

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

6-1-1935

The Divergent Views of Catholicism and Protestantism on the Old Testament Apocrypha

Henry L. Lieske

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_lieskeh@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv>



Part of the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Lieske, Henry L., "The Divergent Views of Catholicism and Protestantism on the Old Testament Apocrypha" (1935). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 705.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/705>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

The Divergent Views of Catholicism and

Protestantism on the Old Testament Apocrypha,

- I. General Introduction, 1.
- II. Introduction to get at point at issue, 2.

I. Apocrypha, 2.

- a. Etymology, 2.
- b. Development of usage of term, 3.
- c. List of Apocrypha, as we are treating them, 4.

II. Canon, 5.

THE DIVERGENT VIEWS OF CATHOLICISM AND
PROTESTANTISM ON THE OLD TESTAMENT APOCRYPHA

- a. Origin, 6.
- b. Author - a prophet, 6.
- c. Testimony, or witness of church immediately after, 7.
- d. Language, Submitted in
- e. Agreement with canonists, 8.

III. What we will treat, 9. 1935

IV. Catholicism, 10.

I. Roman, 10. as a B. D. Thesis

- a. Their position as shown by 11.
 - 1. Confession of Council of Trent, 10.
 - 2. Vatican Council by

b. Disputes, and consequent protest and denunciations, 12.

c. The reasons the Henry L. Lieske

- 1. Q. To James not closed till after Christ, as some have been asked, 13.
- 2. Though excluded from the Protestant canon, yet there are two books, viz. 1st & 2nd Esdras, 14.
- 3. Christ and the apostles were not concerned with or later scholars were not, 15.
- 4. Early versions have them, 16.
- 5. They were read in the church, 17.
- 6. Quotations from them, 18.
 - aa. Apostolic fathers, 18.
 - bb. Postapostolic fathers, 19.
 - cc. Later fathers and church, 20.
- 7. Even church councils say so, 21.
- 8. Development of doctrine, 22.

Approved:

W. Arndt.

M. S. Sommer (per W.A.)

The Divergent Views of Catholicism and

Protestantism on the Old Testament Apocrypha.

A. General Introduction. 1.

B. Introduction to get at point at issue. 2.

I. Apocrypha. 2.

a. Etymology. 2.

b. Development of usage of term. 3.

c. List of Apocrypha, as we are treating them. 5.

II. Canon. 6.

a. Etymology and use of term. 6.

b. Importance of having correct rule or guide. 7.

c. Marks of a canonical book. 8.

1. Inspired by God. 8.

2. Author - a prophet. 8.

3. Testimony, or witness of church immediately after writing
(of a book. 8.

4. Language. 9.

5. Agreement with Pentateuch. 9.

III. What we will treat. 9.

C. Catholicism. 10.

I. Roman: 10.

a. Their position as shown by 10.

1. Confession of Council of Trent. 10.

2. Vatican Council. 10.

b. Disputes, and consequent proto- and deutero-canonical divisions. (11.

c. The reasons they give for considering them canonical. 13.

1. O.T. Canon not closed till after Christ, so could have
been added. 13.

2. Though excluded from the Palestinian Jewish Canon, yet
there are two Jewish canons, and one of them, the
Alexandrian, has them. 14.

3. Christ and the apostles must have pronounced them canonical
or later scholars would not have. 15.

4. Early versions have them. 15.

5. They were read in public worship. 16.

6. Quotations from fathers. 16.

aa. Apostolic fathers. 16.

bb. Postapostolic fathers. 16.

cc. Later fathers and even popes. 17.

7. Even church councils say so. 18.

8. Development of doctrine theory. 19.

C. Catholicism (cont.)

II. Greek. 20.

- a. Their use of the LXX. 20.
- b. Development of practice in this church. 20.
 - 1. Early fathers. 20.
 - 2. Council of Laodicaea. 20.
 - 3. Later fathers and councils. 21.
 - 4. General use. 23.

III. Old Catholic. 24.

D. Protestantism, In general, 25.

I. Reformed: 25.

- a. Who they are. 25.
- b. Their position at first. 25.
- c. Later development of strictness, shown by confessions. 26. ²⁹
- d. Similar strictness and bitterness in Apokryphenstreigkeiten. 29
- e. Postion of Anglican Church. 30.

II. Lutheranism. 33.

- a. Luther. 33.
- b. Our confessions. 33.
- c. Our dogmaticians. 36.
 - 1. Chemnitz. 36.
 - 2. Gerhard. 37.
 - 3. Baier. 38.
 - 4. Hollaz. 38.
- d. Our attitude summed up. 38.

E. Reasons we reject the Apocrypha as uncanonical. 40.

I. Jews did not accept them into canon. 40.

- a. Neither the Palestinian. 40.
 - 1. Canon closed at time of Ezra and Nehemiah, and Apocrypha were written later. 41.
 - 1) Legends, kernel of truth. 42.
 - a) Nehemiah founded library. 42.
 - b) Ezra rewrote the whole Bible. 42.
 - c) Great Synagogue. 42.
 - 2) Need for such a collection at this time. 42.
 - a) Israel repentant. 42.
 - b) Language changing. 42.
 - c) Last prophet had spoken. 42.
 - 3) Later books claiming to be divine were not included. ⁴³ 43
 - 4) Numerous witnesses in Apocrypha. 44.
 - a) Prologue to Ecclesiasticus. 44.
 - b) Ecclesiasticus 44 - 49. 44.
 - c) 1 Mac. 12, 9. 44.
 - 5) Ezra, Nehemiah, Chron. at end of canon, modesty. ⁴⁴ 44.
 - 6) Josephus' testimony. 45.
 - 7) No later man of God who could have collected. 46.
 - 2. Not written by prophets. 46.
 - 3. Language in which written. ⁴⁷ 47.

E. Reasons we reject the Apocrypha as uncanonical (cont.)

I. Jews did not accept them into Canon (cont.)

- a. Neither the Palestinian.
- b. Nor the Alexandrian. 47.
 1. Prologue of Jesus Sirach. 48.
 2. Wanted to remain orthodox, and would not have a larger canon, and thus give appearance of unorthodoxy. 48.
 3. Josephus' testimony. 48.
 4. Philo. 48.
 5. Presupposed that Jews knew distinction, and they did. ^{49.} 49.

II. Christ and Apostles did not accept the Apocrypha as canonical. 49.

- a. From their own expressions. 49.
- b. Used LXX, but not the Apocrypha in them. 50.
- c. Showed acquaintance. 50.
- d. Answer to: they must have, or later fathers would not have. ^{50.} 50.

III. Early Church did not accept them. 51.

- a. Apostolic fathers indeed show acquaintance with. 51.
- b. When confusion arose, scholars studied the matter. 51.
 1. Melito. 51.
 2. Origen. 52.
 3. Athanasius. 52.
 4. Jerome. 52.
 5. Others, Hugo Cardinalis. 53.
- c. Explanation of how confusion arose. 53.
 1. LXX. 53.
 2. Loose use - analogy in our time. 53.
 3. Explain Augustine's stand, and that of Hippo and Carthage. ^{-arg.} (55).

IV. Later Church cannot make uncanonical books canonical. 56.

V. Also reject because of content. 56.

- a. Against historical facts. 56.
- b. Against other plain statements of Scripture. 56.
 1. Say nothing of Christ, as O.T. otherwise does. 56.
 2. False doctrines. 56.

F. They why did Catholics add them? 57.

I. To oppose and be different from Protestantism. 57.

II. Found in them "ihren eigenen Geist." 57.

G. Conclusion. 58.

H. Bibliography.

The Divergent Views of Catholicism and
Protestantism on the Old Testament Apocrypha.

It has been estimated that there are somewhat over 2,000,000,000 people in the world today. Of these, about two-thirds profess to be members of non-Christian religious bodies, as Mohammedanism, Buddhism, Confucianism, etc, or profess no religious belief at all. The remaining one-third, about 680,000,000, are professedly Christians. The two-thirds referred to have their various sacred books which they regard as the basis of their beliefs. By the Christians, in a more or less loose or strict sense, the Bible is considered the norm of doctrine, the principium cognoscendi, that book upon which all doctrines are to be based.

However, of this one-third, or 680,000,000, about 475,000,000 are members of the Roman and Greek Catholic Churches, and about 205,000,000 belong to Protestantism. Now it becomes ^{ent}evident that the above-mentioned theme is a study of great importance, when it is stated that even in Christianity there is a difference of opinion, there are divergent views, as to what constitutes the Bible, the Word of God. In the Roman Catholic Bible are found certain books ^{that} that are not found in the Protestant Bible. This fact has often given offence to that two-third non-Christian population, and also to that one-third in the Christian Church. "Why", they ask, "should we ^{become} become Christians, when you who profess to be Christians aren't even agreed among yourselves as to your source of teaching and doctrine? You Christians aren't even agreed as to what the Word of God is." A Christian might say, "Are we right after all? Is the Bible so divine a book as we have always believed? Is there not, perhaps, something to the claims of Comparative Religionists, that the

Bible is not the absolute truth, but only relative, on the same order as sacred books of other religions?" This divergent view causes confusion. Men will say that if the Bible is such a book of which one cannot be sure, it is no better than a human book. For these reasons this study is of importance, that we may gain a clear conception of these divergent views, and the reasons underlying them, also how we ought to judge of the matter.

If you should by chance get into an argument with a Roman Catholic and tell him, "I don't believe that the Apocryphal books ^{are} are inspired, and for this reason I don't think they ought to be in a Bible", he may answer, "I perfectly agree with you; I don't believe either that apocryphal books belong to the Canon of Holy Scripture." It would thus seem that a Lutheran and a Roman Catholic would be agreeing, and yet, they would not be, for the two would be speaking about altogether different books. If the conversation would continue, and the Lutheran would ask the Catholic, "Then why do you ^{have} have the Apocrypha in your official Vulgate Bible, and why do you base doctrines on these books?" he would soon be stopped and told, "Wait a minute, who said that we do that?"

To have the meaning of "Apocrypha" properly elucidated, ^{we shall} we shall go into the etymological meaning of it, and also consider how the term has been variously used, and how we are using it in this study.

The word "Apocrypha" comes from the Greek ἀποκρύπτειν, to hide from, secrete, cover. Ἀπόκρυφον then means something, here a book, or books, that is hidden, or secret, and Ἀπόκρυφα ^{the} is the neuter plural, Apocrypha, denoting all such books. That is the etymological meaning.

The term was first used of books that were secret or ^{known,} unknown, dark, both as to content and as to the author. The word soon develop-^{-log-}ed to mean those books of the Gnostics which were thought to contain superior wisdom, and hence were kept from, hidden from, the public, ^{and} and retained for the initiated. Now among these secret, or so-called esoteric, writings, there were very soon also regarded those books that claimed as authors some of the Old Testament fathers and important personages, but patently did not come from their hand, hence ^{were} were pseudonym, spurious, or supposititious; we find such books especially ^{-ly} among the heretics. Into the word "Apocrypha" there was then ^{-really} gradually injected the connotation of being unguine, as being fabricated, not being what they claimed to be, and thus also diverting from scriptural authority. In this sense the Church of the first few centuries used the term "Apocrypha", to denote such books as "The Assumption of Moses", "Fourth Book of Esdras", "Apocalypse of Baruch", "Apocalypse of Abraham", "Book of Henoeh", etc, books which nowadays are known in our circles as Pseudepigraphic Writings of the Old Testament.

In the early Church we find, then, these three divisions of religious books: 1) Canonical Books, those books that were in the Jewish Canon, or, in other words, those books of the Old Testament which are found today in Protestant Bibles, that were considered inspired, from which doctrines were to be taken. 2) "Alii libri, qui ecclesiasticè a majoribus appellati sunt" (Rufinus), or ^{these} Ἀπὸ γὰρ τῶν ἡγουμένων (Athanasius), Vorleseschriften; in this group were the books that are found in the Roman Catholic Bible, Old Testament, ^{about} above and besides those found in the Jewish Canon, or above and besides those found in Protestant Old Testaments. 3) "Apocryphae, quae in ecclesiis legi noluerunt" (Rufinus, in this sense also Athanasius). ^{-ius,}

Here were classed those writings which were mere fables and which, of course, consequently deserved no further regard; to this group belong such as were mentioned above, "Assumption of Moses", etc. To such Augustine refers when he says, "Omittamus earum Scripturarum fabulas, quae Apocryphae nuncupantur, eo quod earum occulta origo non claruit patribus." This use as found in this third class ^{the} was the way the term was used in the first centuries.

However, as the early Christians were having disputes with Jews, and Christians would bring proof passages from this second ^{class} class of writings, the Ecclesiastici, or Ἀρχαίως ἠρόμενος, such as Wisdom, Judith, Maccabees, etc, their attention was called to the ^{fact} fact that these books were not found in the Jewish Canon, could not therefore be brought as proof. The Christians went into the question, and soon two tendencies became evident in regard to these Ecclesiastici ^{- tici} Libri, which now concern us: 1) Augustine's view, that these books too were canonical; 2) Jerome's view, who called these Ecclesiastici ^{- tici} Libri "Apocryphae", with the connotation of "uncanonical." The Catholic Encyclopedia says (s.v. Apocrypha, p. 601): "St. Jerome evidently applied the term to all quasi-scriptural books which in ^{his} his estimation lay outside the canon of Holy Writ, and the Protestant Reformers, following Jerome's Catalogue of Old Testament Scripture - - one which was at once erroneous and singular among the Fathers of the ^{the} Church - - applied the title Apocrypha to the excess of the Catholic Canon of the Old Testament over that of the Jews."

These two views as to the Ecclesiastici obtained, the one regarding them as canonical, the other as "Apocrypha", until the ^{time} time of the Reformation.

During the Reformation Carlstadt was the first to apply the term Apocrypha to these Ecclesiastici Libri; and then later also Luther and the other Protestants. The Protestant Church since the Reformation has called the following books Apocrypha, those namely that are found in the Catholic Canon of the Old Testament in excess of the Jewish and Protestant O. T. Canon, Namely:

1) Judith, found in Catholic Bibles after Tobias, which is placed after Nehemia (or II Esdras).

2) Wisdom of Solomon, or Sapientia, in Catholic Bibles ^{after} after Canticle of Canticles (Song of Solomon).

3) Tobias, in Catholic Bibles after Nehemia (II Esdras).

4) Jesus Sirach, or Ecclesiasticus, in Catholic Bibles after Wisdom, which is after Canticle of Canticles.

5) Baruch, which in Catholic Bibles is found after Lamentations, as ^Prophetia Baruch.

6) Two Books of Maccabees, after Malachi.

7) Fragments in Esther, found in Catholic Bibles with the ^{book} book of Esther (which with them contains 16 chapters).

8) Fragments in Daniel:

a) History of Susanna and Daniel (Daniel 13)

b) Bel at Babylon (Daniel 14, 1 - 21).

c) Dragon at Babylon (Daniel 14, 22 - 42).

d) Prayer of Asaria (Daniel 3, 24 - 50).

e) Song of the Three Holy Children (Daniel 3, 51 - ^{90/}90).

9) Prayer of Manasse, king of Juda. Not numbered with the canonical books in Catholic Bibles; placed by Luther among the ^{- apocrypha} Apocrypha.

10) III and IV Esdras are by some placed among the Apocrypha; Luther did not translate them, nor assign them a place.

The Prayer of Manasse and the III and IV Book of Esdras are considered Libri Apocryphi by the Catholics, and if found in their ^{their} Bibles are so signified and placed at the end, after Revelation.

(The Concordia Cyclopedia incorrectly states that Catholics place III and IV Esdras and Song of Manasse into the canon. s.v. Apocrypha). ^{- crypha.}

These above-mentioned books we shall then treat in this article, and call them according to Jerome and many scholars of the Middle Ages, and according to Luther and all Protestants since then: The Apocrypha of the Old Testament.

We have thus far established what we mean by Apocrypha and stated that they are not in the Canon of Scripture. What is Canon of Scripture, what or who determines that such and such a book belongs ^{- belongs} to canonical Scripture, when was this determined, and what is the importance of having a Scriptural Canon?

The word "canon" is sometimes used in this sense: as a decree ^{- decree} or ruling or decision of some body of men, as of a council. Thus ^{we} we say: "the decrees and canons of the Council of Trent." That is not the sense in which it is used in the expressions "Canonical Scripture" ^{- true} or "Canon of Scripture."

The word *κανών*, in the sense in which it is used in ^{Canon} "Canon of Scripture" is used several times in the Bible. Thus in Gal. 6, 16: *ἡ δὲ ὁδὸς ἐστὶν κανὼν τούτου εἰς χάριστος εἰρήνης*, ^{16:} *ἐπ' αὐτοῦς ἡ δὲ εἰρήνης*: "Those who follow or walk according to this 'canonem seu regulam', this canon or rule, on them be peace, etc. ^{to} etc." Also Phil. 3, 16: Let us walk by the same rule, *κανὼν*. (Vulgate: Et in eadem permaneamus regula; Chemnitz translates: eodem canone seu regula ambulare.) In 2 Cor. 10, 13 *κανών* is used to apply to apostolic doctrine. Chemnitz tells us that in Ps. 19, 4:

"Their line (margin: Their rule, or direction) is gone out through ^{all} the earth" $\square \text{ } \gamma \text{ } \rho$ from $\text{ } \dot{\gamma} \text{ } \rho$ "significat canonem seu regulam."

Thus *ἡ ἀρῆ* means first of all a straight line, a cord, as e.g. a carpenter uses a colored chalk or cord, snaps it and makes a ^{ght} straight line; then, metaphorically, the word means a guide, a straight line, from which one is to go neither to the right nor to the left. As the carpenter who made a straight line will saw along that line, and not half an inch to either side, so the Canon of Scripture is to be our rule, guide, which we follow. It is then used to denote a collection or list of biblical books that are the inspired Word of God, and can and must serve as such an infallible rule or guide. *Chemnitz:

"Scriptura vocatur canonica, libri canonici, sive canon scripturae, quia est talis regula, ad quam structura fidei Ecclesiae formanda et aptanda est, ita ut quicquid ad illam regulam convenit, rectum, ^{sanum} et apostolicum iudicetur, quicquid vero non quadrat, sed ab illa ^{-gula} regula sive in excessu, sive in defectu exorbitat et aberrat, recte iudicetur supposititium, adulterimum, erroneum," (De Scriptura Canonica, 3).

The canonical books of the Bible are thus our rule and guide for faith and life.

It is thus very important that we have the correct rule, ^{-gula} regula canon, in other words, that guide which God wants us to have, so that the foundation of our faith may be sure, a firm foundation, also that human books may not be added to make this rule longer or shorter, permitting more, or not permitting as much as God permits and teaches. ^{so.} Our faith is to be based on God's Word, and not man's, "That your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God." (1 Cor. 2, 5) It is also important that no human books be added, lest, someone knowing that some of these books that we put into the canon are human, this man will not only deprecate those human books,

but also the divine books placed side by side with the human in such a canon.

What, then, makes a book canonical, when is it a book to whose ^{whose} authority we must bow? To be reckoned as canonical a book must be inspired by the Holy Ghost. Πᾶσα γράφῃ θεοπνευστος.

"All Scripture is given by inspiration of God." How can we tell which books are given by inspiration of God, which books belong to the ^{the} γράφῃ θεοπνευστος? Another passage says: "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." Which now ^{now} were these holy men? They were the prophets in the O. T., from Moses, through to Malachi, including such men as David and Solomon. How do we know that these are the "holy men", that their writings and only theirs belong to the canon, are θεοπνευστος? To Christ had come down a certain canon of Scripture, a certain collection ^{which} which he knew as ^{the} γράφῃ, and which he quoted as ^{the} γράφῃ, thereby putting his stamp of approval on them as those books of the O. T. which belonged to the Canon of Scripture.

Thus we have as the first and most important mark of a book to show that it belongs to the Canon this: that it is inspired by the ^{the} Holy Ghost, for which we have the infallible testimony of Christ ^{himself} himself

Another mark from which we can tell whether a book is ^{is} canonical is the writer. Is the writer a prophet of God, did God show by sure signs and testimonies that this prophet was his spokesman?

Yet another way of telling whether a book is canonical is by the testimony of the Church at or immediately after the writing of a certain book. That Church, at or immediately after the writing of a book, cannot make a book canonical that is not inspired and therefore ^{canonical, but it is in a position to know better than anybody at} canonical, but it is in a position to know better than anybody at

a later date whether such and such a book really is written by the ^{one} who ~~claims~~ to have written it, whether this writer really bore with ^{him} his marks of divine sanction for the prophetic office. Neither the primitive, and much less the later, Church, or church council, can by a fiat make a ^{book} canonical. All they can do is tell us how it was looked upon by the Church at the time of the writing of the book.

Other touchstones are these: In the Old Testament the ^{prophet} naturally spoke and wrote Hebrew, so the language also is a ^{stone} touchstone; then also this: Does it agree with the Pentateuch?

To the above Catholics will not agree. They say: "These criteria are negative and exclusive rather than directive. The negative tests were arbitrary, and an intuitive sense cannot give the assurance of divine certification. Only later was the ^{infallible} voice to come (of the council!) and then it was to declare that the Canon of the Synagogue though unadulterated indeed, was ^{incomplete} incomplete!" (Cath. Ency., s.v. Canon of Holy Scripture, p. 269). But theirs is an arbitrary fixing of the canon. How can a Council, e.g. in ~~16~~ 1546, decree such and such a book to be canonical, if it is not? They could then also take Aesop's Fables or books of Thomas Aquinas and make them canonical by the same arbitrary method.

We have here considered some of the marks by which we can tell a canonical book. The time when the Old Testament Canon was closed we will discuss later.

In this study, now after we have laid the basis, what books we mean by Apocrypha, and what Canon means, we will treat the divergent views of Catholicism and Protestantism on these books, first, of Catholicism, Roman, Greek, and Old; then we will give the Protestant ^{view, Reformed and Lutheran, and the reasons for the Lutheran position.} view, Reformed and Lutheran, and the reasons for the Lutheran position.

In discussing Catholicism we shall first see what the view of Roman Catholics is over against the Apocrypha. They have very definitely laid down their position. In the Fourth Session of the Council of Trent, of the 8th of April, 1546, in the Decree concerning the Canonical Scriptures, we find: "... And it has thought it meet ^{ing} that it meet ^{that} a list of the sacred books be inserted in this decree, lest a doubt ^{may} arise in any one's mind, which are the books; of the Old Testament: the five books of Moses, to wit, Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy; Josue, Judges, Ruth, four books of Kings (this is the ^{same} as the ~~two~~ books of Samuel and two books of Kings in our Bibles), ^{two} of Paralipomenon (same as our Chronicles), the first book of Esdras, and the second which is entitled Nehemias; Tobias, Judith, Esther, Job, the Davidical Psalter, consisting of a hundred and fifty ^{psalms;} psalms; the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, the Canticle of Canticles, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Isaias, Jeremias, with Baruch; Ezechiel, Daniel; the twelve minor prophets, to wit, Osee, Joel, Amos, Abdias, Jonas, ^{Michaas} ~~Michaas~~, Nahum, Habacuc, Sophonias, Aggaeus, Zacharias, Malachias; two books of the Maccabees, the first and the second. Of the New Testament:..... (same as in our Bibles)... But if any one receive ^{not} not, as sacred and canonical, the said books entire with all their parts, as they have been used to be read in the Catholic Church, and as they ^{they} are contained in the old Latin Vulgate edition; and knowingly and deliberately contemn the traditions aforesaid; let him be anathema." (Waterworth, Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, p. 18. 19).

That was in 1546. They might have changed their idea later - but they did not. In the last great council that was held, ^{in that church.} the Vatican Council of 1870, the following decrees were made: In Chapter II, of Revelation: "And these books of the Old and New Testament are to be ^{be} received as sacred and canonical, in their integrity, with all their ^{their} their

parts, as they are enumerated in the decree of the said Council (of Trent) and are contained in the ancient Latin edition of the Vulgate. These the Church holds to be sacred and canonical, not because, having been carefully composed by mere human industry, they were afterwards approved by her authority, nor merely because they contain revelation, with no admixture of error; but because, having been written by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, they have God for their author."

"If any one shall not receive as sacred and canonical the books of Holy Scripture, entire with all their parts, as the Holy Synod of Trent has enumerated them, or shall deny that they have been divinely inspired, let him be anathema." (Quoted in Schaff's "Creeds of Christendom", Vol. II, pp. 241 - 253).

These are the very clear statements of Rome on these books we call Apocrypha. But even at the Council of Trent there were dissenting votes, and indeed this council can hardly be called a general synod. "Concilii Tridentini decretum factum est sess. 4. Legati, cardinales, archiepiscopi, episcopi, qui tum praesentes adfuerunt, et hoc decretum de numero librorum canonicorum ediderunt, omnes circiter 50 fuerunt, iique fere Itali et Hispani. In tanta infrequentia nullum haberi potuit generale concilium." (Chemnitz, De Scriptura Sacra, 105. (p. 50)). As there were here and during the Middle Ages many Roman Catholics who held the view of Jerome on these books, that they were not canonical, so also since this council many Catholic scholars have not considered the Apocrypha on the same level with canonical Scripture. For this reason the Roman Church has arbitrarily set up the division of proto-canonical and deutero-canonical, but only since the 16th century, and certainly in violation of the spirit of the Council of Trent. Thus the Catholic Encyclopedia, s.v. Canon, p. 267: "Only in a partial and restricted way may we speak of a first and sec-

ond canon. Protocanonical (πρῶτος "first") is a conventional word denoting those sacred writings which have been always received^{ly} by Christendom without dispute. The protocanonical books of the Old Testament correspond with those of the Bible of the Hebrews and the Old Testament as received by Protestants. The deutero-canonical (δευτερος , "second") are those whose scriptural character were^{as} contested in some quarters, but which long ago gained a secure^{ing} footing in the Bible of the Catholic Church, though those of the Old Testament^{-ment} are classed by Protestants as 'The Apocrypha.'

There has thus been a stricter and a laxer conception of the decree of Trent, and Rome certainly has had its difficulty^{its} in its arbitrary fixing of the canon. Bern. Lamy, a Catholic scholar,^{says:} "Idcirco libri qui in secundo canone sunt, licet conjuncti cum ceteris^{ceteris} primi canonis, tamen non sunt ejusdem auctoritatis." (Quoted by Keil, Introduction, Vol. II, p. 372). So Jahn and other Catholic scholars, so Sixtus of Siena. Bellarmin has as a rule upheld the stricter view of the matter, but even he has three divisions of Holy Scripture: 1) Those whose authority has never been doubted; 2) Those ~~that~~ have apostolic and prophetic authority, but that have been attacked in some quarters; among these he counts our Apocrypha. But even these are "infallibilis veritatis." He furthermore^{that} says ~~that~~ before a general council had passed a decree one could doubt^{matter} the matter without being a heretic, but now the Church has set all doubts^{arise.} asise. 3) Those never openly approved. (Quoted in Oehler, p. 268)

Another example of uncertainty can be cited in Eck, in his disputes with Luther. Eck brought passages from the Apocrypha, and when Luther pointed out that they were from the Apocrypha, and that^{they} they would therefore not hold, Eck did not dispute long to uphold his^{side.} side.

Thus, in general, Rome has arbitrarily fixed her canon, putting into it also the Apocrypha, but there has been some uncertainty as to whether these books are really of the same authority as the other books of the Old Testament.

In thus putting the Apocrypha into the Canon the Roman Catholic have of course given their grounds for doing so, and we shall not consider these alleged grounds.

They say that there were very good reasons why the Apocrypha might be in the Christian Canon, though not in the Jewish Canon, because the Canon was not definitely closed till ca. 90 A.D., and furthermore, one ought to make a distinction between the Jewish and the Christian Canon. They tell us that the Old Testament Canon was not closed at the time of Ezra, i.e. about 425 B.C., as we hold, but that only some divisions were then definitely closed, and one left open for later additions. The Old Testament Scripture, they grant, is divided into three parts, as used in Luke 24, 44: 1) The Law, 2) The Prophets, 3) and the Psalms, or the Hagiographa, the Holy Writings, or Kethubim. Now they tell us: Yes, indeed, the Law (1) and the Prophets (2), these two parts of the Canon were closed, but not so the Holy Writings (3); this was not definitely closed till after Christ. And since the Apocrypha are all written in the period of 400 B.C. to the time of Christ, they could well have been added to this third group to complete the Canon. Thus the Catholic Ency. (III, p. 268ff): "But the Catholic Scripturists who admit an Esdrine Canon are far from allowing that Esdras and his colleagues intended to so close up the sacred library as to bar any possible future accession. The Spirit of God might and did breathe into later writings, and the presence of the deutero-canonical books in the Church's Canon at once forestalls and answers those Protestant theologians who claim that

Esdras was a divine agent for an inviolable fixing and sealing of ^{the} the Old Testament." Then it goes on to say that they place the lowest possible terminus for finishing of the canon for the Nebim (Prophets) ^{- phets} about 132 B.C., and the completion of the Kethubim, the Holy Writings, ^{- ings} for the completion of the Jewish Canon from 165 B.C. to the middle of the second Century of our era. "The Catholic scholars ^JJahn, etc... without sharing all the views of the advanced exegetes, regard the Hebrew Hagiographa as not definitely settled till after Christ." Plain enough what their position. "The so-called Council of Jamnia (A.D. 90) has reasonably been taken as having terminated the disputes ^{- the} between rival rabbinical schools concerning the canonicity of Canticles, etc. We must conclude that it was the word of official authority which actually fixed the limits of the Hebrew Canon."

We Christians, they say, need not be bound to the Jewish Canon; we see that there was ample opportunity to add the Apocrypha, and the Christian Church is to decide what books belong to the Canon of Old Testament Scripture.

Closely connected with this argument is the following, that there were really two canons of Scripture among the Jews, "a smaller, ^{- or,} or incomplete, and a larger, or complete. Both of these were handed ^{- ed} down by the Jews; the former by the Palestinian, the latter by the Alexandrian, or Hellenistic Jews." (Cath. Ency., III, 267). The Canon among the Palestinian Jews corresponds to the ~~OT~~ ^{found} books found in Protestant Bibles, and to the protocanonical books of Rome; but, they say, that "was too rigid a conception of canonicity, to confine ^{- fine} the Holy Ghost to a terminus ~~to~~ ^{of} time, and to the Hebrew language in the Old Testament." The Palestinian canon, they say, is incomplete. But the Jews in Alexandria had a larger, a more complete Canon. ^{The} The Jews in Alexandria did not use the Jewish language, but the Greek. Jews in Alexandria did not use the Jewish language, but the Greek.

Thus also the Old Testament was translated into the Greek, into the so-called Septuagint, and this LXX does contain more books. It ^{contains} contains those also which we term Apocrypha, and which Rome terms deuterocanonical. "These deuterocanonical books are interspersed with the others (in the LXX) thus asserting for the extra writings a substantial equality of rank and privilege."

They say, furthermore, that Christ and the apostles must have pronounced these books as canonical, or how would the later writers have done so? Bellarmin: "Nisi apostoli declarassent hos libros esse canonicos Cyprianus, Clemens et alii non dixissent tam constantes esse divinos." (Quoted in Gerhard, Loci, I, p. 49) But how about Christ, and his use of the $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\tau\alpha$? The question bothers them; they say: "On the one hand, such frequent terms as 'The Scripture', 'the Scriptures', 'the holy Scriptures' applied in the N.T. to the older writings would lead us to believe that the latter already ^{formed} formed a definite fixed collection; but, on the other, the reference in St. Luke to 'the Law and the Prophets and the Psalms', while demonstrating the fixity of the Torah and the Prophets as sacred groups, does not warrant us in ascribing the same fixity to the third division, the ^{all} Palestinian Jewish Hagiographa..... We are sure, of course, that all the Hagiographa were eventually committed to the Church as Holy Scripture, but we know this as a truth of faith, and by theological deduction, not from documentary evidence in the New Testament. The latter fact has a bearing against the Protestant claim that Jesus approved and transmitted en bloc an already defined Bible of the Palestinian Synagogue." (Cath. Ency., s.v. Canon of H.S., p. 269).

Another argument they take from the use of the Apocrypha in the early Church. After the time of Christ and the apostles there were ^{were} soon circulated versions of Scripture. Now, we are told, the Apocrypha soon circulated versions of Scripture. Now, we are told, the Apocrypha

were included in these early versions of Scripture, and that they must therefore have been regarded by these early Christians as the Word of God.

Another argument that we hear is this, that the Apocrypha were read in public worship, for this reason also called ^{μυστα} *Avayivwσ Hōpococ* Vorleseschriften. And, they say, from this we can also gather ^{that} that the early Christians considered the Apocrypha as canonical. We shall ^{show} show later how this is to be explained

Another argument is that these Apocrypha were quoted by the fathers as divinely authoritative; they introduced them by formulas used for quotations from Scripture. We shall now consider some of these quotations.

With the Apostolic Fathers we do not find the usage of ^{using} adducing apocryphal sayings and introducing them by such formulas, yet,

a) Barhabas was familiar with Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus, and quotes IV Esdras as the work of a prophet.

b) ^{some} So others show at least that they are familiar with the Apocrypha, and also regard some of them at least as true history.

But with the Postapostolic fathers and the Antenicene fathers (especially from the years 160 - 260) we have a different story. Roman Catholics bring citations from them to prove their point, that in the early centuries the Christians regarded the Apocrypha as inspired. These fathers indeed used many expressions, such as *λεγει θεος*; *λεγει η σοφια*; *γεγραπτη*; *η γραφη* *scriptum est, sicut scriptum*, etc, not only of canonical books, but also of the Apocrypha.

a) Thus Justin Martyr (Apol. I, 46) permits a quotation from the addition to Daniel to creep in.

b) Irenaeus (Adv. Haer. IV, 3) quotes the same passage as Daniel Propheta, and at another time (ib. V, 35) a passage from Baruch as Jeremias Propheta.

c) Tertullian quotes a passage from Jesus Sirach (Exhort. ^{-wort.} ad castit. 2) as sicut scriptum est; and quotes Book of Wisdom (Adv. ^{Adv.} Valent. 2) as : ut docet sophia non quidem Valentini sed Salomonis.

d) Cyprian quotes Sirach, Tobias, Baruch, Wisdom, and uses with them these expressions: Scriptura divina dicit, sicut scriptum est.

e) The same is also found with the Greek fathers as Clemens Alexandrinus, who often quotes Ecclesiasticus, introducing the quotations with η σοφία λέγει, η ἡ δὲ γραφή.

And furthermore, Roman Catholics will tell us, it was not ^{only} only in these early times that the fathers used these expressions, as Scriptura dicit, etc. with the Apocrypha, but also later, many of the greatest fathers, and even popes, did the same.

a) Thus they point to St. Augustine, a very distinguished ^{-ed} and influential man, ^{his} often known as one of the chief fathers. In his private writings, e.g. in his De doctrina Christiana, ch. 2, 8, he enumerates the books which he considers canonical, and among them ^{are} are a large number of those we call Apocrypha. It will later also be ^{-sing} pointed out that he had a great influence on several synods, influencing them to take a similar stand.

b) Among the bishops of Rome is mentioned Innocent I, who was bishop of Rome about 402, and he is said to have drawn up a list of the canon and included in this list the Apocrypha. A Catholic ^{-die} writer ^{writes} Becanus adds: "Vixit autem Innocentius anno Christi 402. writer Becanus adds: "Vixit autem Innocentius anno Christi 402.

Igitur ab illo tempore primitivae ecclesiae ad nos usque per ^{-nam}continuum traditionem perseverat idem ille scripturae canon, quem nos ^{-ici}Catholici nunc tenemus et amplectemur." (Quoted in Hoeneche Dog., I, 444)

c) Also Gelasius I, pope 492 - 496 in his Decretum de libris sacris et ecclesiasticis cum LXX episcopis has a ^{-que}catalogue of canonical books, said to be a reprint of a list made by the Synod under Damasus in 382, and containing the Apocrypha under the canonical books of Scripture.

d) M. Aurelius Cassiodorus, though not a pope, was an influential man at the Monastery Vivarium, in 544 wrote an ^{-utis}Institutio divinarum Lectionum, no. 14, and there enumerates with books ^{-ing}belonging to the Scriptura sancta secundum antiquam translationem, also Wisdom, Sirach, Tobith, Judith, and I and II Maccabees.

e) So Isidorus, lib. 6, etymol c.1.

f) Likewise Rabanus, in his De institutione clericorum.

These then are the early and late church fathers, ^{and}popes, and other scholars who as it seems place the Apocrypha among the canonical books.

A further argument that they bring is that even ^{the}councils of the Church gave out lists of canonical books and included among them the Apocrypha.

a) First are mentioned the Synods of Hippo (393) and Carthage (397 and 419). Of the first discussion at Hippo the ^{-sion}decision is lost, but the statutes were revised and confirmed by the two ^{-later}later synods, and these in their list of canonical books include the Apocrypha.

b) We are also told that at a much later time, at the Council of Florence in 1439 a list of canonical books was drawn up ^{that}the ^{corresponds}corresponds to that ^{given}given by the Synod of Carthage.

But perhaps the reason that will salve most consciences in the Roman Catholic Church is this, namely their development of doctrine theory, that the truth is continually revealed by and in the Catholic Church. Thus what is held in the first century on the matter of canon may be incomplete, needs further to be developed in later centuries. "Distinguendum esse inter tempus, quo nondum ^{-facte} perfectus constitutus ac notus fuit V. T. Canon, et inter illud, quo publica ecclesiae auctoritate fuit editus." And this time when the Church ^{has} definitely spoken, in which the "V. T. Canon publica ecclesiae auctoritate fuit editus" was the Council of Trent! In 1546! That is authoritative. It took the Christian Church ^{-uries} sixteen centuries to find out what belongs to its sacred book, the Bible! If any church ^{church} fathers had divergent views before, that is permissible. Bellarmin says (De Verbo Dei, I, 11ff) that before the matter was decided by a general synod, a person could doubt the canonicity of the Apocrypha, without being called a heretic - - (that is where the good church fathers that uncautiously drew up wrong lists can crawl out) - - but now the Church has settled all doubts.

These then are the arguments with which we are confronted, which are to prove definitely that the Apocrypha are canonical ^{books,} and that now after the Council of Trent the matter is definitely settled: The Apocrypha are canonical books, and he who says nay, Anathema sit!

Do these arguments hold? Are all good Christians now to build ^{build} their faith and hope also upon the Apocrypha? Or is ^{that} at a matter that one can settle one way or the other? We will enter in upon all of these points later on in the paper when we give the Lutheran view on these Apocrypha, and their reasons for regarding them as uncanonical.

This was the position of the Roman Catholic Church. What stand does the Greek Church, or Orthodox Church, take over against the Apocrypha?

The text used by this church body is the Septuagint, which includes also the Apocrypha, and so also their official position is that they rank the Apocrypha among the canonical books. However, there has also been a diversity of opinion, and though the official position is as stated, many theologians and even synods have held differently, and especially in common usage a distinction seems to be made between canonical and apocryphal books.

It will be best to give the development as we find it in ^{this} Church. At first the Greek fathers made a similar threefold ^{-ion} division

as was made in the Roman Church: 1) (22) *Κατοικισόμην*.

~~2) (5)~~

2) (5) *Ἀναγιγνωσκόμενα*

3) *Ἀπόκρυφα*

Among those Greek fathers that left either catalogues or at least indications that they put no more books into the Canon than were ^{found} in the Jewish Canon, were Athanasius of Alexandria, Epiphanius, Amphilochius of Iconium in Asia Minor, Gregory of Nazianzum of ^{Cappa-}Cappadocia, also Basil the Great of Cappadocia, and Chrysostom, the distinguished preacher and Patriarch of Constantinople.

Also very early, in 360, we find a synod taking the same stand. The Synod of Laodicaea, a small gathering of clergy from ^{parts} parts

of Lydia and Phrygia, decreed: *ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ἰδεωτικῶν
ψαλλῶν λέγεσθαι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ οὐδε
ἃ κατοικιστὰ βιβλία, ἀλλὰ μόνον τὰ κατοικιστὰ τῆς*

καίουης καὶ Παλαιᾶς διαθήκης (Quoted in Fuerbringer, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, p. 4), and then follows a list of books, excluding the Apocrypha. Some have tried to say that this list is not genuine,

but of all this Oehler says: "Ein Kanon dessen Aechtheit von einigen, jedoch mit unzureichenden Gruenden, bestritten worden ist." (p. 262)

Of later church fathers Green says (General Intro. to O.T., Canon, p. 176): "From the fourth century onward the leading authorities of the Greek Church, like their predecessors, in their lists of the books of the Old Testament reject the Apocrypha. Thus Anastasius, Patriarch of Antioch (A.D. 560) and Leontius of Byzantium (A.D. 580), make the number of the sacred books 22. And 'John of Damascus, the last of the great Greek fathers, whose writings are still regarded with the deepest reverence in the Eastern Church.... transcribes almost verbally one of the lists of Epiphanius, which gives only the books of the Hebrew canon as of primary authority. To these Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom are subjoined as an appendix, 'being noble and good books, though not prophetic.'" (Green quotes Westcott, p. 222).

In 1625 or 1626 there was given out a Confession of Metrophanes Critopulos, later Patriarch of Alexandria, and in this he states that the books Tobith, Judith, etc, because they contained πολλὰ καὶ ἡλιθία ἐπαύου ἄξια were not to be rejected, but nevertheless, since the Church had never regarded them as canonical and authentic, they were not to be used "zu dogmatischer Beweisfuehrung." Also he thus speaks against the full canonical authority of the Apocrypha.

A few years later Cyrillus Lucaris in his confession enumerates the books which he considers ἐν τῷ γράφῃ, and from that list excludes all books except the 22 in the Hebrew Bible. However, also he in practice was not quite consistent, for he quotes in a Homily Tobith as γράφῃ and quotes ~~Wisdom~~ Wisdom, introducing it with the formula γὰρ ἡ σοφία .

Of both of these confessions we must say that they never received official standing, and soon there were objections raised against them. Already the Confessio Orthodoxa (1643) of Mogilas departed somewhat from their stand, being more favorable toward the Apocrypha, and several times passages from Jesus Sirach are quoted as canonical.

But then a very opposite stand was taken by the Synods of Constantinople in 1638, of Jassy in 1642 and Jerusalem in 1672. The position of these aforementioned confessions was rejected. Especially the Synod of Jerusalem, which was a very important Synod, and has high standing in the Greek Church, "welche durch die Vielseitigkeit der ihr zu teil gewordenen Anerkennung alle folgenden Synoden der griechischen Kirche uebertrifft and daher fuer das Erkennen der griechisch-orthodoxen Glaubenslehren von entscheidender Bedeutung ist, . . . gab in der Konfession des Dositheus eine bestimmte Antwort auf die Frage, welche Buecher man ἐπιτὴν γραφῶν zu nennen habe."

(Strack, p. 764) Here I will give a German translation of this Confession as translated by Guenther in his Populaere Symbolik: "Welche Buecher nennst du heilige Schrift: Der Regel der katholischen Kirche folgend, nennen wir alle diejenigen Buecher Heilige Schrift, welche Cyrillus der Synode von Laodicea entnimmt und aufzaehlt, und auszer diesen diejenigen, welche er in Unverstand und Unwissenheit vielmehr boeswillig Apokryphen genannt hat, naemlich die Weisheit Salomonis usw." After this list of the Apocrypha is then given,

the Greek continues: Ἡμεῖς γὰρ μετὰ τῶν ἀλλῶν τῶν ἁγίων γραφῶν γυναικίω β. β. κίω καὶ ἐδὲ τὰ γυναικίω τῶν γραφῶν κείνη κρινόμεν.

This position seems to have been the official one of this church body since that time. And for this reason we are all the more surprised to find in Schaff's "Creeds of Christendom," under "Symbola Graeca et Russica" the following, the "Longer Catechism of Eastern Church", which, we are told, is now the most authoritative doctrinal standard of the orthodox Graeco-Russian Church, which, it is also stated, has been examined and approved by the most Holy Governing Synod, and published for the use of schools and of all orthodox Christians, by order of His Imperial Majesty, Moscow, 1839:

"31. How many are the books of the Old Testament? St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Athanasius the Great, and St. John Damascene reckon them as twenty-two, agreeing therein with the Jews, who so reckon them in the original Hebrew tongue. (Athanas. Ep. xxxix. De Test.; J. Damasc. Theol. lib. IV, c. 17). 32. Why should we attend to the reckoning of the Hebrews? Because, as the apostle Paul says, unto them were committed the oracles of God; and the sacred books of the Old Testament have been received from the Hebrew Church of that Testament by the Christian Church of the New. Rom. 3, 2. 34. Why is there no notice in this enumeration of the books of the Old Testament, of the books of Wisdom, of the son of Sirach and of certain others? Because they do not exist in the Hebrew. 35. How are we to regard these last-named books? Athanasius the Great says that they have been appointed of the Fathers to be read by proselytes who are preparing for admission into the Church." And then follows a division of the Old Testament into Books of the Law, Historical books, Doctrinal Books, Prophetical books, and again under these groupings the apocryphal books are not enumerated.

From all this it would seem that although the official position of the Greek Church, according to the Confession of Dositheus

which is ranked very highly in their midst, is this, that the Apocrypha form part of the Canon of the Old Testament, nevertheless, ^{as,} in general use they are not regarded as such.

There remains a small body of Catholics known as the Old Catholic Party, which in 1870 separated from the Roman Catholics, when the papal infallibility decree was promulgated. They do not ^{take} take a very favorable attitude toward the Apocrypha, although in general it must be said that it is rather hard to say what their doctrinal position is. In the Fourteen Theses of the Old Catholic Union, Conference at Bonn, in 1874 in article I they confess: "We agree ^{that} that the apocryphal or deutero-canonical books of the Old Testament ^{are} not of the same canonicity as the books contained in the Hebrew Canon." (Schaff, p. 546.)

We have now given the views of Catholics, Roman, Greek, ^{and} and Old, as regards the Old Testament Apocrypha. In the following ^{pages} pages when we see the views of Protestantism, we shall see that there are indeed divergent views.

Not all Christendom shares the views of Catholicism in regard^{-said} to the Old Testament Apocrypha. Whereas before the 16th century one^{me} might say the views on the Apocrypha were not definitely crystallized,^{-igod} during and after this century there have been two definite trends: In Catholicism to put the Apocrypha into the Canon; and in Protestantism^{-tant-} to regard them outside of the Canon, mere human, religious books.^{books} This, in general, is the position of Protestantism, as opposed to Catholicism: The Apocrypha are not to be regarded as divinely inspired^{-ired} books, they are not to serve as texts for sermons, or to be adduced to prove a doctrine, and if printed in the Bible book, they are to be^{be} subordinated to Scripture, and regarded merely as interesting human literature, in part linking up the Old Testament with the New. All Protestants agree that the Apocrypha are to be excluded from the Canon, even though there is not perfect agreement as to the esteemⁱⁿ in which they are to be held.

Now in going more into detail in Protestantism we shall divide this body into the Reformed Church and the Lutheran Church. All Protestantism, though there are many divisions, can be conveniently^{-iently} grouped thus for our purpose.

In the Reformed group are all the larger non-Lutheran Protestant groups, as Methodists, Presbyterians, Baptists, Congregation^{-ation-}alists, Reformed Church, Evangelical Synod, Protestant Episcopal Church, etc. These Reformed bodies today all have these general opinions: Strictly to exclude the Apocrypha, also not to print them in their Bibles, and thus legalistically, puritanically, to have nothing^{-ing} to do with these books, and to avoid them.

At first these bodies were not quite so strict, though they to^{two} put them below the canonical books. One might say that at first

they still regarded them as worthwhile reading. Later, however, ^{they} they became much stricter than Lutheranism. E.g. in 1529, Luther did not come out fast enough for the followers of ^{Zwingli} Calvin with a translation ^{not} of the Apocrypha. Leo Judae then made one, which appeared in 1529, ^{as} as addition to the Old Testament, with the words: "Dasz sind die buecher die by den alten vnder Biblische geschriffte nit gezelt sind, ^{cher} ouch ^{by} by den Ebreern nit gefunden." In the first editions of the Bibles in Zurich, the Apocrypha are found at the end of the whole Bible. ^{Thus} Thus also the first Swiss Genevan Bible, as also the French ^Protestant Bible had the Apocrypha. And even much later the same view was held ^{held} in regard to the English Bible. We are told (Davis, "A dictionary of the Bible," s.v. Apocrypha, p. 43) "The Apocrypha was introduced into the English version by Coverdale in 1535, and was included in the King James Version, but began to be omitted as early as 1629. When inserted it was placed between the Old and New Testament."

Some of the earlier confessions definitely place the Apocrypha ^{- apocrypha} outside of the Canon, but are not so strict as to the use as is later ^{later} the case. Second Helvetic Confession, of 1566, with the writing of which Bullinger, the successor of Zwingli had much to do, of which Schaff says: "It was adopted, or at least highly approved, by nearly ^{all} all the Reformed Churches on the continent and in England and Scotland", states in Cap. I, De Scriptura Sancta, Vero Dei Verbo: "1. Credimus et confitemur, Scripturas Canonicas sanctorum ^Prophetarum et Apostolorum ^{- atem} utriusque Testamenti ipsum verum esse verbum Dei, et auctoritatem sufficientem ex semetipsis, non ex hominibus habere." This latter is ^{is} stressed against Rome, which teaches that it is the Church or a ^{council} council that has given these books their real authority. "2. Interim nihil ^{- to} dissimulamus quosdam Veteris Testamenti libros a veteribus nuncupatos ^{legi} esse apocryphos, ab aliis ecclesiasticos, utpote quos in ecclesiis leg

voluerunt, non tamen proferrri ad auctoritatem ex his fidei confirm-
andam." (Schaff, p. 237f).

Confessio Fidei Gallicana, of 1559, prepared by Calvin
and adopted by the Synod of La Rochelle: "III. These Holy Scriptures
are comprised in the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments,
as follows: (then follow the 39 books of the O.T. as found in our
English Bibles)... IV. We know these books to be canonical.....
illumination of the Holy Spirit, which enables us to distinguish ^{them} them
from other ecclesiastical books upon which, however useful, we cannot ^{- not}
found any articles of faith.....V. We believe that the Word contained ^{- ed}
in these books has proceeded from God, and receives its authority
from him alone, and not from men.... It is not lawful for man nor ^{even} even
for angels, to add to it, to take away from it, or to change it."
(Schaff, p. 360 - 362)

5
Confessio Belgica, 1561: "Article IV. Canonical Books of the ^{the} the
Holy Scripture. We believe that the Holy Scriptures are contained in
two books, namely, the Old and New Testaments, which are canonical...
The books of the Old Testament are (and then follow the 39 as in
our Bible.) Article VI. We ~~d~~ distinguish these sacred books from the
apocryphal, viz., the third and fourth book of Esdras, the Song of ^{the} the
Three Children in the Furnace, the History of Susannah, of Bel and ^{the} the
Dragon, the Prayer of Manasses, and the two books of Maccabees. All
which the church may read and take instruction from, so far as they
agree with the canonical books; but they are far from having such
power and efficacy as that we may from their testimony confirm ^{point} any point
of faith or of the Christian religion; much less to detract from the
authority of the other sacred books." (Schaff, 385 - 387)

Up until this time we can say Reformed and Lutherans agreed quite well as to the Apocrypha. But beginning with the 17th century a different spirit begins to prevail. It is then that in Reformed circles they began definitely to oppose all their use and became ^{more} bitter against them; they were regarded in an evil light, the errors in them were more strongly accentuated.

Lively opposition against the Apocrypha was voiced at the Synod of Dort (1618 - 16¹9), when among others a certain Gomarus asked that the Apocrypha be removed from the Bible. However, the Synod decided not to exclude them altogether, though it expressed ^{the} the idea that it would have been better if they had never been added to Bible editions. Henceforth the Apocrypha were to appear with a ^{special} special title, with a special preface, in smaller type, and with glosses to point out the errors. This greater strictness was especially called for in opposition against Romanism.

The same strict spirit we find in the Westminster Confession of 1648: "II. Under the name of Holy Scriptures, or the Word of God written, are now contained all the Books of the Old and New Testament, ^{- meant,} which are these (then follows a list as we have them).... all of which ^{which} are given by inspiration of God to be the rule of faith and life.... III. The books commonly called Apocrypha, not being of divine ^{inspire} inspiration, are no part of the canon of Scripture; and therefore are of no ^{no} authority in the Church of God, nor to be any otherwise approved, or made use of, than other human writings." (Schaff, p. 601. 602). Hengstenberg adds: "Das einzige reformierte Glaubensbekenntnis, auf welches die moderne Erbitterung gegen die Apokryphen sich mit einigem Rechte berufen kann, ist das der Presbyterianer in Schottland."

- desc.

There are a number of other confessions that we could adduce, especially confessional statements of modern Protestant bodies, but they all contain practically the same statements, and hold the same position. In general one can say that from this time forward the Apocrypha are relegated to the position of private use in all Reformed bodies, except in the Anglican Church (of which later).

This bitterness again came out in the 19th century, in the so-called Apokryphenstreitigkeiten, the Apocryphal Controversy, in Bible societies, especially the British and Foreign Bible Society - which was instrumental in distributing large numbers of Bibles in various languages. Especially from Scotland came the demand that these Bibles be printed without the Apocrypha. "If we do that, include the Apocrypha in the Bible, can we say that we still have the pure, unadulterated Word of God?" was the question. When this society distributed Bibles in Germany, and used as a basis a version of Luthers, containing the Apocrypha, and when in Catholic countries like Italy, Spain, Portugal, Bibles were distributed, and the text used was that used in the Roman Church, with the apocryphal books interspersed with the canonical, there was much opposition. The distributors in Catholic countries stated that they could not distribute any Bibles at all unless they could use the Vulgate text, or translations based on the Vulgate. The conflict lasted many ^{years,} and much was written on either side. Finally the main societies ^{decid-} ed that they would exclude the Apocrypha, and furthermore that they would not help support the smaller societies if these continued to print the Apocrypha in their Bibles. "The agitation was accordingly ^{-ly} continued until finally, on May 3, 1827, it was resolved 'that no association or individual circulating the apocryphal books should receive aid from the Society; that none but bound books should be

distributed to the auxiliaries, and that the auxiliaries should circulate them as received; and that all societies printing the apocryphal books should place the amount granted them for Bibles at the disposal of the parent Society.'" (Green, Intro. to O.T., Canon, p. 194, quoting Bible Societies, in Appleton's Encyclopedia).

Later on toward the middle of the century, the fight waged again in Germany. On the side opposing the Apocrypha were men like Joh. Schiller, Kluge, Ph. Keerl, Wile. Men like Stier, Hengstenberg^{-berg,} and Bleek upheld the use of the Apocrypha. Oehler says of all this: "Doch kann der Schreiber dieses, der sine ira et studio den Verhandlungen gefolgt ist, sich nur dahin aussprechen, dasz ihm das groeszere^{-zee} Recht auf Seiten der Apokryphengegner zu sein scheint." (p. 269) "Wenigstens die Frucht duerfte der lange Streit tragen, dasz die Apokryphen kuenftig dem evangelischen Volk in strengerer Sonderung dargeboten, dasz sie nicht mehr als etwas behandelt werden, ohne das^{das} die Bibel unvollstaendig waere." (p. 270)

However, in one branch of the Reformed Church, namely in the^{The} Anglican Church, or Church of England, where the 39 Articles and the Book of Common Prayer are used, we do not find this bitterness toward the Apocrypha. The Thirty-nine Articles state (of the year 1562, quoting the American Revision of 1801, VI, of the Sufficiency of the Holy Scripture for Salvation): "Holy Scripture containeth^{all} all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein,^{-sin,} nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought^{it} requisite or necessary to salvation. In the name of the Holy Scriptures we do understand those canonical books of the Old and New Testament, of which^{-site} authority was never any doubt in the Church." The^{do} under the heading^{whose} Of the Names and Number of the Canonical Books, we find for the Old^{-ing;}

Testament the 39 as found in our Bibles. And then: "And the other books (as Hierome saith) the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners; but yet it doth not apply to them to establish any doctrine; such are these following: The 3rd Book of Esdras, 4th Book of Esdras, Book of Tobias, Book of Judith, the rest of the Book of Esther, Book of Wisdom, Jesus the Son of Sirach, Baruch the Prophet, the Song of the Three Children, the Story of Susanna, of Bel and the Dragon, The Prayer of Manasses, the First Book of Maccabees, The Second Book of Maccabees." (Schaff, p. 489. 490).

We note this difference between the Westminster Confession and the Thirty-nine Articles: Westminster says: "Therefore they are of no authority in the Church of God, nor to be any otherwise approved or made use of, than other human writings"; Thirty-nine Articles say: "And the other books the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners."

Accordingly in the Book of Common Prayer, the liturgical book used in all Anglican Churches we find the following. Suggestions are given for reading Scripture for every day of the year, morning and evening; from Sept. 27 in the evening until Nov. 23 in the morning the readings suggested are taken from the Apocrypha.

Furthermore, for lessons on certain festivals, viz. Innocents' Day, Conversion of St. Paul, Purification of Mary, St. Matthias, Annunciation of Our Lady, St. Barnabas, St. Peter, St. James, St. Bartholemew, St. Matthew, St. Luke, and All Saints' Day, lessons from Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus are suggested as fitting lessons. It has been the tendency in recent years, since the Oxford Movement, and then again at the centenary of this movement toward Catholicism, to lay undue stress on the Apocrypha in certain circles, and these High Churches.

men based their arguments also on such texts as are found in the Book of Common Prayer. However, outside of this High Church ^{-ment} movement, there have also arisen sentiments against the Apocrypha, as is evidenced by the fact that an attempt was made in recent years to make changes in the Book of Common Prayer. A change was desired just because of the feeling against those pages in the Book of ^{Common} Prayer that recommended the Apocrypha for Bible reading, and for lessons on certain festivals. Parliament however voted not to make any changes.

One large wing of Protestantism we have now considered, ^{and} and their views toward the Old Testament Apocrypha. There is left to set down the position of the other wing, namely Lutheranism.

We shall give the personal position of Martin Luther, the founder of Lutheranism, in his own words. In his German translation ^{- time} of the Bible he grouped them ^{of} all together, and placed them between the Old and the New Testament with the heading: "Apocrypha. Das sind ^{sind} Buecher, die der Heiligen Schrift nicht gleichzuhalten und doch nuetzlich und gut zu lesen sind." That was his viewpoint, ^{that} and that has been followed by Lutheranism since his time. In judging these books thus he followed Jerome and many other church fathers, as we shall show later. In the rest of his writings he never speaks of them en bloc, but merely speaks of the merits and demerits of the individual books. ~~(XV)~~ (XIV, 68 - 85; XXII, 1411 - 1413).

What do Lutheran Confessions say about these books?

"For we know that those things which we have said are in harmony with the prophetic and apostolic Scriptures." (Apology, Art. III, 268. Triglot, p. 225). "We believe, teach, and confess that the sole rule and standard according to which all dogmas, together ^{with} with (all) teachers should be estimated and judged are the prophetic ^{and} and apostolic Scriptures of the Old and of the New Testament alone." (Of the Summary Content, Rule, and Standard, par. 1. Triglot, p. ⁷⁷⁷ 777). "First (then, we receive and embrace with our whole heart) the Prophetic and Apostolic Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the pure, clear fountain of Israel, which is the only true standard by which all teachers and doctrines are to be judged." (F. C. Th. Decl. Comprehensive Summary. Triglot p. 851). "Besides, we also grant that the angels pray for us..... Although concerning the ^{saints} saints ^{we concede that, just as, when alive, they pray for the Church.} we concede that, just as, when alive, they pray for the Church

universal in general, so in heaven they pray for the Church in general, ^{- anal,} albeit no testimony concerning the praying of the dead is extant in the ^{the} Scriptures, except the dream taken from the Second Book of Maccabees, 15, 14." (Apology. Art XXI (IE). Triglot p. 345). Also in the Apology, Art. III (Triglot p. 198f) several verses from Tobias are cited, but only because the Romanists have cited them to prove a ^{certain} point, which is there being refuted.

This is all our confessions have. What can we gather from these words as regards the Apocrypha? "The sole rule and standard ^{- ment."} are the prophetic and apostolic Scripture of the Old and New Testament." If someone, not very well versed in dogmatic^s terms should look into our confessions to see what the Lutheran view on the Apocrypha is, ^{and} see these quotations, he would undoubtedly not be able to determine ^{just} just how we stand, though the expression quoted above is undoubtedly there to exclude the Apocrypha. "'The prophetic Scriptures', - that does not include, but specifically excludes the Apocrypha." (Pop. Sym., Engelder et al., p. 27). "In den lutherischen Bekenntnis^schriften ^{wird} wird in Betreff des Schriftkanons nichts festgestellt. Doch ist durch ^{die} die Bestimmung ~~des~~ Concordienformel, nach welcher die prophetischen und apostolischen Schriften Alten und Neuen Testaments die einzige ^{- norm} Lehrnorm bilden und diesen keine andere Schriften gleichgeachtet werden sollen, ^{- an} der dogmatische Gebrauch der Apokryphen des Alten Testaments ausgeschlossen." (Oehler, p. 266). "Die Apokryphen sind damit deutlich degradiert und vom alttestamentlichen Kanon im engeren Sinne als dem Inbegriff der prophetica scripta Veteris Testamenti ausgeschlossen." (Strack-Zoekler, p. 15). That is what scholars have thought of that expression, "^{prophetic and apostolic} ~~apostolic~~ ~~and~~ ~~prophetic~~ Scripture", that it excludes the Apocrypha, though to a layman it might not convey that meaning.

One might also ask, How about writings of David and Solomon, were these men prophets, and are their writings included in this "prophetic Scripture"? The Lutheran Church has always held that ^{also} they are so designated. In this connection it might be interesting to note what Jews would say to that. The Jewish Encyclopedia, s.v. Bible Canon, says: "The oldest Baraita assumes the author of every book to have been a prophet.... Not only the patriarchs, ^{but} but David and Solomon also were considered prophets." (p. 147).

One might also wonder, How about the citations from the Apocrypha that are found in our confessions without stating that ^{these} these books do not belong to the Canon of Scripture? In the first place, their number is very small, so that Strack says: "Die lutherischen Bekenntnisschriften enthalten keine ausdrueckliche Erklaerung gegen die nicht im hebraeischen Kanon stehenden Schriften; indes betrachten ^{-kan-} sie tatsaechlich die kanonischen Schriften als dogmatisch allein ^{gultig} giltig, denn die wenigen in der Apologia Confessionis aus den Apokryphen angefuehrten Stellen werden nur darum citiert, weil die Gegner sich auf sie berufen hatten." (765). This then is the reason these apocryphal verses are adduced in our confessions: Rome had adduced them as proof texts, and now in defending the Lutheran position, these texts are mentioned to show how they are taken up wrongly by Rome. "Aus den Apokryphen werden zwar ein paar Stellen citiert aber nur weil die Gegner sie geltend gemacht hatten, freilich auch ohne ausdrueckliche Verwerfung derselben als apokryphischer." (Oehler, p. 266).

But why do not our confessions also draw up a list of ^{-ical} canonical books, as Rome does and as the Reformed Churches do? In the first place, our theologians did not want to call anyone a heretic who, ^{e.g.} e.g. did not accept the Epistle of Jude as canonical. Then in regard to ^{the} the Old Testament, why is not there a list of that given to show which ^{ones} ones

are considered to be canonical, or why is it not stated whether or not we consider the Canon as held by the Jews to be the correct one? I believe it can be satisfactorily explained thus: Luther was regarded as the great leader of Lutheranism, and he had in his Bible translation stated how the Apocrypha were to be regarded: "Buecher, die der Heiligen Schrift nicht gleichzuhalten, und doch nuetzlich und gut zu lesen sind." This was regarded as final; it was thought that there was no further need of stating in the confessions how these books were to be regarded. Hengstenberg ("Fuer Beibehaltung der Apokryphen", p. 95) expresses it thus: "Waehrend die lutherischen Bekenntnisschriften von den apokryphischen schweigen*.. (footnote) * Es wird aber nicht verkannt werden koennen, dasz das Urteil Luthers, ausgesprochen in der von der ganzen Kirche angenommenen Bibeluebersetzung, der Sache nach einer Erklaerung in den Bekenntnisschriften gleichgilt."

Though our confessions do not give us a definite list of the Old Testament Canon, yet the later dogmaticians showed that there was no doubt in their minds what the Lutheran position was, and they can leave no doubt in our minds as to what definitely is the position of Lutheranism over against the Apocrypha. We shall give the position of a few of the outstanding men.

Martin Chemnitz (1522 - 1586), that alter Martinus of whom Catholics say: Si alter Martinus non venisset, primus Martinus non stetisset, has this to say about the books we are treating: "Et ex scriptis veteris Testamenti, inter apocrypha quae non sunt in canone, numerantur Liber Sapientiae, Syrach, Judith, Tobias, tertius et quartus Esdrae, Baruch, Epistola Jeremiae, libri Machabaeorum, particulae in Esther et Daniele." (Examen, De Scriptura Canonica, 19). These books, Chemnitz says, are rightly called Apocrypha (according to the definition by Augustine of Apocrypha: "Apocryphae nuncupantur eo, quod earum

occulta origo non claruit patribus") "propterea quod non satis ^{-tis} certis
testificationibus constitit, an essent a prophetis vel apostolis ^{sive}
editi sive comprobati." "Nullum igitur dogma ex istis libris ^{-turi} exstrui
debet." (25)

The next great dogmatician was Johann Gerhard (1582 - 1637),
called the "arch-theologian", "the oracle of his times." He divides
all the apocrypha (understanding under that term both the Pseudepigrapha ^{-grapha}
and the Apocrypha) into two classes: "prioris generis libri dicuntur
apocryphi qui sunt absconditi, i.e. originis absconditae et occultae;
posterioris generis libri dicuntur apocryphi sensu eo, quod sind
abscondendi nec in ecclesia legendi." He also states (De Scriptura
Sacra, caput VI, par. 67): "Apocryphi Veteris Testamenti sunt reliqui
omnes qui praeter canonicas in Veteris Testamenti codice continentur.
Illorum potest duplex constitui classis. 1) ~~Quidam~~ etiam ipsorum
Pontificiorum confessione sunt apocryphi, utut in codice biblico ^{Graeco}
vel Latino contineantur. Tales sunt..... Oratio Manassis....."
(In this place it can be stated that in the back of some Catholic
Bibles the following can be found: "Libri Apocryphi. Oratio Manassae,
necnon Libri duo, qui sub libri Tertii et Quartii Esdrae nomine circum-
feruntur, hoc in loco, extra scilicet seriem Canonicorum Librorum, ^{quos}
sancta Tridentina Synodus suscepit, et pro canonicis suscipiendos
decrevit, sepositi sunt, ne prorsus interirent, quippe qui a nonnullis
sanctis Patribus interdum citantur, et in aliquibus Bibliis Latinis
tam manuscriptis quam impressis reperiuntur.") 2) "Quidam a Pont-
ificiis habentur pro canonicis, cum tamen revera sint apocryphi. Illi ^{illi}
sunt.... (and here follow the Apocrypha, in the sense in which this
paper treats them.)"

Another dogmatician of the Lutheran Church, Johann Wilhelm Baier (1647 - 1695), whose work we have retained in [#]Baier's "Compendium Theologiae Positivae", in an edition edited by C.F.W. Walther in 1879, says (De principio Theologiae, par. 37) "Qui autem praeter istos in codice biblico Veteris Testamenti aliquando ^{reut} comparent libri: Judith, Sapientiae, Tobiae, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, duo Maccabaeorum, fragmenta Estherae, Danielis, de Susanna, de Bel et Dracone, ^e Babylonico, orationes Asariae, trium puerorum, et Manassis..... recte dicuntur apocryphi."

Hollaz (1648 - 1713), also distinguishing two classes of Apocrypha, writes: "Libri canonici sunt: 1. qui in codice quidem, sed non in canone biblico exstant, neque immediato Dei afflatu scripti ^{sunt} sunt; 2. qui continent fabulas, errores ac mendacia ac proinde non sunt in ecclesia legendi."

Statements from later dogmaticians, as Pieper and Hoenecke, etc. could be cited here also; these men hold the same position as Luther and the later Lutheran dogmaticians.

In general, the attitude of Lutheranism has not been as ^{little} bitter nor as legalistic as that of the Reformed Church, as can be seen ^{from} from Luther's "doch nuetzlich zu lesen", and from the quotations ^{from} from other dogmaticians, as also ^{by} the fact that these books are even today in the Lutheran German Bibles, inserted between the Old and the New Testaments. Of this attitude Walther at one time said (Lutheraner, 38, 62), in commenting on an action of the Ministerium in Germany: "Vom Ministerium ist an die Schulinspektion eine Verfügung ergangen, darauf zu achten, dasz in den Schulen des Landes keine Bibeln ohne Apokrypha gebraucht werden, da zwar nach der Lehre unserer Kirche ^{die} die apokryphischen Buecher den kanonischen nicht gleichzustellen, aber ^{auch} auch

aus den Apokryphen doch Sprueche wie ganze Geschichten fuer den Religionsunterricht sehr wertvoll seien. Ueber diese Ordnung kann man sich nur freuen. Der Einwurf der Calvinisten, dasz, wenn die Apokryphen der Bibel beigegeben seien, Gottes Word und Menschenwort mit einander vermischt wuerden, ist ganz ohne Grund." We are, then, not afraid to have the Apocrypha bound in our Bibles, knowing the right distinction. And yet there are many good Lutherans who also hold that it might be better if the Apocrypha were removed from the Bible and printed ^{separate-} separately, because, well, because the Bible is God's Word, and why clutter it up with human works? We don't include books by other human authors in the sacred volume. They are still, however, "nuetzlich zu lesen." The best way would then perhaps be to print them separately, so that our people could still have access to them, even though they are not in the sacred volume. They are "nuetzlich zu lesen", because they ^{give} give us the historical connecting link between the Old and New Testament, show us what the people in those days believed, how many pious ^{people} people lived, and also because they contain many sound moral principles - - we ought to read them as we would read and enjoy these things in any other merely human book. Hirschberger Bibel: "Mit gehoeriger ^{-fuer} Pruefung zu lesen" (as one ought to read all human books, and not docilely accept all that is printed) "und nur das darin allgerings hin und her befindliche Gute zu behalten und nachzuahmen."

Here then we have the views of Lutheranism, both from their confessions and their dogmaticians. The Lutheran and Catholic views on the Old Testament Apocrypha are indeed divergent: The one places the books into the Canon and anathematizes those who do not receive them as "sacred and canonical"; the other considers them outside of the Canon. The two large branches of the Christian Church split asunder on an important question, the question of what constitutes the norm

of faith, of what belongs into the Holy Bible, of what really is the Word of God.

What are then the reasons why we maintain our position to be correct, and with which we reject the arguments of Rome, given ^{before} in this paper?

One of the main reasons we do not accept the Apocrypha of ^{the} the Old Testament as canonical is that the Jewish Church of the Old Testament did not accept them in their Canon as such. The Apocrypha are excluded from the Jewish Canon. Look at any Jewish Bible today - - it corresponds in contents (not in arrangement of books) exactly to the Old Testament of Protestantism.

We must first of all get this fundamental principle straight: The books of the Bible were written and designed to be held sacred and divinely authoritative, and not that the halo of age gradually gave them canonical standing. These books were included in the Canon ^{because} because they were written by the prophets, inspired by God. ~~∅~~ These books were not made canonical by putting them into, or counting them with the Canon. "The Canon does not derive its authority from the Church, ^{whether} whether Jewish or Christian; the office of the Church is merely that of a custodian and witness." These books have their authority from God, and the Jews by receiving them into the Canon, merely made "recognition ^{-ition} of the righteousness of their claim to be a revelation of the will of God." (Green, Intro., Canon, 30 - 35). And the Jews at and immediately after the writing of these books were in a position to ^{judge} judge as a witness and say: Yes, it's true, this book is or is not by such ^{and} as such a prophet of God. They could judge whether God had inspired ^{the} the book or not. Rom. 3, 2: "Unto them (the Jews) were committed the oracles of God." These books were committed to them to hand down;

they took the greatest of care. They could tell which were divinely inspired books, for they knew the authors which by special signs God had pointed out, and they knew which were their writings, and whether the contents of these books was in agreement with what they had openly preached.

We exclude the Apocrypha because they were written at a time when the Old Testament Canon had already been closed. These books called the Apocrypha were all written between the years 280 B.C. - 40 B.C. There is much dispute as to the exact date of each book, ^{but} scholars are pretty well agreed that all these books can be placed ^{into} into this period.

But if they were written in this period, they were written ^{after} after the closing of the Old Testament Canon. The Jewish Old Testament is divided into three parts: Law, ^Prophets, and Writings or Hagiographa. The Canon including all three of these divisions was closed at about the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, though Rome tells us that that is true of only the first two parts, the Law and the ^Prophets, and that the Writings were left open till about 90 A.D. "The spirit of God might and did breathe into later writings and the presence of the deuterocanonical books in the Church's Canon at once forestalls and answers those Protestant theologians who claim that Esdras was a divine agent for an inviolable fixing and sealing of the Old Testament." (Cath. Ency., III, 268). Which is a good *Petitio Principii*: The Apocrypha could have been added later because the Canon was not yet closed; the Canon was not yet closed because the Apocrypha were added.

We can, however, show that the Canon, the entire Canon, was closed around the years 425-400 B.C.

1) There are among the Jews a number of legends that are in themselves very fantastic, fixed up with a great deal of imaginative material, but which nevertheless seem to have a kernel, a historically ^{-ally,} correct kernel, about the closing of the Canon.

a) There is thus one legend that states that Nehemiah founded a library.

b) Another states that Ezra rewrote the whole Bible, that God inspired him and he wrote the entire Bible and handed it down to posterity.

c) There is in the Talmud a Jewish tradition of the so-called Great Synagog, which assembled for the purpose of collecting ^{-ing} the sacred volume.

Now it is certainly true that all the details connected with some of these fantastic legends are not true, but when we boil them down and remove all the imaginative adornment, there is left, it ^{seems,} seems, a historical fact, incident, namely that at the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, about 425-400 B.C., the books of the Bible, of the Old Testament were all collected in a closed sacred volume.

2) Now this would fit in very well with the circumstances of this time; there was just at this time a great need for such a collection. The Jews had been led away into Captivity some 80 or 90 years prior, and there in captivity had turned, many of them, from their ^{their} former wicked ways. Adversities and afflictions have a tendency to make men seek after God and his Word, as David says: "It is good for me ^{me} that I have been afflicted that I might learn ~~the~~ statutes." This people now returned repentant, thirsting to read the Word of God, and wishing to conserve it for future generations.

But they could no longer read it . The Torah, etc. were all ^{written in the Hebrew -- and in the captivity Israel had become an} written in the Hebrew - - and in the captivity Israel had become an

Aramaic speaking people. In Nehemiah chapter 8 we read of how worship was again introduced, and there in verse 8 we read: "So they read in the book in the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading." Here the Hebrew was ^{read,} and then men explained the words in the Aramaic so that ~~the~~ people could understand them. There were besides that various dialects of the Aramaic as Neh. 13, 24 shows. Now these people wanted to have ^{their} Word of God, and wanted to hand it down. There was then a need of conserving these books at this time, lest they be lost to posterity, since so few could read them.

That there was a need of a collection now is further shown ^{by} this that the last prophet had spoken. Malachi wrote: "Behold, I ^{will} send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me," and "Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord." The next great event after this prophet would be, not the coming of another prophet, but the coming of the messenger who was to come just before the Messiah, and then the coming of the Messiah himself. ^{Of} this last passage the Jewish Encyclopedia says (s.v. Bible Canon, p. 145): "Perhaps the ^{last} three verses of the book of Malachi the last prophet, are to be considered as a kind of canonization."

3) That the Canon was closed is further shown by this that ^{later} late books - - that even laid a strong claim to being divine, were not ^{added.} added. Why not? Because the sacred volume was closed, and no more ^{were} books were to be added, till "Elijah should come." Ecclus. 24, 45. 46: "Denn meine Lehre leuchtet so weit als der lichte Morgen und scheint ferne. Auch schuettet meine Lehre Weissagung aus (ὧς ἰσχυρὰ φωνὰ τελέουσι) die ^{ewig} ewig bleiben musz" - - and yet Ecclesiasticus was not placed into the ^{Jewish Canon,} Jewish Canon.

4) We can furthermore point to numerous passages in the Apocrypha themselves which say or presuppose the Canon to have been closed. The Prologue to Ecclesiasticus, written by the grandson of the author of this book, in a German translation reads as follows: "Da uns durch das Gesetz, die Propheten, und die sich daran anschliesz-^{-liege}
enden so Vieles and so Groszes ueberliefert ist, wogendessen man Israel ^{Israel} der Weisheit, und Froemigkeit loben musz, und weil es noetig ist, nicht nur dasz die ^Leser selbst die rechte Einsicht erlangen, sondern auch dasz die Liebhaber der Weisheit durch Lesen und Schreiben denen, die drauszen sind, nuetzlich werden, hat mein Groszvater, nachdem er das Gesetz, die Propheten und die andern Schriften der Vaeter fleiszig^{-zig} gelesen und darinnen....." This Prologue calls attention to these three divisions of Scripture, and presupposes that they were known.

Also Ecclesiasticus 44 - 49 speaking of the great men of God and their works mentions all the prophets and their works, presupposing ^{-ing} a collection to have been extant.

In 1 Mac. 12, 9, Jonathan is sending a letter of comfort to friends that are worrying about him, and says: "Wiewohl wir nun jetzt nicht fremder Hilfe beduerfen und Trost haben an Gottes Wort, das wir taeglich lesen."

5) An indication that Ezra and Nehemiah were instrumental in collecting the inspired books of the Old Testament into a Canon we ^{find} find in this fact that in the Jewish Canon the books of Ezra, ^{and} Nehemiah, and Chronicles are at the end. Why? If Ezra and Nehemiah collected the sacred books, they out of modesty would not put their books at the beginning, or at some other prominent place, but at the end. This ^{of} of course is no proof, but corroborates the other arguments.

6) Another very strong proof we ~~that~~ have that the Canon was closed before the Apocrypha were written, and hence excluded, ~~is~~ is a quotation from Josephus. About 100 A.D. Josephus is writing against Apion, and wants to show him that Hebrew history is correct, which the Hellenistic is not. He says that with the Hellenes not enough care was taken to get it accurately. With the Hebrews this ^{care} care was left to the priests, and these priests carefully preserved the writings. He enumerates the books in the Jewish Canon (like ours) and then says (Contra Apionem, I, 7) "Die ὑπογράφειν Abfassung, habe nicht in der Willkuer eines jeden gelegen, ἀλλὰ μόνον τῶν προφητῶν ἐν μὲν ἀνωτάτῳ καὶ πλεονεχέστατῳ καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐπιχειροιδίᾳ τῇ ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ μαρτυρούμεναι, ἐν δὲ καὶ αὐτοῦς ὡς ἐγένετο καθὼς συγγράφονται." ^{thousands} He then continues, I, 8, in translation: "We have not ^{thousands} tens of thousands of books, discordant and conflicting, but only twenty-two, containing ^{-aining} the record of all time, which have been justly believed (to be ^{divine} divine.) And of these, five are the books of Moses, which embrace the laws and the traditions from the creation of man until Moses' death. This ^{period} period is a little short of three thousand years. From the death of Moses ^{to} to the reign of Artaxerxes, the successor of Xerxes, king of Persia, ^{the} the prophets who succeeded Moses wrote what was done in thirteen books. The remaining four books embrace hymns to God and counsels for men ^{for} for the conduct of life. From Artaxerxes" (i.e. Artaxerxes Longimanus, 465-425 B.C., under which Persian king the last prophet, Malachi, prophesied) "until our time everything has been recorded, but has not been deemed worthy of like credit with what preceded because the exact succession of the prophets ceased. But what faith we have placed in our own writings is evident by our conduct; for though so long a time ^{has} has now passed, no one has dared either to add anything to them, or to take ^{take} anything from them, or to alter anything in them. But it is instinctive

in all Jews at once from their very birth to regard them as commands of God, and to abide by them, and if need be, willingly to die for them." (Quoted from Green, Canon, p. 37). This shows how scrupulously the Jews guarded their sacred script, and how highly they regarded and how carefully they preserved it after it had been established what belonged to the Canon.

7) Furthermore, there were no later prophets, as Malachi testifies, and as Josephus tells us, who could have been God's ^{agents} agents in gathering the sacred books together.

From these points we can definitely see that the Canon was closed, at the time of Ezra, and closed in its entirety, before the Apocrypha, thus rejecting the arguments of the Roman Catholic Church.

A further proof that the Apocrypha were not and could not be in the Canon is because of their authors. A book, to have claim for canonicity, must have been written by a prophet. This is a principle we find laid down for us in the New Testament. "They have Moses and the prophets. "And beginning at Moses and all the prophets he ^{expounded} expounded unto them..." (Luke 24, 27). "God who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets." (Heb. 1, 1) But the Apocrypha do not meet that requirement: the line of prophets had ceased with Malachi, as his pointing forward to the next great ^{event} event the coming of Elijah, and his presupposing that no other prophet ^{would} would come till then, signifies. These apocryphal books were in some cases indeed written by pious men, but often we do not even know who wrote them, and at other times they lay claim to having as their authors ^{men} men like Solomon (Wisdom) and Daniel (all of the fragments in Daniel), ^{which} which we know to be a false claim. We can for this reason justly call them spurious. They lay claim to having such and such an author, and seek

thereby to gain recognition; but that claim is false. Furthermore, Josephus in Contra Apionem testifies that the Jews knew the line of prophets to have ceased. "From Artaxerxes until our time everything has been recorded, but has not been deemed worthy of like credit with what preceded because the exact succession of the prophets ceased." The Apocrypha were not included in the Canon because of the men who wrote them.

Another reason that the Apocrypha do not belong in the Canon and were not placed there by the Jews is the language in which they were written. Taken for granted that only the prophets of God wrote God-inspired books in the Old Testament, it follows that the language in which these books would be written - - for God using the prophets as instruments used also their language - - would be the language of the prophets, namely the Hebrew. But the Apocrypha were, with the exception of perhaps Jesus Sirach, written in the Greek language, and so also this reason would militate against placing the Apocrypha into the Canon. So far for the Jewish Palestinian Canon.

We, moreover, saw from the arguments of Roman Catholics that they say: But the Alexandrian Jews had a larger, a more complete Canon. They included the Apocrypha. They say, the Jews in Alexandria used the Greek language, translated the Old Testament into the Greek, and added some books in the Greek. Furthermore they say that the Apocrypha are interspersed with the others, thus being placed on the same level of canonicity with the others.

Now we will grant that in the LXX, the Greek translation of the Old Testament, the Apocrypha were added, also that these were interspersed - - in fact, that is where the trouble and confusion started - but we will not grant that the Alexandrian Jews considered the Apocrypha

as on the same level with the canonical books.

The Prologue to Jesus Sirach quoted before speaks of the Greek LXX translation and there again mentions the three parts of the ^{the} Palestinian Canon: "Denn wenn man das Hebraeische in eine andere Sprache uebersetzt, findet sich nicht immer ein Wort von genau derselben Bedeutung, und nicht allein dies, sondern das Gesetz und die Propheten, und die andern Schriften weisen einen bedeutenden Unterschied in der Sprache auf." Thus this writer's grandfather - - the author of Jesus Sirach - - read the Old Testament Bible in its three divisions, ^{the} Palestinian divisions.

Furthermore, these Jews in Alexandria wanted to remain ^{- orthodox} orthodox Jews - - they did not want to have any one get the idea that they were getting away from the moorings of their fathers - - and this they could not have done with a larger canon than that found in their old native land.

Another argument: Josephus in writing against Apion, a ^{- arian} grammarian of Alexandria, would certainly have reprovved and condemned this man if he and other Alexandrian Jews would have added more books to the ^{Canon} Canon - but Josephus says nothing like that; consequently we assume that there ^{there} was nothing wrong or different with the Alexandrian Jewish Canon.

Then how about Philo, that great ^Sscholar, and outstanding man among Alexandrian Jews? Philo wrote voluminously, treating first of all ^{all} and especially the Pentateuch. But in fifty or more places he also treats other portions of the Old Testament writings; furthermore, he freely quotes men like Plato, Solon, Hippokrates, Heraclitus - - - but never mentions the Apocrypha. Strack-Zoekler: "Ein anderes Ansehen als das von bloszen Privatschriften scheint er ihnen also nicht bei-

gelegt zu haben." (p. 11).

Then why were they interspersed? First of all, it was pre-supposed that the Jews knew what belonged to the Canon, and the example of Philo shows that they did know. Then, in numerous places where the text of the sacred book merely hints at the exact order of events, Jews with imagination filled in stories of plausible explanation^{- ations} or wrote whole books - - for religious literature. But the Jews all knew where the line was - - they knew: this belongs to the Canon, this^{this} is a story from so and so's imagination.

We have here then sufficient evidences that the Canon of the Jews in Alexandria was the same as that of the Palestinian Jews, and that^{that} the supernumerary books found in the LXX were never by them regarded as belonging to the Canon just as little as in Palestine.

What then did Christ and the apostles hold in regard to these books? We can show that also they considered only those books canonical which were in the Jewish Canon. "To the Jews were committed the oracles of God." That was generally understood, and what the Jews had^{had} in their Canon, as sacred books, was the $\eta \gamma\rho\lambda\varphi\eta$. Christ frequently^{- generally} uses $\eta \gamma\rho\lambda\varphi\eta$ and similar terms to denote the Old Testament Canon. With his threefold $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\rho\lambda\pi\tau\delta\epsilon$ he defeated Satan, who was tempting him. That $\gamma\rho\lambda\varphi\eta$ had authority for him, and what was his^{- his} $\gamma\rho\lambda\varphi\eta$? Naturally, what the Jews, "to whom the oracles of God were^{were} committed", knew to be such - - namely the Old Testament as the Jews have it today, and as Protestants have in their Old Testament. Witness^{Witness} what the Jewish Encyclopedia says, s.v. Bible Canon, p. 146: "The New Testament shows that its (Old Testament's) Canon was none other than that which exists today." And Christ by quoting the $\gamma\rho\lambda\varphi\eta$ gave his sanction to it as it existed. The three divisions mentioned^{before} before

Law, Prophets, Holy Writings - were known to Jesus, and ^{on} to these he puts his stamp of approval - "en bloc", to borrow a phrase from the Roman Catholics; and the fact that the question troubles the Romanists ^{its-} and that they have not sufficiently explained it away, nor can, is for us further proof of Christ's approval en bloc.

Christ and the apostles, in quoting the Old Testament, very frequently use the LXX. Now the fact that in the LXX the Apocrypha were found, and the fact that nevertheless, in spite of this, the Apocrypha were not quoted, is all the stronger evidence that Christ ^{and} and the apostles and all Jews regarded these books outside of the Canon.

They, it is true, seem to show acquaintance with the thought in these books. Matt. 7, 12 and Luke 6, 31 sound very much ^{Tobias} like Tobias 4, 16; Matt. 25, 35f like Tobias 4, 17; Rom. 1, 20 - 32 has similar thoughts as found in Wisdom 13 - 15. However, these are never introduced as ἡ γὰρ ψῆξις; then, these thoughts were also present in many of the other writings of the time; and, even if the thought ^{be} taken directly from the Apocrypha, these men do not thereby concede divine origin to the Apocrypha; Luke and Paul quote sayings of Greek poets ^{and} and wise men (Acts 17, 28 and Titus 1, 12), but they do not thereby say ^{that} that these men, these heathen poets, were inspired.

Thus also Christ and the apostles do not put the Apocrypha ^{into} into the Canon.

That Romanists say that Christ and the apostles must have included them, or men like Cyprian, Clemens would not have called them divine, is indeed a weak argument - - another argumentum in circulo. It is the same as if we would say of any other false doctrine held by later church fathers: Christ must have taught that too, or these men would not have done so - which is of course, rather poor logic.

Then how about the early Church? How did the Christians of the first few centuries look upon the Apocrypha? We shall give ^{list} a list of quotations of the fathers, in which they clearly show that they regarded the Apocrypha outside of the Canon, and later we shall deal with those fathers who seem to put the Apocrypha into the Canon.

The Apostolic Fathers, even as Paul and Luke, sometimes make use of the thoughts in the Apocrypha, but never quote them as divinely inspired Scripture, thus Polycarp, Clemens of Rome, Barnabas, and the writers of the Dádache. Justin Martyr, a little later, one of the great Apologists who lived and suffered martyrdom around the year 164 A.D., born in Palestine, travelled and wrote much; he quoted the canonical books freely, also uses some of the Apocrypha, e.g. the Additions ^{-tions} to Daniel, but he too does not quote them as Scripture.

Toward the end of the second century there had arisen some confusion as to the right use of the Apocrypha, and so we find at ^{this} this time and later many scholars who thoroughly went into the subject of Apocrypha and Canon, and have left us their reports. Some men at ^{this} this time had not observed the proper distinction in the use of these apocryphal books, and in disputing with the Jews, their attention was directed to what really constituted the Canon, and it was pointed out to them that some of the books that they quoted did not belong to Scripture.

Thus Melito, Bishop of Sardis (after 171 A.D.) made diligent inquiries in Palestine and other places in order to get this matter ^{of} of Apocrypha and Canon straight. He left a list of canonical books, and ^{and} does not include the Apocrypha in his list. His list of the Old Testament corresponds exactly with the Old Testament of Protestants, except that Esther is left out - - which we could also explain if we ^{had more space, or in another study.} (In Eusebius, "Eccl. Hist." 4, 26). had more space., or in another study. (In Eusebius, "Eccl. Hist.", 4, 26).

Origen (died 254), one of the most learned of the Greek ^{fathers,} reckons, as Josephus, the number of canonical books as 22, and in ^{this} numbering definitely leaves out the Apocrypha. In Eusebius, 6, 25, where this list of Origen is found, we find also this that the books of the ^{of} Maccabees are Εἰς τὸ ἔξω τῶν ἁγίων (outside of the Canon, outside of the sphere of these others, namely the canonical).

Athanasius (Epist. fest., 39) gives a list of the Canon which corresponds to that given by Origen and Melito. He says also: "All the Scripture of us Christians is divinely inspired. It contains ^{books} books that are not indefinite, but comprised in a fixed canon." Then he enumerates those in the Canon and says: "But besides ^{these} these books there are also some others of the Old Testament not indeed received into ^{the} the Canon, but which are only read before the catechumens. These are Wisdom, Sirach or Ecclesiasticus, Esther, Judith, and Tobit. These ^{are} are not canonical." (Synopsis Sac. Script., quoted in Green, Canon, p.184).

So also Jerome considers as canonical only those ⁱⁿ books found in the Jewish Canon. In his Prologus Galeatus (the helmeted prologue, helmeted or guarded, to guard off the entrance of books that do not belong into the sacred volume) he gives a list of books as found in the Hebrew Canon, and then goes on to say: "Quicquid extra hos est, inter apocrypha esse ponendum. Igitur Sapientia, quae vulgo Salomonis ^{- omis} inscribitur, et Jesu filii Sirach liber, et Judith et Tobias et ^{- ty} Pastor non sunt in canone." He says in another place of these Apocrypha: "Ecclesia legit quidem sed inter canonicas scripturas non recepit.... Quos legit ecclesia ad aedificationem plebis, non ad auctoritatem ^{Salomoni} ecclesiasticorum dogmatum confirmandam." (Hier. in praefat. lib. Salomoni)

And in the same manner we could give many more quotations from ^{from} prominent church fathers, and scholars up to the time of the Reformatio^{- tion,}

among them we would find such names as Hilary, Rufinus, Gregory the Great, the Venerable Bede, Alcuin, Rhabanus Maurus, and Hugo of St. Victor, and even some popes - - all of ^{whom} which made this distinction ^{that} that the Apocrypha did not belong to the Canon. We will quote only one little poem by Hugo Cardinalis, in his prologue to Joshua:

"Restant apocryphi Jesus, Sapientia, Pastor,
Et Maccabaeorum libri, Judith atque Tobias,
Hi quia sunt dubii, sub canone non numerantur,
Sed quia vera canunt, ecclesia suscipit illos."

(The above verse is quoted in Gerhard, Loci, Vol. I, De Scriptura Sacra, Caput VI, p. 44).

Now what of Catholic scholars, don't these men know what the church fathers said and thought of the Apocrypha? - - It doesn't ^{phase} phase them at all; they say: "Obviously the inferior rank to which deuterocanonicals were relegated by authorities like Origen, Athanasius, and Jerome was due to too rigid a conception of canonicity." (Cath. Ency., s.v. Canon of Holy Scripture, p. 272.)

How did it happen then that in spite of these definite statements of many of the leading fathers the Apocrypha were considered by others of the church fathers to belong to the Canon? It must be attributed to the use of the Greek LXX by the early Christians, and the loose and careless way in which they used this. The early Christians ^{trans-} could not read the Old Testament in the Hebrew, so they used the translation into the Greek, and this, the Septuagint, as we have explained had the Apocrypha. Very soon they came loosely to regard everything between the two covers of the LXX as canonical, and carelessly quoted the Apocrypha as Scripture - - because these too were in this volume from which they quoted. We can point to a number of analogies even today, where there is perhaps a loose use of apocryphal writings, and which show to us that a similar loose use ~~the~~ ^{centuries} in the first few ^{accounts for the confusion that was caused.} centuries accounts for the confusion that was caused.

In the Apology of the A. C., Art III, 156ff Tobias is quoted and ^{refut-}refuted and no mention is made that this is an apocryphal book. In the Concordia Triglot, under Index of Scripture Texts we find Mal. 3, 6, and immediately after this text, with no indication that the real Scripture texts stop here, we find "Tob. 4, 6..... p. 198; Tob. 4, 11... p. 198; Tob. 4, 20..... p. 198". (p. 1158). In the back of the German C.P.H. Bibles, under "Nachweisung der sonn- und festtaeglichen ^{-en}Episteln und Evangelien durch das ganze Jahr" for "Am 3. Weinachtsfeiertag oder am Tage St. Johannis des Apostels, Ep. Heb. 1, 1 - 12; oder Sirach 15, 1 - 8." Also "Am Tag Philippi und Jakobi, Ep. Eph. 2, 19 - 22; oder Weish. 5, 1 - 12". In German Bibles, after the Apocrypha, just before the New Testament, we find: "Ende der Buecher des Alten Testaments." Walther has a funeral sermon for a child, based on Wisdom 4, 14: "Denn seine Seele gefaellt Gott, darum eilet er mit ihm aus dem boesen Leben." So in Register to Pieper's Dogmatik, "Verzeichnis der Bibelstellen", right after ^{that}Malachi, no indication that canonical books now end: "Weisheit Salomonis 11, 26 - - II, 99; Jesus Sirach 25, 2 - - II, 99".

We all know that our Lutheran Church does not consider the Apocrypha~~χ~~ to be canonical, and yet some one seeing these quotations, this loose use, might get a different conception. Without doubt it was in a similar manner that the erroneous views in the first few centuries of the Christian era originated. Some of the church fathers, whom we quoted as excluding the Apocrypha from the Canon, at other ^{times}times in ordinary use, perhaps in writing or speaking, carelessly used the Apocrypha, and quoted them as $\tilde{\eta} \gamma \varphi \alpha \varphi \tilde{\eta}'$. Hence the seeming ^{contradictions}contradictions in some fathers. And that is also how the Apocrypha got ^{into}into some of the early versions of Scripture, from the LXX, and from such a loose use; but we can state that the Apocrypha were by no means in all ^{all}the early versions of Holy Scripture.

As to Augustine and the Councils of Hippo and Carthage - - ^{the} the main bulwark of the Catholic Church for their position - - we can say this. These are not three independent testimonies, but only one, ^{namely} namely that of Augustine, for he was the governing spirit at these Councils. Furthermore as to Augustine, he seems to have put into the concept "canonical" a wider sense than ~~that~~ in which we use it, meaning with him "sanctioned or edifying religious books." That Augustine ^{did} did not put the canonical and the apocryphal books on the same level, though in the list that he gives he calls them all canonical, can be shown from the following quotations. The wise student of divine Scriptures "will therefore hold this course in regard to the ^{usual} canonical Scriptures, that he prefer those which are received by all Catholic Churches to those which some do not receive." (De Doctr. Chr. 2, 8). Also "Those things which are not written in the Canon of the Jews ^{cannot} cannot be adduced with so much confidence against opposers." (De Civitate Dei, 17, 20). Again: "The Jews do not have this ~~of~~ ^{is} Scripture which is called Maccabees, as they do the law and the prophets, to which the ^{Lord} Lord bears testimony as to his witnesses. But it is received by the ^{Church} Church and heard not without advantage, if it be read/^{and heard} soberly (si sobrie legatur vel audiatur) especially for the sake of the ~~h~~ history of the Maccabees, who suffered so much from the hand of persecutors for the sake of ^{the} the Law of God." (Contra Epistolam Gaudentii Donatistae, ch. 23). Furthermore, that the Synods of Hippo and Carthage were not ^{- this} altogether sure of their ground is shown by the fact that it gave the direction that the "Transmarine" Church, the Church beyond the sea, should be consulted in respect to the confirmation of the canon. This then ^{shows} shows the position of the church fathers, and explains the difficulty ^{find} we find in this that with many fathers we can find statements endorsing the Apocrypha, and some statements condemning them.

The early church fathers could not make these books inspired or canonical, they could merely be witnesses as to whether a book ^{was} inspired and therefore canonical or not. They were in a position ^{to} do this because they lived comparatively close to the time of writing ^{of} the Old Testament books. But they could not make a book canonical - and much less can the later church or a later council, as that of Trent, ^{do so.} The later church or council cannot decree that a certain book is canonical if it is not. It could just as well then take Aesop's Fables, etc., decree them to be canonical - - and that would make these ^{these} fables as little canonical as their decree makes the Apocrypha ^{- is ab.} canonical

Another reason we reject the Apocrypha as ~~can~~ uncanonical is because of their contents, which militates against historical facts ^{and} against other plain statements of Scripture. In Tobias, Judith and 2 Maccabees there are geographical, historical, and chronological ^{errors.} errors. The Bethulia of Judith 6 does not exist. In Baruch the temple ^{is spoken} is spoken of as standing, although the temple had been burned at the time the city was taken. There are countless historical errors in 2 ^{- see.} Maccabees.

As to the content: The purpose of the Old Testament is ^{point} to point forward to the ^{Christ} Messiah. In the Apocrypha we find nothing about Christ that we do not have in other books of the Old Testament; we lose nothing if we do not have them; the Bible is complete without them.

Some of the false doctrines we find in these books are: The strange tale of the angel in Tobias, who tells a lie (5, 12); angels are there spoken of as our intercessors with God (12, 12. 15); witchcraft is represented by a smoking liver and heart of a fish, ^{which} which works miracles - - and all this is sanctioned in Tobias 6, 7 - 17; almsgiving is overemphasized as a virtue, its meritoriousness is held forth, that it saves from death (4, 11: "Denn die Almosen erlösen von ^{allen Sünden, auch vom Tode.} allen Sünden, auch vom Tode."); In Judith (9, 10; 10, 5. cf. Rom. 3, 8)

the heroine's conduct is deceitful, and yet it is praised and approved ^{-ed} by God - - as though the good end would justify the evil means; in 2 Maccabees (14, 41 - 46) the suicide of Rhazi is praised and spoken well of; also in this book (12, 41 - 45) prayer is offered for the ^{dead} dead ("It is a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead."); in the same chapter we find an offering being given for the dead. On passages ^{-ages} like these Rome seeks justification for her teaching of masses for ^{the} the dead, purgatory, indulgences, etc. etc. All these are errors that are ^{are} contrary to other plain passages of Scripture, and for this reason ^{also} also we reject the Apocrypha and refuse to put them into the Canon of Holy Scripture.

Then why, we ask - - since these arguments sufficiently ^{- were} answer the arguments that the Romanists bring to substantiate their claims that the Apocrypha too are canonical - - and since these arguments ^{show} show that at all times believers in a position to know and be ^g witnesses, scholars who have studied the problem, since these all say: the Apocrypha are outside of the Canon of Scripture - - why then did Rome at the Council of Trent act in the face of all this and decree that the Apocrypha be held on the same level as canonical books of Scripture? It was doubtless first of all to oppose Protestantism, just to be different, and to hold differently from what Protestants hold - - ^{- this} to this point their enmity had brought them. Then a second reason we can ^{a deluce} adduce for their action is this: "Sie fanden in diesen Buechern ihren eigenen Geist wieder." Many of the false teachings that we mentioned are just what Catholics needed to bolster up their teachings on intercession ^f of angels, for their teaching that souls can be saved in the state ^{- tween} between death and resurrection, and together with that Purgatory and prayers for the dead; as well as also almsgiving as a meritorious deed. For these their doctrines they could find no basis in canonical Scripture, ^{but} but

the Apocrypha stood them in good stead - - if anyone should ask them for a Scripture proof for their teachings! These are doubtless the real reasons that moved Trent to "canonize" the Apocrypha.

This closes our treatment of the topic: The Divergent Views of Catholicism and Protestantism on the Old Testament Apocrypha. Both sides have been presented, and the arguments on both sides considered, and considering the whole problem, we hold that Lutherans did right in excluding these books from the Canon, as the Jewish Church, as Christ and the Apostles, as the early Christians, and well informed later scholars did; and furthermore, though, as Luther says, these books are "nuetzlich und gut zu lesen", as religious literature ^{- these} of the period from Malachi to Christ, yet it might be better to ^{print} print these books not in the sacred volume - - lest we also as the early Church, by loose use come into danger of putting the Apocrypha on the same level with canonical books, - - but in a separate book, and thus exclude them from the Book of the Bible, as we do in our English Bibles.

The Bible has by this study become to us all the sure^{er}, ^{the} all the more certainly the Word of God, the absolute truth, far beyond any religious but merely human books, be they Apocrypha, or Pseudepigrapha, ^{- grapha} or Koran, or what they may be. The Apocrypha are and will ever be but ^{but} human literature, with no lasting and binding force, but the Bible ^{as} as God's Word is the "word which liveth and abideth forever."

The end.

Bibliography,

1. Otto Zockler, Apokryphen des Alten Testaments (Strack-Zockler Commentary). 1891.
- Herm. L. Strack, Kanon des Alten Testaments, Vol. 9 in Herzog-Hauck Realencyklopaedie. Leipzig. 1901. *Hauck*
- E. Schuerer, Apokryphen des Alten Testaments, (Vol. 1), in Herzog-Hauck Realencyklopaedie. Leipzig. 1896. *Hauck*
- Oehler, Kanon des Alten Testaments. Vol. 7 in Herzog Realencyklopaedie of the year 1857. *-paedie*
- W. O. E. Osterley, The Books of the Apocrypha, Their Origin, Teaching, and Content. New York, Revell. 1914. *-ing*
- Schaff-Herzog Religious Encyclopedia, s.v. Apocrypha.
- Encyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Eccl. Lit., McClintock and Strong, s.v. Apocrypha. *-ing*
- Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, Vol. I, s.v. Bible, James Hastings
- Encyclopedia Britannica. *H.S.*
- 10 Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. I and III, s.v. Apocrypha, and Canon of H.S.
- Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. II. III., s.v. Apocrypha, and Bible Canon.
- Keil, Introduction to the Old Testament, Vol. II, 337-378.
- Green, Introduction to the Old Testament, The Canon.
- Fuerbringer, Einleitung in das Alte Testament.
- Schaff's Creeds of Christendom, Vol. II and III.
- Concordia Triglotta.
- Book of Common Prayer.
- Guenther, Populaere Symbolik.
- Engelder, et al., Popular Symbolics.
- 10 Luther, Vol. 14, 68 - 85; 22, 1411 - 1413.
- Martin Chemnitz, Examen, De Scriptura Canonica. *63-239*
- Johann Gerhard, Loci, De Scriptura Sacra, p. 35 - 102, Paragraphs 63-239
- Baier, Compendium, ed. Walther, Vol. I.
- Pieper, Christliche Dogmatik, Vol. I, II, and Register.
- Hoenecke, Dogmatik, Vol. I.
- Dau, Mimeographed Notes on Graebner's Outlines, s.v. Bibliology.
- Hirschberger Bibel.
- CPH German Bible.
- Latin Bible, Vulgate.
- 50 Davis, A Dictionary of the Bible.
- Ira M. Price, The Ancestry of our English Bible.
- Schaller, Bibelkunde.
- Eckhardt, Reallexicon, s.v. Bibel.
- Buechner, Handconcordanz.
- Stock, Hom, Reallexicon.
- Daechsel, Bibelwerk, II, 888-890; 876; II, Anhang.
- Lehre und Wehre, 17, 226. 257. 258; 28, 174 - 177. *Israel."*
- Theological Monthly, 1925, p. 1ff: "The Pure, Clear Fountain of Israel.
- Synodal Bericht, West. Dist., 1873, p. 46.
- 40 Schulblatt, 11, 292; 31, 160.
- Lutheraner, 2, 20; 38, 62; 4, 26. *-ischen*
- Hengstenberg, Fuer Beibehaltung der Apokryphen, aus der Evangelischen Kirchenzeitung, 1853.
- Phil. Friedr. Keerl, Das Wort Gottes und die Apokryphen des Alten Testaments, Streitschrift wider Prof. Hengstenberg.
- 44 H. B. Swete, Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek.