

No one could say that since there is too much variety in the orders. The reason that there are so many differences within the group is that these rolls were all mixed up within the group and though the order would get all mixed up within the box yet they would be kept from getting into another grouping. That would be easy to do but if you kept the order by writing you would not be able to explain it in ~~such~~ this fashion. Our MSS are comparatively few. Some will have this part and another will have another part--Name the one which we have as the most complete. To say that there is a complete order of the agreement, one would have to have a lot more evidence. There is no Greek MSS which follows the Heb. order. The early translations of the O.T. into other languages were all made from Greek and not Hebrew and in Jerome's time they had a translation that was used in Italy which was used extensively which was called the Old Latin which was made from the Greek and not from the Hebrew; Jerome made a new translation from the Heb. which he claimed was the original and many people criticized him very severely for doing this. His translation was so good that it soon displaced the Old Latin except in the case of the Psalms because they were so accustomed to singing them in their services that way, that they refused to accept his translation. He got a translation from the Greek for them for the Psalms but they refused to change the Psalm. Originally all these translations were made from the Greek and when Hebrew came along they generally followed the order which was already well known in the Greek; that is why Luther followed the order he did in the German. We must not assume a fixed arrangement. There is definite evidence why we can't assume this but now let us turn to N. 4.

4§ What was the early situation regarding the grouping of the books? In the light of the evidence as we have examined it we can say that the earliest situation.....

a. If the books were originally in one group and were not kept in distinct grouping they might just have been thought of as just 22 books--there is no specific grouping. The assumption that there were as the critics claim is a pure assumption. It is possible that there was no fixed grouping--

b. Notice that people speak of them by three groupings--the law, the prophets and the Hag. (132 B.C.) It is just a general way of referring to refer to the whole O.T. ON the other hand maybe it is another way to refer to a specific grouping; if that is the case, it is not the grouping which we note in our Heb. Bibles today--Lam. and Ruth are in the P~~ro~~phets. Josephus arranged them in still a different arrangement. he says 5-13-4--Psa. Prov. S. of S. and Ecc.