

In both the Old & New Testament Antilegoumena's, these books were initially accepted as canonical. Later on, a few people questioned their canonicity (whether they should be in the Bible). In all cases, their canonicity was firmly established and supported. Below are the reasons as to why they were even questioned. As you can see, these reasons didn't hold up very well at all.

OT Antilegoumena:

Song of Songs....It seemed sensual to some people. Being that it describes married love, it should be sensual.

Ecclesiastes....It seemed skeptical to some people. Being that it shows the futility of life without God, it should sound skeptical. But in the last chapter (C12V9-13) it says that knowing God and keeping His commandments is the right thing to do to have a fulfilling life.

Esther....The name of God is absent from this book and because of this, some people doubted it. But the absence of God's name is more than compensated for by the presence of His power and grace in the deliverance of His people.

Ezekiel....It was questioned by some people because of its seemingly anti-Mosaical teachings. However, no specific examples were ever supplied that contradict the teachings of Moses. If there were actual contradictions, then this would disqualify it from the Bible. The lack on any scriptures to support this view was an embarrassment to the people who held this view.

Proverbs....Some people thought it was illogical and contradicted itself. The supposed contradiction was in Chapter 26 Verses 4,5 but these few people just didn't understand that many proverbs used the expression, "On the one hand....and on the other hand".

NT Antilegoumena:

Hebrews....the author's name has been lost to antiquity. While the Eastern Church always accepted it, the Western Church questioned it for a brief time but finally accepted it.

James....Some thought that James was preaching "salvation by works". Quickly, they realized that he was talking about works as the "fruit of salvation", not as a means of salvation.

2Peter....some people noticed that 2Peter is stylistically different from 1Peter. Sometimes, the authors had scribes do the physical writing for them. There is also a lot on internal evidence for 2Peter being written by Peter the apostle.

2nd & 3rd John....Some people thought that because of these letters private nature, written to individual people, that they shouldn't be included. But look at 1st & 2nd Timothy, Titus & Philemon. These letters had wide circulation and were written by an apostle.

Jude....Some people questioned this because of its reference to the pseudopigraphical "Book of Enoch" (V14,15) and possibly to the "Assumption of Moses" (V9). Remember that Paul referenced pagan poets (Acts 17:28, 1Cor 15:33 & Titus 1:12). Referencing something doesn't mean that you support the whole book.

Revelation....Some people questioned it because it didn't support their end-times view. It does seem to support millennialism, the one thousand year rule of Christ. This dispute was quickly rejected by the vast majority of believers.