

and when we find far more difficulties in those seven books than in all the rest of the Bible combined I would say that we had an adding evidence not of one book but that all were questionable. If we had authority that these books were part of God's Word we would have to accept them but we have so much difficulty--I said to a professor once--What do R.C. scholars do with these difficulties and he told me that they spend their time defending problems in other parts of the Bible which they find much easier to defend and most of them just don't take the time to do into the problems. There is the matter of Augustine in the 4th Cent. We find good evidence from other places that they didn't accept these books and if the North Africa church differed strongly on this matter you would naturally expect to find some controversy about but we don't have it. Then we note that "Canonical" is used not to mean authoratative but rather helpful books. Augustine came out of rank heresy and compared to the books that he was used to the Apocrypha was very good. He tells people not to read the harmful books but these which would be helpful. Occasionally he refers to some of them in his writings and he makes statements which prove that he puts them in a different class. He brings out that the Jews did not have the book of Maccabees but it is received by the church with advantage if they ~~xx~~ they will receive it. It is a good book to read but we don't establish doctrines thereon.

(3) In the 4th Cent. we have St. Jerome. He is one of the greatest scholars in the history of the Christian church. When he translated the Vulgate he didn't want to translate the Apocrypha and later through pers~~x~~uasion did translate a portion of it and did in such a short time that it proved that he didn't think that these books were authoratative.