§ 1] ITS AUTHORSHIP. [iyrropuction.   
   
   
 24. As far then as we have at present advanced, we seem to have   
 gathered the following as the probable result, as to the practice and   
 state of opinion iu the Alexandrine church :   
 (a) That it was customary to speak of and quote from the Epistie as   
 the work of St. Paul.   
 (0) That this was done by writers of discernment, and familiarity with   
 the apostolic writings, not because they thought the style and actual   
 writing to be St. Paul’s, but as seeing that from the nature of the   
 thoughts and matter, the Epistle was worthy of and characteristic of   
 that Apostle ; thus feeling that it was not without reason that those   
 before them had delivered the Epistle down to them as St. Paul's.   
 (c) That we nowhere find trace of historical tradition asserting the   
 Pauline authorship : but on the contrary, we find it expressly quoted on   
 the other side ‘.   
 25, We now pass to other portions of the church : and next, to pro-   
 consular Africa. Here we find, in the beginning of the third century,   
 the testimony of TenTUt1an, expressly ascribing the Epistle to Bar-   
 nabas. “There exists also a writing under the name of Barnabas,   
 addressed to the Hebrews ; a man of sufficient authority, considering   
 that Paul ranked him with himself in the practice of abstinence   
 (1 Cor. ix. 6).” And then he cites Heb. vi. 4—8, as an admonition of   
 Barnabas.   
 26. From the way in which the Epistle is here simply cited as the   
 work of Barnabas, we clearly see that this was no mere opinion of Ter-   
 tullian’s own, but at all events the accepted view of that portion of the   
 church. He does not hint at any doubt on the matter. But here again   
 we are at a‘loss, from what source to derive this view. Either, sup-   
 posing Barnabas really the author, genuine historical tradition may have   
 been its source,—or lacking such tradition, some in the African church   
 may originally have inferred this from the nature of the contents of the   
 Epistle ; and the view may subsequently have become general there.   
 One thing however the testimony shews beyond all doubt: that the   
 idea of a Pauline authorship was wholly unknown to Tertullian, and to   
 those for whom he wrote.   
 27. If it were necessary further to confirm evidence so decisive, we   
 might do so by eiting his eharge against Marcion, of falsifying the   
 number of the Epistles of St. Paul: “ Yet I am astonished, seeing that   
 he received Epistles written to individuals, that he has rejected the   
 two to Timothy, and one to Titus, on the state of the church.   
 He has taken upon him, I fancy, also to falsify the number of the   
 Epistles.”   
 Now secing that Marcion held ten Epistles only of St. Paul, it would   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
 4 On the phanomenon of the diversify of traditions, see below, par. 36 1.   
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