

existence at the time of the completion of the second part of the canon. As otherwise the collectors of the prophetic writings who in their care did not neglect even the parable of Jonah would hardly have ignored the record of such a great prophet as Daniel is represented to be. Is it the matter of how good the man is? Jonah was fleeing from God and even at the end Jonah was dissatisfied with what God was doing. Surely if it is the greatness of the man, you would think Daniel would be among the prophets and Jonah among the Hagiographa rather than reverse. Now Professor Cornill is one of the great liberal scholars at the end of the last century and his in introduction to the canonical books of the O.T., he says that among objective reasons of the utmost weight which render the view of its genuineness necessary is the position of the book in the Hebrew Canon where it is not among the prophets but in the third division of the Canon in the so-called Hagiographa. If it were the work of a prophet from the time of Cyrus he says, there is no reason evident why it should be withheld from the Canon, a designation that was not denied Haggai, Zechariah and Malachai. Then look at Bennett and _____ in their Biblical Intro.--They say that in the Hebrew Canon Daniel is not placed among the prophets but in the Hagiographa, the latest section of the Canon although Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachai, who were later than the time that Daniel is described to have written --the Jews did not regard the book as prophetic or it was considerable later than Malachai which was 444 B.C. Now we can see the strength of their argument. Review of what the Critical theory is.

B. The Argument advanced to uphold the Theory--

11 1. Some of the books were not in existence in the time of Ezra and therefore Ezra couldn't possibly have been the man to compile these books into the Canon. They say that Daniel, Esther, Chronicles, Etc. weren't even written at the time of Ezra. We have noticed a little how far from conclusive the evidence which these higher critics have used--it doesn't prove the theory but it is a step in that direction.

2. The three divisions indicate three stages of collection. If the books of the 2nd and 3rd division had been arranged at the same time --Ezra and Nehemiah would certainly be put in with Samuel and Kings--Daniel would certainly be with Isaiah and Ezekiel--the fact that these books are in the 3rd division proves that only that division was open when they were produced. The 2nd division was already closed. This is a strong argument--Green's answers would demolish their argument if one could prove it but it can't be proved.