IxTRopuction.] THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS. [eu. xv.   
   
 tinued to gain ground. It is maintained by Gerhard (1641) and   
 Caloyius (1676): and since the middle of the seventeenth century has   
 been the prevailing view in the Lutheran Chureh.   
 105. In the Calvinistic or Reformed Church, the same view became   
 prevalent even earlier, Of its various confessions, the Gallican, it   
 is true, sets the Epistle at the end of those of St. Paul: but the   
 Belgic, Helvetic, and Bohemian Confessions cite and treat it as   
 St. Paul’s.   
 106. The exceptions to this prevailing view were found in certain   
 Arminian divines, who, without impugning the authority of the Epistle,   
 did not bind themselves to a belicf of its Pauline origin. Such were   
 Grotius, who inclines to the belief that it was written by St. Luke: Le   
 Clere, who holds Apollos to have been the Author: Limborch, who holds   
 it to have been written “by some one of Paul’s companions with his   
 privity, and taken from his teaching:” and among the Socinians,   
 Schlichting, who says of it, “though it had not Paul himself for its   
 author, yet it came forth, if I may so say, from his manufactory, i. e.   
 was written by some one of his friends and companions, and that by   
 Paul's instigation, and in his spirit.”   
 107. There was also a growing disposition, both.in the Romish and~   
 in the reformed churches, to erect into an article of faith the Pauline   
 origin, and to deal severely with those who presumed to doubt it. Many   
 learned men, especially among Protestants, appeared as its defenders :   
 among whom we may especially notice Spanheim (the younger, 1659),   
 Braun and D’Outrein in Holland, our own Owen (1667), Mill (1707),   
 Hallet (the younger, 1727), Carpzov (1750), Sykes (1755), J. C. Wolf   
 (1784), and Andr. Cramer (1757), to whom Bleck adjudges the first   
 place among the upholders of the Pauline authorship.   
 108. Since the middle of the last century, the ancient doubts have   
 revived in Germany ; and in the progress of more extended and aceurate   
 ical enquiry, have now become almost universal. The first that care-   
 fully treated the matter with this view was Semler (1763), in his edition   
 of Baumgarten’s Commentary on the Epistle. Then followed Michaelis,   
 in the later editions of his Introduction: in the earlier, he had assumed   
 the Pauline authorship. The same doubts were repeated and enforced   
 by Ziegler, J. E. C. Schmidt (1804), Eichhorn (1812), Bertholdt (1819),   
 David Schulz (who carried the contrast which he endeavours to establish   
 between the Writer of this Epistle and St. Paul to an unreasonable length,   
 and thereby rather hindered than helped that side of the argument),   
 Seyfferth (who sets himself to demonstrate from the Epistle itself, that   
 it cannot have been written by St. Paul, but has no hypothesis respecting   
 the Writer), Béhme (who holds Silvanus to have been the Writer,   
 from similarities which he traces between our Epistle and 1 Peter, the   
 Greek of which he holds also to have proceeded from him), De Wetie   
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