they had which magnified the idea of one true God and of His covenant with Israel and which they thought were part of the Old Testament, but they were not sure. They were anxious to find out, solds it would seem likely that Melito took a complete set of these scrolls. These would all be in the Greek language. I doubt very originally much that Melito knew Hebrew. He understood that the Old Testament had been written in Hebrew but he had translations of it in Greek.

Melito gives us his list of books and as we look at it we do not find any-elearevidence absolute evidence that he did not consider the Aprochrypha al books as part
of the Old Testament. Out of the m seven books that are in the Roman Catholic Bible
and not in ours, six are definitely not mentioned in his list. There is one case where
to be a r2-f- reference
an expression in his list ax has been ixxx interpreted by some in reference to one
of these but most interpreters consider it rather as simply as a statement about the book
of m Proverbs. It would be practically certain that he did not accept the 7thmone.

When we come to the additions of the two books, the boom-book of Daniel and the Book of Esther, the situation is someth-somewhat different. We must realize that the Jews who translated the Bible into Greek did not think of this in any sense the inspired Bible. It was merely a presentation in the Greek and language for private study and reading. Brooks Their peopel people considered the whole Bible as the true, insprir inspired bible. It was very important to preserve the Bible accurately. Similar efforstefforst efforts were not made to preserve the translations into Greek and there are far more variations in our manuscripts of the LXX than there are in the MSS of the Hebrew. It would seem that some storage of about Daniel, a great man of will wisdom gradually developed and some of these stories came to be added at the end of certain copies of