intropuction.] THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS. [cu. xv.   
   
   
 before the age of Jerome, this Epistle was not received by the Latins   
 among the canonical ones.”   
 96. A more remarkable testimony is that of CarpinaL CageTAn, as   
 cited by Erasmus, who says that the Cardinal, both in conversation when   
 alive and in a work of his, cited the Epistle without its writer’s name,   
 designating him as “the author of the Epistle to fhe Hebrews.” Bellar-   
 mine cites Cajetan as objecting to the idea that St. Paul wrote the Epistle,   
 ch, ix, 4, as inconsistent with 1 Kings viii. 9, and saying, “ Thereforo   
 either Pan! lies, or he did not write this Epistle.”   
 97. Erasmus gives it as his decided opinion that the Epistle is not   
 written by St. Paul: and alleges at length the principal argnments on   
 which it is founded. The passage is a long one, but important, and   
 will be found quoted entire in the corresponding paragraph of the   
 Prolegomena to my Greek Testament : and other passages to the same   
 effect are cited in Bleck,   
 98. Luruer spoke still more plainly. In his introdnetion to his   
 version of the Epistle, he maintains that it cannot be St. Paul’s, nor   
 indeed the writing of any apostle: appealing to such passages as ch. ii. 3;   
 vi. 4 ff.; x. 26 ff; xii. 17. But whose it is he does not pretend to say,   
 further than that it comes from some scholar of the Apostles, well versed   
 in the Scriptures. Aud with this view his manner of citation is gene-   
 rally consistent. His well-known conjecture, that the Writer of the   
 Epistle was Apollos, is expressed in his Commentary on Genesis.   
 99. In one place he seems to imply that others had already conjectured   
 Apollos 1o be the author. But this does not appear to be so; and he   
 may, as Bleek imagines, be merely referring to opinions of learned   
 men of his own day, who had either suggested, or adopted his own   
 view.   
 100. Canviy’s opinion was equally unfavourable to the Pauline   
 authorship. While in his Institutes he ordinarily cites the Epistle as   
 the words of “the Apostle,” and defends its apostolicity in the argument   
 to his Commentary, yet he sometimes cites the “author of the Epistle   
 to the Hebrews ;” and when he comes to the question itself, declares   
 his view very plainly :   
 “ Who composed it, is hardly worth caring about. Some have thought   
 him to be Paul, some Luke, Barnabas, or Clement. I know that   
 in the time of Chrysostom, it was very generally received by the   
 Greeks among St. Paul's; but the Latins thought otherwise,   
 especially those who were nearest to the times of the Apostles.   
 Nothing will induce me to acknowledge St. Panl as its author.   
 For those who say that his name was purposely suppressed beeanse   
 it was odious to the Jews, allege nothing to the point. For if it   
 were so, why should he have made mention of Timotheus? By   
 this indication he betrayed himself. But the manner of teaching   
 160