intropuction.] TIE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS. [cn. xv.   
   
 50. As we pass downwards, I shall mention but ecursorily those   
 writers who uniformly quote the Epistle as St, Paul’s ; pausing only to   
 notice any trace of a different opinion, or any testimony worth express   
 citation. The fnll testimonies will be found in Bleek, and most of them   
 in Lardner, vol. ti. .   
 51. Of the class first mentioned in the foregoing paragraph, are   
 Cyril of Jerusalem (died 886); Gregory of Nazianzum (died 389);   
 Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis in Cyprus (died 402); Basil the Great,   
 Bishop of Cwsarea in Cappadocia (died 379); his brother Gregory,   
 Bishop of Nyssa (died about 370); Titus of Bostra (died about 371);   
 Chrysostom (died 407); Theodore of Mopsuestia (died about 428) ;   
 Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus in Cilicia (died 457).   
 52. In the works of this latter Father we find it asserted that the   
 Epistle was written from Rome. Also we find the Arians charged with   
 setting it aside as spurious.   
 The same accusation is found,—in the Dialogue on the Trinity,   
 ascribed sometimes to Athanasius, sometimes to Theodorét : where the   
 orthodox interiocutor makes the rather startling assertion, “ that ever   
 since the Gospel was first preached, the Epistle had been believed to be   
 Paul’s;’—and in Epiphanius, Her. Ixix. 14, p. 788, where at the same   
 time he charges them with misusing Heb. iii. 2, Him that made Him,   
 for the purposes of their error, From this, and from the Epistle of Arius   
 to Alexander, where he professes his faith, and cites Heb. i. 2, it is plain   
 that the Arians did not reject the Epistle altogether. Nay, they hardly   
 denied its Pauline authenticity ; for in that case we should have Atha-   
 nasius in his polemics against them, and Alexander, defending this   
 authenticity, whereas they always take it for granted. Moreover in the   
 disputation of Augustine with the Arian Gothic Bishop Maximinus,   
 we find the latter twice quoting the Epistle as St. Paul’s. So that   
 whatever may have been done by individual Arians, it is clear that as   
 a party they did not reject cither the Epistle itself or its Pauline   
 authorship.   
 53. Correspondent with the spread of the acceptance of the Epistle as   
 St. Paul’s was its reception, in the MSS., into the number of his Epistles.   
 It was so received in the character of a recent accession, variously ranked:   
 cifher at the end of those addressed to churches, or at the end of all.   
 54. The motives for these differing arrangements were obvious. Some   
 placed it last, as an addition to the Epistles of St. Paul; others, to give   
 it more its proper rank, put it before the Epistles to individuals. But   
 had it been originally among St. Paul’s Epistles, there can be ro doubt   
 that it wonld have taken its place according to its importance, which   
 is the principle of arrangement of the undoubted Pauline Epistles in the   
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 55. A trace of a peculiar arrangement is found in the Great Vatican   
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