intRopuction.| THE EPIStLE TO THE HEBREWS. — [cn. xv.   
   
 5. As preliminary then to all such specific considerations, we will   
 enquire first into the external and ‘traditional ground, then into that   
 which is internal, arising from the Epistle itself, of the supposition that   
 Sr. Paur was the Author and Writer, or the Author without being the   
 Writer, of the Epistle.   
 6, Some think that they sce an allusion to our Epistle in 2 Pet. iii.   
 15, 16. But to this there are several objections ; among which the   
 principal is, that no passages can be pointed ont in our Epistle answering   
 to the description there gi This point has not been much pressed,   
 even by those who have raised it ; being doubtless felt to be too insecure   
 to build any safe conclusion upon.   
 7. The same may be said of the idea that our Epistle is alluded to by   
 St. James, ch. ii. 24,25. Hug supposes that the citation of Rahab as   
 justified by works is directly polemical, and aimed at Heb. xi. 31. But   
 as Bleek well remarks, even were we to concede the polemical character   
 of the citation, why need Heb. xi. 81 be fixed on as its especial point   
 of attack ? Was it not more than probable, that the followers of   
 St. Paul would have adduced this, among other examples, in their oral   
 teaching ? -   
 8. We come then to the first undoubted allusions to the Epistle ;   
 which occur in the Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians,   
 dating before the conclusion of the first century. Clement is well   
 acquainted with the Epistles of St. Paul: he quotes by name 1 Cor. ;   
 he closely imitates Rom. i. 29—82: he frequently alludes to other   
 passages. But of no Epistle does he make such large and constant use,   
 as of this to the Hebrews : and this is testified by Eusebius,—‘ in which   
 (i.e. his Epistle to the Corinthians) he brings forward many thoughts   
 out of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and even some passages out of it   
 verbatim, thus shewing clearly that the work was no new one in his   
 time.” The same is testified by Jerome also.   
 9. Now some have argued from this that, as Clement thus reproduces   
 passages of this as well as of other Epistles confessedly canonical, he   
 must have held this to be canonical, and if he, then the Roman church,   
 in whose name he writes; and if canonical, then written by St. Paul.   
 But Bleek well observes, that this whole argument is built on an   
 unhistorical assumption respecting the Canon of the New Test., which   
 was certainly not settled in Clement's time ; and that, in fact, his usc   
 of this Epistle proves no more than that it was well known and exceed-   
 ingly valued by him. It is a weighty testimony for the Epistle, but   
 says nothing as to its Author\*,   
 10. The first notices in any way touching the question of the author-   
 ship mect us after the middle of the second century, And it is remark-   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
 ? See this, and the inference from it, treated more fully below, Sect. vi. par. 2.   
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