THE

INTERNATIONAL STANDARD BIBLE ENCYCLOPAEDIA

JAMES ORR, M.A., D.D., GENERAL EDITOR

JOHN L. NUELSEN, D.D., LL.D.
EDGAR Y. MULLINS, D.D., LL.D.
ASSISTANT EDITORS

MORRIS O. EVANS, D.D., PH.D., MANAGING EDITOR

VOLUME II
CLEMENT—HERESH

to give the interpretation thereof. The wise men having said that they could not tell the dream, nor interpret it as long as it was untold, the king threatened them with death. Daniel, who seems not to have been present when the other wise men were before the king, when he was informed of the threat of the king, and that preparations were being made to slay all of the wise men of Babylon, himself and his three companions included, boldly went in to the king and requested that he would appoint a time for him to appear to show the interpretation. Then he went to his house, and he and his companions prayed, and the dream and its interpretation were made known unto Daniel. At the appointed time, the dream was explained and the four Hebrews were loaded with wealth and given high positions in the service of the king. In the 4th chapter, we have recorded Daniel's interpretation of the dream of Nebuchadnezzar about the great tree that was hewn at the command of an angel, thus prefiguring the insanity of the king.

Daniel's third great appearance in the book is in ch **5**, where he is called upon to explain the

3. Interpreter of Signs extraordinary writing upon the wall of Belshazzar's palace, which foretold the end of the Bab empire and the incoming of the Medes and Persians. For this service Daniel was clothed with purple, a chain of gold put around his neck, and he was made the third ruler in the kingdom.

Daniel, however, was not merely an interpreter of other men's visions. In the last six chapters we

4. Seer of Visions have recorded four or five of his own visions, all of which are taken up with revelations concerning the future history of the great world empires, esp. in their relation to the people of God, and predictions of the final triumph of the Messiah's kingdom.

In addition to his duties as seer and as interpreter of signs and dreams, Daniel also stood high

5. Official of the Kings in the governmental service of Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar, and Darius the Mede, and perhaps also of Cyrus. The Book of Dnl, our only reliable source of information on this subject, does not tell us much about his civil duties and performances. It does say, however, that he was chief of the wise men, that he was in the gate of the king, and that he was governor over the whole province of Babylon under Nebuchadnezzar; that Belshazzar made him the third ruler in his kingdom; and that Darius made him one of the three presidents to whom his hundred and twenty satraps were to give account; and that he even thought to set him over his whole kingdom. In all of these positions he seems to have conducted himself with faithfulness and judgment. While in the service of Darius the Mede, he aroused the antipathy of the other presidents and of the satraps. Unable to find any fault with his official acts, they induced the king to make a decree, apparently general in form and purpose, but really aimed at Daniel alone. They saw that they could find no valid accusation against him, unless they found it in connection with something concerning the law of his God. They therefore caused the king to make a decree that no one should make a request of anyone for the space of thirty days, save of the king. Daniel, having publicly prayed three times a day as he was in the habit of doing, was caught in the act, accused, and on account of the irrevocability of a law of the Medes and Persians, was condemned in accordance with the decree to be cast into a den of lions. The king was much troubled at this, but was unable to withhold the punishment. However, he expressed to Daniel his belief that his God in whom he trusted continually would deliver him; and so indeed it came to pass. For in the morning, when the king drew near to the mouth of the den, and called to him, Daniel said that God had sent His angel and shut the mouths of the lions. So Daniel was taken up unharmed, and at the command of the king his accusers, having been cast into the den, were destroyed before they reached the bottom.

LITERATURE.—Besides the commentaries and other works mentioned in the art. on the Book of Dnl, valuable information may be found in Jos and in Payne Smith's *Lectures on Daniel.*

R. DICK WILSON

DANIEL, dan'yel, BOOK OF:

I. Name.—The Book of Dnl is rightly so called, whether we consider Daniel as the author of it, or as the principal person mentioned in it.

II. Place in the Canon.—In the Eng. Bible, Dnl is placed among the Major Prophets, immediately after Ezk, thus following the order of the Sept and of the Lat Vulg. In the Heb Bible, however, it is placed in the third division of the Canon, called the Kethuvim or writings, by the Hebrews, and the hagiographa, or holy writings, by the Seventy. It has been claimed, that Dnl was placed by the Jews in the third part of the Canon, either because they thought the inspiration of its author to be of a lower kind than was that of the other prophets, or because the book was written after the second or prophetical part of the Canon had been closed. It is more probable, that the book was placed in this part of the Heb Canon, because Daniel is not called a *nābhī'* ("prophet"), but was rather a *ḥōzeh* ("seer") and a *ḥākhām* ("wise man"). None but the works of the *nᵉbhī'īm* were put in the second part of the Jewish Canon, the third being reserved for the heterogeneous works of seers, wise men, and priests, or for those that do not mention the name or work of a prophet, or that are poetical in form. A confusion has arisen, because the Gr word prophet is used to render the two Heb words *nābhī'* and *ḥōzeh.* In the Scriptures, God is said to speak to the former, whereas the latter see visions and dream dreams. Some have attempted to explain the position of Daniel by assuming that he had the prophetic gift without holding the prophetic office. It must be kept in mind that all reasons given to account for the order and place of many of the books in the Canon are purely conjectural, since we have no historical evidence bearing upon the subject earlier than the time of Jesus ben Sirach, who wrote probably about 180 BC.

III. Divisions of the Book.—According to its subject-matter, the book falls naturally into two great divisions, each consisting of six chapters, the first portion containing the historical sections, and the second the apocalyptic, or predictive, portions; though the former is not devoid of predictions, nor the latter of historical statements. More specifically, the first chapter is introductory to the whole book; chs **2-6** describe some marvelous events in the history of Daniel and his three companions in their relations with the rulers of Babylon; and chs **7-12** narrate some visions of Daniel concerning the great world-empires, esp. in relation to the kingdom of God.

According to the languages in which the book is written, it may be divided into the Aram. portion, extending from **2** 4*b* to the end of ch **7**, and a Heb portion embracing the rest of the book.

IV. Languages.—The language of the book is partly Heb and partly a dialect of Aram., which has been called Chaldee, or Bib. Aram. This Aram. is almost exactly the same as that which is found in portions of Ezr. On account of the large number of Bab and Pers words characteristic of this Aram. and of that of the papyri recently found in Egypt, as well as on account of the general similarity of the nominal, verbal and other forms, and of the syntactical construction, the Aram. of this period might properly be called the Bab-Pers Aram. With the exception of the sign used to denote the sound *dh*, and of the use of *ḳōph* in a few cases where Dnl has *'ayin*, the spelling in the papyri is the same in general as that in the Bib. books. Whether the change of spelling was made at a later time in the MSS of Dnl, or whether it was a peculiarity of the Bab Aram. as distinguished from the Egyp, or whether it was due to the unifying, scientific genius of Daniel himself, we have no means at present to determine. In view of the fact that the Elephantine Papyri frequently employ the *d* sign to express the *dh* sound, and that it is always employed in Ezr to express it; in view further of the fact that the *z* sign is found as late as the earliest Nabatean inscription, that of 70 BC (see Euting, 349: 1, 2, 4) to express the *dh* sound, it seems fatuous to insist on the ground of the writing of these two sounds in the Book of Dnl, that it cannot have been written in the Pers period. As to the use of *ḳōph* and *'ayin* for the Aram. sound which corresponds to the Heb *çadhē* when equivalent to an Arab. *dad*, any hasty conclusion is debarred by the fact that the Aram. papyri of the 5th cent. BC, the MSS of the Sam Tg and the Mandaic MSS written from 600 to 900 AD all employ the two letters to express the one sound. The writing of *'āleph* and *hē* without any proper discrimination occurs in the papyri as well as in Dnl. The only serious objection to the early date of Dnl upon the ground of its spelling is that which is based upon the use of a final *n* in the pronominal suffix of the second and third persons masc. pl. instead of the *m* of the Aram. papyri and of the Zakir and Sendschirli inscriptions. It is possible that Dnl was influenced in this by the corresponding forms of the Bab language. The Syr and Mandaic dialects of the Aram. agree with the Bab in the formation of the pronominal suffixes of the second and third persons masc. pl., as against the Heb, Arab., Minaean, Sabaean and Ethiopic. It is possible that the occurrence of *m* in some west Aram. documents may have arisen through the influence of the Heb and Phoen, and that pure Aram. always had *n* just as we find it in Assyr and Bab, and in all east Aram. documents thus far discovered.

The supposition that the use of *y* in Dnl as a preformative of the third person masculine of the imperfect proves a Palestinian provenience has been shown to be untenable by the discovery that the earliest east Syr also used *y*. (See M. Pognon, *Inscriptions sémitiques*, première partie, 17.) This inscription is dated 73 AD. This proof that in the earlier stages of its history the east Aram. was in this respect the same as that found in Dnl is confirmed by the fact that the forms of the 3d person of the imperfect found in the proper names on the Aram. dockets of the Assyr inscriptions also have the preformative *y*. (See *CIS*, II, 47.)

V. Purpose of the Book.—The book is not intended to give an account of the life of Daniel. It gives neither his lineage, nor his age, and recounts but a few of the events of his long career. Nor is it meant to give a record of the history of Israel during the exile, nor even of the captivity in Babylon. Its purpose is to show how by His providential guidance, His miraculous interventions, His foreknowledge and almighty power, the God of heaven controls and directs the forces of Nature and the history of nations, the lives of Heb captives and of the mightiest of the kings of the earth, for the accomplishment of His Divine and beneficent plans for His servants and people.

VI. Unity.—The unity of the book was first denied by Spinoza, who suggested that the first part was taken from the chronological works of the Chaldaeans, basing his supposition upon the difference of language between the former and latter parts. Newton followed Spinoza in suggesting two parts, but began his second division with ch **7**, where the narrative passes over from the 3d to the 1st person. Köhler follows Newton, claiming, however, that the visions were written by the Daniel of the exile, but that the first 6 chapters were composed by a later writer who also redacted the whole work. Von Orelli holds that certain prophecies of Daniel were enlarged and interpolated by a Jew living in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, in order to show his contemporaries the bearing of the predictions of the book upon those times of oppression. Zöckler and Lange hold to the unity of the book in general; but the former thought that **11** 5–45 is an interpolation; and the latter, that **10** 1—**11** 44 and **12** 5–13 have been inserted in the original work. Meinhold holds that the Aram. portions existed as early as the times of Alexander the Great—a view to which Strack also inclines. Eichhorn held that the book consisted of ten different original sections, which are bound together merely by the circumstance that they are all concerned with Daniel and his three friends. Finally, De Lagarde, believing that the fourth kingdom was the Rom, held that ch **7** was written about 69 AD. (For the best discussion of the controversies about the unity of Dnl, see Eichhorn, *Einleitung*, §§ 612–19, and Buhl in *RE*, IV, 449–51.)

VII. Genuineness.—With the exception of the neo-Platonist Porphyry, a Gr non-Christian philosopher of the 3d cent. AD, the genuineness of the Book of Dnl was denied by no one until the rise of the deistic movement in the 17th cent. The attacks upon the genuineness of the book have been based upon (1) the predictions, (2) the miracles, (3) the text, (4) the language, (5) the historical statements.

The assailants of the genuineness of Dnl on the ground of the predictions found therein, may be divided into two classes—those who deny prediction in general, and those who claim that the apocalyptic character of the predictions of Dnl is a sufficient proof of their lack of genuineness. The first of these two classes includes properly those only who deny not merely Christianity, but theism; and the answering of them may safely be left to those who defend the doctrines of theism, and particularly of revelation. The second class of assailants is, however, of a different character, since it consists of those who are sincere believers in Christianity and predictive prophecy. They claim, however, that certain characteristics of definiteness and detail, distinguishing the predictive portions of the Book of Dnl from other predictions of the OT, bring the genuineness of Dnl into question.

1. The Predictions

The kind of prediction found here, ordinarily called apocalyptic, is said to have arisen first in the 2d cent. BC, when parts of the Book of En and of the Sibylline Oracles were written; and a main characteristic of an apocalypse is said to be that it records past events as if they were still future, throwing the speaker back into some distant past time,

for the purpose of producing on the reader the impression that the book contains real predictions, thus gaining credence for the statements of the writer and giving consolation to those who are thus led to believe in the providential foresight of God for those who trust in Him.

Since those who believe that God has spoken unto man by His Son and through the prophets will not be able to set limits to the extent and definiteness of the revelations which He may have seen fit to make through them, nor to prescribe the method, style, time and character of the revelations, this attack on the genuineness of Dnl may safely be left to the defenders of the possibility and the fact of a revelation. One who believes in these may logically believe in the genuineness of Dnl, as far as this objection goes. That there are spurious apocalypses no more proves that all are spurious than that there are spurious gospels or epistles proves that there are no genuine ones. The spurious epp. of Philaris do not prove that Cicero's Letters are not genuine; nor do the false statements of 2 Macc, nor the many spurious Acts of the Apostles, prove that 1 Macc or Luke's Acts of the Apostles is not genuine. Nor does the fact that the oldest portions of the spurious apocalypses which have been preserved to our time are thought to have been written in the 2d cent. BC, prove that no apocalypses, either genuine or spurious, were written before that time. There must have been a beginning, a first apocalypse, at some time, if ever. Besides, if we admit that the earliest parts of the Book of En and of the Sibylline Oracles were written about the middle of the 2d cent. BC, whereas the Book of Esd was written about 300 AD, 450 years later, we can see no good literary reason why Dnl may not have antedated En by 350 years. The period between 500 BC and 150 BC is so almost entirely devoid of all known Heb literary productions as to render it exceedingly precarious for anyone to express an opinion as to what works may have characterized that long space of time.

Secondly, as to the objections made against the Book of Dnl on the ground of the number or character of the miracles recorded, we shall
2. The only say that they affect the whole
Miracles Christian system, which is full of the miraculous from beginning to end. If we begin to reject the books of the Bible because miraculous events are recorded in them, where indeed shall we stop?

Thirdly, a more serious objection, as far as Dnl itself is concerned, is the claim of Eichhorn that
the original text of the Aram. portion
3. The Text has been so thoroughly tampered with
and changed, that we can no longer get at the genuine original composition. We ourselves can see no objection to the belief that these Aram. portions were written first of all in Heb, or even, if you will, in Bab; nor to the supposition that some Gr translators modified the meaning in their version either intentionally, or through a misunderstanding of the original. We claim, however, that the composite Aram. of Dnl agrees in almost every particular of orthography, etymology and syntax, with the Aram. of the North Sem inscriptions of the 9th, 8th and 7th cents. BC and of the Egyp papyri of the 5th cent. BC, and that the vocabulary of Dnl has an admixture of Heb, Bab and Pers words similar to that of the papyri of the 5th cent. BC; whereas, it differs in composition from the Aram. of the Nabateans, which is devoid of Pers, Heb, and Bab words, and is full of Arabisms, and also from that of the Palmyrenes, which is full of Gr words, and having but one or two Pers words, and no Heb or Bab.

As to different recensions, we meet with a similar difficulty in Jeremiah without anyone's impugning

on that account the genuineness of the work as a whole. As to interpolations of verses or sections, they are found in the Sam recension of the Heb text and in the Sam and other Tgs, as also in certain places in the text of the NT, Jos and many other ancient literary works, without causing us to disbelieve in the genuineness of the rest of their works, or of the works as a whole.

Fourthly, the objections to the genuineness of Dnl based on the presence in it of three Gr names of
musical instruments and of a number
4. The of Pers words do not seem nearly as
Language weighty today as they did a hundred
years ago. The Gr inscriptions at Abu Simbal in Upper Egypt dating from the time of Psamtek II in the early part of the 6th cent. BC, the discovery of the Minoan inscriptions and ruins in Crete, the revelations of the wide commercial relations of the Phoenicians in the early part of the 1st millennium BC, the lately published inscriptions of Sennacherib about his campaigns in Cilicia against the Gr seafarers to which Alexander Polyhistor and Abydenus had referred, telling about his having carried many Greeks captive to Nineveh about 700 BC, the confirmation of the wealth and expensive ceremonies of Nebuchadnezzar made by his own building and other inscriptions, all assure us of the possibility of the use of Gr musical instruments at Babylon in the 6th cent. BC. This, taken along with the well-known fact that names of articles of commerce and esp. of musical instruments go with the thing, leave no room to doubt that a writer of the 6th cent. BC may have known and used borrowed Gr terms. The Aramaeans being the great commercial middlemen between Egypt and Greece on the one hand and Babylon and the Orient on the other, and being in addition a subject people, would naturally adopt many foreign words into their vocabulary.

As to the presence of the so-called Pers words in Dnl, it must be remembered that many words which were formerly considered to be such have been found to be Bab. As to the others, perhaps all of them may be Median rather than Pers; and if so, the children of Israel who were carried captive to the cities of the Medes in the middle of the 8th cent. BC, and the Aramaeans, many of whom were subject to the Medes, at least from the time of the fall of Nineveh about 607 BC, may well have adopted many words into their vocabulary from the language of their rulers. Daniel was not writing merely for the Jews who had been carried captive by Nebuchadnezzar, but for all Israelites throughout the world. Hence, he would properly use a language which his scattered readers would understand rather than the purer idiom of Judaea. Most of his foreign terms are names of officials, legal terms, and articles of clothing, for which there were no suitable terms existing in the earlier Heb or Aram. There was nothing for a writer to do but to invent new terms, or to transfer the current foreign words into his native language. The latter was the preferable method and the one which he adopted.

Fifthly, objections to the genuineness of the Book of Dnl are made on the ground of the historical
misstatements which are said to be
5. Histori- found in it. These may be classed as
cal State- (1) chronological, (2) geographical, and
ments (3) various.
(1) *Chronological objections.*—The first chronological objection is derived from Dnl **1** 1, where it is said that Nebuchadnezzar made an expedition against Jerus in the 3d year of Jehoiakim, whereas Jeremiah seems to imply that the expedition was made in the 4th year of that king. As Daniel was writing primarily for the Jews of Babylon, he would naturally use the system of dating that was

employed there; and this system differed in its method of denoting the 1st year of a reign from that used by the Egyptians and by the Jews of Jerus for whom Jeremiah wrote.

The second objection is derived from the fact that Daniel is said (Dnl **1** 21) to have lived unto the 1st year of Cyrus the king, whereas in **10** 1 he is said to have seen a vision in the 3d year of Cyrus, king of Persia. These statements are easily reconciled by supposing that in the former case it is the 1st year of Cyrus as king of Babylon, and in the second, the 3d year of Cyrus as king of Persia.

The third chronological objection is based on **6** 28, where it is said that Daniel prospered in the kingdom of Darius and in the kingdom of Cyrus the Persian. This statement is harmonized with the facts revealed by the monuments and with the statements of the book itself by supposing that Darius reigned synchronously with Cyrus, but as sub-king under him.

The fourth objection is based on **8** 1, where Daniel is said to have seen a vision in the third year of Belshazzar the king. If we suppose that Belshazzar was king of the Chaldaeans while his father was king of Babylon, just as Cambyses was king of Babylon while his father, Cyrus, was king of the lands, or as Nabonidus II seems to have been king of Harran while his father, Nabonidus I, was king of Babylon, this statement will harmonize with the other statements made with regard to Belshazzar.

(2) *Geographical objections.*—As to the geographical objections, three only need be considered as important. The first is, that Shushan seems to be spoken of in **7** 2 as subject to Babylon, whereas it is supposed by some to have been at that time subject to Media. Here we can safely rest upon the opinion of Winckler, that at the division of the Assyr dominions among the allied Medes and Babylonians, Elam became subject to Babylon rather than to Media. If, however, this opinion could be shown not to be true, we must remember that Daniel is said to have been at Shushan in a vision.

The second geographical objection is based on the supposition that Nebuchadnezzar would not have gone against Jerus, leaving an Egyp garrison at Carchemish in his rear, thus endangering his line of communication and a possible retreat to Babylon. This objection has no weight, now that the position of Carchemish has been shown to be, not at Ciressium, as formerly conjectured, but at Jirabis, 150 miles farther up the Euphrates. Carchemish would have cut off a retreat to Nineveh, but was far removed from the direct line of communication with Babylon.

The third geographical objection is derived from the statement that Darius placed 120 satraps in, or over, all his kingdom. The objection rests upon a false conception of the meaning of satrap and of the extent of a satrapy, there being no reason why a sub-king under Darius may not have had as many satraps under him as Sargon of Assyria had governors and deputies under him; and the latter king mentions 117 peoples and countries over which he appointed his deputies to rule in his place.

(3) *Other objections.*—Various other objections to the genuineness of Dnl have been made, the principal being those derived from the supposed non-existence of Kings Darius the Mede and Belshazzar the Chaldaean, from the use of the word Chaldaean to denote the wise men of Babylon, and from the silence of other historical sources as to many of the events recorded in Dnl. The discussion of the existence of Belshazzar and Darius the Mede will be found under BELSHAZZAR and DARIUS. As to the argument from silence in general, it may be said that it reduces itself in fact to the absence of all reference to Daniel on the monuments, in the Book of Ecclus,

and in the post-exilic lit. As to the latter books it proves too much; for Hag, Zec, and Mal, as well as Ezr, Neh, and Est, refer to so few of the older canonical books and earlier historical persons and events, that it is not fair to expect them to refer to Daniel—at least, to use their not referring to him or his book as an argument against the existence of either before the time when they were written. As to Ecclus, we might have expected him to mention Daniel or the Three Children; but who knows what reasons Ben Sira may have had for not placing them in his list of Heb heroes? Perhaps, since he held the views which later characterized the Sadducees, he may have passed Daniel by because of his views on the resurrection and on angels. Perhaps he failed to mention any of the four companions because none of their deeds had been wrought in Pal; or because their deeds exalted too highly the heathen monarchies to which the Jews were subject. Or, more likely, the book may have been unknown to him, since very few copies at best of the whole OT can have existed in his time, and the Book of Dnl may not have gained general currency in Pal before it was made so preëminent by the fulfilment of its predictions in the Maccabean times.

It is not satisfactory to say that Ben Sira did not mention Daniel and his companions, because the stories concerning them had not yet been imbedded in a canonical book, inasmuch as he does place Simon, the high priest, among the greatest of Israel's great men, although he is not mentioned in any canonical book. In conclusion, it may be said, that while it is impossible for us to determine why Ben Sira does not mention Daniel and his three companions among his worthies, if their deeds were known to him, it is even more impossible to understand how these stories concerning them cannot merely have arisen but have been accepted as true, between 180 BC, when Ecclus is thought to have been written, and 169 BC, when, according to 1 Macc, Matthias, the first of the Asmoneans, exhorted his brethren to follow the example of the fortitude of Ananias and his friends.

As to the absence of all mention of Daniel on the contemporary historical documents of Babylon and Persia, such mention is not to be expected, inasmuch as those documents give the names of none who occupied positions such as, or similar to, those which Daniel is said to have filled.

VIII. Interpretation.—Questions of the interpretation of particular passages may be looked for in the commentaries and special works. As to the general question of the kind of prophecy found in the Book of Dnl, it has already been discussed above under the caption of "Genuineness." As to the interpretation of the world monarchies which precede the monarchy of the Messiah Prince, it may be said, however, that the latest discoveries, ruling out as they do a separate Median empire that included Babylon, support the view that the four monarchies are the Bab, the Pers, the Gr, and the Rom. According to this view, Darius the Mede was only a sub-king under Cyrus the Pers. Other interpretations have been made by selecting the four empires from those of Assyria, Babylonia, Media, Persia, Medo-Persia, Alexander, the Seleucids, the Romans, and the Mohammedans. The first and the last of these have generally been excluded from serious consideration. The main dispute is as to whether the 4th empire was that of the Seleucids, or that of the Romans, the former view being held commonly by those who hold to the composition of Dnl in the 2d cent. BC, and the latter by those who hold to the traditional view that it was written in the 6th cent. BC.

IX. Doctrines.—It is universally admitted that the teachings of Daniel with regard to angels and

the resurrection are more explicit than those found elsewhere in the OT. As to angels, Daniel attributes to them names, ranks, and functions not mentioned by others. It has become common in certain quarters to assert that these peculiarities of Daniel are due to Pers influences. The Bab monuments, however, have revealed the fact that the Babylonians believed in both good and evil spirits with names, ranks, and different functions. These spirits correspond in several respects to the Heb angels, and may well have afforded Daniel the background for his visions. Yet, in all such matters, it must be remembered that Daniel purports to give us a vision, or revelation; and a revelation cannot be bound by the ordinary laws of time and human influence.

As to the doctrine of the resurrection, it is generally admitted that Daniel adds some new and distinct features to that which is taught in the other canonical books of the Old Testament. But it will be noted that he does not dwell upon this doctrine, since he mentions it only in **12 2**. The materials for his doctrine are to be found in Isa **26** 14.21 and **66** 24; Ezk **37** 1–14, and in Job **14** 12; **19** 25; Hos **6** 2; 1 K **17**; 2 K **4**, and **8** 1–5, as well as in the use of the words for sleep and awakening from sleep, or from the dust, for everlasting life or everlasting contempt in Isa **26** 19; Ps **76** 6; **13** 3; **127** 2; Dt **31** 16; 2 S **7** 12; 1 K **1** 21; Job **7** 21, and Jer **20** 11; **23** 40. The essential ideas and phraseology of Daniel's teachings are found in Isa, Jer, and Ezk. The first two parts of the books of En and 2 Macc make much of the resurrection; but on the other hand, Eccl seems to believe not even in the immortality of the soul, and Wisd and 1 Macc do not mention a resurrection of the body.

That the post-exilic prophets do not mention a resurrection does not prove that they knew nothing about Dnl any more than it proves that they knew nothing about Isa, Jer, and Ezk.

There are resemblances, it is true, between the teachings of Daniel with regard to the resurrection and those of the Avesta. But so are there between his doctrines and the ideas of the Egyptians, which had existed for millenniums before his time. Besides there is no proof of any derivation of doctrines from the Persians by the writers of the canonical books of the Jews; and, as we have seen above, both the ideas and verbiage of Daniel are to be found in the acknowledgedly early Heb literature. And finally, this attempt to find a natural origin for all Bib. ideas leaves out of sight the fact that the Scriptures contain revelations from God, which transcend the ordinary course of human development. To a Christian, therefore, there can be no reason for believing that the doctrines of Dnl may not have been promulgated in the 6th cent. BC.

The best commentaries on Dnl from a conservative point of view are those by Calvin, Moses Stuart, Keil, Zöckler, Strong in Lange's *Bibelwerk*, **Commentaries and Introductions** Fuller in the *Speaker's Commentary*, Thomson in the *Pulpit Commentary*, and Wright, *Daniel and His Critics*. The best defences of Daniel's authenticity and genuineness are Hengstenberg, *Authenticity of the Book of Daniel*, Tregelles, *Defense of the Authenticity*, Auberlen, *The Prophecies of Daniel*, Fuller, *Essay on the Authenticity of Daniel*, Pusey, *Daniel the Prophet* (still the best of all), C. H. H. Wright, *Daniel and His Critics*, Kennedy, *The Book of Daniel from the Christian Standpoint*, Joseph Wilson, *Daniel*, and Sir Robert Anderson, *Daniel in the Critics' Den*. One should consult also Pinches, *The Old Testament in the Light of the Historical Records of Assyria and Babylonia*, Clay, *Light on the Old Testament from Babel*, and Orr, *The Problem of the OT*. For Eng. readers, the radical school is best represented by Driver in his *Lit. of the OT* and in his *Daniel*; by Bevan, *The Book of Daniel*; by Prince, *Commentary on Daniel*, and by Cornill in his *Intro to the OT*.

X. Apocryphal Additions.—In the Gr translations of Dnl three or four pieces are added which are not found in the original Heb or Aram. text as it has come down to us. These are The Prayer of Azarias, The Song of the Three Holy Children, Susanna, and Bel and the Dragon. These additions have all been rejected from the Canon by the Protestant churches because they are not contained in the Heb Canon. In the Church of England they are "read for example of life and instruction of manners." The Three was "ordered in the rubric of the first Prayer Book of Edward VI (AD 1549) to be used in Lent as a responsory to the OT Lesson at the Morning Prayer." It contains the Prayer of Azarias from the midst of the fiery furnace, and the song of praise by the three children for their deliverance; the latter being couched largely in phrases borrowed from Ps **148**. Sus presents to us the story of a virtuous woman who resisted the seductive attempts of two judges of the elders of the people, whose machinations were exposed through the wisdom of Daniel who convicted them of false witness by the evidence of their own mouth, so that they were put to death according to the law of Moses; and from that day forth Daniel was held in great reputation in the sight of the people. Bel contains three stories. The first relates how Daniel destroyed the image of Bel which Nebuchadnezzar worshipped, by showing by means of ashes strewn on the floor of the temple that the offerings to Bel were devoured by the priests who came secretly into the temple by night. The second tells how Daniel killed the Dragon by throwing lumps of mingled pitch, fat and hair into his mouth, so causing the Dragon to burst asunder. The third gives a detailed account of the lions' den, stating that there were seven lions and that Daniel lived in the den six days, being sustained by broken bread and pottage which a prophet named Habakkuk brought to him through the air, an angel of the Lord having taken him by the arm and borne him by the hair of his head and through the vehemency of his spirit set him in Babylon over the den, into which he dropped the food for Daniel's use.

LITERATURE.—For commentaries on the additions to the Book of Dnl, see the works on Dnl cited above, and also *The Apocrypha* by Churton and others; the volume on the Apocrypha in Lange's *Commentary* by Bissell; "The Apocrypha" by Wace in the *Speaker's Commentary*, and Schürer, *History of the Jewish People*.

R. DICK WILSON

DANITES, dan'īts (הַדָּנִי, *ha-dānī*): Occurs as describing those belonging to Dan in Jgs **13** 2; **18** 1.11; 1 Ch **12** 35.

DAN-JAAN, dan-jā'an (דָּן יַעַן, *dān ya'an*; B, Δὰν Εἰδὰν καὶ Οὐδάν, *Dán Eidán kai Oudán*): A place visited by Joab and his officers when taking the census (2 S **24** 6). It is mentioned between Gilead and Sidon. Some would identify it with *Khān Dāniān*, a ruined site N. of Achzib. The text is probably corrupt. Klostermann would read "toward Dan and Ijon" (cf 1 K **15** 20).

DANNAH, dan'a (דַּנָּה, *dannāh*): One of the cities in the hill country of Judah (Josh **15** 49) between Socoh and Kiriath-sannah (Debir), probably Idhna—the Iedna of the *Onom*—8 miles W. of Hebron. See *PEF*, III, 305, 330.

DAPHNE, daf'nē (Δάφνη, *Dáphnē*, "bay-tree"): A suburb of Antioch on the Orontes, according to Strabo and the Jerus itinerary, about 40 furlongs, or 5 miles distant. It is identified with *Beit el-Mā'* on the left bank of the river, to the S.W. of the city. Here were the famous grove and sanctuary of Apollo. The grove and shrine owed their origin to Seleucus Nicator. It was a place of great natural beauty, and the Seleucid kings spared no outlay in adding to its attractions. The precincts enjoyed the right of asylum. Hither fled Onias the high