inTRoDUCTION.] THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS. [cu. xv.   
   
 part of the church in after times, may have at first occasioned its   
 insertion in the canon; but we cannot say that it did.   
 7. But in the Alexandrine Church the case was different. There, as   
 we have scen, the assumption of Pauline authorship appears early and   
 soon prevails universally: and in consequence we find the canonical   
 authority there unquestioned, and the Epistle treated as the other parts   
 of Scripture.   
 8. Throughout the Eastern Churches, the canonicity and apostolicity   
 were similarly regarded as inseparably connected. It is true that   
 Eusebius, in numbering it among the controverted books, together with   
 the Epistles of Barnabas and Clement and Jude, and the Wisdom of the   
 Son of Sirach, might seem to attribute to it another authorship, were it   
 not evident from his constant use of it,and his numbering it in his prin-   
 cipal passage on the Canon among the acknowledged books, that the   
 doubt must be resolved into that on the Pauline authorship,   
 9. In the Western Church, where this was not recognized, neither do   
 we find, even down to the middle of the fourth century, any use made of   
 the Epistle as canonical. Even Novatian and Cyprian, who might well   
 have thus used it, have not done so: nor in the controversies on the   
 reception of the lapsed, and on the repetition of heretical baptism, do we   
 ever find it adduced on either side, apposite as some passages are to the   
 subjects in dispute. Only with the assumption, gradually imported from   
 the East, of a Pauline origin, do we find here and there a Western   
 writer citing it as of canonical authority.   
 10. It is in Jerome first that we find® any indication of a doubt   
 whether canonicity and Pauline authorship are necessarily to stand and   
 fall together. The same is found’ now and then in the writings of   
 Augustine. But soon after this time the general prevalence, and ulti-   
 mately authoritative sanction, of the view of the Pauline authorship,   
 closed up any chance of the canonicity of the Epistle being held on   
 independent grounds: and it was not till the times of the Reformation,   
 that the matter began to be again enquired into on its own merits.   
 11. The canonicity was doubted by Cardinal Cajetan, but upheld by   
 Erasmus, in these remarkable words: ‘Nay, I cannot think that our   
 faith is in peril, if the whole Church is at fault in the title of this   
 Epistle, if only it be acknowledged that the Holy Spirit was the primary   
 Author, which is commonly held by all.” In the Roman Catholic   
 Church, however, the authoritative sanction given by the Council of   
 Trent to the belief of the Pauline origin effectually stopped all intelligent   
 enquiry.   
 12. Among reformed theologians, the canonicity of our Epistle was   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
 © See above, § i. parr, 6S—80: esp. par. 74 ff.   
 7 See § i. par. 81 ff.   
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