



The Princeton Theological Review

JULY, 1915

HISTORY AND FAITH*

The student of the New Testament should be primarily an historian. The centre and core of all the Bible is history. Everything else that the Bible contains is fitted into an historical framework and leads up to an historical climax. The Bible is primarily a record of events.

That assertion will not pass unchallenged. The modern Church is impatient of history. History, we are told, is a dead thing. Let us forget the Amalekites, and fight the enemies that are at our doors. The true essence of the Bible is to be found in eternal ideas; history is merely the form in which those ideas are expressed. It makes no difference whether the history is real or fictitious; in either case, the ideas are the same. It makes no difference whether Abraham was an historical personage or a myth; in either case his life is an inspiring example of faith. It makes no difference whether Moses was really a mediator between God and Israel; in any case the record of Sinai embodies the idea of a covenant between God and His people. It makes no difference whether Jesus really lived and died and rose again as He is declared to have done in the Gospels; in any case the Gospel picture, be it ideal or be it history, is an encouragement to filial piety. In this way, religion has been made independent, as is thought, of the uncertainties of historical research. The separation of Christianity from history has been a great concern of modern theology. It has been an inspiring attempt. But it has been a failure.

Give up history, and you can retain some things. You

* An address delivered May 3, 1915, by John Gresham Machen on the occasion of his inauguration as Assistant Professor of New Testament Literature and Exegesis in Princeton Theological Seminary.

THE BOOK OF DANIEL AND THE CANON

In all recent works on the Book of Daniel the charge is made, that the position of the book in the Hebrew Canon points to the conclusion that the book was written at a time much later than that at which the Jewish and Christian churches have always and unanimously, until recently, supposed that it was written. Since the last six chapters are in the first person, and since they are dated from the reigns of Belshazzar, Darius the Mede, and Cyrus, no one can doubt that they claim to be the record of visions which can have been known only to Daniel himself. The first six chapters, though written in the third person, purport to record actual events in the lives of Daniel and his three companions during the reigns of Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar, and Darius the Mede. In ancient times, the claim of Daniel to be historical was contested only by Porphyry, a man who rejected all of the sacred books of the Old and New Testaments. Within the last two centuries, however, it has been frequently asserted, that the first six chapters of Daniel are at best but a series of traditions "cast by the author into a literary form, with a special view to the circumstances of his own time"; and that the visions of the last six chapters are a narration of events already past, put in an apocalyptic form.

Among the specifications in this general charge against the historical character of Daniel, is the one which will now be considered, to wit: That the position of the Book of Daniel in the Hebrew Canon points "more or less decisively to an author later than Daniel himself"

In the discussion of this specific charge, I shall pursue the following method. First, I shall state the charge in the words of those that make it. Secondly, I shall present the admissions and assumptions involved in the charge. Thirdly, I shall cite and discuss the evidence upon which these assumptions rest. And, lastly, I shall give the conclusions which the evidence seems to justify.

THE CHARGE

The first proof of the late date of Daniel is "the position of the Book in the Jewish Canon, not among the Prophets, but in the miscellaneous collection of writings called the *Hagiographa*, and among the latest of these, in proximity to Esther. Though little definite is known respecting the formation of the Canon, the division known as the Prophets was doubtless formed prior to the *Hagiographa*; and had the Book of Daniel existed at the time, it is reasonable to suppose that it would have ranked as the work of a prophet, and have been included among the former".¹

In the Hebrew Scriptures "Daniel never occupied a place among the Prophetical Books, but is included in the third collection of sacred writings, called the *Kethubim* or *Hagiographa*. Of the history of the Jewish Canon very little is known with certainty, but there is every reason to believe that the collection of Prophetical Books, from which lessons were read in the Synagogue, was definitely closed sometime before the *Hagiographa*, of which the greater part had no place in the public services. That the collection of Prophetical Books cannot have been completed till sometime after the Exile, is obvious, and on the supposition that Daniel was then known to the Jews, the exclusion of this book is wholly inexplicable."²

³"The place of the Book of Daniel among the *Hagiographa* favors also its late composition. If it had been written during the Exile, notwithstanding its apocalyptic character, it naturally would have been placed among the prophets."³

"Not until the time of the LXX (which, moreover, has treated the text of Daniel in a very arbitrary fashion) does it find a place, after Ezekiel, as the fourth of the 'great'

¹ Driver, *Literature of the Old Testament*, p. 497.

² A. A. Bevan, *A Short Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, p. II.

³ E. L. Curtis in *Hastings Bible Dictionary*.

prophets, and thus it comes to pass that once in the New Testament Daniel is designated as a prophet."⁴

"The position of the book among the Hagiographa instead of among the Prophetical works would seem to indicate that it must have been introduced after the closing of the Prophetical Canon." "The natural explanation regarding the position of the Book of Daniel is that the work could not have been in existence at the time of the completion of the second part of the Canon, as otherwise, the collectors of the Prophetical writings, who in this case did not neglect even the parable of Jonah, would hardly have ignored the record of such a great prophet as Daniel is represented to be."⁵

Among "objective reasons of the utmost weight, which render the view of its non-genuineness necessary", Professor Cornill mentions "the position of the book in the Hebrew Canon, where it is inserted, not among the prophets, but in the second division of the Canon, the so-called Hagiographa. If it were the work of a prophet of the time of Cyrus, no reason would be evident, why there should be withheld from it a designation which was not denied to a Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi—nay, even to a Jonah".⁶

"In the Hebrew Canon, Daniel is not placed among the Prophets, but in the Hagiographa, the latest section of the Canon; although Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, who were later than the time at which Daniel is described as living, are placed among the prophets. Either the Jews did not regard the book as prophetical, or it was considerably later than Malachi, c. 444."⁷

ASSUMPTIONS

The assumptions involved in the above statements are as follows: 1. It is assumed that the position of a book in the Hebrew Canon determines the time of its writing, or

⁴ Kamphausen in *Encyclopædia Biblica*, Vol. i, p. 1011.

⁵ Prince, *Commentary on Daniel*, pp. 15-16.

⁶ *Introduction to the Old Testament*, pp. 384-6.

⁷ Bennett; *A Biblical Introduction*, p. 225.

2. at least that the position of a book in the Hebrew Bible determines the time of its admission into the Canon. 3. It is assumed that the division of the Hebrew Bible called "Prophets" in our Hebrew Bibles was doubtless formed prior to the Hagiographa. 4. It is assumed that had the book of Daniel existed at the time when the division called Prophets was formed, it is reasonable to suppose, that if it had been ranked among the prophetic books, it would have been placed in this division. 5. It is assumed that no reason is evident why there should have been withheld from a Daniel a designation which was not denied to a Haggai, a Zechariah, and a Malachi—nay, even to a Jonah. 6. It is assumed that Daniel never occupied a place among the prophetic books. 7. It is assumed that the collection of prophetic books from which lessons were read in the synagogues, was definitely closed before the Hagiographa. 8. It is assumed that the greater part of the Hagiographa had no place in the public services.

ADMISSIONS OF THE CRITICS

Before proceeding to a discussion of these assumptions, special attention should be called to the admissions of the critics on the matter of the evidence bearing on the assumptions; and on the character of the premises that justify these critics in their conclusions. First, as to the evidence, Dr. Driver admits that "little definite is known respecting the formation of the Canon". Mr. Bevan, also, admits that "of the history of the Jewish Canon very little is known". Secondly, as to the character of the premises from which they deduce their conclusions, it will be noted in the above citations, that Dr. Driver says, after having admitted that very little is known respecting the formation of the Canon, that the division known as the Prophets was "doubtless formed prior to the Hagiographa", and that "it is reasonable to suppose that the Book of Daniel would have been included among the former". Professor Cornill says that "no reason is evident why Daniel should not be among the

Prophets". Professor Prince says that the position of the book would seem to indicate, that it was introduced into the Canon after the closing of the Prophetical Canon, and the natural explanation of its position is that it did not exist at the time of the closing of the Prophetical Canon. Mr. Bevan says that there is every reason to believe that the collection of Haphtaroth was made before the closing of the Hagiographa; and that on the supposition that Daniel was known, his exclusion from the Prophetical Canon is inexplicable, or not very easy to reconcile with the theory of the antiquity of the Book.

It will be observed that, while admitting that little is known, the critics indulge in such phrases and words as "doubtless", "reasonable to suppose", "seem to indicate", "every reason to believe", "supposition", "not easy to reconcile", "inexplicable", "natural explanation", and so forth. All of these words and phrases are admissions on the part of the critics that their theory with regard to the book of Daniel is not convincingly supported by the evidence, even themselves being witnesses.

EVIDENCE

The evidence bearing upon the divisions, number, order, and use of the books regarded by the Jews and Christians as canonical may, for convenience of treatment, be marshalled under two heads: 1, the evidence relating to the divisions, number and order; and 2, that relating to the use.

1. *Divisions, Number and Order*

1. Ben Sira, the elder, speaks a number of times of the Law,⁸ and cites in order Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Job, The Twelve Prophets, and Nehemiah. He cites, also, from Chronicles, and mentions the Psalms of David and the Proverbs of Solomon.⁹

2. The Prologue to the Greek translation of Ben Sira,

⁸ References to the Torah are found in 15-1; 32.15, 17, 18, 24; 33.2, 13; 41.4, 8; 42.2; 45.5; 48.3, 6; 49.4; 50.20.

⁹ Chapters 44-49.

written about 132 B.C., refers three times to the three-fold division of the Old Testament, as follows: (1) The Law and the Prophets and the other books which follow them. (2). The Law and the Prophets and the other ancestral books. (3). The Law and the Prophecies and the rest of the books.

3. The First Book of Maccabees contains the following speech delivered by Mattathias, the father of the Maccabees, to his sons in the year 169 B.C., just before his decease (ii. 49^b-61): "Now hath pride and rebuke gotten strength, and the time of destruction, and the wrath of indignation: now therefore, my sons, be ye zealous for the Law and give your lives for the covenant of your fathers. Call to remembrance what acts our fathers did in their time; so shall you receive great honor and an everlasting name. Was not Abraham found faithful in temptation, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness? Joseph in the time of his distress kept the commandment and was made lord of Egypt. Phinehas our father in being zealous and fervent obtained the covenant of an everlasting priesthood. Jesus for fulfilling the word was made a judge in Israel. Caleb for bearing witness before the congregation received the heritage of the land. David for being merciful possessed the throne of an everlasting kingdom. Elias for being zealous and fervent for the Law was taken up into heaven. Ananias, Azarias, and Misael, by believing were saved out of the flame. Daniel for his innocency was delivered from the mouth of lions. And thus consider ye throughout all ages, that none that put their trust in him shall be overcome," etc.

4. The Second Book of Maccabees contains a letter written in 124 B.C., in which the writer speaks (ii. 13) of "the records and commentaries of Nehemiah and how founding a library, he gathered together the books concerning the kings and prophets and those of David and epistles of kings concerning votive offerings." The Syriac version is slightly different and reads thus: "It is related in books

and in memoirs that Nehemiah did thus: that he assembled and arranged in order the books of the kingdoms and of the prophets and of David and the letters of the kings which concern offerings and sacrifices".¹⁰

5. Philo, who died about A.D. 40, says that the sect of the Therapeutae received "the Law, and the Oracles uttered by the Prophets, and the hymns and the other (writings) by which knowledge and piety are augmented and perfected".¹¹

6. In the New Testament the following passages bear upon our subject: (1). In Luke xxiv. 44, the Lord speaks of those things which were written concerning Him "in the Law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms". (2). In Luke xxiv. 27, the author speaks of "Moses and all the Prophets". With this compare "Law and the Prophets" of John i. 45. (3). In Matthew xxiv. 15, mention is made of "Daniel the prophet". With this compare "David the prophet" Mat. xiii. 35, Acts ii. 30; "Isaiah the prophet", Mat. iii. 3, "Jonah the prophet", Mat. xii. 39; and "the prophet Joel" Acts ii. 16.

7. Josephus has the following to say of the Canon: "We have not an innumerable multitude of books among us, disagreeing from and contradicting one another, but only twenty-two books, which contain the records of all the past times; which are justly believed to be divine; and of them five belong to Moses, which contain his laws, and the traditions of the origin of mankind till his death. This interval of time was little short of three thousand years; but as to the time from the death of Moses till the reign of Artaxerxes king of Persia, who reigned after Xerxes, the prophets, who were after Moses, wrote down what was done in their times in thirteen books. The remaining four

¹⁰ See Lagarde, *Libri Apocryphi Veteris Testamenti Syriace*, p. 216.

¹¹ *De Vita contemplativa*, ii. 475. The genuineness of this work has been defended in recent times by F. C. Conybeare, P. Wendland, and L. Massebieau; the last of whom has "shown with great thoroughness that in language and thought alike it is essentially Philonic". See Art. by Professor Bigg in *Ency. Brit.* XXI. 412.

books contain hymns to God, and precepts for the conduct of human life. It is true, our history has been written since Artaxerxes, very particularly, but hath not been esteemed of like authority with the former by our forefathers, because there hath not been an exact succession of prophets since that time; and how firmly we have given credit to those books of our own nation is evident by what we do; for during so many ages as have already passed, no one has been so bold as either to add anything to them or take anything from them".¹²

Of Daniel himself, Josephus says: "He was so happy as to have strange revelations made to him and those as to one of the greatest of the prophets. . . . He retains a remembrance that will never fail, for the several books that he wrote and left behind him are still read by us till this time; and from them we believe that Daniel conversed with God; for he did not only prophesy of future events, as did the other prophets, but he also determined the time of their accomplishment; and while the prophets used to foretell misfortunes, and on that account were disagreeable both to the kings and to the multitude, Daniel was to them a prophet of good things, and this to such a degree, that, by the agreeable nature of his predictions, he procured the good-will of all men; and by the accomplishment of them, he procured the belief of their truth, and the opinion of (a sort of) divinity for himself, among the multitude. He also wrote and left behind him what made manifest the accuracy and undeniable veracity of his predictions. . . . And indeed it so came to pass, that our nation suffered these things under Antiochus Epiphanes, according to Daniel's vision, and what he wrote many years before they came to pass. In the very same manner Daniel also wrote concerning the Roman government, and that our country should be made desolate by them. All these things did this man leave in writing, as God had showed them to him, insomuch as that such as read his prophecies, and see

¹² *Contra Apion*, i. 8.

how they have been fulfilled, would wonder at the honor with which God honored Daniel".¹³

8. In his Eclogues, a collection of testimonies to Christ and Christianity made from the Old Testament, Melito, Bishop of Sardis about A.D. 175, gives "a catalogue of the books of the Old Testament which it is necessary to quote". We have two recensions of this catalogue, one in the Church History of Eusebius, iv. 26, the other in the Syriac fragments published by Cureton. The Greek of Eusebius reads: "Melito to his brother Onesimus, Greeting: since thou hast often, in thy zeal for the word, expressed a wish to have extracts made from the Law and the Prophets concerning the Saviour, and concerning our entire faith, and hast also desired to have an accurate statement of the ancient books, as regards their number and their order, I have endeavored to perform the task, knowing thy zeal for the faith, and thy desire to gain information in regard to the word, and knowing that thou, in the yearning after God, esteemest these things above all else, struggling to attain eternal salvation. Accordingly, when I went East, and came to the place where these things were preached and done, I learned accurately the books of the Old Testament, and sent them to thee as written below. Their names are as follows: Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Leviticus, Deuteronomy, five books; Jesus Nave, Judges, Ruth; of Kings, four books; of Chronicles, two; the Psalms of David, the Proverbs of Solomon, which also is Wisdom, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Job; of Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah; of the twelve prophets, one book; Daniel, Ezekiel, Esdras."

From the Syriac recension I shall give only the names in order, to wit: "Of Moses, five (books), Genesis, and Exodus, and Numbers and that of the Priests, and Deuteronomy; and again that of Joshua son of Nun, and the book of Judges and Ruth; and the book of four Kings; the book of two Chronicles; and the Psalms of David; and of Solomon, the Proverbs, which is Wisdom, and Koheleth,

¹³ *Antiquities*, X. xi. 7.

and the Song of Songs; and Job; and of the Prophets, Isaiah and Jeremiah, and the Twelve Prophets together, and Daniel, and Ezekiel and Ezra.”

9. In Chapter iv. 21-22 of *The Ascension of Isaiah*, is found the following partial list of Old Testament books: “All these things, behold they are written in the Psalms, in the Parables of David the son of Jesse, and in the Proverbs of Solomon his son, and in the words of Korah and Ethan the Israelite, and in the words of Asaph, and in the rest of the Psalms also which the angel of the Spirit inspired. 22. (Namely), in those which have not the name written, and in the words of my father Amos, and of Hosea the prophet, and of Micah and Joel and Nahum, and Jonah and Obadiah and Habakkuk and Haggai and Zephaniah and Zechariah and Malachi and in the words of Joseph the Just, and in the words of Daniel.”¹⁴

10. In the first chapter of *Fourth Esdras*, the Minor Prophets are enumerated in the following order: Hosea, Amos and Micah, Joel, Obadiah and Jonah, Nahum and Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, which is called also an angel of the Lord”.

11. In the Talmud, the following are the most important allusions to the Old Testament Canon.

(1) “The Rabbis have taught the order of succession in the Books of the Prophets runs thus: Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Isaiah, and the Twelve. The order of succession in the Hagiographa is: Ruth, the Book of Psalms, Job and Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Songs, and Lamentations, Daniel and the Book of Esther, Ezra and Chronicles.”¹⁵

(2) “All Sacred Scriptures render the hands unclean. The Song of Songs and Ecclesiastes render the hands

¹⁴ See *The Ascension of Isaiah* by R. H. Charles. If we put these verses in the Testament of Hezekiah, they will have been written according to Charles between A.D. 88 and 100. If they belong to the Redactor, they were written about A.D. 200. See pp. xlv-xlv.

¹⁵ *Baba Bathra* 14b.

unclean." "All the Scriptures are holy."¹⁶ "The Aramaic portions of Ezra and Daniel render the hands unclean." "The Sadducees said: 'we blame you Pharisees because you say Sacred Scriptures render the hands unclean, but the books of Hameram¹⁷ do not render the hands unclean'. . . . They say that the bones of an ass are clean, but the bones of Jochanan the High Priest are unclean." "According to their value is their uncleanness, so that no one may make the bones of his father and mother into spoons." "So are the Sacred Scriptures; according to their value is their uncleanness. The books of Hameram, which are not valued, do not render the hands unclean".¹⁸

(3) "Rab Yehuda alleges that Shemuel said the book of Esther does not defile the hands. This is tantamount to saying that it was Shemuel's opinion that the book of Esther was not dictated by the Holy Spirit. But Shemuel asserted that the book of Esther was dictated by the Holy Spirit."¹⁹

(4) "Remember that man with respect; his name is Hananiah the son of Hezekiah. Had it not been for him, the book of Ezekiel would have been suppressed, because its contents were contradictory to the words of the Law."²⁰

(5) On the festival of the Year, three texts at least were read from the Law, three from the Psalms, and three from the Prophets.²¹

(6) On the Day of Atonement, selections were read to the High Priest "in Job and in Ezra and in Chronicles. Zechariah, the son of Kebutal said, 'I often read before him in Daniel'. "²²

¹⁶ *Yadayim*, iii. 5. Id. iv. 4.

¹⁷ Perhaps Hameram is Homer.

¹⁸ *Yadayim*, iv. 5.

¹⁹ *Megilla*, fol. 7d. See Hershon, *Treasures of the Talmud*, p. 44

²⁰ Hershon, p. 45. *Moed Katan*, 5a. In a note, Hershon adds: "Rashi *in loco* points Ezek. xliv. 31 and xlv. 20 as contradictions to the Law. From the former text it might be inferred that Israelites are allowed to eat that which was prohibited to the priests, and this would be a contradiction to the Law. The second passage contains an innovation of the prophet, for the Law says nothing about such a sacrifice as that on the second day of the month".

²¹ See Barclay, *The Talmud*, p. 157.

²² *Yoma*, i. 6.

(7) "The Chaldee (Aramaic) passages in Ezra and Daniel defile the hands."²³

(8) "All the Holy Scriptures may be saved from fire on the Sabbath". "This is interpreted as referring to the Hagiographa as well as to the Law and the Prophets."²⁴

(9) All the books of the Old Testament are cited as Scripture in one or another of the tractates of the Mishna. The two usual formulas of citation are "It is written", and "It is said", both being used alike for quotations from the Law, the Prophets, and the Hagiographa. For example, (a) "It is written". Deut. xvi. 14, in *Moedkaton*; 1 Kings vi. 20 in *Megillah*; Dan. ii. 46 in *Sanhedrin*, Dan. iii. 12 in *Megillah*. (b). "It is said". Gen. xxiv. 42 in *Sanhedrin*; 1 Sam. xv. 32, *id.*; Dan. ii. 32, *id.*

(10) Especially to be noted is the citation of all of the so-called disputed books, Proverbs, Chronicles, Jonah, Ezekiel, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Songs, and Esther, with the same formulas as those employed for the Law. E.g., 2 Chron. xxxiii. 13, *Sanhedrin*: Proverbs, iii. 2, 8, 16, 18, iv. 9, 22, *Aboth*; Ezekiel xli. 22, *Aboth*; Jonah iii. 10, *Taanith*; Ecc. i. 15, *Sukkoth*, *Chagiga*; Song of Songs iii. 11, *Taanith*; Esther ii. 22, *Aboth*. A citation from the Song of Songs, iii. 9, 10, is introduced by the phrase "the explanation of the Prophets is", *Sukkoth*, vi.

(11) "Some desired also to withdraw (*ganaz*) the book of Proverbs from use because it contained internal contradictions,²⁵ but the attempt was abandoned because the wise men declared: 'We have examined more deeply into the book of Ecclesiastes, and have discovered the solution of the difficulty'.²⁶

(12) "At first, they withdrew Proverbs, and the Song of Songs, and Ecclesiastes from public use, because they

²³ *Yadayim*, iv. 5.

²⁴ *Shabbath*, xvi.

²⁵ E.g. xxvi. 4 and 5, "Answer a fool according to his folly", and "Answer not a fool according to his folly".

²⁶ *Sabbath*, 30 b.

spoke in parables. And so they continued, until the men of the Great Synagogue came and expounded them."²⁷

(13) "The wise men desired to hide (ganaz) the book of Koheleth, because its language was often self-contradictory."²⁸

(14) "Again, it was asserted that Ecclesiastes contradicted other Scriptures. Thus, in *Sabbath* 30a, where it is asserted that the Preacher contradicts the words of the Psalter: "O Solomon, where is thy wisdom? where is thy discernment? Doth it not suffice thee that many of thy words contradict the utterances of David, that thou contradicest even thyself?"²⁹

(15) "Moses wrote his own book, as also the chapter of Balaam's prophecy and Parables, and the book of Job. Joshua wrote his own book and the last eight verses of the Pentateuch. Samuel wrote his own book, and also Judges and Ruth. David wrote the book of Psalms through the ten elders Adam, Melchisedek, Abraham, Moses, Heman, Jeduthun, Asaph, and the three sons of Korah. Jeremiah wrote his own book, as also the Kings and the Lamentations. Hezekiah and his company wrote the book of Isaiah, Proverbs, Canticles, and Ecclesiastes. The men of the Great Synagogue wrote the book of Ezekiel, the twelve Minor Prophets, the book of Daniel, and the book of Esther. Ezra wrote his own book and joined on the Chronicles."³⁰

(16) Next to the Law, most of the so-called disputed Books were most highly honored in the services of the Temple. Thus, (a) Jonah was the only one of the Prophets of which the whole was read in the public services. On the Sabbaths and Feast days, selections, called Haphtaroth, were read from the other Prophets; but the whole of Jonah

²⁷ *Aboth di Rabbi Nathan*.

²⁸ *Sabbath*, 30. E.g., "sorrow is better than laughter" (vii. 3), and "I said of laughter, it is to be praised" (ii. 2).

²⁹ See Ryle, *The Canon of the O. T.* p. 196.

³⁰ *Baba Bathra*, 14 b.

was read on the day of Atonement.³¹ (b) Twelve Haphtaroth were selected from the Book of Ezekiel, sixteen from Isaiah, nine from Jeremiah, fifteen from the Minor Prophets (one at least from all except Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah and Haggai), three from Joshua, three from Judges, six from Samuel, ten from First Kings, and five from Second Kings. No Prophet, except Isaiah, was more highly honored in this respect than Ezekiel. (c) Aside from the Law and Jonah, only three other books were wholly read in the public services of the Temple. These were all from the Hagiographa, and were: Ecclesiastes, read at the Feast of Tabernacles; the Song of Songs, read at the Feast of the Passover; and Esther, at the Feast of Purim. There is evidence that the book of Esther was thus read as early as the middle of the second century B.C. (d) Parts, at least, of Chronicles were read to the High Priest during his preparation for the functions of the day of Atonement.³² (e) Although the Book of Proverbs was not read in the public services, it is cited in the Mishna for proof texts more frequently than any other book of the Hagiographa, except the Psalter. E.g., in *Aboth* from sections iii. 14 to vi. 10 inclusive, there are citations of Proverbs iv. 2, xvi. 32, viii. 21, 14, xi. 22, iii. 35, iv. 22, 9, iii. 2, 8, 16, 18, i. 9, xvi. 31, xvii. 6, vi. 22, viii. 22, xvi. 3.

12. The Old Testament Books as given in the principal Greek Manuscripts. (1). They all agree in the number and order of the Pentateuch, to wit: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy. (2). For the rest of the books, the order is as follows: (a). For Codex Vaticanus: Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Kingdoms a-d, Paraleipomenon a-b, Esdras a-b, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Asma (the Song), Job, Wisdom of Solomon, Wisdom of Sirach, Esther, Judith, Tobit, Hosea, Amos, Micah, Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah,

³¹ See the conspectus of the Haphtaroth at the end of any good edition of the Hebrew Bible.

³² See *Kippurim*, i. 6.

Malachi, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Baruch, Lamentations, Epistle of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel. (b). For Codex Alexandrinus: "Joshua son of Nun, Judges, Ruth (together books 7), Kingdoms a-d, Paraleipomenon a-b (together six books); Prophets 16, Hosea, Amos, Micah, Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Isaiah (the) Prophet, Jeremiah (the) Prophet, Baruch, Lamentations (of Jeremiah), Epistles of Jeremiah, Ezekiel (the) Prophet, Daniel (+ Prophet, 16 in *catalogue*), Esther, Tobit, Judith, Ezras a the Priest, Ezras b the Priest, Maccabees a-d, Psalter, Job, Proverbs of Solomon, Ecclesiastes, Songs of Songs, Wisdom of Solomon (the Panaretos), Wisdom of Jesus son of Sirach, Psalms of Solomon. (c). For Codex Sinaiticus, so far as known: "Paraleipomenon a-(b), Esdras (a)-b, Esther, Tobit, Judith, Maccabees a-d, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentations of Jeremiah, . . . Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Psalms of Dadibi, Proverbs (+ of Solomon in *subscrip.*) Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Wisdom of Jesus son of Sirach, Job. (d). For Codex Basiliano-Venetus: Joshua, Ruth, Judges, Kingdoms a-d, Paraleipomenon a-b, Esdras (a)-b, Esther, . . . Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Wisdom of Jesus son of Sirach, Hosea, Amos, Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Baruch, Lamentations, Ezekiel, Daniel, Tobit, Judith, Maccabees a-d.³³

13. (1) The Armenian version has the following order: "Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Kings 4, Chronicles 2, Esdras 1 and 2, Nehemiah, Esther, Judith, Tobit, Maccabees 1-3, Psalms, Proverbs, Koheleth, Song of Songs, Wisdom, Job, Isaiah, Hosea, Amos, Micah, Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Jeremiah, Lamentations, Daniel, Ezekiel." In an Appendix, after the New Testament, it adds Sirakh, IIIrd Ezra, Manasseh, IIIrd

³³ For these lists, see Swete's *Introduction to the O. T. in Greek* and Ryle's *Canon of the O. T.*

Corinthians, John?, and the Prayer of Eithami.^{33b} (2). The Ambrosian codex of the Harclensian Syriac contains the following: Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon, the Two Wisdoms, the Twelve Prophets, Jeremiah (with Baruch, Lamentations, and the Epistle), Daniel (with Susanna and Bel), Ezekiel, Isaiah. (3). The order in several fragments of the Itala is as follows: (a). In the *Fragmenta Wirceburgensia*: Hosea, Jonah, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentations, Ezekiel, Daniel, Bel. (b). In the *Fragmenta Weingartensia*: Hosea, Amos, Micah, Joel, Jonah, Ezekiel, Daniel. (c). In the *Fragmenta palimpsesta Vaticana*: Hosea, Joel, Amos, Jonah, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Zechariah. (d). In the *Fragmenta Stutgardiana*: Amos, Ezekiel, Daniel.³⁴

14. The lists in the Greek fathers are as follows:³⁵

(1). Origen: Joshua the son of Nun, Judges, Ruth, Kings a-d, Paraleipomenon a-b, Esdas a-b, Book of Psalms, Proverbs of Solomon, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Isaiah, Jeremiah with Lamentations and the Epistle in one, Daniel, Ezekiel, Job, Esther. And beside (*hexo*) these, is the Maccabees.

(2). The list of Athanasius is the same as that of Origen as far as the Song of Songs. After that we have: Job; Prophets,—the Twelve, Isaiah, Jeremiah and with him Baruch, Lamentations, Epistle, Ezekiel, Daniel. There are also other books beside these, not canonized by the fathers, but approved to be read with those now listed: Wisdom of Solomon, Wisdom of Sirach, Esther, Judith, Tobias.

(3). The list of Cyril of Jerusalem: The first books, the five of Moses: Gen. Ex. Lev. Num. Deut.; and besides, Joshua the son of Nun (and) the book of Judges with Ruth; and of the remaining historical books, Kingdoms 4, Esdras 2, Esther (twelfth); and there are found five poetical books, Job, the book of Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Songs (seventeenth book); and in addition five

^{33b} See the edition of the Old Armenian Bible published in 1804.

³⁴ See Swete's *Introduction*, pp. 96, 97.

³⁵ For Melito, see above under 7.

prophetical (books), one of Isaiah, one of Jeremiah with Baruch and Lamentations and the Epistle, Ezekiel, Daniel (twenty-second book).

(4). There are three lists of Epiphanius, no two of them alike. (a). Gen. Ex. Lev. Num. Deut. Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Job, Psalter, Prov. of Sol. Ecc. Song of Songs, Kingdoms 4, Chron. 2, The Dodekapropheton, Isaiah the Prophet, Jeremiah the Prophet with Lamentations and his Epistles and Baruch, Ezekiel the Prophet, Daniel the Prophet, Esdra 2, Esther. (b). Five Law books (the Pentateuch and the Nomothesia Genesis-Deuteronomy). Five Poetical books. (Job, Psalter, Prob. of Sol. Ecc. Song of Songs'.) Another Pentateuch, called Grapheia, and by some Hagiographa (Joshua the son of Nun, the Book of Judges with Ruth, Chron. 2, Kingdoms a, b, Kingdoms c, d). The Prophetical Pentateuch (the Dodekapropheton, Isa. Jer. Ezek. Daniel). Two others (two of Esdra, called one, Esther), that of Solomon called the Panarete; the book of Jesus the son of Sirach. (c). The Law as in a. The (book) of Joshua the son of Nun, Job, Judges, Ruth, the Psalter, Chronicles 2, Kingdoms a-d, the book of Proverbs, the Preacher, the Song of Songs, the Dodekapropheton, of the Prophet Isaiah, of Jeremiah, of Ezekiel, of Daniel, of Esdra a, b, of Esther.

(5). The list of Gregory of Nazianzus. The twelve historical books, Gen. Ex. Lev. Num. Deut. Josh. Jud. Ruth, Acts of Kings, Chron. Esdras. Five poetical books, Job, David, three of Solomon, -Ecc. Song, Proverbs. Five prophetical books, the Twelve, -Hos. Amos, Micah, Joel, Jonah, Ob. Nah. Hab. Zeph. Hag. Zech. Mal. -Isa. Jer. Ezek. Daniel.

(6) The list of Amphilochius. The Pentateuch, Creation (ktisis), Ex. Lev. Num. Deut. Jos. Judges, Ruth, Kingdoms a-d, Chron. a, b, Esdras a, b, Five poetical books, Job, Psalms, Three of Solomon,—Prov. Ecc. Song of Songs. The Twelve Prophets,—Hos. Amos, Micah, Joel, Ob. Jonah, Nah. Hab. Zeph. Hag. Zech. Mal. The four

Prophets,—Isa. Jer. Ezek. Daniel. To these some adjudge Esther.

(7) The list of Pseudo-Chrysostom. The historical (part). The Octateuch,—Gen. Ex. Lev. Num. Deut. Joshua the son of Nun, Judges, Ruth. The Kingdoms a-d, Esdras. The advisory (symboleutic) part, as the Proverbs, the Wisdom of Sirach, the Preacher, the Song of Songs. The prophetic (part), as the sixteen Prophets. Ruth(?) =Job(?), David.

(8). The Synopsis, revised by Lagarde. The Mosaic. Gen. Ex. Lev. Num. Deut. The others, Joshua the son of Nun, Judges, Ruth—the Octateuch. The Tetrabasileion, a, b, c, d, Chronicles a, b, Esdra a, b, Esther, Tobit, Judith, Job. Of Solomon, Wisdom, Proverbs, Ecc. Song of Songs. The Twelve Prophets, Hos. Amos, Micah, Joel, Ob. Jonah, Nah. Hab. Zeph. Hag. Zech. Mal. The four great Prophets, Isa. Jer. Ezek. Daniel. The end of the sixteen Prophets. Wisdom of Jesus the son of Sirach.

(9) The list of the anonymous Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila. The Mosaic Pentateuch, Gen. Ex. Lev. Num. Deut. The son of Nun, the Judges with Ruth, the Chronicles, a, b, of the Kingdoms a, b, of the Kingdoms c, d, Job, the Psalter of David, the Proverbs of Solomon, the Preacher with the Songs, the Dodekapropheton, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Esdras, Judith, Esther. Apocrypha: Tobias, the Wisdom of Solomon, the Wisdom of Jesus the son of Sirach.

(10) The list of Junilius. Histories (XVII): Gen. Ex. Lev. Num. Deut. Josh. Judges, Ruth, Kingdoms I-IV (many add: Chronicles 2, Job 1, Tobias 1, Esdras 2, Judith 1, Esther 1, Maccabees 2). Prophecies (XVII): Psalms CL, Hosea, Isaiah, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi. Proverbs (II): Proverbs of Solomon, Jesus son of Sirach. (Some add the book of Wisdom, and the Songs of Songs). Dogmatics (I): Ecclesiastes.

(11) The list of the Pseudo-Athanasius. Gen. Ex. Lev.

Num. Deut. Joshua the son of Nun, Judges, Ruth, of Kingdoms a, b, of Kingdoms c, d, of Chronicles a, b, Esdras a, b, the Davidic Psalter, the Proverbs of Solomon, Ecclesiastes of the same, Song of Songs, Job, Twelve Prophets numbered as one: Hos. Amos, Micah, Joel, Ob. Jonah, Nah. Hab. Zeph. Hag. Zech. Mal.; and besides these, four others, Isa. Jer. Ezek. Dan. And beside these, there are other books as follows: Wisdom of Solomon, Wisdom of Sirach, Esther, Judith, Tobias, four books of Maccabees, the Psalms and Ode of Solomon, Susannah.

(12) The list of Leontius. The Historical Books (12): Gen. Ex. Num. Lev. Deut. Joshua the son of Nun, Judges, Ruth, the Words (logoi) of the Kingdoms a-d, Chronicles, Esdras. The Prophetical (Books) (5): Isa. Jer. Ezek. Dan. the Dodekapropheton. The Paranetic (Books) (4): Job, Proverbs of Solomon, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Songs, the Psalterion.

(13) The list of John of Damascus. The First Pentateuch, which also is Nomothesia. Gen. Ex. Lev. Num. Deut. The Second Pentateuch, which is called Grapheia, but by some Hagiographa: Joshua the son of Nun, Judges with Ruth, of Kingdoms a, b, of Kingdoms c, d, of Chronicles a, b. The Third Pentateuch, the Poetical (sticherai) Books, that of Job, the Psalterion, Proverbs of Solomon, Ecclesiastes of the same, the Song of Songs of the same. The Fourth Pentateuch, the Prophetical,—the Dodekapropheton, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel. Two Others: Book of Esdra a, b, Esther. The Paranetic, that is, the Wisdom of Solomon, the Wisdom of Jesus.

(14) The list of Nicephorus. (A) Writings approved by the Church and canonized: Gen. Ex. Lev. Num. Deut. Josh. Judges and Ruth, of Kingdoms a, b, of Kingdoms c, d, Chronicles a, b, Esdras a, b, Book of Psalms, Proverbs of Solomon, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Job, Isaiah the Prophet, Jeremiah the Prophet, Baruch, Ezekiel, Daniel, the Twelve Prophets. Together the 22 books of the Old Testament. (B) Books that are disputed and not approved by the

Church. Maccabees 3, Wisdom of Solomon, Wisdom of the son of Sirach, Psalms and Odes of Solomon, Esther, Judith, Susanna, Tobit which also is Tobias.

(15) List of the Canons of Laodicea. Genesis of the World, Exodus from Egypt, Leviticus, Numbers, Deut. Joshua the son of Nun, Judges-Ruth, Esther, of Kingdoms a, b, of Kingdoms c, d, of Chronicles a, b, Esdras a, b, the Book of Psalms, Proverbs of Solomon, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Job, Twelve Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah and Baruch, Lamentations and Epistles, Ezekiel, Daniel.

(16) List of the Apostolic Canons. Five of Moses (Gen. Ex. Lev. Num. Deut.), Joshua the son of Nun, Ruth, four of Kingdoms, two of Chronicles, two of Esdras, Esther, three of Maccabees, Job, Psalter, three of Solomon (Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs), one of the Twelve Prophets, Isaiah one, Jeremiah one, Ezekiel one, Daniel one. Besides, learn by inquiry, that your youths learn the Wisdom of the very learned Sirach.

(17) The list of the Cod. Barocc. Concerning the books of the LXX and those not included in them. Gen. Ex. Lev. Num. Deut. Joshua, Judges and Ruth, of Kingdoms a-d, Chronicles a, b, Job, Psalter, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Esdras, Hosea, Amos, Micah, Joel, Jonas, Obadiah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel. . . . And in addition to the LXX, the Wisdom of Solomon, the Wisdom of Sirach, of Maccabees a-d, Esther, Judith, Tobit.

(18) The list of Ebedyesu. Gen. Ex. the Book of Priests, Num. Deut. Joshua son of Nun, Judges, Samuel, of Kings, Book of Dabariamin, Ruth, Psalms of David the King, Proverbs of Solomon, Koheleth, Song of Songs, Son of Sira, Great Wisdom, Job, Isaiah, Hos. Joel, Amos, Obad. Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Hab. Zephaniah, Hag. Zech. Mal. Jer. Ezek. Daniel, Judith, Esther, Susanna, Esdras, Daniel Minor, Epistle of Baruch, Book of the Tradition of the Elders, Proverbs of Joseph, History of the sons of Samona, the Book of Maccabees (I-III).

(19). The list of Hilary. I-V. The five books of Moses. VI. Joshua the son of Nun. VII. Judges and Ruth, VIII. of Kings 1, 11, IX. of Kings 3, 4, X. Chronicles 1, 2, XI. Accounts (sermons) of the days of Esdras, XII. Book of Psalms, XIII-XV. Proverbs of Solomon, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs. XVI. The Twelve Prophets, XVII-XXII. Isaiah, Jeremiah, with Lamentations and Epistle, Daniel, Ezekiel, Job, Esther, (XXIII-XXIV. Tobias, Judith).

(20) The list of Ruffinus. The five books of Moses (Gen. Ex. Lev. Num. Deut.), Joshua the son of Nun, Judges along with Ruth, Kings IV, Chronicle (=Book of Days), of Esdras 2, Esther, of the Prophets (Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, the Twelve Prophets, one book), Job, Psalms of David, of Solomon 3 (Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs). Wisdom of Solomon, Wisdom of Sirach (=Ecclesiasticus), Tobias, Judith, the books of Maccabees.

(21) The list of Augustine. Histories. Five of Moses (Gen. Ex. Lev. Num. Deut.), Joshua son of Nun, Judges, Ruth, Four books of Kings, Two books of Chronicles, Job, Tobias, Esther, Judith, Two books of Maccabees, Two books of Esdras. Prophecies. The book of the Psalms of David, Three books of Solomon (Proverbs, Song of Songs, Ecclesiastes), Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, The Twelve Prophets (Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habukkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi), The volume of the four Major Prophets (Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, Ezekiel).³⁶

(22) The list of Innocent I. The five books of Moses (Gen. Ex. Lev. Num. Deut.), Joshua son of Nun, Judges, Four books of Kings, Ruth, Sixteen books of the Prophets, Five books of Solomon, The Psalter, Histories: Job, Tobias, Esther, Judith, Two books of Maccabees, Two books of Esdras, Two books of Chronicles.

(23) The list of the Pseudo-Gelasius. Five books of Moses, Gen. Ex. Lev. Num. Deut. Joshua son of Nun,

³⁶ The twelve Minor Prophets and the four Major are embraced by Augustine under the phrase "proprie prophetae".

Judges, Ruth, Four of Kings. Likewise the books of the prophets, sixteen in number (Isa. Jer. Ezek. Dan. Hos. Amos, Micah, Joel, Obad. Jonah, Nah. Zeph. Hag. Zech. Mal.), two of Chronicles, 150 Psalms, three books of Solomon (Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs), Book of the Wisdom of the son of Sirach, Another following book of Wisdom, Likewise of Histories: Job, Tobias, Esther, Judith, two books of Maccabees.

(24) The list of Cassiodorus. Gen. Ex. Lev. Num. Deut. Joshua son of Nun, Kings I-IV, Chronicles I, 2 Psalter, Five books of Solomon (Proverbs, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs), Prophets (Isa. Jer. Ezek. Dan. Hos. Amos, Micah, Joel, Obad. Jonah, Nah. Hab. Zeph. Hag. Zech. Malachi which also is Angelus), Job, Tobias, Esther, Judith, Esdras two books, two books of Maccabees.

(25) The list of Isidorus. 1. Five books of Moses. 2. Joshua son of Nun, Judges, Ruth. 3. Four of Kings, Two of Chronicles, Tobias, Esther, Judith, Esdras, Two Books of Maccabees. 4. Prophets: One book of Psalms, Three books of Solomon (Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs), Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, sixteen books of Prophets.

(26) The list of Mommsen. The canonical books: Gen. Ex. Num. Lev. Deut. Joshua son of Nun, Judges, seven books. Ruth, Four of Kings, Two of Chronicles, Two of Maccabees, Job, Tobias, Esther, Judith, 151 Psalms of David, of Solomon, of the Prophets: Isa. Jer. Daniel, Ezekiel, The Twelve.³⁷

(27) List in the Codex Claromontanus. Gen. Ex. Lev. Num. Deut. Joshua son of Nun, Judges, Ruth, Four of Kings, the Davidic Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Wisdom, Wisdom IHU (i.e. of Jesus ben Sirach), Twelve Prophets: Hos. Amos, Micah, Joel, Obad. Jonah, Nah. Hab. Zeph. Hag. Zech. Mal. Isa. Jer. Ezek. Daniel, Maccabees, First, Second, and Fourth, Judith, Esther, Job, Tobias.

³⁷ From this list I have omitted some irrelevant matter.

(28) List of the Liber Sacramentorum. Gen. Ex. Lev. Num. Deut. Joshua, Judges, Books of Women: Ruth, Esther, Judith, two books of Maccabees, Job, Tobias, Four of Kings, Sixteen books of Prophets, Five of David, Three of Solomon, One of Esdras. The books of the Veteris make in number XLIII.

(29) The list of the Council of Carthage. Gen. Ex. Lev. Num. Deut. Joshua son of Nun, Judges, Ruth, Four books of Kings, Two books of Chronicles, Job, the Davidic Psalter, Five books of Solomon, Twelve books of Prophets, Isa. Jer. Ezek. Daniel, Tobias, Judith, Esther, Two books of Esdra, two books of Maccabees.^{37a}

15. The Old Syriac version, called the Peshitto, has an order differing from all others. It puts Job before the Psalter and gives a unique arrangement of both the major and minor Prophets.

2. *The Use*

Since Mr. Bevan has appealed to the Haphtaroth, or selections from the prophetic books, to be read on the Sabbaths and feast days, as evidence that the book of Daniel was not in existence when these selections were made, it seems best to give a list of these Haphtaroth so that the evidence may be forthcoming for the discussion of this view, which will be given later.

(1). 1). The blessing before the reading of the Haphtarata reads: "Blessed art Thou, Jehovah our God, the king of the world, who hast chosen good prophets and accepted their words, which were spoken in truth. Blessed art Thou who didst choose the Law and Moses thy servant and Israel Thy people and the prophets of truth and righteousness." 2). The blessings after the reading are: (a). "Blessed art Thou Jehovah our God, king of the world, rock of all the ages, righteous in all generations, the faithful God, who sayeth and it is done, speaketh and it stands fast; for all

^{37a} For the most part, these lists have been translated from the originals as given in Swete's *Introduction to the O. T. in Greek*, pp. 198-214.

his words are truth and righteousness." (b). "Faithful art Thou, Jehovah our God, and faithful are thy words, one word of thine shall not return back in vain; for a faithful king art Thou, O God. Blessed be Thou, Jehovah, the God who is faithful in all his words." (c). "Comfort Thou Zion, for it is the house of our life. And for humility of soul do Thou save quickly in our days. Blessed be Thou, Jehovah, who rejoicest Zion with her sons. Make us to rejoice, O Jehovah our God, through Elijah the prophet thy servant, and through the house of David thine anointed, quickly let him come and let our heart rejoice. Upon his throne let not a stranger sit, and let not others inherit again his glory; for by thy holy name hast Thou sworn to him, that his light shall not be quenched for ever and ever. Blessed be Thou, Jehovah the shield of David." (d). "For the Law and for the service and for the prophets and for this Sabbath day, which Thou hast given to us, O Jehovah our God, for sanctification and for rest, for glory and for beauty; for all, O Jehovah our God, we are thanking Thee, and blessing Thee. May Thy name be blessed by every living one for ever and ever continually. Blessed be Thou Jehovah, who sanctifiest the Sabbath."^{37b}

(2). The Haphtaroth selections in use among the modern Hebrews are as follows: 1). From Joshua. a. i. 1-18. b. ii. 1-24. c. v. 2-vi. 27. 2). From Judges. a. iv. 4-v. 31. b. xi. 2-31. c. xiii. 2-25. 3). From First Samuel. a. i. 1-ii. 10. b. xi. 14-22. c. xv. 1-22. d. xx. 18-42. 4). Second Samuel. a. vi. 1-29. b. xxii. 1-59. 5). From First Kings. a. i. 1-31. b. ii. 1-12. c. iii. 15-28. d. v. 26-vi. 13. e. vii. 13-26. f. vii. 40-51. g. viii. 2-21. h. viii. 54-66. i. xviii. 1-39. k. xviii. 46-xix. 21. 6). From Second Kings. a. iv. 1-23. b. iv. 42-v. 19. c. vii. 3-20. d. xi. 17-xii. 17. e. xxiii. 1-27. 7). From the First part of Isaiah. a. i. 1-28. b. vi. 1-13. c. x. 32-xii. 6. 8).

^{37b} These prayers have been translated from the *Seder Birekhoth Hahaptarah* of the Jewish Year Book of Adelbert della Torre, published at Vienna in 1861, p. 50.

From Isaiah ii. a. xl. 1-26. b. xl. 27-xli. 16. c. xlii. 5-21. d. xliii. 21-xliv. 23. e. xlix. 14-li. 3. f. li. 12-lii. 9. g. liv. 1-10. h. liv. 11-lv. 5. i. lv. 6-lvi. 8. k. lvii. 14-lviii. 14. l. lx. 1-22. lm. lxi. 10-lxiii. 9. n. lxvi. 1-24. 9). From Jeremiah. a. i. 1-ii. 3. b. ii. 4-28, iv. 1, 2. c. vii. 21-viii. 12. d. viii. 13-ix. 23. e. xvi. 9-xvii. 14. f. xxxi. 2-20. g. xxxii. 6-27. h. xxxiv. 8-22. i. xlvi. 13-28. 10). From Ezekiel. a. i. 1-28. b. xvii. 22-xviii. 32. c. xx. 2-22. d. xxii. 1-16. e. xxviii. 25-xxix. 21. f. xxxvi. 16-36. g. xxxvi. 37-xxxvii. 14. h. xxxvii. 15-28. i. xxxviii. 18-xxxix. 16. k. xliii. 10-27. l. xliv. 15-31. m. xlv. 16-xlvi. 18. 11). From Hosea. a. ii. 1-22. b. xi. 7-xii. 12. c. xii. 13-xiv. 7. d. xiv. 2-10. 12). From Joel. ii. 1-27. 13). From Amos. a. ii. 6-iii. 8. b. ix. 7-15. 14). From Obadiah i. 1-21. 15). From Jonah. i. 1-iv. 11. 16). From Micah. v. 6-vi. 8. 17). From Habakkuk. ii. 20-iii. 19. 18). From Zechariah. a. ii. 14-iv. 7. b. xiv. 1-21. 19). From Malachi. a. i. 1-ii. 7. b. iii. 4-24.³⁸

(3). In addition to the Haphtaroth in use among the modern Jews, which are to be found listed with their corresponding sections from the Law in the conspectus of the appendix of our Hebrew Bibles, the following Haphtaroth in use among the Karaites and the earlier Jews are mentioned in an article by Prof. A. Büchler in volume six of *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, pp. 1-73. I. a. Joshua iii. b. iv. 1-15, 3-18. c. xiv. 6. e. xvii. 4. f. xxi. 41. 2. Judges ii. 7. b. xi. 16-26. c. xviii. 7. d. xix. e. xix. 20. 3. I Sam. ii. 21-28. b. vi. 6. c. xii. 3-xiv. 2. d. x. 24. e. xv. 2. 4. I Kings. iv. 20. b. x. 9. c. xvii. 24. 5. II Kings xii. 14, 23. b. xx. 8. 4. ii. Sam. v. 13-vi. 1. b. xi. 5. c. xiii. d. xvi. 21. 7. Isaiah, First Part. a. iv. 6. b. xxvii. 6. c. xxix. 8-14. d. xxx. 15. e. xxxii. 18. xxxiii. 17. f. xxxiv. 11. g. xxvii. 31-37. h. xvii. 14-xviii. 7. 8. Second Part. a. xlii. 12-17.

³⁸ For the list here given, see the *Conspectus Haphtararum* in the Appendix to any good edition of the Hebrew Bible.

b. xliii. 1-7. c. xlvi. 3. d. xlvi. 12. e. xlix. 9-13. lxiv. 1. f. lxv. 10. g. lxv. 23-lxvi. 8. 9. Jeremiah. xii. 15. b. xiv. 19-22. c. xxix. 8. d. xxx. 10-16. e. xxxviii. 8. 10. Ezekiel. xii. 20. b. xvi. c. xx. 41. d. xiv. 11. e. xlv. 1. f. xlv. 12. 11. Hosea xii. 4-13. 12. Joel iii. 3. 13. Amos i. 3-15. 14. Micah. ii. 12. b. vi. 3-vii. 20. c. vii. 9. 15. Nahum i. 12-ii. 5. 16. Zephaniah i. 12. b. iii. 9-19. 17. Zech. x. 6-11.

(4). 1. In Luke iv. 17, we are told that Jesus "went to the synagogue, as was his wont every Sabbath day, and stood up for the purpose of reading. And there was given to Him the book of the prophet Isaiah, and He opened the book, and found the place where it is written: The Spirit of the LORD God is upon me" &cet. 2. In Acts xii. 14, 15, we are told that Paul and Barnabus went into the synagogue at Antioch, and, after the reading of the Law and the Prophets, Paul, on the invitation of the rulers, stood up to make an exhortation. 3. In Acts xiii. 27, we are told that the Prophets were read every Sabbath day.

DISCUSSION

In discussing the assumptions of the critics with regard to the historicity and date of the Book of Daniel on the basis of the evidence just given above, I shall consider first the relation between the dates of the books of the Old Testament and their position in the present Hebrew Canon. All of the critics argue as if the presence of Daniel among the books which by us are called Hagiographa is a sure indication of the lateness of its composition. That this is not the case, I shall proceed to show, first, by a consideration of the Law; and, secondly, by a consideration of the rest of the books of the Old Testament. In the course of this discussion of the main proposition assumed by the critics, I hope to make it plain, that not merely it, but also the other assumptions and conclusions with regard to the date of the Book of Daniel in so far as they are derived from its position in the present Hebrew Bible, are false.

First, let us take the order of the books in the Pentateuch. According to the order in all Hebrew and Greek manuscripts that contain the Pentateuch, the books were arranged in their present order, that is, the order of the historical sequence of the events and of the supposed order of the codes of law contained in them. Genesis gives the history from the creation to the establishment of Israel in Egypt; Exodus and Leviticus, the account of the exodus and of the events and laws connected with Sinai; Numbers, the story of the wanderings; and Deuteronomy, a résumé of the history and of the laws enacted up to the arrival of the children of Israel at Sinai. The oldest evidence for this order is to be found in the works of Origen from the middle of the third century A.D. The only list of the books of the Law antedating this, is that given by Melito, Bishop of Sardis, from the latter part of the second century A.D.; but it gives the books in the order Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Leviticus, Deuteronomy. Since Melito and Origen, these two earliest witnesses for the order, number, and names, of all of the books of the Law, thus differ as to their order, it is manifest that at the time when they wrote their order had not yet been fixed. The relative position of a book in the so-called earliest Canon had, therefore, nothing essential to do with its canonicity.

Again, according to the radical critics, the Hebrew Pentateuch was not finished till after the time when the translation of the Seventy was made.³⁹ Dividing the main sources of the five-fold book of the Law into the Jehovistic, Elohist, Deuteronomistic, and Priestly portions, denoted respectively by J, E, D, and P, they place J somewhere between 850 and 625 B.C.; E, at about 750; D, at or shortly before 621; and P, at 444 B.C.⁴⁰ The canonization of D was made in 621 B.C., and that of P in 444 B.C.⁴¹

³⁹ Cornill, *Introduction to the Canonical Books of the Old Testament*, p. 474.

⁴⁰ *Id.* p. 91.

⁴¹ *Id.* p. 472.

The whole work was put together in its present form about 400 B.C., though additions and corrections were made even subsequently to the time of the Seventy;⁴² that is, after 280 B.C. The redactor Rp, who is said to have put J, E, D, and P together, excluded from and added to the original documents whatever he pleased, and put them together in the order that seemed to him to be best. But this order, while chronological according to the time at which the books purport to have been written, is not chronological according to the time at which the critics say that they were written; for Rp puts the laws of P before those of D, although according to the modern critics of the Wellhausen school, D was written about two hundred years before the writing of P.

It will be noted, also, that even though the five-fold division of the Law cannot be traced back farther than Philo,⁴³ and even though it may have existed only a short time before the time when the version of the Seventy was made,⁴⁴ this does not affect the fact that in the Pentateuch as far back as we can trace it,⁴⁵ the P laws preceded the laws of D in the document as it came from the hand of Rp.

Further, since the critics claim that D was canonized before P, it follows that the position of a book in the Canon, or in a part of the Canon, was not always, or necessarily determined by the time of its canonization, or by the time of its composition. So, then, the position of Daniel in the present Hebrew Bible has not necessarily anything to do with the time of its composition, or of its canonization.

It will be noted that I have written "present Hebrew Bible"; for there is no evidence to show that any old Hebrew manuscript ever contained the books of the Old Testa-

⁴² *Id.* p. 474.

⁴³ *De Abrahamo*, I.

⁴⁴ Cornill, p. 28.

⁴⁵ The Samaritan Hebrew text and Targum, as well as all the ancient versions, primary and secondary, and all the lists of the books of the Law, early and late, unite in placing D after P.

ment Canon as they are arranged in our Hebrew Bibles as now printed. Nor did either of the great schools of Hebrew manuscripts, the Spanish, or the German-French, or the Massoretic, have the books arranged as they are now printed; nor are they printed in the order given in the Talmud. Nor do they follow the order of the earliest printed Hebrew Bibles, such as the *Editio Princeps* of Bomberg, which put the five Megilloth immediately after the Pentateuch. Our Bibles agree with the Spanish and Massoretic manuscripts in the order of the Prophets, but with the German and French in the Hagiographa. The order of the Talmud differs from that of the early printed Bibles and from that of the editions in use at present. It differs, also, in the order of the books both in the Prophets and the Hagiographa from the Massoretic, Spanish, and German-French manuscripts. The Peshitto Syriac version of the Prophets differs in the order of the books both in Prophets and Hagiographa from every one of these Hebrew orders. The lists of Melito, Origen, and Jerome, all of whom derived their information from the Hebrew scholars of their respective times, give an order differing from one another and from all the Hebrew manuscripts, lists, and versions. Moreover, no one of the great Greek uncials, Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, and Basiliano-Venetus, agrees in order with any other one of them, or with any one of the Hebrew or Syriac sources. And lastly, of the many lists of the Greek and Latin Fathers and Synods, no two are found to agree with each other; nor does anyone of them agree with any other list from any other ancient source.

In short, of forty-three lists given above, no two present exactly the same order for the books comprising the Old Testament Canon; so that it can be affirmed positively that the order of those books was never fixed by any accepted authority of either the Jewish or Christian church.

When we leave the order and come to the names, numbers and divisions, or groupings, of the books of the Old Testament, we find no evidence, except in the case of the

Law, that the position of the book of Daniel had anything to do with its date. The earliest witnesses give the names of the divisions as follows:

1. The Prologue to Ecclesiasticus, (1) The Law, the Prophets and Others that followed their steps. (2) The Law and the Prophets and the other ancestral books. (3) The Law and the Prophecies and the rest of the Books.

2. Second Maccabees says that Nehemiah gathered together (1) the books concerning the kings and prophets, (2) those of David, and (3) epistles of kings concerning votive offerings.

3. Philo says that the Therapeutae received (1) the Law, (2) and the oracles uttered by the prophets, and (3) the hymns and other (writings) by which knowledge and piety are augmented and perfected.

4. Luke xxiv. 44 speaks of (1) the Law, (2) the Prophets, and (3) the Psalms.

5. Josephus divides the books into (1) the Law, (2) the Prophets, and (3) the remaining four, containing hymns to God and precepts concerning the conduct of human life.

6. Melito gives (1) the Five of Moses, (2) Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Kings, Chronicles, (3) Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song, Job, (4) Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, The Twelve, Daniel, Ezekiel, (5) Esdras.

7. Baba Bathra speaks of (1) Moses' "own book", (2) of the Prophets, of whom he names eight, not including Daniel, and (3) of the Hagiographa, of which it names eleven.

8. Origen names (1) the five books of the Law, (2) six historical books, counting the four of Samuel and Kings as one, Judges including Ruth, Ezra-Nehemiah, and Chronicles as one each, (3) Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song, (4) Isaiah, Jeremiah with Lamentations and the Epistle as one, Daniel and Ezekiel (the Twelve having been dropped from the list, probably through an error of some copyist), (5) Job, Esther, and (6) outside (*hero*) these is the Maccabees.

9. The four great Greek uncials give only the names of the books, but no names of divisions, except that A heads the names of the Prophets with the phrase "The sixteen Prophets", among which it puts Daniel. If it be allowed to indicate divisions based on the order and character of the books, they would be as follows: (1) For B, (1) the Law, Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy. (2) Historical books, Josh., Jud., Ruth, Kingdoms 4, Chronicles 2, Ezra 2. (3) Poetical books, Psalms, Prov., Ecc., the Song, Job, Wisdom, Sirach. (4) Esther, Judith, Tobit. (5) The xii, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Baruch, Lamentations, Epistle, Ezek., Dan. (2) For S, (a) the Law, of which, however, only Genesis and Numbers remain. (b). Historical books, of which remain Chronicles, Ezra-Neh., Esther, Tobit, Judith, and four of Maccabees. (c) Proph. books, Isa., Jer., Lam., Joel, Obad., Jonah, Nahum, Hab., Zeph., Hag., Zech., Malachi. The other books have been destroyed. (d). Poetical books, Psalms, Prov., Ecc., Song of Songs, Wisdom, Sirach, Job. (3). For A, (a) the Law, Genesis of the World, Exodus from Egypt, Lev., Num., Deut. (b). Historical books, Josh., Judges, Ruth, Kings 4, Chron. 2. (3). Prophets 16, the Twelve, Isa., Jer., Baruch, Lam., Epis., Jer., Ezek., Daniel. (d). Esther, Tobit, Judith, Ezras a, Ezras b, Maccabees 4. (e). Poetical books, Psalterion, Job, Prov., Songs, Wisdom, Sirach, Psalms of Solomon. (4). For Bas.-Ven. (a) the Law, Lev. Num. Deut. (all that remain). (b). Josh., Ruth, Judges, Kingdoms 4, Chron. 2, Esdras 2, Esther (lacuna). (c). Poetical books, (Psalms), Job, Prov., Ecc., Song, Wisdom, Sirach. (d). Prophetic books, the Twelve, Isa., Jer., Bar., Lam., Ezek., Daniel. (e). Tobit, Judith, Maccabees 4.

10. The principal Greek lists make, or imply, the following divisions: (1). Melito: Law 5, History 5-9, Poetry 5, Prophecy 5, Others 1. (2). Origen: Law 5, History 6-11, Poetry 4, Prophecy 4, Others 1-2. (3). Athanasius: Law 5, History 6-11, Poetry 5, Prophecy 5, Others 5. (4). Cyril: Law 5, History 6-12, Poetry 5, Prophecy 5. (5).

Epiphanius a: Law 5, History 3, Poetry 5, History 2-6, Prophecy 5, Others 2-3, Extra 2. (6). Epiphanius b: Law 5, Poetry 5, Hagiographa 5, Prophecies 5, Others 2, Extra 2. (7). Epiphanius c: Law 5, History 3, Psalms 1, History 2-6, Solomon's Works, Prophecies 5, Others 2-3. (8). Gregory Naz.: History 12, Poetry 5, Prophecy 5. (9). Amphilochius: Law 5, History 6-11, Poetry 5, Prophecy 5, Proverbs 2, Extra: Esther. (10). Pseudo-Chrysostom: Octateuch, History 2-5, Admonitory 4, Prophecy 16, Extra 2. (11). Synopsis: Octateuch; History 12, Solomon 4, Prophecies 12, Major Prophets 4. Extra Wisdom of Jesus ben Sirach. (12). Dialog. Tim. et Aquila: Mosaic Pentateuch, History 5, Poetry 4, Prophecy 6, Additional 2. Extra 3. (13). Junilius: Histories xvii, Prophecies xvii, Proverbs ii (Additional ii), Dogmatics i. (14). Pseudo-Athanasius: Law 5, Histories 7-11, Poetry 5, Prophets xii, Four others besides—the Major Prophets, Beside these, viii books. (15). Leontius: The Historical Books 12, the Prophetical 5, the Paranetic, 4(5?). (16). John of Damascus: First Pentateuch, or Nomothesia; Second Pentateuch, or Hagiographa; Third Pentateuch, or the Poetical Books, Fourth Pentateuch, or the Prophetical. Others 2. Extra: Two. (17). Nicephorus: Law 5, History 6-10, Poetical 5, Prophetical 6. Antilegomenoi: 8-10. (18). Ebeyesu: Law 5, History 6, Poetical 7, Prophets 16, Others 12. (19). Canons of Laodicea: Law 5, Historical 7-11, Poetical 5, Prophetical 5. (20). Apostolic Canons: Five of Moses, Historical 14, Poetical 5, Prophetical 5. Extra: The Wisdom of the very learned Sirach. (21). List in Cod. Baroc.: Law 5, Historical 4-9, Poetical 5, Esdras, Prophetical 16, . . . Extra 6-9. (22). Hilary: Five books of Moses, Histories 6-9, Poetical 4, Prophets 12. Six other prophets, among which are included Lamentations and Epistle of Jeremiah, Job, and Esther. Extra 2. (23). Ruffinus: Five books of Moses, Historical 6-10, Prophets 5, Poetical 5. Extra: 5-8. (24). Augustine: Histories 16-22, Prophecies 22. (25). Innocent I.: Five books of

Moses, Historical 4-7, Prophets 16, Books of Solomon 5, Psalter, Histories 7-10. (26). Pseudo-Gelasius: Books of Moses 5, Historical 4-8, Prophets 16, Chronicles 1-2, Poetical 6. Likewise, histories 5-6. (27). Cassiodorus: Law 5, Historical 3-7, Poetical 6, Prophets 16, Others 6-8. (28). Isidorus: Five books of Moses, Historical 10-15, Prophets 22 (including the 5 poetical books). (29). Mommsen's List: Heptateuch(?), Historical 15, Major Prophets 4, Prophets 12. (30). Codex Claromontanus: Law 5, Histories 7, Poetry 6, Prophets 16, Additional 8 (including Job and Esther). (31). Liber Sacramentorum: Law 5, Historical 13, Prophetic 16, Davidic 5, Solomonic 3, Esdras= xliii books. (32). Council of Carthage: Law 5, Histories 5-9, Poetry 7, Prophets 16. Others 5-7.

A review of the testimony just given will show that only one witness puts the book of Daniel under any other heading than that of the Prophets. This witness is the *Baba Bathra*, a work not written till about A.D. 200, and deemed by the critics as so unreliable that they reject all that it says in the immediately succeeding context about the writers of the various books of the Old Testament. All of the witnesses who derived their information from Jewish sources antedating this time, place Daniel among the Prophets,—Philo, Matthew, Luke, Josephus, and Melito. Even Origen and Jerome who studied with the Jewish Rabbis of their time, place Daniel among the Prophets. It is proper, therefore to conclude that the fact that the later Jews placed Daniel among the *Hagiographa* has nothing to do with the questions of its canonicity and date.

Having thus considered the main charge against the early date of the book of Daniel based upon its position in the present Hebrew Bibles, I shall next devote myself to some subsidiary questions more or less relevant to the main charge, and which the critics bring forward to support it.

The late Dr. Driver says, that "the age and authorship of the books of the Old Testament can be determined (so far as this is possible) only upon the basis of the internal

evidence supplied by the books themselves, by methods such as those employed in the present volume; no external evidence worthy of credit exists."⁴⁶ If this proposition were true, it might be well to ask why, then, Dr. Driver considered it necessary to present eleven pages of historical and philological reasons, alleged to be derived from, or supported by, evidence external to Daniel, in order to show that it could not have been written in the sixth century B.C. The most admirable thing about Dr. Driver, and that which gained for him his exalted position in the scholarly world, was the masterly manner with which he essayed to support his judgments based upon the internal evidence of a book by evidence external to the book itself. What I object to in the case of Dr. Driver and his followers, is that they seem to seek in every possible way to pervert the internal and external evidence as to the Canon in general, and as to the canonicity and date of Daniel in particular, so as to confirm their own preconceived opinion as to what they ought to be. For as to the internal evidence, no one can doubt that the book of Daniel claims on the face of it to be genuine. It purports to make known to us the deeds of Daniel and his three companions and the visions of the last named. It relates itself to the history of the sixth century B. C. That it is full of alleged miracles and of accurate and detailed predictions, is not internal evidence against its historicity or date; for the histories of the Old and New Testaments, as well as those of Ashurbanipal, Nabunaid, and Alexander, are full, also, of alleged miracles and predictions. The only thing for us to do is to recognize the internal testimony at its face value and to test this testimony by means of all the external evidence that is relevant and available. In the case before us, the specific charge is made, that the book of Daniel cannot be genuine, because the book itself claims to be, in large part at least, a work from the sixth century B.C., whereas its position in

⁴⁶ See the Introduction to the *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, p. xi.

the Canon indicates that it cannot have been written before the second century B.C. To support this charge, it is alleged that the part of the Old Testament which in our present Hebrew Bibles is called the Prophets, embracing only Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve Minor Prophets,—eight books in all according to the reckoning of the ancient authorities—, was canonized and closed at, or before, the year 200 B.C.

Now, since all admit that the Prophetical books were canonized before 200 B.C., and called the Prophets, the only question at issue is as to the correctness of the use of the word “closed” as applied to the books called Prophets. Is there evidence to prove that the eight books named in Baba Bathra were then canonized, and called Prophets, and that afterwards no book, or part of a book, was ever added to, or taken away from, the eight that were thus canonized and named Prophets? If this can be proven it would have to be admitted that the book of Daniel cannot have been among them. If, on the other hand, it can be shown by external evidence, that the division of the Old Testament Canon called the Prophets contained at an earlier time than that at which the Baba Bathra was written more books than the eight named in its list, it follows that Daniel may have been one of these books. For some reason, known or unknown to us, it may have been removed from an earlier position among its fellow prophets; but the fact will be patent that its later position among the Hagiographa would not indicate that the book was not in existence before 200 B.C.

There are five prime witnesses, antedating the time at which the first sketch of the Mishna was written, and they all testify clearly that an eight-booked Canon of the Prophets was not in existence in the time at which they wrote. These witnesses are the Prologue to Ecclesiasticus, Philo, Luke, Josephus, and Melito. I shall discuss them in the order, Josephus, Luke, Philo, the Prologue to Ecclesiasticus, and Melito.

Josephus is the principal witness, because he states expressly that the Jews had only twenty-two canonical books.

Of his twenty-two books he specifies five as constituting the Law and four as containing "hymns to God and precepts for the conduct of human life". These last were probably the Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Songs. This would leave Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Ezra-Nehemiah, Chronicles, Esther, Job, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, and the Twelve Minor Prophets, as the thirteen others,—he having counted Ruth as part of Judges, Nehemiah as one with Ezra, and Lamentations as belonging to Jeremiah. Job was accounted a prophetic book, as in Ben Sira, xlix. 9.

Now, whatever may be thought about the opinion of Josephus about the time when the last of the prophetic books was written, seeing that this opinion is expressed about events which happened 500 years before his time, there is no reason to doubt that in telling of the number and divisions of the books held sacred by the Jews of his time, no witness could possibly be better. For he was a priest of the royal Asmonean line, educated in all the wisdom of the innermost circles of Jewish scholarship, possessed of the official Temple copy of the original Hebrew Scriptures, which had been taken from the Temple and presented to him by Titus himself. He certainly would not in a controversial treatise, like that against Apion, where he challenges the world to dispute his statements and constantly appeals to written documents and to the acknowledged current opinions of the contemporary Jews,—he certainly would not have dared to divide the books of the Jews as he does, unless that division was the one accepted by the learned Jerusalem scholars of his day. And in this division he certainly places Daniel in the second of the three divisions, which embraced all the books except the Law and the Poetical books.

The next Jewish testimony is that of Luke xxiv. 44, where Jesus is represented as saying, "All things must be fulfilled, which are written in the Law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me". This

passage from Luke's Gospel I am not introducing in evidence as the infallible statement of an inspired book, nor as having back of it the authority of an infallible man, nor even as having ever been said by Jesus at all; but simply as an ordinary statement of the writer of this book, called the Gospel of Luke. It is admitted by all the leading critics that this book was written before or about the year A.D. 70.⁴⁷ And no text is better supported than that of this verse.

What, then, does this verse prove? It proves that in the time when Luke wrote, the Jews divided the books of the Old Testament into three parts, the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms. Everyone admits that by Law the five books of Moses are meant. In view of the statement of his contemporary, Josephus, it would be most natural to suppose that by Psalms he means what Josephus includes in his third division, that is, the books called by us, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Song of Songs. In the Prophets, there would be included the other thirteen books which Josephus embraces in his second division, including, of course, Daniel. That the writer of Matthew's Gospel, also, considered Daniel to be among the prophets is supported by Mt. xxiv. 15, where we read of "the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet".

Dr. Driver, in his discussion of the Canon in the opening chapter of his *Literature of the Old Testament*, as well as in his chapter in the same volume on the book of Daniel, studiously avoids all reference to this testimony of the New Testament books to the opinions of the Hebrew writers as to the Old Testament Canon. He appeals at length to the Talmud, Josephus, Ben Sira, 2 Maccabees, and the 4th Book of Ezra; but passes by in silence the testimony of the New Testament, of Melito, and of all Christian writers! One might understand the motive for this in a Jew, but it is hard to understand what possible motive a Christian can have in thus ignoring the testimony of writings whose date

⁴⁷ McClymont, *Baird Lectures*, pp. 142 f.

is certainly as determinable as that of 4th Ezra, 2 Maccabees, or the Talmud, and whose veracity as respects the point here at issue can not be questioned.

Professor Cornill, indeed, goes one step farther than Dr. Driver; for he says that "Jesus cannot be appealed to as witness for the Old Testament Canon".⁴⁸ This is a confusion of the point in discussion. If he means that we have no written testimony by Jesus Himself as to the Old Testament Canon, no one has ever claimed as much. But if he means that we have less direct and reliable testimony as to what Jesus thought about the Old Testament Canon than we have in regard to what other Jews of his time thought, Josephus and the New Testament writers alone excepted, why does he not state where it is found? I know of none such. He goes on to say, "He (i.e., Jesus) indeed lived and moved in the holy literature of Israel, towards which he did not take up any different position from that of his Jewish contemporaries, and, in fact, in his days almost the same books were counted as Holy Scriptures as are found in our Old Testament".⁴⁹ How does he know that Jesus took up the same position as his contemporaries? He can know it only from Josephus, Philo, and the New Testament, as far as contemporary written testimony is concerned; and, as we have seen, Josephus and the New Testament both have three divisions of the Canon and both place Daniel among the Prophets. Jesus, therefore, must have done the same, Professor Cornill himself being witness.

Professor Cornill proceeds further to state that "in fact in his days almost the same books were counted as Holy Scripture as are found in our Old Testament".⁵⁰ This will be readily admitted by all, except for the word "almost". The only ground for the insertion of this limiting particle is that the Sanhedrin, said to have been held at Jamnia at some time between A.D. 70 and 100, expressed itself in favor

⁴⁸ *Introduction*, p. 482.

⁴⁹ *Id.*, pp. 482, 483.

⁵⁰ *Id.* p. 483.

of the canonicity of certain books whose right to a place in the Canon had been disputed. To which it may be said that no contemporary testimony bears witness to any such Sanhedrin or to any such dispute. Any knowledge that such a Sanhedrin was ever held is due to a tradition among the Jews first put in writing about A.D. 200. A writer who ignores the testimony of Melito and Origen and subjects to severe criticism the testimony of the New Testament and Josephus, should not be so ready to accept an unwritten tradition of the Jews!

But even granting that some books were disputed at A.D. 100, or at the time of Rabbi Akiba, at A.D. 135, or at any other time, let it be remarked that *Daniel was not one of the books disputed*. Let it be remarked again that Ezekiel was one of the disputed books. If Ezekiel, a book which all the critics say was in the second part of the Canon,—a part which, they say was canonized by 200 B.C.,—could be disputed as late as A.D. 100, 300 years after it was canonized, and 650 years after it was written, how does it follow that the disputing of the canonicity of Esther, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Songs shows in the opinion of the critics that they were written late? At any rate, how does the disputing of one or all of these books affect the canonicity of Daniel, a book that, so far as we know, was never disputed?

But not only was the book of Daniel not disputed, but Daniel himself was held by Josephus to have had “strange revelations made to him and those as to one of the greatest of the prophets” (*Antiq.* X. x. 1. 7). And with the writers of the New Testament, and from all accounts, with the Lord Himself, Daniel was among the greatest in his influence, being referred to or cited by them more than a hundred times.

The next Jewish testimony to the Old Testament Canon is to be found in Philo Judaeus, who flourished about A.D. 40. In describing the Therapeutae, he says that “they receive the Law, and the Oracles uttered by the Prophets, and the hymns and the other (writings) by which knowledge and

piety are augmented and perfected".⁵¹ In this statement, the hymns are evidently the Psalms, and the other writings possibly Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Songs, corresponding to the "rules of life for men," of Josephus.

At any rate, it seems certain that the only place for Daniel in this list is among the Prophets. ✓

The fourth direct Jewish witness to the three-fold division of the Old Testament books is to be found in the Prologue to the Greek translation of Jesus ben Sira, made by his grandson of the same name. This Prologue was most probably written in 132 B.C. He mentions the threefold division three times. First, he says that "many and great things have been delivered unto us by the law, the prophets, and the other (books) which follow after them". Secondly, he says that his grand-father Jesus had given himself to "the reading of the law and the prophets and other ancestral books"; Thirdly, he speaks of "the law itself, and the prophets, and the rest of the books".

Since he intimates nothing as to the character of the contents of the second and third parts nor as to the number of books in each, it is simply a matter of conjecture as to where he may have put Daniel. It seems likely that he placed it in the second division rather than in the third, in view of the fact that the next witnesses in point of time (that is, Philo, Luke, Josephus, and perhaps the writer of the Martyrdom of Isaiah), all put it there; and further, in view of the fact that never till the Talmudical period do we find Daniel placed anywhere else.

Certainly, at least, no laws of evidence will permit the critics to force Daniel into the third division on the ground of testimony which was written from 200 to 500 years later than the time when this Prologue was written.

The fifth first-class witness is Melito, bishop of Sardis at about A.D. 180. He says that he desired to make an accurate statement of the ancient book as regards the number and order of the books and that when he had gone to

⁵¹*De Vita Contemplativa*, ii, 475; vd. Budde, *Kanon*, p. 56.

the East and come to the place where the things (recorded in them) were preached and done, he learned accurately the books of the Old Testament and sent the names of them in a letter to his friend Onesimus. In the list of these names he gives the Prophets as consisting of the following: Isaiah, Jeremiah, the Twelve, Daniel, Ezekiel (and) Esdras.

Some doubt may be felt as to whether he meant to put Esdras among the Prophets; but there can be none as to Daniel, because it precedes Ezekiel. Further, it will be noted that Melito does not put Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings among the Prophets; but puts them, followed by Chronicles, after the Pentateuch and before the Psalms of David. It is scarcely possible, in view of his deliberate and voluntary statement that he had carefully investigated as to the number and order of the books, that he would have intentionally made a false list of them, especially in view of the fact that such a falsehood could so easily have been exposed. We are justified, therefore, in concluding that at his time there was either no fixed order and number of books in the division of the Prophets; or that, if there were, in holding that it was afterwards changed.

All the direct evidence, then, that precedes the year 200 A.D., supports the view that Daniel was in the earliest times among the Prophets. Further, this conclusion is supported by all the direct evidence outside the Talmud, which is later than A.D. 200. Thus Origen, at A.D. 250, and Jerome, at A.D. 400, both of whom were taught by Jewish Rabbis and claim to have gained their information from Jewish sources, put Daniel among the Prophets and separate the strictly prophetic books from those which are more properly called historical.

And, lastly, all the Greek uncials and the Greek and Latin fathers, unite in placing Daniel among the Prophets and in separating the Prophets from the Historical Books.

Nor can the view that Daniel was originally among the Prophets be successfully impugned on the ground that other testimony, mostly late and indirect, indicates the contrary.

Appeal has frequently been made to the Sanhedrin or assembly of Rabbis held at Jamnia some time between A.D. 70 and 100, as having first settled authoritatively for the Jews the extent of their Canon. This testimony, however, is rendered less valuable owing to the fact that it is not contemporaneous, i.e., we have no *written* records referring to any such Sanhedrin going back beyond the two tractates of the Mishna called *Yadaim* and *Idayot*, which were written about 200 A.D. However, admitting that the testimony is genuine, what does it prove? Simply that certain books had a right to be held as canonical. These books were Ezekiel, Proverbs, Esther, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Songs, Jonah, and Ruth. With regard to Jonah no technical phrase is used; with respect to Ezekiel and Proverbs, the question was whether they should be *hidden*; with regard to the four others, whether they *defiled the hands*. With regard to the meanings of these two terms, the following may be said. First, *Genaz*, in the technical sense in which it is used in the discussion of the Canon, means "to withdraw from use".⁵² "The Talmudical view is that canonical books may *not* be 'hidden', for this is only done in the case of books which are really offensive".⁵³ The books which the Rabbins 'hide' (*genaz*) are always such the contents of which were regarded as objectionable, that is, heretical".⁵⁴ The word would be inapplicable if applied to the books of the Hebrew Canon, or to the books of the Apocrypha".⁵⁵

Secondly, with regard to the phrase, "defile the hands", the author accepts the definition of this term given by Professor Robertson Smith and elaborated by Professor Karl Budde in his work entitled, *Der Kanon des A.T.*, (p. 3-6). Professor Budde first rejects the opinion of Buhl that it was meant by this phrase to guard against the profane use of worn-out (*abgenutzte*) rolls of the Scriptures; and the

⁵² See Oesterly, *The Books of the Apocrypha*, p. 183.

⁵³ *Id.*, p. 184.

⁵⁴ *Id.*, p. 185.

⁵⁵ *Id.*, p. 185.

opinion of Strack and others that by this phrase it was meant that the Holy Scriptures, as unclean, should always be kept apart so as not to be exposed to harm resulting from touching consecrated corn or from eating by mice; and the opinion of Geiger, that holy books written upon the skin of unclean animals were alone to be declared unclean. "All such explanations", says he, "are contradicted by Yad. III. 4, where the question especially is decided whether the margins and back sides of the rolls made the hands unclean. In all these explanations, this question is never raised. It deserves to be noticed rather, that to the Holy Scriptures alone tradition ascribes a rendering of the hands unclean,—their touch making necessary a ritual washing of the hands". The Pharisees (under protest from the Sadducees)⁵⁶ attributed to the holy books such a high degree of holiness that whoever touched them dared not touch other things before he had observed the same ritual hand-washing as if he had touched something unclean. The correlative term for this kind of uncleanness of the hands is holiness". "In accordance with this view, the Old Testament books are called in the Mishna 'the holy books'; or 'books of holiness' ". "For these two attributes, holiness and uncleanness of the hands, are expressed at the same time and indeed only of a wholly limited number of writings, that is, the canonical".⁵⁷

See also Dr. Oesterley's discussion of this term in *The Books of the Apocrypha*, pp. 175-182, where he says. "Defilement arose from the fact that the canonical books were 'holy', and holy things defiled by touching them. Compare Lev. x. 10, where holy=unclean. According to Lev. xvii. Aaron washed after coming out of the most holy place and taking off his holy garments. So since sacredness was imputed to the canonical books, contact with them necessitated a washing of the hands; and therefore anyone who touched a sacred book was said to be defiled."

⁵⁶ Cf. *Yadayim*, iv. 6.

⁵⁷ Cf. *Yadayim*, iii. 5.

It is necessary to observe in connection with this phrase (1) that only the Aramaic part of Daniel is spoken of in the Talmud as defiling the hands, it being taken for granted that the Hebrew portion did; (2) that the Aramaic portions of Ezra are said in the same passage to defile the hands; (3) that Ezekiel, one of the Major Prophets and one cited already as a prophet by Jesus ben Sira, was disputed; (4) that Jonah, one of the Twelve, a portion of the Canon recognized again by Jesus ben Sira, was possibly another one thus disputed; (5) that Proverbs, which all authorities acknowledge to have been one of the four books of Josephus' third division, and also to have been used by Ben Sira, is another of them; and (6) that Ruth, the composition of which Cornill puts in the time of Ezra-Nehemiah, is also disputed.

So, then, the fact that the right of a book to a place in the Canon was disputed by some Jewish scholars does not prove that it had not been received as canonical before the time even of Ben Sira, the critics themselves being judges; for they all place Ezekiel and nearly all place Jonah, in the second, or prophetic division, which they state to have been "closed" about 200 B.C. And, if this be so of books whose right to be in the Canon was disputed, how much more must it be true of a book like Daniel where right to be in the Canon was never denied.

Again, there is certain evidence in I Maccabees, also, that Daniel existed before the time of the Maccabees. For from the speech given in chapter II, 51-60, we learn, (1) that the author supposes that the story of Daniel and his three companions was known to the Jews before the rebellion under the Maccabees commenced. (2) That he considered Daniel and his companions to be as historical as Abraham, Joseph; Phinehas, Joshua, Caleb, David, and Elijah. (3) That a writer who was almost certainly a contemporary of most of the events that he narrates would scarcely have treated the information of a book of fiction written in his own age (i.e., if we date Daniel in 164-5 B.C., and I Maccabees between 125 and 100 B.C.) as affording a fitting climax for a stirring

exhortation such as Mattathias is said to have made to his compatriots. The writer must have believed that the stories of the fiery furnace and the lions' den were known not merely to Mattathias but to those whom he addressed. As this address was made in the year 169 B.C., it is evident that the stories must have been in existence long enough to have been learned by Mattathias and his followers and also to have been accepted by them as true histories of what had occurred. Otherwise, to have placed the reference to them in the climax of his address would have weakened and made ineffective the force of his argument.

To use a phrase of Mr. Bevan's it is marvelous that no reference to Daniel is to be met with in 1 Maccabees. Notwithstanding that this first book of Maccabees is supposed by the critics to have been written at this time for the consolation of the Jewish patriots, this exact and sympathetic narrative never so much as alludes, except in the passage cited above, to either the book of Daniel or its author! The failure to mention the writer of Daniel might be pardoned, inasmuch as he evidently intended that his work should be accepted as a production of the supposititious Daniel, whom he so often represents as speaking in the first person. Whether it was originated in the sixth or in the second century B.C., it is remarkable, however, that the writer of Second Maccabees takes no notice of it, and the writer of First Maccabees cites it but once. It is another remarkable fact that First Maccabees mentions no divisions of the Old Testament Canon except the Law.

Next, the Epistle of Aristeeas, which was written about 200 B.C., shows no knowledge on the part of the author of any divisions of the Old Testament except the Law. This bears upon the controversy about Daniel only in so far as it shows that the omission of all references to books of the Old Testament and to persons and events mentioned in them does not prove that the author who fails to mention them was not cognizant of their existence, or that the books did not actually exist.

Again, the greatest of Jewish extra-canonical writings known to us, coming from pre-Maccabean times, is the book of Ecclesiasticus by Jesus ben Sira. The prologue to this work, written by a second Jesus ben Sira, the grandson of the first, has already been considered. In the original work itself, we have a direct reference once to the Law of Moses (xxiv. 23), and many statements which show a knowledge of its contents. Many of the heroes of Israelitish history whom the author celebrates in his song of praise (xliv-1), are those whose merits are depicted in the Law. As to the prophetic books he shows his knowledge of the book of Joshua in his account of Joshua and Caleb (xlvi. 1-10), refers to Judges (xlvi. 11, 12), to Samuel the prophet (xlvi. 13-20), to Nathan and David (xlvii. 1-11), to Solomon (xlvii. 12-23), to Rehoboam and Jereboam the son of Nebat (xlvii. 23), to Elijah (xlviii. 1-12), to Elisha (xlviii. 12-14), to Hezekiah (xlviii. 17-22), to Isaiah (xlviii. 20-25), to Josiah (xlix. 1-4), to Jeremiah (xlix. 6, 7), to Ezekiel (xlix. 8), to Job (xlix. 9), to the Twelve (xlix. 10), though he mentions none of them by name. Of the books afterwards classed among the Hagiographa, he mentions Job and Nehemiah and makes several citations from the parts of Chronicles which are not found among the parallels in Kings. He probably refers, also, to Ezra in xlix. 14, and possibly to Daniel in xlix. 10.

Nowhere in Ecclesiasticus do we find any knowledge of a threefold, or fourfold, division of the Old Testament; nor any intimation that the division of the Prophets had been closed; nor any indication, except perhaps in his use of the Law, of his having considered some books more sacred than others. Besides, he elaborates the praises of Simon the High Priest more than those of any of the great men of Israel whose records are found in the books of the Old Testament Canon. It is a remarkable fact that he does not pay any regard to the great men who had exercised their functions outside the bounds of the land of Israel, such as Jonah at Nineveh, Daniel in Babylon, and Mordecai in Persia. In

speaking of Abraham, he does not refer to his coming out of Ur of the Chaldees, nor to his visit to Egypt. In speaking of Jacob, Joseph, and Aaron, he says nothing of the land of Egypt; nor does he intimate that Moses had ever been in Egypt, saying simply of the wonderful deeds done by him there, that "God gave him might in terrible wonders", and that "through the word of his mouth he caused signs to happen quickly, and caused him to be strong before the king". Of all the foreign kings mentioned in the Old Testament, he refers to but two—once to Pharaoh and once to Sennacherib. As far as Daniel is concerned, therefore, and the foreign kings among whom he labored, it is entirely in harmony with the plan of the work of Ben Sira, that no one of them should be noticed. This silence does not show that Ben Sira did not know about them. It was simply his determination to ignore them. Whether the books containing mention of one or all of them were among those deemed canonical by the Jews of his time, does not appear in any suggestion of his work. It will be noted especially that Ben Sira calls Job a prophet (xliv. 8), and that he places him between Ezekiel and the twelve Minor Prophets.

Another piece of circumstantial evidence with regard to the Old Testament Canon is to be found in the second chapter of Second Maccabees, where the author quotes a letter written in 124 B.C. as saying that Jeremiah the prophet gave them that were carried away the Law, charging them not to forget the commandments of the Lord, and exhorting them that the Law should not depart from their hearts and speaking of the things that were reported in the writings (or official archives) and commentaries (or memoirs) of Nehemiah; and how he, founding a library, gathered together the books of the Kings and the Prophets (Syr. "those of the Kings and those of the Prophets"), and those of David, and the epistles of the Kings concerning the holy gifts (Gk. *anathemata*; Syr. "offerings and sacrifices"); and that Judas in like manner gathered together all the things that had escaped (Syr. "had been scattered"), on ac-

count of the wars which we had: and they are still with us. Further in chapter xv. 9, Judas Maccabeus is represented as comforting the people out of the Law and the Prophets, and with putting them in mind of the battles which they won afore.

This book of Second Maccabees was probably written sometime in the first century B.C. and professes to be an epitome of an earlier work by Jason of Cyrene, unfortunately lost, but to which the author of the epitome attributes an exact handling in a work of five books of every particular of the wars of the Maccabees.

The author of this letter contained in 2 Maccabees seems to have divided the Jewish literature of Nehemiah's time into five or six parts, (1) the Law, (2) the books concerning Kings and Prophets, (3) the memoirs of Nehemiah, (4) the epistles of the Kings, and (5) the books of David. The Syriac version separates the Kings (which it renders kingdoms) from the Prophets, thus making six divisions. Of these divisions, three and four were added in the time of Nehemiah, and would be probably the subject-matter of our books of Ezra and Nehemiah. The books of David would be what Luke calls the Psalms. If Daniel were anywhere in any of these divisions, it would be in the second division of the Greek text, and in the second of its two sub-divisions in the Syriac version, that is, in the sub-division which concerned the Prophets.

It is true that the author of 2 Maccabees never mentions Daniel, nor does he refer to any of the events or persons recorded in his book. This, however, is more extraordinary, if the book of Daniel were written in the second century B.C. than if it had been composed four centuries earlier.

The next Jewish witness to the Canon is the Martyrdom of Isaiah embedded in the larger work called the Ascension of Isaiah. According to Prof. C. H. Charles, this work was probably known to the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, who seems to quote from it in Heb. xi. 37. If

so, it will have been written before A.D. 70. In Book iv. 21, 22, he speaks of the Psalms, which he makes to include the Parables⁵⁸ of David and the Proverbs of Solomon and the words of Korah, Ethan, and Asaph; and proceeds to speak of the words of Amos, Hosea, Micah, Joel, Nahum, Jonah, Obadiah, Habakkuk, Haggai, Zephaniah, Zechariah, and Malachi, and of the words of Joseph the Just,⁵⁹ and of the words of Daniel.

In this list, it will be observed that Daniel comes after the Minor Prophets and not among the Hagiographa; also, that the Twelve are arranged in an order not to be found elsewhere in any source. This unique arrangement shows conclusively that the books of the Old Testament were not fixed as to their positions when the book of the Ascension of Isaiah was written.

Attention should be called also to three other items of indirect evidence as to the Old Testament Canon. One is that to be derived from the Massoretic notes to be found at the end of most of the books of the Old Testament. Among these notes is usually one telling of the number of Sedarim, or sections, in each book. Thus, Genesis is said to have 43; Exodus, 29; Leviticus, 23; Numbers, 32; Deuteronomy, 27; Joshua, 14; Judges, 14; First and Second Samuel together, 34; First and Second Kings, 35. So, the number of Sedarim

⁵⁸ In the Ethiopic original, the word for psalms "mazameret" is clearly the equivalent of the Hebrew "miznor". The words, parables and proverbs, in Charles version are translations of the same word "mesaleyata" of the original, the equivalent of the Hebrew "meshalim". While more commonly used for the proverbs of Solomon, it is employed also in Psalms xlix. 4 and lxxviii. 2, and in Job xxvii. 1 and xxix. 1 in the sense of 'songs', or 'poems'.

⁵⁹ Prof. Charles thinks that this probably refers to an extra-canonical book of antichristian character. In connection with the name of Daniel, it would be more natural to refer them to the well known Joseph of Egypt, who like Daniel was a great interpreter of dreams. One is tempted to believe that the Ethiopic text has made a mistake of putting Joseph for Job. In the book of Job, i. 1, Job is called "the just". The letters for s and b are almost exactly alike in Ethiopic. If Job be the true reading, he would be classed among the Prophets, as in Ecclesiasticus xlix. 9, in the Hebrew and Syriac recensions.

is given at the end of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Job, Psalms, and Proverbs. The twelve Minor Prophets, Ezra and Nehemiah, and First and Second Chronicles, have one each between them. Now, of the five Megilloth, only Esther and Ecclesiastes have a statement of their Sedarim. In the case of Ruth and Lamentations, this was doubtless because when the Sedarim were made and counted, the former was still united to Judges and the latter to Jeremiah. As to the Song of Songs, it would seem as if it in like manner had been counted with Ecclesiastes; since the Sedarim are given but once for the two books. The Talmud and all the ancient lists except Augustine and Junilius place Ecclesiastes before the Song. Augustine agrees with the Spanish and Masoretic manuscripts in giving the opposite order. The printed Bibles follow the German and French manuscripts in giving the order of their use in the yearly festivals, that is, the Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther. Junilius has a singular division and classification of his own into *Historia*, *Prophetia*, *Proverbia*, and *Dogmatica*; putting the Law, Ruth, Esther, and Job in the *Historia*, the Psalms in the *Prophetia*, the Song of Songs in the *Proverbia*, and classing Ecclesiastes all by itself as *Dogmatica*. He attempts apparently to arrange his so-called *Prophetia* in a chronological order, resulting as follows: Psalms, Hosea, Isaiah, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi.

Since the arrangement is thus so obviously due to an attempt to give a combined logical and chronological arrangement, his testimony on this point should be ruled out. This will leave Augustine as the only ancient source placing Ecclesiastes after the Song of Songs. But Augustine, like Junilius, has an arrangement all his own; for he divides all the books into *Historiae* and *Prophetae*. Among the *Historiae*, he counts the five of the Law, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, four of Kings, two of Chronicles, Job, Tobias, Esther, Judith, two of Maccabees, and two of Esdras. Among the

Prophetae, he counts the Psalms, Proverbs, the Song of Songs, Ecclesiastes, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, the Twelve (Minor Prophets), and the four Major Prophets in the order, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, Ezekiel. It will be seen that he has invented an order for himself differing from all others, following the freedom of his own will without regard to the authorities that preceded him. Yet, it is noteworthy that the Massoretic and Spanish manuscripts have the same order as that of Augustine; and since the Massoretic manuscripts have transmitted to us the Massoretic notes, including the numbers of the Sedarim, the note giving the number of the Sedarim of the combined book is placed properly in our Bibles after the book of Ecclesiastes.

The testimony of the Massoretic notes on the Sedarim would indicate that these notes were made at a time when the Jews still counted Ruth as a part of Judges and Lamentations as a part of Jeremiah; and also, that when they were made, they counted Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs as one book. If Ruth and Lamentations could, after the time when these notes were made, be separated from among the Prophets, so also could Daniel and Esther be thus separated. The evidence goes to prove that the position and divisions of the books as at present constituted has nothing necessarily to do with their age and canonicity.

A second piece of circumstantial evidence bearing upon the date of Daniel is that suggested by Mr. Bevan when he says that Daniel may not have been admitted to the Canon because no selection from it appears in the Haphtaroth, or lessons read on Sabbaths and feast days in the Temple and synagogues. It must be admitted that no selection from Daniel is found in these lessons as read at present; but this is no proof that Daniel did not exist, or was not deemed a prophet, when these selections were made.

For, first, no one knows when these selections were first made and used. The earliest mention of their use is to be found in Luke iv. 16, where it is said that Jesus read in the synagogue on the Sabbath day the passage of Isaiah

beginning with the words; "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me." But, since the Jews of the first century A.D. certainly acknowledged Daniel to be a prophet, they cannot have failed to make a selection from his prophecy because they did not consider him to be a prophet.

If, however, it be said that the selections from the Prophets must have been made long before the first century A.D., I admit that they most probably were; but this is no proof that the book of Daniel did not exist when they were made, or that it was not then placed among the Prophets, or even that selections from it were not at that time read in the synagogue services. For Büchler and others have shown beyond a doubt that three times as many passages were once read as are read today, that the limiting of the length to be read was late, and that passages from some of the prophets from which there are at present no selections were once read. The evidence collected above goes to show that only such sections were selected as magnified the Law and the Sabbath and the nationalistic hopes and aspirations of the Jews. Most of them have some readily visible point of contact with the portion of the Law which was to be read on the day for which the particular Haphtara was selected. Thus at the feast of the passover, such portions of the prophetic books as Joshua v. 2-vi. 27 which recounts the great passover at Gilgal, and 2 Kings xxiii. 1-27 which tells of the great passover of Josiah, were read. For Exodus xxv-xxx. 10, which gives the plan of the tabernacle, or Exodus xxxv-xl, which give an account of the completion of the tabernacle, the portions chosen as Haphtaroth are from 1 Kings v. 26 to vii. 51. For the passage, Ex. xxx. 11 following, which tells about the golden calf, the appropriate Haphtara is the account of the controversy between Elijah and Ahab recorded in 1 Kings xviii. 1-39. The account of the spies of Jericho is read with Numbers xiii, which tells of the other spies who were sent to spy out the land. The Haphtaroth, then, were selected with a regard to the appropriateness of their

contents for the occasion, and for the portion of the Law which they were meant to illustrate. Those who made the selections were the judges of what they deemed to be appropriate. Some of us might differ from these judges as to the aptness of some of their selections. We might even go so far as to contend that some of their principles of selection were wrong. We might have taken one from Haggai, which they apparently did not. We might have retained one, or more, of the portions which once were read from Zephaniah and Nahum, which the modern Hebrews have rejected. We might, possibly, have found some portion in Daniel appropriate to be read, which they apparently did not find. But the fact remains that the selection of the Haphtaroth had nothing to do with the age or canonicity of the books nor, as far as we know, with the position of a book among the divisions of the Old Testament as they were constituted at the time when these Haphtaroth were chosen. Did Mr. Bevan ever attempt to select a few passages from the book of Daniel which he thinks more appropriate for reading in the services of the synagogue on any given occasion, or along with any particular portion of the Law, than that which as a matter of fact is now employed? I for one think that the Jews have done about the best that was possible in harmony with the principles upon which they acted in the making of their choice.

Further, it seems to me that what we have just learned about the Haphtaroth affords the best explanation possible for the reduction of the number of the books in the prophetic division from its earlier number as given by Josephus to the number as derived from the list of prophetic books as given in the Mishna, that is, from 13 to 8. When once the Haphtaroth had been selected, a reason would at once be apparent why the books in which they were contained should be put and kept together for readiness of use in the services of the synagogue; just as in later times the five Megilloth were put together for the same purpose, or, as in the modern Vienna edition of Adelbert della

Torre, we find the Hebrew Torah, the Targum of Onkelos, the Five Megilloth, and various prayers and comments published in one volume, together with the appropriate Haphtaroth.

Such considerations as this last lead us naturally to the evidence as to the divisions and arrangements of the Old Testament books to be derived from the way in which we know that ancient books were written. In the pre-Christian times books were written upon tablets of clay or stone, or upon rolls of papyrus, or skin; so that instead of one book, the Old Testament contained from 22 to 39 books according to the number of rolls upon which it was written. These books could be arranged in any order that suited the good pleasure of their owner. According to any system of arrangement, logical or chronological, the Law would naturally be put first; but the lists show that even here Melito and Leontius placed Numbers before Leviticus. The early editions of the printed Bible put the Megilloth immediately after the Law, though all the manuscripts, versions, and ancient lists, either put them all together in the third part of the Canon, or some among the Prophets, and some among the Poetical books. This will account, also, for the fact that no two ancient sources agree as to the order of the books. As the lists have been handed down to us, it would be impossible for any one to say where certain books might be found. Job, for example, is placed by Cyril and by Epiphanius (in one of his three lists) immediately after the Law; whereas in the Codex Sinaiticus, it is the last book of all. Ruth, Lamentations, Chronicles, Esther, Psalms,—all shift their positions according to the pleasure of the owner, or the writer of the list. Some books, never acknowledged as canonical by the Jewish church, such as Tobit, Judith, and Wisdom, became mingled in certain collections of private owners of religious literature with the Holy Books, and in this manner probably they at first assumed a semi-canonical character, and were afterwards listed by their indiscriminating possessors among the can-

onical books. In the case of Daniel, however, it is found in all lists and sources, in all ages, always among the canonical books, and always in the ancient sources among the Prophets, except in the list found in the *Baba Bathra*.

CONCLUSIONS

The evidence given above and its discussion permit only of the following conclusions:

1. That the position of a book in the Hebrew Canon was not determined by the time at which it was written.

2. That the position of a book in the list of the Mishna, or of the Hebrew manuscripts, versions, and editions, does not determine the time at which it was admitted to the Canon.

3. That all the earlier Hebrew sources, and all the Greek, Latin, Syriac, and Armenian sources put Daniel among the Prophets.

4. That Daniel's genuineness, or its right to be in the Canon, was never disputed by the ancient Jews or Christians.

5. That there is no external evidence, direct or indirect, except the argument from the silence of *Ecclesiasticus*, that Daniel was not composed till the time of the Maccabees.

6. That the silence of *Ecclesiasticus* is more than offset by the silence of First and Second Maccabees, and of all other sources, as to the origination of any such book, or the existence of the author of any such book, at the time of the Maccabees.

7. That there is no direct evidence of the existence of a threefold division earlier than the prologue of *Jesus ben Sira*, written in 132 B.C.

8. That the absence of any selection from Daniel in the *Haphtaroth* does not prove that the book of Daniel was not in existence, or acknowledged as canonical, when the *Haphtaroth* were chosen.

9. That Daniel was always considered by Josephus, and

by the writers of the New Testament, to be a prophet, and that his book was placed by the same authorities among the prophetic books.

10. That all the early Hebrew authorities which place Daniel among the Prophets, agree with the Mishna in holding to a threefold division of the Canon.

11. That the testimony that we possess does not show that the second part of the Canon was closed before the books of the third part were all written.

12. That the assumption that the division of the Hebrew Canon called the Prophets in our present editions of the Hebrew Bible was doubtless formed prior to the Hagiographa, is unfounded, inasmuch as there is no evidence that this division as it is now made was in existence before the second century A.C. ?

13. That all witnesses agree in putting the Law first; and that Melito and Leontius alone change the order of the books of the Law, in that they put Numbers before Leviticus.

14. That not one of the ancient witnesses puts the five Megilloth together, not even the Talmud.

15. That in nearly all the lists, the five poetical books are placed together.

16. That the only great difference of order between Philo, Luke, and Josephus, representing the earliest Hebrew arrangement, and the early Christian lists, arises from the fact that the former put the poetical books at the end, whereas the latter usually place them before the sixteen books of the Prophets.

17. That the books of the Old Testament Canon were never authoritatively and fixedly arranged in any specific order, either by the Jews, or by the Christians.

18. That the order has nothing to do with the canonicity, nor necessarily even with the date of a book.

19. That length, supposed authorship, subject-matter, and convenience, as well as the material upon which a book

was written, were the potent factors in all the ancient arrangements of the books.

20. That since the modern Jews have changed the position of Ruth, Lamentations, and Esther, to suit their convenience in the public service, there is every reason to believe that their so-called book of the Prophets was collected together into one for the same reason; and that the omission of Daniel from this collection had nothing to do either with its age or canonicity, but simply with the fact that it was not employed in these public services.

21. That all the testimony that the ancient Jewish and Christian sources give, bearing upon the time of the composition of the Old Testament books, is consentient in granting the claims of the books themselves as to their historicity, genuineness, and authority.

22. That the determining factor in the canonization of a book was its supposed age and author, and its agreement with the Law.

23. That in accordance with these rules Ecclesiasticus, Tobit, Maccabees, and other apocryphal books were rejected from the Canon.

24. That those who rely upon documentary evidence, cannot escape the conclusion that the indictment against the Book of Daniel on the ground that it is not among the Prophets is false; and that in so far as the age and canonicity of the book of Daniel are assailed on the ground of its position in the Canon, the old view stands approved.

Princeton.

ROBERT DICK WILSON.