§ 1] ITS AUTHORSHIP. [inrropuction.   
   
 some . . . . wish to adduce it to support their opinions, and I bow to   
 the authority of the Eastern churches which hold it to be canonieal,—   
 let us see how strong testimonies for our view it contains.”   
 In the beginning of his Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans   
 (written in A.p, 394), he says : “ Except the Epistle which he wrote to   
 the Hebrews, where he is said purposely to have omitted a salutation at   
 the beginning, lest the Jews who never ceased to ery out against him   
 should, by the mention of his name, be offended, or read with a preju-   
 diced mind, or should not eare to read at all what he had written for   
 their good. Whence some have been afraid to receive that Epistle into   
 the canou of Scripture. But however that question is to be answered, ex-   
 cept this Epistle, all those which are received without doubt by all the   
 churches as St. Paul’s, contain such a salutation,” &e.   
 In his treatise on the City of God: “in the Epistle which is in-   
 scribed to the IIcbrews, which most say is the Apostle Paul's, but some   
 deny it.”   
 In that on Faith, Hope, and Charity (a.p. 421): “in the Epistle to   
 the Hebrews, which illustrious defenders of the Catholic faith have used   
 as testimony.”   
 84. Sometimes indced he cites our Epistle simply with the formule,—   
 “you hear the Apostle’s exhortation :”—“ listen to what the Apostle   
 says :”—sometimes with such words as these, “whom the Scripture   
 blames, saying ;” “lastly, on account of what is said.” But much more   
 frequently he cites either merely “ the Epistle to the Hebrews :” or “the   
 Epistle which is written (or, ‘ which is,’ or, ‘which is inseribed ’) to the   
 Ilebrews.” It is certainly a legitimate inference from these modes of   
 quotation, that they arose from a fecling of uncertainty as to the   
 authorship. It would be inconceivable, as Bleck remarks, that Augus-   
 tine should have used the words “in the Epistle which is inscribed to   
 the Romans, to the Galatians,” &e.   
 85. It is of some interest to trace the change of view in the Romish   
 church, which seems to have taken place about this time. In the synod   
 of Hippo, before referred to (par. 81), and in the 3rd council of Carthage   
 (ib.) it was determined to consult “the church over the sea” for con-   
 firmation of the canon of Scripture as then settled. And what was meant   
 by this, is more fully explained by a similar resolution of the 5th council   
 of Carthage (ib.): viz, that St. Boniface, then Bishop of Rome, and   
 other bishops of those parts were to be consulted. Whether these refe-   
 rences were ever made, we have no means of knowing; but we possess   
 a document of the same age, which scems to shew that, had they been   
 made, they would have resulted in the confirmation of the canonical   
 place of the Epistle. Pope Iunocent I. in his letter to Exsuperius,   
 Bishop of ‘Toulouse (a.p. 405 ff.), enumerates the books of the New Test.   
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