

Some trust in chariots and some in elephants but some in the name of the Lord our God--but that is not what it says--it says trust in chariots and some in horses. Look at Psa. 33:17--an elephant is vain thing for safety, etc. but it doesn't say that--it mentions the horse which ~~did~~ did not have nearly the power or the fame of the elephant in the Maccabbean time. Psa. 147:10-- He delighteth not in the strength of the elephant, a very natural thing to say if it were written at the time of the Maccabees but that is not what it says, but it does say the horse which was so important at the time of David and Solomon, when the horse was so vital to the conquering; there is much in it which fits in better with the earlier time--the argument from silence isn't conclusive but it bears a thought on this matter; the word elephant is never even found in the O.T. except in connection with tusks or ivory. Ill. of writing a story around 1862--the fine wig-wags--how they carried messages, you know they wouldn't be talking about this day. Ill. of a poem written by Robert E. Lee just before the battle of Gettysburg with the planes flying overhead and the bombs dropping--it would all be quite anachronistic. It seems strange that no references would be made to the elephants since they were so important in the days of the Maccabees. Another book which is said to be late is the book of Daniel-- it is the most difficult book of the O.T. from the critical viewpoint--it speaks of Daniel right at the court of the greatest monarch of that day--King Nebuchadnezzar who went out of his head for a time and then later came to the cognizance of the true God--if God could perform this marvelous miracles at the court of the greatest earthly king of the day, it is pretty hard to think that this was written down at that time unless it was true. If God intervened, we must have a Supernatural God--it is easy to say about some of these other books that they were written in some corner of the world and they are obscure and probably just fables, but this was written in Babylon at the leading king's court of the day--written by a man who sees these things written and done right there; of course if it had been written by someone 400 years later when people remembered about as much about ~~him~~ as we know about Charles V, though he ruled a terrific amount of territory--if it was written that long afterward ~~it~~ it would be quite natural to get some details mixed up--so destructive critics may differ on this or on that but the point to which they hold so tenaciously is that Daniel comes from the time of the Maccabees, at least two or three hundred years after the time of Nebuchadnezzar--but we have details of even the court session of Belshazzar and giving us facts which we didn't know until long after the time--it is very difficult to reconcile that this book was written long after Daniel.