

The Journal *of* *Theological Studies*

APRIL, 1907

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

I. LUTHER AND KARLSTADT.

IN a previous paper I have tried to analyse the history of the Canon in the Anglican Church of the sixteenth century more definitely and precisely than has been done previously. I have shewn that the Canon in question has very slight, if any, ecclesiastical authority, and I have traced it through Coverdale's unauthorized translation of the Bible, in which it first appeared, to the continental reformers. If this view can be justified, it makes it particularly important for us to try and understand the nature and basis of the Bible Canon as accepted by these foreign reformers, a question upon which, notwithstanding German diligence, by no means the last word has been said.

The continental movement was intended by those who initiated it, namely, the men of the New Learning, the Humanists, to be a reformation and not a revolution. With them, again, it was more a philosophical than a purely theological movement. It dealt with the initial question of what was the true method of analysing truth and acquiring knowledge. It was an accident of the position that so much of the discussion converged upon the theological arena, due to the great space that theology had occupied hitherto in the serious studies of mankind. What the men of the New Learning really rebelled against, in fact, was scholasticism, whose essence was the application of *a priori* and syllogistic reasoning not

to testing the validity of the thinking process, but to the enhancement of knowledge and the discovery of Truth; results which, disguise the method as we may, can only be arrived at by induction.

The appeal from the scholastic to the more or less inductive method of theological study speedily led to the abandonment of such a *vade mecum* of the contents of the Bible as the *Sententiae* of Peter Lombard, and a reversion to the Bible text itself. This again led to a demand for that text in its oldest and purest form, and in the original languages in which it was written, Hebrew and Greek, the study of which now received a great impetus everywhere.

The two most famous revivers and disseminators of the study of Hebrew and Greek respectively, as is well known, were John Reuchlin, who was born on the 28th of December, 1455, and Erasmus, who was born ten years later. Reuchlin, who was an accomplished linguist, was the first to introduce the serious study of Greek and Hebrew into the German universities. It was, however, as a Hebrew scholar and as the author of the *Linguae Hebraicae Rudimenta* that his influence was most far-reaching. He was virtually the first Christian writer of the Renaissance who had a scholar's knowledge of Hebrew, the study of which had hitherto been limited to the Jews, and he became steeped in Hebrew thought. His Bible was essentially the Hebrew Bible, which, like Jerome, he treated as the primitive verity, and he opposed to the fashionable scholasticism of the schoolmen a scholasticism of his own, which has been described as a Pythagorean-Platonic-Cabalism, in which he initiated a mystical method of interpreting the Bible in the spirit of the mediaeval Jews. While Reuchlin's Cabalism died with him, his zeal for the Hebrew text of the Bible survived him and became the moving principle of Biblical criticism among the Reformers. He was also an active spirit among the professors, both at Tübingen and Heidelberg, and, what was perhaps more far-reaching, he was one of those who founded the University of Wittenberg, where his grand-nephew and pupil Melancthon became (on his nomination) professor of Hebrew and Greek.

While Reuchlin claimed the privilege exercised by Jerome of criticizing and amending the Biblical text according to the new lights derived from his linguistic studies, it was always in

subordination to the authority of the Church, to which he insisted to the very end that private judgement ought ultimately to submit. He would have nothing to do with Luther's and Melancthon's revolt from the Church, and in fact he virtually disinherited the latter on this very ground. This was also the attitude of most of the prominent Humanists, including their great coryphaeus Erasmus.

Erasmus had views about the relative merits of the Bible books, but he submitted his judgement in the matter to that of the Church. These are the words he used in reply to the censures of the Sorbonne professors on the subject :

'Iuxta sensum humanum nec credo epistolam ad Hebraeos esse Pauli aut Lucae, nec secundam Petri esse Petri, nec Apocalypsin esse Ioannis apostoli. . . . Si tamen titulos recipit Ecclesia, damno dubitationem meam ; plus apud me valet expressum Ecclesiae iudicium quam ullae rationes humanae' (*Declar. ad censuram facult. theol. Paris.* Op. ix 864).

Like the other Humanists, he was willing to press criticism as far as it would go, with one qualification, namely, that it did not transcend the definitions and pronouncements of the Church, which he, like them, deemed to be infallible, and to which he always claimed that he was prepared to submit.

The seed which Reuchlin sowed at Wittenberg fell on fruitful soil. It was natural that a university whose patron was Saint Augustine, and several of whose early professors were Augustinian friars, should cultivate the theological method of Augustine, which was so good an antidote to scholasticism, and should make much of the study of the Bible and of the languages necessary to its complete apprehension. Among the professors were two friends who had been fellow students at Erfurt—Andreas Bodenstein, known from the place of his birth as Karlstadt, and Luther. The former, who was born in 1480, was three years older than the latter. They differed much in temperament and for a time also in views. While Karlstadt was still a devoted propounder and defender of scholasticism, Luther had been early imbued with the thoughts and methods of Augustine and with the fervour and mental habit of the mystic Tauler.

Karlstadt in the year 1505 took his bachelor's degree at

Wittenberg, and in 1507 he published his first book, which was Thomist in every way. It was entitled *De intentionibus*. This—the first work of any moment published by the new university—brought him the Deanery of the Faculty of Arts. It was followed by a second work of the same school, entitled *Distinctiones Thomistae*. In 1510 he became a Doctor of Theology and in that capacity conferred the doctorate on Luther on October 18th, 1512. He still, however, remained a fierce champion of scholasticism. Thus in Luther's *Tischreden* we read:

'Carlstadt und Petrus Lupinus waren in der Erste, da das Evangelium anging, meine heftigsten Widersacher; aber da ich sie mit Disputieren beschloss und ueberwand sie mit den Schriften Augustini und sie denselben gelesen hatten, waren sie viel heftiger in dieser Sache denn ich. Aber die schändliche Hoffart betrog den Carlstadt.'

His views, however, presently took an entirely new turn on this matter, the result of Luther's pertinacious and really overwhelming pleas. The 13th of January, 1517, was a critical day in his career. Let me quote his own words:—

'Profecto cum Lipsim hoc anno Idibus Ianuariis concessissem confestimque sanctissimi Augustini opera mihi empta aperuissem, porciunculas dedita opera adversus memoratum D. Martinum particularim excerpsi, ut ex parte triumpho potirer. Forte fortuna (mihi ingrata) obiecta est sententia, quippe ea, qua arenam scholasticam dispergi et edificium in illa collabascere adverti. Obstupui: obmutui: successui. At festivas vel verius sophisticas commentari solutiunculas evestigio cepi, illi sententiae adversa contrariaque perquirere; nec coherentiam sententiarum magnifeci. Sed R. P. aperta veritas rubore ac verecundia me suffudit. Cognovi enim me in scholasticis mille sententiis deceptum. Asinum ad molam: Cecum ad lapidem et perperam hallucinatum fuisse' (Barge *Andreas Bodenstein, Anlagen* ii 534 N. 5 a).

This change in the fundamental basis of his methods and views naturally drew Karlstadt nearer to Luther, and one result of the change is to be found in a series of 152 theses which the former produced on the 26th of April, 1517, with a general challenge to defend them, and in which his newly adopted Augustinianism is very obvious. These theses were, curiously enough, entirely lost for a long period and were only recently recovered by Kolde, who found them in the Berlin Library (see *Zeitsch. für Kirchengeschichte* xi p. 450 &c.).

Their publication preceded Luther's famous challenge on the question of Indulgences, and they are remarkable for the bold utterance they contain on the relative authority of the Bible and of the Fathers as the basis of theological truth. On this issue Karlstadt defined his position in the first six of the theses, they are as follows:—

1. 'Dicta sanctorum patrum non sunt neganda. 2. Nisi essent correcta vel retractata. 3. Si fuerint diversa non secundum nudum placitum sunt eligenda, contra multos. 4. Sed ea quae divinis testimoniis magis vel ratione iuvantur. 5. Inter suffulta testimoniis praeferuntur quae evidentioribus nituntur autoritatibus. 6. Si varietas inter dicta unius doctoris absque concordia reperitur posteriori standum est'. (See Kolde in *Z. f. Kirchengeschichte* xi 450.)

On these six theses Barge, the admirable biographer of Karlstadt, says very truly:

'Als erste Ansätze zu einer Quellenkritik sind jene Versuche immerhin beachtenswerth' (*op. cit.* i 76).

Thesis 143 shews how far Karlstadt had now travelled from scholasticism. It reads:

'Doctrina Aristotelis in scholis theologorum facit malam mixturam.'

It does not appear that Karlstadt's challenge was accepted by any one. The matter was doubtless treated by the authorities as largely an academic one and very different in importance from such an open challenge of the authority of the Holy See as was made by Luther a few months later; and yet it was singularly premonitory. The issuing of the theses however, with their Augustinian tendency, drew the two professors at Wittenberg still nearer each other.

We find Karlstadt on the 18th of November, 1517, writing in his preface to Augustine's work *De spiritu et litera*:

'Exurrexit dei ope quidam de nostris Venerandus P. Martinus Luther et arcium acutissimus et theologiae doctor acerrimus atque eorundem fratrum per Saxoniam Vicarius, qui meraciores sanctae scripturae literas perdidicit et earum succum ultra fidem epulavit, asserebatque scholasticos doctores et a Christi non solum documentis, sed et intelligentia tam Augustini (cuius documenta frequentius citat) tam aliorum similium esse alienissimos.'

On the other hand, writing to his friend Spalatin on the 18th of January, 1518, Luther says:

'Incipies autem (si mea tibi placent studia) B. Augustinum de Spiritu et litera, quem iam noster Carlstadius, homo studii incomparabilis, explicavit miris explicationibus et edidit.'

We now reach a more critical turn in the road along which the friends were travelling.

According to Melanchthon it was at midday on the 31st of October, 1517, that Luther nailed his own fateful theses to the church door at Wittenberg. These theses, it must be remembered, were written in Latin and not in German and were therefore addressed to scholars and not to the crowd. They formed a compendium of Luther's objections to the whole theory of Indulgences as maintained by the Roman Church at this time, and were framed with pitiless directness.

The sting in the document did not consist so much in its raising issues about the metaphysical doctrine of Indulgences. The Roman Church had been very complacent in regard to the discussion of such issues among the learned, but what Luther's attack meant was a much more practical issue. It was virtually a resuscitation of the policy of reforming the abuses in the administration of the Church, and especially the financial abuses which had been pressed home so much at the Councils of Constance and Basle. The policy in question was bitterly opposed there by the bureaucratic Curia, and by those who had the difficult duty of providing an adequate income for the Holy See, whose necessary expenses were enormous. Hence, very largely, the bitterness with which Luther's attack on the sale of Indulgences (probably the most lucrative of all the Papal sources of income) was immediately met, especially by the militant religious orders, the Janissaries of the Papacy. Luther's theses were presently answered by Dr John Eck, of Ingolstadt, admittedly a controversialist of skill and learning, in a series of what he called 'Obelisks'. These were in the first instance replied to by Luther's recruit and friend Karlstadt in a second series of theses, which were published on May 9th, 1518.

In these theses a remarkable and significant position was for the first time taken up in emphatic terms regarding the authority of the Bible as the ultimate rule of Faith. They prove how in some essential matters of controversy Karlstadt forestalled Luther. Thus in the first thesis we read :

'Textus Bible per Ecclesiasticum doctorem allegatus plus valet ac vehementius urget, quam dictum allegantis.'

In the 12th :

'Textus Bible non modo uni pluribusve Ecclesie doctoribus sed etiam tocius ecclesie auctoritate prefertur.'

In the 13th :

'Capiendo ecclesiam pro fidelium omnium congregatione seu contione.'

In the 14th :

'Premissa intantum procedit, quod dicto doctoris auctoritate canonica communito plusquam declarationi pape credendum est.'

Again in the 17th :

'Bene tamen idem Gerson, sed rursus male tacito imitationis vestigio, affirmavit, quod in sacris literis excellenter erudito et auctoritate intendi plus est credendum quam generali consilio.'

Lastly in the 19th :

'Hoc pulchre ex eius sexta consideratione et prima secundae partis deducitur, scilicet quod sacra scriptura nec fallere nec falli potest.'

In these theses Karlstadt went far beyond what any one had hitherto affirmed as to the supremacy of the Bible over any pronouncement of Pope, or Council, or Church. The nearest approach to it occurs in a work published not long before. This was written by Pupper von Goch, who was born in the beginning of the 15th century, and in 1451 founded the Priory of Augustinian Canons at Thabor, near Mechlin or Malines. In the first chapter of his book on the Bible he says :

'Sola Scriptura Canonica fidem indubiam et irrefragabilem habet auctoritatem. Antiquorum patrum scripta tantum habent auctoritatis, quantum canonicè veritati sunt conformia.'

This looks superficially like what Karlstadt himself said later, as we have seen, but the earlier author qualifies his phrase a few sentences further on, when he says :

'Ecclesie auctoritas est maxima auctoritas, quia ut dicit Augustinus : Si non crederem ecclesiae, non crederem evangelio' (see *Clemen Johann Pupper von Goch* pp. 75, 84).

It is not clear that Karlstadt's pronouncement about the supremacy of the Bible (which was theoretically treated as the ultimate appeal even at Rome) was resented by the Roman

authorities. At all events we do not find that Eck in his subsequent disputations with Karlstadt took exception to it, and Karlstadt himself seems to have held that the appeal involved no breach of orthodoxy. To the *Obelisks* of Eck, Luther also replied in person, in what he called his *Asterisks*. The only passage in the reply which is of any moment to our present purpose is that in which he says :

‘Per totum illud obeliscorum cahos nihil sacrarum literarum, nihil ecclesiasticorum Patrum, nihil Canonum, sed omnia scholasticissima, opiniosissima meraque somnia commiscitur et prorsus ea ipsa, contra quae ego disputo, Ita ut, si vellem et ego peripateticari, uno flatu hos omnes eius pappos dispergerem diceremque illud magistri sui decretum : Petito principii vicium est disputationis seu argumentationis. Sperabam enim quod ex Bibliis vel ecclesiasticis Patribus aut Canonibus contra me pugnaret. At ipse furfures et siliquas Scoti, Gabrielis caeterorumque Scholasticorum (quibus est ventrem refertissimus) mihi nunc demum neganti opponit’ (Luther *Werke* ed. Weimar i 281–282).

This was a vigorous protest against the scholastic methods of conducting theological controversy.

In the latter part of 1518 Luther was assailed for his views on the ecclesiastical authority of the Pope by the official censor, Silvester Mazzolini, in a document which, in his reply, Luther calls ‘Dialogus ille tuus satis superciliosus et plane totus Italicus et Thomisticus’ (*ib.* 647). In his reply to what he calls the ‘solas opiniones Divi Thomae’ upon which Mazzolini rests his case, he refers him to St Augustine’s answer to Jerome :

‘Ego solis eis libris, qui Canonici appellantur, hunc honorem deferre didici, ut nullum scriptorem eorum errasse firmissime credam. Caeteros autem, quantalibet doctrina sanctitateque polleant, non ideo verum esse credo, quia illi sic senserunt,’ etc. (*ib.* 647).

One phrase in this pronouncement was much more far-reaching than would appear at first sight. Luther here appeals not merely to the Bible but to the books he called Canonical as alone binding. As we shall see, this meant with him a very great qualification, since he had already begun to hold views about the Canon which were not those of the Church to which he still belonged, so that he was in effect appealing to a Rule of Faith hitherto unknown to and unrecognized by the Church.

We now reach the famous disputations which took place at

Leipzig in the summer of 1519 between Karlstadt and Eck and Luther and Eck respectively. In a letter written by Eck to Luther at this time, the former calls Karlstadt 'propugnator tuus', and he adds:

'Tu vero principalis existis qui haec dogmata per Germaniam seminasti . . . quasi convenit et te illuc venire et vel tua tueri vel nostra improbare' (Enders i 429: Barge i 140 note).

The discussion between Karlstadt and Eck preceded that with Luther, and commenced on the 27th of June, 1519. It was on the subject of Free Will. In his initiatory protestation Karlstadt makes an avowal shewing that he then deemed himself quite an orthodox churchman. His words are:

'Primo illud testamur et ubique testatum esse volumus, nusquam ab ecclesia catholica ad latum digitum nos velle discedere. Quod si huiusmodi quid deprehendatur, non dedita opera, sed humana inscitia elapsam iam nunc pro recantato haberi volumus. . . . Sacris autem scripturis hunc honorem impendimus: quod nihil sine his aut asserere aut praecipere volumus. In ceteris autem, quae non liquide hinc doceri possunt, solis ecclesiasticis primas damus' (O. Seitz *Der authentische Text der Leipziger Disputation*, Berlin 1903, p. 14).

What is perhaps more remarkable, considering that the discussion took place only a few months before Karlstadt's great work on the Canon was produced, is that Eck should have begun it with an appeal to a book presently pronounced to be apocryphal by Karlstadt.

'Et pro illo primo adduco textum sacrae scripturae adductum in defensione, conclusione 9 Eccl. [Sir.] xv [vv. 14-18],'

and that far from taking exception to its authority Karlstadt should then have accepted it as authoritative (*ib.* pp. 15, 16).

On the 4th of July a much more important discussion commenced at Leipzig between Eck and Luther (see Luther *Werke* ed. Weimar 1884, vol. ii p. 254 &c.). Luther begins his disputation by affirming his adherence to the protestation previously made by Karlstadt and Eck, thus:

'Protestationem utriusque egregii domini et Andree Carolstadii et Iohannis Eckkii amplector et sequor.'

But he continues:

'Hoc unum addo, quod pro reverentia summi Pontificis et Romane

Ecclesie libens hanc materiam non necessariam et mire invidiosam pretermissem, nisi per propositionem egregii d.d. Ioannis Eckii in eam pertractus fuisset,' etc.

The discussion took place upon the following subjects: I, *De potestate immo de primatu Romani pontificis*; II, *De purgatorio*; III, *De indulgentiis*; IV, *De penitentia*.

On the 8th of July, when the subject of purgatory was being discussed, Luther somewhat abruptly said:

'Admitto et illud Machabeorum 2. [2 Macc. xii 45] Sancta est et salubris cogitatio pro defunctis exorare, etc. Sed hoc volo, quod in universa scriptura non habeatur memoria purgatorii, que posset stare in contentione et convincere: nam et liber Machabeorum, cum non sit in canone, pro fidelibus potens est, contra pertinaces nihil facit' (*ib.* p. 324).

Here, then, we have the first direct statement by a Reformer that a book hitherto received by the Church as Canonical, namely, the second of Maccabees, was not in the Canon, and was not to be quoted to prove a doctrinal point.

To Luther's statement just quoted Eck replied:

'De libris Machabeorum, quos dicit facere pro fidelibus, sed non esse in canone, et hoc, inquam, falsum est. quamvis enim apud Hebreos in canone non fuerint, tamen ecclesia recepit eos in canonem, ut pater domini patris Augustinus lib. de civitate dei testatur lib: 18. et sanctus Ipho in suis decretis constitutionem inserit, qua ecclesia libros illos in canonem recepit' (*ib.* p. 324):—

an argument which seems to me to appeal unassailably to all churchmen who base their position on primitive tradition.

Luther in turn replied:

'Primum quod egregius d. d. dicit, non ideo aliquid negandum esse de scriptura, quia pertinaces convinci non possint, optime et verissime dicit: sed loquor ego de his pertinacibus, qui nos nostra auctoritate et proprio iaculo confodere possunt. Evidens enim est, librum Machabeorum pertinere ad vetus testamentum: quando ergo sanctus Hieronymus canonem hebreum conscripserit et eos solos libros valere in contentione, qui de canone sunt, definiat sitque in hac sua sententia receptus, facile nostro telo verberabimur nisi fidelibus persuadeamus.

Secundo probat librum Machabeorum esse receptum in canonem: contendit ad equivocationem et facile concordabimur. Scio, quod ecclesia recipit hunc librum, et hoc dixi: sed non potest ecclesia plus tribuere auctoritatis aut firmitatis libro quam per seipsum habeat, sicut et ceterorum patrum opuscula approbat et recipit, sed non ideo con-

firmat aut meliora reddit. Transeo ergo ista, que in multis dicuntur canon et canon' (*ib.* p. 325).

Here we have the first statement by Luther of the criterion by which he deemed a book to be Canonical. According to this statement, such a book affirms its own authority and needs no other witness but itself.

The discussion was resumed on the following day, the 9th of July, by Eck, who, in regard to the equivocation alleged by Luther, says very truly :

'Quod vero divinatur canonis equivocacionem, non patior, quoniam Augustinus in illo li: 18 de civitate dei eundem terminum maxime in puncto adversativo non potuit equivocare dicendo, quod non fuerit in canone apud Hebreos, sed apud ecclesiam. Deinde exploratum est, cum plura essent evangelia scripta, auctoritate ecclesie quatuor in canonem recepta, et sic libros Machabeorum receptos testatur prologus: tamen ab ecclesia inter divinorum voluminum annotantur historias' (*ib.* p. 326).

Eck goes on to say :

'Quia se fundat in hoc, quod purgatorium non sit in sacris literis expressum, contra quod est concilii Florentini decretum, quod et Greci abnegato errore assumpserunt.'

This appeal to the Council of Florence is to the decision of that Council on the subject of Purgatory, when the second book of Maccabees, ch. 12, was specially quoted. Thus we read in Mansi vol. xxxi supplement p. 1662, who prints the discussion and says of this matter :

'Declaratur primo ex veteri testamento in libro Machabeorum, ubi dicitur: Sancta et salubris est cogitatio pro defunctis exorare, ut a peccatis solvantur,' etc.

To return to Eck, however; a few paragraphs further on he again says :

'Quare nedum in libris Machabeorum, quod utique ecclesie sufficeret.'

To this Luther again replies :

'Quod canonem ego equivocaverim contra Augustinum, lib. 18. c. 26. coegit me divus Hieronymus, item Eusebius in historia ecclesiastica recensens et antiquorum auctoritates. ideo stat equivocatio, cum aliter Augustinus aliter Hieronymus de antiquioribus de canone sentiunt, et per consequens nullum robor argumenti in contentione relictum est. An prologus Hieronymi inter divina volumina libros Machabeorum enumeret, non memini.'

Here Luther seems entirely to throw over the authority of Jerome, and quotes him and Augustine against each other in a very unceremonious way; deducing from the process that neither of them has any authority to decide what is Canonical.

He presently goes on to say:

'Post hoc dicit, contra concilium Florentinum esse, quod purgatorium non sit in scriptura expressum. Respondeo: concilium non potest facere de scriptura esse, quod non est de scriptura natura sua, sicut nec ecclesia potuit facere Evangelia, etiamsi approbavit Evangelia' (*ib.* p. 329).

Again Eck replies:

'Tertio ad Augustinum dicit de libris Machabeorum, fortiozem opponendo beatum Hieronymum. At Hieronymus nullibi negat libros Machabeorum apud ecclesiam esse de canone bible, quin in prologo hoc constanter asserit, fuit annotatum inter divinorum voluminum historias. quare opusculis sanctorum patrum in can: Sancta Romana, 15. dis: non debuit equiparari. Cum vero ei opposuissem de concilio Florentino, respondet, concilium non posse facere aliquid esse de scriptura quod non sit, hoc quidem verum, sed quid hoc est? Concilium tam laudabile tanta temeritate contaminare, ut hoc absurdum decernat. Cum vero doctissimi fuerint in eo concilio viri, malo credere concilio quod a spiritu sancto regitur quam domino Luthero, non quod concilium faciat aliquid de scriptura quod non sit, sed quod credam concilium melius habere sensum et intelligentiam scripturarum decernendo hoc esse de scriptura quod in scriptura reperitur . . . propter peccata venialia et propter peccata mortalia, tamen contrita, in purgatorio puniuntur, quod ex Machabeis accipimus, dum inquit: Sancta et salubris est ergo cogitatio pro defunctis exorare, ut a peccatis solvantur. hi enim, qui occisi fuerant et pro quibus Iudas Machabeus oblationes fecit, peccaverant mortaliter propter spolia idolorum, quamvis credantur penituisse in ipsa cede, iuxta glossam ordinariam ibidem. et illud psalmi: Cum occideret eos, querebant eo' (*ib.* pp. 335, 336).

Luther again replies, saying:

'Ad aliud, de canone librorum, ubi, nixus Hieronymi et concilii Florentini auctoritate, mavult credere concilio quod a Spiritu sancto regitur quam mihi, ei gratias ago. Pie enim sapit: nunquam volui mihi credi. sed respondeo breviter. conciliet ipse primum Hieronymum sibi, qui in prologo galeato Machabeorum libros et nonnullos alios manifeste inter Apocrypha recenset, qua auctoritate fit, ut mihi liber Machabeorum sit gratus et probatus, sed contentiosis pateat ad repulsam.'

Presently the discussion turned on Indulgences, when Eck quoted in favour of them from the same book :

‘Non semper pro culpa sed etiam pro pena culpe debita usurpatur, sicut apud Machabeos, ut a peccatis solvantur (2 Macc. xii 46), quod de culpa nequit intelligi mortali, sed de pena culpe debita’ (*ib.* p. 350).

In his answer, Luther on this occasion does not raise any question about the validity of the book, but has an effective reply on the substantive issue. He says :

‘Transeo illud, quod remissionem peccatorum intelligit remissionem penarum, cum sepe peccatum pro pena accipiatur, Macch. xii. Ego non sepe invenio peccatum pro pena accipi, nisi forte ubi de Christo scribitur, quod peccata nostra ipse portavit, quod tamen et ipsum non ausim dicere simpliciter pro pena accipi’ (*ib.* p. 355).

It seems to me that in regard to the Canon and what constitutes Biblical authority Luther had much the worst of this discussion, in which Eck falls back upon a very reasonable support, namely, the authority and tradition of the Church, while Luther offers no definite criterion, quoting Jerome when he wishes to outflank Augustine, but falling back in substance upon subjective arguments, which in such a matter are useless as well as dangerous.

It is an interesting fact that earlier in the same year in which this disputation took place, Luther published a small tract entitled *Eine kurze Unterweisung, wie man beichten soll*. As an appendix to this tract, he published a translation of the Prayer of Manasses with the heading *Des Konygs Manasses gebeth tzu der beicht ser dienstlich*, and in the body of the tract, after quoting Ps. xxv 11, he goes on to say :

‘. . . wie denn des menicklich weyter erinnerung ausz des konigs Manasses tzu Juda gebeth nemen mag. Welches gebeth, weil es ser wol tzu der beicht dient, mag es ein utslichs christlichs mensch vor seiner beicht sprechen.’

It is strange that among Luther’s very earliest Bible translations should be this prayer, which has been excluded from the canon by Roman Catholics and Protestants alike, and, as I believe, on quite inadequate grounds.

Meanwhile, the first of the quarrels which marked Luther’s intercourse with some of his early friends who, like himself, were rebelling against Rome, began to break out at Wittenberg ; and

it was about a very critical matter, namely, the canonical authority of certain books. We can only gather by inference what took place, but it would seem that Luther, in his lectures to the students, argued with great freedom of language that certain books, especially some New Testament books, were not to be treated as authoritative, although hitherto universally received as such, and this was especially the case with the Epistle of St James.

Luther's great doctrinal anchor was of course an exaggerated appeal to Justification by Faith and Faith alone, and in order to meet the strong pronouncement on the other side of St James's Epistle on the subject, he did not scruple to pour contempt on that book. Karlstadt, who devoted the summer term of 1520 to lecturing on the same Epistle, apparently maintained its canonicity in vigorous language, and there arose a feud and rivalry which extended to their respective students. During the year 1520 (perhaps in the early part of that year) Luther published a tract entitled *De captivitate babylonica ecclesiae*, in which, speaking of James v 14 in regard to the sacrament of Extreme Unction he uses the words :

'Omitto enim, quod hanc Epistolam non esse Apostoli Iacobi nec apostolico spiritu dignam multi valde probabiliter asserant, licet consuetudine autoritatem, cuiuscunque sit, obtinuerit. Tamen si etiam esset Apostoli Iacobi, dicerem, non licere Apostolum sua autoritate sacramentum instituere' (Luther *Werke*, Weimar, vi 568).

This attitude of Luther meant his adoption of the most extreme theories of individual private judgement in deciding upon the canonicity of a Bible book. It in fact reduced the whole matter to a mere subjective question of personal caprice and choice, in which any good Christian might decide the most critical of all questions by internal illumination alone. It apparently aroused the animosity and dread of Karlstadt, who had a more logical mind and who saw that by such a process all authority would eventually be dissolved away. Everybody must in fact either become an infallible Pope to himself or else accept Luther as an infallible Pope. This was apparently (although it has not been generally noticed) the motive Karlstadt had for writing his very remarkable work on the Canon which appeared in the course of the year 1520, and was the first attempt to deal with the problem in modern times in a scientific way. In

this work he makes a very pointed attack on Luther, although he does not mention him by name. As the passage is historic, marking a crisis in the history of the Canon as viewed by the Continental Reformers, and hardly known in England, I propose to give it at length:—

‘At si scriptores tot historiarum sunt incerti et nos hodie latent, nihil tamen minus reputantur, quam apocryphii, qui fit, quod nonnulli pronuntiant apocryphas Epistolas, quarum autores ignorantur? Hodie huius rei specie, ni fallor, propter Carolstadium, male Iacobus audit; conatus eius, uti magis devotus quam religiosus et quam veridicus, laceratur, quicumque is Iacobus fuerit, cuius epistola tanquam catholica circumfertur. Hoc certum est, ea, quae in illa scribuntur epistola, in libris (praeter omnem recusationem) canonicis scribi, vel saltem inibi aut elici aut confirmari posse. Reijciuntur autem dicta Iacobi, quia ipse forsitan eum explanandum susceperam, itaque cum interprete, sermo veteribus admodum acceptus commutatur; discipulis caeco praeceptorum amore raptis, totam Iacobi epistolam contemnentibus, qui existimant iure lacerandum quod fortasse nonnullorum procacitas dilacerat. Pervenerunt plerique (sibi sua persuasione magni) in eam insaniam, ut epistolam illam Hieronymo inscriberent, in eam dementia (nimio praeceptorum honore) ducti, magnus videri vult, qui dixit eam epistolam Hieronymi non Iacobi fuisse, qua tamen facetia homo ridiculus (quantum gravitatem simulet) imprudens ostendit, quam accurate Hieronymi gustaverit stylum, quot denique lineas in eo traxerit. Neniis illius boni sacerdotis, veteris amicitiae nostrae discidia aliquamdiu sum passus, neque iam amicitiam bene conservatam ledere conabar neque carissimis alioqui atque eruditissimis quicquam (quod eos male habeat) vel obflare cupio. Verum non possum non diluere frivola illius presbiteri argumenta, quibus eruditam Iacobi epistolam obruit, odio fortasse mei incensus; allegat phrasim clemens ille dominus, rumpar si uspiam Iacobi Apostoli stylum, quantum ad orationis pertinet structuram, legit; demus autem esse Iacobi sed non Apostoli. Licuit ideo illi auditores fastidiis Iacobinae Epistolae inflammare? atque ab auditorio subtrahere? Iam ego discipulos alloquar. Cur quaeso in Iacobi epistola fastiditis addiscere, quod in Evangelicis, quod in Apostolicis, quod in Mosaicis, quod in prophetis libris non audetis fastidire? Contemptusne fuerit (mulctandus paenitudine) an Christiana religio, velle in Iacobo obiicere, ab ecclesiis recepto, quod aliis in codicibus colligere deberes? Praeterea si, Hieronymo duce, de Iacobo coepistis dubitare, fueritne Iacobus is Apostolus? cur eundem non emulamini ducem, dum affirmat eandem illius epistolam autoritatis dignitatem usu et vetustate commeruisse? et cum eam dicit ab apocryphia suspitione

vindicatam antiquitus? Cur adeo sumus in abiiciendos autores propensi, quos maiores nostri coluerunt, et quos multis nominibus defendere possumus, et quos denique dumtaxat titulo respuimus, et aliis in voluminibus aliaque sub specie cohonestamus? Incertum esse fateor Iacobum Epistolae scriptorem, at non itidem obscuram epistolae dignitatem concedo. Porro, si eatenus incerti nomen auctoris perturbat, cur non epistolam ad Hebraeos doctissimam (dato repudii libello) relegatis? nimirum cum par sit causa utramque reiiciendi. Deinceps quantum pertinet ad historiae descriptionem, dubitant Hebraei, quisnam Mosaicos exceperit libros, non tamen uspiam aliquis fuit ausus ambigere de librorum autoritate. Postremo, si Iudaeis permittitis, quod, in recipiendo, libros comprobant, cur tantundem iuris recusatis ecclesiis Christi dare, quando Ecclesia non sit minor quam synagoga? Nisi me nescio quid capiat ausim dicere: si Evangelicas Matthaei literas interpretandas accepissem, eandem iniuriam passas fuisse propter Carolstadium, quia dubitatur a pluribus an Chaldaeo an Hebraico sermone fuerint scriptae. Hoc minime dico, quod velim quempiam retaliare aut latam contumeliam in auctores regerere, sed eo, deum testor, animo, quod mea prorsus simplicitate aliter sentire de receptis literis non quaeo, nisi quod nos ad sui custodiam urgeant. Neque tamen eandem auctoritatem eis libris de quorum auctoribus disceptatur, et quorum certos auctores scimus, concesserim, sed in sacra auctoritatis et dignitatis aula primas, secundas et tertias invenio et posteriores velim superioribus caedere, primas autem occupantibus, imperii ius in singulos habere. Neque tamen tertias qui possident, extra dignitatis domum proscribere.'

This remarkable pronouncement, as I have said, is contained in a remarkable work, namely Karlstadt's treatise on the Bible Canon, which Credner has shewn was published in August, 1520. It was entitled *De Canonicis Scripturis Libellus*. It is now extremely scarce. A copy does not exist in the British Museum except as a reprint in an appendix to Credner's work on the Canon. Contemporaneously with it, Karlstadt published a small epitome of it in the vernacular which was entitled *Welche Bucher biblisch seint. Disses Buchlein leret unterscheyd zwueschen biblischen Buchern und unbiblischen, darinnen viel geyrret haben und noch yrren. Dartzu weissset das Buchlin, welcher Bucher in der Biblien ersilich seint zu lesen*. The important work, above mentioned, he dedicates *eminenti viro D. Guolphgango Kuchio*, who was the Priest of Joachimsthal, and in the dedication he tells him he proposes to explain to him about the Catholic scriptures:—

'Nempe quod sunt quaedam apta contioni, sed concertationi non

admodum congrua, nonnulla sola vetustate meruerunt auctoritatem, quibus, nisi fallor, iure praeferemus, quae et antiquitate et auctoritate invaluerunt, quorum ordinem atque dignitatem, quantum nunc sinunt negocia, bis humeris incumbentia, recensebo.'

In this work Karlstadt emphasizes and enlarges upon the views of Scripture which he had set out in his thesis two years before. It begins with a paragraph fitly headed *Qualis sit scripturae maiestas*, and proceeds in what is in part a paraphrase of Augustine to pronounce a eulogium upon the Bible as the most incomparable of all works, and speaks of it in hyperbolic language as :

'Divina lex una et sola extra omnem erroris suspicionem posita, caeteras universas in suam ditionem trahit, aut omnino perdit si renituntur';

and he proceeds in biting terms to denounce those who mingled human traditions with it :

'Quid hic pontificibus, quid nonnullis doctoribus dicam, qui farinas suas sacris libris immiscuerunt, qui repurgatum triticum, qui casta et emuncta domini eloquia suis doctrinis, suis traditionibus foedaverunt?'

He then turns to those who claimed that while the Bible was excellent it did not nevertheless contain all things necessary for salvation, and thus reports their contention :

'Bone Deus, bona datis verba, atque tandem persuadebitis, non omnes praeceptiones (ad vitam perpetuam indispensandam) necessarias, in divina lege conscriptas, atque consequenter non esse sufficientem legem divinam.'

He denounces the notion that the decrees of God as to the duty of man need to be supplemented and sophisticated by human agencies, some of which had distorted it, while others had reduced religion to formalism :

'Ore et labiis deum colit, corde longius amotus.'

He concludes therefore :

'Scripturam sanctam esse fortissimam omnium, quoniam traditiones hominum sapientium, etiam eorum, qui leges colendi et timendi Dei constituunt . . . perdit . . . Haec vis, hi aculei, hoc robur, hic valor literarum, haec illarum veritas et inconcussa maiestas ut solis eis Christianus vacet et invigilet.'

And he goes on severely to blame those who pronounced people to be heretics and worthy to be burnt in the fire for disobeying (not the Scripture) but the works of the schoolmen :

'Franciscani Alexandrum de Hales ob doctrinam, Scotum ob ingenii subtilitatem, Bonaventuram ob sanctimoniam ad coelum tollunt';

and he deems Augustine to have been fortunate in having lived so long before, or he would certainly have been himself treated as a heretic. He goes further, and says of what he calls the very pillars of the Church:

'In Augustino, in Hieronymo, in Ambrosio, in Gregorio, in Cyrillo, in Chrysostomo et in caeteris scriptoribus, multa comperimus, quae dubitamus, plura videmus obeliscis expungenda, non pauca itidem boni consulenda.'

He denies that the right interpretation of Scripture is limited to priests, bishops, or pontiffs, and defines his position in a remarkable sentence, considering the year when it was published:

'Addidi quoque ad omnes interpretationes scripturae pertinere. Id sic intellectum volo, quod omnes quibus dominus deus illud muneris interpretandae scripturae largitur, possunt scripturam interpretari, sive sit laicus, sive clerus, sive prophanus, sive sacer.'

Karlstadt then proceeds to argue, chiefly basing his view on that of Augustine, that Councils were superior to popes and other bishops:

'Sequitur ex Augustino similiter, quod Concilium est supra singulos Episcopos et principes, supraque Romanum Pontificem et imperatorem'; and inasmuch as provincial Councils can err, and be corrected by plenary, general or universal Councils, and similarly since later general Councils can correct earlier ones, as Augustine affirms, it follows, to use Karlstadt's words:

'Concilium plerarium aberrare posse, et quod non omnia spiritus sanctus fuerit elocutus, et quod consulto patiat deus interdum deviare plerarium concilium';

and he consequently concludes that the Sacred Scriptures are superior to all Bishops and all Councils. He then argues at more length that ancient and continuous custom and tradition must similarly give way to the dicta of the Bible. His words are:

'His itaque satis constat quomodo omnes omnium Ecclesiarum consuetudines sacra scriptura demolitur.'

Lastly, he contends that the very prayers of the Church, however venerable, must conform to Scripture or be discarded.

'Nulla etiam Ecclesiae precula, etiamsi est vetustissima et per multa Monachorum labia profecta, digna fuerit usa, quae sacris literis discrepat.'

Having thus placed the Bible at the very source of all authority in theological discussion, as he had in fact done in his theses, and as he had been followed in doing by Luther, he proceeds to analyse the authority of the several Bible books, and for the first time in modern days to examine in detail and scientifically the fundamental question of what ought to constitute canonical authority in a book. In his initial postulate as to Canonicity, it is probable that, like Luther and others, Karlstadt was influenced very largely by Reuchlin, who, following St Jerome, deemed the Hebrew Old Testament to be the primitive verity. It is very probable that Reuchlin's view on the question extended not merely to the text but to the Canon, although his professed submission to the Church in all things prevented him from maintaining publicly the cause of the Hebrew Canon against that accepted by the Church. Karlstadt had no such scruples, and he avowedly accepted the Hebrew Canon as alone authoritative, just as we have seen that Luther did. Karlstadt's words are:

'Apud Hebraeos quidam conservabatur Canon, in quo canonici libri habebantur, quibus indubitata fidem debemus.'

This being his fundamental position, he next turns to the definition and connotation of the term Apocrypha, which, like Luther, he uses in a different sense from that afterwards prevailing: *αποκρυφος* or *αποκρυφιος* means, he affirms, that which is concealed or occult, and whose origin is unknown (*'dicitur valde latens et occultus, cuius origo ignoratur'*); and he continues:

'Dicitur autem liber occultus, cuius authorem ignoramus et quem hominum consensus e librorum familia submovit. Nam libri capiunt autoritatem vel ab ipsis autoribus, vel ab usu.'

Karlstadt, like others, had a difficulty in equating the etymological meaning of the word with its theological sense, and he sharply denies that a book is to be deemed apocryphal, as Jerome seems to say, when its author is unknown, since that would imply that a book like the Epistle to the Hebrews was apocryphal.

'Neque valeo', he says, *'Hieronymi commune dictum dissimulare dicentis, quod Apocrypha nescit Ecclesia, id est; Ecclesia respuit occulta et latentia vel volumina vel documenta. Hoc si verum est,*

necessum est nos infitari omnes libros apocryphos esse, de quorum auctoribus ambigitur; quoniam quidem conspicuum fuerit, dubitatum, cuius sit Epistola ad Hebraeos, quae tamen, ut est doctissima, omnibus Christianorum ecclesiis usu venit, atque omnium consensu probatur';

and he puts Jerome on the horns of a dilemma when he says:

'Aut falsum fatebimur, Ecclesiam apocrypha nescire; aut anonymos esse apocryphos negabimus; aut ecclesiam eis uti, quibus universis videntibus utitur. Igitur Epistolam incerti auctoris et usus et vetustas approbare potest, tametsi ignoratur eius auctor. Super hac re Hieronymus adeo perplexus scripsisse visus est, ut etiam doctissimus vix queat extricare duo haec: Ecclesia nescit apocrypha, et multi libri, quorum nescimus auctores, usu et vetustate auctoritatem meruerunt. Proinde nihil ex definito hic contendo, sed apocryphorum librorum iudicium sub tuum iudicium posueram.'

In this matter of the Apocrypha he prefers to follow Augustine (whose pronouncement is not, however, too clear in the matter). Karlstadt says himself:

'Neque nomen auctoris firmum librum, neque incertus auctor Apocryphum libellum facit, sed oportet quod illum Canon habeat, hunc vero respuat. Haec meo iudicio videtur August. opinari, si modo passim et accurate legatur. Iccirco canonicum codicem dicemus, quem inter receptos libros connumeratum spectamus.'

Having thus defined his position on two main factors of the problem, Karlstadt proceeds to criticize Augustine's theory of the Canon, and, as Barge says, he was the first among the reformers to question the authority of that Father. His difference with Augustine arose, of course, in respect of whether the early Christian Canon which Augustine accepted, or the Hebrew Canon maintained by Jerome and supported by Karlstadt, was the authoritative one. With this contention in view, he proceeds to criticize Augustine's Canon.

Augustine, in enumerating the Old Testament books of Moses, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, four books of Kings, and two of Paralipomena, says of the last:

'Non consequentibus sed quasi a latere adiunctis simulque pergentibus.'

He then goes on to say:

'Sunt aliae tanquam ex diverso ordine, quae neque huic ordini neque inter se connectuntur, sicut est Iob et Thobias, Hester et Iudith,

Machabaeorum libri duo et Esdras duo, qui magis subsequi videntur ordinatam illam historiam, usque ad regnorum vel paralipomenon terminatam.'

From these words Karlstadt seems to deduce the quite unwarranted conclusion that Augustine in some way made a distinction in canonical authority between these books (which he styles *secundus ordo*) and those before cited; whereas he merely pointed out the disconnexion of their narrative compared with the continuous historical story as told in the previous books. Inspired by his views on the Hebrew Canon, Karlstadt strongly objects to Augustine's joining Job with the other books in his second class, and continues:

'Ipse autem viderit Augustinus, si tantum ius Tobiae, Iudith et Machabaeorum codicibus concedere potuit, verum an censoria virgula praenotari debeant, ex iis, quae Hieronymo censore adiciemus, perspicitur, neque silendum puto, hodie nostris in libris eiusmodi autores seiunctos esse, et ab hoc ordine submotos, nempe quod omnium veterum postremus est Machabaeorum.'

He then says:

'Esdrae vero duos libros addunt, id quod nescio si licuerit. Esdras filius Saraie, filii Helchie, Neemias filius Helchie, duos libros occupant. Quamquam fortasse dictio sermonis unum scriptorem ostendit, duo tamen libri diversorumque existimantur . . . Quod certe non assequor cogitatu, quia ipse Augustinus tantum duos esse Esdrae libros fassus est, itaque quoniam caeteri duo apocryphii censentur, me latet qui fecerit, ut tercia libri sensum ascisceret.'

It is clear that Karlstadt did not understand that what Augustine meant were the books styled Esdras A and B in the Greek manuscripts, that is to say, the so-called apocryphal Esdras I of our Bibles and the joint books of Ezra-Nehemiah, possibly first separated for the Christians by Jerome. Karlstadt then continues:

'De Machabaeorum libris idem Augustinus eodem capitulo sic iudicat: "Machabaeorum libros non Iudaei, sed Ecclesia pro canonicis habet" quod sane dubiosum fuerit.'

Here we see, especially in the concluding phrase, how far from Augustine's standpoint Karlstadt's attachment to the Jewish Canon had led him, especially in the last clause, where he objects to Augustine's appeal from the Hebrew Canon to the Canon of the Church as illegitimate.

Turning to the third class of books in which Augustine puts all the rest, namely the Prophets, he questions that Father's statement about the Psalms, as contained in book xvii, ch. 14, of the *De Civitate Dei*. Augustine there says that the Psalms of David are 150 in number, of which, he adds, some will have it that only those which bear his name are really David's, while others deem that only those specially entitled *ipsius David*, and not the rest styled *ipsi David*, belong to him. To such writers Augustine had replied:

'Quae opinio voce Evangelica Salvatoris ipsius refutatur, ubi ait, quod ipse David in Spiritu Christum dixerit esse suum dominum, quoniam psalmus centesimus nonus sic incipit. . . Et certe idem psalmus non habet in titulo: ipsius David sed ipsi David sicut plurimi.'

To this Karlstadt answers:

'Mihi autem credibilibus videntur existimare, qui omnes centum quinquaginta psalmos eius operi tribuunt, eumque aliquos praenotasse etiam nominibus aliorum, aliquid, quod ad rem pertineat, figurantibus, caeteros autem nullius hominis nomen in titulis habere voluisse, sicut ei varietatis huius dispositionem quamvis latebrosam, non tamen inanem dominus inspiravit. Nec movere debet, ad hoc non credendum, quod nonnullorum nomina prophetarum, qui longe post David regis tempora fuerunt, quibusdam psalmis in eo libro leguntur inscripta, et quae ibi dicuntur, velut ab eis dici videntur. Neque enim non potuit propheticus spiritus prophetanti regi David haec etiam futurorum prophetarum nomina revelare, ut rex aliquid, quod eorum persone conveniret, propheticè cantaret, sicut rex Iosias exorturus et regnurus post annos amplius quam trecentos cuidam prophetae, qui etiam facta eius futura praedixit, cum suo nomine revelatus est.'

This is a remarkable sample of Biblical criticism, considering the date at which it was published, and clearly forestalls methods of a much later time.

Augustine, having attributed the three books of Proverbs, Canticles, and Ecclesiastes to Solomon, goes on to say that Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom were commonly assigned to him from their style. Although the more learned did not admit this, yet, he continues:

'In auctoritatem maxime occidentalis recepit ecclesia. In libro Sapientiae passio Christi apertissime prophetatur. . . In Ecclesiastico fides gentium futura praedicatur.'

Upon this phrase Karlstadt comments :—

‘Equidem aut urgeor eo, quod occidentali Ecclesiae tam eminentem autoritatem tribuerit, ut soli liceat canonicos libros facere: Porro si Sapientia et Ecclesiasticus nondum ab orientali Ecclesia sunt recepti, non sunt Catholici, id est non sunt universales, ab omnibus scilicet ecclesiis accepti. Deinceps in libro Retractionum secundo c. 4, constanter negat Ihesum filium Sirach autorem sapientiae. Sapientiae liber fuit quondam ab inimicis Augustini, quasi parum canonicus, repulsus, quibus quid eius rei gratia responderit adnotare malui.’

He then quotes from Augustine’s *liber de praedestinatione Sanctorum* xiv :

‘Fratres istos ita respuisse (viz. Wisd. iv 11) dixistis, tanquam de libro non canonico adhibitum, quasi excepta illius libri attestatione, res ipsa non sit clara. . . . Quae tamen cum ita sit non debuit repudiari sententia libri, qui meruit in Ecclesia Christi de gradu electorum Ecclesiae Christi, tam longa annositate recitari et ab omnibus Christianis, ab Episcopis usque ad extremos laicos fideles, penitentes catechumenos cum veneratione divinae autoritatis audiri. . . . Sed qui sententiis tractatorum instrui volunt, oportet ut istum librum Sapientiae omnibus tractatoribus anteponan, quoniam sibi anteposuerunt proximi Apostolorum egregii tractatores, qui eum testem adhibentes, nihil se adhibere nisi divinum testimonium crediderunt.’

To this Karlstadt replies :

‘Haec ille, quibus, opinor, praecipue docet, ne scientes prophana testimonia, tanquam divina assumamus Vae et iterum vae illis, qui per industriam non sacra pro sanctis, inepta pro aptis adferunt, devincendi hostis causa; qui, quicquid dixerint, hoc legem dicendi putant nec scire dignantur, quid prophetae quid Apostoli senserint, sed ad suum sensum incongrua aptant testimonia, quasi non sit sacrilegium depravare sententias et ad suam voluntatem repugnantem scripturam trahere. Deinde tantae fortitudinis Sapientiae librum existimat, quod olim doctorum ecclesiae cervices eo comprimentur. Postea (a fine rependo) ex quotidiano et veteri usu Sapientiae codicem probavit. . . . Nam si perpetuus et longevus ecclesiae clamor ususque posset exercitas in ecclesia sentiuntias confirmare, omnium pessime firmarentur praeces. Nam quidem eis, quum vix detergendo podici convenirent, et oculos et aures feriunt et spiritum confricant. Absit igitur ut ex ea et admodum frivola defensione Sapientiae codex sit defensus et in Canonem coassumptus. At illud impense sapientiam canonizat, quod ea continet, quae in literis reliquis (citra omnem controversiam canonicis) continentur, quapropter addidit non semel ista verbula. Quasi et excepta

illius libri contestatione, res ipsa non clareat ex aliis dei testimoniis, quam volumus docere.'

He then goes on to quote Jerome's *Tract. advers. Pelag.* lib. i, where he says :

'Ac ne forte volumini sapientiae contradicas, audi Apostolum Evangelica clangentem tuba';

and adds :

'Hic manifeste negat canonicum esse sapientiae volumen, dicitque id vulgo Salomonis inscribi et Ihesu filii Sirach; consequitur ergo, quod est et incerti auctoris et non canonicum';

and he scouts the notion of quoting Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom against Moses or Christ or the Apostles, and concludes :

'Valent igitur sapientiae dicta in exercitu posita, etiamsi velut singula et seiuncta quorundam haereticorum colla non auxerint. Id autem quod nunc in Ecclesiastico et Sapientia duxi iudicandum, idem de reliquis libris obscure canonicis opinor custodiendum.'

Here again he is all through championing the Hebrew Canon.

Having thus discarded the guidance of Augustine in favour of the Hebrew Canonical Scriptures, Karlstadt turns to Jerome, who did accept the Hebrew Canon and its division into the Law, the Prophets, and the Hagiographa. He points out, however, the inconsistencies in which Jerome is himself entangled by his adherence to Church authority. Jerome had two main criteria of canonicity. Karlstadt states his position thus :

'Ultimo dicit Hieronymus, hoc prologo (i. e. the *Prologus Galeatus*) scire debemus, quicquid extra hos libros est, apocryphum esse. Hoc palam fatetur hic caeleberrimus scriptor quod prius coniectura assequeretur, scilicet non sequi protinus: Hic liber est certi auctoris, igitur non apocryphus; item isthic liber est auctori incerto inscriptus, ergo est apocryphus; quoniam in manifesto est, librum Thobiae et Iudith et Machabaeorum certorum auctorum esse, non tamen canonici, sed apocryphi censentur.

Secundum Hieronymi sententiam censebimus apocryphum unumquemque librum veteris testamenti in prioribus non numeratum. Ergo est apocryphus: Sapientiae liber, item Ecclesiastici, item Baruch, item Iudith, item Thobiae, item Machabaeorum. Hoc die lucide confitetur Hieronymus.'

To these criteria of Jerome, Karlstadt replies :

'Nunc autem, ut de meo quiddam adiitiam, constat incertitudinem auctoris non facere apocrypha scripta, nec certum autorem reddere

canonicas scripturas, sed quod solus canon libros (quos respuit) apocryphos facit, sive habeant autores et nomina sive non. Addamus multos libros certos esse, quantum ad rem gestam pertinet, verum quantum ad enarratorem rei transactae spectat, de multis canonicis literis ambigenter possumus loqui.'

He then cites and discusses at some length the authorship of the five books of Moses. He denies that Moses was their author, and adduces very similar arguments to those with which modern writers have made us familiar.

Nor will he allow that Ezra was their author either, and adds, 'ex iis autem nunc adductis autorem historiae Mosaicae scriptorem incertum esse et latentem probavi, neque inter Iudaeos convenire.' Nor do we know, he says, who wrote the books of Judges, Samuel, or Kings.

Karlstadt then turns to the second criterion of Jerome and puts together some contradictory statements in which he is entangled. Thus Jerome claims that only the books enumerated in his *Prologus Galeatus* are to be deemed canonical. These include only the books accepted by the Jews, excluding all others as apocryphal. On the other hand he declares that the Church does not recognize apocryphal books, 'apocrypha nescit Ecclesia' (Preface to Chronicles). The Church, however, admits such books as Judith, Tobias, Wisdom, &c., &c., into its Canon. Upon this palpable contradiction Karlstadt dilates with considerable point,—

'Vellem', he says, 'hac de re magis audire, quam loqui. Conspicuum enim est, quam se Hieronymus tricus implicat. Audimus item, quoties librorum (quos canon complectitur) in Ecclesia concinnantur testimonia. Ecclesia ergo apocryphos non modo scire sed etiam approbare usu vincitur, nisi ita dicatur, quod Ecclesia eiusmodi libros ad concertationem et pugnam non aptat.'

To the plea that although accepted by the Church for edification they were not accepted as canonical and to be used in controversy (which Jerome affirms especially of the books of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus), Karlstadt replies that in his controversy with the Pelagians he quotes the authority of Wisdom against them.

This quotation occurs in Jerome's work *adversus Pelagianos* lib. i. 33, where he adds, 'Ac ne forte huic volumini contradicas

audi Apostolum.' This phrase virtually challenges the Pelagians to accept the quotation in question or proclaim themselves heretics, and Karlstadt neatly asks whether, according to Jerome, 'haereticus pronuntiari vel possit vel debeat, qui solis Tobiae, Iudith, Sapientiae, Ecclesiastici et Machabaeorum aculeis ferientibus nihil caedit.'

Having thus discarded the guidance of Augustine and Jerome, Karlstadt proceeds to set out his own theory of the Canon. As I have said, he accepts the Jewish Canon of the Old Testament intact, and in this follows Jerome in his *Prologus Galeatus*. He nowhere, however, justifies or tries to justify this very arbitrary choice against the continuous tradition of the Christian Church in east and west, but like Jerome takes it for granted that the Jews must have been right and the early Christians wrong.

Having arbitrarily accepted the Jewish Canon against the Christian one, he goes on to classify the Bible books accepted by the Jews, in a fashion very like that followed by them. In the first class, *primus ordo canonis*, he puts the five books of Moses, to which they gave a special sanctity, and which, like them, he calls 'the Thora' or the Law.

In the next class, the *secundus ordo canonis* (answering to the Prophets among the Jews), he puts Joshua, Judges, Ruth, the four books of Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, and with a certain hesitation, Daniel; and, lastly, the twelve lesser prophets. Daniel seems to embarrass him, but he finally concludes by putting him among the prophetic books. He says of the book:

'Hic ego novitate teneor, hic defixus cogitatione moror, hic omnia circumspicio: Danielelem autem quem Hieronymus philistorum, id est cognoscendi cupidum, quia vir desideriorum dicitur, Daniel 9, nusquam reperio inter prophetas.'

He then goes on to point out that Jerome is inconsistent in his treatment of Daniel. 'Nempe,' he says, 'interdum inter agiographos, non prophetas eum censet, nonnunquam vero dicit Danielelem inter quatuor prophetas extremum esse.' He also points out how Augustine and Jerome are at issue in regard to the so-called additions to Daniel and their authority, and he does not mince his phrases:

'Illud autem operae pretium arbitror, ut miremur, ne dicam, miseremur fraterculorum superstitionem reverentiam, quorum ductu pro

certis incerta, pro receptis apocrypha, pro laudatis deridenda multos iam annos, velut leges, consecramur. Nam irrisionem meretur is, qui hebraeorum canonem sese amplecti iactat, quique nolit sic latum quidem unguem a libris veteris legis discedere, et ea ipsa, quae non modo non habent hebraei sed repudiant, et quasi ronchis eiiciunt, complectitur atque defendit. Nemo non scit, quot conentionibus trium puerorum cantum sacerdotes insibilant, quem tamen hebraeorum volumina neque continent neque admittunt; fateamur universa vera esse, legem tamen habemus veterem suis septis conclusam, cui nec iota fuerit vel adiiciendum, vel detrahendum, vel immutandum. Quamlibet autem pia fuerint, puerorum cantica apud Iudaeos non habentur, atque sic non parva pars capitis tertii Danielis velut extranea a canonicis scripturis seiungitur. Duo similiter extrema capita Danielis tanquam fictitiae fabulae sunt repulsae. Caeterum ut brevior sim, consecutum me reor illam tertii capitis partem: et ambulabant in medio flammae etc., atque ultima duo capita prorsus apocrypha fuisse, atque eiusmodi hodie aestimanda.'

In his third class, *tertius ordo canonis*, he puts what he calls the agiographi, 'hoc est eos sanctos scriptores, quos in canonis inferiori parte digessere.' Here again, he follows his Jewish guides, from whom he also takes over the term Hagiographa. They comprise Job, Psalms, the three books of Solomon, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, the two books of Chronicles, and Esdras (which, he says, among the Greeks and Latins was divided into two books, Ezra and Nehemiah), and he adds:

'Nec apocryphorum tertii et quarti libri somniis delectetur, quia et apud Hebraeos Esdrae et Neemiae sermo in unum volumen coartatur. Et quae non habentur apud illos, nec de viginti quatuor senioribus sunt, procul abiicienda. Esdra hebraicis literis sed chaldaeo sermone conscriptus.'

Then follows 'Hester' of which he says:

'Nonum Hester in ecclesiae typo populum liberat a periculo. Librum eius variis translatoribus constat esse vitiatum in quo sunt addita, quae ex tempore dici potuerunt. Ideo cavendum ne consarcinata verba, velut ipsas canonicas literas, consecreris, circumspecte et cum delectu contemplare.'

This completes his list of the twenty-two books of the Old Testament, contained in the Jewish Canon, and which was determined among them by the number of letters in the Jewish alphabet.

In regard to the Canon as he accepted it from the Jews, Karlstadt in fact made no innovations, but was perfectly consistent.

He then turns to the books of the Old Testament received by the Church as Canonical, which he rejects from the Canon as not being accepted by the Jews: These he divides in his own fashion into two classes, of which he gives the following lists, with the glosses attached:

Wisdom.	} These are <i>apocryphi</i> , he says, i.e. outside the Hebrew Canon, nevertheless <i>agiographi</i> ('Hi sunt apocryphi, i.e. extra canonem hebraeorum, tamen agiographi').
Ecclesiasticus.	
Judith.	
Tobias.	
Two books of Maccabees.	
The two later books of Esdras.	} These books are plainly apocryphal ('Hi sunt plane apocryphi, virgis censoriis animadvertendi').
Baruch.	
The Prayer of Manasses.	
A large part of the third chapter of Daniel.	
The two last chapters of Daniel.	

Of this last he says:

'Magnum inter istos libros discrimen est. Nam Iudaei libros plane apocryphos irrisionibus et lusionibus insartunt, eosque sic contemptos abiiciunt.'

Of the Prayer of Manasses he says: 'nec est in Hebraeo neque de textu Bibliorum', and he proceeds to give some examples of what he deems a contradiction between its statements and those of other biblical books.

Whence he concludes:

'Ideo oratio sane suspitiosa. Porro demus multa bona in ea contineri, non tamen ex ea Christianorum infantia formari debet. Nam pius animus illis libris ceu quibusdam incunabulis est applicandus, qui omni carent suspitione, qui possunt quemquam extra fidei damna offerre. Postremo demiror, eiusmodi orationem gladii iugulatam placuisse.'

In regard to the two later books of Esdras, as he calls them, he says:

'Tertius et Quartus Esdrae deridentur' (a phrase which is an echo of Jerome) 'in quibus (quanquam id tacuit) Augustinus legis iram et aculeos, item concupiscentiae incendia atque Adami veteris adnisus, ac

denique nonnulla admirabilia digna certa Theologica tractatione conspicatus, mutuari videtur.'

He thus, like Jerome, seems to confound these two books as if their contents had anything in common. Of Tobias, Wisdom, and Ecclesiasticus he says: 'Sunt in libris Tobiae, Sapientiae et Ecclesiastici, quibus sua sunt fortissima, in scriptura, firmamenta.' Of Baruch he says:

'Baruch Notarius fuit Hieremiae prophetae qui apud hebraeos nec legitur nec recipitur secundum Hieronymum Tomo 4 fol. 11. Ideo tametsi sententias verissimas teneat, tamen velim, quia mens tenerior firmioribus palis primum applicaretur, alioqui contra Iudaeos pugnaturi merito paciemur salsa nimis scornata.'

In regard to the New Testament, Karlstadt accepts all the books as canonical, which had been deemed canonical in the Roman Church. He, however, separates them into three classes. In the first he puts the four Gospels, 'Evangelicas lampades, sive, si magis cupis, totius veritatis divinae clarissima lumina.' In the second, the 13 epistles of Paul, the first Epistle of Peter and the first of John, the authorship of all of which he deemed to be certainly known, and which were generally received as apostolical. In the third class, which he put into a lower grade, 'In tertium et infirmum auctoritatis divinae locum,' he places the Epistle of James, the second Epistle of Peter, the two last of John, and the Epistle to the Hebrews. 'Non,' he says, 'quod velim hanc istis inferiorem pronuntiare, sed ideo illis connumeravi, quod de eius autore dubitatur, quemadmodum de reliquarum (quas recensui) epistolarum autoribus ab olim dubitatum est. Adde et Apocalypsim.' This third class he thus treats as quite authoritative and canonical.

Of the six Epistles first named in this class he says: 'Auctoritatem apostolicam et divinam habuerunt a proximis Apostolorum temporibus.' In regard to the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse he says: 'Multos annos post decessum apostolorum, praesertim apud Rhomanos auctoritatem sanctam demeruerunt.'

It is curious that Karlstadt nowhere mentions the Acts of the Apostles in his somewhat elaborate dissection of the New Testament books. Whether this was due to an oversight or to premeditation I do not know, but it seems probable to me that it was entirely due to an oversight.

This completes my analysis of Karlstadt's very important and notable work, the first one produced by any champion of the Reformation in which the Canon was critically treated, and in which the books of the Bible are classified according to their supposed inspiration and authority, and in which a list of books was first separated from the rest, as contained in the Vulgate, and deliberately styled *apocrypha*. The term Apocrypha is used, however, as equivalent not to spurious but to non-canonical, a sense which speedily became perverted. It is plain, therefore, that Karlstadt, in regard to the Canon, was a great deal more logical than Luther. In regard to both Testaments he merely took over the Canon as it was theoretically accepted by Jerome, who however as regards the Old Testament put aside his own view in deference to the decision of the Church.

This is a very different position from that of his colleague and rival, Luther, who fell back upon no tradition and no criterion save his own internal illumination and inspiration, and his own subjective opinion as to what a canonical book ought to be; which in effect meant that in order to be accepted by him it must equate itself with his *a priori* dogmatic position. It is a pity that Karlstadt's views on the Canon were so much put in the shade among the early German Reformers by the transcendental arguments of Luther.

Let us now pass on.

The first complete Reformers' Bible was prepared by Andreas Osiander, the Lutheran evangelist, who converted the Prussian knights to the New Faith, and whose niece Cranmer married. In this Bible the Jewish Canon of the Old Testament was also adopted, probably in consequence of Karlstadt's arguments. It was published in December, 1522. It was a new edition of Jerome's Vulgate in Latin, professedly corrected in a few places from the Hebrew. It adopted Jerome's theory of the Canon, and included his prefaces to the various books. There is no initial list of books in this Bible. In it the Prayer of Manasses follows immediately after the second book of Chronicles. It is headed *Oratio Manasse regis iuda*, while in the margin are the words *non est ī hebraeo*. Esdras III and IV are headed *Posteriores hi duo libri Esdrae nō sunt canonici nec habent apud hebraeos*, while the fourth is specially headed *Quartus liber Esdrae qui et ipse inter Apocrypha cōputat*.

In the margin of Tobias we also read *non est canonicū*. Judith has no marginal note. The fragments of Esther are separated from the main text of the book and printed at the end of it, each with Jerome's preface. To Job, in addition to Jerome's preface, we have another, headed *argumentum incerti auctoris*. To the Psalter there are two prefaces in addition to Jerome's, each headed *alius prologus*. Wisdom is headed *Liber Sapient*. *Liber Sapientiae apud hebraeos nusquā est*. Ecclesiasticus, in addition to Jerome's prologue, has a second which is worth recalling. It is headed *Incipit prologus Rhabani in librum Ecclesiasticum*, and is as follows:—

'Librum Iesu filii Sirach dicit se Hieronymus reperisse apud hebraeos: nō ecclesiasticum ut apud latinos: sed parabolas praenotatum: cui iuncti erant Ecclesiastes et canticum canticorum, ut salomonē non modo librorum numero; sed et materiae genere coaequaret, librum vero sapientiae se non reperisse apud eos: sed magis graecam adolere eloquentiam quē nonnulli philonis esse affirmant. Ecclesiasticus vero sicut ecclesiastes ecclesiae utillissimus est: qui congregator vel collector interpretatur sicut ille cōcinator. Sed ecclesiastes ad Christū refert et ad quemlibet praedicatorē ecclesiasticus. qui propter excellentiā virtutū suarū panaeritos. id est omnium virtutum capax appellatur. Cuius tanta claritas tātaq̄ latinitas est: ut ipse sibi commentasit.'

Ecclesiasticus is followed by the prayer of Solomon, headed *Oratio Salomonis* without any preface or note, and this by Isaiah. Then comes Jeremiah with Jerome's prologue and a short paragraph headed *vita eiusdem*. Then follows Lamentations.

Baruch follows immediately on Lamentations, and is headed *Praefatio in librū Baruch prophetae*.

'Liber iste q̄ barech noīe praenotatur in hebraeo canone nō habet: sed tantum in vulgata aeditione: similiter et epistola hieremiae. Propter notitiam aut̄ legentiū hic scripta sunt: quia multa de christo novissimis temporibus indicant.'

The so-called additions to Daniel are curiously enough incorporated in the text without note or comment. To the two books of Maccabees are appended Jerome's prologue and also a second one headed *alius prologus* as follows:—

'Machabaeorū libri licet nō habeantur in canone hebraeorū: tamen ab ecclesia inter divinūs voluminē annotantur̄ historias. Praenotat aut̄ praelia inter hebraeorum duces gētesque persarum: pugnam

quoque Sabbatorū et nobiles Machabaei triumphos: foedus quoque amicitiarū cū romanorū ducibus atque legationū. Machabaei septem fratres ab una matre Machabaea noīe geniti: custodiētes legem patris traditione: non manducantes carnē porcinam: ob hoc ab Antiocho rege sevissimo in Antiochia martyrii gloria coronati sunt iū matre sua atque sepulti cum magna veneratione ibi quiescunt.’

In the New Testament Luther’s order of the books (*vide infra*) is not adopted. It ends with a long paragraph with a singular heading:

‘De libris utriusque testamenti: partim reiectis: aut non sine contradictione admissis: partim apocryphis: ex athanasio: tametsi mihi suspectus est titulus: Erasmo roterodamo interprete.’

Then follows a translation of Athanasius’s criticism of the value of the various Bible books. It is curious that in this Bible the four Evangelists are followed by the Pauline Epistles and these by the Acts.

Let us now return to Luther. It was on Friday, April 26, 1521, that he left Worms after rejecting the Emperor’s demand for a recantation unless he was refuted by scriptural testimonies or by clear arguments, for he declared he believed neither the Pope nor the Councils alone, since both had erred and contradicted each other. He claimed to have been convinced by the passages of Scripture he had cited, that his conscience was controlled by the word of God, and that it was dangerous to act against conscience. This appeal seemed to him no doubt to necessitate as speedy a translation of the Bible into the vulgar tongue as possible, so that every man might have the materials for forming a judgement on matters so nearly concerning himself, and he now hastened on with his translation of the New Testament which he deemed to be most pressingly needed. He based his translation, which was completed in three months, on the second edition of the Greek Testament of Erasmus. The first edition of Luther’s New Testament appeared in September and the second in December, 1522. To this New Testament he added an introduction in which he very clearly sets out how he applied his subjective method of exegesis. It is headed *Wilchs die rechten und edlisten bucher des neuen testaments sind*. Then follows:—

‘Aus disem allen kanstu nu recht urteylen unter allen buchern, und unterscheyd nehmen, wilchs die besten sind, Denn nemlich ist

Iohannis Euangelion vnd Sanct Paulus Episteln, sonderlich die zu den Romern, und sanct Peters erste Epistel der rechte kern uñ marck vnter allen buchern, wilche auch billich die ersten seyn sollten, Vñ eym iglichen Christen zu ratten were, das er dieselben am ersten vnd aller meysten lese, vnd yhm durch teglich leszen so gemeyn mechte, als das teglich brott, Denn ynn disen findistu nicht viel werck vnd wunderthatten Christi beschrieben, Du findist aber gar meysterlich auszgestrichen, wie der glawbe an Christum sund, tod vnd helle vberwindet, vnd das leben, gerechtigkeit vnd seligkeit gibt, wilchs die rechte artt ist des Evangeli, wie du gehoret hast.

Denn wo ich yhn der eyns mangelln sollt, der werck odder der predigt Christi, szo wollt ich lieber der werck, denn seyner predigt mangelln, Denn die werck hulffen myr nichts, aber seyne wort die geben das leben, wie erselbs sagt. Weyl nu Johannes gar wenig werck vō Christo, aber gar viel seyner predigt schreybt, widderumb die andern drey Euangelisten viel seyner werck, wenig seyner wort beschreyben, ist Iohannis Euangelion das eynige zartte recht hewbt Euangelion vñ den andern dreyen weyt weyt fur zu zihen vñ hoher zu hebē, Also auch Sanct Paulus vñ Petrus Episteln weyt vber die drey Euangelia Matthei, Marci vnd Luce furgehen.

Summa, Sanct Iohannis Euangeli vnd seyne erste Epistel, Sanct Paulus Epistel, sonderlich die zu den Romern, Galatern, Ephesern, vnd Sanct Peters erste Epistel, das sind die bucher, die dyr Christum zeygen, vnd alles leren, das dir zu wissen nott und selig ist, ob du schon kein ander buch noch lere nummer sehest noch horist, Darumb ist Sanct Jacobs Epistel eyn rechte stroern Epistel gegen sie, denn sie doch keyn Euangelisch art an yhr hat, Doch dauon weytter ynn andern vorrheden.'

In his list of books of the New Testament printed on the back of this preface he gives the names of twenty-three which are all numbered. From these, separated by a space and unnumbered, he detaches four books, namely the Epistle to the Hebrews, those of James and Jude, and the Apocalypse, which he thus puts into a class apart. Not only so, but he takes them out of the usual Bible order and prints them together at the end of the New Testament, and in the preface to the Hebrews he says definitely:

'Bisher haben wyr die rechten gewissen hewbt bucher des newē testaments gehabt, Dise vier nachfolgēde aber habē vor zeytten eyn ander ansehen gehabt, Vnd auff's erst, das dise Epistel zu den Ebreern nicht Sanct Paulus noch eynigs Apostel sey, beweyset sich dabey, das ym andern capitel stehet also, Dise lere ist' etc.

While he treats it as later than the Apostolic writings, and of unknown authorship, and heads it merely *Die Epistel an die Ebreer*, and professes to point out certain passages in the sixth, tenth, and twelfth chapters which are inconsistent with all the Evangelists and St Paul's Epistles, he nevertheless gives it high praise.

To the Epistles of James and Jude he prints a common preface, which begins with a very depreciatory notice of the former Epistle. *Inter alia* he says :

‘ . . . acht ich sie fur keyns Apostelschrifft, vnnd ist das meyn vrsach. Auffs erst, das sie stracks widder Sanct Paulum vnnd alle ander schrifft, den wercken die rechtfertigung gibt, vnd spricht, Abraham sey [etc.] . . . Darumb diser mangel schleust, das sie keyns Apostel sey.

‘ Auff ander, das sie will Christen leutt leren, vnnd gedenckt nicht eyn mal ynn solcher langer lere, des leydens, der aufferstehung, des geysts Christi, er nennet Christum ettlich mal, aber er leret nichts vō yhm, sondern sagt von gemeynem glawbē an Gott.’

He then proceeds to define his criterion, a purely subjective one, of what a book ought to be if it was to be accepted as completely authoritative, or, in other words, canonical :

‘ Deñ das ampt eyns rechten Apostel ist, das er von Christus leyden vñ aufferstehen vnd ampt predige, vnnd lege des selben glawbens grund, wie er selb sagt Iohan 18. yhr werdet vō myr zeugen, Vnd daryn stymmen alle rechtschaffene heylige bucher vber eyns, das sie alle sampt Christum predigen vnd treyben, Auch ist das der rechte prufesteyn alle bucher zu taddelln, weñ man sihet, ob sie Christū treyben, odder nit, Syntemal alle schrifft Christum zeyget Ro. 3. vnnd Paulus nichts denn Christum wissen will. 1. Cor. 2. Was Christum nicht leret, das ist nicht Apostolisch, wens gleich Petrus odder Paulus leret, Widerumb, was Christum predigt, das ist Apostolisch, wens gleych Iudas, Annas, Pilatus vnd Herodes thett.’

Assuredly a more elastic, uncertain, and arbitrary rule of canonicity was never invented. Presently he continues :

‘ Darumb will ich yhn nicht haben ynn meyer Bibel ynn der zahl der rechten hewbtbücher, will aber damit niemant weren, das er yhn setz vnd hebe, wie es yhn gelustet, denn es viel guter spruch sonst drynnen sind, Eyn man ist kein man ynn weltlichen sachen, wie solt deñ diszer eyntzeler, nur alleyn widder Paulum vnnd alle andere schrifft gelten?’

In his *Tischreden*, or Commonplace book, we find him writing thus of the Epistle of St James :

‘Viele haben gearbeit, sich bemühet, und darüber geschwitzet, über der Epistel S. Jacobi dass sie dieselbige mit S. Paulo verglichen. Wie denn Ph. Mel. in der Apologia etwas davon handelt, aber nicht mit einem Ernst; denn es ist stracks wider einander, Glaube macht gerecht, und Glaube macht nicht gerecht. Wer die zusammen reimen kann dem will ich mein Baret aufsetzen, und will mich einen Narren schelten lassen’ (Luther *Sämtl. Werke*, Erlangen, lxii 127).

Of the Epistle of Jude he says :

‘Die Epistel aber Sanct Iudas, kan niemand leugnen, das eyn austzog oder abschrift ist aus Sanct. Peters ander Epistel, so der selben alle wort fast gleich sind. Auch so redet er von den Apostelln, als eyn iunger lengist hernach, Vnd furet auch spruch vnd geschicht, die yñ der schrift nyrgend stehen, wilchs auch die alten veter bewegt hat, dise Epistel aus der hewptschrift zu werffen, Datzu so ist der Apostel Iudas ynn kriechische sprach nit komē, sondern ynn Persen landt, als man sagt, das er ia nicht kriechissch hatt geschrieben. Darumb ob ich sie wol preysse, ist doch eyn vnnotige Epistel vnter die hewbtbücher zu rechen, die des glawbens grund legen sollen.’

In regard to the Apocalypse Luther in the preface to the book says :

‘An diesem buch der offnbarung Iohannis, las ich auch yderman seynes synnes walden, will niemand an meyn dunckel odder urteyl verpunden haben, Ich sage was ich fule, Myr mangellt an diesem buch nit eynerley, das ichs wider Apostolisch noch prophetisch hallte, Auffß erst vnnd aller meyst, das die Apostell nicht mit gesichten vmbgehen, sondern mit klaren und durren wortten weyssagen, wie Petrus, Paulus, Christus ym Euangelio auch thun, denn es auch dem Apostolischē ampt gepurt, klerlich vñ on bild odder gesicht vō Christo vñ seynem thun zu reden. Auch so ist keyn Prophet ym allten testament, schweyg ym newen, der so gar durch vnd durch mit gesichten vnd bilden handelt, das ichs fast gleich bey myr achte dem vierden buch Esdras, vnd aller dinge nicht spuren kan, das es von dem heyligen geyst gestellet sey. Datzu dunckt mich das alltzu viel seyn, das es so hartt solch seyn eygen buch, mehr denn keyn ander heylige bucher thun Endlich, haltt dauon yderman, was yhm seyn geyst gibt, meyn geyst kan sich yñ das buch nicht schicken, Vñ ist myr die vrsach gnug, das ich seyn nicht hoch achte, das Christus drynnen widder geleret noch erkandt wirt, wilchs doch zu thun fur allen dingen eyn Apostel schuldig ist, wie er sagt Act. 1. yhr solt meyne zeugē seyn, Darumb bleyb ich bey den buchern, die myr Christum hell vñ reyn dar geben.¹

¹ This was published in 1522. In his complete Bible of 1534 Luther modified his previous preface to Revelation. He then writes : ‘So lange solche weissagungē

In these statements Luther affirmed that the Bible needed no warranty from the Church, but warranted itself; that it was in fact an impertinence to attempt to buttress or defend a divine message by human testimony of any kind, and that the Almighty had given to His faithful people the innate power of recognizing and accepting without doubt or fear the divine and inspired character of any book.

It must be said that an appeal from history and tradition to the personal inspiration and direct illumination of every good Christian man on such a subject, seems to me an appeal both to a dangerous and to a very uncertain tribunal; unless we are to understand that every good Christian man is divinely protected against the frailties of human error, and becomes infallible when he has to decide questions of dogma and faith. This last postulate would assuredly be hard to equate with the incessant clamour of rival Christian sects fighting over almost every conceivable issue in religion.

It is perfectly clear from these facts that Luther had not only definitely cut himself off from the Church, but had entirely discarded the Church's, and everybody else's, Canon of the Bible, and also the criteria by which that Canon had hitherto been determined. It was no question with him of accepting or rejecting the Hebrew Canon of the Old Testament, and sheltering behind the arguments of Jerome. It was a definite breach with all Church tradition in East and West, in respect even of the New Testament itself. Nor did he attempt like Karlstadt to make a scientific analysis of the evidence *pro* and *contra*, apart altogether from his own personal equation and the influences of his pre-conceived theories. Basing his views as to what was the essence

vngedeutt bleibet, vnd keine gewisse auslegung krigt, ists eine verborgene stumme weissagung, vnd noch nicht zu jrem nutz und frucht komen, den sie der Christenheit geben sol, wie denn auch diesem Buch bisher gegangen, Es haben wol viel sich dran versucht, Aber bis auf den heutigen tag nichts gewisses auff bracht, etlich viel vngeschickts dinges, aus jrem kopff hinein gebrewet. Vmb solcher vngewissen auslegung vnd verborgen verstands willen, haben wirs bisher auch lassen ligen, sonderlich weil es auch bey etlichen alten Vetern geachtet, das nicht Sanct Iohannes des Apostels sey, wie in libro. iij. Hist. Ecclesi. xxv. stehet, In welchem zweifel wirs fur vns auch noch lassen bleiben, Damit doch niemand gewehret sein sol, das ers halte für Sanct Iohannis des Apostels, odder wie er wil. Weil wir aber dennoch gerne die deutung odder auslegung gewis hetten, wollen wir den andern und höhern geistern vrsachen nach zu denken geben,' etc.

of Christianity upon his own interpretation of Paul's theological position, especially on the subject of Justification by Faith, he poured contempt and ignominy on at least four books of the New Testament which he considered to contain teaching inconsistent with that of Paul, and placed the books in question in a suspense account at the end of the New Testament; thus basing his Canon on the preposterous pedestal of his own arbitrary whim, or rather upon the arbitrary choice of every chance reader of the Bible who might answer the description of a godly man.

Let us now turn to Luther's treatment of the Old Testament. On this also he had views which were very personal to himself. He claimed that the virtue of an Old Testament book must be measured entirely by its bearing on evangelical doctrine, as he says 'Wir erleuchten die alte Heilige Schrift durch das Evangelium' (*Werke* iv 1728), and adds quite frankly, in his commentary on the Psalms, 'Quodsi adversam Scripturam verse sunt contra Christum nos urgemus Christum contra Scripturam.' He accordingly measured the canonicity of the various books by this test.

The first volume of Luther's translation of the Old Testament was published in 1523 at Wittenberg. It contains only the Pentateuch, but on the back of the title-page is a list of the contents of the whole Bible, as he no doubt intended eventually to issue it. In this list, after the twelve minor prophets, and therefore at the end of the Jewish Canon of the Old Testament, we have the following list of books, printed without any heading, and separated by an interval from the other books: Thobia, Iudith, Baruch, Esra, Das buch der Weyssheyt, Weyseman, Machabeus.

It is quite plain therefore that in 1523 Luther had, in regard to the Old Testament, fully adopted the principle, which he afterwards carried out, of separating the so-called apocryphal books into a special and inferior class, and printing them apart at the end of the canonical books of the Old Testament.

The second volume of Luther's first edition of the Old Testament was published in 1523, or early in 1524, and contains the historical books from Joshua to Esther in the following order: Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah and Esther. As Panzer has noticed, the book of Esther in the table of contents to the volume is put before Ezra and Nehemiah.

The third part of the same Bible was also first published in 1524, and contains the book of Job, the Psalter, and the books attributed to Solomon. In the list of books at the beginning of this volume the Prophets are also given, shewing that it was probably his original intention to include them, but, as he confesses, he found the book of Job more difficult than he expected, and therefore postponed it. The books are printed in this order: Job, the Psalter, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Canticles.

In 1525 Tyndale printed his New Testament, the text of which, as has been shewn by several writers, was largely dependent on that of Luther. What is more important is, that, as I pointed out in my previous paper, he copied Luther in printing the four critical books, which the latter had placed at the end of the New Testament, and he defined them in his prefixed list in the same way. He does not mention Luther, but he has the latter's prefaces in view in his own. Thus in regard to the Epistle to the Hebrews he says: 'Whether it were Paul's or no I say not, but permit it to other men's judgements; neither think I it to be an article of any man's faith, but that a man may doubt of the author. . . . But in spite of these doubts this epistle ought no more to be refused for a holy, godly and catholic than the other Catholic scriptures.'¹

In regard to the Epistle of James, he says 'Though it were refused in old times and denied by many to be the Epistle of a very Apostle, and *though also it lay not the foundation of the Church of Christ, methinketh it ought of right to be taken for Holy Scripture*'.

'As for the Epistle of Judas,' he says, 'though men have and yet do doubt of the author, I see not but that it ought to have the authority of Holy Scripture.'

Meanwhile there appeared in the years 1524-1526 at Strassburg an edition of the Aldine Greek Bible under the auspices of the reformers. In the *Ratio Partitionis* in this Bible, as pointed out by Dr Nestle, we have the interesting and remarkable heading:

'Proinde in partitione & serie voluminum sequuti sumus. M. Lutherum, unum illum & præstantissimum sacrarum literarū PHOENICEM.

¹ It is a noteworthy fact that in the list of contents of the first edition of Tyndale's Testament, of which only a fragment remains, the Epistle to the Hebrews is not attributed to St Paul and is merely headed 'the pistle to the Ebraes'. There is no extant table of the contents to the second edition, but the book itself is headed there the 'pistle off Paul unto the Hebraes'.

qui eū ordinē, quem hic uides, in Germanica sua Bibliorum uersione, obseruauit. Vnde & quos Apocryphos uocant libros, omnes ad finem in unū fascem collegimus, sunt enim tales, qui in hebræis Biblijs non sunt quique in ordinem redacti, in omnibus fide digni non sunt. Quos et eo consilio seiunximus, ut qui uolet in priuū libellū seponere queat.'

Accordingly on pp. 264 ff of the third volume of this work we have the heading ΑΠΟΚΡΥΦΟΙ αὐτὰ παρ' Εβραίων (*sic*) ἐκ τοῦ τῶν ἀξιοπιστῶν ἀριθμοῦ συγκαθίστανται. Then follow Tobit, Judeth (*sic*), Baruch, the Epistle of Jeremiah, the Song of the Three Children, Esdras, Wisdom, Sirach, Susanna, the Dragon, the three books of the Maccabees, and Josephus on the Maccabees (*op. cit.*, see also *Septuaginta* iii (1899) 7 and 8; iv (1903) 14). It does not contain the Prayer of Manasses, and very oddly it contains the fourth, but not the third, book of Esdras.¹

It seems plain, from the fact that Luther's translation of the Apocrypha was not printed till 1534, that is to say, until eight years after the appearance of the Strassburg Greek Bible, that the above reference to his arrangement of the Apocrypha merely meant that the editor had followed Luther's example in separating the so-called apocryphal books from the rest and printing them together, instead of in their usual order in the Greek Bibles; for the list of apocryphal books given by Luther in the volume cited, and that given in the Strassburg Aldine Bible, are not the same.

There is a curious equation between the lists, however, which I have not seen noticed. In Luther's he inserts the enigmatical name 'Esdras' between Baruch and Wisdom, where if the name occurred at all we should expect to find Esdras III and IV. It is curious, as we have seen, that in the Strassburg Bible only one of these two books is in fact printed, i.e. the book of Esdras IV, so that in that particular Bible the only book in the so-called Apocrypha whose absolute claim to be in the Canon is indisputable is left out altogether.

It is curious that this Bible, which follows Luther in regard to the Old Testament Canon, and also adopts the order of the Prophets in the Hebrew Bible, ignores Luther's treatment of the New Testament books.

¹ On the other hand, it claims to give us a 4th and additional book of Maccabees for the first time. In the table of contents these books are thus described Μακκαβαίων λόγος τρεῖς. Ἰωσήπου περὶ μακκαβαίων.

To return to Luther; in 1532 he issued the Prophets in a fourth volume, forming part iv of his complete Bible. They were printed in the following order: Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Michah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi. In Daniel he follows the Hebrew text, excluding the so-called additions. This completed what he deemed to be the canonical books. Of those he styled apocryphal he had many years before, as we have seen, printed a translation of the Prayer of Manasses. In 1529 he published a translation of the so-called Wisdom of Solomon, about which he wrote to Spalatin :

‘Ego verti librum sapientiae dum raucatione . . . cruciarer : is statim exhibet meliorē faciē, quam sit in Latinis et Graecis originalibus.’

In 1533 he published a translation of Jesus Sirach and also of the first book of Maccabees, together with Susanna and Bel and the Dragon.

About the same time he brought out a translation of the book of Judith, of which a reprint appeared at Magdeburg in 1534 (see Scholl *Geschichte der Teutschen Bibel-Uebersetzung D. Martin Luthers* p. 71).

The Apocrypha were originally intended to form the fifth part of Luther's translation of the Old Testament. That part never appeared separately, but in the first complete edition of Luther's Bible, which appeared in two folio volumes in 1534, the Apocrypha are printed at the end of the Old Testament books. It is noteworthy that the list of apocryphal books given at the beginning of this Bible does not quite agree with that printed on the fly-leaf of the edition of the Pentateuch above mentioned. The two lists are as follows :—

Pentateuch of 1523-4	Bible of 1534
Thobia	Iudith
Iudith	Das buch der Weisheit
Baruch	Tobia
Esra	Jesus Syrach
Das buch der Weyssheyt	Baruch
Weyseman	Maccabeorum
Machabaeus	Stücke jnn Esther vnd Daniel

It will be specially noticed that the name Esra has dropped

out in the latter list, and Luther in fact nowhere printed the third and fourth books of Esdras nor the third or fourth of Maccabees. The Prayer of Manasses, although not named in either list, is duly printed at the end of the apocryphal books, each of which had a preface.

There is, however, no justification given for separating the Apocrypha from the other Bible books except the general heading 'Apocrypha. Das sind Bücher: so nicht der heiligen Schrift gleich gehalten: vnd doch nützlich vnd gut zu lesen sind'.

Let us now consider some of Luther's judgements upon the Old Testament books. He did not scruple to extend his sifting process, from the books he called apocryphal, to some at least of those which were fully accepted by the Jews in his time, while he speaks very slightly of others. Thus in regard to the books of Kings and Chronicles he says in his *Tischreden* :

'Die Bücher der Könige gehen hundert tausend Schritt fur dem, der die Chronika beschrieben hat, denn er hat nur die Summa und fůhnehmsten Stück und Geschicht angezeigt, was schlecht und gering, hat er ubergangen; darumb ist den Büchern der Könige mehr zu glůuben denn der Chroniken' (Luther *Sámtl. Werke*, Erlangen, lxii 132).

Again, he says in the same work :

'Liber Esther, quamvis hunc habent in canone, dignior omnibus me iudice, qui extra canonem haberetur';

and further we read :

'Und da er, der Doctor, das ander Buch der Maccabäer corrigirte, sprach er; Ich bin dem Buch und Esther so feind, dass ich wollte, sie wären gar nicht vorhanden; denn sie judenzen zu sehr, und haben viel heidnische Unart' (*ib.* 131).

Of Ecclesiastes again he says :

'Diess Buch sollt völliger sein, ihm ist zu viel abgebrochen, es hat weder Stiefel noch Sporn, es reitet nur in Socken, gleichwie ich, da ich noch im Kloster war' (*ib.* 128).

Speaking of its attribution to Solomon he says :

'So hat er selbst das Buch, den Prediger, nicht geschrieben, sondern ist zur Zeit der Maccabäer von Sirach gemacht. Es ist aber ein sehr gut Buch' (*ib.* 128).

In his preface to Proverbs he says of the Canticles :

'Item, das hohelied Salomo siehet auch als ein gestickt Buch, von andern auch Salomos Munde genommen. Daher auch keine Ordnung

in diesen Büchern gehalten ist; sondern eins ins andre gemenet, wie sie es nicht alles zu einer Zeit, noch auf einmal von ihm gehört haben: wie solcher Bücher art seyn muss.'

Again, in his *Tischreden* he says of the Prophet Jonah:

'Diese Historia des Propheten Jonas ist so gross, dass sie schier ungläublich ist, ja, lautet lügerlich und ungereimpter, denn irgend der Poeten Fabeln eine, und wenn sie nicht in der Bibel stünde, so lacht ichs wie einer Lügen. Denn wenn man ihm will nachdenken, wie er drei Tage in dem grossen Bauche des Wallfisches gewesen sei, da er doch in dreien Stunden hätte können verdauet, und in des Wallfisches Natur, Fleisch und Blut verwandelt werden . . . heisst das nicht mitten im Tode leben? also, dass gegen diesem Mirakel das Wunderzeichen im rothen Meer nichts sei. Es geht auch eben närrisch zu. Darnach, da er nu erlöset und errettet war, fährt er an zu zörnen und zu expostuliren, und sich unnütz zu machen umb eines geringen Dinges willen, nämlich umb ein Gräslein. Es ist ein gross Geheimniss; ich schäme mich meiner Auslegung über dieser Propheten, dass ich den Häupthandel und Zweck des Wunderwerks so schwächlich gerühret habe' (*op. cit.* 148).

Again, later on in paragraph 2684 he says:

'Diese Historie (von Jonas) soll uns der höchsten Trost einer und ein Zeichen der Auferstehung der Todten sein, sie ist sehr lügerlich; ich selbst gläubts nicht, wens nicht in der heiligen Schrift stünde. Also pfeget Gott die Seinen zu demüthigen. Aber er (Jonas) ward darnach viel ärger, wollte Gott meistern, ward zum grossen Todtschläger und Mörder, der da wollt eine so grosse Stadt, darinnen so viel Volks war, gar vertilgen. Das ist mir ein Heiliger!'

In regard to some of the apocryphal books he has some words to say. Thus in his *Tischreden* he says:

'Das Buch, so man nennet Ecclesiasticus, ist also verfälscht, dass fur das Wort Jesus das Wörtlin Nisus, Griechisch Νῆσος, das ist Insula, geschrieben und gesetzt ist worden. Denn Ecclesiasticus, der das Buch gemacht hat, ist ein rechter Gesetzprediger oder Jurist, lehret, wie man einen feinen äusserlichen Wandel führen soll; ist aber kein Prophet, weiss noch lehren von Christo nichts. Denn das Evangelium ist eine Lehre vom ersten und andern Gebot, und nicht über das dritte Gebot in der ersten Tafel Mosi, denn es achtet des Sabbaths oder Feiertags nicht, weil derselbige nur ein Zeitlang gewähret, und umbs Predigt-ampts willen geordnet ist, dass man Gottes Wort lehren und warten soll' (*ib.* 127-128).

Of the third and fourth of Esdras he says :

‘Das dritte Buch Esdrae werfe ich in die Elbe. Im vierten Buch, darinne was den Esra geträumet hat, sind schöne und sonst auch gute Pösslin ; als : Der Wein ist stark, der König stärker, die Weiber noch stärker, aber die Wahrheit am allerstärksten’ (*ib.* 129–130).

In this paragraph Luther confounds the title of the two Esdras books.

In his preface to Baruch he again speaks of these two books :

‘. . . weil so gar nichts darinnen ist, das man nicht viel besser in Aesops oder noch geringeren Büchern kann finden ohne das im 4. Buch dazu eitel Träume sind.’

Of the book of Judith he says :

‘Aus allen Historien der h. Schrift kann ich nicht nehmen, dass das Buch Judith eine Historie sei ; dazu wird auch darinne nicht das Land angezeigt, in welchem es geschehen soll sein ; sondern wie die Legenden der Heiligen gemacht sind, also ist auch diess Poema und Gedicht gemacht von einem frommen Mann, auf dass er lehrete, dass fromme, gottfürchtige Leute, unter welchen Judith, das ist, das Königreich der Jüden, in welchem man Gott bekannte, dem Holoferne obsiegete, überwunden, das ist, alle Reich der Welt ; und dass alle Tyrannen ein solch Ende bekämen, und gehet ihnen, wie Holofernes, nämlich, dass sie von einem Weibe erwürget werden und umbkommen. Und hat der Meister solches Buchs Judith nur gewollt, dass es eine Figur und Bedeutung sein solle. . . . Darumb dünkt mich, Judith sei ein Tragödia und Spiel, darinnen beschrieben und angezeigt wird, was fur ein Ende die Tyrannen nehmen. Tobias aber ein Komödia, in der von Weibern geredet wird. Diese ist ein Exempel des Haus-Regiments ; jene aber des weltlichen, in welchem angezeigt wird, wie es in einem Regiment pfeget zuzugehen’ (*ib.* 130 and 131).

These extracts shew what Luther’s criterion of canonicity was, and how unflinchingly he applied it to the books contained in the Church’s Canon.

The facts constrain us to conclude, that with all his vigour and effectiveness as a combatant and as a destructive agent, Luther, in giving no stronger support to the Bible as the final court of appeal for Christianity than his own personal caprice and judgement, has planted the churches which bear his name on the sands. By substituting the Bible for the Church as the *ultima lex* of Theology he put a tremendous strain upon that book. There was one way in which he might logically have tried to carry out

his plan. He might have refused entirely to discuss the question of canonical authority, and simply accepted the Bible from the Church as a primitive document sanctioned by time and prestige and having the *prima facie* claim to authority which attaches to a document fourteen centuries or more old, which had been accepted by all Christians and was in no wise a mere Roman document. Having accepted it on these terms he might then have constructed and built upon it the theological scheme with which he proposed to replace that of the Church he had left. This he would not do. With him it was an essential postulate that mere Tradition (however old) or Church authority went for nothing. He probably thought that if he were to appeal to Tradition his severance from the Church would seem to many an unpardonable schism. His appeal was continually and explicitly to the continuing inspiration of the Holy Spirit in the heart of every godly man, which he taught had been promised and which he held would save him from error and be a lantern to his feet continually.

It was on this ground that he claimed to take the library of books sanctioned as authoritative by the Church, and to judge each individual book by his subjective test of its leading men to Christ and sustaining his cardinal doctrine of Justification by Faith. Those books which stood this test he allowed to be canonical, and those which did not he threw out on to the dust-heap and labelled them apocryphal, or else he poured terms of contumely upon them and refused to acknowledge their authority. It is not to be wondered at that the later Lutherans, who found themselves sorely smitten in their controversies by having no better criterion for their Bible books than the *ipse dixit* and personal caprice of their strong-willed founder, should have tried in various ways to qualify his position in the matter, and to plant their Bible Canon on a firmer pedestal than the needs of Luther's theological polemics and his personal view of what did and what did not lead men to Christ.

To us who live outside the Lutheran fold and have our own domestic difficulties in regard to the Canon, which enable us perhaps to survey our neighbour's vineyard with a more neutral eye, it would in fact seem that no scheme of Christian Theology or Philosophy can stand whose chief pedestal is so fragile as the

Lutheran Bible theory. To substitute one Pope for the scores of Popes who have created the Roman polity, is not a very promising change in such a difficult and critical matter as re-settling on a new basis the true criterion of Biblical authority. To accept a Bible from any man's hands as irreproachable and infallible, because he has told us that the books he has sanctioned have the full adhesion of his personal judgement and conform to his subjective notions of what the books ought to be, is to abandon history and criticism and to hand ourselves over tied hand and foot to an absolutely unauthorized dogmatic autocrat. That the position which is so illogical should have survived so long, and so dominated a people particularly proud of their analytical acumen in such matters, is indeed surprising. Far better surely is the older test which, if not complete, is at least workable, namely, that we should patiently endeavour to discover the Biblical Canon of Christ and His Apostles and of the primitive Church they founded, and to abide by that.

I should like to complete this survey in another paper, when I hope to deal with the question of the Biblical Canon among the so-called evangelical Churches of the Continent, and their children the old English Puritans and the modern English dissenters.

HENRY H. HOWORTH.

Notes and Corrections on the previous paper (J.T.S. Oct. 1906, pp. 1 sqq.).

P. 4, l. 12. The lections from the O.T. here referred to are printed at the end of the editions of Tyndale's N.T. of 1534 and onwards. They are contained among the 'pistles which are red in church after the vse of Salisburye vpon certain days of the yere', and consist of Eccus. xv on S. John the Evangelist's day, Eccus. xxiv on 'the Conception and Assumption of our Lady', and Wisd. v on 'S. Philip and S. James' day'.

P. 5, l. 27. *For 1636 read 1536.*

P. 6, l. 3. The colophon to Coverdale's first Bible says 'Prynted in the year of our Lord m̄d. xxxv. and fynished the fourth day of October'.

P. 19, ll. 19 and 20. This reads ambiguously: the canticle in question was of course transferred to the Prayer Book from the Sarum Breviary.

P. 26, l. 32. *For thirty-first read thirty-fifth.*

P. 36, l. 33. 'The first Bible' ought to read 'the first English Bible': a German Bible was published in 1743 at Germanstown.