

Now, it is the month of Ab, and it is a book which you don't ordinarily read but since here is a special day, so you go to the boxes and you thumb through these different rolls--it would be a good idea to put these separately. They remain in that corner or box and certainly is a very reasonable suggestion. Green even accepts the suggestion--once you have admitted this, then you admit that the Jews didn't keep the books in the necessary arrangement; they made a shift at one time and if they made it at one time, why couldn't they at another? You have no right to assume that which has not been proved. Both are based on presuppositions which do have any foundation. Within the three sections there is a difference of order--there was no strict order of the books. In different MSS there is found a different listing; at least in different orders. It is even contrary to the evidence, that there was any keeping of the books in the same order but of course once you start putting them in book form, naturally you will follow a certain order unless you have a good reason for changing the order. They will automatically just perpetuate themselves then. No. 4 was that we note that the earliest situation was one of two possibilities. (a) That they thought of the Book simply as 22 books; these are the Law, these are the Prophets and these are the Hagio. and if there were 22 books you might put them on the table but to keep them in the same order on the table would be extremely unlikely or even in three piles. Maybe they had 3 boxes, and they might put five of them into the Law, then others into the Prophets and then the rest into another group, such as the songs, and so forth which you think of as little different. (b) They may have been put and kept in 3 groups and if kept in 3 boxes they could have been kept thus but there is no special mention of the fact; no place do we find in Scripture that that is the way they are to be preserved and if thus was the case, then they must have been kept in the order that Josephus mentions. Other early references that refer to a three-fold division fit either of these two suggestions--the first was the Prologue to Eccles.--the Law, the Prophets and the books that follow after. The critics say that from this you can prove that the Law and Prophets were definite, but the rest were still indefinite, but it fits just as well with the idea that you lump them into no specific grouping; we noticed that in Philo's statement it would fit better with Josephus's arrangement but when you come to the statement of Lk. 24:44 there surely you have the arrangement but doesn't fit all with our present arrangement. This is all a review of what already has been said. Did the Lord say that He wanted the disciples to believe all that was written in the Law, the Prophets and in the Psalms? That is not what He said, was it?