

erroneous, as is clearly shown by the large number of religious works, possessing considerable worth, excluded from the canon. It is true the principles on which they formed their conclusions were not quite the same as those in vogue at Tübingen. They were really more sensible, because more distinctly historical and more firmly applied. Hence in the case of canonical books accepted by the Church, the presumption is strongly in favour of receiving their statements as to authorship at their face value.

Now how far has this presumption been borne out by recent criticism? Out of the sixty-six books which compose the collection, there are thirty-three that may be regarded as making direct statements as to their own authorship. These are, Canticles, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the twelve minor prophets, except Jonah, in the Old Testament; the thirteen Pauline epistles, those of James, Peter and Jude with the apocalypse, in the new. Every one of these have been scrutinized in the most searching way, and with what results? I believe it can be said broadly that there is no single instance in which the criticism of the nineteenth century has succeeded in finally discrediting their genuineness. Some of them, such as the Pastoral epistles and Second Peter, have trembled in the balance, but as yet they keep their place and seem likely to do so. Canticles has, by very many, been referred to some author long after Solomon's death, but Prof. Robertson Smith, one of the most thorough-going disciples of the German critical school, while questioning the accuracy of the title attributing it to Solomon, now admits that it must have been written about Solomon's time. If so, it is little better than downright perversity to allow any theory as to the interpretation of the book to set aside a plain statement as to the authorship; for even if this statement is not as old as the book itself, it certainly represents the earliest and only tradition on the point. As to the rest, perhaps the most serious doubt at the present hangs over the latter part of the book of Isaiah, which is now very generally attributed to a nameless prophet of the captivity. The question, however, is by no means closed, and there are a good many points that will bear further investigation in the new light that is being thrown on Isaiah's time by recent Assyrian discoveries. But even if it should turn out that those chapters are not Isaiah's, this would hardly be an exception to the above statement. The book has always been known to be a collection of separate compositions, though believed to be all by the same writer. This last section, however, is really anonymous, and is con-

✓