

The Canon—What Is The Import Of The Distinction Between The Canonical And Deuterocanonical (Antilegomena) Books?

[An Essay Presented at the Pastoral Conference, New Brunswick, New Jersey, November 4, 1970]

By Pastor Gary P. Baumler

In searching for an answer to the question posed in the title of this essay by poring through the volume of inconclusive verbiage on the subject, one soon learns that historical evidences, like statistics, can be made to say what one pleases. From an historical point of view—depending upon one's bias—one is led to believe that the Canon of Scripture either evolved, happened strictly by chance, was the result of a scholarly process, was simply determined by the Church at a point in history, cannot be finally determined, or whatever.

In the search, one gets a compelling urge to settle the matter short by opting in favor of the legendary determination made at the Council of Nice. One Pappus reported that the council members, having “promiscuously put all the books that were referred to the council for determination under the communion table, they besought the Lord that the inspired writings might get upon the table, while the spurious ones remained underneath, and it happened accordingly.”ⁱ

Had God chosen to establish his sacred Canon in such a miraculous manner, it should silence all questions about it for all time. But only friend Pappus seriously advances the possibility. The rest of us have to wade through the sands of time and waves of eternity to learn

WHAT DETERMINES A BOOK'S CANONICITY.

The term Canon—as used here—means the infallible and sufficient authority of God, given to man by God, to determine all matters of faith and salvation. Everything of a spiritual nature is to be measured by this authority (Canon, rule) of God. In a word, the Canon is God's Word. God speaks to man, and what he says is canonical. As long as the words are derived immediately from God, the Scriptures have canonical authority. Or, in the words of our Lutheran Church Father John Baier, “Whatever Scripture is recorded by divine inspiration, that is certainly and infallibly true,”ⁱⁱ i.e., it is canonical.

If it is God-breathed, it is God's Canon. Man in no way makes that determination. Whether or not a man or group of men recognizes a canonical book does not alter its canonicity. God's authority does not become any less authoritative if man fails to accept it. Man is the loser, not God. Even as a gunshot is a gunshot whether or not it hits someone, so a canonical book is a canonical book whether or not it hits someone as such.

Clearly recognizing God's exclusive work in determining the Canon rules out some false concepts. It rules out any kind of an historic free-for-all in which books, not originally intended for that status, became canonical by virtue of their ability to survive. It rules out the idea that the Church or any human agency has the authority to fix the Canon, to make books canonical by fiat. The Canon makes the Church; the Church doesn't make the Canon. It rules out a Canon devoid of authority.

Nevertheless, God's Canon, to be useful and practical for human beings, has had to be *recognized* by human beings. It is this need to recognize God's authority that leads to the questions one may have about the Canon and opens a necessary historical review to see how the process of recognition took place leading to the books in our Bible, no more and no less.

It is impossible in a paper of this scope to develop every detail of the historical process of recognizing God's Canon. We can, however, make certain generalizations based on the history that will be helpful in finally answering the question that has prompted this research. But one cannot be too careful as he attempts to identify—after the fact—the historic process that in its time may have been a lot more or less spontaneous than now appears evident. One must admit that the historical record is relatively scanty, leaving much unsaid. It is a great temptation to let one's imagination run wild in the far reaches of historical silence.

The recognition of God's Canon began with the writing of the inspired books and the reading of them by the first Christians. Both the writers and the recipients of the books seem to have recognized the canonicity of the Scriptures from the beginning. In fact, much of the questioning of today's Canon came at a later date when other forces (heresies, persecutions, mission expansion) forced a re-evaluation and a redefining of the recognized Canon. One should be bold to say, however, that the received biblical Canon "was complete and closed with the appearance of the last book of Revelation about 95 A.D."ⁱⁱⁱ Conservative scholars agree, furthermore, that the testimony of the Apostolic Fathers demonstrates that they accepted and used the books of the New Testament before the middle of the second century (the O.T. already being settled) as they appear in today's Bible.^{iv} Considering the difficulties of transportation and communication in those days, this is a strong argument for the immediate recognition of the Canon.

Although many criteria have been suggested to explain how the subsequent Christians knew they had all God's books and nothing but God's books, the one criterion under which all the others can be grouped (in a demonstrable historic sense) is the test of apostolicity. To some this means that one of the Twelve Apostles or the Apostle Paul actually must have written the book for it to rate canonicity. Historically, however, the term apostolic as a guideline to discovering the Canon seems to have a more inclusive meaning. A majority of scholars conclude that apostolicity cannot be limited to apostolic authorship, but of necessity must allow for apostolic authority, apostolic approval, and apostolic content. The books of Mark, Luke, and Acts in the unquestioned Canon support this contention. As Floyd Filson says, canonical books "had to come from apostles or from those who could give the witness of the Apostolic Age."^v

What one concludes about apostolicity as a criterion for recognizing God's Canon has an important bearing on what one should respond to the question before us. If apostolic authorship (written by Paul or one of the Twelve) *per se* were the guiding factor to recognize a canonical book, we may choose today to throw some books out of the New Testament.

When the historical evidence of the recognition and collection of God's Canon has all been tabulated, one can see that today's Bible in a collected form appeared as God's received Canon by virtually all in the Church by the fifth century. In the West, Athanasius stated dogmatically in A.D. 367 what the church councils were to reconfirm before the turn of that century. Speaking of the twenty-seven books of our New Testament, he said, "In these alone is proclaimed the good news of the teaching of true religion. Let no one add to them nor remove anything from them."^{vi} The East following the lead of the West accepted the modern day Canon before the close of the fifth century. In noting these developments, Professor Frederick Blume of Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary reminds us, "Before the fourth century was out Christians everywhere accepted precisely those books as infallible apostolic word which the church's first leaders of whom we have any knowledge were already accepting when the second century was just getting under way."^{vii}

But before one bogs down in the pages of historical evidences and blindly places his *imprimatur* on the declarations of men on the subject, he should look up and balance the evidence with the divine side of the process of recognizing God's Canon. Most authorities, certainly all conservative authorities, emphasize that without the providence of God and without the inner working of the Holy Spirit through the Word, there could be no recognizable Canon as we have described that term. The power and authority of God must be evident if man is to accept it. God must guide the historic mechanics. Most of all, God the Holy Spirit must enlighten the inner man to know that the words before him are God's words, God's Canon. As surely as no one of us would seek to prove the inspiration of the Scriptures without an appeal to the inner working of the Holy Spirit, so surely no one can answer the questions about the Canon without an appeal to the inner working of the Holy Spirit. We cannot recognize the Canon unless God Himself gives us the ability to identify it. That he does through the Word itself.

God's part in our receiving his Canon is an intangible. It cannot receive the same close scrutiny as the historic process can. As a result it is often ignored or forgotten in favor of the latter, although the process cannot truly exist and be meaningful without God's part in it. Let us emphasize, therefore, that the matter of recognizing God's authority is ultimately in God's hands. Let us remember God's part in the process when we

attempt to answer questions about it, especially where the historical clues are inconclusive. Let us repeat that God convinces us of Canon.

While we are looking up to God for understanding of the subject let us see

WHAT GOD'S SCRIPTURES THEMSELVES TELL US ABOUT THE CANON.

So far we have limited our remarks in this presentation mostly to the New Testament Canon. The primary reason for doing so is that the evidence of the New Testament, in the opinion of the essayist, has settled any question outstanding on the canonicity of the Old Testament. Every book of the Old Testament with the exception of Judges, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Solomon, Esther, Ezra and Nehemiah is quoted in the New Testament. Nowhere in the New Testament are the Apocryphal Books quoted on a level of authority with the Old Testament canonical books. More important, as far as we can determine, our Lord Jesus accepted the Hebrew Canon as we have it today. On that subject, he had no dispute with the tradition-bound Pharisees. He appealed to the Old Testament as God's Word. Almost certainly he used the Canon we have today. He said, "The Scripture cannot be broken." (Jn 10:35) He promised that "all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms [i.e., in the Old Testament Canon] concerning Me." (Lk 24:44) He exhorted, "They have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them." (Lk 16:19) Much more, of course, could be said about the Old Testament Canon, but we can best discuss the question posed here by narrowing the subject to the New Testament.

The basic historic guideline, we noted, for recognizing God's Canon is apostolicity. This is not an arbitrary rule of thumb devised by the early church fathers. It has its basis in Scripture. Jesus arranged it when he called his disciples to him and promised them the special outpouring of the Holy Spirit. "He will guide you into all truth," (Jn 16:13) assured Jesus. The Apostle Paul verified it when he told believers, "[You] are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets...." (Eph 2:20)

Paul could call the apostles the foundation of the Church because Christ Himself was still the "chief corner stone." The real authority is Jesus Christ. Jesus had promised his disciples, "He that heareth you heareth Me." (Lk 10:16) Jesus, incidentally, said that to seventy disciples, which may indicate a larger body to choose from if one insists upon apostolic authorship to prove canonicity. At any rate, it reminds one that the real voice of Scripture is Christ's own, through his appointed disciples. By turning to the Apostles and the apostolic teachings, the first Christians heard the voice of Christ. "And they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine...." (Ac 2:42) In the process one can be confident that they recognized God's authority. Jesus tells us, "My sheep hear My voice...." (Jn 10:27)

Without a doubt the writers of the New Testament Canon presented their books as the authoritative Word of God, and the persons who received them looked upon them as the very words of God, canonical and authoritative. Paul said it the most clearly: "... when ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth the word of God...." (1 Th 2:13) Luke claimed authority as an eyewitness of the life of Christ. (Lk 11:1-4) John declares that his words "are written that ye might believe." (Jn 20:31) In Revelation he passes on a grave warning not to add or take away from the words of the book. (Rev 22:18,19) The words of all the books virtually bristle with the authority of God.^{viii}

It would seem that this evidence implicitly answers the question of the importance of distinguishing between the canonical and deuterocanonical books. On the face of it, there is little basis for such a distinction. But, on the other face of it, the internal evidence just adduced cannot stand alone as a definitive answer. Each book obviously needs the working of the Holy Spirit to prove its claims in the hearts of men. Meanwhile, one cannot evade the fact that in time, beginning in antiquity, men have questioned the authoritative claims of some of the books in our New Testament. These doubts must be met and evaluated where they occur. One needs to take a good look at

HOW THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE BOOKS CAME TO BE.

There can be no doubt of the doubts entertained about some of the books presently in our Canon. But there are serious doubts about the significance of the questions raised. The distinction between books canonical (homologoumena) and deuterocanonical (antilegomena) apparently appeared for the first time in history in a printed document by Origen early in the third century. Again in the fourth century Eusebius, the church historian, uses the terminology and divides the extant books vying for recognition into three categories: accepted books (homologoumena), disputed books (antilegomena), and rejected books (spurious). Others earlier surely cast doubt on some of the books later labeled “doubtful” (antilegomena), but the bulk of earlier evidence is an embarrassing silence that somehow fits into everyone’s interpretation with a bang. For we clearly do not know for sure why so many say so little about some books at first.

The heart and core of the New Testament, happily, has never been seriously questioned as to canonicity from the beginning. Seven books, however, have rated the distinction of being spoken against, antilegomena. The seven are Hebrews, James, 2 Peter, 2 John, 3 John, Jude, and Revelation. Reasons for doubting the canonicity of these books are various, but in a word, men came to doubt their apostolicity. It was easy for the later writers to publicize their doubts boldly because so many before them simply did not mention the books.

But whatever the silence meant, some things should be clear. Just because a writer did not mention a book does not mean he rejected it. Much of the early testimony for canonicity lies in how the books were quoted, and we can hardly expect the shorter general epistles to be quoted very extensively. Furthermore the conditions of travel and communications would slow the process of collecting some of the personal or general epistles. A book like Hebrews, written exclusively to a Jewish Christian Church, might be slow to circulate at first among the Gentile Christians. Furthermore, the men who first made the distinction between homologoumena and antilegomena themselves accepted the antilegomena in the Canon. They just wanted to explain that some others did not.

This exercise of evaluating the books claiming canonicity, which Origen systematized, was a necessary historical development. It ought to make today’s Christian more sure rather than more doubtful about God’s Canon. At least a dozen other books, since rejected and labeled spurious, were making serious bids for recognition in the New Testament. Noteworthy among these were *1 Clement*, *Barnabas*, *Shepherd of Hermas*, *Didache*, and *Apocalypse of Peter*. They did not stand the tests of time and of apostolicity. They did not prove to have apostolic authorship, apostolic content, or apostolic approval. They did not convince most Christians of their divine authority. The Holy Spirit did not work through them to constrain believers to acknowledge their divine inspiration. They are not canonical.

The Church Fathers did not take this exercise lightly when they engaged in it. They were jealous of God’s Word. A noncanonical book had about as much chance of making the Scriptures as any of us would have of making the Detroit Lions football team. The early attitude apparently was, “If in doubt throw it out.”^{ix} As a result, the antilegomena, particularly Revelation in the East and Hebrews in the West, were slow to receive universal acclaim during this period. Having them in our Bible from early antiquity argues eloquently that they belong there. They made good their claims to be included. As a result, from the fifth until the fifteenth centuries there was very little controversy on the Canon. Under God’s guiding hand, it was settled and accepted as we have it today.

It seems strange perhaps that the question of canonicity should ever rise again and the distinction between canonical and deuterocanonical books should be re-evaluated. But when in history the Church as a visible body began to take away the authority of God and substitute man’s authority, the resultant reformation quite naturally re-examined all authority in the Church. Luther and the Lutheran theologians immediately following him wrestled with the problem of which books belong in the Bible. Prerequisite, therefore, to drawing any final conclusions about the import of distinguishing between accepted and disputed books of the Scriptures is an examination of

THE HISTORIC LUTHERAN POSITION ON THE QUESTION.

Lest we as Lutherans should feel too comfortable in our position about the Canon, Luther himself prods us to take yet another hard look to be sure we are using God's Word and nothing but God's Word. He treats the extent of the Canon as an open question. He suggests that each Christian should make his own judgment on the basis of apostolic authority understood in two senses, apostolic authorship and apostolic content. He recognized that only men specially sent and decreed by God were infallible teachers and could give us infallible writings. He stressed even more so that only writings that clearly teach Christ and Christ's Gospel deserve a place in the Canon.

When Luther used this critical rule himself, most of the New Testament Canon remained unchallenged. He considered four books (Hebrews, James, Jude, Revelation) to be antilegomena. One gets the feeling that Luther would have been much happier, however, having these four completely outside of the Canon. He definitely placed them on a lower level from the others. The epistle to the Hebrews he concluded was not the work of an Apostle. He doubted its teaching about the denial of repentance to apostates. James, the "Straw" epistle, he also said was not written by an Apostle. He felt it clashed with the doctrine of justification by faith and had not the spirit of Christ. He considered Jude but an extract or copy of 2 Peter. He held the book of Revelation to be "neither apostolic nor prophetic."^x It had too many visions and too little of Christ.

Luther did not actually omit the antilegomena from the Canon altogether. But in his own Bible he placed the four books last, and, in order to indicate his low view of them, he did not number them as he did the first twenty-three. At the same time, however, he had some praise for every one of the books. He recommended them all as valuable reading. And he left the question open whether anyone else wanted to receive them as canonical or not.

If one will properly understand Luther's conclusions, it is important to keep in mind two things when considering his approach to the Canon. First, he apparently did not have at his disposal much of the external evidence that is available to scholars today. Second, Luther did not hesitate to assert the infallible, inerrant truth of every word and letter of the canonical Scriptures. Nor did he lightly dismiss any from the Canon. He set the standard that became part of the Lutheran Confessions: "We believe, teach, and confess that the sole rule and standard according to which all dogmas together with [all] teachers should be estimated and judged are the prophetic and apostolic Scriptures of the Old and of the New Testament alone..."^{xi} Luther in no sense wished to cast doubts on God's authority. To the contrary, he wanted to make doubly sure that he used only God's authority to establish doctrine.

The questions Luther raised about the Canon have helped to determine the historic Lutheran position since then. Others of the Lutheran theologians also distinguished between the received books and left the question of the Canon open. To this day it is historically Lutheran not to close the question on the canonicity of the antilegomena. Martin Chemnitz (1522-1586), "the incomparable theologian," held serious doubts about the disputed books, treating them seemingly as apocryphal. Reacting against the Roman Church's untenable position as the body that determines the Canon, he reminds us, "... the Church has not the power to make ... of doubtful and uncertain, certain, canonical, and legitimate..."^{xii} John Gerhard (1582-1637) acknowledged "canonical books of the first and second rank." With those of the first rank, the "authors or authority" were never in doubt. With those of the second rank, the "authors" were doubted by some in the church.^{xiii} Franz Pieper in his *Christian Dogmatics* demonstrates that "also the fathers of the Missouri Synod recognized the distinction between the homolegomena and the antilegomena," leaving it to each individual to form his own views with regard to the antilegomena.^{xiv}

It is significant, nevertheless, that this distinction seemed to fade into the background if not disappear altogether through much of Lutheran history. John Baier (1647-1695), exegete *par excellence*, reports that the deuterocanonical books "are not ignored when we are asked for the rule of faith, but they have authority in such case by common consent at the present day among Christians, especially those of our confessional."^{xv} David Hollaz (1646-1713) concludes, "... since at the present time all evangelical teachers assign divine authority to these deuterocanonical books, there seems to be no occasion any longer for that distinction."^{xvi} Franz Pieper

seems to settle in favor of a fixed Canon of the present twenty-seven books, with little import to the distinction between canonical and deuterocanonical.^{xvii}

So the question is asked again today, “What is the import of the distinction between the canonical and deuterocanonical (antilegomena) books?” Based on the historic facts and the results from the guidance in history of God the Holy Spirit, we shall conclude by suggesting

A RESPONSIBLE POSITION ON THE SUBJECT FOR ORTHODOX LUTHERAN CHRISTIANS TODAY.

It would be a sly deception if we were to discount any importance to the distinction between the homolegomena and the antilegomena. The results of the historic disputes, though repeatedly resolved in favor of the twenty-seven books of our Canon, have had some far-reaching effects. Although few, if any, would today omit any of the books in question from the Canon, many of us, in the spirit of Luther, quite commonly distinguish between the relative value of the various books. We favor the books of John and Romans, for instance, and firmly agree that James is “strawlike” by comparison. We shy away from the visions of Revelation in favor of the more concrete truths presented in the other twenty-six books. We rank the books. We establish a canonical and deuterocanonical order within the received Canon. We are, consciously or otherwise, following an historical precedent.

Some, however, will see such a position as self-contradictory. When speaking of God’s inviolable Word it is difficult to conceive of any of it being secondary to the rest in any sense. As we suggested earlier, canonical is canonical. It either is or it is not. It can hardly be more or less canonical. That seems so; but in practice one can assign different value or rank to the books without giving up a word of the verbally inspired Canon. Though we might use one book less, considering it of less value, we would defend to the end every word of it as long as we received it as God’s Canon. Perhaps the analogy to degrees of glory in heaven is fitting here. As heaven will be perfect bliss for everyone and still feature degrees of glory, so the Bible as received can be all God’s authoritative Canon and still feature degrees of value.

The distinction under discussion seems to have little of a major theological import. Contrary to the fears of some, allowing the doubts on the Canon does not endanger the doctrine of the Church, It doesn’t cast us off into a sea filled with waves of wonder that threaten to batter and smash our divine authority. It leaves us still moored to the solid rock of God’s Word. We can, for example, emphasize the positive truth that the bulk of today’s New Testament has no questions about its authenticity. It has met the objective and the subjective tests from the beginning and has always been acknowledged as canonical. Also, there is no book from early Christian times that can make a serious bid any more to be added to the Canon.

As for the disputed books, they do not contain any false doctrine nor any doctrine that goes beyond the books unanimously received by the primitive Church. They were not in dispute at the very beginning. And though historic agreement is wanting for these books, the important testimony in their favor is so strong that we can see nothing to prevent us from accepting them as canonical. This was the studied opinion of virtually all Christians at least by the fifth century. The books, despite the questions raised, proved their place. We have no compelling reason, not even Luther’s doubts, to judge differently. We are safe to take our position with the theologian who writes: “These twenty-seven writings [including the antilegomena] were born out of an intense and incomparable experience of the confrontation of creature with creator, of sin with holiness, and of time with eternity. These writings have both a high voltage and a high amperage, to use a figure.”^{xviii}

But this does not “close” the matter of the Canon. That we cannot do. The extent of the Canon is not a scriptural article of faith. It is a matter of faith insofar as the inner working of the Holy Spirit and God’s providence are involved and concerned. But it is a matter of scholarship insofar as the objective tests of apostolicity and the historic processes are involved and concerned. Where the latter has left doubts, no one today can insist that there should be no doubts. Knowing, however, that God’s Words will not pass away and

will be our guide to eternal salvation, we may have faith that God has preserved those words in their purity for us.

At last, the import of the distinction between the canonical and deuterocanonical books is evident just by this exercise in research and presentation. It helps us make sure of the basis of our faith.

ENDNOTES

- i. Quoted by P. Marion Simms, *The Bible from the Beginning* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1929), p. 106.
- ii. Quoted by Heinrich Schmid, *The Doctrinal Theology of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, Charles A. Hay and Henry E. Jacobs, Translators (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1899), p. 54.
- iii. Julian G. Anderson, "Scripture and Tradition in Relation to the Church," *This Steadfast Word*, Carl J. Lawrenz, ed. (Lutheran Free Conference Publications, 1965), p. 148.
- iv. Cf. F. Blume, "The Formation of the New Testament Canon," *Theologische Quartalschrift*, Vol. 38, No. 4 (October, 1941), p. 285. Norman L. Geisler and William E. Nix, *A General Introduction to the Bible* (Moody Press, 1968), p. 186. Henry Clarence Thiessen, *Introduction to the New Testament* (Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1943), p. 9.
- v. Floyd V. Filson, *Which Books Belong in the Bible?* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1957), p. 124. See also Thiessen, *Introduction*, p. 10. Samuel Terrien, *The Bible and the Church* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1962), p. 1312. Geisler and Nix, *A General Introduction*, p. 183. Blume, "The Formation," pp. 289-290.
- vi. Quoted by Fred Gladstone Bratton, *A History of the Bible* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1959), p. 195.
- vii. Blume, "The Formation," p. 292.
- viii. Also on the New Testament presented and received as authoritative, see Col. 4:16; 1 Thess. 5:27; 2 Thess. 3:14; Jude 17; Rev. 1:3; Gal. 1:1,11,12; 1 Cor. 11:2; 2 Pet. 3:2,15,16; John 21:24; Heb. 1:1,2.
- ix. Geisler and Nix, *A General Introduction*, pp. 139-141.
- x. Martin Luther, *Works of Martin Luther*, The Philadelphia Edition, Vol. VI (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1932), p. 488.
- xi. "The Formula of Concord. Epitome," *Concordia Triglotta* (Minneapolis: The Mott Press, 1955), p. 777.
- xii. Quoted by Francis Pieper, *Christian Dogmatics*, Vol. I (CPH, 1957). p. 333.
- xiii. Quoted by Schmid, *Doctrinal Theology*, pp. 90-91.
- xiv. Vol. I, p. 331.
- xv. Quoted by Schmid, *Doctrinal Theology*, p. 91.
- xvi. Quoted by Schmid, *Doctrinal Theology*, p. 91.
- xvii. *Christian Dogmatics*, Vol. I, pp. 336-337.
- xviii. *The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow*, Harold R. Willoughby, ed. (The University of Chicago Press, 1947), p. 433.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, Julian G. "Scripture and Tradition in Relation to the Church," *This Steadfast Word*, edited by Carl J. Lawrenz. Lutheran Free Conference Publications, 1965, pp. 142-159.
- Bissell, Edwin Cone. *The Historic Origin of the Bible*. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph Company, 1873, pp. 140-186, 277-292.
- Blume, F. "The Formation of the New Testament Canon," *Theologische Quartalschrift*, 38, No. 4 (October, 1941), pp. 272-292.
- Bratton, Fred Gladstone. *A History of the Bible: An Introduction to the Historical Method*. Boston: Beacon Press 1959, pp. 103-124, 184-197.

- Filson, Floyd V. *Which Books Belong in the Bible?* Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1957
- Flack, Elmer E., Bruce M. Metzger, et al. *The Text, Canon, and Principal Versions of the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1956, pp. 23-29.
- Frank, Henry Thomas, Charles William Swain, Courtland Canby. *The Bible Through the Ages*. Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1967.
- Geisler, Norman L. and William E. Nix. *A General Introduction to the Bible*. Moody Press, 1968, pp. 127-211.
- Goodspeed, Edgar J. *How Came the Bible?* New York: Abingdon Press, 1940, pp. 9-87.
- Goodspeed, Edgar J. *The Formation of the New Testament*. The University of Chicago Press, 1926.
- Grant, Robert M. *The Formation of the New Testament*. New York: Harper Row Publishers, 1965.
- Green, William Henry. "The Canon", *General Introduction to the Old Testament*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1898.
- Gregory, Caspar René. *Canon and Text of the New Testament*. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1907, pp. 1-295.
- Helps to the Study of the Bible*. Oxford University Press, n.d., pp. 2-6.
- Henry, Carl F. H., ed., *Revelation and the Bible: Contemporary Evangelical Thought*. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Reformed Publishing Company, 1958, pp.153-203, 265-283.
- Lampe, G. W. H., ed., *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, Vol. 2, "The West from the Fathers to the Reformation" Cambridge University Press, 1969, pp. 1-54.
- Pieper, Francis. *Christian Dogmatics*, Vol. I. CPH, 1957, pp. 292-297, 330-338.
- Schmid, Heinrich. Charles A. Hay and Henry E. Jacobs, translators. *The Doctrinal Theology of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1899, passim.
- Simms P. Marion. *The Bible from the Beginning*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1929, pp. 77-151
- Souter, Alexander. *The Test and Cannon of the New Testament*. London: Duckworth, 1913, pp. 150-248.
- Steinmueller, John E. "General Introduction to the Bible," *A Companion to Scripture Studies*, Vol I. New York City: John F. Wagner, Inc., 1941, pp. 44-128.
- Tenney, Merrill C. *New Testament Survey*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1961, pp. 401-411.
- Terrien, Samuel. *The Bible and the Church: An Approach to Scripture*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1962, pp. 52-65.
- "The Formula of Concord. Epitome." *Concordia Triglotta*. Minneapolis: The Mott Press, 1955, passim.
- Thiessen, Henry Clarence. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1943, pp. 2-30
- Wescott, Brooke Foss. *A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament*. London: Macmillan and Company, Ltd., 1896.
- Willoughby, Harold R., ed. *The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow*. The University of Chicago Press, 1947, passim.
- Works of Martin Luther*, Vol. VI. The Philadelphia Edition. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1932, pp. 363-488.

ⁱ Quoted by P. Marion Simms, *THE BIBLE FROM THE BEGINNING*. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1929), p. 106.

ⁱⁱ Quoted by Heinrich Schmid, Translated by Charles A. Hay and Henry E. Jacobs, *The Doctrinal Theology of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*. (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1899), p. 54.

ⁱⁱⁱ Julian G. Anderson, "Scripture and Tradition in Relation to the Church" in *This Steadfast Word*, Carl J. Lawrenz, ed. (Lutheran Free Conference Publications, 1965), p. 148.

^{iv} Cf. F. Blume, "The Formation of the New Testament Canon" in *Theologische Quartalschrift*, Vol. 38, No. 4 (October, 1941), p. 285.

Norman L. Geisler and William E. Nix, *A General Introduction to the Bible* (Moody Press, 1968), p. 186.

Henry Clarence Thiessen, *Introduction to the New Testament* (Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1943), p. 9.

^v Floyd V. Filson, *Which Books Belong to the Bible?* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1957), p. 124.

Thiessen, *Introduction*, p.10.

Samuel Terrien, *The Bible and the Church*. (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1962), p. 131.

Geisler and Nix, *A General Introduction*. p. 183.

Blume, "The Formation," pp. 289-290.

^{vi} Quoted by Fred Gladstone Bratton, *A History of the Bible* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1959), p. 195.

^{vii} Blume, "The Formation," p. 292.

^{viii} Also on the New Testament presented and received as authoritative, see Col 4:16; 1 Th 5:27; 2 Th 3:14; Jude 17, Rev 1:3; Gal 1:1,11,12; 1 Co 11:2; 2 Pe 3:2,15,16; Jn 21:24; Heb 1:1,2.

^{ix} Geisler and Nix, *A General Introduction*. pp. 139-141.

^x Martin Luther, *Works of Martin Luther*. The Philadelphia Edition, Vol. VI (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1932), p. 488.

^{xi} "The Formula of Concord. Epitome," *Concordia Triglotta*. (Minneapolis: The Mott Press, 1955), p. 777.

^{xii} Quoted by Francis Pieper, *Christian Dogmatics*, Vol. 1 (CPH, 1957), p. 333

^{xiii} Quoted by Schmid, *Doctrinal Theology*, pp. 90-91.

^{xiv} Vol. 1, p. 331

^{xv} Quoted by Schmid, *Doctrinal Theology*, p. 91.

^{xvi} Quoted by Schmid, *Doctrinal Theology*, p. 91.

^{xvii} *Christian Dogmatics*, Vol. I, pp. 336-337.

^{xviii} Harold R. Willoughby, ed. *The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow* (The University of Chicago Press, 1947), p. 433