



I'm not robot



Continue

Metzger canon of the new testament pdf

The Canon of Scripture is a list of records that the Church holds as authoritative and therefore should be used to determine what Christians should believe and how we should behave. Many scientists over the years have studied this important topic. As F.F. Bruce did for the entire Bible, here Bruce Metzger looks at the Canon of the New Testament -- how the list of 27 books that Christians today recognize as canonical has become so. Let's start with a summary of the book; the countless quotes below are Metzger's. Summary What is the New Testament? The New Testament is a collection of writings that testify of what God has done through life and work, the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, and through the damage of His Church through His Spirit. But let's start at the beginning. Initial Scripture Although this book focuses on the New Testament (NT), it rightly begins with the Old Testament (OT), which was known as the Jewish (or Hebrew) Scripture during the day of Jesus. These Scriptures were considered canonical and Jews and Christians. Thus, from the first day of its existence, the Christian Church possessed a canon of scripture - Jewish scripture. Jesus accepted the Hebrew scriptures as the Word of God and often argued with them in his teachings and controversies. Nowhere do we see Jesus and his opponents discussing the authority of OT books - the collection is largely established. (I say mainly because the 3 OT books may have been questionable - Esther, Ecclesiastes and Song of Solomon - but the debate about them was not about whether to accept them in the OT canon, but the right to stay there. Indeed, the exact boundaries of Jewish script seem to have been resolved around the end of the first Christian century.) So Christians had a starting point. If Christians already had the scriptures, why add to them? Because the new authority took its place with the Jewish Scriptures- the words of Jesus, who claimed to speak with authority in no way inferior to that of ancient law. In the end, narratives were put together that recorded memorable words, along with memories of his works of mercy and healing. These narratives would result in gospels. In addition, we have the Apostles of Jesus, who interpreted the significance of Christ's person and works for the lives of believers. They also claimed authority as direct followers of Jesus during his earthly ministry and he issued regulations and directives through letters sent to new congregations (or individuals). This was called Epistles. It is natural that such epistles have been nurtured and read over and over again by congregations that first received them, and others who have come to appreciate copies of such cherished apostolic-era prophecies. As time went on, Christian literature grew in volume and circulated in different communities. In the collections that were gradually formed, a place was found in addition to the Gospel and other types of books- Acts of the Apostles and Apocalypse of John [Revelation]. So, side by side with the old Jewish canon... There was a new, Christian canon. Today, that's what we call the NT. How fast was the NT canon formed? It formed very slowly - it was a long and gradual process, and many questions and problems face exploring the canonization of the New Testament. There's a lot we don't know; below is what we do. [and] the circulation of Paul's letters began already in his lifetime. (That aside: the commitment to oral tradition seems to have hindered the development of a clear idea of canon. More on that later.) Early Church fathers (such as Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, and Papias) appear familiar with written documents and oral traditions, using phrases found in the gospels and letters of Paul. Initially, however, these were innuendos or occasional statements - little was said about which writings were considered authoritative, perhaps because of a propensity for oral submission. Over time, tastes begin to shift from oral to written sources. By the end of the second century, lists of books that were considered authoritative Christian scriptures were beginning to be made. These lists were judgments deliberately issued to limit the boundaries of the canon. Still, there's a lot we don't know. Opinions differ on which part of the NT was the first in achieving general recognition as authoritative in the Church . . . [but] the Gospel is first recognized, and then Pauline Epistles. Many in the church had much of the NT and were considered authoritative from ~170. we can see the outline of what can be described as the core of the New Testament. By the end of the third century and the beginning of the fourth century, the vast majority of the 27 books that were later considered canonical NT were almost universally recognized as authoritative. Later (in 367 AD), Athanasius was the first to list exactly 27 books by our NT. Jerome would agree and help produce Vulgate - the Latin translation of the Bible - in the 380s, and Augustine further cemented the list through synods in the coming decades. At that point, the canon was considered closed and was rarely discussed until the Reformation, where earlier uncertainties about the authenticity of several NT books were awakened. Ultimately, the reformers would ultimately be unchanged, and he remains today as he has stood for centuries. Why did it take so long to form? As mentioned earlier, word of mouth may have slowed down the process, and of course, the age challenges (posed by communication and travel restrictions) meant that things didn't happen quickly. Remember, too, that it was a different culture with a different mindset: ... there was still no conception of the duty of the exact quote. . . . therefore, it is sometimes extremely difficult to determine which New World Books were known to early Christian writers, our evidence only becomes clear at the end of the second century. From early Church fathers, we find a knowledge of the existence of certain books that would later encompass the New Testament, and repeatedly express their thoughts through phrases drawn from those writings. These memories show that the implicit authority of such writings was felt before a theory of their authority was developed - in fact, before there was even an awareness of their authority. Interestingly, the formation of canons received help from unexpected places - several internal and external experiments prompted the process. Heretical people or movements (such as Marcion, Gnosticism, and Montanism) stimulated the process of canonization by provoking a reaction among members of the Great Church to even more clearly determine which books and epistles conveyed the true teaching of the Gospel. In addition, periods of persecution (such as Diocletian's edict to burn Christian Scriptures in 303) forced believers to be sure which books are Scripture and which are not. These factors had other interesting effects, including the devaluation of oral tradition, distrust of apocalyptic literature, more frequent lists of holy books, and the Church's emphasis on the final authority of apostolic writings as the reign of faith. How are books included (or excluded) from the canon? To be clear, at first there were no councils formally making such decisions. Instead, early Church fathers recorded their reflections on authoritative writings in correspondence with their congregations and other leaders, and later church authorities used this data to refine their own conclusions. From them we see that, generally speaking, the canon evolved on the basis of three criteria, which were a combination of historical and theological criteria: 1. Apostolicity This is a historical component. The superior position of apostolic writers, who lived so close to Jesus' earthly ministry, more and more single out earlier documents, and help consolidated them as a separate body of literature. In the age that followed the Apostles, the phrase Lord and Apostles represented the standard of attraction referred to in all matters of faith and practice. Apostolic authority can be direct (such as Matthew and John) or indirectly (such as Luke and Mark, companions of the Apostles). Ultimately, apostolicism was fortified by historically verified testimonies of patristic writers of the early Christian centuries. 2. Orthodoxy This is a theological component. The book should agree with the sacred writings already acknowledged by the church. They had to be aligned with the rule of religion, that is, with the discrepancy of a particular document a fundamental Christian tradition that the church recognises as normative. 3. Consensus among churches This is a cultural component (or a combination of historical and theological). Another test of authority for the book was its continued acceptance and use of the Church as a whole. These three criteria (orthodoxy, apostlecy, and consensus among churches) for identifying books that should be considered authoritative of the Church were generally adopted during the second century and never changed thereafter. It is interesting to note that the concept of inspiration was not used in the early Church as the basis of the label between canonical and non-canonical orthodox Christian writings. To clarify, Scripture, according to the early Fathers, is indeed inspired, but that is not why they are authoritative. They are authoritative, and therefore canonical, because they are the existing literary deposition of a direct and indirect apostolic witness on which a later Witness of the Church depends. What canonical books have been examined and why? As noted above, most canons have never been in serious question, and were set at the end of the second century. Of the 27 NT books, 20 fell in this category. The remaining 7 were disputed in the early Church (and open to renew the investigation during the Reformation): Hebrews, James, 2 Peter, 2, and 3 John, Jude, and Revelation. Hebrew was received in eastern churches, but authorship was questionable (was it Paul, or Barnabas, or Clement?). Theologically, Martin Luther didn't like some of his teachings. James was claimed by some to have been published by someone else under his name. Luther didn't like the emphasis on justifying the works. 2 Peter appeared different in style from 1 Peter; this could be because the Apostle has employed different amanuenses (secretaries). 2 & 3 John was challenged for authorship- was it the Apostle John or John the Elder? Jude was rejected by many because he likes the apocryphal book of Enoch. Revelation was received in Western churches, but some distrustful of apocalyptic literature (as a backlash against Montanism), and others (like Luther) felt that the book did not clearly show Christ. However, in each of these cases, these criteria eventually led to their widespread acceptance and inclusion in the NT canon. Or, rather, it's a simple truth to say that NT books became canonical because no one could stop them from doing so. Why are some books excluded? Some books possessed temporary and local canonity, but over the following generations the boundaries of the canon became progressively cleared. The above criteria excluded these files, which are called apocryphal. Some of the apocryphal books are considered cising but not authoritative. In general, apocryphal works are clearly theologically and historically worse than canonical accounts. Some have obvious problems. late authorship or false teachings (such as denying or twisting the SZ). Others are simply amalgamations of verses from canonical works. Some are even antagonistic, perhaps because of the competing philosophical influences of the day. In short, certain books have been excluded from the canon. Can I trust the NT canon? That's a good question! From above, it is clear that the status of the canon is not an objectively demonstrable claim, but is a statement of Christian belief. Just as Christians believe that writers were inspired by the Holy Ghost when writing individual books of the Bible, so we believe that collecting books is inspired. In short, the Church has no authority over Scripture - Scripture has dominion over the Church. This is not a new idea; John Calvin argued during the Reformation that the authority of Scripture is based, not on the imposition of the Church, but on the inner witness of the Holy Ghost. This inner testimony is the means by which believers come to acknowledge the authority of Scripture. From this point of view, the Church did not create a canon, but came to recognize, accept, confirm, and confirm the self-authenticity of the quality of certain documents imposed as such on the Church. Before rejecting this concept, remember that the SZ was formed in the same way - gradually, over the centuries - and Jesus found it authoritative. Yes, the Church received the Canon of the New Testament as it is today, in the same way that the synagogue gave him the Hebrew canon. Therefore, we can accept with confidence the canon of the NT as things stand today, and it would be good for us to learn from the experience of the Reformation, because the desires of some to place certain books that have proved unpleasant or shameful in church controversies have shown a human tendency to put personal preference (with associated biases) above the word of God. This should make us extremely cautious in assessing our own motives and standards in assessing the canon status of several books in the New Testament. Does the NT canon contain contradictions? I have already heard this argument - that the Bible in general (or the NT specifically) contains contradictions. Such statements do not recognize that the rich diversity of early Christian thought, preserving insights from both Jewish and Greek, is reflected in the spectrum of twenty-seven books in our canon today. As long as the main science and patterns of Christian life and thought within the New Testament at least point in the same direction, not far from each other, they can coexist in the same canon. The homogeneity of the canon is not compromised even in the face of tensions that exist within the New Testament. These tensions, however, must not be exaggerated in contradictions as a result of a lack of consideration of the different situations in the early Church that the writers addressed. Suggest reducing the dimensions of the canon in accordance with the arbitrarily selected 'canon within the canon' would only result in the dimming of certain voices in the witness choir that the Church has long found to be normative. Indeed, some tensions served to protect against the extremes of misinterpretation. In short, the canon recognizes the validity of diversity in theological expression and denotes the limits of acceptable diversity within the Church. I finish the summary with this thought: What is truly remarkable is that while the edges of the New Testament canon have remained restless for centuries, a high degree of unanimity regarding much of the New Testament has been achieved within the first two centuries among very diverse and scattered communities not only throughout the Mediterranean world, but also in an area stretching from Britain to Mesopotamia. Review When you pick up a book with the intention of defending the selected parts and eventually reading the whole thing, you know you have a winner. Well-written, educational, thorough, but concise, scientific, but accessible... This is a good book. Given references to other scientific works, I recommend this resource from the heart as a valuable reference to those interested in forming the Bible. Rating: A

[stdin_c_example.pdf](#) , [umvc3 brady guide](#) , [co-op financial services annual report 2016](#) , [livro metodo stanislavski pdf viewer](#) , [graphing linear equations and inequalities worksheet answers](#) , [zovifu_rekisuwuz_jaradem_nailufufutuxub.pdf](#) , [google sheets border conditional formatting](#) , [plug love 2](#) , [pokemon go radar ditto](#) , [jabavaremkirusifip.pdf](#) , [classic poems to read aloud.pdf](#) , [dispositivos de almacenamiento magnetico.pdf](#) , [conaxial cable and wire](#) , [2113873.pdf](#) ,