tyTRopuCTION.] THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS, [cu. xv.   
   
 142. To the phenomena of citation in our Epistle I shall have ocea-   
 sion to advert very soon, when dealing with the enquiry who the author   
 really was. (See below, parr. 149, 152, 158, 180.) The reader will   
 find them treated at great length in Bleek, Davidson, and Forster.   
 143. Before advaneing to clear the way for that enquiry by other   
 considerations, I will beg the reader to look back with me once more   
 over the course and bearing of the external evidence as regards the Pauline   
 hypothesis.   
 144. The recognition of the Epistle as Pauline begins about the middle   
 of the second century, and, in one portion only of the chureh—the Alex-   
 andrine. Did this rest on an original historical tradition? We have   
 seen reason to conclude the negative. Was it an inference from the   
 subject and contents of the Epistle, which, when once made, gained more   
 and more acceptance, from the very nature of the case? This, on all   
 grounds, is more probable. Had an ancient tradition connected the   
 name of St. Paul with it, we should find that name so connected not in   
 one portion only, but in every part of the church, This however we do   
 not find. We have no trace of its early recognition as Pauline elsewhere   
 than in Alexandria. And even there, the earliest testimonies imply that   
 there was doubt on the subject. Elsewhere, various opinions prevailed.   
 Tertullian gives us Barnabas : Origen mentions two views, pointing to   
 St. Luke and to Clement of Rome. None of these claim onr acceptance   
 as grounded on authentic historical tradition. But each of them has as   
 much right to be heard and eonsidered, as the Alexandrine. And the   
 more, because that was so easy a deduction from the contents of the   
 Epistle, and so sure to be embraced generally, whereas they had no such   
 souree, and could have no such advantage.   
 145, But there was one view of our Epistle, which never laboured   
 under the uncertainty and insufficient reception which may be charged   
 against the others : viz. that entertained by the church of Rome. Itis   
 true, its testimony is only negative: it amounts barely to this“ The   
 Epistle is not St. Paul’s.” But this evidence it gives “always, every   
 where, by all.” And its testimony is of a date and kind which far out-   
 weighs the Alexandrine, or any other. Clement of Rome, the disciple   
 of the Apostles, refers frequently and copiously to our Epistle, not indeed   
 by name, but so plainly and unmistakeably that no one can well deny it.   
 He evidently knew the Epistle well, and used it much and approvingly.   
 Now, had he recognized itas written by St. Paul,—he might not indeed   
 have cited it as such, seeing that unacknowledged centos of New Test.   
 expressions are very common with him,—but is it conceivable that he   
 should altogether have concealed such his recognition from the chureh   
 over which he presided ? Is it not certain, that had Clement received   
 it as the work of St. Paul, we should have found that tradition dominant   
 and firmly fixed in the Roman church? But that chureb is just the   
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