

THE
BIBLICAL REPERTORY
AND
THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1832.

ART. I.—RITES AND WORSHIP OF THE EARLY CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

From the German of Neander.*

As the idea of the priesthood of all Christians, became more and more superseded by the notion of a class of persons peculiarly consecrated to God, and set apart for divine service; in the same proportion, the original relation of united Christian worship to entire Christian life—a relation grounded in the very essence of the system—became more and more obscure. It was forgotten, that the divine worship of believers is confined to no certain places, times, or actions, but embraces the whole of a life consecrated to God. Distinguished theologians, however, such as Chrysostom and Augustin, acknowledged that vital Christianity could proceed only from that

* This article consists of a translation from the last volume of the Ecclesiastical History of Neander. The reader will bear in mind that all the statements which it contains relate exclusively to the period between A. D. 312, and A. D. 590; the *second period*, according to the division of this historian. It falls, therefore, within that part of the work which has not yet appeared in English; for the translation by Rose included the history of the first period only. The extract here given will probably be interesting, both as the specimen of a work which is attracting great attention in Europe, and as containing a body of instructive matter upon a very important branch of the subject.

[*Ed. Bib. Rep. & Theol. Rev.*]

ART. III.—HENGSTENBERG'S VINDICATION OF THE
BOOK OF DANIEL*.

THE principles and tendency of German criticism, as applied to sacred subjects, have been so long, and so justly, objects of suspicion with the religious public, that we are glad of an opportunity to bring before our readers something better from that quarter. We take pleasure, even in announcing the existence of such works as the *Christologie* of which we have already given specimens, and the volume now before us, from the same pen. It is as pleasing as it is novel, to read books so strongly marked with all that learning and acuteness which constitute the glory of the German literati, yet having for their object the defence of revelation, and savouring throughout of evangelical religion. The present publication may, indeed, be regarded as a direct attack upon that form of infidelity which arrogates the lofty name of rationalism, or rational religion, and instead of rejecting the Scriptures in a mass, chooses rather to destroy their divine authority and practical effect by the plausible refinements of a subtle criticism. The author, who is known to some of our readers, we presume, as the conductor of an evangelical religious newspaper, and to others as a young but very learned and devout professor in the Berlin University, informs us in his preface, that he had determined to compose a compendious introduction to the Old Testament, for the express purpose of counteracting a work of the same kind by the learned neologist de Wette. As such a work, with such a design, however, was a new thing under the sun, he soon found that it would be necessary to go into large details, and pursue minute inquiries, for the purpose of detecting falsehood and establishing the truth. This led him to project a larger work upon the same general plan, but in filling up the outline, he discovered that some single branches of the subject furnished matter for as many volumes, and were too important to be hurried over slightly. He finally determined to discuss these topics seriatim, publishing the results of his research from time to time. Of this series we have here the first volume, intended to demonstrate the genuineness

* Die Authentie des Daniel und die Integritæt des Sacharjah, erwiesen von Ernst Wilhelm Hengstenberg, Dr. der Phil. & der Theol. der letzt. ord. Prof. Berlin, 1831, 8vo.

of the book of Daniel, and the integrity of the book of Zechariah. The latter subject occupies a small part of the volume. It is the former only that we shall advert to, in the present article.

Having called the attention of our readers to this work, we may perhaps be expected to furnish a particular account of its contents. We have mentioned it, indeed, chiefly because we think it worthy of a more emphatic notice than could well be given to it in a catalogue of recent publications, and because we wish to let the public know what the signs of the times are in the great officina of the learned world. Still we are not unwilling to present an outline of the author's argument. Let it be premised, however, that it is impossible, in such a sketch, to exhibit those qualities which give the work its distinctive excellence. Those qualities are learning, ingenuity, and judgment, displayed for the most part in the detection of plausible fallacies and covert falsehood. Those who would estimate the author's powers, therefore, must read his arguments at length and in detail. We shall attempt no more than to give the substance of such parts as will admit of condensation, without servile adherence to the order or terms of the original.

To destroy the credit of the book of Daniel, has been all along a favourite object with the foes of revelation, whether open or disguised; pagans, deists, or neologists. All the attacks upon it have, indeed, proceeded from that quarter. The Jewish Synagogue and the Orthodox Church, have, with one consent, received it as a part of revelation. Bertholdt has attempted, it is true, to show, by quotations from the Talmud and from Origen, that the book was of old rejected, both by Jews and Christians. That no such conclusion can be fairly drawn from the expressions cited, Dr. Hengstenberg has clearly shown, (pp. 2, 3.)

In the early part of the 18th century, Edward Wells asserted that the first chapter was written after Daniel's death. Sir Isaac Newton and Beausobre went still further, and denied the *genuineness* of the first six chapters, asserting, however, in the strongest terms, the divine authority of the whole. These we believe, are the only exceptions to the striking unanimity which has prevailed among the friends of revelation. We must look elsewhere, then, for the desperate attempts which have been made to overthrow this strong prophetic pillar. Porphyry, who wrote in the third century,

filled one of his fifteen books against Christianity, with an attempt to prove that the pretended book of Daniel was written in Greek, in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes. He was answered by Eusebius, Methodius, Apollinarius, and Jerome. To the latter we owe the preservation of such fragments as continue extant, the work itself having been burnt by order of the Emperor.

The English deist, Collins, was the first in modern times, who undertook to overthrow the credit of this book; for Hobbes and Spinoza went no further than to intimate their doubts. Collins, however, had not learning for the task. The age of *learned* skepticism had not yet arrived. Even Sember, who stands next upon the list of adversaries, argues altogether from the singular position, that the book was wholly void of moral and religious value!

John David Michælis was the first who made it a learned controversy. He was very far, however, from adopting Sember's sentiments. He questions the genuineness of four chapters only (iii.—vi.) and candidly confesses, with respect to them, that the further he examined, the less he felt disposed to doubt. The divine authority of the other chapters he explicitly admits.

Eichhorn went further; yet even he, in the earlier editions of his introduction, rejects the first six chapters only. Hezel maintains the same opinion, and distinctly grants, that as a witness in behalf of revelation, Daniel may be called the most important of the prophets.

The first assailant of the book of Daniel who boldly took his stand upon the ground of rationalism, was Corrodi; and on that same ground stand all who have succeeded him—Bertholdt, Griesinger, Gesenius, Bleek, de Wette, Kirms. It deserves to be recorded, too, that no sooner did Corrodi take this step, than Eichhorn doffed his mask, and went to all lengths with the rest. *Facilis descensus Averni!*

These enemies of the truth differed among themselves (as might have been expected) in relation to two points, the *design* of the book, and the *number* of its authors. To the former we shall have occasion to allude anon. The latter we may spare ourselves the trouble of discussing. No writer since Bertholdt, (who, with true German sagacity, detected the indicia of NINE different authors) has been absurd or bold enough to follow in his train. Gesenius, de Wette, Bleek, and Kirms, not only *admit* the unity of the book, but *prove*

it; thereby furnishing us with arguments, not on that point merely, but in support of the very doctrine which they wrote to overthrow.

We have already mentioned some of those who answered Porphyry. The principal modern writers on the same side, are Luderwald, Studlin, (who changed his mind, however, more than once, and at the best, is only half-way in the right,) Jahn, (who has been the most conspicuous champion of the orthodox opinion) and Dereser, who adopts and vindicates the principles of Jahn. To these might be added many valuable articles in literary journals, both in Germany and Holland.

The grounds on which the genuineness of the book of Daniel has been questioned or denied, are chiefly these:

I. The occurrence of Greek words which indicate, it is said, a period not earlier, at the furthest, than the middle of the reign of Darius Hystaspis, when Daniel could not have been living.

Of these words Bertholdt reckons ten. Four of them have, by later critics, been traced to the old Persian—and Gesenius himself maintains, that the Chaldees and Assyrians were of Medo-Persian origin. Another of the ten is admitted by the same distinguished scholar to be Syriac. The remaining four are the names of musical instruments occurring in the fifth verse of the third chapter. The similarity of these to certain Greek words, may be accounted for in either of three ways.

1. From the ancient intercourse between the Greeks and Babylonians, mentioned by Strabo, Quintus Curtius, and Berosus. 2. On the supposition that the Shemitish and Greek languages bore a common relation to an older tongue. 3. On the supposition, that the names of musical instruments were in the first instance onomapoetic, and might therefore be analogous in languages totally distinct.

Nothing more need be added than a statement of the fact, that the latest writer, on the wrong side of the question, (Kirms) has yielded this whole ground of opposition as untenable.

II. The Hebrew of this book, it is asserted, is too impure for its alleged antiquity. Bertholdt, who is the author of this charge, attempts no proof of it, but merely expresses a vague hope that future critics will supply a demonstration. In this he has been sadly disappointed. Bleek observes very justly, that the relics of that period are too scanty to enable us to draw so bold an inference. Gesenius places this book in

the same rank as to language, with Esther, Chronicles, Jonah, and Ecclesiastes—one degree only below Ezra, Nehemiah, Zechariah, Malachi—and one above Ezekiel, whom he explicitly asserts to be the most incorrect and anomalous of all. Now if Ezekiel, who, though an exile, was surrounded by the other captured Jews, and had thus an opportunity and motive to preserve his native language, is so very incorrect, how can we be surprised that Daniel, an officer of state, compelled *ex officio* to employ another language, and cut off from the society of other Hebrews, should exhibit the same fault, though in a less degree? Still greater was the difference between his situation and that of Ezra, Nehemiah, Haggai, and Zechariah, residing in Judea, where the language, though declining, was not yet extinct. From these considerations, it is also clear, that no more probability attaches to the theory of this book's being written by a Jew of Palestine, in the days of the Maccabees, than to that of its being written, as we hold, by Daniel. For the impurity complained of is no more accounted for by the circumstances of such a Jew, in regard to time and place, than by Daniel's circumstances at the court of Babylon.

III. A third argument is founded on the fact, that Daniel is not mentioned by the Son of Sirach, when eulogizing the worthies of his nation. If this proves any thing, it proves too much. It proves that no such man as Daniel ever lived—nor Ezra, nor Mordecai, nor any of the minor Prophets—none of whom are mentioned.

The credit of this notable argument belongs to Bleek. None of his predecessors lay the slightest stress upon the fact alluded to.

IV. A fourth objection is, that the book of Daniel stands near the end of the Hagiographa, and not among the Prophets.

This circumstance, Bertholdt explains by saying, that this third division of the Old Testament was not formed until after the other two were closed. The compilers, or authors of the canon, he supposes, intended to make two great classes, the law and the prophets. The books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings, were included in the second, merely because there was no third. A third was eventually formed to receive those writings which afterwards laid claim to inspiration.

To this explanation, Hengstenberg objects, that it rests on mere assumptions, and is flatly contradicted by all Jewish

authorities. His own solution may be briefly stated thus: The distinction between the Prophets and the Hagiographa, is not of a chronological kind at all, but is founded on the peculiar character and office of the writers. The prophetic *gift* must be discriminated from the prophetic *office*. The one was common to all who were inspired; the latter to the regular, official Prophets, who communicated the divine will to the Jewish nation. The books written by these Prophets, as such, formed the second great division. The third, our author thinks, contains the inofficial prophecies. Why else should Jeremiah's Lamentations be disjoined from his Prophecies?

As to the relative position of the book among the Hagiographa, it evidently proves neither one thing nor another; as the book of Ezra is placed *after* it, and a slight inspection shows that no regard was had to date in the arrangement of the parts.

V. To the argument derived from the contempt with which the authors of the Talmud and the modern Jews are said to regard the book of Daniel, our author replies that the Talmudists have been misapprehended, and that the modern Jewish prejudice has naturally sprung from their hatred to the Gospel, and whatever goes to prove its authenticity.

VI. A sixth argument is founded on the words of the book itself. "In the first year of his reign, I, Daniel, understood by books, the number of the years, whereof the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah the prophet, that he would accomplish seventy years in the desolations of Jerusalem." (Dan. ix. 2.) The Hebrew word translated *books*, has the article prefixed. This, Bleek considers as synonymous with *biblia* or *the Scriptures*, and a decisive proof that the Old Testament canon was already closed, and in the hands of the writer of this book.

To this it may be replied: 1. That we have no proof of these *books* containing any other matter than the prophecies of Jeremiah. 2. That the technical term in use among the later Jews to designate the canon, was not "the books," but "the writings." 3. That the supposititious forger of the book of Daniel never would have hinted at the canon's being closed, when his very object was to have his book included in it. 4. That before the adjustment of the canon, there were private collections of the sacred books, as appears not only from the nature of the case, but from the fact, that Jeremiah quotes and imitates Moses, Isaiah, Obadiah, and Micah, a circum-

stance admitted both by Eichhorn and de Wette. These reasons are, we think, sufficient, without appealing, as Pareau does, to the Jewish tradition, that the sacred books were secured by Jeremiah before the burning of the temple, and entrusted to the care of Daniel.

VII. The lavish expenditure of signs and wonders, without any apparent object,* has been carped at as unworthy of the Deity.

It is worthy of remark, that one of those who urge this difficulty, has supplied an answer. This is Griesinger, who innocently observes, that no better reason seems assignable for all these miracles, than a disposition to exalt Jehovah above other gods! Can a better be desired? It is true, the adversaries still object, *cui bono?* We need only condense our author's three replies into as many sentences. 1. That the faith and hope of the exiles might be maintained. 2. That a way might be opened for their restoration. 3. That the heathen might be awed into forbearance and respect towards God's peculiar people.

VIII. It is alleged, that the book contains historical inaccuracies. The grossest of these is said to be the statement in the first two verses in the eighth chapter. Bertholdt's objections are—that Elam is mentioned as a province of the Babylonish empire, in which Daniel acted as a royal officer, (v. 27) whereas it was a province of the Median empire, as appears from Isaiah, xxi. 2, and Jeremiah, xxv. 5. 2. That a palace is spoken of at Shushan, whereas the palace there was built by Darius Hystaspis, as appears from Pliny.† 3. That the name *Shushan* itself, (which signifies a *lily*) was not given until long after Darius, and was intended to express the beauty of the edifices which that prince erected.

To these objections, Dr. H. replies: 1. That the subjection of Elam by the Chaldees is predicted by Jeremiah (xlix. 34,) and the fulfilment of the prophecy recorded by Ezekiel, (xxxii. 24.) The prediction quoted by Bertholdt, (Jer. xxv. 5.) represents Elam, not as a province of Media, but as an independent monarchy, and intimates its overthrow. This prophecy was uttered in the first year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign, that of Daniel in the third of Belshazzar's. But even admitting the assertion of the adversary, there is no departure

* Die zwecklose Verschwendung von Wundern. Bertholdt.

† Hist. Nat. vi. 26.

from the truth of history. Daniel was at Shushan only "in a vision," as appears from a strict translation of the passage. The scene of his vision, so to speak, was there, because Shushan was to be the capital of the empire whose fortunes he foresaw. 2. Pliny's statement as to the building of the palace, and indeed the whole city, by Darius Hystaspis, is contradicted by all Greek and Oriental writers, who represent it as extremely ancient. 3. Athenæus and others state that the city was called *Shushan*, from the multitude of lilies growing in that region, a fact reconcilable with any date whatever.

Another passage which has been objected to, is what de Wette calls the laughable description (in ch. vi.) of a lion's den like a cistern, with a stone to close the orifice. We know nothing about the lion's dens in that part of the world; but we know, that in Fez and Morocco, they are subterraneous, and that criminals are often thrown into them.* Who knows how large the stone was in the case before us?

A third objection of the same kind is, that Belshazzar is represented (Dan. v. 11, 13, 18, 22,) as the son of Nebuchadnezzar, whereas, according to profane historians, he was his fourth successor. No fact is more familiar, than that *father* denotes an *ancestor*, *son* a *descendant*.

The other historical objections which our author notices, are, that Cyaxares II. is by Daniel called Darius—and that in the first verse of the first chapter, Jerusalem is said to have been taken by Nebuchadnezzar, in the third year of Jehoiakim, while it appears from Jer. xlv. 1, that the battle of Carchemish, which must have preceded that event, occurred in the fourth year of Jehoiakim, and from Jer. xxv. 1, that this same fourth year was the first of Nebuchadnezzar. Our author's solution of these difficulties carries him so far into minutiae that we can neither follow copy nor abridge his argument. Suffice it to say, that it is wholly satisfactory, and exhibits in a strong light his critical sagacity, his learning, and his judgment.

IX. The inconsistencies and contradictions charged upon the book of Daniel by Bertholdt, as shown by our author, and indeed admitted by most later writers, to be merely apparent, it would, in truth, be passing strange, that so

* See the accounts quoted by Jahn (Archæol II. 2. p. 355) and Rosenmüller, (Arc. N. Morsenland, iv. 1084)

ingenious an impostor should have been betrayed into gross self-contradictions. The last verse of the first chapter has been represented as at variance with the first verse of the tenth, as though the former intimated that he lived no longer! A similar objection has been founded on Belshazzar's not knowing Daniel (v. 14,) who had been exalted to such honour by Nebuchadnezzar (ii. 48, 49,) a circumstance explained by the very characters of the prophet and the king, which were too opposite to admit of intimacy. Daniel would naturally stand aloof from so debauched a court.

Again, the indefatigable adversary asks, how could Nebuchadnezzar be ignorant (iii. 14) whether the Hebrews served his God, when he had himself (ii. 47) acknowledged their's to be a God of Gods and Lord of Lords? This inconsistency, as Dr. H. observes, is chargeable not upon the sacred writer, but upon the heathen king. His former acknowledgment resulted not from a change of heart, but from astonishment and terror—a distinction which the psychology of rationalists knows nothing of. The same may be said of the objection started to the diverse exhibitions of this same king's character in the first three chapters and the fourth.

X. The next class of objections comprehend those founded on alleged improbabilities and incongruities, more or less minute. Our author, instead of contenting himself with a general refutation or reply to these attacks, very wisely enters into the details, follows the adversary step by step, through each successive chapter, and exposes the futility and falsehood of his arguments. This part of the work, comprising sixty pages of minute discussion, important as it is, we of course must leave untouched. The student who is able to make use of the original, will find himself rewarded for the pains he may bestow upon it; and the English reader will in time, we trust, be furnished with the substance and results, (if not the form) of Dr. Hengstenberg's vindiciæ.

XI. It has also been objected to this book, that opinions and usages are mentioned in it, which are clearly modern, that is of later date than that claimed for the book itself. One instance which has been adduced is Dan. vi. 11: "Now when Daniel knew that the writing was signed, he went into his house, and his windows being open *in his chamber toward Jerusalem*, he kneeled upon his knees *three times a day*, and prayed, and gave thanks to his God as he did aforetime."

Here, says the objector, are allusions to three modern customs—that of praying towards Jerusalem—that of praying thrice a day—and that of having a chamber appropriated to prayer. Our author meets the objections with a negative. That the first was an ancient practice, he thinks, is susceptible of proof from Scripture. The law of Moses required all sacrifices to be offered at the place which the Lord should choose “to put his name there.” (Deut. xii. 5, 6.) Prayer would of course accompany oblation. “Their burnt offerings,” says the Lord by the mouth of Isaiah, “and their sacrifices shall be accepted upon my altar; for mine house shall be called a *house of prayer* for all people.” (Isa. lvi. 7.) “In thy fear,” says David, “will I worship *toward thy holy temple.*” (Ps. v. 7. cxxxviii. 2.) “I lift up my hands *toward thy holy oracle.*” (xxviii. 2.) Now, if in the temple prayer was offered toward the oracle or sanctuary, and in the city toward the temple, surely those who were out of the city, whether far or near, would be likely to offer theirs toward Jerusalem itself. “If thy people;” says Solomon in his dedicatory prayer, “go out to battle against their enemy, whithersoever thou shalt send them, and shall pray unto the Lord *toward the city* which thou hast chosen, and *toward the house* that I have built for thy name, then hear thou in heaven,” &c. (1 Kings, viii. 44.) Nor would the practice cease, because the temple was destroyed. Its very site was regarded by the Jews as holy. “Remember this mount Sion, wherein thou hast dwelt. They have set thy sanctuary on fire,” &c. (Ps. lxxiv. 2, 7.)

As to the custom of praying thrice a day, it is so natural, that we find it among those with whom the Jews could have had no intercourse, the Brahmins for example. And what says David? “Evening and morning and at noon, will I pray and cry aloud.” (Ps. lv. 17.)

As to the third particular, it rests upon mere assumption. There is nothing said about a chamber used exclusively for devotional purposes; and if there was, there can be no ground for the assertion, that this was an invention of the later Jewish formalists. Our Lord commands his disciples to go into their closets, and not to pray in public, like the Pharisees. (Matth. vi.) On the other hand, David “went up to the chamber over the gate,” if not to pray, at least to vent his grief, (2 Sam. xviii. 33,) and Elijah went “into a loft” and “cried

unto the Lord." (1 Kings xvii. 20.) Was this a modern pharisaical invention, as affirmed by Bertholdt?

The advice of Daniel to Nebuchadnezzar, (iv. 27,) is represented by Bertholdt as ascribing an efficacy to alms-giving, which was never dreamed of in the days of old. He translates the verse—"Buy off (compensate or atone for) thy sins by gifts, and thy guilt by doing good to the poor." Dr. Hengstenberg shows clearly that the true sense is that which our own translation gives—"Break off thy sins by righteousness, and thine iniquities by showing mercy to the poor." The adversary has the credit, therefore, not of the objection only, but of the fault objected to!

A similar objection has been raised by Gramberg, in relation to the doctrine of *meritorious* fasting, as implied in ch. ix. That religious fasting was a most ancient usage of the Jews, any compend of biblical antiquities will show. That the popish notion of merit should be found in a passage where such words as these occur—"we do not present our supplications before thee for our righteousness, but for thy great mercies"*—argues something rather worse than inadvertence in the caviller who finds it there.

Our limits will not suffer us to enter into an examination of the other alleged anachronisms, which our author mentions. They relate to allusions which the prophet makes to the dispersion of the Jews, the reign of Messiah, and the ministry of angels. This portion of the work is very interesting, as it furnishes the author with an opportunity of showing how impossible it is to understand or explain the Scriptures on the principles of rationalism, and at the same time how clear a light is shed upon the Old Testament, by a simple reception of the doctrine that it all has reference to a promised Saviour.

XII. No ground of objection has been more insisted on, than the extraordinary precision of the prophecies of Daniel as to time, place, and circumstances—a peculiarity which, it is said, distinguishes it wholly from all other prophecies.

The substance of our author's very copious refutation is, that circumstantial accuracy is not confined exclusively to Daniel's prophecies; in proof of which, he cites many cases from the other prophets—that we find condensed and accumulated here, the same sort of predictions which we find de-

* Dan. ix. 18.

tached and scattered in the others—that Daniel's predictions have not the air of history, for they require a knowledge of the history in order to be understood—that the character of prophecy varied with the exigencies of the Jewish nation, being brief and obscure when they were in prosperity, and more explicit when they needed consolation;—lastly, that the great difference between Daniel's prophecies and those of other prophets, is a difference of style: theirs are poetical and his prosaic; which of itself accounts for much that is objected to.

XIII. Our author next considers an objection raised by Porphyry, and echoed by his modern satellites, to wit: that all the clear, definite predictions in this book, which are verified by history, reach merely to Antiochus Epiphanes, while beyond that, nothing is foretold precisely, but the subversion of all thrones, the resurrection, and the reign of the Messiah; as if the writer expected these events to follow the death of Antiochus immediately. Why, it has been asked, this strange limitation, if not because the book was written during that king's reign?

Here, too, our author enters into a detail, affording new proofs of his learning and his critical sagacity. We cannot even help our readers to a rapid glance at his ingenious argument, but must content ourselves with stating very briefly the amount of it in two propositions.

1. Admitting the fact asserted, there would be no valid ground for the conclusions stated. The gift of prophecy was not a *habitus infusus*, subjected to the judgment and volition of the prophet, but a specific inspiration as to certain things, controlled and controllable by none but Him who gave it. It was very common for a Prophet's view to be confined to certain periods, according to the exigencies of the chosen people. There was scarcely an event of moment, from the beginning of Jeremiah's ministry to the return of the captive Jews, which he did not explicitly foretell. Beyond that point, there is nothing definite. To Isaiah, the space between the return from exile and the Saviour's advent, seems to have been, as Dr. H. expresses it, a *terra incognita*, though so much before and after was revealed to him with wonderful distinctness. The transition from proximate to more remote events, too, so far from being an anomalous peculiarity of Daniel, was the ordinary usage of the Prophets. All of them studiously connect the deliverance from exile with the final

deliverance of all God's people, and the temporal judgments threatened to the Jews, with the awful judgment of the last great day. A very obvious and familiar instance is our Lord's prediction of the downfall of Jerusalem.

2. The assertion, upon which the objection rests, is not a true one. The book does contain distinct predictions of events long posterior to the date assigned. The time of Christ's appearing, his death, and the destruction of Jerusalem, are all foretold in the ninth chapter. Our author also undertakes to vindicate the old interpretation of the golden image in the seventh chapter, which makes the last empire symbolized to be the Roman—in opposition to the new interpretation of Eichhorn and de Wette, according to which it was the Macedonian empire. In addition to other arguments, he cites the unanimous consent of Jews and early Christians; and proves, particularly from Josephus, that these prophecies were instrumental in exciting the rebellions of the Jews against the Romans.

XIV. Having despatched the weightier matters urged in opposition, our author closes this part of the subject by a summary settlement of several minor cavils, such as these—coincidences with the books of Maccabees—symptoms of the peculiar national pride of the Jews—the want of a moral—and the praises lavished upon Daniel himself. To the refuting of these arguments ten pages are devoted. We shall content ourselves with saying in as many words, that the author of Maccabees had read the book of Daniel—that the Jewish spirit complained of, runs through all the Scriptures—that a book which demonstrates that Jehovah is omnipotent and faithful to his promises, *must* have a moral—and that Daniel goes no further in self-praise than Paul or Moses.

The arguments, of which we have attempted to give something like an abstract, might justly be considered as determining the controversy. But our author, not contented with this negative demonstration, proceeds to adduce what he regards as positive proof of the correctness of his doctrine.

1. The first witness called, is the writer of the book himself. That he wished it to be regarded as the work of Daniel, is apparent from the use of the first person in so many cases, (vii. 28—viii. 2, 15, 27—ix. 2—x. 1. This is indeed admitted, in relation to the last six chapters, even by those who argue that the first six must be from another hand, because Daniel is there mentioned in the third person. That this by

no means follows, is evidenced by citations from the other Prophets. Hosea, in the first chapter, uses the third person, in the next two, the first. In the seventh chapter of Amos, that Prophet for the most part uses the first person; in the twelfth and fourteenth verses, he employs the third. To these may be added Isaiah xxxvi—xxxix. and Ezekiel i. 1—3. The objection, that no reason can be given for the change of persons in the book of Daniel, has been answered by Gesenius, who states it as a general rule, with very few exceptions, that the first person is used in actual prophecy, the third in matters that are properly historical. This is apparent from the texts before referred to, and from the practice of the Apostle John, in his Gospel and Apocalypse. To add one other argument, is it not clear, that if the first six chapters were a forgery, their author would have carefully avoided the third person? Most minds will probably be satisfied with knowing, that the author of the book, whoever he was, has represented it as Daniel's composition. This, however, is not enough for a rationalist. Eichhorn and Bertholdt maintain that the writer no more designed it to be looked upon as Daniel's, than Cicero designed, the speeches, in his dialogues to pass for the *ipsissima verba* of the speakers introduced—and that the whole book is nothing but an innocent attempt to clothe plain history in a poetic or romantic garb, with a historical preface intended to give an air of reality to the contrivance. Does such a hypothesis need any refutation? It may in Germany, but not with us.

While these learned Thebans would persuade us, that the book of Daniel is a mere jeu d'esprit, Gesenius, de Wette, Bleek, and Kirms, hold it up to our abhorrence as a *pious fraud*—a deliberate attempt to palm a forgery upon the Jewish people as the work of Daniel, with the laudable design, indeed, of strengthening their faith and confirming their obedience. To any but a rationalist, the whole spirit, tendency, and aspect of the book, will give the lie to this poor calumny, even without the aid of that historical and critical proof which exists in such abundance.

2. A second argument in favour of our doctrine may be drawn from the reception of this book into the canon. This leads our author into an inquiry, as to the formation of the canon, which he pursues with much ability. In opposition to the neological opinion, that the canon was formed gradually, and not wholly closed till about 150 years before Christ,

he maintains, that it was completed in the days of Ezra, Nehemiah, and the contemporary prophets, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. This he proves from the direct testimony of Josephus, the Rabbins, and the fathers of the Church—from the fact, that after the date last mentioned, the sacred books are spoken of as forming one collection—from the threefold division spoken of before*—and from the strong presumption furnished by the nature of the case, the condition of the Jews returned from exile, and their pressing need of an authoritative compilation.

3. Not only does this book represent itself as Daniel's composition; not only was it received as such by Ezra and his inspired contemporaries. This is high authority, but we have higher still, that of Christ and his Apostles. It is worthy of remark, that the divine authority of no book in the Old Testament is more distinctly recognized in the New, than that of the disputed book in question. Nothing can well be more explicit than the words of Christ in Matth. xxiv. 15, "When ye shall see the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place, (whoso readeth, let him understand.)" Our author enters at some length into the question, whether the words in the parenthesis are the words of our Lord or the evangelist. Upon this something depends, for accordingly as this point is determined, the word *read* has for its object the gospel of Matthew, or the prophecy of Daniel. Our author concludes that they were spoken by our Lord, for which he gives his reasons in detail. He then argues from the whole passage thus: Christ recognizes Daniel as a prophet, and speaks of reading him, as though his hearers were in possession of that prophet's writings, and moreover represents a passage from those writings as a prediction yet to be fulfilled. This is certainly strong proof, and we think that our author has successfully encountered all attempts to weaken it. To confirm his position that the Saviour regarded Daniel as a prophet, and his writings as authentic, he states, that the phrase, Son of Man, so constantly occurring, has an obvious reference to Dan. vii. 13—and that between such passages as Matth. x. 23, xvi. 27, 28, xix. 28, xxiv. 30, xxv. 31, xxvi. 64, John v. 27, on the one hand, and Dan. vii. 13, 14, 26, 27, on the other, there is a coincidence too striking to be thought fortuitous.

* See page 52.

Dr. H. extends the parallel to the Epistles. We can do no more than mention the correspondent passages, 1 Pet i. 10—12, he compares with Dan. xii. 8, 2 Thess. i. ii., with Dan. ix.—1 Cor. vi. 2, with Dan. vii. 22, ix. 18—Phil. ii. 9—11, with Dan. vii. 13, 14—Acts vii. 56, with the same. The allusion in Heb. xi. 33, 34, requires no comment.

Two neological difficulties here present themselves. Staüdlin suggests that all the allusions are to the last six chapters. True, but we have the clearest evidence that, in the time of Christ, the two parts were extant, and regarded as one book. Corrodi asks, why no use was made of Daniel to prove that Jesus was the Christ? Dr. H. replies, because his prophecies, with one exception, relate to the second advent, and that the one excepted passage has been actually cited in the very way suggested.

4. But we are not without proof that this book was actually extant before the days of the Maccabees. The leading witness of this fact is Josephus, whose account of Alexander the Great's visit to Jerusalem, is well known. Our readers will recollect that, in that narrative, the book of Daniel is expressly said to have been shown to the conqueror, who seemed much gratified with its alleged prediction of himself, and expressed his satisfaction by unwonted favours to the holy city and the Jewish nation.

The truth of this story has, of course, been questioned, and our author therefore enters into a detailed defence of it. We admire the ability with which he treats his subject, and concur in his conclusion, that the statement of Josephus is in itself highly probable, and abundantly confirmed by external evidence. He observes very justly, that it is not necessary for the support of his argument, to assert the truth of every thing said on the alleged occasion, by Alexander on the one hand, or the High Priest on the other. An attempt has been made to set aside the narrative, by sneering at the dreams there spoken of, as if the whole story was on that account a superstitious tale. But even admitting, that the High Priest merely flattered his redoubted guest, and that the latter merely gratified his vanity by listening to fictions, is it not still very likely that a book like that of Daniel, if it did exist, would be exhibited, to aid at least in carrying on the joke? Besides, the same fact is mentioned or alluded to, by Arrian, Pliny, and Hecatæus, of Abdera. And indeed, the supposition of some such occurrence appears necessary, to account for

facts which have never been disputed, especially the extraordinary favour which was certainly exhibited by Alexander to the Jews. We shall only add, that the minutiae of the story are in perfect keeping with the Macedonian's character, and harmonize completely with incidental statements of historians which have no direct reference to this event. Here, as elsewhere, Dr. Hengstenberg goes into a learned and minute investigation of the subject.

Another argument is founded on 1 Maccab. ii. 59, 60. where facts recorded by this Prophet are alluded to. One or two other arguments are built upon certain minute criticisms of the Septuagint and the first book of Maccabees, of which we can only say, that, such as they are, they lead directly to the same conclusion as those already stated, viz: that before the time of the Maccabees, our book of Daniel was in circulation.

5. Besides the external evidence already glanced at, there is internal evidence no less conclusive. As such we may mention the peculiarities of the language. Every biblical student is aware, that the book of Daniel is composed partly in Hebrew, and partly in Chaldee. On this fact Bertholdt built his foolish theory of a plurality of writers, a theory disproved by the simple circumstance that the change of dialect takes place in the midst of indivisible passages. It is evident, indeed, to every scholar who examines the original, that some one must have written it, to whom the two languages were equally familiar. Now this agrees exactly with the history of Daniel, whose native tongue was Hebrew, but who was compelled, by his early captivity, and his official situation, to become familiar with the other dialect. This happy coincidence might seem sufficient, but our author carries out the proof still further, by a nice examination of the Prophet's Chaldee diction. He states it as the result of his personal researches, not only that the Chaldee of this book is so full of Hebraisms, that it could not have been written, as has been asserted, at a time when Hebrew had been *wholly* superseded, in the usage of the Jews, by the language of their conquerors—but also, that it approaches vastly nearer to the Chaldee used by Ezra, than to that in which the Targums are composed. This is the substance of the argument. The minor disquisitions into which it leads the author, though by no means without interest and value, we of course must let alone.

6. The next item of internal evidence is the extraordinary accuracy which this book exhibits in its historical statements and allusions. We shall merely hint at some of the specifications given by our author in detail.

The first chapters represent Daniel as having attained, while yet a young man, an extensive reputation for extraordinary wisdom and devotion to his God. How satisfactorily does this explain the language of Ezekiel, his contemporary and an older man. "Son of man, when the land sinneth against me, &c. though these three men, Noah, Daniel, and Job, were in it, they should deliver but their own souls by their *righteousness*, said the Lord God." (Ezek. xiv. 13, 14.) "Son of man, say unto the Prince of Tyrus, thus saith the Lord God, because thine heart is lifted up, and thou hast said I am a God, &c. thou art *wiser* than Daniel; there is no secret that they can hide from thee." (xxviii. 2, 3.) Can this praise be accounted for in any other way, than by supposing just such facts as are recorded in the Book of Daniel?

The truth with which the characters of certain kings are drawn, deserves attention. The last king of Babylon is represented by Xenophon as an effeminate, but cruel and impious voluptuary, who put a man to death, because he missed his aim in hunting, and was guilty of innumerable other cruelties; who despised the deity, and spent his time in riotous debauchery, but was at heart a coward. Is not this Belshazzar? The same historian represents Cyaxares as weak and pliable, but of a cruel temper, easily managed for the most part, but ferocious in his anger. Is not this Darius*—the same Darius who allowed his nobles to make laws for him, and then repented—suffered Daniel to be cast into the lion's den, and then spent a night in lamentation, and at last, in strict conformity with Xenophon's description, condemned to death, not only his false counsellors, but all their wives and children?

It is also observable, that, in this book, certain events are mentioned as a contemporary would be apt to mention them; that is, concisely, and without minute detail, as being perfectly familiar to his immediate readers. Thus we are told that Daniel survived the first year of Cyrus, a notable year in Jewish history, the year of the return from exile. Now a later writer, one for instance, in the days of the Maccabees, would

* The difference of name is explained at length by Dr. Hengstenberg, p. 46.
VOL. IV. No. I.—I

have been very likely to explain why this was mentioned as a sort of epoch.

Dr. H. adduces other cases, some of them still more striking, which we cannot notice. He also brings together, in one striking view, many coincidences as to matter of fact, between the book of Daniel, and Berosus, Abydenus, Herodotus, and others, which must likewise be passed over. There are three of his remarks, however, under this same head, which we cheerfully make room for. The first is, that in those cases where the Greek and Babylonian authorities are variant, the book of Daniel sometimes sides with one and sometimes with the other. The next is, that the force of the argument from these historic niceties depends upon the aggregate, not the detail, and cannot be destroyed by merely showing how some one or two particulars might have come to the knowledge of a later writer. The last is, that the first book of Maccabees is literally full of palpable errors in geography and history, as he distinctly shows by actual citations.

7. A distinct but analogous body of internal evidence is furnished by the accurate acquaintance which the writer of this book evinces, with the manners, usages, and institutions of the age and country in which it is alleged to have been written. The particular instances are many and minute; we shall indicate a few. Daniel never speaks of adoration being rendered to the kings of Babylon, according to the ancient, oriental usage. Why? Arrian informs us, that Cyrus was the first who received such homage, which arose from a notion that the Persian kings were incarnations of the deity. For the same reason, their decrees were esteemed irrevocable, while no such doctrine seems to have prevailed under the Chaldee monarchs. Daniel accordingly asserts no such thing of any but Darius.

The *land of Shinar* was the name used by the natives, as we learn from good authority. It occurs no where in the historical parts of Scripture, after the book of Genesis, until we meet with it in Daniel. (i. 2.) A resident in Palestine would not have thought of using it.

Nebuchadnezzar commands (i. 5.) that the young men chosen for his service should be fed from his table. That this was the oriental custom, we are informed by Ctesias and others.

Daniel and his companions, when selected for the royal service, received new names, (i. 7.) In 2 Kings xxiv. 17,

we read, that "the king of Babylon made Mattaniah king, and changed his name to Zedekiah." Two of these names, moreover, are apparently derived from those of Babylonish idols.

In Dan. ii. 5, iii. 6, there are tokens of an accurate acquaintance with the forms of capital punishment in use among the Chaldees; while in the sixth chapter, a new sort is described as usual with the Medes and Persians.

The description of the image, in the third chapter, corresponds remarkably with what is known from other sources of the Chaldee taste in sculpture; and the use of music at the worship of it, completely tallies with their well-known fondness for that art.

We find in ch. v. 2, that women were present at the royal banquet. So far was this from being usual in later times, that the Septuagint translators have expunged it from the text. And yet we know from Xenophon, that before the Persian conquest, such was indeed the practice of the Babylonian court.

On no point, however, is this minute knowledge more remarkably displayed, than in relation to the ecclesiastical and civil polity adopted by the two great dynasties which had their seat in Babylon during the life of Daniel. The distinction of ranks, the official functions, and the very titles of the ministry and priesthood, are either stated or alluded to, with a precision, which has forced even Bertholdt to confess, that some parts of the book must needs have been written on the very spot.

Upon this part of the subject Dr. Hengstenberg bestows great pains. A large space is occupied with minute etymological discussion, which we pass by to concur in his concluding interrogatory. How can knowledge so accurate, extensive, and minute, be ascribed without absurdity to any writer, at a period so late as that of the Maccabees, and in a country so remote as Palestine?

8. There are some things peculiar to the prophecies of this book, which clearly indicate that he who was the organ of them, was a *bona fide* resident in Babylon. In the earlier predictions of this book, as in Zechariah and Ezekiel, we find less poetry and more of *symbolik*, than in the pure Hebrew prophets. Every thing is designated by material emblems. Beasts are the representatives of kings and kingdoms. The imagery likewise appears cast in a gigantic mould. All this

is in accordance with the Babylonish taste, with which the Prophet was familiar, and to which the Holy Spirit condescended to accommodate his teachings. A striking confirmation of this exegesis is, that this mode of exhibition ceases suddenly and wholly with the Chaldee dynasty. The last four chapters which were written under the Medo-Persian domination, are without a trace of it.

Again, Daniel's visions, like those of Ezekiel, have the banks of rivers for their scene.* Does not this imply, that the author had resided in a land of lordly streams? This minute local propriety would scarcely have been looked for in a Canaanitish forger, though writing in full view of the very "swellings of Jordan."

Again, Daniel, still like his fellow in captivity and the prophetic office, displays a chronological precision quite unknown to earlier seers, but perfectly in keeping with the character of one who had been naturalized among the great astronomers and chronologers of the old world.

9. Our author closes the whole argument with one or two minuter proofs of genuineness, which we need not copy. The weightiest of them may, for substance, be expressed in these two propositions—that the book abounds with things which would be wholly out of character, as coming from a Jew of later times—and that between the historical and prophetic parts of the book, there exists a unity, a sameness, a consistency of character, especially in relation to the writer himself, which stamps the whole as ONE, GENUINE, and AUTHENTIC.

We have read this work of Dr. Hengstenberg with unfeigned satisfaction, and we close it with a high opinion of the author's erudition, ingenuity, and love of truth. The perusal has suggested two reflections, which we are the more disposed to put on paper, for this reason, that they never could arise from a simple reading of the very meagre abstract which we have presented. There are two things, then, which have struck us very forcibly, since we began this volume. The first is the astonishing diversity of arts to which the devil has resorted for the subversion of men's souls, and the exquisite skill with which they are adapted to successive ages and conditions of society. A Nero or Domitian would, perhaps, have been amazed at the idea of suppressing Christianity by subtle

* Dan. viii. 2—x. 4. Ezek. i. 1, 3.

speculations. Hume, in his turn, *seems* to have had no relish for Voltaire's asp-like sarcasm, or the coarseness of Tom Paine. Rousseau's infidelity is yet another compound of romance and poetry, eloquent inconsistency, and scientific paradox. All these, however, and indeed the whole herd of French and English Deists may hide their diminished heads before that most refined and sublimated form of unbelief—the pseudo-theology of modern German critics. This has incomparably more the air of truth, because it wears her outer garments, mimics her motions, and adopts her phraseology. Against a professed or reputed Deist, common sense is on its guard; but not against Doctors and Professors of Divinity. This seems to be the master-piece, this assumption of truth's colours by the pirate ships of error, this possession of truth's body by the demon of mendacity. Nor does the execution fall below the rare device. Such caution, such nicety, such tact, such remote investigations, such microscopic scrutiny, such diligent employment of "appliances and aids," such displays of candour, such rigorous adherence to established canons, in a word, such efficacious means have never been adopted in the cause of truth, as for years have been effectually and constantly employed by these Scribes and Rabbies in the Synagogue of Satan. Nothing can easily exceed the subtlety evinced by some of these ambuscades in their attacks upon the Bible. Metaphysical sophistry may unsettle the belief, or cloud the understanding; but it can soon be reduced to the standard of first principles, and is commonly, moreover, an enemy professed. But in this new warfare, there is, or seems to be, so much common ground, the foe concedes and parleys and negotiates so much, that we are perfectly bewildered. We defy any man who has been only familiar with the tactics and strategies of old fashioned infidelity, to commit himself a fortnight to such trusty guides as Eichhorn, de Wette, &c. &c. &c. and at the end of that time to tell whether his own belief is standing on its head or feet. It has been so universally the practice for the skeptic to set out by a rejection of the Scriptures, (as the word of God,) that when we find a critic not merely doing no such thing expressly, but confronting us boldly with a long array of lexicons, and grammars, expositions, illustrations, and critical apparatuses, it seems unfair to regard him with suspicion. These things may appear to have a very slight connexion with this work of Dr. Hengstenberg; but as we said before, that work has

now suggested them, although they have of course been often present to our thoughts on different occasions. He has been obliged to quote a multitude of arguments from his opponents, for the purpose of refuting them, and we are free to confess that we have been astonished at the plausibility and air of truth which some of them exhibit. It is true, that they are wanting in consistency; the same writer shifting the very basis of his reasonings, again and again, to provide for some new exigency; but it is in this very thing that their cunning is most visible. It is by breaking up the surface of a subject, so to speak, by clouding the general view, and confining the attention to detached particulars, by means of minute discussion and the parade of accuracy even in minutiaë, that the object is effected. The first thing to be done in opposition to their acts, is to bring the aggregate amount of evidence in favour of the truth to bear at once upon the reader's mind—the next thing is to sweep away the particles of rubbish which, like ants or beetles, they have heaped up one by one. Both these, Dr. Hengstenberg has skilfully accomplished in relation to the highly important subject of his volume.

But it is time to name the other thing which strikes us with such force. That other thing is, the depth of the riches both of the knowledge and wisdom of God, as seen in the overruling of these very artifices, to the praise of the glory of his grace. We may perhaps be charged with treating mere contingencies as facts, and describing what at the furthest is yet future, and may never happen, as a present reality. We do believe, however, that the end of all this will be glorious—that not a grain of the dust which has been thrown into our eyes will be without its use; but that all this apparatus which the enemy has reared against the battlements of Zion, shall be finally applied to the mighty pulling down of his own strong holds. In this very book, for example, there are objections stated, which, if taken by themselves, without any sort of antidote, would shake the faith of any man. Every dark corner of antiquities, geography and history, appears to have been ransacked for the weapons of this warfare. Now, while these remain unvanquished, the effect *must* be pernicious. But only suppose the enemy disarmed, and the advantage is a glorious one. We have not only merely recovered what appeared to have been lost; we have done more. We are masters of his stores and ammunition, and have gained a vantage ground, which renders every onset irresistible. This

change in the fortunes of the fight is now begun. It was in vain to cry peace when there was no peace, by affecting to denounce all learned criticisms as a sin and folly. It was equally vain to pass the matter by, as concerning none but Germans, and arising from their idiosyncracies of intellect. The cordon was passed, and a defence was wanted. The abuse of learning calls not for ignorance, but learning well applied. A better safeguard against the biblical skepticism of the Germans, could not have been provided, than that improvement in biblical literature which has actually taken place in England and America. But to carry the war into the enemy's country, something more was necessary. It was necessary that champions for the truth should arise in the very midst of its assailants, armed with their armour, skilled in their devices. The ablest foreigner would find it hard to wield their lances and direct their darts; and against all other weapons their habergeons are impervious. Let us rejoice, then, that the providence of God has raised up some even there, to battle for the faith; and let us pray that while they are engaged in this sharp conflict, the Lord, their strength, will teach their hands to war and their fingers to fight. We have reason, likewise, to take courage from certain movements in the enemy's camp. Extreme minuteness of investigation, seems, after intoxicating some minds, to have begun to sober them again. Rosenmüller has here and there abandoned an outwork once tenaciously maintained; and the first Hebrew scholar of the day, erroneous as he is, falls very far below the pitch of infidel credulity which some of his disciples and admirers have attained. This seems to show that it is not "much learning," but the smattering of sciolists, that tends to make men mad. At any rate, we may indulge the hope that when a few more Hengstenbergs and Tholucks have arisen, the victory, even in the schools of Germany, will be confessedly upon the side of truth.