THE ORDER OF THE BOOKS IN THE
GREEK OLD TESTAMENT

greg goswell*

Where a biblical book is placed relative to other books influences a reader's view of the book and so influences interpretation. The reader naturally assumes that the placement of books in close physical proximity implies that they are in some way related in meaning. It is this readerly habit that forms the basis of this survey and analysis of biblical orders. It is not necessary to make a judgment about how deliberate the process of ordering was, for the focus of this study is *the effect* on the reader of a given order, not its historical production. Without trying to guess what was in the mind of those responsible for the ordering of the biblical books, there are a number of possible principles of order as inferred by the reader (e.g. common genre, similar theme, storyline thread). In an earlier article I surveyed and analyzed the order of the books in the Hebrew Bible,[1] viewing the ordering of the books as an element of the paratext of Scripture. I now turn to the structure of the OT in the Greek tradition, which will allow comparison between the Hebrew and Greek orders.

It is commonly asserted that the Greek canon basically transposes the second and third sections in the Hebrew ordering of the books. In this way the prophetic books (= Latter Prophets) close the OT canon and, from a Christian perspective, provide a transition to the NT, signaling that the main connection of the NT is with the OT prophetic word pointing forward to the consummation of God's purposes in Jesus Christ. Actually, it is only Vaticanus (B) of the three Great Uncials that places the prophetic books at the end of the canon (the Minor Prophets preceding the Major Prophets), with Daniel the last book listed. In Sinaiticus (א) and Alexandrinus (A) the poetic books are placed last, so that the final section in these two codices is somewhat similar to Writings of the Hebrew canon.[2] This is one indicator that we are not to overplay the difference between the (relatively settled) Hebrew

---

* Greg Goswell is lecturer in biblical studies at Presbyterian Theological College, 684 Elgar Road, Box Hill North Vic 3129, Australia.

[1] Greg Goswell, "The Order of the Books in the Hebrew Bible," *JETS* 51 (2008) 673–88.

[2] See Appendix One. For further details, see H. B. Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek, Appendix Containing the Letter of Aristeas* (ed. H. St. J. Thackeray; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1902; rev. R. R. Ottley; New York: Ktav, 1968) 201–2. There is no uniform Greek order: see B. Botte and P.-M. Bogaert, "Septante et versions grecques," in *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible* (ed. L. Pirot and A. Roberts; Paris: Letouzey & Ané, 1996) 5.541–43, and Martin Hengel, *The Septuagint as Christian Scripture: Its Prehistory and the Problem of Its Canon* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2002) 57–60.

order and the (by no means uniform) Greek orders of the canonical books.[3] Despite all the variety in the Greek (and Latin) lists, what we can say is that the books Genesis–Ruth are a set grouping (Octateuch) and are always in premier position; Ruth is always placed after (or joined to) Judges; Chronicles almost always follows Kings; Lamentations when separately listed is placed after or near Jeremiah; and Daniel is almost invariably put with prophetic books. These are clear trends and distinct differences from the Hebrew ordering. Looking at the Greek lists provided by McDonald we can say that the *majority* Greek order is exemplified in Vaticanus, with the prophetic books often placed last or nearly last (sometimes Daniel attracts Esther and/or 1–2 Esdras after it).

I. A LATER CHRISTIAN ORDERING OF BOOKS?

The Greek majority order is not necessarily a later ordering of the books, nor is it a specifically Christian ordering (despite its adoption by the church). Although the ordering of the biblical books is not due to their authors, it does reflect the perceptions of those who compiled the canon(s) of Scripture. The significance of the fact that the Bible appears in different forms is generally overlooked, but recently Marvin Sweeney has sought to address this omission.[4] He is criticized by Christopher Seitz for oversimplifying and even distorting matters by basing his discussion on the fourfold division reflected in modern printed Bibles that place the prophets last,[5] but so long as it is acknowledged that this reflects only major trends in the Greek tradition, little harm is done. I remain unconvinced, however, that the difference between Hebrew and Greek canons is to be represented (as Sweeney argues) in terms of Jewish versus Christian, for the present evidence is against the notion that the Greek order of OT books originated in a Christian context. There is no formal distinction between the Writings and the Prophets before the rabbinic period,[6] and John Barton has suggested that the distinction may be due to the *later* practice of reading excerpts from the prophetic books (*haftaroth*) in synagogue liturgy but not from the Writings. Nor need the Greek arrangement be understood in polemical terms as a "burial of this promise of return

---

[3] See the tables of lists of early Greek (Eastern) and Latin (Western) orders up to the fifth century provided in Lee Martin McDonald, *The Biblical Canon: Its Origin, Transmission, and Authority* (Peabody: MA: Hendrickson, 2007) 439–42. For a much more detailed listing of the various Latin orders, see Samuel Berger, *Histoire de la Vulgate: Pendant les premiers siècles du moyen âge* (Hildesheim/New York: Georg Olms, 1976) 331–39.

[4] "Tanak versus Old Testament: Concerning the Foundation for a Jewish Theology of the Bible," in *Problems in Biblical Theology: Essays in Honor of Rolf Knierim* (ed. Henry T. C. Sun and Keith L. Eades with James M. Robinson and Garth I. Moller; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997) 353–72.

[5] "Canon, Narrative, and the Old Testament's Literal Sense: A Response to John Goldingay, 'Canon and Old Testament Theology,'" *TynBul* 59 (2008) 29, n. 2. Seitz, however, overstates the case when he says that "there is no 'Greek order' as against a Hebrew order" (p. 28).

[6] See Andrew E. Steinmann, *The Oracles of God: The Old Testament Canon* (St. Louis: Concordia, 1999) 50–85 for the evidence.

and renewal [of the nation in Ezra-Nehemiah] among the historical books of the Christian Old Testament."[7] The Septuagint (LXX) preserves an order that is probably pre-Christian.[8] In the estimation of E. Earle Ellis, Melito's list (c. AD 170) that places the prophets (followed by Esdras [= Ezra-Nehemiah]) last, represents "an accepted Jewish order."[9] There are clear structural differences between the canons, but Sweeney is in danger of overplaying the differences when he assets that there are "two distinctive readings" of the Bible, determined by their respective canonical arrangements, that belong on the one hand to Judaism and on the other to Christianity.

The Hebrew canon does not represent the oldest canonical arrangement, which was subsequently altered by Christians. It is more likely the case that there were alternative traditions before the turn of the era, with some of these reflected in the various sequences of the Greek Bible. The Christian church may not have adopted the order it did for Christological reasons, but simply due to language: it read the *Greek* OT and, as a consequence, took over its ordering of the books. In other words, the early church adopted the LXX because the Greek-speaking church found this convenient. The termination of the sacred collection with the prophets has a certain appropriateness for Christians, but any notion of *choice* undoubtedly overestimates the deliberateness of the process. With regard to the differing orders of the OT books, Brevard Childs is right to warn against an overestimation of the conscious theological intentionality of presumed changes and choices.[10] Meaning can be found in the present arrangements of Jewish and Christian Bibles, but John Barton suggests that it is less clear that anyone in antiquity intended them to have any such meaning.[11] Just as significant, however, is the resulting effect of the different ordering of books on the later reading of the literature, even when fortuitous elements may have been involved, and this effect is the focus of the present study.

[7] As asserted by Barry N. Olshen, "The Return to Tanakh," in *Approaches to Teaching the Hebrew Bible as Literature in Transition* (Approaches to Teaching World Literature 25; ed. Barry N. Olshen and Jael S. Feldman; New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1989) 56 (addition mine).

[8] Harry M. Orlinsky, "Prolegomenon: The Masoretic Text: A Critical Evaluation," in C. D. Ginsburg, *Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible* (London: Trinitarian Bible Society, 1897; New York: Ktav, 1966) xix–xx; Swete, *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, 217–26; J. C. H. Lebram ("Aspekte der alttestamentlichen Kanonbildung," *VT* 18 [1968] 173–89) makes use of Josephus, *C. Apionem* 1.38–41.

[9] *The Old Testament in Early Christianity* (WUNT 54; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1991) 11.

[10] Brevard S. Childs, *Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments: Theological Reflection on the Christian Bible* (London: SCM, 1992) 74–75. See, however, his comments on the contrasting position of the book of Ruth in Hebrew and Greek Bibles in *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture* (London: SCM, 1979) 564, 566–67.

[11] *Holy Writings, Sacred Text: The Canon in Early Christianity* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1997) 146, n. 24. Nahum M. Sarna seeks to explain the concept of an *order* of individual biblical scrolls by reference to the shelving in ancient libraries ("The Order of the Books," in *Studies in Jewish Bibliography, History and Literature in Honor of I. Edward Kiev* [ed. Charles Berlin; New York: Ktav, 1971] 407–13). This is a purely mechanical explanation of the concept of an order of books.

The Greek canon presents salvation history as a progressive movement through temporal stages toward an eschatological goal.[12] According to Sweeney, this gives the Greek canon a primarily historical, even eschatological, orientation, so that Scripture is understood as a linear account of the divine purpose, from the creation to the consummation as promised by the prophets. By placing the prophets at the end of the canon, the Greek OT points beyond itself to a future fulfillment, and the reader will consider eschatology as the guiding thread through the multifarious books of which Scripture is composed.[13] To reiterate, however, the appropriateness of the Septuagintal arrangement for a Christian reading of the OT is apparent, but the evidence (*pace* A. C. Sundberg[14]) is that the LXX is a pre-Christian order and is not shaped by Christian preconceptions. Contrary to what Sweeney asserts, *both* Tanak and Greek canon can be viewed as leading on to the NT.[15] We should not overplay the difference in ordering or view them as Jewish versus Christian canons.

The four-part structure (Pentateuch, historical books, poetic books, and prophetic books) reflects the *generic* character of the books that comprise the Greek OT, and in contrast to the Tanak, there is no disparate literary category of Writings. The four sections together represent, according to Sweeney, a progressive movement of history: the remote past, the recent past, the present, and the future. The Pentateuch represents the distant past for it describes the origins of the world and of Israel.[16] The historical books recount the more recent past, up to and including the Persian period. The poetic books reflect perennial (and therefore present) concerns. Finally, the prophetic books describe the future as envisaged by the prophets. Given their position in the Christian canon, they naturally point to the NT as the fulfillment of prophetic visions of the future purposes of God. Such historical periodization is also evident in the larger two-part canonical structure of OT succeeded by NT.

II. PENTATEUCH

The Pentateuch has the same premier position in the Greek Bible as in the Hebrew canon, and we would not expect its canonical position to alter in any listing of OT books, given the fact that it describes the origin of the world and of Israel. The large area of commonality between the alternative canons should not be overlooked. Although the five books of the Pentateuch are followed by Joshua–Kings classified as "Former Prophets" in the Hebrew canon, the fact that the Greek canon as represented by the three Great Uncials[17] is consistent in the ordering of the books from Genesis to

---

[12] Sweeney, "Tanak versus Old Testament" 359.

[13] John Barton, *Oracles of God: Perceptions of Ancient Prophecy in Israel after the Exile* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1986; New York: OUP, 1988) 21–23.

[14] *The Old Testament of the Early Church* (HTS 20; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964).

[15] See the previous article in this series.

[16] "Tanak versus Old Testament" 360–61.

[17] Namely Vaticanus (B 03), Sinaiticus (א 01), and Alexandrinus (A 02).

2 Chronicles (*Paraleipomena*) could be taken as suggesting that the Pentateuch is being viewed through the same *historical* lens as the books of Joshua and following, that is, the storyline is the important thing, rather than the laying of the covenant foundations for the nation of Israel. On the other hand, the attribution by the Chronicler of a number of cited works to prophetic figures as authors (if that is what the titles do indicate; e.g. "the records of the seer Samuel," 1 Chr 29:29) suggests that Chronicles also embodies a prophetic representation and interpretation of historical events. It is possible, then, that Sweeney and others overstress the differences between the two canons, for Joshua–2 Chronicles may well be viewed as prophetic works in the Greek tradition (cf. the portrait of prophets as historians in Josephus, *C. Apionem* 1.38–41).

The creation backdrop (Genesis 1) to subsequent events in the Pentateuch gives them a universal context and testifies of God's interest in humanity as a whole. The disastrous consequences of the fall and the spread of sin affect all humanity and disrupt the unity of the race (Gen 11:1–9). The divine call and commission of Abram (Gen 12:1–3) is with the aim that the peoples of the world will find blessing through the descendants of Abraham. For the most part, the Patriarchs' relationship with other peoples is portrayed positively.[18] The Patriarchs do their best to maintain peaceful relations with the Canaanites (e.g. Gen 34:30), and the family of Jacob finally finds a safe refuge in a foreign land (Egypt). The exodus deliverance has a worldwide audience in view (Exod 9:14, 16). This is further explicated in the programmatic passage Exod 19:3–6. Israel has the unique status of Yhwh's "treasured possession" (*sĕgullâ*), which is an expression referring to the personal property of the king (cf. Eccl 2:8 and 1 Chr 29:3 for secular usage). Israel has been chosen for this privilege, "for all the earth is mine" (Exod 19:5). This expression does not need to be taken to mean that Exod 19:6 refers to a role for Israel as priests/kings *to the world*. The clause rather refers to her special access to the presence of God,[19] but the world backdrop of God's choice is still significant. Balaam's fourth and final oracle (Num 24:15–24) speaks of Israel's dominion over various named nations and says: "a sceptre shall rise out of Israel" (24:17). At the end of the Pentateuch, though Israel is the focus of attention in the sermons of Deuteronomy, the issue of the nations is not ignored, if nothing else, due to the presence of the Canaanites in the land. God's dealings with Israel take place on an international stage (e.g. Deut 4:5–8; 9:26–28; 15:6). Underlying such passages is the idea that Israel is divinely chosen to be an example for others to emulate.[20]

---

[18] As emphasised by Gordon J. Wenham, *Story as Torah: Reading the Old Testament Ethically* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000) chapter 3.

[19] See John A. Davies, *A Royal Priesthood: Literary and Intertextual Perspectives on an Image of Israel in Exodus* (JSOTSup 395; London: T & T Clark, 2004).

[20] T. Desmond Alexander, *From Paradise to the Promised Land: An Introduction to the Main Themes of the Pentateuch* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1995) 178.

There is nothing in the Pentateuch, therefore, that is incompatible with the world mission that takes place in the NT;[21] however, there is no reason to see the theme of the nations as particularly highlighted in the Pentateuch. The focus is rather on the unfaithfulness of God's people and, notwithstanding this, God's gracious dealings with them in the covenant relationship. The moral failings of the patriarchs—Abraham (Gen 12:10–20; 20:1–18), Isaac (Gen 26:6–16), Jacob (Genesis 27), and Judah (Genesis 38)—are not hidden or excused. These revelations prepare for the persistent unfaithfulness of Israel in the rest of the Pentateuch. The sin of worshipping the golden calf in Exodus 32–34 is notable, as is God's judgment of the rebellious wilderness generation (Numbers 1–25). Moses' preaching in Deuteronomy 9 makes it clear that Israel is not receiving the land "because of [their] righteousness, for [they] are a stubborn people" (9:6). The future prospect provided by Deuteronomy 29 and 31–32 includes the expectation that Israel will fail to keep the law as required. The emphasis in Deuteronomy 27 is on curse, with the altar to be set up on Mount Ebal, the mountain of curse, and a long list of curses.[22] Far more space in devoted to the results of disobedience (28:15–68) than of obedience (28:1–14) in the blessings and curses of Deuteronomy 28. Moses anticipates the apostasy of God's covenant people and their expulsion from the land. Hope is in the grace of God and his promise to circumcise the heart of the nation and bring them back to the land (30:1–10).[23] As far as I can see, the interpretation of the Pentateuch is little affected by whether it is in the Hebrew or Greek canons.

III. THE HISTORIES

The bringing together of various books into one section (Joshua–Esther[24]) suggests that these books are being read according to a historical perspective, which is a feature of the Greek canon generally. The disadvantage in calling these books "Histories" is that it may obscure for the reader the fact that historical writings are not limited to this second section; indeed, the Bible as a whole has a narrative framework. The Pentateuch sketches the history of the world from creation to the death of Moses. The historical books (Joshua–Esther) present the history of Israel as one of failure, but, then, so do the Former Prophets in the Hebrew Bible (Joshua–Kings), which move from land entrance to expulsion from the land.

---

[21] For the previous paragraph I acknowledge my dependence upon Sweeney. He emphasizes the theme of Israel's interaction with the nations. By so doing, he is in danger of reading back into the Greek OT the special focus on the Gentiles in the NT.

[22] Paul A. Barker, "The Theology of Deuteronomy 27," *TynBul* 49 (1998) 277–303.

[23] See the useful discussion in J. Gary Miller, *Now Choose Life: Theology and Ethics in Deuteronomy* (Leicester: Apollos, 1998) 161–80, and more fully in Paul A. Barker, *The Triumph of Grace in Deuteronomy: Faithless Israel, Faithful Yahweh in Deuteronomy* (Paternoster Biblical Monographs; Carlisle: Paternoster, 2004).

[24] The sequence is found in the English Bible (and in Sinaiticus).

According to Sweeney, the relations between Israel and the nations are traced through Joshua–Kings mainly in terms of antagonism,[25] and this is again the theme that he chooses to highlight. For example, these history books narrate the conquest of Canaan (Joshua), the oppression of Israel by foreign kings (Judges), the Philistine threat (1 Samuel), the victories of David (2 Samuel 8), and final defeat and deportation at the hands of the Assyrians (2 Kings 17) and Babylonians (2 Kings 25). This is not the only theme within these books, but it is one that shows their ready compatibility with the NT (which is the reason why Sweeney selects it for special mention). The narrower scope of Chronicles does not significantly change the picture, with the book closing with the picture of the Persian king Cyrus as the undisputed master of the world (2 Chr 36:22–23). In Ezra-Nehemiah steps are taken to break up exogamous marriages. The anti-foreigner attitude is reinforced by the inclusion of Esther at the conclusion of this canonical section, for in that book the Jews slaughter their Gentile adversaries (Esther 9). On this reading, Joshua–Esther show that God's intention that the world be blessed through Israel remains unrealized.

There is no reason, however, to see the theme of Jewish-Gentile relations as the leading theme of Joshua–Esther in the Greek canon. When history is reviewed in the OT and a lesson drawn from God's dealings with his people in successive periods of history, the persistent focus of the presentation is the unfaithfulness of God's people and yet the graciousness of God's dealings with them. This is the case whether the review takes the form of historical psalms (e.g. Psalms 78, 105, 106, 107);[26] speeches and summaries (e.g. 1 Samuel 12; 2 Kings 17); prophetic surveys (Hosea 2; Ezekiel 16, 20, 23); or post-exilic penitential prayers (Daniel 9; Nehemiah 9). If a historical principle is reflected in Genesis–Esther in the Greek tradition, the periodization is in terms of the ups and down of God's dealings with a wayward people. The book of Joshua ends with warnings (Joshua 23–24). This is followed by the cycle of unfaithfulness plotted in Judges 2–3 and illustrated in the rest of the book. The people reject God in asking for a king (1 Samuel 8). David is shown to have feet of clay (2 Samuel 11–20). With only a few exceptions, the kings of Judah and Israel are reprobates (Kings), and the final paragraph of 2 Kings (25:27–30) gives no prospect of a revival of the house of David (agreeing with Noth's minimalist reading). The presentation of Chronicles is little different in this regard and closes with Cyrus as world ruler (2 Chr 36:22–23).[27] Ezra-Nehemiah ends with the failure of God's people to do what they pledged (Neh 13:4–31). Whatever the reason for the nonmention of God in the book of Esther, the book is hardly a glowing endorsement of the character of Jews in the Diaspora.

---

[25] For this paragraph, I acknowledge by dependence upon Sweeney, "Tanak versus Old Testament," 363.

[26] Erik Haglund, *Historical Motifs in the Psalms* (Uppsala: CWK Gleerup, 1984).

[27] William Riley, *King and Cultus in Chronicles. Worship and the Reinterpretation of History* (JSOTSup 160; Sheffield: SAP, 1993), especially chapter 3.

The placement of Chronicles after Kings in the Greek order makes it look like an addendum and supplement, and the Greek title assigned it, namely: "[The books] of the things left out" (Παραλειπομένων), has the same effect. Chronicles has had to live in the shadow of Kings until the recent renaissance of Chronicles scholarship. After a recapitulation of the preceding events (provided by the genealogies of 1 Chronicles 1–9), the detailed story is picked up at the death of Saul (1 Chronicles 10 [= 1 Samuel 31]), so that Chronicles could be understood as supplementing the information given in 2 Samuel and 1–2 Kings. Only the brief final paragraph of 2 Chronicles (36:22–23) takes the reader beyond the point at which the account closed in 2 Kings. As well, the fact that only the Judean line of kings is traced might confirm the reader in the impression of Chronicles as an appendix to the story given a broader scope in Kings. The effect of placing Chronicles, Ezra-Nehemiah, and Esther after Kings (rather than in the Writings) is that the history plotted in Joshua to Kings is extended into the post-exilic period. These three books are viewed as histories rather than as moral tales (as they might be construed in their alternative setting in the Hebrew canon).

The Greek order of Chronicles *followed* by Ezra-Nehemiah gives an impression of continuity and may obscure for the reader the theological distinctives of each work. The "overlap" (as it is often called) in 2 Chr 36:22–23 and Ezra 1:1–3a seems to confirm their continuity, but that description prejudges the issue.[28] With regard to the three Great Uncials, an ellipsis in Sinaiticus makes it unclear whether 2 Esdras (= Ezra-Nehemiah) directly follow Chronicles.[29] In Alexandrinus, 1, 2 Esdras are nowhere near Chronicles. In Vaticanus,[30] the deuterocanonical book 1 Esdras (= Esdras A) intrudes between Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah, which is an appropriate setting for it, in that it reproduces (and rewrites) the substance of 2 Chronicles 35–36, the whole of Ezra (partly rearranged), and then jumps to Nehemiah 8 (which also features the figure of Ezra), so that it spans Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah. 1 Esdras is a *rewriting* of the biblical text to emphasize the contribution of Josiah, Zerubbabel, and Ezra in the reform of Israel's worship, so that it has a contrary orientation to the people-focus of Ezra-Nehemiah.[31] In 1 Esdras, Zerubbabel is viewed as in the line of wise Solomon who built the temple, and his Davidic lineage is mentioned (1 Esdr 5:5), whereas it is not in Ezra-Nehemiah. Tamara Eskenazi suggests that 1 Esdras

---

[28] 2 Chr 36:22–23 has all the appearance of being extracted from Ezra 1. Certainly the decree of Cyrus is much more firmly anchored to the context in Ezra, providing as it does the plan for its first six chapters. See my unpublished M.Th. thesis, *A Discourse-Orientated Analysis of Ezra-Nehemiah* (Australian College of Theology, 1992) 18–30.

[29] *Codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus: The New Testament, the Epistle of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermas* (ed. Helen and Kirsopp Lake; Oxford: Clarendon, 1911) provided on microfilm from the British Library.

[30] See the codex available on microfilm from the Vatican Library (*Vat Greg 1209 Part II*).

[31] See Tamara Cohn Eskenazi, *In an Age of Prose: A Literary Approach to Ezra-Nehemiah* (SBLMS 36; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988).

was in fact written by the Chronicler,[32] so that its placement after Chronicles in Vaticanus is fitting. The upshot of all this is that putting Ezra-Nehemiah straight after Chronicles, as happens in the English Bible, runs the danger of blurring the individual teaching of each book.

Ezra-Nehemiah is followed by Esther (only in Sinaiticus) because it is set in the reign of Ahasuerus (Esth 1:1), and this king (mentioned in Ezra 4:6) preceded Artaxerxes, who was the royal master of Ezra and Nehemiah. The account of Esther's marriage to a Persian king, therefore, follows Ezra-Nehemiah and that book's negative reference to Solomon's marriages to foreign women (Neh 13:26). The book of Esther continues the general negativity about foreigners that is present throughout Ezra-Nehemiah (e.g. Ezra 9:1–2). Mordecai's and Esther's disobedience to the king is based on their Jewish identities, making this a very Jewish (in the ethnic sense) book. Mordecai's refusal to bow before Haman is "because [Mordecai] told them he was a Jew" (Esth 3:4). In the Great Uncials, Esther is always placed with Judith and Tobit (though the order is Esther-Tobit-Judith in Sinaiticus and Alexandrinus). These three books teach Diaspora ethics, an example being the model provided by the pious law-abiding character of Tobit as shown in the description of his godly ways (Tobit 1) and his instructions to his son, Tobias (Tobit 4). In the same vein, Mordecai and Esther serve as models of energetic effort and risk-taking for the sake of the welfare of the Jewish people.[33] Judith's beauty and wisdom are emphasized, in that she beguiles and cuts off the head of Holofernes, commander-in-chief of Nebuchadnezzar's army. With regard to the genre of these three books, they are placed in different positions in the codices. Sinaiticus treats them as histories (seeing that they are narratives), and they are followed by 1 and 4 Maccabees. In Vaticanus they follow (and join) wisdom books and both entertain and instruct readers about sustaining Jewish minority culture in the midst of a pagan world. There is a preponderance of feminine imagery for wisdom in Proverbs, for example, in Proverbs 1–9, the adulterous and foolish woman stands over and against Dame Wisdom, and they are the two potential lovers of the son.[34] The final embodiment and epitome of wisdom in Proverbs is the "woman of worth" of Proverbs 31. This makes it appropriate to have female moral exemplars in the books of Esther and Judith (and let us not forget Sarah in the book of Tobit). In Alexandrinus, Esther-Tobit-Judith follow Daniel (with its narrative additions of Susanna and Bel and the Dragon), so that like Daniel, they are classed as a paradigmatic Diaspora tales. In Alexandrinus, the grouping of Esther-Tobit-Judith is followed by 1 Esdras, Ezra-Nehemiah and 1–4 Maccabees, all of which belong together as post-exilic histories.

[32] "The Chronicler and the Composition of 1 Esdras," *CBQ* 48 (1986) 39–61.

[33] S. B. Berg, *The Book of Esther: Motifs, Themes and Structure* (SBLDS 44; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1979).

[34] Gale A. Yee, "I Have Perfumed My Bed with Myrrh: The Foreign Woman in Proverbs 1–9," *JSOT* 43 (1989) 53–68.

IV. POETRY

The Psalms, by its placement between Job and Proverbs in the English Bible (conforming to the order in the Vulgate[35]), is designated a wisdom book, and this classification is supported by the wisdom psalms sprinkled through it (e.g. Psalms 1, 32, 34, 37, 49, 112, 128) and by the various other psalms that show a wisdom influence (e.g. Psalms 25, 31, 39, 40, 62, 78, 92, 94, 111, 119, 127).[36] This setting makes Psalms a wisdom book rather than a hymn book for temple praise, despite the musical notation found in some psalm titles (e.g. "To the choirmaster"), so that this canonical position adds support to the thesis of Gerald Wilson, who reads the Psalter along these lines.[37] The cultic connections of the Psalter do not, however, have to be denied entirely and are reflected in some of the titles assigned to this book.[38] In the Great Uncials, the Psalter commences a section usually classified as poetic, but seeing that most of the other books in this section are obviously wisdom in character (i.e. Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Job, Wisdom, and Sirach), it seems best to view the section *in toto* as consisting of wisdom books. Psalms is either followed by Proverbs (Vaticanus and Sinaiticus) or Job (Alexandrinus). The placement of "The Song of Solomon" (so-named) in this section makes it *another* wisdom book, with the Solomon connection in the LXX title adding weight to this classification. The Song is more than an effusive outpouring of amorous sentiment but is a means of instruction (and warning), for example, the urging in the refrain-like verses at 2:7, 3:5, and 8:4. The positioning of Job at the beginning of this section in the English Bible is presumably due to chronological priority, given its setting in the patriarchal age.[39]

The juxtapositioning of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes (with Job not far away) is a sign that Job and Ecclesiastes are not to be viewed as "wisdom in revolt"[40] or "protest wisdom,"[41] which, according to this theory, seek to

---

[35] Also in the *Prologus Galeatus* of Jerome.

[36] No two writers agree on which psalms are to be classified as wisdom poems, but the four psalms on which there is widest agreement are Pss 1, 37, 49, and 112. See R. E. Murphy, "The Classification 'Wisdom Psalms'," in *Congress Volume Bonn 1962* (VTS 9; Leiden: Brill, 1963) 156–67.

[37] See Gerald H. Wilson, "Shaping the Psalter: A Consideration of Editorial Linkage in the Book of Psalms," in *The Shape and Shaping of the Psalter* (JSOTSup 159; ed. J. Clinton McCann Jr.; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993) 72–82, esp. pp. 78–81, where he focuses on the apparent clustering of wisdom psalms in Book I (Pss 1–41) and in Book V (Pss 107–150), giving a "wisdom frame" to the whole Psalter.

[38] See my discussion in "What's in a Name? Book Titles in the Latter Prophets and Writings," *Pacifica* 21 (2008) 1–16, esp. pp. 5–7.

[39] For example, Job's wealth is in livestock and servants (Job 1; cf. Gen 12:16; 13:2–13); he offers sacrifices without priestly mediation and intercedes for others (Job 1:5; 42:7–9; cf. Gen 12:7; 18:22–33); and he lived to a great age (Job 42:16; cf. Gen 25:7). He is, then, an Abraham-like figure and a non-Israelite like Melchizedek, Jethro, and Balaam, who knows the true God. The order of the books in Melito's list is: Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, and Job (*apud* Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 4.26.12–14).

[40] *Pace* R. B. Y. Scott, who uses the term for these two books (*The Way of Wisdom in the Old Testament* [New York: Macmillan, 1971]).

[41] As done, for example, by Bruce C. Birch et al., *A Theological Introduction to the Old Testament* (2d ed.; Nashville: Abingdon, 2005) 401–23.

correct or counter Proverbs. Their propinquity assumes and asserts their ready compatibility one with the other, as does the "epilogue" of Ecclesiastes (namely Eccl 12:9–14), which closes with the exhortation to "fear God and keep his commandments."[42] Just like those two books, Proverbs insists that no degree of mastery of the rules of wisdom can confer absolute certainty (e.g. Prov 16:1, 2, 9; 19:14, 21; 20:24; 21:30, 31). A failure to notice this strain of teaching within the book of Proverbs has led many to perceive a tension within the wisdom corpus, if not an irreconcilable conflict between Job–Ecclesiastes and Proverbs. Proverbs, as much as the other two books, stresses the *limitations* of wisdom.[43] The three books are closer to each other in their teaching than usually thought, and the problem has been the common mis-interpretation of Proverbs. The essential mystery of life is not denied or dispelled, and it is a misunderstanding to view Proverbs as naïvely optimistic and life-affirming. Job and Ecclesiastes are not battling a retribution doc-trine propounded by Proverbs, as, for example, a rigid doctrine of wealth and poverty. Although Proverbs can attribute poverty to laziness (19:15, 24) and depict wealth as a reward for godly fear (22:4), it also counsels generosity to the needy (13:8; 21:26) and speaks of the godly poor (15:16–17; 28:6). The call of Proverbs is to trust God (3:5; 16:3; 22:19), not to trust in wealth or in the (supposed) orderliness of the world. If Proverbs is understood in this way, there is no obvious conflict with either Job or Ecclesiastes.

V. THE PROPHETS

If the prophetic books are placed at the end of the OT (as in Vaticanus), it is implied that prophecy is mainly foretelling, pointing forward to the eschaton in which God's plan of salvation for Israel and the nations will come to completion. The fact that a number of individual prophetic books are capped by oracles of hope (e.g. Isaiah 40–66; Ezekiel 40–48; Amos 9:11–15; Mic 7:8–20) shows that this is no tendentious reading of the prophets.

In Vaticanus (B), Alexandrinus (A), and Greek orders generally, the Minor Prophets *precede* the Major Prophets, perhaps because the ministries of Hosea and Amos must have preceded in time that of Isaiah. The accustomed English ordering of these two prophetic blocks is found in Sinaiticus (א). The usual Hebrew order follows a general chronological scheme, beginning with Isaiah, followed up by Jeremiah and Ezekiel (his younger contemporary), with the catch-all book of the Twelve at the end. Certainly the ministries of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi postdate the three great prophets. There is a slight difference in the order of the sequence within the Twelve in the LXX (Hosea, Amos, Micah, Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, Nahum, etc.) compared to

---

[42] See G. H. Wilson, "'The Words of the Wise': The Intent and Significance of Qohelet 12:9–14," *JBL* 103 (1984) 178–79, where he suggests that the phraseology resonates with the content of Qoheleth but is sufficiently general to connect to the broader wisdom tradition, most particularly Proverbs.

[43] Richard L. Schultz, "Unity or Diversity in Wisdom Theology? A Canonical and Covenantal Perspective," *TynBul* 48 (1997) 281–89.

the MT.[44] The last six books are in identical sequence in both versions.[45] Significant for interpretation is the fact that oracles with a Northern provenance (Hosea, Amos, Jonah), those originating from the Southern Kingdom (Joel, Obadiah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah), and those addressed to post-exilic returnees (Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi) are placed together and even mixed together, so that they become in this larger canonical conglomerate the word of God for God's people *irrespective* of time and location. The reference to both Northern and Southern kings in the superscription in Hos 1:1 and Amos 1:1 has the same effect. In the LXX, the order of Obadiah followed by Jonah is the same as the MT. The juxtapositioning of Jonah and Nahum is supported by the Nineveh orientation of both books (Nah 1:1a: "An oracle concerning Nineveh"). The bringing together of Hosea, Amos, and Micah places these three larger books at the head of the book of the Twelve, with Mic 1:1 indicating a later dating than either Hosea or Amos, and the smaller books follow in their train, so that size appears to be a contributing factor to the LXX arrangement.

VI. ALTERNATIVE POSITIONING OF PARTICULAR BOOKS

1. *Ruth*.   The position of Ruth varies among canons, and the purpose of the present discussion is not to discover the *original* position of Ruth, if such a concept has any meaning.[46] In Hebrew Bibles, Ruth is put either before Psalms as a kind of biography of the chief psalmist, David (due to the genealogy of Ruth 4:18–22), or after Proverbs, as an example of "a good wife/ worthy woman," making the book of Ruth a wisdom piece (the first book of the *Megillot*). In Greek orders (and the Vulgate) Ruth comes after Judges, in an apparent effort to put it in its historical setting, because the story is set "in the days when the judges ruled" (Ruth 1:1).[47] In such a setting, it forms a delightful contrast to Judges. Are we to read the book of Ruth as a lead-up to David, as a festal scroll (*Megillot*), or as an historical book following Judges? There may be no right or wrong answer, rather the point is that the differing canonical positions make a difference to how one views and reads

---

[44] Cf. Emanuel Tov, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Ḥever (8ḤevXIIgr) (The Seiyâl Collection I)* (DJD VIII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1990). This scroll supports the MT order (the scroll preserving parts of columns containing Jonah–Zechariah).

[45] See the comparison and analysis by Marvin A. Sweeney, "Sequence and Interpretation in the Book of the Twelve," in *Reading and Hearing the Book of the Twelve* (SBL Symposium Series 15; ed. James D. Nogalski and Marvin A. Sweeney; Atlanta: SBL, 2000) 49–64. In the 34-page codex Washington-Freer 5 (LDAB 3124) the order is Hosea, Amos, Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, Nahum. Online at http://www.trismegistos.org/ldab/text.php?quick=3124 (accessed May 16, 2008).

[46] See L. B. Wolfenson, "Implications of the Place of the Book of Ruth in Editions, Manuscripts, and Canon of the Old Testament," *HUCA* 1 (1924) 171–75.

[47] Jerome states that this is the reason for this placement (*Prologus Galeatus*); for a translation, see Beckwith, *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church* 119–20. In Josephus, *Ant.* 5.318–337, the story of Ruth follows that of the judges. So, too, in the list of Melito (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 4.26.13–14), Ruth follows Judges, and in Origen (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 6.25.2), Ruth is joined to Judges as one book.

the book. Different sorts of questions arise out of distinct literary contexts. A popular critical view has been that Ruth is a late work, written against the extreme anti-foreigner theology of Ezra and Nehemiah that protested against exogamous marriages. Though the MT places Ruth in the third section of the canon, it does not read like a post-exilic political tract written against the Ezra-Nehemiah reforms. What is undeniable is that Ruth does not contain any open polemic.

Ruth as the first of the *Megillot* follows immediately upon Proverbs (in the Leningrad Codex) because of a link in their subject matter. Proverbs closes with a poem celebrating the "worthy woman" (31:10 אשת חיל) and the book of Ruth goes on to describe just such a woman. In Ruth 3:11, Boaz actually calls Ruth a "worthy woman" (אשת חיל). The description in Prov 31:31 fits the woman Ruth ("her deeds will praise her in the gates"; cf. Ruth 3:13) and Prov 31:23 applies to Boaz, too ("Her husband is known in the gates, when he sits among the elders of the land"), for this sounds like an allusion to the scene in Ruth 4. This placement suggests a reading of Ruth as a wisdom piece, with Ruth the Moabitess a real life example of the piety taught in Proverbs and embodied in the exemplary woman of Proverbs 31.[48] Ruth followed by Song of Songs in the *Megillot* (or preceded by it according to the order of the annual festivals)[49] emphasizes the love story aspect of Ruth, and Ruth, for its part, gives an agrarian setting for the pastoral images of Song of Songs.

On the other hand, Ruth 1:1 locates the action in the period of the judges, and Ruth forms a sharp contrast with the story of the Levite from Bethlehem (Judg 17:8–9) and that of the Levite's concubine who comes from Bethlehem (19:1–2) and with the drastic method used to provide wives for the surviving Benjaminites (Judges 21).[50] The LXX places it after the book of Judges, and the intention may be to magnify the house of David. The idiom "to take wives" (Judg 21:23; the Hebrew using the verb נשא) recurs in Ruth 1:4, and Ruth depicts God's providence in preserving the Bethlehemite family that eventually produces David (Ruth 4:18–22). In the person of Ruth, the book gives a more favourable view of Moabites than does Judg 3:12–30 with its description of fat and stupid Eglon. Thus Judges serves as a foil for Ruth. In the other direction, there are connections between the figures of Ruth and Hannah, who through her offspring Samuel (the anointer of the first two kings) is also related to the coming monarchy. The marriage of Boaz and Ruth and the birth of a son thematically prepare for Elkanah and Hannah and their (at first) childless relationship. The book of Ruth covers the same ground as do the books of Samuel, namely, the period from "the days when the judges ruled" (Samuel being the last judge) to David, and the importance of David is signalled before the books of Samuel have even commenced (Ruth 4:17b, 18–22). In the LXX canon, Ruth 4:15 and 1 Sam 1:8, with their similar but different

---

[48] Carlos Bovell wants to relate Orpah to the "strange woman" of Proverbs; see "Symmetry, Ruth and Canon," *JSOT* 28 (2003) 175–91, esp. pp. 183–86.

[49] Wolfenson, "Implications of the Place of the Book of Ruth" 157.

[50] E. F. Campbell, *Ruth* (AB 7; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1975) 35–36.

expressions, are only a dozen verses apart.[51] It must be said, then, that the book of Ruth works well in all these possible canonical positions.

2. *Lamentations.*   With regard to Lamentations, one frequent suggestion for the *Sitz im Leben* is that the songs come from ceremonies of lamentation such as those mentioned in Zech 7:3, 5, and 8:19. This is, however, pure speculation. No person is specifically named in the MT as the author. In the MT, the book is placed in the third division of the canon under a section called *Megillot*. The books in Leningradensis (the basis of *BHS*) appear to be in presumed chronological order of composition: Ruth, Song of Songs (young Solomon?), Ecclesiastes (old Solomon?), Lamentations, and Esther. Lamentations is read on the annual festal commemoration of the fall of Jerusalem in 587 BC, so that in Jewish liturgy it is associated with the ninth day of Ab, the anniversary of that event.[52] The fact that Lamentations gives little away as to the specific crisis to which it is the response shows that the author is not interested in wedding the book to any one historical event. As with Psalms 74 and 79, where those who sacked the temple are not identified, the lack of specificity within Lamentations fits it for reuse in new contexts. Its liturgical use (as one of the *Megillot*) is a recognition and affirmation of this ongoing role in the religious life of God's people. Lamentations alludes to destroyed Jerusalem's widow status (Lam 1:1; cf. 5:3), and this forms a parallel to Naomi's situation as featured in the book of Ruth (e.g. 1:1, 5, 20–21). Ruth and Lamentations each in their own way wrestle with the problem of theodicy.[53] Ecclesiastes shares the somber mood of Lamentations and generalizes its negative experience of life.

Should we place Lamentations with the festal scrolls or should it follow Jeremiah? Such alternatives reflect the different uses and interpretations of this scriptural work within the Hebrew and Greek (Latin) traditions and affect reading at least initially. This book is traditionally assigned to Jeremiah[54] and its placement in the LXX (Sinaiticus[55]) directly after the prophecy of Jeremiah is an authorship attribution and acts as a vindication of the preaching of the much-maligned prophet. This makes Lamentations a personal reaction by Jeremiah to the fall of Jerusalem (the account of which immediately precedes in Jeremiah 52), though the suffering community is also given a voice in Lamentations 5.

---

[51] David Jobling, "Ruth Finds a Home: Canon, Politics, Method," in *The New Literary Criticism and the Hebrew Bible* (JSOTSup 143; ed. J. Cheryl Exum and D. J. A. Clines; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993) 125–39.

[52] Specific clues to dating are difficult to discern in Lamentations itself, and recently Iain W. Provan has argued that we have no clear idea as to the specific historical period to which the text relates; see "Reading Texts against a Historical Background: The Case of Lamentations 1," *SJOT* 1 (1990) 130–43. For example, Lamentations makes no reference to the Babylonians.

[53] Noted by Marjo C. A. Korpel, *The Structure of the Book of Ruth* (Pericope: Scripture as Written and Read in Antiquity 2; Assen: Van Gorcum, 2001) 230–31.

[54] See Goswell, "What's in a Name? Book Titles in the Latter Prophets and Writings" 10–11.

[55] In Vaticanus and Alexandrinus the order is: Jeremiah, Baruch, Lamentations, Epistle of Jeremiah.

3. *Daniel.*   Daniel is given a historical focus by its placement after Esther in the Hebrew canon, with this book (especially Daniel 1–6) amounting to further "court tales." This reading is reinforced by Ezra-Nehemiah which follows, featuring as it does other Jewish heroes who come from the Persian court (Zerubbabel, Ezra, and Nehemiah, in turn). Ezra-Nehemiah can be viewed as an answer to the prayer of Daniel 9 (with its sanctuary focus), and the taking of the temple vessels (Dan 1:1–2; cf. 5:1–5) is reversed by the movement recounted in Ezra 1.[56] The quite different character of the two halves of Daniel seems to be what caused the different positioning of the book in the Hebrew and the Greek canons. In the latter canon, which became the Bible of the primitive church, Daniel is regarded as a prophet (the subscription of Alexandrinus names the book Δανιήλ προφήτον [Daniel the prophet]),[57] and his book follows that of Ezekiel as the last of the great prophets.[58] That would seem to be the intent of this placement. This tradition shows itself in a *florilegium* of biblical passages from Qumran,[59] in the NT, in Josephus, in Melito, and in Origen,[60] all of which refer to Daniel as a prophet. The inclusion of Daniel among the prophets was perhaps suggested by the visionary character of chapters 7–12. Following Ezekiel, which ends with the vision of the new temple (Ezekiel 40–48), the temple theme of the book of Daniel is highlighted, commencing as it does with the sacking of the temple.[61] Also, the prayer of Daniel 9 results from the hero's pondering of the prophecies of Jeremiah, so that it sheds light on earlier parts of the prophetic corpus (to which it belongs in the Greek orders).

Rabbinic thought rejected the designation of Daniel as a prophet, declaring "they [Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi] are prophets, while he [Daniel] is not a prophet,"[62] which need not be understood as downgrading the book so much as a *post eventum* recognition of the book's position among the Writings.

---

[56] P. R. Ackroyd, "The Temple Vessels—A Continuity Theme," in *Studies in the Religion of Ancient Israel* (VTS 23; Leiden: Brill, 1972) 166–81.

[57] H. J. M. Milne and T. C. Skeat, *Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus* (London: British Museum, 1938) plate 24; F. G. Kenyon, ed., *The Codex Alexandrinus (Royal MS. 1 D V–VIII) in Reduced Photographic Facsimile: Old Testament Part III Hosea–Judith* (British Museum; London: Longmans & Co., 1936) plate 417.

[58] This is the order in Vaticanus and Alexandrinus (Sinaiticus is defective), namely: Ezekiel, Susanna-Daniel-Bel and the Dragon, all viewed as one book in Alexandrinus (the subscription τελος Δανιήλ προφήτον [the end of Daniel the prophet] only coming after Bel and the Dragon). 𝔓967 is a Greek manuscript dated c. AD 200 (the earliest witness to the Old Greek version) and has the order: Ezekiel, Daniel, Susanna, Bel and the Dragon, Esther (communication to the author from John Olley).

[59] John M. Allegro, *Qumrân Cave 4.1 (4Q158–4Q186)* (DJD V; Oxford: Clarendon, 1968) 54, 70.

[60] 4QFlor 2:3 ("[whi]ch is written in the book of Daniel the prophet"), Matt 24:15; Mark 13:14, Josephus (*Contra Apionem*, 1.8; *Ant.* 10.11.7, 10.26.7–8 and 11.8.5); the order of the prophets (so designated) in Melito is: Isaiah, Jeremiah, the Twelve in one book, Daniel, Ezekiel (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 4.26.13–14); Origen in his exposition of Psalm One includes the catalogue: Isaiah, Jeremiah-Lamentations-Letter, Daniel, Ezekiel (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 6.25–26).

[61] See Tim Meadowcroft, "Exploring the Dismal Swamp: The Identity of the Anointed One in Daniel 9:24–27," *JBL* 120 (2001) 435, for the importance of the sanctuary theme.

[62] Talmud *Sanh.* 93b; see also *B. Bathra* 14b–15a, a listing that places the book of Daniel between Lamentations and Esther.

Accordingly, in the Hebrew canon, Daniel comes after Esther and before Ezra-Nehemiah, that is, between books that are considered histories. Maimonides confirmed that Daniel was among the Writings (the third part of the canon) in *The Guide to the Perplexed* 2.45.[63] He justified the placement of Daniel in the Writings by the fact that Daniel received his revelation through the medium of dreams, which is one degree below that of full prophecy as defined by Maimonides. More likely, it was the narrative character of chapters 1–6 that caused the book to be placed among the post-exilic histories.[64] Also, Daniel's characterization as a wise man (Dan 1:3–5; 2:48–49) and the book's wisdom theme generally (e.g. Dan 11:33, 35; 12:3) suit its position in a section of the Hebrew canon whose nucleus is made up of wisdom books.[65] It is not necessary to decide which is the correct positioning of the book of Daniel, given that both locations throw light on its contents (albeit on different aspects), introduce the book to the reader, and are a part of the reader's initial orientation to the book. It is as a guide to reading and interpretation that the question of canonical placement is important.

VII. CONCLUSION

By way of conclusion, the following comments may be made about the order(s) of the books that make up the Greek OT. The reader naturally assumes that the placement of books in close physical proximity implies that they are related in some way. Propinquity is taken as an indication that there is a significant connection between books so conjoined. This readerly habit has formed the basis of this survey and analysis of biblical orders.

A historical principle is reflected in the arrangement of the Greek Bible into four sections reflecting a chronological sequence (Vaticanus), though the fact that Sinaiticus and Alexandrinus end with poetry, not prophecy, is one of a number of factors that show that we are not to overdraw the contrast between the Greek and Hebrew traditions. We are certainly not to see these *rival* orders as sectarian in origin or polemical in purpose.

The placement of Psalms alongside (other) wisdom books shows that some ancient readers viewed the Psalter in that light. The LXX placement of Chronicles after Kings has contributed to its comparative neglect. Proverbs next to Ecclesiastes and Job indicates that the three books are readily compatible in outlook.

The fact that books like Ruth, Lamentations and Daniel can be placed in quite different positions in the Hebrew Bible and Greek OT shows that

---

[63] *The Guide for the Perplexed* (trans. M. Friedländer; rev. 2d ed.; New York: Dover) 241–45.

[64] The positioning cannot be turned into an argument in favour of the late (Maccabean) dating of the book; see R. D. Wilson, "The Book of Daniel and the Canon," *PTR* 13 (1915) 352–408. Klaus Koch, however, views this as a later relocation of the book by the rabbis who disapproved of a revolutionary use of its eschatological contents ("Is Daniel Also Among the Prophets?," *Int* 39 [1985] 117–30).

[65] See Max L. Margolis, *The Hebrew Scriptures in the Making* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1922) 80.

book order reflects readerly perception of what a book is about. The positioning of a book due to thematic considerations means that alternative placements are possible on this basis, for any book is likely to have more than one theme. For example, Proverbs followed by Ruth is due to the perception that the figure of Ruth provides a real life example of the "good wife" described in Prov 31:10–31. The main message of Ruth when placed between Judges and Samuel becomes the providential preservation of the family that produced great King David. The book of Lamentations in the LXX is found after Jeremiah (due to attributed common authorship), but in the Hebrew Bible it is put among the *Megillot*, as one of five festal scrolls, showing that the message of Lamentations is not tied to any one historical crisis. Presumably, it is the different generic character of the two halves of Daniel (chapters 1–6, 7–12) that explain its placement alongside other court tales (Hebrew Bible) and its alternate classification as prophecy (LXX).

This survey supports the supposition that where a biblical book is placed relative to other books in the library of Scripture has hermeneutical implications for the reader who seeks to make sense of a text. Indeed, when the same book is placed in alternative positions (e.g. Daniel) in different canonical arrangements (Hebrew versus Greek), this fact may assist the reader to notice features of that book that are normally obscured or underplayed, and so assist in refining interpretation.

APPENDIX ONE: MAJOR SEPTUAGINT MANUSCRIPTS

Codex Vaticanus (B) (early 4th century AD)	**Codex Sinaiticus (א)** (early 4th century AD)	**Codex Alexandrinus (A)** (5th century AD)
Pentateuch	**Pentateuch**	**Pentateuch**
Genesis	Genesis	Genesis
Exodus	[Exodus]	Exodus
Leviticus	[Leviticus]	Leviticus
Numbers	Numbers	Numbers
Deuteronomy	[Deuteronomy]	Deuteronomy
History	**History**	**History**
Joshua	[Joshua]	Joshua
Judges + Ruth	[Judges + Ruth]	Judges + Ruth
1, 2 Kingdoms	[1, 2 Kingdoms]	1, 2 Kingdoms
3, 4 Kingdoms	[3, 4 Kingdoms]	3, 4 Kingdoms
1, 2 Paraleipomena	1, [2] Paraleipomena	1, 2 Paraleipomena
1 Esdras*	[Ezra]-Nehemiah	
Ezra-Nehemiah	Esther + Tobit*	**Prophets**
	Judith*	The Book of the Twelve #
Poetry	1, 4 Maccabees*	Isaiah
Psalms		Jeremiah + Baruch*
Proverbs	**Prophets**	Lamentations + Epistle of Jeremiah*
Ecclesiastes	Isaiah	Ezekiel
Song of Solomon	Jeremiah	Daniel + Susanna*
Job + Wisdom*	Lamentations	Bel and the Dragon*
Sirach*	[Epistle of Jeremiah]	

More History?
Esther + Judith*
Tobit*

Prophets
The Book of the Twelve #

Isaiah
Jeremiah + Baruch*
Lamentations + Epistle of
Jeremiah*
Ezekiel
Daniel + Susanna*
Bel and the Dragon*

[Ezekiel]
[Daniel + Susanna]
[Bel and the Dragon]
The Book of the Twelve #
[Hosea-Micah missing]
Ezra-Nehemiah

Poetry
Psalms + Psalm 151*
Proverbs
Ecclesiastes
Song of Solomon
+ Wisdom*
Sirach*
Job

More History
Esther + Tobit*
Judith*
1 Esdras*
1–4 Maccabees*

Poetry
Psalms + Psalm 151* +
Odes*
Job
Proverbs
Ecclesiastes
Song of Solomon
+ Wisdom*
Sirach*
Psalms of Solomon*

[] = defective or missing
*Non-canonical work(s)

Adapted from Paul D. Wegner, *The Journey from Texts to Translations: The Origin and Development of the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1999) 48. # order: Hosea, Amos, Micah, Joel, etc.