

This is the only reference to a three-fold division in the whole N.T. What it says is, "These are the things which I spoke unto you while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled that was written in the Law of Moses and the Prophets and in the Psalms concerning me. Then opened He their understanding so that they could understand the Scriptures and said thus it is written and thus it behooved Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead on the third day." Cf. v. 27. He is not here referring to the O.T. specifically as a totality but refers to the predictions in the O.T. which refer to Himself, and particularly to those which He now discusses as He opens their understanding. Now this fits with either of the two situations, which we suggested but does not fit with the present arrangement. Take it that you have only 22 books--the Law has many references to Christ and so do the prophets--you take that out and what do you have left that specifically refers to Him and naturally you have the Psalms. It doesn't prove there were three specific groups at all. It goes just as well with our latest point. Would his statement fit Josephus' arrangement? It would fit the Law and the Prophets but Psalms would be about 2/3 of the the Hagio. so it would be quite natural to describe the whole thing and it would be quite natural to call it Psalms. Now it might be that he isn't describing the whole group but why would he put in those three little books when there were passages which were so much clearer. It would fit perfectly with the context if referred specifically to the Psalms in this situation. This would fit all right. Now suppose this with Baba-Bathra's arrangement in our present Hebrew Bible--would this be the way that the Lord would refer to this in an arrangement as we have it today? The Law and the prophets would be all right but then you have the Hagio. with its 11 books in it--is He there referring to all 11 books or just to the Psalms. Rylex says that He is referring only to the book of Psalms and I think that we would agree with him. There is no proof that they ever referred to one of these divisions by the name of it first book nor evidence that the Psalms meant the Hagio. If you have four books and all of them are poetry it might be all right to refer to the group as the Psalms but to refer to the 11 books as as the Psalms when it includes Chron. and Ezra, Dan.--it just doesn't fit. Psalms is so utterly different; suppose that He is referring only to an individual book, He just picked Psalms, then it is quite reasonable since they don't refer to Himself ~~like~~ like the Psalms, but to say that he left out all the Hagio. is very unreasonable. (1) Any reader of Dan. will see that it has Messianic prophecy and (2) Christ, Himself quotes from Dan. and refers a passage there to Himself. To say that He just doesn't believe in Dan. is utterly irrational. If it refers to an arrangement commonly held in the time of Christ, the arrangement to which it