inTRopuction.] THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS. [en xv.   
   
   
 it, as the Hebrews suspected and disliked him, and so he would not   
 alienate them in the very beginning of his work.”   
 15. Valuable as the above passage is, it fails to point out to us defi-   
 nitively the ground and the extent of the opinion which it expresses.   
 ‘The citations from the Epistle throughout Clement’s writings shew us,   
 that his persuasion respecting its having been put into Greek by St.   
 Luke, did not prevent him from every where citing the Greck as the   
 words of St. Paul; either expressly naming him, or indicating him   
 under the words “the [divine] Apostle.” But whether the opinion was   
 derived from tradition, or from his own critical research, there is nothing   
 here to inform us. The reference to the similarity of diction to that in   
 the Acts seems rather to point to the latter source. Nor again can we   
 say whether he is representing (1) a gencral opinion, prevalent as trans-   
 mitted in the Alexandrian church, or (2) one confined to himself, or   
 (3) one which had spread through the teaching of Pantienus his master.   
 ‘This last is hardly probable, seeing that he gives for the anonymonsness   
 of the Epistle a far more sensible reason than that which he imme-   
 diately after quotes from Pantenus. We can derive from the passage   
 nothing but a surmise respecting the view prevalent in Alexandria at   
 the time. And that surmise would lead us to believe that St. Paul was   
 not there held to have been the writer of the Epistle in its present Greek   
 form, however faithfully that present form may represent his original   
 meaning.   
 16. We now come to the testimony of OrtcEN ; from which, without   
 being able to solve the above historical question, we gain considerably   
 more light on the subject of the tradition respecting the Epistle.   
 17. In his own ordinary practice in his writings, Origen cites the   
 Epistle as the work of St. Paul, using much the same terms as Clement   
 iz. cither “ Paul” or “the Apostle.” In the Homilies on   
 Joshua, he distinctly ascribes fourteen Epistles to St. Paul. But in   
 what sense he makes these citations, we must ascertain by his own more   
 accurately expressed opinion on the matter ; from which it will appear,   
 how unfairly Origen has been claimed by superficial arguers for the   
 Pauline anthorship, as on their side.   
 18. Before however coming to this, it may be well to adduce two or   
 three passages in which he indicates the diversity of opinion which pre   
 yailed. In his Commentary on Matt. xxiii, 27, speaking of the slaying   
 of the prophets, he cites, as from St. Paul, 1 ‘Thess. i. 14, 15, and Heb.   
 xi. 87, 38 ; and then adds, “ But suppose any one repudiates the Epistle   
 to the Hebrews as not being Paul's.” And then after a cantion against   
 apoeryphal works foisted in by the Jews (among which he clearly docs   
 not mean to inchide onr Epistle), he adds, “Still, if any one receives   
 that to the Hebrews as an Epistle of Paul,” &e.   
 Again, in his Epistle to Africanus, in the course of removing the   
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