

THE CANON OF THE BIBLE AMONG THE LATER REFORMERS.

IN the previous paper I carried down the history of the Canon among the continental reformers until the death of Luther. Before continuing it further it will be well to survey the position as it then stood rather more definitely.

The main anchor of the Reformers' position was an appeal from the authority of the Church and from the cogency of its tradition as a criterion of Divine Truth. They professed to deny the authority of its corporate judgement and the paramount obligation to follow it when duly expressed, and appealed against it to the individual judgement of every truly pious man, who was alleged to be inspired for the task by the Holy Spirit. In order to give any stability or precision to this appeal and to prevent the chaos and anarchy which overwhelmed the mystics and illuminati who each professed to find a special gospel in his own heart, it was necessary to agree upon some fixed standard and criterion, upon which to base their corporate faith. This the Reformers all professed to find in the Scriptures, and their appeal was in fact from the Church to the written word of God.

This appeal necessarily involved another. It was very well to fall back upon the Bible, but who was to certify the Bible but the Church which had been its custodian for so many centuries? But to the Church as the ultimate witness in regard to the validity of the Bible the Reformers took exception.

As Reuss says :

‘Nothing was further from the thoughts of Luther, Calvin, and their illustrious associates—nothing was more fundamentally opposed to their principles, than to base the authority of the holy books on that of the Church and its tradition, to have the Fathers turned out on guard, and to bring their catalogues on parade, with the reservation of removing their obscurities and contradictions by forced and violent interpretations, as is the custom now. They understood perfectly well that nothing could have been more illogical—nay, more ruinous—to

their system than to assign to the Church the right of making the Bible, when they had disputed her right of making dogma, for the one includes the other.' (*History of the Canon*, Engl. tr., p. 294.)

The position was a difficult one. The Reformers were speedily reminded that the Church existed before the Bible, and that to appeal from the authority of the Church to that of the Bible on questions like that of the Canon was in effect to appeal from the institution which collected the Bible books and first gave them authority, to its own handiwork. No one could seriously contend that the Bible as it stood had fallen from heaven as a complete whole. It is composed of various distinct works, professedly written at different times and by different authors, and the work of collecting and selecting them is a part of history to be studied and decided by the ordinary methods of historical enquiry. If the Bible was not to be accepted and taken over on the authority of a Church which claimed to be infallible and under the continual guidance of divine wisdom, the reasons why its contents were to be accepted as inspired must be extraordinarily cogent and conclusive since the book itself was in future to become the single pedestal upon which the Christian faith was to be planted. The early Reformers confessedly had to face a stupendous difficulty therefore when they set out to replace the authority of the Church by some other authority equally cogent by which to give an irreproachable sanction to their new Rule of Faith, for they were not like the fortunate founders of other religions who composed their own Bibles and could therefore certify them themselves. The Bible they planted themselves upon was no new book. They could not deny that it had been for fifteen centuries the groundwork of the Creed of Christendom.

They went through no process of analysing and dissecting afresh the ultimate data of Religion. They nowhere stopped to enquire whether Divine Revelation was a reality or not, and, if it was, whether it was contained in the Bible rather than in the sacred books of other religions making similar pretensions. They took their conclusions on both questions for granted as having been decided for them long before. What they were alone content to do was to try and substitute some sanction for the contents of the Bible as they stood other than the authority

of the Church or, as they phrased it, the traditions of men; and thus to avoid what they deemed the inconsistency of certifying a divine message by mere human testimony.

In prosecuting this end Luther formulated a theory of his own which was particularly inconsequent. He tested the canonicity or validity of any book in the Bible, not by its being contained in a recognized 'Bible Canon', but by the conformity of its teaching with what he *a priori* laid down as the essential element of Christianity. He began by making the contents of certain books the test and measure of what the others must be if they were to be accepted as genuine Scripture. He did this in the main by selecting from the Pauline Epistles a dogma which he claimed to be the dominating factor in true evangelical teaching, namely, the doctrine of Justification by Faith alone, and he applied this Pauline and Augustinian conclusion as a touchstone, and held that its 'canonicity was to be determined by what each biblical book (real or pretended) thus taught regarding Christ and the salvation of men'. This meant of course the testing of the canonicity of the several books by an entirely new, self-evolved and uncertain criterion, and one based only on what the writer himself judged to be the one cardinal evangelical truth among the many possibilities within the Bible teaching; that is to say, upon an assertion of personal infallibility.

On the other hand Calvin and his scholars, while avoiding any appeal to a general proposition, such as Luther's about Justification, chose a still more elastic and uncertain criterion. They claimed that the Holy Spirit speaking within them teaches men how to distinguish what is the true word of God from what is spurious.

This latter theory, which has pervaded the theological writings of that large portion of the reformers who claim Geneva for their Mecca, meant basing canonicity on the internal witness of the Holy Spirit speaking in the heart of each man, educated or simple, normal or excentric, and left the problem to be solved according to the caprice or prejudice of each individual enquirer who might claim to be internally illuminated, and it naturally led quite good Christian men to adopt the most contradictory and inconsistent theories on the authority of the Bible and its various parts.

It is a remarkable fact, not I believe hitherto noticed, that while rejecting tradition as a guide to the legitimate contents of the Bible, the early reformers should have accepted the Bible as preserved by the mediaeval Church at least as containing the maximum of canonical books. The contents of that Bible, there could be no doubt, were only a small selection from a great crowd of others with similar pretensions which had been examined and rejected by the Church in early days. Nowhere do we find any evidence, however, that the early reformers subjected these excluded books to a re-examination and to the potent test of their own new criteria. Whatever the Church had discarded as uncanonical they discarded too quite as a matter of course.

For those who entirely repudiated human tradition as having any legitimate voice whatever in the matter, this was assuredly most inconsequent, for it in fact meant that what had been brought together by the early Church after much patient discussion and enquiry constituted the whole of the documents which without further enquiry need be considered as worthy of any toleration when tested by entirely different criteria. Who was to say that among the literature both of the Old and of the New Testament rejected by the old Church from its Canon, and still existing in such profusion, there may not have been works entitled to be in the Bible if access to that distinction was to be measured by the reformers' new tests?

It seems clear that by accepting the old Church's Bible as the maximum of possible inspired literature, Luther and Calvin in fact conceded the position that the Bible as it stood had been originally certified by the Church; and this was going a long way towards giving the Church paramount authority to decide upon the legitimate contents of the Book, and it meant *pro tanto* an abandonment by the reformers of their exclusion of Church tradition as a support to the Bible. It is plain therefore that when they were content without further enquiry to treat the Church's Bible as containing all the inspired works which are of authority among Christians, they really abandoned their objection to tradition as having any voice in the matter at all.

Having so accepted it, and having placed the cardinal limitation on their choice that it must not go outside the contents of the

accepted Bible of the Church, they were not content to stop there, but proceeded to resist the contents of the Bible as it had been thus handed down, and to discard from it several books as not having the critical characters by which an inspired work should be marked. That is to say, having accepted the Bible from the Church as a *maximum* of authoritative materials, they proceeded to separate from this maximum a minimum to which alone they were willing to adhere. In doing this they proceeded by various methods, and they treated the books of the New Testament and those of the Old in different ways.

Let us first consider their varying attitude towards the New Testament.

It is necessary to remember in this behalf that the fact of the Reformers applying criticism to the origin and contents of the New Testament books is in no way to be confused with their attitude towards the Canon of the Bible. Such criticism had been freely applied by the early Fathers, by the mediaeval theologians and by the men of the New Learning, notably by Erasmus, as it was now applied without stint or scruple by Calvin and his followers, no less than by Luther and Zwingli. Thus Calvin in his commentaries, while rejecting the Pauline authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews, refers to it continually as an authority of the first quality. He defends the Epistle of James as canonical, although doubtful as to its authorship. Of the Second Epistle of Peter, about which many of the Fathers had disputed, he says expressly :

‘Quamvis aliqua notari possit affinitas, fateor tamen manifestum esse discrimen quod diversos scriptores arguat. Sunt et aliae probabiles coniecturae ex quibus colligere liceat alterius esse potius quam Petri. Interim omnium consensu adeo nihil habet Petro indignum ut vim spiritus apostolici et gratiam ubique exprimat. Quod si pro canonica recipitur Petrum eius authorem fateri oportet quando . . . ipse etiam **testatur** cum Christo se vixisse. Haec autem fictio indigna esset **ministro** Christi, obtendere alienam personam. Sic igitur constituo, si **digna** fide censetur Epistola, a Petro fuisse profectam, non quod eam scripserit ipse sed quod unus aliquis ex discipulis ipsius mandato complexus fuerit quae temporum necessitas exigebat . . . Certe quum in omnibus epistolae partibus Spiritus Christi maiestas se exserat eam prorsus repudiare mihi religio est.’

This also, says Reuss, determined the place he assigns to it ; for he alone, among all the reformers, separates it from the first epistle by interposing those of John and James ; a very curious peculiarity which modern editions, modified by orthodoxy, have taken care to efface. Reuss adds that, when he made this statement, he had six editions of Calvin's commentary on the Catholic Epistles before him, Latin as well as English, all issued under the author's own eyes between 1551 and 1562. Calvin again did not write any commentary on the Apocalypse nor on the two shorter Epistles of St John, but he certainly quotes the Apocalypse under John's name in the *Institutes*. The two epistles, however, he does not quote, and he refers to the first Epistle in such a way as to exclude them : 'Iohannes in sua canonica', he says of the first Epistle (*Inst.* iii 2. 24 ; 3. 23 : see Reuss, p. 318 note 2). It is perfectly plain, therefore, that Calvin, the father of the so-called Reformed churches, no less than Luther and Zwingli, exercised the greatest freedom in commenting on the relative value of the New Testament books.

In regard to the New Testament *Canon*, however, he and his scholars differed widely from their rivals. This is best shewn by an examination of the contents of their respective Bibles, which are really the best test of such a question. In all the Bibles issued under the auspices of the Genevan reformers and their followers the New Testament Canon as accepted by the Latin Church is duly followed. It is the same with the official pronouncements of this school of reformers.

None of the Helvetic Confessions give any list of canonical books. Such a list, however, was contained in the Confession composed in French by Guy de Bres for the churches of Flanders and the Netherlands in 1565, and afterwards sanctioned by the Synod of Dort in 1619. In this the list of Canonical books of the New Testament follows that of the Vulgate explicitly. In the Confession of Rochelle, dated in 1571, the only difference (which is really an immaterial one) is that the Epistle to the Hebrews is treated as anonymous and separated from the other Pauline Epistles, and the Apocalypse is attributed merely to 'Saint Jean', and not to the Apostle John. This Confession was the handiwork of Calvin and his pupil De Chandieu, and was approved by Henry the Fourth of France.

It is plain, therefore, that whatever pious esoteric views the writers of the Reformed church of Geneva and its descendants, including the English Puritans, held in regard to canonical books proper and to Antilegomena in the New Testament, their views were excluded from their Bibles and Confessions, the contents of which constituted their official statement on the subject. So that a question about the legitimate contents of the New Testament Canon never rose among them, and has never done so since.

As we have seen, the Anglican Church in its Articles similarly accepts the old view of the New Testament Canon. In the sixth article it says explicitly, 'All the Books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received, we do receive, and account them Canonical.'

Let us now turn to the theory of Luther and Zwingli.

Luther's own criterion of a Canonical book, as we have seen, was, *inter alia*, whether it conformed or not to his test of teaching the rigid doctrine of Justification by Faith alone. When thus tested, he claimed, as we said in the previous paper, that four of the New Testament books as hitherto received by the Church failed to comply with his condition, and he accordingly, as we have seen, discarded them from his strict New Testament Canon. His rejection of them was accepted, as we have further seen, by Zwingli, and was endorsed by the various schools of reformers who accepted Luther as their prophet, in Scandinavia, England, and Holland. The only voice raised against him on the subject by any of the early reformers was that of his early friend and later critic Karlstadt. Luther was, however, shortly called to book by the champions of Rome. Thus, within four years of the appearance of Luther's New Testament, Emser, in the preface to the *Annotationes*, speaks bitterly of his treatment of the New Testament books. Thus he says :

'Aber was solt der nit straffen oder tadeln der auch dem heyligen Apostel Sancto Jacobo sein Epistel verschumffirtt vñ spricht es sey ein rechte strörin Epistel die keyn Euangelische art an ir habe, wölche Blasphemien und lesterüg ich dan verantwortē wil so wir auff die selbe Epistel kōmen werden.'

Again he says :

'Und letzten verkurtzt Luther auch das nawe Testament unnd verwurfft unnd verstöst etliche bücher daraus, als nämlich die Epistel zu den

Ebreern, die Epistel Jacobi, die Epistel Jude, und die heymliche offenbarüg Joannis welche doch die Christenliche kirch vor tawsent iaren canonizirt und dem testamēt Christi eingeleybt hat, wölchen mehr zu glouben, dan tawsent Luthern. Das aber Luther fur wēdet wie etzlich aus dē altē an disen vier büchern selber gezweyfelt habē, ist gar ein loss argument, Dann solte der gantzen Christenlichē kirchē ein-trechtige ordnüg und bewarüg der canonischen bücher nit mehr stat oder glaubens bey uns habē, dañ etzlicher einzeln personē wahn oder zweyfel. Ja wan man ein ding darüb verwerffen solt, das etzlich daran tzweyfel, solten die ketzer zu letzt nit allein die canonischē bücher sonder auch wol Christū selber verwerffen wöllen, darumb das vil Judē und Heydē an ihm gezweyfelt, und in nicht fur den Son Gottes oder den warhafftigē Messiam gehaltē haben' (ff. xvi sq.).

Further on again, in his prefaces to the four books we are discussing, Emser enters at greater length into the question of their authority and authenticity, and speaks very plainly of Luther's method of criticism as applied to them.

Luther was similarly attacked by a still more persistent champion of Rome, namely Cochlaeus. Thus, in his work entitled *De Canonicae Scripturae & Catholicae Ecclesiae Autoritate*, addressed to Henry Bullinger, 1543, he says :

'Nos enim Catholici omnes novi testamēti libros pro Canonicis & sacrosanctis habemus, quos hactenus tota tenuit Ecclesia, quosque concilium Carthaginense tertium & S. Augustinus . . . At Lutherus in sua in nouum testamentum praefatione, & in plerisque prologis Canoniarum epistolarum atque Apocalypsis audacissimum sese scripturarum novi Testamenti censorē, iudicemque constituit, aliisque Suermeris ad temeraria de scripturis sanctis iudicia falsasque et impias censuras licentiae fenestram aperuit atque audendi ansam praebuit. Hae enim ipsius, non nostrae sunt propositiones' (cap. iii f. 14).

He then sets out in order the various propositions in regard to the four books in question to which Luther takes exception, and continues :

'Haec & id genus plura Lutheri, non nostra, de scripturis novi testamenti sunt iudicia. De quibus audatius adhuc magisque impie iudicavit post eum Otto Brunfelsius (quē tibi notissimū fuisse arbitror) in quodam problemate. Is eñ nullā uult scripturam dici sanctam praeterque vetus Testamentum. Ideo non censet inter sanctas scripturas Evangeliiū, sed habet illud pro mera relatione Cabalistica, qua inuicē alius erudit alium. Atque huc omnia tendere affirmat, ut apostolos

hoīes fuisse credamus & labi potuisse, atque etiā pugnātia scripsisse' (ff. 15 sq.).

Again, in his *Commentaria de actis et scripturis Martini Lutheri . . . usque ad anum* M.D. xlvi, published in 1549, we find Cochlaeus, on page 60, writing :

'Optimis enim quibusque videbatur Lutherus nimis malitiose grassari in sacras literas novi Testamenti. E quorum Canone, audaci censura reiiciebat Epistolam ad Hebraeos, Epistolam Iacobi, Epistolam Iudae & Apocalypsin Ioannis. Quas sane & atrocibus infamabat calumniis in suis praefationibus. In praefatione vero generali, etiam in sacratissima Evangelia audacissime manum mittebat : volens in primis repudiandam esse vetustissimam hanc et omnibus Christianis notam ac receptam opinionem & sententiam . . . Evangelium enim non requirere opera, aut praecepta praescribere, sed solum fidem in Christum docere et dulciter consolari credentes affirmabat.'

These and other similar attacks by the champions of Rome, especially after the Council of Trent had emphasized the adherence of the Roman Church to the complete Canon, had to be met, and the Lutheran apologists found them very difficult to meet without qualifying their master's position very materially. Especially did they find it necessary to go behind his own pontifical pronouncements as to what ought and what ought not to be found doctrinally in a truly Canonical book, and to import into their arguments references to the opinions and decisions of the early Church, and, in fact, to abandon the rigid appeal to internal inspiration in regard to Canonicity and to wander into what Luther and Zwingli both denounced as an unpardonable fault, namely, to quote traditional and historical arguments in favour of their position. Thus, as we have seen, Oecolampadius at a very early stage, when giving advice to the Waldenses as to the New Testament Canon, did not quote Luther's Canon, but the Canon of some of the early Fathers who had raised questions about the authority of seven and not merely about four books as Antilegomena, but in a very different way from Luther's.

Thus again Flacius, the most devoted of Luther's champions, says of the Bible books :

'Distinguuntur quoque, in Canonicos, et dubios ac denique apocryphos, taceo enim iam plane supposititios atque adeo reiectos.

'Canonicos eos voco, qui plane accepti probatique sunt et in Canone Biblico semper censiti, quos supra recensui. Dubios eos dico, de quibus est dubitatum; ut sunt in N. Testamento Epistola Petri ii, ad Hebraeos, Iacobi duae posteriores Iohannis, Iudae et Apocalypsis.'

Again, in his tract on the New Testament in the first volume of the *Magdeburg Centuries*, having given a list of those writings which, according to Eusebius, had always been received as undoubted (*pro indubitatis*), he continues :

'Sunt autem et alia quaedam hoc seculo scripta, per ecclesias nomine Apostolorum aut eorum discipulorum sparsa: quorum quaedam in medio propter quorundam dubitationem, sunt aliquamdiu relicta, postea vero in numerum catholicorum scriptorum recepta: quaedam vero prorsus pro apocryphis reiecta. Prioris generis sunt: Epistola Iacobi, epistola Iudae, posterior Petri, et altera ac tertia Ioannis: epistola ad Hebraeos, et apocalypsis Ioannis. Eusebius de suo tempore loquens, epistolam Iacobi primam inter septem catholicas, et Iudae epistolam quoque inter eas unam, et publice in plurimis ecclesiis legi, dicit: sed tamen eas adulterinas esse ex eo affirmat, quod non multi ex veteribus mentionem earum faciant (Eusebius ii ch. 23). Praeter hoc vero argumentum, a testimonio antiquitatis sumptum, alia quoque sunt haud obscura indicia, unde colligi potest, earum autores non esse Apostolos Iacobum et Iudam. Nam Epistola Iacobi ab analogia doctrinae Apostolicae haud mediocriter aberrat, dum iustificationem non fidei soli sed operibus adscribit: et legem appellat legem libertatis, cum lex fit Testamentum generans in servitutem Galat iv. Deinde nec modum docendi Apostolorum observat. . . . Praeterea sententiis quibusdam Petri et Pauli utitur: nec se appellat Apostolum Christi, sicut Paulus et Petrus faciunt, sed tantum servum Christi. Non igitur est absimile vero, eam epistolam a quodam discipulo Apostolorum sub finem huius seculi, aut superiori tempore scriptum est.

'Iudae epistolam etiam haec arguunt non esse genuinam, quod non apostolum, sed servum se appellat: quodque ipse se post apostolos vixisse prodit, quum inquit: Vos autem dilecti, memores estis verborum, quae antehac dicta fuerunt ab Apostolis Domini nostri Iesu Christi, quod dixerunt vobis, . . . Quod quaedam de verbo ex posteriori Petri describit, et quod citat sententiam de certamine Michaelis archangeli adversus diabolum de corpore Mosi, et ex vaticinio Enoch, quae in probatis ceteris scripturae libris non habentur. . . . Et quod Iudam non in Graeciam, sed in Persiam venisse, memoriae proditum est, ubi Persice potius quam Graece scripsisset.'

Flacius then quotes the opinions of Eusebius in regard to the Second Epistle of Peter and the Second and Third Epistles of John as not legitimate works, a view in which he apparently concurs, as he does in regard to the Epistle to the Hebrews, of which he concludes :

‘His et similibus rationibus mota prudens vetustas, quae omnia ad ἀναλογίαῖν fidei examinare solita est, de Epistola ad Ebraeos iure dubitasse videtur.’

In regard to the Apocalypse he also quotes Eusebius’s phrase :

‘Alios certis et authenticis sacrae scripturae libris adiudicare : alios vero eis non annumerare’ (iii ch. 25).

He discusses the book in many aspects, generally favourably, but ends by putting it among those Works ‘qui dubitationi obnoxii fuerunt’ (*Centuriae Magdeburgenses* i 451–566).

It will be noticed how far Flacius in these paragraphs had shifted his ground from that occupied by his master, and how he had fallen back from the latter’s largely subjective methods upon distinctions already recognized in the earlier centuries of Christianity between the *homologoumena* and *antilegomena*, and had thus really given up Luther’s objections to any appeals to authority on the subject.

Flacius was not the only one to do this. Bucer (*Enarr. in Evv.* fol. 20) also insists that the early Church recognized only the twenty homologoumena as authoritative—that is, he also based his position on traditional arguments. The same was the case with Chemnitz, the most skilful and powerful of the anti-Roman controversialists at this time. Thus, in *Exam. Trident.* ed. 1578, p. 54, he says :

‘Quaestio est . . . an ea scripta, de quibus in antiquissima Ecclesia . . . dubitatum fuit, ideo quod testificationes primitivae Ecclesiae de his non consentirent, . . . praesens Ecclesia possit facere canonica? Pontifici . . . illam autoritatem usurpant . . . sed manifestissimum est . . . ecclesiam nullo modo habere illam autoritatem; eadem enim ratione posset etiam vel canonicos libros reicere vel adulterinos canonisare. Tota enim haec res . . . pendet ex certis testificationibus eius Ecclesiae quae tempore Apostolorum fuit,

Here Chemnitz entirely abandons the subjective method of dealing with the problem of canonicity, and falls back upon

Church tradition, and is led by this guide not merely to question the four books which Luther virtually discarded from the Canon, but the whole of the seven antilegomena.

This point of view was pressed home with increasing force by subsequent controversialists, and at the beginning of the seventeenth century the whole antilegomena of the New Testament were actually pronounced by Lutheran controversialists to be *apocrypha*. Thus M. Hafenreffer, in his *Loci Theol. De Script. Sacra*, 1603, p. 140, says:

‘Apocryphi Libri in Nouo Testamento sunt: Posterior Epistola Petri: secunda & tertia Iohannis: Epistola ad Hebraeos: Epistola Iacobi: Epistola Iudae: & Apocalypsis Ioannis Theologi. Hi apocryphi libri quanquam in diiudicatione dogmatum canonicam auctoritatem non habeant: quia tamen quae ad institutionem et aedificationem faciunt plurima continent, cum utilitate et fructu, tum privatim legi, tum publice in Ecclesia recitari possunt.’

J. Schroeder, in his *Aphorismi e comp. th.* 1599, Disp. I, thes. 16, says of these books, ‘*Apocrypha N. T. sunt: Ep. ad Hebraeos*’, &c. Aeg. Hunnius, in his *Disp. de Scr. can.* 1601 (*Dispp. Witt.*, 1625, vol. i. *de S. Scriptura Canonica* pp. 156 f), says:

‘Fatemur haud gravate, Novi Testamenti Scripta apocrypha maiorem ecclesiae primitivae meruisse consensum et approbationem, quam apocrypha veteris Testamenti. . . . Nos etiam de auctoritate Epistolae ad Hebraeos, similiter secundae et tertiae Ioannis, posterioris Epistolae Petri et apocalypseos non magnopere cum quoquam pugnaturus.’

In a later paragraph he speaks of the Epistle ‘of James and the remaining *apocrypha* of the New Testament’, and adds of the former:

‘Quod Christi et doctrinae de ipso tam rara fit mentio, de ratione autem consequendi vitam aeternam per solum Christum verbum nullum exstat in Epistola bene longa, quae non veteris Testamenti scriptum est ubi doctrina de Christo magis erat implicita.’

In paragraph cxvi of this work, in enumerating the canonical books of the New Testament, he excludes the Epistle of James as well as the five books above mentioned.

This view was not merely pressed by private theologians and doctors. Thus the faculty of Theology at Wittenberg, in its reply to the Socinian catechism entitled *Ausführliche Widerlegung des arianischen Catechismi*, 1619, p. 13, says:

'Gleichfalls von den Apocriphis Newes Testaments soll verstanden werden als da ist Epistola Judae, Jacobi, die ander Epistel S. Petri unnd dergleichen: deren Gewissheit man so eigentlich nicht als der andern Schriften darthun kan. Darümb hette hievon billig mit unterscheid sollen gehandelt werden.'

The attitude here adopted in support of Luther's method was clearly a dangerous one, and opened some very awkward questions in view of the persistent and very able polemics of the Jesuits, and we presently find the more advanced Lutheran theologians modifying their ground again. Thus Hafenreffer (*l. c.*) himself says that, while numbering the antilegomena among the Apocrypha, he holds that these New Testament apocrypha have a greater authority than those of the Old. F. Balduin, in his *idea dispos. bibl.* p. 68 sq., says:

'Est discrimen inter apocryphos V. et N. T. Ex illis nulla confirmari possunt dogmata fidei sed propter moralia tantum leguntur in ecclesia; horum autem maior est auctoritas ita ut nonnulli etiam ad probanda fidei dogmata sint idonei, praesertim Ep. ad Hebraeos et Apocalypsis.'

Similarly Dieterich, in his *Institt. catech.*, 1613, p. 19 f, says of these books:

'Dubitatum fuit de autore, non de doctrina. Errant autem pontificii qui absolute parem auctoritatem cum canonicis apocryphos libros habere dicitant.'

In his *Loci Comm.*, 1619, p. 17, L. Hutter 'claims for the Apocrypha of the N. T. *auctoritatem quandam*, arguing that they occupy a place intermediate between those of the O. T. and the canonical books' (Reuss, *op. cit.* p. 368 note 2).

Again, B. Mentzer *De S. S.*, Disp. 1, th. 25 f, says:

'Libri apocryphi primi ordinis s. ecclesiastici N.T. in nostris ecclesiis fere eandem obtinent cum canonicis auctoritatem.'

This modified attitude presently still further gave way as the more orthodox began to fear the dangerous approaches of a more active criticism, and the term apocrypha largely fell out of use as applied to the New Testament writings.

Thus Quenstedt *Theol. did. pol.* c. iv, qu. 23, p. 235, says:

'Disceptatum fuit de his libris, non ab omnibus sed a paucis, non semper sed aliquando, non de divina eorum auctoritate sed de autoribus secundariis. Sunt aequalis auctoritatis cum reliquis non autem aequalis cognitionis apud homines.'

Instead of apocrypha the books were now generally distinguished as *Libri canonici secundi ordinis; deutero-canonici, &c.* The pietistic movement of the eighteenth century and the highly conservative influence (in this regard) of the reformed communities, caused the Lutheran writers to move nearer and nearer to the old accepted Canon of the New Testament, and to base its authority on the perpetual tradition of the Church. The following paragraph from Reuss condenses the later theories on the subject held by the more influential Lutheran divines :

‘Buddeus, *l. c.* p. 146, says : “Dubitatum olim fuit ; etiam nostri doctores aliquando haesitarunt ; postquam autem cuncta adcuratori studio et explorata sunt, nullum temere, cur recipi non debeant, superesse potest dubium.” J. C. Pritii *Introd. in N. T.*, 1737, pp. 37 f : “Inter canonicos libros nullum ordinem, nullamque eminentiam agnoscimus : etsi quoque daremus incertum esse auctorem, inde tamen immerito ad negandam libri auctoritatem canonicam concluditur.” J. W. Rumpaei *Comm. Crit. ad ll. N. T.*, 1757, p. 188 : “Hodie distinctio illa expiravit.” J. A. Dietelmaier *Theol. Beitr.*, 1769, I. 377 : “Heutiges Tages koennten wir diesen Unterschied zur Noth entbehren ; weil er aber doch noch einigen Gebrauch hat und besorglicher Massen bald noch einen mehrern bekommen moechte (!), so ist fleissig zu erinnern dass die Zusätze *proto- deutero-* nicht einen verschiedenen Werth anzeigen sollen, sondern eine frühere oder spätere Aufnahme.” Ch. F. Schmidt, *Hist. et vind. canonis*, 1775, p. 56 : “Impune et sine ulla impietatis nota licuit priscis ambigere de ll. N. T. quorum divina origo istis temporibus nondum satis nota esset. . . . quod nunc post perspecta clarissima argumenta, traditionem perpetuam ecclesiae constitutumque publicum eorum usum indulgeri nequit.” (Reuss, p. 370 note ¹.)

This attitude was still further emphasized as time went on. Thus Thiersch, in his *Versuch zur Herstellung* p. 17, says of Luther's theories about certain books of the New Testament :

‘Diese Ansichten Luthers, deren bleibendes Denkmal die Hintanstellung des Briefes an die Hebräer, der Briefe Jacobi und Judä sammt der Offenbarung in unsern deutschen Bibelausgaben ist, wurden von seinen Nachfolgern, den orthodox lutherischen Theologen, theils eine Zeitlang, wenn gleich in gemilderter Form, festgehalten, theils wenigstens sehr schonend beurtheilt. Und während in mehreren reformirten Bekenntnisschriften der belgischen, gallicanischen und anglicanischen Confession der Kanon des neuen Testaments festgesetzt wurde, um den Katholiken feierlich zu erklären, dass man hierin auf Neuerungen nicht

sinne, wird in dem Concordienbuche der Lutheraner jede Bestimmung hierüber vermisst; ein Schweigen das freilich keineswegs als absichtliche, legislatorische Freistellung des Urtheils aufgefasst werden darf.'

Having traced the course which Luther's theory of New Testament canonicity passed through under the influence of the sharp polemics with Rome, when its dependence on a mere masterful *obiter dictum* about the real fundamental basis of canonicity was found to be untenable, it will be well to turn to the corresponding modifications which occurred in the Lutheran Bibles. These were almost entirely limited to those countries which in early days had largely accepted Luther's teaching, but were not immediately dominated, as Germany and Scandinavia were, by his pontifical authority.

The first actual departure from his example among those who had accepted his teaching was in England. England, as we have seen, was completely committed to the Canon of Luther's and Zwingli's New Testament Canon by Coverdale's, Taverner's, and Matthew's Bibles. It was in 1539 that we first find Luther's New Testament Canon abandoned. This was in the important new edition of the Bible known as 'the Great Bible', which was specially authorized as the Bible to be used in the public services, and in which we find a return to the New Testament Order and Canon as contained in the Vulgate. This reversion to the older theory of the New Testament Canon was carried out in the subsequent editions of the Great Bible, which appeared during Henry the Eighth's reign, and was probably due to the conservative tendencies which prevailed in the latter part of that king's reign.

After the accession of Edward the Sixth, while the Great Bible continued to be the Bible appointed to be read in churches, and continued the old Church tradition as to the New Testament Canon which had been reverted to in that edition (see editions of 1550, 1553, and of 1559), new editions of Coverdale's (1550), Taverner's, and Matthew's Bibles (1551) appeared in which Luther's and Zwingli's Canon and order of the books were still followed. It is a curious and little noticed fact that in these Bibles of Edward the Sixth's reign the appended table of lessons was declared to be that *according to the Salisbury Use*, although that Use had been abolished in 1550.

With the accession of Queen Elizabeth, Lutheran influence was replaced by that of Geneva in England. Then new editions of Coverdale's, Taverner's, and Matthew's Bibles ceased apparently to be published. The Great Bible continued to be the authorized Bible so far as the mere royal authority could give it that character, while in 1560 there appeared the first edition of the Geneva Bible, which became the principal Bible of the middle classes and of the Puritans in England and Scotland. This Bible was largely based on that of Calvin, who, as we have seen, like Lefèvre and Olivetan, his precursors in issuing reformed Church Bibles, never adopted the New Testament Canon of Luther and Zwingli, but remained attached to that previously prevailing in the Church. It is not strange, therefore, that the Genevan-English Bible shews no traces of Luther's and Zwingli's revolutionary attitude towards the New Testament Canon.

In 1568 the so-called Bishops' Bible was published, and replaced the Great Bible as the official Bible. It followed the example of the latter in regard to the New Testament Canon, and remained constant to the pre-Lutheran tradition. This again was the case with the authorized version of 1611, which finally became the recognized New Testament Canon of all sections of English and Scotch Reformers. We must not forget, however, that from 1536 to 1539 the only New Testament Canon current in the vernacular in England was that of Luther and Zwingli, and that this continental and sophisticated and mutilated New Testament Canon continued to prevail here alongside of the older Canon down to the end of Edward the Sixth's reign.

Let us now turn to the Church of the German-speaking Swiss Reformers. Dr Nestle calls attention to the fact that in several of the so-called Kombinierte Bibeln, in which Luther's and Zwingli's texts were combined, the Epistle to the Laodiceans is included. He mentions four such Bibles: one published at Worms in 1529; the so-called Täuferbibel which first among the protestants bore the common name Biblia, and was largely a reprint of the Zürich Bible of 1527; two editions of the Bible published at Strassburg by Wolff Köppfl in 1530; and Egenolph's Frankfurt Bible of 1534. In addition to these four there was

also an edition of Luther's Bible published at Strassburg by Wm. Köppl in 1537. In all these there occurs without any warning among the Canonical books the Apocryphal Epistle to the Laodiceans. Professor Nestle says it was taken over from one of the pre-Lutheran German Bibles where it is placed after Philemon (*Urtext und Uebersetz. der Bibel* p. 132).

After Zwingli's tragic death in 1531 his place at Zürich was taken by Bullinger, who was a more thoroughgoing opponent of the Lutherans than Zwingli had been.

In 1539 there was issued at Zürich a new translation of the Bible into Latin with the following title: *Biblia Sacra utriusque testamenti et vetus quidem post omnium hactenus aeditiones, opera D. Sebast. Munsteri evulgatum et ad Hebraicam veritatem quod fieri potuit redditum, collatis ubique vetustissimis et probatissimis eius linguae scriptoribus. Novum vero non solum ad Graecam veritatem, verum etiam ad multorum utriusque linguae et interpretum et codicum fidem opera D. Eras. Rot. ultimo recognitum et auditum. Additi sunt à LXX versione et Apocryphi libri sive Ecclesiastici, qui habentur extra Canonem.*

This Bible does not follow the order of the books of Luther and Zwingli but maintains the Vulgate order, thus causing a break in what had been previously the practice at Zürich.

There is prefixed an introduction headed: *De omnibus sanctae scripturae libris, eorumque praestantia et dignitate, Heinrichi Bullingeri expositio ad lectorem Christianum*, which contains a paragraph headed *De Canonicis libris veteris testamenti et eorum ordine* in which we read:

'Canonica scriptura est, quae intra controversiam afflatu sancti Spiritus prodita est, irrefutabilis existens autoritatis et de cuius fide nefas est dubitare et hoc dividitur in vetus testamentum et novum.'

Then follows a description of the various books as they occur in the Hebrew Canon ending with Ezra. It then continues:

'Intra hunc numerum concluderunt & Hebraei & prisci Christiani volumina veteris testamenti, et nehas erat de eorum fide dubitare. Nunc vero receptus est in usum ecclesiasticum Sapientiae liber, quem quidam suspicantur esse Philonis Iudaei: & alius qui dicitur Ecclesiasticus, quem putant esse Iesu filii Sirach. Receptus est & liber Tobiae, Iehudith et Machabaeorum libri duo. Receptae sunt et duae historiae, quae Danieli annexae sunt, una de Susanna & altera

de Belo et dracone. Accesserunt & duo alii libri ad librum Ezrae, tertius scilicet et quartus. Et hos omnes Hebraei ignorant, licet de Machabaeis . . . nonnihil in historiis habeant, sicut superioribus annis edito libello ex Iosippo ostendi.'

In his notes on the several Canonical books, Bullinger, in this address, does not say a word to shew that he in any way doubts their complete validity or that he shares the views of Luther and Zwingli on the subject. At the end of his notes on them, however, he adds the words:

'Plures libros non habet novi Testamenti Canon. Nec magnopere curandum existimo quod a quibusdam traditur quosdam veterum dubitasse de epistola ad Hebraeos, de epistola posteriore Petri et Iudae, de epistola Iacobi & Apocalypsi. Quid enim ad nos quod pauci aliquot suis affectibus corrupti de rebus certis et authenticis autoribus dubitarunt? Credendum est plane hos quos recensuimus libros testamenti utriusque a Spiritu dei profectos et a prophetis apostolisque domini ecclesiae dei esse traditos: atque in his doceri omnem veritatem certam nihil iis vel erroris misceri vel mendacii. Haec dicta est veteribus Canonica, id est regularis, quod a deo nobis data fit vitae & veritatis regula, qua omnia probemus & iuxta quam vivamus.'

In the Zürich German Bible of 1542 which appeared under Bullinger's influence, the Epistle to the Hebrews is assigned to St Paul and placed in its old position after the rest of St Paul's Epistles. The Epistle of James is not, however, restored to its old place. The same was the case in the editions of 1548 and 1560, in which it is immediately followed by Revelations.

In 1543 there appeared a fresh translation of the Old Testament at Zürich made by L. Juda, T. Bibliander, and P. Cholinus, and a revised translation of the New Testament by Gevalter, the whole being edited by Pellicanus. This Bible has also Bullinger's preface just mentioned. The New Testament books follow Luther's order. It is an interesting fact that in the British Museum there is a copy of this Latin Bible which belonged to Henry the Eighth, and has Queen Elizabeth's arms on the cover.

The Zürich German Bible of 1545 is preceded by a translation of Bullinger's preface from the Latin of Sebastian Munster's edition already named. In this Bible, curiously enough, Luther's order of the New Testament books is still retained in the

initial table of lessons, but not in the text, which follows that of 1542.

The Zürich Bible of 1560 contains a list of contents divided into two series of books; those of the New Testament being placed in the second list. The four books separated by Luther are printed at the end of the rest in his order, so that this Bible was a retrograde one.

In the Zürich Bible of 1638, however, Luther's innovations in regard to the New Testament were entirely abandoned, and the old Vulgate order was explicitly followed. This was also the case in the great three-volume edition of the Bible published at Zürich in 1711, and apparently in all subsequent Zürich Bibles; and this meant an abandonment of Zwingli's example as well as of Luther's by the church of Zürich, and was probably the result of the influence of the Genevan reformers.

In an edition of the Bible however, professedly following Luther, published at Basle in 1699 by Brandmüller, while the Epistle to the Hebrews is put at the end of St Paul's Epistles, James, Jude, and Revelation are put together at the end of the New Testament, so that in this instance the fashion introduced by Luther still survived; but this was quite an exception, and the Germano-Swiss Reformers of Zürich and Basle, in respect to their New Testament Canon, apparently assimilated themselves to the Reformed Church from the early seventeenth century.

Let us now turn to Holland. In Holland there was a considerable struggle between the Lutherans and the Reformed, which ended in the triumph of the latter, a fact represented in the Bibles. The earlier Bibles mainly apparently followed Luther's New Testament order. Thus, in the Bible published at Emden for the Memnonites in 1560, Luther's arrangement of the New Testament books is followed. In another Bible published the following year at the same place, the old Vulgate order of the New Testament and not Luther's is adopted, and Hebrews is attributed to St Paul. In another Bible, also published at Emden in 1562, by Nicolas Briestkens, Luther's order is again used. Again in a revised edition of the last-named Bible, published in 1648 at Amsterdam, and known as Vischer's Bible, Luther's order of the four critical books is followed as well as his various prefaces.

Other editions of Dutch Lutheran Bibles also appeared in 1655, 1657, 1662, 1671, 1701, and 1702. These Lutheran Dutch Bibles were, however, only meant for the small Lutheran communities surviving in Holland, where the greater part of the people belonged to the Reformed Church, and accepted the Bible authorized by the Synod of Dort, to which I shall revert presently; and this was also accepted by the Remonstrants after they had subjected it to a rigid examination. This meant the acceptance of the Vulgate Canon of the New Testament by the Dutch Reformers.

Let us now turn to the more strictly Lutheran countries of Germany and Scandinavia.

While the exigencies of the polemic with Rome necessitated a change of attitude towards the question of canonicity on the part of the Lutheran apologists, there was an almost rigid adherence to Luther's view in the Lutheran Bibles of Germany and Scandinavia. One singular exception, very singular considering the strong views in regard to inspiration which were held by the Reformers, was the insertion of the Epistle to the Laodiceans, which had no claims to canonicity, among the accepted books in several early German Bibles (see above, p. 199). With this exception, we have to go on for some time before we find any trace of change in the Lutheran New Testament. I first find one in a polyglot edition of the Bible published in 1596 at Hamburg, in which the table of contents divides the books into Canonical and non-Canonical; the latter including the Apocalypse without the author's name, and three Epistles, one that to the Hebrews of uncertain origin, the other two by known authors, 'certorum auctorum.'

A remarkable proof of the tenacity with which Luther's theory of the New Testament Canonicity still prevailed is to be found in an edition of the Greek New Testament published at Halle in 1740, in which his order of the books is followed, as it was in the first edition of the German Bible published in America in 1743. To revert, however; in the famous Weimar Bible, published in 1644, Luther's order of the New Testament books was duly maintained, and his prefaces to the several books were duly set out, and so they were treated in the Lutheran Bibles during the rest of that century. Lastly, in the revised and standard edition

of Luther's Bible of 1534, the Epistles to the Hebrews, of James, and of Jude are printed after all the other Epistles, but are not separated from them by any gap, but continuously numbered with them. The Revelation, however, is put into a separate class by itself, headed *Das prophetische Buch*, and printed at the end. In the list of lessons at the end of this Bible there are none from the so-called apocryphal books of the Old Testament, but lessons occur from the four New Testament books which Luther treated with contumely.

The only actual breach in Luther's Canon of the New Testament in a Bible still dominated by Lutheran theories was a very trifling one which took place in Scandinavia, in the great Swedish Bible published at Widerholm in 1703. While the Epistle to the Hebrews is not attributed to St Paul, it is put immediately after the Pauline Epistles, following directly on that to Philemon. James, Jude, and the Apocalypse are put together at the end of the New Testament, and the last is attributed to St Johann Theologus. The same order of the books is followed by Melius in his great Swedish Bible published at Lund in 1787. The Apocalypse is there headed in neutral fashion *Johannis Uppenbarelse*.

A curious example of the difference that prevailed between the champions of Luther's Bible text and the Apologists is to be found in the German Bible published at Tübingen in 1730, professedly as stated on the title-page after the translation of Luther with his prefaces and marginal notes, and edited with new prefaces by Christ. Math. Pfaffen. In this Bible we find that although the four critical New Testament books are all placed in Luther's order at the end, Luther's deprecatory introductions to them are supplemented or replaced by fresh ones, in which his views are largely abandoned. Thus, in regard to the Epistle to the Hebrews, we read in the new preface:

'Einige der Alten haben Barnabam, Clementem von Rom, Lucam, Apollom davor gehalten, denen auch einige von den Neuern beypflichten. Die gemeinste Meynung aber streitet vor den heiligen apostel Paulum.'

The author then sets out the reasons for the two opinions.

In regard to the Epistle of James he says:

'Der Urheber dieser Epistel ist Jacobus, nicht der grössere, Zebedai Sohn, den Herodes Agrippa enthaupten lassen, Gesch. 12. 2,

sondern Jacobus der kleinere. . . . Einige von Alten und Neuern (wie auch der seelige Lutherus anfänglich) haben diese Epistel nicht für Göttlich halten wollen, weil besonders darinnen auch den Wercken die Rechtfertigung zugeschrieben werde. Es ist aber dieser Zweifel bald gehoben, wie aus den Erklärungen des zweyten Capitels wird ersichtlich seyn: Der Brief ist nicht an eine gewisse Gemeine, sondern an die zerstreuten Bekehrten aus den Juden geschrieben. Wo und welcher Zeit er aber geschrieben worden, kan man nicht wissen.'

In his own text Luther attached a joint introduction to the two Epistles of James and Jude. In this edition there is a new introduction to each. In it we read:

'Von dieser Epistel ist der Urheber Judas, der Apostel, sonst auch Thaddäus und Lebbäus genannt. . . . Es ist diese Epistel spät geschrieben, besonders aus Gelegenheit der schändlichen Ketzler, welche viel Aergerniss unter den Christen damals anrichteten. . . . Ist eine Göttliche Epistel, ohngeacht sie vormals, aber ohne Grund, von einigen in Zweifel gezogen worden. Denn das Judas die Prophezeung Enoch und den Streit zwischen dem Erzengel Michael und dem Satan, und die Lehre der Apostel anführet, ist theils aus Göttlicher Offenbarung geschehen, theils bestärket es die Göttlichkeit des Briefes, wie wenn die Urheber der Bücher des N. Testaments die gleichstimmigen Worte der Propheten des A. Testaments anführen. . . .'

In regard to the Apocalypse this edition contains a long new introduction in which we read:

'Es ist diese Offenbarung Jesu Christi ein recht fürtrefflicher Antheil der Bücher des Neuen Testaments, ein herrlich- und mit fürtrefflichsten Weissagungen angefülltes Wunder-Buch, ein Kern und Auszug, was zumalen die letzte Seiten angehet. . . . man wohl mit Wahrheits Grund sagen mögen, dass der Geist alle die Fürtrefflichkeiten der alten Propheten, Mosis, Jesaia, Jeremia, Daniels, Ezechiels etc. in Johanne zusammen fließen. . . . Dieses voraus gesetzt muss man sich fast wundern, dass man jemals in der Kirche gezweifelt ob diese offenbarung Göttlich, und der Urheber derselben Johannes, der Apostel des Herrn, der Evangelist und Schoos-Jünger Jesu, derweil er gleich in Anfang seines Evangelii von der Gottheit ueberhaupt besonders Jesu Christi so herrlich geschrieben, Theologus von den Alten genennet worden seye? . . . Ist aber von einem andern Johanne Marco, oder Johanne Presbytero hier gar nicht zu gedencken etc., etc.'

Such were the methods by which the later Lutherans tried to make their master's words and arguments more acceptable to the students of rational and scientific theology. Their concessions

and their arguments were, however, by no means acceptable to the majority of those who had to guide the fortunes of the Lutheran church. The wave of free enquiry and rationalism which swept over Germany at the close of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth century made pastors and congregations equally stubborn and determined to abide at all hazards by their founder and revered prophet, by his Bible, his Catechism, and his theology, as embodied in the Augsburg Confession and its supplements. Here they saw what seemed a safe anchorage where their church had outridden many a storm. Hence the Lutheran Bibles as we have seen everywhere followed the model of Luther's Bible, arranging the books after his fashion, separating them into the same classes as he did, and, generally speaking, preserving his prefaces. What is more important is to remember the fact that the Lutheran church continued to be, and is now, committed to a theory of New Testament canonicity, dependent not merely on subjective methods but upon an extravagant dictum the cogency of which in this behalf has been repudiated by the most learned Lutherans, and by all the other children of the Reformation, and which is only tenable on the theory that Luther himself was inspired.

Let us now turn to the Canon of the Old Testament. We have seen that the Reformers of all schools accepted the New Testament of the mediaeval Church as containing all the books which had a claim to be inspired, and with the exception of the strict Lutherans and the early Zwinglians, they continued to accept that New Testament without addition or curtailment.

In the case of the Old Testament matters were very different. There had been since the early centuries of Christianity a conflict between theologians on the subject of the Old Testament canon. The great bulk of churchmen supported the official and conciliar pronouncements on the subject, and accepted the longer or Septuagint Canon which had been accepted by the Church as legitimate from Apostolic times onwards. A certain number of theologians with Jerome at their head had agreed, however, that this Septuagint Canon was illegitimate, and that inasmuch as the Old Testament was confessedly the Jewish Bible it was rational to accept the Jewish or Masoretic Canon, from which several complete books and certain fragments of others contained

in the Septuagint were absent. This latter view had never been endorsed by the Church. It was endorsed, however, by the Reformers—Lutherans and Calvinists alike. While all the Reformers accepted the Jewish Canon of the Old Testament, the fathers of the movement did not avowedly base their acceptance of it on the ground of its being the Canon of the Jewish Church. As in the case of the New Testament, to do so would have been fatal to their contention that the Bible certified itself and needed no attestation from tradition either Jewish or Christian.

As in the case of the New Testament, however, while professing this pious opinion they in practice took over the Old Testament which had been previously used in the Church, as containing all the books with canonical authority, without a fresh analysis of the materials which had been rejected when the Old Testament Canon was put together by Jews and Christians in early times; and as in the former case they found themselves in the virtually miraculous position of formulating, by the exercise of a merely subjective choice, the same Canon which had previously been accepted by the Jews on entirely different grounds, and this while completely repudiating the authority of the Synagogue in its decisions on the Old Testament Canon, as they repudiated that of the Church in regard to the New Testament.

As a matter of fact the pretence was only a pretence to save their consistency; but it was pressed with the gravity which the ancient augurs used to assume in delivering their pronouncements. What was most singular in this extraordinary pretension was that the exact identity of the selection made by the Jews when they defined the contents of their Bible with the selection made by Luther and Calvin was avowedly reached by the employment of methods of selection entirely different in the two cases. The Jews put together their Bible (as we know from the Talmud) after long and intricate discussions as to the several merits of the books which they accepted or rejected as viewed from the point of view of strictly Jewish exegesis, and by a process (however elementary) of real historical and critical analysis. The Reformers on the other hand made no such examination, but professed that their subjective criteria in regard to the sacred books brought them to precisely the same conclusion

as the Jews had already arrived at. This was not all. As in the case of the New Testament Luther and Calvin employed different criteria. In regard to the Old Testament as well as to the New, Luther professed to measure the value of a book by the degree of evangelical teaching which he found in it. His disciples went further and professed the very dangerous view that the validity of an Old Testament book was to be tested by the fact that it was quoted in the New. Thus Flacius in his tract on the Old Testament in the first volume of the *Magdeburg Centuries* I ii 4, says:

‘Etsi numerus librorum authenticorum Veteris Testamenti ab apostolis ex professo nominatim non est expressus, tamen haud obscure, ex citationibus coniectari potest quod eos pro certis et probatis habuerint de quibus antiquitas Iudaica nunquam dubitavit.’

What may well seem to ingenuous people strange and inconsequent is that having professedly reached the same conclusion in regard to the legitimate contents of the Old Testament as had been reached by the Jews, Luther and his followers should not have been more logical and entirely evicted from the Bible what was not inspired as he claimed the Canonical Scriptures to be, but should have retained in the same cover and in a book which was professedly the foundation-stone of the Faith under the name of Apocrypha what he deemed to be works of purely human invention and in no way to be used in polemics for the establishment of doctrines. Assuredly in this matter the more extreme Calvinists and the English Puritans were more consistent when they entirely excluded the Apocrypha from their Bibles. To the excuse he urged for this it may well be replied that if the Bible was to contain merely useful, as well as inspired books, why not insert the numerous monuments of Christian piety from the Apostolic Fathers which were once admitted down to the works of the Reformers themselves which were eagerly read by thousands every day (Reuss, p. 311). The inconsistency just mentioned involved others. Thus on what possible ground did he limit what he called the Apocrypha to the particular books which he printed under that title in his Bible? Here at all events he could not and did not profess to use his special criterion, nor did he make a special examination of the various Jewish Apocrypha whose claims to be included ought assuredly to have

been re-examined. Books like the Book of Enoch, the Book of Jubilees, the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, all of which fulfilled the condition that they were profitable reading and being so might claim admission as much as Susanna and the Elders or Bel and the Dragon.

The fact is that as in other cases the process he actually followed was not covered by any rational theory. He merely seems to have separated from his Canon of the Old Testament all those portions of the Catholic Canon not contained in the Hebrew Bible, and then put them together under the name Apocrypha and included them in the book upon which his faith was professedly based and whose contents ought to be without reproach. Reuss who champions his method has no better justification for the retention of the Apocrypha in the Bible after its Canonical authority had been denied it than that 'it was a concession to ecclesiastical usage, the habits of the people, the opinion of the Early Fathers, and the fear of the storm which an innovation might cause'. None of them be it spoken reasons consistent with the basis of the Reformer's position. Let me call attention to still another inconsistency of Luther in selecting the contents of his Bible. One would have supposed, if the Old Testament Apocrypha were admitted at all as having been once acknowledged by the Church as canonical, that the claim would have been extended by him to all the books and fragments of the Vulgate Canon not contained in the Jewish Scriptures, but this was not so. Apparently on the ground, very inconsequent from his point of view, that Jerome had refused to translate the so-called books of 3 Esdras and 4 Esdras, and had spoken with extreme contumely of them, Luther not only excluded them from his Canon but even from the Apocrypha and left them out altogether. He also similarly excluded the Third Book of Maccabees, while he admitted the Prayer of Manasses which was contained only in some MSS of the Vulgate. In doing this he very dangerously and inconsequently separated himself from Zwingli, whose translation of the Apocrypha was published before his own, on the critical question of the legitimate contents of the Bible. In all this again he was exercising a purely arbitrary choice as to these contents and giving an excellent proof of the quicksand upon which he had ventured to set up his canonical

theory when he rejected the authority of tradition as its real criterion.

We have seen that Luther's subjective dogmatism on the question of the Canon of the New Testament was found to be untenable by the apologists of the Reformation who had to sustain the assault of the Jesuit controversialists after the Council of Trent had finally defined the contents of the Canon in the Roman Church. A similar difficulty was felt by them in defending his subjective criteria for the Canon of the Old Testament, and we speedily find his scholars disregarding these criteria more and more and falling back on more reasonable arguments. Thus as early as 1535 we find in the Confession of Bohemia, Art. I :

'Docent scripturas sacras quae in Bibliis ipsis continentur et a patribus receptae autoritateque canonica donatae sunt pro inconcusse veris habendas.'

In the Würtemberg Confession presented to the Council of Trent, on January 24, 1552, we read under the heading *De Sacra Scriptura* :

'Vocamus eos Canonicos libros veteris & Novi Testamenti, de quorum autoritate in Ecclesia nunquam dubitatum est. Hanc Scripturam credimus et confitemur esse oraculum Spiritus Sancti, coelestibus testimoniis ita confirmatum, ut si Angelus de coelo aliud praedicaverit anathema sit. Quare detestamur omnem doctrinam, cultum et religionem pugnantem cum hac scriptura.'

This view prevailed more and more among the so-called Lutheran dogmatists.

Chemnitz, in his *Examen concilii Trident.*, 1578, p. 59, says of the Canon :

'Libros illos non proprie vocari canonicos, qui leguntur quidem in ecclesiis, sed non ad confirmandum ex his fidei auctoritatem, et quorum auctoritas non idonea iudicatur ad roboranda ea quae in contentionem veniunt. Convenit enim appellatio (*sc.* canonici) proprie ad illos libros, qui sunt canon dogmatum et fidei; ἀπόκρυφοι proprie vocantur illi libri, quorum occulta origo non claruit illis, quorum testificatione auctoritas verarum Scripturarum ad nos pervenit: sicut inquit Augustinus, de Civit. lib. xv capit. 23: Et contra Faustum lib. ii cap. 2. Dicit, vocari apocryphos, qui nulla testificationis luce declarati et prolati sunt. Haec explicatio appellationis recte convenit ad illos libros, qui in vulgatis editionibus habentur quidem sed non sunt in Canone. . . .

Ad tertium genus scriptorum, quae adulterina et falsa sunt, sive haec sive alia appellatio accommodetur, non pugno.'

Hollaz thus distinguishes them :

'Libri apocryphi sunt : 1. qui in codice quidem, sed non in Canone biblico exstant, neque in mediato Dei afflatu Scripti sunt : 2. qui continent fabulas, errores ac mendacia ac proinde non sunt in ecclesia legendi.'

John Gerhard writes :

'Prioris generis libri dicuntur Apocryphi, qui sunt absconditi i. e. origine absconditae et occultae; posterioris generis libri dicuntur apocryphi sensu eo, quod sint abscondendi nec in ecclesia legendi.'

Upon which Strack comments :

'Mit dieser Beurteilung der Apokryphen des A. T. ist das Verfahren der älteren Reformierten vollkommen in Einklang.' (*Hauck Real-Encycl.* ix 765 sq.)

Luther's Bible continued to be edited in Germany in its old form, as it had left his hands, until the year 1644, when a new edition of it appeared known as the Weimar Bible, from its having been issued under the auspices of Duke Ernest of Saxe-Weimar. This contains a preface addressed to the Christian reader, and dated at Jena in 1640, which states that it was the work of the theological faculty at Jena. In the list of contents of the Apocrypha in this edition three books are added for the first time in a professedly Lutheran Bible, namely the Third and Fourth of Esdras and the Third of Maccabees. They are put at the end of the rest of that section. The Apocryphal books in the Weimar Bible have a special title-page. They are thus enumerated : 1. Judith. 2. Das buch der Weissheit. 3. Tobias. 4. Syrach. 5. Baruch. 6. Maccabees. 7. Stuck in Ester. 8. Stuck in Daniel. Then follow the words :

'Warumb aber diese Schrifften nicht unter die Haupt Bücher des Alten Testaments zu zehlen ist Ursach I Weil sie erst nach Malachiae Zeiten welcher die Haupt-Bücher beschlossen und gleichsam versiegelt beschrieben worden, II Nicht in Hebraischer Sprach, III Weder von der Judischen noch der ersten Kirchen dess neuen Testament da-fur erkant, IV Weil sie widrige und Theils unverantwortliche Sachen erzehlen wie jedesmals an seinem ort soll angezeigt werden.'

Here we have a complete departure from Luther's subjective tests of canonicity, and a reversion to tests similar to those

employed by Karlstadt, and notably an appeal to the Hebrew Canon.

To some of the so-called Apocryphal books is prefixed an introduction explaining their contents and also a special exegetical preface. Thus of Judith we read :

‘Der Christliche Leser wird sich allhier bescheiden dass wie dieses Buch in Ebreischer Sprach nicht vorhanden, also auch die Exemplar in der Chaldeischen Sprach darinnen es zu befinden gewesen nach Aussage dess alten Kirchenlehrers Hieronymi nicht miteinander wollen ubereintreffen. Daher es auch kommen dass die Griechischen und Lateinischen dolmetschungen nicht allenthalben zusammenstimmen und eine bald mehr bald weniger hat denn die andere. Es sind auch uber das wenn man gedachte beyde Dolmetschungen gegeneinanderhält die namen der hierinn benamten personen Länder und Oerter sowol als die Rechnung der Jahre fast ungleich: Welches aber drunten in der Erklärung mit Stillschweigen ubergangen worden auff dass der gemeine mann nicht irre gemacht würde. M. Luth. hat in seiner deutschen Dolmetschung nicht dem griechischen sondern dem Lateinischen und zwar einem andern Exemplar denn wir jetzunder gemeinschaftlich brauchen gefolget.’

To the Wisdom of Solomon is attached Luther’s preface, and then we read :

‘Die Weissheit Salomonis an die Tyrannen Diss Buch so von Philone (wie etliche dafür halten) beschrieben worden.’

To Tobias there is no special note, nor yet to Jesus Sirach, Baruch, or 1 and 2 Maccabees.

The Fragments of Esther and Daniel are put together in this Bible after the Maccabees, with the heading ‘Vorrede auff die Stucke Esther und Daniel D. Martin Luther’. Then follows Luther’s introduction; then the Fragments of Esther in six sections; then the History of Susanna; then the Account of Bel in Babylon; then the Dragon at Babylon; then the Prayer of Azarias in the Third Book of Daniel; then the Song of the Three Men in the Fire from the same chapter; then the Prayer of Manasses. None of these has any special heading or justification.

After the Prayer of Manasses we have the words, ‘Ende der Bücher dess Alten Testaments.’ Then follows ‘Anhang: Zugab dreyer bücher, Des dritten Buchs Esra, des vierdten Buchs Esra, des dritten Buchs der Maccabeer’. Then follow the words :

Vorrede ueber das dritte Buch Esra.

‘Dass Buch ist auss den Büchern der Chronic wie auch auss Ezra und Nehemias Buchern (nach welchen beide dess Buch das dritte Esra genennet wird) zusammengeschrieben aussgenommen die Fabel von den dreyen Leibdienern dess Königs Darii welche von die Frage was am allerstärcksten sey disputiren. Cap 3 und 4 Wiewol aber dasselbe Buch von etlichen Kirchenlehrern angezogen wird gehöret es doch nichts in die Zahl der Göttlichen unfehlbaren und bewärten Biblischen Bücher des Alten Testaments dieweil 1 es nicht in Hebreischer Sprache geschrieben 2 Im dritten Capitel vom Bau dess Tempels und der Stadt Jerusalem dem Propheten Haggai und der Historischen zuwider ist 3 Das Kirchen Zeugnis mangelt beides in Judenthum und in Christenthumb.’

The preface to the Fourth Book of Esdras is as follows :

‘Dass Buch gehöret nicht unter die bewährten Canonischen Bucher dess Alten Testaments denn 1 ists nicht Ebreisch ja auch nicht Griechisch sondern nur Lateinisch geschrieben und wirde Gott nicht zugelassen haben dass es in der Grundsprach verlohren worden da es in derselben were beschrieben worden, 2 Wollen die 4 B Esi 10 v 22 und 2 B Maccab 2. v 4 wie Maccabeer Buch nicht Canonisch ist, 3 Mangelt diesem Buch nicht allein der Israelitischen sondern auch den Christlichen Kirchen Zeugnis, 4 Und weil Cap IV 40 dieses Buch Malachias der letze Prophet angezogen und sein name aussgelegt wird muss dasselbe nach Malachia Zeiten seyn geschrieben worden. 5 Es sind auch in diesem Buch Judische Fabeln begrieffen wie dann Lutherus in Vorrede ueber dē Baruch schreibt ohne dass in 4 Buch darzu eitel Traume sind wie Hieronymus selbst saget. 6 Darumb hat auch Lyra diss Buch keiner Ausslegung gewirdiget wie auch hernach Vortablus Osiander etc. Ja Lutherus hat es nicht wollen verdolmetschen wie er schreibt in gedachten Vorrede. 7 Und die verständigen Aussleger der H. Schrift im Pabsthum schliessen diss Buch auss dem Canone welches wider die newen Traumer zu mercken die diss Buch so hoch halten. II Es hat fast das Ansehen dass diss Buch sey nach der Offenbarung Johannis geschrieben und dass der Dichter es dem heiligen Johanni habe nachthun und nachreden wollen doch mit sehr ungleichem Geiste. So gar auch dass er viel holz den Stopfeln mit untermenget und man ihm in allen dingen nicht helfen noch entschuldigen kan. Was aber guts daran ist das hat er auss andern Büchern entlehnet und so weit kan dasselbige gelten. Sonsten können wir dess ganzen Buchs ohn einigem Schaden leicht entrahten D. Cramerus — Wiewol wenn das was im 3. Cap VI gesetzt wird waar seyn soll diss Buch ehe

muss seyn geschrieben worden als das Canonisch Buch Esra. Were also der Titul desselben unrichtig.

III Er ist aber solch Buch ein Prophetisch Buch und hält in sich erstlich zwo Predigten 1 Eine scharffe Straffpredigt Esra wider die ungehorsamen Juden 2 Eine liebliche Trostpredigt vom glucklichem Zustand dess Volcks Gottes im Reich Christi. Darnach wunderliche Gesichte durch welche die Predigten bekräftiget und angezeigt wird warumb die Juden soviel Elend leiden müssen und was beides die Glaubige für Wolthaten die Gottlosen für Straffen von Christo zu gewarten haben.'

To the Third Book of Maccabees the following heading is attached:

'Dass Buch gehöret nicht unter die bewährten Canonischen Bucher das Alten Testaments Denn 1 ist es nicht in Prophetischer Hebreischer sondern in Griechischer Sprach geschrieben 2 Mangelt demselben das Zeugnis der Judischen Kirchen dero Canonen oder unfehlbare Bucher ins alte Testament gehorig Christus bestetigt und gutgeheissen hat 3 Es hat auch die erste Kirche in Newen Testament dasselbe nit für Canonisch gehalten 4 Wie denn auch die Autzleger der H. Schrift dasselbe der Erklärung nicht gewirdiget haben.'

'II Es hat das Ansehen es habe diss Buch gemacht eben der Scribent der das Buch der Weissheit geschrieben dieweil in beiden einerley Sprüche und Art zu reden begriffen seyn. Und vermeinen etliche sey Philo Alexandrinus. Es solte billich nicht ein Buch der Maccabeer (denn dieses Namens ganz nicht darinnen gedacht wird hat sich auch die darinn verfaste Geschichte lange Zeit vor den Macabeern begeben) sondern das Buch Simons dess Hohen-priesters dessen Verrichtung furnemlich darinnen beschrieben wird oder doch das erste Buch der Maccabeer wegen der Zeit und ordnung der Verfolgung genennet werden.

'III Es begreiff aber diss Buch die Geschicht (die sich in kurzer Zeit hat zugetragen im vierdttten jahr Antioch den Grossen) wie grausam sich Ptolemaus Philopator König in Egypten gegen die Juden bezeigt habe und dass dennoch Gott der Herr solchen Tyrannischen Rath des Königs umbgekehret und alles zu einem gewünschten Ende den Juden zum besten gebracht habe zum Exempel dess Spruch Salom c. 21 der Spruchw. vi Des Königs Hertz ist in der Hand dess Hernn wie Wasserbäche und er neigets wohin er will.'

At the end of the Third Book of Maccabees we have the words, 'Ende dess dritten Buchs der Maccabeer und der Zugab dess Alten Testaments.'

I have thought it right to give these introductions at some length as they shew how far the Lutheran commentators had found it necessary in 1644 to depart from their founder's subjective theories of inspiration.

In the great Tübingen Bible of 1731 there is a fresh preface to the Apocrypha in the words:

‘Apocrypha bedeuten diejenige Schrifften, welche der heiligen Schrift Alten Testaments wohl beygefüget werden, aber jeden noch nicht von dem heil. Geist eingegeben worden, sondern entweder nur die Historie des Volcks Gottes beleuchten, oder sonst nützliche Sitten Lehren in sich halten, und vorhin unter denen Jüden, vornemlich denen, die ausser dem gelobten Lande sich befanden, sind bekannt gewesen. Werden so genennet, weil sie nicht in dem Kasten, da die Canonische Bücher waren, sind aufgehoben worden, oder weil deren Urheber unbekannt, oder sie selbst unter den Büchern der Heil. Schrift nicht bekannt waren. Dass diese Bücher nicht vom Geiste Gottes eingegeben worden auch nicht unter die Canonische Bücher gehören, erhellet aus den vielen Fehlern, welche darinnen befindlich, und die wir in einem jedwedem besondere an seinem Orte anmercken werden, ferner dass sie nicht in Hebraischer Sprache anfänglich geschrieben, Rom 3. 2. auch weder von der Jüdischen noch Christlichen Kirche in die Zahl der Canonischen Bücher gebracht worden, auch in Neuen Testament nicht als Göttliche Bücher angeführet werden. Wenn auch schon die Jüden ausser Jerusalem sie gelesen und zum Theil noch behalten so hat doch eigentlich die Jüdische, und so dann auch die Christliche Kirche sie niemals angenommen, ob schon die Romische Kirche sie, aber ohne Grund, als Göttliche Bücher ansihet.’

To each of the books a new preface is added, in which illuminating criticisms of their texts and contents are given, the most interesting feature of which to us is the continual reference to their absence from the Hebrew Canon as an excuse for excluding them from the Christian Canon.

While in succeeding Bibles Luther's prefaces were occasionally omitted, his attitude towards the Old Testament Apocrypha, save for the addition of three new books in some Bibles, was rigidly maintained. Under the stress of conflict with Socinians and Romanists the Lutherans found it convenient to cling desperately to his Bible as he had left it as an ultimate bulwark, and to stand by the Apocrypha as well as the books strictly Canonical. Although he had separated certain books and called

them Apocrypha, he had not excluded them from his Bible, as Jerome would have done if he could. He had deliberately translated these books, had said some nice things about some of them, and continually emphasized the fact that, although not to be ultimately quoted as decisive in deciding dogmatic questions, they were godly books full of illuminating instruction, and deserved the place he gave them in his Bible. His example has been followed by his people, who, with some isolated exceptions, throughout their history have steadily refused to discard them from their Bibles. When the great struggle took place in the English Bible Society, when that Society first countenanced their exclusion in the year 1826, it led to similar fierce struggles in Germany.

The cause of the dispute, and the eventual schism between the English Bible Society and its branches in Germany, was the proposal by the former to issue Bibles without the Apocrypha. Among those who took the conservative side, the most notable no doubt was E. Reuss, in his *Diss. Polem.* The feud was renewed with greater fierceness in 1853, when the English Society went a step further and determined not to print any portion of the Apocrypha in future, and when Stier and Hengstenberg championed the cause of the Apocrypha. The Lutheran authorities decided that they could have no part in such a movement, and refused to countenance the issuing of mutilated Bibles or to depart from Luther's example in such a critical matter, and they have since remained staunch to that decision.

Let us now turn to the Reformers of Zürich and Basle.

In Zwingli's Bible, of which the volume with the Apocrypha was published in 1529, the Third Book of Maccabees and the Third and Fourth of Esdras are included, but not the fragments of Esther, the Prayer of Azarias, the Song of the Three Children, and the Prayer of Manasses.

In the list of books recognized by Oecolampadius in his interview with the Waldenses in 1530, the Third of Maccabees, the fragments of Esther, the Prayer of Azarias, the Benedicite, and the Prayer of Manasses are not mentioned.

In the second edition of the Zürich Bible, published in 1530, the Third of Maccabees is duly printed, but the other omissions are maintained. In the next edition in 1531 the fragments of Esther are also printed.

In Bullinger's preface to Sebastian Munster's Latin Bible, published in 1539, he says:

'De Apocryphis nihil nunc dicam, cuius generis sunt liber Tobiae, Iudith et reliqui quidam. De vocabulo non omnibus cognito hoc tantum adiiciam, Graecam esse vocem. Significat autem ἀπόκρυφα, occulta aut abscondita. Igitur veteres appellarunt Apocrypha occulta sive latentia scripta, quae domi quidem aut privatim pro suo cuique animo plus esset legere, caeterum in publicis conventibus preferam autem in templis sacris, non recitarentur neque quisquam illorum autoritate premeretur. Non desunt tamen qui istos libros demptis duobus Esdrae, non apocryphos (sicut Hieronymus appellavit) sed Ecclesiasticos appellari voluerunt, de quorum numero fuit Cyprianus, sive is Ruffinus est. Verba eius si quis requirat haec sunt. Hos legi quidem maiores nostri in ecclesiis voluerunt, non tamen proferri ad autoritatem ex his fidei confirmandum.

In the Zürich Latin Bible of 1543, edited by Pellicanus, there is in the preface a short notice of the history and value of the several Apocryphal books.

In the German Zürich Bible of 1545 Bullinger's preface as above abstracted is translated from Latin into the vernacular.

The Zürich Bible published in 1712 contains an address 'Allgemeine vorrede der Kirchen und Schuldieneren zu Zürich an die Christlichen Leser'.

In the table of books the Apocrypha are separated under the title *Bücher welche Apocrypha genennet werden*. Then follows:

'1 Das buch der Weisheit 2 das buch Jesu des Sohns Sirach, Das buch Tobie, Der Prophet Baruch, Brieff Jeremie. 6 Das Buch Judith 7 das III Buch Esdre, 8 Das IV Buch Esdre. 9 Stuck in Esther, 10 Historia von Susanna. Historia von Bel zu Babel, das Gebätt Azarie. 14 Gesang der dreyen Männern im feur. 15 Das Gebätt Manasseh. 16 Das I Buch der Machabeer 17 Das II Buch der Machabeer 18 Das III Buch der Machabeer.'

The New Testament books are arranged in the old order and not in Luther's, and Hebrews is assigned to St Paul. By this time therefore the Canon of the Zürich Bible had become assimilated to that of the French-speaking Reformers and included all the books in the Vulgate.

Let us now turn to the theories of the Reformed Church.

The real initiator of the discussion about the Canon of the Old Testament among the French-speaking Protestants was Olivetan in his Bible published in 1535 in which the Apocryphal books as generally received are all contained except the Third of Maccabees and the Prayer of Azarias (?). In his preface to the Apocrypha he justifies their exclusion from the Canon on the ground that they do not occur in the Hebrew Bibles and were rejected by St Jerome.

Calvin, who was the real creator of French Protestantism, adopted as we saw in the last memoir a very different reason for rejecting the apocryphal books. He does not appeal to the practice of the Jews or to St Jerome and rejects all reliance on human tradition as Luther had done before him. He appeals to the direct inspiration of the Holy Spirit working in our hearts and consciences as an infallible guide to what is inspired in Scripture, and not to the Church as his director in the determination of what is and what is not Canonical.

When speaking of the authority of Scripture his words are :

‘C'est à scavoir que nous la fondions sur le tesmoingnage interieur du Sainct Esprit. Car çasoit qu'en sa propre maiesté elle ait assez de quoy estre reuerée ; neanmoins elle commence lors à nous vrayement toucher quand elle est scellée en nos coeurs par le Sainct Esprit. Estans donc illuminez par la vertu d'iceluy, desià nous ne croyons pas ou à nostre iugement, ou à celui des aultres, que l'Escriture est de Dieu : mais par dessus tout iugement humain nous arrestons indubitablement qu'elle nous a este donnée de la propre bouche de Dieu, tout ainsi que si nous contemplions à l'œil l'Essence de Dieu en icelle.’ (*Institutes* I vii 5.)

In Calvin's edition of Olivetan's Bible published at Geneva in 1540 the Third Book of Maccabees is excluded.

Calvin's purely subjective theory of canonical inspiration was largely adopted by his followers. Its difficulties, however, soon led to finely drawn dialectical discussions. In founding the authority of the Scripture on its contents he opened the gate to very delusive *petitiones principii* as did his more subtle position that it was only when a man was converted by the Scripture that he became sufficiently illuminated to discriminate between the legitimate and the spurious in professed Biblical books, and thus to qualify the subjective authority pro-

fessedly held to be the basis of certitude as to Biblical inspiration with more homely appeals to another basis of such certitude.

Thus in the Scotch or Westminster Confession of 1560, article 19, we read: 'As we believe and confesse the Scriptures of God sufficient to instruct and make the man of God profite, so do we affirm and avowe the authoritie of the same to be of God and neither to defend na. men nor angelis. We affirm therefore that sik as allege the Scripture to have na uther authoritie bot that quhilk it has received from the kirk to be blasphemous against God and injurious to the trew kirk, quhilk alwaies heares and obeyis the voice of her awin Spouse and Pastor, but takes not upon her to be maistre over the samin.' This statement is somewhat qualified by a phrase in the same confession referring directly to the Canon, where we read: 'The buiks of the Auld and New Testamentis, *those buiks, we mean quhilk of the ancient have been reputed Canonically.*' This statement of the Scotch Calvinists preceded by three years the similar one in the 6th Article of the English Church which we discussed in an earlier memoir and was preceded by the similar statement in the Württemberg Confession of 1552.

In the Gallican Confession of 1561, article 4, we read:

'Idque non tantum ex communi ecclesiae consensu sed etiam multo magis ex testimonio et intrinseca Sp. S. persuasione, quo suggerente docemur illos ab aliis libris ecclesiasticis discernere.'

Similarly in the so-called Belgian Confession of 1561, article 5, we read:

'Hosce libros solos pro sacris et canonicis recepimus . . . idque non tam quod ecclesia eos pro huiusmodi recipiat et approbet, quam imprimis quod Spiritus Sanctus in cordibus nostris testetur a Deo profectos esse, comprobationemque eius in se ipsis habeant.'

This position was not found easy to defend, but it was defended notwithstanding, and substantially on the ground that what had to be proved was not so much the authenticity and external pedigree of the Bible as the fact that it contained *the word of God*. In proving this, Reuss (a champion of the view) says that arguments purely historical and the testimonies of the Fathers lost all value and had to give place to what the Apostle long ago called the demonstration of spirit and power. An instance

or two of the conclusions of the more distinguished Reformers of this school may be apposite.

Musculus in his *Loci Communes* published at Basle in 1560, pages 220-221, under the heading *De divisione Sacrarum Scripturarum*, says :

‘Sacrae Scripturae quarū geminum corpus sacra Biblia vocatur, dividūtur in vetus ac Novum testamentū et vocantur aliae canonicae, aliae apocryphae. Canonicae pro authenticis habentur, in causa fidei ac religionis comprobandae : quae extra canonem et apocrypha sunt, autoritatē hanc non sunt assequutae.’

After enumerating the canonical books according to the Hebrew canon, he continues :

‘Quicquid extra hos est, inquit Hieronymus in Prologo Galeato, inter apocrypha ponendum est.’

He then continues :

‘Inter libros veteris testamenti apud Graecos et Latinos reperiūtur hi libri quos Ebraei ad Canonis auctoritatem non admittunt. Tobias videlicet, Iudith, Baruch, Epistola Hieremiae, oda trium puerorum, Esdrae tertius et quartus, Sapientia Salomonis, Sapientia Sirach, quem librum Latini Ecclesiasticum vocant, historia Susannae, Belis et Draconis, libri Machabaeorum, quibus Greci librū Iosephi addunt.’

He then goes on to say :

‘Habentur isti pro apocryphis, non quod habendi sint in aliqua secreta autoritate, sed quod vel occulta extiterit illorum origo ; vel quod non palam in Ecclesia Dei quemadmodū canonici, sed in abscondito ac domi a privatis legi consueverint. Sonat enim apocryphon idem quod secretum et absconditū. Forsan inde irrepsit haec vox in Ecclesiam, quod lectio talium librorum qui secretiora et abstrusiora continent, qualis est liber Apocalypseos, quem rectius librum absconditorū vocaveris, nō solerent ad publicam et Ecclesiasticā lectionem admitti, et quorum non admittebantur, quicumque non sunt de canone sacrae scripturae, successum temporis obtinuit in Ecclesia, ut omnes eiusmodi libri a canone exclusi, apocryphi, id est, absconditi vocarentur. Exclusi vero sunt a Canone qđ magis ἀνθρωποπνεύσως quam θεοπνεύσως scripti et quaedam canonicis scripturis non satis conformia habere videntur : denique, sicut August. lib. II contra Faustum Manichaeum cap. 2 dicit, Nescio quorum praesumptione prolati.’

After depreciating the relative value of the latter he continues :

‘Verum dicitur mihi : Si talia sunt scripta patrum, ut nec aliquid habeant autoritatis, nec origini suae habeantur conformia, quorsum

testimonia ex illis citas, ad cōprobandum et extollendum Canonicae scripturae auctoritatem et refutandum eos qui illa plurimi faciunt. Respondes quod me attinet non requiro testimonia patrum, quibus auctoritas Canonicae scripturae tribuatur . . . verum quoniam adversarii veritati negocium pretextu patrum facere moliantur, illorumque scripta tantum non evehant supra canonicas scripturas, recte ea adduco ubi conatibus illorum resistunt, uterque armis quae ipsi adferunt . . . Obiiciunt auctoritatem ecclesiae. Ecclesia, inquam, antiquior est scripturis. Etenim, quum apostoli inciperent praedicare, nulla erat scriptura evangelii, nulla epistola Pauli, et tamen erat ecclesia Christi sanguine dedicata. Ergo maior est auctoritas Ecclesiae, quam scripturae.'

To this awkward argument which is quite fairly stated, Musculus replies very ineffectively. He says:

'Vera Christi ecclesia nunquam est hoc argumento adversus auctoritatem sacrarum et canonicarum Scripturarum usu, quantumvis variis et multis haeresibus impeteretur, sed perpetuo fidei suae puritatem auctoritate illarum defendit et asseruit. Quare manifestum est, eos qui hoc argumento dogmata sua tueri conantur, haudquaquam pugnare pro vera Christi ecclesia, nec pro veritate aliqua asserenda, quae sacrarum scripturarum posset auctoritate defendi, sed pro ecclesia adultera et sede Antichristi, quae quoniam veritatis patrocinio destituitur: vel vi ac tyrannide, vel falso usurpata sub nomine ecclesiae auctoritate sese tueri cogitur. . . . Ecclesia, inquiunt, antiquior est scripturis sacris. Quae ecclesia, quibus scripturis? Prima illa Evangelica ecclesia antiquior est scripturis Evangelicis et Apostolicis. Est sane. Sed quorsum divellunt canonicas utriusque Testamenti scripturas et neglectis prioribus de posterioribus argumentum texunt? An solae canonicae sunt quae per Apostolos et Evangelistas sunt scriptae? Nequaquam. Astus est, quod eas quae novi Testamenti sunt a vetustioribus avellunt, quemadmodum id est quod primae Evangelicae ecclesiae auctoritatem extollunt. Primum hoc facto facilius deprimi posse putarunt novi Testamenti scripturas, si avulsas a reliquo corpore vetustatis auctoritate privarent, ac tãquam recentiores ecclesiae postponerent. Deinde has potissimum exauthorandas esse iudicarunt, quod illarum sese auctoritate magis quam caeterarum praemi senserunt. Tertio quoniam sacrosancta est prioris ecclesiae existimatio hac visum est extollere, ac sub illius nomine adulterinã illam cōmendare. Alioque cum ecclesia catholica haud primum tempore novi Testamēti coeperit, sed inde ab Adamo origine habes universos electos.'

I will next quote from another of the Reformers, who had very considerable influence in England, and also qualified his master's rigid views by similar concessions.

Peter Martyr Vermillius says in his *Loci Communes*, which was published in London in 1576, edited by R. Masson, S.D., and was dedicated to D. Antonius Cope :

‘Est ergo magnopere cavendus Antichristorum periculosissimus error, qui dicere audent Ecclesiam esse, quae divinis libris auctoritatem concialiarit, cum longe secus res habeat. Quicquid enim auctoritatis et existimationis Ecclesiae contigit, id totum a verbo Dei profectum est. Horrendum est auditu sacra oracula et verba Dei ab hominibus alioqui mendacibus fidem suam nancisci. Verumtamen haec illi fingunt, ut quum deprendantur non semel in Sacramentis, et dogmatis longe secus decrevisse, ac sanxisse quam divinae literae ferant, id fieri volunt, sibi facere licuisse, quod Ecclesia, quae verbis Dei auctoritatem et fidem contulerit, posset in eis, id quod visum fuerit, immutare. Quo-circa modis omnibus est ipsis in eo quod sibi sumunt resistendum. Non patiamur nos eo adduci, ut sacra volumina suam fidem et auctori-tatem habuisse ab Ecclesia existimemus.’

Having laid down this position, he proceeds, however, to qualify it considerably :

‘Nec ista scribo,’ he says, ‘quasi asperner, aut contemnam Ecclesiae dignitatem, cui tria munera, eaque pulcherrima, circa verbum Dei tribuo. Primum eorum est, ut eam confitear tanquam testem, sacros libros asservare. Verum inde non potest confici, ei licere, quicquam aut pervertere aut commutare in sacris voluminibus . . . sed quod, uti diximus, nulla ratione vel torquere vel immutare licuerit Ecclesia. Id secundo loco eius esse non dubitamus ut sermones a Deo sibi commissos promulget ac praedicet. . . . Quare ministros Ecclesiae nihil magis curare atque studere oportet, quam ut fideles inveniantur.

‘Postremo loco Ecclesiae quoque functionem esse agnoscimus, ut cum fit praedita divino spiritu, synceros et germanos libros divinarum literarum ab adulterinis et Apocryphis discernat, quod utique non est auctoritate superiori pollere, ut multi stulte somniarunt. Sic enim aiunt, cum Ecclesia Scripturas partim receperit, et partim repudiaverit, ius habet ut de illis pro suo arbitratu statuatur. Verum hoc argumenti genus infirmissimum est. Facile quippe dabimus, antiquam Ecclesiam tanto spiritu fuisse praeditam, ut eius ductu et auspiciis facile agnoverint, inter illa quae sibi proponebantur, quaenam legitima et genuina verba Dei essent et has spirituali facultate canonem Scripturarum ab Apo-cryphis libris discreverunt. Quod ubi perfectum est, nequaquam pro libito interpretari eas licuit, sed fuit et spiritus Christi audiendus et consensus omnium locorum Scripturae diligenter spectandus. Quod idem videmus quotidie fieri. Cum regiae literae afferuntur,

possunt quidem civitatum praefecti et provinciarum administratores, ex usu et civili peritia satis agnoscere, num verae an adulterinae sint literae, quae sibi nomine Regis redduntur: eas tamen cum intellexerunt non vitiatas aut fictas esse, non leet proprio arbitrato, vel invertere vel torquere. Nec secus de Ecclesia oportet existimare: testis quidem est et fida conservatrix divinorum codicum, cui tamen haud permittitur, ut aliud quippiam constituat atque Deus his literis definiverit.' (*op. cit.* cl. I loc. vi §§ 7 sq.)

Later on in the same work he speaks in the same strain. Thus he says:

'Id non esse verum quod assumunt, Scripturam habere auctoritatem ab Ecclesia. Eius enim firmitas a Deo pendet, non ab hominibus: et prius est Verbum, et quidem firmum ac certum, quam Ecclesia. Nam Ecclesia per verbum vocata fuit. Et spiritus Dei egit in cordibus audientium verbum et illud legentium: ut agnoscerent non esse humanum sermonem, sed prorsus divinum. A Spiritu itaque accessit auctoritas verbo Dei, non ab Ecclesia.'

He then goes on, as Calvin had done, to qualify and explain away the critical statement of St Augustine on the other side (*op. cit.* ed. 1576, cl. III l. iii § 3).

The extreme champions of this subjective method of testing the Canon were meanwhile not satisfied with publishing positive arguments in its favour, but applied it with rigour to discrediting all the books in the Old Testament received by the early and mediaeval Church but not recognized by the Jews. Reuss, who was a distinguished member of the Reformed Church, does not disguise his disapproval of the suicidal method thus employed. He says: 'Those who relied on the witness of the Holy Spirit diligently sought in the Apocrypha for historical errors, heresies, absurdities, all sorts of faults to establish the point that religious sentiment was not wrong in excluding them from the Canon . . . the critics rivalled one another in heaping on the Apocrypha the epithets suggested by contempt and prejudice. The Apocrypha was hated because the Catholics were hated.' *Falsa, superstitiosa, mendacia, suspecta, fabulosa, impia* were some of the terms applied to the rejected books. He gives a number of instances of the puerile and hapless arguments offered by these dangerous champions, in which they forgot how the supposed absurdities in the Apocryphal books might be so easily matched from the Canonical

ones. Among the instances quoted is a sentence from Chamier, *Panstratia Catholica* Loc. I qu. I lib. v c. 5 § 4:

‘Quid primum reprehendam? . . . An quod piscis ita exiliit ut dum clamat puellus, dum iubet Angelus prehendi, non potuerit resilire? Et quidem magnum aliquem oportuit esse . . . quia resilire non potuit . . . tum quia devoraturus erat Tobiam. Idem tamen . . . a puerulo trahitur in siccum. Hem, quam subito immutatus! Nam quem prius sturionem aut thunnum aut aliquid maius credebamus, nunc apparet lucius aut gobio.’

Upon which Reuss comments sarcastically that ‘the scoffs thrown at the little fish of Tobit will sooner or later destroy Jonah’s whale’.

This form of attack, however, proved effective, as aggressive war often does, and aroused a widespread hatred and contempt for the so-called Apocrypha among the more extravagant and champions of the Genevan school, and notably among the English Puritans.

The divergent orientation of the Lutherans and the Calvinists in relation to the fundamental question of the ultimate authority of the Bible had been, indeed, singularly reflected in England in the struggle between the Church and the Puritans. Questions about the Canon do not seem to have aroused attention here, however, until the framing of the Thirty-Nine Articles, which first gave a definition as to what the Biblical Canon in the English Church comprised.

It was not long after these Articles were framed that an attack began to be made by the Puritans upon the place given in them to the Apocrypha, and demands were made by Martin Marprelate and others inspired from Geneva for their excision from the Bible.

It would seem that it had become the fashion for some of the binders to exclude the Apocrypha in binding the text of the Bible, and instances are known in which the Apocryphal books occur in the table of contents, but are absent from the Bible text itself. A reference to this practice is to be found in the first of the Marprelate tracts, where it is complained that ‘the last Lent there came a commaundement from his Grace (i.e. the Archbishop) into Paul’s Church Yard that no Byble should be bounden without the Apocrypha’. ‘Monstrous and ungodly wretches’ is the

comment, 'that to maintain their owne outragious proceedings thus mingle heaven and earth together and would make the spirite of God to be the author of prophain bookes.' (See W. Marshall *Hist. of the Martin Marprelate Controversy*, 1845.)

The spokesmen of the Church, and notably the Archbishop of Canterbury, in the discussion that followed adopted the attitude of the later Lutheran apologists. They warmly defended the presence of the Apocrypha in the Bible, while they as strongly opposed the Tridentine decision in regard to their Canonical position. In this latter polemic they fell back upon the arguments of Jerome and on the reasonableness of accepting the true Canon of the Old Testament from the Jews, who claimed to have collected the books which it comprised, to have been its continuous custodians, and to have exercised extraordinary vigilance in preserving it pure and intact. This argument was specially developed and pressed home in the famous work of Bishop Cosin on the Canon, which was the first scientific treatise in English on the subject. This was, of course, a much safer and more defensible attitude than the elastic criteria employed by Luther and Zwingli and Calvin. It was none the less an entire departure from the pedestal on which the early reformers had based their great argument when they quarrelled with the Church, which was that the Bible required no external evidence or certifying witness to uphold its authority, which divine grace sufficiently led men to recognize as God's direct message.

The movement deprecatory of the Apocrypha, and demanding its excision from the Bible, continued to grow, however, and it naturally found a place among the Divines at the famous Synod held at Dort in 1619. Accordingly we find in the Acts of the Ninth Session the following statement :

'Quandoquidem libros Apocryphos scripta mere humana esse constat, nonnullos quoque suppositios, Iudaicis fabulis et commentis aspersos, quales sunt Historiae Iudithae, Susannae, Tobithi, Belis Draconisque, atque imprimis tertius et quartus Esdrae : nonnullos etiam continere quaedam dogmatica et historica, libris Canonicis repugnantia : cumque nec in Iudaica, nec in antiquissima Ecclesia Christiana sacro Veteris Testamenti codici fuerint adiuncti, deliberatum fuit : an et illi accuratiori versione digni sint. Tunc vero utrum conveniat, ut cum sacris et Canonicis libris, in uno volumine porro

coniungantur : cum praesertim illa coniunctio idem progressu temporis periculum creare possit, quod in Pontificia Ecclesia accidisse videmus : ut scripta haec mere humana tandem pro Canonicis, divinisque, ab imperitioribus haberentur. Re diu deliberata rationibusque variis ac gravissimis utrinque allatis atque explicatis, spatium maturius rationes allatas expediendi, postulatum fuit.'

At the Tenth Session the discussion was renewed, and Gomar of Leyden and Deodatus of Geneva and other pastors set out their objections to the inclusion of the Apocrypha ; but the opinion of the majority, which was the other way, prevailed, and it was decreed that they should be retranslated from the Greek, but not with the same care as the Canonical books. The decree then adds :

'Ac quandoquidem a multis retro saeculis, libri hi cum sacris scriptis uno eodemque volumine coniuncti fuerunt, atque haec coniunctio in Reformatis quoque omnium Nationum Ecclesiis etiamnum servetur, cumque distinctio seu separatio horum librorum a volumine Bibliorum, nec exemplo nec suffragiis aliarum Ecclesiarum Reformatarum sit comprobata, sed occasionem et scandalorum et calumniarum, facile datura sit, quanquam optarent quidem omnes libros hosce Apocryphos, sacris Scripturis nunquam adiunctos fuisse ; placuit tamen eos hoc tempore sine aliarum Ecclesiarum Reformatarum consensu atque approbatione, a corpore voluminis Biblici non esse segregandos ; sed eidem coniungendos, adhibitis tamen hisce cautionibus . . .'

For these reasons it is enacted that a space be left between the Apocrypha and the Canonical books, that they be preceded by a warning that they are of human origin, and that the reader be warned of their errors and scant authority. They are also to be printed in smaller type, with *marginalia* pointing out where they are inconsistent with the Canonical books. They are to have a special pagination, and to be put at the end of the Bible.

The first title-page of this famous Dutch Bible thus authorized, which was published at Amsterdam in 1637 in response to the resolution of the Synod, is headed *Biblia dat is de gantsche H. Schrifture vervattende alle de Canonijcke Boecken des ouden en des Nieuwen Testaments, &c.* Here, therefore, the contents of what was thought the legitimate Bible are distinctly separated and labelled Canonical books on the title-page. In accordance

with the directions of the Synod, the Apocrypha are placed in a separate section at the end of the New Testament, and the title-page is headed *De Boecken genaemt Apocryphe . . . van nieuws-ryt het Grieksch in onse Nederlandtsche Tale getrouwelick over-geset*. On the back of the title-page is a list of these books as follows:

'De Apocryphe Boecken. Het III Boeck Esdre. Het IV Boeck Esdre. Het Boeck Tobie. Het Boeck Judith. Het Boeck der Wysheyd. Ecclesiasticus, Jesu Sirach. Het Boeck Baruch, met den Sentbrief Jeremie. Het Aenhanghsel aen Esther. Eenige Aenhanghselen aen Daniel, namelick Het Gebedt Azarie, ende 't gesangh der drie Mannen in den gloeyenden oven. De Historie van Susanna, ende Van Bel ende den Draeck. 'Het Gebedt van Manasse I Boeck der Machabeen. II Boeck der Machabeen. III Boeck der Machabeen.'

Then follows a long introduction explaining why these books are separated from those in the Canon, discussing their authority, and headed *Waerschouwinge aen de Lesers Van de Apocryphe Boecken*.

This Bible became the Standard Dutch Bible, and was accepted by the Remonstrants as well as by the Reformed Church of Holland, while the Dutch Lutherans continued to use various editions of Biestkens' Bible of 1560 and Vischer's Bible of 1648.

In 1640 there appeared at Amsterdam an edition of the English Genevan Bible, from which the Apocrypha so far as I know were for the first time deliberately omitted. Very irregularly an exception is made in favour of the Prayer of Manasses, which is entered in the table of contents immediately after 2 Chronicles thus: 'The Prayer of Manasse, Apocrypha,' and is duly printed in the same position in the text, with the marginal note, 'This prayer is not in the Ebrew, but is translated out of the Greeke.' Why this favour was shewn to this prayer I cannot explain. At the end of Malachi the explanatory preface about the Apocrypha contained in the Dutch Bible just mentioned is translated. It is there entitled:

'An admonition to the Christian reader concerning the Apocrypha Books, wherein are shewed the reasons and grounds wherefore they are here omitted, as not Canonically, and not to be accounted amongst the Books of undoubted truth, as the Holy Scriptures are to be held.'

We are told in this statement that—

‘The writings which anciently have been joyned together in that Book, which we call the Bible, or the Scriptures, are of two kinds: Some are given by inspiration of God, . . . and therefore are Divine scriptures of an undoubted and infallible truth: these we commonly call by a Greek word, *Canonically Books*, because they contain a doctrine which is as a Canon or rule of all that must be beleaved and done to be saved. Or because they stand in the Canon, that is, in the Register of the Divine Books, which both the Jewish, and Christian Church at all times have had. Athanasius in his Synopsis saith: Some books are written by the will of men that are lyable to errour in doctrine and therefore cannot be a rule unto our faith and cariage and these are called Apocrypha-books that is Hidden . . . As for the books of the New Testament which are contained in the Bible although some particular Doctors, though without reason, have doubted, whether the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistle of James, the second of Peter, the second and third of John, the Epistle of Jude and the Revelation of John, were to be held for Canonically or no: yet notwithstanding the Primitive Church generally have never doubted of it, neither are they in our time questioned, but are by whole Christendome esteemed and held to be divine and Canonically books.’

The two concluding paragraphs of the original Dutch address apologizing for the insertion of the Apocrypha, notwithstanding their uncanonical character, and explaining the reasons for their publication, are omitted.

It closes with the phrase:

‘Ordned at the Synod of Dort in the year 1618, set out and annexed by the deputies to the end of the Dutch Bible newly translated.’

It is thus a curious fact, and it ought to be specially interesting to Englishmen, that the first printed Old Testament from which the Apocrypha were deliberately omitted was an English Bible. It was no doubt printed under the inspiration of the English colony in Holland which belonged to the Reformed Church.

In 1637 the Scotch Prayer Book omits all ferial lessons from the Apocrypha, and includes only ten portions assigned to Saints’ days.

In the year 1645, according to Dr Eadie, a prayer-book was compiled for the navy in which the Apocrypha were ignored.

In 1648 John Field issued a Bible at London without the

Apocrypha entitled, *The Holy Bible containing the Old and New Testaments Newly Translated*. It is expressly said to have been appointed to be read in churches.

In 1657 another edition of the great Dutch Bible, with commentaries, was issued under the authority of the States General. It was a reprint of the edition of 1637, and in it the Apocrypha was treated in the same way. In the same year a translation of this Dutch official Bible, with its annotations, by Thomas Hoak, was published in London. The translation gives an account of how the famous original had been authorized and carried out by the Synod of Dort.

What is remarkable about this translation is that it completely excludes the Apocrypha which, as we have seen, were contained in the original Dutch, and it seems plain that the fashion of so excluding them had become very prevalent among the English nonconformists, and that it was not by any means unusual from this time onwards to issue English Bibles without them. In some cases the list of Apocryphal books was duly contained at the beginning of the Bible, but the books themselves were excluded from the text, thus carrying out Lightfoot's demands in his harangue before Parliament in 1643, when he denounced the authorities for retaining in the Bible what they had ejected from the 'Canon, as if God should have cast Adam out of the *state* of happiness and yet have continued him in the place of happiness'.

The S.P.C.K. issued no Bible without the Apocrypha till the year 1743.

It would appear that the dominating influence of the official Dutch Bible authorized by the Council of Dort, in which the Apocrypha were contained, prevented for some time longer the Dutch Reformers from doing what their ecclesiastical children—the English dissenters—had done some time before, namely, from excluding the Apocrypha, and the first Dutch Bible in which I have met with this exclusion is dated in 1655, and was published by Ravesteyn. Other similar editions occur in 1657 and 1662 and subsequently.

I will now shortly sum up the general conclusions of this paper in regard to the Canon as viewed by the reformers.

Luther's theory of the Canon, according to which it was to be

tested by its conformity with his own primary postulate in regard to Justification by Faith and which dominated the early Lutherans is now virtually extinct. It is generally felt to be untenable. Reuss makes only a qualified defence of it. Thus he says:

‘The material principle of Protestantism is placed above the formal principle, the gospel of grace above the written word which bears testimony to it; but an attentive study of the history of the origin of the Reformation shews us that this step was quite natural at the beginning of the movement, and it is in accordance with strict logic to give precedence to the truth itself over the witness that attests it.’ (*op. cit.* p. 323.)

Later on he argues against the champions of the historical school and urges that ‘Luther’s method was both natural and legitimate in any one who set out from a purely dogmatic standpoint and subordinated Scripture to his system, exclusively Pauline, or if you will Augustinian’.

The theory in which all the early reformers concurred that the canonicity of a book is not to be tested or supported either explicitly or implicitly by Church tradition in any way, but is dependent entirely on the strength and cogency of the divine Word itself and its direct effect on the human conscience, has also been largely surrendered, but still has some adherents.

The case against it is excellently stated by J. D. Michaelis, in his Introduction to the New Testament. He says of this mode of discriminating Scripture:

‘Ein innerlich gefühltes Zeugnis des heiligen Geistes, oder eine Empfindung und Erfahrung des Nutzens der Schriften zur Ausbesserung meines Gemüths, kann die Sache eben so wenig entscheiden. Das erstere habe ich für meine Person in meinen Leben nicht gefühlt, aber ich halte den der es gefühlt hat, auch nicht für glücklicher oder der Gewissheit näher denn der Muhammedaner fühlt es eben so gut, und wirklich das innere Gefühl von Gott ist der ganze Beweiss auf den Muhammed seine Religion gründet, und so viel Millionen sie glauben es muss also wol nur zuwege gebrachtes Gefühl, Selbstbetrug seyn.’ (J. D. Michaelis *Einleitung in d. göttl. Schr. d. Neues Band*, ed. 1777, p. 77.)

When we come down to later times we find how embarrassing the position has become, and how difficult it is to reconcile this protestant theory of canonicity with any reason-

able argument. Thus Dr Samuel Davidson, a scholar of very considerable attainments and acuteness, is found occupying a very ambiguous position. Like the early reformers he urges in regard to the classification of the Sacred Books that—

‘such books as embody the indestructible essence of religion with the fewest accidents of time, place, and nature, which present conditions not easily disengaged from the imperishable life of the soul, deserve the first rank. . . . In regard to the Old Testament, conformity to Christ’s teaching will determine rank ; or which is tantamount, conformity to that pure reason which is God’s natural revelation to man. . . . The canonical authority of Scripture does not depend on any church or council. . . . Canonical authority lies in Scripture itself and is inherent in the books so far as they contain a declaration of the Divine will. Hence there is truth in the statement of old theologians that the authority of Scripture is from God alone.’ (Davidson *Canon of the Bible*, ed. 1878, pp. 269 &c.)

Here we have the subjective method of Luther reaffirmed in almost its naked baldness. When we turn, however, to the justification of the theory as evidenced by his description of the practice of the early reformers in the selection of their canon, we find Dr Davidson speaking most emphatically in another way :

‘Should,’ he says, ‘the distinction between the apocryphal and canonical books of the Old Testament be emphasized as it is by many? Should a sharp line be drawn between the two as though the one class, with the period it belonged to, were characterized by the errors and anachronisms of its history ; the other by simplicity and accuracy? . . . Can this aggregation of the Apocrypha over against the Hagiographa, serve the purpose of a just estimate? Hardly so ; for some of the latter, such as Esther and Ecclesiastes, cannot be put above Wisdom, 1 Maccabees, Judith, Baruch, or Ecclesiasticus. The doctrine of immortality, clearly expressed in the Book of Wisdom, is not in Ecclesiastes ; neither is God once named in the Book of Esther as author of the marvellous deliverances which the chosen people are said to have experienced. The history narrated in 1 Maccabees is more credible than that in Esther. It is therefore misleading to mark off all the apocryphal books as *human* and all the Canonical ones as *divine*. . . . The human element still permeates them (i. e. both classes of books) as long as God speaks through man ; and He neither dictates nor speaks differently.’ (*ib.* pp. 262 sq.)

Similar views were expressed by a greater scholar than Davidson, namely, Professor Reuss, a great champion of the protestant idea. In response to demands for some historical proofs made by scholars who relied largely on rational proofs in their apologetics, he too affirms that 'inward experience is the surest controul of theory', and that 'pure and simple piety, especially in the sphere of Protestantism, did not fail to hear the word of God, to feel it, so to speak, in virtue of that mysterious contact of the Eternal Spirit there revealed with the soul which opens itself to His beneficent working'. At the same time he confesses that the action is not uniform in all individuals, and that, according to the dispositions of character and temperament, according to the current of ideas at each epoch or in a particular circle, the impression received from reading the Holy Scripture would vary very considerably, and that one might be edified and touched by a writing which might have little or no influence on another. That is to say he largely concedes what the critics of the subjective method urge, namely the uncertainty and inoperative-ness of the criteria, and he concedes further that the theory has proved to be insufficient in practice, and that those who had formulated it were the first to diverge from it, and to drift into strange inconsistencies (*op. cit.* pp. 305 sq.). Reuss, like Davidson, points his moral by a similarly embarrassing application of the theory to the facts. Speaking of the separation of the Apocrypha from the Canonical Books on this subjective ground, he asks:

'Was it really in virtue of the sovereign principle of the inward testimony of the Holy Spirit? Would it be quite true to say that the first Protestant theologians, while unmoved by the enthusiastic eloquence of the author of Wisdom, so much extolled by the Alexandrians, felt the breath of God in the genealogies of Chronicles, or the topographical catalogues of the book of Joshua? Did they really find so great a difference between the miracles of the Chaldean Daniel and those of the Greek Daniel, that they felt bound to remove two chapters from the volume which bears Daniel's name? I have some difficulty in believing that they arrived at *the distinction* they drew by any test of that kind.' (*op. cit.* p. 312.)

This argument is assuredly conclusive in regard to any attempt to base the determination of the supreme issue of the legitimate

contents of the Bible on so insecure a ground as the personal opinion of the reader, or even to remit the decision to any supremely confident, courageous, but after all mortal, pontiff like Luther.

If there be such a thing as a Canon of Scripture, it must be the result of something more tangible and constant than individual illumination. The Canon is the correlative of the Church, and for its verification we must appeal to history and tradition, sifted by criticism. If the documents which form the Canon were selected by the Church out of a larger collection, as the ultimate appeal for the contents of its own Faith, it is illegitimate for the individual to claim first to reconstruct the Faith *a priori* and then to criticize the Canon itself and reject some of its contents, which have the same pedigree as the rest, because they do not support the reconstruction.

H. H. HOWORTH.