§1] ITS AUTHORSHIP. {ixtropuction.   
   
 able enough, that from these notices we must gather, that at that carly   
 date there were the same various views respecting it, in the main, which   
 now prevail ; the same doubt whether St. Paul was the author, or some   
 other Teacher of the apostolic age; and if some other, then what part   
 St. Panl had, or whether any, in influencing his argument or dictating   
 his matter.   
 11. The earliest of these testimonies is that of Panrxnus, the chief   
 of the catechetical school in Alexandria about the middle of the second   
 century. There is a passage preserved to us by Eusebius from a lost   
 work of Clement of Alexandria, in which the latter says that the blessed   
 Presbyter said, that since our Lord was the real Apostle to the Hebrews,   
 St. Paul, out of modesty, and as being himself sent to the Gentiles, did   
 cee essa his name to this Epistle,   
 . There can be no doubt that by the blessed Presbyter here, Clement   
 means Pantenus. Eusebius tells us of Clement, that he in this lost   
 work reported the sayings of his master Pantenus.   
 13. Nor can there be any doubt, from these words, that Pantenus   
 believed the Epistle to be the work of St. Paul. But as Bleck observes,   
 we have no data to enable us to range this testimony in its right place   
 as regards the controversy. Being totally unacquainted with the con-   
 text in which it occurs, we cannot say whether it represents an opinion   
 of Pantenus’s own, or a gencral persuasion ; whether it is adduced   
 polemically, or merely as solving the problem of the anonymousness of   
 the Epistle for those who already believed St. Paul to be the Author.   
 Nothing can well be more foolish, and beside the purpose, than the   
 reason which it renders for this anonymousness : are we to reckon the   
 assumption of the Pauline authorship in it as a subjectivity of the same   
 mind as devised the other? For anght that this testimony itself says,   
 it may have been so: we can only then estimate it rightly, when we   
 regard it as one of a class, betokening something like consensus on the   
 matter in question.   
 14. And such a consensus we certainly seem to be able to trace in the   
 writers of the Alexandrian school. Creuent himself, both in his works   
 which have come down to us, and in the fragments of his lost works   
 preserved by Eusebius, frequently and expressly cites the Epistle as the   
 work of St. Paul. Nay, his testimony goes further than this. Ina   
 well-known passage of Euscbius, he cites from the same lost work of   
 Clement as follows :   
 “He says that the Epistle to the Hebrews is Panl’s, and was   
 written to Hebrews in the Hebrew tongue, and that Luke dili-   
 gently translated it and published it for the Greeks. From which   
 circumstance it is, that its style has a similarity to that of the Acts.   
 But that Paul very naturally did not prefix ‘Paul the Apostle’ to   
 8 See below, par. 71, a very similar sentiment from Jerome.   
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