intRopuction.] THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS. [cu. xv.   
   
 know absolutely nothing of the man, his learning, his particular training,   
 or the likelihood that he should have given us such an Epistle as we now   
 Ilis claim is (with that one acerca) unexceptionable : but   
 it must retire before that of any who is recommended by positive cousi-   
 derations \*,   
 168. A fur stronger array of names and claims is made out for   
 Ciement oF Rome, one of the fellow-workers of St. Paul in Phil. iv. 3.   
 We have seen above (par. 19), that his name was one brought down to   
 Origen by the “account which has come down to us,” together with that   
 of St. Luke: we have found him mentioned as held by some to be the   
 translator, e. g., by Euthalius (par. 46), Eusebius (par. 48) : the author,   
 by Philastrius (par, 65), Jerome (par. 69), &e. This latter has in   
 modern times been the opinion of Erasmus (par. 97), and of Calvin   
 (par. 100).   
 169, We cannot pronounce with any certainty whether Clement was   
 a Jew by birth or not. The probability is against such a supposition.   
 ‘The advocates of this theory however rest his claim mainly on the fact   
 that many expressions and passages of our Epistle occur in the (un-   
 doubtedly genuine) Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians.   
 170. But to this it has been satisfactorily replied by Bleek and others,   
 that such passages have much more the air of citations, than that of   
 repetitions of the same thought and diction by their original author, and   
 that they in fact in no wise differ from the many other reproductions of   
 passages of the New Test., especially of St. Paul’s Epistles, in the same   
 letter of Clement. Bleek has besides directed attention to the great   
 dissimilarity of the two writings, as indicating different authors.   
 Clement’s Epistle has nothing of the Alexandrine character, nothing of   
 the speculative spirit, of that to the Hebrews. His style is pure and   
 correct, but wants altogether the march of periods, and rhetorical rhythm,   
 of our Epistle. Another objection is, that had Clement written it, there   
 could hardly have failed some trace of a tradition to that effect in   
 the church of Rome ; which, as we have seen, is not found.   
 171. The idea that Barnasas was the author of our Epistle seems to   
 have been prevalent in the African Church, seeing that Tertullian quotes   
 him as such without any doubt or explanation (above, par. 25). But it   
 was unknown to Origen, and to Eusebius : and Jerome, in his Catalog.   
 ¢. 5, vol. ii. p. 838, says “either of Barnabas according to Tertullian, or   
 of the Evangelist Luke according to some, or of Clement, &e. :” so that   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
 3 Mynster and Bébme, from different points of view, have held to Silvanus: the   
 formor, assuming that our Epistle was sent with that to the Galatians, and to the same   
 churches: the latter, faneying a great resemblance between our Epistle and the first   
 of St. Peter, and holding it to have been written under the superintendence of that   
 apostle : a supposition, I need not say, entirely untenable.