intRopuction.] THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS. [cn. xv.   
   
 and who, although the founder of a heresy, appears not to have severed   
 himself from the chureh, is repeatedly adduced by Epiphanius as eiting   
 the Epistle as “the Apostle’s :” and the same Epiphanius says of the   
 Melchiscdekites (see on ch, vii. 3), that they attempted to support their   
 view by Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews.   
 ALEXANDER, bishop about 312, says in an Epistle to Alexander bishop   
 of Constantinople,   
 “ Agreeably to this exelaims also the lofty speaker Paul, saying   
 concerning Him, ‘Whom He appointed heir of all things, by whom   
 also He made the worlds ’” Heb. i. 2.   
 Antonius, the celebrated promoter of the monastic life in Egypt, in   
 one of his seven epistles to various monasteries, says, ‘ of whom Paul   
 saith that they, on account of us, have not reeeived the promises” (Heb.   
 xi. 13, 39, 40).   
 43. But the most weighty witness for the view of the Alexandrine   
 chureh at this time is AruaNasivs, in the middle of the fourth century.   
 He enumerates the canonieal books which have come down and are   
 believed to be inspired, among which he names fourteen Epistles of St.   
 Paul, and among them our Epistle, without alluding to any doubt on   
 the subject. And in his other writings every where he cites the Epistle   
 as St. Paul's.   
 44, Belonging to nearly the same time in the same church are three   
 other writers—by all of whom the Epistle is either expressly or implicitly   
 cited as the work of St. Paul.   
 45. It would be to little purpose to multiply names, in a church which   
 by this time had universally and undoubtingly received the Pauline   
 authorship. Bleck has addneed, with copious citations, Dinymvs (the   
 teacher of Jerome and Rufinus),—Manccs Eremra (about 400),—   
 Tueoruitus of ALEXANDRIA (about 400),—Istpore of Petusrus (died   
 450),—Cynit of ALexanpriA (died 444): concerning which last it is   
 to be observed, that though Nestorius had adduced passages from the   
 Epistle on his side, as being St. Paul's, Cyril, in refuting them, does not   
 make the slightest reference to the formerly existing doubt as to the   
 authorship.   
 46. And so it continued in this church in subsequent times : the only   
 remarkable exception being found in Eurmarius (about 460), who,   
 though he regards the Epistle as of Pauline origin, and reckons fourteen   
 Epistles of St. Paul, yet adduces the old doubts concerning it, and believes   
 it to be a translation made by Clement of Rome from a Hebrew original   
 by the Apostle. ‘This view he supports by the considerations, 1. of its   
 style ; 2. of its wanting an addr from the writer ; 3. on account of   
 what is said ch. ii. 3, 4. For the first, he gives the reason that it was   
 translated from the Hebrew, some say, by Luke, but most, by Clement,   
 whose style it resembles, Then he gives the usual reason for the want of   
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