

Canon which the Jews accepted in their day. We have seen strong evidence that the Christian church has taken a position agreeing mostly with the Canon of the Jews and the over whelming majority of Christian leaders have taken the same attitude in more recent years. Let us look briefly at these three arguments. (1) It is a broad generalization that the early Bible had the Apocrypha included therein which does not stand examination. The Syriac-Pishitta does not contain them. The early LXX contain some of them and others contain other portions of the LXX. The Vulgate, which the ~~many~~ R.C. take as their authority, the very translator of these books refused to accept them and did translate them very hastily. And some of those which he did, they did not accept as authoratative. The value of the Vulgate is an important question but one which we won't take up just now.

52 Ill. of letter being read in a service but no conclusion that this letter was inspired or a part of God's Word. The question is what is going to be your attitude on what you use in a service and there is not enough evidence in the early Church. Young man in NY has the extreme attitude that it is wrong to use anything that is not the inspired Word of God--if the early church held that view, we know anything they then used in a service, they considered it to be a part of the Word of God. The Apostle Paul went into the synagogue and reasoned with the people and presented his arguments and explanations to them. He did not hesitate to use human words to present his thoughts --we read the apostles, in their meetings, sanggan hymn occasionally but we don't know if that hymn was a part of Scripture or not, we have no evidence. No proof that it would be wrong according to them to read something in public worship which was not a part of the Word and authorative. Thinking of this, even if we do find they used something else doesnot prove to us as to wheather those people considered it a part of the Word of God or not.

Interesting that the Church of England in its Credial statement accepts the OT as we have it and rejects the Apoc.and declares it not to be inspired and not to be a part of the Word of Godyet in the Hom. of the Church of England which are read during their weekly services, they occasionally read selections from the A. They consider these books as they have been in the early copies of the English Bible--they were printed as they are printed in the German Bible to this day. They are printed separately and it is said they are to read in public service for example of life and instructionbut not to establish any doctrine. We have no evidence wheather they considered it as part of the Word of God . Also no evidence as to how much they were read