and the temple – and with the Jewish Christians there (13:23)?

Baxter concludes, “On the whole, therefore, we ourselves incline the more confidently to believe that Paul, and no other, was the human author of the Epistle to the Hebrews.”

CONCLUSION

Ten observations were made of primarily internal evidences within the Scriptures itself, including four key antagonist objections (#6, 8, 9 and 10) alleged thereto against the Pauline authorship of Hebrews. All ten on deeper consideration clearly and unanimously support Paul's authorship of the Epistle, which also accords with the external testimonies of the early church from the earliest of times. This settles the issue unequivocally per the principle of 2 Cor 13:1.

If I could add just one last and obvious observation: Romans and Hebrews are two great master treatises of the New Testament and they are written by the same man! They are companion treatises on the Doctrine of Justification by Faith in Jesus Christ alone; one written to the Gentiles, the other to the Hebrews! Only one man qualified to write both treatises, by virtue of his strict Jewish upbringing, his tutelage under Gamaliel, his exceeding intellect, his call as an Apostle to the Gentiles and the strict way he lived, “And unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the law, as under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law; To them that are without law, as without law, (being not without law to God, but under the law to Christ,) that I might gain them that are without law.” (1 Cor 9:20-21)

Rejection of the Pauline authorship of Hebrews based on an apparent anonymity/absence of a formal salutation, a misreading of Heb 2:3 and arguments of Greek literary style, has resulted in a wild odyssey that completely missed the wood for the trees. They searched long in vain and implausibly for an alternate author, over-looking the real, historic author under their nose!

The “author unknown” consensus is however not just dismal but potently insidious against saving faith. Vanity becomes despair; despair becomes doubt. By various similar inferences, half of Paul's 14 epistles are no longer popularly regarded as authored by him, as in many Bible Colleges and Seminaries, today. The consequence is doubt created in many hearts regarding the Canon of the New Testament and the Divine Verbal Plenary Inspiration of the Bible itself.

Those who defend the oldest truths have long been a dying breed. We pray that the Lord will re-ignite the truths of His Word with renewed fire in many hearts today, starting with our own.

1 November 2010, Singapore