

books which don't seem to be any more prophetic than many in the third. The critics say there is not logical arrangement. In general the third section books are later than the second. So it is a process, a historical process, which has made this three-fold division come into existence. It is very strong argument and in answer to that argument the statement is made by many conservative defenders that actually the books are according to a definite, logical arrangement and if you can prove that it goes a long way toward answering the argument. Now we do not accept the logical arrangement that the Jewish rabbi says is there. The one that is suggested instead is that the second division of the canon is those books which were by men who had the prophetic office and the third those who had the prophetic gift. There are some difficulties found in that which are rather slight and easily brushed aside but there are other difficulties which are very serious. If Jeremiah had the prophetic office when he wrote the book of Jeremiah why didn't he have it when he wrote the book of Lamentations that is in the last section. The N.T. speaks of Daniel, the prophet, now what right do we have to say Daniel is not a prophet and belongs over in the Sacred Writings. Daniel had the prophetic gift, but not the prophetic office. We don't find anywhere in the Bible any distinction between a prophetic office and prophetic gift. There is no reference in any ancient document to any such distinction. It doesn't prove it is wrong, it may have been there and just not stated, but it is a big argument against it. It is reason for hesitating. That being the case, I think we ought <sup>to</sup> look at the evidence regarding the antiquity of the three fold division. It is assumed by all the liberal scholars that the division we have today is the division which was there right from the time they were made canonical. The conservative defenders as a rule assume that our present arrangement goes right back to Ezra and he put them in this arrangement. Maybe that is so but let us look at the evidence. How old is this order? What evidence do we have.

#### D. Evidence regarding the antiquity of the three-fold division.

1. There are very early references to the books of the O.T. under three groupings.
  - a. Prologue to the book of Ecclesiastes - the Greek translation of the book. This book of Ecclesiasticus is one of the Apocryphal books. It is a book which was written by a Jewish rabbi in Jerusalem. He wrote it probably at about 200 B.C. It is