

How the Bible Became the Bible

The term canon has become a fixed concept in Christianity ever since the 4th century AD. It comes from the Hebrew word, “qaneh,” meaning a “reed” or “stalk” used as a measuring stick. The Greeks incorporated the word into their language as “kanon,” also meaning “measuring rod” or “a rule or standard and guideline.” This is where we get the word in English, “canon.” When the word “canon” is associated with the Scriptures it refers to those books that are received as properly belonging to the group of books that form the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament. So, how did people come to realize which books were inspired by God (thus canonical), and which ones weren’t?

While we have no surviving eyewitness accounts of the entire process, we do know quite a bit of how the Bible came together by looking at the Bible itself and by taking note of what we learn through the texts of history. It’s amazing to think that the books contained in the Bible were written over a period of about 2,000 years (from about 1400BC to 100AD), and that the entire 66 books of Scripture were recognized as Scripture by the end of the first century AD, to be officially formalized and affirmed already by the mid-fourth century AD through the church councils. It would seem that since the very beginning of the writings of Scripture, there was a progressive and increasing recognition of certain authoritative books as canonical by readers and listeners who knew the writers themselves and who could sense the authenticity of the writings, by the power of the Holy Spirit. Simply, the general history of the Bible can be divided into three segments:

- 1) Composition (when the individual books were written).
- 2) Canonization (when the books were collected and arranged into the Bible as a whole). Ongoing, but especially in between 586BC and 70AD. Kind of like how a modern documentary film happens – records of the past are preserved in a meaningful way by collecting and arranging them into a complete picture.
- 3) Consolidation (when the books were more-or-less officially recognized as an essential part of the Jewish and Christian communities). This happened informally by 100AD and was recognized more formally by the 4th century AD through the church councils.

Both Testaments went through a similar process, though at different times. For the Old Testament canon, the canon was determined long before the birth of Jesus. The traditional view begins with the “autographs” aka the “original” books of the Bible written by men inspired by the Spirit of God. The first five books of the Law (Pentateuch) were written primarily by Moses. He kept records and wrote down the laws that God revealed at Mount Sinai (see [Ex. 17:14 and Joshua 1:8](#)). Moses wrote the first five books as a guide for all future generations to read and meditate on in order to find God’s will for their lives. This was in accordance with God’s command that His covenantal revelation be written, preserved and passed on ([Ex. 17:14; 24:4; 31:18; 34:27; Deut. 10:5; 29:29; 31:9-12, 25-26](#)). Moses’ writing was understood to be the words of the LORD ([Exod 24:3-4](#)). After Moses, other divinely commissioned and inspired prophets carried on the writing of divine revelation ([Joshua 24:26; I Sam 10:25; Isa 30:8, Jeremiah 30:2, and Habakkuk 2:2-3](#)).

According to [Deuteronomy 31:24](#), the books of the Law were placed in the ark of the covenant. To this first book were added all the succeeding inspired texts as they were written. For example, Joshua wrote the book of Joshua ([Josh. 24:26](#)); Samuel wrote Judges, Ruth and the first part of Samuel; Job wrote his book. Etc. Preserved in the ark of the covenant was the canon of the Old Testament up to the time of David. Then, during and after the time of Solomon, these books were no longer kept in the ark ([I Kings 8:6, 9](#)) but rather in the treasury of the temple where they were cared for by the priests ([II Kings 22:8](#)). More books were added during the time of Hezekiah, such as the Psalms, Proverbs and the prophecies of Isaiah, Hosea, and Micah ([Prov. 25:1](#)) Additionally, the prophets also continually called the

people to “**Hear the word of the Lord**” which was to function as their covenantal rule of faith and practice (Deut 11:22; Josh 22:5; Amos 3:1; Jer 2:4; Ezek 6:3; Hos 4:1; Zech 7:12; Neh 9:30). Over 5,000 times in the Old Testament alone, the prophets refer to their writing as, “**Thus says the Lord.**”

With the destruction of Jerusalem in 586BC and then the resulting Exile, the “autographs” were destroyed, lost or mostly scattered. After the return from exile, Ezra and the “men of the great synagogue,” (an official board of religious leaders in Israel), collected what remained of the “originals” and corrected the available copies. Then, after adding the books of Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles, and the prophets Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, they arranged all the Old Testament works into one systematic corpus, or “canon.” This final canon of the Old Testament was then stored in an ark constructed for the second temple.

What we now have as the Old Testament (Hebrew Bible), in what is called the “Masoretic text,” is a virtual copy of that original corpus that was stored in the second temple. Already by the 2nd century BC there is pretty clear awareness of an established canon for the Old Testament – usually referred to in the historical texts as “the law and the prophets” or as a three part set of sacred, authoritative writings – “The Law, Prophets and Other Writings.”

For example, the prologue to the Greek translation of Ben Sira speaks of the grandfather’s zeal in studying “the Law and the Prophets and the other books of our ancestors.” This is very similar to Jesus’ statement in **Luke 24:44** where he says, “**Everything written about me in the law of Moses, the prophets, and the psalms must be fulfilled.**” So, it would seem that there was already a general consensus by this time of what books were included in the canon of Scripture. These texts gave Jews their identity, heritage and provided a fixed point of reference through centuries of change. We also see this same affirmation near the end of the 1st Century AD when Josephus enumerated the sacred Old Testament books at 22¹ and the author of 4 Ezra² enumerated them at 24 (4 Ezra 14:45). These authors give us additional expression to the conviction that there was a fixed number of sacred Scriptures (even though that precise number would continue to be slightly debated for another century). In these enumerations by Josephus and 4 Ezra, the 12 Minor Prophets are counted as one book (since they were one scroll), Ezra and Nehemiah count as a single book, and the dual books of Samuel, Kings and Chronicles each are counted as a single book.

There are additional good reasons to believe that the Hebrew canon was established within Judaism prior to the 1st century AD. This is confirmed by the writings of the New Testament themselves, which are some of our best 1st century sources and regularly cite the Old Testament as Scripture, but give no similar treatment to the books of the Apocrypha. Christ repeatedly refers to the “Law and the Prophets” as authoritative (e.g. **Matt 5:17; 7:12; 11:13; 22:40; Luke 16:16; 16:29; Matt 11:13, Luke 24:44; 24:27**) showing us modern readers that there was recognition of a functional Old Testament canon by the mid-first century. In Matthew, Mark and Luke alone, Jesus quotes or alludes to 23 of the 39 books of the Hebrew Bible.³ On Roger Nicole’s count,⁴ 278 different Old Testament verses are cited in the New Testament: 94 from the Pentateuch, 99 from the prophets and 85 from the writings. The writers of the New Testament explicitly quote from the Old Testament documents but never quote from the Old Testament Apocrypha.

¹ See his “Against Apion 1.38”

² (=chs. 3-14 of 2 Esdras)

³ See R.T. France. Jesus and the Old Testament. Regent College Publishing. 1982: 259-263.

⁴ Roger Nicole. (“New Testament Use of the Old Testament” in Revelation and the Bible, ed. Carl F.H. Henry, Baker, 1958: 138.

Why did Jews draw a line after (approximately) the 5th century BC and believe that later literature did not merit canonization?⁵ Well, unfortunately, most of the exact details have been lost over time. But we do know that Josephus, a late first-century Jewish historian, believed that Judaism as a whole had come to the conviction that after the last of the writing prophets, like Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, formal prophecy had ceased in Israel. Thus, no more Scripture could be written until the coming of the Messiah. Among the rabbis, only Ben Sira received attention as a possible candidate for a sacred text, but the only evidence we have is negative.⁶ The book Ben Sira was read and quoted by rabbis and apparently continued to carry weight in their debates, but it was not to be held in the same esteem as the older, sacred texts.

The impression one gets from the above discussion of the process of Old Testament canonization is that of ripples in a pond, with the Torah standing squarely in the center (the rock dropped from above, as it were), the Prophets forming the next ripple, and then several ripples of “the rest of the books” and others (such as the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha) of which are pushed farthest out from the central core. Although this last group of writings may be read, studied, and even cited, they are not at the center of the community’s reflection upon itself, its calling, or its identity.⁷

God had entrusted the Old Testament books to the Jews and they received them by a wide consensus (**Rom 3:2**). Thus, we should take seriously which Old Testament books the Jews considered canonical, and which books weren’t canonical. In the first few centuries of the church we have good evidence that the dominant position (though not the exclusive position) was an acceptance of the Jewish Old Testament canon and not the Apocrypha. This would include church fathers like Melito of Sardis, Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Epiphanius, Hilary of Poitiers, Gregory of Nazianzus, Rufinus, and Jerome.

As far as the New Testament is concerned, its composition and collection followed much the same process as the Old Testament. It was watched over by the apostles in the early church, who wrote some of the books and supervised the writing of others. The many Greek manuscripts of the New Testament that are available today enable us to come extremely close to what the original text was.⁸ The Old Testament was written in Hebrew, the language of Israel, and the New Testament was originally written in Greek, which was the common language of the world at the time of Christ.

There are virtually no disputes whatsoever about the finality of the 27 books of the canon of the New Testament. In fact, the New Testament books were so widely used and agreed upon that nearly the entire New Testament could be reconstructed from the historical writings of the 2nd-4th century church fathers alone!⁹ At an early stage in the history of the church, the New Testament canon was closed, and no new books were added. In fact, most of the New Testament books were written before the destruction of the temple by the Romans in 70AD. Thus, our certainty in the New Testament canon is very strong. Of course, one might ask, “what tests were used to find out which book is authentically from God, and which books aren’t?” Well, generally, some of the rules (called by scholars, “criteria of authenticity”) included questions, such as:

⁵ See also David Noel Freedman’s argument that the Old Testament canon was completed not later than 400-350B.C

⁶ See T. Yadayim 2.13.

⁷ This analogy comes from page 32 of David A. DaSilva’s Introducing the Apocrypha: Message, Context and Significance. Baker Academic. 2002.

⁸ Interesting fact: There is more abundant and accurate manuscript evidence for the New Testament than for any other book from the ancient world. We have literally thousands and thousands of copies.

⁹ (For a full tabulation, see Norman Geisler and William Nix, A General Introduction to the Bible: Revised and Expanded. Moody Press. 1986: 419-33.

- 1) Is this work universally accepted among God’s people (Israel for the Old Testament and the church for the New Testament) as inspired by God? A work which enjoyed only local recognition was not likely to be acknowledged as part of the canon of the church. Additionally, has this book been widely affirmed throughout the history of the church?
- 2) Does this work bear the internal witness of the Holy Spirit? Is it clear that this book, while bearing the vocabulary of the human author, is a message from God? Does the book bear “divine qualities”?
- 3) Was this work commissioned by God and/or does it showcase prophetic and apostolic origins? Think about how the prophets talked in the Old Testament. Accordingly, the New Testament is filled with references to the apostles as Christ’s foundational New Testament witnesses ([Luke 24:48](#); [Acts 1:8, 22; 3:15; 5:32; 10:39-41; 26:16](#); [Eph 2:20](#)).
- 4) Did the author have direct witness to the people and events it is describing either firsthand or by direct association ([Acts 1:2-4; 9:3-15; 10:41-43; 26:12-18](#))? This is also called the “Test of antiquity.” Writings of later dates could not be included.
- 5) Is this work consistent with past “canonical” revelation? They believed that any genuine new revelation would not contradict any genuine previous revelation. This can also be called the “test of orthodoxy.” In this test they are trying to figure out if a work is harmonious with all the other accepted works of the canon.
- 6) Do the events in the book have multiple attestation? Is the material recorded numerous times? If so, the more sources, the more likely it is to be true
- 7) Is this book historically dissimilar? This rule argues that if a teaching is unlike a person’s cultural roots or unlike what came after that person, then it is likely authentic. It is the very uniqueness of the teaching that suggests someone else did not create it.

As God’s people were guided by the Holy Spirit, a wide consensus was reached by the Jewish “church” for the 39 books of the Old Testament and in the first centuries of the Christian church, for the 27 books of the New Testament, but not the Apocrypha. Most significantly for Protestants, for the level of inspiration of the Old Testament, we have the confirmation of Jesus. Throughout his ministry, Jesus quoted and used the Scriptures as God’s word. To accept His authority is to accept the authority of the Old Testament. For the New Testament we have the confirmation of the apostles – the authoritative men who had received direct instruction from Jesus during his earthly ministry.¹⁰

Thus, we should not be surprised that the 66 books of the Old and New Testament have been recognized by the majority of Christians throughout the ages. Judaism and Christianity nearly unanimously agree that the 39 Old Testament books (or 24 as they are seen in the Hebrew Bible) are canonical. Further, the 27 books of the New Testament are nearly unanimously accepted as canonical throughout Christianity. Among most Christians, then, the debate concerns NOT whether the 39 Old Testament books and the 27 New Testament books are generally canonical but whether there are OTHER books that should be viewed as canonical, particularly the Old Testament Apocrypha or Pseudepigrapha.

The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha include numerous writings coming from the historical period of Second Temple Judaism. These works were composed during the period spanning the 4th Century BC through the 1st Century AD. One collection of writings has come to be called the Old Testament Apocrypha – works that would eventually be accepted into Roman Catholic and/ Eastern Orthodox canons. How one counts the actual number of documents depends both on which branch of Christianity one is describing and also on how one counts multiple additions to the books of Daniel and Esther. These include 4 books describing the Maccabean period (1-4 Maccabees), historical novels (Judith and Tobit),

¹⁰ It is also significant that some portion of every book of the Hebrew canon has been found at Qumran among the Dead Sea Scrolls (except for Esther). On the other hand, only three books of the Apocrypha are represented among the fragments.

books of proverbs and wisdom (Ecclesiasticus/Sirach and Wisdom of Solomon) and shorter works such as the Prayer of Manasseh and the Letter of Jeremiah.

Another 60 or more books from this period have been recovered and are known as the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha because they are typically attributed to some ancient Old Testament patriarch or key figure in Jewish history who lived long before the time of the book's actual writing. With only one or two exceptions, these works were never seriously considered for canonization by anyone in the early church. While Protestants do not believe these books deserve the rank of "canon", we believe they are nonetheless HELPFUL to read since they can provide invaluable background to understanding the theological developments within Judaism just before the time of Christ and his apostles.

Eventually, the Apocrypha, became a point of intense contention especially at the time of the Protestant Reformation. Although never accepted as inspired or authoritative by any branch of Judaism, nor even put forward as candidates for canonization within Judaism, these writings came to be valued in early Christianity, especially after the time of Constantine. They were prized because they taught on doctrines not found anywhere else in Scripture (like purgatory or praying for the dead); because they were exciting and inspiring (like Judith and Tobi); because these texts could be interpreted allegorically; they could be viewed as foreshadowing Jesus, or simply because they were high quality, enjoyable, religious literature. Yet despite their widespread usage, including for preaching in churches, no empire-wide council ever officially declared them canonical until the Council of Trent in 1546. Only after Martin Luther insisted that Christians return to the Bible of the Jewish Jesus and the Jewish apostles, so to speak, did irate Catholic authorities retaliate by formally canonizing the Apocrypha.

As David DaSilva says,

"No suggestion has been made that Protestant Christians or Jews should revise the limits of their canons. Fundamentally, the need for studying the Apocrypha is not based on decisions about their status as Scripture. It is based on the fact that these texts open up to our view the three centuries concerning which the Protestant and Jewish Canonical Scriptures are almost completely silent. In so doing, they become indispensable for a more accurate grasp of the world of the New Testament, as well as the world of emerging rabbinic Judaism."¹¹

The Apocrypha includes about eleven pieces of literature (7 books and 4 parts of books) that the Roman Catholic Church pronounced as part of the canon in 1546AD at the Council of Trent. These books are also known by Catholics as the "deuterocanonical books." The Council of Trent affords these books full canonical status and pronounces an anathema (excommunication) on any who rejects them. In their words:

"If anyone however should not except the said books as sacred and economical entire with all their parts and if both knowingly and deliberately he should condemn the aforesaid tradition let him be anathema."¹²

The same language affirming the Apocrypha is repeated by the Council, Vatican II.¹³ So, why did the Roman Catholic and Orthodox churches later canonize them 1500 years later? Well, we know that the Apocryphal books would have been attractive to the Roman Catholic church during the Reformation since

¹¹ David A. DaSilva. Introducing the Apocrypha. Baker Academic. 2002: 26.

¹² Henry Denzinger. Sources of Catholic Dogma. CreateSpace. 2013: 245

¹³ See Documents of Vatican II: Vatican Translation. Alba House. 2009. "Document on Revelation," and chap. 3: "The Divine Inspiration and the Interpretation of Sacred Scripture.

the Apocrypha could be used to justify doctrines that were being challenged in the Reformation, like purgatory and prayers for the dead that were at the heart of the ecclesiastical abuse of power.

Roman Catholic reasons advanced for accepting the Apocrypha as part of the Scriptural canon are as follows¹⁴:

- 1) The New Testament reflects the thought of the Apocrypha and even refers to events contained in it (Hebrews 11:35 with II Macc. 7, 12).

Protestant Response: There may be New Testament allusions to the Apocrypha, but there are no clear New Testament quotations from it. Not once. Further, although the New Testament cites the Hebrew Old Testament as authoritative, it never once quotes any of the apocryphal books as divinely authoritative or canonical. They are never referred to like, “thus says the Lord, or “as it is written” or “the Scriptures say.”

- 2) The New Testament quotes mostly from the Septuagint (Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible) which contained the Apocrypha. this gives approval of the whole text, including the Apocrypha, from which they quoted.

Protestant Response: The fact that the New Testament often quotes from the Greek Old Testament in no way proves that the Apocryphal books contained in the Greek manuscripts of the Old Testament are inspired. First, it is not certain that the Septuagint of the first century contained the Apocrypha. The earliest Greek manuscripts that include them date from the fourth century A.D. Further, even if they were in the Septuagint of apostolic times, Jesus and the apostles never once quoted them, although they’re supposed to have been included in the very version of the Old Testament that they usually cited. Finally, even the notes in the current Roman Catholic Bible (NAB) make the reviewing admission that the Apocryphal books are “religious books used by both Jews and Christians which were not included in the collection of inspired writings.” Instead, they “were introduced rather late into the collection of the Bible. Catholics call them deuterocanonical (second canon) books.”¹⁵

- 3) Some of the early church fathers quoted and used the Apocrypha as Scripture in public worship

Protestant Response: Citations of the church fathers in support of the canonicity of the apocrypha are selective and misleading. While some fathers accepted their inspiration, Others use them only for devotional or homiletical purposes but did not accept them as canonical as a recent authority in the Apocrypha, Roger Beckwith observes,

“When one examines the passages in the early fathers which are supposed to establish the canonicity of the apocrypha one find that some of them are taken from the alternative Greek text of Azariah or from additions or panda says to Danielle, Jeremiah or some other canonical book, which... are not really relevant; that others of them are not quotations from the apocrypha at all; and that, of those which are, many do not give any indication that the book is regarded as scripture.”¹⁶

So, unqualified Catholic appeal to the use of the Apocrypha is misleading for, as Beckwith notes, in many cases the Fathers were not claiming divine authority for one or more of the eleven books canonized by the

¹⁴ Taken from pages 159-175 of Norman L. Geisler and Ralph E. MacKenzie. Roman Catholics and Evangelicals: Agreements and Differences. Baker. 1995.

¹⁵ New American Bible, page 413.

¹⁶ See Roger Beckwith. The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church and Its Background in Early Judaism. Eerdmans, 1986: 427 n. 208.

Council of Trent. Rather, they were either citing a book that was part of the Hebrew canon or not quoting the Apocryphal books as Scripture.

- 4) Some of the early church fathers – Ireneaus, Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria- accepted all the books of the Apocrypha as canonical.

Protestant Response: Although some individuals in the early church had a high regard for the Apocrypha there're many who vehemently opposed it. For example, Athanasius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Origin, and the great Roman Catholic biblical scholar and translator of the Latin Vulgate, Jerome, all opposed the Apocrypha. Even the early Syrian church did not except the Apocrypha. In the second century A.D. the Syrian Bible (Peshitta) did not contain the apocrypha.

- 5) Early Christian catacomb scenes depict episodes from the Apocrypha, showing it was part of the early Christians religious life. If not their inspiration this at least reveals a great regard for the Apocrypha.

Protestant Response: As even many Catholic scholars will admit, scenes from the catacombs do not prove the canonicity of the books whose events they depict. Such scenes need not indicate any more than the religious significance the portrayed events had for early Christians. They may show respect for the books containing these events without recognizing that they're inspired.

- 6) The early Greek manuscripts (Aleph, A, and B) interpose the Apocrypha among the Old Testament book. This reveals that they were part of the Jewish-Greek translation of the Old Testament.

Protestant Response: None of the great Greek manuscripts (Aleph, A, and B) contain all of the Apocryphal books. In fact, only four (Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, and Sirach [Ecclesiasticus]) are found in all of them, and the oldest manuscripts (B or Vaticanus) totally exclude the books of Maccabees. Yet Catholics appeal to this manuscript for proof of their deuterocanonical books that include the Apocrypha! What is more, no Greek manuscript has the same list of Apocryphal blocks excepted by the Council of Trent

- 7) Several early church councils accepted the Apocrypha; the Council of Rome (AD 382) the Council of Hippo (AD 393), and the Council of Carthage (AD 397)

Protestant Response: There are some important reasons why citing these Church Councils does not prove the Apocrypha belongs in the canon of the Christian church. First, these were only local councils and were not binding on the whole church. Second, these books were not part of the Christian writings – they were Jewish. The Jews had rejected them as part of the canon centuries before. Third, the books accepted by these Christian Councils may not have been the same ones in each case. Fourth, the local councils were influenced by Augustine, who is the most significant voice of antiquity that accepted these books. Augustine erroneously reasoned that these books should be in the Bible because of their mention of “extreme and wonderful suffering of certain martyrs.”¹⁷ On that ground one could argue that Foxe's Book of Martyrs should also be in the Canon!

- 8) The Eastern Orthodox Church accepts the Apocrypha revealing that it is not simply a Roman Catholic doctrine.

¹⁷ See Augustine's The City of God, #18 and #36.

Protestant Response: The Greek Church has not always accepted the Apocrypha, nor is its present position unequivocal. At the Senate of Constantinople (AD 1638), Jaffa (1642) and Jerusalem (1672) these books were declared canonical. But even as late as 1839 their Larger Catechism expressly omitted the Apocrypha on the ground that its books did not exist in the Hebrew Bible. This is still their position.

- 9) The Roman Catholic church proclaimed the Apocrypha canonical at the Council of Trent (AD 1546). This was in accord with pronouncements at earlier councils and the Council of Florence not long before the Reformation (AD 1442)

Protestant Response: Unfortunately, the proclamation came a millennium and a half after the books were written and in an obvious polemic against Protestantism. Furthermore, the official edition of books that support prayers for the dead is highly suspect, coming as it did only a few years after Luther protested against this very doctrine. It has all the appearance of an attempt to provide ecclesiastical support for Roman Catholic doctrines that lack biblical support.

- 10) The Apocryphal books were included in the Protestant Bible as late as the 19th-century this indicates that even Protestants excepted the Apocrypha until very recently.

Protestant Response: True, Apocryphal books did appear in Protestant Bibles prior to the Council of Trent, but were generally placed in a separate section because they were not considered of equal authority. While Anglicans and some other non-Roman Catholic groups have a high regard for the devotional and historical value of the Apocrypha, they did not consider it inspired and of equal authority with Holy Scriptures.

- 11) Some Apocryphal books written in Hebrew have been found among other Old Testament canonical books in the Dead Sea community at Qumran. This shows that they were part of the Hebrew canon

Protestant Response: The discovery at Qumran included fragments of *hundreds* of books. Among these were some Old Testament Apocryphal books. But the fact that no commentaries were found on an Apocryphal book and that only canonical books, not the Apocrypha, were found in the special parchment scholar on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Miller Burrows, concluded: "There is no reason to think that any of these works were venerated as sacred scripture."¹⁸

Additional Resources:

- Pps. 645-659 of Craig L. Blomberg's The Historical Reliability of the New Testament. B&H, 2016
- Norman L. Geisler and Ralph E. MacKenzie. Roman Catholics and Evangelicals: Agreements and Differences. Baker. 1995.
- Roger T. Beckwith. The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church. Eerdmans 1985.
- Lee M. McDonald. The Formation of the Christian Biblical Canon, exp ed., Hendrickson, 1995.
- John H. Sailhamer. How We Got the Bible. Zondervan. 1998.
- Craig L. Blomberg. Can We Still Believe the Bible? Brazos. 2014.
- <http://www.str.org/articles/the-apocrypha#.WDMx96IrKRt>
- <http://www.conversantlife.com/theology/where-did-the-bible-come-from>
- Christianity Today. Issue 43: How We Got Our Bible: Canon to King James. 1994.

¹⁸ Millar Burrows. More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Viking Press. 1958: 178.