

The advocates of this theory answer the objection thus--they say that you find evidence of Jerome and probably Josephus--that often Lamentations were often put with Jeremiah and Judges--they were then in the 2nd division originally. Liberals have naturally attacked this view and one of the things they say--take Amos 7:14--Amos wasn't a prophet, but Amos means that he wasn't a prophet before the Lord called him. But the greatest difficulty is with Daniel--there never was a man more in keeping with a prophet than he. Ravin just bypasses it and claims that he was an exception--the N.T. calls Daniel a prophet and yet he says that David and Daniel had the prophetic gift but not the prophetic office, and so they belong over in the right. That shows us the weakness and the strength of it.

C. The critics do not accept either this view mentioned above or the Jewish view--they would claim that there was no logical reason why the books would get in this arrangement. They say the Jewish idea just doesn't make sense; that the idea mentioned above has no foundation in Scripture and it doesn't fit in with either Daniel, Lamentations or Joshua.. They say it is just like the people in this room--you suggest different reason why these sat here and others sat there but it just doesn't fit--what is the historical development and has no logical arrangement--They say it shows us how the Canon really came into existence--first you have five books of Moses, and though none of them were written by Moses but they came together through historical progress--J, P, E, and they fit together, and Ezra fits them together and and the Jews say in Neh. 8 that they will accept these five books as our Canon--100 years go by and they look for more sacred books to make the Canon larger--they find Isaiah, Jeremiah, Joshua, Judges, etc. and they call that the Prophets. Then some other books were written after that and the time comes when they wanted a third canon--they were all accepted before the time of Christ --this is the historical development^{#8}7-Prof. Cornell--Daniel is placed in the latest section of the Canon although Haggai, Zechariah and Malachai, who were later than the time Daniel is described as living are placed among the prophets. Either the Jews did not regard the book as prophetic or else it was considerably later than Malachai--Prof. Prince would claim that Daniel was ~~introduced~~ introduced long after the prophetic canon was closed. The work could not have been in existence in the time when the second part of the Canon was written, otherwise the collectors of the prophetic writers who in their care did not even neglect the parable of Jonah would hardly have ignored such a great prophet as Daniel. That is the logic of the higher critics--must the answer be found in some other way than this?