

to it as authoritative.

Critics have attacked the trustworthiness of the Book of Daniel on all these grounds. Some have even denied the existence of the man. The attempt has been made to prove that it was not written till four hundred years later than the time of the events which it describes. These are not really attacks upon the Old Testament Canon, but upon the Christian religion itself.

However the Old Testament Canon is brought into these attacks as a factor. A theory of the origin of the Canon is formed. On the basis of this theory, the books which in our present Hebrew Bibles appear in the division called the Prophets are supposed to have been canonized about 280 B.C. The Hagiographa are said to have been canonized at about 200 B.C. Then, they try to use the omission of Daniel from the first of these groups as a proof that it was not written until later, or, at any rate, was not recognized at the time of the canonization of the Prophets. This theory is based upon a number of assumptions, most of which are without any real foundation. Dr. Wilson has demonstrated their fallacy in an article in the "Princeton Theological Review" for January, 1915. It hardly seems to be necessary to the subject of the present paper to quote extensively from his arguments. It should suffice to say that ~~all~~ our ancient lists of Canonical books give Daniel among them, and only one, the Batha Babra fails to place it among the Prophets. Christ and the Apostles quote him as a prophet. Josephus infers that his book belonged among the Prophets. We can not attach much weight to the statements of the B---.B---, for it is a late writing (about 200 A.D.) and its statements are so generally unreliable that the critics attach no weight to his statements regarding the origin of the other prophets. Ecclesiasticus pays no attention to Daniel,