he might find it diff̧icult to be certain in every case. However, it would be quite easy foxkinaxixumuf present-world-that for him $\alpha x$ in our present world to get hold of a copy of the Bible, and look at the table of the contents, and see which of these books are infcluded and which are not. This
 the point where books are fairly cheap and easy to secure. In the early days there this was was no printing. Books had to be copied by hand. And theywere very expensive. And previous to the fourth century most ofx books were on scrolls, and consequently contained comparatively small amount of material. This being the case, hardly one would have a complete set of the scrolls of the Bible. The early Christian church spread read fapidly among the Gentiles before many generations passed comparatively few people with much knowledge of Judaism were in the church. The leaders were active in presenting the truths of salvation through Christ, but few of the $m$ had time to do investigation through all of the serools scrolls of the New Testament. Doubtless most of them familiar with a good mary of the Psalms and with the Book of Genesis and with certain other sections , but other sections of the O ld Testament were comparatively little known even to men-efthe-mifr many of the ministers $x$ in odx the Christian Church in early centuries. It is therefore very interesting when we have- look at the compatively small amount of written materid that has been preserved xam from that second century AD we note that one of the earliest $\mathbb{Q}$ writers of whom we have a considerable amount of material, namely Justin Matfys Matyr, though he quotes extensively from most of the books of the Old Testament, ne ver quotes from any of the Aprochryphax. It is also interesting to note that in his-contreveris- xx controversiadky with Trypho there was no suggestion of any difference with the Jews as to wheik- which books were considered inspired, which would make it quite clear that it was-tin- the-intention- understandigng

