§1] ITS AUTHORSHIP. [ivtropvetion.   
   
 a superseription, viz. that St. Paul was not tho Apostle of the Jews but   
 of the Gentiles, citing Gal. ii. 10: and proceeds, but the Epistle is   
 afterwards seen to be Paul’s, by ch. x. 34, in which the (now exploded)   
 reading with my bonds is his point: by ch. xiii. 18, 19: by ch. xiii. 23,   
 in which he interprets the word which we render, “ set at liberty,” “ sent   
 forth for the ministry,” which he says no one could do but St. Paul: and   
 then expecting him soon, he promises, as is his custom frequently, a   
 visit from himself with him.   
 ‘This testimony is valuable, as shewing that in the midst of the pre-   
 valence of the now accepted opinion, a spirit of intelligent criticism still   
 survived.   
 47. If we now turn to other parts of the Eastern Church, we find the   
 same acceptation of the Pauline authorship from the middle of the third   
 century onwards. Bleck gives citations from Mernoptus, Bishop of   
 Olympus in Lyeia, about 290: from Pau of Samosata, Bishop of An-   
 tioch in 264: from Jacos, Bishop of Ntstxts, about 325: from Errren   
 the Syrran (died 378).   
 48. A separate notice is required of the testimony of Eusrpius   
 of Casarea, the well-known Church historian. In very many passages   
 throughout his works, and more especially in his commentary on the   
 Psalms, he cites the Epistle, and always as the work of St. Paul, or of   
 « the Apostle,” or “ the holy Apostle,” or “the divine Apostle.” In his   
 Ecclesiastical History also he reckons it among the Epistles of St. Paul.   
 In the chapter which treats especially of the eanon of the New Test., while   
 there is no express mention of the Epistle to the Hebrews, it is evident,   
 by comparing his words there and in another place, that he reckons it as   
 confesscdly one of the writings of St.Paul. For he enumerates among   
 those New Test. books which are ‘received by all, fourteen Epistles of   
 St. Panl.   
 Still it would appear from another passage, that Eusebins himself be-   
 lieved the Epistle to have been written in Hebrew by St. Paul and trans-   
 lated by Luke, or more probably by Clement, whose style it resembles.   
 Ifsuch was his view, however, he was hardly consistent with himself:   
 for elsewhere he seems to assume that the Epistle was written in Greek   
 by the Apostle himself; an inconsistency which betrays cither carcless-   
 ness, or change of opinion.   
 49, Marks of the same inconsistency further appear in another place,   
 where he numbers our Epistle among the donbtful books, saying of Cle-   
 ment of Alexandria, that he cites testimonies from doubtful books, such   
 as that called the Wisdom of Solomon, Jesus the Son of Sirach, and the   
 Epistle to the Hebrews, and those of Barnabas and Clement and Jude.   
 It has been suggested that the inconsistency may be removed by aceept-   
 ing this last as a mere matter of fact, meaning that these books are ealled   
 in question by some.   
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