

“Lost Books” of the New Testament

Dub McClish

Introduction

A widely advertised book titled, *Lost Books of the Bible*, is on the market. One can even be found advertised in some of the widely distributed mail order household gadget catalogs that come to most of our mailboxes. This book of almost three hundred pages contains twenty-six documents, concerning which the expanded title of the book says:

The *Lost Books of the Bible* being all the gospels, epistles, and other pieces now extant attributed in the first four centuries to Jesus Christ, His apostles, and their companions, **not included by its compilers**, in the authorized New Testament; and Syriac MSS of Pilate's letters to Tiberius, etc. [emph. DM].¹

The current catalog from Barnes and Noble Booksellers offers this book with the following description:

Written soon after Christ's death by such men as Nicodemus and Peter, these texts were not included in the early Bible. They show more of Jesus as a child...of Mary's life before his birth. Coming now after centuries of secrecy, their appearance is a remarkable event.²

What shall we say of these claims? What about these “lost books”? Were they (and a host of similar documents) mistakenly left out of the Bible? Do these books really belong in the Bible, as the title of the aforementioned book implies? Were these (and other such documents omitted from the New Testament) actually written by such men as Paul, Peter, Nicodemus, Pontius Pilate, and even the Lord Himself? Why were these books not included in the Bible? Let us now seek the answers to these questions.

Some Definitions

Any student who wishes to inform himself concerning these alleged “lost” New Testament books will not do much research without encountering some words that are used frequently in the discussion of this subject. A few of these words need to be clearly defined, particularly, *canon*, *Apocrypha*, *Pseudepigrapha*, and *antilegomena*. Obviously, these are not “everyday” words and may therefore be strange or even foreboding to some readers.

Canon

Canon has to do with the catalog or collection of which books are generally accepted as genuinely inspired by the Holy Spirit. This word is borrowed directly from the Greek word, *kanon*, meaning a reed or measuring rod, thus a standard, rule, or norm. By derivation it came to mean that which has been measured by a standard or rule. In the case of the Bible,

Inspiration was the standard, test, or rule, and various documents (essays, books, epistles, etc.), which were deemed to “measure up” to this standard, became the “canon” of Scripture.

When we speak of the “canon of Scripture” we speak of the list of books that are accepted as authoritative and sacred. “Athanasias (c. A.D. 350) was the first person known with certainty to apply the term to sacred Scripture. Thereafter the concept became general both in the Greek and Latin churches.”³ Accordingly, a “canonical book” is one that belongs in the Bible, while a “noncanonical book” does not belong. We cannot study the subject of whether or not there are some “lost books” of the New Testament without studying matters pertaining to the sacred canon.

Apocrypha

Our English word, *apocrypha*, is simply the Anglicized or transliterated Greek word, *apokruphos*, which means “hidden” or “concealed.” When applied to literature, the word at first was used merely in reference to works that were withheld, thus hidden, from public view or circulation. These were thus purposely handled either (1) because their contents were deemed to have special value, (2) they were meant only for an “inner circle,” or (3) they were deemed understandable by only “insiders.” *Apocrypha* was, in fact, synonymous with the concept of that which was “esoteric” (private, secret).

Some of the early “church fathers” (A.D. 2nd–5th cent) used *apocrypha* to refer to the apocalyptic books of both Testaments since they contained many signs, symbols, numbers, and figures of speech, the interpretation of which, in their view, was beyond the general reader’s comprehension (thus “hidden”). It was in such a sense that Gregory of Nyssa (4th cent.) and Epiphanius (early 5th cent.) spoke of John’s Apocalypse (the book of Revelation) as “apocryphal.”⁴ Obviously, no negative connotation is attached to this usage of the word.

In this same period, however, the term was also being used in reference to the **origin** of a given document as well as to (or apart from) its contents. The books whose authors or origins were obscure came to be described as “apocryphal.” The next step in the development of this word was to consider such works as spurious and untrustworthy, as opposed to those works whose authors were known, respected, and accepted. Thus, *apocrypha* became synonymous with that which is false, unreliable, suspect, spurious, and untrustworthy—indeed, noncanonical. Origen, Irenaeus, Tertullian (all in 3rd cent.), Athanasius (4th cent.), and Jerome (5th cent.) all used the term *apocryphal* and *canonical* as antitheses.

The sixteenth century Reformers are credited with narrowing the use of *apocrypha* to refer to the fourteen extra books, which the Roman Catholic Church includes in its versions of

the Bible. These books are sandwiched between the last book of the Old Testament and the first book of the New, purportedly to fill that four-century gap of silence. Most often these books are now referred to as the “Old Testament Apocrypha” to distinguish them from the apocryphal books relating to the New Testament.

Modern dictionaries confirm that the foremost meaning attached to *apocryphal* in modern usage is “of doubtful origin and authorship,” “unauthentic,” “spurious,” and thus untrustworthy and, pertaining to the Bible, “noncanonical.”

Pseudepigrapha

Pseudepigrapha, meaning, “falsely inscribed,” represents another Greek word. This word describes those documents persons unknown wrote that, but who forged the names of well-known men, whether respected or otherwise (e.g., Paul, Peter, Barnabas, Nicodemus, Pilate, et al.), to them in an attempt to give them credibility. The essence of this word is captured in the following statement from *Schaff-Herzog*: “The work done [i.e., when the author of an apocryphal document had completed it, DM], the author took care to conceal his own name, and inscribed his book with the name of some apostle or disciple, in order to give it authority.”⁵

The relationship between the Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha should be evident. Even from the second century (as noted earlier), writers used *apocrypha* to refer to materials, which were of doubtful or hidden origin. They were of doubtful origin and authorship because they were ascribed to famous men who were not their authors—the very definition of *pseudepigrapha*. These terms have thus come to be used almost interchangeably:

The authors of these so-called apocryphal books being unknown, it was sought to gain respect for these writers by tacking onto them well-known names, so that, particularly in the western church, *apocryphal* came to be almost synonymous with *pseudepigraphal*.⁶

Sundry Details Regarding the New Testament Apocrypha

Quantity of New Testament Apocryphal Books

There was a huge proliferation of such works beginning in the second century (A.D.) and continuing through several centuries. At least fifty such apocryphal “gospels” are extant.

These exist mainly in fragments and scattered notices; though some...are either entire or nearly so.... Of many indeed no more is known than the names of the authors [or, in some cases, alleged authors, DM], such as the gospel of Basilides, of Cerinthus, of Apelles, of Matthias, of Barnabas, of Bartholomew, of Eve, of Philemon and many others.⁷

The next largest group of these books is composed of books of “acts” of various individuals. *Unger’s Bible Dictionary* says that altogether there are over one hundred apocryphal documents relating to the New Testament.⁸ Hastings calls this body of literature “voluminous.”⁹

Classification of Documents

The classification of the New Testament apocryphal books follows that of the inspired books, namely, (1) additional “gospels,” (2) additional books of “acts,” (3) additional epistles, and (4) additional apocalypses. Since, as noted, the “gospels” constitute the larger portion of the entire body of apocryphal works, accordingly, some students have further subdivided this largest class of books. *ISBE* gives two classes: (1) heretical and (2) supplemental or legendary.¹⁰ H.T. Andrews classifies the “gospels” as follows: (1) those which he alleges have some claim to be regarded as genuine and authentic (he includes only *The Gospel According to the Hebrews*), (2) heretical “gospels,” (3) *The Logia* (documents purporting to contain extra-canonical sayings of Jesus), and (4) legendary “gospels.”¹¹

Motivations and Methods of Authors

Motivations:

The purposes of these books are not usually stated forthrightly. However, these can usually be determined by their contents, even as we sometimes must do with books of the New Testament. Hastings suggested three motivations and purposes of the apocryphal “gospels”: (1) a “common Evangelic tradition,” by which he seems to refer to an honorable desire to spread the Gospel of Christ, (2) a “homiletic tendency,” which led the ancients to want to “fill in” the missing “details” of the life of the Lord, even if they had to make them up, and (3) a need to make the actual Gospel appear to support various heresies (e.g., Gnosticism and asceticism).¹²

ISBE observed:

The aim of the apocryphal gospels may be regarded as (1) heretical or (2) supplemental or legendary: that is to say, such as either were framed in support of some heresy or such as assume the canonical gospels and try to make additions—largely legendary—to them.¹³

Everett Harrison assigned similar motivations to all of the New Testament Apocrypha:

Two factors were largely responsible for the creation of these writings. One was the desire for further information about the life of Jesus and the careers of the apostles.... A second factor was the desire of those with heretical tendencies to foist their ideas on the church with the alleged endorsement of Christ or the apostles.¹⁴

Irenaeus (late 2nd cent.) wrote that the Marcosians produced “an unspeakable number of apocryphal and spurious writings, which they themselves had forged, to bewilder the minds of the foolish.”¹⁵

Schaff-Herzog, after stating that many of these works (especially the various “Acts”) were written to advance various heresies, says: “Of course, not all of these writings were

composed directly for heretical purposes. Many of them, no doubt, had more innocent motives, such as mere 'pious fraud' [an interesting epithet, DM]."¹⁶

As seen from these quotations, it is difficult to assign any innocent or pure (much less "pious") motives to the authors of these works. Those that were heretical and were written to advance and give credence to some hobby or error have a patently impure motive. Even those that were not written to advance a given heresy are no less guilty. A **private curiosity** about the family life of Joseph and Mary, the details of the Lord's childhood and early manhood, and the experiences of the other apostles besides Peter and Paul is innocent enough. However, it is far from innocent to invent one's own versions of these things, publish them as factual, and then forge the name of another to them!

Methods:

Schaff-Herzog commented as follows on the methodology of the authors of the apocryphal "gospels":

The method employed in these compositions is always the same, whether the author intended simply to collect and arrange what was floating in the general tradition or intended to produce a definite dogmatic effect. He rarely relied on his own invention; but generally elaborated what was hinted at in the canonical Gospels, transformed words of Jesus into deeds, described the fulfillment of an Old Testament prophecy in a slavishly literal manner, or represented Jesus as working marvels closely resembling but surpassing Old Testament miracles.¹⁷

Thus the flight of Joseph and Mary with the infant Jesus to Egypt provided an invitation to the fertile imagination of the writer of *The First Gospel of the Infancy of Jesus Christ* to invent all sorts of fantastic and ludicrous stories of miracles performed by the infant Lord. Though not in one of the canonical **Gospel** accounts, Peter's statement concerning Christ, "being put to death in the flesh, but made alive in the spirit; in which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison" (1 Pet. 3:18–19) gave rise to a fanciful section of *The Gospel of Nicodemus* in which Jesus is depicted as entering into Hell and doing and saying various many strange and unscriptural things.

The authors of the apocryphal acts, epistles, and apocalypses followed the same course. They took the silence of Luke's book of *Acts* concerning the labors of most of the apostles and filled in the "gaps" for the rest of them! Paul referred to an earlier epistle to the Corinthians than our *1 Corinthians* (1 Cor. 5:9), so some enterprising soul supplied one! There was a letter from Paul to Laodicea (or from Laodicea to Colossae and perhaps others) (Col. 4:16), which did not survive to the time the New Testament canon was settled. However, some forger was quite willing to furnish us with *The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Laodiceans*.

Paul could tell little about his ascension to Paradise (2 Cor. 12:1–4), but someone else wrote *The Apocalypse of Paul* and signed his name to it, purporting to supply that “unutterable” information.

A study of these materials and of those who are authorities on them make it clear that, almost without exception, the apocryphal authors used two principal methods in producing their books: (1) they forged the names of well-known and respected individuals to their spurious works and (2) they sought out some remote, incidental, or obscure statement of Scripture as a basis for their subject-matter. Both of these methods were manifestly for the purpose of lending as much credibility as possible to their works.

Why These Books Were Rejected

I have already provided hints as to why the apocryphal books were not admitted to the New Testament canon. More particularly, one may summarize these objections under three headings: (1) the standard set for accepted books by post-apostolic church leaders as early as the mid-second century, (2) the questionable, if not hidden, origin of most of the books, (3) the manifestly heretical content of most of them, and (4) the wide discrepancy in style, emphasis and soberness between them and the canonical books.

ISBE mentions two standards church leaders recognized as early as the second century for writings to be accepted as canonical (for both Old and New Testament): “(1) that no writer could be inspired who lived subsequent to the apostolic age; (2) that no writing could be recognized as canonical unless it was accepted as such by the churches in general.”¹⁸ Of course, the first of these is the principal and necessary one, since it was apostles whom the Lord promised to guide into “all the truth” through the Holy Spirit (John 16:13). It is evident that all the accepted books were written either by an apostle or by an immediate associate. However, as Benjamin Warfield emphasized, the concern of those primitive brethren was more than merely apostolic authorship:

And in every case the principle on which a book was accepted, or doubts against it laid aside, was the historical tradition of apostolicity. Let it, however, be clearly understood that it was not exactly apostolic **authorship** which in the estimation of the earliest churches, constituted a book a portion of the “canon.” ...The principle of canonicity was not apostolic authorship, but **imposition by the apostles as “law.”** ...In imposing new books on the same churches, by the same apostolical authority, they did not confine themselves to books of their own composition. It is the Gospel according to Luke, a man who was not an apostle, which Paul parallels in 1 Timothy 5:18 with Deuteronomy as equally “Scripture” with it, in the first extant quotation of a New Testament book as Scripture.... The authority of the apostles, as by divine appointment founders of the church, was embodied in whatever books they imposed on the church as law, not merely in those they themselves had written. The early churches, in

short, receive, as we receive, into their New Testament all the books historically evinced to them as given by the apostles to the churches as their code of law.¹⁹

The second test is not wholly without merit (allowing for the non-miraculous Providence of God), however. In the very nature of the case, the two tests worked in tandem: The only books which would be generally accepted among the churches would be those whose authorship was known and whose authors were either an apostle or a close associate. While certain individuals and/or congregations held some of the apocryphal books in high esteem, none of them ever received near general currency. Thus Unger noted:

The apocryphal books of the N. T....have never claimed the faith of the Christian Church, excepting in a few and isolated instances. There are over 100 of them, and it is doubtful whether one of them appeared before the 2nd century of our era. Most of them portray a much later date. They are valuable as an indication of the growth of thought and the rise of heresy in the age just subsequent to that of the apostles. None of them ever received the sanction of any ecclesiastical council.²⁰

Some of the early writers evaluated these works as follows: Both Irenaeus and Tertullian (late A.D. 2nd cent.—early 3rd cent.) referred to the apocryphal books as noncanonical.²¹ Origen (early 3rd cent.) commented as follows:

The church receives only four gospels; heretics have many, such as the gospel of the Egyptians, the gospel of Thomas, etc. These we read, that we may not seem to be ignorant to those who think they know something extraordinary, if they are acquainted with those things which are recorded in these books.²²

Ambrose made a similar statement in the fourth century:

We read these that they may not be read by others; we read them that we may not seem ignorant; we read them, not that we receive them, but that we may reject them; and may know what those things are, of which they make such a boast.²³

For the very same reasons Ambrose mentioned it is wise for saints today who are sound and mature in the faith to read the books and journals of modern heretics!

Schaff-Herzog provides the following:

They [the New Testament Apocrypha, DM] are writings which by name and contents pretend to be canonical, though the Church, because of their dubious origin and contents, has not given them a place in the canon... These writings are of very unequal value. The apocryphal Acts seem to have had the most influence in the Church; for they, more than the Gospels, were looked upon as “the source and mother of heresy.” ...But from their first appearance a suspicion of heresy clung to them all and contributed much to put the whole literature under ban.²⁴

It seems clear that the ablest, most reliable, and most stable saints who lived closest to the apostolic age (2nd–4th cent.)—and who were in the best position to know—wisely rejected these books for the right reasons.

Consider what various scholars have said about the noticeable differences in the quality of the apocryphal books when compared with the New Testament books:

Even the most superficial reader of these Gospels recognizes their inferiority to the canonical, not merely in point of literary style, but also in general soberness of view. In practically all of them are to be found illustrations of the legend-making process which early overtook the Christian Church. They abound in accounts of alleged miracles, the purpose of which is often trivial, and sometimes even malicious. With the exception of a few sayings, mostly from the Gospel according to the Hebrews, the teaching they contain is obviously a working up of that of the canonical Gospels, or clearly imagined... They are of small importance beyond heightening our estimation of the soberness and simplicity of the canonical narratives.²⁵

The most cogent proof that these books are intrinsically on a different plane from the books of the New Testament is afforded merely by reading them side by side with the books of the New Testament and allowing each to make its own impression. Then, in the words of M.R. James, "it will very quickly be seen that there is no question of anyone's having excluded them from the New Testament: they have done that for themselves."²⁶

If he [i.e., the student, DM] has misgivings about the formation of the canon, feeling that perhaps the endorsement of the books was somewhat arbitrary, it is morally certain that he will be won to a position of complete confidence in the superiority of the New Testament books on the basis of comparison.²⁷

The additions to the NT narrative found in them [i.e., the Apocryphal Acts, DM] are highly flavored with romance and reveal an extravagant and unhealthy taste for the miraculous. Wonderful tales, the product of an exuberant fancy, often devoid of delicacy of feeling and always out of touch with reality, are freely heaped one upon the other... Taken as a whole the picture given in the Apocryphal Acts of the missionary labors of the apostles is a grotesque caricature.²⁸

I will let these representative statements suffice to explain the grounds upon which the apocryphal books were and are rightly omitted from the New Testament.

Samples of Content

Perhaps nothing will show more clearly why the "lost books" of the New Testament were originally allowed to be and should still be lost as far as the New Testament canon is concerned. This being so, I invite your consideration of some excerpts from various ones of these documents for illustrative purposes.

The Gospel of the Birth of Mary: This book purports to cover Mary's birth, rearing in the temple, espousal to Joseph, and pregnancy with Jesus up to the point of His birth. The seeds of Mariolatry are evident in such repeated statements as, "The blessed and ever glorious Virgin Mary" (1:1), and "Mary the Virgin of the Lord" (5:5). The doctrine of the perpetual virginity of Mary appears in the declaration of the angel to Mary's mother: she would "never know any man" (3:4).

The Protevangelium of James: This work is also known by two other titles: *An Historical Account of the Birth of Christ, and the Perpetual Virgin Mary, his Mother, by James the Lesser, Cousin and Brother of the Lord Jesus, chief Apostle and first Bishop of the Christians in Jerusalem,* and *The History of James Concerning the Birth of the All-Holy and Ever-Virgin Mother of God and of Her Son Jesus Christ.* The titles alone give some idea of the ignorance and superstition of whoever worded them. From this book we “learn” the following:

1. Mary was fed by an angel while she grew up in the temple
2. Joseph was an old widower with children when he was chosen by God through the high priest to be betrothed to Mary
3. Mary was fourteen when she conceived
4. Upon learning of Mary’s pregnancy, the high priest brought her and Joseph to Jerusalem for the ordeal of bitter water to determine if fornication had been committed (Num. 5). However, instead of giving the water to Mary (as Num. 5 specifies), the high priest made Joseph drink it to determine whether or not he had lain with Mary

This book also describes Joseph’s experience as he allegedly left Mary to seek a midwife in Bethlehem: “But as I was going (said Joseph) I looked up into the air, and I saw the clouds astonished, and the fowls of the air stopping in the midst of their flight” (13:2). When Herod ordered the Bethlehem infants slain, Elizabeth was there with baby John. The following account is given of her rescue:

Elizabeth also, hearing that her son John was about to be searched for, took him and went up unto the mountains, and looked around for a place to hide him; and there was no secret place to be found. Then she groaned within herself, and said, O mountain of the Lord, receive the mother with the child. For Elizabeth could not climb up. And instantly the mountain was divided and received them” (16:3–7).

When Herod’s servants could not find John nor could get Zacharias to tell them where he was, they allegedly murdered him at the entrance to the temple.

The First Gospel of the Infancy of Jesus Christ: This book supposedly gives a record of Jesus’ birth and infancy, but especially his miracle-working activity while an infant during the Egyptian sojourn and on into young boyhood after the family returned to Nazareth. It claims to be from the records kept by Caiaphas, the high priest. It is strongly flavored with Mariolatry—*St. Mary* and *our Lady, St. Mary* are found dozens of times. One interesting passage involves the circumcision of Christ:

And when the time of his circumcision was come, namely, the eighth day, on which the law commanded the child to be circumcised, they circumcised him in the cave. And the old Hebrew woman took the foreskin, and preserved it in an alabaster box of old oil of spikenard... Now this is that alabaster box which Mary the sinner procured, and poured forth the ointment out of it upon the head and the feet of our Lord Jesus Christ, and wiped it off with the hairs of her head (2:1–4).

On several occasions various people were allegedly healed of their maladies by being sprinkled with the bath water of the infant Jesus. A leprosy girl was thus instantly cleansed of her leprosy, causing the following reaction: “The people therefore said Without doubt Joseph and Mary, and that boy are Gods, for they do not look like mortals” (6:17–18). Then there was the case of the young man who was bewitched by “some giddy and jealous woman,” turning him into a mule. However, when the sisters of the mule appealed to Mary she placed the infant Jesus on the mule’s back, saying, “O Jesus Christ, restore according to thy extraordinary power this mule, and grant him to have again the shape of a man and a rational creature, as he had formerly,” whereupon the mule became a man instantly. While still a mere lad Jesus allegedly stretched a board which Joseph, his carpenter father, sawed too short while building a throne for the King of Jerusalem. He struck dead a boy who bumped into Him and a schoolteacher who was preparing to whip Him.

This sampling of the content of a few of the apocryphal “gospels” is a fair representation of the inferiority, incredibility, fiction, falseness, and downright silliness of them as a whole, whether they assume the form of gospels, acts, epistles, or apocalypses.

Conclusion

I have endeavored to demonstrate why the apocryphal books were never received into the New Testament canon, thereby being recognized as genuine and authoritative Scripture. Their content, their motivation, their methodology, and even their source and time of origin all testify against them. They stand as powerful testimony to the ability and tendency of men to be innovators in religion—they seem never to be able find contentment with God’s way for mankind for very long. If saints who lived only one or two generations from the inspired apostles could so soon apostatize it should be no surprise to us (though no less a cause of grief) when saints almost 2 millennia removed from the inspired men cannot be content with the doctrine of Christ.

Although patently false, legendary, mythical, and mystical, the apocryphal books relating to the New Testament have had a profound influence on millions of people through the centuries. Certain distinctive doctrines of Roman Catholicism owe their source to this corpus of literature, including the adoration of Mary, the perpetual virginity of Mary, the bodily assumption of Mary, purgatory, and salvation by meritorious works. The mark of these works on literature, architecture, and art can be seen far into the Middle Ages. Cogent observers never cease to be amazed at the propensity of men to reject the sublime for the ridiculous, the inspired for the imagined, the revealed for the invented, the simple for the complex, the harmonious for the chaotic, and the authorized for the unauthorized in matters of the soul and spirit! The creation of

these documents is a powerful exhibit of the almost unbroken chain of rebellion against the revealed will of God, even by those who claim to serve Him.

The following observations are appropriate to conclude this study:

As a believer in the authenticity of our accepted Scriptures I have no hesitancy in saying that I am perfectly satisfied to let the common sense of the world decide upon the superiority of the accepted text. The publication of this book [i.e., *The Lost Books of the Bible*, DM] will do good because it takes away the veil of secrecy that has hidden for many years the act of the church in accepting certain Scriptures and rejecting others. All of the grounds are rendered perfectly intelligible to the common man.²⁹

The study of the documents above described fully justifies the observation of the editors of the Anti-Nicene Library that while they afford us “curious glimpses of the state of the Christian conscience, and of modes of thought in the first centuries of our era, the predominant impression which they leave on our minds is a profound sense of the immeasurable superiority, the unapproachable simplicity and majesty, of the Canonical Writings.”³⁰

Endnotes

1. *The Lost Books of the Bible* (New York, NY: Bell Pub. Co., 1979), title page.
2. *Catalog* (New York, NY: Barnes and Noble Booksellers, Inc., 1992), p. 44.
3. *Unger's Bible Dictionary*, ed. Merrill F. Unger (Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1977), p. 174.
4. *The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia*, ed. James Orr (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1955), 1:180.
5. *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, ed. Samuel Macauley Jackson (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1977), 1:226.
6. *ISBE*, 1:180.
7. *ISBE*, 1:196.
8. Unger, p. 71.
9. *Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. James Hastings (New York, NY: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1937), p. 308.
10. *ISBE*, 1:196.
11. H.T. Andrews, *An Introduction to the Apocryphal Books of the Old and New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1964), pp. 97–98.
12. Hastings, p.308.
13. *ISBE*, 1:196.
14. Everett F. Harrison, *Introduction to the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1971), pp. 121–22.
15. *ISBE*, 1:196.
16. Schaff-Herzog, 1:225.
17. *Ibid.*, pp. 225-26.
18. *ISBE*, 1:180.
19. Benjamin B. Warfield, *The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible* (Phillipsburg, NJ: The Presbyterian and Reformed Pub. Co., 1979), pp. 415–16.
20. Unger, p.71.
21. *ISBE*, 1:180.
22. Harrison, p. 122.
23. *Ibid.*
24. *Schaff-Herzog*, 1:225.
25. Hastings, p. 308.

26. Bruce M. Metzger, *An Introduction to the Apocrypha*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1957), pp. 262–63.
27. Harrison, pp. 122-23.
28. *ISBE*, 1:186–87.
29. *The Lost Books of the Bible*, pp. 15–16.
30. *ISBE*, p. 200.

[Note: I wrote this MS for and presented a digest of it orally at the First Annual Gulf Coast Lectures, hosted by the Portland Church of Christ, Portland, TX, May 23–26, 1993. It was published in the book of the lectures, *Biblical Inerrancy*, ed. Jerry Moffitt (Portland, TX: Portland Church of Christ, 1993.)

Attribution: From *TheScripturecache.com*, owned and administered by Dub McClish.