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 CHAPTER XIV.   
   
   
 THE EPISTLE TO PHILEMON.   
   
 SECTION I.   
 ITS AUTHORSHIP.   
   
   
   
 1, Tue testimonies to the Pauline authorship of this Epistle are   
 abundant.   
 (a) Tertullian, in enumerating the Epistles of St. Paul with which   
 Marcion had tampered, concludes his list by excepting this to Phi-   
 lemon, which, he says, has escaped through its brevity.   
 (6) Origen quotes expressly, from the Epistle of Paul to Philemon,   
 verses 7, 9, 14.   
 (c) Eusebius reckons this Epistle among those universally received.   
 (d) Jerome argues at some length against those who refused to   
 acknowledge this Epistle for St. “Pan's because it was aad on   
 personal matters and contained nothing for edification.   
 2. That neither Ireneus nor Clement of Alexandria cite our - Epistle,   
 is easily accounted for, both by its shortness, and by the fact of its   
 containing nothing which could illustrate or affirm doctrinal positions.   
 Ignatius seems cevrerrl times to allude to it.   
 8. The internal evidence of the Epistle itself i is so decisive for its   
 Pauline origin,—the occasion and object of it (see below, § ii.) so simple,   
 and unassignable to any fraudulent intent, that one would imagine the   
 impugner of so many of the Epistles would at least have spared this one,   
 and that in modern times, as in ancient, according to Tertullian and   
 Jerome, its very brevity would have defended it. But Baur has rejected   
 it, or, which with him-is the same thing practically, has placed it in his   
 second class, of controverted Epistles, in common with the other Epistles   
 of the imprisonment.   
 4. In so doing, he confesses to a fecling of subjecting himself to the   
 imputation of hypercritical scepticism as to authenticity : but maintains   
 that the Epistle must stand or fall with those others: and that its very   
 insignificance, which is pleaded in its defence, all the more involves it in   
 their fate. Still, he professes to argue the question on the ground of   
 the Epistle itself.   
 5. He finds in its diction several things which strike him as un-   
 pauline: several which establish a link between it and those other   
 Epistles. The latter position we should willingly grant him, and use   
 against him, But the fermer is here, as so ofter, taken up by him in   
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