

J. The Critical Theory of the Canon. We have already described what it is and have shown what its relation is to the canon and we will take up a fuller discussion of it under a Roman numeral by itself--

#### IV. The Critical theory of the ~~Canon~~ formation of the Canon.

A. The importance of the theory. It is not a great deal known in conservative circles and in liberal circles it is simply taught as a fact--Many liberal books claim that this is far more plausible and easier to understand and this theory is presented as the only acceptable theory.

1. Note how it strikes at the very root of our idea of the Bible. If Daniel was written around 500 B.C. but the Jews didn't include it in their Canon which was put together around 300 B.C. Then the Psalms were written around 1000 B.C. but it was included in the Canon until the last one was formed, you can see what that would mean about our idea of the Bible being formed. # 10

2. As regards specific books--This has to do most particularly with the book of Daniel and some quotations have already been read from some critical books showing the attitude toward the book of Daniel on this <sup>ground</sup> ~~matter~~--Was Daniel written at 550 B.C. by Daniel who saw the things that he describes in it or is the writing of an anonymous writer making up these stories 400 years later--this makes up the big difference--whether the book is dependable and reliable or if it is just someone's imagination. Ill. of Wilmington paper mentioning how great it was to find an old book of Lamech which doesn't even compare with the discovery of Isaiah. Thomas Mann has just recently written a whole lot of books of Joseph in Egypt and many are deceived to the point that they think that he puts down there what actually happened in Egypt--while Mann doesn't even believe that there was a Joseph. The question for us is--did someone 400 years later write some beautiful story about this man and call him Daniel or did it come about just we believe it did. The critic's chief argument is that since Daniel is found in the Hagiographa therefore it was written very late. Read Devan 's quotation. So you see the strength of the argument, its a very strong argument. If this theory of the canon is true , then the book of Daniel is doubtless a fraud. Somebody's imagination four centuries later. I might right now sit down and write you a book telling about the Youth of Christopher