THE PROPHET DANIEL

I. His Existence.
A. He was the author of Daniel. cf. 7:28; 8:2; 10:2.
B. Hewas attested to:
1. By Ezekiel 14:14, 20; 28:3. Show piety and wisdom of Daniel. Ezek old saint and Dan young and favored
2. 1 Maccabees, 2:59-60 authenticates.
3. Josephus Antiq x.11 refers to Daniel's prophecies.
4. X, Matt 24:15. Called prophet here.
5. Allusions in NT which must have Dan in mind, 1 Pet 1:10 (Dan 9:3; 12:8); 2 Thess 2:3 (9:27); 1 Cor 6:2 (7:22); Heb 11:33 (3)
6. Intimate knowledge of Chaldean history as confirmed by secular historicans and archaeology. If these facts true then A. above true too.
7. Fulfilled prophecy. Cummings p. 27.

C. He was active man.
1. He was a disciplined child. 1
2. He was an interpreter of dreams. 2
3. He was an interpreter of signs, 5.
4. He was a seer of visions, 6-12.
5. He was a politician. In service of Neb, Bel, Darius, and perhaps Cyrus.
a. Had wisdom and skill in governmental matters.
b. Kept up his prayer life and testimony. Pious participant.

II. His Era.
A. Israel's revolt from Judah on accession of Rehoboam. Also revolted against God and forsook worship of Jeh. 975 B.C.
B. Israel into Assyrian captivity in 721. 2½ centuries of apostasy and no bright spot in it. In captivity 100 years before Daniel born.
C. Judah retained nominal independence. Nabopolassar (father of Neb) raising up an empire in the north. Egypt still enemy on south. Daniel born about 625.? Still a boy when Pharaoh Necho unsuccessfully invaded Assyria, 2 Chron 35:20; 2 Kings 23:29.
On homeward march Pharaoh made Eliakim king instead of rightful Jehoahaz, younger son of Josiah, and changed Eliakim's name to Jehoiakim and made him vassal of Egypt 608
2 Kings 23:33-35; 2 Chron 36:3-4.
D. Third year after these events Neb in command of father's armies captured Jerus but left Jehoiakim on throne bec he promised alliegance and took only vessels of temple and few youths of royal seed of Judah, 2 Kings 24:1; 2 Chron. 598B.C.
36:6-7; Dan 1:1-2. After 3 years Jehoiakim revolted.
E. 2nd invasion of Jerus and Jehoiachin king and offered to surrender. Neb sacked the city, 2 Kg 24:14. Jehoiachin's unvle, Zedekiah was left as governor of the despoiled and depopulated city. Ezekiel captured in this one, Ezek 1:2. Isaiah predicted in 39:7
F. Background of 3rd invasion by Babylon.
1. Servitude of Judah to Babylon predicted in days of Hezekiah (2 Kings 20:17); Jeremiah had message of hope (29:10) but Zedekiah warned those who remained in Jerus not to fight lest they bring worse punishment (Jer 24:8-10; 25:9; 27:3-8). False porphets fed vanity of people (Jer 28:1-4) and king deceived got promise of armed support from Egypt, then revolted against Neb.
2. Neb attacked and Egypt came to aid and Babylons retreated, Jer 37:1,5,11.
3. Neb. himself came against city and after 18 months seige Jerus completely sacked (2 Kings 25:1-3). Complete destruction, 2 Chron 36:17-21.
Esti ate 1,100,000 Jews killed in Jerus this time. (From Anderson)
First invasion 606B.C. 2nd in 598 and 3rd in 587.

THE BOOK OF DANIEL

I. Its Place in the Canon

A. Eng. Bible puts with Major Prophets. Same in LXX and Vulgate.
B. Heb. Bible puts in 3rd division, Kethuvim or writings. Why?
1. Bec Jews thot less inspired.
2. Bec written after 2nd division closed.
3. Bec Dan not called a prophet, nabhi, rather called a hozeh, seer, and hakham, wise man. Greek word prophetes renders both nabhi and hozeh. Thus Lord rightly designated him, but Jews reserved 2nd division for those called nabhi. This best suggestion tho no real evidence for order of canonicity bec no historical evidence until 180 B.C.

II. Its Divisions

B. Subject matter divisions. 1-6 historical; 7-12 prophetic.
Tho 1-6 has prophecy in it and 7-12 history.

A. Language divisions. 1:1-2:4a intro. 2:4b-7:28 Aramaic. 8-12 Hebrew.
Not a logical division.

Reasons for preferring B.
a. Standpoint of writer. 1:1-7:1 writer speaks in 3rd person. Didn't need to, cf. 2:14. 7:2 to end Daniel uses 1st person.
b. Character of contents. Historical and predictive.
c. Agency of revelation. 1-6 prophet empowered by HS is only agent.
7-12 a divine messenger is interpreter and agent of rev.

III. Its Authenticity.
Charges are brot against : ISBE
A. Its Predictions.
1. By non-theists who deny the possibility of predictive prophecy.
2. By theists who point out that Dan is apocalyptic (less definite).
More like things written in 2nd c B.C.
Answer: a. Book of Enoch (2nd c B.C.) and Book of Esdras (300A.D. 450 years later) both called apolcalyptic. Why couldn't Dan antedate Enoch by mere 350 years. There had to be a beginning somewhere.
b. Dead Sea scrolls show Dan accepted, LXX trans, by their time (and they reflect 100 B.C. or earlier) which would be difficult if Dan not written until 200 B.C. Takes time for all that acceptance.
Doesn't prove 6th c B.C. date.

B. Its Miracles.
This charge affects all of Xnty and many books of Bible. Where stop?

C. Its Text. 3 Greek names of musical instruments and number of Persian words. But Greek inscriptions of early 6th c B.C. found. Phoenicians brot commerce in 1st millennium B.C. would allow for adoption of foreign words. Persian words are (1) either really Babylonian as some have found to be or (2) Median and Israel would have known these from Assyrians and Dan including Israel as well as Judah in his writings.

D. Its History.
1. Chronological objections.
a. 1:1--3rd year. cf Jer 25:1--4th year. Dan used Babylonian system of dating leaving out the incomplete year. Jer uses Jewish system which include
b. 1:21 and 10:1. 1:21 is first year of Cyrus as king of Babylon and 10:1 is 3rd year of Cyrus as king of Persia.
c. 8:1 Belshazzar sub-king.while father out.

2. Geographical objections.
   a. 7:2 where Susan subject to Babylon tho really Media.
      But some say it was to Babylon and maybe no prob at all bec
      this was a vision.
   b. 6:1—satrapy too big for 120 of them. But Sargon of Assyria had
      117 of them so must shrink out conception of satrapy.

3. Other
   Belshazzar and Darius never existed. But archaeology has disproved.
   But once these suspicitons get started it's hard to remove them.

Note on name Nebuchadrezzar—Jer 25:1
Nebuchadnezzar—Dan 1:1
LXX Nabouchodonosor.
Vulgate Nabuchodonosor.
Change from r to n not uncommon in Semitic languages
as Ben-hadad and Bar-hadad
Possible that nezzar is Aramaic trans of Baby rezzar.

DANIEL'S DEDICATION

Intro. All consider this chpt as introductory. Some say it is Dan's personal history; others that it shows the moral conditions of the time and thus gives setting for book (HAI). Several themes in it like Education (by family, by state, by religion) or Providence of God (acc to fixed laws, Jer 25:11; over nations, over individuals); but most obvious theme is dedication of Dan.

I. The Circumstances of his dedication, 1-7.

A. Family background circumstances.
1. Tribe of Judah, royal tribe, 3,6 cf. 2 Kings 20:17-18. 1 Cor 1:27 ff.
Man of rank and dignity. Isa royal; David shepherd; Amos herdsman; Elisha ploughman.
2. Uprooted from family while teen ager, 4. Children prob 12-14 yrs old.
3. Handsome, 4. Good looks connected in Oriental ideas with mental power.
4. Godly parents, 6. Godly name--God my judge. Sets theme of book (God's judgment on heathen powers.)
Also seen from fact of Dan's behaviour thruout book. Doesn't come overnight.

B. Religious circumstances.
1. Covenant relationship bec a Jew. Still God's people even tho being punished.
2. Conversion relationship, 8. Naturalness of v 8 shows Dan was godly boy and had evidently experienced some akin to NT conversion. Note: child evangelism.

C. Political circumstances.
1. Nationally. See intro. Sowing and reaping. Gal 6 ; Heb. 11:6.
2. Individually. a. Chosen, 3-4. To be taught wisdom of Babylon.
cf. Moses trained in Egypt or Magi. Impt as wisdom of world is in its place, it doesn't compare with wisdom from God as ch 2 shows. 1 Cor 1.
b. Cared for, 5. 3 yr course all expenses paid. Eunuchs means chamberlains. King's meat a great privilege and wine a delicacy.
c. changed in an attempt to corrupt, 6-7. Neb wanted their skill but not their religion and their names were a constant remindar of the latter.
Daniel--God my judge; Belteshazzar--Bel's prince.
Hananiah--whom Jeh hath favored; Shadrach--messenger of king. Rak was sun god.
Mishael--who is what God is? (comparable to God); Meshach--belonging to goddess Shak (note el replaced by shak).
Azariah--whom Jeh helps; Abednego--servant of Nego.
Note: all names contain heathen gods of Babylon. Bel was chief god; others in order were sun god, earth god, fire god.
Note: Dan didn't protest at this. Christian was name of shame at first.
"What's in a name? that which we call a rose
By any other name would smell as sweet." But lots in a name--cf Marcel.
However, this wasn't a cause for protest.

II. The Characteristics of his dedication, 8-16-17.

B. A Climactic Commital, 8. Purposed--decided resolution. Commit.
Rom 12:1. Note that a particular issue brot him to it, but involved whole life.

A. Conviction. After Changing names then Neb changed food. Forget name and forget creed that goes with it. Custom to throw small part of meat and wine on altar as libation to gods and thus meat offered to idols. Also for Dan some meat was doubtless unclean and forbidden. So wrong on 2 counts.

C. A Campaign, 9-16.
1. Tact. Politeness.
2. Persistence. Went to prince of eunuchs and to chief butler who distributed food. Pulse is vegetable food in general.

D. Consistency, 17-18. Rom 8:13. 2 Tim 2:22.
1. Man's part, 18. Continued for 3 years in this discipline and training.
2. God's part, 17. He supplied wisdom that comes in no other way.

III. The Consequences of his dedication, 17-21

A. Discernment, 17. Jas 1:5.

B. Distinction, 20. God made the despised captives wiser than the sages of Babylon.

C. Difficulties. Rest of book. ch 3 for 3 yo ng men and ch 6 for Dan himself.

Culver

4A. THE GENUINENESS OF THE BOOK OF DANIEL.

Definitions: In literary criticism, "genuineness" is the fact of a book's actually being written by the one to whom its authorship is ascribed. "Authenticity" is the fact of a book's being truthful and worthy of belief (synonymous with credibility). "Integrity" has to do with the preservation of a book. A book having integrity is one preserved from textual corruption.

1b. The critical attack upon the genuineness of Daniel.

1c. The history of the critical attack against the genuineness of Daniel.

This begins with the name of Porphyry, a neo-Platonist, heathen writer. Porphyry was a disciple of Plotinus. Plotinus (204-270) was the greatest of the neo-platonist philosophers, who having being educated in Alexandria and having served the Roman army in the Middle East, went to Rome and there established a school. In this school was one, Porphyry, a native of Tyre (b. 233), brought up in a Christian home according to Augustine (De Civit. Dei X 20) and Eusebius, and later converted to the Gaeco-Roman paganism. He became the leading disciple of Plotinus at Rome and after the master's death, edited and collected his writings and notes on his lectures into a 9 volume series called "Enneads."

From a spirit of revenge, Porphyry wrote 15 treatises against the Christians (Fuller, Hist. of Phil. p.331). Among these his most famous was ΚΑΤΑ ΧΡΙΣΤΙΑΝΩΝ. Several of the Fathers wrote answers to his criticisms, but all his and their works have perished except that preserved by reference, allusion, and quotation in Eusebius, (His.Eccl. VI 19, Demonstr. Evang.III 6) and in Augustine (De.Civ.Dei., XIX 23.), Jerome, and others.

Porphyry was a clear thinker and a clever writer. Thus, he saw the importance of Daniel as a bulwark of inspiration and the Christian faith and aimed his cleverest arguments and heaviest blows at the genuineness and integrity of that book. His contemporary Christian writers were no less able and answered every one of his charges and arguments.

It will not be necessary here to list them, for they will all appear in the attack of modern writers. They have not improved on Porphyry. As Dr. Pusey so well observed (Pref. IV) "Human inventiveness..... is very limited. It would be difficult probably to invent a new heresy.

2c. The basis of the charges brought by the critics against Daniel's genuineness.

It has been said that the real reason for the rejection of Daniel is never discussed or tried, because it is never brought into court. That reason is the presence of genuine supernatural power, authenticated predictive prophecy, attested miracle in the natural realm if Daniel is genuine.

"In the case of many on the critical side, the historical and linguistic objections paraded forth hide what is the real and insoluble objection - the presence of miracle. Many of the critical school seem as if they were not conscious of this latent motive, yet in many ways it manifests itself. Closely connected with miracle is prophecy, and to that idea too, they have an invincible repugnance. . The attitude thus taken up is eminently unscientific. To approach any problem with a determination to exclude all features that cause difficulty is the very reverse of scientific."(Thomson, Pulpit Comm., Daniel XLIXII)

Occasionally, however, even the critics are candid about their infidel views of the supernatural, especially if they are not responsible to some church body which would "fire" them if they admit their infidelity. Among these is the latest of the critical dynasty of high priests, Dr. Robert H. Pfeiffer, of Harvard Univ. When his book, "Introduction to the Old Testament" (917 pages) was released a few years ago, the Christian Century, leading spokesman for modernism in America wrote,

> "No longer need the minister avoid Old Testament themes, or employ them with uneasiness lest he commit some faux pas. Here is a readable volume that will permit him to move with some confidence and ease among the seemingly endless difficulties and problems of the literature of ancient Israel."

Here is what Pifer writes about Daniel, page 755:

> "The traditional view in Judaism and Christianity was that Daniel wrote his book in the sixth century. This theory is still stoutly defended, by means of arguments drawn from archaeology, by some conservative scholars.
>
> "This traditional theory, by accepting the book at its face value, necessarily presupposes the reality of the supernatural and the divine origin of the revelations it contains. Such miracles as the revelation to Daniel of the details of Nebuchadnezzar's dream and their meaning, the deliverance of the three confessors from the fiery furnace and of Daniel from the lions, and a hand without a body writing a message on a wall, lie outside the realm of historical facts. Similarly, the correct prediction in the sixth century of the course of history down to the second century (For good reasons Peiffer refuses to recognize that the prediction reaches down past the 3rd century A.D., at least) belongs to the realm of the supernatural. Historical research can deal only with authenticated facts which are within the sphere of natural possibilities and must refrain from vouching for the truth of supernatural events. The historicity of the Book of Daniel is an article of faith, not an objective scientific truth--- no offense being intended for its learned and able advocates. In an historical study of the Bible, convictions based on faith must be deemed irrelevant, as belonging to subjective rather than objective knowledge."

Thus by "one fall swoop" Pfeiffer "throws out the window" or to use the previous figure, "throws out of court" all evidence that a supernatural event ever took place as being outside the realm of history. However, as a matter of fact, history is the one place in which the natural and the supernatural meet. And, though we can not but pity those who refuse to know the truth, we dare not pause to join them. We are reminded of two passages of Scripture, II Cor. 4:4 - "In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them," and Rev. 22:11a -- "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still. ." These verses express about all that can be said, unless it is to add John 3:19,20.

3c. The general position of the higher criticism concerning the date and authorship of Daniel. First it is better to give the words of the critics themselves and then analyse them.

1d. The critical principles of judgment.

1. Pfeiffer, 765, Int. to the O.T.
"Disregarding therefore the imaginary lifetime of Daniel, the date of the book is to be determined, as in the case of all apocalypses, by the last historical event occuring before the advent of the Messianic age."

2. R.H.Charles, Art. "Apocalyptic Literature." Hastings Dict. of the Bible, Vol. I page 110a.

"Apocalyptic arose in a time when Israel had been subject for centuries to the sway of one or another of the great world powers. Hence, in order to harmonize such difficulties with God's righteousness, it had to take account of the role of such empires in the counsels of God; to recount the sway and downfall of each in turn, till, finally the lordship of the world passed into the hands of Israel, or the final judgment arrived. The chief part of these events belonged, it is true, to the past; but the Apocalyptic writer represented them as still future, arranged under certain artificial categories of time, andas definitely determined from the beginning in the counsels of God and revealed by Him to His servants the prophets."

3. Oesterly and Robinson, An Intro. to the Books of the O.T. Pages 336,337.

"In common with all the apocalyptic writers, our author wrote his book under an assumed name.....If a servant of God felt that he had a message to offer his people, there was no chance of his obtaining a hearing unless he wrote under the name of oneof the great ones of the past."

(Oesterley explains what is recognized by all as true that by the 4th century B.C., prophecy was regarded by the Jews as ceased. See Josephus on this point.)

From these very clear statements, the principles followed by the critics in determining date and authorship of Apocalyptical literature, of which Daniel was a part, are as follows:

learn!

1e. No apocalypse was written by the man to whom it was attributed.

2e. Authorship of Apocalypses was spuriously ascribed to ancient respected men, whose writings, if known, would be of binding authority.

3e. The true author ("a servant of God") of Apocalypse chose the avenue of "pious" fagery in order to "Obtain a hearing" and to gain acceptance of his message by the community.

4e. The contents of apocalypse, while relating to the past except for the Messianic sections, are written from the standpoint of one who lived before the events described, thus apocalypse is history, not prediction.

5e. The date of the writing of an apocalypse is always near the last historical event described.

2d. The results of application of these principles:

1e. By application of principle one, it is determined that Daniel was not the author.

2e. By application of principle two, it is agreed that the "spurious" author Daniel was an ancient Jew, perhaps of the 6th century B.C., but probably earlier, whose name was known and respected in Jewish tradition. Since Ezekiel, a 6th century writer mentions him three times, twice in connection with Noah and Job, it is agreed that he must have lived in patriarchal times.
(See Ezekiel 14:14, 14:20; 28:3)

3e. By application of principle three, it is agreed that the author was a pious Jew who wished to encourage his countrymen to faithful observance of the law and loyalty to the commonwealth in a time of oppression and danger.

4e. By application of principle four, the critics find it necessary that all the apocalyptical portions relating to the nations refer to events which occured before the writing of the book. Hence Daniel is not really prediction at all, but history.

"Daniel not only, as do the other prophets, writes that Christ should come, but also teaches at what time He should come, and arranges the kings in order, and numbers the years, and announces the most evident signs. Porphyry then, seeing all these things to have been fulfilled, and unable to deny that they had taken place, had recourse to this calumny. On the ground of a partial resemblance, he contended that these things which Daniel foretold as to

Anti-Christ at the end of the world had been fulfilled under Antiochus Epiphanes: whose assault is a testimony to the truth. For such as the accuracy of the Prophet's words, that to unbelieving men he seemed not to have foretold the future, but to relate the past." --- JEROME.

5c. By application of principle <u>five</u>, the critics are required:

1. To say that the clear prophecies of the Roman empire refer to the Greek empire. (See chapters 2 and 7)

2. To explain away the clear predictions of the first advent of Christ in chapter 9.

3. To date the book in B.C. 166-165, which they generally agree is the date of the last historical event described in the book.

"Our author has an accurate knowledge of the history of the Greek period down to and including the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes; the details which he gives agree with other historical sources. The conclusion is, therefore, <u>irresistible</u> (italics mine) that he lived during the period of which he has an accurate knowledge; and as the details of chapter XI show, the actual time at which he wrote must have been shortly before the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, for he does not record his death (163 B.C.), this he would certainly have mentioned had he written after the death of this king. But a more exact date can be given: from VIII. 11 ff it is clear that the author wrote after the erection of the heathen altar in the Temple on the 15 Chislen (December), 167-6 B.C., and before the dedication of thenew altar on the 25 Chislen 164-3 B.C., as the Jewish year began in the spring, the exact year, according to our reckoning, will be 166-4 B.C." --
"An Intro. to the Books of the O.T.", Oesterley and Robinson, p.p. 335-336

<u>NOTE</u>: It is to be observed with some satisfaction that we Pre-Millenial interpreters are not the only one who engage in "hair splitting" chronological calculations in the study of the Book of Daniel!!

4c. Specific charges brought against the credibility of Daniel by the critics, in support of their attack on its genuineness and of their own view of its authorship and date.

1d. The author makes <u>historical blunders</u>. Oesterley & Robinson, "Introduction to the Books of the O.T." p.335

"The author makes erroneous statements about the history of the sixth century B.C. which would be incredible on the part of one who really lived during that period."

Following this statement is a list of 8 alleged blunders, not one of which has not been satisfactorily explained several

times, in published writings, during the last 150 years. Some of them must be regarded as real difficulties, but not insoluble ones. The best thing in print in answer is R.D.Wilson, "Studies in the Book of Daniel" First series,1917, a 400 page book. His article on Daniel in the I.S.B.E. is a digest of part of this work. Also Boutflower

2d. The types of Aramaic and of Hebrew in Daniel are both of a later variety than was in use in the 6th century.

Oesterly and Robinson, Ibid., 336
"The late date of the book is supported by the form of both languages; the Aramaic is held by expert opinion to be of a later type than that of the book of Ezra, similarly, the Hebrew is of a late date and poor style, quite different from the exilic writings....."

It is manifest that this is a question upon which only the most highly trained experts are entitled to an opinion. It is reassuring to know, however, that Semitic scholars of the highest calibre declare that the Aramaic is of a type in use only before the 4th century. Among these in the 19th century was Dr. E.B.Pusey, Professor of Hebrew at Oxford University near the close of the century, and in recent times Dr. R.D.Wilson, Professor of Semitic languages and Old Test. criticism at Princeton Theological Seminary, also Boutflower.

Note: The above two are the only charges made by Oesterley and Robinson, who do claim to be "moderate" critics.

3d. The language and diction of the Book of Daniel are anachronistic if it is dated in the 6th century.

1e. The presence of "probably at least 15" (S.R.Driver L.O.T. 469) Persian words indicates a date of composition after the beginning of the Persian supremacy.

S.R.Driver L.O.T. 470
"that such words should be found written.....after the Persian empire was organised... is not more than would be expected;.....but that they should be used as a matter of course by Daniel under Babylonian supremacy.....before the conquest of Cyrus is surprising."

When one realizes the proximity of Persia, and the intercourse these countries had from very ancient times, this fact is not strange. Linguists and comparative philologists have long known that imported foreign ideas and items of commerce tend to carry their foreign names with them. The 15 words noted by Driver, 7 are names of officers, three are names of garments, one is the name of a food, four are names of musical instruments. Daniel could not have been accurate without use of these words any more than we could today describe modern America without mentioning foods such as tea, Chinese; coffee, Arabic; maize, Indian; and garments such as corset, Old French; trousers, Old French; trousseau, Old French; and

musical instruments such as the piano, Italian; the guitar, Greek; and officers such as lieutenant, French, Latin; Colonel, Latin, etc.

As Dr Pusey said, "Those who invent a later date for the book of Daniel can attempt no real explanation how a Jew, who according to their hypothesis, lived in Palestine about 163 BC, should be acquainted with Aryan (Persian) words, which related to offices which had long ceased to exist, or to dress which no one wore."

2e. The presence of "at least three" (Driver) Greek words in Daniel (see 3:5) would be impossible if Daniel were written in the 6th century.

The words in question are names of musical instruments. The instruments are the harp, psaltery, and dulcimer of Daniel 3:5. Driver (L.O.T., 471) says the name of the psaltery was first used in Greek literature by Aristotle, the dulcimer by Plato ~~Aristotle~~, both 4th century Greek, and since the Greek conquest was not till the 4th century, Daniel could have known no such Greek term had they existed, Driver argues.

In answer, it can be said that the critics have been gradually giving up on this argument, first by reducing the list of Greek words from ten in Bertholdt's time to three in Driver's day, and now to one. Dr. Pusey denied that there were any. Further, it is now known that

> "there were Greek colonies on the coast of Palestine in the time of Hezekiah (a century before Daniel's birth) and they already enjoyed so much power there that a Greek usurper was made king of Ashdod. The tel-el-Armana tablets carry back a contract between Greece and Canaan to a still earlier period." Sayce, the Higher Criticism and the Monuments, pp. 494,495.

So the presence of Greek names of musical instruments is not in the least surprising.

When one understands how unsound and shopworn the critical arguments on the basis of peculiarities of the language and the types of Hebrew and Aramaic discussed under the preceding point are, he wonders at the credulity of one who could sum up his whole argument on the basis of language as he did.

"The verdict of the language of Daniel is thus clear. The Persian words presuppose a period after the Persian empire had been well established: the Greek words demand, the Hebrew supports, and the Aramic permits, a date after the conquest of Palestine by Alexander the Great. (B.C.332)

4d. Daniel's position in the third division of the canon makes it necessary that it should have been written after the close of the prophetic canon, at about 200 B.C.

This charge is fully discussed in our course in O.T.I., and would occupy too much space to include a discussion here.

5d. Other charges less important, and even less convincing are:

1. Daniel would not have been omitted from Ben Sirach's list of worthies in Ecclesiasticus written about 200 B.C. if he had known of such a person and such deeds as are recorded of him. (See R.D.Wilson, Studies on Book of Daniel, II page 76 ff for complete answer)

2. Daniel's theological concepts are too advanced for the 6th century B.C. These concepts are concerning (1) Messiah, (2) Angels, (3) resurrection, (4) judgment. (See R.D. Wilson, Ibid page 117 ff. for complete answer)

3. Daniel is unknown in all writings down to the second half of the second century B.C. If it had been a 6th century book, then it would have become known. (See R.D.Wilson, Ibid, page 157 ff. for complete anwer)

2b. Positive evidence for the genuineness of Daniel.

1c. The approval of the prophecies by our Lord is sufficient evidence for the believer. See Matt.24:15 - Jesus called him "the prophet."

2c. The very fact that Daniel was received into the canon is the strongest kind of evidence that it is genuine. The most learned men of Ancient Israel saw no evidence of spuriousness.

3c. Its inclusion in the LXX translated before 200 B.C. is evidence that Daniel is at least older than the date set by the critics.

4c. The accuracy of the historical statements concerning Babylon is strong evidence that it was written there.

Daniel 4:30 is a correct representation of Nebuchadnezzar's building activity.

That Daniel was thrown into lion's den, not firey furnace reflects the fact that Darius was a fire-worshipper.

Even Pfeiffer admits (Ibid. 758,759)
"We shall presumably never know how our author learned that the new Babylon was the creation of Nebuchadnezzar. .and that Belshazzar,.... was functioning as king when Cyrus took Babylon in 538." These two facts were unknown to the Greek historians, and only with the discovery in recant times of Babylonian inscriptions and annals have they come to light.

No historical error has been proven of Daniel.

5c. Ezekiel bears strong witness to the existence of the author and to his reputation as a wise man. Ezekiel 14:14,20; 28:3.

6c. The crowning proof is that even if the latest possible date the critics claim for the authorship be granted them, there is a large and important residuum of prediction fulfilled near and after the birth of Christ, and which many believers think is being fulfilled even today. We have in mind specifically the prophecies of the Roman empire in chap. 2 & 7, and the prophecy of 70 wks. in chap. 9.

7c. The complete failure of the higher criticism is of high value as testimony. nothing withstands the assaults of cross-questioning quite like the truth.