

3. The Pseudepigrapha --"books which are claimed to be written by other persons that actually they are. The additional acts of Adam; the book of Lamech and perhaps it has been rediscovered according to the newspapers but of minor importance. Daniel according to the critics is exactly in this same class. We Protestants use this word in rather a technical way--we use it to mean other ancient Jewish books written by Jews or possibly by early Christians which are similar somewhat to some of the Biblical books but are not a part of the Bible. The R.C. call the Pseudepigrapha the Apocrypha. And that which we call the Apocrypha they call part of the O.T. Now there is little use on our taking much time on the Pseudepigrapha since even the R.C. don't claim that these books are authoritative and though some of them are very good books, good helpful suggestions and none of them do I think are as bad as the N.T. Apocrypha though some of them get into some vagaries and queer junk. They are not authoritative for any doctrine. They are like Pilgrim's Progress on which every young Christian child was brought up until recently. They were taught and nurtured in this book but ~~no~~ no one thought for a moment that this was part of the Bible. It is just a fine Christian book by a Christian man who is giving us his ideas--as such it is excellent but not an authoritative book. That was what much of the Apocrypha were and some of the Pseudepigrapha though some of the books were in quite a different category.

4. Our attitude toward the Apocrypha. It all depends for what purpose you are using them. If someone comes to me with a beautiful legend about ~~the~~ some Indian tribe in Penna. and Nova Scotia--I might say how beautiful it was written and has lovely stories therein and quite helpful. But if someone brings me the same thing exactly and claims that the state divisions should be along the way the Indians had it, I would look at it entirely differently. Here you would be claiming that this was a history and authority over U.S.--in the first place how do you know whether the book is even true. Where it came from you don't know nor who wrote it. If you present it as good literature I'll read it and get the good out of it I can and won't worry about things that aren't true there. If you present it as authoritative I immediately begin to question it. If you present me with a book of History and it says something about Richard the Lion-hearted was released from his prison in Austria and reached England at a certain date--I could point out that it was two years before that and point out that that book was not reliable at all. If you bring me Sir Walter Scott's Ivanhoe and here I would