

The Princeton Theological Review

OCTOBER 1926

JOHN D. DAVIS*

The Reverend John D. Davis, Doctor of Philosophy, Doctor of Divinity, Doctor of Laws, Helena Professor of Oriental and Old Testament Literature in Princeton Theological Seminary, died on June 21, 1926, in the seventy-third year of his age.

At the beginning of the last academic session he seemed to be in the full enjoyment of his usual vigor of body and mind, and, so far as his colleagues could observe, he performed his duties throughout the year with his customary fidelity, efficiency, and success. Few, even among those intimately associated with him, had any inkling that his health was being impaired. His familiar form was conspicuous for its absence from the Commencement Exercises in May, and as the word spread among the members of the Faculty, the graduating class, and the large gathering of alumni and friends of the Seminary, that our beloved senior professor had left town in order to undergo a surgical operation, expressions of sincere regret and deep solicitude were heard on every hand; nor were our apprehensions altogether allayed by the assurance, emanating from a seemingly trustworthy source, that under normal circumstances his early restoration might be confidently expected. All that human skill and af-

* A memorial discourse, delivered by appointment of the Faculty of Princeton Theological Seminary, in Miller Chapel, on Tuesday, October 12, 1926.

JESUS AND THE OLD TESTAMENT

Objection has frequently been made to the use of the testimony of Jesus in corroboration of the historicity of the persons and events of the Old Testament to which the Gospels tell us that He referred, apparently in full belief in the accuracy and veracity of the Old Testament accounts of these persons and events. These objections are based fundamentally upon the supposition, that Jesus in these references was merely conforming to the opinions and beliefs common among the Jews of His time, or that He really did not know enough to perceive that these opinions of His contemporaries were false and their beliefs groundless. For myself, I have always been of the belief and am today, that Jesus knew more about the Old Testament than the Jews of His day and than any, or all, of the wise men of all time; and this belief is based upon the conviction that God hath demonstrated Him to be the Son of God by His resurrection from the dead. And, if He is the Son of God, I can believe that He was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, crucified for my sins, and that He has ascended up on high, having brought life and immortality to light in His gospel. As my Lord and Teacher, I take what He has said *con amore, ex animo*, and without any mental reservations. Doubts arise in my mind only when I cannot be sure of what He did say, or of the meaning of what He said, owing to difficulties in the text or in its interpretation. Nevertheless, notwithstanding this faith of mine and partly because of it, I am interested in attempting to remove from the minds of others the doubts which hinder them from trusting His words as the words of truth. Consequently, in the following pages, I shall address myself to answering the questions, What did Jesus say with regard to the Old Testament? and, Can any one show that what He said is not true? In view of the character of Jesus as portrayed in the New Testament it seems to me that all Christians at least should accept His opinion as to the facts of the Old Testament, unless it can be proved beyond controversy that what He

thought and said about these facts is false. When it shall have been shown that Jesus was wrong in His treatment of the Old Testament, it will be time to resort to the theory of *kenosis*,¹ in order to retain at least a remnant of our faith.

As the basis of this article, I shall take a criticism by Dr. T. R. Glover of Cambridge, England, of two lectures delivered by me in June, 1925, before the Bible League of the United Kingdom in Central Hall, Westminster.² A stenographic report of these lectures seems to have been published in a bulletin of the Bible League. I have never seen this report, but it appears from the criticism that it contained some typographical errors—especially in the Latin citations—over which the critic makes himself merry. I commend to him a perusal of Polybius' defense of Ephorus when the latter was attacked by Timaeus on the ground of certain obvious inconsistencies in some of his statements.³

After this preliminary criticism, the learned critic proceeds to state for me the principle of my method, as follows: "He knows quite well, and admits it, that the accuracy of any statement in the Old Testament is only to be verified in one way—by evidence." I neither know nor admit any such statement; but, on the contrary, I maintain that inas-

¹ I refer here to the theory of *kenosis* according to which it is held that the "emptied himself" (R.V.) of Phil. ii. 7, included His divine knowledge as well as His form, or glory.

² Written under his signature with the caption "Fundamentalism on the Defensive" by T. R. Glover, D.D., LL.D., and published in the *Daily News*, London, Jan. 16, 1926.

³ Polybius in his *Histories* as translated by Evelyn S. Shuckburgh, M.A., Cambridge, says in Book xii. 4 (a), in speaking of the attack of Timaeus upon Ephorus as follows: "He [i.e. Timaeus] falsely charges Ephorus with contradicting himself, on the ground that he asserts that Dionysius the Elder ascended the throne at the age of twenty-three, reigned forty-two years, and died at sixty-three. Now no one would say, I think, that this was a blunder of the historian, but clearly one of the transcriber. For either Ephorus must be more foolish than Coroebus and Margites, if he were unable to calculate that forty-two added to twenty-three make sixty-five; or if that is incredible in the case of a man like Ephorus, it must be a mere mistake of the transcriber, and the carping and malevolent criticism of Timaeus must be rejected."

much as the Old Testament Scriptures, wherever they could be thoroughly tested, have stood the test of outside evidence, the presumption is that the *prima facie* evidence of the Scriptures is to be taken as correct where it cannot be tested. I maintain, further, that no mere opinion, even of the wisest man now living, is sufficient to cast a doubt upon the veracity of documents two or three thousand years old; that opinions and conjectures are not evidence; and that the only evidence by which we can test the reliability of ancient historic documents, except so much as is to be acquired from analogy, must be derived from other ancient and, if possible, contemporaneous documents.

The critic then proceeds to express his opinion as to certain parts and statements of the Old Testament to which the Lord refers. To quote his own words, he says: "After all his [i.e. Wilson's] talk of defending Daniel 'philologically, palaeographically and historically' it is plain [i.e., plain to Dr. Glover], that he rests on traditional dogma." If he had read my *Studies on the Book of Daniel*, he would probably not have made such an assertion. He cites me, further, as saying: "I never thought that I knew more than Jesus Christ"; and then proceeds to make the following comment:

That means in plain English, this: Our Lord—if the text is right, if the oral transmission behind the text is right, if the interpretation is right that He was definitely deciding a textual question, if no other qualification is to be added—appears, or can be made to appear, to attribute the 110th Psalm categorically to David and to accept Jonah's three days in the whale's belly.

Now, to anybody who compares Luke and Matthew, and cares to look at the sense of the passage, it is plain [*sic!*] that the reference to Jonah is parallel with that to the Queen of Sheba and that the whale verse in Matthew is irrelevant and is only explicable as an interpolation.⁴

⁴ Dr. Glover here gives a good example of his own method of criticism. He asserts that "the whole verse in Matt. xii. 40 [referring to Jonah] is irrelevant and is only explicable as an interpolation." This he does in spite of the fact that all the manuscripts, texts and versions of Matthew support the genuineness of this verse. All the texts and versions of Jonah, also, agree in the account of the miracle as given in our English Bible and as cited in the New Testament.

The passages, referred to above, concerning the 110th Psalm are Matt. xxii. 43-45, Mark xii. 35-37, Luke xx. 41-44; those concerning the Queen of Sheba are found in Matt. xii. 42 and Luke xi. 31; and those concerning Jonah in Matt. xii. 39, 40, xvi. 4, and Luke xi. 29, 30. My readers will be good enough to read for themselves these passages and, also, the heading of Psalm cx., the account of the Queen of Sheba in 1 Kings x. 1-10, and the first and second chapters of the book of Jonah. My readers will note, also, that the correctness of the English version of the original text of all these passages cannot be denied^{4a}; and that the manuscripts and versions agree as to the accuracy of the text that has been transmitted to us. Then, let my readers bestir themselves and think what they would decide, if they were serving on a jury, as to the evidence of documents, regarding whose text and obvious meaning there could be no doubt on the ground of evidence except only that suggested by the lawyer who wanted to impugn the veracity of the documents. We *know* that these passages of the Old Testament were the same in the time of Jesus that they are now. We have the testimony of three of the Synoptic Gospels as to Psalm cx; two references to Jonah in Matthew and one in Luke; and references to the Queen of Sheba in Matthew and Luke. No textual variants of any moment are found in any of the manuscripts or versions. There is no serious dispute as to the meaning of any clause in any of the passages. And yet, the distinguished public orator of Cambridge seems to expect us to reject all of this impregnable testimony of Kings, Psalms and Jonah, and of Matthew, Mark and Luke, simply because he and those like him have thought out a lot of "ifs" and use without evidence such phrases as "it is clear to me" with a view to showing that Jesus did not mean what He said, or did not say what He meant. Before undertaking again to inveigh against the *prima facie* evidence of the Scriptures, it will be well for Dr. Glover to gather together some objective evidence in

^{4a} Except that κῆτος would better be rendered "sea-monster" or "great fish."

language, manuscripts, versions and inscriptions, that will enable him to persuade a grand jury of sensible lawyers, trained in the law of evidence, or even of the general public, that he has a case fit to be presented before a court for trial.

After having given expression to the general opinions above stated, Dr. Glover proceeds to throw upon the Bible Union the burden of proof, as to the veracity of the Scriptures and as to the knowledge of Jesus, declaring that before we can believe in the trustworthiness of the one or the knowledge of the other there must first be "established" the following seven points. His statement is as follows:

Several things then have to be established—First, that the historical tradition is solidly represented by the Authorized Version; second, that our Lord never meant more than the Bible League has discovered; third, that He was deadly literal (and it is clear He was not); fourth, that He never argued *ad hominem* (which He clearly did); fifth, that He really aimed at establishing the verbal accuracy of Biblical texts (though He threw over Moses' laws as to the Sabbath and divorce); sixth, that He, made in the likeness of man, after "emptying Himself," as St. Paul puts it, must have retained omniscience on things of major or of minor importance; and, seventh, that if astray or indifferent as to a comma of the received O.T. text of His day, He is of no further value. And I think some of these propositions will take some arguing.

Now, I have no means of knowing what the thousands of members of the Bible League may hold, individually or collectively, as to these seven points; so I shall merely state my own views with regard to them. Taking them up in order, then, let me say:

1. It is scientifically certain that the Authorized Version, so-called, represents with substantial accuracy the meaning of the "received text" both of the Old Testament in Hebrew and Aramaic and of the New Testament in Greek. Not merely so, but every version of the Bible, honestly made, from the Septuagint down to the last published by the British and Foreign, or the American, Bible Society, "solidly represents" the history of Israel, the prophecies, and the poetical books of the Old Testament; and the life of Jesus, the acts of the Apostles, the revelation of St. John, and the epistles of the New Testament. That is, they all present the great facts of

sacred history and the doctrines of redemption in such a way that they who know them may by them be made wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus.

2. I doubt if any member of the Bible League ever thought, or said, that the Lord never meant more than he himself or all the members of the League taken together had discovered; or, for that matter, than Dr. Glover, or any other man has discovered, or could discover.

3. Some things seem to be "clear" to Dr. Glover that are not clear to us. For example, what does he mean by "deadly literal"? Is he sure that there is not a *non*-literal that is much more deadly than a deadly literal? As he has not given any specifications, nor any evidence, but merely makes an assertion, let us wait and see what he means. Perhaps, we shall agree with him.

4. Who says that Jesus never used the *ad hominem* argument? It is certainly possible and many consider it probable that in His argument with the Jews about the casting out of demons Jesus used such an argument when He said, "And if I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out?" (Matt. xii. 27, cf. Lk. xi. 19). The question is not whether Jesus ever used an *ad hominem*, but whether in referring to Jonah and to Ps. cx. etc., he was employing this argument. This is obviously a very different question.

5. What the Lord may have "aimed at" aside from setting aside, as the Lord of the Sabbath and of man, the outgrown laws of Moses, given because of the hardness of Israel's heart, I do not know—nor does Dr. Glover, nor any other man. What is clear, however, is, that Jesus recognizes the verbal accuracy and the authority of the Biblical texts bearing upon the Sabbath and divorce; and, then, as the Lord of both Sabbath and of man, He makes known a higher and better law.

6. As to the doctrine of kenosis, I am not prepared to say that the God-man *must* have maintained His omniscience; but I am ready to maintain that as far as any one today *knows*, every reference that He made to the Old Testament

is true. In former days, many good Christian men, who truly loved the Lord and relied humbly on His grace, believed in this doctrine; largely because they thought that the sayings of Jesus with regard to the Old Testament were not true in fact. Judging by the analogy of the Greek and Roman histories, they argued that the early history of the Old Testament consisted largely of myths and legends; and having given up their faith in its historic trustworthiness, and recognizing that Jesus believed in its trustworthiness, they preserved their faith in Him by taking refuge in kenosis. But today we know that the history of Israel, unlike that of Greece and Rome, is confirmed by a mass of evidence, which rules out all the old-time mythical theories as to its origin. Wherever the Old Testament records can be thoroughly tested, they have stood the test. As to writing, language, forms of literature, law, history and religion, it stands approved by the evidence of contemporaneous documents of unquestioned veracity and relativity. Its statements must be accepted on their face value unless it can be shown by evidence from outside that they are false.

7. It will be time enough to discuss this last point, when it shall have been shown that Jesus did go astray or was indifferent to the *Textus Receptus* of His day.⁵

⁵ It is true that Jesus does not expressly say that He is interested in, or is making use of, the *Textus Receptus* of His day; but this is different from implying that He was indifferent to it. Besides it cannot be shown that Jesus went astray in His use of the text of the Old Testament. One of the most noteworthy facts in the consideration of the New Testament citations from the Old Testament, is the marvelous manner in which the citations attributed by the evangelists to Jesus Himself agree with the *Textus Receptus* of our Hebrew Bibles. In most of these citations by Jesus, we have exactly the same text in the Gospels as we find in the Hebrew, e.g., Matt. iv. 4, 7, v. 5, 21, 27, 31, 38, 43, viii. 17, ix. 13 (?), xv. 4, 27, xvii. 16, xix. 4, 7, 19, xxi. 13, 16, 42, xxii. 32, 44, xxvii. 46. In Matt. iv. 10 and Luke iv. 8 the word "only" is added in accordance with the Septuagint and with the sense. In Matt. xi. 10, xiii. 14, 15, 35, xxvi. 37 the text is substantially the same. In xv. 8, 9, there is a slight variation by way of adaptation and in xix. 5 an "unimportant variation." In xxvi. 31, there is an interpretation by way of adaptation; and in xxiv. 21 a "free citation." See *Quotations in the New Testament* by Crawford Howell Toy, late Professor in Harvard University.

How, then, is it with the statements of the Old Testament to which Jesus refers and which from the *prima facie* evidence of the Gospels He seems to have believed to be true? Can these statements be accepted as true or can they not? Dr. Glover is clearly of the opinion that they cannot be accepted. His whole line of argument rests upon this assumption. If his assumption is correct his arguments are worthy of consideration. But if that assumption is untrue, most of his contentions are of no value. We shall now proceed therefore to examine all the passages in which Jesus refers to the Old Testament, which are cited by Dr. Glover, as well as a number of others which he does not mention, with a view to showing that Dr. Glover's assumption is not justified by the facts.

Adam.

In Matt. xix. 4 Jesus says: "Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female," referring to Gen. i. 27. As the context clearly shows, Jesus means the pair of whom it was said in Gen. i. "let us make man in our image according to our likeness," and whom He created male and female. In the more particular account in Gen. ii, it is said in vs. 7 that Jehovah formed Adam from the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and, in vs. 22, that He built up Eve from a rib or side of Adam. Does any one know that this account is not true to the facts? Surely, man is made of dust, or chemical elements, to which our physical bodies return after death. Surely, also, man must have been male and female from the beginning of the race to which we belong. Surely, last of all, we have more or less of the divine likeness and image. Is any man prepared to affirm that he knows that this God-like *genus homo* to which we belong and of which Jesus speaks was not, or could not have been, made as Jesus says that he was? The when, the where, the how, no one knows. Why not admit as much as this?

In Matt. xix. 5 He says further that God said: "For this

cause shall a man leave father and mother and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh (cf. Mk. vi. 7, 8). This is objected to on the ground that it affirms monogamy to have been the original family bond. This has been challenged by the evolutionists who regard the monogamous relation as the result of a long process of development. But can anyone maintain that this has been conclusively proved to be the case? If man is really a fallen creature, as the Bible affirms, he may have departed rapidly and far from this primitive ideal. If man is not a fallen being, not merely does our whole theology need to be radically reconstructed, but the need of redemption is annulled and God's revelation of free and abundant grace through Jesus Christ, the Son of God, becomes an absurd delusion.

Abel.

"The blood of Abel" (Lk. xi. 51), or "righteous Abel" (Matt. xxiii. 35), implies that there was an Abel and that he was killed by Cain as is stated by the record in Gen. iv. There is no evidence in existence to show that this account is not true nor that Jesus did not know that it was true.

Noah.

In Matt. xxiv. 37, 39, Jesus says that "as the days of Noe *were*, so also shall the coming of the Son of man be. For as in the days that were before the flood, they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage until the day that Noe entered into the ark, and knew not until the flood came, and took them all away," etc. (See, also, Luke xvii. 26, 27). This passage implies that Jesus believed there was a Noah, an ark, a flood, and that all who had not entered the ark were swept away. Every one of these points is clearly set forth in Gen. vi-viii and is (though with another name for Noah) confirmed by the Babylonian account of the deluge found in the Eleventh Tablet of the Gilgamesh story. Jesus says nothing about the ark's dimensions, nor about how many persons or animals or what kinds of provisions entered the ark, nor about the way the flood came, nor about how long it en-

duced, nor about its extent. About all of these minor questions he is silent; but as to the four main points in the narrative of the flood, He certainly states them as if He believed them to be true. Can any historian, geologist, or philosopher, prove that such a flood with its accompaniments, did not occur? Having seen the Johnstown flood and lived through the Yokohama earthquake, I am exceedingly sceptical about all theories of uniformitarianism in the course of this earth's history.⁶ A study of the Johnstown flood and its ravages and of the overflows of the Mississippi and other great rivers would be a good preparation for those who attempt to settle the chronology of Egypt by measuring the amount of sediment from the ordinary rate of increase of the soil in the last 3500 years, or so.⁷ A study of the earthquakes of which we know, such as that of Yokohama, might make people more modest about generalizing concerning the rate of changes in the earth's surface and might also throw some light on the ease with which God could have effected the passage of the Jordan and the fall of the walls of Jericho; and, one might add, the turning back of the shadow on the dial plate of Ahaz. That earthquakes were common in Palestine seems evident from 1 Kings xix. 11, 12, Is. xxix. 6, Amos i. 1, Zech. xiv. 5 and the references to them in Matthew, Acts and The Revelation. The manner in which the difficulty about the sun standing still has been removed by a study of Babylonian as-

⁶ Sir William Dawson says in his work *The Earth and Man*, page 3: "The uniformity has been in the methods, the results have presented a wondrous diversity and development"; and on p. 287 "the erosion [in the pluvial, or post-pliocene, age] was enormous in comparison with anything in our experience."

⁷ In the *Forum* for October, Sir Flinders Petrie, whom we all honor for his great work in Egyptology, calculates that the rise of the sediment in the valley of the Nile has been at the same rate for 3500 years ago as it is today. He says on p. 532 that "it is not likely to have accumulated on an entirely different scale before that time." Against the validity of this assumption see Chapter VII of G. M. Price's *New Geology*. Why may the two feet or so of pebbles and rubble in the Fayoum Valley not be due to a sudden and overwhelming overflow occasioned by the bursting of some inland African lake and a sudden breach in the west bank of the Nile?

tronomy, showing that the Hebrew word translated in the English version by standing still means *to be darkened*, or *eclipsed*⁸ should teach us that real knowledge is in harmony with the Word of God. God, who made and preserves the universe, including chemicals and physical forces and vegetable and animal life, is the greatest of all chemists and physicists and physicians; and floods and earthquakes and eclipses and life and death and resurrections and immortality are still within His power, His wisdom, His control. That He should have caused the Noachic flood and have given us a sign that there would never be another like it, is clearly within the confines of reasonable belief to all who believe in Him at all. Certain it is, at least, that no man knows enough to say that there was no Noachic flood, or that Jesus was wrong, or did not know, that such a flood took place.

Abraham.

In nine distinct passages Jesus mentions Abraham by name, as follows:

a. Matt. viii. 11; "many shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven."

b. Matt. xxii. 31, 32: "As touching the resurrection of the dead, have you not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living." Mark xii. 26, 27: "As touching the dead, that they rise; have ye not read in the book of Moses, how in the bush God spoke unto him, saying, I am the God of Abraham," etc. "He is not the God of the dead but the God of the living." Luke xx. 37, 38: "Now that the dead are raised even Moses shewed at the bush, when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham," etc. "For He is not a God of the dead, but of the living."

c. In Luke xiii. 16, Jesus calls a woman a "daughter of Abraham whom Satan hath bound," etc.

⁸ See my article, "What does 'the Sun Stood Still' Mean?" in this REVIEW, Vol. xvi., pp. 46-54.

d. In Luke xix. 9 he calls Zaccheus "a son of Abraham."

e. Luke xiii. 28 "There will be weeping and gnashing of teeth when ye shall see Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and all the prophets in the kingdom of God," etc.

f. In Luke xvi. 22, He concludes the parable of the rich man and Lazarus in Abraham's bosom by the words: "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead."

g. In John viii. 39, He speaks of "the children of Abraham" and "the works of Abraham."

h. In John viii. 56, He says that "Abraham rejoiced to see my day and he saw it and was glad."

i. In John viii. 58, He says: "Before Abraham came into being, I am."

In every one of these nine passages, Jesus speaks as if He thought that there was a man called Abraham. He says that He Himself existed before Abraham was born and implies that He had seen Abraham, inasmuch as this verse was a reply to the question of the Jews in the preceding verses: "Thou art not yet fifty years old and hast Thou seen Abraham?" He claims, also, to have known the works of Abraham (John viii. 39) and that the living God was the God of an Abraham who was still living in heaven long after his body had died on earth. These statements clearly indicate, that Jesus believed that He existed before Abraham, knew all about his life here, and thought that he, Abraham, still existed. What logical ground has a Christian for denying any of these things? What man knows enough to say that Jesus was wrong in believing them to be true?

Without mention of the name of Abraham, the Lord refers to four other events connected with his history—the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah (Matt. xi. 24, Mark vi. 11, Luke x. 12), Lot's going out of Sodom (Luke xvii. 28, 29), Lot's wife (Luke xvii. 32), and the institution of the rite of circumcision by the fathers before the time of Moses (John vii. 22). In our present state of knowledge about these

events, it is certain that we do not know that the references to them by Jesus are not all true. Doubtless, when Dr. Glover produces some direct evidence upon these statements militating against the truthfulness of what the evangelists state that Jesus said, the members of the Bible League of the United Kingdom will sit up and take notice. His mere opinion upon these matters is of no more value as evidence than the opinion of any other man now living. That is, it is of no value whatsoever.

Moses.

In every one of the Gospels, Jesus is said to have referred by name to Moses, and to some words or acts of his :

a. Matt. xix. 8: "Moses suffered you to put away your wives, but in the beginning it was not so," etc.

b. Mark x. 3: "What did Moses command you?"

c. Luke xx. 37: "That the dead are raised, Moses shewed at the bush," etc.

d. John iii. 14: "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so shall the Son of Man be lifted up," etc.

e. John v. 45: "One accuseth you, even Moses in whom ye trust."

f. John vi. 32 (referring to the manna): "Moses gave you not that bread from heaven."

g. John vii. 19: "Did not Moses give you the law?"

h. John vii. 23: He speaks of "the law of Moses."

These eight passages show us that Jesus believed that there was a Moses who figured in these events recorded of him in the Pentateuch and especially who gave the Law to the Israelites. Particularly noteworthy is His use of the raising up of the serpent in the wilderness. Does anyone know that any one of these statements is wrong or that Jesus did not know that they were true? If so, how does he know? What is his evidence? No event of history is self-evident and nothing is impossible with God.

Jesus cites from every one of the five books ascribed to Moses and He says expressly "He wrote of me." This implies

three things. First, there was a Moses; secondly, he wrote; thirdly, he wrote concerning Jesus. As to the first of these implications, that is, that there was a man called Moses, can there really exist a man who thinks he knows enough to make a denial that such a person ever existed at the court of Pharaoh sometime between 1250 and 1500 B.C.?⁹ We know that the Hebrew language was in common use in Palestine and Syria before the time of the conquest of these countries by Thothmes III who probably preceded Moses by several centuries; for the cities of these lands, which he enumerates three times on the gates of the temple which he built at Karnak, mostly bear good Hebrew names.¹⁰ We know further that the scribes both of Palestine and Syria on the one hand and of Egypt on the other knew Hebrew, for the Hebrew words inserted by way of explanation in the El Amarna letters written to the kings Amenophis, the Third and Fourth, could otherwise not have been either written in these letters, or read by the scribes of Egypt. Further, the mention of the Israelites by Merenptah shows that a people of this name was known to him; and it is probable that the word Habiru of the Amarna letters was the Babylonian equivalent of "Hebrew" (עברי). Since it is certain, therefore, that there were Hebrews in Egypt at the time when according to the Scriptures Moses was born and enacted his extraordinary deeds, it is a ridiculous assumption of a knowledge not possessed by any man to assert that Moses could not have existed.

Further, no one can doubt that the Hebrews were in Palestine in the time of Shishak and of Tiglath-Pileser III (IV); and the Biblical records give us the only account known of the origin of the kingdoms of Judah and Israel whose separate existence is confirmed by the Assyrian documents. The books of the prophets, the Psalms, and the historical books of the Old Testament, all unite in assuring us that the Israelites were in Canaan long before the time of Saul and David

⁹ Moses may have existed without being mentioned on the Egyptian monuments. See *Studies in the Book of Daniel*, chaps. I and II.

¹⁰ See W. Max Müller's *Die Palästina-liste Thutmosis III.*

and that their religious centre at Jerusalem was firmly fixed by the construction of the temple in the time of Solomon. That there was a period of judges before there was a king in Israel can be denied by no one; and there must have been a first and a foremost of these judges who led the people in the conquest which all must admit to have occurred. Who, then, was this first of the judges? Who was this leader of the Israelitish people who led the embattled hosts of the Hebrews against the walled cities and chariots of the preceding inhabitants of the land? The Bible calls him Moses and his minister Joshua and makes him to have been the founder of the institutions of his people. Does anyone know that the Bible is wrong in what it says with regard to this man Moses? More particularly, can any one have the audacity to say that he *knows* that there was not a Hebrew leader, prophet, and founder of the people and institutions having this name? No. A thousand times: No. And, if they do not know this, what right have they to say that Jesus did not know that he was, or that he was wrong in assuming that he was.

Secondly, if there was a Moses, why may he not have written books or documents? Surely, no one can deny that writing was in use from the Tigris to the Nile hundreds of years before the time when the Biblical accounts say that Moses lived. Moreover, we know that both Hebrew and Babylonian¹¹ as well as Egyptian were known at the court of Pharaoh before the time of Moses, and that thousands of scribes were active about 1500 B.C. in Babylonia, Crete, Syria, Palestine, Egypt, and among the Hittites and Southern Arabians. Were the Hebrews the only ones who could not read and write?

Again, we know that the peoples of those times were thinking and writing about the same kinds of things that we find described in the books of the Pentateuch. The Babylonians of

¹¹ The Amarna letters written in cuneiform could not have been read, had there not been those at the Court of Egypt who knew it. The parentheses in Hebrew would have been senseless unless the scribes of Egypt could have read them.

Abraham's time have left us accounts of the creation and flood similar in many respects to those contained in Genesis. The numerous autobiographies of the ancient Egyptians resemble in many particulars the lives of Abraham, Jacob, Joseph and Moses. The art of poetry, as exemplified in the poems of the Pentateuch, is in its main features like that to be found among the remains of both Babylonian and Egyptian literature. The subjects and form of the laws are found in the code of Hammurabi; and the vast ceremonial literature of the Babylonians, while different in subject and treatment, is of the same general form as that in the books of Moses. The temples of Egypt, also, must have been constructed after plans which would dwarf the plan of the tabernacle and have minimized the work of Aholiab and Bezaleel. The customs of the Babylonians appear properly in the life of Abraham and those of the Egyptians in the lives of Joseph and Moses. The nations and cities mentioned harmonize with what we could have expected to characterize documents written about 1500 B.C. In short, it is impossible to pick out a statement made in the books attributed to Moses of which it can be said: This could not have been written by him, or by some one inserting a parenthesis to explain his statements. And finally, there is no man living that knows enough to affirm that Moses could not have written the Pentateuch.

Thirdly, Jesus says that Moses "wrote" of Him.^{11a} This idea is reaffirmed in Luke xxiv. 27 when it is said that on the way to Emmaus, Jesus beginning from Moses and from all the prophets interpreted in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself; and in Luke xxiv. 44 where we read that

^{11a} John v. 46. The importance in the mind of the Lord of Moses' having written concerning Him appears more clearly when we look at the context which reads: "How can ye believe, which receive honour one of another, and seek not the honour that cometh from God only? Do not think that I will accuse you to the Father: there is one that accuseth you, even Moses, in whom ye trust. For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?"

Jesus said to the apostles, that it was necessary that all things be fulfilled that were written in the law of Moses and in the Prophets and in the Psalms concerning Him.

To what things recorded by Moses concerning Himself did Jesus probably refer? We find in the Pentateuch the following predictions that can most naturally be interpreted as referring to the Messiah:

1. In Gen. xlix. 10: "The scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until that Shiloh come; and unto him shall be the gathering (?) of the people." The Targum of Onkelos renders "lawgiver" (מחקק) by "scribe" and Shiloh by "the Messiah whose is the kingdom" and the last clause by "him shall the peoples obey." The Targum of Jonathan renders the verse: "Kings and sultans shall not cease from those of the house of Judah nor scribes from the thousands of the law from his descendents until the time when the king Messiah shall come, the least of his sons, and on account of him shall the peoples pass away." The Samaritan Targum (Petermann's edition) reads: "The scepter shall not cease from Judah nor a leader from between his ranks until that Shiloh come and to him shall the peoples be assembled." The Greek LXX reads: "A ruler shall not depart from Judah nor a leader from his loins until the things that are in store for him shall come; and he is the expectation of the nations." The Latin Vulgate reads: "The scepter shall not be taken away from Judah nor a leader from his loins until he who is to be sent shall come; and he shall be the expectation of the nations." The Arabic of Saadya reads: "The scepter shall not pass away from Judah nor a lawgiver from his command until that he to whom it belongs shall come and unto him shall the tribes be gathered."

It is easy to see by reading these early versions, that the Jewish expositors interpret this verse of the Messiah. Does any one of the present generation know that these words were not said originally by Jacob in the spirit of prophecy and that they were not written by Moses and that they do not

really refer to Jesus? If any one knows, how does he know and what is the evidence that he knows?

2. The "star" and "scepter" of Num. xxiv. 17 are rendered by "king" and "Messiah" by the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan and by many Christian expositors. Does any one know that this is not the correct interpretation? If so, how does he know?

3. The protevangelium of Gen. iii. says that the seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head. This has been interpreted as meaning that the Messiah shall destroy the power of that old serpent, the devil. Does anyone know that this is not the right meaning? If so, how does he know?

4. The prophet like unto Moses of Deut. xviii whom the Lord was to raise up and whom the people should hear most probably refers to Jesus. At any rate, who knows that it does not?

The Manna.

This seems to be the most suitable place to bring in the reference of Jesus to the manna. In John vi. 30, 31, the people said to Jesus: "What sign shewest thou then, that we may see and believe thee? what dost thou work? Our fathers did eat manna in the desert, as it is written, He gave them bread from heaven to eat." This eating of the manna Jesus admits and says in verse 49, "Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness" (cf. vs. 58).

Now, nobody knows for certain just what this manna was. It may have been some kind of gum. It may have been some kind of tuber like a potato. It may have been something else. We do know, that the introduction of the potato saved the French people from the horrors of famine resulting from the Revolution. We do know, that the failure of the potato crop caused the terrible Irish famine. We do know how edible mushrooms spring up in a night and cover the face of the ground, and that Mr. Burbank made the apparently useless cactus into an edible vegetable. But just what God did there in the wilderness, we do not know, nor how He did it. Nor

do we know how Jesus fed the five thousand. Neither do we know how He made the universe and the mountains and the cattle on a thousand hills. He is the greatest of all physicists, electricians and mechanics, the maker of chemists and chemicals, the fashioner of our bodies and spirits and the one who cares for them. When He wills to go beyond the ordinary processes and laws of the nature, which He has created, we pause in adoration and wonder and exclaim: What has God wrought? We read Job and Isaiah and cry out: What is man that thou are mindful of him?

David.

Jesus twice refers to David. The first reference has to do with the question of Sabbath observance (Matt. xii. 3f., Mk. ii. 25f., Lk. vi. 3f). Jesus points out first that a law may permit of exceptions. Then from the nature of these exceptions he infers that "the Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath." As to the law of the Sabbath Jesus may have been thinking of the Fourth Commandment (Ex. xx. 8) or of the Sabbath of the creative week (Gen. i.). But the reference is not specific. Is there any proof that the law of the Sabbath cannot have been in operation in the times of David? Not a few even of the destructive critics still regard the Decalogue as Mosaic and there is absolutely no direct evidence that it is not. The first exception cited deals with the incident at Nob. The incident rests on the narrative of 1 Sam. xxi. It assumes that there was a David, that he went to Nob, that there was a house of God there,¹² where there were priests and shewbread, and that David made unlawful

¹² Jesus in Matt. xii. 4 speaks of David as "entering into the house of God at Nob," whereas the phrase "house of God" is not used in the account given in 1 Sam. xxi, xxii. Nevertheless, it is obvious that there must have been a house of some kind in which to keep the shewbread and the sword of Goliath and the ephod and where one could inquire of the Lord. (See xxii. 13.) Besides, Nob is called "the city of the priests" (xxii. 19), and the place where these priests ministered would properly be called the house of God. Compare Gen. xxviii. 17, 22, Deut. xxiii. 19, Jos. vi. 24, Jud. xvii. 5, 1 Sam. i. 24, iii. 15, 2 Sam. xii. 20 *et al. mul.*, and especially Jud. xviii. 31.

use of the shewbread. The second exception affirms that the law required the priests to "profane" the Sabbath (by offering sacrifice). What evidence is there which proves that these statements cannot be correct? There is no evidence so far as we are aware. There is only the theory of certain of the critics that the priestly legislation which refers to shewbread must, despite its explicit claims to the contrary, be post-exilic.

Secondly, in the three first Gospels it is expressly said that Jesus attributed the authorship of the 110th Psalm to David (Matt. xxiv. 43, 45, Mark xii. 35, 37, Luke xx. 42, 44). With virtual unanimity, these modern critics, almost 3000 years after David's time, deny that David wrote the psalm. They give two principal grounds for their denial. (1) They say that the presence (a) of the word "youth" in verse three shows that the psalm must have been written after the captivity; because, they say, the ending *-û*, or *-ûth*, was adopted into Hebrew from the Aramaic after that time. But, this ending is known to have been an ending of many Babylonian nouns as early as the time of Hammurabi¹³ and it is probably found in a Hebrew noun in one of the El-Amarna letters.¹⁴ (b) The second objection is the mention of Jerusalem. But since Jerusalem is mentioned in the El-Amarna letters,¹⁵ there is no reason known why it may not have existed in the time of Abraham and have had a king at that time named Melchizedek. Besides, the records of Egypt and Babylon show clearly that a king reigning over Jerusalem about 1000 B.C. may easily have known the name of a king who had reigned over the same city a thousand years before.¹⁶

¹³ The ending *-uth* occurs frequently in Babylonian even as early as Hammurabi. See my article on *Scientific Biblical Criticism* in this REVIEW, Vol. XVII. p. 402.

¹⁴ E.g. in *riputi* (רִפּוּטִי), cf. Knudtson, *Die El-Amarna Briefe*, no. 269, I. 17.

¹⁵ Jerusalem is mentioned in the Amarna letters (*Knudtson*) in 287, II. 25, 46, 61, 63; 289, II. 14, 29; 290, I. 15.

¹⁶ Nabunaid, king of Babylon from 555 to 538 B.C., speaks of Sargon, son of Naramsin as living 3200 years before his time and puts Ham-

The heading of Psalm cx. in the Hebrew Textus Receptus ascribes the psalm to David. The name of David is omitted from the heading in Kennicott's MSS. 97, 133 and 238; that is, in only three manuscripts out of more than four hundred. All the manuscripts of all the primary versions, Greek Septuagint, Aramaic Targum, Syriac Peshitto, Latin Vulgate, and (to judge from Field¹⁷ and the Syriac version of Origen's Hexapla) Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, ascribe this psalm to David. The secondary versions of the Septuagint, also, Sahidic and Memphitic, Armenian, Ethiopic and Latin, uniformly, ascribe this psalm to David, the only exception being the Arabic, which was not made till some time between 1100 and 1500 A.D.¹⁸ To assert that Jesus was wrong in saying that David wrote this psalm is, in view of the fact that there is not a scrap of evidence to show that he did not while almost all the headings of all the texts and versions expressly state that he did, one of the most noteworthy instances in existence of the extreme egotism and unfairness of the destructive critics. It is bad enough when a professed infidel assails the trustworthiness of the statements of Jesus; but it makes one's blood boil, to see his clear statements of fact, supported by all the evidence known to history, denied by those who hold positions of trust in the church of Jesus Christ, the Son of God.

Elijah and Elisha.

In Luke iv. 25, 26, the Lord says that "many widows were in Israel in the days of Elias, *when* the heaven was shut up three years and six months, *when* the great famine was throughout the land; but unto none of them was Elias sent save unto Sarepta, a city of Sidon, unto a woman that was a widow." This city is mentioned already in the Papyrus An-

murabi 700 years before Burnaburiash. See Zehnpfund-Langdon, *Neubab. Königsinschriften*, I. pp. 229, 245.

¹⁷ Field in his edition of Origen's *Hexapla* gives about all the fragments that are known. Ceriani's facsimile edition of the Harklensian Syriac is our best single source of information as to the Hexapla.

¹⁸ The date of the Arabic version is discussed at length by Ryssel in ZATW. V. 102-138.

astasi I, and in the Taylor Inscription of Sennacherib.¹⁹ Sennacherib says that he took from Luli, king of Sidon, the cities of Great Sidon, Little Sidon, Sarepta and Akzib, Akko, and other places and set Ethbaal upon the throne of the kingdom. Surely, Dr. Glover is not going to deny that there was an Elijah! Nor does he know enough to say that there was not a famine such as the one mentioned. Perhaps, he doubts whether there were any widow women either in Israel or Sarepta!

In Luke iv. 27, Jesus says: "Many lepers were in Israel in the time of Eliseus the prophet; and none of these was cleansed, saving Naaman the Syrian." This statement is based upon the record of 2 Kings v, where Naaman is called the captain of the host of the king of Syria, of which Damascus was the capital. A Hebrew maiden was a captive in his household. That there was a kingdom of Damascus at this time is abundantly corroborated by the Assyrian inscriptions, as also that the Syrians had armies capable of contending with the Assyrians. That a Hebrew maiden may well have been a captive in Naaman's house is in accordance with the history of the time in which Elisha lived. Leprosy was a prevalent disease in that part of the world as early as that time.²⁰

Jonah.

Two incidents in the book of Jonah are cited by Jesus in such a way as to lead us to conclude that he really thought that they had occurred. One is, the existing of Jonah in the belly of the fish for three days; and the other, the repentance of the men of Nineveh at the preaching of Jonah. As to the first of these, it is clear, that no unbiassed reader can doubt that the argument of Jesus demands and his language implies that both he and his hearers believed that the real his-

¹⁹ Schrader, *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, II. 90.

²⁰ According to the *Encyclopedia Britannica* (XVI. 479) leprosy was endemic in Egypt as early as 1500 B.C. In the Bible, outside of 2 Kings v., it is noted already in Exodus iv. 6 (J), and Deut. xxiv. 8, and frequently in Leviticus and Numbers; also, in 2 Sam. iii. 29 and 2 Kings vii. 3, 8.

toric event had happened. Jesus does not say "as it is said that Jonah was"; but, "as Jonah was." He does not say "so shall it be said that the Son of man shall be three days in the heart of the earth"; but "so shall the Son of man be three days in the heart of the earth." The certainty of the second clause depends upon that of the first. The language in the Gospels supports the view that Jesus looked upon both clauses as expressing facts. For the rule in Greek as stated by Jelf is that the words are indicative "when the comparison is viewed as an actual fact."²¹

We seem driven, then, to the conclusion that Jesus believed that a great fish swallowed Jonah and that he lived in its belly for three days, unless we are ready to give up the belief that Jesus was three days in the grave. But we Christians are convinced that He was in the grave three days. We cannot logically give up one without giving up the other. Surely, that God could have a great fish ready and able to swallow Jonah and that God could keep him alive for three days in the fish's belly is no more wonderful, nor miraculous, than that He should raise Jesus from the dead. It is ridiculous to

²¹ Jelf, *Grammar*, § 868.4; cf. also Kühner, *Gram. of Gk. Language*, § 342. In the similitive, or comparative, clauses of the New Testament Greek the clause introduced by "as" (*καθώς, ὡσπερ, ὥς*) almost always uses an indicative, wherever a verb is found; and the clause introduced by "so" depends upon that introduced by "as." That is, the "so" statement is as certain, or true, as the "as" statement. It is evident that to say "as Alexander founded Alexandria with streets running at right angles, so did Penn found Philadelphia" implies that to the speaker both events are looked upon as true. Whereas, to say "as Ishtar went down to hell" or "as Dante went down to the Inferno" so shall all the nations that forget God go down would scare those only who believed that Ishtar and Dante had gone down. They would inevitably conclude that as Ishtar's and Dante's descents are figurative and never in reality occurred, so their descent is to be taken as figurative. This will appear to those who look up the clauses in the New Testament beginning with *καθώς*, such as Luke xi. 30, xvii. 26, John iii. 14, vi. 57, 58, viii. 28, xii. 50, xiv. 31, xv. 4, xx. 21, I Cor. xv. 49, 2 Cor. i. 5, viii. 6, x. 7, Phil. iii. 17, Col. iii. 13, I Thess. ii. 4, I John iv. 17. It appears, also, in the clauses with *ὡσπερ* and *ὥς*, such as Matt. v. 48, xii. 40, xiii. 40, xiv. 27, 37, Luke xvii. 24, John v. 21, 26, Rom. v. 12, 19, 21, vi. 4, 19, xi. 30, I Cor. xi. 12, xv. 22, 2 Cor. i. 7, Gal. iv. 29, Eph. v. 24, Jas. ii. 26.

call this great fish a whale, inasmuch as a whale is not a fish.²² There is no evidence that the Greeks ever meant what we call whale by their word κῆτος "ketos." It was rather a sea-monster of some kind. That there were sea-monsters in the Mediterranean in ancient times supposed to be able to swallow a man seems evident from the story of Andromeda. The *kētōs* (κῆτος) is used by Homer as a synonym of seal (φώκη). No one knows enough to say what kind of a sea-monster the great fish of Jonah may have been, nor to say that such a monster may not have existed. As to the preservation of Jonah's life for three days in the belly of a fish, no one knows enough about the bellies of all fishes to say that there have been none in which a man might live for an indefinite time. Besides, God is said to have prepared this particular great fish and it may have been abnormal in its size and formation. In view of what our modern physicians can do in the preservation of life by means of oxygen, it seems absurd to attempt to limit the power of the Almighty in the case of Jonah,²³ for it is reasonable to suppose that He who made the chemical elements and their compounds as well as the chemists who combine and decompose them, is able to do many things in the chemical line that would surprise and surpass the greatest of human chemists. The physicians use oxygen in "the resuscitation of the apparently drowned"; why could God not use it to preserve life in the belly of the fish? Would these Christians who profess to believe in the resurrection of Jesus from the dead have preferred that Jonah had died and been resurrected to his having been preserved alive in the belly of the fish? They strain at a gnat and swallow a camel. They are like a horse that shies and baulks at a piece of paper and rushes fearlessly to the cannon's mouth. For they are making preservation or resuscitation of life, which differs only in degree from what human physicians can ac-

²² See *Encyc. Brit.* XXVIII. 568. The only word I can find in Semitics for "whale" is the Arabic and Æthiopic *'anbar*.

²³ On the use of oxygen in medical practice see *Encyc. Brit.* XX. 424a.

comply, a greater fact than a resurrection, which the great giver of life alone can effect.

As to just what kind of a plant the "gourd" (*kîkâyôn*, Jon. iv. 6, 7, 9, 10) may have been, it is difficult to determine.²⁴ But, whatever the plant may have been, it is ridiculous to suppose that God could not have caused it to grow up in a night. It is strange that many of those who are loudest in their praise of that great genius, Burbank, the wizard of the cactus, should talk as if the maker and endower of Burbank and of all the plants that grow, should not be able to manipulate the forces and elements of plant life so as to hasten the steps in the growth of a pumpkin. Thank God for Burbank. Thank Him for Pasteur and Edison and Ford and Watt and Stephenson and Marconi and all the brilliant benefactors of the human race, whom He has endowed with gifts to bless mankind. But thank Him still more for the revelation of Himself as the Creator of all things and persons, as the Controller and Governor of the universe.

As to the other questions entering into the discussion of the book of Jonah, I refer my readers to my articles on the authenticity of Jonah.²⁵ I have shown there, that the objections against the historical character of the book arising from its language, rhetoric, and historical complications, are groundless. For,

1. An investigation of the vocables alleged by the critics to be signs of a late date shows that there is not sufficient evidence to support the allegation that these vocables are late.

2. An examination of the so-called reminiscences demonstrates the fact that the second chapter of Jonah is unique and original in its phraseology.

3. No one can show that the allusions to Nineveh and its

²⁴ The ancient versions generally render by "gourd," but Jerome by "ivy." The *kikkānitu* of the Assyrian is said by Muss-Arnolt to mean "cucumber."

²⁵ "The Authenticity of Jonah" in this REVIEW, Vol. XVI, pp. 280-296, 430-456.

king are not exactly in accordance with the facts of archaeology.

(1) That it is said of Nineveh that it "was" (היתה Greek ἦν) a very great city does not imply that Nineveh was no longer in existence; for both in Hebrew, Arabic, Syriac, Ethiopic and Greek the verb "to be" is used in the Perfect (Greek Imperfect) to denote "has been and is."²⁶

(2) It is futile to say that there could not have been a man called "king of Nineveh." For as I have shown in *Studies in the Book of Daniel* the mayor of a city might in Hebrew and Aramaic be called a melek or king. And, secondly, the empire of Assyria was in such a state of confusion and civil war in the time of Jonah that one of the contestants for the throne may very well have been designated by the title "king of Nineveh."²⁷ Besides, Jonah's mission was not specially to the king but to the whole people of Nineveh. There was, therefore, no special reason for mentioning him by name.

Dr. Glover says that "the reference to Jonah is parallel with that to the queen of Sheba." This can only mean that Dr. Glover thinks that the story of Jonah is no more true than is that of the queen of Sheba's visit to Solomon; thus implying that every one admits, or should admit, that a queen of Sheba could not have, and did not, come to Jerusalem as the

²⁶ היתה "was and is." Cf. Wright *Arab. Grammar* II. 1, B (c), (d): "The Perfect indicates a past act of which it can be said that it has taken place, or still takes place (has been and is)." Jelf's *Gram. of the Gk. Lang.* § 398.4: "The Imperfect is used when the thought which the sentence expresses is not taken merely as an indefinite proposition, true at the present moment, but is referred in the speaker's (or writer's) mind to some past time." So especially the Imperfect ἦν is used for ἐστὶ He gives many examples from Homer, Sophocles, and Plato. So also, Kühner, *Grammar* § 256.4 (a). See also, Nöldeke *Syr. Grammar* § 256, "a Perfect, expressing the result of a prior occurrence, has often for us the appearance of a present; thus h'wa has become γέγονε often = 'is';" and Dillmann, *Eth Gr.* p. 126, "halawa 'to be' in the sense of 'it is' is nearly always in the Perfect where we in German cite the present."

²⁷ The mayor of Nineveh was called *limmu*. In Aramaic or Hebrew this would best be rendered by *melekh*, and in Greek by *archon* or *basileus*. See *Studies in the Book of Daniel*, pp. 83-95 and Winckler's *History of Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 232.

book of Kings states. It is implications such as this, that make the judicious grieve. Dr. Glover might easily have learned that the Sabean inscriptions from South Arabia are variously dated by different adept scholars at from 800 to 1600 B.C.²⁸ Even if we accept the latest of these dates as the correct one, no one, would be likely to maintain that the Sabeans did not exist and that they did not write documents long before the ones we have as yet discovered. Certainly, no one will deny that the Sabeans may have flourished as early as 1000 B.C. Before the time of the Ptolemies, when the overland route to India was established, the route to the Orient was by ship to Southern Arabia and from there by caravan to Egypt and Palestine. The Sabeans controlled this route and managed the caravans. It was just about twice as far from Aden to Jerusalem as from Mecca to Damascus; and yet, every one knows that Mahomet journeyed yearly for a time all the way from Mecca to Damascus.²⁹ Could not the Queen of Sheba, then, have made one trip from Southern Arabia to Jerusalem? Besides, it is a singular fact that queens seem to have been common in ancient Arabia. Egypt had its one great queen, Hatshepsu, in the 18th dynasty and one in the 30th dynasty, Cleopatra; Judah had one usurping queen, Athaliah; but in the Assyrian records, Tiglath-Pileser III (IV) mentions Zabibi, queen of Arabia, and Samsi, queen of Arabia, mentioned again by Sargon, and It'amara of the Sabeans.³⁰ In view of the recent discoveries of written documents in Syria and Palestine antedating Solomon by hundreds of years, and of the express statements of 1 Kings xi. 41 with regard to writings containing the acts of Solomon, it requires more than the off-hand assertion of the public orator of Cambridge to prove that the Queen of Sheba did not visit Solomon in all his glory.

²⁸ On the state of opinion as to the Sabean inscriptions, see *Encyc. Brit.* II. 264a; Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris* I. 90.

²⁹ See Ibn Hisham, I. 90.

³⁰ Schrader, *Keilinsch. Bib.* II, 33, 55.

Daniel.

Again, Dr. Glover dismisses the whole question of the genuineness and authenticity of Daniel, as if it were certain that the Lord did not mean to endorse the historicity of the book. Even if he did mean it, Dr. Glover assures us that he did not know enough to speak with authority upon such a subject. He presents seven reasons why we should not accept the sayings of Jesus at their face value. These reasons are mostly subjective and so far as Daniel is concerned depend for their validity upon Dr. Glover's ability to show that as a matter of fact Daniel was not, and the book of Daniel is not, what the apparent meaning of Jesus implies. It is a case of Glover *versus* Christ. Now, I for one frankly admit that I am on the side of Christ; not merely because I think He knew what He was talking about, but because I am convinced that the critics have failed to make good their charges against the claims of Daniel to be historical. It is absurd for one who believes that "by Him the worlds were made" and that "it was impossible for death to hold Him" to affirm the miracles of Daniel are sufficient to refute its historicity. It is absurd also for one who believes that God foreknows whatsoever comes to pass or even that he can at any time reveal the distant future to man, to deny the predictive character of Daniel's prophecies on the ground of their minute details. As to the languages of Daniel I have given in my article, "The Aramaic of Daniel,"³¹ in my *Studies in the Book of Daniel*³² and in my "Scientific Biblical Criticism,"³³ the reasons for concluding that it is most probable that the book was written in Babylonia about the year 500 B.C., and that there is no contemporary documentary evidence in existence to show that it was written in Palestine in the second century B.C. In my *Studies in the Book of Daniel* and in a dozen or more

³¹ *Biblical and Theological Studies by the Faculty of Princeton Theological Seminary* (1912), pp. 261-305.

³² Vol. I was published in 1916 by Putnam, N.Y.

³³ This REVIEW, Vol. XVII, pp. 190-240, 401-456.

articles in this REVIEW since 1916³⁴ and in my articles on "The Title of the Persian Kings" in the *Sachau Denkschrift*, I have endeavored to show by objective reliable documentary evidence that neither in literary form nor historical and doctrinal substance is there ground for concluding that the statements of the book of Daniel are not trustworthy. I freely confess that I do not understand the meaning of every word and phrase, nor can I explain all the difficulties; but I hope I have shown, that the critics have not made out their charges against the book of Daniel, and that its *prima facie* evidence may still be reasonably believed.

The above passages give all of the direct references of Jesus to the persons and events of the Old Testament. He does say in Luke x. 18, that He saw Satan fall as lightning from heaven and in John xvii. 5 that He had glory with the Father before the worlds were; but these events are matters of faith and beyond the scope of this article. In regard to all of the statements of Jesus, however, which might have been tested, or can be tested, by evidence known to us, it can truly be said, that there is not one of them concerning which there is any proof that it is not true. Even if Jesus had been merely a man, it would be unfair to charge him with making false statements, if we could not prove it. To charge that the events to which He refers can not be true and that, therefore, He did not know that they happened, is a ridiculous inconsistency on the part of anyone who claims to be a Christian; or a Theist; because both of these profess to believe that God can and does interfere, when He will, in the affairs of hu-

³⁴ "The Book of Daniel and the Canon" (XIII, pp. 352-408); "The Silence of Ecclesiasticus concerning Daniel" (XIV, pp. 418-474); "מנה 'to Appoint' in the Old Testament" (XVI, pp. 645-654); "The Word הוהי in Daniel xii. 3" (XVII, pp. 128-133); "Scientific Biblical Criticism" (XVII. 403, 409-411, 420, 432); "Apocalypses and the Date of Daniel" (XIX, pp. 529-545); "Daniel not Quoted" (XX, pp. 57-68); "Darius the Mede" (XX, pp. 177-211); "The Origin of the Ideas of Daniel" (XXI, pp. 161-200); "Influence of Daniel" (XXI, pp. 337-371, pp. 541-584); "The Background of Daniel" (XXII, pp. 1-26); "The Prophecies of Daniel" (XXII, pp. 377-401); "Aramaisms in the Old Testament" (XXIII. 4, 12, 19, 23-31).

manity. Further, anyone who professes to believe that the New Testament teaches that the Scriptures of the Old Testament were "of divine origin and excellence" (*ιερά*), that every Scripture is inspired of God (*θεόπνευστος*) (2 Tim. iii. 15, 16), that Jesus found in the Law, the Prophets and the Psalms, things that concerned Himself (Luke xxiv. 27, 44), and that Jesus, the evangelists, and all the writers of the books of the New Testament, show their faith in the veracity of the Old Testament records, must hesitate to place his opinion over against that of the founders of Christianity. Lastly, those of us who believe that Jesus was the Messiah sent from God, the prophet that was to come into the world, the Logos, the only-begotten Son of God, will be pardoned for thinking that it is little short of blasphemy for a professing Christian to assert that Jesus did not know. If we believe not Him when He has spoken of earthly things, which we can more or less investigate and test, how can we believe Him when He speaks of heavenly things? Let us all say, with joy and thanksgiving: Lord, Thou knowest all things; Thou knowest that we love Thee.

Princeton.

R. D. WILSON.