inrropuction.] THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS. [cn. xv.   
   
   
 “Now whether it were Paul’s or no, I say not, but permit it to   
 other men’s judgments : neither think I it to be an article of any man’s   
 faith, but that a» man may doubt of the author.” Then, having met   
 several objections against its canonicity urged from certain texts in it,   
 as ch, vi. 4 ff, ch. x. 26 ff., ch. xii. 17, he concludes, “ Of this ye see   
 that this Epistle ought no more to be refused for a holy, godly, and   
 catholic, than the other authentic Scriptures.” And, speaking of the   
 Writer, he says, “It is easy to see that he was a faithful servant of   
 Christ, and of the same doctrine that Timothy was of, yea and Paul   
 himself was of, and that he was an Apostle, or in the Apostles’ time, or   
 near thereunto, And seeing the Epistle agreeth to all the rest of   
 the Scripture, if it be indifferently looked on, why should it not be   
 authority, and taken for holy Scripture \*?”   
 18. Fulke, in his defence of Translations of the Bible\*, while de-   
 fending the omission of the name of St. Paul in the title of the Epistle   
 in the Geneva Bible of 1560, says, “ Which of us, I pray you, that   
 thinketh that this Epistle was not written by St. Paul, once doubteth   
 whether it be not of apostolical spirit and authority ? Which is mani-   
 fest by this, that both in preaching and writing we cite it thus, the   
 Apostle to the Hebrews.”   
 19. Bp. Jewel again, in his Defence of the Apology, p. 186, where he   
 is speaking of the charge of anonymousness brought against it, says,   
 “The Epistle unto the Hebrews, some say, was written by St. Paul,   
 some by Clemens, some by Barnabas, some by some other: and so are   
 we uncertain of the author’s name.”   
 20. Whittaker says, “Thus, then, we doubt not of the authority of   
 any book of the New Testament, nor indeed of the author of any, save   
 only the Epistle to the Hebrews. That this Epistle is canonical, all   
 concede in the fullest sense: but it is not equally clear that it was   
 written by the Apostle Paul. . . . We need not be very earnest in this   
 debate ; it is not a matter of necessity, and the question may very well   
 be left in doubt, provided that, in the mean while, the authority of the   
 Epistle be allowed to remain clear and uncontested ”.”   
 21. With regard to the question itself, in what light we are to look   
 on our Epistle with respect to canonicity, it is one which it will be well   
 to treat here on general grounds, as it will come before us again more   
 than once, in writing of the remaining books of the New Test.   
 22. We might pnt this matter on the ground which Jerome takes in   
 his Epistle to Dardanus, “It makes no matter whose it is, for it is   
 plainly the work of a catholic (ecclesiastical) author :” or on that   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
 8 Tyndale’s Doctrinal Treatises, &e, Parker Society’s edn., pp. 521, 522,   
 ® Parker Society’s edn., pp. 82, 83.   
 10 Parker Society’s edn., pp. 106, 107.   
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