





BS1555

A. W. 75

42

STUDIES IN THE BOOK OF DANIEL
SECOND SERIES

STUDIES
IN THE
BOOK OF DANIEL

SECOND SERIES

BY
ROBERT DICK WILSON
PH.D., D.D., LL.D.



NEW YORK
Fleming H. Revell Company
LONDON AND EDINBURGH

Copyright, MCMXXXVIII by
FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY

All rights reserved; no part of this book may be reproduced in any form without permission from the Publisher, except by a reviewer desiring to quote brief passages for inclusion in a notice to be inserted in a newspaper or periodical.

Printed in the United States of America

New York: 158 Fifth Avenue
London: 21 Paternoster Square

INTRODUCTION

THOSE who are acquainted with the first volume of Dr. Wilson's *Studies in the Book of Daniel* will need no extended introduction to the present volume. "The method pursued," he tells us, "is to give first of all a discussion of some of the principles involved in the objections considered in the pages following; then to state the objections with the assumptions on which they are based; next, to give the reasons why these assumptions are adjudged to be false; and lastly, to sum up in a few words the conclusions to be derived from the discussion." Dr. Wilson was accustomed to say that he would not attempt to answer general or sweeping charges against the Bible. But where specific charges were made, reflecting upon the truthfulness of the Bible, and where evidence was presented in support of such charges, he was prepared to undertake the most painstaking investigations to test the correctness of the charges. He believed thoroughly in "scientific Biblical criticism." His method and aim were truly scientific. He was not only willing, but eager to ascertain the facts and all the facts. For he believed and showed again and again that the facts support the high claims of the Bible to entire trustworthiness as the Word of God. Consequently in his great debate with the critics he tried to single out the strongest and most serious charges as expressed by their most influential spokesmen, to state these objections in their own words, and then to deal with them as thoroughly as possible in the light of the evidence.

Dr. Wilson's original plan was to write three books on Daniel. The first which dealt with historical questions appeared in 1917. The second was to deal with the linguistic problem, the objections raised by the critics on the ground of "philological assumptions based on the nature of the Hebrew and Aramaic in which it was written." The nucleus of this volume might well have been the article on "The Aramaic of Daniel," which he had contributed to *Biblical and Theological Studies*, the Centennial Volume published by the Faculty of Princeton Theological Seminary in 1912. In this

article he had maintained against the higher critics and especially Dr. Driver that the Aramaic of the Book of Daniel is of the character which we would expect to have been spoken in Babylon in the Neo-Babylonian and early Persian period. About a year before Dr. Wilson's death in 1930, Mr. Harold H. Rowley published a book on *The Aramaic of the Old Testament* (Oxford, 1929) in which he took issue with Dr. Wilson's conclusions regarding Daniel and defended the critical views of Dr. Driver. Dr. Wilson spent much time during the last summer of his life in studying this book. From casual statements made to members of his family and to his colleagues at Westminster Seminary it was inferred that Dr. Wilson had practically completed his investigation, that he felt that he could satisfactorily answer Mr. Rowley, and that his reply was practically ready for publication. Consequently in the memorial articles which appeared in the *Sunday School Times* and in *Christianity Today*, shortly after his death, it was stated that Dr. Wilson's reply to Mr. Rowley would soon be published. Unfortunately, search for the manuscript of the reply was unsuccessful, nor were any data sufficient to form the basis for such an article discovered. Either Dr. Wilson's statements as to the shape in which his material stood were misunderstood, or the manuscript material was lost or accidentally destroyed. Whichever be the explanation, it is most regrettable that Dr. Wilson's own defense of his position could not be published. Especially is this to be regretted since Dr. Wilson's other studies in the philology of the Book of Daniel, which appeared in the *Princeton Theological Review*, in addition to being highly technical are hardly extensive enough to form anything but the nucleus of a volume on philology. And as they are there available to specialists, it has not seemed advisable to include them in a volume which deals with other subjects.

The contents of the present volume, consequently, represent the studies which Dr. Wilson intended for the third volume of the series: "In a third volume I shall discuss Daniel's relation to the canon of the Old Testament as determining the date of the book and in connection with this the silence of Ecclesiasticus with reference to Daniel, the alleged absence of an observable influence of Daniel upon post-captivity literature, and the whole matter of apocalyptic

literature, especially in its relation to predictive prophecy." Two of the studies referred to had recently appeared in the *Princeton Theological Review*, and Dr. Wilson allowed the others also to appear first in its pages without, however, relinquishing the plan with regard to them, which he had stated in the first volume on Daniel. In view of the fact that this plan was never carried out and since with the lapse of years magazine articles tend to become inaccessible, it has been deemed advisable to gather them all together, and present them in the form which was originally intended by their author. This has been made possible through the generosity of a personal friend of Dr. Wilson's who is unwilling to have his identity disclosed.

In view of my close and intimate association with Dr. Wilson, a friendship begun in my student days and extending over a period of more than a quarter of a century, it was thought appropriate that I should prepare these articles for the press. I have counted it a privilege to help in this way to make the writings of a great defender of the faith more widely known. I have had the advantage of access to copies of these articles which contained Dr. Wilson's notes, comments and corrections. It has not been possible to use all of this material, and certain further changes have also seemed advisable. It has been my aim however to make only such changes as I felt sure that he himself would have approved. Thanks are due to Rev. Leslie W. Sloat, one of the last students privileged to study under Dr. Wilson, for help in preparing the copy for the press, and for assistance in proof reading. Mr. Sloat has also prepared the index.

OSWALD T. ALLIS.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE BOOK OF DANIEL AND THE CANON	9
II. DANIEL NOT QUOTED	65
III. THE SILENCE OF ECCLESIASTICUS CONCERNING DANIEL	76
IV. APOCALYPSES AND THE DATE OF DANIEL	101
V. THE ORIGIN OF THE IDEAS OF DANIEL	117
VI. THE INFLUENCE OF DANIEL	157
VII. THE BACKGROUND OF DANIEL	233
VIII. THE PROPHECIES OF DANIEL	258
INDICES	281

STUDIES IN THE BOOK OF DANIEL

CHAPTER I

THE BOOK OF DANIEL AND THE CANON

IN ALL recent works on the Book of Daniel the charge is made, that the position of the book in the Hebrew Canon points to the conclusion that the book was written at a time much later than that at which the Jewish and Christian churches have always and unanimously, until recently, supposed that it was written. Since the last six chapters are in the first person, and since they are dated from the reigns of Belshazzar, Darius the Mede, and Cyrus, no one can doubt that they claim to be the record of visions which can have been known only to Daniel himself. The first six chapters, though written in the third person, purport to record actual events in the lives of Daniel and his three companions during the reigns of Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar, and Darius the Mede. In ancient times, the claim of Daniel to be historical was contested only by Porphyry, a man who rejected all of the sacred books of the Old and New Testaments. Within the last two centuries, however, it has been frequently asserted, that the first six chapters of Daniel are at best but a series of traditions "cast by the author into a literary form, with a special view to the circumstances of his own time"¹; and that the visions of the last six chapters are a narration of events already past, put in an apocalyptic form.

Among the specifications in this general charge against the historical character of Daniel, is the one which will now be considered: that the position of the Book of Daniel in the Hebrew

¹ S. R. Driver, *Literature of the Old Testament*, p. 511 (abbrev. *L.O.T.*).

Canon points "more or less decisively to an author later than Daniel himself."²

In the discussion of this specific charge, I shall pursue the following method: First, I shall state the charge in the words of those that make it. Secondly, I shall present the admissions and assumptions involved in the charge. Thirdly, I shall cite and discuss the evidence upon which these assumptions rest. And, lastly, I shall give the conclusions which the evidence seems to justify.

THE CHARGE

The first alleged proof of the late date of Daniel is "the position of the Book in the Jewish Canon, not among the prophets, but in the miscellaneous collection of writings called the *Hagiographa*,³ and among the latest of these, in proximity to Esther. Though little definite is known respecting the formation of the Canon, the division known as the 'Prophets' was doubtless formed prior to the *Hagiographa*; and had the Book of Daniel existed at the time, it is reasonable to suppose that it would have ranked as the work of a prophet, and have been included among the former."⁴

In the Hebrew Scriptures "Daniel has never occupied a place among the prophetic Books, but is included in the third collection of sacred writings, called the *Kethubim* or *Hagiographa*. Of the history of the Jewish Canon very little is known with certainty, but there is every reason to believe that the collection of Prophetic Books, from which lessons were read in the Synagogue, was definitely closed sometime before the *Hagiographa*, of which the greater part had no place in the public services. That the collection of Prophetic Books cannot have been completed till sometime after the Exile, is obvious, and on the supposition that Daniel was then known to the Jews, the exclusion of this book is wholly inexplicable."⁵

² *Id.*, p. 497.

³ The *Hagiographa*, or holy writings, consist, according to our present Hebrew Bibles, of the books—Pss., Prov., Job, Cant., Ruth, Lam., Eccl., Esth., Dnl., Ezra, Neh., 1 and 2 Chron.

⁴ *Id.*, p. 497.

⁵ A. A. Bevan, *A Short Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, p. 11.

"The place of the Book of Daniel among the Hagiographa favors also its late composition. If it had been written during the Exile, notwithstanding its apocalyptic character, it naturally would have been placed among the Prophets." ⁶

"Not until the time of the LXX (which, moreover, has treated the text of Daniel in a very arbitrary fashion) does it find a place, after Ezekiel, as the fourth of the 'great' prophets, and thus it comes to pass that once in the New Testament Daniel is designated as a prophet." ⁷

"The position of the book among the Hagiographa instead of among the Prophetical works would seem to indicate that it must have been introduced after the closing of the Prophetical Canon. . . . The natural explanation regarding the position of the Book of Daniel is that the work could not have been in existence at the time of the completion of the second part of the Canon, as otherwise, the collectors of the prophetical writings, who in their care did not neglect even the parable of Jonah, would hardly have ignored the record of such a great prophet as Daniel is represented to be." ⁸

Among "objective reasons of the utmost weight, which render the view of its non-genuineness necessary," Cornill mentions "*the position of the book in the Hebrew Canon, where it is inserted, not among the prophets, but in the third division of the canon, the so-called Hagiographa.* If it were the work of a prophet of the time of Cyrus, no reason would be evident why there should be withheld from it a designation which was not denied to a Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi—nay, even to a Jonah." ⁹

"In the Hebrew Canon, Daniel is not placed among the Prophets, but in the Hagiographa, the latest section of the Canon; although Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, who were later than the time at which Daniel is described as living, are placed among

⁶ E. L. Curtis, art. "Daniel," in *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. I, p. 554f.

⁷ Kamphausen in *Encyclopedia Biblica*, Vol. I, p. 1011 (Macmillan).

⁸ Prince, *Commentary on Daniel*, pp. 15-16.

⁹ *Introduction to the Canonical Books of the Old Testament*, pp. 384-386.

the prophets. Either the Jews did not regard the book as prophetic, or it was considerably later than Malachi, c. 444.”¹⁰

ASSUMPTIONS

The assumptions involved in the above statements are as follows: 1. It is assumed that the position of a book in the Hebrew Canon determines the time of its writing, or at least 2. that the position of a book in the Hebrew Bible determines the time of its admission into the Canon and that the proximity of Daniel to Esther proves the late date of Daniel. 3. It is assumed that because a division of the Hebrew Bible called “Prophets” in our Hebrew Bibles was doubtless formed (i.e. collected and named) prior to the Hagiographa, therefore a book of prophecy originally not included in this division must have been written after this collection was completed. 4. It is assumed that, had the Book of Daniel existed at the time when the division called Prophets was formed, it is reasonable to suppose, that if it had been ranked among the prophetic books, it would have been placed in this division. 5. It is assumed that no reason is evident why there should have been withheld from a Daniel a designation which was not denied to a Haggai, a Zechariah, and a Malachi—nay, even to a Jonah. 6. It is assumed that Daniel never occupied a place among the prophetic books. 7. It is assumed that the collection of prophetic books from which lessons were read in the synagogues, was definitely closed before the Hagiographa were canonized. 8. It is assumed that the greater part of the Hagiographa had no place in the public services.

ADMISSIONS OF THE CRITICS

Before proceeding to a discussion of these assumptions, special attention should be called to the admissions of the critics on the matter of the evidence bearing on the assumptions; and on the character of the premises that justify these critics in their conclusions. First, as to the evidence, Driver admits that “little definite

¹⁰ Bennett and Adeney, *A Biblical Introduction*, p. 225.

is known respecting the formation of the Canon." Bevan, also, admits that "of the history of the Jewish Canon very little is known." Secondly, as to the character of the premises from which they deduce their conclusions, it will be noted in the above citations, that Driver says, after having admitted that very little is known respecting the formation of the Canon, that the division known as the Prophets was "doubtless formed prior to the Hagiographa," and that "it is reasonable to suppose that the Book of Daniel would have been included among the former." Cornill says that "no reason is evident why Daniel should not be among the Prophets." Prince says that the position of the book would seem to indicate, that it was introduced into the Canon after the closing of the Prophetical Canon, and the natural explanation of its position is that it did not exist at the time of the closing of the Prophetical Canon. Bevan says that there is every reason to believe that the collection of Haphtaroth was made before the closing of the Hagiographa; and that on the supposition that Daniel was known, its exclusion from the Prophetical Canon is inexplicable, or not very easy to reconcile with the theory of the antiquity of the book.

It will be observed that, while admitting that little is known, the critics indulge in such phrases and words as "doubtless," "reasonable to suppose," "seem to indicate," "every reason to believe," "supposition," "not easy to reconcile," "inexplicable," "natural explanation," and so forth. All of these words and phrases are admissions on the part of the critics that their theory with regard to the Book of Daniel is not convincingly supported by the evidence, even themselves being witnesses.

EVIDENCE

The evidence bearing upon the divisions, number, order, and use of the books regarded by the Jews and Christians as canonical may, for convenience of treatment, be marshalled under two heads: 1, the evidence relating to the divisions, number, and order; and 2, that relating to the use.

1. *Divisions, Number, and Order*

1. *Ben Sira*, the elder, speaks a number of times of the Law, ¹¹ and cites in order Josh., Jgs., Sam., Kgs., Isa., Jer., Ezk., Job, the Twelve, and Neh. He cites, also, from Chr., and mentions the Pss. of David and the Provs. of Sol.¹²

2. The Prologue to the Greek translation of *Ben Sira*, written about 132 B.C., refers three times to a threefold division of the Old Testament, as follows: (1) "The Law and the Prophets, and the other books which follow after them"; (2) "The Law and the Prophets and the other ancestral books"; (3) "The Law itself and the Prophecies and the rest of the books." Notice that he gives neither the number nor the names of the books in these divisions.

3. *First Maccabees* contains the following speech delivered by Mattathias, the father of the Maccabees, to his sons in the year 169 B.C, just before his decease:

"Now hath pride and rebuke gotten strength, and the time of destruction, and the wrath of indignation: now therefore, my sons, be ye zealous for the Law and give your lives for the covenant of your fathers. Call to remembrance what acts our fathers did in their time; so shall ye receive great honour and an everlasting name. Was not Abraham found faithful in temptation, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness? Joseph in the time of his distress kept the commandment and was made lord of Egypt. Phinehas our father in being zealous and fervent obtained the covenant of an everlasting priesthood. Jesus for fulfilling the word was made a judge in Israel. Caleb for bearing witness before the congregation received the heritage of the land. David for being merciful possessed the throne of an everlasting kingdom. Elias for being zealous and fervent for the Law was taken up into heaven. Ananias, Azarias, and Misael, by believing were saved out of the flame. Daniel for his innocency was delivered from the mouth of lions. And thus consider ye throughout all ages, that none that put their trust in him shall be overcome. . . ." ¹³

¹¹ References to the Torah are found in xv, 1; xxxii, 15, 17, 18, 24; xxxiii, 2, 13; xli, 4, 8; xlii, 2; xlv, 5; xlviii, 3, 6; xlix, 4; 1, 20.

¹² Chapters xlv-xlix. His citation from Chr. is mingled with those from Kgs. and Isa., and his references to the Pss. and Prov. are inserted in his account derived from Kgs. Notice that he puts Job among the Prophets, and gives the longest eulogy of all to the high priest Simon. He probably does not mention Daniel, Ezra, Esther, or Mordecai (See below Chap. III).

¹³ ii, 49b-61.

Notice that Mattathias refers to events recorded in the Law, the Former Prophets, and in Daniel, esteeming all the records as of equal veracity. Did he not know of the Latter Prophets, since he does not quote from them, nor the Psalms, nor Job?

4. *Second Maccabees* contains a letter written in 124 B.C., in which the writer speaks of "the records and commentaries of Nehemiah, and how founding a library he gathered together the books concerning the kings and prophets and those of David and epistles of kings concerning votive offerings."¹⁴ The Syriac version is slightly different and reads thus: "It is related in books and in memoirs that Nehemiah did thus: that he assembled and arranged in order the books of the kingdoms and of the prophets and of David and the letters of the kings which concern offerings and sacrifices."¹⁵ Daniel could only have been in the division called "the prophets."

5. *Philo*, who died about 40 A.D., says that the sect of the Therapeutæ received "the Law, and the Oracles uttered by the Prophets, and the hymns and the other (writings) by which knowledge and piety are augmented and perfected."¹⁶ Daniel was almost certainly in the division called "the prophets."

6. In the *New Testament* the following passages bear upon our subject: (1) In Luke xxiv, 44, the Lord speaks of those things which were written concerning Him "in the Law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms." (2) In John xv, 25, Psalm lxix, 5 is referred to as in "their Law." (3) In Luke xxiv, 27, the author speaks of "Moses and all the Prophets." With this compare the phrase, "the Law and the Prophets" (Matt. vii, 12; xxii, 40, cf. Jn. I, 45). (4) In Matt. xxiv, 15, mention is made of

¹⁴ ii, 13.

¹⁵ See Lagarde, *Libri Apocryphi Veteris Testamenti Syriace*, p. 216.

¹⁶ *De Vita contemplativa*, ii, 475. (Cf. Westcott, *The Bible in the Church*, p. 33). The genuineness of this work has been defended in recent times by F. C. Conybeare, P. Wendland, and L. Massebieau; the last of whom has "shown with great thoroughness that in language and thought alike it is essentially Philonic." (See Art. by Bigg in *Encyc. Brit.*, xxi, 412). Philo cites from every book of the Old Testament, except Ruth, Est., Eccl., Cant., Lam. (i.e., the Megilloth), Ezk., and Dnl. He expressly calls the author of Pss. xxiii and lxxxiii a prophet. In the headings David is called the author of the former and Asaph of the latter.

"Daniel the prophet." With this compare the mention of Asaph as "the prophet" (Matt. xiii, 35, cf. Ps. lxxviii, 2), of David "the prophet" (Acts ii, 30), "Isaiah the prophet" (Matt. iii, 3), "Jonah the prophet" (Matt. xii, 39), and "the prophet Joel" (Acts ii, 16). Compare also Mark i, 2; Luke xviii, 31; xxiv, 25; John vi, 45; Luke xvi, 16; Acts xiii, 35, Rom. iii, 21; and "in the book of the Prophets" (Acts vii, 42); "in the book of Psalms" (Acts i, 20).

7. *Josephus* has the following to say of the Canon:

"We have not an innumerable multitude of books among us, disagreeing from and contradicting one another, but only twenty-two books, which contain the records of all the past times; which are justly believed to be Divine; and of them five belong to Moses, which contain his laws, and the traditions of the origin of mankind till his death. This interval of time was little short of three thousand years; but as to the time from the death of Moses till the reign of Artaxerxes king of Persia, who reigned after Xerxes, the prophets, who were after Moses, wrote down what was done in their times in thirteen books. The remaining four books contain hymns to God, and precepts for the conduct of human life. It is true, our history hath been written since Artaxerxes, very particularly, but hath not been esteemed of the like authority with the former by our forefathers, because there hath not been an exact succession of prophets since that time; and how firmly we have given credit to those books of our own nation is evident by what we do; for during so many ages as have already passed, no one has been so bold as either to add anything to them or take anything from them. . . ." ¹⁷

Josephus quotes all the Old Testament books except Job, Cant., Eccl., and Prov., and uses 1 Macc., though excluding it from the Canon. It seems clear that his third division of the Canon consists of Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and Canticles.

Of Daniel himself, Josephus says:

"He was so happy as to have strange revelations made to him, and those as to one of the greatest of the prophets. . . . He retains a remembrance that will never fail, for the several books that he wrote and left behind him are still read by us till this time; and from them we believe that Daniel conversed with God; for he did not only prophesy of future events, as did the other prophets, but he also determined the time of their accomplishment; and while the prophets used to tell misfortunes, and on that account were disagreeable both to the

¹⁷ *Contra Apion*, i, 8.

kings and to the multitude, Daniel was to them a prophet of good things, and this to such a degree, that, by the agreeable nature of his predictions, he procured the good-will of all men; and by the accomplishment of them, he procured the belief of their truth, and the opinion of (a sort of) Divinity for himself, among the multitude. He also wrote and left behind him what made manifest the accuracy and undeniable veracity of his predictions. . . . And indeed it so came to pass, that our nation suffered these things under Antiochus Epiphanes, according to Daniel's vision, and what he wrote many years before they came to pass. In the very same manner Daniel also wrote concerning the Roman government, and that our country should be made desolate by them. All these things did this man leave in writing, as God had showed them to him, insomuch that such as read his prophecies, and see how they have been fulfilled, would wonder at the honour with which God honoured Daniel."¹⁸

8. In *The Ascension of Isaiah*, is found the following partial list of Old Testament books:

"All these things, behold they are written in the Psalms, in the Parables of David the son of Jesse, and in the Proverbs of Solomon his son, and in the words of Korah and Ethan the Israelite, and in the words of Asaph, and in the rest of the Psalms which also the angel of the Spirit inspired. (Namely), in those which have not the name written, and in the words of my father Amos, and of Hosea the prophet, and of Micah and Joel and Nahum, and Jonah and Obadiah and Habakkuk and Haggai and Zephaniah and Zechariah and Malachi and in the words of Joseph the Just, and in the words of Daniel."¹⁹

The threefold division is not recognized and the order of The Twelve is different; Daniel is apparently among the prophets.

9. In the Latin translation of *Fourth Esdras*, (chap. i,) the Minor Prophets are enumerated in the following order: "Hos., Am. and Mic., Joel, Ob. and Jon., Nah. and Hab., Zeph., Hag., Zech. and Mal., which is called also an angel of the Lord."²⁰

10. In his *Eclogues*, a collection of testimonies to Christ and Christianity made from the Old Testament, *Melito*, Bishop of Sardis about 175 A.D., gives a "catalogue of the books of the Old

¹⁸ *Antiquities*, X, xi, 7.

¹⁹ iv, 21-22. See *The Ascension of Isaiah* by R. H. Charles (pp. xliv-xlv). If we put these verses in the Testament of Hezekiah, they will have been written according to Charles between 88 and 100 A.D. If they belong to the Redactor, they were written about 200 A.D.

²⁰ This is the order of the Greek MS "B," but is not the Hebrew order.

Testament which it is necessary to quote." We have two recensions of this catalogue, one in the Church History of Eusebius,²¹ and the other in the Syriac fragments published by Cureton. The Greek of Eusebius reads:

"Melito to his brother Onesimus, greeting: Since thou hast often, in thy zeal for the word, expressed a wish to have extracts made from the Law and the Prophets, concerning the Saviour, and concerning our entire faith, and hast also desired to have an accurate statement of the ancient books, as regards their number and order, I have endeavoured to perform the task, knowing thy zeal for the faith, and thy desire to gain information in regard to the word, and knowing that thou, in thy yearning after God, esteemest these things above all else, struggling to attain eternal salvation. Accordingly, when I went East and came to the place where these things were preached and done, I learned accurately the books of the Old Testament, and send them to thee as written below. Their names are as follows: Of Moses, five books: Gen., Ex., Nu., Lev., Dt.; Jesus Nave, Jgs., Ruth; of Kgs., four books; of Chr., two; the Ps. of David, the Prov. of Solomon, which also is Wisdom, Eccl., Song of Songs, Job; of Prophets, Isa., Jer.; of the Twelve Prophets, one book; Dnl., Ezk., Esdr."²²

From the Syriac recension I shall give only the names in order:

"Of Moses, five (books), Gen., and Ex., and Nu. and that of the Priests, and Dt.; and again that of Josh. son of Nun, and the bk. of Jgs. and Ruth; and the bk. of four Kgs.; the bk. of two Chr.; and the Ps. of David; and of Sol., the Prov., which is Wisdom, and Koheleth, and the Song of Songs; and Job; and of the Prophets, Isa. and Jer., and the Twelve Prophets together, and Dnl., and Ezk. and Ezra."

Esther is omitted from Melito's canon, and Ezra as well as Daniel is among the prophets. The threefold division is broken by Ruth, Lam., Dnl., and Ezra.

11. In the *Talmud*, the following are the most important allusions to the Old Testament Canon:

(1) "The Rabbis have taught the order of succession in the Books of the Prophets runs thus: Josh., Jgs., Sam., Kgs., Jer., Ezk., Isa., and the Twelve. The order of succession in the Hagiographa is: Ruth, and the Bk. of Ps., Job and Prov., Eccl., the

²¹ iv, 26.

²² *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Second series, I, 206.

Song of Songs, and Lam., Dnl. and the roll of Est., Ezra and Chr.”²³

(2) “All Sacred Scriptures²⁴ render the hands unclean. The Song of Songs and Ecclesiastes render the hands unclean.” “All the Scriptures are holy.”²⁵ “The Aramaic portions of Ezra and Daniel render the hands unclean.” “The Sadducees said: ‘we blame you Pharisees because you say Sacred Scriptures render the hands unclean, but the books of Hameram²⁶ do not render the hands unclean’. . . . They say that the bones of an ass are clean, but the bones of Jochanan the High Priest are unclean.” “According to their value is their uncleanness, so that no one may make the bones of his father and mother into spoons.” “So are the Sacred Scriptures; according to their value is their uncleanness. The books of Hameram, which are not valued, do not render the hands unclean.”²⁷

(3) “Rab Yehuda alleges that Shemuel said the book of Esther does not defile the hands. This is tantamount to saying that it was Shemuel’s opinion that the book of Esther was not dictated by the Holy Spirit. But Shemuel asserted that the book of Esther was dictated by the Holy Spirit.”²⁸

(4) “Remember that man with respect; his name is Hananiah the son of Hezekiah. Had it not been for him, the Book of Ezekiel would have been suppressed, because its contents were contradictory to the words of the Law.”²⁹

(5) On the festival of the Year, three texts at least were read

²³ *Baba Bathra* 14b. Cf. Green, *The Canon*, p. 139. Note that the order of the Megilloth is broken, but follows a chronological arrangement.

²⁴ כתבי הקודש This phrase also in *Tosefta Sab.* xiii (xiv) and xvi, 15.

²⁵ *Yadayim*, iii, 5. Id. iv, 4.

²⁶ Perhaps Hameram is Homer.

²⁷ *Yadayim*, iv, 5.

²⁸ *Megilla*, fol. 7d. See Hershon, *Treasures of Talmud*, p. 44. On Esther, cf. Green, *Canon*, pp. 139f.

²⁹ Hershon, p. 45. *Moed Katan*, 5a. In a note, Hershon adds: “Rashi *in loco* points to Ezek. xliv, 31 and xlv, 20 as contradictions to the Law. From the former text it might be inferred that Israelites are allowed to eat that which was prohibited to the priests, and this would be a contradiction to the Law. The second passage contains an innovation of the prophet, for the Law says nothing about such a sacrifice as that on the second day of the month.”

from the Law, three from the Psalms, and three from the Prophets.³⁰

(6) On the day of Atonement, selections were read to the High Priest "in Job and in Ezra and in Chronicles. Zechariah, the son of Kēbutal said, 'I often read before him in Daniel.'" ³¹

(7) "The Chaldee (Aramaic) passages in Ezra and Daniel defile the hands." ³²

(8) "All the Holy Scriptures may be saved from fire on the Sabbath." "This is interpreted as referring to the Hagiographa as well as to the Law and the Prophets." ³³

(9) All the books of the Old Testament are cited as Scripture in one or another of the tractates of the Mishna. The two usual formulas of citation are "It is written," and, "It is said," both being used alike for quotations from the Law, the Prophets, and the Hagiographa. For example, (a) "It is written": Deut. xvi, 14 in *Moed katon*; 1 Kings vi, 20 in *Megillah*; Dan. ii, 46 in *Sanhedrin*; Dan. iii, 12 in *Megillah*. (b) "It is said": Gen. xxiv, 42 in *Sanhedrin*; 1 Sam. xv, 32, *id.*; Dan. ii, 32, *id.*

(10) Especially to be noted is the citation of all of the so-called disputed books—Proverbs, Chronicles, Jonah, Ezekiel, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Songs, and Esther,³⁴ with the same formulas as those employed for the Law. E.g., 2 Chron. xxxiii, 13 in *Sanhedrin*; Proverbs iii, 2, 8, 16, 18, iv, 9, 22 in *Aboth*; Ezekiel xli, 22 in *Aboth*; Jonah iii, 10 in *Taanith*; Eccl. i, 15 in *Sukkoth* and in *Chagiga*; Song of Songs iii, 11 in *Taanith*; Esther ii, 22 in *Aboth*. A citation from the Song of Songs, iii, 9, 10 is introduced by the phrase "the explanation of the Prophets is" (*Sukkoth*, vi.).

(11) "Some desired also to withdraw (*ganaz*) the book of Proverbs because it contained internal contradictions³⁵, but the

³⁰ See Barclay, *The Talmud*, p. 157.

³¹ *Yoma*, i, 6.

³² *Yadayin*, iv, 5.

³³ *Shabbath*, xvi.

³⁴ Esther was translated into Greek by Lysimachus and brought to Egypt in the fourth year of Ptolemy and Cleopatra, *i.e.*, c. 178 B.C. (?). Cf. Swete, *Introduction to the O. T. in Greek*, p. 258. The schools of Hillel and Shamai united in the recognition of Esther (*Megilla*, 7a).

³⁵ E.g. xxvi, 4 and 5, "Answer a fool according to his folly," and "Answer not a fool according to his folly."

attempt was abandoned because the wise men declared: 'We have examined more deeply into the Book of Ecclesiastes, and have discovered the solution of the difficulty'.³⁶

(12) "At first, they withdrew Proverbs, and the Song of Songs, and Ecclesiastes from public use, because they spoke in parables. And so they continued, until the men of the Great Synagogue came and expounded them."³⁷

(13) "The wise men desired to withdraw (*ganaz*) the book of Koheleth, because its language was often self-contradictory."³⁸

(14) Again, it was asserted that Ecclesiastes contradicted other Scriptures. Thus, in *Sabbath* 30a, where it is asserted that the Preacher contradicts the *Sabb* words of the Psalter: "O Solomon, where is thy wisdom? where is thy discernment? Doth it not suffice thee that many of thy words contradict the utterances of David, that thou contradictest even thyself?"³⁹

(15) "Moses wrote his own book and the chapter of Balaam and Job. Joshua wrote his own book and the last eight verses of the Pentateuch. Samuel wrote his own book, and also Judges and Ruth. David wrote the Book of Psalms through the ten elders Adam, Melchisedek, Abraham, Moses, Heman, Jeduthun, Asaph, and the three sons of Korah. Jeremiah wrote his own book, as also the Kings and the Lamentations. Hezekiah and his company wrote the book of Isaiah, Proverbs, Canticles, and Ecclesiastes. The men of the Great Synagogue wrote Ezekiel, the twelve Minor Prophets, Daniel, and the book of Esther. Ezra wrote his own book and a genealogy which belongs to the Chronicles."⁴⁰

(16) Next to the Law, most of the so-called disputed Books were most highly honoured in the services of the Temple. Thus, (a) Jonah was the only one of the Prophets of which the whole was read in the public services. On the Sabbaths and Feast days, selections, called Haphtaroth, were read from the other Prophets;

³⁶ *Sabbath*, 30 b.

³⁷ *Aboth di Rabbi Nathan*.

³⁸ *Sabbath*, 30. E.g., "sorrow is better than laughter" (vii, 3), and "I said of laughter, it is to be praised" (ii, 2).

³⁹ See Ryle, *The Canon of the O.T.*, p. 196.

⁴⁰ *Baba Bathra*, 14 b.

but the whole of Jonah was read on the day of Atonement,⁴¹ and Daniel was often read on this day.⁴² (b) Of the Haphtaroth in use among the Jews of to-day, twelve are selected from Ezekiel, sixteen from Isaiah, nine from Jeremiah, fifteen from the Minor Prophets (one at least from all except Hag.), three from Joshua, three from Judges, six from Samuel, ten from First Kings, and five from Second Kings. No Prophet, except Isaiah is more highly honoured in this respect than Ezekiel. (c) Aside from the Law and Jonah, only five other books were read in full in the public services of the Temple, and they were called by the special name "Megilloth" (rolls). These were all from the Hagiographa, and were: Ruth, read at the feast of Weeks; Lamentations, read on the day of the fast for the destruction of the Temple; Ecclesiastes, read at the Feast of Tabernacles; the Song of Songs, read at the Feast of the Passover; and Esther, read at the Feast of Purim. There is evidence that Esther was thus read as early as the middle of the second century B.C. (d) Parts, at least, of Chronicles were read to the High Priest during his preparation for the functions of the day of Atonement.⁴³ (e) Although the Book of Proverbs was not read in the public services, it is cited in the Mishna for proof texts more frequently than any other book of the Hagiographa, except the Psalter. E.g., in *Aboth* from sections iii, 14 to vi, 10 inclusive, there are citations of Proverbs iv, 2, xvi, 32, viii, 21, 14, xi, 22, iii, 35, iv, 22, 9, iii, 2, 8, 16, 18, i, 9, xvi, 31, xvii, 6, vi, 22, viii, 22, xvi, 3.

(17) The order of the books in the Hebrew Manuscripts varied, outside the Law, apparently at will. In proof of this statement see, e.g., the tables in Ryle and Ginsburg; also Swete, *Introduction*, p. 200.

12. *The Old Testament Books as given in the principal Greek Manuscripts.*

(a) They all agree in the number and order of the Pentateuch, to wit: Gen., Ex., Lev., Nu., Dt.

⁴¹ See the conspectus of the Haphtaroth at the end of any good edition of the Hebrew Bible.

⁴² *Yoma*, i, 6.

⁴³ See *Kippurim*, i, 6.

(b) For the rest of the books, the order is as follows:

(1) For Codex Vaticanus (B): Josh., Jgs., Ruth, Kingdoms a-d, Paraleipomena a-b, Esdras a-b, Ps., Prov., Eccl., Asma (the Song), Job, Wisd. of Sol., Wisd. of Sirach, Est., Jth., Tob., Hos., Am., Mic., Joel, Ob., Jon., Nah., Zeph., Hag., Zech., Mal., Isa., Jer., Baruch, Lam., Ep. of Jer., Ezek., Dnl.

(2) For Codex Alexandrinus (A): Joshua son of Nun, Jgs., Ruth (together books 7), Kingdoms a-d, Paraleipomena a-b (together six books); Prophets 16, Hos., Am., Mic., Joel, Ob., Jon., Nah., Hab., Zeph., Hag., Zech., Mal., Isa. (the) Prophet, Jer. (the) Prophet, Bar., Lam. (of Jeremiah), Ep. Jer., Ezk. (the) Prophet, Dnl. (+Prophet, 16 in *catalogue*), Est., Tob., Jth., Esdras a the Priest, Esdras b the Priest, Macc. a-d, Ps., Job, Prov. of Sol., Eccl., Song of Songs, Wisd. of Sol. (the Panaretos), Wisd. of Jesus son of Sirach, Ps. of Sol.

(3) For Codex Sinaiticus, so far as known: "Paraleipomenon a-(b), Esdras (a)-b, Est., Tob., Jth., Macc. a-d, Isa., Jer., Lam. of Jer., . . . Joel, Ob., Jon., Nah., Hab., Zeph., Hag., Zech., Mal., Ps. of David, Prov. (+of Solomon in *subscrip.*), Ecc., Song of Songs, Wisd. of Sol., Wisdom of Jesus son of Sirach, Job.

(4) For Codex Basiliano-Venetus (N & V): Josh., Ruth, Jgs., Kingdoms a-d, Paraleipomenon a-b, Esdras (a)-b, Est., . . . Job, Prov., Eccl., Song of Songs, Wisd. of Sol., Wisdom of Jesus son of Sirach, Hos., Am., Joel, Ob., Jon., Mic., Nah., Hab., Zeph., Hag., Zech., Mal., Isa., Jer., Bar., Lam., Ezk., Dnl., Tob., Jth., Macc. a-d.⁴⁴

(5) The order of books in the Hexaplaric Syriac was: Law, Josh., Jgs., Kgs., Chr., Ezra, Est., Jth., Tob., Ps., Job, Prov., Eccl., S. of S., two Wisd., Twelve Prophets, Jer. (with Bar. Lam., and Ep.), Dnl., with Sus. and Bel, Ezk. and Isa.^{44a}

13. The Armenian, Harkensian Syriac and Itala.

(1) The Armenian version has the following order: "Law, Joshua, Jgs., Ruth, Kgs. 4, Chr. 2, Esdras 1 and 2, Neh., Est., Jth.,

⁴⁴ For these lists, see Swete, *Introduction to the O. T. in Greek*, pp. 201f; and Ryle, *Canon of the O. T.*, p. 215f, where the order of the fragmentary uncials and cursives is given. On Constantinople Bible cf. Westcott, *The Bible in the Church*, p. 165.

^{44a} Swete, *Introduction*, p. 113, and Conybeare's list.

Tob., Macc. 1-3, Ps., Prov., Koheleth, Song of Songs, Wisd., Job, Isa., Hos., Am., Mic., Joel, Ob., Jon., Nah., Hab., Zeph., Hag., Zech., Mal., Jer., Bar., Lam., Dnl., Ezk." In an Appendix, after the New Testament, it adds Sirach, 3 Ezra, Prayer of Manasseh, 3 Cor., John?, and the Prayer of Eithami.⁴⁵

(2) The Ambrosian codex of the Harclensian Syriac contains the following: Ps., Job, Prov., Eccl., Song of Sol., the Two Wisdoms, the Twelve Prophets, Jer. (with Bar., Lam. and the Ep.), Dnl. (with Sus. and Bel), Ezk., Isa.

(3) The order in several fragments of the Itala is as follows: (a) In the Fragmenta Wirceburgensia: Hos., Jon., Isa., Jer., Lam., Ezek., Dnl., Bel. (b) In the Fragmenta Weingartensia: Hos., Am., Mic., Joel, Jon., Ezk., Dnl. (c) In the Fragmenta palimpsesta Vaticana: Hos., Joel, Am., Jon., Hab., Zeph., Zech. (d) In the Fragmenta Stutgardiana: Am., Ezk., Dnl.⁴⁶

14. The lists in the Greek, Latin, and Syrian fathers are as follows:⁴⁷

(1) Origen (d. A.D. 254): Gen., Ex., Lev., Nu., Dt., Josh. the son of Nun, Jgs., Ruth, Kgs. a-d, Paraleipomenon a-b, Esdras a-b, Bk. of Ps., Prov. of Sol., Eccl., Song of Songs, Isa., Jer. with Lam. and the Ep. in one, Dnl., Ezk., Job, Est.⁴⁸ And beside (*hexo*) these, is the Maccabees.

(2) The list of Athanasius (c. 367 A.D.; d. 373) is the same as that of Origen as far as the Song of Songs. After that we have: "Job; Prophets,—the Twelve, Isa., Jer. and with him Bar., Lam., Ep., Ezk., Dnl. There are also other books beside these, not canonized by the fathers, but approved to be read with those now listed: Wisd. of Sol., Wisd. of Sirach, Est., Jth., Tob." ⁴⁹

(3) The list of the Pseudo-Athanasius. Gen., Ex., Lev., Nu., Dt., Josh. the son of Nun, Jgs., Ruth, of Kgdms., a, b, of Kgdms. c, d, of Chr. a, b, Esdr. a, b, the Davidic Psalter, the Prov. of Sol.,

⁴⁵ See the edition of the Old Armenian Bible published in 1804.

⁴⁶ See Swete, *Introduction*, pp. 96, 97.

⁴⁷ For Melito, see above under 10.

⁴⁸ The Twelve is omitted, probably the mistake of a copyist. (Cf. Westcott, *Bible in the Church*, p. 135).

⁴⁹ The Syrian list by Cureton agrees with the Greek given by Zahn, II, p. 211.

Eccl. of the same, Song of Songs, Job, Twelve Prophets numbered as one: Hos., Am., Mic., Joel, Ob., Jon., Nah., Hab., Zeph., Hag., Zech., Mal.; and besides these, four others, Isa., Jer., Ezk., Dnl. And besides these, there are the antilegomena as follows: Wisd. of Sol., Wisd. of Sirach, Est., Jth., Tob., four bks. of Macc., the Ps. and Odes of Sol., Sus. And again there are the apocrypha: Enoch, Patriarchs, Prayer of Joseph, Testament of Moses, Ascension of Moses, Abraham, Eldad and Medad; and the Pseudepigrapha of the prophet Elijah, of the prophet Zeph., of Zech. the father of John, of Bar., Hab., Ezk., and Dnl.

(4) The list of Cyril of Jerusalem (c. 348 A.D.; d. 386): The first books, the five of Moses: Gen., Ex., Lev., Nu., Dt.; and besides, Josh. the son of Nun (and) the book of Jgs. with Ruth; and of the remaining historical books, Kgdms. 4, Chr. 2, Esdr. 2, Est. (twelfth); and there are found five poetical books, Job, the book of Ps., Prov., Eccl., the Song of Songs (seventeenth book); and in addition five prophetic (books), the XII prophets, one book, one of Isa., one of Jer. with Bar. and Lam. and the Ep., Ezk., Dnl. (twenty-second book).

(5) There are three lists of Epiphanius (c. 392 A.D.; d. 403), no two of them alike. (a) Gen., Ex., Lev., Nu., Dt., Josh., Jgs., Ruth, Job, Ps., Prov. of Sol., Ecc., Song of Songs, Kgdms. 4, Chr. 2, The Dodekapropheton, Isa., Jer., with Lam. and his Ep. and Bar., Ezk., Dnl., Esdr. 2, Est. (b) Five Law books (the Pentateuch and the Nomothesia Gen.-Deut.). Five Poetical books (Job, Ps., Pro. of Sol., Ecc., Song of Songs). Another Pentateuch, called Graphaia, and by some Hagiographa (Josh. the son of Nun, the Book of Jgs. with Ruth, Chr. 2, Kgdms. a, b, Kgdms. c, d). The Prophetic Pentateuch (the Dodekapropheton, Isa., Jer., Ezk., Dnl.). Two others (two of Esdr., called one, Est.), that of Solomon called the Panarete; the book of Jesus the son of Sirach. (c) The Law as in (a). The (book) of Josh. the son of Nun, Job, Jgs., Ruth, the Ps., Chr. 2, Kgdms. a-d, the book of Prov., the Preacher, the Song of Songs, the Dodekapropheton, of the Prophet Isa., of Jer., of Ezk., of Dnl., of Esdr. a, b, of Est.

(6) The list of Gregory of Nazianzus (d. 390 A.D.). The twelve historical books, Gen., Ex., Lev., Nu., Dt., Josh., Jgs., Ruth, Acts

of Kgs., Chr., Esdr. Five poetical books, Job, David, three of Sol., (Eccl., Song, Prov.). Five prophetic books, the Twelve (Hos., Am., Mic., Joel, Jon., Ob., Nah., Hab., Zeph., Hag., Zech., Mal.), Isa., Jer., Ezk., Dnl. Two and twenty books. Esther is omitted.

(7) The list of Amphilochius (d. 395 A.D.). The Pent., Creation (*ktisis*), Ex., Lev., Nu., Dt., Josh., Jgs., Ruth, Kgdms. a-d, Chr. a, b, Esdr. a, b, Five Poetical books, Job, Ps., Three of Solomon, (Prov., Eccl., Song of Songs). The Twelve Prophets, (Hos., Am., Mic., Joel, Ob., Jon., Nah., Hab., Zeph., Hag., Zech., Mal.). The four Prophets,—Isa., Jer., Ezk., Dnl., the wisest in deeds and words. To these some adjudge Esther.

(8) The list of Pseudo-Chrysostom. The historical (part). The Octateuch, - Gen., Ex., Lev., Nu., Dt., Josh. the son of Nun, Jgs., Ruth. The Kgdms. a-d, Esdr. The advisory (symboleutic) part, as Prov., Wisd. of Sirach, the Preacher, the Song of Songs. The prophetic (part), as the sixteen Prophets. Ruth (?) = Job (?), David. Est. omitted.

(9) The Synopsis, revised by Lagarde.⁵⁰ The Mosaic. Gen., Ex., Lev., Nu., Dt. The others, Josh. the son of Nun, Jgs., Ruth = the Octateuch. The Tetrabasilion, a, b, c, d, Chr. a, b, Esdr. a, b, Est., Tob., Jth., Job. Of Solomon, Wisd., Prov., Eccl., Song of Songs. The Twelve Prophets, Hos., Am., Mic., Joel, Ob., Jon., Nah., Hab., Zeph., Hag., Zech., Mal. The four great Prophets, Isa., Jer., Ezk., Dnl. The end of the sixteen Prophets. Wisd. of Jesus the son of Sirach. Psalms apparently omitted.

(10) The list of the anonymous Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila. The Mosaic Pentateuch, Gen., Ex., Lev., Nu., Dt. The son of Nun, Jgs. with Ruth, the Chronicles, a, b, of the Kgdms. a, b, of the Kgdms. c, d, Job, Ps. of David, Prov. of Sol., the Preacher w. the Songs, the Dodekapropheton, Isa., Jer., Ezk., Dnl., Esdr., Jth., Est. Apocrypha: Tob., the Wisd. of Sol., the Wisd. of Jesus the son of Sirach.

(11) The list of Junilius. Histories (17): Gen., Ex., Lev., Nu., Dt., Josh., Jgs., Ruth, Kgdms. a-d (many add: Chr. 2, Job

⁵⁰ *Septuaginta Studien*, II, p. 50f. Discussed by Zahn, II, 302-18.

1, Tobias 1, Esdr. 2, Jth. 1, Est. 1, Macc. 2). Prophecies (17): Psalms (150), Hos., Isa., Joel, Am., Ob., Jon., Mic., Nah., Hab., Zeph., Jer., Ezk., Dnl., Hag., Zech., Mal., Prov. (2): Prov. of Sol., of Jesus son of Sirach. (Some add the book of Wisdom, and the Song of Songs.) Dogmatics (1): Eccl.

(12) The list of Leontius (d. 543, A.D.). The Historical Books (12): Gen., Ex., Nu., Lev., Dt., Josh. the son of Nun, Jgs., Ruth, the Words (logoi) of the Kgdms. a-d, Chr., Esdr. The Prophetical (Books) (5): Isa., Jer., Ezk., Dnl., the Dodekapropheton. The Paranetic (Books) (4): Job, Prov. of Sol. Eccl., the Song of Songs, the Psalterion. Esther is omitted. (MS #124 has Lev. and Nu. after Dt.)

(13) The list of John of Damascus. The First Pent., which also is Nomothesia (Gen., Ex., Lev., Nu., Dt.). The Second Pent., which is called Grapheia, but by some Hagiographa (Josh. the son of Nun, Jgs. with Ruth, of Kgdms. a, b, of Kgdms. c, d, of Chr. a, b). The Third Pent., the Poetical (sticherai) Books, (Job, the Ps., Prov. of Sol., Eccl. of the same, Song of Songs of the same). The Fourth Pentateuch, the Prophetical (the Dodekapropheton, Isa., Jer., Ezk., Dnl.). Two others: Esdr. a, b, Est. The Paranetic, that is, the Wisd. of Sol., the Wisd. of Jesus.

(14) The list of Nicephorus (d. 611 A.D.). (A) Writings approved by the Church and canonized: Gen., Ex., Lev., Nu., Dt., Josh., Jgs. and Ruth, of Kgdms. a, b, of Kgdms. c, d, Chr. a, b, Esdr. a, b, Ps., Prov. of Sol., Eccl., Song of Songs, Job, Isa., Jer., Bar., Ezk., Dnl. the Twelve Prophets. Together the 22 books of the Old Testament. (B) Books that are disputed and not approved by the Church: Macc. 3, Wisd. of Sol., Wisd. of the son of Sirach, Ps. and Odes of Sol., Est., Jth., Sus., Tobit which also is Tobias. Apocrypha of the Old Testament: Enoch, Patriarchs, Prayer of Joseph, Testament of Moses, Ascension of Moses, Abraham, Eldad and Medad, Elijah the prophet, Zephaniah the prophet, Zechariah the father of John, The pseudepigrapha of Baruch, Habakkuk, Ezekiel, and Daniel. (See Zahn II, 300.)

(15) List of the Canons of Laodicea. Genesis of the World,

Exodus from Egypt, Lev., Nu., Dt., Josh. the son of Nun, Jgs., Ruth, Est., of Kgdms. a, b, of Kgdms. c, d, of Chr. a, b, Esdr. a, b, the Bk. of Ps., Prov. of Sol., Eccl., Song of Songs, Job, Twelve Prophets, Isa., Jer. and Bar., Lam., and Ep., Ezk., Dnl.

(16) List of the Apostolic Canons. Five of Moses (Gen., Ex., Lev., Nu., Dt.), Joshua the son of Nun, Jgs., Ruth, four of Kgdms, two of Chr., two of Esdr., Est., Jth., three of Macc., Job, Ps., three bks. of Sol. (Prov., Eccl., Song of Songs), one of the Twelve Prophets, Isa. one, Jer. one, Ezk. one, Dnl. one. Besides, take care that your youths learn the Wisd. of the very learned Sirach.

(17) The list of the Cod. Barocc. Concerning the books of the LXX and those not included in them. Gen., Ex., Lev., Nu., Dt., Josh., Jgs. and Ruth, of Kgdms. a-d, Chr. a, b, Job, Ps., Prov., Eccl., Song of Songs, Esdr., Hos., Am., Mic., Joel, Jon., Ob., Nah., Hab., Zeph., Hag., Zech., Mal., Isa., Jer., Ezk., Dnl. . . . And in addition to the LXX, the Wisd. of Sol., the Wisd. of Sirach, of Macc. a-d, Est., Jth., Tob. And a large number of Apocrypha: Adam, Enoch, Lamech, Patriarchs, Prayer of Joseph, Eldad and Medad, Testament of Moses, Ascension of Moses, Psalms of Solomon, Apocalypse of Elias, Visions of Isaiah, Apocalypse of Zephaniah, Apocalypse of Zechariah, Apocalypse of Esther. (See Zahn II, 291.)

(18) The list of Ebedyesu. Gen., Ex., Bk. of Priests, Nu., Dt., Josh. son of Nun, Jgs., Sam., of Kgs., Book of Dabariamin, Ruth, Ps. of David the King, Prov. of Sol., Koheleth, Song of Songs, Son of Sira, Great Wisdom, Job, Isa., Hos., Joel, Am., Ob., Jon., Mich., Nah., Hab., Zeph., Hag., Zech., Mal., Jer., Ezk., Dnl., Jth., Est., Sus., Esdr., Dnl. Minor, Ep. of Bar., Bk. of the Tradition of the Elders, Prov. of Josephus, History of the sons of Samona, the Book of Maccabees (a-c).

(19) The list of Hilary, (d. 366 A.D.). i-v. The five books of Moses. vi, Joshua the son of Nun. vii, Jgs. and Ruth, viii, of Kgs. a-b, ix, of Kgs. c-d, x, Chr. a-b, xi, Accounts (sermons) of the days of Esdras, xii, Bk of Ps., xiii-xv, Prov. of Sol., Eccl., Song of Songs. xvi, The Twelve Prophets, xvii-xxii, Isa., Jer. w. Lam., and Ep., Dnl., Ezk., Job, Est., (xxiii-xxiv, Tob., Jth.).

(20) The list of Rufinus (d. 410 A.D.). The five books of Moses (Gen., Ex., Lev., Nu., Dt.), Joshua the son of Nun, Jgs. along with Ruth, Kings 4, Chr. (= Book of Days), of Esdr. 2, and Est., of the Prophets (Isa., Jer., Ezk., Dnl., the Twelve Prophets, one book), Job, Ps. of David, of Sol. 3 (Prov., Eccl., Song of Songs). These conclude the number of books of the Old Testament. Some other books called not canonical, but ecclesiastical, are Wisd. of Sol., Wisd. of Sirach (= Ecclesiasticus), Tob., Jth., the books of Macc.

(21) The list of Augustine (d. 430 A.D.). Histories. Five of Moses (Gen., Ex., Lev., Nu., Dt.), Joshua son of Nun, Jgs., Ruth, Four books of Kgs., Two books of Chr., Job, Tob., Est., Jth., Two books of Macc., Two books of Esdr., Prophecies. The Ps. of David, three bks. of Solomon (Prov., Song of Songs, Eccl.), Wisd., Ecclus., The Twelve Prophets (Hos., Joel, Am., Ob., Jon., Mic., Nah., Hab., Zeph., Hag., Zech., Mal.), the volume of the four Major Prophets (Isa., Jer., Dnl., Ezk.).⁵¹

(22) The lists of Jerome (d. 420 A.D.).

(a) In the *Prologus Galeatus* to his version of Sam. and Kgs. Jerome gives the following order for the twenty-two books: the Law, (Gen., Ex., Lev., Nu., Dt.); The Prophets (Josh., Jgs. w. Ruth, Sam., Kgs., Isa., Jer. w. Lam., Ezk., the Twelve); Hagiographa (Job, David, Sol. [Prov., Eccl., Song], Dnl., Chr., Ezras, Esth.)⁵²

(b) In his *Institutio* Cassiodorus gives a list of Jerome's which differs from the above: Law (Gen., Ex., Lev., Nu., Dt.), Prophets (Josh., Jgs., Ruth, Sam., Isa., Jer., Ezek., Dnl., the Twelve), Hagiographa (Job, David, Sol. [Prov. Ecclus. (?), Song], Verba dierum id est Paralep. Ezras, Esth.).⁵³

⁵¹ The twelve Minor Prophets and the four Major are embraced by Augustine under the phrase "proprie Prophetæ." Augustine follows his list with the remark: *His quadraginta quattuor libris Veteris Testamenti terminatur auctoritas.*

⁵² Cf. Westcott, *Canon*, p. 529f, Wildeboer, *Canon*, p. 80ff.

⁵³ This list omits Kgs. and according to the Bamberg Ms. it also omits Daniel. Zahn (*Geschichte*, II, p. 270) points out that the omission of Daniel must be a copyist's error since Daniel is needed to make up the twenty-two. Zahn raises the question whether the fact that the Bamberg text reads *de verba dierum* means that "de" is a corruption of "Daniel" and that Daniel

(23) The list of Innocent I (d. 417 A.D.). The five books of Moses (Gen., Ex., Lev., Nu., Dt.), Josh. son of Nun, Jgs., Four books of Kgs., Ruth, Sixteen books of the Prophets, Five books of Solomon, The Psalter, Histories: Job, Tob., Est., Jth., Two books of Macc., Two bks. of Esdr., Two books of Chr.

(24) The list of the Pseudo-Gelasius.⁵⁴ Five books of Moses (Gen., Ex., Lev., Nu., Dt.) Josh. son of Nun, Jgs., Ruth, Four of Kgs. Likewise the books of the prophets, sixteen in number (Isa., Jer., Ezk., Dnl., Hos., Am., Mic., Joel, Ob., Jon., Nah., Zeph., Hag., Zech., Mal.),⁵⁵ two of Chr., 150 Psalms, three books of Solomon (Prov., Eccl., Song of Songs), Bk. of the Wisd. of the son of Sirach, another following book of Wisd., likewise of Histories: Job, Tob., [Zahn (II, 262) adds—Esdras two], Esther, Jth., two bks. of Macc.

(25) The list of Cassiodorus, (d. 544 A.D.) Gen., Ex., Lev., Nu., Dt., Joshua son of Nun, Jgs., Ruth, Kings a-d, Chr. a-b., Ps., Five books of Solomon (Prov., Wisd., Ecclus., Eccl., Song of Songs), Prophets (Isa., Jer., Ezk., Dnl., Hos., Am., Mic., Joel, Ob., Jon., Nah., Hab., Zeph., Hag., Zech., Mal. which also is Angelus), Job, Tob., Est., Jth., Esdr. two books, two books of Macc. In all 44 books.

(26) The list of Isidorus. 1. Five books of Moses. 2. Josh. son of Nun, Jgs., Ruth. 3. Four of Kgs., Two of Chr., Tob., Est., Jth., Esdr., Two bks. of Macc. 4. Prophets: One bk. of Psalms, Three bks. of Sol. (Prov., Eccl., Song of Songs), Wisd., Ecclus., sixteen books of Prophets.

(27) The list of Mommsen, from the year 359 A.D. The canonical books: Gen., Ex., Nu., (*sic!*) Lev., Dt., Josh. son of Nun, Jgs., seven books. Ruth, Four of Kings, Two of Chronicles, Two of Macc., Job, Tob., Jth., Est., 151 Psalms of

should therefore precede Chron. as in the *Prologus Galeatus*. But he apparently favours the view that Daniel should follow Ezekiel in Jerome's list as given by Cassiodorus.

⁵⁴ There are four or five different lists of the decree of Gelasius discussed by Zahn (II, 259-67).

⁵⁵ Thiel gives the order from this on: Chron. two books, Ps., Solomon three (Prov., Eccl., S. S.), Wisd., Ecclus.

David, of Solomon, of Major Prophets: Isa., Jer., Dnl., Ezk., The Twelve.⁵⁶

(28) List in the Codex Claromontanus (c. 300 A.D.) Gen., Ex., Lev., Nu., Dt., Josh. son of Nun, Jgs., Ruth, Four of Kgs., Chr. two, the Davidic Psalms, Prov., Eccl., Song of Songs, Wisd., Wisd. IHU (i.e. of Jesus ben Sirach), Twelve Prophets: Hos., Am., Mic., Joel, Ob., Jon., Nah., Hab., Zeph., Hag., Zech., Mal., Isa., Jer., Ezk., Dnl., Macc., First, Second and Fourth, Jth, Ezra, Est., Job, Tob.

(29) List of the Liber Sacramentorum (6th or 7th cent. A.D.) Gen., Ex., Lev., Nu., Dt., Josh., Jgs., Bks. of Women: Ruth, Est., Jth., two books of Macc., Job, Tob., Four of Kgs., Sixteen books of Prophets, Five of David, Three of Solomon, One of Esdras. The books of the Veteris make in number forty-three.

(30) The list of the Council of Carthage (397 A.D.) Gen., Ex., Lev., Nu., Dt., Josh. son of Nun, Jgs., Ruth, Four books of Kgs., Two books of Chr., Job, the Davidic Psalter, Five books of Sol., Twelve books of Prophets, Isa., Jer., Ezk., Dnl., Tob., Jth., Est., Two books of Esdr., two books of Macc.⁵⁷ Ballerini's text gives the order: Daniel, Ezekiel. See Zahn II. 252. And it omits the books of Maccabees.

15. The Old Syriac version, called the Peshito, has an order differing from all others. It puts Job before the Psalter and gives a unique arrangement of both the major and minor Prophets. The original Peshito seems to have omitted Chr., Ezra-Neh. and Est. but accepted Ecclus.⁵⁸

16. Theodore of Mopsuestia omits Chr., Ezra-Neh., Est. and Job.

17. The Nestorians omit Chr., Ezra-Neh., and Est., but receive Job, Ben Sirach, and the additions to Dnl.

18. Some Monophysites take the same view as the Nestorians, but add Esther.

19. Barhebraeus takes no account of Chronicles.⁵⁹

⁵⁶ From this list I have omitted some irrelevant matter.

⁵⁷ For the most part, these lists have been translated from the originals as given in Swete, *Introduction to the O.T. in Greek*, pp. 198-214.

⁵⁸ See Wildeboer, p. 85.

⁵⁹ For 16-19 above, cf Buhl, *Canon and Text*, pp. 53, 190.

20. The Ethiopic Bible, in a MS in the British Museum gives in order: the Law of Moses 5, Jgs. 3, Jub. 1, Kgs. 4, Chr. 1, Job 1, Bks. of Sol. 5, (Prov. is divided in two), Isa. 1, Jer. 1, Ezk. 1, Dnl. 1, The Minor Prophets 12, Ezra 2; Macc. 1, Tob. 1, Jth. 1, Assenath 1, Est. 1, Ecclus. 1, Ps. 1, Ozias 1. The sum of the Old Testament is 46.⁶⁰

2. *The Use*

Since Bevan has appealed to the Haphtaroth, or selections from the prophetic books, to be read on the Sabbaths and feast days, as evidence that the Book of Daniel was not in existence when these selections were made, it seems best to give a list of these Haphtaroth so that the evidence may be forthcoming for the discussion of this view, which will be given later.

(1) The blessing before the reading of the Haphtara reads:

“Blessed art Thou, Jehovah our God, the king of the world, who hast chosen good prophets and accepted their words, which were spoken in truth. Blessed art Thou who didst choose the Law and Moses thy servant and Israel Thy people and the prophets of truth and righteousness.”

The blessings after the reading are:

(a) “Blessed art Thou Jehovah our God, king of the world, rock of all the ages, righteous in all generations, the faithful God, who sayeth and it is done, speaketh and it stands fast; for all His words are truth and righteousness.”

(b) “Faithful art Thou, Jehovah our God, and faithful are Thy words, one word of thine shall not return back in vain; for a faithful king art Thou, O God. Blessed be Thou, Jehovah, the God who is faithful in all His words.”

(c) “Comfort Thou Zion, for it is the house of our life. And for humility of soul do Thou save quickly in our days. Blessed be Thou, Jehovah, who rejoicest Zion with her sons. Make us to rejoice, O Jehovah our God, through Elijah the prophet thy servant, and through the house of David thine anointed, quickly let him come and let our heart rejoice. Upon his throne let not

⁶⁰ Cf. Westcott, *Bible in Church*, p. 238, where he follows Dillmann, *Cat. MSS. Aeth.* p. 4.

a stranger sit, and let not others inherit again his glory; for by thy holy name hast Thou sworn to him, that his light shall not be quenched for ever and ever. Blessed be Thou, Jehovah the shield of David."

(d) "For the *Law* and for the service *and* for the *prophets* and for this Sabbath day, which Thou hast given to us, O Jehovah our God, for sanctification and for rest, for glory and for beauty; for all, O Jehovah our God, we are thanking Thee, and blessing Thee. May Thy name be blessed by every living one for ever and ever continually. Blessed be Thou Jehovah, who sanctifiest the Sabbath."⁶¹

(2) The Haphtaroth selections in use among the modern Hebrews are as follows: 1). From Joshua. (a) i, 1-18. (b) ii, 1-24, (c) v, 2-vi, 27. 2). From Judges. (a) iv, 4-v, 31. (b) xi, 2-33. (c) xiii, 2-25. 3). From First Samuel. (a) i, 1-ii, 10. (b) xi, 14-22. (c) xv, 1-22. (d) xx, 18-42. 4). Second Samuel. (a) vi, 1-29. (b) xxii, 1-51. 5). First Kings. (a) i, 1-31. (b) ii, 1-12. (c) iii, 15-28. (d) v, 26-vi, 13. (e) vii, 13-26. (f) vii, 40-50. (g) viii, 2-21. (h) viii, 54-66. (i) xviii, 1-39. (k) xviii, 46-xix, 21. 6). From Second Kings. (a) iv, 1-23. (b) iv, 42-v, 19. (c) vii, 3-20. (d) xi, 17-xii, 17. (e) xxiii, 1-27. 7). From the First part of Isaiah. (a) i, 1-28. (b) vi, 1-13. (c) x, 32-xii, 6. 8). From Second Part of Isaiah. (a) xl, 1-26. (b) xl, 27-xli, 16. (c) xlii, 5-21. (d) xliii, 21-xliv, 23. (e) xlix, 14-li, 3. (f) li, 12-lii, 9. (g) liv, 1-10. (h) liv, 11-lv, 5. (i) lv, 6-lvi, 8. (k) lvii, 14-lviii, 14. (l) lx, 1-22. (m) lxi, 10-lxiii, 9. (n) lxvi, 1-24. 9). From Jeremiah. (a) i, 1-ii, 3. (b) ii, 4-28, iv, 1, 2. (c) vii, 21-viii, 12. (d) viii, 13-ix, 23. (e) xvi, 19-xvii, 14. (f) xxxi, 2-20. (g) xxxii, 6-27. (h) xxxiv, 8-22. (i) xlvi, 13-28. 10). From Ezekiel. (a) i, 1-28. (b) xvii, 22-xviii, 32. (c) xx, 2-20. (d) xxii, 1-16. (e) xxviii, 25-xxix, 21. (f) xxxvi, 16-36. (g) xxxvi, 37-xxxvii, 14. (h) xxxvii, 15-28. (i) xxxviii, 18-xxxix, 16. (k) xliii, 10-27. (l) xliv, 15-31. (m) xlv, 16-xlvi, 18. 11). From Hosea. (a) ii, 1-22. (b) xi, 7-xii, 12. (c) xii, 13-xiv,

⁶¹ These prayers have been translated from the *Seder Birekhoth Hahap-tarah* of the Jewish Year Book of Adelbert della Torre, published at Vienna in 1861, p. 50.

7. (d) xiv, 2-10. 12). From Joel. ii, 1-27. 13). From Amos. (a) ii, 6-iii, 8. (b) ix, 7-15. 14). From Obadiah. vs. 1-21. 15). From Jonah. i, 1-iv, 11. 16). From Micah. v, 6-vi, 8. 17). From Habakkuk. ii, 20-iii, 19. 18). From Zechariah. (a) ii, 14-iv, 7. (b) xiv, 1-21. 19). From Malachi. (a) i, 1-ii, 7. (b) iii, 4-24.⁶²

(3) In addition to the Haphtaroth in use among the modern Jews, which are to be found listed with their corresponding sections from the Law in the conspectus of the appendix of our Hebrew Bibles, the following Haphtaroth in use among the Karaites and the earlier Jews are mentioned in an article by Büchler in *The Jewish Quarterly Review*.⁶³ 1) Joshua (a) iii, (b) iv, 1-15. (c) 3-18. (d) xiv, 6. (e) xvii, 4. (f) xxi, 41. 2) Judges (a) ii, 7. (b) xi, 16-26. (c) xviii, 7. (d) xix. (e) xix, 20. 3) 1 Sam. (a) ii, 21-28. (b) vi, 6. (c) xii, 3-xiv, 2. (d) x, 24. (e) xv, 2. 4) 2 Sam. (a) v, 13-vi, 1. (b) xi, 5. (c) xiii. (d) xvi, 21. 5) 1 Kings (a) iv, 20. (b) x, 9. (c) xvii, 24. 6) 2 Kings (a) xii, 14-23. (b) xx, 8. 7) Isaiah, First Part. (a) iv, 6. (b) xxvii, 6. (c) xxix, 8-14. (d) xxx, 15. (e) xxxii, 18. xxxiii, 17. (f) xxxiv, 11. (g) xxxvii, 31-37. (h) xvii, 14-xviii, 7. 8) Second Part. (a) xlii, 12-17. (b) xliii, 1-7. (c) xlvi, 3. (d) xlvi, 12. (e) xlix, 9-13. lxiv, 1. (f) lxv, 10. (g) lxv, 23-lxvi, 8. 9) Jeremiah. (a) xii, 15. (b) xiv, 19-22. (c) xxix, 8. (d) xxx, 10-16. (e) xxxviii, 8. 10) Ezekiel. (a) xii, 20. (b) xvi. (c) xx, 41. (d) xiv, 11. (e) xlv, 1. (f) xlv, 12. 11). Hosea xii, 4-13. 12) Joel iii, 3. 13) Amos i, 3-15. 14) Micah (a) ii, 12. (b) vi, 3-vii, 20. (c) vii, 9. 15) Nahum i, 12-ii, 5. 16) Zephaniah (a) i, 12. (b) iii, 9-19. 17) Zech. x, 6-11.

(4) *The New Testament*. 1. In Luke iv, 17, we are told that Jesus "went to the synagogue, as was His wont every sabbath day, and stood up for the purpose of reading. And there was given to Him the book of the prophet Isaiah, and He opened the book, and found the place where it is written: "The Spirit

⁶² For the list here given, see the Conspectus Haphtararum in the Appendix to any good edition of the Hebrew Bible. (The minor variations between the Sephardim and the Ashkenazim are not noted.)

⁶³ Vol. VI, pp. 1-73.

of the Lord is upon me," etc. (Isa. lxi, 1f). 2. In Acts xiii, 14, 15, we are told that Paul and Barnabas went into the synagogue at Antioch, and, after the reading of the Law and the Prophets, Paul, on the invitation of the rulers, stood up to make an exhortation. 3. In Acts xiii, 27, we are told that the Prophets were read every Sabbath day.

It is to be noted that neither of the above lists includes a selection from Haggai; also that Isa. lxi, 1f. is not found in either.

DISCUSSION OF THE EVIDENCE

In discussing the assumptions of the critics with regard to the historicity and date of the Book of Daniel on the basis of the evidence just given, I shall consider first the relation between the dates of the books of the Old Testament and their position in the present Hebrew Canon. All the critics argue as if the presence of Daniel among the books which by us are called Hagiographa is a sure indication of the lateness of its composition. That this is not the case, I shall proceed to show, (1) by a consideration of the Law; and, (2) by a consideration of the rest of the books of the Old Testament. In the course of this discussion of the main proposition assumed by the critics, I hope to make it plain, that not merely it, but also the other assumptions and conclusions with regard to the date of the Book of Daniel in so far as they are derived from its position in the present Hebrew Bible, are false.

1. The Order of the Books

The Pentateuch. First, let us take the order of the books in the Pentateuch. According to the order in all Hebrew and Greek manuscripts that contain the Pentateuch, the books were arranged in their present order, that is, the order of the historical sequence of the events and of the supposed order of the codes of law contained in them. Genesis gives the history from the creation to the establishment of Israel in Egypt; Exodus and Leviticus, the account of the exodus and of the events and laws connected with Sinai; Numbers, the story of the wanderings; and Deu-

teronomy, a résumé of the history and of the laws enacted up to the arrival of the children of Israel at Shittim. The oldest evidence for this order is to be found in the works of Origen from the middle of the third century A.D. The only list of the books of the Law antedating this, is that given by Melito, Bishop of Sardis, from the latter part of the second century A.D.; but it gives the books in the order Gen., Ex., Nu., Lev., Dt. Since Melito and Origen, these two earliest witnesses for the order, number, and names, of all of the books of the Law, thus differ as to their order, it is manifest that at the time when they wrote their order had not yet been fixed. The relative position of a book in the so-called earliest Canon had, therefore, nothing essential to do with its canonicity.

Again, according to the radical critics, the Hebrew Pentateuch was not finished till after the time when the translation of the Seventy was made.⁶⁴ Dividing the main sources of the five-fold book of the Law into the Jehovistic, Elohist, Deuteronomistic, and Priestly portions, denoted respectively by J, E, D, and P, they place J somewhere between 850 and 625 B.C.; E, at about 750; D, at or shortly before 621; and P, at 444 B.C.⁶⁵ The canonization of D was made in 621 B.C., and that of P in 444 B.C.⁶⁶ The whole work was put together in its present form about 400 B.C., though additions and corrections are alleged by some to have been made even subsequently to the time of the Seventy,⁶⁷ that is, after 280 B.C. The redactor Rp, who is said to have put J, E, D, and P, together, excluded from and added to the original documents whatever he pleased, and put them together in the order that seemed to him to be best. But this order, while chronological according to the time at which the books purport to have been written, is not chronological according to the time at which the critics say that they were written; for Rp puts the laws of P before those of D, although according to the modern critics of the Wellhausen school, D was written about two hundred years before the writing of P.

⁶⁴ Cornill, *Introduction*, p. 474.

⁶⁵ *Id.*, p. 91.

⁶⁶ *Id.*, p. 472.

⁶⁷ *Id.*, p. 474.

It will be noted, also, that even though the five-fold division of the Law cannot be traced back farther than Philo,⁶⁸ and even though it may have existed for only a short time before the time when the version of the Seventy was made,⁶⁹ this does not affect the fact that in the Pentateuch as far back as we can trace it,⁷⁰ the P laws preceded the laws of D in the document as it came from the hand of Rp.

Further, since the critics claim that D was canonized before P, it follows that the position of a book in the Canon, or in a part of the Canon, was not always, or necessarily determined by the time of its canonization, or by the time of its composition. So, then, the position of Daniel in the present Hebrew Bible has not necessarily anything to do with the time of its composition, or of its canonization.

The Rest of the Old Testament. It will be noted that I have written "present Hebrew Bible"; for there is no evidence to show that any old Hebrew manuscript ever contained the books of the Old Testament Canon as they are arranged in our Hebrew Bibles as now printed. Nor did either of the great schools of Hebrew manuscripts, the Spanish, or the German-French, have the books arranged as they are now printed; nor are they printed in the order given in the Talmud. Nor do they follow the order of the earliest printed Hebrew Bibles, such as the Editio Princeps of Bomberg, which put the five Megilloth immediately after the Pentateuch. Our Bibles agree with the Spanish and Massoretic manuscripts in the order of the Prophets, but with the German and French in the Hagiographa. The order of the Talmud differs from that of the early printed Bibles and from that of the editions in use at present. It differs, also, in the order of the books both in the Prophets and the Hagiographa from the Massoretic, Spanish, and German-French manuscripts. The Peshito Syriac version differs in the order of the books both in Prophets and Hagiographa from every one of these Hebrew orders. The

⁶⁸ *De Abrahamo*, I.

⁶⁹ Cornill, p. 28.

⁷⁰ The Samaritan Hebrew text and Targum, as well as all the ancient versions, primary and secondary, and all the lists of the books of the Law, early and late, unite in placing D after P.

lists of Melito, Origen, and Jerome, all of whom derived their information from the Hebrew scholars of their respective times, give an order differing from one another and from all the Hebrew manuscripts, lists, and versions. Moreover, no one of the great Greek uncials, Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, and Basiliano-Venetus, agrees in order with any other one of them, or with any one of the Hebrew or Syriac sources. And lastly, of the many lists of the Greek and Latin Fathers and Synods, no two are found to agree with each other; nor does anyone of them agree with any other list from any other ancient source.

In short, of more than sixty lists given above, no two present exactly the same order for the books comprising the Old Testament Canon; so that it can be affirmed positively that the order of those books was never fixed by any accepted authority of either the Jewish or Christian church.

2. Names, Numbers and Divisions

When we leave the order and come to the names, numbers and divisions, or groupings, of the books of the Old Testament, we find no evidence, except in the case of the Law, that the position of a book had anything to do with its date. The earliest witnesses give the names of the divisions as follows:

1. The Prologue to Ben Sira, (1) The Law, the Prophets and Others that followed after them. (2) The Law and the Prophets and the other books of our fathers. (3) The Law itself and the Prophecies and the rest of the Books.

2. Second Maccabees says that Nehemiah gathered together (1) the books concerning the kings and prophets, (2) those of David, and (3) epistles of kings concerning votive offerings.

3. Philo says that the Therapeutæ received (1) the Law, and (2) the oracles uttered by the prophets, and (3) the hymns and other (writings) by which knowledge and piety are augmented and perfected.

4. Luke xxiv, 44 speaks of (1) the Law, (2) the Prophets, and (3) the Psalms.

5. Josephus divides the books into (1) the Law, (2) the

Prophets, and (3) the remaining four, containing hymns to God and precepts concerning the conduct of human life.

6. Melito gives (1) the Five of Moses, (2) Josh., Jgs., Ruth, Kgs., Chr., (3) Ps., Prov., Eccl., Song, Job, (4) Prophets (Isa., Jer., The Twelve, Dnl., Ezk.) (5) Esdras.

7. Baba Bathra speaks of (1) Moses' "own book," (2) of the Prophets, of whom it names eight, not including Daniel, and (3) of the Hagiographa, of which it names eleven including Daniel.

8. Origen names (1) the five books of the Law, (2) six historical books, Josh., Jgs. w. Ruth, Sam. (two in one), Kgs. (two in one), Chr. (two in one), Esdr. (two in one), (3) Ps., Prov., Eccl. and the Song,⁷¹ (4) Is., Jer. with Lam. and the Ep. as one, Dnl. and Ezk. (the Twelve having been dropped from the list, probably through an error of some copyist), (5) Job, Est., and (6) outside (*hexo*) these is the Maccabees.

9. The four great Greek uncials give only the names of the books, but no names of divisions, except that A heads the names of the Prophets with the phrase "The sixteen Prophets," among which it puts Daniel. If it be allowed to indicate divisions based on the order and character of the books, they would be as follows: (1) For Vaticanus (B) (a) the Law, Gen., Ex., Lev., Nu., Dt. (b) Historical books, Josh., Jgs., Ruth, Kgdms. 4, Chr. 2, Ezra 2. (c) Poetical books, Ps., Prov., Eccl., the Song, Job, Wisd., Sirach. (d) Est., Jth., Tob. (e) The Twelve, Isa., Jer., Bar., Lam., Ep., Ezk., Dnl. (2) For Alexandrinus (A), (a) the Law, Gen., Ex., Lev., Nu., Dt. (b) Historical books, Josh., Jgs., Ruth, Kgs. 4, Chr. 2. (c) Prophets 16: the Twelve, Isa., Jer. also Baruch, Lam., Ep., Ezk., Dnl. (d) Est., Tob., Jth., Ezdras a, b, Macc. 4. (e) Poetical books, Ps., Job, Prov., Song, Wisd., Sirach, Ps. of Sol. (3) For Sinaiticus (S), (a) the Law, of which, however, only fragments of Gen. and Nu. remain. (b) Historical books, of which remain Chr., Ezra-Neh., Est., Tob., Jth. and four of Macc. (c) Proph. books, Isa., Jer., Lam., Joel, Obad., Jon., Nah., Hab., Zeph., Hag., Zech., Mal. The other books have been destroyed. (d) Poetical books, Ps., Prov., Eccl., Song of

⁷¹ Probably the four of Josephus' third division of the Canon.

Songs, Wisd., Sirach, Job. (4) For Basiliano-Venetus. (a) the Law, Lev., Nu., Dt. (all that remain). (b) Josh., Ruth, Jgs., Kgdms. 4, Chr. 2, Esdr. 2, Est. (lacuna). (c) Poetical books, (Ps.), Job, Prov., Eccl., Song, Wisd., Sirach. (d) Prophetical books, the Twelve, Isa., Jer., Bar., Lam., Ezk., Dnl. (e) Tob., Jth., Macc. 4.

10. The principal Greek, Latin, and Syrian lists make, or imply, the following divisions: (1) Melito: Law 5, History 5-9, Poetry 5, Prophecy 5, Others 1. (2) Origen: Law 5, History 6-11, Poetry 4, Prophecy 4, Others 1-2. (3) Athanasius: Law 5, History 6-11, Poetry 5, Prophecy 5, Others 5. (4) Pseudo-Athanasius: Law 5, Histories 7-11, Poetry 5, Prophets 12, Four others besides—the Major Prophets, Beside these 8 books. (5) Cyril: Law 5, History 6-12, Poetry 5, Prophecy 5. (6) Epiphanius a: Law 5, History 3, Poetry 5, History 2-6, Prophecy, 5, Others 2-3, Extra 2. (7) Epiphanius b: Law 5, Poetry 5, Hagiographa 5, Prophecies 5, Others 2, Extra 2. (8) Epiphanius c: Law 5, History 3, Psalms 1, History 2-6, Solomon's Works, Prophecies 5, Others 2-3. (9) Gregory Nazianzus: History 12, Poetry 5, Prophecy 5. (10) Amphilocheus: Law 5, History 6-11, Poetry 5, Prophecy 5, Proverbs 2, Extra: Esther. (11) Pseudo-Chrysostom: Octateuch, History 2-5, Admonitory 4, Prophecy 16, Extra 2. (12) Lagarde's Synopsis: Octateuch; History 12, Solomon 4, Prophecies 12, Major Prophets 4. Extra: Wisdom of Jesus ben Sirach. (13) Dialog. Tim. et Aquila: Mosaic Pentateuch, History 5, Poetry 4, Prophecy 6, Additional 2. Extra 3. (14) Junilius: Histories 17, Prophecies 17, Proverbs 2, (Additional 2), Dogmatics 1. (15) Leontius: The Historical Books 12, the Prophetical 5, the Paranetic 4 (5?). (16) John of Damascus: First Pentateuch, or Nomothesia; Second Pentateuch, or Hagiographa; Third Pentateuch, or the Poetical Books, Fourth Pentateuch, or the Prophetical. Others 2. Extra: Two. (17) Nicephorus: Law 5, History 6-10, Poetical 5, Prophetical 6. Antilegomenoi: 8-10. (18) Ebedyesu: Law 5, History 6, Poetical 7, Prophets 16, Others 12. (19) Canons of Laodicea: Law 5, Historical 7-11, Poetical 5, Prophetical 5. (20) Apostolic Canons: Five of Moses, Historical 14, Poetical 5, Prophetical 5. Extra:

The Wisdom of the very learned Sirach. (21) List in Cod. Baroc.: Law 5, Historical 4-9, Poetical 5, Esdras, Prophetical 16, . . . Extra 6-9. (22) Hilary: Five books of Moses, Histories 6-9, Poetical 4, Prophets 12. Six other prophets, among which are included Lamentations and Epistle of Jeremiah, Job, and Esther. Extra 2. (23) Ruffinus: Five books of Moses, Historical 6-10, Prophets 5, Poetical 5. Extra: 5-8. (24) Augustine: Histories 16-22, Prophecies 22. (25) Jerome a (List in *Prologus Galeatus*), Law 5, Prophets 8, Hagiographa 9; b (as given by Cassiodorus) Law 5, Prophets 9, Hagiographa 8. (26) Innocent I.: Five books of Moses, Historical 4-7, Prophets 16, Books of Solomon 5, Psalter, Histories 7-10. (27) Pseudo-Gelasius: Books of Moses 5, Historical 4-8, Prophets 16, Chronicles 1-2, Poetical 6. Likewise, Histories 5-6. (28) Cassiodorus: Law 5, Historical 3-7, Poetical 6, Prophets 16, Others 6-8. (29) Isidorus: Five books of Moses, Historical 10-15, Prophets 22 (including the 5 poetical books). (30) Mommsen's List: Heptateuch (?), Historical 15, Major Prophets 4, Prophets 12. (31) Codex Claromontanus: Law 5, Histories 7, Poetry 6, Prophets 16, Additional 8 (including Job and Esther). (32) Liber Sacramentorum: Law 5, Historical 13, Prophetical 16, Davidic 5, Solomonic 3, Esdras—xliii books. (33) Council of Carthage: Law 5, Histories 5-9. Poetry 7, Prophets 16. Others 5-7.

This review of the testimony given above shows that only one witness puts the Book of Daniel under any other heading than that of the Prophets. This witness is the *Baba Bathra*, a work not written till about A.D. 200, and deemed by the critics as so unreliable that they reject all that it says in the immediately succeeding context about the writers of the various books of the Old Testament. Besides, it simply says that the *Rabbis* had taught the order of succession. They did not follow it in their MSS Bibles. All of the witnesses who derived their information from Jewish sources antedating this time, either expressly or impliedly, place Daniel among the Prophets,—Philo, Matthew, Luke, Josephus, and Melito. Even Origen and apparently Jerome⁷² who studied with the Jewish Rabbis of their time, placed Daniel

⁷² See above, pp. 24, 29.

among the Prophets. It is proper, therefore to conclude that the fact that the later Jews placed Daniel among the Hagiographa has nothing to do with the questions of its canonicity and date.

3. *Subsidiary Questions*

Having thus considered the main charge against the early date of the Book of Daniel based upon its position in the present Hebrew Bibles, I shall next devote myself to some subsidiary questions more or less relevant to the main charge, and which the critics bring forward to support it.

Driver says, that "the age and authorship of the books of the Old Testament can be determined (so far as this is possible) only upon the basis of the internal evidence supplied by the books themselves, by methods such as those followed in the present volume: no external evidence worthy of credit exists."⁷³ If this proposition were true, it might be well to ask why, then, Driver considered it necessary to present eleven pages of historical and philological reasons, alleged to be derived from, or supported by, evidence external to Daniel, in order to show that it could not have been written in the sixth century B.C. The most admirable thing about Doctor Driver, and that which gained for him his exalted position in the scholarly world, was the masterly manner with which he essayed to support his judgments based upon the internal evidence of a book by evidence external to the book itself. What I object to in the case of Doctor Driver and his followers, is that they seem to seek in every possible way to pervert the internal and external evidence as to the Canon in general, and as to the canonicity and date of Daniel in particular, so as to confirm their own preconceived opinion as to what they ought to be. For as to the internal evidence, no one can doubt that the Book of Daniel claims on the face of it to be genuine. It purports to make known to us the deeds of Daniel and his three companions and the visions of the former. It relates itself to the history of the sixth century B.C. That it is full of alleged miracles and of accurate and detailed predictions, is not internal

⁷³L. O. T., p. xi.

evidence against its historicity or date; for the histories of the Old and New Testaments, as well as those of Ashurbanipal, Nabunaid, and Alexander, are full, also, of alleged miracles and predictions. The only thing for us to do is to recognize the internal testimony at its face value and to test this testimony by means of all the external evidence that is relevant and available. In the case before us, the specific charge is made, that the Book of Daniel cannot be genuine, because the book itself claims to be, in large part at least, a work from the sixth century B.C., whereas its position in the Canon indicates that it cannot have been written before the second century B.C. To support this charge, it is alleged that the part of the Old Testament which in our present Hebrew Bibles is called the Prophets, embracing only Josh., Jgs., Sam., Kgs., Isa., Jer., Ezk. and the twelve Minor Prophets,—eight books in all according to the reckoning of the ancient authorities—, was canonized and closed at, or before the year 200 B.C.

Now, since all admit that the prophetic books were canonized before 200 B.C. and called the Prophets, the only question at issue is as to the correctness of the use of the word "closed" as applied to the books called Prophets. Is there evidence to prove that the eight books named in Baba Bathra were then canonized, and called Prophets, and that afterwards no book, or part of a book, was ever added to, or taken away from, the eight that were thus canonized and named Prophets? If this can be proven it would have to be admitted that the Book of Daniel cannot have been among them. If, on the other hand, it can be shown by external evidence, that the division of the Old Testament Canon called the Prophets contained at an earlier time than that at which the Baba Bathra was written more books than the eight named in its list, it follows that Daniel may have been one of these books. For some reason, known or unknown to us, it may have been removed from an earlier position among its fellow prophets; but the fact will be patent that its later position among the Hagiographa would not indicate that the book was not in existence before 200 B.C.

THE CANON OF THE PROPHETS

1. Direct Evidence

There are six prime witnesses, antedating the time at which the first sketch of the Mishna was written, and they all testify clearly that an eight-booked Canon of the Prophets was not in existence in the time at which they wrote. These witnesses are the Prologue to Ecclesiasticus, Philo, Luke, Matthew, Josephus, and Melito. I shall discuss them in the order, Josephus, Luke, Matthew, Philo, the Prologue to Ecclesiasticus, and Melito.

1. *Josephus.* Josephus is the principal witness, because he states expressly that the Jews had only twenty-two canonical books.

Of his twenty-two books he specifies five as constituting the Law and four as containing "hymns to God and precepts for the conduct of human life." These last were probably the Ps., Prov., Eccl. and the Song of Songs. This would leave Josh., Jgs., Sam., Kgs., Ezra-Neh., Chr., Est., Job, Isa., Jer., Ezk., Dnl. and the Twelve Minor Prophets as the thirteen others,—he having counted Ruth as part of Jgs., Neh. as one with Ezra, and Lam. as belonging to Jer. Job was accounted a prophetical book, as in Ben Sira, xlix. 9.

Now, whatever may be thought about the opinion of Josephus as to the time when the last of the prophetical books was written, seeing that this opinion is expressed about events which happened 500 years before his time, there is no reason to doubt that in telling of the number and divisions of the books held sacred by the Jews of his time, no witness could possibly be better. For he was a priest of the royal Asmonean line, educated in all the wisdom of the innermost circles of Jewish scholarship, possessed of the official Temple copy of the original Hebrew Scriptures, which had been taken from the Temple and presented to him by Titus himself. He certainly would not in a controversial treatise, like that against Apion, where he challenges the world to dispute his statements and constantly appeals to written documents and to the acknowledged current opinions of the contemporary

Jews,—he certainly would not have dared to divide the books of the Jews as he does, unless that division was the one accepted by the learned Jerusalem scholars of his day. And in this division he certainly places Daniel in the second of the three divisions, which embraced all the books except the Law and the Poetical books.

2. *Luke xxiv. 44.* The next Jewish testimony is that of Luke xxiv. 44, where Jesus is represented as saying, "All things must be fulfilled, which are written in the Law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me." This passage from Luke's Gospel I am not introducing in evidence as the infallible statement of an inspired book, nor as having back of it the authority of an infallible man, nor even as having ever been said by Jesus at all; but simply as an ordinary statement of the writer of this book, called the Gospel of Luke. It is admitted by all the leading critics that this book was written before or about the year A.D. 70.⁷⁴ And no text is better supported than that of this verse. What, then does this verse prove? It proves that in the time when Luke wrote, the Jews divided the books of the Old Testament into three parts, the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms. Everyone admits that by Law the five books of Moses are meant. In view of the statement of his contemporary, Josephus, it would be most natural to suppose that by Psalms he means what Josephus includes in his third division, that is, the books called by us, Pss., Prov., Eccl., and Song of Songs. In the Prophets, there would be included the other thirteen books which Josephus embraces in his second division, including, of course Daniel.

3. *Matthew xxiv. 15.* That the writer of Matthew's Gospel, also, considered Daniel to be among the prophets is supported by Mt. xxiv. 15, where we read of "the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet."

Doctor Driver, in his discussion of the Canon in the opening chapter of his *Literature of the Old Testament*, as well as in his chapter in the same volume on the Book of Daniel, studiously

⁷⁴J. A. McClymont, *The History and Results of New Testament Criticism*, p. 142f.

avoids all reference to this testimony of the New Testament books to the opinions of the Hebrew writers as to the Old Testament Canon. He appeals at length to the Talmud, Josephus, Ben Sira, 2 Maccabees, and 4 Ezra; but passes by in silence the testimony of the New Testament, of Melito, and of all Christian writers! One might understand the motive for this in a Jew, but it is hard to understand what possible motive a Christian can have in thus ignoring the testimony of writings whose date is certainly as determinable as that of 4 Ezra, 2 Maccabees, or the Talmud, and whose veracity as respects the point here at issue can not be questioned.

Cornill, indeed, goes one step farther than Driver; for he says that "Jesus cannot be appealed to as witness for the Old Testament Canon."⁷⁵ This is a confusion of the point in discussion. If he means that we have not written testimony by Jesus himself as to the Old Testament Canon, no one has ever claimed as much. But if he means that we have less direct and reliable testimony as to what Jesus thought about the Old Testament Canon than we have in regard to what the Jews of his time thought, Josephus and the New Testament writers alone excepted, why does he not state where this direct and reliable testimony is to be found? I know of none such. He goes on to say, "He, (i.e., Jesus) indeed lived and moved in the holy literature of Israel, toward which He did not take up any different position from that of His Jewish contemporaries, and, in fact, in His days almost the same books were counted as Holy Scripture as are found in our Old Testament."⁷⁶ How does he know that Jesus took up the same position as His contemporaries? He can know it only from Josephus, Philo, and the New Testament, as far as contemporary written testimony is concerned; and, as we have seen, Josephus and the New Testament both have three divisions of the Canon and both place Daniel among the Prophets. Jesus, therefore, must have done the same, Cornill himself being witness.

Cornill's statement that "in fact in His (i.e., Jesus') days almost the same books were counted as Holy Scriptures as are

⁷⁵ *Introduction*, p. 482.

⁷⁶ *Id.*, pp. 482, 483.

found in our Old Testament," will be readily admitted by all, except for the word "almost." The only ground for the insertion of this limiting particle is that the Sanhedrin, said to have been held at Jamnia at some time between A.D. 70 and 100, expressed itself in favour of the canonicity of certain books whose right to a place in the Canon had been disputed. To which it may be said that no contemporary testimony bears witness to any such Sanhedrin or to any such dispute. Any knowledge that such a Sanhedrin was ever held is due to a tradition among the Jews first put in writing about A.D. 200. A writer who ignores the testimony of Melito and Origen and subjects to severe criticism the testimony of the New Testament and Josephus, should not be so ready to accept an unwritten tradition of the Jews!

But even granting that some books were disputed in A.D. 100, or at the time of Rabbi Akiba (A.D. 135), or at any other time, let it be remarked that *Daniel was not one of the books disputed*. Let it be remarked again that Ezekiel was one of the disputed books. If Ezekiel, a book which all the critics say was in the second part of the Canon—a part which they say was canonized by 200 B.C.—could be disputed as late as A.D. 100, three hundred years after it was canonized, and six hundred and fifty years after it was written, how does it follow that the disputing of the canonicity of Esther, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Songs shows in the opinion of the critics that they were written late? At any rate, how does the disputing of one or all of these books affect the canonicity of Daniel, a book that, so far as we know, was never disputed?

But not only was the book of Daniel not disputed,⁷⁷ but Daniel himself was held by Josephus to have had "strange revelations made to him and those as to one of the greatest of the prophets" (*Antiq.* X. x. 1.7). And with the writers of the New Testament, and from all accounts, with the Lord Himself,

⁷⁷ This is certainly true of the Hebrew portion of Daniel. In *Yadaim* iv, 5 it is said that the Aramaic passages in Ezra and Daniel defile the hands (*i.e.*, are canonical). These Aramaic passages may have been disputed simply because they were written in Aramaic rather than Hebrew. (See above, pp. 19 f.).

Daniel was among the greatest in his influence, his book being either referred to or cited by them more than a hundred times.

4. *Philo Judæus*. The next Jewish testimony to the Old Testament Canon is to be found in Philo Judæus, who flourished about A.D. 40. In describing the Therapeutæ, he says that "they receive the Law, and the Oracles uttered by the Prophets, and the hymns and the other (writings) by which knowledge and piety are augmented and perfected."⁷⁸ In this statement, the "hymns" are evidently the Psalms, and the "other writings," possibly Prov., Eccl., and the Song of Songs, corresponding to the "precepts for conduct of human life" of Josephus. At any rate, it seems certain that the only place for Daniel in this list is among the Prophets.

5. *The Prologue to Ben Sira*. The fifth direct Jewish witness to the threefold division of the Old Testament books is to be found in the Prologue to the Greek translation of Jesus ben Sira, made by his grandson of the same name. This Prologue was most probably written in 132 B.C. He mentions the threefold division three times. First, he says that "many and great things have been delivered unto us by the law, the prophets, and the other (books) which follow after them." Secondly, he says that his grandfather Jesus had given himself to "the reading of the law and the prophets and other ancestral books." Thirdly, he speaks of "the law itself, and the prophets, and the rest of the books." Since he intimates nothing as to the character of the contents of the second and third parts nor as to the number of books in each, it is simply a matter of conjecture as to where he may have put Daniel. It seems likely that he placed it in the second division rather than in the third, in view of the fact that the next witnesses in point of time (that is, Philo, Luke, Josephus, and perhaps the writer of the Ascension of Isaiah), all put it there; and further, in view of the fact that never till the Talmudical period do we find Daniel placed anywhere else. Certainly, at least, no laws of evidence will permit the critics to force Daniel into the third division on the ground of testimony

⁷⁸ *De Vita Contemplativa*, ii, 475; vd. Budde, *Kanon*, p. 56.

which was written from 200 to 500 years later than the time when this Prologue was written.

6. *Melito of Sardis*. The sixth first-class witness is Melito, bishop of Sardis at about A.D. 180. He says that he desired to make an accurate statement of the ancient books as regards their number and order and that when he had gone to the East and come to the place where the things (recorded in them) were preached and done, he learned accurately the books of the Old Testament and sent the names of them in a letter to his friend Onesimus. In the list of these names he gives the Prophets as consisting of the following: Isaiah, Jeremiah, the Twelve, Daniel, Ezekiel and Esdras. Some doubt may be felt as to whether he meant to put Esdras among the Prophets; but there can be none as to Daniel, because it precedes Ezekiel. Further, it will be noted that Melito does not put Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings among the Prophets; but puts them, followed by Chronicles, after the Pentateuch and before the Psalms of David. It is scarcely possible, in view of his deliberate and voluntary statement that he had carefully investigated as to the number and order of the books, that he would have intentionally made a false list of them, especially in view of the fact that such a falsehood could so easily have been exposed. We are justified, therefore, in concluding that at his time there was either no fixed order and number of books in the division of the Prophets; or that the order was afterwards changed.

All the direct evidence, then, that precedes the year 200 A.D., supports the view that Daniel was in the earliest times among the Prophets. Further, this conclusion is supported by all the direct evidence outside the Talmud, which is later than A.D. 200. Thus Origen, at A.D. 250, and Jerome, at A.D. 400, both of whom were taught by Jewish Rabbis and claim to have gained their information from Jewish sources, put Daniel among the Prophets and separate the strictly prophetic books from those which are more properly called historical. And, lastly, all the Greek uncials and the Greek and Latin fathers, unite in placing Daniel among the Prophets and in separating the Prophets from the Historical Books.

2. *Other Evidence to Canon of Prophets*

Nor can the view that Daniel was originally among the Prophets be successfully impugned on the ground that other testimony, mostly late and indirect, indicates the contrary.

1. *Council of Jamnia.* Appeal has frequently been made to the Sanhedrin of Rabbis held at Jamnia some time between A.D. 70 and 100, as having first settled authoritatively for the Jews the extent of their Canon. This testimony, however, is rendered less valuable owing to the fact that it is not contemporaneous, i.e., we have no *written* records referring to any such Sanhedrin going back beyond the two tractates of the Mishna called *Yadayim* and *Idayot*, which were written about 200 A.D. However, admitting that the testimony is genuine, what does it prove? Simply that certain books had a right to be held as canonical. These books were Ezk., Prov., Est., Eccl., the Song of Songs, Jon. and Ruth, and the Aramaic portions of Ezra and Dnl. With regard to Jonah no technical phrase is used; with respect to Ezekiel and Proverbs, the question was whether they should be withdrawn (*genaz*); with regard to the Aramaic portions of Daniel and Ezra, it is said that they defile the hands; with regard to the four others the question was whether they *defiled the hands*. With regard to the meanings of these two terms, the following may be said: (1) *Genaz*, in the technical sense in which it is used in the discussion of the Canon, means "to withdraw from use."⁷⁹ "The Talmudical view is that canonical books may *not* be 'hidden,' for this is only done in the case of books which are really offensive."⁸⁰ "The books which the Rabbins 'hide' (*genaz*) are always books the contents of which were regarded as objectionable, that is, heretical."⁸¹ "The word would be inapplicable if applied to the books of the Hebrew Canon, or to the books of the Apocrypha."⁸² (2) With regard to the phrase, "defile the hands," the author accepts the definition of this term given by Robertson Smith and elaborated by Budde in his work

⁷⁹ See Oesterley, *The Books of the Apocrypha*, p. 183.

⁸⁰ *Id.*, p. 184.

⁸¹ *Id.*, p. 185.

⁸² *Id.*, p. 185.

entitled, *Der Kanon des A. T.*, (p. 3-6). Budde first rejects the opinion of Buhl that it was meant by this phrase to guard against the profane use of worn-out (*abgenutzte*) rolls of the Scriptures; and the opinion of Strack and others that by this phrase it was meant that the Holy Scriptures, as unclean, should always be kept apart so as not to be exposed to harm resulting from touching consecrated corn or from eating by mice; and the opinion of Geiger, that holy books written upon the skin of unclean animals were alone to be declared unclean. "All such explanations," says he, "are contradicted by *Yad.* III. 4, where the question especially is decided whether the margins and back sides of the rolls made the hands unclean. In all these explanations, this question is never raised. It deserves to be noticed rather, that to the Holy Scriptures alone tradition ascribes a rendering of the hands unclean,—their touch making necessary a ritual washing of the hands." The Pharisees (under protest from the Sadducees)⁸³ attributed to the holy books such a high degree of holiness that whoever touched them dared not touch other things before he had observed the same ritual hand-washing as if he had touched something unclean. The correlative term for this kind of uncleanness of the hands is "holiness." "In accordance with this view, the Old Testament books are called in the Mishna 'the holy books'; or 'books of holiness.'" For these two attributes, holiness and uncleanness of the hands, are expressed at the same time and indeed only of a wholly limited number of writings, that is, the canonical."⁸⁴

It is necessary to observe in connection with this phrase (1) that only the Aramaic part of Daniel is spoken of in the Talmud as defiling the hands, it being taken for granted that the Hebrew portion did; (2) that the Aramaic portions of Ezra are said in

⁸³ Cf. *Yadayim*, iv, 6.

⁸⁴ Cf. *Yadayim*, iii, 5. See also Oesterley's discussion of this term in *The Books of the Apocrypha*, pp. 175-182, where he says, "Defilement arose from the fact that the canonical books were 'holy', and holy things defiled by touching them. Compare Lev. x. 10, where holy=unclean. According to Lev. xvii. Aaron washed after coming out of the most holy place and taking off his holy garments. So since sacredness was imputed to the canonical books, contact with them necessitated a washing of the hands; and therefore anyone who touched a sacred book was said to be defiled."

the same passage to defile the hands; (3) that Ezekiel, one of the Major Prophets and one cited already as a prophet by Jesus ben Sira, was disputed; (4) that Jonah, one of the Twelve, a portion of the Canon recognized by Jesus ben Sira, was possibly another one thus disputed; (5) that Proverbs, which all authorities acknowledge to have been one of the four books of Josephus' third division, and also to have been used by Ben Sira, is another of them; and (6) that Ruth, the composition of which Cornill puts in the time of Ezra-Nehemiah, is also disputed. So, then, the fact that the right of a book to a place in the Canon was disputed by some Jewish scholars does not prove that it had not been received as canonical before the time even of Ben Sira, the critics themselves being judges; for they all place Ezekiel and nearly all place Jonah, in the second, or prophetic division, which they state to have been "closed" about 200 B.C.⁸⁵ And, if this be so of books whose right to be in the Canon was disputed, how much more must it be true of a book like Daniel whose right to be in the Canon was never denied.

2. *First Maccabees*. Again, there is certain evidence in 1 Maccabees, also, that Daniel existed before the time of the Maccabees. For from the speech given in chap. ii, 51-60,⁸⁶ we learn, (1) that the author supposes that the story of Daniel and his three companions was known to the Jews before the rebellion under the Maccabees commenced. (2) That he considered Daniel and his companions to be as historical as Abraham, Joseph, Phinehas, Joshua, Caleb, David, and Elijah. (3) That a writer who was almost certainly a contemporary of most of the events that he narrates would scarcely have treated the information of a book of fiction written in his own age (i.e., if we date Daniel in 164-5 B.C., and 1 Macc. between 125 and 100 B.C.) as affording a fitting climax for a stirring exhortation such as Mattathias is said to have made to his compatriots. The writer must have believed that the stories of the fiery furnace and the lions' den were known not merely to Mattathias but to those whom he

⁸⁵ But Josephus, about 90 A.D., puts Ruth and Lamentations in the second division.

⁸⁶ Cf. supra p. 14.

addressed. As this address was made in the year 169 B.C., it is evident that the stories must have been in existence long enough to have been learned by Mattathias and his followers and also to have been accepted by them as true histories of what had occurred. Otherwise, to have placed the reference to them in the climax of his address would have weakened and made ineffective the force of his argument.

To use a phrase of Bevan's "it is marvellous" that no reference to Daniel is to be met with in 1 Macc. Notwithstanding that this first book of Maccabees is supposed by the critics to have been written at this time for the consolation of the Jewish patriots, this exact and sympathetic narrative never so much as alludes, except in the passage cited above, to either the Book of Daniel or its author! The failure to mention the writer of Daniel might be pardoned, inasmuch as he evidently intended that his work should be accepted as a production of the supposititious Daniel, whom he so often represents as speaking in the first person. Whether it was originated in the sixth or in the second century B.C., it is remarkable, however, that the writer of Second Maccabees takes no notice of it, and the writer of First Maccabees cites it but once. It is another remarkable fact that First Maccabees mentions no division of the Old Testament Canon except the Law.

3. *Aristeas*. Next, the Epistle of Aristeas, which was written about 200 B.C., shows no knowledge on the part of the author of any division of the Old Testament except the Law. This bears upon the controversy about Daniel only in so far as it shows that the omission of all references to books of the Old Testament and to persons and events mentioned in them does not prove that the author who fails to mention them was not cognizant of their existence, or that the books did not actually exist.⁸⁷

4. *Ecclesiasticus*. Again, the greatest of Jewish extra-canonical writings known to us, coming from pre-Maccabean times, is the book of Ecclesiasticus by Jesus ben Sira. The prologue to this

⁸⁷ Cooper, in the *Last of the Mohicans*, says that he examined many European and British accounts of the battle of Braddock and that in no one of them was the presence of Washington mentioned.

work, written by a second Jesus ben Sira, the grandson of the first, has already been considered. In the original work itself, we have a direct reference once to the Law of Moses (xxiv, 23), and many statements which show a knowledge of its contents. Many of the heroes of Israelitish history whom the author celebrates in his song of praise (xliv-1), are those whose merits are depicted in the Law. As to the prophetic books he shows his knowledge of the book of Joshua in his account of Joshua and Caleb (xlvi, 1-10), refers to Judges (xlvi, 11, 12), to Samuel the prophet (xlvi, 13-20), to Nathan and David (xlvii, 1-11), to Solomon (xlvii, 12-23), to Rehoboam and Jereboam the son of Nebat (xlvii, 23), to Elijah (xlviii, 1-12), to Elisha (xlviii, 12-14), to Hezekiah (xlviii, 17-22), to Isaiah (xlviii, 20-25), to Josiah (xlix, 1-4), to Jeremiah (xlix, 6, 7), to Ezekiel (xlix, 8), to Job (xlix, 9), to the Twelve (xlix, 10), though he mentions no one of them by name. Of the books afterwards classed among the Hagiographa, he mentions Job and Nehemiah and makes several citations from the parts of Chronicles which are not found among the parallels in Kings. He probably refers, also, to Ezra in xlix, 14, and possibly to Daniel in xlix, 10.

Nowhere in Ecclesiasticus do we find any knowledge of a threefold, or fourfold, division of the Old Testament; nor any intimation that the division of the Prophets had been closed; nor any indication, except perhaps in his use of the Law, of his having considered some books more sacred than others. Besides, he elaborates the praises of Simon the High Priest more than those of any of the great men of Israel whose records are found in the books of the Old Testament Canon. It is a remarkable fact that he does not pay any regard to the great men who had exercised their functions outside the bounds of the land of Israel, such as Jonah at Nineveh, Daniel in Babylon, and Mordecai in Persia. In speaking of Abraham, he does not refer to his coming out of Ur of the Chaldees, nor to his visit to Egypt. In speaking of Jacob, Joseph, and Aaron, he says nothing of the land of Egypt; nor does he intimate that Moses had ever been in Egypt, saying simply of the wonderful deeds done by him there, that "God gave him might in terrible wonders," and that "through the

word of his mouth he caused signs to happen quickly, and caused him to be strong before the king." Of all the foreign kings mentioned in the Old Testament, he refers to but two—once to Pharaoh and once to Sennacherib. As far as Daniel is concerned, therefore, and the foreign kings among whom he laboured, it is entirely in harmony with the plan of the work of Ben Sira, that no one of them should be noticed. This silence does not show that Ben Sira did not know about them. It was simply his determination to ignore them. Whether the books containing mention of one or all of them were among those deemed canonical by the Jews of his time, does not appear in any suggestion of his work. It will be noted especially that Ben Sira calls Job a prophet (xlix, 8), and that he places him between Ezekiel and the twelve Minor Prophets.

5. *Second Maccabees*. Another piece of circumstantial evidence with regard to the Old Testament Canon is to be found in the second chapter of Second Maccabees, where the author quotes a letter written in 124 B.C. as saying that Jeremiah the prophet gave them that were carried away the Law, charging them not to forget the commandments of the Lord, and exhorting them that the Law should not depart from their hearts and speaking of the things that were reported in the writings (or official archives) and commentaries (or memoirs) of Nehemiah; and how he, founding a library, gathered together the books of the Kings and the Prophets (Syr. "those of the Kings and those of the Prophets"), and those of David, and the epistles of the Kings concerning the holy gifts (Gk. *anathemata*; Syr. "offerings and sacrifices"); and that Judas in like manner gathered together all the things that had escaped (Syr. "had been scattered"), on account of the wars which we had, and they are still with us. Further in chap. xv, 9, Judas Maccabeus is represented as comforting the people out of the Law and the Prophets, and putting them in mind of the battles which they won afore.

This book of 2 Maccabees was probably written sometime in the first century B.C. and professes to be an epitome of an earlier work by Jason of Cyrene, unfortunately lost, but to which the

author of the epitome attributes an exact handling in a work of five books of every particular of the wars of the Maccabees.

The author of this letter contained in 2 Macc. seems to have divided the Jewish literature of Nehemiah's time into five or six parts, (1) the Law, (2) the books concerning Kings and Prophets, (3) the memoirs of Nehemiah, (4) the epistles of the Kings, and (5) the books of David. The Syriac version separates the Kings (which it renders kingdoms) from the Prophets, thus making six divisions. Of these divisions, three and four were added in the time of Nehemiah, and would be probably the subject-matter of our books of Ezra and Nehemiah. The books of David would be what Luke calls the Psalms. If Daniel were anywhere in any of these divisions, it would be in the second division of the Greek text, and in the second of its two sub-divisions in the Syriac version, that is, in the sub-division which concerned the Prophets.

It is true that the author of 2 Maccabees never mentions Daniel, nor does he refer to any of the events or persons recorded in his book. This, however, is more extraordinary, if the Book of Daniel were written in the second century B.C. than if it had been composed four centuries earlier.

6. *Martyrdom of Isaiah.* The next Jewish witness to the Canon is the Martyrdom of Isaiah embedded in the larger work called the Ascension of Isaiah. According to Charles, this work was probably known to the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, who seems to quote from it in Heb. xi, 37. If so, it will have been written before A.D. 70. In Book iv, 21, 22, he speaks of the Psalms, which he makes to include the Parables⁸⁸ of David and the Proverbs of Solomon and the words of Korah, Ethan, and Asaph; and proceeds to speak of the words of Am., Hos., Mic., Joel, Nah., Jon., Ob., Hab., Hag., Zeph., Zech. and Mal.,

⁸⁸ In the Ethopic original, the word for psalms "mazameret" is clearly the equivalent of the Hebrew "mizmor." The words, parables and proverbs, in Charles' version are translations of the same word "mesaleyata" of the original, the equivalent of the Hebrew "meshalim." While more commonly used for the proverbs of Solomon, it is employed also in Psalms xlix, 4 and lxxviii, 2, and in Job xxvii, 1 and xxix, 1 in the sense of "songs," or "poems."

and of the words of Joseph the Just,⁸⁹ and of the words of Daniel.

In this list, it will be observed that Daniel comes after the Minor Prophets and not among the Hagiographa; also, that the Twelve are arranged in an order not to be found elsewhere in any source. This unique arrangement shows conclusively that the books of the Old Testament were not fixed as to their positions when the book of the Ascension of Isaiah was written.

7. *Massoretic Notes.* Attention should be called also to three other items of indirect evidence as to the Old Testament Canon. One is that to be derived from the Massoretic notes to be found at the end of most of the books of the Old Testament. Among these notes is usually one telling of the number of Sedarim, or sections, in each book. Thus, Genesis is said to have 43; Exodus, 29; Leviticus, 23; Numbers, 32; Deuteronomy, 27; Joshua, 14; Judges, 14; 1 and 2 Samuel together, 34; 1 and 2 Kings, 35. So, the number of Sedarim is given at the end of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Job, Psalms, and Proverbs. The twelve Minor Prophets, Ezra and Nehemiah, and 1 and 2 Chronicles, have one each between them. Now, of the five Megilloth, only Esther and Ecclesiastes have a statement of their Sedarim. In the case of Ruth and Lamentations, this was doubtless because when the Sedarim were made and counted, the former was still united to Judges and the latter to Jeremiah. As to the Song of Songs, it would seem as if it in like manner had been counted with Ecclesiastes; since the Sedarim are given but once for the two books. The Talmud and all the ancient lists except Augustine and Junilius place Ecclesiastes before the Song. Augustine agrees with the Spanish and Massoretic manuscripts in giving the opposite order. The printed Bibles follow the German and

⁸⁹ Charles thinks that this probably refers to an extra-canonical book of antichristian character. In connection with the name of Daniel, it would be more natural to refer them to the well known Patriarch Joseph of Egypt, who like Daniel was a great interpreter of dreams. One is tempted to believe that the Ethiopic text has made the mistake of putting Joseph for Job. In the book of Job, i, 1, Job is called "the just." The letters for s and b are almost exactly alike in Ethiopic. If Job be the true reading, he would be classed among the Prophets, as in Ecclesiasticus xlix, 9, in the Hebrew and Syriac recensions.

French manuscripts in giving the order of their use in the yearly festivals, that is, the Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther. Junilius has a singular division and classification of his own into *Historia*, *Prophetia*, *Proverbia*, and *Dogmatica*; putting the Law, Ruth, Esther, and Job in the *Historia*, the Psalms in the *Prophetia*, the Song of Songs in the *Proverbia*, and classing Ecclesiastes all by itself as *Dogmatica*. He attempts apparently to arrange his so-called *Prophetia* in a chronological order, resulting as follows: Ps., Hos., Isa., Joel, Am., Ob., Mic., Nah., Hab., Zeph., Jer., Ezk., Dnl., Hag., Zech., Mal. Since this arrangement is thus so obviously due to an attempt to give a combined logical and chronological arrangement, his testimony on this point should be ruled out. This will leave Augustine as the only ancient source placing Ecclesiastes after the Song of Songs. But Augustine, like Junilius, has an arrangement all his own; for he divides all the books into *Historiae* and *Prophetae*. Among the *Historiae*, he counts the five of the Law, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, four of Kings, two of Chronicles, Job, Tobias, Esther, Judith, two of Maccabees, and two of Esdras. Among the *Prophets*, he counts the Psalms, Proverbs, the Song of Songs, Ecclesiastes, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, the Twelve (Minor Prophets), and the four Major Prophets in the order, Isa., Jer., Dnl., Ezek. It will be seen that he has invented an order for himself differing from all others, following the freedom of his own will without regard to the authorities that preceded him. Yet, it is noteworthy that the Massoretic and Spanish manuscripts have the same order as that of Augustine; and since the Massoretic manuscripts have transmitted to us the Massoretic notes, including the numbers of the Sedarim, the note giving the number of the Sedarim of the combined book is placed properly in our Bibles after the book of Ecclesiastes.

The testimony of the Massoretic notes on the Sedarim would indicate that these notes were made at a time when the Jews still counted Ruth as a part of Judges and Lamentations as a part of Jeremiah; and also, that when they were made, they counted Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs as one book. If Ruth and

Lamentations could, after the time when these notes were made, be separated from among the Prophets, so also could Daniel and Esther be thus separated. The evidence goes to prove that the position and divisions of the books as at present constituted has nothing necessarily to do with their age and canonicity.

8. *The Haphtaroth.* A piece of circumstantial evidence bearing upon the date is that suggested by Bevan when he says that the second or prophetic part of the canon cannot have been in use before 200 B.C. because no selection from Daniel appears in the Haphtaroth, or lessons read on Sabbaths and feast days in the Temple and synagogues. It must be admitted that no selection from Daniel is found in these lessons as read at present; but this is no proof that Daniel did not exist, or was not deemed a prophet, when these selections were made.⁹⁰

For, first, no one knows when these selections were first made and used. The earliest mention of their probable use is to be found in Luke iv, 16, where it is said that Jesus read in the synagogue on the Sabbath day the passage of Isaiah beginning with the words; "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me" (Isa. lxi, 1), but this is in no known Haphtaroth. But, since the Jews of the first century A.D. certainly acknowledged Daniel to be a prophet, they cannot have failed to make a selection from his prophecy because they did not consider him to be a prophet.

If, however, it be said that selections from the Prophets must have been made long before the first century A.D., I admit that they most probably were; but this is no proof that the Book of Daniel did not exist when they were made, or that it was not then placed among the Prophets, or even that selections from it were not at that time read in the synagogue services. For Büchler and others have shown beyond a doubt that three times as many passages were once read as are read to-day, that the limiting of the length to be read was late, and that passages from some of the prophets from which there are at present no selections were once read. The evidence collected above goes to show that only such sections were selected as magnified the Law and the Sab-

⁹⁰ See above pp. 32-35.

bath and the nationalistic hopes and aspirations of the Jews. Most of them have some readily visible point of contact with the portion of the Law which was to be read on the day for which the particular Haphtara was selected. Thus at the feast of the passover, such portions of the prophetic books as Josh. v, 2-vi, 27 which recounts the great passover at Gilgal, and 2 Kgs. xxiii, 1-27 which tells of the great passover of Josiah, were read. For Ex. xxv-xxx, 10, which gives the plan of the tabernacle, or Ex. xxxv-xl, which gives an account of the completion of the tabernacle, the portions chosen as Haphtaroth are from 1 Kgs. v, 26 to vii, 51. For the passage, Ex. xxx, 11 f., which tells about the golden calf, the appropriate Haphtara is the account of the controversy between Elijah and Ahab recorded in 1 Kgs. xviii, 1-39. The account of the spies of Jericho is read with Nu. xiii, which tells of the other spies who were sent to spy out the land. The Haphtaroth, then, were selected with a regard to the appropriateness of their contents for the occasion, and for the portion of the Law which they were meant to illustrate. Those who made the selections were the judges of what they deemed to be appropriate. Some of us might differ from these judges as to the aptness of some of their selections. We might even go so far as to contend that some of their principles of selection were wrong. We might have taken one from Haggai, which they apparently did not. We might have retained one, or more, of the portions which once were read from Zephaniah and Nahum, which the modern Hebrews have rejected. We might, possibly, have found some portion in Daniel appropriate to be read, which they apparently did not find. But the fact remains that the selection of the Haphtaroth had nothing to do with the age of the books nor, as far as we know, with the position of a book among the divisions of the Old Testament as they were constituted at the time when these Haphtaroth were chosen. Did Professor Bevan ever attempt to select a few passages from the Book of Daniel which he thinks more appropriate for reading in the services of the synagogue on any given occasion, or along with any particular portion of the Law, than that which as a matter of fact is now employed? I for one think that the Jews

have done about the best that was possible in harmony with the principles upon which they acted in the making of their choice.

Further, it seems to me that what we have just learned about the Haphtaroth affords the best explanation possible for the reduction of the number of the books in the prophetic division from its earlier number as given by Josephus to the number as derived from the list of prophetic books as given in the Mishna, that is, from 13 to 8. When once the Haphtaroth had been selected, a reason would at once be apparent why the books in which they were contained should be put and kept together for readiness of use in the services of the synagogue; just as in later times the five Megilloth were put together for the same purpose, or, as in the modern Vienna edition of Adelbert della Torre, we find the Hebrew Torah, the Targum of Onkelos, the Five Megilloth, and various prayers and comments published in one volume, together with the appropriate Haphtaroth.

9. *O.T. Books written on Rolls or Tablets.* Such considerations as this last lead us naturally to the evidence as to the divisions and arrangements of the Old Testament books to be derived from the way in which we know that ancient books were written. In the pre-Christian times books were written upon tablets of clay or stone, or upon rolls of papyrus, or skin; so that instead of one book, the Old Testament contained from 22 to 39 books according to the number of rolls upon which it was written. These books could be arranged in any order that suited the good pleasure of their owner. According to any system of arrangement, logical or chronological, the Law would naturally be put first; but the lists show that even here Melito and Leontius placed Numbers before Leviticus. It is noteworthy that there is no MS with the Pentateuch and Joshua alone; the Hexateuch is a creature of the imagination. The early editions of the printed Bible put the Megilloth immediately after the Law, though all the manuscripts, versions, and ancient lists, either put them all together in the third part of the Canon, or some among the Prophets, and some among the Poetical books. This will account, also, for the fact that no two ancient sources agree as to the order of the books. As the lists have been handed

down to us, it would be impossible for any one to say where certain books might be found. Job, for example, is placed by Cyril and by Epiphanius (in one of his three lists) immediately after the Law; whereas in the Codex Sinaiticus and in many Syriac MSS, it is the last book of all. Ruth, Lamentations, Chronicles, Esther, Psalms,—all shift their positions according to the pleasure of the owner, or the writer of the list. Some books, never acknowledged as canonical by the Jewish church, such as Tobit, Judith, and Wisdom, became mingled in certain collections of private owners of religious literature with the Holy Books, and in this manner probably they at first assumed a semi-canonical character, and were afterwards listed by their indiscriminating possessors among the canonical books. In the case of Daniel, however, it is found in all lists and sources, in all ages, always among the canonical books, and always in the ancient sources among the Prophets, except in the list found in the Baba Bathra.

CONCLUSIONS

The evidence given above and its discussion permit only of the following conclusions:

1. That the position of a book in the Hebrew Canon was not determined by the time at which it was written.
2. That the position of a book in the list of the Mishna, or of the Hebrew manuscripts, versions, and editions, does not determine the time at which it was admitted to the Canon.
3. That all the earlier Hebrew sources, and all the Greek, Latin, Syriac, and Armenian sources put Daniel among the Prophets.
4. That Daniel's genuineness, or its right to be in the Canon, was never disputed by the ancient Jews or Christians except possibly the Aramaic portions.
5. That there is no external evidence, direct or indirect, except the argument from the silence of Ecclesiasticus, that Daniel was not composed till the time of the Maccabees.
6. That the silence of Ecclesiasticus is more than offset by the silence of 1 and 2 Maccabees, and of all other sources, as to the

origination of any such book, or the existence of the author of any such book, at the time of the Maccabees.

7. That there is no direct evidence of the existence of a three-fold division earlier than the prologue of Jesus ben Sira, written in 132 B.C.

8. That the absence of any selection from Daniel in the Haphtaroth does not prove that the Book of Daniel was not in existence, or acknowledged as canonical, when the Haphtaroth were chosen.

9. That Daniel was always considered by Josephus, and by the writers of the New Testament, to be a prophet, and that his book was placed by the same authorities among the prophetic books.

10. That all the early Hebrew authorities which place Daniel among the Prophets, agree with the Mishna in holding to a three-fold division of the Canon.

11. That the testimony that we possess does not show that the second part of the Canon was closed before the books of the third part were all written.

12. That the assumption that the division of the Hebrew Canon called the Prophets in our present editions of the Hebrew Bible was doubtless formed prior to the Hagiographa, is unfounded, inasmuch as there is no evidence that this division as it is now made was in existence before the second century A.D.

13. That all witnesses agree in putting the Law first; and that Melito and Leontius alone change the order of the books of the Law, in that they put Numbers before Leviticus.

14. That not one of the ancient witnesses puts the five Megilloth together, not even the Talmud.

15. That in nearly all the lists, the five poetical books are placed together.

16. That the only great difference of order between Philo, Luke, and Josephus, representing the earliest Hebrew arrangement, and the early Christian lists, arises from the fact that the former put the poetical books at the end, whereas the latter usually place them before the sixteen books of the Prophets.

17. That the books of the Old Testament Canon were never

authoritatively and fixedly arranged in any specific order, either by the Jews, or by the Christians.

18. That the order has nothing to do with the canonicity, nor necessarily even with the date of a book.

19. That length, supposed authorship, subject-matter, and convenience, as well as the material upon which a book was written, were the potent factors in all the ancient arrangements of the books.

20. That since the modern Jews have changed the position of Ruth, Lamentations, and Esther, to suit their convenience in the public service, there is every reason to believe that their so-called book of the Prophets was collected together into one for the same reason; and that the omission of Daniel from this collection had nothing to do either with its age or canonicity, but simply with the fact that it was not employed in these public services.

20a. That the Haphtaroth and the eight prophetic books never are found in the same MSS.

21. That all the testimony that the ancient Jewish and Christian sources give, bearing upon the time of the composition of the Old Testament books, is consentient in granting the claims of the books themselves as to their historicity, genuineness, and authority.

22. That the determining factor in the canonization of a book was its supposed age and author, its agreement with the Law, and its approval by the prophets.

23. That in accordance with these rules Ecclesiasticus, Tobit, Maccabees, and other apocryphal books on the one hand, and on the other hand the pseudepigraphical books of Adam, Enoch, Noah, Jubilees and the XII Patriarchs, were rejected from the Canon.

24. That those who rely upon documentary evidence, cannot escape the conclusion that the indictment against the Book of Daniel on the ground that it is not among the Prophets is false; and that in so far as the age and canonicity of the Book of Daniel are assailed on the ground of its position in the Canon, the old view stands approved.

CHAPTER II

DANIEL NOT QUOTED

THE design of this chapter is to show the absurdity of the claim made by the critics that the Book of Daniel cannot have been composed in the sixth century B.C. based on the fact that it is not quoted until the second century B.C. Following my usual method in discussing objections put forth against the *prima facie* evidence of the books of Scripture, I shall state the claim founded on the absence of citation, as it is made in the words of Professor Bevan of Cambridge, England, one of the most scholarly of the radical commentators on Daniel. Next, I shall give the assumptions involved in this claim, and lastly, I shall endeavour to show the baselessness of these assumptions.

THE CHARGE

“On the supposition that the narrative in Daniel is historical, it is marvellous that it should be passed over in utter silence by all extant Jewish writers down to the latter half of the 2nd century B.C., that it should have left no trace in any of the later prophetic books, in Ezra, Chronicles, or Ecclesiasticus. It is, of course, possible in each particular case to imagine some reason for the omission of the subject, but the cumulative evidence is not so easily set aside. Thus it has often been said that nothing can be concluded from the silence of Ben Sira in Ecclesiasticus xlix. But in order to realize the true state of the case we should consider how easy it would be to refute, from Jewish literature, any one who asserted that the book of Isaiah or that of Jeremiah was composed entirely in the Maccabean period.”¹

THE ASSUMPTIONS

There are in these objections four assumptions:

1. That it is marvellous that the narrative of Daniel if his-

¹ Bevan, *The Book of Daniel*, pp. 12, 13.

torical "should be passed over in utter silence by all extant Jewish writers down to the later half of the 2nd century B.C.

2. That it is marvellous, "that it should have left no trace in any of the later prophetic books, in Ezra, Chronicles or Ecclesiasticus."

3. That it is easy to refute from Jewish literature "anyone who asserted that the book of Isaiah or that of Jeremiah was composed entirely in the Maccabean period."

4. That there is cumulative evidence that Daniel did not exist, in the silence of the later prophets and other books with regard to it.

We will now discuss these four assumptions in the order in which they have been stated:

First Assumption

The first of these assumptions has absolutely nothing to support it, inasmuch as there are no Hebrew writings extant from before the Maccabean period, which could justly have been expected to mention Daniel.

Of the extra-biblical works of this period it is to be noted:

1. The fragments of *Aristobulus*, who wrote about 160 B.C. and is first mentioned in 2 Macc. i, 10 (written about 135 B.C.), say nothing about any of the historical persons or events of any book of the Old Testament; but state simply that the complete translation of the whole of the Law was made in the time of the king surnamed Philadelphus.²

2. The Aramaic fragments of *Ahikar* from the fifth century B.C. do not quote from any other Old Testament book. Why then should they have quoted Daniel?

3. Whenever the books of *Jubilees* and the *XII Patriarchs* were written, it is obvious that they could not have quoted Daniel or any of the prophets without stultifying themselves; since they claim to have been apocalypses composed before the time of Moses.

4. The *Letter of Aristeas* written in Greek about 200 B.C. "does

² Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* xiii, 12, 2.

not profess to discuss the origin of any part of the Alexandrian Bible except the Pentateuch." A careful reading of it fails to reveal any reference to any of the books or events or persons of the Old Testament except those that belong to the Books of Moses.

5. Aside from the books named in the second assumption, the only Biblical book which claims to have been written in this period is that of Esther. Since this book does not mention any of the other prophets, there is no good reason why it should be expected to mention Daniel. Again, if its failure to mention Daniel shows that Daniel did not exist, it might be argued that its failure to mention the other prophets proved that they also did not exist. This would be absurd. Besides, no one claims this.

It is, therefore, perfectly fair to affirm that the assumption that Daniel might be expected to have been mentioned in these Jewish writings from before the time of the Maccabees is without any foundation whatever.

Second Assumption

In the second assumption, however, it is presumed that Daniel ought to have been mentioned in the later prophetic writings, or in Ezra, Chronicles, or Ecclesiasticus.

The late prophetic writings are Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi; to which some critics would add Jonah and Joel. Since no one of these prophets refers by name to Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, or any of the earlier prophets, it can hardly seem *marvellous* that they do not refer to Daniel. As to Chronicles, why should it be considered marvellous that Daniel is never mentioned in it, seeing that with the exception of the last ten verses and the fragments of one or two genealogies, the history contained therein ceases with the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar? To be sure, we find Isaiah prominent in the part narrating the political history of Hezekiah, and Jeremiah is said to have lamented the untimely end of Josiah and to have prophesied the captivity in Babylon and its end after 70 years; but there was no occasion for naming Daniel, who had nothing directly to do with the political affairs of Jerusalem. Moreover Daniel's history and visions occurred in the time of Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar, Darius and Cyrus, at

the beginning and near, or after, the end of the captivity, and the history of Chronicles with the exception of the last two verses extends merely till the destruction of Jerusalem. Besides, Chronicles contains no mention of Ezekiel, nor of any of the Minor Prophets.

As to the last two verses of Chronicles where it is said that Jehovah, in order that the word of the Lord by Jeremiah the prophet might be accomplished, stirred up the spirit of Cyrus so that he made the decree to rebuild Jerusalem, can it really seem marvellous to Bevan that Daniel is not mentioned there? Perhaps, he would have had the author throw out *Jehovah* and put Daniel in its place?

Further, why should it seem a marvellous thing, that no trace of Daniel appears in Ezra? It will be just as hard to find in Ezra any trace of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and of any of the Minor Prophets except Haggai and Zechariah,—and Haggai and Zechariah are named because they lived and laboured with Jeshua and Zerubbabel in the building of the second temple, of which Ezra gives the history. Some analogies to Ezekiel may be found in Ezra, because they are both writing largely of matter concerning the Law; but the name of Ezekiel is not found, nor is his book referred to.

The discussion of the silence of Ecclesiasticus, the last of the books appealed to by Bevan, as to Daniel will be reserved for the next chapter. Suffice it to say at this point that Daniel is possibly referred to in chap. xlix, 10; but if this be not admitted, it is possible that Ben Sira did not mention Daniel, either because he was opposed to his doctrines, or because he was not personally acquainted with his book.

It is not so certain, as Bevan would have us suppose, that the LXX translation of Deut. xxxii, 8 was not influenced by the view of angels propounded in Daniel. It certainly looks as if it were, and we need more than the mere *opinion* of a modern scholar to prove that it was not.

In this connection, too, one might ask why Bevan fails to appeal to Nehemiah. For it is certain that his prayer in chap. ix, has a striking resemblance to the prayer of the ninth chapter of Daniel.

One of them almost certainly had the prayer of the other in mind when he made his own. Since Daniel purports to have made his prayer about the middle of the sixth century B.C. and Nehemiah his toward the end of the fifth, the *prima facie* evidence would assuredly be in favour of Daniel.

Lastly, the testimony of Ezekiel as to the existence and character of Daniel is not to be so easily set aside as Bevan and others suppose. Ezekiel mentions him by name together with Noah and Job in xiv, 14, 20 and xxviii, 3. So far as we know, no other Daniel but the one who flourished at Babylon as a contemporary of Ezekiel can have been compared in wisdom with Noah and Job. It would have been senseless for Ezekiel to have appealed to the wisdom of a person unknown to his hearers and readers. It is not fair to say, that he could not have cited the wisdom of a contemporary. Napoleon, even during his lifetime, was frequently compared to Alexander and Cæsar, and to-day some compare Hindenburg to Napoleon. Anyone of us might use Bismarck or Cavour as examples of statesmanship. It was a natural compliment to his great compatriot on the part of Ezekiel and an appeal which those whom he addressed could all understand, since they had doubtless all heard of the wisdom of Daniel and what it had brought to him at the court of Nebuchadnezzar.

Third Assumption

In regard to the third assumption, it cannot be admitted that the cases of Isaiah and Jeremiah on the one hand, and that of Daniel on the other are identical. In the case of the former, we have the books of Kings and Chronicles covering the whole period in which Isaiah lived and a large part of that in which Jeremiah lived. Besides, Isaiah lived more than one hundred and fifty years before Daniel and his work is one of the earliest of the prophetic books, and Jeremiah laboured mostly before the destruction of Jerusalem, and both were intimately bound up with the history of Jerusalem and its kings and prophesied to and for the people of Israel in particular. Whereas Daniel prophesied and wrote after most of the books of the Old Testament had been written. No history covering his time has come down to us. His labours had

nothing to do with Jerusalem, or its kings, and his prophecies concerned the world at large rather than the Jewish people in particular.

Moreover, it is not so much easier to prove by external evidence that the prophecy of Isaiah is pre-Maccabean than it is to show that Daniel was. For what is the evidence aside from the book itself for the early date of Isaiah? The Book of 2 Kings? No, for it contains no evidence as to Isaiah except what is found in substantially the same words in chaps. xxxvi-xxxix of Isaiah itself. The Book of 2 Chronicles? No, for it again contains nothing about Isaiah except what is found in Kings and in chaps. xxxvi-xxxix of the Book of Isaiah. In these three books we have, except for slight textual variations, exactly the same account of the reign of Hezekiah and of the person and work of Isaiah. This account does not mention the prophecies contained in Isa. i-xxxv, and xl-lxvi; nor that Isaiah ever wrote such prophecies at all. For direct evidence in favour of the genuineness and authenticity of the prophetic parts of the Book of Isaiah, we are left, therefore, as far as these three books are concerned, to the internal evidence of the prophecies themselves. They stand on exactly the same footing in this respect as the Book of Daniel. If we are not allowed, then, to use the *prima facie* evidence of the Book of Daniel, neither should we use *prima facie* evidence of the Book of Isaiah.

As to other evidence for the Book of Isaiah, what is there? The three verses of chap. ii, 2-4, which are almost the same as iv, 1-3 of Micah? But, if the author of Isaiah quoted Micah, he may have quoted him as well in the 2nd century B.C. as in the 7th or 8th. In 2 Chron. xxvi, 22, we are told that Isaiah, the son of Amos, wrote the acts of Uzziah, first and last. Whatever this work may have been, it is no part of our present Book of Isaiah. Again, in 2 Chron. xxxii, 32, it is said, that "the rest of the acts of Hezekiah and his goodness are written in the vision of Isaiah, the son of Amos, in the book of the kings of Judah and Israel." This is probably the book from which the historical section of Isaiah, contained in chaps. xxxvi-xxxix, was taken. It cannot be shown to have embraced the other chapters.

Lastly, there is the evidence of the Book of Ecclesiasticus as to Isaiah. Let us cite the evidence in full. It will be found in Ecclesiasticus xlvi, 17-25, and is as follows :

17. Hezekiah fortified his city and brought water into the midst thereof: he digged the hard rock with iron (Heb. bronze) and constructed wells for water (Heb. dammed up mountains for a pool). 18. In his days Sennacherib came up, and sent Rabshakeh and lifted up his hand against Zion, and boasted proudly. 19. Then trembled their hearts and hands, and they were in pain as women in travail. But they called upon the Lord who is merciful (Heb., God Most High) and stretched out their hands toward him: and immediately the Holy One heard them out of heaven (Heb., and he heard the voice of this prayer), and delivered them by the hand of Isaiah. 21. He smote the camp of the Assyrians and his angel destroyed them (Heb., and he discomfited them with a plague. Syr., with a great plague). 22. For Hezekiah had done the thing that pleased the Lord (Heb. omits the Lord) and was strong in the ways of David his father (Heb. omits his father), according as Isaiah the prophet who was great and faithful in his visions had commanded him. 23. Also in his days the sun went backward (Syr., stood) and he lengthened the king's life. 24. He saw by an excellent spirit (Heb. Syr., "strong spirit") what should come to pass at the last, and he comforted them that mourned in Zion. 25. He showed what should come to pass forever, and secret things or ever they came.

This extract gives the only direct evidence to be found in Ecclesiasticus to the existence and labours of Isaiah. And what does this evidence prove? Only that Ben Sira knew that part of Isaiah which is embraced in chapters xxxvi, xxxix, (the exact portions which are found also in Kings and Chronicles!) and that he was acquainted with the so-called Deutero-Isaiah beginning in Isa. xl, with the words "Comfort ye, comfort ye, my people," or at least with lxi, 2, 3, where we find the words "to comfort them that mourn in Zion," and with their context, where we find the reference to the glorious future of Israel! In other words, the only part of the *prophecies* of Isaiah which Ben Sira proves to have existed before his time is the part which the critics say that Isaiah never wrote at all!

As to other Biblical testimony, Isaiah is worse off than Daniel. For, whereas in the case of Daniel, Bevan would deem it "marvellous" that he is not mentioned in the later Hebrew prophets

(i.e., in Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi), Isaiah is not merely not mentioned in them, but neither is he mentioned in Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Jeremiah, or Ezekiel, nor in Ezra, Nehemiah, or Esther,—all of whom were later than he and must have been acquainted with his works. Furthermore, the letter of Aristæus never mentions Isaiah nor does any extra-Biblical source, except Ecclesiasticus, till the time of Maccabees.

Again, the fatuity of the argument against Daniel based on the fact that he is not mentioned in the post-captivity literature can not be more clearly shown than in the following comparisons:

1. Daniel is mentioned by name only in Ezk. xiv, 14, 20 and xxxviii, 3 and is referred to in 1 Macc. ii, 59, 60.

2. But (1) Isaiah is never mentioned by name by any of the prophets who succeeded him; and is referred to in the O.T., aside from a brief reference in 2 Chron. xxvi, 22, only in the passages of 2 Kings and 2 Chronicles which are as we have seen the same as those found in Isaiah xxxvi-xxxix. He is quoted possibly in Mic. iv, 1-3. Outside the O.T., he is first cited in Jewish literature in Ecclesiasticus xlvi, 22-25, where his name also is mentioned. The passages in 1 Macc. vii, 41 and 2 Macc. xv, 22 which mention the destruction of the army of Sennacherib, may have been derived from 2 Kings or 2 Chronicles as well as from Isaiah xxxvii. Yet the Book of Ecclesiasticus was written 520 years after the admittedly genuine prophecies of Isaiah.

(2) Jeremiah is referred to by name in Dan. ix, 2 and in 2 Kings and 2 Chronicles; but is not mentioned, nor cited, in Haggai, Zechariah, or Malachi, nor in Ezra, except in i, 1, which is the same as 2 Chr. xxxvi, 22. Afterwards, he is not cited nor mentioned till in Ecclus. xlix, 6, 7 and next in the 1st century B.C. in 2 Macc. ii, 1-8 and xv, 14 and in the introduction of the apocryphal Epistle of Jeremiah. It is remarkable that the book of Baruch does not mention him by name. It thus appears that Jeremiah is not mentioned by any Jewish writer from the time of the captivity till 180 B.C., except by the composer of the first two verses of Ezra, which are the same as the last two verses of 2 Chronicles. As the critics hold that these verses were not written till 300 B.C., or later, the external testimony to Jeremiah would

thus be for *them*, at least 250 years after the time of his death.

(3) Ezekiel is not mentioned by any writer of his own time, nor by any succeeding prophet, nor by any canonical book of the Old Testament. He is mentioned only in Ecclesiasticus xlix, 8 of all the Old Testament apocryphal literature. He is not named in the New Testament nor in Philo; but Josephus mentions him by name four times.³

(4) Of the Minor Prophets, Jonah, Haggai, and Zechariah alone are mentioned in the historical writings of the Old Testament and no one of them is mentioned by name in any other prophetic work, except Micah in Jer. xxvi, 18. No one of them is mentioned in extra-Biblical literature till New Testament times except Habakkuk in the apocalyptic additions to Daniel. In the New Testament the prophet Joel is named and cited in Acts ii, 16-21; and Jonah is mentioned and cited in Matt. xii, 39 and Lk. xi, 29. The others are not mentioned by name. It is true that Ben Sira in xlix, 10 speaks of the Twelve Prophets; but as he has not given their names, the testimony is so indefinite as to make it questionable whether Jonah was one of them!

The above considerations will be sufficient to show that the line of argument pursued by Bevan would, if valid, prove too much. It shows, also, that later Jewish writers were not in the habit of naming preceding ones, simply because they did not care to do so. If most of our modern critics, instead of citing what they call authorities, would do more investigating of original sources for themselves, it is certain that they would not make so many erroneous statements as now mar the works of some of them. The mania for citing opinions of modern writers instead of testing the evidence in ancient documents, is, like Achilles' wrath to Greece, the direful spring of woes unnumbered in the history of the literary criticism of the Biblical books.

With regard to Jeremiah, it will be readily admitted, that the proof outside the Book of Jeremiah itself that the prophecies were "not entirely written in the Maccabean period" is amply sufficient to satisfy any reasonable mind. But, when we come to the much more important question, and the real one at issue, as to whether

³ *Antiq.* X. v, 1, vi, 3, vii, 2, viii, 2.

the prophecies as a whole are genuine and authentic, the case of Jeremiah is not so much better, or easier, than is that of Daniel. Might we not say that it is "marvellous" that the Book of Kings which narrates at length the events of the reigns of Josiah, Jehoiakim, Jehoiachin and Zedekiah, never mentions Jeremiah by name, nor cites any of his prophecies or deeds? Is it not "marvellous" that Ezekiel never mentions, nor cites him, and that the post-exilic prophets never allude to him? Daniel, indeed, refers to him (ix, 2), but the critics are debarred from citing him except as a writer of the Maccabean times. It is to be feared that Bevan will find evidence in support of the direct historicity of Jeremiah to be confined in the Old Testament only to the much despised Book of Chronicles and the two verses repeated from it at the beginning of Ezra.⁴

Outside of the Old Testament, of the extant Jewish writings, the only ones which are generally acknowledged as having been written before Maccabean times are the letter of Aristeeus, Ahikar, parts of Enoch, the Epistle of Jeremy, and Ecclesiasticus. The first three named do not mention Jeremiah. The fourth purports expressly to be by him. The last cites (chap. xlix, 6, 7) from the first chapter of Jeremiah and from the events spoken of in Jer. xxxvii, 8 and xxxix, 6, as follows: "They burnt the holy city and destroyed its ways, according to the prophecy of Jeremiah. But they afflicted him, although he had been formed a prophet from the womb to root out and to pull down and to destroy, and in like manner to build, and to plant, and to restore."

It will be noted, that Bevan does not say that it would be easy to show that Ezekiel was not entirely Maccabean. And yet it is supported outside of its own self-witness by the statement of Ecclus, xlix, 8, 9 alone. Here we read: "It was Ezekiel who saw a glorious vision which was showed him upon the chariot of the cherubin. For he made mention of the enemies (or of Job) under the figure of the rain and directed them that went right." As

⁴ These verses according to the critics were written also by the Chronicler (Cornill p. 252). Driver puts the composition of Chronicles at about 300 B.C. (*L.O.T.* p. 535) and Cornill, "with absolute certainty" in the Greek period "perhaps the first half of the third century" B.C. (*Introd.* p. 228).

verse 9 probably refers to Job, only the 8th will refer to Ezekiel.

To sum up with regard to the third assumption, it will be seen that, outside of the testimony to be derived from the books themselves, Isaiah and Ezekiel are supported by the testimony of Ben Sira alone, Jeremiah by that of Ben Sira and the Chronicler, and Daniel by that of Ezekiel. According to all the laws of evidence, the testimony to Daniel's existence and wisdom, being that of a contemporary, who had opportunity and intelligence to know whereof he wrote and whose honesty cannot be impeached, would be better than the testimony to the others, dating as *the critics say* it does from the 3rd and 2nd centuries B.C., 400 to 500 years after the death of the men of whom they write.

Fourth Assumption

The fourth assumption is that the cumulative argument from silence shows that Daniel did not exist till about the middle of the second century B.C. While admitting that it is possible in each particular case to imagine some good reason for the silence, it is supposed that the cumulative silence is convincing. This is equivalent to saying that although two times nothing is nothing, yet two times nothing plus two times nothing plus two times nothing is something. Besides, it ignores the positive testimony to Daniel's existence and wisdom given by Ezekiel in three passages and the appeal of Mattathias about 168 B.C. to the lions' den and the fiery furnace, as recorded in 1 Macc. ii, 59, 60. Lastly, it ignores the obvious fact that by similar reasoning we would have a cumulative argument from silence that Ezekiel and most of the Minor Prophets did not exist until the time of Ben Sira. In short, the argument is absurd.

CHAPTER III

THE SILENCE OF ECCLESIASTICUS CONCERNING DANIEL

IF WE can believe the newspaper reports of the answers of Madame Caillaux, wife of the late Finance Minister of the French Republic, to the interrogatories of the magistrate conducting the preliminary examinations into the reasons why she assassinated M. Calmette, the editor of *Figaro*, it was a difficult matter for her to determine why she fired the fatal shot. It is, in fact, a difficult matter for any of us to analyze the various motives which have conduced to any given course of action, or that have converged toward the production of a certain line of thought. Much more difficult is it to unfold the manifold complexities involved in our critical conclusions and in our literary judgments.

Yet, in spite of this recognized difficulty in discovering our own motives, how many there are who think that they can perform the much more difficult task of discovering the motives of a man who lived two thousand, or more, years ago. This is especially true, when we come to consider the reasons why an author is silent with respect to some person, or event, of his own or preceding times. This silence may have resulted from ignorance; but it may just as well have resulted from prejudice, misjudgment, neglect, or contempt. In no case, however, would the silence prove that the person never existed, or that the event did not occur.

For example, it is found that in Ecclesiasticus, Jesus ben Sira makes no mention of Daniel, nor any reference to the book bearing his name. The motive, or reason, for this silence is utterly unknown to us. Nevertheless, this silence has been assumed to be a proof that at the time of Ben Sira the book of Daniel had not been written, and even, that at that time the Jews were in ignorance of the fact that such a man as Daniel had ever existed. This assumption is made, notwithstanding that there is good reason

for supposing that Ben Sirach intentionally omitted all reference to Daniel, or his book. For the works of Ben Sirach show that he was a man of pronounced prejudices and opinions. His views might be characterised as Sadducean and nationalistic. When he gives an account of the great men of his nation, he selects for his encomiums those who had most distinguished themselves according to his ideas of what constituted greatness. We, doubtless, would have added some names that he has omitted from his list. We might have omitted some that he has selected. We certainly would have given more space to the praise of some than he has given, and less to the praise of others. But after all has been said, we will have to admit that there must be granted to him the right and the liberty to praise as he pleases the men whom he wishes to praise. That he has passed by some whom we most highly esteem does not show that he was not aware of their existence. It simply shows that he had reasons of his own, that seemed satisfactory to him, for rejecting them from his list of worthies.

This brief exordium is by way of introduction to the objections made to the early date of the Book of Daniel on the ground that it cannot have existed before Ecclesiasticus was written, because neither Daniel nor his book is mentioned, nor apparently even referred to, by Ben Sirach. The objections are stated as follows:

THE CHARGE

“Jesus the son of Sirach (writing *c.* 200 B.C.), in his enumeration of Israelitish worthies, chaps. xliv-1, though he mentions Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and (collectively) the Twelve Minor Prophets, is silent as to Daniel.”¹

“The silence of Jesus Sirach (Ecclesiasticus) concerning Daniel seems to show that the prophet was unknown to that late writer who, in his list of celebrated men (chap. xlix), makes no mention of Daniel, but passes from Jeremiah to Ezekiel and then to the twelve Minor Prophets and Zerubbabel. If Daniel had been known to Jesus Sirach, we would certainly expect to find his name

¹Driver, *L.O.T.*, p. 498.

in this list, probably between Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Again, the only explanation seems to be that the Book of Daniel was not known to Sirach who lived and wrote between 200 and 180 B.C. Had so celebrated a person as Daniel been known, he could hardly, have escaped mention in such a complete list of Israel's leading spirits. Hengstenberg remarked that Ezra and Mordecai were also left unmentioned, but the case is not parallel. Daniel is represented in the work attributed to him as a great prophet, while Ezra appears in the Book bearing his name as nothing more than a rather prominent priest and scholar."²

That Ben Sira knew nothing about Daniel is said to be supported by his statement in chapter xlix, 17, that "no man was born upon earth like unto Joseph, whereas the narratives respecting Daniel represent him much like unto Joseph in regard to both the high distinctions he attained and the faculties he displayed; and further, the very wording of the narratives in the first part of Daniel is modelled after that of the narratives in Genesis concerning Joseph."³

ASSUMPTIONS

The assumptions involved in the above objections are as follows:

1. That Ezra and Mordecai did not deserve mention by Ben Sira as well as Daniel did.
2. That the mention of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Twelve, by Ben Sira, while he is silent as to Daniel, proves that Daniel was unknown to him.
3. That the passing from his mention of the Twelve directly to Zerubbabel, implies that Daniel was not known to Ben Sira.
4. That the silence of Ecclesiasticus concerning Daniel, shows that the prophet and his book were unknown to Ben Sira.
5. That the statement of Ben Sira, that there was no man like Joseph, shows an ignorance on his part of the existence of the man Daniel.

² Prince, *Commentary on Daniel*, p. 161.

³ Driver, *Daniel*, pp. 17 and 64.

DISCUSSION OF THE ASSUMPTIONS

First Assumption

The assumption that the omission of the names of Ezra and Mordecai from the list of Ben Sira's worthies is easily to be accounted for on the ground of their relative inferiority to Daniel is a matter of opinion merely. Prince thinks that "Daniel is represented in the work attributed to him as a great prophet, while Ezra appears in the Book bearing his name as nothing more than a rather prominent priest and scholar." As to the part of this statement which refers to Daniel, I would be the last man to deny it; although as I have shown elsewhere, I believe that Daniel's greatness as a prophet was not recognized until after so many of his predictions had been so accurately fulfilled in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. But even if he had been recognized as a great prophet, we must remember that he had said and done nothing to exalt or save the Law, the Temple, the city of Jerusalem, or the land or people of Israel. Ezra, however, was the greatest protagonist of the Law since the days of Moses and Joshua. The whole critical hypothesis of the formation of the Canon and of the fixation of the vast fabric of the Jewish ceremonies of the Second Temple, is based on the theory that Ezra collected and edited and induced the people to accept formally the so-called first part of the three-fold Canon of the Old Testament Scriptures. In his own time he was the determiner and the champion of orthodoxy, and in all succeeding ages he has been recognized as the organizer of the Temple service and the first of the ready scribes in the Law of Moses.

Now, as to Ezra, Driver says, that "the second section of the book, chaps. vii,-x, dealing with Ezra's own age, there is no reason to doubt, is throughout either written by Ezra or based upon materials left by him";⁴ and Kusters and Cheyne say, that of his "memoirs, written by himself, some portions unaltered and others considerably modified, have come down to us in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah."⁵ If the failure of Ben Sira to mention

⁴ *L.O.T.*, p. 549.

⁵ *Encyc. Bibl.*, p. 1473.

Ezra is no evidence against the existence, the works, and the writings of Ezra, or against Ben Sira's knowledge of the same; so, in like manner, his failure to mention Daniel is no evidence against the existence, the work and the writings of Daniel, or against Ben Sira's knowledge of them.

As to Mordecai's being in the same class of great men as Daniel, I am inclined to agree with Professor Prince that he was not. But unfortunately for Prince's argument, neither his opinion nor mine is the determining factor in this discussion, but that of the Jews of the time of Ben Sira; and as to this I am not so certain as Prince seems to be that in their estimation Mordecai may not have been "parallel" to Daniel but even have outranked him in importance. For to them Daniel was a minister of foreign kings and the interpreter of their dreams, the great seer of the fortunes of world empires, and the least nationalistic—perhaps we might even say the least patriotic—of all the prophets; whereas Mordecai was the upholder of the narrowest form of racial exclusiveness, the deliverer of his people from extermination, and the founder of the great national festival of Purim, the only festival which in the belief of the Jews had been decreed between the time of Moses and that of Ben Sira. By all critics, therefore, who like Driver put the book of Esther as early as the third century B.C.,⁶ this omission of the name of Mordecai from a list of Israel's heroes must be acknowledged as parallel to that of Daniel. So that it seems impossible to escape the conclusion that Ben Sira's failure to mention Daniel, Ezra, and Mordecai, is no argument against the existence of the works and writings of the persons bearing their names, nor of Ben Sira's knowledge of the same.

Second Assumption

As to the assumption that because Ben Sira mentions Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the Twelve, without mentioning Daniel, he did not know of Daniel, several remarks may be made:

1. Ben Sira does not propose to mention all the prophets of the Old Testament. As a matter of fact, he names only Moses,

⁶ *L.O.T.*, p. 484.

Samuel, Nathan, Elijah, Elisha, Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel. All of these were prominent in the political and religious history of the land and people; whereas, Daniel left his land while a boy, and spent his life among the kings and wise men of Babylon.

2. Ben Sira does not propose to mention the books of the Old Testament; nor does he mention a single one of them, nor cite specifically by name from any one of them.

3. In Ben Sira's time, Daniel may have been counted as one of the Twelve, just as Ruth was, then and as late as the time of Josephus and later, counted as part of Judges; and just as Lamentations was often counted as part of Jeremiah. In the time of Ben Sira, Jonah may have been a part of the book of Kings; for as Driver says: "Both in form and contents, the Book of Jonah resembles the biographical narrative of Elijah and Elisha"⁷ It must be remembered that Ben Sira does not name anyone of the Twelve Minor Prophets and that all that he says of them is: "Let their bones be flourishing" (chap. xlix, 10b) and, if the rest of the verse refers to them and not to Daniel, that "they comforted Jacob and saved him with the hope of truth."⁸

Third Assumption

The next assumption is that the Book of Daniel was not known to Ben Sira because he passes from Jeremiah to Ezekiel and then to the Twelve Minor Prophets and Zerubbabel without mentioning Daniel. This assumption is based on two false assumptions. First, that Ben Sira is naming the books of the Old Testament; and secondly, that he is naming all of his heroes in a chronological order. In the former case, one might ask where he finds the books of Phinehas and Zerubbabel. In the latter case, attention need only be called to the facts, that the account of Josiah is inserted between the mention of Isaiah and that of Jeremiah, and the description of Job between that of Ezekiel and that of the Twelve, and that of Joseph between that of Nehemiah and that of Simon.

Again, it is remarkable that just as Nathan is connected with

⁷ *L.O.T.*, p. 322.

⁸ See below p. 82 f.

David, so Isaiah and Jeremiah are mentioned in connection with Hezekiah and Josiah respectively. Each of the three kings of Israel had a good prophet to support him. Each of the three good prophets had a worthy Israelitish king to support.⁹ But of what good king of Israel was Daniel the prophet? Of Nebuchadnezzar, forsooth?

Furthermore, Prince fails to notice three other points which are at least as surprising as Ben Sira's failure to mention Daniel and Ezra and Mordecai. The first is that Ben Sira should have placed Zerubbabel among the great men he has mentioned. Certainly, most men in making a list of twenty of the worthies of Israel would not have included him among them. The same might be said of Phinehas and Caleb and Nathan and Adam, and Seth and Shem and perhaps even of Enoch and Noah and Job.

The second is that he should have given eleven verses to Elijah and only two to Jeremiah and one to Ezekiel; three verses to Phinehas and none to Ezra; two verses to Caleb and only eight to Samuel and but one to all the Minor Prophets; and seventeen verses to Aaron and twenty-one to Simon (a non-biblical hero) while giving only five to Moses, one to Nehemiah, and none to Ezra.

The third is that he mentions such men as Caleb and Seth and Shem, while never mentioning by name Gideon and Deborah and Jephthah and Samson; nor Jehoshaphat, Jehoiada, Esther and Ezra; nor any of the twelve Minor Prophets.

Ben Sira certainly did not estimate the Israelitish worthies as Prince does, nor as any one of us would do. But what are we going to do about it? Call him an ignoramus, or admit his right of private judgment?

Fourth Assumption

The fourth assumption is that the silence of Ben Sira concerning Daniel shows that the prophet and his book were unknown to him. But is Ben Sira actually silent regarding Daniel and his book?

⁹For as Ben Sira says in xlix, 4: Aside from David, Hezekiah, and Josiah, all of the kings had acted corruptly.

This is admittedly true of the LXX and Peshito versions of Ecclesiasticus, but it is not certain when we look at the original Hebrew text, which has been discovered since Bleek put forth this objection to the early date of Daniel. In chap. xlix, 10 we read: And I will mention "also the Twelve Prophets; let their bones sprout beneath them." Then follow the words: **אשר החליטו את יעקב וישעוהו**. If we take the first three letters as the relative the sense may well be: "who comforted Jacob and saved him." But if we point the letters as a segholate noun, the verse would read: "Blessed be they who comforted Jacob and saved him" *etc.*, and since the Greek has the verb in the singular we could render: "Blessed be he who comforted Jacob" *etc.* If taken in this later sense, the words would most naturally refer to Daniel. Or, by adopting a different meaning of the verb we might render the words by "Blessed be he who explained dreams to Jacob" *etc.*¹⁰

But let us waive this conjecture, granting for the sake of argument either that Sira did not mention Daniel or that he shows no acquaintance with the Book of Daniel. What then? There are three possibilities: (1) he may have known the Book of Daniel, but not have seen fit to use it; (2) he may have known about the man Daniel, while not being acquainted with the book; and (3) both the book and the man may have been unknown to Ben Sira.

1. Taking these three possibilities in order, let us suppose that Sira was acquainted with the Book of Daniel, but did not please to use it. Is there any reasonable way of accounting for such a fact?

This is purely a psychological question having to do with the opinions, feelings, and judgment of Ben Sira himself. He may have been of the opinion that Daniel did not measure up to the standard of the "fathers of the aeon" whose praises he was cele-

¹⁰ The sense of "comfort" for the hiphil of חָלַם is supported by Isa. xxxviii, 16, and by the use of the Aramaic and late Hebrew. But the hiphil of this verb may also mean "to cause to dream" (Jer. xxix, 8), or, after the analogy of חָזָה, "to show or explain visions" (Isa. xxx, 10; Lam. ii, 14). Comp. New Hebrew where חָלַם means "an interpreter of dreams." As to the construction and use of אִשְׁרֵי in the construct before the verbal sentence in the genitive, compare Ecclus, xlvi, 11: "Blessed be he who saw Thee and died." Compare also Ps. lxxv, 5, where אִשְׁרֵי is employed in like manner.

brating. For we must remember that what made the Book of Daniel of such supreme importance to the Jews and Christians of later times were its manifest references to Maccabean and New Testament times. To a Jew living at 200 B.C., its message must have been largely closed and sealed. It is hard to see why he should have been specifically mentioned, in view of the failure of Sira to name Samson, Gideon, or Jonah. Besides, with the deliverance from the fiery furnace, the most extraordinary of the miracles mentioned in his book, Daniel personally had nothing to do. As to the failure of the lions to eat him, when cast into their den, the pages of Herodotus, Livy, and of many other ancient authors, are full of just as astounding statements. As to his ability to explain dreams, the Egyptian, Assyrian, and Babylonian kings, Croesus, Xerxes, and Alexander, and indeed, one might say, almost all men of all classes, believed in the significance of dreams and in the power of correct interpretation; so that Sira may have thought that there was no special reason for mentioning Daniel on this account. The equivocal position in which Daniel stood in the Babylonian court may not have been thought by Sira to entitle him to be inscribed in the catalogue of the fathers of his people. He was after all but a slave dancing attendance on a tyrant's will. Besides, so far as is recorded, he never did anything for the Jews in general, but only accomplished the promotion of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego. Many other Jews must have been known to Sira who had risen high in the courts of heathen kings, and who had done much more for their contemporary Israelites: such for example, as Ezra, Mordecai, Athanaeus, and Joseph the son of Tobias, the last a contemporary of Ben Sira himself. Why should Daniel have been signalled and these not?

Again, a close study of Sira's encomiums on the celebrated men of his nation reveals some noteworthy facts:

(1) From the time preceding Abraham, he names Enoch (perhaps twice),¹¹ Noah and apparently Adam, Seth, Enosh, and Shem.

¹¹ Enoch is certainly mentioned in Chap. xlv, 16, which reads, according to the Hebrew text: "Enoch walked with God, a sign of knowledge to all generations." The Greek translation reads: "Enoch pleased God and was translated, being an example of repentance to all generations." The Peshito omits the verse.

(2) From Abraham to Joshua, he names Abraham, Isaac, Israel, Moses, Aaron, Phinehas, Caleb, Joshua, and, as it were as an afterthought, Joseph.

(3) From the times succeeding Joshua, he names only Samuel, David, Nathan, Solomon, Elijah, Elisha, Hezekiah, Isaiah, Josiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Nehemiah, and Daniel, and possibly refers to Job and Ezra.

(4) From post-biblical times, he names Simon the High Priest, who served about 280 B.C.

(5) He refers to the twelve patriarchs, the judges and the twelve Minor Prophets without mentioning any one of them by name, except Samuel.

(6) If his estimate of the relative importance of the great men he mentions can be derived from the number of verses written about them, they will stand in the following order: the high priest Simon 21 verses, Aaron 17, Solomon 12, Elijah 11, David 10, Hezekiah 9, Samuel 8, Moses 5, Josiah 4, Abraham 3, Phinehas 3, Elisha 3, Noah 2, Jeremiah 2, Joseph one or two, and Isaac, Israel, Nathan, Ezekiel, Zerubbabel, Jeshua, and Nehemiah, one each. The twelve Minor Prophets are honoured in but one verse, or less; Shem, Seth and Adam, the three together in one verse; Enoch, in one or two; Job, Ezra and Daniel possibly in one or part of one each.

Whether Ezra and Job are referred to depends as in the case of Daniel, which has already been discussed, upon whether we follow the reading of the Hebrew text or the Greek version.

In xlix, 14, the Greek reads: "But upon the earth was no man created like Enoch; for he was taken from the earth." The Peshito has simply: "Few were created upon earth like Enoch." The Hebrew text as amended by Smend is: **מעט נוצרו על הארץ כהנוך וגם הוא נלקח פנים**. Thus read, the translation would be: "Few have been formed upon earth like Enoch; and he, also, was taken away bodily." But, it is to be noted, that the Hebrew manuscript gives us **כהניך**, and that the last letter of **נוצרו** "appears to have been added" (Smend). Following the general principle of the original writing of the vowel letters as propounded by

Cornill,¹² the text of the first part of the verse might be as follows : כהנך... מעט נוצר. The verse would, then, read: "For a little while thy priest was kept upon the earth; and he, also, was taken away bodily." מעט would be used adverbially as in Ruth ii, 7, Ps. xxxvii, 10; and נלקח would have the same sense as in the probable original of the Ezra-Apoc. viii, 14. Thus rendered, the verse will refer to Ezra, who may justly be looked upon as the greatest of all the priests. For the belief that Ezra was taken away bodily, compare 4 *Ezra* xiv, 9, 49, vi, 26, vii, 28, viii, 19. In xiv, 9, the voice out of the bush says to Ezra: "Thou shalt be taken up from among men." In xiv, 49, it is said: "Then was Ezra caught away and taken up into the place of such as were like him." In viii, 19 is found: "The beginning of the prayer of Ezra, before he was taken up"; and in vi, 26: "The men who have been taken up, who have not tasted death from their birth, shall appear." In favour, also, of this latter text and rendering are two important circumstances: first, Enoch has already been mentioned by Ben Sira in his proper place in chap. xlv, 16; and secondly, Nehemiah has just been referred to in the preceding verse, and we would naturally expect to have Ezra noticed in connection with his great collaborator.

Job is mentioned in the Peshitto text of xlix, 9, which reads: "And also concerning Job he said, that all his ways were right." The Greek here has: "For he made mention of the enemies under the figure of a cloud." The Hebrew original has: "And also I will mention Job *etc.*" The only difference between the two readings is that one has אויב (enemy) whereas the other had איוב (Job).

(7) It will be observed, further, that our author gives 21 verses to the high priest Simon, a non-biblical character, and one who is known elsewhere only in two short notices by Josephus; whereas he gives 17 verses to Aaron and only five to Moses. Samuel is honoured with 8 verses, and all the other judges with but two. Phinehas is granted as long a notice as Abraham. Hezekiah receives almost as much attention as David and Solomon combined. Caleb is treated with the same consideration as

¹² *Introd.*, p. 491.

Jeremiah, and receives twice as much notice as Ezekiel and at least twice as much as all the Minor Prophets together.

(8) Many persons notable in the history of Israel are not mentioned at all by Ben Sira. Such are, of priests, Abiathar, Jehoiada, Hilkiah, Eliashib and Jaddua; of judges, Gideon, Jephthah, and Samson; of kings, Saul, Asa, Jehoshaphat, Jehu, and Jeroboam II; of prophets, Hosea, Jonah, Haggai, and Zechariah. Besides, all the women, without any exception, are passed over in silence,—Sarah, Rachel, Miriam, Deborah, Ruth, and even Esther.

(9) Of the 133 verses employed in the encomiums, 42 are given to the priests, 35 to the kings, 32 (or 33, if we count Job as a prophet) to the prophets, 8 or 9 to the patriarchs, 12 to Joshua and the judges, and two to Zerubbabel and Nehemiah.

(10) Further, it will be noted that, with the exception of the doubtful case of Job, all of the "famous men" from Moses onward exercised their activities in Palestine, and had to do with the establishment, defense, or renovation, of the laws, institutions, and polity of the Jews, with the conquest of the land, or with the building, or restoration, of Jerusalem and the temple. In this connection, Jehoiada, Jehoshaphat, Zechariah, Haggai, and Ezra, might have been mentioned; and also, Mordecai, at least had he laboured and lived in Palestine. But Daniel, so far as we know, originated no laws, did not assist in any national movement, did not participate in the return from Babylon, nor in the rebuilding of the walls of Jerusalem, nor in the reestablishment of the people and of its laws.

(11) No one can maintain that Ben Sira failed to mention Daniel on account of not being acquainted with him, or with his book, without maintaining that he was also ignorant of the existence and labors of Ezra. But Ben Sira's knowledge of Nehemiah would seem to make it certain that he knew also of Ezra.

(12) Ben Sira's judgment as to what rendered men famous, is certainly odd and eccentric. For example, of the 21 verses of encomium upon the high priest Simon, 17 are taken up with a description of the beauty of his person and of the ceremonies connected with the service at the altar, and of the blessing which

the congregation received at his hands. In the case of Aaron, also, a large part is taken up with a description of his garments. If we compare the ideas of Ben Sira with those of the Book of Daniel, we find very substantial reasons why the former may not have deemed Daniel worthy of a place among the famous men of his nation. The greatest things that Daniel ever did were to interpret the dream of Nebuchadnezzar and to explain the writing on the wall of Belshazzar's palace. Now, in the beginning of chapter xxiv, Ben Sira has expressed plainly his opinion of dreams, when he says among other things, that "dreams lift up fools," "whoso regardeth dreams is like him that catcheth at a shadow and followeth after wind," "divination and soothsaying and dreams are vain," "for dreams have deceived many, and they have failed that put their trust in them."

Again, Daniel expresses his belief in a resurrection, whereas Ben Sira never even hints at such a possibility. The only kind of immortality that he expressly teaches, is the immortality of fame, and of nationality, family, and institutions, such as the covenant and the priesthood. Moreover, Ben Sira never refers to the distinction between clean and unclean foods, or to praying toward Jerusalem, or to praying three times daily, to fasting, or to a *post mortem* judgment of the world—all doctrines that distinguish the book of Daniel. With reference to angels, also, Ben Sira never expresses his own belief, merely mentioning them in allusions to the earlier history.

To sum up, it may be said that while it is probable that Ben Sira does not refer to Daniel, nor show any knowledge of his book, yet this is no indication that he was not acquainted with both. For as a matter of fact, he does not purpose to give, nor does he give, a complete list of Israelitish worthies; the ones he does mention being selected and celebrated after a manner peculiar to himself. After the conquest, he praises especially priests, kings, and prophets, to none of which classes did Daniel officially, at least, belong. After the conquest, moreover, he mentions, with the possible exception of Job, none but those whose activities were passed in Palestine. With the exception of Solomon and Isaiah, the writers of the nation are given scant space and praise. And

finally, there are special reasons why Daniel should have been passed over by Ben Sira, arising from the fact that the doctrines and practices of Daniel were out of harmony with those approved and taught by Ben Sira.

2. Some writers, while maintaining that the Book of Daniel was not written till the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, maintain that the man Daniel was, in the words of Driver, "a historical person, one of the Jewish exiles in Babylon, who, with his three companions, was noted for his staunch adherence to the principles of his religion, who attained a position of influence at the court of Babylon, who interpreted Nebuchadnezzar's dreams and foretold, as a seer, something of the future fate of the Chaldean and Persian empires. Perhaps, written materials were at the disposal of the author; it is at any rate probable that for the descriptions contained in chaps. ii-vii he availed himself of some work, or works, dealing with the history of Babylon in the 6th century B.C." ¹³

In view of the fact that Ben Sira gives his longest encomium to the high priest Simon, a non-biblical character, it is hard to see how he can have failed to mention Daniel, this well known and distinguished man, even though the book that bears his name had not yet been written. Objections that Ben Sira may have reasonably made to doctrines of the Book of Daniel he can not have made in like measure to the historical character of Daniel ii-vi. If we assert that the Book of Daniel was not written before 180 B.C., we can no longer compare the silence of Ben Sira with his mention of the authors of the books of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the Twelve; but we must compare this silence with his mention of the great men who, so far as we know, were not authors, that is, with his mention of Caleb, Phinehas, Elijah, Elisha, Josiah, Zerubbabel, and Simon. So that, when we deny the existence of the Book of Daniel and admit the knowledge of the man, whether this knowledge had been gained from "written materials," or from oral tradition, we have not escaped the difficulties involved in Ben Sira's silence. We have simply shifted them from the book to the person. For, if this silence disproves

¹³ *L.O.T.*, pp. 510, 511.

the existence of the book, it disproves equally the knowledge of the person. In the opinion of the present writer, the silence of Ben Sira with reference to Daniel neither proves nor disproves anything with regard to either the existence of the book, or his knowledge of the person of Daniel. His silence may have been intentional, or unintentional. It may have been through ignorance, or design. But the reason for it is to be sought in the mind of Ben Sira, and this mind is beyond our ken.

3. Much more consistent is the view of Prince and others, who hold that the silence of Ben Sira with regard to Daniel shows that both the book and the man were unknown to him. When, however, Prince says that the only explanation of this silence "seems to be that the Book of Daniel was not known to Sirach," and "had so celebrated a person as Daniel been known, he could hardly have escaped mention in such a complete list of Israel's leading spirits," he is, as has been shown above, going beyond what his premises justify.

(1) For, first, let us suppose that the Book of Daniel was unknown to Ben Sira. What follows? Not necessarily, as Prince concludes, that there was no such book in existence. Here is a fallacy which few writers on Old Testament introduction seem able to avoid. They confound the time of the writing of an Old Testament book with the time of its assumption into the collection of the canon. The New Testament books were presumably all written before the close of the first century A.D. Their acknowledgment as canonical, and their collection into one book, took place many years afterwards. So, the books of the Old Testament may have been written centuries before they were recognized as canonical, or admitted into the collection of the sacred scriptures. Daniel, for example, may have been written in Babylon in the 6th century B.C., and may not have been received officially into the canon of the Palestinian Jews until after its predictions had been so significantly and accurately fulfilled in the events of the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes.

To be sure, according to Josephus, the high priest Jaddua showed the predictions of the book to Alexander the Great in 332 B.C. To be sure, also, the author of First Maccabees represents Mat-

tathias as inciting the Asmoneans to rebellion against Antiochus in 169 B.C., by citing the deliverance of the three children from the flames and of Daniel from the lions' den. But while Jaddua in the fourth century B.C. may have known of the book, and while Mattathias and his hearers may have known about the fiery furnace and the deliverance from the lions in 169 B.C., it may be possible that Ben Sira, who wrote his work about 180 B.C. was, as Prince and others have brought themselves to believe, entirely ignorant of both the book and the person of Daniel. Jaddua may have known the book. Mattathias and his hearers may have known the person, but for some reason unknown to us Ben Sira may have been unacquainted with either the book or the person of Daniel. But all this does not prove that the book did not exist in the time of Ben Sira, or that the facts recorded in the Book of Daniel had not occurred. For the collection of the sacred books to which Ben Sira had access may not have contained the Book of Daniel; or, for reasons deemed sufficiently good by him, may not have been acknowledged by him as canonical. As has been shown above, he may have known the book, but on account of its doctrines, or of the locality in which its deeds were enacted, he may have refused to recognize its authority, or to celebrate its heroes. Or, the book may not have been accessible to him; for it is a mistake to suppose that all of the books recognized as canonical were at that time bound together in a single volume. Dr. Gregory of Leipzig has shown that folios did not come into use till the second century A.D. Before that time, it was the sacred books (*biblia*) that men had, not the holy Bible, or book (*biblion*). The oldest MS of the Hebrew scriptures, whose date is generally accepted, contains only the Prophets. The next oldest has nothing but the Law. Till printing came into vogue, few institutions, or churches, and still fewer individuals, had a complete collection of the books of the Canon. It is not to be imagined that among the scattered and impoverished Jews of the second century B.C. there were many who were fortunate enough to possess copies of all the Old Testament books. Josephus states that a copy of the Law, which had been laid up in the temple, was carried in the triumphal procession of Titus; but he does not say whether by Law he

means only the Pentateuch, or the whole Old Testament. In his *Life*, he says that he himself received from Titus as a special mark of his favour, the "holy books" indicating clearly that he considered this gift of the Cæsar as a noteworthy concession.¹⁴ The Prologue to Ecclesiasticus affirms that Ben Sira the elder had given himself much to the reading of the Law, and of the Prophets, and of the other books of the fathers. What and how many books these were, he does not state. It is altogether possible that he had not access to a copy of the Book of Daniel, and that for this reason his language shows no signs of having been influenced by it. If the book of Daniel had been in circulation in Palestine in his time, it is hardly possible, however, to perceive how something of the principal events and persons described in it could have been utterly unknown to Ben Sira. This knowledge must have seemed to him to be of such a character as not to justify him in placing Daniel among his famous men, especially in view of the fact that he thought best to omit from his list so many others that to us seem equally worthy of mention.

(2) Secondly, let us suppose that Ben Sira did not even know that a man called Daniel had ever lived. In answer to this supposition, one might content himself with referring to the fact that Ezekiel twice mentions a Daniel as a wise man of equal standing with Noah and Job. Since Ezekiel wrote in the early half of the sixth century B.C., the Daniel to whom he refers must have lived as early, at least, as that time; and there is no other Daniel known to history, except the Daniel of our book, who can by any possibility have been referred to in such a connection. Josephus, also, treats Daniel as an historical character. This he would not have done, unless it had been the common opinion of the Jews of his time. Moreover, he and his contemporaries had access to many sources of information which have since ceased to exist. These sources covered the period of the Maccabees. But no one of them gives a hint that anyone had ever suspected that Daniel was a fictitious character, or that the account of him given in his book is not historical.

The author of First Maccabees, also, considered Daniel to be an

¹⁴ Sec. 75.

historical person; for he says that Mattathias, the father of Judas Maccabæus, exhorted his adherents in the following words:

“Call to remembrance what acts our fathers did in their time; so shall ye receive great honour and an everlasting name. Was not Abraham found faithful in temptation, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness? Joseph in the time of his distress kept the commandment, and was made lord of Egypt. Phinehas our father in being zealous and fervent obtained the covenant of an everlasting priesthood. Jesus for fulfilling the word was made a judge in Israel. Caleb for bearing witness before the congregation received the heritage of the land. David for being merciful possessed the throne of an everlasting kingdom. Elias for being zealous and fervent for the law was taken up into heaven. Ananias, Azarias, and Misael, by believing were saved out of the flame. Daniel for his innocency was delivered from the mouth of the lions. And thus consider ye throughout all ages, that none that put their trust in him shall be overcome.”¹⁵

First Maccabees records the history of the Jews from 169 to 135 B.C. and is our principal source of information for the events of which it speaks. The speech of Mattathias was, according to the author of First Maccabees, made in 169 B.C. According to the view of those who deny that there ever was a real Daniel, the book named after him was written about June 164 B.C., about five years after the speech was delivered. Is it possible that a reliable author, such as the writer of First Maccabees certainly was, would have put such statements with regard to Daniel and his companions into a speech made five years before the work of fiction containing the supposititious history of them was written?

Again, how can we account for the fact that the author of First Maccabees, if he himself manufactured the speech, should have placed these fictitious characters in the very climax of his heroic appeal? If he had had a suspicion even that they were not real persons, and that there had been no deliverance from the flame and from the lions, would he have finished this magnificent call to patriotism and faith by descending from the thrilling experiences of Abraham, Joseph, Phinehas, Joshua, David, and Elijah, —all bearing directly upon his attempt to stir up his hearer to their noblest endeavours for God and country—by descending, I

¹⁵ I, ii, 51-61.

say, to such bathos as this? Surely, also, the author of this speech must have known that the enthusiasm of the hearers could not be aroused by appealing to the example of men whose names and deeds were unknown to them. If Mattathias made this speech, it shows that he esteemed the traditions about Daniel as being of equal value with those concerning the others to whom he appeals. If the author of First Maccabees composed the speech, and put it into the mouth of Mattathias, he must have thought, at least, that those for whom he wrote his history would acknowledge that Mattathias might have made such a speech, and that his hearers might have understood it. That it is a good speech for the alleged purpose of it, no one can deny. That it accomplished its purpose is equally undeniable. Finally, the author of First Maccabees writes like one who had first hand information of the facts that he records. He probably lived throughout most, if not all, of the stirring times which Daniel predicts and that he describes. Is it not, then, remarkable that if the Book of Daniel were first written in 164 B.C., and had been expressly published with the purpose of exciting the flagging energies of the despondent and faithless Jews, that no mention is made in First Maccabees of any such publication, or even of its author? But no. The references to Daniel and his companions are made in the same way as to Abraham and David, showing clearly, that the author put the sources of Daniel in the same class as the Law and the Prophets.

That the Jews of the first century A.D., also, considered Daniel to be an historical person is abundantly shown, moreover, in the numerous references which the New Testament writers make to the book. It will not do to say that they would have referred to it in the same way and with the same frequency, if they had looked upon it as fiction; for they do not thus refer to Judith, Tobit, and other works of a fictitious character.

4. Now, against this consentient testimony of the New Testament writers, Josephus, and the Maccabees, as to the existence of a knowledge of Daniel and of his book before the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, what have those who deny this knowledge to advance? Nothing but two opinions: first, that these writers, whose honesty they will probably admit, did not have the oppor-

tunity or the intelligence to judge correctly on such subjects; and secondly, that it is impossible that there can have been predictions of such a character as those to be found in the Book of Daniel.

(1) As to the first of these opinions, it may be remarked, first, with reference to the New Testament writers, that, inspiration aside, they certainly give us the views prevalent among the Jews of their time. Writers like the apostle Paul must have known the history of the Jewish people from the time of the High Priest Simon the Just onward, much better, at least, than any one can know it to-day. Hostile readers and critics, such as those to whom the Epistle to the Hebrews was directed, render it incredible that an educated author, such as he was who wrote this epistle, could have referred to what he considered to be imaginary events and persons in the clauses "stopped the mouths of lions," and "quenched the violence of fire". Whether Paul, or Apollos, or whoever wrote this epistle, he was certainly acquainted with the history of Israel, and he undeniably meant to give us a list of the real heroes of faith, in order to stimulate his readers to follow their example. Such a stimulus could not have been derived from the supposititious heroes of romance, any more than it could be to-day; unless, indeed, both writer and readers believed that they were historical. Let our belief in the truthfulness of the cherry tree incident be dissipated, and it will be vain to cite the veracity of the boy Washington to excite the emulation of the youth of America. Let our belief in the reality of the miracles and privations of the saints be destroyed, and these signal events of their lives will at once cease to be ensamples for our conduct and consolation. Let our belief in the fact of the incarnation, or of the resurrection, and in the correctness of the records of the words and deeds of Jesus once be done away, and our appeal to sinners to accept of Jesus as their Lord and Saviour will inevitably lose its conviction and its power. These are psychological facts, which the experience of every one will approve as true.

In like manner, we must agree that the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews would not have appealed to imaginary characters and events to support and strengthen the failing faith of his readers. He must, then, himself have believed that Daniel and

his companions lived and acted as the Book of Daniel asserts that they did. Living within 250 years of the time when some assume that the Book of Daniel was written, and at a time of great literary activity, it is scarcely possible that a writer of such intelligence as is displayed throughout the Epistle to the Hebrews should not have known whether the heroes that he cites as examples were real or fictitious characters.

Secondly, as to Josephus, we have in him a witness whose honesty and intelligence no one can dispute. His opportunity to learn the facts can alone be controverted. But we have no evidence with regard to what he says about Daniel, to show that he can be effectually controverted. For he lived only about 250 years after the time of the Maccabees, and all of the earlier part of his life was passed in Palestine. He had access to all of the religious literature of the Jews and to all of the profane literature of the Gentiles, and was thoroughly acquainted with all the laws, institutions, and traditions of his people. Of all ancient historians, none but Polybius and Pliny cite as many authorities, and no one as many archives, as he. No one so often appeals to the best sources of information on the different matters of which he treats. Nor does anyone so persistently defy all critics, nor so consistently marshal the testimony of the original sources.

Now, Josephus treats the Book of Daniel as historical, and gives all of the tenth and eleventh chapters of Book X of his *Antiquities of the Jews*, embracing six whole pages of Whiston's translation, to a narration of the principal events of Daniel's career. In language which cannot be surpassed, he says of him:

"It is fit to give an account of what this man did, which is most admirable to hear; for he was so happy as to have strange revelations made to him, . . . , and now that he is dead, he retains a remembrance that will never fail, for the several books that he wrote and left behind him are still read by us till this time; and from them we believe that Daniel conversed with God. . . . He also wrote and left behind him what made manifest the accuracy and undeniable veracity of his predictions. . . . And indeed, it so came to pass that our nation suffered these things under Antiochus Epiphanes, according to Daniel's vision, and what he wrote many years before they came to pass. In the very same manner, also, Daniel wrote concerning the Roman government,

and that our country should be made desolate by them. All these things did this man leave in writing, as God had showed them to him, inasmuch that such as read his prophecies and see how they have been fulfilled would wonder at the honour wherewith God honoured Daniel, and may thence discover how the Epicureans are in error, who cast providence out of human life, and do not believe that God takes care of the affairs of the world, nor that the universe is governed and continued in being by that blessed and immortal nature.”¹⁶

From these citations from Josephus it appears clearly that this careful writer, whose great vocation in life it was to defend the institutions and writers of his nation, and to describe the persons and events of its history, never harboured a suspicion that the Book of Daniel was other than historical, or was in any wise different, as a trustworthy source of information, from the other books of the Old Testament, whose records, as Josephus says in his first treatise against Apion, “had been written all along down to his own times with the utmost accuracy.”¹⁷ “For we have not,” says he, “an innumerable number of books among us, disagreeing from and contradicting one another, but only twenty-two books, which contain the records of all the past times. And of them five belong to Moses, which contain his laws, and the traditions of the origin of mankind till his death. But as to the time from the death of Moses till the reign of Artaxerxes king of Persia, who reigned after Xerxes, the prophets who were after Moses, wrote down what was done in their times in thirteen books. The remaining four books contain hymns to God, and precepts for the conduct of human life.”¹⁸ From this last statement of Josephus it is apparent that he classed Daniel among the prophets, and deemed his book of equal authority with the rest.

(2) As to the second opinion mentioned above that it is impossible that there can have been predictions of such a character as those to be found in the Book of Daniel, let it suffice to say here that to one who grants the possibility and the fact of a revelation from God it is unreasonable to lay down the limits and to define the character of that revelation. It is at least probable that God

¹⁶ Book X, xi, 7.

¹⁷ Section 6.

¹⁸ Section 8.

would speak in divers manners through the prophets. No man, be he ever so wise, can say to the All Wise: Thus must Thou have spoken, or not at all. The length, the detailed description, and the literary form of the revelation, may differ as widely as the truth permits; but they do not affect the truth. God alone can be the judge of how, and when, and where, and to whom, He will reveal His thoughts and plans.

Fifth Assumption

The fifth assumption of those who assert that Ben Sira knew nothing about Daniel, is based on the allegation that Ben Sira states that there was no man like Joseph, "whereas the narratives respecting Daniel represent him much like unto Joseph in regard to both the high distinction he attained and the faculties he displayed; and further, the very wording of the narratives in the first part of Daniel is modelled after that of the narratives in Genesis concerning Joseph."¹⁹

By the method pursued by Driver in this citation, we could establish, or condemn, almost any proposition ever made. By omitting the qualifying clauses of Ben Sira's statement, he has made him appear to say what he does not say at all. Ben Sira does not make the very questionable assertion that no man like Joseph was ever born; but, that no man was born like Joseph in this respect, that his dead body was mustered (i. e., counted in the muster). In the preceding verse, according to Smend's and Strack's texts of the Hebrew original, he had just said that "few were formed upon earth like Enoch, in that he was taken away bodily." In the 16th verse, he says that no man was born like Joseph in that his body was mustered. The two verses are of the same construction. In each case, the comparison is limited by the second clause of the verse; and the statements of the first clauses, when thus limited, are in both cases perfectly true. At least, it is perfectly true concerning Joseph.²⁰ For of no other man could it be said that his dead body had been preserved as

¹⁹ See Driver, *Daniel*, pp. 17 and 64. (*Vide supra*, p. 78).

²⁰ In the case of Enoch it might be doubted whether in view of Elijah's ascension it could be said that he alone of all men had been translated bodily.

was that of Joseph in Egypt, and mustered as his was among the embattled hosts of Israel. In this particular, Joseph was and will be forever unlike all other men; and it is in this particular that Ben Sira says that Joseph was unlike all other men. He does not say a word, or give a hint, as to his meaning to suggest or insinuate that no one was like Joseph "as to both the high distinction he attained and the faculties he displayed."

Nor will Driver's assertion derive any support from the Greek version of Ecclesiasticus, which reads: "Neither was there a man born like unto Joseph, a governor of his brethren, a stay of his people, whose bones were regarded of the Lord." Nor will the Syriac Version help him; for it reads: "And no mother has borne a child like Joseph, in that his body was assembled (*i.e.*, gathered to his fathers) in peace."

As to the further part of the citation from Driver, that "the very wording of the narratives in the first part of Daniel is modelled after that of the narratives of Genesis concerning Joseph," it has absolutely nothing to do with the question of the date of the composition of the Book of Daniel. Since, according to Driver himself, the whole history of Joseph belongs to the so-called Jehovistic and Elohist documents,²¹ and since critics agree that both of these documents were certainly finished before 750 B.C.,²² it is perfectly obvious that a writer of the sixth century B.C. may have imitated the account in Genesis as readily as one who lived in the second century B.C.

Moreover, in only three particulars can the life of Daniel be said to resemble that of Joseph. They were both captives at the court of a mighty foreign monarch; they both rose to positions of preëminence at these respective courts; and they both rose because of their skill in the interpretation of dreams. In all other respects their lives differ as much as it is possible for human lives, especially of men in somewhat similar circumstances, to differ. But finally and chiefly, it is to be noted that it is not to one of these resemblances, but to one of the differences, between Joseph and Daniel, that Ben Sira calls our attention; that is, that

²¹ *L.O.T.*, p. 17.

²² *L.O.T.*, p. 122.

something was done with the body of Joseph such as never happened in the case of any other man. For when Joseph was about to die, he gave commandment concerning his bones, saying to the children of Israel: "God will surely visit you, and ye shall carry up my bones from hence" (Gen. 1, 25). In Ex. xiii, 19, we are told that Moses took the bones of Joseph with him, when he went out of the land of Egypt; and in Josh. xxiv, 32, it is said that the children of Israel buried these bones, which they had brought all the way from Egypt, in a parcel of ground in Shechem which became the inheritance of the children of Joseph.

This was the unique, the unparalleled, event in the history of Joseph. It was recognised as such by Ben Sira in his day, and by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews in his. And it must be recognized by us to-day. In this one respect there was no one like him among all the children of Israel, nor ever has been, nor ever can be among all the sons of men.

CONCLUSION

Having thus considered fully all the objections to the early date of the Book of Daniel made on the ground of the silence of Ben Sira with respect to it, there seems to be no sufficient reason for doubting the conclusion that notwithstanding this silence the Book of Daniel may have been in existence before 180 B.C.

CHAPTER IV

APOCALYPSES AND THE DATE OF DANIEL

APOCALYPSE means revelation. In Biblical literature and the literature connected with it, there is a large number of books either in part or in whole of an apocalyptic character, either real or assumed, in which there purports to be unveiled before us the secrets of the past, the present, or the future, which could not have been learned by mere human insight or foresight. The preliminary question, and perhaps the more important question, to be answered before we consider the specific case of Daniel, is therefore, whether such a thing as a revelation has taken place, or at least whether it is possible. Every one who believes that Jesus is the Son of God and also every one who believes in the claims of the prophets of the Old Testament, must believe both in the possibility and the fact of such a thing as revelation by God to man. It is to such, and such only, that the discussion in this article is addressed, and we shall discuss in their proper place whether there is anything in the revelations contained in Daniel either in form or in character and content which renders it impossible to believe in the possibility or in the actuality of their having been made in the 6th century B.C.

THE CHARGE

The necessity of entering upon this discussion arises, not from the fact that their predictive character is denied by those who reject the theistic system, but because in its most essential features it is impugned by many who profess their belief that "God who at sundry times and in divers manners spoke in times past unto the fathers by the prophets hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son." The objections to Daniel to which attention is called

will be stated, then, in the words of Professor Charles, and in those of Professor Prince. They are as follows :

“Apocalyptic arose at a time when Israel had been subject for centuries to the sway of one or another of the great world powers. Hence, in order to harmonize such difficulties with God’s righteousness, it had to take account of the *rôle* of such empires in the counsels of God; to recount the sway and downfall of each in turn, till, finally, the lordship of the world passed into the hands of Israel, or the final judgment arrived. The chief part of these events belonged, it is true, to the past; but the Apocalyptic writer represented them as still in the future, arranged under certain artificial categories of time, and as definitely determined from the beginning in the counsels of God and revealed by Him to His servants the prophets.”¹

“It should be noticed that the Book of Daniel differs materially from all the prophetic writings of the Old Testament in the general style of its prophecies. Other prophets confine themselves to vague and general predictions, but the author of Daniel gives a detailed account of the historical events,” etc.²

It is asserted, also, that the apocalypse of Daniel resembles the apocalyptic literature of the period from 200 B.C. onward to 135 A.D. rather than the visions of the earlier centuries.

ASSUMPTIONS

These objections involve the following assumptions :

I. That the form in which the supposed predictive elements of Daniel are clothed is such as could not have been employed in the 6th century B.C.

II. That Daniel’s apocalypse resembles those from the 2nd century B.C. to 135 A.D. rather than those of the Biblical writers of earlier times.

III. That the character of the predictive elements is such as to render it in the highest degree improbable, to say the least, that they could have been written before the events which they so accurately describe had actually occurred.

¹ Charles, Art. “Apocalyptic Literature.” *Hasting’s Dict. of the Bible*, Vol. I, p. 110a.

² Prince : *Commentary on Daniel*, p. 21.

IV. That since apocalyptic writers represent past as future, Daniel is false simply because it is or contains apocalypses.

First Assumption

As to the form of the Book of Daniel, it will be noted that only a part can be called apocalyptic. The first six chapters, with the exception of a part of chapter two, contain a narrative of some of the events in the life of Daniel and of his three companions. The form of this narration is not dissimilar from that followed in the case of Joseph, Samuel, David, Jeremiah, and Ahikar, so that no one perhaps would deny that so far as its literary form is concerned, aside from its linguistic characteristics, it might have been written as early as the 6th century B.C.; were it not that, since Daniel is usually considered to be a unit, it is thought necessary to bring this historical part down to a time when the apocalyptic parts, if *post-eventum*, must have been written.

Since, then, it is to the form of the apocalyptic portion that exception is made, we shall confine ourselves strictly to it. It may be said in the first place that the apocalyptic material of Daniel is not an apocalypse but a number of apocalypses occurring under five subsidiary forms. And it is to be observed that each one of these forms occurs in sacred and secular literature of the sixth century B.C. and earlier.

(1) There is a dream and its interpretation (chaps. iv, vii.).

(2) There is a prayer and its answer (chap. ix).

(3) There are two or three visions each consisting of a symbol, or sign, and its explanation; these are to be found in chaps. viii, x, and xii.

(4) There is in chaps. xi-xii, 4 a direct address to the prophet without telling the manner of the coming of the information.

(5) God, or his angel, speaks directly to someone.

I. As to the first of these, the dream apocalypses, we have abundant parallels in the literature preceding the time of Daniel (*cir.* 535 B.C.), both profane and sacred. In the Scriptures, we have among others the dreams of Joseph, of the chief butler and chief baker, and of Pharaoh, recorded in Gen. xxxvii, xl, and xli, and the dream of the Midianite mentioned in Jgs. vii, 13, 14: in

which the Lord revealed his will through dreams. In all these cases, as in that of Nebuchadnezzar, the dreams are such as the persons dreaming them would naturally have had and the interpretations are in harmony with the person and circumstances concerned. The narratives differ in length but not in essential characteristics from those of Daniel.

In profane literature, I shall cite parallels only in the case of five kings, one of Lydia, one of Assyria, one of Babylonia, one of Persia, and one of Greece. Gyges, king of Lydia, is reported by Ashurbanipal to have seen a dream in which Ashur revealed the name Ashurbanipal to Gyges and said: "Grasp the feet of Ashurbanipal, king of Assyria, and thou shalt through his name conquer thy enemies."³

Again, Ashurbanipal says⁴ that he slew Teumman, king of Elam, in the power of Ashur and Marduk the great gods his lords who had encouraged him by means of a sign, an oracular dream, the message of a priest, and again⁵ that the goddess Ishtar had caused his troops to see a dream toward the end of night in which she said to them: "I am going before Ashurbanipal the king whom my hands have made"; and that "relying upon this dream, his troops crossed the Idide river in good spirits." He tells, moreover, of a seer of dreams (*shabru*) who lay down toward the end of night and saw in a dream that upon the sickle of the moon stood written: "Whoever plans evil and undertakes war against Ashurbanipal, King of Assyria, him will I cause an evil death to overtake; through the quick iron sword, the firebrand, hunger, the plague of Gira, will I put an end to his life." When the king heard this dream he relied upon the word of Sin his Lord; for as he says⁶ the gods had announced to him continually joyous messages concerning the conquest of his enemies and had made his dreams upon his bed favourable.

So Nabunaid was caused to see the following dream:

³ Schrader, *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, II, 172, 173.

⁴ *Id.* II, 253.

⁵ *Id.* II, 201.

⁶ *Id.* II, 233.

"In the beginning of my enduring reign they caused me to see a dream; Marduk, the great Lord, and Sin, the light of heaven and earth stood beside me. Marduk spoke to me: Nabunaid king of Babylon, with thy horses and wagons bring bricks, build Ehulhul and let Sin, the great Lord make his dwelling therein. Fearfully spake I to Marduk the Lord of the Gods: That temple which thou hast ordered me to make, the Umman-Manda have surrounded it and great is their might. Then spake Marduk to me: The Umman-Manda whereof thou speakest, their land and the kings who stood by their sides to help them exist no more." ⁷

Herodotus tells us that Xerxes was not at first inclined to make war against Greece but was driven thereto by a couple of dreams.

"The first night he imagined that a tall and handsome man stood before him and said: Do you, then, change your mind, O Persian, and resolve not to lead an army against Greece, after having ordered the Persians to assemble their forces? You do not well to change your resolution, nor is there any man who will agree with you; therefore pursue that course which you resolved upon in the day. The second night, after that Xerxes had paid no attention to the first dream, the same dream came to him again and said: Son of Darius, you have, then, openly renounced, in the presence of the Persians, the intended expedition, and make no account of my words, as if you had not heard them from anyone. Be well assured, however, of this, that unless you immediately undertake this expedition, this will be the consequence to you: As you have become great and powerful in a short time, so you shall become low again in an equally short time." ⁸

Josephus ⁹ says that Alexander the Great told Jaddua the high priest that while he was at Dios in Macedonia he had seen him in a dream in the very habit in which he came to meet Alexander when on his way to Jerusalem; and that in this dream Jaddua had exhorted him boldly to pass over the sea, for that he would conduct his army and give him the dominion over the Persians.

2. As a parallel to the prayer of Daniel in chapter ix, and its answer we have in the Scriptures the instance where Hezekiah laid the letter of Sennacherib before the Lord and prayed and the answer came to him through Isaiah the prophet assuring him that

⁷ *Id.* III, II, p. 99.

⁸ Book VII, 12, 14.

⁹ *Antiq.* xi, viii, 5.

Sennacherib should return to Assyria without capturing Jerusalem (Isa. xxxvii, 10-35). In like manner Ashurbanipal says that on account of the wickedness which Teumman king of Elam had spoken he went to the exalted Ishtar, stood before her, and bowed down to her, his tears aflowing, and said:

“O Mistress of Arbela! I am Ashurbanipal, king of Assyria, the creature of thy hands . . . of the father thy begetter. For the renovation of the temples of Assyria and the completion of the great cities of Accad, I have sought thy holy places and have gone to worship. . . . But as to Teumman, king of Elam, who honours not the gods, do Thou, O Mistress of Mistresses, goddess of battle, mistress of conflict, queen of the gods, who speakest favourably before Ashur thy father, thy begetter; do thou (destroy) him who has set his army in motion, and made war and taken up arms, to go against Assyria. Do Thou, the warrior of the gods, like a *bitte* in the midst of the battle put him in disarray and smite him with a storm and an evil wind.” Ishtar heard my sighing sighs and said, “Fear not” and encouraged my heart. She said: “On account of the raising of thy hands, which thou has raised, and of thy eyes which are filled with tears, I will show thee favour.”

Toward the end of that night in which I had turned myself to her, a seer laid himself down and saw a dream-vision, a vision of the night Ishtar caused him to see, and he told it to me, as follows: “Ishtar who dwells in Arbela entered and to right and left she hung quivers. She had her bow in her hand and drew from its sheath a sharp warlike sword. Before her didst thou enter. She, like the mother who bore thee, spake with thee. Ishtar, the exalted of the gods, spake to thee and issued the command to thee: “See that thou givest battle (?); wherever thy person (*panuki*) dwells, I shall go.” Thou spakest to her: “To the place where thou goest, will I go, O Mistress of Mistresses.” She told thee: “Thou mayest abide here in the place of the habitation of Nebo, eat food, drink wine, make music, honour my godhead, till I go and do that work and fulfill the wish of thy heart; thy face shall not blanch and thy feet shall not turn (*inarridu*), nor shalt thou put thy *kurget* in the midst of the battle; in her good bosom shall she cover thee (*tahšinka*) and protect all thy form (?). Before her, a flame will flare up and for the conquest of thy foes she will cause it to burst forth. Against Teumman, king of Elam, with whom she is enraged, her face is fixed.”¹⁰

3. As to the vision consisting of a symbol and an explanation, we find it to be the favourite method of the prophets just as it was

¹⁰ Dream of Nabunaid.

in the case of Daniel. Thus Amos has the visions of the plumb-line (vii) and of the basket of summer fruit (viii). Isaiah has the vision of the Lord in His temple (vi), and that of Maharshalal-hash-baz (viii). Jeremiah has the vision of the two baskets of figs (xxiv). Ezekiel has the visions of the cherubim (i & x), of the fire (viii), of the dry bones (xxxvii), and of the temple (xl-xlviii). Zechariah has those of the red horse, of the four carpenters (i), of Joshua and Satan (iii), of the golden candlestick and the two olive trees (iv), of the flying roll, and of the woman sitting in the ephah (v), and of the four chariots (vi). Compare also the vision of the burning bush (Ex. iii), Elijah at Horeb (1 Kgs. xix), and Micaiah before Ahab (1 Kgs. xxii).

So in profane literature, an Assyrian writer¹¹ tells the story of how a fox made its way into the royal park of the city of Assur and took refuge in the lake but was afterwards caught and killed.¹² This was interpreted by the astrologers as a sign.

Nabunaid¹³ says that on account of the conjunction of a great star with the moon he was thoughtful in his heart, etc.

4. Fourthly, the prophet predicts without telling in what manner he got his information (xi). Compare Dt. xxxii, 33; Gen. xlix and numerous tablets in Thompson's *Reports*.

5. A fifth kind of prediction is frequently found in the prophets of the Old Testament wherein God or his angel is represented as speaking to the prophet without the intervention of a dream or vision, e.g., Dan. ix, 22-27.

So, also, Ashurbanipal says that the goddess Nannai foretold saying: Ashurbanipal shall bring me out of wicked Elam and shall bring me in to Eanna.¹⁴

Second Assumption

But not only is the form in which the visions and dreams of Daniel are presented to us permissible in the 6th century B.C.

¹¹ K 551.

¹² R. C. Thompson, *The Reports of the Magicians and Astrologers of Assyria and Babylonia*, p. xvii.

¹³ In *Deutsche Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, Num. 8, Col. vii, 4.

¹⁴ *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, II, 211.

We can go further and say that it was not a common form in use in the 2nd century B.C. Of all the apocalyptic literature of the Hebrews, the only ones of which the whole or parts are thought to have been written in the 2nd century B.C. are Jubilees, the XII Patriarchs, and parts of Enoch, of the Sibylline Oracles, and of Baruch.

1. As to *Jubilees*, the form is not at all that found in Daniel. This book gives citations from the historical portions of the Pentateuch and then gives a sort of commentary upon them, in which the author attempts to show that the principal laws of the Pentateuch were in existence in the time of the men whose history is recorded in Genesis, and that in many cases God had revealed these laws to the fathers long before the time of Moses. Long passages of Genesis are cited almost verbatim and certain laws which were afterwards clearly enunciated by Moses are inferred as having been not merely implied in these narratives, but as having been expressly declared at the time when the history was enacted. The form is not that of dreams and visions which are interpreted, with the prayers and the answers of Moses, such as we find in Daniel; but it resembles rather the admixture of history and law which is found in Numbers, or Chronicles.

2. As to *The XII Patriarchs*, the twelve so-called visions of it are fashioned after the prototype of the blessings of Jacob recorded in Gen. xlix, and those of Moses found in Deut. xxxiii. Each one of the patriarchs before his death calls his sons together and makes predictions as to their future, just as Jacob and Moses are said to have done, except that their sons are not mentioned by name nor their blessings divided. The age of each of the patriarchs at the time of his death is usually given at the beginning of his blessing and at the end it is said that the bones of each one of them, except Joseph, were carried up and buried in Hebron. One patriarch discusses the harmful effects of lust, another of theft, another of murder, etc. In the case of others, such as Joseph, the virtues of continence and mercy are exalted. The form is the same in all the twelve and in no one of them is there any resemblance to any one of the visions or dreams of Daniel.

3. The form of that part of the apocryphal book of *Baruch* which is usually put in the 2nd century B.C.¹⁵ is like the narrative in the Book of Jeremiah and has no resemblance whatever to that of the Book of Daniel. The confessions of the people are mostly taken apparently from Neh. ix, and Dan. ix, but are not followed by a vision as in Daniel.

4. The parts of the *Sibylline Oracles* which are thought to have been written before 100 B.C. comprise most of Book III. They are all written in the metre of Homer's *Iliad*. No author is mentioned, nor is any date given. They are admitted to have been formed after the analogy of the heathen oracles of the Sibyl, and nothing like them was, so far as we know, ever composed in Hebrew, and certainly nothing like them is to be found in Daniel.

5. There remain only the portions of *Enoch* which are said to have been written before 100 B.C. These are the only apocalyptic writings of this period which in form may be said to resemble Daniel. The principal argument is that both authors assert that they have received the subject-matter (?) of their narratives by a revelation and this commonly from an angel. But as we have seen above, nearly all of the prophets say that they had visions; and angels are said to have spoken to Abraham, Jacob, Moses, Joshua, Gideon, and especially to Zechariah. The differences however between Daniel and Enoch are very great and should not be overlooked. For example, Daniel always gives a definite time and place for his visions, Enoch never. Daniel confines himself to earthly localities for his revelations. Enoch is snatched off to the heavens for his. Daniel speaks of well known potentates of earth, such as Nebuchadnezzar and Cyrus; whereas Enoch mentions no man by name, but confines his personal designations to archangels, good and bad. Daniel confines himself to dreams and visions such as would naturally be suggested by his earthly surroundings, situated as he is said to have been in the courts of the kings of Babylon and Persia; but Enoch hies away like a witch on a broomstick to sweep the cobwebs from the sky. Daniel confines himself to prose, or the

¹⁵ See Churton, on *Baruch* in *Com. on O. T.*

higher style of prophetic discourse; whereas Enoch slips off into poetry, in which more than half of his material is composed. Daniel is so definite and clear in his allusions and statements that in some parts (as chap. xi) what he writes might well be taken as an outline of the history of the times of which he speaks and all commentators are agreed as to the events to which the larger part of his apocalypse refers; whereas Enoch is so indefinite, that it is only with great difficulty that any two commentators can agree as to the events to which he refers. Daniel by his frankness boldly challenges the world to investigate the truth of his statements; whereas Enoch hides himself behind a mass of dark figures and recondite allusions and veiled and dubious utterances, as if he feared that his meaning should be revealed to those whom he addressed.

Nor is it correct to say that the form of the visions of Daniel was a common form of the apocalypse after 100 B.C. For:

1. The books of *Enoch* and the *Sibylline Oracles* are just as different from Daniel in their later as in their earlier portions.

2. The seven portions of the *Apocalypse of Baruch*, which Professor Charles dates from shortly before 70 A.D. to between 130 and 180 A.D., when a redactor is said to have put them together, have an artistic form that is utterly foreign to Daniel. According to the scheme of the final editor, the seven parts are divided from each other by fasts. Thus in v, 2, ix, 2, xii, 5, xxi, 1, xlvii, 2, there are fasts,—the last four being each of seven days.¹⁶ In each part the fast is generally followed by “a prayer; then a divine message or revelation, then an announcement of this either to an individual or to the people, followed occasionally by a lamentation.”¹⁷ In some of the parts we find indications of the form of vision given to Daniel (*e.g.*, xxii, 1, liii, 1, lv, 3); but in general it is copied rather after the style of Jeremiah.

3. The *Assumption of Moses* is in the form of a dying charge from Moses to Joshua, similar to the blessings of Jacob in Gen. xlix, and that of Moses in Deut. xxxiii, only that it gives the fortune of the people of Israel rather than the fortune of the in-

¹⁶ These may be compared to the fasts mentioned in Dan. ix, 3, 20-21.

¹⁷ Charles, *Apocalypse of Baruch*, p. 9.

dividual tribes. In parts, such as the ninth verse of chapter vi, it resembles, it is true, in its detailed statement of events, the eleventh chapter of Daniel. But, in chap. x, 1-10 it is more similar in form to the Sibylline Oracles, or to the poetical parts of Enoch, which have no parallel in Daniel; and in chapters vii-ix, it seems to be in imitation of Deut. xxviii. It nowhere purports to contain a vision, or a dream, or an interpretation of a dream; but like the blessings of Isaac, Jacob, and Moses, gives a lengthy prediction of the history of Israel from the standpoint of the time of the supposed speaker. The rest of the book is an expansion of the last scenes and words between Moses and Joshua as recorded in the last chapter of Deuteronomy.

4. The so-called *Ascension of Isaiah* is divided by Professor Charles into three parts—of these, the first, called the “Martyrdom,” purports to be and is written as if it were historical, after the manner of the Books of Kings. The second part, the “Testament of Hezekiah,” is a professedly predictive description of the coming forth of the Beloved (the Messiah) from the seventh heaven and of his life on earth, of his crucifixion, and the sending forth of the twelve disciples, etc. It is derived apparently from the records of the *Gospels* and of the *Acts of the Apostles*. It appears from iii, 13 that it was meant to represent the contents of a vision of Isaiah. Parts of it may be compared to Daniel xi; though it is much more definite and explicit than anything in Daniel. Parts of it, however, are more like the predictions in the letters of Paul and in the Revelation of St. John and in the discourses of Jesus recorded in Matt. xxiv, Mk. xiii, and Lk. xxi, and to those in Jer. 1, Deut. xxviii. and elsewhere in the Old Testament.

The third part of the *Ascension of Isaiah*, called by Professor Charles the “Vision of Isaiah,” is based partly on the vision of the sixth chapter of Isaiah and resembles in part the visions of the Revelation of St. John. In form it is like nothing in Daniel, resembling rather the Babylonian poem of the Descent of Ishtar with the seven heavens put in place of the seven departments of Hades.

5. *Fourth Ezra* is divided by its latest editor, Doctor Box, into six parts. (1) The Salathiel Apocalypse, (2) an Ezra Apocalypse, (3) the Eagle Vision, (4) the Son of Man Vision, (5) an Ezra-piece, and (6) the parts added by the Redactor.

The *Salathiel Apocalypse* consists of four visions. Each of these is preceded by a fast, followed by a prayer in answer to which the angel Uriel reveals the contents of the Vision. The contents are in the form of a debate relieved by many poetic passages of great beauty. The *Ezra-Apocalypse* has also alternating selections from a poem inserted by the Redactor in the midst of the first three visions of Salathiel. The *Eagle Vision* of chaps. xi-xii, which Doctor Box thinks to have been excerpted from a book of dream visions, is more like the visions of Daniel than any other apocalypse, consisting of a dream, a prayer and an interpretation, and followed by a command to write what he had seen in a book to be put in a secret place. The *Son of Man Vision*, also, is after the same form except that it omits the seal of the vision. The Ezra-piece, the so-called *Seventh Vision* or *Ezra Legend*, is modelled partly on the account of Moses at the burning bush, partly on that of Elijah under the juniper tree, but has nothing specifically like anything in Daniel, except in its reference to the esoteric nature of its disclosures. A large part of it, also, is poetic in form.

6. In the *New Testament*, also, most of the apocalyptic portions differ largely in form from that used in Daniel.

(1) In the apocalypse contained in Matt. xxiv, and in the parallel passages in Mk. xiii, and Lk. xxi, Jesus as usual speaks on his own authority and without the intervention of dreams, visions, or angels, avoiding, also, the form of debate characteristic of Daniel and of others of the apocalypses.

(2) In the apocalyptic parts of the *Epistles*, also, the form is different from that found in Daniel. In the short apocalypse recorded in 1 Tim. iv, 1-3, and in that in 2 Tim. iii, the Spirit is represented as the speaker, no dream vision, or angel being mentioned. The apocalyptic portions of 1 Cor. and of 1 and 2 Thess. describe the coming day of Christ; but they are cast in a form different from that of the ordinary apocalypses. In 2

Peter iii, the apostle bases his apocalypse on the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets and on the commandments of the apostles.

(3) The *Revelation of St. John*, also, cannot be said to be an imitation in form of the Book of Daniel, though in many minor points it resembles it. It has no definite dates like the visions of Daniel, nor any dreams or prayers; nor does it mention the kings by name, nor concern itself preëminently with the kingdoms of this world as Daniel does. In one great particular, however, they are alike: for they both alike make the culmination and consummation of every vision to be the time when the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ.

From the above review of the forms of the Apocalyptic literature from the time of Isaiah to 135 A.D., it is evident that there was never any time during this period when as far as form is concerned Daniel might not have been written. During this whole time, with the exception of the years from Zechariah to the 2nd century, we have apocalypses resembling these in Daniel in some particular and differing from them in others. No two apocalypses are exactly alike in form. Some of those that are most unlike came from the same period; for example, the Sibylline Oracles, and Jubilees and Enoch and the Testimony of the XII Patriarchs from the 2nd century B.C.; and Baruch, the Testimony of Hezekiah and the Revelation of St. John from the 1st century A.D. In respect to the form of Daniel, then, it seems clear that the critics of Daniel have been drawing on their imagination for their facts, both when they have asserted that judged by the criterion of form it could not have been written in the 6th century B.C. and when they have asserted that judged by the same criterion it must have been written in the 2nd century B.C.

Third Assumption

With regard to the third assertion, that Daniel must have been written after the events which are so accurately described in it actually occurred, we claim that this is not a specific indictment of the Book of Daniel but of the whole system of Christianity

which is based upon the possibility and the fact of a supernatural revelation. If we put Daniel at a late date simply because of the fact that otherwise we would be compelled to admit that it accurately predicts events occurring after the 6th century B.C., we must for the same reason put Luke xxi, after 70 A.D.

If Christ were a mere man, his claim to predict events might be cast aside. Were Daniel not a prophet of the Lord, so his also might be cast aside. But if holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit and if God at sundry times and in divers manners spake unto men by the prophets and in the latter times through his Son by whom He made the worlds, then they spake for God who knows the end from the beginning. If God spake by the prophets, and Jesus acknowledged Daniel as a prophet, what man can put a limit to the extent and accuracy of that which God spake? "O fools and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets hath spoken," your *musts* are not the *musts* of the prophets,—your *musts* are not the *musts* of God who hath showed the things that are to come hereafter that they may know that He is God.

Fourth Assumption

But, finally, the critics intimate or assert that the Book of Daniel is false simply because it is, or contains, apocalypses. This is based upon the presumption that all apocalypses are false. Of course, if we define an apocalypse as an account written after certain events have happened and purporting to have been written before they happened, than all apocalypses would be false. But certainly no one would claim that the Revelation of St. John is such an apocalypse; nor do we think that anyone could show that large parts of the books of Enoch, or the 4th Ezra, would come under such a definition of an apocalypse. Nor can the parts at least of any of the pre-Christian apocalypses which speak of a judgment, or a resurrection, or a Messianic kingdom, be put under that definition.

The fact is, however, that an apocalypse claims to be a revelation of events yet future from the standpoint of the writer, or the speaker of the vision. The question for us to determine is,

whether this claim to be an apocalypse is true or false. All apocalypses might be false; all might possibly be true. Each must be investigated and judged according to the laws of evidence proper to such predictions. A priori, no man can dogmatically assert that all such predictions are false either in intention or fact; because no man is omniscient. Nor can any man lay down rules for the possibility or character of a divine revelation.

To all who admit the possibility of a revelation from God to man, the truth or falsity of any apparent apocalypse will depend upon its claim and the evidence in support of that claim. Thus, in the case of Matt. xxiv, Mk. xiii, and Lk. xxi, the direct claim is that it is an apocalyptic discourse of the Lord with reference especially to the destruction of Jerusalem. The text of these chapters is supported by the same direct evidence as that which we have for the remaining parts of the books in which they occur. The ability of Jesus to make such a revelation of future events will not be disputed by anyone who believes that He was the Son of God. The fact of the revelation and the trustworthiness of it, were never disputed by the early writers, so far as anyone knows. So far, in fact, as the account in Luke is concerned, the evidence for the rest of the book is so overwhelming that Harnack can reject the 21st chapter only on the ground that it is apocalyptic.

So, also, in regard to the apocalyptic parts of Daniel. The text of the apocalyptic parts is supported by exactly the same evidence as that for the rest of the book. The unity of the book is so generally admitted on reasonable grounds by critics of all schools that it scarcely needs to be defended. In fact, it would probably never have been assailed, were it not for the difficulty of the problem suggested by the apocalyptic parts of the book. To Christians the truth of the claim of Daniel to be a true narrative of the life and apocalypses of the man Daniel would seem to be confirmed by the treatment accorded to it by Christ and the New Testament writers in general.

Again it cannot be said that any Jews of the early ages ever denied the canonicity or authenticity of Daniel on any ground whatever, nor especially on the ground that it was, or contained,

an apocalypse. In *Yadayim*, iv, 5, it is expressly stated that "the Aramaic passages in Ezra and Daniel defile the hands," i.e., are canonical. No reference, or allusion is to be found either in the Talmud, or Josephus, or any other source, suggesting that any rabbi, or Jew, of ancient times ever questioned the genuineness, authenticity, or canonicity, of the Hebrew portions of Daniel. The canonicity of Esther is said to have been questioned on the ground that it was not dictated by the Holy Spirit.¹⁸ Ezekiel was in danger of being suppressed, because its contents were alleged to be contradictory to the words of the Law.¹⁹ Some desired to withdraw the Book of Proverbs from use because it contained internal contradictions.²⁰ Some are said to have withdrawn Proverbs, the Song of Songs, and Ecclesiastes, from public use, because they spoke in proverbs.²¹ Some would have withdrawn Ecclesiastes, because it is self-contradictory, contradicts the words of David, and favours heresy.²²

These instances from the Talmud teach us that the canonicity of certain books was questioned because of the language in which they were written, on the ground of their proverbial character, of their self-contradictions, or of their disagreement with the Psalter or the Law; or, because they were thought not to have been dictated by the Holy Spirit. No one ever disputed a book on the ground of its apocalyptic character. It remained for the heathen, Neo-Platonic philosopher Porphyry, at the end of the third century, A.D., to enunciate and elaborate this objection to the Book of Daniel. It is a heathenish objection, resting simply on the philosophical assumption that there is no such thing as predictive prophecy.

¹⁸ *Megilla*, fol. 7d.

¹⁹ *Moed Katan*, 5a.

²⁰ *Sabbath*, 30b.

²¹ *Aboth di Rabbi Nathan*.

²² *Sabbath*, 30a, *Midrash Vayyikra Rabba*, c. 28.

CHAPTER V

THE ORIGIN OF THE IDEAS OF DANIEL

BEFORE entering upon the discussion of the origin of the ideas of Daniel, several fallacies must first be considered.

Thus it is claimed that it is possible to determine the time of a revelation from its ideas in the same manner as we would determine that of a mere human production. But, for those who believe in a thinking God who has made the universe, including man, it is impossible to deny the possibility of a revelation to His creatures of Himself and of His plans up to the capacity of those creatures to receive such a revelation. How and why He makes such a revelation it may be impossible for the objects of it to determine or to understand: but that He can reveal what He desires to reveal must be admitted.

Further, to all who believe that God has begun to make such a revelation it is clear that no limits as to the time and manner and order and emphasis, extent and subject-matter, of such a revelation can be set by the creatures who receive it. These are matters for the Revealer to determine and not for the persons to whom the revelation is made.

To those who accept these premises (and we take it that all Christians must accept them), all objections against the Book of Daniel on the ground of the character of the revelation that it contains may safely be looked upon as beyond the legitimate realm of discussion. Whether God saw fit to reveal these truths in the sixth or in the second century B.C. must be a matter of comparatively little importance. What is of importance for us is, that He has revealed them.

To object to the fact of a certain alleged revelation that it is too detailed, or that it is written in veiled language, or in an unusual rhetorical style, or in a novel literary manner, is fatuous

and unreasonable. At sundry times and in divers manners, God spake unto man through the prophets.

Further, though we admit that there is a development in the fullness and clearness of God's revelation of certain truths to man, there is no reason for contending that no revelation of an entirely new truth should ever be made, nor for attempting to fix the time at which the revelation of the new truth should be made. These points, again, are fixed by the Revealer.

It is to be observed further that the laws of the evolution of ideas which may be justly applied to a purely human production do not necessarily apply to a document which is said to be, or contain, a revelation from God. This may be observed in the case of the idea of a Messiah. In the sense in which this idea is put forth in the Scriptures it is unique and can be, if it be true, naught but a matter of revelation as over against a result of mere human longing and development. Most of what any prophet did, or could, say with regard to such a person would be necessarily dependent upon what God pleased to reveal to him. The time and place at which the lineaments of character and work should be made known to man would be subject to the divine will and pleasure. What Isaiah, Micah, Zechariah, or any prophet said with regard to Him, or what any prophet might have said, is not for us to judge, nor for any man to judge.

Sometimes, it is true, it may be possible to determine the date of a document by the ideas that are found to be expressed in it for the first time, especially where we have a vast mass of literature revealing a natural intellectual development for a long period of time, or where the idea has been declared by the author or acknowledged by contemporaries or successors to have originated with him. But where these ideas are religious or philosophical, and above all where they are contained in what claims to be a revelation from God, the time when the ideas are first stated or promulgated depends on the mind of the Thinker and the will of the Revealer rather than upon the general condition of mankind. This general condition may indeed suggest the thought of the Thinker and may occasion the form of the revelation; but it can not be said to have originated it. For example, there were many

times before that of the Maccabees, when the Israelites had been grievously oppressed by foreign foes—by Egyptians, Philistines, Assyrians, Babylonians, Persians, and Greeks—and when Israel's heroes had performed deeds of valour in their own defence. It would seem absurd to attempt to determine the date of a psalm or prophecy from a general reference to persecution or destitution or from words of comfort contained in it. It would seem equally absurd to attempt to fix the date of a literary production from the fact that it contains words, or references, which would suit many known or unknown eventualities; as, for example, when a distinguished scholar attempts to place the composition of parts of Nahum in the time of the Maccabees, because in chap. ii, 2 the prophet speaks of him who dashes in pieces (מפיץ). This word might just as well indicate the time of Deborah because she says that Jael "took a hammer" (המקבת) and "smote" (תקע) the head of Sisera.

Another absurdity is to assert that the fact that a book alleged to have been written by a certain author is not quoted or used by a later author proves either that the apparently earlier one did not exist, or that his work was unknown to the later writer. Take in illustration of this the Book of Esther. Here we find no mention of God, nor of the prophets, nor even of the Law. Nor does the writer quote from any of the Psalms, nor from any of the historical books. Does this silence on his part disprove his knowledge of any of these books, or show that they did not exist? Everyone will say, Certainly not! How then has the failure of the post-captivity authors to mention Daniel, or to cite from him, or to refer to the ideas which he first promulgated, proved that Daniel did not exist at the time when Esther was written?

It is equally absurd to suppose that it is always possible to determine from a comparison of similar, or the same words, phrases, or ideas, occurring in two writings which of them has borrowed from the other. For in most cases it is obvious that both may have had before them the same original from which they have both cited, or that they may both unconsciously have happened to use the same words or to express the same thought in the same or in like language. Thus the verses in Mic. iv, 1-4 are the same as ii,

2-5 of Isaiah. Does this show that Isaiah borrowed from Micah or that Micah borrowed from Isaiah or that both derived from a common original? Again, Deut. xiv, is almost the same as Lev. xi. Does this show that D is later than P or that P is later than D, or may the same writer have expressed the same thought at different times in slightly different phraseology? The accounts of the Sermon on the Mount as given by Matthew and Luke differ in many particulars from one another. Did one of them derive the discourse from the other, or did they both derive it from the same source, or from different accounts given by hearers of the original discourse?

A multitude of such questions confronts us in the literary study of almost every book of the Bible and of the apocryphal and apocalyptic literature; and as we might expect, we find a number of them awaiting us when we enter upon the literary discussions centering around the Book of Daniel. From a comparison of the prayer in Daniel ix, with that in Neh. ix, it has been attempted to prove that Daniel is later than Nehemiah or *vice versa*. In the opinion of the present writer such attempts taken by themselves are almost sure to be in all cases devoid of convincing results; especially when, as in this instance, the similar phrases may have been derived from a common source found in the literature of the Jews written long before the time either of Nehemiah or of Daniel, or, where not thus found, may well have been the natural and appropriate language of prayer when made by men situated in like circumstances, reared in the same traditions, experiencing the same needs, and desiring help from the same God. Numerous prayers of the Egyptian, Assyrian, and Babylonian kings have in them many words and phrases that are the same and many more that are similar; but it would be impossible in most cases to determine from these words and phrases the relative dates of the prayers. There are certain phrases that for centuries were the same, that had been stereotyped, so to speak, and that consequently can determine nothing definite as to the date of the document in which they occur.

Lastly, it is ridiculous for a Christian to be always running to heathen sources for the origin of the religious ideas which are contained in the Scriptures, and especially for their confirmation.

If Daniel speaking of himself says that there will be a resurrection of those who sleep in the dust, then, it may be an interesting question as to whether he is the first human being that ever put this thought in writing. It would, however, be merely his opinion and no better than any other man's; unless this other could prove by experiment, or scientific proof, that a resurrection will certainly take place. But if Daniel, speaking by revelation from God, says there will be a resurrection, this statement is no longer a man's opinion merely, but the truth of God to which all men must attend.

OBJECTIONS OF THE CRITICS

According to Driver: "It is undeniable that the doctrines of the Messiah, of angels, of the resurrection, and of a judgment on the world, are taught with greater distinctness, and in a more developed form [in Daniel] than elsewhere in the Old Testament, and with features approximating to (though not identical with) those met with in the earlier parts of the Book of Enoch, *c.* 100 B.C." ¹

Cornill says: "At the present time the view which sees in Daniel a work of the Maccabean period is the all-prevailing one." Among the "objective reasons of the utmost weight, which render the view of its non-genuineness necessary" is the presence in it of a "developed angelology" and of a "twofold individual resurrection of the dead to bliss and to damnation." ²

Prince tells us: "It is now very generally admitted that this doctrine [of the resurrection] also originated among the Persians and could only have become engrafted on the Jewish mind after a long period of intercourse with the Zoroastrian religion. . . . The investigations of Persian scholars, especially of Haug, Spiegel, and Windischmann, show that this is a real Zoroastrian doctrine. . . . It is clearly impossible, therefore, that the author of passages showing such beliefs could have lived as early as the time of Nebuchadnezzar." The angelology of Daniel, there can be little doubt, "is an indication of prolonged Persian influence." ³

¹ *L.O.T.*, p. 508.

² *Introduction*, pp. 384-386.

³ *Commentary on Daniel*, p. 21.

ASSUMPTIONS

I. It is assumed in the above statements that the doctrine of Daniel on the resurrection, angels, Messiah, and judgment is shown by comparison with other biblical documents to be too highly developed for the sixth century B.C., and especially that the doctrines of the resurrection and of angels as stated in Daniel originated among the Persians, that they were derived by the Jews from the Zoroastrians, and that, hence, they could not have been known to a Jewish author living as early as the time of Nebuchadnezzar.

II. It is assumed that the features of these doctrines as found in Daniel approximate those met with in parts of Enoch to such an extent as to justify the conclusion that the Book of Daniel and these parts of Enoch are from the same time.

ANSWERS TO ASSUMPTIONS

Taking up these assumptions in order we shall endeavor to show that all of the four doctrines mentioned by Driver as indications of the late date of Daniel may have been treated of in the sixth century B.C. as well as in the second. To one who believes that the Bible contains a revelation or a series of revelations from God to man, the question of the origin of the ideas peculiar to any individual writer of the Old Testament is interesting principally from the standpoint of the Biblical theologian who desires to trace the manner and order of those revelations, or of the historian who would give us an account of the gradual preparation of the world for the coming of Christ. A study of the history of Israel seems to teach that an acknowledgment of a need of light from above upon some question insoluble by unaided human intellect, or the expression of a desire for such light, has usually preceded in point of time the revelation which supplies the light needed and meets the want expressed. Hence, such questions as those that concern the origin of the ideas of angels, resurrection, judgment and a Messiah are proper for us

to consider even apart from the fact of whether God has seen fit to give us any light upon this subject and when and how He has given this light. That man has recognized that he is a sinner against God, and has need of redemption is one thing; that God has supplied a redemption to meet the need is another thing. That man is mortal and desires immortality is one thing; that God should declare that he is, or may become, immortal is another thing. So also, that men should think that there are angels and hope or fear that there may be a resurrection, or judgment and a Messiah, is one thing; whereas the questions of whether God has said that angels do exist, and as to whether there will be a resurrection and a judgment and a Messiah are an entirely different thing.

Recognizing, then, these distinctions, it will be understood that in the following pages we are not going to consider whether God could have made revelations with regard to angels, resurrection, judgment and the Messianic kingdom as early as the sixth century B.C.; but merely whether we have any evidence that men had thought about these questions as early as that time and as to what they had thought about them. If we can show that they had already thought about these things, then the statements of Daniel might be looked upon as the answers which God gave to their natural queries upon these matters for which the human mind could find no solution. If we find that they did not express any thoughts upon these subjects, we may still suppose that they had thought upon them or that possibly there first arose in the great mind of Daniel or Isaiah the questions concerning these important matters affecting the future of humanity to which God saw fit to vouchsafe the answers. In no case will it be necessary to suppose that such questions must have arisen or that the unaided human intellect could have found an answer to such questions more readily in the second century B.C. than in the sixth. Nor, in any case, can it be thought for a moment, that God knew the answers to such questions better in the second than in the sixth century B.C.

THE ANTIQUITY OF THE IDEAS OF DANIEL

Resurrection

I. First, then, let us consider where and when the idea of a resurrection is first met.

a. According to Professor Breasted⁴ the early Egyptians (about 4000 B.C.) believed in a life hereafter, subject to wants of the same nature as those of the present life. The most obvious explanation of the origin of embalming is that it was expected that the soul which had departed would after a time return again to its former body.⁵

b. Among the Babylonians the phrase "giver of life to the dead" (*muballiṭ mituti.*) which is found frequently of Marduk "who loves to make the dead alive" and of others of the gods, certainly shows at least that the Babylonians had a conception of revivification of the dead. The argument seems to be, "O Marduk, who can raise the dead to life, restore this sick person to health once more." The sentence in King's *Babylonian Magic* (No. ii, 21) expresses the idea more clearly; for it says: "The body of the man who has been brought down to Arallu (their place of the dead), thou dost (or canst) bring back" (*ša ana aralli šurudu paḡaršu tutira*). These texts show that the Assyrians and Babylonians in the times of Ashurbanipal and Nebuchadnezzar had at least the idea of and the longing for, a restoration or continuation, of life after death and a belief that the gods could, if they would, give life unto the dead and bring back their bodies from the place of the dead.

c. Among the old Iranians the doctrine of the resurrection of the body seems to be clearly taught in the nineteenth, or Zamyâd, Yasht.⁶ The three passages in the Yashts are almost exactly the

⁴ *A History of the Ancient Egyptians*, p. 36.

⁵ That the ancient Egyptians of the pyramid dynasties believed in the resurrection of the body is demonstrated from numerous texts by Professor Erman of Berlin in his *Handbook of Egyptian Religion*, pp. 85-114.

⁶ §§ 11, 12; 19, 20; 89, 90. See the *Zend-Avesta in the Sacred Books of the East*, Vol. XXIII, translated by J. Darmesteter, and a fragment translated by L. H. Mills in the *Zend-Avesta*, Part 3 in the *Sacred Books of the East*, Vol. XXXI, p. 390.

same. In the first, it is said that the creatures of Ahura-Mazda, in the second, that the Amesha-Spentas, in the third, that the victorious Saosyant and his helpers, "shall restore the world, which will (thenceforth) never grow old and never die, never decaying and never rotting, ever living and ever increasing, and master of its wish, when *the dead will rise*, when life and immortality will come, and the world will be restored at its wish," etc. In the fragment translated by Mills we read, "Let the dead arise unhindered by these foes [i.e., Angra Manyu and the Dævas] and let bodily life be sustained in these lifeless bodies."

This evidence shows us that the Avesta manuscripts teach clearly a resurrection of the dead. It is to be noted, however, that the oldest of these manuscripts is dated in the year 1323 A.D.⁷ Besides, as expert a critic as de Harlez maintains that this resurrection is spiritual and that the Pahlavi theology first introduced the notion of a *resurrectio carnis*. Still after having read the testimony of such experts as Windischmann, Spiegel, Haug, West, Moulton, Jackson, Mills, Geldner, Darmesteter, de Harlez, and Soderblom, and also the testimony of the Greek and other sources of information as to the religion of the ancient Persians,⁸ one is driven to accept the opinion that the doctrine of the resurrection spoken of in these passages refers to a literal resurrection of the body and that the sixth Yasht at least was most probably written before the time of Alexander the Great. Moulton suggests that the doctrine itself was probably much older than these records, or even than the time of Zoroaster.⁹ While accepting this suggestion, it is fair to say that by analogy it is also probable that the doctrine of the resurrection as propounded by Isaiah, Job, and Daniel, is much older than any one of these books.

Since the latest authorities on the Avesta¹⁰ do not place Yasht xix among the Gathas, it may be well to quote part of what Moulton says on the *Saosyant*.¹¹ "The 'Consummation' of the

⁷ Haug in West's edition of the *Language, Writings and Religion of the Parsis* in the chapter on the "Extant Pahlavi Literature," pp. 93-115.

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 3-54.

⁹ *Early Zoroastrianism*, p. 260.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 343 f.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 158 f.

Gathas involves a 'Renovation of the World,' a divine event towards which the whole creation is moving. It is accomplished by the present labours of 'those that will deliver,' the *saosyants*. In the Gathas these are simply Zarathushtra himself and his fellow-workers."¹² Saosyant comes from a root *sav* meaning "to benefit."¹³ A Persian word corresponding to the Messiah (the anointed) of Daniel is not found in the Avesta, nor is "the Benefactor" called a prince or a prince of princes.

d. In the Old Testament outside of Daniel, a resurrection is referred to:

(1) In Isa. xxvi, 19, which reads: "Thy dead shall live, with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust; for thy dew is as the dew in the herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead."

(2) In Ezek. xxxvii, the idea of a resurrection of the dead is clearly expressed in the vision of the dry bones.

(3) In Isa. liii, 10 it is said that when the Lord shall have made the soul of his servant an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hands.

(4) In Job xvi, 13 ff. and xix, 25 the author "rises to the thought and throws out the wish that there may be release from sheol, and later on is assured that his redeemer (*gō'ēl*) lives, and that his flesh will see God. All this implies literal death, and then restoration of life after death, i.e., resurrection in the proper sense of the word."

(5) Finally, the actual raisings to life by Elijah and Elisha recorded in 1 Kings xvii, and 2 Kings iv, express a belief in the possibility, and in these cases in the fact, of a revivification of the dead.¹⁴ The assumptions of Enoch and Elijah show that the Hebrews believed in a future life in a physical body, and

¹² Thus in *Yasna* 49.9 the helper (*saosyant*) who was created to bring deliverance is said by Moulton to have been Jamaspa the son-in-law of Vishtaspa.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 145.

¹⁴ For any further information as to the O.T. teaching on this subject, see the article by E. R. Bernard in *Hastings' Dict. of the Bible*, Vol. IV, p. 232.

the raising of Samuel that some at least thought that there was a life after death and that there could be a resumption of the well known physical body.

Judgment to Come

2. As to the origin of the idea of a judgment to come, we find that it also was prevalent among the Egyptians and Babylonians as well as among the Persians.

a. The Egyptians taught that there would be an "ethical test at the close of life, making life hereafter depend upon the character of the life lived on earth."¹⁵ Erman cites the *Pyramid Texts* as follows: "Around thee stand the gods and call to thee 'rise, stand up' and thou awakest."^{15a} This reminds us of Daniel. And, "Thou eatest the food of the gods. He (Re) places thee as the morning star in the midst of the field of Eavv."¹⁶ "Those that failed to pass the judgment must lie hungry and thirsty in their graves and can not behold the sun."¹⁷

b. The Babylonians, also, believed in some kind of a judgment after death involving a separation and a determination of death or life to the departed.¹⁸

c. According to the Avesta,¹⁹ Ahura Mazda will conduct a judgment after death in which he will be assisted by Zoroaster as advocate for the good.²⁰

d. In the books of the Bible written before 550 B.C., we find frequent references to a judgment.²¹

Angelology

3. Regarding the Angelology:

a. There is no proof that the Hebrews derived their ideas con-

¹⁵ Breasted, *History of Egypt*, p. 67 and Budge, *The Book of the Dead* I, xciii-cix.

^{15a} *Op. cit. supra.*

¹⁶ See also Naville, *The Old Egyptian Faith*, pp. 193-207.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 105.

¹⁸ See Zimmern, *Keilinschriften und das A. T.*, p. 637.

¹⁹ Gatha, *Yasna* 46.

²⁰ *Early Zoroastrianism*, pp. 166, 374 f. See Tisdall, *Christianity and Other Faiths*, p. 133.

²¹ See especially Isaiah, chapter two.

cerning angels from the Persians. The earliest portions of the Avesta, as we have it, were collected and edited in the time of the Sassanians (226 A.D.-637 A.D.). Parts of the collection, called the Gathas, most probably date back to about the year 600 B.C., or possibly even earlier. The word Amashaspand which is said to be equivalent to archangel does not occur in the Gathas, nor indeed in any of the earliest texts.²² *Vohu Manu* "Good Thought" and other terms which came to be used in later Mazdaism to denote the beings or ideas called Amashaspands are never used in the Gathas to denote persons, though at times they are personified, like the Hebrew wisdom in Proverbs. In the memoric stanza (*Yasna*, 47. 1) the names of all the future Amashaspands are found. The stanza as translated by Moulton²³ reads as follows: "By his Holy Spirit and by Best Thought, and Word, in accordance with Right, Mazda Ahura with Dominion and Piety shall give us Welfare and Immortality." It is absurd to suppose that Daniel's ideas of angels were derived from such abstractions or personifications as the Best Thought, Right, Dominion, Piety, Welfare, and Immortality of this passage. The verse sounds like, "I, Wisdom dwell with Prudence" of Proverbs. In Daniel, Michael, Gabriel and all the angels are real persons, the messengers of God and mediators between God and man, whereas in the Gathas Mills says that he can recall no passage in which the so-called angels "are not felt to mean exactly what they signify as words," i.e., Right, Piety, etc.²⁴

The *Yashts*, the next oldest portions of the Avesta, (except the small prose portion called *Haptanghaite*) seem to have been composed in their original form about 400 B.C.,²⁵ or as Mills says, "in the third or fourth century before Christ." Here the attributes of God such as Right, Might, etc., have not merely been personified but are treated as objects of worship, just like the gods Ahura Mazda, Mithra, and Anahita. The only example of any one's being sent is in *Yasht* V, 8, 5, where Ahura Mazda

²² It occurs first in the *Haptanghaite*. See Mills in *Sacred Books of the East*, xxxi, 281; Moulton, in *Early Zoroastrianism*, p. 121.

²³ *Early Zoroastrianism*, p. 376.

²⁴ *Sacred Books of the East*, Vol. XXXI, p. xxiv.

²⁵ *Early Zoroastrianism*, p. 78.

orders Anahita to come down from the stars to earth. Anahita was a god and not an Amashaspand. Zeus in Homer also sends his messengers and in the Babylonian Nabu is called the messenger of Bel. A word for messenger, or angel, never occurs in the Gathas or Yashts. Except for the compound word Ahura Mazda, no name compounded with the name for god and hence corresponding to Gabri-El and Micha-El, is found in the early Parsi literature. Daniel's angels are not numbered, nor worshipped, like the Amashaspands of the Yashts, Yasnas, and other literature of the Parsis. The general charge made by Prince of the dependence of Daniel's ideas on those of the Persians is so devoid of all direct evidence and even of probable inference, that one is filled with amazement that he could have made it. In support of this amazement, appeal is made to the works of Moulton,²⁶ and Darmesteter.²⁷

b. The Assyrio-Babylonians believed in messengers of the gods and in good and evil spirits. Many of these had names. A man had his guardian angel, dwelling within him or going beside him. In a letter from the time of Hammurabi we find the phrase: "Thy guardian god hold thy head for good." A letter to the mother of Esarhaddon says: "A messenger of grace from Bel and Nebo goes at the side of the king." Nabopolassar says: Marduk "caused a good demon (*šedu damku*) to go at my side; in all that I do he causes my work to prosper." Further, the assembly of the Igigi and Anunnaki was a great council in which the destiny of the earth and of men was determined, as in the host of heaven in the vision of Micaiah recorded in 1 Ki. xxii, 19 and in the sons of God of Ps. xxix, 1 and elsewhere, and in the council of the holy ones of Ps. lxix, 6-8. The evil spirits among the Babylonians have distinctive class names such as *ekimmu*, *šedu* and *lilitu*. Judging from the magical texts, the number of these spirits is incalculable. In the Creation Story (III, 67-71) Gaga is the messenger of his father Ansar; in the story of Nergal and Eriškigal a messenger (*mar šipri*) is sent by the gods to

²⁶ *Early Zoroastrianism*, especially the translation of the Gathas, pages 343-390.

²⁷ *The Zend-Avesta*, Part II, in the *Sacred Books of the East*, Vol. xxiii.

Eriškigal (I, 3). On the Reverse I, 5f the messenger of the gods (Nergal) is accompanied by fourteen others whose *names are given*. In Ishtar's *Descent to Hell*, Namtar is called the messenger (*sukallu*) of Eriškigal. See other examples in the story of Adapa.²⁸

c. With regard to angels, *Daniel* gives the following information:

(1) The ordinary word for angel (מלאך) occurs only in iii, 28 and vi, 22, both in the Aramaic part.²⁹ In the former passage it is used by Nebuchadnezzar; in the latter, by Daniel.

(2) In the dream of Nebuchadnezzar recorded in chapter iv, he says that he saw "a watchful one and a holy" (vss. 13, 23) coming down from heaven.³⁰ This messenger from heaven speaks of the decree of "the watchful ones" and the word of "the holy ones" (vs. 17).

(3) In vii, 10, speaking of the judgment by the Ancient of Days, Daniel says that he beheld "a thousand thousand ministering unto him and ten thousand times ten thousand standing before him." Whether these multitudes are angels or men, or angels and men, is not certain. Since, according to verses 1, 2 it was in a dream-vision by night that Daniel saw this judgment scene of the Most High, it may be looked upon as an enlargement of what he was accustomed to see at the court of Nebuchadnezzar, the greatest of earthly potentates. Or he may have been attempting to enumerate "all the

²⁸ *Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, VI, i.

²⁹ The root of this word does not occur in Hebrew or Aramaic, or Assyrian. It is common in Ethiopic in the sense "to send." It appears to have been used in Arabic also.

³⁰ עיר is commonly derived from the verb עיר "to be awake," found in Syriac also in this sense. Some would connect it with the Hebrew ציר messenger, thus making it a synonym of מלאך, the usual word in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Arabic for messenger, or angel. Thus in Obad. 1, "a messenger has been sent among the nations," (cf. Jer. xlix, 14). In Isa. xviii, 1, 2, "Ethiopia that sendeth צירים by the sea . . . Go ye swift מלאכים" etc., and in Prov. xiii, 17, the two words are in the parallel sentences. (Compare also Isa. lvii, 9 and Prov. xxv, 13). Philologically, it would be equally possible to connect עיר with the Babylonian *širu* "exalted." Since Nebuchadnezzar is the one using this word, it would be entirely in harmony with Babylonian usage for him to speak of the person seen in his vision as "an exalted and illustrious one," i.e., *širu u kuddušu*.

host of heaven" of which Micaiah speaks in the vision of Jehovah's judgment recorded in 1 Kings xxii, 19, which even the critics would scarcely put later than the sixth century B.C., and which the writer of Kings places in the ninth.

(4) An angel named Gabriel is commissioned to explain a vision to Daniel while the latter is in a deep sleep (viii, 16-18). This same angel in the form of a man explains another vision in ix, 21ff.

(5) A man clothed in fine linen and certain other nameless angels are mentioned here and there, *e.g.*, x, 5, xii, 6. So, also the "saint" (קדוש) of viii, 13.

(6) Michael, "one of the chief princes," is said to have come to help Daniel (x, 13). He is called Michael your (i.e. Israel's) prince (x, 21) and "the great prince which standeth for the children of your people" (xii, 1), and it is said that he shall stand up at the time of the end.

d. Of the Old Testament as a whole it may be said that the idea of angels pervades the literature from the oldest to the latest. Of evil angels Satan is mentioned as the name of one in Zech. iii, 1, Job i, 6, and 1 Chr. xxi, 1; Lilith is found in Isa. xxxiv, 14 and Shed in Deut. xxxii, 17 and Ps. cvi, 37. Of the good angels Gabriel and Michael alone are mentioned by name and that in Daniel only.³¹

It seems evident from the above facts that the ideas of Daniel about angels can be accounted for *on their human side* by the preceding literature of the Old Testament reinforced by the Babylonian without recourse being had to Persian analogies.

Messiah

4. With regard to the idea of a Messiah,

a. It seems certain that no Egyptian or Babylonian text has as yet revealed any hope or belief that any one of the gods was going to intervene in the affairs of men for their redemption from sin

³¹ These angels are mentioned by name in the New Testament also, Michael in Jude 9 and again in Rev. xii, 7, and Gabriel in Luke i, 26. See Article "Angel" in Hastings' *Dictionary* by A. B. Davidson and the chapter on "Angels and Demons" in *The Religion of Israel* by Barton.

and suffering and death. The only ancient records,—from any nation at least that came into contact with the Jews—which give any such idea are those of the Zoroastrians. It is said in *Yasht* xix §§ 88, 89 that the prophet Saosyant the Victorious and his assistant will make a new world and that at his will the dead will rise again and immortal life will come.³²

b. The Old Testament, however, is full of the idea of redemption from sin and its consequences. Daniel and Psalm ii, are the only parts in which the agent in this redemption is called Messiah and Daniel the only one in which he is called the Prince; but the idea of a redeemer from sin and of God's appearing at the end of the world for judgment and to establish a kingdom is found all through the Old Testament.

DANIEL AND ENOCH

The assumption is groundless, that Daniel and the earlier part of Enoch approximate so closely in their treatment of the four subjects under discussion as to make certain the conclusion that they are from the same time. This will appear from a comparison of the teachings of Daniel on angels, resurrection, judgment, and the Messiah with what we find in other Old Testament works, in Enoch and in the other works of the second and first centuries B.C. and in the New Testament and other works of the first century A.D. In making these comparisons we shall follow the divisions and dates of the Book of Enoch as given by Charles.³³ We shall give the teachings on these four subjects of (a) Daniel, (b) the rest of the Old Testament, (c) Enoch and other extracanonical works of the second and first centuries B.C., and (d) the New Testament and other works of the first century A.D.

Resurrection

a. Daniel refers to the resurrection but once, that is, in xii, 2: "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt."

³² Tisdall p. 110. See above under "Resurrection" (pp. 125 f.).

³³ In the *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* II, 170.

b. Of the rest of the *Old Testament*, the fifty-seven psalms which Reuss, Cheyne, or other critics assign to the second century B.C., do not once mention a resurrection, nor does Ecclesiastes, nor the Song, nor any other portion of Scripture which is placed in this period by the critics. The references to the resurrection have been discussed above.

c. *The Book of Enoch*, etc.

(1) Of the four parts of the Book of Enoch thought to have been written in the second century B.C. :

(a) The *Book of Noah*, containing all or parts of sixteen chapters, says nothing about a resurrection.

(b) The only reference to a resurrection in the First Section of *Enoch* is in the passage (xxv), where it is said that the fruit of a fragrant tree shall after the great judgment be given to the righteous and holy elect and they shall live a long life on earth.

(c) The Second Section of *Enoch* (lxxxiii-xc) contains only a "veiled reference to the resurrection." In xc, 33, it is said that all that had been destroyed and dispersed assembled in the Lord's house, and that the Lord rejoiced because they were all good.

(d) The Third Section of *Enoch* (lxxii-lxxxii) does not mention a resurrection.

(2) The *Testaments of the XII Patriarchs* (written, according to Charles, between 137 and 107 B.C.) speak of the resurrection oftener than any other pre-Christian book. Thus in Benjamin x, 6-8, we read: "Ye shall see Enoch, Noah, and Shem, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, rising on the right hand in gladness. Then shall we also rise, each over our own tribe, and we shall worship the heavenly king. Then shall we all be changed, some into glory, and some into shame." In Simeon x, 2, the patriarch says: "Then shall I arise." In Zebulun x, 2, he says: "Then shall I arise again in the world." In Judah xxv, 1, 4 we read: "And after these things, shall Abraham and Isaac and Jacob arise unto life" and "those who have died in grief shall arise in joy and they who are put to death for the Lord's sake shall arise."

(3) The *Book of Jubilees* has given up all hope of a resurrection. According to Charles this book was written between 153 and 105 B.C.

(4) The parts of the *Sibylline Oracles* supposed to have been written in the second century B.C., do not mention a resurrection.

(5) The so-called *Addenda to the Book of Esther*, the *Book of Baruch*, the *Epistle of Jeremiah*, the *Story of Zerubbabel*, the *Additions to the Book of Daniel*, *Tobit*, *Judith* and *I Maccabees* make no reference to a resurrection.

(6) The *Wisdom of Solomon* may make a negative reference to it in ii, 1, where it represents the ungodly as reasoning within themselves but not rightly: "Our life is short and tedious, and in the death of a man there is no remedy; neither was there any man known to have returned from the grave."

(7) *Ecclesiasticus* makes no reference to a general resurrection.

(8) *Second Maccabees* shows a highly developed view of a resurrection. Thus in vii, 9 the second of the seven brethren who were slain by Antiochus for not eating swine's flesh says at his last gasp: "The king of the world shall raise us up, who have died for his laws, unto everlasting life." In verse 14, the third brother says: "It is good, being put to death by men, to look for help from God to be raised up again by him; as for thee [meaning king Antiochus], thou shalt have no resurrection to life." In vs. 23, the mother exhorts her last child saying: "Doubtless the Creator of the world will give you breath and life again." In xii, 43-45 Judas is said to have been mindful of the resurrection, "for if he had not hoped that they that were slain should have risen again, it had been superfluous and vain to pray for the dead." And also, "he perceived that there was great favour laid up for those that did godly." Lastly, in xiv, 46 Razis "plucked out his bowels, calling upon the Lord of life and spirit to restore them to him again."

(9) The Fifth Section of *Enoch* says merely that "the righteous sleep a long sleep and have nought to fear" (c. 5.).

(10) The Sixth Section of *Enoch* says in li, 1 that "the earth shall give back that which has been entrusted to it"; and in lxi, 5 that the righteous and the elect "shall return and stay themselves on the day of the Elect One."

(11) The Third and Fourth Books of *Maccabees*, the Fourth

Section of *Enoch*, and the *Psalms of Solomon*, do not mention the resurrection.

d. The Literature from the First Century A.D.

(1) At least seventeen of the *New Testament* books speak of a resurrection. Two of them, 1 Cor. xv, and Rev. xx, enlarge upon the nature of it.

(2) The *Testimony of Hezekiah* speaks of the resurrection of the beloved, (iii, 18).

(3) The *Vision of Isaiah* mentions the resurrection of the righteous, (ix, 17).

(4) The *Salathiel Section* of Fourth Ezra written about 100 A.D., implies a resurrection, (v, 37, 45).

(5) The *Zadokite Fragments* (written about 40 A.D.), the *Ezra Apocalypse*, the *Son of Man Vision*, the *Ezra Piece*, the *Eagle Vision*, the *Martyrdom of Isaiah*, the *Assumption of Moses* and apparently *Fourth Maccabees* do not refer to a resurrection.

Judgment

a. *Daniel* speaks of a judgment only in vii, 10, 22, 26. In verse 10 we read: "The judgment was set and the books were opened"; in vs. 22, "The Ancient of days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High," and in vs. 26, "the judgment shall sit," etc.

b. The only references to a judgment in the other parts of the *Old Testament* are:

(1) Isa. xlii, 1-4 where it is said that Jehovah's servant "shall bring forth judgment to the gentiles," "shall bring forth judgment unto truth," and "shall set judgment on the earth."

(2) Ps. ix, 7, 8 where we read that Jehovah "hath prepared his throne for judgment and he shall judge the world in righteousness, he shall minister judgment to the people in uprightness."

(3) Ps. i, 5, "the wicked shall not stand in the judgment."

(4) Joel iii, 9-17, Ps. lxxvi, 9, lxviii, 14, speak of a judgment on the nations.

(5) Of the fifty-seven psalms assigned by one or another critic to the second century B.C., only Ps. lxxvi, 9 refers to a judgment.

(6) Ecclesiastes refers to it (iii, 17) in the words, "I had said

in my heart that God will judge the righteous and the wicked"; and in xii, 14, that he will bring every work into judgment and every secret thing whether it be good or whether it be evil. In iii, 20 he says that men shall return to dust and in xii, 7 that the dust shall return to the earth as it was and the spirit to God who gave it.

c. The *Book of Enoch*, etc.

(1) In the *Book of Noah* we read of "the day of the great judgment" (x, 6) when Azazel "shall be cast into the fire"; and in x, 11, 12 that Semjaza and his associate angels are to be bound fast till the day of their judgment, the judgment that is for ever and ever.

(2) In the First Section of *Enoch* it is said (xvi, 1) that the giants shall destroy until the day of the consummation, the great judgment over the Watchers and the goddess; in xxv, 4, that no judgment, when the Holy Great One, the Lord of Glory, the mortal is permitted to touch the fragrant tree of life until the great Eternal King shall sit on his throne and take vengeance on all and bring everything to its consummation for ever; and in xxvii, 2, there is mention of an accursed valley which shall be the place of judgment (or habitation).

(3) In Section Two of *Enoch* we are told (xc, 20-27) that "a throne was erected in the pleasant land and the Lord of the sheep sat himself thereon and one took all the sealed books and opened those books before the Lord of the sheep." "And the judgment was held first over the stars and they were judged and found guilty and likewise the seventy shepherds to whom the sheep had been delivered were judged and found guilty and last of all the blinded sheep were judged and found guilty and all were cast into a fiery abyss and burned."

(4) The Third Section of *Enoch* does not mention the judgment.

(5) The *Testaments of the XII Patriarchs* mention the judgment three times. Benj. x, 8, 9 reads: "For the Lord judges Israel first for the unrighteousness which they have committed and then so shall he judge all the gentiles"; and Levi. iii, 3 says that "in the second (or third?) heaven are the hosts of the armies

which are ordained for the day of judgment," and in iv, 1 it is said that "the Lord shall execute judgment upon the sons of men."

(6) The *Book of Jubilees* speaks of "the day of the great judgment" (xxiii, 11); and apparently it is on this day that the righteous "shall see all their judgments and all their curses on their enemies," (xxiii, 30).

(7) The *Sibylline Books* speak of "the judgment of the great king, the deathless God" (iii, 56).

(8) The *Addenda to Esther*, the *Book of Baruch*, the *Epistle of Jeremiah*, the *Story of Zerubbabel*, the *Additions to the Book of Daniel*, *Tobit* and *1 Maccabees* do not refer to the judgment.

(9) *Judith* says: "Woe to the nations that rise up against my kindred! The Lord Almighty will take vengeance of them in the day of judgment" (xvi, 17).

(10) The *Wisdom of Solomon* says that the souls of the righteous "shall judge the nations" (iv, 8).

(11) *Second Maccabees* mentions a judgment (vii, 35, 36), but it is doubtful whether the passage refers to a judgment in the present life or hereafter.

(12) The Fourth Section of *Enoch* speaks of the day of judgment (lxxxix, 4).

(13) The Fifth Section of *Enoch* speaks of a final judgment with the destruction of the present heavens and earth and the creation of new ones (xc, 14-16).

(14) The Sixth Section of *Enoch* says there will be a judgment of the righteous and the wicked, on angels and on men (xcvi, 2-4, xlviii, 2).

(15) *Third and Fourth Maccabees* are silent on the subject. d. In the literature of the First Century, A.D.

(1) All of the *Gospels*, the *Acts*, the *Revelation*, and most of the *Epistles* speak of a judgment.

(2) The *Testament of Hezekiah* speaks of the judgment once in iv, 18.

(3) The *Vision of Isaiah* mentions it in x, 12.

(4) The *Assumption of Moses* describes how the Heavenly One will arise from his royal throne and amid the disturbance

of earth and sea and sun and stars will punish the gentiles and Israel shall be exalted (x, 3-10).

(5) The *Son of Man Vision* tells how God's Son is to judge and to destroy the nations of the earth and to defend the people of Israel (xiii, 37, 49).

(6) The *Eagle Vision* speaks of the Messiah's making the kings of Rome alive for judgment and then destroying them (xii, 12).

(7) The *Salathiel Section* speaks of the judgment and of punishment and salvation after death (vii, 67, 70, 73, 102-105, viii, 38, 61, x, 16).

(8) The *Martyrdom of Isaiah*, the *Ezra Apocalypse*, and the *Ezra Piece*, do not mention a judgment.

(9) In *Second Baruch*, there is a long and detailed account of the judgment extending from xxiv, 1 to xxx, 1.

(10) In the *Zadokite Fragments* the judgment is probably referred to in ii, 4, where it says that with God are "power and might and great fury with flames of fire wherein are all the angels of destruction." (Compare i, 2 and ix, 12.)

(11) *Philo* and *Josephus* are silent on the subject.

Messiah

a. *Daniel* ix, 25, 26 is one of the two Old Testament passages where the expected Saviour of Israel is called *Messiah*. The verses read: "Know therefore and understand that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks, and three score and two weeks: the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times. And after three score and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself . . ." In viii, 25 the king of fierce countenance is represented as standing up "against the Prince of princes." In ii, 34, 45, the deliverer is likened to a stone cut out without hands that smote and broke in pieces the image of iron and clay. In iii, 25, he may possibly be the Son of God thus spoken of. In vii, 13, he is likened to a son of man and comes to the Ancient of days and is given dominion and glory and a kingdom which shall not pass away. It is pos-

sible, also, that Michael the prince of x, 21 and the Michael of xii, 1 is none other than the Messiah himself.

b. The Rest of the Old Testament.

(1) Ps. ii, (which Driver thinks to be pre-exilic and which neither Reuss, Cheyne nor W. Robertson Smith places as late as the Maccabean times) agrees with Daniel in calling the Son of God the *Messiah*.

(2) Already in the seed of the woman of Gen. iii, 15 and in the Shiloh of xlix, 10 we have intimations of the coming king who should bruise the head of the serpent. These passages are both assigned to J.

(3) In Num. xxiv, which is assigned to JE, the Messiah is prefigured in the star which was to come out of Jacob, and the sceptre which should arise out of Israel.

(4) The Prince of Peace of Isa. ix, 6, 7 and the root that should come forth out of the stem of Jesse and the branch out of his roots of Isa. xi, 1, also refer to him. Both of these passages are assigned by the critics to the genuine Isaiah.

(5) The ruler in Israel who, according to Mi. v, 2, should come forth from Bethlehem of Judah must refer to the Messiah, as must also the "Lord" of Ps. cx, 1.

(6) In the writers contemporary with Daniel, the Branch of Jer. xxiii, 5, 6 and xxxiii, 15-17 and the Shepherd of Ezek. xxxiv, 23-31 clearly indicate the Saviour to come.

(7) Zechariah, who wrote but a few years after the time of Daniel, speaks of him as the Branch (iii, 8, vi, 12), the Shepherd (xi, 16, xiii, 7), the fountain opened for sin (xiii, 1), the one from the house of David who was to be pierced (xii, 10) and the King who was to come to Zion (ix, 9) and the one whose price was thirty pieces of silver (xi, 12).

(8) Of the fifty-seven psalms assigned by one or more of the critics to the Maccabean period only cx, 1, and cxviii, 22 refer to a Messiah. Driver³⁴ thought that Ps. cx, "may be presumed to be pre-exilic." Reuss, Cheyne and W. Robertson Smith class Ps. cxviii, as Maccabean, to which date Cheyne assigns Ps. cx, also. The verse "The Lord said unto my Lord," etc. is

³⁴ *L.O.T.*, p. 384.

attributed expressly by the New Testament writers and by the Lord himself to David. See Matt. xxii, 49, Mk. xii, 36, Lk. xx, 42, Acts ii, 34.

c. The *Book of Enoch*, etc.

(1) The *Book of Noah* and the First and Third Sections of the *Book of Enoch* are silent as to a Messiah.

(2) The Second Section of *Enoch* speaks of a white bull with large horns whom all the beasts of the field and all the birds of the air feared and to whom they made petitions all the time (xc, 37).

(3) The *Testaments of the XII Patriarchs* says in Judah xxiv, 5, 6: "Then shall the sceptre of my kingdom shine forth, and from your root shall arise a stem, and from it shall grow a rod of righteousness to the gentiles, to judge and save all that call upon the Lord." In Judah xxiv, 1-3, we read: "And after these things shall a star arise to you from Jacob in peace and a man shall arise like the sun of righteousness, walking with the sons of men in meekness and righteousness and no sin shall be found in him," etc. In Levi viii, 14 we read that "a king shall arise in Judah and shall be beloved as a prophet of the Most High," etc. Dan v, 10, says that the salvation of the Lord shall arise from Levi. Joseph xix, 11 says: "Honour Levi and Judah, for from them shall arise unto you one who saveth Israel." Zebulun ix, 8 reads: "After these things shall arise unto you the Lord Himself, the light of righteousness." In Levi xviii, 1-14 there is a long and beautiful description of the new priest to whom all the words of the Lord shall be revealed.

(4) One place only in *Jubilees* refers to the Messiah. In xxxi, 18, 19, in a passage recording an alleged blessing of Levi and Judah, by Isaac, it is said of Judah in evident imitation of Gen. xlix, 10 that one of his sons should be a prince over the sons of Jacob and that in him should be the help of Jacob and the salvation of Israel.

(5) The *Sibylline Books* have a long passage (Book III, 652-818) containing an account of a king sent by God from the sunrise who shall give every land relief from the bane of war in obedience to the good ordinances of the mighty God.

(6) *Ecclesiasticus*, *Wisdom*, *Tobit*, *Judith*, and *1 Maccabees*, do not mention a Messiah.

(7) The Fifth Section of *Enoch* speaks of a kingdom where God and his Son will be united for ever with the children of earth (cv, 2).

(8) In the Sixth Section of *Enoch* the Messiah is called:

(a) The Son of Man (xlvi, 2-4, xlviii, 2, 9, xlix, 2, 4, li, 5, 6, lii, 6, 9, liii, 6, lv, 4, lxi, 5, 8, lxii, 1).

(b) God's Anointed (xlvi, 10).

(c) The Elect One (xlv, 4).

(d) He will have universal dominion, sit on the throne of his glory, and judge angels and men.

(9) The *Psalms of Solomon* call the Messiah, the king, the son of David and the servant of God (Ps. xviii, 6).

(10) The Second, Third, and Fourth Books of *Maccabees* and the Fourth Section of *Enoch* are silent on this subject.

d. The Literature of the First Century A.D.

(1) The Messiah is mentioned in every book of the *New Testament*.

(2) The *Testament of Hezekiah* speaks of "Jesus the Lord" (x, 4, 13) and of the "Beloved" (iii, 17, 18, iv, 3, 6, 9, 13).

(3) The *Vision of Isaiah* mentions "the Messiah" (vii, 8, 12), "the Beloved" (vii, 17, 23), "His Beloved the Christ" (viii, 18), "His Beloved the Son" (viii, 15), "the Only Begotten" (vii, 37), "the Elect One" (viii, 7), "Lord God the Lord Christ who will be called Jesus" (ix, 5), "Lord who will be called Christ" (ix, 13), "Lord Christ" (ix, 17, 32), "That One" (ix, 26, 38), "This One" (ix, 31), "a Certain One" (ix, 27).

(4) The *Son of Man Vision* of Fourth Ezra calls the Messiah "God's Son" (xiii, 32, 37) and says he is to judge and to destroy the earth (xiii, 37, 49) and to defend the people of Israel (xiii, 49).

(5) The *Ezra Piece* speaks of Ezra's translation to be with God's Son, but otherwise does not refer to the Son.

(6) The *Eagle Vision* mentions a Messiah who is to spring from the seed of David and make the kings of Rome alive for judgment and destruction (xii, 32).

(7) The *Martyrdom of Isaiah*, the *Assumption of Moses*, the *Ezra Apocalypse*, and the *Salathiel Section* do not mention a personal Messiah.

(8) The *Zadokite Fragments* say that God through his Messiah will make known his Holy Spirit (ii, 10). Also, ix, 3 (in Text B) quotes Zech. xiii, 7 where the shepherd refers to the Messiah; and in ix, 8 the scepter of Gen. 49, 10 "appears to denote the Messiah." In ix, 10 (B), 29 (B), the sword of the Messiah is spoken of.

Angels

a. The Book of Daniel.

(1) In iii, 25, Nebuchadnezzar says that he saw four *men* in the midst of the fire and that the form of the fourth was like to a "son of gods" (*cp.* Gen. vi, 3). In iii, 28, this fourth man is called an angel.

(2) In iv, 17 we read of "the decree of the watchers and the demand by the word of the holy ones"; and in iv, 23 it speaks of "a watcher and a holy one coming down from heaven" and announcing the decree.

(3) In vi, 22 God is said to have "sent his angel who shut the mouths of the lions."

(4) In vii, 10, "a thousand thousands minister unto Him (the Ancient of days) and ten thousand times ten thousand stand before Him."

(5) In x, 5, Daniel saw "one man" clothed in linen, etc. So, also, xii, 6, 7.

(6) In x, 16, one like the similitude of the sons of a man (Adam) touched his lips, etc.

(7) In x, 18, one like the appearance of a man (Adam) came and strengthened him.

(8) In viii, 13, Daniel heard "one holy one" speaking to "another holy one."

(9) In viii, 16, Gabriel is mentioned. In ix, 21, he is called the *man* Gabriel (*cp.* Gen. xxxii, 24).

(10) In x, 13, 21, xii, 1, Michael the prince or "the great prince" or "one of the chief princes" is mentioned.

b. In the other Books of the *Old Testament* we find:

(1) The angel of Jehovah, (Gen. xvi, 7, 9, 10, 11, xxii, 11, 15, Ex. iii, 2, Num. xxii, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 31, 32, 34, 35, Jud. ii, 1, 4, v, 23, vi, 11, 12, 21bis, 22bis, xiii, 3, 13, 15, 16bis, 17, 18, 20, 21bis, 2 Sam. xxiv, 16, 1 Ki. xix, 7, 2 Ki. i, 3, 15, xix, 35, 1 Chr. xxi, 12, 15, 16, 18, 30, Ps. xxxiv, 8, xxxv, 5, 6, Isa, xxxvii, 36, Zech. i, 11, 12, iii, 1, 5, 6, xii, 8, Mal. ii, 7.)

(2) The angel of (the) God, (Gen. xxi, 17, xxxi, 11, Ex. xiv, 19, Jud. vi, 20, xiii, 6, 9, 1 Sam. xxi, 9, 2 Sam. xiv, 17, 20, xix, 27).

(3) The (an) angel (Gen. xlvi, 16, Ex. xxiii, 20, xxxiii, 2, Nu. xx, 16, 2 Sam. xxiv, 16bis, 17, 1 Kgs. xiii, 18, xix, 5, 1 Chr. xxi, 15bis, xv, 20-27, 2 Chr. xxxii, 21, Hos. xii, 4, Zech. i, 9, 13, 14, ii, 2, 7, iii, 3, iv, 1, 4, 5, v, 5, 10, vi, 4, 5).

(4) His (mine) angel (Gen. xxiv, 17, 40, Ex. xxiii, 23, xxxii, 34, Mal. iii, 1.)

(5) Angels (of God), (Gen. xix, 1, 15, xxviii, 12, xxxii, 2.

(6) His angels (Ps. xci, 11, ciii, 20, civ, 4, cxlviii, 2).

(7) Evil angels (Ps. lxxviii, 49).

(8) Angel of his presence (Isa. lxiii, 9).

(9) Angel of the Covenant (Mal. iii, 1).

(10) Angel of the Lord of hosts (Mal. ii, 7).

(11) Cherubim (Gen. iii, 24, Ps. xviii, 10, Ez. ix, 3, x, 1, (*et passim*), xi, 22, xxviii, 14, 16).

(12) Seraphim (Isa. vi, 2, 6).

(13) A man clothed with linen (Ez. ix, 2, 3, 11, x, 2, 6, 7).

(14) Sons of God (Gen. vi, 3 (?), Deut. xxxii, 19, Job i, 6, ii, 1).

(15) Gods (Ps. viii, 6).

(16) Twenty thousand thousands of angels (אֲנִיִּים), Ps. lxviii, 18).

(17) Mighty (angels?) (Ps. lxxviii, 25, Joel iii, 11).

(18) Holy ones, (Deut. xxxiii, 3 (?), Job v. 1, xv, 15, Zech. xiv, 5, Ps. lxxxix, 6, 8).

(19) Sons of the Mighty (Ps. xxix, 1, lxxxix, 6).

(20) Watchmen (Isa. lxii, 6).

(21) The host of the high ones (Isa. xxiv, 21).

- (22) Morning stars (Job xxxviii, 7).
 (23) Members of God's council (Job i, Ps. lxxxix, 7, 1 Ki. xxii).
 (24) Guardian angels (Ps. xxxiv, 8, xci, 11).
 (25) Intercessors (Job. v, 1).
 (26) Punishers of the wicked (Ps. lxxviii, 49).
 (27) (The) Satan (Zech. iii, 1, 2*bis*, Job, i-ii (*passim*), Ps. cix, 6, 1 Chr. xxi, 1).
 (28) Demons (*shedim*, Ps. cvi, 37).
 (29) Satyr (?*sa'ir*, Isa. xxxiv, 14).
 (30) Night Monster (*Lilith*, Isa. xxxiv, 14).
 (31) Deep (?*Tehom* Deut. xxxiii, 13, Ps. cxlviii, 7).
 (32) Rahab (Isa. li, 9, Ps. lxxxix, 10, Job ix, 13, xxvi, 12).
 (33) Leviathan (Job iii, 8, Ps. lxxiv, 14).
 (34) Azazel (Lev. xvi, 8, 10*bis*, 26).
 (35) Princes of God (LXX version of Deut. xxxii, 8).
 (36) Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs do not speak of angels and in all the fifty-seven psalms assigned by one or more critics to the second century, B.C., we find angels referred to only in Psalm cxlviii, 2.

c. The *Book of Enoch*, etc.

(1) The *Testaments of the XII Patriarchs* mention Satan and Beliar by name. They speak, also, of the angel of God, of angels of the presence, of watchers, and archangels.

(2) The *Book of Jubilees* mentions by name Mastema (Satan) and Beliar. It speaks, also, of angels of the presence, and of guardian angels and of angels of the wood, fire, clouds, etc. It describes the creation and circumstances of the fallen angels, their marrying the daughters of men, their judgment and punishment.

(3) The *Sibylline Books* mention the angel Beliar.

(4) The *Book of Noah* is almost entirely an imaginative explanation of the "sons of God" of Gen. vi, 2, giving their names, duties, teachings, sins, judgment, and punishment.

(a) vi, 7, 8 gives the names of the eighteen chiefs of tens, and lxix, 2, 3, the names of twenty-one chiefs over hundreds and over fifties and over tens. In alphabetical order the eighteen are

Ananel, Armaros, Arakiba, Asael, Baraqijal, Batarel, Danel, Ezeqeel, Jomjael, Kokabiel, Rameel, Samiazaz, Samsapeel, Sariel, Satarel, Tamiel, Turel, Zaqiel. Over all these Semjaza was chief. In lxvi, 2, 3 the names are given as, Armaros, Armen, Artaqifa, Azazel (two of this name), Baraqiel, Batarjal, Busasejal, Danjal, Hananel, Jetrel, Kokabel, Neqael, Rumael, Rumjal, Samjaza, Simapesiel, Tumael, Turael, Turel (two of this name). To these are added in verses 4-12 the names Asbeel, Gadreel, Jeqon, Kasdja, and Penemue. Allowing for differences of spelling we have here the names of thirty-seven fallen angels.

(b) In ix, 1 four good angels are named (Michael, Raphael, Uriel, and Gabriel), who are called "holy ones" (ix, 3, lx, 4). These intercede with the Lord of the Ages for the souls of men (ix, 3, 4). Another good angel, Phanuel, is named in liv, 6.

(c) The "angel of peace," (liv, 4, lx, 24).

(d) An "angel of punishment," (lxvi, 1).

(e) An angel without name, (lx. 4, 9, 11, lxviii, 5).

(f) Spirits of the hoar-frost, hail, and snow are called angels, (lx, 17); also, spirits of the mist, the rain, and the dew, (18-21).

(g) Angels without names, (x, 7, cvi, 6, lxvii, 4, 7, 11, 12, lxviii, 2).

(h) Watchers, (x, 7, 9, 15).

(i) "Angels, children of the heaven," (vi, 2). These are said to have been two hundred in number (vi, 6).

(j) The angels are a thousand thousands and a thousand times ten thousand (lx, 1).

(k) "Satans" are mentioned in lxv, 6 where they seem to be distinguished from the angels.

(l) The duties, or functions, of the bad angels are mentioned at length in viii, 3, and of angels in xx.

(m) The duties of the good angels are mentioned in ix, 1, 4, x, 1, lx, 2, 21, 23, lxvi, 2, lxvii, 2, lxix, 4f.

(5) In the First Section of the *Book of Enoch*.

(a) Of the evil angels, Azazel only is mentioned (xiii, 1).

(b) There are some holy angels "who watch" (xx, 2-8), and whose names are Michael, Raphael, Uriel, and Raguel, Saraqiel,

Gabriel and Remiel. See also xxiv, 6, xx, 3, 6, xxxii, 6, xix, 1, xxiii, 4, xxxiii, 4, xxvii, 2, xxi, 5, 9.

(c) Watchers are mentioned (xvi, 1), who are called holy (xv, 9), eternal (xiv, 1), heavenly (xii, 4), children of heaven (xiv, 3, xii, 2, 3, 4, 10, 15²).

(d) Holy one (xiv, 25), the most holy ones (xiv, 23), seven holy angels (xx, 2-8).

(e) Seven stars of heaven (xxi, 6).

(f) Angels (alone) (xxxvi, 4) prisons of angels (xxi, 10, xiv, 21).

(g) Giants (=evil spirits) (xv, 8).

(h) "Ten thousand times ten thousand" angels (xxi, 24).

(6) The Second Section of *Enoch* calls Azazel a star (lxxxvi, 1), speaks of the angels of heaven (lxxxiv, 4) and calls the angels "white men" (lxxxvii, 2). Probably, also, the "seventy shepherds" of lxxxix, 59 are angels.

(7) In the Third Section of *Enoch* angels are mentioned once (xci, 15) and holy angels once (xciii, 2).

(8) The *Song of the Three Children* speaks twice of the angel of the Lord (vss. 26, 37).

(9) *Susannah* mentions the angel of the Lord (vs. 45) and the angel of God (vss. 55, 59).

(10) *Bel and the Dragon* mentions the angel of the Lord in vss. 36, 39.

(11) *Tobit* mentions:

(a) Raphael by name (iii, 17, xii, 15).

(b) Guardian angels (v, 17, 22).

(c) Holy angels (xi, 14).

(d) Seven angels (xii, 15).

(e) Asmodeus, an evil demon (iii, 8, and elsewhere).

(12) *Ecclesiasticus* refers to angels in xxxix, 28, xli, 2, 45, xlvi, 1, but only in passages cited from the canonical books of the Old Testament.

(13) The *Addenda to Esther* represent Esther as saying that the king of Persia appeared to her as an angel of God, (xv, 13).

(14) The *Epistle of Jeremiah* mentions an angel in vs. 7.

(15) The *Book of Baruch* mentions devils (iv, 7).

(16) The *Book of Wisdom* mentions the devil (ii, 24) and speaks of angels' food (xvi, 20).

(17) *Judith*, *I Maccabees*, the *Prayer of Manasseh*, and the *Story of Zerubbabel* are silent as to angels.

(18) The Sixth Section of *Enoch* (xxxvii-lxxi) speaks of :

(a) A righteous angel (xxxix, 5).

(b) Four angels of the presence (Michael, Raphael, Sahiel, and Phanuel) (xl, 9).

(c) Thousands of thousands and ten thousand times ten thousand (xl, 1).

(d) The angel of peace (xliii, 3, lii, 3, liv, 4).

(e) Angels of punishment (liii, 3, lvi, 1).

(f) Satan (liii, 3, 6).

(g) Azazel (liii, 5, lv, 4).

(h) The host of God, Cherubim, Seraphim, and Ophanim (lxi, 10).

(i) The holy ones (lxi, 10).

(19) *Fourth Maccabees*, and the *Psalms of Solomon* are silent on the subject of angels.

(20) In *Second Maccabees* "the terrible rider" and the two men notable in strength who smote at and scourged Heliodorus were probably angels (iii, 25, 26), as were also "the five comely men upon horses" of x, 29, and "the one in white clothing" of xi, 8. Judas, in xv, 22 refers to the angel who smote the host of Sennacherib and prays for God to "send a good angel" to go before the Jewish army.

(21) *Third Maccabees* speaks of two angels glorious and terrible who appeared to Eleazar the high priest.

(22) The Fourth Section of *Enoch* speaks of seven holy ones (lxxxix, 5) and gives the names of the four leaders who divide the four parts of the year and their three followers. These seven are named Milkiel, Hel'emmelek, Mel'ejal, Narel, Adnar'el, Ijasusa'el, 'Elome'el. The leaders under them are called Bir-ka'el, Zelebs'el, Hilujaseph, Gida'yal, Ke'el, He'el, and Asfa'el (lxxxix, 13-20). Uriel also is mentioned in lxxiv, 2, lxxv, 3, 4, and is the one who shows things to Enoch.

(23) The Fifth Section of *Enoch* (xc-civ) mentions the holy

angels (xcii, 2) and the wicked (xcii, 15). Angels are said to place the prayers of the righteous for a memorial before the Most High (xcix, 3, c, 1) to gather the works for judgment (c. 4) and to be guardians over the righteous (c. 5).

d. The Literature of the First Century A.D.

(1) The *Martyrdom of Isaiah* speaks of the angel Sammael (i, 11, ii, 1) Sammael Malchira (1, 8), Beliar (i, 8, 9, ii, 4, iii, 11, 51), and Satan (ii, 2, 7) and of Satan's angels (ii, 2).

(2) The *Testament of Hezekiah* mentions Sammael (iii, 13) Beliar (iii, 13, iv, 2, 16), Beliar and his armies (iv, 14) and the angels and armies of the holy ones (iv, 14).

(3) The *Vision of Isaiah* mentions:

(a) By name, Sammael (vii, 9) and Satan (xi, 43, vii, 9).

(b) An angel who was sent to make the prophet see (vi, 3, vii, 11, 21, 25).

(c) A glorious angel (vii, 2).

(d) Angel of death (ix, 16, x, 14).

(e) Angels about the throne (vii, 14-16, 19).

(f) Angels of fire and Sheol (x, 10).

(g) Angels of the air (x, 30).

(h) Angels of Satan (vii, 9).

(i) Sammael and his hosts (vii, 9).

(j) Angel of the Holy Spirit (vii, 23, ix, 36, 39, 40, x, 4, xi, 4, 33).

(k) Princes, angels, and powers of the world (x, 12).

(l) Princes and powers of this world (x, 15).

(m) Angels (alone) (vii, 22, 27, 37, ix, 6, 28, 29, 42, viii, 2, 15, 19, x, 19).

(4) The *Zadokite Fragments* mention the angels of destruction (ii, 4).³⁵ Belial, also, is named in vi, 9, 10, vii, 19, ix, 12.

(5) The *Assumption of Moses* mentions Satan and an angel (x, 2).

(6) The *Ezra Apocalypse* mentions only the angel who came to speak to him.

(7) The *Son of Man Vision*, the *Ezra Piece*, and the *Eagle Vision* and the parts added by the Redactor do not mention angels.

³⁵ Said by Charles to be an interpolation.

(8) The *Salathiel Section* mentions:

(a) The angel who had been sent unto him (v. 31, vii, 10, 29).

(b) Armies of angels (vi, 3).

(c) Angels who guard the souls of the righteous (vii, 85, 95).

(d) By name Jeramiel (iv, 36) and Uriel (v, 20, x, 28).

(9) The *Apocalypse of Baruch* speaks of the creation of the angels (xxi, 6), of their fall (lvi, 11-13), of armies of them (xlviii, 10, li, 11, lix, 10), of the angel of death (xxi, 6), and names Ramiel (lv, 3, lxiii, 6).

(10) The *New Testament* books mention Michael, Gabriel, Satan, and Beelzebub.³⁶

SPECIAL CONCLUSIONS

In view of the evidence given above it will be obvious to the attentive reader who makes a résumé and a comparison of the documents,

1. That of the books put by the critics themselves in the second century B.C., only three out of the seventy-nine³⁷ make any kind of reference to a *resurrection*.

a. The *Testaments of the XII Patriarchs* is the only one which distinctly mentions a resurrection. It has four such references, of which only that in Benjamin x, 6-8 refers to the resurrection of some to shame. Since the critics place the composition of this work between 137 and 105 B.C., it cannot have influenced the author of *Daniel*, even if he wrote as late as 164 B.C. On the other hand, the author of the *Testaments* may have been influenced by *Daniel*, whether the latter was written in 164 or 535 B.C.

b. As to the testimony to a resurrection in the parts of *Enoch*, assigned by Charles to the second century B.C., it will be observed that the Third Section contains only a veiled reference to it, and that the First Section says of it only that the

³⁶ For further information, see Bernard in *Hastings' Dict. of the Bible*, Vol. IV, p. 233 f.

³⁷ In this total the 57 O.T. Psalms assigned by one or more of the critics to this period and the three additions to *Daniel*, *Susannah*, *Bel and the Dragon*, and the *Prayer of the Three Children* each count as one.

righteous shall after the judgment live a long life on earth, the implication being that they shall live this life in the resurrected body.

c. That the statement of *Daniel* is nearest in form and sense to that of Isa. xxvi, 19, which even the critics do not place later than the fourth century B.C.

2. That *Daniel* and *Enoch* are not the only books which refer to the *judgment*, and that their statements are not identical.

a. That there will be a judgment is stated not merely in *Daniel* and the *Book of Enoch* but also in Isa. xlii, 1-4, Joel iii, 9-17, and in Pss. ix, 7, 8, i, 5, lxxvi, 9, and lxviii, 14.

b. That it will be set is stated not merely in *Daniel* and *Enoch* but also in Isa. xlii, 4 and Ps. x, 7.

c. That the books will be opened is stated only in *Daniel* and in Section Two of *Enoch* which is assigned to the first century B.C.

d. That the Ancient of days will come is stated in *Daniel*, but not in *Enoch*.

e. That judgment will be given to the saints of the Most High is stated in *Daniel*, but not in *Enoch*.

f. In *Daniel* the kings and nations of earth will be condemned, whereas in *Enoch* it is the evil angels and the godless.

3. That, with regard to the *Messiah* the ideas of *Daniel* are distinctive:

a. The name "Messiah" as applied to the future redeemer of Israel, is found in the literature up to the year 100 B.C., only in *Daniel* and Ps. ii, 2.

b. The phrase "Messiah the Prince" is found nowhere except in *Daniel*.

c. The phrase "Prince of princes" is found nowhere else, though Prince of Peace occurs in Isa. ix, 6. The word "prince" in Ezekiel xxxiv, 24 renders a Hebrew word differing from that found in *Daniel*.

d. The title "stone" is found outside of *Daniel* only in Isa. xxviii, 16 and Ps. cxviii, 22.

e. The title "son of gods" occurs nowhere else, but the Messiah is called God's son in Ps. ii, 7, Isa. ix, 6.

f. "Son of man" as a title of the Messiah does not occur out-

side of Daniel till the first century B.C. In Ezekiel it is appropriated to the prophet himself.

g. If Michael the prince be the Messiah, he is so named elsewhere only in the Revelation of St. John.

h. That Messiah was to be "cut off" is stated also in Isa. liii, 8, but nowhere else except in Mk. ix, 12, Lk. xxiv, 26.

i. The statement and figure of the breaking of the image is found nowhere except in *Daniel*.

j. The glory and the kingdom find their best analogy in Zech. ix, 10.

k. Of the early parts of *Enoch*, the fragments of the Book of Adam, and the First and Third Sections are absolutely silent with regard to a Messiah. The Second Section (from the first century B.C.) refers to him but once and that under the figure of a *white bull* whom all the beasts of the field and all the birds of the air feared and to whom they made petitions all the time! This is the only "approximation" of Enoch to Daniel concerning the doctrine of the Messiah. It will be seen that Daniel approximates to Isaiah four times, to Zechariah once, and to the Second Psalm twice. The other phrases and titles used of the Messiah by Daniel are all peculiar to himself.

4. With regard to *Angels* it will be noted:

a. In the books of the Old Testament outside Daniel.

(1) They are mentioned in Gen., Ex., Lev., (?), Num., Deut., Josh., Jgs., Sam., Kgs., Chr., Isa., Joel, Zech., Mal., Pss., and Job.

(2) That, if we take demons, or evil spirits, to be angels we have Lilith, Sa'ir, and Rahab mentioned by name in Isaiah; Shedub in Deut. and Ps. cxlviii; Leviathan in Job and Ps. lxxiv; Rahab in Isa., Ps. lxxxix, and Job; Azazel in Lev. (H); Satan in 1 Chron., Zech., Job, Ps. cix.

(3) That classes of angels seem to be denoted by the Seraphim, Cherubim, Shedim and by the Princes of God.

(4) That angels are distinguished as holy, guardian, mighty, watchers, intercessors, sons of God, punishers of the wicked, members of God's council, and as evil and tempters of mankind,

and that they are practically innumerable, being a host and thousands of thousands.

b. That the *New Testament* agrees with *Daniel* in almost every particular. It speaks of the angels as mighty and strong, as guardians, as mediators, as punishers of the wicked, as surrounding the throne of God, of evil angels, of the Devil as a tempter, of ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands, and it names Michael, Gabriel, Satan or Diabolos, Beelzebub and Abaddon or Apollyon.

c. That the treatment of angels differs in the four sections of the *Book of Enoch* and that in no one of the sections can it be fairly said that there is an "approximation" of the treatment of angels with that of *Daniel*. Thus,

(1) In the Third Section of *Enoch* the angels are mentioned but twice, once with the epithet "holy."

(2) In the Second Section of *Enoch*, angels are mentioned only three times certainly and possibly four times. They are called "angels of heaven," "white men," one of them "Azazel," and "seventy shepherds" are spoken of. Not one of these phrases, nor the name Azazel, occurs in *Daniel*.

(3) The First Section of *Enoch* and the *Book of Noah* both agree with *Daniel* and other books of the *Old Testament*,

(a) In expressing a belief in angels.

(b) In giving names to some of them.

(c) In arranging them in classes, or ranks.

(d) In mentioning "watchers." This designation of angels is found also in Isa. lxii, 6.

(e) Further, *Daniel* agrees with the *Book of Noah* alone, in speaking of angels as a thousand thousand and ten thousand times ten thousand. A similar phrase is found also in Rev. v. 11. The First Section of *Enoch* has the latter part of this phrase "ten thousand times ten thousand" (*cp.* Ps. lxviii, 18).

(f) *Daniel* agrees with the First Section alone of *Enoch* in designating angels as "holy." This designation is found, also, in Job v. 1, xv, 15, Zech. xiv, 5, Ps. lxxxix, 6, 8, and Deut. xxxiii, 3 (?).

(4) The First Section of *Enoch* and the *Book of Noah* disagree with *Daniel* in the following particulars:

(a) *Daniel* introduces angels merely incidentally, whether as messengers to communicate the will of God or as agents for the deliverance or strengthening of His servants; whereas in both the *Book of Noah* and the First Section of *Enoch*, the angels are the subject of the discourse and the whole narration is taken up with the story of the "sons of God" of Gen. vi, 2, 3.

(b) *Daniel* mentions good angels only, whereas the *Book of Noah* and the First Section of *Enoch* are concerned almost entirely with the angels who fell.

(c) *Daniel* names two good angels alone, whereas the *Book of Noah* mentions four good angels and thirty-seven wicked angels, and the First Section of *Enoch* mentions by name one bad angel and seven holy ones.

(d) The *Book of Noah* speaks of two hundred "angels, children of heaven," of spirits of hoar-frost, hail, snow, mist, rain and dew, of an angel of peace and of an angel of punishment, and of Satans. *Daniel* never refers to any of these.

(e) The First Section of *Enoch* calls angels "stars" and "giants." *Daniel* never does this.

(f) The duties, or functions, of the angels both good and bad are given at length and specifically both in the *Book of Noah* and the First Section of *Enoch*. *Daniel* never refers to their duties as such and leaves us to infer them from the words which they spake and the actions they performed.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

The following general conclusions may be drawn from the above discussion and special conclusions.

1. That of the four doctrines cited by Doctor Driver it cannot be fairly said that the teachings of Daniel approximate to those of the early parts of the *Book of Enoch*, seeing that no one of these parts expressly mentions all of the doctrines.

2. That on the doctrine of the resurrection, Daniel approximates most nearly the teachings of Isa. xxvi; on that of the

judgment, he makes a slight advance on the teachings of Joel, Isaiah and certain of the psalms, but agrees in only one particular with any one of the Sections of Enoch alone; that on the matter of the Messiah, his closest approximations are to Isaiah, Zechariah and certain of the psalms; and that on the doctrine of angels he is unique as far as the pre-Christian literature is concerned and is approximated only by the Book of the Revelation of St. John.

3. It is asserted by Driver that whether or not, in one or two instances, the development of the four doctrines of the resurrection, judgment, Messiah, and angels "may have been *partially* moulded by foreign influences, they undoubtedly mark a later phase of revelation than that which is set before us in [most of the] other books of the Old Testament."³⁸

If by "revelation," Driver had meant what the New Testament and the Christian Church have always meant by it (that is, a making known to man by God of certain ideas in accordance with his good pleasure), we cannot see why God could not have revealed the ideas of Daniel in the sixth century B.C., as well as in the second. If the old view of the dates of the books is taken, Daniel would still represent a comparatively late view of these four doctrines. Moreover there is no doubt that the doctrine of angels is more fully developed in Daniel than in any other book of the Old Testament, the nearest approximation being in Zechariah, another prophecy of the sixth century. As to the resurrection, Isaiah xxvi, 29, and, as to the judgment, Joel iii, are as fully developed as Daniel; and as to the Messiah, the teachings of the other books of the Old Testament such as Isaiah, Zechariah, and certain of the psalms, though different in some respects from Daniel, are in the view of the New Testament writers, (and we think of any fair minded critic) more explicit, and just as important and highly developed as anything in Daniel. Driver, and those who agree with him, think and say that God *must* have revealed his ideas in a certain order of time and in the midst of certain circumstances and temporal conditions. Having assumed this order

³⁸ *L.O.T.*, p. 508.

and these conditions, it seems "undoubtedly" true, that this or that prophecy must have been written or spoken at a certain place and time. "Undoubtedly," if the doctrines could all be proven to be late, the books containing them would be late. "Undoubtedly," if the books, or parts of books, containing the doctrines could be proven to be late, the doctrines also would be late. But *undoubtedly*, also, it is not fair to say without positive proof that the doctrines are late because they are in certain books or parts of books, and that the books or parts of books are late because they contain the doctrines. This, however, is exactly what the critics do. One of their principal reasons for putting Isa. xxiv,-xxvi, and Job late is the fact that the doctrine of the resurrection is taught in them. Joel is said to be late because of its prophecy on the judgment and the kingdom.

Lastly, might I be pardoned for asking a question to which I would like to have an answer? If the absence of any reference to these doctrines is a proof that the earlier prophets and psalmists did not know anything about them, how about the fifty-seven psalms, Ecclesiastes, and other parts of the Old Testament which the critics put in the time of the Greek domination and many of them as late even as the Maccabean times? Why is First Maccabees altogether silent on all of them and Ecclesiasticus substantially so? If the absence of all reference to a resurrection in Zechariah, Haggai, Malachi and Chronicles proves that Daniel was written later than they were, why does the silence of the Third and Fourth Sections of the Book of Enoch, of Jubilees, of the Sibylline Oracles, of the Addenda to Esther and Daniel, of Tobit, Judith, First, Third and Fourth Maccabees, the Book of Baruch, the Book of Wisdom, and the Psalms of Solomon not show that Daniel was not written till after they were? Finally, since Haggai, Malachi, Chronicles, and Ezra-Nehemiah, are absolutely silent on most, or all, of these four doctrines, how do the critics know what were the views of the authors of these books upon these doctrines? Or, if we hold that the doctrines as expounded in Daniel are not his own opinions on these doctrines, but are really revelations

from God, do the critics mean to insinuate that God could not have revealed them to the authors of these books, if He had thought it well so to do? Is it necessary to suppose that every author of a book must have told all he knew on every subject, or that God must have given the same message to every writer of the same period, no matter what may have been the purpose of his writing, or the work he had to do?

CHAPTER VI

THE INFLUENCE OF DANIEL

A LARGE part of the difficulty which confronts us when we consider the origin of a writer's ideas meets us also when we try to trace the influence of these ideas upon succeeding literary productions. The seeming traces may have come from some other source than the one supposed, or they may be original in the mind of the later writer without any real, or at least conscious, knowledge of the work of the preceding author. If the two works be from approximately the same period of time, or if the circumstances of the two periods of time were substantially the same, the same or similar *Zeitgeist*, or spirit of the times, would naturally produce the same or similar thoughts and expressions of thought. For example, the ennui, the *Weltschmerz*, the disgust with the world and its gifts, and the despairing flight of the soul to its refuge in God, which are manifest in the Book of Ecclesiastes, may have been equally characteristic of any period of outward natural prosperity, coincident with moral and spiritual decay. The moralists of the old Egyptians of the Fifth Dynasty, such as Ptahhotep and Imhotep, as well as the Roman satirists, such as Juvenal and Seneca, bear witness to the fact that the soul of man can not be satisfied with mere earthly grandeur and material success. The Aramaic fragments of Achikar as well as the Jewish proverbs of Solomon, Hezekiah, Ben Sira, and Wisdom, exhibit in like manner the vanity of earthly greatness and the transitoriness of human friendship, wealth and happiness. How much, if anything, the Greek philosophers may have derived from the Egyptians, Babylonians, Hindoos, and Hebrews, we may never be able to determine. The Greeks assert that Pythagoras, Plato, and Æsop, were all influenced by oriental savants. In the case of Æsop, this assertion is confirmed by the recent find of

the Aramaic fragments of Achikar. In view of the fact that Herodotus, Xenophon, and many other Greek historians, made known to the Greeks much of the history of the oriental nations and that this knowledge was increased by contributions to national history such as those of Berossus, Manetho, Nicolaus of Damascus, Dius of Tyre, Menander and Josephus, it is most probable that the philosophical ideas combined with the proverbs and the wisdom literature of the Hebrews, Arameans, Egyptians and others would also have been communicated to the Greeks by hearsay if not by writing. Since scarcely one in a thousand of the writings of the Greeks and hardly any of those of the orientals have come down to our day, it is impossible for us to judge of all the literary influences which may have shaped the thoughts and forms of expression of the few writers who are known to us.

So, in like manner, to attempt to show the influence exerted by a given writer upon his successors from the scanty literary material which we possess is futile. It is doomed to failure because of the paucity of the material at our disposal. And the failure is more sure in the case of the literature of the Egyptians, Persians, Arameans, Phoenicians and Hebrews than it is in the case of the Greeks and Romans, because in the case of the former, the content and extent of the literature known to us is much less and in some instances almost nil.

When we come to investigate the influence of Daniel upon succeeding generations we must remember, then, that there are in our possession from the period between 550 and 150 B.C. but a very few Hebrew works at most which could possibly have been subjected to this influence and that for a long period of time there is not known to us a single literary production of any kind in which such influence could possibly be found, or at least, be justly expected to be found. Before going further into the discussion of this subject, let us first state the objections made to the early date of the Book of Daniel on the ground that the influence of its ideas cannot be traced in the literature of the Hebrews which precedes the time of the Maccabees.

OBJECTIONS OF THE CRITICS

Cornill says: "If Daniel had been composed by a contemporary of Cyrus, we should necessarily have expected that so peculiar and highly important a work would have shown some evidence of its being known and used. When one sees how echoes and reminiscences of Deuteronomy, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Deutero-Isaiah are traceable in all the literary productions that were written after them, the same results would be looked for from Daniel. But nothing of this is to be discovered."¹

Bevan holds that, "On the supposition that the narrative of Daniel is historical, it is marvellous that it should be passed over in utter silence by all extant Jewish writers down to the latter half of the second century B.C., that it should leave no trace in any of the later prophetic books, in Ezra, Chronicles, or Ecclesiasticus."² And he adds, "In order to realize the true state of the case we should consider how easy it would be to refute, from Jewish literature, anyone who asserted that the book of Isaiah or that of Jeremiah was composed entirely in the Maccabean period."³

According to Driver, ". . . it is undeniable that the doctrines of the Messiah, of angels, of the resurrection, and of a judgment on the world, are taught with greater distinctness, and in a more developed form, than elsewhere in the Old Testament, and with features approximating to (though not identical with) those met with in the early parts of the Book of Enoch, c. 100 B.C."⁴

It was the view of Farrar that, "Admitting that this pinnacle of eminence, [assigned to Daniel of which the Dean has just spoken in the preceding context] may have been due to the peculiar splendour of Daniel's career, it becomes the less easy to account for the total silence respecting him in the other books of the Old Testament, in the Prophets who were contemporary with

¹ *Introduction*, p. 386f.

² *The Book of Daniel*, p. 12.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

⁴ *L.O.T.*, p. 508.

the Exile and its close, like Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi; and in the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah, which give us the details of the Return.”⁶

ASSUMPTIONS

These objections are all based upon the following *assumptions*:

I. That if there were no traces of the influence of Daniel found in pre-Christian literature till 165 B.C., the Book of Daniel could not have been written till then.

II. That, as a matter of fact, there is no trace of the influence of Daniel in pre-Christian literature till 165 B.C., the implication being that after that date the influence is marked.

III. That this literature is of such a character that we would have expected to find traces of this influence, provided that Daniel had written as early as the latter part of the sixth century B.C.

IV. That the same measure of influence would be expected from Daniel as from other books, especially Deuteronomy, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Deutero-Isaiah.

V. That because the ideas of Daniel and those of the First Section of Enoch approximate, they must have been from the same time.

ANSWERS TO ASSUMPTIONS

We will discuss these assumptions under the following heads: (1) the alleged silence of the pre-Maccabean literature; (2) the traces of the influence of Daniel up to 200 B.C.; (3) the traces of the influence of Daniel from 200 B.C. to 135 A.D.; (4) a comparative study of Daniel's influence; (5) the approximation of Daniel and Enoch.

I. THE ARGUMENT FROM SILENCE

In answer to the first of these assumptions, let it be said that it would not be necessary to admit that Daniel could not have been written in the sixth century B.C., even if no trace of it were to be found in the pre-Christian literature before 165 B.C. No one knows enough about the history and literature of that time to

⁶ *The Book of Daniel* (Expositors' Bible), p. 11.

be able to make any such assertion upon the basis of evidence. We can gather from the contents of the book itself that it was most probably written at or near Babylon. This conclusion is rendered almost certainly conclusive by the character of the language in which the book is written.⁶ What convincing reason have we, then, for supposing that a book written at Babylon about 535 B.C. *must* have been known to Zechariah and Haggai writing at Jerusalem about 520 B.C. in the second year of Darius Hystaspis (Hag. i, 1, Zech. i, 1)? It was not the age of printing presses, nor of the rapid multiplying of copies. Besides, we can see good reasons why Daniel, the trusted servant of Cyrus, might not have desired to publish a work which predicted—in unmistakable terms—the eventual overthrow of the kingdom of Persia. Such a publication would certainly have done no good, either to Daniel or to the people of Israel.

Further, Daniel was commanded by the angel to shut up and seal the book until the time of the end (Dan. xii, 4, 9). Whatever these words mean, they would certainly indicate that the Book of Daniel was not intended so much to meet the immediate religious needs of the Israelites, as to serve the wants of future generations. According to the book itself (ix, 24, 25) the vision and prophecy were to be sealed until Messiah-Prince should come. It is possible therefore that the book was preserved in secret until the time of the Maccabees when it was thought that in some prince of the Asmonean line the predicted Messiah had at last come unto his own. If it be said in reply to this, that we have no record of any such publication in the time of the Maccabees, a sufficient answer is, Neither have we any record of the existence of the pseudo-Daniel of the critics nor of the publication of his work at that time.

It will be seen from the above that we are not prepared to admit that the Book of Daniel was not written in the sixth century B.C., even though it may not have been known to the Jewish Palestinian writers of the time from 535 down to 165 B.C. But, we go further and affirm that it is not necessary to suppose that

⁶ See article on "The Aramaic of Daniel" in *Biblical and Theological Studies*, by the Faculty of Princeton Theological Seminary, 1912.

they were not acquainted with the work because they have not cited from it, nor shown any traceable influence of it. There are few citations in any of these works from any of the works preceding them. There are few traces of previous authors to be found in any of the literature of these times, Ecclesiasticus alone excepted. They were too full of the important matter which they were describing and of the messages from God which they had to deliver, to be pre-occupied with the thoughts and messages of the prophets and holy men that had preceded them.

II. TRACES OF DANIEL'S INFLUENCE ON HEBREW LITERATURE UP TO 200 B.C.

Having thus repudiated at the start any presupposition of the critics with regard to the date of Daniel based upon the possible absence of traces of Daniel's influence on the pre-Christian writings, let us now examine whether after all there are traces of the influence of the ideas of Daniel in any part of this pre-Christian literature; and if in some parts of it there are no traces, how we are to account for this fact.

And first, let us ask what are these pre-Christian books to which the critics appeal? It will be admitted by all that they embrace the books of Zechariah, Haggai, Malachi, Esther, Ezra-Nehemiah, and Chronicles. To these, some of the critics would add Ecclesiastes, the Song of Songs, and some of the Psalms; while others would also add Joel, Jeremiah, and many parts of other books, such as the priestly part of the Pentateuch, commonly denoted by P, the larger part of the Book of Proverbs, parts of Isaiah and Nahum, the larger part of the Psalter, and even Job.

1. Taking up first of all the works which are admittedly from the period between 538 and 200 B.C., let us inquire whether any trace of the ideas of Daniel can be found in them; and if not, why not. In treating of this subject we shall confine ourselves to the four marks of influence the lack of which is said by Driver to show that Daniel was not written till the middle of the second century B.C., i.e., angels, resurrection, judgment, and the Messiah.

a. Beginning with Haggai, we observe that this short book of two chapters is taken up entirely with the affairs connected with the rebuilding of the temple, and that it contains several messages from Jehovah directed to Zerubbabel, the governor of Judah, to Joshua the High Priest, and to the rest of the people urging them to build the house of the Lord. Yet even here we find in chapter ii, 7, 9, 22, 23 statements concerning the overthrow of the kingdoms of the nations and the establishment of the peace of Jehovah in his temple at Jerusalem. This overthrow of the kingdoms of the nations may be compared with Dan. ii, 44 where it says that the Lord God shall set up a kingdom which shall break in pieces and consume all the kingdoms of the earth. Since Haggai does not speak of the resurrection, nor of angels, no one can tell what his ideas on these subjects may have been. Certainly it is not fair to say that they must have been different from those of Daniel. Haggai says that the word of the Lord came unto him and that he had a message (*mal'ekhuth*) from Him. He calls himself also, an angel or messenger (*mal'ak*) of Jehovah, a phrase peculiar to himself, putting us in mind of the *mar shipri* of the Babylonians just as the word for message recalls the *shipru* with which the gods of Babylonia communicated their will to men.⁷

b. In Zechariah, however, we find the use of the vision method which characterizes Daniel (as in i, 8, 18, ii, 1, iii, 1, iv, 1, v, 1, 6, vi, 1); but he says that the word of Jehovah came unto him (as in i, 1, vii, 1, 4, 8, viii, 1, 18) and speaks of the burden (*massa'*) of Jehovah (ix, 1, xii, 1). He makes frequent mention of the Messiah and of his kingdom, (vi, 12, ix, 9, xiii, 1) and speaks of the angel who was talking with him and of another angel who went out to meet him (ii, 3). He speaks also of Satan and of the angel of Jehovah (iii, 1), and of the holy ones (xiv, 5). He speaks of a judgment of Jehovah and his saints upon the nations and of the establishment of the kingdom of God over all the earth. Of the specific doctrines of Daniel of which Driver speaks, all but the resurrection are mentioned in Zechariah. On

⁷ Haggai mentions no proverbs; does this prove that there were no proverbs before Haggai?

angels and the Messiah the statements of Zechariah are even more explicit than those of Daniel. Of the doctrines mentioned by both Zechariah and Daniel the latter is more explicit on the judgment alone.

c. Malachi does not mention the resurrection; nor does he speak of angels, unless Malachi itself means "my angel." He does speak, however, of the Messiah as the messenger or angel (*mal'ak*) of the covenant (iii, 1) and as the Sun of righteousness who should arise with healing in his wings (iii, 20 AV, iv, 2 in the MT); and of the judgment (iii, 5).

d. The Books of Ezra and Nehemiah are taken up with geneological and historical matter connected with the building of the wall of Jerusalem and with the reforms of religion in Israel. Being filled with the accounts of such earthly matters, they say nothing about resurrection, angels, judgment, or Messiah. What the author, or authors, may have thought on these subjects, is not even hinted at. This does not imply that they had no thoughts on these subjects, nor, if they had thoughts, that they did not agree with Daniel. Nor does the fact that they do not mention Daniel imply that they did not know about him any more than the fact that they do not mention Isaiah, Hosea, and the other prophets, implies that they did not know about them.

e. The Books of Chronicles, however late they may have been written, do not, except in the last four verses, bring down the history of Israel later than the time of the conquest of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar. In a history such as this there was never any occasion for the author's speaking of the resurrection, nor of the judgment, nor of the Messiah. Incidentally, he mentions Satan as having stood up against Israel and tempted David to number Israel (1 Chr. xxi, 1).

f. Esther treats of but one subject, the origin of the feast of Purim. The writer of this book never mentions the name of God. We might as well infer from this omission that he did not know about God as to infer from his omission of all reference to the resurrection, angels, etc. that he had no opinion on these matters. It seems wonderful, that if the author of Daniel lived in Pales-

tine, as the critics say, at about the same time that the author of Esther did, he should have been so influenced by the Persian religion as to adopt from them his ideas about resurrection, judgment, angels, and Messiah; whereas a writer that knows so much about Persia, as it is admitted that the author of Esther did,⁸ should never have referred to any of those ideas at all. In view of the frequency with which the Behistun and other Persian inscriptions mention the name of God, it is remarkable also that this Jewish writer should never refer to Him. Evidently, the influence of the Persian conquerors upon the religion of their subjects was not so great as some would have us imagine.

It thus appears that of the books (Chron. Ezra-Neh., Esther, Zech., Haggai, and Mal.) which according to the traditional view were written after 538 B.C., Chronicles, Zechariah, and Malachi, mention angels; Zechariah, Haggai and Malachi refer to the Messianic times, and to the judgment.

2. According to the critics, Joel, Jonah, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, the document P, most of the Psalms, Job, parts of Isaiah, Hosea, Amos, Micah, Obadiah, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Nahum, and Proverbs, were also written in post-exilic times. Of these the following mention one or more of the four subjects under discussion:

- (1) Messiah, or his Kingdom—Joel, Psalms, Micah.
- (2) The Judgment—Joel, Psalms, Obadiah, Isaiah.
- (3) The Resurrection—Job, Psalms, Isaiah.
- (4) Angels—Psalms, Job, Isaiah, Ecclesiastes, Proverbs.

The following mention none of the four subjects:

- (1) The passages, or parts, of Nahum, Hosea, Amos and Zephaniah alleged to be post-exilic.
- (2) The books alleged to be entirely post-exilic, such as Jonah, Joel, Canticles and P.

It is obvious, that if the failure of these documents to mention any one of these four subjects proves that Daniel did not exist, it proves also that JE and Isaiah did not exist; for both JE and Isaiah mention angels and Isaiah certainly refers to the Messiah. That a document says nothing about certain subjects proves noth-

⁸ Hastings, *Dict. of the Bible*, Vol. I, 774.

ing as to the ideas of the author of the document upon the subjects not spoken of by him. An author cannot say all he knows in every book he writes.

a. Taking up these books and parts of books which some critics claim to have been written between 538 and 200 B.C., the general remarks may be made with regard to them that: (1) As respects angels, it is true that no influence of Daniel can be discerned in them. For they never mention them at all. But if this failure to mention angels proves that they did not know about the Book of Daniel (i.e., supposing it could be shown that they were written in the period between 538 and 200 B.C.), it would prove also that their authors were ignorant of J and E, of the first part of Isaiah and Ezekiel and Zechariah, all of which mention angels. In other words, it would prove too much, the critics themselves being judges. For none of them would place J and E and Zechariah and Isaiah vi, after their alleged dates for Jonah, Joel and Isaiah xxiv-xxvii. It would be remarkable, also, that the Persian doctrine of angels should be accepted in the second century under Greek rule rather than under Cyrus. (2) As to the resurrection, neither Jonah nor Joel alludes to it. What they may have thought about it or whether they thought of it at all, they do not state and we cannot possibly know. Consequently, it is evident, that we cannot make a comparison between their view of the resurrection and that of Daniel. All we can say is that in the small fragments of their works that have come down to us, they do not talk upon this subject. A large part of the literature written about the Old Testament would never have been written, if the critics had only remembered, that we have no way of judging from the few chapters which most of the Old Testament writers have handed down to us, what their views were upon the countless subjects which they never treat. But let us examine the subject more in detail.

b. If we place, as many of the critics (*e. g.* Budde) do, the Book of Jonah in this period we find that Jonah makes no reference to any of the four doctrines which Driver propounds as characteristic of Daniel. Neither resurrection, angels, general judgment, nor the Messiah, is even remotely referred to in the

whole work. The only judgment hinted at is an earthly one, consisting of a threatened destruction of Nineveh. Sheol is mentioned (ii, 2), but only figuratively in describing the descent of Jonah into the depths of the sea. If it could be proven that Jonah was not written till post-captivity times, his silence with regard to Daniel might possibly have some significance. But that remains to be proven. Moreover, even if it could be proven that Jonah was later than 500 B.C., an argument as to whether Daniel was earlier or later than Jonah could not be made on the basis of these four doctrines, since Jonah has made no allusions to them.

c. In Isaiah xxiv,-xxvii, we find an apocalypse which Driver refers to the early post-exilic period:⁹ (1) because, he says, modern critics are generally agreed that it lacks a suitable occasion in Isaiah's age, (2) because in literary treatment it is in many respects unlike Isaiah and (3) because the thoughts are different from Isaiah.

Before calling attention to the teachings of this passage on the four subjects which, Driver says, were developed by Daniel, I cannot refrain from remarking upon the kind of evidence put forth by the critics and accepted by Driver as sufficient to form their conclusions. "Modern critics are agreed" forsooth! But on what grounds are they agreed? Does anyone of them know enough about the age of Isaiah to say that this passage was not suitable to his times? Where do they get their information? There is none, except what is contained in the Old Testament itself and in the few references to the Jewish history of that period that are contained in the Assyrian and Egyptian documents.

According to Cheyne and Duhm, the genuine verses of Isaiah, 269 to 307½ in number,¹⁰ cover the period from 740 to 701 B.C.

⁹ L.O.T., p. 221.

¹⁰ Duhm limits the genuine prophecies of Isaiah to i, 2-26, 29, 31, ii, 2-4, 6-19, 21, iii, 1-9, 12-15, iv, 1, v, 1-14, 17-29, vi, 1-13, vii, 2, 8a, 9-14, 16, 18-20, viii, 1-18, 21, 22, ix, 2-7, 8-14, 17, x, 4, 5-9, 13, 14, xi, 1-8, xiv, 24, 25a, 26, 27, xvii, 1-6, 9-14, xviii, 1-6, xx, 1, 3-6, xxi, 16, 17, xxii, 1-9a, 11b-14, 15a, 16-18, xxviii, 1-4, 7-29, xxix, 1-4a, 5-7, 9-10, 13-15, xxx, 1-7a, 8-17, 27-32, xxxi, 1-4, 5, 8a, 9b, xxxii, 1-5, 9-18, 20. Cheyne limits the genuine parts of

From the earlier part of this period, we have the prophecies of Hosea, 746-734 B.C., several passages of which are held by certain critics to be later additions, partly on the ground that in their opinion they express thoughts alien to Hosea's position, partly because they are supposed to interrupt the connection of thought. From the later years of Isaiah we have the prophecies of Micah. Here, again, the critics find that much material has been interpolated, such as part, or all, of chaps. iv and v. These interpolations, or additions, are alleged on the ground that to the critics they seem to be "inconsistent," "not to harmonize," or "difficult to reconcile" with the portions they admit to be genuine. 2 Kings xv-xx treat, also, of the times of Isaiah. But, since large portions of these chapters are supposed to be "the work of a prophet writing in the subsequent generation,"¹¹ it is left to the judgment of each critic to determine how much of them is reliable history. The Books of Chronicles, so far as they contain matter additional to that of Kings, need not, in the opinion of the critics, be considered, inasmuch as it does not seem possible to treat them "as strictly and literally historical."¹²

Having thus rejected more than half of the records attributed by the sources to the period from 740 to 700 B.C., because it does not seem to them to be consistent with what they think to be genuine, the critics proceed to give us their view of what Isaiah and his contemporaries thought. The amusing thing about this method of procedure is, that those using it do not seem to

Isaiah to i, 5-26, 29-31, ii, 6-21, iii, 1-4, 5, 8, 9, 12-17, 24, 41, v, 1-14, 17-25b, vi, 1-13, vii, 2-8a, 9-14, 16, 18-20, viii, 1-18, 20b-22, ix, 8-13, 16, x, 4, 5-9, 13, 14, 27-32, xiv, 24, 25a, 26, 27, 29-32, xvi, 14 (from *within*), xvii, 1-6, 9-14, xviii, 1-6, xx, 1, 3-6, xxi, 16, 17, xxii, 1-9a, 11b-14, 15a, 16-18, xxiii, 1, 2, 3, 4, 6-12, 14, xxviii, 1-4, 7-19, 21, 22, xxix, 1-4, 6, 9, 10, 13-15; xxx, 1-7a, 8-17; xxxi, 1-5a (to *birds*): all that remains consist of editors' additions or post-exilic insertions. That is, out of the 1295 verses attributed to Isaiah by the Massorettes, Duhm accounts 307½ and Cheyne 269 to be genuine. They deliberately throw out from three-quarters to four-fifths of the entire book without any documentary or even circumstantial evidence except that which is to be derived from their own precarious theories or opinions of what Isaiah ought to, or might have, written.

¹¹ *L.O.T.*, 197.

¹² *Ibid*, 532.

see how absurd it is. The serious thing about it is, that they do not see how wicked it is. To change a document for a purpose is not permissible in the ordinary transactions of life, nor in the editing of letters and other literary documents. In legal phraseology, it is called falsification, that is, "the intentional alteration of a record, or of any document so as to render it untrue," or different from what the original writers wrote.

In all this, I am not intending to cast a slur upon any well directed attempt to arrive by means of manuscripts and versions, or even by means of established principles of textual criticism, at the correct original of the Scriptures, nor to reflect upon any sincere endeavour to get at the right meaning of them; but I do intend to protest against the tacit claim on the part of some, without any superhuman knowledge, who pretend to be able to interpret the Mene-mene-tekeli-upharsins of ancient history. Before any one has the right to deny that Isaiah xxiv-xxvii had a "suitable occasion" in the age of Hezekiah, he must know thoroughly the history of the period in which Isaiah lived. No one knows thoroughly that history. Therefore, no one has the right to deny that these chapters may have been written by Isaiah.

Again, it is said, that the literary treatment is unlike that of Isaiah. Of course, the critics mean by this statement, that the literary treatment of chapters xxiv-xxvii is unlike that of the parts of Isaiah which they recognize as genuine. Here, once more, a caveat must be made. For even at the risk of appearing to reflect on the literary judgment of the eminent critics who make this assertion, I am constrained to express the opinion, that they do not know enough of the literary possibilities of a writer of the imagination and versatility of Isaiah to affirm that he could not have employed styles differing as much as are claimed to appear in various parts of the works bearing his name. Of the style of Ezekiel, or of Jeremiah, we might form a correct judgment because of general sameness. But a gifted genius like Isaiah transcends all ordinary canons. He must be compared, not to Johnson, or Macaulay, with their stereotyped and stilted style; but rather with him "whose soul was like a star, and dwelt apart" who had "a voice whose sound was like the sea,"

now moving in majestic numbers as he narrates the speech of Satan to his marshalled hosts of embattled angels, now swelling in joyful pæans to the heaven-born Redeemer, now sounding in reverberating denunciations the doom of Waldensian persecutors, now booming in the grandiloquent prose of the Areopagitica in praise of that liberty that he loved so well; but, again, moving along in his *History of England* with scarcely a break to the monotony, or sinking to the almost frozen stiffness of the Common Place Book. Milton's Note Book shows that he wrote some of his lines five times before he published them. Macaulay says that he put three whole years upon the production of his *Lays of Ancient Rome*, writing and re-writing until they had reached the highest degree of perfection to which he could bring them. May not Isaiah have elaborated some of his works with more assiduity than others? May he not have cultivated, as we know that Robert Louis Stevenson did, a variety of styles sufficient to express most appropriately his varied ideas? May he not intentionally have put into the sections including chapters xxiv-xxvii the "synonymous clauses," "the alliterations and word-plays" the "many unusual expressions" and all the other features, "which though they may be found occasionally [elsewhere] in Isaiah, are never aggregated in his writings as they are here?" Who knows? The critics think they do. How do they know? How can they know? Have they sufficient evidence to show that they know? We think not.

Lastly, the critics assert that the thought of chapters xxiv-xxvii is different from Isaiah's. There are "points of contact" which show that the author of these chapters "was familiar with Isaiah's writings"; but there are features "which seem to spring out of a different (and later) vein of thought from Isaiah's."¹³ "Veins of thought" forsooth! and "different veins of thought"! and "later veins of thought"! Beautiful phrases! Empty phrases! Unjustifiable phrases! For by what method of psychological analysis, or historical investigation, have the critics arrived at the conclusion, that Isaiah may not have had different veins of thought at different periods of his life? Who of us has not had

¹³ *L.O.T.*, 220.

in the course of forty years, or less, many new veins of thought, a new philosophy of life, perhaps an altered view of the universe and God? Who of us does not know of many men, who in a score of years or less, have apparently changed their whole attitude toward the scheme of things? That these changes have taken place, we know; but whence and how they came, we cannot always tell. We do not know all the influences that shape and change our own lives, much less the lives of others. But, as to those who have long since been dead, and of whose outer and inner life little information has come down to us, it is, and must be, impossible for us to determine the number, variety, and causes, of their changes of thought, and of the frequency and extent of these changes. How, then, when we go back twenty-five hundred years to the time of Isaiah, can we expect to tell what veins of thought he may have had, and whence and how they may have originated? How can we measure the periphery of the circle of his ideas? How can we sound the depths of his researches, or soar to the heights of his imagination? How can we determine, that he may have discovered certain "veins of thought," but that certain others must have been unknown to him?

And yet, this is just what the critics of Isaiah claim the capacity for doing. They claim to have the ability to distinguish from the thoughts expressed the parts of the present Book of Isaiah that were composed about 700 B.C., the parts that are alleged to have been written from 550 to 500 B.C., and the parts that, they say, must have been written as late as 400, or even 175 B.C. On the face of it, this claim has the appearance of a hypersensitized egoism.

For, says Driver, "it is true," that in these chapters, "the author follows Isaiah more than other prophets"; but, at the same time, "his prophecy contains similarly reminiscences from other prophets," such as Hosea, Amos, Micah, Nahum, and Jeremiah.¹⁴ But Driver fails to inform us, how he knows that Nahum and Jeremiah were not influenced by the writer of these chapters, rather than the opposite, or that all three may not have

¹⁴ *L.O.T.*, 220.

been influenced by some earlier unknown prophet whose works have been lost. In the case of Nah. ii, 11, and Isa. xxiv, 1-4, the reminiscence (*sic!*) seems to have been confined to the use of the one root "to be empty" (*buq*, or *baqaq*),—a very slender support for a literary reminiscence, especially since Hosea and Jeremiah, also, use the same word. Must every one who speaks of the sound of a voice have a reminiscence of Wordsworth's sonnet to Milton, or of Tennyson's *In Memoriam*?

Again, Driver says that "the absence of *distinct* historical allusions" makes the question as to what period the prophecy is to be assigned a difficult one to answer.¹⁵ "The unnamed city is, most probably, Babylon." Yet he adds, "it is doubtful, however, whether the literal Babylon is intended by the author. The lineaments of the city which he depicts are so indistinct and unsubstantial that the picture seems rather to be an ideal one: Babylon becomes a type of the powers of heathenism, which the prophet imagines as entrenched behind the walls of a great city, strongly fortified, indeed, but destined in God's good time to be overthrown." And yet, on the ground of this imaginary picture, the critics attempt to fix the date of these chapters; some placing it as late as about 334 B.C. This could be, says Driver, because Babylon "remained an important city till the close of the Persian empire. . . ." While this is true, yet it was even more true in the times of Hammurabi, of Merodach-Baladan (during whose reign Isaiah the son of Amos prophesied) and of Nebuchadnezzar. Always, from the time of Hammurabi to that of Alexander, Babylon the Great was the centre of Semitic heathenism. To Isaiah and his contemporaries, it was not merely a type; it was the real, living, Jehovah-defying, centralized and radiating, power of this world. According to the prophecies expressly assigned to Isaiah in the book that bears his name, a large part of his thoughts and predictions were taken up with the future relations of Israel with this crowning city of heathendom. In chap xxxix, he predicts that Hezekiah's descendents should be taken captive thither; in xl-lxvi, he comforts the people with the assurance of the faithfulness and power of Jehovah and of their eventual

¹⁵ *L.O.T.*, 221.

return from exile; in xiii-xiv, the ultimate complete destruction of Babylon is predicted. If we believe in predictive prophecy, the whole of the Book of Isaiah may confidently be attributed to him. But, granting for the sake of argument all that the critics claim as to the date of Isa. xxiv-xxvii, what effect would this have upon the theory of the absence of the influence of ideas of Daniel on post-exilic literature? If with Driver, we were to refer these chapters "most plausibly to the early post-exilic period," we might mark the influence of Daniel in regard to angels, the judgment, and the Messianic kingdom. For in xxiv, 21-23, we read that "It shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall punish the host of the high ones that are on high [i.e., the angels] and the kings of the earth upon the earth. And they shall be gathered together, as prisoners are gathered in the pit, and shall be put in the prison, and after many days shall they be visited.¹⁶ Then the moon shall be confounded, and the sun ashamed, when the LORD of hosts shall reign in mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients gloriously."¹⁷ Again touching the resurrection, we read in xxvi, 19: "Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust: for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead." Surely if we were to place the composition of Daniel at about 535 B.C., and that of Isa. xxiv-xxvii at 525, or after, it would be difficult to escape the conclusion that the latter was influenced by the former.

d. As to the *Priests' Codex* (P) which is put by the critics from 400 to 300 B.C., it will be admitted by all that it contains no intimation of a resurrection, of angels, of a judgment following death, nor even of a Messiah. It is noteworthy, however, if the author of this part of the Pentateuch wrote at so late a date (for he is put in the Persian times), that he should have said nothing about a Messiah or about angels, even if he be silent as to a resurrection and an after judgment. The critics may satisfy themselves as to the absence of reference to the latter by supposing that they were first suggested by a Daniel living in

¹⁶ i.e., in judgment. See also xxvi, 21, xxvii, 1.

¹⁷ i.e., in the Messianic kingdom. See also xxvii, 6.

the second century B.C., but how on their own principle that the influence of the ideas of preceding authors should be traceable in later ones, will they explain the absence of all reference to the Messiah, and to angels in this great P document? If the absence of all reference to two of the doctrines proves that Daniel did not exist before P was written, the absence of all of them would prove that Isaiah and Zechariah did not exist.

e. The Proverbs of Solomon mention no future judgment, no Messiah, no kingdom, and no resurrection. The word for angel occurs in xvi, 14 where the wrath of a king is said to be as angels of death, and in xvii, 11, "An evil man seeketh only rebellion: therefore a cruel angel shall be sent against him."

f. With regard to Joel, the case is different. It makes no mention of the resurrection or of angels. The Messianic times, however, are described in ii, 28-30 and iii, 18-20, though the Messiah himself is not referred to. The great day of Jehovah (ii, 2) is the main theme of the book. On this day, the Lord will bring the nations down to the valley of Jehoshaphat and will judge them there. Thither, also, according to iii, 12, the nations, having been awakened, shall come up, when Jehovah shall sit there to judge all the nations round about.

g. At whatever date the critics place the composition of the Song of Songs, it would be preposterous to expect to find in a poetical work of its character, any reference to any one of the four subjects that are said to characterize the Book of Daniel. Whatever its symbolical interpretation may be, its strict adherence to the theme of an earthly love that is stronger than death, excludes the expectation of finding any allusion in it, to any of the higher matters which are the theme of Daniel's discourse. This is not a matter of date and influence, but one of subject matter and literary consistency.¹⁸

3. The Apocryphal and other Extra-Canonical Writings of the Hebrews probably antedating the alleged date of Daniel in 164 B.C., are, Tobit, Ecclesiasticus, Achikar, the Aramaic Eryp-

¹⁸ For a discussion of the Psalms assigned by critics to this period, see below.

tian papyri, and the Letter of Aristeas. As to the four subjects under discussion, the following traces are to be found in them:

*a. Tobit*¹⁹ says nothing about resurrection, judgment, Messiah or kingdom; but has a great deal to say about angels. Thus in iii, 17 he names *Raphael* who is the *deus ex machina* sent by God to direct the whole plan of God's providence with reference to Tobit and Sara. The belief in guardian angels is expressed in v, 17, 22 and in holy angels in xi, 14. Raphael (xii, 15) is called one of the seven holy angels who stand and enter before the glory of the Lord. *Asmodeus*, an evil demon, is mentioned by name (iii, 8 and elsewhere).

b. Ecclesiasticus mentions (1) angels (xxix, 28, xli, 2, xlvi, 21, and (2) resurrection (xlvi, 12, 20, xlvi, 5, xlix, 10).

c. Achikar (500-400 B.C.) is silent on all four subjects and displays no knowledge of the law or of the prophets, nor even of the history of Israel.

d. The other *Aramaic Documents* from Elephantine are equally silent on these four subjects.

e. Aristeas (200 B.C.) is silent on all four subjects.

III. TRACES OF DANIEL'S INFLUENCE FROM 200 B.C. TO 135 A.D.

For convenience of discussion we shall sub-divide this long period into three divisions: the period from 200-100 B.C., that that from 100 B.C. to 1 A.D., and the third from 1-135 A.D.

Second Century B.C. Taking up the Post-Captivity Literature that was, or is thought to have been, written between 200 and 100 B.C., let us see whether the ideas which characterize Daniel are to be found, also, in them.

a. And first, let us consider the Canonical Books or parts of books, that are said by certain critics to have been composed in the second century B.C.

(1) Fifty-seven of the Psalms are alleged by either Driver, or Cheyne, or Reuss, or Robertson Smith, to have been written in the time of the Maccabees. In these psalms, there is no mention

¹⁹ Dating from 350 to 170 B.C. according to Simpson in *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the O. T.*, ed. by Charles. Vol. I, p. 183.

of the resurrection, nor of the final judgment. Psalm cxlviii, 2 alone speaks of angels; and only cx, 1 and cxviii, 26 refer clearly to the Messiah. In the three psalms (xliv, lxxiv, and lxxix) which Driver puts in these times, there is no reference to any one of the four subjects that, in discussing Daniel, he alleges to be indicative of the Maccabean period, the distinguishing mark of its *Zeitgeist*. Strange, indeed, is it that those who make so much of the spirit of the times, of Persian ideas and Grecian philosophy, in the consideration of Ecclesiastes and Daniel, should be blind to the absence of Persian and Greek influences from the psalms! Think of it! In none of these fifty-seven psalms is Persia, or Greece once mentioned. No king of Persia, or Greece, is named. No Persian, or Greek, word is employed. The phalanx and the elephant, those mighty and almost invincible weapons of Seleucid warfare, are passed over in silence.

But, the absence of all direct and indisputable evidence of the Maccabean origin of these psalms might in a measure be considered negligible, if the critics were unanimous in their conclusions as to what were Maccabean. But, we find that in their conclusions, no two of them are agreed. Cheyne assigns 30 psalms to this period and Reuss 31; but they agree only as to eight of them. Perowne and Delitzsch put Pss. xliv, lxxiv, and lxxix, in Maccabean times; but Cheyne agrees with them only as to Ps. xliv, assigning Ps. lxxiv and lxxix to the time of Artaxerxes Ochus, while Reuss assigns no one of the three to the time of the Maccabees. In the midst of such glaring, and, if we follow the subjective methods of their sponsors, such inevitable disagreements, as to the dates of these poetic compositions, one may be pardoned for judging that their methods are inconclusive and their opinions unreliable.

(2) Ecclesiastes, the date of whose composition is placed by Plumptre, Cornill, and Driver, at about 200 B.C., mentions neither the Messiah nor the Messianic kingdom, nor angels, nor the resurrection. With regard to judgment, it represents the author as saying in his heart that God will judge the righteous and the wicked (iii, 17) and as stating that God will bring every work into judgment with every secret thing whether it be good, or

whether it be evil (xii, 14); and that the dead know not anything, neither have they any more a reward (ix, 5).²⁰

(3) Up to the present time, Professor Haupt of Johns Hopkins seems to be the only critic who has had the presumption to place any part of the Book of Nahum in the Maccabean period. Yet, among the many equivocal grounds which he gives in favour of the late date of parts of this prophecy, he does not even suggest that there is the slightest hint in any verse of Nahum at

²⁰ It will be known to most of my readers, that the three great criteria used by the critics for determining the approximate dates of literary documents are the agreements, or disagreements, in reference to history, doctrine and language. One may perceive from the above statement that Daniel and Ecclesiastes both treat of but one doctrine in common, and that they differ considerably even in the treatment of this one. As to history, they never touch on the same subjects. Daniel, indeed, speaks expressly of certain events in the lives of Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar, Darius the Mede, and Cyrus; but Ecclesiastes makes no direct or definite allusion to anyone, save Solomon. When we come to the third criterion, that of language, to which Driver in his *L.O.T.* has appealed so frequently and with such an assumption of cocksureness, we find that the disagreements are sufficient to make us doubt entirely the manner in which this criterion is used by the critics. If the *prima facie* and traditional view of the dates of the Old Testament books be correct we would expect the linguistic characteristics of Daniel to agree in large measure with those of Chronicles, Ezra-Nehemiah, and Esther. If the views of the critics were correct, we would expect to find a still closer resemblance between the language of Daniel and that of Ecclesiastes, the so-called Maccabean psalms, and Ecclesiasticus. Now, of the thirty-two words marshalled on pp. 506-507 of *L.O.T.* to show that the Hebrew of Daniel resembles in all distinctive features the Hebrew of the age subsequent to Nehemiah, we find that twenty-five are found also in other books of the Old Testament. It will be seen, also, that fourteen of the words and seven of the phrases, that is, all but four, occur in Chronicles. Of the remaining four, one occurs in Nehemiah and two in Esther. Of the whole thirty-two, only one word and one phrase are met with in Ecclesiastes and only one word in the fifty-seven so-called Maccabean psalms. On the other hand, of the fifteen words and phrases cited on page 475 of *L.O.T.* as proof of the late date of Ecclesiastes, not one occurs in Daniel and only one in any of the supposedly Maccabean psalms.

All that is needed to test these almost unbelievable statements is to read and compare the collections of words and references on pp. 475, 506-7, and 387-9 of *L.O.T.* And while the gentle reader of these lines is testing these statements, let him read also what Driver has to say on pages 484-5, 535-540, and 545-547, about the expressions characteristic of Esther, Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah, and he will observe that they agree with Daniel in

any one of these four doctrines which are said to characterize the Book of Daniel and to be indicative of the second century B.C., and for this good and sufficient reason, that as a matter of fact, not one of them is so much as hinted at in the whole book.²¹

employing a goodly number of Persian words; whereas, the fifty-seven psalms have not one; and only one, and that of doubtful origin, is alleged to be found in Ecclesiastes.

Furthermore, of the four great peculiarities of the language of Ecclesiastes—the frequent use of nouns ending in *-uth* and *-on*, the employment of the relative *she*, and of the *waw* conjunctive with the perfect—not one is found in the Hebrew of Daniel. So that in the words of Driver himself (*L.O.T.*, 473), we may say, that “linguistically, Qohêleth stands by itself in the O.T.” And since it stands by itself, it shows the futility of attempting, by such methods as those employed by the critics, to determine the date and composition of the documents on the ground of peculiar expressions found in them.

²¹ One of the fanciful reasons that are given by Haupt for the late date of a part of Nahum is the word *mephets* occurring in ii, 2. This word means “he that dashes in pieces,” and it is supposed by Haupt that it refers to Judas Maccabæus. The plural of the word is found in Jer. xxiii, 1, where it is translated in the English version by “scatter.” A noun of the same form is found in Prov. xxv, 18, in the sense of “maul,” or “hammer.” This verse is among those that were copied out by the men of Hezekiah from the proverbs of Solomon. If the author of Nahum ii, 2 had employed some derivative of *nakab* “to hammer,” there would have been the appearance at least of an argument in favour of Professor Haupt’s view arising from the fact that Judas was called the *Maḳḳabi*. This appearance, however, would not be significant of a late date, first, because the words *maḳḳabah* and *maḳḳebeth* “hammer” occur in Isaiah, Jeremiah, and 1 Kings, and also in Judges iv, 21, which many of the critics consider to be about the earliest part of the Old Testament. Now, since a hammer implies a hammerer, it is obvious that *maḳḳabi* might have been used as early as Judges iv. Surely, Jael was a great hammerer!

Secondly, no argument for the late date of a document can be made on the basis of this word, seeing that not merely is it absent from the Old Testament literature of the late period—even from the so-called Maccabean portions—but the word, except possibly as a proper noun, is not found in the New Hebrew and Aramaic of the Targums and Talmud, nor in the Syriac.

Since this fancied reference of this one word to Judas Maccabæus is the nearest approach to objective evidence for the late date of a part of Nahum to be found in the whole of Professor Haupt’s work, our readers cannot imagine with what far-fetched conjectures and might-have-beens, with what flashes of “phosphorescent punk and nothingness” the writer attempts to enlighten us with his subjective lucubrations. Brilliant they often are, but they lack the first principles of science, logic, and evidential value.

(4) As to the ninety-two, or more of the Psalms of David said by the critics to have been written between 539 and 100 B.C., the following references to the four subjects under discussion occur in them, to wit:

(a) Angels are said in ciii, 20, 21, to be strong heroes that do Jehovah's word and his ministers that do his will. In xci, 11, they are said to keep us in all our ways; and in xxxiv, 8, to encamp around those that fear Him and to deliver them. In lxxviii, 17, they are said to be many thousands in number.

(b) As to the resurrection, these psalms have nothing to say, except possibly Ps. xxx, 4.

(c) As to the judgment, there are probable intimations in ix, 7, 8, and 1, iff.

(d) The Messiah is expressly named in ii, 2, and is called God's Son in ii, 5, and is referred to in lxxii, 7, 8, cxxxii, 11, and in xxi, xxiv, xxvii, xxx, xxxiv, xxxv, xli, lxxviii, lxix and cix.

In the Hebrew text, three of these psalms (i, ii, xci) are without headings; the fiftieth is ascribed to Asaph, the seventieth, to Solomon, the eighty-ninth to Ethan, and all the rest, except possibly the one hundred and thirty-second to David.²²

(5) Isaiah xxiv-xxvii, which some critics allege to have been written in the Maccabean period has already been sufficiently discussed.

b. In the second place, in the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical Books written from 200 to 100 B.C. the following situation with regard to these four doctrines is to be found:

(1) *Ecclesiasticus* mentions angels, but only in references to

²² In *L.O.T.*, pp. 384-386, Driver gives the dates of the psalms as follows: In Books I and II, psalms ii, xviii, xx, xxi, xxviii, xlv, lxi, lxiii, and lxxii, will presumably be pre-exilic; of the rest, many, it is probable, spring from different parts of the Persian period. In Book III (psalms lxxiii-lxxxix), he supposes lxxvii, lxxviii, lxxx, lxxxii, lxxxv, lxxxvi, lxxxvii, to be post-exilic; lxxiv, lxxix, and perhaps lxxxiii, to be Maccabean; and lxxiii, lxxv, lxxxii, and lxxxiv, not earlier than Jeremiah. In Books IV and V, he makes ci and cx to be presumably from before the exile, xc and xci possibly so, and cii, exilic; xciii, xcvi-xcix, are either from the latter part of the exile, or soon after.

the narratives in the canonical books. The other three subjects are not even hinted at.

(2) The *Book of Wisdom* calls the manna "angels' food" (xvi, 20), says that the righteous shall receive a glorious kingdom (v, 15, 16), rebukes the ungodly for saying that no man was known to have returned from the grave (ii, 1), says that the souls of the righteous shall judge the nation (iii, 1, 8), and the unrighteous "shall have no hope, nor comfort, on the day of trial" (iii, 18).

(3) *First Maccabees* is silent on all four subjects; but emphasizes the importance of keeping the sabbath, as to which Daniel says nothing.

(4) The *Addenda to Daniel* show no trace of the influence of the canonical Daniel, as far as it affects these four doctrines.

(5) The *Addenda to Esther* represent Esther as saying to the king of Persia, that he appeared to her as an angel of God. (xv, 13).

(6) The Book of *Baruch* mentions none of the four subjects, unless by devils (iv, 7) evil angels are meant.

(7) *Judith* is silent on all four subjects.

(8) Fragments of the *Book of Noah* are said to be embedded in the *Book of Enoch*. These fragments are supposed by Charles to be parts of a work that was written about 170 B.C., though the grounds upon which this early date is assigned to it are not absolutely convincing. They consist mostly of a commentary on the life of Noah as recorded in Genesis, and especially upon chapter vi, 1-4, which treats of the fallen angels, or "sons of God." Chaps. liv, lv, lx, and lxv-lxix give an account of the flood and of the judgment on the fallen angels; and cvi, cvii of the birth of Noah. The book names nineteen leaders of the rebellious sons of God and four others as leaders of the holy ones of heaven; and mentions Satan and even Satans (vi, 7, ix, 1, liv, 6, lxv, 6, lxix, 2-11). An angel of peace is spoken of in liii, 4, liv, 4, and lx, 24, and angels of punishment in v, 33, lxvi, 1. An angel went with Enoch (Noah?) and angels built the ark (lx, 11, lxvii, 2). There were

a thousand thousand and ten thousand times ten thousand of angels, some of whom were called watchers (lx, 1; x, 7, 9, 15).

The day of the great judgment is referred to in x, 6, lx, 6, 25, after which the bad angels will be led off to the abyss of fire (x, 15, lxvii, 12, lxviii, 2), and the Messianic times of righteousness and truth and peace will be established (x, 16, xi, 2). Nothing is said in this book about a resurrection.

(9) The so-called First Section of the *Book of Enoch*, containing chaps. vi-xxxvi, names Raphael, Michael, Uriel, Raguel, and Azazel (xxii, 3, 6, xxiv, 2, xix, 1, xxi, 5, 9, xxvii, 2, xxiii, 4, xiii, 1) and seven holy angels who watch (xx, 2-8). It mentions the watchers of heaven (xii, 2, 3, 4, xiii, 10, xv, 21), watchers (xvi, 1), holy watchers (xv, 9), and the seven stars of heaven (xxi, 6). It speaks of holy ones (xiv, 25), and of most holy ones (xiv, 23), and calls them eternal (xiv, 1), children of heaven (xiv, 3) and says that they see the glory of God (xxxvi, 4). Evil spirits are called giants (xv, 8), for whom a prison is reserved (xxi, 10). The duties of angels are declared in xx. The spirit of Abel lives on after death (xxii, 7), and compartments of Sheol exist for the spirits of the dead (xxii, 5, 8-13). In number there are ten thousand times ten thousand angels (xiv, 22).

The judgment is referred to in xiv, 4, xix, 1, xxv, 4, xxvii, 11, and a resurrection is implied in xxv, 6. No Messiah is mentioned.

(10) The Second Section of the *Book of Enoch* embraces lxxxiii-xc. Except in a veiled reference in xc, 33, it does not mention the resurrection; nor, since xc, 37 may refer to John Hyrcanus, does it mention in express terms a Messiah. Angels may be meant by the seventy shepherds. A judgment on the stars and shepherds and blinded sheep is spoken of in xc, 24-27.

(11) *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, written according to Charles about 107 B.C., never name Gabriel or Michael, but speak of Satan and Beliar. They speak, also, of the angel of God, of angels of the presence, and of archangels and watchers. In Benjamin x, 8, 9, it speaks of the judgment and says: The Lord judges Israel first for the unrighteousness which they have committed, and then so shall they judge the gentiles [compare

Levi iii, 3]. In Benj. x, 6-8, it speaks of a resurrection of the wicked as well as of the righteous, saying: Ye shall see Enoch, Noah, and Shem, Abraham, and Isaac and Jacob, rising on the right hand of gladness; then, shall we also rise, each over our own tribe, and we shall worship the heavenly king. Then, shall we all be changed, some into glory and some into shame; for the Lord shall judge Israel first for the unrighteousness which they have committed and then shall he judge also the gentiles. In Sim. x, 2, the patriarch says: Then shall I arise; and in Zeb. x, 2, we read: Then shall I arise again in the world. Judah xxv, 1, 3, 4, reads: And after these things shall Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, arise unto life, and I and my brethren shall be the chiefs of the tribes of Israel . . . and ye shall be the people of the Lord and have one tongue; and there shall be no spirit of deceit, for he shall be cast into the fire forever and they who have died in grief shall arise in joy and they who are put to death for the Lord's sake shall awake. Of the Messiah, the book says in two places that he will be from Judah, and in six, that he will be from Levi. It says, also, that he will war against Beliar and deliver his captives, that he will be free from sin, will walk in meekness and righteousness and open Paradise to the righteous.

(12) The *Book of Jubilees*, written according to Charles at about 107 B.C., has given up all hope in a resurrection. It mentions by name Mastema and Beliar and speaks of the creation and circumstances of angels, of guardian angels, of angels of the presence, of the duty of angels to instruct mankind, and of angels of wood, clouds, fire, etc.; as also, of their marrying the daughters of men, of their punishment, and of their children. It speaks, also, of the final judgment of the fallen angels and of their sons, and of a great judgment, apparently for all men (xxiii, 11, 30). Of the Messiah, it speaks in but one ambiguous passage (xxxii, 18, 19), where it says to Judah: A prince shalt thou be, thou and one of thy sons, over the sons of Jacob: in thee shall be the help of Jacob and in thee be found the salvation of Israel. This reference to the Messiah is based on Gen. xlix, 10.

(13) The *Sibylline Books* are composed of material of such uncertain date, that it is impossible to determine exactly when the

different parts were written. Parts of Book Three are generally supposed to have been written in the latter part of the second century B.C. In line 775 of this book the Messiah is called the son of the great God, and in lines 49, 50, a holy king ruling all the lands of earth. In line 56 the sibyl speaks of the judgment of the great king, the deathless God; and in line 63, of the angel Beliar.

First Century B.C. In the Jewish Literature of the First Century B.C., we find the following testimony about the four subjects.

a. *Second Maccabees* is silent as to the Messiah and the kingdom. It refers to a good angel sent to save Israel (xi, 6, xv, 21), shows a belief in the resurrection of the righteous (vii, 29) and in a judgment.

b. *Third Maccabees* speaks of two angels, glorious and terrible, who appear to Eleazar the high-priest; it has nothing to say of the other subjects.

c. The writer of *Fourth Maccabees* does not believe in a resurrection of the body, but "in the immortality of all souls." He is silent on the other doctrines.

d. The *Epistle of Jeremiah* mentions an angel in verse 7, but is silent on the other subjects.

e. The *Psalms of Solomon* speak of the Messiah and of the king, the son of David and God's servant (xviii, 6). They do not mention the other three doctrines.

f. The *Story of Zerubbabel* says nothing about any of these doctrines.

g. The *Song of the Three Children* mentions neither resurrection, judgment, nor Messiah. In verse 26, it speaks of the angel of the Lord as coming into the furnace with Azariah and his fellows; and in verse 37, calls upon the angel of the Lord to bless him.

h. In the *History of Susanna*, the angel of the Lord is mentioned in vs. 45, and the angel of God in vss. 55, 59; but the other subjects are not mentioned.

i. In the story of *Bel and the Dragon*, the angel of the Lord is said to have brought Habbakkuk from Judah to Babylon and to

have carried him back again (vss. 36, 39) ; but no reference is made to the other subjects.

j. In the Third Section of *Enoch*, angels are mentioned in xci, 15, and holy angels in xciii, 2; the righteous judgment in xci, 14, and the eternal judgment in xci, 15. Resurrection and Messiah are not referred to.

k. The Fourth Section of *Enoch* in certain passages, where according to Professor Charles the redactor tries to bring the subject-matter of this section into harmony with the rest of the book, mentions the son of man, the day of judgment, seven holy ones, and the names of the leaders of the stars, one for each season and one for each of the twelve months. Uriel is named as leader and shows things to Enoch.

l. The Fifth Section of *Enoch*, written between 95 and 64 B.C., mentions clearly all four subjects. There will be a judgment and a resurrection of the righteous dead (c, 5), a final judgment with the destruction of the former heavens and earth and the creation of a new heaven (xcii, 14-16), and a Messianic kingdom, where God and His Son will be united with the children of the earth forever (cv, 2). The holy angels are spoken of in xci, 2 and the wicked in xci, 15. Angels are said to place the prayers of the righteous for a memorial before the Most High (xcix, 3), and to gather the world for judgment (c, 4) and to be guarding over the righteous (c, 5).

m. The Sixth Section of *Enoch*, written between 94 and 79 B.C., speaks of a resurrection of all Israel (li, 1, lxi, 5) and of a judgment on the righteous and the wicked, on angels and on men (xlvi, 2-4, xlviii, 2). The Messiah is called the elect one (xlv, 4, xlviii, 8, xlix, 2, 4, li, 5, 6, lii, 6, 9, liii, 6, lv, 4, lxi, 5, 8, lxii, 1), God's anointed (xlviii, 10), the son of man (xlvi, 2, 3, 4, xlviii, 2), who will possess universal dominion, sit on the throne of his glory, and judge all angels and men, slaying the wicked by the word of his mouth (lxii, 7, 9, 14, lxix, 26, 28, 29). There are righteous angels and the five angels of the presence, Raphael and Michael among them (xxxix, 5, xl, 9), and the angel of peace who went with Enoch (xliii, 3, lii, 3, liv, 4, lv, 2), and angels of punishment (liii, 3, lvi, 1), and thou-

sands of thousands and ten thousand times ten thousand (xl, 1). Of bad angels, Satan and Azazel are named (liii, 3, 5, 6, lv, 4), and five Satans (lxix, 4), and twenty leaders of the evil angels (lxviii, 2). He speaks, also, of the host of God, of Cherubim, Seraphim, and Ophanim, and all the angels of power (lxi, 10).

1-135 A.D. In the Jewish and Judæo-Christian Literature from the year 1 A.D. to the year 135 A.D., or thereabouts, we find the following testimony on these subjects.

a. Apocalyptic and Pseudepigraphical Literature:

(1) The *Martyrdom of Isaiah* mentions several bad angels Sammael, Malchira, Beliar, and Satan; but it is silent with respect to the other three subjects, except that by the beloved of i, 13 the Messiah is probably meant.

(2) The *Assumption of Moses* contains ostensibly a revelation of Moses, which mentions an angel (x, 2), the judgment (x, 3-8), and the kingdom (x, 1); but no resurrection, nor Messiah.

(3) The *Apocalypse of Baruch* speaks of angels as created on the first day (xxi, 6), of the existence of armies of them (xlviii, 10, li, 11, lix, 10), of the fall of them (lvi, 11-13), of the angel of death (xxi, 6), and names one of them Ramiel, who presides over true visions (lv, 3, lxiii, 6). It speaks in xxx, 1 of the time of the advent of the Messiah "when all who have fallen asleep in hope in him shall rise again"; and in chaps. 1 and li, the resurrection is described at length. It speaks, also, of the revelation of the Messiah (xxix, 3), of his correcting the leader of the wicked and all his impieties (xl, 1), and of his summoning all the nations, some of whom he will save and some of whom he will slay (lxxii, 2). The Messiah is called a judge (xlviii, 39) and there will be a day of judgment (lix, 8).

(4) The *Testament of Hezekiah* mentions Sammael, Beliar, and the armies of Beliar, the angels and armies of the beloved one. It speaks of the beloved (iii, 17, 18, iv, 3, 6, 9, 13), and of Jesus the Lord Christ (iv, 13). In iii, 18, the resurrection of the beloved is mentioned and in iv, 18 the judgment.

(5) The *Vision of Isaiah* speaks frequently of angels (vii, 22, 27, 37, ix, 6, 28, 29, 42, viii, 2, 15, 19, x, 19), and of the angels

of the glory of this world (vi, 13, vii, 2, viii, 4, 23, 25, ix, 11, 21, 25, 31, 32, 37, 39, x, 6, 18, 28, xi, 1, 34), and of angels about the throne (vii, 14-16, 19, 24, 30, 31, 33, viii, 16), and of the angel of the Holy Spirit (vii, 23, ix, 36, 39, 40, x, 4, xi, 4, 33). It also speaks of an angel who was sent to make him see (vi, 13, vii, 11, 21, 25), of a glorious angel (vii, 2), of an angel of death (ix, 16, x, 14), of an angel of Sheol (x, 8), of angels of the firmament and of Sheol (x, 10), and of angels of the air (x, 30). It names Satan and Sammael (xi, 41, 43), and Sammael and his hosts (vii, 9), and speaks of princes, angels, and gods of the world (x, 12), and of princes and powers of that world (x, 15). The Messiah is named (vii, 8, 12), and has many titles, such as beloved (vii, 17, 23, ix, 12), his beloved the Christ (viii, 18), his beloved the Son (viii, 25), the Son crucified (ix, 14), the only begotten (vii, 37), the elect one (viii, 7), one (ix, 26, 38), this one (ix, 33), a certain one (ix, 27), Lord (viii, 26), Lord Christ (x, 17, 32), the Lord who will be called Christ (ix, 13). The Lord, the Lord Christ, who will be called Jesus (ix, 5), is said to have ascended from the grave (ix, 1). The resurrection of the righteous is spoken of in ix, 17, and the judgment in x, 12.

(6) The *Ascension of Isaiah* contains two visions which are said to have been revealed to Isaiah just before he was put to death by Manasseh king of Judah. In form, these visions, especially the one recorded in vii, 1f, are more like those in Daniel than any other thus far noticed, in that they give the details of the history of the times of Jesus in much the same way that Daniel presents the details of the history of the Seleucid kings.

(7) Following for the sake of convenience the divisions suggested by Box, the book of *Fourth Ezra* will be considered under six sections.

(a) The *Ezra Apocalypse* refers only to Messianic woes and tells of an angel who came to speak with Ezra.

(b) The *Son of Man Vision* calls the Messiah God's Son (xiii, 32, 37), and says that he is to judge and to destroy the nations of the earth (xiii, 37, 49), and to defend the people of Israel (xii-xiii, 49).

(c) The *Ezra-Piece* speaks of Ezra's translation to be with God's Son (xiv, 9).

(d) The *Eagle Vision* tells of the Messiah (xii, 32), who shall spring from the seed of David, who shall make the people alive for judgment and then destroy them.

(e) *The Salathiel Section* mentions armies of angels (vi, 3), and angels who guard the souls of the righteous (vii, 85, 95); also, the angel that was sent unto him (v, 31, vii, 7, x, 29). Jeramiel (iv, 36), and Uriel alone are named. Immortality is spoken of in viii, 54 and the resurrection in v, 37, 45. There is to be a judgment (vii, 102-115, viii, 38, 61, x, 16); and punishment and salvation after death (vii, 66, xiv, 34, 35). No personal Messiah is spoken of; but the Messianic times are referred to in vii, 75.

(f) In the passages which Box assigns to the redactor, it is said that God's son, the Messiah, shall be revealed (vii, 28), and after his death, the earth shall restore those who sleep in her (vii, 32) and the dust of those that are at rest therein. The Most High shall be revealed upon his throne of judgment and judge the nations that have been raised (vii, 33-44).

(8) The Book of the *Secrets of Enoch* gives the names of seven individual angels and of at least eight classes of angels. It speaks, also, of the prince of the watchmen and of the rulers of Tartarus. There are elders and rulers of the stellar orders, and terrible angels guarding the snows and clouds and dews. There are angels guarding night and day and sun and paradise and the keys of hell. These angels are myriads in number and will all be brought into judgment. There are at least three archangels, Michael, Gabriel and Praviel (or Vretil), and Sataniel is called the prince of the watchmen. Men also will be judged. There appears to be no reference to a resurrection or to a Messiah.

(9) The *Zadokite Fragments* mention the angels of destruction, the angel of the Mastema, Belial, and the watchers of heaven. A Messiah is spoken of in ii, 10, ix, 10 (B) and a Messiah from Aaron and from Israel in ix, 29 and xv, 4. There is no reference to a resurrection, nor to a judgment to come.

(10) *Philo* discusses angels a number of times,²³ but he does

²³ See Bohn's Translation, i, 332, ii, 237, 341, 418-420, iv, 252, 334.

not assign names to them, nor give their number. He gives no hint of a Messiah, nor of a resurrection, though he does imply a judgment (iv, 243).

(11) *Josephus*, in discussing Genesis (vi, 1-6), speaks of the angels. If the passage is genuine, he refers to Jesus as the Christ in *Ant.* XVIII, iii, 3. In *Ant.* XVIII, I, 3; and in *The Wars of the Jews*, VI, v, 4, he tells of a prediction that about the time of the fall of Jerusalem "one from their own country should become governor of the habitable earth."

b. The New Testament:

(1) In the New Testament, angels are mentioned in every book, except Philippians, 1 Thes., 2 Tim., Tit., Philemon, James, and 1, 2 and 3 John. They are given names in Mat., Mark, Luke, John, Acts, Jude, Rev., Rom., 1 Cor., 2 Cor., 1 Thes., 2 Thes., 1 Tim. In Matthew, there are said to be legions of them; and in Hebrews, an innumerable company. Paul denotes their relations to mankind by such words as principalities, authorities, powers, lordships and thrones. They are good or evil. Michael is the archangel of the good and Beelzebub, or Satan, is the prince of this world, of the demons, and of the powers of the air.²⁴

(2) The resurrection is mentioned in all the Gospels and in Acts, Rom., 1 Cor., Eph., Phil., 1 Thes., 2 Tim., Heb., 1 Pet., and Rev.; and described at length in 1 Cor. xv.

(3) The judgment is referred to in all the Gospels and in Acts, Rom., 1 Cor., 1 Tim., 2 Tim., Heb., James, 1 Pet., 2 Pet., 1 John, Jude, and Rev.

(4) The Messiah, or Christ, is named in every book of the New Testament. Since the whole New Testament is concerned with Him, it is impossible and unnecessary to give any particular items of evidence upon this subject.

IV. A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF DANIEL'S INFLUENCE

From the survey which has just been given of the literature of the Jews and Christians from the time of Cyrus to 135 A.D., as far as this literature is concerned with the four subjects (angels,

²⁴ See further in any concordance of the Bible.

resurrection, judgment and Messiah) mentioned by Driver as tests of the influence of Daniel on later literature,²⁵ it is evident that the absence of all apparent reference to these subjects in a given work does not prove that the Book of Daniel was not known to any given author of a later book, much less that the Book of Daniel did not exist before the time of the composition of the later one.

Angels

For, first, with regard to the argument from angels, five points may be considered, covering the statements of the Jewish and Christian writers up to 135 A.D., respecting the existence of angels and their number, classes, ranks, names and duties.

a. As to the existence of angels, no book of the Scriptures denies that there are angels, and most of them, from the earliest to the latest, state expressly that there are angels. Thus, according to J (Gen. xvii; xviii) angels appeared to Abraham; and according to E, Jacob saw angels ascending and descending the ladder (Gen. xxviii). According to JE, an angel appeared to Joshua (Josh. v, 15) and according to Judges to Gideon, Manoah and the wife of Manoah (Jud. vi, 11-24, xiii, 3, 13-21). In 2 Sam. xxiv, 16, it is said that an angel smote Israel with a pest. This evidence is sufficient to show that the idea of the existence of angels was known in Israel long before the time of Cyrus.

b. As to the number of the angels, J speaks of cherubim (Gen. iii, 24) and of sons of God (Gen. vi, 2); and Isaiah vi of seraphim. Michaiah saw the Lord sitting on his throne and all the host of heaven standing by him (1 Kings xxii, 19). It is not necessary to give more examples to prove that Daniel is in agreement with the older Old Testament writers as to the number of the angels.

c. As to the classes, or ranks, of angels, Daniel mentions princes, watchers, and angels. Elsewhere in the Old Testament cherubim and seraphim are spoken of (Gen. iii, 24 and Isa. vi). In Joshua v, 15, the prince of the host of Jehovah addresses Joshua in a JE passage. No writer of the Old Testament, however, had a de-

²⁵ See above pp. 159 f., 175 f.

veloped system of ranks and classes such as we find in Enoch. It follows, therefore, that no argument for the date of Daniel can be made on the basis of what he teaches as to the ranks and classes of angels, nor on the ground of the absence of the influence of what little he says upon these subjects upon later literature. If what he says is a reason for putting his book late, we should also put Isaiah and JE late.

d. As to names of angels, Daniel gives only two, Michael and Gabriel, neither of which is found elsewhere in the Old Testament. Satan, however, is found in 1 Chron. xxi, 1 and in Ps. cix, 6, and with the article (*the* Satan) in Job i, 6, ii, 1 and Zech. iii, 1. Cherubim are mentioned in Gen. iii, 24 and Ezek. x; and seraphim in Isa. vi.

(1) *Tobit*, written probably in the fourth century B.C., names Raphael.

(2) Of works from the second century B.C., the *Sibylline Books* name Beliar; the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Beliar and Satan; and the *Book of Jubilees*, Beliar and Mastema. Of all the other literature of this century the *Book of Enoch* alone mentions the name of any of the angels. Thus, the first part, called the *Book of Noah*, gives the names of nineteen angels and five satans who were leaders of the rebellious sons of God and of four others who were leaders of the holy ones, among whom are Gabriel and Michael; and the so-called First Section mentions the bad angel Azazel and seven holy angels, among whom, also, are Gabriel and Michael.

(3) Of the large number of works from the first century B.C. the Sixth Section of Enoch alone mentions angels by name.

(4) Of works from the year 1 A.D. up to 135 A.D., the *Apocalypse of Baruch* names Ramiel; the *Testament of Hezekiah* Beliar and Sammael; the *Vision of Isaiah*, Sammael and Satan; and the *Book of Fourth Ezra*, Uriel and Jeramiel.

(5) In the New Testament books, Satan is named in Mat. iv, 10 and Rev. xii, 9; Beelzebub in Mat. x, 25, xii, 24, 27, Mark iii, 22; Belial in 2 Cor. vi, 15; Abaddon, or Apollyon, in Rev. ix, 11; "the prince of the demons" in Mat. ix, 34; Gabriel in Luke i, 19, 26; and Michael, in Jude 9, Rev. xii, 7.

e. As to the duties, or functions, of the angels of Daniel, they are three in number, (1) to reveal the will of God; (2) to protect and deliver his people; (3) to preside over the nations.

(1) That it was a function of angels to reveal the will of God is clearly shown in the earliest records of the Old Testament. Angels delivered God's messages to Abraham, Joshua, Gideon, and Manoah; and the Angel of Jehovah spake to Moses, Isaiah and Zechariah. In New Testament times, also, angels spake to Zacharias and Mary and to the shepherds at Bethlehem. That the angels of Daniel performed this function is therefore, no indication of date.

(2) That another function of angels was to protect the people is clearly shown, also, throughout all the history of Israel. They kept the way to the tree of life. They destroyed the armies of Sennacherib. They protected Joshua. They delivered Peter. That an angel should have delivered Daniel from the lions is, therefore, no indication of the date of Daniel v.

(3) That each nation has an angelic prince presiding over its destinies is a doctrine peculiar to Daniel and, hence, is no indication of its date. It is barely possible that there is some ground for such a doctrine in Deut. xxxii, 8, where the Greek translation says, that God set the boundaries of the nations according to the number of the angels of God.²⁶ The best and closest analogy to this teaching of Daniel is to be found, however, in the view of the Babylonian astrologers, that every nation had a particular star and a particular god presiding over it and representing it in the calculations of the seers. Versed in the literature and customs of the Babylonian wise-men, Daniel has substituted for the stars and gods of their heathen superstition the archangels of the one true God. This affords another proof that Daniel was written at Babylon.

The conclusions which can be drawn from the testimony regarding Angels are as follows:

a. The New Testament recognizes, not merely the existence of

²⁶ This translation involves the change of **ישראל** into **שריאל**. Every student of Hebrew palaeography and textual criticism must admit that the Greek reading may be correct.

angels, but that these angels have names. The only good angels mentioned in the New Testament are designated by the very names used by Daniel. No Christian, therefore, who accepts the authority of the New Testament, can logically deny that these names may have been employed as early as the sixth century B.C. Jude says that an archangel named Michael had contended with the devil for the body of Moses. In his vision of the war in heaven, St. John sees this same Michael casting down the Devil and Satan. Luke states Gabriel to have been the name of the angel who brought messages from heaven to Zacharias and Mary, the mother of our Lord. These New Testament writers, therefore, agree in representing the two angels of Daniel as real persons, and not as merely creatures of the imagination. If they are real persons with real names, why may the persons and the names not have been made known at 600 B.C. as well as at 200 B.C.?

b. In the Old Testament outside of Daniel, no good angel is ever named. It is doubtful, also, if in the Old Testament any evil spirit, or angel, is ever designated by a proper name.²⁷ The good angels are described simply as spirits, or messengers of Jehovah, or of God; and the bad as evil spirits or adversaries. How, then, does it come that Daniel alone among biblical writers designates two of the good angels by proper names? (1) The simplest answer to this question is to say that it pleased God to have his messengers reveal their names to Daniel alone of the Old Testament prophets. (2) Another answer might be, that a revelation of the names of angels at an earlier time might have enticed the people to the worship of the messengers. (3) A third answer is that the idea of naming angels was derived from the Persians, who designated the Amashpands, or attributes of the Deity, by the terms that denote them. But, as we have already shown,²⁸

²⁷ The Hebrew word *satan*, employed in 1 Chron. xxi, 1 and Psalm cix, 6, is probably to be translated simply as adversary. In Job i, 6, ii, 1, and Zech. iii, 1, 2, where it has the definite article, the rendering "the adversary" should almost certainly be given. In Gen. iii, 1, this adversary is called the serpent. Hence, in Rev. xii, 9, we are told, that "the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world."

²⁸ See chapter V.

these names are names of attributes and not of persons and they are never used to designate the messengers of God. If, however, the Jews derived the idea of naming angels from the Persians, how are we to account for the fact that of Old Testament writers Daniel alone gives names to angels? The critics assign about half of the literature of the Old Testament to Persian and Greek times; and of this literature, Daniel alone names angels, though it was written they tell us among the very latest of them all. Long after the Persian empire had ceased to exist, after the greatest of Alexander's successors had been crushed at Pydna and Magnesia, when the ashes of Corinth were lifting their grey bosom to the unheeding sun and the Roman legates were dictating peace to the rival monarchs of Syria and Egypt, this Persian idea, like a long lost seed, is supposed to have suddenly sprung up in Palestine, a thousand miles from the place of its birth and four hundred years after the time that Babylon fell before the arms of Cyrus. Believe it who can and will!

(4) The fourth and most probable answer to the question as to why the names of the angels of God were first revealed to Daniel is, that he was the first and only writer of an Old Testament book that lived in Babylon and was conversant with the literature and language of the Babylonians. From the earliest times, the Babylonians had been in the habit of giving names to the messengers of the gods. In the Creation Tablets, Gaga is the messenger of Anshar. In the story of Erishkigal, Nergal and fourteen others who accompany him are mentioned by name. In Ishtar's Descent to Hades, Namtar is called the messenger of Erishkigal. When, therefore, a messenger came from the true God to a Jew who had been educated in all these old Babylonian legends which assigned names to the messengers of their false gods, it was perfectly natural that his name should be announced. The fact that Daniel names his angels and that the writers who lived in Palestine do not name them is a strong proof of the genuineness of Daniel's book, and that it was really written in Babylon.

c. The main theme of the *Book of Noah* is the fall of the angels, as recorded in Gen. vi, 1-8. In large measure, the fallen angels are the theme, also, of the First Section of *Enoch*. It was natural,

therefore, that those writing on such a subject should have given names to the sons of God that they were describing. None of the other five Sections of *Enoch*, however, nor any other of the numerous works whose teaching on angels is cited above, covering a period of nearly seven centuries, gives the names of more than two or three angels; many of them name one only. The Revelation of St. John alone names three, and most of the New Testament books name none. As against twelve different names for good and bad angels together in all the other literature of these seven centuries, the three Sections of *Enoch* give the names of about thirty.

The penchant for naming angels seems, therefore, to have been confined to the writers of the parts of *Enoch* which deal expressly with angels and their history. To argue from such documents as to the usage of books that only mention angels incidentally is, to say the least, a hazardous and inconclusive method of procedure. Judging from the numerous names of the messengers of the gods and of the evil spirits that are found in the Babylonian legends and magical works the Book of Enoch and Daniel and all the other works naming angels, may have been written at any time after the children of Israel were carried captive and brought into contact with the demon worshippers of Babylon.

We conclude, therefore, that there is nothing in the teachings of Daniel with regard to angels, that necessitates the placing of the composition of the book at a date later than the sixth century B.C.; and that, on the contrary, there is much that indicates Babylon as the place where it was written.

Resurrection

With regard to the Resurrection:

a. Daniel makes but one statement. In xii, 2, he says that "many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." A resurrection is taught, also, in Isaiah xxvi, 19, where we read: "Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust: for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead."

In Job xix, 25, 26 a belief in a resurrection is expressed by the patriarch in the words: "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth: and though, after my skin, (worms) destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God." Moreover, the thought of a possible resurrection was present in his mind, when he asked, "If a man die, shall he live (again)?" (xiv, 14). In Matthew xxii, 31, Jesus seems to assert that the fact of a resurrection was involved in the statement, "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." In Acts ii, 27-32, Peter declares that David had taught the doctrine of the resurrection in Ps. xvi, 10, where he says: "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thy Holy One to see corruption." In 1 Cor. xv, 54, Paul discerns a reference to a resurrection in the words of Isaiah xxv, 8: "He will swallow up death in victory."

b. Further, that the ancient Israelites believed in the possibility at least of a resurrection is shown by the story of the raising of Samuel by the witch of Endor (1 Sam. xxviii, 11-20), by the story of the man who was revived by touching the bones of Elisha (2 Kings xiii, 21), and by Ezekiel's vision of the dry bones (Ezek. xxxvii, 1-10). Moreover, Elijah and Elisha each raised the dead to life (1 Kings xvii, 17-24, 2 Kings iv, 32-35); and Enoch and Elijah were both translated that they should not see death, thus teaching that the soul and the body could be united in the other world.

c. Of uncanonical works from before the year 100 B.C., the only ones that refer to a resurrection are the First Section of *Enoch* which says in xxv, 3-6 that the righteous and holy shall eat of a tree, whose fragrance shall be in their bones, and they shall live a long life on the earth; and the *Testaments of the XII Patriarchs*, which speak of a resurrection of the wicked as well as of the righteous (Benj. x, 6-8).

d. Of works from the first century B.C., *Second Maccabees*, the Fourth Section of *Enoch* (c, 5), the Fifth Section of *Enoch* (li, 1, lxi, 5), and the *Psalms of Solomon* (ii, 35, xiv, 2), teach a resurrection of the righteous dead; but not one of them teaches clearly

the resurrection of the wicked, though the writer of *4 Enoch* may possibly mean that they shall be raised for judgment.

e. Of non-biblical works from the first century A.D., the *Apocalypse of Baruch* (1, 2) states that all that have fallen asleep in hope in God shall rise again, and that the earth will assuredly restore the dead (xxx, 1, 1, 2). In a passage from *4 Ezra*, which is said by Box to have been added about 120 A.D., it is said that those that sleep in the earth shall be restored to life in order to be judged (vii, 52). Josephus, also, affirms his belief in a resurrection. The *Testament of Hezekiah* refers to the resurrection of the beloved (iii, 18), and the *Vision of Isaiah*, to the resurrection of the righteous (ix, 17).

f. All of the New Testament writers, with the exception of James and Jude, who say nothing about it, teach a resurrection of both good and bad.

From this testimony, it is evident, that, outside the New Testament, of the vast body of literature cited above only the *XII Patriarchs*, *2 Maccabees*, the Fourth and Fifth and possibly the First Section of *Enoch*, the *Psalms of Solomon*, the *Apocalypse of Baruch*, and *4 Ezra*, and *Josephus*, refer to a resurrection and that of these, the *XII Patriarchs* alone teaches that both righteous and wicked shall be raised. Since the last mentioned work was written, according to Professor Charles, about 107 B.C., it is evident that, even if the author got his idea of a resurrection from Daniel, this will not determine whether Daniel was written in the sixth, or in the second century B.C.

Judgment

As to the Judgment:

a. Daniel says that the judgment was set, the Ancient of Days presiding, and that the books were opened and the beast slain (vii, 10-14, 26); and that judgment was given to the saints of the Most High and they possessed the kingdom (vii, 22). There are involved in these statements the following facts:

(1) There will be a judgment. (2) There will be a judge. (3) Certain titles of the judge. (4) Books will be opened. (5) The beast will be slain. (6) Judgment will be given to the saints

of the Most High. Taking these facts up one after the other, it will be seen from the testimony that they do not support the view that Daniel was composed in the second century B.C.

(1) The fact of a judgment is mentioned in Isa. xxviii, 17, xlii, 1, Zeph. iii, 8, Hag. ii, 7, 9, 22, 23, Zech. vii-xiv, Mal. iii, Ps. i, 5, lviii, 11, xcvi, 14, xcvi, 9. Most of these texts concern the judgment of the nations, just as those in Daniel do.

(2) In all of the texts cited under (1) the person of the judge is God, just as in Daniel.

(3) The titles of the judge are "the Ancient of Days" and "the most High." The first of these is found nowhere except in Daniel. The second phrase, the most High, occurs as early as Num. xxiv, 16 and 2 Sam. xxii, 14.

(4) The idea of a book of life being kept by the Lord appears already in Ex. xxxii, 32, 33 (ascribed by the critics to E), in Isa. iv, 3, and in Ps. lxix, 28. In Mal. iii, 16 (cf. Ps. xl, 8, lvi, 8) these books are called books of remembrance in which good deeds were recorded, and in Isa. lxv, 6, books where evil deeds are recorded. It is obvious, therefore, that the idea is earlier than the sixth century B.C.

(5) The statement that the beast was slain is merely a detail of the vision of the four beasts. As this whole vision is peculiar to Daniel, so also is this feature of the description of the fourth beast. It is worthy of note, however, in this connection, that no vision of any of the apocalyptic books names the same animals as those mentioned here by Daniel. Daniel mentions the lion (*aryeh*), a word familiar from its use in Judges xiv, 8, 1 Kings xiii, 24, and elsewhere. The word for bear (*dov*) is found in 1 Sam. xvii, 34; the word for leopard (*nemer*) in Hos. xiii, 7, Is. xi, 6—all early passages. It will be noted, also, that Daniel's lion has eagle's wings, like the winged lions of Assyria and Babylonia,—a very appropriate figure in a vision at Babylon in the time of Belshazzar; but scarcely fitting to one seen, or imagined, by a Jew in Palestine in the time of the anti-foreign revival under the Maccabees. This winged lion may be compared to the living creatures of Ezekiel and to the seraphim of Isaiah. The apocalyptic literature of the post-Babylonian times dropped this symbolism of wings as a fea-

ture of animals that did not naturally have them. In 4 Ezra x, 1, the wings are wings of eagles.

(6) That the judgment was given to the saints of the Most High is ambiguous, since it is not clear whether it means that the saints were judged, or that they issued judgment. That by saints the holy people is meant seems certain from vii, 27, where it is said, that the kingdom shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High. That God will judge his people is taught in Deut. xxxii, 36, Mal. iii, 5, Ps. 1, 4, cxxxv, 14, and in the *XII Patriarchs* (Benj. x, 8). In the Fifth Section of *Enoch* (xlvii, 2) written about 95 B.C., this idea of Daniel may be referred to when it says that the holy angels pray on behalf of the righteous that judgment may be done unto them. It is clear, then, that according to this interpretation the Book of Daniel may have been written either in the sixth, or in the second century B.C. The other interpretation, which makes the holy people participate in the judgment, is taught by Mat. xix, 28, Luke xxii, 30, and 1 Cor. vi, 3. Since it is not found in the early apocalyptic literature, it can have no bearing upon the date of Daniel.

As far, then, as the teaching of Daniel on the judgment is concerned, there is no reason for supposing that it may not have been written as early as 535 B.C.

Messiah

The teachings of Daniel with regard to the Messiah may be considered under the four heads of (a) the idea of a Messiah, (b) the names and titles of the Messiah, (c) his character, and (d) his functions.

a. As to the Idea of a Messiah:

(1) In the literature of the Old Testament preceding the time of Daniel, it is found expressed with more or less clearness and certainty in the "seed" of Gen. iii, 15 (J), in the "Shiloh" of Gen. xlix, 10 (J), in the "star" of Num. xxiv, 17, (JE), in the "prophet" of Deut. xviii, 15 (D), in the "prince of peace" of Is. ix, 6, 7, in the "rod of the stem of Jesse and the branch out of his roots" of Is. xi, 1, in the "righteous branch" of Jer. xxiii, 5, 6, and xxxiii, 11-17, in the "shepherd and prince (*nasi*)" of

Ezek. xxxiv, 23-31, and in the "ruler in Israel" of Mi. v, 2. From these passages, it is evident that the idea of a Messiah antedated the time of Cyrus, and hence that the presence of this idea in Daniel does not require us to place its date as late as the second century B.C.

(2) The idea of a Messiah is found, also, in the literature between Cyrus and 200 B.C. Thus, the "branch" is spoken of in Zech. iii, 8, vi, 12, the "king" in ix, 9; while Mal. iii, 1 speaks of the coming of the "messenger of the covenant."

That the idea of a Messiah should be absent from Esther and certain other post-captivity books is no more an argument against the early date of Daniel than it is an argument against the early date of J, E, D, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel. On the contrary, according to the critics' way of arguing, the presence of the idea in Zechariah and Malachi should argue for the earlier date of Daniel.

Again, if the absence of the idea of a Messiah from Esther, Ezra, Nehemiah, P, and other alleged post-captivity works proves that Daniel was not known to the authors of these works, by parity of reasoning its absence from the four books of Maccabees, from the additions to Daniel and Esther, from the Martyrdom of Isaiah, the Ascension of Moses, and other late works would prove that their authors, also, knew nothing of Daniel. Besides, since most of them show no knowledge of J, D, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and many other Old Testament books, are we to presume that they, also, were unknown to them? It is absurd to suppose that every writer should express all his ideas on every subject in every book that he writes. No one does do it. No one can do it. No one should be expected to do it. Nor should anyone be accused of ignorance, because he says nothing about a subject concerning which he may have had an opinion, but did not think best to express it. How can Bevan or Cornill know what the author of Esther knew about the idea of a Messiah? It would be interesting to all historians and searchers after truth, if they would reveal the sources of their information. The author of Esther is dead. He has said not a word about the Messiah, nor about why he said not a word. Neither intellect, nor imagination,

can possibly discover what he might have written, had he written, nor why he did not write what he did not write.

b. Nor do the Names and Titles of the Messiah give us information from which we may determine the date of Daniel. We shall demonstrate this by giving these names and titles as they appear in the literature of Jews and Christians up to the year 135 A.D. And here we shall give, not merely those that have been universally acknowledged as designating the Messiah, but those also that were in later times interpreted as referring to him.

I. NAMES AND TITLES OF THE MESSIAH IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

1. The seed of Eve, Gen. iii, 15.
2. The seed of Abraham, Gen. xxii, 18.
3. Shiloh, Gen. xlix, 10 (Targum of Onkelos: Messiah whose is the kingdom).
4. A prophet like Moses, Deut. xviii, 18.
5. A star, Num. xxiv, 17.
6. A sceptre, Num. xxiv, 17 (Onkelos translates by "Messiah").
7. A Son of God, Ps. ii, 7, Isa. ix, 6 (?).
8. The prince of peace, Isa. ix, 6 (Targum: Messiah who shall multiply peace, etc.).
9. Wonderful, Isa. ix, 6.
10. Counsellor, Isa. ix, 6.
11. Mighty God, Isa. ix, 6.
12. The everlasting Father, Isa. ix, 6.
13. Jehovah, our righteousness, Jer. xxiii, 6.
14. God's messenger, Isa. xlii, 19.
15. God's servant, Isa. xlix, 3 (Targum to xlii, 1, lii, 13, liii, 10, calls this servant "Messiah").
16. God's righteous servant, Isa. liii, 11.
17. The man of sorrows, Isa. liii, 3.
18. The shepherd of Israel, Ezek. xxxiv, 23.
19. The root of Jesse, Isa. xi, 10.
20. A rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch (Heb. נצר, Targum מטשיחא) from his roots, Isa. xi, 1.
21. The branch of Jehovah, Isa. iv, 2 (Targum: The Messiah of Jehovah).
22. The branch of righteousness, Jer., xxxiii, 15 (Targum: A Messiah of righteousness).
23. The righteous branch, Jer. xxiii, 5 (Targum: A Messiah of the righteous).

24. A plant of renown, Ezek. xxxiv, 29.
25. A great light, Isa. ix, 2.
26. The rock of ages, Isa. xxvi, 4.
27. A stone, Isa. xxviii, 16.
28. A tried stone, Isa. xxviii, 16.
29. A precious corner stone, Isa. xxviii, 16.
30. The head of the corner, Ps. cxviii, 22.
31. A sure foundation, Isa. xxviii, 16.
32. God's elect, Isa. xlii, 1.
33. The redeemer (*goel*), Isa. lix, 20.
34. The witness, Isa. lv, 4.
35. The holy one of Israel, Isa. xlix, 7.
36. A leader (*nagid*), Isa. lv, 4.
37. A commander, Isa. lv, 4, A ruler, Mi. v, 2.
38. David their king, Jer. xxx, 9 (Targum: Messiah the son of David their king).
39. Messiah, Ps. ii, 2.
40. The man of (Jehovah's) fellowship, Zech. xiii, 7.
41. My (Jehovah's) Shepherd, Zech. xiii, 7.
42. My servant, the branch, Zech. iii, 8 (Targum: My servant, the Messiah).
43. The branch, Zech. vi, 12 (Targum: Messiah).
44. The king, Zech. xiv, 16, Jer. xxx, 9.
45. The King, just and having salvation, Zech. ix, 9.
46. A fountain for sin and for uncleanness, Zech. xiii, 1.
47. The one whom they have pierced, Zech. xii, 10.
48. The angel of the covenant, Mal. iii, 1.
49. The sun of righteousness, Mal. iii, 20.
50. (David's) Lord, Ps. cx, 1.
51. The salvation of Israel, Ps. xiv, 7, liii, 7.

II. NAMES AND TITLES FROM THE EXTRA-BIBLICAL LITERATURE BEFORE CHRIST

1. King, Sib. Oracles iii, 652, Pss. Sol. xvii, 23.
2. Righteous king, Pss. Sol. xvii, 35.
3. King, son of David, Pss. Sol. xvii, 23.
4. King Christ the Lord, Pss. Sol. xvii, 36.
5. His King is Lord, Pss. Sol. xvii, 38 (?).
6. God's anointed, or Messiah, Enoch xlvi, 10, lii, 4.²⁹

²⁹ This and the following titles up to 11 inclusive are from the Fifth Section of Enoch, which was written, according to Professor Charles, between 94 and 64 B.C. In Enoch, the Ethiopic word is *Mahih* the exact equivalent of the Hebrew *Mashiah*.

7. The elect one, Enoch xlv, 3, 4, xlix, 2, 4, li, 5bis, lii, 6, 9, lv, 4, lxi, 5, 8, 10, lxii, 1.
8. The elect one of righteousness and faith, Enoch xxxix, 6.
9. The righteous one, Enoch xxxviii, 2.
10. The righteous and elect one, Enoch liii, 6.
11. The son of man, Enoch xlvi, 2, 3, 4, xlvi, 2, lxii, 5, 7, 9, 14, lxiii, 11, lxix, 26, 27, 29, lxx, 1, lxxi, 14, 17.
12. The white bull, Enoch xc, 37.
13. God's son, Enoch cv, 2.
14. A prince, Jubilees xxxi, 18.
15. The help of Jacob, Jub. xxxi, 19.
16. The salvation of Israel, Jub. xxxi, 19.
17. God's servant, Pss. Sol. xviii, 6.
18. The king, the son of David, Pss. Sol. xviii, 6.
19. King, the anointed of the Lord, Pss. Sol. xvii, 6, xviii, 8.
20. His (God's) anointed, Pss. Sol. xviii, 6.
21. The Messiah, 2 Bar. xxix, 3, xxx, 1, xxxix, 7, xl, 1, lxxii, 2.
22. The rod of righteousness, XII, Pat. Jud. xxiv, 6.
23. The star of peace, XII, Pat. Jud. xxiv, 1a.
24. The salvation of the Lord, XII. Pat. Dan v. 10.
25. A lamb, XII. Pat. Jos. xix, 8, Enoch xc, 38 (?).

III. NAMES AND TITLES IN THE EXTRA-BIBLICAL LITERATURE FROM 1 TO 135 A.D.

1. The beloved, Vision of Isaiah vii, 17, 23, ix, 12, Mart. Isa. i, 13, Test. Hez. iii, 17, 18, iv, 3, 6, 9, 13.
2. His beloved the Christ, Vis. Isa. viii, 18.
3. His beloved son, Vis. Isa. viii, 25.
4. Jesus, the Lord Christ, Test. Hez. iv, 13.
5. The only begotten, Vis. Isa. vii, 37.
6. The elect one, Vis. Isa. viii, 7.
7. The Lord, Vis. Isa. viii, 26.
8. The Lord God, the Lord Christ, who is called Jesus, Vis. Isa. ix, 5.
9. The Lord who will be called Christ, Vis. Isa. ix, 13.
10. (God's) son, Vis. Isa. ix, 14, 16, Son of Man Vis. xiii, 32, 37, 4 Ezra xiii, 52, xiv, 9.
11. The Lord Christ, Vis. Isa. ix, 5, 17, 32, Test. Hez. iv, 13, Odes. Sol. xvii, 15, xxxix, 10.
12. That one, Vis. Isa. ix, 26, 27, 31, 38.
13. Messiah, Odes Sol. xxiv, 1, xli, 16, Eagle Vis. xii, 32, Redactor Ezra vii, 28, Zad. Frag. ii, 10, ix, 10b, 29, xv, 4.
14. The loving one, Odes Sol. iii, 8.
15. The pleroma, Odes Sol. vii, 14.

16. The word, Odes Sol. xii, 8, 9, 11, xli, 11.
17. The Son of God, Odes Sol. xxxvi, 3, xlii, 21.
18. The son of the Most High, Odes Sol. xli, 14.
19. Jesus, Test. Hez. iv, 13, Vis. Isa. ix, 5, Josephus Antiq. xviii, iii, 3.
20. Christ, Josephus Ant. xviii, iii, 3, Tacitus: Annals. xv, 44, Odes Sol. ix, 2, xxix, 6, xli, 3, Vis. Isa. viii, 18, ix, 13.
21. Jesus who was called Christ, Jos. Ant. xx, ix, 1.
22. (God's) Son the Messiah, 4 Ezra vii, 27, 29.
23. The lion, the Messiah from the seed of David, 4 Ezra xii, 32.

IV. NAMES AND TITLES OF THE MESSIAH IN THE DIFFERENT BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

A. NAMES AND TITLES IN MATTHEW

1. Son (i.e., of God or of the Lord) ii, 15, xi, 27 *ter*, xxviii, 19.
2. Young child, ii, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 20, 21.
3. Son of man, 32 times.
4. The son of the carpenter, xiii, 55.
5. Son of God, iv, 3, xiv, 33, xxvii, 40, 43, 54.
6. Jesus, son of God, viii, 29.
7. Christ, son of God, xxvi, 63.
8. Christ, the son of the living God, xvi, 16.
9. Beloved Son, iii, 17.
10. The (my, his) son, xxi, 37, 38, xxii, 2.
11. Son of David, ix, 27, xii, 23, xxi, 9, 15, cf. xxii, 42.
12. Lord, son of David, xv, 22, xx, 30, 31.
13. Jesus, 131 times.
14. Christ 11 times.
15. Jesus Christ, i, 1, 18.
16. Jesus, the Christ, xvi, 20.
17. Jesus which is called Christ, xxvii, 17, 22.
18. Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham, i. 1.
19. Lord (of Christ), 33 times.
20. King, xxi, 5, xxv, 34, 40.
21. King of Israel, xxvii, 42.
22. King of the Jews, ii, 2, xxvii, 11, 37.
23. Great King, v, 35.
24. Governor (*hegoumenos*), ii, 6.
25. Master (*rabbi*), xxiii, 7, 8, xxvi, 25, 49.
26. Master (*didaskalos*), viii, 19, ix, 11, xii, 38, xvii, 24, xix, 16, xxii, 16, 24, 36, xxvi, 18.
27. Master (*kathegetes*), xxiii, 10.
28. Nazarene, ii, 23.
29. Jesus, the Nazarene, xxvi, 71.

30. Jesus, the prophet of Nazareth of Galilee, xxi, 11.
31. One of the prophets, xvi, 14.
32. John the Baptist, xvi, 14.
33. Elijah, xvi, 14.
34. Jeremiah, xvi, 14.
35. He that should come, xi, 3.
36. One greater than the temple, xii, 6.
37. One greater than Jonah, xii, 41.
38. One greater than Solomon, xii, 42.
39. My (i.e., God's) servant, xii, 18.
40. My (i.e., God's) beloved, xii, 18.
41. Just (man), xxvii, 19, 24.
42. This (man, or fellow), xii, 24, xxvi, 61.
43. That deceiver, xxvii, 63.
44. Beelzebub, x, 25.
45. Stone, xxi, 42.

B. NAMES AND TITLES IN MARK AND PETER

MARK

1. Son (i.e., of God), xiii, 32.
2. Son of man, 14 times.
3. Son of Mary, vi, 3.
4. Son of God, iii, 11, xv, 39.
5. Beloved Son (i.e., of God), i, 11, ix, 7.
6. Jesus, son of the Most High God, v, 7.
7. Jesus Christ, the son of God, i, 1.
8. Christ, the son of the Blessed, xiv, 61.
9. Son of David, x, 48, xii, 35.
10. Jesus, son of David, x, 47.
11. Jesus, 93 times.
12. Jesus of Nazareth (or the Nazarene), i, 24, xiv, 67
13. Christ, viii, 29, ix, 41, xii, 35, xiii, 21.
14. Jesus Christ, i, 1.
15. Christ, the king of Israel, xv, 32.
16. Lord (of Christ), 8 times.
17. Lord of the sabbath, ii, 28.
18. Holy One of God, i, 24.
19. The king of the Jews, xv, 2, 9, 12, 18, 26.
20. Master (*rabbi*), ix, 5, xi, 21, xiv, 45 *bis*.
21. Master (*rabboni*), x, 51.
22. Master (*didaskalos*), 12 times.
23. Good master (*didaskalos*), x, 17.
24. A prophet, vi, 15, viii, 28.

25. John, vi, 16.
26. John the Baptist, vi, 14, viii, 28.
27. Elijah, vi, 15, viii, 28.
28. Stone, xii, 10.

FIRST PETER

1. Christ, 8 times.
2. Christ Jesus, v, 10 (?), 14 (?).
3. Jesus Christ, 8 times.
4. Lord (i.e., of Christ), ii, 3, 13, iii, 12*bis*.
5. Lord Jesus, iii, 15 (Syr. Pesh: Lord Messiah).
6. Lord Jesus Christ, i, 3.
7. Shepherd and bishop of souls, ii, 25.
8. Chief Shepherd, v, 4.
9. Stone, ii, 7.
10. Precious corner stone, ii, 6.

SECOND PETER

1. Our God and our Saviour, Jesus Christ, i, 1.
2. My beloved Son, i, 17.
3. Lord, (i.e., of Christ), ii, 9, 11, iii, 9, 10, 15.
4. Jesus Christ, i, 1.
5. Jesus our Lord, i, 2.
6. Lord Jesus Christ, i, 8, 14, 16.
7. Lord and Saviour, iii, 2.
8. Master (*despotes*), ii, 1.

PETER'S SPEECHES IN ACTS

1. Seed, iii, 25.
2. (God's) son, (Jesus), iii, 13, 26.
3. Holy child Jesus, iv, 27, 30.
4. Jesus, i, 16, ii, 32, 36.
5. Jesus of Nazareth (or the Nazarene), ii, 22, x, 38.
6. Christ, ii, 31, 36, iii, 18, iv, 26.
7. Jesus Christ, ii, 38, iii, 20, ix, 34, x, 36, 48 (?).
8. Jesus Christ, the Nazarene, iii, 6, iv, 10.
9. Lord, i, 24 (?), ii, 21 (?), 25 (?), 34, 36, iii, 19, iv, 29, xii, 11, 17.
10. Lord Jesus, i, 21.
11. Lord of all, x, 36.
12. Lord Jesus Christ, xi, 17, xv, 11 (?).
13. Holy One, ii, 27, iii, 14.
14. The Just, iii, 14.
15. Prince of life, iii, 15.
16. A prophet, iii, 22.

C. NAMES AND TITLES IN LUKE AND ACTS

LUKE

1. Son, x, 22 *ter*.
2. Son of man, 26 times.
3. Son of Joseph, iii, 23, iv, 22 (?).
4. Son of God, i, 35, iv, 3, 9, xxii, 70.
5. Son of the Highest, i, 32.
6. Jesus, son of God Most high, viii, 28.
7. Christ, the son of God, iv, 41 (?).
8. Beloved Son, iii, 22, ix, 35.
9. Son of David, xviii, 39, xx, 41 (?).
10. Jesus, son of David, xviii, 38.
11. Christ, the son of David, xx, 41 (?).
12. Jesus, 98 times.
13. Christ, ii, 11, iv, 41, xxii, 67, xxiii, 2, 39, xxiv, 26, 46.
14. Jesus, Master (*epistates*), ix, 33.
15. Jesus, the Nazarene, iv, 34, xviii, 37, xxiv, 19.
16. Jesus, Lord, xxiii, 42.
17. Lord (*despotes*), xxiii, 42.
18. Lord Jesus, xxiv, 3.
19. Lord's Christ, ii, 26.
20. Christ, the Lord, ii, 11.
21. Christ of God, ix, 20.
22. Holy One of God, iv, 34.
23. Holy thing that shall be born, i, 35.
24. Christ, the chosen of God, xxiii, 35.
25. King, xix, 38.
26. King of the Jews, xxiii, 3, 37, 38.
27. Master (*epistates*), v, 5, viii, 24*bis*, 45, ix, 33, 49, xvii, 13.
28. Master (*didaskalos*), 14 times.
29. Good Master (*didaskalos*), xviii, 18.
30. A prophet, ix, 19.
31. Great prophet, vii, 16.
32. One of the old prophets, ix, 19.
33. He that should come, vii, 19.
34. John the Baptist, ix, 19.
35. Elijah, ix, 19.
36. Christ, a king, xxiii, 2.
37. Salvation, ii, 30.
38. A man eating and drinking, a friend of publicans and sinners, vii, 34.
39. Stone, xx, 17.

Acts

1. Son (i.e., of God), xiii, 33.
2. Son of man, vii, 56.
3. Son of God, viii, 37 (?), ix, 20.
4. Lord (*despotes*), iv, 24 (?).
5. Lord Jesus, 12 times.
6. Lord Jesus Christ, 6 times.
7. His (God's) child (Jesus), iii, 13, 26.
8. Thy (God's) holy child, Jesus, iv, 27, 30.
9. Jesus, 26 times.
10. Christ, iv, 26, xviii, 5 (?).
11. Jesus Christ, 9 times.
12. Christ Jesus, xix, 4 (?).
13. Jesus of Nazareth, or the Nazarene, ii, 22, vi, 14, x, 38, xxii, 8, xxvi, 9.
14. Jesus Christ, the Nazarene, iii, 6, iv, 10.
15. Saviour, Jesus, xiii, 23.
16. Prince and Saviour, v, 31.
17. Holy One, ii, 27.
18. The holy One and just, iii, 14.
19. Just One, vii, 52, xxii, 14.
20. A prophet, iii, 22, 23, vii, 37.
21. Judge of quick and dead, x, 42.
22. Prince of life, iii, 15.
23. Lord of all, x, 36.
24. Stone, iv, 11.

D. NAMES AND TITLES IN JOHN'S WRITINGS³⁰

1. Son (i.e., of God), 16 times, 1 John, 9 times, 2 John, vs. 9.
2. Son of man, 11 times.
3. Son of God, 7 times, 1 John, 8 times.
4. (God's) son, Jesus Christ, 1 John i, 3, iii, 23, v, 20.
5. Jesus (Christ ?), His Son, 1 John i, 7.
6. Christ, the son of God, xi, 27, xx, 31.
7. Christ, the son of the living God, vi, 69 (A.V.); the Holy One of God (ARV).
8. Only begotten Son, iii, 16, 1 John iv, 9.
9. The only begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father, i, 18.
10. The only begotten of the Father, i, 14.
11. The only begotten Son of God, iii, 18.

³⁰ Unless specially noted the references will be to the *Gospel* of John.

12. The Son of the Father, 2 John 3.
13. The Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the Father, 2 John, 3.
14. Jesus, 252 times, 1 John ii, 22, iv, 15, v, 1, 5, Rev. xiv, 12, xvii, 6, xix, 10*bis*, xx, 4, xxii, 16.
15. Jesus, the son of Joseph, vi, 42.
16. Jesus, the Nazarene, xviii, 5, 7.
17. Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph, i, 45.
18. Christ 14 times, 1 John ii, 22, v, 1; 2 John 9*bis*; Rev. xi, 15, xii, 10, xx, 4, 6.
19. Jesus Christ, i, 17, xvii, 3; 1 John iv, 2, 3, v, 6; 2 John 7; Rev. i, 1, 2, 5, 9*bis*, xii, 17.
20. Jesus Christ, the righteous, 1 John ii, 1.
21. Jesus Christ, the faithful witness, the firstborn from the dead, the ruler of the kings of the earth, Rev. i, 5.
22. Lamb, Rev., 23 times.
23. The lamb of God, i, 29, 36.
24. Lord, 37 times, Rev., 7 times.
25. Lord Jesus, Rev. xxii, 20.
26. Lord Jesus Christ, Rev. xxii, 21 (A. V.; A. R. V., Lord Jesus).
27. Lord of lords and king of kings, Rev. xvii, 14.
28. Lord God of the spirits of the prophets, Rev. xxii, 6.
29. Lord and God, xx, 28.
30. The Logos, (or Word), i, 1*ter*, 14, 1 John v, 7 (?).
31. The Word of God, Rev. xix, 13.
32. The Word of life, 1 John, i, 1.
33. Holy One, 1 John ii, 20 (?).
34. The holy, the true, who has the key of David *et cetera*. Rev. iii, 7.
35. Rabbi, i, 38, 49, iii, 2, vi, 25, ix, 2, xi, 8.
36. Rabboni, xx, 16.
37. Master (*didaskalos*), 8 times.
38. Master, or Lord (*despotes*), Rev. vi, 10.
39. Sir (*kurios*), 17 times.
40. A prophet, vi, 14, ix, 17.
41. The prophet, vii, 40.
42. The door, x, 9.
43. The door of the sheep, x, 7.
44. The vine, xv, 5.
45. The true vine, xv, 1.
46. The bread of life, vi, 35.
47. The light, xii, 46.
48. The light of the world, viii, 12, ix, 5.
49. The comforter, xiv, 16.
50. Messiah, i, 41, iv, 25.
51. King, xii, 15.

52. King of Israel, i, 49, xii, 13.
53. King of the Jews, xviii, 39, xix, 3, 19, 21.
54. Jesus of Nazareth, the king of the Jews, xix, 19.
55. King of saints, Rev. xv, 3.
56. King of kings and Lord of lords, Rev. xix, 16.
57. Saviour of the world, iv, 42.
58. The good shepherd, x, 11, 14.
59. The Amen, the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God, Rev. iii, 14.
60. Alpha and Omega, Rev. i, 8, 11, xxi, 6, xxii, 13.
61. The beginning and the end, Rev. xxi, 6.
62. The first and the last, Rev. 1, 17.
63. The living One, Rev. 1, 18.
64. The lion of the tribe of Judah, the root of David, Rev. v, 5.
65. The root and offspring of David, the bright and morning star, Rev. xxii, 16.
66. Faithful and true, Rev. xix, 11.

E. NAMES AND TITLES IN PAUL'S WRITINGS

1. Son (i.e., of God), Rom. v, 10, viii, 3, 29, 32; 1 Cor. xv, 28, Gal. i, 16, iv, 4; 1 Thes. i, 10; Acts. xiii, 33 cit.
2. Son of God, Rom. i, 4; Gal. ii, 20; Eph. iv, 13.
3. Son of God, Jesus Christ, 2 Cor. i, 19.
4. His (God's) son, Jesus Christ our Lord, Rom. i, 3; 1 Cor. i, 9.
5. Jesus, Rom. iii, 26, viii, 11; 1 Cor. xii, 3*bis*; 2 Cor. iv, 10, 11*bis*, xi, 4; Eph. iv, 21; Phil. ii, 10; 1 Thes. i, 10, iv, 14*bis*; Acts xiii, 33, xxii, 8, xxvi, 15, xxviii, 23.
6. (God's) dear son, Col. i, 13.
7. Christ, Romans, 35 times; 1 Cor., 47; 2 Cor., 38; Gal., 25; Eph., 28; Phil., 18; Col., 19; 1 Thes., 3; 2 Thes., 2; 1 Tim., 2; 2 Tim., 1; Philemon, 2; Acts (in Paul's speeches), 3.
8. Christ Jesus, Rom. iii, 24, viii, 1, 2, xv, 5, xvi, 3; Gal. ii, 4, iii, 26, 28, iv, 14; Eph. i, 1, ii, 6, 7, 10, 13, iii, 21; Phil. i, 1, ii, 5, iii, 3, 12, 14, iv, 7, 19, 21; Col. i, 4, 28; 1 Thes. ii, 14, v, 18; 1 Tim. i, 14, 15, iii, 13, vi, 13; 2 Tim. i, 1, 9, 13, ii, 1, 3, 10, iii, 12, 15; Philemon 1, 9.
9. Christ Jesus, our Lord, Rom. viii, 39; 1 Cor. xv, 31; 2 Cor. iv, 5 (?); Eph. iii, 11; Phil. iii, 8; Col. ii, 6; 1 Tim. i, 12; 2 Tim. i, 2.
10. Christ who is over all, blessed for ever, Rom. ix, 5.
11. Jesus Christ, Rom., 13 times; 1 Cor., 2; 2 Cor., 4; Gal., 8; Eph., 5; Phil., 7; Col., 1; 1 Tim., 3; 2 Tim., 3; Ti., 1; Acts xvi, 18.
12. Jesus (Christ) our Lord, Rom. iv, 24; 1 Cor. i, 9, ix, 1; 1 Tim. i, 2.
13. Jesus Christ, our Saviour, Titus iii, 6.

14. Lord, Rom., 14 times; 1 Cor., 43; 2 Cor., 21; Gal., i, 19; Eph., 17; Phil., 9; Col., 9; 1 Thes., 12; 2 Thes., 9; 1 Tim. i, 14; 2 Tim., 14; Philemon 16, *zobis* (?); Acts xiii, 10, 11, xvi, 32, xx, 19, xxii, 10, 16.
15. Lord Jesus, Rom. x, 9, xiv, 14, xvi, 18; 1 Cor., v, *4bis*, 5 (?), vi, 11 (?), xi, 23; 2 Cor. i, 14, iv, 10, 14; Gal. vi, 17; Eph. i, 15; Phil. ii, 19; Col. iii, 17; 1 Thes. ii, 15, iv, 1, 2; 2 Thes. i, 7; Philemon 5; Acts xx, 24, 35.
16. Lord Christ, Rom. xvi, 18 (?); Col. iii, 24.
17. Lord Jesus Christ, Rom., 9 times; 1 Cor., 12; 2 Cor., 5; Gal. 3; Eph., 7; Phil., 2; Col., 2; 1 Thes., 9; 2 Thes., 11; 1 Tim., 4; 2 Tim., 2; Philemon, 2; Acts xvi, 31, xx, 21, xxi, 13, xxviii, 31.
18. Lord Jesus Christ, Saviour, Titus i, 4.
19. Lord of glory, 1 Cor. ii, 8.
20. Lord of peace, 2 Thes. iii, 16.
21. Master (*kurios*), Eph. vi, 9, Col. iv, 1.
22. Saviour, Jesus Christ, 2 Tim. i, 10.
23. Saviour, Lord Jesus Christ, Phil. iii, 20.
24. Jesus our deliverer, 1 Thes. i, 10.
25. The man, Acts. xvii, 31.
26. This man, Acts xiii, 38.
27. The second man, the Lord from heaven, 1 Cor. xv, 47.
28. The man Christ Jesus, 1 Tim. ii, 5.
29. God (?) manifest in the flesh, 1 Tim. iii, 16.
30. Great God and our Saviour, Jesus Christ, Titus ii, 13.
31. Holy One, Acts xiii, 35.
32. Just One, Acts xxii, 14.
33. God, Acts xx, 28.
34. Jesus, the Nazarene, Acts xxii, 8, xxvi, 9.
35. The light of the gentiles, Acts xiii, 47.
36. The seed of Abraham, Gal. iii, 16.

F. NAMES AND TITLES IN HEBREWS

1. Son, i, 2, *5bis*, 8, ii, 6, v, 5, 8, vii, 28.
2. Son of God, vi, 6, vii, 3, x, 29.
3. Jesus, the son of God, iv, 14.
4. Only begotten, xi, 17.
5. Jesus, ii, 9, vi, 20, vii, 22, x, 19, xii, 2, 24, xiii, 12.
6. Christ, iii, 6, 14, v, 5, vi, 1, ix, 11, 14, 24, 28, xi, 26
7. Lord, ii, 3, vii, 14.
8. Jesus Christ, x, 10, xiii, 8, 21.
9. Lord Jesus, xiii, 20.
10. Priest, vii, 17, 21.

11. High Priest, x, 21.
12. Apostle and High Priest of our profession Christ Jesus, iii, 1.
13. Great High Priest, Jesus the Son of God, iv, 14.
14. Mediator, viii, 6, ix, 15.
15. Jesus, the Mediator of the new covenant, xii, 24.
16. Forerunner, vi, 20.
17. Captain of salvation, ii, 10.
18. He that shall come, x, 37.
19. Author and finisher of our faith, x, 2.
20. Lord Jesus Christ, the great shepherd of the sheep, xiii, 20.

G. NAMES AND TITLES IN JAMES

1. Lord, 10 times.
2. Lord Jesus Christ, i, 1, ii, 1.
3. Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory, ii, 1.

H. NAMES AND TITLES IN JUDE

1. Jesus Christ, *ibis*.
2. Lord Jesus Christ, 17, 21.
3. Lord, 5, 9, 14 (?).
4. Our only Lord and Master (*despoten kai kurion*) Jesus Christ, 4.

I. NAMES AND TITLES IN STEPHEN'S SPEECH

1. Son of man, Acts vii, 56.
2. Lord, vii, 60.
3. Lord Jesus, vii, 59.
4. A prophet, vii, 37.
5. Just One, vii, 52.

V. THE TITLES OF THE MESSIAH IN DANIEL

1. The Messiah, ix, 26.
2. Messiah prince (*nagid*), ix, 25.
3. The prince of princes, viii, 25.
4. The stone, ii, 34, 35.
5. One like a son of gods, iii, 25.
6. One like a son of man, vii, 13.

Our conclusions based on the testimony regarding the Messiah are:

- a. It cannot be argued from the titles of the Messiah that

Daniel was written in the second century B.C.; for the titles given in Daniel are not significant of that period of time, as will be seen from the evidence collected from the above lists.

(1) Messiah, as a title of the expected redeemer of Israel, occurs already in Ps. ii, which Driver³¹ admits to be presumably pre-exilic. Then, outside of Dan. ix, 26, it does not occur again till in the Second Section of *Enoch* (xlviii, 10, lii, 4), and the *Pss. of Solomon* (xvii, 6, xviii, 6, 8), both from the first century B.C. In the later literature, outside the New Testament, it is found in the Odes of Solomon, Fourth Ezra, the Vision of Isaiah, the Testament of Hezekiah, the Zadokite Fragments, Josephus, and Tacitus, mostly written under Christian influences; and in the Targums and Talmud.

(2) Messiah the Prince is found only in Daniel ix, 25, and hence, cannot be indicative of date. Besides, the term *nagid* used by Daniel for prince, is found elsewhere as a title of the Messiah only in Is. lv, 4.

(3) The title "Prince of princes" occurs nowhere else as a designation of the Messiah, not even in the New Testament; though *sar*, the word used in Dan. viii, 25 for prince, is found in Is. ix, 6 in the phrase "the prince of peace."

(4) The title "stone" of Dan. ii, 34, 35, is used besides in the Old Testament only in Is. xxviii, 16 and Ps. cxviii, 22, and the phrase "rock of ages" only in Is. xxvi, 4. In the New Testament, this "stone" is used of Christ in Mat. xxi, 42, Mark xii, 10, 1 Pet. ii, 6, 7. It occurs also, in Barnabas vi, 4.

(5) The phrase "one who is like a son of gods" occurs in Dan. iii, 25 alone. "Sons of God"³² is used in Gen. vi, 2 to denote the angels. If the word *bar*³³ in Ps. ii, 12 means son,

³¹ *L.O.T.*, p. 385.

³² In the later literature outside the New Testament, the phrase occurs only in the *Vision of Isaiah* (ix, 14, 16) and in Fourth Ezra (xiii, 32, 37). If the plural here means God, it is the only example of the plural of majesty found in Aramaic. Since it is Nebuchadnezzar who employs the phrase, he probably meant by it a godlike person.

³³ The occurrence of the word *bar* on a lately discovered Phœnician document from about 850 B.C. does away with any supposed necessity for ascribing the use of *bar* to Aramaic influence.

it must mean the son of God and designate the Messiah of verse 2. The phrase is not met with again till in Enoch cv, 2, according to Charles "a passage of uncertain date and origin."³⁴

(6) Whatever the origin and meaning of the phrase "son of man," it is used outside of Daniel as a title of the Messiah only in the New Testament and in the Fifth Section of Enoch (which was probably written in the early part of the first century B.C.), in the Traditions of Matthias (once), in Justin twice, in Ignatius once, and in Celsus once. "The likeness of a man" in 4 Ezra xiii, 3 probably refers to the same person.

We have no right, therefore, to presume that Daniel cannot have been written before 200 B.C. because the designations of the Messiah found in it are absent from the post-captivity literature composed before that date, unless we are prepared, also, to maintain that Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Zechariah, are later than 200 B.C. For Isaiah's designations "stone," "rock of ages," "prince" (both *nagid* and *sar*), "prince of peace," "servant," and "righteous servant" are all absent from the literature from 500 to 200 B.C.; so also, are Jeremiah's designations "David the king," "branch," "righteous branch," and "branch of righteousness," and the "king" and "shepherd" of Zechariah and Ezekiel. So that, it is evident that, if this method of reasoning from the silence of one document as to doctrines taught in another is valid, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Zechariah, must also be later than 200 B.C.

b. No argument for the late date of Daniel can be made from the use of its designations of the Messiah in the literature written after 200 B.C., that will not for the same reason make a stronger argument for putting the composition of Isaiah and Zechariah after 200 B.C. For Isaiah's designations, "the elect one," "a child," "servant," and Zechariah's designations, "king" and "one that was pierced" are found in the literature from 200 B.C. to 135 A.D.; whereas, no designation peculiar to Daniel, except possibly the phrase "son of man," occurs in this period. "Son of God"

³⁴ The one hundred and fifth chapter of the Book of Enoch follows the so-called Fifth Section of Enoch and constitutes a sort of appendix to the whole book. It will probably have been written, therefore, not earlier than about 50 B.C.

may just as well come from Ps. ii, 12, or Is. ix, 6, as from Nebuchadnezzar's phrase "one like a son of gods" in Dan. iii, 25. Messiah may be due to Ps. ii, 2, as well as to Dan. ix, 26. "The stone" is derived from Isa. xxviii, 16, or Ps. cxviii, 22, rather than from Dan. ii, 34, 35.

c. As to the character of the Messiah, it is said in Daniel that he would be an anointed leader, a prince of princes, and that he would be cut off, but not for himself. The idea of the anointed leader is found in the Second Psalm's anointed king. He is called a leader (*nagid*) in Isa. lv, 4 and with the synonym *nasi'* in Ezek. xxxiv, 24. The phrase nearest to "prince of princes" is found in the prince of peace of Isa. ix, 6, *sar* being used for prince in both phrases. The idea that the Messiah should suffer, involved in the cutting off of ix, 26, is expressed most fully in Isa. liii, and in Ps. xxii, both placed by the critics during, or a little after, the captivity.³⁵

The only one of Daniel's characteristics of the Messiah that is found in the literature of the second century is "prince," which occurs in Jubilees xxxi, 18. Since Jubilees, even if written originally in Hebrew, is now known only in a translation, it is impossible to determine whether its word prince stands for one of the words for prince used in Daniel, or whether it represents some other word, such as the *nasi'* of Ezekiel. The only one of the characteristics found in the literature of the first century B.C. is "anointed," appearing in Enoch lii, 4. It thus appears that the usage of Daniel agrees with that of captivity rather than of Macabean times, even if we accept the dates assigned by the critics to Isaiah and the Psalms.

d. As to the functions of the Messiah, Daniel states simply that his dominion shall be everlasting and that all nations shall serve him. In order to show that these ideas with regard to the length and extent of the dominion of the Messiah were held by the people of Israel before, or about the sixth century B.C., I shall cite first what Daniel says and next, what we find in other early works.

(1) In Dan. vii, 14, we read that there was given to him who was like a son of man dominion and glory and a kingdom that

³⁵ L.O.T., p. 245, 386.

all peoples, nations, and languages shall serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.

(2) In Isa. ix, 6, 7,³⁶ it is said of the prince of peace that "of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom to order it, and to establish it, with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for evermore."

(3) In Ps. lxxii, which Driver says to be presumably pre-exilic,³⁷ it is said in vs. 11 that all kings shall fall down before the king whom Solomon typified; and in vs. 17, that his name should endure forever, and all nations shall call him blessed.

The two points of everlastingness and universality of the kingdom of the Messiah are thus shown to have been taught long before the time of Cyrus.

CONCLUSIONS

From the above testimony and discussions it will be seen that the four subjects to which Driver appeals as evidence proving the late date of Daniel are all mentioned in Isaiah as well as in Daniel, that three of them are mentioned in Zechariah, and that not more than one, or at most two of them, are mentioned in that vast mass of canonical literature which the critics assign to post-captivity times. That some works written between 500 and 200 B.C. do not refer to any one of these four subjects, no more proves that Daniel did not exist, or was not known, than it proves that Isaiah and Zechariah did not exist, or were unknown to the authors of these works. Many books written after 150 B.C. do not show any knowledge of any of these doctrines. This does not prove that Isaiah, Daniel, and Zechariah were not known before the birth of Christ. The Martyrdom of Isaiah, the Ezra-Apocalypse, and the Ezra-piece, are silent as to all but one of these doctrines. This does not prove that Isaiah, Daniel, and Zechariah, were not composed until after 135 A.D.

³⁶ Dating according to *L.O.T.* from 735-734 B.C.

³⁷ *L.O.T.*, p. 385.

In short, this argument from silence has been much over-emphasized by the critics; and besides, it proves too much.

That more indications of the existence of Daniel are not found in post-captivity writers may be accounted for on the ground that it was a sealed book, or that the Palestinian writers were not acquainted with a work that had been composed at Babylon, or that they had not yet admitted its canonicity, or simply on the ground that the subjects of which they were treating gave no opportunity of expressing their views on these doctrines; just as, for similar reasons, many writers after 150 B.C., have failed to mention either him, or his doctrines.

Having seen that the doctrines of Daniel agree more nearly with those of Isaiah and Zechariah than with those of any other books of the Israelites up to 135 A.D., let us, before closing this chapter, and by way of summarizing the argument for the early date, give in short compass the results gathered from all of our investigations. The critics in their attack on Daniel appeal to the evidence of history, literature, language, and doctrine. It was shown in volume one of *Studies in the Book of Daniel*, that there is no sufficient reason for denying the historical statements of Daniel. Belshazzar was certainly in some sense a king of Babylon; and Darius the Mede may have been a sub-king under Cyrus. In the discussion of *Apocalypses and the Book of Daniel* in the present volume we have seen that the literary forms of Daniel were known in the sixth century B.C. and that these forms differ from those found in Enoch. We have also showed³⁸ that the foreign words in Daniel, especially the Persian, support the traditional view that Daniel was written in the Persian period, which produced, also, the books of Zechariah, Haggai, Esther, Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah; for these books are characterized by Persian words and no other books of the Old Testament are. Not one of the numerous psalms assigned by the critics to the post-captivity period has a single Persian word, nor has Ecclesiasticus, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Songs,³⁹ Jonah, Joel,

³⁸ "The Aramaic of Daniel," in *Biblical and Theological Studies*, 1912.

³⁹ The so-called Persian words in the Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs are more probably Hittite.

Nahum, the so-called Priestly Document of the Pentateuch, nor any of the parts of Isaiah, Hosea, Amos, Proverbs, nor any other possible excerpts from any other Old Testament composition. In short, Persian words occur where one would expect them to occur,—in works from Persian times—and Daniel is one of these works. Nor, as we shall show in the next chapter, if Daniel were written in the second century B.C., is it easy to account for the absence in it of any mention of elephants and phalanxes, the main strength of the Grecian army of the Seleucids.

Taken, therefore, either separately, or collectively, the form, language, and contents, of Daniel point to the sixth century B.C., rather than to the second, as the time of its composition. The only grounds left for impugning the historicity of the Book of Daniel are the character of the miracles and predictions recorded in it. On these grounds alone, no Christian, or theist, can logically or consistently reject the evidence in its favour.

It is assumed by the critics that, had the Book of Daniel been written in the sixth century B.C., the biblical literature written after that time would show larger traces of its influence, than it does show.

This assumption has been partly answered in the discussion of the second assumption. It may be said further, that the Book of Daniel was composed at Babylon; and, hence, may not have been known in Palestine until after the other books were written. It was sealed. This implies that it was inscribed on clay tablets. These tablets may not have been unsealed until long after Daniel was dead. They may even have been written in Babylonian cuneiform, and perhaps even in the Babylonian language.

Besides, the Book of Daniel was not meant so much for immediate effect as for the time of the end. It is doubtful whether it would have been safe, or prudent, to have published it—full, as it is, of predictions of the fall of Babylon and Persia—while the threatened world-powers were still flourishing. When the Maccabean heroes had smashed the power of the last of these, and when the star of Judah was once more in the ascendent, its contents could be revealed without endangering the people of

Israel. The record of the constancy of Daniel and his three companions, and of their extraordinary deliverance from their oppressors, and especially, the marvellous and exact fulfilment of the predictions contained in the book, would then serve to arm the despondent nation against the sea of troubles that seemed about to overwhelm it. The broad view which Daniel held of the purposes of God, that he unfolds for us in his vast panorama of world-history—relegating the Jews to their proper place in the movements of the current of human progress—would naturally make his book unpopular among a people, and particularly among leaders like Zerubbabel, Ezra, and Nehemiah, who were intensely narrow and nationalistic in their conception of God's mercy and of the extent and ultimate purpose of his call of Israel and of his government of the nations.

But, even granting that the Book of Daniel was published about 535 B.C., the above assumption cannot be admitted, whether we accept the conservative or radical view of the dates of the other books of the Old Testament.

For, first, according to the opinion of both conservative and radical scholars, Haggai, Esther, Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles, and the first part of Zechariah, were composed after the return from captivity.

Haggai, having been written about 520 B.C., can hardly be expected to show many traces of Daniel's influence. It has only thirty-eight verses, and the subject of his prophecy is the rebuilding of the temple. Mere silence, therefore, about the matters treated of in Daniel proves nothing as to what Haggai's views on these matters may have been.

Zechariah, both in form and subject-matter, shows more likeness to the Book of Daniel than can be found in any other work of the Old Testament.

Esther presents few traces of any earlier literature, and as the events narrated by its writer have no connection, historically or doctrinally, with the events and teachings of Daniel, it is hard to see that they are of such a character as that traces of Daniel should certainly be found in them.

Malachi exhibits as many possible traces of Daniel as it does of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the other prophetic works.

Chronicles purports to give the history of Israel down to the captivity alone. It would be an evident anachronism for its writer to have shown traces of the influence of a book written fifty years after the destruction of Jerusalem.

Ezra and Nehemiah are largely personal memoirs, genealogies, and narratives concerning the building of the wall of Jerusalem and the reëstablishment of the Law. They show slight traces of any of the prophets and none of most of them; why then should we expect to find large traces of Daniel in them? None but a critic's eye "in a fine frenzy rolling" could have expected to trace the marks of Daniel's teachings on the great things of the kingdom amid the intricacies of the laws on intermarriage with heathen wives, amid the descriptions of the building of the wall, among the special injunctions for the observance of the Sabbath, or even in the account of the keeping of the feast of Tabernacles and of the renewal of the covenant. The prayer of Nehemiah, recorded in chapter nine of the book named after him, certainly has some resemblances to chapter nine of Daniel; but in the chapters themselves there is no evidence to show which of them copied from the other.

Secondly, as to the various books and parts of books that the critics assign to the period from 535 to 165 B.C., such as Joel, Jonah, the Priestly Narrative, Isaiah xxiv-xxvii, the Song of Songs, etc., it may be remarked in general, that here, as frequently, the critics are resorting to the fallacy of attempting to prove one assumption by another equally inadmissible. For, we do not admit that it has been proven, nor that it can be proven, that these assumedly post-captivity productions were really so. But, even granting that some of these works were written in post-captivity times, what reason have we for expecting that they must in that case have exhibited large traces of the influence of Daniel? Take Jonah, for example. Suppose its author had been acquainted with the history of Daniel and his three companions, how can he have been expected to show his acquaintanceship in a narrative about his mission to Nineveh, or

in his description of his experiences in the belly of the fish, or under the shadow of the gourd? The same is true of Ruth and of the Song of Songs. Only a perverted imagination and a literary acumen possessed only by "all eminent scholars" would have looked for traces of the fiery furnace and the lions' den in the field of Boaz or the paradise of Solomon.

It cannot be denied by the critics who date Isa. xxiv-xxvii about 400 B.C. that the doctrine of the resurrection taught in xxvi, 19, might have been derived from Daniel xii, 2, provided the latter was written in the sixth century B.C.

The critics assert that most of the psalms were written in post-captivity times. It is, indeed, surprising that so little is said in them about these four doctrines which are characteristic of Daniel; but is it not even more surprising that still less is said about them in the fifty-seven psalms which are assigned by these same critics to Maccabean times? Does it not seem as if there were a conflict here between the literary critics' doctrine of the *Zeitgeist*, or spirit of the times, and that of the traceability of the influence of ideas in successive stages of literary development? If the *Zeitgeist* theory be appealed to, in order to put Daniel and Enoch in the same age, how about these fifty-seven psalms; and how about Ecclesiastes, Ecclesiasticus, Jubilees, Judith, Wisdom, and First Maccabees, most of which make no reference to any of the doctrines characteristic of Daniel? If large traces of the influence of a document of a pre-existent period must be found in all succeeding literature of the same people, how comes it that the great work of Isaiah (except the historical part occurring in chapters xxxvi-xxxix) is never referred to during all the period from 700 to 200 B.C., nor Ezekiel from 550 to 200 B.C.? Further, if Daniel were written in 164 B.C., why is there no trace of his influence on a large part of the Jewish literature that was composed after that time?

Of course, the obvious and only sensible answer to this last question is, that traces of the influence of the ideas of Daniel upon First Maccabees, the Zadokite Fragments, and other works, can only be expected to be found, where and when the author of the later works were treating of the same subjects as

those about which Daniel writes. So also, we have the right to presume that the sensible way of accounting for the absence of large traces of the influence of Daniel upon Haggai, Ezra, Nehemiah, and the authors of other post-captivity works, is the recognition of the fact that they treated of different subjects from those of which Daniel speaks. Galen, writing about medicine, can not be dated by the traces of the Roman laws and jurisprudence that might possibly be looked for in his works. The code of Justinian would not be expected to say much about medicine. Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles, are long on genealogies and short on angels and the resurrection. Daniel is short on genealogies and long on angels and the doctrines of the Messiah, the resurrection, and the judgment. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?

While, on account of the reasons just given, I think that we should not expect to find traces of the ideas of Daniel in such works as Haggai, Esther, and Ezra, I cannot see how there should be so few traces of these ideas in the Psalms, if, as the critics assert, nearly all of them were composed for the service of the second temple, and more than fifty of them in Maccabean times. For example, is it not remarkable that angels are so seldom mentioned in the psalms, and that neither Gabriel, nor Michael, is named? Why do so few of these numerous poems refer to the Messiah, and why is the glorious and comforting doctrine of the resurrection scarcely hinted at? The theories of *Zeitgeist* and of traces of influence must not be used by the critics only when they seem to support their assumptions. In the case of the psalms, the theories are both dead against the critics.

It is assumed that the same measure of influence on post-captivity literature would be expected from Daniel, as from other early books, especially such as from Deuteronomy, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Deutero-Isaiah.

This assumption expresses the opinion and expectation of Professor Cornill, its author; but we doubt, if many other critics will agree with him. It gives too much honour and relative importance to Daniel in comparison with these four great masterpieces of Hebrew literature. Since Professor Cornill gives no

reasons for his expectation, it becomes incumbent upon us to state both side of the questions raised by his assertion.

Suppose we admit that these four great books exerted a larger measure of influence upon post-captivity literature than Daniel did, why should they not have done so? They are larger works. They are earlier works. They were ascribed to four of the greatest and most conspicuous of the prophets. Deuteronomy was universally ascribed to their accredited lawgiver, the supposed founder of their nation. "Deutero-Isaiah" was accepted as a production of the most prominent and influential of the prophet-counsellors of the kings of Judah and certainly possessed all the brilliancy and convincingness of his "genuine" works. Jeremiah stood in a unique relationship to the Jews of the captivity, as the one who had predicted its beginning and its end, and had thus demonstrated that he was truly a prophet of God in a distinguished degree. Ezekiel was himself one of the captives and lived and prophesied among his fellow exiles; and if the radical view of the origin of the Priestly-code be correct, he was the originator of many of its peculiar ordinances.

Besides, all these works are distinctively nationalistic. They are specifically addressed to the Israelites and speak of the other nations only in their connection with the children of Abraham. Whereas, Daniel is a book full of the history of foreign kings and their Hebrew subjects. It is one of the least nationalistic and one of the most catholic and world-embracing of all the Old Testament books. It supplies not a single Haphtara, or reading lesson, to be read by the Jews on the Sabbath day. It arrived at its proper influence only when the gospel, as the means of salvation for all the world, had been proclaimed.

Again, distinctions in books as well as among individuals are invidious. The question in dispute about Daniel is one of existence and not one of relative influence. A book may exist without having any perceptible influence, or any great number of readers. Some books only can be the best sellers of the year. Some of Paul's epistles have exerted tenfold the influence that others have and are read ten times as much. Some of Milton's works are read by all pupils in the high schools; others are read

by all cultivated people; others are scarcely read at all. That Daniel cannot have existed unless we can show traces of his having influenced his contemporaries and successors as much as Jeremiah and others did is simply an assertion made thoughtlessly, hastily, or in the heat of argument. It is utterly without proof and is beyond the reach of proof. It is unworthy of the learned man that made it. May the day soon be past when the dictum of a professor will be considered to outweigh the evidence of common sense, analogy, and documents. Homer sometimes nods; and so also does the most eminent of scholars.

V. THE APPROXIMATION OF DANIEL AND ENOCH

It is assumed that the ideas of Daniel and those of the first part of Enoch approximate and that, because the ideas approximate, the books must have been written at about the same time.⁴⁰ There are here two assertions: first, that the ideas approximate, and second, that this approximation shows that the two works must have been composed at about the same time.

The first of these assertions will have credence only with those who have not read the first section of Enoch; for both in the subjects treated and in the manner of their treatment, the two works differ materially. The First Part of Enoch is concerned with the fall and punishment of the angels who kept not their first estate, but took wives from the daughters of men. It is a kind of commentary, or sermon, on the first part of the sixth chapter of Genesis, and gives numerous details about the fallen sons of God. It tells the number of the angels and the names of the leaders and describes the unpardonable nature of their sin and the kind and place of their judgment. It mentions, also, by name the seven good archangels among whom appear Michael and Gabriel. These two names are the only particular in which this section of Enoch can be said to show any approximate connection with Daniel.

It is probable, however, that Doctor Driver referred to the section of Enoch which is embraced in chapters lxxxiii-xc, which

⁴⁰ See above p. 160.

is denominated by Professor Charles as the Third Section. This section contains two dream-visions, the first on the deluge, and the second on the history of the world from the fall of the angels to the founding of the Messianic kingdom. Chapter xc, gives a figurative résumé of the history from Alexander the Great to the coming of the white bull, which may possibly represent the Messiah. In order that our readers may be able to judge for themselves as to the approximation of this chapter to the Book of Daniel, I shall cite it, beginning with the preceding context (lxxxix, 68), where it begins to treat of the period following the destruction of Jerusalem.

And the shepherds and their associates delivered over those sheep to all the wild beasts, to devour them, and each one of them received in his time a definite number: it was written by the other in a book how many each one of them destroyed of them. And each one slew and destroyed many more than was prescribed; and I began to weep and lament on account of those sheep. And thus in the vision I saw that one who wrote, how he wrote down every one that was destroyed by those shepherds, day by day, and carried up and laid down and showed actually the whole book to the Lord of the sheep—everything that they had done, and all that each one of them had made away with, and all that they had given over to destruction. And the book was read before the Lord of the sheep, and He took the book from his hand and read it and sealed it and laid it down.

And forthwith I saw how the shepherds pastured for twelve hours, and behold three of those sheep turned back and came and entered and began to build up all that had fallen down of that house; but the wild boars tried to hinder them, but they were not able. And they began again to build as before, and they reared up that tower, and it was named the high tower; and they began again to place a table before the tower, but all the bread on it was polluted and not pure. And as touching all this the eyes of those sheep were blinded so that they saw not, and (the eyes of) their shepherds likewise; and they delivered them in large numbers to their shepherds for destruction, and they trampled the sheep with their feet and devoured them. And the Lord of the sheep remained unmoved till all the sheep were dispersed over the field and mingled with them (i.e., the beasts), and they (i.e., the shepherds) did not save them out of the hand of the beasts. And this one who wrote the book carried it up, and showed it and read it before the Lord of the sheep, and implored Him on their account, and besought Him on their account as he showed Him all the doings of the shepherds, and

gave testimony before Him against all the shepherds. And he took the actual book and laid it down beside Him and departed.

xc. And I saw till that in this manner thirty-five shepherds undertook the pasturing (of the sheep), and they severally completed their periods as did the first; and others received them into their hands, to pasture them for their period, each shepherd in his own period. And after that I saw in my vision all the birds of heaven coming, the eagles, the vultures, the kites, the ravens; but the eagles led all the birds; and they began to devour those sheep, and to pick out their eyes and to devour their flesh. And the sheep cried out because their flesh was being devoured by the birds, and as for me I looked and lamented in my sleep over that shepherd who pastured the sheep. And I saw until those sheep were devoured by the dogs and eagles and kites, and they left neither flesh nor skin nor sinew remaining on them till only their bones stood there: and their bones too fell to the earth and the sheep became few. And I saw until that twenty-three had undertaken the pasturing and completed in their several periods fifty-eight times.

But behold lambs were borne by those white sheep, and they began to open their eyes and to see, and to cry to the sheep. Yea, they cried to them, but they did not hearken to what they said to them, but were exceedingly deaf, and their eyes were very exceedingly blinded. And I saw in the vision how the ravens flew upon those lambs and took one of those lambs, and dashed the sheep in pieces and devoured them. And I saw till horns grew upon those lambs, and the ravens cast down their horns; and I saw till there sprouted a great horn of one of those sheep, and their eyes were opened. And it looked at them (and their eyes opened), and it cried to the sheep, and the rams saw it and all ran to it. And notwithstanding all this those eagles and vultures and ravens and kites still kept tearing the sheep and swooping down upon them and devouring them: still the sheep remained silent, but the rams lamented and cried out. And those ravens fought and battled with it, and sought to lay low its horn, but they had no power over it.

All the eagles and vultures and ravens and kites were gathered together, and there came with them all the sheep of the field, yea, they all came together, and helped each other to break that horn of the ram. And I saw till a great sword was given to the sheep, and the sheep proceeded against all the beasts of the field to slay them, and all the beasts and the birds of the heaven fled before their face. And I saw that man who wrote the book according to the command of the Lord, till he opened that book concerning the destruction which those twelve last shepherds had wrought, and showed that they had destroyed much more than their predecessors, before the Lord of the sheep. And I saw till the Lord of the sheep came unto them and took in His hand the staff of His wrath, and smote the earth, and the earth

clave asunder, and all the beasts and all the birds of the heaven fell from among those sheep, and were swallowed up in the earth and it covered them.⁴¹

And I saw till a throne was erected in the pleasant land, and the Lord of the sheep sat Himself thereon, and the other took the sealed books and opened those books before the Lord of the sheep. And the Lord called those men the seven first white ones, and commanded that they should bring before Him, beginning with the first star which led the way, all the stars whose privy members were like those of horses, and they brought them all before Him. And He said to that man who wrote before Him, being one of those seven white ones, and said unto him: "Take those seventy shepherds to whom I delivered the sheep, and who taking them on their own authority slew more than I commanded them." And behold they were all bound, I saw, and they all stood before Him. And the judgment was held first over the stars, and they were judged and found guilty, and went to the place of condemnation, and they were cast into an abyss, full of fire and flaming, and full of pillars of fire. And those seventy shepherds were judged and found guilty, and they were cast into that fiery abyss. And I saw at that time how a like abyss was opened in the midst of the earth, full of fire, and they brought those blinded sheep, and they were all judged and found guilty and cast into this fiery abyss, and they burned; now this abyss was to the right of that house. And I saw those sheep burning and their bones burning.⁴²

In this whole passage Professor Charles finds but one verse showing verbal coincidences with Daniel; whereas, he cites five verses using ideas and phrases similar to those found in ten different places in Isaiah, two verses probably referring to three places in Zechariah, two referring to two in Micah, and four verses referring respectively to a passage in Ezekiel, Haggai, Malachi, or Tobit. The verse showing resemblances to Daniel is the twentieth verse in chapter xc. This verse speaks of "the pleasant land," of a "throne being erected" upon which "the judge sat," and of "sealed books" that were opened before the judge. Each of these statements is fully paralleled in Daniel; but it does not follow from this, that Daniel and Enoch were composed at about the same time, nor that one of them borrowed from the other. As to the phrase "pleasant land," a closer exami-

⁴¹ I have omitted the duplicate verses from 13 to 15 inclusive.

⁴² See *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, vol. ii, 256-260.

nation of the original Hebrew seems to show that the English word "pleasant" is the correct translation in Jer. iii, 19, Zech. vii, 14, Ps. cvi, 24; but in Daniel xi, 16, 41, 45, the "glorious land" of the Revised Version is better. Unfortunately, the Hebrew, or Aramaic original of Enoch has utterly disappeared; and not a single fragment of this section is preserved in any version except the Ethiopic. In the Ethiopic, the word rendered by "pleasant" is *charwas*, derived from a root corresponding to the Hebrew and Arabic *chamad* or *chamada*. In the verses cited above from Jeremiah, Zechariah, and Ps. cvi, a derivative of this verb is rightly rendered by "pleasant" in both Ethiopic and English.^{42a}

Now, it is generally admitted that the Ethiopic version was made from the Greek, though it may afterwards have been revised in parts on the basis of the Hebrew. But, the Greek translators, Theodotion as well as the Seventy, give us little light on the meaning of this word as employed in Daniel. In Dan. viii, 9, the Seventy render it north ($\beta\acute{o\rho\rho\rho\alpha\nu$) and Theodotion probably by power ($\delta\acute{\upsilon}\nu\alpha\mu\iota\varsigma$).⁴³

In Dan. xi, 16, 41, and 45, Theodotion transliterates and the Seventy omit except in the forty-fifth verse, where they render by "wish," having doubtless read *ṣebu* (צְבוּ) which in Syriac means wish, or will.

The Syriac Peshitto gives us even less light than the Greek versions. In viii, 9, it gives no translation; in xi, 16 and 41, it

^{42a} The verb *patawa* is commonly used in Ethiopic to render *chamad*, as also *'awah* to desire, or covet. The Ethiopic verb *charwas* and its derivatives are used to render at least eight different Hebrew words for sweet, or pleasant. The idea of glory, however, is expressed by seven, or more roots, all different from those used to render the idea of pleasant. The distinction between pleasant and glorious is thus closely observed all through the Ethiopic version. Now, it is a singular fact that no one of these fifteen Hebrew roots thus clearly distinguished is the one found in Daniel; but a sixteenth root occurs in the derivative *ṣebi*.

⁴³ Theodotion renders the last part of the ninth verse by "towards the south and towards the power," thus omitting the second direction "towards the east." He has evidently read צְבוּ instead of צָבוּ, or else has given the same meaning to the two words; for *dunamis* is the usual rendering of the former, being employed by the LXX more than one hundred and forty times as the translation of צָבוּ.

renders by the phrase "land of Israel"; and in xi, 45, by a form of the verb "to be."

Jerome is the only one of the ancient first-hand translators to be consistent and correct in the rendering. In xi, 41, he renders by "gloriosam," and in xi, 16, 45, by "incluta" and "inclutum." In viii, 9, he has probably read *šaba* (שָׁבָא), as Theodotion did, and has rendered by "fortitudinem."

From the evidence just given it appears that the Ethiopic version always distinguishes between the ideas of glorious and pleasant; that the idea of a pleasant land is found in Jeremiah, Zechariah, and Ps. cvi, and may easily have been derived by the author of Enoch from one or another of these places; and that Daniel never speaks of a pleasant land, but always of a glorious one. There is in this phrase, therefore, no evidence that proves that Enoch and Daniel were from the same age, or derived one from the other.

But even if *šebi* meant glory, there would be in this no certain proof that the writer of Enoch derived his idea from Daniel; for Ezekiel uses the same word twice to describe the land of Palestine (xx, 6, 15), once of Moab (xxv, 9), and once of Tyre (xxvi, 20); while Isaiah uses a similar phrase of Babylon (xiii, 19).

As to the second phrase in Enoch xc, 20, saying that "a throne was erected," it is scarcely possible to imagine that any writer of antiquity can have been so ignorant as not to know that gods, kings, and all kinds of judges sat upon thrones when they were hearing cases brought before them. In the Egyptian judgment scenes, Osiris and the other gods sit as judges.⁴⁴ Among the Assyrians, the judge was said to have a throne of judgment.⁴⁵ One of the inscriptions of Ashurbanipal⁴⁶ uses the phrase *dinu ishakan*, which is almost identical with the *dina yethib* of Daniel. The third clause of xc, 20, stating that books were opened, is the same as one found in Daniel vii, 10. This does not prove, however, that Daniel derived the idea from Enoch, or Enoch from

⁴⁴ See Budge; *Osiris and the Egyptian Resurrection*, vol. i, 318.

⁴⁵ A *kussu daianuti*. See Johns; *Babylonian and Assyrian Laws*, etc., p. 81.

⁴⁶ IV Rawlinson xlvi, 10.

Daniel. For, that a book of life was kept by the Lord appears already in Ex. xxxii, 32, 33 (ascribed by the critics to E), in Is. iv, 3, and Ps. lxix, 28. In Mal. iii, 16, (cf Ps. lvi, 8) these books are called books of remembrance in which good deeds were recorded; and in Is. lxv, 6, records of evil deeds are said to be written. Among the Egyptians, also, as early as the fourth millennium B.C., Osiris was able to be a just judge, because all the words and deeds of men had been written down carefully by the two scribe-gods, Thoth and Sesheta, and his verdict was according to the evidence written.⁴⁷ Among the Babylonians, we have two documents dictated by Hammurabi in which he tells of cases that had been brought before him which were determined on the evidence of tablets that were examined before him. We know that most of these tablets were covered with an envelope of clay. When wanted to be read in a court, these tablets are said to have been opened.⁴⁸ In Muss-Arnolt (page 850) we find the phrase *sha unqu ipattani* "whosoever opens the seal, or tablet." "Opening a letter" is also a phrase in use. (*id.*) In short, it stands to reason, that tablets which were written, sealed, covered, sealed again, and indorsed, in order to be kept as evidence of certain transactions, would be opened in case of need in order to get at the very evidence on account of which they were written and preserved.

It is noteworthy that the verb *pitu* used in Babylonian for the opening of tablets, is the same as the verb for the opening of letters found in Dan. vii, 10 and Neh. viii, 5. The word translated "book" in Dan. vii, 10 is the one commonly employed in Hebrew as an equivalent of the various words used for tablets of record in Babylonian for documents of different kinds. Moreover, these books of the Hebrews were sealed "according to law and custom." (Is. xxix, 11, Jer. xxxii, 10), apparently in a way similar to that employed among the Babylonians.⁴⁹

It seems evident, therefore, that from Abraham downwards

⁴⁷ See Budge: *Osiris* i, 309.

⁴⁸ See King; *The Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi*, pp. 23-28.

⁴⁹ See Schorr; *Urkunden des altbabylonischen Zivil- und Prozessrechts*, p. xxxvii.

there were sealed books in the libraries of Babylon that would be opened whenever a case came for adjudication before a judge. It is further evident that the phrases used by Daniel describe accurately what may have been observed every day in the law courts of Babylon, in one of which Daniel himself may have sat as judge. In fact, these phrases afford one of the best undesigned coincidences in favour of the veracity and the Babylonian provenance of Daniel.

Further, an argument for a close connection between Daniel and Enoch might seem to be found in the frequent use in both of the word for horn. Enoch employs it a number of times in *xc*, 9, 12, 16, 37, and Daniel in the Hebrew of *viii*, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 20, 21, and in the Aramaic of *vii*, 7, 8, *ii* 20 21, 22. But that there is no real force in this argument may be seen from the fact that horns are mentioned also in *Amos vi*, 13, *Mi. iv*, 13, *Deut. xxxiii*, 17, *i Sam. ii*, 1, 10; *2 Sam. xxii*, 3, *Jer. xlviii*, 25, *Ezek. xxix*, 21, *xxxiv*, 21; *Lam. ii*, 3, 17, *Job. xvi*, 1-5, *Pss. lxxv*, 4, 5, 10, *lxxxix*, 17, 24, *xcii*, 10, *cxxxii*, 17, *cxlviii*, 14. In the symbolic use of the word these passages show that in all ages and kinds of Hebrew literature horn was employed exactly as in Enoch and Daniel.

Nor can the fact that both Daniel and Enoch see animals in their visions prove approximation, imitation, or contemporaneity. For, animals are characteristic of the dreams and visions of Jacob, Pharaoh, and Zechariah.

Nor can the fact that both mention stars prove approximation. For stars are mentioned among other places in the vision of Abraham (*Gen. xv*, 5) in the dream of Joseph (*Gen. xxxvii*, 9) and in the prophecy of Balaam (*Num. xxiv*, 17). Besides, Daniel says that the righteous shall shine like stars; but, Enoch that judgment was held over the stars (*xc*, 24). Enoch, moreover, employs "star" to denote living beings, but Daniel never.

Nor can the fact that Enoch, like Daniel, is said to have seen in a vision all these things that he records, be interpreted as implying any special approximation to Daniel. For visions had been a common means of the communication of divine thoughts from the time of Abraham onwards. The Egyptians, Assyrians,

and Babylonians, also, believed in visions from the earliest times and all through their history.⁵⁰

Again, the visions of Daniel are distinguished from those of Enoch in that they give definite dates, and mention the names of the kings in whose reigns they occurred. In fact, the main objection made to the reality of Daniel's visions is that they are too definite and so closely in harmony with what we know from other sources to have happened. It has been argued from this very harmony, that the records of Daniel's visions are historical rather than predictive, and the events narrated in them are actually employed in constructing the history of the period of the successors of Alexander.

Contrast with this exactness of description the indefiniteness of Enoch. It gives no dates, mentions no names of kings, and counts the number of the shepherds, or rulers, in vs. 1, as thirty-five, in vs. 5, as fifty-eight, in vs. 22, as seventy, without giving any clear intimation of whom they mean.⁵¹

The only possible reference to the Messiah found in Enoch is xc, 37, 38, where a white bull is said to have been born which afterwards became a lamb. No angel is mentioned by name in this passage, nor is there any reference to a resurrection. Some interpreters make the "new house" of verse 29 to be the New Jerusalem, but it may, so far as the context indicates, refer to a rebuilding of the temple.

But, even if it could be shown that this ninetieth chapter of Enoch, or any other chapter, or section, approximates in form or content to Daniel, it does not follow that such an approxi-

⁵⁰ See above Chapter IV.

⁵¹ Charles, indeed, says (p. 257), that this number 35 is found by counting twenty-three kings of Egypt from 330 to 200 B.C. and twelve Seleucid kings from 200 to 130 B.C. If, as he further says on p. 171, this section of Enoch must have been written before the death of Judas Maccabaeus in 161 B.C., it follows that the writer must have been able to predict the exact number of the kings of Syria between 161 and 131 B.C., an exceedingly difficult performance in view of the fact that kings of Syria were rising and falling at that time at the rate of about one every five years. In his endeavour to give to his beloved Enoch the gift of predictive prophecy, Charles fails to note the inconsistency of denying the same power to Daniel. In fleeing from Daniel's bear he rushes into the jaws of Enoch's lion.

mation would prove that Daniel and Enoch are from the same time. Enoch may be an imitation of Daniel. No one would affirm that the Revelation of St. John is from the same time as Daniel, and yet it resembles Daniel much more closely than Enoch does. Macauley says that he imitated Thucydides. Many a man has attempted to imitate the Latin of Cicero. Robert Louis Stevenson says that he studied to make his style suit the particular subject which he treated. The sonnet which was taken over into English from the Italian of Petrarch was brought to perfection by Shakespeare and Milton. Yet, equal perfection of form and wealth of idea and expression can scarcely be denied to Landor, Wordsworth, and Keats. Do these "approximations" prove that all these poets were from the same age? Such examples convince us that no trustworthy argument as to the time of the composition of a document can be based upon form, or style, or subject alone.

CHAPTER VII

THE BACKGROUND OF DANIEL

THE critics are in the habit of making one or more unfounded assumptions and then basing upon these unproved and unprovable assumptions still others equally baseless. In the case of Daniel they have assumed that the book is unhistorical, that its miracles are impossible, and that its presumed predictive prophecies are dim recollections of long past events. They even assume that there was no man called Daniel living in the time of Nebuchadnezzar and Cyrus,¹ and that the customs, objects, and events mentioned or not mentioned in the book, as well as the language in which they are mentioned, indicate the age of Judas Maccabeus. That there is no ground for denying the existence and the deeds of Daniel as recorded in the book named after him has been shown in *Studies in Daniel*, Series One, where the harmony between the life of the man and his surroundings has been maintained. The existence of such a Daniel is upheld by the testimony of his great contemporary Ezekiel who mentions him three times as a model of wisdom and righteousness (xiv, 14, 20, xxviii, 3). No other man worthy of being placed alongside of Noah and Job, as is done by Ezekiel, is known to history, or would, so far as we know, have been known to the Jews whom Ezekiel addressed. The critics, in their endeavours to account for this singular prominence given by their favourite author to an otherwise unknown person, are reduced to the most absurd conjectures. Hitzig supposed that Daniel was another name for Melchizedek.² Prince conjectures that he was "really a well known character under the disguise of another name," probably "some celebrated ancient prophet," but which one "cannot possibly be known, as there is not a single trace

¹ Prince, *Commentary on Daniel*, p. 28.

² *Id.*, p. viii.

to guide research as to his origin and date." Bevan says it is "impossible to decide who the Daniel was to whom reference" is made by Ezekiel,³ but he qualifies this statement with the remark: "Presumably Ezekiel believed him to be, like Noah and Job, a person of the remote past." Bevan here assumes that Ezekiel believed Job to be a person from the remote past.

This is an example of a kind of assumption frequently indulged in by certain critics, that is, that they can tell exactly what an ancient prophet *believed*. Cornill maintains that the Book of Job was written after Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Proverbs and P.⁴ If this be so, then we would have Ezekiel citing as models two men not known to have existed before his time, and of whom his readers could have known merely the names and an indefinite number of traditions, as the works describing them had not yet been written. We could understand this concerning Job, since the book gives no indication of time; but we cannot see why a writer later than Ezekiel would have taken traditions current among the people before the time of Ezekiel and have centered these traditions about a contemporary of Ezekiel. According to the critics, the writer of Daniel knew the prophets. According to some of them he got the name of Daniel from these very passages in Ezekiel. Why then did he not place Daniel at the court of some Pharaoh, or of some Assyrian or Elamite king, instead of making him a younger contemporary of Ezekiel? We leave the critics to conjecture why, and returning to our subject, we sum up by saying that we have two first class witnesses to the fact that Daniel lived at the time of Nebuchadnezzar; first, the Book of Daniel itself, and secondly, the Book of Ezekiel. They both testify also that he was a man of wisdom and righteousness. Further, another first class witness, the First Book of the Maccabees, testifies that the two most notable events recorded in Daniel (the fiery furnace and the den of lions) were known to the Jews in 169 B.C., when they were cited by Mattathias in the climax of his great speech in which he stirred up his compatriots to rebellion. This speech is reported to have been delivered five years before the date at which the critics assign the

³ *Commentary*, p. 12.

⁴ *Introduction*, p. 433.

composition of the Book of Daniel. Josephus, also, testifies that the Book of Daniel was shown to Alexander the Great in 336 B.C. Dare we ignore the testimony of such a scholar?

Now compared with this direct evidence in favour of the existence of Daniel in the sixth century B.C., and of a knowledge of some of the contents of his book before the time of the Maccabees, what direct evidence have the critics to offer in favour of the year 164 B.C. as the time of the composition of the book? Absolutely none. Not a single word, or intimation, or opinion, can be produced from any source before the third century A.D. in favour of the view that Daniel was written in Maccabean times. The New Testament in its references to Daniel the prophet and to the fiery furnace and the den of lions implies at least that Daniel is what it appears to be, a record of historic facts enacted in the sixth century B.C. Josephus treats the book as reliable and the author as the Daniel of the book, and one of the greatest of the prophets. It is not till the third century A.D. in the writings of a heathen assailant of Christianity that we find the first expression of the *opinion* that the book may have been a fabrication, full of pseudo-predictions written *post eventum*. This opinion was never accepted by Origen or any of the scholars claiming to be of the Jewish or Christian faith, till the beginning of the nineteenth century. Bertholdt and Gesenius were the proponents of the view that Daniel was neither authentic nor genuine, that its historical parts were a pure fabrication, and that its alleged predictions were written *post eventum*. These professors were both German rationalists of the most pronounced type. They based their opinion of Daniel upon the assumption that miracles and predictive prophecies are impossible, that the historical statements are largely false, and that the language, customs, and ideas are those of the age of Antiochus Epiphanes. Like Bevan and other living members of their school, they preferred the opinion of the neo-Platonist Porphyry in his virulent and prejudiced assault on Christianity, and especially on the Book of Daniel, to the opinions of Eusebius of Cæsarea, Origen, and Jerome in their answers to Porphyry; although these three are justly esteemed the greatest scholars and critics of the early church and had before them all

the sources of information and all the evidence possessed by the heathen Porphyry; neither is there any proof that they were more prejudiced in favour of Christianity than he was against it. Besides, in Josephus, that great Jewish scholar of the first century A.D., we have a better judge of the reliability of Daniel than any of these third and fourth century critics.

JOSEPHUS

In the first place, Josephus lived two hundred years earlier than Porphyry and Origen. Secondly, he had access to many more and much better sources of information as to Seleucidian times than the later writers give evidence of. Of the sources which Jerome says to have been used by Porphyry, Josephus names Polybius, Posidonius, and Hieronymus. Of Polybius, Josephus speaks in high praise in general,⁵ but differs modestly with him in regard to the death of Antiochus Epiphanes.⁶ Posidonius, who lived about 300 B.C., he accuses of telling lies about the Jews and of "framing absurd and reproachful stories about our temple,"⁷ and cites against him the testimony of Polybius, Strabo, Nicolaus of Damascus, Timagenes, Castor the chronologer, and Apollodorus.⁸ Of Hieronymus he asserts that he "never mentions us in his history, although he was bred up very near to the places where we live."⁹ The other sources of Porphyry mentioned by Jerome are not named by Josephus; and since the works of most of them have been lost, we can form no correct opinion as to their merits. Callinicus, we know, lived about 300 B.C., and consequently can have testified only as to matters concerning Alexander and his sons and his generals who immediately followed him.

⁵ As in *Antiquities*, XII, III, 3, XII, IX, I, and *Contra Apion*, II, 7.

⁶ *Antiquities*, XII, IX, I.

⁷ *Contra Apion*, II, 7.

⁸ *Id.*

⁹ *Contra Apion* I, 23. The question naturally arises, whether Jerome was wrong in saying that Hieronymus was one of the authorities of Porphyry. Even if he was an authority, it could have been only for the time of Alexander's immediate successors, since he was a friend of Antigonus and a contemporary of Hecateus.

Diodorus flourished in the reign of Augustus and can only have written at second hand. Having access to the same sources, Josephus may have thought it unnecessary to allude to him. As to Claudius, Theon, and Andronicus, not only are their works lost, but nothing is known of their age or histories.

On the other hand, Josephus had the use of many sources that are not mentioned as having been known to Porphyry. Aside from official documents from Jerusalem, Tyre, Sparta, Rome, and from the kings of Egypt and Syria, he cites among others Hecataeus of Abdera, Nicolaus of Damascus, Menander of Tyre, Berosus for Babylon, Manetho for Egypt, Epistles of Alexander, Ptolemy Soter and the succeeding kings, Agatharcides, Posidonius, Lysimachus, Aristeus, Theopompus, Theodotus, Apollodorus, Apollonius, Molo, Timagenes, Strabo, Polybius, Hieronymus, Castor, Theophilus, Mnasias, Aristophanes, Hermogenes, Euhemerus, Conon, Zopyrion, Eupolemus, Demetrius Phalereus, the elder Philo, and others. In addition to these, he would know, of course, the Books of the Maccabees, and a large number of the apocryphal and pseudepigraphical works of the Jews. His mention of the elder Philo implies his knowledge of the younger.

In the third place, Josephus was not an aspiring publicist seeking to gain a livelihood, nor an ambitious writer hoping to win an Olympian crown by his rhetoric and patriotic utterances, regardless of truth and reckless of consequences; but as the learned Scaliger justly says, "he was the greatest lover of truth of all writers and it is safer to believe him, not only as to the affairs of the Jews, but also as to those that are foreign to them, than all the Greek and Latin writers; and this because his fidelity and compass of learning are everywhere conspicuous." Besides, his writings were a challenge and an affirmation. He defied the world to deny or refute his statements and he affirmed the incontestable truth of his history. Nor was he an unknown author hiding in a corner, unrecognised by his contemporaries or unworthy of their acceptance as an opponent. Educated as a priest in all the learning of his people, versed in Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek and Latin, and in a measure in Babylonian, Egyptian, and Phœnician, he cites his authorities at first hand, and uses them with a skill that betrays

on every page the hand of the master. The laws and literature of all the preceding ages seem to have been at his command, mostly in the original languages in which they were written. Homer and Hesiod, Herodotus and Thucydides, Plato and Pythagoras, Berosus, Menander, Nicolaus, Manetho, and Polybius were known to him. He compares the laws of Moses with those of Draco, Lycurgus, and Solon. He discusses the histories and the historians of the different states of Greece and condemns forgeries and lies in the most unsparing terms. His purpose in all his writings was to vindicate the truth and to correct and instruct the ignorant.

The accuracy and truthfulness with which Josephus wrote his histories was attested in his own time by the emperors Vespasian and Titus and by king Agrippa. Titus subscribed the *Wars* with his own hand and ordered them to be published. Agrippa wrote a letter to Josephus in which he said: "I have read over thy book with great pleasure, and it appears to me that thou hast done it much more accurately and with greater care, than the other writers."¹⁰ Besides, the accuracy of the transmission and the truthfulness of the subject matter of his writings are attested by an almost unbroken succession of the most brilliant scholars from his own time up to the present. Tacitus and Justin Martyr seem to have used his statements and certainly Origen, Eusebius, Ambrose, Jerome, Isidorus, Sozomen, Cassiodorus, Syncellus, Photius, and Suidas cite him and attest his works as reliable.¹¹ According to the ordinary laws of evidence, these giants of old were better able to testify as to the text and veracity of Josephus than any scholars of to-day. For they lived nearer to the time of Josephus by a thousand to fifteen hundred years. They were the brightest men and the most accomplished scholars of their respective generations. They did not read laboriously a musty manuscript, or a classical author, with the aid of grammar and dictionary; but were to the language born. They had not merely fragments and desultory references and short descriptions concerning the events to which Josephus alludes, but possessed many complete works

¹⁰ *Life of Flavius Josephus*, 65.

¹¹ See Dissertation I, in Whiston's *Josephus*.

which since have perished. We may safely conclude, therefore, that Josephus knew what he was writing about and that he told the truth.

Knowing, then, all the sources of information that we have to-day and a great many more than either we or Porphyry can claim, and animated by the highest principles of veracity and the strongest desire for accuracy, Josephus agrees with both Porphyry and his opponents as to the exactness with which the narratives in Daniel harmonize with the events that occurred in the time of the Maccabees. But he does not on that account consider that Daniel was a forgery written *post eventum*. On the contrary, he narrates at length the history of Daniel at the courts of Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar, and Darius the Mede, following herein the Book of Daniel. He says that Daniel was one of the greatest of the prophets; that the several books that he wrote were still read in his time; that Daniel conversed with God; that he did not only prophesy of future events, as did the other prophets, but that he determined also the time of their accomplishment, and that by their accomplishment he secured belief in the truth of his predictions. He emphasises especially the vision of Daniel at Susa, recorded in the 8th chapter, and says expressly that the Jews suffered in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes the things predicted there so many years before they came to pass.¹² He says, further, that the Book of Daniel was shown to Alexander who supposed that himself was the person intended to destroy the empire of the Persians, as Daniel had predicted in chapter xi, 3.¹³ And again he states that in the same manner Daniel wrote also concerning the Roman government and that his country should be made desolate by it.¹⁴ "All these things," he says, "did this man leave in writing, as God had showed them to him, insomuch that such as read his prophecies, and see how they have been fulfilled, would wonder at the honour with which God honoured Daniel; and would thence discover how the Epicureans are in error, who cast providence out of human life, and do not believe that God takes care of the affairs of the

¹² Bk. X, xi, 7.

¹³ Bk. XI, viii, 5. Prince, p. 14.

¹⁴ Bk. X, xi, 7.

world.”¹⁵ Finally, Josephus says that the desolation of the temple by the Macedonians had been predicted by Daniel four hundred and eight years before it was accomplished.¹⁶ It is possible, also, that when Josephus¹⁷ calls Jesus *Christ* he derived the title *Christ* from Daniel; for we have shown elsewhere,¹⁸ that, contrary to the common opinion, the title *Messiah* or *Christ*, as applied to the Saviour was a very unusual one, being found in the Old Testament only in Ps. ii, 2, and Dnl. ix, 25, 26, and in the other pre-Christian literature of the Jews in Enoch xliii, 10, lii, 4, Ps. of Sol. xviii, 6, 8, alone.¹⁹

It is evident, then, that Josephus must have thought that the background of Daniel was that of the times of Nebuchadnezzar and Cyrus and not that of the Maccabees. If there had been any indication of the later time, surely one of his knowledge and opportunities and methods and love of veracity would have detected it, whether it was in the sphere of history, customs, or language. Surely, also, he, if anyone, was in a position to know that it was written in the second century B.C., if that had been the age of its composition. But neither he, nor any of his sources, nor any source possibly unknown to him, gives any intimation that anyone even thought that it was written then. More than 500 years after the death of Antiochus Epiphanes, a heathen philosopher antagonistic to Christianity startles the world with his opinion that it was composed shortly before the death of Epiphanes, and lo! the German critic puts this forth as *evidence* that it was written then. Let him follow Porphyry who will, but let him cease to say that he does so on the ground of evidence. Let him be honest enough to say that he does so because like Porphyry he does not believe in the possibility of miracles, nor in predictive prophecy,—at least in that kind of predictive prophecy which is found in Daniel.

¹⁵ *Id.*

¹⁶ Bk. XII, vii, 6.

¹⁷ Bk. XVIII, iii, 3.

¹⁸ *Vide supra*, pp. 132, 138, 212.

¹⁹ Since Josephus never elsewhere pays any attention to this apocryphal literature it is possible at least that he derived the title *Christ* from Daniel directly, as the people of New Testament times seem to have done.

ALLEGED EVIDENCE OF LATE DATE

Daniel's Praying

But, since Josephus was not infallible, let us look at some of the other alleged evidence that the background of Daniel is that of the second century B.C. Professor Cornill reasserts²⁰ the old opinion that the fact that Daniel is said to have *prayed three times a day with his face turned to Jerusalem* shows that Daniel was written in the second century B.C. rather than in the sixth. He gives no evidence in support of this assertion and for the very good reason that there is none to give. He says only that "all this would have been unintelligible at the time of the Babylonian exile," a statement of the kind frequently indulged in by special pleaders of Professor Cornill's school, but which has absolutely no value as evidence. How can we know that it was unintelligible? To pray three times a day is a very simple act. To pray with one's face toward Jerusalem, the place of Jehovah's residence, is another very simple act. Why could either of these acts be more intelligible in the second century B.C. than in the sixth? What is unintelligible is, that a German professor of the twentieth century A.D. should make such an unfounded statement.

For, in fact, no better illustration of the falseness of the critical method can be found than this very case. As to praying *toward Jerusalem*, the practice is referred to three times in the prayer of Solomon (1 Kings viii).²¹ That this prayer of Solomon was

²⁰ *Introduction*, p. 388.

²¹ The three places are 1 Kings viii, 30, 38, and 48, which read as follows:

And hearken thou to the supplication of thy servant, and of thy people Israel, when they shall pray toward this place: yea hear thou in heaven thy dwelling-place; and when thou hearest, forgive. . . .

What prayer and supplication soever be made by any man, or by all thy people Israel, who shall know every man the plague of his own heart, and spread forth his hands toward this house. . . .

If they return unto thee with all their heart and all their soul in the land of their enemies, who carried them captive, and pray unto thee toward their land, which thou gavest unto their fathers, the city which thou hast chosen, and the house which I have built for thy name.

known to Daniel seems evident from the fact that in his own prayer he uses such significant phrases of Solomon's as "prayer and supplication," "we have sinned, we have done iniquity, we have transgressed," and "keeping the covenant and the mercy."²² It is immaterial as far as Daniel's use of the direction is concerned, whether this prayer was really made by Solomon, as the Book of Kings affirms, or was written during the captivity as the critics assert.²³ Since, according to Driver, the compiler of Kings was "a man like-minded with Jeremiah, and almost certainly a contemporary,"²⁴ the prayer of Solomon, even according to the higher critics themselves, was written before the reign of Cyrus when Daniel's prayer was made. After a hundred years of diligent search, no other trace of this custom has been found by the critics, till we come to the Mohammedan times in the 7th century A.D., unless with Hitzig we find an allusion to the custom in Tobit iii, 7, where Sarah is said to have "stretched forth her hands toward the window and prayed." However we may attempt to account for this failure of the immense Jewish literature to mention the fact that the direction in Solomon's prayer had become a custom, certain it is that no argument for the late date of Daniel can be based upon the fact that he alone of all men in the long period from 550 B.C. to 600 A.D. is recorded to have followed the direction of Solomon.

As for the statement that Daniel prayed *three times a day*, the case for the critics is not much better. In Psalm lv, 18 the Psalmist says: "Evening and morning and at noon will I pray and cry aloud." In the heading this Psalm is ascribed to David; but the critics regard it as probably from the time of Jeremiah.²⁵ The next reference to the custom is found in the Acts of the Apostles (x, 9) a work written about 70 A.D.; so that if we suppose that Jeremiah died about 550 B.C. there were at least 620 years between these two solitary allusions to the custom that the critics can find outside of Daniel. As far as this custom is concerned it is evident, therefore,

²² Daniel ix, 3, 4, 5 compared with 1 Kings viii, 28, 47, and 23.

²³ Thus Hitzig, *Com. on Daniel*, p. 94; Bevan, *The Book of Daniel*, p. 111.

²⁴ *L.O.T.*, p. 199.

²⁵ Prince, *Com.*, p. 126.

that Daniel may have been written at any time between 550 B.C. and 70 A.D. In other words the custom proves nothing as to the date of the book.

Fasting

Cornill makes the importance placed upon *fasting* in Daniel another evidence of its late date. In favour of this importance he cites ix, 3 and x, 3. The former reads: "And I set my face unto the Lord God, to seek by prayer and supplications, with fasting and sackcloth and ashes." The latter reads, beginning with verse two, "In those days I Daniel was mourning three full weeks. I ate no pleasant bread, neither came flesh nor wine in my mouth," etc. Cornill might have added vi, 18, where we read: "Then the king went to his palace and passed the night fasting: neither were instruments of music brought before him." In the first of these passages the Hebrew word for fasting is *šôm* from a root found in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Arabic. The verb is found twenty-one times in the Old Testament Hebrew, and the noun twenty-six times. Neither of them is found in the Hexateuch; but one or the other occurs in thirteen of the other books of the Old Testament (Jgs. 1, Sam. 8, Kgs. 3, Chr. 2, Ezra 2, Neh. 2, Est. 4, Isa. 7, Jer. 3, Joel. 3, Jon. 1, Zech. 7, Ps. 3, and Dnl. 1. In Isaiah it occurs only in chap. lviii, 3, 4, 5, and 6, where we find the verb three times and the noun four times. In Zechariah the verb occurs three times in chap. vii and the noun four times in chap. viii. In 2 Sam. xii, the verb is found four times and the noun once. In the literature classed by the critics as late, the verb is found once in Chronicles and that in a passage found also in Samuel, once in Ezra, once in Nehemiah, and twice in Esther; while the noun occurs once in Chronicles, once in Ezra, once in Nehemiah, twice in Esther, three times in Joel, once in Jonah, and three times in the Psalms. Altogether, therefore, even granting the claims of the critics as to the dates of the books, the verb occurs in the late literature five times as compared with sixteen in the earlier and the noun twelve as compared with fourteen times. According to the traditional view of the dates, the verb occurs in the early literature sixteen times and five times in the later literature, and the noun

eighteen or nineteen times in the one and eight or seven times in the other. It should be noticed that verb and noun occur eight times in Samuel, seven times in Zechariah vii-viii, seven times in Isaiah lviii. Wherein any special importance can be found in Daniel's single and appropriate act of fasting from which to determine the late date of the book named after him, the superman professor of Koenigsberg has not made known to us. Presumably, he has willed it thus to be and so it must be! When the lion roars, let all the beasts of the forest keep silence.

Our German professor has discovered another important act of fasting in chap. x, 3, where Daniel says that because he was mourning he ate no pleasant bread nor partook of meat or wine for three weeks. Surely no one but an eminent professor in the school of Kant could have the penetration into the evolution of nature and history to perceive that a man depressed with mourning might have abstained from his ordinary diet 2100 years ago but could not or would not have done so 2500 years ago. Nor is it clear to the writer how the phrase "I ate not, I drank not" could have been used by the Sumerian author of the Nimrod Epic²⁶ hundreds of years before the time of Darius the Mede and still could be an important factor in determining the late date of the Book of Daniel. Is it not probable that in all the ages since man has lived upon the earth deep grief has taken away the desire for the ordinary pleasures of the palate? Real mourning does not express itself in champagne suppers and pâtés de fois gras, and disgust with life has driven many a hermit to a lonely cave and a beggar's fare.

The third instance of fasting mentioned in Daniel (to which Cornill has failed to allude) is found in vi, 18, where Darius is said to have passed the night fasting because of the predicament of Daniel who had just been cast into the den of lions. Since this chapter is in Aramaic, the word for fasting is in Aramaic also, and is not found in Biblical Hebrew.²⁷ While the word is

²⁶ See Haupt, *Nimrod-Epos*, in *loco*.

²⁷ The root occurs in Arabic, where it means "to be hungry." In Syriac the verb means to "roast," but the noun has the sense of fasting. The usual word for fast in both Aramaic and Arabic is the same as the Hebrew *sum*.

not found in Babylonian, a parallel to the whole passage occurs in an inscription of Ashurbanipal where it says that Ishtar of Arbila said to him: "Where the place of Nebo is, eat food and drink wine, let music be made, and honour my divinity."²⁸ Numerous parallels can be found, also, in the *Arabian Nights*, which show clearly that to oriental kings eating and drinking and music were the ordinary means of distraction and dissipation. Abstinence from them was a sign of low spirits. Haroun ar Rashid is represented as frequently refusing these common enjoyments and as demanding some extraordinary means of relieving the gloom and ennui of life. That Darius should have been sorely grieved because of his friend Daniel was natural and commendable and that he should have abstained from the nightly routine of pleasures was to have been expected, because he was a man as well as a disgruntled king made helpless by his own thoughtless decree; but to assert that his fasting was an important event or an indication of the date of the book that records it, would be preposterous. It was simply human. Had he done otherwise, he would have been a monster.

The phrase "to afflict one's soul" which is employed in the so-called Holiness and Priestly codes as an equivalent of the words for fasting, is not found in Daniel; but even if it were, it would not indicate the late date of Daniel, inasmuch as the Holiness code at least is usually assigned by the critics to the time of the captivity.²⁹

The conclusion from the review of fasting, as far as it is mentioned in the Old Testament, can only be that the writer of Daniel does not attach an importance to it superior to that to be found in Samuel, Isaiah and Zechariah, and that no indication of date can be derived from the reference to it in Daniel. In works antedating the New Testament writings the only sure evidence (aside from the special "affliction of the soul" that characterized the services of the Day of Atonement) of any particular importance imputed to the act of fasting is to be found in the

²⁸ *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, II, p. 252.

²⁹ See Lev. xvi. 31, xxiii, 27, 29, 32, Num. xxix, 7. Compare Cornill, *Introduction* p. 132-36.

Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. This book according to Charles was written between 109 and 107 B.C.³⁰ According to this document "Reuben practices abstinence for seven years (i, 10), Simeon for two (iii, 4), and Judah till old age (xv, 4, xix, 2), in expiation of their sins. Joseph fasts seven years to preserve his chastity (iii, 4). Issachar in his righteousness and self-control abstains from wine all his life (vii, 3). The righteous man combines fasting with chastity (ix, 2), the double-hearted man superstitiously combines fasting and adultery, (ii, 8, iv, 3)." ³¹ None of the other pre-Christian writings even so much as mention fasting. To be sure, Charles finds in the second chapter of Tobit a fasting that had "not reached the culmination of its development." To show how far this fasting of Tobit's was from a culmination it is only necessary to quote the passage in full:

"When Esarhaddon was king I came home again, and my wife Anna was restored unto me, and my son Tobias. And at our feast of the Pentecost, which is the holy feast of the Weeks, there was a good dinner prepared for me; and I laid me down to dine. And the table was set for me, and abundant victuals were set for me, and I said unto Tobias my son, Go, my boy, and what poor man soever thou shalt find of our brethren of the Ninevite captives, who is mindful of God with his whole heart, bring him and he shall eat together with me; and lo, I tarry for thee, my boy, until thou come.

"And Tobias went to seek some poor man of our brethren and returned and said, Father. And I said to him, Here am I, my child. And he answered and said, Father, behold, one of our nation hath been murdered and cast out in the marketplace, and he hath but now been strangled. And I sprang up and left my dinner before I had tasted it, and took him up from the street and put him in one of the chambers until the sun was set, to bury him. Therefore I returned and washed myself, and ate food with mourning, and remembered the word of the prophet which Amos spake against Bethel, saying: Your feasts shall be turned into mourning, and all your ways into lamentation." ³²

The Oxford professor who can discern the undeveloped custom of fasting in this story of Tobit is evidently not the editor

³⁰ *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, II, p. 290.

³¹ *Id.*, p. 296, note to vs. 10.

³² Tobit, 1-6.

of *Punch* nor a lecturer on the humour of Dickens and Jerome K. Jerome. One can imagine him sitting down to an abundant repast in honour of the king of England's birthday, while a captive in Broussa or Iconium, and sending out a messenger to invite to his dinner some stranded countryman. The messenger returns with the terrifying announcement that while going out at the front gate he stumbled over the dead body of an Englishman just slain by the Bashi Bazouks. The nice fresh corpse is brought in. But the professor says in sang froid: On with the dinner. Let joy be unconfined. And so he gorges himself with soupe a la reine, and ros-bif and chilton cheese and plum pudding and gooseberry tart and a cup of Mocha with a glass of Benedictine and a Sumatra cigar (or a half dozen Memnon cigarettes), while the company drink their port and raise the rafters with the chorus: Britannia Rules the Waves. According to him Harpagus would have sent up his plate for some more little boy soup after he had been informed that the soup had been made from his own little boy; and Hannibal would have celebrated the unexpected arrival of the head of Asdrubal. As for your humble servant, he would have done as Tobit did. When Tobit saw the dead body of his countryman, he simply did not eat. Reader, what would you have done? And is it not absurd to express a belief that in this natural loss of appetite on the part of Tobit one can see the undeveloped germs of a custom of religious fasting for the good of one's soul?

Almsgiving

Another late custom which Cornill discerns as proving the late date of Daniel is that of Almsgiving. The only statement that can possibly support his view is the clause in iv, 24 (27) where Daniel advises Nebuchadnezzar to "break off his sins in righteousness and his iniquities by showing mercy to the poor." He follows the Septuagint, Peshitto, and Talmud by rendering the Aramaic word usually translated "righteousness" by "almsgiving," and then argues that this use of the word is later than the sixth century. In view of the use of this word in the Teima Aramaic inscription from the fifth century, it is doubtful if a

good case could be made against the early date of Daniel, even if it were admitted that the word meant almsgiving here in Daniel.³³ This, however, would not prove that it was used in this sense in Daniel, nor does the fact that the early translators into Greek and Aramaic interpreted it as meaning alms. No one disputes that when these translations were made the word had acquired this meaning. In fact, in Aramaic the common word for sin denoted originally "debt," and so the word for righteousness came to mean the means of getting rid of the debt by payment. It was a *quid pro quo* system of redemption; so much sin, so much righteousness, a system of indulgences on a universal scale. But that it is not so used in Dan. iv, 24 appears from the following reasons. First, righteousness or right conduct suits the connection. Secondly, a king would more naturally be asked to be righteous than to give alms. Thirdly, the parallel clause "showing mercy" favours the judicial rather than the beneficiary interpretation. Fourthly, many of the radical critics hold to the sense of righteousness.³⁴ Fifthly, in ix, 7, 16, 18, the only other places where Daniel employs the word, it is admitted by all to be used in the sense of righteousness, or righteous deeds.

Abstinence

The last custom which Cornill cites as indicating a late origin for Daniel is that of abstaining from flesh and wine in intercourse with the heathen.³⁵ In regard to this abstention Prince says that it is a "distinctly Maccabean touch."³⁶ "We have," he adds,

³³ Compare Bevan (*Commentary*, p. 94) who says that its use on the Teima inscription shows that the Aramaic word had acquired the sense of a "payment for religious purposes" long before the second century.

³⁴ So, Von Lengerke, *Das Buch Daniel*, p. 185; Prince, in his *Commentary*, p. 88, makes it mean "kind acts."

³⁵ *Introduction*, p. 288: Objection must be made to Cornill's translation of *patbag* by "flesh." In none of the derivations for this word suggested by the eminent Persian scholars and by the translators and lexicographers who have attempted to give its meaning is the sense confined to flesh. Prince's "dainties" is better but his "food" is better still, since the writer of Daniel defines it in verse 12 by *maⁿkal*, a term which means "anything that is eaten." The good old word "victuals" is, perhaps, as correct an equivalent as the English language affords.

³⁶ *Commentary on Daniel*, p. 61.

“only to refer to 1 Macc. i, 62-63 to see how such a defilement [as that of eating unclean food] was regarded by the pious Jews of that period. The persecuting Syrian king was particularly importunate against the ritualistic requirements of the Jewish Law and especially against the regulation forbidding the Jews to touch a strange food (see *l.c.* i, 60). The author of Daniel, therefore, in emphasizing this act of piety on the part of his hero, is plainly touching on a point of vital importance to his readers.”³⁷

Since this passage in First Maccabees is the only one in pre-Christian literature outside the Bible bearing upon uncleanness of food, we shall give it in full before proceeding to comment on the subject. We shall quote the passage from the 54th verse to the 64th, inclusive:

“And on the fifteenth day of Chislev in the one hundred and forty-fifth year [i.e., 168 B.C.] they set up upon the altar an abomination of desolation, and in the cities of Judah on every side they established high places; and they offered sacrifices at the doors of the houses and in the streets. And the books of the Law which they found they rent in pieces and burned them in the fire. And with whomsoever was found a book of the covenant, and if he was consenting unto the Law, such an one was, according to the king’s sentence, condemned to death. Thus did they in their might to the Israelites who were found month by month in their cities. And on the twenty-fifth day of the month they sacrificed upon the altar which was upon the altar of burnt-offering. And, according to the decree, they put to death the women who had circumcised their children, hanging their babes round their (mothers’) necks, and they put to death their (entire) families, together with those who had circumcised them. Nevertheless, many in Israel stood firm and determined in their hearts that they would not eat unclean things, and chose rather to die so that they might not be defiled with meats, thereby profaning the holy covenant; and they did die.”

Upon this passage from Maccabees it may be remarked:

1. It is the only place in the book in which unclean foods are mentioned.
2. Abstention from wine is not expressed in it.
3. It was the law as a whole and in all its parts that Antiochus

³⁷ *Id.*, p. 61, 62.

was attempting to destroy, the laws against eating certain meats being only a part of it.

4. The laws about clean and unclean animals occur in Deut. xiv, as well as in Lev. xi. They were in existence, therefore, according to the critics, before the sixth century B.C., so that they would be as binding on Jews in Babylon in the time of Nebuchadnezzar as on those in Palestine in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes.

5. A strange inconsistency is latent in this assumption of the anti-biblical critics with regard to the alleged emphasis placed upon unclean foods in the second century B.C. It is a fundamental assumption of those who believe in the natural evolution of religion that fetichism and totemism, with their involved distinctions of holy and unholy, clean and unclean, are to be found in the first stages of religious development, and yet these critics of Daniel would have us believe that the importance attached to it arose in the second century B.C! To carry one point they argue that the distinction is among the earliest of all customs. To carry another point, they argue that it is among the latest.

6. There was no more reason for a pious Jew's abstention from unclean meats in the second century B.C. than there was in the sixth. The Law of God was just as binding at the earlier as at the later period. And this Law, according to the critics themselves, contained the injunctions and regulations with regard to clean and unclean animals and with regard to the eating of blood. According to these same critics the man Daniel is represented in the book named after him as a pious Jew living in Babylon in the sixth century B.C., but the ignorant author makes him in fact live like a pious Jew of the time of the Maccabees. No proof of this opinion can be found either in the law or the custom of abstention from unclean animals. Besides, the inscriptions of Nebuchadnezzar clearly show that no man was ever a more ardent and faithful and munificent worshipper of the gods than he and hence would be more likely than he to require conformity to the religious customs prevailing in his palace. The numerous temples which he built or renovated and the bountiful gifts with which he endowed them are the theme of his tireless boastings and

the ground of his repeated prayers. In some cases he has enumerated his donations toward the support of the temple service. Thus in the Grotfend Cylinder³⁸ he says that he had increased his fat offerings and clean freewill offerings to Marduk, among which he names "for every day one fat ox, a perfect ox, . . . fish, birds, various kinds of vegetables, honey, butter, milk, the best oil and a dozen different kinds of wine and strong drink," which he made to abound "upon the table of Marduk and Zarpinat my (his) Lords." In the same inscription, he is said to have offered substantially the same things to Nebo and Nana. Now, from what we know of all ancient nations and their religions we are certain that they all had rules as to what was a proper offering to make to the gods and how it should be offered. Their offerings were usually the best of what they allowed themselves. Reasoning from analogy, it is certain that the Babylonian court would have its etiquette and the priests their observances, and that every courtier and servant of the king would be compelled to submit to them, especially if he had an order of the king to that effect. Daniel and his three companions at court were therefore in an apparently inescapable dilemma. They must either obey the law of their God or obey the king. By a permissible subterfuge they circumvented the king. By confining themselves to a diet of cereals and, possibly, fruits and herbs, they escaped the danger of eating blood, eels, swans, and other unclean things, and of drinking strong or mixed drinks, perhaps mixed with blood; and especially they avoided the outward appearance of honouring the gods to whom possibly all of the meats and drinks on the king's table had first been offered.³⁹ In short, so true to what the life of a pious Jew at the court of Nebuchadnezzar in Daniel's circumstances must have been is this first chapter, that the author of it, if he really lived in the second century, must have had the genius of an historical novelist of the first order. The injunction about clean and unclean foods

³⁸ *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, III, II, 32 f.

³⁹ So, at least, thinks Hitzig: "Sie wollten keine Speise geniessen, von der möglicher Weise den Götzen geopfert werden, oder die vielleicht noch obendrein von einem unreinen Thier herrührte" (*Das Buch Daniel*, p. 10.)

had been given long before the sixth century. The observance of the injunction by a pious Jew of the sixth century was to be presupposed. Daniel is represented as such a pious Jew. Therefore he must have observed the injunction. And consequently, to use the statement that Daniel observed this injunction as an argument for the late date of the book is absurd.

POSITIVE EVIDENCE OF EARLY DATE

Thus far we have been on the defensive with regard to the customs referred to in Daniel which are said to have been emphasized, also, in the time of the Maccabees and thus to indicate an origin of Daniel at that time. Now, before concluding this matter, a few offensive, or offensive-defensive, counter charges along this line of customs must be made.

The Law

Take, for example, the custom of magnifying the importance of the Law which is the outstanding feature of First Maccabees and Jubilees, and compare it with the fact that the Law is never mentioned in Daniel except in ix, 11 and 13.⁴⁰ Jubilees is really a sort of commentary on the laws of Moses, and First Maccabees again and again represents the great war of liberation as a revolt against the attempt of Antiochus Epiphanes and his successors to suppress the Law and to Grecize the Jews. Thus in 1 Macc. i, 42, Epiphanes writes to his whole kingdom that everyone should give up his usages, and letters from the king were sent to Judea to the effect that they should practice foreign customs, cease the offerings in the sanctuary, profane the Sabbaths, feasts, and sanctuary, build high-places, sacred groves, shrines for idols, sacrifice swine and other unclean animals, and leave their sons uncircumcised, *so that they might forget the Law*. In accordance with this decree, high places were established in the cities, sacrifices were offered at the doors of the houses and in the streets, the books of the Law were rent in pieces and burnt, whoever had a copy of the Law was put to death, and the women

⁴⁰ In verse 10 the laws of the prophets are spoken of.

who had circumcised their children were put to death with their families.⁴¹ In ii, 21, Mattathias proclaimed the principle of the rebels when he said with a loud voice: Heaven forbid that we should forsake the Law and the ordinances. He showed his zeal for the Law by killing the king's officer who had come to Modin to enforce the king's decree and fled to the mountains after he had cried: Let everyone that is zealous for the Law and that would maintain the covenant come forth after me.⁴² Afterwards there were gathered unto him the mighty men who willingly offered themselves for the Law,⁴³ and they went round about and pulled down altars and circumcised children by force and rescued the Law out of the hand of the Gentiles.⁴⁴ In his great speech delivered just before his death he says among other things: "My children, be zealous for the Law and give your lives for the covenant of your fathers, be strong and show yourselves men on behalf of the Law, take all who observe the Law and avenge the wrong of your people, and render a recompense to the Gentiles and take heed to the commandments of the Law."⁴⁵ After the death of Epiphanes, when his commander Lysias wanted to make peace with the Jews, he said: "Let us settle with them that they be permitted to walk after their own laws as aforetime; for because of their laws which we abolished were they angered and did all these things."⁴⁶ In comparing the references to the Law and laws in Daniel with what is said in Maccabees, it must be noticed, also, that in the former it is the wilful transgressions of them by the fathers that are always in mind; whereas in Maccabees, it is the attempted annulment of them by an alien, and an enforced transgression of them by the living Israelites to which allusion is made.

Circumcision and Sabbath

What is true of the Law in general is true of circumcision and the Sabbath in particular. First Maccabees contains numerous and scattered references to the Sabbath and one to the sabbatic

⁴¹ i, 44-61.

⁴² ii, 19-28.

⁴³ ii, 42.

⁴⁴ ii, 45-48.

⁴⁵ ii, 49-68.

⁴⁶ vi, 55-60. For other references to the Law and the laws, see iii, 29, 48, 56; iv, 42, 47, 53; x, 14; xi, 21; xiii, 3; xiv, 14, 29.

year, and the first two chapters describe at length the endeavours to suppress the usage of circumcision and on the part of apostate Jews to conceal even its traces; whereas Daniel never mentions either Sabbath or circumcision. If Daniel were a fiction with Maccabean background, it certainly seems a great defect that the author failed to show how his heroes refused to work on the Sabbath day or that they were tempted to hide their circumcision.

Elephants and Phalanx

One other feature that is conspicuous in the background of the Maccabees is utterly ignored in Daniel, that is the use of the phalanx and of elephants in war. The Egyptian, Assyrian, Babylonian, and Persian armies never employed the elephant; and in harmony with this fact, the books of the Old Testament never mention it. Alexander the Great was the first of the Greeks to come in contact with the elephant as an instrument of warfare. This was in his battle with Porus in the Punjab. Seleucus Nicator introduced it first in the battles of Western Asia. Pyrrhus and the Carthaginians used it in their wars with Rome and it continued to be a much dreaded arm of service until at the command of Scipio Africanus the Romans at the battle of Zama which sealed the fate of Carthage discomfited his great rival Hannibal by opening up the legions so that the elephants would pass between the serried ranks. In the wars against Antiochus the Romans triumphed by using the same tactics, and we hear nothing of their use in battle after the fall of Carthage and of the Seleucid kingdom. In the wars of Antiochus Epiphanes and his successors against the Jews, however, they were still the main arm of the service and at first they struck terror into their rebellious adversaries. Eleazar, one of the brothers of Judas Maccabeus, was crushed by the falling on him of an elephant which he had stabbed from underneath in an endeavour to kill the king.⁴⁷ They are mentioned, also, elsewhere⁴⁸ as constituent and important parts of the Syrian armies.

The phalanx, that great Greek rival of the Roman legion, was

⁴⁷ 1 Macc. vi, 36-46.

⁴⁸ In i, 17, iii, 34; viii, 6; and xi, 56.

the ordinary formation of the heavy armed troops of the Syrian as well as the Macedonian armies, and the word is found in 1 Macc. vi, 35, 38, 45; ix, 12; and x, 82. In Daniel, however, neither elephant nor phalanx is mentioned, but simply the old time horses and chariots of the Persian and pre-Persian period. It seems to be incumbent on the critics to explain how an artist of the ability of the writer of Daniel could be so correct in some parts of his background and so defective in others,—that is, if this artist really lived in the second century, and painted the background of his fiction with the colours of his time. This wonderful accuracy of his in describing what existed in the sixth century confirms us in our belief that the author of the book really lived in that period. For we cannot see how one who was so ignorant of the history of Babylon, Persia, and Greece, as the critics assert that this author was, could have known that the elephants and phalanxes were not in existence in the time of which he feigned the history. He is supposed (?) to err on such important and easily ascertained matters as who was the last king of Babylon, who was Darius the Mede, and how many were the kings of Persia, and yet he knows enough about their times to steer clear of any mention of elephants in his description of the great army of the king of the north referred to in xi, 40. He describes so accurately the history of the wars between the Ptolemies and Seleucids that the critics say that the account must have been written *post eventum*, and yet he knows so little of their armies as to speak of their chariots, and horsemen, and fleet and never mention their phalanxes and their elephants.

Sealing Documents

One other custom is mentioned in Daniel which seems eminently fitted to a Babylonian background in the sixth century B.C., but for which we will look in vain in the Palestine of the second century. This is the custom of closing and sealing documents. As is well known, the Babylonian clay tablet or brick was first prepared and inscribed and then was covered with an envelope of clay upon which a docket or endorsement was written, and

the whole was stamped with a seal.⁴⁹ The statements of Dan. viii, 26 and xii, 4, 9 would then be clear. Daniel's visions were to be written on tablets, closed up, and sealed, until the time of the end.⁵⁰ The endorsement on the envelope may have directed when the tablet was to be uncovered. Two tablets of the size of the Creation Tablets would contain the whole of Daniel. The first tablet may have contained the part in Aramaic and the second that in Hebrew (i.e., chapters viii-xii) or there may have been nine or ten tablets. The injunction of the prophetic writer to keep the vision secret would then be not a "mere literary device to explain to the readers of Daniel why the book was not known before their time"; but it would be a real part of the vision, repeated on the endorsement, and designed as it says to preserve the contents of the vision from the prying eyes of the curious. That the keeping of the contents of a document "hidden from immediate posterity" was not a difficulty in the view of "the oriental mind" is apparent from the fact that the contents of their contract tablets were concealed by their envelopes from all prying eyes, until the time of breaking off the envelope arrived. That time would be determined either by the instructions on the envelope or by the decision of the custodians or judges. The Assyrian and Babylonian tablets were preserved in the archives of the temples, palaces, and banks. Daniel's tablets would naturally be entrusted to the care of the proper Jewish custodians, to be opened according to the instruction given in the endorsement, or docket, which was inscribed on the envelope. If in chap. xii, 11 we read *daleth* instead of *resh* giving us *husad* instead of *husar*, the endorsement may have read that the tablet

⁴⁹ It is possible that the Babylonian word *šatam*, used to denote an official of the temples, may be derived from the root "to close, or shut up." The man who closed up the inside tablet and endorsed and sealed it would be a more important individual than the scribe who wrote the document. Hommel's translation "secretary" would be a very good equivalent. One *šatam* might have a dozen tablet-writers under him, it being his business to read over, and close up, endorse, and seal the letters and contracts.

⁵⁰ One is tempted to take the word *keš*, usually meaning *end*, as an infinitive from *kašas* meaning "to break off," and to translate "until the time of breaking off," i.e., of taking off the clay envelope which contained the tablet on which the vision was written.

was to be opened 1290 years after the daily offering had been instituted at Sinai. If Daniel and the custodians dated this institution at Sinai at 1460 B.C., the time for the opening would be 170 B.C. If the text as it stands is preferred and the 1290 days be interpreted as literal days, it might mean, as Bevan suggests,⁵¹ 1290 days after the desecration of the temple and the taking away of the daily offerings. In 2 Macc. ii, 14, Judas is said to have collected all the writings which had been scattered owing to the outbreak of the war. Among these writings the Book of Daniel may have been found with the tablets still in their original envelopes which may then have been broken, and the book translated, and published. Whatever may be said of this conjecture, it is certainly as sensible as many of those put forward by commentators. It would eliminate all objections made to the early date of Daniel, in so far as they are based upon the character of the language in which the book is written.

⁵¹ *Commentary*, p. 207.

CHAPTER VIII

THE PROPHECIES OF DANIEL

THE FOURTH KINGDOM

It is assumed by the critics that the fourth kingdom of Daniel is the Greek instead of the Roman empire.¹ This involves the further assumption that not merely xi, 20-45 but also ii, 31-34, 40-43, vii, 9, 19-27, viii, 9-14, 23-26 refer to Antiochus Epiphanes.

The assumption that Alexander and his successors, especially the kingdom of the Seleucids, represent the fourth kingdom of Daniel, depends on the further assumption that the second kingdom was Median, an assumption that has no foundation in the Book of Daniel.² To be sure Darius is called a Mede (vi, 1), and is said to have received the kingdom of Belshazzar; and the two horns of the ram spoken of in viii, 20 are said to denote the kings of Media and Persia. But since Belshazzar was not king of Media but of Babylon and probably of Accad and Chaldea, it is to be presumed that Darius the Mede received the kingship over that comparatively small part of the empire of Cyrus that had been ruled over by Belshazzar the Chaldean. There is absolutely no foundation for the assertion of the critics that Daniel makes Darius the Mede to have ruled over Babylon before the accession of Cyrus.³ He is said in vi, 1 to have "received" (*kābbel*) the kingdom and from whom could he have received it except from Cyrus?⁴

¹ Prince, *Commentary on Daniel*, p. 71.

² For a full discussion of the assumption that the second kingdom was Median the reader is referred to the writer's *Studies in the Book of Daniel*, Series One, pp. 128-238.

³ So Bevan, *Commentary on Daniel*, p. 20.

⁴ The verb *kābbel* means "receive," not "take by force." Brockelmann in his Syriac Dictionary renders it by *accepit*, that is *annehmen*, not *einnehmen*. In the Targum of Onkelos, it always has the sense of "receive," the sense of "taking by force" being expressed by *kevash* and *'ehad*.

In ix, 1, it is said that Darius was *made* king (*homlak*) over the realm of the Chaldeans. Who could have made him king but Cyrus? Hitzig, indeed, says that this does not mean merely that he was made king by God, but that he must by human action have been made king of Babylon and that this action was taken by the army led by Cyrus.⁵ It seems convenient for Bevan and Prince to ignore these two passages in their discussions of Darius the Mede, an admirable way for a special pleader to escape the necessary conclusion to be derived from indisputable evidence against his side of the case!⁶ They confuse the issue by making long dissertations on irrelevant matters connected with the Median kingdom of Deioces and his successors down to Astyages whom Cyrus overthrew. For example, Prince affirms, that "Babylon was captured by Cyrus the Persian, who, sometime previously, had obtained possession of Media and its king Astyages."⁷ He then discusses the theory formerly advanced by some that Darius the Mede was "identical with Cyaxares, son of Astyages, mentioned in Xenophon's *Cyropædia*."⁸ He then compares "the data of Xenophon regarding the last Median kings with those of Herodotus on the same subject," and notices in passing that "neither Berosus nor any other ancient author knows of a Median ruler after the fall of Babylon."⁹ He next states that the *Annals* of Nabonidus and the *Cyrus Cylinder* make no mention "of any ruler of Media between Astyages and Cyrus nor of any king of Babylon intervening between Nabonidus and Cyrus."¹⁰ He then continues to discourse at length on the Cyaxares of Xenophon, the Darius of Eusebius, and the coin *darik*, and gives a résumé of the history of Media from Deioces to Cyaxares and finally gives his views as to the probable origin of the conception of Darius the Mede as given in Daniel.¹¹ He concludes by saying

⁵ *Commentary on Daniel*, p. 145.

⁶ Bevan assumes that *kabbel* means "take possession," (*Comm.*, p. 109), but he does not attempt to prove it.

⁷ *Commentary on Daniel*, p. 44.

⁸ *id.* pp. 45, 46.

⁹ *id.* p. 47.

¹⁰ *id.* p. 48.

¹¹ *id.* pp. 48-55.

that Darius the Mede "appears therefore to have been a product of a mixture of traditions" of the "destruction of Nineveh by the Medes" and of the "capture of Babylon by Darius Hystaspis,"¹² and thinks that "it seems apparent that the interpolation of Darius the Mede must be regarded as the most glaring inaccuracy in the Book of Daniel."¹³

THE SECOND KINGDOM NOT MEDIAN

We readily give Professor Prince the credit of having produced the most scholarly and up to date presentation of the case of the critics *versus* Daniel that has so far been published. We think that most of his statements as to facts are undeniable, that Cyrus did conquer Babylon, that Xenophon and Herodotus differ as he says, that Berosus and the other ancient authors know nothing of a Median ruler after the fall of Babylon, that the Annals of Nabonidus and the Cyrus Cylinder make no mention of a Median king of Babylon, that there is doubt as to who the Cyaxares of Xenophon was and as to the Darius of Eusebius; but he will pardon us for the inability to perceive that his views and conclusions are justified by the facts and the evidence that he has produced. Our reasons for differing from his conclusions are the following:

1. All authorities are agreed that Cyrus took Babylon. Herodotus and Xenophon say so expressly. Isaiah implies it. The Cyrus Cylinder confirms it, but adds that his general Gubaru took it for him and that Cyrus himself did not enter the city till four months later. Gubaru, according to the Cylinder, was made "governor" (in Aramaic *malaka* "king") of the city by Cyrus, a position which he seems to have held for at least twelve years.¹⁴

2. Whether there was a Cyaxares the son of Astyages and what his relationship to Cyrus may have been, are interesting

¹² *id.* p. 55.

¹³ *id.* p. 56.

¹⁴ See tablet published by Pinches in *The Expository Times* for 1915.

questions; but the Book of Daniel says nothing bearing directly on either question.¹⁵

3. Since Daniel does not say that a Median king independent of Cyrus ruled over Babylon after the Chaldean empire was destroyed, the silence of Berosus and other ancient authors on this subject agrees with the silence of Daniel. The statement that Darius was a Mede no more proves that he was king of Media than does the statement that Napoleon was a Corsican prove that he was king of Corsica. Besides he may have been a king of Media and still have been subordinate to Cyrus king of Persia. Murat was a Frenchman who was made king of Naples and was subordinate to a Corsican Italian who had become emperor of the French.¹⁶

4. Prince points out that the Annals of Nabonidus and the Cyrus Cylinder make no mention of a ruler of Media between Astyages and Cyrus. In this they agree with Daniel.

5. The Annals of Nabonidus and the Cyrus Cylinder are said to make no mention of any king of Babylon intervening between Nabonidus and Cyrus. To this statement we take exception because of the ambiguity of both terms of the phrase "king of Babylon," and because of the use of the word "intervening." As

¹⁵ Since the *Ku* of the Greek Kuaxares corresponds to *Eva* in the Persian cuneiform of the Behistun inscription, it might be possible that the Hebrew and Aramaic Ahasuerus represents the *avares* of Cyaxares. In this case, Darius the Mede would be the son of Cyaxares, the son of Astyages, the son of Cyaxares; or he might be descended from the father of Astyages. In the Behistun Inscription the Median claimants to the throne call themselves the sons of Cyaxares. If Darius the Mede were the son of Cyaxares the son of Astyages, he could be called "of the seed of Media," that is, of the royal family of Media, without his father or himself having really been king of Media.

¹⁶ Again Darius the Mede may have been the son of Cyaxares, predecessor of Astyages, king of Media. Since he was sixty-two years old when he was made king of Babylon (by Cyrus?), he would have been born in 600 B.C. If Sayce is right in supposing that Astyages was a Scythian who conquered Media, Darius the Mede may have been the heir of Cyaxares. The defection of the Medes under Harpagus during the battle between Astyages and Cyrus would be accounted for if we could be certain that Astyages was a Scythian conqueror of the Medes. The Medes in this case were simply going over to their kinsmen the Persians and throwing off the yoke of the foreign despot who had subdued them.

has been shown elsewhere,¹⁷ the Aramaic word for king may denote the son of a king, the ruler of a city, of a province, or of an empire. Babylon, also, may mean the city of Babylon, or the lower region of the Euphrates-Tigris valley, or the whole Babylonian empire. Now, it is true that the records of Nabonidus and Cyrus do not mention a king of the empire as intervening between Nabonidus and Cyrus; but the records of Nabonidus and Cyrus do speak of many kings as reigning in subordination to them. Thus, in the Abu-Habba Cylinder (I, 45), Nabonidus refers to the kings, princes, and governors which the gods had made subject to him, and in I, 27, speaks of Astyages and the kings who helped him; and Cyrus in his Cylinder Inscription says that all the kings from the upper to the lower sea came to Babylon and kissed his feet. In the Chronicle, also, the kings of the sea-land (i.e. Phenicia) who were subject to Nabonidus are mentioned.¹⁸ In the Abu-Habba Cylinder, (I, 29), Cyrus king of the land of Anzan is called the "little servant of Astyages." In the Chronicle (lines 15-17), Cyrus king of Persia is said to have crossed the Tigris below Arbela and to have killed a king who must have been a sub-king to Nabonidus, king of Babylon. Nerglissar in the Cambridge Cylinder (I, 14) calls himself the son of Belshumishkun king of Babylon. This Belshumishkun must have been king of the city of Babylon at some time when Nabopolassar or Nebuchadnezzar was king of the empire; for the Chaldean empire began in 626 B.C., and the reign of Nerglissar began in 559 B.C.¹⁹ It is probable that a son of Nabonidus of the same name and title as his father was king of Harran while his father and overlord was still reigning as king of the empire of Babylon.²⁰ Belshazzar is treated as king when his name is used in an oath along with that of his father. Besides, his father invokes

¹⁷ *Studies in the Book of Daniel*, Series One, pp. 90-94.

¹⁸ Reverse 3.

¹⁹ Of course if he were sixty-seven or over when he began to reign, his father may have been king of Babylon before Nabopolassar. In this case he must have been sub-king to Shamashshumukin or to Ashurbanipal king of Assyria; for the latter was overlord of Babylon till his death in 626 B.C.

²⁰ See the Eshki-Harran Inscription edited by Pognon.

the gods to bless him just as he invokes them to bless himself. Antiochus in like manner joins his son Seleucus with him and expressly calls his son king.²¹ The "son of the king" who commanded Nabonidus' armies in Accad was probably Belshazzar and in the 10th year of Nabonidus this son seems to have been made governor (Aramaic, *malka* "king") of Erech.²² He would be the natural successor in the kingship over Babylon as soon as his father was made prisoner by Cyrus at Sippar. Gubaru the governor (*pihu*) of the land of Gutium took Babylon for Cyrus and was then made governor (*pihu*) of the city of Babylon, a position which he seems to have been occupying as late as the 4th year of Cambyses.²³ Finally Cyrus and Cambyses were both kings of Babylon at once.²⁴

The above evidence proves that Nabonidus, Astyages, and Cyrus were all kings of kings, and that in the two accredited instances of Belshumishkun and Cambyses these sub-kings were called on the Babylonian monuments and in the Babylonian language king (*sharru*) of Babylon. Gubaru, also, although he is not called *sharru* is called *shaknu* of Babylon and this would in Aramaic be equivalent to *malka* "king" of Babylon. "Out of the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established." The necessity for supposing that, if Daniel is true, there must have been a king *intervening* between Nabonidus and Cyrus does not exist. Like many other objections to the statements of the Bible, it is not merely unsupported by the evidence we possess, but is absolutely contrary to it.

6. Who the Cyaxares of Xenophon may have been, or whether he existed at all, is a question of importance for students of Xenophon, or historians of Media or Cyrus; but we agree with Professor Prince that there is not sufficient evidence to justify us in supposing that he was the same as Darius the Mede of Daniel. The same may be said of the Darius of Eusebius.

7. As to the word *darik*, it is now generally agreed that it has

²¹ *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, III, 11, 139.

²² *Id.*, 133.

²³ cf. Footnote 14 *supra*.

²⁴ See, *Studies in the Book of Daniel*, Vol. 1. 132f.

probably no connection with the name Darius; since it occurs in a contract tablet from the reign of Nabonidus.²⁵

The conclusion, then, to be derived from this long discussion of Darius and the Medes is that Darius the Mede is one of the hundreds of sub-kings who reigned over parts of the great empires of the Assyrians, Babylonians, Medes, and Persians, whose name has been rescued from oblivion because of his connection with the prophet Daniel. Who he was and what he was we may never definitely determine. Most probably, he was either the same as Gubaru to whom Cyrus entrusted the government of Babylon immediately after its capture, or a greater sub-king who ruled over Media as well as Assyria and Babylonia and Chaldea, or a subordinate of Gubaru who we know was governor of Gutium before he was given the government of Babylon. But, whoever he was and whatever the extent of his government, there is no intimation in Daniel, or elsewhere, that he ever ruled over an independent kingdom, or that he ever was king of the Medes, or that his kingdom intervened between that of Nabonidus and Cyrus. Consequently, that the second empire of Daniel was that of the Medes is a figment of the critics' imagination. With no evidence in support of its existence, it should be dropped from all serious discussion of the meaning of the predictions of Daniel.

Having thus ruled out the supposititious Median empire, the four kingdoms of Daniel's visions will be the Babylonian, the Persian, the Greek, and the Roman, as has been held by most of the ablest Christians interpreters from the earliest times to the present.²⁶

DARKNESS AND LIGHT IN DANIEL'S PREDICTIONS

It is assumed by the critics, (1) that the part of Daniel which treats of the Ptolemies and Seleucids down to the year of the

²⁵ Strassmaier: *Inschriften von Nabonidus*, 1013, 26.

²⁶ It seems, also, to have been the view of our Lord; for he speaks of "the abomination of desolation spoken of by the prophet Daniel" as being about to be fulfilled in its true import in the time future to his own (Matt. xxiv, 15). No new evidence has appeared since the old commentaries were written that could cause us to change the traditional interpretation. On the contrary, the new evidence is preponderatingly in favour not merely of the historicity of Daniel, but of the old view of the meaning of his predictions.

death of Antiochus Epiphanes is substantially correct, and (2) that all before and after this is enveloped in darkness.²⁷

1. With the first statement, all conservative scholars will agree. The part of Daniel concerned with Antiochus Epiphanes is correct as far as we can judge, but it is frequently enveloped in the same kind of darkness that is supposed to characterize the rest of the book. In their commentaries, the radical critics admit this "darkness." In their attempts at interpretation of the passages referred to Epiphanes, they indulge in such words as "probable," "incorrect," author's "ignorance of facts," and obscurity "owing to our ignorance regarding the history of Israel at this period."²⁸ They disagree among themselves and resort to many violent changes of the text in order to make it suit their conception of what it ought to be. The most damning evidence of their inability to make the account of Antiochus Epiphanes harmonize with their view of the date of Daniel occurs in xi, 40-45. DeWette-Schrader put the time of writing Daniel at between 167 and 164.²⁹ Driver at some time about 168 B.C.;³⁰ and Cornill asserts that it must have been written between the end of December 165 and June 164, thus probably in January 164.³¹ But the commentators of the radical school say that the campaign against Egypt spoken of in verses 40-43 never occurred.³² Yet we are expected to believe that the people of Israel were such a lot of innocents (?) and ignoramuses as to accept shortly after it was written this book as a genuine and authentic work of a great prophet living 400 years before! It was, says Cornill, "the work of a pious Jew, loyal to the Law, of the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, who was animated with the desire to encourage and support his persecuted and suffering comrades."³³ Bevan asserts that "everything combines to show that the Book of Daniel is, from beginning to end, an exhortation addressed to the pious Israelites in the days of the great religious

²⁷ Bevan, *Comm.* p. 162; Cornill, *Introduction*, p. 384.

²⁸ See Prince, *Commentary*, pp. 171-188.

²⁹ *Einleitung*, p. 507.

³⁰ *L.O.T.*, p. 497.

³¹ *id.*, p. 390.

³² Prince, p. 186; Bevan, p. 198.

³³ *Introduction*, p. 388.

struggle under Antiochus Epiphanes." ³⁴ Prince makes it a "consolation to God's people in their dire distress at the time of Antiochus Epiphanes." ³⁵ Bevan asserts that it was "read aloud in public." ³⁶ All are agreed that it was known in the Maccabean times, for the author of First Maccabees cites from it. ³⁷

And yet, we are asked to believe, that those men who had lived through the whole reign of Epiphanes and must have known all about his various campaigns accepted a work as historical and its predictions as having been fulfilled, when it speaks of a whirlwind conquest of Egypt which never took place at all! Why, it is fifty-three years since the American war of secession, and there are tens of thousands of us now living who were boys in 1865 and thousands of veterans of the blue and of the grey who would laugh to scorn a historian who attempted to palm off on us a third Bull Run, or to add to the campaign of Antietam and Gettysburg a third great invasion of the Northern States under the command of General Lee! But if the historian camouflaged himself as a prophet of the Lord and sought to encourage us in these troublous times by stating that in his third campaign, Lee had captured Washington, Baltimore, and Philadelphia, but had suddenly turned back across the Potomac because of rumours which he had heard from the west and from the south, we would peremptorily reject his whole series of stories and visions as a tissue of lies and would refuse to be comforted by all his exhortations and consolations. We would inevitably conclude that a book claiming to have been written four hundred years ago and narrating the marvellous interventions of God in behalf of his people in the days of old and predicting the persecutions and triumphs of the nation in our own times for our encouragement and support was an impudent and baseless forgery, provided that we saw clearly that the author was incontrovertibly wrong in his alleged prognostications with regard to the events which were transpiring before our very eyes.

³⁴ *Comm.* p. 23.

³⁵ *Comm.* p. 24.

³⁶ *Comm.* p. 25.

³⁷ I Macc. ii, 59, 60.

But, one can hear the supermen of Germany and their English and American scholars cry out in amazement, "You must not suppose that the Jews of Maccabean times were men of intelligence like us of to-day. Our people have *die Kultur, la civilization*, the university professor, to guard them from the acceptance of such forgeries; but the Jews of Maccabean times were ignorant peasants, knowing nothing of criticism and sources." In such an opinion there is some measure of truth. The average man of to-day has doubtless more both of learning and scientific knowledge than the average man then possessed. But this is not a matter of education but of memory and common sense, and in these two particulars there is no evidence to show that the men of to-day are superior to what they were two thousand years ago. At that time, when there were fewer books, the memories of men were most highly cultivated. Besides, there never was a man not an idiot who did not remember the great events of his own life time.

Further, Daniel was not received by the common man alone, but by the leaders of the nation, by men like the Maccabees who had fought the armies of this same Antiochus Epiphanes and with zealous care had watched all his wicked machinations against their people from the beginning of his tyrannical conduct unto the end of his career. This was a time also when the Greek learning was spread all over the countries that had been conquered by Alexander. Most of the Old Testament books had already been translated into Greek by Jewish scholars who were competent for their task. It was the age when Jewish writers of ability like Aristobulus, and Jason of Cyrene, and the Ben Siras, and the writers of First and perhaps of Second Maccabees, and Wisdom and Judith and parts of Enoch flourished. The Jews of Egypt, Cyrene, Syria, Cyprus, and other parts of the Diaspora had adopted Greek as their language. A hellenizing party had arisen even in Palestine itself which was ready to accept the innovations imposed by the Syrian king and prided itself on its Greek citizenship and customs. Alexandria and Antioch with their teeming Jewish populations were already the rivals of Athens and the centres of Greek learning. The critics

of Alexandria were discussing the text of Homer and the works of Plato and Aristotle, and some at least of their Jewish scholars would be acquainted with their methods. Polybius, that great historian of Rome, was writing his unsurpassed discussion of how history should be written and condemning in unsparing terms the false statements of Timæus, Calisthenes and the others of their kind. In order to prevent interpolations, the works of Æschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides had been collected at Athens in a standard edition which later was secured through fraud by Ptolemy Philadelphus for his library at Alexandria. As to the sacred writings of the Jews, they were most certainly looked upon with the deepest veneration long before the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. This is attested, not merely by the fact that most of them at least had been translated into Greek before this time, but also by the fact that the astute tyrant saw the necessity of destroying the books if he would destroy the religion based upon them, and by the further fact that the Jews preferred death to the giving up of their sacred writings.

Now, the radical critics, without any direct evidence to support them, profess to believe that, into the midst of these sacred writings for which men readily died, a forged document of unknown authorship and (according to the critics) full of easily detected errors and of doctrines unrecognized in the Law and the other books of the Prophets was quietly admitted as a genuine and authentic writing of a prophet hitherto unknown to history. They would have us believe that this fictitious volume became immediately the model of a vast amount of similar literature and they admit that in the New Testament its influence is apparent almost everywhere and that "no writing of the Old Testament had so great a share in the development of Christianity."³⁸ They admit, also, that in early times its canonicity and truthfulness were never seriously disputed by Jews or Christians. Truly, the credulity of these critics is pitiable in its eccentricities! They cannot believe in miracles and predictive prophecy which involve nothing but a simple faith in a wise and mighty and merciful God intervening in behalf of his people for his own glory and

³⁸ Bevan, *Comm.*, p. 15, quoting Westcott.

their salvation; but they can believe that a lot of obstreperous and cantankerous Jews who through all their history from Jacob and Esau down to the present time have disagreed and quarrelled about almost everything, or nothing, could have accepted, unanimously and without a murmur, in an age when they were enlightened by the brilliant light of Plato's philosophy, and Aristotle's logic, and the criticism of the schools of Alexandria, a forged and fictitious document, untrue to the well remembered facts of their own experience and to the easily ascertained facts concerning their own past history and the history of the Babylonians, Medes, Persians, and Greeks of whom the author writes. Such a psychological improbability, devoid of any direct evidence in its support, let the critic believe if he can. Your unsophisticated servant prefers his belief in predictive prophecy to any such quixotic and sciolistic attempts to belittle and besmirch a book simply because we cannot understand the why and the how of all the extraordinary deeds and doctrines that are recorded there.

2. As to the second part of the assumption of the critics, to wit, that all the records of Daniel before the time of the Seleucids and after June 164 B.C., is "enveloped in darkness," the whole of the first volume of *Studies in the Book of Daniel* is intended to show that this is not true of the historical part which treats of the reigns of Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar, Darius the Mede, and Cyrus. As to the predictions which touch matters subsequent to June 164 B.C., the visions and interpretations of Daniel were no more veiled in darkness to those who lived in the sixth century B.C., than were those of Jacob, Moses, Balaam, Nathan, David, Isaiah, and Zechariah to those of their time, or than the predictions of Jesus, Peter, Paul, and John to the men of the first century A.D. The prophets, we are told on the highest authority, foretold many things which they themselves did not fully understand, let alone their hearers, but which they "desired to look into."³⁹ To the question of the disciples as to when the things of which Jesus spoke should be, the Lord replied: No man knoweth these things but the Father.⁴⁰

³⁹ 1 Peter i, 10, 11.

⁴⁰ Mat. xxiv, 3, 36.

The predictions of Daniel in regard to the resurrection, the judgment, the world kingdoms, and the Messiah, are no more obscure or difficult of interpretation than are some of those in the Gospels, the Epistles, and the Book of the Revelation of St. John. Of course, those who do not believe in God, nor in a revelation from God to man, nor in any superhuman prediction of future events, will reject alike the predictions of Daniel, Jesus, Paul, and John. But for those who call themselves Christians to deny the resurrection, the judgment, the second coming, and other predicted events, is absurd enough to make all the logicians in Hades laugh and all the angels weep. To reject a book from the sacred writings because it contains such statements with regard to the future, is to reject that in the book which most of all makes it sacred. For the distinguishing characteristic of sacred as contrasted with profane writings is this very fact, that they do contain, or are related to, such predictions. The most precious promises of the gospel from the protevangelium to the last verses of the Book of the Revelation of St. John all refer to that blessed future which now we see through a glass darkly, but where we are assured sorrow and sin and death shall be no more. To the true Christian those things to come are the brightest things in all the universe, the anchor of the soul sure and steadfast; but the god of this world has blinded the eyes of the children of disobedience, lest seeing with their eyes they should believe and be converted. Woe to the so-called Christian who under the pretence of a science falsely so-called denies the reality of revelation. Like Esau, he has sold his birthright of the hope of eternal glory for a mess of pottage, the beggarly elements of worldly wisdom and pride.⁴¹

THE IMPORTANCE OF ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES

The time has now arrived to grapple with the most insidious and treacherous attack that has been made upon the Book of Daniel. It is insidious because it claims to be philosophical and scientific. It is treacherous in so far as it is made by professing

⁴¹ For a thorough discussion of this subject, see Pusey's *Lectures on Daniel*, pp. 60-233.

Christians. A philosopher who believes that God wound up the universe, like a clock, and then let it run its course without any interference, must refuse to accept the Book of Daniel as true. So, also, must one who thinks that nothing contrary to the ordinary course of human or natural events can be proved by testimony. A scientist (or shall we say sciolist?) who thinks he knows that the laws of nature are binding on their Creator and that a modern chemist or psychologist or animal trainer can manipulate the elements, or the minds of men, or of lions, better than the Almighty, will not hesitate to reject Daniel because of the extraordinary events recorded there as having been wrought by God. But a Christian who necessarily accepts the principles of theism, and who consequently believes in God's intervention in the affairs of men, and in predictive prophecy as well as miracle, cannot refuse to accept the Book of Daniel as historical and reliable, as authentic, genuine, and veracious, simply because of the *character* of its predictions. Now, in works already published⁴² and elsewhere in this volume we have endeavoured to show, that the objections against Daniel based upon the alleged inaccuracy of its statements about the age of Nebuchadnezzar and Cyrus are unfounded, that the argument from silence as illustrated in Ecclesiasticus and other cases is fallacious, that the argument from Daniel's place in the present Hebrew Bible has no basis to rest on, and that the origin and influence of its ideas and its background including its language are in harmony with its claims to have been written in the sixth century B.C. in a Babylonian environment.⁴³ There remains but one important obstacle standing in the way of the Christian who desires to follow Christ and the apostles in their apparent acceptance of the Book of Daniel as being what it purports to be. It is the fact that Antiochus Epiphanes looms so high in the mind of the prophet. It is difficult to account for the prominence given to this "contemptible" monarch in the midst of a narrative that opens with an account of Nebuchadnezzar the king of great Babylon that he had built, that thinks Cyrus the founder of the Persian empire to be worthy of the merest reference, and that

⁴² Especially in *Studies in the Book of Daniel*, Series One (1916).

⁴³ See above, Introduction p. 5f.

alludes to Alexander the Great in the most cursory fashion. Why should Epiphanes be selected from all the successors of Alexander, the Ptolemies, the Seleucids, Perdiccas, Eumenes, Antigonus, Demetrius Poliorcetes, and the rest? Why should he be given forty verses, or more, of a book which barely squints at the Persian kings, and never gives but a glimmering intimation that the Roman fleets and legions were to become in his time the masters of the world? Why should a vision predicting with such accuracy and detail the campaigns of the kings of the North and the South never allude to that unequalled family of heroes who were to begin at Modin the liberation of God's people and scatter like the leaves of Vallombrosa the numerous and frequent hosts of deadly enemies who were to desolate the homes and attempt to suppress the religion of that Jehovah in whose name the prophet spoke? Why above all was his detailed vision to cease with the renovation of the temple and fade off into dim outlines when it passed beyond that time into the more distant vistas but the more glorious hopes of the Messianic kingdom? Why especially should he describe the true course of events in Epiphanes' expedition against Egypt till the year 169 and then picture another campaign which according to the critics never occurred at all?

These and similar questions have vexed the righteous souls of many who would like to believe in the real Daniel and who have no prejudices against the possibility of the kind of predictive prophecy alleged to be found in the book. They can accept the first six chapters which record the striking occurrences in the lives of Daniel and his companions. They can accept the principle of the possibility and the fact of divine revelation of future events. But they hesitate at accepting the whole, at least, of Daniel, because they see no good and sufficient reason why he should have narrated with such length and clearness the history of the Seleucids up to the death of Epiphanes and have given so much emphasis to the deeds of this tyrant while barely mentioning such superlatively and relatively important events as the resurrection, the judgment, and the kingdom of the Messiah.

Now, in order to remove this hesitation, it may seem to some sufficient to affirm our belief that these predictions might have been

made by God through Daniel, even though we could perceive no good reason for them. We think, however, that we can perceive a good and sufficient reason for them, one at least that justifies them in our estimation, and we shall proceed to state it, in order that if possible we may make the ways of God appear just to the men of little faith.

It appears to us, then, that the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes was one of the most important events in the history of the church. It can be rivalled only by the call of Abraham, the giving of the Law, the Captivity, and the Incarnation. Among all the crises to which the people of God have been subjected, it can be compared only with the dispersion in the time of Nebuchadnezzar. The return of the exiles had been definitely foretold by Jeremiah, and Jeremiah's prediction was known and pondered by Daniel.⁴⁴ He was not needed, nor was it given to him, to supplement the work of his great predecessor. But he performed a greater and more lasting service for the church. He showed clearly that all the tyrants of the earth were under the control of the God of heaven, that the kingdoms of this world were foreordained by Him and should at last be superseded by the Kingdom of the Messiah and his saints, and he encouraged the people not merely of his own time but of all time to be steadfast in the midst of fiery trials and deadly perils of all kinds in view of the certainty that God could and would eventually circumvent or crush the tyrants and deliver the innocent for time and for eternity.

Now, the deadliest peril that the church has ever confronted was the attempt of Antiochus Epiphanes to suppress it utterly. For reasons of state, and perhaps also of religion, he determined to enforce conformity of worship throughout his dominions. His plan of operations was the most astute that has ever been devised. He ordered the cessation of circumcision, the sign of the covenant between the people and their God and that which held them together as a race. He stopped the services in the temple and instituted in their stead the worship of Jupiter. He set up idol altars in every city and demanded that every Jew should sacrifice according to the heathen ritual which he had introduced. He commanded that the

⁴⁴ See Dan. ix, 2.

holy writings should be destroyed so that the laws and customs and institutions might be gradually but surely forgotten and eliminated. And for all who refused to accept these severe and stringent regulations and requirements he pronounced the penalty of death; whereas he crowned with honours and emoluments all who apostatized and renounced the God of their fathers. The result of his well calculated machinations was almost complete enough to equal the most sanguine expectations. Most of the Jewish people seem to have cast away without any apparent qualm the hereditary claims of race and country and religion, and to have grasped with eagerness the proffered hand of the subtle enemy of their faith. The blood-thirsty tyrant executed his threats of death upon all who opposed his will. Men, women, and children were ruthlessly slaughtered. Whole families were extirpated for the guilt of one of their number. The chosen people were on the point of being annihilated and the promises and the hopes of the covenant of being annulled for ever.

There never was, before or since, such a period of desperation and despondency in the history of the church. Pharaoh's aim had been to destroy the race, but the promise to Abraham had been fulfilled through Moses and Joshua. Nebuchadnezzar had carried the people captive and destroyed Jerusalem and the temple; but the sacred books had been preserved, apostasy was rare, and through God's servants, the kings of Persia, the people and the temple were at length restored to their former worship, as it had been foretold by the prophets. But, now, under Epiphanes, was attempted what had never been proposed by Babylonian conqueror or Persian friends, the entire destruction of people and religion at one fell blow. Prophecy had ceased. The tribes of Israel were scattered over the earth, some foreign cities like Alexandria and Antioch having more Jewish inhabitants than Jerusalem. The Holy Land was largely in possession of the Gentiles. The Jews themselves had become indifferent to the Law. The High Priests were murdering each other and one of them when deposed at Jerusalem built a rival temple in Egypt. The whole polity of the Jews was disintegrated, all their

fortresses and cities were in the hands of the enemy, they had no army and no leaders, and all seemed lost.

Then it was that one man stood up and defied the haughty king. His name was Mattathias. He lived at a village named Modin. The heathen had constructed an altar. The priest was ready to sacrifice the victim, when Mattathias slew him and made a fiery appeal to his fellow citizens to take arms against the tyrant. To hearten them, he called to mind the great deeds of their fathers and the faith that had inspired them. In the climax of his speech he referred to the fiery furnace and to Daniel in the den of lions. This recalled to them that their God could and would save those who put their trust in Him. They rallied round Mattathias and his five noble sons, the most valiant and able of them all. The pious sprang to arms and after many a hard fought fight the Syrians were overcome and the kingdom of the Jews was reëstablished under the Asmonean rulers. Had the attempt of Antiochus succeeded, the preparation for the coming of the Messiah could not have been completed. A people waiting for his appearing would not have been existent. A Diaspora eager to receive and disseminate the gospel would not have been ready. In short, the continuity of the church would have been destroyed, the records of the Old Testament might have disappeared as utterly as the archives of Tyre and the memoirs of Hannibal, the New Testament could not have been written, the life of Jesus would have been entirely different, the method of the early propagation of the gospel must have been altered and the whole plan of salvation changed.

But, it will be said, how did the time when these alleged predictions of Daniel were written affect all this? Only in this respect, that it affords sufficient reason for their having been made so many years before. Just as the deliverance of the three children from the fiery furnace and of Daniel from the lions' den on account of their faith in Israel's God gave Mattathias a fitting climax in his speech inciting the people to steadfastness in their trials, so the knowledge that their evil condition had been foretold nearly four hundred years before would strengthen the hearers' confidence that the rest of the prediction would be fulfilled in the overthrow

of the oppressor and in the ultimate triumph of the kingdom of God. The stupendous crisis justified the prediction; the prediction justified the expectation of deliverance. Because the hearers of Mattathias knew about the three children and Daniel, they were incited by Mattathias' speech to emulate their conduct and to imitate their faith. Because the learned leaders of the Jews believed that the visions were really those of Daniel, they accepted the book as true and received it as canonical. Had the history been fictitious, Mattathias would not have cited from it and the people would not have been roused by it. Had the visions not been considered genuine, the educated church of that day would not have acknowledged the book as holy and its teachings as divine. Had the book not been deemed authentic, it would have been condemned as a forgery and would have failed in that purpose of consolation and encouragement to which all critics ascribe the reason of its existence. Because both people and rulers and literati esteemed the book to be authentic, genuine, and veracious, they placed it among those holy writing for whose preservation they willingly gave up their lives.

No other satisfactory explanation of the canonization and influence of Daniel has ever been given. The theories that the Jews received into their canon all of their national literature, or all that was written in their own language, or all that was religious in character, all break down in view of the Book of Ecclesiasticus alone; for it was written in Hebrew and is exceedingly religious and nationalistic. It is impossible also to see why First Maccabees and Tobit and the first and third sections of Enoch should have been rejected on the ground of not possessing these qualifications. Moreover, Jubilees, Judith, and the Testimony of the Twelve Patriarchs are religious and nationalistic in an eminent degree. We are shut up, therefore, to the conclusion that the sharp-witted and intensely conscientious Jews of the second century B.C., who determined the limits of the canon, investigated thoroughly the origin, purpose, and contents, of the books which they accepted as authoritative as a rule of faith and practice, and that Daniel, if a forgery, could not have escaped detection and rejection when subjected to their intelligent and searching scrutiny.

It is utterly irrelevant to assert that there were many "pious frauds" that were put forth during the second century B.C. and later, and that consequently Daniel must have been a fraud. There are three inadmissible assumptions in this proposition.

1. It is assumed that the proof that one document is a forgery, or fraud, or fiction, shows that another is of the same character. You might as well assume that all coins are counterfeit because some are. You might as well assume that Polybius was a liar as he asserts that Ephorus and Timæus were; that Cicero's and Pliny's letters were not authentic, because the epistles of Phalaris have been demonstrated by Bentley to have been written 500 years after Phalaris was dead; that all the tragedies of Euripides were falsely ascribed to him, because some are acknowledged to have been written by other and unknown authors; that the four canonical gospels were identical in origin with the gospel of Peter and those of the Infancy; that the lives of Augustine and Jerome were of the same character as those of St. Anthony and St. Christopher; that the decrees of Constantine, Theodosius, and Charlemagne in favour of the papacy were forged because the decretals of Isodore are false; that all parts of Ashurbanipal's Annals are unreliable because some parts certainly are; that Cæsar's Commentaries on the Gallic War are spurious because his Commentaries on the Civil War may be. In short the argument is absurd. For counterfeits involve the existence of the genuine; forgeries presuppose similar documents that are authentic; fictions are but the shadows of verisimilitude. The Jewish religious authorities accepted the Book of Daniel because they believed it to be authentic, genuine, and true. They rejected Tobit, Judith, Enoch, Jubilees, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, and the other apocryphal and pseudepigraphical writings, because in their judgment they were lacking in one or more of these features.

It may be attempted to escape this judgment by affirming that the Jews who accepted Daniel as canonical were deceived, or befooled, so that they decided wrongly with reference to this particular book. But this affirmation cannot be established as true. For the Jews who made the decision were living and present at the very time when the critics allege that Daniel was written

and when the events described in the eleventh chapter, upon which the allegation is based, were enacted. Many of them had taken part in the glorious conflict for freedom and religion, and could no more be deceived as to what had happened than could the common soldiers of the Grand Army of the Republic who participated in the campaigns of Meade or Grant be deceived about the results of Gettysburg and Appomattox. As to the customs, they certainly would recognize anachronisms, incongruities, and inconsistencies better than we can do to-day after two thousand years have passed. As to the languages also, it is passing strange, if they contain so many marks of Hebrew and Aramaic of Maccabean times as the critics claim, that the Hebrew purists did not recognize the anachronisms; and, on the other hand, if the book were designed for a stimulus to the common people, how does it come to contain so many uncommon words and so many difficult constructions as to have rendered it largely "unintelligible" (to use Bevan's word) to the Hebrews who, shortly after it was written (if we accept the critics' date), translated it into Greek. It must have been hard to fool a people as to what was good Hebrew in the age that produced the Ben Siras, for the grandfather certainly knew how to write good Hebrew, unadulterated with foreign words and clear in its rhetoric and grammar; and the grandson knew both Hebrew and Greek well enough to make a magnificent version of his grandfather's work. As to the Aramaic portions of the book, if they were, as Bevan suggests to be probable, a version of the original Hebrew by the author himself, the decision as to the date of the original would be made regardless of the peculiarities of the Aramaic version. If, however, the Aramaic was the original, it seems hard to account for the use, in a work designed to comfort the people, of so many words that must have been unintelligible to them; for there is no proof in favour of, and the analogies are all against, the probability of the presence of so many Babylonian and Persian words in an Aramaic composition of the second century B.C.¹⁵ To say that the author, like

¹⁵ See the writer's article on "Babylon and Israel" in the *Presbyterian and Reformed Review* for April 1903, pp. 239 f.

another Chatterton, had dived into the records of the past and drawn from them a number of antique expressions in order to give credence to his forgery and to deceive his readers, breaks down because of three considerations: (1) a scholar with learning enough to investigate such ancient documents in order to give an antique colouring to his writings would certainly have used the antique spelling and pronouns, whose absence from Daniel is the strongest objective argument against its early date; (2) he would have used the eastern forms of the verb, if, as the critics affirm, those eastern forms were different from those of Palestine; and (3) he could hardly have known so much of the character of the ancient documents without having more knowledge of the times in which they were written than the critics ascribe to him.

3. There remains, then, only the hypothesis that the writer of the book and those who accepted it as true were united in an endeavour to impose upon the common people. The chief objection to this hypothesis is that there is not a single item of evidence in its favour. It is absurd to suppose that men who were willingly giving up their lives for the preservation of their holy writings from destruction would have been participants in a fraud to perpetuate the Book of Daniel as one of their holy writings. But since such general charges of fraud without specifications and proofs are beneath the notice of a sober, scientific, historian, we leave the consideration of the charge of fraud until such time as the critics advance a specific charge with alleged proofs in its behalf. The investigation and arraignment of unexpressed motives and plausible possibilities are hereby relegated to the speculative philosopher and the examiner of psychological phenomena; the undeniable fact is that history knows nothing of the alleged composition and publication and canonization of the Book of Daniel in the Maccabean age. When it first emerged into historic view, it was already stamped with the same authority as the other books of the Old Testament. Its authenticity, genuineness, and veracity, have never been denied except by those who have disbelieved in miracle and predictive prophecy and by some weak-kneed Jews and Christians of these later de-

cares who have thought that they were scientific when they were merely blind followers of the blind. Scientific? This word implies knowledge. And where did they get their knowledge? Let the critics produce it. Where are their facts in evidence? The great jury of Christendom demand that they be produced. History and philology and archæology, have been searched for centuries and they have failed to present a single fact of direct evidence in support of the critics' positions. The time is past when a German professor can pound his desk and overawe his submissive students with the shout, "Meine Herren, es ist unmöglich," or "Es ist ganz selbstverständlich."

We Christians demand some facts to prove that the Book of Daniel is false before we will admit the charge from any man. We still believe that Christ and the Apostles and the Maccabean and Rabbinical Jews knew more about the origin and veracity and authority of Daniel than the critics do or can know. The vociferous and continuous cry of "all scholars agree" has weight only with those who are ignorant of what these scholars really know. As a fact, they know very little about Daniel, or any other Old Testament book, except what the book testifies as to itself. Against this first hand and direct testimony they put forth a host of conjectures and opinions and ask the world to accept them as the testimony of science and scholarship. They set up their golden calves of what they call history and criticism and cry out: These be thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. They make a golden image of their own reason and imagination and command that all men shall bow down and do homage, in pain of being cast into the fiery furnace of their professional contempt and branded as bigots and ignoramuses. But the church of Christ will never bow down to this image, and God will deliver it from all evil and in the fiery furnace of the world's criticism there will always be one like unto the Son of God to save it from all its foes. In the case of Daniel, Daniel is with us and Christ is with us.

Caveat criticus!

INDICES

GENERAL

- Abstinence of Daniel, 248-252
Ahura Mazda, 125, 127
Alexander the Great, 90, 105
Alexandrinus, Codex, *see* "Greek MSS"
Almsgiving, 247-248
Amashaspand, 128
Amesha Spenta, 125
Amphilochius on Canon, 26; on Divisions of O.T., 40
Angelology among Persians, 127ff.; Assyrio-Babylonians, 129; Daniel, 130; Daniel Compared w. other literature, 142; Conclusions regarding, 151, 154, 166, 189, 191
Antiochus Epiphanes, 90, 270-276
Apocalypses, of Jubilees, 108; of Twelve Patriarchs, 108; of Baruch, 109f.; of Sibylline Oracles, 109f.; of Enoch, 109; of Assumption of Moses, 110; of Ascension of Isaiah, 111; of iv. Esdras, 112; of New Testament, 112; of Revelation, 113
Apocalypses and Date of Daniel, 101; found in Daniel, 103; in profane literature, 104; Daniel's form not common in second century B.C., 108; nor after 100 B.C., 110
Apostolic Canons, on O.T. Canon, 28; on Divisions of O.T., 40
Arabian Nights, 245
Aramaic Documents of Elephantine, 175
Aristobulus, 66
Armenian Version, evidence on Canon, 23
Ashurbanipal, 104, 106
Assyrio-Babylonian belief in heavenly messengers, 107, 129; doctrine of Resurrection, 124; of Judgment, 127
Astyages, 260
Athanasius on Canon, 24; on Divisions of O.T., 40
Augustine on Canon, 29; on Divisions of O.T., 41; also 57-58
Avesta MSS on Resurrection, 125
Baba Bathra, 39, 41
Barhebraeus on Canon, 31
Basiliano-Venetus, Codex, *see* "Greek MSS"
Belshazzar, 262
Belshumishkun, 262
Ben Sira the Elder, Silence on Daniel, 76; Silence on Ezra and Mordecai, 79; Possible reference to Daniel, 82; Reasons for silence on Daniel, 83; Judgment as to fame, 87; opinions of dreams, 88
Bertholdt, 235
Bevan, A. A., on Daniel, 10, 59, 65, 68, 73; on Silence regarding Daniel, 159; on Ezekiel, 234; cf., 265
Book of Life, 229
Breasted, J. H., on Resurrection, 124
Büchler on Haphtaroth, 34, 59
Budde, K., on meaning of "defile the hands," 50f.
Callinicus, 236
Cambyses, 263
Canon of O.T., Evidence on Divisions, Number and Order of Books, 14-32; Evidence on use of Books, 32-35
Canon of Prophets, 44f.
Canons of Laodicea, on Canon, 27f.; on Divisions of O.T., 40
Carthage, Council of, on Canon, 31; on Divisions of O.T., 41
Cassiodorus on Canon, 30; on Divisions of O.T., 41; on Jerome in *Instituto*, 29, 41.
Charles, R. H., on Apocalypses of Daniel, 162; on Fasting of Daniel, 246
Circumcision, 253f.
Claromontanus, Codex, on Canon, 31; on Divisions of O.T., 41
Cod. Barocc. on Canon, 28; on Divisions of O.T., 41

- Cornill, C. H., on Date of Daniel, 11; on Testimony of N.T., 46; on Doctrines of Daniel, 121; on Silence regarding Daniel, 159; on Job, 234; on Daniel, 265
- Cyaxares, 259, 263
- Cyril of Jerusalem, on Canon, 25; on Divisions of O.T., 40
- Cyrus Cylinder, 259
- Daniel the man, referred to by Mattathias, 14, 91, 93; Josephus on, 16f., 96; Silence of Ben Sira, 92; References to in N.T., 94f.; Compared to Joseph, 98f.; Praying of, 241; Fasting of, 243
- Daniel, Prayer of, paralleled by Hezekiah's, 105; paralleled in profane literature, 105
- Darius the Mede, 258, 264
- "Defile the hands," meaning of, 50
- Diodorus, 237
- Driver, S. R., on Daniel, 9, 10; on internal evidence, 42; on Testimony of N.T., 45f., 48; on Silence of Ecclus., 77f.; on Daniel the man, 89; on Daniel and Joseph, 98; on Doctrines of Daniel, 121, 154, 159; on Genuineness of Isaiah, 171f.
- Ebedyesu on Canon, 28; on Divisions of Canon, 40
- Egyptian idea of Resurrection, 124; of judgment, 127
- Elephants, 254
- Epiphanius on Canon, 25; on Divisions of O.T., 40
- Ethiopic Bible, on Order of books, 32
- Farrar, F. W., on Silence concerning Daniel, 159
- Fasting of Daniel, 243
- Gabriel, 131
- Gathas, 128
- "Genaz," meaning of, 50
- Gesenius, W., 235
- Greek MSS, Evidence on Canon, 22f.; on Divisions of O.T., 39
- Gregory of Nazianzus on Canon, 25f.; on Divisions of O.T., 40
- Gubaru, 260, 263
- Gyges, 104
- Haphtaroth, Evidence on Canon, 21; Blessings before and after, 32; Selections now in use, 33; used by Karaites, etc., 34; indicated in N.T., 34; on Daniel, 59
- Harelsian Syriac on Canon, 23
- Haupt, P., on Nahum, 177
- Herodotus, 105
- Hexaplaric Syriac on Canon, 23
- Hilary on Canon, 28; on Divisions of O.T., 41
- Innocent I., on Canon, 30; on Divisions of O.T., 41
- Institutio of Cassiodorus, on Jerome and O.T., 29, 41
- Iranian, Old, Idea of Resurrection, 124; of Judgment, 127; Angelology, 128
- Ishtar, 104, 106; Descent of, 130
- Isidorus on Canon, 30; on Divisions of O.T., 41
- Itala, Evidence on Canon, 24
- Jaddua, High Priest, 90, 105
- Jamnia, Council of, 47, 50
- Jerome on Canon, 29; on Divisions of O.T., 41; on Daniel among the prophets, 49
- John of Damascus on Canon, 27; on Divisions of O.T., 40
- Joseph, Compared with Daniel, 98
- Josephus on Canon, 16; on Daniel the man, 16f., 90f., 96; on Divisions of O.T., 38f.; on Canon of Prophets, 44f.; on Judgment, 138; on Resurrection, 196; importance as historian, 236ff.
- Judgment to come, Idea of, 127; References to in ancient literature, 135; Conclusions regarding, 150, 154, 196
- Junilius on Canon, 26; on Divisions of O.T., 40, 58
- Laodicea, Canons of, *see* "Canons of L."
- Leontius on Canon, 27; on Divisions of O.T., 40
- Law, the, in Maccabees and Daniel, 252
- Liber Sacramentorum on Canon, 31; on Divisions of O.T., 41
- Marduk, 105, 124

- Massoretic notes, evidence on Canon, 57
- Mattathias on O.T. heroes, 14, 52, 93, 275
- Mazdaism, 128
- Melito on Canon, 17f.; on order of Pentateuch, 36; on Divisions of O.T., 39, 40; on Canon of Prophets, 49
- Messiah, Idea of, 131ff.; Not found among Babylonians or Iranians, 131; Zoroastrian, 132; in Daniel and other literature, 138; conclusions regarding, 150, 154, 198, 211f.
- Messiah, Names and Titles of in O.T., 200; in Apoc. literature, 201; in N.T., 203
- Method of investigation, 10
- Michael, 131
- Milton, 169
- Minor Prophets, citations of compared with Daniel, 73
- Mishna on Canon, 20
- Mommsen, T., on Canon, 30; on Divisions of O.T., 41
- Monophysites on Canon of O.T., 31
- Mordecai not mentioned by Ben Sira, 79f.
- Nabopolassar, 129
- Nabunaid, 105, 107, 261, 262
- Nebuchadnezzar, 251
- Nergal and Erishkigal, 129
- Neriglissar, 262
- Nestorians on Canon, 31
- New Testament on Canon, 15; Haphtara indicated in, 34; Apocalypses of, 112; on Resurrection, 135; on Judgment, 137; on Messiah, 141; on Angels, 149, 188, 190
- Nicephorus on Canon, 27; on Divisions of O.T., 40
- Old Testament, Order of Books in, 37; Doctrine of Judgment, 127; References to judgment, 135; on Messiah, 139, 198; on Angels, 143, 192; Traces of Daniel's influence, 163f.; on Resurrection, 133, 195; on Judgment, 197
- Origen on Canon, 24; on Divisions of O.T., 39, 40, 49
- Palimpsesta Vaticana, Fragmenta, *see* "Itala"
- Pentateuch, order of books in, 35f.; critical reconstruction of, 36
- Peshito on order of Books, 31
- Phalanx, 254
- Philo on Therapeutae and Canon, 15; on Divisions of O.T., 38; on Canon of prophets, 46; on Judgment, 138, 187
- "Pleasant Land," meaning of phrase in Enoch and Daniel, 226
- Polybius, 268
- Porphyry, 9, 116, 235
- Praying of Daniel, 241f.
- "Priest's Codex" (P) and influence of Daniel, 173
- Prince, J. D., on Daniel, 11, 79, 82, 266; on Silence of Ecclus. regarding Daniel, 77; on Apocalypses, 102; on Doctrines of Daniel, 121, 129
- Prologus Galeatus on Canon, 29
- Prophets, Canon of, 41ff.
- Pseudo-Athanasius on Canon, 24; on Divisions of O.T., 40
- Pseudo-Chrysostom on Canon, 26; on Divisions of O.T., 40
- Pseudo-Gelasius on Canon, 30; on Divisions of O.T., 41
- Pyramid Texts, 127
- Resurrection, Idea of, 124; among ancient Egyptians, 124; among ancient Babylonians, 124; among ancient Iranians, 124; in O.T., 126f.; Daniel compared w. other literature, 132f.; conclusions regarding, 149, 152, 194
- Rolls, O.T. written on, 61
- Rufinus on Canon, 29; on Divisions of O.T., 41
- Sabbath, 253f.
- Saoyant, 125f.
- Sealing of Documents, 255
- Simon, mentioned by Ben Sira, 86
- Sinaiticus, Codex, *see* "Greek MSS"
- Stutgardiana, Fragmenta, *see* "Itala"
- Synopsis of Lagarde on Canon, 26; on Divisions of O.T., 40
- Talmud on Canon, 18

- Theodore of Mopsuestia, on Books of O.T., 31
 Therapeutae on Canon, 15; on Divisions of O.T., 38, 48
 Vaticanus, Codex, *see* "Greek MSS"
 Visions, use of by prophets, 105f.
 Weingartensia, Fragmenta, *see* "Itala"
 Wellhausen School, theory on Pentateuch, 36
 Wirceburgensia, Fragmenta, *see* "Itala"
 Xerxes, 105
 Yashts, 128
 Zoroaster, 127
 Zoroastrianism, Early, on Resurrection, 124-125; on Judgment to come, 127; on Angels, 128-129; on Messiah, 132

BIBLICAL

- Deuteronomy xxxii. 8; 68, 191
 Ruth, Book of, disputed at Jamnia, 52
 Chronicles, Book of, Silence regarding Daniel, 67f.; and influence of Daniel, 164
 Ezra, Book of, Silence on Daniel, 68; not mentioned by Ben Sira, 79; Possible reference to in Ben Sira, 85; and influence of Daniel, 164
 Nehemiah, Book of, and influence of Daniel, 164
 Nehemiah ix., 68, 120
 Esther, Book of, Silence on Daniel, 67; and influence of Daniel, 164
 Job, Book of, Possible reference to in Ben Sira, 86
 Job xvi. 13 and xix. 25; 126
 Psalms, Book of, and Ideas of Daniel, 175
 Proverbs, Book of, disputed at Jamnia, 52; and influence of Daniel, 174
 Ecclesiastes, Book of, and Ideas of Daniel, 176
 Song of Songs, and influence of Daniel, 174
 Isaiah, Book of, Citations of, 70; Citations of, analyzed, 72; and influence of Daniel, 167; critic's treatment of, 167ff.
 Isaiah xxiv.-xxvii., 167ff.; lxi. 1; 35; lxi. 2, 3; 71
 Jeremiah, Book of, Citations compared with Daniel's, 72; Value of citations, 73
 Ezekiel, Book of, disputed at Jamnia, 52; and Daniel, 69; citations of compared with Daniel, 73; Testimony to Daniel, 233
 Ezekiel xiv. 14, 20 and xxviii. 3; 69
 Daniel, Book of, and the Canon, 9-64; Charge stated, 65; Assumptions of critics, 12; Admissions of critics, 12f.; Evidence presented, 13ff.; Evidence discussed, 35ff.; and the Canon of the prophets, 44-62; Conclusions, 62-64
 —, Not Quoted, 65-75; Charge stated, 65; Assumptions of critics, 65; Discussion of Assumptions, 66ff.; Comparison with citations of prophets, 72
 —, Silence of Ecclesiasticus concerning, 76-100; Charge stated, 77; Assumptions of critics, 78; Discussion of Assumptions, 79ff.; Conclusions, 100
 —, Apocalypses and, 101-116; Charge stated, 101; Assumptions of critics, 102; Discussion of Assumptions, 103ff.
 —, Origin of Ideas of, 117-156; Erroneous claims discussed, 117; Objections of critics, 121; Assumptions of critics, 122; Regarding antiquity of ideas, 124; re-

- garding Daniel and Enoch, 132; Special conclusions, 149; General conclusions, 153
- , Influence of, 157-232; Objections of Critics, 159; Assumptions of Critics, 160; Answers to Assumptions, 160; Argument from Silence, 160; Influence before 200 B.C., 162; up to 135 A.D., 175; Comparative study of influence, 188; Conclusions, 215; Approximation of Daniel and Enoch, 223
- , The Background of, 233-257; Testimony of Josephus, 236; Alleged evidence of late date, 241; Positive evidence of early date, 252ff.
- , The Prophecies of, 258-280; The Fourth Kingdom, 258; Second Kingdom not Median, 260; Darkness and Light in Daniel's predictions, 264; Importance of Antiochus Epiphanes, 270
- Daniel, Book of, Not disputed at Jamnia, 47; Aramaic part defiles hands, 51; Possible reference in Ben Sirā, 82f.; on Angels, 142
- Daniel vi., 1; 258; ix., 1; 259; ix., 24, 25; 161; xi., 16, 41, 45; 227; xii., 4, 9; 161
- Joel, Book of, and Influence of Daniel, 174
- Jonah, Book of, Disputed at Jamnia, 52; and influence of Daniel, 166
- Nahum, Book of, and Ideas of Daniel, 177
- Haggai, Book of, Possible traces of Daniel's influence, 163
- Zechariah, Book of, Possible traces of Daniel's influence, 163
- Malachi, Book of, Traces of Daniel's Influence, 164
- Matthew xxiv., 15; 15, 45
- Luke iv., 17; 34; xxiv., 27; 15; xxiv., 44; 38, 45
- John xv., 25; 15
- Acts xiii., 14, 15, 27; 35
- Hebrews, Epistle to, on Daniel, 95
- Hebrews xi., 37; 56
- Revelation of St. John, Apocalypse of, 113

APOCRYPHA AND PSEUDEPIGRAPHIA

- Ahikar, Aramaic fragments of, 66, 74, 157f., 175
- Apocalypse of Baruch, on Angels, 149, 185, 190; on Resurrection, 196
- Aristeas, Epistle of, 53, 66, 72, 74, 175
- Ascension of Isaiah, on Canon, 17, 56; Apocalypse of, 111; Cf., 186
- Assumption of Moses, Apocalypse of, 110; on Resurrection, 135; on Judgment, 137; on Messiah, 142; on Angels, 148, 185
- Baruch, Book of, Apocalyptic not like Daniel, 109; Apocalypse of, 110; on Resurrection, 134; on Judgment, 137; on Angels, 146, 180
- II. Baruch on Judgment, 138
- Bel and the Dragon, on Angels, 146, 183
- Ben Sirā the Elder, on Canon, 14; on Divisions of O.T., 53ff.; on Isaiah, 71; References to Prophets, 81; References to Israelite Heroes, 84; on Daniel the man, 89; on the Resurrection, 134; on Messiah, 141; on Angels, 146, 175, 179 (Cf. also in General Index)
- Ben Sirā the Younger, on Canon, 14; on Divisions of O.T., 38, 48; on Ben Sirā and the Prophets, 92
- Daniel, Additions to Book of, on Resurrection, 134; on Judgment, 137, 180
- Eagle Vision, Form of, 112; on Resurrection, 135; on Judgment, 138; on Messiah, 141; on Angels, 148, 187

- Ecclesiasticus, *see* "Ben Sira the Elder"
- Enoch, Book of, 74; Alleged resemblance to Daniel, 109; Apocalypses of, 110; on Resurrection, 132f., 195; on Judgment, 136f., 198; on Messiah, 140; on Angels, 145f., 180, 184, 190; Ideas of compared with Daniel, 223
- IV. Esdras on Canon, 17; Apocalypse of, 112, 186; on Angels, 190; on Resurrection, 196
- Esther, Addenda to Book of, on Resurrection, 134; on Judgment, 137; on Angels, 146, 180
- Ezra Apocalypse, 112; on Resurrection, 135; on Judgment, 138; on Messiah, 142; on Angels, 148, 186
- Ezra Legend, 112
- Ezra Piece on Resurrection, 135; on Judgment, 138; on Messiah, 141; on Angels, 148, 187
- Isaiah, Martyrdom of, on Canon, 56; on Resurrection, 135; on Judgment, 138; on Messiah, 142; on Angels, 148, 185
- Jeremiah, Epistle of, 74; on Resurrection, 134; on Judgment, 137; on Angels, 146, 183
- Jubilees, Book of, 66; visions of, 108; Apocalypse of, 108; on Resurrection, 133; on Judgment, 137; on Messiah, 140; on Angels, 144, 182, 190
- Judith, Book of, on Resurrection, 134; on Judgment, 137; on Messiah, 141; on Angels, 147, 180
- I. Maccabees on Canon, 14, 52, 93; on Resurrection, 134; on Judgment, 137; on Messiah, 141; on Angels, 147, 180; on Unclean foods, 249
- II. Maccabees on Canon, 15, 55; on Divisions of O.T., 38; on Resurrection, 134; on Judgment, 137; on Messiah, 141; on Angels, 147, 183
- III. Maccabees on Resurrection, 134f.; on Judgment, 137; on Messiah, 141; on Angels, 147
- IV. Maccabees on Resurrection, 134; on Judgment, 137; on Messiah, 141; on Angels, 147, 183
- Noah, Book of, on Resurrection, 133; on Judgment, 136; on Messiah, 140; on Angels, 144, 180, 190
- Prayer of Manasseh on Angels, 147
- Psalms of Solomon, on Resurrection, 135; on Messiah, 141; on Angels, 147, 183
- Salathiel Apocalypse, 112; on Resurrection, 135; on Judgment, 138; on Messiah, 142; on Angels, 149, 187
- Sibylline Oracles not like Daniel, 109; Apocalypse of 110; on Resurrection, 134; on Judgment, 137; on Messiah, 140; on Angels, 144, 182
- Son of Man Vision, 112; on Resurrection, 135; on Judgment, 138; on Messiah, 141; on Angels, 148, 186
- Song of the Three Children, on Angels, 146, 183
- Susannah on Angels, 146, 183
- Testament of Hezekiah, form of, 111; on Resurrection, 135; on Judgment, 137; on Messiah, 141; on Angels, 148, 190
- Timothy and Aquila, Dialogue of, on Canon, 26; on Divisions of O.T., 40
- Tobit, Book of, on Resurrection, 134; on Judgment, 137; on Messiah, 141; on Angels, 146, 190; on Ideas of Daniel, 175; Fasting of, 246
- Twelve Patriarchs, Testaments of, 66; visions of, 108; on Resurrection, 133, 196; on Judgment, 198; on Messiah, 140; on Angels, 144, 181, 190, 246
- Vision of Isaiah, form of, 111; on Resurrection, 135, 196; on Judgment, 137; on Messiah, 141; on Angels, 148, 185, 190
- Wisdom of Solomon, on Resurrection, 134; on Judgment, 137; on Messiah, 141; on Angels, 147, 180
- Zadokite Fragments, on Resurrection, 135; on Judgment, 138; on Messiah, 142; on Angels, 148, 187
- Zerubbabel, Story of, on Resurrection, 134; on Judgment, 137; on Angels, 147, 183



