

The Princeton Theological Review

JANUARY, 1921

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE REFORMED THEOLOGY TODAY*

MR. PRESIDENT, GENTLEMEN OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS, FATHERS AND BRETHERN :

I have a very profound sense of unworthiness in taking up the duties of the Chair to which you have called me—a Chair made famous by the illustrious men who have preceded me, and whose labours have helped to give Princeton Seminary a fame throughout the world for sound learning and true piety. We think today of Archibald Alexander, that man of God, the first Professor in this Seminary; of Charles Hodge, whose Systematic Theology today remains as probably the greatest exposition of the Reformed Theology in the English language; of Archibald Alexander Hodge, a man of rare popular gifts and of unusual metaphysical ability; and last, but not least, excelling them all in erudition, of Dr. Warfield, whose recent death has left us bereft of our leader and of one of the greatest men who have ever taught in this Institution.

I would pause a moment to pay a tribute to his memory. He was my honoured teacher and friend. For twenty years I had the privilege of helping him in this department, and drew inspiration from his broad minded scholarship. At the time of his death he was, I think, without an equal as a theologian in the English speaking world. With Doctors Kuyper and Bavinck of Holland, he made up a great trio of outstanding exponents of the Reformed Faith. His loss is simply irreparable. But he has gone to his reward, to

* An Inaugural Address delivered by Caspar Wistar Hodge on the occasion of his induction into the Charles Hodge Chair of Didactic and Polemic Theology, Miller Chapel, October 11th, 1921.

“DANIEL NOT QUOTED”

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

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

There are in these objections four assumptions:

1. That it is marvellous, that the narrative of Daniel if historical “should be passed over in utter silence by all extant Jewish writers down to the later half of the 2nd century B.C.”
2. That it is marvellous, “that it should have left no trace in any of the later prophetic books, in Ezra, Chronicles or Ecclesiasticus.”
3. That it is easy to refute from Jewish literature “any-

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

one who asserted that the book of Isaiah or that of Jeremiah was composed entirely (?) in the Maccabean period."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. The *Letter of Aristaeus* written in Greek about 200 B.C. "does not profess to discuss the origin of any part of the Alexandrian Bible except the Pentateuch." A careful reading of it fails to reveal any reference to any of the books or events or persons of the Old Testament except those that belong to the books of Moses.

5. Aside from the books named in the second assumption, the only Biblical book which claims to have been written in this period is that of Esther. Since this book

² Eusebius, *Præp. Evang.* xiii. 12.2.

does not mention any of the other prophets, there is no good reason why it should be expected to mention Daniel. Again, if its failure to mention Daniel shows that Daniel did not exist, it might be argued that its failure to mention the other prophets proved that they also did not exist. This would be absurd. Besides, no one claims this.

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

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

The late prophetic writings are Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi; to which some critics would add Jonah and Joel. Since no one of these prophets refers by name to Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, or any of the earlier prophets, it can hardly seem *marvellous* that they do not refer to Daniel. As to Chronicles, why should it be considered marvellous that Daniel is never mentioned in it, seeing that with the exception of the last ten verses and the fragments of one or two genealogies, the history contained therein ceases with the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar? To be sure, we find Isaiah prominent in the part narrating the political history of Hezekiah, and Jeremiah is said to have lamented the untimely end of Josiah and to have prophesied the captivity in Babylon and its end after 70 years; but there was no occasion for naming Daniel, who had nothing directly to do with the political affairs of Jerusalem. Moreover Daniel's history and visions occurred in the time of Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar, Darius and Cyrus, near, or after, the end of the captivity, and the history of Chronicles with the exception of the last two verses extends merely till the destruction of Jerusalem. Besides, Chronicles contains no mention of Ezekiel, nor of any of the Minor Prophets.

As to the last two verses of Chronicles where it is said

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

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

As to Ecclesiasticus,⁸ the last of the books appealed to by Mr. Bevan, Daniel is possibly referred to in chap. xlix.10; but if this be not admitted, it is possible that Ben Sira did not mention Daniel, either because he was opposed to his doctrines, or because he was not personally acquainted with his book.

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

In this connection, too, one might ask why Mr. Bevan fails to appeal to Nehemiah. For it is certain that his prayer in chapter ix. has a striking resemblance to the prayer of the ninth chapter of Daniel. One of them almost certainly had the prayer of the other in mind when he made his own. Since Daniel purports to have made his prayer

⁸ See my article in this REVIEW for July 1916.

about the middle of the sixth century B.C. and Nehemiah his toward the end of the fifth, the *prima facie* evidence would assuredly be in favor of Daniel.

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

III. In regard to the third assumption, it cannot be admitted that the cases of Isaiah and Jeremiah on the one hand, and that of Daniel on the other are identical. In the case of the former, we have the books of Kings and Chronicles covering the whole period in which Isaiah lived and a large part of that in which Jeremiah lived. Besides, Isaiah lived more than 150 years before Daniel and his work is one of the earliest of the prophets, and Jeremiah labored mostly before the destruction of Jerusalem, and both were intimately bound up with the history of Jerusalem and its kings and prophesied to and for the people of Israel in particular. Whereas Daniel prophesied and wrote after most of the books of the Old Testament had been written. No history covering his time has come down to us. His labors had nothing to do with Jerusalem, or its

kings, and his prophecies concerned the world at large rather than the Jewish people in particular.

Moreover, it is not so much easier to prove by external evidence that the prophecy of Isaiah is pre-Maccabean than it is to show that Daniel was. For what is the evidence aside from the book itself for the early date of Isaiah? The book of Kings? No, for it contains no evidence as to Isaiah except what is found in substantially the same words in chapters xxxvi.-xxxix. of Isaiah itself. The book of Chronicles? No, for it again contains nothing about Isaiah except what is found in Kings and in chapters xxxvi.-xxxix. of the book of Isaiah. In these three books we have, except for slight textual variations, exactly the same account of the reign of Hezekiah and of the person and work of Isaiah. This account does not mention the prophecies contained in 1-35 and 40-66; nor that Isaiah ever wrote such prophecies at all. For direct evidence in favor of the genuineness and authenticity of the prophetic parts of the book of Isaiah, we are left, therefore, as far as these three books are concerned, to the internal evidence of the prophecies themselves. They stand on exactly the same footing in this respect as the Book of Daniel. If we are not allowed, then, to use the *prima facie* evidence of the book of Daniel, neither should we use *prima facie* evidence of the book of Isaiah.

As to other evidence for the book of Isaiah, what is there? The three verses of chapter ii. 2-4, which are almost the same as iv. 1-3 of Micah? But, if the author of Isaiah quoted Micah, he may have quoted him as well in the 2nd century B.C. as in the 7th or 8th. In 2 Chron. xxvi. 22, we are told that Isaiah, the son of Amos, wrote the acts of Uzziah, first and last. Whatever this work may have been, it is no part of our present book of Isaiah. Again, in 2 Chron. xxxii. 32, it is said, that the acts of Hezekiah and his goodness are written in the vision of Isaiah, the son of Amos, in the book of the kings of Judah and Israel. This is probably the book from which the historical section

of Isaiah, contained in chapters xxxvi.-xxxix., was taken. It cannot be shown to have embraced the other chapters.

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

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

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

As to other Biblical testimony, Isaiah is worse off than

Daniel. For whereas in the case of Daniel Mr. Bevan would deem it marvellous "that he is not mentioned in the later Hebrew prophets (i.e., in Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi); Isaiah is not merely not mentioned in them, but neither is he mentioned in Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Jeremiah, or Ezekiel, nor in Ezra, Nehemiah, or Esther, —all of whom were later than he and must have been acquainted with his works.

Furthermore, the letter of Aristeas never mentions Isaiah nor does any extra-Biblical source, except Ecclesiasticus, till the time of 1st Maccabees.

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

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

2. But (1) Isaiah is never mentioned by name by any of the prophets who succeeded him; and is referred to in the Bible, aside from a brief reference in II Chron. xxvi. 12, only in the passages of II Kings and II Chronicles which are as we have seen the same as those found in Isaiah xxxvi.-xxxix. He is quoted possibly in Mic. iv. 1-3. Outside the Bible, he is first cited in Jewish literature in Ecclesiasticus xlvi. 22-25, where his name also is mentioned. The passages in 1 Macc. vii. 41 and 2 Macc. xv. 22 which mention the destruction of the army of Sennacherib, may have been derived from 2 Kings or 2 Chronicles as well as from Isaiah xxxvii. Yet the book of Ecclesiasticus was written 520 years after the admittedly genuine prophecies of Isaiah. (2) Jeremiah is referred to by name in Dan. ix. 2 and in 2 Kings and 2 Chronicles; but is not mentioned, nor cited, in Haggai, Zechariah, or Malachi, nor in Ezra, except in i. 1, which is the same as 2 Chr. xxxvi. 22. Afterwards, he is not cited nor mentioned till in Ecclus. xlix. 6, 7 and next in the 1st century B.C. in 2 Macc. ii. 1-8 and xv. 14 and in the introduction of the apocryphal

Epistle of Jeremiah. It is remarkable that the book of Baruch does not mention him by name.

It thus appears that Jeremiah is not mentioned by any Jewish writer from the time of the captivity till 180 B.C., except by the composer of the first two verses of Ezra, which are the same as the last two verses of 2 Chronicles. As the critics hold that these verses were not written till 300 B.C., or later, the external testimony to Jeremiah would thus be for *them*, at least 250 years after the time of his death. (3) Ezekiel is not mentioned by any writer of his own time, nor by any succeeding prophet, nor by any canonical book of the Old Testament. He is mentioned only in Ecclesiasticus xlix. 8 of all the Old Testament apocryphal literature. He is not named in the New Testament nor in Philo; but Josephus mentions him by name four times (B. X. v. 1, vi. 3, vii. 2, viii. 2). (4) Of the Minor Prophets, Jonah, Haggai, and Zechariah alone are mentioned in the historical writings of the Old Testament and no one of them is mentioned by name in any other prophetic work, except Micah in Jer. xxvi. 18. No one of them is mentioned in extra-Biblical literature till New Testament times except Habakkuk in the apocalyptic additions to Daniel. In the New Testament the prophet Joel is named and cited in Acts ii. 16-21; and Jonah is mentioned and cited in Matt. xii. 39 and Lk. xi. 29. The others are not mentioned by name. It is true that Ben Sira in xlix. 10 speaks of the Twelve Prophets; but as he has not given their names, their testimony is so indefinite as to make it questionable whether Jonah was one of them!

The above considerations will be sufficient to show that the line of argument pursued by Mr. Bevan would, if valid, prove too much. It shows, also, that later Jewish writers were not in the habit of naming preceding ones, simply because they did not care to do so. If most of our modern critics, instead of citing what they call authorities, would do more investigating of original sources for themselves,

it is certain that they would not make so many erroneous statements as now mar the works of some of them. The mania for citing opinions of modern writers instead of testing the evidence in ancient documents, is, like Achilles wrath to Greece, the direful spring of woes unnumbered in the history of the literary criticism of the Biblical books.

With regard to Jeremiah, it will be readily admitted, that the proof outside the book of Jeremiah itself that the prophecies were "not entirely written in the Maccabean period" is amply sufficient to satisfy any reasonable mind. But, when we come to the much more important question, and the real one at issue, as to whether the prophecies as a whole are genuine and authentic, the case of Jeremiah is not so much better, or easier, than is that of Daniel. Might we not say that it is "marvellous" that neither the book of Kings which narrates at length the events of the reigns of Josiah, Jehoiakim, Jehoiachin and Zedekiah, ever mentions Jeremiah by name, or cites any of his prophecies or deeds? Is it not "marvellous" that Ezekiel never mentions, or cites him, and that the post-exilic prophets never allude to him? Daniel, indeed, refers to him (ix. 2), but the critics are debarred from citing him except as a writer of the Macabbean times. It is to be feared that Mr. Bevan will find evidence in support of the direct historicity of Jeremiah to be confirmed in the Old Testament only by the much despised book of Chronicles and the two verses repeated from it at the beginning of Ezra.⁴

Outside of the Old Testament, of the extant Jewish writings, the only ones which are generally acknowledged as having been written before Maccabean times are the letter of Aristaeus, Ahikar, parts of Enoch, the Epistle of Jeremy, and Ecclesiasticus. The first three named do not mention Jeremiah. The fourth purports expressly to be by him.

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

The last cites (chap. xlix. 6, 7) from the first chapter of Jeremiah and from the events spoken of in Jer. xxxvii. 8 and xxxix. 6. as follows: They burnt the holy city and destroyed its ways, according to the prophecy of Jeremiah. But they afflicted him, although he had been formed a prophet from the womb to root out and to pull down and to destroy, and in like manner to build, and to plant, and to restore."

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

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

IV. The fourth assumption is that the cumulative argument from silence shows that Daniel did not exist till about the middle of the second century B.C.. While admitting that it is possible in each particular case to imagine some good reason for the silence, it is supposed that the cumulative silence is convincing. This is equivalent to saying

that although two times nothing is nothing, yet two times nothing plus two times nothing plus two times nothing is something. Besides, it ignores the positive testimony to Daniel's existence and wisdom given by Ezekiel in three passages and the testimony of Mattathias about 168 B.C. to the lions' den and the fiery furnace, as recorded in 1 Macc. ii. 59, 60. Lastly, it ignores the obvious fact that by similar reasoning we would have a cumulative argument from silence that Ezekiel and most of the Minor Prophets did not exist until the time of Ben Sira. In short, the argument is absurd.

Princeton.

R. D. WILSON.