

Making it an authority for his kingdom. But when you read it he didn't make it canon. He said, Great wrath is come upon our nation because we have not obeyed these commands of God. He recognized it as having been a canon for a long time. ~~It is no~~ ~~happened~~ that he made it a canon then.  
evidence/

Then they say that the N'blim, the Prophets, the second division of the Hebrew Bible, was made a canon by an assembly of the Jews deciding we'll add these books to the ~~Law~~ Law and make them canonical. There is no evidence of any such ~~decision~~ decision, any such act, any such combination having been made into a canon. The books were canonical from the time they came into existence.

God might have chosen to have people recognize them in this form. But there is no evidence He did, and I think He intentionally did not do it that way. Because if it was done that way it could be a strong starting point for the argument that the critics all hold that the authority comes from the group of people who said, We're going to collect these books. We see the hand of God in these books, so we say these are canonical. The books are canonical as soon as they are given.

The third point under F is really outside our present field. It relates to the NT. I think it is a very important point, but it's really outside our present field, so it's extra. But very important.

Before going on to that is there any further question about these points regarding the OT? Is there anything in it I have not made completely clear?

Question: Man would have to be perfect to recognize ? ?

Answer: I would think so, yes, because I think most any man would say, Ecclesiasticus -- what a wonderful, spiritual book. Ecclesiastes and Esther ~~and~~ they don't sound spiritual. on first reading. You study deeper into them, you find & yes, Ecclesiastes and Esther are God's Word to us. Ecclesiasticus is the wisdom of a godly Jew. But we accept them as such, because God gave us these two and the other one is not part of the canon. It is a divine wisdom, not a human wisdom . . .

Question: (indistinct?)

Answer: The conservative view -- I don't exactly like to use that term for it -- the term that most of the conservative books present is a view which I think just doesn't stand up at all. The idea that Ezra arranged the books according to a logical principle. There's no evidence Ezra arranged them; there's no logical principle in it. I think we showed that very clearly. I believe the evidence I presented should be enough to show that there is no reason to believe our present 3-fold division goes back of 300 or 400 A.D. at the earliest. 300 at the earliest. Certainly we find it by 400 A.D. There's no evidence to show it goes back of that time. There's very strong evidence against any fixed set division having existed before. They are too many books to just have in one big box(?)