

# The Princeton Theological Review

APRIL 1927

---

## ON THE HEBREW OF DANIEL

In his *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*,<sup>1</sup> Dr. Driver gives a list of twenty-five words and usages to show that the Hebrew of Daniel is "of the age subsequent to Nehemiah." As No. 16 in this list he cites the use of the verb *'āmadh* "to stand up" and its derivatives and forms. The statement reads as follows:

עמד *to stand up* [is used by Daniel], where the earlier languages would use קום, viii. 22, 23, xi. 2-4, 20f., 31, xii. 1a, (probably also xii. 13), as Ezra ii. 63, Eccl. iv. 15 (contrast Ex. i. 8), 1 Chron. xx. 4 (contrast Ps. xxvii. 3): with על *against* viii. 25, xi. 14, as 1 Chron. xxi. 1, 2 Chron. xx. 23, xxvi. 18 (contrast Dt. xxii. 26): in the sense of *to be established* xi. 17b (contrast Is. vii. 7). Cf. Sir. xlvii. 1, 12.

No. 14 refers to the use of *'ōmedh*, "place" or "standing." It reads thus:

על עמרי (עמור) lit. *on my (thy) standing* viii. 18 (cf. vs. 17) x. 11, Neh. viii. 7, ix. 3, xiii. 11, 2 Chron. xxx. 16, xxxiv. 31, xxxv. 10.

No. 21 deals with the use of this verb in the Hiphil stem:

העמיר xi. 11, 13, 14, not literally *to station*, as in the earlier books, but in the weakened sense, *appoint, establish*: see p. 535, No. 4.

Turning to the treatment of Chronicles, referred to at the end of No. 21, we find this additional statement:

העמיר metaph. *to establish, appoint* (a weakened sense: in earlier books lit. *to station*): 1 [Chron.] vi. 16 [A.V. 31], xv. 16, 17, xvi. 17 (= Ps. cv. 10), xvii. 14, xxii. 2, 2 [Chron.] viii. 14, ix. 8, xi. 15, 22, xix. 5, 8, xx. 21, xxiv. 13 (cf. Ezr. ii. 68), xxv. 5, 14, xxx. 5, xxxi. 2, xxxiii. 8, [2 Ki. נתתי], xxxv. 2, Ezr. iii. 8, Neh. iv. 3, vi. 7, vii. 3, x. 33, xii. 31, xiii. 11, 30, Dan. xi. 11, 13, 14. Cf. Ps. cvii. 25 (Also 2 [Chron.] xxxiv. 32 used specially. In 2 [Chron.] xxiii. 10, 19, xxix. 25, xxxiii. 19, Ezr. iii. 10, Neh. iv. 7, xiii. 19 the lit. sense is more prominent: in Neh. iii. iff., vi. 1, vii. 1,

---

<sup>1</sup> Pp. 506f. This volume will be referred to by the familiar abbreviation LOT.

of setting up *doors*). An approximation to the weaker sense occurs in I Ki. xii. 32, xv. 4.

### ASSUMPTIONS

There are in these statements the following assumptions:

1. That in the use of the *Ḳal* or simple stem of *'āmadh* in the sense of "stand up" Daniel resembles the Hebrew of the age subsequent to Nehemiah.
2. That the literature before Nehemiah would have used *ḵûm* in this sense.
3. That his use of *'āmadh* with the preposition *'al* (against) shows an age subsequent to Nehemiah.
4. That in xi. 17b *'āmadh* is used in the sense of "to be established"; and that this sense belongs to the age subsequent to Nehemiah.
5. That *'ōmedh* preceded by *'al* indicates a date subsequent to Nehemiah.<sup>2</sup>
6. That the use of the Hiphil (Causative) stem of *'āmadh* in the sense of "appoint" shows a date subsequent to Nehemiah.
7. That its use in the sense of "establish" shows the same late date.

### DISCUSSION OF THE ASSUMPTIONS

#### I. *General Remarks.*

1. It must be admitted that from the earliest times of Hebrew history and especially after the captivities of the eighth century when, scattered and intermingled as they were among the Arameans from Media to Elephantine, the Hebrews were continuously in contact and intercourse with Aramaic speaking people, there must inevitably have been more or less of a transfer of ideas and vocables from one language to the other. As early as the latter part of the sixth century B.C., the Jews of Elephantine had adopted Aramaic as their written language at least for literary, legal, and diplomatic documents. Their letters to the High Priest at Jerusalem, to Sanballat ('s sons) at Samaria, and to Bagoas the

<sup>2</sup> See Bevan, *Introduction*, p. 171.

Persian governor were all in Aramaic. The same is true of the letters and decrees of the book of Ezra and the endorsements on Babylonian documents of the fifth century. But, on the other hand, the prophets Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi and the writers of Chronicles, Esther and of the larger part of Ezra and Nehemiah wrote in Hebrew. Ecclesiasticus, composed about 180 B.C., the Zadokite Fragments from about 40 A.D., and probably First Maccabees, the Book of Jubilees, and other works later than Ecclesiasticus were also written in Hebrew. This Hebrew, which can be judged only by Ecclesiasticus and the Zadokite Fragments, preserves all the marks of classical Hebrew, such as the Wau Converso-consecutive, and the Niphal and Hophal stems. It has scarcely a trace of Greek and Latin influence, and is almost absolutely free from Persian, Babylonian, and Aramaic ingredients. In short, the Aramaic and Hebrew documents of the Israelites which have been discovered since LOT was written demand a complete revision of the history of the Hebrew language as it was conceived by Gesenius, Ewald, Keil, Nöldeke, and by Dr. Driver himself. They were not to blame for their ignorance; but they were to blame for supposing that they could make up for the lack of evidence by conjecture and purely subjective considerations. In a later article, this subject will be thoroughly discussed. At present, let it suffice to affirm that the documentary evidence of the Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus and of the Zadokite Fragments is dead against the views expressed in LOT as to the history of the Hebrew language in the times *subsequent to Nehemiah*, and to challenge Dr. Driver's successors to controvert the affirmation, not by asseverations and opinions, but by *proofs*.

2. Not merely is the Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus and of the Zadokite Fragments against Dr. Driver's theory, but so also is that of the parts of the Old Testament which the radical critics date from the times subsequent to Nehemiah. It will not do for Dr. Driver and his fellow-critics and followers to cite certain peculiarities in which Chronicles, Ecclesiastes, Esther and Ezra-Nehemiah agree, as distinguishing charac-

teristics of the post-Nehemian literature. They must show, also, that these peculiarities characterize the rest of that considerable body of Hebrew literature which, without any external evidence, they assign to the second, third and fourth centuries B.C. It will be observed that Dr. Driver cites many examples of the use of *'āmadh* from Chronicles and Daniel but only two from the Psalms. One of these latter (cv. 10) is according to Dr. Driver the same in sense as 1 Chr. xvi. 17 and the other (cvii. 25) is used in a connection not paralleled in the Old Testament.<sup>3</sup>

3. Had Daniel and Chronicles used *ḵûm* in the sense of *'āmadh*, it might have been claimed as due to Aramaic influence; for עמד "to stand" is not found in Aramaic and *ḵûm* is commonly used in Aramaic as the equivalent of both the Hebrew verbs.<sup>4</sup> The tendency among Aramaic speaking Jews in writing Hebrew would therefore have been to substitute *ḵûm* for *'āmadh* and not *vice versa*.

4. Since Daniel was written under Babylonian influences we would expect to find in it traces of Babylonian usage. This influence was seen in *mānā*,<sup>5</sup> and it will be observed also in *'āmadh*, both in the verb and the noun. Thus *indu* (for *imdu*) means "place," and *emēdu* means "stand, place, erect, lay upon, approach, stand still, take, appoint, quit, arrive, settle, dedicate, offer, strengthen, arrange (for battle), to be."<sup>6</sup> The synonym *našāzu* means "stand, step, tread, take a stand, stand

<sup>3</sup> In the expression, "He commanded and *raised* the stormy wind."

<sup>4</sup> Onkelos nearly always translates *'āmadh* by *ḵûm* and never renders by *'āmadh*. Syriac and Palestinian Syriac use this root only in the sense of "baptize." Ethiopic, Palmyrene, Nabatean, Mandaean and the North Semitic Aramaic inscriptions do not have the root at all. Most of these languages and dialects have borrowed the word for "pillar" from the Hebrew, or Arabic. The verb is found, however, in Babylonian, Phœnician and Arabic in the same sense as in the Hebrew. In the Egypto-Aramaic in line 160 of the tale of Achikar, Cooke reads עמר where Sachau suggests שמר and Ungnad עמר. If Cooke is right, this would be the only occurrence of the word in the sense "to stand" in all the Aramaic dialects.

<sup>5</sup> See this REVIEW for October 1918, pp. 645-654.

<sup>6</sup> See definitions under *emēdu* in Muss-Arnolt's Assyrian Dictionary, p. 55.

firm, *remain*, establish oneself, rely (upon), be present as a witness, stand up, arise, disappear, make a stand, come (before), enter the service of, withdraw, oppose, assist, take possession of, rest (in), stand still, set up, erect, place, collect, settle.”<sup>7</sup>

Every sense in which ‘*āmadh* and *ḵûm* and their derivatives are used in Daniel will be found to be covered by the meanings of these two Babylonian verbs.<sup>8</sup>

## II. *Special Remarks on the Assumptions.*

### I. The Use of the *Ḳal* of ‘*Āmadh*.

(1) As examples of the use of ‘*āmadh* in the *Ḳal* stem in the meaning “stand up” as indicating the age subsequent to Nehemiah, Dr. Driver cites viii. 22 (*bis* ?), 23, xi. 2, 3, 4, 7, 20f [i.e. 21], 31, xii. 1a, and “probably also” xii. 12 (13); and compares its use in Ezra ii. 63, Eccl. iv. 15 (contrasted with Ex. i. 8), 1 Chr. xx. 4 (contrasted with Ps. xxvii. 3). That is, he finds this “late” sense in Daniel ten, eleven or twelve times; in Chronicles, Ecclesiastes and Ezra, once each; and not at all in this sense in Esther, P. or the Psalms. This is not convincing of late date since the concordance shows that ‘*āmadh* in the simple stem occurs in Daniel 40 times; in Chronicles, 41 times; in Ezra-Nehemiah, 17 times; in Ecclesiastes, 5 times; in Esther, 10 times; in P, 14 times; in Jonah once; and in the Psalms, 26 times,<sup>9</sup> 18 of which are in the last three books of the Psalter. All or part of these books the radical critics assert to have been written largely in Maccabean times and in the centuries immediately preceding.

(2.) Moreover, many of the examples given for the use of ‘*āmadh* in the sense of “an earlier *ḵûm*” cannot be shown to have that sense. Thus in Dan. xi. 7, 20, 21 the verb is followed by ‘*al kēn* “upon a base or place,” a phrase never used after *ḵûm* anywhere in the Old Testament Hebrew. Besides, “to stand upon a place” makes better sense than “to arise

<sup>7</sup> *Id.*, p. 656.

<sup>8</sup> *Ḳûm* does not occur in Babylonian.

<sup>9</sup> Book I, 8 times; II, once; IV, 4 times; and V, 13 times.

upon a place." In viii. 22a, Eccl. iv. 15, 'āmadh is used before תחת a construction very rare with *ḵûm* (cf. Ex. x. 23, Josh. v. 7). In Dan. viii. 25, and 1 Chr. xx. 4 'āmadh is used with מלחמה "battle" in the sense of the Babylonian verb *emêdu* "to set in battle array," in which sense *ḵûm* is never used in Hebrew, early or late."<sup>10</sup> 'Amadh in the sense of "to be" explains Dan. xi. 2, 3, and viii. 22, 23, though the latter two may be explained by the analogy of the "ram" of viii. 3f which "stood up." In xi. 4, the sense is "when his kingdom shall have been established, it will be broken." In xi. 31, we read "his forces shall prevail and pollute the holy place."<sup>11</sup> *Ḷûm* is never used in this sense, but 'āmadh is so used in xi. 15, 25 and Ezek. xiii. 5. In xii. 1 we read: "At that time shall Michael, the great prince who stands by ('al)<sup>12</sup> the children of thy people prevail . . . and thy people shall be delivered." *Ḷûm* is used in this sense in Ps. xciv. 16 but with ה instead of 'al. This Psalm is assigned by Cheyne (?) and Reuss to the Maccabean period. Dr. Driver seems to put it among those that are late in the post-exilic period.<sup>13</sup> In xii. 13, Dr. Driver says that the earlier language would probably have used *ḵûm*. If, as the commentators interpret, this passage refers to the resurrection, this is the only place in Semitic literature where 'āmadh is used to denote the "rising" from the dead. If this is the earliest clear reference to the resurrection, it is better to suppose with Bevan that, when Daniel was written, a term to denote the idea had not yet been fixed upon. The word used in Aramaic is תחיותא or תחיתא, in Hebrew תחיה and in Syriac and Arabic ordinarily a derivative of *ḵûm*. It is obvious that no proof of date can be derived from this unique occurrence in Daniel.

<sup>10</sup> In xi. 17 'āmadh is a synonym of *ḵûm* and means she shall not "stand firm or establish herself" i.e. as we say, "make good." In Is. vii. 7, it is היה that is the synonym of 'āmadh and not *ḵûm*. The verse means: The evil counsel of Syria and Samaria shall not be confirmed and it shall not come to being.

<sup>11</sup> So substantially both Bevan and Prince.

<sup>12</sup> *Dienstbereit beisteht*, as in Zech. iv. 14.

<sup>13</sup> LOT, p. 375.

In the twenty-eight other places that Daniel uses *'āmadh* in the *Ḳal* stem, Dr. Driver finds no indication of late date. In view of Daniel's fondness for this verb and of the many nuances that the verbs of "standing" have in languages (for example, *emēdu* and *nazāzu* in Assyrian), and in view of the fact that with the aid especially of the Assyrian we can find an appropriate meaning for almost, if not every, case where Daniel employs *'āmadh*, it seems unjustifiable to assume that his use of it was determined by the period in which he lived rather than by his own discrimination. It is not for us to say what Daniel ought to have said nor in what language he should have said it. Of all Old Testament writers Daniel uses *'āmadh* most frequently and in most diverse meanings, but this has no necessary connection with the time when he wrote, and it cannot be shown that it indicates that his book was written in the times subsequent to Nehemiah.

2. It is assumed that in the earlier literature (i.e., that before Nehemiah) *ḵûm* was used in the sense in which Daniel, Chronicles, Ecclesiastes, Ezra-Nehemiah, Esther, and the literature subsequent to Nehemiah use *'āmadh*. We do not believe that this view harmonizes with the facts for the following reasons:

(1) Both verbs are used in all the periods of Hebrew literature whatever dates and arrangements be made for them. The following table will show this:

	PROVERBS & PSALMS &				
	HEXATEUCH	JUD-KGS	PROPHETS	LATE BOOKS	DANIEL
<i>'Amadh</i>	84	93	106	114	40
<i>Ḳûm</i>	116	148	90	98	1

(2) The only examples of this use in the earlier literature that Dr. Driver gives are to be found in Ex. i. 8, and Ps. xxvii. 3. In Ex. i. 8, it is said that a *new* king of Egypt "arose" who knew not Joseph.<sup>14</sup> The old dynasty of Hyksos kings who were friendly to Joseph and the Israelites had fallen, or passed away, and the Ramessids had arisen in their

<sup>14</sup> Dr. Driver assigns this verse to J which he says was written before 750 B.C. (LOT, 121).

place. The point emphasized is the change of conditions and the succession of dynasties, not the endurance and stability of the government. To express this change and succession, the latest literature of the Old Testament would also use *ḵûm*.<sup>15</sup> Daniel, however, is not speaking of the rising of new kings but of their stability. The kingdom of Persia *arose* under Cyrus, it *stood* in its might and continued in its power throughout the reigns of Cambyses, Darius and Xerxes. Rebellions occurred in Babylon, Media, Persia, Bactria, and Egypt, and many kings, such as Smerdis the Magian, and the two Babylonians who called themselves Nebuchadnezzar the son of Nabunaid, and the various claimants to the succession of Cyaxares, arose and fell; but the three kings of Persia stood victorious over all those who rose up against them. The distinction between "rising" and "standing" is brought out clearly in a number of passages. Thus in Job xxix. 8 the aged "arose and stood" (קמו עמדו); and in Est. viii. 4. Esther "arose and stood before the king." The two verbs are used also in Nah. i. 6.<sup>16</sup> Sometimes, also, one is said to "rise and sit" as in 1 Kgs. viii. 20; and scores of times, to "arise and go." In 1 Sa. xxiv. 20, it is said that the kingdom should "arise" (i.e. originate, or, attain its limits of greatness) through David. The surest cases in the early literature in which *ḵûm* may mean "stand up" are to be found in Psalm xxiv. 3,<sup>17</sup> and 2 Kings. xiii. 21 where the dead child revived by Elisha "rose up" upon his feet. Since the critics place Is. xxvii after the time of Nehemiah and possibly Psalm i also, they are foreclosed from citing Ps. i. 1 and Is. xxvii. 9 in favor of their contention. The other examples of the use of

<sup>15</sup> E.g. 2 Chr. vi. 10, "I am risen up in the room of David"; xiii. 6, Jeroboam "is risen up"; xxi. 4, Jehoram "was risen up to the kingdom."

<sup>16</sup> *Ḵûm* "to rise" is distinguished from other verbs of standing in Gen. xxxvii. 7 where Joseph's sheaf "arose and also stood" (התנצב); in Ps. xciv. 16, where we read: "Who will rise up for me against the evildoers? or Who will stand up (יתיצב) for me against the workers of iniquity?" So, also, in Ps. xx. 8: "we are risen and stand upright" (נתעורר).

<sup>17</sup> Who shall ascend into the hill of the Lord and who shall arise (= stand) in His holy place?

*ḵûm* in the sense of "stand" are found in 1 Chr. xxviii. 2 and 2 Chr. xiii. 4, xx. 19,—all from a time subsequent to Nehemiah according to the opinion of the critics.<sup>18</sup> Thus not only did the early literature not often use *ḵûm* in the sense of "stand up," but the later literature did use it.

(3) In the sense of "stand against" Dr. Driver cites Dan. viii. 25, xi. 14, 1 Chr. xxi. 1, 2 Chr. xx. 23, xxvi. 18 as characteristic of the age subsequent to Nehemiah and contrasts the use of *‘āmadh* in these places with the use of *ḵûm* in Deut. xxii. 26. In the four cases (Dan. viii. 25, xi. 14, 2 Chr. xx. 23, and xxvi. 18) where the sense is that of "arraying themselves for battle," the sense is one in which *ḵûm* is not used in Hebrew. In 1 Chr. xxi. 1, Satan is said to "stand up against" Israel. It is to be presumed that Satan "stood up" before Jehovah as he is represented in Job i. and ii. to have done. In Job, the verb הִתִּיצַב "to stand" is used, but the angels and priests who appear before the Lord are always represented as "standing," and *‘āmadh* is the verb ordinarily used. Deut. xx. 26 where it speaks of a man "rising against" his neighbor and slaying him is not parallel; for *‘āmadh*, if used here, might mean that the murderer stood in self-defense, whereas *ḵûm* indicates that the initiative was on the part of the slayer.

3. The third assumption that *‘āmadh* is used with *‘al* in the literature subsequent to Nehemiah where *ḵûm* would have been used before is false (1) because in the sense of "arraying for battle" *‘āmadh* is used in the Babylonian literature.<sup>19</sup> Assuming that Daniel and Chronicles were written by Daniel and Ezra respectively, they would naturally employ the technical language of the Babylonians among whom they lived in describing the military manoeuvres of the armies of their times. This sense will account for Dan. viii. 25, xi. 14, and 2 Chr. xx. 23.

<sup>18</sup> 1 Chr. xxviii. 2 reads: "And David the king arose upon his feet"; 2 Chr. xiii. 5: "And Abijah stood up upon mount Zemaraim"; and xx. 19: "And the Levites stood up to praise."

<sup>19</sup> KB. II. 106, *puḥuršunu innindu* "their armies were arranged for battle."

(2) In 1 Chr. xxi. 1, Satan is said to have "stood up against" Israel, and enticed David to number the people. Since *ḵûm* is never used of the "standing" of angels, there seems no special reason why it should have been used here in Chronicles. In Nu. xxii. 22 the angel of the Lord "stood" (התיצב) and again in vs. 24 he "stood" (ויעמד). In Zech. iii. 5 and 1 Chr. xxi. 15 the angel of the Lord "stood" (*āmadh*). Satan, also, in Job i. 6 is said to have "stood" (התיצב) before God, and in Zech. iii. 1 and Ps. cix. 6 he is said to "stand" at the right hand, *āmadh* being used in both cases. Since, therefore, neither Satan, nor any other angel, is ever said in the Old Testament to "arise" (*ḵûm*), it is absurd to affirm that the use of *āmadh* by the writer of Chronicles rather than *ḵûm* when speaking of the "standing" of Satan is an indication of a date subsequent to the time of Nehemiah. Chronicles simply uses the verb in common use by all the Hebrew writers.

4. It is assumed that in Dan. xi. 17b *āmadh* is used in the sense "to be established" and that this sense indicates a date subsequent to Nehemiah. But

(1) It is not probable that *āmadh* in this place means "to be established." Hitzig and Bevan translate the clause: "it shall not avail"; and Prince, "she shall not avail," i.e. "will not side with her father." The Babylonian *nazāzu* suggests that it may mean "she shall not be trustworthy," or "she shall be unreliable."

(2) If the use of *āmadh* in the sense "to be established" were characteristic of the Hebrew subsequent to Nehemiah, it is unaccountable that Dr. Driver could find no other instance of its use in this sense. 1 Sa. xiii. 14 and xxiv. 20 where the kingdom is said to "arise" are the only possible passages elsewhere which would justify this sense for *ḵûm*. In both of these cases the sense of "rising" is more prominent than that of "standing"; for Saul's kingdom never "rose" to the full height of a realm extending from the Euphrates to the River of Egypt, and David's did.

(3) In xi. 17 the sense "to be established" is very

doubtful. Bevan and Prince render the verb by "avail." After the analogy of the Babylonian and of Dan. xii. 1, the sense of "assist" seems better, though the Babylonian would justify the meaning "rely upon" or "have confidence in." The translation would then be: "She shall not assist him and shall not be for him."

5. It is assumed that *'ōmedh* indicates a date subsequent to Nehemiah. The assumption is made simply because, outside of Jer. xviii. 20, the word happens to occur only in Chronicles, Nehemiah, and Daniel.<sup>20</sup> In all of these places except three it is preceded by the verb *'āmadh* followed by the preposition *'al*. In Neh. ix. 3, *kūm* is the verb used. In Dan. viii. 17 it is preceded by the preposition אצל "beside" used after the verb בוא "to come in." In Dan. xi. 1 it is the subject of the nominal sentence whose predicate consists of ל and the infinitive. The use of the noun in Jer. xviii. 20 is enough to overthrow the claim of post-Nehemian origin and use.

From this induction of the evidence as to nouns denoting "place" in Hebrew the following conclusions are to be drawn:

(1) The Arabic and the Babylonian have each one or more words similar to *'āmadh* to denote "place." If Daniel and the writer of Chronicles were influenced by any other Semitic language in the use of it, that language must have been the Babylonian, inasmuch as Aramaic does not have the word in the sense "to stand." This would harmonize with the position of Daniel and Ezra at Babylon.

(2) No other writer, early or late, uses just the same words for "place" that Daniel does; and the same is true of Chronicles, Ezra-Nehemiah, and the Psalms.

(3) Especially noticeable is the fact that Daniel never uses *māḱôm*, whereas Chronicles uses it 29 times and Ezra-Nehemiah 11 times.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>20</sup> 2 Chr. xxx. 16, xxxiv. 31, xxxv. 10, Neh. viii. 7, ix. 3, xiii. 11, Dan. viii. 17, 18, x. 11, xi. 1.

<sup>21</sup> Besides *māḱôm* is used in Gen. 47 times, Ex. 10, Lev. 24, Nu. 18, Deut. 33, Jos. 9, Jud. 14, Ruth 3, Sam. 36, Kings 29, Est. 3, Job 21, Pss. 8, Prov. 3, Ecc. 9, Is. 17, Jer. 46, Ezek. 15, Hos. 2, Joel 1, Am. 2, Mi. 1, Na. 2, Zeph. 2, Hag. 1, Zech. 1, Mal. 1.

(4) Daniel uses *kēn* four times; no other late document uses it in this sense.<sup>22</sup>

(5) To be noted, also, is the almost absolute absence of words for "place" in the so-called Maccabean and other psalms said by the critics to have been written subsequent to Nehemiah.<sup>23</sup>

Since Ezra-Nehemiah, and Chronicles really "form a single continuous work,"<sup>24</sup> the argument of Dr. Driver amounts to this that the presence of *'ōmedh* in this composite work and in Daniel indicates that they were composed in the time subsequent to Nehemiah. This is arguing in a circle with a vengeance: *'ōmedh* is late because it is in these books; and these books are late because *'ōmedh* is in them. It is arguing in another circle because it asserts that Daniel is late because it contains this word which is found in the late book of Chronicles, and that Chronicles is late because it contains this word which is found in the late book of Daniel. That *'ōmedh* is found four times in Daniel and seven times in Ezra-Nehemiah-Chronicles may indicate that these documents are from the same period, but it does not in itself indicate whether that period was early or late. That it is not found in Ezekiel, Zechariah, and the other literature from 600 to 400 B.C. is offset by the fact that it does not appear in that mass of literature which the critics allege to have been written after 400 B.C.<sup>25</sup> Neither does this word occur in Ecclesiasticus, nor the Zadokite Fragments, nor in the Hebrew or Aramaic of the Targums and Talmud, nor in any of the

<sup>22</sup> Besides תחת in the sense of "in the place of" is found in Jos. v. 7, Ex. x. 23, with קום, cf. Ps. xviii. 40; and with עמר in Lev. xiii. 23, 28, Ec. iv. 15, 1 Sam. xiv. 9.

<sup>23</sup> In the Psalms mentioned in LOT, p. 287f. as assigned by any critic to Maccabean times, the common words for "place" do not occur at all, מעונה alone is found in Ps. lxxvi. 5, which Reuss thought to be a song of triumph from the Maccabean period.

<sup>24</sup> LOT, p. 516.

<sup>25</sup> That is, most of the Psalms, Ecclesiastes, parts of the Hexateuch, of Proverbs, of Isaiah and of other prophets.

Aramaic dialects. The only approaches to the form and meaning are found in Babylonian and Arabic.<sup>26</sup>

6. It is assumed that the occurrence in Daniel and Ezra-Nehemiah-Chronicles of the Hiphil of *'āmadh* in the sense of "appoint" shows that they were written in the age subsequent to Nehemiah.

This is another example of the absurd logic of the radical critics. The use of the verb is late because it is found in these books, and these books are late because they contain the verb. Moreover, the citations of proofs of the usage of the Hiphil in the sense of "appoint" as showing that this usage arose subsequent to the time of Nehemiah furnish a brilliant example of the kind of evidence often furnished by the critics of the biblical writers. Think of presenting such evidence as the following in a court of law before a judge and jury with an ordinarily intelligent lawyer on the other side! Neh. iv. 3, vi. 7, vii. 3, xii. 31, xiii. 11, 30 are cited as having the Hiphil in the sense of "appoint."<sup>27</sup> The word in this sense is cited elsewhere as one of "a list of words and idioms" "sufficient to substantiate the statement" that Daniel was written in an age subsequent to Nehemiah."<sup>28</sup> Yet we are told that chapters iv, vi, vii, xii and xiii of Nehemiah are "excerpts" or "extracts" "to all appearance unaltered" from the memoirs of Nehemiah himself.<sup>29</sup> Consistency is a jewel to anyone but a critic.

Again, in Job xxxiv. 24 we have one of the best examples of the use of this verb in the sense of "appoint." The verse reads: "He shall break in pieces mighty men without number and set (i.e. appoint) others in their stead (תחתם). But Dr. Driver says that Job was written about 500 B.C.<sup>30</sup> If so, the word must have been used in this sense before the time of Nehemiah.

<sup>26</sup> The Babylonian *imdu* means "prop, post" and the Arabic *'imād*, *'amud* and *'umdat* mean "support, base, prop."

<sup>27</sup> LOT, p. 535.

<sup>28</sup> *Id.* pp. 506f.

<sup>29</sup> *Id.* pp. 550f.

<sup>30</sup> *Id.* p. 432.

Again Dr. Driver cites 2 Chr. xi. 15 and xxxv. 2 as examples of the late use and says that 1 Kings xii. 32 is merely "an approximation to the weaker sense." 1 Kings xii. 32 says that Jeroboam "appointed" in Bethel the priests. 2 Chr. xi. 15 says the same thing. 2 Chr. xxxv. 2, says that Josiah "appointed" the priests, over their charges. All three passages use the Hiphil of *'āmadh*. None but a critic could see any difference in the use of the verb in the three places. Moreover, in Judges xx. 28 (cf. Ps. cvi.) it is said that Phinehas the priest "stood" (Kāl of *'āmadh*) before Jehovah. He was "caused to stand" and he "stood." In Deut. xvii. 12, the priest is said to "stand" to minister before the Lord.

Again Dr. Driver cites 2 Chr. xix. 8 and Ezra iii. 8 and 1 Chr. xv. 16, 17 as showing the late and weaker (?) sense. They read as follows. In 2 Chr. xix. 8, Jehoshaphat is said to have "set" of the Levites in Jerusalem. In Ezra iii. 8, Zerubbabel and others "appointed" the Levites, etc. In 1 Chr. xv. 16, the chief of the Levites are ordered by David to "appoint" their brethren, etc.; in vs. 17, the Levites are said to have "appointed" Heman and others. In Num. viii. 13 Moses is ordered to "set" (cause to stand) the Levites before Aaron. In Neh. xiii. 11 (which is from the Memoirs of Nehemiah) Nehemiah says that he "set" them upon their place. In Deut. xviii. 7, the Levites are said to "stand" before the Lord. In 2 Chr. xxxi. 2, Hezekiah "appointed" (caused to stand) the courses of the priests and Levites according to their service. Since Deuteronomy and Numbers use the Kāl of the verb in speaking of the duties of the Levites and the Memoirs of Nehemiah the Hiphil, how does it show a date later than the age of Nehemiah for Chronicles to use it?

The porters or gatekeepers, also, were ministers or servants who "stood" during their service and hence would naturally be "caused to stand." Thus in Neh. xii. 25 (in the Memoirs) the porters are said to keep the ward of the threshold; in 2 Chr. viii. 14 they, along with the priests and Levites, are said to have been "appointed" (caused to stand); and in 2 Chr. xxiii. 19, Jehoiada set gatekeepers "at the gates

of the house of the Lord that none which was unclean in anything should enter in." Besides, in 1 Chr. ix. 22 the four chief porters at least are said expressly to have been Levites.

What is true of the porters is true also of the singers. In 1 Chr. xv. 16 David is said to have ordered the Levites to "appoint" (cause to stand) their brethren to be singers. In 2 Chr. vi. 12 the Levites who were the singers are referred to. In 2 Chr. xxxv. 15 they were "in their place" (על-מעמדם). In 2 Chr. xx. 21, Jehoshaphat "set" them in their place to praise the Lord as they went out before the army. In 1 Chr. vi. 16-18, we read: "These are they whom David appointed (Hiphil) over the service of song in the house of the Lord and they were ministering before the dwelling place of the tabernacle of the congregation with singing and then waited on their office.<sup>31</sup> And these are they that "waited" (העמידים): Heman the singer, etc." Since these singers "stood" in their service, why should they not have been "caused to stand"?

Since the use of the Hiphil to denote the appointment of prophets is found only in Neh. vi. 7 which Dr. Driver considers to be a part of the genuine Memoirs of Nehemiah,<sup>32</sup> it is the business of Dr. Driver's followers to show how it could have been used by Nehemiah himself and still be an indication of the usage of an age subsequent to Nehemiah.

In 2 Chr. xix. 5 Jehoshaphat is said to have "appointed" (caused to stand) judges in the land. In the 8th verse, it is said, that he "appointed" (caused to stand) some of the Levites as judges in Jerusalem. The most obvious conclusion from verse 8 would be that other Levites had been appointed in the land. This conclusion is supported by 1 Chr. xxiii. 2-4, where it is said that among the 38,000 Levites that were numbered by David "6000 were officers and judges." The only other references to the making or appointing of judges are in Deut. xvi. 18 where it is said "judges and officers shalt thou make," where *nāthan* is used; and 1 Sa. viii. 1 where Samuel made his sons judges, and 2 Sa. viii. 4 where Ab-

<sup>31</sup> ויעמדו על עבודתם.

<sup>32</sup> LOT, p. 542.

salom says, "Oh that I were made judge," where *sîm* is used. That *nāthan* and *sîm* in the sense of "appoint" were not unused by the writers of Daniel and Chronicles is evident from 1 Chr. xii. 18 and 2 Chr. xxxii. 6 and Neh. ix. 17 where captains are "appointed" (*nāthan*), 1 Chr. xvi. 4 and vi. 48 where Levites are "appointed" (*nāthan*) 2 Chr. ix. 8 and Neh. xiii. 26 where a king is said to be "appointed" (*nāthan*). That *sîm* in the sense of "appoint" was not unused in the books assigned by the critics to the age subsequent to Nehemiah is shown by Ps. cv. 21 "he *made* him lord of"; 1 Chr. xi. 25 "and David *set* him over his guard," 1 Chr. xxvi. 10 "his father *made* him chief"; 2 Chr. xxiii. 18, "Jehoiada *appointed*"; 2 Chr. xxxiii. 14 "and *put* captains"; Est. viii. 2 "and Esther *set* Mordecai over the house," and by the fact that in the Aramaic of Ezra vi. 14 Sheshbazzar is said to have been "made" governor. This fact, that other verbs were used in the later literature as well as in the earlier to denote the idea of "appointing" would indicate to a student of language that the words were synonymous but not homologous. The most important words that are translated by "appoint" in the English versions may be clearly distinguished in a sentence like the following: "God commanded (צוה) Moses to give (נתן) the Levites to Aaron to stand (עמד) before him and he set (שם) some of them up as judges and gave others the oversight (פקד) of the offerings and assigned (מנה) them special food, services," etc.

Lastly, in 2 Chr. xxv. 5 we are told that Amaziah "made" (*he'emidh*) the men of Judah captains, etc. This is the only place in the Old Testament where this verb is used in connection with the appointment of captains. *Nāthan* and *sîm* are the usual verbs to denote this not merely in the early literature but in that which the critics place in the age subsequent to Nehemiah, e.g., *sîm* in Ps. cv. 21, 1 Chr. xi. 25, xxvi. 10, 2 Chr. xxxiii. 14, Est. viii. 2, and *nāthan* in Neh. ix. 37 (of kings), 2 Chr. ix. 8 and Neh. xiii. 26 (of a king), 1 Chr. xii. 18, 2 Chr. xxxii. 6, and Neh. ix. 17 (of a captain, or

prince). It is worthy of note, also, that the Babylonian uses *emēdu* in the sense of "appoint."

In 1 Chr. xxii. 2, Solomon is said to have "appointed" (caused to stand) *masons* to hew the stones for the temple. In 2 Chr. ii. 18 (17) he is said to have "set them" (שׁע being used). No indications of date can be found here, since no other mention of the "setting" or "appointing" of hewers is mentioned in the Old Testament.

In Neh. x. 33 the children of Israel are said to have "laid" (*he'emīdh*) commandments upon themselves. With this may be compared the Babylonian (?) phrase: "upon the sinner lay (*emid*) his sin."<sup>33</sup> The use by Nehemiah may show Babylonian influence, much as we might expect; but, it does not indicate a date after Nehemiah.

In 2 Chr. xxxiii. 8 we read that God said to David and Solomon that he would not remove the foot of Israel from the ground which he had "appointed" to their fathers. This probably refers to 2 Sam. vii. 10 where God says to David: "I will appoint (*sīm*) a place (*mākôm*) for my people Israel." The verb and noun both differ in the two places as words do differ so frequently between the early books (Samuel-Kings) and Chronicles. But these differences, while they do point to different authors and might indicate different times of composition, do not determine anything about the length of the period existing between the times of their composition. If the books of Samuel were "as a whole pre-Deuteronomic and hardly later than 700 B.C.,"<sup>34</sup> how can such a variation of expression as that found in this instance go to prove that Chronicles must have been written at about 300 B.C.<sup>35</sup> rather than about 400 or 450 B.C.?<sup>36</sup>

<sup>33</sup> *Bel hite emid hitašū*, Muss-Arnolt, *Dictionary*, p. 56a.

<sup>34</sup> LOT, p. 183.

<sup>35</sup> LOT, p. 535.

<sup>36</sup> If the original documents from which both Samuel and Chronicles were ultimately derived were written in some system of signs like the cuneiform, such a difference might have arisen in the same age; for the sign for "appoint" may have been read either *sīm* or *'āmadh* and the sign for the noun by either *'adhama* or *mākôm*.

7. It is assumed that the use of the Hiphil of *'āmadh* in the sense of "establish" is an indication of the age subsequent to Nehemiah. The passages cited by Dr. Driver in which it has this sense are 1 Chr. xvi. 17, xvii. 14, 2 Chr. ix. 8, xxiv. 13, xxv. 14, and xxx. 5 and he compares Ezra ii. 68 and Ps. cv. 10 (= 1 Chr. xvi. 17).

It is admitted that the Chronicler uses this verb in this sense more frequently than the earlier writers, but this does not tend to prove that his book was composed subsequently to the time of Nehemiah. In 2 Chr. xxiv. 13 it is said that they "set" (Hiphil) the house of God upon its base (*math-kunto*) and strengthened it (*'immēš*). In Ezra ii. 68 some of the fathers are said to have offered freely for the house of God to "set it up" (cause it to stand) in its place (*'al m<sup>o</sup>kono*).<sup>37</sup> Perhaps *kûn* might have been used in one or both of these cases. The Chronicler, however, probably knew a distinction between the two words; for he uses *kûn* of houses in 1 Chr. xvii. 24. In 2 Chr. xxv. 14 Amaziah "sets up" the Edomite gods and bows down before them. No other Hebrew verb would express the idea as well as *he'emîdh*.<sup>38</sup> So in Prov. xxix. 4 the earth or land is made to "stand"; in Ps. xxx. 7, it is the mountains; in 1 Kings xv. 4, Jerusalem; in 2 Chr. ix. 8, Israel. The usage of 1 Chr. xvii. 14 where it says of Solomon that he will "settle" him in his house forever, is exactly paralleled in the Babylonian by *ina bîti luzziz*, "I will rest in the house" and *kirib êkalliya ulzizšunuti* "I settled them in the midst of my palace." In 1 Chr. xvi. 17 where the covenant is said to be "established" and in 2 Chr. xxx. 5 where the same is said of the word (or decree), the idea of endurance or fixedness probably dictated the choice of *he'emîdh* instead of *hêkîm*. Since the date of Ps. cv. has not been fixed, we cannot tell whether it copied vs. 10 from 1 Chr. xvi. 17 or *vice versa*; or whether both copied from a common original.

<sup>37</sup> In Assyrian the same verb is used for the standing of walls, as in the phrase *la innendu igarušu* "its walls stood not."

<sup>38</sup> Compare the Assyrio-Babylonian *ušaziz šalam šarrutiya*, "I erected the image of my royalty."

As to Ps. cxlviii. 6 the verb is used in the sense of the Assyrio-Babylonian *emid* "to be." Heavens, angels, sun, and all things visible were "caused to stand" (or "be") at the command of God; therefore, should we praise him.<sup>39</sup> This use may show Babylonian influence, but it does not determine as to whether the date of the Psalm was before or after Nehemiah.

#### CONCLUSIONS

1. The noun '*ōmed* "place" occurs only in Chronicles (3 times), Ezra (3 or 4 times), and Nehemiah (3 times). It occurs in Neh. xiii. 11 which, according to Dr. Driver's division of Nehemiah, is ascribed to the Memoirs of Nehemiah himself. What is there, then, in this word that indicates a date *subsequent to Nehemiah*? Besides, it is noteworthy that it does not occur in Esther, Ecclesiastes, P, nor in any of the parts of Proverbs, nor in any of the Psalms, not even in those which the critics assign to the Maccabean times. But this use is found in the Assyrian *emdu*.

2. '*Āmad* occurs in only eighteen Psalms, in seven of them two times in each. Of these, Cheyne assigns only xxxiii, cxxxv and cxlvii to Maccabean times and Reuss only lxxvi and cii. The word does not occur in any of the psalms which Driver says that "very many commentators—including even Delitzsch and Perowne—admit (on historical grounds) to belong to this period"<sup>40</sup> i.e., in Pss. xlv, lxxiv, lxxix; nor in any of those which Robertson Smith "places in the early years of the Maccabean sovereignty,"<sup>41</sup> i.e., Ps. cxiii-cxviii, cxlix. In not one of these eighteen Psalms is the verb used in the sense of "stand up." Besides, no two of these great critics agree as to the date of a single psalm. Even Dr. Driver seems to have been unable to make up his mind as to the date of any one of them!

3. '*Āmad* occurs ten times in Esther; in iv. 14 in the sense of "stand up" and in iii. 4 in the sense of "be established." But since both senses are found besides only in Daniel and

<sup>39</sup> Compare also the use of *innindu* in the Creation Tablets, I. 1. 21.

<sup>40</sup> LOT, 387.

<sup>41</sup> *Id.*, 389.

Chronicles, why could not all three have been written between 400 and 540 B.C. as well as between 164 and 300 B.C.?

4. *ʿĀmad* is found five times in Ecclesiastes, i.e., i. 4, ii. 9, iv. 12, 15 and viii. 3. In iv. 12 and 15 alone can it mean "stand up" and in both cases it is followed by a preposition not found with this verb in Esther or Daniel.<sup>42</sup> There is nothing in all this to show that any one of the words is later than Nehemiah.

5. *ʿĀmad* occurs twenty-five times in P, never in the sense "stand up" or be "established," but always meaning to "present" or "cause to stand."

6. The Hiphil or causative stem, is found in six of the Psalms, to wit: xviii. 34 (= 2 Sa. xxii. 34), xxx. 7 (8), xxxi. 9, cv. 10 (= 1 Chr. xvi. 17), cvii. 25, cxlviii. 6. In Ps. cxlviii. 6, it is used in the sense "establish" as in 1 Kings xv. 4 and Prov. xxix. 4. Ps. cv. 10 is the same exactly as 1 Chr. xvi. 17. In the other four Psalms, we have the ordinary sense of "cause to stand." Of these six Psalms, Cheyne and Reuss put Ps. cxlviii alone in Maccabean times. Since there is no heading to either Ps. cv or cxlviii, nor any certainty as to when 1 Chr. xvi. 17 was written, no argument as to a date before or after Nehemiah can be based upon them.

7. The only place in Esther where the Hiphil could possibly have the meaning "appoint" is in iv. 5; but as the verb is followed by the word "before" (לפני), the common translation "cause to stand" brings the use into harmony with that which we find in Deut., Judges, Samuel, Kings, and in fact with the general usage throughout the whole Old Testament.

8. In Nehemiah the sense of "appoint" is found only in vi. 7, vii. 3 and xii. 35, of which all are assigned by Dr. Driver<sup>43</sup> to the Memoirs which he ascribes to Nehemiah himself. Surely, this use of the word by Nehemiah can not be brought forward as a proof that the employment of the word in the

<sup>42</sup> Chronicles uses it once (2 Chron. vi. 12) with *neghedh* the preposition found in Ecc. iv. 12.

<sup>43</sup> LOT, 542f.

Book of Daniel shows that Daniel was written *subsequent to the age of Nehemiah*. And yet, this is exactly what Dr. Driver does!<sup>44</sup>

9. The Hiphil in the sense of "appoint" is found in Job xxxiv. 24. Job, according to LOT, was most probably "written either during or shortly after the Babylonian captivity." If it used this verb, why may Daniel not have used it?

10. Prov. xxix. 4, in a section ascribed to Solomon, says that "the king by judgment *establishes* the kingdom." This testifies to this sense of the verb as being pre-exilic.

11. I Kings xv. 4 says that Jehovah gave David a lamp in Jerusalem to "set up" (להקים) his son after him and to "establish (להעמיד) Jerusalem." According to Wellhausen, and Kuenen, the compilation of the Book of Kings was completed substantially *before* the exile (c. 600 B.C.).<sup>45</sup>

12. In Ex. xv. 9 we read that God said to Pharaoh: "for this cause have I raised thee up" i.e. established or appointed thee as king. This passage is assigned by Dr. Driver to J.<sup>46</sup> According to Dr. Driver, critics "agree that neither [i.e. J or E] is later than c. 750 B.C."<sup>47</sup>

13. P never uses the Hiphil except in the sense of "present."

14. The only place in Ecclesiasticus where the Hiphil is used in the sense of "appoint," or "set over," is in x. 4.

15. The Hiphil is never used in the Zadokite Fragments.

16. The verb in any sense or form given by Dr. Driver does not appear in any Aramaic document of any age. In Syriac, it means "to baptize."

17. The verb in the senses of "appoint" and "establish" is not used with persons in the Hebrew of the Talmud.

18. The verb is not found in Ethiopic.

19. The verb and derivatives are found in Assyrian, Arabic and Phenician.

<sup>44</sup> Compare LOT, pp. 506f. with 535. 4.

<sup>45</sup> *Id.*, p. 198.

<sup>46</sup> *Id.* pp. 24, 27.

<sup>47</sup> *Id.* p. 123.

20. In Assyrian the verb in its different forms is used in all the senses peculiar to Daniel and to Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah.

We conclude, therefore, that the uses of the verb and its derivative *'ōmed* as found in Daniel are found sporadically, also, in J, Kings, Job, Proverbs and the so-called Memoirs of Nehemiah. Since Daniel, Ezra and probably Nehemiah (Neh. xiii. 6) all lived and flourished in Babylon, it is probable that their more frequent use of the verb in these so-called "weaker" senses was influenced by the fact that the Babylonian language was so familiar to them. The writer of P never used the verb in these senses, and the writers of the Psalms but twice at most, because they lived and wrote at a time preceding the contact with these Babylonian influences.

On the other hand, we find that P and H and D and E, and 148 of the Psalms, and all of Judges, Samuel and Kings, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, Amos, Micah, Habakkuk, Nahum, Obadiah, Jonah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, and Canticles uniformly use the verb in its ordinary senses; that Isaiah and Proverbs and J and Kings and Job and Ecclesiasticus use the extraordinary senses but once for each; and that Daniel, Esther, Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah are the only ones that use the verb frequently in these extraordinary nuances. When we find, further, that with the exception of Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, these five books, Daniel, Esther, Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah, are the only ones that claim and are admitted by all to have been written after the conquest of Babylon by Cyrus and hence under Babylonian influences, we see how the writers of the five books may have preferred the use of *'āmādh* to that of *ḵûm*. Especially is this the case since the writers of these books were probably the only ones who were settled in Babylon and acquainted with its literature and language. Finally, we can understand how Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah and the writers of Esther and Chronicles have been influenced by the Babylonian, since the Babylonian had the verb *emēdu*; but we cannot see how Jewish writers can have been influenced by the Aramaic to use *'āmādh*

instead of an earlier *kûm*, inasmuch as no one of the Aramaic dialects ever used the word 'āmadh in any of the senses used anywhere in the ancient Hebrew.

What then must the verdict be? It can only be that the evidence given by Dr. Driver about the use of 'āmadh and 'ōmedh corroborates the *prima facie* evidence of the five books that they are substantially contemporaneous records written by men influenced by the Babylonian language rather than the Aramaic; that the books not so influenced by Babylonian were probably written at a time antedating Cyrus; and that there is not one item of evidence to be derived from the use of 'āmadh or 'ōmedh to show that the turning point of the Hebrew language was the age of Nehemiah or that the language of Daniel or Chronicles is "of the age *subsequent to Nehemiah.*"

*Princeton.*

R. D. WILSON.