

# How we got the Bible

## **Old Testament Antilegoumena:**

*These books were initially accepted as canonical. Later on, a few people questioned their canonicity (whether they should be included in the Bible). In all cases, their canonicity was firmly established and supported.*

***Below is a list of the reasons as to why these books were even questioned to begin with... As you can see, these reasons didn't hold up very well at all...***

***Song of Songs*** ~ It seemed \_\_\_\_\_ to people. Being that it describes married love, it is understandable that it is sensual.

***Ecclesiastes*** ~ It seemed \_\_\_\_\_ to some people. Being that it shows the futility of life without God, it should sound skeptical. But in the last chapter (12:9-13) it says that knowing God and keeping His commandments is the right thing to do in order to have a fulfilling life.

***Esther*** ~ The name of God is absent from this book, and because of this, some people doubted its worthiness for canonization. But the absence of God's name is more than compensated for by the presence of His power and grace in the deliverance of His people.

***Ezekiel*** ~ It was questioned by some people because of its seemingly anti-\_\_\_\_\_ teachings. However, no specific examples were ever supplied that contradict the teachings of Moses. If there were actual contradictions, then this would certainly disqualify it from being included in the Bible. The lack of any scriptures to support an anti-Mosaic teaching was an embarrassment to the people who held this view.

***Proverbs*** ~ Some people thought it was \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ itself. The supposed contradiction was in 26:4-5 but these few people just didn't understand that many proverbs used the expression, "on the one hand... and the other hand".

## How we got the Bible

### **New Testament Antilegoumena:**

*These books were initially accepted as canonical. Later on, a few people questioned their canonicity (whether they should be included in the Bible). In all cases, their canonicity was firmly established and supported.*

*Below is a list of the reasons as to why these books were even questioned to begin with... As you can see, these reasons didn't hold up very well at all...*

**Hebrews** ~ *The author's name has been lost to antiquity. While the Eastern Orthodox Church always accepted the book of Hebrews, the Western Church questioned it for a brief time, but then finally accepted the book as inspired by God.*

**James** ~ *Some thought that James was preaching 'salvation by \_\_\_\_\_'. Quickly, they realized that he was talking about works as the '\_\_\_\_\_ of salvation', not a 'means' of salvation.*

**2<sup>nd</sup> Peter** ~ *Some people noticed that 2<sup>nd</sup> Peter was \_\_\_\_\_ different from 1<sup>st</sup> Peter. Sometimes, the authors had scribes doing the physical writing for them. There is also a lot of internal evidence for 2<sup>nd</sup> Peter being written by Peter the Apostle.*

**2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> John** ~ *Some people thought that because these letters were \_\_\_\_\_ in nature, written to individual people, that they shouldn't be included. But look at 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Timothy, Titus, and Philemon. These letters had wide circulation and were written by an Apostle to an individual...*

**Jude** ~ *Some people questioned this because of its reference to the Pseudopigraphic "Book of Enoch" (verses 14-15) and possibly to the "Assumption of \_\_\_\_\_" (verse 9). Remember that Paul referenced pagan poets (Acts 17:28, 1<sup>st</sup> Corinthians 15:33 and Titus 1:12). Referencing something doesn't mean that you support the whole book.*

**Revelation** ~ *Some people questioned it because the book didn't support their \_\_\_\_\_ - \_\_\_\_\_ view. The book does seem to support millennialism (the one-thousand-year rule of Christ). This dispute was quickly rejected by the vast majority of believers.*

*(Continued next page)*