



THE BIBLE: THE BOOKS THAT BELONG TO IT

Chapter 1

THE question sometimes arises, What are the books that belong to the Bible? We define the Bible as being God's inspired revelation (which excludes His uninspired revelation as contained in nature), given by Him through His specially inspired agents. Therefore our answer to this question is: Every Divinely inspired book is a book of the Bible.

In ecclesiastical language from the second century onward the term *canon* (Greek for *rule*) is used synonymously with the Bible as the *source and rule* of faith and practice given as such by God to His people. Accordingly, in various Christian authors, the sense of the question (What are the books that belong to the Bible?) is put as follows: What are the books that belong to the canon? So they speak of the canon of the Jewish church, thereby meaning the Old Testament, and of the canon of the Christian church, thereby meaning the Old and New Testaments.

What books did the Jewish church accept as having been given by God as His inspired revelation to the Jewish church, through His specially inspired agents? Or to put the question in another form, What books did God give as His inspired revelation to the Jewish church, through His specially inspired agents? As a matter of fact, God could have made an inspired revelation through His specially inspired agents, regardless of whether the Jewish or Christian church had accepted it or not (Rom. 3:3), though as a matter of fact the Jewish church accepted what He offered them as such (Rom. 3:2); so, too, the Christian church accepted what He offered to them as such, yet their accepting it as such did not make it a Divinely inspired revelation. Its being such depended on His *making it*, not on *their accepting it* as such, because He is the Revealer.

THE TESTIMONY OF JOSEPHUS

It is not disputed that in the day of Christ and the Apostles the Jews received as their Bible or canon the same (24 or 39) books—no more and no less—than are printed in all editions of the Hebrew Bible. We will offer some testimonies on this: The first of these is from the pen of Josephus, who was born 37 A.D. and died about 100 A.D. Writing against Apion, an Alexandrian grammarian and an enemy of the Jews, in Book I, chap. 8, he says:

"We have not tens of thousands of books discordant and conflicting, but only 22 [he thus counted Ruth a part of Judges and Lamentations a part of Jeremiah, while the usual practice of the Jews was to count them as separate books, thus making the total 24, which is one of the ways the Bible counts the number of the Old Testament books], containing the records of all time, which have been justly believed to be Divine. And of these five are the books of Moses [the

Pentateuch], which embrace the laws and traditions from the creation of man until his [Moses'] death. This period is a little short of 3,000 years.

"From the death of Moses to the reign of Artaxerxes, the successor of Xerxes, king of Persia, the Prophets who succeeded Moses wrote what was done in thirteen books. The remaining four books embrace hymns to God and counsels for men for the conduct of life. From Artaxerxes until our time everything has been recorded, but has not been deemed worthy of like credit with what preceded, because the exact succession of the Prophets ceased [thus Josephus shows that the Jewish church, recognizing the existence of the Apocrypha and other Jewish books, did not recognize them as a part of the canon or Bible].

"But what faith we place in our own Scriptures is evident by our conduct; for though so long a time has now passed, no one has dared either to add anything to them, or to take anything from them, or to alter anything in them. But it is instinctive in all Jews at once from their birth to regard them as commands of God, and to abide by them, and, if need be, willingly to die for them." Such was their devotion!

According to this passage the Bible of the Jews was begun in the days of Moses and finished in the days of Artaxerxes I of Persia, who reigned from 474 to 425 B.C. He was Esther's husband (Esth. 2:16, 17), who in the seventh year of his reign sent Ezra to Jerusalem to further the worship of Jehovah there (Ezra 7:7, 11-28), and in his twentieth year sent Nehemiah there to rebuild the walls and the city of Jerusalem (Neh. 2:1-8), and again in his thirty-second year sent him there to continue his work of advancing the Jews in Jerusalem and Judea (Neh. 13:6, 7).

Josephus was a highly educated Jew of priestly lineage and the historian of his nation, who was therefore well qualified to state truly what books the Jews regarded as canonical. He wrote these words in a controversy with a learned enemy of the Jews and of their Bible; hence he took special care to be exact in his statements. He stated, in harmony with the testimonies of other Jewish authorities before and after him, that the spirit of prophecy—inspiration—ceased with Malachi, whose book was written between 443 and 425 B.C., *i.e.*, toward the end of Artaxerxes' reign and after Nehemiah's second trip to Jerusalem from Persia.

THE TESTIMONY OF SOME OTHERS

The Old Testament was expressly said to have been studied in *its threefold division* by Jesus, the son of Sirach, the author of the Apocryphal book of Ecclesiasticus, who lived about 200 B.C. In the times of Judas Maccabees, about 167 B.C., he and others lamented that the spirit of prophecy—inspiration—no more existed in Israel since Malachi's death. Accordingly, the substance of Josephus' statements quoted above was authoritatively accepted in Israel hundreds of years before Josephus in 93 A. D. wrote the above-quoted statement.

About 75 years later than Josephus, the Talmudic tract, Baba Bathra, written by Judah Hakkodosh, set forth a catalog of the sacred books. They are there classified as in our Hebrew Bibles (such as Leeser's)—five books of the Law, eight of the Prophets and eleven of the Kethubim (the Holy Writings), totaling 24. In this catalog the two Samuels are counted as one, as are the

two Kings, and also the two Chronicles. The twelve Minor Prophets are counted as one, as are Ezra and Nehemiah. Thus the 39 books in the King James Version Old Testament are classified as 24 in the Hebrew Bible.

From Josephus' description of his third division of four books, we infer that it consisted of Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and Canticles. Hence his second division of thirteen books must have been the following: (1) Joshua, (2) Judges (including Ruth); (3) 1, 2 Samuel; (4) 1, 2 Kings; (5) 1, 2 Chronicles; (6) Ezra and Nehemiah; (7) Esther; (8) Job; (9) Isaiah; (10) Jeremiah (including Lamentations); (11) Ezekiel; (12) Daniel; (13) the Minor Prophets. Josephus in his histories quotes from every Old Testament book except Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles (which, of course, furnish no historical data, and so were not available for his use) and Job, which lay outside the scope of his subject. While he quotes from 1 Maccabees, which treats historically of one of the periods treated by him, he does so with the distinct statement that it was not Divinely authoritative, because coming after inspiration ceased in Israel. He shows no acquaintance with the rest of the Apocrypha, though Judith and 2 Maccabees would certainly have been used by him, had he known of them and considered them trustworthy.

PHILO OF ALEXANDRIA'S TESTIMONY

From another Jewish source we can see what the Jewish Bible in the time of Jesus and the Apostles was, that is, from Philo, the learned Jewish scholar of Alexandria, of priestly descent, who was born about 20 B.C. and died about 42 A.D. He wrote a commentary on the Pentateuch. Of the Pentateuch he says:

"After a lapse of more than 2,000 years [the Jews] have not changed a single word of what had been written by [Moses], but would sooner endure to die a thousand times than consent to violate his laws and customs." While stressing the Pentateuch above the other Old Testament books, he quotes from the other two divisions of the Old Testament as of Divine authority.

Thus Philo quotes, as of the Former Prophets, from Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings, as being of "the sacred word," "the Divine oracle." As of the Later Prophets he quotes from Isaiah and Jeremiah, as of "the greater prophets," and from Hosea and Zechariah, as of "the lesser prophets," ascribing Divine inspiration to all of them. As of the third division of the Hebrew Bible he quotes from its historical books, Chronicles and Ezra, and from its poetical books, Psalms, Proverbs and Job.

Philo never quotes from the Apocrypha, though he undoubtedly was acquainted with them. In speaking of the Therapeutae, an order of Jewish ascetics, he alludes to the threefold division of the Hebrew Bible in the words, "In each house of these ascetics there is a temple ... in which they perform the rites of a holy life, introducing nothing ... which is needed for ... the body, but *laws* [of Moses] and *oracles* delivered by *prophets*, and *hymns* [Psalms, the first book of the third division of the Hebrew Bible] ... by which knowledge and piety are mutually increased and perfected."

TESTIMONY FROM THE SAMARITANS, ETC.

The parts of the Old Testament accepted and rejected by the Samaritans have a strong bearing here. The Samaritans were a people composed of parts of the ten tribes left in Palestine when the Assyrian conqueror, Sargon, according to his claim, carried away only 27,290 members of the ten tribes and of various mixed races. Their religion was a mixture of Mosaism and of heathenisms (2 Kings 17:24-41).

Claiming to be Jews, Jehovah's people, the Samaritans tried in the times of Zerubbabel to join with the Jews in rebuilding the temple; but their co-operation was refused (Ezra 4). Thereupon enmity that endures to this day set in. These Samaritans received the Pentateuch from the apostate priest sent among them to teach them "the manner of the God of the land" (2 Kings 17:27, 28). But please note that while they received the Pentateuch (a very old copy of it is now in their possession), they received no more of the Old Testament.

Why did the Samaritans not receive the Prophets and the Writings, the other two parts of the Hebrew Bible? Because both parts condemned them as non-Israelitish, despite their claims to be Israelites, some by blood, others by alleged adoption of their religion (Ezra 4:2, 9, 10; John 4:12). Of course, they would not accept the Prophets, since some of these books (2 Kings) condemned them as non-Israelitish. Nor would they accept the Holy Writings, since some of these books condemned them as non-Israelitish (2 Chron., Ezra, Nehemiah). Accordingly, the fact of their accepting the Pentateuch and rejecting the Prophets and the Writings (Kethubim) proves that these three parts of the Hebrew Bible were not only the Bible of the Jews in the time of Christ, but very much earlier.

We could also refer to some statements in the Babylonian Talmud that show the same lines of thought on the books and threefold division of the Hebrew Bible; but these were first written out about 450 A.D., though like other parts of that Talmud they were held for centuries before as parts of the oral tradition; hence we will lay no stress on them. They are found in the part of the Babylonian Gamara (commentary part of the Talmud) called Baba Bathra (another tract than that of the same name written by Judah Hakkodosh), which enumerates the books and divisions of the Hebrew Bible.

The testimonies that we have given from Jewish sources prove that the Jews of Christ's time and centuries earlier received as Divine oracles the 39 books that we now have in our English Bibles, which were classified as 24 in the Hebrew Bible. What results from this fact? This, that the 39 books of the Old Testament are a part of the Divinely inspired Scriptures, because God made the Jews the custodians of His Old Testament revelation, and therefore what they had and regarded as that revelation was the revelation of which they were the custodians, and so what the Christian church received from them as the Divine oracles was deposited by God with them as a part of the Bible of the Christian church.

These two facts—(1) *that the Jews in the time of Christ had and regarded the 39 (or 24) books of the Hebrew Scriptures as the Divinely inspired oracles committed to their care, and (2) that these Hebrew Scriptures received from the Jews by the Christian church are a part of the Divine*

oracles deposited by God with them as a part of the Bible of the Christian church—are also proved by the testimonies of Christ and the writers of the New Testament.

It is on all hands admitted that the Christian church received from the Jews the 39 (or 24) Old Testament books or oracles. Hence the following parts of the two foregoing propositions are all that we will have to prove: (1) *that the New Testament teaches that the 39 (or 24) books of the Old Testament Scriptures are the Divinely inspired oracles committed to the Jewish church's custodianship*; and (2) *that the New Testament teaches that these Old Testament Scriptures are a part of the Divinely inspired oracles of the Christian church*.

THE NEW TESTAMENT ON THE CANON

In proof of the first proposition we offer a variety of Scriptures which in various ways demonstrate it. One of the ways that this is proved is by the name *oracles* that is given to parts and to the whole of the Old Testament: "Unto them [the Jews] were committed the oracles of God" (Rom. 3:2). Acts 7:38; Heb. 5:12; 1 Pet. 4:11 are other passages that refer to the Old Testament as God's oracles.

It will be more convincing on the point now under discussion for us to divide the New Testament writings into their three natural groups and then show how each of these three groups refers to the Torah (Law), Nebiim (Prophets) and Kethubim (Writings), the three divisions of the Hebrew Bible. The first group of the New Testament writings consists of the first three (the Synoptic, *i.e.*, common view) Gospels, Acts and the Epistles of James, Peter and Jude; the second group, the Epistles of Paul; and the third group, the writings of John. With these three groups in mind we desire to show how each of these three groups quotes from, and deals with each one of the three Old Testament's divisions as parts of the oracles of God. This point is very convincing.

Apart from the name *oracles*, the plainest designation of the Old Testament as God's oracles in the New Testament is the name *Scriptures* or *Scripture*. This name as applicable to the Hebrew Bible is found in each of the three groups of New Testament writings (Matt. 22:29; Acts 17:11; 1 Cor. 15:3; John 5:39). And that to which these passages apply this name is in these passages implied to be the Divine revelation (Matt. 26:54; 1 Cor. 15:3, 4), and it is appealed to as the authoritative source and rule of faith and practice (Luke 24:27; Acts 18:28).

Not only is the Old Testament called in these three groups of New Testament writings *the Scriptures*, or *the Scripture*, but it is also called in them the Law and the Prophets, or Moses and the Prophets (the term *Prophets* here is used in its wide sense, *i.e.*, to include also the inspired writings of those men who did not belong to the order of Prophets—men like David, Daniel, Ezra, *etc.*; in other words, it includes all the books of the second and third divisions of the Old Testament; this is seen in the following passages: Matt. 7:12; Luke 16:29, 31; John 1:45; Rom. 3:21).

In harmony with the Jewish custom of calling a scroll of the entire Old Testament the Torah, the Law, the New Testament calls the entire Old Testament the Law (John 12:34); for this reason Jesus speaks of quotations that He made from the Psalms (the first book of the Old Testament's

third division) as made from the Law (John 10:34; 15:25) and Paul speaks similarly of a passage quoted from the Prophets (1 Cor. 14:21).

The threefold division of the Old Testament is clearly recognized in the words of Jesus, "All things must be fulfilled which were written in [1] the law of Moses, and in [2] the prophets, and in [3] the psalms [the first book of the third division of the Old Testament is here made to stand for that third division by metonymy]" (Luke 24:44).

Dr. B.F. Westcott, one of the ablest students of the New Testament Scriptures in the 19th century, speaking of the way the New Testament uses and refers to the Old Testament, says: "The existence of these collective titles [that the New Testament uses as names of the Old Testament], the universal assumption of their intelligibility, the absence of all trace of doubt as to their application in the districts over which the evidence extends, the unhesitating appeal to the writings described by them, the absolute equality of the different parts which are recognized in the whole collection, have an important bearing both positively and negatively upon the special testimonies to separate books. They extend the testimony from one book to a group of books; and they exclude the inference that a possible use of other books places them on the same footing with those which belong to the recognized collection. ... There is not the slightest evidence to show that the Hebrew Bible ever included any more books than are now contained in it."

N.T. NEVER QUOTES FROM APOCRYPHA

Never does the New Testament quote from the Apocrypha, which in the 16th century the Roman Catholic Church declared to be a part of the Old Testament. While the Apocryphal books were previous to the 16th century used for edification, as any good book may be used, it was not regarded as a part of the canon in the early or medieval church. The catalog of Old Testament books that Athanasius, Augustine, Jerome, *etc.*, drew up did not contain the Apocrypha. Jerome would not translate them in his Vulgate as a part of the Bible, but acceded to Pope Galasius' request to translate them as a sort of an appendix, to be used for edifying reading, but not for authoritative Scripture, even as some editions of Protestant translations so treat them. But while the New Testament never quotes from the Apocrypha, its writers, as shown above, quote from every division of the Old Testament, and, what is more, from almost every one of its books.

Our Lord Jesus quotes passages from Gen., Ex., Num., Deut., 1 Sam., Psa., Isa., Dan., Hos., Jonah and Mal., stressing them as Divinely authoritative. Additionally, in their own, not in Jesus' words, Matthew and Luke quote from Lev., Jer., Mic. and Zech. The book of Acts quotes passages from Gen., Ex., Deut., Psa., Isa., Joel, Amos and Hab. James, Peter and Jude quote from Gen., Isa. and Prov. The wide extent of these quotations, considering the smallness of the books that do the quoting, makes this remarkable indeed.

In Rom., 1 and 2 Cor. and Gal., Paul quotes from Gen., Ex., Lev., Deut., 2 Sam., 1 Kings, Job, Psa., Isa., Jer., Hos., Hab. and Mal. Hebrews quotes from the Old Testament more than the other Epistles of Paul, and thus quotes from Gen., Ex., Deut., 2 Sam., Psa., Prov., Isa., Jer. and Hag.

John's Gospel quotes from Ex., Psa., Isa. and Zech., while Revelation is very largely constructed by piecing together disjointed parts of the Old Testament into a connected whole.

Besides the *express* quotations, which are the only ones referred to above, the New Testament writings are literally saturated with the adoption of shorter expressions taken from the Old Testament. Very few verses of the New Testament do not contain some word or phrase taken from the Greek Old Testament (the Septuagint).

But apart from such shorter parts taken from the Old Testament, the *express* quotations taken from the Old Testament in the New Testament are from every one of the former's books, except Josh., Judg., Chron., Cant., Eccl., Ezra, Neh., Esth., Obad., Zeph. and Nah. These Old Testament books not quoted from in the New Testament refer exclusively to the Parousia, or to the Epiphany stages of Jesus' Second Advent, or to both, and, therefore, do not contain matters appropriate for proof texts pertinent to earlier times; and so their not being quoted in the New Testament is just what should be expected of them. If we should take into account coincidences of thought or expression, the quotations in the New Testament from the Old must be at least 700.

The following table of Dr. Westcott shows the number of express quotations in the three New Testament groups of books from the threefold division of the Old Testament, these being, of course, sentence quotations, not simply quotations of a few words or of a phrase:

	Law	Prophets	Writings
I. Synoptic Gospels	15	21	6
Acts	7	9	7
Catholic Epistles	4	1	2
II. The Epistles of St. Paul	25	28	13
Epistle to the Hebrews	11	4	11
III. John's Gospel	2	6	6

NEW TESTAMENT ON INSPIRATION OF OLD

The second proposition, i.e., that the New Testament teaches that the 39 (or 24) books of the Old Testament are God's inspired revelation, and as such are a part of the Divinely inspired oracles of the Christian church, is easy of proof. Not only does Rom. 3:2, already quoted in another connection, prove this point, but Christ and the Apostles directly teach it in many places, and presuppose it everywhere when referring to the Old Testament.

The classic passage on this subject is 2 Tim. 3:15-17. Here St. Paul tells Timothy that from childhood he had been studying the Holy Scriptures, the Old Testament (since none of the New Testament had yet been written while Timothy was a child). He then calls the whole Old Testament Divinely inspired Scripture, which as such is profitable for doctrine, reproof (refutation), correction and instruction in righteousness, sufficient to equip the Lord's servants fully for their work. Opposers of the inspiration of the Bible, particularly of its Old Testament part, find this passage an insuperable obstacle to their theories. Sophistize on it as much as they will, its testimony overwhelmingly foils their attacks. But this is not the only passage to the point.

The following lines of thought corroborate this teaching. Jesus shows that God in the bush account made a revelation to Israel, "unto you," in proof of the resurrection (Matt. 22:31, 32). Zacharias tells of God's having promised a Savior by the mouth, writings, of His Prophets from the outstart of the Jewish Age (so the Greek; Luke 1:70). St. Paul told the Roman Jews that the holy Spirit spoke by Isaiah the Prophet to the fathers (Acts 28:25). He tells us that God spoke at various times and different manners to the fathers by the Prophets (Heb. 1:1). Quoting from the Psalms he says that what he quoted was a saying of the holy Spirit (Heb. 3:7). Peter says that the Prophets searched the writings that the holy Spirit was by them testifying (1 Pet. 1:11). He assures us also that the Old Testament Scriptures came not by the will of man, but that their writers were moved, inspired, by the holy Spirit (2 Pet. 1:21). Accordingly, the various lines of reasoning given above prove that in the days of Christ and the Apostles the Hebrew Old Testament was the Divinely inspired revelation given by God to the Jewish church.

The following is involved in our second proposition: *that the New Testament teaches that the 39 (or 24) books of the Old Testament are a part of the Divinely inspired oracles of the Christian church is evident from the fact that Christ and the New Testament writers quote from the Old Testament as an authority for the faith and practice of the Christian church.* It is on account of this course of Christ and the New Testament writers that the Christian church has always accepted the 39 (or 24) books of the Old Testament as a part of its Divinely inspired oracles. Indeed, this was the church's only Bible before the New Testament was written, which is self-evident.

OLD TESTAMENT CANON'S FORMATION

The Old Testament testifies to its formation as the canon. That which, according to the Bible, gives canonicity to a book is that it was produced by a Divinely inspired man. The first part of its canon is the Pentateuch, the product of Moses, which was set aside or deposited solemnly beside the Ark of the Covenant as an evidence of its Divine origin and authority (Deut. 31:24-26); it was required to be read in its entirety to the people at least once in seven years (Deut. 31:10-13); the future king was commanded to have a copy of it made and to study it continually (Deut. 17:18, 19); Joshua (and this implied all other Judges of Israel, as *quasi*-kings, were included in the same command, *etc.*) was commanded to have a copy of it, read it, meditate on it, speak of it and practice it (Josh. 1:8). Saul forfeited his kingdom for failing to obey one of its requirements (1 Sam. 15).

David charged Solomon to obey the law of Moses (1 Kings 2:3), as David was frequently commended for keeping it (1 Kings 9:4; 11:6, 34, 38; 14:8). Israel's kings were praised or censured accordingly as they obeyed or disobeyed it. The Pentateuch, through long neglect by wicked kings' apostasies and the consequences of these on the people, was for a while lost from sight, but was found again in Josiah's days (2 Kings 22:8-20).

Joshua made an addition to the Old Testament after the Pentateuch was completed (Josh. 24:26). So did Samuel (1 Sam. 10:25). These two transactions show us how the post-Pentateuchal Old Testament books found their way into the Bible: Whenever in the Jewish Age a book was

written by a Divinely inspired man, it became by that very fact a part of the Old Testament; and in this way the Old Testament grew. There never was a council called which, as higher critics claim, canonized the Old Testament books. Rather, whenever a duly accredited Divinely inspired man produced a book, the people of Israel received it as a part of the canon, the Bible.

Thus did the canon grow, until in the days of Ezra, Nehemiah and Malachi it attained its full growth in its Old Testament part. Not only the facts so far given prove this to be the way the canon grew, but the fact that Isa. 34:16 refers to the book of Jehovah, in which prophecies previous to Isaiah's were written by Prophets proves it; and the further fact that Daniel refers to "books" in which a prophecy of Jeremiah about to be fulfilled was given (Dan. 9:2) likewise proves it. Thus the books of the Old Testament were progressively collected into one book, *as each inspired book was written.*

THE APOCRYPHA PROVEN UNCANONICAL

The Apocrypha (meaning *hidden*, or *secret*), which books the custodians of God's Old Testament oracles never acknowledged as a part of the canon, and which therefore cannot be a part of that canon, but which Rome sought to canonize, are by their own contents proven to be unworthy of a place in the canon. The test of the Apocrypha, as well as of other scriptures, is the seven negative axioms of Scriptural authority and Scriptural teaching: *a book or a teaching cannot be inspired of God if it be self-contradictory or contradictory of Scriptural passages, doctrines, God's character, the Sin-offering, facts and the purposes of the Divine Revelation.*

The Apocrypha subjected to this test and that of Biblical Numerics break down as uninspired: Tobit and Judith contain many geographical, chronological and historical mistakes; they promote superstition and deception, and make justification depend on external formal works. The Wisdom of Solomon and Ecclesiasticus, while containing some excellent things, inculcate a morality based mainly on expediency, and are at variance with the holiness of God. Their wisdom is not Solomonic, but Alexandrine. The pre-existence of souls, with their destiny fixed by conduct prior to their human birth, is taught (Wis. 8:19, 20). The material body is taught to be a weight and clog to the soul (9:15). It teaches prodigies instead of miracles (16:20, 21). It adds unbelievable details to the Egyptian plagues (16:17). The symbolic meanings attached to the high priest's dress are false (18:24, 25). Cain's murder of Abel is falsely given as the cause of the flood (10:4)! Solomon could not have been its author: for it teaches that Israel was then subject to its enemies; and it was written in Greek!

Ecclesiasticus, amid many good things, teaches the following errors: that almsdeeds atone for sin; that generosity should not be shown the wicked; that cruelty may be exercised toward slaves; that the Samaritans should be hated; that expediency is substituted for right (3:30; 12:4-7; 33:26, 28; 43:5; 50:25, 26; 38:17).

Baruch, allegedly written by the companion of Jeremiah, quotes from Daniel and Nehemiah, who wrote, the one 70, the other nearly 200 years later! Again, it is written in Greek! Baruch is said to have been taken to Babylon; the Bible says he went with Jeremiah to Egypt (Jer. 43:6). The temple is said to be existing and offerings made there; the Bible teaching is that it was

destroyed with the city in 607 B.C. The vessels of the temple are said to have been returned to Jerusalem in Jeremiah's day: the Bible teaching is that this occurred in the days of Zerubbabel and Ezra. God is said to hear the prayers of the dead; Jeremiah while dead is said to have prayed for Israel (this is one reason Rome canonized the Apocrypha). It contradicts Jeremiah by the claim that the Babylonian captivity lasted at least seven generations.

1 and 2 Maccabees contain many errors; the latter abounds in legends, fables, and gives the extraordinary prodigy of the preservation of the sacred fire; Jeremiah is said to have hid the tabernacle (then non-existent), the ark and golden altar on Mt. Nebo. It justifies suicide; it also sanctions prayers and sacrifices for the dead (hence canonized by Rome). The author does not claim inspiration, but only to have written according to ability.

The additions to Esther contradict the Biblical book of that name, and introduce confusion into its narratives. The additions to Daniel, *i.e.*, the alleged prayer of the three youths in the fiery furnace, is not a prayer but a meditation, unsuitable to the occasion, and gives some particulars inharmonious with the true narrative (vs. 23-27). The story of Susannah contains a play on words proving that it was written in Greek. The legend of Bel and the Dragon is foolish imagination.

Thus the Apocrypha violate all seven axioms of Scripture and Scriptural interpretation; hence they cannot be a part of the Bible. If they were, the Jews who were God's accredited custodians of His Old Testament revelation would have accepted and preserved them as such; for the fact that God appointed the Jews to be the custodians of His Old Testament revelation implies this, since He would not have selected unfit custodians, which they would have been, if they failed to receive and preserve all of it alone as God's revelation.

The genuine Old Testament is in its books and in their teachings in harmony with these seven axioms; therefore from their standpoint nothing can be said against their inspiration. They come to us well guaranteed and accredited. Therefore with confidence we may say of them: "This is the Finger of God." "All Scripture is Divinely inspired." Therefore we may confidently accept them as a Divinely inspired Revelation. (For much more on which books belong to the Bible, see our book *The Bible*, pp. 72-102)

Chapter 2

The main features of the first part of this treatise may be summarized in these two propositions:

(1) *The Old Testament canon, i.e., the books that became the Bible of Israel, was formed, not by a council of learned Jews (as some imagine), but through the writing of these books by inspired men as God's mouthpieces. Accordingly, as each book in turn was produced by such instruments of the holy Spirit, it was given to Israel by them and was, on the fact of its authorship's having been proven to be from such a source, accepted by the Israelites into their canon of the Scriptures.*

(2) *We of the Christian church accept as belonging to the canon of the Old Testament those books only that the Jews accepted as such, because they were the Divinely appointed custodians of the Old Testament oracles of God and because in selecting such custodians the all-wise God selected such as would preserve as His oracles those books only that were such oracles (Rom. 3:2), in order that those of the higher dispensation—the Gospel Church—might have these books as a part of their source and rule of faith and practice.*

These two propositions are, therefore, our warrant for accepting the 24 books of the Law, Prophets and Writings, or the first 39 books of the Bible, as the Old Testament Scriptures.

TWO PROPOSITIONS CONCERNING THE N.T.

Two very similar propositions have made the Church of the Gospel Age accept the 27 books written by some of the Apostles and by some of their companions who wrote under Apostolic supervision, as the canon of the New Testament.

Underlying these two propositions was the conviction of the early Church that our Lord Jesus came as the Divinely authorized Agent of a *new* and—to the Church—*final* revelation of God's Plan. Thus He revealed God (Matt. 11:27; John 3:2, 13, 34; 17:6, 14, 26; Heb 1:1, 2), declared His doctrine to be of God (John 8:26, 28; 12:49, 50; 14:10, 24; 15:15; 17:8, 26), and wrought and taught so mightily as to convince people generally that He was the great Prophet who was to come (Matt. 21:11, 46; Luke 24:19; John 3:2; 4:19; 6:14; 7:40; 9:17). This mission of Jesus Christ as the Divinely appointed and unique Mouthpiece of God is the basis of the two propositions that convince the Christian church that the 27 books that proceeded from the hands of some of the Apostles and some of their amanuenses (secretaries) constitute the canon, the books, of the New Testament.

These two propositions are: (1) *The twelve Apostles were the specially selected and Divinely authorized and inspired mouthpieces of Christ, to preserve and expound the pre- and post-Pentecostal Gospel-Age revelations of Christ for the entire Christian Church, which all of them did orally, and which certain of them—directly or indirectly, i.e., through companion agents—did in writings.* (2) *Such attested writings were accepted as Scripture by their disciples because of their Apostolic origin, and solely BECAUSE OF THEIR APOSTOLIC ORIGIN, because these disciples believed*

them to be the Divinely authorized and inspired mouthpieces of Christ. Thus these two propositions on their very face show that Jesus Christ was by all believers accepted as the Divinely authorized Agent of a *new*—and to the Church—*final* revelation of God's Plan. These propositions imply that these 27 books did not become canonical because, allegedly, the Church gave them canonicity, as Roman Catholics claim, but *because of their direct and indirect Apostolic origin*, and were accepted as canonical by the early Christians *because of such Apostolic origin*. The Church merely accepted them as canonical because of that origin. Its accepting them as canonical no more made them canonical than the Israelites' accepting the Law, the Prophets and the Writings made them canonical. In both cases their canonicity was due to *their having been written by Divinely inspired mouthpieces*.

However, just as we would not accept any book as belonging to the Old Testament canon unless Israel had that book in its canon, neither would we accept a book as belonging to the New Testament canon unless the early Church had that book in its canon. *Canonicity depends on God as the Giver of the Scriptures, not upon the people of God as custodians of the oracles of God.* But what the early custodians accepted as having canonicity should now be accepted as such—not on their, but on Christ's authority, who used the Apostles as His Divinely authorized and inspired mouthpieces as teachers and writers.

APOSTLES ONLY WERE N. T. WRITERS

How can we harmonize the thought that only the Apostolic origin of a New Testament book is the proof of its canonicity with the fact that three of its books were not written by Apostles, namely, Mark, and also Luke and Acts (by Luke)? To this question we answer:

Mark, the writer of the Gospel bearing his name, was not its independent human author. He wrote it as the amanuensis (secretary) of the Apostle Peter; and Luke, the writer of the Gospel bearing his name and the Acts of the Apostles, wrote them as the Apostle Paul's amanuensis. As implied in Acts 12:12, Mark was a disciple of Peter, and according to well-authenticated history he was a companion of Peter for years. Accordingly, he thus became equipped with the knowledge of Christ's history and teachings as preached by Peter, and wrote his Gospel at Peter's dictation.

Luke was the companion of Paul for years, even to the end of the Apostle's course (Col. 4:14; 2 Tim. 4:11; this is shown also in the "we" sections of the Acts from Acts 16:10 onward). This companionship of Luke with Paul enabled Luke to learn very familiarly from Paul the history and teachings of Christ and Peter and Paul, and at Paul's dictation wrote these out in the Gospel bearing his name and in the Acts. Thus it was really the Apostles Peter and Paul who wrote through Mark and Luke.

Accordingly, *the entire New Testament was of Apostolic authorship*; and it is this fact that moved the brethren in the early Church to accept such writings as Divinely authorized. There was no other requirement than that of Apostolic authorship put upon a writing to entitle it to a place in the New Testament canon. And without such an origin no writing was accepted by the churches as Divinely authoritative, and thus accepted into the New Testament canon.

JESUS AUTHORIZED THE TWELVE APOSTLES

Why, then, did the Church of the first century and subsequently require such an origin of a writing as an absolutely essential prerequisite for its acceptance of it as a part of the New Testament oracles? We reply: Jesus constituted the Twelve (the Apostle Paul taking Judas' place in the Apostolic band) His plenipotentiaries as mouthpieces and executives (John 20:21, 22; Matt. 18:18).

And the early Church, believing this of the Twelve, accepted their—and only their—oral and written teachings and arrangements as Divinely authoritative and inspired, and thus as binding on the Church in matters of faith and practice. They were warranted in such a belief because of their accepting Jesus Christ as God's unique and final Mouthpiece, who as such gave God's revelation to the Church through the Apostolic teachings and writings (John 14:26; 15:26, 27; 16:12-15). This is the teaching of the New Testament, as the passages just cited prove.

The Apostles were given certain powers by Christ which He gave to no others: (1) *the power authoritatively to bind on the Church what it should believe and practice, and to free (loose) the Church from any belief or practice that others sought to foist upon it, or that it under deception might have been inclined to accept* (Matt. 18:18; Gal. 1:8, 9); and (2) *the power to bestow the "gifts" of the spirit* (Gal. 3:5; Acts 8:14-25; 19:6).

Though the evangelist Philip could preach and work miracles, he lacked the power to bestow the "gifts" of the Spirit, so he sent for Apostles to do this. They were, accordingly, bestowed by Peter and John, as the record shows. In the case of the disciples of Acts 19:1-6, they did not receive the "gifts" until the Apostle Paul laid his hands on them. In a unique sense these powers made the Apostles the main part of the foundation of the Church (Eph. 2:20). In common with the Apostles, others could preach and work miracles; but the two above-mentioned powers no others than the twelve Apostles have ever had.

EARLY CHURCH A WITNESS TO CANONICITY

Our thought that no book is to be considered as belonging to the New Testament canon unless written by an Apostle directly, or indirectly through one of their amanuenses, *and accepted as such by the early Church*, does not mean that it was the Church's acceptance of such books that gave them canonicity, as the Church of Rome alleges, and therefore claims to have the power to make books canonical. This power she claims to have exercised when the Council of Trent allegedly made the Apocrypha canonical. Canonicity did not depend on the Church's accepting the Apostolic writings; rather, *the Church was obliged to accept them as canonical, because they were Apostolic writings*.

Why then do we give as a secondary proof for the Canonicity of a book the fact that it was accepted by the early Church? It is because their accepting it as such is partly a faith proof and partly a historical proof to us that they regarded such a book as Apostolical. Their accepting it as Apostolic and thus canonical is a reason why we should accept such a book as Apostolic and canonical; for the first accepters of such books had first-hand evidence of their Apostolic origin,

which we living 19 centuries later cannot have and, therefore, in part accept it on their testimony as of Apostolic origin.

We say, in part we accept it on their testimony, because we also accept such books because of their own testimony to this effect. One might say that to believe these books as canonical, because they claim to be of Apostolic origin is to accept their own witness as a proof of their canonicity, which the objector would say is assuming the thing to be proved and to take one's own witness as proof, whereas its proof should be based on others' witness.

We reply that if other humans would make such claims as the reason for accepting them as such, it would be proper to require other than their own evidence as proof. But in this case we come to the rock-bottom of proof—God by reason of His supreme wisdom, justice, love and power is the final authority on all Truth; and His utterances are of themselves absolute and final evidence of Truth. Jesus came as the fully accredited mouthpiece of God, and the Apostles came as the fully accredited mouthpieces and executives for Jesus as God's final Mouthpiece.

Therefore we see that the fundamental evidence of the canonicity of the books of the New Testament is *their Apostolic origin*; and the early Church's accepting them as such simply gives us a historical proof thereon, which is only partial and not complete. This evidence is necessary, because many writings claim to be Apostolic which are not so.

How may we differentiate? In this way: The early Church by its contact with the Apostles knew them, their teachings and their writings, and therefore historically can help us to know which writings are Apostolic and which are not. Its rejecting many writings as non-Apostolic, despite their claims to Apostolicity, is a distinct historical proof to us that such writings lacked the necessary proof of their Apostolicity and, therefore, are non-Apostolic and hence non-canonical; and its accepting the genuine Apostolic writings as such, and therefore as canonical, helps us to see which are canonical. Thus the testimony of the early Church is a supporting, not a fundamental, proof of the canonicity of the New Testament books.

There is another point that must be considered in connection with the value of the early Church's testimony on the Apostolicity of the New Testament books, namely, the providence of God operating to bring the Church into accepting as of the canon only Apostolic books; for if God undertook to give a revelation through the Apostles, certainly He would so work as to cause that revelation to be accepted as such by those for whom He was making it, *i.e.*, the church.

ROMANISTS DID NOT DETERMINE CANONICITY

This view of the early Church's relation to the canon as a witness of its Apostolic origin is quite a different thing from Rome's claim that it has the power to determine which books are canonical. *God alone, through Christ and the Apostles, had and exercised that power.* Therefore the Roman Catholic Church's challenge, "How would you know what books are canonical except by the authority of the Church?" falls to the ground. In the first place, by the early Church we do not mean the Roman Catholic Church, which for centuries was a growing, and now is a gigantic apostasy from the early Church, while the true Church consisted of the faithful in Christ Jesus.

The Roman Catholic Church took over from the early Church the New Testament books as canonical—it *did not make them canonical*. Nor did the Church ever before the 15th century by a pope nor before the 16th century by a council claim authority, or presume to exercise the alleged authority, to make books canonical. While certain councils before the 16th century declared that the books of our Bible were canonical, *e.g.*, that at Carthage in 397, they did not presume to make them so; they accepted them as such from the earlier Church; they declared them so because of their prophetic and Apostolic origin.

The first authoritative claim of the Roman Catholic Church to make books canonical, and assumption to give effect to such a claim, was that of Pope Eugenius (1441 A.D.), who promulgated the same list (like ours, with the addition of the Apocrypha) as the council of Trent (1546) allegedly authorized as canonical. This brief discussion of the subject shows a wide distinction between the Church as a qualified historical witness to us of what books were Apostolic and canonical, and the Roman Catholic Church's claim of authority to fix the canon of Holy Scripture. The whole question is one of *authorship*, and therefore is far removed from papal or conciliar authority.

When the question is recognized as one of *authorship*, we see at once that all that is needed is credible and qualified historical testimony on that of authorship. No papal or conciliar authority is needed to determine which writings are Luther's or Wesley's; all that is needed to prove them to be such is credible and qualified witnesses. So the acceptance of any writing as of Paul's authorship would depend on credible and qualified witness, which the churches and individual had to whom he wrote it, and who accepted it on credible and competent witness as to the writing as of his authorship. Thus we see fall one of the swelling words of papal blasphemy.

Before considering the historical witness of the Church to the canonicity of the New Testament books, it would be in place for us to consider, in addition to what we gave above on the Divinely given authority of the Apostles to issue canonical writings to the Church, the proofs that the New Testament offers on their having authority to issue such books. And this line of thought we will preface by other pertinent things laid down in the Scriptures.

BIBLE PASSAGES TEACH TWO-PART MAKEUP

The first of these is the fact that the Bible in both literal and symbolic passages teaches that it would consist of two parts, *i.e.*, the Old and New Testaments. Eph. 2:20 is a literal passage to this effect. Primarily by the "prophets" of this passage the Old Testament Scriptures are meant, and by the "apostles" the New Testament Scriptures are meant. These are the primary foundation of the Christian Church as God's temple, because it (the church) is built upon the Holy Scriptures in their two parts: the Old and the New Testaments, which, accordingly, are its foundation as to faith and practice.

These two parts of the Bible are the two witnesses of Rev. 11:3-12, which prophesied in the sackcloth of dead languages during the 1260 symbolic days (years) of their prophecy, from 539 to 1799. In this passage they are also called the two olive trees (see also Zech. 4:3), because of

their containing the symbolic oil, *i.e.*, the spirit of understanding of the Truth (Matt. 25:3, 4, 8; Jas. 5:14; Psa. 141:5), and also the two candlesticks, because they give out the symbolic light, the Truth (Psa. 119:105, 130; Rev. 18:23).

In the types of the tabernacle everything pertinent to the service of the antitypical Priesthood is set forth. The two parts of the Bible are among such pertinencies; and we should, therefore, expect to find its two parts somewhere typed in the tabernacle arrangement. This seems to be done by the two onyx stones attached to the ephod at the high priest's shoulders (Ex. 28:9-12), the one on the right standing for the New Testament and the one on the left for the Old Testament. The names of the twelve tribes engraved thereon seemingly type the twelve graces of Millennial Israel, which are embedded in the two Testaments. Thus we see that the fact that the Bible would consist of two parts is set forth in literal and symbolic Bible passages.

BIBLE PASSAGES SHOW 66-BOOK MAKEUP

We know of no literal passages of the Scriptures that show that the Bible consists of 66 books. But this is set forth in several ways in symbolic passages. The thought of Eph 2:20, that the Old and New Testaments ("built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets") are the foundation of the church as God's temple, is worked out in the tabernacle types as follows:

The Old Testament consists from one standpoint of 39 books and the New Testament of 27 books—66 in all. These 66 books are represented by the tabernacle's boards, bars and pillars, which total exactly 66, as follows: It had 48 boards (Ex. 26:18, 19, 22, 23), 9 sets of bars, by counting as a set each of the three rows on each of the three sides of the tabernacle (Ex. 26:26-28), and 9 pillars (Ex. 26:32, 37). These numbers total 66, the number of the Bible books.

The following will clarify how the thought of Eph. 2:20, *i.e.*, that the books of the two parts of the Bible are the foundation upon which the Church as God's temple rests. The tabernacle in a wide and in the usual sense of the word was the whole structure built of the boards, pillars, bars and their four different curtains. But in a narrow sense it was the linen curtain which represents the Church as New Creatures (Ex. 26:1, 6, 7; 36:8-14). This curtain rested directly on the boards and pillars of the structure as these were held connectedly by its bars. Thus as the Church rests upon the 66 books of the Bible as its foundation, so the linen curtain which represents the Church as such rested upon the boards, pillars and bars of the tabernacle. Surely this is a remarkable piece of symbolism, beautifully typing that there are 66 books in the Bible as the foundation on which the Church rests!

In still another way the books of the Bible are represented as being 66 in number. We recall that the shewbread (Lev. 24:5-9) consisted of 12 cakes of bread placed upon the table in two rows, six loaves to a row. Primarily these loaves represent the truths of God's Word considered as spiritual food (John 17:17; 1 Cor. 5:8; Isa. 55:2) for the twelve tribes of Spiritual Israel (Rev. 7:4-8). Secondly, they represent the Bible as the embodiment of these truths. The two rows, each of six loaves, as they stood side by side and read as numbers give us the number 66; and thus they pictured forth the thought that the Bible consists of truths contained in 66 books. Thus

does the Bible in its literal and symbolic passages show that it consists of the Old and New Testaments and that these consist of 66 books.

The Bible shows also that the Old Testament consists of 39 books and the New Testament of 27 books. It does not do this in literal passages, but it does this in symbolic passages—by the way the boards, bars and pillars of the tabernacle were arranged. Thus, among other things, the 9 pillars, 5 in the Holy and 4 in the Most Holy, and the 18 complete boards in the Most Holy, 6 on each side, represent the 27 books of the New Testament. The rest of the boards, 30 in number, and the 9 rows of bars, 39 in all, represent the books of the Old Testament. These 30 boards were arranged as follows: On the north and south sides of the tabernacle there were 28 boards minus those wholly within the Most Holy, and in the northwest and southwest corners of the Most Holy were two other boards 1/3 visible in the Most Holy.

Thus by a literal passage and by several symbolic passages God has indicated to us that the Bible would consist of two parts: the Old and New Testaments, and by several symbolic passages He has shown us that it would consist of 66 books, and that the Old Testament would contain 39 and the New Testament 27 of these. As so symbolized, the Bible consists of 66 books: 39 in the Old Testament and 27 in the New Testament. How wise is our God!

Thus, before any book of the Bible was written, God showed that the Bible would consist of 66 books—39 in the Old Testament and 27 in the New Testament. Therefore we know that only 39 books belong to the former and 27 to the latter, which overthrows the Roman Catholic canon as containing more than 39 Old Testament books. This proves also that the Bible of the Protestants contains the right number of books; and since no other than the books that we have in the New Testament were written by Apostles, it follows that the 27 books of our New Testament are canonical and that they are the only ones that belong to the New Testament canon.

"THE EPISTLE FROM LAODICEA"

The Apostle Paul tells the Colossians to read the epistle that would come to them *from (ek)* the Church of Laodicea (Col. 4:16). This evidently refers to the Epistle to the Ephesians, which was written at Rome by the Apostle Paul at the same period as that to the Colossians was written. Both of these epistles were intended by Paul to be circulated among the churches. Some, failing to note that Paul here says, "the epistle *from* Laodicea," not *of* Laodicea, have thought that a non-canonical epistle was here meant. The Apostles wrote no non-canonical epistles. The many of such ascribed to them are fraudulent.

In Col. 4:16 the Apostle Paul speaks of the circulation of two of his epistles among at least two churches, and shows the order of the circulation so far as the two are concerned as to the two named cities: one was first to be read at Colosse, then to be taken from there to be read in the church at Laodicea; the other was to be read first in the church at Laodicea and *from* there was to be brought to Colosse and there read in its church.

The fact that God tells us that there would be 27 books in the New Testament, *i.e.*, books of Apostolic origin, no more and no less, also proves that the many apocryphal books ascribed to

Apostolic authorship are fraudulent—they are the first examples of novels produced by the fertile fancies of Christian romancers, who wrote to feed the voracious appetite of miracle-hungry nominal Christians.

BIBLE PROOF THAT APOSTLES' TEACHINGS ARE N.T. ORACLES

Now we submit—additional to that given above—the Biblical proof that the oral and written teachings of the Apostles, as being those of Christ's plenipotentiaries in teaching and executive matters, are God's oracles of the New Testament. One of the strongest proofs on this point—other than those given above—is in Gal. 1:11, 12 (ASV): "I make known to you, brethren, as touching the gospel which was preached by me, that it is not after man [of human origin]. For neither did I receive it from man, nor was I taught it [by human teachers], but it came to me through revelation of Jesus Christ."

It was of this Gospel that the Apostle says in vs. 8, 9, that if anyone, even an angel, would preach another gospel than that preached by him, let him be accursed; "God ... hath in the last of the days [the Gospel Age is the last Day of the Second Dispensation] spoken unto us by his Son ... [of the] so great salvation, which had the beginning of being spoken by the Lord [Jesus] and was confirmed unto us [orally and literally] by them [the Apostles] that heard him, God bearing them witness both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Spirit, according to his own will" (Heb. 1:1, 2; 2:3, 4).

Thus the Apostle Paul claims for his teachings that they are not the word of man but the Word of God, and upon that authority binds them, whether in oral or literary form, as obligatory on Christians (1 Thes. 2:13). Therefore he charges Christians to hold fast to his oral and written teachings (2 Thes. 2:15), and binds on Christians arrangements for the Church (1 Cor. 7:17).

The Apostle John writes his epistles in the same sense, binding authoritatively the Divine arrangements and teachings on the brethren; and in the Revelation he calls on the faithful to hear his teachings as those of the Spirit spoken to the churches (Rev. 2:3) and denounces woes on Bible tamperers (Rev. 22:18, 19).

While the Apostle James makes no such claims in his epistle, he compares his sayings with those of the Prophets as substantially the same, and sets forth his views as comparing with those of the Prophets' writings, and in the same tone of authority as theirs lays charges on his readers. The entire epistle bristles with this view and spirit.

The Apostle Peter exercises a similar attitude less trenchantly put. His claim of Apostleship implies such authority (1 Pet. 1:1; 2 Pet. 1:1) and his writing for future generations of the Church implies this thought (2 Pet. 1:13-15). And he, therefore, speaks of the Apostles as having a surer word of prophecy than visions, which came by inspiration like that of the Old Testament writers (2 Pet. 1:16-21).

The Apostle Jude exercises an Apostolic function by addressing the entire Church and laying various necessary obligations upon them (Jude 1, 3, 20-23).

It is the Apostle Peter himself that refers to the Apostle Paul's epistles as of equal authority with the rest of the Scriptures (2 Pet. 3:15, 16). Here he refers not only to the Old Testament Scriptures but also to the New Testament Scriptures. And thus he puts them together as of a class by themselves and thereby implies the inspiration (God-inbreathing) of the New Testament, as Paul does that of the Old Testament (2 Tim. 3:15-17). Thus the New Testament sets forth the thought that the Apostles as Christ's plenipotentiaries have given us the New Testament, consisting of 27 books attested by God and Christ.

Just one more thought in elucidation of this proposition on the canonicity of the 27 New Testament books. To refresh our memories we will repeat this first proposition: *The twelve Apostles were the specially selected and Divinely authorized and inspired mouthpieces of Christ, to preserve and expound the pre- and post-Pentecostal Gospel-Age revelations of Christ for the entire Christian Church, which all of them did orally, and which certain of them did directly or indirectly—i.e., through companion agents—in writings.* Now for the final clarifying thought on this first proposition: *The main and controlling objection that certain ones in the fourth century entertained as to the canonicity of certain New Testament books, the so-called "disputed books," WAS THEIR DOUBTS AS TO THEIR APOSTOLICITY.*

Some doubted that the book of Hebrews came from the Apostle Paul's pen, mainly because its style is different from, and better than that of his other writings. (The Apostle Peter in 2 Pet. 3:15, when contrasted with v. 16, refers to the Epistle to the Hebrews; for 2 Pet. was written to Hebrew Christians, whom in v. 15 he refers to an epistle of Paul written to them, whereas we know of no other letter of Paul being written to them. Thus we have here an inspired proof of Paul's authorship of Hebrews.)

While Revelation was everywhere accepted at first, later when the Millennial hope was swallowed up by the hope of first converting the world and then reigning 1,000 years over it before Christ's return, *i.e.*, Pre-Millennialism was swallowed up by Post-Millennialism, some began to dispute its canonicity. Thus also there was some doubt as to James and 2 Peter, in which pre-Millennialism is taught. These books were called "disputed."

But the main and controlling basis for disputing their canonicity by some was their doubts as to their Apostolic origin. Thus we see that the principle prevailed in the early Church that only Apostolic writings could belong to the New Testament canon. It will be noted that neither James nor Jude call themselves Apostles. This we ascribe to their humility, James speaking of himself as a servant of God and our Lord (Jas. 1:1), and Jude speaking of himself as a servant of Jesus Christ and brother of James (Jude 1). But they were undoubtedly those of the Twelve who are called James the son of Alphaeus (Matt. 10:3), and Judas, not Iscariot (John 14:22), called Lebbaeus and Thaddaeus in Matt. 10:3, and Judas, the brother of James, in Luke 6:16. We now close our discussion and trust that it will be helpful to our understanding of why our 39 Old Testament books and our 27 New Testament books belong to the Bible, the canon or rule and source of faith and practice.