

The Princeton Theological Review

OCTOBER, 1921

APOCALYPSES AND THE DATE OF DANIEL

Apocalypse means revelation. In Biblical literature and the literature connected with it, there is a large number of books either in part or in whole of an apocalyptic character, either real or assumed, in which there purports to be unveiled before us the secrets of the past, the present, or the future, which could not have been learned by mere human insight or foresight. The preliminary question, and perhaps the more important question, to be answered before we consider the specific case of Daniel, is therefore, whether such a thing as a revelation has taken place, or at least whether it is possible. Every one who believes that Jesus is the Son of God and also every one who believes in the claims of the prophets of the Old Testament, must believe both in the possibility and the fact of such a thing as revelation by God to man. It is to such, and such only, that the discussion in this article is addressed, and we shall discuss in their proper place whether there is anything in the revelations contained in Daniel either in form or in character and content which renders it impossible to believe in the possibility or in the actuality of their having been made in the 6th century B. C.

The necessity of entering upon this discussion arises, not from the fact that their predictive character is denied by those who reject the Theistic system, but because in its most essential features it is impugned by many who profess their belief that "God who at sundry times and in divers manners spoke in times past unto the fathers and the prophets hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son." The objections to Daniel to which attention is called will be stated, then, in the words of Professor Charles, profes-

of the various documentary theories advanced concerning the literary history of the Pentateuch have all along claimed that the differences in style observable in Genesis and elsewhere are explained by the difference of subject-matter and do not require the assumption of diverse authorship, since genealogies, laws, statistics are naturally, and almost unconsciously, presented by a writer in a different literary form from the description of awe-inspiring events or thrilling adventure. Here, in this volume by Dr. Kyle, is an investigation of the legal portions of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy. The inquiry has resulted in the discovery that the laws are distributed in the Pentateuch into three classes and a sub-class by names that describe their origin and character, and each class is marked by a peculiarity of style that its own nature determines. This being so, there is no reason to assume diversity of author for the several codes. In the light of these results the question arises anew, and is debated, whether the theory of the single authorship of the entire Pentateuch is not after all the satisfactory view to take of its composition.

The study is a worthy one, but unfortunately the book lacks good form. It is vexatious by reason of excessive repetitiousness; the use of capital letters is haphazard; the transliteration of Hebrew words follows no rule, and is at times quite incorrect; proper names found in the Old Testament, Obadiah, Nehemiah, Haggai, Sheth, Tamar, are misspelled (pages 205, 213, 246, 247), and in the Stone Lectures Abimelech, Shechem, Jeroboam, Havilah, Potiphar, Tamar (pages 13, 24, 39, 119, 153, 276). This is harsh criticism; but it concerns form, not matter. Perhaps the question may be permitted: Would it not be better to use the word ordinance, rather than the comprehensive term statute, as the translation of *hok*, since the *mishpatim* no less than the *hukkot* are statutes, applying the principles of the Ten Commandments, the constitution of the theocracy, to the affairs of daily civil life?

Princeton.

JOHN D. DAVIS.

The Old Testament in the Life of Today. By JOHN A. RICE, A.M., LL.D., Professor of Old Testament Interpretation in the Southern Methodist University. New York: The Macmillan Co. 1920. 12mo; pp. xxxiii, 320.

After reading the book carefully several times, it seems to us that, if Professor Rice's interpretation be correct, Aesop's Fables and the Arabian Nights, Plato and Cicero, might afford just about as good material for meeting the wants of the present age as that set forth in the prophets and wisdom literature of Israel. Throughout the whole series of discussions, the example and authority of Christ and the apostles are ignored. "Thus saith the Lord" is never mentioned as the source of the prophets' message, which is said to be derived from experience. The prophets are compared to Shakespeare, Tennyson, H. G. Wells, and Winston Churchill. The atonement is yet to be defined in

terms of democracy, whatever that means. Ingersoll's attack on God as cruel seems to be justified in the view of the author (pp. xxvii, 140). Inspiration in the historical sense is denied (xviii, xxvii) and infallibility is ridiculed.

It is alleged that the "scientific spirit has routed the church." Mr. Wesley is condemned for thinking that we had as well give up the Bible as our belief that there is such a thing as witchcraft. Since Dr. Rice does not cite which Wesley says this, or where he says it, we can only express our amazement that any scholar (!) should insinuate that the Bible is wrong in what it says of witchcraft. The Bible says: "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live" (Ex. xxii. 18). The Hebrew word for witch employed in this place is *mekashshepha*, i.e., one who gives a *kesheph*. The first law of the code of Hammurabi declares that anyone accused of giving a *kishpu* (Heb. *kesheph*) should be cast into the water and, if he sank, his goods should be given to the accuser. *Kishpu*, or *kesheph*, was a synonym of *imtu*, "poison." The law against the witch was right. Judges and interpreters may have been wrong at times in deciding that this or that person was a witch. *Humanum est errare*. But the Bible itself was right in condemning to death anyone who practiced witchcraft, i.e., poisoning.

As long as Dr. Rice soars on the wings of eloquence amid the regions of conjecture, he is beyond the reach of scholarship and evidence. When, however, he makes a statement for which the evidence can be investigated, he reveals a lamentable ignorance of the facts in evidence. Thus he says that the style and language of Isaiah xxiv-xxvii. are post-exilic and hence he dates the composition of this passage at 170 B.C. Now, the proofs of lateness in the language of a Biblical document are either the foreign words embedded in it or its resemblance to the Hebrew of the Talmud. But this particular passage has not one foreign word in it. Of the twelve words occurring in it which are found only five times or under in the Old Testament, only two (*šuk* "to pour out" and *gir* "chalk") are found in later Hebrew literature; and neither of them occurs in the same sense in Syriac. (This statement is based upon a complete concordance which I have prepared but not yet published of all the words in the Hebrew Bible occurring five times or under, and a comparison in the case of each word with the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Syriac of Dalman's and Brockelmann's dictionaries.)

Again, when Dr. Rice says the phrase "God of Heaven" is post-exilic, how does he reconcile this with the fact that it is found twice in Gen. xxiv. which the critics assign to J., a document which Dr. Rice himself dates as from the 9th or 8th cty. B.C. Further, he objects to calling the king of Assyria by the title "King of Nineveh," although the kings of Israel were called kings of Samaria by the Assyrians. He says the proper title for Jonah to use would have been "the great king of Assyria"; but this particular title is never used by any king of Assyria. (See my list of the titles of the Assyrian kings in this Re-

VIEW for 1904.) He says further that the psalm in Jonah ii was composed of sentences taken from the psalms of the Psalter. But, as is shown in my articles in this REVIEW for 1918 on the "Authenticity of Jonah," some of these psalms were, according to the critical school, to which Dr. Rice belongs, not written till the 2nd century B.C.; whereas Dr. Rice puts the date of Jonah at 400 B.C. How could an author writing in 400 B.C. have used a document written in 200 B.C.?

One of the most extravagant and unfounded statements of Professor Rice is that the "linguistic peculiarities of Chronicles—Ezra—Nehemiah (C-E-N) everywhere indicate close kinship to the Priests' Code" (p. 145). Nothing could be farther from the truth. C-E-N has at least 30 words derived from the Persian; P has none. C-E-N mentions the temple (הֵיכָל) 19 times; P not at all. C-E-N speaks 77 times of the "House of Jehovah" and 52 times of the "House of Elohim"; P never employs either term. Of the 124 words occurring five times or under in the Old Testament that are found also in C-E-N, only 11 are found in P as against 9 in JE, 21 in Sam.-Kings, 17 in Isaiah, 10 in Ezek., 5 in Prov., 6 in Dan., and 6 in Jer.; and one or more in one or other book of the Old Testament, except Ruth and seven of the Minor Prophets. On the other hand, of the 64 words of the same kind occurring in P, 11 only are found in C-E-N, while 12 occur also in Ezek., 10 in Isa., 9 in Jer., 9 in Sam.-Kings, 4 in Dan., 4 in Jb., 3 in Prov., and one or more in Ps., Joel, Micah, Hab., Mal., Job, Esther, Eccl., and Lam.

Besides, C-E-N has about 20 Babylonian words; whereas, outside of Gen. i. it is doubtful if P has any. (See my article on "Babylon and the Bible" in this REVIEW for 1903.) And lastly, about half of the narrative portion of Ezra is in Aramaic and words of Aramaic origin are found in other parts of C-E-N; whereas it is impossible to show conclusively that P has any Aramaic words. Against this clear evidence of the documents the opinions and assertions of "all the scholars" now living are worthless. Why do the heathen rage and the critics imagine a vain thing? The foreign words embodied in the text of the O. T. documents afford a rock of defense against which all the waves of criticism have beaten in vain.

Dr. Rice asserts that the records of Judges, Samuel, and Kings did not please the priests because they did not show "a continuous picture of priestly ritual in force. The Chronicler therefore rewrote the history to remedy this defect" and "presents a distorted picture in the interest of post-exilic institutions" (p. 45).

In answer to this, one may admit, that the writer of Chronicles probably did intend to supply the omissions of his predecessors. Why else should he have written his work? But this intention of the Chronicler to supplement the works of his predecessors does not show that his additions are false. A few years ago Scribner's *History of the United States* was published in five volumes, quarto, containing more than three thousand pages, with fifty-three double column pages of index,

with more than five thousand references to more than three thousand subjects. The subject "Methodist" does not occur in the index; nor Christian, except one reference to the Christian Commission. There are 18 references to Benedict Arnold and 93 to General Grant. It is a political history and it sticks to its subject. On the other hand, I have before me a *History of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in America*, in one large volume of nearly 800 pages. It scarcely mentions political events except the relation of some of the covenanters to the war of the revolution and that of 1812, and their stand on slavery. Nearly 600 pages are taken up with the origin of the Covenanter institutions and with genealogies of the ministers of the Reformed Church. Is one of these histories false? No. They supplement each other and are both derived from authentic original sources.

The first two parts of Schrader's *Cuneiform Library* give more than 500 pages of historical inscriptions. They throw but little light on the religious observances of the people. On the other hand, the New-Babylonian Inscriptions of the Babylonians (see Langdon-Zehnpfund's *Die neubabylonische Königsinschriften*) in their more than 200 pages have only a few references to historical events.

The Code of Hammurabi, king of Babylon, was published about 2000 B.C. It was probably the civil and criminal law of Babylon to the end of the empire; and, possibly, it was the law of Assyria, also. But, it is never mentioned in any of the numerous inscriptions of Babylon and Assyria, and even the name of Hammurabi is scarcely found again for nearly 1500 years when Nabonidus thrice mentions him, not in connection with his laws, but as the founder of the temple of Ebarra. (Langdon-Zehnpfund, 238. 20, 250. 1, 244. 4.)

Dr. Rice says (p. 180) that the passages of the Old Testament "interpreted as referring to Jesus have been overworked." It seems to us that the so-called priestly additions of Chronicles to the narratives of Samuel-Kings and the omission by Samuel-Kings of references to the religious cult of the Hebrews, have likewise been overworked, when interpreted as evidence of the historical untrustworthiness of Chronicles. We fail to see that the mere fact of additions or omissions has in itself anything to do with the veracity of either document. The author of Kings appeals to his sources; the author of Chronicles, to his. Has any scholar the right, about 2500 years after the documents were written, and without the evidence of other documents to support him, to impugn the veracity of the author of Chronicles,—the one who above all other writers of the Old Testament appeals to older sources in confirmation of his statements? (For a further discussion of the attack on the veracity of Chronicles, see my articles on "Scientific Biblical Criticism" in this REVIEW for 1919. For a discussion of the argument from silence, see the first chapter of my *Studies on the Book of Daniel*, Putnams, 1916.)

As might have been expected from his general attitude, Prof. Rice puts all of the Psalms in the times after the destruction of Jerusalem

and many of them in the 2nd century B.C. Although asserting that the headings are "worthless," he employs them as the basis of his claim that there are eleven hymnals which he alleges to have been collected from the period immediately after the Return and down to the end of the 2nd century. He holds, also, that none of the Psalms are pre-exilic; but all were written, or at least, collected for the service of the second temple.

All of these assertions are made with so much assurance, that one who is not deemed worthy of being put in the "all scholars" class naturally hesitates to question so much allegedly learned authority. But seeing that Mathew, Mark, and Luke represent the Lord as attributing the 110th Psalm to David, and Peter and Paul and the author of Hebrews and the whole company of the disciples with one accord (Acts, iv. 25) assign certain Psalms to David, we are emboldened to ask a few questions by way of recording our *caveat* and of expressing our surprise that a Christian should be so ready to accept the view that "the background of these [so-called] Davidic Psalms is such that it cannot be made to fit into the life and times of David" and that the fact that "the suffering of the early post-exilic period is reflected" in them shows that they were written at that late time.

1. Our author admits that the literary style of the Davidic Psalms is "vigorous, fresh, and free from Aramaisms." Since they contain, also, no Persian or Babylonian words, what objective linguistic evidence have the critics for putting these Psalms in the post-exilic period?

2. If the headings are reliable enough to have enabled them to serve as the basis of the collection, called the First Hymnal "probably made in the early Persian period," what objective evidence have the critics to prove that both headings and Psalms may not have been pre-exilic and even as early as David?

3. The Psalms make mention of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Aaron, Phinehas, Samuel, and David and of many of the events and persons preceding the time of Solomon. Why do they mostly stop just then? If prepared for the first temple, we can understand it; if for the second, why the lack of all mention of the heroes of the faith in the time of the kingdom? Ben Sira praises most of Israel's worthies including kings and prophets and makes his greatest eulogy on Simon, a high priest of the 3rd century B.C. The 137th Psalm speaks of sitting by the rivers of Babylon. This reference fixes the authorship as non-Davidic. How about the other Psalms? Why no mention of the Babylonians, and Persians, nor of sages, prophets, and teachers, the Babylonian and Persian names for governor?

4. It is alleged that some of the Psalms headed "by David" cannot have been written by him because they do "not fit into his life and times." Since the critics deny the historicity of Chronicles, all that they know about the life of David is continued in about forty chapters of Samuel and Kings, of which fifteen are principally taken up with the history of Saul. In view of such meagre information about

his life and times, is it reasonable to assume that none of the Psalms attributed to David can have been written by him? How especially about the 23rd, the 51st, and the 110th?

5. Assurbanipal, king of Assyria, ends one of his inscriptions with a psalm of lamentation that fits in but badly with what we know of him from his annals, building, and other inscriptions. It proves that even victorious and successful kings had hearts and hopes and fears like other men. Could one expect them to have often expressed their feelings in their public records?

6. Reasoning by analogy, what ground have we to suppose that the worship of the Hebrew temple alone was devoid of poetic prayers and praises? The earliest Egyptians, Babylonians and Assyrians had them. Why not the Hebrews?

7. Even if it could be shown that some of the headings are irrelevant, or misplaced, how would this prove that all are?

8. If the headings are as late as the critics claim, how does it come that the Greek translators of the LXX did not understand the meaning of some of the terms used and that the meaning of such terms as *מחלת* and *מכתם* was unknown to the Jews of post-Maccabean times?

When the critics are prepared to answer these questions satisfactorily, we may be ready to consider the bearing of their theories on the origin of the Psalms and on the character of Christ. Till then we prefer to treat the headings and the Psalms as they were treated by Christ and the apostles.

In order, apparently, to minimize as much as possible the divine element in the history of Israel, Dr. Rice attributes the religious superiority of the Hebrew over the Greek to the fact that "the Semite was the religious genius of mankind" (p. xxv). "Prophecy was a 'national religious' feeling" (p. 32). "Amos got his message from observation, Hosea from the agony of experience" (p. 45). The prophets were "hurled into a creative epoch," when they "were forced, as we are, to get an enlarged conception of God" (p. 59). To the prophet.

". to know

Rather consists in opening out a way
Whence the imprisoned splendor may escape,
Than in effecting entrance for a light
Supposed to be without" (p. 32).

Now this all sounds well. It is very flattering to our self-conceit that we should be placed in the same class with the prophets. It does away with the old doctrine of revelation and inspiration and makes the religion of Israel to be due to illumination dependent on the high religious feeling of the Semite.

But there are two insuperable objections to this way of regarding the origin of the Bible. First, with one accord the law-givers and prophets of Israel declare that their peculiar ideas came not from themselves, but from God; and secondly, all the historical records of ancient nations unite in showing that the Semites in general did not

possess any superiority over other races in regard to religious matters. The Hebrews alone had the oracles of God. The other Semites produced religions, not higher in morality and doctrine than the Aryans, but among the most debased and demoralizing that the world has known. Look at the Babylonians with all their wealth and culture! For two thousand years, or more, one can trace the history of their religion and one finds no progress in the knowledge of God or in the morality of the people. The period of Hammurabi surpasses in almost every respect that of Nabonidus. Or, take the Phenico-Carthaginians! To the very last days of Carthage their heathenish cruelties were a shock to the hard hearts of Rome. And the Arabs! Till the 7th century A.D. when Mohammed converted them to a perverted doctrine of Monotheism derived indirectly from the Jews and Christians, they were sunk in the worst forms of animism. The Greeks produced at least the great philosophies of the Stoics and of Neo-Platonism and the Persians the religion of Zoroaster; but the Semites, aside from the Hebrews, never rose above the worship of magic and polytheism with all their attendant evils. Moreover, when we look at Egypt, China, and India, we find no evidence of an evolution from lower to higher forms of religious ideas and practice; but on the contrary, they afford consentient testimony to a gradual decay from nobler to baser forms.

The Hebrews alone show a progressive unfolding of the character and ways of God from the beginning of their history to the culmination of revelation at Calvary. All of the writers of the Old and New Testament alike attribute this progress to the direct intervention of God, who at sundry times and in diverse manners spoke by the prophets, and in the last days by his Son. Mr. Wesley may have been mistaken as to what was meant by the Biblical witch; but he thoroughly believed the Bible and what it says about witches. Professor Rice does not believe what the Bible says about witches, inspiration, predictions, atonement, and redemption; and yet, he is a teacher in the church that the Wesleys founded! O tempora! O mores! And the great Methodist Church keeps silence, because he asserts that all scholars agree with him. Does he say that Jesus Christ, or the apostles and evangelists, or the Christian Church in all the ages; agree with him? No. They were all ignorant of the origin of the universe, of the origin of man and sin and redemption. The wise men of this world know more than prophets and apostles and none who today agree with Christ and the church are worthy of the name of "scholar." Modesty is a jewel most fitting for a critic's crown. We commend it to Dr. Rice and all his scholars.

Dr. Rice begins his attack on the infallibility of the Bible by pooh-poohing its statements on scientific matters. He ignores the obvious fact that these statements are phenomenal, *i.e.*, are based on what people saw. Judged in this way what more scientific and sensible and pertinent to its purpose than the law about the coney. We know that it does not chew the cud like the cow. But they saw and knew that

it made a motion with its lips similar to that made by the ruminating animals. The law served its purpose. It served to differentiate the coney to the eyes of the smallest boy in Israel as an animal that should not be eaten. We know a horse when we see it, though like the circus-rider's child of Nicholas Nickleby we may not define it as a herbivorous pachydermatous quadruped. The Israelite knew a coney when he saw it; that was enough of science for him. He eschewed the coney forthwith.

Mr. Maunder of the Greenwich Observatory holds that the first chapter of Genesis is not inharmonious with the science of astronomy. The account of the sun and moon in Joshua vii. is in accord with Babylonian and modern science. "*Dom*" does not mean "stand still" but be "eclipsed or darkened" (see my article on "What does 'the Sun stood still' mean?" in this REVIEW for 1918). Dana, Guyot, Dawson, and Wright (not to mention others), maintain that Gen. i. is not in conflict with the modern knowledge of geology. Gen. i. teaches that all we see, beginning with the farthest away, and coming in concentric circles from the periphery to the observer at the center has been made by God. The account is in poetic form. It teaches clearly, so that the least wise may understand, that all we see was the creation of the one and only God. As to the Biblical doctrine of the unity of the human race, Mr. Darwin himself in his *Descent of Man*, part I, ch. 7, seems to favor the theory that all races are "descended from a common progenitor." And Professor Tyler in the last edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, Vol. II, 1146, says that "modern views have tended to restore the doctrine of a single human stock." The least that can be said for the geography of the Bible, especially of Genesis x., is that it is the most accurate that has come down to us from pre-Grecian times. (See my article on the Tenth Chapter of Genesis in the *Presbyterian and Reformed Review* for 1890.) As to political economy, it is difficult to prove that modern science has advanced in principle beyond the land-laws, poor-laws, and tax-methods of the ancient Israelites. As to hygiene and medicine, the laws of Moses were certainly millenniums ahead of the rest of the world and of the wisest of other nations, such as those of the Egyptians and Babylonians. (Compare them, for example, with the magical formulas of the Babylonians as given in Dennefeld's *Geburts-Omina*). It is impossible for Dr. Rice to show that the Hebrews' "supposed magic passed for science," or that magic was authorized by the law or the prophets. As to chronology, no one can deny that in general the chronology from Abraham and Hammurabi downward is in remarkable agreement with that of the Assyrian and Babylonian monuments as now understood, and Egypt has no dependable chronology. Of the times between Adam and Abraham, it is probable that the chronological statements of Genesis v. and xi. have been misinterpreted by us, because we have lost the key to their right interpretation. To throw away the whole Bible, because with our present knowledge acquired by evidence gained from sources

outside the Scriptures, we cannot explain all its apparent inconsistencies, is absurd. Let us labor and wait. Time and further investigations may clear up this difficulty also.

That the Bible purports to give a true history of the people of Israel no one will deny. That their history from Solomon to Esther is in remarkable agreement with extra-Biblical sources no one can successfully dispute. From Abraham to Solomon, our sources of information are so meagre, that the part of wisdom and loyalty for a Christian is to wait in silent confidence that future evidence will corroborate the narratives concerning the early history that are recorded in the Books of Moses, Joshua and Judges. Let the cohorts of Christ stand closely together, resolved to meet with unflinching firmness any attacks upon this Gibraltar of their faith. The works of Celsus and Porphyry were controverted and their influence destroyed by the scholarship and arguments of Origen. The works of their modern successors will no less be forced to yield to the assaults of Christian learning and logic. For, in spite of all that has been said against the word of God, still

It floateth like a banner
 Before God's host unfurled;
 It shineth like a beacon
 Above the darkling world.
 It is the chart and compass
 That o'er life's surging sea,
 'Mid mists and rocks and quicksands,
 Still guides, O Christ, to Thee.

Princeton.

R. D. WILSON.

Jesus and Paul. Lectures given at Manchester College, Oxford, for the Winter Term, 1920. By BENJAMIN W. BACON, D.D., Buckingham Professor of New Testament Criticism and Interpretation in Yale University. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1921. Pp. x, 251.

This book contains a rather comprehensive exposition of Professor Bacon's views with regard to the New Testament and the origin of Christianity. The exposition is somewhat lacking in clearness, partly because of a repetitious and piecemeal method of treatment, and partly because the effort to exhibit an affinity between New Testament Christianity and modern liberalism has led to a vagueness of terminology in dealing with the New Testament phenomena which has sometimes obscured the author's meaning. It is therefore not altogether easy to summarize the book. But the following seem to be the chief elements in the author's reconstruction of primitive Christianity.

Jesus of Nazareth, according to Professor Bacon, came forward first as a prophet who sought to reconcile His people to God by continuing (consciously or unconsciously) the work of John the Baptist. This effort having resulted in failure, Jesus then placed His work under the category of Messiahship and as the Messianic king entered into con-