

It would seem that all this would preclude the possibility of one place having 39 books and the Jews in Alex. having 46. This prologue of 130 B.C. gives good proof to this effect.

(3) Josephus was writing against Alexandrian anti-Semites. That includes all our 39 books. You would not find anyone who would say that his list includes more than our list. So they say he refers to the Palestinian Canon, but Josephus is writing against Appian, an Alexandrian Grammarian. For him to simply refer to just what the Palestinian Jews believed when he knew other Jews differed--that would be mere foolishness.

(4) Philo never refers to the Apocryphal books at all--here is a Jew from Alex. of great eminence--the only one whose work has been preserved. He makes many comments on the O.T. but never does he quote or refer in any way to the seven books and parts of two additional books which the R.C. says are part of the O.T. Prof. Eichorn claims that he doesn't even show them the respect which he shows Plato, Hippoditus, etc. etc. and so he makes references to Greek literature but never once does he refer to these Apocryphical books. A little discussion is given on the virtues of W.H. Green's books--The Text and the Canon--he does get off on the idea of the Prophetic office and the Prophetic gift.

(5) The presence of Apocryphal books in MSS of the LXX does not prove that the Alexandrian Jews regarded these books as part of the whole Scripture. This is a very important statement. Here are these various MSS--now in the MSS, one of them you find these Apocryphal books--does this prove that the Jews of Alex. thought these other books were part of the Canon?

35 - It is a fact but gets rid of the idea that the three-fold division goes back to the time of Ezra but he doesn't relate it in that other question. Cf. statement of Sr. Henry Barkely Swete who was Prof. at Cambridge Univ. He made a very compilation of the text of the LXX. (3 vols.) He has written extensively in this field--in this book he brings out the fact that the LXX. the books at least before the 2nd cent. that these books were all kept on a separate rolls--these rolls were all kept in boxes and these rolls were not considered by the Jews at all to be of the same sacredness as the books of the Hebrew--it was just considered as a translation of the Bible in common language--he points out that he, a Jew would easily and think nothing of putting other rolls in the same box with the LXX. Ill. of different versions of the Bible which you could easily have mixed up with your ordinary books and think nothing of it. You don't have bound in your Bible anything but the Scripture but you have on