

someone else was during this time king of Babylon" 239 "It is not probable, that the Greek historians would not have noted this extreme old age in one so well known as he, etc. ")

The chapters on the historicity of Daniel and on the possibility of Nebuchadnezzar's expedition in the third year of Jehoiakim are good, it seems to me. Many more instances might have been added to the examples on page 78 of an army leaving a hostile fortress in its rear. In the spring of 1099 the surviving leaders of the First Crusade spent nearly three months trying to reduce Arzas, but finally pushed on to Jerusalem, leaving that city, Damascus, and many others unsubdued in their rear.

It is when we approach the three points which Dr. Driver has singled out as the strongest arguments against the historicity of the book, viz: Belshazzar, Darius, and the Kasdim, that difficulties seem to pile up. To account for Belshazzar's third year (Dan 8:1) the author is driven to postulate a second sub-kingship for him over the southern part of Babylonia, Chaldea proper. But it seems very strange indeed to use this dating for an event in Elam, where at the best Belshazzar was only military governor. Moreover it involves the hypothesis of a double system of dating events under a king, or rather two different starting points for his reign, although no explanation is made of it, and the events are not concerned with Chaldea proper at all. Furthermore Darius is spoken of as king over the realm of the Chaldeans (9:1), but with all the author's efforts to extend his dominion (143) he does not treat the realm of the Chaldeans in his case, as anything different from Babylon itself, it seems.

*This is of course dealt with in the book, but scarcely satisfactorily to me.*

The reviewer scarcely knows enough to say anything about the force of the argument from the oaths taken only by kings and