§v] LANGUAGE AND STYLE. [ixrnovucrion.   
   
 2. The idea of a Hebrew original is found in Clement of Alexandria   
 (cited above, § i. par. 14), in Eusebius (ib. par. 48), Jerome, Theodoret,   
 Euthalius (above, § i. par. 46), Primasius, John Damascenus, CEcume-   
 nius, Theophylact,—in Cosmas Indicopleustes,—in Rhabanus Maurus,—   
 in Thomas Aquinas; in some modern writers, especially Hallet, in an   
 enquiry into the author and language of the Epistle, appended to Peirce’s   
 Commentary (1742), and Michaelis.   
 3. Still such an apparently formidable array of ancient testimony is   
 not to be taken as such, without some consideration. Clement’s assertion   
 of a Hebrew original is not reproduced by his scholar Origen, but on the   
 contrary a Greek original is presupposed by his very words (above, § i.   
 par. 19), And this his divergence from Clement of Alexandria is not   
 easy to explain, if he had regarded him as giving matter of history, and   
 not rather a conjecture of his own. Indeed, the passage of Clement   
 seems to bear this latter on the face of it: for it connects the similarity   
 of style between this Epistle and the Acts with the notion of St. Luke   
 being its translator, If we might venture to fill up the steps by which   
 the inference came about, they would be nearly these: “ The Epistle   
 must be St. Paul’s. But St. Paul was a Hebrew, and was writing to   
 Hebrews: how then do we find the Epistle in Greck, not unlike in style   
 to that of the Acts of the Apostles? What, if the writer of the Greek   
 of that book were also the writer of the Greck of this,—and St. Paul,   
 as was to be supposed, wrote as a Hebrew to the Hebrews, in Hebrew,   
 St. Luke translating into Greek ?”   
 4, Again, Eusebius is not consistent in this matter with himself. In   
 another place he clearly implies that the Epistle was written in Greck.   
 And such has been the opinion of almost all the moderns: of all, we may   
 safely say, who have handled the subject impartially and intelligently.   
 The reasons for this now generally received opinion are mainly found in   
 the style of the Epistle, which is the most purely Greek of all tho   
 writings of the New Test.: so that it would be violating all probability   
 to imagine it a translation from a language of entirely different rhetorical   
 character. The construction of the periods is such, in distinction from   
 the character, in this particular, of the Oriental languages, that if it is a   
 translation, the whole argumentation of the original must have been   
 broken up into its original elements of thought, and all its connecting   
 links recast; so that it would not be so much a translation, as a re-   
 writing, of the Hebrew Epistle.   
 5. The plays on words again, and the citations from the Septuagint   
 version being made in entire independence of the Hebrew text, form col-   
 lectively a presumptive proof, the weight of which it is very difficult to   
 evade, that the present Greck text is the original. Such peculiarities   
 belong to thought running free and selecting its own words, not to the   
 constrained reproduction of the thoughts of another in another tongue.   
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