The Princeton
Theological Review

EVIDENCE IN HEBREW DICTION FOR
THE DATES OF DOCUMENTS

This is the first of two articles in which I shall address myself not merely to the consideration of the changes in the Hebrew language which are affirmed by the critics to be characteristic of an age subsequent to Nehemiah, but rather to the whole question of the determination of the age of the documents of the Old Testament on the ground of evidence derived from language. This argument from language as determinative of the age of a document may be divided into two parts: (1) the argument derived from the Hebrew itself; and (2) the argument derived from the foreign words embedded in the Hebrew text.[1]

In the present article I shall consider the first of these subjects namely the argument for the age of documents derived from a consideration of the vocabulary and grammar of the Hebrew in which the document is written; and especially that form of the argument which is based upon the

---

[1] That the evidence of lateness in the Hebrew documents of the Old Testament, derived from the presence in them of words derived from the Aramaic, is futile, has been discussed at length in this REVIEW for January, 1925. As to the evidence of date in the Hebrew documents from the presence in them of words derived from Babylonian, Persian and other languages, it is the intention of the writer to discuss the subject fully in the next issue of this REVIEW. Till then, let it suffice to say that it is contrary to analogy to suppose that these words should be an indication that the documents containing them were written long after the Babylonian and Persian dominion over the Jews had come to an end,—a hundred years or more after the time of Nehemiah. In the next article I shall endeavor to show that the influx of foreign words into the Hebrew literature was in all cases coincident with the subservience of the Israelites to the great world powers whose vocables they here and there adopted.

supposition that a given form, meaning, or usage, is a sign of the lateness of the document. More especially still I shall confine myself to that part of this argument which is based on the assumption that the occurrence of a word, or usage, once or more, in the Old Testament Hebrew and its occurrence again only in the Hebrew or Aramaic of the Targums and Talmud is an evidence of the comparatively late age of the composition of the document in which the word is found.

The Contention of the Critics

That this consideration is of vital importance to the student of the literature of the Old Testament will be apparent to anyone who will read practically any "critical" Introduction to a part, or the whole, of the Old Testament Scriptures. That I may not seem as one that beateth the air, let me begin the discussion by citing some passages from Dr. Driver's *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*.[2] Thus, he makes the general statement:

In order properly to estimate the *Hebrew* of Daniel, it must be borne in mind that the great turning-point in Hebrew style falls in the age of *Nehemiah*. The purest and best Hebrew prose style is that of JE and the earlier narratives incorporated in Jud. Sam. Kings: Dt. (though of a different type) is also thoroughly classical: Jer., the *latter* part of Kings, Ezekiel, 2 Isaiah, Haggai, show (though not all in the same respects or in the same degree) *slight* signs of being later than the writings first mentioned; but in the "memoirs" of Ezra and Nehemiah (*i.e.* the parts of Ezra and Neh. which are the work of these reformers themselves, see p. 544), and (in a less degree) in the contemporary prophecy of Malachi, a more marked change is beginning to show itself, which is still more palpable in the Chronicles (*c.* 300 B.C.), Esther and Ecclesiastes. The change is visible in both vocabulary and syntax. In vocabulary many new words appear, often of Aramaic origin, occasionally Persian, and frequently such as continued in use afterwards in the "New Hebrew" of the Mishnah (200 A.D.), &c.; old words also are sometimes used with new meanings or applications. In syntax, the ease and

---

[2] The familiar abbreviation LOT will be used in referring to this work. Other abbreviations which will be used are: NH for New Hebrew (i.e., the Hebrew of the Talmud), A for the Aramaic of the Targums and Talmud, BH for Biblical Hebrew. In the lists given below BH placed after a word means that the word is not found in the Aramaic but only in the Hebrew of the Talmud.

grace and fluency of the earlier writers (down to at least Zech. xii-xiv) has passed away; the style is often laboured and inelegant: sentences constantly occur which a pre-exilic, or even an *early* post-exilic writer, would have moulded differently: new and uncouth constructions make their appearance. The three books named do not, however, exhibit these peculiarities in equal proportions: Ecclesiastes (p. 474) has the most striking *Mishnic* idioms: the Chronicler (pp. 535 ff) has many peculiarities of his own, and may be said to show the greatest uncouthness of style; but they agree in the possession of many common (or similar) features, which differentiate them from all previous Hebrew writers (including Zech. Hagg. Mal.), and which recur in them with decidedly greater frequency and prominence than in the memoirs of Ezr. and Neh. And the Hebrew of Daniel is of the type just characterized: in all distinctive features it resembles, not the Hebrew of Ezekiel, or even of Haggai or Zechariah, but that of the age *subsequent to Nehemiah*.[3]

In treating of Ecclesiastes, Dr. Driver gives a list of 30 or more words,[4] many of them common in the Hebrew and Aramaic of the Targums and Talmud, occurring only in Ecclesiastes or other "late" writings, especially Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther and Chronicles and claims that they are indicative of late date. The following statements regarding the books which Dr. Driver claims as late may also be quoted:

CHRONICLES :

The style of the Chronicles, is singular. Not only does it display the general novelties of vocabulary and syntax indicated in pp. 505 f., showing that the language itself is in decadence, or that the author has an imperfect command of it; but it has in addition numerous peculiarities and mannerisms of its own, not found in other post-exilic writings. . . . In some instances they appear in germ, or *occasionally* (cf. p. 505 *n*), at an earlier period of the language; in others, they consist of a peculiar application of old words.[5]

EZRA AND NEHEMIAH :

The Books of Ezra and Nehemiah are a compilation made by an author (to all appearance identical with the Chronicler) writing long after the age of Ezra and Nehemiah themselves, on the basis, partly, of the authentic "memoirs" (as the parts written in the first person are generally termed) of those two reformers, and partly of other materials . . . other parts . . . exhibit close affinities with the style of the Chronicler.[6]

NEHEMIAH :

As might be expected his memoirs contain examples of late words and idioms; but they are much less numerous and marked than those which occur in the writings of the Chronicler.[7]

---

[3] LOT, pp. 504 f.   [5] *Id.*, p. 535.   [7] *Id.*, p. 553.
[4] *Id.*, pp. 473 ff.   [6] *Id.*, p. 544.

EZRA:

Ezra's style approaches slightly more than Nehemiah's does to that of the compiler.[8]

ECCLESIASTES:

Linguistically, Qohéleth stands by itself in the O.T. The Hebrew in which it is written has numerous features in common with the latest parts of the O.T., Ezra and Nehemiah, Chronicles, Esther, but it has in addition many not met with in these books, but found first in the Mishnah (which includes, no doubt, older elements, but received its present form *c.* 200 A.D.) . . . there is a very decided admixture of words and idioms not found before, having usually affinities with the Aramaic, or being such as are in constant and regular use in the Hebrew of post-Christian times (the Mishnah, &c.). And this latter element is decidedly larger and more prominent in Ecclesiastes than in either Esther or Ezr., Neh., Chron.[9]

ESTHER:

By the majority of critics the Book is assigned either to the early years of the Greek period (which began B.C. 332), or to the 3rd cent. B.C. With such a date the diction would well agree, which, though superior to that of the Chronicler, and more accommodated to the model of the earlier historical books, contains many late words and idioms, and exhibits much deterioration in syntax.[10]

SONG OF SONGS:

The diction of the poem exhibits several peculiarities, especially in the uniform use of the relative שֶׁ- (except in the title i. 1) for אֲשֶׁר, and in the recurrence of many words found never or rarely besides in Biblical Hebrew but common in Aramaic. . . .[11]

JOB:

. . . the vocabulary contains a very noticeable admixture of Aramaic words, and (in a minor degree) of words explicable only from the Arabic.[12]

PROVERBS:

. . . the vocabulary of the Book includes many words and expressions which are met with seldom or never in other parts of the O.T., though here they recur with considerable frequency.[13]

MALACHI:

It is evident that the prophecy of Malachi belongs to the period after the Captivity when Judah was a Persian province ("thy *governor*" פֶּחָתֶךְ i. 8: cf. Hag. i. 1, Neh. v. 14, xii. 16 &c.). . . .[14]

JONAH:

. . . taken as a whole they [the linguistic features] can only be con-

---

[8] *Id.*, p. 553.
[9] *Id.*, pp. 473 f.

[10] *Id.*, p. 484.
[11] *Id.*, pp. 448 f.
[12] *Id.*, p. 434.

[13] *Id.*, p. 403.
[14] *Id.*, p. 357.

sistently explained by the supposition that the book is a work of the post-exilic period. . . . A date in the 5th cent. will probably not be far wide of the truth.[15]

JOEL:

The phraseology, viewed as a whole, can hardly be cited as positively favouring the later date, though it is true that it includes some words and expressions which are more common in the later than in the earlier literature.[16]

PSALMS:

[Most of the Psalms in Books IV and V] will be post-exilic, some, per- haps, late in the post-exilic period—especially those Psalms in which Aramaisms &c., are marked.[17]

Very many commentators—including even Delitzsch and Perowne— admit (on historical grounds) that *some* Psalms [viz. xliv, lxxiv, lxxix] belong to this [the Maccabean] period. . . . But some scholars, es- pecially Olshausen (1853), and more recently Reuss and others, have attributed a much larger number of Psalms, and even the majority, to the same period.[18]

---

[15] *Id.,* p. 322.

[16] *Id.,* p. 313.

[17] *Id.,* p. 385.

[18] *Id.,* p. 387. Thus Delitzsch says: "Maccabean psalms are not . . . an absolute impossibility—no doubt they were many; and that some of them were incorporated in the Psalter, cannot be denied *à priori.* But still the history of the canon does not favour this supposition, and the circum- stance of the LXX version of the Psalms (according to which citations are made even in the first Book of the Maccabees) inscribing several Psalms Ἀγγαίου καὶ Ζαχαρίου while however it does not assign the date of the later period to any, is against it. And if Maccabean psalms be sup- posed to exist in the Psalter, they can at any rate only be few, because they must have been inserted in a collection which was already ar- ranged" (*Biblical Commentary in the Psalms,* p. 12). Perowne says merely: "The date of the forty-fourth has been much questioned, but it may perhaps be Maccabean" (*The Book of Psalms,* I, 62) Bleek-Well- hausen says: "It is a matter of dispute as to how late some psalms are to be placed" (*Einleitung,* p. 503) Hitzig says: "From the third book on, all psalms are to be assigned to the period of the Maccabees" (*Die Psalmen,* II, xi). Reuss assigns to Maccabean times Psalms xliv, liv-lx, lxii, lxiv, lxxi, lxxv-lxxvii, lxxix, lxxxiii, lxxxvi, lxxxviii-xc, xciv, xcvi-c, cii, cx, cxvi, cxviii, cxxxviii, cxl, cxlii, cxliii, cxlviii, cxlix. (*Ge- schichte der Heiligen Schriften des Alten Testaments,* p. 630). Cheyne assigns to this period, Pss. xvi, xx, xxi, xxxiii, xliv, lx, lxi, lxiii, lxxv, lxxxiii, lxxxvi, xciv, ci, cviii, cx, cxv-cxviii, cxxxiii-cxxxviii, cxliv-cl (*Bampton Lectures* for 1889, *passim*). Robertson Smith says: "The last

ASSUMPTIONS INVOLVED

1. That the turning point in Hebrew style is in the age of Nehemiah.

2. That the change is "palpable" in Ecclesiastes.

3. That the distinctive features of the Hebrew of Daniel resemble those of the age subsequent to Nehemiah.

4. That the changes in style which demand a post-Nehemian age for Chronicles, Esther, Ecclesiastes, and parts of Ezra and Nehemiah, are observable in both vocabulary and syntax.

5. That from three to more than half of the Psalms, though (as will be shown further on) only one of them has a single word implying an origin after the time of Nehemiah, may nevertheless "on historical grounds" be put in the period "subsequent to Nehemiah."

EXAMINATION OF ASSUMPTIONS

I. *As to Vocabulary*

A. Alleged Evidence of Lateness.

In support of these assumptions, Dr. Driver presents lists of Hebrew words occurring in one, or more, of the books of Daniel, Esther, Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah and Ecclesiastes,—the allegedly later Psalms having no list because they have altogether only one word of the kind. First of all, then, I shall give these lists of words presented in evidence of his contention, that these books, or, in the case of Ezra, Nehemiah and the Psalms, parts of these books are post-Nehemian. I shall give these lists in the order, Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Daniel, Ecclesiastes, Psalms; inasmuch as the first four are admitted by all to be among the latest books of the Old Testament, whereas the relative date of the last three is disputed.

---

part of the Psalter must be thrown into the Greek period, and probably not the earliest part thereof. . . . The language of some of the Psalms points to a very late date indeed!" (*The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, p. 208).

1. The Hebrew words mentioned by Dr. Driver as show-
ing that these books were written in Greek times (after
about 300 B.C.) are for:

a. Chronicles: צרך, ספר, מפשׁעה, מדרשׁ (NH), לעב, גופה (NH),
תלמיד (NH), שׁחיטה.

b. Ezra: (none).

c. Nehemiah: (none).

d. Esther: שׁתיה,(BH), פתר, מאמר, הושׁיט, בזיון, אנס.

e. Daniel: (NHA—) פלמני (—NHA) מכמן, חתך, זרענים, הזהיר, גיל,
רשׁם.

f. Ecclesiastes: משׁך, לוה, כבר, יתרון, חפץ, חסרון, בטל, אי, אבד,
תקן, שׂכה, שׁ־, פשׁר, ענין, עדן, עבד, נסכן, נהג.

g. Psalms: the only words of this kind in the Psalter are: טפשׁ, יון,

קציעה, עמר, מחוז, תאב, and שׁבליל. No Psalm containing any one of
these words is placed in Maccabean times except by Hitzig, who puts
all of Psalms lxxiii.-cl. in the post-Nehemian period.

2. In addition to the above words which occur in but one
book, the following should be mentioned, because they are
found in two of these books, viz in:

a. Chronicles and Esther: דחף.
   Chronicles and Daniel: היך.

b. Ezra and Esther: בקשׁה (NH).

c. Esther and Daniel: תקף.
   Esther and Ecclesiastes: אלו.

d. Daniel and Psalms: בזר. (Ps. lxviii. contains בזר which is found
besides only in Daniel xi. 24. Since no one claims that this Psalm is late,
this example may be ruled out.)

3. The only cases where a word of this kind occurs in
three or more of the books under discussion are the fol-
lowing:

a. Daniel, Nehemiah (?), Psalm cxxx. 4: סליחה (NH).

b. Chronicles, Daniel, Ezra: אבל (NH), צפיר.

c. Chronicles, Daniel, Esther: נבעת.

d. Chronicles, Daniel, Ecclesiastes: מדע.

B. Counter Evidence.

The evidence just presented would seem to be convincing
at least for Chronicles, Esther, and Daniel, could it be shown
that these kinds of words are to be found in these books
alone. But it is not true that they are found only in the litera-
ture of the late period. Accepting for the sake of argument

the four periods or groupings advocated by Dr. Driver—
First Period (before 650 B.C.); Second Period (650-550,
B.C.); Third Period (550-400, B.C.); Fourth Period (after
400 B.C.)—the facts regarding these words are:

1. We find them not merely in the Fourth Period, but,
also, in the Third, in which Dr. Driver places the "memoirs"
of Ezra and Nehemiah, the Song of Songs, Jonah, Joel, Job,
Haggai, Zechariah, Ruth, Malachi, P, and parts of Isaiah,[19]
Psalms, Proverbs and Micah. Taking these books up in the
order just named, we find the following lists:

   a. Memoirs of Ezra: (none).

   b. Memoirs of Nehemiah: (none).

   c. Song of songs: קפץ, סתו, סרג, סוג, מזג, מה, חרך, הגיע, טנף,
מרקח, רקח.

   d. Jonah: קריאה, עשת, השב.

   e. Joel: צחנה.

   f. Job: שמץ, שׂהר, צח, ענם, ספק, סד, נהג, (NH) טרח, גושׁ,
תנחומה.

   g. Haggai: (none).

   h. Zechariah: גל, בבה (NH).

   i. Ruth: צבת, צבט, ענן.

   j. Malachi: (none).

   k. P. (the Priest-Codex): מסוה, מלק, מכס, מוך, נבהת, גבה (NH),
צבאות, נאחז, שחלת, שׂזר (*roqah*) רקח, קור, עבור, סרח.

   l. Isaiah xxiv-xxvii, xl-lxvi: (none).

   m. Psalms which may have been written in this period: מחזו, טפשׁ,
תאב, עמר.

   n. Proverbs xxx, xxxi: (none).

   o. Micah iv, v: (none).

2. We find these kinds of words, also, in the literature
which Dr. Driver places between 650 B.C. and 550 B.C. *i.e.,*
in Obadiah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Jeremiah, Eze-
kiel, Lamentations, H., Deuteronomy (with the exception of
a few chapters), Judges, Samuel, and Kings.

   a. Obadiah, Nahum and Zephaniah: (none).

---

[19] In this article, I have denoted the parts of the Book of Isaiah which
Dr. Driver assigns to the authorship, or times, of the son of Amos by the
sign "1 Isaiah." This includes all of the first thirty-nine chapters except
xiii-xiv, xxiv-xxvii, and xxxiv-xxxix. "2 Isaiah" denotes the last
twenty-seven chapters.

b. Habakkuk : מִשְׂחָק.

c. Jeremiah : סַלְסְלָה (NH), נָעַר (to roar), כַּשָּׁף (*kaššāf*).

d. Ezekiel : סָרָב, נָדָה, מַשְׁטָה, מַשּׁוֹט, טָעָה, אַנֶק.

e. Lamentations : שָׁתַם, שָׁמֵם, צָחַח.

f. H. (Holiness Code) : (none).

g. Deuteronomy : חִרְחֵר, חָסַל.

h. Judges (except chaps. v. and vi.) : עָצֵל (vb.), שׁוֹךְ.

i. Samuel : (none).

j. Kings : קָב, צָבוּר, פְּקוּעָה, מָכַר, יָצִיעַ (NH), גָּלַל.

k. Isaiah xiii, xiv, xxxiv-xxxix : (none).

3. We find also some of these words in the literature written according to LOT before 650 B.C., to wit, in J, E, Hosea, Amos, and the early parts of Isaiah, Micah, Proverbs, and Judges, as follows :

a. J : קַר, בְּדֹלַח.

b. E : שִׁמְצָא, שֶׁדֶף, פָּתַר, עָקַד, סֶלֶם, טַעַן.

c. Hosea : הַבְהַב.

d. Amos : (none).

e. I Isaiah : פְּלִילָה, סַמָּן, סוֹחֵה, מֶעְדֵּר, מַחְלָה, טַלְטֵלָה, גְּבָהוּת, שָׁבִים (NH).

f. Micah : (none).

g. Proverbs, early parts : צִיר, סֶלֶף, סַגְרִיר, עָצֵל (adj. NH), חִרְחֵר.

h. Judges : סָפַל, מָחַק, יָבָב.

4. Some words occur only in books said by LOT to have been written before 400 B.C.

a. Words in two or more books written according to LOT between 550 B.C. and 400 B.C.
P and Canticles : דֶּגֶל (*degel*, NH).

b. Words in two or more books written between 650 B.C. and 550 B.C.
D and Ezekiel : חָסַם.
Lamentations and Ezekiel : עָמַם.
D and Habakkuk : בָּאַר.
Samuel and Kings : שָׁתַן.
Samuel, H, and Ezekiel : פֶּלֶךְ.
Kings, D, Ezekiel, Jeremiah, H : נָלוֹל (NH).
H, Ezekiel, Samuel : מָעַךְ.
H and Judges : הָלוּל (NHA-?).

c. Words in two or more books written before 650 B.C.
J and E : סָהַר.
Proverbs and Micah : חָדַק (*ḥedeq*)

5. There are words, also, in two or more books of two or more periods before 400 B.C. (i.e. in the pre-Nehemian liter-

ature), one at least of them being from the first period. (i.e. before 650 B.C.)

   a. Hosea and Jeremiah: נִיר.
      Hosea, J, Kings, Lamentations: כָּמַר (*kamar*).
      Hosea, J, D, 2 Isaiah: עוֹף.
      Hosea, Proverbs, D, Jeremiah, Zechariah, Job, Joel: מַלְקוֹשׁ.
      Hosea, Amos, 1 Isaiah, 2 Isaiah, Samuel, Kings, Proverbs, Lamentations: דֹּב.

   b. Amos and D: חֹסֶר (*ḥoser*, NH).
      Amos and Jeremiah: מִרְזַח.
      Amos and 2 Isaiah: נֵדֶה.
      Amos, Job, Isaiah. xiii: כְּסִיל (Orion).
      Amos, Kings, P: קִרְקַע.
      Amos, Jeremiah, Ezekiel: סָרַה.
      Amos, 2 Isaiah, Joel, Canticles: עָסִים.
      Amos, JE, Judges, Lamentations, H, P: נָזִיר.
      Amos, Hosea, 2 Isaiah, 2 Isaiah, Samuel, Kings, Proverbs, Lamentations: דֹּב.

   c. Micah, Ezekiel, 2 Isaiah: מַטֶּה.
      Micah, Nahum, Kings, 2 Isaiah: כֶּשֶׁף (*kešef*).

   d. J and Samuel: אֵשֶׁל.
      J and Isaiah xiii: אֹהֶל.
      J and Kings: סְנִיר.
      J, E, Job: שִׂיחַ.
      J, Samuel, Kings: סְאָה.
      J, E, Judges, P: צָחַק.
      J, JE, D, P: אָבִיב.
      J, Hosea, Kings, Lamentations: כָּמַר.
      J, D, H, P: כָּבַשׁ (NH).
      J, Hosea, D, 2 Isaiah: עָרַף.
      J, E, Hosea, Proverbs, 1 Isaiah, Judges, Ezekiel, Job, P: נָזַם.
      J, Amos, Jonah, 2 Isaiah, Canticles: עָלַף.

   e. E and D: מִרְצַע.
      E and Jeremiah: מַחְתֶּרֶת.
      E and Samuel: צָדָה.
      E and J: סֹהַר.
      E and P: קֶמֶץ (*qemeṣ*).

   f. 1 Isaiah and H: מְרַח.
      1 Isaiah and 2 Isaiah: נֶעֱצוּץ.
      1 Isaiah and Jeremiah: פּוּק.
      1 Isaiah and D: טְרַח.
      1 Isaiah and Ezekiel: תְּרַן.
      1 Isaiah, Job, H: נָקַף.
      1 Isaiah D, P: עֲטַלֵּף.

      1 Isaiah, 2 Isaiah, Hosea, Amos, Samuel, Kings, Proverbs, Lamentations: דֹּב.

g. Proverbs and Job: חסר (*ḥeser*).

Proverbs and D: תהפוכה.

Proverbs and Jeremiah: קור, סחר, נתר.

Proverbs and Ezekiel: מתר.

Proverbs and Micah: חדק.

Proverbs and Habakkuk: יהיר.

Proverbs, Joel, Canticles: תפוח.

Proverbs, Habakkuk, Ezekiel: חדד.

Proverbs, Hosea, Amos, Samuel, Kings, 1 Isaiah, 2 Isaiah, Lamentations: דב.

Proverbs, 1 Isaiah, D, Kings, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Job, P: הדף.

Proverbs, JE, Judges, Samuel, 2 Isaiah, Job: נקר.

Proverbs, E, 1 Isaiah, 2 Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Kings, P: סחר.

Proverbs, D, Nahum, Ezekiel, 2 Isaiah: סבא.

6. On account of the difficulty and variety of the dating of the 150 Psalms, we present the special facts with regard to the vocabulary of the Psalter as follows:

a. Words occurring in the Old Testament in the Psalter only; found also in NHA but not in Syriac: קציעה, פסן, עמר, מחוז, טפש, תאב, שבליל.

b. Same kind of words in Psalter and one other book of the Old Testament.

Psalms and Proverbs: שקץ.

Psalms and Deuteronomy: ענק.

Psalms and Samuel: קרסל, צנור, צלצל.

Psalms and Canticles: דגל (*dagal* NH).

Psalms and Job: שמץ, טפל.

Psalm cxliv (bis) and Chronicles: זן (?NH).

c. Words occurring in the Psalter and in two other books.

Psalms, J, and Judges: אטד.

Psalms, 2 Isaiah and Proverbs: חתת.

Psalms, J and E: יחם.

Psalms, Proverbs and D: נסח.

Psalms, J and P: מבול.

Psalms, JE and Nehemiah: מצולה.

Psalms, Proverbs and Malachi: קבע.

Psalms, Proverbs and Job: קרע.

Psalms, Proverbs and Ecclesiastes: כסיל (fool).

Psalms, JE and Job: הופיע.

Psalms, JE and Isaiah xiv: יחד.

Psalms, Ezekiel and 2 Isaiah: מעמק.

Psalms, Jeremiah and Lamentations: מחול.

Psalms, Daniel and Ezra: רעד.

Psalms, Ezekiel and P: שרץ.

Psalms, Samuel and Job: יָעַל.
Psalms, Job and Lamentations: חרק.

d. The only words occurring in the Psalter and in three other books, all of which are alleged to be post-captivity are: נָאלָם which is found in Psalms and in Ezekiel, 2 Isaiah and Daniel: and צִיּוּן which is found in Psalms lxxii. 16, xc. 6, xcii. 8, ciii. 15, cxxxii. 18 and in Ezek., Is. xxvii. 6, Cant., and P.

e. The only word occurring in the Psalter and in three or more books admitted by all to be pre-captivity is סָעַד which is found in J, 1 Isaiah, Proverbs, and Judges.

f. There are 61 other words of this kind occurring in the Psalter and in three or more books of the Old Testament and found in from two to all of the four periods.

7. Remarks and Conclusions from the Vocabulary.

a. The above given collation of facts with regard to the Hebrew words in the documents of the Old Testament (which are found also in the Hebrew and Aramaic of the Talmud and Targums, but not in Syriac) shows conclusively that no argument for the date of an Old Testament document can safely rest upon the presence in it of such a word. Rather, this collation shows that the later Jews, who wrote both Targums and Talmud, drew largely from the treasure-house of words found in the Sacred Scripture which they translated and expounded. They did this without regard to the date of the book translated or expounded, and regardless of the date at which the translation or exposition was made.

b. There are 209 words occurring in one to three of the documents of the first three periods and only 76 in those of the fourth. Of these 76, 27 are certainly foreign words—mostly Persian; whereas of the 209, 7, or 8 only are foreign words. Thus over 200 words occurring in the Old Testament literature in one to three of the earlier books are found in the New Hebrew and Aramaic of the Talmud and Targums and not in Syriac against about 50 in the period designated by Dr. Driver as post-Nehemian.

Besides, there are 260 roots of this kind in the whole Old Testament which are found in four or more documents. Of these, only 44 occur in any of the documents assigned by Dr. Driver to the post-Nehemian period, whereas 216 of

them are found in the documents admitted by him to have
been written before 400 B.C. It is evident, therefore, that
Hebrew words of this kind are no indication of post-
Nehemian date, nor, in fact, of any date at all. It is all right
to give lists of the Hebrew words peculiar to a given docu-
ment, but it is not fair to use such words as a sign of early, or
late, composition. Yet, this is exactly what all the critics do
who put Daniel and Ecclesiastes in the second century B.C.

c. As a proof of this last statement, take the case of
גיל (age).[20] It is given by Dr. Driver in a list of words to
substantiate the statement that Daniel was written in the
"age subsequent to Nehemiah." He remarks simply that the
word is found "also in Samaritan and Talmudic." He might
have added, in Arabic also, where it means "race," "genera-
tion" or "family." In the Samaritan Pentateuch it is used in
Gen. vii. 1 (כיל for גיל), xv. 16 xvii. 7, 12, 23; Deut. xxiii.
3 (MS, A), xxxii. 5, 7, as a translation of דור, but never
thus in the Targum of Onkelos. According to Levy and
Jastrow in their great dictionaries, it means primarily "those
who are born at the same hour" or those "who are approxi-
mately of the same age."[21]

In Daniel i. 10, the prince of the eunuchs means to express
his fear lest the face of Daniel should be "worse liking" than
should appear the face of one of the like age with him. No
other word in Hebrew could express this idea. This idea is
expressed nowhere else in the Old Testament. There are
many words for company, fellowship, band, age, and so
forth; but no one of them implies that the members of the
company had been born at about the same time. If Moses,
David, Isaiah, or Ezra had wished to express this idea, he
would have probably used the same word as Daniel; or must
have employed a circumlocution. It is evident, therefore, that

---

[20] LOT, p. 506, no. 10.

[21] See Levy: *Neuhebräisches und Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die
Talmudim und Midraschim.* I. 324, and Jastrow: *A Dictionary of the
Targumim and Talmud.* I. 238.

the use of this word by Daniel is no indication of the time at which his book was written.

But, if *gîl* be considered an indication of lateness in Daniel, what shall we say of a word עָקַד (bind) which is found only in E? According to Dr. Driver, both J and E were written certainly before 750 B.C. and this word is found only in Gen. xxii. 9, a verse assigned to E. It resembles *gîl* in that both occur in the Hebrew and Aramaic of Talmud and Targums, both are absent from Babylonian and Syriac, and both are present in Arabic. Further, '*āḳad* is used in Genesis of the binding of Isaac; and in the Talmud when this event is referred to, or when the binding of the victim especially of the *tamîd,* or daily burnt offering, is meant.[22] Just as *gîl* has a specific denotation which distinguishes it from all other words for company and age; so '*āḳad* refers to the binding of hands and feet together and differs thus from the eleven other words used in the Old Testament to denote the idea of "binding." It is a most remarkable fact that H and P should never have employed this word when speaking of the sacrifices; and that it should never be used a second time in literature until a thousand years, or more, after the time when the critics say that E was written. Surely, this fact should teach us to recognize the illogicality and futility of attempting to determine the date of a document by this kind of reasoning. For if '*āḳad* can have been used in 800 B.C. or earlier and not again until 200 A.D., certainly, *gîl* may have been used in 500 B.C., and not again until 200 A.D.

d. It is a noteworthy fact that the 27 chapters of the book of Isaiah said by Dr. Driver to have originated with the prophet himself have 13 of these singular words, whereas the 39 chapters ascribed to later authors have only 4 of them. Chapters xiii, xiv, xxiv-xxvii, xxxiv-xxxix, which the critics all put in the times following the destruction of Jerusalem have not a single one of these words. This is a reversal of what we should have expected to find, if the

---

[22] See Levy and Jastrow *in loc.*

reasoning of the critics were correct. What is true of *gîl* is also true of *kether* (crown, Es. i. 11, ii. 17, vi. 8) and of *dahaf* "to hasten" (Es. iii. 15, vi. 12, viii. 14; 2 Chron. xxvi. 20). Neither of them is found in Persian, Greek, Syriac, Arabic, or Babylonian. Both of them are used in the Hebrew and Aramaic of the Talmud and Targums; though neither appears in Onkelos. At least five other words for "hasten" occur in the Old Testament Hebrew and three others for "crown." Since the authors of Esther and Chronicles certainly antedated the writers of the Targums and Talmud by some hundreds of years, all we can conclude is that the latter may have borrowed from Esther and the Chronicles; but the words certainly give no intimation, or data, for determining when the books of Esther and Chronicles were written, whether in the third, the fifth, or for that matter, the tenth century B.C.

In the case of מאמר (command, Est. i. 15, ii. 20, ix. 32), the evidence of date is just as poor; because nowhere else in any of the languages or dialects or documents, except in the Targum and Talmud, is this word found in this sense.

e. The fifth chapter of Judges, containing the song of Deborah, has three of these words; whereas the rest of the book has only two (not counting one in chapter six which occurs also in chapter five). Many critics consider the song to be the earliest, or about the earliest, part of the Old Testament. Moreover, by way of contrast, we find none of these words in Malachi or Haggai; nor, aside from two Persian words, in the memoirs of Ezra.

f. The early parts of Proverbs have five of these words, whereas the late chapters have none.

g. J, E, and JE have nine of these words and D has two; whereas, H has none and P has twelve. When one considers the fact that P's words are largely technical and further that HP embraces more than half of the Hexateuch, it will be seen that the argument that these words show comparative lateness breaks down here also.

h. The critics make no distinction between the words

which occur only in Old Testament Hebrew on the one hand, and, on the other hand, those which occur also in the Hebrew of the Talmud, or possibly also in the Aramaic of the Targums and Talmud, or in Syriac, Babylonian, or one or more other languages or dialects. In the marshalling of their evidence for the date of the documents, they jumble together all sorts of words and forms without, in most cases, stating clearly their origin, usage, analogues and meaning and their respective bearing upon the matter of date and authorship. Thus, of the 176 words which I have collected from LOT, Cornill and DeWette-Schrader, 31 are found only in the Hebrew of the Old Testament and 21 more only there and in extra-biblical Hebrew; 8 occur in Old Testament Hebrew and Babylonian alone and 2 more only in Old Testament Hebrew, the Hebrew of the Talmud and Babylonian; 8 occur only in Old Testament Hebrew, and the Aramaic Targums and 29 more only in the Old Testament Hebrew and in the Hebrew and Aramaic of the Targums; and 33 are found in Babylonian or Persian. Not one Semitic word is found in Old Testament Hebrew and Syriac alone and only one root with one derivative in the Hebrew of the Old Testament, of the Talmud and of Syriac alone. Only one word occurs in the Old Testament Hebrew and in the Aramaic of the Targums and in Syriac alone. 19 words are found in O.T. Hebrew, the Hebrew and Aramaic of the Targums and Talmud and Syriac alone. The remaining 30 items of alleged evidence of lateness are confined to Hebrew words, forms, and idioms of which most occur but once. In the extraordinary uses in which they are employed, many of them are without analogy in the extra-biblical Hebrew, as well as in the Aramaic. But there is absolutely no direct evidence to show that all of them may not have been used in documents written at or before the time of Nehemiah.

i. It will be observed that the great and original writers of the Old Testament literature are, aside from technical expressions, the ones who use the most of these extraordinary expressions. Like Shakespeare and Milton, so Deborah,

Solomon (and this is an argument in favor of his writing Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs), Isaiah, Jonah, Daniel and the author of the Book of Job, are the ones who have control of the largest and most carefully selected vocabulary. Instead of being an argument for date, this size and variety of diction are rather an argument for the genius and versatility of these brilliant men, whose works never grow old, but are the delight and inspiration and guide and solace of millions today in all lands "where'er the sun does his successive journeys run." Let us leave to them the glory of their originality, their versatility, their inspiration and their God-given light, offspring of heaven, first born and last.

j. Altogether, there are about 550 roots in the Old Testament which are found in the Hebrew and also usually in the Aramaic of the Talmud and Targums, but not in Syriac. Some only of these words are given in the above lists, the others being found in places and books too numerous to mention here; but patent to those who can read the dictionaries and concordances bearing on the case.

II. *As to Grammar*

Having thus shown that the age of an Old Testament document cannot be determined as post-Nehemian by the fact that it contains words which are found elsewhere only in the Hebrew and Aramaic of the Targums and Talmud, let us look next at the claim that it can be determined by the orthography, etymology and syntax.

1. *The Orthography.*

a. It is generally admitted that the vowel points were not inserted in the Hebrew text until about 600 A.D.[23] Yet we find DeWette-Schrader's Introduction giving the reading *habal* instead of *hebel* as a ground for supposing that Ecclesiastes was not written by Solomon.[24] Wellhausen himself argues from the use of *zakar* and *zakur* for the division of

---

[23] See Bleek-Wellhausen: *Einleitung* § 290 for a good discussion of this question.

[24] P. 347.

the Pentateuch into documents.[25] It seems obvious that vowel signs that were first introduced about 600 A.D. cannot determine the date of documents written only with consonants from 800 to 2000 years earlier.

b. DeWette-Schrader, also, call attention to the reading הסור (Ecc. iv. 14) for האסור as a sign of the lateness of Ecclesiastes.[26] But such an omission occurs everywhere in the Old Testament text in the first person singular of the Imperfect Kal of some Pe Aleph verbs of all documents and ages. Besides, the omission of an *Aleph* is not the more common writing in such cases in any of the languages or dialects of the Semitic either early or late, and hence must be considered in Ecc. iv. 14 as a scribal error, or as an individual idiosyncrasy of the writer, but not as an indication of the date of the document.

2. The Etymology.

Coming next to the etymology, we find with regard to noun forms:

a. That Dr. Driver cites *k'bār* and *ᵃbād* as signs of the lateness of Ecclesiastes.[27] But this formation of the noun is found in Hebrew in about 34 different words occurring in all four periods of the literature, according to the dates of the documents given by Dr. Driver himself. Eight of the nouns with this form occur for the first time and three of them only, in the first period; four of them, first and one only, in the second period; nine of them, first and seven only, in the third period; seven of them, first and only, in the fourth period.

שאר and יקר alone appear in all periods. אנך, גרר and עים appear only in the first period; שאט only in the third period; and sixteen of them do not appear at all in the fourth period. Again, the formation is found in Arabic, Babylonian, and Ethiopic, as well as in Aramaic and Hebrew. Further-

---

[25] In his *History of Israel*, p. 389.

[26] P. 474.

[27] LOT, p. 474.

more, the discussion depends upon the assumption that the vowel pointings are in all cases correct.

Lastly, of the twelve words of this formation occurring in the documents of the fourth period, אדר is derived from the Babylonian, and קרב is found in Babylonian and also occurs in Samuel, Job, Zechariah and five of the Psalms, כתב occurs in Ezekiel; שאר in the first part of Isaiah twelve times, as well as in Zephaniah, Malachi, and the Memoirs of Ezra. יקר occurs already in Proverbs, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Zechariah and Job. כלל is found only in the Memoirs of Ezra. זמן is supposed to be derived from the Persian *zrvan*.[28] This leaves us only five words to be specially considered, as follows:

(1) אבל, which in Genesis, Samuel and Kings (five times in all) means "indeed," or "verily," six times in Chronicles, Ezra (Memoirs), and Daniel means "but," or "nevertheless." There are 133 particles used in the Old Testament Hebrew, of which Daniel uses 42. *'ᵃbāl* is the only particle which he uses in a sense different from that found in early documents. There are 101 particles in New Hebrew, beside all the adverbial endings in *-îth* which are not found in Daniel. This shows that the style of Daniel in general was modelled on the Hebrew of the Old Testament and not on that of the Talmud; because the particles are the greatest of all indicators of dialect and style.

Besides, it is a noteworthy fact that of *'ak, 'ulam, 'akan, zulā* and *kî 'im,* the common words for "but" in O.T. Hebrew, the first three all mean both "but" and "surely." ובאפם is used for "but" in Daniel viii. 25 and *kî 'im* in x. 21. *'Abāl* does not occur in the Fragments of *Ben Sira* nor in the *Zadokite Fragments.* In the *Pirke Aboth* it occurs only in iii. 2, 3, 17,—a chapter coming from shortly before the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. אלא is the common particle for "but" in *Pirke Aboth* in all chapters. *'ᵃbāl* does not occur in Aramaic, Syriac, Babylonian, or Arabic.

---

28 See Justi, *Handbuch der Zendsprache,* p. 128.

We see, therefore, that the only question is whether the use of this word in Daniel, Chronicles and the Memoirs of Ezra (according to Dr. Driver from the fifth century B.C.) and occurring first again about 70 A.D. is evidence that Daniel could not have been written in the sixth century or Chronicles in the fifth. My readers have all the facts before them and may judge for themselves. For myself, I think it is a very slight ground for bringing down the dates of documents a matter of one or two hundred years. Somebody must have used it first in writing Hebrew. Why not Daniel?

(2) יָעֵף (Dan. ix. 24) occurs neither in appropriate root, nor form, nor meaning, in any other place in any language or dialect. It seems from the context to be connected with the root עוּף (to fly). Certainly, no argument for date can be made from such a word.

(3) כְּבָר is found nine times in Ecclesiastes but nowhere else in the Old Testament. To quote Delitzsch,[29] it "probably denotes length or greatness of time (as כִּבְרָה length of way)." The English equivalent is "long ago" or "already." The root is found in Babylonian, Arabic, Syriac and Hebrew. One of the derivatives in Babylonian means "length." In Arabic "old" and "great" are the underlying ideas. The Hebrew *k'bār* may be compared in use to the Arabic *qad* as in the sentences "already he has done the thing," "already such a one has died." Since no other word in Hebrew denotes this idea, and since the root is evidently primitive Semitic, there is no reason why the word may not have been used by a writer in the year 1000 B.C. as well as one in 100 B.C. As to its being used in Ecclesiastes alone, this no more argues for a late date than do the numerous other words used only by one writer.

(4) סָפַר (2 Chron. ii. 16, numbering). This root is found in the sense "to number" in Hebrew alone, having a different meaning in Arabic, Babylonian, and Aramaic. The form is, as we have seen above, a good Hebrew form, being

---

[29] *Commentary on Ecclesiastes,* p. 225.

found in about 34 different words. This is the only place in
the Old Testament where any word to denote *numbering* is
used; because this is the only place where the idea is expressed.
The writer of Chronicles says: "Solomon numbered all the
strangers after the *numbering* with which David his father
had numbered them." Since the Chronicles and P are the only
books which commonly give numerations, and since Chron-
icles presents a review of the history of Israel, it is easy to see
why one of these books should be the one to contain the only
example of the use of this word. Surely, no argument for a
date of Chronicles later than Nehemiah can be derived from
the fact that this word is found also in the Hebrew and Ara-
maic of the Talmud and Targums; for in these dialects the
word does not mean "numbering" but "boundary" or "dis-
trict."[30] So that, in conclusion, it is to be noted that 2 Chron. ii.
16 is the only place in all literature where this word is used in
this sense. Consequently, no evidence for the date of the
Chronicler can be derived from its use by him of this word.

(5) עבד (work ?) is found only in Eccl. ix. 1. In-
stead of pointing the word as the plural of *ᵃbād* the Targum
has pointed it as the plural of *'ebed* "servant," and makes the
clause read: "The righteous and the wise and their scholars
(i.e., servants)." The text as pointed in the Hebrew Bible
might be rendered "the righteous and the wise and their
services," or "acts." (Compare the same meanings for *ᵃboda*
in Is. xxviii. 21, Ps. civ. 23, 1 Kings xii. 4, Ex. xxxvi. 5.)

It is only in Syriac and Palestinian Syriac that we find the
word with the meaning "work." It is not found in this sense
in the Hebrew and Aramaic of the Talmud and Targums,[31]
nor in Arabic. There is no good reason why it may not have
been used as early as 1000 B.C.

It might be asked why the author of Ecclesiastes did not

---

[30] See Jastrow, Levy and Dalman's dictionaries *in loc.*

[31] It is not found in the Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus, the *Zadokite Frag-
ments,* or *Pirke Aboth.*

use *'aboda* a word used 135 times in the Old Testament. This
is not known. Neither is it known why such a word as חק
(statute) is used 125 times and the feminine חקה 104 times
as follows:

Gen.	3 to 1	Kings	6 to 13	Jer.	3 to 6
Ex.	8 to 7	Chron.	8 to 1	Ezek.	6 to 22
Lev.	9 to 26	Ezra	2 to 0	Am.	1 to 0
Num.	3 to 14	Neh.	4 to 0	Mic.	1 to 1
Deut.	21 to 8	Job	7 to 1	Zep.	1 to 0
Josh.	1 to 0	Pss.	30 to 3	Zech.	1 to 0
Jud.	1 to 0	Prov.	3 to 0	Mal.	2 to 0
Sam.	1 to 0	Is.	2 to 0		

That is, חק is used in the Pentateuch 25 times to 56 for
חקה; in the books from Joshua to Kings inclusive 9 to 14; in
Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah, 14 to 1; in Job, Psalms and
Proverbs 35 to 3; and in the Prophets 17 to 29. Or, in the
four literary periods: First period, J, 7 to 1; E, 3 to 0; JE,
0 to 1; Proverbs, 1 to 0; Is. 1 to 0; Amos, 1 to 0; Mi., 1 to 1;
altogether 14 to 3. Second period, in D, 21 to 8; Jud., 1 to 0;
Sam., 1 to 1; Kings, 6 to 13; Is., 1 to 0; Jer., 3 to 6; Ezek.,
6 to 22; Zep. 1 to 0; altogether 40 to 50. Third period, H, 2
to 19; P, 13 to 24; Job, 7 to 1; Prov., 2 to 0; Zech., 1 to 0;
Mal., 2 to 0; Ezra's Memoirs, 2 to 0; altogether 29 to 44.
Fourth period, Chron., 8 to 1; Neh., 4 to 0; Ezra (outside
the Memoirs), Esther, Ecclesiastes and Daniel, 0 to 0; al-
together 12 to 1.

In tabular form:

FIRST PERIOD	SECOND PERIOD	THIRD PERIOD	FOURTH PERIOD
14	40	29	12
3	50	44	1

We commend this table and these numberings of the fre-
quency of the occurrence of these two words in the Hebrew
of the Old Testament to the study of our readers. Perhaps,
when they have studied them long enough, they will agree
with me that the knowledge of the fact that these words
were used is a different thing from knowing *why* they were
used. To know *that* they were so used belongs in the region
of science. To know *why* they were so used is generally a

matter of psychology, or mind-reading, of imagination or guess-work. And so, let us leave the consideration of *ᵃbād* with the remark that so far as we know the author of Ecclesiastes may have used it as early as Solomon's time; but why he used it, we do not know and never shall know. As to *when* he used it, the word itself does not determine. As far as the consonantal text is concerned, the word may have been as the Hebrew Received Text represents it, (*i.e.*, *ᵃbādēhem,* "their works"), or it may have been, as the translators of the Targum read it (*i.e.*, *'ab'dēhem* "their servants, or scholars"). But in neither case will the reading be able to determine for us the date, or authorship.

   b. LOT states that *baqqasha,* בקשה, (used also in Ezra vii. 6) is an indication of the extreme late date of Esther.[32] Surely, however, this late post-Nehemian date cannot be argued from the use of this word; for according to LOT[33] "the phrase in Ezra vii. 6 *end;* 9 *end* will have been taken naturally from Ezra's Memoirs." Of these Memoirs Dr. Driver says,[34] that "there is no reason to doubt," that they were "throughout either written by Ezra, or based upon materials left by him."

   The form of this word occurs already in J. The root in the Piel in the sense of *seek* occurs in all four periods of the literature. In the sense of "ask" or "desire" or "require," it is found also in all four periods, e.g., Ex. x. 11 J, Jud. vi. 29, Ezek. iii. 18, and Est. iv. 8; and also in the Hebrew of the Talmud, but not in Aramaic, Arabic, nor apparently in Assyrian. It is certain, however, that the form and meaning are found in all periods of Hebrew literature and probably the word itself as early as the time of Nehemiah; so that it is surely doubtful, if its presence in Esther and Ezra vii. 6 can be taken as evidence that these works are post-Nehemian. Finally, if it was used by Ezra about 400 B.C., why can it not

----

[32] LOT, p. 484.
[33] LOT, p. 549.
[34] *Id.,* p. 549.

have been used about the same time by the author of Esther?

c. Dr. Driver implies that הצלה is a sign of a post-Nehemian date for Esther.[35] How, then, about הכרת in Is. iii. 9?[36] For these two words are of the same form and their respective roots occur in all four periods of the literature.

d. Again, LOT implies, that הנחה is a sign of the post-Nehemian date of Esther.[37] How, then, about הנפה (Is. xxx. 28 which Dr. Driver considers to be "one of a series of prophecies belonging (if xxix. 1 be rightly interpreted) to the year before Sennacherib's invasion of Judah, i.e., to 702 B.C."?[38]

e. Prof. Cornill in his *Introduction* asserts[39] what Dr. Driver assumes, that "the abstract formations endings in *-ûth, -ôn,* and *ān*" are "absolutely convincing and irrefutable" evidence showing that the Hebrew of Koheleth "moves entirely in the region of the Mishna and of the 'Chaldee' parts of the O.T." As to the ending *ûth* as an evidence of date, I refer my readers to the full discussion of this ending which I have made in my book *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament* (pp. 105-110). I have there tried to show that "this ending is no proof of the date of a Hebrew document, nor in fact of a document in Babylonian, Assyrian, or Aramaic." As to the endings in *-n,* I refer my readers to the discussion in the same book on page 110 and on pages 147-152, where I have shown that the nouns ending in *-n* are no more common in Aramaic than in Hebrew and that they are found in all Semitic languages in all stages of their development as demonstrated in their literature. There is no sufficient reason for supposing, or concluding, therefore, that nouns with these endings indicate that the documents containing them originated in a time of "linguistic decay," as Cornill states. Professor Franz Delitzsch, whom he cites in

---

[35] LOT, p. 484.
[36] Assigned by Dr. Driver to Isaiah himself (LOT, p. 207).
[37] *Id.,* p. 484.
[38] LOT, p. 224.
[39] *Introduction,* p. 449.

favor of his view, wrote his volume on Ecclesiastes (whose translation into English was supervised by him and in which occurs his great list of the peculiarities of the book) before the year 1877, *i.e.*, fifty years ago. Probably with a knowledge of Babylonian and of the Aramaic inscriptions and especially of the Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus and of the Zadokite Fragments, he would have changed his mind, at least as to the importance of the argument from the endings of the abstract nouns. To my mind, the number and frequency of occurrence of this kind of noun in Ecclesiastes are due to the philosophical character of the book and to the new ideas there first expressed, and only there expressed, in the Hebrew of the Old Testament.

f. The use of *tamîd*[40] with the article to denote "the continual burnt-offerings, as in the Mishna" is said to be a mark of the post-Nehemian date of Daniel.[41] "In the older Heb., the full phrase עולת התמיד is always used, Nu. xxviii. 10 etc., Neh. x. 34." It is hardly fair to say that this phrase is always used, since in four cases the article is omitted, to wit, in Ex. xxxix. 42, Num, xxviii. 6, Ezek. xlvi. 15 and Ezra iii. 5.

There is no doubt, however, that Daniel is unique among Old Testament writers in using *hattamîd* in the general sense to denote all kinds of the morning and evening daily sacrifices. Since these are mentioned in Leviticus and Numbers and one of them in Ezekiel xlvi. 15, this seems no good reason for concluding that Daniel, whenever he wrote, may not have used the word *tamîd* with the article to denote both morning and evening sacrifices and also all kinds of Tamid offerings. Ben Sira, writing in the second century B.C., uses it with *minḥah* showing that at that time *hattamîd* had not superseded the more specific uses. However, there is no good reason apparent why the writer of Daniel may not have gen-

---

[40] תמיד,
[41] LOT, p. 506.13.

eralized a few years after Ezekiel as well as a few years after Ben Sira.

3. *Forms and Meanings of Verbs.*

With regard to the forms of verbs and their meanings and use the critics think, also, that they have found in them evidence of the lateness of the documents which they assign to the post-Nehemian period. Thus

a. The Piel, or intensive, form אבד (to lose) in Ecc. vi. 3 is given as if it were a sign of lateness. The same form in the same sense is found in Jer. xxiii. 1, where, however, it has the object "sheep."[42] We admit that the form used absolutely is found only in Ecc. vi. 3; but claim that it may have been used as early as Solomon. For, first, the intransitive simple stem (Kal) is used in 1 Sam. ix. 3 of the asses of Saul that were lost. The causative (Hiphil) stem would mean that he caused the asses to be lost. But the intensive (Piel) stem would mean he lost his asses. The Aramaic Targum to Ecclesiastes recognizes this distinction; for it paraphrases the clause: "a fit time to seek riches and a fit time for losing riches." The Syriac having no intensive stem of this verb uses the causative instead. The LXX has "a time to lose"; the Latin Vulgate, *tempus perdendi*. The Arabic renders by an infinitive of the second, or intensive, stem of *da'a,* a verb meaning in the first stem "to be lost" and in the second "to lose." In New Hebrew, the verb is found in the intensive sense of "lose"; in Taharoth viii. 3, the participle with the article being used without an object, just as the Infinitive in Ecc. vi. 3, and means clearly "he who loses something." This absolute sense of the Piel, so far as I am able to learn, occurs only in these two places, i.e., in Ecc. vi. 3, and Taharoth viii. 3, although Kal, Piel, and Hiphil are common in other senses in both Talmud and Old Testament. Delitzsch in his commentary on Ecclesiastes gives an example in the sense of "lose" from the *Sifra* on Deut. xxiv. 19; but it has an object. The Talmudic dictionaries of Levy,

---

[42] LOT, p. 474.

Jastrow, and Dalman cite no examples of the use of the verb in this sense. It seems obvious, therefore, that no argument for the date of Ecclesiastes can be derived from the employment of this word in it. The thought "there is a time to lose" is one which might have occurred to any sensible man at any time; and, so far as we know, this was the only, or certainly the best, word in Hebrew to express the thought.

b. (1) On the Hithpael or reciprocal form התחזק Dr. Driver remarks[43] that in the sense "to strengthen oneself" it is found in 1 Chron. xi. 10, xix. 13 (= 2 Sam. x. 12) 2 Chron. i.1, xii. 13, xiii. 7, 8, 21, xv. 8, xvi. 9, xvii. 1, xxi. 4, xxv. 11, xxvii. 6, xxxii. 5; cf. Dan. x. 19-21. He says that its use in earlier books is "both rarer and more distinctive." Under Daniel he simply says, while speaking of the marks of the age subsequent to Nehemiah: "Comp. also התחזק עם x. 21, 1 Chron. xi. 10, 2 Chron. xvi. 9."[44] It is sufficient to say that the verb in the same form and meaning is found also in Neh. xiii. 20 (which Dr. Driver on page 62 assigns to JE), Gen. xlviii. 2 (assigned by Dr. Driver, on page 17, to E), Jud. xx. 22 (apparently pre-exilic *id.* p. 170), in Ezek. vii. 13 and 1 Sam. iv. 9, xxx. 6, 2 Sam. vi. 2, x. 12, 1 Kings xx. 22, and in Ezra vii. 28 which Dr. Driver places in the *Memoirs.* Thus, while there is no doubt that the Chronicler and Daniel used the word with comparative frequency, it is to be noted, first, that it is used in E, JE, Jud., Samuel, Kings, and Ezekiel and the *Memoirs* of Ezra, all preceding Nehemiah, and never in the later parts of Ezra, and Nehemiah, nor in Esther, Ecclesiastes, nor in any of the other works (such as some of the Psalms) which critics call late.

(2) התנדב (to offer oneself willingly) is found only in Chronicles (8 times), Ezra (twice), Nehemiah (once), and in Judges v. 2, 9. This fifth chapter of Judges is considered by most radical critics to be one of the earliest parts of the Old Testament. It will be noted again that,

---

[43] *Id.,* p. 536, no. 8.
[44] *Id.,* p. 507.

while it is true that in the accounts of the transactions after the return from Babylon given in Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah, this word is used with comparative frequency; yet, it occurs in no other of the books assigned by the critics to post-Nehemian times.

(3) התיהד   (to become a Jew) is found only in Est. viii. 17 and very appropriately; but no one can possibly claim that its use in Esther determines at all the post-Nehemian date of the document. When else would there have been any inducement, or advantage, in becoming a Jew?

(4) התיחש   (to be true) is used only in Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah. Unfortunately for Dr. Driver's argument for post-Nehemian origin so far as it is based on this word, it appears to be used in Ezra and Nehemiah only in the *Memoirs,* which according to Dr. Driver were written by the authors themselves.

c. Among the evidences which Dr. Driver gives that the Hebrew of Daniel, Chronicles, and parts of Nehemiah are subsequent to Nehemiah is the use in them of the Hiphil stem of חזק (to be strong) רשע (to be wicked) and זהר (to shine) in an intransitive sense. The first of these occurs in Dan. xi. 7, 32, 2 Chron. xxvi. 8; the second in Dan. ix. 15, xi. 32, xii. 10, Neh. ix. 33, 2 Chron. xx. 35, xxii. 3, Job xxxiv. 12, 29 and Ps. cvi. 6; and the third in Dan. xii. 3. To these DeWette-Schrader add מרעיד (trembling) in Dan. x. 11, Ezra x. 9, and החניף (to be corrupt) in Dan. xi. 32. But that this intransitive use of the causative stem is not a sign of lateness in a Hebrew document appears from the following facts:

This use of the causative appears in Babylonian, Arabic and Syriac as well as in Hebrew and can, therefore, be called correctly a Semitism. It is used already in the Babylonian Creation Tablets from the time of Hammurabi.

The causative, or Hiphil, form is used, as the intransitive is used in English, in all the Semitic languages and from the time of Hammurabi down. Thus in Assyrian we find *šulbur*

(to become old), *šuṣat* (had sprung up),[45] and *ušeṣu* (they took to flight).[46] In Arabic, this use of the causative is common. Thus *halaqa,* simple and causative stems (to be or become old), *'ajdaba* (to be dry), *'aḥsana* (he acted well), *'aṣaba* (he did what was right).[47] So, in Syriac the Aphel frequently has an inchoative sense, as *'aḥwar* (to become old), *'asmaq* (to become red), and even occasionally is hardly to be distinguished from the simple stem, as *'amhel* (to be feeble).[48]

The intransitive or "inwardly transitive" use of the causative form is found also in the Hebrew literature of all ages, according to all views of the date of the documents held by either radicals or conservatives.[49]

Thus in Ex. xvi. 18 (P) "had lack" *i.e.* "became wanting" is in the causative stem in Hebrew; in Neh. iii. 20 "earnestly" is literally "was or became hot," in Joel i. 12, 17, "is withered" is in the causative; and so with many other verbs.[50]

Again, this kind of causative may mean to act "in some particular direction." For example, Lev. v. 4 "to do good" (so also in Is. i. 17, Jer. iv. 22, x. 5, xiii. 23, Jon. iv. 9, Zech. viii. 15, Gen. iv. 7 (J)); Gen. xxxi. 28 (JE) and 1 Sam. xxvi. 21 "to act or play the fool."[51]

(1) Now הרשיע means "to do wickedly" in Dan. ix. 5, xi. 32, xii. 10, 2 Chron. xxii. 3, Neh. ix. 33, a usage just in harmony with the general use of the causative in so many other verbs. Besides, it is so used in Job xxxiv. 12, which Dr. Driver dated about the fifth century B.C.

(2) Likewise, החזיק in Daniel xi. 7 means "become strong" and in xi. 32 "to act strongly," just as in Neh. v. 16 (*Memoirs*) and Job xviii. 9.

(3) מרעיד (trembling, in Dan. x. 11) is used in ex-

---

[45] See King, *The Seven Tablets of Creation,* p. 73, Tablet iv. 109.
[46] Delitzsch; *Assyrische Grammatik,* § 84; Muss Arnolt 85b.
[47] Wright, *Arabic Grammar* I. § 45.
[48] Duval, *Grammaire Syriaque,* p. 183.
[49] See Gesenius, *Hebrew Grammar* I. § 53.2d.
[50] *Id.,* § 53.2e.
[51] *Id.,* § 53.2f

actly the same sense as in Ezra x. 11, which belongs to a
chapter concerning which Dr. Driver says, "that in all
probability the narrative has been somewhat altered in form,
and abridged, from the Memoirs of Ezra." Surely, a shaky
foundation upon which to build an argument for the claim
that Daniel was written in an age "subsequent to Nehemiah."

(4) הזהיר (Dan. xii. 3 "to shine," i.e., "become
bright") is, to be sure, used only here in the Old Testament;
but the verb is found also, not merely in Aramaic, but in the
Hebrew and in the Arabic. In the Arabic, it means "to shine"
in both the first and fourth stems, which correspond to the
simple and causative in Hebrew. The noun from this root
denoting "brightness, splendor" is found in Dan. xii. 3 and
Ezek. viii. 2. In Arabic, the root occurs in too large a number
of species and in too many derivatives to have been a deriva-
tive from Aramaic or Hebrew. One of these derivatives
denotes Venus and another is used for the two great lights,
or shiners, the sun and the moon. When he compares the
righteous to the stars, we can understand how Daniel, living
in the very center of Babylonian astronomy, should have
used language suitable to the shiners of the sky. But, why not
as well in the sixth century B.C. as in the second?[52]

(5) DeWette-Schrader put "החניף zum Abfalle ver-
leiten (entice to apostasy) in Dan. xi. 32" among the "late
Aramaic words" occurring in Daniel. The evidence as to
the use of this word is as follows.

The verb occurs in the Kal in Mi. iv. 11, Is. xxiv. 25, Jer.
iii. 1 (bis), 9, xxiii. 21, Ps. cvi. 38; in the Hiphil, in Jer. iii.
2, Num. xxxv. 33 (bis), and Dan. xi. 32; the adjective in
Is. ix. 16, x. 6, xxxiii. 14, Prov. xi. 9, Ps. xxxv. 16 and 8
times in Job; one noun in Is. xxxii. 6 and another in Jer.
xxiii. 15. In the Talmud all these forms are found except the
noun of Is. xxxii. 6; but no new forms occur. The verb and a
noun in the cognate accusative occur in a letter from Abd-
hiba of Jerusalem to the king of Egypt found in the Tel-

---

[52] See further in a note by the writer in this REVIEW for January, 1919.

Amarna letters.[53] In the Hebrew of the Talmud, the Kal means "to flatter" and the Hiphil "to submit to the power of."[54] In the Aramaic of the Targums the Pael means "to flatter, favor, deceive," and the Aphel means the same.[55] A *ḥanef* is a "hypocrite," arbitrary or faithless one, and *ḥanefa* and *ḥanufa* mean "hypocrisy, flattery, and heresy."

In Arabic, the verb means "to bend to one side," and a *ḥanif* is one who "inclines from one religion to another." Thus according to some, it "was applied to the Muslim because of his turning from a belief in a plurality of gods."[56]

In Syriac, it is used in the intensive and causative stems, the former meaning *in paganitatem induxit* and the latter *paganus factus est*. The two derivatives mean "pagan" and "paganism."[57]

In Hebrew, the verb is always used of "defiling or profaning" the land, except in Jer. xxiii. 11 where the prophets and priests are said to be *ḥanef,* and in Dan. xi. 32 where the king of Syria is said to make *ḥanif* through flatteries those who transgress the covenant. The meaning of *ḥanif* is clear from the numerous passages cited above. It is a synonym of sinner, evil-doer, wicked, and the antonym of the innocent, the trustful, the upright, and the righteous. The Hiphil is rightly used by Daniel in the sense of "make *ḥanif*." This was always good usage of the Hiphil in Hebrew. Compare the similar phrases: "to make great, small, holy or righteous."

Further, DeWette-Schrader state that the meaning of the Hiphil of this verb in Aramaic is "to entice or seduce to apostacy," rather than "to make apostate." It is a pity that they cite no passages as examples of this meaning of the

---

[53] See Winckler, *Tell-el-Amarna Letters,* No. 181.7, 8.

[54] See Levy, Jastrow and Dalman *in loc.*

[55] *Id.*

[56] See Lane, *Arabic Dictionary.*

[57] See Brockelmann, *Lexicon Syriacum* and Payne Smith's *Thesaurus, in loc.*

Hiphil. In Syriac the Pael may have this sense, but the Hiphil means to make *hanif*. Since neither Syriac nor Arabic uses the simple stem in a religious sense, it looks as if they both derived the use from the Hebrew.

4. *The Syntax.*

a. It is charged that the frequent use of *wau conjunctive* with the perfect is an indication that Ecclesiastes is the latest book of the Old Testament. The discovery of the Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus has deprived this statement of all force; for we find that Ben Sira uses *wau conversive* with the imperfect 120 times and *wau conjunctive* with the perfect only 5 times. Besides, the *Zadokite Fragments,* written somewhere between 100 B.C. and 40 A.D., have *wau conversive* with the imperfect 85 times and *wau conjunctive* with the perfect only 3 times.

Further, the book of Daniel (which, according to the radical critics, was written about the middle of the second century B.C., just about the time at which they assure us that Ecclesiastes was written) has *wau conversive* with the imperfect about 200 times and *wau conjunctive* with the perfect only about 5 times.

It is noteworthy, also, that this usage was not common in Chronicles, Esther, the Maccabean psalms and the later parts of Ezra and Nehemiah. These all, as well as the books of Ecclesiasticus and the Zadokite Fragments still use commonly as the oldest documents did, the *wau conversive* with the imperfect. Note, also, this phrase "the oldest documents." For Judges v, which some critics allege to be the oldest part of the Old Testament, has the *wau conjunctive* with the perfect twice; and the Balaam account, considered also to be one of the oldest sections in the Scriptures, has the perfect with *wau conjunctive* seven times to two times for the imperfect with *wau conversive.*

It seems to me that this testimony to the late date of Ecclesiastes would better be ruled out.[58]

---

[58] See further on this subject pages 150-152 of *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament.*

b. One of the alleged proofs of the charges that Daniel was written in the age *subsequent to Nehemiah* is that in chapters i. 21, x. 1 the name of the king precedes the title. Dr. Driver claims that the early writings had nearly always the order "the king" followed by the name; whereas in the times *subsequent to Nehemiah,* the order was the name followed by the title. Fortunately, this statement is one open to exact and complete investigation of the testimony; for we have all the documents before us and good concordances withal. These concordances show us that the order "X the king" occurs in Chronicles 19 times and the order "the king X" 18 times; in the Hebrew of Ezra it is 2 to 2; in Nehemiah 0 to 2; in Daniel 0 to 2; and in Esther 24 to 0. Notice that Chronicles alone gives any support to the theory that "X the king" was the order in Hebrew documents written subsequent to the time of Nehemiah; for all the titles in Nehemiah and all the titles in Ezra having this order occur in the Memoirs which Dr. Driver admits to have been written by Ezra and Nehemiah themselves, and in the 24 cases in Esther the order is always "the king Ahasuerus."

Finally, anyone who will take the trouble to look up the scores of thousands of titles from among the nations of antiquity[59] will discover that, when they used not merely the word king but the name of the country ruled over along with the name of the king, the order was "X the king of Y." Thus the order "Cyrus king of Persia" was the natural and common order for all nations and all times. So then, no argument for the date of a document can be made from the use of this phrase.

c. Of a similar kind with the last bit of alleged evidence is the claim that the phrase "king of Persia" is one of "the internal marks" that the books of Ezra and Nehemiah were "compiled in an age long subsequent to that of Ezra and Nehemiah." For "the addition would during the period of the Persian supremacy be at once unnecessary and contrary

---

[59] See my articles cited in Note 60 below.

to contemporary usage." "The expression used by Ezra and Nehemiah, when speaking in their own person, or in passages extracted from sources written under Persian rule is simply "the king." "The observation is due to Ewald, *Hist.* 1.173."

Since this phrase *king of Persia* is used after Cyrus in Daniel x. 1, Ezra i. 1 (bis), 2, 8, iii. 7, iv. 3, 5, 2 Chron. xxxvi. 22 (bis), 23; after Darius in Ezra xii. 5, iv. 24; and after Artaxerxes in iv. 7, vi. 14, vii. 1, it is apparent that, if what Dr. Driver says be true, the books of Daniel, Chronicles and the parts of Ezra not included in the Memoirs must have been written, or at least revised, in the times following the conquest of Alexander the Great. It will be observed that Dr. Driver asserts that in Persian times the title "king of Persia" was (1) unnecessary, (2) contrary to usage, (3) that the title used in Persian times was simply "king" and (4) that these facts imply that the documents containing the phrase "king of Persia" were written after the dominion of Persia had ceased to exist.

Now in a series of articles in this REVIEW for 1904-5, I published an approximately complete induction of the titles and designations of the kings of the ancient Egyptians, Babylonians, Assyrians, Persians, Parthians, Greeks, Hebrews and other nations of antiquity. These collations show that it was the usage among all these people to employ the phrase "king of Egypt," "king of Babylon," "king of Persia," etc., in all public documents and during the life-time of the kings named in the documents and of the countries over which these kings ruled. This was true no less for the kings of Persia than it was for the kings of all other countries. It is futile to drag into this discussion the statement of the brilliant German scholar Ewald; for he lived and wrote before the time when we had access to the treasures of the Egyptian, Babylonian and Persian records. Moreover, his statement was at best an *opinion,* and cannot stand in the face of the abundant evidence that we now possess that he was mistaken. Tens of thousands of items of evidence show that it was

usual among all nations to employ this or a similar phrase. Besides, eighteen different authors in at least nineteen different documents from Persian times use this title altogether thirty-eight times. They use it in six different languages and of at least six different Persian kings. It was used in documents from Media, Babylonia, Asia Minor, Greece and Palestine; and according to Herodotus in Ethiopia. It is used especially in letters, decrees, and other like documents of the Scriptures just as it is in extra-biblical documents. It is used of Cyrus in an inscription written seven years before the conquest of Babylon and of Artaxerxes III about 365 B.C., thus both antedating and postdating in the extra-biblical usage of the Persian period anything that we find in the Scriptures. That is, the earliest use in the Bible is in the decree of Cyrus made in 539 B.C., whereas the Nabonidus-Cyrus Chronicle mentions Cyrus as king of Persia in the year 546 B.C.; and the latest use of the phrase in the Bible is in a reference dating certainly from before 400 B.C., whereas in the monuments we meet it in an inscription of Artaxerxes III from the year 356 B.C.

Finally, the title was not used commonly of the Persian kings by Greek writers after the time of Alexander the Great. Diodorus Siculus, an historian of the first century B.C., and Josephus, from the end of the first century A.D., are the only Greek writers to use the phrase "king of Persia" after the name of the king.[60]

CONCLUSION

My readers will admit that in this article I have endeavored to show that the evidence in our possession does not support the claim of the radical critics, that the Hebrew language used in Daniel, Esther, Ecclesiastes, Chronicles, and

___

[60] For the detailed evidence for the above discussion on the title "king of Persia," see this REVIEW for 1904, pages 257-282, 465-97, 618-664, and for 1905, pages 55-80, 238-267, 422-440, 558-572; and the article on "Titles of the Persian Kings" in the *Sachau Denkschrift*, Berlin, 1912.

the parts of Ezra and Nehemiah not in the Memoirs, demonstrates that these books were written in an age "subsequent to Nehemiah." I hope further, that they will admit that there is hardly a shred of evidence in the Hebrew language to show that any of the Psalms were written in this period. Since almost all of the documents of the Old Testament have words found only in them and in the Hebrew and Aramaic of the Targums and Talmud, the presence of such words in a particular document cannot be used as evidence of the lateness of that document; unless we are prepared to claim that almost all the documents are late. We would have to claim, also, that many that were considered late are really early, because they contain none of these words. I think, therefore, that I have reduced the argument to an *ad absurdum*, or, in plain English, made it ridiculous. Those who agree with me in this opinion will accept the *prima facie* evidence of the *Textus Receptus* as standing unimpaired by this attack upon it, and will continue to believe that the Old Testament, as we have it, is true.

Princeton.   R. D. WILSON.