



Book Outline and Notes

Louis Berkhof's
Introduction
to the
New Testament

by M. David Johnson

Louis Berkhof's
Introduction to the New Testament
Book Outline with Notes

Copyright © 2021 by
M. David Johnson
mdj@theologyfrombelow.org

License

Having obtained a copy of this paper by whatever means, you are hereby licensed to make and distribute as many copies of this paper as you wish, free of charge, so long as:

1. You do not change this paper or its copies in any way.
 2. You do not use this paper or its copies in any way or for any purpose which would not glorify the Name of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ.
-

Table of Contents

My Introduction	3
01: Preface	4
02: Prolegomena	5
03: The Gospels in General	6
04: Matthew	10
05: Mark	12
06: Luke	14
07: John	15
08: Acts	17
09: The Epistles in General	20
10: The Epistles of Paul	21
11: The Epistle to the Romans	22
12: The First Epistle to the Corinthians	25
13: The Second Epistle to the Corinthians	26
14: The Epistle to the Galatians	28
15: The Epistle to the Ephesians	29
16: The Epistle to the Philippians	31
17: The Epistle to the Colossians	32
18: The First Epistle to the Thessalonians	33
19: The Second Epistle to the Thessalonians	34
20: The Pastoral Epistles	36
21: The First Epistle to Timothy	38
22: The Second Epistle to Timothy	39
23: The Epistle to Titus	40
24: The Epistle to Philemon	41
25: The Epistle to the Hebrews	42
26: The General Epistle of James	46
27: The First General Epistle of Peter	47
28: The Second General Epistle of Peter	48
29: The First General Epistle of John	49
30: The Second and Third General Epistles of John	50
31: The General Epistle of Jude	51
32: The Revelation of John	52
My Closing Thoughts	55
Works Cited	56
Other References	59

My Introduction

The outlining of books is a well-honored scholastic tradition, so finding a requirement to prepare an outline and notes from the main textbook for a given course should be no surprise.

But, the values of such an endeavor far exceed those of the school-setting in which the assignment is first addressed. The document produced can be a repository for the addition of future notes and comments beyond those gleaned during the initial development of the outline. Thus, the outline produced can become a valuable guide for future research and reference.

Wikipedia tell us that:

Louis Berkhof (October 13, 1873 – May 18, 1957) was a Dutch-American Reformed theologian whose works on systematic theology have been influential in seminaries and Bible colleges in the United States, Canada, Korea and with individual Christians in general throughout the 20th century....

Berkhof wrote twenty-two books during his career. His main works are his *Systematic Theology* (1932, revised 1938) which was supplemented with an *Introductory Volume to Systematic Theology* (1932, which is included in the 1996 Eerdman's edition of *Systematic Theology*) and a separate volume entitled *History of Christian Doctrines* (1937). He wrote a more concise version of his *Systematic Theology* for high school and college students entitled *Manual of Christian Doctrine*, and later wrote the even more concise *Summary of Christian Doctrine*. He also delivered Princeton Theological Seminary's Stone Lectures in 1921. These were published as *The Kingdom of God*. In addition to this, he worked on many papers for the Christian Reformed Church as well as collections of sermons. (Wiki01).

This paper constitutes an outline and notes for Berkhof's 1915 *New Testament Introduction*. This 197 page textbook is significantly briefer than his 745+ page 1938 *Systematic Theology*. It's also similarly briefer than Wayne Grudem's 1528+ page 2020 *Systematic Theology*, and Charles Hodge's massive three-volume 2220+ page 1872-1873 *Systematic Theology*.

But, as it deals specifically with Introduction, this outline and notes paper should be an especially useful place to assemble an ongoing collection of information, and of pointers to related documents and other references.

Louis Berkhof's Introduction to the New Testament
01: Preface - Outline and Notes

I. Preface

A. Built upon the work of previous scholars.

1. Davidson
2. Reuss
3. Weiss
4. Westcott
5. Lightfoot
6. Godet
7. Holtzmann
8. Julicher
9. Zahn

B. Method of treatment

1. Partially Berkhof's own individual method.
2. Partially based on Kuyper's *Encyclopedia of Sacred Theology*.

C. Intended to introduce students to the books of the New Testament.

1. The books as they were transmitted to the Church.
2. "... critical questions, though not disregarded, do not loom as large on its pages as they often do in works on Introduction" (Berk01 2).
3. Positive construction given precedence over apologetics.
4. Consideration given to both the human and the divine elements of the writing.

Interestingly, the preface in this 1915 *Introduction* is significantly more administrative and technical than the more relaxed and friendly preface in Berkhof's later 1938 *Systematic Theology*:

I have every reason to be grateful for its kind reception, for the favorable testimony of many reviewers, and for the fact that the book is now used as a textbook in many Theological Seminaries and Bible Schools in our country, and that requests were even received from abroad for permission to translate it into other languages. (Berk02 5).

I would have normally expected the opposite: that the *Systematic Theology* would have been comparatively intense, while the *Introduction* would be lighter. Perhaps Berkof has simply mellowed with age and experience by this latter date.

Louis Berkhof's Introduction to the New Testament 02: Prolegomena - Outline and Notes

II. Prolegomena

A. Name and idea

1. Introduction = Isagogics from the Greek εισαγωγή
Originally designated “a conglomeration of rhetorical archaeological, geographical and historical matter such as might be helpful in the interpretation of Scripture.” (Berk01 3).
2. Alternate naming (instead of “Introduction”):
 - a. Critical History
 - b. Special Canonics

B. Function

1. “It is now generally understood and admitted that the study must investigate the questions of the authorship, the composition, the history, the purpose and the canonicity of the different books of the Bible.” (Berk01 4).
2. Canonical books only vs. Canonical + Apocryphal books.
3. Human authorship only vs. Human + Divine Authorship.
“Thus we begin with a theological postulate, and our aim is to set forth the true character of Scripture, in order to explain, why the Church universal honors it as the Word of God; to strengthen the faith of believers; and to vindicate the claims of the canonical books over against the assaults of Rationalism.” (Berk01 4).

C. Leading principles which govern the investigation

1. The Bible is the very Word of God.
2. We accept everything the various books of the Bible tell us.
3. *Zeitgeschichtliche* (= contemporary) arguments given little weight.
4. Church fathers given significant weight.
5. Use of working hypotheses considered generally legitimate.
6. The problems of New Testament Introduction are not considered to be insignificant.

D. Encyclopaedic place = within the exegetical group of theological disciplines.

E. Historical review of past efforts at compiling introductions.

1. Early = Origen, Dionysus, Eusebius.
2. Reformation period = Paginus, Sixtus of Siene, Serarius, Walther, Rivetus, Heidegger, Richard Simon.
3. 1700s and early 1800s: Semler, Schleiermacher, Baur and the Tubingen school, Bleek, Ewald, Reuss, Ritschl, et al.
4. Late 1800s: Lightfoot, Westcott, Ellicott, Godet, Dods, Pullan, et al.

F. Select Literature.

1. Books on Introduction, Bible Dictionaries, and Related (59).
2. Commentaries (25).

Louis Berkhof's Introduction to the New Testament
03: The Gospels in General - Outline and Notes

III. The Gospels in General

A. The titles of the gospels (or "Inscriptio" as per NA28).

1. Κατά Μαθθαῖον, etc. = the shortest.
2. τὸ κατὰ Μαθθαῖον εὐαγγέλιον = TR and some others
3. εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Μαθθαῖον = most mss.

But this 1915 information is seriously outdated. From (NA28 1):

ἘΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΘΘΑΙΟΝ

Inscriptio: εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Μαθθαῖον (Μαθθαῖον W 565) D K W
Γ Δ f¹³ 33. 565. 700. 892. 1424 m bo
| αγιον εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Μαθθαῖον f¹ (bo^{ms})
| ἀρχὴ συν θεῶ του κατὰ Μαθθαῖον εὐαγγέλιου 1241
| ἐκ του κατὰ Μαθθαῖον L
| - N* B*
| txt N¹ B¹

B. Recognition of the various gospels in the early church - evidence for the currently accepted four gospels and only those four:

1. The Apostolic Fathers.
2. Peshito (100-150 A. D.)
3. Muratorian Fragment (about 170 A. D.)
4. Diatessaron of Tatian (date not certain).
5. Eusebius (about 324 A.D.)
6. Irenaeus (c. 120-200 A. D.)
7. Tertullian (Most likely not c. 150-130 - Berkhof seems to have a typo here).
Tertullian lived c. 155-220 A.D. (Wiki03)
8. Origen (sic, should be Origen)
Origen lived c. 184 – c. 253 A. D. (Wiki02).
Berkhof cites Eusebius' Church History VI, 25, indicating that Origen wrote:

I have learnt by tradition concerning the four Gospels, which alone are uncontroverted in the Church of God spread under heaven, that according to Matthew, who was once a publican but afterwards an apostle of Jesus Christ, was written first; . . . that according to Mark second; . . . that according to Luke third; . . . that according to John last of all. (Berk01 14).

My copy of Eusebius presents similar but slightly different wording:

As I have understood from tradition, respecting the four gospels, which are the only undisputed ones in the whole church of God throughout the world. The first is written according to Matthew, the same that was once a publican, but afterwards an apostle of Jesus Christ, who having published it for the Jewish converts, wrote it in the Hebrew. The second is according to Mark, who composed it, as Peter explained to him, whom he also

acknowledges as his son in his general Epistle, saying, 'The elect church in Babylon, salutes you, as also Mark my son.' And the third, according to Luke, the gospel commended by Paul, which was written for the converts from the Gentiles, and last of all the gospel according to John. (Eusebius 245-246).

Berkhof sums up this section as follows:

From the testimony which we have now reviewed the conclusion seems perfectly warranted that the Church from the earliest times knew four and only four canonical Gospels; and that these four are the same that she has recognized ever since. (Berk01 14).

C. Literary character of the gospels.

1. Classified as *sui generis* (of its own kind), i.e. unique; not comparable to any other book or group of books in the Bible; four yet one - four sides of one gospel.
2. Not myths, fables, or without historical basis; yet not biographies either; although they obviously do contain some significant biographical details.
3. Not arranged in chronological order.
4. Each gives a certain view of Jesus, but it takes all four together to present the full gospel picture; the fourfold presentation of the apostolic κήρυγμα (preaching).

D. The Synoptic Problem: Matthew, Mark, and Luke.

1. "This remarkable agreement on the one hand, and these manifest dissimilarities on the other, constitute one of the most difficult literary problems of the New Testament. The question is, whether we can account for the origin of these Gospels in such a manner that we can explain both the close resemblances and the often surprising differences." (Berk01 15-16).
2. Each of these three Gospels significantly diverges from the material common to all
3. Four hypotheses:
 - a. The mutual dependence theory.
 - b. The oral tradition theory.
 - c. The one principal gospel theory.
 - d. The two document theory.

Contra Berkhof, I would indeed give strong credence to the fact that God is the ultimate author of the Gospels. That does not preclude His having directed their writers in the use of existing documents and other sources. Nor does it necessarily entail a dictation model of inspiration.

E. Relationship between the Gospel of John and the Synoptics.

1. Differences re: the external course of events in Jesus' ministry:
 - a. Synoptics primarily in Galilee; John primarily in Judea.
 - b. Synoptics refer to just one Passover; John refers to 3 or 4.
 - c. Synoptics primarily about Jesus' interaction with Galilean peasants; John primarily about with His interactions with the leaders of the Jews.
 - d. Synoptics show Jesus having, at first, great success with the Jews; John shows the Jews as hostile from the beginning.

- e. The timing of various events such as the cleansing of the temple, and the eating of the Passover meal, vary between the Synoptics and John.
 - 2. Differences re: the form and contents of Jesus' teaching:
 - a. Synoptics show short incisive sayings; John shows extended discourses.
 - b. The Kingdom of God is the central theme of the Synoptics; Christ Himself is the central theme of John.
 - 3. Accounting for the differences.
 - a. Neither the Synoptics nor John are intended to be complete histories.
 - b. John's purpose was clearly stated in John 20:31; Luke's purpose was declared in Luke 1:1-4; Matthew generally presents Jesus as Israel's Messiah; and Mark shows Jesus as the Christ, the Son of God.
 - c. Berkhof indicates:

We have no doubt that John had read the other Gospels before he wrote his own. There are certain features in his Gospel that we can understand only on that supposition. According to 21:19 John wrote his Gospel after the death of Peter and therefore comparatively late. Now he certainly would not be such a stranger in his own world of thought as not to know the Gospels that had already been composed. Then we find that in several places the evangelist trusts to the previous knowledge of his readers. (Berk01 24).
 - d. Each author was an individual and his individual stamp is on his Gospel.
- F. The Inspiration of the Gospels.
- 1. Three points of comparison between the prophets and the apostles:
 - a. The Holy Spirit indwelt the apostles; but worked from without on the prophets. (I don't see the justification for this conclusion. That the Spirit did not permanently indwell the prophets does not entail external rather than internal direction).
 - b. The direction of the prophets was the entrance (note that "entrance" implies internal) of a foreign element; while the direction of the apostles was an ongoing ministry of the indwelling Spirit. Also note the intermittent (prophets) vs. continuous (apostles) nature of the respective directing.
 - c. "The prophets often spoke of unknown and unseen things, while the apostles discoursed on things which they knew and saw." (Berk01 27).
 - 2. Evidences for the inspiration of the Gospels:
 - a. The Gospel contents testify to their divine origin.
 - b. The Old Testament requires a compliment (sic, should be "complement").
 - c. At least two of the apostolic writers displayed inspired verbal witness; their written testimony should also be considered inspired.

- d. Internal testimony to the inspiration: cf. Luke 1:3; 10:7; Acts 26:4; 1 Timothy 5:18; and 2 Peter 3:15-16.
 - e. From the beginning, the early church accepted these Gospels as canonical.
 - f. The Holy Spirit testifies to the Gospels' inspiration in the hearts of every believer.
- G. Canonical significance of the gospels as a whole.
1. The Gospels portray the fulfillment of the Old Testament Messianic prophecies.
 2. The Gospels also form the foundation for the remainder of the New Testament.

Louis Berkhof's Introduction to the New Testament
04: Matthew - Outline and Notes

IV. Matthew

A. Contents

1. The Advent of the Messiah.
2. The public proclamation of the Kingdom of God.
3. Jesus open and public declaration that He is the Messiah.
4. The sacrifice of the Messiah as priest.
5. The triumph of Messiah as Savior and King.

B. Characteristics

1. Jewish numerical arrangement; the *καὶ ἐγένετο* and *καὶ ἰδοὺ* transition formulae.
2. Narrative not continuous; interrupted by five major discourses.
3. Jewish aspect:
 - a. Alludes to the Old Testament more than the other Gospels do.
 - b. Characteristic use of *ἵνα* (ὅπως) πληρωθῆ in quotations

C. Authorship

1. Berkhof affirms:

The superscription ascribes the first Gospel to Matthew. That this embodies the opinion of the early Church is evident from the testimony of Irenaeus, Tertullian, Origen, Eusebius and several others, who all point to Matthew as the author. The Gospel itself shows unmistakably, by its Jewish physiognomy, that its author was a Jew, yea even that he was a Palestinian Jew, for he quotes from the Hebrew and not from the Septuagint. (Berk01 32).

2. Davidson, Julicher, Baljon, et al. deny apostolic authorship on the grounds that:
 - a. The Gospel contains legendary and irrelevant material which would not likely have been included by a true eyewitness.
 - b. The Gospel is too dependent upon the Gospel of Mark.
 - c. The author never affirms that he was an eyewitness through the use of the pronouns I or we.
3. But, disbelief in miracles does not prove them to be false.

D. Composition

1. Original Language.

- a. Thought to be Hebrew by Papias, Irenaeus, Pantaeus, Eusebius, Jerome, Athanasius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Epiphanius, Ebedjesu, and Chrysostom.
- b. Others believe it to originally have been written in Greek because the present Greek does not impress one as having been a translation from the Hebrew.
- c. The original language having been Greek is more likely because:
 - i. There is no trace of any Hebrew original.
 - ii. Citations of the early church fathers are all from the present Greek.
 - iii. Four theories:

(1.) Matthew wrote in Hebrew; another translated it to Greek.

(2.) There never was any Hebrew original.

(3.) Matthew wrote no Gospel; what we have is Papias' $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\iota\alpha$.

(4.) Matthew wrote in Hebrew and rewrote it in Greek.

iv. Berkhof contends:

The internal evidence of our present Gospel proves conclusively that this is not a mere translation of a Hebrew original. . . . It seems most plausible that Matthew himself, shortly after he had written the Hebrew Gospel, translated it, adjusting it in several respects to the needs of the Jews that were dispersed in different lands. (Berk01 35).

2. Readers and Purpose: clearly, it was intended for the Jews, and its purpose was to convince them that Jesus is the Christ.

3. Time and Place. The place of publication was likely Jerusalem or elsewhere in Judea or Palestine. Time is not certain: tradition says Matthew was the first Gospel written, perhaps around 63-67 A. D.

4. Method. Whether or not Matthew employed sources in the preparation of his Gospel is a matter of significant conjecture.

E. Canonical Significance: Matthew has been accepted as canonical from the very earliest times.

Louis Berkhof's Introduction to the New Testament
05: Mark - Outline and Notes

V. Mark

A. Contents

1. The advent of the mighty worker.
2. The conflict of the mighty worker.
3. The claim of the mighty worker.
4. The sacrifice of the mighty worker.
5. The mighty worker as conqueror of death.

B. Characteristics

1. The Gospel of Mark is highly descriptive and detailed.
2. Concentrates more on Jesus' works than on His teachings.
3. Several words of Jesus against the Jews are left out.
4. Mark is more lively than Matthew. Mark "delights in using words like εὐθύς or εὐθέως and πολὺς prefers the use of the present and the imperfect to that of the aorist, and often uses the periphrastic εἶναι with a participle instead of the finite verb. There are several Latinisms found in his Gospel, as κεντυρίων, κορδάντης, κράββατος, πραιτώριον, σπεκουλάτωρ and φραγελλοῦν." (Berk01 39)

C. Authorship

1. The early church was unanimous in ascribing the writing of this Gospel to Mark.
2. Papias, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Jerome, Eusebius, et al. all concur.
3. The Gospel itself does not indicate its author in any way.
4. Some scholars dispute the identity of Mark, the Gospel writer, with John Mark, the companion of Barnabas and Saul, but most agree they are the same person.
5. "Papias says that 'Mark was Peter's interpreter and wrote down carefully all that he recollected.' Clement of Alexandria also says that he wrote down the discourses of Peter, as he remembered them. Irenaeus, Tertullian and Jerome all style Mark 'the interpreter of Peter.' Tertullian even says that 'the Gospel published by Mark may be reckoned Peter's, whose interpreter he was.' And Origen still stronger: 'Mark wrote his Gospel according to the dictates of Peter.' Similarly Athanasius. All these testimonies agree in asserting that Mark was dependent on Peter in writing his Gospel; they disagree, however, as to the degree of dependence, some claiming merely that Mark recorded what he remembered of Peter's preaching, and others, that he wrote what Peter dictated." (Berk01 40-41).

D. Composition

1. Readers and purpose. Intended for Rome and the Romans. "Mark's aim was simply to record the gospel narrative without any special dogmatic aim, but to do this in such a manner as would be most suitable for the Romans". (Berk01 42).
2. Time and place. Probably between 67 and 70 A. D.

3. Method. Augustine said Mark abridged Matthew. But others say Mark was written before Matthew and thus Matthew expanded upon Mark. Berkhof favors the idea that Mark recorded the preaching of Peter and added material from the Hebrew original of Matthew.

E. Integrity (i.e. Textual Criticism).

1. The last twelve verses of Mark (16:9-20) are not included in some of the oldest mss extant. This has led some scholars (the division appears to have been about 50-50 in Berkhof's day) to conclude that they were spurious additions and not part of the original Gospel.
2. \aleph and B are missing these verses. Eusebius and Jerome state these verses were missing from almost all the Greek copies in their times.
3. These verses are found in most uncials, in all cursives; in most ancient versions, and in the Greek and Syriac lectionaries. Irenaeus, Justin Martyr, Epiphanius, Ambrose, Augustine, and others among the later fathers quote from these verses.
4. Though held somewhat in disrepute by many modern textual critics, Dean Burgon made an interesting case for the inclusion of these verses in his book on the subject. (twelve chapters and eight appendices). Therein, he notes, among other arguments, that "That there is not so much as one of the Fathers, early or late, who gives it as his opinion that these verses are spurious". (Burgon 1).

F. Canonical Significance

1. There was no doubt in the early church concerning the avowed canonicity of the Gospel of Mark.
2. "The special purpose of this Gospel in the canon is to show us Christ in his divine power, destroying the works of satan, and conquering sin and death... Mark is the only one of the evangelists that speaks of the future Kingdom of God as coming with power". (Berk01 44-45).

Louis Berkhof's Introduction to the New Testament
06: Luke - Outline and Notes

VI. Luke

A. Contents

1. The Advent of the divine man.
2. The work of the divine man for the Jewish world.
3. The work of the divine man for the Gentiles.
4. The sacrifice of the divine man for all mankind.
5. The divine man Savior for all nations.

B. Characteristics

1. More complete than the other Gospels.
2. Christ is portrayed as the perfect man with wide sympathies.
3. More universal than the other Gospels.
4. More contemporaneous history.
5. The Greek in Luke is more pure than the Greek in the other Gospels.

C. Authorship

1. The fathers universally ascribe this Gospel to Luke, the beloved physician.
2. "In 1882 Dr. Hobart published a work on, *The Medical Language of St. Luke*, showing that in many instances the evangelist uses the technical language that was also used by Greek medical writers". (Berk01 48).
3. "The only certain knowledge we have of Luke is derived from the Acts of the Apostles and from a few passages in the Epistles of Paul. From Col. 4:11,14 it appears that he was not a Jew and that his worldly (sic) calling was that of a physician." (Berk01 48). But cf. The discussion under the authorship of the Book of Hebrews re: the possible Jewishness of Luke.
4. "he himself says that he traced everything from the beginning and speaks of both oral and written sources that were at his command." (Berk01 49).

D. Composition

1. Readers and purpose. First intended for Theophilus, most likely a Gentile Christian of high station; and as representative of a large circle of readers.
2. Time and place. About 54-68 A. D.; most conservative scholars make it 58-63 A.D. Regarding the place of the writing, tradition indicates Achaia and Boeotia.
3. Method. It is most likely that Luke referred to both oral tradition and written sources.; many scholars indicate he used both Mark's Gospel and the apostolic source Q. I personally give a stronger credence to the inspiration of the indwelling Holy Spirit than do many of these other scholars, but that does not obviate use of external sources as well.

E. Canonical Significance: the entire primitive church universally received it as canonical.

Louis Berkhof's Introduction to the New Testament
07: John - Outline and Notes

VII. John

A. Contents

1. The advent and incarnation of the Word.
2. The incarnate Word the only life of the world.
3. The incarnate Word: the life and light in conflict with spiritual darkness.
4. The incarnate Word saving the life of the World through His sacrificial death.
5. The incarnate Word, risen from the dead: the Savior and Lord of all believers.

B. Characteristics

1. Emphasizes the Divinity of Christ more than the other Gospels.
2. Jesus' teaching predominates in John's Gospel, but the teaching takes different forms than the teaching in the other Gospels.
3. In John, Jesus' ministry in Galilee is presupposed without much detail, and the Gospel concentrates rather on His ministry in Jerusalem and Judea.
4. "The Gospel of John is far more definite than the Synoptics in pointing out the time and place of the occurrences that are narrated; it is in a certain sense more chronological than the other Gospels. We are generally informed as to the place of Christ's operation. Definite mention is made of Bethany, 1:28; Cana, 2: 1; Capernaum, 2:12; Jerusalem, 2:13; Sychar, 4: 5; Bethesda, 5 : 2, etc. The designations of time are equally distinct, sometimes the hour of the day being given." (Berk01 54).
5. Despite the absence of outright Hebraisms, John's Gospel has a style closer to that of the Old Testament writers than do the other three Gospels.

C. Authorship: "The voice of antiquity is all but unanimous in ascribing the fourth Gospel to John." (Berk01 55).

1. The author was a Jew.
2. The author was a Palestinian Jew.
3. The author was an eyewitness of the events which he relates.
4. The author was the Apostle John. There were no critical attacks on the authorship of John until the late 1700s A. D., but they hold little force today.

D. Composition

1. Readers and purpose. Probably written for the Christians of Asia Minor. The purpose is clearly stated in John 20:31.
2. Time and place. During the period 68-98 A. D. "Moreover we infer from 21:19 that John knew of the manner in which Peter died, and presupposes this knowledge in his readers. Therefore it is unlikely that the Gospel was written before A. D. 70." (Berk01 59). But I lean towards the idea that he wrote it before 70 A. D. because, otherwise, he could have hardly avoided (at least in passing) mentioning the destruction of the Temple in 70 A. D. in fulfillment of Jesus' prophecy as recorded in Matthew 24:2. Tradition says John wrote his Gospel from Ephesus.
3. Method. Berkhof says that John's Gospel is "autoptic" (based on one's own observation) in character.

E. Canonical Significance

1. The overwhelming majority of the entire early church confirmed John's Gospel as canonical.
2. The only exceptions were Alogi and Marcion.
3. "In all at least nineteen witnesses testify to the use and recognition of the Gospel before the end of the second century." (Berk01 60).

Louis Berkhof's Introduction to the New Testament
08: Acts - Outline and Notes

VIII. Acts

A. Contents

1. The establishment of the Church from Jerusalem.
2. The establishment of the Church from Antioch.

B. Characteristics

1. Indicates the establishment and organization of the early Christian Churches.
2. Centers around two persons: Peter and Paul.
3. Records many miracles.
4. The style is very similar to the Gospel of Luke, and also somewhat similar to the Epistle to the Hebrews.

C. Title: "The Greek title of the book is πράξεις ἀποστόλων, Acts of Apostles. There is no entire uniformity in the MSS, in this respect. The Sinaiticus has simply πράξεις although it has the regular title at the close of the book. Codex D is peculiar in having πράξις ἀποστόλων, Way of acting of the Apostles. We do not regard the title as proceeding from the author, but from one of the transcribers". (Berk01 62). This is not completely correct: In the original hand, Sinaiticus had no inscriptio; the πράξεις was added by the first corrector. Also, modern scholarship includes a much wider and more detailed selection (in what follows, Sinaiticus = 01* and 01C1 for the original hand and the first corrector respectively, and Codex D = 05). From (ECM3.1.1 1):

ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

2 4

Inscriptio der griechischen Handschriften I of the Greek manuscripts

2-4 πράξεις αποστολων Φ ^{56V}. 03C1. 044. 468. 607

b om 01*. 02. 03*. 08. 014S. 0142. 619. 621. 629.630. 808. 1003. 1162.

1270. 1563. 1595. 2818

c πράξεις 01C1. 1175

d αι πράξεις 61. 522

e πραξις αποστολω 05

f πράξεις των αποστολων 69. 81. 876. 886. 2138. 2374

g αι πράξεις των αποστολων 94. 323SV. 945. 1241

h πράξεις των αγιων αποστολων 049. 1V. 18. 35. 88. 93. 103V. 104. 206S.

228. 254. 307. 429. 431. 436. 453. 459. 467. 610. 617. 665. 915. 996.

1127. 1243. 1251. 1359. 1448. 1490. 1611. 1838. 1874. 1884. 1890S2.

2805

i αι πράξεις των αγιων αποστολων 6. 218. 365. 398V. 1505. 1609. 1718.

1739S. 1831S. 2298. 2718

j πράξεις των θειων αποστολων 1751

k πράξεων των αποστολων το αναγνωσμα 378. 2243. L60. L1178

l πράξεων των αγιων αποστολων το αναγνωσμα 5

m αρχη συν θεω των πραξεων των αποστολων 1678

n αρχη εν θεω των πραξεων των αποστολων συγγραφεισων παρα του

αγιοθ αποστολου και ευαγγελιστου λουκα 1842

ο λουκα πράξεις των αποστολων 424
 ρ λουκα ευαγγελιστου πράξεις αποστολων 1292. 1509
 ρ λουκα ευαγγελιστου πράξεις των αποστολων 181. 1875. 2774
 ρ λουκα ευαγγελιστου πράξεις των αγιων αποστολων 33. 326. 636. 1735.
 1837. 1891. 2344
 σ λουκα ευαγγελιστου σθηγγραφη πράξεις των αποστολων 180
 τ λουκα ευαγγελιστου και αποστολου πράξεις των αγιων αποστολων 1501
 υ λουκα του ευαγγελιστου σθηγγρα(φη) πράξεις των αγιων αποστολων 43
 ν πράξεις των αγιων αποστολων λουκα του ευαγγελιστου 1297
 wf πράξεις των αγιων [αποστο]λων συγγραφεις παρα του ευαγγελιστου
 λουκα 2412
 x αι πράξεις των αποστολων συγγραφεισαι παρα λουκα του αποστολου
 και ευαγγελιστου 2147
 y πράξεις των αγιων αποστολων συγγραφεισαι παρα του αγιου λουκα
 2200
 zf πράξεις των αγιων αποστολων συγγραφεις παρα του αποστολου και
 ευαγγελιστου λουκα 614
 a' πράξεις των αγιων αποστολων συγγραφεισαι παρα του αγιου αποστολου
 και ευαγγελιστου λουκα 2495
 b' αι πράξεις των αγιων αποστολων γραφεισαι παρα του λουκα
 ευαγγελιστου 330
 c' αι πράξεις των αγιων αποστολων συγγραφεισαι παρα λουκα του
 αποστολου και ευαγγ[ελιστου] 2652
 d' πράξεις των αγιων αποστολων σθηγγραφεισαι παρα του θειου
 ευαγγελιστου λουκα 1642
 e' πράξεις των αγιων αποστολων πράξις των αγιων αποστολων
 συγγραφεισαι παρα του αγιου λουκα του αποστολου και ευαγγελιστου
 1704
 f' πράξεις και διδχαι των αγιων αποστολων και οικουμενικων διδασκαλων
 1409
 g' πρσξαποστολος συν θεω των αγιων αποστολων λουκα ευαγγελιστου
 πράξεις των αγιων αποστολων 642
 — ρ⁸. ρ²⁹. ρ³³. ρ³⁸. ρ⁴¹. ρ⁴⁵. ρ⁴⁸. ρ⁵⁰. ρ⁵³. ρ⁵⁷. ρ⁷⁴. ρ⁹¹. ρ¹¹².
 ρ¹²⁷. 04. 014. 020. 025. 048. 057. 066. 076. 077. 093. 095. 096. 097.
 0120. 0140. 0165. 0166. 0175. 0189. 0236. 0244. 0294. 0304. 206.
 319. 321. 323. 383. 441. 623. 1067. 1729. 1827. 1827S. 1739. 1831.
 1832. 1852. 1874S. 1890. 1890S1. 2464. 2570. L23. L156. L156S1.
 L173. L587. L809. L1188.L1188S. L1825. L2010

At the end of Acts, Berkhof is correct: Sinaiticus has the subscriptio πράξεις ἀποστόλων, Acts of Apostles, in the original hand. So does P74, 03, 044, 181, 1175, and 2344C. ECM apparently does not specify any subscriptio for Codex D, nor does it indicate that the subscriptio is omitted in Codex D. Among the other mss, the subscriptio is equally as varied as the inscriptio. (ECM3.1.2 1088).

D. Authorship: The early church was unanimous in ascribing this book to Luke.

1. “We” sections.
2. Medical language.

3. Comparisons with Luke's Gospel.
 4. Clearly written by a companion of Paul.
- E. Composition
1. Readers and purpose. Theophilus and his wider circle of readers; continues Luke's Gospel.
 2. Time and place. About 63 A. D. Most likely from Rome.
 3. Method. Luke was an eyewitness to much of this history and could easily have gained the rest through personal testimonies. Some written sources might have been used.
- F. Inspiration
1. A continuation of Luke's Gospel.
 2. Quoted as scripture in 1 Timothy 5:18.
- G. Canonical Significance: Never disputed, other than by the Marcionites, Ebionites, and Manichaeans.

Louis Berkhof's Introduction to the New Testament
09: The Epistles in General - Outline and Notes

IX. The Epistles in General

- A. About 1/3 of New Testament is in epistolary form.
- B. Paul probably introduced the epistolary form.
- C. The prophets delivered oracles, but the apostles wrote letters.
- D. Inspiration: "Moreover there are several explicit statements in the Epistles testifying to the fact that the apostles were aware of being the instruments of Gods Spirit."
(Berk01 69).
- E. Canonical Significance: "After the Spirit of God has been poured out, Christ, who had formerly dwelt among men, makes his abode in the very hearts of believers."
(Berk01 70-71).
- F. Classification: Two classifications - Pauline and General.

Louis Berkhof's Introduction to the New Testament
10: The Epistles of Paul - Outline and Notes

X. The Epistles of Paul

- A. Deissmann characterized Paul as a worm before God, but an eagle before men.
- B. Berkhof assumes Festus succeeded Felix in 60 A.D.
- C. Paul was martyred at Rome, about 67-68 A. D.

Louis Berkhof's Introduction to the New Testament
11: The Epistle to the Romans - Outline and Notes

XI. The Epistle to the Romans

A. Contents

1. Doctrine 1:1-11:36.
2. Practical: 12:1-16:27.

B. Characteristics

1. The most systematic among Paul's writings.
2. Style exhibits energy, vivacity, and calm.

C. Authorship: Paul the Apostle.

D. The Church at Rome,

1. Possible origins.
 - a. According to the Roman Catholic Church, the Church at Rome was founded by Peter in 42 or 44 A. D.
 - b. Protestants often attribute it to Roman Jews who were in Jerusalem at Pentecost.
 - c. By missionaries from Antioch in Syria.
2. It is not certain whether the Church at Rome was predominantly Jewish or predominantly Gentile. Berkhof himself holds that it was predominantly Gentile.

E. Composition

1. Purpose: three schools of thought
 - a. Dogmatic - a systematic exposition of the doctrine of salvation.
 - b. Controversial - the opposition of Judaism to his gospel.
 - c. Conciliatory - aiming to unify Jews and Gentiles at the Church in Rome.
2. Time and place. About 57-58 A. D. From Corinth.
3. Method.

F. Integrity. "Touching the integrity of the Epistle to the Romans two questions have arisen: 1. Is the doxology, 16: 25-27, in the right place, or does it belong between 14: 23 and 15:1, or is it spurious? And 2. Are the chapters 15 and 16 genuine or spurious? (Berk01 81).

1. External evidence the place of the doxology at the end of Chapter 16, since the majority of the mss place it there. Berkhof says that Zahn favors its placement at the end of chapter 14 because:
 - a. "Paul's letters are often interspersed with doxologies, but never end with them.
 - b. "seems unlikely that Paul should add a doxology, closely connected with the body of the letter, after a list of personal greetings not so connected with it.
 - c, "The doxology is closely related to the subject-matter of 14: 23 and 15:1.
 - d. "It is far harder to explain its transfer from the 16th chapter to the 14th than the reverse. Einl. I p. 268 ff." (Berk01 81-82).
2. Some reject the 15th chapter as spurious because:
 - a. It is not found in the canon of Marcion.

- b. Verses 8, 19, 24, 28, and 29 don't sound like Paul or show conflicts.
- 3. Many more reject the 16th chapter because:
 - a. It is not found in the canon of Marcion.
 - b. It is uncommon for Paul to end a letter with so many greetings.
 - c. Paul was not in a position to know that many people at Rome.

(Aland and Aland 296-297) indicate:

The textual tradition for the conclusion of Romans is so complicated that it can be dealt with only by analyzing the text into four units: 1:1—14:23 = A, 15:1—16:23 = B, 16:24 = C, 16:25—27 = D. The earliest surviving form of the tradition appears as follows:

- 1. \aleph B C 048 (etc) 1:1-16:23 + 16:25-27 (A + B + D)
- 2. D F G (etc) 1:1—16:23 + 16:24 (A + B + C)

(a page-and-a-half of additional discussion follows).

(The parentheses above indicate where I've abridged the Alands' text).

(Metzger 471) provides a list of where the doxology appears within the various mss:

- a. 1.1—16.23 + doxology
 \aleph^{61vid} \aleph B C D 81 1739 it,^{d.,61} vg syr^p cop^{sa,bo} eth
- b. 1.1—14.23 + doxology + 15.1—16.23 + doxology
 A P 5 33 104 arm
- c. 1.1—14.23 + doxology + 15.1—16.24
 L Ψ 0209^{vid} 181 326 330 614 1175 Byz syr^h
 mss^{acc. to Origen(lat)}
- d. 1.1—16.24
 F^{gr} G (perhaps the archetype of D) 629 mss^{acc. to Jerome}
- e. 1.1—15.33 + doxology + 16.1-23
 \aleph^{46}
- f. 1.1—14.23 + 16.24 + doxology
 Vg^{mss} Old Latin^{acc. to capitula}

(Comfort, 2015 313-316) follows Metzger with a couple of minor differences, and also provides a more extensive discussion of the mss variations. In his earlier work (Comfort, 2008 477-481), he presents essentially the same information on the doxology as he does in his 2015 book, but with some additional details and discussion.

But Gamble indicates:

It has long been recognized that various aspects of the textual tradition of Romans suggest the currency, at one time or another, of as many as three basic forms of the letter, characterized primarily by differences of length, but also by other features. (15).

It is generally and properly assumed that the doxology, by virtue of its tone and extent, must be regarded as a concluding element, and that it would therefore have stood at the end of the letter, wherever that might be. On the basis of this assumption the presence of the doxology after 14:23 constitutes indirect testimony to the fourteen-chapter form of the text, even though all MSS which so place the doxology now contain the final two chapters. (24).

Gamble's 151-page book contains extensive discussion of this issue, far more than space allows for consideration here. The interested reader is encouraged to explore Gamble's book in detail.

G. Canonical Significance

1. One of the best attested writings of the New Testament.
2. Nineteen witnesses confirming it before the beginning of the third century, including some of the apostolic fathers, The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, Justin Martyr, the Muratorian Canon, Marcion, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian.
3. "That salvation can be had through faith only, and not by the works of the law, not by one's works of morality, on which the man of the Roman type was inclined to place his reliance, is at once the great central doctrine of this epistle and its permanent lesson for all ages. (Berk01 83).

Louis Berkhof's Introduction to the New Testament
12: The First Epistle to the Corinthians - Outline and Notes

XII. The First Epistle to the Corinthians

A. Contents

1. Condemns factions within the Church.
2. Espouses the necessity for Church discipline.
3. Answers enquiries sent by the Church at Corinth.
4. Discusses the resurrection.
5. Commends the Corinthians for their collection for the Church at Jerusalem.

B. Characteristics

1. A comprehensive set of subjects.
2. The most practical of the Pauline letters.
3. The language is that of a Hellenistic Jew.

C. Authorship: Paul the Apostle.

D. The Church at Corinth

1. Origin: founded by Paul during his second missionary journey.
2. Consisted primarily of Gentile Christians. Four factious divisions:
 - a. "I am of Paul."
 - b. "I am of Apollos."
 - c. "I am of Cephas."
 - d. "I am of Christ."
3. Paul's communications with Corinth:
 - a. Paul visited Corinth in 52 A. D. And in 57 A. D. And possibly at other times.
 - b. Paul probably wrote more letters to the Corinthians than just the two we have in the Bible.

E. Composition

1. Purpose. To address reports which Paul had received from Corinth.
2. Time and place. Probably early in 57 A. D. From Ephesus.

F. Canonical Significance: Abundantly testified to by early Christian literature, including Clement of Rome, Barnabas, Hermas, Ignatius, Polycarp, and Irenaeus.

Louis Berkhof's Introduction to the New Testament
13: The Second Epistle to the Corinthians - Outline and Notes

XIII. The Second Epistle to the Corinthians

A. Contents

1. Review of Paul's relationship with the Corinthians.
2. The collection for the Judaeans Christians.
3. Paul's vindication of his apostleship.

B. Characteristics

1. One of the most personal and least doctrinal of Paul's letters.
2. The least systematic of Paul's letters.
3. The language is more rugged and harsh than in Paul's other letters.

C. Authorship: Paul the Apostle; so indicated by Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian.

D. Composition

1. Purpose. Paul's thankfulness for the manner of their receipt of his previous letter, and his joy at their willingness to mend their ways.
2. Time and place. Probably during the Summer of 57 A. D. From somewhere in Macedonia.

E. Integrity. To points of contention:

1. "The integrity of the letter has been attacked especially on two points. It is claimed by some that the verses 6: 14—7: 1 do not belong, where they stand, but form an awkward interruption in the course of thought." (Berk01 93).
 - a. Berkhof discounts this on the basis of comments by Meyer and Alford.
 - b. Metzger doesn't mention any such controversy. (512).
 - c. Neither does Comfort. (2008 543, 2015 332-333)I tend to agree with Berkhof that this conjecture lacks persuasiveness.
2. "Several critics opine that the chapters 10-13 did not originally form a part of this letter." (Berk01 93).
 - a. Berkhof discounts this on the basis that "If we adopt the theory that another letter intervened between our two canonical Epistles. we are led to a very complicated scheme of Paul's transactions with Corinth, a scheme so complicated that it is its own condemnation." (Berk01 93).
 - b. Metzger doesn't mention any such controversy. (513-519).
 - c. Neither does Comfort in (2008 548). However, in (2015 333) Comfort writes:

It is possible that Paul took pen (stylus) in hand and began to write the rest of the epistle (see 13:10), as he did in other epistles (Gal. 6:11-18; 2 Thess. 3:17-18). Some scholars think chapters 10-13 are a separate epistle, perhaps "the sorrowful letter" that Paul refers to in 7:8, which was then appended to the end of chapter 9 by some editor early in the textual history of Paul's epistle.

I can see Comfort's contention that Paul began with his own hand at this point, but I see little to support the idea that chapters 10-13 form a separate epistle.

F. Canonical Significance: the ancient Church was unanimous in accepting 2 Corinthians into the canon; so testified to by Polycarp and Marcion. It also stresses "that it is not the wisdom of the world but the foolishness of the cross that saves". (Berk01 94).

Louis Berkhof's Introduction to the New Testament
14: The Epistle to the Galatians - Outline and Notes

XIV. The Epistle to the Galatians

A. Contents

1. Paul defends his apostleship.
2. Paul defends the doctrine of justification.
3. Practical exhortations.

B. Characteristics

1. Galatians has a lot in common with Romans.
2. But there are also significant differences:

In the Epistle to the Romans Paul does not directly encounter such as are hostile to the truth or personal adversaries; hence it is written in a calm spirit and is at most indirectly polemical. This is quite different in the Epistle to the Galatians. (Berk01 95).

3. Many striking contrasts.
 - a. Grace vs. Law.
 - b. Faith vs. Works.
 - c. Fruits of the Spirit vs. Works of the Flesh.
 - d. Circumcision vs. The New Creation.
 - e. The enmity of the World to the Cross.
4. The style unites severity with tenderness.

C. Authorship: Paul the Apostle per both internal and external evidence, cf. Marcion and Irenaeus and the Muratorian Fragment.

D. The Churches of Galatia

1. This is Paul's only epistle which is addressed to a group of Churches.
2. Geographically, Galatia is a Northern District of Asia Minor.
3. Politically, "Galatia" also refers to the entirety of the Roman province of Galatia, of which the community of Galatia is a part.
4. This has led to a conjecture regarding the specific addressees of this epistle. Some hold that it is addressed to the Northern part of the province, while others hold that it is addressed to the Southern part. Berkhof prefers the Southern theory, and concludes that the recipients of this epistle were the Southern Churches founded by Paul during his first missionary journey. These Churches were primarily Gentile in character, but did also include an important Jewish contingent.

E. Composition

1. Readers and purpose: to counter the arguments of the Judaizing teachers.
2. Time and place. Although there is significant disagreement on this issue, Berkhof prefers the view that Galatians was written from Corinth during Paul's second missionary journey.

F. Canonical Significance. There has never been any doubt as to the canonicity of Galatians.

Louis Berkhof's Introduction to the New Testament 15: The Epistle to the Ephesians - Outline and Notes

XV. The Epistle to the Ephesians

A. Contents

1. Doctrinal: The unity of the Church.
2. Practical: Exhortations to conversations worthy of the calling and unity of believers.

B. Characteristics

1. The treatment of unity is both profound and sublime.
2. Great similarity to the Epistle to the Colossians, but Ephesians is more theological.
3. The style is exalted: It is Paul's grandest letter.

C. Authorship: Paul the Apostle. Both the internal and external evidence is exceptionally strong.

D. Destination

1. "There is considerable uncertainty respecting the destination of this Epistle. The question is whether the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ in 1:1 are genuine. They are indeed found in all the extant MSS. with the exception of three, viz, the important MSS. Aleph and B and codex 67." (Berk01 105).
2. "The conclusion to which the majority of scholars come is, either that the Epistle was not written to the Ephesians at all, or that it was not meant for them only, but also for the other churches in Asia." (Berk01 105).
3. "In all probability the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ were not originally in the text.... Most likely, therefore, this was a circular letter, sent to several churches in Asia, such as those of Ephesus, Laodicea, Hierapolis, e. a." (Berk01 105).

Comfort writes, "Title: To the Ephesians. This is the wording in the three earliest MSS (ⱼ⁴⁶ Ɀ B)." (2015 340).

Metzger discusses this in somewhat more detail:

[ἐν Ἐφέσῳ] {C} The words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ are absent from several important witnesses (ⱼ⁴⁶ Ɀ* B* 424c 1739) as well as from manuscripts mentioned by Basil and the text used by Origen. Certain internal features of the letter as well as Marcion's designation of the epistle as "To the Laodiceans" and the absence in Tertullian and Ephraem of an explicit quotation of the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ have led many commentators to suggest that the letter was intended as an encyclical, copies being sent to various churches, of which that at Ephesus was chief. Since the letter has been traditionally known as "To the Ephesians," and since all witnesses except those mentioned above include the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, the Committee decided to retain them, but enclosed within square brackets. (532).

ΠΡΟΣ ΕΦΕΣΙΟΥΣ is the inscriptio which appears in all the modern editions, cf. (NA28 590). (NA27 503). (NA26 503). (NA25 489). (NA21 489), (NA16 489). (UBS5 n.p#). (UBS4 654). (UBS3 664). (UBS2 664).

In 1869-1894, von Tischendorf, Gregory, and Abbott also used the simple ΠΡΟΣ ΕΦΕΣΙΟΥΣ. (n. P#).

In 1881, however, Westcott and Hort showed ΠΡΟΣ ΕΦΕΣΙΟΥΣ ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ ΠΑΥΛΟΥ. (n. P#). They were possibly following Stephen's 1550 Textus Receptus (n. P#) which also used the longer inscriptio. However, given Westcott and Hort's often very strongly expressed disdain for the Textus Receptus, this really doesn't seem very likely.

E. Composition

1. Occasion and Purpose. Apparently, the purpose was simply to respond to the Ephesians' love for all the saints. It was occasioned by the pending departure of Tychicus and Onesimus for Colossae.
2. Time and place. Probably about 62 A. D. From Rome.

F. Canonical Significance

1. The early Church had no doubt as to the canonicity of the Epistle to the Ephesians.
2. Ephesians is possibly attested to in Colossians 4:16.
3. Ignatius, Polycarp, Herman, Hippolytus, Marcion, the Muratorian Canon, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian all testify the early recognition of the Epistle to the Ephesians.
4. "The great practical exhortation of the Epistle is that believers live worthily of their union with Christ, since they were sometime darkness, but are now light in the Lord, and should therefore walk as children of light, 5:8." (Berk01 107).

Louis Berkhof's Introduction to the New Testament
16: The Epistle to the Philippians - Outline and Notes

XVI. The Epistle to the Philippians

A. Contents

1. Paul tells them about his imprisonment.
2. He urges them to imitate Christ.
3. He speaks of his efforts on their behalf.
4. He warns them about the Judaisers and the Antinomians.
5. He urges them to avoid dissensions and to pursue good things instead.

B. Characteristics

1. One of the most personal of Paul's letters.
2. No controversies are discussed.
3. Addresses not only saints, but also bishops and deacons.
4. Style = fervent, discontinuous, and abrupt.

C. Authorship: Paul the Apostle; established as well as anything can be.

D. The Church at Philippi.

1. A Roman colony with special privileges.
2. Exempt from oversight of Roman Governors.
3. Immune from poll and property taxes.
4. Right to property in the soil.
5. The Church was founded by Paul about 52 A.D.
6. (Berk01 111) notes:

Little can be said regarding the composition of the Philippian church. In the narrative of its founding we find no specific mention of Jews, although the assembly by the river points to their presence. However the fact that there was no synagogue, and that the enemies contemptuously emphasized the Jewish nationality of the missionaries leads us to think that they were few and greatly despised.

E. Composition

1. Fourfold Purpose:

- a. Expression of gratitude for the financial support from the Philippian Church.
- b. Expression of Paul's love in the Lord for the Philippians.
- c. To give warning about personal rivalries and divisions.
- d. An exhortation to be joyful.

2. Time and place. Probably about 61-63 A. D. From Rome.

F. Canonical Significance

1. Philippians is not quoted by the early fathers as often as are Paul's other epistles.
2. Nonetheless, its canonicity is well established.
3. Some traces of its language in Clement of Rome and Ignatius.
4. Also cf. Polycarp, Diognetus, Justin Martyr, Theophilus, Marcion, the Muratorian canon, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian.
5. It contains the important doctrine on the kenosis (the self-emptying) of Christ in 2:6-11 (Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus....).

Louis Berkhof's Introduction to the New Testament
17: The Epistle to the Colossians - Outline and Notes

XVII. The Epistle to the Colossians

A. Contents

1. Doctrine: the unique significance of Christ.
2. Practical: diverse directives and exhortations.

B. Characteristics

1. Discusses errors which had been creeping into the Colossian Church.
2. Very similar to Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, but Colossians is more Christological.
3. The style of Colossians is also similar to the style of Ephesians.

C. Authorship: Paul the Apostle.

D. The Church at Colossae

1. We have no information concerning the founding of the Church at Colossae.
2. The Church appears to have consisted of Gentiles only. There is no evidence that any Jews were present.
3. The Colossian Church was in danger of being misled by certain false teachings.
4. "The Colossian error was, therefore, a strange mixture of Jewish doctrines, Christian ideas and heathen speculation; and this composite character makes it impossible to identify it with any one heretical system of the apostolic time". (Berk01 116).

E. Composition

1. Purpose: to encourage resistance to the invading false teachings.
2. Time and place. Probably about 61-62 A. D. From Rome.

F. Canonical Significance

1. The Church has never doubted the canonicity of the Epistle to the Colossians.
2. cf. Clement of Rome, Barnabas, Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Theophilus, Marcion, the Muratorian Fragment, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian.
3. "The permanent value of this letter is found primarily in its central teaching, that the Church of God is made perfect in Christ, its glorious Head." (Berk01 117).

Louis Berkhof's Introduction to the New Testament
18: The First Epistle to the Thessalonians - Outline and Notes

XVIII. The First Epistle to the Thessalonians

A. Contents

1. Paul's recounts his prior work among the Thessalonians and their subsequent growth in Christ.
2. Practical Christian living.
3. Eschatology - Christ's parousia (His Second Coming).

B. Characteristics

1. Very letter-like; like the Epistle to the Philippians.
2. An extensive discussion of Christ's Second Coming, c.f. 1:10; 2:19; 3:13; 4:13-18; 5:1-11, 23.
3. 1 Thessalonians never refers to, or quotes from, the Old Testament.
4. The style is similar to that of the Epistles to the Corinthians.

C. Authorship: Paul the Apostle.

D. The Church at Thessalonica

1. Still ranks as the second city of European Turkey (after Constantinople, i.e. Istanbul).
2. Founded by Paul (accompanied by Silas and Timothy) about 52 A. D.
3. Consisted of both Jewish and Gentile Christians.

E. Composition

1. Threefold Purpose:
 - a. Expression of gratitude for the faithful perseverance of the Thessalonian Church.
 - b. To establish them in faith, given that the enemy had sown tares among the wheat.
 - c. To correct their mistaken ideas regarding Christ's Return.
2. Time and place. Probably near the end of 52 A. D. From Corinth.

F. Canonical Significance:

The canonicity of this Epistle was never questioned in ancient times. There are some supposed references to it in the apostolic fathers, Clement of Rome, Barnabas, Ignatius and Polycarp, but they are very uncertain. Marcion and the Muratorian Fragment and the old Latin and Syriac Versions testify to its canonicity, however, and from the end of the second century its canonical use is a well established fact. (Berk01 122).

Louis Berkhof's Introduction to the New Testament
19: The Second Epistle to the Thessalonians - Outline and Notes

XIX. The Second Epistle to the Thessalonians

A. Contents

1. Introduction and Blessing.
2. Instructions regarding the Second Coming.
3. Practical: withdraw from those who refuse to work, etc.

B. Characteristics

1. The main characteristic is the apocalyptic section in 2:1-12.
2. Paul's gratitude for the Thessalonians' faith and endurance; words of encouragement and fatherly advice.
3. The style is elevated in the apocalyptic section; simple and direct in the other parts.

C. Authorship

1. The Epistle claims to be the work of Paul.
2. But, that the Epistle is genuine has been doubted on five principal objections:
 - a. The teaching of Paul regarding the parousia in 2:1-12 is not consistent with what he wrote in I Thessalonians 4:13-18; 5:1-11. According to the first letter the day of Christ is imminent and will come suddenly and unexpectedly; the second emphasizes the fact that it is not close at hand and that several signs will precede it. (Berk01 124).
 - b. The eschatology is closer to that of Revelation than to 1 Thessalonians.
 - c. To a great extent, 2 Thessalonians is but a copy of 1 Thessalonians.
 - d. There are many peculiar expressions not found anywhere else in Paul.
 - e. The salutation of 3:17 is suspicious.
3. But the objections raised are not sufficient to discredit the authenticity of our Epistle. The contradictions in Paul's teaching regarding the parousia of Christ, are more apparent than real. The signs that precede the great day will not detract from its suddenness any more than the signs of Noah's time prevented the flood from taking his contemporaries by surprise. Moreover these two features, the suddenness of Christ's appearance and the portentous facts that are the harbingers of his coming, always go hand in hand in the eschatological teachings of Scripture. Dan. 11:1—12: 3; Mt. 24: 1-44; Lk. 17:20-37. As to the immediacy of Christ's coming we can at most say that the first Epistle intimates that the Lord might appear during that generation (though possibly it does not even imply that), but it certainly does not teach that Christ will presently come. (Berk01 124-125).

D. Composition

1. The purpose of the writer was to encourage the sorely pressed church; to calm the excitement by pointing out that the second advent of the Lord could not be expected immediately, since the mystery of lawlessness had to develop first and to issue in the man of sin; and to exhort the irregular ones to a quiet, industrious and orderly conduct. (Berk01 126).
2. Time and place. Probably about the middle of 53 A. D. From Corinth.

E. Canonical Significance:

The early Church found no reason to doubt the canonicity of this letter. Little stress can be laid, it is true, on the supposed reference to its language in Ignatius, Barnabas, the Didache and Justin Martyr. It is quite evident, however, that Polycarp used the Epistle. Moreover it has a place in the canon of Marcion, is mentioned among the Pauline letters in the Muratorian Fragment, and is contained in the old Latin and Syriac Versions. Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian and others since their time, quote it by name.... The letter also reminds us once more of the fact that the day of the Lord will be a day of terror to the wicked, but a day of deliverance and glory for the Church of Christ. (Berk01 126).

Louis Berkhof's Introduction to the New Testament
20: The Pastoral Epistles - Outline and Notes

XX. The Pastoral Epistles

Authorship

- A. "From the time of Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian, who were the first to quote the New Testament books by name, until the beginning of the nineteenth century, no one doubted the Pauline authorship of these letters." (Berk01 127).
- B. Based upon internal evidence, J. E. C. Schmidt cast doubt upon their Pauline authorship in 1804. Schleiermacher, the Tubingen School, Neander, Meyer, Sabatier, and others followed.
- C. Five arguments against Pauline authorship:
 - 1. They do not reflect the life of Paul.
 - 2. The definition of Christianity espoused in these letters apparently does not match Paul's definition elsewhere in his writings.
 - 3. The Church organization portrayed in these letters points to a later age.
 - 4. The false teachers these letters warn about are evidently second century Gnostics.
 - 5. The style of these letters vary greatly from Paul's style elsewhere.
- D. Five counter-arguments:
 - 1. While these books do not reflect the life of Paul as presented in the book of Acts; if, as seems correct from other evidence, Paul was subsequently released from his imprisonment in Rome as portrayed at the end of Acts, this argument loses its force.
 - 2. But Paul's teaching elsewhere does not contradict the depictions in these Pastoral Epistles; it actually complements them. Berkhof's use of the Latin here (*cum grano salis* = with a grain of salt) is an amusing, if nonetheless cogent, interjection.
 - 3. The emphasis on external Church organization does not preclude Pauline authorship. Knowing that the Return of Christ was not immanent (2 Thessalonians 2:1-12), meant that placing some stress on organization was at that point appropriate.
 - 4. It is an unproven contention that the author's warnings against false teachers are directed at gnosticism of any kind.
 - 5. Arguments from style are very precarious.

These issues were also addresses by Henry Alford in 1872. He dealt with them in significantly more detail than Berkhof does here (understandable, as Berkhof's book is a New Testament Introduction, while Alford's is a detailed commentary). At the end of his analysis on this subject, Alford writes:

I would state then the general result to which I have come from all these considerations:

- 1. External testimony in favor of the genuineness of our Epistles is so satisfactory, as to suggest no doubt on the point of their universal reception in the earliest times.

2. The objections brought against the genuineness by its opponents, on internal grounds, are not adequate to set it aside, or even to raise a doubt on the subject in a fair-judging mind.

I therefore rest in the profession of the Epistles themselves, and the universal belief of Christians, that they were VERITABLY WRITTEN BY ST. PAUL. (Alford04 108-109).

A contemporary of Alford's, Charles Ellicot, concluded:

In reference to the genuineness and authenticity of this Epistle, with which that of the other Pastoral Epistles is intimately connected, we may briefly remark, (a) that there was never any doubt entertained in the ancient Church that these Epistles were written by St Paul (see the testimonies in Lardner and Davidson), and (b) that of the objections urged by modern scepticism the only one of any real importance,—the peculiarities of phrases and expressions (see Huther, *Einleitung*, p. 50, and the list in Conybeare and Howson, *St Paul*, Vol. II. p. 663 sq. ed. 2) may be so completely removed by a just consideration of the date of the Epistles, the peculiar nature of the subjects discussed, and the plain substantial accordance in all main points with the Apostle's general style (admitted even by De Wette), that no doubt of the authorship ought now to be entertained by any calm and reasonable enquirer: see the very elaborate and able defence of Davidson, *Introduction*, Vol. III. p. 100 sq. (xx).

More recently, in 2021, Andreas Köstenberger concluded:

It was only in the late eighteenth century that the authenticity of Paul's correspondence with Timothy and Titus began to be challenged. A number of commentators claim these letters constitute an instance of pseudonymous writing in which a later follower attributes his work to his revered teacher in order to perpetuate his teaching and influence,²⁹ possibly including some authentic material. p 15 At a first glance this contention may appear surprising since all three letters open with the unequivocal attribution, "Paul, an apostle of Christ Jesus," or a similar phrase (1 Tim 1:1; 2 Tim 1:1; Titus 1:1). It's difficult to imagine someone other than Paul writing these letters and falsely attributing them to the apostle without deceptive intent, and the church accepting them into the NT canon on the mistaken notion that they were Pauline. , Vol. III. p. 100 sq. (14-15).

Louis Berkhof's Introduction to the New Testament
21: The First Epistle to Timothy - Outline and Notes

XXI. The First Epistle to Timothy

A. Contents

1. Introduction - Discussion of heresies to be combated.
2. General regulations for Church life.
3. Personal advice to Timothy.
4. Conclusion - Another polemic against heretical teachers.

B. Characteristics

1. Sent to a person who was engaged in pastoral work.
2. Practical rather than doctrinal.
3. Emphasizes the external organization of the Church.
4. Exhibits a simple connection of ideas.

C. Recipient

1. "Timothy my own son in the faith"
2. Timothy was an inhabitant of Lystra when were first encountered him in Acts 16:1.
3. His mother was Jewish and his father was Greek.
4. His mother Eunice and his grandmother Lois were both Christians.
5. At the time of writing, he was in charge of the Church at Ephesus.

D. Composition

1. Occasion and Purpose. Paul's extended absence from Ephesus. To combat errors which were threatening the Ephesian Church.
2. Time and place. About 65 or 66 A. D. From somewhere in Macedonia.

E. Canonical Significance

- "There was not the slightest doubt in the ancient church as to the canonicity of this Epistle." (Berk01 135).

Louis Berkhof's Introduction to the New Testament
22: The Second Epistle to Timothy - Outline and Notes

XXII. The Second Epistle to Timothy

A. Contents

1. Courage and other considerations to strengthen Timothy.
2. Exhortations concerning Timothy's teaching.
3. Personal reflections.

B. Characteristics

1. Primarily practical rather than doctrinal.
2. “¹⁶All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: ¹⁷That the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works.” (1 Timothy 3:16-17 KJV).
3. This is the last Epistle Paul wrote.

D. Composition

1. Occasion and purpose. Paul's impending death: exhortation and encouragement for Timothy.
2. Time and place. In the fall of 67 A. D. From Rome.

E. Canonical Significance

“The canonicity of this Epistle has never been questioned by the Church; and the testimony to its early and general use is in no way deficient.” (Berk01 137).

Louis Berkhof's Introduction to the New Testament
23: The Epistle to Titus - Outline and Notes

XXIII. The Epistle to Titus

A. Contents

1. Instructions for the appointment of pastors.
2. Harmony in the Church with Gospel teachings.
3. Personal details re: an upcoming visit of Titus to join Paul in Nicopolis.

B. Characteristics

1. This letter is of a personal nature.
2. Covers most of the same information as 1 Timothy.
3. Mostly practical rather than doctrinal.
4. But the great doctrine of grace is stated in Titus 2:11-14; 3:4-8.

C. Recipient

1. "Titus mine own son after the common faith,"
2. Does not appear in the Book of Acts.
3. Galatians 2:1, 3 relates that Titus was a Greek, that he was not compelled to undergo circumcision, and that he accompanied Paul to the council at Jerusalem..

D. Composition

1. Occasion and purpose. Paul's request that Titus come to visit him in the near future:

The object of Paul in writing this letter is to summon Titus to come to him, as soon as another has taken his place; to give him directions regarding the ordination of presbyters in the different cities; to warn him against the heretics on the island; and guide him in his teaching and in his dealing with those that would not accept his word. (Berk01 140).

2. Time and place. Probably the early part of 67 A. D. From a location which has not been determined.

E. Canonical Significance.

The Church from the beginning accepted this Epistle as canonical. (Berk01 141).

Louis Berkhof's Introduction to the New Testament
24: The Epistle to Philemon - Outline and Notes

XXIV. The Epistle to Philemon

A. Contents

1. Introduction, blessing, and thanksgiving.
2. Paul's request on behalf of Onesimus.
3. Paul's indication to come see Philemon for a visit.

B. Characteristics

1. This letter was closely related to the Epistle to the Colossians.
2. Great delicacy and tactfulness.

C. Authorship: Paul the Apostle.

D: Recipient. "Philemon our dearly beloved and fellow-laborer, and to our beloved Apphia, and Archippus, our fellow-soldier, and to the church in thy house," (Berk01 143).

E. Composition

1. Occasion and purpose. To plead to Philemon on behalf of Onesimus.
2. Time and place. (Berk01 143) says "For the discussion of the time and place of composition cf. what was said respecting the Epistle to the Ephesians." But I suspect this is a misprint. I suspect Berkhof meant for us to refer instead to the Epistle to the Colossians, from which we glean "Probably about 61-62 A. D. From Rome."

F. Canonical Significance

1. Rarely quoted by the early Church fathers.
2. "The letter is recognized by Marcion and the Muratorian Fragment, and is contained in the old Latin and Syriac Versions. Tertullian quotes it more than once, but no trace of it is found in Irenaeus and Clement of Alexandria. Eusebius classes it with the Homologoumena and Jerome argues at length against those who refused to accept it as Pauline. The Church never doubted its canonicity." (Berk01 143).
3. "Moreover it reveals to us how Paul, in view of the unity of bond and free in Jesus Christ, deals with the perplexing question of slavery. He does not demand the abolishment of the institution, since the time for such a drastic measure had not yet come; but he does clearly hint at emancipation as the natural result of the redemptive work of Christ. (Berk01 143-144).

The little book of Philemon holds a special place in my heart. It's a magnificent display of God's mercy and grace. Harry Ironside said:

This same God was watching over Onesimus. He saw him when he stole that money, and as he fled from his master's house. He watched him on his way to Rome, and in due time brought him face to face with Paul. Through that same precious gospel that had been blest to the salvation of Philemon, Onesimus, the thieving runaway slave, was also saved, and another star was added to the Redeemer's crown. (9).

Louis Berkhof's Introduction to the New Testament 25: The Epistle to the Hebrews - Outline and Notes

XXV. The Epistle to the Hebrews

A. Contents

1. The superiority of Christ as mediator.
2. Christ; the true high priest.
3. Pre-eminence of the New Covenant mediated by Christ.
4. Application of these truths, and the writer's personal epilogue.

B. Characteristics

1. If not for the personal notes in 10:34; 13:18, 25; and the salutation and greetings, Hebrews would be better considered as a treatise than as an epistle.
2. Close relation to the Old Testament: not viewing the Law as a body of commandments, but rather as a revelation of its own insufficiency for the removal of sin.
3. The quotations of the Old Testament are uniformly from the LXX.
4. The language of Hebrews is the best literary Greek in the New Testament.

C. Authorship

1. Clement of Alexandria said the writer was Paul.
2. Tertullian ascribed it to Barnabas.
3. Luther thought the writer might have been Apollos.
4. Calvin thought the writer might have been Luke or Clement.
5. Beza held that the writer was some disciple of Paul.

Who wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews? There seem to be almost as many opinions as there are New Testament scholars.

From the earliest times, the Eastern Church acknowledged PAUL as the Author. Some in the Western Church, in the third and the fourth century, did not regard PAUL as the Author, but LUKE, or CLEMENT, or BARNABAS. JEROME and AUGUSTINE in the fifth century, a more enlightened age than the two preceding centuries, ascribed to PAUL the authorship; and since their time the same opinion has prevailed in the Western, as it did from the beginning in the Eastern Church. (Calvin viii).

The Apostle Paul is said to be the writer of the epistle, with the general consent of antiquity. Above all, Peter, writing to the elect strangers scattered through Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, praises the letters of Paul, which he wrote to them also. But the other epistles of Paul were sent to Gentile converts; this one alone to the Hebrews. (Bengel 333).

This, we are fully assured, was the apostle Paul. Though he was distinctively and essentially the "apostle of the Gentiles" (Rom. 11:13), yet his ministry was by no means confined to them, as the book of Acts clearly shows. At the time of his apprehension the Lord said, "He is a chosen vessel unto Me, to bear My Name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel" (Acts 9:15). It is significant that Israel is there mentioned last, in harmony with the fact that his Epistle to the Hebrews

was written after most of his others to Gentile saints. That this Epistle was written by Paul is clear from 2 Peter 3:15. (Pink 12).

Many Bible scholars believe that the letter was written by Paul, but an equal number can present their strong reasons against this view. (MacDonald 1/2).

When it was accepted as part of the NT, this was partly at least because contemporaries held Paul to be the author. This view, however, appears to rest on no reliable evidence but rather to be a deduction from the facts that Paul was a prolific writer of epistles and that Hebrews is a noble writing that must have had a distinguished author. But both the language and thought forms are unlike those of Paul. The Greek is polished; Paul's is rugged, though vigorous. This book moves in the context of Levitical symbolism, about which Paul elsewhere says nothing. The same argument also tells against Clement of Alexandria's view that Luke translated it. (Morris 6).

"My King James Bible says Paul wrote it, so that must be the case!" is a common response. And yet Origen, a biblical scholar of the second and third centuries, felt that because of style the epistle could not have been the direct work of Paul. (Evans Jr. 21).

The Alexandrian belief that Paul was the author influenced the judgment of eastern Christianity, and ultimately, from the middle of the fourth century, of western Christianity too. But even at Alexandria, the sense of literary criticism possessed by the leaders of the catechetical school made it plain that Pauline authorship could not be predicated simpliciter of this epistle as it could of Romans or Galatians. (Bruce 14-15).

Frank Boyd writes:

As to its authorship, no one knows absolutely and finally. The point has been (and probably will be, to the end of this Christian dispensation) a matter of debate. We can dismiss the matter with just the bare statement that it was not written by Barnabas, Luke, Silas, or Clemens Romanus (Clement of Rome) although there are plausible and not unweighty considerations in their favor.

The main field of argument is whether Paul or Apollos of Alexandria (Acts 18:24ff) was the author. (Boyd01 13).

But Eusebius indicates in his Book VI, Chapter XIV, on the books of the Bible which Clement of Alexandria mentions:

But the Epistle to the Hebrews he asserts was written by Paul, to the Hebrews, in the Hebrew tongue; but that it was carefully translated by Luke, and published among the Greeks. Whence, also, one finds the same character of style and of phraseology in the epistle, as in the Acts. "But it is probable that the title, Paul the Apostle, was not prefixed to it. For as he wrote to the Hebrews, who had imbibed prejudices against him, and suspected him, he wisely guards against diverting them from the perusal, by giving his name." A little after this he observes: "But now as the blessed

presbyter used to say, ‘since the Lord who was the apostle of the Almighty, was sent to the Hebrews, Paul by reason of his inferiority, as if sent to the Gentiles, did not subscribe himself an apostle of the Hebrews; both out of reverence for the Lord, and because he wrote of his abundance to the Hebrews, as a herald and apostle of the Gentiles.’” (233-234).

And Henry Alford devoted several pages in his commentary to the question of who authored the Epistle to the Hebrews. With respect to Luke, he concludes:

160. These are the following: Barnabas, Luke, Clement, Mark, Titus, Apollos, Silvanus, Aquila. These are all the companions of St. Paul, who were of note enough to have written such an Epistle: with the exception of Timotheus, who is excluded from the list, by being mentioned in the Epistle (ch. 13:23) as a different person from the Author.

161. Of these, TITUS is excluded by the fact mentioned Gal. 2:3,—that he was a Greek, and not circumcised even at the time when he accompanied St. Paul in his third journey to Jerusalem, Acts 15:2, 3 ff.

162. It is doubtful, whether a like consideration does not exclude ST. LUKE from the authorship of our Epistle. Certainly the first appearance of Col. 4:10–14 numbers him among those who were not of the circumcision. (Alford04 176).

But, David Allen, the Dean of the School of Preaching at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, indicates:

In my estimation, the primary reason Luke has not been considered seriously is the presumption he was a Gentile, while the author of Hebrews was apparently a Jew. For centuries, the paradigm in New Testament studies that Luke was a Gentile has been axiomatic, as can be seen by any cursory reading of commentaries on Luke-Acts. However, within Lukan studies today, there is no such consensus regarding Luke’s background. As will be demonstrated, there is much evidence to suggest Luke was a Hellenistic Jew whose writings exhibit both Jewish and Greek Characteristics. (Allen02 6-7).

In the same year that he wrote the above, Dr. Allen also penned this equally strong statement in the Hebrews volume of the New American Commentary:

When one considers the lexical, stylistic, and theological similarities between Luke-Acts and Hebrews coupled with the way in which a theory of Lukan authorship can be historically reconstructed from the texts themselves, there is impressive evidence that points to the Lukan authorship of Hebrews. No longer should it be said that “the points of connection between Luke and Hebrews are too slight to support a theory of common authorship.” At any rate, whoever the author was, he must be

classed among the upper echelon of New Testament writers in terms of stylistic ability and theological prowess, as has been continually noted throughout church history.¹⁸⁰

Many additional arguments can be marshaled in favor of Lukan authorship. The combined evidence should evoke among New Testament scholars a closer look at Luke as the author of Hebrews. (Allen01 61).

D. Destination

1. Was Hebrews written for Jewish or for Gentile Christians?
 - a. Until recently, Jewish Christians were assumed.
 - b. More lately (when Berkhof was writing, I.e. 1915) Schuirer, Weizsacker, Von Soden, Julicher and McGiffert concluded that Gentile Christians were the readers being addressed.
2. Where were the first readers located? Four possibilities:
 - a. Alexandria. (Berkhof favors this choice).
 - b. Antioch in Syria.
 - c. Rome.
 - d. Jerusalem.

E. Composition

1. Occasion and purpose. The danger of Apostasy which threatened the Epistle's readers.
2. Time and place. Berkhof doesn't actually discuss the location from which Hebrews was written, but he places it at about 69 A. D., before the 70 A. D. Destruction of the Temple at Jerusalem.

Given the difficulty in determining the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews, it is not surprising that the location of its writing is also obscure.

F. Canonical Significance

The letter was not regarded as canonical in the Western church until the fourth century; in the Eastern church, however, the recognition of its apostolicity and canonicity went hand in hand. Clement of Alexandria often quotes the letter as canonical, and Origen does sometimes, though he felt uncertain as to its Pauline authorship. The Epistle is found in the Peshito, but it is uncertain, whether it also had a place in the earliest Syriac translation. From the fourth century the Western church also admitted its canonical authority. (Berk01 151).

Louis Berkhof's Introduction to the New Testament
26: The General Epistle of James - Outline and Notes

XXVI. The General Epistle of James

A. Contents

There are no clearly defined parts in this Epistle; hence no classification of its contents is attempted. (Berk01 153).

B. Characteristics

1. No benediction at the beginning, and no greetings or salutation at the end.
2. The Epistle is ethical rather than doctrinal.
3. The Epistle has a somewhat Jewish complexion.
4. Good Hellenistic Greek.

C. Authorship: James, the half-brother of Jesus.

D. Destination: "the twelve tribes which are in the dispersion". Two possibilities:

1. Jewish Christians who lived outside of Palestine.
2. All the believers in Jesus Christ who were scattered among the Gentiles.

We prefer to think of the Jewish Christians of the diaspora in Syria and neighboring lands, which were probably called "the twelve tribes" as representing the true Israel, because (1) the Epistle does not contain a single reference to Gentile Christians; (2) James was pre-eminently the leader of the Jewish Church; (3) the entire complexion of the Epistle points to Jewish readers. (Berk01 157).

E. Composition

1. Occasion and purpose. To comfort, reprove, and correct.
2. Time and place. Between 45 and 50 A. D. From Jerusalem.

F. Canonical Significance

1. The early Church expressed significant doubt as to the canonicity of the Epistle of James.
2. The church began and continued to honor it as canonical in and after the fourth century.
3. "The great permanent value of this Epistle is found in the stress it lays on the necessity of having a vital faith, that issues in fruits of righteousness. The profession of Christ without a corresponding Christian life is worthless and does not save man. Berk01 159).

Louis Berkhof's Introduction to the New Testament
27: The First General Epistle of Peter - Outline and Notes

XXVII. The First General Epistle of Peter

A. Contents

1. Praising God for the blessings of salvation.
2. Christian hope and holiness.
3. Directions for the special relationships of life.
4. Prayer, brotherly love, hospitality, and conscientiousness.

B. Characteristics

1. Primarily practical and ethical rather than doctrinal.
2. More Old Testament quotations than any other New Testament writing.
3. All the thought of Romans 12-13 are also found in this epistle.
4. The Greek usage is excellent.

C. Authorship

1. "The external authentication of this Epistle is very strong. Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen and Cyprian all quote it by name and without expressing the slightest doubt as to its canonicity. And Eusebius says: "One Epistle of Peter called his first is universally received." (Berk01 161).
2. Internal evidence of authorship is mostly missing.

D. Destination: "the elect who are sojourners of the dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia".

E. Composition

1. Occasion and purpose: the prospective journey of Silvanus to visit the recipients.
2. Time and place. There are significant differences of opinion concerning this. We are inclined to think that he composed the Epistle, when Paul was on his journey to Spain, about A. D. 64 or 65. (Berk01 166).

F. Canonical Significance

There was no doubt as to this epistle's canonicity in the early church.

Louis Berkhof's Introduction to the New Testament
28: The Second General Epistle of Peter - Outline and Notes

XXVIII. The Second General Epistle of Peter

A. Contents

1. The importance of Christian knowledge.
2. Warning against false teachers.

B. Characteristics

1. Practical warning, exhortation, and encouragement.
2. The similarity of 2:1-18; 3:1-3 with the Epistle of Jude points to the dependency of one upon the other. Most scholars maintain the priority of Jude.
3. There are significant differences between the Greek of 2 Peter and that of 1 Peter.

C. Authorship

1. The authorship of this book is more weakly attested than any other book of the New Testament.
2. There is some conjecture that Peter used different interpreters during the writing of the respective two epistles.
3. The internal evidence definitely points to Peter as the author.

D. Destination: those "that have obtained like precious faith with us through the righteousness of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ".

From 3: 1 we gather, however, that they are identical with the readers of the first Epistle and from 3:15, that they were also the recipients of some Pauline Epistle(s). (Berk01 170).

E. Composition

1. Occasion and purpose. The dangerous heresies which were at work in some of the churches.
2. Time and place. Probably 66 or 67 A. D. From Rome.

F. Canonical Significance: See under "Authorship" above.

Louis Berkhof's Introduction to the New Testament
29: The First General Epistle of John - Outline and Notes

XXIX. The First General Epistle of John

A. Contents: "It is impossible to give a satisfactory schematic representation of the contents of this letter." (Berk01 173).

B. Characteristics

1. Literary form is different from the other books of the New Testament. It does not name its author.
2. But, the affinity with the Gospel of John is striking.
3. The truth is represented ideally rather than historically.
4. The style is very similar to that of John's Gospel.

C. Authorship

1. External testimony clearly attributes this Epistle to the Apostle John.
2. In the sixteenth century, Joseph Scaliger insisted that none 1, 2, or 3 John were written by John the Apostle. S. G. Lange, Bretschneider, Volkmar, Zeller, Davidson, and Scholten also denied John's authorship.
3. Four arguments against Johannine authorship:
 - a. The epistle is evidently directed against second century Gnosticism.
 - b. It also appears to be a polemic against second century Docetism.
 - c. There are references to Montanism in the Epistle.
 - d. The difference from Revelation is so great that it's impossible that one man should have written both.

D. Destination: There is little information available on this. Most scholars hold that the Epistle was written to the Christians of Asia Minor in general.

E. Composition

1. Occasion and purpose'

The direct purpose of the author is to give his readers authentic instruction regarding the truth and reality of the things which they, especially as believers in Jesus Christ, accepted by faith; and to help them to see the natural issues of the fellowship to which they had been introduced, in order that they might have a full measure of peace and joy and life. The purpose of the writer is therefore at once theoretical and practical. (Berk01 176).

2. Time and place. Probably between 80 and 98 A. D. From Ephesus. But I do not agree with Berkhof here, because the Epistle makes no mention of the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple in 70 A. D. I would thus place the writing of this Epistle before 70 A. D.

F. Canonical Significance

1. The canonicity of this Epistle was never doubted by the early church.
2. "It describes that community as the sphere of life and light, of holiness and righteousness, of love to God and to the brethren; and as the absolute antithesis to the world with its darkness and death, its pollution and unrighteousness, its hatred and deception." (Berk01 177).

Louis Berkhof's Introduction to the New Testament
30: The Second and Third General Epistles of John - Outline and Notes

XXX. The Second and Third General Epistles of John

A. Contents

1. 2 John: The writer's joy as a result of some of the addressee's children walking in the truth. Reiteration of the great commandment of brotherly love.
2. 3 John: Commendations for Gajus (sp? Gaius?) and disapproval of Diotrephes.

B. Characteristics

1. These two epistles exhibit several points of similarity.
2. They also both show a close affinity to 1 John.

C. Authorship

1. Their authorship is not well attested, probably due to their brevity.
2. The internal evidence favors John the Apostle being the author of both.

D. Destination:

1. 2 John: "to ἐκλεκτῇ κυρίᾳ and her children, whom I love in truth, and not only I, but all those that know the truth" which has been variously translated as (1) to an elect lady; (2) to the elect lady; (3) to the elect Kuria; (4) to the Lady Electa; (5) to Electa Kuria. (Berk01 179).
2. 3 John: Gajus (sp? Gaius?) of whom we have no further information.

E. Composition

1. Occasion and purpose.
 - a. 2 John: The false agitators of 2 John 7-12.
 - b. 3 John: The reports of certain brethren who traveled about, preaching the Gospel.
2. Time and place. The time is indeterminate. Probably from Ephesus.

F. Canonical Significance: There was some doubt as to the canonicity of these two epistles in the early church, but several of the early church fathers accepted them as such.

Louis Berkhof's Introduction to the New Testament
31: The General Epistle of Jude - Outline and Notes

XXXI. The General Epistle of Jude

A. Contents

1. Against certain intruders in the Church, who deny Christ.
2. Exhortations to increase in faith and keep themselves in the Love of God.

B. Characteristics

1. Very close resemblance to parts of 2 Peter.
2. Contains quotations from apocryphal books.
 - a. Verse 9 is from the *Assumption of Moses*.
 - b. Verses 14 and 15 are from the *Book of Enoch*.
3. Jude's Greek has a Jewish complexion but is fairly correct..

C. Authorship: "Jude the servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James." Berkhof (as with most scholars) equates this with Jude, the half-brother of Jesus.

D. Destination: "those that are sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ, and called." But we have no information concerning the actual Physical locality of the recipients.

E. Composition

1. Occasion and purpose. Jude counsels his readers to earnestly contend for the faith.
2. Time and place. About 65 A. D., possibly from Jerusalem.

F. Canonical Significance

1. In the early Church, there was significant doubt as to the canonicity of the Epistle of Jude.
2. Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and Origen held it to be authentic.

Tommy Wasserman relates:

The Epistle of Jude contains only twenty-five verses, and yet the number of text-critical problems are both relatively numerous and complicated as compared to other books of the NT... this book has been largely neglected in the history of exegesis in general, and even treated with contempt on the part of some scholars. However, there has been major progress in recent years". (3).

On March 15, 1980, Jude 24 led me to forsake my naive antinomianism, and to embrace Spirit-led obedience to Christ's Gospel instead. I was saved at Moody Church in Chicago on December 25, 1967, but March 15, 1980 was a deeply significant day in my walk with the Lord. Accordingly, the book of Jude remains a very fascinating target of study for me to this day.

Louis Berkhof's Introduction to the New Testament
32: The Revelation of John - Outline and Notes

XXXII. The Revelation of John

A. Contents

1. The first vision, 1:9-3:22, the glorified Christ in the midst of the Church.
2. The second vision, 4:1-8:1, God ruling and Christ taking the book of divine decrees, and breaking the seven seals.
3. The third vision, 8:2-11:19, seven angels with seven trumpets.
4. The fourth vision, 12:1-14:20, conflict of the world with the Church of God.
5. The fifth vision, 15:1-16:21, seven angels with seven vials.
6. The sixth vision, 17:1-20:15, Christ's victory over the harlot city Babylon.
7. The seventh vision, 21:1-22:7, the New Jerusalem.

B. Characteristics

1. This is the only prophetic book in the New Testament.
2. Its thought is clothed in symbolic language.
3. Unlike the rest of the New Testament, the language of Revelation is definitely Hebraistic Greek.

C. Authorship

1. There is strong external evidence for the author being the Apostle John.
2. The external evidence is corroborated by internal evidence.
3. But there have been dissenting voices from the beginning. Principal objections:
 - a. While the writer of the Gospel and the Epistles doesn't identify himself, the writer of Revelation names himself in both the first person and the third person forms.
 - b. The writing of the two is quite different from each other.
 - c. The doctrine in Revelation has a significantly Jewish stamp, while the doctrine in the Gospel does not.
 - d. The Hebraistic style of Revelation is very different from anything else John has written.
4. But, Berkhof does not accept those objections. "It cannot be maintained that the Christological and Soteriological teaching of the Apocalypse is essentially Jewish.... The fact that the author so often violates the rules of Greek grammar, does not necessarily mean that he did not know them, but may also indicate that under the stress of the lofty ideas that he wished to express, he naturally resorted to Aramaic usage, which was easier for him." (Berk01 189).

D. Destination: "The apostle addresses the Apocalypse to 'the seven churches which are in Asia,' 1:4. Undoubtedly this number is not exhaustive but representative of the Church in general... These churches are types that are constantly repeated in history." (Berk01 189).

E. Composition

1. Occasion and purpose. The increasing hardships faced by the Church, and its struggle with the hostile world.
2. Time and place. From Patmos? Two opinions as to time:
 - a. About 95 or 96 A. D. The testimony of antiquity favors this view.

b. About 68 or 69 A. D. Favored by the Syrian version.

I would hold to choice “b” due to the lack of any information in Revelation about the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple in 70 A. D.

3. Method. Four theories:

a. Incorporation theory - general unity, but several Jewish or Christian fragments added in.

b. Revision theory - the book has been subject to one or more revisions.

c. Compilation theory - two or more sources have been pieced together.

d. Jewish and Christian theory - Jewish writing in Aramaic about 65-70 A. D., followed by later Christian editing and translation.

I would hold to general unity - with the Holy Spirit-inspired Apostle John as the author; but that would not preclude John from having referred to outside sources.

F. Interpretation. Three methods:

a. Continuist - a prophetic compendium of Church history from the first century to the Second Coming.

b. Futurist - All the events in Revelation are future; to be found in the short period immediately preceding the Second Coming

c. Praeterist - Almost all of the events were fulfilled before the Fall of Rome (476 A. D.)

d. More recently, Clouse divides current viewpoints along the lines drawn by the concept of the Millennium (The thousand-years’ reign of Christ on Earth) as portrayed in Revelation 20:

i. Historic Premillennialism - Christ will return at the end of the Great Tribulation and will then literally reign on Earth for a thousand years (17-18).

ii. Dispensational Premillennialism - Christ will return secretly at the beginning of the Great Tribulation to Rapture the Church, and then will return openly at the end of the Great Tribulation and will then literally reign on Earth for a thousand years (63-64).

iii. Postmillennialism - “The kingdom of God is now being extended through Christian teaching and preaching.” (8).

iv. Amillennialism - “the Bible does not predict a period of universal peace and righteousness before the end of the world... there will be continuous growth of good and evil in the world which will culminate in the Second Coming of Christ”. (8-9).

e. Contemporaneously with Clouse, Pentecost further divides Dispensational Premillennialism into four sub-theories centered around the timing of the Second Coming in relation to the Great Tribulation of Daniel’s Seventieth Week, as mentioned in Matthew 24:24, and as further delineated by the seals, trumpets, and vials of Revelation.

i. The Partial Rapture - Only “spiritual” believers will be raptured. (158).

- ii. The Posttribulation Rapture - The Church will go through the Great Tribulation and will be raptured at the Second Coming at the end of the Great Tribulation. (164).
 - iii. The Midtribulation Rapture - The Church will go through the first half of Daniel's Seventieth Week (the first half of the 7-year period) and then be raptured at the seventh trumpet of Revelation. (179).
 - iv. The Pretribulation Rapture - The Church will not go through any portion of the Great Tribulation, but will instead be raptured out of the world prior to the commencement of the Great Tribulation. (193).
- f. Yet more recently, (Rosenthal 60) has proposed the Pre-Wrath Rapture position:
- i. The Rapture of the Church will occur immediately prior to the beginning of the Day of the Lord.
 - ii. The Day of the Lord commences sometime within the second half of the seventieth week.
 - iii. The cosmic disturbances associated with the sixth seal will signal the approach of the Day of the Lord.
 - iv. The Day of the Lord will begin with the opening of the seventh seal (Rev. 8:1).

Eschatology is a subject far beyond the scope of the available space for discussion here, and will have to wait for a later, more specific treatment. But, briefly, I hold to a Posttribulationist Premillennial position where the Rapture occurs at the seventh trumpet of Revelation; that the seventh trumpet is equated with the "last trump" of 1 Corinthians 15:52; and that the seven trumpets are contained within the seventh seal and the seven vials are contained within the seventh trumpet. Furthermore, I hold with the midtribulationists' concept that tribulation and wrath are not the same thing, but I don't believe that such precludes the Church from going through the entire Great Tribulation: our Great God is just as able to protect us in the midst of His wrath falling upon the Earth in general, as He was able to protect the Israelites in the land of Goshen while His plagues were falling upon the rest of Egypt.

G. Inspiration: As with the Old Testament prophets, John was the recipient of divine revelation via visions with angelic interpretation, and was commanded by God Himself to write and to prophecy.

H. Canonical Significance

- 1. The canonical authority of Revelation was not doubted by the early Church.
- 2. Later Millenarian positions made the book obnoxious to some Church fathers.
- 3. "Its central teaching is, 'I come quickly!'... 'Even so, come, Lord Jesus!'" (Berk01 193).

My Closing Thoughts

I've found that preparing this outline and notes paper has helped me categorize and structure my own thoughts on the various books of the New Testament and their relationships within the Bible as a whole. Perhaps you will find it helpful too.

The Westminster Shorter Confession directs:

Q. 1. What is the chief end of man?

A. Man's chief end is to glorify God, [a] and to enjoy him for ever. [b]

[a]. Ps. 86:9; Isa. 60:21; Rom. 11:36; 1 Cor. 6:20; 10:31; Rev. 4:11

[b]. Ps. 16:5-11; 144:15; Isa. 12:2; Luke 2:10; Phil. 4:4; Rev. 21:3-4

(Westminster01, cf Westminster02)

“That I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death”. (Philippians 3:10, KJV).

M. D. J.

2021/07/07

Works Cited

- Aland, Kurt and Aland, Barbara. *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism*. Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989. Print.
- [Alford04] Alford, Henry. *The New Testament for English Readers: A Critical and Explanatory Commentary*. New Edition. Vol. 2. London; Oxford; Cambridge: Rivingtons; Deighton, Bell and Co., 1872. Print.
- [Allen01] Allen, David L. *Hebrews*. Nashville, TN: B & H Publishing Group, 2010. Print. The New American Commentary.
- [Allen02] Allen, David. *Lukan Authorship of Hebrews*. Nashville: B&H Publishing, 2010. Print.
- Bengel, Johann Albrecht. *Gnomon of the New Testament*. Ed. M. Ernest Bengel and J. C. F. Steudel. Trans. James Bryce. Vol. 4. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1860. Print.
- [Berk01] Berkhof, L. *New Testament Introduction*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans-Sevensma Co., 1915. Print.
- [Berk02] Berkhof, L. *Systematic Theology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans publishing co., 1938. Print.
- [Boyd01] Boyd, Frank. *Hebrews and the General Epistles*. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1977. Print.
- Bruce, F. F. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1990. Print. The New International Commentary on the New Testament.
- Burgon, John W. *The Last Twelve Verses of the Gospel according to S. Mark*. Oxford; London: James Parker and Co., 1871. Print
- Calvin, John, and John Owen. *Commentary on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews*. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2010. Print.
- Clouse, Robert. ed. *The Meaning of the Millennium: Four Views*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1977. Print.
- Comfort, Philip W. *A Commentary on the Manuscripts and Text of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2015. Print.
- Comfort, Philip W. *New Testament Text and Translation Commentary: Commentary on the Variant Readings of the Ancient New Testament Manuscripts and How They Relate to the Major English Translations*. Carol Stream, IL: Tyndale House Publishers, Inc., 2008. Print.
- [ECM3.1.1] Strutwolf, Holger et al. *Novum Testamentum Graecum, Editio Critica Maior*. III: Die Apostelgeschichte, Teil 1.1: Text: Kapitel 1-14. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2017. Print.
- [ECM3.1.2] Strutwolf, Holger et al. *Novum Testamentum Graecum, Editio Critica Maior*. III: Die Apostelgeschichte, Teil 1.2: Text: Kapitel 15-28. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2017. Print.
- Ellicott, Charles J. *The Pastoral Epistles of St. Paul: With a Critical and Grammatical Commentary, and a Revised Translation*. London: Longmans, Green, Reader, & Dyer, 1869. Print.
- [Eusebius] Pamphilus, Eusebius. *The Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius Pamphilus*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1991. Print.
- Evans Jr., Louis. *Hebrews*. Waco, TX: Word, 1985. Print. The Communicator's Commentary

- Gamble Jr., Harry. *The Textual History of the Letter to the Romans: A Study in Textual and Literary Criticism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977. Print. Studies and Documents Founded by Kirsopp and Silva Lake, Volume 42.
- Ironside, H. A. "Charge That to My Account." *Charge That to My Account and other Gospel Addresses*. 6-14. Chicago: Moody Press, 1931. Print.
- [KJV] The Holy Bible: King James Version. electronic ed. of the 1769 edition of the 1611 Authorized Version. Bellingham WA: Logos Research Systems, Inc., 1995. Print.
- Köstenberger, Andreas J. *1-2 Timothy & Titus*. Ed. T. Desmond Alexander, Thomas R. Schreiner, and Andreas J. Köstenberger. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2021. Print. Evangelical Biblical Theology Commentary.
- MacDonald, William. *Hebrews: From Shadow to Substance*. Chicago: Moody Bible Institute, 1957. Print.
- Metzger, Bruce Manning, United Bible Societies. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament, Second Edition a Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament (4th Rev. Ed.)*. London; New York: United Bible Societies, 1994. Print.
- Morris, Leon. "Hebrews." *The Expositor's Bible Commentary: Hebrews through Revelation*. Ed. Frank E. Gaebelein. Vol. 12. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1981. Print.
- [NA16] Nestle, D. Erwin. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 16th Edition. Stuttgart, Germany: Privileg Württ Bibelanstalt, 1936. As photographically reproduced by New York: American Bible Society. Print. ,
- [NA21] Nestle, D. Eberhard and Nestle, D. Erwin. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 21st Edition. Stuttgart, Germany: Privileg Württ Bibelanstalt, 1952. Print.
- [NA25] Nestle, Erwin; Aland, Kurt; et al. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 25th Edition. Stuttgart, Germany: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1963. Print.
- [NA26] Aland, Kurt; Black, Matthew; et al. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 26th Edition. Stuttgart, Germany: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979. Print.
- [NA27] Aland, Barbara; Aland, Kurt; et al. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 27th Edition. Stuttgart, Germany: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993. Print.
- [NA28] Aland, Kurt et al. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 28th Edition. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012. Print.
- Pentecost, J. Dwight. *Things to Come: A Study in Biblical Eschatology*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1958. Print.
- Pink, Arthur Walkington. *An Exposition of Hebrews*. Swengel, PA: Bible Truth Depot, 1954. Print.
- Rosenthal, Marvin. *The Pre-Wrath Rapture of the Church*. Nashville: Nelson, 1990. Print.
- Stephen's 1550 Textus Receptus: With Morphology*. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2002. Print.
- Tischendorf, Constantin von; Gregory, Caspar René; and Abbot, Ezra: eds. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. Lipsiae: Giesecke & Devrient, 1869–1894. Print.
- [UBS2] Aland, Barbara; Black, Matthew; et al. *The Greek New Testament, Second Edition* Münster, Germany: United Bible Societies; Institute for New Testament Textual Research, 1966. Print.
- [UBS3] Aland, Barbara; Black, Matthew; et al. *The Greek New Testament, Third Edition Corrected*. Münster, Germany: United Bible Societies; Institute for New Testament Textual Research, 1975. Print.

- [UBS4] Aland, Barbara; Aland, Kurt; et al. *The Greek New Testament*, Fourth Revised Edition (with Morphology). Stuttgart, Germany: United Bible Societies; Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1983. Print.
- [UBS5] Aland, Barbara; Aland, Kurt; et al., eds. *The Greek New Testament*. Fifth Revised Edition (with Morphology). Stuttgart, Germany: United Bible Societies; Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2014. Print.
- Wasserman, Tommy. *The Epistle of Jude: Its Text and Transmission*. Stockholm, Sweden: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2006. Print. Coniectanea Biblica New Testament Series 43.
- Westcott and Hort Greek New Testament (1881): With Morphology*. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2002. Print.
- [Westminster01] Westminster Assembly. *The Westminster Confession of Faith: Edinburgh Edition*. Philadelphia: William S. Young, 1851. Print.
- [Westminster02] *Westminster Shorter Catechism*. Web. <http://www.reformed.org/documents/wsc/index.html> . (cf. TNARS TH610) Last Accessed 2021/04/27.
- [Wiki01] “Louis Berkhof.” *Wikipedia*. Web. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Louis_Berkhof . Last Accessed 2021/07/06.
- [Wiki02] “Origen.” *Wikipedia*. Web. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Origen> . Last Accessed 2021/06/26.
- [Wiki03] “Tertullian.” *Wikipedia*. Web. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tertullian> . Last Accessed 2021/06/26.

Other References

- Abegg Jr., Martin; Flint, Peter; and Ulrich, Eugene. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1999. Print.
- Adeyemo, Tokunboh. *Africa Bible Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010. Print.
- [Alford01] Alford, Henry. *How to Study the New Testament: The Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles*. London: Strahan, 1867. Print.
- [Alford02] Alford, Henry. *How to Study the New Testament: The Epistles (First Section)*. London: Strahan, 1865. Print.
- [Alford03] Alford, Henry. *How to Study the New Testament: The Epistles (Second Section) and the Revelation*. London: Strahan, 1872. Print.
- [Boyd02] Boyd, Frank. *The Life of Christ*. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1968. Print.
- [Boyd03] Boyd, Frank. *Old Testament Studies*, 3 volumes. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1967. Print.
- [Boyd04] Boyd, Frank. *The Pauline Epistles*, 2 volumes. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1969. Print.
- [Boyd05] Boyd, Frank. *Studies in the Revelation of Jesus Christ*. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1967. Print.
- Bruce, F. F.. *The Canon of Scripture*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1988, Year. Print.
- Comay, Joan and Brownrigg, Ronald. *Who's Who in the Bible*. City not listed: Bonanza Books, 1980. Print.
- Cross, Frank. *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 3rd Edition. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995. Print.
- Douglas, J. D. And Tenney, Merrill. *NIV Compact Dictionary of the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1989. Print.
- Evans, Craig. *Ancient Texts for New Testament Studies: A Guide to the Background Literature*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2005. Print.
- Gaster, Theodor. *The Dead Sea Scriptures In English Translation*, Revised and Enlarged Edition. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1964. Print.
- Grudem, Wayne. *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine*. Second Edition. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Academic, 2020. Print
- Goldin, Judah. *The Living Talmud*. New York: Mentor, 1957. Print.
- Harrison, R. K.. *Old Testament Times*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970. Print.
- Hodge, Charles. *Systematic Theology*. Three volumes. Oak Harbor, WA: Logos Research Systems, Inc., 1872-1873:1997. Print.
- Jenkins, Simon. *The Bible From Scratch*. Batavia, IL: Lion Publishing, 1987. Print.
- Lamsa, George. *Idioms in the Bible Explained and A Key to the Original Gospels*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1985. Print.
- Nelson, Tommy. *The Story of God: Understanding the Bible from Beginning to End*. Plano, TX: Hudson Productions, 2007. Print.
- Neusner, Jacob. *The Babylonian Talmud: A Translation and Commentary*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2011. Print.
- Neusner, Jacob. *The Jerusalem Talmud: A Translation and Commentary*. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 2008. Print.

- Packer, James; Tenney, Merrill; and White, William. *The Bible Almanac*. Nashville: Nelson, 1980. Print.
- Pfeiffer, Charles. *Baker's Bible Atlas*, Revised Edition. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984. Print.
- Retter, Daniel. *HaMafteach: An Indexed Reference Guide to the Talmud Bavli (Babylonian Talmud) and Its Mishnayos*. Jerusalem: Koren, 2014. Print.
- Richards, Lawrence. *The Word Bible Handbook*. Waco, TX: Word, 1982. Print.
- Riedel, Eunice; Tracy, Thomas; and Moskowitz, Barbra. *The Book of the Bible*. New York: William Morrow, 1979. Print.
- Riggs, Ralph. *The Life of Christ*. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1968. Print.
- Robertson, A. T. *A Harmony of the Gospels*. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2009. Print.
- Robertson, A. T. *A Harmony of the Gospels For Students of the Life of Christ*. New York: Harper & Row, 1950. Print.
- Schaff, Philip; Hitchcock, Roswell; and Eadie, John, eds. *The Analytical Reference Bible*. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1918r. Print.
- Schultz, Samuel. *The Old Testament Speaks*. New York: Harper, 1960. Print.
- Smith, Colin. *Unlocking the Bible Story*, 4 volumes. Chicago: Moody, 2002. Print.
- Souter, Alexander. *The Text and Canon of the New Testament*. London: Duckworth, 1913. Print.
- Sparks, Kenton. *Ancient Texts for the Study of the Hebrew Bible: A Guide to the Background Literature*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2005. Print.
- Tenney, Merrill. *New Testament Survey*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1961. Print.

**This paper was originally submitted
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
Master of Divinity Degree
at
The North American Reformed Seminary
a.k.a.
The Log College & Seminary
(BS512 Biblical Studies)**