

# The Complete Bible: Why Catholics Have Seven More Books

**ISSUE:** Catholic Bibles contain seven more Old Testament (46) books than Protestant Bibles (39). Catholics refer to these seven books as the “deuterocanon”<sup>1</sup> (second canon), while Protestants refer to them as “apocrypha,” a term used pejoratively to describe non-canonical books. Protestants also have shorter versions of Daniel and Esther. Why are there differences?

**RESPONSE:** Catholic Bibles contain all the books that have been traditionally accepted by Christians since Jesus’ time. Protestant Bibles contain all those books, except those rejected by the Protestant Reformers in the 1500’s. The chief reason Protestants rejected these biblical books was because they did not support Protestant doctrines, e.g., 2 Maccabees supports prayer for the dead.<sup>2</sup> The term “canon” means rule or guideline, and in this context means “which books belong in the Bible (and, by implication, which do not).”

The Catholic Old Testament follows the Alexandrian canon of the Septuagint,<sup>3</sup> the Old Testament which was translated into Greek around 250 B.C. The Protestant Reformers follows the Palestinian canon<sup>4</sup> of Scripture (39 books), which was not officially recognized by Jews until around 100 A.D.

**DISCUSSION:** Prior to Jesus’ time, the Jews did not have a sharply defined, universal canon of Scripture. Some groups of Jews used only the first five books of the Old Testament (the Pentateuch); some used only the Palestinian canon (39 books); some used the Alexandrian canon (46 books), and some, like the Dead Sea community, used all these and more. The Palestinian and Alexandrian canons were more normative than the others, having wider acceptance among orthodox Jews, but for Jews there was no universally defined canon to include or exclude the “deuterocanonical” books around 100 A.D.

The Apostles commissioned by Jesus,<sup>5</sup> however, used the Septuagint (the Old Testament in Greek which contained the Alexandrian canon) most of the time and must have accepted the Alexandrian canon. For example, 86 percent of Old Testament quotes in the Greek New Testament come directly from the Septuagint, not to mention numerous linguistic references. Acts 7 provides an interesting piece of evidence that justifies the Apostolic use of the Septuagint. In Acts 7:14 St. Stephen says that Jacob came to Joseph with 75 people. The Masoretic Hebrew version of Gen. 46:27 says “70,” while the Septuagint’s says “75,” the number Stephen used. Following the Apostles’ example, Stephen clearly used the Septuagint. In the mid-twentieth century, Dead Sea Scrolls scholars discovered older Hebrew manuscripts that agree with the Septuagint rather than the Masoretic texts. The Septuagint was not only used by the Apostles, but in some cases it was more accurate.<sup>6</sup> (We also know from other ancient Christian documents, like the *Didache*<sup>7</sup> and Pope St. Clement’s Letter to the Corinthians, that the apostles’ successors not only used the Septuagint, but quote from all of the books in the Alexandrian canon as the authoritative word of God.)

There is no divinely inspired “table of contents” for the Bible, therefore, Christians need an authority, like the infallible Church established by Christ, to discern which books are the divinely inspired ones. (Indeed, even if there were such a “table of contents” list, we would need an authority to tell if the list itself were inspired.) Even many Evangelical Protestant Bible scholars admit this:

While we know that at the time of Jesus there were different canons of the Old Testament because the canonical process was not yet complete, the glorious truth is that God has invited humans to be partners in the putting together of Scripture. I think the implications are that *you cannot have Scripture without the community of faith [in other words, the Church]. It’s not just a private revelation. God gives us Scripture, but then the [Church], by God’s guidance, has to choose what’s in and what’s out.*<sup>8</sup>

Why don’t the Jews accept the Alexandrian canon now, though? They follow after their predecessors, who around 100 A.D. decided that the Septuagint which followed the Alexandrian canon had at least two problems: First, it was written in Greek, which after the destruction of Jerusalem by Gentiles seemed “un-Jewish” or even “anti-Jewish.”<sup>9</sup> Second, Christians, following the lead of their apostolic leaders, widely used the Septuagint, especially in

apologetics to the Jews; thus, non-Christian Jews wanted to deny the value of some of its books, such as the Book of Wisdom, which contains a profound prophecy of Christ's death.

In the words of Protestant Septuagint scholar Sir Lancelot Benton:

The veneration with which the Jews had treated this [Septuagint] (as it is shown in the case of [Jewish historians] Philo and Josephus), gave place to a very contrary feeling when they found how it could be used against them [i.e., in Christian apologetics]: hence they decried the [Septuagint] version, and sought to deprive it of any authority.<sup>10</sup>

What are the classic Protestant arguments against the seven deuterocanonical books? Their major objection is that the deuterocanonals contain doctrines and practices, such as the doctrine of purgatory and praying for the dead, that are irreconcilable with authentic Scripture. This objection, of course, begs the question. If the deuterocanon *is* inspired Scripture, then those doctrines and practices are not opposed to Scripture but part of Scripture. Another objection is that the deuterocanonical books “contain nothing prophetic.” This is clearly proved false by comparing Wis. 1:16-2:1 and 2:12-24 to Matthew's passion account, especially Mt. 27:40-43.

Many Protestants also argue that, because neither Jesus nor His apostles quote the deuterocanonical books, they should be left out of the Bible. This claim ignores that Jesus nor His apostles do not quote Ecclesiastes, Esther or the Song of Songs, nor even mention them in the New Testament; yet Protestants accept these books. Furthermore, the New Testament quotes and refers to many non-canonical books, like pagan poetry quoted by Paul and Jewish stories referred to by Jude, which neither Protestants nor Catholics accept as Scripture. Clearly New Testament quotation, or the lack thereof, cannot be a reliable indicator of Old Testament canonicity. (This also begs the question of which books belong in the New Testament and which do not.)

Other Protestants argue that today's Jews do not accept the deuterocanon. This objection is problematic for two reasons. The first is *why* the Jews reject those books (see above). These books are rejected by Jews on the basis of bias against Christianity, something to which Protestants should not want to support. The second problem is this: Why should Christians accept the authority of post-Church-establishment, non-Christians instead of the Apostles of the Church that Christ founded? Would God found a Church and then let it fall into grave error concerning the Old Testament canon? This is an untenable position for *any* Christian to take.

Others point to St. Jerome's “rejection” of deuterocanonical material. While Jerome was originally suspicious of the “extra” Old Testament books, which he only knew in Greek, he fully accepted the judgment of the Church on the matter, as shown in a letter written in 402 A. D.:

What sin have I committed if *I follow the judgment of the churches?* . . . I was not relating my own personal views [when I wrote the objections of the Jews to the longer form of Daniel in my introduction], but rather the remarks that [the Jews] are wont to make *against us* [Christians who accept the longer form of Daniel], (*Against Rufinius*, 11:33, emphasis added).<sup>11</sup>

Remember that Protestants reject the longer, Alexandrian version of Daniel; St. Jerome did not.

Still more Protestants claim that the Church did not authoritatively define the canon of Scripture until the Council of Trent and, since that Council was a reaction to the Reformation, the deuterocanon can be considered an “addition” to the original Christian canon. This is also incorrect. Regional councils of the early Church had enumerated the books of the Bible time and again prior to the Reformation, always upholding the current Catholic canon.<sup>12</sup> Examples include the Council of Rome (382), the Council of Hippo (393), and the Third and Fourth Councils of Carthage (397, 418).<sup>13</sup> *All of these affirmed the Catholic canon as we know it today*, while none affirmed the Protestant canon.

This exact canon also had the total support of important Church Fathers like St. Augustine (*Christian Instruction*, 397).<sup>14</sup> In 405, Pope St. Innocent also taught the Catholic canon in a letter to Exsuperius, Bishop of Toulouse,<sup>15</sup> the same year that St. Jerome completed the Latin Vulgate translation of the Bible at the request of the Popes. A thousand years later, while seeking reunion with the Copts, the Church affirmed the same canon at the ecumenical<sup>16</sup> Council of Florence in 1442.<sup>17</sup> When the canon became a serious issue following the Protestant schism in the early 1500s, Trent dogmatically defined what the Church had consistently taught for more than 1,000 years.

R.C. Sproul, a prominent Protestant theologian, asserts that we must accept the Bible as a “fallible collection of infallible books,” and many Protestants find this idea appealing. There are serious problems with this position however. The chief problem is this: While it acknowledges that infallible books exist somewhere in the world, **it implies that we can have no guarantee that all, or indeed any, of those infallible books are in the Bibles Christians use.** If the collection is fallible, the contents are not **necessarily** the books which are infallible. How do we know, then, that John’s Gospel, which all Christians accept, is legitimately Scripture, while the so-called “Gospel of Thomas,” which all Christians reject, is not? Sproul’s statement points to the need for an authority outside the Bible so that we can have an infallible collection of infallible books. It is ultimately contradictory to believe in the Bible’s infallibility, and the reliability of its canon, without believing in the Church’s infallibility.<sup>18</sup>

To answer the question, “Who decided which books are in the Bible?” we must inevitably recognize the authoritative Church that Christ founded, the Church that infallibly discerned with God’s guidance which books belonged and which didn’t.<sup>19</sup> This means recognizing that the longer Old Testament canon is the correct one.

<sup>1</sup> The seven deuterocanonical books are Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Sirach (Ecclesiasticus), Baruch, and 1 and 2 Maccabees.

<sup>2</sup> For similar reasons, Martin Luther rejected the canonicity of the Letter of James in the New Testament. However, his Protestant counterparts included James. James is part of the New Testament deuterocanon, which also includes 2 and 3 John, 2 Peter, Jude, Hebrews, and Revelation. Protestants accept the New Testament deuterocanon, but not the Old Testament deuterocanon. See CUF’s “What’s in a Name?” FAITH FACT, which further explores the distinction between the protocanon, deuterocanon, and the apocrypha.

<sup>3</sup> The Septuagint is often abbreviated as “LXX.”

<sup>4</sup> The Palestinian canon is sometimes called “Masoretic” after the medieval rabbis called “Masoretes.”

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Mt. 28:19-20; 1 Tim. 3:15. For more information on the biblical and other historical roots of the Church, see CUF FAITH FACT: “Rock Solid: The Salvation History of the Catholic Church.”

<sup>6</sup> Catholic Bible translations make use of the oldest and most accurate manuscripts, regardless of language, whenever possible. It was not known until late in this century that the number “75” (which Stephen used in Acts 7:14) was older and more reliable, so your own Bible probably does not say “75” in Genesis 46:27. Future translators who take the new evidence into account will probably fix the discrepancy between Acts and Genesis.

<sup>7</sup> The *Didache* is a first-century document that contain teachings of Christ’s apostles (cf. Acts 2:42).

<sup>8</sup> Dr. Peter Flint, an Evangelical Protestant theologian who earned his doctorate at the University of Notre Dame, quoted in *Christianity Today*, October 6, 1997; emphasis added.

<sup>9</sup> Scholars now know, based on evidence from the Dead Sea Scrolls, that some of the deuterocanonical books previously existed in Hebrew. The Jews of 100 A.D. did not know this.

<sup>10</sup> Sir Lancelot C. L. Benton, Introduction to *The Septuagint With Apocrypha*, Hendrickson Publishers, 1997.

<sup>11</sup> In addition, the Latin Vulgate version of the Bible, which St. Jerome finished around 406 A. D. at the request of the Popes, included the deuterocanonical books.

<sup>12</sup> Some Protestants will cite the writings of St. Melito, Bishop of Sardis, who wrote in the late first century, and St. Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria, in the mid-fourth century. Both saints affirmed the Old Testament canon as best they knew it, and did exclude several deuterocanonical books. However, fatal to the Protestant position, Melito included Wisdom and Athanasius included Baruch while omitting all of Esther; so neither affirmed the Protestant canon. See William J. Jurgens, *The Faith of the Early Fathers, Vol. 1*. Collegeville, Minn.: The Liturgical Press, 1970, pp. 81 (no. 190) and 341-42 (no. 791).

<sup>13</sup> R.C. Fuller, “The Old Testament Canon,” in Fuller, Reginald; Johnston, Leonard; and Kearns, Conleth; A; *A New Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture*. Nashville, Tenn.: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1975, p. 26.

<sup>14</sup> This canon was, of course, supported by many more Church Fathers than these, but these are examples of early Church Fathers who give an exact list of the canonical books. Most Church Fathers took the canon for granted, quoting the Scriptures—including the deuterocanon—without formally listing them, which is even more telling.

<sup>15</sup> Later, Pope St. Gregory the Great spoke of 1 Maccabees as being among “those books which, though not canonical, were produced for the edification of the Church.” However, Pope Gregory’s statement was not a formal, universal teaching for the faithful. See Fuller, “The Old Testament Canon,” *A New Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture*, p. 26.

<sup>16</sup> The term “ecumenical” literally means “universal,” meaning that an ecumenical council is one in which the college of bishops from around the world are meeting in union with the Pope.

<sup>17</sup> Florence issued a binding decree on the subject; Trent affirmed Florence with its dogmatic definition.

<sup>18</sup> G. K. Chesterton’s *Conversion and the Catholic Church*, which is currently available in a collection of his works from Ignatius Press (1-800-651-1531), contains a humorous and rather convincing “man on the street” scenario about this topic.

<sup>19</sup> The Church is a crucial authority for Christians: Mt. 16:18-19; 1 Tim. 3:15; Jn. 14:26, 16:13; 2 Thess. 2:15, 3:6. See also *Dei Verbum*, Vatican II’s Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation, especially chapter II.

*For more information on this specific topic, CUF recommends the books marked with a “†” in “books available.” Other books listed below cover related topics.*

### **AVAILABLE FROM CUF BOOKS AND TAPES BY MAIL:**

*Catechism of the Catholic Church*; \$19.95 • CUF Member . . . \$12.00 (Paperback).

†*By What Authority?* . . . *Catholic Tradition*; Mark P. Shea; \$7.95 • CUF Member . . . \$6.95.

*The Catholic Church and the Bible*; Fr. Peter Stravinskis; \$9.95 • CUF Member . . . \$8.75.

*Jesus, Peter, & the Keys: A Scriptural Handbook on the Papacy*; Butler, Dahlgren, and Hess; \$14.95 • CUF Member . . . \$13.45.

**FAITH FACTS:** “Sola Scriptura? Not According to the Bible”; “Rock Solid: The Salvation History of the Church”; “What’s in a Name?: Protocanon, Deuterocanon, Apocrypha”; **Free to Members.**

### **OTHER RECOMMENDED READING:**

†*Where We Got the Bible: Our Debt to the Catholic Church*; Henry Graham; Catholic Answers, San Diego, California (1-888-291-8000).

**Catholics United for the Faith  
827 North Fourth St.  
Steubenville, OH 43952  
(800) 693-2484  
\*Books and Tapes only: (888) 316-2640**