

A fitting conclusion to this article will be the mention of the fact that through the exertions of the Marchioness of Dufferin, Lady Reay, Lady Roberts, Lady Lyall and others, a nursing system has been established for both civil and military hospitals in India, where so many of our friends and relatives are located; especially as the writer, in his book entitled "Health in the Tropics; or, Sanitary Art applied to Europeans in India," published so far back as 1862, strongly advocated this movement. It was then proposed that an officers' hospital should be built near every large military or civil station, to which a European nurse should be attached.

The advantages of such a plan would be manifold. At the present time the sick bachelor officer lies in his bungalow dependent on the kindness of his comrades, and on the oftentimes lazy attendance of his native servants . . . and he is dependent on the mess for his sick wants. Should he become delirious or helpless, he must either be left to the care of natives or become a tax on the kindness of his brother-officers, who, to their credit be it said, are ever ready to feed, tend, wash, to sit up with him—in fact, to act as nurses. This, however, should not be. A man cannot perform the office of a nurse.

Thanks to the exertions of the ladies mentioned above, to be an invalid in India has now become a much less trial than formerly for all classes. Lastly, with reference to a statement which has been "going the round of the press," that arrangements have been made at Aldershot for soldiers' wives to undergo a course of instruction in nursing, it may be remarked that such a system has been in operation in India for some years past.

WILLIAM MOORE.



ART. IV.—THE GENUINENESS AND AUTHENTICITY OF THE BOOK OF DANIEL.

PART I.

AN earnest student of the Bible must be in some sense a critic. When a man is deeply impressed with the importance of his spiritual interests, he has recourse to that book which professes to be "a lamp unto his feet and a light unto his path"; and he cannot read the marvellous revelations disclosed on those sacred pages without examining their claims upon his reason and his conscience. What evidence of the truth of these things is forthcoming? What testimony can they summon in their support? What external proofs can be produced? and what corresponding echoes of internal evidence testifying to wants supplied corroborate their demands? Such questions press for a reply. But to be a true critic the

student must bring to the task of his investigations a mind perfectly unprejudiced, or as much so as is possible, allowance being made for his idiosyncrasies and surroundings. If once we turn the pages of the Bible solely to search for arguments to prove or disprove, as the case may be, our own private preconceptions upon any question that is open to dispute, it is astonishing how large and ready a supply of weapons will be contributed to our controversial armoury. To be honest both to ourselves and to others we must renounce all foregone conclusions. The primary resolve of the student of Scripture must be to seek and find the rock of truth, and for this he must dig deep, for he will not meet with it on the surface of any subject, and on the foundation he must build up facts and not fancies, discoveries and not guesses. The lack of this prefatory qualification of an honest and good heart, and the leaning on a biased judgment, have been in all ages the fruitful sources of error and heresy. Visionary ideas and imaginings have so strong a charm and fascination for some minds that reason itself is seduced from the pursuit of the straight line of truth into the tortuous mazes of fantastic probabilities, till previous convictions and conclusions give place to the delusions of dreamland. There are other minds that are not able to originate a design. They have not imagination enough to coin a new heresy. Such are wont to adopt a leader whom they soon learn to follow blindly through any morass that he may assure his admirers is a "highway in the wilderness." It is to this source that the rapid spread of novel theories is to be traced, and the large increase of junior pupils in a new school of thought is to be accounted for. Fresh recruits in our intellectual forces, and for that matter not a few who are of riper years, shrink from thinking for themselves, but on most important questions prefer that others should think for them and bear the responsibility of the result, and the inventors of the attractive system are content to receive as their reward the homage of hero-worship.

There is one feature which at the first blush is somewhat puzzling, but on closer inspection is painfully consistent, which reminds us of the teaching of St. James, that he that offends in one point is guilty of all. We can understand that an inquirer in taking up the subject known by the name of the "Higher Criticism," may feel a difficulty in some one or other of the many questions opened to debate, as for example, the unity of the prophecies of Isaiah or of Zechariah, but why is it that further conversation generally elicits the admission that he entertains serious doubts also about the origin of Deuteronomy and, indeed, of the entire Pentateuch, of the credentials of Daniel and Jonah, and of other portions of the

Old Testament Scriptures? If we change the subject of literary evidence and turn to the claims which the fundamental doctrines of the Church have upon our credence, the same individual will often be found to have anything but clear notions concerning the problem of the knowledge of our incarnate Lord, he will water down the nature and authority of inspiration, he will ignore the atonement, or instead of accepting it as a great mystery, but at the same time a great fact, he will overload it with metaphysical conditions and human theories which cancel all its consolations and render the doctrine unintelligible to the majority, and impracticable and perhaps incredible to all. We are thus led to learn the painful fact that doubt admitted concerning one book of the Bible or one article of the faith implies the probable denial of all the rest, as the removal of a stone here and there in a building is very likely to involve the ruin of the entire edifice. This discovery, however, opens our eyes to a question of much importance, Has this wholesale defection, this ill-concealed apostasy so rife in our day, anything to do with true criticism? Criticism implies a judicial examination of, and a calm and cautious inquiry into, the merits of the matter under dispute, and a settlement of the controverted points according to comparative evidence, but how can a process be called by the name of criticism when the rationalistic objector on the very threshold of the controversy anticipates all argument by laying down the stumbling-block of an inexorable law that *foretelling the future is impossible*? To what purpose is it that the disputant is challenged, that the Scripture asserts the possession of this power, that exact and minute declarations have been made and have found their fulfilment centuries afterwards, and that our Lord Himself uttered predictions which have been satisfied to the very letter? The only reply which the Rationalist deigns to make is the cuckoo-cry, "It is impossible!" With him a prediction is a guess, or an ideal picture reflected in the mirror of a fortunate coincidence, or a history pre-dating itself and assuming the vesture of a past generation, or in the case of the Lord Himself, words put into His mouth by His followers which He never uttered. It is doubtful whether any benefit can arise from a discussion about holy things with a mind held in bondage by such fetters. If a man will close his eyes and declare that light is impossible, where is the use of bringing him abroad in the full blaze of a summer noon-day? He will account for the impression made upon the eyes of others in a thousand ways: he may laugh at their credulity, or charge them with ignorance of some scientific discovery or some recently-discovered disproof, but his own creed will still commence and close with the negation, "It is impossible!" If

prophecy is solely the word of man, then it can only mean what the writer intended; but if it is the word of God, it will mean all that God intended, and that meaning will unfold as His purposes proceed, and will be a running commentary on the events as they evolve. The interpretation will be not the bald statement of an isolated fact, but like the growth of a germ or seed passing through all stages from the first bud to the ripest fruit, as the ever-continued and concomitant explanation of the mysteries of our race, testifying by an inspired elasticity of adjustment that God is His own interpreter.

Perhaps it may be considered that these remarks violate the law laid down above that a sound critic must be free from bias. Is not bias visible in these very statements? Whatever amount of truth may be in this countercharge, it will be plainly seen from what follows, in the inquiry before us into the genuineness and authenticity of the book of Daniel, that those who controvert both the antiquity and authority of that book are the very men who as a rule call in question other, we might almost say all the books of the Bible, and evaporate many of the essential doctrines of the Church of Christ. This leads us to set forth the names of the objectors and the nature of their objections. We should have thought it a poor consolation to a Christian mind to find that such an one as Porphyry was the first to take up a hostile position against the book of Daniel. If St. Athanasius or one of the Cyrils or Gregories could have been produced as having left it on record that he was not satisfied either with the evidence or the arguments in support of this book in his day, such an objector would, at least, have claimed our respect for his opinions, because his motives would be above suspicion, and it would have been recognised as a duty incumbent upon all Biblical students to investigate the reasons that placed him in opposition to the general *consensus* of the Church upon this point; but when we remember who Porphyry was and what were his principles, and what was his openly-avowed purpose in his writings, the case is totally different. This Neo-platonist of the close of the third century was a devotee of paganism, and was bitterly hostile to the Church. He wrote fifteen books against the Christian religion, and in the twelfth book assailed the prophecies of Daniel as one of the chief foundation-stones of the faith. He asserted that Daniel was not the author of the work that goes by his name, but that it was written by someone who lived in Judæa in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, as all before that date was true and all after it was false, hence the so-called predictions were not prophecy but history written after the occurrences. This first assault was met and refuted by the Church in the persons of Eusebius, Apollinarius, and

Methodius, and afterwards by St. Jerome. It is scarcely necessary to point out that the position taken by Porphyry is exactly identical with the teaching of the critics of our own day who roundly affirm that, as Antiochus Epiphanes died in 164 B.C., the earliest date at which this book could have been written is 163 B.C., so as to contain the history of that tyrant; for prophecy these critics will not admit it to be. The attack of this champion of infidelity, who would not allow the existence of miracle or prophecy, rebounded like a "telum imbellis sine ictu" from the massive armour of the Church; no wound was inflicted, no effect produced. Fourteen centuries dragged "their slow length along," and then Spinoza and Hobbes, the Pantheist and the Deist, commenced their attacks on Revelation. The former held that ch. viii.-xii. were only genuine; ch. i.-vii. might have belonged to Chaldaean annals, which, with the last five chapters, were put out by a later writer, and the latter threw out doubts whether Daniel himself or a later writer recorded his prophecies. Eichhorn, about the beginning of the present century, engaged in a work of mutilation of this book, but the man who picked up Porphyry's rusty weapon was Corrodi, in the last century, who coolly branded the author of Daniel as an impostor who lived in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes; and it is more than painful in such a connection to find no less a personage than Dr. Arnold, of Rugby, writing in the present century:

I have long thought that the greater part of the book of Daniel is most certainly a very late work, of the time of the Maccabees; and the pretended prophecy about the kings of Grecia and Persia and of the north and south is mere history, like the poetical prophecies in Virgil and elsewhere; in fact, you can trace distinctly the date when it was written, because the events up to the date are given with historical minuteness, totally unlike the character of real prophecy, and beyond that date all is imaginary.

And Dr. Williams, in his contributions to "Essays and Reviews," quotes with approval the opinions of Baron Bunsen in distinguishing the man Daniel from the book Daniel, and in bringing the latter as low as the reign of Epiphanes, and coolly adds that the author was "only following the admitted necessities of the case." And in a less outspoken way, and with a timid mixture of evasiveness of the result, combined with an attempted conciliation of the critics, Mr. Gore, in *Lux Mundi*, p. 355, writes: "Criticism goes further and asks us to regard Jonah and Daniel as dramatic compositions worked up on a basis of history." And again: "But we would contend that if criticism should show these books to be probably dramatic, that would be no hindrance to their performing an important canonical function, or to their being inspired." Now these are, for the most part, the very arguments

advanced by Porphyry and the Deists who revived his profanities, and all of them savour of his teaching, and lead to the same conclusion, whether expressed in the language of a coarse Philistinism or with the embellishments of a euphemistic decorum. And certainly it does strike us as strange that men of learning, claiming a character for piety, should be found to consent to such an alliance, and almost to take a pride in tracing their pedigree through a lineage of sceptics and scoffers; but such is the melancholy fact. A large number of names of some of the most reputed German critics and expositors, and, alas! a considerable number, also, of English imitators and plagiarists, do not shrink from such a parentage and fellowship, but boast of their critical acumen as being far in advance of other students, and appear to assert that learning and repudiation of the archives of our faith are almost convertible terms; and thus fortified with weapons forged on the anvil of professed enemies of revelation, and with the armour of their own assertions, these teachers instruct their classes and inform the public at large that the writer of this book, whom our Lord Himself entitles a "prophet," and added a solemn caution as to the care to be exercised in reading his writings, was nothing more than a dramatist and an impostor, *proh pudor!*

Men of ability must have reasons, valid or weak, as the case may be, in forming or adopting an opinion upon any subject. What, then, are the grounds on which such critics have taken this attitude of opposition against this book, and manifested so much antipathy to its contents? We can only find space for a selection of such objections, but shall endeavour to produce the most feasible and forcible. But before entering on the catalogue of minor charges brought against the book of Daniel, much trouble is spared us by the open admission of the majority of our antagonists; we are not imputing motives to them; it is their own confessed statement and standpoint: a miracle is an impossibility, and prophecy, or foretelling an event, is a species of miracle, and therefore an impossibility; moreover, the miracles related in this book are not only startling in character, but prodigal in numbers, and the prophecies are so many and so minute that if any truth is contained in them they must have been penned after the event, or, to put it more moderately, they are to be attributed to the apocalyptic appetite for visions and symbolic allegories, for which the Jews of the post-exilic period were noted; or, to take the most favourable view, they were forebodings of the future transferred by the process of idealization from the present to the past. Now, to demand the acceptance of such a postulate that the Church of the nineteenth century must surrender miracle and prophecy and

give them up, as babes to the wolves, to spare a scant residuum of morals and sentiment, is of so portentous and prodigious a nature in the face of the claims which Scripture challenges for itself, in the presence of the prophets of the Old Covenant, and the apostles of the New, and in contradiction of the very teaching of our Lord Himself, that it appears to be practically a summons to surrender the whole doctrine of revelation. The motives at work may be mixed or even contrary: some may be labouring to destroy the Divine record altogether, others to save one half by the sacrifice of the other half, and some may persuade themselves that they are earnest seekers after truth; but each will find, after working out his problem in his own way, that the same quotient will be arrived at—the denial or the weakening of “the faith once for all delivered to the saints.” But whatever the motives are, the patent fact is before us that they have come to the conclusion that prophecy in the sense of prediction must be abnegated; but bare denial would not carry conviction with the majority, hence the authors of this theory of demolition and their abettors found it necessary to discover some grounds on which to find a bill and get up a case that might be brought before the jury of Biblical students. To this end astute minds engaged in search for points of evidence which might weigh with the jurors and the public at large. This must never be forgotten that the charge of forgery, however it may be euphemized, of Daniel’s name, and the charge of perjury in representing history as prophecy, were alleged against the author of the book prior to the trial; he was condemned by his judges beforehand on the ground of the impossibility of prophecy, and in the case of Porphyry and some others because of their pre-determination to destroy Christianity. The trial was demanded afterwards under the hope that items of evidence might be discovered to convict the defendant of at least being guilty of the pious fraud perpetrated by Virgil, who described the rise and progress of the Roman Empire under the guise of a prophetic vision granted to Æneas in the realms of Pluto without the honesty of the poet who closed the revelation with the confession that the dream proceeded out of the ivory gate. An honest mind will naturally resent such a mode of procedure, nevertheless we must be content to listen to the depositions that have been made against the accused, and afterwards hear the defence that can be made in his favour, and the arguments that plead for his acquittal.

1. The Hébrew Scriptures, it will be remembered, were divided into three classes: the *Law*, containing the five books of Moses; the *prophets*, embracing the books known as Joshua, Judges, 1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah,

Ezekiel, and the twelve minor prophets; the *residue* were grouped together and called the *Psalms*, or the *Ketubim*, *i.e.*, writings, Scriptures, or *Hagiographa*, *i.e.*, sacred writings. It is in the last class or division that Daniel is placed in the copies of the Hebrew Bible, and the testimony of the Talmud confirms this; hence it is urged by those who call in question the claims of Daniel that if he had been a prophet, and recognised as such, he would have been reckoned among his fellows, and because he is not ranked with them, they join in the cry, "Daniel is no prophet"; he saw, or claims to have seen and interpreted, visions, but he is not entitled to be enrolled in the "goodly fellowship"; and then they proceed to infer from this exclusion that this book was simply unknown, because unwritten, when the canon of the prophets was completed. A similar objection has been raised in connection with the version of the LXX., but our remarks on that portion of the subject must be deferred till we take into consideration the arguments for the defence.

2. The book called *Ecclesiasticus* was written in all probability only a few years short of 300 B.C., or at all events, according to another theory, somewhat later in the same century in its original oriental form, and was translated into Greek by the grandson of the author. In the concluding portion of this book there is a brilliant panegyric of the fathers of old, commencing with Enoch and ending with Simon the famous high-priest. Daniel's name is passed over in silence, and it is inferred that if this book had been by him he certainly would have found a place in this calendar of Israel's worthies; and hence a further conclusion is arrived at that this book must have been composed after the time of Simon, and is, therefore, a work of the Maccabæan period.

3. It is well known that when the Jews returned from Babylon they had contracted the use of the Aramaic dialect, and lost to a considerable extent the Hebrew of their forefathers. It may be that even in the earliest days of the restoration this change of speech necessitated an oral interpretation of the law as it was read (Neh. viii. 8), but as years passed on this was certainly the custom, and hence arose the Chaldee Targums as they are termed, *i.e.*, free translations or explanatory paraphrases of the ancient text in the "language understood by the people." The Targum on the prophets was written by Jonathan the son of Uzziel; there is some question as to the date at which he flourished, whether before or after the time of our Lord, but it seems to have been about that period. This Targumist omits the book of Daniel. This, it is urged, shows that he did not esteem Daniel on a level with the other prophets, and depreciated the value of his writings.

4. The charge brought against the author of the book of using the name of a noted member of the Jewish captivity is for the most part thus argued and excused by the opponents of the genuineness of the work. The author was a Scribe of the Maccabæan age, when the people were in sore distress by the persecutions and butcherly cruelties of Antiochus Epiphanes, and he selected certain current traditional stories from the last "great tribulation" of his people, and treated them dramatically, at the same time inventing some striking visions for the purpose of inspiring hope and courage into the hearts of his suffering brethren and leading them to trust in the providence of God—thus Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar are only histrionic characters under which Antiochus is represented. The use of another's name, they proceed to affirm, was by no means unfrequent at that period: Ecclesiastes, for example, claims the authorship of Solomon (which, by the way, categorically it does not), and the "Wisdom of Solomon" is allowed by all critics to be apocryphal, and the name is assumed only as a *nom de plume* to carry weight with the readers. The foregoing are the leading points of evidence of an *external* nature that have been levelled against the integrity of the book of Daniel; we now proceed to bring forward some examples of hostile assumptions that have been culled from *internal* evidence.

1. One of the most important with which we are confronted is the argument derived from the language and diction of the book itself. The Hebrew and Aramaic are condemned as corrupt. There are also words of Persian source and use which could not have been known at the time Daniel is stated to have lived; most of the titles in iii. 1, 2 are claimed as Persian. To these are added several others such as the words rendered "meat," i. 5, 8; "coats," ii. 6; "palace," xi. 45, etc. There are, moreover, several words of Grecian extraction found—a language which it is averred could not have been known till long after the captivity; these are names of musical instruments translated "harp," "sackbut," "psaltery," and "dulcimer" (iii. 5.) The cumulative evidence supplied by these facts being brought to light by philological research furnishes a strong testimony to the late date of the composition, when the language of the Jews was deteriorated and foreign admixtures had been freely admitted.

2. Self-praise is advanced as a ground of objection. Daniel could hardly have said of himself that he "had understanding in all visions and dreams," and that there were "none found like him and his fellows" (i. 17, 19); nor could he have quoted the laudatory words of the queen to Belshazzar (v. 11); he could scarcely have borne witness concerning himself, that he

was "faithful, neither was any error or fault found in him" (vi. 4); nor would he have repeated the words of the angel, "Thou art greatly beloved" (ix. 23 and xi. 11). Such panegyric befits the pen of a writer who desired to exalt his hero, but it would ill suit the author to describe himself in such adulatory terms. The compiler of the work must have been a later dramatist.

3. A further charge of a very serious character is brought forward—historical inaccuracies. These are so various and complex that space will not permit of their being considered specifically. Names and relationships and offices are set down which, according to other sources of information—histories and cuneiform inscriptions—are erroneous. Statements are made about the monarchs who are mentioned which will not bear investigation, neither will the chronology of events square with the narratives which have been transmitted to us through other channels. All this must greatly detract from the inspiration and authority of the book.

4. Among the contents of the book which are open to exception are the preposterous occurrences which are related with an extravagance of detail and minute particularity that is equally marvellous and incredible. Miracles are impossible *per se*, but the miracles of this book so far out-miracle all others, that, if there could be degrees of comparison in the impossible, they would reach the superlative. Such are the wonderful escapes of Daniel and his brethren, the colossal altitude of the image Nebuchadnezzar set up, and the strange madness that befell that monarch, and the intricate specification of the visions and dreams of the king and of the seer, to which may be added the definition of future events which are laid down with a surprising nicety of calculation both as to time and circumstance of fulfilment. All these features combined are simply baffling and forbid credence, and compel us to relegate the compilation to the regions of the legendary.

5. The introduction of guardian or patron angels, princes who "in heavenly places" preside over the fortunes of nations and men, is traceable to Persian influence and the doctrines of Parseeism. This article of faith was not currently received among the Jews till a late period, and the free and natural way in which these celestial beings are presented on the pages of this book, with their names and the provinces under their jurisdiction, shows that the doctrine had become familiarized to the writer, who therefore could not have performed his task much, if at all, before the Maccabæan age.

This outline will serve to exhibit fairly, we trust, though compendiously, the chief charges derived both from external

and internal evidence against the genuineness and authenticity of the book of Daniel. It will now be our duty to meet these charges, and produce on the other side, in behalf of the defendant, points of evidence also from external and internal sources.

Before entering on the specific arraignments against the credibility of Daniel, it was thought desirable to trace the history of the hostile attacks to which this book has been subjected. In like manner, before dealing with the specific charges and protesting against the deductions drawn from them, it is also desirable to trace the pedigree of the witnesses for the credibility of Daniel, who have held the traditional view that this book is by no other author than the prophet of that name, although it may be granted that the work in its present form and arrangement was moulded by the members of the Great Synagogue, of whom Daniel himself was one, associated, according to Jewish tradition, with Ezra the president, Jeshua the high-priest, Zerubbabel, the three youths who had passed through the furnace, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Nehemiah, and Mordecai. There is also a tradition preserved in the Talmud that the men of the Great Synagogue wrote—which may mean copied from autographic notes, or wrote out and edited and threw into orderly shape—the works of Ezekiel, the twelve minor prophets, Daniel and Esther. Can we trace the tradition from our day up to that distant date?

The point from which we take our start is the testimony of our own Church. In her sixth article, in enumerating “the names and number of the canonical books,” she sets down “the four prophets the greater.” Daniel is therefore classified and placed on a level with the three other well-known members of the “goodly fellowship.” Again, in her authorized version of the Holy Bible, Daniel holds the same position and rank. If we consult the Latin Vulgate, the Bible of the Middle Ages, the same arrangement meets the eye, certifying us of the judgment of St. Jerome and the Jewish tutor who aided him in his labours. The historian Josephus (A.D. 38-100), in B. J., iv., 6, 3, and in vi. 2, 1, though not mentioning Daniel by name, yet evidently refers to his writings under such titles as “prophecies,” “the writings of the ancient prophets,” and “oracle.” The next step brings us to the writers of the New Testament Scriptures. There is no portion of the Old Testament that has had so much influence on the New Testament as the book of Daniel. In many places the Apocalypse is a reproduction of its predictions; St. Jude records an act of Michael the archangel; St. Paul, when he would paint the awful portrait of the final Antichrist, appropriates the features and the colouring from this prophet, and

in another place he arranges, as it were, in parallel columns the "voice of the archangel" and the resurrection of the dead in Christ (1 Thess. iv. 16) with the standing up of Michael, the great prince of Israel, and the awakening of the dead (Dan. xii. 1, 2). Above all other witnesses our Lord Himself stands pre-eminent. No testimony can be more explicit and decisive than the words of Him who is "the truth," when the disciples pointed out the grandeur and the greatness of the architecture of the Temple, and He predicted the total downfall of all this magnificence, and gave them injunctions how to escape the impending judgment. "When ye shall see the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet, then let them that are in Judæa flee to the mountains"; and what a pointed emphasis He imparted to the quotation, as though there was latent in the words a mystery not yet unfolded! "Let him that readeth understand" (Matt. xxiv. 15). Further, the title "Son of Man," the name specially assumed by the Lord Himself, and only once used otherwise, and that undoubtedly as a quotation from the Lord's own confession (Acts vii. 56), a name full of the deepest mystery both theologically and prophetically, must be referred immediately to this book. Closely connected with this title of the King is that of His empire, "the kingdom of heaven," "the kingdom of God." The announcement that this kingdom is at hand, the requirements for entering inside its gates, and the promises of thrones and rewards to those that are admitted within its precincts, pervade the pages of the evangelists; but we trace the origin both of the revelation and of the phrase to the prophet Daniel, who sets forth in his interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream (iii. 44) and of his own vision (vii. 14, 27) the four kingdoms of earthly origin and earthly power, and their destruction by the kingdom which has its origin and power from heaven and from God, the kingdom whose duration is everlasting, its jurisdiction universal, and its monarch the Messiah. Passing beyond the times of the New Testament, the next witness is the author of the first book of Maccabees, who wrote most probably about a hundred years before the birth of Christ. To say nothing of other passages which show acquaintance with this book, the dying words of Mattathias, as recorded in ii. 60, make mention of the deliverance of Daniel from the lions. A most important witness in every respect is the version of the LXX. It is well known that the rendering of the book of Daniel in this version was considered so incorrect and unsatisfactory by the Church in early times that it was rejected, and the translation made by Theodotion in the second century was placed in its room. The original translation by the LXX. was entirely

lost till the middle of last century, when a copy was found in Rome. The student will find an easily-accessible edition of it in Tischendorff's LXX. The only point insisted upon in this place is that the book of Daniel was translated by the LXX. at the same time as the rest of the Old Testament Scriptures, in the third century B.C., and that it occupied the place of honour among the four greater prophets.

Although the account has come down to us through Josephus, who wrote a long time after the event, and through the Talmud, still the occurrence itself belongs to the fourth century B.C., and therefore, notwithstanding the efforts that have been made to set it aside, may be cited as another link in the chain of evidence. It is related that Alexander the Great, when intending to attack Jerusalem, was turned from his purpose by the high-priest, and that he was shown the prophecies of Daniel which foretold his victory. Whatever view may be taken respecting the date of the book of Baruch, it seems almost certain that it was written at a still more remote period in the history of the Jewish nation, and the internal evidence of this book goes a long way to prove that the author was acquainted with the writings of Daniel, who must therefore have been his predecessor. We are now led up to the very times of Daniel himself. Ezekiel, who prophesied during the period of the exile while Daniel was carrying out God's purposes at the court of Babylon, makes special reference to him. Divers efforts have been employed to show that the Daniel spoken of by Ezekiel must be a different person, and one who lived in a different period, but this dispute is clearly set at rest by Ezekiel's own words. In ch. xxviii. 3, he assails the king of Tyre with a satirical similitude: "Behold thou art wiser than Daniel; there is no secret that they can hide from thee." This repute for wisdom at once identifies the man. Again, in Ezek. xiv. 14, in reproving the iniquity of the land, the prophet declares by the word of the Lord, "Though these three men, Noah, Daniel, and Job, were in it, they should deliver but their own souls by their righteousness, saith the Lord God." There are two difficulties to account for in these passages, but they vanish upon inspection. How could one so young, and one of the then present generation, have acquired such a reputation as to be classed with two such compeers? In reply it may be observed that Hengstenberg has satisfactorily proved that Daniel at the period that Ezekiel uttered these words was thirty years of age, and it was quite ten years before this date that he had received signal rewards and honours and promotion for his penetration and wisdom. In short, he was, and was recognised as, the prodigy of his day, of which

his exalted rank was a constant advertisement before the eyes of his people. The second difficulty is closely connected with this. Noah had flourished at a remote period, and notwithstanding the opinions prevalent among some modern critics, a distant antiquity must also be claimed for Job; how, then, could one of the present generation have been interpolated between these two grand examples of old? A great number of explanations have been offered for this, perhaps none of them altogether convincing, but one may be suggested which will put the question in a clearer light. The order of the names is arranged according to the scope and extent of the blessing conferred by these holy men, each in his own day and generation. Noah procured mercies and blessings for the whole race of man—for the whole world; Daniel for a nation, and Job for a family. The radius of the circle of influence fixed the order in which the names of the several benefactors are arranged.

We may now set side by side the two pedigrees, and put the question to the jury both of scholars and men of common-sense. Which claims the verdict in its favour, the private opinions of a knot of men, chiefly of the Lutheran community, who on all other subjects of a kindred nature are known to be more or less sceptical, and who derived the first impulse of their opinions on this point from a noted infidel and adversary—a pagan philosopher of early days; or the voice of the Church Catholic in all ages—the Church which in that day refuted the arguments of the assailant, the testimony of the historian Josephus, the teaching of the Apostles, the express declaration of the Lord Jesus Christ Himself, the witness of the deuterocanonical books of Maccabees and Baruch, the corroboration of the LXX., and the confirmation of the prophet Ezekiel, who lived and laboured in the same age as Daniel himself? Surely no jury could be imposed upon by any amount of special pleading to set aside evidence so strong, continuous, and circumstantial as this, in favour of arguments so flimsy, unsupported by facts, and suspicious in origin, as those advanced by advocates who declare, in the presence of the whole court, that before hearing the evidence, they have an invincible prejudice against the possibility of prophecy.

F. TILNEY BASSETT.

(To be continued.)

