

least Melito might have been under the impression that Esther was not one of the books of the Canon. It is possible that he was mistaken on this point but by no means certain. This is the earliest list and stands almost exactly on the grounds of our present O.T.

(b.) Justin Martyr is the second evidence of the 2nd century. He was a great Christian apologist who was martyred for his faith in A.D. 164. He was born in Palestine but after his conversion he resided chiefly in Rome. He traveled extensively and presented the Gospel as a philosopher. He quotes frequently and constantly from the books of our O.T. but never once from the Apocryphal books. He has big controversy with ~~Philo~~ Trypho. We have this debate preserved for us. There is no suggestion at all in the whole debate as to which books should be included in the O.T. It would be very strange indeed if these seven books that at least some mention of a disagreement to be mentioned.

(c.) The Old Syriac translation of the O.T. It is questionable since we are not 100% sure as to when it was translated. No matter when it was translated we do know that it was early.

#### b. The third Century--

We have a catalog or list of the books from the learned men. Origen was very highly educated and wrote voluminously and much of it is preserved. We have a quotation from him by Eusebius in the Ecclesiastical History. Green says that the list according to Melito numbers 22. Note book VI, ch. 24. "It should be stated that the Canonical books as the Hebrews have handed them down are 22." That fits exactly with what Jerome said around 400 A.D. Melito may or may not be evidence for the number 22 but it is definite that Origen says that there are 22 books. Eusebius is considered a reliable source when quoting from earlier books. He says that there are 22 and proceeds to give the Hebrew and Greek names. After the list he names the book of the Maccabees it would seem that he didn't think of it as being authoritative--at least he mentions no other books.

# 50 There is no controversy over the minor prophets ever being included so it would seem there was a slip when Origen just mentions 21. It is very easy to skip a line and just left it out--it would be very easy. His omission of the minor prophets is not important because there never has been any question about them in the Christian church. Apart from these he says is the book of Maccabees. Origen also mentions Jeremiah with its epistle. Some think