

versally allowed to be genuine, though used in the churches and esteemed by many. Among these he names five, which he places first ; they are retained in *our* canon (though two or three of them are as doubtful now as they were then), viz., the Epistles of James and Jude, the 2nd of Peter; and the 2nd and 3rd of John. The other names by him in this class have been since rejected as spurious, in consequence of further examination. 3. In the third class, he mentioned many that are still partially known to us, which were considered then, as they are now, to be absurd or irreligious writings, invented by enemies to Christianity, and quite unworthy a place in the New Testament. Eusebius is doubtful regarding the genuineness of the Book of Revelations; and decides nothing with regard to the authenticity of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Origen and other learned writers who lived nearest the age in which the books of the New Testament were written, also doubted with regard to the authorship of some of the Epistles, placed by Eusebius in his 2nd Class, as well as respecting the genuineness of the Book of Revelations. Still these have been retained in our collection of the Scriptures.

Such then is the origin of the *Christian's Book*, so far as concerns the decision respecting what should be considered scripture and what should not. It is throughout evident that our present canon is the result to which the learning of many generations, and the decisions of many councils, have gradually led. The general conclusion has been that our present collection of narratives are, for the most part, genuine productions of the persons whose names they bear; and that they are divine or holy writings, because they contain a history of God's revelations to man-