

The Book of Daniel Its Historical Trustworthiness and Prophetic Character

G. Ch. Aalders

[p.242]

In the January issue of this periodical I endeavoured to throw light upon the turn of the tide which has been accomplished in Pentateuchal criticism during the last decennia. I now want to draw the attention of our readers to another problem of the Old Testament which has been of no less importance in negative Bible criticism.

The vast majority of Old Testament students have been wont to deny to the Book of Daniel any historical value and to dispute its real prophetic character. In the case of this book it again was regarded as one of the most certain and unshakable results of scientific research, that it could not have originated at an earlier date than the Maccabean period, and, therefore, neither be regarded as a trustworthy witness to the events it mentions, nor be accepted as a proper prediction of the future it announces. Now as to this date, criticism certainly is receding; and this retreat is characterised by the fact that, in giving up the unity of the book, for some parts a considerably higher age is accepted. Meinhold took the lead: he separated the narrative part (chs. ii-vi) from the prophetic part (chs. vii-xii), and leaving the latter to the Maccabean period claimed for the former a date about 300 B.C.¹ Various scholars followed, e.g. my fellow-countryman Wildeboer, who accepted the possibility of Maccabean revision of an older narrative²; some of them even proceeding a little further by assuming an older date for chs. i-vii.³ The most radical position was taken by Wilhelm Erbt, who assumes not less than five different re-mouldings, not only bearing upon the narrative part, but also reaching the prophetic part: the first from the year 562 B.C. and the second from 538, both about the time claimed by the book itself, the third and fourth in 521 and 9.86, and the last in the Maccabean period.⁴ From this it

[p.243]

is manifest that the pretended certainty of negative Bible criticism in respect of the Book of Daniel is a mere product of its imaginative power. What solid, accurate and cautious examination of the book teaches, we will try to show in this article.

THE HISTORICAL TRUSTWORTHINESS

Critics assert that the Book of Daniel contains a number of historical errors and absurdities which clearly show that it cannot have originated in the period of which it speaks; for an author who had been eye-witness of the related events could, of course, not

¹ *Das Buch Daniel*, Nördlingen, 1889; *Einführung in das Alte Testament*, Giessen, 1919, pp. 303f.

² *De letterkunde des Onden Verbonds*,² Groningen, 1896, p.511.

³ e.g., Sellin, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*,² Leipzig, 1914, p. 143, F. M. Th. Böhl, *Het Olde Testament*, Groningen-den Haag, 1919, pp. 70f., Hölscher and Haller in *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1920, pp. 113-138, and 1921, pp. 83-87.

⁴ *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, col. 6-17, 33-41.

have written such inaccuracies. It is necessary to subject these alleged mis-statements to a careful examination.

1. *The Deportation of Daniel and his Friends during the Reign of King Jehoiakim*

According to the opinion of the majority of Old Testament scholars the author inaccurately has combined the communications of 2 Kings xxiv. 1, 2 and 2 Chron. xxxvi. 6. This, however, cannot be true. For, granting that an author might have understood 2 Chron. xxxvi. 6, from an actual deportation of King Jehoiakim (which is not expressed by the words), he certainly could not have made the mistake of placing this deportation in his *third* year; 2 Kings xxiv. 1, too plainly speaks of three years of *subjection* to Nebuchadnezzar; and besides it was known from 2 Kings xxiii. 36 and 2 Chron. xxxv. 5 that Jehoiakim reigned *eleven* years; if he therefore indeed took 2 Chron. xxxvi. 6 from his deportation to Babel, he could not have placed this event in his third year.

Moreover, it is altogether incredible that the deportation of Daniel and his friends by a later compiler should have been dated as it is in Dan. I. 1. Had the book been made up by conjecture and not on the basis of trustworthy historical tradition, the author without doubt would have had recourse to one of the two well-known deportations, of Jehoiachin (2 Kings xxiv. 12-16, 2 Chron. xxxvi. 9, 10) or Zedekiah (2 Kings xxv. 7, 2 Chron. xxxvi. 17-21). Just the unusual date of the deportation is a guarantee of its historical character.

Still there remains, however, a difficulty. That Nebuchadnezzar made a campaign against Jerusalem during the reign of Jehoiakim is sufficiently proved by 2 Kings xxiv. 1 and 2 Chron.

[p.244]

xxxvi. 6; and probably it is the same expedition to which reference is made in Jer. xxxv. 11. But there are insuperable difficulties to date this expedition in the third year of King Jehoiakim. In the first place, we learn from Jeremiah that Nebuchadnezzar did not yet appear before Jerusalem in the fourth and even the fifth year of King Jehoiakim (*cf.* Jer. xxxvi. 2, 29). Secondly, if Nebuchadnezzar's campaign took place in the third year of Jehoiakim, it follows from 2 Kings xxiv. 1 that he revolted in his sixth year, and as he has reigned eleven years Nebuchadnezzar should have left him unpunished for five years, which is incredible. I believe this difficulty can be solved by assuming a slight mistake in the Hebrew manuscripts. As is known, mistakes of this kind are rather numerous, and are caused by the usage of not writing the numerals at full length but indicating them by the characters of the Hebrew alphabet. The numeral three in this case, indicated by the ם [gimel], erroneously replaced the original six ן [vau], a mistake which easily would be caused by the likeness of these characters.

2. *The Use of the Name Chaldeans in the sense of Sorcerers*

This is regarded as an eloquent evidence that the author of the Book of Daniel must have been living in a much later period; for it is impossible that this name should have been a

title at the time when the Chaldean empire still was in existence. Here I wish to point to the excellent remark of Robert Dick Wilson, who has devoted a great deal of his time and energy to the study of the Book of Daniel, that the Babylonian monuments mention a class of priests bearing the name *galdu*, which may be the same as the Chaldeans of the Book of Daniel.⁵

3. *The Improbability of Daniel and His Friends having been incorporated with the Babylonian "Wise Men"*

We are told that this again supplies an excellent proof of the unreliableness of the Book of Daniel. Foreigners on no account would be accepted in a Babylonian priest-class. So, if the author of the Book of Daniel tries to make us believe that four young Jews were taken into the caste of the Babylonian "wise men," he certainly does not deserve our confidence. But we must notice that it is not said that the young Daniel and his

[p.245]

three friends were incorporated with the "wise men." In the first chapter we find them among the courtiers, they were made pages of the king (Dan. i. 4f, 18). Then we are told that they surpassed in wisdom even the most learned men of the kingdom, the Babylonian priests; but it is not said that they themselves belonged to these priests (Dan. i. 19f). And when in the second chapter the royal anger threatens all the "wise men" with death, it is again not said that Daniel and his friends formed part of these "wise men"; on the contrary it is mentioned as an isolated particular, that these young men also were sought to be killed (Dan. ii. 13). Had they been incorporated into the caste, it would have been wholly superfluous to state this. Moreover, had they been incorporated into the caste, they would have been summoned to the royal palace with all the other "wise men" in order to interpret Nebuchadnezzar's dream (*cf.* Dan. ii. 2). The reason why even Daniel and his friends had to be put to death was that the king's roused temper could not be satisfied but by the extermination of all men of "knowledge" throughout his empire. Lastly, when Daniel is raised to the rank of "chief governor over all the wise men of Babylon" (Dan. ii. 48), this surely does not imply his being incorporated with the caste. The dignity conferred upon him has to be considered merely as a post of honour, supposing as little that he actually formed part of the "wise men" as *e.g.* the British President of the Board of Agriculture necessarily has to be a farmer.

4. *Nebuchadnezzar's Madness*

The Babylonian monuments observe a profound silence on this sad episode from the life of their great king; and this offers to the majority of scholars a ground for denial of the historical trustworthiness of the narrative in Daniel iv. But is it fair to place such a high value on this Babylonian silence? Is it not perfectly explainable that the native monuments preferred to suppress what had been a dark shadow on the bright life of their hero? Moreover, the Babylonian silence is not so absolute as might be supposed. According to later testimonies Megasthenes relates a Babylonian tradition which informs us on the wars and conquests of Nebuchadnezzar; but after this, it is said, he ascended the roof of his palace, and being possessed by some god or other, cried aloud: "O

⁵ *Studies in the Book of Daniel*, New York-London, 1917, pp. 337-339, 431ff, and especially 361f.

Babylonians, I, Nebuchadnezzar, announce to you beforehand the coming misfortune, which Bel

[p.246]

my ancestor and the Queen Beltis are alike powerless to persuade the Fates to avert. A Persian mule will come, having your own deities as his allies, and will bring slavery. He who will help him in this undertaking will be the son of a Median woman, the boast of Assyria. Would that, before my citizens were betrayed, some Charybdis or sea might receive him and utterly extinguish him, or that, betaking himself elsewhere, he might be driven through the desert, where is no city nor track of man, where wild beasts have their pasture and birds do roam, and that among rocks and ravines he might wander alone! And that I, before he imagined this, might meet with some happier end!" Having uttered this prophecy, he forthwith disappeared and his son succeeded him on the throne.⁶ Here we see in what euphemistic manner the Babylonians handed down to their posterity the memory of the terrible malady which befell their great king: the ascending of the roof of the palace, and the possession of some deity (in ancient times often the interpretation of madness) manifestly point to Dan. iv. 29ff, and the fate he invokes upon his nation's foe, the Persian mule (= Cyrus), is similar to his own, according to Dan. iv. 33.

5. *The Impossibility of Royal Edicts like those mentioned in the Book of Daniel: iii. 28, 29; iv; vi. 26-28*

This argument is not of great importance. Nobody can produce evidence against the historical character of these proclamations. When it is said by Montgomery that the pronouncements of Dan. iii. 28, 29 "may well have been true to the official protection of religions under the later empires,"⁷ why, we ask, should it be wholly improbable at a somewhat earlier date? As to the edict of Nebuchadnezzar on account of his madness, it must be regarded as a sign of prudent policy not to obfuscate what had been manifest to everybody; only by frankness could the matter be improved.

6. *Belshazzar*

The figure of the king Belshazzar for a long time has been one of the *cruces* of apologists. However, at last the Babylonian monuments began to speak, and now generally it is admitted,

[p.247]

that Belshazzar was an historical person. But, nevertheless, what the Book of Daniel says about him again and again is alleged as proof of its historical worthlessness. The outstanding points whereon this verdict is based are the following: Belshazzar is represented as *king* of Babylon, but according to the monuments he was indicated as the "king's son" to the day of his death; Nebuchadnezzar is called his *father*, and in point of fact Nabunaid, the father of Belshazzar, was not related to Nebuchadnezzar; Belshazzar promises and dispenses honours in his kingdom, though the inscriptions teach us that

⁶ Eusebius, *Praep. Evang. IX.*, *¶r*; cf. Driver, *The Book of Daniel*, Cambridge, 1922, p. 59.

⁷ *Critical and exegetical commentary on the Book of Daniel*, Edinburgh, 1927, p. 216.

even three months before his death the Persian troops had taken possession of Babel; solemnly it is announced that his kingdom will be given to the Medes and Persians, whilst actually it was already in their possession. In answering these objections, we firstly wish to draw attention to the fact, known from the monuments, that Belshazzar about 550-545 B.C. during his father's absence actually had the rule over Babel. This fact can easily have caused the author of the book to call him "king"; the more so as during the last days of his life the same state of affairs had returned Nabunaid having been captured by the advancing Persians, his son and heir naturally could claim the throne. Secondly, it is not at all surprising to find Nebuchadnezzar called the father of his not related successor since we have Assyrian inscriptions indicating Jehu, the king of Israel, as *son* of Omri.⁸ And, thirdly it is true that during the last days of Belshazzar the capital was already in possession of the Persian troops, and he must be considered to have held out in the palace as the last stronghold, but if his resistance should have any reason he naturally must have cherished the hope of repelling the enemy and regaining the power; therefore it is neither improbable that he promised and dispensed honours nor improper that the vanity of his hopes is announced.

7. Darius the Mede

The case of Darius the Mede is much more difficult than the former, for the monuments have not delivered a single indication which might help us to identify him. Of course critics have not hesitated to lay due stress on this fact. However, this silence does not produce the necessity of abandoning the historical character of this king. Years ago the famous Assyrian

[p.248]

king, Sargon, was merely known from the Bible; that this was no reason to doubt his existence was afterwards irrefutable proved by numerous inscriptions that have been found of him.⁹ Various solutions of the difficulty have been proposed, some of which, indeed, with more or less probability, do offer an explanation: e.g. that the Persian general Gobryas, who captured the city, or some one of Cyrus' relatives, had been made king of Babel in name, in order to spare the national feelings of the people.

Now the more serious objection attached to the name of Darius the Mede is that the author of the Book of Daniel had the mistaken idea of a separate Median kingdom between the Babylonian and Persian empire, and, therefore, placed this king between Belshazzar and Cyrus. And this again is alleged as a conclusive argument against the historical reliability of the book. But, on the contrary, it is manifest that the book does not suppose a Median kingdom between the Babylonian and Persian empire, and is in strict harmony with the actual historical course, the Babylonian empire being followed by the Medo-Persian kingdom. This is irrefutably proved by Dan. viii. 3 where the prophet describes a visionary ram which had two horns: and the two horns were high, but one was higher than the other, and the higher came up last. In the explanation which is given by Gabriel this animal is interpreted as "the kings of Media and Persia" (viii. 20). It is one empire composed out of two parts, quite in accordance with the historical reality. And it is therefore utterly unjust to ascribe to the author

⁸ Cf. C. van Gelderen, art. *Belsazar* in *Christelijke Encyclopaedie*, Kampen I, p. 279.

⁹ Cf. van Gelderen, art. *Darius de Meder* in *Chr. Encyclopaedic*, I, p. 555.

of Daniel a misrepresentation of the course of events, which is contrary to the deliberate testimony of the book itself.

We now may come to the conclusion, that there is no sufficient ground to impute to the Book of Daniel historical inaccuracies and incongruencies, which should induce us to dispute the historical trustworthiness. Even Driver expresses himself in a very cautious manner after discussing the alleged arguments, when he says: "they do not show positively that the Book is a work of the second century B.C., but they point with some cogency to the conclusion that it reflects the traditions, and historical impressions, of an age considerably later than that of Daniel himself."¹⁰ Next to this statement of a decided advocate

[p.249]

of the critical view I wish to cite the opinion of one of the best connoisseurs of old Persian history, the famous Elamist, George Husing, who declares that he does not see any necessity of imputing to the author of the Book of Daniel erroneous conceptions with respect to the Chaldean and Persian period.¹¹

THE PROPHETIC CHARACTER

The heathen antagonist of the young Christian church, Porphyry, was the first to contend that the prophecies, contained in the Book of Daniel, were no real, true predictions, but merely *vaticinia ex eventu*. This assertion has been renewed by the negative Bible criticism of rationalistic origin, and among the majority of modern scholars it is regarded as a matter of fact that the book describes the history from Nebuchadnezzar till Antiochus Epiphanes in the form of a series of predictions; the sole thing which may be an actual prediction, concerns the death of Antiochus and the therewith connected arrival of the Messianic kingdom. The underlying supposition of this statement is, that the book does not contain anything which surpasses the limit of Antiochus' death. And the conclusive argument in favour of the critical theory is, that the given predictions up to the rededication of the temple on December 25th, 165 B.C., accurately concur with historical events, but from that moment pass into more vague indications.

Now at once the objection must be offered that the exegetical basis of the critical opinion is decidedly erroneous. It is not true that the limit of the predictions lies in the death of Antiochus. Detailed exegetical investigation teaches us that there are several points where necessarily a large diversity of opinion must rise with regard to the question whether Antiochus is meant. An eloquent instance is the announcement of the four empires as is given in chs. ii and vii. They who put the extreme limit with Antiochus' death, assume these four empires to be the Babylonian, Median, Persian and Greek. Here we immediately meet with a deliberate contradiction from chapter viii. As we have seen already, the book does not admit a separate Median kingdom between the Babylonian and Persian empire, but manifestly supposes one Medo-Persian empire (*cf.* viii. 3 and 20). Now it is of course a rule of sound exegesis to start from

[p.250]

¹⁰ *The Book of Daniel*, Introduction, p. lvi.

¹¹ *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, 1913, Col. 100.

explicit and unequivocal statements. Such a statement is given by ch. viii; so that must be our starting-point to reach exegetical certainty as to the meaning of chs. ii and vii, where the empires are not named, except the first, the Babylonian empire. Proceeding from this starting-point we must interpret the four empires as the Babylonian, Medo-Persian, Greek and Roman. With this all at once the limit of the prophetic prediction is removed far beyond the death of Antiochus. Meinhold, whom I mentioned before, tries to evade this conclusion by interpreting the fourth empire as the Syrian, the kingdom of the Seleucidae.¹² But this attempt can only be regarded as a failure: again, ch. viii deliberately teaches that the kingdoms of the Diadochi are not considered as independent empires but merely as offshoots from the great Greek or Macedonian empire; there is the one he-goat with the notable horn between his eyes, which was broken and instead of it there came up four notable horns toward the four winds of heaven (viii. 5, 8). It therefore can hardly be disputed that the fourth empire is the Roman; a conclusion even accepted by de Lagarde, who found himself under the necessity of bringing the date of chapter vii down to the year 69 A.D.¹³

Critics on the other hand generally take their starting-point elsewhere and venture to assure us that from this they with necessity reach the conclusion that the death of Antiochus is the ultimate terminus, and the last empire must be the Greek. They start from the comparison of the two little horns (vii. 8 and viii. 9). It is quite beyond doubt that the little horn of chapter viii is Antiochus; so in chapter vii the same must be meant, and reasoning from this assumption they come to their conclusion regarding the four empires. This argument looks very strong, and, indeed, it would have a great deal of probability, if it was not opposed by the contrary facts mentioned above. In such a case we have to realise which weighs the best in the scale. And we notice that in the case of the ram and the he-goat there is *the explicit statement of the text*, mentioning the symbolised kingdoms by name, whilst in the case of the little horns such explicit statement is *wanting*; that the two little horns indeed must be identified cannot with certainty be derived from the text, yet even in ch. viii it is *not explicitly said* that the little horn is Antiochus. Thus, at any rate, the argument derived

[p.251]

from viii. 3 and 20 is the strongest, and we must take our starting-point from that. There is more. Not only it is not said that the two little horns symbolise the same person, but the text contains various indications that they do *not*. It may be conceded that there are several traits of resemblance: both in chs. vii and viii to the horn are ascribed human features, and each is regarded as hostile to God and a persecutor of the pious; both in chs. vii and viii the *little* horn becomes *great*. But, contrary to these traits of resemblance, we find the following points of difference the little horn of ch. vii rises from the head of the fourth beast, amidst the other horns (v. 8), and the little horn of ch. viii grows like a protuberance from another horn on the head of the he-goat (v. 9); this is a matter of important consequence, for in the frame of the symbolism of these chapters the little horn of ch. vii then must be considered to be a *power* coming forth from the last empire, whilst the little horn of ch. viii has to be regarded as a *king*. In connection with this, viii. 23ff picture *personal* qualities of the little horn, of which in ch. vii every trace is wanting. Moreover, the little horn of ch. viii takes action against the Jewish people, whilst that does not appear to be the case in ch. vii; so it takes

¹² At least in ch. VII., see his *Das Buch Daniel*, p. 262. 198f.

¹³ Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen, 1891, p. 497ff.

various measures affecting the worship of the temple in Jerusalem (viii. 11, 12), of which nothing is found in ch. vii. The domination of the horn in ch. vii endures till the day of judgment, and is put to an end by the appearance of the "son of man" with the clouds of heaven, concerning which no word is said in ch. viii; the judgment passed upon the horn in ch. vii is put together with the destruction of the fourth beast, but in viii. 25 there is merely mentioned the unexpected death of the king: "he shall be broken without hand." Further, the persecuted "saints" in ch. vii receive the everlasting kingdom, but of such a reward to the destroyed Jews of ch. viii we do not read a word. In ch. vii stress is laid on the fact that the little horn shall be diverse from the former (v. 24), just as the fourth beast is said to be diverse from all the beasts that were before it; ch. viii, on the contrary, refers to nothing of this kind. Finally, in ch. vii is mentioned how before the little horn three of the first horns were plucked up by the roots (vv. 8 and 24). whilst again, ch. viii remains silent.

With respect to vii. 25, the phrase "he shall think to change the times and the law" is by the critics compared with viii. 11f—the suspension of the Jewish worship. We must remark that the

[p.252]

words "times" (Aramaic ܛܝܡܝܢ) and "law" (Aramaic ܠܘܐ) do not necessarily denote things belonging to the religious sphere, but rather have a general sense, as to a certain degree is granted even by Driver¹⁴; "time" (ܛܝܡܝܢ) in the Aramaic portions of the Old Testament *never* has the sense of "religious feast," and "law" at least in the Book of Daniel as a *rule* has the general sense (ii. 9; 13, 15; vi. 9, 13, 16). The terminus indicated in the same verse, "a time and times and half a time" also is brought together with the 2,300 evenings and mornings of viii. 14; but howsoever these termini are calculated, it is impossible to make them tally with one another.¹⁵ So it is clear that the points of difference between the two little horns are much more numerous and important than the points of similarity, which still more weakens the argument derived therefrom.

Perhaps it is not wholly out of order to devote some words to the illustrious prediction of the seventy weeks (Dan. ix. 24-27). This is one of the most difficult passages of the Old Testament, and it must be admitted, a satisfactory interpretation till now has not been offered. The critics understand it thus, that it is ultimately limited by the period of Antiochus; but it cannot be denied that it is impossible to get the chronological calculation square: in the most favourable case it goes short sixty years. Now it is usual to overcome this by imputing to the author such a grave mistake; but it is perfectly clear that this cannot be regarded as a solid exegetical basis. On the other hand we must willingly admit, that other explanations which surpass the limit of Antiochus' death no more are able to solve all difficulties in a satisfactory manner, but in this respect they by no means stand behind the critical conception. And therefore certainly the conclusion is justified that Dan. ix. 24-27 is not favourable to the thesis that the book does not contain any statement which surpasses the limit of Antiochus' death.

¹⁴ *The Book of Daniel*, p. 92.

¹⁵ Even if we accept the most usual calculation of 3½ years and 1,150 days, there is at any rate a difference of about 90 days.

Moreover, it is not beyond objection, that the predictive element as far as it touches the history up till the moment of the rededication of the temple is, in a most accurate manner, in harmony with the actual course of events, whilst from that time it should pass into more vague indications. This point especially affects the chapters viii and xi, and what is related therein with respect

[p.253]

to Antiochus and the preceding history of the Diadochi. It is true, in these chapters numerous particulars are portended, of which we are able to indicate the fulfilment as precisely as might be wanted; but we must draw attention to the fact that this does not hold good in every case even before December 25th of the year 165 B.C. Allow me to point to the following features, which at least up till now cannot be traced in history: in Dan. xi. 24 a certain party amidst the Jews is mentioned in the days of the Egyptian king Ptolemy V Epiphanes (205-181 B.C.), which cannot be determined; and we are informed of attempts made by this party to effectuate a certain prediction, which historically is wholly unknown; in Dan. xi. 26 a treacherous action of Egyptians against their king Ptolemy VI Philometor is depicted, of which we all the same are ignorant. On the other hand it is no more true, that accurate agreement between prophecy and history beyond December 25th, 165, is altogether lacking. We point to the death of Antiochus, predicted Dan. viii. 25 and xi. 45: he was "broken without hand," a severe illness made him meet his fate. Critics consider it as a contradiction with xi. 45 that this happened at Tabae in Persia and not in the Holy Land, but this is only due to a misunderstanding of the text: it is not said that he should die in Palestine; what is actually expressed is, he shall visit the Holy Land again and "shall plant the tents of his palace between the sea and the glorious mountain," and "yet he shall come to his end, and none shall help him." This however does not necessarily imply that his visit to the Holy Land and his death will be simultaneous, nor that the Holy Land will be the scene of his fate. We also point to xi. 44: "tidings out of the east and out of the north shall trouble him"; we know from history that Antiochus had to undertake some campaigns against the king of Armenia (to the north) and against the Parths (to the east). And with regard to the most prominent discrepancy which is supposed, the renewed war against Egypt, xi. 40-43, unknown in history, there are reasons not to speak too boldly, for we have Porphyry, the very accuser of the book, as a witness of this war.¹⁶

Consequently, the supposition which has to sustain the *vaticinia ex eventu* theory lacks exegetical validity. With this

[p.254]

the whole theory becomes unstable. It is necessary to lay due stress thereon. For, of course, the belief in the truth of Holy Writ does not depend upon the result of any scientific investigation, yet, over against the claim of negative Bible criticism, as if it were arriving at its conclusions merely by a thorough, impartial investigation of the Bible

¹⁶ According to Jerome in his notes on this verse. The silence of Livius and Polybius can be accounted for by the large gaps in their description of Antiochus' last years. For a full discussion of this and all other questions I refer to my commentary on Daniel, in Dutch: *Het boek Daniël, opnieuw uit den grondtekst vertaald en verklaard*, Kampen, 1928.

G. Ch. Aalders, "The Book of Daniel: Its Historical Trustworthiness and Prophetic Character," *The Evangelical Quarterly* 2.3 (July 1930): 242-254.

itself, we have to throw strong light upon the fact that a solid, accurate, scientific examination of the Bible does not impugn its truth.

© G. Ch. Aalders. All reasonable efforts have been made to contact the present copyright holder of this article without success. If you hold the rights, please contact me.

Prepared for the Web in February 2008 by Robert I. Bradshaw.

<http://www.biblicalstudies.org.uk/>
