§1] ITS AUTHORSHIP. [srropverion.   
   
 is not believed to be his, on account of the difference of style and   
 diction, but is thonght to be either Barnabas’s, aceording to ‘Tertul-   
 lian, or Luke the Evangolist’s, according to some, or Clement’s,   
 afterwards bishop of the Roman chureh, who is reported to have   
 arranged and adorned Paul’s thoughts in words of his own; or at   
 any rate that Paul, in writing to the Hebrews, on account of his   
 nnpopularity among them, suppressed the mention of his name in   
 the opening salutation. For he had written as a Hebrew to the   
 Ilebrews in Hebrew, i.e, in his own mother tongue, most   
 cloquently, and those things which were written cloquently in   
 Hebrew were still more eloquently turned into Greek: and this is   
 the cause why it seems to differ from the rest of Paul’s Epistles.”   
   
   
   
 70. In this passage, while he relates the doubts and hypotheses, his   
 own leaning scems to be, to believe that the fact of St. Paul having   
 written in Hebrew, and having omitted a salutation owing to his   
 unpopularity among the Jews, would be enough to account for the   
 phenomena of the Epistle.   
 71. But in other places, he gives other reasons for the difficulties   
 of the Epistle and for the doubts respecting it. Thus in his Commentary   
 on Gal. i, 1 he says, that St. Paul does not in it call himself an Apostle,   
 or mention his name, because it would be incongrnous, where Christ   
 was going to be called an Apostle (Heb. iii. 1, iv. 14), that Paul should   
 haye the same appellation.   
 Again, on Isa. vi. 9, 10, he says that the Epistle is questioned, be-   
 cause in it Paul, writing to Hebrews, uses testimonies which are not in   
 the Hebrew books.   
 72. In the prologue to his Commentary on Titus, he severely blames   
 the Marcionites and other heretics for excluding arbitrarily certain   
 Epistles from the number of the Apostolic writings, instancing the   
 Pastoral Epistles and this to the Hebrews. He then proceeds:   
   
   
   
   
 “Tf they gave any reason why they think them not the Apostle’s,   
 we might try to make some answer satisfactory to the reader. But   
 since now they prononnee with heretical authority, and say that   
 Epistle is Pauls, this is not, let them take the same kind of   
 authority as their refutation on behalf of the truth, by which they   
 are not ashamed to invent falschoods.”   
   
   
 Still that this strong language does not prove him to have been   
 satisfied as to the Pauline authorship, is shewn by two passages in his   
 commentary on this same Epistle to Titus:   
   
 «Pay also particular attention to this, how speaking of the presby-   
 ters of one city, he afterwards calls them bishops. If any likes to   
 acknowledge that Epistle which under the name of Paul is written   
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