intRopuctiIon.] THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS. [cn xv.   
   
   
 appear by combining this with the former testimony, that the Epistle to   
 the Hebrews was not here reckoned among them.   
 28, Among the witnesses belonging to the end of the second and   
 beginning of the third century, none is of more weight than Irex.xus, a   
 Greek of Asia Minor by birth, and bishop of Lyons in Gaul, and thus   
 representing the testimony of the church in both countries. In his   
 great work against Heresies, he makes frequent use of the Epistles of   
 St. Paul, expressly quoting twelve of them. ‘There is no citation from   
 the Epistle to Philemon, which may well be, from its brevity, and its   
 personal character. But nowhere in this work has he cited or referred   
 to the Epistle to the Hebrews at all, although it would have been   
 exceedingly apposite for his purpose, as against the Gnosties of his time.   
 Eusebius says “that a work of Ireneus was extant in his time, called   
 treatises concerning various matters, wherein he quoted passages from   
 the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Wisdom of Solomon.” From this   
 it would seem that Eusebius was unable to find any citations of the   
 Epistle in other works of Irenwus known to him. And he does not   
 even here say that Ireneus mentioned St. Paul as the author of the   
 Epistle.   
 29, Indeed we have a testimony which goes to assert that this Father   
 distinetly denied the Pauline authorship. Photius cites a passage from   
 Stephen Gobar, a tritheist of the sixth century, in which he says, “that   
 Hippolytus and Jrenaus assert the Epistle to the Hebrews, commonly   
 ascribed to Paul, not to be by him.” The same is indeed asserted of   
 Hippolytus by Photius himself ; but it is strange, if Irenwus had asserted   
 it, that Eusebius should have made no mention of the fact, adducing   
 ashe does the citation of the Epistle by him. At the ‘same time,   
 Gobar’s language is far too precise to be referred to the mere fact that   
 Trenus does not cite the Epistle as St. Paul’s, as some have endeavoured   
 to refer it: and it is to be remembered, that Eusebius does not pretend   
 to have read or seen all the works of Irenzus then extant. Bleek puts   
 the alternative well, aceording as we accept, or do not accept, the asser-   
 tion of Gobar. If we accept it, it would shew that Irenzeus had found   
 somewhere prevalent the idea that St. Paul was the author ; otherwise he   
 would not have taken the pains to contradict such an idea. If we do not   
 accept it as any more than a negative report, meaning that Irenwus   
 nowhere cites the Epistle as St. Paul’s, then at all events, considering   
 that he constantly cites St. Paul’s Epistles as his, we shall have the   
 presumption, that he neither accepted, nor knew of, any such idea as   
 the Pauline authorship.   
 30. If we now pass to the Church of Rome, we find, belonging to the   
 period of which we have been treating, tho testimony of the presbyter   
 Caius. Of him Ensebius relates, “that in a dialogue published by   
 him, he speaks of thirteen Epistles only written by Paul, not numbering   
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