

Finally, to give a complete review, we must consider some of the methods employed. We have already noted some assumptions that appear rather gratuitous, and a tendency to trust to late authors, in certain cases. Of a piece with this last, is the assumption that it is "perfectly evident that all educated men living in and before the second century B. C. must have had access to so much information with regard to the number and history of the Babylonian and Persian kings as to render it highly improbable that any writer of the second century could have been as ignorant of the history of Persia as certain critics represent the writer of Daniel to have been." This does not appear evident when we recall that we may know a great deal more about the crusades now than did sixteenth century writers. Three or four centuries is a long time, and we must remember also, that, *ex hypothesi*, the second century writer of Daniel, if such there were, wrote at a time of great persecution, when it was difficult to keep any sacred books, and when many fled to the wilderness to escape.

Certain arguments seem to have been used as opportunity demanded. On page 304-5 Nebuchadnezzar is represented as very religious on the basis of his inscriptions, while on 261 the same sort of inscriptions of Darius Hystaspis are dismissed as indicating merely general piety. On page 42 the importance of Daniel is minimized to account for the lack of his name on the monuments, while the text states the Nebuchadnezzar worshipped him, and an equally good case could be made out for his great importance if need be.

Again, with all the appeal to the facts as against professors, there seems to be a tendency to accept professors' theories freely