

“Babylon Rising” and Canon in Crisis

Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Fresh Revelations, and an “Open” Canon

“For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; **And they shall turn away *their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables.***” Paul, 2 Timothy 4:4, Emphasis Added.

Lewis Sperry Chafer (1871-1952), the first president of Dallas Theological Seminary, once reportedly said that all heresy is either *the Bible plus*, or *the Bible minus*. The work of radical higher criticism, as it has affected, even determined, the liberal view of the Christian faith since the late 1800s, has seen to it that there’s a lot of *Bible-minus* ideology amongst professing Christians now-a-days, even among so-called evangelicals. Now however, voices are emerging which advocate a *Bible-plus* view of Holy Scripture. One such voice has stated:

While I do believe that the Holy Bible is Divinely inspired and written by men, *I do not necessarily hold to the idea that only the 66 books we now have in our (Protestant) bibles are the sole Divinely inspired books of antiquity.* [1] (BR, Chapter 1, 1, Emphasis added) [2]

Why does Rob Skiba, the author who wrote this statement above, not limit inspiration of ancient books to *only* to the sixty-six of the Protestant canon? It appears that he and others like Tom Horn, Joseph Lumpkin, and Chuck Missler, need other books of antiquity and mythologies to integrate paranormal activity with the end-times scenario that they are seeking to create, a scenario Skiba calls, “The Genesis Six Experiment.” (BR, Chapter 2, 1-2)

In Skiba’s thinking, “The Genesis Six Experiment” takes off from Jesus’ statement in His prophetic sermon (The Olivet Discourse) when he said, “But as the days of Noe [Noah] were, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be” (Matthew 24:37, KJV). This statement is then linked to Genesis 6 where Moses records that “the sons of God” (angels) mated with “the daughters of men” thereby generating a race of giants called *nephilim*. (Genesis 6:1-6). As Skiba states, that’s “why God decided to destroy the world with a Great Flood.” Because the *nephilim* had corrupted the whole earth, God destroyed the whole earth. In Skiba’s view, the same thing that happened then is happening today. For reason of angel-alien-watchers cohabitating somewhere with human females, a whole new DNA-altered-trans-human-hybrid species is arising, a new *nephilim* that will corrupt, if it has not already done so, human life on this planet in such a widespread fashion that God will have to wipe out the world again as He did in the days of Noah. To bolster this premise, Skiba and others use ancient writings outside the canon of Holy Scripture.

The intent in this writing is not to deal with “The Genesis Six Experiment,” or the “seed thesis” as Skiba calls it. I have done so in another writing. [3] The purpose of this article is to deal with

the issue of other ancient books, and the attendant question, “Are such ancient writings, if only in part, divinely inspired and therefore endowed with spiritual authority on a par with the sixty-six books of the Protestant Bible?” To support the prophetic scenarios they create, Skiba and others believe they are. In their view such writings, whether in whole or in part, are inspired because they are ancient. [4]

Let it be said that Skiba is to be commended for stating upfront and forthrightly his position that besides the books in the Protestant Bible, there are other ancient and “inspired” writings out there. He hopes that readers will not consider his view of *extra-Protestant-canonical-divinely-inspired* writings to be heresy, and if they disagree, “to provide proof text for a contrary view.” (BR, Chapter 1, 2) Such proof I will offer as I defend the traditional, and I believe orthodox, understanding that the sixty-six books of the Protestant Bible, to the exclusion of other ancient apocryphal and pseudepigraphal books, possess divine inspiration and therefore the authority to be called Holy Scripture. In this defense, we shall deal with the Old (39 books) and New (27 books) Testament canon and its relation to the books of *Jashar* and *Enoch*. We turn our attention to the heresy, as Dr. Chafer put it, of *the Bible plus*. [5]

The Old Testament Canon: Only 39 Books?

The Apostle Paul states that to the Jews “were committed the oracles of God” (Romans 3:2). Any consideration of the extent of the Old Testament canon must begin with the Jews and with Jesus. This of course eliminates all non-Jewish sources from any canon. As He both quoted from and made references to it, did Jesus view the Old Testament canon as closed and consisting exclusively of the thirty-nine books of our Protestant Bible as we have them? Or as Rob Skiba states, did Jesus “clearly” think that some of the books not found in our current Bible to be “worthy of study and quotation”? (BR, Chapter 1, 2) The answer to this question must begin with the Lord Jesus, for after all He claimed that, “All authority has been given to Me in heaven and on earth” (Matthew 28:18, NASB).

The Canon of the Christ

Skiba boldly asserts that Jesus and His disciple-apostles thought other books of antiquity were “worthy of study and quotation.” If so, where can it be documented that He, or for that matter any of the other prophet-apostles, quoted from other books or recommended them as if they possessed the authority of Scripture? Where? Give us chapter and verse. If Jesus thought other books to be worthy, why did He not reference them to Himself like He did the books of the extant Jewish canon of His day? But in no place did He do so. He plainly stated on a few occasions that it was the Law, the prophets and the writings alone which bore witness to Him (Luke 24:27, 44). Of the Jewish Old Testament scriptures, Jesus said, “these are they which testify of me” (John 5:39). In other words, the traditional Jewish canon was Christocentric! Indeed as one of the ancient church fathers put it, “Ignorance of the Scriptures is ignorance of Christ.” [6] There is not one instance where Jesus quoted from ancient apocryphal and pseudepigraphal sources to testify concerning His Person. Why—because He did not consider those extra-canonical books to be inspired on a par with the Torah and therefore possess the authority of Scripture. Neither did those writings testify of Him.

Devout Jews believed that the last prophetic voice of the Old Testament was Malachi. After the decease of that prophet, there followed a four-hundred-year period of prophetic quiet which

ended when God raised-up John the Baptist as the forerunner of the Messiah, Jesus Christ. As Simmons states, John the Baptist's "public ministry ended nearly four hundred years of prophetic silence." [7] Most of the apocryphal and pseudepigraphal writings arose during this time period because the Jewish people could not stand the silence. Enter Jesus.

During His life and ministry, Jesus often quoted from the Law (His favorite book being Deuteronomy), the prophets and the writings. He told the Emmaus disciples "that all things which are written about [Him] in **the Law of Moses** and **the Prophets** and **the Psalms** [writings] must be fulfilled" (Luke 24:44). But what books constituted the Law, the prophets and the writings? In short, the same books that, though combined and arranged differently in the Hebrew canon, constitute the thirty-nine books of the Protestant Bible's Old Testament. On this point, Old Testament scholar Gleason Archer (1916-2004) informs:

[The threefold] division [law, prophets and writings] consisted of the same content as the thirty-nine books [of the Jewish Masoretic Text]. . . . Yet essentially, whether thirty-nine books [the Protestant Bible], or twenty-four [the Masoretic Text], or twenty-two [Josephus, *Contra Apionem*, I: 8], the basic divisions [and contents] of the Hebrew canon have remained the same. [8]

Not once in the Gospel record does Jesus quote from an apocryphal or pseudepigraphal writing. Though He could have, He did not. Skiba says Jesus valued those books, but ironically he never quoted from or alluded to them. [9] How then do we know He valued them? We do not. In short, Jesus recognized the extent of the Jewish canon to be that of traditional Judaism. This brings us to the books of *1 Enoch* and *Jashar*, both of which are cited in the Bible (*Enoch*, Jude 14; and *Jashar*, Joshua 10:12, 2 Samuel 1:18, and possibly 1 Kings 8:12).

Note: Skiba's assertion that the 1611 *King James Version* contained apocryphal books is correct. [10] As a kind of third testament, those translators inserted thirteen apocryphal books between the Old (39 books) and New (27 books) Testaments of that Protestant Bible, even though, for the most part, they were written by persons *during* the inter-testamental period, *during* the four-hundred years of silence, and *before* Jesus' incarnation and ministry. Because they existed before He lived on earth, Jesus could have quoted from the apocrypha during His ministry, but He did not; and neither did His prophet-apostles. Though Jesus quoted prolifically from the established Jewish canon (39 books) and testified to that canon's threefold division (i.e., the Law, the Prophets, and the Writings), He did not quote from one apocryphal book as a witness to His to messianic identity. Why not? Because unlike the Jewish canon of Scriptures which Jesus told the Pharisees "bear witness of Me" (John 5:39, NASB), those books bore no testimony to Him. In short, the translators of the 1611 *King James Version* erred by including 13 apocryphal books between the Old and New Testaments. It was a human decision made outside Jesus' authority and the canon He recognized. On this point, Skiba is correct in stating, "I'm not prepared to accept that the acquisition and accumulation of these texts was always necessarily inspired by God." (BR, Chapter 1, 2) Neither Jesus nor His disciple-apostles recognized those 13 apocryphal books (there were 15 in all) as "Scripture." I would also note that neither *Jashar* nor *1 Enoch* are included among the apocryphal writings in the 1611 *King James Version* of the Bible.

Apocrypha means “hidden” or “concealed.” On the whole, the writings conceal more than they reveal. [11] This fits into the cultural/spiritual milieu of that ancient era. Old Testament scholar R.K. Harrison (1920-1993) wrote that,

Hidden or esoteric teachings [like the Apocrypha or Pseudepigrapha] were not part of the Hebrew tradition, which based its spirituality on the first five books of the Hebrew canon. Insofar as mysterious doctrines came into Hebrew life, they did so from pagan sources and generally involved magical practices which were forbidden to Israel [See Deuteronomy 18:9-15.]. [12]

So Dr. René Pache summarized the value of ancient apocryphal texts:

Except for certain interesting historical information (especially in I Maccabees) and a few beautiful moral thoughts (e.g., Wisdom of Solomon), these books contain absurd legends and platitudes, and historical, geographical and chronological errors, as well as manifestly heretical doctrines; they even recommend immoral acts (Judith 9:10, 13. [13]

In light of these evaluations, are we really ready to assign “divine” origin (i.e., inspiration) to such writings? No wonder Jesus quoted only from the established Jewish canon extant in His life. We turn now to the biblical mention of *I Enoch* and *Jashar*.

***I Enoch* (Circa 200 B.C. to A.D. 100)**

Skiba tells readers of *Babylon Rising* that the Jews seemed to consider the pseudepigraphal book of *I Enoch* to be Scripture, and makes the grandiose claim that “Jesus, Peter, Paul and Jude all made references to it.” In fact,” he goes on to state, “there are more than a hundred statements in the New Testament alone that find precedence nowhere else but in that book.” (BR, Chapter 1, 3) Upon investigation, this statement proves to be patently false. [14]

Genesis records that after living three-hundred and sixty-five years during which he “walked with God,” that suddenly Enoch “was not; for God took him” (Genesis 5:23). Any concordance study of the Bible will find references to this historical man. In addition to the mention of him in Genesis (Genesis 4:17-18; 5:18-24), the chronicler refers to him in his genealogy (1 Chronicles 1:3). Luke too mentions him in his genealogy (Luke 3:37). The author of Hebrews refers to him as a man of faith (Hebrews 11:5). In all these references it is important to note that the mentions of Enoch are to the historical person named Enoch and NOT to the books that bear his name. This brings us to Jude’s solitary New Testament quotation from the book of *I Enoch* (Jude 14-15). Does Jude’s mention of the book endow the whole of it to have been inspired of God? No, it does not, and here’s why.

Genesis tells us that one day, after Enoch walked with God for 365 years, “he was not, for God took him” (Genesis 5:24). What happened to Enoch? Where did he go after God “took him”? After he went missing, did he leave any report of what he might have encountered? To some persons (the pseudepigraphal books had multiple authors) many centuries later, the gaps in the Genesis narrative proved too tantalizing to be left blank, so they (the pseudepigraphal authors

of the books of *Enoch*) over time composed and edited the books of *Enoch* to fill in the blank.

So as an extant Jewish writing, Jude knew of *I Enoch*. In verses 14-15 of his little letter, Jude or Judas (Matthew 13:55), the brother of James and Jesus, quoted from it. Because of the quotation, some evangelicals jump to the conclusion that the books of *Enoch* are divinely inspired and assign a spurious canonicity to them, and this to establish credibility for the fantastic apocalyptic scenarios they create. **[15]** But it should be noted that Jude's quotation of *I Enoch* no more endows the book to be divinely inspired than Paul's Mars Hill citation of a pagan poet/philosopher or his quotation of one "unruly and vain" talker who racially stereotyped Cretans to be "always liars, evil beasts, lazy gluttons" endowed those words to have been God-breathed (Acts 17:28; Titus 1:12; 2 Timothy 3:16). **[16]** They are quotations and that's all.

Jude (Jude 14-15) does quote *I Enoch* 1:9. **[17]** But in his citation of the pseudepigraphal book, it should be noted that Jude neither called *Enoch* "scripture" nor prefaced his quotation of it with, "it is written." Clearly, Jude did not view *I Enoch* to be Scripture, to be an inspired and sacred text on a par with Scripture, but merely cited a known and surviving prophecy, authentic to Enoch, the seventh generation from Adam, of future judgment. Such a judgment was canonically **predicted** by the prophets ("the Lord . . . will come, and all the holy ones with Him!" Zechariah 14:5, NASB. Compare Deuteronomy 33:2.), **confirmed** by Jesus ("For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works," Matthew 16:27; Compare also Matthew 25:31, Mark 8:38 and Luke 9:26.), and **affirmed** by the Apostle Paul ("the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, In flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ," 2 Thessalonians 1:7-8: Compare 1 Thessalonians 3:13).

So why did Jude cite *I Enoch* 1:9? Jude may have quoted *I Enoch* because on the one hand false teachers rejected the authority of the Jewish canon, the canon accepted by Jesus and the Apostles, while on the other hand they treasured *Enoch* and other apocryphal and pseudepigraphical books (i.e., the corpus of spurious writings, esp. writings erroneously credited to written by characters in biblical times). *The teachings of pseudo-teachers thrive on pseudo-books!* So inspired by the Holy Spirit, Jude told his readers that the false teachers who were disturbing their faith were heading for judgment, something that they, in their smug superiority complexes and self-righteousness, presumed they were going to avoid! And he did so by citing a writing which the false teachers considered sacred. *Take that, Jude tells the false teachers, and from one of the books you consider inspired and "sacred"!* **[18]**

The New Testament's quotation of *I Enoch* is exceptional, and exceptions do not make the rule (i.e., canon means rule or measurement). The canon of writings is the basis upon which Christianity is to be received and believed. They, the writings, are God's Holy Word. As to the rule of faith, any assumption that there exists inspired-extra-canonical writings is rogue regarding the Christian faith "which was *once for all delivered* to the saints" (Emphasis added, Jude 3).

Jashar (Circa 14th–10th century B.C.)

The book of *Jashar* (or variously *Jasher* or *Jashur*) is mentioned two, possibly three times in the Old Testament canon (Joshua 10:13; 2 Samuel 1:18; and perhaps alluded to in 1 Kings 8:12). About the *Book of the Upright* as it was also known (from Hebrew *yashar* meaning “upright”), one Old Testament scholar informs us that based upon the samples from *Jashar* in Joshua and 2 Samuel there’s no doubt about their authenticity, and that “the book originated in the late Amarna period [14th century B.C.]; additions were made until the time of Solomon [middle of the 10th century B.C.]” [19] The book appears to have been a collection of poems and songs which celebrated notable events in ancient Israel’s history, perhaps functioning like a modern-day Christian hymnal. *Jashar*’s contents may have been primarily transmitted in oral form by professional singers. Though well known in ancient Israel, the book has not survived. An introduction to one book staking claim to the name of *Jashar* notes:

This is one of the apocryphal [sic] *Books of Jasher*. There are several (as many as five) separate works by this title, *all composed much later than Biblical times*. This particular one is a translation of a Hebrew book printed in 1613. [20]

About the authenticity of any contemporary book of *Jashar*, another source states: “Printed books of *Jashar* are modern fabrications.” [21]

Thus, it becomes difficult to see how the example of *Jashar* validates Skiba’s thesis-proof that there exist ancient and inspired books outside the Protestant canon. Today, as cited by Joshua and David, the song book of *Jashar* does not even exist. So how can it prove the divine inspiration of other ancient texts? Just because Joshua and David cited the apocryphal book did not endow it to be worthy of canonization. If it had been, Jesus might have quoted from it. Just because a book is ancient does that mean it is inspired (breathed out) from God (2 Timothy 3:16).

A “Subjective” Canon

On what basis does Skiba establish the authority of extra-canonical writings? Subjectively, he appeals to his own ongoing revelations, what he calls God’s Word “written on our hearts,” and confirming “experience” of prayer (See Jeremiah 31:33.). [22] Because of this word-writing on our hearts, Rob Skiba postulates that, “it seems more reasonable to assert that God’s Word is not so much what’s in print, but rather what is in the hearts of His people.” Then he says: “And I might add that I also believe He still speaks to and through men and women who have His Word written on their hearts.” (BR, Chapter 1, 2) So mystically, he tells readers that the Holy Spirit has also been giving him “revelation and new insights.” (BR, Chapter 1, 1) For purpose of validating the model of ongoing revelations, he tells readers: “Pray about it and see if the Holy Spirit confirms what I am saying.” (BR, Chapter 1, 1)

This attempt to mystically authenticate the divine inspiration of other religious writings and new revelations reminds me of the time when two Mormon missionaries visited me back in the mid-1970s. Seated in my living room on the sofa, they kept trying to convince me that *The Book of Mormon* was a divinely inspired book. I, of course, argued otherwise. Finally, exasperated with me, one of the elders slammed his *Book of Mormon* on my coffee table, and forcefully said to me (having momentarily lost his cool), “Your whole problem is that you need to pray about

this book. If you do, you'll come to believe it's inspired of God." My prayers, in addition to yours, will not make any book or confirm any other revelation as having been inspired by God. I don't know about you, but I am totally averse to prefacing anybody's personal revelation and/or opinion with, "Thus saith the Lord . . ." As Paul the Apostle compares the revelatory gifts to love, he states: "if *there are gifts of prophecy*, they will be done away; if *there are tongues*, they will cease; if *there is knowledge*, it will be done away" (1 Corinthians 13:8, NASB). Only God can divinely inspire any writing, and any writing is either from God or it's not. And if it's not, no amount of prayer over it, or should I say *for* it, will inspire it. As to receiving extra-heart-felt revelations that one might want to put on a par with the canonical Scriptures, I would state again:

Claims to receive new or "fresh revelations" raises the following conundrum. If the new revelations or insights repeat Scripture, then they are *unnecessary*. If the new revelations or insights contradict the Word of God, then they are *heresy*. If they add to the Bible, then they impugn Scripture's *sufficiency*. And to this point Proverbs warns: "Add thou not unto his [God's] words, lest he [God] reprove thee, and thou be found a liar." (Proverbs 30:6, KJV)

Conclusion

Lying Spirits, Oracles and Forged Writings

If something is valuable it's worth counterfeiting. Beginning with God's gift of the Torah to Moses, the oracles given to the Jewish people were of exceptional worth. Therefore, it should come as no surprise that there should arise, both from within and without Israel, fake prophecies and spiritual writings as false prophets and teachers would desire to get in on the "oracular action." But Jeremiah told devout Israel: "Thus saith the Lord of hosts, Hearken not unto the words of the prophets that prophesy unto you: they make you vain: they speak a vision of their own heart, *and* not out of the mouth of the Lord" (Jeremiah 23:16; See Jeremiah 14:14.). And in light of the spiritual counterfeiting going on, the prophet Isaiah also directed and advised the Jews: "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, *it is* because *there is no light in them*" (Isaiah 8:20). In a similar way, Paul explained to the Thessalonians who were being disturbed by false teachers who were employing "a **spirit** [a false *pneuma*] or a **message** [a counterfeit *logos*] or a **letter** [a forged *epistole*] *as if from us*," and thereby upsetting the faith of some "that the [apocalyptic] day of the Lord has come." Then the apostle added, "Let no one in any way deceive you . . ." (2 Thessalonians 2:1-3, NASB).

No Bible Plus

In light all the deception going on, even during the apostolic age, Jude appealed to Christian believers to, "contend earnestly for *the faith* which was *once for all delivered* to the saints" (Emphasis mine, Jude 3, NASB). In the New Testament the word for faith (Greek, *pistis*) can refer to either *the dependence of trust* (believing on the Lord Jesus Christ), or *the deposit of truth* (the Christian Gospel and the doctrines which attend it). The latter is the sense of Jude's appeal (Compare Galatians 1:22-23.). Believers are to contend for the faith once deposited. **[23]** Because "the faith" was "once delivered" (Greek, *hapax*) to the saints, it will not change and cannot be altered. It's like a picture that's been taken. The faith is what it is, and should not be "doctored up" by spurious writings, no matter how ancient they might be. Twenty years ago

Peter Jones warned that new interpretations like *Babylon Rising* may become a “wave of the future.” Then he adds, if these interpretations

have their way, and they probably will . . . there will be a move to open the church's canon for the inclusion of a certain number of these . . . ‘Christian’ Gnostic documents. And then the struggle for orthodoxy will take on proportions of difficulty the church has rarely known. [24]

This struggle then will become ominous for the Christian faith for as apologist and theologian Cornelius Van Til (1895-1987) put it: “Fundamental to everything orthodox is the presupposition of the antecedent self-existence of God and his infallible revelation of himself to man in the Bible.” [25]

“For we have not followed **cunningly devised fables**, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ . . .” (Emphasis added, 2 Peter 1:16).

END NOTES

[1] Emphasis added, Rob Skiba II, *Babylon Rising: And The First Shall Be The Last*, 2011. Online at: (<http://www.seedtheseries.com/blog/PDF/BabylonRising.pdf>) 275 pages.

[2] All further references to Rob Skiba's PDF book *Babylon Rising*, shall be cited in the body of my text as follows: (**BR**, *chapter number*, page number). In all, Skiba's online book consists of fifteen chapters, with documentation and fanciful (or should we think inspired?) pictures.

[3] See Larry DeBruyn, “Demons, Daughters and DNA: The Sons of God, the Daughters of Men, and the Nephilim in Genesis 6,” June 22, 2011, *Guarding His Flock Ministries* (<http://guardinghisflock.com/2011/06/22/demons-daughters-and-dna/#more-1846>).

[4] For a resource of the multitude of ancient and so-called sacred texts, one can consult the website, *Internet Sacred Text Archive* (<http://www.sacred-texts.com/index.htm>). The Bible is mentioned, but only as “one” sacred text among hundreds of others.

[5] The word heresy means “A taking for oneself, choosing, or choice; and in this connection it has a partisan flavor, and is used for an election of magistrates, in which sides are taken for one against the other.” See J.C. Metcalfe, *There Must Be Heresies* (Dorset, England: The Overcomer Literature Trust, n.d.): 5.

[6] The quote is Jerome's (347-420 A.D.).

[7] William A. Simmons, “John the Baptist,” *Baker Theological Dictionary of the Bible*, Walter A. Elwell, Editor (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1996): 423.

[8] Gleason L. Archer, Jr., *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction* (Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1964): 60. Even the apocryphal book of *2 Esdras* (circa 100 A.D.) mentions that only 24 books (the Jewish equal of the 39 books of the Protestant Old Testament Canon) are to be made public, and advises, “let the worthy and the unworthy read them” (2 Esdras 14:45).

[9] Skiba writes: “For Jesus and the Disciples clearly thought some of the books not found in our current Bible worthy of study and quotation.” (**BR**, *Chapter 1, 2*) The question to be asked is, “Where?” Give chapter and verse. The evidence is that with the exception of Jude, who

referenced the book of *I Enoch*, neither Jesus nor any of the biblical prophet-apostles quoted from a book not found in our current Bible. Frequently and abundantly, they quoted from the Old Testament canon, and in a few instances from the words of Jesus (1 Timothy 5:18), but not from a book outside the Bible. While they could have, they did not. The burden of proof is upon those who say they did.

[10] *The Holy Bible, King James Version* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 2005, A reprint of the edition of 1611). The thirteen apocryphal books are: *1 Esdras, 2 Esdras, Tobit, Judith, Esther, Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, The Song of the Three Holy Children, Sufanna, Bel and the Dragon, 1 Maccabees, and 2 Maccabees*. Two other ancient extant writings accorded apocryphal status are *The Letter of Jeremiah* and *The Prayer of Manasseh*. In all, there are fifteen books accorded inclusion in the Apocrypha.

[11] I am aware that the “concealed” aspect of the meaning of apocrypha had to do with churches wanting the books not to be read in their public assembly.

[12] R.K. Harrison, “Old Testament and New Testament Apocrypha,” *The Origin of the Bible*, Philip Wesley Comfort, Editor (Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House Publishers, Inc., 1992): 83.

[13] René Pache, *The Inspiration and Authority of Scripture*, Translated by Helen I. Needham (Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1969): 172.

[14] From *Enoch*, there is one quotation in the New Testament and thirteen parallels, not hundreds. Admittedly, there exist in the New Testament “allusions” and “verbal parallels” to apocryphal writings outside the Jewish canon, but that is all they are. It is a delusion to transfer divine inspiration to an ancient text for reason of a biblical allusion to it. There are parallels with other ancient writings in the New Testament, but it ends at that. For a list of the allusions and parallels, see *The Greek New Testament*, Fourth Revised Edition, Barbara Aland, et al., Editors (Stuttgart, Germany: The United Bible Societies, 1993): 900-901.

[15] Evidently, to demonstrate his “seed thesis” Skiba would not be against citing “the many characters of Greek mythology and the mythologies of other cultures that all speak of demigod heroes and giants.” (**BR**, Chapter 1, 1) Since when should mythology inform theology? In fact, Paul tells Timothy not “to pay attention to **myths**,” presumably including not only those of Jewish origin, but also of Greek and Roman (Emphasis added, 1 Timothy 1:4.).

[16] Paul’s quotation reads: “One of themselves [one of the “many unruly and vain talkers and deceivers . . . of the circumcision”], even a prophet of their own [evidently claiming to be inspired of God], said, *The Cretians are always liars, evil beasts, slow bellies. This witness is true*. Wherefore rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith; Not giving heed to Jewish fables, and commandments of men, that turn from the truth” (Emphasis added, Titus 1:12-14). When Paul states, *This witness is true*, he’s not validating the contents of what was said, but only that a false prophet, likely a Jew, “really” uttered the false prophecy as witnesses confirmed to him.

[17] The exact citation from *I Enoch* reads: “Behold, he [God] will arrive with ten million of the holy ones in order to execute judgment on all. He will destroy the wicked ones and censure all flesh on account of everything that they have done, that which the sinners and the wicked ones committed against him.” See “The Book of Enoch,” *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, Volume 1, James H. Charlesworth, Editor (New York, NY: Doubleday, 1983): 13-14.

[18] On this point Jude is addressing false teachers. They are the ones to whom the repeated demonstrative pronoun “these” and variant appellations refer to in Jude 4-19.

[19] James Orr and Roland K. Harrison, “Book of Jashar,” *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, Volume Two, Geoffrey W. Bromiley, General Editor (Grand Rapids, MI: William

B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1982): 970.

[20] Emphasis added. See *The Book of Jasher* (Salt Lake City, UT: J.H. Parry & Company, 1887): 91 Chapters. Available online: (<http://www.sacred-texts.com/chr/apo/jasher/index.htm>).

[21] A. van Selms, D.D., "Book of Jashur," *The New Bible Dictionary*, J.D. Douglas, Editor (Grand Rapids, MI, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1962): 600.

[22] This aspect of the Spirit's work refers to God's moral Law, which under the former dispensation of Israel's history, was written on tablets of stone, but is now upon believers' hearts, upon those whose hearts haven been "born from above" (John 3:3, 7). For reason of being regenerated, God's moral law becomes constitutional to believers (2 Corinthians 5:17). Before it was external, now it's internal. In other words, the Word of God is written upon a believer's heart for the purpose of influencing obedience to God's moral law, and not for reception inspired oracles.

[23] See Richard J. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter: Word Biblical Commentary* (Waco: Word Books, 1983): 32-33.

[24] Peter Jones, *The Gnostic Empire Strikes Back: An Old Heresy for the New Age* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1992): 94.

[25] Cornelius Van Til, *An Introduction to Systematic Theology* (Class Syllabus, Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, 1970) 1, quoted by Clark H. Pinnock, *Tracking the Maze: Finding Our Way through Modern Theology from an Evangelical Perspective* (San Francisco: Harper & Row Publishers, 1990): 44.