

The question is one of premises, and not of conclusions. If we start with the belief that Moses could not have known Genesis, as we have it, there are many things which may tend to strengthen that belief; if we suppose him to have done so, and believe the record is historical, I know of nothing to contradict the belief, not even the record of the kings of Edom, or the statement that Abraham, when he entered the promised land, found the Canaanite already there.

If we believe, as we have no ground for not believing, that chap. xiii. is rightly ascribed to Isaiah, we shall not be staggered by his mention of Cyrus. If we believe that his vision had nothing in it of the supernatural, then I cannot understand how he should have written the seventh chapter any more than the fifty-third, or the ninth any more than the forty-fourth or the forty-fifth. If it is a question of evidence, let us abide by the evidence which has not yet been, and is not likely to be, disproved; if it is a question of subjective impression, of antecedent improbability, of preconceptions as to the "analogy of prophecy" and the like, then let us frankly give up the appeal to evidence and be guided and ruled by our own imaginations. If Daniel was the prophet that our Lord declared him to be, there is more than one prophecy in his book which defies the supposition of a late date, and is not to be accounted for by any preconceptions as to the analogy of prophecy. For the prophecy of the kingdom which shall never be destroyed appeals as much to our faith now as it did in the second or the sixth century before Christ, and the prophecy of the seventy weeks which supplies the only evidence we have for the actual time when Christ appeared is the most marvellous demonstration of superhuman knowledge conveyed and imparted to a man of which we have any record; and no theory of the analogy of prophecy or of the nature and limits of inspiration can be accepted as satisfactory which fails to account for this prophecy, if given, as it purports to be, in the first year of Darius the Mede, or which fails to explain how it should ideally have been ascribed to Daniel in the middle of the second century before the coming of the Messiah, whose cutting off it foretold.

STANLEY LEATHES, D.D.