§1] ITS AUTHORSHIP. [iyrropvction.   
   
 one, where we find no trace of such a tradition : a fact wholly irrccon-   
 cileable with such recognition by Clement. And if Clement did not so   
 recognize it, are we not thereby brought very much nearer the source   
 itself, than by any reported opinion in the church of Alexandria ?   
 146. I shall have oceasion again to return to this consideration: I   
 introduce it here to shew, that in frecly proposing to ourselves the   
 enquiry, “Who wrote the Epistle ?” as to be answered entirely from   
 the Epistle itself, we are not setting aside, but are strictly following,   
 the earliest and weightiest historical testimonies respecting it, and the   
 inferences to be deduced from them. And if any name seems to satisfy   
 the requirements of the Epistle itself, those who in modern times sug-   
 gested that name, and those who see reason to adopt it, are not to be   
 held up to derision, as has been done by Mr. Forster, merely because   
 that name was not suggested by any among the ancients. The question   
 is as open now as it was in the second century. They had no reliable   
 tradition ; we have none. If an author is to be found, it must be by   
 consideration of the subject-matter itself.   
 147. With these remarks, I come now to the enquiries, 1) What data   
 does the Epistle furnish for determining the Author ? and 2) In what   
 one person do those characteristics mect ?   
 148. I.a) The writer of the Epistle is also the avutnor. It is of   
 course possible, that St. Paul may have imparted his thoughts to the   
 Hebrew church by means of another. This may have heen done in one   
 of two ways: either by actual translation, or by transfusion of thought   
 and argument : setting aside altogether the wholly unlikely hypothesis,   
 that the Epistle was drawn up and sent as St. Paul’s by some other,   
 without his knowledge and consent.   
 149. But first, the Epistle 1s Nor A TRANSLATIO The citations   
 throughout, with one exception (noticed below, § ii. par. 35 note), are   
 from the Septuagint Greek version of the Old Test., and are of such a   
 kind, that the peculiarities of that version are not unfrequently inter-   
 woven into the argument, and made to contribute towards the result   
 which would be impossible, had the Epistle existed primarily in Hebrew.   
 Besides, the prevalence of alliterations and plays on words, and the   
 Greek rhythm, to which so many rhetorical passages owe their foree,   
 would of themselves compel us to this conclusion \*.   
 150. And secondly, there are insuperable difliculties in the way of the   
 hypothesis of any such secondary authorship as has very commonly been   
 assumed, from the time of Origen downwards. Against this militate in   
 their full strength all the considerations derived from those differences of   
 style and diction, which as in this Epistle are inseparably interwoven into   
 the argument: against this the whole arrangement aud argumentation of   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
 8 Sco this treated more fully below, § v. parr. 1—8.   
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