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 and style betoken another than Paul: and the writer confesses   
 himself to have been one of the disciples of the Apostles, ch.   
 which is repugnant in the last degree to the habit of Paul.”   
 And he speaks similarly in his Commentary on ch. ii. 3 itself,   
 101. Very similar are the comments of Brza, at least in his earlier   
 editions : for all the passages quoted by Bleck, from his introduction,   
 on ch. ii. 3, xiii. 26, as being in his own edition of Beza 1582, and from   
 Spanheim, as not extant in that edition, are, in the edition of 1590,   
 which I use, expunged, and other comments, favourable to the Pauline   
 origin, substituted for them.   
 102. And this change of opinion in Beza only coincided with in-   
 fluences which both in the Romish and in the Protestant churches soon   
 repressed the progress of intelligent criticism and free expression of   
 opinion. Cardinal Cajetan was severely handled by Ambrosius Catha-   
 rinus, who accnged him of the same doubts in relation to this Epistle   
 as those entertained by Julian respecting the Gospel of St. Matthew:   
 Erasmus was attacked by the theologians of the Sorbonne in a censure   
 which concludes thus: “‘ Wonderful is the arrogance and the pertinacity   
 of this writer, in that, when so many Catholic doctors, pontifis, aud   
 councils declare that this Epistle is Paul’s, and the universal use and   
 consent of the Church approves the same, this writer still doubts it,   
 as being wiser than the whole world.” And finally the council of ‘T'rent,   
 in 1546, closed up the question for Romanists by declaring, “Of the   
 New Testament, . . . . fourteen Epistles of Paul the Apostle: to the   
 Romans, &e. . . . . to the Hebrews.” So that the best divines of that   
 Church have since then had only that way open to them of expressing   
 an intelligent judgment, which holds the matter of the Epistle to be   
 St. Paul’s, but the style and arrangement that of some other person:   
 so Bellarmine: so Estius, in his introduction to the Epistle, which   
 is well worth reading, as a remarkable instance of his ability and   
 candour.   
 103. In the Protestant churches we find, as might be expected, a   
 longer prevalence of free judgment on the matter. It will be seen by   
 the copious citations in Bleck, that Melanchthon remained ever con-   
 sistent in quoting the Epistle simply as “the Epistle to the Hebrews :”   
 that the Magdeburg Centuriators distinctly denied the Pauline origin:   
 that Brenz, in the Wirtemburg Confession, distinguishes in his citations   
 this Epistle from those of St. Paul.   
 104, At the same time we find inconsistency on the point in Brenz   
 himself: in the Commentary on the Epistle written by his son, the   
 Pauline authorship .is maintained: also by Flacius Illyricns (1557)   
 on 2 priori grounds. In the Concordien-lormel, the Epistle is cited in   
 the original German without any name, whereas in the Latin ve   
 ave “the Apostle saith,” and the like. And this latter view con-   
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