

"Studies in the Book of Daniel"

review.

It is with considerable reluctance that this review is written. Not only is this true because a warm sun and a fine spring day make it difficult to overcome the writer's mental inertia, but because the task assigned is one for which he is not fitted either by a knowledge of the languages involved or of the general history of the period. Nevertheless, having had a smattering of historical training in another field, he might even so write with some readiness were it not that he hesitates to express an unfavorable opinion. Not only is this true because the review is going to the author, but because the writer dislikes to crystallize impressions of a nature unfavorable to a conservative position. It is hard enough to believe without giving concrete expression to one's doubts. Nevertheless there is no escape, so we must proceed.

The principle on which the book is based seems to be that contained in the following sentences on page 23 and 297: "A man is presumed to be innocent until he is proven guilty. A book, or document is supposed to be true until it is proven false." "Certain, also, is it that no event that has been recorded can be rejected as impossible, simply because there is but one witness to the fact of its occurrence. A thing may have happened even if there were no record of it. Countless things, indeed, have happened of which no record at all exists. Even the events of a novel like "Sue" may have transpired. The ingenuity with which the author keeps within the sphere of the possible, while