

but this is balanced by the failure of 1 and 2 Maccabees to ~~do~~ to make much reference to the book, as they certainly would have done if it had then been but recently written. The one reference which they do make, at the end of a speech in 1 Maccabees, would be ridiculous if Daniel were then a recently composed book of fiction. The speaker refers to God's miraculous interposition recorded in it as the climax of his exhortation. If the event referred to were a fiction, its use in such a place would be preposterous. This should demonstrate that at the time of the writing of 1 Maccabees Daniel was regarded as a historical figure and his book as a true account.

The attacks on the book of Daniel rest on no foundation of fact. We have evidence that the book has been from the earliest times regarded as a part of the inspired Word of God. Attacks upon its authority, historicity, and genuineness, rest upon assumptions and upon dangerous arguments from silence. We can not be expected to substantiate every one of his statements by quotations from ~~other~~ contemporaries. This can not be done in the case of other nations, and the modern historical school does not require it in the case of Israel either. In the last analysis the attacks upon the historicity of the Old Testament are really based upon the assumption that the supernatural is improbable, if not impossible, an utterly unwarranted assumption, and certainly an unChristian one.

But that is not the subject of this paper. The general subject of the Canon of the Old Testament has been assigned. I have dealt with this, therefore, paying only incidental reference to the question of Daniel and the Canon.

The idea of the Canon of the Old Testament is found all through the book, and all through Christian literature. Its extent was