

the theory and I don't think that they are wrong in saying that they were once in the Prophets and we have noticed that there is quite a bit of evidence to that--most scholars in the past century would admit that. But then comes their argument against Green and those that believe his theory. See what H.E. Ryle says in his book on O.T. decides that 22 never did represent the number of books and in order to do that he has to brush aside Josephus and Origen and Jerome and he makes out that Jerome knew that there were 24 but he wanted to make it fit with the Hebrew alphabet, that shows that he is making an artificial list. But if you are going to throw that aside you might as well bring up about the 24 elders in Rev. We don't have to be so contentious about Jerome. He does try to make a relationship between the 22 in the alphabet and the number of books in the O.T. and that probably is wrong but he wouldn't deliberately change the number in the Heb. to try and make it fit that. I do think that he made a mistake about the five when he himself mentions that there are six--trying to make it fit with the five double letters of the alphabet. In Greek there are 22 books Ryle says but where he gets that from the Greek I don't know. IN the LXX they make even more divisions than the Heb. Bible has. You will never reach truth by simply brushing aside the facts; see what the facts are and take them all into account and not merely taking the facts that you like. The LXX has them entirely differently arranged from the Hebrew and this means that the LXX puts the five books of Moses first, then after that we find the books arranged according to subject matter. They put the historical books next and then come the poetical books and then they put the books which they consider to be prophetic in type--not the books which the Jews called the Prophets. The Greeks arranged them in what they thought was the logical order. If the Greek Jews had told them how important the order was, it is strange that they should so readily change it, but it was the habit of the Greek mind to try and put things in a logical pattern, that is if it was very important as to what order they should have been placed. The fact that there is a change in order is a good argument; the LXX order was taken over by Jerome in his translation of the Latin Bible and then that order is followed in our English. No, the 70 only translated the books of Moses. The name was later applied to the rest of the translation and was done by different people at different times. The first five books are done very well but in some of the other books--some are very accurate and some aren't done well at all. They were evidently made by people for convenience rather than for accuracy. Look up Swete's Intro. to the O.T. and in it he tells the order of the books in the LXX. There is a certain amount of variety.