§1] ITS AUTHORSHIP. [xxrropuction.   
   
 among them that to the Iebrews, because it is even till now (Euse-   
 bius’s time) thought by some at Rome not to be the Apostle’s.”   
 These words can lead only to one of two inferences: that Caius, not   
 numbering the Epistle among those of St. Paul, either placed it by   
 itself, or did not mention it at all, In either case, he must be regarded   
 as speaking, uot his own private judgment mercly, but that of the   
 church to which he belonged, in which, as we further learn, the same   
 judgment yet lingered more than a century after,   
 81. Another testimony is that of the frigment respecting the canon   
 of the New Test., first published by Muratori, and known by his name,   
 generally ascribed to the end of the second or the beginning of the third   
 century. In this fragment it is stated that St. Paul wrote Epistles to   
 seven churehes ; and his thirteen Epistles are enumerated, in a peculiar   
 order: but that to the Hebrews is not named, unless it be distantly   
 hinted at, which is not probable.   
 32. As far then as we have advaneed, the following seems to be our   
 result, Nowhere, except in the Alexandrine church, does there scem to   
 have existed any idea that the Epistle was St. Paul’s. Throughout the   
 whole Western Church, it is either left unenumerated among his   
 writings, or expressly excluded from them, That it is wholly futile to   
 attempt to refer this to any influence of the Montanist or Marciouite   
 disputes, has been well and simply shewn by Bleck. ‘The idea of the   
 catholic teachers of the whole Western Church disparaging and ex-   
 cluding an apostolical book, because one passage of it (ch. vi. 4—6)   
 secmod to favour the tenets of their adversaries, is too preposterous   
 ever to have been suggested, except in the interests of a desperate   
 eause: and the fact that Tertullian, himself a Montanist, cites Heb. vi.   
 4—6 on his side, but without ascribing it to St. Paul, is decisive   
 against the notion that his adversaries so ascribed it at any time: for   
 he would have been sure in that case to have charged them with their   
 desertion of such an opinion.   
 33, And even in the Alexandrine Church itself, as we have seen,   
 there is no reliable trace of a historical tradition of the Pauline author-   
 ship. Every expression which scems to imply this, such c.g. as that   
 much-adduced one of Origen, “for not in vain have the ancients handed   
 it down as being Paul's,” when fairly examined, gives way under us.   
 The traditional account, though inconsistent with itself, was entirely   
 the other way.   
 84. The fair account then of opinion in the latter end of the second   
 century seems to be this: that there was then, as now, great uncertainty   
 regarding the authorship of our Epistle: that the general cast of the   
 thoughts was recognized as Pauline, and that the ancients, whatever   
 that may imply, had not unreasonably handed it down as St. Paul's:   
 but on what grounds, we are totally unable to say: for ecclesiastical   
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