

If that was done, and I frankly think it unlikely, they would remember that these are the books of the Hagiographa, would not bother with the order of them. If you come to learn the books of the Hag. it isn't hard to learn which books and the order of them in the group. The difficulty is that they are preserved through the memory of your mind and by passing them on thus, and not on paper--if that were the case, or even if put on paper, certainly they would keep the books in the same order in the Hag. and in the Prophets--as a matter of fact some critical books talk as if the order of these books are fixed--Wm. Hen. Green gives a list which I didn't give you here. As one of the arguments he gives--"The order of the books in the Hag. suggests that they came into existence by this critical approach. The order of the books within the group. But he doesn't elaborate on the argument and no critical book that I have read on the subject gives details on this phase. The argument assumes that there is a definite fixed order in each of these groupings. Is there a fixed order? You have to find them in some order--once you start binding books together, you have to keep to some sort of order and you are going to follow the same order unless someone puts up a big argument that another order is best. So that we would say that whether the rolls were put in one big box, or a table, or put in little boxes--the fact that they were in rolls means that you would not have a precise definite grouping and order unless a specific effort was made to preserve such a group in order. It wouldn't just come that way without your bothering about it. It could only be done if considered so important that an effort was made to do it. We have no evidence of such effort being done. There is no statement that shows they made a particular effort to keep the books in a certain order. Now we have an evidence of a change--repetition of what has been said in summary form--8-9. Origen says also that there are 22 books but doesn't make any reference to a three-fold division. Lam. goes with Jer. and Ruth goes in with Judges and consequently and most of the scholars today even admit that this is true. There are various liberal German scholars that have spoken very positively on that matter--Green gives quotations from some of them and I will read to you one or two of these which he gives. "Without Ruth the historic part of the canon is incomplete and defective. That is the genealogy of one of the most powerful race of kings with whose fortunes . . . the changeful paths of people and its glorious future so eagerly and surely expected . . . . . out of the house of Jesse. That such a genealogy had been contained in the book of Samuel and was only omitted in closing the canon of the prophets. . . . . This has the supposition of Ruth into the Canon and of the Prophets. The transfer to the Hagiographa didn't take place until the Talmudic period or the