

THE ORIGIN AND AUTHORITY OF THE
BIBLICAL CANON ACCORDING TO THE
CONTINENTAL REFORMERS.

II. LUTHER, ZWINGLI, LEFÈVRE,
AND CALVIN.

IN my previous paper I urged again the familiar view that the Reform movement on the Continent received its initial impulse from the Humanists or Men of the New Learning who had revolted against Scholasticism. It would be a mistake, however, to confuse the two movements. They had in fact and in essence very little in common, and it has been a quite illogical process by which men like More, Erasmus, and others have been attacked because they did not openly join in the great campaigns led by Luther and Calvin.

It has been forgotten that the Reformers, notwithstanding their language on some occasions, were not really opposed to Scholasticism. What they objected to was the Scholasticism of the writers of the Middle Ages, while they had a scholasticism of their own quite as metaphysical as the other, and one which they clung to with desperation. Erasmus and his friends, on the other hand, were as much opposed to the new scholasticism as they were to the old, and perhaps more so. Hence it is irrational to blame them for refusing to accept this new metaphysic; when it was *a priori* reasoning and metaphysics of all kinds in theology to which they objected. And at the same time, as I said in my last paper, submission to the Church in the last resort was not contested even by the more daring Humanists.

Nothing can be more plain than the unconditional avowal made by Erasmus on this subject. In my previous paper I quoted his answer to the Sorbonne doctors. It is perhaps more effective to quote what he said in the privacy of correspondence with his friend Pirkheimer. He is protesting against Oecolampadius, the Professor of Theology at the University of Basle, who had written an introduction to his own Greek Testament, and having now joined the Reformers spoke of Erasmus as 'our Erasmus'. Erasmus felt that the phrase was compromising to him and by no means expressed his views, and he accordingly wrote as follows:—

'Illud inter amicos dixi, me posse in illius sententiam pedibus discedere, si probasset eam autoritas Ecclesiae, sed adieci, me nullo pacto ab ea posse dissentire. Ecclesiam autem voco totius populi Christiani consensum. An idem dixerint Hypocritae quorum meministi, nescio. A me certe sine fuco dictum est et ex animo, nec unquam de Eucharistiae veritate vacillavi. Quantum apud alios valeat autoritas Ecclesiae, nescio, certe apud me tantum valet ut cum Arianis et Pelagianis sentire possim, si probasset Ecclesia quod illi docuerunt. Nec mihi non sufficiunt verba Christi, sed mirum videri non debet, si sequor interpretem Ecclesiam, cuius autoritate persuasus credo scripturis canonicis. Fortasse plus vel ingenii, vel roboris est aliis, ego nulla in re tutius acquiesco, quam in certis Ecclesiae iudiciis. Rationum et argumentationum nullus est finis.'

This letter was written from Basle, and is dated 'postrid. Lucae, An. 1527' (*Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami*, Basle 1529, p. 732).

This attitude of Erasmus was shared by many of the very prominent Humanists quite honestly, and explains the position they took in the controversies of the early sixteenth century, which has been much misunderstood. They were champions of a new logic, an empirical and inductive logic, and of a new literary culture, and by no means anxious to adopt a new scholastic metaphysics built up by Luther or Calvin and their scholars, which they doubtless deemed to have much less authority than the philosophy of Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus, and to be quite as much based upon limited premisses and an imperfect *a priori* logic.

The methods of Biblical exegesis, however, patronized by

the Humanists, were directly adopted and followed by the Reformers. These methods were not new. They and their results were borrowed very largely from those of Saint Jerome.

The first scholar north of the Alps who thus adopted them in a scholar's way in modern times, and must assuredly claim to have been the forerunner of Biblical studies in the modern sense, was Jacques Lefèvre, of Étapes, a person much too little known to English readers. His importance as a factor in the great changes of the sixteenth century must excuse my devoting some paragraphs to him. He was born at Étapes in Picardy about 1450, of humble parents, took his degree at the University of Paris, and in his early days devoted himself to private teaching. His ardour in pursuit of classical studies took him to Italy, and he soon became a Greek scholar of distinction. He was admitted as a professor at the College of Cardinal Lemoine at Paris, and there proceeded to edit a number of Greek texts, especially devoting himself to Aristotle's *Physics*, *Metaphysics*, and *Ethics*. In 1507 he entered the Benedictine abbey of St-Germain-des-Prés at Paris, and from that time he began to abandon his secular studies and to devote himself to theology. His first work in this new line was a parallel edition of the Psalter in five versions, with a commentary. This he finished in 1508, and several editions of it were printed. In his Hebrew studies for this work (*Comm. ad Ps.* 114-15, &c.), he tells us he was largely indebted to Reuchlin's *Rudimenta lingue Hebraicæ*, which, as we have seen, was such a potent instrument in the initiation of Hebrew studies in Germany. Reuchlin and he, in fact, became close friends and correspondents. In 1512 he published at Paris a very remarkable work, especially remarkable considering its date, which preceded all the critical works on the Bible of Erasmus and the German Reformers. It consisted of a revised Latin translation of St Paul's Epistles, based largely on the Vulgate, with many corrections from the Greek, and printed in a parallel text with the Vulgate. Graf, in his life of Lefèvre, has given numerous examples of his new readings. The most remarkable features of the book, however, were the illuminating and singularly daring commentaries it contained, in which the old methods of scholastic exegesis were completely abandoned, and the text was discussed quite in

a modern way. So novel was it all that Lefèvre found it prudent to conciliate the authorities in a prefatory 'epistle' which was not quite ingenuous, and in which he claimed that he had ventured to some extent to correct the Vulgate, because in these Epistles the accepted Vulgate was not St Jerome's, but the text which that Father had himself corrected. Thus he says:

'Nos ad sacri Hieronymi translationem nihil ausos sed ad vulgatam aeditionem quae longe fuit ante beatum et gloriosum Ecclesie lumen Hieronymum et quam nobiscum ipse suggillat carpit et coarguit et quam veterem et vulgatam appellat aeditionem.'

He professes to prove this elaborately in the *Apologia* prefixed to the work itself, and headed 'Apologia quod vetus interpretatio Epistolarum Beatissimi Pauli quae passim legitur non sit translatio Hieronymi'.

In the commentaries following, the importance of which has never been quite appreciated, Lefèvre largely forestalls Luther's main contentions, those indeed with which his name is chiefly associated, namely, his views on Divine Grace and on the Sacrament of the Eucharist. In regard to the former, in his comments on the tenth chapter of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians fol. cxv he says:

'Spem habemus, crescente fide vestra in vobis magnificari secundum regulam nostram abunde in iis quae ultra vos sunt evangelizare non in aliena regula in iis quae prompta sunt gloriari. Qui autem gloriatur: in domino gloriatur. Non enim qui seipsum commendat ille probatus est, sed quem dominus commendat. Dei munere nonnulla parata Paulus habebat, quae superioribus Corintho regionibus praedicaturus erat, in quibus evangelizandis gloriari posset secundum mensuram ac normam donationis Christi. Sed id non est in se gloriari: sed in deo qui dat. Qui enim in aliquo gloriatur non quia in se est sed quia ab aliquo est, non propter se sed propter eum qui largitur, non in se sed in largiente gloriatur, et haec gloriatio vera et sancta est. Quam nobis largiatur Christus in omnia saecula benedictus: in quo solo universus gloriatur mundus.'

In regard to the mass, he says, in his commentary on the seventh and thirteenth chapters of the Epistle to the Hebrews, *op. cit.* fols. cxciij and ccvii:

‘Quod caeteri sacerdotes quotidie pro propriis peccatis et pro peccatis populi innumeris repetitis vicibus faciebant: Christus non pro propriis peccatis (ut qui peccatum non fecit nec inventus est dolus in ore eius) sed pro totius mundi una oblatione satisfecit unus et uice una: potentior innumeris infinitis iteratis hostiis. Ergo quae in ministerio sacerdotii eius quotidie peraguntur: non tam sunt iteratae oblationes quam unius eiusdem et quae semel tantum oblata est victimae memoria ac recordatio. Haec (inquit) quotiescunque feceritis: in mei memoriam facietis, semel enim pro omnibus satisfecit. Neque aliud mysterium continet, quam ex praesentia corporis et sanguinis olim oblati illius divinae et omni-salvificae oblationis sanctificationisque memoriam, quae omni sacrificio et omni oblatione ad finem usque mundi deo est acceptior. Et hic sacerdos noster et haec victima non est a lege Hebraeorum instituta, sed a divino iusiurando quod non pro tempore legis fuit sed pro sacerdotio post legem. . . . Ergo in luce novi sacerdotis et novi sacrificii ambulantes: in ipsum semper intendamus, gratia eius illuminati qui est filius dei, solus in aeternum perfectus consummatusque sacerdos, qui nos lavit, nos redemit, aversos et odibiles nos convertit et reconciliat deo patri in memoria illa oblationis qua seipsum ei pro nobis obtulit. . . . Gratia quae confirmat cor doctrina Christi est. Cibi in quibus qui ambulaverunt non profecerunt: variae doctrinae et peregrinae quae dei sermonem non continent sed potius illi adversantur. Nam (ut scriptum est) non in solo pane vivit homo: sed in omni verbo quod procedit ex ore dei. Qui cultum habent tabernaculi: Iudaei sunt (de veteri enim tabernaculo id dictum est) qui non participant altari Christi. Et ideo potestatem non habent ut edant de altari Christi: id est ut vitalem doctrinae Christi cibum in se transferant, tanto minus et nos de doctrinis Iudaeorum et aliorum edere debemus sed debemus sequi Christum extra omnia castra, extra omnes alienas doctrinas et extra hunc mundum. Quod et Iudaeis monstrabatur in figura: nam vitulus qui fiebat pro peccato. . . . extra castra comburebatur: indicium quod Christus qui immolaretur pro peccato mundi extra hunc mundum quaerendus esset. Et in huius rei argumentum: Christus dominus cum nos sanguine suo sanctificavit in monte Calvariae extra portam Hierusalem passus est. Extra ergo omnem doctrinam, quae celestis non sit et evangelica aut evangelicae assecla, quaerendus est Christus.’

I have thought it right to extract these passages, since they are virtually unknown to English readers, and are remarkable statements to have been publicly made by one who was professedly an orthodox person, in a work especially dedicated to a bishop. As Mr H. C. Lea says of Lefèvre's work, that it is

'the first example of casting aside the scholastic exegesis for a treatment in which tradition was rejected and the freedom of individual judgement was exercised as of right'.

Lefèvre's criticism was not always along lines afterwards approved by the Reformers, but was singular and detached. Thus, in regard to the way in which Adam's fall brought the penalty of death into the world and Christ's grace repaired the mischief, he did not hold with the predestinarianism of Augustine and of many of the Reformers, but was a champion of Free-will as the real cause of human sin; while on the other hand he held that man can do no good act by his own effort (*ad Rom.* vii 8 and ix 14), and he strove to reconcile the teaching of Paul and James on good works.

In other passages he sharply attacked the methods employed by the friars in their missionary work, in which they put the Scripture aside in favour of superstitious practices and crude stories of miracles, &c. *Inter alia*, he pointedly objected to converging so much attention on the stigmata of St Francis, while forgetting the real stigmata of Christ. He questioned the efficacy of prayers made in a language which men did not understand (*ad 1 Cor.* xiv and xvi), and the excessive self-mortification and the exaggerated fastings and abstinence which were deemed to be remedies for sins which the death of Christ alone washed out (*ad 2 Cor.* ii 16, iii 5-7; *ad Heb.* vi 6; *ad Rom.* xiv 13). While approving of celibacy among those who had a vocation, he strongly opposed its adoption among those who had not, and called attention to the fact that until the time of Gregory the Seventh, priests were allowed to marry once, while the practice still prevailed in the Greek Church (*ad 1 Cor.* vii 25; *Phil.* iv 1).

All this is very noteworthy, and not less so because Lefèvre never openly broke with the Church, nor was he ever driven out of it; while, as we shall see, his influence on the text of the Bible used by the French Reformers was paramount.

Let us now turn elsewhere. Four years after Lefèvre published his Commentaries just named, i.e. in 1516, Erasmus brought out the first edition of his Greek New Testament at Basle. It was an epoch-making work, which both directly and indirectly had a great effect on Biblical studies.

In the preface to this work Erasmus speaks with incisive keenness of the barren study of Scholasticism, which had paralysed theology for so many centuries, and his language on the subject is not less remarkable because it appears on the same page with profuse adulation of Pope Leo the Tenth to whom it was dedicated, and who (Epicurean as he was) doubtless sympathized with it all. In the same preface he addresses almost hyperbolic compliments to his Mecaenas, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Warham, whose friends and associates were, it will be remembered, the group of scholars forming the English humanists—More, Colet, and the rest. Erasmus thus describes Warham and denounces Scholasticism in the same paragraph :

‘ Ille apud suos, virtutum ac literarum omnium Mecaenas et antistes, Gulielmus Archiepiscopus Cantuariensis, totius Angliae non tituli tantum honore primas, ac tuae sanctitatis legatus, ut vocant, natus, cui meipsum quoque quantus quantus sum debeo, non modo universum studii mei proventum . . . ’

This dedication is interesting in view of what follows. In his *paraclesis* to the pious reader, he says :

‘ Christianis omnibus evangelia et apostolorum literae ita sanctae habeantur, ut haec prae illis non videantur esse sancta. Quid Alberto magno, quid Alexandro, quid Thomae, quid Aegidio, quid Ricardo, quid Occam alii velint tribuere, per me sane cuique liberum erit, nolim enim cuiusque imminuere gloriam, aut cum inveteratis iam hominum studiis dimicare. Sint illa quantumvis erudita, quantumvis subtilia, quantumvis si velint seraphica, haec tamen certissima fateantur oportet.’

In the second address, styled *Methodus*, he speaks more plainly :

‘ Praestat paulo minus esse sophistam quam minus sapere in evangelii ac Paulinis literis. Satius est ignorare quaedam Aristotelis dogmata quam nescire Christi decreta. Denique malim cum Hieronymo pius esse theologus, quam cum Scoto invictus. . . . Quis enim omnino nodus dialectica subtilitate necti potest, qui non eadem subtilitate dissolvatur, si liberum fit utrisque, quod volet assumere. At simplices illae literae totius orbis populos pauculis annis innovare potuerunt. . . . Cui placent scholasticae conflictationes sequatur, quod in scholis receptum est. At si quis magis cupit instructus esse ad pietatem quam ad disputationem in primis et potissimum versetur in fontibus, versetur in his scriptoribus,

qui proxime biberunt de fontibus. Quod diminutum erit in syllogismis, id pensabit oratio. Et satis invictus fueris theologus, si eo profeceris, ut nulli succumbas vicio, nullis cedas cupiditatibus, etiam si a disputatione quodlibetica discesseris inferior. Abunde magnus doctor est qui pure docet Christum.'

Erasmus does not disguise his views about certain books. In his *Argumentum* at the head of the Epistle to the Hebrews, he explains why it is anonymous, and attributes it to the modesty of the Apostle, but he heads it 'ΤΟΥ ΑΓΙΟΥ ΠΑΥΛΟΥ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΟΥ ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ ΠΡΟΣ ΤΟΥΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ Beati Apostoli Pauli Epistola ad Hebraeos'. Jude is put immediately before Revelation.

Erasmus exercised very great freedom of criticism in his prefaces to the various Bible books. Thus, in his annotations to the Epistle of James, which he heads 'Annotationes in Epistolam Iacobi', he says:

'Apostolus non additur in his libris, quos ego viderim, nec in latinis emendatioribus. Et fieri potest, ut nomen commune cum apostolo praeberit occasionem, ut haec epistola Iacobo apostolo ascriberetur, cum fuerit alterius cuiusdam Iacobi, nam de hac quoque nonnihil est dubitatum. Idem accidit in duabus posterioribus, quae ob nomen commune Ioanni tribuuntur apostolo, cum alterius sint, autore Hieronymo.'

Of the Second Epistle of Peter, he says:

'De hac quoque secunda Petri epistola, cuius esset in controverso erat. Id attestatur Hieronymus in catalogo scriptorum illustrium his quidem verbis: Scripsit duas epistolas, quae canonicae nominantur, quarum secunda a plerisque eius esse negatur, propter stilum cum priore dissonantem. At idem alias variat, nunc volens eam esse Petri, et stili dissonantiam reiiciens in interpretem, quo tum Petrus sit usus, nunc negans illius esse quod reclamatur stilus.'

In regard to the two latter Epistles of St John, Erasmus says:

'Constat inter autores, primam Ioannis epistolam eius esse Ioannis, quam Iesus dilexit plurimum. Caeterum duas posteriores, Ioannes presbyter scripsit, non Ioannes apostolus. Qua quidem de re prodidit Hieronymus in Catalogo scriptorum illustrium, his quidem verbis . . .'

About the Apocalypse, Erasmus writes:

'Quamquam in calce huius libri, nonnulla verba reperi apud nostros,

quae aberant in Graecis exemplaribus, ea tamen ex latinis adiecimus. Testatur divus Hieronymus Apocalypsim, ne sua quidem aetate fuisse receptam a Graecis. Ad haec quosdam eruditissimos viros, totum hoc argumentum ceu fictum multis conviciis insectatos fuisse, quasi nihil haberet apostolicae gravitatis, sed vulgatam tantum rerum historiam figurarum involucris adumbratam. Ut de his interim nihil dicam, me nonnihil moverunt cum aliae coniecturae, tum illae quod revelationes scribens tam sollicite suum inculcat nomen. Ego Ioannes ego Ioannes perinde quasi syngraham scriberet non librum, idque non solum praeter morem aliorum apostolorum, verum multo magis praeter suum morem, qui in evangelio modestiora narrans . . . Ad haec in Graecis quos ego viderim codicibus, non erat titulus Ioannis evangelistae, sed Ioannis theologi, ut ne commemorem, stilum non parum dissonantem ab eo qui est in evangelio et epistola. Nam de locis quos quidam calumniati sunt, velut haereticorum quorundam dogmata redolentes, non magni negotii sit diluere, haec inquam me nonnihil moverent, quo minus crederem esse Ioannis evangelistae, nisi me consensus orbis alio vocaret, praecipue vero autoritas ecclesiae, si tamen hoc opus, hoc animo comprobaret ecclesia, ut Ioannis evangelistae velint haberi, et pari esse pondere, cum caeteris canonicis libris. Iam Dorotheus Tyri episcopus ac Martyr in compendio vitarum prodidit Ioannem evangelium suum scripsisse in insula Patmo. Caeterum de Apocalypsi nullam omnino facit mentionem. Nec Anastasius quidem in suo Catalogo audent affirmare, opus hoc illius esse, tantum ait receptum a quibusdam tanquam illius opus. Equidem video veteres theologos magis ornandae rei gratia, hinc adducere testimonia, quam ut rem seriam evincant. Quando quidem inter gemmas etiam nonnihil est discriminis, et aurum est auro purius ac probatius. In sacris quoque rebus, aliud est alio sacratius. Qui spiritualis est, ut inquit Paulus omnia diiudicat et a nemine diiudicatur.'

All this is very plain speaking from one who claimed to submit absolutely to the Church, and shews that Erasmus practised criticism without hesitation as freely as Luther himself. At the end of the New Testament there is appended an address to the reader by Oecolampadius, who this same year became professor of Theology at Basle, and who was afterwards such a vigorous champion of the Reformation. He speaks in this address in hyperbolic terms of Erasmus as 'plane sicut raritate eruditionis Phoenicem volucrem, ita et invicto animi robore phoenicem arborem hoc est palmam referat'.

In the same year, viz. 1516, there appeared at Delft a translation into Dutch of the Latin text of Erasmus's New Testament

which had the approval of Pope Leo the Tenth. The following year two notable steps were taken towards the Reformation. One of them, the nailing of Luther's theses to the door of the Castle church at Wittenberg, has been sufficiently appreciated. The other has hardly been noticed at all, at least in England; I mean, the publication of a second highly polemical work by J. Lefèvre, *de Maria Magdalena et triduo Christi disceptatio*. In this work Lefèvre aroused the greatest animosity of the monks and friars and of the doctors of the Sorbonne by what they deemed an attack on the Breviary, on the traditions of the Church, and on the veneration due to the saints, and they clamoured for the book to be put into the fire, and with it its author. Lefèvre in fact argued that the Church had been mistaken in making one famous saint out of two, and that the 'Peccatrix', Mary the sister of Martha, and Mary Magdalen out of whom Christ cast seven devils, were three different people. To this argument he added an appendix in which he claimed to shew also that Christ rose again on the third day during the daytime and not the night. In a second edition of this tract, in which he defended himself, he further questioned another view long held by the Church, and appealed on the matter from the Church in error to a better-informed Church. This appeal, it must be said, was a position rather trying to the orthodox of the period. He in fact claimed to refute the view that St Anne, the mother of the Blessed Virgin, had been married three times—to Joachim, to Cleophas, and to Salomas successively, and had had by each a daughter Mary; that these Marias had respectively married Joseph, Alphaeus, and Zebedee, and become the mothers (1) of Christ, (2) of St James the less, Joseph Justus, and Simon, and (3) of St James the greater and St John. He claimed to shew, in fact, that St Anne had only one husband, namely, Joachim, and one daughter, the Virgin Mary; and he argued that Salomas was merely Salome, the wife of Zebedee, transformed by mistake into a man.

Lefèvre was vigorously supported in these contentions by J. Clictov and Cornelius Agrippa and others, and found a more potent defender in Francis the First and his sister Marguerite, who sheltered him from the prosecution of the ecclesiastical officials.

What is perhaps more interesting for us is the fact that Lefèvre's memoir was answered at some length by John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester and Chancellor of Cambridge University. His reply was published in 1519. A complimentary letter prefixed to this answer, and addressed by a certain Didimus Lycoucarius, a student of Paris, to Nich. Metchalfe, S.T.P., Archdeacon of Rochester, begins as follows :

'Nisi virtutis (vir erudite) maior habenda esset ratio quam fortunae: cui patriam singuli suam debemus: vix aequo animo ferre ipse possem tantam omnium laudum excellentiam Angliae merito ascribi. Nam ut omittam Coletum, Linacrum, Paceum, Tunstallum, Morum, Latymerum, & Grocinum, Roscios omnis scientiae numeris absolutos: Qualis iam nunc isthic in harenam descendit Milo? Qualis (inquam) prodit Episcopus?' (Fisher *de unica Magdalena* f. 1^v.)

The second edition of Erasmus's Greek Testament was published at Basle in 1519. Basle was then the centre of the European printing and book trade, as Leipzig became later, and the necessities of seeing his exceptional book through the press, had in fact as early as 1515 taken Erasmus to Basle, where, as we shall see, his influence was very marked. Basle has some claims indeed to be the real cradle of the Reformation.

It was at Basle that the famous Council met between 1431 and 1443. Although its labours proved abortive it was the last concerted movement before Trent to reform the abuses of the Curia and the morals of the clergy, and it would seem as if the influence of its discussions lasted there into another generation. The University of Basle was founded by Pope Pius the Second in 1459, and it presently became a centre of the Humanist movement. A potent influence was exercised there in the beginning of the sixteenth century by Thomas Wittenbach, who was born at Biel in 1472, and became a professor, first at Tübingen, then at Basle, where he died in 1526. Of him, one of his pupils, Leo Judas, writes:

'E vobis prodiit nobis D. Thomas ille Wittenbachius, vir in omni disciplinarum genere exercitatissimus, et qui propter multiugam eruditionem omnibus istius saeculi doctissimis hominibus miraculo et stupori, et Phoenix quaedam habitus sit. Quo praeceptore Zwinglius et ego, uno eodemque tempore circa annum Domini 1505, Basileae literis operam navantes formati sumus. Nec solum in cultioribus disciplinis,

quarum erat callentissimus, sed in scripturarum quoque veritate. Ut enim homo ille praeter singularem eloquentiam acuto erat ingenio, multa quae posteris temporibus ab aliis prodita sunt praevidebat et praesagiebat, ut de Indulgentiis papisticis, et aliis rebus, quibus Romanus Pontifex stultum mundum aliquot iam saeculis dementaverat. Ex hoc hausimus quidquid nobis fuit solidae eruditionis, atque hoc ei etiam debemus.' (Pantaleon *Prosopograph.* iii 43.)

Wittenbach was a strenuous upholder of the new views and not only denounced the sale of indulgences at Basle, but also openly taught that the death of Christ was the only way to salvation. He was also an opponent of the celibacy of the clergy. (*Lebens Doctor Thomas Wittenbachs Bernerisches Mausoleum*, I. 1, etc.)

An eager pupil of Wittenbach's at Basle was Zwingli, who was born on January 1st, 1484, at Wildhaus in the Canton of St-Gallen. His nearest relations on both sides were ecclesiastics. Having gone to school at Vienna, he returned to Basle in 1502 when 18 years old, where he sat at the feet of Wittenbach. In 1506 he was ordained priest and appointed to the Church of Glarus. It has been the fashion for Lutheran historians to minimize the initial work of Zwingli as compared with that of their special hero, whom he undoubtedly forestalled in his defiant campaign against the Roman authorities.

Zwingli says of himself :

'Coepti ego Evangelion praedicare anno salutis decimosexto supra millesimum et quingentesimum, eo scilicet tempore, quum Lutheri nomen in nostris regionibus ne auditum adhuc erat. Sic autem praedicavi, cum Missa adhuc in usu esset Pontificiis. Evangelium quod in Missa legebatur, populo proposui explicandum ; explicandum, inquam, non hominum commentis, sed sola Scripturarum Bibliacarum collatione.' (Zwingli *Opera* i p. 37.)

Wolfgang Capito says in a letter to Bullinger :

'Antequam Lutherus in lucem emerisset, Zwinglius et ego inter nos communicavimus de pontifice deiiciendo, etiam cum ille vitam degeret in eremitorio. Nam utriusque ex Erasmi consuetudine et lectione bonorum autorum quaecumque iudicium tum subolescebat.' (Gerdesius *Introd. ad Hist. Evang.* i 117.)

The friendship of Zwingli with Erasmus and Capito, here referred to, was formed in 1515. The next year, while Erasmus was at Basle, and before he had heard of Luther, Zwingli

was transferred to Einsiedeln, and was there engaged in denouncing the pilgrimages which have always been such a feature of that place. It is clear therefore that Zwingli, in the earlier part of his career as a Reformer, owed nothing to Luther, and in fact was his predecessor. In 1518 Zwingli was appointed preacher at Zürich, and at once began to denounce the sale of indulgences, fasting, the celibacy of the clergy, &c., and at length the Pope called upon the people of Zürich to abandon him. This they refused to do, and the Council, after he had produced and defended sixty-seven theses, at a conference held at Zurich on the 29th of January, 1523, were so convinced by his eloquence that they separated the canton from the bishopric of Constance, and thus established the Reformation in a definite way there. This was followed by a series of other changes further emphasizing his separation from Rome.

While Zwingli and Luther disagreed materially about the true explanation of the Mass, and spoke of each other in consequence in terms hardly credible, they held similar views in regard to the Bible and its authority. In the first of the theses just named Zwingli said: '*Quicumque evangelia nihil esse dicunt nisi ecclesiae calculus et adprobatio accedat, errant et deum blasphemant.*' He thus repudiates very vigorously the notion that the authority of the Bible is in any way based on the tradition or authority of the Church.

In his memoir *De perspicuitate et certitudine vel infallibilitate verbi divini*, he speaks most plainly on the subject:

'Hoc verbum Dei,' he says, 'non invenies apud concilia et pontifices, sed in cubiculo tuo, ubi solus fueris cum Deo. Ora Deum, hauri ex Scriptura, noli quaerere ex Scriptura confirmationem sententiae tuae. Adi solum evangelium, abice nugas theologorum scholasticorum.' (Huldreich Zwingli *Werke*, Zürich 1828, i 66.)

Again he says:

'Ego certo scio me a Deo doceri; nam sensi eum. Ne autem quis mihi obiciat hoc verbum, intellege, quomodo sciam me a Deo doceri . . . Nunc certus sum sententiam Dei eam esse, quam intellexi. Nunc affer omnia mendacia et fictiones iuristarum, omnem simulationem cuculatorum, omnem iram praelatorum inflatorum, omne venenum Romanum, omnem ignem Aetnae vel gehennae: non me convertes ad aliam opinionem. . . . Verbum Dei (id est, quod venit a solo Dei Spiritu)

summopere honorandum neque ulli verbo tanta fides adhibenda est, quanta ipsi. Ipsum enim certum est, infallibile, lucidum, non sinit in tenebris errare, docet se ipsum, explicat se ipsum, illuminat mentem humanam omni salute et gratia.' (*ib.* i 74 sq.)

This being his theory, he did not shrink from applying it. Thus in regard to the Apocalypse, we have it reported that at the Berne disputation (ii p. 169) he said, 'Us Apocalypsi nemend wir kein kundschaft an, dann es nit ein biblisch buch ist.' Again, in his book *de claritate verbi Dei* p. 310, he says, 'Apocalypsis prorsus non sapit os et ingenium Ioannis. Possum ergo testimonia si velim reiicere.' Here we have the subjective theory so characteristic of Luther's exegesis put in practice in its most extreme form, and it is plain in fact that Zwingli adopted Luther's test of Canonical authority, and stood in this matter on precisely the same platform as the latter did.

Let us now return again shortly to Lefèvre, who was carrying on a parallel campaign in France. It was about the year 1520 that he left Paris and took up his residence at Meaux, where the bishop was his friend, and where he worked at his commentary on the Gospels, which was finished in 1521. In this book he took up the same dogmatic position as in his work on St Paul's Epistles, but he had become bolder in his criticism, and in his appeal to God's grace and to the Gospel against the notion of the efficacy of good works. He prudently, however, avoided direct and dangerous attacks on the administrative abuses of the Church, nor was he entirely opposed to the old views. Thus he defended the doctrine of Purgatory, approving the scholastic distinction between *satisfactio culpae* and *satisfactio poenae*. In regard to the Eucharist, he emphasizes his former statements thus:

'Ubicunque sane Christus est, Christus incarnatus est: incarnatus autem sine corpore non est. Et magna est fides cognoscere Christum corporaliter esse ubi sacramentaliter est, sed maior est cognoscere eum absolute ubique corporaliter esse.' (*op. cit.*, *ad Joan.* iv 19. See also vi 47 and xx 19.)

The Sacrament with him was no Sacrament without Faith, but Faith could do much without the Sacrament.

Without denying the intercession of Saints and the efficacy of their invocation, which would have put him at issue with the

Church's regulations, he deemed it useless to apply vicariously when we can go directly to the fountain-head. While he maintained in a stronger form his views about liberty, grace, and good works, he strongly supported the unity of the Church, and opposed schisms and sects. But the union he defended was not the external union which meant union with the Chair of Peter, but union with Christ, who, he urged, alone had the power of the keys, which He deputed to all who built up His Church as well as to Peter. He deplored the decay of the Church, which could only be restored by the preaching of the Gospel everywhere among men: the rest was all vain. It is well to remember the vigour as well as the daring of this language at this date; published, too, not in the dominions of friendly Electors and other potent people in Germany, who were in full sympathy, but in the much more dangerous latitude of France. Lutheranism itself had meanwhile got a considerable foothold at Meaux among the work-people, and also among some of the preachers imported by Briçonnet the bishop, to whom Lefèvre's teaching was apparently not distasteful, while Lutheran books were openly sold in spite of the prohibitions of the Sorbonne doctors. In 1523 they issued a special order confiscating all Luther's works, and ordering them to be burnt, and prohibiting those of Erasmus; and a large number of propositions taken from Lefèvre's Commentary on the Gospels were condemned. He, however, refused to retract, and would have been imprisoned if he had not been protected by Marguerite, sister of Francis the First. Francis himself appointed a commission of prelates and doctors of theology, who examined Lefèvre's incriminated works. They found in favour of the accused, whereupon the king issued a letter filled with his praises, and forbade the Sorbonne to trouble him.

The defeat and capture of Francis the First at Pavia were unfortunate for the reforming party in France, and greatly strengthened the hands of the clerical conservatives at Meaux. The Bishop, afraid of the Sorbonne, himself, on the 15th October, 1523, issued a synodal, in which he forbade, on pain of excommunication, the reading or keeping of Luther's works, or the denial of the doctrine of Purgatory and of the Invocation of Saints. He pronounced anathema against preachers who taught Lutheranism, and withdrew licences from some of his own

Evangelical protégés among the preachers. When, however, he affixed papal indulgences, as well as printed prayers, to the doors of the cathedral they were torn off. The culprits were discovered and duly punished, but the bishop's former views and more probably his known secret encouragement of the Reformers were not forgotten. The Cordeliers openly charged him and his preachers with favouring heresy, and especially that he had encouraged French translations of the New Testament and the Psalter, and had even ordered preachers who were illiterate to read Lefèvre's translations of the Gospel of the day. (Graf *op. cit.* 104-109.)

Lefèvre now undertook a translation of the New Testament, which was sanctioned on condition that he followed the text of the Vulgate without change. The four Evangelists, preceded by an Introduction, appeared accordingly on the 8th of June, 1523, and the rest of the New Testament a few months later. They were published anonymously, but were undoubtedly the work of Lefèvre. We read in the Introduction:

'Sachons que les hommes et leurs doctrines ne sont riens, sinon de autant que elles sont corroborées et confirmées de la parole de Dieu. . . . Mais Jésus-Christ est tout.'

He went on to invite the simple and unlearned to read the actual words of the Bible without human paraphrase. If the Gospels contained difficulties which poor Frenchmen could not understand, why, he urged, was not this so with poor Greeks and poor Latins when they were written in those languages, and he asked why poor Christians should not be permitted to defend their faith from their Bibles, as poor Jews were wont to do theirs.

Lefèvre's New Testament was reprinted several times in 1524 and 1525. In February of the latter year he followed it up with a French Psalter, while the Bishop issued in French a collection of the passages to be used for Epistle and Gospel all the year round in the diocese of Meaux, which is also attributed to Lefèvre, whom the friars called 'le domestique et commensal de l'évêque'. All this was very distasteful to the authorities. One of the Meaux preachers after another was summoned by the Sorbonne and condemned, and on August 25th, 1525, it was expressly forbidden to issue translations of the Bible or of sections of it in the vernacular.

Lefèvre had at this time finished his commentary on the

Catholic Epistles, which he dedicated to the Chancellor Duprat. In it, while his phrases were more studied, he maintained his old views. He implored kings and powerful men to permit the free circulation of the Gospel, and recalled what Francis the First had already done in this behalf. In regard to the priesthood he says, 'Tous les fidèles sont des temples spirituels, des prêtres spirituels oints par le Saint Esprit pour qu'ils offrent leurs sacrifices à Dieu dans une conscience pure, et Jésus Christ connaît partout ces prêtres.' Those in orders were specially meant to teach the others, he said, and to administer the sacraments. In commenting on 1 Peter v 13 he associated Babylon and Rome; on the subject of good works and the Eucharist he reiterated his previous views. The friars and their patrons were naturally still further exasperated by these publications. Lefèvre and others, including the bishop, were cited with a view to being interrogated. Fifty propositions were abstracted from the exhortations in Lefèvre's editions of the Gospels and Epistles as heretical, including most of the principal so-called Evangelical views. They were declared to be 'inventions of the devil and heretical lies'. The finding was sent to the Inquisitors appointed by the Holy See. All this happened during the imprisonment of Francis the First at Madrid. On his return the King, while apparently not interfering to assist others, again threw his protection over Lefèvre. Some of his friends suffered various penalties or fled, while the bishop apparently adopted Cranmer's accommodating attitude under similar difficulties. He accordingly returned to his diocese, where he died some years later.

We will now revert shortly to Germany and its borders. Luther's New Testament, as we saw, was first published in September 1522, three months only before Lefèvre's. It was not long before it was translated into other languages. Notwithstanding Charles the Fifth's determined opposition to all Luther's works and the heavy hand he always kept upon Flanders, a translation of his New Testament into Dutch was published by Adrian Van Bergen at Antwerp in 1523. It contains Luther's prefaces to the New Testament and its several books, and the books are arranged in the order in which he printed them. Le Long says of the prefaces to the later Epistles of St. Paul in this Dutch New Testament:

'Zynde die van Mart Luther, gelyk ook die op alle de volgende Epistelen doch sommige, gelyk selfs dere Voorreeder, zyn aan 't eynde een weinig verkort; en die van Jacobus en Judas geheel nyt gelaaten.' (*Boekzaal der niederduytsche Bybels* 521.)

In 1525 there appeared a translation of the Old Testament into Dutch. It was published in four small volumes at Antwerp. The Pentateuch and the Psalms were translated from Luther's version, and it is singular that the historical books were not so also, since Luther's translation of them was now available. The other books, however, were translated from the Delft edition of the Vulgate of 1477. The Prayer of Manasses is given at the end of 2 Chronicles. The rest of the Apocryphal books are given in the order and position they occupy in the Vulgate, with Jerome's prefaces. At the end of Malachi we have the phrase 'Hier na sal volgen dboeck der Machabeorum', but strangely none of these books is actually given in the text. A very curious thing about this Bible not previously noticed is that the concluding pages of volumes three and four are occupied with the royal arms of Henry the Eighth. What the explanation of this may be it is difficult to say, since in 1525 Henry was by no means friendly to schemes for Bible translation, and especially would a translation incorporating a part of Luther's work be distasteful to him. The printers of this Bible were Christopher and Hans Van Roemundt. The former had to flee from Antwerp the same year for printing a Lutheran book. He came to England and got into trouble for disseminating Tindale's New Testaments, and died in prison here in 1531. It may be that the addition of the English royal arms to this Bible was to facilitate its circulation in England.

In 1526 there appeared another complete Bible in Dutch, published by Van Liesveldt. It was in two volumes divided into three parts. The first volume, from Genesis to Canticles inclusive, followed Luther's translation, as did the New Testament. The second volume was also divided into three parts. The first contained the Prophets and Baruch, and the second the so-called Apocryphal books, and is headed 'De Boecken die van 't Canon niet en syn, dats te weten, dye men by den Joden in t' Hebreusch niet en vyndt'. These are named 'derde en vierde Boek Esdre Thobias Judith Wysheyt Ecclesiasticus het xiii

en xiiii Cap. Daniels (welc niet in 't Ebreusch, maer in Theodotionis ouersettinge staet) en de twee Boeken der Machabeer'.

This was apparently the first Bible in a modern vernacular in which the so-called Apocrypha were separated from the Canonical books and printed apart. The third part of this Bible consists of the New Testament, and follows the text and order of Luther.

It thus came about that in Holland, as in Germany, Luther's theory of the Bible Canon was accepted by a large section of the reformers. Let us turn to Scandinavia. In 1524 there was published a New Testament in Danish at Leipzig, which was translated by Mikkelsen. In this New Testament the Gospels and the Acts were translated from the Latin version of Erasmus, while the Epistles and the Revelation were taken from Luther's New Testament, as were the general introduction and the introductions to the several books, and, what is more important, the order of the New Testament books was adopted. This was followed in 1526 by the first Swedish New Testament, which was published at Stockholm, and, while largely incorporating Luther's text, also incorporated his prefaces and adopted his order of the books. Thus Scandinavia (for Denmark then included Norway) was entirely committed to Luther's theory of the New Testament Canon.

Zwingli's views as to the supreme authority of the Bible made him, like Luther, an early champion of translation into the vernacular of his native land. In this work he was assisted by his friends Leo Judas, Pellicanus,¹ Caspar Grossman, and others. It was published in 1527-1529. In regard to such parts as had been translated by Luther, including the whole of the New Testament and the Old Testament from Genesis to Canticles, Zwingli's Bible was mainly an edition of Luther's text in Swiss German, with some emendations. This part of the Zürich Bible occupied three volumes, the first of which is alone dated, namely, in 1527. Esther is placed between Chronicles and

¹ Pellicanus was probably the best scholar. He was indeed a remarkable Hebrew scholar for the time. He was born at Ruffach in Alsace in 1478, and learnt Hebrew from a Jew who had become a Franciscan friar. In 1519 he himself became the head of the Franciscan convent at Basle, secretly adhered to Luther until 1526, when he became professor of Hebrew at Zürich, where he died in 1566. He wrote on Hebrew grammar, &c. Courayer thinks Reuchlin was much helped by him, and he greatly aided in preparing the Zürich Bible.

Ezra in the list on the title-page, but in the text it duly follows *Nehemiah*.

In addition to these books, Zwingli and his friends also translated Luther's text of the New Testament. And they not only followed Luther's text, but what is more important for us to remember, they followed his treatment of the books, arranging their names in the table of contents in the same order as he does. The earlier books are successively numbered from I to XXIV, while the Epistle to the Hebrews and those of James and Jude, with the Apocalypse, are put at the end unnumbered and in a class by themselves, separated by a space from the rest, and are printed together in the text. The Epistle to the Hebrews (again following Luther's plan) is not assigned to St Paul, while the Revelation is attributed to 'Sant Joannis des Theologes'.

It is therefore plain that Zwingli completely committed himself to Luther's theory as to the relative value of the New Testament books.

In regard to those parts of the Old Testament not as yet translated by Luther, the Swiss translators had naturally to turn elsewhere. The fourth volume of the Zürich Bible containing the Prophets was in part an original translation made by Zwingli, Pellicanus, and others. It is dated the 1st of March, 1529, and on its title-page we read 'durch die predicanten zu Zürich inn Teusch vertolmätchet'. They call themselves in the introduction 'wir die diener des Evangelii der Statt Zürich'. At the end of the volume we read 'End aller Propheten so vel by den Ebreern unnd bey den Altern under Biblische geschriff'. This phrase explicitly cuts the deuterocanonical books out of the Canon. The translation of the Apocrypha in this Bible formed its fifth volume. It was the work of Leo Judas, as we learn from the title-page, where we read:

'Diss sind die bücher die by den altē under Biblische geschriff nit gezelt sind, auch bey den Ebreern nit gefundenn. Neüwlich widerumb durch Leo Jud verteütschet.'

The titles of the books are given as follows:—

'I. Die zwey letzten bücher *Ezra*. II. *Tobias*. III. *Judith*. IIII. *Baruch*. V. Das Büch der *Weyssheit*. VI. Der weyssman *Ecclesiast*.

ticus. VII. Die zwey Bücher Machabaeorum. VIII. Die Histori von Susanah. IX. Die Histori vom Bel zü Babel.'

On the back of the title-page to this volume is the following Address to the Reader :—

'Gnad und frid dem Christelichen Läser. Dise bucher so hie den Biblischē angehenckt sind der meinung vō uns getruckt nit das sy in wārd un acht der der heiligen gschrift gleych gehalten werden söllind sunder das denen so auch liebe zü disen bücheren habend zelafen weder mangel noch klag wāre und das ein yetlicher funde das im schmackte : dann ob schon dise bücher under die Biblischen heyliger schrift bücher weder von den alten noch von uns gezelt sind doch vil ding darinn die Biblischer gschrift dem glauben und liebe keins wāgs wider sträbend ja auch etliche iren grund in Gottes wort findend. Daruñ habend wir dise zu gut gmeinem volck treüwlich verteütschet wiewol die exemplaria aus denē wir sy getolmetschet vast falsch uñ wirrig gewesen sind. Ye doch habend wir müglichen fleyss ankert allen mangel uñ prästen zebesseren und zeersenen. Und das auss den examplarien die wir habed; dañ Ebreische (deren sich etlich rümēd) habend wir nit gehept. Was arbeyt aber und müh wir geschluckt habind werdend die können ermessen die das Griechisch uñ Latinisch das alt tolmetschen und unsers zesamen vergleychend. Desshalb bittend wir alle frōmen Läser sy wollind alle ding in besten verstōn uñ auss liebe urteylen uñ alles ir lāsen zü Gottes lob und eer und seel heylrichten.'

Although only two books of Maccabees are mentioned in the list on the title-page of this edition of the Zürich Bible, the third book is included in the text with the curious heading 'Das dritt büch Machabaeorum nach dem Graechischen (als der sibenzig spraachmeysteren edition vermag) recht tygenlich verteuschet'. This edition excludes the fragments of Esther, the Prayer of Azarias, the Song of the Three Children, and the Prayer of Manasses. On the other hand it includes the third and fourth books of Esdras.

At the end of the volume containing the Apocrypha we read :

'End dieser Bucher, so geschrift gemass doch nit als Biblisch, oder in gleychem wārd bey den Hebreen gehaltend werdend.

Etlich wenig menden die sich zu tragen habend in disem werck findest du hiernach verzeychnet.'

This being the theory of the Canon contained in the Zürich Bible, it will be well to supplement it by an express statement of

the views held on the subject by Zwingli's close friend and ally, Oecolampadius.

Scultetus in his *Annales Evangelii* describes how the deputies of the Waldenses went in 1530 to Basle to consult Oecolampadius about the affairs of their Church. Oecolampadius deemed the matter too important to be decided at an interview and asked them to write down their case. The document was preserved among his papers. In this document they incorporated their creed, and *inter alia* they asked :

'Qui sacrae Scripturae in utroque Testamento sint veri libri, ut dicunt, Canonici, etiam quae ad horum declarationem essent nobis, ad nostramque & plebis utilitatem volumina emenda.' (*op. cit.* ii 305.)

To this Oecolampadius replied in writing. He said *inter alia* :

'In Canonicis scripturis annumeramus quinque libros Mosis, Josuae, Judicum, Ruth, quatuor libros Regum, duos Paralipomenon, unum Esdrae, unum Neemiae : & hi quidem historici sunt. Job, Psalterium, Parabolas, Cantica & Ecclesiasten Salomonis : Esaiam, Hieremiam, Ezechielem, Danielem : & duodecim Prophetas juniores, Hoseam, Joëlem, Amos, Abdiam, Jonam, Micheam, Naum, Abakuk, Sophoniam, Aggaeum, Zachariam, & Malachiam, ut Scripturas a Spiritu sancto inspiratas habemus. Judith, Tobiam, Ecclesiasticum, Baruch, duos ultimos Esdrae, tres libros Machabæorum, duo capita ultima Danielis, non contemnimus : sed non divinam cum cæteris illis auctoritatem damus. In novo Testamento quatuor Evangelia cum Actis Apostolorum & quatuor decim Epistolis Pauli & septem catholicis, una cum Apocalypsi recipimus : tametsi Apocalypsim cum epistola Jacobi et Judae & ultimâ Petri, ac duabus posterioribus Joannis, non cum cæteris conferamus.' (*ib.* 313 and 314.)

This is the most explicit statement on the part of any of the early reformers except Karlstadt as to what the Canon was deemed by them to be, and it doubtless covers, at all events, the position of the Zürich Church. It will be noticed that the fragments of Esther, the Prayer of Azarias, the Benedicite, and the Prayer of Manasses are not mentioned in the Old Testament, nor the Epistle to the Hebrews in the New Testament.

Let us now revert once more to Lefèvre. In 1528 there appeared his French translation of the Pentateuch, and in 1530 that of the whole Bible, a most famous book, because it was the foundation upon which all future French Bibles were built up

It was styled on the title-page 'La sainte Bible en Francoys, translatee selon la pure et entiere traduction de saint Hierome, conferee et entierement reuisitee, selon les plus anciens et plus correctz exemplaires'. It was published anonymously at Antwerp, and was printed with the imperial privilege of Charles, Emperor of the Romans, King of Castille, &c., i.e. Charles the Fifth, who had caused it to be translated into French. It was approved by the Inquisitor and others of the theological faculty of Louvain, and was especially authorized by the Emperor and his Council.

In the Preface headed 'Prologue de tous les liures de la Sainte escripture, & de ceulx qui les ont mis par escript', we read that the Old Testament, according to the most common division, consists of four parts. The first contains the books of the law :

'Lesquelz (selon les docteurs des Hebreux) Moyses a mis par escript, exceptez huyt vers en la fin du Deuteronomie commêceans : Et la mourut Moyses seruiteur, & cetera, iusques en la fin du liure.'

In regard to the books in the second division he says :

'Desquelz Iosue a escript son liure, & les huyt vers de la loy derniers. Samuel a escript les Iuges, Ruth, le premier, & le second liure des Roix. Ieremias a escript le troiziesme & le quattresme liure des Roix. Esdras a escript les deux de Paralipomenon, & les deux premiers liures du dict Esdras. Les homes de la grande Sinagogue ont escript Hester. Moyses a escript le liure de Iob. Il nest pas trouue qui aient escript les autres.'

Of the books of the third class he says :

'Desq̄lz Esaie a escript les trois premiers (i.e. Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Canticles). Le liure de Sapièce est escript selon les Juifz par Philo. Lecclesiastique a este fait par Iesu filz de Syrach.'

Of the fourth part he says :

'Desquelz Daud & dix prophetes ont escript les pseaulmes. Esaias a escript son liure. Ieremias a escript son liure, & les Trenes. Les hōes de la grāde Synagogue ont escript Hezechiel, & Daniel avec les douze petis Prophetes, ascavoir, Oseas, Ioel, & ce. ¶ Parquoy entre tous les liures dessus dictz aucuns sont que lon ne trouue pas en Hebreu, ou qui ne sont point liures Canoniques : lesquelz toutesfois pour la bonne doctrine & Prophetie q̄ est trouuee en eulx, sont receus & approuuez de leglise. Comme le troiziesme & quattresme liures de Esdras, 'Tobias, Iudith, Sapience, Lecclesiastique, Baruch, & les deux liures des

Machabees, dont le premier est trouue en Hebrieu. Et sont iceulx liures appelez Apocryphes, cest adire, desquelz l'authenticite est incongneue.'

In regard to the New Testament books, the Epistle to the Hebrews is assigned to St Paul, while of the Apocalypse we read, 'L'apocalypse ou reuelation de *Sainct Jean dict Theologien ou Evangelist.*'

The chapters are headed with explanatory paragraphs. At the end of 2 Chronicles we have the prayer of Manasses, headed with the words 'L'oraison de Manasses roy de Iuda, ou sa confession: quant il estoit detenu prisonnier en Babilone, pour ses maux, fort conuenable a tous penitēs: laquelle toutesfois nest pas en Hebrieu, & nest pas du texte de la Bible'. The third book of Esdras is headed 'Le troiziesme liure de Esdras le Prophete'. The fourth is headed 'Le quattresme liure de Esdras, lequel ne contient fors q̄ aucunes visions'. Judith is headed 'Le liure de Iudith traduict de la langue Chaldaïque'.

The fragments of Esther separated by Jerome are printed at the end of the book, with the heading 'Autre exēple dunes lettres qui ne sont trouuees en Hebrieu...'. Wisdom is headed 'Le liure de Sapience nest trouue nulle part vers les Hebreux: aussy le langage ensuyt mieulx leloquēce des Grecz. Les Iuifs afferment iceluy estre fait par Philo: lequel est appelle Sapience, pour ce q̄ en iceluy est exprimee la venue de Christ, qui est la sapience du pere: & aussy sa passion'. Jeremiah is followed by Lamentations headed 'Les Threnes, ou les lamentations de Ieremie, qui sont appellees en Hebrieu Cinnoth'. Of Lamentations the Prayer of Jeremiah forms the fifth chapter. Then follows Baruch, headed 'Sainct Hierome. ¶ Le liure icy q̄ est appelle Baruch, nest pas trouue entre les escriptures canoniq̄s des Hebreux: mais en la cōmune edition: semblablement le pistre de Ieremias. Mais po^r donner cōgnoissance a ceulx q̄ le lysent sont ilz icy escriptz: pource quilz annoncent pluseurs choses de Christ, & de des derniers temps'. At the close of the seventh chapter of Daniel we read: 'Hierome. Jusq̄s icy lisons nous Daniel, au volume des Hebreux: tout ce q̄ sensuyt, iusques en la fin du liure est trāslate de ledition de Theodotiō.'

Another edition of this Bible was published in 1534, and it was greatly changed in some respects, having a large number of

additional marginal notes, &c. In the prologue it is claimed that in this second edition a great many improvements are introduced in the translation. In it a special table of the books occurs, in which the so-called Apocryphal books are distinguished by having their titles set back. Although the Prayer of Manasses is not named in this list, nor Lamentations and the Epistle of Jeremy, these books are duly contained in the text.

Simon, in regard to this translation, which in a note in a copy in the British Museum he unhesitatingly attributes to Lefèvre, says of him :

‘Lefèvre parloit le langage des protestans d’Alemagne avec lesquels il avoit des grandes liaisons, et qui vouloient qu’on lut dans les eglises l’écriture sainte en langue vulgaire, en un mot il tendoit a introduire la Reforme en France.’ (*Bibliothèque Critique*, lettre 15, p. 112, tome A.)

In spite of this fact, his Antwerp Bible, as we have seen, was brought out under the most orthodox auspices.

In 1530 there appeared a new edition of the Zürich Bible, with corrections, in one volume, in which the so-called Apocryphal books are printed at the end of the New Testament, and thus still more separated from their original position. In this edition the Third of Maccabees is duly entered in the table of contents and included in the text, but the other omissions above described are still maintained.

The following year another edition appeared with an introduction which Dr Nestle assigns to the pen of Zwingli himself. In this address we are told the books from Job to Canticles had been retranslated by the Zürich pastors. The initial list of Bible books in this edition is arranged not according to their order in the text, but alphabetically. In it the so-called additions to Esther occur for the first time in the Zürich Bible. They are entered as *Das ander büch Ester*, and the double entry is duplicated again under Hester. In the text these fragments of Esther are put among the Apocrypha, next to Judith, and thus entirely separated from the main text of the book, with the heading ‘Dises sind die Capitel die im Buch Hester in Hebreischem Text und Biblischer gschrift nit gefunden werdend Doch habends die Griechischen Tolmetschen auch die Latiner desshalb wir sy

auch hienaauch inn Tütsch habend wöllen setzen das niemants nichts mangle'.

In Zwingli's preface already named, the so-called Apocryphal books are thus referred to :

'Dise bücher sind mit den bücheren, der ersten ordnung nit in gleycher acht. Dann ob gleych vil waars unnd nutzbars (das zü from̄keyt des läbens unnd erberkeyt dienet darinnen finden wirdt so sind doch nit alle ding so aussgestochen unnd lauter als in den vorgemälten. Ein bild unnd angesicht wirdt vil häller unnd eigentlicher in einem spiegelglass gesähen dann in einem wasser unnd in einem lauterer stillen wasser vil bass dann in einem betrübtten unnd bewegten. Es mischet sich in denen bücheren oft vil eyn das sich der lauterer waarheyt nit wil zum gnöuwesten angestalten das fahlen gleycher sicht. Jedoch wöllend wir nichts verachtet haben daraus güts unnd nutzes gezogen mag werden. Es sol das gut dess bösen nit entgelten unnd sol der kaarn mit den sprüweren nit hingeworffen sonder auss den sprüweren geläsen unnd abgesünderet werden. Der läser sol thün als das Bynlin das das best auss allen blümen saugt unnd zeücht und die reynen thier essend nüt unreynes sonder scheydend unnd sünderend das unreyn ab das güt brauchend sy inen zur speyss. Bewärend alle ding spricht Paulus was güt ist das nemmend an. Deshalb habend wir sy auch wöllen trucken das hieran niemants keynen mangel noch klag hette unnd ein yetlicher funde das seynem mangel liebete. Nun ists an dem das wir zum kurtsesten unnd in einer gmeyn anzeygind was in den bücheren dess alten Testaments gehandelt werde.'

In this Bible the so-called Apocryphal books follow immediately after Esther and complete the first volume. The second volume begins with Job and ends with Revelation, the last four books of the New Testament still following Luther's order. The third book of Esdras, which is the first of the so-called Apocryphal books, is headed 'Diss sind die bucher die bey den alten unnder Biblische geschriff nit gezelt sind ouch bey den Ebreern nit gefunden'. The books are given in the following order: 'Das dritt Buch Esdre. Das Vierdt Buch Esdre. Das Buch der Weyssheit. Das buch Ecclesiasticus das man nennen mag die weysen Sprüch Jesu des suns Sirach. Das buch Tobie. Der Prophet Baruch. Das buch das Judith heizt. Das buch Hester (i. e. the fragments with the heading previously cited). Das Erst, das ander and das dritt buch Machabeorum respectively. Die schön histori Susannah, &c. Die histori vom Bild zü Babel,

vom Beel genañt'; concluding with the words: 'End dess ersten teyls des Alten Testaments mit Sampt den Büchern der gschriftt doch nit als Biblisch oder in gleychem werd bey den Hebreern gehalten werdend', &c. The Song of the Three Children, the Prayer of Azarias, with the Prayer of Manasses, are still wanting in this Zürich Bible, which was published in 1531.

Zwingli was killed on October the 11th, 1531, at the battle of Cappel, and Oecolampadius, his friend and ally, died at Basle of the plague on December the 1st following.

Zwingli was succeeded at Zürich by Bullinger, and Oecolampadius at Basle by Myconius.

In 1529 there appeared at Wittenberg a Latin translation of Luther's Bible, as far as it had then been printed, i. e. of the Old Testament, Pentateuch-Kings, and the New Testament, with the books in the latter arranged in Luther's order.

In 1532 there appeared a revised version of Liesveldt's Dutch Bible, in which the prophetic books were translated from Luther's text. Luther's translation of the prophets came out that year.

In the table of contents at the beginning of this edition, after 2 Esther, we have the 3rd and 4th books of Esdras, Tobit, Judith, Hester, Job, . . . Ecclesiastes, Ecclesiasticus, Canticles, Wisdom, the Prophets, the two books of Maccabees, the Story of Bel, and that of Susanna. The Prayer of Manasses is printed after Chronicles. The fragments of Esther are put at the end of the book, with an explanatory preface. Baruch is put after Lamentations, with a preface. The Prayer of Azarias and the Song of the Three Children are omitted. While the New Testament books in the initial list are given in the old order; in the text they follow Luther's: the Epistle to the Hebrews is not assigned to Paul, but merely headed 'di Epistel tol den Hebreen'; James's Epistle is headed 'Sint Jacobs Epistel', Jude's 'die Epistel van Judas Thade'; while the Apocalypse is assigned to John the Theologian.

In 1534 there appeared three remarkable Bibles. One published by Egenolph at Frankfort was a new edition of the German Bible. In this edition it would appear that all that had been translated up to this time by Luther was incorporated, including his translation of Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, and 1 Maccabees. The

rest of the so-called Apocrypha was taken over from Leo Judas's translation already named. The woodcuts in this Bible are supposed to be those which were used in Coverdale's Bible of 1535. The so-called Apocrypha are printed after Malachi, with a special title-page, and inscribed 'Apocrypha : Die Bucher so bei den alten under die Biblische geschriff nit gezilet sind Auch bei den Hebreern nit gefunden'. Baruch is put among the Apocryphal books, and not with Jeremiah. The additions to Esther are entitled in the list of books 'Siben Capitel Hesta'. Three books of Maccabees are given, but neither the Prayer of Azarias, nor the Song of the Three Children, nor the Prayer of Manasses. Luther's arrangement is followed in the New Testament.

A second notable work which was published this year was the first translation of the Bible into the Low German dialect, or Platt Deutsch of North Germany. This was the work of Bugenhagen, and was published at Lubeck. It was entitled, 'Die Biblie uth der uthlegginge Doctoris Martini Luthers yn dyth düdesche vlitich uthgesettet', and introduced Luther's Bible theories among the Lutherans of North Germany.

The third Bible, which was the most famous of all, was the first complete edition of Luther's own Bible, and included his first translation of the so-called Apocrypha as a whole. Previously he had only published certain detached books. It is noteworthy that in its contents it did not exactly follow the table of books which he had published in his Pentateuch, and neither the third nor the fourth book of Esdras is contained in it. He did not therefore follow the example of the Zürich Bible, which did contain these books. He thus emphasized the difficulty created by the subjective method of discriminating the Canonicity of the books, and, by his own practice, admitted that among the Reformers there was dissension as to the very keystone of their position, i. e. as to what were the legitimate contents of the Bible.

To each of the so-called Apocryphal books Luther affixes in this edition an explanatory preface, so that we can ascertain his exact views about each of them. Thus, of Judith he says :

'Wo man die geschichte Judith kundte aus bewereten gewissen Historien beweisen, so were es ein eddel feines Buch, das auch billich jnn der Biblien sein solt, Aber es wil sich schwerlich reimen mit den

Historien der heiligen Schrift, sonderlich mit Jeremia vnd Esra, welche anzeigen, wie Jerusalem vnd das gantze land verstöret gewest, und darnach kümmerlich widder erbawet worden sind, zu der zeit der Persen Monarchia, welches alles land jnnen hatten umbver.'

He shews, with Philo, that the scene of the story was clearly laid in the days after the Captivity, when the Jews

'wedder Tempel noch Jerusalem erbawet noch Regiment hatten, Bleibt also der jrthum vnd zweiucl beide der gezeiten vnd namen, das ichs nirgent kan zu samen reimen';

and he continues :

'Etliche wöllen, Es sey kein geschicht, sondern ein geistlich schöne geticht, eines heiligen geistreichen mans, der darinn hab wöllen malen vnd furbilden, des gantzen Judischen volcks glück vnd sieg, widder alle jre feinde von Gott allezeit wunderbarlich verlihen.'

He explains the names of the chief actors as having an etymological meaning. Thus Judith the Widow represents, he contends, the widowed Judaea; Holofernes, he argues, means 'Prophanus dux vel gubernator', and personifies the enemies of the Jews; while Bethulia, he says, means a 'maiden'.

'anzuzeigen, das zu der zeit die gleubigen fromen Jüden, sind die reine jungfraw gewest, on alle Abgötterey vnd vnglauben. . .'

He closes the preface with the words :

'Als ein lied auff solch spiel, welchs desselben Buchs wol mag ein gemein Exempel heissen.'

In regard to the Wisdom of Solomon he says :

'Das Buch ist lang im zang gestanden, obs vnter die Bücher der heiligen Schrift, des alten Testament zu rechen sein solt, odder nicht. Sonderlich weil der Tichter seit hören lesst im neunten Capitel, als redet jnn diesem gantzen Buch der König Salomon, welcher auch von der weisheit, im Buch der Könige hoch gerhümet wird. Aber die alten Veter habens stracks aus der heiligen Schrift gesondert und gehalten, Es sey vnter der person des Königes Salomon gemacht. . . Sie halten aber, Es solle Philo dieses Buchs meister sein, welcher on zweiucl der aller gelertesten, vnd weisesten Jüden einer gewest ist, so das Jüdisch volck nach den Propheten gehabt hat, wie er das mit andern Büchern vnd thaten beweiset hat.'

He goes on to describe Philo's visit to Caligula at the instance of the Jews, and continues :

'Aus solchem grund vnd vrsache dünckt mich, sey dis Buch geflossen,

das Philo, die weil seine vnd der Jüden sache vnd recht nicht hat mügen stat finden fur dem Keiser, wendet er sich zu Gott, vnd drewet den gewaltigen, vnd bösen meulern, mit gottes gericht. . . Aber hernachmals ist dis Buch von vielen, fur ein recht Buch der heiligen Schrift gehalten, sonderlich aber jnn der Römischen kirchen, also hoch und schon gehalten, das freilich kaum aus einem Buch jnn der Schrift, so viel gesanges gemacht ist, als aus diesem, Vileicht aus der vrsache weil jnn diesem Buch die Tyrannen so heftig mit worten gestraffet vnd angegriffen, widderumb die Heiligen und Merterer so höchlich getrötet werden, Vnd zu Rom die Christen mehr denn sonst jnn aller welt, verfolgt vnd gemarteret wurden, haben sie dis Buch am meisten getrieben. . . .’

He especially emphasizes the importance of its teaching :

‘ Das die weltlichen Oberherrn, jre gewalt von Gott haben, vnd Gottes Ampt leute seien. . . .’

and concludes :

‘ Zu letzt ist dis Buch ein rechte auslegunge, vnd exempel des ersten Gebots.’

In regard to the book of Tobit :

‘ Was von dem Buch Judith gesagt ist, das mag man auch von diesem Buch Tobia sagen, Ists ein geschicht, so ists ein fein heilig geschicht, Ists aber ein geticht, so ists warlich auch ein recht schön, heilsam, nützlich geticht vnd spiel, eins geistreichen Poeten. Vnd ist zueremuten, das solcher schöner geticht vnd spiel, bey den Jüden viel gewest sind, darinn sie sich auff jre Feste vnd Sabbath geübt, vnd der jugent also mit lust, Gottes wort vnd werck eingebildet haben. . . . Denn Judith gibt eine gute, ernste, dapffere Tragedien. So gibt Tobias eine feine liebliche, Gottselige Comedien.’

He explains the names as having a punning sense :

‘ Denn Tobias heisst ein from man, der zeugt auch widder einen Tobias. . . . Nanna heisst, holdselig, das ist, eine liebe hausfraw. . . . Der Teufel Asmodes, heisst, ein vertilger odder verderber, das ist der Hausteuffel, der alles hindert vnd verderbet. . . . So ist der Engel Raphael (das ist) Artzt odder gesundmacher auch da, vnd nennet sich Asaria das ist, Hölfier odder beistand, des grossen Asaria son, das ist, Gottes des Höhesten beistand, gesandter odder bote. . . . Darumb ist das Buch vns Christen auch nützlich vnd gut zu lesen, als eines feinen Ebreischen Poeten, der kein leichtfertige, sondern die rechten sachen handelt, vnd aus der massen Christlich treibt vnd beschreibt. Vnd auff solch Buch gehöret billich der Jesus Syrach, als der ein rechter Lerer vnd tröster ist,

des gemeinen mans vnd Hausuaters jnn allen sachen, Vnd Tobias eben solchs Buchs ein Exempel.'

In his preface to the book of Jesus Syrach, Luther says :

'Das buch ist bisher genant im latin Ecclesiasticus, welchs sie haben verdeuscht, Die geistliche zucht, Vnd ist fast wol getrieben vnd gebraucht jnn den Kirchen, mit lesen, singen vnd predigen, aber mit wenigem verstand vnd nutz, on das es hat müssen, der geistlichen stand vnd Kirchen geprenge rhümen. . . . Wie auch Mose, Josue, Esaie vnd aller Propheten bücher, nach jren meistern heissen. Vnd ist von den alten Vetern nicht jnn der zal der heiligen Schrift, sondern als sonst ein gut fein buch eines Weisen mans, gehalten, da bey wirs auch lassen bleiben.

'Es dünckt vns aber weil er selbs jnn der vorrhede bekennet, Er sey zu des Königes Euergetis zeiten jnn Egypten komen, vnd da selbs dis Buch volendet (welchs sein gros vater hatte zuuor angefangen) das er habe aus vielen Büchern zu samen gelesen das beste, so er funden hat, sonderlich weil jnn Egypten eine köstliche Librerey war, durch Euergetis vater den König Philadelphon zugericht, das zu der zeit, beide Bücher vnd gelerte leute inn grossen ehren waren, vnd aus allen landen, als jnn eine grosse hohe Schule zu schlugen, sonderlich aus Griechen land, dazu auch die Jüden einen Tempel dasels baweten, vnd Gottes dienst auffrichten.

'Solchs zeigt auch an, das jnn diesem Buch, nicht ordenlich ein stück auff das ander gefasset ist, als eines meisters werck, sondern aus mancherley meistern vnd Büchern gezogen, vnd durch einander gemenget, wie eine biene aus mancherley blumen, jr sefflin seuet, vnd jnn einander menget, Vnd scheint, das dieser Jesus Syrach, sey gewest aus dem Königlichem stam Davids, vnd ein neff odder enckel Amos Syrach, welcher der Oberst Fürst gewesen ist, im hause Juda, wie man aus Philone mag nemen, vnd die zwey hundert iar vor Christ geburt, ungefehr bey der Maccabeer zeit.

'Es ist ein nützlich buch, fur den gemeinen man, Denn auch alle sein vleis ist, das er einen burger odder Hausuater Gottfürchtig, from vnd klug mache, wie er sich gegen Gott, Gottes wort, Priestern, Eltern, weib, kindern, eigen leib, güter, knechten, nachbarn, freunden, feinden, Oberkeit, vnd jederman, halten sol, das mans wol möcht nennen, Ein Buch von der Hauszucht, odder von tugenden eines fromen hausherrn, welchs auch die rechte geistliche zucht ist, vnd heissen solt.

'Was vns aber fur erbeit gestanden hat, dis Buch zuerdeutschen Wer das zu wissen begerd, der mag vnser deutsch, gegen alle ander, exemplar halten, beide, Griechischer Latinischer vnd Deutscher sprachen, sie sind alt odder newe, so sol das werck den meistern wol zeugnis geben, Es sind so viel Klügling jnn allen sprachen vber dis

Buch komen, das nicht wunder were, weil, on das alle ding drinnen von seinem anfang, nicht jnn der ordnung gefasset gewest sind, das es gantz vnd gar, vnkendlich vnuerstendlich, vnd aller ding vntüchtig worden were. . . .'

In his preface to Baruch, Luther says :

'Seer geringe ist dis buch, wer auch der gute Baruch ist, Denn es nicht gleublich ist das Sanct Jeremias diener, der auch Baruch heisst (dem auch diese Epistel zugemessen wird) nicht solt höher vnd reicher im geist sein, weder dieser Baruch ist. Trifft dazu die zal der jar, mit den Historien nicht ein, Das ich gar nahe, in hette mit dem dritten vnd vierden buch Esra lassen hin streichen, Denn die selben zwey bücher Esra, haben wir schlechts nicht wollen verdeutschen, weil so gar nichts drinnen ist, das man nicht viel besser in Esopo, oder noch geringern büchern kan finden, on das im vierden buch dazu eitel trewme sind, wie S. Hieronymus zwar selbst sagt, vnd Lyra nicht hat wollen auslegen, dazu im Griechischen nicht funden werden, Es sol vnd mag sie sonst verdolmetchen wer da wil, doch jnn dieser bücher zal nicht mengen, Baruch lassen wir mit lauffen vnter diesem hauffen, weil er wider die Abgötterey so hart schreibt vnd Moses Gesetz furhellt.'

The preface to Luther's translation of the First book of Maccabees says :

'Das Buch ist auch der eins, die man nicht jnn die Ebreischen Biblien zelet, wie wol es fast eine gleiche weise helt mit reden vnd worten, wie andere der heiligen Schrifft Bücher, Vnd nicht vnwürdig gewest were, hinein zu rechen, weil es seer ein nötig vnd nützlich Buch ist, zuverstehen den Propheten Daniel im eilfften Capitel.'

Having shewn how important its statements are for understanding the prophecies of Daniel, he adds :

'Der halben es vns Christen auch nützlich ist zu lesen vnd zu wissen. . . . Zum andern, Das wir vns auch des trösten, das er jhenen hilfft, nicht allein wider den Antiochum vnd die Heiden, sondern auch wider die Verhether vnd abtrünnige Jüden, die sich zun Heiden schlugen, vnd huffen jr eigen volck, jre Brüder, verfolgen, tödten, vnd alles hertzeleid anlegen. . . .'

The preface to the Second of Maccabees says :

'Dis heisst vnd sol sein das Ander Buch Maccabeorum, wie der titel anzeigt, Aber das kan nicht recht sein, weil es etliche geschicht meldet, die vor des ersten buchs geschichten geschehen sind, vnd nicht weiter kompt, denn auff den Juda Maccabeum, das ist, bis, inn das siebende Capitel des ersten buchs, 'Das es billicher das erst deñ das ander solt

heissen, Man wolt es denn heissen, Ein anders buch, vnd nicht ~~das~~ ander buch Maccabeorum, Alium vel alienum scilicet non secundum, Aber wir lassens so mit hin gehen umb der schönen geschicht willen der, sieben Merterer Maccabeorum vnd jrer mutter, vnd anderer mehr stücken, Es sihet aber, als sey es nicht ein Meister gewest, sondern zu samen geflickt aus vielen büchern, Hat auch einen harten knoten im vierzehenden Capitel, an dem Rasiar der sich selbs erwürgete, welchs auch Sanct Augustinus vnd die altern Veter ansicht, Denn solch exempel taug nicht, vnd ist nicht zu loben, obs gleich geduldet vnd wol aus gelegt mag werden, So beschreibts auch den tod Antiochi im ersten Capitel gar anders, denn das erste buch thut Summa, so billich das erste buch solt jnn die zal der Heiligen Schrift genomen sein, so billich ist dis ander buch heraus geworffen, ob wol etwas guts drinnen stehet, Es sey aber alles dem fromen Leser befolhen vnd heimgestellet, zu vrteilen vnd erkennen.'

Of the fragments of Esther and Daniel, Luther says, in a paragraph at the end of the Second of Maccabees :

' Hje folgen etlich stücke, so wir im Propheten Daniel vnd im buch Esther nicht haben wollen verdeutschen, Denn wir haben solche kornblumen (weil sie im Ebreischen Daniel vnd Esther nicht stehen) ausgeraufft, vnd doch, das sie nicht verdörben, hie jnn sonderliche wurtzertlin oder bete gesetzt, weil dennoch, viel guts, vnd sonderlich der lobesang, Benedicite, drinnen funden wird. Aber der Text Susanne, des Beel Abacuc und Drachens, sihet auch schönen, geistlichen getichten gleich, wie Judith vnd Tobias, Denn die namen lauten auch dazu, Als Susanna heisst eine Rosen, das ist, ein schön from land vnd volck, oder armer hauffe vnter den dornen, Daniel heisst ein Richter, vnd so fort an, ist alles leichtlich zu deuten auff eine Polickey, economie oder fromen hauffen der gleubigen, es sey vmb die geschicht wie es kan.'

The Prayer of Manasses is printed at the end of the Song of the Three Children, without preface or comment. I have already in the previous paper discussed the prefaces to the four books of the New Testament which Luther treated with such despite.

In 1535 a New Testament, in which the table of contents to the text follows the order and headings of Luther, was published at Augsburg.

We now reach the time when Coverdale was preparing his English Bible. A great deal has been written on the texts from which he took his translation, and the matter is not yet finally settled. On the title-page of the first issue of Coverdale's first

edition of the English Bible, he claims to have translated the Old and New Testament 'out of Douche and Latyn in to Englishe'. In the second issue of this first edition, the original title-page, of which only one copy is extant, was cancelled, and in the substituted one the words 'out of Douche and Latyne' were omitted, probably to disarm suspicion that it might be a Lutheran document. The date 1536 was also substituted for 1535. In the Apologue addressed to the Christian reader, Coverdale says:

'I have had sundry translations, not only in Latin but also of the Dutch interpreters, whom (because of their singular giftes and special diligence in the Bible) I have been the more glad to follow for the most part according as I was required . . . lowly and faithfully have I followed mine interpreters.'

In the dedication to the King, Coverdale says more definitely:

'I have with a clear conscience purely and faithfully translated this out of five sundry interpreters,' &c.

It has been generally held that the five interpreters referred to by Coverdale in this dedication were the Zurich Bible, Luther's translations so far as available, the Latin version of the Dominican Pagnini, the Vulgate, and those parts of the Bible which had been translated by Tindale, and that substantially it followed Zwingli's Zürich Bible of 1531. This view was strongly maintained by Dr. Ginsburg in Kitto's *Encyclopaedia* i 568, and Dr. Westcott; and it has been urged, probably on the ground of the language and phraseology used, which Dr. Ginsburg declares are alike in both, and partly on the ground that the type used in Coverdale's is said to resemble that of Froschover, employed in the Zürich Bible. It is, at all events, rather remarkable that the Third book of Maccabees, which is contained in the Zürich Bible, should be absent from Coverdale's. Perhaps he relied here on the majority of the Vulgate copies. His initial phrase about the so-called Apocrypha certainly seems a translation of that used in the Zürich Bible. It is remarkable that the engravings in Coverdale's Bible are the same as those in Egenolph's Frankfort Bible of 1534.

Let us now return to the French Bible. Peter Robert, a native of Noyon in Picardy, and known as Olivetan, was a relative of Calvin's. He was a private tutor at Geneva, and there came into contact with the Waldenses, at whose instance he

undertook a new translation of the Bible into French. The New Testament appeared in 1534, and the Old in February 1535, at Neuchâtel, and was published by Peter de Wingle. Graf says it is a mere edition of Lefèvre's Bible with a few corrections from Pagnini's Bible of 1528, from that of Erasmus, and from the marginal notes in the Antwerp Bible of 1534. Olivetan's Bible was preceded by an address from Calvin to all Cæsars, kings, princes, &c., which was written in Latin. Calvin seems to have had little to do, however, with the translation. The translator himself follows Calvin's address with one of his own, headed, 'P. Robert Oliuetanus lhumble & petit Translateur, a Leglise de Jesus Christ.' This is again followed by the Apology of the translator, which is a scholarly document, considering it was written in 1535, and proves him to have been a Hebrew scholar. It is followed by another strangely headed address: 'Cv. F. L. a nostre allie & confedere le peuple de lalliance de Sinai,' which ends with the words 'Gloire & honneur & paix a ung chascun qui fera bien au Juif, premierement, aussi au Grec'.

In the table of contents, the books of the Hebrew Canon are set out in order. Then follows the heading, *Les Apocryphes*. Each book has the number of chapters it contains and the folio on which it commences. They run thus: III Ezra, IIIJ Ezra, Tobiah ou Tobie, Jehudith ou Judith, Sapience, Jesua ou Ecclesiastique, Baruch avec Lepitre de Jeremiah, I Machabees, II Machabees, Lhistoire de Esther ch. vii etc., Canticque des troys enfans en la fournaise, Lhistoire de Susanne, De lidole Bel & du Dragon, Loraison de Manasseh; so that the only book of the generally accepted Apocrypha missing is the Third of Maccabees. The so-called Apocrypha have a special title-page, entitled:

'¶ Le volume de tous les liures Apocryphes, contenus en la translation commune, lesquelz nauons point trouvez en Ebrieu ny en Chaldee.

'¶ Item, une epistre de lauthorite di ceulx, selon Eusebe et saint Hierosme: avec le registre de leurs noms, en la page suyuante.'

Then follows this address:

'Aux fideles lecteurs. Attendu que les liures precedés se trouuent en langue Ebraicque receuz dung chascun, & que les autres ensuyuâs qui sont dictz Apocryphes (pourtât qui souloiêt estre leuz non en publicq̄ & cōmun, mais cōme en secret & a part) ne se trouuent ny en Ebrieu ny en Chaldee, ausquelles langues iadis ont este escritz (fors a laduétude

le liure de Sapièce) dont maintenāt grāde difficulte seroit a les restituer. Et que aussi ne sont point receuz ny tenus cōme legitimes tāt des Ebriuez que de toute leglise, ainsi q̄ refere saint Hierosme : nous les auōs separez & reduictz a part pour les mieulx discerner & cōgnoistre : affin q̄ lon sache desquelz le tesmonnage doit estre receu, ou non. Car ledict saint Hierosme parlant du liure de Jehudith (qui est Apocryphe) dit q̄ lauthorite diceluy nest point estimee idoine & suffisante pour cōfirmer les choses qui suruiēnt en disputatiō. Et generallemēt de tous les liures Apocryphes, dit quō les peult lire pour ledificatiō du peuple : mais nō point por vouloir corroborer lauthorite des doctrines Ecclesiastiques. Je laisse icy le droit (quon appelle) des canōs au. c. sancta Romana. v̄v. distfc. ou il en profere son iugemēt. Pareillement la glose du. c. canones. xvj. distinc. qui dit quon les lict : mais non point en general, cōme si elle vouloit dire q̄ generallemēt par tout ne soiēt point approuuez. Et nō sans cause, car q̄lz ayent este corrōpus & falsifiez en plusieurs lieulx, assez appert par Eusebe en son histoire Ecclesiasticq̄. Ce que facillemēt certes est auiourdhuy cōgneu en certains pointz, notāment es liures des Machabees : desquelz saint Hierosme confesse nauoir point trouue le second en Ebriue : au moyen de quoy nous est rendu plus suspect & moins receu. Semblablemēt est il du. iij. & iiij. liure de Ezra : desquelz saint Hierosme proteste ne les auoir point vōulu traduire les estimāt cōme songes, ia soit toutes foyz que (Iosephus en les antiquitez deduyse sa matiere cōme quelque histoire, tāt du liure des Machabees q̄ du. iij. de Ezra, combien quil estime les liures qui traictēt depuis le Roi Artaxerxes, iusque a son temps, estre Apocryphes.

Parquoy donc quād tu voudras maintenir aucune chose pour certaine rendant raison de ta foy, regarde de y proceder par viue & puissante escripture, en ensuyuant saint Pierre qui dit : Celuy qui parle, quil parle comme parole de Dieu. Il dit parole de Dieu, comme tres veritable & trescertaine, manifestee par les Prophetes et Apostres diuinement inspirez, desquelz avons le tesmoignage plus clair que le iour. Les Iurisconsultes aussi ayans grand soing de confirmer & establir leurs opinions par la foy humaines, disent quilz ont honte de parler sans foy. Combien donc plus grand horreur et vergongne doibt auoir celuy qui se dit Chretien lequel ne se attent ou ne se arreste es loix du Dieu viuant : mais aux humaines, iugeant de toutes choses selon icelles, et a la fantasie et iugement incertain ? Par ainsi nous edifiez sur le fondement des saints Prophetes & Apostres (sur lequel ilz se sont fondez & lequel ilz ont annonce qui est Iesus Christ, la ferme pierre) delaisserons les choses incertaines pour suyure les certaines, nous appuyans et arrestans en icelles & la fichās nostre ancre cōme en lieu seur. Car nostre foy chretiēne ne cōsiste point es choses douteuses, mais en plaine &

trescertaine assuree, & tres vraye persuasiō prinse & confirmee par verite, qui est infallible. En laquelle nous Dieu doit cheminer perpetuellemēt, affin que selon icelle (accōplissant en nous sa sainte volonte, & deiectant toute autre inuention a luy contraire) puissions viure a son hōneur et edification de son eglise. Ainsi soit il.'

After this follows a fresh register of the names of the various books in their order, with the number of chapters in each and the leaf on which they begin. There are some minor changes in the wording, the only one of any mark being, that in this second table, instead of 'L'Histoire de Esther, chap. vii', &c., as in the first, we have, more accurately, 'La reste du liure de Esther depuis la moytie du. v. iusque a la fin, contiēt quasi. vij. Chap.'

The Prayer of Manasses in this edition comes last among the books of the Old Testament, and is followed by the words 'La fin de tous les liures Apocryphes, contenus en la translation cōmune, lesquels ne se trouuent point a present en Ebrieu ne en Chaldee'.

In the New Testament the order of the books is that of the Vulgate, and the Epistle to the Hebrews is assigned to St Paul. Revelation is headed 'La Reuelatiō, dicte Lapocalypse de saint Jehan Theologien'.

The so-called Apocryphal books in Olivetan's Bible are, with slight verbal changes, in the same language as in Lefèvre's Bible, and merely form in fact a slightly revised edition of the latter. The Prayer of Manasses is, I believe, identically the same in both.

The English Bible known as Matthew's Bible, which was published in 1537, was largely based on that of Coverdale, but it was also much influenced by the French translations of Lefèvre and Olivetan, as Dr Westcott and Dr Aldis Wright have shewn. From the former it derived its table of contents, chapter-headings, a large part of its marginal matter, and its woodcuts; while from Olivetan, who generally follows Lefèvre closely in the Apocryphal books, it derived its concordance, a translation of the address 'aux fideles lectures', and the preface to the Apocrypha.

Lefèvre himself died in 1537 at the age of eighty, and it is a curious circumstance that his Bible which had had the double distinction of appearing with the privilege of the great Kaiser

Charles the Fifth, and the imprimatur of the Holy Office of Louvain, should have been put on the Index in 1546.

Although Lefèvre and Olivetan did so much to initiate the Reformation in France, it was Calvin whose masterful spirit and strong logical method really turned the tide of Reform into the channel which it afterwards followed in French-speaking countries, in Holland, and among the English Nonconformists.

Calvin's view in regard to the authority of the Bible, like that of Luther and Zwingli, discarded all appeals to the Church or to tradition as a support to the book itself. In the first edition of his famous *Institutes*, published in 1536, there is no treatise on the Scriptures and their authority. In the 1539 and subsequent editions, he speaks on the subject with great definiteness. He says :

'Inualuit autem apud plerosque perniciosissimus error : Scripturae tantum inesse momenti, quantum illi Ecclesiae suffragiis concitur. Ac si ea vero aeterna inuiolabilisque Dei veritas hominum arbitrio niteretur. Sic enim magno cum ludibrio Spiritus sancti quaerunt. Ecquis nobis fidem faciat, haec a Deo prodiisse? Ecquis salua & intacta ad nostram usque aetatem peruenisse; certiores reddat? Ecquis persuadeat, librum hunc reuerenter excipiendum; alterum numero expungendum: nisi certam istorum omnium regulam Ecclesia praescriberet? Pendet igitur, inquit, ab Ecclesiae determinatione: et quae scripturae reuerentia debeatur: et qui libri in eius catalogo censendi sint. Ita sacrilegi homines, dum, sub Ecclesiae praetextu, volunt effrenatam tyrannidem inuehere, nihili curant, quibus se et alios absurditatibus illaqueent, modo hoc unum extorqueant apud simplices: Ecclesiam nihil non posse: atqui si ita est: quid miseris conscientii fiet, solidam vitae aeternae securitatem quaerentibus: si quaecumque extant de ea promissiones, solo hominum iudicio fultae, consistent? An accepto tali responso fluctuari et trepidare desinent? Rursum quibus impiorum sannis subiicitur fides nostra? quantum apud omnes in suspicionem vocatur? si credatur, hominum beneficio, non secus ac precariam habere autoritatem. Sed eiusmodi rabulae vel uno Apostoli verbo pulchre repelluntur. Ecclesiam ille testatur prophetarum et apostolorum fundamento sustineri. Si fundamentum est Ecclesiae prophetica et Apostolica doctrina: suam huic certitudinem ante constare oportet, quam illa extare incipiat. Neque est quod caillentur: etiam si inde primum exordium ducat Ecclesia: manere tamen dubium quae prophetis et Apostolis sint adscribenda: nisi iudicium ipsius intercedat. Nam si Christiana Ecclesia prophetarum scriptis, et Apostolorum praedicatione initio fundata fuit, ubicunque reperietur ea

doctrina, Ecclesiam certe præcessit eius approbatio : sine qua nunquam Ecclesia ipsa exstisset. Vanissimum est igitur commentum, scripturæ iudicandæ potestatem esse penes Ecclesiam : ut ab huius nutu illius certitudo pendere intelligatur. Quare dum illam recipit, ac suffragio suo obsignat, non ex dubia aut alioqui nutabunda authenticam reddit : sed quia veritatem esse agnoscit Domini sui, pro pietatis officio, nihil cunctando, veneratur. Quod autem rogant, Unde persuadebimur a Deo fluxisse, nisi ad Ecclesie decretum confugiamus? perinde est acsi quis roget, Unde discemus lucem discernere a tenebris, album a nigro, suaue ab amaro? Non enim obscuriorem veritatis suae sensum ultro Scriptura prae se fert, quam coloris sui res albæ ac nigrae : saporis, suaues & amaræ.' (*op. cit.* ed. 1545, 9 and 10.)

Having thus set out his own views, Calvin proceeds to animadvert (although he does it in a tender way) upon Augustine's famous saying in the opposite sense : 'Ego vero evangelio non crederem nisi me catholicae ecclesie commoveret auctoritas' (*Aug. c. Epist. Manich.* ch. 6). This tenderness, as Reuss says, was doubtless due to the fact that he and other Protestant divines were more dependent on St Augustine than they were aware of, and much more than they liked to confess.

Olivetian's Bible was republished at Geneva in 1540 by Calvin, with corrections. On the title-page of this edition we read :

'La Bible en la quelle sont contenus tous les livres canoniques, de la sainte escriture, tant du vieil que du nouveau Testament & pareillement les Apocryphes. Le tous translate en langue françoise avec diligente collations non seulement aux anciens & fideles exemplaires, mais aussi à loriginal & sequamment des canoniques.'

The emphasis laid on the Canonical books in this paragraph is noteworthy. The Apocrypha, in the list of books at the beginning, is headed 'Le nom des liures Apocryphes de l'ancien Testament, car du nouveau nous n'en auons point faict de section'. The text of the Apocryphal books is headed 'Le volume de tous les livres Apocryphes qui sont communement adiointz aux livres canoniques tant les entiers que ceux qui sont parties & fragmens adiouxtez aux susdictz liures du Canon'. Both the Third and the Fourth book of Esdras are given, although in the initial table the word Esdras alone occurs. The Epistle of Jeremiah, although numerated as the sixth chapter of Baruch in the text, has a separate heading. The Third of Maccabees is omitted, and the

Prayer of Manasseh is put at the end of the Apocrypha, and followed by the words 'La fin'.

In 1540-1541 the whole Bible was published for the first time in Swedish at Upsala. It follows Luther's Bible of 1534, contains his preface (in Swedish) to the whole Bible and follows it exactly in separating the so-called Apocryphal books in the initial list, which it heads 'Apocrypha'. The list contains the same books in the same order. The special title-page to the Apocrypha is headed 'Apocrypha. Thet åro Bóker som icke finnas in then Ebreiska Biblien och åro fór then skul icke lijka reknadha widh the andra bóker & then helgha Scryfft Doch syliligka til at låsa'. The prefaces to the Apocryphal books are translated from Luther's, sometimes abridged, and the fragments of Esther and Daniel are put at the end of the other Apocryphal books in Luther's Bible; the Prayer of Manasses is printed at the end of the Apocrypha although it is not mentioned in the initial list. As with Luther, the Third and Fourth of Esdras and the Third of Maccabees are excluded. As in the edition of 1526, the books of the New Testament are printed in Luther's order, with translations of his prefaces. It is clear, therefore, that the Lutherans of Sweden completely adopted Luther's theory of the Canon of the Bible.

In 1542 there was published a revised edition of the Zürich Bible of 1531. In this, the so-called Apocrypha of the Old Testament are treated as in the former edition, and placed in the same position immediately before Job, but Luther's order of the New Testament books is abandoned. Hebrews is headed 'Desz heyiligen Apostels Pauli Epistel an die Ebreer', and is put after Titus and before 1 Peter; while, contrary to the practice of Luther, who calls their two authors 'St James' and 'St Jude' only, this Bible, for which Bullinger was doubtless responsible, assigns each of these books to the Apostle of the name.

It has been remarked as a singular fact, that while the Confessions of the Swiss and of the other so-called Evangelical Reformers contain specific statements in regard to the criteria of Canonicity in Bible books, no such pronouncement is found in the early Lutheran Confessions—neither in that of Augsburg dated in 1530, nor in the subsequent *Articuli Smalcaldici* drawn

up by Melancthon in 1538—so that among the early Lutherans there was no corporate pronouncement on this most important matter.

As is well known, while Lutheranism, as a principle defined doctrinally by the Augsburg Confession, was generally accepted among the German Reformers, the regulation of the services was left very largely to the initiative of the local authority, and thus it came about that almost every important locality had its Use defined in what was called an *Ordnung*. Richter has collected these *Ordnungen*, in which the ritual and other observances are regulated, and in most cases they adopt a conservative attitude towards the old service-books, which in fact continued to be very generally accepted, except those parts which were deemed to teach erroneous doctrine. I have examined a large number of them, and in only one have I found any reference to the Bible Canon. This is in the *Ordnung* dated 1543, regulating the services of the Church at Cologne, where we read :

‘Den wie auch die alten Vätter erkennenet, vnd gepotten haben, sollen kein Apocrypha, vnnd vngewisse historien in der kirchen gelesen werden.’ (Richter *Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen* ii 49.)

This is an important pronouncement and it may possibly represent the policy tacitly followed, although not openly avowed, of entirely discarding the so-called Apocrypha from the public services of the Lutheran Church and thus treating them as under a ban, very differently from the earlier writers who, in speaking of Apocrypha meant, not books excluded from the Church service, but merely those not included in the technical canon.

In 1544 an edition of the Vulgate came out at Leipzig with a preface by J. Brenz, generally called Brentius. In this preface, when describing the books of the Old Testament, Brentius does not say a word about the Apocrypha, none of the books in which does he make any comment upon. He has a sentence in the preface which might be supposed to be aimed at Luther, if he were not such a devoted Lutheran. In this, speaking of different ways in which different people had received the Bible, he says :

‘Alii agnoscunt quidem vetus sacrae Scripturae Testamentum, novum autem reiiciunt. Alii novum probant et vetus improbant. Alii ex

veteri & novo colligunt, partim quae defendant, partim quae refutant, adeoque cum alio qui minime inter illos conveniat, in neganda tamen et oppugnanda veritate maxime conveniunt.'

In the list of books in this Bible, those not in the Hebrew Canon are not separated into a class apart, but are distinguished by being printed on a different line of names. They include the Third and Fourth of Esdras and the Third of Maccabees. Jerome's prefaces are all given. The Prayer of Manasses is omitted from this table of contents.

The Apocrypha is reprinted in the same form in which it occurs in the edition of 1534. In the editions of Luther's Bible published down to that of 1545 (which was called the Standard Edition), the same arrangement with slight variations is maintained, except that in the titles to the parts of Daniel remitted to the Apocrypha the title 'Von dem Bel und Drachen' of the edition of 1534 is broken up into two, headed respectively, 'Von dem Bel zu Babel' and 'Vom Drachen zu Babel'. In the same way, the title 'Der gesang der dreier menner im feur Daniel am dritten dem aus Griechischen' in the edition of 1534, reads 'Das Gebet Azarie Dan III aus dem Griechischen', and 'Der Gesang der dreien menner im Feiur' in the later edition. In both, the Song itself is written in strophes. In both, the Prayer of Manasses, which is not named in the initial list, is printed at the end of the so-called Apocrypha, and followed by the words 'Ende der bucher des alten Testaments'. In the Standard Edition there is no separate title to the Apocrypha, the prologue to Judith following immediately after the list of books as given on page 156.

I must here bring to a close this long paper, in which I have tried perhaps to survey too wide a field. My object has been to bring to a focus the various theories about the Bible Canon and the way they were applied by the early Reformers down to the death of Luther, which nearly coincided with the pronouncement of the Council of Trent on the subject. It is plain that, with the exception of Karlstadt, and perhaps of Brenz, they all adopted extravagant subjective tests for the Bible books. Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin—the three great leaders of the three lines of Continental Reformers—were at one in this, and in repudiating traditional and historical arguments as the ultimate

basis for the authority of the Canon. They accordingly very naturally came to different conclusions as to the legitimate contents of their Bibles. For those with whom 'the Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture' was the supreme and only test of Eternal Truth, this particular result was most unfortunate. I had hoped to complete the survey of the story of the Biblical Canon among the Reformers in this paper, but have found it impossible if I was to do justice to the intricate subject, and must reserve the survey of its later history for another occasion.

H. H. HOWORTH.