§ vt] CANONICITY. [wrropuction.   
   
 and copious use of it, never citing it expressly, never appealing to it as   
 Seripture, but adopting its words and expressions, just as he docs those   
 of other books of the New Testament. It is to be observed, that when   
 in the course of thus incorporating it he refers to the Scripture, or uses   
 the expression it is written, it is with regard to texts quoted not from it   
 only, but also from the Old ‘Test. By this procedure we caunot say that   
 Clement easts any slight on this Epistle, for it is his constant practice.   
 He frequently quotes Scripture as such, but it is always the Old Test.   
 Two or three times he adduces the sayings of our Lord, but never even   
 this in the form of a citation from our existing gospels, or in agreement   
 with their exact words. All we can gather from Clement is, that, treat-   
 ing this as he does other Epistles’, and appropriating largely as he docs   
 its words and expressions, he certainly did not rank it below those   
 others: an inference which would lead us to believe that he recognized   
 its canonical authority, But to found more than this on Clement’s   
 testimony, would be unwarranted by fair induetion.   
 8. Justin Martyr, amidst a few allusions to our Epistle, makes what   
 can hardly but be called canonical use of it in his first Apology. There,   
 in explaining that the Word of God is also His Son, he adds, “ Jfore-   
 over, He is called Angel and Apostle.” Now it appears from his own   
 statement in another place, that the allusion in the words, “ He is called   
 ‘an angel,” is to Gen. xviii. 2. It wonld seem therefore, seeing that   
 Heb. iii. 1 is the only place where our Lord is entitled an aposile, that   
 the clause meant to embrace under it that. Passage as a Seripture   
 testimony equipollent with the other.   
 4, In Clement of Alexandria and Origen, the reeognition of our Epistle   
 as canonical depends on its recognition as the work of St. Paul. Where   
 they both cite it as Scripture, it is as written by him: and where Origen   
 mentions the doubt about its being his, he adduces other Scripture testi-   
 mony, observing that it needs another kind of proof, not that the Epistle   
 is canonical, but that it is St. Paul’s.   
 5. And very similar was the proceeding of those parts of the church   
 where the Pauline authorship was not held. Irenaus, as we have seen,   
 makes no use of the Epistle. The fragment of Muratori, representing the   
 view of the Roman church, probably does not contain it. Tertullian, who   
 regards it as written by Barnabas, the “companion of the Apostles,” cites   
 it, not as authoritative in itself, but as recording the sentiments of such   
 a companion of the Apostles.   
 6. Our Epistle is, it is true, contained in the Syriac version (Peschito)   
 made at the end of the sceond century: but it is entirely uncertain,   
 whether this insertion in the canon accompanied a recognition of the   
 Pauline authorship, or not. This recognition, which prevailed in that   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
 5 The only exception is in an express citation in c. 47 from 1 Corinthians, where,   
 writing to the Corinthians, he is appealing to the authority of St. Puul.   
 201 02