

BS

1700

D 23

THE USE OF THE APOCRYPHA

IN THE

CHRISTIAN CHURCH

—  
*W. H. DAUBNEY*



BS  
1700  
D23

CORNELL  
UNIVERSITY  
LIBRARY



GIFT OF

Alfred C. Barnes

Cornell University Library  
BS1700 .D23

Use of the Apocrypha in the Christian ch



3 1924 029 308 222  
olin



Cornell University  
Library

The original of this book is in  
the Cornell University Library.

There are no known copyright restrictions in  
the United States on the use of the text.

<http://www.archive.org/details/cu31924029308222>

# The Use of the Apocrypha in the Christian Church.

BY

WILLIAM HEAFORD DAUBNEY, B.D.,

JEREMIE PRIZEMAN, 1873,

RECTOR OF LEASINGHAM, DIOCESE OF LINCOLN.

LONDON:

C. J. CLAY AND SONS,

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE,

AVE MARIA LANE.

Glasgow: 50, WELLINGTON STREET.

1900

[*All Rights reserved.*]

E.V.

B.2000

Cambridge:

PRINTED BY J. AND C. F. CLAY,  
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

DEDICATED  
TO  
THE REV. B. BLENKIRON, M.A.  
VICAR OF LITTLE COATES,  
WITH GRATITUDE, RESPECT AND AFFECTION.

---

ולמלמדי אתן הודאה:

Ecclus. li. 17<sup>b</sup> (Cairo Genizah MS.).



## PREFACE.

THE following pages have been written in the hope of supporting the position taken up by the VIth Article of Religion with regard to the Apocryphal books.

The negative side of that position seems to have been far too much insisted upon ; the positive side far too little. The results may be perceived in the omission of these books from the great majority of English Bibles printed in the present century, and in the disproportionately small use made of the Apocrypha for the purposes the Article specifies. That such was not the practice of the Church in the early centuries, nor formerly of the Church of England, either before or after the Reformation, it is the aim of this Essay to shew. There are now distinct indications that the neglect of "the other books" is on the wane. An extremely low estimate of them can only be a passing phase of feeling,

produced by temporary causes ; for there is that in the Apocrypha which may be surely trusted eventually to re-assert its power, spiritual as well as literary.

My thanks are due to Dr Sinker, Librarian of Trinity College, Cambridge, as well as to others, for many kind helps and suggestions.

W. H. D.

LEASINGHAM RECTORY,

*March* 26, 1900.

## CONTENTS.

### PART I. ANCIENT USE.

CHAP. I.	INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
„	II. NEW TESTAMENT USE . . . . .	12
„	III. USE BY EARLY CHRISTIAN WRITERS . . . . .	32
„	IV. ACTION OF COUNCILS . . . . .	41
„	V. CATALOGUES OF SCRIPTURE BY INDIVIDUALS . . . . .	50

### PART II. MODERN USE.

„	VI. ENGLISH AND FOREIGN USE AT REFORMATION PERIOD . . . . .	56
„	VII. BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER AND HOMILIES . . . . .	63
„	VIII. USE BY DIVINES, CHIEFLY ENGLISH . . . . .	71
„	IX. POPULAR USE . . . . .	94
„	X. CONCLUSION . . . . .	106
INDEX I.	NAMES OF PERSONS . . . . .	111
INDEX II.	TEXTS REFERRED TO . . . . .	115



# PART I.

## ANCIENT USE.

### CHAPTER I.

#### Introduction.

THE English term 'Apocrypha' is probably derived not directly from the Greek, but through the Latin word 'apocryphus.' This is itself borrowed by simple transliteration from the Greek adjective *ἀπόκρυφος*. This word is a perfectly classical one, though not perhaps of very frequent use. Its meaning of 'hidden away,' 'recondite' does not appear to have been subject to any material variations. The phrase of Socrates "*Οὐδὲν ἀπόκρυφον δοκεῖ μοι εἶναι*" (*Xen. Mem.* III. v. 14) may be taken as containing a fair specimen of its classical use. The adjective 'apocryphus' appears to have been imported into the Latin language in post-classical times.

It was in ecclesiastical writings, however, both in Greek and Latin, that the word secured its widest currency; and it is in their use of it that its principal

interest lies. This interest far exceeds any with which classical authors invested it.

The earliest appearance of ἀπόκρυφος in ecclesiastical Greek is in the LXX. version. In Deut. xxvii. 15 it is there used as a translation of סֵתֶר. It occurs many other times in the later books of that version, notably in the 'Apocrypha' itself, especially in Ecclesiasticus, where in xlii. 19 and xlvi. 25 it is used as an equivalent of the same Hebrew root. In one case, Eccles. xxxix. 3, ἀπόκρυφα παροιμιῶν ἐκζητήσῃ, a reference to books may possibly be included.

In the N. T. the word occurs thrice; twice in the Gospels (Mk iv. 22; Luke viii. 17) and again in Col. ii. 23.

In Christian writers the word very soon came to the front and was early applied to certain classes of books. One of its earliest occurrences is in Irenæus, *adv. hæres.* i. xiii. 1 "πλῆθος ἀποκρύφων καὶ νόθων γραφῶν," where "apocryphorum" appears in the Latin version. In the 2nd section of the same chapter the form 'apocryphon' appears, as if the word was not yet completely Latinized: in this case it is not applied to a book. Tertullian in his *de Pudicitia* c. x. uses 'apocrypha' in connection with 'scriptura'. After this the term is of very frequent occurrence in ecclesiastical writings, in both languages, to signify more or less unauthorized books. To a considerable extent it corresponded with the neo-hebraic use of the word סֵתֶר in so far as their authority was disputed, but with סֵתֶר in so far as they were decisively rejected.

<sup>1</sup> The passage is quoted in *Action of Councils*, p. 43.

'*Ἀπόκρυφος* is a word of fairly fixed meaning, not departing from its original sense of 'hidden away' in one form or another. Yet although it underwent but little change in its own meaning, it came to be employed in a variety of applications in the Christian Church. So far as it was used with reference to religious books, Bp Lightfoot (*Ignat.* i. p. 339) distinguishes three stages in the process of its gradual transfer from one class of uncaonical writings to another.

*Firstly*, it was taken to designate those books which were 'held in reserve and studied privately,' but not read in churches (Orig. *Ep. ad Afric.* 9). *Secondly*, it came to denote books affected by heretics, and carried with it the ideas of 'spurious' and 'heretical' (Iren. i. xx. 1); and *Thirdly*, it was applied to non-canonical books whether genuine or spurious (Jer. *Prol. Gal.* 1).

It may well be thought, however, that these three 'stages' in the application of the word frequently overlapped one another; contemporary or nearly contemporary writers applying it differently. In evidence of this it is to be noted that the references given by Bp Lightfoot in support of his second stage of use are to writers, in the main, of an earlier date than those quoted in support of the first stage, which he describes as "its earliest usage."

But to whatever applications the word was turned, its main acceptation of 'hidden away' continued through all. Apocryphal books were those which had something of concealment about them, either as to (1) origin, or as to (2) the manner of their perusal,

or as to their (3) exclusion from the canon of Scripture, or as to the (4) secrecy of their contents.

The books which, on one or other of these accounts, have been called 'Apocrypha' by Christian writers are very numerous. They form an immense mass of writings, and are, as might be expected, very heterogeneous in character. Some are of high religious interest and of reverent tone; others are markedly lacking in these qualities<sup>1</sup>: some possess much literary value, while others have, in this respect, little beyond their antiquity to commend them: some are distinctly heretical, while others are perfectly Catholic<sup>2</sup>.

Out of this mixed collection of apocryphal writings a certain number gradually emerged. They obtained a more permanent footing and a higher standing than the rest. Probably their early embodiment in the LXX. version of the Bible had much to do with their wide and lasting acceptance, both in the Eastern and the Western Churches. With three possible exceptions, ii. (iv.) Esdras, Baruch and the Prayer of Manasses, they are probably all of pre-Christian date. Yet, in spite of this, they have secured a hold on Christian veneration

<sup>1</sup> Is it to such books that Hen. VIII. refers in his Order to Convocation in Feb. 1543? He directs "that all mass books, antiphoners and portuises...be castigated from all manner of... *apocryphas*, feigned legends, superstitious oraisons &c." For no serious attempt seems to have been made at that time to exclude the regular apocrypha.

<sup>2</sup> A peculiar account of 'Apocrypha' is given in *Reeves' Bible* (Lond. 1802) as "something that is removed far *from the Crypt*, or sacred repository of the ark, where the canonical books, the authority of which was not doubted, were laid up."

which has never been so continuously and persistently granted to the apocrypha written by Christians. Some of these last, such as the Shepherd of Hermas, the epistles of Barnabas and Clement of Rome, won strong local and temporary recognition ; but even the most popular or the most valuable of Christian apocryphal works never secured anything approaching to the wide diffusion and lasting esteem which, rightly or wrongly, has fallen to the lot of what, from their position in the LXX. and Vulgate, have been termed 'the deutero-canonical books.' The all-but universal acquaintance with them, in one position or another, on the part of every branch of the historic Church, is a remarkable fact. For, *à priori*, it might reasonably have been supposed, that at least as worthy a standing would have been accorded to Christian authors as to these works, which were certainly excluded from the Hebrew canon, however nearly one or two of them may have risen to the standard of possible admission. But events took another course. Such Christian writings as were at certain times and places deemed near to the entry of the N. T. canon, little by little fell away into obscurity ; but these Jewish additions to the O. T. rose rather than fell as time went on, until in one large portion of the Church most of them were eventually decreed to be canonical. They were felt to have a value beyond other apocryphal writings, and their popularity has stood the test of time : while those books by Christian authors, which might once have been termed their rivals, have sunk into an obscurity into which few but students penetrate. In some cases the reason is

apparent. No one, for instance, can read a chapter of one of the spurious gospels and then a chapter out of the O. T. apocrypha, without feeling that the former, notwithstanding their Christian profession, stand on a platform of tone and thought, as well as of literary merit, far lower than the latter. Much of what is original in them continually shocks us by its coarseness, absurdity or irreverence ; and this apparently without any intention to do so on the part of their authors.

But with those books which form the excess of the LXX. over the Hebrew Canon, the case is different, as the Church of Christ has long discerned.

These books correspond very nearly with those 14 books styled 'Apocrypha,' and printed between the O. and N. Testaments, in complete copies of the English Authorized Version. This seems to be their best position, for they contain matter connecting the two Testaments, and, with three doubtful exceptions, noted above, were certainly composed in the interval between the latest writer of the O. T. and the earliest of the New.

Three of these books, I. and II. (III. and IV.) Esdras, and the Prayer of Manasses, are still regarded by the Roman Church as Apocrypha<sup>1</sup>, and are printed in her authorized copies of the Vulgate after the N. T. The others at the 4th session of the Council of Trent she decreed to be canonical, and inserts them amongst the books of the O. T.

Why the three excluded books were not canonized

<sup>1</sup> She occasionally uses them in her services : e.g. the Introit for Whit-Tuesday in the Roman Missal is from II. Esd. ii.

with the rest is not clearly known. The reason frequently given<sup>1</sup> is, that the non-existence or the absence of Greek originals militated against their admission. But though the Greek of II. Esd. is wanting (except a few verses quoted in the Epistle of Barnabas, and by Clement of Alexandria), that of I. Esd. and of the Prayer of Manasses has never been lost. The former was in print in the Aldine edition fifty years before the Tridentine decree; the latter in Stephen's *Vulgate* of 1540 (Paris)<sup>2</sup>. Some other influence must therefore have been at work.

The separation of the fourteen books, which the A. V. styles Apocrypha, from the other apocryphal writings, may not be a strictly scientific line of cleavage: but the authority of use has made it, in some respects, a very convenient term for a definite body of books. Some indeed of those excluded from this collection of Apocrypha *par excellence* (such as the Psalms of Solomon and the Book of Enoch) may seem to have considerable claims for admission. But the verdict of time and of the Church has, to this extent, gone against them. Without being denied a proper value, there has fallen away from them that approach to public recognition which, in varying degrees, they once obtained.

In our VIth Art. of Religion these same 14 books are expressly recognized and a list of their names is

<sup>1</sup> Bissell, *Apocr.* p. 70: Lord A. Hervey, *Smith's Bib. Dict.* i. 576 a.

<sup>2</sup> V. Dr E. Nestle's *Septuagintastudien* III. p. 8 (Stuttgart, 1899). He states that the first printed *Septuagint* to contain the Prayer of Manasses in Greek was Frick's of 1697.

given<sup>1</sup>. They are spoken of as “the other books<sup>2</sup>,” and are treated in paragraphs between those on the O. and N. Testaments.

But the application of the term ‘apocrypha’ to these books in particular is by no means an English peculiarity. The American writers, Bissell and Porter, adopt it very nearly: the former in his *Apocrypha of the O.T.*<sup>3</sup>, and the latter in his article ‘Apocrypha’ in Hastings’ *Dictionary of the Bible*. He writes “Both the collection and the use of the word Apocrypha as its title, are distinctively Protestant, though having roots in the history of the O.T. canon.” And the German authors, Schürer and Nestle, make use of the word in the same limited acceptation, the former in his *History of the Jewish People*<sup>4</sup>; the latter in *Urtext und Übersetzungen der Bibel*<sup>5</sup>, where he finds “die sogenannten Apokryphen” (p. 61), afterwards abbreviated into simply “die Apokryphen” (p. 140 *et passim*), a convenient title for these books<sup>6</sup>. Dr Martensen, the Dane, uses ‘Apocrypha’ in the

<sup>1</sup> Dr E. C. S. Gibson (*XXXIX. Arts. ed. 2, 1898, p. 277*) defines Apocrypha as “the title of that collection of books which the Church of England declines to regard as canonical, but reads in the church for example &c.”

<sup>2</sup> It is a remarkable fact that the word ‘Apocrypha’ itself occurs nowhere in the Articles or Prayer-Book, although large use is made of the apocryphal books.

<sup>3</sup> Edinb. (no date) pref. 1880.

<sup>4</sup> Eng. trans. (Clark) II. iii. 10, ed. 1894.

<sup>5</sup> Leipzig, 1897.

<sup>6</sup> So Kautzsch in his *Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen* keeps the former word for our Apocrypha and the latter for extra-apocryphal books.

same sense, *v.* quotation in Part II. p. 60. As such it will be used in these pages.

What does our VIth Art. say of these books? It says "The other Books (as Hierome saith) the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners; but yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine." Here we have a statement that the Church agrees with St Jerome in his estimate of these books, given in the form of two assertions, an affirmative one and a negative one. The affirmative takes precedence: "The Church doth read" them is positively stated, for pattern of conduct to Christians, and to help in the formation of their character. Then this assertion is in one particular limited by the negative one which follows in the second place, "but yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine." They are more for practical than dogmatic purposes: doctrines must be established from the canon.

The passage of St Jerome referred to is found in the latter part of his *Præfatio in libros Salomonis*. Of Judith, Tobit and Maccabees he says "libros legit quidem Ecclesia, sed eos inter canonicas scripturas non recipit; sic et hæc duo volumina legat<sup>1</sup> ad ædificationem plebis, non ad auctoritatem ecclesiasticorum dogmatum confirmandam." The "duo volumina" are Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom, whose claims to Salomonic authorship he has just discussed and rejected. The words therefore which St Jerome uses of two books of the Apocrypha, our Church takes as expressing her view of them all.

<sup>1</sup> Legit, Cod. Amiat.

It is somewhat strange that the second and negative assertion of the Article has greatly overshadowed in popular practice the first and the affirmative one. Many who are ready enough to wield the authority of the negative clause as a weapon wherewith to depreciate the Apocrypha, keep a discreet silence as to the positive one<sup>1</sup>, or even attack it as "dangerous and unprofitable<sup>2</sup>."

Perhaps the oft-quoted words of Richard Cecil, one of the fathers of the evangelical school, may partially account for this: "Man is a creature of extremes. The middle path is generally the wise path; but there are few wise enough to find it. Because Papists have made too much of some things, Protestants have made too little of them....The Papist put his Apocrypha into the Canon: the Protestant will scarce regard it as an ancient record<sup>3</sup>."

Dr Streane<sup>4</sup> suggests that "the dubious reputation which adheres to the adjective 'apocryphal' to some extent affects the kindred substantive<sup>5</sup>."

Still in the face of the constant use of the Apocrypha from the earliest Christian era to the present time—a use consistently maintained by the

<sup>1</sup> E.g. J. P. Boulton, *Expos. of XXXIX. Articles*, Lond. 1873.

<sup>2</sup> R. L. Cloquet, *Expos. of XXXIX. Articles*, Lond. 1885, p. 115.

<sup>3</sup> *Remains*, p. 364, quoted in Bp Browne's *Expos. of XXXIX. Articles*, Lond. 1871, p. 185.

<sup>4</sup> *Age of the Maccabees*, Lond. 1898, p. 96.

<sup>5</sup> A. Coker Adams (*Clergyman's Mag.* Nov. 1891, p. 222), however, discovers a favourable meaning in the word: "it should set us searching for hidden treasures of sacred lore."

rule, at any rate, of the English Church—these suggestions do not seem fully to account for the common neglect<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> An astonishing instance of the suppression of the apocryphal books is afforded by a work in two volumes published in 1844 entitled "The LXX. Version of the O.T. according to the Vatican text, translated into English by Sir L. C. L. Brenton, Bart." With the exception of some of the additions to Esther, the removal of which would have caused (presumably) too great a laceration of the text, the Apocrypha is wholly omitted, *sub silentio*! It would appear that the translator was ignorant of the existence of such books in "the Vatican text." Yet surely this was impossible.

## CHAPTER II.

### New Testament Use.

LET us examine the use which has been made of the Apocrypha in the past.

First, in the New Testament.

Here we do not find any direct quotations—as indeed we do not find any direct quotations from some books in the canon. But we find many allusions and reminiscences or the like recalling the phraseology of the apocryphal books. Such occur too often to be all of them accidental coincidences. And when we consider at how early a date<sup>1</sup> the apocryphal books were incorporated with the LXX., of which the N.T. writers indisputably made use, the improbability, even from external evidence, of their being unacquainted with those books becomes very great. In both thought and language, the N.T. appears to have received an impress from the apocryphal books. Prof. E. Kautzsch in his *Apokryphen u. Pseudepigraphen des A.T.*<sup>2</sup> expressly says: “Herrscht angesichts der ausserordentlichen Wichtigkeit dieser ganzen Litteratur für das Studium des Neuen Testaments.....längst nur eine Stimme”: and again, “das N.T. zwar kein ausdrück-

<sup>1</sup> See what is said on this *post* pp. 28, 29.

<sup>2</sup> Freiburg im Breisgau, 1899, Vorwort p. iii., Einleitung p. xii.

liches Citat aus den sogen. Apokryphen, wohl aber allerlei Anspielungen an dieselben enthält."

Our Blessed Lord Himself did not disdain to employ them. Wisdom says of herself (Ecclus. xxiv. 21), "They that eat me shall yet be hungry; and they that drink me shall yet be thirsty." It is difficult to suppose that our Lord was not thinking of these words when He said (St John vi. 35), "He that cometh to me shall never hunger, and he that believeth on me shall never thirst." The wisdom known to the Son of Sirach was so good that men would long to eat and drink of her again; but Christ inserts the negatives, not to contradict, but to raise the thought into a higher sphere, signifying that His Wisdom was all-satisfying, and would leave no longing in the souls of those whom He fed. For a similar insertion of a negative, cf. St Matt. vi. 19 with Ecclus. xxix. 12.

Again, His order to the seventy, "Eat such things as are set before you" (Luke x. 8), looks very like the direction to a guest in Ecclus. xxxi. 16, "Eat, as becometh a man, those things which are set before thee."

Again, Ecclus. xxviii. 2 is unmistakably an anticipation of a petition in the Lord's Prayer, "Forgive thy neighbour the hurt that he hath done unto thee, so shall thy sins also be forgiven when thou prayest."

Edersheim (*Comment. in loc.*) regards this as a "Christian alteration": but on no stronger ground than the difficulty of finding a parallel sentiment in Rabbinic writings.

Ecclus. xxxii. (xxxv.) 24 (19) is in close agreement with Christ's words in St Matt. xvi. 27—"ἕως ἀνταποδοῦ ἀνθρώπου κατὰ τὰς πράξεις αὐτοῦ," and "ἀποδώσει

ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὴν πράξιν αὐτοῦ." Prov. xxiv. 12 and Ps. lxii. 13, sometimes given as the passages alluded to, are somewhat less close, having ἔργον instead of πράξις.

It has been suggested by Mr R. G. Moulton<sup>1</sup> that two parables of Christ are "called up" (to use Mr Moulton's own phrase) by two passages of Ecclesiasticus. He apparently means the parables of the Unmerciful Servant and of the Rich Fool. The passage quoted in support of the first (xxviii. 2 sq.) teaches no doubt the principle of forgiving our fellows, if we would be forgiven ourselves; yet it requires some straining, I think, to see in it the basis of our Lord's parable. But the other instance affords a much closer parallel. In xi. 18 sq. we find a far nearer resemblance, not only of principle but of outline and even of words. We find the same well-provided man, making the same self-satisfied, self-comforting soliloquy, proposing to himself the assurance of carnal ease; but forgetful (as we are reminded in both cases) of death, which was coming to disperse his goods to others. The words used too, ἀγαθά, ἀνάπαυσις, φάγομαι, πλουτῶν, all meet with their parallels in St Luke xii. 16 sq. Cf. also St Luke xii. 20, with Wisdom xv. 8 (end).

It is difficult to read Eccles. xix. 21 without being reminded of our Lord's parable of the Two Sons. But the Gk MS. authority for this verse is small.

Another passage in Ecclesiasticus which reminds us of our Lord's words is the concluding section of

<sup>1</sup> *Modern Reader's Bible*, Ecclesiasticus, p. xxxii.

the author's prayer (li. 23 sq.). There is much in this which strikes one as similar to His teaching as recorded in St Matthew xi. 28—30. And this resemblance is not merely in the ideas, abridged and strengthened, but also in some of the words employed. In both passages the disciples are exhorted to come *πρός με*, and the words *ψυχὰὶ ὑμῶν, ζυγός, εὐρέιν, ἀνάπαυσις, κοπιᾶω* are found in both.

So too our Lord's parable in St Luke xiv. 7—11 is an expansion of the teaching of Eccles. xx. 11. Both passages shew how *ταπεινώσις* leads to *δόξα*.

The division of the Old Testament into the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms (Luke xxiv. 44), recognized by our Lord, appears for the first time in the Prologue to Ecclesiasticus<sup>1</sup>; except that instead of the מִצְוֹת וְהַנְּבִיאִים being represented by *ψαλμοί*, they are there styled *τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν βιβλίων*. "The Law and the Prophets" of St Matt. v. 17 al. occurs in II. Macc. xv. 9.

If the Prayer of Manasses be of pre-Christian date, our Lord's saying in St Luke v. 32 is strongly suggested, both in ideas and words (*δίκαιος, ἁμαρτωλός, μετάνοια*), by v. 8 of the Prayer.

The germ of the teaching of St Luke xiv. 7—11 has been discerned in Eccles. xxxii. 1, 2: and there is considerable resemblance of thought and phraseology between the mockery of the evil at the righteous in St Matt. xxvii. 43 and Wisd. ii. 18.

Again, our Lord possibly condescends to follow out and expand in his Sermon on the Mount the saying of Tobit (xii. 8), "Prayer is good with fasting

<sup>1</sup> Line 15, ed. Swete: cf. also line 7.

and alms and righteousness." The three sections on prayer and alms and fasting are clear in the A.V., cf. St Matt. vi. 2, 5, 16; but now righteousness is introduced as well, in St Matt. vi. 1 (R.V.), on strong MS. authority, thus making complete the parallel with Tobit.

The words of our Lord, *τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί* (St John ii. 4) are found in I. Esd. i. 24 (26) and in other places of the LXX., but the phrase is too common a query to be treated as a quotation.

The similarity often observed between Christ's words in St Matt. xxiii. 34, 37, St Luke xi. 49, 50, and those attributed to "the Almighty Lord" in II. Esd. i. 30, 32, would be sufficiently accounted for by the post-Christian date of II. Esdras. And this applies also to the similarity noticed by J. H. Blunt (*Annotated Bible*, 1879) between St Luke xiii. 23 and a verse in the Bensly addition to II. Esd. vii.<sup>1</sup>

It has been thought that St John viii. 44, "there is no truth in him" (cf. I. St John ii. 4), may have been based on I. Esd. iv. 37; St John xiv. 15 on Wisd. vi. 18; St Luke vi. 35 on Ecclus. iv. 10 (*υἱὸς Ὑψίστου*); St John ix. 4 on Ecclus. li. 30 (*ἐργάζεσθε τὸ ἔργον*); St Matt. xiii. 38 on Bar. v. 6 (*υἱὸς βασιλείας, A, Q*); and St Luke i. 68 on I. Esd. vii. 9, 15 (*κυρίου θεοῦ Ἰσραήλ*).

The collocation of *πέμπω* with *τὸ πνεῦμα* in St John xv. 26, respecting the mission of the Holy Ghost, suggests a reminiscence of Wisd. ix. 17.

<sup>1</sup> Numbered 47 or 11 as reckoned from the beginning of the chapter, or from the commencement of the recovered portion.

The parallel sometimes adduced between our Lord's words, as recorded in St Matt. vi. 19, and Bar. vi. 12 does not seem so convincing.

Tob. iii.<sup>8</sup> 15, however, may possibly have suggested the Sadducees' enigma as to the childless woman with seven husbands (St Luke xx. 27 sqq., St Mk and St Matt.).

In the speech of the Jerusalem Jews in St John xi. 48 there is a collocation of τόπος and ἔθνος, as applied to Jerusalem and themselves respectively, which is strongly reminiscent of II. Macc. v. 19.

The greeting of Ozias to Judith (xiii. 18) is not without resemblance to Elizabeth's greeting to the Virgin Mary (St Lk. i. 42). The last words of St Luke i. 47 and Eccclus. li. 1, except in case, are the same: and in both places they are found at the commencement of a song of praise. In Ps. lxiv. (lxv.) 6 the same phrase occurs, but with a plural pronoun.

In St Paul's Epistles<sup>1</sup> we find several indications of his knowledge of the Apocryphal books. To take some instances.

<sup>1</sup> Schürer (*Hist. J. P.* II. iii. 234) writes: "In the Pauline Epistles such loud echoes are found as make St Paul's acquaintanceship with the Book of Wisdom probable."

Liddon (*Bamp. Lect. Div. of Our Lord*, 1882, pp. 62, 63) expresses himself to the same effect. "Do we not already seem to catch in Alexandrian dress the accents of those weighty formulæ by which Apostles will presently define the pre-existent glory of their Majestic Lord?"

Kautzsch (I. 479) even speaks of "die nicht zu bezweifelnde Bekanntschaft des Apostels Paulus mit dem Buche" [Weisheit]; and again (II. 355) he compares the speculation of the Pauline epistles with the religious problems of II. (IV.) Esd.

His quotation Gen. xv. 6 in Rom. iv. 3, "Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness," had been anticipated by the author of I. Macc., who writes, "Was not Abraham found faithful in temptation, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness?" (ii. 52). This is of course only quotation from a common source; but it is clear that St Paul followed a former writer, and did not lead the way in quoting these words for a didactic purpose<sup>1</sup>.

The injunction in Rom. xii. 15, "Weep with them that weep," is contained in Ecclus. vii. 34, "Fail not to be with them that weep, and mourn with them that mourn."

In I. Cor. vi. 12 and x. 23 we have St Paul's saying, "All things are lawful for me, but all things are not expedient"; and in Ecclus. xxxvii. 28, the Son of Sirach's saying, "All things are not profitable for all men." In both cases *οὐ πάντα συμφέρει* are the words used; and both writers in the succeeding verses proceed to speak of foods under the same title, *βρώματα*. There is a remarkable correspondence between the Vulgate of Judith viii. 25 and I. Cor. x. 9, 10. The exact phrase, "et a serpentibus perierunt," occurs in both passages, as well as the words "exterminator," "murmuratio," and "murmurare." The Greek is quite different.

<sup>1</sup> In like manner the *βδελυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως* of Matt. xxiv. 15 and Mk xiii. 14 had already been quoted from Dan. ix. 27 in I. Macc. i. 54, which agrees with the N.T. in having *ἐρημώσεως* instead of *ἐρημώσεων*. But the singular occurs in the LXX. of Dan. xi. 31 and xii. 11 and in Theodotion's version of the latter verse also.

In Eph. vi. 14 we read *ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν θώρακα τῆς δικαιοσύνης*, and in Wisd. v. 18, *ἐνδύσεται θώρακα δικαιοσύνην* (-ης in Cod. Sin.).

The collocation of *πίστις* and *πραότης* in Gal. v. 22, 23 and in Ecclus. i. 27 and xlv. 4 is noteworthy.

Dean Plumptre, in Bishop Ellicott's *Commentary for English Readers*, writes on II. Cor. v. 4, "The whole passage is strikingly parallel to Wisd. ix. 15."

In commenting on Rom. i. 20, Bishop Lightfoot<sup>1</sup> says, "All which follows in this chapter shows a remarkable correspondence with Wisd. xiii.—xv., a passage which St Paul must have had in his mind." Rom. i. 21, 23 has also verbal correspondences with Wisd. xi. 15.

Cornelius Jansen, Bishop of Ypres, in the introduction to his commentary on Wisdom (Paris, 1661), says that the Apostle Paul seems to allude to phrases of this book, "ut perspicuum est ex Rom. xi. 34 et Heb. xi. 5 collatis ad Sap. ix. 17 et iv. 10." The latter of these parallels seems more convincing than the former.

The phrase "treasures of wisdom" in Col. ii. 3 appears to be borrowed from Ecclus. i. 25 and xli. 12: in the latter the Heb. only contains the phrase, and has a various reading, apparently paraphrased by the Greek translator. The words *θησαυροὶ ἀπόκρυφοί* are common to this same N.T. passage and I. Macc. i. 23.

There is a strong similarity of idea, and to some extent of phraseology, between I. Tim. vi. 19 and Tob. iv. 9; as also between iv. 17 (end) of the same epistle

<sup>1</sup> *Notes on Epistles of St Paul*, 1895, p. 252.

and Esther xiv. 13, 14 ; between I. Thess. vi. 37 (cf. Jas. v. 8) and Ecclus. vi. 37 (*στηρίζω τὴν καρδίαν*) ; between II. Thess. iii. 11 and Ecclus. iii. 23 ; between I. Cor. vii. 19 and Ecclus. xxxii. 23 (*τήρησις ἐντολῶν*), and between I. Thess. i. 3 and I. Macc. xii. 11 (*ἀδιαλείπτως...μυμνησκόμεθα ὑμῶν...μνημονεύειν ἀδελφῶν*).

In Ecclus. l. 10 (Heb. only) we have the wild olive branches of Rom. xi. 21, 24.

In Acts xvii. 23, St Paul's words "*τὰ σεβάσματα ὑμῶν εὔρον*," applied by him to idols at Athens, call to mind Daniel's derisive saying in Bel and the Dragon (Theod. 27), after the overthrow of the former and the explosion of the latter, "*ἴδετε τὰ σεβάσματα ὑμῶν*." Compare also Acts xvii. 30, in the same speech of St Paul, with Wisd. xi. 23.

A similarity has also been traced between Acts xxvi. 24 and Wisd. v. 4, the word *μανία* being in both passages applied to the godly, and in those passages only. *Μαίνεται*, however, occurs in a similar connection in St John x. 20.

In II. Pet. ii. 13 and Ecclus. xiv. 16 there is the same combination of the ideas of *ἀπάτη* and *τρυφή* ; and in iii. 9 of the same epistle and Ecclus. (Gk) xxxii. 22 (xxxv. 18 A.V.) there is strong similarity of phrases.

The Epistle to the Hebrews in xii. 23 has *πνεύματα δικαίων* in common with the Song of the Three, 86 (64).

Once more in Heb. i. 3 and in Wisd. vii. 26<sup>1</sup> occurs the unusual word *ἀπαύγασμα*, in connection

<sup>1</sup> "The similarity here is too close to be accidental," Deane, W. J., *Wisdom*, Oxf. 1881, p. 36.

with the divine glory. Both passages in which it occurs (and it occurs in these alone) are among the most sublime in the Bible, treating of the manifestation of God's glory to man, in the one case through a personified Wisdom, and in the other through the Incarnate Son. "When," wrote Dr Liddon (*Bamp. Lect.*), "He is termed the Son of God, or the Son, the full sense of that term is drawn out in language adopted, as it seems, from the Book of Wisdom."

This is perhaps the best known of all the New Testament references to the Apocrypha, and the translators of the Authorized Version inserted a marginal reference in Hebrews to Wisdom; but this, with other references to the apocryphal books, has been in modern Bibles improperly expunged, as Matt. xxvii. 43, to Wisd. ii. 15, 16<sup>1</sup>. These objectionable omissions were made after the custom arose of publishing Bibles without the Apocrypha. These apparently profess to be what they are not, entire copies of the Authorized Version; just as, recently, books have been issued by the Queen's printers, professing to be "The Book of Common Prayer," yet omitting all that follows after the Communion Service except the Psalms. Plainly, the references to the Apocrypha told an inconvenient tale of the use which the Church intended should be made of it; so, either from dissenting influence without, or from prejudice within the Church, these references disappeared from the margin. Later on, in the Epistle to the Hebrews

<sup>1</sup> Dr Scrivener in his *Introduction to the Cambridge Paragraph Bible* calls this proceeding "an unwarrantable licence" (p. lvi.).

(xi. 35—7), there is a clear allusion to the terrible martyrdoms of Eleazar and of the seven brethren and their mother related in II. Macc. vi. and vii. The word in Heb. xi. 35, rendered “tormented,” is a peculiar one (*τυμπανίζω*), translated by Alford “broken on the wheel,” and is used here in reference to the *τύμπανον*, in the account of Eleazar’s martyrdom in Maccabees, which the Dean does not hesitate to assert is the case especially intended<sup>1</sup>. Also the word for “cruel mockings” in verse 36 is peculiar to this verse and 2 Macc. vii. 7. Others of the deeds and sufferings enumerated are also based upon the Maccabean history. In this case likewise a marginal reference to II. Macc. has been illicitly suppressed<sup>2</sup>.

Another passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews (xii. 12), usually deemed a quotation from Isaiah xxxv. 3, is yet more closely paralleled by Eccus. xxv. 23, at least verbally (*παρειμένας*, Heb. and Eccus., *ἀνειμένας* Is.). Kautzsch *in loc.* says the expressions are taken from LXX., though not verbally, and adds “wogegen Heb. xii. 12 mit der Stelle hier genau hinübereinstimmt.” The phrase *τόπον μεταβολάς* of Wisd. xii. 10 is borrowed in Heb. xii. 17, and the unusual use of *ἔκβασις* for “issue,” “end” in Wisd. ii. 17 is paralleled in Heb. xiii. 7. The sole biblical use of the word is confined to these passages and two others in Wisd. viii. 9 and xi. 15. Bengel in his *Gnomon* on St Luke i. 17 cites Eccus. xlvi. 10,

<sup>1</sup> So Bp Middleton ‘Greek Article’ *in loc.* ed. 1828.

<sup>2</sup> These, with other references, have now happily been restored to the margin of the R.V.

adding "Minime proletarium esse Siracidæ librum, convenientia ejus cum angeli sermone docet."

In *Ecclus.* xviii. 13 and *I. Peter* ii. 25 there is a noteworthy resemblance in the use of words *ἐπιστρέφω* and *ποιμήν* in reference to the Divine Shepherd.

One more instance from the New Testament of Apocryphal knowledge in its writers. St John in his first epistle (iii. 2) uses the well-remembered words "We shall see him as he is." In *Ecclus.* xliii. 31<sup>1</sup> we read, "Who hath seen him that he might tell us? and who can magnify him as he is?" Here the sentence is indeed broken, and the idea of magnifying inserted, which St John omits; but the same verb for 'seeing' is used in a different tense; and both verses conclude alike, word for word, with *αὐτὸν καθὼς ἐστίν* as applied to God<sup>2</sup>.

There is a singular correspondence between Pilate's words in *St Matt.* xxvii. 24, "Ἀθῶός εἰμι ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος τούτου," and *Susannah* 46, in *Theodotion's* version, "Ἀθῶος ἐγὼ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος ταύτης," on which the A.V. is based. But *Theodotion* may have been influenced by the Gospel, and Pilate seems an unlikely person to quote from the apocryphal *Daniel* in a moment of excitement. Moreover the MSS. A and Q read *καθαρός* for *ἀθῶος*.

With regard to the Epistle of St James, *Prebendary Scrivener*<sup>3</sup> asserts that it is "full of allusions to Wisdom and to the first five chapters of Ecclesi-

<sup>1</sup> This verse is omitted in the Hebrew.

<sup>2</sup> κύριον *Ecclus.*, θεοῦ *St John*.

<sup>3</sup> *Camb. Par. Bib.* *Intro.* p. lxvi.

asticus." The allusions, however, seem by no means confined to those early chapters of Ecclesiasticus, as may be seen by observing the strong similarity of thought between St Jas. i. 13 and Ecclus. xv. 11, 12<sup>1</sup>, and by comparing St Jas. v. 3 with Ecclus. xii. 10, 11, where it is to be noted that the word *κατιόω* does not occur elsewhere in the N.T. or LXX. Dr J. B. Mayor<sup>2</sup> gives a list of no less than 32 "resemblances" to Ecclesiasticus, and 12 to Wisdom. The former is much larger than any list of resemblances which he discerns to a canonical book, Proverbs taking the lead of these, with 13.

Schürer<sup>3</sup>, in his *History of the Jewish People*, states that "There are unmistakable reminiscences of it," i.e. of Ecclus., in St James; and Kautzsch on Ecclus. xxix. 10 writes "Vgl. Jak. v. 3 welche Stelle auf das Buch Sirach zurückgeht"; and sees (I. 241) "eine umfassende Benutzung des Buches Jesus Sirach im Jakobusbrief."

In connecting the Apocrypha with the N.T. it is interesting and instructive to compare Achior's speech (Judith v.) with St Stephen's (Acts vii.). Cp. especially vv. 9 and 11 of the former with vv. 3, 18 and 19 of the latter.

It is of much importance to notice that there are a large number of words common to the Greek of the Apocrypha and the N.T. which do not occur in the canonical books of the LXX.

<sup>1</sup> Edersheim (*Speaker's Comm.* p. 22) says "the result is to prove beyond doubt the familiarity of St James with Ecclus."

<sup>2</sup> *St James*, Lond. 1897.

<sup>3</sup> II. iii. 28 (Engl. translation, T. and T. Clark).

Such are:—

ἀποτόμως	διακωλεύω
ἀποφεύγω	διεγείρω
ἀπρόσκοπος	ἔγγυος
ἄρμος	ἔκβασις
ἀσέλγεια	ἔκδοτος
ἀσκέω	ἦθος
ἀσμένως	θεομαχέω
ἀσύμφωνος	θεριστής
ἀτενίζω	θρησκεία
ἄτερ	ιερόφυλος
αὔξησις	ικετηρία
αὔστηρός	ἵππικός
αὐτόματος	ἱστορέω
ἄφθαρσία	καταδίκη
ἄφθαρτος	κατάκριμα
ἄχαριστος	καταλαλιά
ἄχρι	καταπονέω
ἄψευδής	κατασειώ
ἄψυχος	καταστέλλω
βαίον	καταχράομαι
βάρος	κατέρχομαι
βασκαίνω	κατευλογέω
βέβαιος	κατιώ
βίωσις	λαμπρός
βλάβπτω	λήψις
βούλημα	λυσιτελεῖ
βραβεύω	μέμφομαι
βρέφος	μεταλλάττω
βυθίζω	μετέπειτα
γαμέω	μετρίως
γνήσιος	μηκέτι
γνησίως	μιμέομαι
δημιουργός	νομίζω

νουθεσία	συνελαύνω
νυμφών	συνέπομαι
νύσσω	συνεργέω
ξενίζω	συνεργός
ὁδηγός	συνευδοκέω
ὁδοιπορία	συννοικοδομέω
ὄρεξις	συντυγχάνω
παρουσία <sup>1</sup>	σχεδόν
περιλείπω <sup>2</sup>	σωφρόνως
περιφρονέω	σωφροσύνη
πρεσβυτέριον	τάχα
ῥώννυμι	τεκμήριον
σέβασμα	τελείως
σιγή	τηλικούτος
σκάφη	τήρησις
σκῆνος	ὑπαντάω
σκοπέω	ὑπηρετέω
σκύβαλον	ὑπογραμμός
σπείρα	ὑποζώννυμι
σπιλώω	ὑπόκρισις
σπουδαίως	ὑπόμνησις
στάδιος	φιλάδελφος
στοιχείον	φιλάγαθος
στράτευμα	φιλανθρωπία
συγγνώμη	φιλανθρώπως
συγκεράννυμι	φιλονεικία
συλάω	φιλοφρόνως
συμφύω	φυλακίζω
συναποθνήσκω	φύσις
συναυξάνω	χειρόγραφον
συνδρομή	χρηματισμός

<sup>1</sup> Occurs in A of Neh. ii. 6.

<sup>2</sup> Occurs in A of II. Chron. xxxiv. 21.

Πεντηκοστή, used by itself as if it were a noun in I. Cor. xvi. 8, is first found so used in II. Macc. xii. 32: and in the same book, xiii. 4, we have the title βασιλεὺς τῶν βασιλέων applied to God which is borrowed in Rev. xvii. 14, xix. 16. (Cf. I. Tim. vi. 5<sup>1</sup>.) “The writers of the N.T. have adopted it and given it the highest possible consecration.” (Canon Rawlinson, *in loc.*)

So much for instances of the N.T. use of the Apocrypha. I think these ought to be enough (though a variety of others have been detected) to convince us that the N.T. writers had some acquaintance with the Apocrypha. Even if the coincidences had been with classical writings, with which, from any other information we possessed of their reading, they might or might not have been familiar, a strong presumption would be raised of their acquaintance and familiarity with such writings. But when we remember that, on grounds of religion and locality alone, the improbability is extreme of their non-acquaintance with the Apocryphal books, the conclusion cannot, I think, be avoided that they both read them and made use of them, as good after their kind—not indeed on a level with the Hebrew Canon, but still holding beneath it their own privileged position. This view is confirmed by the fact that though employing these books for religious purposes, they do not name them, or call them ἡ γραφή<sup>2</sup>. The very early date<sup>3</sup>, too, at which the

<sup>1</sup> βασιλεὺς τῶν βασιλευόντων, the form used by St Paul in the above passage, is exactly paralleled in Enoch ix. 4 (Syncellus only).

<sup>2</sup> Westcott, Art. ‘Canon’ in *Smith, D. B.* p. 253 note *n.*

<sup>3</sup> Streane, *Age of the Maccabees*, p. 239, “The LXX., as we now have it, was nearly, if not quite, complete by the middle of the

Apocryphal books were incorporated with the Septuagint increases the difficulty of supposing that they were ignored by the writers of the N.T. That they were well acquainted with the LXX. is fully proved by their frequent quotations from that version<sup>1</sup>.

The idea, entertained by Prof. J. M. Fuller, in his Introduction to the 'Rest of Esther' in the *Speaker's Commentary*<sup>2</sup>, of the existence of a Palestinian Septuagint without Apocrypha seems unsupported by convincing evidence. He adduces none. In the same work<sup>3</sup> it is stated by the Rev. C. J. Ball that the "Additions constitute integral portions of the LXX. text of Daniel."

The fact that non-Alexandrian writers such as Josephus, Melito and, of a later age, Ruffinus, did not regard the Apocrypha as canonical Holy Scripture, by no means proves that they were unacquainted with these books, or set no value on them. Indeed, in the case of Josephus<sup>4</sup> and Ruffinus<sup>5</sup> there is conclusive

2nd cent. B.C." And (p. 98) "The Greek Bible had always included such books."

<sup>1</sup> Grinfield (*Apol. for LXX.* p. 37) estimates that out of some 350 O.T. quotations not more than 50 differ materially from the LXX.

<sup>2</sup> p. 367.

<sup>3</sup> p. 308.

<sup>4</sup> *Antiq.* x. iv. 5 sqq., xi. i.—v. "Das dritte Esrabuch von Josephus...fleissig benutzt ist." (Kautzsch, *Apokr.* p. 2.) Yet at the end of the work, xx. xii. 1, he says that he has given the history of the monarchy *ὡς αἱ ἱεραὶ βίβλοι περὶ πάντων ἔχουσι τὴν ἀναγραφὴν*.

<sup>5</sup> Creed, §§ 26, 37. In his *Invective against Jerome*, Ruffinus hotly defends the Additions to Daniel.

evidence that they were acquainted with some of them and used them. The LXX. originated in Alexandria, and so did these books, which there became attached to it. Sufficient proof that the O.T. in Greek was ever circulated without them is entirely wanting. Beyond a certain *à priori* likelihood that Jews in Palestine who spoke Greek might prefer to confine themselves to the books of the Hebrew canon, little evidence is adducible for the existence of this so-called Palestinian LXX. as distinct from the Alexandrian work. No existing MS. of the LXX. is without the apocryphal books. If the Palestinian abridgment ever existed and obtained acceptance, it is very remarkable that no MS. traces of it should remain. The circulation in Palestine, or even elsewhere, of a Septuagint of canonical books only is of course possible, but the weight of evidence seems to the present writer not to be in favour of the supposition.

The conclusion that the N.T. writers made use of the Apocryphal books is strongly supported by items of evidence, the cumulative force of which is very great. Yet the acceptance of this view is sometimes treated as derogatory to the authority of the N.T., and lowering to the whole idea of Christian Inspiration. The assertion of the non-use of the Apocrypha in the N.T. is made perhaps in its baldest form in William Whittaker's *Disputation on Scripture*<sup>1</sup>. There it is stated of the Apocryphal books that "Neither Christ nor his Apostles ever made any use of their testimony." And in more recent times there has been a feeling that it would be 'unworthy of the N.T.

<sup>1</sup> Parker Soc. 1849, p 51.

writers to employ the apocryphal books when the whole field of God's pure word was before them'—'calculated to mislead Christians and to favour Romanism.' Such allegations as these are sometimes advanced with a certain spurious plausibility<sup>1</sup>.

But if allegations of this kind are to be admitted at all, they prove far too much.

If the N.T. writers are to be regarded as strangers to the knowledge and use of the apocryphal books recognized by our Church, what are we to say to St Jude (*vv.* 14, 15) who cites the book of Enoch, and refers (*v.* 9) to the Assumption of Moses, another uncanonical treatise? Our Lord too honoured the book of Enoch by apparently adopting some of its phrases. Cf. St Matt. xix. 28 with Enoch lxxii. 3 and St John v. 22, 27 with Enoch lxxxix. 27.

What shall we say of St Paul, who quoted in his speech on Mars Hill the poet Aratus<sup>2</sup>, confessedly a heathen? (*Acts* xvii. 28), and who disdained not in his Epistle to Titus (*i.* 12) to cite the testimony of Epimenides, another heathen poet? Indeed the line which St Paul chooses is not specially delicate in the expressions employed to describe the character of the Cretans<sup>3</sup>. Yet the Apostle styles his authority 'a pro-

<sup>1</sup> Various objections to the Apocrypha may be found in E. A. Litton's *Guide to the study of Holy Scripture*, pp. 38, 39.

<sup>2</sup> Cleanthes, in whose Hymn to Jupiter the same words are found, was a Stoic poet, and it may be concluded that St Paul at Athens was probably thinking of him; on the other hand, Aratus, being a Cilician, was more strongly connected with St Paul, as his own countryman.

<sup>3</sup> Callimachus also has the first clause of the line in his Hymn to Jove, 8.

phet.' Possibly his line had become proverbial<sup>1</sup>. And, moreover, on a third occasion St Paul (I. Cor. xv. 33) uses a verse from Menander, not only a heathen, but a writer of plays which, if we may judge by Terence's version of them, were not particularly high-toned or even cleanly. Indeed the title of the very play St Paul quotes is the name of Thais, an Athenian courtesan and concubine of Alexander the Great. But he picks the gold out of the dunghill; and under his sanction the Church reads the heathen playwright's words over every corpse she buries.

Surely after these instances of New Testament quotations, it cannot be seriously contended that the spirit of its writers would be lowered, or an insult offered to their inspiration, by attributing to them a considerable use of the Apocrypha. Surely Tobit and Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus and the First of Maccabees, or any of the books contained in the Apocrypha of the English Church are at least as good and worthy of quotation as Aratus and Epimenides and Menander: far be it from me to suggest that they are not vastly better! And if the inspired writers, and even our Lord Himself, thought the Apocrypha worthy of their regard, certainly the Church is justified in reading it for the instruction and example of her children.

In point of fact, she has done so from the beginning.

<sup>1</sup> Epimenides, according to Bloomfield, *in loc.*, was "a writer περὶ χρησμῶν."

## CHAPTER III.

### Use by Early Christian Writers.

NOT to speak of the public reading of the Apocrypha<sup>1</sup> in Christian assemblies, Christian authors, in a continuous chain from the beginning, constantly quote it or allude to it. Canon Churton<sup>2</sup> even states that "the use which early Christian writers make of the books of Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus and Baruch shews that many of them were more familiar with those portions of the Apocrypha than with several books of the New Testament." "In the controversy with the Jews the second chapter of Wisdom was repeatedly alleged as an inspired prophecy of Christ's Passion: and Baruch iii. [37] was frequently quoted, together with portions of Hebrew prophecy, as one of the testimonies of the ancient Scriptures to the Divinity of Christ." Such quotations are those by Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* IV. xxxiv. 4; and Cyprian, *Testim.* II. 6, "apud Jeremiam prophetam." In the newly-discovered "Logia Jesu<sup>3</sup>," the language of the

<sup>1</sup> Kautzsch styles them "Vorlesebücher." Einleitung, p. xiii.

<sup>2</sup> *Uncanonical and Apocryphal Scriptures*, 1884, p. 13.

<sup>3</sup> Lecture on, W. Lock, Oxf. 1897.

third is thought to be coloured perhaps (ἐν σαρκὶ ὄφθην αὐτοῖς) by Bar. iii. 37.

In the earliest Christian writer whose name we know, St Clement of Rome, at least one undoubted quotation from the Apocrypha occurs. In chap. xxvii. of his Epistle to the Corinthians he cites part of Wisd. xi. 21 and xii. 12: "Who shall say, What hast thou done? and who may withstand the power of thine arm?"—verses which might also have been adduced to shew St Paul's knowledge of Wisdom, as disclosed in Rom. ix. 20. In chap. iv. Clement holds up Judith as an example to Christians.

There is another passage, too, in St Clement's epistle (lx.), in the portion so happily recovered after its loss for ages, on which Bp Lightfoot says: "The idea and in part the language is taken from Wisd. xiii. 1.....and in the latter part the language is suggested by Eccclus. ii. 10 sq." In the 2nd Epistle of St Clement, so-called, which the Bp refers to the first half of the second century, there are some phrases (xvi. 4) on which he notes, "the preacher seems to be thinking of Tobit xii. 8." The last words of the same section, "κούφισμα ἁμαρτίας," appear to have been suggested by I. Esd. viii. 83 (Gk).

In the epistles of Ignatius, according to the middle recension, which the late Bp of Durham, after exhaustive research, pronounced the genuine one, it is only fair to notice that no apocryphal quotation occurs<sup>1</sup>; though in the long recension, prepared about

<sup>1</sup> It is stated in Hastings' *Dict. Bib.* (i. art. 'Apocr.' p. 120) that Ignatius contains apocryphal allusions: but no reference is given.

A.D. 350, there are several. But in the short letter of Polycarp to the Philippians there is an indisputable quotation in x. 16 of Tobit iv. 11, xii. 9. This latter is condemned by Bissell as a teaching obviously in contradiction to the letter and spirit of the canonical Scriptures. (*Comm. in loc.*) Polycarp apparently did not think so<sup>1</sup>.

In the newly-discovered 'Teaching of the Twelve Apostles,' possibly the earliest of all Christian writings after the New Testament, out of eleven passages of Old Testament Scripture which de Romestin (ed. 1884) considers to be either quoted or alluded to, no less than six, or an absolute majority, are from the Apocrypha. Among these the similarity between Did. iv. 5 and Ecclus. iv. 31 is perhaps the most striking<sup>2</sup>.

In the lately-recovered *Apology of Aristides*, Canon J. A. Robinson discerns some phrases which he thinks recall II. Macc. vii. 28; and he says that "there seems to be some relation between our *Apology* and several chapters of the Book of Wisdom," which he specifies (pp. 82, 84 note). But by some oversight he omits (even in his 2nd edition, 1893) to point out the corresponding passages in the text.

In the Epistle of Barnabas, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus and II. Esdras are quoted in chaps. vi., xii. and xix. respectively.

<sup>1</sup> Dr C. Taylor (*Wisd. of Ben Sira*, Camb. 1899, p. xxii.) sees some resemblance between Ecclus. vi. 29, 30 and § 1 of Polycarp's epistle. But it does not amount to a proof of Polycarp's knowledge of Ecclus.

<sup>2</sup> Dr J. R. Harris in his ed. of the Teaching (1887) also gives a marginal reference to this text.

St Irenæus quotes a long passage from Baruch iv. and v., under the title of Jeremiah (v. xxxv. 1); and Bel and the Dragon (*vv.* 3, 4, 14), under the title of Daniel (iv. ix. 1). Susannah (*vv.* 20, 26), too, he cites as “a Daniele propheta voces” (iv. xli. 1). In III. xxiv. 1 (end) he is evidently following II. Esd. xiv. In I. xxviii. 5 he explains the distribution of prophets by the Ophites, and includes Tobias in the list.

St Hippolytus, Bp of Portus, wrote an allegoric treatise on the History of Susannah, as attached to Daniel. In the same way he commented on the Song of the Three Children.

Tertullian calls Judith one of the “*exempla sanctorum*” (*De monog.* xvii.), and cites Ecclesiasticus more than once (e.g. *De cultu feminarum* I. 3; *Adv. Valentinianos* II.) with a “*sicut scriptum est.*” In *Scorpiace*, 8, he quotes Baruch vi. 4 (Ep. Jer.) as “*Jeremiah.*” In *De Prescriptionibus* VII. he attributes Wisd. i. 1 to Solomon: “*Salomonis est qui et ipse tradiderat.*” In *Adv. Marcionem* IV. 16 he quotes II. Esd. xv. 1, “*loquere in aures audientium,*” as being an ancient command illustrated by our Lord in St Luke vi. 27.

Both Clement of Alexandria and Origen quote from books of our Apocrypha very frequently. The former in his *Stromata* (III. 16, II. 5) quotes II. Esd. v. 35; in ii. 23, Tob. iv. 16 as “*ἡ γραφή δεδήλωκεν εἰρηκυῖα*”; in vi. 12, Tob. xii. 8, “*ἐπακούσας τῆς λεγούσης γραφῆς*”; and also Ecclus. as *ἡ γραφή* in *Pæd.* I. 8 § 62. In comparing Jewish with Greek history (in *Strom.* I. 21), at much length, he repeatedly mentions incidents from apocryphal books, indifferently

with canonical ones. In his *Commentary on St John's Gospel* he quotes Susannah 56 with "ὡς ὁ Δανιήλ φησι"; Wisd. x. 3 with "ἡ ἐπιγεγραμμένη τοῦ Σαλωμῶντος σοφία"; and Ecclus. xxxiv. 14 (xxxv. 17) with "γέγραπται γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο" (Tom. xx. 5, 4; xxxv. 22).

Origen, in his *Epistle to Africanus*, defends the canonicity of Susannah and of the Rest of Esther. In his *Hom. XIX. in Josuam* he refers to I. Esd. iv. 59 with "sicut in Esdra scriptum est"; and of Ecclus. xxii. 19 in his *Hom. XIII. in Genesim* he says "dicit Scriptura"; and in *Hom. IX. in librum Judicium* he says "Quid ego illam magnificam et omnium feminarum nobilissimam memorem Judith?" (Ruffinus' version.)

Minucius Felix does not appear to have any apocryphal quotations, or canonical<sup>1</sup>.

After this period, in those Fathers who quote Scripture at all freely, one is almost sure to meet with apocryphal quotations interspersed, often introduced by the same formulæ as quotations from the canonical books.

Thus in the genuine works of St Cyprian, according to Hartel's index, apocryphal texts are quoted no less than 77 times: and this reckoning excludes a large number of allusions in the spurious or doubtful

<sup>1</sup> "Total silence is maintained by him concerning the Books of Holy Scripture" (ed. Holden, Camb. 1853, p. xxviii.). At xxxvi. 9, however, Holden gives a reference to Ecclus. ii. 5. Kautzsch also mentions this (I. 241), but thinks an allusion to Prov. xvii. 3 more probable. The coincidences however are of such a general character that it is quite likely that Minucius was not intending any reference to Scripture.

works attributed to that saint. In *Ep.* XLIII. 4 he points his exhortation by a reference to Susannah and the elders; and in LVIII. 5, 6 by the examples of Daniel with Bel, and of the Maccabees. In *De opere et eleemosynis* c. 5, he attributes Ecclus. xix. 29 to Solomon: "apud Salomonem legimus." In *Ep.* LXXIV. 9 he seems to think that our Lord in St John xiv. 6 ("I am the truth") is founding His words on I. Esd. iv. 38—40. Sometimes he introduces his quotations, as in the case of Wisd. iii. 4, in *Ep.* VI. 2, with "loquitur scriptura divina"; or with "per Salomonem Spiritus sanctus ostendit et præcanit dicens," in that to Fortunatus § 12, where the same text is quoted. Our own homilies follow St Cyprian's example in this respect quite sufficiently<sup>1</sup>.

In Lactantius, *Div. Instit.* iv. 8, Migne sees a reference to Wisd. xviii.; and in iv. 6 of the same work, Lactantius attributes Wisd. ii. to Solomon: "Salomon libro Sapientiæ his verbis usus est, Circumveniamus justum, &c.;" and again, after the quotation: "Salomon qui hæc cecinit."

St Athanasius (Easter Letter, 59) says that catechumens ("προσερχομένοι καὶ βουλομένοις κατηγοῖσθαι") were instructed in parts of the Apocrypha. He also in the same letter recognizes Baruch and "the Letter" as part of Jeremiah. In his *Orat.* II.

<sup>1</sup> The decretal epistle (ii.) of Pope Marcellus "ad Maxentium tyrannum," containing towards the end quotations from Tobit and Ecclus., is a forgery of a later age, though printed by Hardouin (I. 224) in chronological order. He gives similar recognition to that of Anterus (I. 121, 122) who is made to quote Wisdom freely.

*cont. Ar.* 20 he quotes I. Esd. iv. 36 and Tob. xii. 7 with “ὡς γέγραπται”; in § 8 Bel and Dragon 5 is quoted as words of Daniel; and in *Cont. Gent.* xvii., Wisd. xiv. 21 is cited with “εἶπεν ἡ γραφή.” In Fragment A (Migne II. 1320), Ecclus. xxxviii. 9 is styled “ἐπουρανία σοφία.” In the *Synopsis Sacræ Scripturæ*, attributed to Athanasius, Tobit, Wisdom, Judith, and Ecclesiasticus are treated as if on a par with the canonical books, but Migne classes this *Synopsis* among his “dubia,” and Canon Bright<sup>1</sup> pronounces it to be certainly spurious.

In the lately-recovered work known as the *Prayer-book of Bp Serapion*<sup>2</sup>, of Thmuis, in Egypt, some knowledge of the book of Wisdom is shewn. In the “Blessing of Oils” (p. 75) words are taken from XI. 26; and in the “Commendation of the Dead” (p. 79) from xvi. 13.

About A.D. 350 is the date Bp Wordsworth (p. 13) assigns to this compilation.

The MS. which contains this Prayer-Book has, amongst other writings, the book of Ecclesiasticus.

St Gregory Nazianzen (*Orat.* xxiv. 10) speaks of God as “ὁς καὶ Σωσάνναν ἐρρύσατο.”

St Ambrose, among the apocryphal quotations, quotes II. Esd. x. 6 as “Holy Scripture” (*de exc. Satyri* I. 65) and vii. 28 in his *Commentary on St Luke* i. 60. He also has an entire treatise *de Tobiâ*. In *de Cain et Abel* (I. 34), Baruch iii. 1 is quoted with “Hieremias quoque ait”: and in “de bono mortis” the recovered

<sup>1</sup> Art. ‘Athanasius,’ *ad fin.*, Smith’s *Dict. Christ. Biog.* I. 203.

<sup>2</sup> Bp J. Wordsworth’s ed., S.P.C.K. 1899.

fragment of II. Esd. vii. is made use of several times in §§ x.—xii., as also are other parts of the book.

In St Chrysostom's six books, *de Sacerdotio*, according to the index in Bengel's edition, out of 20 references to the O.T., seven, or more than one-third, are apocryphal. In § 304 he names the Son of Sirach as τις ἀνὴρ σοφώτατος<sup>1</sup>.

St Augustine, as might be expected, makes large use of the Apocrypha. He terms Ecclesiasticus "verbum Dei" in *Serm.* lxxxvii. 11; and in *de Civ. Dei* xviii. 36 he places, with some hesitation, I. Esd. among the prophetic books. And in *de Predestin. Sanctorum*, chap. 14, he extols Wisdom as a book "qui meruit.....cum veneratione divinæ auctoritatis audiri." According to Prof. Ryle, he never calls these "libri ecclesiastici" by the title 'apocryphal'<sup>2</sup>.

But these examples of apocryphal quotation by the Fathers may be multiplied endlessly. There can be no doubt that the apocryphal books, along with the canonical, were constantly in their hands, and that they used them most thoroughly<sup>3</sup>. It is evident,

<sup>1</sup> Bengel remarks: "Ita laudat Siracidem ut non videatur statutum habuisse, quantum auctoritatis haberet liber ejus" (ed. Leo. Leipzig, 1834).

<sup>2</sup> Smith's *Dict. Bib.* art. 'Apocr.' p. 164.

<sup>3</sup> Kautzsch (Einleitung p. xii.) says that these "Bücher werden zwar von den Gelehrten (so z. B. ausdrücklich von Origenes) in der Theorie von den kanonischen unterschieden, in der Praxis aber seit dem Ende des 2. Jahrh. von den kirchlichen Schriftstellern (und zwar von Origenes selbst) ganz so gewertet und verwertet, wie die kanonischen," and again, p. xiii., "In der Praxis war die gleichmässige Anerkennung der meisten Vorlesebücher als kanonischer bereits durchgedrungen."

too, that the line between the two was not always drawn by them exactly where we draw it. Some indeed attributed to them a much higher authority than others, but all employed them fully to the extent which our Article warrants, and not a few beyond it. All used the Apocrypha in a manner in which they used no other books, except the canonical Scriptures. Continuously, and on the whole increasingly, the use of the Apocrypha was maintained; while the employment of other apocryphal writings, such as Enoch, the epistle of Barnabas, the Testaments of the XII. Patriarchs, and the book of Jubilees, which at one time were quoted with some respect, gradually declined, and for the most part wholly died away, since they had no enduring religious vitality. Believing this to be so, can we doubt that our Church is right in affirming with some qualifications the ecclesiastical use of the Apocrypha? In doing otherwise she would have separated herself, in this respect, from the whole habit and practice of Christendom, handed down from the earliest days and the highest authority. Thank God she has never done so; but has ever acted on the principle that, though these books rest on a lower level than the Canon, yet still they are not to be deprived of the honourable place which is their due, but are to be read, used and respected, in their own sphere, for the instruction and edification of God's people.

## CHAPTER IV.

### Action of Councils.

SUCH was the practical use which early Christian writers made of the Apocrypha—a use both free and constant.

When, however, we raise the question as to how far the Church's official sanction was given to the Apocrypha, we are entering upon a matter of much greater difficulty. Whether she regarded it as on a level with the O.T. or not ; if she did, whether she regarded it as on a level with any other non-canonical religious writings, and if not, how far above them or below them ; these are points which it is much harder to settle satisfactorily. The habits of Christian writers in respect of these books it is comparatively easy to ascertain : the authoritative opinion of the Church at large, if ever decisively expressed, lies in much greater obscurity.

No formal decision on the whole subject appears to have been given by early General Councils. Nor does it seem to have been regarded as one of the first importance. And this is probably the reason why so little definite guidance was given by the Church in her corporate capacity ; and why, when some guidance

was vouchsafed in different quarters, the discrepancies of opinion which manifested themselves in some cases did not give rise, so far as we can see, to any deep-seated or general anxiety in the minds of Christians. And further, notwithstanding the doubts which presented themselves from time to time as to the thorough canonicity of certain books, there was an underlying sense of assurance that though something might have been added on dubious authority to the Canon, nothing at any rate had been lost from it. The whole of Scripture was there, safe in the Church's keeping. This conviction allayed anxieties. As time went on, too, the gradually increasing tendency to admit rather than to exclude questioned books of our Apocrypha was probably helped by the tacit assumption that excess, in this matter, was less dangerous than defect.

Moreover, the early Church's religion was that of a Person in the first place, that of a Book only in the second. Great as might be the divergence of opinion, and variable as was the practice, with regard to the precise authority of the Apocryphal books, the matter never gave rise to acute crises or far-reaching controversies. These arose out of teachings concerning the Person of our Lord, the date of keeping His Resurrection Festival, the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, the admission of Images into Churches. On such topics, rather than on the Canon of Scripture, the strongest feeling centred, the highest excitement arose.

Heretics indeed, who from obvious motives attempted to foist on the Church their own produc-

tions as Scripture, or more frequently to reject large portions of the Canon, were from time to time condemned.

An American writer<sup>1</sup> goes so far as to say, "there was nothing that could be characterized as intelligent opinion on the subject. It was simply drifting." He also speaks of "the well-known thoughtless habits of most of the earlier Christian writers in the matter of indiscriminate quotations." But this is too sweeping an accusation of general carelessness.

The *Shepherd of Hermas*, a non-heretical work, is spoken of by Tertullian (*de Pudicitia* c. 10) as being rejected by all councils, whether Montanist or Catholic: "Sed cederem tibi, si scriptura Pastoris, quæ sola mœchos amat, divino instrumento meruisset incidi, si non ab omni concilio etiam vestrarum inter apocrypha et falsa judicaretur, adultera et ipsa, et inde patrona sociorum."

This is apparently the earliest reference, and that only a vague one, to any conciliar action with regard to the Canon of Scripture: and as to the councils Tertullian thus refers to, nothing more seems to be known as to dates, particulars or results.

But there is no record of the books which form

<sup>1</sup> E. C. Bissell, *Apocrypha*, Edinb. n. d. pp. 51, 411. He is evidently strongly biassed against the religious use of the Apocrypha as commended in Art. VI.; for he says in his preface "Homiletical hints would, of course, be superfluous for Protestant ministers and students." Yet somewhat inconsistently he writes on p. 43, "It is not an uncommon thing in Europe even at the present day, and in Protestant churches, to hear sermons preached from texts taken from these books, particularly from Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus."

our Apocrypha entering into these early controversies. Heretics did not shew any special predilection for them<sup>1</sup>—a strong point in their favour.

At the end of the Council of Antioch in 269, an encyclical letter was addressed to Dionysius of Rome and Maximus of Alexandria. In this there is a reference to Ecclus. ix., introduced by “sicut scriptum est<sup>2</sup>.”

After the Alexandrian council at which Arius was deposed (321) a letter was sent from Alexander, Bp of Alexandria, to Alexander Bp of Byzantium, in which there are quotations of Ecclus. iii. 22 and i. 2<sup>3</sup>, seemingly treated as Scripture proofs.

According to Jerome, in his preface to Judith, the Council of Nicæa (325) declared that book to be canonical. However, it is not mentioned in the Nicene canons; so perhaps Jerome may only mean that it was referred to at the council with approval. His words are: “Hunc librum Synodus Nicæna in numero sanctorum scripturarum legitur computasse.” His information therefore appears to be drawn from some unknown document.

The Council of Sardica (347) is said by Churton\*

<sup>1</sup> The Ophite Gnostics according to Irenæus (*adv. Hær.* ed. Harvey i. xxxviii. 5) reckoned Tobias as a prophet on a par with Haggai. The Nestorians are said to have recognized Ecclesiasticus. (Ryle, *O. T. Canon*, ed. 2, p. 196.) “Erkannten die Nestorianer merkwürdigerweise b. Sirach und die apokryphischen Zusätze zum Daniel als kanonisch an.” Buhl, *Kanon und Text des A. T.* 1891, p. 52.

<sup>2</sup> Hardouin i. 198.

<sup>3</sup> i. 299.

<sup>4</sup> *Uncan. and Apocr. Script.* p. 14.

to have excluded Wisdom from the Canon. Neither the Sardican canons nor the Encyclical make any mention of the book. No trace of the matter occurs in any of the documents of the Council as given by Hardouin<sup>1</sup>. But Labbe<sup>2</sup> gives an appendix to the Sardican Synodal epistle "ex Theodoreto lib. 2 c. 6" in which Wisd. vii. 21 (22) is quoted in conjunction with St John i. 3, as if on an equal footing. This document, if it really is what it professes to be, seems to tell in the opposite direction to Churton's statement, for which he names no authority.

Dr Salmon, however, asserts<sup>3</sup> that "the Council of Laodicea, a small council which met about A.D. 363, appears to have been the first council to make decrees on the subject of canonical books." He adds: "The list of books commonly appended to their decrees, omits the apocrypha, but its authenticity cannot be relied upon."

The 60th and last Canon of Laodicea contains a list of the O.T. books "which may be read aloud," coinciding with our own, except that Baruch with the Letter is explicitly added to Jeremiah<sup>4</sup>. It is probable that Daniel, as is generally the case in Greek lists, covers the 'Additions': and "Εσδρας α', β'" may mean our I. Esdras, Ezra and Nehemiah, as is frequently the case in MSS. of the LXX. The genuineness of the catalogue has been doubted (e.g. by Bp Westcott, 'Canon,' *app. D*), but its spuriousness is by no means fully proved.

<sup>1</sup> *Concilia* I. 635—683.

<sup>2</sup> *Concilia* III. 83.

<sup>3</sup> *Speaker's Apocr.* Introd. p. xxv. a.

<sup>4</sup> Hefele, *Councils*, II. 323.

The Council of Hippo, in 393, reckoned as canonical five books of Solomon (presumably adding Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus to those which we admit), Tobit, Judith and 2 books of Maccabees. (Can. 36.)

This canon was adopted by the Third Council of Carthage in August, 397. Indeed it is from the records of this council that we derive nearly all our knowledge of what passed at Hippo<sup>1</sup>. St Augustine was present on both occasions, as well as at the 16th Council of Carthage (419) which confirmed the rules of former African Synods. (Hef. II. 467.) The same canon of Hippo adds, it is to be noted, "that the transmarine Church is to be consulted concerning its confirmation." Whether such consultation took place or not seems unknown.

Bishop Gray (*Key to O.T.* ed. 3, 1797, p. 519) attempts to minimize the meaning of this inclusion of apocryphal books". "The Council of Carthage appear to have admitted (rather in deference to popular opinion and in compliance with that deference which had arisen from use) most of the Apocryphal books as canonical; meaning, however, canonical in a secondary sense, and still with distinction from those sacred and inspired books which were established on the sanction of the Jewish Church." But this view of the Council's

<sup>1</sup> *Ib.*, 395.

<sup>2</sup> Bp Gray evidently felt a difficulty in reconciling our present canon of Scripture with that of Carthage. He writes under I. Esd. that it admitted that book "as canonical in that extended acceptance of the word which implied only, worthy to be read" (p. 525). He evidently understood "Esdrae libri duo" to include our Apocryphal I. Esd.

intention seems hardly borne out. St Augustine's vacillation on the subject cannot be attributed to this canon.

In the 22nd Canon of the 2nd book of the Apostolic Constitutions<sup>1</sup>, the Prayer of Manasses is given at full length. It is apparently regarded as of equal authority with the narrative of Manasseh's proceedings explicitly cited from II. Kings and II. Chronicles, and is introduced after xxxiii. 12 of the latter book, of which it is apparently regarded as a portion. On the strength of this Manasseh is held up, with others, in the title as "μέγα παράδειγμα μετανοίας." Von Drey deems this book of the Constitutions to have been written "after the middle of the 3rd century<sup>2</sup>."

In the so-called Liturgy of St Clement found in some MSS. of these Constitutions (VIII. 7), II. Esd. viii. 23 is embodied, in a prayer near the beginning.

At the end of the so-called Apostolic Canons comes one (85) which gives a list of "βιβλία σεβάσματα καὶ ἅγια." Among these are reckoned three books of Maccabees, and, in the Latin of the Canon only, Judith. This variation from the Greek list does not seem to be satisfactorily explained. Both versions mention Ecclesiasticus on a lower level than the rest, as a book suitable for the instruction of youth. The canon is thought to be the latest of this very uncertain series. (Hef. I. 492.)

The Quinisext or 2nd Trullan Council of Constantinople (691) confirmed, by its 2nd canon, the

<sup>1</sup> Mansi, *Concil.* I. 318.

<sup>2</sup> Shaw's art. 'Apost. Constit.' in Smith's *Dict. Christ. Antiq.* 125 b.

decrees of the Laodicene and Carthaginian Councils, and the Apostolic Canons<sup>1</sup>. These all, as we have seen, differed greatly as to the canonical books. It is by no means clear, therefore, what rule the Quinisext Council intended Christians to follow in this matter. It has, however, been acknowledged as Œcumenical by the Eastern Church alone. Bishop Jeremy Taylor in his *Liberty of Propheſying* (§ 6, p. 8) uses these facts to prove that "Councils are insufficient to determine controversies<sup>2</sup>."

It is a very remarkable fact that Œcumenical Councils did not attempt to fix the Canon of Scripture by making definite and complete lists of those books which they considered alone to have divine authority. More regulations seem to have been made as to 'Readers' than as to the limits of the divine word which they were ordered to read.

It seems to be the case, however, that this decision was delayed (however unlikely such postponement, *à priori*, might have been thought) until the year 1546. Then the Council of Trent, which Romanists alone however deem Œcumenical, pronounced definitely on the limits of the Canon.

It is worthy of note too that the first Creed, which contained a direct expression of belief in the Scriptures as a whole, was the outcome of this same Council. For it is in the Creed of Pope Pius IV., issued in 1564, the year after the dissolution of the Council of Trent, that the acceptance of the Bible is explicitly named as an article of the Christian's faith.

<sup>1</sup> Hefele, v. 224.

<sup>2</sup> Taylor's Works, vol. VIII. 43 (Heber's Ed.).

“Item sacram Scripturam juxta eum sensum, quem tenuit et tenet sancta mater Ecclesia, cujus est judicare de vero sensu, et interpretatione sacrarum Scripturarum, admitto; nec eam unquam nisi juxta unanimum consensum Patrum accipiam et interpretabor.” The Constantinopolitan Creed has of course always made mention of the Scriptures, but only incidentally, with reference to one article, Christ’s resurrection. And the phrase “Who spake by the Prophets” may reasonably be taken to include their written, as well as their spoken, words. But to those who regard the Church of Rome as an enemy to the full use of the Scriptures, the fact that Pope Pius’ Creed should be the first to contain an express declaration of belief in Holy Scripture must seem strange. On the other hand, however, it is noteworthy that the phraseology of the creed seems to imply a much more hearty acceptance of tradition than of Scripture. For while the former is put first with a warm acceptance “firmissime admitto et amplector,” the latter is received more coldly with a bare “admitto.” But a Roman controversialist would probably point out that rejection of tradition was the dangerous error of the time, and therefore demanded the more earnest counteraction.

## CHAPTER V.

### Catalogues of Scripture by Individuals.

LISTS of canonical books prepared by separate writers do not of course come down to us with the same authority as those which emanate from councils. They are more numerous, however, and some of them are of earlier date than conciliar catalogues. Like these they vary considerably from one another, their voices being far from unanimous as to the exact position of certain books. But they throw a fair amount of additional light on the early acceptance of our sacred writings.

The list of O.T. books which Melito, Bp of Sardis (circ. 170), sent, according to Eusebius (*H. E.* iv. 26), to his friend Onesimus, contains no mention of apocryphal books; nor yet of Lamentations or Esther. These two may however be included under Jeremiah and Esdras respectively, as also may our I. Esdras and Baruch, as well as the Additions under Daniel. Melito's aim seems to have been to give as brief a list as possible in response to his friend's request. It is remarkable that he seems himself to have had some little uncertainty in the matter, since

he tells us that he went to the Holy Land to learn accurately the books of the Old Covenant. After giving his list, he sought further brevity by providing abstracts or selections according to Onesimus' desire : "Ἐξ ὧν καὶ τὰς ἐκλογὰς ἐποιησάμην, εἰς ἕξ βιβλία διελῶν."

We are also indebted to Eusebius (*H. E.* vi. 25) for Origen's list († 253). This agrees with our present Canon except in so far as the usual apocryphal additions may be included under canonical names. "Τὰ Μακκαβαϊκά" are named at the end, however, as "ἔξω...τούτων," thus allowing them a certain position, but one distinctly inferior to that of the O.T. Scriptures preceding.

The Muratorian Fragment (circ. 180) somewhat strangely inserts Wisdom in the N.T. books before Revelation. This may be accounted for by both books being regarded as dubious, and so placed together at the end. On the other hand we are not aware that the Fragment dealt with the O.T. books at all.

In a similar way Epiphanius in one of his lists (*Hær.* 76 i. 941, ed. Dindorf) adds Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus as a kind of appendage to the N.T.<sup>1</sup> This can hardly have arisen from conceiving these books to be the products of Christian writers. In his first list in *De mens. et pond.* 3 he has the same two books at the end, on a lower plane than the O.T. Scriptures. In his other list in the same work (23) no apocryphal books are named.

Hilary of Poitiers († 368) speaks doubtfully as to

<sup>1</sup> Prof. Ryle, Art. 'Apocr.' Smith's *Bib. Dict.*, p. 170 b.

Tobit and Judith. "Quibusdam autem visum est, additis Tobia et Judith, XXIV. libros.....connumerare" (Prol. in Ps. 15).

Athanasius († 373), in his 39th Paschal Epistle, while expressly accepting Baruch as an adjunct to Jeremiah, and the 'Epistle,' puts Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Tobit and Judith (along with Esther and certain extra-apocryphal books) in a distinctly lower class.

We might look to the great names of Jerome and Augustine for decisive guidance in this matter. But though both those saints dealt with the subject of the Canon, their voices are far from clear. The general tendency of St Jerome was to depress the apocryphal books, of St Augustine to exalt them; but the opinion of neither of them seems to have been positive or fixed. Often a sentiment from either of these writers which tells in one direction may be confronted by another, which seems to make for the opposite; so that any quotation from them which is apparently in favour of one view of the matter, may often be balanced by something which it seems permissible to take in a contrary sense.

Thus St Jerome speaks somewhat slightly<sup>1</sup> of the apocryphal books in his *Prologus Galeatus*; but on one plea or another he includes most of them in his translation as part of the Latin Bible.

St Augustine (*de doct. Christ.* II. 8) reckons

<sup>1</sup> I. Macc. he appears to regard more favourably than the rest, because "librum Hebraicum reperi" (*Prol. Gal.*). He says the same, "Hebraicum reperi," of "Panaretos Jesu filii Sirach liber" in his Pref. to the books of Solomon. At the end of the *Capitula* come the words "Explicit liber Ecclesiasticum (sic) Salomonis."

Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Tobit, Judith, I. and II. Maccabees as Holy Scripture ; yet elsewhere (*de Civ. Dei* xv, 23, 24) he speaks of the sacred books as those which were preserved in the temple of the Hebrew people, seemingly limiting them to the Jewish Canon.

Origen, with similar inconsistency, quotes (*Ep. ad Afric.* III.) Esther xiv. as if canonical ; while elsewhere (ap. Euseb. *H. E.* VI. 25) he professes to confine his catalogue Scripture to those books which are “καθ’ Ἑβραίων.”

While considering lists of canonical books given by those who were accustomed to use Greek and Latin versions, it is necessary to bear in mind that apocryphal portions are often included under canonical names. Thus Esther frequently embraces the Additions ; our I. Esdras is sometimes joined to Ezra-Nehemiah ; the ‘Epistle’ is often joined silently to Jeremiah, as well as Baruch<sup>1</sup> ; and Daniel generally includes the Song of the Three Children, Bel and the Dragon, and Susannah. The Prayer of Manasses is occasionally found at the end of II. Chronicles : but Churton’s statement (*Uncan. and Apocr. Script.*, p. 409) that “it is found in several copies of the LXX., where it is inserted in II. Chron. xxxiii.,” seems to lack proof<sup>2</sup>.

The contents of the ancient MSS. of the Bible vary quite as much as the lists given by writers whose names are known. Thus the Codex Sinaiticus

<sup>1</sup> Baruch’s inclusion under Jeremiah is probably more frequent than has been generally supposed. v. Art. *Baruch* in *Hastings’ Bib. Dict.*

<sup>2</sup> In *Apost. Const.* II. 22 the P. of M. is curiously amalgamated with historical narrative, as we have seen.

(4th cent.) contains Tobit, Judith, I. Macc., Wisdom and Ecclus., as well as IV. Macc., Ep. Barnabas, and a large portion of the Shepherd of Hermas : Alexandrinus (5th cent.) has Baruch, the Epistle, Tobit, Judith, Macc. I.—IV., Prayer of Manasses, the Canticles, Wisdom and Ecclus., as well as the Psalms of Solomon and II. Epp. of Clement of Rome ; Vaticanus (4th cent.) has Wisdom, Ecclus., Judith, Tobit, Baruch, and Ep. Jeremiah ; Ephraemi (5th cent.) contained Wisdom and Ecclus., at least, as the O.T. fragments shew ; Claromontanus (6th cent.) has in its Latin list of books, Wisdom, Ecclus., Macc. I., II., IV., Judith and Tobit ; as well as the Epistle of Barnabas, Pastor, the Acts of Paul, and Revelation of Peter.

These were no doubt included in MSS. of the LXX. as read in Christian Churches, some generally, others only locally.

The contention is sometimes made that the failure to define accurately, by authority, the precise limits of the Canon in early times, arose from little or no doubt existing on the point. But this contention can hardly be maintained as a valid one. The frequent quotations of our Apocryphal books as parts of the Canon by some writers, and their treatment by others as on a lower level, prove the existence of very different opinions with regard to them. Yet this difference of opinion does not seem to have been treated as a matter of grave importance, or to have given rise to any serious disquietude in the minds of Christians generally<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> For an attempt to explain this fact, see *Action of Councils*, p. 42.

Bishop Beveridge († 1708), in writing on the Vith Article, goes so far as to make the following assertion: "Thus we see how clear and express the Fathers are, not only in determining the same number of canonical books that is in this Article determined, but also in passing their judgment upon the apocryphal books, as this Article doth<sup>1</sup>." In the face of the preceding references and quotations, it must, I think, be admitted that Beveridge here greatly overstates the case, to an extent quite surprising in a writer who is generally so trustworthy and careful. In this overstatement he has been often followed by more recent, though less learned, writers.

Notwithstanding all variations and inconsistencies, the balance of evidence seems to the present writer to be clearly in favour of our existing Canon as defined in Art. VI.; and equally in favour of admitting "the other books" of our Apocrypha to that privileged position beneath the Canon which the same Article assigns to them. This seems most in accordance with the general tenor of Christian antiquity.

<sup>1</sup> Ed. Oxf. 1840, vol. i. p. 289.

## PART II.

### MODERN USE.

#### CHAPTER VI.

##### English and Foreign.

IN continuing the subject of the use of the Apocrypha into modern times, I purposely pass over the mediæval period. During the centuries included under the term 'middle ages,' the use of the Apocrypha was great, and probably reached its highest point. It was continually quoted and referred to by mediæval preachers and writers for spiritual purposes. The Church employed it largely in her forms of prayer. In a 'Sarum Missal'<sup>1</sup> for example, amongst other apocryphal Lections, those for Tuesday and Thursday in Passion Week, and St Philip and St James, are from Bel and the Dragon, and the Song of the Three Children, and Wisd. v. 1—5 respectively.

Our English writer, Venerable Bede, composed "on the book of the blessed Father Tobias, one book

<sup>1</sup> Church Press Co., 1868.

of allegorical exposition, concerning Christ and the Church<sup>1</sup>." Bede also gives an answer of Pope Gregory to St Augustine (I. 27) in which II. Macc. v. 19 seems to be adapted<sup>2</sup>. Ælfric in his *Homilies* often quotes (in descending order of frequency) *Ecclus.*, *Wisd.*, *Tob.*, *Bel.* and *Song of the Three*<sup>3</sup>.

The judgments which befell Heliodorus and Antiochus Epiphanes were sometimes, in common with canonical instances, called down upon violators of Church property in the curses pronounced at its consecration. An example is given by Spelman, *Fate of Sacrilege*, ed. 1895, p. 312.

But the field of inquiry as to the employment of the apocryphal books during that period is quite different. We should have to look not so much for occasions on which Christian authors make a religious use of the Apocrypha, as for passages in their works in which any distinction is drawn between it and the books of the Canon.

Such are not wanting; and Bishop Westcott in his article on the Canon in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible* gives a list of the more learned Western writers, beginning with Primasius, and ending with Card. Cajetan, who "maintained the distinctive authority of the Hebrew Canon." Others who defend the canonicity of the apocryphal books shew, by the manner in which they do so, that a contrary opinion

<sup>1</sup> *Eccl. Hist.* ed. 1723, p. 477.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.*, p. 73.

<sup>3</sup> A. S. Cooke's *Biblical Quotations in old English Prose-writers*, Lond. 1898.

had substantial support<sup>1</sup>. Prof. Ryle also in his article on the Apocrypha gives a list of mediæval writers (including the Englishman, John of Salisbury, 1172) who put these books on<sup>2</sup> a lower level than the canonical ones. Bp R. Pecock (1460) of St Asaph, in his *Repressor of overmuch witing of the Clergy*, distinguishes strongly between canonical and apocryphal scriptures, intimates that the latter are not Holy Scripture, explains their admission into Bibles by a former scarcity of devout books, and thinks them in no danger of being rated too highly.

When we approach the Reformation period we find the Apocrypha still in full use amongst both the reformed and the unreformed. Wyclif's, Luther's, Calvin's, Coverdale's, the Genevan<sup>3</sup>, and other translations of the Bible, all contained it as a matter of course. Indeed, Luther seems to have regarded some books of it with more veneration than canonical ones; for while he ventured to speak of Esther as "dignior omnibus me judice, qui extra canonem haberetur<sup>4</sup>," and as containing many heathenish improprieties<sup>5</sup>, of Jonah's prophecy as a ridiculous fable, of St Paul's allegory of Hagar and Sarah as "too weak to hold<sup>6</sup>," and of St James' Epistle in a particular aspect as an

<sup>1</sup> So Jacob Pamelius on *Judith*, Migne vol. 91 (appendix to Rabanus Maurus).

<sup>2</sup> Babington's ed. p. 250.

<sup>3</sup> Coverdale's and the Genevan omitted the Prayer of Manasses.

<sup>4</sup> Quoted by Keil, *Esther*, Eng. Tr. (Clark) Edinb. 1873, p. 315.

<sup>5</sup> *Table Talk*, quoted in Hastings' *Dict. Bib.* art. 'Esther.'

<sup>6</sup> Bissell, p. 54.

epistle of straw<sup>1</sup>, he has words of warm praise for “the excellent and saintly doings” of Tobit (Churton, p. 17); he deems I. Maccabees ought to be taken into the reckoning of Holy Scripture<sup>2</sup>; and of Judith he writes:—“It is a good, holy and useful book, well worthy to be read by us Christians; for the words which the characters in the story speak are to be understood as the words of a sacred poet or prophet by the aid of the Holy Ghost” (p. 166). But on these, as on other points, he did not always say the same thing, for in his *Table Talk* he ridicules these books. Luther published various selections from the Bible before his translation of the whole in 1534. One of these selections in 1519 consisted of the Prayer of Manasses with part of St Matthew xvi. He apparently deemed the Prayer to be a choice passage. (*Urtext und Übersetzungen*, p. 130.)

Some of the reformed Germans, however, must have soon begun to think differently, for Pellican, who died only ten years after Luther, calls it “a most holy institution of the Catholic Church that those books were read in the Church,” and that “if that custom had been everywhere continued, so many errors had not crept into the reformed Church<sup>3</sup>.” To this day the Lutheran Bible is printed, like that of the English Church, with the Apocrypha at the end of the Prophets; and a portion of Scripture from Ecclesiasticus xv. is

<sup>1</sup> Döllinger (*Luther, eine Skizze*, ed. Freiburg i. B. 1890, p. 60) says that he attempted to cast it out of the Canon. It stands in his Bible however.

<sup>2</sup> Kautzsch, *Apok.* I. 81.

<sup>3</sup> Quoted by Dean Donne in Sermon on *Heb.* xi. 35.

appointed therein as an alternative epistle for the feast of St John the Evangelist<sup>1</sup>. The fact that it is still used and valued in Germany was impressed upon me by a Mecklenburgher who had been resident for some years in England. Taking up a Bible which was lying on my table, he noticed that it contained the apocryphal books, and at once inquired if that was the Church of England Bible: on learning that it was he expressed great satisfaction, saying that it was what he had always been accustomed to, and that the English Bibles he had hitherto met with had seemed to him imperfect copies. Dr E. Nestle<sup>2</sup> mentions the "Ausschluss der Apokryphen" as an instance of that "Einseitigkeit" which prevents him from regarding the many missionary translations made in England as "lauter Siege echten Christenthums."

The German poet Klopstock († 1803) in his *Messiah* introduces Raphael as St John Baptist's guardian angel (book II.), and the Maccabean mother of the seven martyred sons (book XI.).

The Danish Dr Martensen bitterly deplores the action of the British and Foreign Bible Society in refusing to circulate Bibles including the Apocrypha. He writes, "As long as it adheres to its view that the Bible must only be distributed without the Apocrypha...so long will a great deficiency affect its work, and this work itself be an imperfect one. The Society will, consequently, not deserve in every respect the praise of that love...which seeketh not *her own* (1 Cor.

<sup>1</sup> The Sarum Missal also contains this as a 'Lection' for the same day; also the modern Roman Missal (Venice, 1736).

<sup>2</sup> *Urtext und Übersetzungen der Bibel* (Leipzig, 1897), p. 239.

xiii. 5), since, as far as this point is concerned, it seeks, on the contrary, to rule foreign Churches<sup>1</sup>.”

The naming of a town ‘Bethulie’ in the Orange Free State seems to indicate an appreciation of the book of Judith by the Reformed Dutch Afrikanders.

It is a noteworthy fact, recently unearthed from the archives of the S.P.C.K., that that Society published no Bibles without the Apocrypha until 1743<sup>2</sup>.

Dr J. Hey, the first Norrisian Professor of Divinity, says in his Lectures<sup>3</sup>, “At the Reformation, when men had been brought up to revere them, it would have been both imprudent and cruel to set them aside.”

Nor did the French Protestants, in former times, at any rate, reject the Apocrypha, for a commentary *in Libros Apocryphos* was written by Claude Baduel, one of their ministers. This work was published separately in two or three editions at Lyons; and was also incorporated in Robert Stephen’s Latin *Biblia Utriusque Testamenti* of 1557. In this Bible the Apocryphal are slightly distinguished from the other books of the Old Testament by a deeper indent of the margin of the *Ordo librorum*.

Baduel, in his tract *De ratione vitæ studiosæ &c.*<sup>4</sup>, holds up Sara, Judith and Susannah as “sanctarum feminarum exempla.” Of Sara he writes “cujus pietas...omnibus piis feminis est imitanda”; of Judith “cum singulari quadam virtute.” He speaks of the accounts of them as being “in divinis literis.”

<sup>1</sup> *Christian Ethics*, E. Tr. III., p. 339.

<sup>2</sup> *Two hundred Years, A History of S.P.C.K.*, p. 189.

<sup>3</sup> Ed. 1797, vol. IV. p. 490.

<sup>4</sup> Lugd. 1544, pp. 89—91.

This appeal to the Apocrypha by a French Protestant Pastor is noteworthy.

Even John Wyclif himself does not seem to have held very different views on this subject. In his *Sermons*<sup>1</sup> he quotes Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus very freely, Tobit but rarely. In his *De ente predicamentali* he refers to Ecclus. iii. 11 as "scriptura" (p. 188) and xviii. 1 is cited with "ut dicitur" (p. 146). But perhaps his strongest assertion is in *Quæstiones logicæ et philosophicæ*, where he clinches his argument by saying, "Ista conclusio etiam patet auctoritate scripturæ," Ecclus. xviii. 1. In his treatise *De eucharistia* he guards against idolatry in the Mass by Baruch vi. 1, 56 (p. 57); and in his *Opus evangelicum*, ch. xxviii., he quotes II. Macc. v. 19, against the Pope. This practice of Wyclif's of confuting Popery from the Apocryphal books, in view of later developments on either side, is not without its humorous aspect. In his *Paternoster* he refers to Tobit vi. 17 with apparently full acceptance. He also wrote a *Practical Exposition of the Song of the Three Men in the Furnace*, Dan. iii. 51 sqq.<sup>2</sup>

When Miles Coverdale placed all the Apocrypha (except Baruch) at the end of the New Testament, he expressly stated that he did not wish it to be despised or little set by; and that patience and study would shew that the Apocrypha and the Canon were agreed<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> All references are to the Wyclif Society's editions (1891—7).

<sup>2</sup> P. Lorimer's trans. of Prof. Lechler's *J. Wiclif*, 1878, vol. II., p. 330.

<sup>3</sup> Smith's *Dictionary Bib.* III. 1671 a.

## CHAPTER VII.

### Prayer-Book and Homilies.

THE great use made of the Apocrypha in our Prayer-Book is thoroughly in accordance with Bp Coverdale's opinion. The reformers of our public offices of devotion evidently thought very highly of it, when they accorded to it, or rather retained it in, the position in which we find it. In our Lectionary at the present moment there are no less than forty-four apocryphal first lessons, forty for ordinary, and four for holy days ; but as it left the hands of our reformers there were a still larger number. For in the Prayer-Book of 1549 there were 108 apocryphal daily lessons, which number was increased in the Prayer-Book of 1552 by two proper lessons, and again in 1558 by 25 further proper lessons. This reading of the Apocrypha in place of the Old Testament, advisedly continued in our Church on the model of the earliest times, marks it out as treated by them with distinguished honour, and raised above all other religious writings<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> In the revised Lectionary, substituted in 1561 for that in Elizabeth's Prayer-Book of 1558, Wisd. i. replaces Deut. xxiii. as the first lesson at evensong on Whitsunday, and so continued for a hundred years. During this period the use of the Apocrypha in our Lectionary reached its maximum.

The American Church, which had removed all apocryphal lessons from her Lectionary, has recently re-introduced a considerable number of them.

Then there is one entire Canticle at Morning Prayer, the beautiful Benedicite, taken from the Song of the Three Holy Children<sup>1</sup>; and there are the two offertory sentences from Tobit in the Communion Service. These are all acknowledged extracts from the Apocrypha, given as such in the Prayer-Book: a considerable proportion, especially when we remember that the whole Apocrypha in bulk is less than three-quarters of the New Testament, the former standing to the latter in the ratio of 176 : 240.

But beside these obvious places in which the Prayer-Book avails itself of the devotional treasures of the Apocrypha, there are many others which are not so universally and necessarily known.

The phrase in the Litany, "Spare Thy people, and be not angry with us for ever," is adapted from II. Esdras viii. 45; while the earlier part of the same prayer, "Remember not, Lord, our offences, nor the offences of our forefathers; neither take Thou venge-

<sup>1</sup> Even so temperate a writer as the Rev. F. Procter betrays a lurking prejudice against the devotional use of the Apocrypha, when he says that "Although the Benedicite may be thought suitable to the first lessons of some particular days, or as a substitute...during Lent, yet the general and safe practice is always to use the Te Deum, at least on Sundays." (*History of Common Prayer*, 10th ed., p. 226.) In his *Elementary Introduction* (ed. 1894), written jointly with Dr G. F. Maclear, the Benedicite is spoken of without any sign of disparagement. The word 'safe' may however only refer to strict liturgical propriety.

ance of our sins," is borrowed word for word from the Vulgate of Tobit iii. 3, part of the prayer of Tobias : thus the whole of that suffrage of our Litany, with the exception of one clause, is traceable to apocryphal sources. The greater part, too, of this suffrage from the Litany is used again at the commencement of the Visitation of the Sick, so that it was evidently deemed a worthy one.

Nor is this the only service of the Prayer-Book which is indebted to the Book of Tobit. In the exhortation which opens the Solemnization of Matrimony the phrase "to satisfy men's carnal lusts and appetites, like brute beasts that have no understanding" is based upon the Vulgate of Tobit vi. 17, being part of the advice which the angel Raphael gives to Tobias concerning his marriage to Sarah ; the question, too, about giving away the woman, and the rubrics which direct the pair to take one another's right hands, take their origin from Tobit vii. 15 (13) ; and the phrase in the first blessing, "fill you with all spiritual benediction and grace," is derived from the same quarter. In the Prayer-Book of 1549 there was an explicit mention of "Raphael, Thobie, and Sara the daughter of Raguel," in the prayer after the Versicles. The present mention of Abraham and Sarah was substituted in 1552.

Moreover, the Apocrypha supplies some of the excellent expressions which are embodied in our Collects. For example, the familiar words, "who hatest nothing that Thou hast made" are taken from Wisd. xi. 24. (Cf. Eccclus. xv. 11, Heb.) These words have been great favourites with the Collect-writers,

especially for Lenten use, for they occur in the invocations of three distinct Collects for that season, viz. those for Ash-Wednesday, the third for Good Friday, and the last in the Commination. The two former were new compositions of the reformers in 1549: thus they were not merely continuing apocryphal phrases which they considered harmless, but they were deliberately introducing them where they had not occurred before. The same is the case with the ancient Collect for the Seventh Sunday after Trinity, the invocation of which Cranmer altered, when he translated it, from "God of hosts" to "Lord of all power and might," a clause which he culled from the closing words of Judith's prayer before starting for Holofernes' camp (ix. 14)<sup>1</sup>. The phrase "Who knowest our necessities," in the 5th Collect<sup>2</sup> at the end of the Communion Service, appears to have been suggested by the words of Esther's prayer, xiv. 16, "Tu scis necessitatem meam," in the Vulgate. An expression in the Collect after a Victory at Sea, "in whose hand is power and might," appears to come from the same source; and there are probably many others which have escaped observation from our being, to our own loss, insufficiently conversant with the terms of the Apocrypha<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> The reference to Wisd. xii. 16 supposed by Canon Bright (S.P.C.K. *Student's P.B.* art. 'Collects') to exist in the XIth Sun. after Trin. Collect seems very doubtful.

<sup>2</sup> Composed in 1549.

<sup>3</sup> E.g. the phrases in the long Commination Address "too late to cry for mercy when it is the time of justice. O terrible voice of most just judgment," may well have been suggested by II. Esd. vii. 34, 35, where for 'misery' in the A.V. (v. 33) the best Latin

In the old service for King Charles the Martyr, four verses from Wisd. v. were incorporated in the canticles to be sung instead of the Venite. It may have been to these, but it was more probably to the reappearance of the apocryphal lessons, that Sir Walter Scott, in *Peveril of the Peak*, makes Sir Geoffrey refer immediately after the Restoration, when he takes, in the course of conversation, a simile from Judith, and thereupon expresses "his joy at hearing the holy Apocrypha once more read in churches" (chap vi. p. 79, centenary edition).

The expression "crown her with immortality in the life to come," in the 1st collect of the Accession Service, is probably based upon the beautiful words of Wisd. iv. 2, "ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι στεφανηφορούσα πομπεύει."

### Homilies.

When we turn from the Prayer-Book to those other authorized works of the Church, the Homilies, we find the Apocrypha most extensively employed. In the Index to Dr Corrie's edition no less than seventy-five apocryphal texts are referred to as quoted in the Homilies. High honour is certainly paid to the Apocrypha in those Reformation sermons, almost beyond what at first sight the terms of the Sixth Article would seem to warrant.

In the homily against Swearing, for example, a quotation from Ecclesiasticus is introduced by the text would give 'mercy' (misericordiæ). So R.V. (v. 33) substitutes 'compassion' for 'misery.'

words "Almighty God by the wise man saith" (p. 68)<sup>1</sup>. In the homily against Excess of Apparel, Judith and the apocryphal portions of Esther are cited as "Scripture" (p. 291). Likewise, in the homily against Idolatry, the canonical and uncanonical books are indiscriminately classed together under the common title of "the Scriptures"; the doctrine of the "foolishness of images," it is said, is "expressed at large in the Scriptures; viz. the Psalms, the Book of Wisdom, the Prophet Isaiah, Ezekiel and Baruch" (p. 166). Still more strongly, in the homily of Alms-deeds, do the words sound which preface a verse from Tobit, "The Holy Ghost doth also teach in ... Scripture, saying"; and in the next sentence a text is given from Ecclesiasticus, which is introduced as "confirming the same." But perhaps the strongest statement of all is that in the tenth homily, wherein we are exhorted to learn from the Book of Wisdom, as being the "infallible and undeceivable word of God."

I am aware that an attempt has been made to draw a distinction between the teaching of the first and second books of the Homilies; but with regard to the use of the Apocrypha no such distinction is maintainable, for some of the passages I have named are from the second book; and in the last homily of all, that against Rebellion<sup>2</sup>, we still find ourselves referred

<sup>1</sup> This and the following references are to the Prayer-Book and Homily Society's edition, 1852. All apocryphal texts are unfortunately omitted from the index to this edition.

<sup>2</sup> This is curiously styled in the Canons of 1571 (ed. Collins, 1899, p. 64) "the holy Homelies," the plural being used, presumably, on account of its six parts.

to Wisdom as Holy Scripture, and are still exhorted to hear Baruch as a prophet (pp. 516, 523).

Now the Thirty-fifth Article informs us that the books of the Homilies "contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times," while the Sixth Article states that the "Church doth not apply the Apocrypha to establish any doctrine"; and to both of these the Clergy give their solemn assent, which seems to land them in a somewhat awkward dilemma. I think the way out of it will be found by interpreting the words "any doctrine" in Article VI. as meaning any doctrine contrary to that of the canonical books, in connection with which the apocryphal ones are there being spoken of. Unless we take the words of the Article in this sense, it seems impossible to reconcile it with the doctrinal use of the Apocrypha in the Homilies by the same authorities as those who put forth the Articles; for, remarkably enough, the preface to the first book of the Homilies is dated 1562, the very year in which the passage concerning the Apocrypha was added to the Article. (Bp H. Browne, p. 122.) But the authorities do not seem to have been conscious of any grave discrepancy. Presumably, therefore, they understood the words "any doctrine" of Article VI. in the sense I have suggested<sup>1</sup>.

This view of the limitation set in Article VI. is also supported by the following passage in the *Reformatio Legum*: "Libri sacri, non tamen canonici .....quibus tamen non tantum autoritas tribuitur,

<sup>1</sup> Compare what is said on Abp Secker's doctrinal use of the Apocrypha, p. 86.

ut fidei nostræ dogmata ex ipsis solis et separatim citra alios indubitatæ Scripturæ locos constitui constabilirique, vel possint vel debeant<sup>1</sup>. Bp Short says<sup>2</sup> that this part of the *Reformatio Legum* may be deemed an authorized expression of the meaning of our Articles.

<sup>1</sup> Quoted by Hardwick, *Hist. of Articles*, ed. 1859, p. 374.

<sup>2</sup> *Hist. of Church*, ed. 8, 1869, par. 482 &c.

## CHAPTER VIII.

### Divines.

LEAVING the authorized pronouncements of the Church, and coming to the pages of her divines since the Reformation, we do not find the Apocrypha unused by them.

Richard Hooker defends the public reading of them on principle, though not very heartily, as his private judgment would have dispensed with lessons in Church from them. He (*Ec. Pol.* v. 20) writes, however, of these books: "So little doth such their supposed faultiness in moderate men's judgment inforce the removal of them out of the house of God, that still they are judged to retain worthily those very titles of commendation, than which there cannot greater be given to writings, the authors whereof are men." With questionable taste, he applies *Wisd.* iv. 13, "that which the wise man hath said concerning Enoch," to Edward VI. (*E. P.* iv. 14.)

Archdeacon Philpot († 1555), one of the Marian martyrs, in a letter from prison to his sister, employs two texts from *Ecclesiasticus* (ii. 1, xiii. 1) as sources of comfort and exhortation. In like manner three verses 14, 15, 16 of Chap. vi. of the same book are

employed in a letter of consolation to him by his friend John Careless<sup>1</sup>.

Archbishop Grindal († 1583), in his sermon on the death of the Emperor Ferdinand, dissuades from prayers for him, and anticipates an objection based on II. Macc. xii. 44—45 by urging the authority of St Jerome that these books are insufficient of themselves to establish doctrine. But, somewhat inconsistently perhaps, in the same sermon he places St Luke xii. 48 (our Lord's words) and Wisd. vi. 7, side by side as if of equal weight. He also uses the Apocrypha in the service he put forth for the plague in 1563, appointing a first lesson from II. Esd. ix.<sup>2</sup>, a book hardly ever used in the services of the Church, and in an Admonition of the same year he quotes Eccles. iii. 26 in support of his directions<sup>3</sup>.

Archbishop Whitgift († 1604) makes some remarkably strong statements in support of the Apocrypha, in replying to objections. "The Scripture here called Apocrypha, abusively and improperlie, are Holy Wrytings, voyd of error, Parte of the Bible, and soe accounted of in the purest tyme of the Church and by the best Writers ; ever redd in the Church of Christ, and shall never be forbidden by me, or by my consent." (Strype's *Life of Whitgift*, Lond. 1718, p. 80.)

<sup>1</sup> J. Philpot's Writings, Park. Soc., 1842, pp. 231, 239. In the Reprints of this Society, some of the apocryphal texts quoted by the writers are omitted, accidentally or designedly, from the indices.

<sup>2</sup> It is possible that Neh. ix. may be intended; for Neh. and II. Esd. are regarded as synonymous in the "Homily of the Justice of God," set forth at the same time.

<sup>3</sup> Grindal's remains, Park. Soc. 1843, pp. 18, 23, 106, 271.

“Archbishop Whitgift said he did indeed give command for the Apocrypha to be bound up with the Bible, and meant it to be observed; asking who ever separated the Apocrypha from the rest of the Bible, from the beginning of Christianity to that day? Or what Church in the world, reformed or other, did it at that present? And shall we, added he, suffer this singularity in the Church of England to the advantage of the adversary, offence of the godly, and contrary of all the world besides?...therefore such giddy heads as thought to deface the Apocrypha were to be bridled. And that it was a foul shame and not to be suffered that such speeches should be uttered against those books as by some had been.” (*Ib.* Bk III. ch. xxii. p. 590, ed. 1822.)

This estimate of the Apocrypha seems high enough for the Council of Trent, and coming from one in Whitgift's position and with Whitgift's views seems very singular. Is it permissible to suppose that he was irritated by unreasonable objectors into expressing himself a little too strongly?

Bishop Jewell<sup>1</sup> of Salisbury († 1571), who has, somewhat unfairly perhaps, been accused of puritanic inclinations, made more use of the Apocrypha than might have been expected. He takes I. Esd. iv. 41 “Magna est veritas et prævalet” as the motto for the title pages of his *Defence of the Apology*, and of his *Reply unto M. Harding's Answer*, and also quotes it in *To the Reader*, “and Nehemiah saith, Great is verity and prevaileth.” In Part II. p. 197 he writes

<sup>1</sup> Ed. 1611.

“Touching the book of Maccabees, we say nothing but that we find written by St Jerome, St Augustine, and other holy Fathers.” Also in the same *Reply* (Art. XXVII. “of Ignorance”) he quotes Wisd. xiv. 22, not quite accurately, from the Vulgate, as applicable to the ignorance of Papists. This same text he again quotes in his sermon on Ps. lxix. 9. This time in English, with “the wise man saith.” This same formula of quotation he uses in his *Treatise of the Sacraments* to introduce two texts coupled together, Eccles. i. 14 and Eccles. xl. 1, thus seeming to attribute both books to the same author. In his Commentary on I. Thess. i. 12 he explicitly attributes Eccles. xxx. 9 to Solomon, ending his quotation with the words “saith Solomon<sup>1</sup>.” In his sermon on Lk x. 23, 24, he cites “Baruch the Prophet,” iv. “blessed art thou, Israel, how happy &c.,” probably from memory of v. 4.

Dean Nowell († 1602) was strongly opposed to anything savouring of Popery, yet he admits references to Apocryphal texts in support of his doctrines; as, for instance, in his *Middle Catechism* (1570) where on the 3rd Commandment, Eccles. xxiii. 9 (twice), xxxix. 33, and Wisd. i. 1 and xiv. 30 are referred to, also in Part V., Baruch iv. 1 is joined with some references to the Psalms. (Latin ed. 1852.)

Henry Bull, in his collection of *Christian Prayers*

<sup>1</sup> The idea of attributing Ecclesiasticus to Solomon is even now not quite dead; for in *Homely Words to Young Servants* by M. Conchman, S.P.C.K. 1899, p. 33, chap. xix. v. 30 is prefaced by “Solomon tells us in the Book of Ecclesiasticus.”

and *Holy Meditations* (1566), gives many references to the Apocrypha. Pp. 126, 152, 163<sup>1</sup>.

Dr John Boys († 1625), Dean of Canterbury, often culls from the Apocrypha in his *Exposition of the Festival Epistles and Gospels*, 1615, a work full of force and point, having the ample matter of the Puritan writers, without the tedious lengthiness and laboured style which many of them affected.

Dr Donne († 1631), Dean of St Paul's, occasionally quotes apocryphal texts in his sermons<sup>2</sup>. In Serm. XIX. for instance he cites Ecclus. xxxviii. 1 as having authority, "as we are bid to honour a physician." In Serm. XXII. he defends at some length the use of the apocryphal books as sacred, though at a proper distance below the canonical. He also says "In many Churches of the Reformation their preachers never forbear to preach upon texts taken out of the apocryphal books." None of his own published sermons, however, are on apocryphal texts.

In his *Βιαθάνατος*, written when a young man, first published in 1644, he discusses several apocryphal passages; e.g. Ecclus. xx. 16; Tob. xiii. 2; Wisd. i. 12, apparently without observing that they are apocryphal, even expressly reckoning the last as a "place cited from the books of the O.T." (p. 168). Eleazar and Razis too in II. Macc. have their semi-suicidal acts included under the titles "Examples in Scripture."

Even Elnathan Parr († 1632?), the puritanically inclined Minister of Palgrave, Suffolk, embodies Wisd. i. 4 in what he calls a "Use" in his *Grounds of*

<sup>1</sup> Parker Society's ed. 1842.

<sup>2</sup> Ed. 1640.

*Divinity* (ed. 1632, p. 20). And in his exposition of Romans ix. 27 (ed. 1633) he cites in the marg. II. Esd. viii. 2 (3); on xiii. 3 he brings in Wisd. ii. ult. ("through envy of the Devil" &c., p. 41); and on xiii. 8 he has a reference of St Ambrose *de Tobia*, c. 21. These references to the Apocrypha, without censure, in an author of E. Parr's views, are very unusual.

Bishop Andrewes († 1626), though preaching from no apocryphal texts, makes use of the Apocrypha from time to time in his sermons. As Bishop Jewell uses it rather more, so I think Bishop Andrewes uses it rather less, than we might have expected.

In his *Concio* of Aug. 5th, 1606 he quotes Eccclus. xlvii. 2. In both Sermons X. and XV. of the Nativity, he quotes Wisd. i. 12; in Sermon I. of the Holy Ghost, Judith vii. 30; in Sermon IV. of Fasting, Eccclus. xiii. 1; in Sermon V. he speaks of "Tobie's fast"; and in several other sermons apocryphal phrases are introduced, but usually without any explicit quotation formula. He gives some account too of his view of the Apocrypha in his curious Sermon on Acts ii. 42 *Of the Worshipping of Imaginations*, preached at St Giles', Cripplegate. He condemns the disuse of the Apocrypha as subservience to an unfounded imagination, as follows: "Nor none of Apocrypha cited. Another imagination: for St Jude in his Epistle hath not feared to allege out of the book of Enoch, which book hath ever been reckoned apocryphal. And by his example all the ancient writers are full of allegations from them, ever to these writings yielding the next place after the Canon of the Scriptures; and preferring them before all foreign

writers whatsoever<sup>1</sup>." In his famous devotions, Bishop Andrewes incorporates much of the Prayer of Manasses in the Confession for use on Saturday, and Wisd. v. 14 seems to be referred to in that for Wednesday.

Dr Joseph Mede<sup>2</sup> († 1638) in an appendix to his *Clavis Apocalyptica* has some two pages on Tobit xiv. under the title of *Prophetiæ Tobie moribundi* (pp. 719, 720).

He occasionally, but not very frequently, cites apocryphal texts in his *Discourses*.

Thos. Jackson († 1640), Dean of Peterborough, countenances these books. "Nor doth our Church so disclaim all which the Romans above these two-and-twenty admit, as if it were a point of faith to hold there were no more; it only admits no more into the same rank and order with the former, because we have no such warrant of faith, or sure experiments to do so." (*Works*, ed. 1844, vol. I., p. 312.)

He points out, too, how the fulfilment of one of Zechariah's prophecies (ix. 6) is recorded for us in the first book of Maccabees, and deploras the omission of these apocryphal books from some editions of the Bible.

Of the Second of Maccabees he speaks in singularly high terms: "Unto matters related by the author, if not for his own esteem yet for St Paul's, or whoever were the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, we owe such an historical belief as may ground matters of sacred or canonical use or applica-

<sup>1</sup> Ed. 1635.

<sup>2</sup> Ed. Lond. 1664.

tion, because that sacred author hath given him credit or countenance in his relations of the persecutions of God's people, living before his own time, which are not registered by any ancient author now extant besides." (VIII. p. 14, VI. p. 122.)

Archbishop Ussher<sup>1</sup> († 1656) makes much use of the two books of Maccabees in his *Annales veteris Testamenti*. In his *Answer to the Challenge of a Jesuit* he curiously joins together in one sentence references to II. Kings ii. and II. Macc. ii. 58. "The Scripture assureth us that Elias went up into heaven," and of this Mattathias put his sons in mind upon his deathbed: "Elias being zealous and fervent for the law was taken up into heaven." (Vol. III. p. 280.)

Bishop Hall († 1656)<sup>2</sup>, while objecting to the Roman canonization of the Apocrypha in his *Serious Dissuasive from Popery*, not unfrequently quotes it in his writings. Thus in his *Balm of Gilead*, chap. xv. Pars 1, 13, he quotes Wisd. ii. 24, iii. 1, 3, with the formula "the Wise Man saith"; and in chap. xviii. he quotes Ecclus. xxxviii. 9 with "Take the counsel of the Wise Man." In his *Cases of Conscience*, Decade III., he says of Ecclesiasticus, "This man how obscure soever his authority."

Bishop Patrick († 1707) made large use of the Apocrypha in his Sermons, and in the exquisite meditations of his *Christian Sacrifice*. In his *Answer to the Touchstone to the Reformed Gospel* he speaks,

<sup>1</sup> Ed. Dublin, 1847.

<sup>2</sup> Ed. Oxf. 1838, in which unhappily all apocryphal texts are omitted from the index.

however, of II. Macc. and Baruch as “of no consequence, unless proved by places of canonical writ<sup>1</sup>.”

That very popular anonymous work, *The Whole Duty of Man*, published just before the Restoration, contains several quotations from Ecclesiasticus, each time attributing the words to “the Wise Man.” The book ends with the verse Ecclus. v. 7 as a final counsel. This appreciation of the Son of Sirach’s Wisdom does not extend to the other apocryphal writers, none of whom appear to be cited.

Archbishop Bramhall († 1663), in his *Castigations of Mr Hobbes’ Animadversions*, quotes Wisd. i. 13 in conjunction with Is. xxviii. 21 as “the Scriptures,” but adds “if this place seem to him apocryphal, he may have twenty that are canonical.” He also couples together I. Sam. xxiii. 11 and Wisd. iv. 11 as if on a par with each other<sup>2</sup>. Wisd. xvii. 12 seems to have commended itself very strongly to him, for he quotes it no less than four times.

Archdeacon Mark Frank<sup>3</sup> († 1664) in his vigorous and lively sermons has frequent citations from the Apocrypha. In *Serm. XXI.*, referring to Ecclus. xlix., he speaks of the catalogue made by the Son of Sirach, and “long since added near to the very book of God’s own remembrance.” Though none of Frank’s published sermons are on apocryphal texts, he shews how readily these books lend themselves to homiletic reference and illustration.

Bishop Jeremy Taylor<sup>4</sup> († 1667) makes fairly fre-

<sup>1</sup> Ed. Oxf. 1858, vii. 281.

<sup>2</sup> Ed. Oxf. 1844, vol. iv. pp. 354, 478.

<sup>3</sup> Ed. Oxf. 1849.

<sup>4</sup> Ed. Lond. 1839.

quent quotations from the Apocrypha, but there is nothing specially remarkable in his manner of introducing its words. In his *Holy Dying*, Par. III. 2, he fully accepts two statements which have been often objected to by the Apocrypha's opponents. " 'Alms deliver from death,' said old Tobias, and 'alms make an atonement for sins,' said the Son of Sirach ; and so said Daniel, and so say all the wise men in the world." (Tob. iv. 10, xii. 9 ; Ecclus. iii. 30 ; Dan. iv. 27.) This last statement of Taylor's seems rather too comprehensive.

Dr H. Hammond († 1669), in his commentary on St Matt. xxvii. 5, refers to Tobit as "the Bible," and in his note to Heb. ix. 7 calls the apocryphal authors "the Greek writers of the Old Testament."

Herbert Thorndike<sup>1</sup> († 1672) uses the Apocrypha as freely as anyone. He "mightily commends the wisdom and judgment of the ancient Church in proposing the books which we call Apocrypha for the instruction of the catechumeni or learners of Christianity." (Vol. iv., p. 635.)

Bishop Cosin<sup>2</sup> († 1672) was not a great user of the Apocrypha, but in his second sermon, "as Ecclesiasticus speaks," brings in xlv. 7 of that book.

In his *Scholastical History of the Canon of Scripture* (vol. III., p. 62) he writes with regard to Athanasius' quotation from the Apocrypha: "Some of them are taken from such writings as be none of his, but confessed to be supposititious ; and other

<sup>1</sup> Ed. Oxf. 1852.

<sup>2</sup> Ed. Oxf. 1849.

some are express passages of the Holy Scriptures themselves, which need not these foreign books to authorize them : the rest are only such general terms of speech that they may be applied to other ecclesiastical writings as well as these and make nothing against us."

These explanations, however, do not seem to dispose satisfactorily of Athanasius' apocryphal quotations for distinctly dogmatic purposes, such e.g. as those in his *Ep. I.* to Serapion, or as that from Wisd. xiv. 12—21 in his *Oratio contra gentes*, introduced as ἡ γραφή λέγουσα ; or of his inclusion of Tobit, Judith, Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus in his *Synopsis sacræ Scripturæ*. But this last is placed by Migne amongst Athanasius' 'dubious' works ; and Canon Bright (art. "Athanasius," in Smith's *Dict. of Christian Biography*) considers it as certainly belonging to the 'spurious' class. If so, it probably reflects the views of the sixth century.

Izaak Walton († 1683), who, if not a 'divine' himself, was much devoted to those who were, in his *Letter to two Shopkeepers at Coventry*, in 1679, mentions Wisd. ii. 11 apparently as being the words of "Solomon in book of Wisdom."

Sir Henry Spelman († 1641) comes into the same category. In his *Fate of Sacrilege*<sup>1</sup>, first published in 1689, he draws several instances from the first and second books of Maccabees ; he joins together quotations from Ecclus. vii. and Numbers viii., as if of equal authority (p. 10), and writes of "canonical and apo-

<sup>1</sup> Warren's ed., Lond. 1895.

cryphal books" as composing the "Old Testament" (p. 21). Yet in another place (p. 15) he seems to draw a wider distinction between them, designating "the Old Testament" and "books Apocryphal" separately.

Bishop Pearson (†1686) uses apocryphal texts occasionally in his *Exposition of the Creed*, styling some of them "Holy writ" (Art. I.). He also quotes *Ecclus.* several times in his *Patriarchal Funeral*, a sermon on Gen. i. 10, as "that wise man," or "the Son of Sirach."

Dr Isaac Barrow<sup>1</sup> (†1677) is probably not exceeded by any post-Reformation divine in frequency of apocryphal quotation. This is especially the case in his *Sermons and Treatise on the Creed*: but in his *Treatise on the Pope's Supremacy* and his "Poemata," as he modestly calls his verses, hardly any are to be found. Most frequently he brings in his quotations directly, whether from canonical or uncanonical books, without introducing them by any formula other than 'for' or 'as.' Some curious exceptions occur, however, as in Vol. I. p. 21 of *Wisd.* vii. 28 and iii. 15, he says, "These are the words of wise Solomon in the book of Wisdom." On p. 199 he speaks of *Ecclesiasticus* as the "wise Hebrew Philosopher, Ben Sirach." On p. 652, *Ps.* ix. 9 and *Ecclus.* ii. 10 are joined in one quotation as if on an equal footing. In Vol. III., pp. 157 and 558, he lets fall a different opinion as to the authorship of *Wisdom*, attributing it to the "imitator" of Solomon in *Proverbs*. On p. 373 *Wisd.* is quoted together with canonical authors as the "sacred

<sup>1</sup> Ed. Oxf. 1830.

writers." Both *Wisd.* and *Ecclus.* are referred to from time to time as "the Wise Man," "the Hebrew wise man"; and in *Vol. IV.*, p. 70, he goes so far as to use the expression "as the Wise Man divinely saith," *Wisd. vi. 16.* In *Vol. v.*, p. 93, he names "Jesus the son of Sirach, that excellent writer"; and in *Vol. VIII.*, p. 131, in a Latin *Concio ad Clerum*, he refers to *Judith iv. 9* as being "in sacra pagina."

Archbishop Tillotson (†1694), as might perhaps have been expected, avoids the Apocrypha. He mentions (*Sermon VI. on Heb. x. 23*) and condemns the Roman use of it, but gives no hint of its proper position. "To the Canonical books of the Old Testament, which were received by the Jewish Church (to whom were committed the oracles of God), I say, to these they have added several apocryphal books; not warranted by divine inspiration, because they were written after prophecy and divine inspiration was ceased in the Jewish Church, Malachi being the last of their prophets according to the general tradition of that Church." (*Ed. 1735, Vol. II., p. 40.*)

William Sherlock, Dean of St Paul's (†1707), in his *Discourse of Religious Assemblies* (Melville's ed., 1840, p. 106), refers to *I. Macc. iv. 59* as our Saviour's ground for observing the feast of the Dedication.

Bishop Beveridge's (†1708) view of the Apocrypha has been already given at the end of Part I. His opinion, however, did not prevent him from quoting *Ecclus. xxx. 12* with approval in his *Private Thoughts on Christian Education*, p. 198. (*Lond. 1821.*)

Bishop Bull<sup>1</sup> (†1710) quotes *Wisd. xviii. 15, 16*

<sup>1</sup> *Ed. 1846.*

and Ecclus. xxiv. 3, with great respect, in his *Defensio Fidei Nicænæ* (I. 1, 18, III. 9, 11). In his *State of Man before the Fall* he thus strongly expresses himself: "The almost divine author of the book of Wisdom, which was always entertained in the Christian Church with a reverence next to that which was paid to the divinely-inspired writings."

Bishop Ken (†1711) characterizes Ecclus. xxviii. 1 sqq. as "excellent advice to both the sick and the physician," and makes use of it in his *Prayers for the use of all persons who come to Bath for cure*. (S. P. C. K. 1898, p. 5.)

Robt. South (†1716) quotes phrases from Wisdom, St Luke, and Revelation in one sentence in his sermon on "The Royal Commonwealth Man," p. 24 (ed. 1688), also in his sermon<sup>1</sup> on Ps. lxxxvii. 2 he takes instances of sacrilege from I. Macc. (Antiochus and Nicanor.)

Joseph Addison (†1719) in the *Spectator*, No. 68, on "Friendship," says, "A very ancient author, whose book would be regarded by our modern wits as one of the most shining tracts of morality that is extant, if it appeared under the names of Confucius, or of any celebrated Grecian philosopher." He then makes many extracts from Ecclesiasticus with high commendations. In No. 170 also he quotes Ecclus. ix. 1, and in No. 531 he says, "The advice of the Son of Sirach is very just and sublime." In *Spectator* No. 615 (author undetermined) passages from Wisd. xvii. are quoted with praise.

The Non-juror, John Johnson (†1725), in his

<sup>1</sup> Ed. Oxford, 1823, vol. I., pp. 182—3.

*Unbloody Sacrifice* (1718) makes frequent use of the Apocrypha, referring to I. and II. Esdras, Judith, the Rest of Esther, as well as to the more commonly quoted books.

Another Non-juror, Jer. Collier (†1726), temperately writes: "The Church allows the reading of the Apocrypha and binding it up with the rest of the Canon. But to argue from hence that all the historical passages are unquestionable, the customs warrantable, and the doctrine without exception, would be a wrong consequence." (VI. p. 500.)

Dean Prideaux (†1724), in his *Connexion*<sup>1</sup>, praises highly I. Maccabees as "a very accurate and excellent history, and [that which] comes nearest to the style and manner of the sacred historical writings." But II. Esdras he strongly condemns as "a book too absurd for the Romanists themselves to receive into their Canon." He gauges the apocryphal books therefore on what he conceives to be their individual merits.

Dean Atterbury (†1731) quotes Ecclus. xlvii. 22 in a Sermon before the Sons of the Clergy (London, 1709).

Samuel Parker (†1733), in his *Bibliotheca Biblica*<sup>2</sup>—a commentary on the Pentateuch, highly commended by Dean Burgon in his *Treatise on the Pastoral Office* (1864)—refers to apocryphal texts with great frequency.

Dr Waterland (†1740) often refers to apocryphal passages in his notes, and once or twice in his text: e.g. to Bar. iii. 35 in his *Second Defence of some Queries* (vol. II., p. 493).

<sup>1</sup> Ed. 1799, II. p. 192, I. p. 34.

<sup>2</sup> Oxf. 1720—1735.

Dean Swift<sup>1</sup>, of St Patrick's (†1745), in his *Tale of a Tub*, speaks of "a codicil annexed, written by a dog-keeper"; on which Hawkesworth notes, "I believe this refers to that part of the Apocrypha where mention is made of Tobit and his dog."

Richard Hele<sup>2</sup> (†1756), in his *Select Offices of Private Devotion*, which commanded a continuous sale for more than a century, and are still in print, draws texts from the Apocrypha, e.g. from Wisdom in "Monday afternoon" and "Friday afternoon." And these texts he is careful to inform us are "*wholly taken from Scripture.*" (The italics are Hele's.)

Bishop Sherlock<sup>3</sup> (†1761) makes but sparing use of the Apocrypha. In his Discourse VI. on II. Tim. i. 10 he quotes Wisd. i. 13—16, "The Wise Man tells us." In Discourse III., part I. he curiously joins parts of Is. liii. 4 and Wisd. iii. 2 into one sentence, applying the whole to our Lord, "He was esteemed stricken, and his departure was taken for misery."

Archbishop Secker (†1768), in his *Lectures on the Catechism*<sup>4</sup>, makes a free use of the Apocrypha. He quotes Wisd. i. 4, 5, iii. 1; Ecclus. xxv. 12; II. Macc. vii. 10 among many others. Indeed he uses the Apocrypha in support of various doctrines to such an extent as to make it clear that he understood the reservation of Art. VI. to apply only to other doctrines than those of the canonical books.

Alexander Cruden (†1770) added to his well-known Concordance "an Alphabet," as he styles it, "for those books that are called Apocryphal." Cruden

<sup>1</sup> Works, by John Hawkesworth, Lond. 1766, vol. I. p. 44.

<sup>2</sup> S.P.C.K. 1856.

<sup>3</sup> Ed. 1772.

<sup>4</sup> Ed. 1777.

was an Aberdeen Presbyterian, who, during his long residence in England, did not conform to the Church, but found a more congenial home among the Independents. It is natural, therefore, that he should guard himself against any suspicion of rating these books too highly by expressly stating that his Concordance to them was added that his "work might not be deficient in anything treated of in any other Concordance<sup>1</sup>; those books not being of divine Inspiration, nor any part of the Canon of Scripture, and therefore are of no authority in the Church of God." (Pref. of 1737.) Probably he found that his work would be less acceptable to Churchmen, who would be its principal purchasers, if it were confined to the canonical books.

In some recent editions (e.g. Eadie's), the apocryphal section is omitted; but it is embodied, with revision, in the S. P. C. K. Concordance, which both on this account, and as containing a concordance to the Prayer Book Psalter, is probably the best for general use.

The Rev. C. Crutwell, in his *Concordance of Parallels* (Lond. 1790), an extensive collection of Scripture references, includes references to (but none from) the apocryphal books.

In the last century the saintly Bishop Wilson, of Sodor and Man, includes the Apocrypha in his *Notes on Scripture*<sup>2</sup>. Two of these are worth quoting. One of them is on Tobit xi. 4, a verse in which the dog is

<sup>1</sup> Samuel Newman's Concordance, Lond. 1650, contained the apocryphal books at the end.

<sup>2</sup> Bishop Wilson's Works, Oxf. 1859.

mentioned—a treasure to those who wish to ridicule the Apocrypha. He writes, “The dog, very probably, when he came near home, ran before them; by his coming Anna knew that her son was not far off, and so went out to see if she could meet her son. And this is the reason why the dog is mentioned in the story, and laughed at by ignorant and foolish people only<sup>1</sup>.” The other note, on the History of Susannah, is as follows: “To the glory of God be it here recorded that on Thursday, Nov. 22, 1722, Mr S., a little before evening prayers, came to my house and acquainted me with.....a malicious story raised by a great man .....and propagated by another as wicked, reflecting very much upon my character, and, if true, rendering me very unfit for the ministry (which consideration most afflicted me); but going immediately to the chapel, this very history was appointed to be read .....in which Susannah (*vv.* 42, 43) appeals to God (as to my great comfort I can do) that these men bore false witness against me. And I set this down here because the like has often happened to me in the course of my ministry; that such things have occurred in the daily service, as served either for comfort or direction, to my great surprise, and to the confirmation of my faith in God.....Mr S. was much surprised, and could hardly believe that this was the lesson for the day.....What do we lose when we neglect the daily service!”

Bishop Wilson also quotes *Wisd.* vi. 6 in his IVth

<sup>1</sup> The introduction of the dog has further been condemned on the ground that it was an unclean animal. So it was. But there is no indication that Tobit or his family wished to eat it.

sermon<sup>1</sup>, introducing its words as those of "Almighty God, who has declared," a remarkably strong form of quotation for a text out of that book. His sermon on Ps. xxix. 2 is chiefly an exposition of the Benedicite.

Later in the last century, Bishop Halifax in his preface to the *Analogy* of Bishop Butler, begins by quoting Eccus. xlii. 24, "All things are double, one against another, and God hath made nothing imperfect"; and states, "On this single observation of the Son of Sirach the whole fabric of our Prelate's defence of religion, in his *Analogy*, is raised." A reference to the Prayer of Manasses is made by Bishop Butler himself, in the second part of his *Analogy* (v. 5, note). In his *Sermons*<sup>2</sup> he quotes Ecclesiasticus frequently. Serm. V., for instance, concludes with Eccus. xxxii. 23, as "the proper advice to be given"; and in Serm. VI. he quotes the very text which Bp Halifax considers to be the foundation of the *Analogy*.

A little later, Archdeacon Paley took Eccus. v. 5, 6 as the text of a sermon, in which he remarks, "I know not so much good advice drawn up in so little compass anywhere as in this chapter, nor of that advice any so important as the text." This sermon, together with many others which he wrote, is not found in most of the editions of his works professing apparently to be complete, but it is contained in the separate volume of his *Sermons*, edited by his son, the Vicar of Easingwold, in 1825.

<sup>1</sup> Oxf. 1847.

<sup>2</sup> Bp Steere's ed., Lond. 1862.

It is worthy of note how the two great evidential writers of the last century used the Apocrypha.

Bishop Jolly (†1838), whose charming *Observations on the Sunday Services*<sup>1</sup>, though not published till 1828, were probably composed in the last century, speaks of "the elegant author of the book of Wisdom" in his introduction (p. 59), and quotes Ecclus. on pp. 141, 299.

In the present century we find Bp B. Porteus (†1809) quoting [I.] Macc. ix. 27 with other texts as from "the sacred writers." (*Lect. on St Matt.* Lond. 1824, p. 318.)

In a *Companion to the Altar*, often bound up with Prayer Books in the early part of this century, Ecclus. vii. 16 is quoted with "Let us, as the wise man adviseth," etc.

Thos. Robinson (†1813), Fellow of Trin. Coll., Camb., and Vicar of St Mary's, Leicester, now and then quotes, or gives references to, apocryphal texts in his popular *Scripture Characters*<sup>2</sup>. Thus he employs Ecclus. ii. 1 and I. Macc. iv. 59 in vol. III. pp. 73, 490, and in vol. II. pp. 255 he applies Wisd. v. 21 to such deaths at Ahab's.

Canon H. Melville, in one of his Lothbury lectures<sup>3</sup>, mentions the practice of preaching from apocryphal texts. He says, "In the printed volumes of many of our eminent divines you will find sermons on texts from the Apocrypha, so that we should not be without precedent if we addressed you on passages from these uncanonical books." A little further on, after pointing

<sup>1</sup> Ed. Edinb. 1848.

<sup>2</sup> 8th ed., Lond. 1811.

<sup>3</sup> v. pp. 76, 82 sq.

out how the uncanonical books do not stand on the same level as the canonical, he says : " We would now rather engage you with some evidence of the excellence of the apocryphal books, for there is perhaps more danger of your underrating than overrating these books ; and as the Church bids us now read them in her week-day services, it may be well that we shew you, in one or two instances, how profitable they may be to the scriptural student." Once more, in a later passage, he speaks of the pastoral use of the Apocrypha : " There is no want in the canonical Scriptures of blessed and consolatory passages, which the clergyman may adduce when he takes his pastoral round.....yet he might sometimes take words from the Apocrypha, and find that they too would come home to the sorrowing heart" ; a remark the truth of which those who have used with the sick the apocryphal readings in Bp Walsham How's *Pastor in Parochiâ* must often have proved.

In a Latin responsive Grace, used at Balliol College, Oxford, Wisd. iii. 1 is incorporated. The Latin is not that of the Vulgate, and the Grace was discontinued when Dr Jowett became Master in 1870. (*Life of B. Jowett*, vol. II., pp. 4, 5, 22.) It is probable that other old Graces may similarly borrow from the Apocrypha.

At Cambridge Ecclus. xlv. forms a proper lesson at the Commemoration of Benefactors<sup>1</sup>.

Within yet more recent years the late Bishop of Lincoln, Dr Wordsworth, preached at Cambridge two University sermons on "The Maccabees and the Church," which have been published in a separate

<sup>1</sup> V. F. Procter, *Common Prayer*, ed. 1872, pp. 74, 75.

volume. The same divine, in a note to his Introduction to the book of Daniel, says: "It is much to be wished that certain chapters from I. and II. Macc. were publicly read in our churches in lieu of some other chapters from the Apocrypha. They would be very seasonable and instructive for the present times. The ancient Christian Church recognised their use, and preached many homilies upon them on the ancient festival of the Maccabees, August 1st"; and then he gives references to sermons of Saints Gregory Nazianzen, Chrysostom, Augustine and Leo.

John Cook in his *Preacher's Assistant* (Oxf. 1783) gives references to nineteen sermons on apocryphal texts, including one on Wisd. iii. 4 by Richard Venn, Rector of St Antholin's, London, 1740.

Dr J. M. Neale († 1866) in his *Sermons for Feast Days* and *For the Church Year* has many on texts from the Apocrypha; also one in *Sermons preached in a Religious House*.

Still more recently I find the outline of a sermon for All Saints' Day, with the text, Wisd. iii. 4—8, in the *Clergyman's Magazine*, November 1877, a publication which was produced under what, I believe, were considered to be strictly Evangelical auspices.

Dr Pusey wrote one of his *Parochial and Cathedral Sermons* (1883), "The Peril of Little Sins," on Ecclus. xix. 1.

And a few years ago, Dr Bradley, the present Dean of Westminster, took the text for his annual address to children on Innocents' Day, in the Abbey, from the book of Baruch.

Bishop Lightfoot preached a sermon on Ecclus.

xliv. 1, 13, 14 in Durham Cathedral on St Peter's Day, 1882<sup>1</sup>.

Wisd. iii. 1 is quoted by B. Jowett as a word of comfort to a friend in the sorrow of bereavement<sup>2</sup>.

'Judas Maccabeus' was set in 1877 as the subject for the Seatonian Prize Poem at Cambridge.

The use of the Apocrypha by English divines, which dwindled considerably at the close of the 18th century and commencement of the 19th, seems now to be somewhat recovering itself. Probably the Evangelical movement had something to do with the decreasing use and the contemptuous estimate of the Apocrypha. The Oxford movement gradually had a contrary effect, though not very conspicuously at first<sup>3</sup>. The growth too of what are known as neological views has had some influence in renewing interest in the Apocrypha. But this is chiefly due, not so much to an increased reverence for the Apocrypha, as to a diminished reverence for the Canon, which would bring it down nearly to the apocryphal level, and thus almost remove the religious distinction between them. The recovery of a lost section of II.(IV.) Esdras, and of part of the Hebrew original of Ecclesiasticus, has given a fresh interest to the study of those books; but at present it does not appear to have extended much beyond the linguistic side of the subject.

<sup>1</sup> *Leaders in Northern Church*, p. 103.

<sup>2</sup> *Life*, ed. 1897, i. 222.

<sup>3</sup> I. Williams, however, makes much use of the Apocrypha in his *Devotional Commentary on the Gospel Narrative* and in his *Sermons on the Catechism*.

Ecclus. li. 10 is a noteworthy verse. As it stands in the Greek and in A.V. it is apparently Messianic in its terms: “Ἐπικαλεσάμην Κύριον πατέρα κυρίου μου.” As these words commence the 1st lesson on the morning of Nov. 17th, it is difficult for Christian souls to find in them no thought of Him, who equally with his Father is their “Lord.” Yet in Schechter and Taylor’s edition of further fragments of the Hebrew of Ecclus. all Messianic reference has disappeared from the verse. יהוה אביו אלהים are the words of the Cairo Genizah Manuscript. The LXX. have apparently read אלהים אביו as Dr Taylor suggests in his footnote. The reminiscence of the language of Ps. cx. 1 which Professor Ryle discerned in this verse (Smith’s *Dict. Bib. Art. Apocr.* 188 a) also disappears. The MS., however, is evidently a very inferior one, so that the last word may not have been said upon this verse<sup>1</sup>.

xxix. 15 (20) is another text in this book very applicable to our Saviour (cf. Hebrews vii. 22). Bp Wordsworth, of St Andrews, notes on this verse (S.P.C.K. *Commentary*), “life, i.e. means of livelihood.” But surely this is the meaning of βίος, not of ψυχή.

I. Macc. vi. 44 is also a text singularly applicable to Christ; yet it too can hardly be really “Messianic.” ii. 57, however, seems to recognize the hope, through David, of an eternal kingdom. Cf. iv. 46, xiv. 41.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. R. Arnald’s and Bp Charles Wordsworth’s interesting notes on the Greek and A.V. of this passage.

## CHAPTER IX.

### Popular Use.

BUT besides the various formal references to, and quotations and usages of, the Apocrypha which I have mentioned, there are a great number of phrases and sayings in it which are the source, generally unsuspected, of many familiar words. Some well-known hymns are based upon it. For example, the first line of Charles Wesley's "Jesu, Lover of my soul," is a reminiscence of Wisd. xi. 26. The first verse of hymn 177 (*A. and M.*), "Jesu, the very thought is sweet," appears, as Dr Edersheim<sup>1</sup> points out, to be an adaptation of Eccus. xxiv. 20. The hymn itself is a translation of Bernard of Clairvaux's "Jesu, dulcis memoria."

Almost the whole of that hymn of the Saxon pastor Martin Rinkhard, of Eilenburg, "Nun danket alle Gott," which is so constantly sung in Germany, and is hardly less popular in the English translation, "Now thank we all our God," is derived from Ecclesiasticus; in fact it is merely a metrical rendering of l. 22—24.

H. Travers, Rector of Nunburnholme, in Yorkshire, wrote a poetical paraphrase of part of II. Esdras vi. in his *Poems and Translations* (York, 1740).

<sup>1</sup> *Speaker's Commentary*, in loc.

Among the poets, Chaucer<sup>1</sup> (†1400) makes, as might be expected, considerable use of the Apocrypha. In *The Marchante's Tale* he writes, "And Jesus, filius Sirach, as I gesse" (l. 10124).

In *The Monke's Tale* we have one section headed "Holofernes" and another "Antiochus." In the former occur these lines :

"Judith, a woman, as he lay upright  
Sleeping, his hed of smote, and fro his tente  
Ful prively she stale from every wight,  
And with his hed unto here town she wente."  
(l. 14489 sq.)

and in the latter :

"For swiche another was there non as he ;  
Redeth what that he was in Machabe."  
(l. 14496 sq.)

In the prose tale of *Melibæus* "Jesus Sirak" is quoted more than once (pp. 137, 144); and the example of Judith is ranged with that of Rebecke, Abigail and Hester (p. 148).

Shakespeare, in the *Merchant of Venice*, when he penned those constantly quoted lines (IV. 1)

"The quality of mercy is not strained ;  
It droppeth as the gentle rain from heaven  
Upon the place beneath" \* \* \*

had been forestalled in his similitude by the Son of Sirach some 1700 years before: "Mercy is seasonable in the time of affliction, as clouds of rain in the time of drought" (xxxv. 20). In the same play the exclamations of Shylock and Gratiano, "a Daniel come to judgment," "a second Daniel" (IV. 1),

<sup>1</sup> Ed. Edinb. 1782.

are hardly intelligible to those acquainted with the canonical book only which bears Daniel's name. These sayings are really allusions to his judicial acumen displayed in unmasking the elders who brought a false charge against Susannah, as recorded in *vv.* 45—64 of her history. *Much Ado about Nothing* (III. 3) contains a mention of "god Bel's priests" as the subject of a church window. *Love's Labour's Lost* (v. 2) also makes mention of Judas Maccabæus; and has a schoolmaster named Holofernes as one of its characters<sup>1</sup>.

Milton (*Parad. Lost*, Bk iv. 168) speaks of "Asmodeus with the fishy fume" in connection with "the spouse of Tobit's son"; and in Bk v. 220 he introduces:—

"Raphael, the sociable spirit, that deigned  
To travel with Tobias and secured  
His marriage with the seven-times-wedded maid."

He also refers to the Apocrypha in *Paradise Regained*, Bk III.,

"So did not Maccabeus."

Abraham Cowley<sup>2</sup> († 1667) in his poem on the "Plagues of Egypt" says that the Darkness came

"From the deep baleful caves of hell below,"  
(Vol. II. p. 182),

in evident allusion to *Wisd.* xvii. 14.

Also

"Ten thousand terrors thro' the darkness fled,  
And ghosts complained, and spirits murmurèd,"

is based on *vv.* 4 and 15 of the same chapter.

<sup>1</sup> A daughter of Shakespeare's was named Judith.

<sup>2</sup> Ed. Lond. 1802.

In his *Essay on Agriculture* he quotes *Ecclus.* vii. 15 (Vol. III. p. 148).

That Dryden and Pope should shew intimacy with the Apocrypha is not surprising. Accordingly, we find the following lines in Dryden's *Prologue to the Pilgrim* (ed. Edinb. 1784, Vol. III. p. 121),

“Had he prepared us and been dull by rule,  
Tobit had first been turned to ridicule;  
But our bold Britain, without fear or awe,  
O'erleaps at once the whole Apocrypha.”

(ll. 30—33.)

Pope in his *January and May* writes:—

“Heroic Judith, as old Hebrews shew,  
Preserved the Jews, and slew th' Assyrian foe.”

And most recently, Tennyson in *Queen Mary* (IV. 3) clearly refers to *v.* 27 of the Song of the Three Children:—

“Remember how God made the fierce fire seem  
To those three children like a pleasant dew.”

The saying of Latimer at the stake has been attributed to 2 *Esd.* xvi. 15, “The fire is kindled and shall not be put out”; but *xiv.* 25 seems much more closely to resemble it, “I shall light a candle of understanding in thine heart which shall not be put out.”

The middle of *Judith* viii. 35 (in Luther's version viii. 28) is used as a tombstone text in Switzerland<sup>1</sup>, very appropriately (*Gehe hin im Frieden: der Herr sei mit ihr*). Pettigrew, *Chronicles of the Tombs*, ed. 1857, gives an epitaph on a Lady D'Oyley in which she is compared to various women of Scripture, in-

<sup>1</sup> v. Churchyard of Aeschi, Canton Berne.

cluding Susanna. Unfortunately he merely gives the locality as "in Oxfordshire" (p. 195). In the *Manual of Sepulchral Memorials* by Rev. E. Trollope<sup>1</sup>, afterwards Bp Suffragan of Nottingham, among texts suggested for epitaphs are many from the Apocryphal books.

Then there is the curious story of John Bunyan, who writes in his *Grace Abounding*, "For several days I was greatly perplexed, and was ready to sink with faintness in my mind, but one day, when I had been so many weeks oppressed, and was giving up all hopes of ever attaining life, that sentence fell with weight upon my spirit, 'Look at the generations of old, and see; did ever any trust in the Lord and was confounded?' I looked in my Bible and found it not. For above a year I searched in vain, but at last, casting my eye into the apocryphal books, I found it in Ecclus. ii. 10. This at first did somewhat daunt me, but it troubled me less when I considered that, though it was not in those texts which we call holy and canonical, yet forasmuch as this sentence was the sum and substance of many of the promises, it was my duty to take the comfort of it, and I bless God for that word, for it was of God to me. That word doth still at times shine before my face." A doubt must, one would think, have crossed Bunyan's mind whether that Church, from which he was a deserter, was not more in the right in commanding the Apocrypha to be read and used, than his own sect in despising it.

<sup>1</sup> London and Sleaford, 1858. None of these apocryphal texts appear however in the Churchyard of Leasingham, of which the compiler was then, and long after (till 1893), Rector.

This same text, Ecclus. ii. 10, is also quoted by Mrs M. M. Sherwood (*née* Butt) in her once popular *Infant's Progress* (Lond. 1847), as well as Wisd. ii. 6—9 and 1—4, and iv. 10, 14 (applied as “words of a wise man”), pp. 161, 179, 183, 195. Also in her *Fairchild Family* (Lond. 1819) Ecclus. ii. 10 is quoted (p. 191) as “a very pretty verse”; and on p. 252 Margery Gray calls Ecclus. iii. 12—15 “a verse from the Bible which I worked on my sampler at school.”

Some of our common proverbs come from the Apocrypha. “Birds of a feather flock together” probably has its origin in Ecclus. xxvii. 9. “You can't touch pitch without being defiled” is from ch. xiii. 1 of the same book. The phrase “a hope full of immortality,” which one frequently sees employed without apparently any idea that it is a quotation, is really taken from Wisd. iii. 4; while the saying, “Magna est veritas et prævalebit” (correctly “prævalet”)<sup>1</sup>, is from the mouth of Zerubbabel in 1 Esd. iv. 35, 41, where, in the interesting discussion before Darius, the respective powers of wine, of a king, of women, and of truth are maintained; and the palm, by universal acclamation, is given to the last. Doubtless there are other instances besides these in which the intrinsic value and wisdom of the Apocrypha has forced men to use it, when they little think they are doing so.

A strange example of this occurred in the *York-*

<sup>1</sup> May not an instinctive feeling that the truth does not always prevail at the present, have caused this change to the future tense? No MS. authority, either Greek or Latin, has been produced.

*shire Post* newspaper of November 24th, 1896. In reporting a speech of Mr J. E. Wanklyn, M.P. for Bradford, it was stated that "the Hon. Member quoted *Mr John Bright's* words 'Do not let us forget to praise the great men, our fathers who begat us.'" The sentiment thus absurdly regarded as Mr Bright's own is, of course, from *Ecclus.* xliv. 1.

Another curious error of this kind occurs in a note to the *Spectator*, No. 28, in Alex. Chalmers' *British Essayists*, Vol. 6, p. 130, Lond. 1802. Addison, writing on Inn Signs, says: "Our apocryphal heathen god is also represented by this figure [a bell]; which in conjunction with the dragon makes a very handsome picture in several of our streets." To the words "heathen god" Chalmers puts the ridiculous footnote "St George"! The idol Bel is of course what Addison intended.

Composers of anthems in search of suitable themes have drawn largely from the words of the Apocrypha. It is hardly possible to examine any of the numerous collections (almost every cathedral has its own) without finding several anthems on apocryphal extracts.

The Oratorio *Judas Maccabeus* by Handel is well known.

The Apocrypha has afforded several subjects which have proved very attractive to painters. Subjects from the Book of Tobit have been painted by Rembrandt, E. Le Sueur, Caravaggio, Perugino, Domenichino, Ferrari; from Judith by Domenichino, Cranach, Mantegna, Michael Angelo, Guido; from Susannah by Rembrandt, Santerre, Valentin, Van Dyck, A. Coypel. No less than three subjects

from Tobit are represented in the stained glass of King's College Chapel, Cambridge<sup>1</sup>.

In the British Museum, 2nd North Gallery, Room V., there is a fragment of a glass vessel of the 3rd or 4th century with a gilt representation of Daniel feeding the Dragon (Garucci, Pl. III. 13); also a fragment of the 4th century found at Cologne, containing Susannah (?) among other subjects. See Art. "Glass" in *Dict. Christian Antiq.*, I. pp. 732<sup>a</sup>, 3<sup>a</sup>, for an early instance of Tobit (Tobias?) and the fish.

Robert Nelson in his *Fasts and Festivals* (ed. 1732) has a copper-plate engraving illustrating 2 (4) Esd. ii. 45, by Vander Gucht.

The story of Judith and Holofernes seems to have long interested the populace. According to Hone (*Every-day Book*, Lond. 1826, Vol. I. pp. 1223, 1227) "Judith and Holofernes" were represented at a show in St Bartholomew's Fair in 1721. A wood-cut of Setchel's engraving of the scene is given.

As a last quotation I will give an extract from the critical introduction of Dr Scrivener to the Authorised Version, an extract which will serve to remind us that after all the highest interest of the Apocrypha is not an antiquarian but a religious interest, and that the value which the Church sets upon it is distinctly a

<sup>1</sup> Sculptors appear to have regarded these books with less favour. There is, however, a carving of the 'Victory of Truth' in Rosslyn chapel, portraying the scene, and quoting some of the words of 1 Esd. iv. There is also an ancient Christian sarcophagus at Rome with sculpture shewing knowledge of Bel and the Dragon. See Burgon's *Letters from Rome*, Lond. 1862, p. 247 and frontispiece.

practical and a Christian value. "The editor earnestly trusts that no apology is necessary for the labour bestowed in this volume on the English text and marginal references of the Apocrypha. So long as that very miscellaneous collection of books shall comprise a part of the Holy Bible in its largest form, or lessons shall be selected from it for the course of divine service, it deserves far more regard than has been paid to it in recent times.... But the frequent and exact study of a large portion of the apocryphal writings may be vindicated on higher grounds by such as most loyally accept the rule that 'the Church doth read them for example of life and instruction of manners ; but yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine.' Few more conspicuous instances can be alleged of the tendency of man's nature to rush into extremes than the strong reaction to their prejudice which has set in since the Reformation, by way of protest against the error that had placed the greater part of them on a level in point of authority with the canonical books of the Old Testament<sup>1</sup>....Yet Ecclesiasticus and 1 Maccabees,

<sup>1</sup> It is remarkable how little has been done to promote that didactic use of the Apocrypha, encouraged by the VIth Article. How little is there in the few apocryphal commentaries we possess in the way of moral and religious lessons! How much less use has been made of it than one might have expected, 'for example of life and instruction of manners'! Some treatises confine themselves to explaining why it is *not* Scripture (e.g. T. Boulbee, Articles, 1873) but say nothing as to why it is read: all is negative, telling against it; nothing positive, in its favour; thus fostering the idea that it is a perilous counterfeit rather than a valuable religious aid.

written in the second century before the Christian era, are among the noblest of uninspired compositions; if indeed their authors, so full of faith and holy fear, can be regarded as wholly uninspired.

“The Second of Maccabees, though inferior...to the First abounds in passages fraught with encouragement to those who in every age shall be called to suffer for the truth’s sake; not to add that it powerfully illustrates the eleventh chapter and other parts of Daniel’s prophecies. The Wisdom of Solomon approximates in tone to the spirit of Christ more than any book without the Canon; the Epistle of St James is full of allusions to it and to the first chapters of Ecclesiasticus. Judith, too, is a fine work; grave, elevated, pious, chaste in thought and expression, exquisitely finished. Were it not buried where it is, it would long since have attracted the admiration it deserves; but it is not history and does not claim to be such. It is a fable constructed with a moral purpose, and must have stirred up the heart of many a Jewish patriot in that heroic struggle for liberty and religion whose details fill the books of Maccabees. Baruch, though of course a pseudonym, contains some excellent poetry: the Prayer of Manasses, and the Song of the Three Children, need no praise” (Camb. 1873, p. lxvi).

---

Three small books, intended for the young, may here be mentioned<sup>1</sup>.

1. *Abridgement of the Apocrypha*, by Caroline Maxwell, Lond. 1828. The book contains three lithographs, (1) Judith and Holofernes, (2) Tobias, Raphael and the dog, (3) King Astyages and Daniel with the idol Bel. The authoress entertained a high opinion of the educational value of the Apocrypha, for she states in her Introduction that it "contains the principles of true religion, of the strictest morality, and best rules for conduct through life." She further says that "every incident must tend to stamp deeply on the minds of youth...the fairest impressions of our duty to our God, our neighbour and ourselves," and expresses a conviction "that all these lessons may be drawn from the chapters of the (almost neglected) Apocrypha" (p. vi.).

2. *School Lessons from Ecclesiasticus*, by E. J. Edwards, Perpet. Curate of Trentham, 1853. This consists entirely of brief selections.

3. *Pearls Re-strung: stories from the Apocrypha*, by Mrs Mackarness. Lond. 1880.

<sup>1</sup> These little works are of no importance in the study of the Apocryphal books; but they are interesting as being almost the only attempts made in this country to employ their teaching in religious education. *Benedicite or the Song of the Three Children* by G. C. Child Chaplin, M.D., is a book of reflections for adults on the Prayer-Book canticle of that name. 10th ed. Lond. 1879.

## CHAPTER X.

### Conclusion.

THE instances and quotations which I have adduced have been chosen with a view to illustrate the *use* of the Apocrypha, in accordance with the subject of this essay. No doubt, in certain writers, an equal number of instances might be discovered of its systematic depreciation<sup>1</sup>. But in most cases the accusations brought against the Apocrypha (when they are not mere captious fault-finding) arise from judging it by too high a standard—a standard so unattainably high that the canonical books themselves in many cases will hardly reach it. Indeed, many of the shortcomings alleged against the Apocrypha might with

<sup>1</sup> E.g. John Rainolds (+ 1607), *De libris apocryphis*.

John Trapp (+ 1698), who occasionally refers to the Apocrypha in his quaint commentary, but generally with something of a sneer. On Obad. ii., however, he refers to 1 Esd. iv. 45 as historical, and on Nahum i. 14 to Tobit i. 21 in the same way.

J. Cumming (*Apocalyptic Sketches*, ed. 1853, p. 3). "On the Apocrypha I am silent, or speak only to condemn it."

Prof. Rawlinson, "No weight can be properly attached to the historical statements in Tobit. The book is in the fullest sense of the word, *apocryphal*" (Smith's *Dict. Bib.* ed. 1, art. 'Enemessar').

equal facility be brought against the books of the Canon, as in fact by unbelievers they often are.

If St Matt. xxiii. 33 ("the blood of Zacharias, son of Barachias") and xxvii. 9 ("that which was spoken by Jeremy the prophet") had been found in one of our apocryphal books, would they not have been quickly seized upon as proofs of its unhistoric and uninspired character? I think so. "Too great a wish to discover distinctions between the teaching of apocryphal and canonical books of Scripture has been father to the thought" is a very true observation of the Rev. J. M. Fuller in his Introduction to Tobit<sup>1</sup>.

Professor J. K. Cheyne<sup>2</sup> goes somewhat further. Referring to certain sayings in the Apocrypha the moral tone of which has been questioned, he says, "I admit the imperfections of these moral statements; but can they not, several of them, be paralleled from the Psalms, Proverbs and Ecclesiastes?"

Hooker, *E. P.*, v. 20, justly observes, "An eager desire to rake together whatsoever might prejudice or any way hinder the credit of the Apocryphal books, hath caused the Collector's Pen to run as it were on wheels, that the mind which should guide it, had no leisure to think, &c." And again, "If in that which we use to read there happen by the way any clause, sentence or speech, that soundeth towards error, should the mixture of a little dross constrain the Church to deprive herself of so much Gold, rather than learn how by art and judgment to make separation of the one from the other?"

<sup>1</sup> *Speaker's Comm.*, p. 157.

<sup>2</sup> *Job and Solomon*, 1887, p. 187.

For instance, the History of Susannah has been represented as having an immoral or indecent tendency: but surely an accusation of this kind might be, and has been, brought against several passages of the Old Testament, which it is not necessary to specify.

The mention of Tobias' dog<sup>1</sup> has ever been a favourite opening for ridicule with those who desire to depreciate these books. One of the German commentators says that Balaam's ass has ever afforded an opportunity for the infidel to take his most cheerful ride upon it: in like manner, we may say that the scoffers at the Apocrypha have ever barked out their merriest sallies in company with Tobias' dog. We have already seen<sup>2</sup> how Bishop Wilson treated this trifling cavil. And with regard to Tobias' fish (*ἰχθύς*, ייִשׁ), is it much more marvellous than Jonah's (*גָּד, כְּהָתוֹס*)?

Then, much objection is raised to the act of Judith in slaying Holofernes. It is pretended that a licence is given to treachery and murder. But what then are we to say to the act of Jael in slaying Sisera? If the Book of Judith is to be accused of sanctioning treachery and murder, the same may be said, and indeed has been, of the Book of Judges. Yet the Church has never felt called upon to expunge that book from the Canon, or to admit the accusation as true. Of the two acts, Judith's and Jael's, taking all

<sup>1</sup> It is curious to note how the popular name 'Toby' for a dog has been transferred, apparently for want of a better, from the master to his canine companion.

<sup>2</sup> p. 88.

the circumstances into account, Judith's may, I think, be the most readily defended<sup>1</sup>.

An objection has been felt against Wisd. i. 14 as contrary to the doctrine of original sin : but surely it is no more so than Jer. i. 5 or St Luke i. 15, passages regarded as quite unobjectionable.

Another objection, one of fact and not of feeling, has been brought against the books of Maccabees. An account of the death of Antiochus Epiphanes is given in the second book (ix.) which entirely differs from that in the first (vi.). Hence it is argued that the historian must be untrustworthy, and that it is no credit to the Church to allow such books to be bound up with her Bible. But here, again, it is attempted to apply a stricter standard to the apocryphal than the canonical books ; for a similar phenomenon appears in the Second Books of Kings and of Chronicles, where (ix. 28, xxii. 9) two different accounts are given of the death of Ahaziah, king of Judah. Yet we have never deemed it needful to repudiate either of those books.

Lastly, to revert for a moment to Tobit, the archangel Raphael has been accused of duplicity and dishonourable conduct ; and, of course, the author and users of the book for pious purposes, of condoning his double-dealing. And all this because he appears to Tobias as a young man, and accompanies him as such on his journey to Ecbatane and back

<sup>1</sup> If Judith decked herself out with a view to excite Holofernes' passions (in x. 4 *ἀπάτησις* is better supported than *ἀπάτησις*), she stands no doubt, in that respect, on a lower level than Jael. Yet viii. 8 and xiii. 16 seem inconsistent with an impure character.

(v. 4, 5), and does not make his angelic nature known until they were well returned to Nineve (xii. 15)<sup>1</sup>. But surely those who speak in this way of Raphael's action have forgotten the walk to Emmaus, and how Christ (with all reverence be it said) concealed His identity from the two disciples, when "their eyes were holden that they should not know him" (Luke xxiv. 16). In extenuation too of Raphael's conduct it may be noted that the title he assumed is not without significance as an indication of his real position. "Azarias, the son of Ananias," means the Lord's help springing from the Lord's mercy<sup>2</sup>.

The fact is that in some quarters the Apocrypha has not met with fair treatment, or anything approaching to it. Like the canonical books it has its serious difficulties, and, from the lower position which it holds, we might, I think, have expected a larger crop of them than it actually yields. But the more it is used with devoutness and candour, in the spirit which our Church points out and in her formularies exemplifies, the more, I think, shall we be disposed (even if we do not go so far as Whitgift) to agree with those words of Miles Coverdale, Bishop of Exeter, which I have already cited, "that patience and study will show that the Apocrypha and the Canon are agreed."

<sup>1</sup> Yet in v. 21 he is called "the good angel" by Tobit: see also *rv.* 4 and 6.

<sup>2</sup> The Aramaic has אַנְנָא עֻרְיָה בֶרַךְ אֲנַנְיָא. From the Greek one would have expected the latter name to have been ἐγγήια.

# INDEX I.

## NAMES OF PERSONS.

- Adams, A. C., 10  
Addison, 84, 101  
Ælfric, 57  
Alexander, Bps (2), 44  
Alford, Dean, 22  
Ambrose, St, 38  
Andrewes, Bp, 76, 77  
Angelo, M., 101  
Anterus, 37  
Antiochus Epiph., 57  
Aratus, 30, 31  
Aristides, 34  
Arnold, 94  
Athanasius, St, 37, 38, 52, 80, 81  
Atterbury, Dean, 85  
Augustine, St, 39, 46, 47, 52, 92
- Baduel, 61  
Ball, C. J., 28  
Barnabas, 5, 7, 34, 40  
Barrow, 82  
Bede, 56, 57  
Bengel, 22, 39  
Bensly, 16  
Bernard, 95  
Beveridge, Bp, 55, 83  
Bissell, 7, 8, 43
- Bloomfield, 31  
Blunt, J. H., 16  
Boulton, 10, 103  
Boys, Dean, 75  
Bradley, Dean, 92  
Bramhall, Abp, 79  
Brenton, Sir C., 11  
Bright, Canon, 66, 81  
Bright, J., 101  
Browne, Bp H., 10, 69  
Bull, Bp, 83  
Bull, H., 74, 75  
Bunyan, 99  
Burgon, Dean, 85, 102  
Butler, Bp, 89  
Butt, 60
- Cajetan, 57  
Callimachus, 30  
Calvin, 58  
Careless, 72  
Caravaggio, 101  
Cecil, R., 10  
Chalmers, A., 101  
Chaucer, 96  
Cheyne, Canon, 107  
Chrysostom, St, 39, 92

- Churton, Canon, 32, 33, 53, 59  
 Cleanthes, 30  
 Clement (Alex.), 7, 35  
 Clement (Rom.), 5, 33, 47  
 Cloquet, 10  
 Collier, 85  
 Collins, 68  
 Cook, J., 92  
 Cooke, A. S., 57  
 Corrie, 67  
 Cosin, Bp, 80  
 Couchman, M., 74  
 Coverdale, Bp, 58, 62, 110  
 Cowley, 97  
 Coppel, 101  
 Cranach, 101  
 Cruden, 86  
 Crutwell, 87  
 Cumming, 106  
 Cyprian, St, 32, 36, 37  
  
 Deane, W. J., 20  
 Dionysius (Rom.), 44  
 Döllinger, 59  
 Domenichino, 101  
 Donne, Dean, 59, 75  
 Dryden, 98  
 Dyck, van, 101  
  
 Eadie, 87  
 Edersheim, 13, 24, 95  
 Edward VI., 71  
 Edwards, 105  
 Ellicott, Bp, 19  
 Epimenides, 30, 31  
 Epiphanius, 51  
 Eusebius, 50, 51  
  
 Felix, Minucius, 36  
 Ferrari, 101  
  
 Frank, Archd., 79  
 Frick, 7  
 Fuller, J. M., 28  
  
 Gibson, E. C. S., 8  
 Gray, Bp, 46  
 Gregory, Naz., St, 38, 92  
 Grindal, Bp, 72  
 Grinfield, 28  
 Gucht, 102  
 Guido, 101  
  
 Halifax, Bp, 89  
 Hall, Bp, 78  
 Hammond, 80  
 Handel, 101  
 Hardouin, 37, 44, 45  
 Hardwick, Archd., 70  
 Harris, J. R., 34  
 Heber, Bp, 48  
 Hefele, Bp, 45, 46, 47, 48  
 Hele, 86  
 Heliodorus, 57  
 Henry VIII., 4  
 Hermas, 5  
 Hervey, Ld A., 7  
 Hey, 61  
 Hilary (Poitiers), 51  
 Hippolytus, 35  
 Holden, 36  
 Hone, 102  
 Hooker, 71, 107  
 How, Bp, 91  
  
 Ignatius, 3, 33  
 Irenæus, 2, 3, 32, 35  
  
 Jackson, Dean, 77  
 Jansen, Bp, 19  
 Jerome, 3, 9, 28, 44, 52

- Jewell, Bp, 73, 76  
 John of Salisbury, 58  
 Johnson, 84  
 Jolly, Bp, 90  
 Josephus, 28  
 Jowett, 91, 93  
  
 Kautzsch, 8, 12, 17, 22, 24, 28,  
 32, 36, 39, 59  
 Keil, 58  
 Ken, Bp, 84  
 Klopstock, 60  
  
 Labbe, 45  
 Lactantius, 37  
 Latimer, 98  
 Lechler, 62  
 Leo, 92  
 Liddon, 17, 21  
 Lightfoot, Bp, 3, 19, 33, 92  
 Litton, 30  
 Lock, W., 32  
 Lorimer, P., 62  
 Luther, 58, 59  
  
 Mackarness, 105  
 Maclear, G. F., 64  
 Mansi, 47  
 Mantegna, 101  
 Marcellus, 37  
 Martensen, 60  
 Maximus (of Alex.), 44  
 Maxwell, 104  
 Mayor, J. B., 24  
 Mede, 77  
 Melito, Bp, 28, 50  
 Melville, Canon, 83, 90  
 Menander, 31  
 Middleton, Bp, 22  
 Milton, 97  
  
 Moulton, R. G., 14  
  
 Neale, 92  
 Nelson, 102  
 Nestle, E., 7, 8, 59, 60  
 Nowell, Dean, 74  
  
 Origen, 3, 35, 36, 51, 53  
  
 Paley, Archd., 89  
 Pamelius, 58  
 Parker, 85  
 Parr, 78  
 Patrick, Bp, 78  
 Pearson, Bp, 82  
 Pecoock, Bp, 58  
 Pellican, 59  
 Perugino, 101  
 Pettigrew, 98  
 Philpot, Archd., 71, 73  
 Pius IV., 48, 49  
 Plumptre, Dean, 19  
 Polycarp, Bp, 34  
 Pope, 98  
 Porteus, Bp, 90  
 Porter, 8  
 Prideaux, Dean, 85  
 Primasius, 57  
 Procter, F., 64  
 Pusey, Canon, 92  
  
 Rainolds, 106  
 Rawlinson, Canon, 27, 106  
 Reeves, 4  
 Rembrandt, 101  
 Rinkhard, 95  
 Robinson, Canon, 34  
     — T., 90  
 Romestin, de, 34  
 Ruffinus, 28, 36

- Ryle, Prof., 39, 51, 58, 94  
 Santerre, 101  
 Schechter, 94  
 Schürer, Prof., 8, 17, 24  
 Scott, Sir W., 67  
 Scrivener, 21, 23, 102  
 Secker, Abp, 69, 86  
 Serapion, Bp, 38  
 Setchel, 102  
 Shakespeare, 96  
 Shaw, 47  
 Sherlock, Bp, 86  
     — Dean, 83  
 Sherwood, 100  
 Socrates, 38  
 Solomon, 7, 9, 35, 37, 46, 74, 82  
 South, 84  
 Spelman, 57, 81  
 Steere, Bp, 89  
 Stephens, 7  
 Streane, Dr, 27  
 Strype, 72  
 Sueur, le, 101  
 Swete, Prof., 15  
 Swift, Dean, 86  
 Taylor, C., 34, 94  
     — Jer., Bp, 47, 79  
 Tennyson, 98  
 Terence, 31  
 Tertullian, 2, 35, 43  
 Thais, 31  
 Theodore, 45  
 Theodotion, 18, 23  
 Thorndike, 80  
 Tillotson, Abp, 83  
 Trapp, 106  
 Travers, 95  
 Trollope, Bp, 99  
 Ussher, Abp, 78  
 Valentin, 101  
 Venn, R., 92  
 Walton, 81  
 Wanklyn, J. E., 100  
 Waterland, 85  
 Wesley, C., 95  
 Westcott, Bp, 27, 45, 57  
 Whitgift, Abp, 72, 73, 110  
 Whittaker, W., 29  
 Williams, 93  
 Wilson, Bp, 87, 88, 108  
 Wordsworth, Bp, Charles, 94  
     — — Chris., 38, 91  
     — — John, 38  
 Wyclif, 58, 62  
 Xenophon, 1

## INDEX II.

### TEXTS REFERRED TO.

#### OLD TESTAMENT.

Genesis		lxxxvii. 2.....	84
xv. 6.....	18	cx. 1.....	94
l. 10.....	82	Proverbs	
Numbers		xvii. 3.....	36
viii. ....	81	xxiv. 12.....	14
Deuteronomy		Isaiah	
xxvii. 15.....	2	xxxv. 3.....	22
II. Kings		liii. 4.....	86
ix. 28.....	109	Jeremiah	
II. Chronicles		i. 5.....	109
xxii. 9.....	109	Daniel	
xxxiii. 12.....	47, 53	ix. 27.....	18
xxxiv. 21.....	26	xi. 31.....	18
Nehemiah		xii. 11.....	18
ii. 6.....	26	Obadiah	
Psalms		v. 2.....	106
xxix. 2.....	89	Nahum	
lxii. 13.....	14	i. 14.....	106
lxiv. 6.....	17		

#### APOCRYPHA.

I. Esdras		iv. 37.....	16
i. 24.....	16	iv. 38—40.....	37
iv. 35, 41.....	100, 102	iv. 45.....	106
iv. 36.....	38	iv. 59.....	36

I. Esdras		Wisdom	
vii. 9, 15 .....	16	i. ....	35
viii. 83 .....	33	i. 4, 5 .....	86
II. Esdras		i. 13—16 .....	86
i. 30, 32 .....	16	i. 14 .....	109
ii. ....	2	ii. ....	37
v. 35 .....	35	ii. 6—9 .....	100
vi. ....	96	ii. 11 .....	81
vii. ....	39	ii. 15, 16 .....	21
vii. 28 .....	38	ii. 18 .....	15
vii. 47 (11) .....	16	iii. 1 .....	86, 91, 93
viii. 23 .....	47	iii. 2 .....	86
viii. 45 .....	64	iii. 4 .....	37, 92, 100
x. 6 .....	38	iii. 4—8 .....	92
xiv. ....	35	iii. 15 .....	82
xiv. 25 .....	98	iv. 10 .....	19, 100
xv. 1 .....	35	v. 1—5 .....	56
xvi. 15 .....	98	v. 4 .....	20
Tobit		v. 18 .....	19
i. 21 .....	106	v. 23 .....	90
iv. 9 .....	19	vi. 6 .....	88
iv. 11 .....	34	vi. 16 .....	83
iv. 16 .....	35	vi. 18 .....	16
v. 4, 5, 6, 21 .....	110	vii. 21 .....	45
vi. 17 .....	62	vii. 26 .....	20
viii. 15 .....	17	vii. 28 .....	82
xii. 7 .....	38	viii. 9 .....	22
xii. 8 .....	15, 33, 35	ix. 15 .....	19
xii. 9 .....	34	ix. 17 .....	16
xii. 15 .....	110	xi. 15 .....	22
Judith		xi. 21 .....	33
iv. 9 .....	83	xi. 26 .....	95
v. 9, 11 .....	24	xii. 10 .....	22
viii. 8 .....	109	xii. 12 .....	33
viii. 25 .....	18	xiii.—xv. ....	19
viii. 35 .....	98	xiii. 1 .....	33
x. 4 .....	109	xiv. 12—21 .....	81
xiii. 8 .....	17	xiv. 21 .....	38
Rest of Esther		xv. 8 .....	14
xiv. 13, 14 .....	20	xvii. ....	84

Wisdom		xxiv. 21 .....	13
xvii. 4, 14, 15 .....	97	xxv. 12 .....	86
xviii. 15, 16 .....	83	xxv. 23 .....	22
xix. 1 .....	92	xxvii. 9 .....	100
Ecclesiasticus		xxviii. 1 sq. ....	84
i. 2 .....	44	xxviii. 2 .....	13, 14
i. 25 .....	19	xxix. 10 .....	24
i. 27 .....	44	xxix. 12 .....	13
ii. 1 .....	90	xxix. 15 .....	94
ii. 5 .....	36	xxx. 12 .....	83
ii. 10 .....	33, 82, 98, 100	xxxi. 16 .....	13
iii. 11 .....	62	xxxii. 1, 2 .....	15
iii. 12—15 .....	100	xxxii. 22 .....	20
iii. 22 .....	44	xxxii. 23, 24 ...	13, 20, 89
iii. 23 .....	20	xxxiv. 14 .....	36
iv. 1 .....	96	xxxv. 20 .....	96
iv. 10 .....	16	xxxvii. 28 .....	18
v. 5, 6 .....	89	xxxviii. 9 .....	38
vi. 29, 30 .....	34	xxxix. 3 .....	2
vi. 37 .....	20	xli. 12 .....	19
vii. ....	81	xlii. 19 .....	2
vii. 15 .....	98	xlii. 24 .....	89
vii. 34 .....	18	xliii. 31 .....	23
ix. 1 .....	84	xliv. ....	91
xi. 18 sq. ....	14	xliv. 1 .....	101
xi. 26 .....	38	xliv. 1, 13, 14 .....	92
xii. 10, 11 .....	24	xlv. 4 .....	19
xiii. 1 .....	100	xlvi. 22 .....	85
xiv. 16 .....	20	xlviii. 11 .....	22
xv. 11, 12 .....	24	xlviii. 25 .....	2
xvi. 13 .....	38	l. 10 .....	20
xviii. 1 .....	62	l. 22—24 .....	95
xviii. 13 .....	23	li. 1 .....	17
xix. 21 .....	14	li. 10 .....	93
xix. 29 .....	37	li. 23 .....	15
xx. 11 .....	15	li. 30 .....	16
xxii. 19 .....	36	Baruch and Ep. Jer.	
xxiv. 3 .....	84	iii. 1 .....	38
xxiv. 20 .....	95	iii. 35 .....	85

Baruch and Ep. Jer.		Prayer of Manasses	
iii. 37 .....	31, 33	The whole .....	47, 59
iv., v. ....	35	v. 8 .....	15
v. 6 .....	16	I. Maccabees	
vi. 1 .....	62	i. 23 .....	19
vi. 4 .....	35	i. 54 .....	18
vi. 12 .....	17	ii. 52.....	18
vi. 56 .....	62	ii. 57.....	94
Song of the Three		iv. 46 .....	94
The whole .....	62	iv. 59 .....	83, 90
v. 27.....	98	vi. 44 .....	94
v. 86 (64).....	20	ix. 27 .....	90
Susannah		xii. 11 .....	20
v. 20, 26 .....	35	xiv. 41 .....	94
v. 42, 43 .....	88	II. Maccabees	
v. 45—64.....	97	v. 19 .....	17, 57, 62
v. 46.....	23	vii. 7 .....	22
v. 56.....	36	vii. 10 .....	86
Bel and Dragon		vii. 28 .....	34
The whole .....	101, 102	ix.....	109
v. 3, 4, 14 .....	35	xii. 32 .....	27
v. 5 .....	38	xiii. 4 .....	27
v. 27.....	20	xv. 9.....	15

## NEW TESTAMENT.

St Matthew		xxiv. 15 .....	18
v. 17.....	15	xxvii. 9 .....	107
vi. 1, 2, 5, 6 .....	16	xxvii. 24 .....	23
vi. 19 .....	13, 17	xxvii. 43 .....	15, 21
vi. 28—30 .....	15	St Mark	
xiii. 38.....	16	iv. 22 .....	2
xvi. 27 .....	13	xiii. 14.....	18
xix. 28 .....	30	St Luke	
xxiii. 33 .....	107	i. 15 .....	109
xxiii. 34, 37.....	16	i. 17 .....	22

St Luke		xi. 21, 24.....	20
i. 42 .....	17	xii. 15 .....	18
i. 68 .....	16	I. Corinthians	
v. 32.....	13	vi. 12 .....	18
vi. 27 .....	35	vii. 19 .....	20
vi. 35 .....	16	x. 9, 10 .....	18
viii. 17.....	2	x. 23.....	18
x. 8 .....	13	xiii. 5 .....	61
xi. 49, 50.....	16	xv. 33 .....	31
xii. 16 .....	14	xvi. 8 .....	27
xii. 20 .....	14	II. Corinthians	
xiii. 23.....	16	v. 4 .....	19
xiv. 7—11 .....	15	Galatians	
xx. 27 sq.....	17	v. 22, 23 .....	19
xxiv. 7—11.....	15	Ephesians	
xxiv. 16 .....	110	vi. 14 .....	19
xxiv. 44 .....	15	Colossians	
St John		ii. 3 .....	19
i. 3 .....	45	ii. 23 .....	2
ii. 4 .....	16	I. Thessalonians	
v. 22, 27 .....	30	i. 3 .....	20
vi. 35 .....	13	vi. 37 .....	20
viii. 44.....	16	II. Thessalonians	
ix. 4 .....	16	iii. 11 .....	20
x. 20.....	20	I. Timothy	
xi. 48 .....	17	iv. 17 .....	19
xiv. 6 .....	37	vi. 5 .....	27
xiv. 15 .....	16	vi. 19 .....	19
xv. 26 .....	16	II. Timothy	
Acts		i. 10 .....	86
vii. 3, 18, 19 .....	24	Titus	
xvii. 23 .....	20	i. 12 .....	30
xvii. 28 .....	30	Hebrews	
xvii. 30 .....	20	i. 3 .....	20
xxvi. 24 .....	20	vii. 22 .....	94
Romans		x. 23.....	83
i. 20 .....	19	xi. 5 .....	19
i. 21, 23 .....	19	xi. 35—37 .....	22
iv. 3 .....	18	xii. 12 .....	22
ix. 20 .....	33	xii. 17 .....	22

Hebrews		I. John	
xii. 23 .....	20	ii. 4 .....	16
St James		iii. 2 .....	23
i. 13 .....	24	Jude	
v. 3 .....	24	v. 9, 14, 15 .....	30
v. 8 .....	29	Revelation	
I. Peter		xvii. 14 .....	27
ii. 25 .....	23	xix. 16 .....	27
II. Peter			
ii. 13 .....	20		







