§ 1) ITS AUTHORSHIP, [ayrropuctioy.   
   
   
 doubt of his friend as to the authenticity of the history of Susanna, he   
 meutions the traditional death of Isaiah, which he says “ is testified to   
 by the Epistle to the Hebrews, but is not written in any of the canonical   
 books” (meaning, not that the Epistle was not one of these books, but   
 that the aecount of Isaiah’s is not in any canonieal book of   
 the Old Test.). Then he adds, “ But possibly some who are pressed   
 by this argument may take refuge in the view of those who set aside the   
 Epistle as not written by Panl: and to them we should have to use   
 another argument to shew that the Epistle is Paul’s.”   
 It would have been of some interest to know who these some were,   
 and whether their setting aside of the Epistle arose from the absence of   
 ancient tradition as to the Pauline authorship, or from critical con-   
 clusions of their own, arrived at from study of the Epistle itself. But   
 of this Origen says nothing.   
 19. The principal testimony of his own is qontained in two frag-   
 ments of his lost Homilies on this Epistle, preserved by Eusebius : “In   
 these he observes, that the style of the Epistle is not that characteristic   
 of the Apostle, who declared himself unskilful in style ; but is more   
 Greek in its form of diction, as every one who knows how to discriminate   
 styles must confess. On the other hand, any one who reads attentively   
 the Apostolic writings must also confess, that the thoughts are mar-   
 yellous, and no way inferior to the acknowledged writings of the   
 Apostles. After this, he says that the thoughts appear to him to be   
 those of the Apostle, but the diction and style those of some reporter   
 or paraphraser of the things said by his master.”   
 Then follows the sentence eited by us in par. 1. And afterwards he   
 adds, “The aeeount which has come down to us is divided, some   
 reporting that Clement, who became Bishop of Rome, wrote the Epistle,   
 others that it was Luke, who wrote the Gospel and the Acts.” -   
 We learn from these remarkable fragments several interesting parti-   
   
   
   
   
   
   
 eulars: among which may be mentioned ;   
 First, Origen’s own opinion as to the Epistle, deduced from grounds   
 which he regards as being clear to all who are on the one hand   
 aceustomed to judge of style, and, on the other, versed in the apostolic   
 writings; viz. that its Author in its present form is not St. Paul, but   
 some one who has embodied iu his own style and form the thoughts of   
 that Apostle. One thing however he leaves in uncertainty; whether   
 we are to regard such disciple of St. Paul, or the Apostle himself, as   
 speaking in the first person throughout the Epistle.   
 20. Secondly, the fuct that some churches, or church, regarded the   
 Epistle as the work of St.Paul. Tut here again the expression is some-   
 what vague. The words, “if any church,” may be an uncertain in-   
 dication of several churches, or it may be a pointed allusion to one.   
 If the latter, which from what follows, is the more probable, the chureh   
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