

Reformed Theology – Class 2

THE TRINITY & THE AUTHORITY OF SCRIPTURE

Why does God bother to speak to us? The truly staggering answer that the Bible gives to this question is that God's purpose in revelation is to make friends with us. It was to this end that he created us rational beings, bearing his image, able to think and hear and speak and love; he wanted there to be genuine personal affection and friendship, two-sided, between himself and us — a relation, not like that between a man and his dog, but like that of a father to his child, or a husband to his wife. Loving friendship between two persons has no ulterior motive; it is an end in itself. And this is God's end in revelation. He speaks to us simply to fulfill the purpose for which we were made; that is, to bring into being a relationship in which he is a friend to us, and we to him, he finding his joy in giving us gifts and we finding ours in giving him thanks. — J. I. Packer, *God Has Spoken*

TRINITY TRUTHS

1. Genesis 1:1-3 & 26, Luke 3:22, Matthew 28:19, Acts 5:3-4
2. Galatians 4:4
3. John 4:24, Exodus 3:20
- 4.

SUBORDINATION AND THE DIVINE DANCE (APPLICATIONS)

The gospel writer John describes the Son as living from all eternity in the “bosom of the Father” (John 1:18), an ancient metaphor for love and intimacy. Later in John’s gospel, Jesus, the Son, describes the Spirit as living to “glorify” him (John 16:14). In turn, the Son glorifies the Father (17:4) and the Father, the Son (17:5). This has been going on for all eternity (17:5b).

Glorifying one another.

“The Father...Son...and Holy Spirit glorify each other... At the center of the universe, self-giving love is the dynamic currency of the Trinitarian life of God. The persons within God exalt, commune with, and defer to one another ... When early Greek Christians spoke of perichoresis in God they meant that each divine person harbors the others at the center of his being. In constant movement of overture and acceptance each person envelops and encircles the others.” *Cornelius Plantinga*

In Christianity God is not an impersonal thing nor a static thing—not even just one person—but a dynamic pulsating activity, a life, a kind of drama, almost, if you will not think me irreverent, a kind of dance...The pattern of this three personal life is the great fountain of energy and beauty spurting

up at the very center of reality. *C.S.Lewis*

God is love.

Trinity and Salvation: Why did Jesus die for us? I have given them the glory that you gave me, that they may be one as we are one: I in them and you in me. May they be brought to complete unity to let the world know that you sent me and have loved them even as you have loved me. John 17:22-23

Trinity and Christian living. Ultimate reality is a community of persons who know and love one another. That is what the universe, God, history, and life is all about. Mark 8:35

TRINITY HERESIES

Mormonism

Jehovah's Witnesses

The Watchtower

Modern faith teachers

"Many people conclude that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are all one and the same. Actually, they are not. These people take I John 5:7 to mean one in number, when this is not what is meant at all. They evidently have not studied this in the original Greek language to get its actual meaning. The word "one" in this passage means one in unity. When Genesis says that God made man in His own image, I am convinced that it meant not only in the spiritual image, but also in the physical image. I realize many Bible scholars would chuckle at this statement, but this is the way I see it. I believe that God has a spirit body...I believe His body is in one place at one time, wherever that may be." Jimmy Swaggert, *The Agony of Deceit*

"Even many in the great body of Full Gospel people do not know that the new birth is a real incarnation, they do not know that they are as much sons and daughters of God as Jesus. They only have a hazy concept of what God has done, or what He is to them, and of what they are to God. Jesus was first divine, and then He was human. So he was in the flesh a divine-human being. I was first human, and so were you, but I was born of God, and so I became a human-divine being!" Kenneth Hagin, *The Agony of Deceit*

"Do you know what else has settled in tonight? This hue and cry and controversy that has been spawned by the devil to try to bring dissension within the body of Christ that we are gods. I am a little god. I have His name. I am one with Him. I'm in covenant relation. I am a little god. Critics be gone!" Kenneth Copeland, *The Agony of Deceit*

THE AUTHORITY OF THE BIBLE – THE CANON

God's word consists of 66 books. The Old Testament was originally grouped in three categories (Luke 24:44):

1. The Torah (the law)
 - a. Genesis-Deuteronomy
2. The Prophets
 - a. Former - Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings
 - b. Latter - Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, The Twelve
3. The Writings
 - a. Poetry - Psalms, Proverb, Job
 - b. Five Rolls - Song of Solomon, Ruth, Lamentations, Esther, Ecclesiastes
 - c. Historical Books - Daniel, Ezra-Nehemiah, Chronicles

Our organization of the O.T. books is according to the Septuagint (or LXX), the first Greek translation of the O.T. in the third century B.C. and has four categories: law, history, poets, and prophets.

The Apocryphal books, which are included in the Bible of the Roman Catholic Church, are not inspired and are not a part of God's word. These books have historical inaccuracies and theological heresies which caused them to be denied canonical recognition.

The books which were inspired were granted canonicity. The word canon means measuring rod. It is important to say that God gives a book its authority and the church merely discovers it. The church applied these basic criteria:

- Is it authoritative? Does it claim to be God's word?
- Is it prophetic? Was it written by a prophet or apostle? (Galatians 1:1)
- Is it authentic? Does it contain doctrinal or factual errors?
- Is it dynamic? Is it life-transforming? (Hebrews 4:12)
- Is it accepted by the people of God?

The O.T. canon was complete by the fourth century B.C. The N.T. canon was compiled by the second century, questioned in the third and closed as complete with the decision of the councils of Hippo and Carthage in the third century.

THE AUTHORITY OF THE BIBLE – INSPIRATION AND AUTHORITY

God has chosen to reveal himself to men in two ways. His revelation through his creation we call natural revelation and through extraordinary or supernatural means we call special revelation. The first leaves man without excuse (Romans 1:19-20) but is insufficient to lead men to salvation.

The revelation of God inscripturated by men is "inspired" or God breathed (II Peter 1:21). This

inspiration was not by dictation or the product of “inspired” men but was organic. The personalities of the authors of God’s word were not violated by supernatural intrusion, but God used their literary style, vocabulary, gifts, education, and culture to convey His word. God so influenced their minds, guided their writing and repressed the effect of their fallen nature that we can say that their words are God’s words and are without error and are our only guide for faith and life. This inspiration extends to the whole Bible and even to the very words chosen by the authors.

There is strong internal and external evidence to support the doctrine of Biblical inspiration.

External Evidence

-
-
-

Internal Evidence

-
- Matthew 5:18, Matthew 16:4, Romans 5:14, II Peter 3:15, 16
-
- Genesis 49:8, Micah 5:2, II Samuel 7:12-16, Zechariah 9:9, Isaiah 53
- READ 1 Cor. 15:1-8
-

Even the existence of this proof though will not persuade men to believe God’s word. This is only possible through the inward work of the Holy Spirit (I Corinthians 2:14).

The inspiration and authority of the Bible does not automatically extend to every copy and translation of the Bible, but by God’s care and providence His word has been accurately transmitted to us. In fact, advances in linguistics, lexicology, and archeology have given the church today a much more accurate translation than ever before. Translations like the NIV and ESV are not only more readable but more accurate than the KJV (I John 5:8).

The Bible is very clear that it represents God’s last word to man. God revealed his word through prophets and apostles and with the end of the apostolic age revelation ceased and the canon was closed (Acts 20:27; II Timothy 3:16, 17; Revelation 22:18, 19; Hebrews 1:1,2).

MODERN ATTACKS OF THE AUTHORITY OF GOD’S WORD

Modernism

Neo-orthodoxy

Charismatic Movement

Conclusion

READING ASSIGNMENT

1. Read Essential Truths of the Christian Faith (Sproul), sections 10-18
2. Read the Westminster Confession of Faith, Chapters 1 & 2

BIBLE VERSIONS

Question

I found a passage somewhat ambiguous in the New International Version. I therefore looked up the passage in the King James Version and it was not ambiguous. Is the King James Version more accurate than the New International Version?

Answer

There are several factors to consider when discussing the accuracy of translations.

First, some different translations are based on different manuscripts (old copies of Greek and Hebrew texts). Mostly, the large assortment of manuscripts we have are in agreement, but sometimes they vary from one another. When they vary, some translations follow one reading, while others follow another (there are sometimes quite a number of variations on a particular verse). Generally, the variations are stylistic rather than substantive, but sometimes they are substantive (compare for example 1 John 5:7 in the NIV and KJV). These differences may have arisen for several reasons. Some are merely copying errors; some are due to the fact that some ancient copies are rather interpretive; some are due to the fact that ancient corrections to manuscripts were often made in the margins, where notations were also made, and scribes did not always know which were corrections and which were notations (this probably explains the extra language in the KJV in 1 John 5:7). The NIV employs more manuscripts than does the KJV, and thus has more information at its disposal when determining which reading to follow. While some argue that the manuscripts used by the KJV are the most accurate, there does not seem to be sufficient historical evidence to support this assertion. Personally, I believe that on the whole the NIV relies on a better manuscript tradition than does the KJV.

Second, different translations have different theories and goals. The NIV does not translate word-for-word, but rather looks for dynamic equivalents (modern phrases that convey the same meaning as the original phrase). That is, the NIV is more interpretive than the KJV and other word-for-word translations, and less interpretive than what we call *paraphrases* (such as the Living Bible). Dynamic equivalent translations read more smoothly in English than do word-for-word translations, but are sometimes less reliable in helping you determine the Greek or Hebrew behind the translation. The KJV, however, has the added complexity that its language was rather high and poetic even at the time it was written, and now its language is rather archaic. So, even though it is a word-for-word translation, its meaning is not always clear.

Third, different translators are of different levels of skill in the original languages. The translators of the KJV, as wonderful as they were, did not possess the scholarship or knowledge about Greek and Hebrew that modern experts do -- since the KJV was translated, we have made centuries of progress and discoveries that help us better understand the original languages. In this regard the NIV tends to be more accurate and reliable than the KJV.

Fourth, translation is by nature a rather interpretive work, and one's theology and beliefs tend to influence one's translation. For example, in the Living Bible (a paraphrase), Romans 8:28ff mentions that God foreknew who would come to faith in him -- but this is clearly not what the Greek text

says. Rather, it is an interpretation that seeks to keep the reader from falling into what the translators perceive as an error, namely, the doctrine of predestination. You can compare these verses in both the NIV and the KJV to get a better idea of what the Greek really says. Another obvious example of this is that in the New World Translation (the Jehovah's Witnesses' translation), John 1:1 says that the Word was *a god,* whereas the correct interpretation of the Greek is represented in the NIV and KJV: the Word was *God.* The New World Translation translators did not believe in the doctrine of the Trinity, and thus justified in their own minds a translation which was not accurate. To some extent, this takes place anytime anyone translates any verse, so that all translation is influenced by the beliefs of the translators.

All this said, both the KJV and the NIV are, on the whole, very good and reliable translations. While I generally prefer the NIV and its translations over the KJV, there are passages in which I believe the KJV is preferable. That being said, where reliable translations differ in a substantive manner, and when this substantive difference impacts your theology or application, it is not really a good idea to defer to any one of them on the basis that one is a "better" translation. It is a much better idea to do further study that explains the meaning of the Greek or Hebrew behind the differences you are seeing. For example, when you note that the KJV is not ambiguous where the NIV is, it may be the case that the NIV has obscured the original meaning by adding ambiguity to its translation. On the other hand, it may also be the case that the original text was in fact ambiguous, and that the KJV has obscured the original ambiguity by limiting its translation to only one of the text's possible meanings. It may also be that the original meaning lies somewhere between the KJV and the NIV, or that they both miss the meaning completely. Only deeper study will help you resolve this problem. Again, there may also be a textual difference behind the difference, so that only investigation of the textual traditions followed in each case will help you decide which translation is better.

Granted, all this can make it seem rather daunting to read our English translations, and for some even to trust them. The good thing is that there is no major doctrine that is not accurately represented by all the good English translations (in which group I would include things like the NIV, NASB, KJV, NKJV, RSV, NRSV; and from which group I would exclude paraphrase versions like the Living Bible and highly slanted translations like the New World Translation). Further, the major translations only rarely disagree in any substantive manner. Where they do disagree substantively, we have a tremendous number of resources at our disposal (commentaries, lexicons, grammars, textual criticisms, etc.) with which to research the discrepancies if we so desire.

Ra McLaughlin

TEXTUS REJECTUS

Question

The original writings of the gospel are no longer with us. We just have copies. They are in Greek and Hebrew. The English translations are from these copies. The KJV is from the Received Greek Text and the NIV is from the Critical Text. Some say that the KJV is the only true Bible translation. What is your opinion?

Answer

The debate between the Received Text and the Critical Text of the New Testament is sometimes a fierce one. There are two kinds of arguments made for the Received Text, one is worth considering, and the other is simply annoying.

The annoying argument is that the Received Text is superior because God providentially preserved it. This is annoying because there is no suggestion in Scripture that God will ever do this. Even if one were to argue that the Bible taught that God would always preserve an accurate manuscript (say in Isa. 40:8), there is still no way to tell which manuscript is the one he preserved. There is no real historical evidence from which to argue that the text family from which the Received Text descends was especially chosen by God over and above all other texts. Worse, the Received Text is not actually a text -- it is a compilation made by Erasmus of Rotterdam who did the same kind of work with the documents at his disposal that the compilers of the Critical Text have done in our day, and it has gone through numerous editions. If it was providentially preserved, why did it need to be compiled? And what was wrong with the first edition? Which edition should we use now? In my opinion, this argument for the Received Text is little more than an expression of fideism to a familiar, traditional text of the western church.

The second argument for the Received Text is worthy of consideration. Some assert that the Received Text actually descends from a more reliable manuscript family. These people generally recognize the value of other manuscripts in the same family. Following principles similar to those followed by the compilers of the Critical Text, they determine that the Received Text is more reliable.

At Third Millennium Ministries, we believe that the Critical Text represents the best reconstruction of the original texts. In the tradition of the Received Text, it considers all available documents, and takes its best shot at what the original said. It does not limit itself to the reading of one particular group of manuscripts, but considers all the documents God actually has providentially preserved, that is, all those to which we now have access (including the Received Text). Further, the Received Text does not have a particularly stellar history. Erasmus of Rotterdam compiled it in the 16th century from only seven different manuscripts that he was able to find. Originally, it was even missing the last part of Revelation. Many of the manuscripts considered by the Critical Text are much older than the those used by the Received Text, and many were preserved in places where people actually kept up with their Greek (the eastern church) -- the Latin Vulgate is still the authoritative Bible of the Roman Catholic Church, not the Greek and Hebrew texts.

The argument for the KJV only is an even stranger argument than the annoying argument for the

Received Text. Those who hold this view believe not only that the Received Text is the only legitimate manuscript, but also that the 1611 Authorized translation of the Received Text is the only good English translation. Some actually even assert that the KJV translators were inspired by God (which is refuted in the preface of the 1611 KJV itself -- and the 1611 KJV contained marginal readings because the translators thought the "probability" of either reading was high). Still others (though by far a fringe minority) actually argue that the 1611 KJV is authoritative over the Received Text. A somewhat more reasonable defense of the KJV is made by those who believe that no current scholars are reliable enough to produce a better translation of the Received Text, though there is no warrant for this position (the preface to the 1611 KJV also says that later translations are often improvements on earlier ones).

In any event, essential doctrine is not at stake in this debate -- both the Critical Text and the Received Text teach the same things, even if they use somewhat different words. Substantive differences occur only on minor points. Both are good texts, both are reliable, both are orthodox. And modern translations like the NIV are done by even better scholars with better resources than those who translated the KJV.

Ra McLaughlin

Why Should I trust that the Bible is Accurate?*

Test #1 – The Bibliographical Test

The bibliographical test seeks to determine the quantity and quality of documents, as well as how far removed they are from the time of the originals. The quantity of NT manuscripts is unparalleled in ancient literature. There are over 5, 000 Greek manuscripts, about 8,000 Latin manuscripts, and another 1,000 manuscripts in other languages (Syriac, Coptic, etc.).

Author	Date Written	Earliest Copy	Time Span	# of Copies	Accuracy
Homer	c. 850 BC	---	---	643	95%
Herodotus	c. 450 BC	c. 900 AD	About 1350 yrs.	8	
Euripides	c. 440 BC	c. 1100 AD	About 1500 yrs.	9	Not
Thucydides	c. 420 BC	c. 900 AD	About 1300 yrs.	8	Enough
Plato	c. 380 BC	c. 900 AD	About 1300 yrs.	7	Copies
Aristotle	c. 350 BC	c. 1100 AD	About 1400 yrs.	5	To
Caesar	c. 60 BC	c. 900 AD	About 950 yrs.	10	Reconstruct
Catullus	c. 50 BC	c. 1500 AD	About 1600 yrs.	3	The
Livy	c. 10 BC	---	---	20	Original
Tacitus	c. 100 AD	c. 1100 AD	About 1000 yrs.	20	
New Testament	c. 60 AD	c. 130 AD	About 100 yrs.	Approx 1400	99.5%

Taken directly from Ken Boa's "I'm Glad You Asked," page 78

The age of the manuscripts is also excellent. Possibly the oldest manuscript is a scrap of papyrus (p52) containing John 18:31-33, 37-38, dating from AD 125-130, no more than 40 years after John's Gospel was likely written. A non-Christian scholar, Carsten Peter Thiede even claims that he has dated a fragment of Matthew to about 60 AD. By comparing the ancient manuscripts we find that the vast majority of variations are minor elements of spelling, grammar, and style, or accidental omissions or duplications of words or phrases. Only about 400 (less than one page of an English translation) have any significant bearing on the meaning of a passage, and most are footnoted in Modern English translations. Overall, 97-99% of the NT can be reconstructed beyond any reasonable doubt, and no Christian doctrine is founded solely or even primarily on textually disputed passages.

The Scripture quoted in the works of the early Christian writers (most 95-150 AD) are so extensive that virtually the entire New Testament can be reconstructed except for 11 verses, mostly from 2 and 3 John.

Critics of accuracy of the Bible routinely claimed that it was in fact a series of fables and legends that had developed over hundreds of years because there were not enough copies of ancient manuscripts to alleviate their skepticism. Curiously, a simple shepherd boy dealt a death blow to their criticisms in 1947. He wandered into a cave in the Middle East and discovered large pottery jars filled with leather scrolls that had been wrapped in linen cloth. Amazingly, the ancient copies of the books of the Bible were in good condition despite their age and a harsh climate because they had been well sealed for nearly 1900 years. What is now known as The Dead Sea Scrolls are made up of some 40,000 inscribed ancient fragments. From these fragments more than 500 books have been reconstructed, including some Old Testament books such as a complete copy of Isaiah.

Simply, if someone seeks to eliminate the trustworthiness of the New Testament then to be consistent they would also have to dismiss virtually the entire canon of Western literature and pull everything from Homer to Plato and Aristotle off the bookstore shelves and out of classroom discussion.

Test #2 – The Internal Test

This test of the Bible's accuracy is indeed important because each book is a witness to a body of truth and much like a legal case in our day if a witness were to contradict themselves then their testimony should not be deemed trustworthy. While there is not sufficient time in such a brief booklet to thoroughly defend the internal consistency of the Bible, I will provide a few simple examples that illustrate the amazing internal unity of the Bible.

Neither Islam, nor any other world religion or cult can present any specific prophecies concerning the coming of their prophets. However in the Bible we see hundreds of fulfilled prophecies extending hundreds, and sometimes over a thousand years into the future. Consider the few following prophecies and their fulfillment in Jesus Christ:

1. Born of a woman (Gen. 3:15 cf. Mt. 1:20; Gal. 4:4)
2. Descendant of Abraham (Gen. 22:18 cf. Mt. 1:1; Gal. 3:16)
3. Born of a virgin (Is. 7:14 cf. Mt. 1:18)
4. Born in Bethlehem (Micah 5:2 cf. Luke 2:1-7)
5. Prophesied by the forerunner John the Baptist (Is. 40; Mal. 3:1 cf. Jn. 1:19-52)
6. Rejected by his own people (Is. 53 cf. Jn 1)
7. Presented as a king riding a donkey (Zech. 9:9 cf. Lk. 19:35-37)
8. Betrayed by a friend (Ps. 41:9 cf. Mt. 26:50)
9. Betrayed for 30 pieces of silver (Zech. 11:12 cf. 26:15)

10. Blood money thrown on temple floor & used to buy a potters field (Zech. 11:13 cf. Mt. 27:5-7)
Note: The temple was destroyed in 70 AD so the Messiah must have come prior to then.
11. Crucified (Ps. 22:165 cf. Lk. 23:33)
Note: Crucifixion didn't exist until hundreds of years after the Psalms were written
12. Crucified with thieves (Isa. 53:12 cf. Mt. 27:38)
13. Forsaken by God (Ps. 22:1 cf. Mt. 27:46)
14. Lots cast for His clothing (Ps. 22:18 cf. Jn. 19:23)
15. Buried in a rich man's tomb (Isa. 53:9 cf. Mt. 27:57)
16. Resurrected & exalted (Ps. 16:10, Isa 52:13; 53:10-12 cf. Acts 2:25-32)
17. Ascended into heaven (Ps. 68:18 cf. Acts 1:8; Eph. 4:8)

The Bible is clearly a book of history and not just philosophy because it continually promises concrete historical events that in time come to pass exactly as promised. These promises show the divine inspiration of the Bible and their fulfillment proves that there is a God who rules over human history and brings events to pass just as He ordains them. Because of these facts, we can trust the internal consistency of the Bible to be a chorus of faithful witnesses who sing together in harmony.

Test #3 – The Historical Test

The historicity of Jesus and events surrounding the time of his life has been well established by early Roman, Greek, and Jewish sources. Such ancient historians include Favius Josephus, Mara BarSerapion, Cornelius Tactius, Suetonius, Pliny the Younger, Lucian, and the Jewish Talmud. Simply, when the New Testament mentions such historical facts as rulers, nations, people groups, political events, and the existence of Jesus non-Christian historical sources confirm the accuracy of the New Testament accounts.

A summarized Historical Timeline of Scripture

Old Testament (1800-400 BC)	Inter-Testamental Period (400 silent years)	Life of Jesus (About 0-33 AD)	New Testament (45-95 AD)	Pseuda-pigrapha
Prophets spoke "Thus says the Lord" Same prophets wrote their book (i.e. Jer. 36; Josh 24:26 Is. 30:8; Ez 43:11; Hab 2:2; Dan 7:1-2; II Ch. 21:12) Some prophets had a scribe (i.e. Ex 17:14; 34:28) Books were treated as sacred -Placed in ark (Dt.	No new books of Scripture are given The Old Testament canon is settled without any significant debates regarding certain books Apocryphal "hidden" books are written as history, fiction, wisdom, and apocalyptic literature that become popular books but are never considered to be	400 silent years end with John & Jesus (Mt. 3:1-7; 17:9-12; Lk. 1:8-17)	Jesus spoke of Old Testament history as existing from Abel (Genesis) to Zechariah (the time of Malachi) in Lk 11:51 and Mt. 23:35 Jesus described the Old Testament as Law, Prophets, and Psalms (Lk. 24:4) Jesus quoted the Old Testament freely for teaching	Books written by authors under pen names pretending to be eyewitnesses to Jesus write various false gospels

<p>31:24-26) -Placed in sanctuary (Josh. 24:26) -Placed before God (I Sam. 10:25)</p> <p>Books showed the power of God changing peoples' lives (2 Kings 22-23; Ex. 24:7; Neh. 8)</p> <p>Old Testament books appeal to each other for authority as God's word, i.e. . . .</p> <p>-Josh 1:8 quotes Pentateuch -Den. 9:2 quotes Jeremiah -Esk. 14:14 refers to Noah, Daniel, & Job.</p> <p>Old Testament ends with the last prophet Malachi</p> <p>-Promises that the next event will be Jesus' coming to the temple (Mal 3:1) -Promises that the next prophet will be John the Baptist (Mal 4:4-6)</p>	<p>Scripture</p> <p>Old Testament ends with the promise of John preaching & Jesus coming to the Temple (Malachi 3:1-4; 5:6)</p>		<p>Jesus and the New Testament never quote any apocryphal books and accepted the Old Testament as we have it</p> <p>Jesus promised the Holy Spirit would inspire his disciples (Jn. 14:26, 16:13)</p> <p>New Testament writers were nearly all eyewitnesses (i.e. I Jn. 1:1-3)</p> <p>New Testament books claim to be Scripture (1 Cor. 14:37; 1 Th. 2:13; 2 Th. 2:15; Col. 4:16; Rev 1:3)</p> <p>New Testament authors claimed other works of disciples were Scripture (2 Pet. 3:15-16)</p> <p>After all eyewitnesses died, some pseudepigraphal (pen name) books were written by people presenting to be apostles</p> <p>Almost all New Testament books were accepted by the 2nd century and all were finalized by the 4th century</p> <p>No apocryphal books were accepted until the Catholic Council of Trent in 1546</p>	
---	---	--	---	--

*Excerpted from *Gospel U. Curriculum*, by Scott Sauls, Riverside Church, Webster Groves, MO

English Bible Overview

all contents (c) copyright evangelicalbible.com

