

nected with the rest only by the running title at the head of the page. We might account for its association with them by the supposition that its author was one of the disciples of the school of Isaiah.

Of the remaining 32 books, nine make statements as to their authorship which are somewhat vague and ambiguous, twelve have simply running titles traditionally attached to them in manuscripts with various degrees of probability, two are collections of pieces by different writers, some known some unknown, while ten are altogether anonymous. For the determination of these we must fall back largely upon other sources of information—history, tradition, literary conjecture. What have been the results here?

As to the ten books which are entirely anonymous recent criticism has not been able to tell us much that has not long been known, nor has it reversed many of the conclusions reached by the Church fifteen centuries ago and since then held traditionally. The Acts of the Apostles, the only one of this class in the New Testament is still attributed to Luke as it always has been. Judges, Ruth, and Esther in the Old are still anonymous as they always have been. The Talmudical traditions as to the authorship of Job, Kings and Chronicles, which traditions were committed to writing only after the Christian era and never universally accepted, are perhaps not now held with as much confidence as formerly. But even these have not been quite set aside, except in the case of the book of Job which hardly any one now would attribute to Moses. A vigorous effort has been made to bring Chronicles down to a time much later than Ezra, but with only partial success. The one point where important results are loudly proclaimed is as to the authorship of the anonymous book of Genesis. The origin of this, however, is closely bound up with that of the rest of the Pentateuch and will be noticed later on.

Besides these ten which are admittedly anonymous there are twelve more which are so really, but with which the names of certain authors are associated in the titles. These titles of course formed no part of the original texts, but were attached at a later time and are simply expressive of the generally accepted opinion of the Church at that later time. As might be expected, criticism has shown these to be of somewhat unequal value. But probably they were not all intended to express authorship. Thus for example Samuel can hardly have been regarded as the writer of the books bearing his name, since the history is brought down to a period considerably