§ 1) ITS AUTHORSIIIP. (ixtropvction.   
   
 Pauline authorship, when once advanced by men of authority in teach-   
 ing, should gain general aceeptance, Wo sce this tendency already   
 prevailing in the writings of Clement of Alexandria and Origen ; who,   
 notwithstanding the sentenees which have been quoted from them, yet   
   
 thronghout their writings acquiesce for the most part in a conventional   
 habit of citing the Epistle as the work of St.Paul. And as time passed   
 on, a belief, which so conveniently set at rest all doubts about an impor-   
 tant anonymous canonical writing, spread (and all the more as the   
 character of the times became less and less critical and enquiring) over   
 the whole extent of the church.   
 39. It will be well to interpose two cautions, especially for young   
 readers. It has been very much the practice with the maintainers of   
 the Pauline authorship to deal largely in sweeping assertions regarding   
 carly ecclesiastical tradition. They have not unfrequently alleged on   
 their side the habit of citation of Clement and Origen, as shewing their   
 belief respecting the Epistle, uncorrected by those passages which shew   
 what that belief really was. Let not readers then be borne away by   
 these strong assertions, but let them carefully and intelligently examine   
 for themselves.   
 40. Our second caution is one regarding the intelligent use of ancient   
 testimony. Hitherto, we have been endeavouring to trace up to their   
 first origin the belicfs respecting the Epistle. Whence did they first   
 arise ?- Where do we find them prevailing in the earliest times, and there,   
 why? Now this is the only method of enquiry on the subjeet which is   
 or can be decisive, as far as external evidence is concerned. In follow-   
 ing down the stream of time, materials for this enquiry soon fail ns,   
 And it has been the practice of some of the upholders of the Pauline   
 authorship, to amass long lists of names and testimonies, from later ages,   
 of men who simply swelled the ranks of conformity to the opinion when it   
 once became prevalent. Let readers distrust all such accumulations as   
 evidence. They are valuable as shewing the growth and prevalence of   
 the opinion, but in no other light. No acerctions to the river in its   
 course can alter the situation and character of the fountain-head.   
 41. We proceed now with the history of opinion, which, as before   
 remarked, is become very much the history of the spread of the belief of   
 a Pauline authorship.   
 At Alewandria, as we might have expected, the conventional habit   
 of quoting the Epistle as St. Paul's gradually prevailed over critical   
 suspicion and early tradition,   
 42. Dionysivs, president of the catechetical school, and afterwards   
 bishop of Alexandria, in the middle of the third century, cites Heb.   
 x. 84 expressly as the words of St. Paul. Prrer, bishop (about 300),   
 who suffered under Diocletian, cites Icb. xi. 32 as the Apostle’s.   
 Iherax or Hieracas, of Leontopolis, who lived abont the same time,   
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