§1.J ITS AUTHORSHIP. [intropuction.   
   
 64. On the other hand, Awrrosr, Bp. of Milan (died 397), combating   
 strongly the Arians of his time, and making diligent use of the writings   
 of Origen, Didymns, and Basil, often uses and quotes the Epistle,   
 and always as the work of St. Pant. In one celebrated passage in his   
 treatise on Penitence, where he is impugning the allegation by the   
 Novatians of Heb. vi. 4 ff, he defends the passage from misnnderstand-   
 ing; confesses its apparent inconsistency with St. Paul’s conduct to the   
 sinner at Corinth; docs not think of questioning the apostolical autho-   
 rity of the passage, but asks, “Could Paul preach against his own   
 act?” and gives two solutions of the apparent discrepancy.   
 65. We have an important testimony conccraing our Epistle from   
 Puirastnivs, Bp. of Brescia (died about 387), who while he cites the   
 Epistle as unhesitatingly as his friend Ambrose, in his treatise on   
 Heresies, says, “There is a heresy of some respecting the Epistle of   
 Paul to the Icbrews. There are some who assert it not to be his, but   
 say that it was written either by Barnabas the Apostle, or by Clement,   
 Bishop of Rome. And others say it is an Epistle of the Evangelist   
 Luke to the Laodiccans®, And because some unbelievers have made   
 additions in it, it is not read in the chureh; and, if it is read by some,   
 yet it is not read to the people in the church, but only thirteen Epistles   
 of his, and occasionally that to the Hebrews. Also, because it is written   
 in plansible language after a fashion, they think it not to be the work of   
 that Apostle. Also because in it the author says that Christ was made   
 (ch. iii. 2), it is not read. And equally for another reason, its saying   
 about penitence (ch. vi. 4 ff.), on account of the Novatians.” ‘Then he   
 proceeds to give orthodox explanations of both places.   
 He has also another remarkable passage, in which he enumerates   
 thirteen Epistles of Paul as canonical, and calls the rest apocryphal, to   
 be read for moral instruction by the perfect, but not by all, as having   
 been tampered with (so he would seem to mean) by heretics.   
 These testimonies of Philastrins are cnrious, and hardly consistent   
 with one another, nor with his own usual practice of citing the Epistle   
 as St. Panl’s. They scem to lead us to an inference agreeing with   
 that to which our previous enquiries led, viz. that though some con-   
 troversial writers in the Latin chureh at the end of the fourth century   
 were beginning to cito the Epistle as St. Paul’s, it was not at that time   
 so recognized in that church generally, nov publicly read: or if read,   
 but seldom.   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
 © This curious sentence ean hardly mean, as Bleck, that they believed the Epistle   
 to the Hebrews to be St. Luke’s, also that apocryphal one which is written to the   
 Laodiceans ; but that they believed the Epistle to the Hebrews to be St. Luke’ and   
 that i¢ was also written to the Laodiccans, Epistle alluded to under that   
 designation by St. Paul in Col. iv. 16. What follows is very obscure, but does not   
 seem to me to support this rendering of Bleek’s.   
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